## Applied Surface Science
## Room 209 B W - Session AS-TuA
## Theory and Data

**Moderators: Steve Consiglio**, Tokyo Electron, **Jeffrey Terry**, Illinois Institute of Technology

2:45pm **AS-TuA-3 Artificial Intelligence Algorithms for Materials Characterization Analysis***, **Min Long**,* Boise State University **INVITED**

The analysis of materials characterization techniques is complex and has typically been carried out by highly experienced/trained personnel, requiring significant human effort to extract and interpret meaningful physicochemical insights. This paradigm will be severely challenged by modern and next-generation instruments with high data collection rates, which are orders of magnitude faster than the data can be analyzed using current resources. This problem can even cause reproducibility challenges, one of the major issues affecting the scientific community, due to improper analysis of large and growing data sets. Artificial intelligence (AI) models informed by domain knowledge provide opportunities to address these challenges. We explored AI algorithms and selected a number of them to develop an AI-based spectral analysis framework, Neo, enabling automatic analysis of data from various types of measurements with high accuracy, performance, and reproducibility. The algorithms we adopted include genetic algorithms, differential evolution, and neuroevolution algorithms that can search for optima of physical and chemical properties of materials that lead to high-quality fits of the experimental spectra. A human analyst can first suggest a set of initial parameters potentially present in the sample, used as theoretical standards, and pass it to the framework. The framework will then evaluate those temporary solutions using fitness functions, adjust them by searching for improved solutions in the large multidimensional parameter space of combinations of these materials, until it can determine the set of structural parameters that best reproduce the experimental data. The framework integrates domain knowledge by not only finding the best mathematical description of the data but also the most physically and chemically meaningful results to improve the interpretability of models. The framework and its specialized sub-packages have been applied to various spectroscopy measurements, such as extended X-ray absorption fine structure (EXAFS), nanoindentation load-displacement curve, X-ray emission spectroscopy (XES). We are also planning to extend this framework to other measurements like X-ray photoelectron spectroscopy (XPS). Our results have shown that our methods can successfully provide refined structures in simple molecules, bulk crystals, and from an operando lithium-ion battery with much less human intervention in comparison with conventional methods.

3:15pm **AS-TuA-5 Fourier Denoising of XPS Data: An Algorithm for Automating the Identification of the Cutoff of the Gauss-Hermite Filter in Reciprocal Space and Feature Identification in XPS Spectra***, **Alvaro J. Lizarbe**, Matthew R. Linford, Kristopher S. Wright, Garrett Lewis,* Brigham Young University*; David E. Aspnes,* North Carolina State University*; David J. Morgan,* Cardiff University, UK*; Mark Isaacs,* University College London*; Jeff Terry,* Illinois Institute of Technology*; Stanislav Průša,* Brno University of Technology

Introduction

Especially in X-ray Photoelectron Spectroscopy (XPS), large amounts of data and information are collected in its various modes that include imaging, depth profiling, stability, and operando studies. We recently published a paper[1] introducing Fourier analysis with a Gauss-Hermite filter function as a way to denoise X-ray Photoelectron Spectroscopy (XPS) data. While we always advocate for high quality data to be collected, Fourier analysis offers ways to improve collected data when the best possible signal-to-noise ratios cannot be obtained. Imperfect data are commonly obtained in sample damage studies due to changes in the sample, when elemental concentrations or low, when weak photoemission cross sections (seen in HAXPES) exist, when large numbers of spectra are collected in imaging studies, or when there is limited instrument time available. In such cases, Fourier analysis offers a mathematical approach to reduce noise and enhance signal quality, making it a valuable tool for XPS data analysis. We recommend that the original and smoothed data always be shown together. The Gauss-Hermite filter is a type of low-pass filter that applies a gradual, sigmoidal cutoff to low and high frequencies, allowing for a smooth transition between noise and signal. Currently, the position of this cutoff is adjusted manually by the analyst.

Work to be Presented.

The user must select the cutoff for the Gauss-Hermite filter we use to Fourier denoise XPS data. While the approximate location for this cutoff is generally clear from the shape of the Fourier coefficients in reciprocal space, it would be advantageous to be able to automate this process. In this talk, we describe an algorithm that successfully identifies the cutoff for the Gauss-Hermite filter, which should make this general approach to data denoising more widely applicable. This cutoff is based on statistical analyses of the fits. As a useful expansion to this capability, we show how this general approach can be applied when a high-order polynomial is used to fit carbon Auger data for D-parameter calculations.[2]

(1) Lizarbe, A. J.; Wright, K. S.; Lewis, G.; Murray, G.; Austin, D. E.; Terry, J.; Aspnes, D. E.; Linford, M. R. The case for denoising/smoothing X-ray photoelectron spectroscopy data by Fourier analysis. *J. Vac. Sci. Technol. A* **2025**, *43* (3). DOI: 10.1116/6.0004167

(2) N. Fairley, G. Compagnini, V. Scardaci, J. Baltrus, A. Roberts, A. Barlow, P. Cumpson and J. Baltrusaitis, Surf. Interface Anal. 55 (3), 165 (2023).

4:00pm **AS-TuA-8 Fourier Denoising of XPS Data: Application of the Gauss-Hermite Filter Function to Carbon Auger D-Parameter, HAXPES, and LEIS data, and an Improved Algorithm for Reducing End-Point and Slope Discontinuity Artifacts***, **Matthew R. Linford**, Alvaro J. Lizarbe, Kristopher S. Wright, Garrett Lewis,* Brigham Young University*; David E. Aspnes,* North Carolina State University*; David J. Morgan,* Cardiff University, UK*; Mark Isaacs,* University College London, UK*; Jeff Terry,* Illinois Institute of Technology*; Stanislav Průša,* Brno University of Technology, Czechia

A general trend in surface and material characterization is the collection of larger amounts of data and information. In X-ray photoelectron spectroscopy (XPS), large numbers of spectra are often collected in imaging, depth profiling, damage, and operando studies. These large quantities of data present challenges to the analyst who always has limited time for data analysis. Accordingly, mathematical tools for XPS data analysis should become more relevant and important, not less. We recently presented the case for the Fourier denoising of XPS data (Lizarbe, A. J.; Wright, K. S.; Lewis, G.; Murray, G.; Austin, D. E.; Terry, J.; Aspnes, D. E.; Linford, M. R. *J. Vac. Sci. Technol. A* **2025**, *43* (3)). The highest quality data should be collected whenever possible, and mathematical 'tricks' aren't, in general, a viable way to clean up extremely poor data. However, it's not always possible to collect data with the best possible signal-to-noise ratios. Imperfect data are often collected, when an element or chemical state of an element is present at a very low concentration, when cross section for photoemission is low, like in HAXPES, when many spectra must be collected in a short period of time, as in imaging studies, or when instrument time is simply expensive. For these reasons, noise removal from adequate data has a place in XPS data analysis. We showed that the traditional Savitzky-Golay and Boxcar smooths are lacking in their ability to successfully remove noise from data. These deficiencies, when observed in reciprocal space, demonstrate that these common smooths don't fully remove noise (high frequencies) from XPS data. A better approach to XPS data smoothing is with the Gauss-Hermite filter, which is applied in reciprocal space and has a sigmoidal shape. Below a user-selected cutoff, it preserves all the low-frequency information in a spectrum (low-index Fourier coefficients, signal), while removing high-frequency information.

In this talk, we describe an extension of these approaches to calculating the carbon Auger D-parameter and to smoothing HAXPES data. In addition, we show Fourier smoothing of data from a different technique: low-energy ion scattering (LEIS) data. LEIS spectra can present a challenge to data analysis because of their high sputter backgrounds at low energies. Finally, because numerical artifacts are introduced by Fourier denoising when there are end-point or slope discontinuities in the data, we show an improved algorithm for Fourier denoising via the Gauss-Hermite filter. This approach uses an improved function over what is currently in the software, which substantially reduces the current slope discontinuity in the current procedure.

4:15pm **AS-TuA-9 Identification of Materials from TOF SIMS Spectra via Machine Learning***, Lev Gelb*[1]*, **Amy Walker**,* University of Texas at Dallas

We present progress towards analysis of TOF SIMS data using machine learning (ML) methods. We posit that TOF SIMS is not more widely used because the data is complex and hard to interpret without expert knowledge, and investigate how machine learning might help. We primarily train models on simulated "big" data sets constructed by combining and

[1] **JVST Highlighted Talk**

modifying experimental spectra, with a focus on neural-network (NN) architectures.

Two applications are considered: identification of (presumed) homogeneous samples (which could be even a single pixel in a TOF SIMS image), and separation of multicomponent mixtures. In both cases, the sample consists of compound(s) which appear in some reference library, which is the basis for training. Complicating factors include statistical noise, background, calibration errors, and the likely case that the reference spectra were not taken under exactly the same conditions (primary ion, ion energy, instrument manufacturer, etc.) as the data to be analyzed.

In the first application, we focus on the extent to which improved spectral resolution helps (or hinders) analysis, the effect of reference library size on model performance, the effects of background counts and contamination by other species, and ways to have the model indicate that the sample is *not*described in the library. The NN approach is also compared with more straightforward spectral overlap-based methods and alternative machine-learning algorithms.

In the second application, the sample is assumed to consist of at least two components contained in the reference library. In addition to the complicating factors already mentioned, the presence of matrix effects can significantly complicate automated analysis. As in the first application, NN model performance is quantified and compared with overlap-based methods.

4:30pm **AS-TuA-10 Benefits of a Modern File Format for ToF-SIMS Imaging**, ***Alex Henderson***, University of Manchester, UK **INVITED**

ToF-SIMS data is typically acquired into the proprietary file format of the instrument vendor. The vendor's software has visualisation tools and data analysis routines that are tuned to that format, and that can be sufficient for the end-user. But what if we want to do something the vendor has yet to implement? What about those machine-learning or deep-learning AI methods we read about? Can we share our data with our collaborators? Can we publish it openly, as mandated by most academic funding providers?

Most vendors offer one or two data export options. Sometimes these are only suitable for single spectra, or images of pre-selected ions. Often the file format is something thought up by the vendor, or can be missing important metadata.

For SIMS there are only a limited number of open file formats, each with their limitations. Examples include ISO 14976 (the "VAMAS format") for spectra and maps, and imzML, originally developed for MALDI, for hyperspectral imaging. Each of these has issues with the size of files generated by modern instrumentation, or modalities such as image depth profiling.

In this presentation we will explore formats from other 'big data' domains such as climate science and astronomy, to see whether these can be adapted to our data. In the course of this, we will explore peak detection, data compression, out-of-core data access, visualisation, and machine learning.

We will also present open questions regarding metadata and invite the community to be involved in the process of developing a common format suitable for our requirements.

5:00pm **AS-TuA-12 Template Matching Approach for Automated Determination of Crystal Phase and Orientation of Grains in 4D-STEM Precession Electron Diffraction Data for Hafnium Zirconium Oxide Ferroelectric Thin Films**, ***Alain Diebold***, CNSE, University at Albany, SUNY; *Colin Ophus,* Stanford University; *Amir Kordijazi,* University of Southern Maine; *Steven Consiglio,* TEL Technology Center, America, LLC; *Sarah Lombardo, Dina Triyoso, Kandabara Tapily,* TEL Technology Center, America, LLC, USA; *Ana Mian,* TESCAN GROUP, Inc.; *Nithin BVI Shankar,* TESCAN GROUP, a.s., Czechia; *Tomáš Morávek,* TESCAN GROUP, a.s.,; *Narendraraj Chandran,* TESCAN GROUP, a.s, Czechia; *Robert Stroud,* TESCAN GROUP, Inc.; *Gert Leusink,* TEL Technology Center, America, LLC

Hafnium and zirconium oxide based thin films deposited by atomic layer deposition (ALD) are used as dielectric layers in advanced semiconductor devices. These films can also be stabilized in a ferroelectric phase for applications in memory, logic, and synaptic devices. ALD typically produces small-grained polycrystalline films containing a mixture of ferroelectric and non-ferroelectric phases with varying crystallographic orientations. Routine characterization of these films is critical for the research, development, and manufacturing of next-generation devices. While X-ray diffraction (XRD) is widely used for phase identification, it is limited to large-area, unpatterned thin films. Electron microscopy-based methods, in contrast, enable site-specific characterization within device structures, where local phase distributions may differ from blanket film samples.

This presentation discusses automated analysis of four-dimensional scanning transmission electron microscopy (4D-STEM) precession electron diffraction (PED) datasets for hafnium zirconium oxide (HZO) thin films in TiN/HZO/TiN capacitor structures. STEM lamellae are often thicker than the average HZO grain size, resulting in dynamical diffraction contributions from multiple grains at many probe positions. Additionally, distinguishing between HZO crystal phases is challenging due to small differences in lattice parameters and the potential presence of multiple orthorhombic polymorphs, making automated phase mapping particularly difficult. PED offers advantages over nanobeam electron diffraction (NBED) for phase and orientation analysis, and we find that PED is necessary for reliable automated template matching in HZO diffraction data.

Although automated phase and orientation mapping of HZO films using 4D-STEM has been previously demonstrated, a detailed assessment of different analysis methods has been lacking. Here, we compare results from a commercial software package (NanoMEGAS ASTAR) with an open-source framework (py4DSTEM). Correlation between automated phase maps and electrical verification of ferroelectricity confirms the identification of the non-centrosymmetric orthorhombic space group 29 phase of HZO.

# Author Index

## Bold page numbers indicate presenter

**— A —**
Aspnes, David E.: AS-TuA-5, 1; AS-TuA-8, 1
**— C —**
Chandran, Narendraraj: AS-TuA-12, 2
Consiglio, Steven: AS-TuA-12, 2
**— D —**
Diebold, Alain: AS-TuA-12, **2**
**— G —**
Gelb, Lev: AS-TuA-9, 1
**— H —**
Henderson, Alex: AS-TuA-10, **2**
**— I —**
Isaacs, Mark: AS-TuA-5, 1; AS-TuA-8, 1
**— K —**
Kordijazi, Amir: AS-TuA-12, 2
**— L —**
Leusink, Gert: AS-TuA-12, 2
Lewis, Garrett: AS-TuA-5, 1; AS-TuA-8, 1
Linford, Matthew R.: AS-TuA-5, 1; AS-TuA-8, **1**
Lizarbe, Alvaro J.: AS-TuA-5, **1**; AS-TuA-8, 1
Lombardo, Sarah: AS-TuA-12, 2
Long, Min: AS-TuA-3, **1**
**— M —**
Mian, Ana: AS-TuA-12, 2
Morávek, Tomáš: AS-TuA-12, 2
Morgan, David J.: AS-TuA-5, 1; AS-TuA-8, 1
**— O —**
Ophus, Colin: AS-TuA-12, 2
**— P —**
Průša, Stanislav: AS-TuA-5, 1; AS-TuA-8, 1
**— S —**
Shankar, Nithin BVI: AS-TuA-12, 2
Stroud, Robert: AS-TuA-12, 2
**— T —**
Tapily, Kandabara: AS-TuA-12, 2
Terry, Jeff: AS-TuA-5, 1; AS-TuA-8, 1
Triyoso, Dina: AS-TuA-12, 2
**— W —**
Walker, Amy: AS-TuA-9, **1**
Wright, Kristopher S.: AS-TuA-5, 1; AS-TuA-8, 1