Growth, Defect Formation, and Morphology Control of Germanium–Silicon Semiconductor Nanowire Heterostructures
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ABSTRACT: By the virtue of the nature of the vapor—liquid—solid (VLS) growth process in semiconductor nanowires (NWs) and their small size, the nucleation, propagation, and termination of stacking defects in NWs are dramatically different from that in thin films. We demonstrate germanium–silicon axial NW heterostructure growth by the VLS method with 100% composition modulation and use these structures as a platform to understand how defects in stacking sequence force the ledge nucleation site to be moved along or pinned at a single point on the triple-phase circumference, which in turn determines the NW morphology. Combining structural analysis and atomistic simulation of the nucleation and propagation of stacking defects, we explain these observations based on preferred nucleation sites during NW growth. The stacking defects are found to provide a fingerprint of the layer-by-layer growth process and reveal how the 19.5° kinking in semiconductor NWs observed at high Si growth rates results from a stacking-induced twin boundary formation at the NW edge. This study provides basic foundations for an atomic level understanding of crystalline and defective ledge nucleation and propagation during [111] oriented NW growth and improves understanding for control of fault nucleation and kinking in NWs.
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Atomic level understanding of the growth processes that combine different materials enables a growth-by-design approach to implement device architectures for enhanced control over charge transport in semiconductors. The vapor—liquid—solid (VLS) growth of nanowires (NWs) provides one route to achieve such heterostructures with the special advantage of being able to vary both doping and composition along the length of the NW, thereby enabling energy band-edge engineering in the charge transport direction. Such band engineering along the length of the NW provides an added degree of freedom to tailor transport characteristics of transistors based on NW channel design, but has been challenging to accomplish in Ge–Si heterostructured NWs due to difficulties in rapid growth of high quality structures with large compositional changes. For VLS growth, these difficulties arise from the disparate growth temperatures and chemical potential-induced instabilities in the liquid growth seed upon switching between Si and Ge, which lead to interruption of growth, defect formation, and NW kinking. However, if controlled, these effects at heterostructure interfaces may be used as a fingerprint for investigating defect nucleation and propagation mechanisms during layer-by-layer growth in VLS grown NWs, providing new insight into the atomistics of NW growth. Prior work on NW growth defects and interfaces has emphasized III–V materials which generally exhibit stacking faults and polymorphs oriented perpendicular to the growth axis. In a few other cases, twin boundaries parallel to the growth axis of Si NWs have been observed, but the detailed mechanism by which they form and their relation to NW kinking has not been previously reported.

Here, we exploit understanding of growth kinetics to achieve 100% axial composition modulation of Ge–Si NW heterostructures with liquid phase growth and utilize such heterostructures for tracking ledge nucleation of stacking defects and their propagation during their VLS growth. Precise sequencing of the gas precursor pressure and temperature upon transitioning from Ge to Si during VLS growth is shown to give pure Ge and pure Si NW segments with dimensions suitable for detailed structural study as well as for device applications. For typical Si segment growth rates (~8 nm/s) with high nucleation efficiency, we observe the onset of single two-dimensional defects near the heterostructure interface in the Si segment which propagates along the growing NW. These structures allow us to demonstrate key aspects of the VLS layer-by-layer growth mechanism, as well as advance current understanding for limiting defect and kink formation. This is accomplished through microscopy analysis and molecular dynamics (MD) simulations that strongly
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corroborate the interpretation of the layer-by-layer growth process and provide the foundations for an atomic level understanding of crystalline and defective ledge nucleation and propagation in semiconductor NWs, without the requirement of in situ experiments. This understanding in turn provides insights for suppressing such defects and kinking in NWs.

One challenging obstacle for realizing 100% compositional modulation in germanium–silicon (Ge–Si) semiconductor NWs by VLS growth is the disparity in their growth temperatures due to differences in the precursor decomposition properties. As a result, the reported composition modulation in VLS grown Si–SiGe heterostructure NWs has been typically limited to less than ~30%. Recently, abrupt Ge–Si heterostructure NWs with 100% composition modulation have been obtained using a solid Au–Al alloy catalyst for solid phase NW growth. However, solid phase growth is much slower compared to its liquid phase counterpart, and the detailed growth mechanisms may not be the same as investigated here for liquid mediated growth.

Single phase VLS NW growth typically occurs at ~270–380 °C for Ge using GeH4 and 400–600 °C for Si using SiH4. For heterostructure NW growth, it has been observed that while switching from one material to another, the differences of surface energy and chemical potential between the Au alloy seed and the two materials may destabilize the Au particle and prevent layer-by-layer axial elongation. In that case, off-axis (kinked) growth or Au seed slippage from the top of the NW and growth down the NW sidewalls often occurs. Such undesired growth has also been observed during synthesis of homogeneous NWs for growth at too low temperatures or high partial pressures. We find that maintaining a liquid Au particle with high supersaturation is required to start the epitaxial growth of a Si segment on the previously grown Ge NW, as well as to stabilize the Au seed on top of the NW and prevent kinking. Such 100% Ge to Si growth is demonstrated in Figure 1 by pulsing GeH4 (30% in H2) after a temperature ramp from 270 to 440 °C, followed by immediate introduction of SiH4 (50% in H2) to carry out the Si segment growth. Here, the Ge NW nucleation was carried at ~380 °C for 2 min following by Ge NW elongation for 5 min at ~270 °C both at 2 Torr chamber pressure (0.6 Torr GeH4 partial pressure), after which the temperature was ramped to 440 °C with a ramp rate of 2 °C/s and was stabilized for 7 min prior to pulsing GeH4 for 25 s (0.3 Torr GeH4 partial pressure) followed by SiH4 flow for 30 s at ~3 Torr chamber pressure (1.5 Torr SiH4 partial pressure) to grow the Si segment without any pump/purge in between the two gases. Without pulsing GeH4 prior to SiH4 flow, deficiency in nucleation and wormlike growth of the Si segment were observed with no well-defined long-range growth orientation. A second successful growth method is to maintain the GeH4 precursor pressure during the temperature ramp and then switching to SiH4 at the Si segment growth temperature (Figure 2). Here, the Ge NWs were nucleated at ~370 °C for 1.5 min at 2 Torr followed by Ge NW elongation for 10 min at ~270 °C, both at 2 Torr chamber pressure (0.6 Torr GeH4 partial pressure), after which the temperature was ramped to ~430 °C with a ramp rate of 2 °C/s in the presence of GeH4 flow (0.5 Torr chamber pressure, 0.15 Torr GeH4 partial pressure) at which GeH4 was switched off and SiH4 was switched on for 1.5 min at ~28 Torr chamber pressure (1.4 Torr SiH4 partial pressure) without any pump/purge in between the two gases. We note here that maintaining the GeH4 partial pressure during temperature ramp leads to additional vapor—solid deposition of Ge on the Ge NW sidewalls resulting in a larger diameter Ge NW segment compared to that of the starting Au colloid and Si NW segment. Both methods result in high yield epitaxial growth of Ge–Si axial NW heterostructures with 100% composition modulation and without Si radial overcoating on the Ge segment. However, increasing the temperature in vacuum or H2 ambient leads to Au diffusion on the NW sidewalls, which was confirmed by transmission electron microscopy (TEM), and induces surface roughness.

Figure 1. Cross-sectional SEM image of epitaxial Ge–Si heterostructure NWs on a Ge (111) substrate. The inset shows a z-contrast SEM image of a 100 nm diameter Ge–Si axial heterostructure with the Au growth seed at its tip.

**Figure 2.** (a–c) SEM images of straight Ge–Si axial NW heterostructures with different starting Au colloid diameters, all synthesized simultaneously in the same growth run, and (a’)–(c’) their correspondent backscattering images showing distinct Ge and Si segments. (d–f) Typical Ge–Si axial NW heterostructures that display a systematic kink in the Si segment for any given diameter and (d’–f’) their correspondent backscattering images. The right panel shows statistical counts from wires grown on Ge(111) substrate (~100 data points per diameter) accounting for different kink orientations with red (straight, [111]), green (kinked, [111] → [112]), and blue (kinked, [111] → other (111)). These SEM images are taken on TEM grids such that elemental mapping and analysis are not affected by the growth substrate. Scale bar in (a) for (a–c) and in (d) for (d’–f’) are 1 μm.
due to Au-catalyzed sidewall growth, as can be readily observed on the Ge segment in the scanning electron microscope (SEM) image inset of Figure 1. Keeping a GeH₄ overpressure during the temperature ramp maintains layer-by-layer growth throughout the temperature cycling and prevents Au diffusion; it also enhances the vapor–solid growth rate on the Ge-NW sidewalls that leads to a larger Ge NW diameter compared to the starting Au colloid diameter. Such heterostructured NWs have demonstrated several orders of magnitude superior device performance over their homogeneous counterparts as discussed elsewhere.²⁰ We focus here on atomic level analysis of the VLS growth process in terms of the nucleation of defects and the role of these defects in modulating the nanowire structure. We also noted that for the NWs shown in Figure 2, the SiGe transition region (composition change from 10 to 90%, Supporting Information Figure S1) was found to be ∼0.85d – 1.4d for d = 40–100 nm, where d is the NW diameter, and ∼2d for d ≤ 30 nm due to enhanced solute concentrations at small diameters.²¹ It is also possible that the presence of GeH₄ in the chamber when SiH₄ is introduced has also an effect on the length of the transition regions, however, such effect could not be isolated because pumping GeH₄ from the chamber prior to SiH₄ introduction leads to destabilization of the Au growth seed. Such transition regions (∼d) are typical for liquid phase growth, and while longer compared to the abrupt transition observed for growth using a solid catalyst, they allow the realization of novel bandgap engineered devices.²⁰

In the VLS mechanism, growth is understood to proceed in a layer-by-layer process with ledge nucleation occurring at the triple-phase interface.²²,²³ Thus nucleation and propagation of defects during growth in semiconductor NWs can be dramatically different from that observed in thin films where defects can nucleate at many sites such as grain boundary, surfaces, etc., whereas the nucleation of defects in NWs likely occurs at the edge of their faceted surface due to the small cross-section across their diameter. Particularly at higher supersaturations and growth rates in NWs, the probability of stacking adatoms at faulted locations is expected to be non-negligible. Such effects are relevant here to the Si segments of the heterostructure NWs where Si is known to have higher supersaturations in Au relative to Ge, and generally tend to grow in {211} orientations at higher SiH₄ partial pressures²⁵ that favor enhanced nucleation efficiencies.

Detailed analysis of the microstructure of the Si segments of our Ge–Si heterostructures, as shown in Figure 3, reveals the presence of a single fault per NW segment that nucleates from the same NW facet (left side of NW in Figure 3b where the arrow indicates the growth direction). First, a stacking fault (SF) nucleates and propagates in the {112} orientation indicative of a stacking fault on a {111} growth surface (plane F₁ in Figure 4a) while the NW continues to grow in the {111} orientation. During layer-by-layer growth, nucleation at the triple-phase interface is pinned at the intersection of the SF with the top liquid-NW interface. As a result, access to the low energy {111} facet is prohibited, thereby preventing nucleation of any additional defects until the SF is terminated at the opposite side of the NW. Such a SF requires a NW segment length of d/tan(19.5°) before it terminates at the other surface of the NW, where d is the NW diameter and 19.5° is the angle between the {112} and {111} orientations, and is ∼85 nm for d = 30 nm, which is in agreement with experiment (Figure 3b). Once the SF terminates on the opposite side of the NW, access to the low energy {111} facet is again permitted as nucleation of the next atomic layer occurs.

From Figure 3b, we observe that a twin boundary (TB) is immediately nucleated at the low energy (111) facet at which the preceding stacking fault nucleated, where adatom stacking in two consecutive fault positions leads to TB formation. HRTEM confirms that this process occurs within one atomic layer of the termination of the SF and nucleation switching back to the low energy (111) facet (Supporting Information Figure S2 shows another HRTEM image at same area of Figure 3b). Once formed, theledge nucleation occurs at the TB/{110} facet interface and propagates on the two {111} growth surfaces
(Figure 3b,c) and remains there throughout the growth process. This condition is referred to as the pinning of the nucleation at one point on the triple-phase circumference. The NW diameter consequently increases (see Figure 4j; another HRTEM image at the kink in Figure 3b) until the increasing line tension of the stretched liquid Au surface at the triple-phase interface forces the NW growth direction to switch to the [112] orientation, resulting in a 19.5° kink with respect to the initial [111] growth axis.

**Figure 4.** (a,b) Side and top view of a [111] oriented Si NW showing 6 {110} facets with three {111} inclined triangular facets at their intersections. Nucleation at three of these facets, (1T1) labeled as F1, (1T2) as F2, and (1T3) as F3, results in elongation along the NW growth direction, that is, away from the Ge NW base. (c,d) Side view taken from MD simulations showing nucleation on the (111) F1 facet in proper (c) or faulted (d) positions. The black arrows are inserted to guide the eye for a 4 atom cluster shifting to the faulted position. (e,f) Top (cross-section) and perspective side view of a NW with a stacking fault on the (1T1) as used for MD simulations of nucleation energy barriers at points labeled 1–7 in (e), which are 0.6, 1.4, 1.9, 1.93, 1.85, 1.93, and 1.93 eV, respectively. These energies are expected to be lowered in the presence of a liquid growth seed atop the NW. The nucleation energy is lowest at the [110]/SF interface (i.e., SF/triple-phase interface during NW growth). Thus nucleation is pinned at the SF/triple-phase interface and we can only obtain one fault per NW segment, as observed experimentally in Figure 3b. (g,h) High-contrast (g) and low-contrast magnified top view (h) of Ge–Si heterostructure NW growth from lithographically patterned Au dots showing the observed three possible kink directions (projected onto the top (111) plane) in agreement with MD simulations. The dashed arrows in (g) are in-plane projections of [112] Si segment growth orientation. The dashed cylindrical lines in (h) surround the Ge NW [110] facets and the arrow marks the Si NW (smaller diameter and darker contrast) growth direction. Nucleation of the Si segment appears clearly to emerge at two [110] facet interfaces (dashed hexagons in h) corresponding to F1, F2, or F3 in (b). (i) Side-view cartoon showing the progress of the TB from initial formation stage to the formation of the kink in the NW as growth changes from the [111] to the [112] direction. The color scheme in all panels of MD simulation is to provide a perspective of different atomic layers in 3D. (j) HRTEM image of the corresponding observed TB region showing the increase in NW diameter leading to the increased liquid Au line tension and change in growth direction.
Continuum modeling for other cases of NW growth has also noted that perturbations in the line tension of the growth seed may change the NW growth direction.26

Ledge nucleation during layer-by-layer growth remains pinned at the TB, preventing access to the low energy {111} facets, and the TB propagation continues to the NW tip (top right inset of Figure 3c). Additional extrinsic SFs near the Ge–Si interface that terminate within few monolayers have also been observed (see Supporting Information Figure S3), but are less common in our NWs. We also note that the presence of SF prior to TB formation is not anticipated to be a necessary condition for a TB stacking sequence to form, but this SF followed by a TB sequence has been observed in four NWs examined in detail with HRTEM for the present growth conditions with a similar structural behavior to the NW described in detail in this manuscript displayed in each case. Also, several tens of NWs that were characterized over the course of two years by TEM and displayed 19.5° kinking have all shown TB in their Si segment when oriented properly into a [110] zone axis in TEM. The relative prevalence of this kinked structure with NW diameter is indicated by the pie charts in Figure 2. We hypothesize that once a particular facet is selected through the formation of a stacking fault, the resulting slight twist in the NW, caused by the additional {111} plane on one side of the fault (left side of the NW in Figure 3b) with respect to the other, may cause the second stacking fault to occur on the same facet (both faults nucleated at the left side of Figure 3b).

The possibility of microscopic asymmetries in the facet length at the cross-section of the {110} facets cannot be ruled out; such asymmetries, however, have not been observed in the NWs we examined by SEM as shown in Figure 4h and Supporting Information Figure S5. These striking ex-situ observations of defect nucleation during NW growth establish new features of the VLS mechanism for layer-by-layer NW growth and are further supported by our MD simulations. We note that in situ experiments that discussed pressure induced kinking in Si NWs27 did not have enough resolution or control over NW orientation during the measurements to resolve such fault and kinking behavior on an atomic scale. We also note that the {111} to {111} kinking is frequently observed (Figure 2) and under certain growth conditions, the kink frequency can be pressure controlled.27

Wulff constructions for a [111] oriented NW resulted in a hexagonally shaped NW with six {110} type facets parallel to the growth direction. While several reports have inferred {211} type facets for the [111] oriented Si and Ge NWs54,28 the presence of the {110} facets for our growth conditions is demonstrated here by our combined electron microscopy and crystallographic analysis (see also Supporting Information Figures S6 and S7). As shown in Figure 4a,b, three inclined triangular {111} facets occur at the liquid-NW interfaces intersecting the {110} sidewall facets. MD simulations30,31 (See Supporting Information and Figure S4) have shown that atomic nucleation of succeeding layers in NW growth is energetically preferred at these triangular {111} facets marked F1, F2, and F3 in Figure 4b. Ledge nucleation is thus expected to occur at these inclined {111} facets and propagate on the cross-sectional (111) surface at the liquid–solid interface as each additional atomic layer of NW growth is completed. Such growth behavior from small facets followed by ledge propagation or dissolution at the liquid–solid interface has also been observed using in situ experiments for wurtzite Al2O3 NWs,33 Ge NWs,32 and Si, Ge, and GaAs NWs.33 Orienting NWs into a proper zone axis in these in situ studies is tedious and thus classification of the inclined plane at which NW nucleation occurs is nontrivial (added to this are the complexities of the roughening of low-energy facets during growth). These studies are generally at lower growth pressures and infers nucleation on {110} type planes.31 Since SF and TB defects do not form on {110} planes, nucleation on {110} facets would not appear to apply for our experimental conditions. In our MD simulations, we find that a four-atom cluster growing at the inclined {111} facet not only satisfies minimum energy requirements for nucleation of a stable cluster but is also necessary to maintain the same NW diameter and prevent rapid tapering if nucleation is only to proceed at the plane of the liquid–solid interface. Figure 4c,d shows two possible continuing growth structures: (c) a perfect structure and (d) a faulted structure for the four-atom cluster. MD calculations also showed that the minimum energy for the faulted structure involves a faulted dimer (see also Supporting Information Figure S4).

Ledge propagation then occurs from these {111} facets. By considering different possible nucleation sites for each new layer after SF nucleation, our MD simulations show that cluster nucleation is energetically favorable by ~2× (see Figure 4f) at the triple-phase interface with the SF (Figure 4e,f). This preference is precisely what imposes the condition of a single defect per NW segment length, as seen in experiment (see Figure 3b). For this condition, the nucleation site moves along the circumference of the NW as layer-by-layer deposition proceeds and the SF moves from the left facet to the right facet of the NW.

To support our hypothesis that the NW nucleation occurs at the inclined {111} facets at the interface between two {110} sidewall facets, we performed Ge–Si heterostructure NW growth from lithographically patterned Au dots on (111) Ge surfaces and observed kinking to typically occur in the three well-defined {112} orientations as projected in the top-view SEM image of Figure 4g. We note that lithographically patterned Au dots are used to exploit the known crystallographic orientation of the Ge(111) substrate that is defined through the initial epitaxial Ge NW growth. Thus we have a reference to determine the kink direction crystallographically for different viewing angles and kink orientations. Low-contrast SEM images have revealed that the kink in the Si segment originates at the interface between two sidewall {110} facets, as labeled in Figure 4h, which is in agreement with our MD simulation results of nucleation at one of the three {111} facets, labeled F1, F2, F3 in Figure 4b. Here, the {110} facet assignment is further supported by the observation of Figure 4h. Since we have determined by TEM that the kinked Si NW grows in the {112} orientation (Figure 3c), and since the direction of the Si NW growth is at 30° angle from the flat sidewall facet in Figure 4h, the sidewall facets are therefore of {110} type facets. Otherwise, the kinked Si NW segment would have to grow and point out from the flat facets if they were {112} type facets, which is contrary to our observations. This analysis assumes the same facets in the Ge and Si segments of the NW, which is consistent with the absence of planar faults perpendicular to the growth orientation of these NWs known to cause rotation. This is further supported by a perfect continuum of lattice structure from the Ge segment of the NW to the Si segment of the NW while both segments remain properly oriented into a {110} viewing direction (Supporting Information Figure S3). As further support for the three kinking directions originating from the interface between two {110} facets,
Supporting Information Figure S5 shows two separate larger fields of view with systematic kinking of the Si segments from our ordered growth experiments at lithographically defined locations, along with another set of SEM images showing the Si NW segment kink relative to the sidewall faceting. We also note that the twin-boundary line propagating throughout the length of the Si NW segment is observable by SEM as the sample is tilted while maintaining a [110] viewing perspective (Supporting Information Figure S5). Further, larger diameter NWs can show the faceted structure more clearly. In Figure S6, one can see a stacking fault in the Si segment of the NW necessitating that the viewing orientation is a [110] orientation. Since the observed facet in the Ge part of the NW is perpendicular to our viewing orientation, this facet has to be [110] type.

While we find in our experiments a single TB running down the entire Si segment length in support of a single nucleation site at the triple-line interface, there are other reports that found multiple TBs along the length of (112) oriented Si NWs.8 Such multiple TBs were observed at higher SiH4 partial pressures than we use here (ref 8 cites 2 Torr for the SiH4 partial pressure) and therefore at higher supersaturations and growth rates. Prior to kinking into a [112] orientation, the inclined (1T1) planes still exist at the NW surface. Ledge nucleation is still thermodynamically expected to happen at the TB/triple-line interface, but as the ledge propagates toward these (1T1) facets, Si adatom clusters may deposit at faulty locations at these facets leading to another TB formation. This process can happen multiple times as long as the NW is still growing in the [111] orientation with (1T1) facets. As the NW changes to form the kink due to line-tension distortion and resumes growth along a (112) orientation, the NW becomes bounded by a flat (1T1) facet and no additional TBs can be formed. Ledge nucleation can happen at any of the TB/triple-line interfaces and these TBs nucleated at the [111] segment of the NW will thus continue down the entire length of the newly formed (211) Si NW segment. We note that the streaks in Figure 3c, just above the TB, are due to local strain and small volume at the edge of the NW but display no additional SFs or TBs.

The nucleation efficiency of the Si segments in the axial Ge—Si heterostructure NWs is increased for growth at high Si supersaturations, however higher supersaturations lead to more kinking. As the NW diameter increases, the facets F1, F2, and F3 of Figure 3b become larger and therefore the stability of a faulted cluster on these facets decrease enabling a self-correction mechanism. As such, larger diameter NWs are expected to have less faults and more straight NWs, which is consistent with experiment as shown in the statistical pie charts of Figure 2. By reducing the SiH4 partial pressure from 1.4 Torr (Figure 3a) to ∼0.84 Torr (Figure 5), we find that the reduced growth rate from 8.3 to 3.75 nm/s results in single crystalline Ge—Si segments without stacking faults or twin boundaries with well-resolved lattice fringes as shown in Figure 5. The partial pressure reduction resulted in a 2× increase in the percentage of straight wires with no noticeable defects, as shown in Figure 5. This reduction is consistent with a kinetic origin of the stacking defects and demonstrates the importance of growth kinetics for structural and morphological control in crystal growth at the nanoscale.

The precise control of growth conditions for Ge—Si axial NW heterostructures is shown to allow 100% composition modulation by the VLS method, providing NWs with segment lengths suitable for exploring novel heterostructure architectures. Through such control of the growth kinetics we provide a comprehensive understanding of the VLS growth mechanism through microscopic observation and atomistic modeling of the nucleation and propagation of stacking defects throughout single nanowires. These defects are found to provide a fingerprint of the layer-by-layer growth process in heterostructured NWs, and provide direct evidence for nucleation of layer-by-layer growth from (111) facets, and reveal how the 19.5° kinking in semiconductor NWs observed at higher Si growth rates results from TB formation. As the TB propagates into the NW it increases locally the NW diameter and therefore distorts the liquid growth seed, increasing the line tension that is restored by the change from a (111) to (211) growth direction. The occurrence of such stacking defects is shown to be reduced by decreasing the growth rate, consistent with a kinetic origin. Such understanding may inspire additional studies on defect control in Ge/Si and other NW material systems.
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(29) [112] type facets are usually found to be non-stable and form [110] and [100] facets (see, for example, Verheijen et al. Nano Lett. 2007, 7, 3051. If one assumes the [111] and [110] facets, three [112] kinking directions would be possible if TB nucleation occurs at the [111] facets, and three [110] kinking directions would be possible with TB nucleation occurring at the [111] facets as indicated schematically in Supporting Information Figure S7.


