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Figure 1. (a) SEM micrograph of several rotational twin domains. The twin boundaries are preferentially aligned along $\langle 110 \rangle$ and exhibit a distinct morphology, which is illustrated in (b) and (c) for two different crystallographic directions. Note that the concrete shape in (b) also depends on the exact position on the RTB, while it is more or less independent for (c). (d) displays a schematic side view of a twin domain $\beta$ within the $\alpha$-matrix.
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Figure 2. Representative SEM overview scans (30° tilt view) of NWs grown on GaP/Si(111) substrates with different rotational twin density. (a) and (b) display GaP NWs on GaP/Si with high and low twin density, respectively. (c) and (d) show the growth results for GaAs NWs. The side panels contain statistics over the different types of NWs on different substrates including a GaP(111)B wafer piece as reference. Note that the GaAs NW growth time was set intentionally short, resulting in short NWs for easier characterization. This, in turn, leads to different visibilities of the twin boundaries for the GaP and GaAs NW samples.
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Figure 3. Different types of GaP NWs on GaP/Si substrates. (a) A group of typical vertical NWs exhibiting a hexagonal cross section (upper inset) and grooves at the facets reflecting stacking faults within the NW (lower inset). (b) Diagonal NW emerging at a rotational twin boundary (RTB). The angle $\alpha$ is the angle with the substrate (111)-surface and $\phi$ is the azimuthal angle to the next $\langle 11-2 \rangle$ direction according to Ref. 42. (c) Initially horizontal NW aligned along an RTB in $\langle 110 \rangle$ growing vertically outside the RTB. (d) shows the NW from (c) from the top and another NW initially growing horizontally along an RTB. All scale bars are 200 nm.
Figure 4. Different types of GaAs NWs on GaP/Si substrates. (a) Two typical vertical NWs. The upper NW’s bulge reflects (at least) a stacking fault within the NW. (b) Horizontal NW pointing in ⟨112⟩ without a noticeable substrate defect. (c) Horizontal NW growing at first along a twin boundary in ⟨110⟩ and then in ⟨112⟩ departing from the twin. All scale bars are 200 nm.
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Figure 6. The probability for different nuclei in dependence of the chemical potential difference $\Delta \mu$ calculated for a horizontal GaAs NW on GaP assuming hexagonally shaped nuclei. The range of $\Delta \mu$ relevant for the experiments is highlighted in blue.
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Figure 8. (a) Nucleation probabilities for horizontal GaAs$_{1-x}$P$_x$ NWs grown on GaP(111)B with $x$ ranging from 0 to 1 ($x \in \{0, 0.05, 0.1, 0.2, 0.35, 0.6, 1\}$), i.e. pure GaAs and GaP, respectively. Geometrical parameters are chosen in analogy to Figure 6 and interfacial energies are interpolated linearly between both extremes (cf. section S9). (b) and (c) show horizontal GaAsP NWs on GaP(111)B with two different compositions. While for the lower P ratio all NWs remain horizontal, around 5% of the NWs become vertical for the higher P ratio. The scale bars are 200 nm. For SEM overview scans the reader is referred to Figure S13 in the Supporting Information.
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Impact of rotational twin boundaries and lattice mismatch on III-V nanowire growth
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ABSTRACT: Pseudomorphic planar III-V transition layers greatly facilitate the epitaxial integration of vapor-liquid-solid-grown III-V nanowires (NW) on Si(111) substrates. Heteroepitaxial (in) layer growth, however, is commonly accompanied by the formation of rotational twins. We find that rotational twin boundaries (RTBs), which intersect the surface of GaP/Si(111) hetero-substrates, generally cause horizontal NW growth and may even suppress NW growth entirely. Away from RTBs, the NW growth direction switches from horizontal to vertical in case of homoepitaxial GaP NWs, whereas heteroepitaxial GaAs NWs continue growing horizontally. To understand this rich phenomenology, we develop a model based on classical nucleation theory. Independent of the occurrence of RTBs and specific transition layers, our model can generally explain the prevalent observation of horizontal III-V NW growth in lattice mismatched systems and the high crystal quality of horizontal nanowires.

The epitaxial integration of III-V nanowires (NWs) with silicon has attracted considerable interest as one of the most promising routes of combining the tunable, high-performance properties of III-V materials with the well-established Si technology.1–3 The Au-mediated vapor-liquid-solid (VLS) growth discovered by Wagner et al.1 is a widely used, powerful technique for the fabrication of III-V NWs.4,5 However, direct growth of III-V NWs on Si encounters several difficulties. The strong chemical interaction between Au and the Si1−x can cause unintentional doping of the NWs with Si as well as deep level defects induced by diffusion of Au into Si.6,7 Furthermore, obtaining abrupt interfaces towards Si1−x and a reproducible, adequate substrate pretreatment are challenging tasks. In addition, the condition of the growth reactor plays a crucial role.8,9 To overcome these difficulties, a III-V transition layer can be grown prior to NW growth (often referred to as (III-V-on-Si) virtual substrates or quasi-substrates). This approach was implemented successfully for various III-V NWs such as GaAs,10 InP,11 InAs12 and GaN13,14 NWs. In these studies, (in) oriented substrates were used, as NWs preferably grow in ⟨111⟩ direction, and well-defined NWs oriented vertical to the substrate surface are advantageous for most device architectures.

Heteroepitaxial layer growth on (in) oriented substrates, however, is usually accompanied by the occurrence of rotational twins, which introduce a considerable density of grain boundaries. Despite the expected detrimental effects of these defects on optoelectronic properties, this issue has received only little attention so far, both in studies focusing on NW growth and those rather addressing the layer preparation. In many studies, the occurrence of rotational twins is not mentioned and discussed at all, although they are obviously present and clearly visible in electron microscopical images.5,9 In other cases, if recognized or studied in detail,15 either no NW growth is carried out or their impact on NW growth is not further discussed.6 In a recent study,16 we demonstrated the importance of the GaP/Si(111) nucleation route on the formation of rotational twins and showed that we are able to suppress the density of twins to around 5 vol%.

Here, we present a systematic investigation of the impact of rotational twin boundaries (RTBs) and lattice mismatch on NW growth and their growth directions. For this purpose, GaP(111) transition layers with B-type polarity17 and different twin densities are prepared on Si(111) (according to Ref. 22) and either GaP or GaAs NWs are grown subsequently by the Au-mediated VLS mechanism. It is shown, that the growth characteristics of homoepitaxial NWs (i.e. GaP) and heteroepitaxial NWs (i.e. GaAs) share many similarities, but also differ in some significant aspects. This is important to notice as most of the aforementioned studies that employ transition layers are limited to homoepitaxial NW growth.9,10–12 One
key observation of our study is that both GaP and GaAs NWs grow horizontally along a twin boundary, when growth is initiated at this defect. However, as soon as the NW leaves the twin boundary, GaP NWs change their growth direction towards the vertical [111] direction, while GaAs NWs remain horizontal.

In order to explain the different growth behaviors of homo- and heteroepitaxial NWs, we developed a theoretical model based on classical nucleation theory and preferential interface nucleation.\(^\text{44}\) This model builds upon previous experimental and theoretical studies advocating classical nucleation theory to explain VLS NW growth itself\(^\text{25,26}\) and to describe several related growth phenomena.\(^\text{50-53}\) These studies however, exclusively deal with freestanding NWs. In our model we adopt the basic ideas to explain and describe horizontal growth along substrate surfaces with and without RTBs. Our calculations reveal that strain alone (induced by lattice mismatch between NW and substrate) can be decisive for the final growth direction beyond the issue of rotational twins, our model can be applied to explain in more depth the prevalent observation of horizontally grown NWs (often referred to as planar, or lateral or in-plane NWs) in other lattice-mismatched systems such as InAs(Sb) NWs on GaAs(111)\(^\text{54}\) or Si\(^\text{55}\), GaAs NWs on Si(111)\(^\text{56}\), InGaAs NWs on GaAs(100)\(^\text{57}\), various III-V NWs on graphite or graphene\(^\text{38,39}\) and InP NWs on sapphire.\(^\text{40-43}\)

**Results and discussion**

**Rotational twin domains**

Epitaxy of semiconductors on \((\text{s})\) oriented substrates involves the problem of the formation of rotational twins (shown in Figure 1 with violet highlighting for GaP on Si\((\text{s})\) used in this study). The growth of twinned GaP (referred to as \(\beta\)-GaP in the \(\alpha\)-GaP matrix) is caused by an alternative orientation of the cubic lattice at the interface to the substrate. This so-called cis-coordination can be formally described by a rotation of the GaP lattice around the \([111]\) axis normal to the surface of the silicon substrate by \(60^\circ\). These twinned GaP parts are typically grouped together into large domains (see Figure 1a and d). The resulting lateral RTBs can penetrate through the entire GaP epilayer and reach the surface (cf. Figure 2 of Ref. 44). Here, they form trenches that are a few nm deep and preferably oriented along \((\text{uu})\) directions (for sake of simplicity also referred to as RTBs). For 100 nm thick GaP epilayers, rotational twin domains (RTDs) can be observed with diameters typically ranging from a few 100 nm up to several \(\mu\)m. HR-XRD results show that the \(\beta\)-GaP nucleation and therefore varies strongly with the nucleation conditions and substrate misorientation.\(^\text{44}\) RTBs have a major influence on the resulting GaP surface morphology. A reduction of the \(\beta\)-GaP density causes a significant reduction of the RTB density, which considerably reduces the surface roughness. Besides this dominant effect of the domain boundaries, the roughness within individual \(\beta\)-domains is smaller than that of \(\alpha\)-domains (rms roughness of ~0.56 nm and ~0.87 nm, respectively). The latter show a textured morphology, which is presumably caused by the step structure of the vicinal substrate (in this work Si\((\text{s})\)) substrates with \(3^\circ\) miscut in \([\text{u-u}]\) direction were used). Due to the miscut of the substrates, the \(\beta\)-domain surface seems to be ‘tilted’ with respect to the \(\alpha\)-domain surface. This results in two different types of trenches along the domain boundaries as illustrated in Figure 1b and c. The GaP layers were shown to consist completely of B-type polarity material by low-energy electron diffraction (LEED) measurement.\(^\text{50}\) We observed only \((\text{u-u})\) surface reconstruction even in the case of highly twinned GaP layers, whereas \((\text{u-u})\)A-type material would result in half-order spots, i.e. \((2x2)\) reconstruction. Hence, we can exclude the presence of \((\text{u-u})\)A-type polar surfaces (inversion domains as considered in Ref. 45) and potential influence on NW growth.
Impact of rotational twin boundaries on nanowire growth

The strong impact of RTBs on the NW growth becomes immediately apparent in overview SEM scans such as shown in Figure 2. Parts a and b compare GaP NW growth on GaP/Si(111) substrates with two different twin densities. The side panel indicates the ratio of different NW types as a function of the substrate type. On GaP films with high twin density (Figure 2a), only 75% of the NWs are vertical to the substrate and a significant amount of NWs exhibits undesired growth directions and morphologies such as NWs inclined to the substrate (referred to as ‘diagonal NWs’). These NWs grow diagonally to the substrate surface directly from the start and tend to undergo multiple changes of the growth direction afterwards. Furthermore, Au particles without NW growth are observed (referred to as ‘Au only’) and a multitude of thin parasitical NWs – mostly non-vertical – is present. Note that we call NWs, which are initially vertical and kink later on, still ‘vertical’. All these undesired phenomena can be drastically reduced by employing GaP/Si(111) substrates with a low twin density instead, so that the yield of vertical NWs exceeds 97%. Before we discuss all the different types of GaP NWs in detail, we address the growth of GaAs NWs.

For GaAs NWs the same trend is observed. Here, growth of NWs on GaAs/Si substrates with a high twin density yields only 28% of vertical NWs (Figure 2c), while a reduction of the twin density can increase the yield significantly to up to 80% (Figure 2d). In contrast to GaP NWs, neither diagonal nor kinked NWs are observed for GaAs NWs. Instead, NWs growing horizontally along the substrate represent the main defect type (besides Au-particles without NWs). As will be discussed later, these NWs frequently change their growth direction in plane, but never out of plane. In other words, they always remain horizontal.

Comparing GaP and GaAs NWs, i.e. Figure 2a with c and Figure 2b with d, it is clearly visible that the growth of vertical heteroepitaxial NWs (i.e. GaAs) is much more challenging. On the one hand, this is due to the inherently impeded growth of GaAs NWs on GaP (see statistics in Figure 2 for the reference sample with GaP(111)B wafer piece); on the other hand, the GaAs NW growth is more sensitive to defects at the substrate surface, in particular to RTBs (cf. section S3 of the Supporting Information). The statistical data shown in the side panels demonstrate impressively that the detrimental effect of RTBs on the yield of vertical NWs is more pronounced for heteroepitaxial NWs, where the vertical yield is more than doubled when growth is carried out on the substrate with low twin density (Figure 2d vs. c).

Growth directions of GaP nanowires

Figure 3 shows different types of GaP NWs which will be discussed in the following: (a) vertical NWs, (b) diagonal NWs, and (c) NWs changing their growth direction from horizontal to vertical. Growth in the vertical [111]B direction represents the regular and desired growth direction, and is observed if NW nucleation proceeds without detrimental
influences caused by the substrate surface properties (such as RTBs or other defects). The vertical GaP NWs in Figure 3a exhibit a hexagonal cross section with \( \{112\} \) side facets. These side facets are characterized by more or less equidistant bulges reflecting stacking faults within the NW,\(^{30,47}\) which are typical for III-V NWs grown in \( \langle 111 \rangle \)B direction.\(^{27,47,48}\) Note that some of the initially vertical NWs are kinked in the upper part of the NW (see Figure 2a). We attribute this behavior to process-related growth instabilities and exclude an impact of RTBs, since this behavior is observed for growth on the GaP(111)B reference substrate to the same extent (Figure S1a in the Supporting Information).

Diagonal NWs, in contrast, such as the one shown in Figure 3b, are directly related to RTBs as they are only observed when emerging at RTBs. Since these NWs also have a hexagonal cross section and overall the same morphology as the vertical NWs, we conclude that the diagonal NWs grow in a \( \langle 111 \rangle \)B direction. This conclusion is further supported by growth of GaP NWs on a GaP(111)A substrate. Here, the small fraction of vertical NWs exhibits an overall different morphology characterized by truncated triangular cross section segments that are rotated by 60° every 300 nm (see inset of Figure S1b in the Supporting Information). The vast majority of the diagonal NWs can be explained with (multiple) twinning at \( \{111\} \) facets within the NW bottom according to Uccelli et al.\(^{49}\) Following their definition, \( \alpha \) describes the angle between the NW and the substrate (111)-plane and \( \varphi \) the azimuthal angle towards the next \( \langle 11-2 \rangle \) direction. In the case of the NW shown in Figure 3b, \( \alpha = 33.9° \) and \( \varphi = -18.9° \), which is in very good agreement with the theoretical predictions from Uccelli et al.\(^{49}\) for first order twinning (B-type polarity, \( \alpha = 33.8°, \varphi = \pm 19.1° \)). Moreover, the twinning planes, which are within the NW and in contact with the substrate, can be clearly seen. For better visibility the two NW segments are color-coded in the top view inset of Figure 3b. Figure S3 in the Supporting Information shows pairs of angle values (\( \alpha \) and \( \varphi \)) for another 75 diagonal NWs. With a tolerance of \( \pm 5° \) for both \( \alpha \) and \( \varphi \), 65% of the NWs can be assigned to second and third order B-type (polarity) nuclei (first and second order twinning, respectively). Only a small percentage of 9% undergoes more twinning processes in the initial stage. Moreover, only very few NWs can be assigned to A-type NWs, which is in agreement with the finding that the inspected diagonal NWs exhibit a hexagonal cross section and are consequently B-type. A likely explanation for the formation of these diagonal NWs is the following. Any Au droplet at an RTB initially wets both the \( \omega \) - and the \( \beta \) -domain. When growth begins, nucleation events and growth occur on both domains leading to a twin boundary within the NW. The higher the contact area between the Au droplet and a NW part, the greater the nucleation probability at the respective interface. Therefore, one crystallographic orientation is favored over the other one and, thus, determines the final crystal orientation of the NW.

Figure 3. Different types of GaP NWs on GaP/Si substrates. (a) A group of typical vertical NWs exhibiting a hexagonal cross section (upper inset) and grooves at the facets reflecting stacking faults within the NW (lower inset). (b) Diagonal NW emerging at a rotational twin boundary (RTB). The angle \( \alpha \) is the angle with the substrate (111)-surface and \( \varphi \) is the azimuthal angle to the next \( \langle 11-2 \rangle \) direction according to Ref. 49. (c) Initially horizontal NW aligned along an RTB in (110) growing vertically outside the RTB. (d) shows the NW from (c) from the top and another NW initially growing horizontally along an RTB. All scale bars are 200 nm.
We continue with a growth phenomenon which is particularly relevant for the growth on GaP/Si(111) substrates with a high twin density. Figure 3c and d give examples of GaP NWs growing horizontally in a ⟨110⟩ direction, where the NWs drastically change their growth direction towards the vertical ⟨112⟩ direction when they leave the vicinity of the twin boundary. This behavior is observed for all initially horizontal GaP NWs. Horizontal (planar) NW growth along ⟨110⟩ has not been reported before. Typically, horizontal NW growth occurs in ⟨112⟩ directions,25–27 which is also observed in this study for horizontal GaAs NWs on GaP(Si)B (see Figure 4b and S2 in the Supporting Information). Here, the growth facet is one of the ⟨111⟩ planes and the projection of the corresponding ⟨112⟩ direction on the surface is aligned with the growth direction. This shows that horizontal growth occurs along an RTB, although the RTB is covered by the NW and not always directly visible. Three questions arise: 1. Why does horizontal growth occur at all? 2. Why does it not occur in ⟨112⟩ direction but along the RTB? 3. Why does a NW change its growth direction into the vertical direction, when it departs from an RTB? We first address question 1:

We have observed in all our experiments that Au-particles are preferentially trapped at RTBs. Directly after Au-deposition, only ~10% of the particles are located at an RTB. After annealing (at 600°C for 10 min) the proportion rises (reproducibly) to ~40%. This shows on the one hand that the Au-particles are mobile at these conditions and on the other hand that they get trapped at RTBs; the latter can be explained by a reduction of the total interface energies when a Au-particle covers the trench of a RTB. When NW growth occurs, the Au-particle will stay at the RTB and be shifted along the RTB in ⟨110⟩ with material precipitating at the AuNW interface, which is most likely a ⟨111⟩ plane, too. Consequently, the growth direction ⟨110⟩ and the projection of the normal vector of the growth front on the surface ⟨112⟩ are separated by an azimuthal angle of 30°, as depicted in Figure 7a below. The answer to the 2nd and 3rd question requires a detailed nucleation model and will be discussed in the section ‘Nucleation model’.

Growth directions of GaAs nanowires

Figure 4a shows two vertical GaAs NWs along [111] direction, which represents, in analogy to GaP NW growth, the desired, regular growth direction. The vertical NWs possess a hexagonal cross section with ⟨112⟩ side facets. The bulge of the upper NW clearly indicates the presence of stacking faults in this region and represents a frequently observed phenomenon for all the vertical GaAs NWs that have been investigated. As mentioned before, GaAs NWs on GaP(Si)B substrates tend to grow horizontally on the substrate. This behavior is associated with two aspects: On the one hand growth of vertical GaAs NWs on GaP is inherently impeded, which also leads to horizontal NWs on reference samples with a GaP(Si)B wafer substrate (see statistics in Figure 1 and Figure S2 of the Supporting Information). Here, horizontal NWs are preferentially aligned in ⟨112⟩. The same behavior is observed for GaAs NWs on GaP/Si(111) provided that there is no relevant defect on the substrate surface (see Figure 4b). On the other hand the occurrence of horizontal NWs is directly related to the presence of surface defects such as RTBs. The NW presented in Figure 4c originates at an RTB and initially extends horizontally along the RTB in ⟨110⟩ direction. This means that the RTB guides horizontal growth in the same way as for the GaP NWs presented in Figure 3c. The horizontal GaAs NW, however, remains horizontal after escaping the RTB and alters its growth direction towards ⟨112⟩ and back to ⟨110⟩ in case of encountering another RTB. For this type of NW, other horizontal NW types and additional information the reader is referred to section S3 in the Supporting Information.

Nucleation model

In this section we present a quantitative model, based on classical nucleation theory and preferred interface nucleation.28–30 Within this context we will explain why horizontal NWs always remain horizontal in case of heteroepitaxial NW growth while in case of homoepitaxial NW growth, they change their growth direction towards the vertical [111] direction, when no RTB is present.

Classical nucleation theory has very successfully been applied to explain VLS NW growth itself31,32 and to describe several related growth phenomena such as the simultaneous occurrence of zinc blende and wurtzite33,34 as well as the NW facet formation.35–38 For the Au-mediated VLS mechanism (and most other metallic catalyst materials) the nucleation of a 2D nucleus is predicted, which forms at the triple phase boundary (TPB), where the vapor, liquid (nanoparticle catalyst) and solid phase (NW) meet.35–36 Once a stable nucleus has formed, it will quickly extend laterally in all directions until the TPB is reached: Thus, generally a complete NW slice is created before the next nucleation event takes place.
This mechanism is referred to as 'birth and spread' growth and has also been observed by in-situ TEM measurements.\textsuperscript{10} The above mentioned studies exclusively deal with freestanding NWs – NWs where the growth front is only in touch with the vapor, the catalyst (in most cases Au) and the NW itself (i.e. without contact to the substrate). In our model, we adopt these basic ideas in order to explain and describe horizontal NW growth along a substrate surface.

We start with NW growth outside RTDs. In a birth-and-spread picture, the growth direction of the NWs is determined by the position and orientation of the nuclei. Nucleation is very likely to start at phase boundaries since preexisting interfaces are eliminated.\textsuperscript{13} In our case, the relevant positions as marked in Figure 5a are the TPBs with positions (1) and (a) as well as the quadruple phase boundaries (QPB) with positions (1') and (2'). Generally, nucleation at positions (1) and (2) as well as the quadruple phase boundaries (QPB) will result in an additional layer at the end of the NW (material W, GaAs or GaP) and thereby cause elongated horizontal growth of the wires. On the other hand, nucleation at positions (1') and (2') will result in an additional layer at the end of the NW (material W, GaAs or GaP) and thereby cause elongated horizontal growth along a substrate surface.

We start with NW growth outside RTDs. In a birth-and-spread picture, the growth direction of the NWs is determined by the position and orientation of the nuclei. Nucleation is very likely to start at phase boundaries since preexisting interfaces are eliminated.\textsuperscript{13} In our case, the relevant positions as marked in Figure 5a are the TPBs with positions (1) and (a) as well as the quadruple phase boundaries (QPB) with positions (1') and (2'). Generally, nucleation at positions (1) and (2) as well as the quadruple phase boundaries (QPB) will result in an additional layer at the end of the NW (material W, GaAs or GaP) and thereby cause elongated horizontal growth of the wires. On the other hand, nucleation at positions (1') and (2') will result in an additional layer at the end of the NW (material W, GaAs or GaP) and thereby cause elongated horizontal growth along a substrate surface.

It is crucial to study the Γi in detail for each of the possible configurations. We start with a nucleus at position (i) growing homoeptaxially on W. The nucleus shifts the W-L interface (parallel to W(111)) towards the liquid and creates an additional lateral interface area. We introduce the L-V interface (parallel to the liquid) at the position of the lateral area P (nucleus circumference × effective height of the nucleus faceting, the effective height $h = h \sin(70.5^\circ)$). The dimension of both Γi and $\gamma_{i L}$ is energy per area.
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Values for the interface energies were taken from the literature\cite{5}–\cite{9} and our own DFT calculations – details are given in the Supporting Information in section S7. Note that for GaAs on GaP, $\gamma_{WL}$ = 0.77 eV nm is dominated by the strain energy, since $\gamma_{WL}$ = $\gamma_{SL}$, and the chemical contribution to $\gamma_{WL}$ is vanishingly small. Furthermore, in section S8 we show that the overall trends for $p_i$ remain unaffected even for large parameter variations and the particular nucleus shape.

GaAs nanowires. With these numerical values, we can now evaluate equation (7). The result is shown in Figure 6, where we have highlighted the relevant range of $\Delta \gamma$, which corresponds to typical experimental conditions during growth.\cite{9,10,11} Figure 6 involves $\Delta \gamma$ per unit surface, i.e. $\Delta \gamma$ multiplied by $\phi_i$, which has the same dimension as $\Delta \gamma$. It can clearly be seen that within the experimentally relevant range, the probability for nucleation at positions (i) and (2) is vanishingly small and that position (i) is the most frequent one, i.e. $p_1 > p_2$. There are two reasons for the preference of (i). First, due to the contribution of $\Delta \gamma > 0$ to $\Delta \gamma_1$, nucleation at positions (i) and (2) requires a high amount of energy. Second, the primed positions (i') and (2') have a higher amount of the lateral area already in contact with substrate 5 or the wire W, which is again energetically preferred since the preexisting interface S-L or W-L is eliminated, respectively. Because of that, we expect only few nucleation events to take place at position (2) and most at (i'). These nuclei at (i') are likely to trigger growth of an additional GaAs layer on the inclined W-L interface, thereby continuing horizontal growth. This argument also holds if the NW grows on top of an RTB, because this defect is merely in the substrate below and does not prevent the growth of an additional layer at the W-L interface. This is illustrated in Figure 7a.

As intermediate conclusion, we note that heteroepitaxially grown NWs continue with horizontal growth once they grow horizontally for the following reason. In contrast to a homo-interface, the heterointerface between nucleus and substrate results in a positive value of $\gamma_{WL}$, and hence in an increased $\Delta \gamma$ ($\Delta \gamma = \gamma_{WL} - \gamma_{SW}$). Since the higher the value of $\Delta \gamma$, the smaller the nucleation probability at (2), nucleation at (i) is favored for heteroepitaxial growth of NW, so that horizontal growth is elongated. In case of GaAs NWs on GaP, $\gamma_{WL}$ is dominated by strain energy, which also applies to GaAs/InAs and GaP/InP (cf. section S9 in the Supporting Information). Note that this finding is partially dif-
event from the interpretation of the growth mechanism of horizontal InAs NWs on GaAs(111)B by Zhang et al., who state that "the lattice mismatch only plays a minor or no role in trace formation". They argue that the different interface energies for InAsCL and GaAsCL lead to a Au-particle, which retains contact with the underlying substrate and thereby causes horizontal growth. This argument certainly is important and must be considered in the model (and is included here in $\Delta\gamma \approx \gamma_{\text{F whatever}} - \gamma_{\text{GaAs}}$). However, their argumentation is only of thermodynamic nature and neglects both the kinetics of the growth process and the interfacial energy between substrate and NW. The influence of strain due to lattice mismatch becomes particularly important when the difference between $\gamma_{\text{F whatever}}$ and $\gamma_{\text{GaAs}}$ is smaller than for the material combinations studied by Zhang et al.

As a test of our model, we investigated the stacking fault (SF) density of vertical and horizontal GaAs NWs on GaP(111)B by TEM (see section S6 in the Supporting Information). The data give evidence that horizontal NWs are free of SFs which are parallel to its final growth front. In contrast, both the vertical NW and the initial part of the horizontal NW contain SFs that are parallel to the substrate surface. SFs are introduced when nuclei occur in SF configuration and thereby create a mirror plane with the underlying NW material.

As the additional energy needed is very small (0.11 eV/nm²), the vertical NW and the initial part of the horizontal NW connection is mediated by SFs. In both cases, the SF is parallel to the final growth direction of the horizontal NW. The SF is introduced when a nucleus occurs in SF configuration and thereby creates a mirror plane with the underlying NW material. However, the SFs are not visible in TEM images, which suggests that the SFs are not present in the final morphology of the NWs.

For the calculation of nucleation probabilities in case of (homoepitaxial) GaP NWs, simplifications are possible: Since material W is the same as substrate S, we have $\gamma_{\text{W-W}} = \gamma_{\text{W-S}} = \gamma_{\text{S-S}}$. Thus, $\Delta\gamma_{\text{W-S}} = \Delta\gamma_{\text{S-S}}$, and the positions (1') and (2') become equivalent, i.e. $p_{i'} = p_{i''} = 1$. Therefore, nuclei will form both at (1) and (2'). Just as in the homoepitaxial case, nucleation events at position (2') result in only partial separation of the S-L interface. Hence, a complete separation of the gold droplet from the substrate would only be possible if no other nuclei are present on the corresponding interface. The homoepitaxial GaP NWs grow horizontally along RTBs and continue with vertical growth, once they leave the RTB. A similar argumentation can explain the frequent observation of Au-particles without NW growth, which is described in section S9 of the Supporting Information.
on GaAs show a dependence on the chemical potential very similar to GaAs NWs on GaP (compare Figure 6 with Figure Sa). Here as well, nucleation at position (1') is favored over a wide range of $\Delta \mu$, since nucleation at (2') involves a lot of strain energy – and in case of InAs NWs on GaP, also a significant amount of chemical energy (cf. Table S1 in the Supporting Information).

As mentioned in the introduction, there exists a variety of lattice-mismatched systems, including elementary, III-V, oxide- and selenide materials, where horizontal NW growth is reported.\(^\text{27-31}\) We are convinced that the principal idea of our model can explain the elongated growth of horizontal NWs in all these studies – despite substantial differences to our systems. These differences may correspond to different crystal structures and orientations, magnitudes in lattice-mismatch, type of catalyst and et cetera. The key argument remains the same: nucleation and subsequent layer growth will be far more likely at the NW/catalyst interface (at position (1')) than at the substrate/catalyst interface (position (2'))

since the latter is impeded by strain and chemical dissimilarities. This claim is supported by the fact that in none of these studies, NW material is visible directly between the catalyst and the substrate surface.

Conclusion

We have found a strong detrimental effect of rotational twin boundaries (RTBs) on VLS growth of NWs: RTBs tend to trap Au droplets, which causes either completely suppressed or non-vertical growth of NWs. When nucleated at RTBs, the lattice-mismatch between NW and substrate is decisive for the final growth direction: While homoepitaxial NWs may grow diagonally or horizontally, heteroepitaxial NWs grow persistently horizontally, also away from the RTBs. Homoepitaxial NWs, in contrast, switch to vertical growth away from the RTBs. The suppression of rotational twins in the transition layer is therefore particularly relevant in the case of heteroepitaxial NW growth.

We developed a quantitative model based on classical nucleation theory, which shows that the lattice mismatch between substrate and NW plays an essential role for the nucleus location and thereby the growth direction. Nuclei triggering vertical growth have to form on top of the substrate surface, which involves significant strain energy. Therefore, (strain-free) nuclei at the catalyst-NW interface are favored, leading to horizontal growth. Here, nucleation at the quadruple phase boundary is strongly favored over nucleation at the triple phase boundary (no contact with the substrate), which explains the prevalent observation of defect-free horizontal NW growth. Extending our model could also deepen the understanding of homoepitaxial NW growth on differently oriented substrates as well as vertical versus horizontal NW growth in non-III-V-systems.

METHODS

Both NW and GaP layer growth were carried out by metalorganic vapor phase epitaxy (MOVPE) in an Aixtron AIX 200 reactor with $H_2$ as carrier gas at 50 mbar with a total flow of 7.1 L/min during layer growth and 3.4 L/min during NW preparation.
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Figure 8. (a) Nucleation probabilities for horizontal GaAs$_{x}$P$_{1-x}$ NWs grown on GaP(111B) with $x$ ranging from 0 to 1 (e.g., GaAs, pure GaAs and GaP, respectively). Geometrical parameters are chosen in analogy to Figure 6 and interfacial energies are interpolated linearly between both extremes (cf. section S9). (b) and (c) show horizontal GaAsP NWs on GaP(111B) with two different compositions. While for the lower P ratio all NWs remain horizontal, around 6% of the NWs become vertical for the higher P ratio. The scale bars are 200 nm. For SEM overview scans the reader is referred to Figure S3 in the Supporting Information.

For the preparation of the GaP/Si hetero-substrates, Si(n) substrates with $\gamma$ miscut in [u-u] direction were used. Prior to growth, the substrates were wet-chemically treated by the RCA clean procedure with buffered oxide etch (BOE), and thermally desoxidized in the MOVPE reactor.\(^\text{26}\) The Si(n) surface was then exposed to tertiarybutylarsine (TRAs) to allow for growth of GaP with B-type polarity.\(^\text{33}\) A two-step process for the growth of GaP layers was applied with a nucleation phase at low temperatures (either 420°C or 500°C) for 15 min and subsequent growth at 660°C for further 45 min, resulting in GaP layers with a thickness of around 100 nm. While the nucleation at 420°C leads to a low density of twins (below 8%), nucleation at 500°C results in a significantly higher one (~30%). For further details see Ref. 22. NWs were grown by the Au-mediated VLS mode on these GaP/Si hetero-substrates with different twin density and on GaP(111B) $\gamma$ wafer pieces as a reference free of rotational twins. Prior to NW growth, the substrates were cleaned in acetone and isopropyl alcohol, and subsequently Au particles of ca. 100 nm diameter were deposited from colloidal solution. To desorb oxides from the surface, the samples were loaded into the reactor and annealed for 10 minutes at 600°C with continuous phosphorus stabilization using tertiarybutylphosphine (TBP) as precursor to prevent substrate decomposition. Subsequently, GaP (GaAs) NW growth was performed by supplying trimethylgallium (TMGa) for 10 min (1 min) with a molar fraction of $\chi_{\text{TMGa}} = 6.36 \times 10^{-5}$ (1.26 x 10$^{-5}$) at 500°C (450°C) with a TBP/TMGa (TRAs/TMGa) ratio of 10 (2.5). The growth duration of the GaAs NWs was intentionally kept short to facilitate their characterization. The GaAsP NWs were grown at 450°C for 12 minutes with a V/III of 20 and a TBP/V of 0.5 for the lower and 0.75 for the higher P ratio, respectively. All temperatures mentioned were measured by a thermocouple within the graphite susceptor.
All samples were characterized by means of high resolution scanning electron microscopy (SEM, Hitachi S 4000-II). The majority of NWs were measured under different angels to determine their spatial growth direction. Transmission electron microscopy (TEM, Jeol ARMax00F) was applied to investigate the crystal structure of selected GaAs NWs grown on GaP(111)B. In order to determine the (volumetric) twin density of GaP layers on Si, high resolution x-ray diffraction measurements (HR XRD, Bruker AXS D8 Discover) were performed.  
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Supporting Information available: Nanowire growth on reference measurements (HR XRD, Bruker AXS D8 Discover) were performed on GaAsP nanowires and other hetero-systems (Section S9). The Supporting Information is available free of charge on the ACS Publications website as PDF.
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