Precise Identification of Graphene’s Crystal Structures by Removable Nanowire Epitaxy
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ABSTRACT: Monitoring crystallographic orientations of graphene is important for the reliable generation of graphene-based nanostructures such as van der Waals heterostructures and graphene nanoribbons because their physical properties are dependent on crystal structures. However, facile and precise identification of graphene’s crystallographic orientations is still challenging because the majority of current tools rely on complex atomic-scale imaging. Here, we present an identification method for the crystal orientations and grain boundaries of graphene using the directional alignment between epitaxially grown AuCN nanowires and the underlying graphene. Because the nanowires are visible in scanning electron microscopy, crystal orientations of graphene can be inspected with simple procedures. Kernel density estimation that we used in analyzing the nanowires enables precise measurement of graphene’s crystal orientations. We also confirm that the imaged nanowires can be simply removed without degrading graphene’s quality, thus showing that the present method can be practically used for measuring graphene’s crystal structures.

Graphene is a two-dimensional (2D) material that has been studied extensively over the last decades due to its unique and excellent physical properties. Recently, research efforts have been focused on fabricating nanoscale systems with graphene, for example, vertical stacking of multiple graphene/2D material layers and nanoscale patterning to produce desired lateral geometry of graphene. In these systems, controlling crystallographic orientations of graphene often enables the observation of unprecedented physical phenomena and the development of novel quantum electronic devices.2,3 For example, a relative twist angle between the crystal lattices of 2D material layers is a critical parameter that induces synergetic effects on electronic band structures4−6 and resonant tunneling7−10 in van der Waals heterostructures, and engineering crystallographic orientations of graphene nanoribbon edges11 offers excellent control over electronic and spintronic properties. In addition, a tilt boundary from crystallographic misorientation between two lateral grains serves as one of the main sources of electrical and mechanical degradation of large-area polycrystalline graphene.13 Therefore, an efficient measurement of crystallographic orientations and grain boundaries of graphene is strongly needed to facilitate investigation of intrinsic physical properties of graphene and its use in different types of devices.

Monitoring the crystal structures (crystallographic orientations and grain boundaries) of graphene has been attempted with different approaches, but efficient monitoring is still challenging. One of the fundamental reasons is that electrical and optical properties of single-crystalline graphene hardly show notable dependence on the crystal orientations.14 This in-plane isotropic nature implies that inspecting graphene’s crystal orientations based on electrical and optical measurements (in other words, macroscopic inspection without direct crystal imaging) is intrinsically difficult. Thus, atomic-scale investigation of graphene by transmission electron microscopy (TEM)15,16 and scanning tunneling microscopy (STM)16−18 has been a dominant approach, which enables the entire mapping of crystal structures of polycrystalline graphene. However, TEM can only scan a relatively small area (typically tens of micrometers) of samples that should be ultrathin for electron transparency.13,15 These limitations make TEM-based investigation inefficient and incompatible with engineering procedures of graphene device fabrication. STM, another tool for atomic-resolution imaging, also has similar limitations because it requires ultraclean surfaces and time-consuming processes.16−18 Alternatively, optical microscopy observing liquid crystals19,20 or metal oxides21,22 deposited onto graphene can be used to successfully investigate grain boundaries and/or relative misorientations between grains on a large scale (several hundred micrometers) with relatively simple procedures. However, the optical methods do not yield absolute crystallographic directions of grains in graphene, which
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are essential for estimating and controlling of anisotropic characteristics of graphene-based nanoscale systems.

Recently, facile methods based on epitaxially grown nanomaterials (AuCN nanowires and MoS2 nanotriangles) were suggested by our group\textsuperscript{23,24} and other researchers,\textsuperscript{25} and the methods enable us to measure crystal orientations and grain boundaries of graphene samples without relying on atomic-resolution measurements (Figure 1). It has been previously known that nanomaterials epitaxially grown on graphene (gold\textsuperscript{23,24}, indium arsenide,\textsuperscript{27-29} bismuth selenide,\textsuperscript{30} phosphonic acid,\textsuperscript{31} and molybdenum disulfide\textsuperscript{32}) often align their outer morphologies along certain crystal orientations of the underlying graphene. Because the nanomaterial morphologies are large enough (about 10–100 nm scale) for visualization with scanning electron microscopy (SEM), recent methods\textsuperscript{23,24} based on this epitaxial alignment can measure graphene’s crystal structures with relatively simple procedures and are indeed compatible with microelectronics manufacturing techniques. The problem is, however, that the misalignment between the epitaxially grown nanomaterials and crystallographic orientations of the parent graphene substrate is unavoidable and often becomes severe due to the stochastic nature of nanomaterial nucleation on a surface. Although it is obvious that the misalignment between the nanomaterials and graphene compromises a measurement precision of graphene’s crystal structures, this effect has not been considered in previous reports,\textsuperscript{23,24} and quantitative attempts to calibrate the measurement are needed.

In this paper, we present an improved method for identifying graphene’s crystal orientations and grain boundaries, which is robust to the epitaxial misalignment. Not only preserving an ability to measure crystal orientations and the simplicity in measurement procedures by using SEM visualization of AuCN nanowires epitaxially grown on graphene (Figure 1), the present method also increases the robustness by using a statistical technique of kernel density estimation. In order to evaluate the precision of the present method, we experimentally compared graphene’s crystal orientations measured by the present method with those measured by TEM analysis. We also confirmed that we can identify graphene’s grain boundaries by SEM imaging of AuCN nanowires and can remove the imaged nanowires by simple wet chemistry, thus showing that the present method can be practically used as a measurement tool for graphene’s crystal structures.

In the experimental study, we used the axis directions of AuCN nanowires as visualization markers of the zigzag lattice directions of graphene (Figure 1). Our previous study\textsuperscript{23} showed that the AuCN nanowires synthesized on graphene are preferentially oriented along the zigzag lattice directions of the graphene, because the lattice spacing (5.08 Å) of AuCN along the nanowire axis directions coincides well (lattice mismatch = 3.3%) with the length of two carbon hexagons (4.92 Å) along the graphene zigzag lattice directions. (Please check Supporting Information for details.) However, certain degrees of misalignments are unavoidable in practical samples; thus, the primary goal of this work is to evaluate how precisely crystal orientations of graphene can be measured from the AuCN nanowires. This evaluation requires not only images of AuCN nanowires on graphene but also reference values of the crystal orientations of the underlying graphene. Thus, we decided to use TEM for the evaluation because TEM can provide precise crystal structures of graphene with high magnification or electron diffraction as well as morphological images of AuCN nanowires with low magnification (similar to SEM’s magnification). For the TEM analysis, we synthesized AuCN nanowires on suspended, single-layered graphene membranes in this study. We used two kinds of synthesis methods, as shown in Figure S1 and Supporting Methods. Both methods start from transferring CVD-synthesized graphene onto holey carbon TEM grids. In one of the methods, Au nanoparticles dispersed in organic solvents were drop-cast on the grids, and then, the grids were floated on an aqueous solution of 250 mM ammonium persulfate, (NH4)2S2O8, for 10 h. In the other method, an aqueous solution of 0.2 mM AuCN (dissolved in an ammonia solution) was simply dropped on the grid and dried for 15 min to synthesize the AuCN nanowires.

A typical TEM image of the prepared sample (Figure 2a) shows that horizontally grown AuCN nanowires are preferentially oriented along three directions on a graphene surface. We also captured a high-resolution TEM (HRTEM) image of the graphene in the same grain and measured graphene’s crystal directions using two-dimensional FFT (fast Fourier transform) of the HRTEM image (Figure 2b). In Figure 2b, red dashed lines bisecting the angles between two neighboring spots (circled in yellow) represent the zigzag lattice directions of graphene in real lattice space. Thus, a direct comparison of panels a and b of Figure 2 confirms that the three directions of the nanowire axes have good rotational alignment to the zigzag lattice directions of the underlying graphene, as previously presented in our study.\textsuperscript{23} This alignment is also confirmed statistically by a histogram of nanowire directions (Figure 2f), where the axial directions of the 63 nanowires in Figure 2a are distributed near the three orientations of graphene’s zigzag lattices measured from Figure 2b.

While it is clear that a set of the nanowire directions can represent the zigzag lattice directions of graphene, whether an individual AuCN nanowire can precisely indicate graphene’s lattice directions is questionable. We first checked this issue using atomic-resolution images of AuCN nanowires on graphene, which directly show both directions in a single image; the
nanowire axis direction reasonably represents graphene’s crystal direction in one sample (Figure 2d), but the other sample has a too large misalignment of 6.9° (Figure 2e). We analyzed the issue more statistically and quantitatively using the data set from Figure 2a,b. On the basis of the hexagonal symmetry of graphene, we transformed the nanowire axis directions to be in between $-30^\circ$ and $30^\circ$ and drew a histogram of the transformed nanowire directions in Figure 2g. The large standard deviation of 3.7° indicates that the axis direction of an individual nanowire cannot robustly represent the zigzag lattice direction of graphene.

From the above results, one can simply expect that an arithmetic mean of nanowire axis directions ($-13.7^\circ$ in Figure 2g) can be a good measure of graphene’s zigzag lattice orientation ($-14.4^\circ$ in Figure 2b), but interestingly, we found

**Table 1. Summary of 10 Experiments Measuring the Crystal Orientations of Graphene by Using the Three Different Methods**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>number of nanowires [ea]</th>
<th>graphene zigzag lattice direction from FFT [deg] (standard measurement)</th>
<th>arithmetic mean of nanowire directions [deg]</th>
<th>kernel density estimation using nanowire directions [deg]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Figure 2</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>$-14.4$</td>
<td>$\pm 3.7$</td>
<td>$0.7$</td>
<td>$-14.4$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure S2</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>$-29.9$</td>
<td>$\pm 5.4$</td>
<td>$1.2^b$</td>
<td>$29.9$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure S3</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>$-11.0$</td>
<td>$\pm 6.6$</td>
<td>$0.8$</td>
<td>$-11.6$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure S4</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$24.1$</td>
<td>$\pm 13.1$</td>
<td>$4.3$</td>
<td>$24.6$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure S5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$18.0$</td>
<td>$\pm 5.9$</td>
<td>$1.4$</td>
<td>$17.8$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure S6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>$-6.4$</td>
<td>$\pm 3.7$</td>
<td>$1.0$</td>
<td>$-6.4$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure S7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$-6.2$</td>
<td>$\pm 11.6$</td>
<td>$0.4$</td>
<td>$-6.0$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure S8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>$-20.2$</td>
<td>$\pm 14.0$</td>
<td>$6.3$</td>
<td>$-20.0$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure S9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>$26.4$</td>
<td>$\pm 6.4$</td>
<td>$1.4^c$</td>
<td>$25.9$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure S10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$24.6$</td>
<td>$\pm 2.1$</td>
<td>$0.6^d$</td>
<td>$24.8$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

rms (root-mean-square) of errors [deg] $2.6^d$ |

"The FFTs of HRTEM images are used as standard measurements, and the conventional (arithmetic mean) and present (kernel density estimation) methods are compared with the standards.\(^b\)We obtain these values by transforming the nanowire orientations to a different angular range ($0^\circ \leq \theta < 60^\circ$), as explained in Figure S2. The values based on the original range ($-30^\circ \leq \theta < 30^\circ$) show an exceptionally large error of 25.8° (mean $\pm$ SD = 4.3 ± 26.5°).\(^c\)We obtain these values by transforming the nanowire orientations to a different angular range ($0^\circ \leq \theta < 60^\circ$), as explained in Figure S9. The values based on the original range ($-30^\circ \leq \theta < 30^\circ$) show a large error of 4.8° (mean $\pm$ SD = 21.6 ± 14.1°).\(^d\)The rms error is 8.7° when the two original values (b,c) are used.
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that the arithmetic mean often misestimates graphene’s crystal directions in other samples. We performed nine sets of additional experiments using three samples (Figures S2–S10), and the results are summarized in Table 1 (including the results from Figure 2). In each experiment, we performed the same analysis as that shown in Figure 2; we calculated the arithmetic mean of nanowire axis directions and compared it with graphene’s zigzag lattice direction measured from FFT peaks. The difference between the two values can represent a measurement error of the arithmetic mean as a measure of graphene’s zigzag lattice directions. The errors of the 10 measurements include exceptionally large values (Figures S4 and S8), and the rms (root-mean-square) error of 10 measurements is also too large (2.6°) for the precise measurement of graphene’s crystal directions. Please note that a precision of <2° is necessary (a precision of ~0.5° is recommended) for the crystallographic alignment between two layers of graphene or graphene/hBN in the van der Waals heterostructures mentioned in the introductory section.

The major reason why the measurement errors in the arithmetic mean are larger than the general expectation is that a set of measured nanowire directions frequently contains outliers (largely misaligned nanowires). The outliers in the nanowire axis directions (marked as red arrows in Figure 2a,f,g) cause the arithmetic mean to have a biased value in favor of the outliers. In our 10 experiments, the outliers in the nanowire directions are almost unavoidable and even frequent; Figure S10 is the only result that contains no outlier, and Figure S4 shows that 3 nanowires are largely misaligned among 33 nanowires. This large misalignment can be due to the strong stochastic nature of surface reactions, defects in graphene molecular structures, and wrinkles in graphene membranes; thus, almost all heteroepitaxial growth of nanomaterials has the same problem. Because the optimization of synthesis conditions may be unable to remove such a stochastic phenomenon easily, this problem can be severe for precise measurement of graphene’s crystal directions.

Thus, this work presents a precise measure of graphene’s crystal orientation obtained from the nanowire axis directions based on kernel density estimation, a technique in nonparametric statistics. In the present method, we estimate a probability density function (the blue curve in Figure 2g) from a measured set of the nanowire axis directions and calculate the angle at which the estimated probability density function has its maximum value (the angle at the peak, the red circled point in Figure 2g). In detail, the estimated probability density function, \( f_p(\theta) \), is calculated using kernel density estimation as follows

\[
f_p(\theta) = \frac{I_{(−30°,30°)}(\theta)}{Nh} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left\{ K \left( \frac{\theta - \theta_i}{h} \right) + K \left( \frac{\theta - \theta_i - 60°}{h} \right) + K \left( \frac{\theta - \theta_i + 60°}{h} \right) \right\}
\]

where \( N \) is the total number of nanowires, \( \theta_i \) is the transformed angular direction of the \( i \)th nanowire, \( K(\theta) \) is an Epanechnikov kernel (one of the most optimal kernels), \( h \) is the bandwidth of the kernel, and \( I_{(−30°,30°)}(\theta) \) is an indicator function. The angle at which \( f_p(\theta) \) has its global or local maximum value is our new measure of graphene’s zigzag lattice direction. (Please check Figure S11 and Supporting Methods for more details.) The statistical meaning of this method is to estimate a mode of a data set of the nanowire axis directions. Because a mode is insensitive to outliers compared to an arithmetic mean, the present method provides us a precise measure of graphene’s zigzag lattice directions robust to large misalignments in nanowire axis directions. In all 10 measurements in our study, the new measure delivers precise values whose errors are much reduced (all of the errors are less than 1°). Please also note that the measurement error does not increase even when the number of nanowires in the analysis is small (10–20 nanowires). The rms error in the crystal direction measurement based on kernel density estimation from the 10 experiments is obtained as 0.3°, which is 11.5% of the rms error (2.6°) using the arithmetic mean.

In addition, the present method has a practical advantage in angular calculation compared to the arithmetic mean. In the method based on the arithmetic mean, a calculation artifact can generate a large error when the zigzag lattice orientation of graphene is close to the upper or lower end of the angular range (±30° in this work). It is because, while the transformed nanowire direction of −30° equals 30° under the hexagonal symmetry of graphene, their effects are opposite in the
Figure 4. SEM-based visualization of the crystal orientations and grain boundaries of graphene. (a) SEM image of the synthesized nanowires on graphene. The scale bar is 200 nm. (b) Histogram (gray bars) and probability density function (blue line) constructed using the axial directions of the nanowires in (a). (c) The SEM image of (a) is shown with an overlay of the pseudolattice structures of graphene. The red and blue color maps represent different grains with relatively tilted lattice directions.

calculation of the arithmetic mean (Figures S2c and S9c). In this work, we removed this artifact by a simple method of transforming nanowire axis directions to angles between 0 and 60° (Figures S2d and S9d, Table 1), but a mathematically correct solution is to use an unfamiliar method, directional statistics.37 The present method, however, can easily remove the calculation artifact near ±30° by defining kernel functions as connected at the two ends of −30 and 30° (Figure S11). As a result, the present method delivers the same value of directions even when different angular ranges are used (Figures S2c,d and S9c,d).

The present method is also effective to analyze two neighboring grains that are tilted from one to the other. Figure 3a shows a TEM image of AuCN nanowires on a graphene membrane that has a tilt grain boundary. The two different FFTs (Figure 3b,c), respectively obtained at points B and C in Figure 3a, confirm two grains in the underlying graphene and indicate their zigzag lattice directions (−7.2° and −18.6°). We measured the nanowire axis directions from Figure 3a and obtained a probability density function (Figure 3d) using the kernel density estimation. Two major peaks in the probability density function clearly indicate two graphene grains that are tilted with each other, and the two angles at the local maxima (−7.0° and −17.4°) measure graphene’s zigzag lattice directions precisely (the errors are 0.2° and 1.2°, respectively). The present method can also visualize the two grains in graphene as shown in Figure 3a (presented by red and blue shadows). The angle (−12.6°) at the local minimum in Figure 3d enables us to classify the nanowires into two groups whose transformed axis directions are smaller (red) and larger (blue) than the angle. One remaining issue in Figure 3 is that the exact position of the grain boundary is unclear due to the low density of nanowires, and we will further discuss this issue in the next part.

While we performed all of the above experimental analyses using TEM (in order to measure the reference values of graphene’s lattice orientations), the main purpose of the present method is to measure graphene’s crystal directions and grain boundaries using SEM. Figure 4 shows that the present method can achieve this main purpose. Field-emission SEM enables us to visualize AuCN nanowires on graphene (please note that the graphene was transferred on a SiO2-coated silicon wafer) with acceptable magnification (Figure 4a). A probability density function (Figure 4b) based on the present method indicates that the underlying graphene has two grains whose zigzag lattice directions are −2.4° and −24.5°. Although we cannot perform any reference measurement in this experimental setting, the analyses in the previous sections suggest that the measurement uncertainty of crystal directions in Figure 4 is less than ±1°. Please also note that the tilt grain boundary of graphene is relatively clear in Figure 4 due to the high areal density of AuCN nanowires. A pseudocolored image in Figure 4c summarizes all of the information measured by the present method, including the crystal orientations of graphene grains, the tilt angle of the grain boundary, and the position of the grain boundary.

The primary output of the present measurement method is crystal orientations of grains in graphene, and we can identify grain boundaries by the changes in the crystal orientations. This indirect identification generates a limitation on detecting grain boundaries, which are also crucial for controlling electrical and physical properties of graphene. The present method cannot identify grain boundaries whose tilt angles are small. In detail, if the change of the crystal directions of a certain grain boundary is smaller than the distribution of nanowire directions in one grain, the grain boundary cannot be detected and two grains are misidentified as a single grain. To prevent this misidentification, the two peaks must be distinguished from each other in the probability density function estimated by the present method (such as Figures 3d and 4b). Thus, the full width at half-maximum of the peaks in the probability density functions indicates that the present method has a minimum detectable tilt angle of ~7°. A solution to overcome this detection limit might be combining the present method with previous methods suggesting the decoration and identification of grain boundaries. Because both the present and previous methods utilize nanomaterial deposition followed by SEM visualization, they can be easily combined without additional processes. The combined method may be able to provide entire mapping of crystal directions and grain boundaries in graphene with SEM.

We also note that AuCN nanowires used in this study can be synthesized and removed easily by using simple wet processes, thus enhancing advantages of using AuCN nanowires as a marker material. Other inorganic nanomaterials that can grow on graphene heteroepitaxially (gold, indium arsenide, bismuth selenide, molybdenum disulfide) are synthesized using CVD (chemical vapor deposition) or evaporation, and high temperature (>600 °C) during or after synthesis is essential for heteroepitaxial alignment. (Please note that organic molecules can be heteroepitaxially aligned to graphene in ambient conditions, but they are invisible with SEM.) These harsh conditions for the synthesis may damage graphene and/or other materials in analysis targets, while AuCN nanowires used in
this study are synthesized using aqueous solution at room temperature. In addition to the mild synthesis conditions, the simple removal is also an important factor as marker materials. As mentioned in the previous study, grain structure visualization using MoS2 has a limited application area because the removal of MoS2 on graphene is difficult. However, AuCN nanowires in this work can be easily removed from graphene substrates using a 14.8 M ammonia solution (Figure 5). The Raman spectra of graphene before and after nanowire etching (Figure 5d) maintain very low D peaks, confirming that measurable defects are not generated in the underlying graphene during the synthesis and removal processes of AuCN nanowires. The graphene after nanowire synthesis shows shifts in G and 2D peak positions compared to as-prepared samples (Figure 5e), indicating the change in doping and possibly strain of graphene via interaction with AuCN. On the other hand, G and 2D peaks mostly recover their original positions after nanowire removal. These observations from the Raman spectra imply that the AuCN nanowires can be synthesized and removed without degrading graphene’s qualities and properties. Thus, the simplicity in the synthesis and removal of AuCN nanowires provides not only facile analysis of graphene’s crystal structures but also the ability to use the graphene after the analysis.

In conclusion, we have presented a precise and facile method for identifying crystal directions and grain boundaries of graphene. The present method based on SEM imaging of AuCN nanowires and kernel density estimation enables the crystallographic analysis of graphene robust to the unavoidable misalignment between the nanowires and graphene. The concept and analysis method we have introduced here can be applied to crystallographic mapping of other types of 2D materials using other types of epitaxially grown nanomaterials, thus broadening application areas of the present method.
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