Multi-Component Kardar-Parisi-Zhang Systems: Theoretical Framework and Experimental Feasibility Analysis

A. F. Bentley
Victoria University of Wellington
School of Chemical and Physical Sciences
Wellington, New Zealand

October 2025
PHYS 489 - Advanced Topics in Experimental Physics

Abstract

We develop a theoretical framework for multi-component Kardar-Parisi-Zhang (KPZ) systems with explicit derivations of coupling effects on scaling behavior. Through perturbative renormalization group analysis, we derive first-order corrections to scaling exponents and calculate specific coupling parameter ranges for experimental observability. We provide quantitative feasibility analysis for thin film co-deposition experiments, including realistic parameter estimates ($\lambda_{12} \sim 10^{-3}$ to 10^{-1} μm/s), required measurement precision, and systematic error analysis. Novel contributions include: (i) explicit calculation of cross-correlation scaling functions, (ii) experimental protocol optimization for maximizing signal-to-noise ratios, and (iii) identification of specific material systems where coupling effects exceed measurement thresholds. This work bridges theoretical predictions with experimentally accessible parameter regimes.

Contents

1 Introduction

The Kardar-Parisi-Zhang (KPZ) equation [1] describes interface growth with remarkable universality, yet most experimental systems involve multiple coupled interfaces. While single-interface KPZ theory is mathematically mature [5, 7], multi-component extensions remain theoretically underdeveloped and experimentally unverified.

This work addresses three specific gaps: (1) the lack of explicit calculations for coupling-induced scaling corrections, (2) absence of quantitative experimental parameter estimates, and (3) limited analysis of measurement feasibility in realistic experimental conditions.

1.1 Theoretical Motivation

Standard KPZ theory assumes isolated interfaces, but real systems exhibit: - Cross-catalytic effects in multi-material deposition [2] - Competitive growth in biological systems [4] - Electromagnetic coupling in electrochemical processes

Understanding when these effects produce observable deviations from single-interface behavior requires quantitative theoretical predictions and realistic experimental assessment.

2 Theoretical Framework

2.1 Coupled KPZ Equations

For two interfaces $h_1(\mathbf{r}, t)$ and $h_2(\mathbf{r}, t)$ in one dimension:

$$\frac{\partial h_1}{\partial t} = \nu_1 \frac{\partial^2 h_1}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\lambda_1}{2}\left(\frac{\partial h_1}{\partial x}\right)^2 + \frac{\lambda_{12}}{2}\left(\frac{\partial h_2}{\partial x}\right)^2 + \eta_1(x,t) \tag{1}$$

$$\frac{\partial h_2}{\partial t} = \nu_2 \frac{\partial^2 h_2}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\lambda_2}{2}\left(\frac{\partial h_2}{\partial x}\right)^2 + \frac{\lambda_{21}}{2}\left(\frac{\partial h_1}{\partial x}\right)^2 + \eta_2(x,t) \tag{2}$$

where $\eta_i(x,t)$ are Gaussian white noise terms with $\langle \eta_i(x,t)\eta_j(x',t')\rangle = 2D_{ij}\delta_{ij}\delta(x-x')\delta(t-t')$.

2.2 Perturbative Analysis of Weak Coupling

For weak coupling $|\lambda_{ij}| \ll \lambda_i$, we expand the height-height correlation functions:

$$G_{ii}(x,t) = \langle [h_i(x,t) - h_i(0,0)]^2 \rangle = G_{ii}^{(0)}(x,t) + \lambda_{ji} G_{ii}^{(1)}(x,t) + O(\lambda_{ji}^2) \tag{3}$$

2.2.1 First-Order Correction Calculation

Using the Martin-Siggia-Rose formalism [2], the first-order correction to the roughness exponent involves cross-interface correlations. For the simplified case where we treat the coupling as a perturbation to the response function, the leading correction comes from the cross-coupling term's effect on the noise correlations.

The corrected height-height correlation in Fourier space becomes:

$$\widetilde{G}_{ii}(k,\omega) = \widetilde{G}_{ii}^{(0)}(k,\omega) + \lambda_{ji}\widetilde{G}_{ij}^{(1)}(k,\omega) + O(\lambda_{ji}^2) \tag{4}$$

For weak coupling with correlated noise between interfaces, the cross-correlation term contributes:

$$\widetilde{G}_{ij}^{(1)}(k,\omega) = \frac{2D_{ij}}{(\nu_i k^2 - i\omega)(\nu_j k^2 - i\omega)} \tag{5}$$

where D_{ij} represents the cross-noise correlation strength.

The key insight is that **non-zero corrections require either**: (a) cross-correlated noise ($D_{ij} \neq 0$), or (b) asymmetric parameters ($\nu_i \neq \nu_j$, $D_{ii} \neq D_{jj}$).

Case 1: Symmetric parameters, uncorrelated noise ($\nu_i = \nu_j$, $D_{ii} = D_{jj}$, $D_{ij} = 0$):

$$\delta\alpha_i = 0 \tag{6}$$

This is the trivial case where coupling produces no observable effect.

Case 2: Asymmetric surface tensions ($\nu_i \neq \nu_j$, uncorrelated noise):

$$\delta\alpha_i = \frac{\lambda_{ji} D}{8\pi} \int_0^{\Lambda} dk\, k^{-1/2} \left[\frac{1}{\nu_j^{3/2}} - \frac{1}{\nu_i^{3/2}}\right] \tag{7}$$

This integral requires a momentum cutoff Λ and gives:

$$\delta\alpha_i = \frac{\lambda_{ji} D\sqrt{\Lambda}}{4\pi} \left[\frac{1}{\nu_j^{3/2}} - \frac{1}{\nu_i^{3/2}}\right] \tag{8}$$

Case 3: Cross-correlated noise ($D_{ij} \neq 0$):

$$\delta\alpha_i = -\frac{\lambda_{ji} D_{ij}}{4\nu_i^{3/2}\nu_j^{1/2}}\sqrt{\Lambda} \tag{9}$$

Physical interpretation: Observable coupling effects require either material asymmetry or cross-correlated fluctuations. For thin film co-deposition, cross-correlations arise from shared electromagnetic fields or mechanical stress.

2.3 Cross-Correlation Scaling Function

The cross-correlation function depends on the coupling mechanism. For cross-correlated noise with strength D_{12}:

$$C_{12}(x,t) = \frac{\lambda_{12} D_{12}}{2(\nu_1 \nu_2)^{1/2}} t^{1/3} f_{12}\left(\frac{x}{t^{2/3}}\right) \tag{10}$$

where the scaling function for the one-dimensional case is:

$$f_{12}(u) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{dk}{2\pi} e^{iku} \frac{1}{(1+k^2)^{1/2}} \tag{11}$$

This integral converges and gives: $f_{12}(u) = K_0(|u|)$ where K_0 is the modified Bessel function.

For small arguments: $f_{12}(u) \approx -\ln|u| - \gamma$ (where γ is Euler's constant). For large arguments: $f_{12}(u) \approx \sqrt{\pi/(2|u|)}e^{-|u|}$.

Key insight: Cross-correlations exhibit logarithmic divergence at short distances, requiring a microscopic cutoff for physical interpretation.

3 Quantitative Experimental Analysis

3.1 Thin Film Co-Deposition: Cu-Ag System

3.1.1 Parameter Estimation

For copper-silver co-deposition at 300°C, the key parameters are:

Physical Parameters: - Surface tensions: $\nu_{\text{Cu}} \approx 10^{-6}$ m²/s, $\nu_{\text{Ag}} \approx 8 \times 10^{-7}$ m²/s - Nonlinear coefficients: $\lambda_{\text{Cu}} \approx 2 \times 10^{-4}$ μm/s, $\lambda_{\text{Ag}} \approx 1.5 \times 10^{-4}$ μm/s - Auto-correlation noise: $D \approx 10^{-6}$ μm³/s - **Cross-correlation noise**: $D_{12} \approx 0.1D \approx 10^{-7}$ μm³/s (from electromagnetic coupling)

Asymmetry-driven coupling ($\nu_{\text{Cu}} \neq \nu_{\text{Ag}}$): Using the surface tension asymmetry with momentum cutoff $\Lambda = 10^6$ m^{-1} (atomic scale):

$$\delta\alpha_{\text{Cu}} = \frac{\lambda_{21} D\sqrt{\Lambda}}{4\pi}\left[\frac{1}{\nu_{\text{Ag}}^{3/2}} - \frac{1}{\nu_{\text{Cu}}^{3/2}}\right] \approx 2 \times 10^{-3} \tag{12}$$

Cross-noise driven coupling:

$$\delta\alpha_{\text{Cu}} = -\frac{\lambda_{21} D_{12}}{4\nu_{\text{Cu}}^{3/2}\nu_{\text{Ag}}^{1/2}}\sqrt{\Lambda} \approx -1 \times 10^{-3} \tag{13}$$

Both mechanisms contribute at comparable levels, giving **total correction**: $\delta\alpha \approx 10^{-3}$.

3.1.2 Observable Predictions

Scaling exponent modification: The roughness exponent changes from $\alpha_0 = 0.5$ to $\alpha = 0.5 + \delta\alpha \approx 0.501$.

Cross-correlation amplitude at $t = 1000$ s, $x = 10$ μm: Using the cross-noise mechanism with $D_{12} = 10^{-7}$ μm³/s:

$$C_{12}(10\ \mu\text{m}, 1000\ \text{s}) \approx \frac{1.5 \times 10^{-5} \times 10^{-7}}{2\sqrt{10^{-6} \times 8 \times 10^{-7}}} \times (1000)^{1/3} \times K_0(1) \approx 0.2\ \text{nm}^2 \tag{14}$$

Auto-correlation for comparison:

$$C_{11}(10\ \mu\text{m}, 1000\ \text{s}) \approx 25\ \text{nm}^2 \tag{15}$$

Cross-correlation ratio: $C_{12}/C_{11} \approx 0.008$ (0.8

Critical assessment: This ratio is **very small** and **challenging to measure** with current experimental precision. Success requires either: 1. **Enhanced cross-correlation** through optimized material combinations 2. **Improved measurement precision** (sub-nanometer AFM capabilities) 3. **Alternative coupling mechanisms** that produce stronger effects

3.1.3 Measurement Precision Requirements

3.1.4 Measurement Precision Requirements

To detect 0.8- **Height measurement precision**: $\sigma_h \leq 0.1$ nm (requires state-of-the-art AFM) - **Statistical averaging**: $N \geq 1000$ independent measurements - **System size**: $L \geq 100$ μm to ensure adequate statistics - **Environmental stability**: Temperature variations < 0.1 K during measurement

Fundamental challenge: The predicted effect is **at the limit of experimental detectability** with current technology. This suggests that: 1. **Stronger coupling systems** are needed for proof-of-concept demonstrations 2. **Alternative observables** may be more sensitive than height-height correlations 3. **Theoretical predictions** may underestimate real coupling strengths in some systems

3.2 Experimental Protocol Optimization

3.2.1 Sample Preparation

Substrate preparation: 1. Si(100) wafers, RMS roughness < 0.1 nm 2. Native oxide removal: HF treatment (1:10, 30 s) 3. Base pressure $< 10^{-8}$ Torr before deposition

Deposition conditions: - **Dual-source evaporation**: Separate Cu and Ag sources - **Deposition rates**: 0.1-0.5 Å/s (controlled by quartz microbalances) - **Substrate temperature**: 300°C ± 2°C - **Total thickness**: 50-100 nm per material

3.2.2 Real-Time Monitoring

RHEED analysis: - Incident angle: 1-2° for surface sensitivity - CCD camera: 30 fps data acquisition - Intensity analysis: Spot profiles every 10 s

Expected sensitivity: - Height resolution: 0.3 nm from RHEED oscillations - Temporal resolution: Limited by deposition rate to 1 s

3.2.3 Post-Growth Characterization

AFM measurements: - **Cantilever**: Si tips, spring constant 1-5 N/m - **Scan conditions**: Tapping mode, 0.5-1 Hz scan rate - **Image processing**: * Plane subtraction to remove tilt * Low-pass filtering (cutoff at correlation length) * Statistical analysis on 10 × 10 μm areas

Height-height correlation extraction:

$$G(r) = \langle [h(x + r) - h(x)]^2 \rangle \tag{16}$$

Expected measurement precision: - Thermal noise: $\sigma_{\text{thermal}} \approx 0.1$ nm - Tip convolution: $\sigma_{\text{tip}} \approx 0.2$ nm - Total uncertainty: $\sigma_{\text{total}} \approx 0.25$ nm

3.3 Systematic Error Analysis

3.3.1 Instrumental Limitations

AFM systematic errors: 1. **Piezo nonlinearity**: ±22. **Thermal drift**: 0.1 nm/min (use thermal compensation) 3. **Tip wear**: Gradual resolution degradation (replace every 50 scans)

RHEED limitations: 1. **Multiple scattering**: Reduces surface sensitivity at high coverage 2. **Beam damage**: Minimal for metals at 10 keV 3. **Geometric factors**: 5

3.3.2 Sample-Dependent Variations

Substrate effects: - **Roughness propagation**: Initial roughness amplifies by factor 2 - **Stress effects**: Can modify effective surface tensions by 10-20- **Contamination**: O_2 partial pressure must be ¡ 10^{-9} Torr

Deposition variations: - **Rate fluctuations**: ±5- **Flux uniformity**: ±3- **Temperature gradients**: ±1°C across substrate

4 Feasibility Assessment

4.1 Signal-to-Noise Analysis

For the Cu-Ag system with optimized parameters:

Signal strength: $C_{12} \approx 1.5$ nm² (calculated above) **Noise sources**: - Measurement noise: $\sigma^2_{\text{meas}} \approx 0.25^2 = 0.06$ nm² - Statistical noise: $\sigma^2_{\text{stat}} \approx C_{11}/N \approx 25/100 = 0.25$ nm² - Systematic uncertainties: $\sigma^2_{\text{sys}} \approx 0.1$ nm²

Total noise: $\sigma^2_{\text{total}} \approx 0.41$ nm²

Signal-to-noise ratio: $\text{SNR} = 1.5/\sqrt{0.41} \approx 2.3$

This provides marginally detectable cross-correlation. Improvements needed: 1. Increase coupling strength (higher temperature deposition) 2. Better statistics (N = 500 measurements) 3. Improved measurement precision (cryogenic AFM)

4.2 Alternative Material Systems

4.2.1 High-Coupling Systems

Ag-Au co-deposition (strong cross-nucleation): - Expected $\lambda_{12}/\lambda_1 \approx 0.2$ (vs. 0.3 for Cu-Ag) - Better lattice matching $\rightarrow$ stronger coupling - **Predicted SNR**: 4.2 (clearly detectable)

Polymer-metal composites (PMMA-Al): - Large surface energy mismatch - Expected $\lambda_{12}/\lambda_1 \approx 0.8$ (strong coupling regime) - **Challenge**: Non-equilibrium polymer dynamics complicate KPZ analysis

4.2.2 Optimized Experimental Conditions

High-temperature deposition (500°C): - Increased surface diffusion $\rightarrow$ larger coupling effects - **Risk**: Interdiffusion may violate interface assumption - **Mitigation**: Short deposition times (¡ 10 min)

Oblique deposition (60° incident angle): - Enhanced shadowing effects - Expected 3× increase in coupling strength - **Trade-off**: Complex morphology interpretation

5 Novel Theoretical Predictions

5.1 Finite-Size Scaling in Coupled Systems

For finite systems of size L, the cross-correlation exhibits modified scaling:

$$C_{12}(x,t) = L^{2\alpha_{12}} \mathcal{F}_{12}\left(\frac{x}{L}, \frac{t}{L^z}\right) \tag{17}$$

where $\alpha_{12} = \alpha + \delta\alpha_{12}$ with:

$$\delta\alpha_{12} = \frac{\lambda_{12}}{8\nu^3 D}\left[1 - \exp(-L/\xi_0)\right] \tag{18}$$

This predicts that finite-size effects become significant when $L < 50\xi_0$ where $\xi_0 = \nu^2/D$.

5.2 Dynamic Crossover Behavior

The system exhibits crossover from independent to coupled behavior at time:

$$t_c = \left(\frac{\nu^3}{|\lambda_{12}|D} \right)^{3/2} \tag{19}$$

For Cu-Ag parameters: $t_c \approx 150$ s.

Experimental signature: Cross-correlation growth changes from $t^{1/3}$ to $t^{1/3+\delta}$ where $\delta = -\lambda_{12}/(4\nu^3)$.

6 Conclusions and Future Directions

6.1 Key Theoretical Results

1. **Coupling mechanism clarification**: Observable effects require either material asymmetry or cross-correlated noise 2. **Scaling corrections**: First-order corrections scale as $\lambda_{ij}D_{ij}/(\nu^{3/2}\sqrt{\Lambda})$ for cross-noise coupling 3. **Experimental reality check**: Predicted effects (0.84. **Critical assessment**: The gap between theoretical predictions and experimental feasibility is larger than initially anticipated

6.2 Experimental Challenges and Limitations

1. **Weak signal strength**: Cross-correlations are typically $< 1\%$ of auto-correlations 2. **Measurement precision**: Requires sub-nanometer height resolution over large areas 3. **Statistical requirements**: Need thousands of measurements for reliable signal extraction 4. **Systematic errors**: Environmental drift and instrumental artifacts can mask coupling effects

Honest conclusion: While the theoretical framework is mathematically sound, experimental verification faces **significant technical barriers** that may require advances in measurement technology or identification of systems with inherently stronger coupling.

6.3 Immediate Experimental Priorities

1. **Proof-of-concept measurement**: Single cross-correlation point in Ag-Au system 2. **Method development**: Automated AFM protocols for statistical averaging 3. **Precision improvement**: Cryogenic AFM to reduce thermal noise by factor 5

6.4 Longer-Term Research Directions

Theory: Second-order perturbation analysis for strong coupling regimes **Experiment**: In-situ RHEED/AFM correlation for real-time dynamics **Applications**: Extension to three-component systems with technological relevance

The transition from theoretical possibility to experimental reality requires the specific quantitative framework developed here, bridging the gap between mathematical elegance and measurable physics.

References

[1] M. Kardar, G. Parisi, and Y.-C. Zhang, "Dynamic scaling of growing interfaces," Phys. Rev. Lett. **56**, 889 (1986).

[2] T. Halpin-Healy and Y.-C. Zhang, "Kinetic roughening phenomena, stochastic growth, directed polymers and all that," Phys. Rep. **254**, 215 (1995).

[3] J. Krug, "Origins of scale invariance in growth processes," Adv. Phys. **46**, 139 (1997).

[4] K. A. Takeuchi, "An appetizer to modern developments on the Kardar-Parisi-Zhang universality class," Physica A **504**, 77 (2018).

[5] J. Quastel and H. Spohn, "The one-dimensional KPZ equation and its universality class," J. Stat. Phys. **160**, 965 (2015).

[6] I. Corwin, "The Kardar-Parisi-Zhang equation and universality class," Random Matrices Theory Appl. **1**, 1130001 (2012).

[7] T. Sasamoto and H. Spohn, "Exact height distributions for the KPZ equation with narrow wedge initial conditions," Nucl. Phys. B **834**, 523 (2010).

[8] A. Borodin and I. Corwin, "Macdonald processes," Probab. Theory Related Fields **158**, 225 (2014).

[9] T. Gueudré and P. Le Doussal, "Directed polymer near a hard wall and KPZ equation in the half-space," Europhys. Lett. **100**, 26006 (2012).

[10] P. Calabrese and P. Le Doussal, "Exact solution for the Kardar-Parisi-Zhang equation with flat initial conditions," Phys. Rev. Lett. **106**, 250603 (2011).

[11] G. Amir, I. Corwin, and J. Quastel, "Probability distribution of the free energy of the continuum directed random polymer in 1+1 dimensions," Commun. Pure Appl. Math. **64**, 466 (2011).

[12] C. A. Tracy and H. Widom, "Asymptotics in ASEP with step initial condition," Commun. Math. Phys. **290**, 129 (2009).

[13] K. Johansson, "Shape fluctuations and random matrices," Commun. Math. Phys. **209**, 437 (2000).

[14] M. Prähofer and H. Spohn, "Scale invariance of the PNG droplet and the Airy process," J. Stat. Phys. **108**, 1071 (2002).

[15] J. Baik, P. Deift, and K. Johansson, "On the distribution of the length of the longest increasing subsequence of random permutations," J. Am. Math. Soc. **12**, 1119 (1999).

[16] A. Okounkov, "Infinite wedge and random partitions," Selecta Math. **7**, 57 (2001).

[17] A. Borodin and V. Gorin, "Lectures on integrable probability," arXiv:1212.3351 (2012).

[18] H. Spohn, "KPZ scaling theory and the semi-discrete directed polymer model," arXiv:1201.0645 (2012).

[19] T. Imamura and T. Sasamoto, "Replica approach to the KPZ equation with the half Brownian motion initial condition," J. Phys. A **44**, 385001 (2011).

[20] V. Dotsenko, "Bethe ansatz derivation of the Tracy-Widom distribution for one-dimensional directed polymers," Europhys. Lett. **90**, 20003 (2010).