Introduction

The signs and the magnitudes of Burgers vectors can be determined by matching weak-beam contrast simulations to corresponding dislocation images. This method has been successfully applied by Head et al. [1] on dissociated dislocations and dislocation dipoles. Forwood and Clarebrough [2] determined the Burgers vectors of interfacial dislocations by comparison with computed 'double two-beam' images. Schäublin and Stadelmann [3] showed that, in general, more than two beams have to be considered for weak-beam image simulations. The determination of the directions and the magnitudes of the Burgers vectors is especially important in materials containing ordinary and superdislocations. Dislocations of type $\frac{1}{2}[110]$, [101], and $\frac{1}{2}[112]$ are present in materials with L10 structure, e.g. \(\gamma\)-TiAl. Viguier et al. [4] determined the type of faulted dipoles in TiAl by comparing experimental and simulated weak-beam images. In the case of residual contrast and elastically anisotropic materials a full analysis of weak-beam dislocation images by contrast simulations is necessary to determine the Burgers vector [5] from the invisibility criterion $\vec{g} \cdot \vec{b} = 0$.

Ishida et al. [6] determined the signs and the magnitudes of Burgers vectors of complete dislocations from the number of terminating thickness contour lines $n = \vec{g} \cdot \vec{b}$ at the intersection points of the dislocations with the sample surfaces. No image contrast simulations are necessary for this procedure, and the Burgers vectors of different dislocations in a sample area can be determined easily, e.g. in TiAl [7]. Alternative imaging methods to determine Burgers vectors are based the asymmetry of the contrast features [8] or on the distortion of extinction bands near a dislocation [9]. Convergent-beam electron diffraction can also be used to determine the magnitudes of Burgers vectors of individual dislocations from the number $n = \vec{g} \cdot \vec{b}$ of interruptions of higher-order Laue-zone lines [10].

In the present work terminating thickness contour lines at the exit points of dislocations are analysed. The effective extinction distance $\xi_{\text{eff}}$ and therefore the distance of the thickness contour lines in an image decreases, if the deviation parameter $\sigma^2$ increases [11]. Especially for dense dislocation arrangements the number of terminating thickness fringes can only be determined unequivocally if the contour lines are closely spaced. In the following it is shown that for a different reason $\vec{g} \cdot \vec{b}$ is not an appropriate weak-beam condition to determine the magnitude of a Burgers vector. Imaging conditions with higher deviation parameters have to be used.
**Theory**

If a sample is bent, a local lattice tilt $\frac{d\mathbf{u}}{dz}$ modifies the deviation parameters $s_j$ to

$$s_j + 2\pi \mathbf{g}_j \cdot \frac{d\mathbf{u}}{dz},$$

where $\mathbf{g}_j$ are the different scattering vectors. For image contrast simulations of bent wedge-shaped samples the many-beam Howie-Whelan equations [11] are used:

$$\frac{dw}{dz} = M \Psi \text{ with } M_{jk} = \frac{1}{\xi_{jk}} + \delta_{jk} \left( k_s_j + 2\pi \mathbf{g}_j \cdot \frac{d\mathbf{u}}{dz} \right). \quad (1)$$

In this equation $\xi_{jk}$ is the extinction length (including an imaginary part for absorption) for scattering from the $j$-th to the $k$-th beam. The values have been determined from the EMS package [12]. For a constant lattice tilt contribution $\frac{\mathbf{g}_j \cdot d\mathbf{u}}{dz}$ the amplitudes of the different

---

Fig. 1 (a) Thickness contour lines in a bent γ-TiAl sample obtained with a JEOL200CX operating at 200 kV. $\mathbf{g}=111$, incident beam direction $[1.0 -1.6 0.6]$. (b) Many-beam image simulation of a dislocation with $[\overline{1}10]$ Burgers vector and $[19 -1 -20]$ line vector in a wedge-shaped sample with beams $\mathbf{g}$ to $\mathbf{g}$.

Fig. 2 Weak-beam images of a wedge-shaped bent sample simulated with (a) eight beams and (b) two beams.
beams $\psi_j$ can be determined using the matrix $T = \{\psi\}$ of eigenvectors of $M$ and the diagonal matrix $F$ containing the eigenvalues $\kappa_j$ of $M$ as diagonal elements of the form $\exp(\kappa_j \Delta z)$:

$$\psi(z + \Delta z) = T^{-1} F T \psi(z)$$  \hspace{1cm} (2)

The matrix $T^{-1}$ represents a transformation into the coordinate system of the Bloch waves $\psi_j$. The imaginary parts of $\kappa_j$ are the magnitudes of the wave vectors of the Bloch waves. The amplitudes and the phases of the Bloch waves are simply altered by $\exp(\kappa_j \Delta z)$. The matrix $T$ contains the contributions of the Bloch waves to the different diffracted beams $\psi_j$.

If distortions by defects are present, the matrix $M$ is not constant along the beam direction $z$. Thus, the eigenvalues of $M$ have to be determined several times for each position in an image. To reduce the computing time, Head et al. [1] introduced the generalized cross section for parallel dislocations. Here, instead of the lattice tilt $\Delta u/dz$ the displacements $\vec{u}(z)$ are used:

$$M_{jk} = \frac{\text{int}}{\xi_{jk}} + \delta_{jk} \xi_{j} \exp (2\pi i (\overrightarrow{g_j} - \overrightarrow{g_k}) \cdot \vec{u}(z))$$  \hspace{1cm} (3)

$$\exp (-2\pi i \overrightarrow{g_j} \cdot \vec{u}(z)) N_{jk} \exp (2\pi i \overrightarrow{g_j} \cdot \vec{u}(z)),$$

resulting in:

$$\psi(z + \Delta z) = U^{-1}(z) S L S^{-1} U(z) \psi(z)$$  \hspace{1cm} (4)

Here, the diagonal matrix $L$ contains the eigenvalues $\lambda_j$ in the form of $\exp(\lambda_j \Delta z)$. The eigenvectors $N$ are found in the matrix $S$. $L$ and $S$ do not depend on local distortions introduced by crystal defects. The matrix $U(z)$ contains only diagonal elements of the form $\exp (2\pi i \overrightarrow{g_j} \cdot \vec{u})$. The equations (1) and (3) are equivalent [13], but contrast calculations of defects using eqn. (4) are much faster as the eigenvalues of $N$ have to be determined only once for a whole image [7] as $N$ is constant. However, in the case of an additional sample bending the eigenvalues of $N$ have to be determined for each position. The displacement field $\vec{u}(z)$ of dislocations in elastically anisotropic media is determined using the theory of Stroh [14]. Surface relaxation [15] has not been taken into account.

**Results**

A weak-beam image of a dislocation in a bent $\gamma$-TiAl sample is shown in Fig. 1a. At one exit point of the dislocation two terminating thickness fringes are found, whereas on the other side only one contour line terminates. In this case, the magnitude of the Burgers vector can not be determined unequivocally by the method of Ishida et al. [6]. In many-beam image
simulations of a bent sample with (Fig. 1b) and without (Fig. 2a) a dislocation. Thickness contour lines dissociate near positions with ($q$, $3g$). Extra thickness contour lines appear for low deviation parameters $S_f$. For weak-beam conditions between ($q$,$-q$) and ($q$, $3g$), two-beam (Fig. 2b) and many-beam simulations (Fig. 2a) of thickness contour lines differ significantly.

Figure 3 shows experimental images of thickness contour lines of a bent sample. A splitting of contour lines appears in dark-field images (Fig. 3a) for a systematic row of excited beams. In bright-field images of bent samples dissociations of thickness contour lines occur, too (Fig. 3b).

The extinction length

$$\xi_g = \text{Im} \left( \frac{2\pi}{\kappa_1 - \kappa_2} \right)$$

depends on the difference of the wave vectors $\kappa_1$ and $\kappa_2$ of the two most important Bloch waves for a reflection $g$. Wave vectors of Bloch waves in a bent sample can be represented in a graph of dispersion surfaces (Figs 4a and 4b). A bending of the sample is equivalent to a shift of the centre of the Ewald sphere parallel to the direction of the systematic row of beams. Twice its shift corresponds to the index $x\parallel g$ defining the weak-beam condition ($g$, $x\parallel g$). The difference of the wave vectors of the two Bloch waves is smallest for ($g$, $1g$). Therefore, the extinction length is high and the distance of the thickness contour lines in a bent sample shows a maximum at $x^\parallel = 0$ with $\xi_{eff} = \xi_g$ (Fig. 2b). For two-beam calculations the extinction length is smaller than in a many-beam simulation with $x < 3$ as the distances of the two most important dispersion surfaces depend on the number of beams. For $x >> 3$ the extinction length obtained by two-beam calculations is similar to the result of many-beam simulations.

In many-beam simulations of bent samples the two most important Bloch waves (Fig. 4d) depend on the imaging condition. At the positions with ($q$, $2g$) and ($q$, $3g$) the two most important Bloch waves change. At ($q$, $2g$) the change in the extinction length is small, as the wave vectors of the two Bloch waves (2) and (3) in Fig. 4b are similar. Near ($q$, $3g$) a change of the importance of the two Bloch waves (1) and (2) occurs (Fig. 4d). Their wave vectors are significantly different (Fig. 4b). The difference between the wave vectors (2) and (4) is smaller than between (1) and (3). Therefore, if the Bloch waves (1) and (3) are the most important ones for the beam $g$ extra thickness contour lines are present. They terminate near ($q$, $3g$), as for higher deviation parameters, (2) and (4) are the most important Bloch waves.

Fig. 4 Dispersion surfaces (a) for the two-beam case and (b) for six beams. Contributions of the different Bloch waves to the amplitude of the 111 reflection (c) for the two-beam case and (d) for six beams.
The effect of a dissociation of thickness contour lines occurs as soon as three beams are taken into account for an image simulation. For three beams only one dissociation occurs, in the case of a systematic row of the beams $-\beta, 0, 2\beta$ for $(\beta, 3\beta)$, in the case of the beams $-\beta, \beta, 2\beta$ for $(\beta, -3\beta)$. Figure 2a shows that the distance of the dissociations for $(\beta, 3\beta)$ equals the distance of the thickness contour lines for the exact Bragg condition $(\beta, \beta)$. The difference of the wave vectors of the Bloch wave $(1)$ and $(2)$ in Fig. 4b is related to the occurrence of extra thickness contour lines at $(\beta, 3\beta)$ for thicknesses

$$d = \text{Im} \left( \frac{2\pi}{\kappa_1 - \kappa_2} \right).$$

Concluding remarks

The weak-beam condition $(\beta, 3\beta)$ is not an appropriate imaging condition for the determination of the magnitude of a Burgers vector from the number of terminating thickness contour lines. Extra thickness contour lines occur if more than two beams are considered in a simulation of a bent wedge-shaped sample. In many-beam simulations extra thickness contour lines also terminate at positions with $(\beta, -3\beta)$. No further extra thickness contour lines appear for weak-beam conditions $(\beta, x\beta)$ with $x > 3$. Thus, the length of a Burgers vector can only be determined accurately by the method of Ishida et al. [6] if $x$ is considerably larger than 3. Furthermore, a local strain analysis from the shift of thickness contour lines in two different weak-beam images [16] is only possible for $x > 3$. Weak-beam images are only easily interpretable for large deviation parameters. For all bent materials the dissociation of thickness contour lines occurs near $(\beta, 3\beta)$ for weak-beam images using any systematic row of beams. The dissociation is a consequence of the scattering potential $V(\beta)$ and therefore the extinction length $\xi_\beta$.
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