Measurements of surface attachment kinetics for faceted ice crystal growth
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Abstract

We present new measurements of the growth rates of faceted ice crystals in the temperature range -40°C < T < -2°C, from which we infer the surface attachment coefficients for the two principal facets. Our data are well described by a polynucleation model, allowing a determination of the molecular step energy as a function of temperature for both facets. These results are a substantial improvement over previous work, and we present an analysis showing that the inconsistencies seen in prior measurements could be explained by systematic errors associated with diffusion effects and substrate interactions. These data provide new insights into the surface attachment kinetics governing ice crystal growth, and they suggest new avenues for examining ice growth behavior using molecular dynamics simulations. Knowledge gained by a detailed case study of ice may in turn lead to a greater general understanding of the fundamental physics underlying crystal growth dynamics.

1. Introduction

Crystall growth is typically governed by a broad range of physical processes over many length scales. These include transport phenomena in the material surrounding the crystal, such as heat and particle diffusion, as well as the detailed attachment kinetics that control how molecules become part of the crystalline lattice. The attachment kinetics are especially difficult to model, since the many-body molecular dynamics at the surface can include numerous subtle and nontrivial effects. Advances in materials science are often hindered by uncertainties in crystal growth behavior, so developing a fuller understanding of surface attachment kinetics remains an important goal.

We have been exploring ice crystal growth as a case study for investigating surface attachment kinetics. Ice plays significant roles in many environmental and biological processes, plus the intermolecular potentials between water molecules have been well studied, allowing sophisticated ab initio molecular dynamics simulations of the ice surface structure and growth [1-4]. Ice is also well suited for investigating chemical effects on crystal growth dynamics, since there is a substantial literature on ice surface chemistry, including solvation effects that may be relevant to crystal growth catalysis [5,6].

Ice crystal growth from water vapor exhibits a rich phenomenology that remains rather poorly understood [7]. For example, the morphology of growing ice crystals changes dramatically with temperature, showing several transitions between plate-like and columnar structures. These observations suggest a complex temperature dependence in the attachment kinetics, as well as indicating substantial differences in surface structure and/or dynamics on the principal facets.

A key experimental goal for understanding the attachment kinetics in ice is to establish accurate measurements of crystal growth behaviors under well-defined conditions. Of particular interest are the growth rates \( v(T,\sigma_{surf}) \) of the two principal facets, for each giving the perpendicular surface growth velocity as a function of temperature and supersaturation at the surface. It is often convenient to write \( v(T,\sigma_{surf}) = a(T,\sigma_{surf})\psi_{kin}(T)\sigma_{surf} \), where \( \psi_{kin}(T) \) is a temperature-dependent "kinetic" velocity derived from statistical mechanics [7]. The dimensionless attachment coefficient \( a \) then encapsulates the molecular kinetics governing crystal growth at the solid/vapor interface. From the definition of \( \psi_{kin} \), we must have \( a \leq 1 \).

Comparing measurements of \( a \) with crystal growth theory immediately yields basic information about the ice surface structure and the underlying molecular processes defining the attachment kinetics. For example, observing a functional form \( a(\sigma_{surf}) = \exp(-\sigma_0/\sigma_{surf}) \), where \( \sigma_0 \) is a constant, is strong evidence that the growth is limited mainly by the nucleation of molecular layers [8]. Alternatively, finding \( a(\sigma_{surf}) = \sigma_{surf} \) (or equivalently,
Evidence that layer nucleation is the dominant factor in ice attachment kinetics has been building for many years, suggesting surface with fast attachment kinetics. A polynucleation model is then expected to describe the growth of large surfaces with high nucleation rates, as is typical in many ice growth experiments. This picture has been further supported by direct observations of the nucleation and growth of individual islands on the ice basal and prism facets. The observations are typically done in air at atmospheric pressure, so $\sigma_{\text{surf}}=\sigma_\alpha$ from diffusion effects, and reliably estimating $\sigma_{\text{surf}}$ under such conditions can be exceedingly difficult, as we discuss below. Although much useful information about growth anisotropies and atmospheric phenomenon can be gleaned from morphological studies, quantitative estimates of $\alpha(T,\sigma_{\text{surf}})$ from these experiments are highly uncertain.

Experiments measuring $\alpha(T,\sigma_{\text{surf}})$ more directly have not enjoyed the same reasonable consensus as the morphological studies, however, as we examine below. Quantitative measurements of $v(T,\sigma_{\text{surf}})$ have varied considerably between different experiments, and even the functional form of $v(T,\sigma_{\text{surf}})$ at different temperatures and on different facets has not been on a firm observational footing. A long-sought goal has been to use precise measurements of $\alpha(T,\sigma_{\text{surf}})$ to discover the physical mechanisms underlying the temperature transitions seen in ice growth morphologies. Recent observations in [9] were made using quite large crystals at $p=1$ bar [7].

In the limit $\alpha\ll\Delta v_{\text{diff}}$ we have $\sigma_{\text{surf}}=\sigma_m$, so the growth is primarily limited by attachment kinetics. In the opposite limit, $\alpha\gg\Delta v_{\text{diff}}$, the growth is mainly limited by particle diffusion, giving $v=\Delta v_{\text{diff}}=\Delta v_{\text{surf}}$, which is independent of $\alpha$. When the growth is mainly diffusion-limited, it can be exceedingly difficult to use growth measurements to extract useful information about $\alpha$, since even small uncertainties in measurements of $\alpha$, or $v$ result in large errors in the inferred $\alpha_{\text{surf}}$ and $\alpha$.

Even if $p=1$, we have found that diffusion effects can affect the interpretation of ice growth measurements. For example, if a slowly growing test crystal has a fast-growing neighbor crystal, then the neighbor may substantially perturb the supersaturation field near the test crystal, and determining the size of the perturbation is nontrivial. The best way to avoid this problem is to observe only well isolated test crystals, with no neighboring crystals between the test crystal and the outer boundary where $\sigma_\alpha$ is determined.

Even with well isolated test crystals, fast growing neighboring facets can significantly affect the behavior of slower growing facets, again via a perturbation of the supersaturation field around the crystal. For small perturbations when $p<1$, we have used an approximate correction to $\sigma_{\text{surf}}$

$$\sigma_{\text{surf}}=\sigma_m-\sum f_i v_i \frac{\Delta v_{\text{diff}}}{v_{\text{kin}}}$$

where $f_i$ is the area of a growing region of the crystal, $v_i$ is the growth velocity of that region, $\Delta v_{\text{diff}}$ is calculated using an approximate effective radius for the crystal, and the sum is over the entire exposed area of the crystal. It is straightforward to show that Eq. (2) gives a reasonable approximate correction provided $\Delta v_{\text{diff}}/v_{\text{kin}}<1$, where $\Delta v_{\text{diff}}$ equals the sum in the expression. Eq. (2) is especially useful for estimating residual diffusion corrections in low-pressure growth data, since $\Delta v_{\text{diff}}$ is readily computed from experimentally derived quantities.

Morphological studies have typically been done with $p=1$, often monitoring the growth of numerous neighboring crystals. Quantitative extraction of $\alpha(T,\sigma_{\text{surf}})$ is therefore essentially impossible for these experiments. Similarly, growth measurements reported in [16] were made using quite large crystals at $p=1$, so here also the growth was strongly diffusion-limited, making quantitative analysis to extract $\alpha(T,\sigma_{\text{surf}})$ quite difficult. Recent observations in [9] are likewise ill-suited for determining $\alpha(T,\sigma_{\text{surf}})$, owing to large diffusion effects.
In [17], the authors observed crystal growth velocities at p=0.3 that were lower than expected from similar measurements at p=0, concluding that $\alpha$ was strongly affected by the presence of air in their experiment. A possible alternative interpretation of their observations is simply that the supersaturation in the vicinity of air in the test crystal was somewhat smaller than calculated in their experiments. Perhaps the idea of a large change in $\alpha$ to reproduce the observed growth velocities. We believe, therefore, that the claim made in [17] that $\alpha$ depends on air pressure is questionable, given the data and analysis presented.

Similar conclusions about the dependence of $\alpha$ on air pressure were reached by [18,19], but again we believe diffusion effects provide a viable alternative interpretation of their data. In our own experiments at p=1, done with the apparatus described below, we have found that the diffusion corrections are exceedingly tricky to calculate, even with small test crystals and a greater attention to experimental systematics. One reliable conclusion we have reached from our p=1 data is that the diffusion corrections are considerably more difficult to calculate than was previously appreciated.

The situation is somewhat better in [20], where the authors observed very low growth rates, as low as 0.3 nm/s. Since this is about 10 times lower than a typical $v_{diff}$ in their experiments, the observed growth was partially kinetics limited. Some facets grew considerably faster than this minimum growth rate, however, so a detailed diffusion analysis would be needed to accurately determine $\sigma_{surf}$ on the slower-growing facets.

2.2. Substrate interactions

When the attachment kinetics on a faceted ice surface include a substantial nucleation barrier, we have observed that this barrier may be lowered when the facet intersects a supporting substrate, a phenomenon that can be explained with the contact-angle model illustrated in Fig. 1. This can result in substantial systematic errors in growth measurements, since the ice-substrate contact angle is typically not well known and will depend on the cleanliness of the substrate. If a substrate surface is sufficiently hydrophilic, we have observed that the nucleation barrier can even be eliminated completely, giving unfiltered growth along the substrate.

Substrate interactions were previously observed in [19], where the authors noted that prism facets intersecting their substrate grew up to five times faster than prism facets not intersecting the substrate. It appears that measurements using intersecting facets were included in their final velocity data, however, suggesting that their results may have been seriously compromised by substrate interactions. The key point here is that substrate interactions can strongly affect growth measurements, to a degree that depends on the preparation and cleanliness of the substrate surface. Neglecting substrate interactions therefore casts considerable doubt on the accuracy of an ice growth measurement.

Substrate interactions were also apparently observed in [20], as the authors noted that facets contacting their capillary substrate sometimes grew much more rapidly than noncontacting facets. Substrate interactions may have substantially affected the measurements in [21,17,22] also, as the authors observed the growth of ice crystals with random orientations relative to their substrates.

For the experiments below, we spent some effort searching for a suitably hydrophobic coating that would eliminate or greatly reduce the effects of substrate interactions. Our search was unsuccessful, however, as all surface treatments we tried on our sapphire substrate tended to increase the substrate interaction problem. In the end we found that a carefully cleaned substrate showed the weakest substrate interactions, which were nevertheless often non-negligible.

2.3. Latent heat effects

Crystal heating effects arising from vapor deposition can be substantial for free-floating crystals, and their magnitude can be estimated by solving the double-diffusion problem (i.e. heat and particle diffusion) for the spherical case [7]. The overall effect is mainly to change the effective $\sigma_{surf}$, since the thermal conductivity of ice is high enough that the crystal itself has a uniform temperature, at least for small, slowly growing crystals. The double diffusion problem is nontrivial in general, so we believe that measurements made using freely floating crystals (e.g. [23–25,16]) are not well suited for estimating $\alpha(T, \sigma_{surf})$.

Fortunately, small crystals resting on a substrate are not greatly affected by latent heating, as the resulting crystal temperature rise is often negligible [7]. The growth of larger crystals may be affected by heating, however, leading to a rounding of faceted corners during growth [21].

3. Experimental procedures and growth data

For this investigation we sought to produce more accurate measurements of $\alpha(T, \sigma_{surf})$, improving upon previous work by

![Fig. 1](image-url). If the ice/substrate contact angle $\theta_{contact}$ is less than the intersection angle $\theta_{facet}$ between the facet and the substrate, then the ice/substrate contact will act as a source of molecular steps on the intersecting ice facet, as seen in the diagram on the left. The presence of these molecular steps reduces the normal nucleation barrier on this facet, increasing the surface growth rate. If $\theta_{contact} > \theta_{facet}$, as in the diagram on the right, then the contact will not be a source of steps, and the nucleation barrier will remain unaffected. Since $\theta_{contact}$ depends on the chemical nature of the substrate, as well as on any chemical residue on an imperfectly cleaned substrate, substrate interactions can be somewhat unpredictable in ice growth experiments.
carefully reducing or eliminating the systematic errors described above. An idealized schematic diagram of our experimental set-up is shown in Fig. 2a. The top surface of the experimental chamber consisted of a sapphire "ice reservoir" at a uniform temperature $T_{IR}$, and a layer of ice crystals on its lower surface served as a source of water vapor. At the beginning of each measurement, an isolated test crystal was positioned below the center of the ice reservoir, resting on the bottom sapphire substrate surface held at temperature $T_{subst}$. The ice reservoir and the substrate were thermally isolated with a vertical spacing of 1.0 mm. The temperature difference $\Delta T = T_{IR} - T_{subst}$ determined the water vapor supersaturation seen by the test crystal. As $\Delta T$ was increased, the test crystal growth was monitored.

During a typical experimental run, we continuously nucleated small ice crystals in a much larger outer chamber containing ordinary laboratory air, where they grew while slowly falling to the bottom of the chamber. Typically $> 10^7$ of these micron-scale crystals were growing within the outer chamber at any given time, and the fall times were approximately 3–5 min. This cloud of freshly made, slowly growing crystals served as the source of seed crystals for our growth measurements. Thin plate-like crystals were grown with an outer chamber temperature near $-13^\circ$C, while columnar crystals were grown with a chamber temperature near $-6^\circ$C.

To select a test crystal, an inlet valve on the top of a smaller inner chamber was opened, and air carrying suspended ice crystals was drawn from the outer chamber through the inner chamber. Typically the inner chamber temperature was equal to $T_{subst}$. The operator rotated the substrate disk while observing the test region under the ice reservoir (see Fig. 2b), thus examining crystals that randomly landed on the substrate. After a suitable test crystal was identified and positioned, the inlet valve was closed and the pressure in the inner chamber was reduced so typically $p < 0.025$ during growth observations.

Once the pressure was reduced, the operator first adjusted $T_{IR}$ and observed the test crystal growing or evaporating slightly in order to determine the $\sigma = 0$ point. After this, $\Delta T$ was slowly increased to grow the test crystal. The thickness of the crystal – defined as the distance between the substrate and the parallel top facet – was determined using optical interferometry, while optical imaging was used to record the crystal size and morphology in the substrate plane. These data, along with the temperature difference $\Delta T$, were all recorded as the crystal grew. At the end of a growth run, the crystal was evaporated away and another test crystal was selected. Sample crystals are shown in Figs. 3 and 4, and a more complete description of our apparatus can be found in [26].

The overall design of this experiment was not especially novel, being essentially similar to that described in [22], and it is a redesigned version of our previous experiment [27]. Many very significant improvements were made in the details, however, to ensure more accurate and reproducible measurements with much reduced systematic errors, including: (1) Only crystal facets parallel to, and thus not in contact with, the substrate were used to determine $\sigma(T, \sigma_{surf})$, thus eliminating systematic errors arising from substrate interactions, as described above; (2) crystal sizes typically $< 50 \mu m$ were used, with $p < 0.025$, and residual diffusion effects were corrected using Eq. (2), thus minimizing the systematic errors associated with diffusion-limited growth described above; (3) the ice reservoir was quite close to the test crystal, minimizing perturbations in the supersaturation field arising from unseen neighboring crystals; (4) residual chemical contamination was minimized by using low outgassing materials

Fig. 2. (a) An idealized schematic of the inner sub-chamber of our experimental set-up. The top surface, covered with ice crystals, acts as a water vapor reservoir at temperature $T_{IR}$ for a growing test crystal resting on the substrate at temperature $T_{subst}$. When $T_{IR} > T_{subst}$, growth rates are determined by measuring the thickness of the crystal (i.e., the distance between the substrate and the parallel top facet) as a function of time using optical interferometry, and by measuring the other crystal dimensions using optical microscopy viewing from below the substrate. The schematic in (b) shows the actual test chamber, located inside a larger vacuum chamber. The substrate disk can be rotated to bring test crystals into position under the ice reservoir. Additional experimental details are provided in [26].
in the vacuum chamber construction, placing temperature control elements and wiring outside the vacuum envelope, baking the chamber between runs, and cycling the chamber air between crystals; (5) precision temperature control [28] allowed us to determine the \( T = 0 \) point for each crystal to an accuracy of better than \( \Delta T = \pm 0.03\% \). The calculation relating \( T \) to \( \Delta T \) was validated by nucleating water droplets on the substrate (in the absence of any test crystals) and measuring \( \Delta T \) at which the droplets were neither evaporating nor growing; (6) only crystals with near-perfect simple-prism morphologies were selected for measurement, as these were found to yield the most reproducible growth measurements; (7) crystals were grown only once and then discarded, as again we found that this practice yielded the most reproducible measurements; and (8) over 200 crystals were measured, on average eight for each facet at each temperature, to ensure data consistency and to test for systematic effects.

Fig. 5 shows sample data from our growth measurements of basal facets. As can be seen in these examples, the scatter in our velocity measurements was quite low, yielding accurate measurements of \( v(\sigma_{\text{surf}}) \) for individual crystals. All our growth measurements were well described using the functional form

\[
a(\sigma_{\text{surf}}) = A \exp(-\sigma_0/\sigma_{\text{surf}}),
\]

consistent with a polynucleation model. Attempts to use other growth models, for example the spiral nucleation model with \( v = \sigma_{\text{surf}}^2 \), shown in Fig. 5, yielded much poorer fits to the data.

All our basal growth data were furthermore well described by using \( A = 1 \) in our parameterization of the polynucleation model, as is shown graphically in Fig. 6. For these data, therefore, we set \( A = 1 \) and fit the \( a(\sigma_{\text{surf}}) \) data for each crystal with the single adjustable parameter \( \sigma_0 \).

The main limitation in determining \( a(T, \sigma_{\text{surf}}) \) came from crystal-to-crystal variations in growth, as seen in the histograms in Fig. 5. The source of these variations is not known, but could have been from minor crystal defects, greater than expected uncertainties in the inferred supersaturations, minor residual impurity chemical effects, or perhaps other causes.

In addition to the relatively minor variations in growth rates between crystals that we normally observed, we also found that a small number of crystals, less than 10%, exhibited growth behaviors that were far outside the norm. These “outlier” crystals, being clearly contaminated in some unknown way, perhaps by surface dislocations, were removed from further analysis.

Examining basal growth at \(-12^\circ \text{C} \), where we measured the largest number of crystals, we found no correlation between growth rates and the areas of the basal facets, where the latter ranged from \( 10^{-9} \) to \( 8 \times 10^{-9} \) \( \text{m}^2 \). The scatter in the data was fairly high, but this observation supports the hypothesis of a polynucleation model over a mononucleation model [8].

Fig. 7 shows additional sample data for growth of the prism facet. At temperatures \( T \leq -10^\circ \text{C} \) the overall behavior was similar to that seen with the basal growth measurements, and the polynucleation model with \( A = 1 \) provided a good fit of the data. For \( T > -10^\circ \text{C} \), however, the measurements were no longer consistent with \( A = 1 \), as is shown in Fig. 7b. For these data we fit for both \( A \) and \( \sigma_0 \) at each temperature.

We combined the individual \( \sigma_{\text{fl}} \) measurements for different crystals at a given temperature by weighting each measurement with an uncertainty \( \delta_{\sigma_{\text{fl}}} \) estimated from the scatter in the raw data, producing a weighted mean \( \langle \sigma_0 \rangle \) along with an uncertainty estimate \( \delta(\langle \sigma_0 \rangle) \) for the mean [29]

\[
\langle \sigma_0 \rangle = \frac{\sum \sigma_{\text{fl}} \delta_{\sigma_{\text{fl}}}^2}{\sum \delta_{\sigma_{\text{fl}}}^2},
\]

\[
\delta(\langle \sigma_0 \rangle)^2 = \frac{\sum (\sigma_{\text{fl}} - \langle \sigma_0 \rangle)^2 \delta_{\sigma_{\text{fl}}}^2}{(N_{\text{eff}} - 1) \sum \delta_{\sigma_{\text{fl}}}^2}
\]

where \( N_{\text{eff}} = \left( \sum \delta_{\sigma_{\text{fl}}}^2 / \delta_{\sigma_{\text{min}}}^2 \right) \) is the effective number of points in the sample at each temperature. This method uses the scatter in the measurements along with the \( \delta_{\sigma_{\text{fl}}} \) estimates to determine the error in the mean, and we believe it gave sensible uncertainty estimates. As a test we also formed unweighted averages (ignoring the \( \delta_{\sigma_{\text{fl}}} \) estimates) and found that the results were not significantly different from the weighted averages. And in another test we fit \( \langle \sigma_0 \rangle \) to a data set that combined all the raw \( a(\sigma_{\text{surf}}) \) data at a single temperature, and again the results were essentially equivalent to the weighted averages.

The final results from all our growth measurements are shown in Fig. 8. When we assumed \( A = 1 \) in our fits, as described above, we assigned an approximate uncertainty of \( \pm 0.3 \) to \( A \) in Fig. 8, based on an overall assessment of the measurements. As we demonstrated above, the polynucleation model yielded an excellent fit to all our growth measurements, and the extracted coefficients \( A(T) \) and \( \sigma_0(T) \) then define the attachment coefficients \( a(T, \sigma_{\text{surf}}) \) for the two principal facets.

4. Discussion and interpretation

Interpreting the results shown in Fig. 8 presents a significant challenge, as neither the structure nor the molecular dynamics of the ice surface are well understood, especially over this
measurements of individual crystals often have quite low scatter. The mean are mainly determined by crystal-to-crystal variability, while raw velocity results increased. The line through the points gives the model through the data gives 

\[ \alpha = A e^{-\sigma_0 / \sigma_{surf}} \]

Fig. 6. Agreement with a polynucleation model can be seen more clearly by plotting measurements of \( \sigma_{surf}(T) \) versus \( \sigma_{surf} \) as shown above. Then the model causes a straight line with an intercept \( A = a(\sigma_{surf} = 0) \), and again we see excellent agreement with this functional form. The convergence to a common intercept demonstrates that these growth measurements were well described by this model using \( A = 1 \). A similar convergence to a common intercept has been observed with the growth of helium crystals [31].

Fig. 5. (a) The growth velocity of the basal surface of a single ice crystal as a function of \( \sigma_{surf} \) at \(-12 \) C, where data points were taken as the supersaturation was slowly increased. The line through the points gives the model \( v = a \sigma_{surf} \), with \( a = \exp(-\sigma_0 / \sigma_{surf}) \) and \( \sigma_0 = 2.3 \). The surrounding dotted lines show the same model with \( \sigma_0 = 2.3 \pm 0.2 \). The dashed line shows a spiral dislocation model with \( v = \sigma_{surf} \), which gives a poor fit to the data. The inset graph shows an unweighted histogram of measured \( \sigma_0 \) values for 23 crystals. A weighted fit to these data gives an estimated mean \( \langle \sigma_0 \rangle = 1.95 \pm 0.15 \). The set of plots in (b) show data taken at \(-5.15 \) C. The model lines show \( \sigma_0 = 0.64 \pm 0.06 \) for a single crystal, while a weighted fit to all the data gives \( \langle \sigma_0 \rangle = 0.70 \pm 0.10 \). Note that the errors in the mean are mainly determined by crystal-to-crystal variability, while raw velocity measurements of individual crystals often have quite low scatter.

temperature range near the melting point. We offer the following conclusions and observations:

1. The measured attachment coefficients for both principal facets are well described by a polynucleation model with the simplified parameterization \( \alpha(T, \sigma_{surf}) = A \exp(-\sigma_0 / \sigma_{surf}) \). This supports the existing evidence [9] that layer nucleation is the dominant source of molecular steps in faceted ice crystal growth, and that dislocations play at most a minor role in the basic growth behavior of ice facet surfaces.

2. Embracing the polynucleation model, we reduced our data from a set of velocity measurements \( v(T, \sigma_{surf}) \) to a substantially simpler set of coefficients \( A(T) \) and \( \sigma_0(T) \) for the principal facets. Presenting the data in this way brings us a substantial step closer to addressing the underlying physical processes governing ice growth behavior.

3. The measured \( \sigma_0(T) \) for each facet immediately yields the terrace step energy \( \beta(T) \) from an application of classical 2D nucleation theory in the polynucleation model [8]. A plot of \( \beta(T) \) thus extracted from our data is shown in Fig. 9. We note from the scale on the right side of Fig. 9 that \( \beta(T) \) is much smaller than \( \rho = 3.5 \times 10^{-11} \) J/m, the product of the surface energy \( \gamma = 0.11 \) J/m² of the ice/vapor interface and the nominal molecular step height \( a = 0.32 \) nm, which is an upper limit on the step energy.

4. We note that the step energy \( \beta(T) \) is a fundamental property of a crystalline facet surface, in much the same way that the surface energy is a fundamental quantity. It is also an equilibrium quantity, even though it was derived here from the dynamical process of crystal growth. As an equilibrium, molecular-scale quantity, the step energy \( \beta(T) \) may be amenable to calculation using perturbation techniques or molecular dynamics simulations. The observed strong temperature dependence in \( \beta(T) \), as well as the difference between facets, may thus yield important insights into the equilibrium ice surface structure as a function of temperature.

5. It is likely that the two measured \( \beta(T) \) ultimately derive from temperature-dependent structural changes associated with surface melting on the principal facets. Surface melting is known to produce a quasiliquid layer on the ice surface over this temperature range, with a thickness that is strongly temperature dependent [30]. Surface melting is itself only poorly understood, but our measurements of \( \beta(T) \) suggest that attempts to calculate step energies should be included in more general investigations of ice surface structure in the presence of surface melting.

6. All our basal growth measurements, as well as our prism growth measurements with \( T = -10 \) C, are well described with \( A = 1 \) in the polynucleation model. We do not fully understand the preference for \( A = 1 \), although the limit \( A \to 1 \) when \( \sigma_{surf} \to \sigma_0 \) may simply reflect an effective kinetic roughening phenomenon that yields unimpeded growth in this limit [8]. A similar convergence at high growth rates has been seen in measurements of helium crystals [31].
Our prism data for $T > -10^\circ$C require $A < 1$, and we do not understand the origin of this observation. Calculating the prefactor in the polynucleation model is nontrivial, depending on the lateral growth velocity of molecular steps on the facet surface and other factors [8]. Furthermore, these calculations assume a surface structural model that may be too simplistic for the ice case, when significant surface melting is present.

Above $T = -5^\circ$C we find that $\sigma_{0,\text{basal}} > \sigma_{0,\text{prism}}$. In a temperature regime where we would expect to find a thick quasiliquid layer on the ice surface. This is consistent with the growth behavior of ice from liquid water, where faceted basal surfaces grows much more slowly than prism surfaces at low supercoolings. It also suggests that the nucleation barrier seen in basal growth from vapor at these high temperatures arises at the interface between crystalline ice and the quasiliquid layer at the surface. Quantitatively relating the crystal growth rates from water vapor and from liquid water may be a tractable theoretical problem, since the surface attachment kinetics at the liquid/solid and the quasiliquid/solid interfaces should be similar in the limit of a thick quasiliquid layer.

At $-15^\circ$C we see from Fig. 8 that $\sigma_{0,\text{basal}} > \sigma_{0,\text{prism}}$ at all supersaturations, which is at odds with the formation of very thin plate-like crystals at this temperature, as seen in the morphological studies. The explanation for this may lie in the fact that our measurements give $a(T, \sigma_{\text{surf}})$ only for flat facet surfaces. If $\sigma_0$ on the edge of a thin plate is substantially lower than $\sigma_0$ on a broad prism facet, a hypothesis put forth in [32] as structure-dependent attachment kinetics (SDAK), then this could explain the formation of thin plates at $-15^\circ$C in a way that is consistent with the flat-facet $a(T, \sigma_{\text{surf}})$ measurements. With our improved picture of $a(T, \sigma_{\text{surf}})$ for flat facet surfaces, targeted growth experiments can further explore and quantify the SDAK hypothesis.

Our measurements of $\sigma_0(T)$ for the principal facets are in rough agreement with the $\sigma_{\text{crit}}(T)$ measurements presented in [20]. As discussed above, the data in [20] are partially influenced by diffusion effects, so a direct quantitative comparison between $\sigma_0(T)$ and $\sigma_{\text{crit}}(T)$ may not be strictly accurate. Nevertheless, if one assumes that the discrepancy for the prism growth at $-15^\circ$C is an SDAK effect in [20], then the remaining overall trends in the two data sets are roughly similar.

In summary, we have measured growth rates of the principal facets of ice as a function of supersaturation in the temperature range $-40 < T < -2^\circ$C. By reducing systematic errors that
adversely affected earlier experiments, our measurements have yielded a much clearer picture of the ice attachment coefficients \( \alpha(T, \sigma_{\text{surf}}) \). These data help open a path for more detailed investigations of the ice surface structure, quantitative calculation of molecular step energies on the facet surfaces, and eventually an improved understanding of the general physical processes governing crystal growth dynamics.
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