



BSI Standards Publication

**Surface chemical analysis —  
Auger electron spectroscopy  
and X-ray photoelectron  
spectroscopy — Methods used  
to determine peak intensities  
and information required when  
reporting results**

**National foreword**

This British Standard is the UK implementation of ISO 20903:2011. It supersedes BS ISO 20903:2006 which is withdrawn.

The UK participation in its preparation was entrusted to Technical Committee CII/60, Surface chemical analysis.

A list of organizations represented on this committee can be obtained on request to its secretary.

This publication does not purport to include all the necessary provisions of a contract. Users are responsible for its correct application.

© BSI 2011

ISBN 978 0 580 74520 1

ICS 71.040.40

**Compliance with a British Standard cannot confer immunity from legal obligations.**

This British Standard was published under the authority of the Standards Policy and Strategy Committee on 30 November 2011.

**Amendments issued since publication**

Date	Text affected
------	---------------

---

---

---

**Surface chemical analysis — Auger  
electron spectroscopy and X-ray  
photoelectron spectroscopy — Methods  
used to determine peak intensities and  
information required when reporting  
results**

*Analyse chimique des surfaces — Spectroscopie des électrons Auger  
et spectroscopie de photoélectrons par rayons X — Méthodes utilisées  
pour la détermination de l'intensité des pics et informations requises  
pour l'expression des résultats*





**COPYRIGHT PROTECTED DOCUMENT**

© ISO 2011

All rights reserved. Unless otherwise specified, no part of this publication may be reproduced or utilized in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying and microfilm, without permission in writing from either ISO at the address below or ISO's member body in the country of the requester.

ISO copyright office  
Case postale 56 • CH-1211 Geneva 20  
Tel. + 41 22 749 01 11  
Fax + 41 22 749 09 47  
E-mail [copyright@iso.org](mailto:copyright@iso.org)  
Web [www.iso.org](http://www.iso.org)

Published in Switzerland

# Contents

Page

<b>Foreword</b> .....	<b>iv</b>
<b>Introduction</b> .....	<b>v</b>
<b>1 Scope</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>2 Normative references</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>3 Terms and definitions</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>4 Symbols and abbreviated terms</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>5 Methods for peak-intensity determination — Direct spectrum</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>5.1 General</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>5.2 Selection and subtraction of an inelastic background</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>5.3 Measurement of peak intensity</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>5.4 Measurement of a peak intensity with computer software</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>5.5 Measurement of peak intensities for a spectrum with overlapping peaks</b> .....	<b>5</b>
<b>5.6 Uncertainty in measurement of peak area</b> .....	<b>5</b>
<b>6 Methods for peak intensity determination — Auger-electron differential spectrum</b> .....	<b>6</b>
<b>6.1 General</b> .....	<b>6</b>
<b>6.2 Measurement of Auger-electron differential intensity</b> .....	<b>6</b>
<b>6.3 Uncertainties in measurement of Auger-electron differential intensity</b> .....	<b>7</b>
<b>7 Reporting of methods used to measure peak intensities</b> .....	<b>8</b>
<b>7.1 General requirements</b> .....	<b>8</b>
<b>7.2 Methods used to determine peak intensities in direct spectra</b> .....	<b>8</b>
<b>7.3 Methods used to obtain and determine peak intensities in Auger-electron differential spectra</b> ..	<b>9</b>
<b>Annex A (informative) Instrumental effects on measured intensities</b> .....	<b>10</b>
<b>Annex B (informative) Useful integration limits for determination of peak intensities in XPS spectra</b> ....	<b>11</b>
<b>Bibliography</b> .....	<b>13</b>

## Foreword

ISO (the International Organization for Standardization) is a worldwide federation of national standards bodies (ISO member bodies). The work of preparing International Standards is normally carried out through ISO technical committees. Each member body interested in a subject for which a technical committee has been established has the right to be represented on that committee. International organizations, governmental and non-governmental, in liaison with ISO, also take part in the work. ISO collaborates closely with the International Electrotechnical Commission (IEC) on all matters of electrotechnical standardization.

International Standards are drafted in accordance with the rules given in the ISO/IEC Directives, Part 2.

The main task of technical committees is to prepare International Standards. Draft International Standards adopted by the technical committees are circulated to the member bodies for voting. Publication as an International Standard requires approval by at least 75 % of the member bodies casting a vote.

Attention is drawn to the possibility that some of the elements of this document may be the subject of patent rights. ISO shall not be held responsible for identifying any or all such patent rights.

ISO 20903 was prepared by Technical Committee ISO/TC 201, *Surface chemical analysis*, Subcommittee SC 5, *Auger electron spectroscopy*.

This second edition cancels and replaces the first edition (ISO 20903:2006), which has been revised to include an additional annex (Annex B) giving advice on the selection of the limits between which the peak intensity is measured in X-ray photoelectron spectroscopy.

## Introduction

An important feature of Auger electron spectroscopy (AES) and X-ray photoelectron spectroscopy (XPS) is the ability to obtain a quantitative analysis of the surface region of a solid sample. Such an analysis requires the determination of the intensities of spectral components.

There are several methods of peak-intensity measurement that are applicable to AES and XPS. In practice, the choice of method will depend upon the type of sample being analysed, the capabilities of the instrumentation used, and the methods of data acquisition and treatment available.

This International Standard is expected to have two main areas of application. First, it provides a description of methods that may be used in the determination of the intensity of a peak for an element in a given spectrum. Information is given on the origin of uncertainties in the processes involved, and on how these uncertainties may be reduced. Second, this International Standard specifies reporting requirements for the methods used for peak-intensity measurements so that other analysts may use published results with confidence.





# Surface chemical analysis — Auger electron spectroscopy and X-ray photoelectron spectroscopy — Methods used to determine peak intensities and information required when reporting results

## 1 Scope

This International Standard specifies the necessary information required in a report of analytical results based on measurements of the intensities of peaks in Auger electron and X-ray photoelectron spectra. Information on methods for the measurement of peak intensities and on uncertainties of derived peak areas is also provided.

## 2 Normative references

The following referenced documents are indispensable for the application of this document. For dated references, only the edition cited applies. For undated references, the latest edition of the referenced document (including any amendments) applies.

ISO 18115-1, *Surface chemical analysis — Vocabulary — Part 1: General terms and terms used in spectroscopy*

## 3 Terms and definitions

For the purposes of this document, the terms and definitions given in ISO 18115-1 apply.

## 4 Symbols and abbreviated terms


$A$	peak area
AES	Auger electron spectroscopy
$b$	number of channels over which intensities are averaged to obtain a baseline
eV	electron volts
$n$	number of channels in a spectrum
XPS	X-ray photoelectron spectroscopy
$y_i$	number of counts in the $i$ th channel of a spectrum
$\Delta E$	channel width (in electron volts)
$\Delta t$	dwelt time per channel (in seconds)
$\sigma(A)$	standard deviation of calculated peak area

## 5 Methods for peak-intensity determination — Direct spectrum

### 5.1 General

Figure 1 a) shows a portion of an X-ray photoelectron spectrum in which intensity is plotted as a function of kinetic energy increasing to the right or of binding energy increasing to the left. The intensity is plotted usually in units of counts or sometimes in units of counts per second. Intensities may also be plotted as a digitized

voltage; this procedure is often used when the intensity of an Auger differential spectrum is obtained from an analogue detection system. Energies are commonly expressed in electron volts.



**Key**

- X1 binding energy (eV)
- X2 kinetic energy (eV)
- Y intensity

**Figure 1 — Illustration of procedure involved in the determination of the intensity of a single peak in an X-ray photoelectron spectrum (as described in 5.2 and 5.3)**

The intensity of a single peak in an X-ray photoelectron spectrum can be measured by using the procedure described in the following two subclauses (5.2 and 5.3) or by using computer software as described in 5.4. The measurement of peak intensities for a spectrum containing overlapping peaks is described in 5.5. Information on the uncertainty of a measured peak area for a single peak is given in 5.6.

The intensity of a single peak in a direct Auger-electron spectrum can be measured by following the procedure described in 5.2 and 5.3, although it may be necessary first to subtract a secondary-electron background [1][2]. Alternatively, computer software can be used to measure the peak intensity as described in 5.4.

In some cases, the peak of interest may be superimposed on a sloping background. This background could arise from multiple inelastic scattering of Auger electrons or photoelectrons of initially high energy, from multiple inelastic scattering of primary electrons (in AES), or from photoemission by bremsstrahlung radiation (for XPS with an unmonochromated X-ray source). It may be necessary (e.g. with use of the Tougaard inelastic background described in 5.2) or desirable to subtract this background from the spectrum in the vicinity of the peak before proceeding with the peak-intensity measurements described in 5.2 to 5.5. This subtraction can usually be performed by fitting a straight line to the sloping background at energies between about 10 eV and 30 eV above the peak of interest, extrapolating this line to lower energies, and subtracting the spectral intensities from this linear background. If a linear function is judged to be invalid for describing the sloping background over the spectral range of interest (e.g. for modelling the background of scattered primary electrons in AES), an exponential function can be utilized [3].

## 5.2 Selection and subtraction of an inelastic background

It is necessary to select an appropriate inelastic background and then to subtract this background from the measured spectrum. Three types of inelastic background are in common use:

- a) linear background;
- b) integral or Shirley background [4];
- c) Tougaard background [5][6][7] and Werner background [8][9], based on physical models describing inelastic electron scattering in solids.

Information on procedures and software for determining the Shirley, Tougaard and Werner backgrounds is given in the scientific literature [4]-[13] and ISO/TR 18392 [14].

From a practical viewpoint, the selection of a particular background will depend on (a) whether the relevant software is conveniently available and (b) the type of sample analysed. For insulators, the linear background is often satisfactory, while the Shirley background is often employed for metals. While these two backgrounds are simple and convenient to apply, the limits of these two backgrounds (the starting and ending points on the energy scale) should be chosen carefully so that the background is as nearly continuous as possible with the spectrum in the region of overlap.

Tougaard's approach, in particular, for background determination and subtraction [5][6][7] has found favour over the Shirley background because it describes the physics of the inelastic-scattering process more accurately [15][16]. The Tougaard and the Werner approaches have a further advantage in that they are insensitive to the precise positions of the starting and ending energy points providing they are clearly in the spectral region well away from the main peak of interest (typically starting at an energy at least 10 eV higher than that of the peak of interest and ending at an energy at least 50 eV lower). This requirement is a disadvantage in that spectra have to be recorded over a larger energy range than if the linear or Shirley background is used.

As an example, Figure 1 a) shows an XPS peak whose intensity is to be measured. Vertical lines have been drawn to indicate suitable limits for use of the Shirley background. The spectrum after subtraction of this background is shown on an expanded energy scale in Figure 1 b). For clarity of display, the zero of the intensity scale in Figure 1 b) has been placed at 2 % of the ordinate axis. The end points in Figure 1 b) are at the same positions as those in Figure 1 a).

Averaging over neighbouring channels may be helpful in defining the signal level at the selected end points, thus improving the precision of peak-height or peak-area measurement. The sets of points to be averaged may be located inside or outside of the chosen end points or may be symmetrically placed about the end points. It is important that the end points are chosen to be sufficiently far from the peak so that the averaging process does not include significant peak intensity. Harrison and Hazell [17] have derived an expression for the estimated uncertainty in a peak-area measurement (see 5.6) and have shown that a large contribution to this uncertainty comes from uncertainties arising from the choice of end points and the intensities at these end points.

Smoothing of a spectrum, using a Savitzky-Golay [18] convolution with a width less than 50 % of the full width at half-maximum intensity of the peak, may improve the precision of a peak-height determination. However, smoothing should be avoided for peak-area determination since it cannot improve the precision and, if overdone, will distort the spectrum.

Annex B gives information on the choice of suitable energy limits for the determination of peak intensities or areas in XPS spectra.

## 5.3 Measurement of peak intensity

### 5.3.1 Measurement of peak height

A peak height is determined (i) by direct measurement from a chart output using a ruler, (ii) by using computer software to obtain the intensity difference from the baseline to the peak maximum or (iii) by using computer software to fit an appropriate analytical peak shape (Gaussian, Lorentzian or a mixture of the two [10][11][12]) to the experimental spectrum (that is, the group of data points defining the peak of interest). The length of the

vertical line with arrows in Figure 1 b) is a measure of the peak height in units defined by the intensity scale (either counts or counts per second).

The use of peak heights in subsequent data processing has advantages arising from the speed of processing and the ease with which this method can be applied with many instruments. However, using peak height as a measurement of intensity has several disadvantages: (i) it is insensitive to peak-shape changes arising from the complex chemistry of an element, (ii) it ignores spectral intensity from secondary features in the spectrum (such as satellite peaks) and (iii) the measured height is very dependent on the choice of inelastic background.

NOTE Instruments should be operated with settings chosen to avoid significant nonlinearities in the intensity scales [19]; alternatively, corrections should be made for counting losses due to the finite dead time of the counting electronics [19]. Spectra should be corrected for the intensity-energy response function of the instrument before peak heights are measured [20]. Further information is provided in Annex A.

### 5.3.2 Measurement of peak area

Methods used in the past to determine the peak area have included: (i) tracing the peak shape onto paper, cutting the paper into the shape of the peak and weighing the paper, (ii) plotting the peak onto paper printed with a square grid pattern and counting the grid squares and (iii) using a planimeter, a mechanical device for making area measurements. However, most modern AES and XPS instruments have computer software that can be used to determine the peak area (e.g. by summing the counts above the inelastic background or by numerical integration). Alternatively, the peak area can be calculated from the parameters obtained after fitting the peak with an appropriate analytical function [10][11][12]. The shaded area in Figure 1 b) illustrates the peak area obtained from integration of the peak defined by the end points and subtraction of the inelastic background in Figure 1 a).

The measured intensity in each channel of an AES or XPS spectrum depends on a number of instrumental parameters and settings [20]. For specified instrumental conditions, the measured intensity for each channel can be simply expressed as a number of counts (or counts/second) per eV; Annex A provides further information. A peak area (or peak intensity) is then expressed as the total number of counts (or counts/second) for a specified energy region of summation or integration.

NOTE Instruments should be operated with settings chosen to avoid significant nonlinearities in the intensity scales [19]; alternatively, corrections should be made for counting losses due to the finite dead time of the counting electronics [19]. Spectra should be corrected for the intensity-energy response function of the instrument before peak areas are measured [20]. Further information is provided in Annex A.

In practical AES and XPS, an analyst generally wishes to compare intensities of peaks that were measured with identical instrumental settings [e.g. analyser mode, pass energy (for the constant-analyser-energy mode) and retarding ratio (for the constant-retarding-ratio mode)] but differences in certain other settings (e.g. different energy channel widths or different dwell times). The analyst often will not know certain parameters that affect the absolute intensities of measured peaks (see Annex A) since only relative intensities are needed for practical analyses. In such cases, peak intensities can be determined from simple summations or integrations of measured spectra for the particular conditions, and these intensities are often expressed in units of counts·eV or counts·eV/second. Corrections of peak areas can then be made as needed for different channel widths and dwell times. Annex A provides further information.

The use of peak intensities derived from measurements of peak areas has some clear advantages over the use of measurements of peak heights. First, account can be taken in the measurement of peak areas of any chemical changes that result in reduced peak height and increased peak width (compared to the corresponding values for the elemental solid). Second, any satellite intensity can be easily included in the measurement of peak area. However, the uncertainty of a peak-area measurement may increase for complex specimen materials with many elemental components that could have overlapping spectral features (as described in 5.5). In such cases, the value of the derived peak area may depend on the choice and placement of the inelastic background function in 5.2.

### 5.4 Measurement of a peak intensity with computer software

Computer software can be used to fit a selected analytical function describing the shape of a peak and another function describing the inelastic background to a measured spectrum [10][11][12]. This process essentially


combines the steps described in 5.2 and 5.3 into a single procedure. Prior removal of X-ray satellites from XPS spectra recorded using unmonochromated radiation may be necessary if they contribute intensity in the region of the spectrum defined by the integration limits (see 5.2).

Peak shapes in AES may be more complex than those in XPS, and analytical functions used to fit XPS spectra may then be unsatisfactory for similar fits of AES spectra. In such cases, peak intensities can be derived using spectral addition/subtraction, least-squares analysis with suitable reference spectra, or principal-component analysis [21].

### 5.5 Measurement of peak intensities for a spectrum with overlapping peaks

In many practical cases, a spectrum in the region of interest may consist of two or more overlapping peaks because of the presence of chemically shifted peaks from the same element, the presence of peaks from multiple elements or the presence of peaks arising from X-ray satellites. As an example, Figure 2 shows an X-ray photoelectron spectrum for an oxidized vanadium foil that was measured with an unmonochromated Al  $K\alpha$  X-ray source. In this spectrum, the more intense peaks arise from vanadium 2p and oxygen 1s photoelectrons; there is also a weaker peak due to oxygen 1s photoelectrons excited by the Al  $K\alpha_{3,4}$  satellite line that overlaps the vanadium 2p peaks. Correct identification of chemical state requires calibration of the instrumental binding-energy scale [22] and, for non-conductive specimens, use of charge-control or charge-correction procedures [23].

For a spectrum with overlapping peaks, it is necessary to measure intensities from fits of analytical functions to a selected spectral region [10][11][12]. Peak heights and peak areas can be determined from values of the parameters found for each peak.



#### Key

- X binding energy (eV)
- Y intensity
- 1 O(1s) X-ray satellites

**Figure 2 — X-ray photoelectron spectrum measured with unmonochromated Al  $K\alpha$  X-rays for an oxidized vanadium foil**

### 5.6 Uncertainty in measurement of peak area

The uncertainty in the result of a measurement (such as peak area) generally consists of several components that may be grouped into two categories according to the method used to estimate their numerical values [24]:

type A: those which are evaluated by statistical methods;

type B: those which are evaluated by other means.

The type A uncertainty indicates the component of uncertainty arising from a random effect while the type B uncertainty indicates the component of uncertainty arising from a systematic effect [24]. For measurements of peak areas, type A uncertainties can arise from counting statistics in the measurement of a spectrum and the fitting of an inelastic background to the spectrum (5.2). Type B uncertainties typically arise from the choice of the inelastic background function (5.2), the selection of end points (5.2), the choice of a function to describe a measured peak shape (5.3 and 5.4), the choice of computer software used for peak fitting [25] and the choice of initial parameter values in a non-linear least-squares fitting algorithm. The total uncertainty of a measurement can be obtained from the standard deviation (for the type A uncertainties) and an evaluation of the type B uncertainties [24].

The standard deviation,  $\sigma(A)$ , of the measured peak area,  $A$ , of a single peak measured in counts-eV/second is given by the following expression [17]:

$$\sigma(A) = \left( \frac{\Delta E}{\Delta t} \right) \left[ \left( \sum_{i=2}^{n-1} y_i \right) + \frac{(n-2)^2(y_1 + y_n)}{4} \right]^{0,5} \quad (1)$$

where  $\Delta E$  is the channel width (or energy step) in the spectrum (in eV),  $\Delta t$  is the dwell time per channel (in seconds),  $n$  is the number of channels in the spectrum and  $y_i$  is the number of counts in the  $i$ th channel. If the peak area is measured in counts eV,  $\sigma(A)$  from Equation (1) should be multiplied by  $\Delta t$ .

Equation (1) includes contributions from statistical noise in the experimental spectrum and from the uncertainty arising from placement of the baseline [the final term in Equation (1)], the latter being particularly significant for noisy spectra. The latter uncertainty can be reduced as explained in 5.2, in which case  $\sigma(A)$  becomes:

$$\sigma(A) = \left( \frac{\Delta E}{\Delta t} \right) \left[ \left( \sum_{i=2}^{n-1} y_i \right) + \frac{(n-2)^2(y_1 + y_n)}{4b} \right]^{0,5} \quad (2)$$

where  $b$  is the number of channels adjacent to the end points for which intensities are averaged to obtain the baseline. The final term in Equation (2) will usually be larger than the previous term, in which case  $\sigma(A)$  will be reduced by approximately  $b^{0,5}$  over the value obtained from Equation (1) [17].

The determination of uncertainties in peak areas for a spectrum with overlapping peaks is more complex than for the case of a single peak. The type B uncertainties may be larger than the type A uncertainties, particularly if there is a high degree of peak overlap and if assumptions have to be made concerning the inelastic background function and the function describing the peak shape. Information on type A and type B uncertainties can be found in the scientific literature [17][26]-[30].

## 6 Methods for peak intensity determination — Auger-electron differential spectrum

### 6.1 General

In Auger electron spectroscopy, spectra are often displayed in the differential mode in which the first derivative of the direct spectrum is plotted as a function of kinetic energy. If the direct spectrum is recorded as intensity in counts versus energy in electron volts, the intensity in the differential spectrum will be in units of counts per electron volt.


### 6.2 Measurement of Auger-electron differential intensity

Two methods, illustrated in Figure 3, are commonly used to measure peak intensity of an Auger-electron differential spectrum:

- a) peak-to-peak intensity (measured from the positive to the negative excursions in a differential spectrum);
- b) peak-to-background intensity (measured from the negative excursion to the background on the high-kinetic-energy side of the spectral feature).

Measurements of these intensities were generally made electronically in early commercial AES instruments but numerical methods for differentiation are now also employed [18]. The measurements of peak-to-peak or

peak-to-background intensities can be made rapidly, and are therefore useful in, for example, depth-profiling studies.



#### Key

X kinetic energy (eV)

Y intensity


a Peak-to-peak.

b Peak-to-background.

**Figure 3 — Schematic diagram of an Auger-electron differential spectrum indicating measurements of peak-to-peak and peak-to-background intensities**

### 6.3 Uncertainties in measurement of Auger-electron differential intensity

Auger-electron lineshapes in direct spectra are generally more complex than XPS lineshapes, and these lineshapes may change appreciably with change of chemical state<sup>[31]</sup>. As a result, peak-to-peak and peak-to-background intensities in AES differential spectra can change significantly with chemical state. Compositions derived from AES differential spectra may therefore have larger uncertainties than the compositions obtained from direct spectra in XPS. Additional complications can arise from energy shifts of Auger peaks (e.g. in the vicinity of an interface due to different chemical states or to different amounts of surface charge) and with overlapping peaks from different elements. Figure 4 is an example of an AES differential spectrum with overlapping features due to chromium and oxygen. In such cases, elemental intensities may be derived from spectral addition/subtraction, least-squares analysis with elemental or compound spectra, factor analysis or principal-component analysis<sup>[21]</sup>. Seah *et al.* have reviewed problems involved in the analysis of AES differential spectra and, for quantitative analysis using the differential spectrum, recommend numerical broadening to reduce the effects of peak-shape changes<sup>[32]</sup>.



**Key**

X kinetic energy (eV)  
Y intensity

**Figure 4 — Auger-electron differential spectrum of oxidized chromium showing overlapping peaks due to chromium and oxygen**

## 7 Reporting of methods used to measure peak intensities

### 7.1 General requirements

The analyst shall report the algorithms used for any processing of a spectrum (e.g. smoothing) prior to the intensity measurement as well as those used for the intensity measurement in a report of the analysis. If a sloping background was subtracted from a spectrum prior to further processing (as described in 5.1), the functional form of the background and how it was determined shall be reported. The analyst shall report the channel width for the spectrum.

### 7.2 Methods used to determine peak intensities in direct spectra

#### 7.2.1 Intensity measurement for a single peak, as described in 5.2 and 5.3

The analyst shall report the type of inelastic background utilized (5.2). If a linear or Shirley background was used, information shall be provided on the selected limits and whether intensities were averaged in some manner at these end points. If intensities were averaged, the analyst shall identify the number of data channels that were averaged and their location with respect to the end points. If a straight line was fitted to the intensities of two groups of data channels, the energy ranges of the two groups of channels shall be specified.

If the Tougaard or Werner background was used, the energy range of the spectrum that was analysed shall be specified. The morphological model and values of all parameters used in the analysis shall also be reported.

The analyst shall specify whether a peak height or a peak area was determined, and how the value was determined (5.3).

#### 7.2.2 Intensity measurements from peak fitting, as described in 5.4 and 5.5

The analyst shall report the analytical functions used to describe peak shapes (e.g. Gaussian, Lorentzian and various combination functions [10][11][12][25]), as well as the inelastic background, the energy interval over which a fit was made, the extent to which derived peak parameters depended on initial estimates of these values, and any constraints on peak parameters. The analyst shall report values of the peak parameters. The reported



intensities may be peak areas or peak heights. The analyst shall report derived uncertainties or estimates of uncertainties of peak areas or peak heights [27].

### **7.3 Methods used to obtain and determine peak intensities in Auger-electron differential spectra**

#### **7.3.1 Method used to obtain differential spectra**

The analyst shall report the method used to obtain the differential spectrum. If the differential spectrum was acquired by the phase-sensitive-detection method, the analyst shall specify the frequency of the modulation, the waveform of the modulation (e.g. sinusoidal or square-wave), the peak-to-peak amplitude of the modulation (as the corresponding electron energy in eV) and whether the modulation was applied to the sample or the analyser. If the differential spectrum was acquired by a numerical method, the analyst shall report the numerical algorithm and the parameters of that algorithm.

#### **7.3.2 Method used to determine peak intensities, as described in 6.2**

The analyst shall report whether peak-to-peak or peak-to-background intensities were measured. Information shall be provided on whether intensities were determined by an electronic system of the instrument or by a numerical method. The analyst shall report the numerical algorithm, if used.

## Annex A (informative)

### Instrumental effects on measured intensities

Two types of instrumental effect are described that affect measured Auger-electron and X-ray photoelectron spectra. First, it is desirable (for simplicity) that instrumental settings be chosen so that observed intensities for the spectral regions of interest are linearly dependent on the incident beam current (for AES) or the incident X-ray flux (for XPS) on the sample. Otherwise, the intensity measurements should be corrected for the dead-time counting losses in the electronics [19].

The second type of instrumental effect is the varying intensity response of the electron spectrometer (consisting generally of the analyser, lens system, apertures and detector) for electrons of different energies from the sample [33]. In general, the intensity-energy response of the spectrometer will be different depending on its various settings (e.g. analyser operated in the constant-analyser-energy or constant-retarding-ratio mode, lens voltages and aperture sizes), possible local effects (imperfect alignment of the sample, stray fields and unwanted electrons from other sources), ageing of the detector (with resulting reductions in detector efficiency and possible variations in efficiency as a function of electron energy) and possible instrumental misalignments resulting from additions or modifications of components, bakeouts, etc. The intensity-energy response may thus vary with time. In order to ensure that meaningful comparisons can be made of intensities measured at different times or of intensities measured on different instruments, the instrumental intensity scale should be calibrated [20][34]. Such calibrations will also minimize the need to re-determine relative sensitivity factors [35] as a result of any instrumental changes. A simpler procedure can be utilized, however, to evaluate the repeatability and constancy of the intensity scale with time [36][37].

If the intensity scale of an electron spectrometer has been calibrated, it is then possible to express measured AES or XPS intensities in absolute units [i.e. the number of electrons per unit solid angle per eV per incident electron per unit time (in AES) or the number of electrons per unit solid angle per eV per incident photon per unit time (in XPS) [20]]. Thus, integrations over the whole energy spectrum and the whole solid angle of emission give, for a calibrated spectrometer, the total number of electrons emitted per incident electron (in AES) or per incident photon (in XPS). For AES, this ratio is the total electron yield (the sum of the conventionally defined secondary-electron and backscattered-electron yields), and is dimensionless (i.e. a number).

In practical XPS, the incident flux of X-rays on the sample area viewed by the analyser is generally unknown. For many AES and XPS applications, the analyst will not generally know or need to know the solid angle of acceptance of the spectrometer, the range of electron energies passed by the analyser for a given channel for the chosen settings, or the absolute detection efficiency. It is then convenient to express spectral intensities more simply as the number of counts (or counts per second) recorded in each channel for an instrument with digital signal electronics for specified instrumental operating conditions and measurement time or, equivalently, the measured current for an instrument with analogue signal electronics, again for specified instrumental operating conditions. It is often desirable, however, to determine the intensity at the maximum of a specified AES or XPS peak (for a specified primary-beam current in AES or for a specified operating power of the X-ray source in XPS) for specified spectrometer settings in order to assess the performance of an AES or XPS instrument [38][39].

## Annex B (informative)

### Useful integration limits for determination of peak intensities in XPS spectra

Measurement of peak intensities or areas in XPS spectra is complicated by the need to subtract a background from the measured spectra, as described in 5.2. The analyst typically has to choose energy limits that define the energy range over which the peak intensity is measured, as described in 5.3.2, 5.4 and 5.5. Different measures of peak intensity will generally be obtained, depending on the choice of background (e.g. Shirley, Tougaard or linear) and on the choice of energy limits [7][40][41].

Table B.1 gives suggested energy limits for determination of peak intensities using the Shirley, Tougaard and linear backgrounds for XPS spectra measured with (a) a monochromatic Al K $\alpha$  X-ray source, and (b) an unmonochromated Al K $\alpha$  or Mg K $\alpha$  X-ray source [40]. These limits were obtained from comparisons of XPS intensities reported by volunteer analysts and the corresponding intensities expected for a set of simulated XPS spectra [40][41]. Satisfactory comparisons were obtained when the analyst selected limits close to those given in Table B.1.

The suggested limits in Table B.1 should be a useful initial guide for relatively simple XPS spectra in which the photoelectron peaks of interest are well separated and have full widths at half-maximum intensity which are  $\leq 2$  eV. For measured peaks with full widths at half-maximum intensity larger than 2 eV, it will be generally necessary to increase the energy limits for the Shirley and linear backgrounds from the values listed in Table B.1. For more complex XPS spectra with multiple peaks in the energy range of interest, care will be needed in selecting a background and energy limits to avoid artifacts [7].

The analyst will often be calculating ratios of measured intensities to the relative sensitivity factors for particular elements, and these ratios may be largely independent of different choices made for the background method and the energy limits for each peak if these are selected consistently. Nevertheless, these ratios may depend on the operating mode chosen by the analyser (as discussed in Annex A). In addition, these ratios could vary appreciably if narrow energy limits are chosen and if there are changes in XPS lineshape or shakeup fraction with change of chemical state. To obtain reliable measures of peak intensities, it is necessary to apply a chosen background method in a consistent way from one spectrum to another, and the energy limits should also be chosen consistently [40][41]. While Table B.1 lists the energy limits given in Reference [40], the nearest integer values should be satisfactory for most applications.

For some applications, analysts might wish to determine the morphologies of their samples for more reliable analyses [7], to compare measured peak spectra or intensities with those expected from theory (e.g. to determine the intensity due to intrinsic excitations or shakeup [42]), or to calculate average-matrix relative sensitivity factors [33]. In such cases, it is generally necessary to utilize a background based on the physics of the inelastic-scattering process [5][7] and to select relatively large energy limits, such as those given for the Tougaard background in Table B.1. Tougaard, however, has recently developed a simpler, but more approximate, algorithm with which morphology information and amount of substance can be determined [43].

**Table B.1 — Useful limits on the kinetic-energy scale for the determination of peak intensities in XPS spectra using the Shirley, Tougaard and linear backgrounds for (a) a monochromatic Al  $K\alpha$  X-ray source and (b) unmonochromated Al  $K\alpha$  and Mg  $K\alpha$  X-ray sources <sup>[40]</sup>**

Shirley background		Tougaard background		Linear background	
Lower limit	Upper limit	Lower limit	Upper limit	Lower limit	Upper limit
eV	eV	eV	eV	eV	eV
a) Monochromatic Al $K\alpha$ X-ray source					
-3,6	5,0	-40	10	-3,9	3,2
b) Unmonochromated Al $K\alpha$ and Mg $K\alpha$ X-ray sources					
-5,2	5,0	-40	10	—	—

## Bibliography

- [1] SICKAFUS, E.N.: Linearized Secondary Electron Cascades for Surfaces of Metals — 1. Clean Surfaces of Homogeneous Specimens, *Physical Review B*, Aug. 1977, Vol. 16, No. 4, pp. 1436-1447
- [2] SICKAFUS, E.N.: Linearized Secondary Electron Cascades for Surfaces of Metals — 2. Surface and Subsurface Sources, *Physical Review B*, Aug. 1977, Vol. 16, No. 4, pp. 1448-1458
- [3] JOUSSET, D., and LANGERON, J.-P.: Energy Distribution of Primary Backscattered Electrons in Auger Electron Spectroscopy, *Journal of Vacuum Science and Technology A*, Jul. 1987, Vol. 5, No. 4, pp. 989-995
- [4] SHIRLEY, D.A.: High Resolution X-ray Photoemission Spectrum of the Valence Bands of Gold, *Physical Review B*, June 1972, Vol. 5, No. 12, pp. 4709-4714
- [5] TOUGAARD, S.: Quantitative Analysis of the Inelastic Background in Surface Electron Spectroscopy, *Surface and Interface Analysis*, June 1988, Vol. 11, No. 9, pp. 453-472
- [6] TOUGAARD, S.: Practical Algorithm for Background Subtraction, *Surface Science*, June 1989, Vol. 216, No. 3, pp. 343-360
- [7] TOUGAARD, S.: Quantification of Nanostructures by Electron Spectroscopy, in *Surface Analysis by Auger and X-ray Photoelectron Spectroscopy*, edited by D. Briggs and J.T. Grant, IM Publications, Chichester, 2003, pp. 295-343
- [8] WERNER, W.S.M.: Electron Transport in Solids for Quantitative Surface Analysis, *Surface and Interface Analysis*, March 2001, Vol. 31, No. 3, pp. 141-176
- [9] WERNER, W.S.M.: Electron Transport in Solids, in *Surface Analysis by Auger and X-ray Photoelectron Spectroscopy*, edited by D. Briggs and J.T. Grant, IM Publications, Chichester, 2003, pp. 235-258
- [10] SHERWOOD, P.M.A.: Data Analysis in XPS and AES, in *Practical Surface Analysis*, Vol. 1, *Auger and X-ray Photoelectron Spectroscopy*, edited by D. Briggs and M.P. Seah, Wiley, Chichester, 1990, pp. 555-586
- [11] SEAH, M.P.: Quantification in AES and XPS, in *Surface Analysis by Auger and X-ray Photoelectron Spectroscopy*, edited by D. Briggs and J.T. Grant, IM Publications, Chichester, 2003, pp. 345-375
- [12] FAIRLEY, N.: XPS Lineshapes and Curve Fitting, in *Surface Analysis by Auger and X-ray Photoelectron Spectroscopy*, edited by D. Briggs and J.T. Grant, IM Publications, Chichester, 2003, pp. 397-420
- [13] GRANT, J.T.: Software for Processing AES and XPS Data, in *Surface Analysis by Auger and X-ray Photoelectron Spectroscopy*, edited by D. Briggs and J.T. Grant, IM Publications, Chichester, 2003, pp. 861-868
- [14] ISO/TR 18392, *Surface chemical analysis — X-ray photoelectron spectroscopy — Procedures for determining backgrounds*
- [15] TOUGAARD, S., and JANSSON, C.: Comparison of Validity and Consistency of Methods for Quantitative XPS Peak Analysis, *Surface and Interface Analysis*, Dec. 1993, Vol. 20, No. 13, pp. 1013-1046
- [16] VEGH, J.: The Shirley-Equivalent Electron Inelastic Scattering Cross-Section Function, *Surface Science*, Aug. 2004, Vol. 536, Nos. 1-3, pp. 183-190
- [17] HARRISON, K., and HAZELL, L.B.: The Determination of Uncertainties in Quantitative XPS/AES and its Impact on Data Acquisition Strategy, *Surface and Interface Analysis*, May 1992, Vol. 18, No. 5, pp. 368-376
- [18] SAVITZKY, A., and GOLAY, M.J.E.: Smoothing and Differentiation of Data by Simplified Least Squares Procedures, *Analytical Chemistry*, Jul. 1964, Vol. 36, No. 8, pp. 1627-1639

- [19] ISO 21270, *Surface chemical analysis — X-ray photoelectron and Auger electron spectrometers — Linearity of intensity scale*
- [20] SEAH, M.P.: A System for the Intensity Calibration of Electron Spectrometers, *Journal of Electron Spectroscopy and Related Phenomena*, Apr. 1995, Vol. 71, No. 3, pp. 191-204
- [21] STICKLE, W.F.: The Use of Chemometrics in AES and XPS Data Treatment, in *Surface Analysis by Auger and X-ray Photoelectron Spectroscopy*, edited by D. Briggs and J.T. Grant, IM Publications, Chichester, 2003, pp. 377-396
- [22] ISO 15472, *Surface chemical analysis — X-ray photoelectron spectrometers — Calibration of energy scales*
- [23] ISO 19318, *Surface chemical analysis — X-ray photoelectron spectroscopy — Reporting of methods used for charge control and charge correction*
- [24] ISO/IEC Guide 98-3, *Uncertainty of measurement — Part 3: Guide to the expression of uncertainty in measurement (GUM:1995)*
- [25] SEAH, M.P., and BROWN, M.J.: Validation and Accuracy of Software for Peak Synthesis in XPS, *Journal of Electron Spectroscopy and Related Phenomena*, Aug. 1998, Vol. 95, No. 1, pp. 71-93
- [26] EVANS, S.: Estimation of the Uncertainties Associated with XPS Peak Intensity Determination, *Surface and Interface Analysis*, May 1992, Vol. 18, No. 5, pp. 323-332
- [27] CUMPSON, P.J., and SEAH, M.P., Random Uncertainties in AES and XPS — 1. Uncertainties in Peak Energies, Intensities and Areas Derived from Peak Synthesis, *Surface and Interface Analysis*, May 1992, Vol. 18, No. 5, pp. 345-360
- [28] LECLERC, G., and PIREAUX, J.J.: The Use of Least Squares for XPS Peak Parameter Estimation — 3. Multicollinearity, Ill-conditioning and Constraint-Induced Bias, *Journal of Electron Spectroscopy and Related Phenomena*, Mar. 1995, Vol. 71, No. 2, pp. 179-190
- [29] CONNY, J.M., and POWELL, C.J.: Standard Test Data for Estimating Peak Parameter Errors in X-ray Photoelectron Spectroscopy — II. Peak Intensities, *Surface and Interface Analysis*, July 2000, Vol. 29, No. 7, pp. 444-459
- [30] CONNY, J.M., and POWELL, C.J.: Standard Test Data for Estimating Peak Parameter Errors in X-ray Photoelectron Spectroscopy — III. Errors with Different Curve-Fitting Approaches, *Surface and Interface Analysis*, Dec. 2000, Vol. 29, No. 12, pp. 856-872
- [31] RAMAKER, D.E.: Chemical Information from Auger Lineshapes, in *Surface Analysis by Auger and X-ray Photoelectron Spectroscopy*, edited by D. Briggs and J.T. Grant, IM Publications, Chichester, 2003, pp. 465-500
- [32] SEAH, M.P., GILMORE, I.S., BISHOP, H.E. and LORANG, G.: Quantitative AES — V. Practical Analysis of Intensities with Detailed Examples of Metals and Their Oxides, *Surface and Interface Analysis*, Sep. 1998, Vol. 26, No. 10, pp. 701-722
- [33] SEAH, M.P.: XPS Reference Procedure for the Accurate Intensity Calibration of Electron Spectrometers — Results of a BCR Intercomparison, Co-sponsored by the VAMAS SCA TWA, *Surface and Interface Analysis*, Mar. 1993, Vol. 20, No. 3, pp. 243-266
- [34] Software can be purchased from the UK National Physical Laboratory for the calibration of the intensity scales of AES and XPS instruments (further information is available at: <http://www.npl.co.uk/nanoanalysis>)
- [35] ISO 18118, *Surface chemical analysis — Auger electron spectroscopy and X-ray photoelectron spectroscopy — Guide to the use of experimentally determined relative sensitivity factors for the quantitative analysis of homogeneous materials*
- [36] ISO 24236, *Surface chemical analysis — Auger electron spectroscopy — Repeatability and constancy of intensity scale*

- [37] ISO 24237, *Surface chemical analysis — X-ray photoelectron spectroscopy — Repeatability and constancy of intensity scale*
- [38] ISO 15470, *Surface chemical analysis — X-ray photoelectron spectroscopy — Description of selected instrumental performance parameters*
- [39] ISO 15471, *Surface chemical analysis — Auger electron spectroscopy — Description of selected instrumental performance parameters*
- [40] POWELL, C.J., and CONNY, J.M.: Evaluation of Uncertainties in X-ray Photoelectron Spectroscopy Intensities Associated with Different Methods and Procedures for Background Subtraction — II. Spectra for Unmonochromated Al and Mg X-rays, *Surface and Interface Analysis*, October 2009, Vol. 41, No. 10, pp. 804-813
- [41] POWELL, C.J., and CONNY, J.M.: Evaluation of Uncertainties in X-ray Photoelectron Spectroscopy Intensities Associated with Different Methods and Procedures for Background Subtraction — I. Spectra for Monochromatic Al X-rays, *Surface and Interface Analysis*, March 2009, Vol. 41, No. 3, pp. 269-294
- [42] POWELL, C.J., and JABLONSKI, A.: Progress in Quantitative Surface Analysis by X-ray Photoelectron Spectroscopy — Current Status and Perspectives, *Journal of Electron Spectroscopy and Related Phenomena*, May 2010, Vol. 178-179, pp. 331-346
- [43] TOUGAARD, S.: Energy Loss in XPS — Fundamental Processes and Applications for Quantification, Non-destructive Depth profiling and 3D Imaging, *Journal of Electron Spectroscopy and Related Phenomena*, May 2010, Vol. 178-179, pp. 128-153







# British Standards Institution (BSI)

BSI is the national body responsible for preparing British Standards and other standards-related publications, information and services.

BSI is incorporated by Royal Charter. British Standards and other standardization products are published by BSI Standards Limited.

## About us

We bring together business, industry, government, consumers, innovators and others to shape their combined experience and expertise into standards-based solutions.

The knowledge embodied in our standards has been carefully assembled in a dependable format and refined through our open consultation process. Organizations of all sizes and across all sectors choose standards to help them achieve their goals.

## Information on standards

We can provide you with the knowledge that your organization needs to succeed. Find out more about British Standards by visiting our website at [bsigroup.com/standards](http://bsigroup.com/standards) or contacting our Customer Services team or Knowledge Centre.

## Buying standards

You can buy and download PDF versions of BSI publications, including British and adopted European and international standards, through our website at [bsigroup.com/shop](http://bsigroup.com/shop), where hard copies can also be purchased.

If you need international and foreign standards from other Standards Development Organizations, hard copies can be ordered from our Customer Services team.

## Subscriptions

Our range of subscription services are designed to make using standards easier for you. For further information on our subscription products go to [bsigroup.com/subscriptions](http://bsigroup.com/subscriptions).

With **British Standards Online (BSOL)** you'll have instant access to over 55,000 British and adopted European and international standards from your desktop. It's available 24/7 and is refreshed daily so you'll always be up to date.

You can keep in touch with standards developments and receive substantial discounts on the purchase price of standards, both in single copy and subscription format, by becoming a **BSI Subscribing Member**.

**PLUS** is an updating service exclusive to BSI Subscribing Members. You will automatically receive the latest hard copy of your standards when they're revised or replaced.

To find out more about becoming a BSI Subscribing Member and the benefits of membership, please visit [bsigroup.com/shop](http://bsigroup.com/shop).

With a **Multi-User Network Licence (MUNL)** you are able to host standards publications on your intranet. Licences can cover as few or as many users as you wish. With updates supplied as soon as they're available, you can be sure your documentation is current. For further information, email [bsmusales@bsigroup.com](mailto:bsmusales@bsigroup.com).

## BSI Group Headquarters

389 Chiswick High Road London W4 4AL UK

## Revisions

Our British Standards and other publications are updated by amendment or revision.

We continually improve the quality of our products and services to benefit your business. If you find an inaccuracy or ambiguity within a British Standard or other BSI publication please inform the Knowledge Centre.

## Copyright

All the data, software and documentation set out in all British Standards and other BSI publications are the property of and copyrighted by BSI, or some person or entity that owns copyright in the information used (such as the international standardization bodies) and has formally licensed such information to BSI for commercial publication and use. Except as permitted under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 no extract may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means – electronic, photocopying, recording or otherwise – without prior written permission from BSI. Details and advice can be obtained from the Copyright & Licensing Department.

## Useful Contacts:

### Customer Services

**Tel:** +44 845 086 9001

**Email (orders):** [orders@bsigroup.com](mailto:orders@bsigroup.com)

**Email (enquiries):** [cservices@bsigroup.com](mailto:cservices@bsigroup.com)

### Subscriptions

**Tel:** +44 845 086 9001

**Email:** [subscriptions@bsigroup.com](mailto:subscriptions@bsigroup.com)

### Knowledge Centre

**Tel:** +44 20 8996 7004

**Email:** [knowledgecentre@bsigroup.com](mailto:knowledgecentre@bsigroup.com)

### Copyright & Licensing

**Tel:** +44 20 8996 7070

**Email:** [copyright@bsigroup.com](mailto:copyright@bsigroup.com)



...making excellence a habit.™