Statistical analysis of the temperature dependence of the phonon properties in supported CVD graphene

Jarosław Judek*, Arkadiusz P. Gertych, Maciej Krajewski, Karolina Czerniak, Anna Łapińska, Jan Sobieski, Mariusz Zdrojek
Faculty of Physics, Warsaw University of Technology, Koszykowa 75, 00-662 Warszawa, Poland

**A R T I C L E   I N F O**

Article history:
Received 21 April 2017
Received in revised form 17 July 2017
Accepted 15 August 2017

**A B S T R A C T**

Existing literature reports on the dependence of phonon properties on temperature rarely use statistical analysis. The lack of uncertainty assessment, which takes into account changes in the parameter value within the sample, substantially hinders comparison among the data reported so far. Moreover, it is impossible to determine whether these results display discrepancies between themselves due to sample- and technology-dependent issues, manifestations of statistical noise, or a deeper cause that has not yet been grasped. Here, we show the distributions of the phonon properties at temperatures in the range of 300 K–500 K, which were used to calculate the temperature derivatives of the phonon energies $\chi$. These can be used in the procedure of the extraction of graphene thermal conductivity $k$ but are also related to the anharmonic part of the graphene crystal lattice potential and/or nonadiabatic effects. Finally, we show that the correlation analyses revealed the existence of an unknown physical cause of differences between $\chi$ values, showing that the thermal properties of phonons in graphene are still not fully understood and further studies on the contribution of doping, stress, defects and interaction with the substrate, including its thermal expansion, are required to explain the observed parameter variability.

© 2017 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

Today, eight years after the first reports in the literature [1–3], large-scale graphene production on copper foil using Chemical Vapor Deposition (CVD), the only process that meets industrial requirements, is still not mature. Thus, CVD graphene, in contrast to the exfoliated material, is an inhomogeneous and non-ideal material. Typical SEM images of graphene grown on copper foil and transferred onto a typical Si/SiO$_2$ substrate using the delamination method [4] are shown in Fig. 1. Grain boundaries, second layer seeds, wrinkles, and cracks are only examples of the commonly occurring defects. Therefore, it is intuitive that parameters characterizing such a monolayer related to, e.g., electron [5–7] or phonon properties [8–10], should not be described by single values but rather by distributions. These, characterized by a scope of variation usually much higher than the uncertainty of a single measurement, will reflect the fluctuation of the investigated parameters within the sample; thus, they could be treated as technology quality indicators. Another advantage of having a consistent set of data is the access to correlation analysis, which is able to reveal the physical source of the parameter variability, often giving key interpretations or providing useful features. It was shown, for example, that analysis of the correlations between the energies of different phonons in graphene enables optical separation of the stress and doping level [11] or provides an estimation of the stress variation on the nanometer scale [12], which is suspected to limit the mobility in graphene electrical devices [13,14].

Existing literature reports on the dependence of the phonon energies on temperature $T$ [15–30] rarely use statistical analysis while discussing the presented results. The lack of the uncertainty assessment, which takes into account changes in the parameter value within the sample, substantially hinders comparison among data reported by different authors. Moreover, it is impossible to determine whether these results display significant discrepancies between themselves due to the sample- and technology-dependent issues, manifestations of statistical noise, or a deeper cause that has not yet been grasped. On the other hand, reports containing statistical/correlation analyses [11,12] neglect the influence of temperature — another factor, apart from stress and doping, with the ability to significantly affect phonon properties in...
graphene. This is especially important because the experimental technique, Raman spectroscopy, requires illumination with laser light, which typically leads to an inhomogeneous temperature increase within the spot from which data are collected.

In this paper, we fill the gaps identified above. Using a Raman mapping technique, we obtained distributions of the phonon properties at different temperatures in the range of 300 K–500 K, which were used inter alia to calculate the temperature derivatives of the phonon energies $\chi_T = \partial \omega / \partial T$. These not only can be used in the procedure of the extraction of graphene thermal conductivity $\kappa$ and interface conductance $g$ [31–34] but also have a purely scientific meaning related to the anharmonic part of the graphene crystal lattice potential and/or nonadiabatic effects. Based on the statistical/correlation analyses, we concluded that temperature and stress, including that from the thermal expansion of the substrate, can have similar and comparable contributions to the phonon energies in supported CVD graphene, which impedes the reliable separation of these factors. Moreover, we demonstrate that the variations in temperature derivatives of the phonon energies are correlated, which means that there is a specific cause for their divergence.

2. Methods

A graphene monolayer was grown on an 18-μm-thick Jtchtle Gould copper substrate in an Aixtron Black Magic Pro system from CH$_4$ as a precursor, aided by the use of Ar and H$_2$ gases. After growth, the graphene was transferred onto a typical Si/SiO$_2$ (525 μm thick Si and 285 nm thick SiO$_2$) substrate using a high-speed delamination method [4]. We also used commercially available samples from Graphenea Inc. for comparison purposes to exclude any technology-dependent issues.

Phonon properties were examined using a Raman mapping technique [35], a variation of Raman spectroscopy that yields the spatial distribution of the Raman spectra for a specified area of the sample, called Raman maps. Such results can be used for visualization of the changes in a material property related to Raman spectrum within a sample, which itself is an interesting capability. However, in this paper, the acquired Raman maps are intended for statistical analysis. Every Raman spectrum from the Raman map is a subject of numerical analysis in order to obtain the values of the G and 2D mode peak positions $\omega_0$ (related to phonon energies), widths $\Gamma$ (primary related to phonon lifetimes), intensities $I$ (related to the inelastic scattering amplitude), and subsequently, the derivatives of the peak positions with respect to the temperature $\chi_T = \partial \omega / \partial T$. The derivative has interesting interpretation because it can be expressed as [36]:

$$\chi_T = \left(\frac{\partial \omega}{\partial T}\right)_V + \left(\frac{\partial \omega}{\partial T}\right)_p \cdot \left(\frac{\partial \omega}{\partial V}\right)_T.$$ 

This enables study on the interplay between the purely anharmonic effects and the thermal lattice expansion, which, in this approach, is responsible for the change in the force constant values. All considered distributions comprise the corresponding above described ‘point’ data. Typical ‘point’ Raman spectra are shown in Fig. 2. Two peaks called G and 2D can be observed; both are well described by the Lorentzian function. No D mode is observed in our samples, which denotes low defect concentration. The $I_{2D}/I_G$ ratio equals approximately 3.5, which proves that our samples are high quality.

3. Results and discussion

3.1. Stability tests

All Raman measurements were taken under ambient atmosphere, in an environment characterized by the presence of moisture and oxygen molecules, which are known graphene hole dopants [37,38] and oxidizing agents in the presence of light [39]. Both facts are very important and immediately entail discussion of the impact of the laser light illumination, an inherent element of Raman measurement, on the reliability of the obtained results. Our doubts arise from the literature reports of substrate-dependent optical doping in supported graphene [40] and/or its photo(-thermal) oxidation during laser irradiation [41–44]. The latter process might occur even at laser power densities often assumed to be safe [45]. Both phenomena might lead to significant shifts of the G and 2D mode peak positions in consecutive Raman spectra when making a series of measurements at the same position. In consequence, they potentially affect the value of the derivative of the mode position with respect to the temperature, which requires at least a few experimental points. Therefore, before studying the graphene thermal properties, we performed a stability test, the main results of which are illustrated in Fig. 3. We note that presented data are highly sample- and technology-dependent and are intended only to briefly illustrate the problem of graphene stability and to demonstrate the proper handling of this problem in our work.

Fig. 3 consists of six traces in the main part and two data sets in the inset. The values of the G and 2D peak positions were obtained from 121 consecutive Raman measurements performed at the same position, except for traces (a) and (b), when 484 measurements

![Fig. 1. Typical SEM pictures of CVD graphene monolayers grown on copper foil and transferred onto a typical Si/SiO$_2$ substrate. Left: homemade sample, length of the white bar equals 2 μm; right: commercially available sample from Graphenea Inc., length of the white bar equals 10 μm.](image)

![Fig. 2. Representative Raman spectra of a CVD graphene monolayer grown on copper foil and transferred onto a typical Si/SiO$_2$ substrate. The black solid line corresponds to the sample that we synthesized, while the red solid line corresponds to the commercially available sample from Graphenea Inc. (A colour version of this figure can be viewed online.)](image)
were performed in order to show the scope of possible changes. The G and 2D mode peak positions are visualized in the $h_{0G}$--$h_{02D}$ coordinate system, which is convenient when considering temperature/doping/stress contributions to Raman spectra (after Lee [11], Tiberj [40] and Herziger [43]). Traces (a) and (b) were obtained at two different positions on a fresh sample (just after the production process). The laser power $P_l$ focused on the sample by the 50x objective with $NA = 0.50$ equals 1 mW. Observed changes in the G mode position reach 10 cm$^{-1}$, and the initial part of both traces (symbol * in Fig. 3) often forms a kink. Our results are similar to the results obtained by Tiberj [40], except that the direction of the kink is position dependent.

Traces (c)-(f) were obtained on samples that were kept under ambient atmosphere for a few days. The initial values of the G and 2D mode peak positions are higher than those for fresh samples, and the scale of changes due to laser irradiation is much smaller. Traces (c) and (d) were obtained when graphene was illuminated by the laser beam focused on the sample with $P_l = 6$ mW. Traces (e) and (f) were obtained when graphene was illuminated by the defocused laser beam (with a diameter of approximately 2 μm) with $P_l = 6$ mW. The values of the G and 2D mode positions can both monotonically increase or decrease and the curve can form a kink, depending on the Raman measurement details.

After annealing under ambient atmosphere at 460 K for 30 min, the initial value of the peak positions of the G and 2D modes increased again, and the stability further improved. However, no changes in phonon energies during irradiation were observed for the defocused laser beam and only for part of the samples. Example data obtained from consecutive measurements at two different positions of the annealed sample with the defocused laser beam for when the CVD graphene monolayer was stable under laser irradiation are shown in the inset in Fig. 3. No time evolution can be observed; the data have a Gaussian-like distribution. The standard deviations of the peak positions of the G and 2D modes are identical and equal to 0.12 cm$^{-1}$ for the first position and 0.082 cm$^{-1}$ for the second position. Because all our measurements were performed in one spectral window with otherwise unchanged spectrometer settings, we estimated that the A-type uncertainty [46] for both the G and 2D mode peak positions equals approximately 0.1 cm$^{-1}$. The corresponding value of the A-type uncertainty for G and 2D mode peak widths was assumed to equal 0.3 cm$^{-1}$. We note that the experimentally determined value of the uncertainty does not change in temperature (is constant in the 300 K–500 K temperature range) and it includes particularly following contributions: fluctuations of the laser power (which was estimated to be approximately 0.3% in a 1-h-timescale), fluctuations of the focus position in respect to the sample surface, fluctuations of the temperature of the sample, noise of the CCD, and numerical noise related to the fitting procedure.

The results discussed above are consistent with the work of Lee [11] concerning the changes in the Raman G and 2D mode peak position values versus the temperature of the annealing process, the work of Tiberj [40] concerning the different sensitivities of the samples to optical doping, and the work of Amato [45] regarding the statement that, in the case of CVD graphene, even low laser power densities can lead to nonreversible structural changes. Our results are contrary to the results obtained by Costa, who found that changes in the doping are the dominant reason for shifts in the Raman modes [30].

### 3.2. Temperature studies

Temperature studies were performed on two separate CVD graphene monolayer samples: one commercially available, denoted as S1, and one that we synthesized, denoted as S2. Both samples were annealed just before the measurements (S1 460 K, S2 500 K). The obtained results are reversible with respect to the temperature, and after the heating-cooling cycles, we do not observe significant changes in the D mode intensity (no distinct D mode), in the $I_{2D}/I_C$ ratio (~3.5) or in the average mode positions. We note that our results are contrary to part of the results already published [20,22–24,27,30], which showed differences between the first and next heating-cooling cycles. Based on the results of the stability tests, we used only the defocused laser beam characterized by a diameter of approximately 2 μm and a power of 6 mW in the temperature studies. The Raman mapping involved 121 measurements performed on a 20 μm × 20 μm square area with a 2 μm step. For sample S2, we additionally recorded four Raman maps for each temperature in four corners of the sample that were located approximately 4 mm from each other to see if our map was large enough and whether our data were representative. For every temperature, all four sets did not differ from each other within the uncertainty limit. Thus, we pooled the results for each temperature together to obtain better statistics. The results for samples S1 and S2 do not differ quantitatively, so we focus only on results from sample S2 due to a larger data set (484 experimental points) in the further part of our work.

Fig. 4 shows the main (raw) results of this work, i.e., the distributions of the positions of the G mode $h_{0G}$, distributions of the positions of the 2D mode $h_{02D}$, distributions of the widths of the G mode $\Gamma_C$, and distributions of the widths of the 2D mode $\Gamma_{2D}$, for five temperature values: 300 K, 350 K, 400 K, 450 K, and 500 K. The results are presented in the form of histograms in Fig. 4a–d, and separately in Fig. 4e–h in $h_{02D}$–$h_{0G}$, $\Gamma_C$–$h_{0G}$, $\Gamma_{2D}$–$h_{02D}$, and $\Gamma_{2D}$–$\Gamma_C$ coordinate systems, which is convenient while identifying correlations between sets of variables.

The histograms of the G and 2D mode positions and widths (Fig. 4a–d) demonstrate that the obtained data follow normal distributions. Calculated values of the arithmetic mean $\overline{h_{0G}}$ and standard deviation $\sigma_{h_{0G}}$ are listed in Table 1. The mean values of the G and 2D mode positions, $h_{0G}$ and $h_{02D}$, decrease linearly with temperature, as expected. The mean values of the G and 2D mode widths, $\Gamma_C$ and $\Gamma_{2D}$, increase with temperature, also as expected. The derivative of the mean value of the G mode position with respect to temperature equals:
\[ \chi_{G} = \frac{\partial \delta \omega_{G}}{\partial T} = -0.051 \pm 0.005 \text{ cm}^{-1} / \text{K}, \]  

(1)

the derivative of the mean value of the 2D mode position with respect to temperature equals:

\[ \chi_{2D} = \frac{\partial \delta \omega_{2D}}{\partial T} = -0.101 \pm 0.009 \text{ cm}^{-1} / \text{K}, \]  

(2)

the derivative of the mean value of the G mode width with respect to temperature equals:

\[ \delta \sigma_{G}/\partial T = 0.021 \pm 0.009 \text{ cm}^{-1} / \text{K}, \]  

(3)

and the derivative of the mean value of the 2D mode width with respect to temperature equals:

\[ \delta \sigma_{2D}/\partial T = 0.035 \pm 0.007 \text{ cm}^{-1} / \text{K}. \]  

(4)

The derivates of the values are in good agreement with other studies in the literature, which will be discussed further separately. It is surprising that the values of the standard deviations of the mean, with respect to temperature, are relatively high. This occurs because our calculations of the covariance matrix take into account the uncertainties of the raw experimental data, which represents an advisable but rarely employed approach \[47\]. Uncertainties of the G and 2D mode mean positions and widths are taken as the standard deviations of the corresponding distributions, which is a standard procedure. We note that the values of \( \delta \omega_{G} \) and \( \delta \omega_{2D} \), as well as the values of \( \delta \sigma_{G} \) and \( \delta \sigma_{2D} \), are higher than the corresponding uncertainties of a single measurement, which were assumed previously to equal 0.1 cm\(^{-1}\) in the case of mode position and 0.3 cm\(^{-1}\) in the case of mode width. This means that the divergence of the values of the mode positions and widths comes mostly from the inhomogeneity of the graphene monolayer. We also note that it seems that the values of the standard deviations of the G and 2D mode positions and widths are insensitive to temperature. The assumption that, indeed, \( \delta \sigma(T)/\partial T = 0 \) implies a conditional conclusion that if there is a specific cause of the divergence of the G and 2D mode positions and widths, this cause is insensitive to the temperature changes.

Fig. 4e–h were used for identifying correlations between phonon properties related to the Raman spectra acquired at constant temperature. A distinct dependence between the G and 2D mode positions and between the G and 2D mode widths can be seen in Fig. 4e and h, respectively. The values of the Pearson correlation coefficients \( \rho \), a quantity that is a measure of the linear dependence of two variables, for both data sets are listed in Table 1. We note that \( \rho > 0.67 \) for mode positions for all temperatures and \( \rho > 0.54 \) for mode widths for all temperatures except the highest one, which justifies our previous finding. On the other hand, the results presented in Fig. 4f and g do not allow us to conclude that there is any dependence between mode position and width either in the case of the G or 2D mode.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( T ) (K)</th>
<th>( \delta \omega_{G} \pm \delta \omega_{2D} ) (cm(^{-1}))</th>
<th>( \delta \sigma_{G} \pm \delta \sigma_{2D} ) (cm(^{-1}))</th>
<th>( \rho(\delta \omega_{2D}, \delta \omega_{G}) )</th>
<th>( \rho(\delta \omega_{2D}, \delta \omega_{G})/\partial \sigma_{G} )</th>
<th>( \rho(\delta \sigma_{2D}, \delta \sigma_{G}) )</th>
<th>( \delta \sigma_{2D}/\partial \sigma_{G} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>1600.4 ± 0.8</td>
<td>2702.2 ± 1.3</td>
<td>14.1 ± 1.4</td>
<td>33.8 ± 1.0</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350</td>
<td>1598.1 ± 1.0</td>
<td>2697.4 ± 1.6</td>
<td>15.1 ± 1.2</td>
<td>35.8 ± 1.1</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>1.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>1595.3 ± 0.8</td>
<td>2691.8 ± 1.5</td>
<td>15.8 ± 1.3</td>
<td>37.4 ± 1.1</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>2.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>450</td>
<td>1593.2 ± 0.9</td>
<td>2687.4 ± 1.9</td>
<td>16.9 ± 1.5</td>
<td>38.9 ± 1.4</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>2.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>1590.2 ± 0.8</td>
<td>2681.9 ± 1.6</td>
<td>18.4 ± 1.4</td>
<td>41.1 ± 1.2</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>2.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 4a–d. Pearson correlation coefficients \( \rho \) and derivatives were obtained using Deming orthogonal regression for the data in Fig. 4e and h.

The values of the derivatives are in good agreement with other studies in the literature, which will be discussed further separately. It is surprising that the values of the standard deviations of the G and 2D mode positions and widths are insensitive to temperature. The assumption that, indeed, \( \delta \sigma(T)/\partial T = 0 \) implies a conditional conclusion that if there is a specific cause of the divergence of the G and 2D mode positions and widths, this cause is insensitive to the temperature changes.
\[ \frac{\partial \nu_{2D}}{\partial \Delta \nu} \bigg|_{\nu - \text{const}} = 2.2 \]  
(5)

and the average value of the derivative of the 2D mode width with respect to the G mode width equals:

\[ \frac{\partial \Gamma_{2D}}{\partial \Gamma_G} \bigg|_{\nu - \text{const}} = 0.78 \]  
(6)

Values displayed in eq. (5) are especially interesting because similar values of the position derivative are attributed to the stress variations within the graphene monolayer [11,49–52]. For instance, Lee [11] claims that “most of pristine graphene sheets exhibit strain in the range of −0.2 to −0.4% which varies gradually on the length scale of several microns”. As a result, Lee obtained \( \partial \nu_{2D} / \partial \nu_G = 2.2 \), which matches our result exactly. Stress variation can also be observed at the nanometer scale from the analysis of the derivative of the 2D mode width with respect to the G mode width, whose value, according to Neumann [12] and Shin [52], should equal 2.2. In our case, at constant temperature, \( \partial \Gamma_{2D} / \partial \Gamma_G = 0.78 \), which is significantly below 2.2, taking into account that the diameter of our laser beam is approximately 2 μm, much larger than in the standard case. The conclusion is that the investigated CVD graphene monolayer samples are affected by the stress variation on the length scale of several microns, similar to the graphene samples investigated by Lee and in contrast to the ones examined by Neumann and Shin.

With regard to the mean values of the G and 2D mode positions and widths, there are distinct linear relationships between \( \nu_G \) and \( \nu_{2D} \) (\( \rho \geq 0.99 \)) and between \( \Gamma_G \) and \( \Gamma_{2D} \) (\( \rho \geq 0.99 \)). Therefore, we calculated the derivative of the mean 2D mode position with respect to the mean G mode position, which equals:

\[ \frac{\partial \nu_{2D}}{\partial \nu_G} = 2.0 \pm 0.3 \]  
(7)

as well as the derivative of the mean 2D mode width with respect to the mean G mode width, which equals:

\[ \frac{\partial \Gamma_{2D}}{\partial \Gamma_G} = 1.7 \pm 0.8 \]  
(8)

We note that the relatively high values of both uncertainties come from the high values of the standard deviation of the G and 2D mode positions and widths, in comparison to the changes in the corresponding mean values.

Because the \( \partial \nu_{2D} / \partial \nu_G \) value is close to 2.2, we estimate the influence of the stress on the temperature shifts of the Raman mode positions using the following reasoning. First, we assume that the graphene monolayer mimics the thermal expansion of the silicon wafer. The linear thermal expansion coefficient \( \alpha \) for silicon equals approximately \( 2.56 \times 10^{-6} \text{ K}^{-1} \); however, to be precise, we used data from Ref. [53]. The change of stress acting on the graphene monolayer originating from the thermal expansion of the silicon substrate when changing the temperature from 300 K to 500 K equals approximately 0.054%. Assuming, after Shin [52], that \( \partial \nu_G / \partial \varepsilon = -62 \text{ cm}^{-1} / \% \) and \( \partial \nu_{2D} / \partial \varepsilon = -138 \text{ cm}^{-1} / \% \), we obtained the contributions of the substrate thermal expansion-induced stress on the derivative of the G and 2D mode positions with respect to the temperature, which equal \( \chi_{\text{T,G,SI}} = -0.017 \text{ cm}^{-1} / \text{K} \) and \( \chi_{\text{T,2D,SI}} = -0.037 \text{ cm}^{-1} / \text{K} \). Similar values were reported by Calzò for exfoliated graphene on a silicon wafer [15]. This leads to the conclusion that there could be a significant contribution to the Raman peak shifts with temperature from the substrate-induced stress change. Of course, the explanation of the changes in graphene phonon energies with temperature seems to be much more complicated, at least for the reasoning that

\[ \chi_{\text{T,G,HOPG}} = -0.011 \text{ cm}^{-1} / \text{K} \]  
for HOPG crystal, which was “attributed to the pure temperature effect without an anharmonic contribution" [54]. We also note that the \( \chi_{\text{T,G}} \) value for the unstrained HOPG crystal used for mechanical exfoliation in our previous publication [29] is very close to the \( \chi_{\text{T,G}} \) value for multilayer graphene (\( n = 11 \)) on a Si/SiO\(_2\) substrate (see Table 2), suggesting, in contrast, no substrate contribution.

The influence of the substrate expansion on the temperature dependence of the Raman spectra from CVD graphene was first pointed out by Kalbac [25,26,28]. Investigating strain and doping in monolayer and bilayer isotopically labeled graphene Kalbac observed that “in both monolayer and the bottom layer of the bilayer, which are in contact with the substrate, a significant amount of local strain is induced when the temperature is varied. In contrast, the influence of local strain on the top layer is much smaller.” These conclusions clearly explain why the values of the derivative of the G and 2D mode positions with respect to temperature for unstrained HOPG sample and for exfoliated multilayer graphene on Si/SiO\(_2\) are so close to each other. Moreover, extracted in our previous work [29] value of the interface thermal conductance, much smaller than these reported by other authors [55–59], further proves the claim on the influence of the substrate interaction on \( \chi \). The substrate-induced strain was also investigated for CVD graphene on copper foil and glass. For example, Tivanov [60] reported \( \chi_G = -0.054 \pm 0.004 \text{ cm}^{-1} / \text{K} \) and interpreted this value as significantly higher than the values obtained by other authors due to a volume expansion coefficient difference for graphene and copper foil. However, in this work, we found \( \chi_G = -0.051 \pm 0.005 \text{ cm}^{-1} / \text{K} \) for CVD graphene on Si/SiO\(_2\), which suggests that Tivanov’s claim could be premature. Another interesting study of CVD graphene on copper foil was reported by Wang [61], who found \( \chi_G = -0.101 \text{ cm}^{-1} / \text{K} \) and \( \chi_{2D} = -0.180 \text{ cm}^{-1} / \text{K} \). Assuming that the linear thermal expansion coefficient \( \alpha \) for copper equals \( 17 \times 10^{-6} \text{ K}^{-1} \), we obtained \( \chi_{\text{T,G,Cu}} = -0.105 \text{ cm}^{-1} / \text{K} \) and \( \chi_{\text{T,2D,Cu}} = -0.235 \text{ cm}^{-1} / \text{K} \). We note that the obtained unexpectedly good convergence is puzzling. However, the most striking effect was described by Kolesov [62], who transferred CVD graphene from copper foil onto glass and observed changes in temperature derivative of the G mode position from \( \chi_{\text{T,G,Cu}} = -0.054 \text{ cm}^{-1} / \text{K} \) to \( \chi_{\text{T,G,Glass}} = 0 \).

The influence of temperature on phonon properties was analyzed also theoretically. The most interesting is the work of Bonini [63], who found temperature changes in \( E_{2g} \) phonon energies both for graphite and graphene, Mounet [64], who found the in-plane coefficient of linear thermal expansion using quasi-harmonic approximation with phonon frequencies and Gruneisen parameters, and Zakharchenko [65] who calculated thermal expansion coefficient using atomistic Monte Carlo simulations. The results obtained in Ref. [63] can be used for the calculation of the graphene thermal expansion coefficient \( \alpha \) as described by Yoon [66], Shaiana [67], and Tian [68]. In this work, assuming that \( \alpha \) is constant in the temperature range of 300 K–500 K, we obtained \( \alpha = -2.9 \times 10^{-4} \text{ K}^{-1} \), which is a very reasonable value. We note that theoretical predictions on the temperature changes in \( E_{2g} \) phonon energy can be easily related to the experimental data because the energy of the double-degenerate \( E_{2g} \) Phonons taken at the center of the Brillouin zone (\( \Gamma \) point) equals directly the center of the first-order G mode in the Raman spectrum. Unfortunately, in the case of 2D mode [69–71] the situation is far much complicated because physical process underlying emergence of the 2D mode it “is a fourth order process involving four virtual transitions: a laser induced excitation of an electron-hole pair; (ii) electron-phonon scattering with an exchanged momentum \( \mathbf{q} \) close to \( \mathbf{K} \); (iii) electron-phonon scattering with an exchanged momentum \( -\mathbf{q} \); (iv)
electron-hole recombination\textsuperscript{a} [69]. Therefore, the Raman 2D peak position and shape result from both phonon and electron band structure. Particularly, the $\boldsymbol{q}$ vector, which determines the phonon energy through the $E(\boldsymbol{q})$ relation depends on the details of the electron band structure.

In Fig. 5, we show the distributions of the derivatives of the G and 2D mode positions with respect to temperature, $\chi_{G}$ and $\chi_{2D}$, and their mutual correlations. We note that the distributions of the derivatives were calculated from the Raman maps acquired for each temperature at the same position of the sample, thus enabling the calculation of the derivative at every point of the specified area. Histograms in Fig. 5a and b comprise all the ‘point derivatives’ and prove that they follow normal distributions. The mean value of the derivative of the G mode position with respect to temperature equals:

$$\chi_{G}\frac{\partial \phi_{G}}{\partial T} = -0.051\pm0.006 \text{ cm}^{-1}/\text{K}$$  \hspace{2cm} (9)

and the mean value of the derivative of the 2D mode position with respect to temperature equals:

$$\chi_{2D}\frac{\partial \phi_{2D}}{\partial T} = -0.101\pm0.011 \text{ cm}^{-1}/\text{K}.$$  \hspace{2cm} (10)

The obtained mean values are very close to those calculated using eqs. (1) and (2), including the uncertainties (here, the standard deviations), showing the consistency of our data.

In Fig. 5c, we show the obtained results in the $\chi_{2D}$–$\chi_{G}$ coordinate system supplemented with data from other literature reports, for which the exact numerical values are listed in Table 2. Our results are in good agreement with those reported by other authors and fit well in the overall trend. Moreover, a distinct correlation between $\chi_{G}$ and $\chi_{2D}$ can be observed, which is additionally confirmed by the value of the Pearson correlation coefficient of 0.80. The derivative of $\chi_{2D}$ with respect to $\chi_{G}$ equals:

$$\frac{\partial \chi_{2D}}{\partial \chi_{G}} = 1.96.$$  \hspace{2cm} (11)

The standard deviation of the data in the direction parallel to the line characterized by parameters obtained with the Deming method equals $0.012 \text{ cm}^{-1}/\text{K}$, whereas in the direction perpendicular to that line, the standard deviation equals $0.0034 \text{ cm}^{-1}/\text{K}$. The

![Fig. 5](image-url)

**Fig. 5.** (a) Histogram of the derivative of the G mode position with respect to the temperature $\partial \phi_{G}/\partial T = \chi_{G}$; (b) histogram of the derivative of the 2D mode position with respect to temperature $\partial \phi_{2D}/\partial T = \chi_{2D}$; (c) $\chi_{2D}$ versus $\chi_{G}$. The gray solid line defines a constant ratio that equals 1.96. (A colour version of this figure can be viewed online.)
Pearson correlation coefficient in the coordinate system based on the directions mentioned above for the data shown in Fig. 5c equals $1$ and the comparison to other literature reports led to the conclusion that our values of $\chi_c$ and $\chi_G$ and $\chi_T$ are well fits not only our results but also those of the others, which clearly suggests that there could be a physical origin of the differences between the $\chi$ values, such as doping, stress, the amount of defects or interactions with the substrate. The need for an investigation of this cause is the main conclusion of this work and indicates the direction of possible further research related to the thermal dependence of the phonon properties in graphene and other 2D crystals.

4. Summary

Analysis of the mutual correlations between phonon properties and the comparison to other literature reports led to the conclusion that stress acting on graphene, including that coming from thermal expansion of the substrate, is an important factor when considering the temperature dependence of the phonon energies. The final discussion revealed the existence of an unknown physical cause of differences between reported $\chi$ values, demonstrating that the thermal properties of phonons in graphene are still not fully understood and that further studies on the contributions of doping, stress, defects and interactions with the substrate, including its thermal expansion, are required to explain observed divergence in the values of $\chi_c$ and $\chi_G$ illustrated in Fig. 5c. We also note that the approach presented in this work is not limited to graphene but is universal and can be employed in the investigation of the thermal properties of any other 2D materials or thin films.
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