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In type IIb diamond an electron paramagnetic resonance is observed which presumably arises from holes bound to the acceptor boron. The state is described by $\operatorname{spin} J=3 / 2$ and a spin-Hamiltonian $H$, with $H=H_{B}+H_{\varepsilon^{\prime}}$
$H_{B}=g_{1}^{\prime} \mu_{B}\left(B_{x} J_{x}+B_{y} J_{y}+B_{z} J_{z}\right)+g_{2}^{\prime} \mu_{B}\left(B_{x} J_{x}^{3}+B_{y} J_{y}^{3}+B_{z} J_{z}^{3}\right)$, $H_{\varepsilon}=b^{\prime}\left(\varepsilon_{x x} J_{x}^{2}+\varepsilon_{y y} J_{y}^{2}+\varepsilon_{z z} J_{z}^{2}\right)+d^{\prime}(2 / \sqrt{3})\left[\varepsilon_{x y}\left(J_{x} J_{y}+J_{y} J_{x}\right)+\varepsilon_{y z}\left(J_{y} J_{z}+J_{z} J_{Y}\right)\right.$ $\left.+\varepsilon_{z x}\left(J_{z} J_{x}+J_{x} J_{z}\right)\right]$.
The Hamiltonian constants are $g_{1}^{\prime}=-1.10 \pm 0.05, g_{2}^{\prime}=+0.01 \pm 0.02$ and $\mathrm{d}^{\prime} / \mathrm{b}^{\prime}=1.65[1]$.

The resonance is only observable when an external uniaxial stress $\overrightarrow{\mathrm{P}}$ ext is applied to the diamond. Results for $\vec{P}_{\text {ext }} / /[100]$ and magnetic field $\vec{B}$ rotated in the plane perpendicular to $\vec{P}_{\text {ext }}$ are shown in figure 1 . The magnetic field value at which resonance is observed, $B_{r e s}$, is isotropic with an effective g-value $g_{\text {eff }}=2 g_{1}^{\prime}+5 g_{2}^{\prime}$. Linewidth $\Delta B$ and line intensity $X$, on the other hand, have a pronounced angular dependence. The linewidth variations are probably caused by internal stresses $\vec{P}_{\text {int }}$ in the diamond.

One may assume the presence of internal stresses with a random direction and with a strength distribution according to a Gaussian function. It is useful to decompose the internal stress into its components $\overrightarrow{\mathrm{P}}_{\text {int, }} /$ parallel to the external stress direction $[100]$ and $\vec{P}_{i n t, \perp}$ perpendicular to it. Then the total stress $\vec{P}_{\text {tot }}$ is given by $\vec{P}_{\text {tot }}=\vec{P}_{\text {ext }}+\vec{P}_{\text {int }} / / /+\vec{P}_{\text {int }}, \perp$.

First the effect of $\vec{P}_{\text {int }}, / /$ is considered. Using perturbation theory a more accurate formula for the effective $g$-value can be derived. It reads:
$g_{e f f}=2 g_{1}^{\prime}+5 g_{2}^{\prime}-\left\{\frac{3}{16}\left(2 g_{1}^{\prime}+5 g_{2}^{\prime}\right)-\frac{9}{32} g_{2}^{\prime} \cos 4 \phi\right\} .\left\{\frac{\left(g_{1}^{\prime}+7 / 4 g_{2}^{\prime}\right) \mu_{B} B}{b^{\prime}\left(s_{11}-S_{12}\right) P_{\text {tot }}}\right\}^{2}$. As the formula indicates a dependence of $g_{\text {eff }}$ with $\cos 4 \phi(\phi=$ azimuthal angle) on $P_{\text {tot }}$ as is observed experimentally, is obtained. However, the correction to $g_{\text {eff }}=2 g_{1}^{\prime}+5 g_{2}^{\prime}$ is too small to be of practical significance.

The perpendicular component of $\vec{P}_{i n t}$ has a larger influence. For the effect of tilting $\vec{P}_{\text {tot }}$ away from [100] one derives by series expansion in the polar angle $\theta$ :

$$
g(\theta, \phi)=g(0, \phi)+\left(\frac{d g}{d \theta}\right)_{\theta=0} \cdot \theta+\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{d^{2} g}{d \theta^{2}}\right)_{\theta=0} \cdot \theta^{2} .
$$

Since the linear term vanishes

$$
\frac{\Delta g}{g_{e f f}}=\frac{g(\theta, \phi)-g(0, \phi)}{g_{e f f}}=\frac{1}{2 g_{e f f}}\left(\frac{d^{2} g}{d \theta^{2}}\right)_{\theta=0} \cdot \theta^{2}
$$

Small angles $\theta$ will give no broadening; large angles would do so but have a low probability of occurring. An effective $\theta_{\text {eff }}$ is therefore introduced. Some angles $\phi$ will cause a positive $g$-shift $\Delta g$; others will give a negative g-shift. The line broadening is due to the difference. A measure for the relative linewidth is thus given by:

$$
\frac{\Delta \mathrm{B}}{\mathrm{~B}_{\mathrm{res}}}=\frac{1}{2 g}\left\{\left(\frac{\mathrm{~d}_{\mathrm{eff}} \mathrm{~g}}{\mathrm{~d} \mathrm{\theta}}\right)_{\max }-\left(\frac{\mathrm{d}^{2} g}{d \theta^{2}}\right)_{\min }\right\} \cdot \theta_{\mathrm{eff}}^{2}
$$

The quantity $\frac{1}{2 g e_{\text {eff }}}\left\{\left(\frac{d^{2} g}{d \theta^{2}}\right)_{\max }-\left(\frac{d^{2} g}{d \theta^{2}}\right)_{\min }\right\}$ can be calculated from the spin-Hamiltonian. A graphical representation of it in figure 2 shows a satisfactory agreement with the linewidth $\Delta B / B$ as measured. For measurements with $\vec{B}$ in the (100) plane a linewidth anisotropy can be introduced as the
ratio of the linewidths $\Delta B$ for $\vec{B} / /[010]$ and $\vec{B} / /[011]$. It is given by

$$
\frac{\Delta \mathrm{B}[010]}{{ }^{\Delta \mathrm{B}}[011]}=\frac{\left\{\left(\frac{\mathrm{d}^{2} g}{\mathrm{~d} \theta^{2}}\right)_{\max }-\left(\frac{\mathrm{a}^{2} g}{\mathrm{~d} \theta^{2}}\right)_{\min }\right\}[010]}{\left\{\left(\frac{\mathrm{d}^{2} g}{d \theta^{2}}\right)_{\max }-\left(\frac{\mathrm{a}^{2} g}{\mathrm{~d} \theta^{2}}\right)_{\min }\right\}[011]} \cdot
$$

For C:B the linewidth anisotropy is an experimental 2.2, in quite good agreement with the calculated value 1.8. The significance of the agreement is corroborated by a comparison to a different but similar system, i.e. to Si:Al. For this system both the calculated and measured anisotropy are smaller than one, which implies that the linewidth variation is out of phase with C:B.

An acceptable match between the two curves in figure 2 is obtained for $\theta_{\text {eff }}=12^{\circ}$. Since $\operatorname{tg} \theta_{\text {eff }}=\left|\vec{P}_{\text {int }}\right| /\left|\vec{P}_{\text {ext }}\right|$ and the experiments were performed with $\left|\overrightarrow{\mathrm{P}}_{\text {ext }}\right|=0.50 \mathrm{GPa}$, this leads to an estimated internal stress of about 0.1 GPa. Multiplying with the compliance of diamond, $S_{11}-S_{12}=1.05 \times 10^{-12} \mathrm{~Pa}^{-1}$, the corresponding internal strain $\varepsilon_{\text {int }}$ is calculated to be $10^{-4}$.
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## Figure captions

Figure 1. Angular dependence, for $\vec{B}$ in the (100) plane, of the resonance field $B_{r e s}$, the resonance linewidth $\Delta B$, and its intensity $X$. Compressive stress of $0.50 \mathrm{GPa} / /[100]$.

Figure 2. The relative linewidth $\Delta B / B_{\text {res }}$ as a function of the direction of the magnetic field $\vec{B}$ in the (100) plane. Upper curve: experimental result for $\left|\vec{P}_{\text {ext }}\right|=0.50 \mathrm{GPa}$; lower curve: calculated for $\theta_{\text {eff }}=1^{\circ}$.
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Figure 2. The relative 1 inewidth $\Delta B / B_{\text {res }}$ as a function of the direction of the magnetic field $\vec{B}$ in the (100) plane. Upper curve: experimental result for $\left|\overrightarrow{\mathrm{P}}_{\text {ext }}\right|=0.50 \mathrm{GPa}$; lower curve: calculated for $\theta_{\text {eff }}=1^{\circ}$.

