Electronic and optical properties of 4.2 μm “N” structured superlattice MWIR photodetectors
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A B S T R A C T

We report on the development of a new structure for type II superlattice photodiodes that we call the “N” design. In this new design, we insert an electron barrier between InAs and GaSb in the growth direction. The barrier pushes the electron and hole wave functions towards the layer edges and under bias, increases the overlap integral by about 25% leading to higher detectivity. InAs/AlSb/GaSb superlattices were studied with density functional theory. Both AlAs and InSb interfaces were taken into account by calculating the heavy hole–light hole (HH–LH) splittings. Experiments were carried out on single pixel photodiodes by measuring electrical and optical performance. With cut-off wavelength of 4.2 μm at 120 K, temperature dependent dark current and detectivity measurements show that the dark current is 2.5 × 10−8 A under zero bias with corresponding R0A of 300 K under 300 K background and −0.3 V bias voltage.

1. Introduction

Recently, type-II superlattice (T2SL) infrared photodetectors have received great attention for civilian, military and medical applications. Furthermore, T2SL system is becoming an alternative technology for mercury cadmium telluride (MCT) and QWIP technologies. Ability to control the band gap by varying the InAs thickness [1], with suppressed Auger recombination rates [2], reduced interband tunneling due to higher effective masses of electrons and holes [3] makes T2SL a very promising technology for most of the infrared region (3–30 μm). In the quest of achieving state of art infrared photodetectors, further improvements such as, reducing the dark current level due to generation recombination (G–R) mechanisms and surface conductive channels, are needed. Furthermore, most of the photodetectors in the market requires low operating temperatures that is inconvenient for many applications. Ability to operate higher operating temperatures (HOTs) will reduce cost, volume, weight and power requirements.

Introducing a barrier inside the superlattice period is an efficient way to solve listed problems above. Many such barriers with intuitive material designs have been proposed such as, nBn design [4], PbBn design [5], CBIRD structure [6] and M structure design [7]. These designs aim to block one type of carrier while allowing other type of carriers. These designs have been very effective with the ability to drastically reduce the dark current and increase the BLIP temperature above 100 K. In InAs/GaSb SL p–i–n photodiodes, taking the advantage of the close lattice constants, Nguyen et.al. inserted asymmetric AlSb barrier layer inside the GaSb layer and calling it the “M” structure. M structure blocks the thermal electrons to reduce dark current. Further, it also increases detectivity by increasing electron–hole wave functions overlap integral due to the AlSb barrier pushing the electron and hole wave functions towards the layer edges.

In this report, we introduce a new structure design that we call as “N” design. In this material design, we insert an AlSb layer between the InAs and GaSb layer in the growth direction. This design works similar to M design but it allows better electron–hole wave function overlap under reverse bias conditions, leading to efficient optical absorption. We expect that the N design delivers better optical performance and similar electrical performance when compared with the M design. However, due to relatively large constant mismatch between InAs (6.0584 Å) and AlSb (6.1355 Å) unlike AlSb on GaSb (6.0959 Å) unwanted trap states may be generated at the
interface. This may be overcome with AlSb layers thinner than the critical thickness. Spitzer et al. showed that InSb-like interfaces in AlSb/InAsSb superlattices grow perfectly pseudomorphically while AlAs-like interfaces relax [8]. As will be shown, our dark current measurements show that lattice mismatch does not affect device performance, dramatically.

2. Theory/calculation

Density functional theory (DFT) calculations were performed using the plane-wave basis pseudopotential method as implemented in the ABINIT code [9]. The simulations were carried out using the Fritz-Haber-Institute (FHI) type pseudopotentials, in which the exchange–correlation energy is evaluated in the local density approximation (LDA), using Perdew–Wang parametrization [10] of Ceperley–Alder electron-gas data [11]. For all structures, the plane-wave energy cutoff of 30 Ha were found to be enough for convergence of all the reported quantities.

In particular we have performed systematical calculations for several N-structure InAs/AlSb/GaSb based T2SL structures in order to clear out the effect of AlSb blocking barrier and layer thicknesses on the band gap and HH–LH splitting energies, which are particularly important in the suppression of non-radiative electron–hole recombination in practical detector applications. Due to the well-known tendency of the DFT in order to underestimate the band gap values of semiconductors and insulators, we tested different types of pseudopotentials and proceeded to handle the investigation with the one gives the largest band gap energy for the InAs6/AlSb2/GaSb4 structure. Eventually, the selected pseudopotentials give 0.001, 1.110, and 0.480 eV for the band gap values of bulk InAs, AlSb and GaSb, respectively (Experimentally predicted band gap values are 0.43, 1.65, and 0.81 eV [12] for bulk InAs, AlSb and GaSb, respectively.). In this study, to calculate the exact band gap values, advanced methods such as GW approximation [13] has not been applied because the computational cost would be extreme for the super lattice structures having such a large super cell.

While constructing InAs/AlSb/GaSb structures of two different transition interfaces, InSb and AlAs, they can be formed between the InAs and AlSb layers, see Fig. 1a and b. The effect of these two transition structures on HH–LH splitting energies is examined by band structure calculations of the InAsn/AlSb2/GaSbn-2 (n = 2–8) superlattices with both InSbAl and InAsAl interfaces. Calculated band structures of the InAs3/AlSb2/GaSb1 superlattices are depicted in Fig. 2a and b as illustrations. In Fig. 3, we show the effect of these transition interface types on the HH–LH splittings of superlattices with different number of layers, $n$.

If the transition interface is InSb, energy difference of HH–LH splitting shows ascending behavior while if it is AlAs, HH–LH splitting shows descending range with the increasing layer numbers of the superlattice structures. Range of variations are about 50 meV.

Fig. 1. (InAs)$_3$/(AlSb)$_2$/(GaSb)$_1$ structures with (a) InSb and (b) AlAs interfaces.

Fig. 2. Band structure of (InAs)$_3$/(AlSb)$_2$/(GaSb)$_1$ structures with (a) InSb and (b) AlAs interfaces.

Fig. 3. Heavy hole–light hole splittings of InAs/AlSb/GaSb structures with increasing layer thicknesses.
and the splitting energies of the structures with AlAs interfaces are higher than the InSb ones.

In Fig. 4, we show the effects of layer thickness of InAs and GaSb regions with two different transition interfaces. Structures with the InSb interfaces show increasing splitting value while AlAs interfaced structures show decreasing splitting value with the increase in the number of GaSb layers, see Fig. 4a. However, for both types of interfaces, the splitting values increase with the increasing number of InAs layer thickness, see Fig. 4b.

Fig. 5 shows the calculated $E_{\text{gap}}$ values of superlattices as a function of number of layers ($n$). The $E_{\text{gap}}$ values show descending range with both interfaces and there is no significant difference between these two structures when the well-known discrepancy of the LDA type pseudopotentials on band gap of semiconductors and insulators is considered. On the other hand, the calculated band gap values for $n > 6$ show that the used pseudopotential is not accurate enough in order to predict the semiconductor nature of these super lattice structures.

3. Materials and methods

Fig. 7a shows a schematic draw of the N structure energy band diagram. An AlSb layer inserted between InAs and GaSb layers which blocks the thermal electrons. Structure gives the impression of the Latin capital letter N, which lead us to call this new design as N structure design. Fig. 7b shows layer makeup of the actual superlattice structure. It starts with 100 nm thick GaSb buffer layer and 20 nm Al$_{x}$Ga$_{1-x}$As$_{y}$Sb as an insulator and etch stop layer, followed by 1000 nm GaSb:Be ($p = 1.0 \times 10^{17} \text{ cm}^{-3}$) p contact layer. p–i–n part of the design consist of 90 periods 9 monolayers (MLs) of InAs/2 MLs of AlSb/8.5 MLs of GaSb:Be ($p = 1.5 \times 10^{17} \text{ cm}^{-3}$) p-type layers, 60 periods 9 MLs of InAs/2 MLs of AlSb/8.5 MLs of GaSb i-layers, 40 periods 9 MLs of InAs:Te ($n: 5 \times 10^{17} \text{ cm}^{-3}$/2 MLs of AlSb)/8.5 MLs of GaSb n-type layers and structure is terminated by 20 nm InAs:Te ($n: 5 \times 10^{17} \text{ cm}^{-3}$) cap layer to assure good ohmic contact. The sample studied in this work was grown commercially (IQE Inc. USA) with molecular beam epitaxy on a GaSb substrate.

Single pixel photodetectors were fabricated with mesa sizes ranging from $100 \times 100$ to $700 \times 700 \mu m^2$. To minimize surface damage, mesas have been fabricated by standard lithography and phosphoric acid based wet etch solution. The etch process has been stopped when etch depth reached the bottom contact layer. The complete fabrication processes can be found elsewhere [14]. A protective 250 nm thick SiO$_2$ layer has been deposited using plasma
enhanced chemical vapor deposition (PECVD) system at 160 °C with 2%SiH4/N2 and N2O gas flows of 180 sccm and 225 sccm, respectively. Ohmic contacts were made by evaporating 5 nm Titanium (Ti) and 200 nm Gold (Au) on the bottom and top contact layers of the detectors. Sample was bonded to a chip carrier for further characterization.

Fig. 7. (a) “N” structure superlattice and (b) p–i–n superlattice photodiode structure.

Fig. 8. (a) Dark current measurement for different temperatures. (b) Dynamic resistance measurements for different temperatures.

Fig. 9. Dark current and dynamic resistance vs.1000/T graph.
4. Results

Dark current density measurement for 500 × 500 μm² square single pixel photodetector for different temperatures between 120 K and 240 K has been realized (Fig. 8a), corresponding dynamic resistance vs. applied bias graph is shown in Fig. 8b. At 120 K, results show 1.5 × 10⁻⁹ A dark current and 1.5 × 10¹⁰ cm² dynamic resistance which is very promising towards HOT application.

Fig. 9 shows dark current density and dynamic resistance area product vs. 1000/T graph for 500 × 500 μm² photodiode for different temperatures under zero bias. The I–V curve shows the effect of the diffusion current for temperatures higher than 120 K. For higher temperatures, Arrhenius behavior has been observed.

Spectral response of the photodetectors has been measured using calibrated blackbody source at 450 °C (Newport, Oriel 670000), lock-in amplifier (SRS, SR830 DSP) and mechanical chopper (SRS, SR540) system. Details of the measurement can be found elsewhere [15]. For single pass front illumination condition, highest quantum efficiency (QE) of the photodetector has been determined as 15% around wavelength of 3.5 μm. Quantum efficiency is directly related with the thickness of the absorbing region and can be increased with thicker absorbing region. The cut-off wavelength of the device is determined to be 4.2 μm at 77 K. Additionally, Fig. 10 shows photoresponsivity vs. wavelength graph for the operating temperatures between 79 K and 250 K. Under −0.3 V bias, the peak D* was equal to 2.9 × 10¹² Jones for the photodetector at 4.0 μm and 77 K. BLIP temperature has been determined as 125 K for the N design barrier structure.

5. Conclusions

In conclusion, we introduce a new N design structure with very low dark current and high dynamic resistance at 120 K. N designed superlattice photodetectors show dark current as low as 2.5 × 10⁻⁹ A at 120 K and under zero applied bias. Corresponding resistance area product was 1.5 × 10⁴ Ω cm² for the 500 × 500 μm² single pixel square photodetectors. Quantum efficiency (QE) of the photodetector has been determined as 15% for single pass front illumination condition. Quantum efficiency can be further increased with thicker absorber regions and multipass designs. Temperature dependent dark current measurements revealed Arrhenius behavior with bulk diffusion current effective for the temperatures higher than 120 K. Since AlSb is only two monolayers thick, it does not seem to be generating large amount of electrically active interface states. Our results show that this lattice mismatch is not large enough to reduce device performance significantly. Photodetector reaches BLIP condition at 125 K with the BLIP detectivity (D_BLP) of 2.6 × 10¹⁰ Jones under 300 K background and −0.3 V bias voltage.
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