

TUNNEL MOS HETEROSTRUCTURE FIELD EFFECT TRANSISTOR FOR RF
SWITCHING APPLICATIONS

A Dissertation

by

IMAN REZANEZHAD GATABI

Submitted to the Office of Graduate Studies of
Texas A&M University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Chair of Committee,	Harlan Rusty Harris
Committee Members,	Chin Bing Su
	Gregory H. Huff
	Sreeram Vaddiraju
Head of Department,	Chanan Singh

August 2013

Major Subject: Electrical Engineering

Copyright 2013 Iman Rezanezhad Gatabi

ABSTRACT

GaN RF switches are widely used in today's communication systems. With digital communications getting more and more popular nowadays, the need for improving the performance of involved RF switches is inevitable. Designing low ON-state resistance GaN switches are exceedingly important to improve the switch insertion loss, isolation and power loss. Moreover, considerations need to be taken into account to improve the switching speed of the involved GaN HEMTs.

In this dissertation, a new GaN HEMT structure called "Tunnel MOS Heterostructure FET (TMOSHFET)" is introduced which has lower ON-state resistance and faster switching speed compared to conventional AlGaIn/GaN HEMTs. In the switch ON process, the channel of this device is charged up by electron tunneling from a layer underneath the channel as opposed to typical AlGaIn/GaN HEMTs in which electron injection from the source is charging up the channel. The tunneling nature of this process together with the shorter travel distance of electrons in TMOSHFET provide for a faster switching speed.

In order to understand the tunneling mechanisms in TMOSHFET, the fabrication of AlGaIn/GaN Schottky Barrier Diodes (SBDs) with various AlGaIn thicknesses is demonstrated on Si (111) substrate. The impacts of SF₆ dry etching on the trap density and trap state energy of AlGaIn surface are investigated using the G_p/ω method. Various tunneling mechanisms at different biases are then characterized in samples and compared with each other.

To improve the source and drain resistances in TMOSHFET, a model is generated to optimize the 2DEG density and electric field in AlGaN/GaN heterostructure based on Al mole fraction, AlGaN thickness and the thickness of SiN passivation layer and it is experimentally verified by non-contact Hall 2DEG density measurements. The spontaneous and piezoelectric polarizations together with strain relaxation have been implemented into the model, taking into account the annealing effects. From the experimental data on obtained parameters, the operation and device parameterization of the TMOSHFET is outlined and design considerations to improve the device R_{ON} - V_{BR} figure of merit are discussed.

DEDICATION

To my parents ...

Your love and support will always be remembered.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to extend my sincere appreciation to my advisor, Dr. Harris, for all of his contributions of time and ideas. He offered me a lot of valuable guidance and sufficient freedom of surfing for research. Without his support and help throughout my studies at Texas A&M, it would have been impossible for me to accomplish this project and complete my dissertation. During these years, I have learned a lot from him and I am very grateful that he trusted me and provided me the opportunity of joining his group.

I want to express my gratitude to my committee members, Dr. Vaddiraju, Dr. Huff and Dr. Su, for their guidance and support throughout the course of this research. They have offered me insightful advice and valuable guidance during my research. Special thanks go to Dr. Edwin L. Piner of Texas State University and Dr. Mark Holtz of Texas Tech University for their significant contributions and helps.

Thanks also go to my friends and colleagues and the department faculty and staff for making my time at Texas A&M University a great experience. There are several people that could be mentioned for their assistance in my work and in their friendship. I want to thank Jung Hwan Woo, Derek. W. Johnson, Mary R. Coan, Jae Woo Suh, Feyza Berber and Michael Babb for their help and friendship during these years.

Finally, I would like to thank my parents from the bottom of my heart for their encouragement throughout my life.

NOMENCLATURE

q	Magnitude of electron charge
E_g	Bandgap energy
n_i	Intrinsic electron density
ϵ_r	Relative electric permittivity
ϵ_0	Electric permittivity of vacuum
μ_n	Mobility of electrons
E_c	Critical breakdown electric field
v_{sat}	Saturation velocity of electrons
Θ_K	Thermal conductivity
R_{ON}	ON-state resistance
C_{OFF}	OFF-state capacitance
V_{BR}	Breakdown voltage
E_{SP}	Spontaneous electric field
E_{PE}	Piezoelectric electric field
E_P	Total polarization electric field
P_{SP}	Spontaneous polarization
P_{PE}	Piezoelectric polarization
P_P	Total polarization
I_D	Drain current
V_D	Drain voltage

V_G	Gate voltage
G_P	Parallel conductance
ω	Radial frequency
ε_j	Components of the strain field
m_e	Electron mass
V_{th}	Threshold voltage
R_C	Contact resistance
D_T	Trap density
τ_T	Trap state time constant
σ_T	Trap state's capture cross-section
v_t	Carriers' average thermal velocity
N_c	Density of states in the conduction band
E_T	Trap state energy
T	Temperature
h	Plank constant
J_{TAT}	Trap assisted tunneling current density
m_{AlGaN}	Electron mass in AlGaN
k	Boltzmann constant
n	Diode ideality factor
J_{PF}	Poole-Frenkle emission current density
J_{FN}	Fowler-Nordheim tunneling current density
m^*	Effective mass of electron

A^*

Effective Richardson constant

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	ii
DEDICATION	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
NOMENCLATURE.....	vi
TABLE OF CONTENTS	ix
LIST OF FIGURES.....	xi
LIST OF TABLES	xvii
CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION	1
The need for improving the characteristics of GaN switches	3
Synopsis of this dissertation.....	6
CHAPTER II III-NITRIDE HIGH ELECTRON MOBILITY TRANSISTORS	9
Introduction	9
III-nitride semiconductors	9
AlGaIn/GaN heterostructures and two dimensional electron gas.....	12
AlGaIn/GaN High Electron Mobility Transistors (HEMTs).....	13
CHAPTER III TUNNEL MOS HETEROSTRUCTURE FET (TMOSHFET)	16
Introduction	16
The structure and principle of operation of TMOSHFET	16
Considerations to fabricate TMOSHFET	27
CHAPTER IV SURFACE PASSIVATION AND 2DEG ENGINEERING	29
Introduction	29
Piezoelectric and spontaneous polarizations	30
PECVD SiN passivation and 2DEG density	33
Electric field calculations in AlGaIn/GaN heterostructures	37
Experimental measurement of 2DEG in passivated AlGaIn/GaN heterostructures	40
Surface passivation and breakdown	44

Surface passivation and R_{ON} - V_{BR} FOM	52
CHAPTER V TUNNELING MECHANISMS IN ALGAN/GAN SBD	62
Introduction	62
Ti/Al/Ni/Au Ohmic contact to GaN	62
SF ₆ dry etching of AlGa _N and its impacts on the trap density	67
Current mechanisms in recess-etched AlGa _N /Ga _N SBDs.....	79
CHAPTER VI SUMMARY	94
REFERENCES	95
APPENDIX A SENTAURUS MATERIAL PARAMETER FILE USED IN SIMULATIONS	103
APPENDIX B SAMPLE SENTAURUS INPUT FILE FOR ALGAN/GAN HEMT SIMULATION	117
APPENDIX C IMAN REZANEZHAD GATABI- PUBLICATIONS.....	120

LIST OF FIGURES

	Page
Figure 1. The configuration of a Single-Pole Single-Through (SPST) RF switch and its equivalent circuits when the switch is open and closed.	3
Figure 2. Cross-talk in a switch bank.	4
Figure 3. The R_{ON} - V_{BR} relationships of the experimentally reported literature data for AlGaIn/GaN HEMTs [5-16] and the introduced theoretical limits for Si, SiC and GaN devices.	5
Figure 4. The lattices of N-face and Ga-face gallium nitride.	10
Figure 5. The lattice constants and bandgaps of III-nitride semiconductors and their alloys.	10
Figure 6. Growth of III-N on Si (111) substrate.	11
Figure 7. AlGaIn/GaN heterostructure and its band diagram.	12
Figure 8. A typical AlGaIn/GaN HEMT.	13
Figure 9. The principle of operation of a typical AlGaIn/GaN HEMT.	14
Figure 10. The structure of TMOSHFET.	16
Figure 11. The 2DEG charge in TMOSHFET for zero and positive gate biases.	17
Figure 12. The electron density and band diagram of TMOSHFET at zero gate bias.	19
Figure 13. The zero-gate bias band diagrams along AlGaIn/HfO ₂ and AlGaIn/InGaIn interfaces in AlGaIn for zero and positive drain biases.	20
Figure 14. The electron density in TMOSHFET at the zero gate bias and the drain bias of 10V.	21
Figure 15. The electron density and band diagram of the TMOSHFET at positive gate bias.	22
Figure 16. The band diagrams along AlGaIn/HfO ₂ and AlGaIn/InGaIn interfaces in AlGaIn for zero and positive drain biases and for a gate bias of 3V.	23
Figure 17. The equivalent source to drain resistance of TMOSHFET.	24

Figure 18. The simulated I_D - V_G of TMOSHFET shown in Figure 10.....	25
Figure 19. The current gain versus frequency plots of TMOSHFET shown in Figure 10 for different gate to drain distances and the extracted cutoff frequency..	26
Figure 20. The current gain versus frequency plots of TMOSHFET shown in Figure 10 for different gate lengths and the extracted cutoff frequencies.....	26
Figure 21. The conduction band diagrams of α -SiN passivated and unpassivated AlGaIn/GaN heterostructures.....	35
Figure 22. The 2DEG density at AlGaIn/GaN interface versus Al mole fractions (x) for different AlGaIn thicknesses, d . Dashed lines: With 30 nm α -SiN surface passivation. Solid lines: Without surface passivation.	36
Figure 23. The total polarization electric fields in $Al_xGa_{1-x}N$ layer grown on GaN versus aluminum mole fractions (x) for different AlGaIn thicknesses, d . Dashed lines: With 30 nm α -Si $_x$ N $_y$ surface passivation. Solid lines: Without surface passivation. The experimentally measured literature data are included as reference.....	38
Figure 24. The electric field in $Al_xGa_{1-x}N$ layer grown on GaN versus the thickness of α -SiN passivation layer for different aluminum mole fractions (x) and AlGaIn thicknesses, d	39
Figure 25. The experimentally measured 2DEG density of as-grown PECVD α -SiN passivated $Al_{0.25}Ga_{0.75}N/GaN$ heterostructure versus α -SiN thickness.	41
Figure 26. The experimentally measured 2DEG density of PECVD α -SiN passivated $Al_{0.25}Ga_{0.75}N/GaN$ heterostructure for different annealing times and temperatures. The α -SiN and AlGaIn thicknesses were 60 and 17.5 nm, respectively.	42
Figure 27. The calculated and experimentally measured 2DEG density of as-grown PECVD α -SiN passivated $Al_{0.25}Ga_{0.75}N/GaN$ heterostructure versus α -SiN thickness. The AlGaIn thickness was 17.5 nm.....	43
Figure 28. A typical AlGaIn/GaN HEMT at its OFF state.....	45
Figure 29. The electrostatic potential in AlGaIn side of the AlGaIn/passivation layer interface of the structure shown in Figure 28 with a gate to drain distance of 2 μ m, Al mole fraction of 0.25 and AlGaIn thickness of 30 nm for different donor-like surface trap densities. The trap state energy was set 1eV below AlGaIn conduction band.	48

Figure 30. The total electric field in AlGa _N side of the AlGa _N /passivation layer interface of the structure shown in Figure 28 with a gate to drain distance of 2 μm, Al mole fraction of 0.25, drain bias of 150V and AlGa _N thickness of 30 nm for different donor-like surface trap densities. The trap state energy was set 1eV below AlGa _N conduction band. The peak electric field is decreased by decreasing the trap density.	49
Figure 31. The total electric field in Ga _N side of the AlGa _N /Ga _N interface of the structure shown in Figure 28 with a gate to drain distance of 2 μm, Al mole fraction of 0.25, drain bias of 150V and AlGa _N thickness of 30 nm for different donor-like surface trap densities. The trap state energy was set 1eV below AlGa _N conduction band. The peak electric field is decreased by decreasing the trap density.	50
Figure 32. The I _D -V _D characteristics of the structure shown in Figure 28 with a gate to drain distance of 2 μm, Al mole fraction of 0.25 and AlGa _N thickness of 30 nm for different donor-like surface trap densities. The trap state energy was set 1eV below AlGa _N conduction band. The ON-state resistance is increased by decreasing the surface trap density.....	51
Figure 33. The breakdown voltage of the structure shown in Figure 28 versus the gate to drain spacing for an Al mole fraction of 0.2, AlGa _N thickness of 30 nm and different donor-like surface trap densities. The trap state energy was set 1eV below AlGa _N conduction band.....	53
Figure 34. The ON-state resistance of the structure shown in Figure 28 versus the gate to drain spacing for an Al mole fraction of 0.2, AlGa _N thickness of 30 nm and different donor-like surface trap densities. The trap state energy was set 1eV below AlGa _N conduction band energy.....	54
Figure 35. The R _{ON} -V _{BR} characteristics of the device shown in Figure 28 with an Al mole fraction of 0.2, AlGa _N thickness of 30 nm and different donor-like surface trap densities. The trap state energy was set 1eV below AlGa _N conduction band.	55
Figure 36. The R _{ON} -V _{BR} characteristics of the device shown in Figure 28 with an AlGa _N thickness of 30 nm, AlGa _N /passivation layer trap density of 2.4e13 cm ⁻² and different Al mole fractions. The trap state energy was set 1eV below AlGa _N conduction band.	56
Figure 37. The R _{ON} -V _{BR} characteristics of the device shown in Figure 28 with an Al mole fraction of 0.25, AlGa _N /passivation layer trap density of 2.4e13 cm ⁻² and different AlGa _N thicknesses. The trap state energy was set 1eV below AlGa _N conduction band energy.....	57

Figure 38. The OFF-state electrostatic potential along the drain region of the TMOSHFET structure shown in Figure 10 with a gate to drain spacing of 10 μm at different drain biases of V_D .	58
Figure 39. The OFF-state total electric field along the drain region of the TMOSHFET structure shown in Figure 10 with a gate to drain spacing of 10 μm at different drain biases of V_D .	59
Figure 40. The I_D - V_D characteristics of the TMOSHFET structure shown in Figure 10 with a gate to drain spacing of 10 μm .	60
Figure 41. The R_{ON} - V_{BR} FOMs of the TMOSHFET structure shown in Figure 10 with different gate to drain spacing. The experimentally reported literature data for AlGaIn/GaN HEMTs are included.	61
Figure 42. The cross-sectional SEM image of PECVD SiN on AlGaIn/GaN after 45 sec BOE etching.	64
Figure 43. The programmed (green line) and actual (red line) RTP chamber temperatures.	64
Figure 44. The fabricated Ti/Al/Ni/Au contacts to AlGaIn/GaN heterostructure before and after the annealing.	65
Figure 45. The current-voltage characteristics of Ohmic contacts with different spacing of L .	66
Figure 46. The measured resistance between the contacts versus contact spacing.	67
Figure 47. The cross-sectional SEM of the AlGaIn/GaN heterostructure after 2:30 minutes of SF_6 dry etching with the RF power of 600 W.	68
Figure 48. The cross-sectional SEM of the AlGaIn/GaN heterostructure after 20 minutes of SF_6 dry etching with the RF power of 400 W.	69
Figure 49. The fabrication process of AlGaIn/GaN SBDs.	71
Figure 50. The cross-sectional and top views of fabricated AlGaIn/GaN SBDs.	71
Figure 51. The photo of the fabricated AlGaIn/GaN SBD.	72
Figure 52. The measured G_p/ω traces versus the applied bias to the Schottky contact for the samples with 20 sec and 40 sec recess etches under Schottky contact.	73

Figure 53. The measured and fitted G_p/ω versus ω traces for the samples with 20 sec recess etch under the Schottky contact.....	74
Figure 54. The measured and fitted G_p/ω versus ω traces for the samples with 40 sec recess etch under the Schottky contact.....	75
Figure 55. Trap density versus the applied voltage for the samples with 20 sec and 40 sec recess etches under Schottky contact.	76
Figure 56. Trap state time constant versus the applied voltage for the samples with 20 sec and 40 sec recess etches under Schottky contact.	76
Figure 57. The trap density versus the trap state energy below the conduction band for the samples with 20 sec and 40 sec recess etches under Schottky contact.	78
Figure 58. The band diagram of an AlGaIn/GaN SBD under zero and positive biases [78].	79
Figure 59. The forward bias current-voltage characteristic of an AlGaIn/GaN SBD with an Al mole fraction of 0.3 and an AlGaIn thickness of 21.5 nm [79]. ...	80
Figure 60. The current-voltage characteristics of SBDs with 20 sec and 40 sec recess etches under Schottky contact.	82
Figure 61. The logarithmic y-axis current-voltage characteristics of SBDs with 20 sec and 40 sec recess etches under Schottky contact.	83
Figure 62. The logarithmic y-axis current-voltage characteristics of the SBD with 20 sec recess etch under Schottky contact and the way to extract I_{SI}/S value. ...	84
Figure 63. The conduction band diagram of the AlGaIn/GaN SBD under the Schottky contact at different positive biases.	85
Figure 64. The plot of $\ln(I/E^2_{AlGaIn})$ versus the I/E_{AlGaIn} for SBDs with 20 sec and 40 sec recess etches under Schottky contact to find the regions where the total current is dominated by Fowler-Nordheim tunneling process.....	86
Figure 65. The logarithmic y-axis current-voltage characteristics of SBDs with 20 sec and 40 sec recess etches under Schottky contact and the regions where the total current is dominated by Fowler-Nordheim tunneling process.....	87
Figure 66. The plot of $\ln(I/E_{AlGaIn})$ versus the square root of $E^{0.5}_{AlGaIn}$ for SBDs with 20 sec and 40 sec recess etches under Schottky contact to find the regions where the total current is dominated Poole-Frenkle emission.	89

Figure 67. The logarithmic y-axis current-voltage characteristics of SBDs with 20 sec and 40 sec recess etches under Schottky contact and the region where the total current is dominated by Poole-Frenkle emission.....90

Figure 68. The plot of $\ln(I)$ versus I/E_{AlGaN} for SBDs with 20 sec and 40 sec recess etches under Schottky contact to find the regions where the total current is dominated by trap-assisted tunneling process.91

Figure 69. The logarithmic y-axis current-voltage characteristics of SBDs with 20 sec and 40 sec recess etches under Schottky contact and the regions where the total current is dominated by Fowler-Nordheim tunneling and Poole-Frenkle emission.92

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	Page
1 Physical properties of different semiconductors	2

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Electronic switches play a crucial role in today's power electronics and communication industries. High speed semiconductor devices are key components in communication systems as they can handle analog and digital signals at high frequencies. In applications such as satellite transmitters with on board switching systems, reconfigurable phase shifter in phase array antennas and transmitting stations for cellular phones, there is a high demand for devices that can deliver high power in GHz range frequencies.

From conventional silicon-based switches to today's modern wide bandgap transistors, the search is ongoing to provide devices that are faster and more energy-efficient. The frequency range and power handling capability of silicon based switching transistors are limited due to the material-dependent parameters such as mobility, saturation velocity, critical breakdown electric field and inversion layer charge density. Therefore, new materials and device configurations need to be implemented to meet demands for high frequency and high power switching applications.

Wide bandgap semiconductors and particularly Gallium Nitride (GaN) are gaining a lot of attention for high speed and high power switching applications due to their large critical breakdown electric fields, high mobility and high saturated electron velocity [1, 2]. GaN has a relatively large saturation velocity and peak electron velocity,

wide bandgap and better thermal stability compared to Silicon and Gallium Arsenide [3].

Table 1 compares some material parameters of GaN with other semiconductors [4].

Table 1. Physical properties of different semiconductors

Material	Si	4H-SiC	GaN	AlN	Diamond
E_g (eV)	1.1	3.26	3.39	6.1	5.45
n_i (cm ⁻³)	1.5e10	8.2e-9	1.9e-10	~10 ⁻³¹	1.6e-27
ϵ_r	11.8	10	9	8.4	5.5
μ_n (cm ² /Vs)	1350	700	900	1100	1900
E_c (10 ⁶ V/cm)	0.3	3	3.3	11.7	5.6
v_{sat} (10 ⁷ cm/s)	1	2	2.5	1.8	2.7
Θ_K (W/cmK)	1.5	4.5	1.3	2.5	20

As indicated in this table, the critical breakdown electric field (E_c) of GaN is more than 10 times larger than that of Si, providing for operation at large voltages. Moreover, GaN has an electron saturation velocity (v_{sat}) which is 2.5 times larger than that of Si which provides for a large current handling capability. The large critical breakdown electric field combined with a high saturation velocity makes GaN-based devices suitable for high power and high frequency switching applications.

In addition to higher electron saturation velocity and larger critical breakdown electric field, electrons in GaN based High Electron Mobility Transistors (HEMTs) form a Two Dimensional Electron Gas (2DEG), the density of which can exceed 10¹³ cm⁻².

This high density of electrons in the channel can provide for a very large maximum achievable ON-state current in GaN HEMTs. Moreover, the undoped electron pass in GaN HEMTs results in less impurity scattering and a higher mobility which further increases the maximum ON-state current and switching frequency of the device.

The need for improving the characteristics of GaN switches

RF switches are widely used in modern communication systems. Further advancement in digital communication systems is impossible without design and implementation of high-performance RF switches. Figure 1 illustrates the configuration of a Single-Pole Single-Through (SPST) RF switch and its equivalent circuits when the switch is open and closed.




Figure 1. The configuration of a Single-Pole Single-Through (SPST) RF switch and its equivalent circuits when the switch is open and closed.

When the transistor T_1 is ON and T_2 is OFF, the path between the input and output is connected and the switch is closed. On the other hand, when T_1 is OFF and T_2 is ON, the output is grounded and the switch is open. Due to R_{ON} of T_2 and C_{OFF} of T_1 , some portion of the input signal appears at the output even when T_1 is OFF. The magnitude of the input signal that gets coupled across an open circuit is called isolation. The value of isolation in electronic switches should be larger than 20 dB in order for the switch to be suitable for implementation in communication systems. The isolation is improved by decreasing the ON-state resistance of T_2 . A bad isolation can cause cross-talk where the signal of an unwanted input appears at the output of a switch bank (Figure 2).




Figure 2. Cross-talk in a switch bank.

When the T_1 is ON and T_2 is OFF, a portion of the input signal is grounded due to the R_{ON} of T_1 and C_{OFF} of T_2 . The loss of signal power from input to output in an electric switch is called insertion loss. The value of insertion loss for an RF switch should be smaller than 0.5 dB for implementation in communication systems. This can be achieved by decreasing the R_{ON} of T_1 . Therefore, implementing lower ON-state resistance transistors in RF switches improves both isolation and insertion loss.

In addition to improving the insertion loss and isolation, decreasing R_{ON} is desired to reduce the power loss of switches. This is critically important both in power electronics and RF applications as low ON-state resistance switches provide energy efficient circuits. In an AlGaIn/GaN HEMT, the ON-state resistance can be reduced by decreasing the gate to drain length. However, decreasing the gate to drain distance also reduces the breakdown voltage (V_{BR}) and there is a trade-off between R_{ON} and V_{BR} . Figure 3 illustrates the R_{ON} - V_{BR} relationships of experimentally reported literature data for AlGaIn/GaN HEMTs [5-16] and the theoretical limit for GaN-based devices.




Figure 3. The R_{ON} - V_{BR} relationships of the experimentally reported literature data for AlGaIn/GaN HEMTs [5-16] and the introduced theoretical limits for Si, SiC and GaN devices.

As shown in this figure, in order to achieve lower ON-state resistances, the breakdown voltage needs to be sacrificed. Moreover, the reported R_{ON} - V_{BR} values for AlGaIn/GaN

HEMTs are far away from the introduced GaN limit line. Therefore, it is important to optimize the design parameters in order to improve the R_{ON} - V_{BR} Figure of Merit (FOM).

Lower ON-state resistance is also desirable to increase the switching speed of the device. In devices with shorter gate to drain distances, the gate length is the most important factor that defines the switching frequency. However, as the gate to drain length increases, the output voltage swing will be limited due to RC time constant of the drain terminal. Therefore, the device design should be optimized to achieve higher switching frequencies.

Synopsis of this dissertation

In this dissertation, three approaches are discussed to address the previously mentioned issues and achieve a lower ON-state resistance switch:

First, the structure of Tunnel MOS Heterostructure FET (TMOSHFET) is introduced and its performance is simulated using Synopsys-Sentaurus software. The switch ON process in this device is done by tunneling of electrons from a layer underneath the channel as opposed to electron injection from the source into the channel in typical AlGaIn/GaN HEMTs. Since the nature of this process is tunneling and electrons are traveling a shorter distance to charge up the channel, the switch ON process will be faster compared to GaN HEMTs with the same gate lengths. Moreover, the charges underneath the gate form two parallel sheets which act like two resistances in parallel with each other, decreasing the overall ON-state resistance.

In order to decrease the source and drain resistances, a model is developed to optimize the 2DEG density in an AlGaIn/GaN heterostructure based on AlGaIn

thickness, Al mole fraction and the thickness of SiN passivation layer. The spontaneous and piezoelectric polarizations together with strain relaxation are taken into account to calculate the 2DEG density and electric fields. The Al mole fraction, AlGa_N thickness and passivation layer thickness are calculated to optimize the 2DEG density and electric field. In order to validate the model, SiN films with different thicknesses are grown on AlGa_N/Ga_N heterostructure using Plasma Enhanced Chemical Vapor Deposition (PECVD) method. Then, samples are annealed at different temperatures and the 2DEG density is measured using the non-contact Hall measurement technique. The parameters used in the model are then calibrated using the experimental data.

The $R_{ON}-V_{BR}$ FOM of AlGa_N/Ga_N HEMTs is calculated using the parameters obtained from the first section of the project. The goal of this part is to optimize the design parameters in order to improve the FOM and push the $R_{ON}-V_{BR}$ data closer to the Ga_N limit line (Figure 3). The density of surface traps density at AlGa_N/passivation layer interface and trap state energy are incorporated into simulations as they influence the breakdown voltage and ON-state resistance. The electric field distribution in the device together with I_D-V_D characteristics are simulated for different Al mole fractions and AlGa_N thicknesses to find the breakdown voltage and ON-state resistance. The corresponding $R_{ON}-V_{BR}$ characteristics are then generated for different Al mole fractions, AlGa_N thicknesses and trap densities at AlGa_N/passivation layer interface, allowing for FOM optimization based on these parameters.

Finally, the proposed tunneling process in the TMOSHFET is demonstrated in an AlGa_N/Ga_N heterostructure on Si (111) substrate. Ni/Au Schottky contacts on recess

etched AlGaN are fabricated and characterized to prove the existence of tunneling current from underlying GaN into the top AlGaN layer. The implementation of a dry etch recipe for AlGaN recess etch and its effects on the trap density in the AlGaN layer are investigated using the G_p/ω versus ω method. The fabrication process of these Schottky Barrie Diodes (SBDs) with different AlGaN thicknesses is described and the analysis of I-V characteristics to characterize the tunneling currents is discussed.

CHAPTER II

III-NITRIDE HIGH ELECTRON MOBILITY TRANSISTORS

Introduction

In this chapter, III-nitride semiconductors are introduced and their physical properties are outlined. The spontaneous and piezoelectric polarizations together with the strain due to the lattice mismatch between the layers are discussed. The formation of a Two Dimensional Electron Gas (2DEG) at the interface of AlGa_N/Ga_N heterostructure due to the polarization electric fields is described and its properties are compared with electrons in the inversion layer of MOS structures. The structure of an AlGa_N/Ga_N High Electron Mobility Transistor (HEMT) is then introduced and its fabrication process and principle of operation are discussed and compared with that of a MOSFET.

III-nitride semiconductors

III-nitride semiconductors refer to Gallium Nitride (Ga_N), Aluminum Nitride (Al_N), Indium Nitride (In_N) and their alloys (InGa_N, AlGa_N and InAl_N). Their crystal lattices comprise bonds between a group III element and nitrogen (group V). So, nitrogen gives an electron to the group III element and as the results, nitrogen is positively charged and the group III element is negatively charged. This generates a built-in electric field in the semiconductor which is called spontaneous electric field. Figure 4 illustrates the Ga_N crystal lattice.




Figure 4. The lattices of N-face and Ga-face gallium nitride.

As shown in this figure, depending on whether the GaN is Ga-faced or N-faced, the direction of the spontaneous electric field will be different. Figure 5 illustrates the bandgaps and lattice constants of III-nitride materials and their alloys [17].




Figure 5. The lattice constants and bandgaps of III-nitride semiconductors and their alloys.

In this figure, it is assumed that the lattice constant and bandgap energy of III-N alloys change linearly with the variation of the mole fraction of group III element. Having a lattice constant of 3.112 Å, AlN is fairly lattice matched with Si (111) and it can be directly grown on that. Since Si is cheap, it can be used as the preferred substrate in applications where substrate leakage is not a significant issue. For higher power applications and in order to decrease substrate leakage, SiC and sapphire substrates may be used. For the case of Si (111) substrate, if there is a need to have a GaN layer (in AlGa_xN/GaN HEMTs for example), the transition from AlN to GaN is done through the deposition of several AlGa_xN layers with Al mole fraction decreasing from the bottom to top (Figure 6).




Figure 6. Growth of III-N on Si (111) substrate.

These graded AlGa_xN layers help relieving the strain caused due to the lattice mismatch between the layers, resulting in a lower dislocations and trap densities in upper films.

More details on III-nitride growth on Si (111) substrate are described in reference [18].

AlGaN/GaN heterostructures and two dimensional electron gas

If an AlGaN layer is grown on a Ga-face GaN, it is strained due to the lattice mismatch between two layers and is subjected to piezoelectric polarization. This piezoelectric polarization together with the spontaneous polarization of AlGaN drive the electrons in donor-like surface traps of AlGaN surface toward AlGaN/GaN interface, leaving behind positively-charged empty surface traps at AlGaN surface [19, 20]. The electrons that are driven due to the polarization electric fields are accumulated in the GaN side of AlGaN/GaN interface due to the higher bandgap of AlGaN relative to GaN (Figure 5). The accumulated electrons at AlGaN/GaN interface are called Two Dimensional Electron Gas (2DEG). Figure 7 illustrates the formation of 2DEG in AlGaN/GaN heterostructure together with AlGaN/GaN band diagram.




Figure 7. AlGaN/GaN heterostructure and its band diagram.

The density of electrons in 2DEG can exceed 10^{13} cm^{-2} which is much larger than the one in the inversion layer of an n-channel MOSFET. Moreover, since the GaN layer is not doped, electrons in 2DEG experience less impurity scattering which provides for a

higher mobility. This high mobility together with the high 2DEG density provides for a large current handling capability in AlGaN/GaN based devices.

AlGaN/GaN High Electron Mobility Transistors (HEMTs)

Figure 8 shows the structure of a typical AlGaN/GaN HEMT which can be fabricated on Si (111), SiC or sapphire substrates.




Figure 8. A typical AlGaN/GaN HEMT.

The gate to drain distance is usually longer than gate to source distance to gradually drop the larger drain bias along drain to gate length. The drain electrode can either be Ohmic or Schottky. Different metal stacks like Ti/Al/Ni/Au or Ta/Al/Ta can be used to form Ohmic source and drain contacts. The gate can be a Schottky contact or a typical high- k /metal stack. In a silicon MOSFET, the gate electrode is usually formed first and the source and drain regions are implanted through a gate self-aligned process. However, in AlGaN/GaN HEMTs, source and drain metals can be evaporated before the gate contact metal. After patterning source and drain metals through a lift-off process, they are

annealed so that the metal can diffuse into AlGaN and form Ohmic contact with GaN layer. The gate contact can therefore be formed after source and drain annealing.

Figure 9 illustrates the principle of operation of a typical AlGaN/GaN HEMT.




Figure 9. The principle of operation of a typical AlGaN/GaN HEMT.

At the zero gate bias, the 2DEG exists in GaN side of the AlGaN/GaN interface from the source all the way to the drain. Therefore the device is ON at the zero gate bias. Applying a large enough negative gate bias depletes the electrons underneath the gate, providing a discontinuity in 2DEG path from the source to the drain. So, the device switches OFF for large enough negative gate biases. By applying a positive gate bias, more electrons are accumulated underneath the gate which provides for a lower channel resistance and a higher ON-state current.

Information provided in this chapter was an introduction to III-N semiconductors, AlGaIn/GaN heterostructure and HEMTs. More detailed discussions regarding the surface passivation and 2DEG engineering together with improving AlGaIn/GaN HEMTs FOM will be provided in chapter IV.

CHAPTER III

TUNNEL MOS HETEROSTRUCTURE FET (TMOSHFET)

Introduction

In this chapter, the configuration of the Tunnel MOS Heterostructure FET (TMOSHFET) is introduced and its performance is simulated using Synopsys-Sentaurus software. The switch ON process in this device through a tunneling mechanism and the way it improves the turn ON delay are discussed. Formation of a double layer 2DEG underneath the gate region is described and its effect on reducing the device R_{ON} is demonstrated using the simulation data. Finally, considerations that should be taken into account to improve the device ON-state resistance and Figure of Merit are described which will be discussed in details in the next chapter.

The structure and principle of operation of TMOSHFET

Figure 10 illustrates the structure of the TMOSHFET.




Figure 10. The structure of TMOSHFET.

As shown in this figure, the device comprises of an AlN layer on a substrate which can be Si (111), sapphire or SiC. This AlN is recessed underneath the gate region where the InGaN layer is re-grown to form the charge supplying layer. A top AlGaN layer with low Al mole fraction is grown and etched in the gate region followed by the formation of the gate dielectric and metal contact on top of the gate region. Figure 11 shows the 2DEG charge in the device for zero and positive gate biases.




Figure 11. The 2DEG charge in TMOSHFET for zero and positive gate biases.

As shown in this figure, at the zero gate bias and in the gate region, the 2DEG is at the InGaN side of AlGaN/InGaN interface due to the lower bandgap of InGaN relative to AlGaN (Figure 5). In source and drain regions, however, the 2DEG is formed at the AlGaN side of AlGaN/AlN junction because AlGaN's bandgap is smaller than AlN's (Figure 5). This provides a discontinuous electron path between source and drain electrodes and therefore, the device is OFF at zero gate bias.

Since the AlGaN underneath the gate is thin, applying a positive gate bias causes the 2DEG in the InGaN layer to tunnel into the AlGaN layer and charges up the channel. This provides a continuous electron path between source and drain electrodes and the device switches ON. In typical AlGaN/GaN HEMTs (and FETs in general), charging up the channel and the device switch ON process is done by carrier injection from the source into the channel. These injected carriers have to travel the channel length from source all the way to the drain to switch ON the device. Therefore, the turn ON delay is directly proportional to the gate length. However, in TMOSHFET structure, charging up the channel and the turn ON process is done by electron tunneling from the bottom InGaN layer into AlGaN and electrons are traveling a much shorter distance. This, together with the tunneling nature of this process provides for a fast switching speed.

The band diagram and electron density of the TMOSHFET shown in Figure 10 are simulated with the Synopsys-Sentaurus software. Piezoelectric and spontaneous polarizations are implemented into the simulation, taking into account the strain relaxation. Figure 12 illustrates the electron density and conduction band diagram in the gate region at zero gate bias.




Figure 12. The electron density and band diagram of TMOSHFET at zero gate bias.

Here, the source and drain electrodes are grounded and HfO₂ is used as the gate oxide. As shown in this figure, 2DEG is formed at the InGaN side of AlGaN/InGaN interface at the zero gate bias. In the source and drain regions, however, the 2DEG is formed at the AlGaN side of the AlGaN/AlN interface due to the lower bandgap of AlGaN compared to AlN. The discontinuity in electron path from the source to the drain causes barriers in conduction bands at the gate edges as shown in Figure 13.




Figure 13. The zero-gate bias band diagrams along AlGaIn/HfO₂ and AlGaIn/InGaIn interfaces in AlGaIn for zero and positive drain biases.

The barriers in the conduction band prevent electron transport from the channel into the drain region at positive drain voltage, resulting in the partial depletion of the drain region (Figure 14).




Figure 14. The electron density in TMOSHFET at the zero gate bias and the drain bias of 10V.

Therefore, there is no significant current flow between source and drain terminals at the zero gate bias and the device will be OFF.

Applying a positive gate bias bends the conduction band of the AlGa_{0.15}N layer, making it aligned with that of InGa_{0.9}N. As a result, electrons can tunnel from InGa_{0.9}N into the top AlGa_{0.15}N layer and create a charge sheet at the AlGa_{0.15}N/oxide interface. This completes the electron path between source and drain electrodes and the device switches ON. Figure 15 illustrates the electron density and conduction band diagram in the gate region of TMOSHFET at positive gate bias.




Figure 15. The electron density and band diagram of the TMOSHFET at positive gate bias.

Once the channel is charged up, the barriers in conduction band along the AlGaN (Figure 13) are removed, providing for electron flow from the source to the drain. This is well reflected in Figure 16 where it shows the band diagrams at the positive gate bias for both positive and zero drain biases.




Figure 16. The band diagrams along AlGaN/HfO₂ and AlGaN/InGaN interfaces in AlGaN for zero and positive drain biases and for a gate bias of 3V.

In the turn ON process, electrons are traveling a very short distance (AlGaN thickness) through a tunneling process and this makes the switch ON mechanism much faster than a typical field effect transistor. In typical FETs, charging up the channel and the device switch ON process is done by carrier injection from the source into the channel. These injected carriers should travel the channel length from source all the way to the drain to switch ON the device. Therefore, the turn ON delay is directly proportional to the gate length.

At the ON state, the gate region comprises of two parallel 2DEG charge sheets (Figure 17).




Figure 17. The equivalent source to drain resistance of TMOSH-FET.

These parallel sheet charges act like two parallel resistors to reduce the overall channel resistance. In lower voltage applications where the gate length is comparable with the gate to drain length, the total ON-state resistance is reduced due to the existence of these two charge sheets.

However, small positive threshold voltages are reported in GaN HEMTs with recess-etched gates, typical AlGaN/GaN HEMTs have negative threshold voltages. As shown in TMOSH-FET structure of Figure 10, the InGaN layer underneath the gate is

embedded between two AlGaN regions along the horizontal axis. These regions cause discontinuities in 2DEG path between source and drain electrodes at zero gate bias which results in a positive threshold voltage. Figure 18 shows the simulated I_D - V_G characteristic of the device.




Figure 18. The simulated I_D - V_G of TMOSHFET shown in Figure 10.

The positive threshold voltage is due to the existence of AlGaN regions between InGaN and AlN which make discontinuity in 2DEG pass from source to drain at the zero gate bias.

Figure 19 and Figure 20 illustrate the simulated current gain versus frequency plots of the TMOSHFET shown in Figure 10 for different gate lengths and L_{GD} .




Figure 19. The current gain versus frequency plots of TMOSHFET shown in Figure 10 for different gate to drain distances and the extracted cutoff frequency.




Figure 20. The current gain versus frequency plots of TMOSHFET shown in Figure 10 for different gate lengths and the extracted cutoff frequencies.

As shown in these figures, the cutoff frequency increases by decreasing the gate length. However, increasing the gate to drain distance does not have a significant effect on the cutoff frequency. This is due to the fact that the gate capacitance and input conductance are more dominant than the gate to drain capacitance and conductance in defining the cutoff frequency. The cutoff frequency of the device is directly proportional to the modulation efficiency of the gate that quantifies the ability of the gate to quantify the drain current without modulating the fixed charges. A better electron confinement in the channel underneath the gate improves the modulation efficiency. For the case of TMOSHFET, since the electrons that are tunneled from the bottom InGaN layer into the top AlGaIn channel are highly confined in the triangular quantum well of AlGaIn, the cutoff frequency is improved.

Considerations to fabricate TMOSHFET

Several considerations need to be taken into account to fabricate the TMOSHFET structure. The 2DEG density in source and drain regions need to be optimized based on device parameters to reduce the R_{ON} and improve the device $R_{ON}-V_{BR}$ figure of merit. AlGaIn surface passivation should be implemented to make the device more stable in different environmental conditions and improve the device FOM. The 2DEG density optimization and effects of surface passivation on electric field, 2DEG density and FOM will be investigated in the next chapter.

In addition to 2DEG design and surface passivation, low resistance Ohmic contacts are needed in source and drain regions to increase the ON-state current and reduce the overall source to drain resistance. Moreover, a dry etch recipe should be

implemented to recess-etch the gate region to make the AlGa_N layer thin enough for increasing the tunneling current. This etch recipe should not increase the trap density at the AlGa_N surface significantly to prevent mobility degradation. Demonstration of low-resistance Ohmic contacts to GaN and implementation of an appropriate dry etch recipe and its effects on AlGa_N surface traps will be discussed in chapter V.

CHAPTER IV

SURFACE PASSIVATION AND 2DEG ENGINEERING*

Introduction

In order to decrease the source and drain resistances in TMOSHFET and achieve an optimized breakdown voltage, the 2DEG density and electric fields in the device should be optimized based on different device parameters and dimensions of different layers. Lower source and drain resistances can be achieved by decreasing the gate to drain length, however, the breakdown voltage would be sacrificed. Therefore, a model should be developed to correlate the 2DEG density, R_{ON} and breakdown voltage of the device to device parameters.

In this chapter, the impacts of AlGa_N surface passivation on the 2DEG density, AlGa_N polarization electric field and the R_{ON} - V_{BR} FOM of an AlGa_N/Ga_N HEMT are investigated. A model is developed to optimize the 2DEG density based on AlGa_N thickness, Al mole fraction and the thickness of Si₃N₄ passivation layer. The spontaneous and piezoelectric polarizations together with strain relaxation are taken into account to calculate the 2DEG density and electric fields. The Al mole fraction, AlGa_N thickness and passivation layer thickness are calculated to optimize the 2DEG density and electric field. In order to validate the model, Si₃N₄ films with different thicknesses are grown on

* Part of the data reported in this chapter is re-printed with permission from Gatabi, I.R., Johnson, D.W., Woo, J.H., Coan, M., Piner E.L. and Harris, H.R., PECVD silicon nitride passivation of AlGa_N/Ga_N heterostructures. Electron Devices, IEEE Transactions on, 2013. Vol. 60, Issue 3, p. 1082-1087. © 2013 IEEE.

AlGaIn/GaN heterostructure using the Plasma Enhanced Chemical Vapor Deposition (PECVD) method. Then, samples are annealed at different temperatures and the 2DEG density is measured using the non-contact Hall measurement technique. The measured data are then compared with what are predicted by the model. The parameters used in the model are then calibrated using the experimental data.

The R_{ON} - V_{BR} FOM of AlGaIn/GaN HEMTs is simulated using the parameters obtained from the introduced model. The density of surface traps at the AlGaIn/passivation layer interface and the trap state energy are incorporated into simulations as they influence the breakdown voltage and ON-state resistance. The electric field distribution in the device together with I_D - V_D characteristics are simulated for different Al mole fractions and AlGaIn thicknesses to find the breakdown voltage and ON-state resistance. The corresponding R_{ON} - V_{BR} characteristics are then generated for different Al mole fractions, AlGaIn thicknesses and trap densities at AlGaIn/passivation layer interface, allowing for FOM optimization based on these parameters.

Piezoelectric and spontaneous polarizations

If a thin film is grown on a substrate with different lattice constant, the grown layer is strained and is subject to the piezoelectric polarization [21], which is represented by

$$P_i^p = \sum e_{ij} \epsilon_j, \quad (1)$$

where ϵ_j ($j=1, \dots, 6$) are the components of the strain field and e_{ij} ($i=1, 2, 3$ & $j=1, \dots, 6$) are the piezoelectric constants of the strained layer. When AlGaIn is epitaxially grown on GaN, the AlGaIn will be under biaxial tension and the strain field is written as [21]

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}} = [\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_1, \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_2, \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_3, 0, 0, 0], \quad (2)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_1 = \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_2 = (a_{\text{GaN}} - a_{\text{AlGaN}}) / a_{\text{AlGaN}}$ and $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_3 = (c_{\text{GaN}} - c_{\text{AlGaN}}) / c_{\text{AlGaN}} = -2c_{11} \cdot \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_1 / c_{33}$, in which $(a_{\text{GaN}}, c_{\text{GaN}})$ and $(a_{\text{AlGaN}}, c_{\text{AlGaN}})$ are the lattice constants of GaN and AlGaN, respectively, and c_{ij} are the elastic stiffness constants of AlGaN. Therefore, the piezoelectric tensor of wurtzite crystals is represented as [22]

$$\hat{e} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & e_{15} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & e_{14} & 0 & 0 \\ e_{31} & e_{31} & e_{33} & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (3)$$

From Eqs.1, 2 and 3, the piezoelectric polarization is calculated as

$$\boldsymbol{P}^p = \hat{e} \cdot \hat{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}} = [0, 0, 2e_{31}\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_1 + e_{33}\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_3]. \quad (4)$$

Eq.4 shows that for an AlGaN layer grown on GaN, the piezoelectric induced electric field is along the z-axis. Therefore the z-component of the piezoelectric polarization is written as [23],

$$P_{PE, \text{AlGaN}} = P_z^p = 2e_{31}\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_1 + e_{33}\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_3 = 2 \times \frac{a_{\text{GaN}} - a_{\text{AlGaN}}}{a_{\text{AlGaN}}} (e_{31} - e_{33} \frac{c_{13}}{c_{33}}), \quad (5)$$

where:

$$a_{\text{GaN}} = 3.189 \times 10^{-10} \text{ (m)} \quad [24] \quad (6)$$

$$a_{\text{Al}_x\text{Ga}_{1-x}\text{N}} = x a_{\text{AlN}} + (1-x) a_{\text{GaN}} = (-0.077x + 3.189) \times 10^{-10} \text{ (m)} \quad [24] \quad (7)$$

$$e_{33} = 0.73x + 0.73 \text{ (C/m}^2\text{)} \quad [25] \quad (8)$$

$$e_{31} = -0.11x - 0.49 \text{ (C/m}^2\text{)} \quad [26] \quad (9)$$

$$c_{33} = (-32x + 405) \times 10^9 \text{ (Pa)} \quad [27] \quad (10)$$

$$c_{13} = (5x + 103) \times 10^9 \text{ (Pa)}. \quad [28] \quad (11)$$

P_{PE} is a function of aluminum mole fraction (x) of AlGaN as shown by this set of equations. The piezoelectric polarization is also a function of AlGaN thickness, d , due to the model proposed by Blakeslee [29]. Their study shows that for any Al mole fraction of x , strain relaxation, $r(x)$, and reduction in piezoelectric polarization need to be taken into account for AlGaN thicknesses above the critical thickness. In this case, $P_{PE,AlGaN}$ is represented as [23]

$$P_{PE,AlGaN} = 2 \times [1 - r(x)] \times \frac{a_{GaN} - a_{AlGaN}}{a_{AlGaN}} \left(e_{31} - e_{33} \frac{c_{13}}{c_{33}} \right), \quad (12)$$

in which the strain relaxation is described by

$$r(x) = \frac{a_{AlGaN,strained} - a_{GaN}}{a_{AlGaN,relaxed} - a_{GaN}}. \quad (13)$$

Here, $a_{AlGaN,strained}$ and $a_{AlGaN,relaxed}$ are the lattice constants of the strained and relaxed AlGaN respectively. The parameter $a_{AlGaN,strained}$ should to be measured experimentally. Due to the study performed by Ambacher et. al. [23], for an AlGaN thickness of 30nm, the degree of relaxation, $r(x)$, increases linearly for Al mole fractions larger than 0.35. Assuming the same rate of change of $r(x)$ in its linear regime for different thicknesses of AlGaN, $r(x)$ is written as

$$r(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & : 0 \leq x \leq x_1 \\ \min[3.5 \times (x - x_1), 1] & : x_1 \leq x \leq 1 \end{cases}, \quad (14)$$

where x_1 is the Al mole fraction corresponding to the critical thickness of AlGaN in Blakeslee model [23, 29]. The values of x_1 for different AlGaN thicknesses could be

extracted from figure 4 of reference [23] ($x_1 = 0.7, 0.47, 0.38, 0.36,$ and 0.33 for AlGaN critical thicknesses of 10, 20, 30, 40, and 50 nm, respectively).

In addition to piezoelectric polarization, there is spontaneous polarization due to the crystal structure of III-nitride semiconductors as discussed in chapter II. The spontaneous polarization of GaN is -0.029 C/m^2 [23], however, the reported values for AlN spontaneous polarization ranges from -0.036 C/m^2 to -0.081 C/m^2 [30-33]. Assuming a value of -0.058 C/m^2 for AlN spontaneous polarization, the spontaneous polarization of AlGaN is calculated as

$$P_{SP,AlGaN} = x.P_{SP,AlN} + (1-x)P_{SP,GaN} = -0.029x - 0.029(C/m^2). \quad (15)$$

The mentioned value for AlN spontaneous polarization is selected so that the model best matches the experimental data.

The total macroscopic polarization of AlGaN layer in the absence of external electric field is the sum of spontaneous polarization $P_{SP,AlGaN}$ and the piezoelectric polarization represented by Eq.12.

$$P_{P,AlGaN} = P_{SP,AlGaN} + P_{PE,AlGaN}. \quad (16)$$

Since GaN layer is usually thick (thicker than 1 μm), it is totally relaxed and the piezoelectric polarization of the GaN is zero. So, in GaN layer, there is just the spontaneous polarization which is equal to -0.029 C/m^2 [23].

PECVD SiN passivation and 2DEG density

The as-grown AlGaN/GaN heterostructure has some positive charge on the AlGaN surface from surface states or absorbed ions [34, 35] in response to the negative polarization charge. These positive charges are sensitive to surface treatments and

atmospheric conditions [34-37]. The AlGa_N surface is typically passivated with silicon nitride to resolve the surface state issues. Moreover, the passivated AlGa_N/Ga_N heterostructure exhibits a relatively higher 2DEG density and lower electric field, which are desirable for high voltage and high power applications.

While PECVD α -Si₃N₄ passivation of AlGa_N/Ga_N devices has been investigated in the literature [38-40], no clear design and fabrication methodology has been proposed to improve the properties of the AlGa_N/Ga_N heterostructures. Moreover, there has not been a study of the effects of passivated AlGa_N/Ga_N post annealing on 2DEG density. Therefore, detailed analytical and experimental studies need to be performed to optimize the 2DEG density and electric field in passivated AlGa_N/Ga_N heterostructures by choosing appropriate design parameters (α -Si₃N₄ and AlGa_N thicknesses, Al mole fraction and annealing conditions).

As described in chapter 1, the 2DEG is formed at the Ga_N side of AlGa_N/Ga_N interface due to the piezoelectric and spontaneous polarizations. The 2DEG charge density for the unpassivated case is described by [34, 35, 41] (© 2013 IEEE)

$$\sigma_s = \frac{P_{SP,AlGaN} + P_{PE,AlGaN} - P_{SP,GaN} - c_{AlGaN} \cdot \psi}{1 + c_{AlGaN} \frac{\pi \hbar^2}{q^2 m^*}}, \quad (17)$$

where q is the electron charge, $m^* = 0.22m_e$ (m_e is electron mass) and $\psi = \phi_b - \Delta E_c$. Here, ϕ_b is the AlGa_N surface potential, ΔE_c is the conduction band offset at the AlGa_N/Ga_N interface and c_{AlGaN} is the AlGa_N capacitance per unit area:

$$\phi_b = 1.3x + 0.84(eV) [42], \quad (18)$$

$$\Delta E_C = 1.2x + 0.7x^2 \text{ (eV)} [43, 44] \text{ and} \quad (19)$$

$$C_{AlGaN} = \frac{\epsilon_0 \epsilon_{AlGaN}}{d}. \quad (20)$$

In Eq.20, ϵ_0 is the electric permittivity of vacuum, d is AlGaN thickness and ϵ_{AlGaN} is the dielectric constant of AlGaN represented by [23]

$$\epsilon_{AlGaN} = -0.3x + 10.4. \quad (21)$$

Figure 21 illustrates the conduction band diagrams of α -SiN passivated and unpassivated AlGaN/GaN heterostructures [34, 35, 41] (© 2013 IEEE).




Figure 21. The conduction band diagrams of α -SiN passivated and unpassivated AlGaN/GaN heterostructures.

It has been demonstrated that AlGaN surface passivation results in an increase in 2DEG density. If we assume α -Si_xN_y as the passivating dielectric, the 2DEG charge density is described by [34, 35, 41] (© 2013 IEEE)

$$\sigma_{s,passivated} = \frac{P_{SP,AlGaN} + P_{PE,AlGaN} - P_{SP,GaN} - C_B \cdot \Psi_p}{1 + C_B \frac{\pi \hbar^2}{q^2 m^*}}, \quad (22)$$

in which c_B is the series combination of AlGaN and α -Si_xN_y capacitances and $\Psi_p = \Phi_b - \Delta E_c - \Delta E_{c,ins}$. Here, $\Delta E_{c,ins}$ is the conduction band offset at AlGaN/ α -Si_xN_y interface and Φ_b is the α -Si_xN_y surface potential (Figure 21). Therefore,

$$\frac{1}{c_B} = \frac{1}{c_{AlGaN}} + \frac{1}{c_{SiN}} = \frac{d}{\epsilon_0 \epsilon_{AlGaN}} + \frac{t_{SiN}}{\epsilon_0 \epsilon_{SiN}}, \quad (23)$$

where t_{SiN} is the thickness of the α -Si_xN_y layer. In Eqs.17 and 22, to reach a more accurate calculation, the strain relaxation was taken into account to determine the piezoelectric polarization of AlGaN. Therefore, the 2DEG densities with and without surface passivation are calculated versus Al mole fraction for different AlGaN thicknesses (Figure 22) [41] (© 2013 IEEE).




Figure 22. The 2DEG density at AlGaN/GaN interface versus Al mole fractions (x) for different AlGaN thicknesses, d . Dashed lines: With 30 nm α -SiN surface passivation. Solid lines: Without surface passivation.

It should be noted that for Al mole fractions larger than $x = 0.22$, the 2DEG density is at or above 10^{13} cm^{-2} . The 2DEG density is also increased by increasing the AlGaN thickness and it is improved significantly by surface passivation. While large Al mole fractions are desirable to reach higher 2DEG densities, growing crack-free AlGaN films with very large Al mole fractions on GaN is not feasible from the fabrication standpoint [41] (© 2013 IEEE).

Electric field calculations in AlGaN/GaN heterostructures

In addition to achieving a higher 2DEG density, it is preferable to design the AlGaN/GaN heterostructures with a lower internal electric field in order to improve the breakdown voltage. For the as grown case, the electric field in AlGaN ($E_{AlGaN,unpassivated}$) is equal to the total band bending of AlGaN divided by AlGaN thickness. Therefore,

$$E_{AlGaN,unpassivated} = \frac{\phi_b + \Delta - \Delta E_C}{d}, \quad (24)$$

where ϕ_b and ΔE_C are represented by Eqs.18 and 19 respectively and Δ is calculated as [34, 35, 41] (© 2013 IEEE)

$$\Delta = \frac{\sigma_s \pi \hbar^2}{q^2 m^*}, \quad (25)$$

To calculate the electric field of passivated AlGaN, Gauss' law is applied at the AlGaN/GaN interface :

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon_0 \epsilon_{GaN} \cdot E_{SP,GaN} + \epsilon_0 \epsilon_{AlGaN} \cdot E_{AlGaN,passivated} = \\ P_{SP,AlGaN} + P_{PE,AlGaN} - P_{SP,GaN} - \sigma_{s,passivated} \end{aligned}, \quad (26)$$

where $E_{SP,GaN}$ is the spontaneous polarization induced electric field in the GaN side of AlGaN/GaN interface. $E_{SP,GaN}$ is approximately equal to Δ / W_{2DEG} where W_{2DEG} is the

effective width of the 2DEG which is a function of the 2DEG charge density [45]. Therefore, the total polarization electric fields in the AlGa_xN layer with and without surface passivation are calculated through Eqs. 24 and 26 (Figure 23) [41] (© 2013 IEEE).




Figure 23. The total polarization electric fields in Al_xGa_{1-x}N layer grown on GaN versus aluminum mole fractions (x) for different AlGa_xN thicknesses, d . Dashed lines: With 30 nm α -Si_xN_y surface passivation. Solid lines: Without surface passivation. The experimentally measured literature data are included as reference.

The surface passivation reduces the electric field significantly. Moreover, the electric field is increased by decreasing the AlGa_xN thickness in both passivated and unpassivated cases. The calculated electric fields for unpassivated structures are consistent with the most recent experimentally measured data [46, 47].

Figure 24 illustrates the effects of the α -SiN thickness on electric field of AlGaN layer for different Al mole fractions and AlGaN thicknesses [41] (© 2013 IEEE).




Figure 24. The electric field in $\text{Al}_x\text{Ga}_{1-x}\text{N}$ layer grown on GaN versus the thickness of α -SiN passivation layer for different aluminum mole fractions (x) and AlGaN thicknesses, d .

As shown in this figure, the electric field in AlGaN layer is decreased by increasing the α -SiN passivation layer thickness. Moreover, the electric field is decreased by increasing AlGaN thickness.

The 2DEG density change due to the variation of α -SiN film thickness, Al mole fraction and AlGaN thickness alters the mobility, affecting the ON state resistance in

HEMTs. The variation of Hall mobility for different 2DEG densities has been studied in literature [48, 49].

Experimental measurement of 2DEG in passivated AlGaN/GaN heterostructures

In order to investigate the validity of the proposed model, different α -SiN thicknesses were grown on an $\text{Al}_{0.25}\text{Ga}_{0.75}\text{N}/\text{GaN}$ heterostructure on Si (111) substrate with an AlGaN thickness of 17.5 nm. First, samples were held in diluted HCl solution for 10 minutes to remove the native oxide (The HCl:H₂O ratio was 1:10). α -SiN layers were deposited with an Oxford PlasmaLab 80Plus PECVD system. The SiH₄ and N₂ flow rates were 120 and 900 sccm, respectively, with a table temperature of 350 °C and an RF power of 60 W. The 2DEG density was measured using Lehighton Model 1605 non-contact Hall mobility measurement system, where multiple measurements and averaging were implemented to obtain more statistically significant data. Figure 25 illustrates the measured 2DEG densities for different passivation layer thicknesses [41] (© 2013 IEEE).




Figure 25. The experimentally measured 2DEG density of as-grown PECVD α -SiN passivated $\text{Al}_{0.25}\text{Ga}_{0.75}\text{N}/\text{GaN}$ heterostructure versus α -SiN thickness.

The 2DEG density initially increases with increasing α -SiN layer thickness and eventually saturates for thicknesses greater than 40 nm, denoting the necessary passivation layer thickness to achieve the optimum 2DEG density for Al mole fraction of 0.25 and AlGaIn thickness of 17.5 nm.

To investigate the effects of post-annealing on 2DEG density, an MTI OTF 1200-X Rapid Thermal Processing (RTP) system was used to anneal the sample with α -SiN passivation layer thickness of 60 nm. The samples were first held at 450 °C for 1 minute to stabilize the temperature and reduce the risk of possible sample cracking due to rapid temperature change. The temperature was then increased to the target value with a rise time of 15 seconds. Nitrogen was used as the ambient gas and the chamber

pressure was set to 30 Torr. Figure 26 illustrates the 2DEG density variation for different annealing times and temperatures [41] (© 2013 IEEE).




Figure 26. The experimentally measured 2DEG density of PECVD α -SiN passivated $\text{Al}_{0.25}\text{Ga}_{0.75}\text{N}/\text{GaN}$ heterostructure for different annealing times and temperatures. The α -SiN and AlGa N thicknesses were 60 and 17.5 nm, respectively.

Annealing the sample after α -SiN deposition improves the 2DEG density. The increase in 2DEG density is due to the reduction of trap density at α -SiN/AlGa N interface as reported for $\text{Al}_2\text{O}_3/\text{GaN}$ interface in the literature [50-52].

The 2DEG densities are calculated using the proposed model for the unannealed samples with different SiN thicknesses. Figure 27 compares the experimentally

measured 2DEG density illustrated in Figure 25 with the calculated values based on the proposed model [41] (© 2013 IEEE).




Figure 27. The calculated and experimentally measured 2DEG density of as-grown PECVD α -SiN passivated $\text{Al}_{0.25}\text{Ga}_{0.75}\text{N}/\text{GaN}$ heterostructure versus α -SiN thickness. The AlGaN thickness was 17.5 nm.

The calculated 2DEG densities correspond well with the experimental data. The model accurately predicts the 2DEG density increase with increasing α -SiN thickness, and the saturation that occurs for α -SiN thicknesses greater than 40 nm [41] (© 2013 IEEE).

Surface passivation and breakdown

Analyses have been performed in the literature to describe the impact of material parameters on semiconductor devices performance [53, 54]. According to these studies, in devices with uniformly doped drift region, the smallest ON-state resistance occurs when the drift regions depletion layer punch-through occurs to the heavily doped substrate simultaneously with breakdown. Therefore, to optimize R_{ON} , the doping concentration of the drift region should be selected such that the drift region and depletion layer widths are equal to each other at breakdown [53, 54]. In this situation, the voltage is supported in the depletion layer with a linear electric field distribution which peaks right at the junction. The peak value is equal to the critical electric field (E_{crit}) at breakdown [53, 54]. Therefore, the power device figure of merit is represented as

$$FOM = \frac{V_{BR}^2}{R_{ON}} = \frac{1}{4} \times \varepsilon \cdot \mu \cdot E_{crit}^3, \quad (27)$$

where ε and μ are the electric permittivity and mobility of the semiconductor. Using Eq.27, the R_{ON} - V_{BR} limits of different materials are derived as illustrated in Figure 3 [55, 56]. As shown in this figure, all reported literature data for GaN HEMTs are far away from the introduced GaN limit. The ON state resistances of the experimentally reported data are almost more than an order of magnitude larger than that suggested by the introduced GaN limit. The reason can be explained by the use of a FOM developed for devices with uniformly doped drift regions. It should not be applied to AlGaIn/GaN HEMTs in which the drift region is usually intrinsic and there is no doped junction.

Moreover, Eq.27 does not take into account the polarization electric fields of III-Nitride semiconductors which add to the bias-induced electric field. The existence of polarization electric fields together with the undoped drift region cause the breakdown to occur at much lower voltages than what is predicted by Eq.27. An appropriate figure of merit must be developed for AlGa_xN/GaN HEMTs to allow device designers latitude in higher voltage design. To calculate the FOM of AlGa_xN/GaN HEMTs, 2DEG density and AlGa_xN surface passivation together with polarization electric fields and strain relaxation need to be taken into account.

In order to obtain the power device figure of merit, the breakdown mechanism in AlGa_xN/GaN HEMTs needs to be analyzed. Figure 28 illustrates a typical AlGa_xN/GaN HEMT at its OFF state.




Figure 28. A typical AlGa_xN/GaN HEMT at its OFF state.

In this figure, $P_{SP,AlGaN}$ and $P_{SP,GaN}$ are the spontaneous polarizations of AlGaN and GaN respectively, $P_{PE,AlGaN}$ is the piezoelectric polarization of AlGaN and n_s is the 2DEG density [41] (© 2013 IEEE). Depending on the passivation layer properties and growth conditions, some donor-like surface traps remain unpassivated at the AlGaN/passivation layer interface as illustrated in Figure 28. The density of surface traps could be larger than $1.5 \times 10^{13} \text{ cm}^{-2}$ [57]. A portion of these donor-like surface traps are filled due to electron injection from the gate, resulting in the partial depletion of gate to drain region [58]. The density of the filled surface traps and the depletion length depend on the gate and drain biases, trap density and trap state energy.

In order to investigate the effects of trap density at AlGaN/passivation layer interface on R_{ON} and V_{BR} , the two dimensional potential distribution in AlGaN needs to be calculated. If the drain side of the gate edge is selected as the origin of coordinates (Figure 28), the Poisson equation implies that [58]

$$\frac{\partial^2 V(l, y)}{\partial l^2} + \frac{\partial^2 V(l, y)}{\partial y^2} = \frac{-q \cdot \rho}{\epsilon_0 \epsilon_{AlGaN}}, \quad (28)$$

where $V(l, y)$ is the electrostatic potential at (l, y) coordinates, q is the electron charge, ρ is the charge density, ϵ_0 is the electric permittivity of the vacuum and ϵ_{AlGaN} is the relative electric permittivity of AlGaN. Simulation results with Synopsys-Sentaurus software for different device parameters indicate that the potential distribution along y -axis in AlGaN is linear. Therefore the second term of Eq.28 is equal to zero. Applying Eq.28 to the depletion region and along the line $y = 0$ results in

$$\left. \frac{\partial^2 V(l, y)}{\partial l^2} \right|_{y=0} = \frac{q \cdot (P_{PE, AlGaN} + P_{SP, AlGaN} - D_T + D_{T, Filled}(l))}{\epsilon_0 \epsilon_{AlGaN}}, \quad (29)$$

in which D_T is the donor-like trap density at AlGaN/GaN interface and $D_{T, Filled}(l)$ is the density of traps that are filled due to charge injection from the gate. The potential distribution along the line $y = 0$ in AlGaN can be approximated by a parabolic function as [59]

$$V(l, 0) = a_n \cdot l^n + \dots + a_2 \cdot l^2 + a_1 \cdot l + a_0. \quad (30)$$

Substituting Eq.30 into Eq.29 and evaluating Eq.29 at $l = 0$ (gate edge), a_2 is represented as

$$a_2 = \frac{q \cdot (P_{PE, AlGaN} + P_{SP, AlGaN} - D_T + D_{T, Filled}(0))}{2\epsilon_0 \epsilon_{AlGaN}}. \quad (31)$$

a_2 is the second-order derivative (curvature) of the horizontal potential distribution at the gate edge. As indicated in Eq.31, a_2 is a function of D_T and $D_{T, Filled}$ at the gate edge. This is well-reflected in Figure 29 where it shows the simulated potential distribution along AlGaN/passivation layer interface in a device with the gate to drain distance of 2 μm for various trap densities.




Figure 29. The electrostatic potential in AlGaN side of the AlGaN/passivation layer interface of the structure shown in Figure 28 with a gate to drain distance of 2 μm , Al mole fraction of 0.25 and AlGaN thickness of 30 nm for different donor-like surface trap densities. The trap state energy was set 1 eV below AlGaN conduction band.

Larger trap densities provide more negative a_2 at the gate edge and the potential distribution becomes linear (curvature = 0) by decreasing the trap density. The slopes of these plots represent the horizontal components of the electric field along AlGaN/passivation layer interface. As shown in Figure 29, decreasing the trap density reduces the horizontal electric field at the gate edge. This results in a reduction in the total electric field peak at the gate edge both in AlGaN and GaN layers, improving the breakdown voltage of the device (Figure 30 and Figure 31).




Figure 30. The total electric field in AlGaN side of the AlGaN/passivation layer interface of the structure shown in Figure 28 with a gate to drain distance of 2 μm , Al mole fraction of 0.25, drain bias of 150V and AlGaN thickness of 30 nm for different donor-like surface trap densities. The trap state energy was set 1eV below AlGaN conduction band. The peak electric field is decreased by decreasing the trap density.




Figure 31. The total electric field in GaN side of the AlGaIn/GaN interface of the structure shown in Figure 28 with a gate to drain distance of 2 μm , Al mole fraction of 0.25, drain bias of 150V and AlGaIn thickness of 30 nm for different donor-like surface trap densities. The trap state energy was set 1eV below AlGaIn conduction band. The peak electric field is decreased by decreasing the trap density.

Therefore, the breakdown voltage of the device is increased with a better surface passivation which reduces the density of donor-like surface trap at AlGaIn/passivation layer interface. The increase in the breakdown voltage by decreasing the surface trap density has also been reported in the literature [60].

However decreasing the trap density at AlGaIn/passivation layer interface improves the breakdown voltage, it degrades the ON-state resistance. Figure 32 illustrates the I_D - V_D characteristics of the device simulated in Figure 31 at the zero gate bias.




Figure 32. The I_D - V_D characteristics of the structure shown in Figure 28 with a gate to drain distance of 2 μm , Al mole fraction of 0.25 and AlGaIn thickness of 30 nm for different donor-like surface trap densities. The trap state energy was set 1eV below AlGaIn conduction band. The ON-state resistance is increased by decreasing the surface trap density.

As shown in this figure, the ON-state resistance is increased by decreasing the AlGaIn/passivation layer interface trap density. This is due to charge injection from the gate into some empty traps at the ON-state, resulting in the reduction of 2DEG density. Therefore, there is a tradeoff between the breakdown voltage and ON-state resistance.

Surface passivation and R_{ON} - V_{BR} FOM

In order to obtain the FOM of AlGaIn/GaN HEMTs, the breakdown voltage and ON-state resistance of device need to be determined for different trap densities, gate to drain distances, Al mole fractions and AlGaIn thicknesses. To do so, the 2D electric field distributions of HEMTs with different design parameters have been simulated for various drain biases. The breakdown voltage of the device is defined as the drain bias at which the peak electric field value is equal to the critical breakdown electric field. Assuming a GaN critical breakdown electric field of 2.4 MV/cm, the critical breakdown electric field of AlGaIn for Al mole fractions less than 0.5 is proportional to its bandgap energy to the power of 2.5 [61]. Therefore, the critical breakdown electric field of AlGaIn for different Al mole fractions of x is written as

$$E_{c,AlGaIn} = 0.11(E_g)^{2.5} = 0.11(2.5x + 3.45)^{2.5} (MV / cm), \quad (32)$$

in which E_g is the bandgap energy of AlGaIn. Taking into account these considerations, the breakdown voltage of the structure shown in Figure 28 is simulated for an AlGaIn thickness of 30 nm, Al mole fraction of 0.2 and different gate to drain distances (Figure 33).




Figure 33. The breakdown voltage of the structure shown in Figure 28 versus the gate to drain spacing for an Al mole fraction of 0.2, AlGaIn thickness of 30 nm and different donor-like surface trap densities. The trap state energy was set 1eV below AlGaIn conduction band.

The breakdown voltage increases by increasing the gate to drain distance and it eventually saturates. The gate to drain distance at which the breakdown voltage starts to saturate and the saturation value are functions of trap density, trap state energy, Al mole fraction and AlGaIn thickness. As illustrated in Figure 33, decreasing the donor-like trap density (i.e. better AlGaIn surface passivation), improves the breakdown voltage of the device. The change in breakdown voltage by using different passivation layers has also been reported in the literature. It is shown that SiN-passivated AlGaIn/GaN HEMTs exhibit different breakdown voltages than SiO₂-passivated HEMTs [8]. α -AlN passivated AlGaIn/GaN HEMTs with breakdown voltages larger than 10 kV were recently reported [16].

Figure 34 illustrates the ON-state resistance versus the gate to drain distance for devices simulated in Figure 33.




Figure 34. The ON-state resistance of the structure shown in Figure 28 versus the gate to drain spacing for an Al mole fraction of 0.2, AlGa_N thickness of 30 nm and different donor-like surface trap densities. The trap state energy was set 1eV below AlGa_N conduction band energy.

As shown in this figure, the ON-state resistance is increased by decreasing the trap density.

In order to obtain the FOM of the devices simulated in Figure 34, the ON-state resistance is sketched versus the breakdown voltage (Figure 35).




Figure 35. The R_{ON} - V_{BR} characteristics of the device shown in Figure 28 with an Al mole fraction of 0.2, AlGaN thickness of 30 nm and different donor-like surface trap densities. The trap state energy was set 1eV below AlGaN conduction band.

The R_{ON} - V_{BR} characteristics are near or above SiC limit line and they are far away from the previously introduced GaN limit. This describes the reason why the experimentally reported data in the literature are not close to the GaN limit line as shown in Figure 3.

In order to obtain the R_{ON} - V_{BR} characteristics for different Al mole fractions (x) and AlGaN thicknesses (d), the threshold voltage needs to be calculated for different x and d . If ϕ_b is the effective Schottky gate barrier and ΔE_C is the conduction band discontinuity at AlGaN/GaN interface (Eq.19), the threshold voltage of the device is represented as [62]

$$V_{th} = \phi_b - \Delta E_C - \frac{P_{SP,AlGaN} + P_{PE,AlGaN} - P_{SP,GaN}}{\epsilon_0 \cdot \epsilon_{AlGaN}} \cdot d, \quad (33)$$

in which $P_{SP,AlGaN}$ and $P_{SP,GaN}$ are the spontaneous polarizations of AlGaN and GaN respectively and $P_{PE,AlGaN}$ is the piezoelectric polarization of AlGaN. The $P_{SP,AlGaN}$, $P_{SP,GaN}$ and $P_{PE,AlGaN}$ are calculated for different Al mole fractions and AlGaN thicknesses taking into account the strain relaxation [41] (© 2013 IEEE). Therefore, the threshold voltage of the device is calculated for different Al mole fractions and AlGaN thicknesses, allowing for the simulation of V_{BR} - R_{ON} characteristics for different x and d as illustrated in Figure 36 and Figure 37 [41] (© 2013 IEEE).




Figure 36. The R_{ON} - V_{BR} characteristics of the device shown in Figure 28 with an AlGaN thickness of 30 nm, AlGaN/passivation layer trap density of $2.4e13 \text{ cm}^{-2}$ and different Al mole fractions. The trap state energy was set 1eV below AlGaN conduction band.




Figure 37. The R_{ON} - V_{BR} characteristics of the device shown in Figure 28 with an Al mole fraction of 0.25, AlGaN/passivation layer trap density of $2.4e13 \text{ cm}^{-2}$ and different AlGaN thicknesses. The trap state energy was set 1eV below AlGaN conduction band energy.

As shown in Figure 36 and Figure 37, decreasing x and d allows for achieving higher breakdown voltages, however, it degrades the ON-state resistance due to the reduction in 2DEG density [41] (© 2013 IEEE). For larger x and d , no significant differences are seen in R_{ON} - V_{BR} characteristics as the 2DEG density saturates by increasing d and x [41] (© 2013 IEEE).

In previous simulations, we did not consider the effects of field plate as it has been intensively studied in the literature [63-65]. Different field plate configurations and dimensions will change both R_{ON} and V_{BR} , resulting in different FOMs. In addition to field plate, the implementation of resurf in drain region can improve the breakdown

voltage and affect R_{ON} [13].

In the proposed model in this chapter, we have used the AlGaIn/GaN heterostructure as it is commercially available. However, the drain region of the TMOSHFET is an AlGaIn/AlN heterostructure instead of AlGaIn/GaN. The model can be extended to AlGaIn/AlN if the AlN material parameters are used instead of GaN parameters. Therefore, the proposed model can be used to design the drain region of TMOSHFET.

Figure 38 illustrates the OFF-state electrostatic potential along the drain region of the TMOSHFET structure shown in Figure 10 with a gate to drain distance of 10 μm at different drain biases and Figure 39 shows the corresponding electric field profile.




Figure 38. The OFF-state electrostatic potential along the drain region of the TMOSHFET structure shown in Figure 10 with a gate to drain spacing of 10 μm at different drain biases of V_D .




Figure 39. The OFF-state total electric field along the drain region of the TMOSHFET structure shown in Figure 10 with a gate to drain spacing of 10 μm at different drain biases of V_D .

The breakdown voltage of the device for different gate to drain biases can be extracted by simulating the electric field along the drain as shown in Figure 39. To find the ON-state resistance, the I_D - V_D plots need to be simulated for different gate to drain distances. Figure 40 shows the I_D - V_D plots for a gate to drain distance of 10 μm .




Figure 40. The I_D - V_D characteristics of the TMOSHFET structure shown in Figure 10 with a gate to drain spacing of 10 μm .

Therefore, the R_{ON} - V_{BR} FOM of the TMOSHFETs can be obtained for different gate to drain spacing. Figure 41 compares the R_{ON} - V_{BR} FOM of the TMOSHFET of Figure 10 with different gate to drain spacing with those of the experimentally reported AlGaIn/GaN HEMTs in the literature.




Figure 41. The R_{ON} - V_{BR} FOMs of the TMOSHFET structure shown in Figure 10 with different gate to drain spacing. The experimentally reported literature data for AlGaN/GaN HEMTs are included.

Increasing the gate to drain distance improves the Breakdown voltage of TMOSHFET and it eventually gets saturated. As shown in Figure 41, significant improvements in FOM are achieved in TMOSHFETs with L_{GD} of 5 and 10 nm compared to the AlGaN/GaN HEMTs.

CHAPTER V
TUNNELING MECHANISMS IN ALGAN/GAN SBD

Introduction

In this chapter, the tunneling current in the gate region of TMOSHFET is demonstrated using an AlGa_N/Ga_N heterostructure. AlGa_N/Ga_N Schottky Barrier Diodes (SBDs) with different AlGa_N thicknesses are fabricated and their I-V and G-V plots are analyzed. To do so, first the Ti/Al/Ni/Au Ohmic contacts to AlGa_N/Ga_N heterostructures are realized and characterized. Then, a dry etch recipe is used to etch the AlGa_N to achieve SBDs with various AlGa_N thicknesses. The effects of this dry etch on the trap density of AlGa_N are investigated using $G_p\text{-}\omega/\omega$ method. By analyzing the current-voltage characteristics of SBDs with various AlGa_N thicknesses, different tunneling mechanisms (Poole-Frenkel, Fowler-Nordheim and etc.) in samples are realized and compared with each other.

Ti/Al/Ni/Au Ohmic contact to GaN

To fabricate AlGa_N/Ga_N SBDs, a low-resistance Ohmic contact should first be formed to the Ga_N. Ti/Al/Ni/Au Ohmic contact to Ga_N is investigated in the literature [66-68]. Titanium is used as the first metal since it can form TiN bonds with Nitrogen atoms of Ga_N. Then, a thick aluminum layer is used as the transition layer as it has a low resistance. The top Au layer is to prevent the oxidization of contact and Ni prevents Au diffusion into Al while annealing.

To fabricate the Ohmic contacts on our AlGa_N/Ga_N sample, the sample is first

put in diluted HCl to remove the native oxide (the HCl:H₂O ratio was 1:10). Then 138 nm of α -SiN was deposited with the Oxford PlasmaLab 80Plus PECVD system. The SiH₄ and N₂ flow rates were 120 and 900 sccm, respectively, with a table temperature of 350 °C and an RF power of 60 W. In order to do the lift-off process, the sample is coated with Lift-Off Resist (LOR) for 40 sec at 2000 rpm. The acceleration and deceleration times of the spincoater were 0.2 sec. The sample is then baked on hot plate at 165 °C for 8 minutes. After that, AZ 5214 photoresist is coated on the wafer for 45 sec at 4500 rpm with the acceleration and deceleration times of 5 sec followed by 2 minutes of soft bake on the hot plate at 120 °C. Then, it is exposed to UV light to transfer the mask pattern using the Karl Suss MA6 mask aligner. The exposed regions are then developed in MF 312 photoresist developer for 1 minute followed by sample hard bake in 135 °C oven. To remove the SiN in opened windows, the sample is put in Buffered Oxide Etch (BOE) for 45 sec. The SEM image shows that 45 sec wet etch is enough to remove the entire 138 nm of PECVD SiN (Figure 42). Then, Ti(30 nm)/Al(180 nm)/Ni(40 nm) are evaporated on the sample using the electron beam evaporation system. Right after taking out the sample from the e-beam evaporator chamber, 50 nm of gold is sputtered on the sample using the Hummer Sputter Coater. LOR and photoresists are stripped off using AZ 400T photoresist stripper and the sample is annealed at 165 °C for 30 sec using MTI OTF 1200-X Rapid Thermal Processing (RTP) system.




Figure 42. The cross-sectional SEM image of PECVD SiN on AlGaIn/GaN after 45 sec BOE etching.

Figure 43 shows the programmed temperature profile of RTP (green line) and the actual chamber temperature (red line).




Figure 43. The programmed (green line) and actual (red line) RTP chamber temperatures.

As shown in this figure, the sample is kept at 500 °C for 1 minute before the 865 °C annealing to reduce the risk of sample cracking due to the fast temperature change. Figure 44 shows the photo of fabricated contacts with different spacings before and after annealing.




Figure 44. The fabricated Ti/Al/Ni/Au contacts to AlGaIn/GaN heterostructure before and after the annealing.

The appearance of black dots on the contacts after annealing is due to the intermixing of Al and Au [69].

The current-voltage characteristics of the fabricated contacts with different spacings are measured using HP 4145B Semiconductor Parameter Analyzer and illustrated in Figure 45.




Figure 45. The current-voltage characteristics of Ohmic contacts with different spacing of L .

As shown in this illustration, the contacts are completely linear. The inverse slope of the I-V characteristic gives the resistance between the contacts which is the sum of two contact resistances (R_C) and the 2DEG resistance. The summation of contact resistances can be extracted from the intercept of the resistance versus L plot with the y-axis (Figure 46).




Figure 46. The measured resistance between the contacts versus contact spacing.

For the fabricated contacts, the contact resistance of 0.45 Ohms.mm is realized as shown in this figure.

SF₆ dry etching of AlGa_N and its impacts on the trap density

To fabricate the gate region of TMOSHFET, the AlGa_N should be etched as shown in Figure 10. Chlorine and fluorine based dry etchings are usually used to etch the III-Nitride semiconductors [70-73]. We have used the dry etch recipe introduced in reference [73] to etch the AlGa_N/Ga_N heterostructure using an Oxford PlasmaLab 100 Plus RIE system. First, the native oxide on the wafer is removed by putting the sample in diluted HCl solution with an HCl:DI ratio of 1:10. 138 nm of SiN is then grown on the sample using the PECVD system. After that, 100 nm of Cr was evaporated on the sample and patterned using lithography and Cr-1A etchant to act as the hard mask for the

dry etching. The Inductively Coupled Plasma (ICP) Reactive Ion Etching (RIE) is performed at SF₆ and Ar flow rates of 40 sccm and 10 sccm, respectively, with an ICP power of 200W at the temperature of 16 °C and a chamber pressure of 44 mTorr. Figure 47 and Figure 48 show the cross-sectional SEM of the samples etched for 2:30 and 20 minutes with RF powers of 600 W and 400 W respectively. The AlGa_{0.3}N etch rates were 27 nm/min and 15 nm/min for RF powers of 600 W and 400 W respectively.




Figure 47. The cross-sectional SEM of the AlGa_{0.3}N/GaN heterostructure after 2:30 minutes of SF₆ dry etching with the RF power of 600 W.




Figure 48. The cross-sectional SEM of the AlGaIn/GaN heterostructure after 20 minutes of SF₆ dry etching with the RF power of 400 W.

To investigate the effects of dry etch on the trap density and time constant in AlGaIn, SBDs with Ni/Au Schottky contacts on recess-etched AlGaIn are fabricated and characterized. Al_{0.26}Ga_{0.75}N/GaN heterostructure on Si(111) substrate is used with an AlGaIn thickness of 17.5 nm and a 2 nm cap GaN layer (Details of material growth are described in reference [18]). The native oxide on the sample is first removed by putting the sample diluted HCl for 10 minutes (HCl:DI ratio was 1:10). After that, 138 nm of SiN layer is grown on top of the wafer by Plasma Enhanced Chemical Vapor Deposition (PECVD) method using the Oxford PlasmaLab 80 Plus system. The SiH₄ and N₂ flow rates were 120 and 900 sccm, respectively, with an RF power of 60 W and table

temperature of 350 °C. Then, 100 nm of Cr is evaporated on SiN as the hard-mask for subsequent dry etching. The Cr and SiN are wet etched using Cr-1A and BOE at the Schottky contact region to create openings for the dry etch. Using the Oxford PlasmaLab 100 Plus RIE system, the AlGaIn/GaN heterostructure is etched for 20 sec and 40 sec in two samples. The recipe was same as what mentioned earlier with an RF power of 400 W. The Cr hard-mask is then etched away and the SiN at the Ohmic region is removed using BOE. The LOR and AZ 5214 photoresist are coated and patterned using Karl Suss MA6 mask aligner to form Ohmic regions in subsequent lift-off process. The Ti(30 nm)/Al(100 nm)/Ni(40 nm) metal stack is evaporated on the sample using the e-beam evaporator followed by 50 nm Au sputtering. The Ohmic regions are formed using the lift-off process and the samples are annealed at 865 °C for 30 sec using the MTI OTF 1200-X Rapid Thermal Processing (RTP) system. Finally, 50 nm of Ni is evaporated followed by 50 nm Au sputtering and they are patterned by a lift-off process to form the Schottky contacts on the etched regions. Figure 49 illustrates the fabrication process and Figure 50 shows the cross-section and top views of the fabricated devices.




Figure 49. The fabrication process of AlGaN/GaN SBDs.




Figure 50. The cross-sectional and top views of fabricated AlGaN/GaN SBDs.

Figure 51 illustrates a photo of the fabricated AlGaN/GaN SBD.




Figure 51. The photo of the fabricated AlGaIn/GaN SBD.

The frequency dependent conductance measurement is implemented to characterize the trapping effects in semiconductor devices [52, 74-76]. The relationship between the parallel conductance (G_p) and the trap density (D_T) is expressed as [52, 74-76]

$$\frac{G_p}{\omega} = \frac{qD_T}{2\omega\tau_T} \ln[1 + (\omega\tau_T)^2], \quad (34)$$

where τ_T is the trap state time constant, ω is the radial frequency and q is the electron charge. D_T and τ_T are extracted by fitting Eq.34 to the experimental G_p/ω versus ω trace. To do so, the conductance-voltage characteristics of the fabricated devices were measured at different frequencies using an Agilent 4284A precision LCR Meter (Figure 52).




Figure 52. The measured G_p/ω traces versus the applied bias to the Schottky contact for the samples with 20 sec and 40 sec recess etches under Schottky contact.

The local maxima at small negative biases are due to the increased trap density at those voltages. The increase in the conductance at positive biases is due to the Ni-AlGaN Schottky diode switch ON rather than the change in trap density. So, Eq.34 can not be applied to calculate the trap density at positive biases.

Based on the measured G_p/ω versus voltage traces, the experimental G_p/ω versus ω plots are calculated and Eq.34 is fitted to the experimental data (Figure 53 and Figure 54).




Figure 53. The measured and fitted G_p/ω versus ω traces for the samples with 20 sec recess etch under the Schottky contact.




Figure 54. The measured and fitted G_p/ω versus ω traces for the samples with 40 sec recess etch under the Schottky contact.

The frequency range of the measured G_p/ω is limited due to the frequency range of the LCR meter. The experimental G_p/ω peaks are broader than the peaks predicted by equation for the case of 40 sec etched device and they are narrower for 20 sec etched device. The deviation of the experimental G_p/ω peaks from the ones predicted by Eq.34 is due to the time constant dispersions caused by surface potential fluctuations because of the nonuniformities in AlGaIn charges and interface traps [75, 77].

Figure 55 and Figure 56 illustrate the extracted trap density and trap state time constant versus the applied bias for both samples.




Figure 55. Trap density versus the applied voltage for the samples with 20 sec and 40 sec recess etches under Schottky contact.




Figure 56. Trap state time constant versus the applied voltage for the samples with 20 sec and 40 sec recess etches under Schottky contact.

As shown in these figures, the sample with 20 sec recess etch exhibits a larger trap density and lower trap state time constant at a fixed voltage compared to the sample with 40 sec recess etch. Figure 56 demonstrates that the trap state time constant is an exponential function of the applied bias (i.e. the trap state energy). This exponential relationship between the trap state time constant and trap state energy is written as [74, 75]

$$\tau_T = (\sigma_T N_c v_t)^{-1} \exp\left(\frac{E_T}{kT}\right), \quad (35)$$

where σ_T is the trap state's capture cross-section, N_c is the density of states in the conduction band, v_t is the carriers' average thermal velocity, E_T is the trap state energy, k is the Boltzmann constant and T is the temperature. Considering $N_c = 4.3e14 * T^{3/2}$, $\sigma_T = 3.4e-15 \text{ cm}^2$ and $v_t = 2.6e7 \text{ cm/s}$ [74, 75], the trap state energy can be calculated from Eq.35. Figure 57 illustrates the trap density versus the trap state energy below the conduction band for both samples.




Figure 57. The trap density versus the trap state energy below the conduction band for the samples with 20 sec and 40 sec recess etches under Schottky contact.

As shown in this figure, the dry etch with the implemented recipe does not have a significant effect on the density of traps with energy states closer to the AlGa_N conduction band. The states that are closer to the conduction band of AlGa_N are the ones that contribute to the gate leakage current when the device is ON. Therefore, it is important to implement a dry etch recipe that does not change the density of these traps significantly.

Current mechanisms in recess-etched AlGa_N/Ga_N SBDs

In AlGa_N/Ga_N SBDs, several mechanisms can contribute to the total current of the Schottky junction. In SBDs with large AlGa_N thicknesses, the forward current is dominated by the hole injection from the metal into the valence band of Ga_N due to the ionization of interface states [78]. The metal Fermi level is moved down toward the valence band of AlGa_N at the positive bias, getting aligned with the valence band edge of Ga_N [78]. Therefore, the electrons in valence band of Ga_N are injected toward the metal which is equivalent to the hole injection from metal into the Ga_N. Figure 58 illustrates the band diagram of the AlGa_N/Ga_N SBD under zero and positive biases [78].




Figure 58. The band diagram of an AlGa_N/Ga_N SBD under zero and positive biases [78].

Figure 59 illustrates the current voltage characteristics of an Al_{0.3}Ga_{0.7}N/GaN SBD with an AlGa_N thickness of 21.5 nm [79].




Figure 59. The forward bias current-voltage characteristic of an AlGaIn/GaN SBD with an Al mole fraction of 0.3 and an AlGaIn thickness of 21.5 nm [79].

Since the AlGaIn is relatively thick with an Al mole fraction of 0.3, the magnitude of electron tunneling current is negligible at lower biases due to the wide tunneling barrier. (In very large positive biases, however, the Fowler-Nordheim electron tunneling can contribute to the current due to smaller tunneling width which will be described later). Therefore, hole injection is the major current mechanism in this device. The amount of this current can be calculated through the following set of formula:

$$I_d = I_{S1} \exp[qV_1 / n_1kT] - 1], \quad (36)$$

$$I_d = I_{S2} \exp[qV_2 / n_2kT] - 1], \quad (37)$$

$$V_d = V_1 + V_2, \quad (38)$$

$$I_{s1} / S = A^* T^2 \exp(-q\phi_b / kT) \text{ and} \quad (39)$$

$$A^* = 4\pi q m^* k^2 / h^3. \quad (40)$$

Here, S is the area of the Schottky contact and A^* is the effective Richardson constant, ϕ_b is the Ni-AlGaN barrier height, k is the Boltzmann constant, h is Plank constant, T is temperature, V_d is the voltage across the diode and I_d is the current flowing through the diode. I_{s1} and n_1 can be obtained from the intercept of the tangent line with y-axis and the slope of this line as shown in Figure 59. In our samples, however, the AlGaN is much thinner (8 nm and 14 nm for 40 sec and 20 sec etched samples respectively). Therefore electron tunneling currents can also contribute to the total current. In this case, the ideality factor, n_1 , can not be obtained from the slope of the tangent line as illustrated in Figure 59 and the electron currents need to be taken into account.

In order to investigate the current mechanisms in the fabricated SBDs, the current-voltage characteristics of samples were measured using the HP 4145B semiconductor parameter analyzer. Figure 60 shows the I-V characteristics of both samples in linear y-axis scale.




Figure 60. The current-voltage characteristics of SBDs with 20 sec and 40 sec recess etches under Schottky contact.

The turn ON voltage of the 20 sec etched sample is higher than the one for 40 sec etched sample due to the thicker AlGaIn layer of 20 sec etched sample. Moreover, the 40 sec etched sample exhibits a larger ON state current due to the contribution of electron currents. Figure 61 illustrates the current-voltage characteristics of the sample in logarithmic y-axis scale, showing that the 20 sec etched sample has a lower OFF state leakage current.




Figure 61. The logarithmic y-axis current-voltage characteristics of SBDs with 20 sec and 40 sec recess etches under Schottky contact.

The lower OFF state leakage current in 20 sec etched sample is due to the longer tunneling width because of the thicker AlGaIn layer. As shown in this figure, the I-V characteristics start to deviate from the shape shown in Figure 59. However, for the 20 sec etched sample where the AlGaIn thickness is 14 nm, a local drop in the current can still be seen in the plot. This shows that the electron current is still lower compared to the hole currents, meaning that the effect of electron tunneling is negligible at lower biases. Therefore, the Ni-AlGaIn barrier height, ϕ_b , can be extracted by obtaining I_{S1} as shown in Figure 62 and using Eq.39.




Figure 62. The logarithmic y-axis current-voltage characteristics of the SBD with 20 sec recess etch under Schottky contact and the way to extract I_{S1}/S value.

This leads to a ϕ_b value of 0.84 eV in our device. Knowing the conduction band offset at AlGa_N/Ga_N interface through Eq.19 (ΔE_C) and the thickness of AlGa_N layer (t_{AlGaN}), the zero-bias electric field in AlGa_N is calculated as $E_{AlGaN} = (\phi_b - \Delta E_C) / t_{AlGaN}$.

The contribution of electron current increases by decreasing the thickness of the AlGa_N layer. Figure 63 shows the conduction band diagram of an AlGa_N/Ga_N SBD under the Schottky contact at different positive biases.




Figure 63. The conduction band diagram of the AlGaIn/GaN SBD under the Schottky contact at different positive biases.

Several electron current mechanisms can be realized in AlGaIn/GaN SBDs: Fowler-Nordheim (FN) Tunneling, Poole-Frenkel (PF) emission, Trap Assisted Tunneling (TAT) and Direct Tunneling (DT) [80].

For sufficiently large positive biases, the conduction band edge at AlGaIn/metal interface gets aligned with the 2DEG or it lies below the GaN conduction band edge at AlGaIn/GaN interface (Figure 63). In this case, the electrons from the 2DEG experience a triangular barrier and they can directly tunnel to the conduction band of AlGaIn through a process called Fowler-Nordheim (FN) tunneling. The Fowler-Nordheim tunneling current density is written as [80]

$$J_{FN} = \frac{q^2}{8\pi h \phi_s} E_{AlGaIn}^2 \exp\left[-\frac{8\pi\sqrt{2m^*q}}{3hE_{AlGaIn}} \phi_B^{3/2}\right], \quad (41)$$

in which ϕ_B is the barrier height at the emitting interface and m^* is the effective mass of the tunneling electron in AlGaIn. Therefore, the linear portions of the $\ln(I/E_{AlGaIn}^2)$

versus I/E_{AlGaN} are the regions where the total current is dominated by Fowler-Nordheim tunneling process.

To find the regions where the total current is dominated by Fowler-Nordheim mechanism, $\ln(I/E_{AlGaN}^2)$ is sketched versus I/E_{AlGaN} (Figure 64).




Figure 64. The plot of $\ln(I/E_{AlGaN}^2)$ versus the I/E_{AlGaN} for SBDs with 20 sec and 40 sec recess etches under Schottky contact to find the regions where the total current is dominated by Fowler-Nordheim tunneling process.

From Eq.41, it is inferred that the total current in regions of these plots that are linear and have the following slope are dominated by Fowler-Nordheim tunneling mechanism:

$$FN_{Slope} = -\frac{8\pi\sqrt{2m^*q}}{3hE_{AlGaN}}\phi_B^{3/2}. \quad (42)$$

Here, ϕ_B is the tunneling barrier or the conduction band offset at AlGaN/GaN interface represented by Eq.19. Since the Al mole fraction is 0.26 in our sample, ϕ_B is equal to 0.34 eV, allowing for the slope of the tangent line slope to Fowler-Nordheim plots to be calculated. The regions of I-V characteristics that are dominated by Fowler-Nordheim tunneling process are calculated and sketched in Figure 65.




Figure 65. The logarithmic y-axis current-voltage characteristics of SBDs with 20 sec and 40 sec recess etches under Schottky contact and the regions where the total current is dominated by Fowler-Nordheim tunneling process.

As shown in this figure, the Fowler-Nordheim tunneling is dominant for a wider bias voltage range in 40 sec etched sample compared to the 20 sec etched sample. This is due to the thinner AlGa_N layer of 40 sec etched sample which provides a shorter tunneling width, increasing the tunneling probability.

Poole-Frenkle emission of trapped electrons in AlGa_N can also contribute to the total current [80]. The current due to Poole-Frenkle emission is proportional to [80]

$$J_{PF} \propto E_{AlGaN} \exp\left[-\frac{q}{kT}(\phi_t - \sqrt{qE_{AlGaN} / \pi\epsilon_0\epsilon_{AlGaN}})\right], \quad (43)$$

in which ϵ_0 is the electric permittivity of vacuum and ϵ_{AlGaN} is the relative electric permittivity of AlGa_N. Eq.43 implies that the linear portions of the plot of the $\ln(I/E_{AlGaN})$ versus $(E_{AlGaN})^{1/2}$ shows the regions where the total current is dominated by the Poole-Frenkle emission. The slope of the tangent line to find the regions where the total current is dominated by Poole-Frenkle emission is derived from Eq.43 as

$$PF_{Slope} = \frac{q}{kT} \sqrt{qE_{AlGaN} / \pi\epsilon_0\epsilon_{AlGaN}}. \quad (44)$$

In order to find the regions where the total current is dominated by Poole-Frenkle emission, $\ln(I/E_{AlGaN})$ is sketched versus $E^{1/2}_{AlGaN}$ (Figure 66).




Figure 66. The plot of $\ln(I/E_{AlGaN})$ versus the square root of $E_{AlGaN}^{0.5}$ for SBDs with 20 sec and 40 sec recess etches under Schottky contact to find the regions where the total current is dominated Poole-Frenkle emission.

The 40 sec etched sample does not satisfy the slope requirement of Poole-Frenkle emission for positive biases and only the 20 sec etched sample satisfies the slope requirement.

From Figure 66, the voltage interval at which the total current is dominated by Poole-Frenkle emission is obtained as shown in Figure 67.




Figure 67. The logarithmic y-axis current-voltage characteristics of SBDs with 20 sec and 40 sec recess etches under Schottky contact and the region where the total current is dominated by Poole-Frenkle emission.

In addition to Poole-Frenkle emission and Fowler-Nordheim tunneling, there is the trap assisted tunneling which is a two-step tunneling process via traps in AlGaN. In this kind of tunneling, electrons from the 2DEG at AlGaN/GaN interface can tunnel into the traps in AlGaN at positive bias and then into the metal. The trap assisted tunneling current density is proportional to [80]

$$J_{TAT} \propto \exp\left(-\frac{8\pi\sqrt{2qm_{AlGaN}}}{3hE_{AlGaN}}\phi_t^{3/2}\right), \quad (45)$$

where ϕ_t is the trap state energy, m_{AlGaN} is electron mass in AlGaN, h is the Plank constant, E_{AlGaN} is the electric field in AlGaN and q is the electron charge. The linear

portions of the plot of the $\ln(I)$ versus $1/E_{AlGaN}$ reflect the regions that the total current is dominated by trap assisted tunneling mechanism. The slope of the tangent line is derived from Eq.45 as

$$TAT_{Slope} = -\frac{8\pi\sqrt{2qm_{AlGaN}}}{3h}\phi_t^{3/2}. \quad (46)$$

In our sample, the trap state energy, ϕ_t , is varying as illustrated in Figure 57, providing various allowed TAT slopes. Figure 68 illustrates the plot of $\ln(I)$ versus $1/E_{AlGaN}$.




Figure 68. The plot of $\ln(I)$ versus $1/E_{AlGaN}$ for SBDs with 20 sec and 40 sec recess etches under Schottky contact to find the regions where the total current is dominated by trap-assisted tunneling process.

Since there are different allowed slopes for TAT graph, it is not possible to determine the regions dominated by this tunneling mechanism. Therefore, different current mechanisms for both samples are determined as illustrated in Figure 69.




Figure 69. The logarithmic y-axis current-voltage characteristics of SBDs with 20 sec and 40 sec recess etches under Schottky contact and the regions where the total current is dominated by Fowler-Nordheim tunneling and Poole-Frenkle emission.

As illustrated in this figure, for the sample with thinner AlGa_N (40 sec etched), the Fowler-Nordheim tunneling starts to get dominant at a lower bias. This is due to the shorter tunneling width of 40 sec etched sample which increases the tunneling probability. The current mechanisms in the negative regime have not been investigated because applying a negative bias partially or totally depletes the 2DEG underneath the Schottky contact. Therefore, it can not be assumed that the applied bias drops entirely across the AlGa_N and there is a voltage drop across the depletion region that needs to be taken into account.

The Fowler-Nordheim tunneling process that has been characterized in both samples is occurring at the ON state of TMOSHFET. This is because the gate is positively biased at the ON state. Therefore, structure optimization to increase the amount of this current enhances the device switch ON speed and improves the device performance. This can be done by appropriate selection of AlGa_N thickness and Al mole fraction underneath the gate.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY

In this dissertation, the Structure of Tunnel MOS Heterostructure FET (TMOSHFET) is introduced and its operation is analyzed. A model is developed to design the source and drain regions of AlGa_N/Ga_N HEMTs and TMOSHFET taking into account the polarization electric fields and surface passivation effects. This model is verified by non-contact Hall 2DEG measurements of fabricated samples.

To form the source and drain contacts of TMOSHFET, the Ti/Al/Ni/Au Ohmic contacts to Ga_N are demonstrated and their current-voltage characteristics are characterized. A dry etching recipe to recess the gate region of TMOSHFET is implemented and its impacts on AlGa_N trap density and time constant are characterized.

To understand different current mechanisms in the gate region of TMOSHFET, AlGa_N/Ga_N Schottky Barrier Diodes (SBDs) with different recess etches under the Schottky contact are fabricated and their I-V plots are characterized.

REFERENCES

1. Burnham, S.D., et al., *Reliability of T-gate AlGaN/GaN HEMTs*. Physica Status Solidi (c), 2011. **8**(7-8): p. 2399-2403.
2. Gillespie, J., et al., *AlGaN/GaN ohmic contact resistance variations across epitaxial suppliers*. Solid-State Electronics, 2005. **49**(4): p. 670-672.
3. Ambacher, O., et al., *Two-dimensional electron gases induced by spontaneous and piezoelectric polarization charges in N- and Ga-face AlGaN/GaN heterostructures*. Journal of Applied Physics, 1999. **85**(6): p. 3222-3233.
4. Zhang, N., *High voltage GaN HEMTs with low on-resistance for switching applications*. PhD Dissertation UCSB, Santa Barbara, CA, 2006, p. 2.
5. Tipirneni, N., et al., *The 1.6-kV AlGaN/GaN HFETs*. Electron Device Letters, IEEE, 2006. **27**(9): p. 716-718.
6. Kao, T.T., et al., *2.5-ampere AlGaN/GaN HFETs on Si substrates with breakdown voltage >1,250V*. Proceedings of CS MANTECH Conference, Indian Wells, CA, 2011.
7. Zhang, N.Q., et al., *Kilovolt AlGaN/GaN HEMTs as switching devices*. Physica Status Solidi (a), 2001. **188**(1): p. 213-217.
8. Tipirneni, N., et al., *Silicon dioxide-encapsulated high-voltage AlGaN/GaN HFETs for power-switching applications*. Electron Device Letters, IEEE, 2007. **28**(9): p. 784-786.
9. Srivastava, P., et al., *Silicon substrate removal of GaN DHFETs for enhanced (<1100 V) breakdown voltage*. Electron Device Letters, IEEE, 2010. **31**(8): p. 851-853.
10. Bin, L. and T. Palacios, *High Breakdown (>1500V) AlGaN/GaN HEMTs by substrate-transfer technology*. Electron Device Letters, IEEE, 2010. **31**(9): p. 951-953.
11. Ikeda, N., et al. *High-power AlGaN/GaN MIS-HFETs with field-plates on Si substrates*. in Power Semiconductor Devices & IC's, 2009. ISPSD 2009. 21st International Symposium on., Barcelona, Spain, 2009: p. 251-254.

12. Arulkumaran, S., et al., *Improved power device figure-of-merit ($4.0 \times 10^2 \text{ V}^2 \cdot \text{Ohms}^{-1} \text{ cm}^2$) in AlGaIn/GaN high-electron-mobility transistors on high-resistivity 4-in. Si*. Appl. Phys. Express, 2011. **4**(8): p. 084101.
13. Huang, W., et al. *Lateral Implanted RESURF GaN MOSFETs with BV up to 2.5 kV*. in *Power Semiconductor Devices and IC's, 2008. ISPSD '08. 20th International Symposium on.*, Orlando, FL, 2008: p. 291-294.
14. Kuraguchi, M., et al., *High breakdown voltage AlGaIn/GaN MIS-HFET with low leakage current*. Physica Status Solidi (c), 2005. **2**(7): p. 2647-2650.
15. Hikita, M., et al. *350V/150A AlGaIn/GaN power HFET on silicon substrate with source-via grounding (SVG) structure*. in *Electron Devices Meeting, 2004. IEDM Technical Digest. IEEE International.*, San Francisco, CA, 2004: p. 803-806.
16. Uemoto, Y., et al., *Recent advances of high voltage AlGaIn/GaN power HFETs*. Proceedings of SPIE, San Jose, CA, 2009: p. 721606-721606.
17. Kuzmík, J., *InAlN/(In)GaIn high electron mobility transistors: some aspects of the quantum well heterostructure proposal*. Semiconductor Science and Technology, 2002. **17**(6): p. 540.
18. Roberts, J.C., et al., *AlGaIn transition layers on Si (111) substrates - observations of microstructure and impact on material quality*. MRS Online Proceedings Library, 2008. **1068**.
19. Ibbetson, J.P., et al., *Polarization effects, surface states, and the source of electrons in AlGaIn/GaN heterostructure field effect transistors*. Applied Physics Letters, 2000. **77**(2): p. 250-252.
20. Smorchkova, I.P., et al., *Polarization-induced charge and electron mobility in AlGaIn/GaN heterostructures grown by plasma-assisted molecular-beam epitaxy*. Journal of Applied Physics, 1999. **86**(8): p. 4520-4526.
21. Lee, K.S., et al., *Self-consistent subband calculations of AlGaIn/GaN single heterojunctions*. ETRI Journal, 2002. **24**: p. 270-279.
22. Shi, C., P.M. Asbeck, and E.T. Yu, *Piezoelectric polarization associated with dislocations in wurtzite GaN*. Applied Physics Letters, 1999. **74**(4): p. 573-575.

23. Ambacher, O., et al., *Two dimensional electron gases induced by spontaneous and piezoelectric polarization in undoped and doped AlGaIn/GaN heterostructures*. Journal of Applied Physics, 2000. **87**(1): p. 334-344.
24. Arulkumaran, S., et al., *Electrical characteristics of AlGaIn/GaN HEMTs on 4-in diameter sapphire substrate*. Electron Device Letters, IEEE, 2003. **24**(8): p. 497-499.
25. Aust, M.V., et al. *A high efficiency and high linearity 20 GHz InP HBT monolithic power amplifier for phased array applications*. in Microwave Symposium, 2007. IEEE/MTT-S International., Honolulu, HI, 2007: p. 809-812.
26. Bae, C., et al., *Surface passivation of n-GaN by nitrided-thin-Ga₂O₃/SiO₂ and Si₃N₄ films*. Journal of Applied Physics, 2004. **96**(5): p. 2674-2680.
27. Asbeck, P.M., et al., *Enhancement of base conductivity via the piezoelectric effect in AlGaIn/GaN HBTs*. Solid-State Electronics, 2000. **44**(2): p. 211-219.
28. Asbeck, P.M., et al., *Piezoelectric charge densities in AlGaIn/GaN HFETs*. Electronics Letters, 1997. **33**(14): p. 1230-1231.
29. Matthews, J.W. and A.E. Blakeslee, *Defects in epitaxial multilayers: III. Preparation of almost perfect multilayers*. Journal of Crystal Growth, 1976. **32**(2): p. 265-273.
30. Bernardini, F., V. Fiorentini, and D. Vanderbilt, *Spontaneous polarization and piezoelectric constants of III-V nitrides*. Physical Review B, 1997. **56**(16): p. R10024-R10027.
31. Suzuki, N. and N. Iizuka, *Effect of polarization field on intersubband transition in AlGaIn/GaN quantum wells*. Jpn. J. Appl. Phys., 1999. **38**(Part 2, No. 4A): p. L363.
32. Park, S.-H. and S.-L. Chuang, *Spontaneous polarization effects in wurtzite GaIn/AlGaIn quantum wells and comparison with experiment*. Applied Physics Letters, 2000. **76**(15): p. 1981-1983.
33. Leroux, M., et al., *Barrier-width dependence of group-III nitrides quantum-well transition energies*. Physical Review B, 1999. **60**(3): p. 1496-1499.

34. Shealy, J.R., et al., *Growth and passivation of AlGaIn/GaN heterostructures*. Journal of Crystal Growth, 2003. **250**(1–2): p. 7-13.
35. Prunty, T.R., et al. *Passivation of AlGaIn/GaN heterostructures with silicon nitride for insulated gate transistors*. in High Performance Devices, 2000. Proceedings. 2000 IEEE/Cornell Conference on., Ithaca, NY, 2000: p. 208-214.
36. Byung-Hwan, C., et al., *Wireless detection system for glucose and pH sensing in exhaled breath condensate using AlGaIn/GaN high electron mobility transistors*. Sensors Journal, IEEE, 2010. **10**(1): p. 64-70.
37. Chang, C.Y., et al., *CO₂ detection using polyethylenimine/starch functionalized AlGaIn/GaN high electron mobility transistors*. Applied Physics Letters, 2008. **92**(23): p. 232102-3.
38. Fitch, R., et al., *Effect of silicon nitride PECVD growth on AlGaIn/GaN HEMT dispersion and breakdown characteristics*. Electrochemical Society Proceedings. **2004-6**: p. 459-465.
39. Karoutaa, F., et al., *Influence of the structural and compositional properties of PECVD silicon nitride layers on the passivation of AlGaIn/GaN HEMTs*. ECS Transactions, 2008. **16**(7): p. 181-191.
40. Liu, Z.H., G.I. Ng, and S. Arulkumaran, *Mechanism of increased high-frequency channel noise with PECVD SiN passivation in AlGaIn/GaN HEMTs*. Electron Device Letters, IEEE, 2009. **30**(11): p. 1122-1124.
41. Gatabi, I.R., et al., *PECVD silicon nitride passivation of AlGaIn/GaN heterostructures*. Electron Devices, IEEE Transactions on, 2013. **60**(3): p. 1082-1087.
42. Yu, L.S., et al., *Ni and Ti Schottky barriers on n-AlGaIn grown on SiC substrates*. Applied Physics Letters, 1998. **73**(2): p. 238-240.
43. Martin, G., et al., *Valence-band discontinuity between GaN and AlN measured by x-ray photoemission spectroscopy*. Applied Physics Letters, 1994. **65**(5): p. 610-612.
44. Martin, G., et al., *Valence-band discontinuities of wurtzite GaN, AlN, and InN heterojunctions measured by x-ray photoemission spectroscopy*. Applied Physics Letters, 1996. **68**(18): p. 2541-2543.

45. Asgari, A., M. Kalafi, and L. Faraone, *A quasi-two-dimensional charge transport model of AlGaN/GaN high electron mobility transistors (HEMTs)*. Physica E: Low-dimensional Systems and Nanostructures, 2005. **28**(4): p. 491-499.
46. Kudrawiec, R., et al., *Electromodulation spectroscopy of optical transitions and electric field distribution in GaN/AlGaN/GaN transistor heterostructures with various AlGaN layer thicknesses*. Physica Status Solidi (c), 2012. **9**(3-4): p. 1092-1095.
47. Gladysiewicz, M. and R. Kudrawiec, *Distribution of built-in electric field in GaN(cap)/AlGaN/GaN(buffer) transistor heterostructures with various AlGaN thicknesses*. Physica Status Solidi (c), 2012. **9**(3-4): p. 883-886.
48. Arulkumaran, S., G.I. Ng, and Z.H. Liu, *Effect of gate-source and gate-drain Si₃N₄ passivation on current collapse in AlGaN/GaN high-electron-mobility transistors on silicon*. Applied Physics Letters, 2007. **90**(17): p. 173504-3.
49. Arulkumaran, S., et al., *Sheet carrier density enhancement by Si₃N₄ passivation on nonpolar a-plane (112-0) sapphire grown AlGaN/GaN heterostructures*. Applied Physics Letters, 2008. **92**(9): p. 092116-3.
50. Wu, Y.Q., et al., *Photo-assisted capacitance-voltage characterization of high-quality atomic-layer-deposited Al₂O₃/GaN metal-oxide-semiconductor structures*. Applied Physics Letters, 2007. **90**(14): p. 143504-3.
51. Ostermaier, C., et al., *Interface characterization of ALD deposited Al₂O₃ on GaN by CV method*. Physica Status Solidi (c), 2008. **5**(6): p. 1992-1994.
52. Perez-Tomas, A., et al., *GaN metal-oxide-semiconductor field-effect transistor inversion channel mobility modeling*. Journal of Applied Physics, 2009. **105**(11): p. 114510-6.
53. Baliga, B.J., *Semiconductors for high-voltage, vertical channel field-effect transistors*. Journal of Applied Physics, 1982. **53**(3): p. 1759-1764.
54. Baliga, B.J., *Power semiconductor device figure of merit for high-frequency applications*. Electron Device Letters, IEEE, 1989. **10**(10): p. 455-457.
55. Ikeda, N., et al., *GaN power transistors on Si substrates for switching applications*. Proceedings of the IEEE, 2010. **98**(7): p. 1151-1161.

56. Alekseev, E. and D. Pavlidis, *DC and high-frequency performance of AlGa_N/Ga_N Heterojunction Bipolar Transistors*. Solid-State Electronics, 2000. **44**(2): p. 245-252.
57. Piprek, J., *Nitride semiconductor devices: principles and simulations*. Wiley Publications, San Francisco, CA, 2007: Chapter 10, p. 222-224.
58. Green, B.M., et al., *The effect of surface passivation on the microwave characteristics of undoped AlGa_N/Ga_N HEMTs*. Electron Device Letters, IEEE, 2000. **21**(6): p. 268-270.
59. Chung, S.K., *Analytic model for field-plate-edge breakdown of planar devices terminated with field plate and semiresistive layer*. Science, Measurement and Technology, IEE Proceedings -, 2004. **151**(1): p. 21-24.
60. Saito, W., et al., *Influence of surface defect charge at AlGa_N-Ga_N-HEMT upon Schottky gate leakage current and breakdown voltage*. Electron Devices, IEEE Transactions on, 2005. **52**(2): p. 159-164.
61. Nishikawa, A., et al., *Critical electric fields of AlGa_N in AlGa_N-based vertical conducting diodes on -SiC substrates*. Superlattices and Microstructures, 2006. **40**(4-6): p. 332-337.
62. Charfeddine, M., et al., *2-D theoretical model for current-voltage characteristics in AlGa_N/Ga_N HEMT's*. Journal of Modern Physics, 2012. **3**: p. 881-886.
63. Karmalkar, S. and U.K. Mishra, *Enhancement of breakdown voltage in AlGa_N/Ga_N high electron mobility transistors using a field plate*. Electron Devices, IEEE Transactions on, 2001. **48**(8): p. 1515-1521.
64. Palankovski, V., S. Vitanov, and R. Quay. *Field-plate optimization of AlGa_N/Ga_N HEMTs*. in Compound Semiconductor Integrated Circuit Symposium, 2006. CSIC 2006. IEEE., San Antonio, TX, 2006: p. 107-110.
65. Benbakhti, B., M. Rousseau, and J.C. De Jaeger. *Study of Field Plate AlGa_N/Ga_N HEMTs by Means of a 2D-Hydrdynamic Model for Power Applications*. in *European Microwave Integrated Circuits Conference, 2006. The 1st.*, Manchester, UK, 2006: p. 363-366.
66. Qin, Z.X., et al., *Study of Ti/Au, Ti/Al/Au, and Ti/Al/Ni/Au ohmic contacts to n-Ga_N*. Applied Physics A, 2004. **78**(5): p. 729-731.

67. Papanicolaou, N.A., et al., *Reliable Ti/Al and Ti/Al/Ni/Au ohmic contacts to n-type GaN formed by vacuum annealing*. Journal of Vacuum Science & Technology B: Microelectronics and Nanometer Structures, 2001. **19**(1): p. 261-267.
68. Jacobs, B., et al., *Optimisation of the Ti/Al/Ni/Au ohmic contact on AlGaIn/GaN FET structures*. Journal of Crystal Growth, 2002. **241**(1–2): p. 15-18.
69. Xin, H.P., et al., *Optimization of AlGaIn/GaN HEMT ohmic contacts for improved surface morphology with low contact resistance*. Proc. of CS MANTECH Conference, Portland, OR, 2010: p. 149-152.
70. Sreenidhi, T., et al., *Reactive ion etching of GaN in SF₆ + Ar and SF₆ + N₂ plasma*. Semiconductor Science and Technology, 2008. **23**(12): p. 125019.
71. Cheung, R., et al., *Etch mechanism and etch-induced effects in the inductively coupled plasma etching of GaN*. Journal of Vacuum Science & Technology B: Microelectronics and Nanometer Structures, 2003. **21**(4): p. 1268-1272.
72. Rong, B., et al. *Inductively coupled plasma etching of GaN and its effect on electrical characteristics*. Journal of Vacuum Science & Technology B: Microelectronics and Nanometer Structures, 2001. **19**(6): p. 2917-2920..
73. Basak, D., et al., *Reactive ion etching of GaN layers using SF₆*. Semiconductor Science and Technology, 1997. **12**(12): p. 1654.
74. Stoklas, R., et al., *Investigation of trapping effects in AlGaIn/GaN/Si field-effect transistors by frequency dependent capacitance and conductance analysis*. Applied Physics Letters, 2008. **93**(12): p. 124103-3.
75. Kordos, P., et al., *Characterization of AlGaIn/GaN metal-oxide-semiconductor field-effect transistors by frequency dependent conductance analysis*. Applied Physics Letters, 2009. **94**(22): p. 223512-3.
76. Huang, W., T. Khan, and T. Paul Chow, *Comparison of MOS capacitors on n- and p-type GaN*. Journal of Electronic Materials, 2006. **35**(4): p. 726-732.
77. Schroder, D.K., *Semiconductor material and device characterization*. Wiley Publications, San Francisco, CA, 2006: Chapter 6, p. 310-387.

78. Li, B.K., et al., *Electroluminescence from a forward biased Ni/Au–AlGaIn/GaN Schottky diode: evidence of Fermi level de-pinning at Ni/AlGaIn interface*. Physica Status Solidi (c), 2010. **7**(7-8): p. 1961-1963.
79. Lv, Y., et al., *Extraction of AlGaIn/GaN heterostructure Schottky diode barrier heights from forward current-voltage characteristics*. Journal of Applied Physics, 2011. **109**(7): p. 074512-6.
80. Chen, C.H., et al., *A new and simple model for GaAs heterojunction FET gate characteristics*. Electron Devices, IEEE Transactions on, 1988. **35**(5): p. 570-577.

APPENDIX A

SENTAURUS MATERIAL PARAMETER FILE USED IN SIMULATIONS

Following material parameters are from the Synopsys-Sentaurus example files which are used in our simulations.

```
Material = "GaN" {
```

```
***** Dielectric Constant: *****
```

```
Epsilon
```

```
{ * Ratio of the permittivities of material and vacuum
```

```
  * epsilon() = epsilon
    epsilon = 9.5
```

```
}
```

```
Epsilon_aniso
```

```
{ * Ratio of the permittivities of material and vacuum
```

```
  * epsilon() = epsilon
    epsilon = 10.4 # [1]
```

```
}
```

```
***** Lattice Heat Capacity: *****
```

```
LatticeHeatCapacity
```

```
{ * lumped electron-hole-lattice heat capacity
```

```
  * cv() = cv + cv_b * T + cv_c * T^2 + cv_d * T^3
```

```
    cv      = 3.0                # [J/(K cm^3)]
    cv_b    = 0.0000e+00         # [J/(K^2 cm^3)]
    cv_c    = 0.0000e+00         # [J/(K^3 cm^3)]
    cv_d    = 0.0000e+00         # [J/(K^4 cm^3)]
```

```
}
```

```
***** Thermal Conductivity: *****
```

```
Kappa
```

```
{ * Lattice thermal conductivity
```

```
  Formula = 1
```

```
  * Formula = 1:
```

```
  * kappa() = kappa + kappa_b * T + kappa_c * T^2
```

```
    kappa = 1.3 # [W/(K cm)]
    kappa_b = 0.0000e+00 # [W/(K^2 cm)]
    kappa_c = 0.0000e+00 # [W/(K^3 cm)]
```



```
}
```

```
***** Hydro Parameters *****
```

```
EnergyRelaxationTime
```

```
{ * Energy relaxation times in picoseconds
```

```
Formula(tau_w)_ele = 3
```

```
Spline(tau_w)_ele {
```

```
0.0535    0.02921
```

```
0.0600    0.02927
```

```
0.0824    0.02941
```

```
0.102     0.03051
```

```
0.124     0.03179
```

```
0.155     0.03533
```

```
0.203     0.04224
```

```
0.267     0.05133
```

```
0.362     0.06543
```

```
0.467     0.07951
```

```
0.672     0.10620
```

```
0.974     0.13855
```

```
1.222     0.15871
```

```
1.400     0.16764
```

```
1.538     0.16912
```

```
1.625     0.16697
```

```
1.740     0.15494
```

```
1.820     0.14296
```

```
1.880     0.13077
```

```
1.932     0.11952
```

```
1.965     0.10944
```

```
1.980     0.10027
```

```
2.000     0.09286
```

```
2.100     0.04000
```

```
2.200     0.02000
```

```
2.300     0.01200
```

```
2.400     0.00800
```

```
2.500     0.00600
```

```
}
```

```
(tau_w)_hol = 0.2 # [ps]
```

```
}
```

```
EnergyFlux
```

```
{ * Coefficient in front of the energy flux equation
```

```
* energy_flux_coef=0.6 corresponds to Stratton model
```

```
energy_flux_coef_ele = 0.6 # [1]
```

```

        energy_flux_coef_hol = 0.6 # [1]
    }

ThermalDiffusion
{ * Thermal diffusion factor (0 <= td <= 1)
  * td=0. corresponds to Stratton model
    td_n   = 0.0000e+00 # [1]
    td_p   = 0.0000e+00 # [1]
}

HeatFlux
{ * Heat flux factor (0 <= hf <= 1)
  * Heat flux plays some role in the vertical reach of hot carriers.
  * The values of hf below are NOT calibrated
    hf_n   = 1.0 # [1]
    hf_p   = 1.0 # [1]
}

AvalancheFactors
{ * Coefficientss for avalanche generation with hydro
  * Factors n_l_f, p_l_f for energy relaxation length in the expressions
  * for effective electric field for avalanche generation
  * eEeff = eEeff / n_l_f ( or b = b*n_l_f )
  * hEeff = hEeff / p_l_f ( or b = b*p_l_f )
  * Additional coefficients n_gamma, p_gamma, n_delta, p_delta
    n_l_f   = 0.8 # [1]
    p_l_f   = 0.8 # [1]
    n_gamma = 0.0000e+00 # [1]
    p_gamma = 0.0000e+00 # [1]
    n_delta = 0.0000e+00 # [1]
    p_delta = 0.0000e+00 # [1]
}

***** Bandgap *****
Bandgap
{ * Eg = Eg0 + alpha Tpar2 / (beta + Tpar) - alpha T2 / (beta + T)
  * Parameter 'Tpar' specifies the value of lattice
  * temperature, at which parameters below are defined
  * Chi0 is electron affinity.
    Chi0   = 3.4 # [eV]
    Bgn2Chi = 0.5 # [1]
    Eg0    = 3.47 # [eV]
    alpha  = 7.40e-04 # [eV K^-1]
    beta   = 6.00e+02 # [K]
}

```

```

    Tpar = 0.0000e+00          # [K]
}

```

eDOSMass

```

{
* For effective mass specification Formula1 (me approximation):
* or Formula2 (Nc300) can be used :
    Formula = 2 # [1]
* Formula2:
* me/m0 = (Nc300/2.540e19)2/3
* Nc(T) = Nc300 * (T/300)3/2
    Nc300 = 2.65e18          # [cm-3]
* mass=0.222*mo
}

```

hDOSMass

```

{
* For effective mass specification Formula1 (mh approximation):
* or Formula2 (Nv300) can be used :
    Formula = 2 # [1]
* Formula2:
* mh/m0 = (Nv300/2.540e19)2/3
* Nv(T) = Nv300 * (T/300)3/2
    Nv300 = 2.5e19          # [cm-3]
*mass=1.0*mo
}

```

```

***** Mobility Models: *****
* mu_lowfield^(-1) = mu_dop(mu_max)^(-1) + mu_Enorm^(-1) + mu_cc^(-1)
* Variable = electron value , hole value # [units]
*****

```

ConstantMobility:

```

{ * mu_const = mumax (T/T0)^(-Exponent)
    mumax= 1200 , 2.0000e+01 # [cm2/(Vs)]
    Exponent = 1 , 2.1 # [1]
}

```

DopingDependence:

```

{
* For doping dependent mobility model three formulas
* can be used. Formula1 is based on Masetti et al. approximation.
* Formula2 uses approximation, suggested by Arora.
    formula = 1 , 1 # [1]
}

```

```

* If formula=1, model suggested by Masetti et al. is used:
* mu_dop = mumin1 exp(-Pc/N) + (mu_const - mumin2)/(1+(N/Cr)^alpha)
*           - mu1/(1+(Cs/N)^beta)
* with mu_const from ConstantMobility
  mumin1      = 85, 33                                # [cm2/Vs]
  mumin2      = 75, 0.00E+00                          # [cm2/Vs]
  mu1         = 50, 20                                # [cm2/Vs]
  Pc          = 6.50E+15, 5.00E+15                    # [cm3]
  Cr          = 9.50E+16, 8.00E+16                    # [cm3]
  Cs          = 7.20E+19, 8.00E+20                    # [cm3]
  alpha       = 0.55, 0.55                            # [1]
  beta        = 0.75, 0.7                             # [1]

* If formula=2, model suggested by Arora is used:
***** Not Calibrated *****
***** Parameters Below are for InN *****
* mu_dop = muminA + mudA/(1.+(N/N00)^AA),
* where muminA=Ar_mumin*(T/T0)^Ar_alm; mudA = Ar_mud*(T/T0)^Ar_ald
* N is net doping
* N00=Ar_N0*(T/T0)^Ar_alN; AA = Ar_a*(T/T0)^Ar_ala
}

```

HighFieldDependence:

```

{ * Caughey-Thomas model:
* mu_highfield = mu_lowfield / ( 1 + (mu_lowfield E / vsat)^beta )/beta
* beta = beta0 (T/T0)^betaexp.
  beta0       = 1.7 , 1.7                             # [1]
  betaexp     = 0.0000e+00 , 0.0000e+00              # [1]

* Smoothing parameter for HydroHighField Caughey-Thomas model:
* if Tl < Tc < (1+K_dT)*Tl, then smoothing between low field mobility
* and HydroHighField mobility is used.
  K_dT       = 0.01 ,0.01                             # [1]

* Transferred-Electron Effect:
* mu_highfield = (mu_lowfield+(vsat/E)*(E/E0_TrEf4)/(1+(E/E0_TrEf4)
  E0_TrEf    = 1.5000e+05 , 1.5000e+05              # [1]
  Ksmooth_TrEf = 1 , 1                               # [1]

* For vsat either Formula1 or Formula2 can be used.
  Vsat_Formula = 2 , 2                               # [1]
* Formula2 for saturation velocity:
* vsat = A_vsatsat - B_vsatsat*(T/T0)
* (Parameter Vsat_Formula has to be equal to 2):

```

```

* Obs: experiments seem to confirm a lower vsat for the 2D electron gas than bulk
  A_vsat = 1.5e7 ,      2.1000e+07      # [1]
  B_vsat = 0 ,      0      # [1]
  vsat_min = 5.000e+05 , 5.000e+05      # [1]
}

***** Recombination/Generation Models: *****
* Variable = electron value , hole value      # [unit]
*****

Scharfetter * relation and trap level for SRH recombination:
{ * tau = taumin + ( taumax - taumin ) / ( 1 + ( N/Nref )^gamma
  * tau(T) = tau * ( (T/300)^Talpha )      (TempDep)
  * tau(T) = tau * exp( Tcoeff * ((T/300)-1) ) (ExpTempDep)
    taumin = 0.0000e+00 ,      0.0000e+00      # [s]
    taumax = 1.0000e-9 , 1.0000e-9      # [s]
    Nref = 1.0000e+16 ,      1.0000e+16      # [cm^(-3)]
    gamma = 1 , 1      # [1]
    Talpha = -1.5000e+00 ,      -1.5000e+00      # [1]
    Tcoeff = 2.55 ,      2.55      # [1]
    Etrap = 0.0000e+00      # [eV]
}

vanOverstraetendeMan * Impact Ionization:
{ * G_impact = alpha_n n v_drift_n + alpha_p p v_drift_p
  * with alpha = gamma a exp(-b gamma/E) for E<E0 (low) and E>E0 (high)
  * with gamma = tanh(hbarOmega/(2kT0)) / tanh(hbarOmega/(2kT))
    a(low) = 2.9e+08 ,      1.3400e+08      # [1/cm]
    a(high) = 2.9e+08 ,      1.3400e+08      # [1/cm]
    b(low) = 3.4e+07 ,      2.0300e+07      # [V/cm]
    b(high) = 3.4e+07 ,      2.0300e+07      # [V/cm]
    E0 = 4.0000e+05 ,      4.0000e+05      # [V/cm]
    hbarOmega = 0.035 ,      0.035      # [eV]
}

QuantumPotentialParameters
{ * gamma: weighting factor for quantum potential
  * theta: weight for quadratic term
  * xi: weight for quasi Fermi potential
  * eta: weight for electrostatic potential
    gamma = 1.41, 5.6      # [1]
    theta = 0.5 , 0.5      # [1]
    xi = 1 , 1      # [1]
    eta = 1 , 1      # [1]
}

```

Auger * coefficients:

```
{ * R_Auger = ( C_n n + C_p p ) ( n p - ni_eff^2)
  * with C_n,p = (A + B (T/T0) + C (T/T0)^2) (1 + H exp(-{n,p}/N0))
    A      = 1.0000e-30 , 1.0000e-30 # [cm^6/s]
    B      = 0.0000e+00 , 0.0000e+00 # [cm^6/s]
    C      = 0.0000e+00 , 0.0000e+00 # [cm^6/s]
    H      = 0.0000e+00 , 0.0000e+00 # [1]
    N0     = 1.0000e+18 , 1.0000e+18 # [cm^(-3)]
}
```

RadiativeRecombination * coefficients:

```
{ * R_Radiative = C (n p - ni_eff^2)
  C      = 2.0000e-10 # [cm^3/s]
}
}
```

Material = "AlGaN" {

* Mole dependent material: AlGaN (x=0) = GaN

* Mole dependent material: AlGaN (x=1) = AlN

* Not calibrated.

* No values available in the literature

EnergyRelaxationTime

```
{ * Energy relaxation times in picoseconds
  (tau_w)_ele = 0.05 # [ps]
  (tau_w)_hol = 0.1 # [ps]
}
```

EnergyFlux

```
{ * Coefficient in front of the energy flux equation
  * energy_flux_coef=0.6 corresponds to Stratton model
  energy_flux_coef_ele = 0.6 # [1]
  energy_flux_coef_hol = 0.6 # [1]
}
```

ThermalDiffusion

```
{ * Thermal diffusion factor (0 <= td <= 1)
  * td=0. corresponds to Stratton model
  td_n = 0.0000e+00 # [1]
  td_p = 0.0000e+00 # [1]
}
```

HeatFlux

```
{ * Heat flux factor (0 <= hf <= 1)
    hf_n = 1.0 # [1]
    hf_p = 1.0 # [1]
}
```

QuantumPotentialParameters

```
{ * gamma: weighting factor for quantum potential
  * theta: weight for quadratic term
  * xi: weight for quasi Fermi potential
  * eta: weight for electrostatic potential
    gamma= 1.9 , 5.6 # [1]
    theta = 0.5 , 0.5 # [1]
    xi = 1 , 1 # [1]
    eta = 1 , 1 # [1]
}
```

Scharfetter * relation and trap level for SRH recombination:

```
{ * tau = taumin + ( taumax - taumin ) / ( 1 + ( N/Nref )^gamma)
  * tau(T) = tau * ( (T/300)^Talpha ) (TempDep)
  * tau(T) = tau * exp( Tcoeff * ((T/300)-1) ) (ExpTempDep)
    taumin = 0.0000e+00 , 0.0000e+00 # [s]
    taumax = 1.0000e-09 , 1.0000e-09 # [s]
    Nref = 1.0000e+16 , 1.0000e+16 # [cm^(-3)]
    gamma = 1 , 1 # [1]
    Talpha = 0.0000e+00 , 0.0000e+00 # [1]
    Tcoeff = 0.0000e+00 , 0.0000e+00 # [1]
    Etrap = 0.0000e+00 # [eV]
}
```

Auger * coefficients:

```
{ * R_Auger = ( C_n n + C_p p ) ( n p - ni_eff^2)
  * with C_n,p = ( A + B (T/T0) + C (T/T0)^2 ) ( 1 + H exp(-{n,p}/N0) )
    A = 1.0000e-30 , 1.0000e-30 # [cm^6/s]
    B = 0.0000e+00 , 0.0000e+00 # [cm^6/s]
    C = 0.0000e+00 , 0.0000e+00 # [cm^6/s]
    H = 0.0000e+00 , 0.0000e+00 # [1]
    N0 = 1.0000e+18 , 1.0000e+18 # [cm^(-3)]
}
```

RadiativeRecombination * coefficients:

```
{ * R_Radiative = C ( n p - ni_eff^2)
    C = 2.0000e-10 # [cm^3/s]
```

```

}
}
Material = "AlN" {

***** Dielectric Constant: *****

Epsilon
{ * Ratio of the permittivities of material and vacuum

* epsilon() = epsilon
  epsilon = 8.5          # [1]
}

Epsilon_aniso
{ * Ratio of the permittivities of material and vacuum

* epsilon() = epsilon
  epsilon = 10.7        # [1]
}

***** Lattice Heat Capacity: *****

LatticeHeatCapacity
{ * lumped electron-hole-lattice heat capacity
* cv() = cv + cv_b * T + cv_c * T^2 + cv_d * T^3
  cv      = 1.94          # [J/(K cm^3)]
  cv_b    = 0.0000e+00    # [J/(K^2 cm^3)]
  cv_c    = 0.0000e+00    # [J/(K^3 cm^3)]
  cv_d    = 0.0000e+00    # [J/(K^4 cm^3)]
}

***** Thermal Conductivity: *****

Kappa
{ * Lattice thermal conductivity

Formula = 1
* Formula = 1:
* kappa() = kappa + kappa_b * T + kappa_c * T^2
  kappa   = 2.85          # [W/(K cm)]
  kappa_b = 0.0000e+00    # [W/(K^2 cm)]
  kappa_c = 0.0000e+00    # [W/(K^3 cm)]
}

***** Hydro Parameters *****

```


EnergyRelaxationTime

```
{ * Energy relaxation times in picoseconds
    (tau_w)_ele = 0.05 # [ps]
    (tau_w)_hol = 0.1 # [ps]
}
```

EnergyFlux

```
{ * Coefficient in front of the energy flux equation
  * energy_flux_coef=0.6 corresponds to Stratton model
    energy_flux_coef_ele = 0.6 # [1]
    energy_flux_coef_hol = 0.6 # [1]
}
```

ThermalDiffusion

```
{ * Thermal diffusion factor (0 <= td <= 1)
  * td=0. corresponds to Stratton model
    td_n = 0.0000e+00 # [1]
    td_p = 0.0000e+00 # [1]
}
```

HeatFlux

```
{ * Heat flux factor (0 <= hf <= 1)
    hf_n = 0.5 # [1]
    hf_p = 0.5 # [1]
}
```

AvalancheFactors

```
{ * Coefficientss for avalanche generation with hydro
  * Factors n_l_f, p_l_f for energy relaxation length in the expressions
  * for effective electric field for avalanche generation
  * eEff = eEff / n_l_f ( or b = b*n_l_f )
  * hEff = hEff / p_l_f ( or b = b*p_l_f )
  * Additional coefficients n_gamma, p_gamma, n_delta, p_delta
    n_l_f = 0.8 # [1]
    p_l_f = 0.8 # [1]
    n_gamma = 0.0000e+00 # [1]
    p_gamma = 0.0000e+00 # [1]
    n_delta= 0.0000e+00 # [1]
    p_delta= 0.0000e+00 # [1]
}
```

***** Bandgap *****

Bandgap

```

{ * Eg = Eg0 + alpha Tpar2 / (beta + Tpar) - alpha T2 / (beta + T)
  * Parameter 'Tpar' specifies the value of lattice
  * temperature, at which parameters below are defined
  * Chi0 is electron affinity.
    Chi0 = 1.9 # [eV]
    Eg0 = 6.2 # [eV]
    alpha = 1.7900e-03 # [eV K^-1]
    beta = 1.4620e+03 # [K]
    Tpar = 3.0000e+02 # [K]
}

```

eDOSMass

```

{
  * For effective mass specification Formula1 (me approximation):
  * or Formula2 (Nc300) can be used :
    Formula = 2 # [1]
  * Formula2:
  * me/m0 = (Nc300/2.540e19)^(2/3) = 0.3
  * Nc(T) = Nc300 * (T/300)^(3/2)
    a = 0.1905 # [1]
    ml = 0.9163 # [1]
    mm = 0.0000e+00 # [1]
    Nc300 = 4.10e18 # [cm^-3]
}

```

hDOSMass

```

{
  * For effective mass specification Formula1 (mh approximation):
  * or Formula2 (Nv300) can be used :
    Formula = 2 # [1]
  * Formula2:
  * mh/m0 = (Nv300/2.540e19)^(2/3) ~ 5.0
  * Nv(T) = Nv300 * (T/300)^(3/2)
    a = 0.443587 # [1]
    b = 3.6095e-03 # [K^-1]
    c = 1.1735e-04 # [K^-2]
    d = 1.2632e-06 # [K^-3]
    e = 3.0256e-09 # [K^-4]
    f = 4.6834e-03 # [K^-1]
    g = 2.2869e-04 # [K^-2]
    h = 7.4693e-07 # [K^-3]
    i = 1.7275e-09 # [K^-4]
    mm = 0.0000e+00 # [1]
    Nv300 = 2.8400e+20 # [cm^-3]
}

```

}

***** Mobility Models: *****

* $\mu_{lowfield}^{-1} = \mu_{dop}(\mu_{max})^{-1} + \mu_{Enorm}^{-1} + \mu_{cc}^{-1}$ *

* Variable = electron value , hole value # [units] *

ConstantMobility:

```
{ * mu_const = mumax (T/T0)^(-Exponent)
  Exponent = 1, 2.1 # [1]
  mumax= 300, 14 # [cm2/(Vs)]
}
```

DopingDependence:

```
{
  * For doping dependent mobility model three formulas
  * can be used. Formula1 is based on Masetti et al. approximation.
  * Formula2 uses approximation, suggested by Arora.
  formula = 1, 1 # [1]
  * If formula=1, model suggested by Masetti et al. is used:
  *  $\mu_{dop} = \mu_{min1} \exp(-Pc/N) + (\mu_{const} - \mu_{min2}) / (1 + (N/Cr)^\alpha)$ 
  *  $-\mu_1 / (1 + (Cs/N)^\beta)$ 
  * with mu_const from ConstantMobility
  mumin1 = 20, 11 # [cm2/Vs]
  mumin2 = 65, 0.00E+00 # [cm2/Vs]
  mu1 = 20, 10 # [cm2/Vs]
  Pc = 8.00E+17, 5.00E+18 # [cm3]
  Cr = 7.00E+16, 8.00E+17 # [cm3]
  Cs = 5.20E+17, 8.00E+18 # [cm3]
  alpha = 0.88, 1.05 # [1]
  beta = 0.75, 0.75 # [1]
}
```

* If formula=2, model suggested by Arora is used:

***** Not Callibrated *****

***** Parameters Below are for InN *****

* $\mu_{dop} = \mu_{minA} + \mu_{dA} / (1 + (N/N00)^{AA})$,

* where $\mu_{minA} = Ar_{mumin} * (T/T0)^{Ar_{alm}}$; $\mu_{dA} = Ar_{mud} * (T/T0)^{Ar_{ald}}$

* N is net doping

* $N00 = Ar_{N00} * (T/T0)^{Ar_{alN}}$; $AA = Ar_a * (T/T0)^{Ar_{ala}}$

}

HighFieldDependence:

```

{ * Caughey-Thomas model:
  * mu_highfield = mu_lowfield / ( 1 + (mu_lowfield E / vsat)^beta )/beta
  * beta = beta0 (T/T0)^betaexp.
    beta0 = 2, 2 # [1]
    betaexp = 0.0000e+00, 0.0000e+00 # [1]

  * Smoothing parameter for HydroHighField Caughey-Thomas model:
  * if Tl < Tc < (1+K_dT)*Tl, then smoothing between low field mobility
  * and HydroHighField mobility is used.
    K_dT = 0.01, 0.01 # [1]
  * Transferred-Electron Effect:
  * mu_highfield = (mu_lowfield+(vsat/E)*(E/E0_TrEf4)/(1+(E/E0_TrEf4)
    E0_TrEf = 2.7000e+05, 2.7000e+05 # [1]
    Ksmooth_TrEf = 1, 1 # [1]

  * For vsat either Formula1 or Formula2 can be used.
    Vsat_Formula = 2, 2 # [1]
  * Formula2 for saturation velocity:
  * vsat = A_vsat - B_vsat*(T/T0)
  * (Parameter Vsat_Formula has to be equal to 2):
    A_vsat = 1.5000e+07, 1.5000e+07 # [cm/s]
    B_vsat = 0, 0 # [cm/s]
    vsat_min = 5.0000e+06, 5.0000e+06 # [cm/s]
}

***** Recombination/Generation Models: *****
* Variable = electron value , hole value # [units] *
*****

Scharfetter * relation and trap level for SRH recombination:
{ * tau = taumin + ( taumax - taumin ) / ( 1 + ( N/Nref )^gamma
  * tau(T) = tau * ( (T/300)^Talpha ) (TempDep)
  * tau(T) = tau * exp( Tcoeff * ((T/300)-1) ) (ExpTempDep)
    taumin = 0.0000e+00, 0.0000e+00 # [s]
    taumax = 1.0000e-9, 1.0000e-9 # [s]
    Nref = 1.0000e+16, 1.0000e+16 # [cm^(-3)]
    gamma = 1, 1 # [1]
    Talpha = -1.5000e+00, -1.5000e+00 # [1]
    Tcoeff = 2.55, 2.55 # [1]
    Etrap = 0.0000e+00 # [eV]
}

vanOverstraetendeMan * Impact Ionization:
{ * G_impact = alpha_n n v_drift_n + alpha_p p v_drift_p
  * with alpha = gamma a exp(-b gamma/E) for E<E0 (low) and E>E0 (high)

```

```

* with gamma = tanh(hbarOmega/(2kT0)) / tanh(hbarOmega/(2kT))
  a(low) = 2.9e8 ,      1.3400e+07      # [1/cm]
  a(high)= 2.9e8 ,      1.3400e+07      # [1/cm]
  b(low) = 3.4e8 ,      2.0300e+08      # [V/cm]
  b(high)= 3.4e8 ,      2.0300e+08      # [V/cm]
  E0     = 4.0000e+05, 4.0000e+05      #[V/cm]
  hbarOmega = 0.035,    0.035          #[V/cm]
}

*****
* Parameters for the recombination models below were taken
* from GaAs and require calibration for accurate simulations
*****

Auger * coefficients:
{ * R_Auger = ( C_n n + C_p p ) ( n p - ni_eff^2)
  * with C_n,p = (A + B (T/T0) + C (T/T0)^2) (1 + H exp(-{n,p}/N0))
    A     = 1.0000e-30 , 1.0000e-30    # [cm^6/s]
    B     = 0.0000e+00 ,    0.0000e+00  # [cm^6/s]
    C     = 0.0000e+00 ,    0.0000e+00  # [cm^6/s]
    H     = 0.0000e+00 ,    0.0000e+00  # [1]
    N0    = 1.0000e+18 ,    1.0000e+18  # [cm^(-3)]
}

RadiativeRecombination * coefficients:
{ * R_Radiative = C (n p - ni_eff^2)
  C     = 2.0000e-10 # [cm^3/s]
}

}

```

APPENDIX B

SAMPLE SENTAURUS INPUT FILE FOR ALGAN/GAN HEMT SIMULATION

```
Electrode {
    { Name="gate" Voltage= 0 Schottky Workfunction=3.8}
    { Name="source" Voltage= 0 }
    { Name="drain" Voltage= 0 }
}

File {
    Grid= "strd20120_msh.tdr"
    Parameter= "models.par"
    Current= "n3_des.plt"
    Plot= "plotd20120vg-1.9t2.4.tdr"
    Output= "n3_des.log"
}

Physics {
    Hydrodynamic(eTemperature)
    Mobility(
        DopingDependence
        eHighfieldsaturation(GradQuasiFermi)
    )
    EffectiveIntrinsicDensity (Nobandgapnarrowing)
    Fermi
    Recombination(SRH)
    RecGenHeat
    Aniso(Poisson)
}

Physics (Material="GaN") {
    Traps (
        (Acceptor Level Conc= 5e17 EnergyMid= 1.0 EnergySig= 0 \
        FromMidBandGap eXSection= 1e-15 hXSection= 1e-15)
    )
}

Physics (Material="AlGaN") {
    Traps (
        (Acceptor Level Conc= 5e17 EnergyMid= 1.0 EnergySig= 0 \
        FromMidBandGap eXSection= 1e-15 hXSection= 1e-15)
    )
    MoleFraction(XFraction=0.2)
```

```

}

Physics (MaterialInterface="AlGaN/GaN") {
    Charge(Conc=8.25e+12
* This is pspalgan+ppealgan-ppsgan
)
}

Physics (MaterialInterface="AlGaN/Si3N4") {
    Charge(Conc=-2.64e13
* This is the summation of piezoelectric and spontaneous polarization of AlGaN
)
    Traps (
        (Donor Level Conc= 2.4e13 EnergyMid= 1 FromCondBand)
    )
}

Plot {
    Potential Electricfield/Vector
    eDensity hDensity
    eCurrent/Vector hCurrent/Vector
    TotalCurrent/Vector
    SRH Auger Avalanche
    eMobility hMobility
    eQuasiFermi hQuasiFermi
    eGradQuasiFermi hGradQuasiFermi
    eEparallel hEparallel
    eMobility hMobility
    eVelocity hVelocity
    DonorConcentration Acceptorconcentration
    Doping SpaceCharge
    ConductionBand ValenceBand
    BandGap Affinity
    xMoleFraction
    eTemperature hTemperature
    eTrappedCharge hTrappedCharge
}

Math {
    Extrapolate
    Iterations= 16
    Digits= 6
    ErrRef(electron) = 1E5
    ErrRef(hole) = 1E3
}

```

```

    RHSmin= 1e-10
    RHSmax= 1e30
    CDensityMin= 1e-20
    DirectCurrentComputation
    RelTermMinDensity= 1e5
    eMobilityAveraging= ElementEdge
}

Solve {
    Coupled (Iterations= 100000 LineSearchDamping= 0.001) {Poisson}
    Coupled (Iterations= 100) {Poisson Electron Hole}

    *****
    Plot(FilePrefix="n4_Zero_Bias")
    *****

    NewCurrentFile="IdVg_"

NewCurrentFile="currente1d20x0.2i20t2.4"

    Quasistationary (
        InitialStep=0.1 Increment=1.35
        MaxStep=0.5 Minstep=1.e-5
        Goal { Name="gate" Voltage=-3.57}
    ){ Coupled { Poisson Electron Hole } }

    Quasistationary (
        InitialStep=0.1 Increment=1.6
        MaxStep=0.5 Minstep=1.e-5
        Goal { Name="drain" Voltage=350}
    ){ Coupled { Poisson Electron Hole } }

    Plot(FilePrefix="i20e1d20x0.2vd350vg-1.9t2.4e13")

}

```


APPENDIX C

IMAN REZANEZHAD GATABI- PUBLICATIONS

- 1- Gatabi, I.R., et al., *PECVD silicon nitride passivation of AlGaIn/GaN heterostructures*. Electron Devices, IEEE Transactions on, 2013. **60**(3): p. 1082-1087.
- 2- Coan, M.R., et al., *Band offset measurement of GaN/dielectric interfaces*. Journal of Applied Physics, 2012. **112**: p. 024508.
- 3- Gatabi, I.R., et al., *Performance simulation of three dimensional nano-scale field effect diode*. Semiconductor Science and Technology, 2011. **26**: p. 045014.
- 4- Gatabi, J.R., et al., *Auxiliary fluid flowmeter*. European Journal of Scientific Research, 2010. **42**: p. 84-92.
- 5- Forouzbakhsh, F., et al., *A new measurement method for ultrasonic surface roughness measurement*. Measurement, 2009. **32**(5): p. 702-705.
- 6- Forouzbakhsh, F., et al., *Design considerations to enhance the modulation efficiency and cutoff frequency of AlGaIn/InGaIn/GaN HEMTs*. Proc. of 8th IEEE Int. Conf. on Design and Technology of Integrated Systems in Nanoscale Era, Abu Dhabi, UAE, 2013: p. 47-52.
- 7- Gatabi, I.R., et al., *Single-photon X-ray detector using AlGaIn/GaN heterostructure*. Joint Fall 2012 Meeting of the Texas Sections of the American Physical Society, AAPT, and Zone 13 of the SPS, Lubbock, TX, 2012.
- 8- Woo, J.H., et al., *Energy efficient tunnel transistors using dielectric-gated band engineered tunnel junctions*. Joint Fall 2012 Meeting of the Texas Sections of the American Physical Society, AAPT, and Zone 13 of the SPS, Lubbock, TX, 2012.
- 9- Karaoglan, G., et al., *Photoluminescence investigation of oxidation on GaN*. Joint Fall 2012 Meeting of the Texas Sections of the American Physical Society, AAPT, and Zone 13 of the SPS, Lubbock, TX, 2012.
- 10- Purahmad, M., et al., *Design of an organic pixel addressing circuit for active-matrix OLED displays*. Proc. of ASME MicroNano 2008 Conference, Kowloon, Hong Kong, 2008: p. 727-730.
- 11- Sendi, M.S.E., et al., *Improved low voltage all cascode current source using the DC level shifter*. Proc. of 50th IEEE Midwest Symposium on Circuits & Systems, Montreal, Canada, 2007: p. 171-172.

12- Gatabi, J.R., et al., *A novel Doppler-based ultrasonic surface roughness measurement*. Proc. of 2005 IEEE Int. Ultrasonics Symposium, Rotterdam, Netherlands, 2005: p. 1460-1463.