


Intervalley mixing in two-dimensional n-type Si/SiGe heterostructures

A. Valavanis, Z. Ikonić and R. W. Kelsall


Institute of Microwaves and Photonics,
School of Electronic and Electrical Engineering,
University of Leeds, Leeds LS10 9JT, UK



UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS

Si/SiGe conduction band

- Conduction band edge is located in the Δ valleys in k-space
- In a 2-dimensional heterostructure (*i.e.* free motion over xy plane), strain and effective mass anisotropy splits this degeneracy into two Δ_z and four $\Delta_{x,y}$ valleys
- Δ_z states have basis components with wave vectors centred around either Δ_z valley
- Mixing occurs between basis components reflected by interfaces normal to z -direction
- This mixing splits the degeneracy of Δ_z states



Effective mass approximation (EMA)

- Faster than atomistic methods *e.g.* empirical pseudopotential model (EPM)[1]
- *Usually* requires fitting parameters for valley splitting[2]
- Wave function for Δ_z states is weighted sum of basis components from each valley:

$$\Psi(z) = (a_1 e^{ik_0 z} + a_2 e^{-ik_0 z}) \phi(z)$$

- For *symmetrical confining potentials*, the double valley EMA is self-contained.[3] Weighting coefficients are

$$a_{1,2} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (1, \pm 1)$$


- A *splitting potential* term may be added to the effective mass Hamiltonian.
- It can be shown that this is a product of conduction band envelope potential and an oscillatory function of valley location:

$$U(z) = \pm V(z) \cos(2k_0 z)$$

- We have shown that even for slightly asymmetrical structures, the DVEMA agrees well with the EPM.[4]


Diffuse interfaces

- Valley splitting is a decreasing, oscillatory function of well width.
- Plot shows splitting in quantum well (QW) with Si wells and $\text{Si}_{0.5}\text{Ge}_{0.5}$ barriers on $\text{Si}_{0.8}\text{Ge}_{0.2}$ substrate
- 1ML = half lattice constant
- Ge diffusion modelled for 3 to 4 ML diffusion length
- Diffuse interfaces are modelled as piecewise linear gradings in atomistic simulations
- EMA results agree with EPM (sample data in plot)
- Splitting decreases as interfaces are smoothed



Electric field


- Applied electric field weakens confinement on one side of well
- Splitting is independent of well width at high fields



Quantum cascade lasers (QCL)

- Graph below shows EPM model of valley splitting in lowest pair of Si/SiGe superlattice (SL) minibands as function of well width.
- Constant 4ML, $\text{Si}_{0.5}\text{Ge}_{0.5}$ barrier and variable width Si well on $\text{Si}_{0.8}\text{Ge}_{0.2}$ substrate. Well widths up to around 5.4nm are simulated.
- Inset shows that the miniband in a SL approximates a "miniband" in a QCL. 50 periods of the envelope potential were used to generate the plotted EMA Schrödinger solution.

- SL splitting decreases rapidly with well width
- Oscillations are smaller than QW plot above, but magnitude is larger overall
- In QCLs, "miniband" states are not continuous, but are actually closely spaced discrete states.
- QCL solution is computationally demanding but is located between the SL and QW cases.



Conclusions

- Splitting is decreasing, oscillatory function of QW width at low electric field
- EMA works well in symmetric structures
- Increases at high electric field and is independent of width
- Splitting also decreases with well width in unbiased SLs
- Very low splitting in wide, unbiased QWs such as those in optically pumped lasers
- Significant effect in strongly biased narrow QWs and narrow well SLs. May affect n-type Si/SiGe QCLs

Related publications

- [1] Z. Ikonić, R. W. Kelsall and P. Harrison, Phys. Rev. B **64**, 125308 (2001).
- [2] M. Friesen, S. Chutia, C. Tahan and S. N. Coppersmith, Phys. Rev. B. **75**, 115318 (2007).
- [3] D. Z.-Y. Ting and Y.-C. Chang, Phys. Rev. B **38**, 3414 (1988).
- [4] A. Valavanis, Z. Ikonić and R. W. Kelsall, Phys. Rev. B **75**, 205332 (2007).