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ABSTRACT

The surface kinetics processes in the molecular beam epitaxy (MBE) growth of GaAs (100) and the MBE doping kinetics are studied theoretically, using a stochastic model which is based on the master equation approach and random distribution approximation. The kinetic processes included in the model are: adsorption, surface migration and evaporation. In the study of surface roughening kinetics in GaAs (100) diatomic arsenic molecular specie (As$_2$) was used. The time averaged reflection-high-energy-electron-diffraction (RHEED) intensity obtained from the growth data was in agreement with the theoretical results. A transition temperature at which time averaged RHEED intensity is a maximum was observed. The RHEED intensity increases with temperature till the transition temperature due to surface smoothening resulting from the surface migration of Ga and As to energetically favorable sites. The RHEED intensity decreases beyond the transition temperature due to the evaporation of As from the surface. The transition temperature can be explained by the difference in time for the formation of energetically stable surface adatom clusters resulting from the difference in the effective surface migration rates for various flux ratios. The doping studies were performed for various growth conditions. The predicted sticking coefficient of In versus $\frac{1}{T}$ shows excellent agreement with experiments reported in literature. The sticking coefficient decreases with $T$ due to surface segregation aided evaporation of In at higher temperature. The predicted dopant depth
profile also shows excellent qualitative agreement with experiments. The surface segregation of In occurs due to a strong repulsive interaction between In and the host lattice. The results of this study show that there is a dopant depleted zone (DDZ) where the In concentration is lower than both the bulk and the top surface layer. The observed DDZ qualitatively matches that observed in experiments. The time and growth rate dependences of the phenomenon are studied and found to be in good agreement with experiments. The model was used to study \( \delta \) doping of dopants as a function of temperature. The results are in qualitative agreement with experimental results. With an increase in temperature, the dopant profiles become sharper. This is caused by a smoother growing surface at higher temperatures. Even though, the results of the work qualitatively agree with the experimental work, there is a quantitative difference between the results in terms of dopant profiles. This discrepancy is attributed to the limitation of the model, and the model parameters.
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Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

With the advent of ultra-high vacuum technique of molecular beam epitaxy (MBE), heterostructures consisting of dissimilar materials have been successfully grown and exploited to fabricate novel microstructures such as superlattices and quantum well structures, and therefore has opened up new areas in both device technology and semiconductor physics. The performance of devices fabricated critically depends on the interfacial roughness in heterostructures and the quality of doped and undoped epilayers grown. To achieve device quality, it is of great importance to understand the growth kinetics of material used for growing crystal and also to study the dopant segregation phenomenon.

MBE growth and doping kinetics of many elemental and compound semiconductors has been studied experimentally [3-6,18-22,28-32] and theoretically [9-17,23,27] in the past decade. Of these materials, GaAs and Si have had considerable attention due to their technological advantages over the other materials. Despite numerous studies, there is a considerable lack of understanding of growth kinetics and its relation to the growth parameters. The subject of this thesis is to theoretically address two growth issues: surface
roughening kinetics of \textit{GaAs} (100) and \textit{Si} doping kinetics.

Traditionally the theoretical tools employed for MBE kinetic studies are Monte Carlo (MC) simulations [11,12], Molecular Dynamics (MD), and Stochastic Models [7,13-15]. MC simulation is crystal size limited, but provides microstructural details of thin film surfaces and interfaces. MD simulation provides atomistic details and is very rigorous, but is computationally intensive due to pico second time scale of simulation. The stochastic model approach is not size limited, but does not provide microstructural details of the thin film. Since for the problems to be addressed, crystal size limitation should be avoided and macroscopic roughness (\textit{GaAs}) and spatial distribution of dopant (\textit{Si}) can be obtained without need for microstructural details, the stochastic model approach is adopted for this thesis.

\textbf{Overview of the Thesis}

This thesis theoretically addresses the issues of surface roughening kinetics in the MBE growth of (100) \textit{GaAs} and surface segregation phenomenon during \textit{In} doping of \textit{Si} using the stochastic model and the rate equation model, respectively. A brief literature survey, discussing both experimental and theoretical models for surface kinetic processes in the MBE growth of \textit{GaAs} (100) and MBE doping kinetics of \textit{Si} is presented in Chapter 2. The detailed study of surface roughening kinetics in \textit{GaAs} (100) using stochastic model of MBE growth is presented in Chapter 3. Chapter 4 includes the detailed study of MBE doping kinetics in \textit{In} doped \textit{Si} system and δ doping kinetics using the rate equation model which is a simplified stochastic model. The conclusions are stated in Chapter 5.
Molecular Beam Epitaxy (MBE) is one of the most suited techniques for growing high crystalline quality epilayers with great purity and precise thickness control of semiconductor compounds. In this section, the experimental work on GaAs MBE growth and in situ doping in MBE growth of semiconductors are reviewed along with the theoretical work.

2.1 Molecular beam epitaxy

The technology of crystal growth has advanced enormously during the past two decades. Among the many advances, the development and refinement of molecular beam epitaxy (MBE) has been the most important one. Crystals grown by MBE are precisely controlled and they form the basis for the most advanced microstructures such as superlattices and quantum well structures of which high speed and high frequency opto-electronic devices are fabricated.

MBE is an epitaxial process involving the reaction of one or more thermal beams of
atoms or molecules with crystalline surface under ultra high vacuum ($10^{-9}$ torrs) conditions. MBE can achieve precise control in both chemical compositions and doping profiles. In this growth method, the incorporation of impinging atoms (film constituent or dopant) into the film during growth is controlled by the surface adsorption-desorption-migration kinetics (the so called sticking process) rather than by near-equilibrium thermodynamics, as is the case with other conventional growth techniques such as Chemical Vapor Deposition (CVD) or Liquid Phase Epitaxy (LPE).

MBE crystal growth occurs via the reaction and condensation of molecules that arrive at the surface, rather than viscous or diffusive, flow. In other words, molecules do not collide with one another enroute to the substrate, and the molecules that miss or leave the substrate are pumped away almost instantaneously. As a result, multilayered structures with extremely abrupt interfaces can be grown and microscopic processes occurring on the surface apart from the diffusion-controlled mass and/or heat transport to and from the surface can be studied.

The most important aspect of MBE is the facility to control the growth processes at the atomic or molecular scales (a few \AA). With the conventional crystal growth techniques, growth processes can be controlled only in the macroscopic scale (a few 100\AA). MBE, in contrast to the conventional growth techniques, allows to kinetically control the microscopic surface kinetic processes of the growth of thin films due to the following features:

- Low growth temperatures employed in MBE growth minimize the bulk diffusion of atoms in the growing crystals resulting in the surface kinetic processes dominating the growth.

- The ultra high vacuum of the MBE system facilitates well collimated beams and
maintains clean crystal surfaces, while the use of nearly perfect single crystals as substrates produces atomistically smooth surfaces.

- In addition, a variety of in-situ analytical tools such as reflection high energy electron diffraction (RHEED), Auger electron spectroscopy (AES) flux monitors, and substrate temperature monitors facilitate continuous monitoring and atomic level control of the growth process.

2.2 GaAs Experimental Studies

2.2.1 Review of Experimental Studies

There has been a series of [1-15] experimental and theoretical attempts to understand the origin of the surface kinetic processes in the MBE growth of GaAs (100). Foxon et. al. [3] studied the kinetics of Ga and As$_4$ interaction on GaAs (100) surfaces. In the temperature range 300 – 400°K, As$_4$ is non-dissociating chemisorbed on Ga atoms from a weakly bound precursor state, but above 450°K there is a pairwise dissociation-recombination reaction between As$_4$ molecules adsorbed on adjacent Ga lattice sites. At temperatures higher than 600°K a temperature dependent Ga adatom population is formed by the desorption of As$_2$ from the surface. Thus above 450°K, it is possible to produce GaAs from beams of elements, but below this temperature the stoichiometric compound does not form.

Foxon et. al. [4] used modulated beam technique to study the kinetics of GaAs (100) surfaces. In the temperature range 300 – 600°K they found surface association reaction to occur, leading to the desorption of As$_4$ by a first order process. Above 600°K, As$_2$ is lost from the substrate itself by a dissociation reaction, which gives rise to a temperature dependent Ga adatom population, and this in turn results in a temperature dependent As$_2$
sticking coefficient which can result unity.

In the case of GaAs study \[6\], a transition temperature was observed above and below which the surface is rougher. This transition temperature was observed to be flux ratio and temperature dependent. The kinetics of surface roughening in this case was explained in terms of competition between the surface roughening processes such as adsorption and evaporation and the surface smoothening process such as the migration of atoms to energetically stable sites.

Foxon et. al. \[5\] discussed the growth of binary compounds such as GaAs and alloys with mixed group III and mixed group V elements. He also discussed the relation between growth conditions and resulting film properties for binary compounds, alloys, and interfaces. The Ga and As populations present on the surface during growth depend on both substrate temperature and the relative fluxes of Ga and As atoms reaching the surface. As the substrate temperature is increased, the sticking coefficient of impurities is reduced and at fixed substrate temperatures increasing the As to Ga ratio or changing from As\(_4\) to As\(_2\) reduces the arsenic vacancy concentration.

Foxon et. al. \[5\] also observed that the properties of AlGaAs – GaAs modulation-doped structures depend upon the order in which the layers are grown. For the so called normal structure where AlGaAs is grown on top of GaAs the enhanced mobilities are much better and less sensitive to substrate temperatures than the equivalent inverted structures where GaAs is grown on top of AlGaAs \[33\]. It has been suggested \[33\] that it is related to the influence of substrate temperature on the morphology of AlGaAs.

Chen et. al. \[6\] reported a systematic examination of the influence of each growth parameter on the surface kinetic processes in GaAs MBE growth by employing RHEED
intensity dynamics measurements on GaAs (100). The results reveal the existence of a metastable state regime where the surface migration is favored such as to form an optimal growth front.

2.3 Doping

Doping an epilayer during its growth by coevaporating the dopant has been the standard practice in MBE of semiconductors. Due to low growth rates (1 μm/hr.) and low growth temperatures (limited or negligible diffusion), abrupt dopant profiles should be achievable in MBE grown epilayers. However, for most semiconductors doped in-situ, either a smearing of the dopant profile and/or surface enrichment of the dopant have been observed experimentally [16-32]. In addition, it has been observed that some dopants incorporate inefficiently in some semiconductors due to excessive evaporation dictated by low binding energy of the dopants to the growing surface.

Many experimental and theoretical models have been proposed to explain the behaviour of the dopant atoms during the growth of the crystal. Iyer et. al. [16] proposed a kinetic model which described the time evolution of the surface concentration of dopants in terms of incorporation and evaporation. Their model was able to explain many experimental observations in the doping of Si [25]. However, it did not explicitly include the surface segregation phenomenon. Wood et. al. [17] employed the same model for Mg doping of GaAs and arbitrarily assumed that the incorporation coefficient of the dopant is linearly dependent on the growth rate in order to explain their experimental observations.

Bean et. al. [18] presented detailed behaviour of the n type dopant Sb. Hyperabrupt doping profiles were produced with a resolution superior to that obtained by CVD epitaxy
and Sb surface segregation was also detected for temperature below 850°C.

Ota et. al. [19] tried to study n-type doping techniques in Si MBE by simultaneous arsenic ion implantation and by antimony evaporation. They grew high quality Si MBE with an arsenic ion (As⁺) source or an antimony effusion source. For As⁺ ions at 600eV, the sticking coefficient was > 0.75 at growth temperatures ranging from 750 to 950°C, while that evaporated antimony strongly depended on growth temperature.

Earlier, work with n-type of dopants from separate sources has been performed. Becker et. al. [20] grew epitaxial Si films on single-crystal Si (100) substrates from an electron-gun source in UHV doped with gallium and aluminium from separate oven sources. Ga doping profiles in Si MBE films could be controlled accurately for substrate temperature in the range $10^{14} - 5 \times 10^{17} cm^{-3}$ but precise control of the doping has not been achieved for films doped with aluminium.

A segregation model by Rockett et. al. [21] accounted for the accumulation of Sn at the growing film surface and the corresponding Sn depletion near the film-substrate interface during the deposition of Sn-doped GaAs by MBE. The calculated Sn profiles were found to provide a good fit to experimental data obtained by secondary ion mass spectrometry.

Streit et. al. [22] performed doping of Si in MBE systems by solid phase epitaxy. The doped Si films were deposited by controlled coevaporation or Ga(p) or Sb(n) and Si at room temperature on an atomically clean Si substrate in UHV. The amorphous films that were crystallized by heating the substrate to 575°C, have advantages over normal evaporative doping during MBE:

(1) unity sticking coefficient of dopant (2) no smearing or carry-over of the dopant (3) better mobility (bulk values of n or p ~ $10^{18} cm^{-3}$) (4) higher doping levels (>8 x $10^{18} cm^{-3}$)
for Ga, \( 8 \times 10^{19} \text{cm}^{-3} \) for Sb).

Barnett et al. [21,23] proposed a model including the segregation phenomenon in which they assumed that dopant atoms within several nanometers of the subsurface diffuse to the surface.

Andrieu et al. [24] proposed a new mechanism of dopants climbing to the surface and developed a rate equation model based on this assumption. Their model was able to explain the surface segregation phenomenon satisfactorily.

Parry et al. [25] presented the temperature dependence of incorporation process during heavy Boron doping in Si MBE. Boron doped layers were grown by Si MBE to establish incorporation processes at temperatures between 900 and 450°C. For temperature exceeding 650°C a surface accumulated phase of Boron was formed when doping levels exceeded solid solubility limits. Above 750°C, the measured equilibrium solubility limit was in the \( 10^{19} \text{cm}^{-3} \) range. Below 650°C, the processes leading to the formation of the surface phase were kinetically limited, manifested by a sharp increase in boron solubility limit, with completely activated levels above \( 1 \times 10^{20} \text{cm}^{-3} \). At intermediate temperatures the degree of dopant activation was found to be dependent on growth rate.

### 2.4 Theoretical Analysis

Saito and Krumbhaar [7] studied the influence of the relaxation and the surface diffusion processes on the kinetics of crystal growth. The Saito and Krumbhaar (SK) model is based on the master equation approach with quasi chemical approximation (QCA) and the SOS restriction. The SK model is generalized to crystals with any in-plane coordination number and is applicable to one-sublattice crystal only. By comparing the results of the
MC simulations with that of the SK model, it was shown that the QCA scheme gives rise to reliable results on the kinetics of crystal growth for a chemical potential difference, \( \Delta \mu \) (between the vapor and the solid), greater than the critical value, \( \Delta \mu_c \), for the existence of metastable state with infinite lifetime below even the roughening point. It was also shown that, in general, the surface diffusion enhances the growth rate and reduces the surface roughness.

Arthur et. al. [8] proposed a kinetic model involving changes in surface stoichiometry which gives quantitative agreement with experiment for both desorption rate and surface composition. His model assumes that \( \text{As}_2 \) is adsorbed in a weakly-bound molecular precursor state from which dissociation into \( \text{As} \) atoms in \( \text{As} \) surface sites occurs. Recombination of surface \( \text{As} \) atoms into the molecular state was found to happen at a rate whose activation energy decreases rapidly with increasing \( \text{As} \) concentration in the surface.

Weeks et. al. [9,10] investigated epitaxial crystal growth. The authors utilized the SOS model, in which the crystal is described by an array of columns of atoms with the requirement that no vacancy sites may exist within the crystal, i.e., every atom must possess a nearest neighbor immediately below it. This model for defect-free simple cubic [100] crystal growth was the subject of both analytical and computational approaches. Many aspects of crystal growth were simulated, including evaporation, migration, screw dislocations, and the roughening transitions at high temperatures.

Madhukar et. al. [11] presented a model based on Monte Carlo (MC) simulations to study the RHEED oscillation behaviour as a function of arsenic pressure, \( P_{\text{As}_2} \), for low substrate temperatures. The oscillations decayed faster for growth with high \( P_{\text{As}_2} \) compared to that with low \( P_{\text{As}_2} \). The reason for faster damping is that the growth front roughened
faster due to shorter migration length of Ga. Shorter migration length and roughened growth front result in high Ga vacancy concentration on the Ga sublattice. The RHEED oscillation amplitude for high temperature growth was larger and the oscillations damped at a very slow rate. This suggests that the growth front roughens at a very slow rate indicating that the Ga atoms arriving on the surface migrate very fast to energetically favorable sites before getting trapped by a chemisorbing As$_2$. In other words, the surface migration rate is much faster than the As$_2$ chemisorption rate on the GaAs surface. Results of their simulation compared well with that of experiments for various conditions of pressures and temperatures. It was concluded that high substrate temperature in conjunction with low As$_2$ to Ga pressure results in sharper growth front and low Ga vacancy concentration in Ga sublattice.

Singh et. al. [12] presented a model for the growth of III-V compound semiconductors by MBE which is based on an atomistic MC simulations and a statistical fluctuation theory. Their model concerns itself with the intrinsic growth mechanism only and does not address the role of extrinsic effects such as the impurities. The model allows one to understand the microscopic nature of the growth front and the interface as well as to identify the critical kinetic parameters responsible for their quality. The model includes the growth parameters such as attachment, inter and intra layer migrations. The kinetics of the growth process are given by impinging flux of the cations (Ga), the anion overpressure $P_{As_2}$, the surface migration rates of cations after attaching to the growing surface, and the evaporation rates of the atoms. The evaporation is assumed to be little and the incorporation rate to be unity. Singh et. al. studied the the effect of surface migration of Ga on the kinetics-controlled roughening of (100) GaAs by MC simulation. It was observed that the growth mode
changed from two dimensional to three dimensional with increasing substrate temperature, resulting in a roughening transition for (100) GaAs. It was pointed that the roughening transition described by Burton et. al. (1951) (Burton, Cabrera, Frank) (BCF) differs from what they observed. The roughening transition of BCF is based on the energetics only, and occurs at a specific temperature, whereas the roughening that Singh et. al. (1983) observed, is kinetically controlled and is dependent on the impingement rate and the surface migration kinetics of Ga.

Ghaisas et. al. (1985) using the MC technique, identified two different types of Configuration Dependent Reactive Incorporation (CDRI) mechanisms i.e. Reaction Limited Incorporation (RLI) and Configuration Limited Reactive Incorporation (CLRI). In the case of RLI growth, the rates of dissociative chemisorption reactions of $\text{As}_2$ on one or two Ga atom sites are small and therefore, the chemisorption reactions control the growth. The growth rate as a function of growth time was observed to be oscillatory and the growth front was As-stabilized. In the case of CLRI growth, the rates of dissociating chemisorption reactions are high and therefore do not control the growth. But, the availability of a proper surface Ga configuration for the efficient incorporation of $\text{As}_2$ depends on the surface migration rate of Ga. Growth rate as a function of time was constant without oscillation and the growth front was less As-stabilized.

Vvedensky et. al. [13] proposed a growth model to study the kinetics of MBE for monitoring surface growth in combination with MC simulations by calculating the evolution of the surface step density. Their model is one, with a single species, in which monatomic deposition avoids the incorporation effects. The model includes adsorption and migration processes. Evaporation is neglected, since for typical temperatures at which the growth is
carried out there is negligible dissociation flux from the surface and incorporation prob­
ability is assumed to be unity. As in the solid-on-solid (SOS) the growing substrate is
modelled by a two dimensional matrix, the entries are the heights of columns of atoms at
that point. Their model differs from the SOS model only in that evaporation is neglected.

The evolution of the step density is shown to have a remarkable correspondence to that
of the measured RHEED specular spot intensities for III-V semiconductor compounds.
Vvedensky et. al. studied growth in a variety of systems, as a function of substrate
temperature and drew conclusions concerning the relation between RHEED measurements,
kinetics, and growth quality.

Venkatasubramanian [14] developed a stochastic rate equation model based on the
master equation approach, QCA and the SOS restriction to simulate the MBE growth of
compound semiconductors. His model is based on the SK model. Firstly, the molecular
beams used for growing the crystal consist only of monatomic atoms. Secondly, the atoms
adsorb only at sites satisfying modified solid on solid (MSOS) restriction. In other words,
if the atoms arrive at sites where only one covalent bond can be formed, then the atoms
desorb back into vapor. Thirdly, the interlayer diffusion of atoms is allowed to take place
between any two layers in the sublattice.

Even though the SK model is generalized to crystals with any in-plane coordination
number, it is applicable to one-sublattice crystal only. But, the stochastic model by
Venkatasubramanian is suitable for zinc blende crystals and also for compound semicon­
ductor alloy.

Venkatasubramanian [15] used the stochastic model to study the MBE growth kinetics
of a hypothetical compound semiconductor and diamond cubic alloy. He employed the
model to study the effects of high temperatures due to high surface diffusion rate on the
growth rate, the surface roughness, and the clustering phenomenon. One of the important
features of the stochastic model is that it is not limited by the crystal size and can be
employed to study the doping kinetics in the crystals. Its major limitation is that it does
not keep track of the surface atomic configuration. It can be obtained from the available
data using random distribution approximation.

Computer modeling of GaAs growth has resulted in a better understanding of the
kinetics of the MBE growth of GaAs. These studies have proved that computer modeling
is a viable and complimentary tool for understanding the growth kinetics of MBE. The
limitation of these studies are: 1) all of them employ a rigid lattice gas model of size
about 30 x 30 x 30 or so and therefore are not suitable for studies on stoichiometries and
doping; 2) because of the size limitation, the conclusions are qualitative and at best semi-
quantitative; 3) even though MC simulation of kinetics of MBE growth can be employed
as a complimentary tool to experiments, it requires extensive experimental data such as
surface migration parameters, desorption parameters and the incorporation parameters
to be of value to develop the growth kinetic model; 4) the kinetic model employed was
specified to GaAs MBE growth and therefore, needs to be generalized to study other
material systems.
Chapter 3

Surface Kinetic Processes in the MBE Growth of GaAs (100)

In this chapter, the stochastic model of MBE growth is employed to study the surface roughening kinetics in GaAs (100). Firstly, a brief discussion of the stochastic model of MBE growth is presented. Then the results of the study of surface roughening kinetics of (100) GaAs are presented and compared with the experimental work of Ref.[6]. Based on the results, a physical mechanism which adequately describes experimental observation is presented. Finally, a summary of this study is presented.

3.1 The Stochastic Model

The stochastic model is a rate equation model based on the condition of detailed balance. It describes the time evolution of semiconductor epilayer through a detailed description of macrovariables in terms of rates of surface processes. The surface processes considered
in the stochastic model are: adsorption, evaporation, and migration. Two types of surface migration processes, intralayer and interlayer migrations are considered. The main assumptions of the model are: (i) solid-on-solid (SOS) restriction (ii) random distribution approximation of the surface atomic configurations weighted by the energy of the configuration (iii) Arrhenius type rate equations for the surface kinetic processes (iv) exclusion of anti-site defects (v) exclusion of effects of surface reconstruction on the surface kinetic processes. The primary macrovariables are the concentration of the atoms in the \( n^{th} \) layer, \( C(n) \), and the atom vacancy bond density in the \( n^{th} \) layer, \( Q(n) \), as given by Eqs. 8a and 8b of Ref.[14]. These processes are pictorially represented in Fig. (3.1).

The rate of adsorption can be written as the product of surface sites satisfying the modified solid on solid, MSOS, restriction and the flux rate. The MSOS, employed in this model implies that two nearest neighbor surface atoms be present before an atom gets incorporated at a site in between them at a layer just above as shown in Fig. (3.2). Only the evaporation of atoms exposed to vapor is considered since these atoms have the lowest binding energy and hence a higher probability of evaporation. The rate of evaporation is determined as a product of the fraction of a layer exposed to the vapor, the rate of evaporation of an isolated atom, and the term involving the binding energy of the atom.

The atoms that arrive at non-MSOS sites are allowed to migrate rapidly in their physisorbed state until they find a proper site, either within the layer (intra migration) or in the other layers (inter migration). Unlike in the MC studies in which the interlayer diffusion is allowed only between adjacent layers in the same sublattice, the stochastic model allows interlayer diffusion of atoms between any two layers in the same sublattice.

The evaporation and surface migration processes are described by Arrhenius type rate
equations such as:

\[ R = R_0 e^{-\frac{E_{act} + nK_{aa}}{kT}} \] (3.1)

where \( R \) is the rate in events/sec. and \( R_0 \) is the frequency factor of the process in sec\(^{-1}\). 

\( E_{act} \) is the activation energy of the process for an isolated terrace adatom, \( K_{aa} \) is the second nearest neighbor pair interaction energy in the (100) plane and \( n \) is the number of in-plane nearest neighbors of the atom under consideration. Thus, the activation energy term appearing in the argument of the exponential is coverage dependent with \( n \) equal to zero and four for low and high coverages, respectively. In general, the \( E_{act} \) for surface migration is smaller than that of evaporation. In this study, the \( E_{act} \) for interlayer and intralayer migrations are assumed to be equal. The surface migration of an atom to non-MSOS site is not allowed.

3.1.1 Macrovariables

Zinc blende crystals have two sublattices, cation and anion sublattices. Therefore, two sets of macro-variables, one for each sublattice, should be defined. In the case of GaAs, the cation (Ga) is assumed to belong to the even sublattice and the anion (As) to the odd sublattice. The macrovariables that can be defined for the \( 2n^{th} \) layer are: concentration variable, \( C_{Ga}(2n) \), the second nearest neighbor atom – vacancy bond density, \( Q_{Ga}(2n) \), the second nearest neighbor atom – atom bond density, \( \tilde{N}_{GaGa}(2n) \). These above described variables involve only one layer. In other words, the bonds used in the description of the above variables are inplane bonds.

\[ \tilde{N}_{GaGa}(2n) = 2C_{Ga}(2n) - \frac{1}{2}Q_{Ga}(2n) \]
for $Ga - Ga$ bond density,

and

$$\tilde{N}_{vv}(2n) = 2C_{V}(2n) - \frac{1}{2}Q(2n)$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.2)

for vacancy-vacancy bond density.

The vacancy density, $C_{V}(2n)$ in the above equation is given by:

$$C_{v}(2n) = (1.0 - C(2n)),$$

and

$$C(2n) = C_{Ga}(2n)$$

and

$$Q(2n) = Q_{Ga}(2n)$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.3)

similar equations can be written for the anion sublattice (i.e.), $As$. In the derivation of equations (3.2) and (3.3), the inplane coordination number is assumed to be four.

In this study, $Ga$ is present in the cation sublattice and $As$ in the anion sublattice. Thus, two independent macrovariables for cation sublattice and two independent macrovariables for the anion sublattice should be considered to study the kinetics of MBE growth of $GaAs$.

The independent variables considered are: $C_{Ga}(2n), Q_{Ga}(2n), C_{As}(2n+1)$ and $Q_{As}(2n+1)$.

The rate equation of $Ga$, one of the two sublattices in the diamond cubic crystal ($GaAs$) is given below:

$$\frac{dC_{Ga}(2n)}{dt} = \frac{1}{r_{Ga}}\left(\left[\frac{\tilde{N}_{M}(2n-1)}{2} - C_{Ga}(2n)\right]e^{-L_{A}}\right)$$

(A)
where, term A of the above equation corresponds to the adsorption process, term B corresponds to the evaporation process, term C corresponds to the intermigration of atoms to the \( n^{th} \) layer from other layers and term D corresponds to the interlayer migration of atoms to other layers from the \( n^{th} \) layer.

Similarly, equations for the time evolutions of the macrovariables \( Q_{Ga}(2n) \), \( C_{As}(2n + 1) \) and \( Q_{As}(2n + 1) \) can be written. For the details of the model, the reader is directed to Ref.[14,15].

### 3.1.2 Boundary Conditions

The boundary conditions for the growth of the compound semiconductor \( GaAs \) is discussed in this section. It is assumed that the substrate is flat and that it consists of four layers-the first two layers of the cation \( (Ga) \) and the other two, anion \( (As) \) sublattices. The initial conditions for the independent macrovariables are given by:

\[
C_{Ga}(2n) = \begin{cases} 
1.0 & n = 1, 2 \\
0.0 & n = 3, \ldots, \infty 
\end{cases}
\]

\[
C_{As}(2n - 1) = \begin{cases} 
1.0 & n = 1, 2 \\
0.0 & n = 3, \ldots, \infty 
\end{cases}
\]
$$Q_{Ga}(2n) = 0.0 \quad n = 1, \ldots, \infty$$

and

$$Q_{As}(2n + 1) = 0.0 \quad n = 1, \ldots, \infty$$  (3.5)

### 3.2 The GaAs system: the model and output parameters

The model parameters for the present study of the MBE growth of GaAs were obtained from the literature and the MBE growth parameters of Ref.[6].

The material parameters such as $Ga - Ga$ and $As - As$, second nearest neighbor pair interaction energies are obtained from the data reported in Ref.[26].

$$V_{Ga-Ga} = 0.25 \text{ eV}$$

$$V_{As-As} = 0.325 \text{ eV}$$

The frequency factors for the evaporation and migration processes were chosen as $1.0 \times 10^{13}/\text{sec}$. The activation energy for surface migration of isolated $Ga$ and $As$ atoms was chosen as $1.3 \text{ eV}$ based on Ref.[8]. Based on Ref.[8], the activation energy for evaporation of an isolated $As$ was chosen as $1.675 \text{ eV}$.

The MBE growth parameters for this study were obtained from the experimental data given in Ref.[6]. The growth temperature was chosen in the range $723 - 873^\circ\text{K}$ and the flux rate was set at $2 \text{ Å/sec}$. The cation to anion flux ratio employed for the study was in the range $1:10$ to $1:20$. It is noted that the $(100)$ substrate surface employed in this study is flat without any steps.

RHEED (reflection high energy electron diffraction) is a technique to study the growth
kinetics and chemistry which occur on the substrate surface, using a specular beam of electrons. In this technique, an electron beam is made incident on the growing crystal surface and the intensity of the reflected electron beam (e-beam) from the crystal surface is measured. The intensity of the reflected e-beam depends on the type of interference (constructive or destructive) pattern undergone by the reflected electrons. Also, the interference pattern depends upon the path traversed, which in turn depends upon the roughness of the surface. If the growing surface is smooth, the reflected electrons show constructive interference pattern giving rise to a strong RHEED intensity.

In this study, the intensity of a specular spot (1° off Bragg) of reflection high energy electron diffraction system with 10 kV electron beam was calculated using kinematical theory of electron diffraction as a function of growth time.

\[
TRI(T) = \int_0^t I(t,T) dt
\]  

(3.6)

where \( I(T) \) is the instantaneous RHEED intensity of Off-Bragg specular spot based on kinematical theory of electron diffraction.

The time averaged RHEED intensities, \( TRI(T) \), were calculated for various growth temperatures.

The material and growth data discussed above were employed to calculate the model parameters according to the procedure detailed in section I VB of Ref.[14]. The model parameters were obtained as a function of growth temperature. The time evolution equations given by Eqs 8a and 8b with modifications discussed in Eq 4, and the boundary conditions corresponding a flat substrate described by Eq 14 of Ref.[14] were solved numerically on a CRAY YMP 2/216 at NSCEE, UNLV, Nevada. The CPU time for a typical growth of 20
3.3 Results and discussions

Concentration profiles were obtained as a function of time for various growth temperatures. They are shown for 823°K, 848°K and 873°K in Fig. 3.3a-c, respectively, for flux ratio 1:10. Below 823°K, the concentration profiles look similar to the profile of 823°K and therefore are not displayed. From Fig. (3.3), it is observed that at and below 823°K, the growing surface is As-stabilized as is expected when the cation to anion flux ratio is 1:10. As the temperature increases, the growth surface becomes less As-stabilized. It is also observed that the time delay between the growth of the Ga and subsequent As layers is constant throughout the growth of the As layer for temperatures below 823°K. Above 823°K, the time delay is larger at the start of growth of As layer compared to the completion of the layer. The decrease in the time delay within the growth of a monolayer of As is almost linear with time. This effect is prominent and larger for higher temperatures and lower flux ratios.

The above observations about the time evolution of the concentration profiles can be explained as follows. The growth of an As layer is controlled by two surface processes; adsorption and evaporation. At temperatures lower than 823°K, the evaporation of surface As is negligible. Therefore, the growth rate is equal to the adsorption rate, which is constant during the growth of a layer. Thus, the time delay during the growth of the layer is constant with time. If the temperature is above 823°K, the temperature is high enough that the evaporation of surface As begins. The growth of an As layer is now controlled by the competition between the adsorption and evaporation processes. The growth rate
is the difference between the adsorption rate and evaporation rate. The adsorption rate is independent of the coverage, whereas, the evaporation rate critically depends on the coverage through the activation energy for evaporation which is the binding energy of the atom as discussed under Eq. (3.1). The binding energy of a surface As pair increases with coverage. Therefore, at the start of the growth of an As layer, the binding energy of the As pair is the smallest possible and therefore, the evaporation rate is the largest as given by Eq. (3.1). The growth rate given by the difference between the constant adsorption rate and the large evaporation rate is small. Therefore, there is a large time delay at the start of the growth. As the coverage increases, (i.e., \( n \) increases), the As atoms attain more nearest neighbors, and hence their binding energy increases which results in a decrease of the evaporation rate as given by Eq. (3.1). Then, the growth rate increases with the coverage, which results in a continuous decrease of the the time delay. The time delay is more at higher temperature, due to an increase in the evaporation rate and at lower flux ratio due to smaller adsorption rate. The concentration profiles under similar temperature conditions but for a cation to anion ratio of 1:20 are shown in Fig. 3.4a-c. The observed time delay for this flux ratio is found to be less than that for flux ratio 1:10. This is because, at higher flux ratio (1:20) the rate of adsorption of \( As_2 \) is twice faster and hence the coverage increases at faster rate. Thus intraplanar nearest neighbors, \( n \), increases twice the rate of flux ratio 1:10 resulting in the decrease of time delay. Thus, at lower temperatures and higher flux ratios, the surface appears more As-stabilized. The description of the surface processes is in complete agreement with the mechanisms proposed in Ref.[6] based on the experimental observations.

The intensity of a specular spot (1° off Bragg) of reflection high energy electron diffra-
tion system with 10 kV electron beam was calculated using kinematical theory of electron diffraction as a function of growth time. The time averaged RHEED intensities, $TRI(T)$, were calculated for various growth temperatures. A plot of $TRI(T)$ versus growth temperature is shown in Fig. (3.5) for flux ratios $1 : 10$ and $1 : 20$. The $TRI(T)$ decreases below and above a certain value of $T$ called the transition temperature, and is identified as $770^\circ K$ and $800^\circ K$, respectively, for flux ratios $1 : 10$ and $1 : 20$. The lower $TRI(T)$ above and below the transition temperature is directly related to rougher surface. Below the transition temperature, the thermal activation for surface migration is low and therefore, the Ga and As atoms randomly adsorb on the surface at sites of their arrival resulting in a rough surface. As temperature increases towards the transition temperature, the thermal activation and hence surface migration increases resulting in adatoms finding energetically more stable sites. This surface process decreases the surface roughness. Above the transition temperature, the evaporation of As begins resulting in a rougher surface. The roughness of the surface directly correlates with decreased RHEED intensity due to destructive interference of the electron waves reflecting from various surface layers. Thus, the RHEED intensity peaks at the transition temperature. The flux ratio dependence of $TRI(T)$ can be explained as follows. Lower flux ratio results in longer time for the formation of surface atom clusters with more than two As atoms. This implies that the average evaporation rate during the growth of monolayer of As is larger due lower coverage dependent activation energy for evaporation and hence lower transition temperature. This is in good agreement with the work of Chen et. al. [6].

The plot of $TRI$ versus temperature obtained in this study was compared with that of the experimental study of Chen et al. [6] and semi-quantitative agreement between the
results was obtained. There are two main reasons for the quantitative differences between the results: (i) The molecular species is employed for the experiments (As₄) and our work (As₂) are different. (ii) the flux ratios employed in the experiment and our work may be different as experimental flux ratios are always reported in equivalent beam pressure ratios not in terms of rates of arrival of anion to cation as done in our work. Both of these can influence the result of transition temperature quantitatively.

3.4 Summary

The stochastic model of MBE growth based on the master equation approach with solid-on-solid restriction and quasi-chemical approximation is employed for the study of surface processes in (100) GaAs growth. The growth rate, the time averaged surface roughness and the time averaged RHEED intensity were obtained for various growth temperatures. The kinetic surface roughening transition temperature for the MBE growth of GaAs is identified as 770°K and 800°K for flux ratios 1 : 10 and 1 : 20, respectively, from the temperature dependence of the time averaged RHEED intensity. The results of this study compare favorably with that of the experiments obtained under similar growth conditions[6]. The phenomenon of kinetic surface roughening transition in the MBE growth of GaAs (100) is explained in terms of the competition among various surface processes such as the incorporation and evaporation of atoms which roughen the surface and the surface migration of atoms to energetically favorable sites which smoothens the process.
Figure 3.1: A schematic representation of atomistic picture of all the kinetic processes that are considered for the simulation: (1) incorporation, (2) surface migration, (3) reevaporation.
Figure 3.2: A pictorial representation of the MSOS restrictions.
Figure 3.3: Concentration profiles of Ga and As for flux ratio 1:10 for various temperatures.

(a) 823K (b) 848K (c) 873K.
Figure 3.4: Concentration profiles of Ge and As for flux ratio 1:20 for various temperatures.

(a) 823K (b) 848K (c) 873K.
Figure 3.5: Time averaged RHEED intensity versus temperature for flux ratios (a) 1:10 (b) 1:20.
Chapter 4

MBE Doping Kinetics

In this chapter, a rate equation model based on the master equation approach is developed for the study of MBE doping kinetics. The model includes elementary surface processes such as adsorption, evaporation and migration of atoms. First, the model is used to study the surface segregation phenomenon during In doping of Si. Then the time and growth rate of the dopant segregation phenomenon are studied. The model is used to study δ doping of dopants. Finally, a summary of this study is presented.

4.1 Rate Equation Model for Doping

The elementary surface kinetic processes that control the doping kinetics are: adsorption, evaporation and interlayer migration of the host atom, Si, and the dopant, In, (In is chosen for this study, but the model is general and can be applied to any system). The rate of change of concentration of Si in the nth layer can be written in terms of the rates of the microscopic kinetic processes discussed above. Describing the time evolution of the
concentration of Si in the \( n^{th} \) layer, \( C(n) \), we obtain:

\[
\frac{dC_Si(n)}{dt} = J_{Si} [C(n-1) - C(n)] \quad (A)
- R_{oe} \frac{E_{ave,eva,Si}}{k_B} [C(n) - C(n+1)] \left( \frac{C_Si(n)}{C(n)} \right) \quad (B)
+ R_{oe} \frac{E_{ave,dif,Si}}{k_B} [C(n-1) - C(n)] \left( \frac{C_Si(n+1)}{C(n+1)} \right) \left( \frac{C(n+1) - C(n+2)}{C(n+1)} \right) \left( \frac{C(n+1) - C(n+2)}{C(n+1)} \right) \left( \frac{C(n-1) - C(n)}{C(n-1)} \right) \quad (C)
- R_{oe} \frac{E_{ave,dif,Si}}{k_B} [C(n) - C(n+1)] \left( \frac{C_Si(n)}{C(n)} \right) \left( \frac{C(n+1) - C(n+2)}{C(n+1)} \right) \left( \frac{C(n-1) - C(n)}{C(n-1)} \right) \quad (D)
\]

\[(4.1)\]

Term \( A \) describes the rate of adsorption of Si on to the \( n^{th} \) layer in terms of the available sites for adsorption, \([C(n-1) - C(n)]\), and the flux rate, \( J_{Si} \): The description in Term \( A \) assumes that the atoms adsorb with unity sticking probability at sites which are available for adsorption. Term \( B \) describes the rate of loss of Si from the \( n^{th} \) layer due to evaporation in terms of the number of atoms exposed to vapor, \( \frac{C_Si(n)}{C(n)} [C(n) - C(n+1)] \), the frequency factor which is assumed to be \( 10^{13}/\text{sec.} \) and the average activation energy for evaporation of Si atoms, which depends on the concentration of the layer. In this description, it is assumed that number of nearest neighbors for a Si atom increases directly as the concentration of Si in the layer. Note that since the dopants are in ppm levels, they do not affect the binding energy of Si atoms. Thus, the average activation energy for evaporation of a Si atom in the \( n^{th} \) layer, \( E_{ave,eva,Si} \), is given by:

\[
E_{ave,eva,Si} = E_{iso,eva,Si} + z E_{SiSi} C_{Si}(n) + z E_{SiD} C_D(n) \quad (4.2)
\]

where \( z \) is the inplane coordination number which is 4 for (001) plane and 6 for (111) plane. \( E_{SiSi} \) and \( E_{SiD} \) are the second nearest neighbor interaction energies of \( Si - Si \) and \( Si - D \).
pairs, respectively and $E_{iso,eva,Si}$ is the activation energy for evaporation of an isolated $Si$ atom on the surface. Here $D$ denotes dopant. (Note that within the (001) and (111) planes, the nearest neighbor atoms are actually the second nearest neighbor atoms when the whole crystal is considered.) Term $C$ in Eq. (4.1) is the rate of gain of $Si$ atoms in the $n^{th}$ layer due to interlayer migration of $Si$ to the $n^{th}$ layer from the adjacent layers, $n - 1$ and $n + 1$. Term $D$ in Eq. (4.1) is the rate of loss of $Si$ atoms in the $n^{th}$ layer due to interlayer migration of $Si$ from the $n^{th}$ layer to the adjacent layers, $n - 1$ and $n + 1$. The average activation energy for the migration of $Si$, $E_{ave,diff,si}$ is given by:

$$E_{ave, diff, Si} = E_{iso, diff, Si} + zE_{SiSi}C_{Si}(n) + zE_{SiD}C_{D}(n)$$ (4.3)

where $E_{iso, diff, Si}$ is the activation energy for interlayer migration of an isolated $Si$ atom.

A similar equation for the rate of change of dopant concentration in the $n^{th}$ layer can be written by simply replacing $Si$ with $D$. In the rate equation for the dopant, the activation energy for evaporation and migration should be redefined as:

$$E_{ave, eva, D} = E_{iso, eva, D} + zE_{SiD}C_{Si}(n) + zE_{DD}C_{D}(n)$$ (4.4)

and

$$E_{ave, diff, D} = E_{iso, diff, D} + zE_{SiD}C_{Si}(n) + zE_{DD}C_{D}(n)$$ (4.5)

respectively, where $E_{DD}$ is the $D - D$ atom pair interaction energy.
4.2 Results and Discussion

Two cases, In doping of Si and B delta doping of Si, are studied using the model proposed in section 4.1.

4.2.1 In doping of Si

In the description of Equations (4.4) and (4.5), the fact that the second nearest neighbors of dopant atoms are essentially Si atoms due to the ppm level concentrations of In has been utilized. The activation energy for the evaporation of an isolated Si, $E_{iso,eva, Si}$, has been predicted for (100) and (111) growths to be 2.6 eV and 3.2 eV, respectively [27]. The second nearest neighbor interaction energy, $E_{SiSi}$, for (100) and (111) growths are estimated to be 0.25 eV and 0.325 eV, respectively [27]. The activation energy for evaporation of In is not reported in the literature. Thus, a trial and error approach was taken to fit two of the data points on the concentration of In versus $\frac{1}{J}$ plot reported in Ref.[28]. We obtained a value of 1.6 eV and -0.25 eV for $E_{iso,eva, In}$ and $E_{SiIn}$, respectively. The activation energy for migration of an isolated Si, $E_{iso,dif, Si}$, was chosen as 0.8 eV based on available experimental data for activation energy for Si [26]. $E_{iso,dif, In}$, was assumed to be equal to that of Si for lack of available data.

The growth parameters were chosen exactly as used for the experimental work reported in Ref.[29] and are presented below. The flux rate of Si, $J_{Si}$, was kept at 1µm/hr. The flux ratio between Si and In, $J_{In}/J_{Si}$, was maintained at $2 \times 10^{-4}$. The evaporation of Si was negligible in the temperature range of this study and therefore the growth rate of the epilayer was approximately equal to the $J_{Si}$. The substrate temperature was in the range 500 – 750°C.
The differential equations given by Eq. (4.1) and a similar one for In are coupled non-linear first order differential equations which are not analytically integrable. Therefore, these equations were solved numerically on a CRAY YMP2. The boundary condition is that the first 4 layers are full with Si and rest of the layers are empty at the start of the growth which corresponds to assuming an atomically flat substrate. A typical run for a growth of 20 seconds took about 1 CRAY CPU hour.

Plots of the In sticking coefficient, $S_{In}$, versus time (sec.) for various growth temperatures of the study were obtained and analyzed. (The growths were simulated only for about 20 seconds due to computer time limitations.) Analysis of the data indicated that $S_{In}$ is an exponentially decaying function of time. Exponentials of the form $A(T)e^{-\frac{t}{\tau(T)}}$ were fitted for each temperature. Note that $A(T)$ and $\tau(T)$ are functions of temperature. Using $A(T)$ and $\tau(T)$, $S_{In}$ was obtained for the case of 3000 seconds of growth by extrapolation. Such an extrapolation is justified because the growth rate is constant and the layer-by-layer growth mode is maintained for all growth conditions in this study.

A plot of the extrapolated $S_{In}$ versus $\frac{1}{T}$ is shown in Fig. (4.1) along with the experimental data. The agreement between the theoretical values and the experimental values from Ref.[29] is excellent for the entire temperature range. The mechanism which results in the temperature dependence of $S_{In}$ is as follows. At low temperatures, the surface segregation aided evaporation of In (due to its repulsive interaction with the host sublattice) is not dominant as the thermal energy is not enough to allow this activated process. As temperature increases, the interlayer migration rate of In to the surface increases and the In concentration increases in the surface layer. More In in the top surface layer, results
in more opportunities for evaporation. Thus, a larger evaporation of In results at higher temperature. The evaporation rate of In aided by the surface segregation process is much larger than the typical evaporation rate of atoms from the surface.

Plots of the dopant concentration, $C_{In}$, versus distance from the surface are shown in Fig. (4.2) for various growth times at 660°C. It is observed that the In concentration in the bulk is about the same and is independent of the time of growth. The surface concentration of In, however, is increasing with time as expected. Note that there is a dip in $C_{In}$ for all the profiles just below the surface layer. The concentration of In in this zone is an order of magnitude less than that in the bulk and many orders of magnitude less than that at the surface. We call this region the dopant depleted zone (DDZ). The physical reason for this phenomenon is as follows. The dopant, In, segregates from the layers below upwards due to the repulsive atomic interaction with the host lattice. In other words, considering the $n^{th}$ layer, In atoms migrate from the $n-1^{th}$ layer to the $n^{th}$ layer which increases $C_{In}(n)$ and to the $n+1^{th}$ layer from the $n^{th}$ layer which decreases $C_{In}(n)$. The rates of these processes depend on the availability of In atoms in the respective layers that are exposed to vapor so that they can migrate and the availability of sites in the respective layers. For the migrations to the $n^{th}$ layer compared to the migrations from the $n^{th}$, both of these factors are small. Thus, the rate of migration to the surface layer from the subsurface layer is larger than rate of migration of In to the subsurface layer from one layer below. This difference in the rates results in a deficiency of In atoms in the subsurface layer. This resembles the phenomenon of a precipitation depleted zone (PDZ) which occurs near the grain boundaries in many alloys. This result was compared with the experimental data and a careful observation of the segregation profile data shown in Fig. (2) of Ref.[29] does
show that there is a dip in the profile. In our result the dip is much more pronounced compared to that of the experiments, which may be due to stronger repulsive interaction energies used in our model.

Plots of the In segregation profiles for 853°K, 893°K, and 933°K are shown in Fig. (4.3). It appears that the segregation profiles are similar for various temperatures except that the bulk In concentrations are lower for higher temperature which correlates well with Fig. (4.1). This type of a dopant depleted zone may not always be present even if the dopant interactions with the host lattice is repulsive. It depends on a variety of factors such as the growth rate, the strength of the repulsive interaction ($E_{SiIn}$), the flux ratio, $J_{Si}/J_{In}$ and others.

**Growth Rate and Time Dependence**

The growth at 933°K was studied as a function of growth rate in the range 0.2 to 2 monolayers/sec with the dopant flux at $2 \times 10^{-4}$ monolayers/sec. A plot of dopant concentration versus growth rate is shown in Fig. (4.4). The sticking coefficient decreases with growth rate due to increased evaporation. As a layer nears completion, the activation energy for In evaporation decreases increasing its evaporation rate (In is squeezed out of the layer). If more layers are grown without increasing the dopant flux, the increased evaporation rate will yield a smaller sticking coefficient.

The surface concentration of In during Si growth at 933°K was studied as a function of growth time. A plot of the surface concentration of In versus growth time is shown in Fig. (4.5). This observation agrees quantitatively with the results of Ref.[24] where a functional dependence of the form $1 - \exp\left(\frac{-t}{\tau}\right)$ was obtained.
4.2.2 Delta Doping of Si

Unlike the previous study, here dopants are deposited in a layer in large concentration. Therefore, dopant-dopant pair interactions cannot be neglected and Eqs. 4.2-4.5 were used without any simplifications.

δ-doping of Si with B and Sb have been successfully attempted to achieve more precise control of the doping profile (of the order of tens of Å) and a very high dopant concentration (as high as $10^{21}/cm^3$) in the MBE growth of Si [25,30]. Because the energy parameters for the Si – B and Si – Sb systems are unknown, a hypothetical dopant, D, is used in the δ doping studies of Si. Even though one of the model parameters is chosen arbitrarily, the mechanisms illustrated and the knowledge gained through this study are valid for many real systems.

The growth parameters chosen for the δ doping study were taken from Ref.[30] based on B doping of Si. The shutter sequence for δ doping is as follows. Si was grown at 2 Å/sec. for 2 seconds and then the Si shutter was closed and simultaneously the In shutter was opened. Then, 0.3 monolayer of In was deposited within 1 second. Then the In shutter was closed and simultaneously the Si shutter was opened. The Si growth was continued for 17 seconds after closing the dopant shutter. The total layer thickness of Si grown was about 40 Å. The growth temperatures for the study were in the temperature range 673°K to 973°K. Many studies were carried out for D – D pair interaction energies in the range of $-E_{SiD}$ to $E_{SiD}$. The influence of $E_{DD}$ was found to be negligible, the results presented here corresponds to $E_{DD} = 0.0$ eV. Two sets of calculations with the interaction energies between Si and dopant ($E_{SiD}$), -0.08 eV (strong repulsion) and -0.01 eV (weak repulsion) were made and are reported.
The panels in Fig. 4.6a and b show plots of In concentration as a function of the depth of the layers for two cases (i.e.), -0.08 eV and -0.01 eV, respectively. For case 1 Fig. 4.6a, it is noted that the peak of the dopant concentration has shifted more towards the surface at high temperatures compared to low temperatures. In other words, the dopant profile has shifted away from the layers where they were intended to be. This observation can be explained as follows. High temperatures result in strong surface segregation of $D$ due to increased surface migration. At low temperature the surface migration and hence the surface segregation are minimal and therefore, the bulk of $D$ atoms incorporate very close to or at the intended layers. Due to small repulsive interaction used in Fig. (4.6b), such a shift in the peak of $D$ concentration is not observed.

The other interesting and possibly counter-intuitive observation in Figures 4.6a and b is that as the temperature increases, the breadth of the dopant profile decreases. In other words, higher temperatures result in sharper dopant profiles. This observation is in good qualitative agreement with the results of the experimental work on the $\delta$ doping of $Si$ with $B$ [30]. Even though, the authors of Ref.[30] have attributed this to possible higher error in experimental data due to rounded profiles, our work suggests a possible physical explanation which is as follows. First, let us observe that the area under the curves of Figures 4.6a and b for all temperatures are about equal indicating negligible evaporation in this temperature range. The sharpness of the dopant profile at higher temperature is due to the atomically smooth surface on which the dopants are incorporated. At low temperatures the growth surface is somewhat rougher and the segregation effect is smaller and therefore, the $D$ atoms incorporate at lower unfilled layers and segregate to upper filled layers, resulting in a broader dopant profile.
The model presented in this article is general and can be applied to any MBE doping system with any growth orientation. The model under special conditions may yield analytical solutions which will be helpful for process automation. Results of the present study show that doping kinetics is intimately linked to growth kinetics of the semiconductor epilayer. Many of the theoretical models assume that the semiconductor growth kinetics is decoupled from the dopant kinetics which is correct only under limited circumstances. The limitations of the model is that it requires parameters such as pair interaction energies and activation energies. This limitation is not unique to our model, but is typical of any theoretical study of kinetics. The other limitation of the model is its inability to grow thick epilayers on the order of several microns in a reasonable amount of computer time. In this study, this limitation is overcome by extrapolation of the results. It should be noted that such extrapolation schemes may not always be applicable.

4.3 Summary

A rate equation model based on the master equation approach is developed for the study of MBE doping kinetics. The model is applied to study the surface segregation phenomenon observed during In doping of Si. The doping studies were performed for various growth conditions. The predicted sticking coefficient of In versus $\frac{1}{T}$ and the dopant depth profile shows excellent agreement with experiments. The dopant sticking coefficient decreases with $T$ due to surface segregation aided evaporation of In at higher temperatures. The surface segregation of In occurs due to strong repulsive interaction between In and the host lattice which results in upward migration of In. A dopant depleted zone where the In concentration is lower than that in the bulk and at the surface is observed and agrees well
with experiments. The time and growth rate dependences of the phenomenon are studied and found to agree with work reported in the literature. $\delta$ doping of Si is studied in the range of $673^\circ k$ to $973^\circ K$. The results are in qualitative agreement with experimental results. With an increase in temperature, the dopant profiles become sharper which is explained by smoother growth surface at higher temperatures.
Figure 4.1: Sticking coefficient of the dopant, In, versus $\frac{1}{T}$. 
Figure 4.2: Dopant segregation profile for various growth times for growth at 933°K.
Figure 4.3: Dopant segregation profiles for various temperatures for a growth time of 20 seconds.
Figure 4.4: Dopant sticking coefficient for various growth rates at 933°K.
Figure 4.5: Surface concentration of dopant for various growth times at 933°K.
Figure 4.6: Delta doping profiles with (a) $E_{SID} = -0.08$ eV (strong repulsion) and (b) $E_{SID} = -0.01$ eV (weak repulsion) at 933°K.
Chapter 5

Conclusion

The surface kinetics of MBE growth of (100) GaAs and doping kinetics of In doped Si system were studied theoretically using a stochastic model based on the master equation approach with the solid-on-solid restriction and a quasi-chemical approximation for various growth conditions. The growth rate, the time averaged surface roughness and the time averaged RHEED intensity were obtained for various growth temperatures. The kinetic surface roughening transition temperature for the MBE growth of GaAs is identified as 770°K and 800°K for flux ratios 1 : 10 and 1 : 20, respectively, from the temperature dependence of the time averaged RHEED intensity. The results of this study compare favorably with that of the experiments obtained under similar growth conditions[6]. The phenomenon of kinetic surface roughening transition in the MBE growth of GaAs (100) is explained in terms of the competition among various surface processes such as the incorporation and evaporation of atoms which roughen the surface and the surface migration of atoms to energetically favorable sites which smoothen the process. In the study of surface segregation phenomenon of dopants, the predicted sticking coefficient of In versus $\frac{1}{2}$ and
the dopant depth profile shows excellent agreement with experiments. The dopant sticking coefficient decreases with $T$ due to surface segregation aided evaporation of $In$ at higher temperatures. The surface segregation of $In$ occurs due to strong repulsive interaction between $In$ and the host lattice which results in upward migration of $In$. A dopant depleted zone where the $In$ concentration is lower than that in the bulk and at the surface is observed and agrees well with experiments. The time and growth rate dependences of the phenomenon are studied and found to agree with work reported in the literature. $\delta$ doping of $Si$ is studied in the range of 673° K to 973° K. The results are in qualitative agreement with experimental results. With an increase in temperature, the dopant profiles become sharper which is explained by smoother growth surface at higher temperatures.

Based on the present work, and as a continuation of this work, the following studies are recommended. (1) Develop the stochastic model to study other growth observations such as (111). (2) Use the present model to study other material systems. (3) Explore ways to relax the SOS restriction. (4) Develop a model to obtain microstructural information from the output of the stochastic model.
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