Coupling Atomistic and Finite Element Approaches for the Simulation of Optoelectronic Devices

M. Auf der Maur, F. Sacconi, G. Penazzi,M. Povolotskyi, G. Romano, A. Pecchia,A. Gagliardi and Aldo Di Carlo



University of Rome "Tor Vergata", Italy Department of Electronic Engineering

Outline

- Introduction
- The multiscale approach
- Coupling of FEM and atomistic simulations
- Example
- Conclusion



Introduction



Simulation approaches (Classical)

ZrO₂ no tunneling
HfO₂ no tunneling Approach for 'big' conventional devices: 10 Drain current [A/cm] SiO, no tunneling gate **Classical Drift-Diffusion** ZrO₂ 5nm drain source simulations 25 nm n 10¹⁹ n 10¹⁹ -1.5 -1 -0.5 Gate voltage [V] 0.5 Si 0.5V 10 0.4V p 10¹⁸ 0.3V Drain current [A/cm] 0.2V 0.1V 0.0V -0.1V $V_g = 0 V$ -0.2V -0.3V 1.5 0.5 Drain voltage [V] b) a) Elasticity theory **Drift-Diffusion** IC/m² Potential [V] -0.024 -0.028 0.5 0.5 0.3 -0.1 -0.3 -0.5 -0.7 -0.032 $Tr(\varepsilon)$ -0.036 -0.04 -0.044 -0.048 0.0065 0.0045 -0.052 0.0025 -0.056 0.0005 -0.0015 -0.0035 -0.0055 -0.0075 -0.0095 -0.0115 君寻 IBER

Simulation approaches (Atomistic)



7.7 nm

Micro/macro scale

Many modern devices are based on nanostructures which need a quantum mechanical description, and we know how to do this.

BUT:

In a real device also micro and macro scale should be considered!

- > Number of atoms cannot grow too much in simulations
- > Device should be accessible from a macro scale
- micro/macro scale details are as important as nanoscale features (temperature distribution, electrostatics, strain, air gap, etc.)
- > 20 years of experience with Drift-diffusion matters !



Multiscale structures

Typical Pentium 4 MOSFET section:

InAs quantum dot LASER:



The multiscale problem



University of Rome "Tor Vergata"

TIBER 433





Multiscale components

Finite Element Method

- FEM is the method in engineering problems (deformation/strain, heat, Maxwell, etc. etc.)

-Drift-diffusion (DD) like schemes have been solved with box integration methods.

- DD-FEM have been heavily developed in the last 20 years in the Math community (*Hecht, Marrocco, Brezzi, Sacco, Chen*)

- many FEM library in (L)GPL

Atomistic local basis

- Localized basis approach are very well suited for device simulations

IBER人名弓

- Empirical approaches (ETB)
- Aproximate DFT (DFTB)
- Full DFT (Siesta, DMOL, etc.)

Multiscale methods

OVERLAP METHOD



- the domains are overlapped
- each model computes physical quantities that act as parameters to the other models.

BRIDGE METHOD



- the domains are contiguous and linked through n-1 dimensional regions.
- each domain provides boundary conditions to adjacent domains.



Integration FEM/Atomistic

- FEM and atomistic calculations run in the same environment.
- Tools to automatize crystal atomistic structure description and project quantities between atomistic and continuum domain have been developed.



Atomistic generator features:

- Manage most useful Bravais lattices (cubic, hexagonal, fcc, bcc)
- Provide any basis
- Manage pseudomorphic heterostructure and commensurable interfaces
- Provides hydrogen passivation model suitable for any crystal
- Generates minimal periodical structure for bulk, 1D and 2D calculations





FEM/Atomistic interaction

Strain:

calculate relative displacement u(x,y,z) and apply displacement to atoms, stretching bond lenght from d₀ to d. Tight Binding parameters calculated according to Harrison scaling rule:

Potential:

Use FEM potential solution to provide Hamiltonian shifts.

• If no SCC calculation is needed, slow varying potential is projected simply as point potential on atom position.

• If SCC is needed, a projection over an *s*-type orbital with exponential decay is used.

Charge:

Quantum charge is projected back to FEM grid. An s-type projection with exponential decay is used.

$$V_{\alpha\beta} = V_{\alpha\beta} \cdot \left(\frac{d_0}{d}\right)^{n_{\alpha\beta}}$$

$$V_i = V(r_i)$$
$$V_i = \frac{\tau_i^3}{8\pi} \int V(r_i) e^{-\tau |r-r_i|} dr$$

$$n(r) = \sum_{i} \frac{\tau_i^3}{8\pi} \int \Delta q_i e^{-\tau |r-r_i|} dr$$



Classical/quantum densities: Embracing

For a smooth transition between classical and quantum density we introduce an automatically generated embracing region where the densities get mixed:

 $n(x) = \lambda(x) \cdot n_Q(x) + [1 - \lambda(x)] \cdot n_{cl}(x)$

where $\lambda(x)$ is the solution of a Laplace equation in the embracing region.



IBER 43

K.P quantum model

InGaAs Quantum wire





University of Rome "Tor Vergata"

IBER LAS

- AIGaAs/GaAs nanocolumn with quadratic base
 - solve strain, drift-diffusion, EFA, TB



• classical results (1.75 V)



IBER 433



IBER 433

• selfconsistent results (EFA)

z "x

University of Rome "Tor Vergata"



- selfconsistent results (ETB)
 - ETB calculation takes ~ 2h per state (50000 atoms, 20 orbitals/atom)
 - 1 confined electron state, but many dense hole states
 - \Rightarrow ETB for electrons, EFA for holes



selfconsistent results (ETB)



• selfconsistent results: electron density





- A multiscale simulation model is needed for modern and future optoelectronic devices
- TiberCAD is now capable of doing selfconsistent Drift-Diffusion/EFA/ETB simulations
- Coupling of quantum transport (NEGF) and classical transport is still missing