

Ensemble interactions in strained semiconductor quantum dots

R. Leon

Jet Propulsion Laboratory, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, California 91009

S. Marcinkevičius

Department of Physics II—Optics, Royal Institute of Technology, 100 44 Stockholm, Sweden

X. Z. Liao, J. Zou, and D. J. H. Cockayne

Australian Key Centre for Microscopy and Microanalysis, The University of Sydney, Sydney, NSW 2006, Australia

S. Fafard

Institute for Microstructural Sciences, National Research Council, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada K1A 0R6

(Received 22 April 1999)

Large variations in $\text{In}_x\text{Ga}_{1-x}\text{As}$ quantum dot concentrations were obtained with simultaneous growths on vicinal GaAs [001] substrates with different surface step densities. It was found that decreasing dot-dot separation blueshifts all levels, narrows intersublevel transition energies, shortens luminescence decay times for excited states, and increases inhomogeneous photoluminescence broadening. These changes in optical properties are attributed to a progressive strain deformation of the confining potentials and to the increasing effects of positional disorder in denser dot ensembles. [S0163-1829(99)51136-3]

Successful implementation of technology using self-forming semiconductor quantum dots (QD's) requires a better understanding of their optical properties. Temperature-independent¹ Dirac-delta density of states² can be exploited in low-current threshold lasers³ and infrared photodetectors.⁴ The possibility of using coupled QD's in the fabrication of cellular automata⁵ might revolutionize computation technologies, and this is being explored with different epitaxial, molecular, and nanocrystalline systems. Recent results have shown fourfold arrangement in Ge-Si islands.⁶ Frequency domain optical storage⁷ is an application that exploits the naturally large broadening (inhomogeneous/homogeneous) ratios observed in the photoluminescence (PL) spectra from self-forming QD's. All these device applications need some control and predictability of their optoelectronic properties.

Stranski-Krastanow (SK) QD's have the advantage of enabling integration with highly developed semiconductor technology. However, some of their idiosyncrasies include interaction with a very stable two-dimensional wetting layer (WL) that is formed at the beginning of the deposition. At a strain-dependent critical thickness^{8,9} islands begin to form and their concentration increases exponentially with further deposition.¹⁰ The WL can produce an intense peak in the PL spectra from SK QD structures in low surface densities. Additional complications include strain in the barrier material, within the dot, and randomly varying lateral strain effects from nearby dots. Other recently found complexities particular to $\text{In}_x\text{Ga}_{1-x}\text{As}$ and GeSi dots are indium or germanium enrichment, internal segregation in the islands,^{11,12} and differences in ripening behavior.^{13,14}

Experimental results from studies of energy relaxation processes in QD's have been contradictory. Emission from excited states has been observed from semiconductor dots formed by precipitation,¹⁵ SK growth,¹⁶ island induced strain,¹⁷ or atomic layer epitaxy,¹⁸ and these have been explained as phonon bottleneck or phase filling. In a similar

manner, several authors have found only ground-state emission, even for QD's of larger dimensions, where excited state emission^{2,9,19} would also be expected. Here we describe the changes in the optical properties of strained self-assembled QD's as a function of concentration. We demonstrate that for intermediate and high surface densities ($> 10^9/\text{cm}^2$) most of these properties (including the observation of excited states emission) are strongly influenced by dot-dot interactions.

Details of the growth of these samples by metal-organic chemical-vapor deposition are reported elsewhere.²⁰ Different QD densities were obtained by slight variations in substrate miscut angle (θ_m) in [001] GaAs: 0.00°, 0.25°, 0.75°, 1.25°, and 2° [all $\pm 0.25^\circ$] towards [110], giving different step densities, which are energetically favorable sites for island nucleation. Simultaneous growths eliminate effects from impurities, contaminants, or native defects. Structures grown on $\theta_m=0.00^\circ$ at the same temperature (550 °C) but under conditions producing high surface coverage of stable islands²⁰ were also investigated. Low-temperature (77 K) continuous-wave (CW) PL spectra were obtained using the 532-nm continuous-wave output of a diode-pumped Nd:YVO₄ for excitation, dispersing the signal with a single grating 0.67-m monochromator, and collecting it with a cooled Ge detector and lock-in techniques. Time-resolved photoluminescence (TRPL) measurements were performed at 77 K using a pulsed Ti: sapphire laser (780 nm, 80 fs, 96 MHz) for excitation, and a streak camera, combined with a 0.25-m spectrometer, was used for detection, with temporal resolution ~ 20 ps. Excitation power ranged from 0.01 to 1 mW and was scaled for different samples in proportion to the QD density to generate the same number of excitons per dot. Island concentrations were measured using atomic force microscopy (AFM) and plan view transmission electron microscopy (TEM). Sizes for the capped QD's were determined with plan-view TEM using a Philips EM430 TEM operating at 300 keV.




FIG. 1. Representative images of varying concentrations and spatial arrangements in strained $\text{In}_x\text{Ga}_{1-x}\text{As}/\text{GaAs}$ quantum dots. Imaging conditions were either off-zone-axis or axial bright field. (a) $\theta_m = 0.25 \pm 0.25$, (b) $\theta_m = 0.00 \pm 0.25$, (c) $\theta_m = 0.75 \pm 0.25$, (d) $\theta_m = 1.25 \pm 0.25$, (e) $\theta_m = 2.00 \pm 0.25$, and (f) $\theta_m = 0.00 \pm 0.25$ (different growth conditions that maximize island coverages).

Figure 1 shows TEM micrographs of our capped QD structures. Differences in QD average separation are apparent as reported in previous studies.^{21,22} QD “strings” aligned at multiatomic step edges are observed here for $\theta_m > 0.75^\circ$. Figure 2(a) shows dramatic differences in line shapes, emission energies, and saturation behavior obtained with the different QD concentrations seen in Fig. 1. QD structures giving spectra labeled *A*, *B*, and *C* show similar qualitative behavior, with excited states peaks or “shoulders” appearing at higher excitation. In samples *D*, *E*, and *F*, the PL peak from the QD’s does not change shape with excitation. However, as seen in Fig. 2(b), they do exhibit time-dependent spectra for two samples with small and large QD density. Figure 2(b) shows characteristic time-resolved spectra for two samples with small and large QD density. There is a striking difference between the CW and time-resolved PL spectra for the large density samples: while at the early times after the pulsed excitation the excited state transitions are clearly visible as peaks or shoulders in the time-resolved spectra [Fig. 2(b)], they are completely missing in the CW mode. One should note, however, that while PL peaks from excited states are seen even at long times after excitation for low QD densities, excited states emission decays more rapidly for densely packed QD’s thus giving a much smaller contribution to the time-integrated signal. Figure 3 shows a plot of the energy sublevels and spacings as a function of average dot separation (from fits of spectra in Fig. 2) and these are compared with the variation of level energies obtained after postgrowth annealing. Table I summarizes the experimental observations. These results indicate the following trends with increasing dot-dot proximity: ground-states and excited states energies blueshift, intersublevel energy ($\Delta E_{[(i+1)-i]}$) spacings narrow, emission from excited states decays faster, and PL emission broadens. It is

thus apparent that changing average interdot distances also affects saturation behavior and energy relaxation in strained quantum dot structures besides changing emission energies and inhomogeneous broadening.

A recent report found electron and hole tunneling “in plane” for self-assembled quantum dots²³ since these can be in close proximity. Other reports have found redshifts in vertically aligned strained coupled quantum dots.²⁴ Redshifts would be expected from electronic coupling between dots. Unexpectedly though, one of the most obvious effects seen here is the blueshifting of all levels. Diminishing dot sizes would explain ground-state blueshifts, however, dot sizes are not observed to change significantly for capped dots. Also, narrower $\Delta E_{[(i+1)-i]}$ are observed as a function of increasing dot concentration (larger $\Delta E_{[(i+1)-i]}$ are calculated for smaller dots).

These results have interesting similarities with data recently obtained from QD’s after postgrowth annealing experiments,^{25,26} where interfacial compositional disordering of the $\text{In}_x\text{Ga}_{1-x}\text{As}/\text{GaAs}$ interface was found to blueshift all levels while lowering values for $\Delta E_{[(i+1)-i]}$ due to a reduction in confining potentials. Comparison of the two sets of experimental results is shown in Fig. 3 and can offer some physical insight. The blueshifts and narrower $\Delta E_{[(i+1)-i]}$ seen here for denser dot ensembles can be explained by an effective reduction of the confining potential caused by strain from nearby dots rather than as a consequence of electronic coupling. While no definitive evidence for electronic coupling is obtained from these experiments, it cannot be ruled out, since the faster dynamics of the excited states might be an indication of electronic coupling. Even for the larger interdot separations, the near-neighbor distance distribution would allow tunneling between a fraction of the dots. Also,




FIG. 2. (a) 77 K PL spectra of $\text{In}_x\text{Ga}_{1-x}\text{As}$ QD's with varying concentrations, corresponding to plan-view images in Fig. 1. (b) 77 K TRPL spectra, integrated over a 50-ps temporal window with central time values of 100, 840, and 1670 ps after excitation for (i) sample (C), and (ii) sample (E).

the effective reduction in carrier confinement with decreasing QD spacings increases tunneling probability.

Trends towards decreasing PL decay times are seen for increasing dot concentration and for higher eigenstates. The

latter observation has also been reported for molecular beam epitaxy grown $\text{In}_x\text{Ga}_{1-x}\text{As}$ dots²⁷ and dots formed by segregation epitaxy.¹⁸ Recent measurements of PL decay times confirm that reductions in confining potentials associated with interdiffusion shorten PL lifetimes.²⁸ However, faster interlevel relaxation for dense QD ensembles may be due to several factors. $\Delta E_{[(i+1)-i]}$ is reduced as the QD density increases and approaches GaAs LO phonon energies, potentially changing energy relaxation mechanisms. In addition, close spacing of the QD's might enhance relaxation rates due to level coupling easing interdot carrier transfer. One could also expect faster relaxation due to electronic coupling between QD's densely packed in chains.²⁹ However, we do not observe major differences between the PL dynamics for the high density samples E and F, in one of which the dots are in the chains, and for the other one the dots are distributed randomly (see Fig. 1). This shows that the PL dynamics are more strongly affected by the QD density than by their orientation into closely packed chains. On the other hand, some subtle CW PL spectral features seen in Fig. 2 can be understood by considering the "bunched" character of the QD. Anisotropic spatial distributions can slightly change the recombination dynamics in these dots ensembles. The highest concentration found in the first sample set still leaves zones denuded of QD's [see Figs. 1(d) and 1(e)] and thus recombination from wetting layer states contributes to the spectra even at low excitation intensities. Enhanced dot-dot interaction will be expected for these "bunched" structures, since most dots are in chains, even for low average QD concentrations. These spectra show some of the effects of dot-dot interactions while still producing an intense WL peak.

Inhomogeneous PL broadening is larger in denser dot ensembles. Dot dimensions and size distributions did not vary




FIG. 3. Level energies vs average dot-dot separation (solid diamonds), compared with level shifts induced by thermal intermixing (Ref. 25) (hollow circles).

TABLE I. Energy levels, intersublevel energy spacings, PL decay times (measured at 80 K), and inhomogeneous broadening (2Γ) for quantum dots with different surface densities. σ was determined from plan-view TEM images of QD's, dot concentrations are from AFM of surface dots and plan-view TEM of capped dots (shown in Fig. 2). Error bars in $E_{i=0}$ are from local variations in emission from different areas within a QD structure. The error margins for the PL decay times are $\pm 3\%$.

QD	surface density (cm ⁻²)	Island diam (nm (± 5 nm))	$E_{i=0}$ (eV (± 0.01))	PL decay time ($i=0$) (ns)	$E_{i=1}$ (eV)	PL decay time ($i=1$) (ns)	$E_{i=2}$ (eV)	PL decay time ($i=2$) (ns)	$E_{i=3}$ (eV)	PL decay time ($i=3$) (ns)	2Γ (meV)	σ (%)
A	3.5×10^8	24	1.055		1.119		1.158		1.216		37.4	13.4 ± 4.1
B	3.7×10^8	25	1.077	5.1	1.126	3.2	1.179	2.1	1.230	0.75	34.6	22 ± 6.1
C	7×10^8	23	1.075	1.7	1.129	1.7	1.192	0.98	1.238	0.62	44.7	10.5 ± 2.6
D	2.6×10^9	24	1.119	1.4	1.165	1.2	1.213	0.77	1.259	0.56	62	15.4 ± 2.9
E	7.3×10^9	25	1.160	2.7	1.198	1.1	1.240	0.62			56	14 ± 3.2
F	2.4×10^{10}	25	1.174	1.8	1.219	1.5	1.270				65	11 ± 2.5

significantly from sample to sample. This additional broadening (20–30 meV) in closely spaced dots is most likely due to random spatial variations. Two dots of identical size, shape, and ternary composition will then have different emission energies from local strain asymmetries in their confining potential and “disorder-induced” inhomogeneous broadening will be observed. Rapid progress in ordering self-assembled QD (Ref. 30) structures indicates that ordered III-V QD arrays are a possibility for the near future. The possible contribution from larger homogeneous broadening should also be considered in interpreting the causes for the increased inhomogeneous broadening in dense QD ensembles. Further experiments using micro-PL (single dot spectroscopy³¹) in differently spaced ordered QD arrays are needed to establish the relative contributions from inhomogeneous and homogeneous broadening.

Thermodynamic stability for SK islands has been established theoretically³² and experimentally for In_xGa_{1-x}As dots²⁰ where islands in high concentrations were found to be stable against ripening. Interestingly, the morphologically unstable islands (low densities) show better defined zero-dimensional (0D) properties. Device applications for these 0D structures will then require further studies examining the long-term implications of such structural metastability.

In summary, we have shown that varying the average separation in strained semiconductor quantum dots causes radical changes in their optoelectronic properties, and that the randomness of interdot spacings adds a significant component to inhomogeneous broadening.

Part of this work was sponsored by the Jet Propulsion Laboratory, under a contract with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

- ¹S. Fafard *et al.*, Surf. Sci. **361–362**, 778 (1996).
- ²S. Fafard *et al.*, Phys. Rev. B **50**, R8086 (1994); R. Leon *et al.*, Science **267**, 1966 (1995).
- ³S. Fafard *et al.*, Science **274**, 1350 (1996).
- ⁴J. L. Jimenez *et al.*, Appl. Phys. Lett. **71**, 3558 (1997); J. Phillips, K. Kamath, and P. Bhattacharya, *ibid.* **72**, 2020 (1998).
- ⁵I. Amlani *et al.*, Appl. Phys. Lett. **72**, 2179 (1998).
- ⁶X. Deng and M. Krishnamurthy, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 1473 (1998).
- ⁷S. Muto, Jpn. J. Appl. Phys., Part 2 **34**, L210 (1995).
- ⁸B. G. Orr *et al.*, Europhys. Lett. **19**, 33 (1992).
- ⁹R. Leon *et al.*, Appl. Phys. Lett. **67**, 521 (1995).
- ¹⁰D. Leonard, K. Pond, and P. M. Petroff, Phys. Rev. B **50**, 11 687 (1994); R. Leon and S. Fafard, *ibid.* **58**, R1726 (1998).
- ¹¹X. Z. Liao *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 5148 (1999).
- ¹²J. Tersoff, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 3183 (1998).
- ¹³F. M. Ross, J. Tersoff, and R. M. Tromp, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 984 (1998); G. Medeiros-Ribeiro *et al.*, Science **279**, 353 (1998).
- ¹⁴Y. Kim, B. D. Min, and E. K. Kim, J. Appl. Phys. **85**, 2140 (1999).
- ¹⁵S. A. Empedocles and M. G. Bawendi, Science **278**, 2114 (1997).
- ¹⁶S. Fafard *et al.*, Phys. Rev. B **52**, 5752 (1995).
- ¹⁷H. Lipsanen, M. Sopanen, and J. Ahopelto, Phys. Rev. B **51**, 13 868 (1995).
- ¹⁸K. Mukai *et al.*, Appl. Phys. Lett. **68**, 3013 (1996).
- ¹⁹C. Lobo *et al.*, Appl. Phys. Lett. **72**, 2850 (1998).
- ²⁰R. Leon *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 2486 (1998).
- ²¹N. Ikoma and S. Ohkouchi, Jpn. J. Appl. Phys., Part 2 **34**, L724 (1995).
- ²²R. Leon *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78**, 4942 (1997).
- ²³D. L. Huffaker and D. G. Deppe, Appl. Phys. Lett. **73**, 366 (1998).
- ²⁴G. S. Solomon *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **76**, 952 (1996); M. K. Zundel *et al.*, Appl. Phys. Lett. **71**, 2972 (1997).
- ²⁵R. Leon *et al.*, Phys. Rev. B **58**, R4262 (1998).
- ²⁶A notable difference is the variation of the inhomogeneous PL broadening which shows opposite trends.
- ²⁷S. Raymond *et al.*, Phys. Rev. B **54**, 11 548 (1996).
- ²⁸S. Marcinkevicius and R. Leon, Phys. Rev. B **59**, 4630 (1999).
- ²⁹A. Tackeuchi *et al.*, Jpn. J. Appl. Phys., Part 2 **34**, L1439 (1995).
- ³⁰R. Notzel *et al.*, Nature (London) **392**, 56 (1998); G. Springholz *et al.*, Science **282**, 734 (1998).
- ³¹L. Landin *et al.*, Science **280**, 262 (1998); M. Bayer *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 1748 (1999).
- ³²V. A. Shchukin *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **75**, 2968 (1995); I. Daruka and A.-L. Barabasi, *ibid.* **79**, 3708 (1997); Appl. Phys. Lett. **72**, 2102 (1998).