#### Mobility Enhancement of 2DHG in an In<sub>0.24</sub>Ga<sub>0.76</sub>As Quantum Well by <110> Uniaxial Strain

Ling Xia<sup>1</sup>, Vadim Tokranov<sup>2</sup>, Serge Oktyabrsky<sup>2</sup> and Jesús del Alamo<sup>1</sup> <sup>1</sup>*MIT*, <sup>2</sup>*SUNY Albany* 05.25.2011

# Motivation

- Improve p-channel InGaAs FETs for III-V CMOS
- Enhance  $\mu$  : biaxial strain + uniaxial strain



#### **Experimental structure**

• Biaxially strained p-channel In<sub>0.24</sub>Ga<sub>0.76</sub>As QW:



• Typical output characteristics of fabricated QW-FET



Channel strain : 1.7% biaxial compressive

# Experiment approach

- Apply uniaxial stress to GaAs chips
- Measure response of ungated Hall bars
  - High  $I_{\rm G}$  prevents accurate C-V to extract  $C_{\rm G}$  and  $p_{\rm s}$



- - Can apply **tensile** or compressive stress
- Mechanism to bend GaAs chips Supporting mechanism Stress and Hall bar orientations and connections



Solid lines: linear fittings to data Dashed lines: 1D SP simulation with piezoelectric effect

- Almost identical patterns in  $\Delta p_s$  for Hall bars along [110] and [-110]
  - $-\Delta p_{\rm s}$  determined by piezoelectric effect
  - Similar to our previous p-channel GaAs study. (L. Xia, to be published on TED)

## Hole mobility change



- Dominant factor: relative orientation of stress and transport direction
- Similar in Si and Ge

# Sensitivities of $\mu_h$ to $\sigma_{<110>}$



 $\sigma_{//,[-110]} \sigma_{\perp,[-110]} \sigma_{//,[110]} \sigma_{\perp,[110]}$ 

- Preferred configuration: Compressive  $\sigma$  parallel to [-110] channel
- Questions:
  - Why  $\pi_{//}$  different from  $\pi_{\perp}$  ?
  - Why  $|\pi_{//,[-110]}| \neq |\pi_{//,[110]}|$ , and  $|\pi_{\perp,[-110]}| \neq |\pi_{\perp,[110]}|$ ?

# Anisotropy between $\pi_{//}$ and $\pi_{\perp}$

- Dominated by in-plane VB dispersion anisotropy
  - Simulation: 2D in-plane dispersion relation in QW by *k.p* method



- Change of VB  $(m^*)$  // or  $\perp$  to  $\sigma$  are different  $\rightarrow \pi_{//}$  and  $\pi_{\perp}$  different
  - Sign opposite for  $\Delta m^*_{//}$  and  $\Delta m^*_{\perp}$
  - Magnitude different (will show quantitatively later)
  - Similar in Si or Ge (S. Thompson, *IEDM*, 2004; O. Weber, *IEDM*, 2007)

#### Different $\pi$ along the two <110> directions

- Counterintuitive:
  - $\Delta m^*_{//}$  (or  $\Delta m^*_{\perp}$ ) should be the same for  $\sigma_{[-110]}$  and  $\sigma_{[110]}$
- 1<sup>st</sup> effect :  $p_s$  change due to piezoelectric effect ( $p_s \uparrow \rightarrow \mu_h \downarrow$ )
  - Partly explains  $\pi_{\perp,[-110]}$  and  $\pi_{\perp,[110]}$  difference
  - May have decreased  $\pi_{//,[-110]}$  and increased  $\pi_{//,[110]}$
- 2<sup>nd</sup> effect: polarization-field-induced quantization change



# Comparison between experiments and simulations



- Other sources of anisotropy:
  - Anisotropic scattering (e.g. polar optical phonon scattering)  $\tau_{//} \neq \tau_{\perp}$ when  $m^*_{//} \neq m^*_{\perp}$  (J. J. Harris, *J. Phys. Chem. Solids*, 1973)
  - Lateral composition modulation along [110] (K. Y. Cheng, *Appl. Phys. Lett.*, 1992)
  - Strain relaxation along [110] (B. Bennett, J. Electron. Mater., 1991)

## Comparison with other materials



- Uniaxial strain is a viable path to enhance p-channel III-V FET performance
- Superposition of uniaxial strain on top of biaxial strain  $\rightarrow$  large improvement in  $\mu$

[1] L. Xia, *APL*, 2011.
[2] L. Xia, to be published on *TED* 11