Boundary Conditions in an Electric Current Contact

O. Yu. Titov
CICATA–IPN, Av. Jose Siurob 10, Col. Alameda,
76040 Queretaro, Qro., Mexico

J. Giraldo[y]
Grupo de Física de la Materia Condensada,
Universidad Nacional de Colombia,
A.A. 60739, Bogota, Colombia

Yu. G. Gurevich[z]
Depto. de Física, CINVESTAV–IPN,
Apdo. Postal 14–740, 07000 Mexico, D.F., Mexico

In most electronic devices, electric current of both types (electrons and holes) flows through a junction. Usually the boundary conditions have been formulated exclusively for open circuit. The boundary conditions proposed here bypass this limitation by the first time, as far as we are aware. Besides, these new boundary conditions correctly describe current flow in a circuit, i.e., closed circuit conditions, which are the usual operation conditions for electronic devices and for the measurement of many transport properties. We also have generalized the case (as much as it is possible in a classical treatment), so self-consistent boundary conditions to describe current–flow through a contact between two arbitrary conducting media are developed in the present work. These boundary conditions take into account a recently developed theory: influence of temperature space inhomogeneity due to the interfaces and quasi-particles temperature-mismatch on thermo-generation and recombination. They also take into account surface resistance, surface recombination rates and possible temperature discontinuities at the interface due to finite surface thermo-conductivity. The temperature difference between current-carriers and phonon subsystems is also included in this approach.

PACS numbers: 73.25.+i, 73.30.+y, 73.40.-c

This work addresses the problem of defining appropriate boundary conditions (BCs) in a closed electronic circuit of any type in the simplest general case. It is a continuation and generalization of previous studies published elsewhere.[1,2,3,4,5] They have been undertaken to clarify different processes arising in connection with real working conditions of electronic devices in general,[6,7] and in the search for applications to design new optoelectronic and thermoelectric devices.[8,9,10]

In spite of great advances in the field of contemporary electronics, the effects of any boundary between two arbitrary materials have been studied, in practice, only for open circuits. The presence of both charge carriers (like electrons and holes in semiconducting materials; Cooper pairs in superconductors; etc...) in circuits containing hetero-junctions, makes a big difference when the circuit is closed. Additionally, an intrinsic nonlinear effect due to the temperature difference between electrons and holes, from one side, and phonons, from the other (hot electrons), is usually forgotten (see, for example Ref. 11,12,13). This effect has been studied in Ref. 5.

Actually, one can mention very few works handling closed circuits and non-equilibrium carriers (see Ref. 14 and reference therein). In more recent works[1,2,4] it has been shown that it is compulsory to take into account non-equilibrium carriers in bipolar and p-type semiconductors even in a linear approximation by electric field; furthermore, recombination starts to play an important role even in the linear regime and cannot be neglected.[3,4,5]

In practice, people use zero-current BCs to define the functionality of solid state electronic devices in general.[6,7] This is an ideal assumption that works well in many cases, particularly when there is no different kind of charge and heat carriers and interfaces involved. For a proper description of real performance conditions in hetero-junctions, it should not be ignored that all devices are working in a mode such that electric current flows through the ends of a semiconducting structure and in a whole closed circuit, completed with another semiconductor, a normal metal or a superconducting material. Typically the semiconductors have both charge carriers, electrons and holes, and important recombination processes take place at the ends. All these facts demand a more stringent choice of BCs, and in particular of non-vanishing current BCs at the borders between different elements of a circuit to setup the correct working conditions of solid state electronic devices in general. These BCs become more important nowdays when accurate measurements of current to the level of holes and electrons are feasable.[10]

In what follows, general BCs at the contact between two arbitrary conducting media will be obtained. Next we exemplify the usual case of a metal-semiconductor boundary. Finally we comment our results.

BCs (see, for example, Ref. 15) can be obtained from the transport equations for non-equilibrium carriers.[16] In the static case they look like:

$$\mathrm{div}\, j_n = eR_n; \qquad \mathrm{div}\, j_p = -eR_p: \tag{1}$$

Here $R_{n,p}$ are electron and hole recombination rates;

$$j_n = \sigma_n \frac{d\tilde{\varphi}_n}{dx} - \sigma_n \frac{dT_n}{dx}; \qquad j_p = \sigma_p \frac{d\tilde{\varphi}_p}{dx} - \sigma_p \frac{dT_p}{dx}; \tag{2}$$

are electron and hole electric currents; $\sigma_{n,p}$ | electron and hole conductivity;

$$\tilde{\varphi}_{n,p} = \varphi - \frac{\mu_{n,p}}{e} \tag{3}$$

are the electrochemical potentials (for exhaustive discussion see Ref. 17), where φ is the electric potential and $\mu_{n,p}$ are electron and hole chemical potentials; the latters are related by $\mu_p = -E_g - \mu_n$ (E_g is the semiconductor band gap) only under thermodynamic equilibrium conditions (for exhaustive discussion see Ref. 3); $(-e)$ is the electron charge ($e > 0$); α_n and α_p, electron and hole power coefficients; T_n and T_p | electron and hole temperatures (for exhaustive discussion see Ref. 17). The recombination rates are usually written out in the following form:[18]

$$R_n = \frac{n}{\tau_n}; \qquad R_p = \frac{p}{\tau_p}: \tag{4}$$

Here $\tau_{n,p}$ are electron and hole lifetimes; $n = n - n_0$ and $p = p - p_0$ are electron and hole non-equilibrium concentrations; n and p are the full concentrations; n_0 and p_0 are the corresponding equilibrium values; n and p are related to fluctuations in the chemical potentials $\mu_{n,p}$.[4] Notice that these and the Fermi quasilevels $\tilde{\varphi}_{n,p}(x) = \varphi(x) - (1/e)\mu_{n,p}(x)$ are inhomogeneous across a boundary.

It follows from Maxwell's equations that $\mathrm{div}(j_n + j_p) = 0$ in the steady state, so that taking into account Eq. (4) one obtains from Eq. (1) the unphysical condition: $(n/\tau_n) = (p/\tau_p)$. Gurevich et al. (in Ref. 4) have shown that Eq. (4) is thermodynamically incorrect; moreover, Eqs. (4) should always be replaced by the following relationship (according to Ref. 3):

$$R_n = R_p = R; \qquad R = \frac{n}{\tau_n} + \frac{p}{\tau_p}: \tag{5}$$

The system of Eqs. (1) is incomplete as we have three unknown functions $n(x)$, $p(x)$, and $\varphi(x)$. Poisson equation might be used to complete it. For simplicity, we will assume that all characteristic lengths are much bigger than the Debye's radius,[19] so that:

$$n(x) = p(x) \tag{6}$$

and Poisson equation becomes unnecessary.

Let us assume that the boundary between media 1 and 2 lies at $x = 0$. Integrating Eqs. (1) with x in a short range from $x = -\Delta$ to $x = +\Delta$ and taking the limit $\Delta \to 0$ one obtains:

$$j_n(+0) - j_n(-0) = +eR_s; \qquad j_p(+0) - j_p(-0) = -eR_s: \tag{7}$$

Here

$$R_s = \lim_{\Delta \to 0} \int_{-\Delta}^{+\Delta} R(x)\, dx \tag{8}$$

is the surface recombination rate. Making use of Eq. (5) it can be rewritten as:[3]

$$R_s = S_n\, n + S_p\, p; \tag{9}$$

or, with the help of Eq. (6),

$$R_s = S\, n; \qquad S = S_n + S_p: \tag{10}$$

Notice that the recombination rate R in Eq. (8) is x dependent. Each one of the contacting media changes its properties in a distance close to the Debye's radius and becomes inhomogeneous in that region. This explains the x dependence of R in Eq. (8).

Let us now integrate Eq. (1) with dx from " to , and with d" from to + . One obtains:

$$\begin{aligned} j_n(+0) &= {}^s_n\{\tilde{}_n(\ 0) \quad \tilde{}_n(+0) \quad {}^s_n[T_n(+0) \quad T_n(\ 0)]g + eR^{n+}_s \\ j_p(+0) &= {}^s_p\ \tilde{}_p(\ 0) \quad \tilde{}_p(+0) \quad {}^s_p[T_p(+0) \quad T_p(\ 0)] \quad eR^{p+}_s : \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

Here ${}^s_n$ and ${}^s_p$ are electron and hole surface conductivity:

$$({}^s_{n,p})^{\ 1} = \lim_{\ !\ 0} \int_{\ }^{+} ({}_{n,p})^{\ 1}(\ )d\ ; \tag{12}$$

${}^s_{n,p}$ are thermopower surface coefficients:

$${}^s_{n,p} = \frac{1}{T(\ ) \quad T(\ )} \lim_{\ !\ 0} \int_{T(\ )}^{T(\ )} {}_{n,p}(T)dT; \tag{13}$$

$R^{n+,p+}_s$ are surface recombination rates for electrons and holes to the right of the boundary x = 0:

$$R^{n+}_s = {}^s_n \lim_{\ !\ 0} \int_{\ }^{+} d"\ _n^{\ 1}(") \int_{"} dxR(x) \qquad R^{p+}_s = {}^s_p \lim_{\ !\ 0} \int_{\ }^{+} d"\ _p^{\ 1}(") \int_{"} dxR(x): \tag{14}$$

Using the same procedure, the following BCs are obtained for the left:

$$\begin{aligned} j_n(\ 0) &= {}^s_n\{\tilde{}_n(\ 0) \quad \tilde{}_n(+0) \quad {}^s_n[T_n(+0) \quad T_n(\ 0)]g \quad eR^{n}_s \\ j_p(\ 0) &= {}^s_p\ \tilde{}_p(\ 0) \quad \tilde{}_p(+0) \quad {}^s_p[T_p(+0) \quad T_p(\ 0)] + eR^{p}_s : \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

$R^{n,p}_s$ are surface recombination rates for electrons and holes to the left of the boundary x = 0:

$$R^{n}_s = {}^s_n \lim_{\ !\ 0} \int_{\ }^{+} d"\ _n^{\ 1}(") \int_{\ }^{"} R(x)dx \qquad R^{p}_s = {}^s_p \lim_{\ !\ 0} \int_{\ }^{+} d"\ _p^{\ 1}(") \int_{\ }^{"} R(x)dx: \tag{16}$$

From Eqs. (8), (14), and (16) it becomes evident that

$$R^{n+}_s + R^{n}_s = R^{p+}_s + R^{p}_s = R_s \tag{17}$$

therefore BCs (7), (11), and (15) are not independent and only two of them should be used.

One should base particular decision of which BCs to use on experimental setup or physical sense of the problem to solve. Besides, this decision depends a lot on particular properties of the contact (Schottky barrier, p-n-junction, n^+-n-contact, etc...). We will demonstrate below how to choose the correct BCs for a metal-semiconductor junction.

We would like to emphasize two important facts. Firstly, it is not enough to define general surface recombination rates for the correct definition of transport effects on contact (this follows from Eqs. (11) and (15)). One has to use particular surface recombination rates for every type of current carriers (electrons, holes, etc.) defined on both sides of the contact. As far as we are aware, this has not been taken into account previously by anybody.

Secondly, we have used electron's and hole's Fermi quasilevels in Eqs. (11) and (15). One assumes that the electron's Fermi quasilevel is measured from the bottom of the conduction band, and that the hole's quasilevel is measured from the top of the valence band. Usually the position of the top of the valence band and the bottom of the conduction band are different in heterocontacts. That is why the reference (zero) points for the Fermi quasilevels are different at x = +0 and x = 0.

Next we will describe how to take into account the above mentioned differences in a metal–semiconductor boundary.

It is very common to inject electric current into semiconductor samples through metal contacts. These contacts have an interesting peculiarity: semiconductors can be characterized by the presence of both electrons and holes, while metals have only electrons as current carriers.

Let us take into account this fact in Eqs. (7), (11), and (15). We assume that we have a metal to the left of x = 0 and a semiconductor to the right. Therefore we have that $j^m_p(\ 0) = 0$, so that Eq. (7) leads to $j^s_p(+0) = eR_s$ (the subscript indicates the corresponding media; here "s" stands for semiconductor and "m" for metal).

We can simplify Eq. (15) due to the absence of surface recombination in a metal (it has only electrons as charge carriers): $R_s^n = R_s^p = 0$. Therefore, from Eq. (17) it follows that:

$$R_s = R_s^{n+} = R_s^{p+}: \tag{18}$$

There are no positive charge carriers in metals, which means that electron current in the metal, j_n^m (0), should be equal to the whole current j_0. In this case, the BCs (15) reduce to:

$$j_0 = {}_n^s \; '_m \quad '_s(0) \quad \frac{{}_m}{e} + \frac{{}_s(0)}{e} + \frac{"_c}{e} \quad {}_n^s [\Gamma_n^s(0) \quad \Gamma_n^m(0)] : \tag{19}$$

Notice that the electrical and the chemical potential of the metal have not changed. Let us remind that ${}_m$ and ${}_s$ are calculated from the bottom of the conduction band of each material. This leads to the additional term in Eq. (19) (${}_n^s=e$) $"_c$, where $"_c$ is the distance between the metal and the semiconductor conduction bands.

It follows from the second equation of system (15) that ${}_p^s = 0$. This is to be expected since the absence of holes in a metal means the absence of holes surface conductivity.

Summarizing all the above mentioned facts, we can write Eq. (11) as

$$j_n^s(0) = {}_n^s \; '_m \quad '_s(0) \quad \frac{{}_m}{e} + \frac{{}_s(0)}{e} + \frac{"_c}{e} \quad {}_n^s [\Gamma_n^s(0) \quad \Gamma_n^m(0)] + eR_s; \qquad j_p^s(0) = \quad eR_s: \tag{20}$$

The last condition in (20) is equal to the second condition in (7). The first equation in (7) can be rewritten as

$$j_n^s(0) \quad j_0 = eR_s: \tag{21}$$

Notice that the first equation (20) follows from Eqs.(19) and (21). All this yields the new BCs for a metal-semiconductor junction which are now formed by Eq. (19), Eq. (21), and the second of equations (20).

In conclusion, we have formulated general BCs, corresponding to current flow through the boundary between two conducting media. These conditions consider possible jumps of the electron's and hole's Fermi quasilevels and of the electric potentials at the boundary; they also take into account the surface recombination rates. The general procedure has been applied to a usual contact, namely the metal-semiconductor boundary, but the method is valid for all types of contacts (n^+-n, p^+-p, p-n, Schottky barrier, etc...) between different conducting materials.

This work was partially supported by CONACyT, Mexico. JG has received support from DINAIN (Universidad Nacional de Colombia), Colombia.

Electronic address: oleg.titov@aleph-tec.com
[y] Electronic address: jgiraldo@ciencias.unal.edu.co
[z] Electronic address: gurevich@ s.cinvestav.mx

[1] Yu.G. Gurevich, G.N. Logvinov, O.I. Lyubimov, and O.Yu. Titov, Phys. Rev. B 51, 6999 (1995).
[2] Yu.G. Gurevich, J. Thermoelectricity 2, 5 (1997).
[3] I.N. Volovichev and Yu.G. Gurevich, Semiconductors 35, 306 (2001).
[4] Yu.G. Gurevich, G.N. Logvinov, G. Espejo, O.Yu. Titov, A. Meriuts, Semiconductors 34, 755 (2000).
[5] Yu.G. Gurevich and I.N. Volovichev, Phys. Rev. B 60, 7715 (1999).
[6] J. Singh, Semiconductor devices: basic principles (John Wiley and Sons, New York, 2001).
[7] S.M. Sze, Semiconductor devices: physics and technology (John Wiley and Sons, New York, 1985).
[8] R. Aguado and L. Kouwenhoven, Phys. Rev. Lett. 84, 1986 (2000); C.W. Hoyt et al., ibid, 85, 3600 (2000).
[9] Francis J. DiSalvo, Science 285, 703 (1999); G.D. Mahan and L.M. Wood, Phys. Rev. Lett. 80, 4016 (1998).
[10] A. Fujiwara and Y. Takahashi, Nature 40, 560 (2001).
[11] Jan Tautc, Photo and Thermoelectric Effects in Semiconductors (Pergamon Press, N.-Y., Oxford, London, Paris, 1962).
[12] A.I. Anselm, Introduction to Semiconductor Theory (Mir-Moscow, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1981).
[13] A.F. Ioffe, Physics of Semiconductors (Infosearch, London, 1960).
[14] I.I. Balmush, Z.M. Dashevsky, A.I. Kasiyan, Thermoelectric Phenomena in Multilayer Semiconductor Structures (Shtiintsa, Kishenev, 1992) [in russian].
[15] L.D. Landau and E.M. Lifshits, Course of theoretical Physics, Vol. 8: Electrodynamics of Continuous Media (Pergamon, New York, 1984).
[16] V.L. Bonch-Bruevich, S.G. Kalashnikov, Physics of Semiconductors (VEB Deutscher Verlag der Wissen-Schaften, Berlin, 1982) [in german].
[17] Yu.G. Gurevich, O.L. Mashkevich, Phys. Rep. 181, 327 (1989).
[18] D.A. Neamen, Semiconductor Physics and Devices: Basic Principles (Richard D. Irwin, Boston, 1992).
[19] V.P. Silin, A.A. Rukhadze, Electromagnetic Properties of the Plasma and Related Media (Atomizdat Moscow, 1961) [in russian].