

# Spatially nonuniform energy distribution of electrons in a submicron semiconductor film

Yu. G. Gurevich, G. N. Logvinov, and O. Yu. Titov

Institute of Radiophysics and Electronics, Academy of Sciences of the Ukraine, 310085, Kharkov, Ukraine

(Submitted October 26, 1992; accepted for publication February 1, 1993)

The symmetric part of the distribution of the electrons in a semiconductor submicron film, placed between a heater and refrigeration unit, is derived and analyzed. It is shown that, in general, it is of non-Fermi (non-Maxwellian) nature. A new mechanism is proposed to account for the non-Maxwellian form of the symmetric part of the distribution function. This mechanism is based on the different energy dependences of the momentum relaxation time in the bulk of the semiconductor and its skin layer.

In recent years we have witnessed an increase in the number of problems in which transport phenomena occur under conditions such that the flux of charge carriers moves along an inhomogeneity of the symmetric part of the energy distribution function, which is caused by a departure of carriers from equilibrium (due to an external stimulus).

When the symmetric part of the nonequilibrium distribution function of carriers is of the Fermi (Maxwellian) type, the problem can be solved relatively simply (see, for example, Refs. 1{6) by the use of effective boundary conditions.<sup>7</sup>

However, there are frequency cases in which for a variety of reasons the symmetric part of the equilibrium distribution function is not of the Fermi type.<sup>8{10</sup> In this case, if the external stimulus is an externally imposed potential difference, the physical phenomena are generally insensitive to the actual form of the symmetric part of the distribution function.<sup>11</sup> (the few exceptions<sup>12,13</sup> confirm the general rule). The situation is different if the electron flux is caused by the presence of a refrigerator or a heater. We recall that in the temperature approximation (in which the symmetric part of the distribution function is Maxwellian) the role of the external force is played by a temperature gradient. It is necessary in this case to single out the contribution due to a gradient of the chemical potential (Refs. 14 and 15), i.e., by dividing the thermal diffusion flux into a flux which is due to the built-in thermoelectric field ( $\epsilon_r$ ) and which is compensated by the drift flux ( $\epsilon_r'$ , where  $\epsilon_r'$  is the electrical potential) and a thermal diffusion flux which is included in the external circuit and which forms the thermoelectric current.

However, if the symmetric part of the distribution function is not of the Fermi (Maxwellian) type, the absence of the concepts of temperature gradient and chemical potential gradient (the concepts of temperature and chemical potential in general) creates the problem of separation of the thermal diffusion flux. Accordingly, in the absence of temperature and of chemical potential it is necessary to reformulate the problem of calculation of the thermoelectric current and the thermoelectric emf.

It is shown in Ref. 15 that a correct calculation of an emf of any nature requires consideration of closed circuits, i.e., a study of the physical phenomena which give rise to an emf in the presence of a transport current.

This problem will be dealt with in a separate communication. Our aim here is to prove the hypothesis that a semiconductor film whose thickness is less than the characteristic energy relaxation length (which corresponds to submicron thicknesses) which is placed between a heater and a refrigerator, and which is short-circuited to an external resistance generally forms a distribution function of carriers whose symmetric part is not of the Fermi (Maxwellian) type. We shall show below that there is a fundamentally new mechanism for the formation of the symmetric part of the distribution function which is related entirely to the closed nature of the circuit. This mechanism is responsible for the function  $f_0(\epsilon; r)$ , which differs substantially from the Fermi function. Therefore, one of the goals of the present paper is to identify a case in which such a problem is encountered. Such a problem is encountered in a submicron-thick thermoelement which is connected to an external circuit.

It is shown in Ref. 10 and 13 that in a submicron film or layer we can ignore the bulk process of energy relaxation. The effectiveness of the electron-electron collisions is then governed by the ratio of two frequencies: the frequency of the electron-electron collisions and the surface energy relaxation frequency. Since in the case of submicron layers the latter exceeds greatly the energy relaxation frequency,<sup>16</sup> the electron-electron collisions are generally ineffective.<sup>17</sup> Therefore, "mixing" of the electron fluxes with a fixed energy (partial current) disappears in the bulk and the macroscopic characteristics should then depend strongly on the actual shape of the symmetric part of the distribution function. This means that in such a closed thermoelectric circuit the symmetric part of the electron distribution function cannot, for fundamental reasons, be approximated by a Maxwellian function with an effective temperature (which is frequently done in the case of bulk samples<sup>19</sup>).

We shall consider a conducting semiconductor film of submicron thickness  $2a$ , whose one surface at  $x = -a$  is in contact with a heater held at a temperature  $T_1$  and the other surface at  $x = +a$  is in contact with a refrigerator held at  $T_2$ . A thermoelectric current can flow along the  $x$  axis when the contacts are closed. For simplicity, we shall consider only the case in which  $T_1 = T_2 = T$ ;  $T_1/T_2$  and then in the first approximation with respect to  $\epsilon = (T_1 - T_2)/T = T$

[where  $T = (T_1 + T_2)/2$ ] we find that the distribution function is described by the following system of equations:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{p}{3m} \frac{\partial f_1(\epsilon; x)}{\partial x} &= 0; \\ \frac{1}{(\epsilon; x)} f_1(\epsilon; x) &= \frac{p}{m} \frac{\partial f_0(\epsilon; x)}{\partial x} + eE(x) \frac{f_0(\epsilon; x)}{\partial \epsilon} : \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

Here  $e$ ,  $m$ , and  $p$  are the charge, mass, and electron momentum;  $\tau(\epsilon; x)$  is the momentum relaxation time;  $E(x)$  is the electric field intensity; and  $\epsilon$  and  $x$  are the energy and coordinate of the current carriers.

In the derivation of the system (1) it is assumed that the electron gas is nondegenerate, that the collisions of electrons with the scattering centers are quasielastic, and that the volume collision integrals, which represent the energy relaxation in a submicron film, are unimportant. We can then write the electron distribution function  $f(\epsilon; r; t)$  in the form

$$f(\epsilon; r; t) = f_0(\epsilon; r) + f_1(\epsilon; r) \frac{p}{p} \quad (2)$$

where  $f_0(\epsilon; r)$  and  $f_1(\epsilon; r) (p=p)$  are, respectively, the symmetric part and the anisotropic part of the distribution function such that  $\int f_1 d\Omega = 0$ .

We can easily see that the field  $E(x)$  which is contained in Eq. (1) is independent of  $x$  if  $\epsilon \gg kT$ . In the approximation linear in  $\epsilon$ , the system (1) then reduces to

$$\frac{\partial^2 f_0(\epsilon; x)}{\partial x^2} = 0 \quad (3)$$

The distribution function  $f_0(\epsilon; x)$  in this case can easily be sought in the form

$$f_0(\epsilon; x) = \exp \left( -\frac{\epsilon}{T} \right) [1 + \alpha(\epsilon; x)] \quad (4)$$

where  $\mu$  is the chemical potential of electrons at a temperature  $T$ . The normalization condition then gives

$$\int_0^\infty d\epsilon g(\epsilon) f_0(\epsilon; x) \exp \left( -\frac{\epsilon}{T} \right) = 1 \quad (5)$$

Substituting Eq. (4) into Eq. (3), we find the following expression for  $\alpha(\epsilon; x)$ :

$$\alpha(\epsilon; x) = C_1(\epsilon; x) [x + C_2(\epsilon)] \quad (6)$$

The functions  $C_1(\epsilon)$  and  $C_2(\epsilon)$  represent the boundary conditions at the  $x = \pm a$  surfaces.

We shall now formulate these boundary conditions. As usual (see Ref. 7), we assume that between the semiconductor and the constant-temperature chamber (for example, in the  $x = a$  plane) there is a transition layer of thickness  $2\delta$ , under the assumption that the function  $f_0(\epsilon; x)$  is continuous at the points  $x = a \pm \delta$ .

The existence of surface energy relaxation mechanism mentioned above corresponds to the case in which the first equation in system (1), which describes the distribution function in a transition layer, contains collision integrals representing energy transfer from electrons in a given particle flux to the constant-temperature system whose temperature is  $T_2$ . The absence of such collision integrals in the case of the submicron film and their presence in the transition layer should not be regarded as surprising, since only a peculiar behavior of these integrals (in the limit  $\delta \rightarrow 0$ ) can give rise to a nonzero surface energy relaxation rate. Clearly, inclusion of these collision integrals corresponds to "mixing" of the partial fluxes, which facilitates the formation of a Maxwellian distribution  $f_0(\epsilon; x)$  in the semiconductor near the  $x = a$  surface. In addition to this interaction of electrons with the constant-temperature system during the flow of a current, there is another mechanism for the energy exchange between the electron gas in the film and the constant-temperature chamber (which is effected by the current itself. Since we are interested in the case where  $f_0(\epsilon; x)$  resembles the Maxwellian shape as little as possible, we assume that in the case of the transition layer (and the submicron film) there are no collision integrals<sup>20</sup> in the first equation in system (1). It is important to stress that the mechanism for the energy transfer, which is associated with the flow of a current, operates even when the total current  $j$  is zero. In fact, it does not follow from  $j = 0$  that the partial current  $j(\epsilon; x)$  vanishes. The partial currents therefore effect the energy exchange between the electron gas in the film and the constant-temperature chamber, even when the circuit is open.

Under the assumptions made above it follows from system (1) that

$$j(\eta; x = a) = j(\eta; x = a + \delta) \quad (7)$$

where the partial current  $j(\eta; x)$  is given by the expressions<sup>7</sup>

$$j(\eta; x) = \frac{2e}{3m} g(\eta) \left( \eta \frac{\partial f_0}{\partial x} + eE \frac{\partial f_0}{\partial \eta} \right) : \quad (8)$$

Here  $g(\eta)$  is the density of electron states. The total current density  $j$  is defined in terms of  $j(\eta; x)$  as follows:

$$j = \int_0^{Z_1} d\eta j(\eta; x) : \quad (9)$$

Substituting in  $j(\eta; x = a + \delta)$  the parameters of the transition layer, replacing the derivative  $\partial f_0 / \partial x$  ( $f_0$  is the symmetric part of the distribution function in the transition layer) by  $[f_0(\eta; x = a + \delta) - f_0(\eta; x = a)] / \delta$ , and assuming that  $\delta$  approaches zero, we find from Eq. (8) the following expression (such a procedure is described in greater detail in Ref. 7):

$$j(\eta; x = a) = \frac{s(\eta)}{s} j_s(\eta) \exp \left( -\frac{\eta}{T} \right) \exp \left( -\frac{T_2}{T_2} \eta \right) f_0(\eta; x = a) + \frac{s(\eta)}{s} \int_0^{Z_1} d\eta_s(\eta) \exp \left( -\frac{\eta}{T} \right) \exp \left( -\frac{T_2}{T_2} \eta \right) f_0(\eta; x = a) : \quad (10)$$

Here

$$s(\eta) = \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \frac{2e^2 g_s(\eta) s(\eta) \exp \left( -\frac{\eta}{T} \right)}{3m T} ; \quad (11)$$

$$s_s(\eta) = \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \frac{2e g_s(\eta) s(\eta) \exp \left( -\frac{\eta}{T} \right)}{3m} ; \quad (12)$$

and

$$s = \int_0^{Z_1} d\eta s(\eta) \quad (13)$$

are the parameters of the transition layer, and  $g_s(\eta)$  and  $s(\eta)$  are the density of the electron states and the relaxation time in a transition layer.

Substituting in Eq. (10) (and in a relation similar to it, at  $x = d$ ) the function  $f_0(\eta; x)$  in the form (4) and (6), we find, in a linear approximation in

$$\frac{s(\eta)}{s} j_0(\eta) C_1(\eta) + \frac{s(\eta)}{s} \int_0^{Z_1} d\eta_s(\eta) C_1(\eta) = \frac{s(\eta)}{s} j_0(\eta) s(\eta) C_1(\eta) a - C_2(\eta) + \frac{3}{4} \frac{s(\eta)}{2T} + \frac{s(\eta)}{s} \int_0^{Z_1} d\eta_s(\eta) C_1(\eta) a - C_2 + \frac{3}{4} \frac{\eta}{2T} ; \quad (14)$$

$$s(\eta) = \frac{2e^2 g(\eta) \exp \left( -\frac{\eta}{T} \right)}{3m T} ; \quad (15)$$

$$s_s(\eta) = \frac{2e g(\eta) \exp \left( -\frac{\eta}{T} \right)}{3m} ; \quad (16)$$

$$= \int_0^{Z_1} d\eta s(\eta); \quad j_0 = \frac{j}{a} : \quad (17)$$

For simplicity we assume that the functions  $\psi_s(\epsilon)$  and  $\psi_s(\epsilon)$  differ by a constant [as in the case of the functions  $\psi(\epsilon)$  and  $\psi(\epsilon)$ ]. From Eq. (14) we can then easily determine  $C_1(\epsilon)$  and  $C_2(\epsilon)$ :

$$C_2(\epsilon) = C_2^{(0)} = \text{const}; \quad (18)$$

$$C_1(\epsilon) = \frac{\psi_s(\epsilon)}{(\epsilon) + a_s(\epsilon)} - \frac{3}{4} - \frac{\epsilon}{2T} + C_1^{(0)} \frac{(\epsilon)}{(\epsilon) + a_s(\epsilon)} + C_1^{(1)} \frac{\psi_s(\epsilon)}{(\epsilon) + a_s(\epsilon)} + \frac{\psi_s(\epsilon)}{s} \left[ \frac{\psi_s(\epsilon)}{(\epsilon) + a_s(\epsilon)} \right] j_0; \quad (19)$$

where

$$C_1^{(0)} = \frac{1}{Z_1} \int_0^{Z_1} d\epsilon (\epsilon) C_1(\epsilon); \quad (20)$$

$$C_1^{(1)} = \frac{1}{Z_1} \int_0^{Z_1} d\epsilon a_s(\epsilon) C_1(\epsilon) + \frac{1}{2T} \int_0^{Z_1} d\epsilon \psi_s(\epsilon) - \frac{3}{4} \int_0^{Z_1} d\epsilon \psi_s(\epsilon) :$$

Since  $C_2^{(0)}$  does not depend on energy, we find from Eq. (14) that  $C_2^{(0)} = 0$ .

The constants  $C_1^{(0)}$  and  $C_1^{(1)}$  can be easily found from system (20) by substituting  $C_1(\epsilon)$ .

Since in the temperature approximation we have  $f_0(\epsilon; x) = \exp[(T(x) - \epsilon)/T(x)]$ , and since

$$T(x) = T - \frac{T}{2a} x; \quad (21)$$

it follows that in the case  $a \ll 1$  the expression for  $C_1(\epsilon)$  is

$$C_1(\epsilon) = \frac{3}{4a} - \frac{\epsilon}{2aT}; \quad (22)$$

We can now see that the first term in Eq. (22) represents the influence of the heater and cooler on the distribution function when their coupling to the electron gas in the submicron film is due to some of the partial currents induced by the built-in thermoelectric field and by thermal diffusion. The second and third terms are due to the drift components of the partial thermoelectric current in the semiconductor and in the transition layer (compare with Ref. 14). Finally, the last term is due to the specific mechanism for the establishment of the distribution function which we shall now consider.

For simplicity we shall consider a contact between two n-type semiconductors with zero contact potential, with the same electron densities, but with different energy dependences of the relaxation times.<sup>22</sup> If we ignore the electron-electron collisions and the collisions with the scattering centers accompanied by energy transfer, we find that the partial current in the presence of an external voltage, which induces a current of density  $j$ , is described by

$$\text{div } j(\epsilon; x) = 0; \quad (23)$$

Using Eq. (8) and (15), we obtain the following expression from Eq. (23):

$$\epsilon_1(\epsilon) E_1 = \epsilon_2(\epsilon) E_2 \quad (24)$$

where the index 1 refers the left-hand semiconductor and the index 2 to the right-hand semiconductor. The electron fields  $E_1$  and  $E_2$ , which are contained in Eq. (24), can easily be expressed in terms of the total density of the current flowing through the contact:

$$E_{1,2} = j = j_{1,2}; \quad (25)$$

Using Eq. (25), we can write Eq. (24) in the form

$$\frac{\epsilon_1(\epsilon)}{\epsilon_1} - \frac{\epsilon_2(\epsilon)}{\epsilon_2} = 0; \quad (26)$$

The last equality for different dependences of  $\epsilon_1$  and  $\epsilon_2$  on  $\epsilon$  can be valid only if the distribution functions of the two semiconductors are non-Maxwellian.

A similar situation occurs also in the absence of a contact if  $\epsilon$  depends not only on the carrier energy, but also on the coordinates [naturally, if  $\epsilon(x) \notin F_1(\epsilon)F_2(\epsilon)$  and, consequently, the coordinate dependence of the relaxation time determines the energy dependence of the distribution function].

It therefore follows that if the relaxation time in the submicron  $\epsilon$  depends in different ways on the carrier energy at different points in the direction of flow of the current, a new mechanism, which is responsible for a basically non-Maxwellian distribution function, will appear.

Turning back to the last term in Eq. (19), we can say that it describes this specific mechanism, and that the coordinate dependence of the relaxation times is related to the different forms of  $\epsilon$  in the submicron layer [ $\epsilon$ ] and at the contact.

If the condition  $a_s(\epsilon)$  ( $\epsilon$ ) is valid for all energies  $\epsilon$ , it follows from Eq. (19) that

$$C_1(\epsilon) = C_1^{(0)} \frac{e}{T} + \frac{a_s(\epsilon)}{a_s(\epsilon)} \frac{a_s(\epsilon)}{a_s(\epsilon)} j_0 \quad (27)$$

We then see from the Kirchhoff law that  $j_0 = 0$ , and from system (20) we find that  $C_1(\epsilon) = 0$ . Therefore,  $\epsilon(x) = 0$ . It is thus clear that if  $a_s(\epsilon)$  ( $\epsilon$ ) then the symmetric part of the distribution function of electrons in a submicron  $\epsilon$  is Maxwellian with a temperature equal to  $T$ . Such a situation can therefore be called adiabatic.

If, on the other hand, at all values of  $\epsilon$  we have  $a_s(\epsilon)$  ( $\epsilon$ ), then

$$C_1(\epsilon) = \frac{3}{4a} \frac{\epsilon}{2aT} + C_1^{(1)} \frac{a_s(\epsilon)}{a_s(\epsilon)} + \frac{a_s(\epsilon)}{a_s(\epsilon)} \frac{a_s(\epsilon)}{a_s(\epsilon)} j_0 \quad (28)$$

Since the case  $a_s(\epsilon)$  ( $\epsilon$ ) has been reduced to the adiabatic case (thermal insulation of a  $\epsilon$  from the heater and cooler), the case  $a_s(\epsilon)$  ( $\epsilon$ ) can be naturally called isothermal (representing the ideal thermal coupling between electrons in the submicron  $\epsilon$  with the heater and cooler). However, it then follows from Eq. (28) that the symmetric part of the distribution function of electrons is very far from Maxwellian. In the isothermal case the distribution function becomes Maxwellian only if the load resistance approaches infinity and the current  $j$  approaches correspondingly zero. In fact, if  $j = 0$ , it follows from Eq. (28), with allowance for Eq. (20), that  $C_1(\epsilon) = (3=4a)$  ( $\epsilon=2aT$ ), which – as pointed out above – corresponds to a Maxwellian function which depends on the coordinates in accordance with the law (21).

The maximum deviation of  $f_0(\epsilon;x)$  from the Maxwellian function occurs, as demonstrated by Eq. (19), when  $a_s(\epsilon)$  ( $\epsilon$ ) and then the energy dependences represented by the two functions should be very different. It should be pointed out that since  $a$  is an independent parameter, a change in the thickness of the semiconductor  $\epsilon$  may alter the relationships between  $a_s(\epsilon)$  and ( $\epsilon$ ), which in turn may modify the symmetric part of the distribution function.

We have thus shown that the symmetric part of the distribution function of electrons in a submicron  $\epsilon$  placed between a heater and a cooler may be far from Maxwellian. Therefore, in calculations of the thermoelectric emf and of the thermoelectric current it is necessary to formulate a new approach which does not rely on such concepts as temperature and chemical potential. Such an approach will be developed in a separate paper.

The authors are deeply grateful to V. I. Perel', for valuable comments.

<sup>1</sup> J. Shah and R. C. C. Leite, Phys. Rev. Lett. 22, 1304 (1969).

<sup>2</sup> Yu. G. Gurevich and S. I. Shevchenko, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. 62, 806 (1972) [Sov. Phys. JETP 35, 426 (1972)].

<sup>3</sup> A. I. Vaksar and Yu. G. Gurevich, Fiz. Tekh. Poluprovodn. 12, 82 (1978) [Sov. Phys. Semicond. 12, 46 (1978)].

<sup>4</sup> R. Baltumeyunas, A. Zhukauskas, and E. Kukshtis, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. 83, 1215 (1982) [Sov. Phys. JETP 56, 693 (1982)].

<sup>5</sup> Yu. G. Gurevich and V. B. Yurchenko, Bulg. J. Phys. 14, 52 (1987).

<sup>6</sup> Yu. G. Gurevich and G. N. Logvinov, Phys. Rev. B 46, 15516 (1992).

<sup>7</sup> F. G. Bass, V. S. Bochkov, and Yu. G. Gurevich, Electrons and Phonons in Bounded Semiconductors [in Russian], Moscow (1984).

<sup>8</sup> I. F. Itskovich, M. V. Moskalets, R. I. Shekhter, and I. O. Kuzik, Fiz. Nizk. Temp. 13, 1034 (1987) [Sov. J. Low Temp. Phys. 13, 588 (1987)].

<sup>9</sup> Yu. G. Gurevich and V. B. Yurchenko, Solid State Comm. 72, 1057 (1989).

<sup>10</sup> Yu. G. Gurevich and G. N. Logvinov, Phys. Status Solidi B 170, 247 (1992).

<sup>11</sup> F. G. Bass and Yu. G. Gurevich, Hot Electrons and Strong Electromagnetic Waves in a Semiconductor and Gas-Discharge Plasmas [in Russian], Moscow (1975).

- <sup>12</sup> I. B. Levinson, *Fiz. Tverd. Tela* (Leningrad) 7, 2879 (1965) [*Sov. Phys. Solid State* 7, 2336 (1966)].
- <sup>13</sup> Yu. G. Gurevich, G. N. Logvinov, and V. B. Yurchenko, *Fiz. Tverd. Tela* (St. Petersburg) 34, 1666 (1992) [*Sov. Phys. Solid State* 34, 886 (1992)].
- <sup>14</sup> A. I. Ansel'm, *Introduction to Semiconductor Theory*, Mir, Moscow and Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ (1981).
- <sup>15</sup> Yu. G. Gurevich and V. B. Yurchenko, *Fiz. Tekh. Poluprovodn.* 25, 2109 (1991) [*Sov. Phys. Semicond.* 25, 1268 (1991)].
- <sup>16</sup> Yu. G. Gurevich and G. N. Logvinov, *Fiz. Tekh. Poluprovodn.* 24, 1715 (1990) [*Sov. Phys. Semicond.* 24, 1071 (1990)].
- <sup>17</sup> At very high electron densities, when the electron-electron collisions are important even in submicron films, we can use a theory of thermoelectricity developed in Ref. 18.
- <sup>18</sup> Yu. G. Gurevich and G. N. Logvinov, *Fiz. Tekh. Poluprovodn.* 26, 1945 (1992) [*Sov. Phys. Semicond.* 26, 1091 (1992)].
- <sup>19</sup> I. B. Levinson, *Author's Abstracts of Doctoral Thesis* [in Russian], Leningrad (1967).
- <sup>20</sup> The case considered here corresponds to  $\epsilon_{\text{ext}} = \epsilon_{\text{int}} = 0$  in Ref. 7. One of the possible realizations of our calculations is discussed in Ref. 21. No problems are encountered in allowing for the finite nature of the quantities  $\epsilon_{\text{ext}}$ , or  $\epsilon_{\text{int}}$ .
- <sup>21</sup> E. I. Rashba, Z. S. Gribnikov, and V. Ya. Kravchenko, *Usp. Fiz. Nauk* 119, 3 (1976) [*Sov. Phys. Usp.* 19, 361 (1976)].
- <sup>22</sup> Such a case may be encountered, for example, if a large number of neutral impurities is added to one of the semiconductors.

Translated by A. Tybulewicz