09-22-08 11:18 OUT

	0	0	0	0	0	00	. 1	1	I N	i.
U	9-	6	6-	J	0	09	• 1			V

Quality Assurance and OPSEC Review 2874									
This form is an approval record for ARL generated information to be presented or disseminated external to ARL. Note: Submit all manuscripts in electronic format or camera ready copy. See attached instructions. If more space is needed, use reverse of form (include block numbers).									
A. General	Information	1. Present Date	2. Unclassified Title						
		09/11/2008	Simulations of Qu	antum Dot Growth	on Semiconductor	Surfaces:			
3. Author(s)				4. Office Symbol <i>(s)</i>		5. Telep	hone Nr <i>(s)</i>		
Peter W. Chu	ng, Ernie Pan,	Melissa Sun, Rich	hard Zhu AMSRD-ARL-C		HC	41027	410278-6027		
6. Contractor ge	nerated 🔲 N	lo 🗌 Yes	7. Type: Report Abstract I Publication Presentation (speech, briefing, video clip						
If yes, enter Cor	tract No. and AF	RLCOR	poster, etc) Book Book Chapter Web						
			8. Key Words Quantum Dots, nanotechnology, modeling, kinetic Monte Carlo						
9. Distribution S	tatement (require	ed) Is manuscript	Circle appropriate let	ter and number. (see	instructions for stateme	ent text)	10. Security		
subject to expor	t control?	lo 🗌 Yes	🗶 BCDEF	X 12345	6 7 8 9 10 11		Classification		
B. Reports	11. Series	12. Туре	13. No. of pages	14. Project No.	15. Period Covered	16. Spo	nsor		
C. Publicatio	ons			-					
17. Is MS an inv	17. Is MS an invited paper? 🗵 No 🔲 Yes 19. Material will be submitted for publication in								
18. Publication i	s a refereed jour	nal?	Army Science Co	nference Proceedin	os IIS	SA			
	X N	lo 🗌 Yes		Journal		Co	untry		
D. Presentations 20. Conference N			ame/Location		21. Sponsor				
Army Science			Conference		US Army				
22. Conference Date 23. Due Date			24. Conference is 🛛 Open to general public 🔲 Unclassified/controlled access						
12/01/	2008	09/22/2008	Classified						
25. For nonpubl	ic meetings: Wil	l foreign nationals be	attending? 26. Material will be						
	(If yes, list countri	es and identify Internat	<i>nal Agreement(s))</i> □ Oral presented only ☑ Oral presented and p			d published in			
K Don't know			Army Science Conference Proceedings						
(If published, complete block 18 and 19, Section C.)							tion C.)		
E. Authors Statement: 27. All authors have concurred in the technical content and the sequence of authors. All authors have made a									
substantial contribution to the manuscript and all authors who have made a substantial contribution are identified in Block 3.									
gluino gluino									
ARL Lead Author or COR									
F.Approvals									
28. First line Supervisor of Senior ARL Author or 29. Reviewer(s) (Technical/Editorial/NA)									
J.N	Alan	0 12	$O \mathcal{M}$	1)/_					
$\frac{1}{1670/e_1} \frac{1}{1670/e_2} \frac{1}{1670/e_2} \frac{1}{1670/e_1} \frac{1}{1670/e_2} \frac{1}$						Date			
30. Limited distr	ibution information	on for release to	31. Classified Information						
foreign nationals	3		Classified by						
			Declassified on						
Foreign Disclosure Date Command Security Manager Date				Date					

<pre>mplete : the pro the pro YES YES YES YES YES YES YES YES </pre>	And expla ponent of INO INO INO INO INO INO INO INO	 ain any positive responses in block 9. ain any positive responses in block 9. ain any positive responses in block 9. ain any contract proposals, bids, and/or proprietary information? b. Any information on inventions/patent application for which patent secrecy orders have been issued? c. Any weapon systems/component test results? d. Any ARL-originated studies or after action reports containing advice and recommendations? e. Weakness and/or vulnerability information? f. Any information on countermeasures? g. Any fielding/test schedule information? h. Any Force Protection, Homeland Defense (<i>security</i>) information? i. Information on subjects of potential controversy among military services or other federal agencies? j. Information on military applications in space, nuclear chemical or biological efforts: high energy laser information: narticle heam technology: etc? 	□ YES □ YES □ YES □ YES □ YES □ YES □ YES □ YES □ YES	NO NO NO NO NO NO NO NO NO				
□ YES □ YES □ YES □ YES □ YES		 8. Does this material contain: a. Any contract proposals, bids, and/or proprietary information? b. Any information on inventions/patent application for which patent secrecy orders have been issued? c. Any weapon systems/component test results? d. Any ARL-originated studies or after action reports containing advice and recommendations? e. Weakness and/or vulnerability information? f. Any information on countermeasures? g. Any fielding/test schedule information? h. Any Force Protection, Homeland Defense (<i>security</i>) information? i. Information on subjects of potential controversy among military services or other federal agencies? j. Information on military applications in space, nuclear chemical or biological efforts: high energy laser information: narticle heam technolony: etc? 	 YES 	区 NO 区 NO 区 NO 区 NO 区 NO 区 NO				
□ YES □ YES □ YES □ YES □ YES		 a. Any contract proposals, bids, and/or proprietary information? b. Any information on inventions/patent application for which patent secrecy orders have been issued? c. Any weapon systems/component test results? d. Any ARL-originated studies or after action reports containing advice and recommendations? e. Weakness and/or vulnerability information? f. Any information on countermeasures? g. Any fielding/test schedule information? h. Any Force Protection, Homeland Defense (<i>security</i>) information? i. Information on subjects of potential controversy among military services or other federal agencies? j. Information on military applications in space, nuclear chemical or biological efforts: high energy laser information: narticle heam technolony: etc? 	 YES 	図 NO 図 NO 図 NO 図 NO 図 NO 図 NO				
□ YES □ YES □ YES □ YES	INO INO INO INO INO	 b. Any information on inventions/patent application for which patent secrecy orders have been issued? c. Any weapon systems/component test results? d. Any ARL-originated studies or after action reports containing advice and recommendations? e. Weakness and/or vulnerability information? f. Any information on countermeasures? g. Any fielding/test schedule information? h. Any Force Protection, Homeland Defense (security) information? i. Information on subjects of potential controversy among military services or other federal agencies? j. Information on military applications in space, nuclear chemical or biological efforts: high energy laser information: narticle heart technology: etc? 	 YES YES YES YES YES YES YES YES YES 	KE NO KE NO KE NO KE NO KE NO KE NO				
□ YES □ YES □ YES □ YES	INO INO INO INO	 c. Any weapon systems/component test results? d. Any ARL-originated studies or after action reports containing advice and recommendations? e. Weakness and/or vulnerability information? f. Any information on countermeasures? g. Any fielding/test schedule information? h. Any Force Protection, Homeland Defense (security) information? i. Information on subjects of potential controversy among military services or other federal agencies? j. Information on military applications in space, nuclear chemical or biological efforts: high energy laser information; etc? 	 YES YES YES YES YES YES YES YES 	NO NO NO NO NO NO NO				
□ YES □ YES □ YES □ YES		 d. Any ARL-originated studies or after action reports containing advice and recommendations? e. Weakness and/or vulnerability information? f. Any information on countermeasures? g. Any fielding/test schedule information? h. Any Force Protection, Homeland Defense (security) information? i. Information on subjects of potential controversy among military services or other federal agencies? j. Information on military applications in space, nuclear chemical or biological efforts: high energy laser information: etc? 	□ YES □ YES □ YES □ YES □ YES □ YES	NO NO NO NO NO				
□ YES □ YES □ YES	INO INO INO	 e. Weakness and/or vulnerability information? f. Any information on countermeasures? g. Any fielding/test schedule information? h. Any Force Protection, Homeland Defense (security) information? i. Information on subjects of potential controversy among military services or other federal agencies? j. Information on military applications in space, nuclear chemical or biological efforts: high energy laser information: etc? 	□ YES □ YES □ YES □ YES □ YES	NO NO NO NO NO				
U YES	K NO	 f. Any information on countermeasures? g. Any fielding/test schedule information? h. Any Force Protection, Homeland Defense (security) information? i. Information on subjects of potential controversy among military services or other federal agencies? j. Information on military applications in space, nuclear chemical or biological efforts: high energy laser information; activite heart technology; etc? 	□ YES □ YES □ YES □ YES	NO NO NO NO				
□ YES	K NO	 g. Any fielding/test schedule information? h. Any Force Protection, Homeland Defense <i>(security)</i> information? i. Information on subjects of potential controversy among military services or other federal agencies? j. Information on military applications in space, nuclear chemical or biological efforts: high energy laser information; narticle heart technology; etc? 	□ YES □ YES □ YES	NO NO NO				
☐ YES	X NO	 h. Any Force Protection, Homeland Defense (security) information? i. Information on subjects of potential controversy among military services or other federal agencies? j. Information on military applications in space, nuclear chemical or biological efforts: high energy laser information: particle heart technology. etc? 	□ YES □ YES	NO NO				
☐ YES	K NO	 i. Information on subjects of potential controversy among military services or other federal agencies? j. Information on military applications in space, nuclear chemical or biological efforts: high energy laser information; particle beam technology; etc? 	T YES	K NO				
		j. Information on military applications in space, nuclear chemical or biological efforts: high energy laser information: particle beam technology: etc2						
		aser mornation, particle beam technology; etc.	Tes 🗆	K NO				
		k. Contain information with foreign policy or foreign relations implications?	TES	K NO				
I, the undersigned, am aware of the adversary's interest in DOD publications and in the subject matter of this material and that, to the best of my knowledge, the net benefit of this release out weights the potential damage to the essential security of all ARL, AMC, Army, or other DOD programs of which I am aware.								
Jahr Vale Shiver 7/16/08								
OPSEC Reviewer (Printed name/signature) Date								
Final Release Clearances 32. Public/Limited release information a. Material has been reviewed for OPSEC policy.								
	Dale name/sig xplanati	Dale Shire name/signature) xplanations/cont xplanations/cont (is pot appr etubics. Chie hoff	Dalk Shiver 9/10 name/signature) 0 xplanations/continuations/OPSEC review comments 0 /is pot approved for public release/ has received appropriate tech/ etobing, Chief BCSID 175 http://c 9/2	$\frac{\frac{9}{16}}{\frac{9}{22}}$ $\frac{\frac{9}{22}}{\frac{1}{22}}$ $\frac{9}{22}$ $\frac{9}{22}$ $\frac{1}{22}$				

Report Documentation Page					Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188		
Public reporting burden for the collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to a penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number.							
1. REPORT DATE DEC 2008	EPORT DATE 2. REPORT TYPE N/A				3. DATES COVERED		
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE		5a. CONTRACT	NUMBER				
Simulations Of Quantum Dot Growth On Semiconductor Surfaces: Morphological Design Of Sensor Concepts					5b. GRANT NUMBER		
					5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER		
6. AUTHOR(S)					5d. PROJECT NUMBER		
					5e. TASK NUMBER		
					5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER		
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) 8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION U.S. Army Research Laboratory Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION 21005-5067 8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION							
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) 10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM							
			11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)				
12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release, distribution unlimited							
^{13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES} See also ADM002187. Proceedings of the Army Science Conference (26th) Held in Orlando, Florida on 1-4 December 2008, The original document contains color images.							
14. ABSTRACT							
15. SUBJECT TERMS							
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF: 17. LIMITATION OF 18. NUMBER 19a. NAME OF							
a. REPORT unclassified	b. ABSTRACT unclassified	c. THIS PAGE unclassified	ABSTRACT UU	OF PAGES 10	RESPONSIBLE PERSON		

Standard Form 298 (Rev. 8-98) Prescribed by ANSI Std Z39-18

SIMULATIONS OF QUANTUM DOT GROWTH ON SEMICONDUCTOR SURFACES: MORPHOLOGICAL DESIGN OF SENSOR CONCEPTS

Peter W. Chung U.S. Army Research Laboratory Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21005-5067

Ernie Pan, Melissa Sun, Richard Zhu University of Akron; Akron, OH 44325-3905

ABSTRACT

Due to quantum confinement, superlattice detectors may conceivably be tuned to detect electromagnetic signatures difficult to detect with technology available today. The challenge in creating new superlattice detectors is in the growth process where the confluence of chemistry, physics, and mechanics make control of parameters nontrivial. Furthermore, the time scales involved are often prohibitive for deterministic modeling approaches. We have developed and validated a new modeling method for probabilistic modeling of superlattice growth that spans the appropriate time scales relevant for experiments. The predictions of the models have been tested successfully against numerous independent experiments. Through a fundamentally new Green's function formulation for strain interactions among quantum dots, we present a new kinetic Monte Carlo methodology that can successfully predict pattern surfaces while requiring formation on only experimentally-viable parameters as input. The new method also can be used for engineering design of dot correlations in-plane and in-bulk to predict dot alignment in general superlattices.

INTRODUCTION

Devices such as Fourier Transform Infrared (FTIR) spectrometers can detect electromagnetic signatures related to the energies of bonds in organic molecules. These energies are often in the range of $400 - 5000 \text{ cm}^{-1}$ representing the typical absorption spectroscopy peaks for specific types of bonds. For example, the C-Br bond in bromoalkanes has an accompanying peak at 500 cm-1 while the O-H bond in most alcohols and phenols are around 3000 cm-1. The central detector element is typically a collection of charge-coupled devices (CCD) that is each comprised of a thin semiconductor material layer whose electronic band gap energy uniquely determines the energy range of electromagnetic signal it can detect. Modern fabrication techniques involve growth of these thin layers on inexpensive substrates such as silicon. The grown layers can often be as thin as a few monolayers in height but are often no larger than a micron. At these small length scales, the interaction between the growth and the substrate is nontrivial to the extent that the mismatch in the theoretical lattice constants can appreciably distort the overall band energy of the final system and be used as a design consideration for targeted device performance. Thus it is not uncommon to have a material grown on a substrate detect signals that the free standing material cannot.

Fabrication of these types of detector materials involves complex atomistic processes. It is now wellknown that during fabrication, the interactions among the atoms in the growing layer lead to stark features on the surface known as self-assembled quantum dots (QDs). Self-assembled QDs have been intensely investigated due to observed optical and electronic properties with potential applications in a broad range of new optoelectronic and semiconductor devices (Bressler_Hill, e al., 1995; Bimberg, et al., 1998). The indiumarsenide/gallium-arsenide (InAs/GaAs) heterostructure is a typical example, which is characterized by a large lattice mismatch between alternating InAs and GaAs layers. At the growth surface, the material undergoes a transition from a two-dimensional (2D) cluster to three-dimensional (3D) islands (Stangl et al., 2004; Joyce and Vvedensky, 2004).

Experimental data indicate that InAs/GaAs island array is governed by thermodynamics (Schukin and Bimberg, 1999; Pcheljakov et al., 1997). The physics behind the transition from 2D cluster to 3D islands has been studied recently. For example, using atomic force microscopy, (Arciprete et al., 2006) studied how kinetics drives the 2D to 3D transition in InAs/GaAs(001) heterostructure. The transition from thermodynamically to kinetically controlled QD self-assembly was also studied in (Musikhin et al., 2005), both experimentally and theoretically.

It is argued that strains on the surface change diffusivity and surface mobility (Zandvliet and Poelsema, 1999; Sage et al., 2000; Zoethout et al., 2000; Pao and Srolovitz, 2006) and therefore may be the reason for the enhanced evaporation (Sun et al., 2000). The epitaxial system can lower the free energy by transferring atoms from the island edge to the upper layer, because the transition leads to a decrease in the contact area between the substrate and a new layer (Arciprete et al., 2006). As such atomic transitions to the upper layers lead to the strain field relaxation. The tradeoff between the cost of additional surface energy and the gain of energy due to elastic relaxation is the very driving force for the transition from 2D cluster to 3D islands (Kern and Muller, 1997; Chaparro et al., 2000). These arguments provide reason enough to consider situations when the atom hop probability to an upper layer can be higher than that to a lower layer. The kinetics of such a process could be described by adjusting the probability for atoms to hop up or hop down, which could subsequently lead to 2D cluster or 3D islands self-assembly (Arciprete et al., 2006).

While some simple computational approaches for 2D to 3D self-assembly were discussed before (i.e., (Brunev et al., 2001)), no complete 3D QD self-assembly model has been developed in which the growth from 2D cluster to 3D islands and the corresponding island size equalization can be clearly illustrated during the growth process. In this work we develop a fast multiscale 3D kinetic Monte Carlo (KMC) QD growth model. It is developed from our original (x,y)-plane growth model (Pan et al., 2004; Pan et al., 2006) by a fast algorithm for the long-range strain energy calculation and by introducing the up/down ratio for lateral self-organization (Pan et al., 2007).

With the proposed program, we have successfully simulated the transition of the 2D cluster to 3D island process. Furthermore, depositions with different flux rates are studied to show how the flux rate affects the island equalization during the deposition process.

Our model has also shown clearly the importance of the interruption time during the growth of QD islands. For the sake of extending these models to applications requiring strict control on the ordering, we also investigate the feasibility of using interrupted growth to create desired patterns on surfaces. This obviates the prevailing practice of hand-machining substrate morphology or seeding the surface through an extra step to encourage growth at specified locations. We believe that this model will provide an attractive means for producing predictably ordered nanostructures.

MODEL DESCRIPTION

The 3D layer-by-layer KMC growth model is developed from our 2D (x,y)-plane growth model (Pan et al., 2004; Pan et al., 2006). As in our previous model, the important contribution from the long-range elastic strain energy is included using a fast algorithm based on the Green's function method (Pan, 2002). Furthermore, to account for the out-of-plane (up and down) movement of the atoms, which is also called desorption and adsorption

(Lam and Vlachos, 2001; Lung et al., 2005), an up/down ratio is introduced.

First, the 2D hopping probability of an atom from one lattice site to a nearest or next nearest neighbor site in the (x,y)-plane is still governed by the Arrhenius law enhanced by the long-range strain energy field (Pan et al., 2004; Pan et al, 2006; Nurminen et al., 2001; Larsson, 2001). The Arrhenius law governing the hopping probability is give by

$$p = v_0 \exp\left(-\frac{E_s + E_n - E_{str}(x, y)}{k_{\rm B}T}\right)$$
(1)

where v_0 is the attempt frequency (=10¹³s⁻¹), *T* the temperature, and k_B the Boltzmann's constant. Also in equation (1), E_s and E_n are the binding energies to the surface and to the neighboring atoms, respectively. Finally, $E_{str}(x,y)$, as a function of the plane coordinates (*x*,*y*), is the energy correction from the long-range strain field due to the lattice mismatch between the substrate and the deposited material. As this long-range strain energy needs to be calculated repeatedly during the simulation, we have developed a fast algorithm by precalculating the energy along a unit circle and interpolating the energy at any location afterwards (Pan et al, 2007; Pan and Yang, 2003).

We calculate the binding energy to the neighboring atoms in the (x,y)-plane, E_n , using the following algorithm: We assume that the strength of a single nearest neighbor bond is E_b (=0.3eV), and it is reduced by a factor of α (=1/ $\sqrt{2}$) for the next nearest neighbors. To evaluate the diffusion barrier, the binding energy at the site P_0 , where the diffusing atom is located, is calculated to be

$$E_{\rm P_0} = nE_{\rm b} + \alpha mE_{\rm b} \tag{2}$$

with $n \le 4$ and $m \le 4$ being, respectively, the number of nearest and next nearest atoms. Similarly, for the site P_1 where the atom is going to hop to, we have

$$E_{\rm p} = g\left(n'E_{\rm b} + \alpha m'E_{\rm b}\right) \tag{3}$$

where $n' \leq 4$ and $m' \leq 4$ are, respectively, the number of nearest and next nearest atoms at the new site P_1 , and g (=0.2) describes the coupling between the adjacent lattice sites (Meixner et al., 2003). Therefore, the overall binding energy E_n caused by neighbor interactions for an atom to jump from site P_0 to site P_1 is given by the difference of the binding energies at the corresponding lattice sites

$$E_{\rm p} = \left(n - g \cdot n'\right) E_{\rm p} + \left(m - g \cdot m'\right) \alpha E_{\rm p} \tag{4}$$

Second, the binding energy to the surface of the (x,y)-plane, i.e. E_s , is assumed to be constant $(E_s=1.3\text{eV})$ in our previous 2D (x,y)-plane self-assembly model (Pan et al., 2004; Pan et al., 2006). However, in the 3D case (figure 1), the binding energy to the surface depends on the surface geometry of both the initial and final positions of the atoms. Based on recent molecular dynamics (MD)

calculation (Montalenti and Voter, 2001) and KMC simulation experience (Pan et al., 2004; Pan et al., 2006; Meixner et al, 2003) in 2D, we therefore propose the following simple equation for the 3D surface binding energy calculation.

$$E_{s} = (1-g)E_{s0} + (p-g \cdot p')\alpha E_{s0} + (q-g \cdot q')\alpha \cdot \alpha E_{s0}$$
(5)



Figure 1 Schematic illustration of 3D QD self-assembly model. An atom on top of the substrate surface (x,y)-plane in (a), the relative locations of the atom grid on the (x,y)-plane in (b), the corresponding binding energy E_s related to the in-plane locations in (c).

where E_{s0} is the binding energy for the atom exactly under the selected adatom (figure 1), *p*, *q* are number of nearest and next nearest atoms in original position (n' \leq 4, m' \leq 4), *p'*, *q'* are the number of nearest and next nearest atoms in the new position (n' \leq 4, m' \leq 4). The other two parameters, *g* and α , are used to scale the energy contribution from the atoms in the first and second squares (figure 1a, 1b). Assuming that the maximum surface binding energy to be 1.3eV as before for the 2D growth simulation (Pan et al., 2004; Pan et al, 2006) which means that all the positions under this adatom are occupied by atoms, we can find E_{s0} =0.28eV from equation (5) by back-calculation.

Finally, as discussed in the introduction, the growth system always tries to decrease its free energy by moving atoms at the edge to upper layer to form 3D islands. The possibility for an atom to hop to a higher or lower layer depends on the material properties and growth conditions (Arciprete et al., 2006). To account for the up and down jump activities of the atoms, the parameter up/down ratio ρ is introduced, which is defined as the ratio of the possibility for edge atoms hopping up to that hopping down. In other words, if we let $P_{\rm up}$ be the jump up possibility and P_{down} the jump down possibility, then the up/down ratio $\rho = P_{up}/P_{down}$. It is further remarked that the up/down ratio actually reflects the balance between surface energy increase and strain energy decrease. This physical activity is illustrated in figure 2 where layer 1 is the substrate and the atom "A" is on the edge of layer 2 of the deposited atoms (i.e., within the QD island). It is also understandable that the up or down jump possibility of atom "A" is controlled only by the up/down ratio instead of by the individual jump up and down possibilities. Moreover, strictly speaking, since the strain energy changes along the island height direction, the up/down ratio is, in general, not constant in different island layers.

However, in order to extract the important contribution of the up/down ratio, we assume that the up/down ratio is constant. In other words, it is only affected by the geometry around it but not by the layer position. Furthermore, in order to form 3D islands, the number of atoms jumping up should be larger than those jumping down, which means that ρ should be larger than 1. Otherwise, all the atoms will tend to move to lower layer to form the layer-by-layer Frank-van der Merwe structure.



Figure 2. Illustration of the up or down jump for an edge atom A during 3D QD self-assembly.

RESULTS: PARAMETER STUDIES OF ρ

Using the 3D QD self-assembly approach described above, we can now simulate the epitaxial growth process. The growth model contains 100×100 grids with periodic boundary conditions, and the material is InAs/GaAs (001). We first study the effect of variations in ρ on the island height. The validation of recognizable pattern formations was performed extensively with independent results in the literature in (Pan et al., 2007) and (Zhu et al., 2007). Shown in figure 3 are the islands distributions. It is observed clearly from figure 3 that 1) the average island height increases with increasing ρ (for small ρ , say, $\rho \leq 5$, basically only 2D growth is observed); 2) island size and shape are very sensitive ρ when it is less than 20; 3) it is worthy to remark that ρ determines the 2D to 3D

transition instead of the absolute value of P_{up} and P_{down} . This ratio is directly proportional to the ratio of the ascending (desorption) and descending (adsorption) atoms on the surface (Lam and Vlachos, 2001; Russo and Smereka, 2006).

To further understand the effect of variations in ρ on the average island height the data in figure 3 are analyzed along with more simulated results for large up/down ratios. The relation between the average island height and ρ is presented in figure 4. Figure 4 demonstrates that 1) the average island height experiences sharp changes when ρ varies from 3 to around 20. The island height increases with increasing ρ ; 2) when ρ is larger than 20, the curve asymptotically approaches a maximal island height of approximately 20 grid spacings. This means that the average island height will mostly keep at a constant maximum value when the up/down ratio is large (say, ρ >30); 3) an identifiable inflection point, approximately at ρ =13, physically corresponds to the critical transition point from 2D cluster growth to 3D islands growth. This up/down ratio is roughly equivalent to the surface and bulk energy ratio as was demonstrated in (Brunev et al., 2001; Kratzer et al., 2006) using different approaches.



Figure 3 3D island distributions for different up/down ratios ρ with total coverage *c*=1.6ML. Fixed growth parameters are *T*=700K, *F*=0.01ML/s, and interruption time t_i =200s (The total simulation time = the deposition time (t_d =160s) plus the interruption time (t_i =200s)).



Figure 4. Average island height vs. ρ for ρ =3 to 50. Fixed growth parameters are *T*=700K, *F*=0.01ML/s, *c*=1.6ML, and interruption time *t*_i=200s.

RESULTS: ISLAND SIZE & DISTRIBUTION

Island size equalization relies on the movement of atoms on the surface during epitaxial growth. Equalization starts from the very beginning of the deposition process and reaches equilibrium with sufficient growth time (Pan et al., 2004). Figure 5 demonstrates the island size dependence on growth times for three different up/down ratios ($\rho=10, 20, \text{ and } 30$ in the first, second, and third row). Island distributions immediately after the deposition (i.e., the interruption time $t_i=0$) are shown in the first column, 100 seconds after the deposition $(t_i=100s)$ in the second column, and 200 seconds after deposition ($t_i=200s$) in the third column (figure 5). It is observed from figure 5 that: 1) for a fixed up/down ratio $(\rho=10, 20, \text{ and } 30)$, with increasing interruption time, small isolated islands assemble to form large ones, and the island distribution becomes increasingly ordered; 2) for fixed interruption time ($t_i=0$, 100s, and 200s), an increasing up/down ratio, in general, increases the height of the islands (changes the shape of the islands), similarly observed in figure 3. Since ρ is closely related to the surface and bulk energy ratio, this may enable experimentalists with additional control to optimize the island shape and distribution.

While figure 5 illustrates the influence of the interruption time on the island size, figures 6 and 7 demonstrate further the effect of the deposition time on the island shape and size for fixed up/down ratio ρ =10. In figure 6, island size equalization starts from the beginning of the deposition process and becomes larger with increasing deposition (t_d =50s, 100s, 160s) and interruption time (t_i =200s). Furthermore, with increasing island size, the number of islands decreases. This relation can be observed from the histogram in figure 7 for the relationship between the island diameter (of the

equivalent circle at the bottom of the island) and the corresponding number of islands.

Figure 8 shows the effect of the flux rate (F=1Ml/s, 0.1ML/s and 0.01ML/s) on the island distribution. For a low flux rate (e.g. at F=0.01Ml/s), the atoms are afforded more time to move to the equilibrium position during the deposition process and to assemble together. A low flux rate (say, F=0.01 ML/s) usually corresponds to larger and more ordered islands.



Figure 5. Island distributions for different interruption times (t_i =0s, corresponding to deposition time t_d =160s, t_i =100s, and t_i =200s) and for different up/down ratios (ρ =10, 20 and 30). Fixed growth parameters are *T*=700K, *F*=0.01ML/s, and *c*=1.6ML.



Figure 6. Island distributions during and after deposition. Deposition time t_d =50s with 0.5ML coverage in (a), t_d =100s with 1ML coverage in (b), t_d =160s with coverage 1.6ML in (c) and interruption time t_i =200s in (d). T=700K, *F*=0.01ML/s, *c*=1.6ML, and ρ =10.

RESULTS: PREPATTERNING

Control of pattern formations is currently enabled through premachining of the substrate with pore arrays

(Atkinson et al., 2006) or masked substrates (Liang et al., 2004), both of which require substantial increase in total fabrication time. A nominal change to the interruption time, however, reveals that pattern quality (i.e. larger size and repeated ordering of dots) can be obtained (Pan et al., 2007). In figure 9, significant differences in pattern quality can be observed between traditional continuous deposition (figure 9a) versus employing a growth pause for 50 seconds after an initial 0.3ML deposit and interruption at 150 seconds after 1.6ML deposit.



Figure 7. Average island diameter (of the bottom equivalent circle of the island) vs. number of islands during and after deposition. T=700K, F=0.01ML/s, c=1.6ML and $\rho=10$.



Figure 8. Island distributions for different deposition processes of 0.5ML, 1ML and 1.6 ML with flux rates F=1Ml/s, 0.1ML/s and 0.01ML/s. Fixed growth parameters are T=700K, c=1.6ML and $\rho=10$.



Figure 9. Comparison of (a) continuous growth and (b) prepatterned growth using variations of substrate symmetries (isotropic, (001), and (111)) at T=700K, coverage of 1.6ML and ρ =10.

RESULTS: CORRELATED GROWTH

Finally, using the fundamental developments from (Pan, 2002) that are used in the 3D KMC model, the effect of the buried height of nanostructures on correlated growth in superlattices is investigated. It has been shown that the depth to which QDs are buried in layered structures influences patterns on subsequently grown layers (Holý et al., 1999; Wang et al., 2004). The mechanism that enables this is the interaction of mechanical strain fields owing to the embedding strain of the array of QDs. In particular, Wang et al. showed the strain driven correlation and anticorrelation of InGaAs QDs in detail through cross-sectional STM images.

Using the Green's Functions developed in (Pan, 2002), we computed the strain energy values on the surface due to a buried structure in an elastic half-space. The degree of burial is varied to modulate the degree of strain interaction between the buried QDs and the surface. The dark regions in Figure 10 show regions of increased strain energy where the higher accompanying strain implies that coherent structures like QDs are more likely to grow. This is due to the local relaxation of the degree of lattice mismatch at those regions where the strain fields interact constructively. It is noteworthy that for D=2 the (001) growth is correlated, which agrees convincingly with those of the STM images in (Wang et al., 2004) at small burial heights. At D=20 the (001) growth is anticorrelated which also corresponds to the anti-correlation achieved with increased burial depth in (Wang, et al., 2004).

It is furthermore noteworthy that from the calculations, we show that the (111) growths do not exhibit anti-correlation by increasing the burial depth to D=20 in contrast with the observations from the (001) case. In fact, the growth remains strictly correlated. Although the (111) growth correlation remains to be shown experimentally, the absence of anti-correlation at deeper burial depths appears to be caused by the lack of strain field interactions at the anti-correlated sites due to the additional effect of anisotropy and the overall change in symmetry caused by the change in growth direction.



Figure 10. Strain energy contours of 3x3 buried array at two different depths and two different growth directions. Dark areas indicate regions of favorable growth for the next layer.

CONCLUSIONS

In this report, we propose a 3D QD epitaxial growth model by enhancing our former (x,y)-plane growth model with a fast algorithm for long-range strain energy calculation and an up/down jump ratio for the diffusion atoms. Specifically, the balance between surface energy increase and bulk energy decrease is demonstrated by introducing the up/down ratio. Further studied is the dependence of the island height and shape on the up/down ratio. Combining the up/down ratio and one of the growth parameters (i.e., flux rate), island equalization during deposition process and after deposition is demonstrated.

The developments have also enabled three new fundamental results. The first is the consistent validation of pattern formations for general quantum dot growth on surfaces. By considering only the chemical species used in the material fabrication, fabrication parameters such as temperature and flow rate, and the symmetry of the substrate surface plane, we can repeatedly reproduce the patterns obtained from numerous independent results from the literature. Based only on the experimental parameters reported in those papers, the new modeling theory accurately reproduces the quantum dot arrangements. The second result is a new fabrication procedure that obviates tooling for prepatterned growth when strict control is required on the first surface grown directly on the substrate layer. By adjusting species flow rates during growth, we have simulated a technique for controlling the pattern quality on surfaces. Whereas earlier efforts attempted to seed growth by mechanically creating "dimples" on the substrate, the new method enables ripening to coalesce smaller dots into larger ones, thereby producing more pronounced dot sizes in specifiable patterns without machining the substrate.

The third result is the development of a throughthickness dot correlation technique for superlattices where elastic fields generated from buried quantum dots are demonstrated to provide another means of controlling surface pattern quality. Dots among different layers can interact and produce correlated and anticorrelated patterns. Although the capping layer thickness has been known to produce this effect, these simulated results are the first of its kind.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors gratefully acknowledge support from the Defense Threat Reduction Agency Joint Science and Technology Office (DTRA-JSTO) and computing resources from the ARL Major Shared Resource Center.

REFERENCES

- Arciprete, F., Placidi, E., Sessi, V., Fanfoni, M., Patella, F., Balzarotti, A., 2006. Appl. Phys. Lett. 89, 041904.
- Atkinson, P., Bremner, S. P., Anderson, D., Jones, G. A. C., Ritchie, D. A., 2006. J. Vac. Sci. Technol. B., 24(3), 1523.
- Bimberg, D., Grundmann, M., Ledentsov, N. N., 1998. Quantum Dot Heterostructures, Wiley, Chichester.
- Bressler-Hill, V., Varma, S., Lorke, A., Nosho, B. Z., Petroff, P. M., Weinberg, W. H., 1995. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 74, 3209-3212.
- Brunev, D. V., Neizvestny, I. G., Shwartz, N. L., Yanovitskaja, Z. S., 2001. Nanotechnology 12, 413-416.
- Chaparro, S. A., Zhang, Y., Drucker, J., Chandrasekhar, D., Smith, D. J., 2000. *J. Appl. Phys.* 87 2245-2254.
- Holý, V., Springholz, G., Pinczolits, M., Bauer, G. 1999, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 83, 356.
- Joyce, B. A., Vvedensky, D. D., 2004. *Mater. Sci. Eng.*, R. 46, 127-176 (2004).
- Kern, R., Muller, P., 1997. Surf. Sci. 392, 103-133
- Kratzer, P., Liu, Q. K. K., Acosta-Diaz, P., Manzano, C., Costantini, G., Songmuang, R., Rastelli, A., Schmidt, O. G., Kern, K., 2006. *Phys. Rev. B* 73, 205347.
- Lam, R., Vlachos, D. G., 2001. Phys. Rev. B 64, 035401.
- Larsson, M., 2001. Phys. Rev. B 64, 115428.
- Liang, J., Luo, H., Beresford, R., Xu, J., 2004. *Appl. Phys. Lett.*, 85, 5974.
- Lung, M. T., Lam, C. H., Sander, L. M., 2005. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 95, 086102.
- Meixner, M., Kunert, R., Schöll, E., 2003. *Phys. Rev. B* 67, 195301.
- Montalenti, F., Voter, A. F., 2001. Phys. Rev. B 64, 081401.
- Musikhin, Yu. G., Cirlin, G. E., Dubrovskii, V. G., Samsonenko, Yu. B., Tonkikh, A. A., Bert, N. A., Ustinov, V. M., 2005. Semiconductors. 39, 820-825.
- Nurminen, L., Kuronen, A., Kaski, K., 2001. *Phys. Rev. B* 63, 035407.
- Pan, E., 2002. J. Appl. Phys. 91, 6379-6387.
- Pan, E., Sun, M., Chung, P. W., Zhu, R., 2007. Appl. Phys. Lett., 91, 193110.
- Pan, E., Yang, B., 2003. Appl. Math. Model. 27, 307-326.
- Pan, E., Zhu, R., Chung, P. W., 2004. J Nanoeng. Nanosys. 218, 71-82.
- Pan, E., Zhu, R., Chung, P. W., 2006. J. Appl. Phys. 100, 013527.
- Pao, C. W., Srolovitz, D. J., 2006. J. Mech. Phys. Solids 54, 2527-2543.

- Pcheljakov, O. P., Markov, V. A., Nikiforov, A. I., Sokolov, L. V., 1997. *Thin Solid Films* 306- 310, 299 (1997).
- Russo, G., Smereka, P., 2006. J. Comput. Phys. 214, 809-828.
- Sage, J. F., Barvosa-Carter, W., Aziz, M. J., 2000. Appl. Phys. Lett. 77, 516-518.
- Shchukin, V. A., Bimberg, D., 1999. *Rev. Mod. Phys.* 71, 1125-1171 (1999).
- Stangl, J., Holy, V., Bauer, G., 2004. Rev. Mod. Phys. 76, 725-783.
- Sun, Y., Miyasato, T., Wigmore, J. K., 2000. J. Appl. Phys. 87, 8483-8486.
- Wang, X. D., Liu, N., Shih, C. K., Govindaraju, S., Holmes, Jr, A. L. 2004, *Appl. Phys. Lett.*, 85, 1356.
- Zandvliet, H. J. W., Poelsema, B., 1999. *Phys. Rev. B* 59, 7289-7292.
- Zhu, R., Pan, E., Chung, P. W., 2007, *Phys. Rev. B.*, 75, 205339.
- Zoethout, E., Guerlue, O., Zandvliet, H. J. W., Poelsema, B., 2000. *Surf. Sci.* 452, 247-252.