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Electroluminescent cooling in III-V intracavity diodes: practical requirements

Toufik Sadi, Ivan Radevici, Pyry Kivisaari and Jani Oksanen

Abstract—Recent studies of electroluminescent cooling in III-V structures demonstrate the need to understand better the factors affecting the efficiency of light emission and energy transport in light-emitting diodes (LEDs). In this work, we establish the physical and operational requirements for reaching the efficiencies needed for observing electroluminescent cooling in III-V intracavity double diode structures at high powers. The experimentally-validated modeling framework used in this work, coupling the drift-diffusion charge transport model with a photon transport model, indicates that the bulk properties of the III-V materials are already sufficient for electroluminescent cooling. Furthermore, the results suggest that the bulk power conversion efficiency of the LED in the devices, that allowed the experimentally measured record high coupling quantum efficiency of 70%, already exceeds 115%. However, as shown here, direct observation of electroluminescent cooling by electrical measurements still requires a combination of a more efficient suppression of the non-radiative surface recombination at the LED walls and the reduction of the detection losses in the photodetector of the intracavity structures.

Index Terms—Light-Emitting Diodes, Electroluminescent Cooling, Double Diode Structures, III-As.

I. INTRODUCTION

While the possibility of electroluminescent (EL) cooling was theoretically acknowledged already 60 years ago [1]–[3], quantitative and experimentally validated analysis of the requirements to observe it in practice is not yet available. The strategies for studying EL cooling (ELC) vary from thin-film light-emitting diodes (LEDs) [4], [5] and small band gap low power LEDs [6], [7], to high power visible LEDs [8] and intracavity devices [9]–[12]. The first three approaches deploy traditional light extraction methods with well known challenges, while the last one relies on a thermophotonic heat pump configuration [13], where the light is confined and used within a cavity with an essentially homogeneous refractive index. In this paper, we analyze the feasibility of observing ELC in the intracavity double diode structure (DDS) shown in Fig. 1, using a calibrated electro-optical model. We focus on the adverse role of non-radiative and surface recombination, and photodetector (PD) losses on device performance. Our results suggest that the present devices already have sufficient performance to exhibit ELC internally but reaching the net cooling threshold in practice will still necessitate overcoming selected performance bottlenecks. The presented results will provide valuable insight on establishing the practical conditions for observing ELC at high powers.

II. THE DOUBLE DIODE SETUP

The DDS has been proposed as an attractive experimental setup for studying EL cooling. It encloses an InGaP/GaAs double heterojunction (DHJ) LED and a GaAs photodetector in a single cavity, as illustrated in Fig. 1. The DDS devices have been grown by metal-organic vapour phase and molecular beam epitaxy, with LED mesa diameters up to ∼1000µm [9], [14]. As the DDS configuration removes the need for light extraction, it can act as a useful intermediate research prototype in studying EL cooling. The PD in the DDS absorbs photons generated by injecting a current $I_1$ through the LED, resulting in a current $I_2$ through the short-circuited PD. Advantages of the DDS include bypassing the above mentioned light extraction issues, prevalent in typical LED setups, and minimized current crowding [14]. Additionally, the DDS allows straightforward characterization through measuring its coupling quantum efficiency (CQE), $\eta_{CQE} = I_2/I_1$. In the DDS setup, EL cooling can be directly observed if the power conversion efficiency (PCE) of the DDS $\eta_{PCE} = \eta_{CQE}/\\!\!\!\!\!\!\!\!\!\!\!\!\!\!\!\!\!/U$ is above unity. Here, $U$ is the LED bias and $\hbar\omega$ is the average energy of the emitted photons.

Figure 2(a) further highlights the charge transport and energy exchange effects associated with electroluminescence,
by showing an example band diagram and the corresponding recombination profile of an InGaP/GaAs DHJ LED biased at \( U = 1.15 \) V, which in our study will allow EL cooling after selected optimizations. Luminescence from the LED is additionally directly coupled to the built-in PD, whose band diagram is illustrated in Fig. 2(b). In the setup of Fig. 2, a suitable combination of a high CQE (\( \sim 81\% \) or above) and an LED bias (1.15V) significantly below the bandgap of the active region (AR), results in a PCE above unity. This corresponds to the condition where heat absorption can overcome the internal heat generation leading to EL cooling. Indeed, in an ELC setup, the electrical excitation generally allows using bias voltages that are well below the bandgap voltage (\( \sim 1.42\)V). This is in contrast to photoluminescent (laser) cooling, in which the excitation power quickly falls when the excitation photon energy drops below the bandgap energy.

III. SIMULATION METHOD AND MEASUREMENTS

Charge transport is modelled by solving the three-dimensional drift-diffusion (DD) equations, calculating self-consistently the electrostatic potential, net recombination rates, densities and quasi-Fermi levels for electrons and holes [15], [16]. The recombination rates are determined using the ABC parameterized formula for the Shockley–Read–Hall (SRH), radiative and Auger recombination mechanisms [16]. The rates for interface and surface (non-radiative) recombination are calculated as described in [15]. The LED is biased in the customary manner while short-circuiting the PD. The total recombination in the LED active region (i-GaAs) is coupled to the total generation in the PD (GaAs) layers using an optical coupling constant. The generation profiles in the PD follow the Beer-Lambert law [15]. The coupling constant is evaluated using the three point probe \( I-V \) measurements [9], [14], biasing the LED with a voltage \( U \) and measuring the LED current \( I_1 \), and the current generated in the PD \( I_2 \) by the LED emitted photons.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In this work, the fundamental material parameters are primarily based on the available literature values, whereas the device specific parameters have been calibrated using experiments. A good agreement with experiments is obtained (see Fig. 3) using established values for the recombination parameters, including the recombination constants for radiative \( B = 2 \times 10^{-10} \) cm\(^3\)s\(^{-1}\) [19], [20] and Auger \( C = 10^{-30} \) cm\(^6\)s\(^{-1}\) [21] recombination processes, the recombination velocity \( v_{sr} = v_{sr0} = 4 \times 10^5 \) cm/s at the mesa surfaces [22], and the recombination velocity at GaAs/InGaP interfaces \( v_{int} = 1.5 \) cm/s [22]. For the SRH recombination constant \( A \), we use a conservative value \( 3 \times 10^3 \) s\(^{-1}\) as compared to the best literature values [23]–[25], representing the upper limit for the model calibration sensitivity. Our previous work [9], [14], [15] suggests that the main DDS loss factors include non-radiative and surface recombination, as well as photodetection losses. Here, we study how improvements in selected device parameters affect the DDS efficiency. In section IV-A, we analyze the effect of non-radiative SRH and surface recombination on the LED, PD and DDS quantum efficiencies, by modifying \( A \) and \( v_{sr} \) from their reference values (\( A_0 \) and \( v_{sr0} \), respectively). In section IV-B, we additionally assess the impact of recombination and other associated loss mechanisms on the photodiode quantum efficiency, by varying the thickness of the n-type GaAs layer in the PD from the reference value of 700nm. Finally, in sections IV-C–IV-D, we analyze the impact of recombination processes and device geometry on the power conversion efficiency of the DDS and the LED, and discuss the actions needed to reach the efficiency level required by EL cooling.

A. Quantum efficiency

Effect of surface recombination

![Diagram illustrating the current transport and carrier recombination in the LED, using its band diagram and recombination profiles calculated for a bias voltage \( U = 1.15\) V, which allows ELC. (b) The band diagram and generation profile of the photodetector (PD) excited by the luminescence from the LED. A hole current is harvested in the p-type contact, while the generated electrons are supplied back to the LED.](image-url)
Fig. 3. The effect of surface passivation on the simulated (a) LED ($I_1 - U$) and photodiode ($I_2 - U$) characteristics, and (b) the corresponding LED IQE and DDS CQE as a function of the LED bias $U$. The lines in red show the characteristics for the reference structure (representing also the measurements of the real devices with strong surface recombination), and the lines in blue show the characteristics of the efficiently surface-passivated surface-recombination-free ($v_{sr} = 0$) structure. Measurement results are shown using data points for the reference DDS, indicating excellent agreement with simulations.

To illustrate how surface passivation is expected to affect the device characteristics, we show in Fig. 3 the LED, PD and DDS characteristics for two devices: (i) the measured and simulated data for the reference device and (ii) simulation data for an identical (but passivated) device without surface recombination, as obtained by setting $v_{sr}$ at the mesa walls to zero. In Fig. 3(a), the LED and PD currents, as a function of the LED bias $U$, are shown for both devices. With $v_{sr} = 0$, the LED current at small biases is dramatically reduced becoming comparable to the photocurrent $I_2$, indicating a substantial improvement in the efficiency. In contrast, passivation has no effect on the photocurrent. Fig. 3(b) shows the effect of passivation on the LED internal quantum efficiency (IQE) $\eta_{LED}$ and the DDS CQE $\eta_{CQE}$, as a function of LED bias. Fig. 3(b) clearly highlights how passivation dramatically improves the LED IQE and (consequently) the DDS CQE. Fig. 3 therefore suggests that non-radiative recombination at the outer surfaces of the AR is the main mechanism driving current at low injection ($U < 1.1V$). In addition to reducing the CQE throughout the studied operating range, surface recombination shifts the peak CQE to higher LED biases, making the observation of ELC (via the condition $\eta_{PCE} > 1$) more challenging. Fortunately, it is to be expected that, once identified, this mechanism can be efficiently suppressed by available surface passivation techniques and improvements in the device structure.

**Effect of material quality**

Fig. 4 compares how the material quality of the device affects the CQE, and the LED and PD IQEs of the reference device and the corresponding passivated device. Fig. 4(a) shows that, for a fully-passivated surface, improving the material quality ($A$) substantially increases the peak CQE and moves the peak value of the CQE towards lower biases. For the reference device with very strong surface recombination ($v_{sr} = 5 \times 10^{-6} cm/s$), the improvement in the CQE is clearly visible only when $A$ has a high value of $10^{-5} s^{-1}$. Reducing $A$ below $A_0$ for the unpassivated (reference) device therefore has only a very limited effect on the CQE, which saturates at a peak value of $\sim 70\%$ independent of $A$ if $A < A_0$. This behaviour shows that, in reality, the $A$ parameter in our devices may in fact be smaller than the presently used worst case reference value of $A = A_0 = 3 \times 10^5 s^{-1}$. A similar trend is also clearly visible in the LED IQE, shown in Fig. 4(b), where $A$ has a substantial effect, especially at low biases, only when surface passivation is applied. At larger biases, where the surface current saturates, the IQE still clearly increases with bias for a large $A$, but does not significantly improve as $A$ is lowered to below the $A = A_0$ level. Fig. 4(c) shows the IQE of the PD as a function of the LED bias. While the IQE of the PD is near unity at low biases, it significantly decreases towards higher biases. This introduces a very harmful mismatch between the regions of peak efficiency of the PD and the LED, as analyzed in more details shortly. Neither the surface passivation nor the material quality of the PD have a visible effect on the PD efficiency within the studied range of $A$.

**B. Origin of the PD losses**

As observed in Fig. 4, the performance of the PD in the reference DDS has a profound effect on the CQE at biases
where the LED operates efficiently. To understand the origin of these performance issues and to eliminate it, we analyze the PD losses in more detail. As shown in the example band diagram of the PD in Fig. 2(b), the electron and hole populations in the GaAs layers of the PD can be substantially larger than the respective equilibrium values. Naturally, this can also lead to recombination in these layers. To assess its impact, we show in Fig. 5 a one-dimensional (1D) distribution of the recombination rates in the DDS along the vertical axis at the center of the mesa structure, at a bias \( U = 1.15 \text{V} \). The data is shown for a 700nm n-type GaAs layer in the PD, corresponding to the geometry of the reference device, as well as for a similar structure but with a 200nm n-type layer. Fig. 5 illustrates that the recombination in the PD predominantly takes place in the n-GaAs layer, and that the original DDS with a thick n-GaAs PD layer experiences a larger total recombination than the structure with a thinner n-GaAs layer. This undesirable recombination is a consequence of the accumulation of photogenerated holes in the n-GaAs layer of the PD, due to the very low mobility of holes as compared to electrons and the high electron-hole generation rate in this layer. This results in the reduction of the net photogenerated current (\( I_2 \)) across the short-circuited PD, leading to lower CQEs. To quantify the differences caused by the n-type GaAs layer in more detail, Fig. 6 compares the CQE, and the LED and PD IQEs for layer thicknesses of 100nm, 200nm and 700nm. The CQE and the PD IQE are improved visibly at lower thicknesses, and the passivated device exhibits the highest peak CQE for thin n-layers. Indeed, according to the results, using a thinner n-type layer clearly improves the PD IQEs at large biases and hence increases the peak CQEs (reaching \( \sim 90\% \) or higher). The LED IQE is obviously unaffected by the PD geometry.

C. Power conversion efficiency

Figures 7 and 8 analyze how various non-radiative recombination processes affect the power conversion efficiency of the LED and the DDS when the main recombination parameters and the PD geometry is varied. Figure 7 shows the PCE of the DDS and the internal power conversion efficiency (IPCE) representing the PCE of the LED itself, for the un-passivated reference device and the passivated \( (v_{sr} = 0 \text{cm/s}) \) device, with selected \( A \) values. The IPCE is calculated by \( \eta_{IPCE} = \eta_{LED} \text{h} \omega / qU \), where \( \eta_{LED} \) is the IQE of the LED. Figure 7(a) indicates that lower \( v_{sr} \) and \( A \) give globally a higher PCE with the peak value shifting towards lower biases, similar to the trend observed for the CQE in Fig. 4. Figure 7(a) clearly shows that reducing \( v_{sr} \) close to zero can remarkably increase the PCE of the DDS by almost 15%, as compared to the reference device. This shows that just eliminating the surface recombination would bring the PCE of the DDS already very close to (or even above) unity, for fully feasible values of \( A \) in the range \( 10^4 \text{s}^{-1} - A_0 \), even without additional device optimization. Fig. 7(b) shows the corresponding analysis for the IPCE of the LED, where eliminating the surface recombination directly increases the IPCE to approximately 116%, for the reference (conservative) \( A = A_0 \). This clearly illustrates that the bulk properties of the LED materials are sufficient for achieving EL cooling. In addition, the IPCE of the reference device also reaches \( \sim 105\% \) even without any surface passivation.

\[
\eta \approx \frac{\text{IPCE}}{\text{PD IQE}} \approx \frac{\text{LED IQE}}{\text{PD IQE}}
\]

D. Requirements for direct ELC observation

As seen above, applying one type of optimization (material improvement, passivation or PD optimization) alone may not be sufficient for directly observing ELC in the DDS, especially for conservative \( A \) values \( (A \geq A_0) \). On the other hand, combining two optimizations, such as material improvement and surface passivation as observed in Fig. 7 can result in PCE values that are well above unity. To assess the other combinations leading to PCE values in excess of unity, and hence
the possibility of observing EL cooling, we show in Figs. 8(a) and (c) the extrinsic PCE (EPCE), corresponding to the directly measured PCE involving an additional resistive loss of \( \sim 3.75 \Omega \) in the measurement setup of the DDS, the PCE of the DDS (without the measurement resistance) and the PCE of the LED alone (IPCE), for the structure with a thin absorber layer (100nm), with and without passivated mesa edges, as function of both LED bias \( U \) and the input power \((I_1 \times U)\). The EPCE of the DDS is calculated as \( \eta_{EPCE} = \eta_{CQE} \hbar \omega / q U_1 \), with \( U_1 \) including the external resistive losses associated with the measurement setup. For the thin photodetector structure with surface passivation, all of the PCEs have peak values higher than unity, with maxima 106\%, 108\% and 116\% for the EPCE, PCE, and IPCE, respectively. This indicates that EL cooling can be directly observed in a passivated device when using a conservative \( A \) value \( A_0 = 3 \times 10^7 \text{s}^{-1} \), even when the external resistive losses from the measurement setup are not eliminated. Even without passivation, improvements in the PD alone allow increasing the peak EPCE, PCE and IPCE to 85\%, 96\% and 105\%, respectively. Fig. 8(c) shows that in the structure with an optimized PD and surface passivation, ELC can be directly observed for a wide range of input powers, from \( \sim 1 \text{mW} \) to \( \sim 0.2 \text{W} \) (\( \sim 160 \text{mW/cm}^2 \) to \( \sim 32 \text{W/cm}^2 \)). As for the LED PCE (IPCE), ELC takes place in the input power range from \( \sim 0.2 \text{mW} \) to \( \sim 0.6 \text{W} \) (\( \sim 32 \text{mW/cm}^2 \) to \( \sim 96 \text{W/cm}^2 \).

For further analysis of passivation effects, Fig. 8(b) shows an example on how partial surface passivation affects the PCE of the DDS, by varying the surface recombination velocity for the reference device \( (v_{sr} = v_{sr0} - \text{solid lines/symbols}) \) and the surface passivated device \( (v_{sr} = 0 - \text{dashed lines}) \).

To conclude, we studied the possibility of demonstrating electroluminescent cooling in III-As based intracavity double diode structures (DDSs) at high powers and at room temperature. For a thorough analysis of the device physics

V. CONCLUSIONS

The most basic traditional GaAs passivation techniques can easily reduce \( v_{sr} \) by more than one order of magnitude [26], while epitaxially grown cap layers (e.g. III-P) [28] could ideally bring the values down to the 1.5 cm/s (<0.001\%) level [22]. Hence, it is expected that various efficient passivation techniques, ranging from atomic layer deposition to controlled oxidation [29] and epitaxial regrowth of III-P layers [30], can be developed and exploited to make use of ELC. Equivalently, it is expected that surface recombination can be eliminated by electrically isolating the surface, e.g. by eliminating the p-type conducting channel to the surface. Therefore it seems likely that the surface recombination can be pushed to well below the 1\% limit shown in Fig. 8(b).
and performance, we combined experimental results with a calibrated electro-optical device simulation model. Our results indicate that the bulk properties of the III-V materials forming the DDS are already sufficient for achieving LED EL cooling at high powers, and that direct EL cooling observation through the DDS at such powers is feasible if surface recombination at the mesa edges are minimized and the detection efficiency of the photodetector integrated in the DDS is improved. In particular, our results also indicate that the LED power conversion efficiency of the studied setup can reach values larger than 115%, with LED EL cooling taking place over a wide range of input power densities, extending all the way up to ~96W/cm², if we suppress non-radiative surface recombination at the LED mesa walls, and radiative recombination in the PD by optimizing the PD layer structure.
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