Capture cross sections of the acceptor level of iron–boron pairs in p-type silicon by injection-level dependent lifetime measurements

Daniel Macdonald(a) and Andrés Cuevas
Center for Sustainable Energy Systems, Department of Engineering, FEIT, The Australian National University, Canberra, ACT 0200, Australia

Jennifer Wong-Leung
Department of Electronic Materials Engineering, Research School of Physical Sciences and Engineering, The Australian National University, Canberra, ACT 0200, Australia

(Received 2 January 2001; accepted for publication 26 March 2001)

Injection-level dependent recombination lifetime measurements of iron-diffused, boron-doped silicon wafers of different resistivities are used to determine the electron and hole capture cross sections of the acceptor level of iron–boron pairs in silicon. The relative populations of iron–boron pairs and interstitial iron were varied by exposing the samples to different levels of illumination prior to lifetime measurements. The components of the effective lifetime due to interstitial iron and iron–boron pairs were then modeled with Shockley–Read–Hall statistics. By forcing the sum of the modeled iron–boron and interstitial iron concentrations to equal the implanted iron dose, in conjunction with the strong dependence of the shape of the lifetime curves on dopant density, the electron and hole capture cross sections of the acceptor level of iron–boron pairs have been determined as $(3 \pm 2) \times 10^{-14} \text{cm}^{-2}$ and $(2 \pm 1) \times 10^{-15} \text{cm}^{-2}$. © 2001 American Institute of Physics. [DOI: 10.1063/1.1372156]

I. INTRODUCTION

The recombination properties of FeB pairs in p-type silicon are of considerable interest in silicon device technology. The well established difference in the low-injection recombination strengths of interstitial iron (Fe$_i$) and FeB pairs can be exploited to make very sensitive measurements of the total iron concentration,\(^1,2\) provided the influence of other recombination centers can be discounted. While the fundamental recombination parameters of Fe$_i$, namely the defect energy level and the electron and hole capture cross sections, are relatively well known,\(^3\) this is not the case for the acceptor level of FeB pairs. The energy level of the latter has been determined by deep-level transient spectroscopy (DLTS) with reasonable accuracy, but measurement of the capture cross sections has been uncertain, with estimates varying by up to two orders of magnitude.\(^3\)

Injection-level dependent recombination lifetime measurements offer an alternative method for determining the electron and hole capture cross sections $\sigma_e$ and $\sigma_h$.\(^4\) If the energy level of the state is known, as is the case for FeB pairs, and if intentionally iron-contaminated samples of significantly different resistivities are prepared, then both cross sections can be determined quite accurately by fitting Shockley–Read–Hall (SRH) recombination curves to measured injection-level dependent lifetime data. As shown in this work, the key to accurate results from this method is to use a large range of dopant densities that generate very different injection-level dependences: in fact often the dependence will change direction as the doping changes. In addition, the dissociation of FeB pairs by strong illumination\(^1\) can be exploited to generate different concentrations of FeB pairs in a sample with a known total iron concentration. This provides further scope for uniquely determining the capture cross sections.

II. FeB PAIRS IN SILICON

There is strong evidence from various studies using DLTS, Hall effect and electron paramagnetic resonance for the existence of two charge states of the FeB pair in silicon, as summarized recently by Istratov et al.\(^3\) One state occurs as a donor level at $E_v + 0.1 \text{eV}$, and the other as an acceptor level at $E_c - 0.26(\pm 0.03) \text{eV}$. Brotherton et al.\(^5\) argued that the acceptor level must be the dominant recombination center of the two, due to the fact that it is deeper. Standard SRH recombination theory does not establish a mathematical link between energy levels and cross sections, and so it is possible, within this theory, to attribute unreasonably large cross sections to a very shallow level, resulting in stronger recombination behavior than some deeper levels. However, considering that these recombination processes occur through multiple phonon emission, it seems physically reasonable to expect that shallow levels must have very small cross sections for transitions to or from the furthest band edge, due to the prohibitively large number of phonons that are required simultaneously to carry off the energy difference. Consequently, the deeper acceptor level of FeB pairs should provide a much more efficient recombination channel than the donor level. Hayamizu et al.\(^6\) showed that the acceptor level does indeed dominate recombination through FeB pairs at room temperature. They performed temperature dependent low-injection lifetime measurements using a microwave-detected photoconductance decay (PCD) method. Their data...
could only be adequately described by a relatively deep level around 0.29 eV from either band edge, coinciding with previous DLTS measurements of the energy of the FeB acceptor level. Later temperature-dependent lifetime studies further confirmed their results.

Walz et al.\textsuperscript{8} examined the injection-level dependence of the recombination lifetimes at room temperature of iron-diffused samples for a range of intermediate resistivities, and found that their data could be adequately explained by modeling the combined effect of the acceptor level and the level for interstitial iron. They were able to determine values for the capture cross sections of the acceptor level by fitting SRH curves to the data for the different resistivities. This technique, sometimes referred to as injection-level spectroscopy, can allow more accurate measurement of cross sections than the more commonly used DLTS methods, which require extrapolation of emission rate data to an axis, a process that inherently produces large uncertainties. However, a crucial requirement of the injection-level spectroscopy technique is that samples with widely different dopant densities are used. The important feature of these different resistivities is that the injection-level dependence of the lifetime for a given defect is often markedly different, allowing accurate fitting of SRH curves with a consistent and unique pair of capture cross sections. This method has been used recently to analyze the recombination properties of boron–oxygen complexes in \textit{p}-type Czochralski silicon.\textsuperscript{4} The study conducted by Walz et al. was restricted to a resistivity range of 1 to 20 Ω cm due to constraints of their measurement method (Elymat). In this work, we study a larger range of resistivities, from 0.3 to 150 Ω cm. This corresponds to 25 times the dopant density range used by Walz et al., a feature which turns out to be very important for uniquely determining the cross sections. Also, we explore a broader range of injection levels for each resistivity, which is of further benefit in accurately calculating the capture cross sections. In addition to varying the dopant densities, the dissociation behavior of FeB pairs upon illumination may be used to vary the recombination center densities. By applying various levels of light soaking to the samples before lifetime measurement, different relative populations of FeB pairs and Fe\textsubscript{2} are obtained. In our experiments, the total iron concentration is known from the implantation dose, and so the sum of the modeled FeB and Fe\textsubscript{2} centers can be forced to equal this value. In this way, a good fit can be achieved for each light-soaking condition and resistivity, with uniquely determined capture cross sections.

**III. EXPERIMENTAL METHODS**

A. Sample preparation

Sample preparation is critical in an experiment aimed at investigating metals in silicon. Care needs to be taken to ensure that the deliberately introduced impurities occur evenly throughout the bulk of the wafers, as this is essential for accurate injection-level dependent lifetime measurements. Also, the impurities to be studied should not be subject to significant gettering at the surfaces or damaged regions, nor undergo outdiffusion or precipitation in the bulk. In this study, avoiding loss of iron through these processes allows us to determine the bulk iron concentration, after annealing, from a knowledge of the implantation dose. This is important in modeling the lifetime data and allowing the accurate fitting of the SRH parameters.

Boron-doped \textit{p}-type float zone (FZ) silicon samples of four resistivities (0.3, 1, 5, and 1500 Ω cm) were chosen for this study. The samples were initially etched and cleaned to remove any surface damage and contamination, and then implanted with 70 keV\textsuperscript{56}Fe to doses of $1 \times 10^{11}$ cm$^{-2}$ and $1 \times 10^{12}$ cm$^{-2}$. Annealing was then performed at 900°C for 1 h to distribute the iron uniformly throughout the wafers. FZ silicon was chosen due to its low oxygen and crystallographic defect content, in order to avoid complicating defect reactions during the annealing stage.\textsuperscript{4} The solubility limit of interstitial iron\textsuperscript{3} at 900°C is about $5 \times 10^{13}$ cm$^{-3}$, and so for a 0.03 cm thick wafer implanted with a dose of $1 \times 10^{12}$ cm$^{-2}$, the resulting bulk concentration would be $3.3 \times 10^{13}$ cm$^{-3}$. This is close to the solubility limit, but as revealed by the results below, does not create significant precipitation. For the $1 \times 10^{11}$ cm$^{-2}$ doses, the solubility limit is comfortably avoided. Some samples were implanted with even higher doses ($1 \times 10^{13}$ cm$^{-2}$), which did result in massive precipitation in the bulk and hence a loss of interstitial iron, as discussed in Sec. V.

During annealing, iron can also precipitate at the Si/SiO\textsubscript{2} interface.\textsuperscript{9} To avoid this, the native oxide was removed immediately prior to annealing, and nitrogen gas was used during the anneal to avoid oxide growth. The samples were then cooled rapidly in air to “freeze” the iron in the interstitial state. To minimize the possible loss of iron through outdiffusion, samples of the same implanted dose were annealed face-to-face, with the surfaces in contact. Outdiffusion through the rear of the samples should be insignificant due to the initially low surface concentrations there.

A low implantation energy of 70 keV was used to minimize lattice damage, which can act as unwanted gettering sites during the anneal. Such gettering action may result in nonuniform distributions, which can in turn distort the injection-level dependent lifetime measurements. Furthermore, any remaining lattice damage can directly affect the lifetime measurements and also hinder surface passivation. To avoid these potential problems, several microns of silicon were etched from the wafers after annealing to remove the implanted region. Lifetime measurements before and after this etch revealed no discernible change, indicating that residual damage and gettering in the implanted region was negligible.

After annealing and etching, it is necessary to passivate the wafer surfaces to allow reliable bulk lifetime measurements. This was achieved by depositing films of stoichiometric plasma-enhanced chemical vapor deposited silicon nitride.\textsuperscript{10} We chose this passivation method because it provides very low surface recombination velocities, and also because the relatively low temperature and short time required for deposition (390°C for 10 min) avoid potential precipitation problems that can occur if higher temperature processes such as oxidation are used. According to the results of Henley et al.,\textsuperscript{11} the SiN deposition should result in negligible...
precipitation for the lighter dose of \(1 \times 10^{11} \text{ cm}^{-2}\), and only a small proportion (about 10%) for the heavier dose of \(1 \times 10^{12} \text{ cm}^{-2}\). The effectiveness of the nitride films in passivating the surfaces was verified using control samples, described next. This passivation allows lifetimes of above 1 ms to be observed in high resistivity material.

### B. Lifetime measurements

The quasi-steady-state photoconductance (QSSPC) technique\(^{12}\) was used to measure the injection-level dependence of the effective lifetimes of the iron-diffused samples. This method involves the use of a coil which is inductively coupled to the test wafer, with a circular coil area of about 4 cm\(^2\). The implanted area of our samples was a square of 3 cm \(\times\) 3 cm, large enough to fully cover the measurement region. To ensure that the measured lifetimes reflect the recombination properties of the iron-related states only, and not surface effects or the preimplanted lifetime of the FZ wafers, control samples were included. These were subjected to the same etching, cleaning, annealing, and passivation treatments as the implanted samples. Figure 1 shows injection-level dependent lifetime measurements of the 1 \(\Omega\) cm wafers. The fact that the effective lifetimes measured on the control samples were almost always an order of magnitude or more greater than the lifetimes of the iron implanted samples means that the measurements on the latter are not significantly affected by surface recombination, nor by the intrinsic bulk lifetime of the FZ wafers. It is in fact this constraint which places a lower limit on the iron dose, as lighter doses would result in surface-affected lifetime measurements. If, however, the dose is too high, and the resultant lifetimes too low, the carrier profiles across the thickness of the samples will become strongly nonuniform (when measuring with white light), and the measured injection level dependence incorrect. It is possible to use an infrared filter to avoid this problem, but the low generation rates of the reduced photon flux do not allow sufficiently high carrier densities to be reached. Consequently, we are restricted to doses around \(1 \times 10^{11} \text{ cm}^{-2}\) to \(1 \times 10^{12} \text{ cm}^{-2}\) by considerations of surface recombination, nonuniform carrier profiles, and also by the solubility limit at the chosen annealing temperature.

One further point of interest with respect to photoconductance measurements in general is the observed behavior at very low carrier concentrations. Figure 1 shows that the lifetime abruptly increases below \(1 \times 10^{13} \text{ cm}^{-3}\) for the control sample. This dependence is not related to SRH recombination through defects, but is a result of minority carrier trapping.\(^{13}\) These trapping states, which trap and release electrons from the conduction band without directly contributing to recombination, may reside in the bulk or at the Si/Si interface. In either case, they distort the recombination lifetime measurements in both the control and iron-diffused samples. This trap-affected data does not reflect the recombination lifetime, and must be discarded. This has been done for the iron-doped samples in Fig. 1, and for all subsequent data plotted in this work, although other studies have sometimes failed to recognize this problem and erroneously considered the trap-affected data as SRH recombination lifetimes.\(^{14}\) The onset of trapping is therefore an effective lower bound on the carrier densities for which reliable recombination lifetime data is available. Surface photovoltage methods are immune to trapping effects, but can only measure lifetimes under very low injection-level conditions and so are not appropriate for injection-level spectroscopy.

### IV. SRH STATISTICS

#### A. Injection-level and dopant density dependence of the lifetimes

The injection-level dependence of the SRH lifetime \(\tau_{\text{SRH}}\) is a function of the dopant density \(N_A\), recombination center density \(N_{\text{SRH}}\), defect energy level \(E_T\) and capture cross sections, and for p-Si is given by:\(^{15–17}\)

\[
\frac{1}{\tau_{\text{SRH}}} = \frac{N_A + \Delta n}{n_1(n_1 + \Delta n) + n_0(N_A + p_1 + \Delta n)}.
\]

Here, \(\Delta n = \Delta p\) is the excess carrier density, and \(n_0\) and \(p_0\) are the fundamental electron and hole lifetimes, which are related to the recombination center density, the thermal velocity\(^{18}\) \(v_{th} = 1.1 \times 10^7 \text{ cm s}^{-1}\), and the capture cross sections via \(n_0 = 1/(v_{th} \sigma_{v,n_{\text{SRH}}})\) and \(p_0 = 1/(v_{th} \sigma_{p,n_{\text{SRH}}})\). The electron and hole densities when the Fermi energy coincides with the recombination center energy, \(n_1\) and \(p_1\), are given by:

\[
n_1 = N_e \exp \left( \frac{E_T - E_C}{kT} \right),
\]

\[
p_1 = N_v \exp \left( \frac{E_C - E_G - E_T}{kT} \right).
\]
Values for the effective densities of states at the conduction and valence band edges\(^1\) are taken as \(N_c = 2.86 \times 10^{19}\) and \(N_v = 3.10 \times 10^{19} \text{ cm}^{-3}\).

For carrier densities at which trapping effects are insignificant,\(^{13,17}\) and provided the recombination center density is considerably less than the injected carrier density \((N_{SRH} \ll \Delta n)\), then standard SRH theory is applicable,\(^{17}\) and \(\Delta n = \Delta p\) is a reasonable simplifying assumption. If one or both of these conditions are not satisfied, then the excess carrier concentrations can become strongly unequal, resulting in distorted lifetime measurements. For the majority of the data modeled in this work (the lighter iron dose of \(1 \times 10^{11} \text{ cm}^{-2}\)), these two important conditions are easily satisfied, although for the two samples with the heavier dose of \(1 \times 10^{12} \text{ cm}^{-2}\) the second requirement is not strictly adhered to. The consistency of the results however, suggests that the deviations from the standard theory are small.

Under low- \((\Delta n \ll N_A)\) and high-injection \((\Delta n \gg N_A)\) conditions, Eq. (1) can be simplified for a given recombination center. For interstitial iron, with an energy level close to the middle of the band gap, both \(n_1\) and \(p_1\) are much less than \(N_A\) for all the resistivities used in this study, as shown in Table I. Hence, the right-hand side of Eq. (1) simplifies to \(1/\tau_{n0}\) and \(1/\tau_{p0}\) for low- and high-injection respectively, remembering that \(\tau_{n0} \approx \tau_{p0}\) due to the values of the cross sections. These limiting lifetime values are independent of the dopant density, a general feature of deep levels, irrespective of their capture cross sections. However, this is not necessarily the case for the shallower acceptor state of FeB pairs. For an energy level of \(E_c = 0.23\) eV, which was found to provide the best modeling results in this work, \(p_1\) is still negligible, but \(n_1 \approx 4 \times 10^{15} \text{ cm}^{-3}\). As a result, the low-injection lifetime depends strongly on the dopant density for the resistivities used in this study. The high-injection lifetime is once again given by \(\tau_{p0}\) due to the fact that \(\tau_{n0} \ll \tau_{p0}\). However, the behavior of the FeB level can be entirely different if other recombination parameters are assumed. Table I also lists the energy levels and cross sections reported by Walz et al., and in this case, with a slightly deeper center, \(n_1 \approx 4 \times 10^{14} \text{ cm}^{-3}\). Considering this value, and their reversed asymmetry of the cross sections, the resulting low- and high-injection lifetimes would both be approximately equal to \(\tau_{n0}\), indicating essentially no injection-level dependence, which is contrary to our experimental evidence.

Figure 2 illustrates theoretical injection-level dependent lifetime curves for three cases: interstitial iron, FeB pairs with the recombination parameters used in this work, and FeB pairs with those used by Walz. The curves, calculated for a bulk defect concentration of \(1 \times 10^{12} \text{ cm}^{-3}\) for each of the four resistivities used in this study, reveal the distinct behavior of each level. Note in particular the lack of injection-level dependence of Walz’s parameters for the FeB pair in comparison with those used in this study. However, as mentioned, Walz only measured samples in a small range of resistivities, from 1 to 20 \(\Omega\) cm, and over this narrow range the optimum parameters found in this current study also give a mild dependence with similar magnitudes (note

\[\begin{align*}
\text{Recombination} & \quad \text{Energy Level (eV)} & \sigma_n \text{ (cm}^{-2}\text{s}) & \sigma_p \text{ (cm}^{-2}\text{s}) & N_1 \text{ (cm}^{-3}\text{)} & N_1 \text{ (cm}^{-3}\text{)} & \rho_1 \text{ (cm}^{-3}\text{)} & \rho_1 \text{ (cm}^{-3}\text{)} & \tau_{SRH} \text{ (ns)} & \tau_{SRH} \text{ (ns)} \\
\text{Fe} & \quad E_c = \Delta E & \sigma_n & \sigma_p & n_1 & p_1 & \tau_{SRH} & \tau_{SRH} \\
\text{FeB acceptor} & \quad E_c = \Delta E & \sigma_n & \sigma_p & n_1 & p_1 & \tau_{SRH} & \tau_{SRH} \\
\text{FeB acceptor} & \quad E_c = \Delta E & \sigma_n & \sigma_p & n_1 & p_1 & \tau_{SRH} & \tau_{SRH} \\
\text{(Walz et al.)} & \quad E_c = \Delta E & \sigma_n & \sigma_p & n_1 & p_1 & \tau_{SRH} & \tau_{SRH} \\
\end{align*}\]

\[a\text{See Reference 8.}\]
the curve for the 5 Ω cm case). Hence, the parameters found in this work, and those found by Walz, provide reasonable approximations to one another over the narrower dopant range, despite the large differences between the cross section values. However, when data from a much larger dopant density range is examined, the cross sections determined in this study must be used. These considerations reveal that it is essential to have data from a large range of resistivities to uniquely specify the cross sections.

On a general note, Fig. 2 illustrates some interesting features of Fe/FeB pair recombination. Firstly, although the low-injection lifetime of FeB pair depends on the dopant density, these lifetimes are always significantly higher than those due to interstitial iron. Under high-injection conditions, however, the FeB pair is the dominant center. This leads to the lifetime curves for the dissociated and undissociated states for a single sample crossing over at some intermediate injection-level, which has been observed previously on several occasions.20,21 This phenomenon highlighted the possibility of using injection-level dependent lifetimes to estimate the cross sections.

### B. Modeling procedure

Lifetime measurements obtained by the QSSPC method, and by PCD methods also, represent effective lifetimes, meaning that they comprise components caused by various recombination mechanisms. It is essential therefore to be aware which mechanisms occur and what their relative contributions are in order to single out a particular mechanism for analysis. In many practical cases, more than one type of SRH center may be present simultaneously, as is the case here for iron contaminated p-type Si which contains both FeB pairs and Fe. Also, the effects of Auger recombination are often important in heavily doped or highly excited silicon,22 and need to be considered here at the higher carrier concentrations. For reasons that will be discussed, contributions to the effective lifetime from the surfaces are not significant in the iron-diffused samples studied here, and radiative recombination is negligible in indirect semiconductors such as silicon. Therefore, the effective lifetime, comprising all of the important contributions, can be expressed as:

\[
\frac{1}{\tau_{\text{eff}}} = \frac{1}{\tau_{\text{SRH}}} + \frac{1}{\tau_{\text{SRH}}} + \frac{1}{\tau_{\text{Auger}}},
\]

(4)

The Auger lifetime is calculated using a Coulomb-enhanced Auger recombination model23,24 which is valid for all injection-levels and dopant densities. Values for the Auger coefficients \( C_a \), \( C_p \), and \( C_{\text{FeB}} \), as required in the Auger model, are taken from the literature.22,25

The fitting procedure employed in this work essentially proceeds as follows. Curves such as those in Fig. 2 are taken for interstitial iron and FeB pairs for the appropriate resistivity. These curves are combined in a linear fashion according to Eq. (4), with a term for Auger recombination included, and compared to the measured data. The concentrations of each center are adjusted, and the shape of the FeB curve altered by changing the cross sections, until a good fit is obtained for all the samples with a single set of cross sections. It so happens that the less heavily doped samples yield data which is more sensitive to the value of \( \sigma_a \), while the more heavily doped data allows accurate determination of \( \sigma_p \).

Two examples of the fitting process are given in Fig. 3. In Fig. 3(a), the light-soaked case for the 0.3 Ω cm sample is shown. Due to the light soaking, the majority of the iron present in this sample occurs as interstitial iron. In Fig. 3(b) data for the 5 Ω cm sample without light soaking is shown, and is dominated by the presence of FeB pairs. Note that the dependence of the FeB pair curves is markedly different for the two resistivities, while the shape of the Fe curves are similar apart from being shifted due to the change in dopant density. It is an interesting coincidence that the linear combination of the FeB and Fe terms gives rise to a straight line in Fig. 3(a).

For all samples, the sum of the modeled interstitial iron and FeB pair concentrations is forced to agree with that expected from the implantation dose. For Figs. 3(a) and 3(b), this sum equals \( 3.5 \times 10^{12} \text{ cm}^{-3} \), precisely that expected from an implant dose of \( 1 \times 10^{11} \text{ cm}^{-2} \) in a wafer of thickness 0.0285 cm. This process effectively determines the concentration of FeB pairs for any curve, leaving the two cross sections of the FeB pairs as the only free parameters in the procedure. In principle, therefore, only two largely different
resistivities are needed to obtain unique values of the cross sections. However, the fact that these values also generate good results for the other resistivities used in this study, and also for the different concentrations of FeB pairs as brought about by light soaking, provides greater confidence in the validity of the underlying method.

V. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Figure 1 depicts the results for the 1 \(\Omega\) cm samples. The Auger lifetime represents an intrinsic upper limit in p-type silicon samples of this resistivity, which is approached by the control sample. Below these curves are data for two iron implanted samples, with doses of \(1 \times 10^{11}\) and \(1 \times 10^{12} \text{cm}^{-2}\). There are three curves for the lighter dose corresponding to different light-soaking levels, and hence different relative populations of Fe\(_i\) and FeB pairs. The solid lines which pass through the data represent the SRH lifetimes as calculated using the appropriate recombination parameters for FeB and Fe\(_i\) as given in Table I. Table II lists the concentrations of Fe\(_i\) and FeB pairs that were used to generate the fits. The fact that these concentrations add to agree with that expected from the dose indicates that very little precipitation has occurred in the samples. This is further corroborated by the fact that a good fit for the heavier dose can be achieved by merely scaling up the concentrations by an order of magnitude (see Table II), as should occur if precipitation is negligible. It is interesting to note that even in the fully light-soaked case, it is still necessary to include a small number of FeB pairs to describe the data well, indicating that either pair dissociation is not complete or that some repairing occurs between light soaking and lifetime measurement.

Figures 4 and 5 show the results for the 0.3 and 5 \(\Omega\) cm samples, respectively, both implanted with a dose of \(1 \times 10^{11} \text{cm}^{-2}\), under different light-soaking conditions. Once again, the sum of the modeled concentrations agrees well with that obtained from the dose. Note that the lifetimes of the control samples approach the Auger limit much more closely for the 0.3 \(\Omega\) cm case, indicating that these wafers are of better intrinsic quality. An important observation here is that the dependence of the two resistivities without light soaking goes in opposite directions as the carrier density increases, as expected from Fig. 2. The change in dependence is only mild however, reflecting the fact that the dopant densities for these two cases are not too far removed from the value of \(n_1\).

For the 150 \(\Omega\) cm light-soaked case however, the dependence becomes much more pronounced, as revealed by the data and fit in Fig. 6. In this plot, the constituent SRH curves for the FeB pairs and Fe\(_i\) are also shown, similar to Fig. 3. The strong dependence of the FeB curve is clear in this case, which contrasts with the weak dependence predicted by Walz’s cross sections (see Fig. 2). This comment also holds for the other extreme of dopant densities as shown in Fig. 4 for the 0.3 \(\Omega\) cm case, with the notable difference that the injection-level dependence goes in the opposite direction. The data in Fig. 6 is for a sample that was implanted with a heavier dose of \(1 \times 10^{12} \text{cm}^{-2}\). For this resistivity, the corresponding wafer with the lighter dose gave lifetime data that was too close to the control sample, meaning that surface recombination impacted on the measurements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resistivity ((\Omega) cm)</th>
<th>(N_1 (\text{cm}^3))</th>
<th>(W (\text{cm}))</th>
<th>Fe implant dose ((\text{cm}^{-2}))</th>
<th>([\text{Fe}] (\text{cm}^{-3})) from dose</th>
<th>Light soaking</th>
<th>Modeled (<a href="%5Ctext%7Bcm%7D%5E%7B-3%7D">\text{Fe}</a>)</th>
<th>Modeled (<a href="%5Ctext%7Bcm%7D%5E%7B-3%7D">\text{FeB}</a>)</th>
<th>([\text{Fe}]+<a href="%5Ctext%7Bcm%7D%5E%7B-3%7D">\text{FeB}</a>)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>6.6 (\times) 10^{10}</td>
<td>0.0285</td>
<td>1.0 (\times) 10^{11}</td>
<td>3.5 (\times) 10^{12}</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>1.0 (\times) 10^{12}</td>
<td>2.5 (\times) 10^{12}</td>
<td>3.5 (\times) 10^{12}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7 (\times) 10^{10}</td>
<td>0.0400</td>
<td>1.0 (\times) 10^{11}</td>
<td>2.5 (\times) 10^{12}</td>
<td>partial</td>
<td>2.0 (\times) 10^{12}</td>
<td>1.5 (\times) 10^{12}</td>
<td>2.0 (\times) 10^{12}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.0 (\times) 10^{13}</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>1.0 (\times) 10^{11}</td>
<td>3.5 (\times) 10^{12}</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>0.7 (\times) 10^{12}</td>
<td>2.8 (\times) 10^{12}</td>
<td>3.5 (\times) 10^{12}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.3 (\times) 10^{12}</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>1.0 (\times) 10^{12}</td>
<td>2.9 (\times) 10^{13}</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>0.5 (\times) 10^{13}</td>
<td>2.0 (\times) 10^{13}</td>
<td>2.5 (\times) 10^{13}</td>
<td>10% (\times) 10^{13}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For all of the fits shown, the capture cross sections used for the FeB pairs were \( \sigma_n = 3 \times 10^{-14} \text{cm}^2 \) and \( \sigma_p = 2 \times 10^{-15} \text{cm}^2 \). It is possible to estimate the uncertainty in these values by adjusting them and observing the effect on the fits. As mentioned, the more heavily doped samples are more sensitive to the electron capture cross section, while the high resistivity samples are more strongly affected by the hole cross section. In conjunction with a typical uncertainty in the measured lifetimes of around 20\%, and an uncertainty of about 5\% in the dopant densities, we can state that the fits. As mentioned, the more heavily implanted (10^13 \text{cm}^{-2}) sample will be subject to considerable loss of iron-related centers. The small difference in recombination lifetimes reflects precipitation of iron during annealing.

For the FeB pairs used to generate the fits are given in Table II, and the recombination parameters in Table I.
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For all of the fits shown, the capture cross sections used for the FeB pairs were \( \sigma_n = 3 \times 10^{-14} \text{cm}^2 \) and \( \sigma_p = 2 \times 10^{-15} \text{cm}^2 \). It is possible to estimate the uncertainty in these values by adjusting them and observing the effect on the fits. As mentioned, the more heavily doped samples are more sensitive to the electron capture cross section, while the high resistivity samples are more strongly affected by the hole cross section. In conjunction with a typical uncertainty in the measured lifetimes of around 20\%, and an uncertainty of about 5\% in the dopant densities, we can state that the fits. As mentioned, the more heavily implanted (10^13 \text{cm}^{-2}) sample will be subject to considerable loss of iron-related centers. The small difference in recombination lifetimes reflects precipitation of iron during annealing.

For the FeB pairs used to generate the fits are given in Table II, and the recombination parameters in Table I.
least 80% of the iron has precipitated in the heavier dose (1 x 10^{13} \text{Fe} \text{ cm}^{-2}), in agreement with expectations from the solubility data.

Precipitation was one reason for leaving the data for the heavily implanted sample in Fig. 7 out of the modeling exercise. However, both these wafers suffer from other problems and as a result both sets of data were excluded. For both samples, the recombination center density is comparable to or greater than both the dopant density (N_A < 6 x 10^{13} \text{cm}^{-3}) and also the carrier densities at which the lifetime is to be measured. This implies that the excess carrier populations can become heavily unequal due to ‘trapping’ by the recombination centers, particularly if the capture cross sections are largely different. These effects can significantly distort the lifetime data, making standard SRH modeling inappropriate. Nevertheless, the general trend in Fig. 7 agrees with the theoretical expectations indicated in Fig. 2, considering that the lifetime is shifted to much lower values due to the higher iron concentration in the sample in Fig. 7.

Up to this point, we have only considered FeB acceptors, and the shallower donor level has not been included in the modeling. But, curiously, it is also possible to obtain satisfactory fits to all samples, with an energy level of $E_c + 0.1 \text{ eV}$ and capture cross sections of $\sigma_n = 3 \times 10^{-13} \text{ cm}^{-2}$ and $\sigma_p = 3 \times 10^{-15} \text{ cm}^{-2}$, plus the level for interstitial iron. This apparent weakness in the method, that is, its inability to distort the lifetime data, making standard SRH modeling inappropriate. Nevertheless, the general trend in Fig. 7 agrees with the theoretical expectations indicated in Fig. 2, considering that the lifetime is shifted to much lower values due to the higher iron concentration in the sample in Fig. 7.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

SRH recombination statistics have been fitted to experimental data from $p$-type silicon samples contaminated with known doses of iron. By using a large range of dopant densities, the changing injection-level behavior of the acceptor level of FeB pairs allows accurate determination of the electron and hole capture cross sections for this level at room temperature. The best fits across all samples were obtained with values of $E_c - 0.23 \text{ eV}$ for the energy level, and $\sigma_n = 3 \times 10^{-14} \text{ cm}^{-2}$ and $\sigma_p = 2 \times 10^{-15} \text{ cm}^{-2}$ for the electron and hole capture cross sections, respectively. More generally, this work illustrates that with appropriate choices of implant dose, annealing temperature and time, and a good range of substrate resistivities, injection-level spectroscopy offers an accurate alternative to DLTS techniques for determining capture cross sections of defects in semiconductors, especially if the defect energy is known.
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