

## Modelling of compound semiconductors: analytical bond-order potential for gallium, nitrogen and gallium nitride

This article has been downloaded from IOPscience. Please scroll down to see the full text article.

2003 J. Phys.: Condens. Matter 15 5649

(<http://iopscience.iop.org/0953-8984/15/32/324>)

View [the table of contents for this issue](#), or go to the [journal homepage](#) for more

Download details:

IP Address: 171.66.16.125

The article was downloaded on 19/05/2010 at 15:02

Please note that [terms and conditions apply](#).

# Modelling of compound semiconductors: analytical bond-order potential for gallium, nitrogen and gallium nitride

J Nord<sup>1</sup>, K Albe<sup>2</sup>, P Erhart<sup>2</sup> and K Nordlund<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Accelerator Laboratory, PO Box 43, FIN-00014 University of Helsinki, Finland

<sup>2</sup> Technische Universität Darmstadt, Institut für Materialwissenschaft, Petersenstraße 23, D-64287 Darmstadt, Germany

E-mail: albe@hrzpub.tu-darmstadt.de

Received 8 May 2003

Published 1 August 2003

Online at [stacks.iop.org/JPhysCM/15/5649](http://stacks.iop.org/JPhysCM/15/5649)

## Abstract

An analytical bond-order potential for GaN is presented that describes a wide range of structural properties of GaN as well as bonding and structure of the pure constituents. For the systematic fit of the potential parameters reference data are taken from total-energy calculations within the density functional theory if not available from experiments. Although long-range interactions are not explicitly included in the potential, the present model provides a good fit to different structural geometries including defects and high-pressure phases of GaN.

## 1. Introduction

Gallium nitride is a semiconducting compound material of high technological importance with a variety of applications in optoelectronic, high-power and high-temperature devices (Nakamura and Fasol 1997). An important requirement for the production of such devices is the modification of materials properties by controlled introduction of impurities into the material during growth or alternatively by ion implantation. On the other hand, despite the impressive advances in the growth of GaN, even the best samples still contain high concentrations of as-yet-unidentified microscopic and mesoscopic defects. Therefore, a fundamental understanding of growth mechanisms and processes like dopant implantation and defect formation is of great technological importance.

Atomic-scale computer simulations, such as molecular-dynamics (MD) or kinetic Monte Carlo (KMC) simulations, are nowadays a standard method to perform detailed investigations and allow us to gain a deeper understanding of the relevant materials processes. For the success of any atomistic simulation, however, that can describe experimentally relevant time and length scales, computationally efficient and reliable interatomic potentials are a prerequisite condition. In the past much effort has been devoted to the development of such

potentials for ionic oxides, covalent systems and metals. There are, however, only a few attempts to describe group III nitrides by analytical interatomic potentials.

Gallium nitride is a semiconducting material with mixed covalent–ionic bonds. Therefore, an analytical potential in principle has to include a proper description of both the chemical and electrostatic interactions. The latter is usually described by means of coulombic terms in the potential. Due to the long-range forces, however, the computational efficiency is significantly affected. On the other hand, many materials properties, such as amorphization behaviour or stacking fault energies, can only be reproduced if the Coulomb interactions as well as the directional character of the covalent bonds are considered in the potential description.

In the past Zapol *et al* (1997) have presented a two-body potential consisting of a long-range coulombic part and a Buckingham form, where the shell-model approach was used for the nitrogen ions. Although the directional character of the covalent bonding usually requires angular terms, the authors argue that a sum of two-body terms with partial charges can account for this. Their model reproduces the wurtzite, zincblende and rocksalt structures and was used to calculate defect and surface properties. Angularity was explicitly included in a potential proposed by Wang *et al* (2000), where the Coulomb term was combined with a Keating potential. In contrast, an empirical tight-binding formalism that explicitly neglects long-range forces has been derived by Boucher *et al* (1999). Representing Ga and N with an  $sp^3$  basis set they are able to reproduce some bulk and defect properties of GaN. Another short-range potential based on the Stillinger–Weber formalism was proposed by Aïchoune *et al* (2000) and used in a modified version for modelling dislocation cores in GaN (Béré and Serra 2002).

All of these potentials give parameter sets for Ga–Ga and N–N mostly fitted from defect configurations. Structural properties of the pure constituents like the  $N_2$  molecule or the  $\alpha$ -Ga structure, however, are not considered in any of the previous studies and therefore simulations of surfaces (Northrup *et al* 2000), defect clusters, growth or melting behaviour are not possible. In particular, studying the growth demands good elemental potentials, since the growth process involves the dissolution of molecular (Edgar 1994) or atomic N (Argoitia *et al* 1997) into initially pure Ga.

In the present paper we devise a new analytical bond-order potential for GaN that is able to describe even the pure constituents. In doing so, we follow the same route as chosen in a preceding paper on gallium arsenide (Albe *et al* 2002), where the materials properties of the pure constituents were explicitly included in the fitting scheme. Although long-range interactions are formally neglected, the use of a short-ranged angular dependent potential for modelling the ionic–covalent interaction in GaN can partly be justified by the fact that Madelung energies for this compound are implicitly included in the input data set as taken from experiments or density functional theory (DFT) calculations.

The paper is organized as follows. First, we briefly review the basic algorithm of the potential. Then we give a short description of the fitting scheme and the parametrizations for nitrogen, gallium and GaN, separately. Finally, we discuss the solubility of nitrogen in liquid Ga as a first application of the current model.

## 2. Basic methodology and energy functional

In what follows we briefly report the analytical form of the potential which is discussed in detail in Albe *et al* (2002). The basic idea is to use a bond-order potential of the Tersoff–Brenner (Brenner 1989) form, where the total potential energy is written as a sum over individual bond energies:

$$E = \sum_{i>j} f_{ij}(r_{ij}) \left[ V_{ij}^R(r_{ij}) - \underbrace{\frac{B_{ij} + B_{ji}}{2}}_{B_{ij}} V_{ij}^A(r_{ij}) \right]. \quad (1)$$

The pairlike attractive and repulsive energies are given as Morse-like terms,

$$\begin{aligned} V^R(r) &= \frac{D_0}{S-1} \exp(-\beta\sqrt{2S}(r-r_0)), \\ V^A(r) &= \frac{SD_0}{S-1} \exp(-\beta\sqrt{2/S}(r-r_0)), \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

that depend on the dimer bond energy  $D_0$ , the dimer bond distance  $r_0$  and the adjustable parameter  $S$ . The parameter  $\beta$  can be determined by the ground state oscillation frequency of the dimer. The interaction is restricted to the next-neighbour sphere by a cut-off function

$$f(r) = \begin{cases} 1, & r \leq R - D, \\ \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2} \sin\{\pi(r - R)/(2D)\}, & |R - r| \leq D, \\ 0, & r \geq R + D \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

where  $D$  and  $R$  are adjustable quantities.

The bond-order parameter  $\bar{B}_{ij}$  includes the angular dependences, which are necessary to accurately model the deformation of covalent bonds:

$$\begin{aligned} B_{ij} &= (1 + \chi_{ij})^{-\frac{1}{2}}, \\ \chi_{ij} &= \sum_{k(\neq i,j)} f_{ik}(r_{ik}) g_{ik}(\theta_{ijk}) \exp[2\mu_{ik}(r_{ij} - r_{ik})]. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Here again the cut-off function is included, while the indices monitor the type-dependence of the parameters, which is important for the description of compounds. The angular function  $g(\theta)$  is given by

$$g(\theta_{ijk}) = \gamma \left( 1 + \frac{c^2}{d^2} - \frac{c^2}{[d^2 + (h + \cos \theta_{ijk})^2]} \right). \quad (5)$$

If  $r_b$  is the equilibrium bonding distance and  $E_b$  the energy per individual bond, a simple relation that is sometimes called the Pauling relation can be derived and is valid for any bonded structure independent of the specific choice for the bond-order term:

$$E_b = -D_0 \exp(-\beta\sqrt{2S}(r_b - r_0)). \quad (6)$$

This equation is used to fit bond lengths and energies of structures with different atomic coordinations by adjusting parameters  $D_0$ ,  $S$ ,  $r_b$  and  $\beta$ .

### 3. Fitting procedure

The parameter sets for Ga–Ga, N–N and Ga–N were adjusted independently. Those structures and properties that are affected by the interplay of the different parameters were not included in the fitting procedure, but were analysed later. The parameters in the pairlike terms were chosen in accordance with the dimer properties if possible, while the slope of the energy–bond relation was adjusted to the total-energy data by varying  $S$ . Finally, elastic moduli and structural properties were fitted simultaneously using the Levenberg–Marquardt method (Press *et al* 1992).

#### 3.1. Gallium

The parametrization for the gallium interaction is the same as used before in the GaAs potential (Albe *et al* 2002) (table 1). In the context of the GaAs potential (Albe *et al* 2002), however, the cut-off interval for Ga was taken as 2.8–3.1 Å. In GaN the next-neighbour distance is shorter

**Table 1.** Parameter sets for the three interaction types.

	Ga–Ga	N–N	Ga–N
$\gamma$	0.007 874	0.766 12	0.001 632
$S$	1.11	1.4922	1.1122
$\beta$ ( $\text{\AA}^{-1}$ )	1.08	2.059 45	1.968
$D_e$ (eV)	1.40	9.91	2.45
$R_e$ ( $\text{\AA}$ )	2.3235	1.11	1.921
$c$	1.918	0.178 493	65.207
$d$	0.75	0.201 72	2.821
$h = \cos(\theta_0)$	0.3013	0.045 238	0.518
$2\mu$ ( $\text{\AA}^{-1}$ )	1.846	0	0
$R_{\text{cut}}$ ( $\text{\AA}$ )	2.87	2.2	2.9
$D$ ( $\text{\AA}$ )	0.15	0.2	0.2

and therefore the cut-off range for the Ga–Ga interaction was readjusted to 2.72–3.02  $\text{\AA}$ . This prevents the interaction of Ga atoms with Ga atoms in the second-neighbour shell. This modification affects the thermal properties of the  $\alpha$ -Ga structure as reported in Albe *et al* (2002), where the longest bond length is 2.7  $\text{\AA}$ . We found that the melting point increases to  $700 \pm 100$  K with the modified range of the Ga–Ga interaction. In this context it should be noted that our cut-off range is similar to that chosen in the empirical TB potential of Boucher *et al* (1999). In contrast to their work, however, we did not have problems in fitting the elastic properties of the GaN compound structures using our first-neighbour shell model.


### 3.2. Nitrogen

Diatomic nitrogen is characterized by strong triple covalent bonds. Hence  $\text{N}_2$  has one of the highest binding energies of any molecule. At low temperatures and pressures it forms a molecular crystal with weak van der Waals interaction between molecules. It is the only group V element that does not polymerize to single-bonded systems as phosphorus and arsenic do. A couple of years ago Mailhiot *et al* (1992) presented a theoretical study based on DFT calculations. They investigated the stability of several crystalline structures and concluded that a cubic structure of nitrogen might form at pressures of about 50 GPa. In recent experiments Eremets *et al* (2001) found evidence for a non-molecular structure of solid nitrogen forming at about 100 GPa which stays stable at ambient pressure for temperatures below 100 K.

To fit the Pauling relation shown in figure 1 we used Mailhiot's data on the high-symmetric metallic structures fcc, sc, bcc and diamond, but not the polymeric modifications. It turned out that a reasonable description of all energies was only possible by choosing a ground state frequency of  $1840 \text{ cm}^{-1}$ , that is somewhat lower than the theoretical prediction of  $2291 \text{ cm}^{-1}$ . The final parameter set provides a very good description of the reference bond lengths and energies. As can be seen from table 2 the theoretical bulk moduli as given by Mailhiot *et al* (1992) are consistently higher than the values obtained with the analytical potential. This is a direct consequence of the choice for the parameter  $\beta$  or equivalently the lower ground state oscillation frequency  $\omega$  of the diatomic molecule. At this point the formalism is not flexible enough to reproduce the Pauling relation using the reference value for  $\omega$ .

With the current parameter set a number of quenching simulations were performed. From these we were not able to spot artificial spurious minima and the  $\text{N}_2$  molecule always appeared as the thermodynamically stable ground structure.

We also tested whether the model can reproduce the non-molecular solid nitrogen phase reported by Eremets *et al* (2001). By applying a similar pressurization and pressure relaxation



**Figure 1.** Semi-logarithmic plot of the bond energy/bond length relation for different N structures: shown are results calculated with the analytical potential compared to LDA calculations of Mailhot *et al* (1992).

scheme as in the experiments, we did obtain a metastable disordered polymeric nitrogen phase, which was stable at 0 GPa at 100 K, in good agreement with the experimentally observed behaviour. The atoms in this phase had coordinations of two to five, with three being the predominant coordination. Details of these calculations will be published elsewhere.

### 3.3. Gallium nitride

The increasing interest in GaN has not only stimulated a large number of experimental studies but also quantum-mechanical based calculations of bulk properties (Muñoz and Kune 1991, Kim *et al* 1997, Shimada *et al* 1998, Stampfl and van de Walle 1999, Serrano *et al* 2000, Limpijumnong and Lambrecht 2001a, 2001b), defects (Neugebauer and Walle 1994, Boguslawski *et al* 1995, Mattila *et al* 1996, Mattila and Nieminen 1997, Gorczyca *et al* 1999, 1997, Northrup 2002) and surfaces (Northrup and Neugebauer 1996, Miotto *et al* 1999, Northrup *et al* 2000). The more ionic of the compound semiconductors exhibit a high-pressure phase transition from the tetrahedrally bonded structure to an octahedrally bonded structure, which has been investigated both experimentally (Ueno *et al* 1994) and theoretically (Limpijumnong and Lambrecht 2001a) for GaN. In the present context we used results of DFT calculations on the structure and energy of different solid GaN phases of Serrano *et al* (2000) as well as data of Muñoz and Kune (1991).

The dimer properties of the diatomic molecule GaN have to our knowledge only been calculated by Kandalam *et al* (2000) using nonlocal DFT. They report a bond distance of 2.06 Å, which is well above the next-neighbour distance in tetrahedrally bonded GaN, and therefore cannot be fitted with the present analytical formalism. We therefore decided to choose a dimer bonding distance of 1.921 Å, while keeping the bond energy at the theoretical value. Moreover, we found that the ground state oscillation frequency as determined by DFT calculations (Kandalam *et al* 2000) is too small to describe the bond stiffness correctly. Therefore, we adjusted the parameter  $\beta$  in such way that the bulk moduli of the solid GaN structures are well reproduced. After  $\beta$  and  $S$  were adjusted using the Pauling relation shown


**Table 2.** Energy and structural parameters of different nitrogen phases.

	LDA (Mailhiot <i>et al</i> 1992)	Exp.	Anal. pot.
N <sub>2</sub>			
$r_0$ (Å)		1.11	1.11
$D_0$ (eV)		9.91	9.91
$\omega_0$ (cm <sup>-1</sup> )		2291 (Huber and Herzberg 1979)	1840
Lin. N <sub>3</sub>			
$r_0$ (Å)			1.272
$E_{\text{coh}}$ (eV)			-3.712
Graphite			
$r_0$ (Å)			1.515
$E_{\text{coh}}$ (eV)			-3.513
Diamond			
$a_0$ (Å <sup>3</sup> )	4.10		4.044
$E_{\text{coh}}$ (eV)	-2.145		-2.022
$B$ (GPa)	218.83		117.7
sc			
$a_0$ (Å <sup>3</sup> )	1.84		1.837
$E_{\text{coh}}/\text{fu}$ (eV)	-2.235		-2.231
$B$ (GPa)	228.21		175.7
bcc			
$a_0$ (Å <sup>3</sup> )	2.41		2.391
$E_{\text{coh}}$ (eV)	-1.135		-1.297
$B$ (GPa)	212.81		119.0
fcc			
$a_0$ (Å <sup>3</sup> )	3.08		3.167
$E_{\text{coh}}$ (eV)	-0.895		-1.086
$B$ (GPa)	167.68		101.3

in figure 2, the remaining parameters were fitted by taking into account the structures and energies of all high-pressure phases listed in table 3 as well as elastic properties.

To fit the bulk properties of GaN in wurtzite and high-pressure structures the cohesive energies are required. Interestingly, the values from literature are fairly diverse. If we take the cohesive energies of N<sub>2</sub> as 9.91 eV/molecule and 2.81 eV/atom for the cohesive energies of solid  $\alpha$ -Ga, then the corresponding experimental values for the cohesive energy of w-GaN are 8.96 eV/fu (Harrison 1989), 9.4 eV/fu (Edgar 1994) and 11.4 eV/fu (Jones and Rose 1984). In the present context we took 9.058 eV/fu for the cohesive energy of w-GaN as reported in the work of Stampfl and van de Walle (1999). This is close to the theoretical average of DFT calculations obtained in the local and nonlocal approximations. All other energies listed in table 3 were taken relative to this number. With  $S = 1.1122$  the B2 (CsCl) as well as the B1 (NaCl) structure can be well reproduced. The calculated bulk modulus for the B1 phase is 233 GPa compared to 240 GPa from the LDFT calculation (Serrano *et al* 2000).

The elastic moduli of wurtzite GaN have been studied experimentally (Polian *et al* 1996, Yamaguchi *et al* 1997, Schwarz *et al* 1997) and theoretically (Kim *et al* 1996 (see footnote 3),



**Figure 2.** Semi-logarithmic plot of the bond energy–bond length relation for different GaN structures: shown are the results of the analytical potential and literature values of DFT calculations (Muñoz and Kune 1991, Serrano *et al* 2000, Kandalam *et al* 2000).

Kim *et al* 1997, Wright 1997, Shimada *et al* 1998) by a number of groups. Their results are listed in table 4 and show significant deviations. This is most likely due to the fact that internal strain leads to atomic relaxations, which is treated differently by the relaxation procedures applied. Therefore, we decided to fit the potential parameters to the elastic properties of zincblende GaN, where only the shear modulus  $c_{44}$  is affected by internal strain, and then to validate the results for w-GaN.

Since both structures are characterized by identical tetrahedral building blocks, the elastic tensor of the wurtzite structure ( $c_{ij}^w$ ) can be directly obtained from the moduli of the zincblende structure ( $c_{ij}^z$ ), if structural differences of the third- and fourth-neighbour shells are negligible. Martin devised a transformation procedure (Martin 1972)<sup>3</sup> for wurtzite structures with an ideal  $c/a$  ratio and ideal displacement vector  $u$ , which can be summarized by

$$\begin{pmatrix} c_{11}^w \\ c_{12}^w \\ c_{13}^w \\ c_{33}^w \\ c_{44}^w \\ c_{66}^w \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{6} \begin{pmatrix} 3 & 3 & 6 \\ 1 & 5 & -2 \\ 2 & 4 & -4 \\ 2 & 4 & 8 \\ 2 & -2 & 2 \\ 1 & -1 & 4 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} c_{11}^z \\ c_{12}^z \\ c_{44}^z \end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} \Delta^2/\overline{c_{44}^w} \\ -\Delta^2/\overline{c_{44}^w} \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ \Delta^2/\overline{c_{66}^w} \\ \Delta^2/\overline{c_{44}^w} \end{pmatrix}$$

with  $\Delta = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{6}(c_{11}^z - c_{12}^z - 2c_{44}^z)$  and  $c_{66}^w = 1/2(c_{11}^w - c_{12}^w)$ . The unrelaxed moduli  $\overline{c_{ij}^w}$  are obtained by applying the transformation matrix only without taking into account the second correction term. Since our short-ranged model potential cannot distinguish the different stacking sequences and predicts an ideal  $c/a$  ratio, it is appropriate for testing Martin's transformation method.

To fit the elastic moduli, we have used the static elastic moduli for zincblende GaN as given by Shimada *et al* (1998). With the final parameter set all tensor components were calculated directly by molecular statics allowing for full internal relaxations. The good agreement of the

<sup>3</sup> The  $Q$  vector is mistyped in Martin (1972), Kim *et al* (1996). It should read  $Q = \sqrt{2}/6[1\bar{1}\bar{2}]$ .



**Table 3.** Energy and structural parameters of different GaN phases. Given are experimental values and theoretical results from DFT calculations in comparison to the corresponding numbers as described with the analytical model.

GaN dimer	LCAO (Kandalam <i>et al</i> 2000)	Exp. <sup>a</sup>	Anal. pot.
$r_0$ (Å)	2.06		1.921
$D_0$ (eV)	2.45		2.45
$\omega_0$ (cm <sup>-1</sup> )	447		678
Zinblende GaN LDA (Serrano <i>et al</i> 2000)			
$a_0$ (Å <sup>3</sup> )	4.497	4.50	4.498
$E_{\text{coh}}/fu$ (eV)	9.048		9.056
$B$ (GPa)	196		205
$B'$	4.2		4.14
Wurtzite GaN			
$a_0$ (Å <sup>3</sup> )	3.180	3.190	3.180
$c/a$	1.632	1.627	1.633
$r_0$ (Å <sup>3</sup> )	1.948	1.956	1.948
$u$	0.376	0.377	0.375
$E_{\text{coh}}/fu$ (eV)	9.058	9.058	9.056
$E_{\text{bond}}$ (eV)	2.264	2.264	2.263
$B$ (GPa)	196	188–245	205
$B'$	4.3	3.2–4.3	
$T_{\text{melt}}$ (K)			
B1 LDA (Muñoz and Kune (1991))			
$a_0$ (Å <sup>3</sup> )	4.225		4.304
$E_{\text{coh}}/fu$ (eV)	8.150		7.460
$B$ (GPa)	240		233.0
$B'$	4.5		4.7
B2			
$a_0$ (Å <sup>3</sup> )	2.802		2.676
$E_{\text{coh}}/fu$ (eV)	5.75		6.09
$B$ (GPa)			230.8
$B'$			5.0

<sup>a</sup> Data reported in Serrano *et al* (2000).

zinblende internal strain parameter  $\zeta$  with the most recent DFT calculations (Shimada *et al* 1998) shows that our model also describes the internal relaxations well. The results compared to the transformation method and literature data are given in table 4. All elastic moduli are well reproduced within the uncertainty limits of the reference data. The relative differences of directly calculated values and those obtained by the transformation procedure are most significant for  $c_{44}$ . Since our model fulfils all formal criteria of the transformation method, these differences are due to relaxations of the third- and fourth-neighbour shells and some influence of the relaxation method. Note that the results reported by Zapol *et al* (1997) for their Coulomb–Buckingham potential show a similarly good agreement with experiments and data calculated by DFT methods, although the bulk modulus is too high. The lack of angular dependence in that work only seems to affect  $c_{12}^z$  and  $c_{13}^w$ .

#### 4. Defect properties

Although there has been much progress in growing GaN during the last decade, there are many open questions related to native point defects and impurities. The sources of n-type conductivity

**Table 4.** Elastic constants for zincblende and wurtzite GaN. Lines labelled with a star (★) indicate elastic constants calculated with the transformation method of Martin (1972) (see footnote 3).

	Calc. <sup>a</sup>	Calc. <sup>b</sup>	Calc. <sup>c</sup>	Exp. <sup>d</sup>	Exp. <sup>e</sup>	Exp. <sup>f</sup>	CBP <sup>g</sup>	Anal. Pot.
ZB								
$c_{11}$	285	282	293				300	287
$c_{12}$	161	159	159				191	169
$c_{44}$	149	142	155				160	128
$c_{44}^o$	202		200					244
$B$	202	200	204				227	208
$\zeta$	0.67	0.5	0.61					0.699
WZ								
$c_{11}$	350		367	390	365	377	386	347
★	354	346	363				377	343
$c_{12}$	140		135	145	135	160	160	154
★	150	148	147				183	159
$c_{13}$	104		103	106	114	114	141	123
★	103	105	100				121	123
$c_{33}$	376	405	405	398	381	209	391	381
★	401	389	410				440	379
$c_{44}$	101		95	105	109	81.4	115	81
★	77	76	83				70	72
$c_{66}$	115		116	123	115	109	113	98
★	101	99	108				97	92
$B$	197		202	210	204	173	227	208
★	202	200	204				227	208

<sup>a</sup> LDA pseudopotential calculation (Shimada *et al* 1998).

<sup>b</sup> FP-LMTO LDA calculation (Kim *et al* 1997).

<sup>c</sup> LDA pseudopotential calculation (Wright 1997).

<sup>d</sup> Brillouin scattering (Polian *et al* 1996).

<sup>e</sup> Brillouin scattering (Yamaguchi *et al* 1997).

<sup>f</sup> Resonance ultrasound (Schwarz *et al* 1997).

<sup>g</sup> Coulomb–Buckingham potential (Zapol *et al* 1997). c163345

and yellow luminescence, for example, are still under discussion and the knowledge of electronic properties of defects in GaN in general is still far from being complete, although there are a number of recent theoretical studies (Neugebauer and Walle 1994, Boguslawski *et al* 1995, Mattila *et al* 1996, Mattila and Nieminen 1997, Gorczyca *et al* 1999, 1997).

The formation energy of a defect in a neutral charge state is given by

$$\Omega_D = E_{\text{tot}}(q) - n_{\text{Ga}}\mu_{\text{Ga}} - n_{\text{N}}\mu_{\text{N}} \quad (7)$$

where  $n_{\text{Ga}}$  and  $n_{\text{N}}$  are the numbers of gallium and nitrogen atoms and  $\mu_{\text{Ga}}$  and  $\mu_{\text{N}}$  the corresponding chemical potentials.

The chemical potentials of the pure constituents can vary depending on the chemical environment, but are limited by the chemical potentials of solid gallium  $\mu_{\text{Ga}}^{\text{s}}$  and gaseous nitrogen  $\mu_{\text{N}_2}^{\text{g}}$ . Since the boundary condition  $\mu_{\text{Ga}} + \mu_{\text{N}} = \mu_{\text{GaN}}^{\text{s}} = \mu_{\text{N}_2}^{\text{g}} + \mu_{\text{Ga}}^{\text{s}} + \Delta H_{\text{f}}$  applies, where  $\mu_{\text{GaN}}^{\text{s}}$  is the chemical potential and  $\Delta H_{\text{f}}$  the formation energy of w-GaN, respectively, the defect formation energy at zero temperature can be rewritten as follows (Qian *et al* 1988):

$$\Omega_D(\mu_{\text{Ga}}, \mu_{\text{N}}) = \underbrace{E_D - \frac{1}{2}(n_{\text{Ga}} + n_{\text{N}})\mu_{\text{GaN}}^{\text{s}} - \frac{1}{2}(n_{\text{Ga}} - n_{\text{N}})(\mu_{\text{Ga}}^{\text{s}} - \mu_{\text{N}_2}^{\text{g}})}_{E_D} - \frac{1}{2}(n_{\text{Ga}} - n_{\text{N}})\Delta\mu, \quad (8)$$

where  $\Delta\mu$  is restricted to the range  $-\Delta H_{\text{f}} < \Delta\mu < \Delta H_{\text{f}}$ .

**Table 5.** Defect formation energies  $\Omega_D$  and volume changes  $\Delta V$  for some defects in GaN. The values are for N-rich conditions unless otherwise stated. Energies are given in eV, formation volumes in  $\text{\AA}^3$ .

Defect	$\Omega_D$		$\Delta V$	$\Omega_D^a$	$\Omega_D^b$	$\Omega_D^c$	$\Omega_D^d$
	64 at.	512 at.					
$V_{\text{Ga}}$	4.4	4.4	3.0	6.8		6.3	
$V_{\text{N}}$	1.5	1.4	-12	1.2		4.6	
$V_{\text{Ga}}$ (Ga rich)	5.7	5.7	3.0		8.5		8.1
$V_{\text{N}}$ (Ga rich)	0.2	0.1	-12		1.0		3.2
$\text{Ga}_{\text{N}}$	3.3	3.0	7.2	6.8		10.5	
$\text{N}_{\text{Ga}}$	5.9	5.2	7.7	5.2	5.7	5.8	
$I_{\text{N}}$	5.7	5.7	24	3.2			
$I_{\text{Ga}}$	5.5	5.5	22	4.1			

<sup>a</sup> LDA-DFT pseudopot. calc. (Neugebauer and Walle 1994).

<sup>b</sup> LDA-DFT pseudopot. calc., calculated in ZB (Mattila *et al* 1996, Mattila and Nieminen 1997).

<sup>c</sup> DFT-LMTO calc. (Gorczyca *et al* 1999).

<sup>d</sup> Car-Parrinello (Boguslawski *et al* 1995).

Fairly diverse results were reported in the literature on the formation energies of interstitials, which strongly depend on the charge state, while the data for antisites and vacancies are widely consistent. A major caveat, however, in comparing our results with theoretical values from the literature is that different authors have been using fairly diverse values for the chemical potentials. In our calculation we have chosen  $\mu_{\text{N}_2}^g = 9.91/2$  eV,  $\mu_{\text{Ga}}^s = 2.81$  eV and  $\Delta H_f = 1.29$  eV, which are the formation energies of the corresponding structures as given by the present potential. Moreover, it should be noted that most total-energy calculations are carried out at fixed volumes and therefore neglect the defect formation volume.

Although the present analytic potential cannot account for charge effects, the basic requirement was to reproduce the hierarchy in formation energies of the different point defects, which are to a large extent determined by the significant difference in the atomic covalent radii of nitrogen and gallium atoms. Defects were investigated for a system that was thermally equilibrated at 600 K and then slowly cooled down to 0 K at zero pressure. The defect formation energy was then determined from the potential energy  $E_D$  of the cell containing the defect.

The minimum-energy position for interstitials was obtained by relaxing 100 cells with random interstitial positions. The cells contained either 64 or 512. Since strong internal relaxations may lead to finite-size effects, the larger cell of 512 atoms served as a check against such effects. The defect formation energies and relaxation volumes are given in table 5.

Obviously, the potential describes the nitrogen vacancy very well, which is the most important point defect in GaN. Even the other point defects are reproduced with good accuracy, taking into account the uncertainties of the reference data. Only the formation energy of the Ga antisite, which should be the energetically least favoured defect, is significantly too small. It is noteworthy that finite-size effects are significant for the antisite defects and the nitrogen vacancy, where atomic relaxations exceed the 64-atom cell. This indicates that for these defects the accuracy of the DFT calculations, which use cell sizes of less than or about 100 atoms, may suffer from finite-size effects.

For the N interstitial we find a minimum-energy configuration in a split interstitial state with N-N separation of 1.16  $\text{\AA}$ . The *ab initio* calculations predict a similar configuration, but with a somewhat greater N-N separation of about 1.25  $\text{\AA}$  (Neugebauer and Walle 1994, Boguslawski *et al* 1995). The equilibrium position of the Ga interstitial has been found to be

strongly charge dependent in *ab initio* (Neugebauer and Walle 1994) calculations. Our model predicts a displacement in the same direction as the DFT, but the relaxation is smaller (for the neutral charge state). However, for higher charge states the difference decreases due to the reduced relaxation in the *ab initio* model.

In wurtzite GaN there are two high-symmetry interstitial positions, T and O. The T site is located in the middle of nonbonded Ga and N atoms with two nearest neighbours and six next-nearest neighbours. The Ga(O) interstitial has six nearest neighbours and moves about 0.4 Å from the ideal position during relaxation, which is in agreement with DFT calculations. The energy difference of the Ga(O) and Ga(T) sites is found to be very small in our model, in agreement with DFT calculations (Neugebauer and Walle 1994).

It should be noted again that none of the defect properties reported here has been used to fit the potential parameters, but are just results of the potential formalism.

## 5. Melting point

The melting point of GaN is not known due to experimental difficulties related to the very high temperature and N<sub>2</sub> pressure necessary for melting. Experiments in a high-pressure anvil cell showed that GaN does not melt at temperatures as high as 2573 K at 68 kbar (Edgar 1994).


We carried out extensive tests that the potential does not have states lower in energy than the correct ground state. This was tested with two kinds of simulation. The first kind consisted of heating up crystalline cells until they melt, and subsequently cooling them slowly (over 100 ps–10 ns) to 0 K, checking that the final structure is higher in potential energy than the desired ground state. Although this method is good for finding structures with energy minima far below the ground state, it is not good enough to spot minima lying just slightly lower (~0.1 eV) in energy than the desired state. In order to test the potential against such local minima, we used simulations of a liquid and solid in equilibrium. If other energy minima are present, a phase transition to the lower minimum is likely to be initiated at the liquid–solid interface over long timescales. During all these tests no spurious artificial energy minima were found.

The simulations of the liquid–solid system also served to determine the melting point. To obtain it, we simulated a 5000-atom system at several temperatures and pressures. The simulation box, which initially consisted of liquid and crystalline phases, was first equilibrated near the predicted melting point. Berendsen pressure control (Berendsen *et al* 1984) was used in the melting simulations, independently in the *x*, *y* and *z* dimensions. The equilibrated system was simulated for 1–5 ns at several temperatures. Since crystallization was observed at 3000 K and 20 kbar, and the system melted completely at 4000 K, we conclude that the melting point at this pressure is 3500 ± 500 K. This is in reasonable agreement with the analytical estimate of the melting point of about 2791 K at 45 kbar (Vechten 1973).

## 6. Solubility

We employed the potential to study the solubility of atomic nitrogen in liquid gallium at temperatures and pressures typical for the direct high-pressure synthesis of GaN (Boćkowski 1999) using MD and Monte Carlo (MC) simulations.

From a thermodynamic standpoint the solubility is determined by the dependence of the free energy of mixing  $\Delta G_{\text{mix}}$  on the mole fraction *x*. In order to obtain the temperature and pressure dependence of the solubility this would require sampling  $\Delta G_{\text{mix}}$  in three variables (*x*, *T*, *p*). In addition, computation of free energies by means of simulations is a fairly complicated task (Frenkel and Ladd 1984). These difficulties render a pure thermodynamic approach



**Figure 3.** Temperature dependence of the solubility of nitrogen in liquid gallium at a pressure of 200 kbar.

beyond the scope of the current paper. Instead, we have extracted the solubility directly from simulations of a two-phase system containing liquid gallium and gaseous nitrogen.

Initially, the pure phases were separated by a sharp interface. The system contained 1500 atoms with roughly twice as many gallium as nitrogen atoms. The sample was quenched in an MD simulation to 0 K and 0 kbar and afterwards used for the MD as well as the MC simulations. The systems were equilibrated at a given temperature and pressure until a steady state was reached, indicated by an approximately constant nitrogen concentration. For the MD simulations this required integration of the equations of motion for up to 4 ns. By this procedure, the effect of the diffusivity should be efficiently eliminated.


Single nitrogen dimers can form within the liquid gallium due to local fluctuations of the concentration, but at thermodynamic equilibrium they will immediately decompose and redissolve as atomic nitrogen. On the other hand, a gallium melt oversaturated with nitrogen is not stable and will phase separate. This has been confirmed in independent simulations in which we observed nucleation and growth of nitrogen bubbles within the liquid gallium.

It is the maximum concentration of *atomic* nitrogen which determines the solubility, although nitrogen dimers can be formed temporarily in the melt as described in the previous paragraph. In order to separate atomic and molecular nitrogen in the melt a simple energy criterion was employed. It has been confirmed that the cohesive energy of atomic nitrogen in the molten gallium is smaller than 4.1 eV/atom, enabling straightforward distinction from molecular nitrogen for which the energy is approximately 4.9 eV/atom. Since the number of nitrogen dimers is extremely small this yields, however, only a minor correction.

The average coordination of nitrogen in liquid gallium is approximately 5.8 ( $T = 2000$  K,  $p = 200$  kbar). The Ga–N pair correlation function exhibits a broad peak at roughly 2 Å which is close to the value for crystalline GaN.

Figure 3 shows the temperature dependence of the solubility of nitrogen in liquid gallium at a pressure of 200 kbar. At this pressure the solubility clearly increases with temperature. At lower pressures, the solubility is found to be essentially unaffected by a rise in temperature. On the other hand, there is a pronounced pressure dependence for all the temperatures considered here as illustrated in figure 4.

Experimentally, the solubility of nitrogen in liquid gallium has been reported to be 1% at 1800 K and 20 kbar (Edgar 1994) and was observed to rise with pressure. The solubilities predicted by the potential (e.g., 4% at 2000 K and 200 kbar) are thus of reasonable magnitude.



**Figure 4.** Pressure dependence of the solubility of nitrogen in liquid gallium at temperatures ranging from 2800 to 3200 K.

This provides evidence that our model is suitable for the study of high-pressure synthesis of GaN.

## 7. Conclusions

We have presented a new analytical potential for modelling Ga, N and GaN using a short-ranged bond-order algorithm. The potential describes with good accuracy different dimer properties and several solid structures of the pure elements and the compound including metastable configurations. Important point defect properties, like the nitrogen vacancies, are in line with theoretical results from DFT calculations. Moreover, the potential gives a reasonable description of melting behaviour and solubility of nitrogen. This is to our knowledge the only classical potential that describes structure and bonding of Ga, N and GaN within one analytical form and therefore allows atomistic computer simulations of a wide range of materials problems related to GaN. Most importantly, this study shows that a wide range of relevant properties of GaN can be described well without including long-range forces. The energy difference of wurtzite and zincblende, however, cannot be described with the current approach. Wherever this small energy difference (of the order of 0.01 eV/atom) does not affect the materials process one wants to simulate, this new GaN potential should be an appropriate model for atomistic computer simulations of GaN.

## Acknowledgments

The research was supported by the Academy of Finland under projects No 46788 and No 51585. Grants of computer time from the Centre for Scientific Computing in Espoo, Finland, are gratefully acknowledged. This joint study was made possible by the support of the Academy of Finland and the German foreign exchange server (DAAD) through a bilateral travel programme.

## References

- Aïchoune N, Potin V, Ruteran P, Hairie A, Nouet G and Paumier E 2000 *Comput. Mater. Sci.* **17** 380–3
- Albe K, Nordlund K, Nord J and Kuronen A 2002 *Phys. Rev. B* **66** 035205
- Argoitia A, Hayman C C, Angus J C, Wang L, Dyck L S and Kash K 1997 *Appl. Phys. Lett.* **70** 179
- Béré A and Serra A 2002 *Phys. Rev. B* **65** 205323

- Berendsen H, Postma J, van Gunsteren W, DiNola A and Haak J 1984 *J. Chem. Phys.* **31** 3684
- Boćkowski M 1999 *Physica B* **265** 1–5
- Boguslawski P, Briggs E L and Bernholc J 1995 *Phys. Rev. B* **51** 17255
- Boucher D E, DeLeo G G and Fowler W B 1999 *Phys. Rev. B* **59** 10064–70
- Brenner D 1989 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **63** 1022
- Edgar J 1994 *Properties of Group III-Nitrides* (London: Inspec)
- Eremets M I, Hemley R, Mao H and Gregoryanz E 2001 *Nature* **411** 170
- Frenkel D and Ladd A J C 1984 *J. Chem. Phys.* **81** 3188
- Gorczyca I, Svane A and Christensen N 1997 *Solid State Commun.* **101** 747–52
- Gorczyca I, Svane A and Christensen N E 1999 *Phys. Rev. B* **60** 8147
- Harrison W 1989 *Electronic Structure and the Properties of Solids* (New York: Dover)
- Huber K and Herzberg G 1979 *Constants of Diatomic Molecules* (New York: Van Nostrand-Reinhold)
- Jones R and Rose K 1984 *CALPHAD* **8** 343
- Kandalam A, Pandey R, Blanco M, Costales A, Recio J and Newsam J 2000 *J. Phys. Chem. B* **104** 4361–7
- Kim K, Lambrecht W and Segall B 1996 *Phys. Rev. B* **53** 16310–26
- Kim K, Lambrecht W and Segall B 1997 *Phys. Rev. B* **56** 7018–19
- Limpijumnong S and Lambrecht W 2001a *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86** 91
- Limpijumnong S and Lambrecht W 2001b *Phys. Rev. B* **63** 104103
- Mailhot C, Yang L and McMahan A 1992 *Phys. Rev. B* **46** 14419
- Martin R 1972 *Phys. Rev. B* **6** 4546
- Mattila T and Nieminen R M 1997 *Phys. Rev. B* **55** 9571
- Mattila T, Seitsonen A and Nieminen R M 1996 *Phys. Rev. B* **54** 1474
- Miotto R, Srivastava G and Ferraz A 1999 *Phys. Rev. B* **59** 3008
- Muñoz A and Kune K 1991 *Phys. Rev. B* **44** 10372
- Nakamura S and Fasol G (ed) 1997 *The Blue Laser Diode—GaN-Based Light Emitters and Lasers* (Berlin: Springer)
- Neugebauer J and Walle C G V D 1994 *Phys. Rev. B* **50** 8067
- Northrup J 2002 *Phys. Rev. B* **66** 045204
- Northrup J and Neugebauer J 1996 *Phys. Rev. B* **53** 10477
- Northrup J, Neugebauer J, Feenstra R and Smith A 2000 *Phys. Rev. B* **51** 9932
- Polian A, Grimsditch M and Grzegory I 1996 *J. Appl. Phys.* **79** 3343
- Press W, Teukolsky S, Vetterling W and Flannery B 1992 *Numerical Recipes in Fortran* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)
- Qian G X, Martin R and Chadi D 1988 *Phys. Rev. B* **38** 7649
- Schwarz R, Khachatryan K and Weber E 1997 *Appl. Phys. Lett.* **70** 1122
- Serrano J, Rubio A, Hernández E, Muñoz A and Mujica A 2000 *Phys. Rev. B* **62** 16612
- Shimada K, Sota T and Suzuki K 1998 *J. Appl. Phys.* **84** 4951–8
- Stampfl C and van de Walle C 1999 *Phys. Rev. B* **59** 5521
- Ueno M, Yoshida H, Onodera M Y, Shimomura O and Takemura K 1994 *AIP Conf. Proc.* **309** 557–60
- Vechten J A V 1973 *Phys. Rev. B* **7** 1479–507
- Wang S Q, Wang Y M and Ye H Q 2000 *Appl. Phys. A* **70** 475–80
- Wright A F 1997 *J. Appl. Phys.* **82** 2833
- Yamaguchi M, Yagi T, Azuhata T, Sota T, Suzuki K, Chichibu S and Nakamura S 1997 *J. Phys.: Condens. Matter* **9** 241
- Zapol P, Pandey R and Gale J 1997 *J. Phys.: Condens. Matter* **9** 9517–25