Comparing properties of femtosecond and nanosecond laser-structured silicon

Catherine H. Crouch James E. Carey Jeffrey M. Warrender Michael J. Aziz Eric Mazur

Harvard University

MRS Fall Meeting 2 December 2002

Laser-structured silicon



Irradiate surface with pulsed laser above ablation threshold

fs pulses: Her *et al.*, APL **73**, 1673 (1998) ns pulses: Pedraza *et al.*, APL **74**, 2322 (1999).

How do nanosecond and femtosecond compare?



Morphology

Optical properties

Chemical and structural analysis

Morphology

800 nm, 100 fs, 10 kJ/m²





248 nm, 30 ns, 30 kJ/m²







Nanosecond cones bigger, smoother

Morphology

800 nm, 100 fs, 10 kJ/m²



fs cones etched below surface

248 nm, 30 ns, 30 kJ/m²



ns cones grow above surface



Nanosecond cones bigger, smoother

Nanosecond cones grow, femtosecond cones are etched



Very different morphology!

How do optical properties compare?



reflectance



transmittance









What produces the below-band gap absorption?

Previous work with fs pulses:

ambient species incorporated into cones at surface sulfur required for below-band gap absorption

Younkin et al., to appear in J. Appl. Phys.

Ns and fs cone composition similar

roughly 1% sulfur in surface layer (ion channeling, EDX, ToF SIMS)

sulfur content decreases significantly on annealing

also high fluorine content (ToF SIMS)

Analysis

before annealing





after annealing







lon channeling:

both ns and fs cones crystalline with high defect density

fs cones show much greater disorder

annealing reduces disorder somewhat

cross-sectional TEM of fs cones:

disordered surface layer ~500 nm thick, crystalline core

surface layer includes nanoparticles and nanopores

Femtosecond vs. nanosecond:

Optical properties virtually identical

Composition and structure similar

Morphology vastly different!

Fs and ns laser structuring both:

produce below-band gap absorption incorporate sulfur form crystalline cones with surface defects

Both below-band gap absorption and sulfur content decrease after annealing

Funding: Department of Energy, National Science Foundation (Harvard MRSEC)

Experiments: John Chervinsky (ion channeling), Michael Sheehy and Cynthia Friend (gas dependence), François Génin (TEM), Art Nelson and Kuang Jen Wu (SIMS)

For a copy of this talk and additional information:

http://mazur-www.harvard.edu