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ABSTRACT OF THESIS

A MULTI-PHYSICS COMPUTATIONAL APPROACH TO SIMULATING THZ PHOTOCONDUCTIVE ANTENNAS WITH COMPARISON TO MEASURED DATA AND FABRICATION OF SAMPLES

The frequency demands of radiating systems are moving into the terahertz band with potential applications that include sensing, imaging, and extremely broadband communication. One commonly used method for generating and detecting terahertz waves is to excite a voltage-biased photoconductive antenna with an extremely short laser pulse. The pulsed laser generates charge carriers in a photoconductive substrate which are swept onto the metallic antenna traces to produce an electric current that radiates or detects a terahertz band signal. Therefore, analysis of a photoconductive antenna requires simultaneous solutions of both semiconductor physics equations (including drift-diffusion and continuity relations) and Maxwell’s equations. A multi-physics analysis scheme based on the Discontinuous-Galerkin Finite-Element Time-Domain (DGFETD) is presented that couples the semiconductor drift-diffusion equations with the electromagnetic Maxwell’s equations. A simple port model is discussed that efficiently couples the two equation sets. Various photoconductive antennas were fabricated using TiAu metallization on a GaAs substrate and the fabrication process is detailed. Computed emission intensities are compared with measured data. Optimized antenna designs based on the analysis are presented for a variety of antenna configurations.
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1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

With the pace of technological development and advancement in the world today, the radiating frequencies utilized by systems continue to move into new and unused ranges. One example of this is the current push of systems into the terahertz ($10^{12}$ Hz) frequency band. These systems can be used in a wide variety of applications. Siegel [1] recounts in great detail the past and present work in terahertz technology along with its strengths and weaknesses. Historically, the terahertz band of radiation has been used primarily in astronomy, chemistry, and space science research and discovery. Now new technologies are currently being explored in sensing, imaging, and broadband communication [1]. Although terahertz systems suffer from limitations due to atmospheric absorption; the benefits of high speed communications (either in short range or space applications) and shallow penetration spectroscopy and imaging make this range of radiating systems enticing.

Siegel [1] also states that the primary limitations on wide scale use of terahertz systems are the difficulties in creating sources. Traditional solid state electronics such as oscillators and amplifiers are limited by reactive parasitics or resistive losses. However, another method for generating and detecting terahertz waves is to excite a voltage-biased photoconductive antenna placed on a photoconductive semiconductor wafer with an extremely short laser pulse [2]. The pulsed laser generates charge carriers in the substrate which are swept onto the metallic antenna traces to produce an electric current that radiates a terahertz band signal. A similar approach is used for detection where the
voltage bias is not needed. Instead the charge carriers generated by the laser pulse are moved by the incoming signal radiated from the transmitter. This charge carrier movement similarly produces an electric current.

THz antenna structures can be designed for various application specific requirements. Since fabrication and experimental testing of these antenna designs is costly and time consuming, accurate computer simulation software is desired and can save immense resources. This is a very challenging problem since it requires a combined solution of Maxwell’s equations (which represent the electromagnetic field behavior) and the drift-diffusion equations and continuity relations (which represent the semiconductor device physics).

Various methods are currently used in the computational analysis of electromagnetic fields using Maxwell’s equations. For example, Method of Moment (MOM) techniques are used to solve electromagnetic boundary or volume integral equations in the frequency domain and are very useful in solving radiation and scattering problems [3]. Finite element methods (FEM) can be used to solve both frequency-domain and time-domain problems. The FEM is used to solve boundary valued electromagnetic problems using variable shaped elements allowing for highly accurate discretization of the solution domain [3].

The photoconductive antenna is a broadband device that requires a time domain solution since it is a non-linear problem [4]. Common methods for time-domain analysis are the finite-difference time-domain (FDTD), finite-element time-domain (FETD), and discontinuous Galerkin time-domain (DGTD) methods [5]. The FDTD method was initially proposed by Kane S. Yee in 1966 [6]. This method uses leapfrogged or
staggered finite differences in time and space to solve Maxwell’s equations. Although it is usually straightforward and works well for various types of media, the basic Yee-algorithm is confined to a regularly spaced orthogonal grid and struggles to accommodate complex geometries and higher order accuracy [7]. The FETD is a FEM method in the time domain and, like the FDTD, requires full volume discretization. It is also based on unstructured meshing which more accurately resolves fine geometric details [7]. The FETD method is typically implicit and requires the solution of a global linear system of equations [8] which is computationally intensive. DGTD methods are also based on unstructured meshing but are locally implicit and globally explicit which makes them more efficient in time-dependent solutions [5].

In this thesis, the Discontinuous Galerkin Finite Element Time-Domain (DGFETD) method [9, 10] is presented. The DGFETD method is based on a finite element discretization of Maxwell’s curl equations using field expansions via Nedelec curl-conforming basis functions instead of point based sampling [9-12]. These basis functions avoid the concern of spurious solutions and the need for penalty methods [13, 14]. Like other DGTD methods, the DGFETD also has the advantage of not requiring the solution of a global linear system of equations.

1.2 Methodology

In this thesis, a coupled solution of Maxwell’s equations (describing the macroscopic relationships between the electric and magnetic fields) and the semiconductor drift-diffusion equations is formulated. Solutions for the charge carrier
densities and semiconductor current densities are determined using the drift-diffusion and continuity equations and then coupled to Maxwell’s equations through the current densities at the boundary of a port implementation of the laser photogeneration in the substrate. The resulting time-dependent differential equations are solved using the DGFETD method. Experimental data from the literature is used to validate this method through comparison of antenna emission intensities. Multiple antenna designs are fabricated for further validation.
2 COMPUTATIONAL ANALYSIS

2.1 Discontinuous-Galerkin Finite Element Time Domain (DGFETD) Method

The DGFETD method is based on a finite-element discretization of the coupled Maxwell’s curl equations [9, 10]

\[
\nabla \times \vec{E} = -\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \vec{\mu} \cdot \vec{H} - \vec{\sigma}^* \cdot \vec{H} - \vec{M}, \tag{2.1}
\]

\[
\nabla \times \vec{H} = \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \vec{\sigma} \cdot \vec{E} + \vec{\sigma} \cdot \vec{E} + \vec{J}, \tag{2.2}
\]

where the permeability, permittivity, and conductivity tensors are represented by \(\vec{\mu}, \vec{\epsilon}, \vec{\sigma}, \vec{\sigma}^*\) and the impressed current densities are represented by \(\vec{J}\) and \(\vec{M}\).

The electric and magnetic fields are represented by \(\vec{E}\) and \(\vec{H}\). Considering the fields radiated by these current densities in a domain \(\Omega\) bound by \(\partial\Omega\), a finite-element discretization can be performed to subdivide this domain into non-overlapping and contiguous subdomains \(V_i\) bound by \(\partial V_i\). Within each subdomain, the electric and magnetic field intensities are expanded using a set of hierarchical \(H^p\) - curl conforming basis functions, \(f_i(\vec{r})\), weighted by unknown time-dependent coefficients, \(e_i(t)\) and \(h_i(t)\), such that [9, 11, 12]

\[
\vec{E}(\vec{r}, t) \approx \sum_{i=1}^{N_e} e_i(t) f_i(\vec{r}), \quad \vec{H}(\vec{r}, t) \approx \sum_{i=1}^{N_h} h_i(t) f_i(\vec{r}). \tag{2.3}
\]

A set of testing functions that span the same function space as the fields is introduced [9]. These testing functions are \(\tilde{T}^e\) in the electric field space and \(\tilde{T}^h\) in the magnetic field.
space. The inner product of the coupled curl equations and these test functions is performed resulting in

\[ \int_{V_i} \vec{T}^b \cdot \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \vec{H} + \vec{\sigma} \cdot \vec{H} + \vec{M} + \nabla \times \vec{E} \right] \, dv = 0 \quad (2.4) \]

and

\[ \int_{V_i} \vec{T}^e \cdot \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \vec{E} + \vec{\sigma} \cdot \vec{E} + \vec{J} - \nabla \times \vec{H} \right] \, dv = 0. \quad (2.5) \]

Assuming time independent test functions, a form of Green’s first identity

\[ \hat{i} \int_{V_i} A \cdot \nabla \times B \, dv = \hat{i} \int_{V_i} B \cdot \nabla \times A \, dv + \oint_{\partial V_i} A \cdot \hat{n} \times \vec{B} \, ds \quad (2.6) \]

is applied. The curl term in (2.4) can then be expressed as

\[ \int_{V_i} \vec{T}^b \cdot \nabla \times \vec{E} \, dv = \int_{V_i} \vec{E} \cdot \nabla \times \vec{T}^b \, dv + \oint_{\partial V_i} \vec{n} \times (\vec{E} - \vec{E}^+) \, ds, \quad (2.7) \]

where \( \hat{n} \) is the outward normal of \( \partial V_i \) [9]. By designating the electric field on the boundary \( \partial V_i \) as \( \vec{E} \) (just interior) and \( \vec{E}^+ \) (just exterior) and assuming an impressed magnetic surface current density on the boundary of \( \vec{M}_s \), the tangential electric fields must be such that

\[ \hat{n} \times (\vec{E} - \vec{E}^+) \bigg|_{\partial V_i} = \vec{M}_s. \quad (2.8) \]

Due to the distributive property of the cross product over addition, this can also be written as

\[ \hat{n} \times \vec{E} \bigg|_{\partial V_i} = \frac{1}{2} \left( \hat{n} \times \vec{E} + \hat{n} \times \vec{E}^+ \right) \bigg|_{\partial V_i} + \frac{1}{2} \vec{M}_s. \quad (2.9) \]

Using (2.9) and the relationship described in (2.7), one can show that
\[
\int_{V_i} \mathbf{T}^h \cdot \nabla \times \mathbf{E} \, dv = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\partial V_i} \mathbf{T}^h \cdot \mathbf{n} \times \mathbf{E} \, ds + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\partial V_i} \mathbf{E} \cdot \mathbf{n} \times \mathbf{T}^h \, ds + \frac{1}{2} \oint_{\partial V_i} \mathbf{E} \cdot \mathbf{T}^h \cdot \mathbf{M} \, ds. \tag{2.10}
\]

Applying this to (2.4) results in
\[
\int_{V_i} \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \mathbf{T}^h \cdot \mathbf{n} \cdot \mathbf{H} + \mathbf{T}^h \cdot \mathbf{\bar{\mathbf{\sigma}}} \cdot \mathbf{H} + \mathbf{T}^h \cdot \mathbf{M} \right] \, dv = -\frac{1}{2} \oint_{\partial V_i} \mathbf{T}^h \cdot \mathbf{n} \times \mathbf{E}^+ \, ds - \frac{1}{2} \oint_{\partial V_i} \mathbf{T}^h \cdot \mathbf{M} \, ds. \tag{2.11}
\]

Similarly for (2.5), it can be dually written that
\[
\int_{V_i} \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \mathbf{T}^e \cdot \mathbf{n} \cdot \mathbf{H} + \mathbf{T}^e \cdot \mathbf{\bar{\mathbf{\varepsilon}}} \cdot \mathbf{H} + \mathbf{T}^e \cdot \mathbf{J} \right] \, dv = \frac{1}{2} \oint_{\partial V_i} \mathbf{T}^e \cdot \mathbf{n} \times \mathbf{H}^+ \, ds - \frac{1}{2} \oint_{\partial V_i} \mathbf{T}^e \cdot \mathbf{J} \, ds \tag{2.12}
\]

where an impressed electric surface current density is represented by \( \mathbf{J} \) and \( \mathbf{\bar{H}}^+ \) is similarly the magnetic field exterior to \( V_i \) on \( \partial V_i \) [9].

It is recognized that the fields just exterior to the volumes on the boundary are actually the fields just interior to a neighboring volume on the same boundary. Therefore, each subdomain is coupled with neighboring subdomains through the boundary integral terms in these weak forms of Maxwell’s curl equations applied in each subdomain. If no impressed current densities are placed on the boundaries, these boundary integral terms also weakly enforce tangential field continuity on these boundaries [9]. This first order boundary condition weakly enforcing this continuity of the tangential fields in the absence of a source on the boundary is the central flux formulation [15].

An up-wind flux formulation is posed that uses the Robin-type transmission conditions (RTC) to scale the magnetic field boundary conditions and impressed current densities. The magnetic field boundary conditions are scaled by the effective
characteristic wave impedance $Z^+$ on $\partial V^+$ and $Y^+$ defined as $Y^+ = 1/Z^+$ [14]. Similarly, $Z^-$ is the effective characteristic wave impedance on $\partial V^-$ and $Y^- = 1/Z^-$ resulting in [16]:

$$Z^+ \hat{n} \times \left( \vec{H}^+ - \vec{H}^- \right)|_{\partial V} - Z^+ \vec{J} - \hat{n} \times \left( \vec{E}^- - \vec{E}^+ \right)|_{\partial V} - \hat{n} \times \vec{M}_{s} = 0 \quad (2.13)$$

$$Y^+ \hat{n} \times \left( \vec{E}^- - \vec{E}^+ \right)|_{\partial V} + Y^+ \vec{M} + \hat{n} \times \left( \vec{H}^- - \vec{H}^+ \right)|_{\partial V} - \hat{n} \times \vec{J}_s = 0 \quad (2.14)$$

For a homogeneous medium, the continuity of the normal derivative of the tangential magnetic field and the tangential derivative of the normal magnetic field across the boundary is enforced through the $\hat{n} \times \hat{n} \times \left( \vec{E}^- - \vec{E}^+ \right)$ term. This weak constraint of the continuities creates a higher order boundary condition. In addition, the additional cross product on the RTC term aligns the tangential vectors and the characteristic wave impedance equates the units. With upwind flux boundary conditions, equations (2.11) and (2.12) are written as

$$\int \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \vec{T}^b \cdot \vec{E} + \vec{\sigma} \cdot \vec{E} + \vec{\sigma} \cdot \vec{H} + \frac{1}{2} \vec{\sigma} \cdot \vec{\nabla} \times \vec{E} + \frac{1}{2} \vec{\sigma} \cdot \vec{\nabla} \times \vec{T}^b \right] dv =$$

$$-\oint \vec{T}^b \cdot \hat{n} \times \left( \frac{Y^+}{Y^+} \vec{E}^+ + \frac{Y^+ - Y^-}{2Y} \vec{E} - \frac{1}{Y} \hat{n} \times \left( \vec{H}^- - \vec{H}^+ \right) \right) ds \quad (2.15)$$

$$-\oint \vec{T}^b \cdot \frac{1}{Y} \left( Y^+ \vec{M} + \hat{n} \times \vec{J}_s \right) ds$$

and

$$\int \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \vec{T}^c \cdot \vec{E} + \vec{\sigma} \cdot \vec{E} + \vec{\sigma} \cdot \vec{H} + \vec{\sigma} \cdot \vec{J}_v - \frac{1}{2} \vec{\sigma} \cdot \vec{\nabla} \times \vec{H} + \frac{1}{2} \vec{\sigma} \cdot \vec{\nabla} \times \vec{T}^c \right] dv =$$

$$\oint \vec{T}^c \cdot \hat{n} \times \left( \frac{Z^+}{Z} \vec{H}^+ + \frac{Z^+ - Z^-}{2Z} \vec{H} + \frac{1}{Z} \hat{n} \times \left( \vec{E} - \vec{E}^+ \right) \right) ds \quad (2.16)$$

$$-\oint \vec{T}^c \cdot \frac{1}{Z} \left( Z^+ \vec{J}_v + \hat{n} \times \vec{M} \right) ds$$
where \( \vec{Z} = Z^- + Z^+ \) and \( \vec{Y} = Y^- + Y^+ \) [15].

Fitted polyhedral meshes are used to discretize the volume into subdomains.

Again, the field intensities are expanded as in (2.3). A Galerkin formulation is achieved by spanning the same set of basis functions as test functions over the same function space. This results in the coupled difference equations

\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \mathbf{M}_h^b + \mathbf{M}_e^b + \mathbf{S}_h^b + \mathbf{S}_e^b + \frac{Y^+ - Y^-}{\vec{Y}} \mathbf{F}_e^b + \frac{1}{\vec{Y}} \mathbf{G}_h^b = 0
\]

and

\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \mathbf{M}_e^b + \mathbf{M}_e^b - \mathbf{S}_h^b - \mathbf{S}_e^b - \frac{Z^+ - Z^-}{\vec{Z}} \mathbf{F}_h^b + \frac{1}{\vec{Z}} \mathbf{G}_e^b = 0
\]

derived from (2.17) and (2.18) where the superscripts denote the field test function and the field basis function types. The time-dependent coefficients vectors are \( \mathbf{h} \) and \( \mathbf{e} \) with the + superscript denoting exterior tangential fields. The matrices are computed as:

\[
[\mathbf{M}_v]_{i,j} = \int_{\Omega_i} \vec{f}_j \cdot \vec{V} \cdot \vec{f}_i dv,
\]

\[
[S]_{i,j} = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega_i} (\vec{f}_j \cdot \nabla \times \vec{f}_i + \vec{f}_i \cdot \nabla \times \vec{f}_j) dv,
\]

\[
[F_{e/h}^b]_{j,k} = \frac{1}{2} \oint_{\partial \Omega_i} \vec{n}_j \times \vec{f}_k^e ds,
\]

\[
[T_{f}]_{j} = \int_{\Omega_i} \vec{f}_j \cdot \vec{J}_i dv, \text{ or } [T_{j,k}]_{j} = \frac{1}{2} \oint_{\partial \Omega_i} \vec{n}_j \cdot \vec{f}_k^e ds,
\]

\[
[G]_{k,j} = \oint_{\partial \Omega_i} \vec{n}_k \times \vec{f}_i \cdot (\vec{n}_j \times \vec{f}_j^e) ds,
\]
\[ X_{J_i} = \oint \bar{T}^h \cdot \hat{n} \times \bar{J}_s \, ds, \quad X_{M_i} = \oint \bar{T}^e \cdot \hat{n} \times \bar{M}_s \, ds \]  

(2.24)

where \( \bar{f}_i \) and \( \bar{f}_j \) are the basis and testing functions for the electric and magnetic fields, respectively, and \( \bar{\rho} = \bar{\mu}, \bar{\varepsilon}, \) or \( \bar{\sigma} \). The coupled equations (2.17) and (2.18) can be combined into the difference equation

\[ \dot{x} = Ax + Bx^* + t \]  

(2.25)

where

\[ x = \begin{pmatrix} h \\ e \end{pmatrix}, \quad x^* = \begin{pmatrix} h^* \\ e^* \end{pmatrix}, \]

\[ A = \begin{pmatrix} -M_{\mu}^{h,h^{-1}} \left( M_{\sigma}^{h,e} + \frac{1}{Y} G^{h,h} \right) & -M_{\mu}^{h,e} \left( S^{h,e} + \frac{Y - Y^*}{Y} F_{E}^{h,e} \right) \\ M_{e}^{e,h^{-1}} \left( S^{e,h} + \frac{Z - Z^*}{Z} F_{H}^{e,h} \right) & -M_{e}^{e,e} \left( M_{\varepsilon}^{e,e} + \frac{1}{Z} G^{e,e} \right) \end{pmatrix}, \]

(2.27)

\[ B = \begin{pmatrix} M_{\mu}^{h,h^{-1}} \frac{1}{Y} G^{h,h} & -M_{\mu}^{h,h^{-1}} Y^* F_{E}^{h,h} \\ M_{e}^{e,h^{-1}} \frac{Z - Z^*}{Z} F_{H}^{e,h} & M_{e}^{e,e^{-1}} \frac{1}{Z} G^{e,e} \end{pmatrix}, \]

(2.28)

and

\[ t = \begin{pmatrix} -M_{\mu}^{h,h^{-1}} \left( T_{M}^{h} + \frac{Y^*}{Y} T_{M}^{h} - \frac{1}{Y} X_{J_s} \right) \\ -M_{e}^{e,e^{-1}} \left( T_{J}^{e} + \frac{Z^*}{Z} T_{J}^{e} + \frac{1}{Z} X_{M_s} \right) \end{pmatrix}. \]

(2.29)

The first-order coupled differential equation for the fields in each sub-domain is represented by the local difference equation (2.25). A high-order Runge-Kutta (RK) scheme is used to simultaneously solve the difference operators in all sub-domains [9, 17,
18]. The calculations involving the inverted matrix $M$ are performed using LU-factorization [9].

### 2.2 Semiconductor Physics Equations

In order to accurately solve photoconductive antenna problems with the DGFETD method, the effects of the interactions between the semiconductor and the laser pulse excitation must be considered. To accomplish this, the physics involved in this interaction must be added to the simulation. Consider a semiconductor with a gap between two metal traces deposited on its surface. When the substrate in the gap is illuminated with photons, the energy from the photons generates charge carriers in the substrate. If a voltage bias is applied to those traces, the generated electric field mobilizes these carriers creating current.

It is typical when evaluating the behavior of carriers over time in a substrate to begin with the continuity equations that account for the change in carrier concentrations over time. The total change in carrier concentration must equal the changes due to drift, diffusion, regeneration/combination, and other processes such as photogeneration. The combined effects of all carrier action must satisfy

$$\frac{\partial n}{\partial t} = \frac{\partial n}{\partial t}_{\text{drift}} + \frac{\partial n}{\partial t}_{\text{diffusion}} + \frac{\partial n}{\partial t}_{\text{R-G}} + \frac{\partial n}{\partial t}_{\text{other}} \quad (2.30)$$

and

$$\frac{\partial p}{\partial t} = \frac{\partial p}{\partial t}_{\text{drift}} + \frac{\partial p}{\partial t}_{\text{diffusion}} + \frac{\partial p}{\partial t}_{\text{R-G}} + \frac{\partial p}{\partial t}_{\text{other}} \quad (2.31)$$

where $n$ and $p$ are the concentrations of electrons and holes, respectively [19].

Defining the change in carrier concentration due to other processes as $G$ and the change
in carrier concentrations due to regeneration and combination as $R$ in addition to noting that

$$\frac{\partial n}{\partial t} \bigg|_{\text{drift}} + \frac{\partial n}{\partial t} \bigg|_{\text{diffusion}} = \frac{1}{q} \nabla \cdot \vec{J}_n$$

(2.32)

and

$$\frac{\partial p}{\partial t} \bigg|_{\text{drift}} + \frac{\partial p}{\partial t} \bigg|_{\text{diffusion}} = -\frac{1}{q} \nabla \cdot \vec{J}_p$$

(2.33)

where $q$ is electric charge of an electron, $\vec{J}_n$ is the current density due to electrons, and $\vec{J}_p$ is the current density due to holes; the continuity equations can be more succinctly written as

$$\frac{\partial n}{\partial t} = \frac{1}{q} \nabla \cdot \vec{J}_n - R_n + G_n$$

(2.34)

and

$$\frac{\partial p}{\partial t} = -\frac{1}{q} \nabla \cdot \vec{J}_p - R_p + G_p.$$  

(2.35)

Additionally, it is known that the current across the substrate is due to the drift and diffusion of the charge carriers. Therefore, the following relationships must also be satisfied:

$$\vec{J}_p = q \mu_p p \vec{E} - q D_p \nabla p$$

(2.36)

and

$$\vec{J}_n = q \mu_n n \vec{E} + q D_n \nabla n$$

(2.37)
where $\mu_n$ and $\mu_p$ are the carrier mobility of the electrons and holes respectively, $E$ is the electric field, and $D_n$ and $D_p$ are the carrier diffusion coefficients for the electrons and holes respectively [19]. It is also known that the total current density

$$\vec{J} = \vec{J}_n + \vec{J}_p$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.38)

in steady state conditions. [20]

### 2.3 Coupling of Equations

The semiconductor physics equations (2.34), (2.35), (2.36), and (2.37) must be coupled with Maxwell’s equations (2.1) and (2.2). In the analysis of this system, there are several advantages to isolating the time-varying quantities. First, since the DGFETD method uses time-integration, initial conditions in the form of steady-state sources cause an unfavorable step discontinuity in the simulation. Isolating the time-varying quantities avoids this. Similarly, isolating the time-varying quantities causes the intrinsic carrier density to act as an excitation in the system. Second, by removing the static field from the main simulation, the near-field to far-field calculation does not have to account for this static field. Third, the time-varying fields will converge to zero over time if the time-varying excitation is limited. Therefore, there are no non-zero terms late in the simulation with which a PML formulation for a semiconducting material would need to contend. Fourth, it is believed that the incorporation of doped materials may be easier since the steady-state values are separated from the main simulation process.

Therefore, consider Maxwell’s curl equations (2.1) and (2.2) as the quantities vary with time. With no impressed magnetic or electric current density, the conductivity terms
neglected, and the electric current density only due to the effects of the semiconductor physics, these equations can be written as

\[
\nabla \times \vec{E} = -\mu \frac{d\vec{H}}{dt} \quad (2.39)
\]

and

\[
\nabla \times \vec{H} = \sigma \frac{d\vec{E}}{dt} + \vec{J}_n + \vec{J}_p \quad (2.40)
\]

where \( \vec{J}_n \) and \( \vec{J}_p \) are the volume current densities due to the electrons and holes, respectively. Isolating the time-varying components of the full equation set, one can write

\[
\nabla \times [\vec{E}_0 + \vec{E}_\Delta] = -\mu \frac{d[\vec{H}_0 + \vec{H}_\Delta]}{dt} \quad (2.41)
\]

\[
\nabla \times [\vec{H}_0 + \vec{H}_\Delta] = \sigma \frac{d[\vec{E}_0 + \vec{E}_\Delta]}{dt} + [\vec{J}_{n0} + \vec{J}_{n_\Delta}] + [\vec{J}_{p0} + \vec{J}_{p_\Delta}] \quad (2.42)
\]

\[
q \frac{\partial [n_0 + n_\Delta]}{\partial t} = \nabla \cdot [\vec{J}_{n0} + \vec{J}_{n_\Delta}] + qG(r,t) - qR(r,t;n_0 + n_\Delta,p_0 + p_\Delta) \quad (2.43)
\]

\[
q \frac{\partial [p_0 + p_\Delta]}{\partial t} = -\nabla \cdot [\vec{J}_{p0} + \vec{J}_{p_\Delta}] + qG(r,t) - qR(r,t;n_0 + n_\Delta,p_0 + p_\Delta) \quad (2.44)
\]

\[
[\vec{J}_{n0} + \vec{J}_{n_\Delta}] = q\mu_n[n_0 + n_\Delta][\vec{E}_0 + \vec{E}_\Delta] + qD_n \nabla [n_0 + n_\Delta] \quad (2.45)
\]

and

\[
[\vec{J}_{p0} + \vec{J}_{p_\Delta}] = q\mu_p[p_0 + p_\Delta][\vec{E}_0 + \vec{E}_\Delta] - qD_p \nabla [p_0 + p_\Delta] \quad (2.46)
\]

where the steady state solutions are denoted by the subscript 0 and the time-varying quantities are denoted by the subscript \( \Delta \). All time derivatives are zero in steady state so

\[
\nabla \times \vec{E}_0 = 0, \quad (2.47)
\]
\[ \nabla \times \vec{H}_0 = \vec{J}_{n_0} + \vec{J}_{p_0}, \]  
(2.48)

\[ 0 = \nabla \cdot \vec{J}_{n_0} + \nabla \cdot \vec{J}_{p_0}, \]  
(2.49)

\[ \vec{J}_{n_0} = q \mu_n x_0 \vec{E}_0 + q D_n \nabla x_0, \]  
(2.50)

and

\[ \vec{J}_{x_0} = q \mu_n \Delta x \left[ \vec{E}_0 + \vec{E}_\Delta \right] + x_0 \vec{E}_\Delta + q D_n \nabla (x_0). \]  
(2.51)

Note that even though \( \nabla \cdot \vec{J}_{n_0} \neq 0 \) and \( \nabla \cdot \vec{J}_{p_0} \neq 0 \) individually in general for steady-state, the divergence of the carrier currents is balanced by the steady-state recombination rate such that [21]

\[ \nabla \cdot \vec{J}_{n_0} = q R(r, t; n_0, p_0) = -\nabla \cdot \vec{J}_{p_0}. \]  
(2.52)

Therefore, the time-varying set of equations can be written as

\[ \nabla \times \vec{E}_\Delta = -\mu \frac{d \vec{H}_\Delta}{dt}, \]  
(2.53)

\[ \nabla \times \vec{H}_\Delta = \epsilon \frac{d \vec{E}_\Delta}{dt} + \vec{J}_{n_0} + \vec{J}_{p_0}, \]  
(2.54)

\[ q \frac{\partial n_\Delta}{\partial t} = \nabla \cdot \vec{J}_{n_0} + q G(r, t) - q R(r, t; n_0 + n_\Delta, p_0 + p_\Delta) + q R(r, t; n_0, p_0), \]  
(2.55)

\[ q \frac{\partial p_\Delta}{\partial t} = -\nabla \cdot \vec{J}_{p_0} + q G(r, t) - q R(r, t; n_0 + n_\Delta, p_0 + p_\Delta) + q R(r, t; n_0, p_0), \]  
(2.56)

\[ \vec{J}_{n_0} = q \mu_n n_\Delta \left[ \vec{E}_0 + \vec{E}_\Delta \right] + q \mu_n n_0 \vec{E}_\Delta + q D_n \nabla n_\Delta, \]  
(2.57)

and

\[ \vec{J}_{p_0} = q \mu_p p_\Delta \left[ \vec{E}_0 + \vec{E}_\Delta \right] + q \mu_p p_0 \vec{E}_\Delta - q D_p \nabla p_\Delta. \]  
(2.58)

The implementation of this coupling is done using a port model which includes the interaction with the semiconductor substrate and laser via a port into the field solver.
The two systems of equations are solved independently and interact through the port as shown in Figure 2.1.

![Figure 2.1 - Port Model Implementation [22]](image)

It is assumed that the port is one-dimensional in the sense that variations in relevant quantities are only present in the length dimension of the gap from one PEC to the other, not the width dimension. According to Figure 2.1, the variations would occur in the gap length or vertical direction (y-direction) but quantities would be constant in the directions of the gap width (x direction) and thickness (z-direction). Given this assumption, one can note

\[
\nabla \cdot \mathbf{j} = \left( \frac{d}{dy} \right) j_y
\]

(2.59)

and

\[
\nabla n = \left( \frac{dn}{dy} \right) \hat{y}, \quad \nabla p = \left( \frac{dp}{dy} \right) \hat{y}.
\]

(2.60)

Furthermore, if it is assumed that carrier concentrations and current densities are constant along the direction of the port itself then the derivatives in the y-direction are zero so
\[ \nabla \cdot \vec{J} = 0, \nabla n = 0, \text{ and } \nabla p = 0. \] These assumptions further simplify the port implementation.

The steady state Shockley-Reed-Hall (SRH) recombination rate is calculated as

\[
R = \frac{np - n_i^2}{\tau_p (n + n_i) + \tau_n (p + p_i)} \tag{2.61}
\]

where \( \tau_p \) and \( \tau_n \) are the minority carrier lifetimes of the electrons and holes, respectively. For an undoped semiconductor with a deep level trap energy near the mid-gap, \( n_i \approx p_i \approx n_0 \) [19, 21].

All the carrier generation is assumed to come from the light source \( G = G_L \). The steady state generation rate due to light is

\[
G_L(r, t) = G_0 e^{-\alpha(t-z_0)} e^{-\frac{(x-x_0)^2}{\sigma_x^2} - \frac{(y-y_0)^2}{\sigma_y^2}} e^{-\frac{(t-t_0)^2}{\tau^2}} e^{-\frac{(z-z_0)^2}{\sigma_z^2}} \tag{2.62}
\]

where \( G_0 = \frac{\alpha W_0}{hf} \), \( h \) is Planck’s constant \( (6.626 \times 10^{-34} \text{ J-s}) \), \( W_0 \) \( (\text{J/(s-m^2)}) \) is the peak optical power density, \( f \) \( (1/\text{s}) \) is the laser frequency, and \( \alpha \) \( (1/\text{m}) \) is the absorption coefficient of the semiconductor [19, 21, 23, 24]. The pulse spot size standard deviation is represented by \( \sigma_x, \sigma_y \), the pulse time standard deviation is represented by \( \sigma_t \), and the positions of the carriers are expressed by \( (x, y, z) \). For Gaussian profiles, it is assumed that \( \sigma_x = \sigma_y = \sigma_r \) [21].
3 ANTENNA DESIGN, ANALYSIS, AND VALIDATION

3.1 Base Parameters and Initial Validation

Photoconductive THz antenna structures can be designed for various application specific requirements. The bandwidth and emission intensity can be altered through variation of the dimensions and geometries of the antenna. The effects of these structural parameters are determined by evaluating various antenna structures. The results of the DGFETD computational analysis are presented and compared with expected results where possible. Consider the simple double sided dipole antenna structure presented by Miyamaru, et al. [25] such as in Figure 3.1 for initial validation.

In this example, the dipole gap length \( g = 5 \mu m \), the dipole trace width \( w = 10 \mu m \), and the dipole length \( l \) and coplanar line separation \( c \) varies from \( 200 \mu m \) to \( 20 \mu m \). Corresponding antenna structures are meshed using Cubit by placing PEC strips onto a
substrate as shown in Figure 3.1 and then meshing the volume for analysis. An example of a cross section of such a mesh is shown in Figure 3.2.

These models are analyzed using the DGFETD method with the port implementation described above. The background is set to homogeneous isotropic loss less free space with a 1.0 relative permittivity. A bounding box of $50\,\mu m$ is placed around the antenna. The semiconductor material in the port placed in the dipole gap is has an electron mobility of $0.8\,\frac{m^2}{V\cdot s}$ and a hole mobility of $0.04\,\frac{m^2}{V\cdot s}$. The intrinsic carrier density is set to $2.25\times10^{12}\,\frac{\text{carriers}}{m^3}$ with carrier lifetimes of $0.5\times10^{-12}\,\text{ps}$. The temperature is set to 300 Kelvin. A static voltage of 1.0 V is applied. The semiconductor is excited by a $800\,nm$ laser with a uniform excitation. The laser is pulsed with a $0.1\,\text{ps}$
Full-Width at Half-Maximum (FWHM) pulse centered at 2 ps with a peak power density of $5 \times 10^3 \, \frac{W}{m^2}$. Far field calculations are conducted at an observation point in free space perpendicular to the dipole structure ($\theta = 0, \varphi = 0$) and aligned with the antenna gap. Arbitrary units (A.U.) are applied to the emission intensity results through scaling by the wavenumber

$$k = \omega \sqrt{\mu \epsilon} = \frac{2\pi f \sqrt{\epsilon_r}}{c_0}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.1)

This scaling is necessary because the DGFETD far field calculator normalizes the result by the wavenumber. Therefore, this scaling effectively undoes the internal normalization. The frequency is scaled by

$$\frac{f}{\sqrt{\epsilon_{\text{eff}}}} = \frac{f}{\sqrt{\epsilon_{\text{free}} + \epsilon_{\text{substrate}}}} = \frac{f}{\sqrt{1 + 12.5}}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.2)

to compensate for the radiation through the substrate. The computational analysis in Figure 3.4 agrees with the experimental results of Miyamaru, et al. [25] in Figure 3.3.
It is observed that the resonance frequencies and bandwidth agree fairly well. However, the peak emission intensities relative to each other show a smaller decrease in peak intensity as the dipole length is reduced than expected. This might be caused by several reasons. The difference in relative peak intensities may be due to the effects of...
the real world laser spot size. These simulations assume an ideal uniform excitation as opposed to an actual laser beam spot size. It is possible that a spot size much larger than the gap could cause current flow between coplanar lines or through only part of the dipole as opposed to through the entire dipole, especially at small dipole lengths. The laser spot size of this experiment is unknown.

The lower relative peak intensities may also be due to conduction losses and additional resistances introduced by the connections to testing equipment. The computational analysis does not model many of the real world additional effects of measurement taking such as equipment accuracy and imperfect transitions at device interfaces. In addition it is noted that the intensities drop off faster at higher frequencies in the experimental results than the simulations. It is theorized that this too may be due to conduction losses and resistances not currently accounted for in the simulations.

The computational analysis is conducted using a maximum mesh cell size $m = 10\mu m$ and a basis order of 2. The bases are based on the hierarchical curl-conforming basis functions developed by J. P. Webb [12] for tetrahedron that have been developed for hexahedron [9]. The mesh cell size and basis order parameters are maximized for minimal error with the shortest simulation time. A study was conducted varying the maximum mesh cell size and basis order for the full dipole length of $100\mu m$ case with results plotted in Figure 3.5.
It is more insightful to examine the relative error of the results as shown in Table 3.1. The simulation with basis order of 1 and maximum cell size of $2.5\mu m$ is used as a reference value for the relative error calculations such that

$$relative\_error = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \left| \frac{\text{reference}_n - \text{test}_n}{\text{reference}_n} \right| \cdot 100\%$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.3)

where N is the number of data points and test is the data under analysis.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basis Order</th>
<th>Maximum Cell Size</th>
<th>Relative Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5 µm</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5 µm</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.5 µm</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10 µm</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.5 µm</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>5 µm</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>7.5 µm</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>10 µm</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10 µm</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is noted that using a maximum mesh cell size of 5 µm and a basis order of 1 nearly reduces the error in half from the mesh cell size of 2.5 µm, basis order = 0 case.

Furthermore, the basis order = 2 and maximum mesh cell size of 10 µm resulted in a slightly better relative error. This basis order of 2 with a maximum mesh cell size of 10 µm resulted in best combination of lowest error and simulation time.

The computational analysis is conducted with coplanar lines $L = 200 \mu m$ long on each side of the dipole (for double sided designs). It is determined that this is sufficient for stable analysis results while keeping the problem space as small as possible to minimize simulation time. This value of 200 µm is determined by simulating the same
double sided full dipole antenna with a coplanar line separation of 100$\mu$m with varying coplanar line lengths. Figure 3.6 shows the results with a slight difference in lengths of 100$\mu$m and 200$\mu$m but negligible difference between 200$\mu$m and 400$\mu$m.

![Figure 3.6 - Coplanar Line Length Comparison](image)

The length of the extension of the model volume beyond the antenna structure perpendicular to the dipole and beyond the long edges of the coplanar lines is called the bounding box. It is set to an extension length of $b = 50\mu m$. This value was determined by comparing several lengths between 25$\mu$m and 100$\mu$m as shown in Figure 3.7.
Although the results of the 50\(\mu m\) simulation visibly vary from the 100\(\mu m\) case, it is determined to be a suitable compromise of error and computational time. This bounding box is terminated with an Absorbing Boundary Condition (ABC) boundary. It is determined that this is sufficient by comparing the simulation results with a 4 cell and 8 cell Perfectly Matched Layer (PML) in Figure 3.8.
Using these baseline parameters, additional antenna designs are analyzed and fabricated for further experimental testing and validation.

3.2 Double Sided Dipole

Consider in more detail the double sided dipole. It is expected that modifying the geometry of the dipole including the dipole length and position of the coplanar lines along the dipole will alter the resonant frequency, peak intensity, and bandwidth. In this work, the double sided dipole is defined as a dipole structure with coplanar lines extending away from the dipole in both directions as illustrated Figure 3.9.
Varying the separation between the coplanar lines while keeping the dipole length fixed results in interesting changes in the bandwidth and resonant frequency as illustrated in Figure 3.10.
Figure 3.10 – Double Sided Dipole Computational Analysis

It is interesting that in each case except the 20 µm case, coplanar lines positioned in the middle of the dipole seem to resonate another high intensity frequency. This phenomenon is illustrated more clearly in Figure 3.11.
This resonance peaks at a coplanar line separation of $90\mu m$. At this separation, the coplanar lines start $45\mu m$ from the dipole center in each direction meaning they are centered at $50\mu m$ or the center of the dipole length excluding the width of the coplanar line itself. This resonance resembles the effects of a half wavelength dipole in that shortening the coplanar line separation in half results in a near doubling of the resonant frequency. To further verify these results, a subset of double sided dipole antenna is to be fabricated and tested. The parameters of the fabricated antennas are listed in Table 3.2.
Table 3.2 – Fabrication Double Sided Dipole Parameter List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>l (in (\mu)m)</th>
<th>c (in (\mu)m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3 Single Sided Dipole

The single sided dipole is defined as a dipole antenna with coplanar lines extending away from the antenna in only one direction as illustrated in Figure 3.12. Again, it is not required that the coplanar lines be separated by the full length of the dipole.
A variety of single sided dipole antennas are simulated to illustrate the effects of varying the parameters on the emission intensity frequency response. A sample of these simulation results are presented in Figure 3.13.

![Figure 3.13 - Single Sided Dipole Computational Analysis](image)

Like the double sided dipole, a second resonant frequency is discovered when the coplanar lines separation is half the distance of the dipole length. Here the peak intensity of this resonant frequency is much larger than the full separation case. To verify these results, a subset of single sided dipole antenna is to be fabricated and tested. The parameters of the fabricated antennas are listed in Table 3.3.
Table 3.3 – Fabrication Single Sided Dipole Parameter List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>l (in μm)</th>
<th>c (in μm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4 Bowtie

The bowtie dipole is defined as a dipole structure where the two dipole strips are equivalent trapezoids with the smaller bases meeting at the dipole gap as illustrated in Figure 3.14. In this work, only double sided bowties are considered. This means the coplanar lines extend away from the bowtie dipole in both directions. Again, it is not necessary that the coplanar lines be placed at the larger base edge of the bowties. Instead the separation can be varied to manipulate performance.
First consider the effect of the bowtie flare angle or the angle of the trapezoid legs. The most interesting results of the computational analysis are illustrated in Figure 3.15 with the double sided dipole analysis included for reference.

The results show that as the size of the larger base increases, the frequency response is flattened giving a larger bandwidth at which the intensity is relatively more common. It
is also interesting that each dipole length has a particular frequency/peak intensity point in common with all the flare angles.

Next, consider the separation of the coplanar lines. The results continue to show a resonant point when the coplanar line separation is half the dipole length in agreement with the findings for the dipole cases above. These results are presented in Figure 3.16.
Figure 3.16 - Bowtie Coplanar Line Separation Computational Analysis

To verify these results, the antenna structures described in Table 3.4 are to be fabricated.
Several of these antennas have been fabricated by working with Takehito Suzuki at the Suzuki Laboratory at Ibaraki University in Japan [26]. The antenna structures were tested using wafers with a low temperature grown GaAs (LT-GaAs) layer and a simple semi-insulating GaAs layer (SI-GaAs). The LT-GaAs substrate has a much lower carrier lifetime than the SI-GaAs. The computational analysis is conducted with a carrier

Table 3.4 - Fabricated Bowtie Parameter List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>l (in μm)</th>
<th>c (in μm)</th>
<th>w2 (in μm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
lifetime of 0.5 ps modelling the LT-GaAs. Computational analysis modelling the SI-GaAs will need to be conducted in the future. The parameters of the antennas successfully fabricated are listed in Table 3.5. The measurements taken are presented in Figure 3.17 and Figure 3.18 with the LT-GaAs computational analyses.

Table 3.5 - Successfully Fabricated Bowtie Antenna List [26]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>l (in μm)</th>
<th>c (in μm)</th>
<th>w2 (in μm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3.17 - Fabricated Full Coplanar Line Separation Bowtie Antenna Measurements[26]
Unfortunately the noise level of the measurements is very significant. To minimize the noise for better comparison, the raw time data is gated off or set to zero after the time period of interest. The Fourier transform is then performed on the new gated off data. This removes the late time noise. For example, consider the LT-GaAs full coplanar line separation bowtie dipole with $w_2 = 45 \, \mu m$ (black line) in Figure 3.17. Gating off the measurements after 10 ps, 15 ps, and 20 ps significantly reduces the noise as illustrated in Figure 3.19.
Figure 3.19 - Bowtie Measured Data Noise Reduction Example

Gating off the first 15 ps, measured data is compared with computational analysis in Figure 3.20 and Figure 3.21. The computed results are equally scaled for ease of comparison.
Figure 3.20 - Full Coplanar Separation Bowtie Measured vs. Computed

Figure 3.21 - Half Coplanar Line Separation Bowtie Measured vs. Computed
It is noted that both the measured and computed results demonstrate a narrower or sharper peak in the case where the coplanar lines are separated by half the dipole length. This is consistent with the findings for the other structures studied thus far. Otherwise, the results do not match very well especially in the full coplanar line separation case. With such a high level of noise in the measured data, it is possible the measurement is not very accurate even after the gating of late time values. As seen in Figure 5.13 and Figure 5.14, the printing technique used to fabricate these antennas is also not very high quality. Additional testing is needed to determine which result set is most accurate.

3.5 Split-Ring Resonator

Next, structured metal trace geometries are analyzed. Takano, et. al. [27] present metamaterial structures composed of planar metallic resonators called split-ring resonators. Metamaterials are artificially structured materials that can improve the flexibility of electromagnetic systems [27, 28]. Takano, et al. [27] adapt the metamaterial properties of circular split ring structures as presented by Pendry [29] and Smith [30] to form an additional trace ring outside the typical dipole structure coplanar lines. A closed-ring resonator and two split-ring resonators are presented [27] as in Figure 3.22, Figure 3.23, and Figure 3.24.
Figure 3.22 - Dipole Circular Ring Resonator (D-CRR)

Figure 3.23 - Dipole Split Ring Resonator 1 (D-SRR1)
The split-ring resonator metal rings with gaps determine the total inductance and capacitance of the structure [27]. Therefore, manipulating the parameters of these structures effects the radiation spectra and the radiation efficiency at certain frequencies [27].

Takano, et. al. [27] presents these three structures where the width of the traces is $4 \mu m$, the dipole gap width is $5 \mu m$, the dipole length is $30 \mu m$ from the centers of the coplanar line traces, the square rings are $45 \mu m \times 45 \mu m$ from the center of the traces, and the split ring resonator gap length is $15 \mu m$ where applicable. The structures are fabricated with a superfine ink-jet printer to place silver nanopaste on semi-insulating gallium arsenide (SI-GaAs). The radiation from the antennas is characterized using a spectroscopy system with a Ti:sapphire laser with a 100 fs pulse width, 800 nm center wavelength, and 5.0 mW time average power. A dipole antenna fabricated on low-temperature grown GaAs (LT-GaAs) was used as the detector. Takano, et. al. [27] provides amplitude spectra from experiments and simulations in Figure 3.25. The solid
lines are the x-polarized components and the dotted lines are the y-polarized components.

The spectra are normalized by the peak values of each sample.

![Figure 3.25 - Experimental (a) and Computed (b) Emission Intensities [27]](image)

Computational analysis is conducted using the same free space baseline parameters and wafer characteristics as before with results presented in Figure 3.26.
These results concur with the findings of Takano, et. al. [27]. It is also interesting that, in this case, a ring with no gap results in very similar results to a ring with a middle gap.

It is intended in the future to fabricate similar structures; however, the trace width presented by Takano, et. al. [27] is so small that trace integrity is expected to be difficult with the currently available photolithography and liftoff procedures presented in Chapter 4. The trace width is therefore increased for the remainder of the models to 10\(\mu m\) and the other parameters are increased and varied according to the values shown in Figure 3.27. These parameters are varied in order to discover the effects of parameters on the emission intensity frequency response.
Consider the size and location of the gap in the ring. Analysis is conducted setting $l = x = y = 50 \mu m$ and varying the gap size $h$ and the location of the gap from the side as in Figure 3.23 to the middle as in Figure 3.24. The effects on the frequency response are presented in Figure 3.28.
It is observed that the smaller gaps tend to result in larger emission intensities, especially in the $5\mu m$ middle gap case.

Next, consider the size of the dipole in the structure. Figure 3.29 demonstrates the effects of varying the dipole length $l$ and location of the ring gap while setting $x = y = 50\mu m$ and $h = 5\mu m$.

![Figure 3.29 - Split Ring Resonator Dipole Length Computational Analysis](image)

It is observed that for the side gap cases, the larger dipole length results in higher peak emission intensity. However, the opposite is true for the middle gap cases.

Consider next the size of the ring. By setting the dipole length $l = 50\mu m$ and varying the $x, y$ parameters and location of the gap, the results in Figure 3.30 can be produced.
Figure 3.30 - Split Ring Resonator Ring Size and Gap Location Computational Analysis

It is interesting that when the ring is three times the dipole length, the middle gap case begins to imitate the side gap case with multiple peaks. Likewise, when the ring is 1/3 the size of the dipole length, the side gap case begins to imitate the middle gap case with a single resonant frequency.

Finally, consider the position of the ring. The ring can be moved away from the dipole center as shown in Figure 3.31 where $o$ is the horizontal distance from the center of the ring to the center of the dipole.
When dipole length $l = 50\mu m$, the ring size $x = y = 50\mu m$, and the ring gap $h = 5\mu m$, the position $o$ can be varied such that the frequency response in Figure 3.32 can be generated.

It is noted that in each case, sliding the ring along the coplanar line minimizes the peak emission intensity with no clear advantages.
3.6 Double Split-Ring Resonator

Further exploration of the effects of these ring structures is investigated by modelling and simulating double ring resonator structures with varying parameters. The additional ring is added on the opposite side of the dipole as the single ring as in Figure 3.33.

![Double Split-Ring Resonator Parameters](image)

Figure 3.33 - Double Split-Ring Resonator Parameters

Analysis is conducted varying these parameters in order to determine the effects on the radiation spectra and radiation efficiency. These effects are noticed in the following figures which include the reference single split ring resonator and various ring gap placement. Figure 3.34 presents the effects of having all the gaps on the side of the rings. Figure 3.35 presents the effects of mixed gap locations on the two rings. Figure 3.36
presents the effects of having all the gaps in the middle of the rings. The gap lengths are set as \( h = g = f = 5\mu m \) and the dipole length is set as \( l = 50\mu m \).

Figure 3.34 - Double Split Ring Resonator Side Gaps Computational Analysis
Figure 3.35 - Double Split Ring Resonator Left/Middle Gaps Computational Analysis
Figure 3.36 - Double Split Ring Resonator Middle Gaps Computational Analysis
It is observed that the additional ring increases the peak intensities. This effect is most pronounced in the cases where one ring has a side gap and the other has a middle gap.

3.7 Bowtie Split-Ring Resonator

Finally, the bowtie dipole structure is combined with the split-ring resonator to create Bowtie Split-Ring Resonator structures such as in Figure 3.37 and Figure 3.38.

![Figure 3.37 - Single Split-Ring Resonator Bowtie Parameters](image)
Computational analysis is again conducted with the same free space baseline parameters as before to determine the effects of varying some of the bowtie parameters and the position of the ring gaps with the results presented in Figure 3.39, Figure 3.40, Figure 3.41, and Figure 3.42. The baseline parameters are set to a dipole length $l = 50\,\mu m$, ring sizes $x = y = 50\,\mu m$ and $i = j = 50\,\mu m$ where applicable, gap lengths $g = h = f = 5\,\mu m$, and bowtie small base length $w1 = 10\,\mu m$. 
Figure 3.39 - Single Split-Ring Resonator Bowtie with Side Gap Analysis

Figure 3.40 - Single Split-Ring Resonator Bowtie with Middle Gap Analysis
Figure 3.41 - Double Split-Ring Resonator Bowtie with Side Gaps Analysis

Figure 3.42 - Double Split-Ring Resonator Bowtie with One Side and One Middle Gap Analysis
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It is noted that the addition of the bowtie in the single ring cases significantly decreases the peak intensities without adding a noticeable benefit. The double ring structure with both rings having side gaps also follows this behavior. However, it is interesting that the double ring with one side gap and one middle gap shows great improvement in the peak intensity for the smaller flare angle.

3.8 Summary of Results

In summary, the computational analysis method presented in Chapter 2 has been validated using the full double sided dipole antenna. In addition, using double sided dipole, both the mesh and simulation parameters were optimized. The method was also validated for the bowtie, and split-ring resonator structure using published literature and results from testing. The simulated results compared quite well with the measured data. Slight differences in the peak emission intensity for the smaller full double sided dipole are theorized to be due to effects such as conduction losses and additional resistances in the complete spectroscopy system that were not included in the simulation, as well as non-ideal laser spot size. In the case of the bowtie antenna, the measured data is very noisy and variations from the computational analysis are most likely due to the quality of the fabricated structures and the contributions of the detecting antenna.

After gaining confidence in the accuracy of the DGFETD simulation to estimate the emission intensity of photoconductive THz antennas, a study of a variety of antenna geometries was conducted. It was found that reducing the separation of the coplanar lines of the dipole and bowtie antennas in half results in a strong resonant peak in emissions at nearly twice the frequency as compared to a full separation of the coplanar
lines. It was also discovered that the bowtie structures result in a flattened response area at peak emission intensity, providing a broader bandwidth. It is also shown that in the case of the split-ring resonators, the ring size and gap positions vary the resonant frequency in a manner that seems consistent with adjusting the dipole length appropriately. Further study is required to determine the exact correlations. It was also found that the addition of a second ring in the split-ring resonator structure results in greater peak emission intensities.
4 FABRICATION OF DEVICES

4.1 Description of Devices

The multi-physics port model and DGFETD method are validated with the experimental data presented by Miyamaru, et al. [25] and Takano, et al. [27] for the standard dipole and ring resonator structures, respectively. Further validation is conducted with the experimental results of the bowtie antenna conducted with Suzuki. More complete validation is accomplished by fabricating the other antenna designs presented in Section 3.

A common currently used photoconductive substrate is Gallium Arsenide (GaAs) due to its lower cost and higher availability. A layer of low temperature GaAs can be grown on top of the typical GaAs to increase the recombination rate of the carriers. The carriers need to recombine quickly in the detecting antenna. This low temperature grown layer provides a very short carrier lifetime[31] as well as semi-insulating properties[32]. Therefore, the first fabrication attempt was done on a 500-600 µm SI-GaAs substrate with 1-2 µm layer of low temperature GaAs (LT-GaAs) grown on top at a temperature of 200 – 250 ºC. It was annealed for about 10 minutes at 600 ºC after growth. The wafer had a 2 inch (50.8 mm) diameter and [100] crystal orientation. A commercially available antenna was also purchased (see Figure 4.1). Later fabrication attempts were made on polished undoped SI-GaAs 4 inch wafers that were 625 µm thick. These wafers have a resistivity greater than $10^{-7} \Omega cm$.
Titanium gold (TiAu) traces were used for the antenna structures due to availability at the time of fabrication and thermal stability. The interface to the antenna is vitally important to the functionality because of the picosecond high voltage switching (such as photoconductive switches). Ohmic contacts with negligible contact resistance are preferred in this case to most accurately represent the computational model and make the best possible connections to external circuitry. Heating of the switch may lead to failure [33] with significant contact resistance. It has been determined that a AuGeNi alloy is far more effective than a straight Ti/Au metal layer [34]; however it was not available at the time. Vieweg, et al. [35] have found that annealed ohmic contacts fabricated using a Ni/AuGe/Ni/Au layer stack with 5/90/25/50 nm thickness and subsequent annealing at 420 °C for 90 seconds offer about twice the output signal intensity as TiAu metallization. Vieweg [36] has also found that TiAu is more thermally stable and less reactive than AuGe since titanium has a much higher melting temperature than gold or germanium.
The fabrication of these devices was done using the facilities of the Center for Nanoscale Science and Engineering (CeNSE) located at the University of Kentucky. The fabrication process included photolithography, application of the trace metals, liftoff, and cleaving with the necessary cleaning techniques required at each step. After fabrication of the antenna structures, the cleaved wafer sections were then embedded into printed circuit boards so that they can be tested in a spectroscopy system.

4.2 Photolithography

The first step in the fabrication process is photolithography. In photolithography, photoresist is applied to the wafer and then desired patterns are removed leaving bare surface for metal deposit. There are two different photoresist processes, positive and negative. With positive photoresist, the layer of applied photoresist is exposed to UV light in the areas where it is desired that the photoresist be removed leaving the areas for desired metal traces. This occurs because the UV light changes the characteristics of the photoresist so that it is more soluble in the developer. Therefore, after exposure when the wafer with photoresist is subjected to the developer solution, the photoresist exposed is removed. The other method uses negative photoresist. In this process, the areas of photoresist exposed to the UV light become more resistant to the developer such that application of the developer solution removes all areas that were not exposed.

In this particular fabrication, positive photoresist is used therefore an image mask was created that is clear in the areas where metal traces are desired and opaque elsewhere. The first mask created included 2 copies of 42 antenna structures positioned
on 6 different blocks separated by dicing “streets” or areas for separating the blocks. These 42 antenna structures include the full list of double sided dipole, single sided dipole, coplanar lines only, and bowtie structures presented in Section 3. Each fabricated antenna has coplanar lines 2 mm long in each direction from the center of the dipole gap (where applicable) with a 100 $\mu$m by 100 $\mu$m pad at the outer end for connection to an external printed circuit board so that connections can be made during testing. The mask is designed such that ½ of the wafer is utilized thus saving the other half for a later attempt.
In order to process the wafer and mask such that the photoresist protects the areas between traces and bare wafer is exposed where traces are desired, the GaAs wafer is first coated with positive photoresist. In this case, S1813 photoresist from Shipley is used. According to the documentation provided by Shipley (see
http://nanofab.ece.cmu.edu/resources/s1800seriesDataSheet.pdf), spin coating S1813 at a speed of 2000 rpm provides a layer of photoresist about 19,000 Angstroms (or 1,900 nm) thick. The optimum ratio of photoresist thickness to trace thickness for successful sputtering is approximately 10:1.

After the photoresist is applied, the wafer is placed on a hot plate of 95 °C for 1 minute so that the photoresist can set properly. After cooling, the coated wafer is then aligned and placed in contact with the mask while ultraviolet (UV) light is illuminated. The mask and wafer are illuminated for 9 seconds to adequately expose the transparent areas of the mask so that all the photoresist is removed during development but not to overexpose such that the fine dimensions of the structures are sacrificed.

After exposure, the wafer is placed in a Shipley microposit MF-319 developer solution for at least 1 minute so that the (UV) exposed photoresist is dissolved away. Then the wafer is rinsed in ultra-pure water (H2O) and dried. Once dry, it is placed under a microscope to verify that the antenna patterns are removed properly for metallization. If the process has gone as desired, the wafer is placed back on a hot plate of 95° C for a few minutes to prevent further undesired changes. In instances where the process needs to be repeated, the photoresist layer is removed by applying acetone followed by isopropyl alcohol (IPA) and then a thorough rinsing and drying. This process is repeated as much as necessary to determine the correct equipment settings and achieve the desired result.
4.3 Application of Metal and Liftoff

Proper wirebonding at the University of Louisville requires a pad thickness of 250 – 300 nm. It is common to use a 20% Ti to 80% Au ratio.[37] Therefore, the traces are applied by applying 50 nm of Ti and then 200 nm of Au. This metallization layer is applied to the entire wafer after photolithography. When properly coated the photoresist is lifted off removing the metal from the areas outside the traces.

In preparation for the metal deposit, the wafer is first cleaned of organic particulates to ensure clean access to the GaAs. This is accomplished using oxygen plasma ashing. Plasma ashing uses partially ionized oxygen to remove organic matter from the wafer. Two common contaminants removed in this matter are carbon oxides and water vapor. It is particularly important to remove these contaminants in the case of applying titanium due to its high susceptibility to oxidation. It is also important to note that oxygen plasma ashing will also remove photoresist so it is critical to limit the amount of ashing at this point so that contaminants are removed but the vast majority of the photoresist remains intact for metallization and liftoff. Therefore, at this point the sample is ashed for only 30 seconds.

The process of oxygen plasma ashing is performed in a modified microwave oven designed for this purpose in CeNSE. This machine is fitted with a vacuum pump, oxygen supply, and vacuum chamber. First, the sample is placed in an air tight chamber consisting of a Pyrex dish over a sealing mat in the oven compartment. The vacuum pump is used to vacate the air from the chamber. Then oxygen is supplied to the chamber at a pressure of about 1 mbar. When the microwave is activated, the oxygen is partially ionized creating a plasma around the sample that bonds with organic materials on the
surface. When finished, the oxygen is turned off and the vacuum pump is again applied to remove the lifted contaminants before restoring normal air pressure and removing the sample. This process is done immediately before metallization to ensure the wafer is as free of contaminating organics as possible.

As for depositing the metals, the first three attempts were all made using sputtering. Sputtering is a process of coating a sample with a thin film from a particular target material. The equipment used in this experiment was a small plasma sputterer in CeNSE. The sample is placed on an anode surface in a vacuum chamber opposite a cathode target composed of the material to be deposited. Process gases are used to create a plasma under vacuum which bombards the target material and ejects molecules onto the sample. It is important that the projectile mass match the target mass for efficient momentum transfer and maximum energy transfer. In this case, the inert gas argon is used. The plasma is created by the collision of high energy electrons (accelerated from the cathode toward the anode) with the neutral atoms. As the current grows, there is eventually enough ions and electrons for the plasma to be self-sustaining. It is important to maintain the proper gas pressure during this process. If the pressure is too low, insufficient collisions will occur due to the lack of atoms. If the pressure is too high, the overabundance of atoms will cause too many collisions and the electrons will not gain sufficient energy to ionize the gas.

In each case, the 50 nm titanium layer was deposited first using a 50 W power setting and 15 standard cubic centimeter per minute (sccm) argon flow rate. Then the 200 nm gold layer was deposited using a 35 W setting to start the plasma interactions and
a 25 W setting during the sputtering. Again with the gold, the argon flow rate was set at 15 sccm. The gold was applied by attempting 1000 angstroms or (100 nm) at a time.

After the metal deposits, the remaining photoresist is then removed (during liftoff). As the photoresist is removed the metal on top of the photoresist is also removed. Just as mentioned in section 4.2, the photoresist is removed just as if one were cleaning all the photoresist off for another photolithography attempt. This removal is done by applying acetone and IPA with a thorough rinse of ultra-pure water. It was also mentioned in section 4.2 that the desired ratio of photoresist thickness to metal thickness is approximately 10:1. This is desired so that the process of liftoff may occur more effectively. It is also desired that the photoresist have a slight beveled angle at the substrate so that the acetone is more readily able to reach the bottom of the photoresist.

![Figure 4.3 - Optimal Liftoff Scenario](image-url)
This combination of metallization and liftoff was the most challenging hurdle in the fabrication process. In the first attempt, the liftoff process removed the gold layer from the substrate in addition to photoresist. However, it appeared the titanium layer remained. It is theorized that the oxidation of the titanium during the switching of targets in the sputtering machine prevented the gold from properly adhering. A second attempt was planned to address this issue. In order to make a new attempt, the LT-GaAs must be cleaned to remove the remaining titanium. Unfortunately, an improper cleaning solution was used. The wafer was cleaned using RCA-2 which removes metallic residues. It is commonly used under these conditions with silicon substrates; however, it is not suitable for GaAs. RCA-2 is 6 parts H₂O (DI Water) to 1 part HCl₂ (Hydrochloric Acid) to 1 part H₂O₂ (Hydrogen Peroxide) and unfortunately etches GaAs. Therefore the process damaged the wafer beyond use. New substrates without the low temperature layer were purchased. It was believed that these substrates would function for the THz system transmitter but not the receiver since short carrier lifetimes are only required on the detection antenna. Therefore, the commercially available THz antenna illustrated in Figure 4.1 was also purchased to use as a receiver.

In the second sputtering attempt, the issue of titanium oxidation was addressed by altering the way the targets were changed during sputtering. The small sputtering machine used only allows one target at a time. Therefore, in order to switch from titanium to gold, the vacuum on the chamber must be released and the cover opened. This subjects the substrate to open air. In order to overcome this challenge, the chamber was flooded with nitrogen (Ni) during the exchange of targets. In addition, this exchange was done as quickly as possible by an experienced user. All other variables remained the
same since the titanium appeared to adhere on the earlier attempt. Additional steps were taken during lift off to allow maximum chance for success. Instead of using a sonic cleaner to apply the acetone to the covered substrate, the substrate was allowed to sit in calm acetone on a hot plate set at 60°C for tens of hours with occasional swishing. Although some photoresist area had begun to lift off, the process was taking too long and a new approach was attempted. The least intrusive way to remove the remaining photoresist and subsequent unwanted metal layers was to use extended time in the plasma ash. The substrate was put in plasma ash for no more than 6 minutes at time repeatedly so that the substrate would not experience unwanted thermal stress. This was continued until no further progress was observed. After this attempt, approximately 20% of the antennas looked usable under the microscope. The other 80% either did not adhere properly or had remaining undesired metal leading to possible interconnections. It was also noted that this time the adherence problem was not between the titanium and the gold but between the titanium and the substrate. Unfortunately, as the wafer went through subsequent processing in the form of dicing, cleaving, and embedding onto a printed circuit board, it was observed that the suspected good antenna structures either were damaged or failed to adhere.

For the third attempt, additional steps were taken to solve the problem of adherence. This time, the same quick exchange of targets and minimizing of oxygen in the chamber during the switch were performed. In addition, an additional cleaning of the wafer before the sputtering was performed. The wafer was placed in an ammonium hydroxide bath consisting of 1 part NH₄OH and 10 parts ultra-pure H₂O (UPW) for 60 seconds followed by a 60 second UPW rinse. This method was chosen because it is
known to remove gallium oxides and photoresist scum. A modified RCA1 cleaning of
5:2:50 NH₄OH:H₂O₂:distilled H₂O for 60 seconds followed by a 60 second UPW rinse
was considered but rejected because although it is more effective in removal of
photoresist scum, it is known to slightly etch GaAs and leave oxides. With these
additional steps, the antenna yield improved to approximately 50%. The samples were
cleaved and embedded in PCBs. However, even though the adherence was significantly
improved, the traces were still not adhering adequately for wire bonding (see section 4.5).
Some examples of the most successful antennas are shown in Figure 4.4, Figure 4.5, and
Figure 4.6.

Figure 4.4 - Picture of Fabricated Bowtie with Full Coplanar Line Separation
Subsequent attempts will be made with other metallization approaches. The next attempts will utilize electron beam evaporation at the recommendation of Dr. Hastings, University of Kentucky. This is a more commonly used approach for GaAs processing. In electron beam evaporation, the target anode is bombarded by an electron beam from a charged filament under vacuum. This beam transforms the target atoms into a gaseous
phase. These atoms then precipitate on the desired substrate. This method adds the benefits of more directional application of the metal (line of sight) and increased wear resistance.

4.4 Cleaving and Dicing

After the metal traces are applied to the substrate, it must be cut into the desired pieces for real application. This is achieved using either dicing or cleaving. All of the wafers used in this experiment have a [100] orientation. This means that molecular structure of the wafer is such that it should easily separate along lattice lines in the vertical and horizontal normal directions. Therefore, the blocks to be separated are placed with “streets” for cutting in the horizontal and vertical directions (see Figure 4.2). The first attempt of separating the wafer along the “cleave lines” or “streets” was first attempted using dicing. Dicing uses a fine diamond tipped saw to cut the wafer as desired. However, the specific dicing machine used did not handle manipulation of the wafer between cuts well and much of the wafer was broken in undesired places. The dicing process was ceased and the remaining “cuts” were accomplished using cleaving.

With cleaving, the wafer is etched with a diamond scribe along the desired break line. Gentle even pressure is applied such that the wafer breaks or “cleaves” along the desired line. This method proved to be very successful with no undesired results. Therefore, it was used for all later separations of the wafer.
4.5 Embedding on Printed Circuit Boards

Finally, in order to supply voltage biases to the antenna coplanar lines and make the desired current measurements on the receiver, these antenna structures must have connections to the necessary equipment. The same antenna holder used with the commercial THz transmit antenna was to be used for the fabricated antennas. Therefore, printed circuit boards using the same form factor were created. The antenna holder is the T8-H2 Alignment Package from Thorlabs, Inc./Menlo.

Figure 4.7 - Picture of T8-H2 Alignment Package

It is designed for use with the antenna in Figure 4.1. This antenna has the general form factor described in Figure 4.8 with the antenna gap designed to be placed in the center of the four mounting holes.
The fabricated antennas are placed on wafer pieces such that they are situated in two columns and varying amounts of rows as in Figure 4.9.
In this manner a high number of antennas can be fabricated and tested with a limited number of boards. The printed circuit test boards are made so that they can fit the mounting posts of the holder but also be maneuvered to focus the laser pulse on the different antennas. This is accomplished by changing the post holes to sliders and created two sets, one for each column of antennas (see Figure 4.10).

The wafer blocks are epoxied to the rear of the boards such that the laser pulse can be directed at the gap through the hole in the board. This will allow the THz radiation to be emitter out the back of the wafer (see Figure 4.11).
Since the current antenna traces did not adhere strong enough for wire bonding, six antennas (3 different designs on two different boards) are connected to the PCB by wire bonding one end of a wire to the PCB and connecting the other end to the antenna pads via conductive paste. Although, not ideal, this connection is sufficient for preliminary testing (see Section 5). Wires are then soldered to the pads on the PCB so that connections to the necessary equipment can be made. Two completed boards are illustrated in Figure 4.12 and Figure 4.13.
Figure 4.12 - Finished Antenna Set A

Figure 4.13 - Finished Antenna Set B
5 TESTING

5.1 Testing Approach and Goals

Terahertz waves can be generated by exciting a voltage-biased antenna placed on a photoconductive semiconductor wafer with an extremely short laser pulse [2]. The pulsed laser generates charge carriers in the substrate which are swept onto the metallic antenna traces to produce an electric current that radiates a terahertz band signal. The laser pulse on the emitter is referred to as the pump pulse. A similar approach is used for detection where the voltage bias is not needed. Instead the charge carriers generated by the laser pulse are moved by the incoming signal radiated from the transmitter. This charge carrier movement similarly produces an electric current. The laser pulse on the detector is referred to as the probe pulse.

This method is used to conduct experiments using the fabricated antennas in Chapter 4. The goal of this experiment is to measure the current in the detector antenna in the presence of the incident THz wave. By varying the time delay between the pump and probe pulses, the time dependent amplitude of the THz radiation is measured. The frequency response of the THz radiation is then deduced using a Fourier transform [25].

5.2 Current vs. Voltage Curves

First, the connectivity and functionality of the antennas is tested by investigating the current-voltage relationship of the substrate through the connections on the PCB. The substrate is expected to function as a resistor in the absence of photogeneration. This is
confirmed by measuring the dark current (or current in the absence of photogeneration) at varying bias voltages. The bias voltage is applied across the antenna gap by connecting the leads from the PC board that connect to the coplanar lines of the antenna to a voltage source. The current through the antenna is then measured at varying supply voltages from 1V to 35V. The current-voltage relationships of the six successfully fabricated antennas are found in Figure 5.1.

![I-V Curves](image)

**Figure 5.1 - Antenna Current vs. Voltage Curves**

### 5.3 Equipment Setup and Specifications

THz radiation experiments are conducted using the approach described in Section 5.1 using the facilities at the Ultrafast Spectroscopy Lab at the University of Louisville.
A Ti:Sapphire laser with < 150 fs laser pulse at 775 nm is used to supply the pump and probe pulses. A manual delay stage is used to set an initial delay for the probe pulse to compensate for the transmission time of the emitted THz wave. A motorized delay stage and lock in amplifier are used to record the time-dependent current intensities. Figure 5.2 is a diagram of the experiment setup.

![Figure 5.2 - THz Spectroscopy System Setup](image)

The emitter and detector antennas are mounted in the T8-H2 alignment package holders with a focusing lens directing the laser beam on one side and a silica lens collimating the radiated wave for maximum efficiency. Parabolic mirrors are used to direct the THz wave from the emitter to the detector. Figure 5.3 and Figure 5.4 show a closer schematic and demonstration picture of the transmission portion of the setup.
Figure 5.3 - THz Transmission Diagram

Figure 5.4 - Test Demonstration Setup
To maximize the signal on the detector, the transmission portion of the testing setup is isolated from normal atmospheric conditions by purging the atmosphere in the area. The purge box in Figure 5.5 is used with a flow valve to continually flood the testing area with nitrogen during the experiment.

![Purge Box](image)

**Figure 5.5 - Purge Box**

### 5.4 Results

Multiple attempts were made with various combinations of emitter and detector antenna using the commercial purchased antenna and the six fabricated antennas. Although it is believed that some interaction between the emitter and detector was detected on occasion, successful measurements were not achieved. Various voltage biases were attempted. Many focusing attempts were made with and without the focusing lenses to place the beam spot on the dipole gap. Measurements were attempted using the ammeter and the lock-in amplifier directly.
Unfortunately, all our antennas were either burned up or damaged during the testing with no valid results recorded. The laser and lab equipment used was at least 10,000 times too powerful. The commercial antenna datasheet lists a maximum optical pulse energy of 0.1 nJ. It recommends < 10 mW of optical pulse power with around 100 MHz repetition rate and a < 100 fs pulse. Therefore, the optical pulse energy

\[ E = \frac{P_{\text{pulse}}}{\text{Rate}_{\text{repetition}}} = \frac{10 \text{ mW}}{100 \times 10^6 \text{ Hz}} = 0.1 \text{ nJ}. \] (5.1)

However, the laser system used had an optical pulse power around 10-40 mW, a pulse duration of < 150 fs, but a 1 kHz repetition rate. Therefore, the optical pulse energy can be approximated by

\[ E = \frac{P_{\text{pulse}}}{\text{Rate}_{\text{repetition}}} = \frac{10 \text{ mW}}{10^3 \text{ Hz}} = 10 \mu\text{J}. \] (5.2)

The much more powerful optical pulse energy scorched the antenna and substrate beyond use. The fabricated antennas were also damaged in similar fashion. It is assumed that the fabricated antenna have similar damage thresholds as the commercial antenna. Further testing will require a laser system with a much higher repetition rate or lower optical pulse energy. The burned antennas are shown in Figure 5.6, Figure 5.7, Figure 5.8, Figure 5.9, and Figure 5.10.
Figure 5.6 - Damaged Commercial Antenna

Figure 5.7 - Damaged Fabricated Antenna 1
Figure 5.8 - Damaged Fabricated Antenna 2

Figure 5.9 - Damaged Fabricated Antenna 3
In addition to the damage from the laser, the additional antenna suffered cracks between the dipole and the pads. These cracks occurred while manipulating the antenna during testing. Figure 5.10, Figure 5.11, Figure 5.12 show the cracks in the coplanar lines.
Finally, Takehito Suzuki at the Ibaraki University was able to print traces on some LT-GaAs and SI-GaAs wafers and conduct some testing of several bowtie antennas (see Chapter 3.4 for more information). The antennas are illustrated in Figure 5.13 and Figure 5.14.
Figure 5.13 - Suzuki Fabricated Full Coplanar Line Separation Bowtie Antennas[26]

Figure 5.14 - Suzuki Fabricated Half Coplanar Line Separation Bowtie Antennas[26]
6 CONCLUSIONS

In conclusion, in this thesis the coupling of Maxwell’s equations and the semiconductor physics equations governing the functionality of the THz photoconductive antenna were presented. A solution of the coupled set of equations via a Discontinuous Galerkin Finite Element Time Domain (DGFETD) method was also presented. A port implementation of the semiconductor interactions with the excitation laser was used for the proposed formulation.

The DGFETD method was validated through the simulation of a number of photoconductive THz antenna devices, including double sided dipole, bowtie, and split-ring resonator antenna structures. The simulated results were validated through comparison with experimental data from publications and testing. Interesting characteristics of the antenna design were illustrated including, but not limited to, the shifting of resonant frequency due to the placement of the coplanar lines, the flattening of the emission intensity response by the use of bowtie geometry, the amplification of peak intensities due to the addition of a second ring in the split-ring resonator structures, and the effects of gap placement in the split-ring resonators.

Fabrication of devices was competed using photolithography, application of traces, liftoff, cleaving, and embedding into printed circuit boards. During this process, faulty attempts were encountered. More successful methods were identified and evaluated. More specifically, cleaning the wafer thoroughly with oxygen plasma ashing and an ammonium hydroxide bath with an ultra-pure water rinse and minimizing the exposure of
the wafer and traces to air between changing the trace materials during sputtering yielded the best results.

The functionality of these devices was demonstrated with the measurement of dark current vs. voltage bias. Spectroscopy testing was conducted and challenges were identified and evaluated. Specifications for further testing were presented. Successful printing and testing of devices was accomplished via a partnership with Taketo Suzuki, et al.

In summary, the DGFETD method coupled with photoconductive antenna device physics was validated and used to evaluate various antenna structures. A road map for successful fabrication and testing of photoconductive antennas on a LT-GaAs substrate was also presented.
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