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Abstract—Heating effects on the light power vs. current characteristic of planar top-emitting vertical-cavity laser diodes are analyzed by thermal, optical and electrical modeling. The two-dimensional finite element thermal-electrical simulation considers the spatial current funneling in the top p-doped distributed Bragg reflector and a current density dependent resistivity of the hetero-barrier. Layered regions are described by anisotropic material parameters. Non-uniform refractive index temperature coefficients of the semiconductor materials are applied in the vertical optical modeling. The strongly inhomogeneous temperature distribution causes thermal increases of emission wavelength and reflectivity as well as decreases of threshold gain and external quantum efficiency with rising current. Finally, the calculated maximum light power is found to be decisively affected by the temperature coefficients of the refractive indices.

I. INTRODUCTION

Vertical-cavity surface-emitting laser (VCSEL) diodes are a promising new generation of optical sources which may be utilized in future information processing and communication systems [1]. To support further VCSEL development, modeling efforts are needed to understand and limit several troublesome effects. One of these effects is the thermally induced decrease of output power with higher current seen in a roll-over of the light power vs. current (PI) characteristic. Recently, investigations of this behavior include PI-curve simulations for index-guided VCSELs with upper distributed Bragg reflectors (DBR) formed by etching [2]–[4]. In the present paper, a planar gain-guided top-emitting structure [5] is analyzed. Here, more attention has to be paid to thermal modeling than in the index-guided case because of the non-uniformity of heat generation and heat flux within the p-doped DBR. Such diodes are lasing in continuous wave (CW) at up to 120 C ambient temperature [6], indicating a temperature rise in the active region of more than 100 K during room temperature CW operation. The heating within the p-DBR is even higher and is not without impact on the optical properties of the VCSEL. Our letter focuses on the reduction of threshold gain \( g_{th} \) and external quantum efficiency \( \eta_{ext} \) caused by thermally induced mirror reflectivity, and its consequences for the PI characteristic. This particular effect has not been reported yet and is of general interest for gain-guided and index-guided VCSEL structures. The modeling procedure\(^1\) is given schematically in Fig. 1.

Our device example is a three-quantum-well \( \text{In}_{0.2}\text{Ga}_{0.8}\text{As} / \text{GaAs} \) top-emitting VCSEL with an emission wavelength of typically \( \lambda_0 = 980 \) nm. It contains a stepped-index cavity (Al fraction varied from 0.125 to 0.5) plus GaAs spacer sandwiched between the 19.5 period top DBR (p-doping: \( 4 \times 10^{18} \) cm\(^{-3} \)) and the 23.5 period bottom DBR (n-doping: \( 2 \times 10^{18} \) cm\(^{-3} \)) on 300 nm GaAs substrate. To reduce series resistance, the interfaces of the AlAs/GaAs p-DBR stack include 4 nm thick Al\(0.5\text{Ga}_{0.5}\text{As} \) interlayers and are p-b-doped as described in [7]. Within the top DBR, proton implantation provides lateral current funneling with 6 \( \mu \)m minimum diameter, 2.5 \( \mu \)m below the top surface.

Excessive Joule heating within the p-DBR is considered the main heat source due to potential barriers at the in-
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1. Further details of the model will be published elsewhere.
terfaces of the semiconductor lattice. The resistivity of the stepped AlAs/GaAs interface has been calculated by solving the Schrödinger-Poisson-System [8], but the unknown distribution of the p-dopant Beryllium [7] remains a major uncertainty. Tunneling currents depend crucially on the shape of the potential spike and therefore on the doping profile. Thus, measurements on separated p-DBR stacks were performed [9], yielding the resistivity vs. current density function \( \varrho(j) = 1117 \, \Omega \, \text{cm} \,(j/A \, \text{cm}^{-2})^{-0.792} \), which describes the vertical p-DBR resistivity, whereas the lateral resistivity parallel to the interfaces is much lower.

For the thermal-electrical simulation, the three-dimensional finite element code ANSYS [10] is employed, permitting anisotropic material parameters. First, the spatial current density distribution \( j(r,z) \) \((r,z)\)-cylinder coordinates) is calculated self-consistently, which determines the thermal power density distribution \( q^T \) within the p-DBR. Besides this main heat source, the contact resistance, active region heating, and internal light absorption are taken into account by solving the thermal conduction equation. Herein, the thermal conductivity \( k \) of layered structures depends on the heat flux direction. In general, a simple connection of serial or parallel thermal sheet resistances can be assumed for the calculation of vertical and lateral conductivities \( k_v \) and \( k_l \), respectively. Especially for the AlAs/GaAs lattice, a vertical value of \( k_v \approx 0.3 \, \text{W/cm K} \) has been measured [11], which is less than half of \( k_l = 0.69 \, \text{W/cm K} \). Thus, most of the heat generated in the p-DBR flows first in the lateral direction to reach the bottom contact of the substrate (heat sink \( T = 300 \, \text{K} \)). With high values of the current \( I \), the resulting temperature distribution \( T(r,z) \) shows a temperature rise of more than 100 K within the optical resonator. Fig. 2 displays solutions \( T(0,z) \) along the resonator axis of our device. Each current value \( I \) is connected with a certain temperature distribution, leading to laser threshold parameters as function of \( I \).

The next step in the simulation procedure is the vertical optical modeling of the electromagnetic field distribution within the VCSEL resonator at laser threshold. For this purpose, Maxwell Equations are solved by the transfer matrix method (TMM). Here, the propagation of forward and backward traveling waves through the layers is performed by matrix multiplications. The tangential field components must be continuous at the interfaces and, with a further inverse matrix multiplication, yield the wave amplitudes in the next layer [12]. Recursive calculations for all layers give the overall transfer matrix of this device. The laser condition (no external light absorption) is calculated self-consistently, which determines the thermal power density distribution \( q^{\text{therm}} \) in the cavity, due to the small thermal conductivity of the AlAs/GaAs confinement layer.

The device example, the thermal shifts of the TMM results \( \eta_{\text{therm}} \) and \( \lambda_0 \) are shown in Fig. 2, considering the axial temperature distributions in Fig. 2. The dependency \( n(T) \) dominates these effects, whereas \( d(T) \) is without remarkable influence. The emission wavelength \( \lambda_0 \) rises with increasing temperature, due to an enlarged optical length of the cavity. But the threshold gain \( g_{\text{th}} \) as well as the external quantum efficiency \( \eta_{\text{ext}} \) are substantially reduced by the heating. In the lower index material (AlAs, \( n_0 = 2.96 \)) the increase rate \( \beta \) is smaller than in GaAs (\( n_0 = 3.52 \)). Thus, the DMR reflectivity \( (n_{\text{GaAs}} - n_{\text{AlAs}})^2/(n_{\text{GaAs}} + n_{\text{AlAs}})^2 \) is thermally improved, more radiation is kept inside and less gain is necessary for lasing. This is in contrast to the computed results in [4], where \( \beta = 4 \times 10^{-4} \, \text{K}^{-1} \) is assumed uniform in all materials and, consequently, the reflectivity decreases with temperature, resulting in higher values of \( g_{\text{th}} \) and \( \eta_{\text{ext}} \). Taking the temperature \( T_{\text{QW}} \) of the QWs as abscissa in Fig. 3, nearly linear temperature dependencies of these three parameters
1.1 occur and the relative change per 100 K is 0.9%, -7.4% and -19.5% for $\lambda_0$, $g_{th}$ and $\eta_{ext}$, respectively. The first value is in good agreement with the measured thermal red-shift of the lasing wavelength (0.9% [3], 0.7% [5]). PI measurements at different heat sink temperatures confirm a reduction of $\eta_{ext}$ with rising temperature [5], [6]. In principle, $g_{th}$ could be calculated from the measured threshold current [3], but with theoretical parameters which are too uncertain to give an unambiguous verification of the simulated $g_{th}$ lowering.

Lateral waveguiding is not included in our model, but thermal lensing [17] would even strengthen the $g_{th}$ reduction. The increase of absorption with temperature weakens the $g_{th}$ drop, but its quantitative consideration requires more experimental investigations.

The next modeling step is the calculation of the gain function $g(N, \lambda_0, T_{QW})$ to derive the threshold carrier density $N_{th}$ from the already known parameters $g_{th}$, $\lambda_0$ and $T_{QW}$. Doing this, we assume direct transitions between parabolic bands with a Lorentzian broadening function and include the compressive strain within the QWs [18]. The temperature dependence of the gain is due to the temperature dependencies of gap energy and quasi-Fermi levels. The threshold density leads to the threshold current $I_{th}$, which is calculated by adding the contributions of Shockley-Read-Hall recombination, spontaneous emission, Auger recombination and vertical leakage (recombination within the confinement layers [18]). Only the last two recombination currents are computed to rise strongly enough with temperature to cause the Pi rollover. For the present example, room temperature values of $N_{th} = 1.6 \times 10^{15} \text{ cm}^{-3}$ and $I_{th} = 2.2 \text{ mA}$ are obtained. Due to the thermally increased mismatch between $\lambda_0(I)$ and the wavelength of maximum gain, $N_{th}(I)$ is rising despite the $g_{th}$ reduction. At $I = 40 \text{ mA}$ the threshold current $I_{th}(I)$ is almost seven times higher than at room temperature.

With $\eta_{ext}(I)$, $\lambda_0(I)$ and finally $I_{th}(I)$, all quantities are gathered to calculate the PI characteristic (see Fig. 1). Using the previous results, a maximum output power of $P_{max} = 4.6 \text{ mW}$ occurs at $I = 36 \text{ mA}$ (solid curve in Fig. 4). This PI curve is compared to the assumption of an uniform temperature coefficient $\beta = 4 \times 10^{-4} \text{K}^{-1}$ in all materials (dashed curve in Fig. 4) increasing $P_{max}$ by 55% due to the rising external quantum efficiency. In the case without any temperature dependency of the refractive index $\beta = 0$ (dotted curve in Fig. 4) a medium value of $P_{max}$ is obtained because the thermal shifts of $\eta_{ext}$, $g_{th}$ and $\lambda_0$ are vanishing. For comparison with actual devices, the theoretical PI curve has to be fitted to the measurement under special consideration of the particular leakage current [3].

In summary, with emphasis on thorough thermal modeling a numerical procedure has been developed to simulate the light power vs. current characteristic of planar gain-guided vertical-cavity top surface-emitting laser diodes. Applying the proper refractive index temperature coefficient of the different semiconductor materials results in thermally caused reductions of threshold gain and external quantum efficiency with rising current. These shifts are shown to be essential for computing the maximum output power of the laser diode.
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