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Abstract—A small signal analysis for a separate-absorption-charge-multiplication (SACM) avalanche photodetector (APD) is presented for the general case when the electrons and the holes have different ionization coefficients and different velocities. The analytic expressions for the impedance and frequency response are given and a simplified equivalent circuit (including an inductance with a series resistance in parallel with a capacitance) for the APD is obtained. The calculation and experimental results show that the impedance of the APD operated at high bias voltages has a maximal value at a certain frequency due to the resonance of the LC-circuit, and this is the origin for a peak-enhancement of the frequency response.

Index Terms—Avalanche photodetector (APD), Ge, Si.

I. INTRODUCTION

HIGHLY sensitive photodetectors are desirable for a wide range of applications. One important metric is the gain-bandwidth product (GBP), which is typically in the 80–200 GHz range for III–V avalanche photodetectors (APDs), as is expected for a $k$ value (i.e., the ionization ratio) $\sim 0.4–0.5$ [1]. Silicon has a low $k$-value ($<0.1$), which is desirable for a high GBP, and can be applied to communication applications at 1.3 and 1.55 $\mu$m, respectively, when combined with a material with a high absorption coefficient in the infrared, such as InGaAs [2] or Ge [3]–[5]. Kang et al. reported CMOS-compatible Ge/Si separate-absorption-charge-multiplication (SACM) APDs with a GBP as high as 340 GHz [3]. Zaoui et al. [6], [7] examined higher voltage operation of these diodes and observed a peak enhancement of the frequency response and high gain bandwidth products (840 GHz). Peak enhancement has also been observed for other types of APDs [9]–[11] and is sometimes explained as due to space charge effects. In our previous paper [12], we noted that the impedance for the Ge/Si APD could be fit with an equivalent circuit containing an inductive element and the parameters for the elements in the equivalent circuit were extracted by fitting the measured $S_{22}$ with a genetic algorithm optimization. It was shown that the inductive element plays an important role for the peak enhancement of the frequency response.

Small signal modeling based on fundamental equations (e.g., the Poisson equation and the semiconductor transport equations) is a fundamental and important approach to understand the RF behavior of an APD. Small signal analysis is helpful to make clear the physical mechanism and consequently has been used very widely, e.g., for an RF analysis for impact ionization avalanche transit-time (IMPATT) diodes [13], [14], and for p–n junctions in breakdown [15]. The previous small signal model was developed for IMPATT oscillators and usually with the assumption that the electrons and the holes have equal ionization rates and velocities [15]. In [16], Manasse et al. considered the differences in hole and electron velocities and ionization rates and gave an improved dispersion relationship of a p–n junction avalanche diode, however, for the case with a single uniform depletion layer.

In this paper, we present a small signal analysis to calculate the impedance characteristic and the frequency response of an SACM APD, which includes different parameters for the absorption layer and the multiplication layer. Specifically, we consider the general case that the electrons and the holes have different ionization coefficients and different velocities. It is the first derivation of the peak enhancement of the frequency response. Furthermore, we use this analysis to derive the equivalent circuit model for an SACM APD. From the small signal analysis, we obtain analytical expressions for the impedance and the short-circuit frequency response of the APD and compare to experimental results for Ge/Si APDs as an example.

II. THEORY

Fig. 1 shows the schematic configuration of an SACM APD. There is thin charge layer between the multiplication layer and the absorption layer, which is doped such that one obtains sufficient gain via a high electric field in the multiplication layer, but the electric field in the absorber is low enough that avalanche gain almost does not occur in the absorption layer (see Fig. 1). The charge layer is usually very thin (100 nm in [3]), so we simplify the APD structure into an avalanche layer and an absorption layer, with uniform electrical fields in each. In the following analysis, we consider the avalanche region and the drift region separately.
where
\[
\begin{align*}
A_3 &= \frac{-i\varepsilon_a(\omega|v_{na}|/|v_{pa}| - \gamma_1|v_{na}|)}{1 + |v_{na}|/|v_{pa}|} \\
B_1 &= \frac{-i\varepsilon_a(\omega + \gamma_1|v_{na}|)}{1 + |v_{na}|/|v_{pa}|} \\
A_2 &= \frac{-i\varepsilon_a(\omega|v_{na}|/|v_{pa}| - \gamma_2|v_{na}|)}{1 + |v_{na}|/|v_{pa}|} \\
B_2 &= \frac{-i\varepsilon_a(\omega + \gamma_2|v_{na}|/|v_{pa}|)}{1 + |v_{na}|/|v_{pa}|} \\
A_3 &= \frac{-|v_{na}|\alpha_0}{\alpha_0|v_{na}| + |c|v_{pa}|} - i\omega \\
B_3 &= \frac{-|v_{pa}|\alpha_0}{\alpha_0|v_{na}| + |c|v_{pa}|} - i\omega
\end{align*}
\]
and the eigenvalues $\gamma_1$ and $\gamma_2$ are given by
\[
\gamma_{1,2} = \frac{1}{2}(-b_0 + \sqrt{b_0^2 - 4c_0})
\]
in which
\[
\begin{align*}
b_0 &= -\left[i(c-1)\alpha_0 + \omega \left(\frac{1}{|v_{pa}|} - \frac{1}{|v_{na}|}\right)\right] \\
c_0 &= \frac{1}{\varepsilon_a} \left(\frac{1}{|v_{na}|} + \frac{1}{|v_{pa}|}\right) \alpha_0\bar{J} - \frac{1}{|v_{na}||v_{pa}|} \omega^2 \\
&- i \left(\frac{1}{|v_{na}|} + \frac{1}{|v_{pa}|}\right) \omega\alpha_0.
\end{align*}
\]

The total ac current is given by $J = \tilde{J}_n + \tilde{J}_p + \tilde{J}_d$, where the displacement current $\tilde{J}_d = i\omega\varepsilon_a \tilde{E}$. Then we have
\[
C_3 = \frac{J}{\alpha_3}
\]
where
\[
\alpha_3 = i\omega\varepsilon_a - \frac{|v_{pa}| + |v_{na}|}{\alpha_0(|v_{na}| + |c|v_{pa}|)} - i\omega\alpha_0\bar{J}.
\]
The constants $C_1$ and $C_2$ will be determined according to the boundary conditions given in the following (see Section II-C).

**B. Drift Region**

Now let us consider the drift region where the basic equations are given as follows:
\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{\partial\tilde{E}}{\partial x} &= \frac{1}{\varepsilon_d} \left(\frac{\tilde{J}_p}{|v_{pd}|} - \frac{\tilde{J}_n}{|v_{nd}|}\right) \\
\frac{\partial\tilde{J}_n}{\partial x} &= \left(\alpha_0 - \frac{i\omega}{|v_{na}|}\right) \tilde{J}_n + \frac{c_0}{\alpha_0} \tilde{J}_p + \tilde{J}_n \alpha_0 \tilde{E} \\
\frac{\partial\tilde{J}_p}{\partial x} &= \alpha_0 \tilde{J}_n + \left(\frac{c_0}{\alpha_0} - \frac{i\omega}{|v_{pa}|}\right) \tilde{J}_p + \tilde{J}_p \alpha_0 \tilde{E}
\end{align*}
\]
where $\tilde{J} = \tilde{J}_{n0} + c\tilde{J}_{p0}$ and $c = \beta/\alpha$. Equation (3) has the following solutions:
\[
\begin{align*}
\tilde{E} &= C_1 e^{-i\gamma_1 x} + C_2 e^{-i\gamma_2 x} + C_3 \\
\tilde{J}_n &= A_1 C_1 e^{-i\gamma_1 x} + A_2 C_2 e^{-i\gamma_2 x} + A_3 C_3 \\
\tilde{J}_p &= B_1 C_1 e^{-i\gamma_1 x} + B_2 C_2 e^{-i\gamma_2 x} + B_3 C_3
\end{align*}
\]
and
\[
\begin{align*}
\tilde{E} &= C_1' e^{-i\gamma_1' x} + C_2' e^{-i\gamma_2' x} + C_3' \\
\tilde{J}_n &= A_1' C_1' e^{-i\gamma_1' x} + A_2' C_2' e^{-i\gamma_2' x} + A_3' C_3' \\
\tilde{J}_p &= B_1' C_1' e^{-i\gamma_1' x} + B_2' C_2' e^{-i\gamma_2' x} + B_3' C_3'
\end{align*}
\]
where
\[ A_1' = B_2' = -i\omega\varepsilon_d, \]
\[ A_2' = B_1' = 0, \]
\[ \begin{cases} A_3' C_3' = q\tilde{g} \frac{|v_{nd}|}{\omega} & \text{and} \\ B_3' C_3' = q\tilde{g} \frac{|v_{pd}|}{\omega} \end{cases} \]
\[ \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \gamma_1' = -\frac{\omega}{|v_{nd}|} \\ \gamma_2' = \frac{\omega}{|v_{pd}|} \end{array} \right. \]

From \( J = \tilde{J}_n + \tilde{J}_p + i\omega\varepsilon_d \tilde{E} \), we have
\[ C_3' = \frac{J}{a_{3y} + b_{3y}} \]  
(9)

where \( a_{3y} = i\omega\varepsilon_d \) and \( b_{3y} = q\tilde{g}(|v_{nd}| + |v_{pd}|)/\omega^2\varepsilon_d \). The constants \( C_1' \) and \( C_2' \) will be determined according to the following boundary conditions.

### C. Boundary Conditions

At the left side (n-contact) and the right side (p-contact), we have
\[ \tilde{J}_n|_{x=d_d + d_d} = \tilde{J}_n|_{x=0} \]
\[ \tilde{J}_p|_{x=0} = \tilde{J}_p|_{x=d_d} \]
where \( \tilde{J}_n \) and \( \tilde{J}_p \) are the saturation currents of the electrons and holes, respectively. From these two equations for boundary conditions, we have
\[ C_1' = \frac{\tilde{J}_n|_{x=d_d} - q\tilde{g}|v_{nd}|/|\omega|}{A_1' e_{1d'a'}} \]  
(10a)
\[ B_1 C_1 + B_2 C_2 = \tilde{J}_p|_{x=d_d} - B_3 C_3 \]  
(10b)

where \( e_{1d'a'} = \exp[-i\gamma_1'(d_a + d_d)] \).

At the interface between the avalanche region and the drift region, the electron and hole currents should be continuous, i.e.,
\[ J_n|_{x=d_d} = J_n|_{x=d_d} \]  
and \[ J_p|_{x=d_d} = J_p|_{x=d_d} \]  
and consequently we have
\[ A_1 C_1 e_{1a} + A_2 C_2 e_{2a} = A_1' C_1' e_{1a'} + A_3 C_3' - A_3 C_3 \]  
(11a)
\[ B_1 C_1 e_{1a} + B_2 C_2 e_{2a} + B_3 C_3 = B_1' C_1' e_{1a'} + B_3' C_3' + B_3 C_3 \]  
(11b)

where
\[ \begin{cases} e_{1a} = e^{-i\gamma_1 d_a} \\ e_{2a} = e^{-i\gamma_2 d_a} \end{cases} \]
\[ \begin{cases} e_{1a'} = e^{-i\gamma_1' d_a} \\ e_{2a'} = e^{-i\gamma_2' d_a} \end{cases} \]

For the avalanche region \((0 < x < d_a)\), the voltage is given by
\[ V_1 = \int_0^{d_a} \tilde{E} dx = i\frac{C_1}{\gamma_1} (e_{1a} - 1) + i\frac{C_2}{\gamma_2} (e_{2a} - 1) + C_3 d_a. \]

For the drift region \((d_a < x < d_a + d_d)\), the voltage is given by
\[ V_2 = \int_{d_a}^{d_a + d_d} \tilde{E} dx \]
\[ = i\frac{C_1'}{\gamma_1'} (e_{1d'a'} - e_{1a'}) + i\frac{C_2'}{\gamma_2'} (e_{2d'a'} - e_{2a'}) + C_3' d_d \]

where
\[ \begin{cases} e_{1d'a'} = \exp[-i\gamma_1'(d_d + d_a)] \\ e_{2d'a'} = \exp[-i\gamma_2'(d_d + d_a)] \end{cases} \]

The total voltage \( V \) is then given by
\[ V = V_1 + V_2. \]  
(12)

From (10b) and (11a), we have the solutions for \( C_1 \) and \( C_2 \) as given by
\[ C_1 = c_{11} + c_{12} J \]  
(13a)
\[ C_2 = c_{21} + c_{22} J \]  
(13b)

where
\[ \begin{cases} c_{11} = (A_2 e_{2a} b_{11} - B_2 b_{21})/|A| \\ c_{12} = (A_2 e_{2a} b_{12} - B_2 b_{22})/|A| \\ c_{21} = (B_1 b_{21} - A_1 e_{1a})/|A| \\ c_{22} = (B_1 b_{22} - A_1 e_{1a})/|A| \end{cases} \]  
(14)

Now, we obtain the expressions for all the constants \( C_1, C_2, C_3, C_1', C_2', \) and \( C_3' \) [see (13a), (13b), (6), (10a), (14), and (9)] for the solutions (4) and (8). Inserting these results into (12), we have
\[ V = J \left( i\frac{e_{1a} - 1}{\gamma_1} c_{12} + i\frac{e_{2a} - 1}{\gamma_2} c_{22} + \frac{d_a}{a_3} + i\frac{e_{2d'a'} - e_{2a'} - c_{22}}{\gamma_2} + \frac{d_d}{a_3} \right) \]  
(15)

Finally, we have the following analytical expression for the ac current (16), as shown at the bottom of the next page.

From the way impedance is measured and from its definition, we set \( \tilde{g} = 0 \) when calculating the impedance. Consequently, we have
\[ c_{11} \approx 0, \quad c_{21} \approx 0, \quad C_1' = 0, \quad c_{21}' \approx 0, \quad b_{3y} = 0. \]
Thus, the impedance is then given by

\[ Z = \frac{\hat{V}}{J_S} = \frac{1}{S} \left( i \frac{e_{1a} - 1}{\gamma_1} c_{12} + i \frac{e_{2a} - 1}{\gamma_2} c_{22} ight. \\
+ \left. \frac{d_a}{a_3} + i \frac{e_{2a} - e_{2a'}}{\gamma_2} c_{22'} + \frac{d_d}{a_3'} \right) \]  

(17)

where \( S \) is the APD area. With some more derivation (as shown in the Appendix), we obtain a simplified equivalent circuit for the APD impedance given by (17), as shown in Fig. 2. In this equivalent circuit, an inductance, a resistance and a capacitance are included for the avalanche region. The inductance and the series resistance can be explained as follows. When applying an ac bias voltage on the avalanche region, both the ionization coefficient and the carrier density are modulated. The time variation rate of the carrier density \( \partial n / \partial t \) (as well as \( \partial p / \partial t \)) is not only related with the ac electric field but also the carrier density itself. The interaction between the ac electric field and the ac carrier density introduces an inductance with a series resistance. Particularly, the inductance is due to the phase delay between the ac-current and the electric field (i.e., the ac voltage). In the drift region, there is no avalanche process and consequently no inductance effect. The impedance \( Z_{\text{e.d}} \) is then given by

\[ Z_{\text{e.d}} = -\frac{1}{i \omega \varepsilon_0 S / d_d} \frac{1}{S} \frac{1}{i \omega \varepsilon_0} \| v_{pa} \| e_{2a} - e_{2a'} c_{22}' \] 

From these formulae, one sees that the inductance \( L_a \) and the series resistance \( R_a \) are inversely proportional to the direct current \( J S \) and the differential \( \alpha' \). Usually, the inductance ranges from sub-nH to several nH and the series resistance \( R_a \) ranges from hundreds of Ohm to several Ohm, which depends on the value to the direct current \( J S \) and the differential \( \alpha' \).

This simplified equivalent circuit is helpful for understanding the behavior of the APD impedance and frequency responses and to determine matching circuits for the diode. However, for greater accuracy, we use the APD impedance \( Z \) given by (17) in the rest of the calculations, and compare the two calculations in later figures.

The short-circuit frequency response \( I_{sc} \) of the APD is given by setting \( \hat{V} = 0 \) in (16). In order to include the parasitic effects of series resistance \( (R_s) \), transmission line inductance \( (L_p) \) and pad capacitance \( (C_p) \), we use an equivalent circuit as shown in Fig. 3, where \( R_s \) is the series resistance. In this equivalent circuit, the current source \( I_{sc} \) is given by the response of the APD in the short-circuit case and the impedance \( Z \) is given (17).

From Fig. 3, one sees that the current flowing through the load resistance \( R_L \) is given by

\[ I_L = I_{sc} \kappa \]  

(18)

where

\[ \kappa = \frac{Z}{Z + R_s + 1/(i \omega C_p) + 1/(R_L + R_p + i \omega L_p)} \]

\[ \times \frac{1/(i \omega C_p) + (R_L + R_p + i \omega L_p)}{1/(i \omega C_p)}. \] 

(19)

### III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Here we compare these calculations to measurements on normal-incidence illuminated SACM Ge/Si APDs. Fig. 4(a) shows the cross section of the APD [3]. Fig. 4(b) shows the top view of the fabricated APD. The thicknesses and the doping concentrations for all layers are shown in Fig. 4(c). A silicon-nitride film was deposited and serves as an antireflection coating in the 1310 nm window to improve the quantum efficiency.

From the measured \( I-V \) curves, the dc current is on the order of mA. Even though dc current density for the electrons \( (J_{e0}) \) and for the holes \( (J_{p0}) \) are \( x \)-dependent, in order to have a simplified model we use the averaged current density and assume \( J_{e0} = J_{p0} \) in the calculation below. From the Silvaco simulation for the

\[
J = \frac{\hat{V} - i((e_{1a} - 1)/\gamma_1)c_{11} + i((e_{2a} - 1)/\gamma_2)c_{21} + i(C_1'/\gamma_1'((e_{2a} - e_{2a'})/\gamma_2') + i((e_{2a} - e_{2a'})/\gamma_2'))c_{22} + (d_3/a_3) + i((e_{2a} - e_{2a'})/\gamma_2')c_{22'} + (d_4/a_3')}{i((e_{1a} - 1)/\gamma_1)c_{12} + i((e_{2a} - 1)/\gamma_2)c_{22} + (d_3/a_3) + i((e_{2a} - e_{2a'})/\gamma_2')c_{22'} + (d_4/a_3')} 
\] 

(16)
TABLE I

AVALANCHE COEFFICIENTS FOR SI AND GE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>material</th>
<th>electrons</th>
<th>holes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Si</td>
<td>$A_e \times 10^7$</td>
<td>$1.58 \times 10^8$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ge</td>
<td>$1.55 \times 10^9$</td>
<td>$1.0 \times 10^9$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

dc electric field distribution shown in [7], one sees that electric field strength is around 400 kV/cm in the avalanche region at a high reverse bias voltage. Therefore, here we give an analysis for the performance of the APD operated at around $E = 400$ kV/cm.

The ionization coefficients for the electrons and the holes are given by:

$$\alpha, \beta = A_0 \exp(-B_0/E)$$

where the coefficients are given in Table I [17]. In Table I, the electron/hole saturation velocities of Si and Ge are also given [7]. In our calculation, we use the saturation velocities. This is true at high bias voltage which is the case considered in this paper.

Fig. 5(a) shows the real part and the imaginary part of the impedance $Z$, which shows a strong dependence on the electric-field strength. When the electric field is relatively weak (e.g., $E = 385$ kV/cm), the real part is positive and decreases monotonically with frequency, while the imaginary part is negative and has a minimal value at a certain frequency. This is essentially a parallel-connected resistance–capacitance (RC) circuit, as is seen for a PIN detector. When the electric field is stronger, the impedance becomes very different ($E > 400$ kV/cm curves in Fig. 5(a)). The real part $Z_r$ of the impedance has a peak at a certain frequency $f_r$ and the imaginary part $Z_i$ of the impedance has a transition from a positive to a negative value at almost the same position $f_r$. This indicates that there is an inductance and a capacitance in the equivalent circuit. When $f < f_r$, the imaginary part $Z_i$ is positive since the inductance plays an important role. When $f > f_r$, the capacitance plays an important role and consequently the imaginary part $Z_i$ becomes negative. The inductance effect is because the impact ionization in the avalanche region introduces a phase delay between the ac current and the electric field (i.e., the ac voltage).

In order to compare the measured impedance of the APD with the GSG pads, we calculate the total APD impedance with the parasitic effects, including the inductance $L_p$, the capacitance...
The values for the elements are: $L_p = 0.082 \, \text{nH}$, $C_p = 0.193 \, \text{pF}$, and $R_p = 6.65 \, \Omega$ and $R_n = 16.76 \, \Omega$, which are estimated from the experimental measurements. The calculated impedance with the parasitic effects is shown in Fig. 5(b). When parasitic effects are included, the total impedance is similar to that shown in Fig. 5(a). In Fig. 5(c), we present the real part $Z_r$ and the imaginary part $Z_i$ of the measured impedance for the APD with $D = 80 \, \mu\text{m}$ when the bias voltage varies from $-24.6$ to $-26.6 \, \text{V}$. The impedance was obtained by measuring the microwave reflection parameter $S_{22}$ as the bias voltage is varied by using an Agilent E8364 A network analyzer. From Fig. 5(b) and (c), one sees the calculated results are very close to the measurement results.

In Fig. 6(a) and (b), we also show the calculated and the measured Smith charts. One sees they agree well with each other. The difference between them might be because our model does not include the traps in Ge layer and the interdiffusion layer between the Si and Ge layer. When the bias voltage (or the electric field) is low, the entire curve is below the line $\Gamma_i = 0$ (which corresponds to a resistor and capacitor in parallel, representing the diode capacitance and diode resistance). For a higher bias voltage, one has $\Gamma_i > 0$ in a certain frequency range. The phenomenon becomes stronger when the bias voltage increases further.

For a higher bias voltage, one has $\Gamma_i > 0$ in a certain frequency range. The phenomenon becomes stronger when the bias voltage increases further.
response at low frequency decreases while there is an enhancement in the high frequency range. This enhancement becomes greater as the electric field strength increases. This behavior is also observed in our measurement of APDs. Fig. 7(b) shows the measured frequency responses at different bias voltages (ranging from $-23.8$ to $-26.6$ V). In order to show the origin of the peak enhancement, in Fig. 7(c) we show more details for the frequency response in the case $E = 405$ kV/cm as an example.

In Fig. 7(c), the top curve is for the short-circuit frequency response of APD, which is given by $10 \log_{10}(I_{sc}/P_{in})$. The bottom one is the response for $\kappa$, which is given by (19), and consequently the parasitic effect is included. The dotted one is the frequency response of the current flowing through the load resistance, which is given by $10 \log_{10}(I_L/P_{in}) = 10 \log_{10}(\kappa I_{sc}/P_{in})$. From Fig. 7(c), one sees the peak-enhancement of the response $10 \log_{10}(I_L/P_{in})$ is corresponding to the peak of the coefficient $\kappa$. As we see in Fig. 5, the impedance of the APD (without the parasitic effects) has a maximal value, which results in the peak of the coefficient $\kappa$. Such a peak enhancement of frequency response will enhance the 3-dB bandwidth when the APD operates at high bias voltage. Consequently it is beneficial to achieve high GBP as shown in the previous paper [7].

IV. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we have presented a small signal analysis for an SACM APD and obtained analytical expressions for the impedance and the short-circuit frequency response for the APD. It is the first time the peak enhancement of the frequency response has been presented using small-signal modeling. We have also established an equivalent circuit (including the parasitic effects) for the APD. The theoretical prediction agrees well with the experimental results. From the calculation results, it has been shown that the impedance of the APD will have a maximal value at a certain frequency when the bias voltage is high. This is the origin of a peak-enhancement of the response at a high frequency.

APPENDIX

Here, we obtain the equivalent circuit for the APD impedance $Z$ [given by (17)]. The current density includes two components: the conduction current density and the displacement current density.

1) In the avalanche region, the impedance is given by

$$Z_a = \frac{\tilde{V}_1}{J_{c,a}S + J_{d,a}S} = \frac{1}{(1/Z_{c,a}) + (1/Z_{d,a})}$$  \hfill (A1)

where $J_{c,a}$ and $J_{d,a}$ are the conduction current density and the displacement current density, respectively, and the impedances $Z_{c,a} = \tilde{V}_1/(J_{c,a}S)$ and $Z_{d,a} = \tilde{V}_1/(J_{d,a}S)$. The conduction current density $J_{c,a}$ is given by

$$J_{c,a} = \frac{1}{d_a} \int_0^{d_a} (\tilde{J}_n + \tilde{J}_p) dx.$$  \hfill (A2)

Thus, the impedance is then given by, (A3), as shown at the bottom of this page.

Since $\gamma_1$ and $\gamma_2$ are usually very large (especially at the high frequency), we have

$$\frac{C_1}{\gamma_1} (e^{i\alpha_1} - 1) + \frac{C_2}{\gamma_2} (e^{i\alpha_2} - 1) + C_3 d_a \approx C_3 d_a$$ \hfill (A4)

and

$$Z_{c,a} \equiv R_a + i\omega L_a$$ \hfill (A5)

where

$$R_a = -\alpha_0 \left[ \frac{|v_{na} + iJ_S|}{|v_{na} + iJ_S|} \right] d_a \frac{1}{\alpha' JS} \hfill (A6a)$$

and

$$L_a = \frac{1}{|v_{na} + iJ_S|} d_a \frac{1}{\alpha' JS}. \hfill (A6b)$$

The impedance $Z_{d,a}$ is given as follows:

$$Z_{d,a} = \frac{i\omega \varepsilon a S}{d_a} \equiv i\omega C_a$$ \hfill (A7)

where

$$C_a = \frac{\varepsilon a S}{d_a}.$$ \hfill (A8)

2) In the drift region, similarly we have

$$Z_d = \frac{\tilde{V}_2}{J_{c,d}S + J_{d,d}S} = \frac{1}{1/Z_{c,d} + 1/Z_{d,d}}$$ \hfill (A9)

where $Z_{c,d} = \tilde{V}_2/(J_{c,d}S)$ and $Z_{d,d} = \tilde{V}_2/(J_{d,d}S)$. The conduction current density $J_{c,d}$ is given by

$$J_{c,d} = \frac{1}{d_d} \int_{d_d}^{d_a + d_d} (\tilde{J}_n + \tilde{J}_p) dx.$$ \hfill (A10)

Consequently, we have (A11), as shown at the bottom of this page.

Since $\tilde{g} = 0$ (for calculating the impedance), one has

$$e_{11} \approx 0, e_{21} \approx 0, C'_1 = 0, e_{21'} \approx 0, b_{y'} = 0.$$
Consequently (A11) is rewritten as

\[
Z_{\omega d} = \frac{d_d}{\omega \varepsilon_d S} \left( \frac{d_d}{v_{pd} \varepsilon_d e_{2d\omega} - e_{2a\omega} e_{2\omega}} - 1 \right). \tag{A12}
\]

The impedance \( Z_{\omega d} \) is given as follows:

\[
Z_{\omega d} = \frac{j \omega \varepsilon_d S}{d_d} \equiv j \omega C_d \tag{A13}
\]

where

\[
C_d = \frac{\varepsilon_d S}{d_d}. \tag{A14}
\]

REFERENCES


[5] J. W. Rodwell (F’03) received the B.S. degree from the University of Tennessee, Knoxville, in 1980, and the M.S. and Ph.D. degrees from Stanford University, Stanford, CA, in 1982 and 1988, respectively.

[6] From 1982 to 1984, he was with AT&T Bell Laboratories, Whippany, NJ. He is currently a Professor and Director of the University of California at Santa Barbara (UCSB) Nanofabrication Laboratory and the National Science Foundation Nanofabrication Infrastructure Network at the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, UCSB, Santa Barbara. His research interests include high-bandwidth InP bipolar transistors, compound semiconductor field-effect transistors for very large scale integration (VLSI) applications, and millimeter-wave integrated circuit design in both silicon VLSI and III–V processes.

[7] Dr. Rodwell was the recipient of the 1989 National Science Foundation Presidential Young Investigator Award for his work on GaAs Schottky-diode ICs for subpicosecond/millimeter-wave instrumentation. He was also awarded the 1997 IEEE Microwave Prize.

[8] John E. Bowers (F’93) received the M.S. and Ph.D. degrees from Stanford University, Stanford, CA, in 1982 and 1988, respectively.

[9] He is currently the Director of the Energy Efficiency Institute and a Professor in the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, University of California, Santa Barbara (UCSB). He is also CTO and co-founder of Calient Networks and Chairman of the Board of BioIQ, Santa Barbara, California. He is the cofounder of the Center for Entrepreneurship and Management Engineering, and Founder of Terabit Technology (sold to Ciena). He was also with AT&T Bell Laboratories and Honeywell before joining UCSB. His research interests include silicon photonics, optoelectronic devices, optical switching, and transparent optical networks. He is the author and coauthor of eight book chapters, 450 journal papers, 700 conference papers, and holds 52 patents.

[10] Dr. Bowers is a fellow of the Optical Society of America (OSA) and the American Physical Society, and a recipient of the IEEE Laser and Electro-Optics Society (IEEE LEOS) William Streifer Award and the South Coast Business and Technology Entrepreneur of the Year Award. He was an elected member of the IEEE LEOS Board of Governors, a LEOS Distinguished Lecturer, and Vice President for Conferences for LEOS. He is a member of the National Academy of Engineering. He and coworkers received the ACE Award for Most Promising Technology for the hybrid silicon laser in 2007.
Yimin Kang (M’06) received the B.S. degree from Tsinghua University, Beijing, China, and the M.S. and Ph.D. degrees in material science and engineering from University of California, San Diego, in 1999 and 2003, respectively.

She is currently a Senior Researcher of Intel Corporation, Santa Clara, CA, since 2006. Before joining Intel, she was a Post Graduate Researcher in the University of California, where she was engaged in the development of single photon detector for 1.3–1.55 µm wavelength. Her research interests include silicon photonics and high performance avalanche photodiodes.

Dr. Kang is a member of Laser and Electro-Optics Society.

Mike Morse (M’01) received the B.S. degree in ceramic engineering from Ohio State University, Columbus and the Ph.D. degree in materials science and engineering from Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, in 1997. His Ph.D. thesis was on the erbium doping of epitaxial SiGe for light emission.

He is currently a Principal Engineer in the Photonics Technology Laboratory at Intel Corporation, Santa Clara, CA, where he has been engaged in the research on SiGe p-i-n and avalanche photodetectors.