

A possible scenario of metallization in boron doped diamond CB_x

Yu.G. Pogorelov*

*CFP and Departamento de Física, Faculdade de Ciências,
Universidade do Porto, Rua do Campo Alegre, 687, 4169-007 Porto, Portugal*

V.M. Loktev†

Bogolyubov Institute for Theoretical Physics, Metrologichna str. 14-b, Kiev, 03143 Ukraine

(Dated: November 6, 2018)

Possibility for collectivization of acceptor states in a semiconductor, converting it to metal, is discussed within the scope of Anderson s-d hybrid model. This model is generalized for multi-component band structure and composite acceptor states, localized on pairs of neighbor dopants (impurity “dumbbells”), in order to describe the boron doped diamond CB_x . The resulting parameters of band structure, in particular, position of the Fermi level, are compared to the recent experimental data on metallized and superconducting CB_x .

PACS numbers: 71.55.-i, 74.20.-z, 74.20.Fg, 74.62.Dh, 74.72.-h

Recent discovery of superconducting transition in boron doped diamond CB_x [1] brought a new attention to the problem of impurity induced metallization in semiconductors. This topic is already at the center of discussion on high- T_c metal-oxide perovskites (HTSC), where shallow acceptors by, e.g., divalent alkali earth substitutes A for trivalent lanthanum in $\text{La}_{2-x}\text{A}_x\text{CuO}_4$, give rise to metallic and superconducting state in basal CuO_2 planes at doping x above some critical level $\sim 5\%$. A description of this process on the basis of Lifshitz model of impurity states was proposed by the authors [2]. However the situation in CB_x differs from HTSC in essential aspects: diamond has an exemplary 3D isotropic (cubic) lattice structure [3] and B atoms at relevant doping levels ($x \sim 4\%$) mostly occupy interstitial positions in it [4],[5],[6],[7] where they nominally should stay neutral. Even at lower doping ($x \lesssim 0.5\%$), when they are mostly acceptor substitutes [8], it was already recognized that common effective mass approach does not apply for the deep 0.37 eV level by isolated acceptor [9] whereas the conductivity may result from the interplay between that and some “additional”, much more shallow levels (~ 0.06 eV) by acceptor clusters [10].

This clustering effect should be even more important at higher doping, as seen from statistical weights of configurations around an interstitial impurity (Fig.1) at $x = 4\%$ (8% per diamond unit cell), reaching maximum $\sim 38\%$ for its clusters with another impurity in one of 12 nearest neighbor interstices. The facts that carrier density still grows with doping and that energy would be gained when doped holes are spread around the pair of impurities by B-C covalency effects suggest that such clustered B interstitials (impurity “dumbbells”) also give rise to shallow acceptor levels, supposedly not described by effective mass, like those from clusters of substitutional




FIG. 1: Unit cell of diamond (bigger circles for carbons) where boron dopants (dark circles) occupy an interstitial site at the center and one of 12 nearest neighbor interstices (dashed circles). The resulting impurity “dumbbell” has two acceptor levels, one of them, shallow antibonding, being of principal importance for metallization.

impurities.

When choosing an adequate model for such perturbation of electronic spectrum, one have to rule out either the Mott metallization (since the effective Bohr radius is too small, $\sim 3 \text{ \AA}$ [11]) and the Lifshitz impurity model (which does not provide metallization in 3D doped systems [12]). Then the most natural choice is perhaps the Anderson s-d hybrid model [13], where the possibility for metallization was studied long ago [14]. Here we try to adapt the latter results for the intriguing physics of doped diamond, leaving aside the issue of pairing mechanism in the metallized CB_x (discussed recently in RVB [11] or bond-stretching [15] scenarios).

Referring to the well established theoretical band structure of pure diamond [3],[16] and recent ARPES measurement data [17], the analysis should concentrate around the top of the valence band (chosen as the energy reference). Here the three valence subbands have almost isotropic dispersion $\varepsilon_{j,\mathbf{k}} = -\hbar^2 k^2 / 2m_j$ with effec-

*Electronic address: ypogorel@fc.up.pt

†Electronic address: vloktev@bitp.kiev.ua

tive masses $m_{1,2,3} \approx 2.12, 1.06, 0.7m_e$ (neglecting a small spin-orbit splitting down by ≈ 6 meV for $j = 2$). Considering the most relevant acceptor level ε_i by impurity cluster, closely atop the valence band, and neglecting all other (much higher or/and much fewer) levels by clustered or isolated impurities, the corresponding generalization of hybride model can be presented by the Hamiltonian

$$H = \sum_{j,\mathbf{k}} \varepsilon_{j,\mathbf{k}} a_{j,\mathbf{k}}^\dagger a_{j,\mathbf{k}} + \sum_{\mathbf{p}} \varepsilon_0 b_{\mathbf{p}}^\dagger b_{\mathbf{p}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{j,\mathbf{k},\mathbf{p}} \left(\gamma_j e^{i\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{p}} a_{j,\mathbf{k}}^\dagger b_{\mathbf{p}} + h.c. \right), \quad (1)$$

where N is the number of unit cells in crystal, $a_{j,\mathbf{k}}$ and $b_{\mathbf{p}}$ are the Fermi operators (spin indices suppressed) for excitations of j th subband and of impurity clusters (called simply impurities in what follows) randomly located at \mathbf{p} with concentration $c \approx x/2$ (per unit cell), and γ_j is the constant of hybridization between them [18].

The resulting spectrum generally includes either band-like and localized states and, since each of cN impurities provides one (hole) carrier to the system, the issue of metallization depends on whether the Fermi level ε_F from the equation

$$c = \int_{\varepsilon_F}^{\infty} \rho(\varepsilon) d\varepsilon \quad (2)$$

lies within the domain of band states. The density of states (DOS, per unit cell) $\rho(\varepsilon) = N^{-1} \text{ImTr}(\varepsilon - H)^{-1}$ in the relevant basis of states for Eq.1: $\{|j, \mathbf{k}\rangle, |\mathbf{p}\rangle\}$ (ignoring the conduction band), is calculated through the respective diagonal Green functions.

Let's begin supposing that only single (say, 1st) subband is hybridized with impurity states: $\gamma_{2,3} = 0$, $\gamma_1 = \gamma \neq 0$ (comparison with an alternative choice $\gamma_1 = \gamma_2 = \gamma_3 = \gamma$ will be done at the end), and obtain DOS as a sum of contributions from host (h) and impurity (i) subsystems:

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(\varepsilon) &= \rho_h(\varepsilon) + \rho_i(\varepsilon), \\ \rho_h(\varepsilon) &= \sqrt{-\varepsilon} \left(W_2^{-3/2} + W_3^{-3/2} \right) + \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\pi N} \text{Im} \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \frac{1}{\varepsilon - \varepsilon_{1,\mathbf{k}} - \Sigma_{\mathbf{k}}}, \\ \rho_i(\varepsilon) &= \frac{c}{\pi} \text{Im} \frac{1}{\varepsilon - \varepsilon_0 - \Sigma_i}. \end{aligned}$$

Here $W_j = \pi^{4/3} \hbar^2 / (m_j v^{2/3})$ (v being the unit cell volume) is of the order of width of respective subband, whereas the self-energies $\Sigma_{\mathbf{k}}$ and Σ_i can be presented as expansions in groups of interacting impurities [14]:

$$\Sigma_{\mathbf{k}} = \frac{c\gamma^2}{\varepsilon - \varepsilon_0 - \Sigma_i} (1 + cB_{\mathbf{k}} + \dots)$$

and

$$\Sigma_i = \frac{\gamma^2}{N} \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \frac{1}{\varepsilon - \varepsilon_{1,\mathbf{k}} - \Sigma_{\mathbf{k}}} (1 + cB_i + \dots).$$

The relevant impurity level is defined by the equation $\varepsilon_i = \varepsilon_0 + \text{Re}\Sigma_i(\varepsilon_i)$ in the limit $c \rightarrow 0$, whereas the next terms after unity in the group expansions:

$$\begin{aligned} B_{\mathbf{k}} &= -A_{00} - A_{00}^2 + \sum_{\mathbf{n} \neq 0} \frac{A_{0\mathbf{n}}^3 e^{-i\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{n}} + A_{0\mathbf{n}}^4}{1 - A_{0\mathbf{n}}^2}, \\ B_i &= -A_{00}^2 + \sum_{\mathbf{n} \neq 0} \frac{A_{0\mathbf{n}}^4}{1 - A_{0\mathbf{n}}^2}, \\ A_{0\mathbf{n}} &= \frac{\gamma^2}{N(\varepsilon - \varepsilon_0 - \Sigma_i)} \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \frac{e^{i\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{n}}}{\varepsilon - \varepsilon_{1,\mathbf{k}} - \Sigma_{\mathbf{k}}} \end{aligned}$$

describe all indirect interactions between two impurities (in fact, two “dumbbells”) located at cells $\mathbf{0}$ and \mathbf{n} , via exchange of virtual excitations from 1st subband. The respective contribution to DOS from the states localized at such pairs of “dumbbells” follows from the formula: $\text{Im} \sum_{\mathbf{n}} f_{\mathbf{n}} / (1 - A_{0\mathbf{n}}^2) \approx (\pi/v) \int d\mathbf{r} f_{\mathbf{r}} \delta(1 - \text{Re}A_{0\mathbf{r}}^2)$ (for any real function $f_{\mathbf{n}}$), and the concentration broadening Γ_i of the impurity level ε_i from the condition: $|\text{Re}A_{0\mathbf{r}}(\varepsilon_i \pm \Gamma_i)| = 1$, where $\bar{r} \sim (v/c)^{1/3}$ is the average distance between impurities.

We construct the solution by analogy with the case of donor impurity level $\varepsilon_i < 0$ hybridized to a single parabolic band $\varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}} = \hbar^2 k^2 / 2m$ [14]. There a qualitative restructuring of spectrum happens when the concentration c surpasses the characteristic (supposedly small) value $c_0 \sim (\varepsilon_i/W)^{3/2} / 4\pi$, where $W = \pi^{4/3} \hbar^2 / (mv^{2/3})$. In other words, then \bar{r} turns smaller of the localization radius $r_0 \sim v^{1/3} \sqrt{W/\varepsilon_i}$ and localized impurity states effectively overlap. If c is also greater than other characteristic value $c_{cr} \sim (\gamma/W)^6$, this overlapping leads to formation of two separate bands of coherent extended states, whose structure depends on a specific relation between c_0 and c_{cr} . In particular, if the level ε_i is so shallow that $c_0 < c_{cr}$, the dispersion of two split bands is

$$\varepsilon_{\pm}(\mathbf{k}) \approx \frac{\varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}} \pm \sqrt{\varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}}^2 + 4c\gamma^2}}{2}, \quad (3)$$

for wave numbers k restricted to $k \gtrsim k_{min} \sim (c_{cr}/v)^{1/3}$ for the upper band, $\varepsilon_+(\mathbf{k})$, and to $k_{min} \lesssim k \lesssim k_{max} \sim 1/\bar{r}$ for the lower band, $\varepsilon_-(\mathbf{k})$. These restrictions give estimates for the Mott mobility edges separating band and localized states: $\varepsilon_c \sim \varepsilon_+(k_{min})$, $\varepsilon'_c \sim \varepsilon_-(k_{max})$, $\varepsilon''_c \sim \varepsilon_-(k_{min})$ (Fig.2). Then it can be shown that the lower band only adopts $\sim Nc^{3/4}/c_{cr}^{1/4}$ states, that is less than the total of Nc carriers. Hence the rest of carriers should occupy the “tail” states formed by interacting impurity pairs whose density is defined as

$$\rho_i(\varepsilon) \sim \frac{c^2\gamma^2}{\varepsilon^2} \text{Im}B_i \sim \frac{c^2\gamma^8}{W^3\varepsilon^5} \quad (4)$$

(for $\varepsilon - \varepsilon_i \gg \Gamma_i \sim c^{1/3}\gamma^2/W$) and extends to the edge of the upper band. At $\varepsilon > \varepsilon_+(0)$, the DOS in this band $\rho_h(\varepsilon)$ is much higher than the “tail” function $\rho_i(\varepsilon)$, Eq.4, so that the number of empty tail states above the Fermi

- [6] Y.-H. Chen, C.-T. Hu, and I.-N. Lin, Appl. Phys. Lett. **18**, 2857 (1999).
- [7] K. Thonke, Semicond. Sci. Technol. **18**, S20 (2003).
- [8] M. Werner, R. Job, A. Zaitzev, W.R. Fahrner, W. Seifert, C. Johnston, and P.R. Chalker, phys. stat. sol. (a) **154**, 385 (1996).
- [9] J.W. Glezener, Appl. Phys. Lett **64**, 217 (1994).
- [10] R.F. Mamin, T. Inushima, Phys. Rev. B **63**, 033201 (2001).
- [11] G. Baskaran, cond-mat/0404286.
- [12] M.A. Ivanov, Yu.G. Pogorelov, Sov. Phys. JETP **45**, 1155 (1977).
- [13] P.W. Anderson, Phys. Rev. **124**, 41 (1961).
- [14] M.A. Ivanov and Yu.G. Pogorelov, Sov. Phys. JETP **49**, 510 (1979); *ibid* **61**, 1033 (1985).
- [15] K.-W. Lee, W.E. Pickett, cond-mat/0404547.
- [16] W. Saslow, T.K. Bergstresser, and M.L. Cohen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **16**, 354 (1966).
- [17] I. Jiménez, L.J. Terminello, D.G.J. Sutherland, J.A. Carlisle, E.L. Shirley, and F.J. Himpsel, Phys. Rev. B **56**, 7215 (1997).
- [18] It should be noted that, strictly speaking, there are 3 different types of the considered impurity dumbbells, related to their orientations along x , y , or z crystalline axes. However, we do not expect any specific asymmetry between them in the cubic crystal and attribute the same ε_0 and γ_j values to all of them.
- [19] H. Suhl, B.T. Matthias, L.R. Walker, Phys. Rev. Lett. **3**, 552 (1959); V.A. Moskalenko, Fiz. Metallov i Metallovedenie **4**, 503 (1959).