Comparing distortion and power characteristics of AlGaN/GaN HEMTs between SiC and GaN Substrates
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Abstract In this paper, we compare the distortion and power characteristics between AlGaN/GaN high-electron-mobility transistors (HEMTs) with different epi-structures. Third-order intermodulation distortion (IM3) measurement evaluates distortion characteristics, and on-wafer load and source-pull measurements evaluate the power performance. The results show that the AlGaN/GaN HEMTs directly fabricated on GaN substrates without nucleation layer perform better than those fabricated on SiC substrates. Furthermore, the distortion performance is compared with and without field plate.
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1. Introduction

Microwave power amplifiers are key devices that utilize AlGaN/GaN high-electron-mobility transistors (HEMTs) [1-13]. Amplifier distortion becomes critical because wideband and multivalue linear modulation is used to achieve high speed and large capacity in modern wireless communication. Using the digital predistortion (DPD) algorithm that applies an inverse distortion to the input signal has become a recent trend in reducing the distortion [14-18]. However, memory effects complicate the algorithm and increase the DPD current consumption; therefore, memory effects should be reduced to achieve highly linear power amplification. The major memory effects of GaN HEMT are thermal transient response and current collapse from electron trapping after bias stress. Thermal memory effects are common for most semiconductor devices. When using GaN HEMT, the current collapse is another critical memory effect to realize a linear power amplifier, and considerable research has been conducted to analyze the phenomena and solve the current collapse of GaN HEMT [1]. The AlGaN/GaN HEMTs fabricated on freestanding GaN substrates exhibit fewer defects than that fabricated on SiC substrates, resulting in fewer traps and lower current collapse [19-21]. In this paper, the distortion caused by the current collapse is compared between different structures of devices. The distortion restraint by the field plate (FP) [22–31] is also evaluated. The load-pull measurement is performed to compare the power characteristics. The AlGaN/GaN HEMT on GaN substrates exhibit better power and distortion characteristics compared with AlGaN/GaN HEMT on SiC substrates.

2. Material

Six types of devices composed of three epi-structures and two types of device structures are compared. Fig. 1 shows schematic epi-structures of the evaluated wafers. We evaluated GaN HEMT fabricated on SiC or GaN substrates. GaN on SiC structures require a nucleation layer between a doping GaN layer and SiC substrate, whereas GaN on GaN structures do not require it. Therefore, we can expect a lower current collapse of GaN on GaN compared with GaN on SiC owing to lower defects. For GaN on GaN structures, two types of doping, iron (Fe) and carbon (C), were applied to the buffer layer. As described, three epi-structures are used in this paper, namely, GaN(Fe)-on-SiC, GaN(Fe)-on-GaN, and GaN(C)-on-GaN.

Fig. 1 Schematic wafer structure. (a) GaN(Fe)-on-SiC, (b) GaN(Fe)-on-GaN, and (c) GaN(C)-on-GaN. A nucleation layer (NL) is in (a) but not in (b) and (c).

Each wafer has two device structures, i.e., with and without the FP. The FP structure is commonly used to reduce the current collapse in GaN HEMT. The identical HEMT, except the FP, with a gate length of 1 um and
width of 100um*2, was fabricated on each epi-structure.

3. Distortion measurement setups

The third-order intermodulation distortions (IM3) were evaluated to compare the current collapse of GaN HEMT distortion performance because IM3 is the basic performance parameter to evaluate device distortion. IM3 results from the nonlinearity of the transconductance [32]. When there is any feedback loop from the drain to the gate that cannot be neglected in the microwave region, IM3 also comes from mixing fundamental wave and second-order intermodulation distortion (IM2). The current collapse changes the low frequency impedance; thus, the IM2 performance changes with the current collapse level. Therefore, six devices must show different IM3 performances.

Two IM3 measurements were performed which had different impedance at low frequency region. One had very low impedance, ideally short, that is a conventional IM3 measurement. The other had 1 kΩ which was realized by using diplexer with a 1-kΩ series resistor instead of bias-T at the drain side.

The following conditions were used in the conventional IM3 measurement.
- The center frequency, $f_c = (f_1 + f_2)/2$, is 1 and 2.4 GHz.
- The spacing frequency, $\Delta f = f_2 - f_1$, is one point per decade from 20 Hz to 20 MHz.
- The bias condition is 20-V $V_{ds}$ and the quiescent current, $I_{dq}$, is 3.32 and 15 mA, which are deep and shallow class AB bias points.

In 1-kΩ load at $\Delta f$ measurement setup, the following conditions were used.
- $f_c$ is only 1 GHz.
- $\Delta f$ is the same as the conventional IM3 measurement.
- $V_{ds}$ is lowered from 20 to 10 V to increase the sensitivity to $R_{on}$, and the $I_{dq}$ is only 3.32mA.

4. Measurement results

Before comparing the distortion, the basic DC and small-signal RF performances were compared, and all six devices confirmed to perform similarly. Fig. 2 shows the IM3 measurement result from the conventional IM3 measurement as a function of the output power (Pout) of a single tone wave. The plots are for $f_c = 2.4$ GHz, $\Delta f = 2$ MHz. Fig. 2 (b), the shallow class AB that in the linear bias region, shows GaN-on-GaN HEMTs have smaller distortions than GaN-on-SiC HEMTs. These observations were common with both $f_c = 1.0$ GHz and $f_c = 2.4$ GHz across all $\Delta f$'s. 

The nonlinearity of the transconductance, gm, is evaluated to determine whether the IM3 difference is because of it or the current collapse. Fig. 3 compares gm performances between devices from three epi-structures. For the second derivative of gm, GaN(C)-on-GaN is the largest, followed by GaN(Fe)-on-GaN and GaN(Fe)-on-SiC. If gm results in the difference in IM3, IM3 will decrease in the same order in which the second derivative of gm decreases. However, the IM3 decreases in the order: GaN-on-SiC, GaN(Fe)-on-GaN, and GaN(C)-on-GaN, which is the reverse of that given above. Therefore, this IM3 result does not originate from the nonlinearity of gm but the current collapse.

Fig. 2 shows the IM3 measurement result from 1-kΩ load measurement as a function of Pout of a single tone wave. Fig. 4 (a) compares IM3 of HEMTs that do not have an FP. The GaN-on-GaN HEMTs exhibit lower distortion than GaN-on-SiC HEMTs. GaN(C)-on-GaN shows slightly lower distortion than GaN(Fe)-on-GaN. This result is the same as that given in Fig. 2. Fig. 4 (b) and (c) are the IM3 performances of HEMTs that have FPs. In Fig. 4(b), the IM3 of each HEMT improves from Fig. 4(a), and the improvement amount of GaN-on-SiC HEMT is larger than that of GaN-on-GaN HEMT. Therefore, the superiority of GaN(Fe)-on-GaN to GaN(Fe)-on-SiC HEMT is unclear. In Fig. 4 (c), the stress voltage increases to 15 V. The IM3 difference between GaN-on-GaN and GaN-on-SiC and the superiority of GaN-on-GaN become clear.

As the summary of IM3 measurement,
- the GaN-on-GaN structure exhibits better linearity than GaN-on-SiC.
- by using FP, the linearity improves and the difference between the epi-structure decreases.
the superiority of the GaN-on-GaN linearity is remarkable under a higher operating voltage.

- the superiority of the GaN-on-GaN linearity is remarkable under a higher operating voltage.

Fig. 4 IM3 as a function of Pout measured with \( f_c = 1 \text{ GHz} \) and \( \Delta f = 200 \text{ kHz} \).

5. Power performance

The power characteristics of the HEMT with FPs are evaluated using on-wafer load and source-pull systems. The impedances were tuned to maximize the power-added efficiency. Fig. 5 shows the results of the gain, output power (Pout), drain efficiency (\( \eta_D \)), and power-added efficiency (PAE) as functions of the input power (Pin) at 2.4 GHz. The bias condition is Vds = 20 V and Idq = 3 mA. GaN(C)-on-GaN is the best for the power characteristics followed by GaN(Fe)-on-GaN and GaN(Fe)-on-SiC, which is of the same order as the distortion characteristics.

Fig. 5 Comparison of power characteristics between wafers.

6. Conclusion

The distortion and power characteristics of AlGaN/GaN HEMTs are compared with different epi-structures. Both characteristics show that GaN-on-GaN devices are superior to GaN-on-SiC devices. The distortion of GaN-on-nSiC HEMTs can be reduced by adding a FP structure but cannot be reduced to be as small as that of GaN-on-GaN HEMTs. The superiority of GaN-on-GaN HEMTs comes from a lower current collapse owing to the fewer GaN-on-GaN structure traps. GaN-on-GaN HEMTs will not only maximize the merit of the high-power capability of GaN HEMT but also realize better linearity compared with GaN-on-SiC HEMT.
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