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Abstract
Electromechanical effects are important in semiconductor nanostructures as most of the semiconductors are piezoelectric in nature. These nanostructures find applications in electronic and optoelectronic devices where they may face challenges for thermal management. Low dimensional semiconductor nanostructures, such as quantum dots (QD) and nanowires, are the nanostructures where such challenges must be particularly carefully addressed. In this contribution we report a study on thermoelectromechanical effects in QDs. For the first time a coupled model of thermoelectroelasticity has been applied to the analysis of quantum dots and the influence of thermoelectromechanical effects on bandstructures of low dimensional nanostructures has been quantified. Finite element solutions are obtained for different thermal loadings and their effects on the electromechanical properties and bandstructure of QDs are presented. Our model accounts for a practically important range of internal and external thermoelectromechanical loadings. Results are obtained for typical QD systems based on GaN/AlN and CdSe/CdS (as representatives of III–V and II–VI group semiconductors, respectively), with cylindrical and truncated conical geometries. The wetting layer effect on electromechanical quantities is also accounted for. The energy bandstructure calculations for various thermal loadings are performed. Electromechanical fields are observed to be more sensitive to thermal loadings in GaN/AlN QDs as compared to CdSe/CdS QDs. The results are discussed in the context of the effect of thermal loadings on the performance of QD-based nanosystems.

1. Introduction
Spatially confined motion of electrons in low dimensional semiconductor nanostructures (LDSNs) is attracting increasing attention of physics and engineering communities due to their current and potential applications in optoelectronics, biotechnology and other areas. LDSNs are strained structures as they are normally embedded in a host material with different structural properties. Piezoelectric effects in LDSNs are also important due to the fact that most of the semiconductor materials are piezoelectric in nature [1, 2]. Strain [3, 4] and piezoelectric effects [5] are being used as tuning parameters for the optical response of LDSNs in band gap engineering. On the other hand, thermal effects coupled with electric [6–13] and mechanical [14] fields in LDSNs have also become important. Indeed, as thermoelectric and thermoelastic effects are often significant in LDSNs [6, 13, 14], it is reasonable to expect that the temperature may also be used as a tuning parameter in band gap engineering [12, 13]. One of the difficulties related to this lies with the fact that the novel LDSN-based electronic and optoelectronic devices may face challenges for thermal management [6]. It is expected that by integrating LDSN materials into critical regions of microelectronic circuits, the excess heat that limits device performance will be effectively removed [7]. Therefore, a systematic study on thermal loadings is required for analyzing and optimizing their effects on optoelectronic properties of LDSNs. Furthermore, since there are many practical situations where the interaction of thermopiezoelectric structures with other media such as acoustic [15] and gas/fluid [16] needs to be accounted for, the present formulation can act as a foundation for the study of such coupled models in the context of LDSNs.
Our major attention in this paper is given to QDs, the nanostructures that are considered to be a basis for many innovatory nanoelectronic/optoelectronic devices [2], where thermal effects may also become important. This includes applications of QDs in low temperature Peltier refrigeration [17] and thermal rectifiers [18] as well as their applications for higher temperature ranges. Without accounting for the thermal field, both linear and nonlinear electromechanical effects in QDs and their influence on bandstructures are now better understood [1, 19–21]. Earlier studies have been focusing on coupled thermoelectric effect contributions at the device level based on energy balance models, generalizing drift–diffusion models and allowing us to account for non-local and non-equilibrium processes [22–25]. More recently, generalizations of drift–diffusion models have been carried out to account for quantum effects in LDSNs [26, 27]. At the same time, recent studies have been devoted to elucidating the importance of thermal effects in LDSNs, including the temperature induced stress resulting in phase transitions [28] as well as temperature-dependent phase stability [29] in nanostructures. Although the study of fully coupled thermoelectromechanical effects in QDs has both technological as well as fundamental interest, it has not been carried out until now.

In this paper, we present a mathematical model describing coupled thermoelectromechanical effects in LDSNs, its special cases and generalizations. Our particular focus is on the influence of thermoelectromechanical effects on properties of QDs. Furthermore, a major focus is given to GaN/AlN and CdSe/CdS QD systems, as representatives of III–V and II–VI group semiconductors, respectively. These semiconductors are wurtzite (WZ) crystals and the former ones (GaN-based) are known as potentially important thermoelectric materials [13]. In our study we take a sufficiently wide range of thermal loadings of our structures, from 0 to 1000 K, keeping in mind their potential applications as thermoelectrics and their operations in various temperature regimes. It is for this entire range of thermal loadings that the influence on electromechanical fields and energy bandstructures is studied. To be closer to realistic experimental setups, the geometries and dimensions used in this study are similar to those of experimentally grown QDs [30]. We also account for the wetting layer (WL) because a conventional analysis of QD structures without accounting for the WL may not be sufficient for an adequate characterization of QDs [31–33].

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 provides details of the theoretical formulation of the fully coupled thermoelectromechanical problem for QDs along with constitutive equations and the explicit form of corresponding expressions for the wurtzite crystals we focus on. In section 3, the results of our study of the influence of thermal effects on the electromechanical behavior of QDs and the energy bandstructure, obtained with an 8-band $k \cdot p$ model, for QDs are presented. Section 4 highlights major conclusions drawn from this study.

2. Theory

In what follows, we formulate a mathematical model in order to study thermoelectromechanical effects in QDs. A general two-dimensional (2D) axisymmetric model is developed with coupled multi-physics governing equations. The model is based on a coupled system of equilibrium equations of elasticity, electrostatics and heat transfer.

2.1. Coupled system of equations for mechanical, electric and thermal fields

The linear fundamental equations for the thermoelectromechanical structure occupying volume $\Omega$, under steady state conditions, can be summarized as follows [34, 35]:

\begin{equation}
\sigma_{ij,j} + f_i = 0,
\end{equation}

the equation of electrostatics,

\begin{equation}
D_{ij} - q = 0,
\end{equation}

the thermal energy balance equation,

\begin{equation}
h_{ij,j} - k = 0.
\end{equation}

Here $\sigma_{ij}$ are stress tensor components, $D_i$ are electric displacement vector components, $h_i$ are the components of the heat flux vector, and $f_i$, $q$ and $k$ are body mechanical forces, electric charge and heat source in $\Omega$, respectively. Coupling of equations (1)–(3) is implemented through constitutive equations described in section 2.3.

2.2. Gradient equations

Gradient equations correspond to the relationships between the linear strain and mechanical displacement, the electric field and electric potential, and the thermal field and temperature change. They are stated respectively as,

\begin{equation}
\varepsilon_{ij} = \frac{1}{2}(u_{ij,j} + u_{i,j}),
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
E_k = -V_k,
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
Q_k = -\Theta_k,
\end{equation}

where $\varepsilon_{ij}$, $E_k$, $Q_k$, $u$, $V$ and $\Theta$ are the components of the strain tensor, electric field vector, thermal field vector, mechanical displacement vector, electric potential and temperature change from the reference, respectively. In section 2.5, we will extend equation (4) to account for lattice mismatch in typical nanostructures.

2.3. Constitutive equations

The (Helmholtz) free energy function, accounting for three independent variables, $\varepsilon$, $E$, and $\Theta$, for our system has the following form:

\begin{equation}
\phi(\varepsilon_{ij}, E_i, \Theta) = \frac{1}{2}c_{ijkl}\varepsilon_{ij}\varepsilon_{kl} - e_{ij}E_iE_j - \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon_{ij}E_iE_j - \beta_{ij}\Theta\varepsilon_{ij} - p_iE_i\Theta - \frac{1}{2}a\Theta^2,
\end{equation}

where $c_{ijkl}$ are the components of the strain tensor, $c_{ijkl}$ is the elastic compliance, $e_{ij}$ is the electric displacement, $p_i$ is the electric polarization, $a$ is the thermal expansion coefficient, $\beta$ is the coefficient of thermal expansion, $\varepsilon$ is the strain tensor, $E$ is the electric field, $\Theta$ is the temperature change from the reference, $\phi$ is the free energy function, and $\omega$ is the volume of the system.
where \( a_T = c_T^0/T_0 \), and \( c_T^0 \) is the heat capacity at constant strain and electric field. The constitute relationships are derived from (7) as

\[
\sigma_{ij} = \partial \phi/\partial \varepsilon_{ij}, \quad D_i = -\partial \phi/\partial E_i, \quad S = -\partial \phi/\partial \Theta,
\]

where \( S \) denotes entropy. These constitute relations relating thermoelectromechanical quantities are expressed as,

\[
\sigma_{ij} = c_{ijkl} \varepsilon_{kl} - e_{ijkl} E_k - \beta_{ij} \Theta, \quad D_i = e_{ijkl} \varepsilon_{kl} + \varepsilon_{ij} E_k + p_i \Theta + P_{ij}^\rho, \quad S = \beta_{ij} \varepsilon_{ij} + p_i E_i + a_T \Theta,
\]

where \( c_{ijkl}, e_{ijkl} \) and \( \varepsilon_{ij} \) are the elastic moduli, piezoelectric constants and dielectric constants, respectively. \( P_{ij}^\rho \) is the spontaneous polarization, and \( p_i \) and \( \beta_{ij} \) are thermoelectric and thermomechanical coupling constants, respectively. In this linear case, the thermoelectric coupling coefficient is connected to the pyroelectric coefficient defined via \( \partial P_{ij}^\rho / \partial \Theta \) and measured under constant \( \varepsilon \) and \( E \).

### 2.4. Special cases and generalizations

The model (1)–(3), (4)–(6), (9)–(11) we are focusing on in this contribution covers several important special cases which are becoming increasingly important in applications of low dimensional nanostructures such as quantum dots and often analyzed separately:

- piezoelectric (or more generally electromechanical) models;
- thermoelectric models;
- thermomechanical models.

In what follows, we briefly provide details on each of these three important special cases.

#### 2.4.1. Piezoelectric or electromechanical effects

Constitutive equations of the linear piezoelectricity have the following form:

\[
\sigma_{ij} = c_{ijkl} \varepsilon_{kl} - e_{ijkl} E_k, \quad D_i = e_{ijkl} \varepsilon_{kl} + \varepsilon_{ij} E_k.
\]

The well-posedness of the corresponding mathematical models in this and in more general cases was shown in [36, 37] (see also references therein), while the analysis of the special types of boundary conditions was carried out in [38].

Coupled models of piezoelectricity in a general setting were analyzed in [39–41]. In [1] the resulting models of piezoelectricity were coupled with the Schrodinger equation for electronic bandstructure analysis of low dimensional nanostructures. This has been extended further to account for higher order effects such as electrostriction in [42].

#### 2.4.2. Thermoelectric effects

In this case constitutive equations are usually written in terms of the electric current density \( j^e_1 \) and the heat flux \( h_1 \) as

\[
j^e_1 = \rho E_i - \rho S_0 \Theta, \quad h_1 = -\rho S_0 \Theta V_{,i} - (\kappa_1 + S_0^2 \rho(\Theta) S_0^2 \rho(\Theta)_{,i}),
\]

where \( \rho \) is the electric conductivity, \( \kappa_1 \) is the thermal conductivity, and \( S_0 \) is the Seebeck coefficient (in the general case, these coefficients are temperature dependent), where the thermoelectric figure of merit for isotropic materials is defined through these coefficients as \( Z = \Theta \rho S_0^2 / \kappa \) [43].

Such models of coupled thermoelectricity were studied in [44] in the device application context. The relation (15) generalizes Fourier’s law to account for both Peltier and Thompson effects. The governing equations in this case are

\[
j_{1,1} = 0, \quad h_{1,1} - K = 0,
\]

with \( K = -j^e_1 \cdot \nabla V \). Due to this latter term (that can be interpreted as ‘convective’), the resulting nonlinear model is a generalization of conventional linear models, including a thermoelectric model accounting for the linear Seebeck effect [45] in which we have \( h_1 = -\kappa_1 \Theta_{,i} \) and the coupling is effectively realized via the first equation in (16). For example, in the one-dimensional case, when no Peltier–Thompson effects are present, we have the relationship \( -E + S_0 \Theta/\Theta_{,i} = 0 \) with the temperature-dependent Seebeck coefficient \( S_0 \) which replaces (16) in this particular case.

#### 2.4.3. Thermomechanical effects

Constitutive equations for the case of thermomechanical interactions follow directly from our representations (9)–(11) and details on the corresponding linear models, their generalizations, and numerical methodologies for their solutions can be found in [46–51].

#### 2.4.4. Generalization to thermo-magneto-electro-mechanical effects

Finally, we mention that a straightforward generalization of our model (1)–(3), (4)–(6), (9)–(11) to account for the magnetic field follows from the following representation of the Helmholtz free energy function:

\[
\Phi(\varepsilon_{ij}, E_n, \Theta, B_p) = \Phi(\varepsilon_{ij}, E_i, \Theta) + \frac{1}{2}q_{pq} B_p B_q - \kappa \mu m E_m B_p - \tau_p B_p \Theta,
\]

The resulting constitutive equations in this case have the following form:

\[
\sigma_{ij} = (\partial \Phi/\partial \varepsilon_{ij})_{E,n,\Theta}, \quad D_n = - (\partial \Phi/\partial \varepsilon_{ij})_{E,n,\Theta}, \quad H_p = (\partial \Phi/\partial B_p)_{E,n,\Theta}, \quad S = - (\partial \Phi/\partial \Theta)_{E,n,\Theta}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\sigma_{ij} &= c_{ijkl} \varepsilon_{kl} + e_{ijkl} E_k - \beta_{ij} \Theta, \\
D_n &= e_{ijkl} \varepsilon_{kl} + \varepsilon_{ij} E_k + p_i \Theta, \\
H_p &= -\kappa \mu m E_m - q_{pq} B_p B_q - \tau_p \Theta, \\
S &= -\kappa \mu m E_m + \kappa \mu m E_m + \tau_p B_p + \alpha T \Theta.
\end{align*}
\]
where, $\pi$, $\lambda$, and $\tau$ are the piezo-magnetic, electro-magnetic, thermo-magnetic coupling constants, respectively, whereas $\nu = 1/\mu$, $\mu$ is permeability. This model is used in [52] to study thermo-magneto-electro-elastic effects in nanowire superlattices. Another generalization has recently been developed in [1, 53] where nonlinear strain effects were taken into account.

Next, we provide the explicit expressions for the model we focus on in the case of cylindrical wurtzite nanostructures.

2.5. Explicit form of governing equations for WZ nanostructures in cylindrical co-ordinates

Governing equations for WZ structures in this case are axisymmetric, hence all the thermal, electric and mechanical field solutions are axisymmetric as well. Therefore, the original 3D problem can be reduced in this case to a simpler 2D problem [19]. The linearly independent elastic constants and piezoelectric constants in a crystal with WZ symmetry are

$$C_{1111} = C_1, \quad C_{1122} = C_2, \quad C_{1133} = C_3,$$

$$C_{3333} = C_3, \quad C_{2323} = C_{44},$$

$$C_{2121} = (C_1 - C_2)/2, \quad e_{311} = e_{31}, \quad e_{333} = e_{33},$$

$$e_{133} = e_{13}, \quad e_{113} = e_{15}, \quad \beta_{11} = \beta_1,$$

$$\beta_{33} = \beta_3, \quad \epsilon_{11} = \epsilon_1, \quad \epsilon_{33} = \epsilon_3.$$

The electromechanical balance equations (1) and (2) in the cylindrical co-ordinates for the axisymmetric case take the following form [36]:

$$\frac{\partial \sigma_{rr}}{\partial r} + \frac{\partial \sigma_{rz}}{\partial z} + \frac{\sigma_{rr} - \sigma_{\theta\theta}}{r} = 0,$$  \hspace{1cm} (23)

$$\frac{\partial \sigma_{rz}}{\partial r} + \frac{\partial \sigma_{zz}}{\partial z} + \frac{\sigma_{rz}}{r} = 0,$$  \hspace{1cm} (24)

$$\frac{\partial D_r}{\partial r} + \frac{\partial D_z}{\partial z} + \frac{D_r}{r} = 0.$$  \hspace{1cm} (25)

These equations are invariant with respect to rotations around the $z$ axis, e.g. [57]; hence, solutions can be separated into a $(r, z)$ part and a $\theta$ part, subject to adequate boundary conditions. The constitutive relations in equations (9) and (10) then take the following form for WZ nanostructures:

$$\sigma_{rr} = C_{11} \varepsilon_{rr} + C_{12} \varepsilon_{\theta\theta} + C_{13} \varepsilon_{zz} - e_{31} E_z - \beta_1 \Theta,$$

$$\sigma_{rz} = C_{44} \varepsilon_{rz} - e_{15} E_r,$$

$$\sigma_{zz} = C_{13} \varepsilon_{rr} + C_{13} \varepsilon_{\theta\theta} + C_{33} \varepsilon_{zz} - e_{33} E_z - \beta_3 \Theta,$$

$$D_r = e_{15} \varepsilon_{rz} + \epsilon_1 E_r,$$

$$D_z = e_{33} \varepsilon_{rr} + e_{33} \varepsilon_{\theta\theta} + e_{33} \varepsilon_{zz} + p_3 \Theta + p_{3R}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (26)

To take into account the lattice mismatch, the strain tensor components in equation (4) take the following form:

$$\varepsilon_{rr} = \frac{u_r}{r} - \varepsilon^*_a, \quad \varepsilon_{rz} = \frac{u_r}{r} - \varepsilon^*_e,$$

$$\varepsilon_{\theta\theta} = \frac{u_\theta}{r} - \varepsilon^*_a, \quad \varepsilon_{zz} = \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{\partial u_r}{\partial z} + \frac{\partial u_z}{\partial r} \right),$$  \hspace{1cm} (27)

with $\varepsilon^*_a = \frac{a_m - a_0}{a_0}$ and $\varepsilon^*_e = \frac{c_m - c_0}{c_0}$ inside the QD. Quantities, $a_m$, $c_m$ and $a_0$, $c_0$, $QD$ and the lattice constants of the matrix and the QD, respectively, while quantities, $\varepsilon^*_a$ and $\varepsilon^*_e$ are the local intrinsic strains (lattice mismatch) along the $a$ and $c$ directions, respectively. The directions $a$, $c$ and $r$ correspond to the shorter and longer dimensions of the unit cell of the WZ crystal, respectively. As the substrate is relatively large compared to the QD, we follow common practice to neglect lattice mismatch inside the matrix, i.e. $\varepsilon^*_a = \varepsilon^*_e = 0$ [2, 19, 21, 58, 59].

Here, we neglect the Seebeck effect due to the relatively smaller values of Seebeck coefficients for semiconductor materials of present interest, $\sim 10$ $\Omega$K$^{-1}$ [54, 55] and thermal equilibrium is assumed. Therefore, the temperature change becomes spatially independent, effectively leading to the determination of the solution of the equations (1) and (2) only. However, these equations are coupled via constitutive relations (9) and (10) [56].

2.6. Bandstructure calculations

In order to highlight further our point regarding the influence of thermoelectromechanical effects on optoelectronic properties, we analyze the bandstructure with an 8-band $k \cdot p$ model. We consider two conduction bands coupled with six valance bands including heavy-hole, light-hole and spin–orbit bands. The crystal-field splitting is also accounted for. Electron–hole states are the eigenstates of the 8-band envelope function equation:

$$H \Psi = E \Psi,$$  \hspace{1cm} (28)

where $H$ is the $8 \times 8$ matrix of the Hamiltonian, $\Psi$ is the eight-component column of the envelope wavefunction and $E$ is the energy. The Hamiltonian $H$ can be written as

$$H = \begin{pmatrix}
H^0 + H^c + E_c & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & H^0 + H^c + E_c & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & H^0 + H^c + E_c & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & H^0 + H^c + E_c & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & H^0 + H^c + E_c & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & H^0 + H^c + E_c & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & H^0 + H^c + E_c & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & H^0 + H^c + E_c
\end{pmatrix} + eV.$$  \hspace{1cm} (29)

Here, $H^0_c$ and $H^c_c$ are the kinetic and strain dependent parts of the electron Hamiltonian, respectively, whereas $H^0_h$ and $H^c_h$ are the $3 \times 3$ matrix of the kinetic and strain dependent parts (the spin–orbit interaction and crystal-field splitting terms are included) of the hole Hamiltonian, respectively. $E_c$ and $E_h$ are the energies of unstrained conduction- and valence-band edges, respectively, $e$ is the absolute value of the electronic charge and $V$ is the piezoelectric potential. The unstrained valance band edge of AlN at $T = 0$ K is taken as a reference. The strain dependent electron–hole part of the Hamiltonian, piezoelectric potential and energy band edges are temperature dependent.

The underlying algebraic eigenvalue problem that needs to be solved after discretizing equations (28) and (29) can lead to a number of non-trivial difficulties discussed in detail in [60, 61], while the variational formulations of equations (28) and (29), effectively used in our finite element method, can be found in [62]. We consider the temperature dependence of the band gap energy with the following relation,

$$E_g(\Theta) = E_g(0) - \frac{\alpha_{eg}}{\beta_\Theta} \Theta,$$  \hspace{1cm} (30)
along with $\alpha_{\theta}$ and $\beta_{\theta}$ as Varshni coefficients [63]. Further details of the expressions and parameters for the 8-band $\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{p}$ Hamiltonian can be found in [5, 64, 65].

3. Results and discussions

Figure 1 shows the geometric details of the QD systems, where we consider three different cases with respect to geometries. The geometries we consider are: cylindrical without WL, cylindrical with WL, and truncated conical with WL. GaN/AlN and CdSe/CdS are the two different QD systems, which have been taken here for the analysis, as representatives of III–V and II–VI group semiconductors, respectively. Dirichlet boundary conditions are imposed along boundaries 1, 2, and 3 (see figure 1), while $u_r = \frac{\partial u}{\partial r} = 0$, $u_z = \frac{\partial u}{\partial z} = 0$ and $\frac{\partial T}{\partial r} = 0$ at boundary 4 (denoted by bc4 in figure 1). Due to the axisymmetry of the system (equations, geometry and boundary conditions) there is no angular dependence.

The geometries and dimensions we consider here are based on experimental results (e.g. [30]), and the temperature range from 0 to 1000 K covers most thermoelectric applications of interest. As the deposition temperatures are normally above 1000 K [66, 67], we do not consider a special case of zero lattice mismatch inside QDs. We approximate experimentally grown (hexagonal) pyramidally shaped QDs [30] by truncating conical structures. This approximation can be made without significant error [20]. Physical parameters used in the calculations are given in

Figure 1. Geometry and co-ordinate system for the QD systems in the $(r, z)$ plane. (a) Co-ordinate system, (b) cylindrical QD system, (c) cylindrical QD system with WL, (d) conical QD system with WL.
Tables 1 and 2. The values of lattice mismatch for GaN/AIN QD systems are: $\varepsilon_z^* = -2.47\%$ and $\varepsilon_r^* = -4.07\%$, whereas for the CdSe/CdS QD systems they are: $\varepsilon_z^* = -3.99\%$ and $\varepsilon_r^* = -3.87\%$. The calculated values of electromechnical quantities at $(r, z) = (0, 0)$ are given in table 3 for direct comparison. The results of the bandstructure calculations at different temperatures are also presented for truncated conically shaped GaN/AIN QDs.

All our numerical experiments have been performed under the condition for the relative errors between successive refinements to be less than $10^{-6}$. In our case it has been achieved with around $10^5$ triangular elements. Numerical solutions reflect the effect of the decreasing computational error when the solution approaches the boundary of the domain. Our results in figures 2–5 clearly depict this feature.

### 3.1. GaN/AIN and CdSe/CdS: cylindrical QDs without WL

First, we report results for cylindrical GaN/AIN and CdSe/CdS QDs without WL. These QDs have a radius of 4 nm and a height of 4 nm.

Figure 2 shows the effect of temperature on electromechanical quantities for the cylindrical GaN/AIN QDs without WL. Inside the QD, the magnitude of $\varepsilon_{rr}$ (along the z-axis at $r = 0$, figure 2(a)) decreases with an increase in temperature. At the center of the QD the magnitudes are $\sim 0.65\%$ at 0 K and $\sim 0.4\%$ at 1000 K. The magnitude of $\varepsilon_{zz}$ decreases towards zero (unstrained region) faster at higher temperature than at lower temperature. As seen from figure 2(b), $\varepsilon_{zz}$ is negative everywhere for all temperatures except for the case of 0 K, where near the edges of the QD it takes positive values. The magnitude of $\varepsilon_{zz}$ at the center of the QD, i.e. at $z = 0$, is $\sim 0.18\%$ at 0 K, which increases with an increase in temperature to $\sim 0.475\%$ at 1000 K. The potential difference across the top and bottom of the QD decreases with an increase in temperature, from $\sim 2.45$ V at 0 K to $\sim 2.2$ V at 1000 K (figure 2(c)). The electric field component $E_z$ exceeds $\sim 6$ MV cm$^{-1}$ near the edges of the QD (figure 2(d)). Inside the QD, the $E_z$ decreases with an increase in temperature, for example, at the center of the QD, $E_z = \sim 6$ MV cm$^{-1}$ at 0 K and $E_z = \sim 5$ MV cm$^{-1}$ at 1000 K. Our results at 300 K are in excellent agreement with recent theoretical [19, 58, 59] and experimental [30] reports.

Figure 3 shows the effect of temperature on the electromechanical quantities for cylindrical CdSe/CdS QDs without WL. Quantities $\varepsilon_{rr}$ (figure 3(a)), $\varepsilon_{zz}$ (figure 3(b)), tables and figures.
Figure 2. Effect of temperature on electromechanical quantities for cylindrical GaN/AlN QDs without WL. (a) Strain, $\epsilon_{rr}$, (b) strain, $\epsilon_{zz}$, (c) electric potential, $V$, (d) electric field, $E_z$.

Table 3. Electromechanical parameters at $(r, z) = (0, 0)$ for GaN/AlN QD systems.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Electromechanical parameters</th>
<th>Cylindrical without WL $\theta = 0$ K $\theta = 1000$ K</th>
<th>Cylindrical with WL $\theta = 0$ K $\theta = 1000$ K</th>
<th>Conical truncated with WL $\theta = 0$ K $\theta = 1000$ K</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\epsilon_{rr}$ (%)</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\epsilon_{zz}$ (%)</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.475</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$V$ (V)</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$E_z$ (MV cm$^{-1}$)</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$V$ (figure 3(c)) and $E_z$ (figure 3(d)) show similar qualitative behavior as their equivalents for GaN/AlN. The magnitudes of $\epsilon_{rr}$, $V$ and $E_z$ are much smaller, while the magnitude of $\epsilon_{zz}$ is much higher, as compared to those of GaN/AlN. Following are the values of respective electromechanical quantities at the center of the CdSe/CdS QD:

- $\epsilon_{rr}$: at 0 K, $\sim0.3\%$ and at 1000 K, $\sim0.05\%$
- $\epsilon_{zz}$: at 0 K, $\sim1.2\%$ and at 1000 K to $\sim0.95\%$
- $V$: at 0 K, $\sim0.62$ V and at 1000 K to $\sim0.60$ V
- $E_z$: at 0 K, $\sim1.3$ MV cm$^{-1}$ and at 1000 K to $\sim1.35$ MV cm$^{-1}$.

As expected, all the electromechanical quantities exhibit perfect symmetry in cylindrical QDs without WL. The electromechanical parameters for the GaN/AlN QD system are much more sensitive to temperature than their equivalents for CdSe/CdS. This can be attributed to the low values of stress–temperature coefficients ($\beta_i$) and relatively weak electromechanical coupling in CdSe/CdS. The only difference
in the influence of temperature effects on electromechanical quantities in the CdSe/CdS system is quantitative and even that is too small, whereas, in the case of GaN/AlN all electromechanical quantities vary significantly with temperature. Therefore, based on this observation, next we proceed to the study of QDs with WL and different geometries, focusing exclusively on GaN/AlN QDs.

3.2. GaN/AlN: cylindrical QDs with WL

Figure 4 shows the effect of temperature on electromechanical quantities for cylindrical GaN/AlN QDs with WL. The WL is 1 nm thick, while other dimensions of the structure are the same as those in the case without WL.

Very similar values of $\varepsilon_{rr}$ (figure 4(a)) are observed in both cases where we consider the GaN/AlN QD with and without WL, except for the WL region, where the difference in values is $\sim 0.5\%$. However, values of $\varepsilon_{zz}$ (figure 4(b)) are observed to be much higher in the case with WL compared to those values obtained in the case of the QD without WL. In the case of the QD with WL, the value of $\varepsilon_{zz}$ is almost doubled compared to the case of the QD without WL. Higher values of strain signify that the structure with WL is less relaxed than the structure without WL. With inclusion of the WL, the potential difference across the ends of the QD increases, while $E_z$ decreases (except for the WL region, where $E_z = \sim 7 \text{ MV cm}^{-1}$). Accounting for WL provides an additional region in the structure. The resultant geometry becomes asymmetric about the $r$-axis, which is clearly reflected in our results. Similar strain profiles for QDs with WL are reported in [58, 59].

The qualitative effect of temperature on electromechanical quantities, with (figure 4) and without WL (figure 2) is similar for both geometries analyzed here. We also note that the WL presence hardly modifies the strain component values in zincblende materials [68]. In contrast to this, we observe significantly modified values of $\varepsilon_{zz}$ in wurtzite GaN/AlN QDs. This difference in strain behavior can be attributed to the relatively prominent piezoelectric nature of wurtzite materials, which provides an additional degree of freedom for
electromechanical loadings to relax. Hence, we conclude that
the WL effect on electromechanical quantities significantly
differs in zincblende and wurtzite materials. Earlier it has been
demonstrated that the ground eigenstate of the entire structure
can be considerably affected by the presence of the WL [31].
This indicates that further studies of thermoelectromechanical
effects in QDs with WL could be an important avenue of
research.

3.3. GaN/AlN: truncated conical QDs with WL

Figure 5 shows the effect of temperature on electromechanical
quantities for truncated conical GaN/AlN QDs with WL. The
WL is 1 nm thick and the top radius, the bottom radius and
the height of the QDs under consideration are 4 nm, 8 nm and
4 nm, respectively.

The magnitudes of the electromechanical quantities are
given in table 3 for direct comparison of the values for
different geometries of the GaN/AlN QDs. As the temperature
increases the strain values decrease rapidly from peak values
at edges on either side of the QD. The magnitudes of \( \varepsilon_{rr} \),
\( V \) and \( E_z \) are found to decrease with temperature, while
\( \varepsilon_{zz} \) is observed to increase with temperature. The potential
difference between the base and the top of QDs creates a deep
potential well, for holes at the bottom and for electrons at
the top [21]. Thus, the decrease in potential difference with
temperature will lead to shallower potential wells, relatively
less confinement. A giant built-in electric field of several
MV cm\(^{-1}\) is a characteristic of GaN/AlN structures and has
been observed in several experiments [21, 33, 69] which agrees
well with our simulated results (6–8 MV cm\(^{-1}\)). Due to this
internal electric field, GaN-based LDSNs require relatively
higher carrier densities to generate optical gain [33, 70].
Relatively lower carrier densities to generate optical gain may
be expected at higher temperatures as our results indicate
a decrease in this internal electric field with an increase in
temperature.

The highest magnitude of strain tensor component at 0 K,
\( \varepsilon_{rr} \) at \( z = 0 \), among studied structures of GaN/AlN is about
1%, which is observed in the case of the truncated conical
QDs, whereas $\varepsilon_{zz}$ takes its maximum value of $\sim 0.36\%$ in the case of the cylindrical QDs with WL. The potential difference and electric field take their highest magnitudes at 0 K which are $\sim 3.4$ V and $\sim 6.7$ MV cm$^{-1}$, respectively, for the case of truncated conical QDs.

3.4. GaN/AlN QDs: bandstructure

Most of the electromechanical quantities take higher values and show a significant variation with temperature for truncated conical GaN/AlN QDs with WL. Hence, in order to analyze this issue further, wavefunctions for the ground state and first excited state for truncated conical GaN/AlN QDs with WL under different thermo electromechanical loadings are calculated using an 8-band $k \cdot p$ model and are presented in figures 6 and 7. The significant influence of the WL on the wavefunctions of the QD is discussed in our previous work [31, 32]. In the absence of any thermo electromechanical loadings we observe the localization at the center of the QDs with the ground state energy, $E_1$, at about 4.343 236 eV and with the first excited state $E_2 = 4.378 34$ eV (figures 6(a) and (b)) [31, 32]. However, the electrons are pushed to the QD top when piezoelectric effects are taken into account. This is due to the significantly higher magnitudes of the electric potential and the nature of its profile (figure 5(c)) [5, 20]. The ground state and excited state energies are increased when the piezoelectric effects on bandstructure are taken into account (figures 6(c) and (d)). This effect was experimentally observed through magneto-tunneling spectroscopy measurements that allow the mapping of the electron wavefunctions [71] and was also theoretically proved [72]. The lowest state energies are, $E_1 = 4.373 267$ eV and $E_2 = 4.418 84$ eV. These results are in agreement with previous reports on similar geometries [5, 33].

In order to demonstrate the effect of the thermal loading, we present the ground state and first excited states of the electronic system for $T = 600$ and 1000 K cases in figure 7. The qualitative behavior of electron localizations is dominated by the piezoelectric potentials even at higher temperatures.
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Figure 6. The influence of electromechanical effects on the bandstructure of truncated conical GaN/AlN QDs with WL. (a) Ground state energy $E_1$ without thermopiezoelectric effects, (b) first excited state energy $E_2$ without thermopiezoelectric effects, (c) ground state energy $E_1$ with piezoelectric effects, (d) first excited state energy $E_2$ with piezoelectric effects.

This is due to the fact that thermal loadings do not change the qualitative profiles of the electromechanical quantities and hence electron localization remains the same as in the case of the bandstructure with piezoelectric effects taken into account. The lowest state energies of the electronic system have been significantly reduced as compared to the case without accounting for temperature effects. This results in subband energies having rigid shifts due to the thermal loadings. The lowest state energies at $T = 600$ K are, $E_1 = 4.254236$ eV and $E_2 = 4.295872$ eV (figures 7(a) and (b)). At $T = 1000$ K qualitatively localization remains the same, while further reduced lowest state energies are observed, $E_1 = 4.039266$ eV and $E_2 = 4.077852$ eV (figures 7(c) and (d)). Note that the eigen-energies of electronic states are increased when piezoelectric effects are accounted for and are decreased when thermal loadings are accounted for. Therefore, there could be a situation where these loadings nullify each other’s effects on eigen-energies of electronic states. In the present case it can be observed below 600 K.

4. Conclusions

In this study, based on a fully coupled multi-physics model, we have analyzed for the first time combined contributions of thermoelectromechanical effects in GaN/AlN and CdSe/CdS QDs with different geometries, accounting for the WL. It has been found that GaN/AlN QD systems (III–V group semiconductors) are more sensitive to thermal loadings compared to CdSe/CdS QDs (II–VI group semiconductors). Thermal loadings lead to the increase in magnitude of the strain tensor component $\varepsilon_{rr}$ and decrease in $\varepsilon_{zz}$. However, the electric potential and the electric field are observed to decrease with increase in temperature. Relatively lower carrier densities to generate optical gain may be expected at higher temperatures. The WL effect on thermoelectromechanical distributions differs significantly in zincblende and wurtzite nanostructures. A significant reduction in electronic state energies due to thermal loadings is observed. Thus, in addition to electromechanical tuning, the operating temperature can also provide an additional tuning parameter in band gap engineering of QDs. However, there could be a situation where electromechanical and thermal loadings may
nullify their effects on eigen-energies of electronic states, making the bandstructures of QDs unaffected in such cases by thermoelectromechanical effects. The observed phenomena emphasize the importance of the fully coupled thermopiezoelectric models in studying the properties of LDSNs, in particular QDs.
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