#### **High Mobility Germanium MOSFETs: Study of Ozone Surface Passivation and n-type Dopant Channel Implants Combined with ALD Dielectrics**

**by**

John **J.** Hennessy

B.E. The Cooper Union for the Advancement of Science and Art (2002)

**S.M.** Massachusetts Institute of Technology (2004)

Submitted to the Department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

at the

Massachusetts Institute of Technology

February 2010



**C2010** Massachusetts Institute of Technology **All** rights reserved

 $\mathbf{r}$ 



 $\hat{\vec{r}}$ 

 $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$ 

#### **High Mobility Germanium MOSFETs: Study of Ozone Surface Passivation and n-type Dopant Channel Implants Combined with ALD Dielectrics**

**by**

John **J.** Hennessy

Submitted to the Department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science on January **29, 2010** in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Electrical Engineering

#### **ABSRACT**

Germanium offers higher electron and hole mobility than silicon, making it an attractive option for future high-performance **MOSFET** applications. To date, Ge p-channel device behavior has shown promise, with many reports of measured hole mobilities exceeding that of Si. However, Ge n-channel devices have shown poor performance due to an asymmetric distribution of interface state density  $(D_{it})$  that degrades electrostatic behavior and carrier mobility.

In this work, two methods are investigated for improving the performance of Ge MOSFETs. First, the formation of an interfacial passivation layer via in-situ ozone oxidation is explored. Long channel Ge  $p$ - and  $n$ -MOSFETs are fabricated with  $Al_2O_3$ and HfO<sub>2</sub> gate dielectrics deposited by atomic layer deposition (ALD). The ozone surface passivation is observed to result in significant mobility enhancement for all devices, with particularly dramatic improvement in the n-FETs compared to devices with no passivation layer. Measurements of interface state density show a reduction across the entire Ge bandgap.

Further improvement of the interface quality has been observed to occur in the presence of n-type channel implants in Ge n-FETs and this effect is studied. **All** n-type species investigated in this work (P, As, **Sb)** are seen to result in significant electron mobility enhancement, particularly at low inversion densities. Ge n-FETs receiving channel implants of As or **Sb** along with the ozone surface passivation exhibit effective electron mobilities higher than Si electron mobility under some conditions of surface electric field for the first time. Substrate bias measurements and low temperature characterization both suggest a reduction in  $D_{it}$ , primarily of acceptor-like trap states near the conduction band.

Thesis Supervisor: Dimitri **A.** Antoniadis Title: Ray and Maria Stata Professor of Electrical Engineering

4

 $\mathcal{A}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}$ 

#### **Acknowledgments**

**I** would like to thank Dimitri for his advice and guidance throughout the course of this project. Dimitri is always understanding about the issues that always seem to crop up when working in the lab, but at the same time is also great about keeping the project on course and moving forward. **I'd** also like to thank Judy Hoyt and Tomis Palacios for serving on my thesis committee.

Research in the Microsystems Technology Laboratories is not possible without the help of the staff. **I** can easily say that every single member of the lab staff has helped me at some point along the way. **I'd** like to thank all the members of the **DAA** group for the collaboration, advice, and friendship over the years. Specifically **I'd** like to acknowledge Andy Ritenour who taught me the ways of germanium, and whose work served as motivation for this thesis in many ways. **I'd** also like to thank the past and present members of the Hoyt group and all the students I've crossed paths with in the lab, I've learned a lot from many of them. The entirety of this project was supported **by** the **MSD** Focus Center Research Program. The MARCO meetings, reviews, and teleseminars were always a great source of education and collaboration. **I'd** also like to thank Jill Becker and Douwe Monsma from Cambridge NanoTech for all the help with the **ALD** system.

**I'd** like to thank all the friends I've made here at MIT; there have many good times along the way. Lastly, **I'd** like to acknowledge the encouragement and support from all of my family; Mom and Dad, my grandparents, brothers, and all of the Hennessys, Nyes, Smullins, and Sanfords.

# Table of Contents





 $\label{eq:2} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2.$ 

# **List of Figures**







Figure *5.8.* Threshold voltage shift as a function of temperature for Ge n-MOSFETs receiving As channel implants compared to an un-implanted device and the ideal case **.. 8 0** Figure *5.9.* Interface state density near the conduction band edge calculated from the low temperature threshold voltage shift. Discrete points indicate calculated values of  $D_{it}$ for each step in temperature, while the dashed lines indicate the average of all values n ear E c **. ... 8 1** Figure *5.10.* Subthreshold swing versus temperature for Ge n-MOSFETs receiving As channel im plants. **... 83** Figure **5.11** Measured low temperature **C-V** characteristics for n-type Ge **MOS** capacitors at  $f = 1$  MHz with ALD WN/Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> gate stack. The capacitor on the right received a 4x10<sup>12</sup>**cm <sup>2</sup>**dose implant of **Sb** with a **600 'C** activation anneal prior to gate dep osition **.. 85** Figure *5.12.* Measured shift in flatband voltage as a function of temperature for the **C-V** characteristics shown in Figure **5.11** with comparison to the ideal value in the absence of interface **states... 86** Figure 5.13.  $G_p/\omega$  vs. frequency with gate voltage as a parameter at various temperatures for an n-type Ge **MOS** capacitor with no channel implant. The indicated gate voltages correspond to biasing in depletion where the conductance method is valid. **... 8 7** Figure 5.14.  $G_p/\omega$  vs. frequency with gate voltage as a parameter at various temperatures for an n-type Ge MOS capacitor with a channel implant of Sb  $(4x10^{12} \text{ cm}^{-2}, 30 \text{ keV})$ . **... 8 8** Figure **A. 1.** Forward **C-V** characteristics at **f =** 1 kHz, **10** kHz, and 1 MHz, and reverse (dashed) at **f =** 1 MHz for n-type Ge capacitors with various **ALD** oxide interfacial layers (all capped with  $ALD Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>$ ). Indicated  $D<sub>it</sub>$  values were calculated with the conductance m **ethod...** *95* Figure **A.2.** Forward **C-V** characteristics at **f=** 1 kHz, **10** kHz, and 1 MHz, and reverse (dashed) at **f =** 1 MHz for n-type Ge capacitors with various **ALD** nitride interfacial layers (all capped with ALD  $\text{Al}_2\text{O}_3$ ). Indicated  $D_{it}$  values were calculated with the conductance m **ethod...** *95* Figure **C. 1.** Effective carrier mobility (split-CV) for Ge **p-** and n-MOSFETs fabricated with ALD 40 nm WN  $/ 6$  nm Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> gate stack and two different source/drain activation **conditions... 10 1** Figure **D. 1.** Slow trapping behavior for eight repeated forward sweeps into inversion (solid lines) and Is-Vg hysteresis (dashed line) for the un-implanted lot **C** MOSFETs **(6** nm **ALD A12 0 3,** optimal 03 surface treatment, no **implant)...............................** 104 Figure D.2. Average shift in the extrapolated  $V_t$  of the lot C MOSFETs for successive sw eeps into **inversion..** 104 Figure D.3. Average measured  $I_s-V_g$  hysteresis (evaluated at  $I_s = 1 \times 10^{-3} \mu A/\mu m$ ) for the lot **C** MOSFETs at various doses of ion-implanted **Sb... 105**

Figure D.4. Average shift in the extrapolated  $V_t$  of the  $O_3$ -treated 5 nm  $HfO_2$  MOSFETs for successive sw eeps into inversion. **... 106**

14

 $\sim 10^{11}$  km s  $^{-1}$ 

## **List of Tables**



### **Chapter 1 - Introduction**

#### **1.1 Germanium MOSFETs**

The first transistor, a point-contact bipolar device, was fabricated **by** Bardeen and Brattain in 1947 from a sample of polycrystalline germanium **[1].** The earliest junction bipolar transistors were also fabricated on Ge samples [2], and research in the early *50's* primarily focused on Ge devices. Even at that time it was recognized that surface states could dominate the electrical behavior of metal-semiconductor contacts **[3],** or simple field-effect devices [4] on Ge substrates. The work of Atalla et al. *[5]* showed that the Si-SiO<sub>2</sub> system could produce an interface that was relatively free from the effects of surface states, leading to the development of the Si **MOSFET.** The subsequent development of a planar device structure and the integrated circuit **(IC)** led to the rapid growth of the **IC** industry from the 1970's onward.

This growth was fueled in part **by** the continual improvement in intrinsic device performance realized **by MOSFET** scaling. Generally speaking, **MOSFET** scaling refers to the continual reduction in device dimensions; this results in increased circuit density (transistors per unit area) and also improvement in the switching delay of the **MOSFET** itself. Until recently, the continual improvement in intrinsic device performance has progressed without change to the channel material itself. However, it has been recognized that the parasitic components of the **MOSFET** structure do not follow the same scaling trend as the device size shrinks **[6].** In order to maintain the historical performance trends, new channel engineering solutions have been required, such as the industry's introduction of strain-engineered Si devices **[7].** As noted **by** Khakifirooz **[8],** future scaling requirements will almost certainly require the replacement of the Si channel with higher mobility materials if that historical performance trend is to be matched.

This makes Ge an appealing option because it possesses higher electron and hole mobilities than Si **[9]. Of** course, the same issue that plagued early work on Ge MOSFETs still exists today, the lack of a high quality gate interface. Early Ge MOSFETs **[10]** avoided thermally grown gate oxides due to their inherent instability. The hexagonal  $GeO<sub>2</sub>$  phase of the native oxide tends to decompose at elevated temperature and is water-soluble [11]. The  $GeO_x$  sub-oxide phases are volatile at elevated temperature [12] and tend to sublime during the oxidation process making thickness and stoichiometry control very challenging for thick films.

Early work on nitrided native oxide gates suggested that germanium oxynitrides could provide more a more stable interface with reasonable device behavior [13][14]. Indeed, more recent work **by** Shang et al. *[15]* demonstrated Ge p-MOSFETs with a thin oxynitride gate **(~9** nm total thickness) that exhibited hole mobility 40% greater than Si. However, similar n-channel devices showed a peak mobility of only 100  $\text{cm}^2\text{V}^{-1}\text{s}^{-1}$  [16], far below Si. The majority of recent research for a variety of gate stack approaches has also shown similar behavior. Ritenour et al. demonstrated Ge p-FETs with a HfO<sub>2</sub> gate showing near-Si hole mobility, however similar n-FETs showed only single-digit electron mobilities [17]. Similarly, Nicholas et al. reported Ge FETs with a CeO<sub>2</sub>/HfO<sub>2</sub> gate stack; n-FET devices showed drive currents nearly two orders of magnitude below similarly processed p-FETs **[18].**

Generally, the best Ge **p-FET** results have been obtained using some method of Si surface passivation. In principle, this simplifies the problem of Ge surface passivation to

the better-understood case of Si surface passivation. However, this approach has not proven effective in realizing a well-behaved n-channel device. This asymmetry between hole and electron behavior can at first sight be attributed to the asymmetry of the valence and conduction band discontinuities between the superficial Si and the underlying Ge: holes tend to be confined in the Ge away from the interface while electron layers form at the interface. Brunco et al. reported Si-passivated **p-FET** devices with peak hole mobilities ranging from  $250$ -300  $\text{cm}^2\text{V}^{-1}\text{s}^{-1}$  depending on the thickness of the passivation layer; the equivalent n-FET devices showed electron mobilities from  $1.2-35 \text{ cm}^2\text{V}^{-1}\text{s}^{-1}$ **[19].** Other groups have also reported similar observations [20][2 1].

#### **1.2 GeO2 Passivation Approaches**

The best recent reports on Ge surface passivation have involved some type of  $GeO<sub>2</sub>$ interfacial layer. It has long been speculated that the high interface state density  $(D_{ii})$  of native oxides on Ge was the result of contamination from sub-oxide species other than  $GeO<sub>2</sub>$  [22]. As discussed in the previous section, it is difficult to grow a thick native oxide layer on Ge without significant contribution from  $GeO_x$  sub-species. However, a variety of techniques have emerged that employ a  $GeO<sub>2</sub>$ -Ge interface, often as an interfacial layer that is part of a high-k gate stack. Takahashi et al. deposited GeO<sub>2</sub> layers by RF sputtering onto nitrided Ge substrates [23]. Xie et al. formed a GeO<sub>2</sub> interfacial layer by thermal oxidation at 400  $^{\circ}$ C prior to HfO<sub>2</sub> deposition and CF<sub>4</sub> plasma treatment [24]. Kuzum et al. used thermal oxidation in ozone ambient at 400  $^{\circ}$ C prior to Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> deposition [25]. Lee et al. reported on GeO<sub>2</sub> gate oxides formed by high-pressure oxidation at 550 °C [26]. All reports show significant reduction in  $D_{it}$ , both at midgap and

near the band edges. Carrier transport for both holes and electrons is also greatly improved, with several claims of record **p-FET** and n-FET mobilities in the references above.

#### **1.3 Goals of Thesis**

There are several key challenges facing the incorporation of Ge as a channel material in high-performance MOSFETs. These include junction leakage from band-to-band tunneling **[27],** the diffusion and activation of n-type dopants for low source/drain resistance **[28].** This work focuses on another critical challenge, improving the interface quality between Ge and the gate dielectric. This is primarily accomplished **by** exploring the impact of novel passivation methods on the performance of long-channel, unstrained MOSFETs on **(100)** Ge substrates with gate dielectrics deposited via the Atomic Layer Deposition method **(ALD).** This impact is quantitatively gauged through the reduction of interface state density, improvement in carrier mobility, and improved device electrostatics. Additionally the phosphorus implantation method observed **by** Ritenour **[29]** will be expanded to investigate other n-type species, and the impact of this method on p-channel devices will be studied.

#### 1.4 Organization of Thesis

Chapter 2 describes the investigation of various **ALD** dielectric materials and their electrical behavior on Ge. The choice of wet clean prior to gate deposition is also briefly discussed, revealing that native oxide surfaces can provide superior interface properties on Ge. This is explored in the context of **p-** and n-FET mobility enhancement as well as improvement in electrostatic behavior. Chapter **3** presents the development and optimization of a novel ozone surface passivation technique. **MOSFET** results are presented along with more detailed measurement of  $D_{it}$ . Chapter 4 discusses the impact of n-type dopant channel implants on Ge **FET** characteristics, with particular emphasis on the observed mobility improvement in n-FET devices. Results from Ge p-FETs receiving n-type implants are also presented, suggesting that the improvement in behavior is largely confined to electron transport. Chapter **5** investigates the nature of this observed electron mobility enhancement, and results are presented indicating that the implant improves  $D_{it}$ through a reduction in acceptor-like trap states near the conduction band of Ge. Chapter **6** summarizes the key contributions of this thesis, and discusses the possibilities for future work on this topic.

## **Chapter 2 - ALD Gate Dielectrics on Germanium**

#### **2.1 ALD Material Capabilities**

The **ALD** gate stacks in this work were deposited using a Cambridge NanoTech Savannah<sup>TM</sup> 200 reactor. This is a nitrogen-assisted, lateral flow type reactor designed primarily for use with the alkyl-amide class metalorganic **ALD** precursors summarized in Table 2.1. Secondary ALD precursors utilized include de-ionized H<sub>2</sub>O, purified NH<sub>3</sub>, and ozone generated **by** electrical discharge.

<b>ALD</b> Precursor	Films	Temperature $(^{\circ}C)$
tris(dimethylamido)	$Al_2O_3$ , AlN	200
aluminum		
tetrakis(ethylmethylamido)	$ZrO2, Zr3N4$	200
zirconium $[30][31]$		
tetrakis(ethylmethylamido)	$HfO2, Hf3N4$	200
hafnium		
$\sim$ or $\sim$		
tetrakis(dimethylamido)		
hafnium [30], [31]		
bis(tert-butylimido)-	WN	350
bis(dimethylamido)		
tungsten [32]		

**Table 2.1. Material capabilities of the ALD** system used **in this work along with the typical chamber temperature.**

An initial experiment investigated the use of all available dielectrics as interfacial layers on Ge in order to evaluate their suitability with respect to interface state density. The details of the recipe used for each material can be found in Appendix B. **MOS** capacitors were fabricated on **(100)** Ge substrates that received an HCl-based wet clean prior to dielectric deposition as detailed in Table 2.2. This clean will be referred to in the rest of this thesis as the 'standard wet clean'. In every case **25** cycles of each material was first deposited as an interfacial layer, followed by 75 cycles of  $Al_2O_3$  in order to eliminate the impact of the chosen contact metal on the capacitance-voltage **(C-V)** behavior. No intermediate WN metal was deposited in this case, and all capacitors received a **350 "C** final furnace anneal for 30 min in  $N_2$ . C-V characteristics were qualitatively evaluated for stretch-out, hysteresis, and frequency dispersion. The interface state density near the middle of the bandgap was calculated **by** the conductance method **[33].**

<b>Step</b>	<b>Process</b>	Description
	Ge Standard Wet Clean	5:1 $H_2O$ :HCl 5 min,
		5:1:1 $H_2O:NH_4OH:H_2O_2$ 30 s,
		$5:1$ H <sub>2</sub> O:HCl 10 min
	<b>ALD Various Dielectric</b>	Various Thickness (nominal temp 200 °C)
	ALD Gate Metal (WN) [optional]	$20 - 40$ nm (350 °C)
4	<b>Sputter Front/Back Metal Contacts</b>	Front: 250nm Al
		Back: 50 nm Ti / 1µm Al
	Pattern/Etch Al	Contact Lithography, Aluminum Etchant
6	Dry Etch ALD Gate Metal	CF <sub>4</sub> RIE
	<b>Post-Deposition Anneal</b>	350 – 500 °C (Furnace or RTA in $N_2$ )

**Table 2.2. General process flow for Ge MOS capacitor fabrication.**

Figure 2.1 and Figure 2.2 and show the resulting **MOS** capacitor behavior on p-type Ge for all oxide and nitride interfacial layers, respectively. The behavior of all materials on n-type Ge is presented in Appendix **A.** In both cases the Al-based interfacial layers display more ideal C-V behavior as well as lower calculated values of D<sub>it</sub>. Although the Zr- and Hf-based films are more desirable from the perspective of reduced **EOT** scaling, due to their higher dielectric constant, they display significantly poorer **C-V** behavior on both p-type and n-type Ge, suggesting higher interface density across the

entire bandgap. For this reason the majority of the gate stacks used in this work involve the Al-based materials.



Figure 2.1. Forward **C-V** characteristics at **f=** 1 kHz, **10** kHz, and **1** MHz, and reverse (dashed) at **f= 1** MHz for p-type Ge capacitors with various **ALD** oxide interfacial layers (all capped with **ALD**  $A1_2O_3$ ). Indicated  $D_{it}$  values were calculated with the conductance method.



Figure 2.2. Forward **C-V** characteristics at **f = 1** kHz, **10** kHz, and **1** MHz, and reverse (dashed) at **f** <sup>=</sup> **1** MHz for p-type Ge capacitors with various **ALD** nitride interfacial layers (all capped with **ALD**  $A<sub>12</sub>O<sub>3</sub>$ ). Indicated  $D<sub>it</sub>$  values were calculated with the conductance method.

## 2.2 Influence of Wet Chemistry on Germanium **MOS** Capacitor

MOS capacitors were fabricated on  $(100)$  p-type Ge substrates (Ga: 0.16-0.47  $\Omega$ -cm). Substrates were cleaned in a variety of wet chemistries as indicated in Figure **2.3.** In each case the wafer was exposed to the indicated chemistry for 20 min, followed **by** a 1 min rinse in DI water and then blown dry in  $N_2$ . The wafers proceeded directly to ALD gate deposition, in this case receiving a **25** cycle interfacial layer of **AIN** and a **35** cycle capping layer of **A12 0 <sup>3</sup> .** Sputtered **Al** was used as the top and backside contact metal.

High frequency **C-V** characteristics were evaluated for frequency dispersion, stretch-out, hysteresis, and the relative size of the weak-inversion 'bump'. As Figure **2.3** illustrates, the choice of wet chemistry has negligible impact on any of these parameters, suggesting that the interface quality for all choices is nearly identical. Because most chemically formed and native germanium oxides are water soluble, it is likely that any unique surface configuration provided **by** a specific choice of wet chemistry is ultimately removed during a final water rinse [34].



**Figure 2.3. Forward and reverse C-V characteristics of ALD A1N/A120 3 on p-type Ge for various choices of wet chemistry prior to gate deposition.**

However, even better **C-V** behavior was noted in a similar experiment that investigated the impact of using no wet clean at all prior to **ALD** gate deposition. Figure 2.4 shows that the **C-V** characteristics of two **ALD** materials on Ge can be dramatically improved when no clean is used, compared to the use of a standard HCl-last wet clean. In the case of the AlN interfacial layer shown in Figure 2.4, the minimum  $D_{it}$  near mid-gap as measured by the conductance method was reduced from  $2.0x10^{12}$  cm<sup>-2</sup>eV<sup>-1</sup> for the wetcleaned capacitor to  $3.6x10^{11}$  cm<sup>-2</sup>eV<sup>-1</sup> for the no-clean capacitor.



**Figure 2.4. C-V characteristics of ALD AIN and ALD A12 <sup>0</sup> 3 on p-type Ge for substrates receiving no clean and substrates receiving an HCI-last wet clean prior to deposition.**

#### **2.3** 'Epi-ready' Ge Surface

The manufacturer (Umicore) of the substrates used in this work markets their material as 'epi-ready' indicating that they are suitable for epitaxial growth directly from the package without an intermediate wet chemical clean. The preparation of the 'epi-ready' surface involves a proprietary thermal treatment and wet clean, with the final substrate packed in an  $N_2$  environment before shipping.

**A** simple experiment was performed in order to compare the 'epi-ready' surface to the native oxide of Ge.  $ALD$   $Al_2O_3$  was deposited on p-type Ge substrates that received either no clean, or the standard wet clean followed **by 60** hours exposure to air **(68** \*F, *45%* RH). Both devices received a *350* **"C** furnace anneal for **30** min following sputtering of **Al** metal contacts. Figure *2.5* shows that the high-frequency **C-V** characteristics of both samples are remarkably similar, with only slight differences in D-factor, hysteresis, and maximum accumulation capacitance. This result suggests that the 'epi-ready' surface is chemically similar to the native oxide surface.



**Figure 2.5. Comparison of C-V characteristics for 10 nm ALD A1203 on (a) a substrate receiving no wet clean and (b) a substrate receiving the standard wet clean plus 60 hours exposure to air.**

This observation was confirmed **by** performing x-ray photoelectron spectroscopy (XPS) on Ge samples that were prepared as above. Figure **2.6** shows a broad survey comparison of the spectra measured for both samples, and again suggests the two surfaces are chemically similar. No additional peaks are observable for the 'epi-ready' scan, such as peaks typically observed for **Cl-** *[35]* or S-terminated **[36]** surfaces, two common approaches to Ge monolayer surface passivation. More detailed studies on the interface chemistry of native Ge oxides **[37][38]** indicate that the 4+ oxidation state is the dominant component. This oxidation state is attributed to the  $GeO<sub>2</sub>$  phase of germanium oxide. Figure **2.7** shows a higher resolution scan of the Ge2p peak for each sample, and confirms that the 'epi-ready' surface and native oxide surface are nearly identical in terms of interfacial oxide composition, and also that interface oxide layer is primarily  $GeO<sub>2</sub>$ .



**Figure 2.6. XPS survey scan showing a comparison of Ge substrates receiving: standard wet clean, standard wet clean followed by 60 hrs exposure to air, and no clean directly from the package. [Analysis performed at MIT CMSEJ**



Figure **2.7.** Detailed view of Ge2p XPS spectra for substrates with the 'epi-ready' passivation layer compared to a sample receiving the standard wet clean followed **by 60** hrs exposure to air and to a sample that received the standard wet clean only immediately prior to analysis.

<b>Step</b>	Process	Description
	Ge Standard Wet Clean [skipped for	5:1 $H2O$ :HCl 5 min,
	'epi-ready' devices]	5:1:1 $H_2O:NH_4OH:H_2O_2$ 30 s,
		5:1 H <sub>2</sub> O:HCl 10 min
2	<b>ALD</b> Passivation/Dielectric	Various Thickness (nominal temp 200 °C)
3	ALD Gate Metal (WN)	$\sim$ 40 nm (350 °C)
4	Gate Pattern/Etch	Contact Lithography, CF <sub>4</sub> RIE
5	S/D Ion Implant	$BF_2$ , 40 keV, $1x10^{15}$ cm <sup>-2</sup> (p-FET)
		P, 25 keV, $1x10^{15}$ cm <sup>-2</sup> (n-FET)
6	<b>Interlayer Dielectric Deposition</b>	200 nm PECVD $SiO2$
	S/D Activation Anneal	450 °C 30 min Furnace $N_2$ (p-FET)
		500 °C 1 min RTA $N_2$ (n-FET)
8	Via Pattern/Etch	Contact Lithography, $3:1 \text{ H}_2O:BOE$
9	<b>Contact Metal</b>	Front: 500 nm Al
		Back: 50 nm Ti / 2µm Al
10	<b>Contact Metal Pattern/Etch</b>	Contact Lithography, Aluminum Etchant

**Table 2.3. General long-channel ring-FET process flow.**

Long channel ring-MOSFETs with ALD 40 nm WN  $/ 7$  nm  $Al_2O_3$  gate stacks were fabricated in order to evaluate the impact of the native oxide passivation layer on carrier mobility. The full **MOSFET** process flow is summarized in Table **2.3.** Effective hole and electron mobilities as calculated by the split-CV technique [39][40] are shown in Figure **2.8.** In this figure, and elsewhere in this thesis, the Si universal mobility for holes or electrons is obtained from universal data plotted versus vertical effective field  $(E<sub>eff</sub>)$  [41]. The number of inversion carriers,  $N<sub>inv</sub>$ , is calculated assuming a constant doping profile equal to that of the Ge substrates used in this work  $(N_{A,D} \approx 1 \times 10^{16} \text{ cm-3})$ .

Nearly a 2x improvement in hole mobility is observed for devices receiving no clean compared to the standard clean devices. Even more dramatic improvement is observed in the electron mobility of n-FET devices receiving no clean. As indicated in Figure 2.9, the typical  $I_s-V_g$  curves for n-FET devices receiving the standard wet clean show very poor subthreshold behavior and suppressed drive current, resulting in single digit electron mobility. The 'epi-ready' n-FET devices show significant improvement in subthreshold behavior, with a subthreshold swing of **92** mV/dec that is among the lowest reported for an n-channel Ge **MOSFET.** However, this swing is not as low as the equivalent **p-FET** device **(82** mV/dec), and while the measured hole mobility is higher than that of Si, the measured electron mobility remains below.

It is noted from Figure 2.10 that the contribution of the 'epi-ready' passivation layer to the total capacitance equivalent thickness **(CET)** of the gate stack is greater than 1 nm for both  $p$ -FET and  $n$ -FET devices. Here CET is defined as the  $SiO<sub>2</sub>$  equivalent thickness based on the measured capacitance in inversion, defined as:

$$
CET = \frac{\varepsilon_{ox,Si}}{C_{inv}}\tag{1}
$$

where  $\varepsilon_{ox,Si}$  is the permittivity of SiO<sub>2</sub>, 3.5x10<sup>-13</sup> F cm<sup>-1</sup>, and C<sub>inv</sub> is the maximum measured capacitance from the inversion-side split-CV. This differs from the equivalent oxide thickness (EOT), which is also a  $SiO<sub>2</sub>$  equivalent thickness, but includes the impact of quantum effects on the measured capacitance (see Section *5.2).* The physical thickness of the passivation layer is unknown, however values of the dielectric constant of  $GeO<sub>2</sub>$ have been reported ranging from *5* to **6** [42][43]. Using the **CET** contribution of the native oxide layer indicated in Figure 2.10, the physical thickness is estimated to be between 1.4 and **2.3** nm. The **CET** values obtained for the 'epi-ready' MOSFETs suggest that the passivation layer on p-type substrates (n-FET) is thicker than the n-type substrates, perhaps as the result of an additional thermal step performed **by** the manufacturer. This thickness difference was confirmed **by** XPS. **A** more subtle discrepancy in **CET** was observed in the wet-cleaned devices, where the n-FET displays a 0.5 nm higher CET than the  $p$ -FET device despite receiving an identical 7 nm  $Al_2O_3$  gate dielectric. This offset is attributed in part to the more severe stretch-out observed the measured  $C_{inv}$  in the n-FET device, which will lead to an underestimation of the true oxide capacitance at an equivalent gate voltage.



Figure **2.8.** Effective carrier mobility for **Ge p- and n-MOSFETs with and without standard wet clean prior to deposition of ALD 7** nm **A120 <sup>3</sup>** and 40 nm WN gate stack.



**Figure 2.9. Typical** Is-Vg characteristics for Ge **p- and n-MOSFETs with and without standard wet clean.**



**Figure 2.10. Inversion side split-CV characteristics for Ge p- and n-MOSFETs fabricated with and without the standard wet clean. The measured Cgsd has been normalized to the maximum measured value for each device.**

#### **2.4 Chapter Summary**

**ALD** gate dielectrics deposited directly on wet-cleaned Ge substrates show significant non-idealities in **C-V** behavior as result of high interface state density. Al-based dielectric films show more promising as-deposited behavior than **Hf** and Zr based films. The choice of wet chemistry prior to gate deposition was observed to have little impact on measured **C-V** characteristics, although un-cleaned substrates showed dramatic improvement in C-V behavior as a result of reduced  $D_{it}$ . This reduction in  $D_{it}$  is the result of the presence of the 'epi-ready' passivation layer that behaves very similarly to a simple native oxide.

As discussed in Chapter **1,** thick Ge oxides are difficult to grow without large contributions from non-GeO<sub>2</sub> sub-oxide components that are less desirable from a  $D_{it}$ standpoint. Thin native oxides formed at room temperature are primarily  $GeO<sub>2</sub>$ , but have often been avoided due to their solubility in aqueous solutions and apparent thermal instability. It is speculated that the native oxide passivation layer investigated in this chapter is not degraded during the low temperature **ALD** process (initially 200 **"C),** whereas its instability may be apparent had a higher temperature **CVD** process been used to complete the gate stack formation. It is also speculated that this **ALD** capping layer protects the stability of the native oxide layer during subsequent high temperature source/drain annealing.

MOSFETs fabricated with this passivation layer and receiving activation anneals as high as **500 "C** show improvement in carrier mobility and subthreshold swing over devices receiving only a standard wet clean. The 'epi-ready' **p-FET** devices show a 2x hole mobility improvement over the wet cleaned devices, and even more dramatic improvement was observed in the n-FET devices.
### **Chapter 3 - Ozone Surface Passivation**

### **3.1 Introduction**

From a practical standpoint, the surface treatment of 'epi-ready' substrates discussed in the previous chapter is undesirable. As evidenced **by** the poor characteristics of the wet cleaned devices, the native oxide of Ge is extremely unstable in aqueous solutions, thus limiting its use to pure gate-first processing. Also, as indicated in Figure 2.10, the contribution of the native oxide layer to the total equivalent thickness of the gate is greater than 1 nm, which would preclude its use for aggressively scaled gate stacks.

Ozone is typically used as an alternate oxidizing precursor in a standard **ALD** process *[44][45].* In this work it was investigated for its effectiveness at creating an oxide interfacial layer prior to the deposition of an **ALD** gate dielectric. Ozone was generated using an MKS  $O_3$ Mega electrical-discharge type generator.  $O_3$  is created by introducing high purity  $O_2$  through an electrical-discharge cell that decomposes the molecule into monatomic intermediates that then react with other  $O_2$  molecules to form  $O_3$  at concentrations up to 20% by weight. The addition of a dopant gas, in this case  $N_2$ , is usually required to help catalyze the formation of  $O_3$  and stabilize its output.

Figure **3.1** shows that significant improvement in **C-V** behavior can be obtained for a sample that received the standard wet clean, followed **by** in-situ (in the **ALD** chamber) exposure to high-concentration  $O_3$  immediately prior to ALD  $Al_2O_3/WN$  gate stack deposition.



**Figure 3.1. C-V characteristics for ALD A120 <sup>3</sup>on p-type Ge for samples receiving a wet clean only** and a wet clean plus in-situ exposure to  $O_3$ . These samples received a 500 °C RTA in  $N_2$  for 1 min.

#### **3.2 Ge MOS Capacitor and Interface State Density**

In order to quantify the observed improvement in the C-V behavior of O<sub>3</sub>-treated Ge, the interface state density  $(D_{it})$  was extracted on both  $p$ - and  $n$ -type samples. MOS capacitors were fabricated on **(100)** Ge substrates that received the standard wet clean described in Chapter 2. The untreated sample proceeded directly to **ALD** of **6** nm **of**  $A<sub>1</sub>Q<sub>3</sub>$ , while the  $Q<sub>3</sub>$ -treated sample was first exposed to 10 min of high concentration ozone followed **by** the same dielectric deposition. The process parameters of the ozone generator used in this initial experiment are described in more detail in Section 3.4.

In Figure 3.2a, Dit was calculated near the center of the bandgap **by** the conductance method **[36]** at both room temperature and at *250* K. It has been noted [46] that at room temperature the use of the conductance method with Ge may tend to overestimate the true  $D_{it}$  at midgap due the influence of a minority-carrier weak inversion response on the value of the measured conductance. The smaller bandgap of Ge compared to Si leads to higher intrinsic carrier concentration and therefore a higher density of minority carriers at room temperature. The response from these thermally generated minority carriers in a Ge **MOS** capacitor can mask the measured conductance, particularly at low frequencies.

This is evident in the discrepancy observed between the  $D_{it}$  values calculated on the wet-cleaned p-type samples at room temperature and **250** K where the concentration of minority electrons has been reduced. This discrepancy is not as severe for the  $O<sub>3</sub>$ -treated and n-type samples because the weak-inversion response (apparent as the 'bump' in the measured C-Vs) is comparatively smaller. The response itself can be trap-assisted, so a reduction in trap density leads to less weak-inversion response and less tendency to overestimate  $D_{it}$ . The calculated values of  $D_{it}$  on both  $p$ - and  $n$ -type samples indicate that the  $O_3$  treatment reduces  $D_{it}$  near the middle of the gap by nearly an order of magnitude to a minimum value of nearly  $2x10^{11}$  cm<sup>-2</sup> eV<sup>-1</sup>.

In Figure 3.2b,  $D_{it}$  was calculated closer to the band edges using the Gray-Brown method [47] at temperatures down to **80** K. This method compares the observed flatband voltage shift as a function of temperature to the ideal shift expected. Any additional observed shift in the measured data can be attributed to interface states that lie within the energy range of the corresponding change in Fermi level.



**Figure 3.2. Interface state density for ozone-treated and untreated Ge MOS capacitors with 6 nm ALD A120 <sup>3</sup> . Dit values were calculated by (a) the conductance method and (b) the Gray-Brown method.**

### **3.3 Ozone Passivated Ge MOSFETs**

In an experiment similar to that described in Section **2.3,** long channel ring MOSFETs were fabricated on p-type and n-type Ge **(100)** substrates **(Sb: 0.13-0.16** 92-cm, Ga: **0.16-**  $0.47 \Omega$ -cm). Devices were fabricated with the clean and general process flow described in Table 2.3. All devices received an ALD 40 nm WN  $/$  6 nm Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> gate stack, the 0 3-treated devices received a **10** min in-situ exposure immediately prior to this deposition.

The calculated effective hole and electron mobilities and the corresponding  $I_s-V_g$ and inversion **C-V** characteristics are shown in Figure **3.3,** Figure 3.4, and Figure *3.5,* respectively. Once again, significant mobility enhancement is observed for both **p-FET** and n-FET devices, with particularly dramatic improvement in electron mobility. The improvement in mobility and subthreshold swing is similar to that observed for the 'epi-ready' MOSFETs, illustrating the effectiveness of the  $O<sub>3</sub>$  treatment in emulating the characteristics of the native oxide surface. However, as indicated in Figure **3.5,** the contribution of the **03** treatment to the total **EOT** of the gate stack in considerably less than that added **by** the native oxide. The **p-FET** devices show an increase in **EOT** of only **0.3** nm compared to untreated devices.



Figure 3.3. Observed mobility improvement for Ge p-and n-FETs receiving the in-situ O<sub>3</sub> surface **treatment prior to gate deposition of ALD A120 3.**



Figure 3.4. Typical I<sub>s</sub>-V<sub>g</sub> characteristics for Ge p- and n-MOSFETs with and without exposure to the **03 surface treatment.**



**Figure 3.5. Inversion side split-CV characteristics for Ge p- and n-MOSFETs fabricated with and** without exposure to the O<sub>3</sub> surface treatment.

### **3.4 Ozone Surface Treatment Optimization**

The results in the previous sections of this chapter were obtained with the parameters of the ozone generator set for the maximum stable ozone concentration of the system. These parameters include:

- *1. 80% cell power,* a higher setting is possible but 03 concentration may become unstable due to cell heating and circuit limitations, a lower setting will reduce **03** concentration
- 2. *500 sccm 02 flow,* minimum setpoint, a higher setting will reduce **03** concentration
- **3.** *0.05 sccm N2 flow,* **03** concentration becomes unstable at lower settings, higher settings result in decreased  $O_3$  concentration and increased  $NO_x$  byproducts

At these settings the **03** output concentration as measured **by** the tool's internal sensor was approximately 19% (by weight in  $O_2$ ). The initial work was performed with a 10 min exposure prior to gate deposition, shorter times resulted in notably higher  $D_{it}$ , while longer times yielded negligible change in  $D_{it}$  or EOT contribution. The exposure was performed at an ALD chamber temperature of 200  $^{\circ}C$ , the same temperature as the  $Al_2O_3$ deposition.

**A** more detailed capacitor study was performed in order to investigate and quantify C-V behavior for three main parameters: exposure time, N<sub>2</sub> dopant flow, and exposure temperature. **MOS** capacitors were fabricated on n- and p-type Ge **(Sb: 0.13-** 0.16  $\Omega$ -cm, Ga: 0.16-0.47  $\Omega$ -cm) with a 20nm WN / 6 nm Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> ALD gate stack. Metallic **Al** and Ti/Al front and backside contacts were sputter deposited. The **Al** front contacts were wet etched, followed **by** RIE etching of the WN gate metal in CF4. **All** capacitors received a final rapid thermal anneal in  $N_2$  for 1 min at 500 °C, in order to approximate the typical thermal budget of the full **MOSFET** process flow.

High-frequency **C-V** measurements were performed with an Agilent 4924 impedance analyzer at frequencies from 1 kHz **-** 1 MHz. The highest bandwidth setting was used in order to minimize noise at low frequencies. The same total voltage range was swept for each device with the flatband voltage roughly centered in this range. The measured characteristics were then evaluated for:

1. Minimum  $D_{it}$ , the minimum  $G_p/\omega$  for the voltage curve displaying a clear peak in  $G_p/\omega$  (see Figure 3.6). The interface state density can then be approximated as [48]:

$$
D_{u} \approx \frac{2.5}{q} \left[ \frac{G_{p}}{\omega} \right]_{\text{max}} \tag{2}
$$

2. Hysteresis, measured at 100 kHz at a capacitance of C<sub>max</sub>/2.

- **3.** Frequency dispersion in **Cmax,** defined as the percent change in **Cmax** from 1 kHz to 1 MHz. At low frequencies interface traps respond to the **AC** signal and contribute to the measured capacitance, at higher frequency some traps may no longer be able to respond, resulting in a reduced measured capacitance.
- 4. Weak-inversion 'bump', defined as the difference in area between the 20 kHz curve and 1 MHz curve integrated from the starting voltage to  $C_{\text{max}}/2$ . In Ge, thermally generated minority carriers become trapped **by** midgap states and are able to contribute an additional capacitance to the measured low-frequency **C-V** curve.
- 5. C-V steepness, defined as the maximum slope of normalized capacitance  $(C/C_{max})$ at 1 MHz, at high frequency interface traps may not respond to the **AC** signal but will respond to the slow sweep of the **DC** bias resulting in stretch-out along the gate bias axis. This comparison is only valid for devices fabricated on substrates with identical doping concentrations.

This summary provides an interesting illustration of the difference in behavior between Ge p-type and n-type capacitors. At midgap, the measured  $D_{it}$  and the resulting C-V behavior are similar on both substrates. However, the **C-V** behavior for holes and electrons is markedly different when biased in strong accumulation (near the majority carrier band edge). As indicated in Table **3.1,** all n-type capacitors show significantly more dispersion in C<sub>max</sub> and more than two times the hysteresis of the equivalent p-type capacitor, even for ozone-treated devices.

The resulting analysis is summarized in Table **3.1** along with values for both **p**and n-type capacitors that received no  $O_3$  treatment at all. All ozone-treated devices show significant improvement over untreated devices specifically with respect to the measured interface state density. Variations in exposure time and temperature from the nominal conditions (devices **p2** and n2 in Table **3.1)** described above generally resulted in poorer **C-V** behavior. However, as highlighted in Table **3.1,** increases in the dopant flow rate produced the most noticeable improvements across the majority of metrics for both p-type and n-type capacitors. The optimized **C-V** characteristics are shown in Figure **3.7** and Figure **3.8.** For comparison, the **C-V** characteristics of the untreated p-type and ntype capacitors are shown in Figure **3.9** and Figure **3.10,** respectively. The improvement is most evident in the reduction of the weak inversion 'bump', and also the reduction in **Cmax** dispersion for the n-type capacitor. For each substrate type the overall steepness of the **C-V** curve has also been significantly improved. Although measurable, the impact on **C-V** hysteresis is minor on both substrates despite the large reduction in Dit.

$(p/n-type) + ID#$					
Time (min),	Minimum $D_{it}$	Hysteresis	$C_{max}$ Change	$C$ - $V$ slope	'Bump' Area
Temperature (°C),	$(x10^{11} cm^2 eV^1)$	(mV)	(%)	$(V^l)$	$(x10^8 C/cm^2)$
$N_2$ flow (sccm)					
p1, 1, 200, 0.05	4.7	110	1.77	1.17	3.8
p2, 10, 200, 0.05.	3.7	105	1.16	1.20	2.5
p3, 10, 200, 5.0	3.4	97	1.07	1.21	2.2
p5, 10, 200, 0.01	5.0	116	1.32	1.16	4.3
p6, 30, 200, 0.05	4.0	105	1.16	1.20	2.4
p7, 10, 100, 0.05	5.7	114	1.25	1.17	6.8
p8, 10, 300, 0.05	9.4	109	1.09	1.31	7.6
$pX$ , No $O_3$	14.5	110	1.26	0.93	16.7
n1, 1, 200, 0.05	6.5	243	6.87	1.10	3.1
n2, 10, 200, 0.05	4.7	237	4.58	1.20	2.4
n3, 10, 200, 5.0	3.8	235	4.88	1.30	2.3
n5, 10, 200, 0.01	6.1	259	5.61	1.12	3.1
n6, 30, 200, 0.05	5.8	248	5.52	1.22	3.0
n7, 10, 100, 0.05	8.4	240	6.03	1.08	3.7
n8, 10, 300, 0.05	4.2	240	5.37	1.33	2.5
$nX$ , No $O_3$	24.5	246	7.62	0.82	9.8

**Table 3.1. Experimental investigation of ozone operating parameters. Bolded parameters are variations from the nominal devices p2 and n2. Shaded entries represent the best result for both p and n-type capacitors.**

Interestingly, the ozone concentration is actually lowered to approximately **6%** for the optimal  $N_2$  flow rate of 5.0 sccm. Adding  $N_2$  as a dopant gas at low concentration increases the generated  $O_3$  concentration by a catalytic effect [49]. At larger  $N_2$ concentrations the  $O_3$  concentration decreases as the formation of  $NO<sub>x</sub>$  species becomes more prevalent *[50].* Subsequent tests verified that the interface improvement was not the result of the lower 03 concentration **by** fabricating similar capacitors using reduced cell power or higher **02** flow rates (both of which would also reduce the generation efficiency). In both cases,  $D_{it}$  was observed to increase again, suggesting that moderate 03 concentration plus the additional **NOx** species are both needed for optimal **Di,.**



Figure 3.6. Family of  $G_p/\omega$  curves with applied voltage as a parameter for optimized ozone process **on p-type Ge with ALD A12 0 <sup>3</sup> (sample p3).**



Figure **3.7.** Forward **C-V** characteristics at **f = 1,** 4, 20, **100, 1000** kHz, and reverse curve (dashed) at **f = 100** kHz for optimized ozone process on p-type Ge (sample **p3).** Labels indicate the characteristics investigated in this optimization.



Figure **3.8.** Forward **C-V** characteristics at **f= 1,** 4, 20, **100, 1000** kHz, and reverse (dashed) at **f = 100** kHz for the optimized ozone process on n-type Ge (sample n3), and the family of **G,/o** curves with applied voltage as a parameter for the same device.



**Figure 3.9. Forward C-V characteristics at f= 1, 4, 20, 100, 1000 kHz, and reverse (dashed) at f= 100** kHz for a p-type capacitor receiving no ozone (sample pX), and the family of  $G_p/\omega$  curves with **applied voltage as a parameter for the same device.**



**Figure 3.10. Forward C-V characteristics at**  $f = 1, 4, 20, 100, 1000$  **kHz, and reverse (dashed) at**  $f =$ 100 kHz for a n-type capacitor receiving no ozone (sample nX), and the family of  $G_p/\omega$  curves with **applied voltage as a parameter for the same device.**

**A** subsequent experiment investigated the impact of the optimized **03** process on Ge **MOSFET** performance. Long channel ring-FETs were fabricated on **p-** and n-type Ge substrates (Sb:  $0.16$ - $0.22$   $\Omega$ -cm, Ga:  $0.42$ - $0.46$   $\Omega$ -cm). The devices were fabricated with same process flow and **6** nm **ALD A120 <sup>3</sup>** gate dielectric as the devices described in Section  $3.3$ , with the exception of using the optimized  $O<sub>3</sub>$  surface treatment discussed above. Figure **3.11** shows the effective hole and electron mobilities for the 'epi-ready' and nominal  $O_3$  processes described earlier, compared to the optimized  $O_3$  process described above. The optimized devices show additional increases in both hole and electron mobility, with equivalent subthreshold slope and **EOT** when compared to the nominal **03** process. In fact, the extracted mobility is very similar to that of the 'epiready' devices  $(7 \text{ nm } Al_2O_3 \text{ gate})$ . However, as discussed earlier in this chapter, the  $O_3$ surface passivation layer has far less **EOT** impact than the native oxide layer.



**Figure 3.11. Effective carrier mobility (split-CV) for Ge p- and n-MOSFETs receiving the optimized 03 surface treatment. For comparison the 'epi-ready' devices of Figure 2.8 and the nominal 0 3-treated devices of Figure 3.3 are also shown.**

XPS analysis was performed on Ge substrates receiving the optimized **03** treatment in order to gain more understanding about the chemical nature of the resulting interfacial layer. Samples were capped with 1 nm  $Al_2O_3$  in order to protect the surface configuration during ex-situ analysis, but still allow for a strong enough signal from the interface. The samples also received a 500  $^{\circ}$ C RTA in N<sub>2</sub> for 1 min in order to approximate the thermal budget of the full **MOSFET** process flow. The resulting Ge-related spectra are shown in Figure **3.12** for untreated (standard wet clean only) and O<sub>3</sub>-treated samples. Decomposition of the Ge3d and Ge2p (more surface sensitive) peaks reveals that the  $O_3$  treatment results in an interfacial layer that contains a higher relative concentration of  $GeO<sub>2</sub>$  to other sub-oxides. It is noted that the total contribution from other sub-oxides (compared to the Ge substrate signature) appears relatively unchanged by the  $O_3$  treatment; the dominant effect is an increase in  $GeO_2$ . As discussed in Chapter 1, this is consistent with the observations of other groups on the beneficial nature of  $GeO<sub>2</sub>$ with respect to  $D_{it}$  reduction.



**Figure 3.12. Germanium XPS spectra for untreated and 03-treated substrates. [R. Contreras, M. Milojevic and R.M. Wallace (UT Dallas)]**

### **3.5 Alternate Gate Dielectrics**

As discussed in Section **2.1,** the majority of the devices investigated in this thesis involve the use of **A12 0 <sup>3</sup>** gate dielectrics due to the superiority of their as-deposited behavior on Ge. However, the use of materials with a higher dielectric constant, such as HfO<sub>2</sub>, is more desirable from the standpoint of aggressively scaled equivalent oxide thickness **(EOT).** As illustrated in Figure 3.13, the C-V characteristics of HfO<sub>2</sub> on p-type Ge can be greatly improved using the  $O_3$  treatment discussed in this chapter. Qualitative inspection of the C-V, as well as calculations of midgap  $D_{it}$  compare favorably to the results of  $O_3$ -treated substrates with  $Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>$  gates.



Figure 3.13. C-V characteristics of ALD HfO<sub>2</sub> on O<sub>3</sub>-treated p-type Ge substrates and the corresponding minimum midgap D<sub>it</sub> as calculated by the conductance method. These samples were fabricated with WN gate metal and a final 400  $^{\circ}$ C furnace anneal in N<sub>2</sub> for 30 min.

Long channel **p-** and n-MOSFETs were fabricated with the optimized **03** surface treatment process described in the previous section, and an ALD WN/HfO<sub>2</sub> gate stack. The **HfO2** was deposited with tetrakis(ethylmethylamido)hafnium and water as the **ALD** precursors at a chamber temperature of 200 **\*C.** The details of the **ALD** recipe can be found in Appendix B. Figure 3.14 shows the calculated carrier mobilities for the devices in this study. Once again,  $O_3$ -treated devices show substantial mobility enhancement over untreated devices with dramatic improvement observed in the n-channel devices. The 0 3-treated devices were fabricated with two different physical thickness of **HfO2,** and show little corresponding thickness dependence on either hole or electron mobility.



Figure 3.14. Effective hole and electron mobility for ALD WN  $/$  HfO<sub>2</sub> gate stacks on O<sub>3</sub>-treated Ge. **For comparison the dashed lines show the effective mobilities for the A120 3 MOSFETs of Figure 3.11.**

The untreated HfO<sub>2</sub> p-FET device is observed to have a lower mobility than an untreated  $A1_2O_3$  device (see Figure 3.3), which one may expect based on the  $D_{it}$ calculations made in Chapter 2. However, the  $O_3$ -treated  $HfO_2$  p-FET shows a mobility as good or better than the O<sub>3</sub>-treated Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> p-FET. This suggests that for the case of hole transport, the **03** passivation layer is able to dominate the interface characteristics relatively independent of the choice of dielectric. A similar comparison of HfO<sub>2</sub> and **A120 <sup>3</sup>**n-FET devices is not as favorable, showing lower electron mobilities for both the untreated and O<sub>3</sub>-treated devices. As indicated in Figure 3.15, a similar trend is observed when comparing the subthreshold swing of the  $HfO<sub>2</sub>$  and  $Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>$  devices. The **p-FET** devices show similar values for both dielectrics, while the  $n$ -FET  $HfO<sub>2</sub>$  devices have slightly worse swing.

Nonetheless, HfO<sub>2</sub> is a better option for reduced EOT gate stacks because of its higher dielectric constant  $(K \sim 20 \text{ vs. } -11 \text{ for Al}_2\text{O}_3)$ . Figure 3.16 shows the inversion side split-CV for the untreated and  $O_3$ -treated p-FETs that have a 5 nm physical thickness, along with best-fit ideal **C-V** curves. The ideal curves were calculated with Schred **[51],** a Schrodinger-Poisson solver that was modified with the band parameters and physical constants of germanium. The fits suggest an **EOT** of **0.8** and **1.1** nm for the untreated and 0 3-treated devices, respectively. This is consistent with the observed **EOT** offset in the  $A<sub>12</sub>O<sub>3</sub>$  devices discussed earlier in this chapter. Gate leakage measurements were made on these devices in order to assess the possibility of further  $t_{ox}$  scaling. As shown in Figure **3.17, gate leakage currents lower than 50**  $\mu A/cm^2$  **at**  $|V_t + 1 V|$  **were observed in the 5 nm** devices, the lowest reported value for a similar **EOT** gate stack on Ge [24].



Figure 3.15.  $I_s-V_g$  characteristics for Ge p- and n-MOSFETs with ALD HfO<sub>2</sub> gate dielectrics.



Figure 3.16. Inversion side split-CV measurements on the 5nm HfO<sub>2</sub> p-FETs and the corresponding **Schrodinger-Poisson fit.**



**Figure 3.17. Typical gate leakage for Ge p-FETs receiving the 03 surface treatment with 5 nm or 10 nm ALD Hf0 <sup>2</sup> gate dielectric.**

### **3.6** Chapter Summary

Ozone surface passivation was observed to result in  $D_{it}$  reductions and increased carrier mobility, much like the 'epi-ready devices discussed in Chapter 2. **A** thorough optimization of the  $O_3$  treatment resulted in additional mobility gains, with a performance that closely matches the best 'epi-ready' devices, but with less impact on the total **EOT** of the gate stack. XPS measurements on  $O_3$ -treated substrates show that the dominant component of the passivation layer is  $GeO<sub>2</sub>$ . Similar to claims presented in Chapter 2 regarding the native oxide passivation layer, it is speculated that the thermal stability of the **03** passivation layer is protected **by** its formation and subsequent in-situ capping at low temperature. Additional analysis of the thermal stability of this surface treatment is presented in Appendix B, and suggests that the **03** passivation layer is more stable at typical source/drain annealing temperatures than other reported techniques for forming  $GeO<sub>2</sub>$ .

The optimization of the  $O_3$  process seems to suggest that the addition of  $NO_x$ species (which reduces the  $O_3$  concentration) is beneficial in terms of further reductions in  $D_{it}$ . The experimental evidence also implies that this  $D_{it}$  reduction is not due to the reduced  $O_3$  concentration, and that some combination of  $O_3$  and  $NO_x$  is most desirable.

Additionally, this  $O_3$  passivation technique is observed to be effective for two ALD materials. MOSFETs fabricated with  $HfO<sub>2</sub>$  gates and the  $O<sub>3</sub>$  surface treatment exhibit hole mobility that is very similar to the  $A<sub>12</sub>O<sub>3</sub>$  devices but with slightly degraded electron mobility. Devices are demonstrated with near 1 nm **EOT** and low gate leakage.

# **Chapter 4 - Effect of n-type Channel Implants**

### **4.1 Introduction**

Previous work at MIT has demonstrated that phosphorus implanted n-FET devices exhibit enhanced mobility and improved subthreshold swing for increasing P dose **[52].** The goal of this previous experiment was to fabricate buried-channel like devices in order to demonstrate that high electron mobilities could be obtained if the inversion layer centroid was moved away from the gate interface. Devices in this study receiving a  $1x10^{13}$  cm<sup>-2</sup> dose implant of phosphorus do show significant buried channel behavior, but also dramatic improvement in carrier mobility as shown in Figure 4.1. Interestingly, the devices receiving lower doses show no buried channel characteristics or evidence of reduced effective field operation, but still show substantial mobility enhancement as highlighted in the inset of Figure **4.1.** This enhancement suggested that phosphorus may be accumulating at the gate interface and passivating interface states **[29].**



Figure 4.1. Effective electron mobility for phosphorus implanted Ge n-FETs **[52].**

In this chapter the impact of phosphorus implantation in combination with the ozone surface treatment will be investigated first. Subsequent experiments also investigated the impact of arsenic and antimony channel implants. The initial process flow for these experiments is summarized in Table 4. **1.** Although the target screen oxide thickness was **11** nm, there was significant variation in the final thickness due to difficulty in controlling the deposition rate on the small diameter wafers used in this work. The primary impact of this variation is expected to be in modulation of the relative dose of the implant, as more of the implanted dose will be stopped in the screen oxide if the screen oxide itself is thicker. Figure 4.2 indicates that this variation is likely mitigated for the As and **Sb** implanted device lots as their larger mass and higher implant energy results in less straggle and less as-implanted dose in the screen oxide.

Step	Process	<b>Description</b>		
	Pre-LTO clean	5:1 H <sub>2</sub> O:HCl 5 min, 5:1:1 H <sub>2</sub> O:NH <sub>4</sub> OH:H <sub>2</sub> O <sub>2</sub>		
		30 s, 5:1 H <sub>2</sub> O:HCl 10 min		
$\mathcal{L}$	<b>Screen Oxide Deposition</b>	11 nm (target) LPCVD $SiO2$		
3	Ion-implant	Various n-type species		
4	Implant activation	600 °C N <sub>2</sub> RTA 60 s		
	Screen removal and pre-gate clean	50:1 H <sub>2</sub> O:HF, 5:1 HCl 5 min		

Table 4.1. Initial process flow for n-type channel implanted MOSFETs. Following step **5,** the **MOSFET** is completed as in Table **2.3.**



Figure 4.2. Monte Carlo simulation (TRIM **[53])** of the as-implanted concentrations of the n-typespecies investigated in this work.

	<b>Screen</b>	Species, Dose, Energy	<b>Primary Experimental Goals</b>	
	Oxide			
	<b>Thickness</b>			
$\mathbf{A}$	22 nm,	P, $1x10^{12}$ cm <sup>-2</sup> , 10 keV	Impact of phosphorus $+$ ozone for	
	$14 \text{ nm}$ (thin)	P, $4x10^{12}$ cm <sup>-2</sup> , 15 keV	Ge n-FET, phosphorus impact on	
			p-FET	
			[nominal $O_3$ process]	
B	$11 \text{ nm}$	As, $1x10^{12}$ cm <sup>-2</sup> , 25 keV	Impact of other n-type species on	
		As, $4x10^{12}$ cm <sup>-2</sup> , 25 keV	Ge n-FET	
		Sb, $1x10^{12}$ cm <sup>-2</sup> , 30 keV	[nominal $O_3$ process]	
		Sb, $4x10^{12}$ cm <sup>-2</sup> , 30 keV		
C	$13 \text{ nm}$	Sb, $1x10^{12}$ cm <sup>-2</sup> , 30 keV	Re-investigation of p-FET	
		Sb, $2x10^{12}$ cm <sup>-2</sup> , 30 keV	phenomena, impact of implant	
		Sb, $4x10^{12}$ cm <sup>-2</sup> , 30 keV	activation temperature	
			[optimal $O_3$ process]	

**Table 4.2. Experimental summary for the study of n-type channel implants in Ge MOSFETs.**



**Figure 4.3. Secondary ion mass spectroscopy (SIMS) profile of ion-implanted P in Ge, dashed line indicates approximate substrate doping (p-type, Ga). The implant was performed through a 14 nm LTO screen oxide (equivalent to the thin lot A device). Sample received the full thermal budget of the complete MOSFET process flow.**

### **4.2 Phosphorus Channel Implant with Ozone Surface Treatment**

Long channel ring-FETs were fabricated on **p-** and n-type Ge substrates **(Sb: 0.16-0.22**  $\Omega$ -cm, Ga: 0.42-0.46  $\Omega$ -cm). The devices were fabricated with same process flow and 6 nm ALD  $\text{Al}_2\text{O}_3$  gate dielectric as the devices described in Section 3.3 (un-optimized  $\text{O}_3$ ) process). As in the previous experiment, Ge n-FETs show enhanced electron mobility for increasing dose of phosphorus as shown in Figure **4.1.** Implanted devices show no change in subthreshold swing (see Figure *5.6)* and no evidence of buried channel operation, suggesting that a reduction in interface state density may be responsible for the improved mobility. **A** more detailed discussion of the measured characteristics of the devices in lot **A** will follow in Chapter *5.*



**Figure 4.4. Effective electron mobility (split-CV) for Ge n-MOSFETs (lot A) receiving channel implants of phosphorus in addition to the 03 surface treatment (un-optimized)**

## **4.3 Arsenic and Antimony Implantation**

The lot B experiment investigated channel implants of arsenic and antimony as detailed in Table 4.2. Long channel ring-FETs were fabricated on p-type Ge substrates with the same **ALD** 40nm **WN / 6** nm **A120 <sup>3</sup>**gate stack used in the lot **A** experiment, and again using the nominal  $O_3$  treatment discussed in Section 3.4. It is assumed that the effective implanted dose in this experiment is higher than the lot **A** devices due to the thinner screen oxide used. Figure 4.5 shows the effective electron mobility for devices receiving two different doses of either As or **Sb,** indicating that they behave similarly. Even higher mobility enhancements are observed in this case, with the higher dose devices displaying higher-than-Si mobility at low inversion charge number density,  $N_{inv}$ . As shown in Figure 4.6, the higher dose devices do show some buried channel characteristics, as evident in the degraded subthreshold swing and **C-V** stretch-out compared to the lower-dose devices. This may account for some of the mobility enhancement at low  $N_{inv}$  as the inversion centroid forms further away from the gate interface. However a large mobility enhancement is still observed at high  $N_{inv}$  where even the  $4x10^{12}$  devices become more surface-channel like (apparent from the similar value of  $C_{\text{gsd,max}}$  in Figure 4.6). For comparison, the characteristics of the n-FET devices fabricated in the later lot **C** experiment are shown in Figure 4.7. These devices were fabricated with the same gate stack and very similar implant conditions **(Sb** only) as indicated in Table 4.2, and not surprisingly, show similar electron mobility as the lot B devices.



Figure 4.5. Effective electron mobility (split-CV) for Ge n-MOSFETs receiving channel implants of antimony and arsenic.



Figure 4.6. Typical Is-Vg and inversion-side **C-V** for the **Sb** implanted Ge n-FETs of lot B. The As implanted devices (not shown) behave similarly.



Figure 4.7. Effective electron mobility (split-CV) and the corresponding I<sub>s</sub>-V<sub>g</sub> curves for the Sb**implanted n-FETs of lot C. The measured CET of all devices is 3.9 nm.**

This large mobility enhancement at high N<sub>inv</sub> suggests a fundamental improvement in the quality of gate interface has occurred as a result of the n-type channel implant. In order gauge the influence of the implant on the Ge/high-k interface chemistry, XPS was performed on substrates receiving a  $4x10^{12}$  cm<sup>-2</sup> dose implant of Sb identical to the conditions in lot B. The analysis of the Ge related peaks is shown in Figure 4.8, and reveals no detectable change compared to a substrate receiving no implant (at least within the detection limits of XPS). Additionally, no **Sb** signature was evident, and no difference was observed in other peaks of interest (01s, Cis, Fls). This is in contrast with the analysis **of** 03-treated Ge discussed in Section 3.4, where significant changes in interfacial chemistry was observed. This implies that the mechanism for the mobility improvement is different in the case of the n-type implanted devices. Considerable evidence for improved interface quality and reduced  $D_{it}$  for these devices will be discussed in Chapter **5.**



**Figure 4.8. Germanium XPS spectra for samples receiving no implant and a 4x1012 cm-2 Sb implant. [R. Contreras, M. Milojevic and R.M. Wallace (UT Dallas)]**

### **4.4 Impact on Germanium p-MOSFET**

It was originally speculated **by** Ritenour et al. **[52]** that the observed mobility improvement in P-implanted Ge n-FETs could be the result of the suppression of some undesirable interfacial oxide. The XPS results presented in the previous section would imply this is not the case, and suggests the electron mobility enhancement is the result of a different mechanism. In order to gauge to impact of n-type dopant channel implants on hole transport, long channel Ge p-FETs were fabricated as part of the lot **A** and lot **C** experiments outlined in Table 4.2. The calculated hole mobilities for the lot **A** and lot **C** p-FETs are shown in Figure 4.9 and Figure 4.10, respectively. In contrast with the corresponding n-FET devices, no mobility enhancement is observed in the implanted **p-** **FET** devices. In fact, slight mobility degradation is observed for P and **Sb** implanted devices that worsens for increasing implanted dose.

In this case, devices are fabricated on n-type substrates receiving an additional n-type channel implant, increasing the effective substrate doping concentration. In other words, these **p-FET** devices are operating at an increased effective field. In this light, the observed mobility degradation could be viewed as consistent with increased effective field operation. The actual effective field is difficult to estimate because the precise doping profile of the substrate is not known. Other methodologies for estimating the total depletion charge rely on knowledge of the flatband voltage, which is also difficult to estimate in the presence of significant interface trapping.

Nevertheless, it can be concluded that the n-type channel implants have no beneficial impact on hole transport. This again suggests that the nature of the observed electron mobility enhancement is not due to a passivation effect that is uniform across the Ge bandgap.



**Figure 4.9. Effective bele mobility (split-CV) for Ge p-MOSFETs receiving channel implants of phosphorus (lot A).**



**Figure 4.10. Effective hole mobility (split-CV) and corresponding Is-Vg characteristics for Ge p-FET devices receiving channel implants of antimony (lot C). The measured CET of all devices is 3.8 nm.**

### 4.5 Chapter Summary

**All** n-type species investigated as channel implants prior to **ALD** gate stack deposition were observed to result in enhanced electron mobility in Ge n-FET devices. As and **Sb** implanted n-FETs exhibit electron mobility higher than Si for the first time, but degrade at higher inversion densities. Ge **p-FET** devices implanted with P or **Sb** show degraded mobility compared to un-implanted devices, which is likely the result of increased effective field operation. This suggests that any electrical improvement to the Ge interface as a result of the n-type implant is energetically confined near the conduction band. This claim is investigated in more detail in the following chapter.

# **Chapter 5 - Improved Interface Characteristics for n-type Dopant Implanted Germanium n-MOSFETs**

### **5.1 Introduction**

In the previous chapter, results were presented that indicated significant electron mobility enhancements in Ge n-MOSFETs could be obtained through the use of n-type channel implants. These enhancements were largest at low inversion density, but even for inversion densities up to  $8x10^{12}$  cm<sup>-2</sup>, the mobility for the best performing devices was more than two times higher than for un-implanted devices (see Figure 4.5). This suggests that the mobility enhancements cannot be solely attributed to reduced effective field operation. Evidence will be presented in this chapter that n-type implants improve the electrical quality of the Ge-dielectric interface primarily through the reduction of trap states near the conduction band edge.

### **5.2 Substrate Bias Response**

The application of a reverse bias between the source and the substrate increases the amount of depletion charge at a given gate bias and therefore increases the threshold voltage. It also pushes the average distance of the inversion charge distribution centroid closer to the gate interface, due to the increased magnitude of the electric field near the semiconductor surface. This effect can be exploited to compare the channel-implanted devices (particularly those that display buried-channel behavior) with un-implanted devices at an equivalent centroid distance. The concept of inversion centroid is illustrated

in Figure **5.1** via simulation of the electron concentration in a Ge n-MOSFET  $(Sentaurus<sup>TM</sup> Device Simulator)$ . The classical solution to Poisson's Equation for the electron concentration in the channel of a **MOSFET** yields a density profile that is peaked at the gate interface. **A** more accurate solution considering the quantum confinement of carriers in the **2D** electron gas yields a profile that is peaked away from the interface and has a larger centroid. This more accurate solution is obtained **by** simultaneously solving Poisson's Equation coupled with Schrodinger's Equation to capture quantum effects. It is this increased centroid that leads to the discrepancy between the capacitance equivalent thickness **(CET)** and equivalent oxide thickness **(EOT),** particularly for thin gates.



**Figure 5.1. SentaurusTM simulation of electron density vs. vertical distance away from the gate interface for the classical case (dashed) and considering quantum confinement of the inversion charge (solid).**

Figure 5.2 shows source current vs. gate voltage, I<sub>s</sub>-Vg characteristics for unimplanted and implanted n-FET devices at varying substrate bias. The effect of the substrate can be seen to increase  $V_t$  in both devices and also to degrade  $I_s$  at high gate overdrive. Also, the  $4x10^{12}$  implanted device shows improving subthreshold swing as the buried-channel behavior becomes suppressed due to the shift in the inversion centroid. At approximately  $V_{sb} = -1$  V, the  $4x10^{12}$  device shows a subthreshold swing that is roughly equivalent to un-implanted device with no substrate bias. At this substrate bias (and larger), the implanted device maintains a significantly higher  $I_s$  than the un-implanted device, and also shows less overall degradation in  $I_s$  as a function of substrate bias. This is more clearly evident in Figure **5.3** where the effective mobility of these same devices is shown for different substrate biases. Even at a substrate bias of -2 V, the implanted device maintains more than  $2x$  mobility relative to an un-implanted device at high  $N_{inv}$ .



Figure **5.2.** Is-Vg characteristics for (a) un-implanted and **(b)** Sb-implanted Ge n-FETs (lot B) at various substrate biases.



Figure **5.3.** Effective electron mobility (split-CV) as a function of substrate bias for un-implanted and Sb-implanted Ge n-FET devices (lot B).

**A** similar analysis was performed on the **p-FET** and n-FET devices of lot **C.** Figure 5.4a shows the relative change in Is for both un-implanted and Sb-implanted devices at a constant gate overdrive. In other words this is the measured  $I_s$  independent of the actual threshold voltage  $(V_t)$  of each device and independent of the increase in  $V_t$ caused by the application of a substrate bias. In this case  $V_t$  is defined by the linear extrapolation of the measured  $I_s-V_g$  curve at  $|V_{ds}| = 50$  mV. The actual  $I_s$  for each device is shown in Figure *5.4b.*


Figure 5.4. (a) Relative change in  $I_s$  ( $|V_{ds}| = 50$  mV) at a constant gate overdrive for the p-FET and n-FET devices of lot **C** and **(b)** the corresponding actual **I,** at the same gate overdrive.

**Of** note is the large difference in the degradation of the **p-FET** devices compared to the n-FET devices, illustrating the superiority of the interface as it relates to hole transport. The implanted n-FET device has a higher actual drive current than the unimplanted device, but is also less severely degraded with application of substrate bias, suggesting a fundamental improvement in the quality of the interface for electrons. However, the relative change in current for the implanted **p-FET** device is nearly identical to un-implanted device, suggesting that improvement in the interface is energetically confined near the conduction band.

**A** simulation study was undertaken in order to verify that these qualitative claims regarding centroid modulation are consistent with theory. **A** Schrodinger-Poisson calculation of the inversion centroid in Ge was performed with the Sentaurus<sup>TM</sup> device simulator using Ge band parameters. The average distance of the inversion centroid versus both inversion density and calculated vertical effective field is plotted in Figure 5.5. The implanted device was assumed to have a  $4x10^{12}$  cm<sup>-2</sup> dose implant peaked at the interface with a depth that roughly matches the **SIMS** profile in Figure 4.3. As expected,

the centroid distance is indeed larger for the implanted case when no substrate bias is applied. However with the application of  $V_{bs} = 2 V$ , the centroid distance becomes nearly equivalent to un-implanted case.



Figure 5.5. Simulation of inversion centroid in Ge for a uniformly doped substrate vs. an n-type implanted substrate with and without an applied substrate bias. A doping level of  $N_A = 1 \times 10^{16}$  cm<sup>-3</sup> was assumed.

### **5.3** Threshold Voltage Behavior



Figure **5.6.** Measured **I,-Vg** characteristics for the phosphorus implanted Ge MOSFETs in lot **A.**

Inspection of the  $I_s-V_g$  data in Figure 5.6 shows that while the n-FET devices of lot A show large shifts in  $V_t$  for increasing phosphorus dose, the corresponding p-FET devices show very little shift. It should be noted that the extracted value of  $V_t$  from  $I_s-V_g$ curves may vary depending on the choice of extraction method [48]. The simplest method is to specify a value of source or drain current and define the corresponding gate voltage as  $V_t$ , often referred to as the constant current method. This current value is somewhat arbitrary, but is often taken as  $I_t = (W/L) \cdot 1 \times 10^{-7}$  A [54]. For the device geometries used in this work, this corresponds to a width-normalized source current of  $5x10^{-3} \mu A/\mu m$ , as labeled in Figure 5.7. A more common definition of  $V_t$  is the  $V_g$ -intercept in the linear extrapolation of  $I_s$  at low  $V_{ds}$  (see Figure 5.7). This may result in a different numerical value of  $V_t$  than the constant current method (or other methods), however in this chapter emphasis will placed on the measured shift in  $V_t$  values, which is expected to be less sensitive to the choice of extraction method.

For example, this excess  $V_t$  shift is even more apparent in the n-FET devices of lot B. As indicated in Figure 5.7, the observed shift in the extrapolated  $V_t$  (relative to an un-implanted device) for the device receiving a  $1 \times 10^{12}$  cm<sup>-2</sup> Sb implant is approximately 340 mV. Using the constant current definition of  $V_t$  described above, the same shift is calculated as 400 mV. Interestingly, either value is larger than the maximum shift one could expect assuming the full dose as-implanted was present, active, and completely confined to the interface. In this limiting case the expected shift would be:

$$
\Delta V_t = \frac{qD}{C_{ox}} = \frac{q(1x10^{12} \, \text{cm}^{-2})}{1 \, \mu \text{F} / \, \text{cm}^2} = 160 \, \text{mV} \tag{3}
$$

where q is the elementary charge,  $D$  is the implanted dose, and  $C_{ox}$  is the oxide capacitance. From the **SIMS** profile in Figure 4.3 it is clear that the implant profile extends at least *50* nm into the substrate, and it is also likely that some dopant loss into the screen oxide occurs during the activation anneal, both of which would reduce the expected shift in  $V_t$  from this maximum value.



Figure 5.7. Observed shift in the linearly extrapolated threshold voltage for a  $1x10^{12}$  cm<sup>-2</sup> implantation of **Sb** in a Ge n-FET.

**A** more detailed analysis was performed on the n-FET and **p-FET** devices of lot C, which were also processed with a thinner screen oxide than the phosphorus implanted devices of lot A. The extrapolated  $V_t$  for all devices is summarized in Table 5.1. Once again, for the  $1x10^{12}$  cm<sup>-2</sup> dose n-FET the observed  $V_t$  shift is greater than could be predicted by the limiting case discussed above. A measurable  $V_t$  shift is now apparent in the **p-FET** devices, yet in every case the identically implanted n-FET shows a far greater shift. This additional shift could be attributed to a reduction of acceptor-like trap states. An acceptor trap in the upper half on the bandgap becomes negatively charged when occupied **by** an electron. This negative charge would otherwise result in a higher threshold voltage for n-FET devices and degrade mobility through increased Coulomb scattering.

	$V_{t,PMOS}(V)$ $\Delta V_{t,P}(V)$		$V_{t, NMOS} (V)$	$\Delta V_{t,N}$ (V)	$V_{t,N} - V_{t,P}(V)$
No Implant	$-0.28$	0	0.59	0	0.87
Sb $1x10^{12}$ cm <sup>-2</sup>	$-0.32$	$-0.04$	0.39	$-0.20$	0.71
Sb $2x10^{12}$ cm <sup>-2</sup>	$-0.37$	$-0.09$	0.29	$-0.30$	0.66
Sb $4x10^{12}$ cm <sup>-2</sup>	$-0.46$	$-0.18$	0.10	$-0.49$	0.56

Table **5.1.** Extrapolated threshold voltage from linear **I,-Vg** characteristics for all lot **C** devices.

In the absence of an applied back bias, the threshold voltage of a **N(P)MOSFET** with a uniform doping profile can be approximated **by** *[55]:*

$$
V_{iN(P)} = V_{FB} + (-\frac{2kT}{q} \ln \left[ \frac{N_{A(D)}}{n_i} \right] + (-\frac{\sqrt{2q \varepsilon_s N_{A(D)}}}{C_{ox}} \sqrt{\frac{2kT}{q} \ln \left[ \frac{N_{A(D)}}{n_i} \right]}
$$
(4)

where  $N_{A(D)}$  is the substrate doping concentration,  $n_i$  is the intrinsic carrier concentration,  $\varepsilon_s$  is the semiconductor permittivity, and  $C_{ox}$  is the oxide capacitance. The flatband voltage,  $V_{FB}$  is given by [55]:

$$
V_{FB} = \Phi_{MS} - \frac{Q_f}{C_{ox}} - \frac{Q_i}{C_{ox}}
$$
\n
$$
\tag{5}
$$

where  $\Phi_{\text{MS}}$  is the metal-semiconductor work function difference ( $\Phi_{\text{M}}$  -  $\Phi_{\text{S}}$ ), and  $Q_{\text{f}}$  and  $Q_{\text{i}}$ are contribution from the fixed oxide charge and trapped interface charge, respectively.

The metal work function,  $\Phi_M$ , of the WN produced by the ALD reaction used in this work has been reported elsewhere as 4.6 eV *[56].* In the absence of any oxide fixed charge or interface-trapped charge, this value could be used to calculate ideal values of V<sub>tN</sub> and V<sub>tP</sub>. However, the quantity of oxide fixed charge is not known, and the large C-V

hysteresis and measured  $D_{it}$  values observed in this work imply that additional charge trapping may strongly impact  $V_{FB}$  (see Appendix D). Therefore, a fairer metric is the difference between  $V_{tN}$  and  $V_{tP}$ , which can be expressed, in the ideal case  $(Q_i = 0)$  as:

$$
V_{iN} - V_{iP} = \frac{kT}{q} \ln\left(\frac{N_A N_D}{n_i^2}\right) + \frac{2\sqrt{kT\epsilon_s}}{C_{ox}} \left[\sqrt{N_A \ln\left(\frac{N_A}{n_i}\right)} + \sqrt{N_D \ln\left(\frac{N_D}{n_i}\right)}\right]
$$
(6)

which has no dependence on  $\Phi_M$  or  $Q_f$ .

Using the un-implanted devices of lot C as an example  $(N_A \approx N_D \approx 10^{16} \text{ cm}^3, \text{C}_{ox}$  $= 10^{-6}$  F/cm<sup>2</sup>, n<sub>i</sub> = 2.4x10<sup>13</sup> cm<sup>-2</sup>), the ideal V<sub>t</sub> difference calculated from Eq. 6 is V<sub>tN</sub> - $V_{tP} = 0.40$  V. The actual measured  $V_t$  difference indicated in Table 5.1 is 0.87 V, far in excess of the ideal value. In this light, the excessive shift observed in the implanted n-FET devices can be viewed as consistent with reduced charge trapping, considering that  $V_{tN}$  -  $V_{tP}$  has been reduced. If one assumes that the excess difference in  $V_t$  for the unimplanted devices is due to trapped interface charge, Qi, then the density of that charge,  $D_{trap}$ , can be calculated as:

$$
D_{trap} = \frac{Q_i}{q} = \frac{(\Delta V_{t,meas} - \Delta V_{t,ideal})C_{ox}}{q}
$$
\n(7)

where  $C_{ox} = 0.9 \mu$ F/cm<sup>2</sup> for the lot C devices. This calculation yields a value for  $D_{trap}$  of  $2.6x10^{12}$  cm<sup>-2</sup>. The extent to which  $D_{trap}$  has been reduced for the implanted devices is difficult to assess because the exact doping profile is unknown and therefore the expected change in  $V_t$  is also unknown. However, in the next two sections low temperature measurements will be presented that suggest  $D_{it}$  near the conduction band edge has been reduced by a  $4x10^{12}$  cm<sup>-2</sup> n-type implant by approximately  $7.7x10^{12}$  to  $1.1x10^{13}$  cm<sup>-2</sup>eV<sup>-1</sup> depending on the technique used. For the portion of the Ge bandgap probed in these techniques, this corresponds to a reduction in total trapped charge between  $1.1x10^{12}$  and  $1.7x10^{12}$  cm<sup>-2</sup>, a large portion of the value for D<sub>trap</sub> calculated above.

## 5.4 **Low Temperature Characterization**

**A** series of low temperature measurements were made on the As-implanted devices of lot B in order to provide further evidence for the reduction of interface-state density near the conduction band edge. Measurements were made with a liquid nitrogen cryostat from room temperature down to **80** K. **A** technique similar to the Gray-Brown method discussed in Chapter **3** compares the shift in threshold voltage as a function of temperature compared to the ideal amount expected [48][29]. Any additional shift in threshold voltage can then be attributed to increased charging of interface states that occurs as the Fermi level moves closer to Ec. This behavior is summarized in Figure *5.8* and shows a clear trend that is consistent with the mobility observations discussed in Chapter 4.



**Figure 5.8. Threshold voltage shift as a function of temperature for Ge n-MOSFETs receiving As channel implants compared to an un-implanted device and the ideal case.**

The interface state density can be calculated as:

$$
D_{it} = \frac{\left(\Delta V_{t,meas} - \Delta V_{t,ideal}\right)C_{ox}}{q\Delta E_{F}}
$$
\n(8)

where  $\Delta V_{t,meas}$  is the difference in the linearly extrapolated threshold voltage for a given change in temperature, and  $\Delta E_F$  is the change in the position of the Fermi level (at inversion) over the same temperature range. As shown in Figure *5.9,* this calculation yields an average value of  $D_{it}$  near the conduction band of 1.7x10<sup>13</sup>, 9.6x10<sup>12</sup>, and 6.1x10<sup>12</sup> cm<sup>-2</sup> eV<sup>-1</sup> for the un-implanted, and  $1x10^{12}$  cm<sup>-2</sup>, and  $4x10^{12}$  cm<sup>-2</sup> implanted devices, respectively.



Figure **5.9.** Interface state density near the conduction band edge calculated from the low temperature threshold voltage shift. Discrete points indicate calculated values of D<sub>it</sub> for each step in temperature, while the dashed lines indicate the average of all values near E<sub>C</sub>.

**A** similar analysis can be performed **by** measuring the change in subthreshold slope as a function of temperature. As a **MOSFET** turns on majority carriers can become trapped **by** interface states instead of contributing to the measured current. This becomes apparent as degradation in subthreshold swing, which can expressed as [48]:

$$
S = \frac{kT}{q} \ln 10 \left( 1 + \frac{C_D + C_{ii}}{C_{ox}} \right) \tag{9}
$$

where C<sub>D</sub> is the capacitance of the depletion layer, C<sub>it</sub> is the capacitance of charged interface states, and  $C_{ox}$  in the gate oxide capacitance. The interface state density can then be calculated by comparing the measured value of S to the ideal case where  $C_{it} = 0$ . Then,  $D_{it}$  can be expressed as [48]:

$$
qD_{it} = C_{it} = \left[\frac{S_{meas}}{S_{ideal}}\left(1 + \frac{C_D}{C_{ox}}\right) - 1\right] \frac{C_{ox}}{C_D}
$$
(10)

Figure **5.10** again shows a trend in **S** that is consistent with the observed mobility. Calculating  $D_{it}$  from Eq. 10 for the measured S values at 80 K yields values of 1.3  $\times 10^{13}$ , 9.0  $x10^{12}$ , 5.3  $x10^{12}$  cm<sup>-2</sup> eV<sup>-1</sup> for the O<sub>3</sub>-only, As-1x10<sup>12</sup>, and As-4x10<sup>12</sup> devices, respectively. This is in good agreement with values of  $D_{it}$  calculated above by the  $V_t$  shift method. It is noted that the subthreshold swing of the implanted devices near room temperature is dominated **by** direct leakage from source to drain as a result of the overcompensated doping profile in the channel. This leakage is suppressed at lower temperatures, allowing the trap-limited swing to be measured.



Figure **5.10.** Subthreshold swing versus temperature for Ge n-MOSFETs receiving As channel implants.

#### **5.5** Germanium **MOS** Capacitor Behavior

In order to quantify the impact of the n-type channel implant on fast traps near the conduction band, conductance measurements were made on n-type Ge **MOS** capacitors fabricated with identical conditions to the lot **C** MOSFETs described earlier in this chapter. Conductance measurements are possible on **MOSFET** structures **[57][58],** but the devices fabricated in this work use a thin gate metal that contributes a large series resistance to measured gate capacitance and conductance at high frequencies. The capacitors presented in this section were fabricated with the same Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> and WN process as the lot **C** MOSFETs but capped with **250** nm **Al** metal. **A** post-metal RTA was performed at **500 'C** for 1 min in **N2** in order to replicate the thermal budget of the typical **MOSFET** process flow.

The complete  $G_p/\omega$  characteristics for the un-implanted and Sb-implanted capacitors can be found at the end of this section in Figure **5.13** and Figure *5.14.* Interestingly, the measured profiles from room temperature down to **80** K are nearly identical for both devices. At 300 K where  $E_F$  is positioned near the middle of the bandgap, clear peaks are observed in the  $G_p/\omega$  curves corresponding to a minimum  $D_{it}$ value of approximately  $3x10^{11}$  cm<sup>-2</sup>eV<sup>-1</sup>. As discussed in Chapter 3, lowering the temperature will shift  $E_F$  closer to the conduction band edge (for an n-type capacitor), allowing different trap states to be sampled. The reduction in temperature also increases the time constant for the corresponding states, allowing them to respond to lower measurement frequencies. However in these samples, no distinct peaks are observed in the  $G_p/\omega$  characteristics at 80 K indicating that the fast interface states near  $E_c$  maintain an associated time constant that is out of the range of these measurements. Therefore a precise value of  $D_{it}$  cannot be assigned to this trap level, although inspection of Figure **5.13** and Figure 5.14 would suggest a value at least an order of magnitude higher than the slower midgap states.

Again, as in Chapter **3,** the Gray-Brown method was used in order to quantify the total amount of charge trapping present in these devices. Although it is clear from the conductance data that some states will not be 'frozen-out' at **80** K, this technique should still provide a qualitative comparison between the un-implanted and Sb-implanted samples. It should also capture the effect of slower states that are not accessible via the conductance method *[59].* As shown in Figure *5.11,* a greater flatband shift as a function of temperature is observed in the un-implanted n-type capacitor. Figure *5.12* summarizes the measured flatband shift in both capacitors in comparison with the ideal shift in the absence of interface states. Comparing the total V<sub>FB</sub> shift at 80 K to the ideal value, one obtains  $D_{it}$  values of  $1.2x10^{13}$  and  $5.0x10^{12}$  for the un-implanted and Sb-implanted capacitors, respectively. Once again, this corresponds well to the calculated  $D_{it}$  values from low temperature measurements on the As-implanted MOSFETs of lot B discussed in the previous section.

Although the precise value of 'fast' D<sub>it</sub> cannot be ascertained from the conductance measurements, the similarity of the measured spectra in Figure *5.13* and Figure *5.14* would suggest that overall profile of fast traps is similar for un-implanted and implanted substrates. Combined with the significant reduction in trapping observed using the Gray-Brown method, this would suggest the primary effect of the n-type channel implant is a reduction in slow states near Ec. This is consistent with the observations of Khakifirooz **[6],** who performed pulsed I-V measurements on similar P-implanted Ge n-FETs, and concluded that the mobility enhancement observed in those devices was primarily the result of a reduction in slow trap states.



**Figure 5.11 Measured low temperature C-V characteristics for n-type Ge MOS capacitors at**  $f = 1$  MHz with ALD WN/Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> gate stack. The capacitor on the right received a  $4x10^{12}$  cm<sup>-2</sup> dose **implant of Sb with a 600 \*C activation anneal prior to gate deposition.**



Figure **5.12.** Measured shift in flatband voltage as a function of temperature for the **C-V** characteristics shown in Figure **5.11** with comparison to the ideal value in the absence of interface states.



Figure **5.13.** *G,/o* vs. frequency with gate voltage as a parameter at various temperatures for an ntype Ge **MOS** capacitor with no channel implant. The indicated gate voltages correspond to biasing in depletion where the conductance method is valid.



Figure 5.14.  $G_p/\omega$  vs. frequency with gate voltage as a parameter at various temperatures for an ntype Ge **MOS** capacitor with a channel implant of **Sb** (4x10" cm-2 , **30** keV).

### **5.6 Chapter Summary**

In this chapter significant evidence for  $D_{it}$  reduction resulting from n-type channel implants was presented. Substrate bias response suggests that the observed mobility enhancement is not the result of a shift in the inversion layer centroid. **A** comparison of the degradation in drive current for implanted and un-implanted n-FET devices suggests that a fundamental improvement in the electrical quality of the gate interface has occurred as a result of the n-type dopant channel implant.

Low temperature observations of **MOSFET** threshold voltage and subthreshold swing both suggest a reduction in slow trap states for implanted devices. This claim is further supported by that observation of excessive  $V_t$  shifts in implanted n-FET devices, which is consistent with a reduction in negatively charged acceptor-like trap states. Conductance measurements performed on n-type **MOS** capacitors seem to imply that the density of fast trap states has not been significantly affected by a  $4x10^{12}$  cm<sup>-2</sup> dose ion-implant of **Sb.** However, low temperature measurements performed on the same capacitors also show a large reduction in slow trap states, consistent with the **MOSFET** observations.

Other authors have reported observations of slow acceptor traps in Ge/oxide systems. Afanas'ev et al. reported that Ge/HfO2 **MOS** structures appeared to be dominated **by** slow acceptor states attributed to defects in the near-interfacial oxide layer [60]. Kuzum et al. observed severe slow trapping of electrons in  $Ge/GeO<sub>2</sub>/Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>$  n-FETs attributed to the filling of  $GeO<sub>2</sub>/Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>$  border traps as a result of the low conduction band

89

offset between Ge and GeO<sub>2</sub> [25]. Martens speculated that the poor-performance of Si-passivated Ge n-FETs could be explained **by** a double-acceptor trap state near the Ge conduction band **[61].** The analysis presented in this chapter suggests that the gate interfaces investigated in this work are also dominated **by** slow acceptor-like trap states near Ec that strongly influence the threshold behavior and electron mobility in Ge n-FETs. Channels implants of n-type dopant species are effective at reducing the density of these trap states with a resulting increase in electron mobility.

### **Chapter 6 - Conclusions**

### **6.1 Summary**

The key contributions of this thesis are:

- **1.** Observation that the native oxide of Ge can provide a thermally stable interface with reduced  $D_{it}$  for subsequent deposition of high-k gate dielectrics.
- 2. Development and optimization of a novel  $O_3$  passivation technique that can be performed at low temperatures and in-situ as part of an **ALD** gate stack. The optimal passivation recipe suggests that  $O_3$  along with some contribution from  $NO<sub>x</sub>$  species yields the lowest  $D<sub>it</sub>$ .
- 3. The  $O_3$  surface treatment results in reduced  $D_{it}$  across the Ge bandgap, lowest reported subthreshold swing for surface channel Ge MOSFETs, and higher-than-Si hole mobility with an **EOT** contribution of only **0.3** nm.
- 4. An experimental study on **MOSFET S/D** annealing temperature suggested that, unlike other similar methods, the surface treatment developed in this work is thermally stable at more typical Ge **S/D** activation temperatures.
- **5. A MOSFET** lot was fabricated with **ALD** Hf02 gate dielectrics indicating that the **03** surface treatment is effective with multiple **ALD** materials, and near 1 nm **EOT** devices were demonstrated with very low gate leakage.
- **6.** Several ion-implanted n-type dopant species were observed to result in significant electron mobility enhancement, particularly at low inversion densities, resulting in the first observation of higher-than-Si electron mobility in a Ge **MOSFET.**
- **7.** Substrate bias measurements were performed that indicate that these mobility enhancements are not the result of reduced effective field operation or a shift in the inversion centroid.
- 8. Observations of excessive  $V_t$  shifting in implanted n-FET devices, as well as low temperature **MOSFET** and **MOS** capacitor characterization indicate a large reduction in charge trapping for n-type dopant channel implants.
- **9.** The mobility enhancement is attributed to a reduction in slow acceptor-like trap states near the conduction band of Ge.

### **6.2 Future Work**

The conclusions of Chapter **3** suggest that a combination of **03** at low temperature plus some contribution from  $NO<sub>x</sub>$  species provides additional reduction in  $D<sub>it</sub>$  over  $O<sub>3</sub>$  alone. The exact impact of this additional NOx on the interfacial chemistry of the passivation layer is also not known, but a more detailed XPS study may be possible. The limits of the ozone generator in terms of  $N_2$  dopant flow were reached in this experiment, however alternate methods for introducing  $NO<sub>x</sub>$  during the passivation step may provide even better interface characteristics. These may include introduction of some nitrogen-containing plasma during the passivation step **[62],** or intentionally diluting the inlet  $O_2$  stream of the generator with  $N_2$  prior to discharge. The in-situ addition of  $NH_3$ was investigated prior to, during, and following the O<sub>3</sub> surface treatment but was not observed to have any measurable impact on  $D_{it}$ .

**All** column V dopant species investigated in this work were observed to have a significant effect on charge trapping and electron mobility in Ge MOSFETs. The only

technique investigated in this work for introducing these species was ion-implantation. It is possible that other techniques may be more effective such as the epitaxial growth of a thin, highly-doped Ge layer, or attempting a solid-source doping technique prior to gate deposition. It is also noted that there exists an abundance of reports on the beneficial effects of sulfur **[63][64]** or fluorine [24][65] passivation on Ge surfaces. It may be possible that the investigation of column VI or column VII elements following the technique proposed in this thesis could provide additional improvements.

# Appendix **A -** n-type **C-V** Behavior



Figure **A.1.** Forward **C-V** characteristics at **f = 1** kHz, **10** kHz, and **1** MHz, and reverse (dashed) at **f= 1** MHz for n-type Ge capacitors with various **ALD** oxide interfacial layers (all capped with **ALD**  $\mathbf{Al}_2\mathbf{O}_3$ ). Indicated  $\mathbf{D}_{it}$  values were calculated with the conductance method.



Figure **A.2.** Forward **C-V** characteristics at **f =** 1 kHz, **10** kHz, and **1** MHz, and reverse (dashed) at **f = 1** MHz for n-type Ge capacitors with various **ALD** nitride interfacial layers (all capped with **ALD**  $\mathbf{Al}_2\mathbf{O}_3$ ). Indicated  $\mathbf{D}_{it}$  values were calculated with the conductance method.

# **Appendix B - ALD Recipes**

Recipes were developed for a Cambridge NanoTech SavannahTM 200 **ALD** reactor. The nitrogen carrier flow in all cases was fixed at 20 sccm. ALD-mode operation was confirmed **by** verifying a linear thickness dependence on the total number of **ALD** cycles. The thickness and uniformity of the deposition were measured on **150** mm Si wafers **by** spectroscopic ellipsometry, with a typical uniformity of **<** 2% variation across the wafer. Any non-linear thickness dependence or gross non-uniformity was considered a symptom of **CVD** contamination. This is usually evidenced **by** a gradual drop-off in film thickness measuring from the inlet to the outlet side of the chamber, as well as deposition rates much higher than 1 A/cycle. This can addressed **by** reducing precursor dose **(by** reducing the pulse time or the precursor temperature), or **by** increasing the purge time between pulses. **A** thickness profile that is uniform starting from the inlet side of the chamber and then drops off rapidly is a symptom of an under-dosed **ALD** process. This can be addressed **by** increasing precursor dose.

The complete **ALD** window was not verified systematically for each recipe, but will vary as function of the precursor chemistry. In general, a chamber temperature that is too low will not allow for sufficient chemisorption of the precursor dose to allow **ALD** to occur. **A** chamber temperature that is too high will result in thermal decomposition of the adsorbate before the second precursor is introduced into the chamber. Both of these scenarios will generally result in small or sporadic deposition rates.

Precursor	Precursor T	Pulse $(s)$	Expo(s)	Purge (s)		
<b>TDMAA</b>	$110\,^{\circ}\text{C}$	0.1	0	8		
$H_2O$	<b>RT</b>	0.015		8		
	Notes: Substrate Temp = 200 °C, Deposition Rate $\approx$ 1.1 Å/cycle					
Precursor	Precursor T	Pulse (s)	Expo(s)	Purge $(s)$		
<b>TDMAA</b>	110 °C	0.1	0	8		
NH <sub>3</sub>	RT	0.1	0.1	12		
	Notes: Substrate Temp = 200 °C, Deposition Rate $\approx$ 0.9 Å/cycle					
Table B.2. Hafnium oxide and hafnium nitride ALD recipes. (TEMAH = tetrakis(ethylmethylamido)hafnium)						
Precursor						
	Precursor T	Pulse $(s)$	Expo(s)	Purge $(s)$		
<b>TEMAH</b>	95 $\degree$ C	0.1	0	8		
H <sub>2</sub> O	<b>RT</b>	0.015	0	8		
	Notes: Substrate Temp = 200 °C, Deposition Rate $\approx$ 0.9 Å/cycle					
Precursor	Precursor T	Pulse $(s)$	Expo(s)	Purge (s)		

**Table B.1. Aluminum oxide and aluminum nitride ALD recipes. (TDMAA tris(dimethylamido)aluminum)**

TEMAH 95 °C 0.1 0 8 NH<sub>3</sub> RT 0.2 0.2 12 Notes: Substrate Temp **=** 200 **\*C,** Deposition Rate ~ **1.0** A/cycle

**Table B.3. Hafnium oxide and hafnium nitride ALD recipes. (TEMAH** = **tetrakis(ethylmethylamido)hafnium)**

Precursor	Precursor T	Pulse $(s)$	Expo(s)	<i>Purge <math>(s)</math></i>
<b>TEMAH</b>	$95^{\circ}$ C			
$H_2O$	RT	0.015		
	Notes: Substrate Temp = 200 °C, Deposition Rate $\approx$ 0.9 Å/cycle			
Precursor	Precursor T	Pulse $(s)$	Expo(s)	Purge (s)
<b>TFMAH</b>	$95^\circ$ C			



Precursor	Precursor T	Pulse $(s)$	Expo(s)	Purge (s)	
<b>TDMAZ</b>	$70^{\circ}$ C	0.1			
$H_2O$	RT	0.015			
Notes: Substrate Temp = 200 °C, Deposition Rate $\approx 1.0$ Å/cycle					
Precursor	Precursor T	Pulse $(s)$	Expo(s)	Purge $(s)$	
<b>TDMAZ</b>	$70^{\circ}$ C	0.1			
NH <sub>3</sub>	RT	0.2	0.2	12	
Notes: Substrate Temp = 200 °C, Deposition Rate $\approx$ 1.1 Å/cycle					

Table B.4. Zirconium oxide and zirconium nitride ALD recipes. (TDMAZ = **tetrakis(dimethylamido)zirconium)**

**Table B.5. Tungsten nitride ALD recipe. (W = bis(tert-butylimino)bis(dimethylamino)tungsten)**

Precursor	<i>Precursor T</i>	Pulse (s)	Expo(s)	Purge (s)
	90 °C			
NH <sub>3</sub>		0.2		
	Notes: Substrate Temp $\approx$ 350 °C, Deposition Rate $\approx$ 0.35-0.45 Å/cycle			

# Alternate Recipes











 $\mathcal{A}^{\pm}$ 

**Table B.8. Aluminum oxide with isopropyl alcohol as the oxidizing precursor.**

# **Appendix C - Thermal Stability of 03 Treatment**

There have been several reports on the instability of  $GeO<sub>2</sub>$  passivation layers at elevated temperature, requiring reduced **S/D** activation anneals in order achieve best-case mobilities  $[24][25][26]$ . In order to gauge the stability of the  $O_3$  treatment used in this work, the un-implanted MOSFETs from lot **C** were fabricated with two different activation anneals. Figure **C.1** indicates that little change is observed in both hole and electron mobility as a function of activation temperature. This would suggest that the interface layer created by the  $O_3$  surface treatment used in this work does not suffer degradation at more typical **S/D** annealing conditions.



**Figure C.1. Effective carrier mobility (split-CV) for Ge p- and n-MOSFETs fabricated with ALD 40 nm WN** / **6 nm A120 <sup>3</sup> gate stack and two different source/drain activation conditions.**

### **Appendix D - Slow Trapping Behavior**

Significant slow trapping was observed in the **ALD** films investigated in this work, leading to moderate **C-V** hysteresis (see Figure **3.7** and Figure **3.8).** The **03** surface treatment was observed to have little impact on this hysteresis (see Table **3.1).** The same slow trapping states also lead to large I-V hysteresis in the measured **MOSFET** characteristics. As indicated in Figure **D.1,** additional trapping also leads to a shift (towards larger  $|V_t|$ ) in measured  $I_s-V_g$  characteristics for both p-FET and n-FET devices, consistent with hole and electron trapping respectively. This shift is observed to saturate after several sweeps into inversion, and detrapping does not occur as the gate voltage is swept back out of inversion. In other words, a stable hysteretic loop undergoes the same shift toward higher  $|V_t|$ .

Like the voltage hysteresis, this shift behavior is much more notable for electrons than holes. This behavior is summarized in Figure D.2 indicating that the increase in  $|V_t|$ is approximately 8x higher for the un-implanted n-FET device of lot **C** than the equivalent **p-FET** device. **A** similar shift is observed in the measured split-CV characteristics, which can lead to significant errors in mobility calculations if care is not taken. For example, if the first measured  $I_s-V_g$  curve is used along with a subsequently measured inversion-side **C-V,** then the calculated mobility will be greatly overestimated, particularly at low inversion densities. In order to avoid this pitfall, the method used to calculate effective carrier mobility in this work was to perform repeated forward sweeps into inversion until no additional shifting was observed in either the I-V or **C-V** characteristic. Care was taken to sweep over the same voltage range and at the same sweep rate **(~ 0.5** V/s) for both traces. It is these 'stable' characteristics that are presented in the body of this work, and used for the calculation of  $V_t$  and subthreshold swing. It is noted from Figure **D.1** that the subthreshold swing is not notably impacted **by** this shifting behavior.



**Figure D.1. Slow trapping behavior for eight repeated forward sweeps into inversion (solid lines) and**  $I_s-V_g$  hysteresis (dashed line) for the un-implanted lot C MOSFETs (6 nm ALD  $AI_2O_3$ , optimal  $O_3$ **surface treatment, no implant).**



**Figure D.2. Average shift in the extrapolated V, of the lot C MOSFETs for successive sweeps into inversion.**

A clear correlation between the reduction of the  $|V_t|$  shift and implanted Sb dose was observed for n-FET devices as indicated in Figure **D.2.** Little impact was observed for **p-FET** devices receiving the same **Sb** implant. The same trend is also observed in the measured Is-Vg hysteresis as indicated in Figure **D.3.** Both are consistent with the claims of reduced slow-trapping from n-type dopant channel implants presented in Chapter **5,** and provide further evidence of the impact these slow trap states have on electron mobility.



**Figure D.3.** Average measured  $I_s-V_g$  hysteresis (evaluated at  $I_s = 1x10^{-3} \mu A/\mu m$ ) for the lot C **MOSFETs at various doses of ion-implanted Sb.**

Also of note is a comparison of the same behavior for the HfO<sub>2</sub> devices discussed in Chapter 3. Figure D.4 shows that much larger  $|V_t|$  shifts are observed for both the  $HfO_2$ p-FETs and **HfO2** n-FETs compared to the **A120 <sup>3</sup>**devices above. This is consistent with the increased **C-V** hysteresis observed in **MOS** capacitors fabricated with **ALD HfO2,** as well as the measured  $I_s-V_g$  hysteresis (for the same devices in Figure D.4) which increased from an average of **55** mV in the un-implanted **A120 <sup>3</sup> p-FET** to **155** mV for the HfO<sub>2</sub> p-FET; and increased from 260 mV in the  $Al_2O_3$  n-FET to 330 mV in the  $HfO_2$ n-FET. It is interesting to note that although the HfO<sub>2</sub> p-FET devices show dramatically higher slow trapping behavior than their  $A<sub>12</sub>O<sub>3</sub>$  counterparts, the measured hole mobilities are nearly identical (see Figure 3.14). In contrast, the  $HfO<sub>2</sub>$  n-FET devices also show more slow trapping behavior than the  $Al_2O_3$  n-FETs, yet the HfO<sub>2</sub> devices show degraded electron mobility. Combined with the observation above on the impact of **Sb** implants on the slow-trapping behavior of Ge MOSFETs, it becomes clear that these slow states have a large impact on electron mobility in Ge, but very little impact on hole mobility.



Figure D.4. Average shift in the extrapolated  $V_t$  of the  $O_3$ -treated 5 nm HfO<sub>2</sub> MOSFETs for **successive sweeps into inversion.**

### **Bibliography**

- **[1] J.** Bardeen, and W.H. Brattain. "The Transistor, **A** Semi-Conductor Triode", *Phys. Rev.,* vol. 74, no. 2, **pp. 230-231,** 1948.
- [2] W. Shockley, M. Sparks, and G.K. Teal. "p-n Junction Transistors", *Phys. Rev.,* vol. **83,no. 1,pp.** *151-164,* **1951.**
- **[3] J.** Bardeen. "Surface States and Rectification at a Metal Semi-Conductor Contact", *Phys. Rev.,* vol. **71,** no. **10, pp. 717-727,** 1947.
- [4] W. Shockley, and **G.L.** Pearson. "Modulation of Conductance of Thin Films of Semi-Conductors **by** Surface Charges", *Phys. Rev.,* vol. 74, **pp. 232-233,** 1948.
- *[5]* M.M. Atalla, **E.** Tannenbaum, and **E. J.** Scheibner, "Stabilization of Silicon Surfaces **by** Thermally Grown Oxides," *Bell Syst. Tech. J.,* vol. **38, pp.** 749 *(1959).*
- **[6] A.** Khakifirooz, "Transport Enhancement Techniques for Nanoscale MOSFETs", *PhD Thesis,* Massachusetts Institute of Technology, **2008.**
- **[7] D.A.** Antoniadis, **I.** Aberg, **C.** Ni Chleirigh, O.M. Nayfeh, **A.** Khakifirooz, and **J.L.** Hoyt. "Continuous **MOSFET** performance increase with device scaling: The role of strain and channel material innovations," *IBM J. Res. and Dev.,* vol. *50,* no. 4/5, **pp. 363-375, 2006.**
- **[8] A.** Khakifirooz and **D. A.** Antoniadis. "Transistor performance scaling: the role of virtual source velocity and its mobility dependence," *IEDM Tech. Dig.,* **pp. 667- 670, 2006.**
- **[9] S.M.** Sze, *Physics of Semiconductor Devices. 2"d* **Ed.** New York: Wiley, **1981.**
- **[10]** L.L. Chang, and **H.N.** Yu. "The Germanium Insulated-Gate Field-Effect Transistor **(FET)",** *Proc. IEEE,* vol. *53,* no. **3, pp. 316-317,** *1965.*
- **[11] O.J.** Gregory, **L.A.** Pruitt, **E.E.** Crisman, **C.** Roberts, and **P.J.** Stiles. "Native oxides formed on single-crystal germanium **by** wet chemical reactions," *J. Electrochem. Soc.,* vol. **135,** no. 4, **pp. 923-929,** Apr. **1988.**
- [12] **E.E** Crisman, **J.I.** Lee, **P.J.** Stiles, and **O.J.** Gregory. "Characterisation of n-channel germanium **MOSFET** with gate insulator formed **by** high-pressure thermal oxidation", *Electronic Lett.,* vol. **23,** no. **1, pp. 8-10, 1987.**
- **[13] J.J.** Rosenberg, and **S.C.** Martin. "Self-Aligned Germanium MOSFET's Using a Nitrided Native Oxide Gate Insulator", *IEEE Electron Device Lett.,* vol. **9,** no. 12, **pp. 639-640, 1988.**
- [14] **S.C.** Martin, L.M. Hitt, and **J.J.** Rosenberg. "p-Channel Germanium MOSFET's with High Channel Mobility", *IEEE Electron Device Lett.,* vol. **10,** no. **7, pp. 325- 326, 1989.**
- *[15]* H. Shang, H. Okorn-Schimdt, **J.** Ott, P. Kozlowski, **S.** Steen, **E. C.** Jones, **H.-S.** P. Wong, and W. Hanesch. "High mobility p-channel Ge MOSFETs with a thin Ge oxynitride gate dielectric", *IEDM Tech. Dig.,* 2002, **pp.** 441-443.
- **[16]** H. Shang, K-L. Lee, P. Kozlowski, **C.** D'Emic, **I.** Babich, **E.** Sikorski, M. leong, **H-S.P.** Wong, K. Guarini, and W. Haensch. "Self-Aligned n-Channel Germanium MOSFETs With a Thin Ge Oxynitride Gate Dielectric and Tungsten Gate", *IEEE Electron Device Lett.,* vol. *25,* no. **3,** 2004.
- **[17] A.** Ritenour, **S.** Yu, M.L. Lee, **N.** Lu, W. Bai, **A.** Pitera, **E.A.** Fitzgerald, D.L. Kwong, and **D.A.** Antoniadis. "Epitaxial strained germanium p-MOSFETs with HfO2 gate dielectric and TaN gate electrode", *IEDM Tech. Dig.,* **pp.** 433-436, **2003.**
- **[18] G.** Nicholas, D.P. Brunco, **A.** Dimoulas, **J.V.** Steenbergen, F. Bellenger, M. Houssa, M. Caymax, M. Meuris, Y. Panayiotatos, and **A.** Sotiropoulos. "Germanium MOSFETs With CeO<sub>2</sub>/HfO<sub>2</sub>/TiN Gate Stacks", *IEEE Trans. Electron Devices*, vol. *54,* no. 6, 2007.
- **[19] D.** P. Brunco, B. De Jaeger, **G.** Eneman, **J.** Mitard, **G.** Hellings, **A.** Satta, V. Terzieva, L. Souriau, **F.E.** Leys, **G.** Pourtois, M. Houssa, **G.** Winderickx, **E.** Vrancken, **S.** Sioncke, K. Opsomer, **G.** Nicholas, M. Caymax, **A.** Stesmans, **J.** Van Steenbergen, P. W. Mertens, M. Meuris, and M. M. Heyns. "Germanium **MOSFET** Devices: Advances in Materials Understanding, Process Development, and Electrical Performance", *J. Electrochem. Soc.,* vol. **155,** no. **7, pp. H552-H561, 2008.**
- [20] P. Zimmerman, **G.** Nicholas, B. De Jaeger, B. Kaczer, **A.** Stesmans, **L.A.** Ragnarsson, D.P. Brunco, **F.E.** Leys, M. Caymax, **G.** Winderickx, K. Opsomer, M. Meuris, M.M. Heyns. "High performance Ge **pMOS** devices using a Si-compatible process *flow", IEDM Tech. Dig.,* **2006.**
- [21] **S.** Joshi, **C.** Krug, **D.** Heh, **H.J.** Na, H.R. Harris, **J.W.** Oh, P.D. Kirsch, P. Majhi, B.H. Lee, H-H. Tseng, R. Jammy, **J.C.** Lee, and S.K. Banerjee. "Improved Ge Surface Passivation With Ultrathin  $SiO<sub>X</sub>$  Enabling High-Mobility Surface Channel pMOSFETs Featuring a HfSiO/WN Gate Stack", *IEEE Electron Device Lett.,* vol. **28,** no.4, **pp. 308-311, 2007.**
- [22] **E.E.** Crisman, Y.M. Ercil, **J.J.** Loferski, and **P.J.** Stiles. "The Oxidation of Germanium Surfaces at Pressures Much Greater Than One Atmosphere" *J. Electrochem. Soc.,* vol. **129,** no. **8, pp. 1845-1848, 1982.**
- **[23]** T. Takahashi, T. Nishimura, L. Chen, **S.** Sakata, K. Kita and **A.** Toriumi. "Proof of Ge-interfacing Concepts for Metal/High-k/Ge **CMOS",** *IEDM Tech. Dig.,* **pp. 697- 700, 2007.**
- [24] R. Xie, T. Phung, W. He, Z. Sun, M. Yu, Z. Cheng, **C.** Zhu. "High mobility high-k/Ge pMOSFETs with 1 nm **EOT -** New concept on interface engineering and interface characterization", *IEDM Tech. Dig.,* **2008.**
- **[251 D.** Kuzum, T. Krishnamohan, **A.** Nainani, Y. Sun, P.A. Pianetta, **H.S-.P.** Wong, and K. Saraswat. "Experimental Demonstration of High Mobility Ge **NMOS",** *IEDM Tech. Dig.,* **2009.**
- **[26] C.** H. Lee, T. Nishimura, **N.** Saido, K. Nagashio, K. Kita, and **A.** Toriumi. "Recordhigh Electron Mobility in Ge n-MOSFETs exceeding Si Universality", *IEDM Tech. Dig.,* **2009.**
- **[27]** T. Krishnamohan, **D.** Kim, **C.D.** Nguyen, **C.** Jungemann, Y. Nishi, and K.C. Saraswat. "High-Mobility Low Band-To-Band-Tunneling Strained-Germanium Double-Gate Heterostructure FETs: Simulations", *IEEE Trans. Electron Devices,* vol. *53,* no. *5,* **pp. 1000-1009, 2006.**
- **[28] A.** Satta, **E.** Simoen, T. Janssens, T. Clarysse, B. De Jaeger, **A.** Benedetti, **I.** Hoflijk, B. Brijs, M. Meuris, and W. Vandervorst. "Shallow junction ion implantation in Ge and associated defect control," *J. Electrochem. Soc.,* vol. **153,** no. **3, pp. G229-233, 2006.**
- **[29] A.** Ritenour, "Design, Fabrication, and Characterization of Germanium MOSFETs with High-k Gate Dielectric Stacks based on Nitride Interfacial Layers", *PhD Thesis,* Massachusetts Institute of Technology, **2007.**
- **[30]** D.M. Hausmann, **E.** Kim, **J.** Becker, and R.G. Gordon. "Atomic Layer Deposition of Hafnium and Zirconium Oxides Using Metal Amide Precursors", *Chem. Mater.,* vol. 14, **pp.** *4350-4358,* 2002.
- **[31] J.** Becker, **E.** Kim, and R.G. Gordon. "Atomic Layer Deposition of Insulating Hafnium and Zirconium Nitrides", *Chem. Mater.,* vol. **16, pp. 3497-3501,** 2004.
- **[32] J.** Becker, **S.** Suh, **S.** Wang, and R.G. Gordon. **"Highly** Conformal Thin Films of Tungsten Nitride Prepared **by** Atomic Layer Deposition from a Novel Precursor", *Chem. Mater.,* vol. **15, pp. 2969-2976, 2003.**
- **[33] E.H.** Nicollian and J.R. Brews, *MOS (Metal Oxide Semiconductor) Physics and Technology,* New York: Wiley, **2003.**
- [34] B. Onsia, et al. "On the Application of a Thin Ozone Based Wet Chemical Oxide as an Interface for **ALD** High-k Deposition", *Solid State Phenomena,* v103-104, **p19, 2005.**
- *[35]* H. Adhikari, **P.C.** McIntyre, **S.** Sun, P. Pianetta, and **C.E.D.** Chidsey. "Photoemission studies of passivation of germanium nanowires", *Appl. Phys. Lett.,* vol. **87, pp. 263109, 2005.**
- **[36]** Y. Lee, K. Park, Y.S. Cho, and **S.** Lim. "Effect of Ge surface termination on oxidation behavior", *Applied Surface Science,* vol. 254, no. **23, pp.** 7544-7548, **2008.**
- **[37] S.** Rivillon et al. "Hydrogen passivation of germanium **(100)** surface using wet chemical preparation", *Appl. Phys. Lett.,* v87, **p2 5 3 101, 2005.**
- **[38] N.** Tabet, M. Faiz, **N.M.** Hamdan, and Z. Hussain. "High resolution XPS study of oxide layers grown on Ge substrates", *Surface Science,* vol. **523, pp. 68-72, 2003.**
- **[39] J.** Koomen, "Investigation of the MOST channel conductance in weak inversion," *Solid State Electron.,* vol. **16, pp. 801-810, 1973.**
- [40] **C.** Sodini, T. Ekstedt, and **J.** Moll, "Charge accumulation and mobility in thin dielectric **MOS** transistors," *Solid State Electron.,* vol. **25, pp. 833-841, 1982.**
- [41] S. Takagi, A. Toriumi, M. Iwase, and H. Tango. "On the universality of inversion layer mobility in Si MOSFET's: part I-effects of substrate impurity

concentration", *IEEE Trans. Electron Devices,* vol. 41, no. 12, **pp. 2357-2362,** 1994.

- [42] **A.** Molle, **S.** Spiga, M.N.K. Bhuiyan, **G.** Tallarida, M. Perego, **C.** Wiemer and M. Fanciulli. "Atomic oxygen-assisted molecular beam deposition of Gd<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> films for ultra-scaled Ge-based electronic devices", *Materials Science in Semiconductor Processing, vol.* **11,** no. *5-6,* **pp.** 236-240, **2008.**
- [43] **C.H.** Lee, T.Tabata, T. Nishimura, K. Nagashio, K. Kita, and **A.** Toriumi. " $Ge/GeO<sub>2</sub>$  Interface Control with High-Pressure Oxidation for Improving Electrical Characteristics", **Appl.** Phys. Express, vol. 2, **p.** 071404, **2009.**
- [44] X. Liu, **S.** Ramanathan, **A.** Longdergan, **A.** Srivastava, **E.** Lee, T. Seidel, **J.** Barton, **D.** Pang, and R.G. Gordon. **"ALD** of Hafnium Oxide Thin Films from Tetrakis(ethylmethylamino)hafnium and Ozone", *J. Electrochem. Soc.,* vol. **152,** no. **3, pp. G213-G219, 2005.**
- *[45]* **J.** Kim, K. Chakrabarti, **J.** Lee, K. Oh, and **C.** Lee. "Effects of ozone as an oxygen source on the properties of the  $A1_2O_3$  thin films prepared by atomic layer deposition", *Materials Chemistry and Physics,* vol. **78,** no. **3, pp. 733-738, 2003.**
- [46] K. Martens, **C.** Chui, **G.** Brammertz, B. De Jaeger, **D.** Kuzum, M. Meuris, M.M. Heyns, T. Krishnamohan, K. Saraswat, **H.E.** Maes, and **G.** Groeseneken, "On the Correct Extraction of Interface Trap Density of **MOS** Devices With High-Mobility Semiconductor Substrates", *IEEE Trans. Electron Devices,* vol. *55,* no. 2, **2008.**
- [47] P.V. Gray and D.M. Brown, "Density of Si02-Si interface states", *Appl. Phys. Lett.,* **vol. 8,** no. 2, **pp. 31-33, 1966.**
- [48] D.K. Schroder, *Semiconductor Material and Device Characterization*, New York: Wiley, **1998.**
- [49] P. Lukes, M. Clupek, V. Babicky, V. Janda, and P. Sunka. "Generation of ozone **by** pulsed corona discharge over water surface in hybrid gas-liquid electrical discharge reactor", *J. Phys. D: Appl. Phys.,* vol. **38, pp.** 409-416, **2005.**
- *[50]* **J.** Chang, P. Lawless, and T. Yamamoto. "Corona Discharge Processes", *IEEE Trans. Plasma Sci.,* vol. **19,** no. **6, pp. 1152-1166.**
- *[51]* **SCHRED,** http://nanohub.org/resources/schred
- *[52]* **A.** Ritenour, **J.** Hennessy, **D.A.** Antoniadis, "Investigation of Carrier Transport in Germanium MOSFETs With **WN/A1203/AlN** Gate Stacks", *IEEE Electron Device Lett.,* vol. **28,** no. **8, pp.746-749, 2007.**
- *[53]* SRIM-2000 (http://www.srim.org), based on Ziegler, **J.F.** et al. *The Stopping and Range ofIons in Matter.* **Ed. by J.** Ziegler, Pergamon, New York, *1985.*
- [54] **A.** Ortiz-Conde, **F.J.** Garcia Sanchez, **J.J.** Liou, **A.** Cerdeira, M. Estrada, and Y. Yue. **"A** review of recent **MOSFET** threshold voltage extraction methods", *Microelectronics Reliability,* vol. 42, **pp. 583-596,** 2002.
- **[55]** Tsividis, Y. *Operation and Modeling of the MOS Transistor. 2"d* **Ed.** McGraw Hill, **1999.**
- *[56]* K.H. Kim, D.B. Farmer, **J-S.M.** Lehn, P.V. Rao, and R.G. Gordon. "Atomic layer deposition of gadolinium scandate films with high dielectric constant and low leakage current", *Appl. Phys. Lett.,* vol. **89,** no. **13, pp.** *133512,* **2006.**
- *[57]* K. Martens, B. De Jaeger, R. Bonzom, **J.** Van Steenbergen, M. Meuris, **G.** Groeseneken, and H. **E.** Maes. "New interface state density extraction method applicable to peaked and high-density distributions for Ge **MOSFET** development", *IEEE Electron Device Lett.,* vol. **27,** no. *5,* **pp.** 405-408, **2006.**
- *[58]* **D.** Bozyigit and **C.** Rossel. "On the extraction of interface trap density in the Pt/La<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>/Ge gate stack and the determination of the charge neutrality level in Ge", *J. Appl. Phys., vol.* **105,** no. 12, **p.** 124521, **2009.**
- *[59]* V.V. Afanas'ev, **A.** Stesmans, F. Ciobanu, **G.** Pensl, K. Y. Cheong, and **S.** Dimitrijev. "Mechanisms responsible for improvement of  $4H-SiC/SiO<sub>2</sub>$  interface properties **by** nitridation", *Appl. Phys. Lett.,* vol. **82,** no. 4, **pp.** *568-570,* **2003.**
- **[60]** V.V. Afanas'ev, Y.G. Fedorenko, and **A.** Stesmans. "Interface traps and danglingbond defects in (100)Ge/HfO2", **Appl.** *Phys. Lett.,* vol. **87, p. 032107, 2005.**
- **[61]** K. Martens. "Electrical Characterization and Modeling of Ge/III-V **-** Dielectric Interfaces", *PhD Thesis,* Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, **2009.**
- **[62]** L. K. Bera, B. Senapati, **S.** Maikap and **C.** K. Maiti. "Effects **of** 0 2/N20-plasma treatment on nitride films on strained Si", *Solid State Electronics,* vol. 44, no. **9, pp. 1533-1536,** 2000.
- **[63]** M.M. Frank, **S.J.** Koester, M. Copel, **J.A.** Ott, V.K. Paruchuri, H. Shang, and R. Loesing. "Hafnium oxide gate dielectrics on sulfur-passivated germanium", *Appl. Phys. Lett.,* vol. **89, p. 112905, 2006.**
- [64] R. Xie, and **C.** Zhu. "Effects of Sulfur Passivation on Germanium **MOS** Capacitors With **HfON** Gate Dielectric", *IEEE Electron Device Lett.,* vol. **28,** no. **11, pp. 976- 979, 2007.**
- *[65]* H. Lee, D.H. Leea, T. Kanashimaa, and M. Okuyama. "Characteristics improvement of HfO<sub>2</sub>/Ge gate stack structure by fluorine treatment of germanium surface", *Appl. Surf Sci.,* vol. 254, no. 21, **pp. 6932-6936, 2008.**