Random Telegraph Noise of Gate-All-Around Silicon Nanowire MOSFETs Induced by Single Charge Trap

S. R. Kola, Y. Li*

Parallel and Scientific Computing Laboratory, Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, National Chiao Tung University, Ta-Hsueh Rd. 1001, Hsinchu 300, Taiwan ymli@faculty.nctu.edu.tw

We for the first time study random telegraph noise (RTN) of cylindrical shape gate-all-around silicon nanowire (GAA Si NW) metal-oxide-semiconductor field effect transistors (MOSFETs) with spacer induced by acceptor-type singlecharge trap for sub-7-nm technologies. For GAA NW MOSFETs, the trap position dependence on the RTN magnitude $((\Delta I_D/I_D) \times 100\%)$ in channel is observed. The impact of RTN located middle of the channel is significant. The reduction of on-state current of the explored device with and without spacer are 9.3% and the gate capacitance can be reduced up to 18.56%. Gate-all-around silicon nanowire MOSFET is a promising device for sub-7-nm technology nodes owing to its ultimately electrostatic controllability and good short channel effects (SCE) immunity [1-3]. In this work, we study the transfer characteristic (I_D - V_G) and gate capacitance (C-V) of device with spacer. Random telegraph noise influenced by acceptor-type single charge trap (SCT) presenting at different positions along the channel [4-6] between silicon and silicon dioxide for N-type GAA Si NW MOSFET devices by using an experimentally validated 3D device simulation under the similar parameters settings. The magnitude of RTN induced by cylindrical-type SCT along the channel is estimated for the nominal GAA Si NW MOSFET and the device with spacer. At the drain due to band-toband tunneling the reduction of RTN is caused. By extracting SCE parameters, we discuss characteristic variability induced by SCT. We observe that the magnitude of RTN is high at the SCT middle (i.e., B of Fig. 1(a)) position to source and drain. Figures 1(c) and (d) illustrate the simulated structures for nominal and with spacer GAA Si NW MOSFETs devices. Figures 1(a) and (b) show the positions of SCTs and cross-section view of the channel respectively. The density of interface trap (D_{IT}) is greater than 10^{12} cm⁻². This simulation is examined by solving 3D quantummechanically corrected transport model which is valid by nonequilibrium green function (NEGF) [1]. We express the simulation results, evaluate I_D -V_G electrical characteristics variability due to spacer is shown in Fig. 2; here, the SiO₂ acts as low- dielectric material. The spacer acts like capacitor. The reduction of on-state current of the explored device with and without spacer are 9.3%. Similarly, for the C-V analysis, the capacitance varies largely due to dielectric charging and discharging, which we can clearly observe from Fig. 3. However, for realistic nano-CMOS technologies, the dependence of RTN not only on device geometry but also the trap's location and energy. Figures 4 and 5 illustrate the amplitude of the RTN in the presence of SCT (by calculating the deviation $\Delta I_D/I_D \ge 100\%$.) due to trapping/detrapping in different location for nominal device and the device with spacer, respectively. The amplitude of RTN decreases with increasing V_G due to the low charge carriers. Finally, The RTN amplitude is large when SCT is placed at the position B. As listed in Tab. 1, we compare the magnitudes of RTN for the nominal GAA Si NW MOSFET and the device with spacer, respectively, at the off-state for both doped and undoped channels. Notably, for the device with spacer and undoped channel, the large magnitude of RTN is observed for the trap at position B. In summary, we have investigated the SCT induced RTN; and, for device with spacer and undoped channel, the magnitude of RTN is high when the trap is located at middle of the channel.

This work was supported in part by Ministry of Science and Technology (MOST) of Taiwan under Contracts No. MOST-107-2221-E-009-094 and No. MOST-106-2218-E-009-149.

- [1] Y. Li et al., IEDM, pp. 887-890, 2015.
- [2] W.-L. Sung and Y. Li, IEEE T ED, vol. 65, pp. 2638-2646, 2018.
- [3] D. Nagy et al., IEEE J EDS, vol. 6, pp. 332-340, 2018.
- [4] P. Su et al., ICICDT, vol. 26, pp. 61-64, 2012.
- [5] S.-C. Hsu and Y. Li, Nanoscale Res. Lett., vol. 9, 2014, 633, 2014.
- [6] Y. Li and H.-W. Cheng, Solid-State Electron., vol. 77, pp. 12-19, 2012.



Fig. 1: (a) The single charge trap is located at different position along the channel on the interface of Si/SiO_2 . (b) The cross-sectional view at the middle of the channel. (c) and (d) are the 3D simulated structures of the GAA NW MOSFET without/with spacer.



Fig. 2: $I_D V_G$ plots of electrical characteristics comparison (i.e., nominal device (solid line) and device with spacer (dot)) under the biasing of V_D =0.6 V and the same settings of parameters for both devices.



Fig. 3: C-V comparison of the simulated devices (i.e., nominal device (solid line) and device with spacer (dot)) under the similar parameters and biasing condition of V_D =0.6 V.



Fig. 4: The comparison of calculated magnitude (%) of the random telegraph noise in the presence of the acceptor-type single charge trap at different locations in the channel for nominal GAA NW MOSFET under V_D =0.01 V.



Fig. 5 The comparison of calculated magnitude (%) of the random telegraph noise in the presence of the acceptor-type single charge trap at different locations in the channel for with spacer GAA NW MOSFET under V_D =0.01 V.

Tab. 1: List of calculated magnitudes of RTN (%) comparison in the presence of the acceptor-type SCT placed in different position along the channel for the nominal and with spacer GAA NW MOSFETs under the doped and undoped channel, with similar biasing conditions and device settings.

Type of Device	SCT Position		
	Α	В	С
Without spacer & doped channel	1.095	2.310	2.280
Without spacer & undoped channel	1.290	2.390	2.380
Spacer & doped channel	2.000	5.200	1.560
Spacer & undoped channel	2.200	5.300	1.620

IWCN 2019