Halo Profile Engineering to Reduce Vt Fluctuation in High-K/Metal-Gate nMOSFET
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Abstract—In this work, new halo profile engineering is proposed to suppress the threshold voltage variation ($\sigma$Vt) caused by discrete random dopant fluctuation (RDF). An in-house 3D atomistic numerical simulation tool is utilized to assess nMOSFETs $\sigma$Vt caused by RDF for a HK/MG process. The results show that $\sigma$Vt can be effectively suppressed by 10% by optimizing rotation and tilt angles of the halo implant.
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I. INTRODUCTION

With aggressive scaling down of the physical dimensions of CMOSFETs, severe intrinsic process variations become a bottleneck for device/circuit uniformity control. For example, the threshold voltage variation ($\sigma$Vt) is known to be limited by gate length deviation (GLD), line edge roughness (LER) [1], gate electrode work-function (WF) variation [2-5], and discrete random dopant fluctuation (RDF) [6]. RDF is becoming the most dominant factor in $\sigma$Vt for 32nm node and beyond [4]. Optimizing halo profile can be a more feasible and effective way to reduce Vt variation without degrading the saturation current and overlap capacitance, than increasing the doping gradient of the drain-extension profile [7]. In this work, we successfully demonstrate that halo implant profile engineering can effectively suppress nMOSFET $\sigma$Vt by optimizing rotation and tilt angles for a HK/MG process. Co-optimization of halo profile for both performance and $\sigma$Vt is discussed.

II. TRANSISTOR DESIGN

The initial simulation templates have been well calibrated with silicon, including junction profiles and electrical characteristics. Subsequently, to achieve the best device performance, ultra shallow junction, spacer dimension, metal gate work function, pocket/LDD, and S/D are further optimized.

III. MODELLING OF RDF

Figure 1 shows the in-house 3D RDF simulation flow [5]. Starting with a TSUPREM-4 TIF file containing 2D dopant concentration information generated from a well calibrated template, the continuous doping distribution is first converted to distribution of discrete dopants on each grid point, where the number of discrete random dopants is determined by Poisson statistics and the locations of discrete dopants are distributed randomly within the corresponding grid point mesh. The resulting discrete dopant distribution is then converted back to the continuous doping profile for further 3D device simulation. The conversion from discrete dopants to continuous dopant distribution is accomplished by taking into account a long-range coulomb potential [8]. The charge density from the long-range part of the ionized coulomb potential for each dopant is computed as shown in (1), to convert the discrete random dopants into the continuous doping profile for further 3D simulation.

$$\rho(r) = \frac{k_x^3}{2\pi^2} \frac{\sin(k_x r) - k_x r \cos(k_x r)}{(k_x r)^3}$$

(1)

, where r is the distance to the ionized dopant and $k_x$ is the inverse of the screening length.

The long-range part of the ionized coulomb potential is derived from Fourier transformation of ionized impurity potential in k-space with $|k|<k_x$, as in (2). To keep the total number of discrete dopants conserved, the doping concentration in (1) must be normalized within the device volume in (3) [5]
\[ k_c = \sqrt{\frac{q^2 N_A}{\varepsilon k_B T}} \]  

(2)

where \( \varepsilon \) is the dielectric constant and \( N_A \) is the acceptor concentration for the p-type substrate.

\[ \rho'(r) = \frac{\rho(r)}{V} = \frac{\rho(r)}{\int \int \int \rho(r) dV} \]

(3)

\[ \int \int \int \rho(r) dV = \int \int \int \rho(r) r^2 \sin \theta dr d\theta d\phi \]

where \( V \) is the device volume, \( r \) is the distance to the ionized dopant.

It is well known that fluctuation of dopant location as well as dopant number induces \( V_t \) variation \([6]\). For instance, illustrated in Figure 2, \( \Delta V_t \) (\( V_{t,RDF} - V_{t,\text{no-RDF}} \)) is 3mV, 27mV, and 46mV, respectively, for three cases with the same total number of channel dopants but different spatial distributions.
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Figure 2 (a),(b), and (c) are 3D halo contours. All cases have same number of channel dopants, but different spatial distributions. \( \Delta V_t \) for (a) is 3mV, (b) is 27mV and (c) is 46mV. Only silicon substrate region is shown.

IV. EFFECT OF HALO ROTATION ON \( V_t \) FLUCTUATION

Three different ways of halo rotation are shown in Figure 3.
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Figure 3 Three different rotation methods for halo implantation: (a) R01, (b) R02 and (c) R09.

The rotation angles with respect to channel direction are \( 01^\circ \), \( 02^\circ \) and \( 90^\circ \), where \( 01^\circ < 02^\circ < 90^\circ \), noted herein after as R01, R02 and R09. First, the threshold voltage has been centered so that \( V_{t,\text{no-RDF}} \) is the same for all three cases. \( \sigma V_t \) due to RDF are then simulated and compared in the Pelgrom plots as shown in Figure 4.
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Figure 4 Pelgrom plots of R01, R02 and R09 for HK/MG nMOSFETs. R09 shows 10% \( \sigma V_t \) reduction compared with R01 due to less confined implant dose under channel region for R09. \( V_{t,\text{no-RDF}} \) for R01, R02 and R09 is the same.

R09 shows 10% less \( V_t \) fluctuation than that of case R01 and 4% less \( V_t \) fluctuation than that of case R02. This can be attributed to the halo dose spreading wider laterally under the gate for case R09 than R01 and R02 as shown in Figure 5, which can reduce \( V_t \) sensitivity to dopant profile variation, thus suppress \( V_t \) fluctuation. On the other hand, R01 implant causes halo dose more confined near the gate edge than R09 and R02, thus, causing higher \( V_t \) sensitivity to dopant profile variations.
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Figure 5 3D halo contour plots for implant rotation (a) R01, (b) R02 and (c) R09. Implant dose spreads more under the gate for R09 than with R01 and R02. This larger spread reduces \( V_t \) sensitivity to dopant profile variation. Only silicon substrate region is shown. \( V_{t,\text{no-RDF}} \) is the same for all cases.
Figure 6 Slope of Vt vs. number of channel dopants. (a) R/g5371 with slope 0.0052 V/(number of channel dopants), (b) R/g5372 with slope 0.0047 V/(number of channel dopants), and (c) R90 with slope 0.0042 V/(number of channel dopants). Smaller slope shows smaller $\sigma_{Vt}$.

As shown in Figure 6, among the three different halo implant rotations, the slope of Vt vs. average number of channel dopants is the smallest for the R90 case. Since the number of channel dopants is comparable in these cases, smaller slope produces smaller Vt fluctuation. Figure 7 shows the normalized short channel control (DIBL) and band-to-band tunneling leakage (Iboff), which are sensitive to junction profiles. When matching Vtsat, R02 shows better DIBL due to better halo confinement, while R01 has smaller Iboff because of less required halo dose. On the other hand, R02 is affected the least by gate height shadowing effect due to implant rotation angle. Therefore, co-optimization of halo rotation angle should be considered.

V. EFFECT OF HALO TILT ON VT FLUCTUATION

$\sigma_{Vt}$ plots for 92° rotated implant with three tilt angles, T1, T2 and T3 are shown in Figure 8, where $T1<T2<T3$. Simulations indicate that decreasing halo implant tilt angle can further reduce Vt fluctuation. 3D halo contour plots with the same number of channel dopants, as shown in Figure 9, illustrate that halo dose spreads to a larger area for a smaller halo tilt angle. Vt fluctuation caused by random dopant distribution is reduced for a larger halo dose spreading area.
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Figure 8 Pelgrom plots of tilt angle T3, T2, and T1 of HK/MG nMOSFETs. $\sigma_{Vt}$ is smallest for tilt T1. Vt$_{no-RDF}$ is the same T1, T2, and T3.
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Figure 9 3D halo contour plot for implant tilt angle (a)T3 and (b)T1. Implant dose is less confined under channel region for tilt T1 than T3 which causes smaller $\sigma_{Vt}$ for tilt T1. Only silicon substrate region is shown.

Similarly, a smaller halo dose spreading area gives higher Vt sensitivity to dopant distribution, resulting in a larger Vt fluctuation. Furthermore, the channel dopants are more uniformly distributed on the top surface of the channel for the case with T1 tilt implant than that with T3 tilt. This again leads to Vt fluctuation reduction for T1 tilt angle.
Figure 10 shows the scatter plot of $V_t$ as a function of average channel concentration. It can be seen that tilt T1 case has smaller scatter cloud thus smaller $\sigma_{V_t}$ than that of case T3. T1 case shows 10% less $V_t$ fluctuation than that of case T3. It is also observed that the center of the scatter cloud of RDF samples has lower $V_t$ than the non-RDF reference case. This phenomenon is possibly resulted from the higher tendency of dopants to distribute to locations less effective to control $V_t$ than the opposite.

VI. CONCLUSION

We demonstrate that the combination of halo implant rotation and tilt angles can be used to reduce $V_t$ fluctuation in advanced CMOS technology. A 3D atomistic RDF in-house simulator is used to illustrate that a larger halo dose spreading volume leads to a smaller $V_t$ fluctuation. It is also shown that co-optimization of halo profiles is necessary to improve $\sigma_{V_t}$, process control and SCE control.
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