Abstract—The singular nature of the Boltzmann transport equation leads to the boundary layer around the virtual source in nano-scale device structures. We show that the boundary layer is a key concept to understand the physical mechanism behind quasi-ballistic transport in nano-scale devices. The self-consistent 3D Monte Carlo device simulator is constructed by including accurately the full Coulomb interaction. It is shown that the boundary condition for the electron distribution function plays an essential role to obtain the correct transport characteristics and that the Coulomb interaction is indeed a key ingredient for reliable predictions of device properties.

I. INTRODUCTION

It is now well recognized that simply scaled Si MOSFETs do not exhibit any performance improvement in decanometer regimes and, as a result, the introduction of technology boosters such as strain or alternate materials in the channel region is inevitable to gain the merit of “scaling” [1]. Nevertheless, the origin of the performance degradation is still unclear and usually attributed to additional scattering due to impurities and/or the surface-roughness, or parasitic resistance. Recently, it was pointed out that the trend of device performance degradation is remarkably similar to that due to the Coulomb interaction [2]. Here, we would like to stress that there are two questions to be addressed: One is why scattering is inevitable even in single nano-scale channels. The other is how quantitatively the scattering (interaction) affects device performance in nano-scale devices.

In the present paper, we discuss both problems by the two different means; by purely theoretical analyses under the relaxation time approximation and by numerical Monte Carlo (MC) simulations. We show that scattering is continued to be inevitable even in single nano-scale devices due to the boundary layer formed near the virtual source in the channel and that the accurate incorporation of the Coulomb interaction into 3D MC simulations is essential for reliable predictions of device characteristics.

II. BOUNDARY LAYER STRUCTURE

A. Singularity of the Boltzmann Transport Equation

The concept of the boundary layer (BL) arises from the fact that the Boltzmann transport equation (BTE) is singular with respect to the relaxation time and velocity [3].

Under the relaxation time approximation, the formal solution of the BTE under steady state is given by

\[ f(x) = e^{-\int_{0}^{x} \frac{d\tau}{\tau(x)}} f(x_0) + e^{-\int_{0}^{x} \frac{d\tau}{\tau(x)}} \int_{0}^{x} \frac{f_{eq}(x')}{v(x')\tau(x')} e^{-\int_{x'}^{x} \frac{d\tau}{\tau(x')}} \right] \]

where \( f(x) \) is the velocity distribution at position \( x \), \( v(x) \) is the electron velocity, and \( \tau(x) \) is the position-dependent relaxation time. \( f_{eq}(x) \) is the local thermal-equilibrium distribution and given by either the Maxwell-Boltzmann or the Fermi-Dirac distribution. The first term represents the ballistic component damped with the relaxation time \( \tau \) and the second term represents the diffusive component due to scattering and thermalization. Since the distribution is ought to relax to local thermal-equilibrium, the relaxation time approximation employed here represents both elastic and inelastic scattering. This is a crucial difference from [4] where only elastic scattering is involved in their analyses.

It should be noticed that the relaxation time \( \tau \) does not appear singly in (1), but rather, it is always paired with velocity \( v \). This implies that the ballistic limit corresponding to taking the limit of \( \tau \rightarrow \infty \) cannot be naively taken. In fact, the velocity could be as small as zero near the bottom of the conduction band and (1) becomes singular as \( v\tau \rightarrow 0 \). This leads to a peculiar behavior in the velocity distribution \( f(x) \) near the singularity, as explained in the followings.
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B. Intrinsic Ballistic Parameter

The mathematical structure of the BTE becomes clearer if the BTE is normalized.

To be more specific, let us consider a simple $n^+\cdot n\cdot n^+$ structure, as depicted in Fig. 1 where the potential profile along the channel direction is sketched. The normalized BTE naturally leads to a parameter $\alpha_b$ which is intrinsic to the BTE and expressed as

$$\alpha_b = \frac{e^2 V''(x_b)}{2m},$$  \hspace{1cm} (2)

where $e$ is the elementary charge, $m$ is the effective mass, $V''(x_b)$ is the second derivative of the electrostatic potential at the top of the potential barrier $x_b$, in the $n$ (hereafter, denoted as channel) region (Fig. 1).

A rough estimation of $\alpha_b$ makes its physical implication clear: $\alpha_b = v_d \tau / L_c$, where $L_c$ is the channel length and $v_d$ is the drift velocity along the channel direction. Therefore, $\alpha_b$ represents the ballisticity of electron transport. Typical values of $\alpha_b$ extracted from the potential profiles found from the Drift-Diffusion simulations are listed in the inset to Fig. 1. The most important feature of (2) is that $\alpha_b$ is dependent of the curvature of $V(x)$. This implies that electron transport is intimately nonlocal, i.e., dependent of the functional $V(x)$, and its nonlocality becomes significant as $L_c$ shrinks.

C. Characteristic Region: Boundary Layer

The intrinsic parameter $\alpha_b$ introduces the characteristic region $|x - x_b|$ in the channel, within which the electrons suffer higher probabilities to be scattered. This region denoted as the boundary layer (BL) depends on $\alpha_b$ as

$$|x - x_b| = v_{th} \tau / \alpha_b,$$  \hspace{1cm} (3)

where $\delta$ is the kinetic energy measured from the top of the potential barrier at $x_b$ (normalized by the thermal energy $kT$) and $v_{th}$ is the thermal velocity. The electrons in the BL region suffer scattering and thermalization. The scattering processes in the BL are in fact much involved. The back-scattering dominates around the boundary of the BL region, and the thermalization dominates inside the BL region. The former is strongly dependent of the boundary condition of $f(x)$ at the channel/drain or channel/source junction and contributes to the current, whereas the latter gives rise to nearly no current [3]. Furthermore, it should be pointed out that the size of the BL region depends on the kinetic energy. The larger the kinetic energy, the longer the BL so that the electrons injected from the source with large kinetic energy have higher chances to be back-scattered in the BL region.

It is easy to show that the size of the $kT$-layer proposed in [5] is expressed by

$$L_{th} = \frac{2kT}{eV''(x_b)} = \frac{v_{th}}{\sqrt{\alpha_b}}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (4)

Comparing (4) with (3), we find that the $kT$-layer corresponds to the BL when electron’s kinetic energy is given by the thermal energy $kT$. In other words, if the electrons in the source region are highly degenerate, which is the case in most cases, the kinetic energy of injection electrons at the virtual source is much larger than $kT$, and the energy dependence of the layer should be taken into account. In addition, the physical mechanism implied by the $kT$-layer theory is very different from the present BL model, as described in [3].

Analytical expression of the velocity distribution for the BTE is obtained under the relaxation time approximation and the velocity distributions are plotted with the numerical solutions in Fig. 2 for various channel lengths $L_c$. The velocity distributions for the negative velocity regions which represent the electrons scattered in the channel region are shown. The negative velocity components do not diminish as $L_c$ shrinks even to 10 nm and this finding results from the singularity of the BTE. We must conclude that there is no ballistic limit due to the singularity of the BTE and a naïve picture of ballistic transport is rather misleading.

III. 3D MONTE CARLO SIMULATION AND THE COULOMB INTERACTION

The analyses in the previous section are based on the relaxation time approximation and electron transport in nanoscale devices is actually much more complicated. In order to
investigate the device performance quantitatively, we need to rely on time-consuming numerical simulations.

As pointed out in the previous section, the boundary condition of the velocity distribution $f(x,v)$ at both edges of the channel is most important to determine $f(x,v)$ in the channel region. In other words, it is essential to simulate electron transport not only in the channel region but also in the source and drain regions to get the correct velocity distribution $f(x,v)$. The most important interaction in highly doped source and drain is the electron-electron and electron-impurity scattering through the Coulomb interaction. However, the incorporation of the Coulomb interaction in particle-based simulations is a long-standing problem. It has been tackled with various techniques such as Molecular Dynamics (MD) method, Particle-Particle-Particle-Mesh (P³M) method, and MC method [2]. In the present study, we employ the conventional MC method, yet try to include the Coulomb interaction as accurately as possible [6].

A. Incorporation of the Coulomb Interaction

After very careful optimization of simulation parameters such as mesh size, time step, etc., our 3D self-consistent Monte Carlo simulator is able to reproduce simultaneously both the correct mobility under various impurity densities and the collective excitations at the plasma frequency (Fig. 3). Notice that the former reflects the random agitation and the latter represents the collective motion, and both motions conflict each other which makes MC simulations difficult. The parameter optimization is, thus, crucial for stable simulations. In our case, MC simulations under thermal equilibrium have been performed by artificially turning off the energy-dissipating scattering. The total energy of the system is strictly conserved and could be used as a measure to monitor the accuracy and stability of the simulations [6]. This is important because dissipating scattering always stabilizes simulations no matter what the simulation parameters are chosen.

Furthermore, in order to simulate the degenerate electron gas under high electron densities, it is crucial to take into account of Pauli’s exclusion principle for all short-range scattering in MC simulations. Otherwise, electrons always relax locally to the Maxwell-Boltzmann distribution since they are treated as point particles in MC simulations and the Fermi-Dirac distribution could never be achieved.

B. Device Structure and Potential Fluctuations

The double-gate (DG) MOSFETs with various gate lengths are considered in the present 3D MC simulations described above. We have employed relatively large cross-sectional areas of the device to avoid the effects associated with quantum confinements. The device structure and a typical output (potential profile) from the MC simulations are depicted in Fig. 4. Notice that the magnitude of the potential fluctuations in the source and drain are comparable to the plasmon energy (~200 meV) for the electron density of $10^{20}$ cm$^{-3}$. Fourier-transforming the potential fluctuations, we have confirmed a peak around the plasma frequency in the power spectrum even under device operations. Also, the potential in the channel region greatly fluctuates depending on the position of electrons due to small number.

Fig. 5 shows a snapshot of the spatial distribution of electrons as a function of kinetic energy obtained from (a) self-consistent MC and (b) MC under fixed potential.
C. Boundary Condition of Distribution Function

The boundary condition in any transport problems is crucial because the distribution function is continuous. The BTE intrinsically contains dissipation (otherwise, it would not satisfy the H-theorem by Boltzmann) and the distribution function is ought to relax to the (local) thermal equilibrium distribution, that is the only known boundary condition we could impose on solving the BTE.

The consistency of the boundary condition of the distribution function near the contacts in source and drain is confirmed in Fig. 6 for $L_c = 20$ nm, where the velocity and energy distributions near the source and drain ends are plotted. The shape of the energy distribution in Fig. 6 differs from the thermal equilibrium. This is because it includes both the density of states and potential fluctuations. If the potential fluctuations are de-convoluted from the energy distribution, the energy distribution in Fig. 6 coincides with the Fermi-Dirac distribution.

D. Quasi-ballistic Transport and Coulomb Interaction

The velocity distribution along the channel direction is shown in Fig. 7. Two quasi-ballistic flows in the channel are observed. The most important features are; (1) electrons injected into the drain immediately relax into quasi-thermal equilibrium in c.a. 10 nm, and (2) electrons in the source and drain are highly degenerate. The velocity distribution at the virtual source is also shown in Fig. 7. The velocity distribution in the positive regime greatly spreads due to degeneracy in the source, whereas that in the negative regime is close to thermal equilibrium with $T = 300$ K except the neighborhood of zero velocity where nonequilibrium is very strong. This is consistent with the prediction by the BL theory.

Fig.6. (a) Energy distribution and (b) Velocity distribution close to the ends of the source and drain (see the inset).

Fig.7. (a) Velocity distribution along the channel direction and (b) Velocity distribution at the virtual source.

IV. CONCLUSION

The boundary layer due to the singularity of the BTE has been reviewed and its physical interpretation for quasi-ballistic transport has been clarified. The self-consistent 3D MC device simulator including the full Coulomb interaction has been constructed. We have demonstrated that the boundary condition of the electron distribution function plays an essential role to obtain the correct transport characteristics and that the Coulomb interaction is indeed a key ingredient for reliable predictions of device properties.
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