# FeFET Fabrication and Characterization at RIT

JORDAN MERKEL

# **Outline**

- Introduction/Theory:
	- Electrical Characteristics of Ferroelectrics
	- Intro to FeFETs and Device Operation
	- Previous work at RIT
	- Project Objectives
- Device Fabrication:
	- Proposed n-channel FeFET Process Flow
	- Processing Splits
- Results:
	- Initial findings
	- Leakage Investigation and Device Revival Plan
- Conclusions and Future Work

# Electrical Characteristics of Ferroelectrics

- A hysteresis loop is observed in ferroelectric materials when measuring polarization v. voltage
- Some parameters of interest associated with this loop include:
	- **Coercive voltage or Field (V<sub>C</sub>/E<sub>C</sub>)**, is the voltage or electric field at which there is 0 polarization
	- **Remnant Polarization (P<sub>r+</sub> or P<sub>r-</sub>)**, is the positive or negative polarization of the material at 0V bias, ideally they are equal in magnitude
- This observed bi-stability, even after bias is removed, makes these materials a popular candidate for non-volatile memory applications



## What are FeFETs?

- Ferroelectric field effect transistors (FeFETs), are devices comparable to planar MOSFETs incorporating FE materials
- This material is implemented in place of a traditional gate dielectric (red layer in figure on right)
- State-of-the-art FeFETs utilize doped-<br>hafnium oxide (HfO<sub>2</sub>) ferroelectrics for CMOS compatibility Modified from [1]



#### N-channel FeFET Operation

OFF State:  $V_G < -V_C$ 

ON State:  $V_G > V_C$ 



- Max. MW =  $2*E_c*FE$  Thickness

- Larger Memory Window is Desired

#### Previous work at RIT

- Si:HfO<sub>2</sub> n-channel FeFETs fabricated by Joe McGlone and NaMLab
- A memory window of ~0.6V was observed; on state showed depletion-mode IV characteristics
- Al:HfO<sub>2</sub> capacitors with varying aluminum concentrations made by Casey Gonta and Josh Eschle with in-house ALD system
- Hysteresis was observed in resulting devices' PV characteristics



### Project Objectives

**Goal:** To fabricate and characterize n-channel ferroelectric fieldeffect transistors (FeFETs) in-house at RIT

- Integrate McGlone/Anderson's FeFET process flow with Eschle/Gonta's Al:HfO<sub>2</sub> ALD studies to make in-house n-channel FeFET process flow/devices
- Measure IV characteristics of fabricated devices
	- Investigate impact of threshold voltage adjustment implants on devices/memory window
- Compare in-house deposited ferroelectric films to those deposited at NaMLab in terms of observed memory window

# Proposed n-channel FeFET Process Flow

- 1) RCA Clean
- 2) Zero Level Lithography
- 3) 10:1 BOE etch (native oxide)
- 4) Zero Level Etch (alignment marks)
- 5) Ash Resist
- 6) RCA Clean
- 7) Pad Oxide Growth (50nm)
- 8) Back Side Implant (B11, 2e15)
- 9) LPCVD Nitride (150nm)
- 10) Level 1, "Active" Lithography
- 11) Dry Etch Nitride
- 12) Channel Stop Implant (B11, 8e13)
- 13) Ash Resist
- 14) RCA Clean
- 15) Field Oxide Growth (650nm)
- 16) Hot Phos Nitride Etch
- 17) 10:1 BOE etch (Pad Oxide)
- 18) Kooi Oxide Growth (100nm)
- 19) Level 2+3 "S/D" + "N+" Lithography
- 20) Source/Drain Implant (P31, 2e15)
- 21) Ash Resist
- 22) RCA Clean
- 23) S/D and backside Anneal
- 24) Threshold Adjust Implant
- 25) RTA
- 26) 10:1 BOE etch (Kooi Oxide)
- 27) ALD Ferroelectric Material
- 28) TiN Sputter
- 29) RTA
- 30) Level 5 "Gate" Lithography
- 31) Al:H $fO<sub>2</sub>/TiN$  Etch, LAM 4600
- 32) Resist Strip, Wet Bench
- 33) 10:1 BOE Dip
- 34) Aluminum Sputter (750nm)
- 35) Level 6 "Metal" Lithography
- 36) Aluminum Etch, LAM 4600
- 37) Resist Strip, Wet Bench
- 38) Evaporate Backside Aluminum
- 39) Sinter Aluminum

#### = Process Split Steps

= Skipped Steps

#### FeFET Processing Splits



#### **\* Denotes Wafers that are still in process**

# Threshold Adjustment Implant, Split Step



Modified from [1]

## Gate Stack Deposition, Split Step



Modified from [1]

#### Final Device Cross-section



Modified from [1]

# Microscope Images of Fabricated Devices



# Initial Results, Gate Control with Leakage

- Transfer curve shows "transistor-like" behavior
- Difference between off- and on-state current levels is only a factor of  $^{\sim}10$
- Off-state leakage current is high, µA range
- Channel resistance appears quite large



# Off-state Leakage Investigation

- Wafer type was first verified using "hot-probe" methodology
- Wafer mapping was performed to determine whether leakage was localized
- Parasitic IV characteristics were measured between<br>drain and source and drain and source and source/drain terminals of adjacent devices

· The latter suggests improper n-type junction formation in source/drain regions



# Proposed Plan to Revive Devices

- Etch the aluminum off of one device wafer and expose it to a monolayer doping (MLD) source
- This may provide for a new self-aligned process for doping source/drain regions
- Redeposit aluminum and pattern as before, sinter
- Retest transistors and examine the off-state leakage



# Initial Results, Ferroelectricity

- 2 of 3 FE samples fabricated 3.5  $\times$ 10<sup>-7</sup> Pulsed Transfer Characteristics for Wafer 2, No Threshold Adjustment at RIT demonstrate ferroelectricity in transfer characteristics
- Threshold adjustment implant appears to shift memory window without degrading it
- NaMLab memory window is comparable with opposite charging effects, possibly antiferroelectric



# Initial Results, V<sub>t</sub> Adjustment Implants

**V.** Implant **Conditions**

B11 Implant, 1e13



\*Threshold Voltage was experimentally extracted by finding the intersection of two extrapolated linear lines for each devices' on- and off-state currents P31 Implant, 1e13

**\*Extracted V<sub>t</sub> (V) Shift from** 

(shown in figure)

 $V_{GS}$  (V) \*\*Theoretical threshold shifts were obtained through the following equation:

 $\Delta V_t =$ q ∗ Dose  $\mathcal{L}_{ox}$ 

- Al:HfO<sub>2</sub> relative permittivity from [2] used for computation
- Thickness of deposited  $AI:$ HfO<sub>2</sub> measured with VASE

Discrepancies in theoretical shifts and experimental shifts can be attributed to:

**Control (V)**

 $\sim +1.65$  +1.20 +0.78

- Different permittivity of deposited film than that in [2]
- Oxide charges

**\*\*Theoretical** 

**Shift (V)**

#### Conclusions

- Improper source/drain formation is a strong candidate for the off-state leakage observed in fabricated FeFETs
- Improper formation could be the result of:
	- Junction spiking (not likely, but should be confirmed)
	- Improper dose processing (number of ions implanted)
	- Ion interference
- Ferroelectricity has been demonstrated in 2 of 3 samples fabricated at RIT
- Threshold adjustment was observed to have negligible impact on memory window
- Extracted threshold voltage shifts differ from those theoretically predicted on threshold adjusted wafers, but they appear to have worked accordingly

#### Future Work

- Integration of more advanced CMOS processing techniques such as:
	- Monolayer doping (MLD), process for this has been established at RIT and it would allow for self-aligned gates as well
	- Low-temperature silicide formation, has also been demonstrated at RIT
- Ferroelectric film deposition at RIT paves the way for additional device architectures including:
	- Ferroelectric tunnel junctions (FTJs)
	- Negative-capacitance field-effect transistors (NC-FETs)

### Acknowledgments

- Dr. Santosh Kurinec, Jackson Anderson, Casey Gonta, Joe McGlone and George McMurdy
- Dr. Pearson, Dr. Ewbank and the Class of 2019
- Sean O'Brien, Patricia Meller and the SMFL Staff
- NaMLab and SRC



The author acknowledges the support of the SRC Global Research Collaboration Program (GRC) for partially supporting this work, GRC Project 2825.001