# Ge FETs Gate Stack Passivation Options and their Scalability to low EOT

F. Bellenger<sup>1,2</sup>, B. De Jaeger<sup>1</sup>, L. Nyns<sup>1</sup>, M. B. Zahid<sup>1</sup>, M. Houssa<sup>2</sup>, E. Vrancken<sup>1</sup>, J. Tseng<sup>3</sup>, M. Caymax<sup>1</sup>,

M. Meuris<sup>1</sup>, K. De Meyer<sup>1,2</sup>, M. Heyns<sup>1,2</sup>, and T. Hoffmann<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>imec, B-3000 Leuven, Belgium; <sup>2</sup>KULeuven, B-3000 Leuven, Belgium; <sup>3</sup>TSMC assignee at imec

Phone: +32 16 28 8982 / Fax: +32 16 28 1706, E-mail: Florence.Bellenger@imec.be

## 1. Introduction

Due to its high intrinsic carrier mobility, Germanium is an attractive candidate for sub-22nm MOSFET technology, but it still remains difficult to be efficiently passivated. Recent reports claimed high carrier mobility for GeO<sub>2</sub>-based MOSFETs [1-5] however at relaxed EOT. We report for the first time new understandings of the defects mechanisms occurring in GeO<sub>2</sub> scaled-EOT devices through modeling, physical and electrical characterization, in order to achieve high-mobility devices with low interface states density and low gate leakage current at relatively thin EOT (down to 0.65 nm).

#### 2. Experimental

The  $GeO_2$ -based MOSFET devices presented in this study were fabricated using the process flow described in Fig. 1.



Fig. 1 Process flow and schematic of Ge FETs devices

## 3. Results and Discussion

*Efficiency of GeO*<sub>2</sub> *IL growth on Ge substrate:* The VT<sup>2</sup>CP technique [6] allows profiling defects in both Ge/Si/SiO<sub>2</sub>/HfO<sub>2</sub> and Ge/GeO<sub>2</sub>/HfO<sub>2</sub> stacks (Fig. 2(b)). A higher trap density is found at the Ge/Si<sub>X</sub>Ge<sub>(1-X</sub>/SiO<sub>2</sub> interface, generated by Ge segregation [7] but also by the presence of Ge or Si dangling bonds (DB) at the Ge<sub>(1-X</sub>/Si<sub>X</sub>/SiO<sub>X</sub> interface - depending on the stress accumulated at this constrained interface (Fig. 2(a)). The GeO<sub>2</sub> visco-elastic properties result in a much reduced average stress at the interface [8]. Nevertheless, ab-initio calculation [9] predicts a Ge sub-oxides transition layer at the Ge/GeO<sub>2</sub> interface (Fig. 2(c)), leading to interface degradation.



Fig. 2 (a) Presence of Ge or Si DB at the  $Si_XGe_{(1-x)}/SiO_X$  interface, explaining higher trap density in Ge/Si/SiO\_2/HfO2 stack observed in (b); (c) Presence of Ge sub-oxides at the Ge/GeO2 interface in Ge/GeO2/HfO2 stack.

Impact of GeO<sub>2</sub> IL thickness and well doping reduction: Scaling down the GeO<sub>2</sub> IL generates more remote coulomb scattering defects and interface states promoted by a high fraction of sub-oxides at the Ge/GeO<sub>2</sub> interface (not obviously passivated), thus resulting in electron mobility degradation (Fig. 3(a)). Lowering the well doping from  $3x10^{17}$  cm<sup>-3</sup> to  $10^{15}$  cm<sup>-3</sup> reduces the coulomb scattering in the Ge channel, allowing 3.5x increase in peak mobility, resulting in 360 cm<sup>2</sup>/Vs at a 3.6nm EOT for a Ge/3.5nm GeO<sub>2</sub>/4nm Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> stack (Fig. 3(b)).



**Fig.** 3(a) More interface traps for thinner  $GeO_2$  IL leading to higher  $D_{it}$  and lower

Gate Voltage (V) Fig. 3(b) Lowering well doping reduces impurity scattering, leading to 3.5x mobility increase.

*Effect of HiK capping layer:* In the GeO<sub>x</sub>/HiK stack, large C-V hysteresis observed in Fig. 4(a) are indicative of the  $E_C$  and  $E_V$  band offsets at the interface which is insufficient to block e<sup>-</sup> and h<sup>+</sup> injection leading to significant charge trapping in the stack [10]. Moreover, using the VT<sup>2</sup>CP technique, D<sub>it</sub> is found to be similar at the Ge/GeO<sub>2</sub> interface, but scanning further shows higher trap density at the GeO<sub>x</sub>/HiK transition layer with HfO<sub>2</sub> compared to Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> (Fig. 4(b)), further suggesting that the additional defects are metal-related. In agreement, ab-initio calculation [9] predicts a defect level presence at the Ge/GeHfO<sub>2</sub> interface due to a Ge-Hf bond formation, but a state-free Ge/GeAlO<sub>2</sub> (and Ge/GeLaO<sub>2</sub>) interface as a result of Al incorporation into the GeO<sub>2</sub> matrix (Fig. 4(c)).



Use of La<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> as alternative HiK for Ge passivation: La<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> remains an attractive HiK thanks to its high-k value (~25) and its ability to form aluminum germanate at the interface like Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>, as shown in Fig. 5(a). Both n- and p-FETs devices with a 4nm Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>/(1.2nm La<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>/)1.2nm GeO<sub>2</sub>/Ge stack exhibit a relatively good  $I_{ON}/I_{OFF}$  ratio of  $10^4$ - $10^5$  at  $V_D = \pm 20 \text{mV}$  and a low sub-threshold slope of ±85mV/dec, depending on the gate stack (Fig. 5(b)). Note that a lower amount of traps is found in the upper part of the Ge bandgap for the La<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-based stack, as shown in Fig. 5(c). In agreement, La2O3 interlayer (IL) incorporation results in x3 times higher electron mobility enhancement. This observation further suggests an efficient Ge passivation by a germanate formation at the interface, promoted by the La<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> IL. Moreover, replacing 4nm Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> by 2nm HfO<sub>2</sub> on La<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>/GeO<sub>2</sub>/Ge stack, allows EOT scaling from 3nm to 1.2nm, while maintaining the carrier mobility at  $\sim$ 75 cm<sup>2</sup>/Vs.



**Fig. 6** (a) XPS data showing germanate formation; (b)  $I_{S}$ - $V_G$  curves exhibiting good SS and  $I_{ON}/I_{OFF}$  ratio; (c)  $D_{it}$  distribution within the Ge bandgap and (d) Peak mobility vs. EOT showing a 1.2nm EOT/ 74 cm<sup>2</sup>/Vs  $\mu_{h+}$  achievement.

**Impact of TiN MG on the interface:** Further investigation on Ge/GeO<sub>2</sub>/La<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>/Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> stack reveal a GeO loss and ~40% Ge<sup>4+</sup> oxidation states reduction after TiN deposition as shown in Fig. 7(a) and (b). TiN tends to adsorb the oxygen from the unstable GeO<sub>2</sub> IL through the HiK leading to interface degradation and a possible TiO<sub>2</sub> IL formation underneath TiN MG (Fig. 7(c)).



Fig. 7 (a) XPS data showing GeO loss and (b) ~40% Ge<sup>4+</sup> loss after TiN deposition; (c) Schematic model of the O adsorption mechanism by TiN MG, resulting in interface degradation and TiO<sub>2</sub> IL formation.

Use of  $HfO_2$  HiK for EOT scalability: The use of  $La_2O_3$  IL or/and  $Al_2O_3$  as HiK impede aggressive EOT scaling. HfO\_2-based stack could counteract this, allowing sub-nm EOT approach. As shown in Fig. 8(a) and (b), O\_3-based ALD process results in thicker GeO\_2 IL thickness, corresponding to a IL regrowth during the HiK deposition and exhibits a more pronounced GeO\_2/HiK intermixing than H<sub>2</sub>O-based ALD. GeO\_2 IL can indeed be reduced by its interaction with water during the ALD process, due to its hygroscopic character.



Fig. 8 (a) Evidence of  $GeO_2$  (re-)growth and (b) more pronounced  $GeO_X/HiK$  intermixing during  $O_3$ -based ALD process.

As shown in Fig. 9(a), stacks using  $O_3$ -based ALD process exhibit a better SS~90mV/dec when 4nm HfO<sub>2</sub> is deposited on

a thin GeO<sub>2</sub> IL or straight on Ge substrate, likely due to the IL regrowth during ALD (Fig. 8(a)). H<sub>2</sub>O-based ALD devices exhibit a SS~163mV/dec (Fig. 9(a)) and high D<sub>it</sub> values close to  $E_V$  side in Fig. 9(b), indicative of lower interface quality. Nevertheless, unlike O<sub>3</sub>-based ALD devices which shows a high mobility (~95cm<sup>2</sup>/Vs) but for a 1.5nm EOT, H<sub>2</sub>O-based ALD process allows aggressive EOT scaling down to 0.65nm (Fig. 9(c)). This is the first known Ge MOSFET result reported so far at such low EOT, with conventional channel doping.



**Fig. 9** (a)  $I_S$ - $V_G$  curves exhibiting better SS for  $O_3$ -based ALD; (b)  $D_{ii}$  distribution in the Ge bandgap and (c) Peak mobility vs. EOT showing a 0.65nm EOT achievement.

### 4. Benchmarking

A large gain of gate leakage current  $(10^1 - 10^3 \text{ reduction for } J_G @ V_G - V_I = -1V)$  can be observed at relatively thin EOT with scaled GeO<sub>2</sub> interface in comparison to Si-based devices, as shown in Fig. 10(a). This observation suggests the ability of Ge-based devices to maintain a relatively low J<sub>G</sub> at thin EOT. On the other hand, Fig. 10(b) presents peak electron mobility versus EOT benchmarking further pointing out the EOT-scaled range which reaches a low value of 0.65nm for the first time in Ge devices. Nevertheless, as the mobility drops with the EOT (like in Si devices), a Ge surface treatment prior to HiK deposition would be required to enhance the mobility.



Fig. 10 (a)  $J_G@V_G-V_t=-1V$  data exhibiting a large gain with Ge-based devices compared to Si one [11-13] at thin EOT; (b) Peak carrier mobility vs. EOT showing a 0.65nm low EOT achieved by a complete optimization of the gate stack.

### 5. Conclusion

The mechanisms limiting the carrier mobility in Ge MOS-FETs are comprehensively studied in low EOT region through the optimization of passivation layers, dielectrics, MGs, and doping conditions with in-depth electrical and physical analyses. By following the guidelines here, options for boosting mobility and reaching low EOT are proposed. A record 360 cm<sup>2</sup>/Vs electron peak mobility at an EOT=3.6nm is thus demonstrated, corresponding to the best mobility on Ge n-FETs reported to date at such thin EOT. Moreover, a significant EOT reduction, 0.65 nm EOT, is achieved with a very low  $J_G~10^{-4}A/cm^2$  (2 decades lower than that in Si devices). The potential of Ge-based devices in view of future sub-nm application is enlightened through this study.

#### References

[1] Nakakita, IEDM'08; [2] Kuzum, IEDM'08; [3] Saraswat, ECS'08; [4]
Lee, ECS'08; [5] Lee, IEDM'09; [6] Zahid, IRPS'07; [7] Mitard,
IEDM'08; [8] Houssa, APL 93, 161909, 2008; [9] Houssa, APL 92,
242101, 2008; [10] Afanas'ev, APL 92, 022109, 2008; [11] Ragnarsson,
VLSI'03; [12] Mitard, VLSI'09; [13] Weber, VLSI'04.