Stability Analysis of Subthreshold/Superthreshold Negative Capacitance FinFET SRAM Cell

Zhe-An Zheng, Pin-Chieh Chiu, and Vita Pi-Ho Hu

Department of Electrical Engineering, National Central University, Taoyuan, Taiwan

E-mail: vitahu@ee.ncu.edu.tw

Abstract

In this work, we analyze the read, write, and hold static noise margins (RSNM, WSNM, and HSNM) for 6T negative capacitance FinFET (NC-FinFET) SRAM cell in the subthreshold and superthreshold regions. In the subthreshold region ($V_{DD} = 0.4V$), NC-FinFET SRAM cell shows better RSNM (= 84mV) than Fin-FET SRAM because pass-gate (PG) NC-FinFET operated in the subthreshold and saturation regions exhibits negative differential resistance (NDR) effect and becomes weaker, which reduces the read disturb voltage of NC-FinFET SRAM. Besides, NC-FinFET SRAM shows higher HSNM (= 177mV) than FinFET SRAM due to its lower subthreshold swing induced by negative capacitance effect. At VDD = 0.4V, NC-FinFET SRAM cell shows larger WSNM (= 191mV) than FinFET SRAM cell. This is because PG NC-FinFET with negative capacitance effect becomes stronger in the linear region, and pull-up NC-FinFET with NDR effect becomes weaker in the saturation region. In other words, NC-FinFET SRAM cell resolves the conflict between read and write, and improves RSNM, HSNM and WSNM simultaneously for sub-/near-threshold operation. In the superthreshold region (V_{DD} = 1V), NC-FinFET SRAM cell exhibits 1.73 times larger RSNM (= 183mV) than FinFET SRAM cell, and exhibits adequate WSNM (= 198mV). 6T NC-FinFET SRAM cell performs superior stability in the subthreshold/superthreshold regions.

Introduction

Negative capacitance FET (NCFET) with a ferroelectric layer in the gate dielectric stack shows improved subthreshold swing and Ion/Ioff ratio. NCFET therefore, has emerged as a promising candidate for ultra-low power and high-performance applications [1-4]. Circuit performance analysis of negative capacitance FinFET (NC-FinFET) has been presented [5], and the energy of NC-FinFET can be reduced by ~10x. NC-FinFET SRAM cell has been analyzed at V_{DD} = 0.7V [6]. However, the stability analysis of NC-FinFET SRAM cell operated in the near-/subthreshold region has rarely been examined. In this paper, we analyze the impact of V_{DD} scaling and ferroelectric layer thickness (T_{fe}) on the stability of 6T NC-FinFET SRAM cell compared with FinFET SRAM cell comprehensively. Our results show that for NC-FinFET SRAM cells operated in the subthreshold region, both read and write stability can be improved as T_{fe} increases.

Simulation Framework of NC-FinFET SRAM Cell

In this work, the baseline FinFET is designed with $L_g = 20nm$, fin width = 8nm, and fin height = 42nm. We use TCAD to analyze the current-voltage, charge-voltage, and capacitance characteristics of the baseline FinFET. We establish the simulation framework for circuit analysis by using lookup table based Verilog-A model including Landau-Khalatnikov equation [7], and then using HSPICE to perform the SRAM simulations. The extracted coercive electric field $E_c = 1MV/cm$ and remnant polarization $P_0 = 10\mu c/cm^2$ [3] are used for analyzing NC-FinFET SRAM cells.

Results and Discussion

Fig. 1 shows the I_D -V_G characteristics for NC-FinFETs ($T_{fe} = 7nm$) and FinFETs ($T_{fe} = 0nm$) at V_D = 1 V. NC-FinFETs exhibit

higher Ion/Ioff ratio, better subthreshold swing (SS), and larger threshold voltage (Vt) than the FinFETs. Fig. 2 shows that as ferroelectric layer thickness (Tfe) increases, the read static noise margin (RSNM) increases at V_{DD} ranges from 0.4V to 1V. In the subthreshold region ($V_{DD} = 0.4V$), NC-FinFET SRAM cell with $T_{fe} = 7nm$ shows 1.44xlarger RSNM than the FinFET SRAM cell due to its smaller read disturb voltage ($V_{read,0}$) as shown in Fig. 4. At $V_{DD} = 0.4V$, pass-gate (PG) NC-FinFET operated in the subthreshold ($V_{GS,PG} = 0.4V$ - $V_{read,0}$) and saturation ($V_{DS,PG} = 0.4V - V_{read,0}$, $V_{read,0} = 0.026V$) regions shows negative differential resistance (NDR) [8-10] which makes PG NC-FinFET weaker and reduces Vread.0. RSNM increases as $V_{read,0}$ decreases. In the superthreshold region ($V_{DD} = 1V$), NC-FinFET SRAM cell exhibits 1.73x larger RSNM than the FinFET SRAM cell due to its larger Vt and better SS. Fig. 3 shows the butterfly curves of RSNM for NC-FinFET and FinFET SRAM cells. Negligible hysteresis window of RSNM is observed for NC-FinFET SRAM cell with $T_{fe} = 7nm$.

Fig. 5 shows that in the near-/sub-threshold regions ($V_{DD} = 0.4V$ $\sim 0.6V$), NC-FinFET SRAM cell exhibits larger write static noise margin (WSNM) than the FinFET SRAM cell due to its lower Vwrite,0 as shown in Fig. 6. WSNM increases as $V_{write,0}$ decreases. At V_{DD} = $0.4V \sim 0.6V$, $V_{write,0}$ decreases as T_{fe} increases. For NC-FinFET SRAM ($T_{fe} = 7nm$) operated in the subthreshold region ($V_{DD} = 0.4V$), PG NC-FinFET with negative capacitance becomes stronger in the linear region ($V_{GS,PG} = 0.4V$, $V_{DS,PG} = V_{write,0} = 0.017V$), and pullup (PU) NC-FinFET with NDR becomes weaker in the saturation region (V_{GS,PU} = -0.4V, V_{DS,PU} = V_{write,0} - 0.4V = -0.383V) as shown in Fig. 7(a) and 7(b), which makes NC-FinFET SRAM cell easier to write at sub-/near-threshold regions compared with FinFET SRAM cell. However, in the superthreshold region ($V_{DD} = 1V$), NC-Fin-FETs exhibit larger drain saturation voltage $[V_{Dsat} = (V_{GS} - V_t)/m]$, which makes PG and PU NC-FinFETs operated in the linear region during write operation as shown in Fig. 8(b). Therefore, at $V_{DD} = 1V$, NC-FinFET SRAM cell exhibits lower WSNM than the FinFET SRAM cell. However, NC-FinFET SRAM cell still shows adequate WSNM (= 198mV), which is still larger than RSNM (= 183mV) at $V_{DD} = 1V$. Fig. 9 shows that NC-FinFET SRAM cell exhibits larger hold static noise margin (HSNM) than FinFET SRAM cell due to its better subthreshold swing induced by negative capacitance effect. HSNM increases as Tfe increases. NC-FinFET SRAM cell with TFE = 7nm shows superior HSNM which is nearly close to $V_{DD}/2$ line. Fig. 10 shows a hysteresis window (= 30mV) is observed of HSNM for NC-FinFET SRAM cell ($T_{fe} = 7nm$) at $V_{DD} = 1V$ due to the NDR effect.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by the Ministry of Science and Technology in Taiwan under Contracts MOST 107-2636- E-008- 001 and 106-2622-8-002- 001.

References

 S. Salahuddin et al., *Nano Lett.*, vol. 8, pp. 405, 2008. [2] C. Hu et al, *DRC*, 2015. [3] P.-C. Chiu et al., *IEEE EDTM*, 2018. [4] V. P.-H. Hu et al., *IEDM*, 2017. [5] S. Khandelwal et al., *Symp. VLSI*, 2016. [6] T. Dutta et al., *IEEE EDL*, vol. 38, no. 8, 2017. [7] M. Kobayashi et al., *IEEE IEDM*, 2016.
Y. Li et al., *TED*, 2017[9] J. Seo et al., *TED*, 2017. [10] V. P.-H. Hu et al., *SNW*, 2018.



Fig. 1. The $I_D\text{-}V_G$ characteristics for NC-FinFETs (T_{fe} = 7nm) and FinFETs (T_{fe} = 0nm) at V_D = 1V. NC-FinFETs show larger threshold voltage and better subthreshold swing than FinFETs.



Fig. 4. At V_{DD} = 0.4V~0.6V (near-/subthreshold region), NC-FinFET SRAM cell shows lower read disturb voltage ($V_{read,0}$) than the FinFET SRAM cell due to improved subthreshold swing. The inset shows the definitions of RSNM and $V_{read,0}$. RSNM increases as $V_{read,0}$ decreases.



Fig. 7. (a) At V_{DD} = 0.4V, NC-FinFET SRAM cell with T_{fe} = 7nm shows larger WSNM and smaller $V_{write,0}$ than FinFET SRAM cell. (b) Pull-up PMOS and pass-gate NMOS load line analysis for NC-FinFET and FinFET SRAM cells during write operation, and the intersection of two load lines (blue circle) describes the $V_{write,0}$. At V_{DD} = 0.4V, pass-gate NMOS with negative capacitance effect becomes stronger, and pull-up PMOS with negative DIBL and negative differential resistance effect becomes weaker, and therefore NC-FinFET SRAM cell exhibits lower $V_{write,0}$.



Fig. 2. The read static noise margin (RSNM) for 6T FinFET ($T_{fe} = 0nm$) and NC-FinFET ($T_{fe} = 3nm$ ~7nm) SRAM cells in the near-/sub-threshold and superthreshold regions. NC-FinFET ($T_{fe} = 7nm$) SRAM cell exhibits 1.73 times (1.44 times) larger RSNM than FinFET SRAM cell at $V_{DD} = 1V$ ($V_{DD} = 0.4V$). As T_{fe} increases, RSNM of NC-FinFET SRAM cell increases.



Fig. 5. At $V_{DD} = 0.4V \sim 0.6V$, NC-FinFET SRAM cells ($T_{fc} = 3nm\sim7nm$) show larger write static noise margin (WSNM) than the FinFET SRAM cell ($T_{fc} =$ 0nm). At $V_{DD} = 1V$, NC-FinFET SRAM cells show lower WSNM than the FinFET SRAM cell, while NC-FinFET SRAM cell with $T_{fc} = 7nm$ still exhibits adequate WSNM (= 198mV)



Fig. 8. (a) At V_{DD} =1V, NC-FinFET SRAM cell with T_{fe} = 7nm shows smaller WSNM and lager $V_{write,0}$ than FinFET SRAM cell. (b) NC-FinFETs exhibit larger drain saturation voltage $[V_{Dsat} = (V_G - V_t)/m]$, and both pull-up and pass-gate devices operate in the linear region which increases the $V_{write,0}$ and decreases WSNM. Negligible hysteresis window of WSNM is observed for NC-FinFET SRAM cell.



Fig. 3. The butterfly curves for determining the RSNM of NC-FinFET and FinFET SRAM cells in the near-/sub-threshold ($V_{DD} = 0.4V$) and superthreshold ($V_{DD} = 1V$) regions. NC-FinFETs show better RSNM. Negligible hysteresis window of RSNM is observed for NC-FinFETs SRAM cell at $V_{DD} = 1V$ and 0.4V. 0.5



Fig. 6. NC-FinFETs SRAM cell with $T_{fc} = 7nm$ exhibits larger $V_{write,0}$ at $V_{DD} = 1V$ but smaller $V_{write,0}$ at $V_{DD} = 0.4V{\sim}0.6V$. The inset shows the definitions of WSNM and $V_{write,0}$. For SRAM cell, WSNM increases as $V_{write,0}$ decreases.



Fig. 9. The hold static noise margin (HSNM) for 6T FinFET ($T_{fe} = 0$ nm) and NC-FinFET ($T_{fe} = 3$ nm~7nm) SRAM cells in the near-subthreshold and superthreshold regions. When T_{fe} =7nm, it shows superior HSNM and nearly close to the $V_{DD}/2$ line.



Fig. 10. The butterfly curves of HSNM for NC-FinFET and FinFET SRAM cells in the subthreshold and superthreshold regions. NC-FinFETs SRAM shows better HSNM at $V_{DD} =$ 1V and 0.4V. At $V_{DD} =$ 1V, hysteresis is observed for HSNM.