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Abstract

Effect of Transmission Line Measurement (TLM) Geometry on Specific Contact Resistivity Determination

Sidhant Grover

Supervising Professor: Dr. Santosh Kurinec

Ohmic metal semiconductor contacts are indispensable part of a semiconductor device. These are characterized by their specific contact resistivity ($\rho_c$) in expressed in $\Omega$-cm$^2$, defined as the inverse slope of current density versus voltage curve at origin. Engineering and measurement of specific contact resistivity ($\rho_c$) is becoming of increasing importance in the semiconductor industry. Devices ranging from integrated circuits to solar cells use contact resistivity as a measure of device performance. Novel methods such as contact silicidation, doped-metal contacts, dipole inserted contacts etc. are continually being developed to reduce specific contact resistivity and improve device performance. The Transmission Line Measurement (TLM) method is most commonly used to extract the specific contact resistivity for such applications. This method is, however, not fully understood and modeled to understand the flow of current and behavior of charge carriers for contacts of different dimensions. It has often been observed in literature that applications that involve smaller TLM geometries most often than not, show low values of $\rho_c$ and applications that involve $\rho_c$ extraction through larger TLM geometries show significantly larger values. A perfect example of this would be the inconsistencies observed in extracted $\rho_c$’s from integrated
circuit applications where TLM geometries range from 0.1 µm to 10 µm and extracted $\rho_c$ is of the order of $10^{-8}$ to $10^{-6} \ \Omega\cdot\text{cm}^2$ and photovoltaic applications where geometries are around 50 µm to 1000 µm and $\rho_c$ is of the order of $10^{-5}$ to $10^{-2} \ \Omega\cdot\text{cm}^2$. The transfer length or $L_T$ which is the characteristic length that the charge carriers travel beneath the contact before flowing up into the contact. It has also been seen that in certain cases of TLM device dimensions, the extracted $L_T$ is greater than the actual length of the contact. This occurrence cannot be effectively explained through the conventional TLM analysis.

In this project, the inconsistencies observed in literature were initially attributed to the error in measurement. Equations for relative uncertainty due to systematic error were optimized to obtain values of optimum TLM widths for application specific values of $\rho_c$ and $R_{SH}$. TLM structures with varying widths were fabricated and tested. Underlying doped regions were created through methods of ion implantation and spin-on-doping targeted for particular values of $R_{SH}$. The contacts were fabricated on high and low values of sheet resistances using Aluminum, NiSi and TiSi$_2$ metals. This was used to experimentally compare the experimental and simulated values of the optimum widths. The devices were also fabricated with changing contact length in order to try to explain the occurrence of the transfer length to be greater than the length of the contact. The experimental mask design had test structures with constant width and varying TLM lengths. Scaling structures where both the length and width of the TLM geometry were also increased proportionally to evaluate the scaling effect of the TLM length and width on the extracted transfer length.

The fabricated TLM structures were then tested and the data was analysed to obtain values of the transfer length ($L_T$) and $\rho_c$. The relative uncertainty due to systematic error in $\rho_c$ was also evaluated. The experimental values of the optimum widths for the least amount of measurement error were a close match to those obtained through simulations. It was also observed that for a contact made with a particular metal on a doped layer of a particular $R_{SH}$, the $L_T$ increased as the width of the TLM structure increased. Many
cases were observed where the extracted $L_T$ was greater than the length of the contact, indicative of current crowding. This was the first time this relation was observed and this prompted a mask design with changing TLM lengths. A similar linear relation was observed on constant width and changing the length of the contacts. The scaled structures showed that on simultaneously increasing the length and width of the TLM contacts, the transfer length proportionally increased. There is, therefore, a geometric dependence of $L_T$ extracted from the measurement of the TLM structures. Through the use of the exact field solution modeling, $L_T$ is underestimated in the integrated circuit application space due to current crowding effects and overestimated in the case of silicon photovoltaics. There is no "one-size-fits-all" geometry that can be used for any particular application space. Due to the observed underestimations, it was also concluded that the TLM method is not an appropriate method to determine $\rho_c$ for nanoscale contact applications.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

The advent of modern technological society can be largely attributed to tremendous developments in the semiconductor industry in the past 50 years. Breakthroughs in fabricating smaller and faster integrated circuits as well as more efficient solar cells has created a well connected and environment friendly world around us. The need to improve the performance of these advanced semiconductor devices is what drives a majority of technological advancements today.

Device performance in the semiconductor industry can be impacted by various means. One of the major factors that effect the performance of devices is the resistance between the contacts and the device itself. This is termed as contact resistance. This contact resistance is dependent on contact area. Therefore, a more critical figure of merit called the specific contact resistivity can be employed. The Specific Contact Resistivity or $\rho_c$ is a more effective characteristic as it is independent of contact area size and is a convenient factor while comparing contacts of different sizes. The Transmission Line Method (TLM) can be applied to extract the $\rho_c$ of these contacts. This model gains its name from transmission lines that are used in power transmission. The initial circuit model was based on how transmission lines looked like in the last century as seen in Figure 1.1.
The TLM test structures involve metal contacts fabricated on diffused conducting regions. These contacts have a particular length (L) and width (W) and different spacings between them. Figure 1.2 shows an example of a sample TLM structure. The MESA region is the diffused conducting region. Electrical testing on these structures (described in further detail in Chapter 4) is used to extract the $\rho_c$.

Accurate determination of this $\rho_c$ is essential in understanding its impact on the performance of these devices. This chapter provides a description of the motivation behind this work, a brief overview of TLM analysis and need for optimization. It lays out an outline for the rest of the work and motivates further reading.


1.1 Motivation

The aggressive demand for high performance semiconductor devices has placed a need to effectively extract the specific contact resistivity for contacts made between these devices and their external environment. Integrated circuits and photovoltaic applications commonly use the Transmission Line Method or TLM method to extract the measure of contact resistance i.e. specific contact resistivity or $\rho_c$. In the TLM method, the contact current injection is in a lateral channel that makes the extracted specific contact resistivity values comparable to FET as well as photovoltaic devices. These device structures have varying $\rho_c$ and sheet resistance $R_{SH}$ values and the contacts differ between being alloyed and non-alloyed metal contacts.

Inconsistencies have been observed in literature regarding the specific contact resistivity values extracted from applications involving large TLM geometries and small TLM geometries. For example, values of $\rho_c$ quoted in literature involving integrated circuit applications that have very small TLM contact geometries range from about $10^{-8}$ to $10^{-6}$ $\Omega - cm^2$ [7] [16] whereas those in the photovoltaics domain with larger contact geometries have values of $\rho_c$ between $10^{-5}$ to $10^{-2}$ $\Omega - cm^2$ [6] [5]. This is very interesting to observe as $\rho_c$ is defined to be independent of contact area, but an area dependence is clearly observed in such literature.

An extensive literature search was carried out to compare various $\rho_c$ values found in literature for particular TLM dimensions. It was interestingly noted that not all of the papers studied investigated mentioned TLM dimensions that were used for the measurements. Figure 1.3 shows a TLM Geometry versus $\rho_c$ space with various data values listed illustrating how varied the results have been reported. The differences in measured values of $\rho_c$ due to application specific dimensional variation can clearly be identified.
Figure 1.3: Difference of $\rho_c$ values in literature between Integrated Circuits and Silicon Photovoltaics.[5] [6] [7] [16]

Tremendous reduction in device sizes in modern times have required specific contact resistivity ($\rho_c$) improvement to maintain small parasitic resistances within acceptable ranges, particularly for integrated circuit applications. These parasitic resistances need to be significantly small for all semiconductor applications. Optimum pattern designs for the Transmission Line Model (TLM) that are suggested to achieve minimum measurement uncertainty of the specific contact resistance can be developed for semiconductor applications of varying $\rho_c$ and $R_{SH}$. These values of measurement uncertainty need to be evaluated for TLM geometries of varying sizes to determine if non-optimized TLM geometries cause the measurement inconsistencies. Simulations carried out in this paper as well as in Ueng et al [20] suggest optimum values of the widths of these TLM structures that provide the least uncertainty in measurement. A contour map similar to one below can be formulated for optimum TLM contact geometries for various values of $R_{SH}$ and $\rho_c$ yielding to different semiconductor applications.

- **Gabor 2016**
  $\rho_c = 10^{-3}$ $\Omega \cdot \text{cm}^2$
  $W = 1 \text{cm}, L = 65 \mu\text{m}$

- **Franklin 2014**
  $\rho_c = 2 \times 10^{-5}$ $\Omega \cdot \text{cm}^2$
  $W = 2 \text{ cm}, L = 2 \text{ cm}$

- **Gallacher 2012**
  $\rho_c = 2.3 \times 10^{-7}$ $\Omega \cdot \text{cm}^2$
  $W = 125 \mu\text{m}, L = 75 \mu\text{m}$

- **Stavitski 2006**
  $\rho_c = 3.9 \times 10^{-8}$ $\Omega \cdot \text{cm}^2$
  $W = 8 \mu\text{m}, L = 3 \mu\text{m}$
Figure 1.4: Map of optimum widths for different applications 1 and 2.

Figure 1.4 shows a map of the different optimum widths of TLM structures for applications 1 and 2 with values of sheet resistances $R_{SH1}$ and $R_{SH2}$, and specific contact resistivities $\rho_{c1}$ and $\rho_{c2}$. There is no information on the uncertainties of these alloyed and non-alloyed structures and hence one cannot accurately compare data sets. Similar issues arise for different applications employing varying values of $R_{SH}$ and $\rho_{c}$.

The Transmission Line Measurement or TLM method involves current-voltage measurements on contacts of particular dimensions fabricated on diffused resistors of different doping. These contacts have varying spacing between them and the resistance is measured between each contact of different spacing. The measured resistance is then plotted with the different spacings and the plot is used to extract parameters of transfer length ($L_T$) and specific contact resistivity ($\rho_{c}$). The transfer length is an important factor in the determination of the specific contact resistivity and is defined as the characteristic length along which 63% of the current flows into the contact. Conventional TLM structures do not accurately determine the $L_T$ of the contact. Lateral contacts that have contact lengths much larger than $L_T$ behave as semi-infinite contacts. As the length of the contacts is decreased, below $L_T$, the resistance of the contact increases sharply [14]. The assistance of different modeling methods such as Exact Field Solutions, Lumped circuit modeling, dimensional modeling
using the Finite Element Method can be used to explore reasons for such dependencies.

### 1.2 Thesis Outline

This work follows a logical order starting with the definition of specific contact resistivity of metal-semiconductor contacts. By talking about the Schottky barrier height, the various conduction mechanisms in Metal-Semiconductor ohmic contacts can be discussed and their relationship to the specific contact resistivity can be shown. The technology and operation of metal-semiconductor contact formation techniques like aluminum-to-silicon contacts and silicided contacts is provided. The Transmission Line Measurement (TLM) method is then described in detail and different modeling methods such as the three, two, one and zero dimensional models, the lumped circuit model and the exact field solution model are described.

The process fabrication and experiment and then outlined followed by details of the theoretical and experimental optimization carried out through error analysis. The results of the modeling and optimization, the impact of changing the TLM dimensions on the transfer length are then provided. The experimental measurement errors are also analyzed in the above results. The above results are then summarized to provide conclusions about the applicability of the TLM method as an accurate method for determining $\rho_c$ and ideas for improvement and future research are suggested.
Chapter 2

Specific Contact Resistivity of Metal-Semiconductor Contacts

2.1 Ohmic Contacts

In order to improve the performance of modern semiconductor devices, various methodologies can be applied. One of them is to reduce the resistance between the electrical contacts of the device and its environment. Ohmic contacts are most commonly utilized to make connections between the metal and semiconductors. An ohmic contact is a low resistance junction that allows similar current conduction in both directions between the metal and the semiconductor [22]. The current voltage characteristics of ohmic contacts can be linear or quasi-linear. The voltage drop across the contact junction should be very small when compared to the voltage drop across the device so that the contact can provide the necessary device current [15]. An ohmic contact should not degrade the device and inject minority carriers.

An essential concept to comprehend for ohmic contacts is the barrier height or more formally called the Schottky barrier height, denoted by $\phi_B$ and measured in eV.
2.1.1 Schottky Barrier Height

The barrier between a metal and semiconductor can be identified using an energy band diagrams as shown in figure 2.1. The work function of the metal $\phi_M$ is the minimum energy required to raise an electron from the fermi level $E_f$ to the vacuum level $E_{\text{vacuum}}$. The electron affinity $\chi$ is the difference in energy of an electron in the vacuum level and the conduction band edge. When the metal and semiconductor are brought in intimate contact, electrons travel from the semiconductor to the metal in order to achieve thermal equilibrium.

![Energy band diagram of Metal-Semiconductor contact in thermal equilibrium.](image)

In Figure 2.1, Fermi level, $E_f$ is flat as no voltage is applied across the junction. The right of the junction is an n-type semiconductor and to the left of the junction is a metal. The Schottky barrier height is described as a barrier to the electron or hole flow between a metal and doped semiconductor. For an n-type semiconductor, it is given as $\phi_{Bn}$ and is the energy difference between the fermi energy of the metal and the band edge where the majority carriers reside [10]. For a p-type semiconductor it is $\phi_{Bp}$ and called $\phi_B$ in general.
It is a function of the metal as well as the semiconductor. The barrier height for a metal contact to an n-type semiconductor is given in Equation 2.1.

\[ \phi_{Bn} = \phi_M - \chi \]  

Here, \( \phi_M \) is the metal work-function and \( \chi \) is the electron affinity. Similarly, for a p-type semiconductor, the barrier height \( \phi_{Bp} \) is given in Equation 2.2.

\[ \Phi_{Bp} = \frac{E_g}{q} + \chi - \phi_M \]  

where \( E_g \) is the band-gap of the semiconductor. Measured Schottky barrier heights for for electrons on n-type silicon and holes on p-type silicon for a few different metals is shown in Table 2.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metal</th>
<th>( \phi_M ) (V)</th>
<th>n-Ge</th>
<th>p-Ge</th>
<th>n-Si</th>
<th>p-Si</th>
<th>n-GaAs</th>
<th>p-GaAs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ag</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Au</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cr</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ni</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pt</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.1: Schottky barrier height and work function of a few different metals [13].

### 2.1.2 Conduction Mechanisms

Conduction in metal-semiconductor junctions can be described by three main mechanisms depending on the semiconductor doping. For low-doped semiconductors with a doping density \( N_D < 10^{17} \) cm\(^{-3}\), conduction is mainly through Thermionic emission (TE, Fig. 2.2a). For heavily doped semiconductors \( N_D > 10^{19} \) cm\(^{-3}\), Field Emission (FE) is the
major conduction mechanism where electrons tunnel through the barrier (Fig. 2.2b). For moderately doped semiconductors, the electrons are excited to energy levels where tunneling can take place and this mechanism is called Thermionic Field Emission (TFE, Fig 2.2c).

![Figure 2.2: Current conduction in Metal-Semiconductor junctions.](image)

The three different regimes are differentiated by considering the characteristic energy $E_{00}$ that is given Equation 2.3.

$$E_{00} = \frac{qh}{4\pi} \sqrt{\frac{N}{\epsilon_s m^*}} = 1.86 \times 10^{-11} \sqrt{\frac{N(cm^{-3})}{\epsilon_s m^*}} \tag{2.3}$$

where $N$ is the doping density, $q$ is electron charge $= 1.6 \times 10^{-19}$, $\epsilon_s$ is the relative permittivity of the material and $m^*$ is the effective electron mass. $E_{00}$ can be plotted with respect to the doping density and compared with the thermal voltage $kT$. For $kT >> E_{00}$, Thermionic Emission dominates. Field Emission dominated for $kT << E_{00}$ and for $kT \approx E_{00}$, Thermionic-Field Emission dominates. This behavior can be observed in Figure 2.3.

The process of Thermionic Emission (TE) involves electrons being emitted over a barrier with thermal energies greater than that of the barrier. The current density obtained from this process is given by Equation 2.4.
Figure 2.3: $E_{00}$ and $kT$ as a function of doping density for Si at $T = 300K$ [15].

$$J_{TE} = A^* T^2 \exp \left( \frac{-q\phi_B}{kT} \right) \left[ \exp \left( \frac{qV}{kT} - 1 \right) \right] \tag{2.4}$$

where $A^*$ is called Richardson Constant and is given by Equation 2.5.

$$A^* = \frac{4\pi qmk^2}{h^3} \tag{2.5}$$

The current densities for Thermionic Field Emission (TFE) and Field Emission (FE) depend on the barrier height $\phi_B$ and doping. Their expressions are given by Equations 2.6 and 2.7.

$$J_{FE} = \frac{A^* T \pi \exp \left[ -\frac{q(\phi_B - V)}{E_{00}} \right]}{c_1 k \sin(\pi c_1 kT)} \cdot [1 - \exp(c_1 qV)] \tag{2.6}$$

$$J_{TFE} = A^* T \sqrt{\frac{\pi E_{00} q(\phi_B + v_f - V)}{k \cdot \cosh \left( \frac{E_{00}}{kT} \right)}} \exp \left[ \frac{q\phi_B}{kT} - \frac{q(\phi_B - v_f)}{E_0} \right] \exp \left( \frac{qV}{E_0} \right) \tag{2.7}$$
The variables \( c_1 \) and \( E_0 \) are defined as follows.

\[
c_1 = \frac{1}{2E_{00}} \ln \left( \frac{4\phi_B}{v_f} \right) \tag{2.8}
\]

\[
E_0 = E_{00} \coth \left( \frac{E_{00}}{kT} \right) \tag{2.9}
\]

\( v_f \) is the difference between \( E_c \) and \( E_f \) and can be found using the Joyce-Dixon approximation.

\[
v_f = E_C - E_f = kT \left[ \ln \left( \frac{n}{N_c} \right) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{8N_c}} \right] \tag{2.10}
\]

where \( n \) is the carrier concentration and \( N_c \) is the effective density of states given by

\[
N_c = 2 \left( \frac{m^* kT}{2\pi \hbar^2} \right)^{3/2} \tag{2.11}
\]

\( m^* \) is the effective mass of electron and the value of \( N_c \) for silicon is \( 2.82 \times 10^{19} \text{cm}^{-3} \).

### 2.2 Specific Contact Resistivity

The specific contact resistivity, \( \rho_c \), is a figure of merit for ohmic contacts and is measured in \( \Omega \cdot \text{cm}^2 \). It is used to describe the interfacial quality of the junction. The classic derivation of \( \rho_c \) is the reciprocal of the derivative of the current density with respect to the voltage at zero bias [17],

\[
\rho_c = \left( \frac{\partial J}{\partial V} \right)^{-1}_{V=0} \tag{2.12}
\]

The specific contact resistivity includes the contact resistivity of not only the interface,
but also the regions immediately above and below the interface. The specific contact resistivity is a very useful parameter for ohmic contacts as it is independent of the contact area and is a very convenient parameter for measuring contacts of different sizes. The $\rho_c$ can be measured directly in contrast to contact resistance $R_c$. $\rho_c$ can be measured from the corresponding $R_c$ as

$$\rho_c = R_c A$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.13)

where A is the effective contact area in cm$^2$.

For metal-semiconductor contacts with low doping concentrations, Thermionic Emission dominates. The current due to TE is given by Equation 2.4. The specific contact resistivity due to TE can be obtained by applying Equation 2.12 to the TE current. Therefore, the specific contact resistivity due to Thermionic Emission

$$\rho_{c,TE} = \frac{k}{qA^*} \exp \left( \frac{q\phi_B}{kT} \right)$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.14)

It can be seen from the above equation that low $\rho_c$ can be obtained from a low barrier height. It also shows the temperature dependence of the $\rho_c$ for a given barrier height. For higher doping concentrations, $\rho_c$ starts to depend on the barrier height $\phi_B$ as well as the doping density $N_D$. The specific contact resistivity due to Field emission, $\rho_{c,FE}$, is given by

$$\rho_{c,FE} = \frac{k^2}{qA^*} \cdot \frac{\sqrt{E_0}}{E_{00} \sqrt{\pi (q\phi_B + v_f)}} \cosh \left( \frac{E_{00}}{kT} \right) \exp \left( \frac{q\phi_B}{E_0} - \frac{v_f}{kT} \right)$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.15)

For regions in between, both TE and FE take place the specific contact resistivity, $\rho_{c,TFE}$ is given by

$$\rho_{c,TFE} = \frac{k^2}{qA^*} \cdot \left[ \frac{\pi kT}{\sin(\pi c_1 kT)} \cdot \exp \left( - \frac{q\phi_B}{E_{00}} \right) - \frac{1}{c_1} \exp \left( - \frac{q\phi_B}{E_{00}} - c_1 v_f \right) \right]^{-1}$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.16)
The Richardson constant $A^*$ for silicon is $110 \text{Acm}^{-2}\text{K}^{-2}$.

The specific contact resistivity can be plotted with respect to the doping concentration to show its variation with different barrier heights as seen in Figure 2.4.

![Graph showing specific contact resistivity vs. doping concentration](image)

Figure 2.4: Electron concentration versus specific contact resistivity for Silicon.

It can be observed from the above graph that for higher doping concentrations, lower specific contact resistivity values can be obtained. The values of $\rho_c$ are calculated for each of the conduction mechanisms using equations 2.14 through 2.16 respectively. It can be observed that Field Emission dominates as a transport mechanism in highly doping whereas Thermionic Emission dominates at low doping. The specific contact resistivity is independent of the doping in the Thermionic emission regime and therefore straight lines are
observed. The specific contact resistivity increases with increasing barrier height and therefore, lower barrier heights with high electron concentration are preferred. At low barrier heights, however, very less field emission is observed for high doping concentrations. A discontinuity is also observed in the regions of transition from one transport mechanism to the other.

### 2.3 Effect of Interface States

Interface states on the surface of the semiconductor can also be a significant factor in determining the specific contact resistivity. These interface states can be caused by various reasons such as broken lattice periodicity on the surface, adsorption of foreign particles and impurities. These can give rise to trap sites on the semiconductor surface. The trap sites can be of donor or acceptor type. The sites that are positive when empty and neutral when full are the donor-like trap sites and the ones that are neutral when empty and negative when full are the acceptor like trap sites.

![Figure 2.5: Energy levels of interface states](image)

$q\phi_0$ is the neutral level. Above the neutral level, states are acceptor like and below it, states are donor like. The interface trap density is given as $D_{it}$ and is measured in number of states/cm$^2$-eV. $\phi_0$ and $D_{it}$ can be found using the equations below.

$$\phi_0 = \frac{E_g}{q} - \frac{c_3 + c_2 \chi}{(1 - c_2)}$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.17)
\[ D_{it} = 1.1 \times 10^{13} \left( \frac{1 - c_2}{c_2} \right) \]  

(2.18)

\( E_g \) is the band gap, \( \chi \) is the electron affinity, \( c_2 \) and \( c_3 \) are constants. When there are no surface states present, \( D_{it} \to 0 \). Then, \( c_2 \to 1 \) which causes the barrier height to be a function of the metal-semiconductor workfunction difference forming an ideal schottky barrier. When the amount of surface states is large, \( D_{it} \to \text{inf} \), then \( c_2 \to 0 \). In this case, \( \phi_{Bn} = E_g - \phi_0 \). The fermi-level is pinned to the surface states at a value \( q\phi_0 \) above the valence band. The barrier height is then independent of the metal workfunction and is determined entirely by the semiconductor surface properties. This phenomenon is also known as Fermi-level pinning. It shows the importance of semiconductor surface pre-cleaning prior to metal deposition in order to reduce the trap states between the metal-semiconductor interface. [15] [3]

Figure 2.6: Metal workfunction as a function of barrier height.
2.4 Measurement Techniques

There are numerous methods ranging from two-contact two-terminal techniques to six-terminal methods to measure the specific contact resistivity, $\rho_c$. A few of the test structures commonly employed to measure $\rho_c$ are discussed in this section with additional emphasis on ladder structures leading into the Transmission Line Measurement (TLM) method.

2.4.1 Cross Bridge Kevin Resistance (CBKR)

The Cross Bridge Kevin Resistor or CBKR is a popular four-terminal technique to measure the specific contact resistivity $\rho_c$ for metal-to-semiconductor contacts.

![Figure 2.7: Structure used for CBKR measurement[18].](image)

In the following method, a current $I$ is forced between contacts 1 & 2 and the voltage drop is measured between contacts 3 & 4, $V_{3,4} = V_3 - V_4$. The underlying layer is the doped semiconductor region whereas the upper layer is the metal used for the contact. The value
of the contact resistance $R_c$ is then given by Equation 2.19 below.

$$R_{CBKR} = \frac{V}{I}$$

(2.19)

The specific contact resistivity can then be calculated from the contact area, $A$, using the following equation where $R_{CBKR} = R_c$.

$$\rho_c = R_c A$$

(2.20)

This generic one-dimensional approach does not take into account the effects of current crowding that occur when the contact hole window is smaller than the doped underlying layer, i.e. $\delta > 0$. There is additional voltage drop at the contact periphery and this leads to additional resistance. This additional resistance becomes extremely important for contacts with high sheet resistance and low specific contact resistivity and therefore complicate the CBKR measurements.[18]

### 2.4.2 Shockley Method

In this method, the potential difference between progressing pairs of contacts is plotted with respect to the pair distance. The function when extracted to zero potential gives the transfer length $L_T$, the distance over which most current transfers from one material to the other. The specific contact resistivity $\rho_c$ can be calculated from Equation 2.21, where $R_{SH}$ is the sheet resistance of the underlying layer.

$$L_T = \sqrt{\frac{\rho_c}{R_{sh}}}$$

(2.21)
Figure 2.8: Ladder-structure contacts on doped-semiconductor region, top-down view.

Figure 2.9: Extraction of the transfer length using the Shockley method

Detailed description of $L_T$ is described in Chapter 4 that discusses the TLM Method in detail. Before diving into that topic, the technology behind the formation of these metal-semiconductor contacts needs to be properly understood. The next chapter on the Metal-Semiconductor contact technology serves this purpose.
Chapter 3

Metal-Semiconductor Contact Technology

Metal-semiconductor contacts need to have most, if not all of the following characteristics in order to be effectively utilized in Si technology. They need to have low contact resistance to n+ and p+ regions. They should be easy to form and have good compatibility with Si processing such as deposition, etching, cleaning etc. There must be no reaction or diffusion of the contact metal into Si, SiO$_2$ or any other materials used in back-end technology. There must also be no impact of the metal on the electrical characteristics of the shallow junctions. The contacts must also be thermally stable and reliable.

3.1 Aluminum Contact Technology

Aluminum has traditionally been favored to make metal-semiconductor contacts due to its good conductivity and the formation of a protective oxide on the top surface. It also fulfills most of the requirements of a good metal-semiconductor contact listed above. Usually, a 1-2µm thick layer of Aluminum is deposited on patterned Si wafer where it makes direct contact to the Si in the contact openings. It is the heated to ensure an intimate contact between the Al and the Si.

The use of aluminum to form contacts was predominantly used in the era of larger device sizes. As contact geometries began to shrink, an increase in the contact resistance
was observed in silicon-aluminum contacts. The processing temperatures for back-end silicon processing often reach 450-500°C. In an Al/Si system, the solubility of Si in Al is about 0.5-1% at those temperatures as shown in the phase diagram in Figure 3.1.

Figure 3.1: Al/Si phase diagram [21].

The Si atoms can diffuse into the Al due to their high diffusivity (about 100µm at 450°C in 30 mins). This leads to the issue of junction spiking, where the Al is seemed to ”spike” into the silicon junction leading to the formation of pits. These pits can be observed in Si after etching away the Al as seen in Figure 3.2. In modern contact dimensions, the spikes can be deep enough to destroy device operation. The spiking effect can be reduced by using Rapid Thermal Anneal (RTA) or Processing(RTP). The rapid increase in temperature would reduce the Si diffusion into Al. Another strategy is to add about 1-2% Si in the Al for the deposition in order satisfy the solubility requirement and prevent Al spiking during thermal processing.
3.2 Metal-Silicide Contact Technology

Silicides have been used for interconnects and contacts for many novel devices in the nanoelectronics and photonics industries in the modern era. Near noble and refractory metal silicides are used in the modern semiconductor devices due to their low resistivity and good adhesion to Si. They also provide low contact resistance to Si by forming ohmic contacts to $n^+$ or $p^+$ silicon. Apart from these critical benefits, silicides also have good thermal stability, high corrosion and oxidation resistance, low interface stress and high electromigration resistance. Silicides also have the inherent advantage of compatibility with other processes such as lithography and etching, thereby offering ease of integration into the semiconductor manufacturing process. Table 3.1 outlines some of the main properties of common metal silicides.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>TiSi$_2$</th>
<th>CoSi$_2$</th>
<th>NiSi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Formation Temperature °C</td>
<td>600-700</td>
<td>600-700</td>
<td>400-600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thin Film Resistivity ($\mu\Omega\text{cm}$)</td>
<td>13-20</td>
<td>14-20</td>
<td>14-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schottky Barrier Height (n-Si, eV)</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Si consumption ratio</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silicide thickness ratio</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>2.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1: Main properties of common silicides [3].
3.2.1 Formation of Silicides

The usual formation of metal silicides involves the following steps.

- Cleaning the wafer with a dilute HF and deionized water solution, followed by blowing dry using nitrogen gun or "spin-rinse-dry". This step gets rid of any native interfacial SiO$_2$ layer prior to metal deposition as metal needs to penetrate thin oxide layer in order to react with silicon to form the silicide.

- Metal is then deposited on the wafer using sputter deposition or epitaxial process.

- Wafer is then heat treated using furnace annealing or Rapid Thermal Processing (RTP) to form silicide at the metal-silicon interface.

- Removal of the unreacted metal using Piranha etch chemistry.

Formation of metal silicides are governed predominantly by growth kinetics over growth energetics. Only selective phases of the silicide are detected after thermal annealing of the metal films on silicon. The formation of multiphases in refractory metal/Si systems can however be observed through deeper and more refined analysis using better techniques such as high-resolution transmission electron microscopy (HRTEM) with fast Fourier transform (FFT) analysis.

Various different crystalline phases can be formed in a metal/Si system. For example, the Ti/Si systems forms as many as four different crystalline phases (Ti$_5$Si$_3$, TiSi, C49-TiSi$_2$ and C54-TiSi$_2$). Figure 3.3 shows a sample of the multiphases in Ti/Si. The identification of the initial phases of reaction for these silicides is difficult due to the close proximity and overlap of diffraction rings from their diffraction patterns.

The growth and formation of metal silicides are diffusion controlled or interface-reaction controlled and they can be formed far below the eutectic temperature, the temperature at which a particular mixture freezes or melts. The sequence of phase formation, dependence
of phase growth and morphology of phase and interface structure can be demonstrated using cross-section transmission electron microscopy (XTEM). Inert markers such as ion implanted inert gases, metal deposited inert metal islands, or monitoring movement of neutron bombarded Si (radioactive Si) can be used to determine the dominant diffusion species in the silicidation reaction. The formation of metal-rich silicide, monosilicide and disilicide occurs at about 200, 400 and 600°C, respectively. At low temperatures like 200°C, not many Si atoms get released from its lattice. At temperatures like 600°C, lattice vibrations facilitate the release of Si atoms from the substrate.

3.2.2 Self-aligned Silicide (SALICIDE)

Self-aligned Silicide is used as a process to lower the resistance of the gate, source and drain areas in modern MOS transistors. It is beneficial as it forms low resistance contacts to source/drain regions without the need of an additional lithographic step. The metal is deposited all over the structure followed by a Rapid Thermal Anneal or Process (RTA or RTP) to form the metal silicide. Therefore, the process is Self-aligned. Ti, Co, Ni, Pd and Pt are can be used for the SALICIDE process but Ti, Ni and Co are most commonly used in the IC industry. Figure 3.4 shows self-aligned silicide in a MOSFET.

Usually, a two step process is used to form the SALICIDE. After the initial formation
of the metal silicide mentioned above, the unreacted metal is etched away. Depending on the choice of metal and annealing conditions, a high or low-resistivity phase of the silicide is obtained. A second RTA step can be used to transform the silicide from a high-resistivity to a low resistivity phase.

TiSi$_2$ with a formation temperature of 800°C to 900°C was initially used as SALICIDE for the CMOS process. As linewidths continued to shrink, CoSi$_2$ showed increased promise but was limited to high series resistance of the silicided lines. NiSi has been the material of choice for sub-90nm technology nodes. Issues like NiSi pipes have been observed in industry beyond the 20nm node and it is possible that TiSi$_2$ may be reintroduced for nodes beyond 20nm.

**TiSi$_2$ Technology**

Due to its low resistivity, thermal stability and compatibility with the Si process, titanium silicide was one of the first few silicides to be considered for Si-based devices.

**Formation** Titanium disilicide is of greatest interest to the Si nanoelectronics amongst the several forms, crystal structures and material properties of titanium silicides that can be
formed. It offers the lowest resistivity and good thermal stability during post-processing. The SALICIDE process used for TiSi$_2$ formation is shown in Figure 3.5. The phase formation sequence for the silicidation reaction of Ti/Si involves the following reaction path.

\[
\text{Ti/Si} \rightarrow \alpha - \text{TiSi}_x \rightarrow \text{C49} - \text{TiSi}_2 \rightarrow \text{C54} - \text{TiSi}_2
\]  

(3.1)

Not all the phases appear during heat treatment. The C54 phase offers very low resistivity at equilibrium depending upon method of fabrication. The equilibrium Ti-Si binary
The in situ resistance versus temperature curve for Ti/poly-Si bilayer deposited over silicon dioxide during furnace annealing at 10°C/min shown in Figure 3.7 has four distinct stages in resistance.

1. Linear increase in the resistance with increasing temperature from 25 °C to 350°C.

2. Steep increase in resistance following region 1.

3. Sharp decrease in resistance ~ 550°C.

4. Another sharp drop at ~ 700°C

**Integration and Scaling** Successful integration of TiSi₂ requires adequate consideration and understanding of the effects of dopant type on phase formation and dopant redistribution during silicidation. The effect of impurities, formation ambients, reactions to oxide and/or nitride spacers needs to be understood. The presence of n or p-type dopants in the order of $10^{20}$ /cm³ retards the phase formation and reaction kinetics. Dopant diffusion and
redistribution in grain boundaries of titanium silicide is a concern as it affects source/drain and contact resistance. Dopant segregation can also be electrically active providing additional charge carriers at the interface thereby reducing the silicide/Si interfacial resistance [3]. The reaction between the Ti and oxide or nitride spacers due to silicidation needs to be minimized as residues formed in the reaction can lead to gate-to-source/drain leakage or shorts. These shorts can also occur due to lateral encroachment of the silicide into the gate-to-source/drain regions.

Titanium silicide scaling has conventionally been achieved by reducing the Ti film thickness but this leads to issues such as incomplete C49-to-C54 phase transformation and enhanced agglomeration. The minimum temperature to transform the silicide shifts upward and the maximum temperature before the onset of agglomeration shifts downward leading the a shortening of the silicidation process window for shrinking device dimensions. Increased silicide thickness offers lower sheet resistivities and better defect margin but increases the Si consumption that increases the risk of device leakage and is incompatible with ultra-shallow junction formation. Figure 3.8 below sums up the operatable SALICIDE process window for reduced Ti thickness.
NiSi Technology

Nickel silicides have more recently been investigated for use in microelectronic applications due to their formation in thinner films, low thermal budget of formation, low resistivity in narrow dimensions and low device leakage.

Formation The Ni/Si phase formation sequence is far more complicated than TiSi$_2$ and one can expect up to 11 phases, 6 of which are stable at room temperature. The phase formation sequence becomes far more complicated and there is possible dependence on processing parameters and substrate variations such as dopant type and concentration and cleaning conditions.

The thermal budget of the formation of the low resistivity NiSi phase is much lower than its counterparts and is therefore much easier to form as a monosilicide. The lower temperature of formation of NiSi is due to its higher concentration and diffusivity.

The process of formation of NiSi is predominantly diffusion controlled. This is contrary to nucleation controlled reactions for low resistivity Ti and Co silicides where the reaction is rapid, non-uniform and has some characteristic surface roughness. A diffusion controlled
Integration and Scaling

Apart from the inherent advantages of NiSi over its competitive silicides, there are still some challenges associated with its integration into the conventional
semiconductor manufacturing. Undesired agglomeration of NiSi and formation of NiSi$_2$ at low temperatures, excessive Ni diffusion on narrow Si or poly-Si lines can lead to abnormally high junction leakages. The performance and yield of NiSi on narrow poly-Si gate is far superior than similar silicides. Gate patterning does not limit silicide formation for NiSi as no degradation in resistance is observed which is usually linked to agglomeration, stress and voiding effects.

Due to the presence of more grain boundaries on NiSi films on poly-Si substrates, there is faster diffusion of Ni during phase formation. This process can be optimized to give thicker silicide on poly-si areas and less silicide on active junctions. This would be advantageous for device applications based on Silicon-On-Insulator (SOI) substrates as source and drain regions of the devices would require very small amounts of Si consumption. The formation of high resistivity NiSi$_2$ can also limit the NiSi process. Local stresses can lead to the formation on NiSi$_2$ even if it does not normally occur in temperatures below 800°C. NiSi provides comparatively higher contact resistance to heavily doped p-type substrates over heavily doped n-type, but still lower than contacts with CoSi$_2$. 
Chapter 4

Transmission Line Measurement (TLM) Method

The Transmission Line Measurement or TLM method is popularly used to determine the specific contact resistivity of metal-semiconductor interface in the modern semiconductor industry. Originally proposed by Shockley, it involves current voltage measurements on adjacent contacts with variable spacing between them. It utilizes a similar ladder structure as observed in the Shockley method but the current is not perturbed by contacts in between for this method. The total resistance $R_T$ between any two contacts (of length $L$ and width $W$) separated by a distance $d$ could be measured and plotted as a function of $d$. The resulting equation between $R_T$ and $R$ provides an estimate of $\rho_c$ through the so called transfer length $L_T$, measured from the intersection of the $R$ curve for $R_T = 0$.

4.1 Transmission Line Measurement (TLM) Structure

The Transmission Line Measurement (TLM) structure involves contacts fabricated on diffused semiconductor regions of a particular sheet resistance $R_{SH}$ depending upon the application. These diffused regions are isolated from their surroundings by using trench or MESA isolation. If MESA isolation is used, the depth of the MESA should be greater than
the junction depth \( (x_j) \) of the diffused carriers in order to avoid current leakage. The metal contacts are fabricated with a length \( L \) and width \( W \) and incrementing spacings between each adjacent contact \( d_1, d_2, d_3 \) and \( d_4 \). Figure 4.1 shows a top-down view of a fabricated TLM structure.

![Figure 4.1: Top-down view of TLM structure.](image1)

Insulating oxide can be used to separate the contacts. The contacts can be wired to bond pads with thick wires for ease of measurement with small geometries. The horizontal view of a basic TLM structure can be observed in Figure 4.2 below.

![Figure 4.2: Horizontal view of TLM device structure.](image2)
4.2 $\rho_c$ Extraction

I-V measurement is carried out on each adjacent contact and the resistance is obtained from the slope of the curve. The resistance is then plotted as a function of the contact spacing d. (Figure 4.3)

\[
\text{Slope} = \frac{R_{SH}}{W}
\]

Figure 4.3: Plot to extract transfer length from the TLM method.

The specific contact resistivity is usually obtained from the plot using the extracted transfer length $L_T$ and sheet resistance $R_{SH}$. An equation for the total resistance ($R_T$) of the TLM structures can be extracted from the above plot.

\[
R_T = 2R_C + \left(\frac{R_{SH}}{W}\right)d \tag{4.1}
\]

Upon consideration of the path of the current under a contact, it can be observed that the width of the current path under the contact or the distribution of the current density is directly dependent of the level of specific contact resistivity $\rho_c$.

Figure 4.4 describes the flow of current under a metal contact within the semiconductor region. For very small values of $\rho_c$ the current flows quickly into the contact and only the edge of the contact area is used in conduction(Figure 4.5(a)). For high values of $\rho_c$, the
current path is expanded due to high transition resistance and a larger amount of the contact is used for conduction (Figure 4.5(b)).

The characteristic length when the voltage drops to $1/e$ of its value is called the transfer length $L_T$. The length of the contact must be chosen in close consideration of the transfer length. The transfer length extracted from the TLM method is the half the value of the $x$-axis intercept of the total resistance versus pad spacing plot. This transfer length is depicted
as $L_{TLM}$.

$$L_{TLM} = \sqrt{\frac{\rho_c}{R_{SH}}}$$

![Figure 4.6: Transfer length as a function of $\rho_c$.](image)

The transfer length as a function of the specific contact resistivity $\rho_c$ is plotted in Figure 4.6 above. It can be observed that for a particular application of a given sheet resistance $R_{SH}$ and anticipated $\rho_c$, the transfer length can be estimated and the length of the contact must be design with consideration of the transfer length. Smaller contact lengths can lead to current crowding and larger contact lengths are a waste of usable device area.

The effect of metal resistivity can be included in $\rho_c$ extraction by the means of the following equation below.

$$R_c = \frac{L_T'}{Z} \left[ \frac{(\rho_m^2 + R_{SH}^2)}{(\rho_m + R_{SH})} \coth(L/L_T') + \frac{\rho_m R_{SH}}{\rho_m + R_{SH}} \left[ \frac{2}{\sin(L/L_T')} + \frac{L}{L_T'} \right] \right]$$

(4.2)

where $L_T' = \sqrt{\frac{\rho_m}{\rho_m + R_{SH}}}$

$\rho_m$ is the resistivity of the metal. For aluminum $\rho_m$ is $2.5 \times 10^{-8}$ Ω-m and is neglected.
in calculations in this work due to its small difference percentage wise.
Chapter 5

Contact Resistance Modeling

Accurate modeling of the contact resistance is essential in understanding metal-semiconductor contacts as it is practically difficult to fabricate contacts that have a uniform current density over its conduction area. It is usually considered the limit as the area goes to zero. In real devices, the current distribution is non-uniform and therefore the definition of $\rho_c$ which involves a uniform current density for contact resistance per unit area becomes a bit ambiguous.

![Non-uniform current distribution in a contact.](image.png)

Figure 5.1: Non-uniform current distribution in a contact.
The contact system is described by transport equations. Poissons and two-carrier continuity equations in 3-D can be adequately used to describe the model. These equations are more often then not, simplified into 2-D or 1-D equations.

## 5.1 Three-Dimensional Model

In the three-dimensional model, the topology of the contact can vary in three spatial dimensions of x, y and z. Both, the metal potential \( U_m \) and semiconductor potential \( U \) are functions of the spatial coordinates. The majority carrier equation outside the contact is given by

\[
\nabla \cdot J = \frac{\delta J_x}{\delta x} + \frac{\delta J_y}{\delta y} + \frac{\delta J_z}{\delta z} = 0
\]

(5.1)

The current density in the semiconductor is given by \( J \), where \( U \) is the potential at a coordinate (x,y,z).

\[
\vec{J} = -\sigma \vec{E} = \sigma \nabla U
\]

(5.2)

By combining Equations (5.1) and (5.2), we get

\[
\nabla \cdot \sigma \nabla U = 0
\]

(5.3)

Similar expressions can be applied to the metal region. Usually, the metal conductivity is much larger than that of the semiconductor. Therefore, the metal potential \( U_m \) becomes constant over the entire interface. The only variable that remains is the semiconductor potential \( U \) and it governs the entire metal-semiconductor system. The total current evaluated over a surface of area \( A \) is given by Equation 5.4. Solving the system of equations with appropriate boundary conditions can give us the necessary information regarding the metal-semiconductor contact resistivity.
Several approximations can be made for heavily doped semiconductor junctions. First, the effect of minority carriers is neglected. This is equivalent to neglecting the depletion layer depth or band bending at the contact interface. The total current density is approximately the same as the majority carrier density because the metal-semiconductor interface injects far more majority carriers than minority carriers. Second, due to this majority carrier domination, the majority carrier concentration is approximated to the active dopant density. Hence, only majority carrier continuity equations are used to solve for the semiconductor region beneath the contact. The three-dimensional model can get very difficult in computation and generalization. Therefore, two-dimensional models can be developed while still providing useful insights.

5.2 Two-Dimensional Model

In the two-dimensional model, the contact interface is considered as a 2-D surface perpendicular to the z-axis. The diffused layer is located beneath the metal-semiconductor interface with an effective thickness that is assumed to be the junction depth. This model lumps the effects of the z-axis into a single parameter, $R_{SH}$, the sheet resistance of the diffused layer.

$$R_{SH} = \left( \int \sigma(z) dz \right)^{-1}$$

(5.5)

Since the metal layer is usually more conductive than the semiconductor layer, the metal potential $U_m$ is assumed to be constant. If the metal potential is set to zero, the 3-D equations can be simplified into the following equation called the Helmholtz.
\[ \nabla^2 V = \frac{R_{SH} V}{\rho_c} = \frac{V}{L_T^2} \quad (5.6) \]

In the bulk region with no contact surface, the potential can be described by Laplace’s equation

\[ \nabla^2 V = 0 \quad (5.7) \]

The above equations can be solved to obtain the I-V characteristics and extract values of \( \rho_c \).

### 5.3 One-Dimensional Model

The one-dimensional or 1-D model is a further simplified model where the variation in the y-axis is neglected. Since the potential changes only slightly in other axes, the Helmholtz equation then becomes.

\[ \nabla^2 V = \frac{V(x)}{L_T^2} \quad (5.8) \]

Upon application of the boundary conditions, the Laplace’s equation can be reduced to Ohms law and the potential can be shown as

\[ V(x) = V_i \frac{\cosh \left( \frac{L-x}{L_T} \right)}{\cosh \left( \frac{L}{L_T} \right)} \quad (5.9) \]

The current is given as
\[
I_{tot} = \frac{W}{R_{sh}} \left. \frac{\delta W}{\delta x} \right|_{x=0}
\]

(5.10)

The above equations can be used to extract the contact resistance. The 1-D model can be further reduced to provide an even more intuitive feel to the contact resistance extraction. This is given by the Zero-Dimensional model.

### 5.4 Zero-Dimensional Model

The 1-D model can be simplified to a 0-D model in the cases of large contact windows, very high values of \( \rho_c \) or very small contacts. This model assumes that the current density entering the contact window is uniform and the potential is constant in the semiconductor layer. \( \rho_c \) is considered as a macroscopic quantity and is given by

\[
R_c = \frac{\rho_c}{A}
\]

(5.11)

### 5.5 Lumped Circuit Model

According to the lumped circuit or distributed resistive network model, the behavior of the current flow under a contact can be explained using a resistance network. A distributed resistive network can be simulated in order to understand the metal-semiconductor contact resistance.

The voltage distribution under the contact works out as

\[
U(x) = U_0 \exp \left[ - \left( \frac{x}{\sqrt{\rho_c / R_{sh}}} \right) \right]
\]

(5.12)

When the voltage distribution is plotted with respect to the distance across which the
current flows, the exponential dependence can be noted.

Figure 5.2: Resistive network for metal-semiconductor contact resistance [8].

Figure 5.3: Voltage distribution under contact [8].
It can be observed from Figure 3.3, the voltage drops to $1/e$ of its value after a characteristic length $L_T$. This is called the transfer length and is a characteristic variable for the current path. It can be expressed as function of the specific contact resistivity ($\rho_c$) and the sheet resistance $R_{SH}$ through the following equation.

$$L_T = \sqrt{\frac{\rho_c}{R_{SH}}}$$  \hspace{1cm} (5.13)

Mathematical analysis of the above expressions leads to the following value for the specific contact resistance.

$$\rho_c = \left( \frac{R_c W}{\coth\left(\frac{L}{L_T}\right)} \right)^2 \frac{1}{R_{sh}}$$  \hspace{1cm} (5.14)

Due to the $\coth$ dependence, two limiting cases can be observed on the relation between $L$ and $L_T$.

- For $L < 0.5L_T \rightarrow \coth\left(\frac{L}{L_T}\right) \approx \frac{L_T}{L} \Rightarrow \rho_c = R_c W L$
  - This is known as the **Short Contact Approximation**
  - Here, $\rho_c$ is dependent on the length of the contact.

- For $L > 1.5L_T \rightarrow \coth\left(\frac{L}{L_T}\right) \approx 1 \Rightarrow \rho_c = R_c W L_T$
  - This is known as the **Long Contact Approximation**
  - Here, $\rho_c$ is only dependent on the fraction of the contact used in current conduction i.e. $L_T$.

The two different approximations can be better understood by looking at the graph of the $\coth(x)$ function in Figure 5.4. For very small values of $x = L/L_T$, the function approximates to $x$ or $L/L_T$. For very large values of $x$, the function retains a constant value of $1$. 
The long contact approximation of this model has been widely used as legacy for $\rho_c$ extraction and can potentially be the cause of incorrect values if appropriate contact geometries are not used. An example of this was observed in a paper published by BrightSpot Automation, LLC [6]. Although the length of the contact was 65 $\mu$m, the measured transfer length was significantly larger than it in various cases. It was pointed out that the use of the approximated TLM formula was not applicable for the contact dimensions used in the study and the use of the generic TLM formula with no approximations gave better results. A summary of the recalculations are shown in Table 5.1.

Due to the recalculations carried out, the need for better understanding of the generic formula that has TLM length dependence was highlighted.

The lumped distributed circuit network model for the TLM measurement is limited in certain ways. In this model, the width of the TLM contact (W) is considered to be infinitely large when compared to other dimensions and its effect on the $\rho_c$ extraction is neglected. The model also does not take into account the current crowding at the edge.
of the contact and the constriction (spreading) resistance. It is also assumed that $\rho_c$ and $R_{SH}$ are considered uniform throughout the entire structure. The resistivity of the metal $\rho_m$ is initially neglected is initially neglected and metal lines are therefore equipotential. For these reasons, exact field solution model can potentially provide detailed insight into contact resistance and current crowding. It is discussed in the following section.

### 5.6 Exact Field Solution Model

The exact field solution model is the one of the most recent models for contact resistance extraction. This model involves the consideration of bulk regions I and II with dimensions of $h_1$, $h_2$, $a$ and $b$. The resistivity of these regions are $\rho_1$ and $\rho_2$. This model utilizes fourier series analysis methods to solve the boundary conditions at the different regions and therefore is also called the Fourier Series Analysis model.

A voltage $V_0$ is given at terminal EF and ground is applied to terminal BC. An interfacial layer of specific contact resistivity $\rho_c$ is sandwiched between layer I and II. All other boundaries of the contact are electrically insulated. Boundary conditions across this

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$L_T$</th>
<th>$L_T &lt; L$</th>
<th>$L_T$ Recalc.</th>
<th>$\rho_c$(m$\Omega$-cm$^2$)</th>
<th>$\rho_c$ Recalc.(m$\Omega$-cm$^2$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14.4 $\mu$m</td>
<td>$L_T &lt; L$</td>
<td>21.67 $\mu$m</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.3 $\mu$m</td>
<td>$L_T &lt; L$</td>
<td>9.87 $\mu$m</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 $\mu$m</td>
<td>$L_T &lt; L$</td>
<td>18.69 $\mu$m</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.3 $\mu$m</td>
<td>$L_T &lt; L$</td>
<td>13.79 $\mu$m</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80.5 $\mu$m</td>
<td>$L_T &gt; L$</td>
<td>5.88 $\mu$m</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>2.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.5 $\mu$m</td>
<td>$L_T &lt; L$</td>
<td>12.66 $\mu$m</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.9 $\mu$m</td>
<td>$L_T &lt; L$</td>
<td>7.63 $\mu$m</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.8 $\mu$m</td>
<td>$L_T &gt; L$</td>
<td>6.34 $\mu$m</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>2.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.6 $\mu$m</td>
<td>$L_T &lt; L$</td>
<td>18.00 $\mu$m</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.8 $\mu$m</td>
<td>$L_T &lt; L$</td>
<td>6.87 $\mu$m</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109.9 $\mu$m</td>
<td>$L_T &gt; L$</td>
<td>5.42 $\mu$m</td>
<td>10.05</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.4 $\mu$m</td>
<td>$L_T &lt; L$</td>
<td>12.21 $\mu$m</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.1: Recalculation of $\rho_c$ from general formula.
ininitely thin interfacial layer are given by the normal components of the current density across the interface, \( J_z \), and the potentials \( \Phi_I \) and \( \Phi_{II} \) in regions I and II respectively.

\[
J_z = -\left( \frac{1}{\rho_1} \right) \frac{\delta \Phi_I}{\delta z} = -\left( \frac{1}{\rho_{II}} \right) \frac{\delta \Phi_{II}}{\delta z}; \rho_c J_z = \phi_{II}(y, z = 0^-) - \Phi_I(y, z = 0^+) \quad (5.15)
\]

Fourier series expansion methods are used to solve for \( \Phi_I \) and \( \Phi_{II} \) for values of \( h_1, h_2, a, b (> a) \) and including the interface resistance \( \rho_c \). The total resistance from EF to BC can be given by the following equation.

\[
R_T = \frac{\rho_2(b - a)}{h_2W} + \frac{\rho_2}{2\pi W} R_{c,Total} \quad (5.16)
\]

The first term represents the thin film resistance from EF to DG and the second term represents the total contact resistance in its normalized form as \( R_{c,Total}.W \) is the width of the contact in the dimension perpendicular to the paper. This model is applicable for the limit \( \rho_c \to 0 \). It takes into account the fringing field near the contact edge and effects of current crowding and constriction (spreading) resistance. It also includes the effect of the electrode properties \( \rho_1 \) and \( h_1 \). The transfer length \( L_{T,FT} \) in this case is defined as
the length of the contact interface over which 63.21% of the current transfers from the conducting layer into the contact. This matches the definition used for the transfer length in conventional TLM, where $L_{TLM} = (\rho_c/R_{SH})^{1/2}$. The exact field solution model can be very helpful in understanding the nature of the flow of current into and beneath the contact. It can assist us in providing a systematic evaluation of the current crowding and spreading resistance in thin film contacts made with very large contrasts in dimensions and resistivities [25]. This model can be used to define a transfer length ($L_{T,FT}$) which can then be compared to the conventional TLM transfer length ($L_T$ or $L_{TLM}$). The comparison between $L_T$ and $L_{T,FT}$ can assist us in evaluating the validity of a certain model over the other. It can also help in picking an optimum value of the length of the contacts used in the TLM method for application specific dimensions and contact resistivities. The optimum values of the transfer length would be the range of values for resistivity and geometry for with both $L_T$ and $L_{T,FT}$ agree.

The model considers a pair of contacts that are identical and formed on the top of a conducting layer on top of an insulating substrate.

![Two contact model for the Exact Field Solution Model.](image)

Figure 5.6: Two contact model for the Exact Field Solution Model.

A Fourier Series based analysis of the current density can be carried out of the above two-contact model in order to determine the transfer length or $L_{T,FT}$ for different cases such as changing $\rho_c$, $a$, $h_1$, $h_2$ and $\rho_1$.

Initial simulations were carried out by Dr. Peng Zhang [25] in order to understand the
effect of varying the parameters in the model on the transfer length and are summarized in this section. The effect of varying interfacial contact resistivity ($\rho_c$), contact area (largely dependent upon $a$), thickness of conducting layer ($h_2$) and height of electrode ($h_1$) were carried out through the exact field solution model.

The effect of varying the contact resistivity of the interfacial layer or the specific contact resistivity ($\rho_c$) was modeled using exact field solution. Its effect on the transfer length was observed using current density distributions and plots of transfer length versus $\rho_c$. The current transfer length can be plotted as a function of the interfacial contact resistivity ($\rho_c$). This transfer length, called $L_{T,FT}$ can also be compared with the conventional transfer length from the TLM method $L_{T,LM}$. Unless otherwise specified the simulations used $a=0.5\,\mu m$, $L/2 = 10\,\mu m$, $h_1 = 100\,nm$, $h_2 = 50\,nm$, $\rho_1 = 2.44 \times 10^{-8} \,\Omega\cdot m$ and $\rho_{SH}$ as $100 \,\Omega/sq$. The total current was kept fixed at $50 \,\mu A \,\mu m^{-1}$.

### 5.6.1 Changing Contact Resistivity of Interfacial Layer

From the above modeling, it can be observed that the current density at the edge of the contact increases significantly on decreasing the interfacial contact resistivity or the specific contact resistivity ($\rho_c$). There is increased current crowding at the edge of the contact for lower values of $\rho_c$. The transfer length $L_{T,FT}$ from this model can be extracted as the characteristic length to which $63.31\%$ of the current flows. A comparison of $L_{T,FT}$ and $L_{T,LM}$ can be carried out where $L_{T,LM}$ is the conventional TLM transfer length. According to Figure 5.7(b), it can be observed that the upper limit of $L_{T,FT}$ is bound to $63.21\%$ of the length of the contact and the lower limit is $63.21\%$ of the height of the conducting layer. It can be generally observed that $L_T$ increases as $\rho_c$ increases. This is true irrespective of the measurement technique used. Further, it can be seen that the Exact Field solution model agrees with the conventional TLM model for a small range of values.
5.6.2 Changing Contact Length

The variation of the transfer length on changing the length of the contact a was also modeled and its results can be observed from Figure 5.8. The transfer length from the conventional TLM method $L_{T,TLM}$ has no change upon changing the length of the contact. $L_{T,FT}$
increases till about $2L_{T,TLM}$ but does not change much beyond this point. Therefore, according to the exact field solution model when the length of the contact is very small, the current flows very rapidly into the contact leading to small values of transfer length. Hence, the transfer length increases with increasing contact length up to a certain point where the contact length is large enough for $L_{T,FT}$ coincides with $L_{T,TLM}$. From that point onward, the length of the contact is too large for the current density drop to be significant.

\[ \rho_c = 5 \times 10^{-8} \Omega \text{cm}^2 \]

(a) Figure 5.8: (a) Current density distribution on changing contact length (a) from the exact field solution model. (b) Transfer length as a function of contact length, $a(\mu\text{m})$ [25].
5.6.3 Changing Contact Height

The effect of varying the height of the conducting region, \( h_2 \) was also modeled and are shown in Figure 5.9. As \( h_2 \) decreases, there is significantly more current crowding in the conducting layer. When \( h_2 \) is small, \( L_{T,FT} \) follows closely with \( L_{T,TLM} \) as the TLM model is reliable when only when the length of the conducting layer \( h_2 \rightarrow 0 \). \( L_{T,FT} \) increases with \( h_2 \) till it reaches a constant value of 0.63 times the length of the contact due to the fringing field being determined by the smaller of the dimensions in the contact constriction corner [23].
Figure 5.9: (a) Current density distribution on changing conducting layer ($h_2$) from the exact field solution model. (b) Transfer length as a function of height of conducting layer ($h_2$) [25].
Chapter 6

Fabrication of TLM Structures

Transmission Line Measurement (TLM) structures can be fabricated based on lithographic patterning, etch, deposition and thermal treatment processes. Lithographic patterning is carried out through a mask with predefined levels for MESA isolation, contact cut and metal etch. Two masks were designed for the project. In the first mask, the three levels had TLM patterns where the length was kept constant and TLM width was varied. The layout is shown in Figure 6.1. It included TLM structures that could be tested through the manual test bench or through the automatic probe station. This mask was fabricated using e-beam lithography at RIT using the MEBES mask-making tool. The second mask design shown in Figure 6.2 predominantly included the scaled TLM structures and TLM of changing width and length. It also included circular TLM (CTLM) and 3-D TLM structures that could be used for future research. This mask was fabricated at a commercial site PhotoMask PORTAL™.

A standard process flow is followed for all TLM fabrication steps until the metal deposition. Depending upon type of metal and use of silicides, the process is then altered based on the silicidation reaction or annealing (sinter) for intimate contact formation. The generic process flow for TLM formation until the metal deposition step is described in Figure 6.3. Detailed process flow description is provided with process recipes in Appendix A.
Figure 6.1: Mask layout for constant TLM length and different widths.

Figure 6.2: Mask layout for constant TLM width and different lengths.
6.1 Implant Schemes for Target $R_{SH}$

In this project, two different design spaces of sheet resistance or $R_{SH}$ were fabricated. The two values of $R_{SH}$ were used to replicated those most commonly seen in real world applications such as silicon photovoltaics and integrated circuits. Low values of the sheet resistance about 10 - 50 $\Omega$/sq. were comparable to those in silicon photovoltaics and higher values 800 - 1200 $\Omega$/sq. These values of sheet resistances were obtained through methods of ion implantation and spin-on-doping by light or heavy n-type Phosphorous doping.
Process development for the target $R_{SH}$ was carried out through picking out dose and energy parameters and carrying out process simulations in ATHENA SUPREM™. For spin-on-doped wafers, the process was simulated through the use of a sacrificial heavily doped oxide layer and diffused into the silicon. The parameters for the target values of $R_{SH}$ through ion implantation are described in Table 6.1 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact Metal</th>
<th>Dose (cm$^{-3}$)</th>
<th>Energy (keV)</th>
<th>Target $R_{SH}$ ($\Omega$/sq.)</th>
<th>Meas. $R_{SH}$ ($\Omega$/sq.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - Al</td>
<td>$2 \times 10^{15}$</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>44.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Al</td>
<td>$2 \times 10^{13}$</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - TiSi$_2$</td>
<td>$2 \times 10^{15}$</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>44.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - TiSi$_2$</td>
<td>$2 \times 10^{13}$</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - NiSi</td>
<td>$2 \times 10^{15}$</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>44.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - NiSi</td>
<td>$2 \times 10^{13}$</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.1: Dose and Energy implant parameters for target values of $R_{SH}$.

The simulations were carried out in ATHENA SUPREM™ and the simulation code is provided in the Appendix B. The implant profiles were used to extract the junction depth or $x_j$ (µm). The $x_j$ directly relates to the thickness of the conducting doped region. The simulated values were used as the basis of generating the target values of $R_{SH}$ in the experiment. Ion implantation using the Varian 350D Implanter through a 30 nm screening oxide was carried with the appropriate dose and energy values from Table 6.1. The screening oxide was to prevent non-uniform channeling across the wafer. The wafers were then annealed in a $N_2$ ambient at 1000°C to drive in and activate the dopants. The screening oxide was then stripped in a 5:2:1 Buffered Oxide Etch (BOE) solution and inspected. CDE Res Map was used to measure the $R_{SH}$ values. The experimental were not exactly the same as the simulated values but within the range of differentiability between low and high $R_{SH}$. The experimental values are also recorded in Table 6.1.

Phosphorous doped P509 spin-on-dopant by Filmtronics was used as the source for the spin-on-doped wafers. The process for doping the wafers using this method is summarized...
• Dispense 2ml of solution on wafer.

• Ramp for 3 seconds at 500 rpm.

• Spin at 3000rpm for 30 seconds

• Bake on hot-plate for 10 minutes at 200°C

• Drive-in using recipe 325 (see Appendix)

• Strip baked dopant in 5.2:1 HF BOE for 5 minutes.

• Measure $R_{SH}$

The measured values of $R_{SH}$ were consistent and about 10 Ω/sq..

6.2 Aluminum TLM Process Flow

The process for fabricating Transmission Line Measurement structures for aluminum is described as follows. All the steps are the same until part (d) of Figure 6.3. The steps following involve Aluminum sputter deposition using the CVC601 sputter, patterning using a pre-defined mask level using the ASML stepper and etch to form contacts with bond pads using LAM4600 Rainbow etcher. A brief description is shown in Figure 6.4.

A sintering process is carried out at 450°C to get rid of a native oxide between metal-semiconductor interface and reduce the contact resistance.

6.3 NiSi TLM Process Flow

NiSi metal-semiconductor contacts can be formed by a two-step self aligned process discussed in chapter 4. It involves a sputter deposition of Ni using the P5000 deposition tool
on the substrate patterned with contact cut openings. The Ni is then silicided through a Rapid Thermal Annealing (RTA) in the AG 610A RTA process. Nickel Silicide is formed in the contact cut openings where the Ni is in direct contact with the silicon. The unreacted Ni is then removed using an etch chemistry mixture of sulphuric acid (H\textsubscript{2}SO\textsubscript{4}) and hydrogen peroxide (H\textsubscript{2}O\textsubscript{2}). Aluminum can then be deposited on the NiSi contacts to form bond pads.

### 6.4 TiSi\textsubscript{2} TLM Process Flow

A similar process to NiSi formation is carried out for the TiSi\textsubscript{2} formation. The only difference is that there is a two-step RTP process involved that converts the high resistive C49-TiSi\textsubscript{2} phase to low resistive C54-TiSi\textsubscript{2} phase.

### 6.5 Testing of Fabricated TLM Structures

The fabricated TLM structures were tested using the HP4145 test station using the ICS metrics software. 4 point probe I-V measurement was carried out at each resistive test
structure by sweeping voltage from 0-2 Volts and measuring the current across each resistor. This was used to generate I-V curves for each specific resistor with different spacings for the TLM test structure.

Figure 6.5: Testing of TLM structures

![Image of TLM test structure](image)

Figure 6.6: I-V plots obtained from measuring resistive contacts from different spacings in the TLM test structure.

![I-V plot](image)

The inverse of the slope of each individual curve is the resistance and this resistance is plotted as a function of the pad spacing to extract parameters of transfer length ($L_T$) and
specific contact resistivity ($\rho_c$) similar to one observed in Figure 4.3. The extracted $L_T$ is used to calculate the $\rho_c$ from Equation 5.14 using known parameters of $W$ and $L$. The example of Figure 6.6 involved contacts of Aluminum metal fabricated on heavily doped Silicon of underlying sheet resistance $R_{SH}$ of 50 $\Omega/sq.$.
Chapter 7

TLM Structure Optimization

In order to accurately extract the specific contact resistivity from Transmission Line Measurement (TLM) structures, the TLM geometries must be chosen to provide the least amount of error in measurement. These geometries need to also be optimized based on contact material as well as resistive properties of the underlying material to which the contact is made. In other words, the TLM geometries need to be optimized based on sheet resistance of the underlying doped region for a particular semiconductor application and the specific contact resistance of the metal used to make the contact. Optimization of TLM geometries essentially relates to TLM width optimization as we already discussed the choice of length for accurate $\rho_c$ extraction in Chapter 3.

7.1 Optimization Through Error Analysis

Error in the Transmission Line Measurement (TLM) method can be classified into two main types - Random Error and Systematic Error. Random error measures the difference between the mean determined from a large number of trials and a single measurement of the parameter in consideration. Systematic Error is a consistent shift of means of a parameter that cannot be reduced by taking a large number of trials. In this paper, only systematic error was optimized due to ease of calculation and order of importance. The fundamental
variables of the TLM procedure, the total resistance \((R)\), pad spacing \((d)\) and pad width \((W)\) had systematic errors \(\delta R\), \(\delta d\) and \(\delta W\) associated to them due to errors in measurement. The procedure for evaluating the general error propagation and its contributions to the specific contact resistivity and sheet resistance can be described. The general error in specific contact resistivity and sheet resistance is given by \(\Delta \rho_c\) and \(\Delta R_{SH}\) respectively. A master equation based on Equation (5.1) can be written as below.

\[
R = A + Bd
\]  
(7.1)

Where

\[
A = 2R_C
\]  
(7.2)

\[
B = \frac{R_{SH}}{W}
\]  
(7.3)

\(\Delta \rho_c\) and \(\Delta R_{SH}\) can be expressed in terms of errors in \(A\) and \(B\), \(\Delta A\) and \(\Delta B\) which in turn can be expressed as uncertainties in the measured parameters \(\Delta R\), \(\Delta d\) and \(\Delta W\). The expression for \(\rho_c\) in the long contact limit can be written in terms of \(A\) and \(B\) using Equations (6.2) and (6.3) [20].

\[
\rho_c = \frac{WA^2}{4B}
\]  
(7.4)

This equation is extremely important as it can be used to determine \(\Delta \rho_c\) in terms of error contributions from measured parameters. By differentiating Equation (6.4), the uncertainty in \(\rho_c\) can be derived as.
\[ \Delta \rho_c \approx \left( \frac{\delta \rho_c}{\delta A} \right) A \Delta A + \left( \frac{\delta \rho_c}{\delta B} \right) B \Delta B + \left( \frac{\delta \rho_c}{\delta W} \right) W \Delta W \]

\[ = \left( \frac{WA}{2B} \right) \Delta A + \left( \frac{WA^2}{4B^2} \right) \Delta B + \left( \frac{A^2}{4B} \right) \Delta W \]  \hspace{1cm} (7.5)

The relative uncertainty in \( \rho_c \) can therefore be given by.

\[ \frac{\Delta \rho_c}{\rho_c} \approx 2 \left( \frac{\Delta A}{A} \right) + \frac{\Delta B}{B} + \frac{\Delta W}{W} \] \hspace{1cm} (7.6)

The relative uncertainty of the sheet resistance \( \Delta R_{SH} \) can be derived in a similar manner and is given by.

\[ \frac{\Delta R_{SH}}{R_{SH}} \approx \frac{\Delta B}{B} + \frac{\Delta W}{W} \] \hspace{1cm} (7.7)

The changes in A and B caused due \( \delta R \) and \( \delta d \) can be described in the TLM extraction plot of differential resistance versus pad spacing plot as shown in the figure below.

For a change in \( R \), i.e. \( \delta R \), the slope of the plot remains the same and the vertical intercept shifts \( \delta R \).

\[ \delta A|_{\delta R} = \delta R \] \hspace{1cm} (7.8)

\[ \delta B|_{\delta R} = 0 \] \hspace{1cm} (7.9)

Similarly, change in \( d \), i.e. \( \delta d \) does not change the slope but results in the change of the vertical intercept.

\[ \delta B|_{\delta d} = 0 \] \hspace{1cm} (7.10)

\[ \delta A|_{\delta d} = B \delta d \] \hspace{1cm} (7.11)
By taking partial derivatives of Equation (6.4) and \( A = 2 \sqrt{\rho_c R_{SH}/W} \) with respect to \( W \), we get

\[
\delta B|_{\delta W} = \left( \frac{B}{W} \right) \delta W \tag{7.12}
\]
\[
\delta A|_{\delta W} = \left( \frac{A}{W} \right) \delta W \tag{7.13}
\]

By substituting the above two equations in Equation (6.6) and (6.7), the total relative uncertainty in the specific contact resistivity due to systematic error is given by Equation (6.14) below.

\[
\frac{\delta \rho_c}{\rho_c} = \left( \frac{W}{\sqrt{\rho_c R_{SH}}} \right) \delta R + \left( \sqrt{\frac{R_{SH}}{\rho_c}} \right) \delta d + \left( \frac{4}{W} \right) \delta W \tag{7.14}
\]

Similarly, the total relative uncertainty due to systematic error in the sheet resistance is
given by.

\[
\frac{\delta R_{SH}}{R_{SH}} = \left( \frac{2}{W} \right) \delta W
\]  

(7.15)

Since the systematic error is more significant, its optimization is more important when compared to the random error. The values of \( R_{SH} \) and \( W \) which yield minimum uncertainty in \( \rho_c \) can be derived from partial derivatives of of Equation (6.14) with respect to \( R_{SH} \) and \( W \), and setting them equal to zero. This gives us the equation for the optimum width \( W_{opt} \).

\[
W_{opt} = \sqrt{4 \sqrt{\rho_c R_{SH}} \left( \frac{\delta W}{\delta R} \right)}
\]  

(7.16)

Simulations of the optimum widths can be carried out for application specific ranges of values of \( R_{SH} \) and \( \rho_c \). \( \delta R \) and \( \delta W \) are chosen with respected to anticipated error in experimental values where \( \delta R = 0.2 \Omega \) and \( \delta W = 1.5 \mu m \). A contour map of the systematic error optimization can be generated with values of optimum TLM width \( W_{opt} \) for each particular combination of \( R_{SH} \) and \( \rho_c \).
Figure 7.2: Contour map of $W_{opt}$ for application specific $\rho_c$ and $R_{SH}$.
Chapter 8

Results and Discussion

8.1 Optimization Results

The theory of TLM optimization is described in detail in chapter 6. As mentioned in the chapter, the systematic error optimization of the TLM width can be carried out. A contour map of the optimum width calculated for least relative systematic uncertainty can be generated for application specific values of $\rho_c$ and $R_{SH}$.

Figure 8.1 is the same contour plot as in Chapter 7. The particular regions of specific contact resistivity and sheet resistance have an optimum value of TLM width $W_{opt}$ that provides the least amount of systematic error in measurement. It can be observed that for larger values of $R_{SH}$ and lower values of $\rho_c$, the optimum width is in the range of about 800-1200$\mu$m. For lower values of $R_{SH}$ and higher values of $\rho_c$, the optimum width is clearly below 200$\mu$m.

TLM test structures were fabricated with different contact metals and underlying sheet resistivities of the conducting regions and tested. The relative uncertainty due to systematic error in the specific contact resistivity was calculated for each TLM structure of different contact width. The TLM width that had the least relative uncertainty due to systematic error was the optimum width. Equation 6.14 was used for the calculation of the error in
Figure 8.1: Contour plot of the systematic error optimization for application specific values of $\rho_c$ and $R_{SH}$.

measurement.

Figure 8.2 shows the values obtained from the calculation of relative uncertainty due to systematic error from the measurement of TLM structures of different lengths. The optimum width can be observed as the minima of the curve as the error in measurement is the least for this particular width of the TLM structure. In the above structures tested, the value of the TLM length was kept at a constant of $10\mu m$. The values of $\delta d$, $\delta R$ and $\delta W$ were $0.5\mu m$, $0.2\Omega$ and $1.5\mu m$ respectively.

In another experiment, the width of the TLM was kept constant and the length was varied. It was interesting to see that an optimum length could also be found for the different cases under experimentation.

Figure 8.3 shows the relative uncertainty due to systematic error in $\rho_c$ upon keeping the TLM width constant and on changing TLM length. It can be observed that as the TLM length decreases, the uncertainty in measurement of $\rho_c$ is significantly higher. It
Figure 8.2: Relative uncertainty due to systematic error as a function of TLM width for (a) low and (b) high $R_{SH}$ using Al and NiSi contact metals.

decreases to an optimum value upon increasing the TLM length and tends to increase again for larger values. The relative uncertainty is also higher for TLM structures fabricated on a conducting layer of higher sheet resistance $R_{SH}$. 
Figure 8.3: Relative uncertainty due to systematic error in specific contact resistivity ($\rho_c$) as a function of TLM length (L, $\mu$m) for $R_{SH} = 1000$ $\Omega$ and $W = 100$ $\mu$m.

Figure 8.4: Relative uncertainty due to systematic error in specific contact resistivity ($\rho_c$) as a function of TLM length (L, $\mu$m) for $R_{SH} = 50$ $\Omega$ and constant width $W = 100$ $\mu$m.
Figure 8.5: Relative uncertainty due to systematic error in specific contact resistivity ($\rho_c$) as a function of TLM length (L, $\mu$m) for $R_{SH} = 10\ \Omega$.

A similar trend was observed for the case of values of low $R_{SH}$ as seen in Figure 8.4, only difference being that the values of the relative uncertainty in $\rho_c$ were significantly lower than that obtained from TLM structures with a highly resistive conducting layer. Figure 8.5 also showed higher values of the relative uncertainty indicating that there also exists optimum values of $R_{SH}$ for which there is least amount of systematic error in measurement. This is helpful for optimizing TLM length and width (which gives similar results, Figure 8.2) in order to obtain an optimized design space for applications with a particular $R_{SH}$.

These results are interesting as it was earlier assumed that the TLM length has no impact on the relative uncertainty due to systematic error. The most probably cause can be attributed to the use of the approximated formula used in the derivation of the equation of the relative uncertainties and optimum widths. If the general TLM formula is used in case of the long contact approximation, the TLM length can be taken into account due to the
hyperbolic dependence of $L$. As no optimization was carried out for the TLM length, the experimental values could not be compared to any equation or model.

### 8.2 TLM Width and Transfer Length

Transmission Line Measurement (TLM) structures with a fixed contact length ($L$) and changing width ($W$) were fabricated with different contact metals and sheet resistances of the underlying layer. The TLM widths were varied from 10 $\mu$m to 2000 $\mu$m. Upon measurement of the fabricated structures, a trend between the transfer length ($L_T$ or $L_{T,TLM}$) and TLM width dimension was observed.

![Diagram](image)

**Figure 8.6:** Transfer Length as a function of TLM width ($W$, $\mu$m).

It can be seen from Figure 8.6 that larger values of TLM width seem to have longer transfer lengths. This can be attributed to the larger effect of the fringing field at the edges of the contact. This means that current has to flow a larger distance around and under the
contact to get through to the metal. This result was particularly interesting as it has been historically understood that the TLM width has no impact on the transfer length as the flow of current is perpendicular to its direction.

### 8.3 TLM Design Length and Transfer Length

The impact of changing the TLM length on the extracted transfer length was also studied for a value of constant TLM width. The TLM width was kept constant at 100 µm and the TLM length was varied from 20 µm to 100µm. The results obtained were similar to those observed by scaling TLM dimensions as well as constant length and varying width and are observed in Figure 8.7.

![Figure 8.7: Dependence of transfer length on the length of TLM at constant width.](image)

Since the width was kept a constant at W = 100µm and the length for some structures was 100µm, the observed transfer length was greater the length of the contact in some cases. It can be observed that the values of the transfer length extracted within the dotted
lines of the contact dimensions are true values whereas those greater than the those true dimensions are fictitious values. The TLM model does not work for those extracted values and other models need to be used to understand this behavior.

### 8.4 TLM Scaling

In order to understand the variation of transfer length with changing TLM contact dimensions, incrementally scaled TLM structures were fabricated. All dimensions such as the length (L), width (W) and spacings $d_1$, $d_2$, $d_3$ etc. were scaled together. For example, a for a structure with a length of $10\mu m$, width of $10\mu m$ and $d_1$, $d_2$, $d_3$, $d_4$ and $d_5$ of 10, 20, 30, 40 and 50 $\mu m$ respectively had 5x scaled structures of length of 50$\mu m$, width of 50$\mu m$ and $d_1$, $d_2$, $d_3$, $d_4$ and $d_5$ of 50, 100, 150, 200 and 250 $\mu m$ and 10x scaled structures of length of 100$\mu m$, width of 100$\mu m$ and $d_1$, $d_2$, $d_3$, $d_4$ and $d_5$ of 100, 200, 300, 400 and 500 $\mu m$.

![Scaled TLM contact structures with 1x, 2x and 4x scaling.](image)

It can be observed that the transfer length scales proportionally with the TLM dimensions. The plots seen in Figure 8.9 are very close to linearity which shows that the specific
contact resistivity does seem to be affected by the contact dimensions. Upon increasing the length, width and spacing between the contacts, the transfer length extracted from the measurement of the TLM structures increases accordingly. This relation is similar to one we observe in realistic applications where TLM geometries vary such as high values of $\rho_c$ for photovoltaic applications with larger TLM geometries and low $\rho_c$ for integrated circuit applications with smaller TLM geometries. The standard TLM model is not valid once the extracted TLM transfer length is greater than actual contact geometries.

8.5 Modeling Results

In order to better understand the behavior of the flow of the current under these contacts experimental parameters were modeled using techniques discussed in Chapter 5. These were helpful the explain the trends observed in the variation of the transfer length due to contact geometry.
8.5.1 Fourier Series Analysis Modeling

As discussed in Chapter 5, the Fourier Series Analysis can be used to extract and exact field solution giving meaningful insights of the current density distribution, current flow patterns, contact resistance that consists of the interface resistance and the constriction (spreading resistance) due to current crowding [25]. The structure used for the simulation of the model is the same as Figure 5.6 and is shown again below.

![Diagram of two contact structure for Fourier Series Analysis simulations.](image)

Figure 8.10: Two contact structure for Fourier Series Analysis simulations.

Figure 8.9 describes two contacts that are placed on top of a conducting layer. This conducting layer is laid on top of an insulating substrate. The contacts are of resistivity $\rho_1$, height of $h_1$ and the length of the contact is $a$. The conducting layer has a height of $h_2$ and a resistivity of $\rho_{SH}$. The spacing between the two contacts is given by $L$. An interfacial layer, which is infinitesimally small is in between the contacts and the conducting layer, it has a specific contact resistivity (or specific interfacial resistivity) denoted by $\rho_c$. When a bias is applied between the two contacts, current flows from one contact to the other through the conducting layer.

Realistic application specific values of specific contact resistivity or interfacial resistivity $\rho_c$, contact length $a$, conducting layer resistivity $\rho_{SH}$, and conducting layer height $h_2$ were provided to Dr. Peng Zhang at the University of Michigan to simulate to see trends
on the transfer length using codes based on Fourier series analysis. Graphs for variation of the transfer lengths $L_{T,TLM}$ and $L_{T,FT}$ with respect to the specific contact resistivity $\rho_c$ can be plotted for the different values of $\rho_{SH}$ and $h_2$.

For a fixed value of contact length $a = 10\mu m$, the resistivity of the conducting layer $\rho_{SH}$ is changed based on expected values of the junction depth ($x_j$) of a particular dopant and is given values of $50 \, \Omega/sq., \, 1000 \, \Omega/sq.$ and $1500 \, \Omega/sq.$ for corresponding $h_2$ or $x_j$ values of $0.5\mu m, \, 0.4\mu m$ and $0.35\mu m$. The transfer length was calculated using the conventional TLM and the fourier models for realistic values of $\rho_c$ ranging between $10^{-8}$ and $10^{-2} \, \Omega - cm^2$.

![Figure 8.11: Modeled transfer length versus specific contact resistivity for $a = 10\mu m$.](image)

In Figure 8.10, the solid lines represent the transfer length modeled through the exact field solution ($L_{T,FT}$) and the dashed line is the transfer length evaluated using the conventional TLM model ($L_{T,TLM}$). Different curves are traced for different values of the
resistivity of the underlying layer which is $\rho_{SH}$ in this model. For the conventional TLM model, this would relate to the sheet resistance of the region under the contact $R_{SH}$. The height of the conduction region $h_2$ is analogous to the junction depth. It can be observed that the Fourier Analysis and TLM model tend to agree for lower values of $\rho_c$ when $\rho_{SH}$ is lower and $h_2$ is high. As $\rho_{SH}$ increases and $h_2$ decreases, the agreement between the Fourier analysis and TLM model shifts towards higher values of $\rho_c$. It can also be observed that the upper and lower limits of $L_{T,FT}$ are bound by the length of the contact and the height of the conducting layer. This causes the models to diverge for lower and higher values of $\rho_c$. The saturation of $L_{T,FT}$ for its lower limit is due to the fringing field being attributed to the smaller of the dimensions in the current crowded corners which in this case would happen to be the contact length.

Figure 8.12: Modeled transfer length versus specific contact resistivity for $a = 100\mu m$. 
Figure 8.11 is modeled with the same parameters from Figure 8.10 except the fact that the length of the contact is increased to 100\(\mu\)m. It can be observed that the agreement between \(L_{T,TLM}\) and \(L_{T,FT}\) exists for a much wider range of values of \(\rho_c\). For higher values of \(\rho_{SH}\) there is very good agreement for larger values of \(\rho_c\) and they coincide as the transfer length increases.

The results from these simulations can be very helpful in deciding appropriate TLM contact design geometries for application specific values of \(R_{SH}\) and \(\rho_c\). The applicability of the general TLM model can be evaluated based on where the transfer lengths in each of the model coincide. From figures 8.10 and 8.11, the regions of \(\rho_c\) where the solid and dashed lines are the same. It was also very interesting to notice that for the values at which the two models agreed, \(L_T = 0.4 \times L\). The explanation for this was beyond the scope of this project and is suggested as future work. Therefore, for contact applications of \(\rho_c\) smaller than \(10^{-6}\ \Omega\cdot\text{cm}^2\), the exact field solution model can better take into account current constriction effects and gives a more accurate value of \(\rho_c\). This also means the TLM model under estimates the value of the transfer length and it is lower for smaller values of \(\rho_c\) which offers an explanation to values for integrated circuit applications observed in literature. This also means that values of \(\rho_c\) larger than \(10^{-4}\ \Omega\cdot\text{cm}^2\), transfer length is largely overestimated explaining larger values of \(\rho_c\) for silicon photovoltaic applications.
Chapter 9

Conclusions and Future Work

In this project, various methods were explored to understand the reason for inconsistent values of $\rho_c$ observed in literature due to differences in TLM contact dimensions used. Starting from a brief introduction to ohmic contact theory and specific contact resistivity ($\rho_c$), the different kinds of metal-semiconductor contacts popularly used were explored. The Transmission Line Measurement (TLM) method was then described in detail and the process of determining $\rho_c$ was described. In order to better understand the TLM method, various models like dimensional models, lumped circuit models and exact field solution or fourier transform models were described. The TLM structures were then fabricated based on optimized width values that were designed on a 3-level mask design.

9.1 Conclusions

The error optimization for the TLM widths was confirmed by the experimental results as TLM structures having widths $W$ with the least amount of systematic error in $\rho_c$ could clearly be identified and the experimental values closely matched the ones that were simulated. It was also interestingly observed the for values of constant TLM width and changing length, there appeared to be optimum values of TLM length as well. These values could not be significantly extracted due to lack of experimental data and no optimization had
been carried out on the general TLM formula. Furthermore, there was a dependence of
the transfer length $L_T$ on the TLM width when the TLM length was kept constant. As the
width was increased, the $L_T$ also increased. A similar trend was observed when the TLM
width was kept constant and the TLM length was increased. This was attributed to current
crowding and constriction effects of current under the contacts.

The scaled structures were fabricated to confirm the dimensional dependence of $L_T$ and
it was observed again that as the length and width of the TLM structures were increased, the
transfer length increased accordingly. It was concluded that beyond a certain regime of
TLM geometry for a particular application, the general TLM model does not work as the
extracted TLM $L_T$ is greater than the length of the contact. To further understand the reason
of this behavior, Fourier transform model or the Exact Field Solution model was used. It
was observed that the Exact field solution and the general TLM models agreed only for
certain values of $\rho_c$ and $L_T$. This value was only where $L_T = 0.4 \times L$. Below those values,
for significantly lower values of $\rho_c$, the transfer length is underestimated due to current
crowding and for larger values of $\rho_c$, there is an overestimation due to the assumption of
current flow equally into the contact.

It was concluded that there is no universal design to determine $\rho_c$ using the TLM
method. There is no ”one-size-fits-all” geometry and it changes based on application space.
The scaling structures confirmed the dependence of TLM geometry on $L_T$. Figure 9.1 de-
scribes this result.

It can be seen from Figure 9.1 that for very low values of $\rho_c$, $L_T$ is drastically underesti-
ated. Since, lower values of $\rho_c$ are predominantly seen in integrated circuit applications,
it could also be said that the TLM method is not an accurate method to determine $\rho_c$ for
such applications. The silicon photovoltaics community on the other hand may actually
be quoting $\rho_c$ values larger than the true values and must design contact dimensions based
projected transfer length values.
9.2 Future Work

In order to further understand the variation of extracted TLM transfer length and specific contact resistivity on TLM geometries and expand this research, a number of future studies can be suggested extending on this work.

- Carry out TLM optimization of generalized TLM equation that has the coth dependence on L to evaluate values of optimum TLM lengths.

- Develop a database of optimized TLM length and width dimensions that can be used for any particular application of varying sheet resistance of underlying layer.

- Incorporate metal resistivity into $L_T$ determination and TLM dimension optimization.

- Further this research by studying novel contact schemes such as dipole insertion, implanted metal contacts, germanosilicided contacts etc. and discuss the applicability
of the TLM method in such low specific contact resistivity schemes.

- Extend the TLM method to non-planar structures fabricated and closely emulate three dimensional contacts observed in FinFET applications.

...
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Appendix A

Detailed Process Flow

Starting Material
Bare Si p-type 1-10 Ohms/sq. Init. Resistivity

Zero Level Lithography
ASML Stepper

Zero Etch
Drytek Quad
CHF3 - 50sccm
CF4 - 25 sccm
O2 - 10 sccm
RF - 200W
Pressure - 100mT
Time - 120 seconds

Resist Strip
**RCA Clean**
Manual RCA Bench

**Screening Oxide Growth**
Bruce Furnace
LFULL Recipe 250
Target Thickness 250 - 300 Angstroms

**Ion Implantation**
Varian Ion Implanter
Wafer P1 - Dose $2 \times 10^{13}$ ; Energy 50keV
Wafer P2 - Dose $2 \times 10^{15}$ ; Energy 50keV
Wafer P3 - Dose $2 \times 10^{15}$ ; Energy 50keV
Wafer P4 - Dose $2 \times 10^{15}$ ; Energy 50keV
Wafer P5 - Dose $2 \times 10^{15}$ ; Energy 50keV
Wafer P6 - Dose $2 \times 10^{15}$ ; Energy 50keV

**Anneal**
Bruce Furnace
LFULL Sub CMOS Anneal Recipe 106

**Screening Oxide Etch**
5.2:1 BOE Solution

**Measure $R_{SH}$**
CDE ResMap
MESA Level Lithography
ASML Stepper
Level 1 - RITTLM2016

MESA Etch
LAM 490
EMCR 613 POLY
Pressure 300mT
RF 150W
O₂ 40 sccm
SF₆ 150 sccm

Resist Strip
GASONICS Aura 1000

TEOS Deposition
AMAT LPCVD P5000
Target thickness - 2000 Angstroms

Contact Cut Lithography
ASML Stepper
Level-2 CC

Contact Cut Etch TRION RIE
Recipe - PVKavya
Time - 350 seconds

**Resist Strip**

**Metal Deposition**
CVC601
Aluminum Wafers P1 and P4
Ar flow 20 sccm
Pressure 5mTorr
Power 2000W
Time 1500s

Ti Wafers P2 and P5
Pressure 5 mTorr
Power 750W
Time 300s

PE4400
Ni Wafers P3 and P6
Pressure 8mT
Power 500W
Time 180s

**Silicidation**
AG 610A RTP
Ti Silicidation Wafers P2 and P5
Recipe FACTISI1.RCP 1 min

Ni Silicidation Wafers P3 and P6
Recipe SISOC550.RCP

**Piranha for unreacted metal removal**

TiSi$_2$ Wafers P2 and P5
150 ml H$_2$SO$_4$ 300 ml H$_2$O$_2$
90 deg 120 seconds
DI Rinse 5 min
Spin-Rinse-Dry

NiSi Wafers P3 and P6
300 ml H$_2$SO$_4$ 150 ml H$_2$O$_2$
90 deg 300 seconds
DI Rinse 5 min
Spin-Rinse-Dry

**Silicidation**

AG 610A RTP
Ti$_2$ Silicidation Wafers P2 and P5
Recipe FACTISI2.RCP 1 min

**Piranha for unreacted metal removal**

TiSi$_2$ Wafers P2 and P5
150 ml H$_2$SO$_4$ 300 ml H$_2$O$_2$
90 deg 120 seconds
DI Rinse 5 min
Spin-Rinse-Dry

**Metal Deposition**

CVC601
Aluminum Wafers P2, P3, P5 and P6
Ar flow 20 sccm
Pressure 5mTorr
Power 2000W
Time 1500s

**Metal Lithography**

ASML Stepper
Level3- Metal

**Metal Etch**

LAM4900 Rainbow Etcher
Recipe 122122

**Sinter**

Bruce Furnace
Wafers P1 and P4
Recipe LFULL 101
Appendix B

ATHENA code for Implant Simulations

go athena
line x loc=0 spac=0.1
line x loc=0.35 spac=0.02
line x loc=1 spac=0.1
#
line y loc=0.00 spac=0.005
line y loc=0.3 spac=0.015
line y loc=0.5 spac=0.02
line y loc=2 spac=0.2
line y loc=5 spac=1
method grid.ox=0.001
# initial wafer
init silicon boron resistivity=10 orientation=100
# implant P
#savefile
structure outfile=Process_Sid.str
# Steam Oxide Growth
method two.dim
diffus time=15 temp=800 f.n2=10
diffus time=10 temp=800 t.final=900 f.o2=5
diffus time=93 temp=900 f.o2=10
diffus time=5 temp=900 f.n2=15
diffus time=20 temp=900 t.final=800 f.n2=10
implant phosphor dose=1.5e13 energy=50 tilt=7
  rotation=45 crystal
diffus time=15 temp=800 f.n2=10
diffus time=10 temp=800 t.final=900 f.n2=10
diffus time=30 temp=900 f.n2=15
diffus time=5 temp=900 f.n2=10
diffus time=20 temp=900 t.final=800 f.n2=10
extract name="ARC" thickness material="SiO^2"
  mat.ocnno=1 x.val=0.45
  # deposit TEOS
deposit oxide thick=0.5
  #Etch TEOS on half of wafer
    #
etch oxide left p1.x=0.5
deposit oxide thick=0.03
  implant phosphor dose=2e15 energy=50 tilt=7
  rotation=45 crystal
    #
etch oxide all
extract name="Rs3" n.sheet.res material="Silicon"
mat.occno=1 x.val=0.45 region.occno=1
extract name="xJ3" xj material="Silicon"
mat.occno=1 x.val=0.45 junc.occno=1
extract name="feildox2" thickness material="SiO^{-2}"
mat.occno=1 x.val=0.2
extract name="Rs2" n.sheet.res material="Silicon"
mat.occno=1 x.val=0.65 region.occno=1
extract name="xJ2" xj material="Silicon" mat.occno=1
x.val=0.65 junc.occno=1
extract name="feildox" thickness material="SiO^{-2}"
mat.occno=1 x.val=0.8
structure outfile=Sid_Process.str
tonyplot Sid_Process.str
quit
RESULTS -
Rs3=49.6841 ohm/square X.val=0.45
EXTRACT> extract name="xJ3" xj material="Silicon"
mat.occno=1 x.val=0.45 junc.occno=1
xJ3=0.463826 um from top of first Silicon layer X.val=0.45
EXTRACT> extract name="feildox2" thickness material="SiO^{-2}"
mat.occno=1 x.val=0.2
Extracted results: N/A
Check cut line and/or selected quantities
EXTRACT>
EXTRACT> #
EXTRACT> #deposit oxide thick=0.5 c.phosphor=1e21

EXTRACT>

EXTRACT> #diffus time= 20 temp = 900 f.n2 =10

EXTRACT>

EXTRACT> #etch oxide all

EXTRACT> extract name="Rs2" n.sheet.res material="Silicon"
    mat.occno=1 x.val=0.65 region.occno=1
Rs2=1705.91 ohm/square X.val=0.65

EXTRACT> extract name="xJ2" xj material="Silicon"
    mat.occno=1 x.val=0.65 junc.occno=1
xJ2=0.368363 um from top of first Silicon layer X.val=0.65

...