

## Assessment of Analog Performance of an Asymmetric Gate Stack D. G. MOSHEMT with respect to Source End Underlap Length.

<sup>1</sup>Dilip Jaiswal, <sup>1</sup>Nandkishor Chavan, <sup>2</sup>Dr. Swati Sharma, <sup>2</sup>Dr. Devendra Nagal

<sup>1</sup>Department of Electronics Engg., Jodhpur National University, Jodhpur, India

<sup>2</sup>Department of Electrical Engg., Jodhpur National University, Jodhpur, India

[dnjais500@gmail.com](mailto:dnjais500@gmail.com) [ndchavan@somaiya.edu.in](mailto:ndchavan@somaiya.edu.in) [er.swatisharma15@gmail.com](mailto:er.swatisharma15@gmail.com) [devendra.nagal@gmail.com](mailto:devendra.nagal@gmail.com)

**Abstract**— This paper presents a systematic comparative study of analog performances of an under lapped double gate (U-DG) MOSHEMT's with Gate Stack (GS) with varying underlap length. In highly scaled devices, conventionally, symmetric underlap is used at the Source and Drain side so as to reduce the short channel effects (SCE's). However, this leads to increased channel resistance decreasing the ON current. Asymmetric underlap devices (A -U-DG) have been proposed as one of the remedies with underlap being present only at the source side. Different parameters such as drain characteristics, transfer characteristics, transconductance (gm), transconductance generating factor (gm/Id) and output resistance (Ro) have been analyzed for various underlap lengths. For optimization of the desired underlap length, the DIBL and the Ion / Ioff ratio have been considered. Analysis suggested that the device with underlap length of 24 nm shows superior Analog Performance in terms of better Ion / Ioff ratio and better resistance to SCE's.

Thus, the optimal underlap length is 24 nm.

**Keywords:** Gate stack; asymmetric underlap; analog performance; DG MOSHEMT's

### I. INTRODUCTION

RECENTLY, AlInN/GaN heterostructure has emerged as a superior alternative to the conventional AlGaIn/GaN heterostructure based High Electron Mobility Transistors (HEMTs) and metal oxide semiconductor HEMTs (MOS-HEMTs) [1-4]. The lattice matched in AlInN/GaN structure offers much better performance than the AlGaIn/GaN structure. The devices deploying AlInN/GaN have higher spontaneous polarization induced two-dimensional electron gas (2DEG) density [5], higher drain current (ID) and the structure is stress-free with enhanced reliability, and better thermal and chemical stability [3]. Al<sub>x</sub>In<sub>1-x</sub>N with Al composition of about 0.83 is nearly lattice-matched to GaN and superior-quality AlInN/GaN heterostructure have been grown by metal-organic vapor phase epitaxy (MOVPE) [7]. Devices using AlInN/GaN have shown very high electron mobility (1200 to 2000 cm<sup>2</sup>/Vs) and high 2DEG sheet carrier densities (3.2x10<sup>13</sup>cm<sup>-2</sup>) [7-8]. Considering the enormous potential of AlInN/GaN heterostructure it has been deployed in the present work.

The Double gate (DG) MOSFET with asymmetric source underlap at the source side suffers from SCE's owing to high

scaling [6-7]. Symmetric underlap is introduced to reduce SCE's like Drain Induced Barrier Lowering (DIBL) [8-9]. Gate Induced Drain Leakage (GIDL) and fringing of underlap [10]. However, owing to increased effective channel length, the channel resistance increases and as a result, the on current (Ion) gets affected. But the foremost demand from a device used in System on Chip (SoC) applications is a high value of Ion [11]. So to reduce channel resistance, Asymmetric Underlap Double Gate MOSHEMT with Gate Stack (A-U-DG- MOSHEMT) is proposed as a modification to the conventional U-DG-MOSHEMT. Here, the underlap is only present at the source side. This reduces the channel resistance and correspondingly improves Ion. The main objective of the paper is to provide a comparative study between Asymmetric Underlap Double Gate MOSHEMT with Gate Stack (A-U-DG-GS MOSHEMT) devices with different underlap lengths. Different parameters such as the drain current (ID), transconductance (gm), the transconductance generation factor (gm/ID) and the output resistance (ro) are analyzed to judge the device performances. The optimization of the desired underlap length is assessed on the basis of the FOM: Ion / Ioff ratio.

The thickness of oxide layer has a major influence on the performance of MOS-HEMTs. The effect of high-k oxides such as Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>, ZrO<sub>2</sub> and HfO<sub>2</sub> on the gate current leakage of MOS-HEMT devices are analyzed by few group [3-4]. Other than that no major has been done in this area. Considering the utility of underlap DG MOS-HEMT devices for high speed and high power application, the comprehensive investigation analyzing the effect oxide thickness on performance of AlInN A-U-DG- MOSHEMT is of paramount significance. Thus, in this paper for the first time, we analyze the effect of Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> thickness on the performance of the AlInN/GaN A-U-DG- MOSHEMT. Extensive device simulations of transfer characteristics, output characteristics, transconductance (gm), transconductance generation factor (TGF).




Fig1. Cross sectional view of AlInN/GaN Hetrostructure Gate Stack A-U-DG- MOSHEMT The channel consists of undoped narrow bandgap GaN (TC=10nm) region and two wide bandgap barrier Al<sub>0.83</sub>In<sub>0.17</sub>N (TB=3 nm) regions. Source/drain region doping is 1020cm<sup>3</sup> with 5nm length. The gate length L<sub>g</sub>=18nm and Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> gate dielectric is constant. source end Lun varied from 18 nm to 24 nm in steps of 3nm.

The highly scaled devices also suffer from SCE's owing to high scaling [17-18]. Asymmetric source underlap is introduced to reduce SCE's like Drain Induced Barrier Lowering (DIBL) [19-20]. Gate Induced Drain Leakage (GIDL) and fringing capacitance are also reduced with the introduction of underlap [21]. However, owing to increased effective channel length, the channel resistance increases and as a result, the on current (I<sub>on</sub>) gets affected. But the foremost demand from a device used in System on Chip (SoC) applications is a high value of I<sub>on</sub> [22]. So to reduce channel resistance, Asymmetric Underlap Double Gate MOSHEMT with Gate Stack (A-U-DG-GS MOSHEMT) is proposed as a modification to the conventional U-DG-MOSHEMT. Here, the underlap is only present at the source side. This reduces the channel resistance and correspondingly improves I<sub>on</sub>.

The main objective of the paper is to provide a comparative study between Asymmetric Underlap Double Gate MOSHEMT with Gate Stack (A-U-DG-GS NMOSFET) devices with different underlap lengths. Different parameters such as the drain current (I<sub>D</sub>), transconductance (g<sub>m</sub>), the transconductance generation factor (g<sub>m</sub>/I<sub>D</sub>) and the output resistance (r<sub>o</sub>) are analyzed to judge the device performances. The optimization of the desired underlap length is assessed on the basis of the FOM: DIBL and I<sub>on</sub> / I<sub>off</sub> ratio.

## II. DEVICE DESCRIPTION AND SIMULATION

All the device parameters and supply voltage used for the device simulations are in accordance with the ITRS

Roadmap for RF and Mixed Signal Applications [23]. All simulations have been performed using Sylvaco TCAD, a 2-D device simulator, using the standard density gradient model [24]. The device structure under consideration is shown in Fig. 1.

An asymmetric underlap double gate MOSHEMT, with Gate Stack (A-U-DG-GS) is taken as the base device for simulation where the channel doping concentration is fixed at 10<sup>15</sup> cm<sup>-3</sup> and a doping concentration of 10<sup>20</sup> cm<sup>-3</sup> is chosen for the source and drain region. The device has a gate length (L<sub>g</sub>) of 18 nm. The underlap is present only on the Source side (L<sub>un</sub>). For optimization, the underlap lengths of 18 nm, 21 nm and 24 nm have been considered. The silicon body thickness (t<sub>si</sub>) is about 16 nm whereas the gate height is 9.1 nm. The EOT of the device is 0.9 nm [14], which is achieved by using an interfacial layer (Tox<sub>low</sub>) of SiO<sub>2</sub> of 0.45 nm and an oxide layer (Tox<sub>high</sub>) of HfO<sub>2</sub> of about 2.9 nm. The HfO<sub>2</sub> layer is placed over the SiO<sub>2</sub> layer which provides higher physical gate height to the device. The foundation device is a nitride spacer.




Fig. 2. Comparison of I<sub>d</sub> of A-U-DG-GS MOSHEMT with various underlap lengths as a function of V<sub>gs</sub>, at V<sub>ds</sub> = 0.5 V the device with 21 nm underlap shows lower on current and the device with 24 nm underlap shows the least on current.

## III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

The Analog performance of the A-U-DG-GS NMOSFET is analyzed in this section. The underlap lengths have been varied from 18 nm to 24 nm. The analog parameters analyzed here are I<sub>ds</sub>, g<sub>m</sub>, g<sub>m</sub>/I<sub>ds</sub>, r<sub>o</sub> and g<sub>m</sub>.r<sub>o</sub>.

The transfer characteristics curves of the three devices are analyzed from Fig. 2. It is observed that the device with an underlap of 18 nm shows a greater on current for a given value of gate voltage. The device with 21 nm underlap shows a lesser on current and the device with 24 nm underlap shows the least on current for a given gate voltage.




Fig. 3: Comparison of  $I_d$  of A-U-DG-GS MOSFET with various underlap lengths as a function of  $V_{gs}$ , at  $V_{ds} = 0.5$  V.

The barrier height of the device with 24 nm underlap is greater than the barrier height of the device with 21 nm underlap, and the device with 18 nm underlap shows the least barrier height. Greater barrier heights suggest lower on currents. Thus, the device with 18 nm underlap shows the highest on current, The  $I_{ds}$ - $V_{ds}$  curves of the three devices are presented. It is inferred from the figure that lower the underlap length, higher is the drain current,




Fig. 4. Comparison of  $g_m$  of A-U-DG-GS MOSHEMT with various underlap lengths as a function of  $V_{gs}$ , at  $V_{ds} = 0.5$  V.

The parameter  $g_m$ , depends upon  $V_{gs}$  and  $I_d$ , at a fixed  $V_{ds}$ . Since the gate biasing  $V_{gs}$  is same for all the devices it is the  $I_d$  which is responsible for the variation in  $g_m$  in the devices. Thus, the device with higher  $I_d$  also has a higher  $g_m$ .

The variation of Conduction Band Energy for various underlap lengths of the A-U-DG-GS MOSHEMT device as a function of distance along




Fig. 5 compares the  $g_m/I_d$  curves of the three devices.

Since the device with 18 nm underlap shows both the highest drain current and the highest  $g_m$ , it shows the least  $g_m/I_d$ . Similarly, the device with 21 nm underlap shows slightly higher  $g_m/I_d$  and the device with 24 nm underlap shows the maximum  $g_m/I_d$ .




Fig. 6. Variation of  $I_{on}/I_{off}$  ratio of A-U-DG-GS MOSHEMT for various underlap lengths.

Fig. 6 shows the variation of the  $I_{on}/I_{off}$  ratio of the devices with respect to their underlap lengths. The device with an underlap length of 24 nm displays the highest  $I_{on}/I_{off}$  ratio while the device with the 18 nm underlap displays the lowest  $I_{on}/I_{off}$  ratio. Variation of  $I_{on}/I_{off}$  ratio of A-U-DG-GS MOSHEMT for various underlap lengths, which is consistent with the theory that a greater effective channel length increases the channel resistance, thus reducing the  $I_{ON}$ .




Fig. 7. DIBL for various underlap lengths of A-U-DG-GS MOSHEMT at  $V_{ds} = 0.5$  V and  $V_{gs} = 1$  V.

Fig. 7 lists the DIBL values of the three devices. The device with 24 nm underlap displays the least DIBL while the device with 18 nm underlap shows the maximum DIBL. This is because the underlap provides a screening effect from the drain bias and thus prevents the barrier lowering caused by the drain bias.




Fig. 8 compares the output resistance of the three devices. Greater the underlap, greater is the output resistance. Thus, the device with 18 nm underlap shows minimum  $r_o$ , the device




Fig. 9. Comparison of  $r_o$  of A-U-DG-GS MOSHEMT with various underlap lengths as a function of  $V_{gs}$  at  $V_{ds} = 0.5$  V.

#### IV. CONCLUSION

In this work, the optimization of underlap length in an A-U-DG-GS MOSHEMT is presented. On comparing the characteristics of the three devices, it is observed that the  $I_{on}$  is increased by reducing the channel length. However, the  $I_{on}/I_{off}$  ratio the device with an underlap of 24 nm shows an improvement of 30.78% compared to the device with 18 nm underlap and 14.1% compared to the device with an underlap of 21 nm. Furthermore, scaling down the device greatly increases the risk of Short Channel Effects. The device with 18 nm underlap is most susceptible to SCE's. The device with an underlap of 24 nm shows a 9.6% lesser DIBL than the device with an underlap of 18 nm and 4.2% lesser DIBL than the device with an underlap of 21 nm. Considering all these factors, the use of 18 nm underlap in an A-U-DG-GS MOSHEMT is discouraged. The underlap of 24 nm offers superior performance on all parameters is hence preferred.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] Chau R, Doyle B, Datta S, et.al., Integrated Nanoelectronics for the future, *Nature Mater*, 6, 2007, 810– 812.
- [2] Iwai H, Roadmap for 22 nm and beyond, *Microelectronics Engineering*, 86 (7-9), 2009, 1520–1528.
- [3] Hemant Pardeshi, Godwin Raj, Sudhansu Kumar Pati, N. Mohankumar, and Chandan Kumar Sarkar, *Semiconductors*, 46 (10), 2012, 1299–1303.
- [4] K. Majumdar, R. S. Konjady, R. T. Suryaprakash, and N. Bhat, *IEEE Transaction on Nanotechnology*, 10, 2011, 1249-55.
- [5] L. Morassi, G. Verzellesi, H. Zhao, J. C. Lee, D. Veksler, G. Bersuker, *IEEE Transactions on Electron Devices*, 59, 2012, 1068-1074.
- [6] Synopsys TCAD, Sentaurus device user's manual version 2012.06.
- [7] C. Canali, G. Majni, R. Minder, G. Ottaviani, *IEEE Transactions on Electron Devices*, 1975 1045-1046.
- [8] J. D. Bude, *Simulation of Semiconductor Processes and Devices*, USA, 2000, 23-25.
- [9] Ioffe Institute, *New Semiconductor Material Characteristics and Properties*. <http://www.ioffe.ru/SVA/NSM/S>.

- [10] K. Choi, H. N. Al shareef, H. C. Wen, H. Harris, H. Luan, Y. Senzaki, P. Lysaght, P. Majhi, B. H. Lee, *Applied Physics Express*, 89, 2006, 87-91.
- [11] G. Ji, H. Liu, Y. B. Su, Y. X. Cao, Z. Jin, *Chinese Physics B*, 21, 2012, 058501-1 to 058501-6.
- [12] M. M. A. Hakim and A. Haque, 2002. Effects Neglecting Carrier Tunneling on Electrostatic Potential in Calculating Direct Tunneling Gate Current in Deep Submicron MOSFETs, *IEEE Transactions on Electron Devices*, vol. 49, no. 9.
- [13] C. R. Manoj and V. R.Rao, 2007. Impact of High-k Gate Dielectrics on the Device and Circuit Performance of Nanoscale Fin FETs, *IEEE Electron Device Letters*, vol. 28, no. 4, pp. 295-297.
- [14] B. Cheng, M. Cao, R.Rao, A. Inani, V. V. Paul, W. M. Greene, J. M. C. Stork, Y. Zhiping, P. M. Zeitzoff, and J. C. S. Woo, 1999. The impact of High-K gate dielectrics and metal gate electrodes on sub-100nm MOSFETs, *IEEE Trans. Electron Devices*, vol. 46, no. 7, pp. 1537-1544.
- [15] W. Zhu, J. Han, and T. P. Ma, 2004. Mobility Measurement and Degradation Mechanisms of MOSFETs Made With Ultrathin High-k Dielectrics, *IEEE Trans. Electron Devices*, vol. 51, no. 1, pp. 98-105.
- [16] F. Crupi, P. Srinivasan, P. Magnone, E. Simoen, C. Pace, D. Misra, and C. Claeys, 2006. Impact of the Interfacial Layer on the Low-Frequency Noise (1/f) Behavior of MOSFETs With Advanced Gate Stacks, *IEEE Electron Device Letters*, vol. 27, no. 8, pp. 688-691.
- [17] Y. Taur and T. H. Ning, 2009. *Fundamentals of Modern VLSI Devices*, Cambridge University Pres.
- [18] Q. Xie, J. Xu, and Y. Taur, 2012. Review and critique of analytic models of MOSFET short-channel effects in subthreshold, *IEEE Trans, Electron Devices*, vol. 59, no. 6, pp. 1569-1579.
- [19] K. Koley, A. Dutta, S. Saha, and C. Sarkar, 2015. Analysis of high-K spacer asymmetric underlap DG-MOSFET for SOC application, *IEEE Trans, Electron Devices*, vol. 62, no. 6, pp. 1733-1738.
- [20] A. Bansal and K. Roy, 2007. Analytical subthreshold potential distribution model for gate underlap double-gate MOS transistors, *IEEE Trans. Electron Devices*, vol. 54, no. 7, pp. 1793-1798.
- [21] K. Koley, A. Dutta, S. Saha, and C. Sarkar, 2014. Effect of source/drain lateral straggle on distortion and intrinsic performance of asymmetric underlap DG-MOSFETs, *IEEE Journal of the Electron Devices Society*, vol. 2, no. 6, pp. 135-144.
- [22] A. Kundu, A. Dutta, K. Koley, S. Niyogi, C.K.Sarkar -RF Parameter extraction of underlap DG MOSFET's: a look up table based approach, *IET Circuits Devices Syst.*, 2014, vol. 8, no. 6, pp. 554-560.
- [23] *International Technology Roadmaps for Semiconductor*, ITRS, London, U.K., 2008.
- [24] *Sentaurus TCAD Manuals*, Release C-2009.06, Synopsys Inc., Mountain View, CA, USA, 2009.
- [25] A. B. Sachid, R. Francis, M. S. Baghini, D. K. Sharma, K. H. Bach, R. Mahnkopf, V. R. Rao, 2008. Sub-20 nm gate length FinFET design: Can high- $\kappa$  spacers make a difference, in *IEDM Tech Dig.*, pp.1-4.
- [26] B. Paul, A. Bansal, and K. Roy, 2006. Underlap DGMOS for digital subthreshold operation, *IEEE Trans. Electron Devices*, vol. 53, no. 4, pp. 910-913.
- [27] R. Granzner, V. M. Polyakov, F. Schwierz, M. Kittler, R. J. Luyken, W. Rosner, and M. Stadele, 2006. Simulation of nanoscale MOSFETs using modified drift-diffusion and hydrodynamic models and comparison with monte-carlo results, *Microelectron. Eng.*, vol. 83, no. 2, pp. 241-246.
- [28] C. Lombardi, S. Manzini, A. Saporito, and M. Vanzi, 1988. A physically based mobility model for numerical simulation of nonplanar devices, *IEEE Trans. Computer-Aided Design*, vol. 7, no. 11, pp. 1164-1171.
- [29] N. D. Arora, J. R. Hauser, and D. J. Roulston, 1982. Electron and hole mobilities in silicon as a function of concentration and temperature, *IEEE Trans. Electron Devices*, vol. 29, no. 2, pp. 292-295.
- [30] D. Esseni, M. Mastrapasqua, G. K. Celler, F. Baumann, C. Fiegna, L. Selmi, and E. Sangiorgi, 2000. Low field mobility of ultra-thin SOI NANDp-MOSFETs: Measurements and implications on the performance of ultra-short MOSFETs, *IEEE Int. Electron Devices Meeting, Tech. Dig.*, pp. 671-678