CYPRESS
Connecting From Last Mile To First Mile.™

Line Edge Roughness Reduction for Advanced Metal Gate Etch with 193nm Lithography in a Silicon Decoupled Plasma Source Etcher (DPSII)

Tito Chowdhury, Hean-Cheal Lee, A Renaldo, K Ikeuchi, B Bruggermann
Cypress Semiconductor R&D, San Jose CA

Yan Du, Meihua Shen, Jinhan Choi, and Shashank Deshmukh
Silicon Etch, Conductor Etch Division, Applied Materials, Santa Clara CA

PEUG JANUARY 13, 2005

Outline

- What is LER
- Why is LER Important
- How is LER measured
- Modulation of LER from Etch Standpoint
  - Gate
  - STIE
- DPSII hardware & design features
- Hard mask open process
  - 193nm and 248nm PR comparison
  - Mechanism for sidewall striation
  - Etch chemistry and process trends
- W/poly gate etch
  - W gate etch mechanism
  - W etch process trends
- Advanced Gate Etch Challenges
  - Gate Stack complexities
- Current results
- Summary and Conclusions
- Acknowledgements & References

Line Edge Roughness (LER) measurement-Introduction

LER Importance:

- Spend considerable amount from CD budget
- Deteriorates single device performance
- Creates in In-homogeneous performance between devices
- All the above scales as: $\sim LER/CD$

LER measurement:

- Currently done by CD-SEM or AFM
- Involve Image grab and off-line data analysis

Importance of LER from Device standpoint*



Fig. 1. LER impact on off-state leakage and drive current normalized to a perfect device with 0-LER, i.e., no gate-edge roughness.

TABLE I
LER REQUIREMENTS AS A FUNCTION OF TECHNOLOGY GENERATION

Technology Generation	Nominal L_g [nm]	LER [nm]	
		Short-range	Long-range
0.18 μm	130	4.1	4.8
0.15 μm	110	3.8	4.5
	80	2.8	3.5
	50-60	1.7	2.1



Fig. 2. Model projection for nMOSFET off-state leakage and drive current as a function of gate length in a 0.13-μm CMOS technology with varying degrees of LER. All technology dependent parameters such as l_c, η, and n_t have been adjusted to fit the 0.13-μm technology with 80-nm nominal gate length devices and 17-Å gate oxides [5].

TABLE II
LER FOR 100-nm RESIST LINES

Lithography approach	Short range LER [nm]	Long range LER [nm]
193 BIM	8.3	9.3
248 APSM	5.9	6.5
248 Alt PSM	3.5	4.1



Fig. 3. Gate LER (long) impact on off-state leakage versus drive current figure-of-merit (FOM) for devices with 17-Å gate oxides. Devices were processed in the same lot but with different patterning schemes. I_{off} improvement at constant I_{dsat} is ~1.5× at nominal L_g of 80 nm and becomes 2× at L_g ~ 70 nm. These values compare well with the 2× @ 80 nm and 3× @ 70 nm analytical model predictions for the corresponding gate patterning processes.

*** IEEE Electron Devices June 2001 Diaz et al.**

Line Edge Roughness Amplitude Measurement Algorithm



Left tilt image of 193 nm resist line

Reported roughness: $$LER = 3(\sigma^2_{left} + \sigma^2_{right})^{0.5}$$

Line Edge Roughness Spatial wavelength Measurement



•Repeated CD measurement with decreasing measurement boxes width and track the LER amplitude

•As the measurement box width decreases below the wavelength of a given roughness component, this component no longer contributes and the roughness amplitude decreases.

•Since the number of line-scans is constant, the resolution of the measurement increase, and short roughness components may emerge.

Possible Sources of LER

- PR Type
  - 193nm or 248 nm PR
- PR Thickness
  - Incoming
  - PR selectivity to Etch
- Etch condition
  - Chemistry
  - Etcher H/W

193 nm vs 248 nm Post Hard mask Etch



PR loss ~ 1800 A for both 248 nm and 193 nm PR
For CHF3/CF4 chemistry





Hard Mask Open Chemistry Options



193nm PR vs. 248nm PR LER for Gate

248nm PR



- PR loss = 110 nm
- Sel. = 1.9:1
- Roughness or sidewall striation
- LER < 5nm

193nm PR



- PR loss = 140 nm
- Sel. = 1.8:1
- Roughness or sidewall striation
- LER > 10nm

- CF4/CH2F2 chemistry
- High selectivity to resist can be achieved due to CFx polymer passivation
- Severe line edge roughness (LER) or sidewall striation is observed on 193nm PR patterned wafer while 248nm patterned wafer etched by the same process shows smooth sidewalls
- Note that sidewall striation is not caused by poor resist selectivity although LER can sometimes be associated with insufficient resist selectivity

Gate Etch Hard Mask Open Chemistry

CF4/CH2F2



- **Rem. PR = 150 nm**
- **Sel. = 1.8:1**
- **Roughness or sidewall striation**
- **LER >10nm**

CF4/CHF3



- **Rem. PR = 105 nm**
- **Sel. = 1.5:1**
- **Smooth sidewall without striation**
- **LER < 5nm**

- Same 193nm patterned wafers display completely different signatures using different HM etch chemistries
- Possible mechanism: The physical strength of CFx based passivating polymer may be proportional to F/C ratio. [1]
- Strength of amorphous carbon can be enhanced dramatically by fluorinating
- "Tougher" passivation layer for CHF3 chemistry is harder to be redefined by ion bombardment and thus results in smooth sidewalls

Reference: [1] T. Miyamoto et al, J. Vac.Sci.Technol. B 9(2), Mar/Apr 1991

Gate Stack Etch ARC Etch Chemistry @ 65 nm

> 8 nm LWR



~ 3 nm LWR



- Same 193nm patterned wafers display completely different signatures using different ARC etch chemistries
- Observation: Non Carbon based ARCE much smoother
- LWR reduces from 8 nm to 3 nm with change in ARC etch chemistry for 65 nm Gate etch process.

STIE Line edge roughness

Technology	Resist	FOM LER (nm)	STIE LER (nm)	Recipe
0.25um	248	6	6	MERIE old
0.1um	193	5	14	MERIE old
0.1um	193	5	9	MERIE new
0.1um	193	5	6.5	DPS

STIE Mask open uses CHF3/CF4 Process for all splits

STIE LER Depends on

- **Resist type (6nm for 248 → 14 nm for 193nm using same etch conditions)**
- **Etch Process conditions modulates LER on same etcher. (14 nm→ 9 nm)**
- **193 and 248 LER performance matched using new Etcher with optimized condition**



R7 248 resist (MERIECh) LER =6nm



R9 193 resist (MERIECh) old recipe LER =14nm



R9 193 resist (MERIECh) new recipe LER =9nm



R9 193 resist DPS LER =6.5nm

LER Stability at P1ME & STIE



P1ME on DPS



STIE on MERIE

Avg. LER using MERIE higher than ICP type reactor by 50 %

DPSII H/W & Design Features

- Process tuning 'knobs'
  - Dual source coil design
  - Center gas feed with symmetric pumping
  - Dual zone Helium cooling







Mechanism for Sidewall Striation Formation





Sidewall striation = LER

Striation Formation Mechanism:

Step1: As etching progresses, polymer builds up (fluorinated amorphous carbon) on the resist sidewalls

Step 2: Depending on the polymer strength, ion bombardment causes non-uniform polymer removal

Step 3: The non-uniform polymer layer results in rough resist sidewalls

Step 4: The striated resist pattern is then transferred down to the underlayers

Sidewall striation formation depends on:

- Resist material
- Etch chemistry
- Power regime

W Gate Etch Mechanism



Fluorine Etchants

- SF_6 - high etch rate, inexpensive, increased lateral etching, small process window, clean
- NF_3 - high etch rate, expensive, good sidewall passivation, large process window, clean
- CF_4 - slow etch rate, inexpensive, reduces roughness

	SF_6 based	CF_4 based	NF_3 based
W/Poly Selectivity	0.3-0.4	<0.5 (very slow)	**>4**
	SF_6 based	CF_4 based	NF_3 based
W/WN_x Selectivity	0.9-1.4	<0.5	0.8-1.4
	SF_6 based	CF_4 based	NF_3 based
W/TiN_x Selectivity	>4	—	>4

Passivants

N_2, Cl_2, CF_4, O_2

W Chemistry Options



SF_6 Based W Chemistry

NF_3 Based W Chemistry

- **SF6 versus NF3 based W etch**
  - SF6 chemistry provides acceptable profile performance but poor etch rate uniformity and severe etch rate micro-loading. Stringers and pitting seen on the same wafer for different loading areas. Screening splits show NF3 best choice for W etch.

Metal-Gate Stack Complexities

AVS'04

CYPRESS
Connecting From Last Mile To First Mile.™



PROCESS FLOW

- **BARC etch**
  -- BARC:PR sel. > 1:1
  -- Dense/Iso CD microloading
  -- Lateral/vertical trim > 2:1
  -- Defectivity control
- **HM (Nitride) etch**
  -- HM : PR sel. > 2:1
  -- CD uniformity
- **HM W etch/OE**
  -- W: HM sel. > 3:1
  -- W: poly sel. > 3:1
  -- vertical W profiles
  -- No NMOS notch
- **Poly etch/ OE**
  -- PMOS taper
  -- NMOS notch
  -- stringer removal

KEY CONFLICTS

- **193 PR with**
  -- Low starting thickness
  -- Poor etch resistance
- **Thinner starting HM**
  -- Smaller HM loss acceptable
- **Less polymerizing etch chemistry**
  -- Low PR selectivity
- **Minimize HM loss, CD control**
  -- Lower fluorine
- **Vertical W, no NMOS notch**
  -- Higher fluorine
- **PMOS taper v/s NMOS notch**
  -- "halogen control"
- **Stringers v/s NMOS notch**
  -- OE characteristics
  -- OE time

Optimized Results











- Remaining HM adequate
- W Profile: >87
- Poly Profile: >89
- Spacer in TEM unoptimized





Summary & Conclusions

- 193 nm PR more susceptible to LER than 248nm.
  - 193 nm resist is Acrylic based polymer compared to 248 nm resist which is Aromatic based polymer, therefore 193 resist is more susceptible to etch conditions.
- Etch conditions is a significant modulator of LER
- 193 nm can perform equivalent to 248 for STIE and Gate as long etch conditions and etcher H/W regime optimized.
- PR Thickness
  - 193 nm PR thinner than 248. This makes LER more challenging.
  - Thinner PR remaining after etch makes LER worse.
  - PR selectivity from Etch for 193 and 248 depends on etch process condition. Can be made equivalent.

Acknowledgments & References

- **Cypress R&D**
  - Chris Seams, Shahin Sharifzadeh, Albert Bruggerman, Harry Lee, Itzhik Gilboa, Jeff Watts, Geetha Narashiman, K. Ramkumar, Alain Blosse, Kiyoko Ikeuchi, Chris Jones, My Thang, Helena Stadniychuk, Peter Keswick, Dan Arnzen, Craig Whichard, Mike Moore, Dick Duvall, Phil Mcgowan, Pete Roth, Robin Van den Neiwzhen, Oliver Pohland, Ravi Kapre, Wade Xiong
- **Applied Materials Silicon Etch division**
  - Thorsten Lill, Dragan Podlesnik, Jack Marvin, Brian McGinley, Steve Philips, Amitabh Sabhrawal, Boaling Yuan, Tin Pham, Edwin Sum, Jitske Kretz
- **Applied Materials North America Regional Support**
  - Eric Lim, Kolan Saravanan, Kamatchi Subramaniam, Leonard Moravek, Paul Arleo, Danny Xiong, Ed Laughlin, Brent Riggs, Joe Farrah, Frank Sekera

- **References**

  - *"An Experimentally Validated Analytical Model For Gate Line Edge Roughness (LER) Effects on Technology Scaling", Diaz IEEE Electron Device Letters Vol. 22 No.6 June 2001*