Investigation of the ways to decrease the influence of structure and process variation on characteristics of IC

Gurin Dina

DA-42m

- With the advances in technology leading to smaller feature sizes and more stringent design constraints, device mismatch considerations are becoming increasingly important.
- The most prospective layout techniques for both linear and nonlinear gradient cancellation will be shown.
- The new models and results of simulations will be shown

Definition



- **Systematic mismatch** is that part of the total mismatch where a deterministic trend can be observed in the mismatch values of the various transistors. It can be precisely predicted, given the process gradients.
- **Random mismatch** represents that portion of the mismatch which is stochastic and hence cannot be predicted.

Graphical depiction of random and systematic variations



Models for analysis of matching properties as function of the structure and process variation

Basic models of random mismatch analysis

- The drain current mismatch in the saturation region is given by (model of Lakshmikumar) :

$$\frac{\sigma_{Id}^2}{Id^2} = \frac{\sigma_\beta^2}{\beta^2} + 4\frac{\sigma_{V_T}^2}{(V_{GS} - V_T)^2}$$

- Variance of parameter ΔP between two rectangular devices is given by (model of Pelgrom):

$$\sigma^2(\Delta P) = \frac{A_P^2}{WL} + S_P^2 D_x^2.$$

where

β – current factor,

V_T – threshold voltage,

A_P - area proportionality constant for parameter P,

S_P - variation of parameter P with the spacing D_x.

Basic models of systematic mismatch analysis



Basic current mirror

$$V_{T1} = V_{TN} + (-D/2 - W/2, 0) \bullet (\alpha\cos\theta, \alpha\sin\theta)$$
$$= V_{TN} - \alpha\left(\frac{W}{2} + \frac{D}{2}\right)\cos\theta$$
$$V_{T2} = V_{TN} + (D/2 + W/2, 0) \bullet (\alpha\cos\theta, \alpha\sin\theta)$$
$$= V_{TN} + \alpha\left(\frac{W}{2} + \frac{D}{2}\right)\cos\theta$$

$$I_D = \frac{1}{2} C_{OX} \mu_N \left(\frac{W}{L}\right)(V_{GS} - V_T)^2$$

$$Mismatch = \frac{I_{D2} - I_{D1}}{I_{D1}} x100\ \%$$



Simple current mirror layout and Linear gradient model



1st Proposed model of systematic mismatch analysis (model)

It is proposed to add separate calculations for carrier mobility, μ, and gate oxide capacitance per unit area, *Cox*, with respect to gradient.

$$V_{ti} = V_{tN} + x_i \cdot \alpha \cos\theta + y_i \cdot \alpha \sin\theta$$

$$\mu_i = \mu_N + x_i \cdot \alpha_\mu \cos\theta_\mu + y_i \cdot \alpha_\mu \sin\theta_\mu$$

$$C_{oxi} = C_{oxN} + x_i \cdot \alpha_C \cos\theta_C + y_i \cdot \alpha_C \sin\theta_C$$



$$I_D = \frac{1}{2} C_{OX} \mu_N \left(\frac{W}{L}\right)(V_{GS} - V_T)^2$$

$$Mismatch = \frac{I_{D2} - I_{D1}}{I_{D1}} x100\ \%$$

1st Proposed model of systematic mismatch analysis (results)







2nd Proposed model of systematic mismatch analysis (model)







It is proposed to add shape coefficient to calculation of parameter with mismatch.

$$V_{ti} = V_{tN} + x_i \cdot \alpha \cos\theta + y_i \cdot \alpha \sin\theta + shape_i$$

$$shape = \frac{S_{circ} - S_{tr}}{S_{circ}}$$



Analysis and estimation of layout techniques for improved matching

Layout techniques for improved matching



Basic current mirror



(a) Simple Technique



(b) Interdigitized Type I



(c) Interdigitized Type II



(d) Common Centroid Type I



(e) Common Centroid Type II



Four segment common centroid



Octagonal tessellation



Hexagonal tessellation


Mismatch (common centroid)
Mismatch (%)
Gradient angle (degrees)
0.1
0.08
0.06
0.04
0.02
0
-0.02
-0.04
-0.06
-0.08
-0.1
0
50
100
150
200
250
300
350
400


x 10^-6
Mismatch (four segment common centroid)
Mismatch (%)
Gradient angle (degrees)
6
4
2
0
-2
-4
-6
0
50
100
150
200
250
300
350
400


x 10^-4
Mismatch (hexagonal tesselation of rectangular transistors)
Mismatch (%)
Gradient angle (degrees)
5
4
3
2
1
0
-1
-2
-3
-4
-5
0
50
100
150
200
250
300
350
400


x 10^-6
Mismatch (octagonal tesselation of rectangular transistors)
Mismatch (%)
Gradient angle (degrees)
1
0.8
0.6
0.4
0.2
0
-0.2
-0.4
-0.6
-0.8
-1
0
50
100
150
200
250
300
350
400


Mismatch (interdigitized type I: abba)
Mismatch (%)
Gradient angle (degrees)
0
-0.02
-0.04
-0.06
-0.08
-0.1
-0.12
-0.14
-0.16
-0.18
0
50
100
150
200
250
300
350
400
Circular symmetry
Square
Rectangle


Mismatch (common centroid)
Mismatch (%)
Gradient angle (degrees)
0.08
0.06
0.04
0.02
0
-0.02
-0.04
-0.06
-0.08
0
50
100
150
200
250
300
350
400
Circular symmetry
Square
Rectangle

Conclusions:

- The advantages and drawbacks of different models for systematic and random mismatch calculation, device shapes and device arrangements for matching improvement are defined and ranged.
- The main recommendations from fulfilled analysis are the next:
  - *Devices with circular symmetry have the best matching properties under conditions of gradient.*
  - *For simulation of precision analog circuits the models, that include gradient of carrier mobility and gate oxide capacitance are the most precise.*
- Two new models for systematic mismatch modeling have been proposed and estimated. These models take into account more device parameters than existing and consider the shape of used devices.
- The new topics for scientific investigation are proposed for extension of matching improvement research. As a next step experimental confirmation of new models' consistency is needed.
- The investigation is conducted with consideration of experience and recommendations of Melexis-Ukraine company based on real projects.

Thank You for your attention

Random mismatch

- Sources for **local mismatch**:
  - polysilicon or metal grain edge boundaries,
  - local etch variation,
  - local implant or diffusion variations.
  - variations in gate oxide thickness or permittivity,
  - dopant variations.

- Sources for **global mismatch**:
  - line edge variation,
  - stepper lens aberrations,
  - loading effects,
  - optical proximity shifts.



A comparison of local and global mismatch errors

Systematic mismatch:

- Results from gradients in processing, stress, and temperature.
- Wafer processing gradients:
  - radially based gradients *(photoresist coat, development, hot-plate bakes, plasma etch, etc.)*;
  - monotonic gradients.
- Process gradients may be radial, linear or otherwise spatially dependent, but given the proximity of devices in a matching pair, it is reasonable to **consider all gradients to be linear**



Radially based wafer gradients

Layout considerations that affect matching:

- **Geometry** - the **random** component of mismatch improves with increasing geometry.
- **Proximity** - physical separation distance between matched devices, the center-to-center spacing of the devices.
- **Matching orientation** - the orientation of the line *("line of matching")* that connects the center of the device in a matched pair(s). Matching orientation is measured in degrees with reference to the wafer flat or notch.



Variations on matching orientation. The arrows represent the "line of matching".

Layout considerations that affect matching (continued):

- **Device orientation** - the orientation of each device in a matching pair with respect to the wafer flat or notch. Device orientation can be important for mismatch for ***two reasons:***
  1. Carrier mobility varies with orientation;
  2. Ion implantation (I/I) angle to the wafer surface may vary. For better control of the ion implantation depth and spread in the depth direction, wafers are implanted with a 7° tilt on the wafer, which minimizes the channelling effect. This angled implant will create a *shadowing effect*, the source/drain regions will be symmetric if the implant angle is 0° or if the 7° implant angle is along with gate polysilicon.



Variations of device orientation



The effect of ion implantation shadowing in (b) versus a 0° implant in (a).

Considering random and systematic mismatch in models

- Total mismatch should be characterized as a **sum of systematic and random components**.
- Systematic component usually models linear gradient across the die:



(a) 3-D plots of actual intra-die mismatch
(b) Systematic mismatch approximated by a linear gradient

Basic models of systematic mismatch analysis
(nonlinear gradient)

Generally, a parameter that has up to *n*th-order gradient components can be modeled as:

$$p_n(x, y) = \sum_{j=1}^{n} G_j(x, y) + C ,$$

where

$$G_j(x, y) = \sum_{k=0}^{j} g_{k,j-k} x^k y^{j-k}$$

is the j^{th}-order component. $g_{k,j-k}$-s are the j^{th}-order coefficients.

Considering mismatch among devices in multiple lots

Variations of any model parameter γ can be expressed as:

$$\gamma(x,y)=\gamma_{NOM}+\gamma_{PROC}+\gamma_{WAFER}+\gamma_{DIE}+\gamma_{SYS}(x,y)+\gamma_{RAN}(x,y)$$

where

- x,y – position on the die
- γ_{NOM} – nominal value of the model parameter
- Other variables are random parameters:
  - γ_{PROC} - variation lot to lot;
  - γ_{WAFER} - variation wafer to wafer in a lot;
  - γ_{DIE} - variation die to die on a wafer;
  - γ_{SYS} – systematic variation location to location on a die, this parameter is position dependent;
  - γ_{RAN} – random variation at the position (x,y);

For devices in close proximity to each other on a die γ_{PROC}, γ_{WAFER}, γ_{DIE} are nearly constant, so most researches focus on last 2 terms.

Reduction of mismatch (linear gradient consideration)

Simulations of most widely used layout techniques



$$Mismatch = \frac{I_{D2} - I_{D1}}{I_{D1}} x100\ \%$$



Application of random mismatch model



Three-dimensional (3-D) plot of I_d mismatch versus L and W for an nMOS current mirror, $I_{ref} = 10\ \mu$A, 0.13-μm CMOS technology.

Increase in ***L*** is more effective for random mismatch reduction than increase in ***W***:

- *L increases* => intrinsic mismatch decreases, ($V_{GS} - V_T$) increases to supply the same reference current. This leads to decrease in σId.
- *W increases* => intrinsic mismatch component decreases, but ($V_{GS} - V_T$) decreases. These two effects offset each other, and can give rise to little or no decrease in σId.

Reduction of mismatch (linear gradient consideration)

Waffle Layout Structure





Deterministic and Random Mismatches of Waffle Structure



Mismatch of Common Centroid and Waffle Structure

Reduction of mismatch (linear gradient consideration)

Test structures for mismatch characterization of most common structures



Microphotograph of test chip



Layout styles:
(a) Finger (siimple technique).
(b) interdigitated finger.
(c) Quad (common centroid technique).
(d) interdigitated waffle.

Reduction of mismatch (linear gradient consideration)

Mismatch characterization results for most common structures



Median of the relative β mismatch values. D-relative distance from the die center, in the x direction.

Standard deviation of VT mismatch versus the inverse transistor area



Standard deviation of relative β mismatch versus the inverse transistor area



Reduction of mismatch (linear gradient consideration)

Hexagonal structure



Interdigitated waffle



Square structure



Hexagonal structure





Parasitic transistor created by the interdigitated waffle structure



Effective W/L ratio Calculation for hexagonal structure:

$$\left(\frac{W}{L}\right)_{eff} = \frac{8}{ln\left(\frac{W_2}{W_1}\right)}$$

Reduction of mismatch (linear gradient consideration)

Matching behavior of hexagonal structure compared to finger structure:





Segmented structures

(common source diffusion, segments are placed at right angles)



Matching enhanced current mirror layout techniques



Example of practical Four-segment rectangular structure (Type I) for eight cascode current sources

Simulation results of segmented structures of Type I - IV

(a)



(b)



(c)



(d)



Reduction of mismatch (nonlinear gradient consideration)

Circular symmetry structures





2nd order circular symmetry pattern



Hexagonal Tessellation

Existing Layout Patterns:

- ***(a) - simple;***
- ***(b) - common centroid (interdigitized);***
- ***(c) - Four segment.***

Simulation comparison between different layout patterns:

Layout structure	Worst mismatch(%)
Simple	4.8807
Common centriod	1.6966e-2
Four segment	1.4090e-4
2nd order circular symmetric	0
hexagonal tessellation	0

Reduction of mismatch (nonlinear gradient consideration)

Comparison of common-centroid based and circular symmetry patterns



Simulation results for systematic mismatch

Mismatch (%)	Highest Order of Gradient Effect				
	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Fig. (a)	0	2.77	5.22	7.43	10.39
Fig. (b)	0	0	0.24	0.87	1.70
Fig. (c)	0	0	0	0.01	0.068
Fig. (d)	0	0	0	0	0.0023
Fig. (e)	0	0	0	0	0
Fig. (f)	0	0	0	0.026	0.18
Fig. (g)	0	0	0.26	0.50	2.24

Layout structures for Nonlinear Gradient Cancellation: 1st order (common centroid) - 5th order central symmetrical patterns (a) - (e), 2nd order circular symmetry pattern (f) and hexagonal tessellation (g).

Measurements of more than 100 chips show that the 2nd-order central symmetry pattern has less than 0.04% and the 3rd-order has less than 0.002% systematic mismatch errors.