

## D. Schmidt<sup>1\*</sup>, M. Junige<sup>2</sup>, J. W. Bartha<sup>2</sup>, E. Schubert<sup>1</sup>, and M. Schubert<sup>1</sup>

<sup>2</sup> Institute of Semiconductor and Microsystems, Technical University Dresden, Germany

ellipsometry.unl.edu \* schmidt@unl.edu

## **Our Message**

- Glancing angle deposition is utilized to grow metal columnar thin films. Subsequently, a functional conformal metal or dielectric is coated by means of atomic layer deposition (ALD).
- > Anisotropic Bruggeman EMA (TAB and RAB) approaches are employed to analyze Mueller matrix ellipsometry spectra and to determine biaxial optical and structural properties as well as fractions of all film constituents.
- > The validity of the AB-EMA models is tested by comparison with an assumption-free homogeneous biaxial layer approach and SEM estimates.
- > Thin films comprising heterogeneous metal-metal and metal-dielectric nanocolumns require different model approaches.



## **Ellipsometry Models for Nanohybrid Functional Columnar Thin Films**

## Homogeneous Biaxial Layer

F1-STFs can be described as single homogeneous biaxial layers with thickness *d* and complex functions  $\mathcal{E}_{eff,i}$  are individually determined other model parameters are

- Euler angles  $\varphi$ ,  $\theta$  of rotation matrix **A**
- internal angle  $\beta$  of projection matrix **U**



Slanted columns are represented by spatially aligned, anisotropic inclusions with three major effective polarizabilities  $\mathbf{P}_{\text{eff},j}$  along principal axes  $j = \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}$ 

## **Rigorous AB-EMA**





A: rotation matrix (Euler angle rotation) **U**: projection matrix (if triclinic or monoclinic)

#### assumption-free model approach

D. Schmidt et al. Opt. Lett. 34, 992 (2009); Appl. Phys. Lett. 94, 011914 (2009).

т

The model accounts for *m* different constituents  $\varepsilon_n$  and volume fractions Real-valued depolarization factors L render the biaxial film geometry (electrostatic approach).  $\sum f_n = 1; \sum L_j = 1$ 

EMA RAB-EMA

96.20(9)

58.33(2)

89.73(8)

21.78(5)

19.40(7)

0.118(3)

0.078(2)

11.42

f. 
$$\sum_{n=1} f_n \frac{\varepsilon_n - \varepsilon_{\text{eff},j}}{\varepsilon_{\text{eff},j} + L_j(\varepsilon_n - \varepsilon_{\text{eff},j})} = 0$$
$$L_j = \frac{U_x U_y U_z}{2} \int_0^\infty \frac{(s + U_j^2)^{-1}}{[(s + U_x^2)(s + U_y^2)(s + U_z^2)]^{1/2}} ds$$

Schematic of a coated columnar thin film with *m*=3 constituents: solid columns and hollow coating in host medium air

D. Schmidt et al. Appl. Phys. Lett. 100, 011912 (2012).

# $D_j = \frac{1}{4\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \int_0^{\pi} \frac{\Gamma_j}{\rho} d\theta d\phi$ $\rho = \frac{\sin^2 \theta \cos^2 \phi}{U_x^2 \varepsilon_{\text{eff},x}^{-1}} + \frac{\sin^2 \theta \sin^2 \phi}{U_y^2 \varepsilon_{\text{eff},y}^{-1}} + \frac{\cos^2 \theta}{U_z^2 \varepsilon_{\text{eff},z}^{-1}}$

 $\Gamma_{x,y,z} = \frac{\sin^3 \theta \cos^2 \phi}{U_x^2}, \frac{\sin^3 \theta \sin^2 \phi}{U_y^2}, \frac{\sin \theta \cos^2 \theta}{U_z^2}$ 

A more rigorous approach considers the depolarization dyadic to be a function of the inclusions' shape  $U_i$ , and effective permittivity tensor (electrodynamic approach). D<sub>i</sub> are generally complex.

Mackay and Lakhtakia, J. Nanophoton. 6, 069501 (2012).

## **Results and Applications**

## **Conformal Dielectric ALD Coating**

Co F1

Co F1-

TF	Parameter	HBLA	TAB-EMA
	<i>t</i> (nm)	95.9(2)	92.34(7)
	Θ (°)	58.38(3)	57.63(3)
	β(°)	89.1(2)	81.40(7)
500 nm	f <sub>co</sub> (%)		22.9(2)
TF + 50 cycles Al <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub>	f <sub>Al2O3</sub> (%)		14.9(2)
	U <sub>x</sub>		0.23(3)
	$U_y$		0.19(3)
	MSE	10.66	15.13
500 nm			

SEM estimates yield a conformal Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> thickness of 2.5 nm TAB(14.9%) = 2.74 nm; RAB(19.4%) = 3.74 nm; (flat control: 2.75 nm)





45 cycles of Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> onto a FeNi F1-STF (ellipsometry not synchronized with growth cycles)

#### **Metal - Dielectric**

optically modeled with a single set of depolarization factors TAB and RAB are in fair agreement

#### Metal - Metal

- set of depolarization factors for each constituent required possibly reveals limitations of AB-EMA models
  - $\rightarrow$  AB-EMA approach yields excellent fraction estimates for thin films with heterogeneous nanocolumns

#### **Conformal Metal ALD Coating**

Parameter	HBLA	TAB-EMA	
<i>t</i> (nm)	83.5(2)	81.1(4)	
Θ (°)	67.84(4)	66.0(1)	
β(°)	79.18(7)	85.82(9)	
<i>f</i> <sub>Ti</sub> (%)		20(2)	
f <sub>Pt</sub> (%)		24.7(4)	
L <sup>D</sup> a Ti, Pt		0.000(1), 0.472(5)	
L <sup>D</sup> <sub>b</sub> Ti, Pt		0.000(1), 0.391(5)	
L <sup>D</sup> <sub>c</sub> Ti, Pt		1.000(1), 0.137(5)	
MSE	2.59	3.61	



with film surface area estimates the TAB-EMA result of  $f_{Pt} = 24.7\%$ yields a Pt thickness of 4.9 nm (flat control: ~5.0 nm)



## ICSE-VI, May 2013, Kyoto, Japan

## Major Funding from NSF EPS-1004094