Etching of Si through a thick condensed XeF₂ layer

Citation for published version (APA):

Sebel, P. G. M., Hermans, L. J. F., & Beijerinck, H. C. W. (2000). Etching of Si through a thick condensed XeF₂ layer. *Journal of Vacuum Science and Technology A: Vacuum, Surfaces, and Films*, 18(5), 2090-2097.
<https://doi.org/10.1116/1.1288194>

DOI:

[10.1116/1.1288194](https://doi.org/10.1116/1.1288194)

Document status and date:

Published: 01/01/2000

Document Version:

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of Record (includes final page, issue and volume numbers)

Please check the document version of this publication:

- A submitted manuscript is the version of the article upon submission and before peer-review. There can be important differences between the submitted version and the official published version of record. People interested in the research are advised to contact the author for the final version of the publication, or visit the DOI to the publisher's website.
- The final author version and the galley proof are versions of the publication after peer review.
- The final published version features the final layout of the paper including the volume, issue and page numbers.

[Link to publication](#)

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal.

If the publication is distributed under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license above, please follow below link for the End User Agreement:

www.tue.nl/taverne

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us at:

openaccess@tue.nl

providing details and we will investigate your claim.

Etching of Si through a thick condensed XeF₂ layer

P. G. M. Sebel, L. J. F. Hermans, and H. C. W. Beijerinck^{a)}

Physics Department, Eindhoven University of Technology, 5600 MB Eindhoven, The Netherlands

(Received 13 August 1999; accepted 12 June 2000)

Etching of silicon by XeF₂ is studied in a multiple-beam setup. Below 150 K XeF₂ condenses and forms a layer on the silicon, which blocks the etching. Upon ion bombardment, this layer is removed and etching will resume. As a function of the layer thickness, the various removal mechanisms of the layer are studied. For a thick condensed layer it is found that 1 keV Ar⁺ ions sputter the condensed layer with a yield of 160 XeF₂ molecules per ion for 1 keV Ar⁺ ions and 280 for 2 keV ions. For thinner layers (below 9 nm for 1 keV ions), this sputter rate by ions decreases significantly. Here, the removal is mainly due to consumption of XeF₂ by etching at the bottom of the layer. This consumption rate reaches a maximum for a layer thickness of about 5 nm. In the steady-state situation, the layer thickness is further decreased, resulting in a smaller consumption and etch rate. Here, sputtering is the most important removal mechanism for the deposited XeF₂ layer. From this, it is concluded that a pulsed ion beam should be used in cryogenic etching to obtain the highest etch rate. © 2000 American Vacuum Society. [S0734-2101(00)07005-6]

I. INTRODUCTION

For etching of SiO₂, fluorocarbon gases are usually applied because of their high etch rate and high selectivity.¹ Etching then occurs through a CF_x fluorocarbon film, deposited on top of the material. In the absence of ion bombardment, the film thickness grows and the surface is passivated. Upon ion bombardment, first the CF_x layer is removed from the surface and subsequently etching begins. Depending on process conditions and material, CF_x film thicknesses ranging from 1 nm (for SiO₂) to 7 nm (for Si) were measured on a sample in a steady-state etching situation.² This selective CF_x deposition on various materials is believed to be the key mechanism for selective etching. The etch rate is inversely proportional to the thickness of this fluorocarbon film.³ Because of the importance of this passivating film, many of its characteristics have been studied.³ From these studies, models have been proposed to explain the transport of etchant flux (both neutrals and ions) and reaction products (e.g., SiF₄) through a passivating layer.²

The etching of Si under cryogenic conditions has already been studied for several gases.^{4–6} For example, Mullins and Coburn⁴ concluded that Si etching by F atoms is blocked by Si₂F₆ at 77 K. However, in none of these experiments were results presented of the etching process after a thick layer of condensed gases had been deposited on the surface.

To expand the knowledge about etching through passivating films, we studied the etching of Si through a condensed XeF₂ layer. As shown by Vugts *et al.*,^{7,8} XeF₂ condenses on Si at $T = 150$ K. Similar to a CF_x layer, the XeF₂ layer blocks the etching of Si. Upon ion bombardment first the passivating layer is removed after which etching is observed. In this article the removal rate by the ions and the consumption rate of the XeF₂ layer due to etching are studied as a function of the thickness of the condensed layer.

After a brief description of the setup a typical measure-

ment of the formation and removal of the condensed XeF₂ layer and its influence on the etch behavior is presented in Sec. III. From this, the consumption and sputter rate as a function of the thickness of the condensed layer are determined when the layer is removed to reach a steady-state. This forms the main part of the article. In Sec. IV the observation that the time to reach a steady state increases with the initial deposited layer thickness is explained. In Sec. V the experimental results are discussed. Finally, in Sec. VI the results for a condensed XeF₂ layer are compared with the measurements for a CF_x layer, together with some general concluding remarks on experimental results.

II. EXPERIMENT

A. Multiple-beam setup

The multiple-beam setup used in our work is the same as described by Vugts *et al.*⁹ The silicon sample is placed at the intersection of the XeF₂ beam and the Ar⁺ beam in an ultra-high vacuum (UHV) chamber (5×10^{-8} mbar) (Fig. 1). On one side the Si(100) sample (n type, phosphorus, 30–70 Ω cm) is clamped on the sample holder by a nickel retainer plate. The samples are cleaned with HF to remove native oxide before being mounted. The XeF₂ beam and Ar⁺ beam are incident under 52° and 45°, respectively, with respect to the surface normal. The sample is connected to an electrometer to measure the ion current. To raise the temperature of the sample, a Thermocoax heating wire is wound around the sample holder. For cooling the sample below room temperature, the sample holder is also connected to a liquid nitrogen vessel by braided copper wire. In this way the temperature can be controlled in the range from 100 to 800 K. The temperature is measured by an alumel/chromel thermocouple, which is placed 1 mm behind the sample. In this work the sample temperature is $T = 130$ K.

The XeF₂ gas is supplied by a multicapillary effusive gas

^{a)}Author to whom correspondence should be addressed; electronic mail: H.C.W.Beijerinck@phys.tue.nl

FIG. 1. Experimental setup (front and top view). The Si sample is clamped by a nickel retainer plate. The different gas flows are incident from the left and the mass spectrometer is positioned perpendicular to the Si at 330 mm from the sample in a differentially pumped chamber.

source. During the experiments a XeF₂ flux of $\Phi_s(\text{XeF}_2) = 0.55 \text{ ML s}^{-1}$ is used. For silicon 1 ML corresponds to a surface density of $6.86 \times 10^{18} \text{ m}^{-2}$. The Ar⁺ ions in the range of 0.5–2.5 keV are produced in a Kratos WG 537 Macrobeam ion gun and its shape is well described by a Gaussian profile with a full width at half maximum of 5 mm. From this it is calculated that an ion current of 1 μA corresponds to an average ion flux of 0.011 ML s^{-1} on the 3 mm diam area viewed by the mass spectrometer. In the experiment, ion currents of 0.65 and 1.35 μA were used, which correspond to an ion flux of $\Phi_s(\text{Ar}^+) = (7.2 \pm 0.7) 10^{-3} \text{ ML/s}$ and $\Phi_s(\text{Ar}^+) = (1.5 \pm 0.1) 10^{-2} \text{ ML/s}$, respectively.

B. Structure of XeF₂

XeF₂ is a symmetric linear molecule and the Xe–F bond is 1.98 Å. The crystal structure of XeF₂ is tetragonal, with lattice parameters $a = 4.315$ and $c = 6.990$ Å.^{10,11} The molecules are aligned along the c axis (Fig. 2). From these parameters and two molecules per cell, a density of 4.32 g/cm³ is calculated.¹⁰ It is also calculated that 1 ML XeF₂ corresponds to a thickness of 4.47 Å. It is noted that the unit ML in this article refers to the surface density of Si [1 ML(Si) = $6.86 \times 10^{18} \text{ m}^{-2}$]. The surface density for XeF₂ is 1 ML(XeF₂) = $3.31 \times 10^{18} \text{ m}^{-2}$ and corresponds to a XeF₂ layer thickness of 2.158 Å.

However, it is unlikely that a perfect crystalline structure will form when XeF₂ condenses on a rough Si surface. Despite this, we will assume a perfect crystal structure to calculate the thickness of the condensed XeF₂ layer in the experiments.

C. Process coefficients

The etch reaction is monitored by a quadrupole mass spectrometer (QMS) in a separate UHV chamber

FIG. 2. Structure of XeF₂: single XeF₂ molecule and the structure of the XeF₂ crystal. The small and large dots indicate the F and Xe atoms, respectively. The circles and ellipses around the atoms indicate the interaction spheres of the F[−] and Xe²⁺ ions.

(<10^{−8} mbar) positioned along the surface normal of the sample (Fig. 1), at a position 330 mm downstream of the sample. The central detection area seen by the QMS is 3 mm in diameter. With the mass spectrometer, the nonreacted XeF₂ signal $I(\text{XeF}^+)$ and the SiF₄ signal $I(\text{SiF}_3^+)$ are measured. The XeF₂ signal $I(\text{XeF}^+)$ is calibrated by measuring the XeF₂ diffusively scattered from the nickel at room temperature. We consider the nickel surface as an inert, diffuse scatterer and thus this signal corresponds to the incident XeF₂ flux $\Phi_s(\text{XeF}_2)$. The nonreacted flux $\Phi(\text{XeF}_2)$ from the Si yields the reaction probability ϵ of XeF₂ at room temperature

$$\epsilon = \frac{\Phi_s(\text{XeF}_2) - \Phi(\text{XeF}_2)}{\Phi_s(\text{XeF}_2)} = 0.17 \pm 0.02. \quad (1)$$

In a similar way, the SiF₄ production coefficient δ_4 is defined as

$$\delta_4 = \frac{4\Phi(\text{SiF}_4)}{2\Phi_s(\text{XeF}_2)}. \quad (2)$$

In the case of spontaneous etching at room temperature SiF₄ is the only reaction product.⁷ This enables us to calibrate the SiF₄ signal $I(\text{SiF}_3^+)$ to the production coefficient δ_4 , by applying a fluorine mass balance

$$\delta_4 = \epsilon. \quad (3)$$

To correct for the temperature-dependent detection probability, it is assumed that 85% of the signal consists of species with the sample temperature T .⁹ Thus, in order to be able to use the calibration at room temperature T_{room} , all measured signals $I(T)$ at a sample temperature T are corrected to I_{corr}

$$I_{\text{corr}} = I(T) \left(0.15 + 0.85 \sqrt{\frac{T_{\text{room}}}{T}} \right)^{-1}. \quad (4)$$

When the Si sample is cooled to 130 K, the XeF₂ condenses on the surface and blocks the etching. Now the fluorine mass balance of Eq. (3) no longer applies and the reac-

FIG. 3. Measured XeF₂ and SiF₄ signal coefficients γ and δ_4 , respectively, during the removal of a XeF₂ layer of 200 ML and subsequent etching at a sample temperature of $T=130$ K. The XeF₂ beam is continuous while the Ar⁺ beam is switched on/off as indicated. In stage 2 only a XeF₂ signal is observed. After $\Delta t=T_2$ a SiF₄ signal is measured, indicating that Si is etched. After $\Delta t=T_3$, a steady state is reached. In stage 4 the ion beam is switched off again. The XeF₂ signal immediately drops to zero, while in the SiF₄ signal first a peak is measured, before it drops to zero.

tion coefficient ϵ is no longer a true reaction coefficient. To describe the XeF₂ signal at this temperature, the XeF₂ reflection coefficient γ is introduced

$$\gamma = \frac{\Phi(\text{XeF}_2)}{\Phi_s(\text{XeF}_2)}. \quad (5)$$

The case $\gamma=0$ corresponds to a sticking probability equal to unity, while $\gamma=1$ corresponds to a situation when no net XeF₂ remains on the surface.

III. EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS AND INTERPRETATION

A. Typical result

In Fig. 3 the signal coefficients γ and δ_4 are shown when the ion bombardment is switched on after a XeF₂ layer of 200 ± 20 ML XeF₂ has been condensed on the surface. The ion current is $1.35 \mu\text{A}$ (i.e., 0.015 ML/s). The behavior of γ and δ_4 is divided into four distinct stages. In the first stage, the XeF₂ condenses on the surface during a time interval T_1 . Both γ and δ_4 are zero, indicating a sticking probability of unity and no etching. In the second stage the ion bombardment is started on the condensed XeF₂ layer, but no SiF₄ signal is measured. The XeF₂ signal γ obviously results from species which are removed from the condensed layer. It was observed that this XeF₂ signal is very unstable during the sputtering of the condensed layer. This instability is charac-

teristic for the sputtering of a thick XeF₂ layer. After a time T_2 , a SiF₄ signal is measured and the XeF₂ signal drops. This marks the end of stage 2.

In stage 3, SiF₄ is produced indicating Si etching under the influence of the ion bombardment. After a time T_3 the SiF₄ signal reaches steady state. Finally, in stage 4, the ion bombardment is switched off. The XeF₂ signal immediately drops to zero. The SiF₄, however, first increases above the steady-state signal under ion bombardment before it drops to zero, indicating condensation of XeF₂ on the surface. The peak in the SiF₄ production after ion switch off is explained by an increasing net influx of XeF₂ after the sputtering ceases, while the SiF₄ production is not yet limited by a condensed XeF₂ layer.

To model the removal and formation of the condensed layer, we use the following rate equation for the amount D_{XeF_2} (ML) of condensed XeF₂ on the surface.³

$$\frac{d}{dt} D_{\text{XeF}_2} = \Phi_s(\text{XeF}_2) - R_{\text{XeF}_2} - C_{\text{XeF}_2}. \quad (6)$$

Here, $\Phi_s(\text{XeF}_2)=0.55 \text{ ML/s}$ is the deposition rate of the XeF₂ layer (the sticking probability is unity because $\gamma=0$ in stage 1). Next, R_{XeF_2} is the sputter rate at the top of the condensed layer due to the ion bombardment and C_{XeF_2} is the consumption rate at the bottom of the condensed layer due to the etching of silicon. Thus C_{XeF_2} is proportional to the SiF₄ production. The sputter and consumption rates are functions of both the condensed layer thickness and the ion flux. Their sum gives the total removal rate of the condensed layer. Obviously, in a steady-state situation this removal rate becomes equal to the deposition rate $\Phi_s(\text{XeF}_2)$.

In the next sections we will investigate the behavior of the sputter and consumption rates as a function of the layer thickness D_{XeF_2} during ion bombardment. First the sputter rate is studied in the case of a semi-infinite layer thickness (stage 2). Next, the sputter and consumption rates are studied during etching (stage 3). Finally, the consumption rate is studied as a function of the layer thickness in the case of spontaneous etching (stage 4).

B. Removal of condensed XeF₂ layer (stage 2)

In stage 2, only a XeF₂ signal was observed (Fig. 3). Thus, the consumption rate is $C_{\text{XeF}_2}=0$. To study the sputter rate R_{XeF_2} of the condensed XeF₂ layer, the ion bombardment time T_2 needed to reach etching is measured as a function of the thickness of the deposited XeF₂ layer. We assume that the total layer condensed XeF₂ has been removed after $t=T_2$ (Fig. 3). In Sec. V we will come back to this assumption. In Fig. 4 the dose $D_{\text{Ar}^+}=\Phi_s(\text{Ar}^+)T_2$ to remove the layer with thickness D_{XeF_2} is shown for 1 keV Ar⁺ ions and ion currents of 0.65 and $1.35 \mu\text{A}$. It is seen that the ion dose increases linearly with the thickness of the layer for both ion fluxes, with an offset on the order of 20 ML. This means that for a layer thickness of less than 20 ML, a SiF₄ signal is measured immediately upon ion bombardment. For 2 keV an

FIG. 4. Ion dose D_{Ar^+} to remove a layer D_{XeF_2} of condensed XeF₂. The results are shown for an ion current of 1.35 μA (closed squares) and 0.65 μA (open circles) at 1 keV. From the slope the net yield Y_{net} of removed XeF₂ molecules per incoming Ar^+ is calculated.

offset on the order of 100 ML was observed. This behavior indicates that for thick layers the sputter rate is independent of the condensed layer thickness.

In terms of our model [Eq. (6)], a layer with a thickness of D_{XeF_2} is removed in a time $t=T_2$. In view of the linear behavior, we write $R_{XeF_2}=R_{\infty}=Y\Phi_s(Ar^+)$, where R_{∞} is the sputter rate for a semi-infinitely thick layer when no etching of Si is observed and Y defines the XeF₂ dose sputtered from the condensed layer per incident ion. Now, Eq. (6) may be written for stage 2 as

$$\frac{-D_{XeF_2}}{T_2} = \Phi_s(XeF_2) - Y\Phi_s(Ar^+) = -Y_{net}\Phi_s(Ar^+). \quad (7)$$

Here, Y_{net} is the net yield derived from the change in the thickness of the condensed layer while the XeF₂ beam was on, corresponding to the inverse slope of the lines in Fig. 4. Using Eq. (7) we can then determine the total yield Y . For 1 keV Ar^+ ions, the yield is equal to $Y \approx 170$ for both ion fluxes (Table I). For increasing ion energy, the yield increases to $Y=300$ at 2 keV.

From the yield Y for 1 keV ions, a threshold ion flux $\Phi_{thres}(Ar^+) = 3.2 \times 10^{-3}$ ML/s (0.3 μA) for an incident XeF₂ flux $\Phi_s(XeF_2) = 0.55$ ML/s is needed to counterbalance the incoming XeF₂ flux. In this case the condensed XeF₂ layer

FIG. 5. Response of the SiF₄ production coefficient δ_4 to the onset of etching after time T_1+T_2 for various thicknesses of the XeF₂ layer (stage 3 in Fig. 3). The signals are only plotted until a steady state is reached.

does not grow, nor is it removed ($Y_{net}=0$). This is in agreement with additional measurements of the upper limit of the ion flux for which no etching stage is reached (not shown here).

C. Etching of Si (stage 3)

After most of the XeF₂ layer has been removed from the surface, a SiF₄ signal is measured indicating that the Si surface is etched (Fig. 3). The subsequent behavior of the SiF₄ signal was found to depend on the initial dose D_{XeF_2} of the film deposited on the surface (Fig. 5). For an initial thickness of 17 ML, a peak of SiF₄ is measured and steady state is reached after 15 s. However, for an initial XeF₂ layer of 132 ML the signal increases slowly and steady state is reached only after a much longer time $T_3=150$ s. It is also seen that the peak broadens for increasing initial thicknesses.

In Sec. IV, it will be shown that the increase of T_3 with increasing ion flux is explained by a nonuniform removal of the condensed layer and is described by Poisson statistics in the number of incident ions per area.

In order to minimize the influence of Poisson statistics when determining the sputter and consumption rates as a function of the thickness [Eq. (6)], we use the data for a thin initial XeF₂ layer of 17 ML. The behavior of δ_4 and γ is shown in Fig. 6. From the behavior of γ it is seen that almost no XeF₂ signal is detected. This indicates that the XeF₂ sputter yield decreases very sharply with decreasing layer thickness around a dose of 17 ML. This lower sputter rate for thin condensed layers is due to competition of SiF₄ formation with the process of sputtering, since a peak in the SiF₄ formation is observed with a maximum of $\delta_4=2.5$. This corresponds to a consumption rate of $C_{XeF_2} \approx 1.8$ ML/s, where it is assumed that besides SiF₄ SiF₂ is also produced. Following

TABLE I. Values of Y_{net} , Y , and Y_{cor} for two ion fluxes and ion energies.

Ion energy (keV)	Ion current (μA)	Y_{net}	Y	Y_{cor}
1	0.6	90 ± 9	167 ± 17	159 ± 17
1	1.35	133 ± 13	170 ± 17	157 ± 17
2	1.25	263 ± 26	300 ± 30	280 ± 30

FIG. 6. Response of the SiF₄ and XeF₂ signals when the ion bombardment (1.3 μ A) is switched on after a layer of 17 ML was deposited on the surface.

the measurements of Vugts *et al.* we assume that 25% of the consumption results in SiF₂ formation and 75% in SiF₄ formation.⁸

The sputter and consumption rates as a function of the thickness D_{XeF_2} can be derived (Fig. 7) for an ion flux of $\Phi_s(\text{Ar}^+) = 0.015$ ML/s (1.35 μ A) using the following data obtained above:

- (1) For a very thick layer the sputter rate is $R_{\text{XeF}_2} = Y\Phi_s(\text{XeF}_2) = 2.4$ ML/s and $C_{\text{XeF}_2} = 0$.

FIG. 7. Sputter rate R_{XeF_2} and consumption rate C_{XeF_2} of the XeF₂ layer for spontaneous and ion-assisted etching (for an ion flux of 1.35 μ A). During ion-assisted etching, the XeF₂ layer is consumed at the bottom to produce etching for a XeF₂ layer of less than 9 nm. The consumption rate first increases with XeF₂ layer thickness after which it decreases sharply around a thickness of 9 nm. For layers thicker than 9 nm the layer is removed by sputtering from the top by the ion bombardment and no consumption at the bottom takes place. Steady state is reached when the removal rate $C_{\text{XeF}_2} + R_{\text{XeF}_2}$ is equal to the incoming XeF₂ flux $\Phi_s(\text{XeF}_2)$. During spontaneous etching, the consumption rate is lower than the incoming XeF₂ flux and shows a maximum around a layer thickness of 1 nm.

- (2) For a layer thickness of about 9 nm (corresponding to a dose of 17 ML), the removal rate decreases and the consumption rate increases with decreasing layer thickness.
- (3) The maximum consumption rate is $C_{\text{XeF}_2} = 1.8$ ML/s.
- (4) In steady state the total consumption rate is $C_{\text{XeF}_2} = 0.18$ ML/s and the total removal rate $R_{\text{XeF}_2} + C_{\text{XeF}_2} = \Phi_s(\text{XeF}_2)$ which results in a sputter rate of 0.37 ML/s.

Furthermore, it is assumed that the remaining XeF₂ thickness $D_{\text{XeF}_2} = 0$, because no conclusions can be drawn from our measurements about the thickness of the XeF₂ layer in a steady-state situation. The resulting plot is shown in Fig. 7. It is noted that this is a construction of the removal and consumption rates. Thus, the plot only gives a rough description of the actual thickness dependence and no conclusions can be drawn from, e.g., the saturation point of the total removal rate around 3 nm.

D. Growth of condensed XeF₂ layer (stage 4)

As shown in Fig. 3, a peak in SiF₄ production is observed when the ions are switched off. The maximum height of the peak corresponds to $\delta_4 = 0.6$. The decay time of this peak varies from 6 to 30 s (at a continuous XeF₂ flux of 0.55 ML/s), depending on the sample history. These variations are attributed to surface roughness. For a rougher surface a thicker XeF₂ layer is needed to cover the whole surface. From the decay time of 6 s we conclude that a layer of about 7 ML XeF₂ is sufficient to stop the etching of silicon. This corresponds to a thickness of 3 nm. Since roughnesses on the order of 100 nm have been reported,¹² it is obvious that roughness will influence the experimental results.

From this observation, it is possible to construct a plot of the consumption rate C_{XeF_2} as a function of the layer thickness in the case of spontaneous etching (i.e., the sputter rate $R_{\text{XeF}_2} = 0$). Since a thick XeF₂ layer is formed on the surface, the consumption rate $C_{\text{XeF}_2} < \Phi_s(\text{XeF}_2)$. Similar to the consumption curve in the case of ion-assisted etching, now a maximum will also be observed. The maximum will occur for a layer of about 1 nm. After 3 nm (depending on the surface roughness) the consumption and thus the etching will cease. This consumption rate as a function of the layer thickness during spontaneous etching is included in Fig. 7.

IV. ION FLUX DEPENDENCE

In this section the behavior of Fig. 5 will be explained qualitatively in terms of Poisson statistics. The explanation does not revert back to Eq. (6) and thus contains no extra information on the sputter and consumption rate as a function of the layer thickness. At the end of this section this explanation will be shown to be corroborated by experiments.

A. Poisson statistics

It was observed that when a thicker film of XeF₂ is deposited, the δ_4 peak is broadened and T_3 increases (Fig. 5).

FIG. 8. Schematic of the sputtering of the condensed XeF₂ layer on the onset of etching. The dotted line at the top is the height of the XeF₂ layer when the ion bombardment is started (corresponding to a deposited dose D_{XeF_2}). Due to statistics in the number of ions incident on the surface area, differences in height Δd form on the surface. The highest peaks are on the order of $2\Delta d$ and the height differences over the surface are on the order of $4\Delta d$.

A similar effect as a function of the film thickness was measured in the sputtering of condensed H₂ by 5 keV H⁺¹³ and the sputtering of condensed CO by 1 keV Ar⁺.¹⁴ Indeed, Fig. 5 is almost identical to the results of the H₂ signal as a function of the bombardment time for various initial thicknesses of the H₂ condensate.¹³ Chrisey *et al.* explained the broadening of the peak of sputtered CO near the surface to be a nonuniform removal of the condensed layer.¹⁴ Below it is shown that the nonuniform removal in our experiment can be described by assuming Poisson statistics in the number of ions arriving at the surface.

Because of the low ion flux (on the order of 1–2 ions/s per area of 10 by 10 Si atoms) and the high yield, statistics in the number of ions will result in a spread of the XeF₂ layer thicknesses over the surface (Fig. 8). Etching starts at a spot on the surface where all XeF₂ has been locally removed. A steady-state situation is then reached when the XeF₂ has been removed from the entire surface. Thus, the driving mechanism for the variations in the XeF₂ layer height can be the Poisson statistics in the ion bombardment. Using a simple model we will try to quantify this picture.

The average dose XeF₂ $\overline{D(t)}$ removed by the ion bombardment, is given from Eq. (7) by

$$\overline{D(t)} = Y_{\text{net}} \Phi_s(\text{Ar}^+) t. \quad (8)$$

To calculate the number of ions arriving at the surface, we assume that each ion affects an area A (ML^{−1}) of the surface. The area A can be expressed in terms of the number of surface XeF₂ molecules capping the volume that is removed by one ion. As a total of Y molecules per ion is removed from the surface, the capping area A is on the order of $A \approx Y^{2/3} = 30.7/\text{ML}$ of incident ions, when we assume that a cube-shaped volume of atoms is removed by an incident ion. The average number $\bar{N}$ of incident ions on such an area A is given by

$$\bar{N} = \Phi_s(\text{Ar}^+) A t. \quad (9)$$

The spread ΔN in this number is given by Poisson statistics

$$\Delta N = \bar{N}^{1/2} = [\Phi_s(\text{Ar}^+) A t]^{1/2}. \quad (10)$$

FIG. 9. Time T_3 to reach a steady-state SiF₄ signal under ion bombardment as a function of the square root of the sputter time T_2 per unit ion flux $\Phi_s(\text{Ar}^+)$. Measurements with an ion current of 1.35 μA (squares) and 0.65 μA (circles) are shown. A linear dependence between both variables is measured (line).

The corresponding spread ΔD in removed layer thicknesses after sputtering for a time $t = T_2$ is now

$$\Delta D / \overline{D(t)} = \Delta N / \bar{N} = [\Phi_s(\text{Ar}^+) A T_2]^{-1/2}. \quad (11)$$

To determine whether these variations in thickness are of importance, we calculate these variations for some characteristic numbers. We take $A \approx 30 \text{ ML}^{-1}$ and $\Phi_s(\text{Ar}^+) T_2 \approx 3 \text{ ML}$ (Fig. 4). For these numbers the spread in thickness is on the order of 10% for a XeF₂ layer of 400 ML.

These variations in the sputtered thickness are shown schematically in Fig. 8 at the onset of etching. Steady state is reached when all the highest peaks are removed from the surface, measured from the lowest points. This thickness is assumed to be on the order of $4\Delta D$, accounting for 95% of all XeF₂ species still remaining on the surface. The time T_3 to remove this thickness is now calculated by using Eqs. (8) and (11)

$$T_3 = \frac{4\Delta D}{Y_{\text{net}} \Phi_s(\text{Ar}^+)} = \frac{4}{A^{1/2}} [T_2 / \Phi_s(\text{Ar}^+)]^{1/2}. \quad (12)$$

In Fig. 9, the measurements of T_3 are plotted as a function of $[T_2 / \Phi_s(\text{Ar}^+)]^{1/2}$ for two different ion fluxes. We see that the linear dependence expected from Eq. (12) applies quite well to the measurements of both ion fluxes and that the results of both ion fluxes now coincide. However, from the fit we find that the proportionality factor $4/A^{1/2} = 2.9$. The corresponding value of $A = 1.9$ would suggest that an ion removes a surface area of 1.9 atoms to a depth of 89 ML. We conclude that this is an unrealistically small value of A when compared to the expected value on the order of $A \approx 30$.

A possible explanation for this discrepancy is the following. In the calculation it is assumed that the XeF₂ is sputtered from the surface with the same characteristics over the whole range. It was, however, already shown that the last 20 ML of condensed XeF₂ are not sputtered from the surface, but Si is etched through this layer while consuming it. Different char-

FIG. 10. Peak value of the SiF₄ signal $\delta_{4,\text{peak}}$ when the ions are switched off as a function of the SiF₄ signal $\delta_{4,\text{ion}}$ at the moment of switch off. A SiF₄ production coefficient $\delta_4=0.25$ is the steady state during ion-assisted etching.

acteristics for the removal of this last layer might explain the observed discrepancy in the value of A . In addition, variations in the simultaneous deposition of XeF₂ are not included. It might well be possible that the XeF₂ deposits preferably on the surface peaks, thus increasing the time to remove the remaining differences in height.

B. Verification

We conclude that the XeF₂ is removed nonuniformly from the surface and islands (crystals) of condensed XeF₂ remain on the surface. Etching only occurs on sufficiently thin surface spots, where the etching is not blocked by a condensed XeF₂ layer. As a consequence, spontaneous SiF₄ production when the ion beam is switched off (stage 4 in Fig. 3) is only possible on these open areas. Thus, the SiF₄ peak height after ion switch off should be linearly proportional to the SiF₄ production just before ion switch off.

The above reasoning is confirmed by an experiment in which the ion flux is interrupted when the SiF₄ signal has *not yet reached* steady state, i.e., during stage 3 in Fig. 3. The result of the subsequent SiF₄ peak height is shown in Fig. 10. These measurements were done after an initial layer of 330 ML XeF₂ was deposited. The ion flux is 0.015 ML/s. It is seen that the peak height $\delta_{4,\text{peak}}$ increases linearly with the SiF₄ signal $\delta_{4,\text{ion}}$ at ion switch off. When the ions are switched off immediately after the first SiF₄ signal is observed, the SiF₄ production decreases to zero within 0.1 s and no peak is measured (offset in Fig. 10). This immediate drop in the SiF₄ signal just after etching has started is always observed, independent of the initial XeF₂ layer thickness. For example, this decrease is also found when the ions are switched off at the peak value of the SiF₄ production for an initial XeF₂ layer of 17 ML (Fig. 5).

This behavior confirms the observation that etching first takes place through a condensed layer: the consumption rate during ion-assisted etching extends to thicker layers (9 nm) than during spontaneous etching (3 nm).

V. DISCUSSION

A. Sputter rate of XeF₂

In the calculation of the yield Y , it was assumed that all of the condensed XeF₂ layer has been removed before the first SiF₄ signal is detected. However, in Sec. IV it was shown that the first SiF₄ signal is already detected when a layer $\bar{D} = D_{\text{XeF}_2} - 2\Delta D$ (Fig. 8) has been removed from the surface. Thus, the total dose removed from the surface is lower than the total condensed dose D_{XeF_2} . As a consequence, the calculated yields are too high (Table I). The corrected yield Y_{cor} is calculated using Eq. (11) with $A=30$ and included in Table I.

The yields of 160 and 280 for 1 and 2 keV ions, respectively, may seem very large compared to the normal yields on the order of 0.1–10 for metals and semiconductors. The explanation for this difference is the low binding energy (0.03–0.5 eV) of the condensed molecules, where only van der Waals forces apply. This binding energy is at least one order of magnitude smaller than those of metals.¹⁵ Sputter yields for other condensed gases are on the same order of magnitude as the measured yields. For example, the yield of 1 keV Ar⁺ ions on condensed Ar, Kr, and Xe layers is 412, 191, and 92, respectively.¹⁶ For condensed molecules, a yield on the order of 500 was reported for 6 keV Ar⁺ ions on condensed CH₄,¹⁷ and a yield of 26 for 1 keV Ar⁺ ions on condensed SiCl₄.⁴

In our measurements, the measured XeF₂ signal corresponds to an apparent XeF₂ flux leaving the surface of $\gamma\Phi_s(\text{XeF}_2)=0.39$ ML/s (Fig. 3), while a true flux $\Phi(\text{XeF}_2)=Y\Phi_s(\text{Ar}^+)=2.52$ ML/s is removed from the surface. This indicates that the XeF₂ signal is a factor of 6.5 too low. This discrepancy is also observed for steady state, where $\gamma=0.1$ is observed (indicating that 10% of the XeF₂ is sputtered), whereas the production only accounts for the consumption of 35% of the XeF₂. Thus, here also a factor of 6.5 is missing, when it is assumed that there is a systematic error in γ . Of course, this could be due to ion-induced sputtering of XeF₂. However, since the XeF₂ sputter rate is determined from the XeF⁺ mass spectrometer signal, ion-induced dissociation is included in γ . Looking at the ratio of the XeF⁺ and XeF₂⁺ mass spectrometer signals as a function of temperature by Vugts *et al.*,⁸ we conclude that ion-induced sputtering of XeF₂ cannot explain the factor of 6.5.

We explain the observed discrepancy by a combination of two factors. The first one is the smaller detection probability of the faster-than-thermal XeF₂ molecules leaving the 130 K surface and the second is the transfer of momentum from the ions incident at 45° to the sputtered XeF₂ species, which leads to an angular distribution outside the acceptance of the mass spectrometer, which is mounted perpendicular to the sample.

B. Comparison with a CF_x layer

It is clear that a XeF₂ layer is different from a CF_x layer in the way it blocks the etching. The XeF₂ layer really blocks the spontaneous etching. During ion bombardment, etching can occur through a layer on the order of 9–45 nm thick, depending on the ion energy, but in a steady state no thick protective layer covers the surface. The CF_x layer, by contrast, acts as a reaction layer in a steady state to supply reactants to form reaction products. This is clearly shown in the case of Si, where diffusion of Si through the CF_x layer is the etching mechanisms.²

The fundamental difference is that etching through a CF_x layer is limited by reaction product *formation* while the etching through a XeF₂ layer is limited by the *release* of the reaction products.

VI. CONCLUDING REMARKS

When XeF₂ is deposited on Si, XeF₂ layers on the order of 3.3 ML (≈1.5 nm) block the spontaneous etching of Si. This layer can be removed by ion bombardment. For thick layers, the layer is sputtered by the ions with a yield of 160±17. For thickness thinner than 9 nm (when sputtering with 1 keV ions), the layer is mainly removed due to consumption of XeF₂ which results in etching. For even thinner layers, sputtering of XeF₂ becomes the most important removal mechanism again. For 2 keV the consumption takes place for layers with a thickness of less than 45 nm and the sputter yield for thick layers increases to 280±30.

During spontaneous etching, the consumption only takes place for layers of less than 3 nm, which is much smaller than for ion-assisted etching. This is confirmed by the observation that no δ₄ peak is observed when the ion bombardment is ceased after the first SiF₄ signal is measured.

From the observation that the consumption is the most important removal mechanism for layers in the range of 2–9 nm, it is concluded that one should use a pulsed ion beam to

obtain the highest etch rate. During the ion beam off cycle a layer on the order of 9 nm should be deposited which should subsequently be removed during the ion beam on cycle. Further it was concluded that no comparison could be made between etching through a CF_x layer and a XeF₂ layer.

The observation that the time to reach a steady state situation increases for increasing initial layer thicknesses is explained by a nonuniform removal of the condensed layer. A simple model assuming Poisson statistics gives a good qualitative description of the observations, but fails to describe the correct time scale to reach a steady state.

¹R. A. H. Heinecke, Solid-State Electron. **18**, 1146 (1975).

²T. E. F. M. Standaert, M. Schaepekens, N. R. Rueger, P. G. M. Sebel, G. S. Oehrlein, and J. M. Cook, J. Vac. Sci. Technol. A **16**, 239 (1998).

³M. Schaepekens, T. E. F. M. Standaert, N. R. Rueger, P. G. M. Sebel, G. S. Oehrlein, and J. M. Cook, J. Vac. Sci. Technol. A **17**, 26 (1999), and references cited herein.

⁴C. B. Mullins and J. W. Coburn, J. Appl. Phys. **76**, 7562 (1994).

⁵D. J. Oostra, A. Haring, A. E. de Vries, F. H. M. Sanders, and G. N. A. van Veen, Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res. B **13**, 556 (1986).

⁶R. B. Jackman, R. J. Price, and J. S. Foord, Appl. Surf. Sci. **36**, 296 (1989).

⁷M. J. M. Vugts, G. L. J. Verschuere, M. F. A. Eurlings, L. J. F. Hermans, and H. C. W. Beijerinck, J. Vac. Sci. Technol. A **14**, 2766 (1996).

⁸M. J. M. Vugts, L. J. F. Hermans, and H. C. W. Beijerinck, J. Vac. Sci. Technol. A **14**, 2820 (1996).

⁹M. J. M. Vugts, G. J. P. Joosten, A. van Oosterum, H. A. J. Senhorst, and H. C. W. Beijerinck, J. Vac. Sci. Technol. A **12**, 2999 (1994).

¹⁰S. Siegel and E. Gebert, J. Am. Chem. Soc. **85**, 241 (1963).

¹¹S. Andersson, Acta Crystallogr., Sect. B: Struct. Crystallogr. Cryst. Chem. **35**, 1321 (1979).

¹²M. J. M. Vugts, M. F. A. Eurlings, L. J. F. Hermans, and H. C. W. Beijerinck, J. Vac. Sci. Technol. A **14**, 2780 (1996).

¹³S. K. Erentz and G. M. McCracken, J. Appl. Phys. **44**, 3139 (1973).

¹⁴D. B. Chrisey, W. L. Brown, and J. W. Boring, Surf. Sci. **225**, 130 (1990).

¹⁵G. Betz and K. Wien, Int. J. Mass Spectrom. Ion Processes **140**, 1 (1994).

¹⁶V. Balaji, D. E. David, T. F. Magnera, J. Michl, and H. M. Urbassek, Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res. B **46**, 435 (1990).

¹⁷R. Pedrys, D. J. Oostra, R. A. Haring, L. Calcagno, A. Haring, and A. E. de Vries, Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res. B **17**, 15 (1986).