JJ

TASCC-P-94-10

PREPRINT

tascc

- TASCC P 94-10
Sw 9424

FORWARD ELASTIC RECOIL MEASUREMENTS USING HEAVY IONS

R. Siegele, H.K. Haugen[†] and J.A. Davies

Accelerator Laboratory, McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario, Canada L8S 4M1

J.S. Forster and H.R. Andrews

AECL Research, Chalk River Laboratories, Chalk River, Ontario, Canada, K0J 1J0

[†] Also with Departments of Physics and Astronomy and Engineering Physics, McMaster University

Submitted to Journal of Applied Phys.

NOTICE

This report is not a formal publication; if it is cited as a reference, the citation should indicate that the report is unpublished. To request copies our E-Mail address is **TASCC@CRL.AECL.CA**.

CERN LIBRARIES, GENEVA

P00023720

Physical Sciences
Chalk River Laboratories
Chalk River, ON K0J 1J0 Canada

1994 May

Forward Elastic Recoil Measurements using Heavy Ions

R. Siegele, H.K. Haugen[†] and J.A. Davies,
*Accelerator Laboratory, McMaster University,
Hamilton, Ontario, Canada L8S 4M1.*

J.S. Forster and H.R. Andrews,
*AECL Research, Chalk River Laboratories,
Chalk River, Ontario, Canada K0J 1J0.*

April 26, 1994

Abstract

We demonstrate the application of the elastic recoil detection technique utilizing heavy ions for the analysis of semiconductor samples. With this technique the depth-profiles of the primary constituents as well as profiles of all impurities can be measured in one spectrum. Depending on the target material, a depth resolution down to 20 nm can be achieved. All elements except hydrogen can be detected with almost the same sensitivity, namely $\sim 1 * 10^{15}$ at/cm² with 136 MeV I in a 30° recoil geometry. For hydrogen, the sensitivity is about four times better.

1 Introduction

Different ion beam techniques are used to measure atomic profiles in the surface region with high sensitivity. Rutherford backscattering analysis (RBS), using ^4He ions, is a powerful non-destructive tool to profile impurities in the surface region ($\sim 1\mu\text{m}$) of solids and it has become a standard technique in most accelerator laboratories. However, the use of RBS is limited because He projectiles backscattered from light surface atoms and heavier bulk atoms deeper in the sample have the same energy. Therefore the detection of light elements in a heavier matrix is often difficult, especially if only trace amounts are present. This is made even worse by the smaller Rutherford cross section of low-Z elements, compared to the cross section of the heavier and more abundant bulk atoms.

Low-Z elements such as hydrogen, carbon, nitrogen and oxygen play a very important role in the processing of semiconductors, especially in CVD-deposited or MBE-grown films. Therefore, a way to measure these impurities and their depth distribution is very important. Different accelerator techniques such as nuclear reactions [1] and resonances [1, 2] have been used to detect and profile some of these elements, but for each element a specific reaction or resonance is needed.

L'Ecuyer et al.[3, 4] developed forward elastic recoil detection to measure low-Z surface impurities, such as H, D, Li, C and O in a heavier substrate. They used a thin mylar film to prevent the heavier bulk recoils and scattered projectiles from reaching the detector.

Since hydrogen is a very frequently encountered impurity, which is often difficult to

measure with other techniques, forward elastic recoil detection (ERD) using a beam of He [5] has been widely used for H-profiling. The energy spectrum of the ejected H-atoms is measured with a surface barrier detector. The He projectiles as well as heavier recoil atoms are stopped in a mylar foil, leaving only the energy spectrum of the H-recoils.

Recently, the ERD-technique has been extended with special detectors, which allow the separation of different recoil species [6–17]. Since the detected particle is the recoil, different elements can be separated by either their nuclear charge or their mass. Time of flight (TOF) and gas detectors, such as a Bragg-detector and various types of ΔE -E detectors, have been developed to achieve this separation. The depth profile of each elemental species may then be derived from its energy spectrum.

In order to detect also the heavy components of a target, their recoils have to be energetic enough to reach the surface and be detected. In the pure Coulomb regime, where the Rutherford scattering law applies, sufficiently high recoil energies can only be obtained with higher energy, heavy projectiles. Heavy projectiles also improve the sensitivity because of their higher cross sections.

The first part of this paper contains a theoretical evaluation of the sensitivity, depth and species resolution for different experimental setups. In the second part, the advantages of high-Z, high-E beams are demonstrated with typical samples produced in many laboratories involved in device fabrication. The results presented are based on measurements with beams of 136 MeV ^{127}I and 239 MeV ^{197}Au in a 30° recoil geometry. The beams were produced by the Tandem accelerator at the TASCC facility in Chalk River.

2 Theoretical Considerations

2.1 Geometry

The geometry of a typical experimental setup for ERD is shown in figure 1. In the laboratory frame a monoenergetic beam of energy E_0 is incident on a target at an angle α with respect to the surface normal. Target atoms recoiling at an angle ξ are detected with an energy E_2

$$E_2 = kE_0 = E_0 \frac{4M_1M_2}{(M_1 + M_2)^2} \cos^2 \xi. \quad (1)$$

M_1 and M_2 are the masses of the incident ion and the target atom respectively. Recoils appear at angles ξ up to 90° . The energy of the recoil can be approximated to

$$E_2 \simeq \frac{E_0}{M_1} 4M_2 \cos^2 \xi \quad (2)$$

provided the projectile mass M_1 is much heavier than the recoil mass M_2 ($M_1 \gg M_2$). As long as equation 2 is valid, the recoil energy is proportional to its mass and to the energy per mass unit ($\frac{E_0}{M_1}$) of the projectile. For a Cl beam, eq. 2 is a reasonable approximation up to mass 7 (Li), while it is good up to mass 24 (Mg) for an ^{127}I projectile. Hence, for a heavy projectile, the energies of heavy recoils are higher, given a fixed energy per mass unit of the projectile. This makes the detection of heavy elements accessible by the ERD technique and offers the possibility of profiling a wide range of elements in a single measurement. In the region of validity of eq. 2, a projectile energy of 1 MeV/amu results in recoil energies of 3 MeV/amu and 1 MeV/amu for recoil geometries of 30° and 60° , respectively.

Another advantage of heavy projectiles is that only heavy target atoms are able to scatter the projectile beam directly into the detector. Whenever the maximum scattering angle (θ_{max}) of the projectile is smaller than the detection angle, the observed spectra are much simpler and the count-rate as well as the dead time of the detector are greatly reduced. The maximum scattering angle for a given projectile/target combination is

$$\theta_{max} = \sin^{-1} \left(\frac{M_2}{M_1} \right) \quad (3)$$

Target atoms heavier than ^{16}O can scatter a Cl beam into angles larger than 30° , while for a ^{197}Au projectile, only target atoms heavier than mass 100 can do so.

2.2 Sensitivity

In materials science the sensitivity of an analysis technique is very important, since impurity levels are in the ppm range for most processes in device fabrication. The sensitivity in an ion beam experiment can be increased by moving the detector closer to the target and thus increasing the solid angle Ω . However, the energy spread, due to the range of recoil angles, limits how much Ω can be increased, without excessive loss in depth resolution.

The sensitivity depends, not only on Ω , but also on the recoil cross section $\sigma(\xi)$. This may be calculated from the scattering cross section in the center of mass frame

$$\sigma_{CM}(\theta) = \left(\frac{e^2}{16\pi\epsilon_0} \right)^2 \left(\frac{Z_1 Z_2}{E_{CM}} \right)^2 \frac{1}{\sin^4 \left(\frac{\theta}{2} \right)} \quad (4)$$

and the relation between recoil angle ξ and scattering angle of the projectile θ

$$\theta = \pi - 2\xi \quad (5)$$

with the energy in the center of mass frame

$$E_{CM} = \frac{M_2}{M_1 + M_2} E_0. \quad (6)$$

Transformation of the recoil cross section to the laboratory frame gives

$$\sigma(\xi) = \left(\frac{e^2}{8\pi\epsilon_0} \right)^2 \left(\frac{Z_1 Z_2 (M_1 + M_2)}{M_2 E_0} \right)^2 \frac{1}{\cos^3 \xi} \quad (7)$$

For very heavy projectiles ($M_1 \gg M_2$), $M_1 + M_2$ can be approximated to M_1 . Hence, the cross sections are roughly proportional to $(Z_1 M_1)^2$. To achieve similar recoil energies, the projectile energy has to be proportional to the projectile mass (i.e. $E_0 \propto M_1$) and the M_1 dependence cancels out. In the case of similar recoil energies the cross section is proportional to Z_1^2 , leading to a higher sensitivity of heavy projectiles. Note that for $M_1 \gg M_2$, $\sigma(\xi)$ is almost independent of recoil mass, because for all elements (except H) the ratio between charge and mass is almost constant ($\frac{Z_2}{M_2} \sim 0.4-0.5$) and $(M_1 + M_2) \sim M_1$. For H recoils, however, the cross section is increased by about a factor of four, since in this case $\frac{Z_2}{M_2}$ is unity.

Because of the $\cos^{-3} \xi$ dependence, the cross section increases strongly at larger detection angles. Moving the detector from 30° to 45° or 60° increases the cross section by a factor of 1.8 and 2.8, respectively. However, this reduces the recoil energy, which means higher projectile energies (and hence smaller cross sections) are necessary in order to obtain recoils of high enough energy. This can usually be done, without departing

from the Rutherford scattering regime, provided much higher energies are achievable; but in most accelerator laboratories, the incident ion energy which is available is the limiting factor.

2.3 Species Resolution

In order to separate different recoils, various techniques can be used. Each technique has its advantages and disadvantages, depending on the experimental parameters; e.g. the type and the energy of the projectile. In principle, there are two possibilities to differentiate the recoils: (i) by their mass, and (ii) by their nuclear charge via their rate of energy loss.

The separation by recoil mass can be accomplished via a time-of-flight (TOF) technique. In a TOF setup both the time of flight along a fixed path and the energy are measured for each recoil. The time of flight allows different recoil species with the same energy to be separated. The species resolution of TOF is given by the time difference at the maximum energy of the recoil species. The difference in time of flight (Δt) for two elements with mass M_a and M_b is given by

$$\Delta t = 7.1979 * 10^{-8} l \frac{\sqrt{M_b} - \sqrt{M_a}}{\sqrt{E_b}} = 7.1979 * 10^{-8} l \sqrt{\frac{M_b}{E}} \left(1 - \sqrt{\frac{M_a}{M_b}} \right). \quad (8)$$

With the energy E in MeV, the mass M in amu and the length l in meters, the time Δt is in seconds. Assuming that eq. 2 is valid and the energy of a recoil is proportional its mass ($\frac{E}{M_b} = \text{constant}$) the mass resolution is given by $\left(1 - \sqrt{\frac{M_a}{M_b}} \right)$. For heavy elements $\sqrt{\frac{M_a}{M_b}}$ becomes close to unity for adjacent elements, thus making their separation more

difficult compared to light ones.

Using a light projectile has the advantage that the energy of the heavy recoils is no longer proportional to their mass, which means they are easier to separate with TOF. Hence, TOF is well suited for use with light projectiles, while it is not very useful in conjunction with heavy projectiles. Because of the geometry, TOF usually results in very small solid angles (typically $\lesssim 0.1$ msr) which limits the achievable sensitivity.

Another way to separate different recoil species is through their energy loss in a gas counter. A good overview of different gas counters for particle identification is given by W. Assmann [18]. Gas counters can be divided into two groups, the Bragg-counter and various types of ΔE -E counters. Special types of gas counter offer solid angles of up to 7.5 msr [16].

Gas counters require a thin window that separates the vacuum chamber from the gas volume. This causes a significant energy loss and energy straggling, especially for the heavier recoils. For this reason heavy recoils have to be quite energetic and therefore the use of a gas counter as a detector only makes sense in conjunction with high energy heavy projectiles.

The species resolution is given by the difference in stopping power for different elements. Figure 2 gives the electronic energy loss for different elements in butane for energies up to 100 MeV. The hatched areas indicate the energies of recoils coming from the surface and from up to 1 μm depth in a Si sample, with a 136 MeV ^{127}I beam with 30° recoil geometry. The figure shows that, for elements up to Ni, the difference in stop-

ping power is sufficient to allow their separation over a depth of 1 μm . Hence, a ΔE -E detector is a good choice for simultaneous particle identification over a very wide range of Z_2 .

2.4 Experimental Limitations

When using ERD as an analysis technique, some additional complications have to be considered. One of these is the sputtering process. Following Feldman and Mayer (pp. 79–80, ref [19]), the sputtering yield Y may be estimated from the nuclear stopping power $\left. \frac{dE}{dx} \right|_n$ and the surface binding energy U :

$$Y = \alpha \frac{0.042}{N U} \left. \frac{dE}{dx} \right|_n \quad (9)$$

where α is a function of the mass ratio $\frac{M_2}{M_1}$ and the angle of incidence. For 136 MeV I on Si at 15° to the surface, $\alpha = 0.8$ and $U = 3 \text{ eV/atom}$. Substitution in equation 9 gives a sputtering yield $Y \sim 0.5$ Si atoms per incident ion. Hence, a bombardment dose of $\sim 2 \times 10^{13}$ ions/ mm^2 would be required to sputter away one monolayer. Since our typical HIERD bombardment (figures 4–11) involves only 1×10^{12} iodine atoms/ mm^2 , sputtering effects are normally not a problem.

However, in some molecular targets (e.g., Si_3N_4), electronic energy loss sometimes produces volatile products such as N_2 , due to the breaking of chemical bonds. This electronic sputtering can be up to 1–2 orders of magnitude larger than the above sputtering estimate of 0.5 atoms/ion [20].

As mentioned above, ERD analysis is very simple as long as the recoil cross sections

are all Rutherford. In a scattering event, the closest approach of the two atoms is given by

$$D = \frac{Z_1 Z_2 e^2}{2E} \frac{M_1 + M_2}{M_2} \left[1 + \frac{1}{\cos \xi} \right] \quad (10)$$

For Rutherford scattering, the closest approach should not be smaller than 3–4 times the sum of the nuclear radii [21]. Using equation 10, the calculations show that the recoil cross sections are Rutherford throughout the projectile energy regime of 0.5–2.0 MeV/amu.

2.5 Depth resolution

In addition to the sensitivity, the depth resolution is also a very important parameter, especially if layered structures are studied, where the change of an impurity concentration at the interface is needed. The depth resolution is given by the energy losses, ε_P and ε_R , of the ingoing projectile and the recoil atom, respectively. It is limited by the energy spread of the detected particle $\delta E_{\delta\xi}$, due to a change of the recoil angle over the detector, and the energy straggling in the detector window (δE_W) and in the target; δE_{SP} , δE_{SR} are the energy straggling of the ingoing projectile and outgoing recoil, respectively. The depth resolution is then given by

$$\frac{\sqrt{\delta E_{\delta\xi}^2 + (k\delta E_{SP})^2 + \delta E_{SR}^2 + \delta E_W^2}}{\frac{\varepsilon_R}{\sin \alpha} + \frac{k\varepsilon_P}{\sin \beta}} \quad (11)$$

The higher value of ε_P for heavy projectiles is almost fully compensated by their smaller k-values and therefore does not result in a better depth resolution. However, for

heavy projectiles the energy spread $\Delta E_{\delta\epsilon}$ for a similar change in recoil angle is larger compared to light projectiles. Hence, the solid angle has to be decreased in order to maintain the same depth resolution. This can be accomplished without any loss in sensitivity, because of the higher cross sections. The use of a detector as described by Assman et al. [16] enables one to utilize fully the higher sensitivity arising from the large heavy-ion σ values, without losses in terms of depth resolution.

2.6 Summary of Theoretical Section

The considerations of this section show: (i) a heavy projectile allows the simultaneous profiling of a wider mass range of recoils (all masses $\lesssim \frac{M_1}{2}$), because of the better energy transfer for a heavier projectile; (ii) since the mass resolution of TOF breaks down in the energy and mass region accessible with heavy projectiles, a ΔE -E detector is the best choice for particle identification. A ΔE -E detector also provides a larger solid angle than TOF.

3 Experimental Technique

The recoils were detected in a specially designed ΔE -E detector (figure 3). Compared to the Bragg-detector used in our previous studies [20], the ΔE -E detector has a very simple design. The ΔE part of the detector is a gas detector, consisting of a pair of plates 4 cm long and located directly behind the entrance window. The residual energy of the particles after traveling through this ΔE detector is measured in a surface barrier

detector (SBD), mounted inside the gas chamber (figure 3). Use of an SBD enables the residual energy to be measured with very good resolution.

This gas counter/SBD detector assembly is mounted via a 2" flange to the scattering chamber. A valve between the target chamber and the detector allows venting of the target chamber, while the detector is kept under operating pressure. We chose mounting flanges for the detector at recoil geometries of 60° and 30° , thus enabling us to take advantage either of the higher cross-sections at 60° or of the enhanced depth resolution and higher recoil energies at 30° . Because of the distance between target and detector, our solid angle is relatively small (0.73 msr).

Isobutane at pressures between 20 and 80 Torr was used as the detector gas. Higher gas pressures allow the detection of low-Z elements like H and He in the coincidence spectrum. The anode was biased to +350 V, while the Frisch grid was at +200 V and the cathode at ground potential. The low gas pressure allows the use of very thin entrance windows. In our initial test, a $250\mu\text{g}/\text{cm}^2$ thick mylar window was used, but thinner windows are available. The results shown here are all for a in a scattering geometry of 30° with either 136 MeV I or 239 MeV Au beams.

3.1 Energy Calibration

To extract depth profiles from the recoil spectra, an energy calibration of the detector is necessary. In principle there are two ways to calibrate the ΔE -E detector.

One way is to calibrate both the gas counter (ΔE detector) and the SBD (E detector).

This involves a calibration with various ions, in order to account for the pulse height defect, due to high plasma densities in the gas counter. In addition, the energy loss of different ions in the detector window has to be determined, preferably at various energies.

Since this would be a very time consuming procedure, we chose a more empirical approach. A particle with energy E_2 loses energy in the window ($\Delta E_W(E_2, R)$) and in the detector gas ($\Delta E_G(E_2 - \Delta E_W, R)$), before it hits the SBD. The energy loss is a function of the recoil species (R) and the energy. Over a wide range of energies the energy loss in the gas detector changes quite slowly with energy (see figures 4, 5, 7, 8, 9 and 11). This can be seen from the almost linear slope of the curves for each element in the ΔE - E coincidence spectra. For elements up to P, the energy loss in the gas counter decreases slowly with increasing energy, while it is almost constant for Ga and As. For still heavier recoils such as In, there is a slow linear increase.

For much lower energies, the energy loss in the detector gas deviates from linear behaviour, but at these energies the curves of different elements merge into each other and they can not be analysed anyway. The residual energy E_D of a particle hitting the SBD (E-detector) can be written as

$$E_D = E_2 - \Delta E_W(E_2, R) - \Delta E_G(E_2 - \Delta E_W, R). \quad (12)$$

This equation gives the relation between the SBD signal and the recoil energy E_2 . It can be determined by measuring the pulse height of the surface recoils at various projectile energies. In a first approximation, this relation is linear, thus leading to

$$E_2 = E_{off} + \Delta E_{chn} N_{chn}, \quad (13)$$

where E_{off} is the sum of the energy loss in the gas and the window. If ΔE_W and ΔE_G do not change over the energy range of the calibration, ΔE_{chn} is simply the pulse-height to energy conversion of the SBD detector. If they change, ΔE_{chn} also includes the change of the energy loss. In fact, for light elements (up to Si), ΔE_{chn} is somewhat smaller than the value derived for an α -particle source, while it is larger for In.

An energy calibration has to be done for each recoil species, but several species can be calibrated simultaneously. This calibration can be done rather quickly and avoids all complications like pulse height defect etc., since it provides directly an empirical relation between the pulse height of SBD signal and the recoil energy. Since this relation is linear over the useful energy range, three or four different projectile energies are sufficient to provide a good calibration.

3.2 Calculation of the Composition Profile

This section describes the procedure used to convert a spectrum into a composition profile. In general, heavy-ion ERD (HIERD) allows the simultaneous measurement of all components of a sample. Hence, the energy spectra can be directly converted to a concentration profile. As an experimental parameter only the energy calibration for each element is necessary. The solid angle (Ω) and the fluence are not needed in the calculation, which eliminates an additional source of error.

An HIERD experiment usually has a wide variety of ion/target combinations. In order to accomodate this fact in a computer-program, a data set is needed that contains

all possible ion/target combinations. This is the case for the TRIM stopping power tables; therefore the TRIM tables were used [22]. The energy loss of composite targets is calculated according to Bragg's rule. Cross sections are calculated from equation 7, with the screening corrections given by Andersen et. al.[23].

The recoil yield Y_i of a target element i is given by

$$Y_i = N \Omega \Delta E_i \frac{\sigma_i(E)}{\varepsilon_i} c_i \quad (14)$$

where N is the number of projectile atoms, Ω the detector angle, ΔE_i the energy width per channel, σ_i the cross section, and c_i the concentration. ε_i is the sum of the energy loss of projectile and recoil in the target and is given by

$$\varepsilon_i = k_i \sum_j c_j \varepsilon_{pj}(E) + \sum_j c_j \varepsilon_{ij}(k_i E) \quad (15)$$

where E is the projectile energy.

The sum of all target components has to add up to unity and therefore the concentration of each component is given by

$$c_i = \frac{Y_i \varepsilon_i}{\Delta E_i \sigma_i} \frac{1}{N \Omega} \quad (16)$$

with

$$\sum_i c_i = 1 \Rightarrow N \Omega = \sum_i \frac{Y_i \varepsilon_i}{\Delta E_i \sigma_i} \quad (17)$$

An iterative procedure has to be used to calculate c_i from Y_i , since the concentrations of the elements also determines ε_i .

In the first step, the energy of the surface recoils for each component is calculated. With the energy calibration for the species, the surface yield is taken from the spectra

and the surface concentrations are calculated from eqs. 16 and 17, as described above. Then the energy loss in a layer with a thickness Δd is calculated, with the surface concentrations determined in the first step. This leads to the recoil energies from this depth. Again, the yields are determined from the spectrum and converted into concentrations. With these concentrations the energy of the recoil originating from one step deeper in the sample is calculated. In this way the calculation proceeds through the sample.

In determining the distribution at a certain depth, the distribution at shallower depths has to be known in order to calculate the energy loss. Since the calculation starts at the surface, this requirement is always fulfilled.

The value of $N\Omega$ has to remain constant over the whole profiling depth, since the number of incoming projectiles and the solid angle are constant. Therefore $N\Omega$ provides a test on the consistency of the calculation. Variations in $N\Omega$ indicate either that an error has been made in the energy calibration or that a substantial target component is missing.

4 Results & Discussion

Various samples have been measured in order to demonstrate the species and depth resolution as well as the sensitivity of the technique.

Figure 4 shows the ΔE -E coincidence spectrum of a stainless steel sample taken with a 136 MeV ^{127}I beam and a gas pressure of 20 Torr in the ΔE detector. The x-axis gives the pulse height in the surface barrier detector (E-detector), while the y-axis gives the

pulse height observed in the ΔE detector. The intensity of each point is proportional to the number of counts. The (roughly horizontal) bands seen in the figure correspond to the different elements present in the stainless steel sample. Beginning at low ΔE , the following elements can be identified; carbon, nitrogen (in very small amounts), oxygen (mostly at the surface i.e., around channel 100), silicon and the principal components of stainless steel: chromium, iron and nickel. The spectrum demonstrates nicely the separation of Cr, Fe and Ni. Using a higher gas pressure of 40 Torr increases the separation even more and enables the separation of adjacent elements up to Ni.

From the spectrum, the composition of the steel was calculated to be 75% Fe, 9% Ni and 15% Cr. Si and C are present in a concentration of 0.8% and 0.3%, respectively. The N and O concentration are below 0.2% and 0.1%, respectively. Between Si and Cr are a few data points which can be related to K or Ca, but the concentration is less than 0.01%.

The other feature visible in the spectrum is an intense band at low-E, which intercepts with the major lines from Cr, Fe and Ni around channel 40. This is due to iodine projectiles undergoing plural scattering events in the target. Note that 27° is the maximum scattering angle of ^{127}I on Fe or Ni. Hence, it requires at least two scattering events for iodine to reach the detector. However, iodine scattered by $\sim 15^\circ$ could travel almost parallel to the surface and hence has a high probability of undergoing another scattering event to the detector.

Figure 5 gives the spectrum of a Si sample with a buried and a surface SiO_2 layer. In

this SIMOX (Separation by IMplantation of OXYgen) sample Si, O and traces of N and C are clearly identified. The N is concentrated at three well-resolved depths. Figure 6 gives the concentration profile of the components Si, O and N as a function of depth, calculated with the computer program described above. Four distinct layers are clearly resolved: surface SiO₂, Si, buried SiO₂ and bulk Si. Their thicknesses are 330 nm and 290 nm for the top and buried SiO₂ layers, respectively, and 200 nm for the intervening Si layer. These values are in good agreement with electron microscopy results of 350 nm and 290 nm for the SiO₂ layers and 180 nm for the Si layer between.

The depth profiles in figure 6 show that the nitrogen is accumulated at the three Si/SiO₂ interfaces. The amount of N at each interface is $5 - 10 \times 10^{15}$ atoms/cm², while the total amount of C in the sample is around $5 - 10 \times 10^{15}$ atoms/cm².

Figure 7 shows a multilayered sample of alternating layers of InP and In_xGa_{1-x}As (x=0.54) on bulk InP. The sample consists of three InP-layers (40 nm, 80 nm and 150 nm) and three In_xGa_{1-x}As layers (60 nm, 120 nm and 180 nm). The graph shows that in the P-recoil spectrum all six layers are resolvable, while in the case of Ga and As recoils only the top five layers are resolvable. The Ga and As recoils which come from the deepest InGaAs layer merge with the signal which stems from scattered iodine projectiles. This gives a probing depth of about 300-400 nm for Ga or As and 700-800 nm for Si and P under these conditions. The lower-Z elements are well separated over their whole probing depth, but Ga and As are only separated within the uppermost 150 nm.

The very intense line, which does not bend over at higher energies is due to a mixture

of In recoils and scattered I projectiles. Since iodine can be scattered by In into angles greater than 30° , scattered iodine is detected as well. Scattered projectiles in the detector could be minimized by going to larger detection angles and/or using heavier projectiles, such as ^{197}Au .

Figure 8 shows the coincidence spectrum of the same sample taken with a 239 MeV Au beam and a gas pressure of 60 Torr in the ΔE detector. Au can still scatter on In into angles greater than 30° , but compared with the iodine beam (fig. 7) the energy loss of Au varies significantly from the energy loss of In and both signals can now be resolved. A change in intensity in the In line can be seen and is due to the varying In concentration in the layers. The probing depth in this case is much larger i.e., around 700-800 nm for Ga and As and about 1500 nm for P, due to the higher energy transfer. Hence, all three GaAs layers are now visible.

Figure 9 shows the coincidence spectrum of a Si sample, that had been pre-implanted with He. The spectrum is taken at a higher gas pressure of 80 Torr. Due to the higher gas pressure, He loses enough energy in the ΔE detector to produce a signal that is well above the noise level. The signal height of elements heavier than N is now above the dynamic range of the amplifier, since they lose too much energy in the ΔE detector at 80 Torr. Therefore the coincidence spectrum shows only events resulting from He, C and N recoils. A coincidence spectrum taken at a gas pressure of 40 Torr reveals the build up of surface contamination (C, N and O) during the He pre-implantation, while the spectrum taken at higher gas pressure shows the profile of the implanted He. Going to

a still higher gas pressure (120 Torr) enabled us to detect even H in the ΔE detector.

In order to obtain coincidence spectra from both the light and heavy elements, two runs at different gas pressures are necessary. This is not very practical. Therefore, at the lower gas pressure (40 Torr), we in addition recorded those events in the solid state detector, which are above the noise level but are not in coincidence with any ΔE signal. This non-coincidence energy spectrum is due to low-Z recoils, which have a below-threshold ΔE signal. At 40 Torr gas pressure this is the case for H, He and Li recoils at high energies.

The non-coincidence energy spectrum from the He implanted sample is shown in figure 10. This spectrum was taken simultaneously with a coincidence spectrum at a gas pressure of 40 Torr. The spectrum shows two peaks: one at ~ 11 MeV and the other at ~ 3 MeV. These two peaks are due to the implanted He and to H incorporated in the surface contamination. This demonstrates that all elements from H up to Si and even higher can be profiled within a single measurement.

Figure 11 shows the coincidence spectrum of a porous silicon sample, taken with a 136 MeV ^{127}I beam and a gas pressure of 40 Torr. The spectrum shows the presence of large amounts of C and O as well the major component of Si. From the non-coincidence spectrum hydrogen was identified as another major component. There are also detectable amounts of F, Cl and N present. The F originates from the HF etch, in which the porous silicon was produced. During the HF etch the back electrode of the silicon sample was protected by wax, which was subsequently removed using trichlorethane. The Cl in the

sample is presumably introduced by this cleaning procedure, since Cl is only present in samples on which the wax had been removed.

From the energy spectra of all the elements present in the sample, the composition profile was calculated and the result of the calculation is shown in figure 12. N, F and Cl are not plotted in the figure, since they are only present in trace amounts.

The figure shows a constant C concentration ($\sim 10\%$) over the whole depth, while the O concentration peaks at the surface ($\sim 40\%$) and then falls gradually towards its 10% level. This may be due to an oxide layer present prior to the anodic etching of the sample. The H content is fairly constant at $\sim 10\%$.

5 Conclusions

We have shown that ERD with heavy ions is very well suited for solving problems in device fabrication and materials science. With ^{127}I projectiles, a sensitivity of $10^{15}\text{at}/\text{cm}^2$ or better is achievable. In a $1\text{ }\mu\text{m}$ layer this is equivalent to 50–100 ppm. Separation of adjacent elements up to Si and P is readily accomplished. Heavy ions also allow the profiling of elements up to In, with almost elemental resolution up to Ga and As. All elements from H up to the heaviest components can be measured simultaneously. A depth resolution down to 20–30 nm can be achieved.

Acknowledgement

We greatly acknowledge the excellent technical assistance of J. Cave in building the ΔE -E detector, as well as the technical assistance of J.J. Hill and P.J. Jones with the TASCC beamline facilities. We also thank I. Emesh and T. MacElwee for the SIMOX samples and B. Robinson for the InP/InGaAs sample. H.K. Haugen and J.A. Davies thank the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council (NSERC) of Canada for their financial support.

[†] *Also with Departments of Physics and Astronomy and Engineering Physics, McMaster University.*

References

- ¹ J.W. Mayer and E. Rimini (Ed.), *Ion Beam Handbook for Material Analysis*, (Academic Press, New York 1977).
- ² J.A. Davies, F.J.D. Almeida, J.S. Forster, H.K. Haugen, T.E. Jackman, and R. Siegele, IBA-93, in print.
- ³ J. L'Ecuyer, C. Brassard, C. Cardinal, J. Chabbal, L. Deschênes, J.P. Labrie, B. Terreault, J.G. Martel, and R. St.-Jacques, *J. Appl. Phys.* **46** (1), 381 (1976).
- ⁴ J. L'Ecuyer, C. Brassard, C. Cardinal, and B. Terreault, *Nucl. Instr. and Meth.* **149**, 271 (1978).
- ⁵ B.L. Doyle and P.S. Peercy, *Appl. Phys. Lett.* **34**(11), 811 (1979).
- ⁶ R. Groleau, S.C Gujrathi, and J.P. Martin, *Nucl. Instr. and Meth.* **218**, 11 (1983).
- ⁷ J.P. Thomas, M. Fallavier, D. Ramdane, N. Chevarier, and A. Chevarier, *Nucl. Instr. and Meth.* **218**, 125 (1983).
- ⁸ M. Petrascu, I. Berceanu, I. Brancus, A. Buta, M. Duma, C. Grama, I. Lazar, I. Mihai, M. Petrovici, V. Simon, M. Mihaila, and I. Ghita, *Nucl. Instr. and Meth.* **B4**, 396 (1984).
- ⁹ J.P. Thomas, M. Fallavier, and A. Ziani, *Nucl. Instr. and Meth.* **B 15**, 443 (1986).

- ¹⁰ H.J. Whitlow, G. Possnert, and C.S. Petersson, Nucl. Instr. and Meth. **B 27**, 448 (1987).
- ¹¹ A.M. Behrooz, R.L. Headrick, L.E. Seiberling, and R.W. Zurmühle, Nucl. Instr. and Meth. **B 28**, 108 (1987).
- ¹² E. Hentschel, R. Kotte, H.G. Ortlepp, F. Stray, and D. Wohlfarth, Nucl. Instr. and Meth. **B 43**, 82 (1989).
- ¹³ J.P. Stroquert, G. Guillaume, M. Hage-Ali, J.J. Grob, C. Ganter, and P. Siffert, Nucl. Instr. and Meth. **B44**, 184 (1989).
- ¹⁴ B. Gebauer, D. Fink, P. Goppelt, M. Wilpert, and Th. Wilpert, Nucl. Instr. and Meth. **B 50**, 159 (1990).
- ¹⁵ R. Behrisch, R. Grötschel, E. Hentschel, and W. Assmann, Nucl. Instr. and Meth. **B 68**, 245 (1992).
- ¹⁶ W. Assmann, P. Hartung, H. Huber, P. Staat, H. Steffens, and Ch. Steinhausen, Nucl. Instr. and Meth. .
- ¹⁷ W. Assmann, H. Huber, Ch. Steinhausen, M. Dobler, H. Glückler and A. Weidinger, ECAART3 93.
- ¹⁸ W. Assmann, Nucl. Instr. and Meth. **B64**, 267 (1992).
- ¹⁹ L.C. Feldman and J.W. Mayer, *Fundamentals of surface and thin film analysis*, North-Holland 1986, New York.

- ²⁰ R. Siegele, J.A. Davies, J.S. Forster and H.R. Andrews, Nucl. Instr. and Meth. in press.
- ²¹ J. Räisänen, E. Rauhala, J.M. Knox and J.F. Harmon, submitted JAP.
- ²² J.F. Ziegler, J.P. Biersack, and U. Littmark, *The Stopping and Range of Ions in Solids*, Pergamon Press 1985, New York.
- ²³ H.H. Andersen, F. Besenbacher, P. Loftager and W. Möller, Phys. Rev. A **21**, 1891 (1980).

Figure Captions:

Figure 1: Schematic showing the scattering geometry of the heavy ion elastic recoil experiment.

Figure 2: Electronic energy loss of different elements in isobutane. In addition, the surface recoil energies of the elements for our specific experimental conditions (136 MeV I and 30° recoil angle) are shown.

Figure 3: Schematic showing the experimental setup and the ΔE -E detector.

Figure 4: Coincidence spectrum of stainless steel taken with 136 MeV ^{127}I beam and a gas pressure of 20 Torr in the ΔE detector.

Figure 5: Coincidence spectrum of a SIMOX sample, taken with a 136 MeV ^{127}I beam and a gas pressure of 40 Torr in the ΔE detector.

Figure 6: Depth profiles of the elements in a SIMOX sample, calculated from the spectrum in figure 5. Four clearly resolvable regions are: 1) Surface SiO_2 (330 nm); 2) Si (200 nm); 3) Buried SiO_2 (290 nm); 4) Bulk Si.

Figure 7: Coincidence spectrum of an indium phosphide sample with three alternating layers of InP and $\text{In}_x\text{Ga}_{1-x}\text{As}$ ($x = 0.54$). The spectrum was taken with a 136 MeV ^{127}I beam and a gas pressure of 20 Torr in the ΔE detector.

Figure 8: Coincidence spectrum of an indium phosphide sample with three alternating layers of InP and $\text{In}_x\text{Ga}_{1-x}\text{As}$ ($x = 0.54$). The spectrum was taken with a 239 MeV Au beam and a gas pressure of 60 Torr in the ΔE detector.

Figure 9: Coincidence spectrum of a Si sample implanted with $2 \times 10^{17} \text{ He/cm}^2$. The spectrum was taken with a 136 MeV ^{127}I beam and a gas pressure of 80 Torr in the ΔE detector.

Figure 10: H and He recoil spectrum of a Si sample implanted with $2 \times 10^{17} \text{ He/cm}^2$. The spectrum shows the non-coincident events in the surface barrier detector. The H is an impurity introduced during the He implantation.

Figure 11: Coincidence spectrum of a porous silicon sample, taken with a 136 MeV ^{127}I

beam and a gas pressure of 40 Torr in the ΔE detector. The spectrum shows not only the major components of porous silicon C, O and Si, but also traces of N, F and Cl.

Figure 12 Composition profile of porous silicon. The profile is calculated from the spectrum shown in figure 11.