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ABSTRACT

The non-quasi-static (NQS) description of device behavior is useful in fast switching and high frequency circuit applications. Hence, it is necessary to develop a fast and accurate compact NQS model for both large-signal and small-signal simulations.

A new relaxation-time-approximation based NQS MOSFET model, consistent between transient and small-signal simulations, has been developed for surface-potential-based MOSFET compact models. The new model is valid for all regions of operation and is compatible with, and at low frequencies recovers, the quasi-static (QS) description of the MOSFET. The model is implemented in two widely used circuit simulators and tested for speed and convergence. It is verified by comparison with technology computer aided design (TCAD) simulations and experimental data, and by application of a recently developed benchmark test for NQS MOSFET models. In addition, a new and simple technique to characterize NQS and gate resistance, $R_{\text{gate}}$, MOS model parameters from measured data has been presented.

In the process of experimental model verification, the effects of bulk resistance on MOSFET characteristics is investigated both theoretically and experimentally to separate it from the NQS effects.
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CHAPTER 1
Introduction

1.1. NQS Compact MOSFET Models

The state-of-the-art design of RF and mixed-signal CMOS circuits can require inclusion of the non-quasi-static (NQS) effects, such as the finite channel transit time [1]. Various compact formulations of NQS models have been reported [3, 4, 6–51]. Among them, [25, 29, 30] are threshold-voltage-based ($V_T$-based) models, [3, 44, 50] are inversion-charge-based ($q_I$-based) models, and [4, 31–34, 47] are surface-potential-based ($\psi_S$-based) models. To be useful in a generic circuit simulator, NQS models need to be large-signal and not rely on the small-signal approximation. Inclusion of NQS effects in a large-signal formulation is a difficult task which when performed rigorously, and increases both the model complexity and the execution time. For example, two accurate large-signal NQS $\psi_S$-based compact models are based on the channel segmentation [31] and spline-collocation-method [32, 33] and are both significantly more complex than the corresponding QS models [52, 53]. A popular simplification of the NQS model is the use of the relaxation-time-approximation (RTA) which reduces the simulation time and improves convergence at the price of the reduced accuracy, especially at high frequencies. These models are described in [29, 34, 54–56] with some additional insights found in [57]. In a different form, RTA also appears in a comprehensive varactor model where it is used to describe the inertia in the formulation of the inversion layer [58–61]. In the development of RTA NQS models, it is common to assume that RTA applies to all terminal charges, including the bulk charge. As shown in [62], this assumption makes RTA models
fail a benchmark test specific for NQS models. The shortcomings of this assumption from the experimental point of view are discussed in [5].

1.2. Existing Large-Signal NQS Models

1.2.1. BSIM3/BSIM4-NQS

BSIM3 and BSIM4 are $V_T$-based models [57, 63–66]. Berkeley’s LEVEL1, LEVEL2, and LEVEL3; BSIM1, BSIM2, BSIM3, and BSIM4; and NXP’s MM9 all belong to this category. The models of this type are formulated directly in terms of figures of merits in mainstream circuit design theory (e.g., $V_T$, subthreshold slope, etc). The $V_T$-based model is essentially a regional model that relies on a piece-wise description of the strong and weak inversion regimes of the device operation.

In the BSIM3 and BSIM4 NQS models, the MOSFET is divided into a few sub-MOSFETs of smaller channel length. The RC network representing the distributed channel is now replaced by an Elmore lumped equivalent circuit that preserves the lowest frequency pole of the distributed channel [29]. The Elmore resistance is given by:

$$R_{ELM} = \frac{L^2}{P_{ELM} \cdot \mu \cdot q_{I}^{(0)}}$$

(1.1)

where $\mu$ is effective channel mobility, $L$ is channel length, $P_{ELM}$ is a fitting parameter, the total inversion $q_{I} = C_{ox} (V_{GS} - V_T)$ is adopted in the $V_T$-based model which is only valid for the strong inversion region, and $C_{ox}$ is the oxide capacitance. The superscript “(0)” denotes the QS value of the corresponding variable and SI units and physical signs are used throughout. The value of $P_{ELM}$ is extracted by matching the time response of the fast switching device operation.
The RTA models in BSIM3 and BSIM4 are essentially the same [29,65,66]:

\[
\frac{dq_T}{dt} = F_T \cdot q_I^{(0)} - q_I \cdot \frac{1}{\tau}, \quad T \in \{D, G, S\}
\]  

(1.2)

where \(F_D, F_G,\) and \(F_S\) are the NQS channel charge partitioning factors for terminals D, G, and S, respectively:

\[
F_S + F_D = 1
\]  

(1.3)

\[
F_G = -1
\]  

(1.4)

Both BSIM3 and BSIM4 large signal NQS models use the quasi-static value for the bulk charge [65,66].

The relaxation time, \(\tau\), is slightly different for BSIM3 and BSIM4. In BSIM3, for a unified expression valid for both strong and weak inversion modes of operation, \(\tau\) is given as a combination of the diffusion and drift mechanisms:

\[
\frac{1}{\tau} = \frac{1}{\tau_{\text{diff}}} + \frac{1}{\tau_{\text{dr}}}
\]  

(1.5)

where

\[
\tau_{\text{diff}} = \frac{L^2}{16 \cdot \mu \cdot \phi_t}
\]  

(1.6)

\(\phi_t\) is the thermal voltage, and

\[
\tau_{\text{dr}} = R_{\text{ELM}} \cdot C_{\text{ox}} = \frac{L^2 \cdot C_{\text{ox}}}{P_{\text{ELM}} \cdot \mu \cdot q_I^{(0)}}
\]  

(1.7)

In BSIM4, \(\tau\) is given by

\[
\frac{1}{\tau} = \frac{1}{R_{ii} C_{\text{ox}}}
\]  

(1.8)

\(^1\text{cf. Eq. (8.1.4b) of [66]}\)
where the inverse of the intrinsic input resistance

\[
\frac{1}{R_{ii}} = XRCRG1 \cdot \left( \frac{I_{DS}}{V_{deff}} + XRCRG2 \cdot \frac{\mu \phi_t C_{ox}}{L^2} \right) \tag{1.9}
\]

Here, XRCRG1 and XRCRG2 are model parameters and \(V_{deff}\) is the effective drain voltage.

### 1.2.2. HiSIM-NQS

HiSIM [56, 67, 68] is a \(\psi_s\)-based model. In fact, HiSIM NQS uses [34]

\[
q_I(t_n) = q_I(t_{n-1}) + \frac{\Delta t}{\tau} \left[ q_I^{(0)}(t_n) - q_I(t_{n-1}) \right] \tag{1.10}
\]

\[
q_B(t_n) = q_B(t_{n-1}) + \frac{\Delta t}{\tau_B} \left[ q_B^{(0)}(t_n) - q_B(t_{n-1}) \right] \tag{1.11}
\]

where \(\tau\) and \(\tau_B\) are the relaxation time for inversion and bulk charges, respectively. After the inversion charge is known, source and drain charges are evaluated by

\[
q_D = F_D^{(0)} \cdot q_I \tag{1.12}
\]

\[
q_S = \left[ 1 - F_D^{(0)} \right] \cdot q_I \tag{1.13}
\]

where \(F_D^{(0)}\) is the QS partitioning factor for drain charge.

The relaxation time, \(\tau\), is evaluated in the same way as (1.5) but with slightly different parameterization of the components for diffusion and drift currents (\(P_{\text{diff}}\) and \(P_{\text{dr}}\) are model parameters) [34]

\[
\tau_{\text{diff}} = \frac{L^2}{P_{\text{diff}} \cdot \mu \cdot \phi_t} \tag{1.14}
\]

\[
\tau_{\text{dr}} = \frac{L^2 \cdot C_{\text{ox}}}{P_{\text{dr}} \cdot \mu \cdot q_I^{(0)}} \tag{1.15}
\]
Fig. 1.1. Schematic for channel segmentation method

Similarly,

\[ \frac{1}{\tau_B} = \frac{1}{\tau_{\text{diff}}} + \frac{1}{\tau_{\text{dr},B}} \]  \hspace{1cm} (1.16)

and

\[ \tau_{\text{dr},B} = \frac{L^2 \cdot C_{\text{ox}}}{P_{\text{dr,B}} \cdot \mu \cdot q^{(0)}_1} \]  \hspace{1cm} (1.17)

where \( P_{\text{dr,B}} \) is an additional model parameter.

The use of RTA (1.11) for \( q_B \) is unphysical as explained in [5]. In particular, it introduces inertia in the response of \( q_B \) to \( \psi_S \) which is not present in real devices.

1.2.3. Channel Segmentation Method

A powerful but computationally expensive method to model a MOS transistor operating under NQS condition is to view its channel as a series connection of segments, each segment being short enough to be modeled quasi-statically [1, 31, 69–78]. The NQS model in MM11 [47, 79, 80] is based on this approach. This idea is illustrated in Fig. 1.1 with each segment modeled by a “subtransistor.” These subtransistors are assumed to consist only of intrinsic parts. In other words, no extrinsic source and drain regions at intermediate points are included. Also, it can be tricky to model short-channel effects.
1.2.4. SP-NQS and PSP-NQS

SP-NQS and PSP-NQS are $\psi_S$-based MOSFET models which are based on SP \[81–85\] and PSP \[52,53,86–88\], respectively. Both models are based on the cubic spine-collocation method which is a weighted residues method. The restraining equations and boundary condition are enforced on the continuity equation at each collocation point to construct a number of (the same number as the user specified collocation points) coupled ordinary differential equations. Detailed descriptions of the model can be found in \[32,33\].

The cubic spline-collocation-method gives physically meaningful approximations and transforms the partial differential continuity equations into a system of ordinary differential equations. Another advantage of this method is that users can choose the number of collocation points to balance simulation speed and accuracy depending on their applications. Still, the spine-collocation NQS model is significantly slower than the QS model (but faster than the channel segmentation method.)

1.3. Existing Small-Signal NQS Models

During small-signal simulations, complex quantities such as the voltage phase and amplitude are used to reduce the complexity of computation \[1,89–91\]; thus, the system matrix becomes complex with a real and imaginary part for each element. In the analysis of high-frequency MOSFET characteristics, the so-called “$y$-parameters” are often used. In this section, we developed the $y$-parameter models for the RTA-based NQS MOSFET model to perform the benchmark test suggested
in [62]. The standard definition of \( y \)-matrix in circuit theory is as follows

\[
y_{jk} = \left. i_j \right|_{v_m=\delta_{mk}}
\]  

(1.18)

For a linear 4-port network, it is assumed that the small-signal terminal currents \( i_d, i_g, i_s, \) and \( i_b \) are linear functions of the applied small-signal terminal voltages \( v_d, v_g, v_s, \) and \( v_b \). Superposition principle may be applied to find a terminal current \( i_j \) when all four of the small-signal voltages are nonzero:

\[
i_j = y_{jd}v_d + y_{jg}v_g + y_{js}v_s + y_{jb}v_b, \quad j \in \{d, g, s, b\}
\]  

(1.19)

The \( y \)-matrix satisfies certain conditions which follow from the following observations:

(1) There is no current flowing if all four small-signal potentials are identical.

(2) The sum of the total 4 small-signal currents have to be zero for a 4-port network.

Consequently, the relations between the \( y \)-parameters are as follows

\[
\sum_k y_{jk} = 0
\]  

(1.20)

\[
\sum_j y_{jk} = 0
\]  

(1.21)

1.3.1. Small-Signal Model in [1]

Physically formulating the \( y_{jk} \) terms is non-trivial, as it requires the solution to the coupled continuity and drift-diffusion equations. Sometimes, numerical results might be practically obtained and used. Analytical solutions are available with simplifying approximations. Presented in [1, 35, 92] is a four-terminal small-signal dc-to-high-frequency model, valid in weak, moderate, and strong inversion regimes.
This model is advantageous in the following aspects. First, it is formulated in a single continuous expression valid for weak, moderate, and strong inversion regimes which is free of discontinuities across the boundaries of different regimes. Second, it is for a 4-terminal MOSFET device which is capable of modeling various substrate effects. Third, it reduces to the QS version of the model at sufficiently low frequencies which contains the nonreciprocal capacitive effects [93].

Various approximations have been made to arrive at the analytic expressions for $y_{jk}$ in [1, 35]. The first assumption is since $\psi_S$ only changes slightly as the gate to bulk voltage, $v_{GB}$, increases in strong inversion, $\psi_S$ is assumed to be pinned at

$$\psi_S \approx \phi_0 + V_{CB} \quad (1.22)$$

where $V_{CB}$ is the channel to bulk voltage,

$$\phi_0 \approx 2\phi_F + \Delta \phi \quad (1.23)$$

with $\Delta \phi$ equal to several $\phi_t$.

Another assumption made is that, in strong inversion, the negative of the normalized inversion charge $u_I$ (for the source referenced model)

$$u_I = v_{GS} - V_{FB} - \phi_0 - \gamma \sqrt{\phi_0 + V_{SB}} - \alpha_0 V_{CS} \quad (1.24)$$

where $V_{FB}$ is the flatband voltage, $\gamma$ is the body effect coefficient, and

$$\alpha_0 = 1 + \frac{\gamma}{2\sqrt{\phi_0 + V_{SB}}} \quad (1.25)$$

. Here, the bulk charge is linearized at its dc biasing point.
The results are

\[ y_{jk} = \frac{\sum_{l=0}^{2} (i\omega)^l N_{jk,l}}{\sum_{l=0}^{2} (j\omega)^l D_l} \]  \tag{1.26a}

where

\[ D_0 = 1 \]  \tag{1.27a}
\[ D_1 = \frac{4}{15\omega_o} \frac{1 + 3\eta_0 + \eta_0^2}{(1 + \eta_0)^3} \]  \tag{1.27b}
\[ D_2 = \frac{1}{45\omega_o^2} \frac{1 + 4\eta_0 + \eta_0^2}{(1 + \eta_0)^4} \]  \tag{1.27c}

and (we consider \( y_{gg} \)) \[1\]

\[ N_{gg0} = 0 \]  \tag{1.28a}
\[ N_{gg1} = C_{C\alpha} \left[ \frac{2}{3\alpha_0} \frac{1 + 4\eta_0 + \eta_0^2}{(1 + \eta_0)^2} + \frac{\alpha_0 - 1}{\alpha_0} \right] \]  \tag{1.28b}
\[ N_{gg2} = \frac{C_{C\alpha}}{\omega_o} \left[ \frac{2}{45\alpha_0} \frac{2 + 11\eta_0 + 2\eta_0^2}{(1 + \eta_0)^3} + \frac{4}{15} \frac{\alpha_0 - 1}{\alpha_0} \frac{1 + 3\eta_0 + \eta_0^2}{(1 + \eta_0)^3} \right] \]  \tag{1.28c}

Here

\[ \eta_0 = \begin{cases} 1 - \frac{V_{DS}}{V_{DS}^\prime}, & V_{DS} \leq V_{DS}^\prime \\ 0, & V_{DS} > V_{DS}^\prime \end{cases} \]  \tag{1.29a}
\[ V_{DS}^\prime = \frac{V_{GS} - V_T}{\alpha_0} \]  \tag{1.30}
\[ \omega_o = \mu \frac{(V_{GS} - V_T)}{L^2} \]  \tag{1.31}

Naturally, these equations are only valid for strong inversion and do not cover all regions of MOSFET operation; in addition they do not account for any small geometry effects and assume constant mobility.
1.3.2. Small-Signal Models in [2, 3]

A set of analytic expressions is presented in [2] for the small-signal analysis of NQS operation of the MOS transistor. This model is derived from the $q_I$-based EKV compact model [94–98]. Expressions for the figures of merit for small-signal analysis are formulated which are valid from weak to strong inversion regimes. The model is derived from the continuity equation and drift-diffusion equation, and relies on the assumptions that underlie $q_I$-based compact models. The results are written in the form of a normalized $y$-matrix, which is expressed in terms of normalized variables including currents and frequency, so that they are independent of the process parameters such as mobility and substrate doping. From this approach, first and second order approximations to the detailed analytical expressions have been obtained.

The results are expressed in terms of Bessel functions of fractional orders and of complex arguments. Such functions are not available in most programming environments, and their numerical evaluation tends to be slow and have poor convergence. Therefore, the results require simplifications in order to become practically useful. In [3], it is proposed that a simple equivalent small-signal circuit is sufficient to express the terms of the transadmittances in [2]. [3] further shows that these functions can be represented in two simple forms, which are valid for all operating regions. Approximate analytical expressions are also proposed in [3].

1.3.3. Small-Signal Model in [4]

In [4], a small-signal MOSFET model is described, which takes the local effects of both velocity saturation and transverse mobility reduction into account.
The model is based on the PSP model and is valid for both QS and NQS operation. Recently, it has been found that, in the presence of velocity saturation, the low-frequency capacitances cannot be determined from the Ward-Dutton charge-partitioning scheme [99, 100]. By use of the small-signal model developed in [4], it is demonstrated that, in the presence of velocity saturation, no terminal drain and source charges exist, from which the capacitances can be derived. The small-signal model enables the determination of the correct capacitive behavior in the presence of velocity saturation. Furthermore, it is demonstrated how the small-signal model can be used to determine the number of collocation points needed in the large-signal NQS PSP model. Finally, inclusion of the local variation of mobility reduction due to the vertical electrical fields provides insight into the approach commonly applied in compact modeling, where these fields are replaced by global ones depending upon the terminal voltages only.

1.4. Present Work

In the present work, we develop a new version of the NQS model based on RTA for the inversion charge (and some other approximations detailed below.) No RTA is used for the bulk charge or (to be consistent with the neutrality condition) for the gate charge. This leads to increased accuracy while retaining the simplicity and speed of the model. Most importantly, the description of the NQS effects in the new formulation becomes reliable in the frequency range up to 1.5-2$f_T$ (in this work $f_T$ is a shorthand for $f_{T,\text{max}}$ for a single transistor as described in [101, 102].) Since practical MOSFET applications for $f > 2f_T$ are rare, this makes the new approach to NQS modeling suitable for most RF applications [59, 103–119].
We note in passing that if for some reason large-signal formulation is not required, then a variety of analytic small-signal models become available even without RTA [3, 4, 25, 35, 41, 44, 49, 50]. These are theoretically significant and in some cases may be practically useful. However, the emphasis in this work is on the complete large-signal formulation required by SPICE-like simulators. The small-signal version of the new model is derived entirely for the purpose of applying the benchmark test of [62].

While the work described in this thesis is based on PSP [52, 53] as the underlying QS model, the approach is quite general and with suitable modifications can be used with any advanced \( \psi_s \)-based model.

In summary, the main objective of the new RTA-based NQS model are as follows:

(1) To formulate an accurate and efficient approach for RF and mixed-signal circuit simulations,

(1-1) To achieve consistency between large-signal and small-signal simulations,

(1-2) To accurately model all terminal currents under NQS conditions up to \( 2f_{T,\text{max}} \),

(1-3) To include all regions of MOSFET operation,

(1-4) To include short-channel-effects (SCEs),

(1-5) To achieve the consistency with QS simulation results for slow transients and low frequencies,

(2) To verify the new NQS model using PSP-NQS, TCAD results and measured data,

(3) To develop a new small-signal y-parameter model based on the new RTA-based
NQS model to perform the benchmark test of [62], and

(4) To implement the model into commonly used circuit simulators and demonstrate the applicability of the new NQS model using circuit simulations.

1.5. Organization of This Thesis

This thesis proceeds as follows. In chapter 2, we formulate the new version of RTA, which is verified by comparison with TCAD simulations and experimental data in chapter 3 while chapter 4 contains results based on the small-signal version of the model. After the modeling of the bulk resistance effect on the high frequency gate capacitances in chapter 5, the conclusions are presented in chapter 6.
CHAPTER 2
The New RTA-Based NQS MOSFET Model

2.1. Terminal Charges

To formulate the RTA, we introduce terminal charges at the source \( q_S \) and at the drain \( q_D \) and the total inversion charge \( q_I = q_S + q_D \). It is assumed that the equation

\[
\frac{dq_T}{dt} = -\frac{q_T - q_T^{(0)}}{\tau}
\]

(\( \tau \) is the relaxation time) is valid for \( T = S, D \) and hence, for \( T = I \). Applying (2.1) to the source and drain charges directly differs from the approach in [34] where (2.1) was used for \( q_I \) and \( q_B \) after which the QS partition of the total inversion charge was adopted to compute \( q_D \) and \( q_S \),

\[
q_D = \frac{q_D^{(0)}}{q_I^{(0)}} \cdot q_I
\]

Strictly speaking, the relaxation time approximation (2.1) is not valid for \( q_B \) since the bulk charge has no inertia to follow the variation of surface potential, hence it doesn’t have a characteristic relaxation time associated with it [5]. This aspect of the new NQS model is further detailed in section 5.2.

The inverse of the relaxation time entering (2.1) is modeled as in [29, 34]:

\[
\frac{1}{\tau} = \frac{12\mu}{L^2} \left[ K_{\text{drift}} \cdot Q_i^{(0)} + K_{\text{diff}} \cdot \phi_t \right]
\]

where \( K_{\text{drift}} \) and \( K_{\text{diff}} \) are model parameters corresponding to the drift and diffusion current components, respectively, \( Q_i^{(0)} = -q_i^{(0)}/C_{ox} \), and \( \phi_t = k_B T/q \) where \( k_B \) is Boltzmann’s constant, \( T \) is the absolute temperature, and \( q \) is the magnitude of the
electronic charge. The form (2.3) is similar to the models of [29,34] but includes the physical factor \( \frac{1}{2} \), which follows from detailed analysis of inversion charge inertia with contacts to both source and drain [1].

The gate charge is

\[
q_G = W \int_0^L q'_G dy
\]  
(2.4)

where \( W \) is channel width and

\[
q'_G = \left( \frac{C_{ox}}{WL} \right) [v_{GB} - V_{FB} - \psi_S(y)]
\]  
(2.5)

where \( \psi_S(y) \) is the surface potential at a point \( y \) along the channel (from \( y = 0 \) at the source to \( y = L \) at the drain). Hence,

\[
q_G = C_{ox} \left( v_{GB} - V_{FB} - \overline{\psi}_S \right)
\]  
(2.6)

where the average value of the surface potential along the channel is

\[
\overline{\psi}_S = \frac{1}{L} \int_0^L \psi_S(y) dy .
\]  
(2.7)

The bulk charge is

\[
q_B = W \int_0^L q'_B dy
\]  
(2.8)

where \( q'_B \) is the bulk charge density per unit area which, unlike the inversion charge, responds practically instantaneously to changes in the surface potential. The functional form of the \( q_B(\psi_S) \) dependence is not affected by NQS effects so

\[
q'_B = -\text{sgn}(\psi_S) C_{ox} \gamma \beta^{-1/2} \sqrt{e^{-\beta \psi_S} + \beta \psi_S - 1} \frac{1}{WL}
\]  
(2.9)
where \( \beta = 1/\phi_t \), thus

\[
q_B = -\frac{\text{sgn}(\psi_S) C_{ox} \gamma \beta^{-1/2}}{L} \int_0^L \frac{e^{-\beta \psi_S} + \beta \psi_S - 1}{\sqrt{e^{-\beta \psi_S} + \beta \psi_S - 1}} \, dy.
\]  

(2.10)

From the first mean-value theorem of integral calculus, there exists a point \( y^* \in (0, L) \) such that

\[
q_B = -\text{sgn}(\psi_S^*) C_{ox} \gamma \beta^{-1/2} \sqrt{e^{-\beta \psi_S^*} + \beta \psi_S^* - 1}
\]

(2.11)

where \( \psi_S^* = \psi_S(y^*) \).

Generally speaking, \( \psi_S^* \) is not known, varies with bias, and differs from \( \bar{\psi}_S \) as defined in (2.7). In the QS case the symmetric linearization method [53, 120] gives

\[
\psi_S^* \approx \psi_M - \frac{(\Delta \psi)^2}{12H} \approx \bar{\psi}_S
\]

(2.12)

where

\[
\psi_M = (\psi_{S0} + \psi_{SL})/2
\]

(2.13)

\[
\Delta \psi = \psi_{SL} - \psi_{S0}
\]

(2.14)

\( \psi_{S0} \) and \( \psi_{SL} \) denote the surface potentials at the source and drain ends of the channel, respectively, and \( H \) is a bias-dependent but position-independent variable whose precise value depends on the details of the velocity-field relation implemented in the compact model. Here, we use \( H \) in the form given in [53].

The additional approximation we make is that

\[
\psi_S^* \approx \bar{\psi}_S
\]

(2.15)

is valid in the more general NQS case. Note that we do not assume that the \( \psi_S^* \) dependence on \( \psi_M \) and \( \Delta \psi \) remains unchanged in the NQS case, which means that (2.15) is a weaker condition than (2.12).
We believe that (2.15) is preferable to assuming that (2.1) applies to the bulk charge. Indeed, (2.15) produces some numerical error in the evaluation of $q_B$ while using RTA for $q_B$ introduces an unphysical inertia in the response of $q_B$ to the surface potential variation. The approximate validity of the NQS model based on (2.1) and (2.15) is justified by comparison with TCAD simulations, experimental data, and a benchmark test in subsequent sections.

The charge neutrality condition

$$q_G + q_I + q_B = 0$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.16)

with (2.6) and (2.15) gives

$$C_{ox} (v_{GB} - V_{FB} - \psi_S) + q_I + q_B(\psi_S) = 0$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.17)

where $q_B(\psi_S)$ is given by (2.11) with $\psi_S^*$ replaced by $\psi_S$. Note that while the corresponding equation for the charge densities per unit area, $q'_I$ and $q'_B$,

$$(C_{ox}/WL) (v_{GB} - V_{FB} - \psi_S) + q'_I + q'_B(\psi_S) = 0$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.18)

is exact, the equation (2.17) for the charges is approximate and is based on (2.15).

The terminal charges are computed as follows: the RTA equations (2.1) are solved for $q_I$ and $q_D$; with $q_I$ known, $\psi_S$ is determined from (2.17) using an accurate analytical approximation originally developed for varactor modeling [59]; with $\psi_S$ thus determined $q_G$ is evaluated from (2.6); and, finally, $q_B$ is calculated from (2.16). All small-geometry and secondary effects are inherited from the QS model used to compute $\mu$, $q_I^{(0)}$, and $q_B^{(0)}$. The resulting NQS model is coded in Verilog-A to make it portable across circuit simulators. While the simulations presented below were
performed using the Verilog-A compilers of two widely used simulators: Spectre and ADS, we have also used automatically generated C-code \cite{121} with identical results. Typical execution time increases by about 40% relative to the QS PSP model \cite{52, 53} which is acceptable for NQS simulations; the exact computational overhead compared to QS modeling depends on details of the circuit, analysis performed, computing platform, compiler, and similar factors.

In this section, we have obtained large-signal NQS terminal charges. This is summarized in Table 2.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sequence</th>
<th>Terminal Charge</th>
<th>Equation(s)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$q_D$</td>
<td>(2.1)</td>
<td>$q_D$ satisfies (2.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$q_S$</td>
<td>Equivalently by (2.1)</td>
<td>$q_S$ satisfies (2.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$q_G$</td>
<td>(2.6) and (2.17)</td>
<td>(2.11) and (2.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$q_B$</td>
<td>(2.16)</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2. Terminal Currents

Terminal currents are given by

\[
i_D = I_D + \frac{dq_D}{dt} \tag{2.19}
\]

\[
i_G = I_G + \frac{dq_G}{dt} \tag{2.20}
\]

\[
i_S = I_S + \frac{dq_S}{dt} \tag{2.21}
\]

\[
i_B = I_B + \frac{dq_B}{dt} \tag{2.22}
\]

where $I_D$, $I_G$, $I_S$, and $I_B$ are convection currents which are computed by the PSP-QS model.
2.3. Small-Geometry Effects, Parasitics, and Noise

Model equations for the small-geometry effects (such as the polysilicon depletion effect [122–125], quantum mechanical corrections [126–129], etc.) are inherited from the PSP-QS model and their description is not affected by the RTA approach. Parasitics [130–132] are also modeled automatically. An NQS noise model [110, 133–148] is not included in the present work. More precisely, small-geometry effects, parasitics, and noise models are included in $i_D^{(0)}$, $i_G^{(0)}$, $i_S^{(0)}$, $i_B^{(0)}$, $q_D^{(0)}$, $q_G^{(0)}$, $q_S^{(0)}$, and $q_B^{(0)}$. The geometry dependence of $\tau$ is given by (2.3).
3.1. Model Validation with TCAD

The new RTA-based NQS model has been implemented in PSP103 [53] and is called PSP-RTA-NQS. Comparisons with two-dimensional (2-D) TCAD [149] results for large-signal simulations are shown in Figs. 3.1-3.4 and for small-signal simulations in Figs. 3.5-3.8. In all cases, \( W=1 \, \mu m, \, L=5 \, \mu m, \, V_{SB}=0, \, t_{ox}=2 \, \text{nm}, \)
\( \mu=0.104 \, \text{m}^2/V\text{-s}, \, N_{\text{sub}}=3 \times 10^{23} \, \text{m}^{-3}, \) and \( T=300 \, \text{K}. \) The relatively large \( L \) was selected to emphasize the NQS effects.

Figs. 3.1 and 3.2 show the terminal currents during switching from depletion to strong inversion operation for \( dV_G/dt = 10^{10} \, \text{V/s}; \) results from the QS version of PSP are also shown for comparison. There is good agreement between PSP-RTA-NQS and TCAD simulations, and the improvement over PSP-QS is apparent. Fig. 3.3 shows transient gate and bulk current during switching from accumulation to strong inversion for a ramp rate of \( 2 \times 10^{10} \, \text{V/s}. \) As expected, NQS effects appear only when the inversion charge becomes significant. This further illustrates the fact that there is no inertia involved in the formation of the bulk charge (at least until the Maxwell relaxation becomes relevant) [5].

RTA-based models are approximations and become less accurate as voltage ramp rates increase, see Fig. 3.4 for gate and bulk currents for a ramp rate of \( 5 \times 10^{11} \, \text{V/s}. \) Even in this extreme case, the qualitative behavior of the PSP-RTA-NQS model remains reasonable.

While an ability to model the large-signal response to a fast transient is im-
Fig. 3.1. Drain and source terminal currents for $v_{GS}$ switching from 0 to 3 V at $10^{10}$ V/s; $V_{DS}=3$ V and $V_{BS}=0$.

Important for NQS models, RF circuit design requires small-signal modeling, including transcapacitances, at high frequencies. Figs. 3.5 and 3.6 show $C_{gg}$ and $C_{gs}$, respectively, for $f$ from 0 to $2f_T$; the new model fits the TCAD results well, with some inaccuracy at the onset of strong inversion at the highest frequency. Fig. 3.7 shows $C_{bg}$ over a significantly extended frequency range; although neither the gate nor the bulk charge are affected by the inertia in the inversion charge, if the partitioning of the NQS inversion charge into source and drain components is done incorrectly, then this induces errors in modeling $C_{bg}$ at high frequencies; the inset in Fig. 3.7 shows that this is not the case for PSP-RTA-NQS.

A further interesting detail that demonstrates how NQS inversion charge par-
Fig. 3.2. Gate and bulk terminal currents for \( v_{GS} \) switching from 0 to 3 V at \( 10^{10} \) V/s, \( V_{DS}=3 \) V.

Partitioning qualitatively affects capacitance modeling is shown in Fig. 3.8. In our model formulation, as described in the previous section, the issue of partitioning does not arise since both \( q_D \) and \( q_I \) are individually computed from (2.1) and \( q_D^{(0)} \) and \( q_I^{(0)} \) are directly provided by the underlying QS model. This results in the physical monotonic behavior of \( C_{ds} \) as a function of the dc bias \( V_{GS} \) in Fig. 3.8. In contrast, if the ratio \( q_D/q_I \) is assumed to be its QS value, as is done in previous RTA NQS models, then \( C_{ds} \) acquires an unphysical peak which becomes more pronounced as frequency increases.
Fig. 3.3. Gate and bulk terminal currents for $v_{GS}$ switching from -3 to 3 V at $2 \times 10^{10}$ V/s; $V_{DS}=$ 3 V.
Fig. 3.4. Gate and bulk terminal currents for $v_{GS}$ switching from 0 to 5 V at $5 \times 10^{11}$ V/s; $V_{DS}=5$ V.
Fig. 3.5. $C_{gg}$ for $f=0, 0.5f_T, 1.0f_T, 1.5f_T$ and $2.0f_T$ (top to bottom), where $f_T=1.6$ GHz; $V_{DS}=0.5$ V. The weak frequency dependence in accumulation is completely due to the bulk resistance effect (extracted $R_{bulk} = 116.8$ Ω from TCAD data) [5].
Fig. 3.6. $C_{gs}$ for $f=0, 0.5f_T, 1.0f_T, 1.5f_T$ and $2.0f_T$ (top to bottom), where $f_T = 1.6$ GHz; $V_{DS}=0.5$ V.
Fig. 3.7. $C_{bg}$ for $f = 0$, $3.1f_T$, $6.3f_T$, $12.5f_T$, $18.8f_T$, $25f_T$ and $31f_T$ (top to bottom in accumulation region, bottom to top in strong inversion inset), where $f_T = 1.6$ GHz; $V_{DS} = 0.5$ V. The significant decrease in the accumulation is completely due to the bulk resistance effect (extracted $R_{bulk} = 116.8$ Ω from TCAD data) [5].
Fig. 3.8. $C_{ds}$ from partitioning based on (2.1) (solid lines) and (2.2) (dot-dash lines), $f_T = 1.6$ GHz; $V_{DS}=0$. 
3.2. Model Validation with Experimental Data

To further validate the accuracy of the new model, we measured $s$-parameters, over a range of gate and drain biases and frequency with $V_{BS}=0$, for a PMOS transistor in a 90nm RF CMOS process. Fig. 3.9 shows the layout view of the device.

Fig. 3.9. Test device with GSG probe pad configuration. Courtesy of Freescale semiconductors, presented with permission.
The device was laid out in a 2-port ground-signal-ground (GSG) probe configuration, with the gate configured as port 1 and the drain as port 2; the structure included 6 gate fingers and a surrounding bulk contact ring, with two devices connected in parallel. De-embedding was done using a 2-step open-short technique [150].

![Graph showing comparison of model and measured data for a PMOS $g_{gg}$ when $V_{DS} = -0.6$ V. Frequencies are 0.1, 0.5, 1 and 2 GHz where $f_T = 0.71$ GHz. $L = 1.2 \ \mu m$, $W = 10 \ \mu m$.]

Figs. 3.10 through 3.33 show measured data from the device (cf. Fig. 3.9), along with simulation results from both the PSP-RTA-NQS model and, for comparison, PSP-NQS with the spine collocation points $N = 9$ which is the maximum allowed number. The $y$-parameters are shown over frequency both vs. $V_{GS}$, for fixed $V_{DS}$, and vs. $V_{DS}$, for fixed $V_{GS}$, with the fixed voltage value chosen to be that for
Fig. 3.11. Comparison of model and measured data for a PMOS $C_{gg}$ when $V_{DS} = -0.6$ V. Frequencies are 0.1, 0.5, 1 and 2 GHz where $f_T = 0.71$ GHz. $L = 1.2 \ \mu m$, $W = 10 \ \mu m$.

which there was the maximum change in qualitative behavior over both frequency and the swept bias. $C_{jk}$ was calculated as $(2\delta_{jk} - 1) \text{Im}(y_{jk})/\omega$, with $y_{jk}$ computed from transformation of the de-embedded $s$-parameters; $f_T$ for the device is 0.71 GHz. $R_{\text{bulk}}$ and $R_{\text{gate}}$ were adjusted to provide a least squares fit to the data. The frequency and bias dependence of the measured data are fitted well, both qualitatively and quantitatively, by PSP-RTA-NQS, and in many of the plots it fits the data better than PSP-NQS, even though the latter is a significantly more complex model. For example, the peak in $g_{gg}(V_{GS})$ in Fig. 3.10 near threshold is able to be modeled by PSP-RTA-NQS.
In particular, Figs. 3.10 through 3.17 are the fitted frequency and gate bias dependance of conductances and normalized capacitances when $V_{DS} = -0.6 \text{V}$.

Fig. 3.12. Comparison of model and measured data for a PMOS $g_{gd}$ when $V_{DS} = -0.6 \text{V}$. Frequencies are 0.1, 0.5, 1 and 2 GHz where $f_T = 0.71 \text{ GHz}$. $L = 1.2 \mu\text{m}$, $W = 10 \mu\text{m}$. 
Fig. 3.13. Comparison of model and measured data for a PMOS $C_{gd}$ when $V_{ds} = -0.6$ V. Frequencies are 0.1, 0.5, 1 and 2 GHz where $f_T = 0.71$ GHz. $L = 1.2 \ \mu m$, $W = 10 \ \mu m$. 
Fig. 3.14. Comparison of model and measured data for a PMOS $g_{ds}$ when $V_{DS} = -0.6 \text{ V}$. Frequencies are 0.1, 0.5, 1 and 2 GHz where $f_T = 0.71 \text{ GHz}$. $L = 1.2 \mu\text{m}$, $W = 10 \mu\text{m}$. 
Fig. 3.15. Comparison of model and measured data for a PMOS $C_{dg}$ when $V_{DS} = -0.6$ V. Frequencies are 0.1, 0.5, 1 and 2 GHz where $f_T = 0.71$ GHz. $L = 1.2 \ \mu$m, $W = 10 \ \mu$m.
Fig. 3.16. Comparison of model and measured data for a PMOS $g_{dd}$ when $V_{DS} = -0.6$ V. Frequencies are 0.1, 0.5, 1 and 2 GHz where $f_T = 0.71$ GHz. $L = 1.2 \ \mu m$, $W = 10 \ \mu m$. 
Fig. 3.17. Comparison of model and measured data for a PMOS $C_{dd}$ when $V_{DS} = -0.6$ V. Frequencies are 0.1, 0.5, 1 and 2 GHz where $f_T = 0.71$ GHz. $L = 1.2$ µm, $W = 10$ µm.
Figs. 3.18 through 3.25 are the fitted frequency and drain bias dependence of conductances and normalized capacitances when $V_{GS} = -0.8$V.

Fig. 3.18. Comparison of model and measured data for a PMOS $g_{gg}$ when $V_{GS} = -0.8$ V. Frequencies are 0.1, 0.5, 1 and 2 GHz where $f_T = 0.71$ GHz. $L = 1.2 \, \mu m$, $W = 10 \, \mu m$. 
Fig. 3.19. Comparison of model and measured data for a PMOS $C_{gg}$ when $V_{GS} = -0.8$ V. Frequencies are 0.1, 0.5, 1 and 2 GHz where $f_T = 0.71$ GHz. $L = 1.2 \text{ } \mu\text{m}$, $W = 10 \text{ } \mu\text{m}$. 
Fig. 3.20. Comparison of model and measured data for a PMOS $g_{gd}$ when $V_{GS} = -0.8$ V. Frequencies are 0.1, 0.5, 1 and 2 GHz where $f_T = 0.71$ GHz. $L = 1.2 \mu m$, $W = 10 \mu m$. 
Fig. 3.21. Comparison of model and measured data for a PMOS $C_{gd}$ when $V_{GS} = -0.8 \text{ V}$. Frequencies are 0.1, 0.5, 1 and 2 GHz where $f_T = 0.71 \text{ GHz}$. $L = 1.2 \mu\text{m}$, $W = 10 \mu\text{m}$. 
Fig. 3.22. Comparison of model and measured data for a PMOS $g_{dg}$ when $V_{GS} = -0.8$ V. Frequencies are 0.1, 0.5, 1 and 2 GHz where $f_T = 0.71$ GHz. $L = 1.2 \ \mu$m, $W = 10 \ \mu$m.
Fig. 3.23. Comparison of model and measured data for a PMOS $C_{dg}$ when $V_{GS} = -0.8$ V. Frequencies are 0.1, 0.5, 1 and 2 GHz where $f_T = 0.71$ GHz. $L = 1.2 \, \mu m$, $W = 10 \, \mu m$. 
Fig. 3.24. Comparison of model and measured data for a PMOS $g_{dd}$ when $V_{GS} = -0.8$ V. Frequencies are 0.1, 0.5, 1 and 2 GHz where $f_T = 0.71$ GHz. $L = 1.2 \, \mu m$, $W = 10 \, \mu m$. 
Fig. 3.25. Comparison of model and measured data for a PMOS $C_{dd}$ when $V_{GS} = -0.8$ V. Frequencies are 0.1, 0.5, 1 and 2 GHz where $f_T = 0.71$ GHz. $L = 1.2 \mu$m, $W = 10 \mu$m.
Figs. 3.26 through 3.33 are the fitted frequency and drain bias dependence of conductances and normalized capacitances when $V_{GS} = -0.9$V.

Fig. 3.26. Comparison of model and measured data for a PMOS $g_{gs}$ when $V_{GS} = -0.9$V. Frequencies are 0.1, 0.5, 1 and 2 GHz where $f_T = 0.71$ GHz. $L = 1.2 \mu$m, $W = 10 \mu$m.
Fig. 3.27. Comparison of model and measured data for a PMOS $C_{gg}$ when $V_{GS} = -0.9$ V. Frequencies are 0.1, 0.5, 1 and 2 GHz where $f_T = 0.71$ GHz. $L = 1.2 \ \mu$m, $W = 10 \ \mu$m.
Fig. 3.28. Comparison of model and measured data for a PMOS $g_{gd}$ when $V_{GS} = -0.9$ V. Frequencies are 0.1, 0.5, 1 and 2 GHz where $f_T = 0.71$ GHz. $L = 1.2$ $\mu$m, $W = 10$ $\mu$m.
Fig. 3.29. Comparison of model and measured data for a PMOS $C_{gd}$ when $V_{GS} = -0.9$ V. Frequencies are 0.1, 0.5, 1 and 2 GHz where $f_T = 0.71$ GHz. $L = 1.2 \mu$m, $W = 10 \mu$m.
Fig. 3.30. Comparison of model and measured data for a PMOS $g_{dg}$ when $V_{GS} = -0.9$ V. Frequencies are 0.1, 0.5, 1 and 2 GHz where $f_T = 0.71$ GHz. $L = 1.2 \ \mu m$, $W = 10 \ \mu m$. 
Fig. 3.31. Comparison of model and measured data for a PMOS $C_{dg}$ when $V_{GS} = -0.9$ V. Frequencies are 0.1, 0.5, 1 and 2 GHz where $f_T = 0.71$ GHz. $L = 1.2 \, \mu m$, $W = 10 \, \mu m$.  
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Fig. 3.32. Comparison of model and measured data for a PMOS $g_{dd}$ when $V_{GS} = -0.9$ V. Frequencies are 0.1, 0.5, 1 and 2 GHz where $f_T = 0.71$ GHz. $L = 1.2 \, \mu m$, $W = 10 \, \mu m$. 

Fig. 3.33. Comparison of model and measured data for a PMOS $C_{dd}$ when $V_{GS} = -0.9$ V. Frequencies are 0.1, 0.5, 1 and 2 GHz where $f_T = 0.71$ GHz. $L = 1.2$ $\mu$m, $W = 10$ $\mu$m.
3.3. Parameter Extraction for RTA-Based NQS MOSFET Models

It is interesting to mention that the fitting results in Sec. 3.2 not only complete the model validation but also suggest a physical extraction methodology for an advanced RTA-based NQS model. In fact, high frequency MOS transistor behavior is also affected by the gate resistance $R_{\text{gate}}$ [5]. In this section, we present a technique to self-consistently determine both $K_{\text{drift}}$ in (2.3) and $R_{\text{gate}}$ from measured data; the approach uses bias dependent $Q_{t_1}^{(0)}$ and effective mobility $\mu$ as computed by the PSP model.

3.3.1. Analysis

The RTA-based model introduces a relaxation time that in strong inversion is

$$\tau_{\text{nqs}} = \frac{\tau_0}{K_{\text{drift}}}, \quad \tau_0 = \frac{L^2}{12\mu Q_{t_1}^{(0)}} \quad (3.1)$$

For a MOSFET in strong inversion with $V_{BS} = 0$ the $y$-parameter matrix accounting for NQS effects in the relaxation time approximation to first order is

$$\begin{bmatrix} y_{gg} & y_{gd} \\ y_{dg} & y_{dd} \end{bmatrix} = \frac{1}{p_1} \begin{bmatrix} j\omega [C_{gs}^{(0)} p_2 + C_{gd}^{(0)} p_3 + C_{gd}^{(0)} p_1] & -j\omega C_{gd}^{(0)} p_3 \\ g_{m}^{(0)} - j\omega C_{gd}^{(0)} p_3 & g_{sd}^{(0)} + j\omega (C_{gd}^{(0)} + C_{bd}^{(0)}) p_3 \end{bmatrix} \quad (3.2)$$

where $p_1 = 1 + j\omega \tau_1$, $p_2 = 1 + j\omega \tau_2$, and $p_3 = 1 + j\omega \tau_3$; the symbols have their usual meaning, the superscript (0) denotes the quasi-equilibrium value, and the time constants $\tau_{123}$, defined in [1], are $V_{DS}$ dependent factors multiplied by $\tau_0$. The simplest terms in (3.2) to analyze are clearly $y_{dg}$ and $y_{gd}$. The latter is small in saturation, so is not reliably measurable there, however $C_{dg}^{(0)}$ is large and easily measurable for all drain biases. In particular, it has a maximum at $V_{DS} = 0$ and at
that bias $g_{m}^{(0)} = 0$. Extraction of NQS effects from measured data is therefore most easily and directly done by analyzing $y_{dg}$ for $V_{DS} = 0$.

Both real and imaginary parts of $y_{dg}$ as a function of $\omega$ could be used for NQS behavior characterization (although $\text{Re}(y_{dg}^{(0)}) = 0$ for $V_{DS} = 0$, at higher frequencies capacitive currents “bleed over” into the real components of all $y$-parameters, giving them a characteristic $\omega^2$ dependence). From measurement, the imaginary component has the cleanest behavior, and it is also the easiest to analyze. Including the effect of $R_{\text{gate}}$ gives

$$C_{dg} = -\frac{\text{Im}(y_{dg})}{\omega} = \frac{C_{dg}^{(0)}}{1 + \tau_{\text{eff}}^2 \omega^2} + O(\omega^4) \quad (3.3)$$

where $\tau_{\text{eff}} = \tau_{\text{nqs}} + R_{\text{gate}}C_{gg}$ is a function of $V_{\text{GS}}$ (through both $\mu$ and $Q_{i}^{(0)}$ in (3.1)).

Rearranging gives

$$\frac{C_{dg}^{(0)}}{C_{dg}} - 1 = \tau_{\text{eff}}^2 \omega^2 \quad (3.4)$$

and this is the basic relationship we use to determine the NQS and $R_{\text{gate}}$ parameters.

3.3.2. Extraction Algorithm

From $C_{dg}$ at $V_{DS} = 0$ over $V_{GS}$ and $\omega$, at each $V_{GS}$, extrapolation of $1/C_{dg}$ vs. $\omega^2$ to $\omega = 0$ gives $1/C_{dg}^{(0)}$. $V_{GS}$ should be where the device is reasonably into strong inversion and $\omega$ should be from well below $f_T$ (so extrapolation to determine $C_{dg}^{(0)}$ is accurate) to roughly $2f_T$ (for higher frequencies higher order terms make (3.3) and (3.4) inaccurate). Knowing $C_{dg}^{(0)}$, from (3.4) regression of $C_{dg}^{(0)}/C_{dg} - 1$ on $\omega^2$ gives $\tau_{\text{eff}}$ as a function of $V_{GS}$ (cf. Fig. 3.34).

In modern technologies with low supply voltages MOS transistors never reach very strong inversion operation, so the assumption that $Q_{i}^{(0)} = V_{GS} - V_T$ is not
accurate, and mobility $\mu$ is not constant but depends on $V_{GS}$. In addition, the RTA NQS model (3.1) is applied to PSP [53] and not to an approximate, simple analytical model; NQS parameters should therefore be extracted to be consistent with $\mu Q_i^{(0)}$ as modeled by PSP. By calculating $\mu Q_i^{(0)}$ from PSP, with parameters extracted to fit dc and low frequency capacitance data, $\tau_0$ in (3.1) can be computed and then from

$$\tau_{\text{eff}} = R_{\text{gate}} C_{gg}^{(0)} + \frac{\tau_0(V_{GS})}{K_{\text{drift}}}$$

(3.5)

$R_{\text{gate}}$ and $K_{\text{drift}}$ can be determined from the intercept and reciprocal of the slope of $\tau_{\text{eff}}$ vs. $\tau_0$ (with $C_{gg}^{(0)}$ extrapolated from the measured data at the highest $V_{GS}$; as $V_{GS}$ increases $C_{gg}$ approaches $C_{gg}^{(0)}$ irrespective of frequency).

3.3.3. Experimental Results

Fig. 3.35 shows a plot of $\tau_{\text{eff}}$ vs. $\tau_0$ for a $W/L = 10\mu$m/$1.2\mu$m pMOS transistor in a 90nm RFCMOS technology; the extracted parameter values are $R_{\text{gate}} = 5.9\Omega$ and $K_{\text{drift}} = 0.959$ (which indicates that the underlying NQS model is quite accurate, if it were perfect then $K_{\text{drift}}$ should equal 1 exactly). It is apparent that our analysis leads to a highly linear relationship, and the extracted value of $R_{\text{gate}}$ is close to the value of 5.54$\Omega$ determined from brute force nonlinear least-squares optimization [5] to gate capacitance at $V_{DS} = 0$ over $V_{GS}$ and frequency. If a constant mobility and $Q_i^{(0)} = V_{GS} - V_T$ are assumed the extracted value of $R_{\text{gate}}$ is 10.3$\Omega$, which is significantly in error.

In this section, we have presented a new and simple technique to characterize NQS and $R_{\text{gate}}$ MOS model parameters from measured data. $\mu Q_i^{(0)}$ from PSP is used
both to ensure consistency between the extracted parameters and the model they will be used for and to avoid the assumptions that mobility is constant and $Q_i^{(0)} = V_{GS} - V_T$, which are inaccurate for modern devices. As far as we are aware, this is the first procedure reported for self-consistent direct extraction of NQS relaxation time and $R_{gate}$ parameters.

Fig. 3.34. Extracted and modeled $C_{dg}^{(0)}/C_{dg} - 1$, pMOS transistor; $V_{DS} = 0$, $V_{SG} = 1.5V$, $f = 0.1, 0.5, 1.0, 2.0$GHz.
Fig. 3.35. Extracted and modeled effective NQS relaxation times, pMOS transistor; $V_{DS} = 0$, $V_{SG} = 0.6$ to 1.5V by 0.1V top right to bottom left.
4.1. Small-Signal RTA-Based NQS Model

Practical applications of NQS models rely on the large-signal formulation, which is the one implemented directly in circuit simulators. The small-signal model is provided directly by the circuit simulator by linearization of the large-signal model. Nevertheless, there are some situations where it is advantageous to have an analytical small-signal model. The small-signal model derived in this chapter is particularly useful to perform an RF benchmark test on NQS MOSFET models.

4.1.1. Model Formulation and Terminal Charges

Fig. 4.1. Intrinsic MOSFET with dc biases and small-signal voltages.

Let us consider a MOSFET driven by a dc bias and small-signal excitation
at each terminal, as shown in Fig. 4.1. One could assume that the small-signal voltages are sinusoids and consider the corresponding small-signal terminal currents. However, the algebra turns out to be unnecessarily complicated. We will thus follow, instead, a standard practice and consider a fictitious complex exponential excitation [1, 89–91, 151]. Thus, the small signal voltages, charges, and currents are given by \((j \in \{d, g, s, b\})\):

\[
v_j(t) = \text{Re} (\Delta v_j e^{i\omega t})
\]

\[
q_j(t) = \text{Re} (\Delta q_j e^{i\omega t})
\]

\[
i_j(t) = \text{Re} (\Delta i_j e^{i\omega t})
\]

where \(\Delta v_j\) denotes the complex amplitude and \(\omega\) is the angular frequency. Similarly, \(\Delta q_j\) and \(\Delta i_j = i\omega \Delta q_j\) denote the complex amplitudes of the corresponding charges and terminal currents. We also use

\[
q_i = q_s + q_d = \text{Re} (\Delta q_i e^{i\omega t})
\]

where

\[
\Delta q_i = \Delta q_s + \Delta q_d
\]

From (2.1)

\[
\Delta q_j = \frac{\Delta q_j^{(0)}}{1 + i\omega \tau}; j \in \{s, d, i\}
\]

where \(\Delta q_j^{(0)}\) denotes the QS value of \(\Delta q_j\). Just as (2.1), (4.4) does not apply for \(j = g\) or \(j = b\). Instead, we use the linearized form of (2.6)

\[
\Delta q_g = C_{ox} \cdot (\Delta v_{gb} - \Delta \psi_S)
\]
where $\Delta \psi_S$ is the surface potential phasor and the linearized form of (2.17)

$$C_{ox} \cdot (\Delta v_{gb} - \Delta \psi_S) + \Delta q_i + \Delta q_b = 0 \quad (4.6)$$

Here, according to (2.11) and (2.15)

$$\Delta q_b/C_{ox} = -\xi \cdot \Delta \psi_S \quad (4.7)$$

where

$$\xi = \text{sgn}(\psi_S) \gamma \beta^{1/2} \left[ 1 - \exp(-\beta \psi_S) \right] / \left( 2 \sqrt{\exp(-\beta \psi_S) + \beta \psi_S - 1} \right) \quad (4.8)$$

The validity of (4.7) is based on the fact that the response of the majority carriers (and hence of $q_B$) to the surface potential is, essentially, instantaneous.

From (4.6) and (4.7)

$$\Delta \psi_S = \frac{\Delta v_{gb} + \Delta q_i/C_{ox}}{1 + \xi} \quad (4.9)$$

and

$$\Delta q_g = (1 - \eta) \cdot \Delta v_{gb} \cdot C_{ox} - \eta \cdot \Delta q_i \quad (4.10)$$

where

$$\eta = \frac{1}{1 + \xi} \quad (4.11)$$

With reference to (4.4)

$$\Delta q_g = (1 - \eta) \cdot \Delta v_{gb} \cdot C_{ox} - \frac{\eta \Delta q_i^{(0)}}{1 + i\omega \tau} \quad (4.12)$$

while from the neutrality condition $\Delta q_b = -\Delta q_i - \Delta q_g$ or

$$\Delta q_b = -(1 - \eta) \cdot \left[ \Delta v_{gb} \cdot C_{ox} + \frac{\Delta q_i^{(0)}}{1 + i\omega \tau} \right] \quad (4.13)$$

So far, we have formulated the small-signal RTA-based NQS MOSFET model.

The terminal charges are summarized in Table 4.1.
### TABLE 4.1
**Small-Signal Terminal Charges**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Terminal Charge</th>
<th>Equation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \Delta q_d )</td>
<td>(4.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \Delta q_s )</td>
<td>(4.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \Delta q_g )</td>
<td>(4.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \Delta q_b )</td>
<td>(4.13)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 4.1.2. \( y \)-Parameters

Denoting

\[
g_{jk} = \text{Re}(y_{jk})
\]

(4.14)

and

\[
c_{jk} = \frac{\text{Im}(y_{jk})}{\omega \cdot C_{ox}}
\]

(4.15)

we have

\[
y_{jk} = g_{jk} + i \omega C_{ox} c_{jk}
\]

(4.16)

with these notations, the traditionally defined transcapacitances become

\[
C_{jk} = (2\delta_{jk} - 1) \cdot c_{jk} \cdot C_{ox}
\]

(4.17)

In terms of complex amplitudes,

\[
y_{jk} = g_{jk}^{(0)} + i \omega \Delta q_j \big|_{\Delta v_m = \delta_{mk}}
\]

(4.18)

whereas

\[
g_{jk} = g_{jk}^{(0)} - \omega \text{Im} \left( \Delta q_j \big|_{\Delta v_m = \delta_{mk}} \right)
\]

(4.19)

\[
c_{jk} = \frac{1}{C_{ox}} \text{Re} \left( \Delta q_j \big|_{\Delta v_m = \delta_{mk}} \right)
\]

(4.20)
In what follows, we present detailed derivation of $y_{gg}$ and $y_{bb}$. The remaining elements of the $y$-matrix will be discussed in a more condensed manner.

Starting with (4.16)

$$y_{gg} = g_{gg} + i\omega C_{ox} c_{gg}$$  \hspace{1cm} (4.21)$$

where from (4.19) and (4.20)

$$g_{gg} = g_{gg}^{(0)} - \omega \cdot \text{Im}\left(\Delta q_g|_{\Delta v_m=\delta_{mg}}\right)$$  \hspace{1cm} (4.22)$$

$$c_{gg} = \frac{1}{C_{ox}} \text{Re}\left(\Delta q_g|_{\Delta v_m=\delta_{mg}}\right)$$  \hspace{1cm} (4.23)$$

Substituting $\Delta q_g$ from (4.12)

$$g_{gg} = g_{gg}^{(0)} - \eta \cdot \Delta q_i^{(0)} \cdot \frac{\omega^2 \tau}{1 + (\omega \tau)^2}$$  \hspace{1cm} (4.24)$$

$$c_{gg} = (1 - \eta) - \frac{\eta}{C_{ox}} \cdot \Delta q_i^{(0)} \cdot \frac{1}{1 + (\omega \tau)^2}$$  \hspace{1cm} (4.25)$$

Substituting

$$\Delta q_i^{(0)} = c_i^{(0)} C_{ox}\Delta v_k = c_i^{(0)} C_{ox}$$  \hspace{1cm} (4.26)$$

and assuming the steady-state gate tunneling current is negligible

$$g_{gg}^{(0)} = \frac{\partial I_G}{\partial V_G} = 0$$  \hspace{1cm} (4.27)$$

yield

$$g_{gg} = -\eta \cdot c_i^{(0)} C_{ox} \cdot \frac{\omega^2 \tau}{1 + (\omega \tau)^2}$$  \hspace{1cm} (4.28)$$

$$c_{gg} = (1 - \eta) - \eta \cdot c_i^{(0)} \cdot \frac{1}{1 + (\omega \tau)^2}$$  \hspace{1cm} (4.29)$$
To evaluate $y_{bb}$, we start with

$$y_{bb} = g_{bb} + i\omega C_{ox} c_{bb}$$

(4.30)

where

$$g_{bb} = g_{bb}^{(0)} - \omega \cdot \text{Im}\left(\Delta q_{bb} \middle| \Delta v_m = \delta_{mb}\right)$$

(4.31)

$$c_{bb} = \frac{1}{C_{ox}} \text{Re}\left(\Delta q_{bb} \middle| \Delta v_m = \delta_{mb}\right)$$

(4.32)

Substituting the expression for $\Delta q_{bb}$ from (4.13)

$$g_{bb} = \omega \cdot (1 - \eta) \cdot \Delta q_{i}^{(0)} \cdot \text{Im}\left(\frac{1}{1 + i\omega \tau}\right)$$

(4.33)

$$c_{bb} = -\frac{1 - \eta}{C_{ox}} \cdot \left[-C_{ox} + \Delta q_{i}^{(0)} \text{Re}\left(\frac{1}{1 + i\omega \tau}\right)\right]$$

(4.34)

Substituting

$$\Delta q_{i}^{(0)} = c_{ig}^{(0)} C_{ox} \Delta v_{b} = c_{ib}^{(0)} C_{ox}$$

(4.35)

and assuming the steady-state bulk tunneling current is negligible

$$g_{bb}^{(0)} = \frac{\partial I_{B}}{\partial V_{B}} = 0$$

(4.36)

yield

$$g_{bb} = -(1 - \eta) \cdot c_{ib}^{(0)} \cdot \frac{\omega^{2} \tau C_{ox}}{1 + (\omega \tau)^{2}}$$

(4.37)

$$c_{bb} = (1 - \eta) \cdot \left[1 - \frac{c_{ib}^{(0)}}{1 + (\omega \tau)^{2}}\right]$$

(4.38)

To evaluate $y_{dd}$, from (4.16)

$$y_{dd} = g_{dd} + i\omega C_{ox} c_{dd}$$

(4.39)
where from (4.19)

\[
g_{dd} = g_{dd}^{(0)} - \omega \cdot \text{Im} \left( \frac{\Delta q_d}{\Delta v_m = \delta_{md}} \right) = g_{dd}^{(0)} - \omega \cdot \Delta q_{d}^{(0)} \bigg|_{\Delta v_m = \delta_{md}} \cdot \text{Im} \left( \frac{1}{1 + i\omega \tau} \right) = g_{dd}^{(0)} + \Delta q_{d}^{(0)} \bigg|_{\Delta v_m = \delta_{md}} \cdot \frac{\omega^2 \tau}{1 + (\omega \tau)^2} = g_{dd}^{(0)} + c_{dd}^{(0)} \cdot \frac{\omega^2 \tau C_{ox}}{1 + (\omega \tau)^2} \tag{4.40}
\]

Here,

\[
g_{dd}^{(0)} = \frac{\partial I_D}{\partial V_D} \tag{4.41}
\]

From (4.20)

\[
c_{dd} = \frac{1}{C_{ox}} \text{Re} \left( \frac{\Delta q_d}{\Delta v_m = \delta_{md}} \right) = \frac{1}{C_{ox}} \Delta q_{d}^{(0)} \bigg|_{\Delta v_m = \delta_{md}} \text{Re} \left( \frac{1}{1 + i\omega \tau} \right) = \frac{1}{C_{ox}} \Delta q_{d}^{(0)} \bigg|_{\Delta v_m = \delta_{md}} \cdot \frac{1}{1 + (\omega \tau)^2} = \frac{c_{dd}^{(0)}}{1 + (\omega \tau)^2} \tag{4.42}
\]

Then, we evaluate \( y_{gd} \) from (4.16)

\[
y_{gd} = g_{gd} + i\omega C_{ox} c_{gd} \tag{4.43}
\]
where from (4.12) and (4.19)

\[
g_{gd} = g_{gd}^{(0)} - \omega \cdot \text{Im} \left( \Delta q_g |_{\Delta v_m = \delta_{md}} \right) \quad (4.44)
\]

\[
= g_{gd}^{(0)} - \omega \cdot \text{Im} \left[ \frac{(1 - \eta) \cdot \Delta v_{gb} \cdot C_{ox} - \eta \cdot \Delta q_i}{\Delta v_d} \right]
\]

\[
= g_{gd}^{(0)} + \omega \cdot \eta \cdot \text{Im} \left( \Delta q_i |_{\Delta v_m = \delta_{md}} \right)
\]

\[
= g_{gd}^{(0)} + \omega \cdot \eta \cdot \Delta q_i^{(0)} |_{\Delta v_m = \delta_{md}} \cdot \text{Im} \left( \frac{1}{1 + i \omega \tau} \right)
\]

\[
= g_{gd}^{(0)} - \eta \cdot \Delta q_i^{(0)} |_{\Delta v_m = \delta_{md}} \cdot \frac{\omega^2 \tau}{1 + (\omega \tau)^2}
\]

\[
= g_{gd}^{(0)} - \eta \cdot c_{id}^{(0)} \cdot \frac{\omega^2 \tau C_{ox}}{1 + (\omega \tau)^2}
\]

(4.45)

Recalling that

\[
g_{gd}^{(0)} = \frac{\partial I_G}{\partial V_D} = 0
\]

(4.46)

we find

\[
g_{gd} = -\eta \cdot c_{id}^{(0)} \cdot \frac{\omega^2 \tau C_{ox}}{1 + (\omega \tau)^2}
\]

(4.47)

From (4.12) and (4.20)

\[
c_{gd} = \frac{1}{C_{ox}^{\text{Re}}} \left( \Delta q_g |_{\Delta v_m = \delta_{md}} \right)
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{C_{ox}^{\text{Re}}} \left[ \frac{(1 - \eta) \cdot \Delta v_{gb} \cdot C_{ox} - \eta \cdot \Delta q_i}{\Delta v_d} \right]
\]

\[
= -\frac{\eta}{C_{ox}^{\text{Re}}} \cdot \text{Re} \left( \Delta q_i |_{\Delta v_m = \delta_{md}} \right)
\]

\[
= -\frac{\eta}{C_{ox}^{\text{Re}}} \cdot \Delta q_i^{(0)} |_{\Delta v_m = \delta_{md}} \cdot \frac{1}{1 + (\omega \tau)^2}
\]

\[
= -\frac{\eta \cdot c_{id}^{(0)}}{1 + (\omega \tau)^2}
\]

(4.48)

Next, we evaluate \( y_{sd} \) from (4.16)

\[
y_{sd} = g_{sd} + i \omega C_{ox} c_{sd}
\]

(4.49)
where from (4.4) and (4.19)

\[
g_{sd} = g_{sd}^{(0)} - \omega \cdot \text{Im} \left( \Delta q_s \big|_{\Delta v_m = \delta_{md}} \right)
\]

\[
= g_{sd}^{(0)} - \omega \cdot \Delta q_s^{(0)} \big|_{\Delta v_m = \delta_{md}} \cdot \text{Im} \left( \frac{1}{1 + i\omega \tau} \right)
\]

\[
= g_{sd}^{(0)} + \Delta q_s^{(0)} \big|_{\Delta v_m = \delta_{md}} \cdot \frac{\omega^2 \tau}{1 + (\omega \tau)^2}
\]

\[
= g_{sd}^{(0)} + c_{sd}^{(0)} \cdot \frac{\omega^2 \tau C_{ox}}{1 + (\omega \tau)^2}
\]  (4.50)

From (4.4) and (4.20)

\[
C_{sd} = \text{Re} \left( \Delta q_s \big|_{\Delta v_m = \delta_{md}} \right)
\]

\[
= \Delta q_s^{(0)} \big|_{\Delta v_m = \delta_{md}} \cdot \text{Re} \left( \frac{1}{1 + i\omega \tau} \right)
\]

\[
= \Delta q_s^{(0)} \big|_{\Delta v_m = \delta_{md}} \cdot \frac{1}{1 + (\omega \tau)^2}
\]

\[
= c_{sd}^{(0)} \cdot \frac{C_{ox}}{1 + (\omega \tau)^2}
\]  (4.51)

It is followed by the evaluation of \( y_{bd} \). From (4.16)

\[
y_{bd} = g_{bd} + i\omega C_{ox} c_{bd}
\]  (4.52)

where from (4.13) and (4.19)

\[
g_{bd} = g_{bd}^{(0)} - \omega \cdot \text{Im} \left( \Delta q_b \big|_{\Delta v_m = \delta_{md}} \right)
\]

\[
= g_{bd}^{(0)} - \omega \cdot \text{Im} \left[ \frac{-(1 - \eta) \cdot (\Delta v_{gb} \cdot C_{ox} + \Delta q_i)}{\Delta v_d} \right]
\]

\[
= g_{bd}^{(0)} + \omega \cdot (1 - \eta) \cdot \text{Im} \left( \Delta q_i \big|_{\Delta v_m = \delta_{md}} \right)
\]

\[
= g_{bd}^{(0)} + \omega \cdot (1 - \eta) \cdot \Delta q_i^{(0)} \big|_{\Delta v_m = \delta_{md}} \cdot \text{Im} \left[ \left( \frac{1}{1 + i\omega \tau} \right) \right]
\]

\[
= g_{bd}^{(0)} - (1 - \eta) \cdot \Delta q_i^{(0)} \big|_{\Delta v_m = \delta_{md}} \cdot \frac{\omega^2 \tau}{1 + (\omega \tau)^2}
\]

\[
= g_{bd}^{(0)} - (1 - \eta) \cdot c_{id}^{(0)} \cdot \frac{\omega^2 \tau C_{ox}}{1 + (\omega \tau)^2}
\]  (4.54)
Recalling that

\[ g_{bd}^{(0)} = \frac{\partial I_B}{\partial V_D} = 0 \]  \hspace{1cm} (4.55)

we find

\[ g_{bd} = -(1 - \eta) \cdot c_{id}^{(0)} \cdot \frac{\omega^2 \tau C_{\text{ox}}}{1 + (\omega \tau)^2} \]  \hspace{1cm} (4.56)

Also from (4.20)

\[
c_{bd} = \frac{1}{C_{\text{ox}}} \text{Re} \left( \frac{\Delta q_b}{\Delta v_m = \delta_{md}} \right)
\]
\[
= \frac{1}{C_{\text{ox}}} \text{Re} \left[ \frac{-(1 - \eta) \cdot (\Delta v_{gb} \cdot C_{\text{ox}} + \Delta q_i)}{\Delta v_d} \right]
\]
\[
= -\frac{1 - \eta}{C_{\text{ox}}} \cdot \text{Re} \left( \frac{\Delta q_i}{\Delta v_m = \delta_{md}} \right)
\]
\[
= -\frac{1 - \eta}{C_{\text{ox}}} \cdot \Delta q_i^{(0)} \cdot \frac{1}{1 + (\omega \tau)^2}
\]
\[
= -\frac{(1 - \eta) \cdot c_{id}^{(0)}}{1 + (\omega \tau)^2} \]  \hspace{1cm} (4.57)

To evaluate \( y_{dg} \) from (4.16)

\[ y_{dg} = g_{dg} + i \omega C_{\text{ox}} c_{dg} \]  \hspace{1cm} (4.58)

where from (4.4) and (4.19)

\[
g_{dg} = g_{dg}^{(0)} - \omega \cdot \text{Im} \left( \frac{\Delta q_d}{\Delta v_m = \delta_{mg}} \right)
\]
\[
= g_{dg}^{(0)} - \omega \cdot \Delta q_d^{(0)} \left|_{\Delta v_m = \delta_{mg}} \right. \cdot \text{Im} \left( \frac{1}{1 + i \omega \tau} \right)
\]
\[
= g_{dg}^{(0)} + \Delta q_d^{(0)} \left|_{\Delta v_m = \delta_{mg}} \right. \cdot \frac{\omega^2 \tau}{1 + (\omega \tau)^2}
\]
\[
= g_{dg}^{(0)} + c_{dg}^{(0)} \cdot \frac{\omega^2 \tau C_{\text{ox}}}{1 + (\omega \tau)^2} \]  \hspace{1cm} (4.59)
From (4.4) and (4.20)

\[
c_{dg} = \frac{1}{C_{ox}} \text{Re} \left( \Delta q_d |_{\Delta v_m = \delta_{mg}} \right)
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{C_{ox}} \Delta q_d^{(0)} |_{\Delta v_m = \delta_{mg}} \text{Re} \left( \frac{1}{1 + i\omega\tau} \right)
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{C_{ox}} \Delta q_d^{(0)} |_{\Delta v_m = \delta_{mg}} \cdot \frac{1}{1 + (\omega\tau)^2}
\]

\[
= \frac{c_{dg}^{(0)}}{1 + (\omega\tau)^2}
\] (4.60)

Similarly, we evaluate \( y_{sg} \) from (4.16)

\[
y_{sg} = g_{sg} + i\omega C_{ox} c_{sg}
\] (4.61)

where from (4.4) and (4.19)

\[
g_{sg} = g_{sg}^{(0)} - \omega \cdot \text{Im} \left( \Delta q_s |_{\Delta v_m = \delta_{mg}} \right)
\]

\[
= g_{sg}^{(0)} - \omega \cdot \Delta q_s^{(0)} |_{\Delta v_m = \delta_{mg}} \cdot \text{Im} \left( \frac{1}{1 + i\omega\tau} \right)
\]

\[
= g_{sg}^{(0)} + \Delta q_s^{(0)} |_{\Delta v_m = \delta_{mg}} \cdot \frac{\omega^2\tau}{1 + (\omega\tau)^2}
\]

\[
= g_{sg}^{(0)} + c_{sg}^{(0)} \cdot \frac{\omega^2\tau C_{ox}}{1 + (\omega\tau)^2}
\] (4.62)

From (4.4) and (4.20)

\[
c_{sg} = \frac{1}{C_{ox}} \text{Re} \left( \Delta q_s |_{\Delta v_m = \delta_{mg}} \right)
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{C_{ox}} \Delta q_s^{(0)} |_{\Delta v_m = \delta_{mg}} \text{Re} \left( \frac{1}{1 + i\omega\tau} \right)
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{C_{ox}} \Delta q_s^{(0)} |_{\Delta v_m = \delta_{mg}} \cdot \frac{1}{1 + (\omega\tau)^2}
\]

\[
= \frac{c_{sg}^{(0)}}{1 + (\omega\tau)^2}
\] (4.63)

It is followed by the evaluation of \( y_{bg} \) from (4.16)

\[
y_{bg} = g_{bg} + i\omega C_{ox} c_{bg}
\] (4.64)
where from (4.13) and (4.19)

\[
g_{bg} = g_{bg}^{(0)} - \omega \cdot \text{Im} \left( \Delta q_b \big|_{\Delta v_m = \delta mg} \right) \tag{4.65}
\]

\[
= g_{bg}^{(0)} - \omega \cdot \text{Im} \left[ - (1 - \eta) \cdot (\Delta v_{gb} \cdot C_{ox} + \Delta q_i) \right]_{\Delta v_g}
\]

\[
= g_{bg}^{(0)} + \omega \cdot (1 - \eta) \cdot \text{Im} \left( \Delta q_i \big|_{\Delta v_m = \delta mg} \right)
\]

\[
= g_{bg}^{(0)} + \omega \cdot (1 - \eta) \cdot \Delta q_i^{(0)} \big|_{\Delta v_m = \delta mg} \cdot \text{Im} \left( \frac{1}{1 + i \omega \tau} \right)
\]

\[
= g_{bg}^{(0)} - (1 - \eta) \cdot \Delta q_i^{(0)} \big|_{\Delta v_m = \delta mg} \cdot \frac{\omega^2 \tau}{1 + (\omega \tau)^2}
\]

\[
= g_{bg}^{(0)} - (1 - \eta) \cdot c_{ig}^{(0)} \cdot \frac{\omega^2 \tau C_{ox}}{1 + (\omega \tau)^2} \tag{4.66}
\]

From (4.4) and (4.20)

\[
c_{bg} = \frac{1}{C_{ox}} \text{Re} \left( \Delta q_b \big|_{\Delta v_m = \delta mg} \right)
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{C_{ox}} \text{Re} \left[ - (1 - \eta) \cdot (\Delta v_{gb} \cdot C_{ox} + \Delta q_i) \right]_{\Delta v_g}
\]

\[
= \frac{1 - \eta}{C_{ox}} \cdot \left[ C_{ox} + \text{Re} \left( \Delta q_i \big|_{\Delta v_m = \delta mg} \right) \right]
\]

\[
= \frac{1 - \eta}{C_{ox}} \cdot \left[ C_{ox} + \Delta q_i^{(0)} \big|_{\Delta v_m = \delta mg} \cdot \frac{1}{1 + (\omega \tau)^2} \right]
\]

\[
= -(1 - \eta) \cdot \left[ 1 + \frac{c_{ig}^{(0)}}{1 + (\omega \tau)^2} \right] \tag{4.67}
\]

In the next we evaluate \( y_{ds} \) from (4.16)

\[
y_{ds} = g_{ds} + i \omega C_{ox} c_{ds} \tag{4.68}
\]
where from (4.4) and (4.19)

\[ g_{ds} = g_{ds}^{(0)} - \omega \cdot \text{Im} \left( \Delta q_d \big|_{\Delta v_m = \delta_{ms}} \right) \]

\[ = g_{ds}^{(0)} - \omega \cdot \Delta q_d^{(0)} \big|_{\Delta v_m = \delta_{ms}} \cdot \text{Im} \left( \frac{1}{1 + i \omega \tau} \right) \]

\[ = g_{ds}^{(0)} + \Delta q_d^{(0)} \big|_{\Delta v_m = \delta_{ms}} \cdot \frac{\omega^2 \tau}{1 + (\omega \tau)^2} \]

\[ = g_{ds}^{(0)} + c_{ds}^{(0)} \cdot \frac{\omega^2 \tau C_{ox}}{1 + (\omega \tau)^2} \]  \hspace{1cm} (4.69)

From (4.4) and (4.20)

\[ c_{ds} = \text{Re} \left( \Delta q_d \big|_{\Delta v_m = \delta_{ms}} \right) \]

\[ = \frac{1}{C_{ox}} \Delta q_d^{(0)} \big|_{\Delta v_m = \delta_{ms}} \text{Re} \left( \frac{1}{1 + i \omega \tau} \right) \]

\[ = \frac{1}{C_{ox}} \Delta q_d^{(0)} \big|_{\Delta v_m = \delta_{ms}} \cdot \frac{1}{1 + (\omega \tau)^2} \]

\[ = \frac{c_{ds}^{(0)}}{1 + (\omega \tau)^2} \]  \hspace{1cm} (4.70)

Then, we evaluate \( y_{gs} \) from (4.16)

\[ y_{gs} = g_{gs} + i \omega C_{ox} c_{gs} \]  \hspace{1cm} (4.71)

where from (4.4) and (4.19)

\[ g_{gs} = g_{gs}^{(0)} - \omega \cdot \text{Im} \left( \Delta q_{g} \big|_{\Delta v_m = \delta_{ms}} \right) \]

\[ = g_{gs}^{(0)} - \omega \cdot \text{Im} \left[ \frac{(1 - \eta) \cdot \Delta v_{gb} \cdot C_{ox} - \eta \cdot \Delta q_i}{\Delta v_s} \right] \]

\[ = g_{gs}^{(0)} + \omega \cdot \eta \cdot \text{Im} \left( \Delta q_{i} \big|_{\Delta v_m = \delta_{ms}} \right) \]

\[ = g_{gs}^{(0)} + \omega \cdot \eta \cdot \Delta q_{i}^{(0)} \big|_{\Delta v_m = \delta_{ms}} \cdot \text{Im} \left( \frac{1}{1 + i \omega \tau} \right) \]

\[ = g_{gs}^{(0)} - \eta \cdot \Delta q_{i}^{(0)} \big|_{\Delta v_m = \delta_{ms}} \cdot \frac{\omega^2 \tau}{1 + (\omega \tau)^2} \]

\[ = g_{gs}^{(0)} - \eta \cdot c_{is}^{(0)} \cdot \frac{\omega^2 \tau C_{ox}}{1 + (\omega \tau)^2} \]  \hspace{1cm} (4.73)
Recalling that
\[ g_{gs}(0) = \frac{\partial I_G}{\partial V_S} = 0 \] (4.74)
we find
\[ g_{gs} = -\eta \cdot c_{is}^{(0)} \cdot \frac{\omega^2 \tau C_{ox}}{1 + (\omega \tau)^2} \] (4.75)

From (4.4) and (4.20)
\[
c_{gs} = \frac{1}{C_{ox}} \text{Re} \left( \Delta q_s \big|_{\Delta v_m = \delta_{ms}} \right)
= \frac{1}{C_{ox}} \text{Re} \left[ \left( 1 - \eta \right) \cdot \frac{\Delta q_i \cdot C_{ox} - \eta \cdot \Delta q_i}{\Delta v_s} \right]
= -\frac{\eta}{C_{ox}} \cdot \text{Re} \left( \Delta q_i \big|_{\Delta v_m = \delta_{ms}} \right)
= -\frac{\eta}{C_{ox}} \cdot \Delta q_i^{(0)} \big|_{\Delta v_m = \delta_{ms}} \cdot \frac{1}{1 + (\omega \tau)^2}
= -\frac{\eta \cdot c_{is}^{(0)}}{1 + (\omega \tau)^2} \] (4.76)

Similarly, we evaluate \( y_{ss} \) from (4.16)
\[ y_{ss} = g_{ss} + i \omega C_{ox} c_{ss} \] (4.77)
where from (4.4) and (4.19)
\[
g_{ss} = g_{ss}^{(0)} - \omega \cdot \text{Im} \left( \Delta q_s \big|_{\Delta v_m = \delta_{ms}} \right)
= g_{ss}^{(0)} - \omega \cdot \Delta q_s^{(0)} \big|_{\Delta v_m = \delta_{ms}} \cdot \text{Im} \left( \frac{1}{1 + i \omega \tau} \right)
= g_{ss}^{(0)} + \Delta q_s^{(0)} \big|_{\Delta v_m = \delta_{ms}} \cdot \frac{\omega^2 \tau}{1 + (\omega \tau)^2}
= g_{ss}^{(0)} + c_{ss}^{(0)} \cdot \frac{\omega^2 \tau C_{ox}}{1 + (\omega \tau)^2} \] (4.78)
From (4.4) and (4.20)

\[
c_{ss} = \frac{1}{C_{ox}} \text{Re} \left( \Delta q_s \bigg|_{\Delta v_m = \delta_{ms}} \right) \\
= \frac{1}{C_{ox}} \Delta q_s^{(0)} \bigg|_{\Delta v_m = \delta_{ms}} \text{Re} \left( \frac{1}{1 + i\omega\tau} \right) \\
= \frac{1}{C_{ox}} \Delta q_s^{(0)} \bigg|_{\Delta v_m = \delta_{ms}} \cdot \frac{1}{1 + (\omega\tau)^2} \\
= \frac{c_{ss}^{(0)}}{1 + (\omega\tau)^2}\tag{4.79}
\]

It is followed by the evaluation of \( y_{bs} \) from (4.16)

\[
y_{bs} = y_{bs} + i\omega C_{ox} c_{bs} \tag{4.80}
\]

where from (4.13) and (4.19)

\[
g_{bs} = g_{bs}^{(0)} - \omega \cdot \text{Im} \left( \Delta q_b \bigg|_{\Delta v_m = \delta_{ms}} \right) \\
= g_{bs}^{(0)} - \omega \cdot \text{Im} \left[ \frac{- (1 - \eta) \cdot (\Delta v_{gb} \cdot C_{ox} + \Delta q_i)}{\Delta v_s} \right] \\
= g_{bs}^{(0)} + \omega \cdot (1 - \eta) \cdot \text{Im} \left( \Delta q_i \bigg|_{\Delta v_m = \delta_{ms}} \right) \\
= g_{bs}^{(0)} + \omega \cdot (1 - \eta) \cdot \Delta q_i^{(0)} \bigg|_{\Delta v_m = \delta_{ms}} \cdot \text{Im} \left( \frac{1}{1 + i\omega\tau} \right) \\
= g_{bs}^{(0)} - (1 - \eta) \cdot \Delta q_i^{(0)} \bigg|_{\Delta v_m = \delta_{ms}} \cdot \frac{\omega^2\tau}{1 + (\omega\tau)^2} \\
= g_{bs}^{(0)} - (1 - \eta) \cdot c_{is}^{(0)} \cdot \frac{\omega^2\tau C_{ox}}{1 + (\omega\tau)^2}\tag{4.82}
\]

Recalling that

\[
g_{bs}^{(0)} = \frac{\partial I_B}{\partial V_S} = 0 \tag{4.83}
\]

we find

\[
g_{bs} = -(1 - \eta) \cdot c_{is}^{(0)} \cdot \frac{\omega^2\tau C_{ox}}{1 + (\omega\tau)^2}\tag{4.84}
\]
From (4.4) and (4.20)

\[ c_{bs} = \frac{1}{C_{ox}} \text{Re} \left( \Delta q_b \big|_{\Delta v_m = \delta_{ms}} \right) \]
\[ = \frac{1}{C_{ox}} \text{Re} \left( \frac{(1 - \eta) \cdot (\Delta v_{gb} \cdot C_{ox} + \Delta q_i)}{\Delta v_s} \right) \]
\[ = \frac{1 - \eta}{C_{ox}} \cdot \text{Re} \left( \Delta q_i \big|_{\Delta v_m = \delta_{ms}} \right) \]
\[ = \frac{1 - \eta}{C_{ox}} \cdot \Delta q_i^{(0)} \bigg|_{\Delta v_m = \delta_{ms}} \cdot \frac{1}{1 + (\omega \tau)^2} \]
\[ = \frac{(1 - \eta) \cdot c_{bs}^{(0)}}{1 + (\omega \tau)^2} \] (4.85)

Then, we evaluate \( y_{db} \) from (4.16)

\[ y_{db} = g_{db} + i \omega C_{ox} c_{db} \] (4.86)

where from (4.4) and (4.19)

\[ g_{db} = g_{db}^{(0)} - \omega \cdot \text{Im} \left( \Delta q_d \big|_{\Delta v_m = \delta_{mb}} \right) \]
\[ = g_{db}^{(0)} - \omega \cdot \Delta q_d^{(0)} \bigg|_{\Delta v_m = \delta_{mb}} \cdot \text{Im} \left( \frac{1}{1 + i \omega \tau} \right) \]
\[ = g_{db}^{(0)} + \Delta q_d^{(0)} \bigg|_{\Delta v_m = \delta_{mb}} \cdot \frac{\omega^2 \tau}{1 + (\omega \tau)^2} \]
\[ = g_{db}^{(0)} + c_{db}^{(0)} \cdot \frac{\omega^2 \tau C_{ox}}{1 + (\omega \tau)^2} \] (4.87)

From (4.4) and (4.20)

\[ c_{db} = \frac{1}{C_{ox}} \text{Re} \left( \Delta q_d \big|_{\Delta v_m = \delta_{mb}} \right) \]
\[ = \frac{1}{C_{ox}} \Delta q_d^{(0)} \bigg|_{\Delta v_m = \delta_{mb}} \text{Re} \left( \frac{1}{1 + i \omega \tau} \right) \]
\[ = \frac{1}{C_{ox}} \Delta q_d^{(0)} \bigg|_{\Delta v_m = \delta_{mb}} \cdot \frac{1}{1 + (\omega \tau)^2} \]
\[ = \frac{c_{db}^{(0)}}{1 + (\omega \tau)^2} \] (4.88)
After that, we evaluate $y_{gb}$ from (4.16)

$$y_{gb} = g_{gb} + i\omega C_{ox} c_{gb}$$  \hspace{1cm} (4.89)

where from (4.13) and (4.19)

$$g_{gb} = g_{gb}^{(0)} - \omega \cdot \text{Im} \left( \frac{\Delta q_{g} |_{\Delta v_{m} = \delta_{mb}}}{\Delta v_{b}} \right)$$  \hspace{1cm} (4.90)

$$= g_{gb}^{(0)} - \omega \cdot \text{Im} \left[ (1 - \eta) \cdot \frac{\Delta v_{gb} \cdot C_{ox} - \eta \cdot \Delta q_{i}}{\Delta v_{b}} \right]$$

$$= g_{gb}^{(0)} + \omega \cdot \eta \cdot \text{Im} \left( \Delta q_{i} |_{\Delta v_{m} = \delta_{mb}} \right)$$

$$= g_{gb}^{(0)} + \omega \cdot \eta \cdot \Delta q_{i}^{(0)} |_{\Delta v_{m} = \delta_{mb}} \cdot \text{Im} \left( \frac{1}{1 + i\omega T} \right)$$

$$= g_{gb}^{(0)} - \eta \cdot \Delta q_{i}^{(0)} |_{\Delta v_{m} = \delta_{mb}} \cdot \frac{\omega^2 T}{1 + (\omega T)^2}$$

$$= g_{gb}^{(0)} - \eta \cdot c_{ib}^{(0)} \cdot \frac{\omega^2 C_{ox}}{1 + (\omega T)^2}$$  \hspace{1cm} (4.91)

Recalling that

$$g_{gb}^{(0)} = \frac{\partial I_{C}}{\partial V_{B}} = 0$$  \hspace{1cm} (4.92)

we find

$$g_{gb} = -\eta \cdot c_{ib}^{(0)} \cdot \frac{\omega^2 C_{ox}}{1 + (\omega T)^2}$$  \hspace{1cm} (4.93)

From (4.4) and (4.20)

$$c_{gb} = \frac{1}{C_{ox}} \text{Re} \left( \frac{\Delta q_{g}}{\Delta v_{b}} \right)$$

$$= \frac{1}{C_{ox}} \text{Re} \left[ (1 - \eta) \cdot \frac{\Delta v_{gb} \cdot C_{ox} - \frac{\eta}{C_{ox}} \cdot \Delta q_{i}}{\Delta v_{b}} \right]$$

$$= -(1 - \eta) - \frac{\eta}{C_{ox}} \cdot \text{Re} \left( \Delta q_{i} |_{\Delta v_{m} = \delta_{mb}} \right)$$

$$= -(1 - \eta) - \frac{\eta}{C_{ox}} \cdot \Delta q_{i}^{(0)} |_{\Delta v_{m} = \delta_{mb}} \cdot \frac{1}{1 + (\omega T)^2}$$

$$= -(1 - \eta) - \frac{\eta \cdot c_{ib}^{(0)}}{1 + (\omega T)^2}$$  \hspace{1cm} (4.94)
Similarly, we evaluate $y_{sb}$ from (4.16)

$$y_{sb} = g_{sb} + i\omega C_{ox} c_{sb}$$  \hfill (4.95)

where from (4.4) and (4.19)

$$g_{sb} = g_{sb}^{(0)} - \omega \cdot \text{Im} \left( \frac{\Delta q_s}{\Delta v_b} \right)$$

$$= g_{sb}^{(0)} - \omega \cdot \Delta q_s^{(0)} |_{\Delta v_m = \delta_{mb}} \cdot \text{Im} \left( \frac{1}{1 + i\omega \tau} \right)$$

$$= g_{sb}^{(0)} + \Delta q_s^{(0)} |_{\Delta v_m = \delta_{mb}} \cdot \frac{\omega^2 \tau}{1 + (\omega \tau)^2}$$

$$= g_{sb}^{(0)} + c_{sb}^{(0)} \cdot \frac{\omega^2 \tau C_{ox}}{1 + (\omega \tau)^2}$$  \hfill (4.96)

From (4.4) and (4.20)

$$c_{sb} = \frac{1}{C_{ox}} \text{Re} \left( \Delta q_s |_{\Delta v_m = \delta_{mb}} \right)$$

$$= \frac{1}{C_{ox}} \Delta q_s^{(0)} |_{\Delta v_m = \delta_{mb}} \text{Re} \left( \frac{1}{1 + i\omega \tau} \right)$$

$$= \frac{1}{C_{ox}} \Delta q_s^{(0)} |_{\Delta v_m = \delta_{mb}} \cdot \frac{1}{1 + (\omega \tau)^2}$$

$$= \frac{c_{sb}^{(0)}}{1 + (\omega \tau)^2}$$  \hfill (4.97)

The evaluated conductances and capacitances can be presented as

$$[g_{jk}] = \begin{bmatrix}
g_{dd}^{(0)} & g_{dg}^{(0)} & g_{ds}^{(0)} & g_{db}^{(0)} \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
g_{sd}^{(0)} & g_{sg}^{(0)} & g_{ss}^{(0)} & g_{sb}^{(0)} \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0
\end{bmatrix} - k_0 F_{\omega} \begin{bmatrix}
-c_{dd}^{(0)} & -c_{dg}^{(0)} & -c_{ds}^{(0)} & -c_{db}^{(0)} \\
\eta c_{id}^{(0)} & \eta c_{ig}^{(0)} & \eta c_{is}^{(0)} & \eta c_{ib}^{(0)} \\
-c_{sd}^{(0)} & -c_{sg}^{(0)} & -c_{ss}^{(0)} & -c_{sb}^{(0)} \\
\zeta c_{id}^{(0)} & \zeta c_{ig}^{(0)} & \zeta c_{is}^{(0)} & \zeta c_{ib}^{(0)}
\end{bmatrix}$$  \hfill (4.98)
where $k_0 = \omega^2 \tau C_{ox}$, $\zeta = 1 - \eta$, $F_\omega = [1 + (\omega \tau)^2]^{-1}$ and
\[
[c_{jk}] = -F_\omega \begin{bmatrix}
-c_{dd}^{(0)} & -c_{dg}^{(0)} & -c_{ds}^{(0)} & -c_{db}^{(0)} \\
\eta c_{id}^{(0)} & \eta c_{ig}^{(0)} - \zeta' & \eta c_{is}^{(0)} & \eta c_{ib}^{(0)} + \zeta' \\
-c_{sd}^{(0)} & -c_{sg}^{(0)} & -c_{ss}^{(0)} & -c_{sb}^{(0)} \\
\zeta c_{id}^{(0)} & \zeta c_{ig}^{(0)} + \zeta' & \zeta c_{is}^{(0)} & \zeta c_{ib}^{(0)} - \zeta'
\end{bmatrix}
\tag{4.99}
\]

Here, $\zeta' = \zeta/F_\omega$. Note that we assumed negligible steady-state gate and bulk currents which lead to the vanishing elements $g_{sk}^{(0)}$ and $g_{bk}^{(0)}$.

4.1.3. Lowest-Order Corrections to the QS Small-Signal Model

To obtain the lowest-order corrections to the QS model needed for the benchmark analysis, we substitute
\[
F_\omega = 1 - (\omega \tau)^2 + O(\omega^4)
\tag{4.100}
\]
in (4.98) and (4.99). This results in
\[
[g_{jk}] = \begin{bmatrix}
g_{jk}^{(0)} \\
\end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix}
g_{jk}^{(1)} \\
\end{bmatrix} + O(\omega^4)
\tag{4.101}
\]
and
\[
[c_{jk}] = \begin{bmatrix}
c_{jk}^{(0)} \\
\end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix}
c_{jk}^{(1)} \\
\end{bmatrix} + O(\omega^4)
\tag{4.102}
\]
where
\[
\begin{bmatrix}
g_{0}^{(0)} \\
\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix}
g_{dd}^{(0)} & g_{dg}^{(0)} & g_{ds}^{(0)} & g_{db}^{(0)} \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
g_{sd}^{(0)} & g_{sg}^{(0)} & g_{ss}^{(0)} & g_{sb}^{(0)} \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0
\end{bmatrix}
\tag{4.103}
\]
\[
\begin{bmatrix}
    (0) & (0) & (0) & (0) \\
    c_{dd} & c_{dg} & c_{ds} & c_{db} \\
    \zeta \cdot c_{id} - \eta \cdot c_{ig} & c_{ig} - \eta \cdot c_{ib} & c_{is} - \eta \cdot c_{ib} & c_{ib} \\
    c_{sd} & c_{sg} & c_{ss} & c_{sb} \\
    -\zeta \cdot c_{id} & -\zeta \cdot (1 + c_{ig}) & -(c_{is} - \eta \cdot c_{ib}) & -(c_{ib} - \eta \cdot c_{ib}) \\
\end{bmatrix}
\]

(4.104)

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
    (1) & (1) & (1) & (1) \\
    g_{jk}^{(1)} = k_0 \\
\end{bmatrix}
\]

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
    (0) & (0) & (0) & (0) \\
    c_{dd} & c_{dg} & c_{ds} & c_{db} \\
    -\eta \cdot c_{id} & -\eta \cdot c_{ig} & -\eta \cdot c_{is} & -\eta \cdot c_{ib} \\
    c_{sd} & c_{sg} & c_{ss} & c_{sb} \\
    -\zeta \cdot c_{id} & -(1 + c_{ig}) & -(c_{is} - \eta \cdot c_{ib}) & -(c_{ib} - \eta \cdot c_{ib}) \\
\end{bmatrix}
\]

(4.105)

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
    (1) & (1) & (1) & (1) \\
    c_{jk}^{(1)} = -k_0 \tau \frac{C_{ox}}{C_{ox}} \\
\end{bmatrix}
\]

(4.106)

Note that

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
    (1) & (1) \\
    c_{jk}^{(1)} = -k_0 \tau \frac{C_{ox}}{C_{ox}} \cdot g_{jk}^{(1)} \\
\end{bmatrix}
\]

(4.107)

Physically, \( g_{jk}^{(0)} \) and \( c_{jk}^{(0)} \) are the QS conductances and capacitances matrices and \( g_{jk}^{(1)} \) and \( c_{jk}^{(1)} \) are the lowest-order corrections predicted by the new RTA model.

4.2. Benchmark Test for \( V_{DS} = 0 \) in Strong Inversion Regime

Smit et al. [62] suggested a benchmark for NQS models based on the double transmission line representation of the MOSFET for \( V_{DS} = 0 \) in the strong inversion.
regime (when the diffusion current may be neglected.) Here, we apply their test to the new RTA model developed.

For $V_{DS} = 0$ we have

$g_{dg}^{(0)} = 0$ \hspace{1cm} (4.108)

$g_{bg}^{(0)} = 0$ \hspace{1cm} (4.109)

$g_{ds}^{(0)} = g_{sd}^{(0)} = -g_{dd}^{(0)}$ \hspace{1cm} (4.110)

and

$g_{ss}^{(0)} = g_{dd}^{(0)}$ \hspace{1cm} (4.111)

Hence, from (4.103)

$$
\begin{bmatrix}
1 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
-1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0
\end{bmatrix}
$$ \hspace{1cm} (4.112)

while $[c_{jk}^{(0)}]$, $[g_{jk}^{(1)}]$, and $[c_{jk}]$ are the same as (4.104), (4.105), and (4.106), respectively.

We next transform the lowest-order corrections $[g_{jk}^{(1)}]$ and $[c_{jk}^{(1)}]$ to facilitate the comparison of the new RTA model with the “exact” results in [62]. For $V_{DS} = 0$ in a strong inversion regime, the $[c_{jk}^{(0)}]$ term in (4.104) should be equivalent to the
corresponding \( c_{jk,TLM}^{(0)} \) term of (7) in [62] which is given below \(^1\)

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
2\alpha & -3 & \alpha & 3 - 3\alpha \\
-3 & 6 & -3 & 0 \\
\alpha & -3 & 2\alpha & 3 - 3\alpha \\
3 - 3\alpha & 0 & 3 - 3\alpha & 6\alpha - 6
\end{bmatrix}
\] (4.113)

where \( \alpha = 1 + \xi \).

By equating elements of (4.104) and (4.113), one finds

\[
c_{dd}^{(0)} = c_{ss}^{(0)} = \frac{\alpha}{3} \quad (4.114)
\]

\[
c_{dg}^{(0)} = c_{sg}^{(0)} = -\frac{1}{2} \quad (4.115)
\]

\[
c_{ds}^{(0)} = c_{sd}^{(0)} = \frac{\alpha}{6} \quad (4.116)
\]

\[
c_{db}^{(0)} = \frac{1 - \alpha}{2} \quad (4.117)
\]

\[
c_{gd}^{(0)} = -\eta \cdot c_{id}^{(0)} = -\frac{1}{2} \quad (4.118)
\]

\[
c_{gg}^{(0)} = 1 - \eta - \eta \cdot c_{ig}^{(0)} = 1 \quad (4.119)
\]

\[
c_{gs}^{(0)} = -\eta \cdot c_{is}^{(0)} = -\frac{1}{2} \quad (4.120)
\]

\[
c_{gb}^{(0)} = -\zeta - \eta \cdot c_{ib}^{(0)} = 0 \quad (4.121)
\]

\[
c_{sb}^{(0)} = \frac{1 - \alpha}{2} \quad (4.122)
\]

\(^1\)The \( c_{jk,TLM}^{(0)} \) of (7) in [62] is a 3x3 matrix. The fourth column and fourth row in this thesis are evaluated by applying the rule that the sum of the matrix elements in each column or row should be zero.
which yields

\[
\begin{align*}
\epsilon_{dd}^{(0)} &= \frac{\alpha}{3} & (4.123) \\
\epsilon_{dg}^{(0)} &= -\frac{1}{2} & (4.124) \\
\epsilon_{ds}^{(0)} &= \frac{\alpha}{6} & (4.125) \\
\epsilon_{db}^{(0)} &= \frac{1 - \alpha}{2} & (4.126) \\
\epsilon_{id}^{(0)} &= \frac{1}{2\eta} = \frac{\alpha}{2} & (4.127) \\
\epsilon_{ig}^{(0)} &= -1 & (4.128) \\
\epsilon_{is}^{(0)} &= \frac{1}{2\eta} = \frac{\alpha}{2} & (4.129) \\
\epsilon_{ib}^{(0)} &= 1 - \alpha & (4.130) \\
\epsilon_{sd}^{(0)} &= \frac{\alpha}{6} & (4.131) \\
\epsilon_{sg}^{(0)} &= -\frac{1}{2} & (4.132) \\
\epsilon_{ss}^{(0)} &= \frac{\alpha}{3} & (4.133) \\
\epsilon_{sb}^{(0)} &= \frac{1 - \alpha}{2} & (4.134)
\end{align*}
\]

Inserting (4.123)-(4.134) into (4.105) and (4.106), one finds that, when \( V_{DS} = 0 \) in a strong inversion regime

\[
\left[ \begin{array}{ccccc}
\alpha/3 & -1/2 & \alpha/6 & (1 - \alpha)/2 \\
-1/2 & 1/\alpha & -1/2 & (\alpha - 1)/\alpha \\
\alpha/3 & -1/2 & \alpha/6 & (1 - \alpha)/2 \\
(1 - \alpha)/2 & (\alpha - 1)/\alpha & (1 - \alpha)/2 & (\alpha - 1)^2/\alpha
\end{array} \right] = k_0
\]

\[
(4.135)
\]
The lowest order NQS corrections to the QS y-matrix are given by

\[
\left[ c_{jk}^{(1)} \right] = -\frac{k_0}{C_{ox}} \cdot \tau \begin{bmatrix}
\alpha/3 & -1/2 & \alpha/6 & (1-\alpha)/2 \\
-1/2 & 1/\alpha & -1/2 & (\alpha-1)/\alpha \\
\alpha/3 & -1/2 & \alpha/6 & (1-\alpha)/2 \\
(1-\alpha)/2 & (\alpha-1)/\alpha & (1-\alpha)/2 & (\alpha-1)^2/\alpha
\end{bmatrix}
\] (4.136)

The lowest order NQS corrections to the QS y-matrix are given by

\[
\left[ g_{jk,TLM}^{(1)} \right] = k_1 \begin{bmatrix}
8\alpha^2 & -15\alpha & 7\alpha^2 & -15\alpha\xi \\
-15\alpha & 30 & -15\alpha & 30\xi \\
7\alpha^2 & -15\alpha & 8\alpha^2 & -15\alpha\xi \\
-15\alpha\xi & 30\xi & -15\alpha\xi & 30\xi^2
\end{bmatrix}
\] (4.137)

and

\[
\left[ c_{jk,TLM}^{(1)} \right] = k_2 \begin{bmatrix}
-32\alpha & 63 & -31\alpha & 63\xi \\
63 & -\frac{126}{\alpha} & 63 & -\frac{126}{\alpha}\xi \\
-31\alpha & 63 & -32\alpha & 63\xi \\
63\xi & -\frac{126}{\alpha}\xi & 63\xi & \frac{126}{\alpha}\xi^2
\end{bmatrix}
\] (4.138)

where

\[
k_1 = \omega^2 C_{ox}^2 / \left[ 360 g_{dd}^{(0)} \right]
\] (4.139)

and

\[
k_2 = \omega^2 C_{ox}^2 \alpha^2 / \left\{ 15120 \left[ g_{dd}^{(0)} \right]^2 \right\}
\] (4.140)

To obtain the lowest order NQS corrections to the y-matrix for the present model, we use expansions (4.101) and (4.102) for the small-signal version of the
model developed in (4.98) and (4.99). In the strong inversion regime for \( V_{DS} = 0 \)

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
g_{jk}^{(1)}
\end{bmatrix} = k_\tau k_1 \begin{bmatrix}
10\alpha^2 & -15\alpha & 5\alpha^2 & -15\alpha\xi \\
-15\alpha & 30 & -15\alpha & 30\xi \\
5\alpha^2 & -15\alpha & 10\alpha^2 & -15\alpha\xi \\
-15\alpha\xi & 30\xi & -15\alpha\xi & 30\xi^2
\end{bmatrix}
\] (4.141)

and

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
c_{jk}^{(1)}
\end{bmatrix} = \frac{5k_2^2 k_2}{6} \begin{bmatrix}
-42\alpha & 63 & -21\alpha & 63\xi \\
63 & -\frac{126}{\alpha} & 63 & -\frac{126\xi}{\alpha} \\
-21\alpha & 63 & -42\alpha & 63\xi \\
63\xi & -\frac{126\xi}{\alpha} & 63\xi & \frac{126\xi^2}{\alpha}
\end{bmatrix}
\] (4.142)

where

\[
k_\tau = \frac{12\tau g_{dd}^{(0)}}{\alpha C_{ox}}
\] (4.143)

is a dimensionless coefficient close to 1. For the purpose of this study, we select

\[
\tau = \frac{\sqrt{30}\alpha C_{ox}}{60\tau g_{dd}^{(0)}}
\] (4.144)

which is equivalent to setting \( k_\tau = \sqrt{30}/5 \approx 1.095 \). This choice makes \( c_{jk}^{(1)} \) close to the ideal value \( c_{jk,TLM}^{(1)} \) given by (4.138). To facilitate the comparison of (4.141), (4.142) with (4.137), (4.138), we introduce the “ratio matrices” \( R_{jk}^{(g)} = g_{jk}^{(1)} / g_{jk,TLM}^{(1)} \)

and \( R_{jk}^{(c)} = c_{jk}^{(1)} / c_{jk,TLM}^{(1)} \). From (4.137), (4.138), (4.141), and (4.142),

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
R_{jk}^{(g)}
\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix}
1.37 & 1.10 & 0.78 & 1.10 \\
1.10 & 1.10 & 1.10 & 1.10 \\
0.78 & 1.10 & 1.37 & 1.10 \\
1.10 & 1.10 & 1.10 & 1.10
\end{bmatrix}
\] (4.145)
Since ideally all elements of these matrices are equal to one, the new RTA model satisfies the benchmark test only approximately. This inherent limitation of the RTA approach can be regarded as the price that is paid for model speed and simplicity.
5.1. Introduction

The gate capacitance, $C_{gg}$, of MOS transistors and capacitors is frequency dependent in all regions of operation. However, different physical mechanisms control the frequency dependence in different regions of operation.

In strong inversion, the electron concentration (here, we assume a $p$-bulk structure) in the channel can lag in time (i.e. have inertia) with respect to changes in gate voltage; for rapidly changing gate bias, the channel charge does not have time to equilibrate to a value consistent with the instantaneous values of the terminal biases. The delay in establishment of the channel charge is in MOS transistors due to the finite transit time of electrons from the source and drain into the channel, and in MOS capacitors due to finite recombination and generation lifetimes for electrons. In both cases, the qualitative effect, but not details of the frequency dependence, is similar: as frequency increases $C_{gg}$ in inversion decreases. This is the so-called NQS behavior.

In accumulation operation, $C_{gg}$ also decreases as frequency increases. In at least one compact MOS transistor model, this has been attributed to inertia in the formation of bulk charge. Actually, the physical cause of this behavior is different; for the $p$-bulk MOS structure in accumulation, there is a plethora of holes available in the bulk immediately adjacent to the surface, so there should be negligible delay in the re-equilibration of the accumulation charge following a change in gate voltage and therefore, no inertia effect on MOS capacitance in accumulation.
In this chapter, we present TCAD simulations and derive a new analytic model for the frequency dependence of $C_{gg}$ in accumulation and depletion that accounts for the series resistance $R_{\text{bulk}}$ of the bulk, to show that the variation of MOS device $C_{gg}$ with frequency in accumulation does not arise from charge inertia effects but rather, is due to the influence of $R_{\text{bulk}}$. We then show that the frequency dependence of $C_{gg}$ for MOS transistors for all biases can be accurately modeled using the PSP-RTA-NQS MOSFET compact model and present measured data, along with simulations from PSP-RTA-NQS, to show that the series resistance $R_{\text{gate}}$ of the gate needs to be included to accurately model the frequency dependence of $C_{gg}$ from accumulation through strong inversion.

The gate capacitance normalized by the oxide capacitance $C_{\text{ox}}$ will be denoted in lower case, i.e. $c_{gg} = C_{gg}/C_{\text{ox}}$ (see (4.17)). In this work, it was not found necessary to include the effect of gate leakage current on the frequency dependence of $C_{gg}$. Generally speaking, this is another source of dispersion in advanced MOS structures [112].

5.2. TCAD and PSP-RTA-NQS Modeling

Fig. 5.1 shows TCAD simulations [149] of MOSFET gate capacitance, for $V_{DS} = V_{BS} = 0$ over gate voltage $V_{GS}$ and frequency $f$, along with simulations from the QS version of the PSP model [53] with no $R_{\text{bulk}}$. The TCAD simulations were performed with an ideal contact at the top of the gate dielectric and so include no parasitic gate resistance; $R_{\text{gate}}$ was therefore set to zero in PSP for all comparisons to TCAD simulations.
Fig. 5.1. TCAD and PSP-QS models of normalized $C_{gg}$, with $R_{bulk} = 0$ for PSP-QS. $W/L = 1.0\mu m/5.0\mu m$, $t_{ox} = 2.0nm$, $N_{bulk} = 3.0 \times 10^{17} cm^{-3}$ (p-type), frequencies are $0, 0.25f_T, 0.5f_T, 0.75f_T, f_T, 1.25f_T$ and $1.5f_T$(top to bottom). Here $f_T = 1.6$ GHz and substrate thickness $t_{bulk} = 30 \mu m$.

The TCAD simulations clearly show the decrease in $C_{gg}$ with increasing frequency, both in accumulation and inversion regions of operation. (The decrease is also apparent in depletion, but is less pronounced.) The PSP-QS model show ideal MOS transistor capacitance behavior irrespective of frequency. Note the qualitative difference in the shape of the $C_{gg}(V_{GS})$ curves over frequency between accumulation and strong inversion. In accumulation, the curves are almost horizontal and move down by approximately the same amount as frequency increases. In strong inversion, the amount of reduction in $C_{gg}$ decreases as $V_{GS}$ increases for a given frequency, i.e. there is a slope introduced into the $C_{gg}(V_{GS})$ characteristics.

If the frequency dependence of $C_{gg}$ is due to the inertia in formation of the in-
version layer, then this should be able to be modeled by the PSP-RTA-NQS model; Fig. 5.2 shows the results of such simulations. The improvement in accuracy of the compact model, which is based on RTA and depends on two adjustable model parameters, is apparent in strong inversion, but there is no improvement in accumulation or depletion where the inversion charge is negligible.

Due to the fact that in accumulation and depletion there is, from the bulk $p$-type doping, an excess of mobile holes (i.e. majority carriers) readily available, there should be negligible inertia in the change in bulk charge with respect to a change in terminal voltages. The frequency dependence of $C_{gg}$ out of inversion, therefore, should not be due to an NQS effect; most likely, it could be from series re-
sistance. Given that \( R_{\text{gate}} = 0 \) in the TCAD simulations, the cause of the frequency dependence of \( C_{gg} \) in accumulation and depletion in Fig. 5.2 should be \( R_{\text{bulk}} \), which should appear in series with the intrinsic MOS capacitance.

To provide an explanation of the difference in qualitative behavior of the TCAD simulations between accumulation and strong inversion, and support for the statements in the two preceding paragraphs, we will use simplified models that are applicable only to each of these individual regions of operation; neither is a general model that is appropriate for all operating regions.

First, in strong inversion, the effective gate capacitance of a MOS transistor, at an angular frequency \( \omega \) for \( V_{DS} = 0 \), using a first order expansion in \( i \omega \) of an NQS analysis based on the continuity equation in the channel [1], is

\[
C_{gg}(\omega) = \frac{C_{gg}^{(0)}}{1 + \left[ \frac{\omega L^2}{12 \mu (V_{GS} - V_T)} \right]^2} \tag{5.1}
\]

where \( V_T \) is the threshold voltage. This indicates that at a given frequency, as \( V_{GS} \) increases in strong inversion, \( C_{gg}(\omega) \) should increase and asymptotically approach \( C_{gg}^{(0)} \) for large \( V_{GS} - V_T \). This is precisely the qualitative behavior seen in strong inversion in Fig. 5.2, both for the TCAD simulations and for the PSP-RTA-NQS model.

Second, consider operation in accumulation. If the device is modeled as \( R_{\text{bulk}} \) in series with \( C_{gg}^{(0)} \), then

\[
C_{gg}(\omega) = \frac{C_{gg}^{(0)}}{1 + \left[ \omega R_{\text{bulk}} C_{gg}^{(0)} \right]^2} \tag{5.2}
\]

If the frequency dependence in accumulation in Fig. 5.2 is due to series resistance, then from (5.2) a plot of \( C_{gg}^{(0)}/C_{gg} \) vs. \( \omega^2 \) should be a straight line with slope
Fig. 5.3. \( \frac{C_{gg}^{(0)}}{C_{gg}} \) vs. \( \omega^2 \) from TCAD simulations at \( V_{GS} = -2 \).

\[
\left[ R_{bulk} C_{gg}^{(0)} \right]^2. \]

Fig. 5.3 shows this plot from the TCAD simulations for frequencies up to \( 1.25 f_T \) (at \( f_T \) there is some deviation from the linear trend predicted by (5.2), which is only a first-order approximation.) This supports the hypothesis that the frequency dependence of \( C_{gg} \) in accumulation is from series resistance. Further, (5.2) indicates that the decrease in \( C_{gg} \) with frequency should, for a fixed series resistance, be smaller if the low frequency capacitance is smaller; the simple series \( R_{bulk} C_{gg}^{(0)} \) model (5.2), therefore, also explains the reduced frequency dependence in depletion, where the low frequency capacitance is significantly smaller than in accumulation, but \( R_{bulk} \) is essentially unchanged. The rapid increase in \( C_{gg}^{(0)} \) as \( V_{GS} \) decreases is the cause of the peak in \( C_{gg} \) around flatband at high frequencies.

We stress that the models (5.1) and (5.2) used for the above analyses are not
general and are only approximate even in the regions of operation they are targeted to model. We now present further PSP-RTA-NQS and TCAD simulation results that verify that the frequency dependence of $C_{gg}$ is due to $R_{\text{bulk}}$ in accumulation and is due to inversion charge inertia in strong inversion.

Fig. 5.4 shows PSP-RTA-NQS simulations that include $R_{\text{bulk}}$; there is a significant improvement in compact modeling accuracy in accumulation and depletion cf. Fig. 5.2, and in particular, the peaks in $C_{gg}$ in the vicinity of flatband at the higher frequencies are captured. The value of $R_{\text{bulk}}$ determined from optimization to fit the TCAD simulations is 2.20 kΩ; this compares well with the values of 2.23 and 2.17 kΩ determined from the slope of a linear regression using the first 3 and
Fig. 5.5. Effect of accounting for $R_{\text{bulk}}$ – TCAD and PSP-QS models of $C_{gg}$ with $R_{\text{bulk}} = 2.2 \text{ k\Omega}$ included for PSP-QS. Same device parameters and frequencies as Fig. 5.1.

the first 5 points of the plot of Fig. 5.3, respectively. As further verification that the frequency dependence of $C_{gg}$ in accumulation is a bulk resistance effect, and not an NQS effect, Fig. 5.5 shows simulations with $R_{\text{bulk}}$ included but using the PSP-QS model; there is no change in the accuracy of fit of $C_{gg}$ in accumulation and depletion cf. Fig. 5.4.

Fig. 5.6 shows results, at $f = f_{T}$, with the body thickness in the TCAD simulations varied from $20 \mu\text{m}$ to $40 \mu\text{m}$. Increasing the body thickness should not alter the inertia of holes at the surface, but increases $R_{\text{bulk}}$ and therefore, decreases the apparent $C_{gg}$ at high frequency; this is exactly what is observed in Fig. 5.6. $R_{\text{bulk}}$ was adjusted in PSP RTA-NQS for each case for good fitting of the TCAD
Fig. 5.6. Effect of variation of bulk thickness, \( f = f_T = 1.6 \text{ GHz.} \) PSP-RTA-NQS model parameter \( R_{\text{bulk}} = 2/3R_{\text{bulk}0}, R_{\text{bulk}0} \) and \( 4/3R_{\text{bulk}0} \) for \( t_{\text{bulk}} = 2/3t_{\text{bulk}0}, t_{\text{bulk}0} \) and \( 4/3t_{\text{bulk}0} \), respectively. Here \( R_{\text{bulk}0} = 2.2 \text{ k}\Omega \) and \( t_{\text{bulk}0} = 30 \mu\text{m}. \)

simulations, and the ratio of \( R_{\text{bulk}} \) to the body thickness varied by less than 10% over the body thickness values that were simulated.

The frequency dependence of \( C_{\text{gg}} \) in accumulation and depletion is thus not an NQS effect for the body charge, but is due to the resistance of the bulk (and, as we will see below, also depends on gate resistance, although to a lesser extent); inclusion of series resistance is therefore necessary to model properly \( C_{\text{gg}} \) over frequency.

5.3. Analytic Expression for \( C_{\text{gg}} \) in the Presence of Bulk Resistance

The simple series \( R_{\text{bulk}}C_{\text{gg}}^{(0)} \) analysis result (5.2) does not take into account details of the operation of MOS devices. In particular, it fails to predict that \( R_{\text{bulk}} \) does not affect \( C_{\text{gg}} \) in strong inversion, see Fig. 5.5. Physically, this is due to the
fact that in strong inversion, the incremental change in inversion charge with bias
flows from the source and drain regions and not from the bulk of the device. To
make this clear, we now develop an analytic expression for the effect of $R_{\text{bulk}}$ while
neglecting, for simplicity, inertia in the formation of the inversion charge.

We adopt the notation

$$v_G(t) = V_G + \text{Re} \left( \Delta v_g \cdot e^{i\omega t} \right)$$  \hspace{1cm} (5.3)

where $v_G(t)$ is the instantaneous value of the gate bias, $V_G$ is its quiescent value,
and $\Delta v_g$ is the phasor representing the small harmonic component with the angular
frequency $\omega$. Another example, the phasors for the substrate displacement current
and charge are related by

$$\Delta i_b = i \omega \Delta q_b.$$  \hspace{1cm} (5.4)

Inclusion of the voltage drop in the bulk in the surface potential equation gives

$$v_{GB}(t) - V_{FB} - \psi_S(t) - i_b(t)R_{\text{bulk}} = -q_I(t) - q_B(t)$$  \hspace{1cm} (5.5)

where $\psi_S$, $q_I$, and $q_B$ are following the same definitions we used in the previous
chapters. It is also assumed that the quiescent substrate current is negligible

$$i_B = i_b.$$  \hspace{1cm} (5.6)

With reference to (5.4), the phasor form of this equation becomes

$$\Delta v_g = [1 + (1 + i\omega T_B)\xi] \Delta \psi_s - \Delta q_i$$  \hspace{1cm} (5.7)
where $T_B = R_{\text{bulk}}C_{\text{ox}}$ and $\xi = -dq_B/d\psi_S/C_{\text{ox}}$, see (4.8). In the QS approximation (neglecting the inertia of the inversion layer formation, cf. [58, 60])

$$\frac{\Delta q_g}{C_{\text{ox}}} = F \Delta \psi_s \quad (5.8)$$

$$\frac{\Delta q_i}{C_{\text{ox}}} = (F - \xi) \Delta \psi_s \quad (5.9)$$

and

$$F = \frac{dv_G}{d\psi_S} - 1. \quad (5.10)$$

Then, from (5.7)

$$\Delta v_g = (1 + F + i\omega T_B \xi) \Delta \psi_s \quad (5.11)$$

$$= (1 + F)(1 + i\omega T_B c_{42}) \Delta \psi_s \quad (5.12)$$

where

$$c_{42} = \frac{\xi}{1 + F} = \frac{1}{C_{\text{ox}} \frac{dq_B}{dv_G}}. \quad (5.13)$$

Using (5.8) once more yields

$$\frac{\Delta q_g}{\Delta v_g} = \frac{\Delta q_g/\Delta \psi_s}{\Delta v_g/\Delta \psi_s} \quad (5.14)$$

$$= \frac{1}{C_{\text{ox}} (1 + F)(1 + i\omega T_B c_{42})} \quad (5.15)$$

and including the quasi-equilibrium value

$$C_{gg}^{(0)} = F/(1 + F) \quad (5.16)$$

of $c_{gg}$ for $R_{\text{bulk}} = 0$ gives

$$c_{gg} = \frac{1}{C_{\text{ox}}} \Im \left( \frac{\Delta q_g/\Delta v_g}{\Delta v_g/\Delta v_g} \right) \quad (5.17)$$

$$= \frac{C_{gg}^{(0)}}{1 + (\omega T_B c_{42})^2} \quad (5.18)$$
In non-normalized form, this is
\[
C_{gg} = \frac{C_{gg}^{(0)}}{1 + (\omega R_{\text{bulk}} C_{bg})^2} \tag{5.19}
\]

The non-trivial aspect of this analysis is that different capacitances appear in the numerator and denominator of (5.18) and (5.19); this does not follow from the simple \( R_{\text{bulk}} C_{gg}^{(0)} \) analysis of (5.2). In strong inversion, \( C_{bg} \) is negligible and the effect of \( R_{\text{bulk}} \) disappears, as explained above. In accumulation, \( C_{bg} = C_{gg}^{(0)} \), so (5.19) reduces to (5.2).

Comparison with the results of TCAD simulations, see Fig. 5.7, shows that (5.18) accurately describes the effects of series resistance, including the peak of \( C_{gg} \) near flatband. This further confirms that NQS effects are not involved in the frequency dependence of \( C_{gg} \) in the accumulation and depletion regions.

5.4. Experimental Data

To further investigate the frequency dependence of MOSFET gate capacitance, we measured s-parameters over gate bias and frequency, with \( V_{DS} = V_{BS} = 0 \), of a PMOS transistor in a 90nm RF CMOS process.

Fig. 5.8 shows measured data from the device, along with simulation results from the PSP-RTA-NQS model. \( R_{\text{bulk}} \) and \( R_{\text{gate}} \) were adjusted to provide a least squares fit to the data. The peak in the \( C_{gg}(V_G) \) characteristic near flatband seen in the TCAD simulations and predicted by our analytic expression (5.18) are also observed in the measured data and are able to be modeled by PSP-RTA-NQS.

Unlike the TCAD simulations, the measured device does not have an ideal gate contact but includes some nonzero \( R_{\text{gate}} \). Fig. 5.9 shows the measured data along
Fig. 5.7. TCAD and analytic models, $R_{\text{bulk}}$ effect only (no NQS) in the analytic model. Same device parameters and frequencies as Fig. 5.1.

with PSP-RTA-NQS simulations with all parameters kept at the same values as those used for Fig. 5.8 with the exception of $R_{\text{gate}}$, which was set to zero. The gate resistance has some effect on the PSP-RTA-NQS simulation results, especially at higher frequencies in strong inversion. This is where it would be expected to have the greatest influence: in strong inversion, the gate charging current is predominantly gate-to-channel. Hence, it should be affected by $R_{\text{gate}}$ but not by $R_{\text{bulk}}$. There is some influence of $R_{\text{gate}}$ in accumulation, as well; however, as Fig. 5.10 shows, if $R_{\text{bulk}}$ is set to zero instead of $R_{\text{gate}}$, the change in behavior in accumulation is significantly greater, and there is only a very small change in the modeled characteristics in strong inversion. This is also expected as, in general, the gate is made from much lower resistivity material than the bulk, therefore, $R_{\text{bulk}}$ should be greater than $R_{\text{gate}}$; they
Fig. 5.8. Measured PMOS data and PSP-RTA-NQS model with both $R_{\text{bulk}}$ and $R_{\text{gate}}$ included. $W/L = 10.0\mu\text{m}/1.2\mu\text{m}$, frequencies are 5, 10, 20, 30, and 50 GHz (top to bottom). $f_T = 0.71\text{GHz}$.

essentially appear in series in accumulation, hence, $R_{\text{bulk}}$ should have the dominant effect on device behavior.

As one final option, Fig. 5.11 shows the measured data along with PSP-RTA-NQS simulations with all parameters kept at the same values as those used for Fig. 5.8, but with the QS, rather than RTA-NQS, version of PSP selected. Compared with Fig. 5.8, clearly, the behavior at the lower frequencies in strong inversion is dominated by NQS effects; however, a comparison of Figs. 5.9 and 5.11 shows that at higher frequencies, the influence of the gate resistance is more pronounced than the contribution of NQS effects. To model accurately, the high frequency behavior of MOS capacitance over all regions of operation, it is, therefore, necessary to account
Fig. 5.9. Effect of not accounting for $R_{\text{gate}}$—measured PMOS data and PSP-RTA-NQS model with only $R_{\text{bulk}}$ included. Same device and frequencies as Fig. 5.8.

for all of $R_{\text{bulk}}$, $R_{\text{gate}}$, and NQS effects.

5.5. Summary

In this chapter, we present an analytic solution for and measurements, TCAD simulations, and PSP-RTA-NQS model simulations of the frequency dependence of MOSFET gate capacitance. We clearly demonstrate that the frequency dependency of $C_{\text{gg}}$ in accumulation and depletion is from $R_{\text{bulk}}$ and, to a lesser extent, $R_{\text{gate}}$ and not, as has been claimed previously, from NQS effects.

In inversion, $R_{\text{bulk}}$ has a significantly smaller effect than in accumulation, but we show that it is important to account both for $R_{\text{gate}}$ and for NQS effects to be able to model accurately the frequency dependency of $C_{\text{gg}}$ in strong inversion.
Fig. 5.10. Effect of not accounting for $R_{\text{bulk}}$ – measured PMOS data and PSP-RTA-NQS model with only $R_{\text{gate}}$ included. Same device and frequencies as Fig. 5.8.

Figs. 5.4 and 5.8 show the capability of PSP-RTA-NQS to fit TCAD simulations and measured data, respectively, when $R_{\text{bulk}}$, $R_{\text{gate}}$, and NQS effects are all taken into account.
Fig. 5.11. Effect of not accounting for NQS effects – measured PMOS data and PSP-QS model with $R_{\text{bulk}}$ and $R_{\text{gate}}$ included. Same device as Fig. 5.8. In addition to the same frequencies as in Fig. 5.8, the curve for $f \ll f_T$ is included as well.
CHAPTER 6

Conclusions

6.1. Conclusion

It is possible to improve on the traditional form of the RTA NQS model by not using the RTA for the bulk and gate charges. The new formulation retains the speed and simplicity of the original RTA NQS approach but improves the accuracy of the model, especially for the gate and bulk currents. The PSP-based formulation of the improved RTA NQS model is verified by comparison with TCAD simulations and experimental data. The new model is coded in verilog-A and several circuit applications are performed to illustrate the new approach and to demonstrate its convergence properties. In addition, a new and simple technique to characterize NQS and gate resistance, $R_g$, MOS model parameters from measured data has been presented.

The effects of bulk resistance on the MOSFET gate capacitance is investigated both theoretically and experimentally to separate it from the NQS effects.
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Model validation against the experimental data was done over a wide range of gate biases, drain biases, and frequencies. These data can be generally categorized into two groups, i.e. those for $V_{DS} = 0$ and those for $V_{DS} \neq 0$. Because of limited space, only representative part of the validation results were presented in Chapter 3 which are for $V_{DS} \neq 0$. Here, additional results for model validation including $V_{DS} = 0$ are provided in Fig. A.1 - A.16. In these cases, the data are presented for swept gate biases from -1.5 to 1.5V with multiple frequencies up to roughly $3f_T$. In the first section, results for $V_{DS} = 0$ are presented.

A.1. $V_{DS} = 0$ V

![Graph showing comparison of model and measured data for a PMOS $g_{gg}$ when $V_{DS} = 0$ V. Frequencies are 0.1, 0.5, 1 and 2 GHz where $f_T = 0.71$ GHz. $L = 1.2 \mu m$, $W = 10 \mu m$.](image_url)

Fig. A.1. Comparison of model and measured data for a PMOS $g_{gg}$ when $V_{DS} = 0$ V. Frequencies are 0.1, 0.5, 1 and 2 GHz where $f_T = 0.71$ GHz. $L = 1.2 \mu m$, $W = 10 \mu m$. 
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Fig. A.2. Comparison of model and measured data for a PMOS $C_{gg}$ when $V_{DS} = 0$ V. Frequencies are 0.1, 0.5, 1 and 2 GHz where $f_T = 0.71$ GHz. $L = 1.2 \mu$m, $W = 10 \mu$m.
Fig. A.3. Comparison of model and measured data for a PMOS $g_{gd}$ when $V_{DS} = 0$ V. Frequencies are 0.1, 0.5, 1 and 2 GHz where $f_T = 0.71$ GHz. $L = 1.2 \, \mu m$, $W = 10 \, \mu m$. 
Fig. A.4. Comparison of model and measured data for a PMOS $C_{gd}$ when $V_{DS} = 0$ V. Frequencies are 0.1, 0.5, 1 and 2 GHz where $f_T = 0.71$ GHz. $L = 1.2$ µm, $W = 10$ µm.
Fig. A.5. Comparison of model and measured data for a PMOS $g_{dg}$ when $V_{DS} = 0$ V. Frequencies are 0.1, 0.5, 1 and 2 GHz where $f_T = 0.71$ GHz. $L = 1.2 \mu$m, $W = 10 \mu$m.
Fig. A.6. Comparison of model and measured data for a PMOS $C_{dg}$ when $V_{DS} = 0$ V. Frequencies are 0.1, 0.5, 1 and 2 GHz where $f_T = 0.71$ GHz. $L = 1.2$ $\mu$m, $W = 10$ $\mu$m.
Fig. A.7. Comparison of model and measured data for a PMOS $g_{dd}$ when $V_{DS} = 0$ V. Frequencies are 0.1, 0.5, 1 and 2 GHz where $f_T = 0.71$ GHz. $L = 1.2$ µm, $W = 10$ µm.
Fig. A.8. Comparison of model and measured data for a PMOS $C_{dd}$ when $V_{DS} = 0$ V. Frequencies are 0.1, 0.5, 1 and 2 GHz where $f_T = 0.71$ GHz. $L = 1.2 \mu m$, $W = 10 \mu m$. 
In the next section, results for $V_{DS} = -0.3V$ are presented.

A.2. $V_{DS} = -0.3V$

Fig. A.9. Comparison of model and measured data for a PMOS $g_{gg}$ when $V_{DS} = -0.3V$. Frequencies are 0.1, 0.5, 1 and 2 GHz where $f_T = 0.71$ GHz. $L = 1.2 \mu m$, $W = 10 \mu m$. 

Fig. A.10. Comparison of model and measured data for a PMOS $C_{gg}$ when $V_{DS} = -0.3$ V. Frequencies are 0.1, 0.5, 1 and 2 GHz where $f_T = 0.71$ GHz. $L = 1.2 \, \mu m$, $W = 10 \, \mu m$. 

Fig. A.11. Comparison of model and measured data for a PMOS $g_{gd}$ when $V_{DS} = -0.3$ V. Frequencies are 0.1, 0.5, 1 and 2 GHz where $f_T = 0.71$ GHz. $L = 1.2$ $\mu$m, $W = 10$ $\mu$m.
Fig. A.12. Comparison of model and measured data for a PMOS $C_{gd}$ when $V_{DS} = -0.3$ V. Frequencies are 0.1, 0.5, 1 and 2 GHz where $f_T = 0.71$ GHz. $L = 1.2$ µm, $W = 10$ µm.
Fig. A.13. Comparison of model and measured data for a PMOS $g_{\text{dg}}$ when $V_{\text{DS}} = -0.3$ V. Frequencies are 0.1, 0.5, 1 and 2 GHz where $f_T = 0.71$ GHz. $L = 1.2 \ \mu\text{m}$, $W = 10 \ \mu\text{m}$. 
Fig. A.14. Comparison of model and measured data for a PMOS $C_{dg}$ when $V_{DS} = -0.3$ V. Frequencies are 0.1, 0.5, 1 and 2 GHz where $f_T = 0.71$ GHz. $L = 1.2\ \mu$m, $W = 10\ \mu$m.
Fig. A.15. Comparison of model and measured data for a PMOS $g_{dd}$ when $V_{DS} = -0.3$ V. Frequencies are 0.1, 0.5, 1 and 2 GHz where $f_T = 0.71$ GHz. $L = 1.2 \ \mu m$, $W = 10 \ \mu m$. 

![Graph showing comparison of model and measured data for PMOS $g_{dd}$]
Fig. A.16. Comparison of model and measured data for a PMOS $C_{dd}$ when $V_{DS} = -0.3$ V. Frequencies are 0.1, 0.5, 1 and 2 GHz where $f_T = 0.71$ GHz. $L = 1.2 \ \mu$m, $W = 10 \ \mu$m.
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