

# Recent progress in ab initio simulations of hafnia-based gate stacks

H. Zhu · C. Tang · L. R. C. Fonseca ·  
R. Ramprasad

Received: 3 March 2012 / Accepted: 8 May 2012  
© Springer Science+Business Media, LLC 2012

**Abstract** The continuous size downscaling of complementary metal–oxide–semiconductor (CMOS) transistors has led to the replacement of SiO<sub>2</sub> with a HfO<sub>2</sub>-based high dielectric constant (or high-*k*) oxide, and the polysilicon electrode with a metal gate. The approach to this technological evolution has spurred a plethora of fundamental research to address several pressing issues. This review focusses on the large body of first principles (or ab initio) computational work employing conventional density functional theory (DFT) and beyond-DFT calculations pertaining to HfO<sub>2</sub>-based dielectric stacks. Specifically, structural, thermodynamic, electronic, and point-defect properties of bulk HfO<sub>2</sub>, Si/HfO<sub>2</sub> interfaces, and metal/HfO<sub>2</sub> interfaces are covered in detail. Interfaces between HfO<sub>2</sub> and substrates with high mobility such as Ge and GaAs are also briefly reviewed. In sum, first principles studies have provided important insights and guidances to the CMOS research community and are expected to play an even more important role in the future with the further optimization and “scaling down” of transistors.

## Introduction

The great success of the semiconductor industry in the last four decades has relied on the size downscaling of metal–oxide–semiconductor field effect transistors (MOSFETs). As per Moore’s law, the density of Si-based on-chip MOSFETs, consisting of polysilicon–SiO<sub>2</sub>–Si stacks, has doubled about every 18 months, leading to higher speed, increased functionality, and lower cost [1]. To maintain the capacitance of the dielectric layer while laterally shrinking the transistor size (or capacitor area), it has become necessary to progressively reduce the SiO<sub>2</sub> layer thickness, as prescribed by the parallel plate capacitor model:  $C = \epsilon_0 k A / t$ , where  $\epsilon_0$  is the vacuum permittivity,  $k$  is the dielectric constant,  $A$  is the capacitor area, and  $t$  is the oxide thickness. SiO<sub>2</sub> has remained a remarkable gate dielectric in Si-based MOSFETs down to the 65-nm technology node which requires a SiO<sub>2</sub> layer thickness of  $\sim 1.2$  nm (Fig. 1a) [2, 3]. Further thinning of the oxide layer leads to high leakage current due to electron tunneling across the oxide, which presents a serious obstacle for device reliability [4].

The replacement of SiO<sub>2</sub> with high dielectric constant, or high-*k*, oxides provides a solution to this problem, as this enables a thicker dielectric layer while still maintaining the required capacitance. A promising high-*k* alternative should have the following key properties to allow its application in transistors [5–9]: (a) its *k* value should be in the range of 10–30 (compared to 3.9 for SiO<sub>2</sub>). Dielectrics with too high *k* values are not preferable as they can induce harmful fringe fields between the gate and the drain/source electrodes; (b) it should have a large band gap ( $E_g > 5$  eV) and large enough band offsets ( $>1$  eV) with respect to Si to minimize carrier injection into its bands; (c) the dielectric should display low density of defects within its bulk region


---

H. Zhu · R. Ramprasad (✉)  
Chemical, Materials and Biomolecular Engineering and Institute  
of Materials Science, University of Connecticut,  
97 North Eagleville Road, Storrs, CT 06269, USA  
e-mail: rampi@ims.uconn.edu

H. Zhu  
e-mail: zhuhong1984sh@yahoo.com

C. Tang  
School of Chemistry, The University of Sydney, Sydney,  
NSW 2006, Australia

L. R. C. Fonseca  
Center for Semiconductor Components, State University  
of Campinas, 130983-870 Campinas, SP, Brazil




**Fig. 1** Transmission electron microscope images of **a** 65-nm technology MOSFETs with a thin SiO<sub>2</sub> dielectric layer and a polysilicon electrode and **b** 45-nm technology MOSFETs with a thicker HfO<sub>2</sub> dielectric layer and a metal electrode [3, 14]. Reprinted with permission from Refs. [3, 14]

as well as at its interfaces with the bottom Si channel and with the top metal electrode; and (d) the entire dielectric gate stack is required to handle the high thermal treatments (e.g., up to 1000 K) during microelectronic fabrication process steps.

The migration from SiO<sub>2</sub> to a high-*k* dielectric also requires the replacement of the polysilicon gate with a metal gate, due to the thermodynamic instability of polysilicon on many high-*k* materials [5, 6]. One desires to utilize metal electrodes with appropriate work functions such that the metal Fermi level lines up with either the valence band maximum (VBM) or conduction band minimum (CBM) of the underlying Si substrate. However, due to interfacial effects (such as charge transfer, bond formation, defect accumulation, dipole creation, etc.), the metal work function shifts from its vacuum value. It is thus this shifted, or *effective*, work function,  $\phi_{\text{eff}}$ , that really matters in the choice of the appropriate metal for the gate electrode [5, 6].

Since the realization of the unsustainability of SiO<sub>2</sub> for continued device miniaturization, a lot of potential high-*k* dielectric materials, such as TiO<sub>2</sub>, SrTiO<sub>3</sub>, Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>, Y<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>, ZrO<sub>2</sub>, HfO<sub>2</sub>, etc., have been examined [9, 10]. It was quickly realized that a general compromising relationship exists for these materials between *k* and  $E_g$ , as shown in Fig. 2 [11–13]. Dielectrics with very large *k* value, such as TiO<sub>2</sub> and SrTiO<sub>3</sub>, have small  $E_g$  and band offsets with Si, and hence display a small electrical breakdown strength. On the other hand, dielectrics with large band gaps, such as Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>, are also not ideal alternatives due to the small *k* value. Among the remaining candidates, Hf-based oxides (e.g., HfO<sub>2</sub>) exhibit the best combination of desired properties and have been successfully introduced into the 45-nm technology node along with a TiN metal gate electrode (Fig. 1b) [14].

The last decade has seen monumental research efforts to address challenges that have accompanied this technology



**Fig. 2** Band gap ( $E_g$ ) versus static dielectric constant (*k*) for representative high-*k* materials [5–7, 9]

evolution [7, 9, 15, 16]. These efforts include the identification and mitigation of charge traps/sources within HfO<sub>2</sub>, determination and control of the causes of the chemical instability of thin HfO<sub>2</sub> layers in contact with Si, and attempts to control the metal Fermi level alignment with the Si band edges to prevent “Fermi level pinning” (e.g., the undesirable pinning of the metal Fermi level at the Si mid-gap energies regardless of metal after high-temperature annealing [5, 6, 17, 18]). An important component of these past research efforts was atomic-level first principles, or *ab initio*, modeling based on density functional theory (DFT) computations, which have provided deep physical understanding and insights. This contribution specifically reviews first principles computational efforts pertaining to HfO<sub>2</sub>-based gate stacks, and complements prior more general reviews [19–21].

Since the late 1990s, DFT has been widely applied to understanding the properties of HfO<sub>2</sub>-based materials. Initial efforts mainly focused on the physical and electronic structure [22–27], phase stability [28–30], and point-defect chemistry of different polymorphs of HfO<sub>2</sub> or ZrO<sub>2</sub> [31–33], using semi(local) exchange–correlation functionals based on the generalized gradient approximations (GGA) and the local density approximation (LDA). More recently, *ab initio* molecular dynamics, Monte Carlo simulations and first principles thermodynamics (FPT) have elucidated high-temperature properties of crystalline HfO<sub>2</sub> and ZrO<sub>2</sub> [28, 34–36] as well as their interfaces with Si or metals [37–39]. DFT studies of Si/HfO<sub>2</sub> or metal/HfO<sub>2</sub> interfaces have demonstrated that the band alignments (or band offsets) and dielectric profile across the heterostructure are strongly related to the local interfacial chemistry, which varies with temperature and pressure [39–51].

Although these GGA or LDA results provide many important insights, they are plagued by the well-known band-gap underestimation problem due to the spurious electron self-interactions leading to uncertainties in computed properties, such as defect levels, defect formation energies, and band offsets. Thus, there is a general growing belief that beyond-DFT methods are necessary for accurate high-fidelity predictions of the electronic structure, defect chemistry, and thermochemistry. Examples of such treatments include the usage of hybrid electron exchange–correlation functionals (instead of purely semilocal functionals) [52–54], the LDA-1/2 technique [55–58], and many-body perturbation theory in the *GW* approximation [59, 60]. Such methods have already been applied to HfO<sub>2</sub> and interfaces involving HfO<sub>2</sub> [61–66]. As the community is poised to explore such sophisticated options, challenges and complications that accompany adoption of these newer methods must be carefully assessed, as has been recently pointed out [61, 67–71].

On the technological side, several challenges pertaining to the further evolution of the current and future generations of MOSFETs remain open. A critical and immediate hurdle is the optimization of the gate stack such that the interfaces of HfO<sub>2</sub> with Si and the metal electrode can be better controlled such that the Fermi level of the metal is aligned with the CBM or VBM of Si [72]. Looking further down the road, viable opportunities include the usage of non-Si substrates (e.g., Ge, GaAs) with HfO<sub>2</sub> as the dielectric [73, 74], and the identification of options for high-*k* dielectrics beyond HfO<sub>2</sub> [75]. It can be expected that these scenarios will spur additional fundamental modeling efforts (to some extent, this has already commenced [76–83]).

While this review focuses on Hf-based dielectrics in gate stacks, it is worth pointing out that these dielectrics have found another potentially important application in resistive random access memory (RRAM) devices [84, 85]. In these devices, information is stored as a reversible change in dielectric resistance due to the formation of a conductive path via defect chains—filaments made of an oxygen-poor conductive phase, or possibly defects along grain boundaries. Such nanoionic devices rely on ion transport and chemical change at the nanoscale [86]. Their performance has been investigated experimentally, with key factors such as programming speed, endurance, and retention characteristics, as well as physical and electrical scalability, showing promising results [87]. It is anticipated that much of the past computational work on HfO<sub>2</sub> pertaining to MOSFETs, and anticipated future work, will thus be relevant for this new class of applications.


This manuscript is organized as follows. “**Bulk hafnia studies**” section describes past studies on bulk HfO<sub>2</sub>, including the physical and electronic structure of defect-free HfO<sub>2</sub>, as well as investigations pertaining to point

defects and dopants in bulk HfO<sub>2</sub>. The Si/HfO<sub>2</sub> interface is considered in “**Interfaces with silicon**” section, with the primary focus being the interfacial band offsets, defect dynamics, and phase diagrams. “**Interfaces with metal electrodes**” section contains an analogous discussion of the metal/HfO<sub>2</sub> interface, with particular focus on the interfacial dipole layer, and its impact on the electrode effective work function ( $\phi_{\text{eff}}$ ). “**Interface engineering**” section discusses past attempts at the engineering of the metal/HfO<sub>2</sub> interface, and anticipated and needed future work. Recent computational work motivated by the anticipated technology evolution beyond Si is briefly discussed in “**Beyond silicon technology**” section, and “**Summary**” section contains the summary.

## Bulk hafnia studies

### Physical and electronic structure

Depending on the growth conditions, HfO<sub>2</sub> can exist in several different polymorphic phases. When chemical vapor deposition, the common technique used within the context of microelectronics, is used, the as-deposited HfO<sub>2</sub> is typically amorphous (a-HfO<sub>2</sub>) which then crystallizes during high-temperature annealing ( $\sim 1000$  K). The three low pressure crystalline polymorphs of HfO<sub>2</sub> are the monoclinic, tetragonal, and cubic phases, as illustrated in Fig. 3. Among the three phases, the monoclinic phase (m-HfO<sub>2</sub>) is stable at low-temperature, which undergoes a phase transition to the tetragonal phase (t-HfO<sub>2</sub>) at  $\sim 2000$  K and subsequently to the cubic phase (c-HfO<sub>2</sub>) at  $\sim 2870$  K [29]. c-HfO<sub>2</sub> displays the fluorite structure with Hf atoms at face-centered-cubic lattice sites and O atoms occupying all tetrahedral interstitial sites. t-HfO<sub>2</sub> can be obtained by deforming the cubic structure along one direction ( $c/a > 1$ ) and displacing alternating pairs of O atoms up and down by a certain amount along the *c* direction. m-HfO<sub>2</sub> has four HfO<sub>2</sub> units in the primitive cell; in each unit the Hf site is sevenfold coordinated and the two O sites are threefold and fourfold coordinated, respectively. [30]



**Fig. 3** Structures of **a** cubic, **b** tetragonal, and **c** monoclinic HfO<sub>2</sub>. Blue and red spheres represent Hf and O atoms, respectively (Color figure online)

The bulk phases of HfO<sub>2</sub> have been studied by several methods at varying levels of sophistication, ranging from treatments using (semi)local functionals (e.g., LDA or GGA) to hybrid functionals to many-body perturbation theory within the *GW* approximation. Among hybrid functionals, the Hyde–Scuseria–Ernzerhof (HSE) “family” of hybrid functionals are becoming increasingly popular. These functionals, which contain two parameters ( $\alpha$  and  $\omega$ ), are built from the semilocal GGA functional developed by Perdew, Burke, and Ernzerhof (PBE) [88].  $\alpha$  represents the fraction of the semilocal PBE exchange interaction replaced by a screened nonlocal functional, and  $\omega$  is the inverse screening length [54]. The two common cases when  $(\alpha, \omega) = (0.25, 0.207 \text{ \AA}^{-1})$  and  $(0.25, 0 \text{ \AA}^{-1})$  are named as HSE06 and PBE0, respectively. In many-body perturbation theory, the self-energy that links the noninteracting system with the interacting one is given by the product of the Green’s function  $G$  and the screened Coulomb interaction  $W$ . Partial self-consistent calculation of  $G$  with fixed screening, denoted as  $GW_0$ , is viewed as a practical and accurate method for evaluating quasiparticle energies [89].

Table 1 summarizes the available theoretical and experimental results for the lattice parameters of m-, t-, and c-HfO<sub>2</sub>. As we can see, the HSE functional does a better job in geometry predictions compared to PBE or LDA. This improvement has been extensively observed before by Hyed et al. [53] who assessed the HSE functional for the prediction of lattice parameters for a set of 40 semiconductors. However, we also note that the PBE (or LDA) lattice parameters of HfO<sub>2</sub> are already in reasonable agreement with experiment with the largest discrepancy of 1.5 % (or 3.7 %), respectively.

Table 1 also provides the trace of the dielectric constant tensor (i.e., its orientationally averaged value) as computed in the past along with comparisons with experiments. The theoretical  $k$  for m-HfO<sub>2</sub>, c-HfO<sub>2</sub>, and a-HfO<sub>2</sub> are  $\sim 16$  (or 18), 26–29, and  $\sim 22$ , respectively, compared to the experimental values of 16–18,  $\sim 25$ , and  $\sim 21$ . The computed  $k$  for t-HfO<sub>2</sub> spreads over a wide range (70 in Ref. [90], 29 in Ref. [97], and 40 in Ref. [91]). In general, among the four structures, m-HfO<sub>2</sub> has the smallest dielectric constant and is thus not favored in high- $k$  dielectric applications. It has hence become a common practice to stabilize the amorphous or high-temperature phases during post-deposition annealing through doping or epitaxial constraints. For example, HfO<sub>2</sub> films doped with Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> with a  $\langle 002 \rangle$ -oriented tetragonal phase exhibited a dielectric constant of 47 [102]. It is also reported that growing HfO<sub>2</sub> on rutile TiO<sub>2</sub> will induce a mixture of tetragonal and amorphous structured HfO<sub>2</sub> and display a dielectric constant as high as 29 [103].

The underestimation of band gaps of non-metallic solids is a well-known issue with conventional DFT that uses LDA or GGA exchange–correlation functionals. As a result, reliable predictions of the band gap and other electronic structure features of HfO<sub>2</sub> had to wait till affordable utilization of hybrid functionals and many-body perturbation theory within the *GW* approximation became possible. We note from Table 1 that the  $GW_0$  and HSE methods improve the band gap of HfO<sub>2</sub>, compared to LDA and PBE.

### Point-defect chemistry

Compared to SiO<sub>2</sub>, HfO<sub>2</sub> contains a much higher defect concentration, which leads to charge trapping, Coulombic scattering of carriers in the transistor channel, threshold voltage shifts, and a potential source of instability [6, 7]. Consequently, there has been a critical need to identify the nature of these imperfections, e.g., the defect energy levels, defect formation, and migration energetics. Recent advances on these defect-related properties of HfO<sub>2</sub> based on semilocal exchange–correlation functionals, hybrid functionals, and many-body perturbation theory are summarized below.

### Defect formation energetics

The formation energy of a defect in a charge state  $q$  is given by

$$E^f(D^q) = E_D^q - E_{\text{bulk}} \pm \mu + q(E_F + E_V + \Delta V), \quad (1)$$

where  $E_D^q$  is the total energy of the supercell with one defect in charge state  $q$ .  $E_{\text{bulk}}$  is the total energy of a perfect supercell and  $\mu$  is the chemical potential of the atomic species constituting the defect. For example, for an O vacancy in HfO<sub>2</sub>,  $\mu$  stands for the chemical potential of an O atom ( $\mu_{\text{O}}$ ). There exist two extreme limits of  $\mu_{\text{O}}$ , corresponding to the O-rich (e.g., O in the O<sub>2</sub> molecule) and the O-deficient (e.g., that defined by Hf–HfO<sub>2</sub> equilibrium) conditions. The Fermi level,  $E_F$ , is referenced to the VBM of the perfect supercell,  $E_V$ , and  $\Delta V$  is a correction to appropriately line up the energy zero of the supercells with and without the defect. Depending on the  $E_F$  position, the preferred charge state of a point defect may vary. The  $E_F$  at which point defects in two different charge states  $q$  and  $q'$  are at thermodynamic equilibrium with each other is defined as the thermodynamic defect charge transition level,  $\tilde{\mu}(q/q')$ . In the above equation,  $E_D^q$  is assumed to include corrections (such as the Makov–Payne [104] and related [105, 106] corrections) to account for the spurious electrostatic interactions of charged defects due to periodicity and finite supercell sizes.

**Table 1** Theoretical and experimental lattice parameters (in Å), orientationally averaged dielectric constant ( $k$ ), and band gap ( $E_g$  in eV) of HfO<sub>2</sub>

System	References	Method	$a$	$b$	$c$	$k$	$E_g$
m-HfO <sub>2</sub>	[62]	LDA	5.171	5.276	5.292		3.9
	[62]	GW <sub>0</sub>					5.9
	[90]	LDA	5.106	5.165	5.281	16	
	[91]	LDA				16.5	4.04
	[63]	PBE	5.09	5.12	5.34		4.34
	[63]	HSE06					5.98
	[63]	PBE0					6.75
	[92]	HSE(0.29, 0.207)	5.12	5.16	5.28		
	[93–96]	EXPT	5.117	5.175	5.291	16–18	5.7
t-HfO <sub>2</sub>	[62]	LDA	5.114		5.169		4.1
	[62]	GW <sub>0</sub>					6
	[90]	LDA	5.056		5.127	70	
	[97]	LDA	5.11		5.17	28.54	
	[91]	LDA				39.9	4.72
	[29]	PBE	5.078		5.228		4.85
	[93–96]	EXPT	5.151		5.181		
c-HfO <sub>2</sub>	[62]	LDA	5.273				3.5
	[62]	GW <sub>0</sub>					5.5
	[90]	LDA	5.037			29	
	[97]	LDA	5.11			26.17	
	[91]	LDA				26.9	4.06
	[29]	PBE	5.076				3.95
	[93–96]	EXPT	5.08			25	5.6–6
a-HfO <sub>2</sub>	[98]	LDA				22	3.8
	[99]	PBE0				21.5	5.3
	[100, 101]	EXPT				21.2	5.5


HSE(0.29, 0.207) stands for the hybrid functional with  $(\alpha, \omega) = (0.29, 0.207 \text{ \AA}^{-1})$

The formation energy of native point defects for m-HfO<sub>2</sub>, such as the O vacancy ( $V_O$ ), O interstitial ( $O_I$ ), Hf vacancy ( $V_{Hf}$ ), Hf interstitial ( $Hf_I$ ), etc., have been extensively studied using standard DFT methods [31–33]. Figure 4a displays the formation energy of these defects in m-HfO<sub>2</sub> computed using the PBE GGA functional by Zheng et al. ( $V_{O(3)}$  and  $V_{O(4)}$  represent O vacancies in the symmetry inequivalent three-fold and fourfold sites present in m-HfO<sub>2</sub>). Over a wide  $E_F$  range, the O-deficient condition favors  $V_{O(3)}$  (the formation energy of  $V_{O(4)}$  is slightly higher especially when in the +2 charge state). Under O-rich conditions, the charged  $V_{Hf}$  and the neutral  $O_I$  have lower formation energy. Moreover,  $V_O$  (and  $O_I$ ) shows negative-U behavior, i.e., the +1 (–1) charged vacancy is not stable against disproportionation into the neutral and +2 (–2) charged ones, in agreement with prior study by Foster et al. [32] and Kang et al. [33]  $\tilde{\mu}(0/+2)$  for  $V_{O(3)}$  and  $V_{O(4)}$  are found to be 2.78 and 2.4 eV above the VBM, respectively. On the other hand,  $\tilde{\mu}(0/–2)$  for  $O_I$  is  $\sim 1.35$  eV. The charge transition levels are summarized in Table 2.

Recently, the more relevant (but also more challenging) a-HfO<sub>2</sub> phase has been investigated using ab initio

computational methods. Treatment of the amorphous phase is appropriate not only because the as-deposited phase is amorphous but also due to the requirement that the HfO<sub>2</sub> layer should be maintained in the amorphous phase [107]. Kaneta and Yamasaki [108] have reported lower formation energies of O-related defects in a-HfO<sub>2</sub> than in crystalline HfO<sub>2</sub>, while Broqvist and Pasquarello [109] have reported similar formation energies. More recently, Tang and Ramprasad have studied the formation of native defects in the amorphous phase, as shown in Fig. 4b [107]. As the amorphous phase contains a variety of coordination environments for the same type of point defect, the formation energy of a point defect spreads over a range of values (shown as the shaded regions in Fig. 4b). Thermodynamically, it was found that  $V_O^{+2}$  and  $V_{Hf}^{-4}$  are the most probable defects over a large atomic and electronic chemical potential range, similar to the behavior displayed by m-HfO<sub>2</sub>.

However, as pointed out earlier, uncertainties exist in the  $E^f(D^q)$  and  $\tilde{\mu}(q/q')$  of defects computed using (semi)-local DFT due to the well-known “band-gap deficiency” (the GGA or LDA band gap of HfO<sub>2</sub> is much smaller than



**Fig. 4** Formation energy for O (Hf) vacancy and interstitial in m-HfO<sub>2</sub> determined from **a** GGA [31], **c** HSE [92], and **d** GW calculations [61]. The GGA results for a-HfO<sub>2</sub> are shown in **b** [107], while shaded bands are intended to capture the range of formation energy values possible in a-HfO<sub>2</sub>. Fermi energy is referred to the VBM. Replotted from data in Refs. [31, 61, 92, 107]

the experimental value of 5.7 eV, see Table 1). Recently, several approaches have been developed to predict defect properties via methods that alleviate the band-gap underestimation issue. Lyons et al. used a HSE functional with

( $\alpha, \omega$ ) = (0.29, 0.2 Å<sup>-1</sup>) to correctly predict the band gap of m-HfO<sub>2</sub> (5.86 eV). The  $E^f(V_O^q)$  of  $V_{O(3)}$ , smaller than that of  $V_{O(4)}$ , is plotted as a function of  $E_F$  in Fig. 4c. An important upshot of this study is that the  $V_O$  appears to have a positive-U behavior, in contrast to the prior GGA or LDA findings of a negative-U behavior. The charge transition levels occur in the upper half of the band gap: the calculated  $\tilde{\mu}(+1/+2)$ ,  $\tilde{\mu}(0/+1)$ , and  $\tilde{\mu}(0/+2)$  levels are 3.93, 4.42, and 4.15 eV above the VBM. On the other hand,  $O_1$  exhibits a negative-U behavior, with a  $\tilde{\mu}(0/-2)$  transition level of 2.58 eV. These results are close to the values predicted using PBE0 functionals [110], and are also collected in Table 2.


Another emerging approach to determine the defect energetics is to combine DFT and GW method, using a formalism constructed by Rinke et al. [60]. Figure 5 schematically shows the main elements of this formalism. If the formation energy of a defect in the charge state  $q$  and with arbitrary ionic coordinates  $\vec{R}$  is represented by  $E_q^f(\vec{R}_q)$ , the charge transition level between  $q$  and  $q - 1$  can be written as:

$$\tilde{\mu}(q/q - 1) = [E_{q-1}^f(\vec{R}_{q-1}) - E_{q-1}^f(\vec{R}_q)] + [E_{q-1}^f(\vec{R}_q) - E_q^f(\vec{R}_q)]. \tag{2}$$

The first bracketed term of Eq. 2 is the relaxation energy (red solid line in Fig. 5) and the second bracketed term is the quasiparticle excitation energy (blue solid line in Fig. 5). The key idea here is to use the GW method to compute excitation energy, and to use DFT to obtain the relaxation energy. In a recent study by Jain et al. [61], two paths were selected to calculate the charge transition levels. Path 1 follows the solid blue and solid red lines as already discussed while path 2 follows the dashed blue and red lines (Fig. 5). As shown in Fig. 4d,  $V_O$  in m-HfO<sub>2</sub> displays a positive-U center, which agrees with the prior HSE work [92]. The computed charge transition levels along these two paths and their averaged values are shown in Table 2.

**Table 2** Charge transition levels for  $V_O$  and  $O_1$  in m-HfO<sub>2</sub> obtained using the standard PBE GGA method [31], HSE(0.29, 0.2) hybrid functional [91], and quasiparticle excitation approach within the GW approximation [61]

	PBE	PBE0	HSE(0.29,0.2)	GW		
				Path 1	Path 2	Avg.
$V_{O(3)}$						
$\tilde{\mu}(0/+1)$			4.42	3.36	3.55	3.46
$\tilde{\mu}(+1/+2)$		3.7	3.93	2.66	2.45	2.56
$\tilde{\mu}(0/+2)$	2.78	3.83	4.15			3
$V_{O(4)}$						
$\tilde{\mu}(0/+1)$				2.91	3.15	3.03
$\tilde{\mu}(+1/+2)$				2.29	2.13	2.21
$\tilde{\mu}(0/+2)$	2.4					2.63
$O_1$						
$\tilde{\mu}(0/-2)$	1.35		2.58			



**Fig. 5** Formation energies versus the generalized coordinate, illustrating the terms in the DFT + GW formalism for the charge transition level  $\tilde{\mu}(q/q-1)$  [61]. Replotted based on Ref. [61]

The GW charge transition levels are close to the PBE ones but very different from HSE results, although the GW and HSE methods both correctly predict band gaps. As the charge transition levels are referred to the VBM, this discrepancy between the GW and HSE results is very probably caused by the “band edge problem” [69, 71], i.e., a functional that may lead to the correct band gap of an insulator may not simultaneously also lead to the correct prediction of other electronic structure features such as the band edge positions [62, 63] (or band widths).

In fact, recent study indicates that the valence band width of the defect-free host material may be even more important than the band gap in determining defect properties [67]. Such a scheme, which uses the valence band width as the descriptor, has been shown to provide accurate predictions of both the formation energy and the charge transition levels for a variety of defects in Si, Ge, ZnO, and ZrO<sub>2</sub> [67]. In the case of ZrO<sub>2</sub>, the valence band width is better represented by the PBE semilocal functional (with respect to experiments) than HSE06 [67]. Since, the electronic structure predictions for HfO<sub>2</sub> is expected to be similar to those for ZrO<sub>2</sub>, the closer agreement of the PBE results for the charge transition levels of V<sub>O</sub> in HfO<sub>2</sub> with the corresponding GW results is not surprising.

### Defect migration energetics

The migration of point defects within HfO<sub>2</sub> has been well studied in the past. Capron et al. [111] found the migration barriers for V<sub>O</sub><sup>+2</sup> in m-HfO<sub>2</sub> are about 0.5–2.5 eV, depending on the hopping path, which are lower than those of neutral vacancies. The migration of O<sub>1</sub> in m-HfO<sub>2</sub> [112] occurs via exchange with a lattice O, with barriers of 0.8, 0.3, and 0.6 eV for neutral, −1, and −2 charged states,


respectively. Thus, O<sub>1</sub><sup>−1</sup> is very active and mobile within the m-HfO<sub>2</sub> dielectric layer.

In contrast to the above findings, point-defect migration energy studies in a-HfO<sub>2</sub> provide a different perspective [107]. Figure 6 shows energy profiles as neutral and charged native point defects migrate across the a-HfO<sub>2</sub> supercell. The migration path was chosen such that the defect traverses the full extent of the a-HfO<sub>2</sub> supercell (composed of 96 atoms), and such that different types of defect sites are sampled along the path. Although several different elementary steps connecting nearest-neighbor point-defect sites were optimized using the nudged elastic band method, only migration pathways that connect one end of the supercell to the opposite end are presented here. In constructing such “long-range” diffusion pathways, an attempt was made to include elementary steps with the smallest barriers. As can be seen from Fig. 6, charged V<sub>O</sub> leads to a drastic lowering of the migration barriers, from 2.8 eV for the neutral to 1.9 eV. In contrast, O<sub>1</sub> and V<sub>Hf</sub> (regardless of whether they are charged or neutral) uniformly display migration barriers of 2.2 and 5.7 eV, respectively. These findings, along with the fact that V<sub>O</sub><sup>+2</sup> is thermodynamically stable (cf. Fig. 4b), lead to the picture that the V<sub>O</sub><sup>+2</sup> defect is the most predominant, mobile, and damaging point defect. This conclusion is consistent with recent experimental findings that oxygen vacancy is a dominant intrinsic electronic defect in HfO<sub>2</sub> [113].

### Extrinsic defect-induced phase transitions

As discussed earlier, the stabilization of the high-temperature phases (e.g., the tetragonal phase) at room temperatures is favored in high-*k* dielectric applications due to its higher *k* value. Recently, a series of experiments and DFT computations illustrate that the addition of cationic dopants into HfO<sub>2</sub> matrix is an efficient approach to stabilize the tetragonal phase [114, 115].

Fischer and Kersch have systematically studied the effect of dopants with +4 valence state on the relative stability of the tetragonal and monoclinic phases of HfO<sub>2</sub> and ZrO<sub>2</sub> [116, 117]. LDA DFT calculations were performed using 24-atom supercells. Substitution of a Hf or Zr atom by a dopant atom (such as Si, C, Ti, Ce, Sn, and Ge) gives a dopant concentration of 12.5 %. The undoped monoclinic phase is more stable than the tetragonal one by 0.086 and 0.049 eV per HfO<sub>2</sub> and ZrO<sub>2</sub> unit, respectively, which is in excellent agreement with recent experimental results of  $0.087 \pm 0.007$  and  $0.055 \pm 0.006$  eV [30]. These predictions are also consistent with the prior LDA values, e.g., 0.099 eV for HfO<sub>2</sub> [118] and 0.063 eV for ZrO<sub>2</sub> [119], although the GGA functional appears to overestimate the energy difference between these two phases [118]. Figure 7a illustrates the energy difference




**Fig. 6** Energy profile for defect migration in amorphous  $\text{HfO}_2$  [107]. Solid and open symbols indicate the energies of defects at various local energy minima and during its migration between these minima, respectively. The energies of the lowest minimum for each charge state were shifted to zero. For each curve, the left-most and right-most atomic configurations are the same and so the migration path crosses between neighboring supercells. Reprinted with permission from Ref. [107]

between the monoclinic and tetragonal phases per  $\text{HfO}_2$  unit,  $dE$ , as a function of ionic radius of dopants. Although no clear correlation between ionic radius and the tetragonal phase stabilization efficiency is visible for the dopants considered, such kind of relationship does exist among the group 14 dopants (C, Si, Ge, and Sn), as indicated by the solid curves in Fig. 7a. A more convincing conclusion may benefit from larger supercell calculations with different doping compositions and a wider range of doping elements. Still, the intuitive notion that group 14 dopants such as Si and Ge which favor tetrahedral coordination in their respective oxides should favor the t- $\text{HfO}_2$  and t- $\text{ZrO}_2$  phases is borne out by these calculations.

In subsequent study by the same group, the influence of temperature on the stabilization of t- $\text{HfO}_2$  was investigated [116, 117]. The Helmholtz free energy  $F$  was calculated, and is given by

$$F = E + F_{\text{phonon}} \quad (3)$$

$E$  is the 0 K internal energy (the DFT total energy) and  $F_{\text{phonon}}$  is the temperature dependent phonon contribution to the free energy, which is computed from the vibrational density of states within the harmonic approximation [116, 117]. The free energy difference between the monoclinic and tetragonal phase is expressed as  $\Delta F = F_m - F_t$ , where



**Fig. 7 a** Energy difference per  $\text{HfO}_2$  ( $\text{ZrO}_2$ ) unit between the monoclinic and tetragonal phases as a function of the ionic radius of the doping elements. A correlation (curve) is found for group IVA dopants [116, 117]. **b** Difference in Helmholtz free energy ( $\Delta F$ ) between the monoclinic and tetragonal phases for undoped and doped  $\text{HfO}_2$  [116, 117]. The doping concentration in both figures is 12.5%. Reprinted with permission from Refs. [116, 117]

$F_m$  and  $F_t$  stand for the free energy for the monoclinic and tetragonal phases, respectively. The calculated t–m transition temperature for perfect  $\text{HfO}_2$  is  $\sim 1750$  K, in contrast with the LDA result of 2350 K reported earlier [120], and with the experimental value of 2052 K. This deviation is possibly caused by the neglect of anharmonicity in the free energy computation. Regardless of the discrepancy between predicted and experimental t–m transition temperature for perfect  $\text{HfO}_2$ , the trend obtained from Fig. 7b is interesting. It shows that Si and Ge, which stabilize the tetragonal phase even at 0 K, are very efficient tetragonal stabilizers compared to the other elements considered. More recently, it has been found that the critical temperature for t–m transition decreases with the Ge concentration in  $\text{HfO}_2$  [121]. Ti, Sn, and Ce could also reduce the t–m transition temperature by some amount while the presence of C actually tends to destabilize the tetragonal phase over a broader temperature window.



## Interfaces with silicon

In MOSFETs, the high- $k$  oxide is in direct contact with the Si channel. Hence, a high quality interface, in terms of morphology (roughness), defect states, and band offsets, is required to achieve a high mobility of charge carriers in the channel, which flow in the vicinity of the interface. The major issue pertaining to the quality of Si/HfO<sub>2</sub> interface is the control of point defects. The interface morphology after annealing is closely related to the supply and migration of oxygen-related defects. Although bulk thermodynamics requires HfO<sub>2</sub> to be unreactive with Si, various phases such as silica, Hf silicides, and Hf silicates have been observed at the Si/HfO<sub>2</sub> interface [17]. These interfacial phases not only affect the smoothness of the interface, but also either reduce the effective dielectric constant or make the interface metallic. It has been found that these interfacial phases can be modified by tuning the oxygen content in the processing atmosphere [122, 123], indicating the effect of oxygen-related defects on the interface structure. Further, point defects in HfO<sub>2</sub> can migrate to the interface and reduce the mobility of charge carriers through scattering, trapping charge carriers, and effectively reducing the band offsets. The understanding and control of the defect behavior at the atomistic level is necessary for a high interface quality. Below, we review a series of relevant work pertaining to the Si/HfO<sub>2</sub> interface.

### Dielectric permittivity across interfaces

The modern theory of polarization provides a rigorous quantum mechanical framework for the determination of the polarization [124, 125] as well as the static and optical dielectric constant tensors of solids [126]. This elegant technique has been used widely in the computation of the dielectric constant tensors for a wide variety of bulk solids [127–129]. This method has also been used recently to explain anomalous dielectric constants in Hf<sub>*x*</sub>Si<sub>1-*x*</sub>O<sub>2</sub> [130] as well as to “design” high dielectric constant materials [131].

In the case of multiple component systems, such as heterostructures between dissimilar materials containing interfaces, direct application of the standard approach presents difficulties. First, the generally large number of atoms involved in heterostructures significantly increases the computational load to compute phonon frequencies (a necessary step in the determination of the dielectric tensor). Second, contributions to the dielectric constant from different parts of the heterostructure (i.e., the local dielectric constant at the interface region, near-interface region, and at regions far from the interface) are inextricably combined. To circumvent these difficulties, recently, several groups [132–135] have introduced practical methods for


the calculation of the position-dependent, or local, dielectric permittivity of multilayer systems. These techniques go beyond the traditional ways of determining the dielectric permittivity of bulk materials, and other indirect methods to determine the surface or interface contributions to the total field-induced polarizations [134, 136–138]. Within this new approach, a local permittivity function is introduced to describe variations of the dielectric response over length scales of the order of interatomic distances, which can be calculated from the local field-induced, self-consistent charge density profile.

Figure 8 shows the dielectric constant profiles for a simple epitaxial model of the Si/HfO<sub>2</sub> interface. The interface model was created by placing an O-terminated (001) t-HfO<sub>2</sub> slab on Si such that the HfO<sub>2</sub> slab was matched coherently on top of Si [139, 140]. The resulting relaxed structure shows that half the interface O atoms move downwards toward Si and the other half move upwards toward the Hf layer (Fig. 8), thereby forming Si–O–Si and Hf–O–Hf bonds which passivate all interfacial Si and Hf atoms. From the position-dependent dielectric constant along the normal to the Si/HfO<sub>2</sub> interface, the dielectric constants in the interior of the HfO<sub>2</sub> and Si regions again match well with the corresponding experimental bulk values. The static and optical permittivities of t-HfO<sub>2</sub> along the (001) direction are 16 and 5, respectively [141, 142]. Enhancement of the permittivities at the free surfaces compared to the bulk values can be seen, which can be attributed to under-coordination of surface atoms (similar behavior has been seen for other systems as well [133]). However, a decrease in the permittivity values results in the Si/HfO<sub>2</sub> interface region relative to the free surfaces. This important behavior, even in such an idealized interface, results from the deviation of the oxidation states of the interface Si and Hf atoms from their nominal values (as indicated by a Mulliken charge analysis).

### Thermodynamics at interfaces

The performance of thin HfO<sub>2</sub> films as gate dielectrics is likely to be affected by various lattice defects. In particular, film annealing involves diffusion of atomic species through the already grown oxide and the possible formation of interfacial phases at Si/HfO<sub>2</sub> interfaces. As the defect chemistry of the bulk HfO<sub>2</sub> has been already discussed in “Point-defect chemistry” section, we now summarize past DFT efforts on the chemistry and thermodynamics at Si/HfO<sub>2</sub> interfaces.

In an attempt to understand the relationship between interfacial phase formation and the behavior of various native defects in HfO<sub>2</sub>, a series of DFT calculations of the formation energies and migration barriers of single defects have been carried out [143–146], including V<sub>O</sub> [143], O<sub>I</sub>



**Fig. 8** Above Atomic model of the (001) Si/HfO<sub>2</sub> interface with O termination. Light gray Si, black O, gray Hf. The atomic model repeats periodically in the plane normal to the interface plane. Below Static (solid) and optical (dotted) dielectric constant of the Si/HfO<sub>2</sub> interface as a function of position  $z$  normal to the interface (Color figure online)


[144], and  $V_{\text{Hf}}$  [145], in different regions across the interface. Strong thermodynamic driving forces, i.e., the large difference between the defect formation energies across the interface, exist for these defects to migrate from bulk HfO<sub>2</sub> to the interface. As an example, Fig. 9 shows the energy profile of  $O_1$  migration across the interface. In spite of the strong driving forces for single defect segregation, the formation of interfacial phases could be hampered by the interface energy associated with the emerging new phases. To address this issue explicitly, the thermodynamic driving forces for multiple O defects in the system were also considered [146]. It was found that the thermodynamic driving force faced by single isolated O defects is well preserved as the density of interfacial defects increases, implying that it is energetically favorable for O defects to accumulate at the interface. Of course, the types of defects that occur in the system depends on their chemical potential or O partial pressure ( $P_{\text{O}_2}$ ).

To address the thermodynamics of Si/HfO<sub>2</sub> interface at elevated temperatures that are technologically important, the above zero temperature studies were [39] extended to non-zero temperatures and O<sub>2</sub> pressure using the FPT approach leading to the temperature–pressure ( $T$ – $P_{\text{O}_2}$ ) phase diagram of the Si/HfO<sub>2</sub> interface. The FPT approach involves a zero-temperature DFT calculation of the energies, a statistical mechanics treatment of the free energy of the gas phase within the ideal gas approximation and vibrational entropy analysis of the condensed phases. The


formation free energies of the system with various interfacial O content were calculated as a function of  $T$  and  $P_{\text{O}_2}$ . Figure 10 shows the resulting phase diagram, along with available experimental results for the Si/HfO<sub>2</sub> interface. The computed interface phase diagram indicates that interfacial silica can occur even at ultrahigh vacuum (UHV) condition ( $P_{\text{O}_2} < 10^{-12}$  atm) in a wide temperature range, which explains why the interfacial silica phase is widely observed. The blue and red circles in the phase diagram, respectively, represent experimental conditions at which SiO<sub>2</sub> and SiO at Si/HfO<sub>2</sub> interfaces are known to occur (the left TEM image shows a SiO<sub>2</sub> interface [147]). The right XPS image illustrates that with the annealing of the Si/SiO<sub>2</sub>/HfO<sub>2</sub> interface at 1173 K, SiO<sub>2</sub> decomposes into SiO leading to Hf–Si bonds. Moreover, SEM images demonstrate that the decomposition of SiO<sub>2</sub> is accompanied with void formation at the Si/HfO<sub>2</sub> interface [148]. In sum, the computed phase diagram is in favorable agreement with available experimental data.

### Interfacial electronic structure

The valence band offset (VBO) at Si/HfO<sub>2</sub> interfaces not only defines the barrier for injection of holes into the oxide but also affects the alignment of the Fermi level of the metal (in metal/HfO<sub>2</sub>/Si stacks) with the Si band edges. Due to the inability of GGA and LDA to accurately predict the band gaps of bulk components, the application of hybrid functionals or other beyond-DFT methods is perceived to be necessary to accurately evaluate electronic structures of such a Si/high- $k$  interface. Recently, the band offsets between HfO<sub>2</sub> and Si have been predicted with reasonable accuracy using DFT calculations based on hybrid functionals [64, 149, 150]. Broqvist et al. [64] have determined the band offsets and defect levels (for  $V_{\text{O}}$  and hydrogen interstitial,  $H_1$ ) at the interfaces of Si/SiO<sub>2</sub>/HfO<sub>2</sub> stacks using hybrid density functionals. In their study, the



**Fig. 9** Energetics of neutral  $O_1$  across Si/HfO<sub>2</sub> interfaces. Solid and open circles indicate the energies of  $O_1$  at various local energy minimum positions and during its migration between these minima, respectively. The solid circles define the formation energies, and their difference with the peak open circles defines the migration barriers. Reprinted with permission from Ref. [144]



**Fig. 10** Middle The phase diagrams of the Si/HfO<sub>2</sub> interface. The blue and red circles stand for the experimental conditions to form SiO<sub>2</sub> and SiO at Si/HfO<sub>2</sub> interfaces, respectively. Left TEM image depicting a SiO<sub>2</sub>-type interface. Right The XPS and SEM images

illustrate that after 1173 K annealing, the interfacial SiO<sub>2</sub> decomposes to SiO, associated with void formations [39, 147, 148]. Reprinted with permission from Refs. [39, 147, 148] (Color figure online)

calculation of band offsets at a A/B interface included three steps. First, the band edges of the bulk components A and B are separately calculated through the use of optimal HSE-type hybrid functional  $\alpha$  values,  $\alpha_A$  and  $\alpha_B$ , that recover the experimental band gaps of A and B, respectively. Next, the local electrostatic (or planar average) potential [151] across the interface is calculated using an interface model and an  $\alpha$ , usually between  $\alpha_A$  and  $\alpha_B$ . The offset of the local electrostatic potential across the interface is found to be, when compared with the band-gap changes in bulk components, only weakly related to the choice of  $\alpha$  [149, 150, 152]. Finally, the band offsets are obtained by aligning the reference levels of bulk A and B to their counterparts in the interface model.

Figure 11 shows the band alignments for the Si/SiO<sub>2</sub>/HfO<sub>2</sub> stack composed of Si, a-SiO<sub>2</sub>, a-HfSiO<sub>4</sub>, a-HfO<sub>2</sub>, and m-HfO<sub>2</sub> regions, obtained by Broqvist et al. [64]. The calculated VBOs of Si/a-SiO<sub>2</sub> and Si/m-HfO<sub>2</sub>, 4.4 and 2.9 eV, respectively, compare well with experimental data [153–156]. Within their scheme, the authors calculated the formation of  $V_O$  in the bulk and interface regions, and related them to Fermi level pinning. It was found that it is energetically favorable for  $V_O$  to locate in the amorphous transition regions of the gate stack and only  $V_O$  in these regions may contribute to Fermi level pinning (Fig. 11). For  $H_i$ , the +1 charged state is stable across the stack, mainly trapped at the Si/SiO<sub>2</sub> interface and in hafnium silicates.

### Interfaces with metal electrodes

As pointed out in “Introduction” section, the metal/HfO<sub>2</sub> interface presents a separate set of issues although these too are related to the interface morphology and defect chemistry. While one desires to utilize metal electrodes with appropriate work functions such that the metal Fermi level lines up with either the VBM or CBM of the underlying Si substrate, the interfacial chemistries lead to shifts in the


work function of the metal on the high- $k$  oxide side ( $\phi_{\text{eff}}$ ) from its true vacuum value ( $\phi$ ) (cf. Fig. 12) [158]. The degree of this shift depends on the processing conditions that the device is subjected to [159–163], leading to the thermal instability of  $\phi_{\text{eff}}$ .

Recent DFT studies have provided important insights on the defect chemistry, interface structure and  $\phi_{\text{eff}}$  for metal/HfO<sub>2</sub> interfaces. In particular, the application of the FPT approach has enabled the determination of the interface phase diagram and the variation of  $\phi_{\text{eff}}$  with respect to the environment.

### Thermodynamics at interfaces


Analogous to Si/HfO<sub>2</sub>, interfacial segregation of point defects has also been observed for metal/HfO<sub>2</sub> interfaces. The formation energy of  $V_O$  at different positions within the metal/HfO<sub>2</sub> interface model (metal = Pt, Ag, Al, and Ti) has been studied by Cho et al. [164].  $V_O$  is found to be strongly attracted to the interface, especially for Pt. The driving force for  $V_O$  to segregate from the bulk toward the interface is  $\sim 1.7$ ,  $\sim 3$ , and  $\sim 4.7$  eV for Al, Ag, and Pt, respectively. These findings shed light on the expected equilibrium structures at metal/HfO<sub>2</sub> interfaces.

As with the Si/HfO<sub>2</sub> interface, the chemistry at the metal/HfO<sub>2</sub> interfaces is also dependent on the O chemical potential [38, 39, 165]. More recently, Zhu et al. applied the FPT method to identify the phase diagrams at the Pt/HfO<sub>2</sub> interface. Figure 13a shows several representative interface structures with the interfacial O coverage ( $\theta_O$ ) being 0, 1, or 2 monolayers (ML), referred to as “clean”, “abrupt,” and “oxidized” interfaces, respectively. Identifying the lowest energy interface for each  $T$  and  $P_{O_2}$  established the interface phase diagram in Fig. 13b. Under typical processing conditions (the shaded region in Fig. 13b), the stable interface O coverage between Pt and HfO<sub>2</sub> varies between 0.5 and 1 ML over a wide temperature range. With the decrease of  $T$  or increase of  $P_{O_2}$ ,



**Fig. 11** Band alignments in the Si/SiO<sub>2</sub>/HfO<sub>2</sub> stack composed of Si and various oxides [64]. The numbers on the oxide side indicate band offsets with respect to Si. **a**  $\tilde{\mu}(0/+2)$  for V<sub>O</sub> along with the associated pinning level,  $\tilde{\mu}^{pin}$ . **b**  $\tilde{\mu}(-/+)$  for H<sub>I</sub>. Reprinted with permission from Ref. [64]

the preferred  $\theta_O$  increases from 0 ML (clean interface) smoothly to  $\sim 1$  ML (abrupt interface) and then abruptly to 2 ML (oxidized interface). This oxidation behavior is similar to the surface oxidation of (111) Pt surfaces [166]. As 0.5 ML O at the Pt/HfO<sub>2</sub> interface passivates HfO<sub>2</sub> and has little interaction with Pt, Pt in Pt:0.5:HfO<sub>2</sub> behaves like a clean Pt surface. The open and solid squares in Fig. 13b stand for the *T* and *P*<sub>O<sub>2</sub></sub> conditions at which 0.25 ML O-adsorbed (111) Pt and clean (111) Pt surface are observed in experiment, respectively, consistent with our  $\theta_{O-0.5}$  ML values of 0.25 and 0, respectively, under those same conditions. Another interesting finding of this work is that the oxidation of Pt at the interface is similar to that of a free (111) Pt surface. The saturation coverage of the chemically adsorbed O on (111) Pt surface is 0.25–0.3 ML, after which a layer of PtO<sub>2</sub> forms immediately on the surface.



**Fig. 12** Schematic of **a** the macroscopic band structure of a metal slab and **b** the band alignment in a metal-oxide stack.  $E_{vac,m}$  and  $E_F$  are, respectively, the vacuum level and Fermi level of the metal.  $E_{vac,o}$ , CBM, VBM,  $\chi$ , and  $E_g$  are, respectively, the vacuum level, CBM, valence band maximum, electron affinity, and band gap of the oxide. VBO stands for valence band offset, and represents the energy difference between the metal Fermi level and the oxide VBM.  $D_m$  and  $D_o$  are the surface dipole moments of the metal-free surface and the oxide-free surface, respectively.  $D_x$  is the excess interfacial dipole moment, i.e., the total interfacial dipole moment minus the metal free surface dipole moment. Reprinted with permission from Ref. [157]


Here, we find that the corresponding  $\theta_{O-0.5}$  ML value beyond which interfacial PtO<sub>2</sub> formed is 0.25–0.5.

#### Effective work function

Figure 12 shows a schematic of the band and potential lineups for a metal slab and a metal-oxide interface. Both the vacuum work function ( $\phi$ ) of a metal, and its effective work function ( $\phi_{eff}$ ) when interfaced with an oxide are indicated. While  $\phi$  of an elemental metal is straightforward to determine [167], particular care must be taken in the determination of this property for multicomponent metals (such as TiN, TiC<sub>x</sub>N<sub>y</sub>, etc.). Nevertheless, a formal and tested basis exists for the calculation of  $\phi$  for any multicomponent metal [168, 169]. Determination of  $\phi_{eff}$ , on the other hand, poses fundamental and formal difficulties. In a past study based on DFT computations,  $\phi_{eff}$  of metals interfaced with oxides have generally been estimated using the following equation [170, 171]

$$\phi_{eff} = \chi + E_g - \text{VBO}, \quad (4)$$

where  $\chi$  is the electron affinity of the dielectric and VBO is the Schottky barrier height between the metal and dielectric in this case (see Fig. 12). Standard DFT calculations cannot correctly predict any of these three terms, especially  $\chi$  and  $E_g$  [150]. The conventional procedure to handle this issue has been to use experimental  $\chi$  and  $E_g$ , and/or scale the VBO based on the band edge shifts for terminating bulk materials based on the GW or HSE corrections. This approach has been applied to many systems, such as Pt/HfO<sub>2</sub>, Mo/ZrO<sub>2</sub>, WC/HfO<sub>2</sub>, and TiN/HfO<sub>2</sub> interfaces [65, 172].




**Fig. 13** **a** Atomic structures of Pt:θ<sub>O</sub>:HfO<sub>2</sub> interfaces with θ<sub>O</sub> = 0, 1, and 2 ML; **b** interface phase diagram for Pt:θ<sub>O</sub>:HfO<sub>2</sub>. The boundaries between two different stable interface configurations are represented by the *black curves*. The *shaded region* represents the regime of expected processing conditions. The *open and solid squares* are the *T* and *P*<sub>O<sub>2</sub></sub> when a 0.25 ML O-adsorbed (111) Pt surface and a clean (111) Pt surface were observed, respectively [166]. Reprinted with permission from Ref. [157]

Prodhomme et al. [65] recently reported the *GW*-based VBO at TiN/HfO<sub>2</sub> interfaces using the lineup approach as described above. The interface structure and the corresponding potential energy are plotted in Fig. 14. The VBO computed using GGA is 2.35 eV, while the quasiparticle corrections to the VBM of m-HfO<sub>2</sub> and the Fermi energy of TiN are -0.5 and +0.4 eV, respectively. Hence, the *GW* corrected VBO is ~3.3 eV. Based on Eq. 4 and the experimental determination of the electron affinity (~2.5 eV [173]) and band gap (~5.7 eV [93–96]) of m-HfO<sub>2</sub>, φ<sub>eff</sub> of TiN with respect to oxide vacuum level is found to be 4.9 eV. However, we shall note that the VBO and hence the φ<sub>eff</sub> computed based on Eq. 4 are sensitive to the band-gap correction schemes, as such corrections are exacerbated by the “band edge problem” discussed in “Bulk Hafnia studies” section.

Recently, an alternative and powerful approach was presented to compute φ<sub>eff</sub>, which is completely devoid of any type of scaling, fitting, or “correcting”, nor does it require experimental input (of γ or E<sub>g</sub>) [157]. This method relates φ<sub>eff</sub> to the interfacial dipole moment. As schematically shown in Fig. 12, when the metal slab with a surface dipole moment of *D<sub>m</sub>* and a vacuum work function of φ is interfaced with an oxide, an extra dipole moment (*D<sub>x</sub>*) is created at the interface, resulting in a vacuum level discontinuity across the interface. φ and the vacuum level discontinuity (through *D<sub>x</sub>*) determines φ<sub>eff</sub>, as

$$\phi_{\text{eff}} = \phi + 4\pi D_x/A, \tag{5}$$

where *A* is the interface area. This methodology to determine φ<sub>eff</sub> using the interface dipole moment when applied to the TiN/HfO<sub>2</sub> interface of Prodhomme’s study leads to a



**Fig. 14** **a** Nitridized TiN/HfO<sub>2</sub> interface. *purple N, turquoise Ti, blue Hf, and red O*. **b** Planar averaged potential projected across the TiN/HfO<sub>2</sub> interface (*black line*) and smoothed by a double convolution (*red line*). The *black arrows* indicate the shifts of the bulk eigenenergies with respect to the averaged potential in the bulk. The *blue arrow* indicates the LDA VBO. Reprinted with permission from Ref. [65] (Color figure online)

φ<sub>eff</sub> value of ~5 eV, in good agreement with Prodhomme’s own result (which was obtained using Eq. 4).

For the case of Pt/HfO<sub>2</sub> interfaces, by combining the above scheme (Eq. 5) for computing φ<sub>eff</sub>, and the results of the interface phase diagram study presented in “Thermodynamics at interface” section, Zhu et al. arrived at a correlation between φ<sub>eff</sub> and the processing conditions for Pt/HfO<sub>2</sub> interfaces. This has led to an understanding of the widely observed thermal instability of φ<sub>eff</sub> [174]. In the sense that a statistical distribution of φ<sub>eff</sub> values is expected for each (*T*, *P*<sub>O<sub>2</sub></sub>) condition, the Pt/HfO<sub>2</sub> stack will display an average φ<sub>eff</sub> value ( $\bar{\phi}_{\text{eff}}$ ).  $\bar{\phi}_{\text{eff}}$  may be defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\phi}_{\text{eff}} &= \sum_{\theta_O=0}^2 \phi_{\text{eff}}(\theta_O) \times \wp(\theta_O) \\ &= \sum_{\theta_O=0}^2 \phi_{\text{eff}}(\theta_O) \times \frac{\exp(-\gamma_{\theta_O}/kT)}{\sum_{\theta_O=0}^2 \exp(-\gamma_{\theta_O}/kT)} \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

where φ<sub>eff</sub>(θ<sub>O</sub>) and ϖ(θ<sub>O</sub>) are, respectively, the φ<sub>eff</sub> value for a coverage of θ<sub>O</sub> and the probability of a coverage of θ<sub>O</sub>. γ<sub>θ<sub>O</sub></sub> is the interface energy (used earlier in the construction of the phase diagram in Fig. 14) for a coverage of θ<sub>O</sub>. The determined  $\bar{\phi}_{\text{eff}}$  as a function of *T* and *P*<sub>O<sub>2</sub></sub> for Pt/HfO<sub>2</sub> is portrayed in Fig. 15. As we can see,  $\bar{\phi}_{\text{eff}}$  decreases with *T* and increases with *P*<sub>O<sub>2</sub></sub>. This finding is consistent with prior experimental work in which a Pt/HfO<sub>2</sub> stack annealed in forming gas and O<sub>2</sub> gas displayed an effective work function of 4.6 and 4.9 eV, respectively [159]. Furthermore, the shaded region in Fig. 15 represents the expected, or generally adopted, processing conditions (from the standard pressure to the ultra high vacuum conditions). The predicted  $\bar{\phi}_{\text{eff}}$  at these expected annealing conditions (4.4–5.5 eV) is in favorable agreement with the reported experimental values (4.6–5.5 eV) [159–162].

The close agreement of the Si/HfO<sub>2</sub> phase diagram with experiments (Fig. 10), and the favorable agreement with

experiments of the computed  $\phi_{\text{eff}}$  of Pt (Fig. 15) determined based on the Pt/HfO<sub>2</sub> phase diagram are indicative of the usefulness of such full first principles property–processing relationship studies.

## Interface engineering

Controlling the  $\phi_{\text{eff}}$  value of metal electrodes interfaced with high-*k* oxides continues to be a challenge. As can be seen from Fig. 16,  $\phi_{\text{eff}}$  of a variety of metal electrodes, upon high-temperature annealing, shifts toward the middle of the Si band gap, regardless of its vacuum work function. An emerging way to control the relative placement of  $E_F$  (or alternatively,  $\phi_{\text{eff}}$ ) is through the introduction of dopant, or “capping”, layers either at the Si/HfO<sub>2</sub> or the metal/HfO<sub>2</sub> interfaces [72]. Note that the preferred location of the capping layers will be determined by energetic and kinetic factors, and placement at either locations can be used to manipulate the  $E_F$  position or the  $\phi_{\text{eff}}$  value. It has been reported that the introduction of capping layers composed of Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> and La<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> effectively shift  $E_F$  toward the VBM and CBM of Si for *p*- and *n*-type MOSFET applications, respectively, for TiN electrodes. These observations have been explained in terms of the different electronegativity of Al (1.61 Pauling) and La (1.1 Pauling) compared to that of Hf (1.3 Pauling) [76–79].

Recent DFT studies have explored the impact of capping layers at metal/HfO<sub>2</sub> and Si/HfO<sub>2</sub> interfaces on  $\phi_{\text{eff}}$ . Xiong et al. [76, 77] studied the Al- and Te-induced modulation of the metal/HfO<sub>2</sub> interface  $\phi_{\text{eff}}$  using LDA calculations with *GW* corrections based on Eq. 4. Al and Te substituting Hf in the dielectric near the interface are found to be energetically stable, which increase and decrease


$\phi_{\text{eff}}$ , respectively. Considering that the electronegativities of Al (1.61) and Te (2.1) are both larger than that of Hf (1.3), no clear trend between the electronegativity of dopants at metal/HfO<sub>2</sub> interfaces and  $\phi_{\text{eff}}$  is achieved.

More recently, Lin et al. [78] and Luo et al. [79] have investigated the impact of capping layers at Si/HfO<sub>2</sub> interfaces on the modification of the band alignment. By investigating a group of dopants with different electronegativities and valences (e.g., La, Sr, Al, Nb, Ti), they found the variation of VBO at Si/HfO<sub>2</sub> interfaces, and hence the alignment of metal  $E_F$  with band edges of Si, strongly correlates with the electronegativity. The computed shift is in agreement with available experiment. In general, it was demonstrated that dopants with electronegativity smaller (or larger) than that of Hf at Si/HfO<sub>2</sub> interfaces tend to move the metal  $E_F$  closer to CBM (or VBM) of Si.


Although the electronegativity of capping layer atoms at Si/HfO<sub>2</sub> interfaces have been demonstrated to be critical in determining  $\phi_{\text{eff}}$ , a systematic understanding of the thermodynamic and kinetic factors that control the preferred location of a large variety of capping layer atoms in the entire metal/HfO<sub>2</sub>/Si stack, and their impact on  $\phi_{\text{eff}}$  is necessary for further targeted optimization of current as well as the next-generation MOSFETs.

## Beyond silicon technology

Owing to their higher electron mobility (compared to Si), Ge, III–V compounds and graphene (or carbon nanotube) [175, 176] are currently under intensive scrutiny as potential alternatives to the Si channel in future MOS devices [10]. Here, we briefly describe recent progress in



**Fig. 15**  $\phi_{\text{eff}}$  as a function of temperature (*T*) and O<sub>2</sub> pressure (*P*<sub>O<sub>2</sub></sub>). The shaded region represents the regime of expected processing conditions. Reprinted with permission from Ref. [157]




**Fig. 16** The effective work function ( $\phi_{\text{eff}}$ ) of various metals on top of dielectrics as a function of annealing temperatures. Replotted with data from Ref. [174]

the first principles studies on Ge- and GaAs-related interfaces with  $\text{HfO}_2$ .

The thermodynamics of  $V_{\text{O}}$  across the Ge/ $\text{HfO}_2$  interface was recently studied by Broqvist et al. [81] based on semilocal and hybrid density-functional approximations. The authors used a series of bulk compounds, including substoichiometric  $\text{GeO}_x$ ,  $\text{HfGeO}_4$ , and a- $\text{HfO}_2$ , to represent various regions at the interface between bulk Ge and bulk m- $\text{HfO}_2$  (Fig. 17). The formation energies of  $V_{\text{O}}$  across the interface were obtained by tuning the formation energies in these bulk compounds in accordance with band structure alignment among these compounds.  $V_{\text{O}}$  is most stable in the  $\text{GeO}_2$  layer for both *p*- and *n*-type doping (the Fermi energy is fixed at the VBM and CBM of Ge, respectively), favoring the formation of interfacial substoichiometric  $\text{GeO}_x$  (Fig. 17). In contrast, for Si/ $\text{SiO}_2$ / $\text{HfO}_2$  stacks, their results indicate the accumulation of  $V_{\text{O}}$  in the interfacial  $\text{HfO}_2$  layer, resulting in substoichiometric  $\text{HfO}_x$ . Recently, Golias et al. [82] have studied defect states induced by GeO within the band gaps of  $\text{HfO}_2$ . They found these defect states can not be completely eliminated by hydrogenation and identified Ge volatilization as a possible defect enhancing leakage currents and degradation in Ge-based high-*k* devices.

A major obstacle to the application of GaAs in high-*k*-based MOSFETs is the poor-quality interface with the gate dielectric. Its interface defect density is more than an order of magnitude higher than that at Si/ $\text{SiO}_2$  interface. Recently, several groups have conducted hybrid functional calculations of the structures, defects and band offsets of GaAs/high-*k* oxide interfaces. Using an interface model formed between a Ga-terminated GaAs surface and an O-terminated c- $\text{HfO}_2$  surface, Wang et al. [83, 177] investigated the relationship between interface O content and interface bonding, stability, and band offsets. They found that Ga dangling bonds and As–As dimers mainly create gap states at high interfacial O contents while at low O contents, the gap states are caused by interfacial Hf–Ga bonds, As and Ga dimers, and As and Ga dangling bonds. Robertson and coworkers recently studied the structures of GaAs/ $\text{HfO}_2$  interfaces based on electron counting rules [178, 179] and proposed that native defects such as dangling bonds and As–As dimers, instead of metal-induced gap states, are the reasons for Fermi level pinning [180]. Hybrid functional calculations of defect levels in GaAs indicate that dangling bonds are possibly responsible for the experimentally observed defect states near band edges, and As antisites are very likely the origin of midgap states [181].

Wang et al. calculated the VBO of GaAs/ $\text{HfO}_2$  interface with various O contents, with and without *GW* corrections [83]. The computed *GW* VBO increases from 0.89 to 3.34 eV as the interface changes from O-rich to O-poor,



**Fig. 17** Formation energies of neutral (circle) and +2 charged (square and triangle)  $V_{\text{O}}$  near Ge/ $\text{HfO}_2$  and Si/ $\text{HfO}_2$  interfaces. The “*p*–” and “*n*-type” are for the doping status of Ge (Si) substrate, corresponding to the Fermi energy fixed at the VBM and CBM of Ge (Si), respectively. Replotted from data in Ref. [81]

compared with experimental values of 2.0–2.85 eV [182–184]. The authors have also studied the passivation of the interface defects using elements such as Si [185], S [186], H, F, and Cl [187]. For both the Si and the S passivations, the defect states near the VBM are removed, but those on the CBM side are only shifted toward the CBM and not completely removed, even at increased passivant concentration. On the other hand, F and H can effectively neutralize the GaAs/ $\text{HfO}_2$  interface and are thus possible candidates for interface passivation.

## Summary

The metal-oxide-semiconductor gate stack architecture has remained a critical component of modern electronic device technologies. The demands placed on this technology, in terms of the need for continued device miniaturization, is gradually leading to the adoption of  $\text{HfO}_2$ -based high dielectric constant (or high-*k*) materials as an inevitable replacement for the erstwhile  $\text{SiO}_2$  oxide dielectric. This technological evolution has spurred a plethora of fundamental research to address several pressing issues.

The present review provides an account of the progress made using first principles computations in studies of  $\text{HfO}_2$ -based gate stacks. Insights that have emerged from conventional DFT computations as well as from studies involving beyond-DFT methods (e.g., those utilizing hybrid electron exchange–correlation functionals and many-body *GW* treatments) are described. Specifically, structural, dielectric, electronic, and point-defect properties of bulk  $\text{HfO}_2$ , Si/ $\text{HfO}_2$  interfaces, and metal/ $\text{HfO}_2$  interfaces are covered in detail. The promise shown by DFT and

sophisticated beyond-DFT methods (and the accompanying challenges), and the predictive power of FPT in determining interface phase diagrams and metal effective work functions are highlighted. Going forward, it is expected that such fundamental studies will play increasingly important roles in emerging topics, including in the control of energy levels across interfaces through proper choice of dopant (or “capping”) layers, and in addressing inevitable hurdles that beyond-Si and beyond-HfO<sub>2</sub> technologies are bound to usher in.

**Acknowledgements** Partial support of this study by grants from the National Science Foundation, the Office of Naval Research, the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation and the Max Planck Society are gratefully acknowledged.

## References

- Moore G (1975) IEDM Tech Dig 22:11
- Chau R et al (2007) Nature Mater 6:810
- Tyagi S et al. (2005) IEEE IEDM Technical Digest 2005 Proceedings: 245
- Muller D, Sorsch T, Moccio S, Baumann F, Evans-Lutterodt K, Timp G (1999) Nature 399:758
- Robertson J (2006) Rep Prog Phys 69:327
- Robertson J (2005) Solid-State Electron 49:283
- Schlom DG, Guha S, Datta S (2008) MRS Bull 33:1017
- Houssa M et al (2006) Mater Sci Eng R 51:37
- Choi JH et al (2011) Mater Sci Eng R 72:97
- Wilk GD et al (2001) J Appl Phys 89:5243
- Kawamoto A et al (2001) J Comput Aided Mater Des 8:39
- Gerritsen E et al (2005) Solid-State Electron 49:1767
- Kwon C et al (1998) J Appl Phys 83:7052
- Mistry K et al. (2007) IEEE IEDM 2007 Proceedings: 247
- Wong H, Iwai H (2006) Microelectron Eng 83:1867
- Wong H-SP (2002) IBM J Res Dev 46:133
- Wallace RM, Wilk GD (2003) Crit Rev Solid State Mater Sci 28:231
- Cho D-Y et al (2005) Appl Phys Lett 86:041913
- Demkov AA et al (2007) Microelectron Reliab 47:686
- Robertson J (2009) J Vac Sci Technol B 27:277
- Demkov AA (2008) In: Korkin A, Rosei F (eds) Nanoelectronics and photonics. Springer, Berlin, p 171
- Lowther JE, Dewhurst JK, Leger JM et al (1999) Phys Rev B 60:14485
- Demkov AA (2001) Phys Status Solidi B 226:57
- Zhao XY, Vanderbilt D (2002) Phys Rev B 65:075105
- Zhao XY, Vanderbilt D (2002) Phys Rev B 65:233106
- Terki R, Feraoun H, Bertrand G (2005) Comput Mater Sci 33:44
- Rignanese GM, Gonze X, Jun G (2004) Phys Rev B 69:184301
- Zhao X, Ceresoli D, Vanderbilt D (2005) Phys Rev B 71:085107
- Beltrán JI et al (2008) New J Phys 10:063031
- Luo X, Zhou W, Ushakov SV, Navrotsky A, Demkov AA (2009) Phys Rev B 80:134119
- Zheng JX, Ceder G, Maxisch T, Chim WK, Choi WK (2007) Phys Rev B 75:104112
- Foster AS, Lopez Gejo F, Shluger AL, Nieminen RM (2002) Phys Rev B 65:174117
- Kang J, Lee E-C, Chang KJ (2003) Phys Rev B 68:054106
- Fabris S, Paxton AT, Finnis MW (2001) Phys Rev B 63:094101
- King-Smith RD, Vanderbilt D (1994) Phys Rev B 49:5828
- Parlinski K, Li ZQ, Kawazoe Y (1997) Phys Rev Lett 78:4063
- Hakala MH et al (2006) J Appl Phys 100:043708
- Gavrikov AV (2007) J Appl Phys 101:014310
- Zhu H, Tang C, Ramprasad R (2010) Phys Rev B 82:235413
- Fiorentini V, Gulleri G (2002) Phys Rev Lett 89:266101
- Robertson J (2002) J Non-Crystalline Solids 303:94
- Puthenkovilakam R, Carter EA, Chang JP (2004) Phys Rev B 69:155329
- Dong YF, Wang SJ, Feng YP, Huan ACH (2006) Phys Rev B 73:045302
- Fonseca LRC, Demkov AA, Knizhnik A (2003) Phys Status Solidi B 329:48
- Robertson J (2000) J Vac Sci Technol B 18:1785
- Kita Y, Yoshida S, Hosoi T, Shimura T, Shiraiishi K, Nara Y, Yamada K, Watanabe H (2009) Appl Phys Lett 94:122905
- Wang XP, Yu HY, Li M-F, Zhu CX, Biesemans S, Chin A, Sun YY, Feng YP, Lim A, Yeo Y-C, Loh WY, Lo GQ, Kwong D-L (2007) IEEE Electron Device Lett 28:258
- Wen H-C, Majhi P, Choi K, Park CS, Alshareef HN, Harris HR, Luan H, Niimi H, Park H-B, Bersuker G, Lysaght PS, Kwong D-L, Song SC, Lee BH, Jammy R (2008) Microelectron Eng 85:2
- Sharia O, Tse K, Robertson J, Demkov AA (2009) Phys Rev B 79:125305
- Sharia O, Tse K, Robertson J, Demkov AA (1999) Phys Rev B 67:681
- Zhong W, Vanderbilt D, Rabe KM (1995) Phys Rev B 52:6301
- Deák P et al (2010) Phys Rev B 81:153203
- Hyed J et al (2005) J Chem Phys 123:174101
- Krukau AV et al (2006) J Chem Phys 125:224106
- Ferreira LG, Marques M, Teles LK (2008) Phys Rev B 78:125116
- Ribeiro M, Fonseca LRC, Ferreira LG (2009) Phys Rev B 79:241312(R)
- Ribeiro M, Fonseca LRC, Ferreira LG (2011) Europhys Lett 94:27001
- Ribeiro M, Fonseca LRC, Sadowski T, Ramprasad R (2012) J Appl Phys 111:073708
- Hedin L (1965) Phys Rev 139:A796
- Rinke P, Janotti A, Scheffler M, Vande Walle CG (2009) Phys Rev Lett 102:026402
- Jain M et al (2011) Phys Rev Lett 107:216806
- Gruning M, Shaltaf R, Rignanese G-M (2010) Phys Rev B 81:035330
- Komsa H-P, Broqvist P, Pasquarello A (2010) Phys Rev B 81:205118
- Broqvist P, Alkauskas A, Godet J, Pasquarello A (2009) J Appl Phys 105:061603
- Prodhomme P-Y, Fontaine-Vive F, Vander Geest A, Blaise P, Even J (2011) Appl Phys Lett 99:022101
- Jiang H et al (2010) Phys Rev B 75:085119
- Ramprasad R, Zhu H, Rinke P, Scheffler M (2012) Phys Rev Lett 108:066404
- Alkauskas A et al (2011) Phys Status Solidi B 248:775
- Alkauskas A, Pasquarello A (2011) Phys Rev B 84:125206
- Komsa H et al (2010) Phys Rev B 81:205118
- Broqvist P, Alkauskas A, Pasquarello A (2010) Phys Status Solidi A 207:270
- Guha S, Naraynan V (2009) Annu Rev Mater Res 39:181
- Frank MM et al (2006) Appl Phys Lett 89:112905
- Chang YC et al (2007) Appl Phys Lett 90:232904
- Coh S et al (2010) Phys Rev B 82:064101
- Xiong K et al (2008) J Appl Phys 104:074501
- Xiong K et al (2008) Appl Phys Lett 92:113504
- Lin L et al (2011) J Appl Phys 109:094502
- Luo X et al (2011) Phys Rev B 84:195309



80. Rumaiz AK, Woicik JC, Carini GA, Siddons DP, Cockayne E, Huey E, Lysaght PS, Fischer DA, Genova V (2010) *Appl Phys Lett* 97:242108
81. Broqvist P, Binder JF, Pasquarello A (2010) *Appl Phys Lett* 97:202908
82. Golias E, Tsetseris L, Dimoulas A, Pantelides ST (2011) *Microelectron Eng* 88:427
83. Wang W, Xiong K, Wallace RM, Cho K (2010) *J Phys Chem C* 114:22610
84. Lin K-L et al (2011) *J Appl Phys* 109:084104
85. Joshua Yang J et al (2012) *MRS Bull* 37:131
86. Waser R et al (2009) *Adv Mater* 21:2632
87. Pegraeve R et al. (2011) Symposium on VLSI Technology: 28
88. Perdew JP, Burke S, Ernzerhof M (1996) *Phys Rev Lett* 77:3865
89. Shishkin M, Kresse G (2007) *Phys Rev B* 75:235102
90. Vanderbilt D, Zhao X, Ceresoli D (2005) *Thin Solid Films* 486:125
91. Cockayne E (2008) *J Appl Phys* 103:084103
92. Lyons JL, Janotti A, Vande Walle CG (2011) *Microelectron Eng* 88:1452
93. Hann RE et al (1985) *J Am Ceram Soc* 68:C285
94. Adams DM et al (1991) *J Phys Chem Solids* 52:1181
95. Kukli K et al (1996) *Appl Phys Lett* 68:3737
96. Garcia JC (2004) *Appl Phys Lett* 85:5022
97. Rignanese G-M (2005) *J Phys Condens Matter* 17:357
98. Ceresoli D, Vanderbilt D (2006) *Phys Rev B* 74:125108
99. Broqvist P, Pasquarello A (2007) *Appl Phys Lett* 90:082907
100. Cherkaoui K et al (2008) *J Appl Phys* 104:064113
101. Takeuchi H et al (2004) *J Vac Sci Technol A* 22:1337
102. Park PK, Kang S-W (2006) *Appl Phys Lett* 89:192905
103. Seo M et al (2010) *Chem Mater* 22:4419
104. Makov G, Payne MC (1995) *Phys Rev B* 51:4014
105. Schultz PA (2000) *Phys Rev Lett* 84:1942
106. Freysoldt C et al (2009) *Phys Rev Lett* 102:016402
107. Tang C, Ramprasad R (2010) *Phys Rev B* 81:161201(R)
108. Kaneta C, Yamasaki T (2007) *Microelectron Eng* 84:2370
109. Broqvist P, Pasquarello A (2007) *Microelectron Eng* 84:2022
110. Broqvist P, Pasquarello A (2006) *Appl Phys Lett* 89:262904
111. Capron N, Broqvist P, Pasquarello A (2007) *Appl Phys Lett* 91:192905
112. Foster AS et al (2002) *Phys Rev Lett* 22:225901
113. Guha S, Narayanan V (2007) *Phys Rev Lett* 98:196101
114. Chalker PR et al (2008) *Appl Phys Lett* 93:182911
115. Gaskell JM et al (2007) *Appl Phys Lett* 91:112912
116. Fischer D, Kersch AI (2008) *Appl Phys Lett* 92:012908
117. Fischer D, Kersch AI (2008) *J Appl Phys* 104:084104
118. Jaffe JE et al (2005) *Phys Rev B* 72:144107
119. Stapper G et al (1999) *Phys Rev B* 59:797
120. Debernardi A, Wiemer C, Fanciulli M (2008) *Mater Sci Semicond Process* 11:241
121. Debernardi A (2012) *Phys Rev B* 85:024109
122. Cho D, Park K, Choi B, Oh S, Chang Y, Kim D, Noh T, Jung R, Lee J, Bu S (2005) *Appl Phys Lett* 86:041913
123. Qiu X, Liu H, Fang F, Ha M, Liu J (2006) *Appl Phys Lett* 88:072906
124. King-Smith RD, Vanderbilt D (1993) *Phys Rev B* 47:1651
125. Resta R (1994) *Rev Mod Phys* 66:899
126. Bernardini F et al (1997) *Phys Rev Lett* 79:3958
127. Wagmare UV, Rabe KM (2005) In: Demkov AA, Navrotsky A (eds) *Materials fundamentals of gate dielectrics*. Springer, New York
128. Getraux F et al (1998) *Phys Rev Lett* 81:3297
129. Fu H, Bellaiche L (2003) *Phys Rev Lett* 91:057601
130. Pignedoli CA, Curioni A, Andreoni W (2007) *Phys Rev Lett* 98:037602
131. Shevlin SA, Curioni A, Andreoni W (2005) *Phys Rev Lett* 94:146401
132. Giustino F, Umari P, Pasquarello A (2003) *Phys Rev Lett* 91:267601
133. Shi N, Ramprasad R (2006) *Phys Rev B* 74:045318
134. Massimiliano S, Spaldin NA (2006) *Nature* 443:679
135. Nakhmanson SM et al (2005) *Phys Rev B* 72:115210
136. Ramprasad R, Shi N (2005) *Phys Rev B* 72:052107
137. Shi N, Ramprasad R (2005) *Appl Phys Lett* 87:262102
138. Botti S et al (2002) *Phys Rev Lett* 89:216803
139. Shi N, Ramprasad R (2007) *Appl Phys Lett* 91:242906
140. Shi N, Ramprasad R (2008) *Trans IEEE DEI* 15:170
141. Zhao X, Vanderbilt D (2002) *Phys Rev B* 65:233106
142. Rignanese GM et al (2004) *Phys Rev B* 69:184301
143. Tang C, Tuttle B, Ramprasad R (2007) *Phys Rev B* 76:073306
144. Tang C, Ramprasad R (2007) *Phys Rev B* 75:241302
145. Tang C, Ramprasad R (2008) *Appl Phys Lett* 92:152911
146. Tang C, Ramprasad R (2008) *Appl Phys Lett* 92:182908
147. Kim KJ et al (2012) *Appl Surf Sci* 258:3552
148. Miyata N et al (2003) *Appl Phys Lett* 82:3880
149. Broqvist P, Alkauskas A, Pasquarello A (2008) *Appl Phys Lett* 92:132911
150. Alkauskas A, Broqvist P, Devynck F, Pasquarello A (2008) *Phys Rev Lett* 101:106802
151. Peressi M, Binggeli N, Baldereschi A (1998) *J Phys D* 31:1273
152. Alkauskas A, Broqvist P, Pasquarello A (2008) *Phys Rev Lett* 101:046405
153. Himpfel F, Mcfeely F, Talebibrabimi A, Yarmoff J, Hollinger G (1988) *Phys Rev B* 38:6084
154. Keister J, Rowe J, Kolodziej J, Niimi H, Madey T, Lucovsky G (1999) *J Vac Sci Technol B* 17:1831
155. Oshima M, Toyoda S, Okumura T, Okabayashi J, Kumigashira H, Ono K, Niwa M, Usuda K, Hirashita N (2003) *Appl Phys Lett* 83:2172
156. Renault O, Barrett N, Samour D, Quiais-Marthon S (2004) *Surf Sci* 566:526
157. Zhu H, Ramprasad R (2011) *Phys Rev B* 83:081416(R)
158. Yeo YC, King TJ, Hu CH (2002) *J Appl Phys* 92:7266
159. Schaeffer JK, Fonseca LRC, Samavedam SB, Liang Y, Tobin PJ, White BE (2004) *Appl Phys Lett* 85:1826
160. Lu C-H, Wong GMT, Deal MD, Tsai W, Majhi P, Chui CO, Visokay MR, Chambers JJ, Colombo L, Clements BM, Nishi Y (2005) *Electron Device Lett* 26(7):445
161. Gu D, Dey SK, Majhi P (2006) *Appl Phys Lett* 89:082907
162. Yang H, Son Y, Baek S, Hwang H (2005) *Appl Phys Lett* 86:092107
163. Paffett MT, Gebhard SC, Windham RG, Koel BE (1990) *J Phys Chem* 94:6831
164. Cho E et al (2008) *Appl Phys Lett* 92:233118
165. Xiong K et al (2008) *J Appl Phys* 104:074501
166. Engstrom U, Ryberg R (1999) *Phys Rev Lett* 82:2741
167. Da Silva JLF, Stampfl C, Scheffler M (2006) *Surf Sci* 600:703
168. Zhu H, Aindow M, Ramprasad R (2009) *Phys Rev B* 80:201406(R)
169. Zhu H, Ramprasad R (2011) *J Appl Phys* 109:083719
170. Cho E, Lee B, Lee C-K, Han S, Jeon SH, Park BH, Kim Y-S (2008) *Appl Phys Lett* 92:233118
171. Fonseca LRC, Knizhnik AA (2006) *Phys Rev B* 74:195304
172. Fonseca LRC et al (2007) *J Integr Circuits Syst* 2:94
173. Bersch E, Rangan S, Bartynski RA, Garfunkel E, Vescovo E (2008) *Phys Rev B* 78:085114
174. Yu HY et al (2004) *IEEE Electron Device Lett* 25:337
175. Javey A et al (2003) *Nature* 424:654
176. Li X et al (2008) *Science* 29:5867
177. Wang W, Hinkle CL, Vogel EM, Cho K, Wallace RM (2011) *Microelectron Eng* 88:1061

178. Robertson J, Lin L (2011) *Microelectron Eng* 88:373
179. Lin L, Robertson J (2011) *Appl Phys Lett* 98:082903
180. Robertson J (2009) *Appl Phys Lett* 94:152104
181. Komsa H-P, Pasquarello A (2011) *Microelectron Eng* 88:1436
182. Afanas'ev VV, Badylevich M, Stesmans A, Brammertz G, Delabie A, Sionke S, O'Mahony A, Povey IM, Pemble ME, O'Connor E, Hurley PK, Newcomb SB (2008) *Appl Phys Lett* 93:212104
183. Seguini G, Perego M, Spiga S, Fanciulli M, Dimoulas A (2007) *Appl Phys Lett* 91:192902
184. Dalapati GK, Oh H-J, Lee SJ, Sridhara A, Wong ASW, Chi D (2008) *Appl Phys Lett* 92:042120
185. Wang W, Xiong K, Gong C, Wallace RM, Cho K (2011) *J Appl Phys* 109:063704
186. Wang W, Gong C, Shan B, Wallace RM, Cho K (2011) *Appl Phys Lett* 98:232113
187. Wang W, Xiong K, Lee G, Huang M, Wallace RM, Cho K (2010) *Appl Surf Sci* 256:6569