

## Placement of Substrate Contacts to Alleviate Substrate Noise in Epi and Non-Epi Technologies

Radu M. Secareanu<sup>1</sup>, Scott Warner\*, Scott Seabridge\*, Cathie Burke\*,  
Thomas E. Watrobski\*, Christopher Morton\*, William Staub\*, Thomas Tellier\*, and Eby G. Friedman  
Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, University of Rochester, Rochester, New York 14627-0231  
\*Xerox Corporation, Ink Jet Supplies Business Unit, Webster, New York 14580

**Abstract**— The placement of substrate contacts in epi and non-epi technologies in order to control and reduce the substrate noise amplitude and spreading is analyzed. The choice of small or large substrate contacts or rings for each of the two major technologies are highlighted. Design guidelines for placing substrate contacts particularly appropriate to improving the noise immunity of digital circuits in mixed-signal smart-power systems are also presented.

### I. INTRODUCTION

Substrate noise can affect the integrity of on-chip analog or digital signals. Substrate noise in analog applications has received a great deal of attention in the past decade [1–6], particularly driven by the high resolution analog signal processing circuits that operate in a noisy mixed-signal environment such as analog-to-digital (A/D) or digital-to-analog (D/A) converters. Substrate noise in digital applications has received far less attention because the digital circuits are capable of rejecting a certain amount of noise without affecting the correct operation of the circuits. A deleterious amount of substrate noise, however, can be exceeded in certain applications, such as in mixed-signal smart-power circuits [7, 8].

Different aspects related to the substrate noise problem have been analyzed in the literature [1–6]. The flow of the substrate noise into the substrate has been qualitatively described by Wooley [1]. The magnitude of the substrate noise together with related nonuniformities within the substrate have been shown to be the two primary factors that influence the noise behavior of digital circuits [7, 8]. It has also been shown that only a large noise amplitude for uniform noise may affect the correct operation of a digital circuit [8]. Accordingly, in smart-power applications, for improved noise immunity of the digital circuits, the noise within the substrate should be uniform and below a certain catastrophic level. For example, for an NMOS [9] 5 volt logic family, this level is  $\approx 1.7$  volts [8].

Several strategies at the technology, circuit, or physical design levels can be used to obtain a uniform and low substrate noise. The focus of this paper is on the physical level, with the principal objective to evaluate the influence of substrate contact placement in order to obtain a uniform and low magnitude substrate noise distribution in both epi and non-epi technologies.

A methodology to generate three-dimensional substrate noise distributions, described in Section II, has

been developed in order to analyze the proper placement of the substrate contacts. The principal results obtained from this analysis for a non-epi technology are described in Section III, while for an epi technology are described in Section IV. Some conclusions are offered in Section V.

### II. METHODOLOGY FOR GENERATING A SUBSTRATE NOISE DISTRIBUTION

A three-dimensional representation of a noise distribution has been developed in order to analyze the placement of substrate contacts. The noise density is generated in a two-dimensional section of the substrate. Several assumptions have been made in the development of the three-dimensional noise distributions: 1) The noise is generated primarily during the transitions between the linear region and the saturation region of operation of the power transistors [7, 8]. 2) The magnitude of the generated noise depends upon the transition times of the input signal, the geometric size of the high power transistor, and certain technological characteristics such as the substrate doping. 3) For a given technology and application, all of these variables are constant; therefore, it is assumed that the generated noise is constant. As a consequence, the noise source is modeled as a constant current source. 4) The constant current source injects noise into a resistive mesh which is used to model the substrate. The capacitive element of the substrate is neglected because once the substrate contacts and rings are placed to minimize the noise amplitude and nonuniformities, any nonuniformities introduced by the capacitive element of the substrate are not sufficient to induce a parasitic transition at the output of a logic element [8].




Fig. 1. Diagram of circuit model used to investigate the three-dimensional noise distribution within the substrate

A diagram of the circuit model used to investigate the noise distribution within the substrate is shown in Fig. 1. For a non-epi substrate, the entire substrate has the same resistivity. For an epi substrate, the epi layer, smaller in thickness than the bulk, has a resistivity  $R1$ , while the bulk has a resistivity  $R2$ .

The substrate is modeled as a resistive mesh, realized by connecting a multitude of two-dimensional resistive primitives, as shown in Fig. 2. The two-dimensional substrate section used to derive a noise distribution is composed of 36 by 24 resistive primitives. For an epi

This research was supported in part by a grant from the Xerox Corporation.

<sup>1</sup>Now with Motorola, Inc., Semiconductor Product Sector, Digital DNA Laboratories - ASRL Advanced Circuits Research Group, Tempe, AZ 85284.

substrate, 36 by 6 resistive primitives represent the epi layer and 36 by 18 resistive primitives represent the bulk. These dimensions represent a good tradeoff between complexity and precision.




Fig. 2. A resistive primitive used to model the substrate as a resistive mesh




Fig. 3. An overall view of a noise distribution for one substrate contact. On the  $y = 0$  row, the noise source is placed at  $x = 4$ , the first substrate contact is placed at  $x = 18$ , and the second substrate contact is placed at  $x = 34$ .




Fig. 4. A magnified back view of a noise distribution for one substrate contact




Fig. 5. A magnified front view of a noise distribution for two substrate contacts. On the  $y = 0$  row, the noise source is placed at  $x = 4$ , the first substrate contact is placed at  $x = 18$ , and the second substrate contact is placed at  $x = 34$ .

The procedure to determine the distribution of the substrate noise is as follows. Several substrate contact placement configurations have been analyzed using the Cadence Spectre [10] simulator. A C program has been developed to process the files generated by the simulator in order to determine the current through each resistor within each resistive primitive. An average value of the current in each resistive primitive is computed as a median of the currents through the four resistors of each resistive primitive. These average currents are plotted to obtain a distribution of the substrate noise.

### III. SUBSTRATE NOISE DISTRIBUTION FOR A NON-EPI TECHNOLOGY

For a non-epi technology, the noise travels predominantly along the substrate surface [1]. Several representative three-dimensional noise distributions are illustrated in Figs. 3, 4, and 5. Note in Fig. 3 the large substrate noise density (the large spikes) at the current source and at the ground line (see Fig. 1). In Figs. 4 and 5, magnified views of the noise distributions are obtained by eliminating the large spikes. In Fig. 4, a back view of a noise distribution is shown. Note that the noise density decreases with the depth of the substrate, and that the substrate noise only exists between the current source and the ground line. Noise distributions have been developed for two or more substrate contacts which are placed at different distances from the current source. An example of such a distribution is shown in Fig. 5.




Fig. 6. A voltage distribution at the substrate surface for one substrate contact. Several important regions of the voltage distribution, denoted by the numbers, are highlighted.

Each of these noise distributions can be translated into voltage distributions. A voltage distribution at the substrate surface is exemplified in Fig. 6. Consider the substrate contact (tied to ground) to be at zero potential. The large spike near the substrate contact produces a potential  $V_1$ . In the immediate vicinity of the substrate contact (region 3 in Fig. 6), the noise density is large, producing a voltage drop of  $V_2 - V_1$ . Accordingly, at the end of this region, the substrate remains biased at  $V_2$  (region 1). This constant bias has been experimentally observed [8]. In region 4, the noise density is smaller and constant and the voltage potential increases near linearly. A similar behavior as in region 3 is noted in region 5. Finally, the large noise spike near the noise source produces the  $V_5 - V_4$  voltage drop. This profile can be symmetric with respect to the  $x$  axis depending upon the direction of the noise within the substrate.

It is a common technique in physical design to place a global substrate contact within a circuit block instead of individual substrate contacts for each constituent transistor. Obvious reasons for this strategy is to save area and for ease in design. Note that if such a circuit block is placed in region 4 of the substrate (see Fig. 6), the constituent transistors are affected by a large and variable potential, which, as shown in [8], may easily induce a parasitic transition. If the sensitive circuitry is placed in region 1, the constituent transistors are affected by an approximately constant potential,  $V_2$  (see Fig. 6). As described in [8], a constant potential, even if large, is less likely to induce a parasitic transition. Region 4 is also an acceptable placement alternative if the distance from a transistor to a substrate contact is much smaller than the distance from the transistor to a noise source.




Fig. 7. Spatial noise distributions for small and large substrate contacts and rings. Lines of equal noise are depicted.




Fig. 8. Microphotograph of a test structure used to probe the quiet zone (as shown in Fig. 7d)

An analysis of the placement of multiple substrate contacts (see Fig. 5 for an example) produces the following conclusions: 1) The noise spike at GND1 (closer to the noise source) is larger than the noise spike at GND2. 2) The noise spike at GND2 decreases while the noise spike at GND1 increases as the distance between GND1 and GND2 increases. 3) The noise density in the region between GND1 and GND2 is much smaller than the noise density in the region between the noise source and GND1. 4) The noise density in the region between GND1

and GND2 decreases as the distance between GND1 and GND2 increases.

Note that, for example, two substrate contacts can efficiently reduce the noise in the region after GND2 (equivalent to region 1, see Fig. 6) if the distance  $L_2$  between GND1 and GND2 is comparable to or larger than the distance  $L_1$  between GND1 and the noise source. If  $L_2$  is much smaller than  $L_1$ , the two substrate contacts receive essentially the same noise, making the use of multiple substrate contacts less efficient.

Lines of equal noise are shown in Fig. 7 for a) small substrate contacts, b) large substrate contacts, and c) rings. In Fig. 7d, the "quiet zone" behind a large substrate contact is drawn. Note in Fig. 7a the high density of lines with different noise magnitudes. Two transistors, tx1 and tx2, even if placed close to another may exhibit noise lines of different magnitudes. Accordingly, a noise nonuniformity may exist between the two transistors. Large substrate contacts produce a larger zone of noise uniformity (note the quiet zone in Fig. 7d). This quiet zone has also been experimentally observed [7, 8] using the test circuit shown in Fig. 8 where large substrate contacts, placed parallel to the noise sources at different distances, are used to probe the substrate voltage. A ring surrounding the noise source, as shown in Fig. 7c, provides in any of the 1, 2, 3, or 4 sections of the substrate a noise distribution consistent with the two substrate contact case (see, for example, Fig. 5). Since a resistance is present between any two points of the substrate, a ring is equivalent to connecting multiple resistors in parallel, thereby creating a path of reduced resistance for the noise signal to propagate towards the ground. For the same distance, this path has a lower resistivity than using either small or large substrate contacts. A similar beneficial low resistivity path for the noise can also be obtained by using wide substrate contacts.




Fig. 9. Placement of a ring surrounding a noisy drain

The efficiency of the noise reduction process with two substrate contacts depends upon  $L_1$  and  $L_2$ . These distances can be equated to the substrate resistances,  $R_1$  and  $R_2$ . The noise at GND2 is directly proportional to the  $R_1/R_2$  ratio. A reduced noise at GND2 is obtained when

$$\frac{R_1}{R_2} \ll 1. \quad (1)$$

The smaller  $R_1$  and the larger  $R_2$ , the smaller the noise at GND2 and the larger the noise at GND1. The smallest ratio of  $R_1/R_2$  can be obtained by minimizing  $R_1$  which can be accomplished by placing a ring as close as possible to the noisy drain (as shown in Fig. 9). A wider ring further decreases  $R_1$ .  $L_2$  should therefore be as large as the physical design constraints permit, creating a large  $R_2$ .  $R_1$  can be further decreased if a buried layer is placed below the noisy transistor.

If multiple independent noise sources exist [7,9], the following substrate contact placement methodology is recommended to both minimize and equalize the noise across the substrate:

- Use substrate contacts at each noise source (see Fig. 9).
- Progressively surround groups of noise sources with rings. Multiple layers of rings are created. The higher the layer, the more noise sources are surrounded. The rings are placed to create small R1/R2 ratios. The primary drawback of multiple layers of rings is the large area. Rings placed close to each other do not have much benefit other than those rings closest to the noise source which decreases R1. To further decrease the R1/R2 ratio, the rings closest to the noise source should be wider, while the rings farther from the noise source should be thinner.
- Using small substrate contacts for each transistor or a larger substrate contact for each small group of transistors is beneficial. These substrate contacts should be placed at a distance from the last ring or substrate contact such that the R1/R2 ratio is small. By using this technique, a local noise reduction is achieved (in the area surrounding the substrate contact) and a high noise uniformity for the transistors across the substrate is obtained.




Fig. 10. The effect of a gap in a substrate contact ring




Fig. 11. Ring surrounding sensitive circuitry




Fig. 12. An example of a substrate noise distribution for an epi technology. A detailed view for one substrate contact is shown, eliminating the large noise spikes at the input and output (see Fig. 3)

When a ring is used, multiple lines such as the power and control lines for the noise sources must be connected to the circuitry outside the ring, requiring the Metal 1 layer of the ring to be interrupted, as shown in Fig. 10. The connection between the *Metal 1a* and *Metal 1b* sections of the ring is made through the *P+* diffusion of the ring, creating a resistance *R*, thereby producing an *IR*

voltage drop which may bias *Metal 1b* with reference to *Metal 1a*. This voltage drop biases the substrate below *Metal 1b* and may produce noise through any of the mechanisms described in [8], depending upon the magnitude of the *IR* drop. In the limit, if the *IR* drop is significant, the situation is equivalent to there not being a substrate contact below *Metal 1b*.

Solutions exist to minimize or eliminate this effect: 1) Do not break the *Metal 1* routing along with the *P+* substrate contact. Make the necessary connections to the noise sources in *Metal 2*. 2) Minimize the current passing through the resistor by creating a low resistance path to ground through a careful physical layout. 3) Create low resistivity paths between *Metal 1a* and *Metal 1b* by connecting the two sections (for example, with *Metal 2*).

A ring surrounding the sensitive circuitry may actually create adverse noise effects and/or waste area as discussed next, and therefore is not justified for noise reduction and uniformity (see Fig. 11). If *L* is small, than the A, B, C, and D sections of the ring have different R1/R2 ratios. Therefore, a nonuniform noise distribution occurs within the ring sections. This nonuniform distribution degrades the noise tolerant characteristics of the sensitive circuitry. However, the A section of the ring creates a "quiet zone" (see Fig. 7d), which benefits the sensitive circuitry. Therefore, a large substrate contact placed similar to the A section of the ring has the same effect as a ring and consumes less area. At large distances *L* (see Fig. 11), a ring is similar to placing one large substrate contact or several individual substrate contacts from a noise reduction and uniformity perspective.

#### IV. SUBSTRATE NOISE DISTRIBUTION FOR AN EPI TECHNOLOGY

For an epi technology, the noise travels predominantly along the interface between the epi layer and the bulk [1]. Note in Fig. 12 the large substrate noise density at the epi-bulk interface, and the relatively low noise density at the substrate surface.

There are major differences in using substrate contacts in an epi and a non-epi technology, the principal reason for these differences being the bulk resistivity (typically,  $\rho_{epi} = k\rho_{bulk}$ ). Multiple experiments suggest the following strategies for placing substrate contacts in an epi technology:

- For the same distance between the noise source and a substrate contact (GND1) as in a non-epi technology, the noise spikes at the noise source and at the substrate contact are larger in an epi technology, but the noise nonuniformity along the substrate surface is smaller. Therefore, the epi technologies offer a more uniform noise distribution throughout the substrate even if the noise is larger in magnitude as compared to a non-epi technology. Due to the low resistivity path through the bulk, the noise uniformity varies less with distance.
- Since, in an epi technology, a higher noise uniformity occurs due to the inherent nature of the technology, the primary task is to develop methods to reduce the noise level. Two such methods are discussed here: 1) to reduce the noise injected by the noise source into the bulk, and

2) to collect a major portion of the noise from the bulk.

Referring to Fig. 13, reducing the noise injected into the bulk is equivalent to placing a substrate contact between the noise source and the noise receptor (or the substrate contact which is tied to ground) in order to maximize the noise that travels along the surface of the substrate. The necessary condition is (see Fig. 13)

$$kL_2 \ll 2kL_1 + L_2, \quad (2)$$

where  $L_1$  is the thickness of the epi layer and  $L_2$  is the distance from the noise source to the substrate contact. To maximize this condition, solutions such as increasing the epi layer thickness, creating a buried layer within the epi layer and below the noise source, diffusing the substrate contact deeper into the epi layer, or creating wider substrate contacts may be employed.




Fig. 13. Resistance distribution between the noise source and a substrate contact for an epi technology

To collect a major portion of the noise from the bulk, multiple substrate contacts are used. Reference is made to Fig. 14. The objective is for the substrate contact 1 (SC1) to collect significantly more noise than SC2. Note that the noise may travel between the noise source and SC1 either mostly through the epi layer if (2) is satisfied, or mostly through the bulk. Defining  $R_m$  as the smallest resistance between the two noise paths,

$$R_m = \text{Min}\{R_2, 2R_1 + R_3\}, \quad (3)$$

the condition for SC1 to collect a significant amount of noise from the bulk is

$$R_m \ll R_5 + R_1. \quad (4)$$




Fig. 14. Efficient placement of multiple substrate contacts in an epi technology

Note that in order to satisfy (4),  $L_3$  must be significantly larger than either  $L_2$  or  $L_1$  and  $L_2$ . Note that  $R_5$  is the bulk resistance through  $L_3$ , and is compared in (3) and (4) to  $R_2$  and/or  $R_1$  of the epi layer. In order to obtain the same resistance through the bulk as through the epi layer, the distance through the bulk ( $L_3$ ) must be  $\rho_{\text{epi}}/\rho_{\text{bulk}}$  times larger than the equivalent distance through the epi layer. To obtain a significant reduction in the substrate noise,  $R_5 + R_1$  must be significantly larger than  $R_m$ , a condition that is satisfied only for a large  $R_5$

(or a large  $L_3$ ). A large  $L_3$  uses on-chip area inefficiently (see Fig. 14). However, this solution may be viable for certain applications.

As compared to non-epi technologies, rings or large substrate contacts are not as beneficial. Therefore, excluding the two situations where rings are beneficial, namely, placing a ring close to the noise source as shown in Fig. 13 and placing a second ring or large substrate contact at a large distance from the first ring as depicted in Fig. 14, rings or large substrate contacts in an epi technology do not produce any significant benefits. Rather, a substrate contact placed close to each small group of sensitive transistors (based on the criteria illustrated in Fig. 14) is highly recommended for an epi technology.

## V. CONCLUSIONS

The placement of substrate contacts in epi and non-epi technologies has been analyzed. A methodology to derive three-dimensional substrate noise distributions has also been discussed. The major differences between the two technologies have been noted. Rules for placing substrate contacts in order to minimize the noise while obtaining a uniform noise distribution have also been developed. Several physical design issues which influence the noise distribution have been discussed. First order expressions for efficiently placing substrate contacts in both epi and non-epi technologies have also been provided. Summarizing, a methodology for placing substrate contacts to minimize noise in mixed-signal circuits has been presented.

## REFERENCES

- [1] D. K. Su and B. A. Wooley, "Experimental Results and Modeling Techniques for Substrate Noise in Mixed-Signal Integrated Circuits," *IEEE Journal of Solid-State Circuits*, Vol. 28, No. 4, pp. 420-430, April 1993.
- [2] X. Aragones and A. Rubio, "Analysis and Modelling of Parasitic Substrate Coupling in CMOS Circuits," *IEE Proceedings-Circuits, Devices and Systems*, Vol. 142, No. 5, pp. 307-312, October 1995.
- [3] S. Masui, "Simulation of Substrate Coupling in Mixed-Signal MOS Circuits," *Proceedings of the IEEE International Symposium on VLSI Circuits*, pp. 42-43, June 1992.
- [4] T. Blalack and B. A. Wooley, "Experimental Results and Modeling of Noise Coupling in a Lightly Doped Substrate," *Proceedings of the IEEE International Electron Devices Meeting*, pp. 623-626, December 1996.
- [5] K. M. Fukuda and M. Hotta, "Voltage-Comparator-Based Measurement of Equivalently Sampled Substrate Noise Waveforms in Mixed-Signal Integrated Circuits," *IEEE Journal of Solid-State Circuits*, Vol. 31, No. 5, pp. 726-731, May 1996.
- [6] B. R. Stanicic, N. K. Verghese, and D. J. Allstot, "Addressing Substrate Coupling in Mixed-Mode IC's: Simulation and Power Distribution Synthesis," *IEEE Journal of Solid-State Circuits*, Vol. 29, No. 3, pp. 226-238, March 1994.
- [7] R. M. Secareanu, I. S. Kourtev, J. Becerra, T. E. Watrobski, C. Morton, W. Staub, T. Tellier, and E. G. Friedman, "Noise Immunity of Digital Circuits in Mixed-Signal Smart Power Systems," *Proceedings of the IEEE Great Lakes Symposium on VLSI*, pp. 314-317, February 1999.
- [8] R. M. Secareanu, I. S. Kourtev, J. Becerra, T. E. Watrobski, C. Morton, W. Staub, T. Tellier, and E. G. Friedman, "The Behavior of Digital Circuits under Substrate Noise in a Mixed-Signal Smart-Power Environment," *Proceedings of the IEEE International Symposium on Power Semiconductor Devices and ICs*, pp. 253-256, May 1999.
- [9] E. Peeters and S. Verdonck-Vandebroek, "Thermal Ink Jet Technology," *IEEE Circuits and Devices Magazine*, Vol. 13, No. 4, pp. 19-23, July 1997.
- [10] Cadence Design Tools, "Cadence Design Systems, Inc.," San Jose, CA, 1998.