



# Fabrication of High Aspect Ratio SU-8 Structures for Integrated Spectrometers

Thomas A. Anhøj

Ph.D. defence April 20th 2007





# **Outline**

- 1. Introduction
- 2. Device fabrication
- 3. Device performance
- 4. Conclusion







### Lab-on-a-chip

- The goal of lab-on-a-chip systems is to transfer the analytical capabilities of a traditional lab on to a single chip
- The benefits of integration and miniaturization are many
	- Analysis time
	- Sample and reagent consumption
	- Portability
- Sample analysis is realized in many different ways, often involving optical detection
	- Fluorescent detection
	- Absorption spectroscopy
	- Raman spectroscopy...?





Introduction  $\rightarrow$  Device fabrication  $\rightarrow$  Device performance  $\rightarrow$  Conclusion





# **Motivation**

- $\rightarrow$  Raman spectroscopy: SERS-on-a-chip
- $\rightarrow$  Integrated optical system and microfluidic system
- $\rightarrow$  On-chip spectrometer







## Integrated spectrometers



At the output:  $m\lambda = \Delta l_1 + \Delta l_2$ 

Design parameters:

- Diffraction order
- Wavelength
- Focal length
- Linear dispersion

- Important characteristics:
	- Transmission loss
	- Resolution
	- Free spectral range
	- Linear dispersion

Introduction  $\rightarrow$  Device fabrication  $\rightarrow$  Device performance  $\rightarrow$  Conclusion

Ph.D. defense Thomas Anhøj

Claus Rye





## Integrated spectrometers

- Challenges in the photolithographic fabrication process
	- Line broadening
	- Corner effects
	- Sidewall angle
- Consequences
	- Increased transmission loss
	- Decreased resolution



Introduction  $\rightarrow$  Device fabrication  $\rightarrow$  Device performance  $\rightarrow$  Conclusion





# Device fabrication

- Substrate preparation
- Spin coating
- Pattern transfer
- Bonding
- Dicing









# SU-8 processing

SU-8 is a chemically enhanced, negative tone photoresist.

Cross-linked SU-8 is transparent in the visible and near-infra red wavelength range, and has a high refractive index (1.6 @ 633 nm)

- Spin coat
- Soft bake Silicon Silicon
- **Exposure**
- Post-exposure bake
- Development of non-cross linked SU-8

 $\triangleright$  Introduction  $\triangleright$  Device fabrication  $\triangleright$  Device performance  $\triangleright$  Conclusion





# SU-8 processing



- Line broadening and corner effects due to proximity effect caused by the edge bead
- Solution:
	- Remove edge bead
	- Optimize process parameters





### Experimental approach

- Investigations and optimization is carried out using design of experiments (DOE)
- Once suitable ranges of the involved parameters have been chosen, the experiment is designed using commercial software (MODDE 6.0 from Umetrics, Sweden)
- The result of the experiment is modelled and the models are used to optimize the process



 $\triangleright$  Introduction  $\triangleright$  Device fabrication  $\triangleright$  Device performance  $\triangleright$  Conclusion





# Experimental approach

### Edge bead removal

- 8 variables
- Response surface modeling including both second order and interaction terms
- 54 wafers

### Parameter optimization

- 6 variables, 6 responses
- Response surface modeling including both second order and interaction terms
- 76 wafers







# Edge bead removal

When a wafer is spin coated with resist, a surplus of material builds up at the edge of the wafer. This effect is called 'edge bead'. The edge bead has a negative effect in the photolithographic process, as

• EBR arm position well as in the bonding process.  $\cdot$  EBR time Post-EBR spin • Post-EBR acceleration • Post-EBR spin speed • Post-EBR spin time

 $\triangleright$  Introduction  $\triangleright$  Device fabrication  $\triangleright$  Device performance  $\triangleright$  Conclusion

Ph.D. defense Thomas Anhøj

Edge bead removal

Solvent reduction

• SR temperature

• Cooling step time

Edge bead removal

 $\cdot$  SR time





### Edge bead removal



- The application of the solvent during EBR (position and duration) is the most significant factor in the model
- The model is used to optimize the EBR process

 $-10$  $-20$  $-30$  $-40$  $\Omega$ 10 20 30



- Solvent reduction 9:23 min @ 50 °C;
- Edge bead removal (PGMEA) 40 s, 5 mm from edge;
- Post-spin 28 s @ 1440 rpm.

### Result:

Edge bead height  $< 1 \mu m$ , i.e. practically gone.

Introduction  $\rightarrow$  Device fabrication  $\rightarrow$  Device performance  $\rightarrow$  Conclusion

80 90 100

40 50 60 70

Distance from edge (mm)







# Edge bead removal results







### Process parameter optimization

With the edge bead gone the lithographic resolution has improved significantly. This makes it possible to study the effect of process parameters.

Cracks are an issue, especially in the large spectrometer slab, but also in waveguides and in the fluidic channel.



Response monitors

- trenches
- $-$  ridges
- $-cracks$

50 un





# Process parameter optimization

Starting point

- Soft bake:
	- $-30 \text{ min}$  @ 95 °C
- Exposure:
	- $-$  25 s @ 9 mW/cm<sup>2</sup>
- Post-exposure bake:
	- $-4$  min @ 95 °C
	- 10.5 trench aspect ratio
	- 5.1 ridge aspect ratio
	- $-1-9\%$  cracks

Optimized recipe

- $-5$  min @ 65 °C
- $-20 s \omega 9$  mW/cm<sup>2</sup>
- $-30 \text{ min}$  @ 65 °C
- 11.4 trench aspect ratio
- 8.8 ridge aspect ratio
- No cracks!

 $\triangleright$  Introduction  $\triangleright$  Device fabrication  $\triangleright$  Device performance  $\triangleright$  Conclusion





## The effect of soft bake temperature

- The soft bake temperature has the biggest effect in several of the second DOE models.
- Soft bake effects
	- Polymerization
	- Resist sensitivity
	- Resulting material strength
- May be explained by
	- Solvent dependent photoinitiation
	- Solvent dependent polymerization







# Parameter optimization results

### Starting point **Optimized recipe**







## Spectrometer characterization







# Spectrometer performance



- Order:
	- $-$  m=9 (m<sub>0</sub>=9)
- Wavelength: – 726 nm (730 nm)
- FSR:
	- $-89.2$  nm  $(91.3$  nm)
- Linear dispersion:
	- $-7.5\pm0.2 \,\mu m/nm (7.5 \,\mu m/nm)$

 $\triangleright$  Introduction  $\triangleright$  Device fabrication  $\triangleright$  Device performance  $\triangleright$  Conclusion





### Result of optimization



- Loss: 22.3 dB 13.1 dB
- FWHM: 5.8 nm 7.5 nm

- The transmission increase due to the optimized fabrication is 7.5 dB
- The intrinsic spectrometer transmission loss is estimated to 9.8 dB

Introduction  $\rightarrow$  Device fabrication  $\rightarrow$  Device performance  $\rightarrow$  Conclusion





### Using the spectrometer









## **Conclusion**

- Trench aspect ratio increased from 6 to above 11
- Cracks eliminated
- Spectrometer transmission increased six-fold
- Outlook
	- Proof of concept
	- SERS active surface
	- Blazed spectrometer design



 $\triangleright$  Introduction  $\triangleright$  Device fabrication  $\triangleright$  Device performance  $\triangleright$  Conclusion





# Acknowledgements

- Evaluation committee: Jürgen Brugger, Jens Engholm Pedersen, Michael Svalgaard
- Supervisors: Jörg Hübner, Anders Michael Jørgensen
- InSERS HQ: Anders, Dan, Peter, Anders, Rasmus
- Stefan, Gabriella
- Helle, Conny, Yvonne, Majken
- Kristian, Brian, Morten, Christian, Frederik, Torsten, Maria, Mads, Detlev, Karin, Fridolin, Henning, and all the rest of MIC
- Regulars and visitors in the FridayBar
- B98 and Co.
- **Christoph**
- Pia, Sarah, Cecilie