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Nanolaminate structures have many prospective uses in mechanical, electrical, and optical applications due to the wide selection of materials and precise control over layer thicknesses. In this work, ultrathin Al$_2$O$_3$/TiO$_2$ nanolaminate structures deposited by atomic layer deposition from Me$_3$Al, TiCl$_4$, and H$_2$O precursors with intended bilayer thicknesses ranging from 0.1 to 50 nm were characterized by x-ray reflectivity (XRR) measurements. The measurements were simulated to obtain values for thickness, density, and roughness of constituting layers. XRR analysis shows that the individual layers within the nanolaminate remain discrete for bilayers as thin as 0.8 nm. Further reduction in bilayer thickness produces a composite of the two materials.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Nanolaminates are structures composed of alternating thin layers of different materials. Due to the sequential and self-terminating nature of atomic layer deposition (ALD), alternating films with abrupt interfaces are deposited with excellent control over layer thickness. Additionally, a wide selection of materials can be utilized. These are beneficial qualities in nanolaminate based mechanical, electrical, and optical applications.

In this work, the structural properties of Al$_2$O$_3$/TiO$_2$ nanolaminates were studied by x-ray reflectivity (XRR). XRR is a powerful and nondestructive technique used to study thin film thickness, density, and roughness. Nanolaminates with varied layer thicknesses were characterized to determine the minimum observable layer thickness. XRR analysis shows that the individual layers within the nanolaminate remain discrete for bilayers as thin as 0.8 nm. Further reduction in bilayer thickness produces a composite of the two materials.

II. EXPERIMENT

A series of Al$_2$O$_3$/TiO$_2$ nanolaminate samples with varied bilayer thicknesses was studied. In this work, a bilayer denotes the combination of one Al$_2$O$_3$ and one TiO$_2$ layer. The samples were deposited on 6 in. Si substrates in a Picosun™ R-150 ALD reactor from Me$_3$Al, TiCl$_4$, and H$_2$O precursors. The deposition temperature was 200 °C for all samples. A schematic illustration of the nanolaminate structures is seen in Fig. 1. The alternating layer sequence was started with an Al$_2$O$_3$ layer and an even number of layers were deposited to yield a total nanolaminate thickness of 100 nm. The nanolaminates were then capped with a 2 nm Al$_2$O$_3$ layer. Samples were manufactured with intended bilayer thicknesses from 0.1 to 50 nm. The cycle counts of individual Al$_2$O$_3$ and TiO$_2$ layers were linearly scaled from known growth rates to approximate equal target thicknesses. Linear scaling was however not possible in the cases of the thinnest films.

The XRR measurements were performed with parallel beam conditions, x-ray wavelength Cu-K$_{α1}$, acceleration voltage 40 kV, and anode current 40 mA. Measured reflectivity curves were simulated using the X'pert Reflectivity software to determine the thickness, density, and roughness of the nanolaminate layers. For a review on XRR, see Ref. 4. The reflectivity curves were simulated assuming all bilayers identical, i.e., only one set of thickness, roughness, and density values per material was considered. Since the layers are very thin, both Al$_2$O$_3$ and TiO$_2$ affect the critical angle of total external reflection and individual densities could not be determined. The TiO$_2$ density was therefore simulated assuming a constant Al$_2$O$_3$ density $\rho = 3.05 \text{ g/cm}^3$. The

![Fig. 1. (Color online) Schematic view of the nanolaminate structure.](image-url)
Al₂O₃ density value was adopted from experiments of single Al₂O₃ films grown at the same temperature⁵ and is in good agreement with earlier published values.⁶,⁷

**III. RESULTS**

Measured and simulated XRR curves of samples with target bilayer thicknesses ranging from 1 to 50 nm are shown in Fig. 2. The simulations are vertically offset for better clarity. Figure 2 displays how the XRR curves gradually change with decreasing bilayer thickness and increasing bilayer count. The sharp maxima that are first seen in the 20 nm bilayer sample [Fig. 2(b)] are characteristic of superlattice structures and indicate the bilayers are highly uniform with sharp interfaces.⁸ The shorter oscillation period is inversely proportional to the total nanolaminate thickness.⁸ These shorter oscillations are also in good agreement with the simulations, giving further evidence of layer thickness uniformity.

The period of the superlattice maxima becomes gradually longer as the bilayer thickness decreases. It is seen in Fig. 2(f) that the measurement of the 1 nm bilayer reaches the noise floor but the maximum corresponding to a repetition of a ≈0.5 nm layer is nevertheless visible at ≈4.6.⁶ This suggests that the deposited Al₂O₃ and TiO₂ layers retain a discrete layer structure even at such a small individual layer thickness.

Additional samples with bilayer thicknesses close to 1 nm were also studied to confirm the existence of individual 0.5 nm layers and to determine the point where the layers collapse into a single thick Ti₅₅Al₄₅Oₓ layer. XRR measurements and simulations of samples with intended bilayer thicknesses 1.2, 0.8, and 0.5 nm are presented in Fig. 3. It can clearly be observed that the 1.2 nm [Fig. 3(a)] structure demonstrates a superlattice maximum. The corresponding maximum of the 0.8 nm bilayer [Fig. 3(b)] is barely distinguishable as seen from the enlargement in the inset. The XRR data of the intended 0.5 nm thick bilayer structure [Fig. 3(c)] lacks the superlattice maximum and only displays the small period oscillation related to total thickness. The measurement curves of samples with even smaller intended thicknesses were similar to Fig. 3(c) and are not shown here.
XRR measurements therefore indicate the studied Al2O3/TiO2 nanolaminates maintain a layered structure down to ≈0.4 nm individual layer thickness. These results are in good agreement with a similar study on ZnO/Al2O3 nanolaminates, where the observed minimum bilayer thickness was 1.6 nm.9 In the case of ZnO/Al2O3, no layering was observed for bilayer thickness 0.8 nm, but the multilayer signal could have been obscured by interfacial roughness or thickness variations.

The growth cycle numbers and results based on simulations of XRR measurements are summarized in Table I, where tBL denotes bilayer thickness, ρ mass density, and σ interface roughness. The TiO2 content has been calculated as the thickness weighted average of the TiO2 density. The simulated thicknesses are in good agreement with target thicknesses, although the simulated values are systematically ≈3% smaller than the target values. This is a rather small discrepancy and is a consequence of linearly scaling cycle numbers from values used for thicker films with uncertainty in the thickness value. The accuracy of thin film thickness is generally not limited by the instrument resolution but the accuracy of simulation.10 The accuracy is therefore case dependent and reported values for a single or bilayer are in the range of ±0.2 to 0.5 nm (Refs. 11 and 12) and ±0.1 for a multilayer.10 However, due to repetition of the bilayer the position of a superlattice maximum is extremely sensitive to
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**Fig. 3.** (Color online) XRR measurement and simulation curves of samples with target bilayer thicknesses ranging from 1.2 to 0.5 nm. Simulation curves are vertically offset for better clarity. The positions of the maxima are related to bilayer thickness and sharpness of the maxima to layer thickness uniformity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target tBL (nm)</th>
<th>Cycles/layer</th>
<th>Al2O3 TiO2</th>
<th>Cycle ratio TiO2/Al2O3</th>
<th>tBL (nm)</th>
<th>Al2O3 TiO2</th>
<th>Al2O3 TiO2</th>
<th>Al2O3 TiO2</th>
<th>TiO2 content (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Single layer</td>
<td>138.5</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Single layer</td>
<td>94.0</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Single layer</td>
<td>110.5</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>3.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>3.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>9.70</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>19.40</td>
<td>9.50</td>
<td>9.90</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>48.20</td>
<td>23.70</td>
<td>24.50</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Table 1.** ALD cycle numbers for individual layers and a summary of the XRR results for samples with intended bilayer thickness ranging from 0.1 to 50 nm. The TiO2 content has been calculated as the thickness weighted average of the TiO2 density.

---

**JVST A - Vacuum, Surfaces, and Films**
the bilayer thickness and a change of 0.1 nm in a simulation is clearly observed. While the position of the superlattice maximum corresponds to the bilayer thickness, individual layer thicknesses are determined with fair precision by fitting the relative intensities of the superlattice maxima. As an example, in Fig. 2(c), the even number maxima have lower intensities, and this data may be used to fit individual thicknesses, as predicted by Parratt. Samples for which only one superlattice maximum could be recorded, i.e., bilayer thicknesses ≤ 2 nm, thus have greater uncertainty in the simulated individual thicknesses. These simulations were carried out assuming equal or close to equal layer thicknesses.

Interestingly, the smallest observed bilayer thickness before layer disintegration was 0.76 nm, simulated with equal 0.38 nm layer thicknesses. This is probably close to the achievable minimum thickness, since one estimate for Al2O3 monolayer thickness with density 3.05 g/cm3 is 0.38 nm. Using the same method of calculation as in Refs. 2 and 14, the estimated TiO2 monolayer thickness is 0.33 nm, assuming a TiO2 density of 3.75 g/cm3.

The practically constant roughness values presented in Table I support the conclusion that interfaces are on average very sharp. The small roughness values also indicate that the bilayer thicknesses as predicted by Parratt. Samples for which only one superlattice maximum could be recorded, i.e., bilayer thicknesses ≤ 2 nm, thus have greater uncertainty in the simulated individual thicknesses. These simulations were carried out assuming equal or close to equal layer thicknesses.

Table I shows that the densities and film thicknesses vary greatly in the samples with decomposed TiAlOx layers. The density values are a result of the change in TiO2/Al2O3 cycle ratios due to small cycle numbers. The thickness is in good agreement with the total number of cycles, not displayed in Table I.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

Al2O3/TiO2 nanolaminates with varied bilayer thicknesses were studied by x-ray reflectivity. Film thickness, density, and roughness values were determined by simulating XRR curves of nanolaminate structures with target bilayer thicknesses ranging from 0.1 to 50 nm. The nanolaminates were found to preserve an alternating layer structure down to individual layer thickness of 0.38 nm after which the nanolaminates decompose into single TiAlOx layers. XRR measurements show that the layers are uniform with sharp interfaces. It was shown that XRR is a viable technique for structural characterization of nanolaminates with ultrathin layers.
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