An Empirical HBT Large-Signal Model for CAD

I. Angelov,1 K. Choumei,2 A. Inoue2

1 Microwave Electronics Laboratory, Chalmers University of Technology, S-41296 Göteborg, Sweden
2 Mitsubishi Electric Corporation, 4-1 Mizuhara Itami Hyogo, Japan

Received 10 October 2002; accepted 19 June 2003

ABSTRACT: A new, simple heterojunction bipolar transistor (HBT) large-signal model for use in CAD is proposed and experimentally evaluated. The important development in this model is that the main model parameters are derived directly from the measurements taken during typical operating conditions. The model was evaluated with extensive measurements at different temperatures by DC, S, and power-spectrum measurements. Good correspondence was obtained between the measurement and experimental results. © 2003 Wiley Periodicals, Inc.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Heterojunction bipolar transistors (HBTs) have become very promising devices for different applications at microwave and millimeter-wave frequencies. An important condition for any successful design is the availability of an accurate large-signal model (LSM). In recent years, more than 100 papers in the literature have been devoted on the creation of a compact model for use in CAD tools and procedures for extraction of parameters for these models [1–29]. Despite the tremendous work already done on the subject, we still do not have unified, accurate model standards in the industry, together with an automatic extraction procedure. The reason for this is that the physics of the device is very complicated, the range of currents is broad, and the power density at which the device operates is very high. All this, together with poor thermal conductivity of the III-V materials, makes the problem of creating universal LSM for HBTs difficult. Many of the existing HBT models are based on solid physical background, but again, because of the difficulties of the problem, they end up with many empirical coefficients that are difficult to extract.

In some cases, the HBT models can be excessively accurate and include effects that may not be particularly important; model simplification is appropriate in such cases. When the model is complicated, an additional difficulty is added to the extraction problems — such a model may exhibit problems with convergence.

II. DEVICE MODELING

The HBTs used in this study are mainly AlGaAs/GaAs HBTs with a 4 × 20 μm² emitter [30]. Systematic DC and multi-bias S-parameter measurements were performed at different temperatures (−25–+125°C) in order to obtain a general picture of the device’s behavior. ICCAP software (Agilent) was used in the measurement and extraction of basic parasitic parameters such as parasitic resistances, parasitic capacitances, and bias dependencies of $C_{be}$ and $C_{bc}$.

The frequency range of the S-parameter measurements were determined by the frequency range in which the devices should operate and the available measurement setup.
Figures 1–3 show some results for the forward Gummel (FG) $I_{be}$, $I_{ce}$, and $\beta$ obtained from these devices that are typical of many HBTs. As can be seen in Figure 4, when keeping the $I_{be}$ (or $I_{ce}$) constant, the voltage shift of the BE junction is almost linear and can be used to monitor the device’s temperature. Increasing the temperature will decrease the base voltage required to sustain the same current and the temperature coefficient is rather small, with $T C_{Vjbe} \approx -0.002$. A problem with this type of transistors is that $\beta$ cannot be considered constant (see Fig. 3). The models that consider $\beta$ constant, such as the Gummel–Poon model, produce significant error, and separate equations for $I_{be}$ and $I_{ce}$ should be used in this model. In addition, it should be considered that there is a bias dependence of the voltage $V_{be} = f(V_{ce})$ at which we have maximum of $\beta$. At the change of the $V_{be}$, we have maximum $\beta$ and this needs to be considered in the LSM. The logogriphic plots in Figures 1 and 2 are close to a straight line (as should be the case based on the device physics), but deviate at small currents. This means that the main function describing the device current should be exponential with a proper correction.

The transistor can be described with a conventional equivalent circuit shown in Figure 6. Current source $I_{ce}$ with transconductance $g_m$ is nonlinear, and also nonlinear can be considered capacitances $C_{be}$ and $C_{bc}$. The remaining elements can be considered linear and there is a significant amount of papers that describing extraction of the small-signal equivalent circuit [14–28]. For devices exhibiting substrate effects, an extra port should be added.

**Base Current**

We can significantly simply the self-heating modeling if we use the fact that, when keeping the diode current...
constant, the junction voltages vary linearly with the temperature; however, this requires modification of the diode-current definition. It is a common practice to describe the complicated $I_{be}$ dependence by several diodes (respective exponential functions) in order to improve the accuracy and describe the different physical phenomena occurring in the device [1–12]. According to the device physics, we use an exponential function to describe the semiconductor junction, but change the reference points of the currents and respective voltages at which we normally operate the device to be closer to the currents (voltages) at which $\beta$ is maximum (see Fig. 3). In addition to this change of reference points, the argument of the equation for the junction current is described as a power series.

![Figure 5. $I_{be}$ vs. $V_{be}$.](image1)

This gives us the possibility to fit a variety of doping profiles; many factors and effects will influence the currents:

$$I_b = I_{be} + I_{bc}$$

$$I_{be} = I_{be0} \exp(P_{be0}) - \exp(P_{be0}), \quad (1)$$

$$I_{bc} = I_{bc0} \exp(P_{bc0}), \quad (2)$$

$$P_{be} = P_{be1} (V_{be} - V_{je}) + P_{be2} (V_{be} - V_{je})^2 \ldots, \quad (3)$$

$$P_{bc} = P_{bc1} (V_{bc} - V_{jc}) + P_{bc2} (V_{bc} - V_{jc})^2 \ldots$$

$$P_{be0} = -P_{be1} \cdot V_{je} - P_{be2} \cdot V_{je}^2 \ldots$$

$$P_{bc0} = P_{bc1} \cdot (-V_{jc}) + P_{bc2} \cdot (-V_{jc})^2 \ldots, \quad (4)$$

$$P_{be1} = q/e K_b \cdot T_{amb} \cdot N_{b1} = 1/V_t \cdot N_{c1} \equiv 38.695/N_{b1}, \quad (4a)$$

where $q$ is the electron charge, $K_b$ is the Boltzmann constant, and $N_{b1}$ is the ideality factor. The coefficient $38.695 \equiv 1/V_t$ at room temperature.

This definition is equivalent to a conventional diode equation, but the extraction point is changed. In a textbook definition of the diode current, the extraction point in fact is at $V_{be} = -\infty$. At small currents, the measurement data are quite often noisy and, what is most important, we usually do not operate the device at such small currents. With the reference and extraction points selected in the operating region of voltages and currents, we will describes the currents with highest accuracy in the useful operating range.

![Figure 6. Transistor equivalent circuit.](image2)
When $V_{be} = V_{je}$, the base current $I_{be}$ is equal to $I_{jbe}$ and when $V_{be} = 0$, $I_{be} = 0$. The terms $P_{be0}$ and $P_{bc0}$ are important to define the current to be zero when the voltage at the junction is zero. The correction is small, but critical so that the HB will converge properly. The equations for $P_{be0}$ and $P_{bc0}$ are obtained by substituting in equations for $P_{be}$, $P_{bc} = 0$, and $V_{be} = 0$, respectively. Usually, one term in the power series is enough to provide accuracy of better then 5% in five-to-six decades of the diode current. If higher accuracy is required, or for some reason is important to keep this accuracy in a range of currents more then six decades, then more terms can be used. Typically, three terms of the power series are enough to obtain 2% global accuracy.

The approach of using power series in the argument is equivalent to fitting the specific doping profile of the device which will determine currents $I_{be}$ and $I_{ce}$. Using this approach, we can reduce the number of the diodes (exponents) and obtain very high accuracy. The reduction of the number of exponents in turn will improve the convergence of the LSM.

The temperature dependence of $I_{be}$, $I_{ce}$, $\beta$ versus $V_{be}$ is one of the main factors responsible for the high temperature sensitivity of these devices. Figure 4 and Table I show extracted parameters of the base part of the model, using one term in the power series of eqs. (1–3) at different temperatures. The changes of the parameters are almost linear with respect the temperature and this can be used to model self-heating in a simple way by using linear dependencies. In fact, the current of the bipolar devices is controlled by the intrinsic diode voltage, but when the device is biased with a constant DC voltage source at the base, this can produce a thermal runaway; the model should describe this phenomenon.

### Collector Current

In a method similar to that used with the base current, we can keep the basic form of the Gummel–Poon model [10], but shift the reference point at $V_{bep}$ and define the collector current source argument as a power series:

$$I_c = I_{pkc}(\exp(P_{cf}) - \exp(P_{cf0})) \left(1 - \frac{V_{be}}{V_{af}}\right), \quad (5)$$

where $P_{cf}$ is a power series centered at $V_{pcs}$ and with a variable $V_{be}$, given by

$$P_{cf} = P_{cf1}(V_{be} - V_{bemp}) + P_{cf2}(V_{be} - V_{bemp})^2 \ldots$$

$$P_{cf0} = P_{cf1}(-V_{bemp}) + P_{cf2}(-V_{bemp})^2 \ldots$$

$$P_{cf} = P_{cf1}(V_{be} - V_{bemp}) + P_{cf2}(V_{be} - V_{bemp})^2 \ldots$$

$$P_{cf0} = P_{cf1}(-V_{bemp}) + P_{cf2}(-V_{bemp})^2 \ldots$$

$$= \frac{q}{\eta K T} I_{cf}. \quad (6)$$

When $V_{be} = V_{bep}$, the collector current is equal to $I_{pkc}$, the transconductance is equal to $g_m = I_{pkc} \cdot P_{cf1}$.

The $V_{bep}$ and $I_{pkc}$ are taken directly from the measurements and there is some freedom for their selection. Probably, the best choice is to select $V_{bep}$ equal to the voltage at which $\beta$ is maximum, but usually even a simple fitting program will converge and find the optimum values, because of the presence of an

### Table I.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current parameters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$I_{pkc}$ (mA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Parasitics         | $R_v$    | $R_c$    | $R_{bmin}$ | $R_{max}$ | $R_{bex}$ | $R_{bc1}$ | $n$ | $m$ | $V_{Cmin}$ |
|--------------------|
| $I_{jbe}$ (mA)     | $N_{he1}$ | $N_{he2}$ | $V_{jbe}$ | $D_{vph}$ | —         | —        | — | — | — |
| 0.24              | 1.2       | 0         | 1.39       | 0.01      | —         | —        | — | — | — |

| Temperature coefficients | $T_c I_{pkc}$ | $T_c V_j$ | $T_c \beta$ | $T_c C_{be0}$ | $T_c C_{bc0}$ |
|---------------------------|
| 0.002                     | $-0.0018$  | $-0.008$  | $+0.001$    | 0.001      | —           |
infection point. Typical parameters are $I_{be} = 0.2–2$ mA and $I_{pkc} \approx I_{ce}$ (at $\beta_{max}$) with corresponding $V_{bep}$.

Usually, the device is biased at positive $V_{ce}$, the forward and reverse part can be considered equal, and these will simply further the equations. The collector current $I_{ce}$ can be expressed in compact form:

$$I_{ce} = I_{cf} \cdot \tanh(\alpha \cdot V_{ce})(1 + \lambda \cdot V_{cb})$$

$$I_{cf} = I_{pkc} \cdot (\exp(P_{cf0}) - \exp(P_{cf0})/\cosh(B_{be}(V_{be} - V_{bep}))$$  \hspace{1cm} (7a)

In the case of one term in the power series the arguments $P_{cf0}, P_{cf1}$ are transformed to:

$$P_{cf0} = P_{cf1}(V_{be} - V_{bep}); \quad P_{cf1} = P_{cf1}(-V_{bepm})$$

Some of the parameters like $\alpha$ and $V_{bep}$ are bias dependent due to the Kirk effect, and this should be accounted for as follows:

$$\alpha = \alpha_r + \alpha_s \left( \exp\left(\frac{38.695}{N_{c1}} \cdot V_{ce}\right) - 1 \right); \quad (7b)$$

$$V_{bepm} = V_{bep} + \Delta V_{pk} * (1 + \tanh(P_{cf1} * V_{ce}))$$

$$- \Delta V_{s2} * (V_{cb} - V_{b})^2; \quad (7c)$$

The parameters $\alpha_r, \alpha_s$ reflect the dependence of the collector current versus $V_{be}$ at small collector voltages, as Figure 7 and parameter $B_{be}$ in the term $1/\cosh(B_{be}(V_{ce} - V_{bep}))$ will define the bell shape of $\beta$ dependence versus $V_{be}$. Parameters $\alpha_r$ and $\alpha_s$ adjust precisely the slope at small collector voltages due to the Kirk effect and $\lambda$, the output conductance dependence at high $V_{ce}$ due to the Early effect. Parameter $\Delta V_{s2}$ is used in the breakdown modeling.

The definition of $I_{ce}$ behaves well with eq. (7) from a numerical point of view; it converges better than eq. (5), because $\tanh$ is a limited function, with the strictly defined solution $I_{ce} = 0$ when $V_{ce} = 0$. In addition, the result will not depend on the correct choice of the forward and reverse parameters of the Gummel-type model.

Figure 8 shows a comparison between the calculated results for the collector current using eqs. (5) and (7). In this figure, for the sake of simplification, one term in the power series was used. As can be seen, the results are almost identical. The model, given by eq. (7), is simpler, with only eight parameters taken directly from measurements. Thus, we can describe the collector current with a good accuracy.

Bounded Current Models for $I_{be}$ and $I_{ce}$

It is a common practice to limit the exponential growth of the current using a modified exponent (soft exponent). Above some certain value of the exponent, the exponential dependence is switched to a linear dependence and numerical overflow is avoided. But this does not completely solve the problem, because at the connecting point the derivatives will be different and this discontinuity will increase the simulation time.

Taking the approach of using a power series in the argument, we are no longer required to use the soft exponent, because we can limit the exponential growth of the current by selecting the coefficients of the arguments of eq. (3) in a proper way. The derivatives of $I_{be}$ and $I_{ce}$ will not be influenced, because we retain the exponential envelope.

When using a power series in eqs. (1) and (7), the argument function shown in Figure 9 can be adjusted to track the individual properties of the device and behave monotonically from $-\infty$ to $+\infty$, but we can limit the argument to a useful range.

We can tailor the argument by properly selecting the coefficients to be fitted. For example, when the
second term $P_{bc2}$ is used, we should always add a positive 3rd term, $P_{bc3}$, in order to provide stable solution from $-\infty$ to $+\infty$. Fitting of the extracted argument is rather easy, because a polynomial function is used for this purpose.

As shown in Figure 9, the magnitude of the extracted argument is determined by the leakage and the maximum current which the devices can handle (usually not higher then 100 Å). This means that it is possible to use a bounded function to limit the argument, which is important when working with exponential functions as in the case of BT. Simultaneously, it is important to keep a correct value of $P_{bc1}$ because this will determine the derivative (transconductance).

We can use tanh as a limiting function and split the $P_{bc1}$ into two parts, $P_{bc1e}$ and $P_{bc1l}$ [see eq. (3a)]. For large deviation from the $V_j \tanh = 1$, $P_{bc1e}$ will determine the maximum of the argument, respective leakage, and the maximum current.

The derivatives will be correct if $P_{bc11}$ is calculated from:

$$P_{bc1} = P_{bc1e} \tanh(P_{bc11}).$$

The external parameter $P_{bc1e}$ can be calculated as:

$$P_{bc1e} = \ln(I_{bc1}/I_{js})$$

$$P_{bc} = P_{bc1e} \cdot \tanh(P_{bc1} * (V_{bc} - V_j)) + P_{bc2}(V_{bc} - V_j)^2 \ldots, $$

$$P_{bc0} = P_{bc1} \cdot \tanh(P_{bc1} * (-V_j)) + P_{bc2}(-V_{je})^2 \ldots, $$

$$P_{bc} = P_{bc1} \cdot \tanh(P_{bc1} * (V_{bc} - V_j)) + P_{bc2}(V_{bc} - V_j)^2 \ldots, $$

$$P_{bc0} = P_{bc1} \cdot \tanh(P_{bc1} * (-V_j)) + P_{bc2}(-V_j)^2 \ldots, $$

(3a)

The leakage typically is in the order of $I = 10^{-9}$, but usually we do not operate the device at such a small currents. If we fix the magnitude of the exponent, as for example in eq. (3a), to $P_{bc} = 1/2V_j \cdot N_{bc1} = 19.347/N_{bc1}$, this will bound the maximum possible current to $I_{bc1} \approx 126260 \, \text{Å}$ and the minimum current to $I_{bc1} \approx 10^{-13}$, which are adequate for most practical cases. If required, the bounding level can be changed. Rewriting the current equations using the ideality factors $N_j$ and $N_b$, leads to the following equations for the base and collector currents.

Base current:

$$I_{bc} = I_{bc1}(\exp(P_{bc}) - \exp(P_{bc0})), I_{bc2} = I_{bc2}/B_{max}$$

$$P_{bc} = (19.347/N_{bc1}) \cdot \tanh(2 * [(V_{bc} - V_j) + N_{b2}(V_{bc} - V_{bc})^2 + N_{b3}(V_{bc} - V_{bc})^3 \ldots])$$

$$P_{bc0} = (19.347/N_{bc1}) \cdot \tanh(2 * [-V_{bc} + N_{b2}(-V_j)^2 + N_{b3}(-V_j)^3 \ldots])$$

(8)

Collector current:

$$I_c = I_{cf} \cdot \tanh(\alpha \cdot V_{ce})(1 + \lambda \cdot V_{eb})(5a);$$

$$I_{cf} = I_{cf0}(\exp(P_{cf}) - \exp(P_{cf0}))/\cosh(B_{bc}(V_{bc} - V_{bepm}))$$

$$P_{cf} = (19.347/N_{cf1}) \cdot \tanh(2 * [(V_{bc} - V_{bep}) + N_{c2}(V_{bc} - V_{bep})^2 + N_{c3}(V_{bc} - V_{bep})^3 \ldots])$$

$$P_{cf0} = (19.347/N_{cf1}) \cdot \tanh(2 * [-V_{bep} + N_{c2}(-V_{bep})^2 + N_{c3}(-V_{bep})^3 \ldots])$$

$$\alpha = \alpha_s + \alpha_i(\exp(38.695 \cdot N_{c1} \cdot V_{ce}) - 1).$$

$$V_{bepm} = V_{bep} + \Delta V_{bep} \cdot (1 + \tanh(P_{cf1} * V_{ce}) - V_{bep}^2(V_{cb} - V_{bc})^2);$$

(9)
With three terms in the power series model, there are 15 parameters and in single term case we need a total of 11 parameters for the collector and base current:

\[ I_{pkc}, V_{bep}, \beta_{max}, B_{he}, N_{e1}, \alpha, \alpha_2, \lambda, N_{h1}, V_{je} = V_{bep}, \Delta V_{pkc}, I_{beh} = I_{pkc}/\beta_{max} \]

The base junction current \( I_{beh} \) is calculated from the slope of the logarithmic plot. When we define the parameters by using eqs. (8) and (9) we will have correct derivatives, and bounded minimum and maximum currents. This in turn will improve the convergence. This is valid, because the first derivative of tanh is in fact \( P_1 \cdot z \), but it is limited at large deviations as follows:

\[
\tanh(P_1 \cdot z) = P_1 \cdot z - (P_1^2 z^3)/3 + (2P_1^3 z^5)/15 \ldots \] (9b)

Figure 10 shows some measured and simulated results for \( I_{beh} \), when the argument is limited by using eq. (8).

With one term in the power series, eq. (8) will provide a good fit in many decades.

When using eq. (9), the collector current will be limited from the tanh(\( \alpha \cdot V_{ce} \)) for the collector voltage and from the argument for \( I_{he} = I_{beh} \cdot \exp(19.347 \cdot \tanh(2(V_{he} - V_{je})) \) in the exponential part of \( I_{he} \) and \( I_{ce} \) versus \( V_{he,e} \). This leads to a compact, bounded model with correct derivatives without discontinuities.

### III. HBT CAPACITANCES

Devices can operate at high currents and voltages and their nonlinear capacitances need to include both depletion and diffusion parts. The total \( C_{bc} \) capacitance shows rapid increase and then decrease at high bias. This is also the case for homojunction transistors \([7, 14]\), but for HBTs this increase will be larger than the increase we observe in homojunction transistors. It is a matter of tradition to treat the device capacitance as consisting of two parts — depletion and diffusion — that are connected in parallel.

Diffusion capacitances are described as \([1]\):

\[
\begin{align*}
C_{bedf} &= C_{bep} + C_{bhe} \cdot (1 + \tanh(C_{bhe10} + C_{bhe11} \cdot V_{be})) \\
C_{hedf} &= C_{hpe} + C_{he0} \cdot (1 + \tanh(C_{he02} + C_{he11} \cdot V_{be}))
\end{align*}
\] (10)

Integrating with the terminal voltages we can obtain the \( Q_{bc} \) and \( Q_{he} \) when using the following charge definition:

\[
\begin{align*}
Q_{bedf} &= C_{bhe0} \frac{\log[cosh(C_{bhe10} + C_{bhe11} \cdot V_{be})]}{C_{bhe11}} + (C_{bhe} + C_{bhe0})V_{be} \\
Q_{hedf} &= C_{he0} \frac{\log[cosh(C_{he10} + C_{he11} \cdot V_{be})]}{C_{he11}} + (C_{hpe} + C_{he0})V_{be}
\end{align*}
\] (11)

The ordinary equation for the depletion part \( C_{dep} = C_{dep0}/(1 - V_{bc}/V_{bci})^n \) can create convergence problems when \( V_{bc} \approx V_{bci} \). The accepted approach is to define the capacitance with two definitions — below and above \( V_{bci} \). At the connection point, it is important to keep the function and the derivatives equal; otherwise, the HB simulator will not converge. This problem is not easy to solve and can increase the simulation time. For the simulators using charge definitions, some stable solutions, suitable for the capacitance modelling, can be integrated in hypergeometrical functions that are not available in circuit simulators. In addition, the use of such functions will make the extraction difficult. To avoid these problems, the equation for the depletion capacitance equation is modified as follows:

\[
C_{dep} = C_{depp} + C_{depp} \left( x^2 + m \right)^{-n/2} \left( m - (2n - 1) x^2 \right),
\] (12)

where \( x = V_{bc}/V_{bci}, n \) is the grading coefficient, and the \( m \) parameter determines the maximum/minimum capacitance ratio where \( y = V_{bc}/V_{bci} \).

Figure 11 shows comparison between the measurements of the standard depletion capacitance model and the new eq. (12). The model for capacitance \( C_{bc} \) can be further extended in \( (0 < m < 0.5) \). \( C_{depp} \) can
be associated with the parasitic elements. As is expected, the standard depletion capacitance model has a singularity at $V_{bc}$, Eq. (12) gives results identical to the textbooks’ depletion capacitance definition, but it is well defined at $V_{bc}$ — the function is positive and without poles in the interval $-\infty < V_{bc} < \infty$. The derivatives of the capacitance are also well defined, [see Fig. 11(b)]. In addition, this equation models the decrease of the capacitance as it is in [7, 14] at voltages larger then $V_{bc}$. This equation can be modified to be completely equivalent to the standard depletion capacitances and used as a direct replacement in the Spice circuit simulators (if required). For the simulators using a charge definition, a simple, closed form of the charge can be derived and combined with the diffusion part [see eq. (11)]:

$$Q_{bcdep} = C_{bcdep} (m + x) - n x,$$

$$Q_{bedep} = C_{bedep} (m + y) - n y,$$  \(13\)

where $y = V_{bc}/V_{bei}$. The model for capacitance $C_{bc}$ can be further extended in order to consider the dynamic dependence of $C_{bc}$ upon the collector current and an approach similar to that in [5] can be used:

$$C_{bc} \approx C_{dep} \left( 1 - I_c/I_{cr} \right)^{p}.$$  \(14\)

The $C_{bc}$ dependence on the collector current can be transferred directly to the intrinsic voltages by using

$$C_{bc} \approx C_{dep} \left( 1 + \frac{1}{\exp(V_{bc} - V_{min})} \right) + C_{dbei} \left( \exp\left( \frac{38.695}{N_c} \tanh(V_{bc} - V_{min}) \right) \right),$$  \(15\)

where $V_{min}$ is the voltage (with respective current) at which the capacitance is minimum and $C_{dbei}$ will determine the slope of the $C_{bc}$ increase at voltages $V_{bc} > V_{min}$. This approach corresponds to the device physics and is stable in the extraction, because a limited function, which provides a good fit to the measured $C_{bc}$ [see Fig. 11(c)], is used.

IV. SELF-HEATING MODELING

Figures 12–14 show extracted basic parameters $V_{jbe}$, $P_{jbe}$, and $I_{jbe}$ at different temperatures. Since the temperature coefficients of different model parameters are small (on the order of $10^{-3}$) [8], the changes of the model parameters versus temperature can be considered linear in a limited temperature range [see eq. (16)]. If required, when the temperature range of operation is extended, more terms can be added. The values of $I_{ce}$ and $V_{ce}$ are available from the harmonic balance simulator and are used to calculate both the dissipated power $P_{tot}$ and the junction temperature $T_j$ (calculated dynamically):
$P_{tot}$ is the dissipated power and $R_{th}$ is the thermal resistance. For higher accuracy, the thermal resistance $R_{th}$ can be made temperature dependent, that is, $R_{thT}$.

$$R_{thT} = R_{th}(1 + T_{ch}(T_j - T_r))$$ (17)

Thermal parameters are normalized to the reference temperature $T_{ref}$ at which we extract parameters.

V. BREAKDOWN MODELING

The breakdown is influenced by the effects existing on the base side (with the change of $V_{bcp}$) and on the collector side. The $I_{ce}$ breakdown can be modeled by using an idea similar to the breakdown model implementation in [33]:

$$I_{ce} = I_{p0} \cdot I_{ce}(1 + \lambda \cdot V_{ce} + L_{ab0} \cdot (V_{be} - V_{b0}))$$

$$V_{bep} = V_{bep} + \Delta V_{bep} * (1 + \tanh(P_{v1} * V_{ce})$$

$$+ KV_{bd2} * V_{be})$$ (18)

The value of $KV_{bd2}$ is taking into account the change of intrinsic base voltage $V_{bep}$, because as a result of this change, the collector current $I_{ce}$ will increase. The coefficient $L_{ab0}$ reflects the sharp increase of $I_{ce}$, which is influenced by the collector voltage at voltages larger than the threshold $V_{be}$, Figure 15.

The breakdown parameters are temperature dependent, and when this problem becomes important, thermal coefficients for the $V_{v1}$, $L_{ab0}$ and $KV_{bd2}$ parameters should be extracted.
VI. DELAY MODELING

The importance of the proper delay modeling has been very well described in classic papers [5, 13, 26–28]. Figure 16 shows a typical bias dependence of the delay. It increases with the collector current and eventually saturates and decreases, as the collector voltage increases. Usually in the simulators the bias eventually saturates and decreases, as the collector voltage increases. Usually in the simulators the bias saturates and decreases, as the collector voltage increases. Usually in the simulators the bias saturates and decreases, as the collector voltage increases. Usually in the simulators the bias saturates and decreases.

where \( T_f \) is the independent part of the forward delay, \( Xf \) is the bias-dependent part of the forward delay, and \( Vf \) is a fitting coefficient, as they are defined in

\[
T_f = T_f(1 + 0.5 \cdot Xf \cdot (1 + \tanh((38.76/Nc)(Vbe - Vf))) \cdot \exp(Vbe/(1.44 \cdot Vf)))
\]

(19)

The extraction of parameters starts with the extraction of the DC parameters. The basis of the proposed model is that the main parameters are taken directly from the measurements — not extracted. In the simple case of one term in the power series, which is accurate enough for most practical RF applications, the model equations are as follows.

Base current:

\[
I_{be} = I_{be}(\exp(P_{be}) - \exp(P_{be0})),
\]

\[
P_{be} = (19.347/Nc) \cdot \tanh(2 * [(Vbe - Vbep)]),
\]

\[
P_{be0} = (19.347/Nc) \cdot \tanh(2 * [-Vbe]).
\]

(8b)

Collector current:

\[
I_c = I_f \cdot \tanh(\alpha \cdot Vc)(1 + \lambda \cdot Vc),
\]

\[
I_{cf} = I_{pcf}(\exp(P_{cf}) - \exp(P_{cf0})/\cosh(B_{pc}(Vbe - Vbep)),
\]

\[
P_{cf} = (19.347/Nc) \cdot \tanh(2 * [(Vbe - Vbep)]),
\]

\[
P_{cf0} = (19.347/Nc)\tanh(2 * [-Vbep]).
\]

(5a)

The three base current parameters to be found are: \( I_{be} \), \( I_{cf} \), \( P_{be} \), \( P_{be0} \), \( P_{cf} \), \( P_{cf0} \), \( V_{bep} \), \( V_{bep}\), \( N_{c1} \), \( \alpha_r \), \( \alpha_s \), \( \lambda \), \( \Delta V_{pk} \).

\( I_{be} \), \( V_{bep} \), \( I_{pcf} \), \( V_{bep}\), \( \beta_{max} \), and \( \beta_{max} \) are taken directly from the measurements for currents at which we have maximum \( \beta \); typically, at \( V_b \sim 0.6–0.8 \) V. The ideality factors are calculated from the derivative of the \( I_{be} \), which is \( I_{be} \) at this point. The four remaining parameters, \( B_{be} \), \( \alpha_r \), \( \alpha_s \), and \( \lambda \), can be found with a simple

other software packages such as ADS and ICCAP. In ADS the bias-dependent delay can be implemented using the delay function \( H \) of SDD.

VII. EXTRACTION OF THE MODEL

The number of parameters to be extracted using this approach for the nonlinear part of the large signal model is significantly reduced in comparison to other models with comparable accuracy. Many of the model parameters are taken directly from simple measurements. Even when using one term in the power series, the model will be exact at the selected operating point and provide a good global accuracy in 5–6 decades of currents, as shown in Figure 16. When higher accuracy is required (that is, more terms) the remaining fitting parameters can be extracted with simple fitting programs. The reduced number of parameters and the use of bounded functions will result in improved convergence in CAD tools. This is also beneficial for the extraction procedure, because the same problems with convergence are valid for the extraction programs.

The extraction of parameters starts with the extraction of the DC parameters. The basis of the proposed model is that the main parameters are taken directly from the measurements — not extracted. In the simple case of one term in the power series, which is accurate enough for most practical RF applications, the model equations are as follows.
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\[
I_{be} = I_{be}(\exp(P_{be}) - \exp(P_{be0})),
\]

\[
P_{be} = (19.347/Nc) \cdot \tanh(2 * [(Vbe - Vbep)]),
\]

\[
P_{be0} = (19.347/Nc) \cdot \tanh(2 * [-Vbe]).
\]

(8b)

Collector current:

\[
I_c = I_f \cdot \tanh(\alpha \cdot Vc)(1 + \lambda \cdot Vc),
\]

\[
I_{cf} = I_{pcf}(\exp(P_{cf}) - \exp(P_{cf0})/\cosh(B_{pc}(Vbe - Vbep)),
\]

\[
P_{cf} = (19.347/Nc) \cdot \tanh(2 * [(Vbe - Vbep)]),
\]

\[
P_{cf0} = (19.347/Nc)\tanh(2 * [-Vbep]).
\]

(5a)

The three base current parameters to be found are: \( I_{be} \), \( I_{cf} \), \( P_{be} \), \( P_{be0} \), \( P_{cf} \), \( P_{cf0} \), \( V_{bep} \), \( V_{bep}\), \( N_{c1} \), \( \alpha_r \), \( \alpha_s \), \( \lambda \), \( \Delta V_{pk} \).

\( I_{be} \), \( V_{bep} \), \( I_{pcf} \), \( V_{bep}\), \( \beta_{max} \), and \( \beta_{max} \) are taken directly from the measurements for currents at which we have maximum \( \beta \); typically, at \( V_b \sim 0.6–0.8 \) V. The ideality factors are calculated from the derivative of the \( I_{be} \), which is \( I_{be} \) at this point. The four remaining parameters, \( B_{be} \), \( \alpha_r \), \( \alpha_s \), and \( \lambda \), can be found with a simple

other software packages such as ADS and ICCAP. In ADS the bias-dependent delay can be implemented using the delay function \( H \) of SDD.
fitting program. The parameter $B_{be}$ is found from the $\beta$ versus $V_{be}$ dependence, parameter $\alpha_e$ will influence $I_{ce}$ at small currents, and low $V_{ce} < V_f$ and $\alpha_e$ parameters will influence the shape of $I_{ce}$ at the knee $V_f$. The output conductance parameter $\lambda$ will fit the $I_{ce}$ at voltages above $V_f$ and this give the possibility to fit $\alpha_e$, $\alpha_e$, and $\lambda$ separately.

There are many fitting programs such as Mathematica, MathCAD, Kaleidagraph, XLfit3, and so forth that can be used to fit basic parameters of the model. Figure 17 shows some results from measured and modeled $I_{be}$, $I_{ce}$ (measured points and modeled lines) with one term in the equations using a simple fitting program (Kaleidagraph), and if more terms are used in the power series in the argument. In addition, we can use specialized extraction programs such as ICCAP.

The peak current $I_{emax} \approx I_{ce}$ is close to the currents for which we have maximum $\beta$ with corresponding $V_{ce}$. $P_{cf}$ can be extracted directly from the derivative of the argument (ideality factor) at the selected bias voltage $V_{be}$ (see Fig. 8), such that $P_{cf} = g_m I_{emax} = 38.695/N_{e1}$. A typical value for the extracted base current is $I_{ib} \approx 0.2–2$ mA with the corresponding $V_{be}$.

There is a large amount of papers on the extraction of parasitics in the small-signal equivalent circuit [8, 14–28] of HBTs. Some of the parasitics such as the resistances and capacitances used in this study are available directly from measured data. The $R_e$ extraction was compared using both the open-collector method and the high-frequency extraction method proposed by S. Maas [18]. The rest of the parasitics are found from optimization by using the CAD tool set for multiple-bias $S$-parameter optimizations.

Generally, the base resistance $R_b$ in these types of transistors is rather low (this is one of their benefits) and, in order to simplify the model extraction, the base and collector resistances in this case were considered constant. The base resistance consists of three parts as follows: $R_b = r_b + r_{bs} + r_{bo}$, where $r_b$ is active, $r_{bs}$ is spreading resistance, and $r_{bo}$ is ohmic metal contact resistance. The series-access components are bias independent and when the injection level...
is high, the changes of $R_b$ are very small and can be neglected. If required, the bias dependence of $R_b$ can be modeled using approach similar to that in [6, 34]:

$$R_b = \frac{R_{b\text{ max}}}{1 + (I/\text{I}_{50})^{\alpha}}$$

(20)

VIII. EVALUATION OF THE MODEL

The model was implemented as an SDD in MDS and ADS (Agilent) with self-heating and delay, and was experimentally evaluated using DC, $S$-parameter and power-spectrum measurements.

Figure 20. Measured and modeled magnitude and phase $S_{11}$, $S_{21}$, $S_{12}$, $S_{22}$, $V_{ce} = 3$ V; $V_{be} = 1.32$, 1.34, and 1.36 V.
Figures 18 and 19 show measured and modeled $I_{ce}$. In the example shown in Figure 18, the base current $I_{be}$ is a parameter and in Figure 19, $V_{be}$ is a parameter. The fit is good, even with such a simple definition of the model and using two terms in the power series for $I_{ce}$. Despite this simplicity, the model is able to describe the thermal runaway of Figure 19, with an accuracy similar to more complicated models in the practical range of currents and voltages with a significantly reduced number of parameters.

Figure 20 shows some results of S-parameter measurements and simulations. The model accurately describes the small-signal behavior. The large-signal properties of the model were evaluated using a PS method [31]. Figures 21 and 22 show some results of the measurements and simulations, and the fit is good. The models for currents and capacitances facilitate the convergence in large-signal applications, due to the use of well-defined functions and symmetry.

The model definitions are quite general and can be applied to other types of HBT, as well as ordinary Si bipolar transistors. Figure 23 shows the results of the measured and simulated $I_{ce}$ for InGaP HBT.

Figures 24 and 25 show measured and modeled $I_{be}$ and $I_{ce}$ for a commercial Si microwave transistor AT 42070 (Agilent). With one term in the power series, the fit is very good for the practical range of currents.

This approach can be extended with more features, which we will eventually need in order to model more complicated effects in HBTs and BJTs. For example, the bias dependence of the output conductance in certain HBTs and high-power Si BJTs can be strongly bias dependent and, in order to track this, the output conductance parameter $\lambda$ can be made bias dependent:

$$I_{ce} = I_{cf} \cdot \tanh(\alpha \cdot V_{ce}) \left(1 + \lambda \cdot V_{cb} + \lambda_{max}\right)$$

(21)

$$\lambda_{max} = \lambda_2 \cdot V_{cb} \cdot \left(1 + \tanh \left(\frac{19,347}{N_{cf}} \cdot \left(2(V_{be} - V_{bep})\right)\right) + \lambda_3 \cdot (1 + V_{ce}^2)\right)$$

(22)

In this case, the additional term $\lambda_2$ provides dependence of the output conductance on the base voltage $V_{be}$ and $\lambda_3$ on collector voltage $V_{ce}$. The parameter $\lambda_2$ is effective at high $V_{ce}$ and $\lambda_3$ at low $V_{ce}$. Even in this case of complicated output conductance, the number of extracted parameters (11) is rather small, the model is stable in extraction & simulations, because functions used in the model are monotonic and limited.

Figure 26 shows some results modeling SiGe HBT and high-power Si BJT is shown in Figure 27. The correspondence between the measured parameters and model is good, even using one term in the power series. In these examples of a complex output-conductance dependence, the total number of $I_{ce}$ and $I_{be}$
current parameters is 11, with one term in the power series; however, this is sufficient to provide good accuracy in the practical working range of currents and voltages. If for some reason a higher global accuracy is required, then two more terms can be added to the power series in the argument.

IX. CONCLUSION

A simple bias-dependent HBT model applicable to CAD was proposed and implemented. The model was experimentally evaluated using DC, S-parameter, and power-spectrum measurements, and good correspondence was obtained between the measurements and the model. The model can be adopted for use as a simple BJT model.
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