Quantum electrodynamical formulation of photochemical acid generation and its implications on optical lithography
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Abstract

The photochemical acid generation is refined from the very first principles of elementary particle physics. We first briefly review the formulation of the quantum theory of light based on the quantum electrodynamics framework to establish the probability for acid generation at a given spacetime point. The quantum mechanical acid generation is then combined with the deprotection mechanism to obtain the probabilistic description of the deprotection density, directly related to the feature formation in a photoresist. A statistical analysis of the random deprotection density is presented to reveal the leading characteristics of stochastic feature formation.

1 Introduction

The physics of optical lithography has been steadily entering the quantum regime due to the constant demand for reducing the physical length scale of the patterning process. In particular, the classical-to-quantum transition has been accelerated by the introduction of extreme ultraviolet (EUV) exposure system with a typical wavelength of around $10^{-8}$m.

Among other things, the quantum effect in the EUV lithography has been most faithfully represented by shot noises arising from the quantum fluctuation on the intensity of incident light. Such quantum fluctuation has been statistically averaged out for an exposure system having a high photon density of states (i.e., dose per energy of each photon). However, in EUV exposure, no drastic increase in the exposure dose compared to the increment of the individual photon energy gives rise to the severe quantum fluctuation on the light intensity.

It has been widely accepted that the fluctuation can be depicted by the randomness in the number of photons following the Poisson distribution under a given dose [1]. Nevertheless, the fully quantum mechanical exposition of shot noises in the context of optical lithography has barely been studied.

In this paper, we provide a firm physical ground for quantum mechanical shot noises on optical lithography by employing the quantum electrodynamics (QED) [2]. More precisely, we reformulate the photochemical process for acid generation in the language of QED by identifying the photochemical process with the photoelectric detection of light.
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The QED formulation of acid generation merely shows the well-known proportionality between the classical light intensity and the photoelectric detection probability \[3\]. However, the exceptional merit of introducing the QED to optical lithography is its capability to integrate physical descriptions on the primary and secondary photochemical processes such as flares and secondary electrons into a single framework, although such secondary effects are not discussed in this work.

Having the probabilistic acid generation, we proceed to the stochastic deprotection mechanism of the photoresist by defining the deprotection density as a random variable on spacetime points of localized acid generation. The random deprotection density then allows us to compute the probability for a pixel formation at each spatial location in the resist, which leads to the probability of forming a feature in a given region.

The probabilistic feature formation in our work is somewhat closely related to former works in \[4, 5\]. However, our work elaborates discussions in those works with the detailed quantum mechanical acid generation and rather refined statistical analysis.

This paper is organized as follows. In the next section, we provide a QED formulation of the photochemical acid generation. It includes a brief review of the construction of the QED as well as the revision of the photoelectric detection of light. In Sec. 3, we provide statistical analysis on the randomness of the feature formation in a resist arising from the probabilistic nature of acid generation. Section 4 is devoted to the conclusion and outlook of the current work.

2 Quantum mechanical formulation of acid generation

In optical lithography, a feature on a photoresist is formed by developing deprotected polymers in a photoresist by using a resist developer. Deprotected polymers are generated through the deprotection mechanism carried out by the chemical reaction between protected polymers and acid in which the acid is produced by the photochemical process of photoacid generators (PAGs).

At the molecular level, the generation of acid occurs when confined electrons of PAGs are released through the interaction with exposure light. Accordingly, the rate of the acid generation can be identified with the rate of the photoelectric detection of light, which is a well-known application of the quantum theory of light. This section provides a quantum mechanical description of acid generation by reformulating the photoelectric detection of light in the QED.

2.1 The quantum theory of light: a brief review

The quantum theory of light and its interaction with charged particles have been most successfully formulated in the quantum field theory (QFT) framework, ensuring the manifest spacetime Lorentz symmetry and the unitarity of the quantum mechanics. In this subsection, we briefly review the formulation of the QFT of light and charged particles, called the quantum electrodynamics, by following the notations and conventions in \[6\].

In the QFT framework, the elementary quantum state relevant to light is an excited quantum state over the ground state \(|0\rangle\) called the photon. A photon can be created and annihilated by the set of creation and annihilation operators \(\{a(p, \sigma), a^\dagger(p, \sigma)\}\) where \(p = (p^0, p^1, p^2, p^3)\) and \(\sigma = \pm 1\) denote the four-vector momentum and intrinsic spin of the photon respectively.

\[\text{In particular, the Planck's constant } \hbar\text{ and the speed of light } c \text{ are taken to be unity. We also use the Einstein summation convention for repeated indices.}\]
The four-vector momentum $p$ satisfies the massless condition
\[ 0 = (p^1)^2 + (p^2)^2 + (p^3)^2 - (p^0)^2, \quad p^0 \geq 0 \] (2.1)
and $p^0$ can be identified with the energy of the photon. The creation-annihilation pair satisfies the following commutation relation:
\[ \left[ a(p, \sigma), a^\dagger(p', \sigma') \right] = \delta_{\sigma \sigma'} \delta(p - p'), \quad p = (p^1, p^2, p^3), \quad p' = (p'^1, p'^2, p'^3). \]

The creation-annihilation pair forms the quantum field $A^\mu(x)$ ($\mu = 0, 1, 2, 3$) as
\[ A^\mu(x) = (2\pi)^{-3/2} \sum_{\sigma = \pm 1} \int \frac{d^3p}{\sqrt{2p^0}} \left( e^\mu(p, \sigma)a(p, \sigma)e^{ipx} + e^{\mu^*}(p, \sigma)a^\dagger(p, \sigma)e^{-ipx} \right). \]
where $e^\mu$ is the polarization vector and $e^{\mu^*}$ is the complex conjugation of $e^\mu$. Often, it is convenient to decompose $A^\mu$ into $A^\mu(+)$ such that
\[ A^\mu(x) = A^\mu(+)(x) + A^\mu(-)(x) \]
where
\[ A^\mu(+)(x) = (2\pi)^{-3/2} \sum_{\sigma = \pm 1} \int \frac{d^3p}{\sqrt{2p^0}} e^\mu(p, \sigma)a(p, \sigma)e^{ipx} \]
\[ A^\mu(-)(x) = (2\pi)^{-3/2} \sum_{\sigma = \pm 1} \int \frac{d^3p}{\sqrt{2p^0}} e^{\mu^*}(p, \sigma)a^\dagger(p, \sigma)e^{-ipx}. \]

The massless condition in Eq. (2.1) is translated into the equations of motion of $A^\mu$ as
\[ \Box A^\mu = 0 \]
which is a homogeneous wave equation. Also, the Lorentz symmetry implies the dynamics of $A^\mu$ to be invariant under the gauge transformation given by
\[ A^\mu(x) \rightarrow A^\mu(x) + \partial^\mu \Omega(x), \quad \partial^\mu = \frac{\partial}{\partial x^\mu}. \] (2.2)

In order to construct the dynamics of $A^\mu$ consistent with the gauge symmetry we introduce the field strength
\[ F_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu A_\nu - \partial_\nu A_\mu \]
showing the linear relation between the field strength $F$ and $A^\mu$. Then the most general form of the action is given by
\[ S = \int d^4x \mathcal{L}, \quad \mathcal{L} = -\frac{1}{4}F_{\mu\nu}F^{\mu\nu} + J_\mu A^\mu + \mathcal{L}_{\text{matter}} \] (2.3)

\[ \text{The linearity between a given quantum field and its field strength reflects the abelian nature of the gauge transformation in Eq. (2.2). Also, the linearity ensures that there is no self-interaction between photons so that photons can only interact with each other through charged particles.} \]
where \( J_\mu = J_\mu(\psi) \) is a current written in some charged matter fields \( \psi \) and \( L_{\text{matter}} \) is the lagrangian for the charged particles represented by \( \psi \).

The dynamical system of \( A_\mu \) represented by Eq. (2.3) is a constrained system due to the existence of the gauge symmetry in Eq. (2.2). Consequently, only \( A_m (m = 1, 2, 3) \) are dynamical, and we have to choose an appropriate gauge to exhaust the gauge freedom. Here we choose the Coulomb gauge

\[
\partial_m A^m = 0, \quad m = 1, 2, 3.
\]

Altogether, we find the Hamiltonian of the system as

\[
H = \int d^3x \left( \frac{1}{2} E^m E_m + \frac{1}{2} B^m B_m + J^m A_m \right) + H_{\text{matter+Coul}} \tag{2.4}
\]

where

\[
F^0m = E^m, \quad F^{mn} = \epsilon^{mnp} B_p, \quad m, n, p = 1, 2, 3
\]

and

\[
H_{\text{matter+Coul}} = H_{\text{matter}} - \frac{1}{2} \int d^3x d^3y \frac{J^0(x)J^0(y)}{4\pi|x - y|}.
\]

Having the Hamiltonian \( H \) in Eq. (2.4) for light and charged matter, one can compute the evolution of a quantum state given at the initial time. The detailed discussion of the quantum evolution of a physical system can be found in the standard literature such as [7].

### 2.2 The photoelectric detection probability

As indicated at the beginning of this section, the acid generation can be identified with the photoelectric detection of light. In the photoelectric detection process, the exposure system can be represented by the Hilbert space \( \mathcal{H} \) which is a product space \( \mathcal{H}_\gamma \otimes \mathcal{H}_\psi \) of the space of photons \( \mathcal{H}_\gamma \) and charged particles \( \mathcal{H}_\psi \). At the initial time \( t_0 \) two systems are completely disentangled [8] so that the initial state \( |\Psi(t_0)\rangle \in \mathcal{H} \) is given by

\[
|\Psi(t_0)\rangle = |\chi\rangle \otimes |\psi\rangle, \quad |\chi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_\gamma \quad \text{and} \quad |\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_\psi.
\]

For the detection of light, we are merely interested in the occurrence of the interaction between light and charged matter at a given time \( t > t_0 \). Therefore, we do not have to specify states in \( \mathcal{H}_\psi \) at \( t_0 \) and \( t \) if they satisfy the condition

\[
|\psi\rangle \perp |\bar{\psi}\rangle \quad \iff \quad \langle \bar{\psi} | \psi \rangle = 0, \quad |\psi\rangle, |\bar{\psi}\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_\psi.
\]

where \( |\bar{\psi}\rangle \) denotes the state of the charged matter at time \( t \). Also, we trace \( \mathcal{H}_\gamma \) out at \( t \) since the final state of light is not our concern.

Altogether, we have the transition amplitude \( T(t, t_0) \) equivalent to the probability of the occurrence of a photochemical interaction as

\[
T(t, t_0) = \sum_{\psi, \bar{\psi} \in \mathcal{H}_\psi} \frac{1}{|\psi\rangle \perp |\bar{\psi}\rangle} \text{Tr} \left( |\bar{\psi}\rangle \langle \bar{\psi} | \rho_\psi(t) \right)
\]
where $\rho_\psi(t)$ denotes the density matrix obtained by tracing out $\mathcal{H}_\gamma$ as

$$\rho_\psi(t) = \text{Tr} \rho(t), \quad \rho(t) = |\Psi(t)\rangle \langle \Psi(t)|.$$  

In the perturbative expansion, the first non-vanishing contribution to $T(t,t_0)$ is given by

$$T(t,t_0) = \int_{t_0}^{t} dt_1 \int_{t_0}^{t_1} dt_2 \sum_{\psi,\bar{\psi} \in \mathcal{H}_\psi} \langle \bar{\psi} | J_m(x_1) | \psi \rangle \langle \psi | J_n(x_2) | \bar{\psi} \rangle \langle \chi | A^m(x_1) A^n(x_2) | \chi \rangle + c.c.$$  

(2.5)

where $c.c.$ denotes the complex conjugate of the previous term.

In order to simplify the transition amplitude in Eq. (2.5) we impose the following assumptions arising from the typical exposure process:

A.1 The wave vector $\mathbf{k}$ and the wave frequency $\omega$ of light are sharply peaked around $\mathbf{k}_0$ and $\omega_0$ (i.e., quasi-monochromatic) so that the investigated physical scale of the spacetime satisfies

$$|\Delta x| \ll \left| \frac{1}{\Delta k_0} \right|, \quad |\Delta t| \ll \left| \frac{1}{\Delta \omega_0} \right|$$  

(2.6)

where $\Delta \mathbf{k}_0 = \mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}_0$ and $\Delta \omega_0 = \omega - \omega_0$. The first condition in Eq. (2.6) reflects that we are interested in the spatially localized detection of light achieved by restricting the spatial integration domain in Eq. (2.5). Therefore, otherwise specified, the spatial integration domain in Eq. (2.5) in the below is taken to be small enough to satisfy the condition in Eq. (2.6).

A.2 The charged medium (i.e. the photoresist) is isotropic on the orthogonal plane of $\mathbf{k}_0$. For notational simplicity, we take $\mathbf{k}_0$ to be along with the $z$-direction so that $xy$-plane is the orthogonal plane of $\mathbf{k}_0$.

Then, A.1 implies the correlation of light in Eq. (2.5) to be

$$\langle \chi | A^m(x_1) A^n(x_2) | \chi \rangle \approx \langle \chi | A^m_0(x_0) A^n_0(x_0) | \chi \rangle \times 2 \cos (k^\mu_0 (x_1-x_2)_\mu), \quad k^\mu_0 = (\omega_0, \mathbf{k}_0)$$

for a spacetime point $x_0 = (x_0, t_0)$ in the integration domain of Eq. (2.5). In turn, one can write Eq. (2.5) as

$$T(t,t_0) = \langle \chi | A^m_0(x_0) A^n_0(x_0) | \chi \rangle \kappa_{mn}$$

where

$$\kappa_{mn} = 2 \sum_{\psi,\bar{\psi} \in \mathcal{H}_\psi} \int_{t_0}^{t} dt_1 \int_{t_0}^{t_1} dt_2 \langle \bar{\psi} | J_m(x_1) | \psi \rangle \langle \psi | J_n(x_2) | \bar{\psi} \rangle \cos (k^\mu_0 (x_1-x_2)_\mu).$$

Since $\kappa_{mn}$ is symmetric in its indices the isotropy of the charged medium together with the Coulomb gauge condition combined with A.1 indicates

$$\kappa_{mn} = \delta_{mn} \eta, \quad \eta = \frac{1}{3} \text{Tr} (\kappa_{mn}).$$
Therefore, one finds

\[ T(t, t_0) = \eta \langle \chi \mid A_{t_0}^{-m}(x_0) A_{t_0}^{+}(x_0) \mid \chi \rangle. \]

Finally, the optical equivalence theorem \[3, 10\] implies that \( A_{t_0}^{-m}(x_0) A_{t_0}^{+}(x_0) \) is proportional to the quantum correspondence \( I(x_0) \) of the classical intensity of light. By absorbing the proportional factor into \( \eta \) we find the well-known photoelectric detection probability \[3\]

\[ p_{x_0} = \eta \langle I(x_0) \rangle. \]  

(2.7)

in which \( \eta \) is called the quantum efficiency.

Furthermore, by applying the Poisson statistics to \( p_{x_0} \) one can obtain the detection probability for \( n \) photons in a spatial region \( V \) and a time interval \( \Delta t \) as \[11\]

\[ p_{\gamma, E(V, \Delta t)}(n) = \left\langle \mathcal{T} \frac{W^n e^{-W}}{n!} \right\rangle \]  

(2.8)

corresponding to the total intensity absorbed in \( (V, \Delta t) \). The Poisson-like distribution \( p_{\gamma, E}(n) \) in Eq. (2.8) is often approximated by

\[ p_{\gamma, E}(n) \approx \frac{\langle W \rangle e^{-\langle W \rangle}}{n!} \]

which reproduces the Poisson distribution on the number of photons in \[1\].

3 Analysis on probabilistic feature formation

3.1 Deprotection density as a random variable

Given a localized generation of acid, the deprotection mechanism can be effectively depicted by a chemical kinematics model as in \[12\]. In such kinematics model, the density of the deprotected polymer at \((x, t)\) arising from the acid catalyzed deprotection with respect to each localized acid generation at \((x_j, t_j)\), \( j = 1, 2, \ldots, n \) is given by \( \rho_D(x, t; x_j, t_j) \) so that the total deprotection density \( \rho_{D, \text{total}} \) is determined by \[4\]

\[ \rho_{D, \text{total}}(x; t; x_j, t_j, n) = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \rho_D(x; t; x_j, t_j). \]

The quantum mechanical description of the acid generation in the previous section indicates that the acid generation at a given spacetime occurs with the probability \( p_{x, t} \) in Eq. (2.7). Moreover, given a spacetime region \( E \), one can easily find the probability for local generations of acid at \((x_j, t_j)\), \( j = 1, 2, \ldots, n \) as

\[ p_{\gamma}(x_j, t_j; j = 1, 2, \ldots, n) = p_{\gamma, E}(n) \prod_{k=1}^{n} \hat{p}_{\gamma}(x_k, t_k), \quad \hat{p}_{\gamma}(x, t) = \frac{p_{x, t}}{W} \]
since \( p_{x_j,t_j} \) provides the relative probability of the acid generation at each \( (x_j,t_j) \).

Consequently, \( \rho_{D,\text{total}}(x,t;x_j,T_j,N) \) can be seen as a random variable \( \rho_{D,\text{total}}(x,t;x_j,T_j,N) \) defined by random variables

\[
(X,T) \sim \hat{\rho}_y, \quad N \sim p_{y,A}
\]

where \( \sim \) denotes the corresponding probability measure. By using the relation between \( p_{x,t} \) and the aerial intensity \( i_{\text{aerial}}(x,t) = \langle I(x,t) \rangle \) in Eq. (2.4) we have the expectation of \( \rho_{D,\text{total}} \) as

\[
E[\rho_{D,\text{total}}(x,t)] = (\eta \rho_D \otimes i_{\text{aerial}})(x,t)
\]

\[
= \int d^4x \eta \rho_D(x,t;x',t') i_{\text{aerial}}(x',t').
\]

(3.9)

to which \( \rho_{D,\text{total}} \) converges for large absorption \( W \) of open dose. The form of Eq. (3.9) implies that the expectation of \( \rho_{D,\text{total}} \) corresponds to the convolution imaging of \( i_{\text{aerial}} \) often taken as the nominal intensity \( i_{\text{resist}} \) of the resist image.

### 3.2 Probabilistic feature formation

In the patterning process, a pixel for a feature on a photoresist is formed if the density of deprotected polymer exceeds a certain threshold \( \tau \) at the development process \([4, 5]\). Thus, the probability for the generation of a pixel at a given position \( x \) is given by

\[
p_{\text{pixel}}(x) = P[\rho_{D,\text{total}}(x,t_f) \geq \tau]
\]

where \( P[...] \) denotes the probability for the condition \([...]\) and \( t_f \) is the final time for the exposure process.

Also, features in the exposed region \( E \) corresponds the 3-dimensional object defined by

\[
\{x \in E | \rho_{D,\text{total}}(x,t_f) \geq \tau\}.
\]

Therefore, a feature is formed in a given region \( P \subseteq E \) only if \( \rho_{D,\text{total}} \) exceeds \( \tau \) for every point \( x \in P \). The corresponding probability can be thus obtained by the Poisson statistics with respect to \( p_{\text{pixel}} \):

\[
p_{\text{feature}}(P) = \exp \left( \int_P d^3x p_{\text{pixel}}(x) - \text{area}(P) \right).
\]

(3.10)

Similarly, one can find the probability that no feature is found in a given region \( P \) as

\[
p_{\text{missing}}(P) = \exp \left( - \int_P d^3x p_{\text{pixel}}(x) \right).
\]

(3.11)

Furthermore, the quantity

\[
P_{\text{boundary}}(\partial P) = p_{\text{missing}}(E \setminus P) \times p_{\text{feature}}(P^o)
\]

(3.12)

in which \( A \setminus P = E \cap P^c \) and \( P^o \) is the interior of a given region \( P \subseteq E \) corresponds to the probability that the boundary of a feature is formed at the boundary \( \partial P \) of \( P \).

It is then straightforward to define probabilities of various printing failures by using Eq. (3.10), Eq. (3.11) and Eq. (3.12). For instance, the probability for the unexpected patterning (resp. missing) in a given region \( P \) corresponds to \( p_{\text{feature}} \) (resp. \( p_{\text{missing}} \)).
3.3 Asymptotic analysis on the probabilistic feature formation

In this subsection, we discuss the asymptotic behavior of the probabilistic density \( \rho_{D,\text{total}} \) of deprotected polymer for large absorption \( W \) in Eq. (2.8). The large absorption condition can be achieved by increasing the dose of the exposure or the area of the exposed area of interest.

For the large \( W \), the number \( N \) of photoelectric interactions is also getting larger and approaches to \( W \). Therefore, one can apply the central limit theorem to show that

\[
\rho_{D,\text{total}}(x, t_f) \sim \mathcal{N} \left( i_{\text{resist}}(x, t_f), W \sigma_D^2(x, t_f) \right)
\]

where \( \sigma_D^2 \) denotes the variation of \( \rho_D \) and \( \mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma^2) \) is a normal distribution with mean \( \mu \) and variance \( \sigma^2 \).

Moreover, once we assume that \( \rho_D(x, t_f; X, T) \) is sharply peaked around \( X, T \), \( \sigma_D^2 \) can be approximated by \( \hat{\rho}_\gamma(x, t_f) \int_E d^4x' \rho_D^2(x, t_f; x', t') \) [13, 14]. Consequently, we can find the asymptotic probability distribution \( \rho_{D,\text{total}} \) as

\[
\rho_{D,\text{total}}(x, t_f) \sim \mathcal{N} \left( i_{\text{resist}}(x, t_f), \hat{\rho}_\gamma(x, t_f) W \int_E d^4x' \rho_D^2(x, t_f; x', t') \right).
\]

By inserting the definition of \( \hat{\rho}_\gamma \)

\[
\rho_{D,\text{total}}(x, t_f) \sim \mathcal{N} \left( i_{\text{resist}}(x, t_f), \eta_{\text{aerial}}(x, t_f) \int_E d^4x' \rho_D^2(x, t_f; x', t') \right).
\] (3.13)

As a simple example illustrating the asymptotic behavior in Eq. (3.13), we take a family of static single line patterns (i.e., the corresponding light intensity is constant in time) defined by

\[
i_{\text{aerial}}(x) = i_0 \sin(2\pi x)^2, \quad \sin(x) = \frac{\sin(x)}{x}
\]

whose elements are classified by the relative intensity \( i_0 \) at \( x = 0 \). For simplicity, we set the quantum efficiency \( \eta = 1 \) and employ the normalized Gaussian kernel for the deprotection kernel, i.e.,

\[
\rho_D(x) = \mathcal{N}(x, h^2)
\]

in which \( h = 1/50 \) to fit our purpose here. Then given the threshold \( \tau \), the critical dimension (CD) of the single line is determined by the interval \( \{ x \in \mathbb{R} | \rho_{D,\text{total}}(x) \geq \tau \} \) (see Fig. 1).

In Fig. 2 we illustrate the probability for a pixel generation at each point on \( x \) with two different relative intensities \( i_0 = 5 \) and \( i_0 = 20 \). Also, Fig. 3 shows the relation between the probability for no patterning in the nominally patterned area and the relative intensity (left) or the nominal CD (right). As one can easily see in both figures, our simple example captures the characteristic of stochastic printing failures in [15] at least qualitatively.

Another consequence of the large \( W \) condition is the probabilistic deviation of the boundary of a given feature from its nominal boundary. For this let \( x_0 \) be the nominal boundary of the feature, so that for a given threshold \( \tau \), \( E[\rho_{D,\text{total}}(x_0)] = \tau \).

Then for a small deviation \( \delta x \) we have the condition

\[
\tau = \rho_{D,\text{total}}(x_0 + \delta x, t; X_j, T_j) \approx \rho_{D,\text{total}}(x_0, t; X_j, T_j) + \delta x^m \partial_m \rho_{D,\text{total}}(x_0, t; X_j, T_j).
\]

to \( x_0 + \delta x \) be the deviated boundary. Therefore, by defining the line edge roughness (LER) as

\[
\text{LER} = E\left[ \delta x^2 \right]
\]
one finds

\[ \text{LER} = \frac{W \sigma_D^2}{\delta m_i_{\text{resist}}(x_0) \delta m_{i_{\text{resist}}}(x_0)} \]

which reproduces the result in [4].

4 Conclusion and outlook

In this work, we have applied the QED to find a fully quantum mechanical description of the photochemical acid generation identified with the photoelectric detection of light. We have seen that one can reproduce the well-known proportionality between the probability of acid generation and the intensity of incident light under some assumptions in QED.

Although we have focused on the mere occurrence of acid generation, a more detailed analysis is available in the QED framework by emphasizing the dynamics of charged matter and the final state of the exposure system. For instance, one may split the final state of photons by the momentum of a state having an acute angle with respect to the incident wave vector to investigate the rate of the generation of flares during the exposure. Also, by specifying the dynamics of the charged matter to be that of electrons through the spin 1/2-field, one can find the rate of the generation of secondary electrons having enough energy to trigger the deprotection mechanism further. In this sense, the QED formulation provides an integrated framework to investigate secondary effects discussed in future work.

By using probabilistic acid generation, we have constructed the probabilistic description of the deprotection density in the photoresist, which has been noticed by [4, 5]. The probabilistic nature of the deprotection density reveals the relation between the expectation of the deprotection and the resist image intensity of the convolution imaging. Also, the explicit form of the deprotection density allows us the asymptotic analysis at the large absorption condition, which refines the works in [4, 5].
Figure 2: Probability for a single pixel formation of a single-line under two relative intensities.

Figure 3: The probability for no patterning in the region reserved by the nominal resist intensity with respect to the relative dose (a) or the nominal CD (b).

In a typical lithography process, the large absorption condition can be achieved by enlarging the exposed area of interest, the asymptotic analysis can be thus taken to construct a simulation model for the quantum fluctuation in the patterning process. In particular, by approximating the deprotection blur \( \kappa = \left( \int_{E} d^{4}x \eta \right) \times \left( \int_{E} d^{4}y \rho_{D,\text{total}}^{2}(y) \right) \) to be constant, we may write the asymptotic formula as

\[
\rho_{D,\text{total}}(x,t_{f}) \sim \mathcal{N}(i_{\text{resist}}(x,t_{f}), \kappa i_{\text{aerial}}(x,t_{f}))
\]

so that \( \kappa \) is fit by the measurement under the given resist image intensity and aerial intensity computed by a conventional simulation model. This simulation model is conceptually somewhat similar to the work in [5], but has a relatively simple formula in its construction.

Finally, the parameter \( \kappa \) can be considered as the leading characteristic of the photoresist, which governs the sensitivity of the resist under the quantum fluctuation. In this sense, \( \kappa \) here can be a physically refined parameter of the \( k_{4} \) factor in [16].
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