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Abstract
This paper describes a physics-based semi-analytical model for Schottky-barrier carbon nanotube (CNT) and graphene nanoribbon (GNR) transistors. The model includes the treatment of (i) both tunneling and thermionic currents, (ii) ambipolar conduction, i.e., both electron and hole current components, (iii) ballistic transport, and (iv) multi-band propagation. Further, it reduces the computational complexity in the two critical and time-consuming steps, namely the calculation of the tunneling probability and the self-consistent evaluation of the surface potential in the channel. When validated against NanoTCAD ViDES, a quantum transport simulation framework based on the non-equilibrium Green’s function method, it is several orders of magnitude faster without significant loss in accuracy. Since the model is physics-based, it is parameterizable and can be used to study the effect of common parametric variations in CNT diameter and GNR width, Schottky-barrier height, and insulator thickness.

Categories and Subject Descriptors: B.7.1 [Integrated circuits]: Types and Design Styles—Advanced technologies

General Terms: Design, Performance

Keywords: Carbon nanotubes, graphene nanoribbons, Schottky-barrier, models

1. Introduction

Carbon-based materials such as carbon nanotubes (CNTs) and, more recently, graphene nanoribbons (GNRs), have attracted strong interest as alternative device technologies for future nanoelectronics applications [1–4]. Devices based on these materials offer high mobility for ballistic transport, low drain-induced barrier lowering, high mechanical and thermal stability, and high resistance to electromigration. Although different families of CNTFETs and GNRFETs have been fabricated and studied, the most important distinction is between Schottky-barrier-type (SB-type) and MOSFET-type FETs [5–7]. SB-type FETs (SBFETs henceforth) are the most easily fabricated devices, since they use intrinsic CNT/GNR channels with metallic drain and source contacts. MOSFET-type devices are characterized by doped CNT/GNR channels and Ohmic contacts, and pose more engineering challenges. In SBFETs, a SB is formed between the channel and source/drain contacts and the gate modulates the quantum tunneling current through the SB [5]. It is the tunneling current, as opposed to the thermionic current in MOSFET-type devices, that dominates the device transport. SBFETs are ambipolar, i.e., they conduct both electrons and holes, showing a superposition of n- and p-type behavior.

Modeling approaches for such novel devices [8] are based on (i) computationally intensive, quantum-theory-based non-equilibrium Green’s function (NEGF) approaches [9, 10] or (ii) simpler semi-classical approaches [11–18]. NEGF-based approaches are highly accurate but extremely time consuming. Further, they provide limited intuition necessary for circuit design and optimization with multiple devices. In comparison to NEGF-based approaches, the simpler semi-classical approaches are computationally very efficient. Further, they are physics-based and parameterizable, providing good intuition to designers. It has been shown that for MOSFET-type devices, a semi-classical description is valid for a channel length down to about 10nm [12–14,19].

However, when GNRFETs and CNTFETs are SBFETs whose switching behavior stems from the gate modulation of the tunneling probability through the source/drain-channel contacts, a quantum-mechanical description is indispensable [5]. State-of-the-art models for SBFETs, such as [15–18], are based on the semi-classical approach augmented with quantum theory to handle tunneling in SBFETs. The earliest model described in [15] was more efficient than NEGF-based approaches, but still infeasible for routine simulations required for circuit design due to two computationally intensive steps: (i) the calculation of tunneling probability at the SBs and (ii) the self-consistent evaluation of the surface potential in the channel. In [16], the tunneling probability and the surface potential are obtained using approximate closed-form expressions at the cost of physical intuition. In [17, 18], the models are made computationally efficient by considering SBFETs in only the quantum capacitance limit to eliminate the need for self-consistent solution. However, this restricts the use of the model to ultimately scaled devices free of parasitics.

This paper describes an accurate and computationally efficient physics-based semi-analytical model for SB-type CNTFETs and GNRFETs. The model includes the treatment of (i) both tunneling and thermionic currents, (ii) ambipolar conduction, i.e., both electron and hole current components, (iii) ballistic transport, and (iv) multi-band propagation. Further, it reduces the computational complexity in the two critical and time-consuming steps of the semi-classical SBFET modeling approach. First, in the calculation of the tunneling probability through the SB using the Wentzel-Kramers-Brillouin (WKB) approach, we propose linear solutions to substitute for the computationally intensive integral for tunneling probability. Second, in the self-consistent loop to evaluate the surface potential in the channel, we simplify the process to calculate the probability. Second, in the self-consistent loop to evaluate the surface potential in the channel, we simplify the process to calculate the probability.
which flows above the SBs and tunneling current, which flows

\[ I_{\text{thermionic}} = \frac{2q}{h} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} (f(E) - f(E_{FS}) - f(E - E_{FD})) T_e(E) \, dE \]

where \( f(E) \) is the Fermi function, \( E_{FS} \) and \( E_{FD} \) are the Fermi levels at the source and the drain, respectively, and \( T_e(T_h) \) is the transmission coefficient for electrons (holes). When all terminal biases are added, the only parameters that remain unknown are the transmission coefficients at the contacts.

**Calculating the transmission coefficients:** At each contact the transmission coefficients for electron current and hole current need to be calculated, for a total of four coefficients: \( T_{se} \), \( T_{sh} \), \( T_{de} \) and \( T_{dh} \). The final transmission coefficients for electrons \( T_{e} \) and holes \( T_{h} \) are obtained by combining \( T_{se}, T_{de} \) and \( T_{sh}, T_{dh} \).

The current is divided into two components: thermionic current, which flows above the SBs and tunneling current, which flows through the SB. Whereas the transmission coefficient is 1 for the thermionic current, it is given by the tunneling probability for the tunneling current. The tunneling probability is calculated using the simple but accurate Wentzel-Kramers-Brillouin (WKB) approach that has been widely used in literature [21]. Based on the WKB approach, the tunneling probability \( T \) is given by

\[ T = \exp \left( -2 \int_{z_{\text{in}}}^{z_{\text{final}}} k_z(z) \, dz \right) \]  

where \( z_{\text{in}} \) and \( z_{\text{final}} \) are the classical turning points, illustrated in Figure 2, and \( k_z \) is the parallel momentum related to the \( E-k \) relationship of CNTs. Consider electron tunneling for example. \( k_z \) is given by the expression:

\[ k_z = \sqrt{k_n^2 - \left( \frac{E_g}{2} - \left( E_{C}(z) - E \right) \right)^2} \]

where \( k_n \) is the perpendicular momentum of the \( n \)th sub-band, \( E_g \) is the energy band-gap, \( E_{C}(z) \) is the bottom of the conduction band in the \( z \) direction, \( R \) is the radius of the CNT, \( \alpha_{c-c} \) is the carbon-carbon bond distance [22], and \( V_{DPA} \) is the carbon-carbon bonding energy [23]. Neglecting phase coherence, the overall transmission coefficient is given by [20]:

\[ T_{(th)} = \frac{T_{sc}(th)T_{dc}(th)}{T_{sh}(th) + T_{dc}(th) - T_{sc}(th)T_{dc}(th)} \]

**Modeling the energy band diagram:** In order to evaluate the transmission coefficients for the electron and hole tunneling current, the energy profile for the bottom of conduction band \( E_C(z) \) and the top of valence band \( E_v(z) \) need to be modeled, respectively, as illustrated in Figure 3. For a long channel, where the SBs at the source and drain contacts do not influence each other, the bottom of the conduction band inside the channel \( E_{\text{bot}} \) is given by the expression:

\[ E_{\text{bot}} = \varphi_{SB} + U_{sc} + qV_{th} \]

where \( \varphi_{SB} \) is the SB height, \( U_{sc} \) is the surface potential, and \( V_{th} \) is the flat band voltage. For the coaxial gate geometry, the conduction band \( E_C \) near the two contacts can be modeled as [17]:

\[ E_{C,\text{left}}(z) = \varphi_{SB} - (\varphi_{SB} - E_{\text{bot}})(1 - e^{-2z_{\text{ins}}/L}) \]

\[ E_{C,\text{right}}(z) = (\varphi_{SB} - qV_{bs}) - (\varphi_{SB} - E_{\text{bot}} - qV_{bs})(1 - e^{-2(z-L)/t_{\text{ins}}}) \]

where \( t_{\text{ins}} \) is the thickness of insulator and \( L \) is the channel length. Similarly, the top of the valence band is shifted down by a value of \( E_{g} \), which is the energy gap of the CNT.
Determining the surface potential: The surface potential \( U_{\text{act}} \) still remains to be evaluated in order to model the energy band diagram. It is solved through a self-consistent loop \([12, 14, 15]\) according to:

\[
U_{\text{act}} = U_L + U_P
\]

where \( U_L \) is the Laplace potential due to the applied terminal biases and \( U_P \) is the potential due to the change in carrier densities. If the substrate is sufficiently thick, \( U_L = -qV_0 \). Evaluating \( U_P \) is computationally demanding, however, since it depends on the change in carrier densities as explained below. Consider electrons for illustration. When the terminal biases are zero, the electron density in the channel is:

\[
N_0 = \int_{E_{\text{bot}}}^{\infty} D(E) f(E - E_F) \, dE
\]

where \( D(E) \) is the density of states at the bottom of the conduction band \([20]\) and \( f(E - E_F) \) is the Fermi function. Note the integral is from the bottom of the conduction band to infinity. When the terminal biases are not zero, the device is not at equilibrium and the states at the bottom of the conduction band are filled by two different Fermi levels. States with positive velocity \( N^+ \) and negative velocity \( N^- \) are filled by electrons according to:

\[
N^{\pm} = \frac{1}{2} \int_{E_{\text{bot}}}^{\infty} D(E - U_{\text{act}}) f^{\pm} \, dE
\]

where \( f^{\pm} \) are the Fermi functions modulated by the SBs [15]. \( U_P \) is then evaluated as:

\[
U_P = \frac{q}{C_{\text{ins}}} \Delta N = \frac{q}{C_{\text{ins}}} (N^+ + N^- - N_0)
\]

where \( C_{\text{ins}} \) is the insulator capacitance. Since this \( U_P \) is the potential due to the density change in electrons, the effects of holes must be added to obtain:

\[
U_P = \frac{q}{C_{\text{ins}}} \Delta N_e - \Delta N_h
\]

The most computationally intensive steps of SBFET modeling is thus the self-consistent solution for the surface potential \( U_{\text{act}} \), which has to be repeated for each combination of terminal biases. Within the self-consistent loop, the core computational steps are (i) the evaluation of carrier densities, including electron density and hole density, and (ii) the transmission coefficients \( T_3 \) and \( T_7 \) at the source and drain contacts for both electrons and holes. The next section describes the key contributions of this paper to reduce the computational complexity of these steps in SBFET modeling.

3. Reducing computational complexity

In this section, we describe two key simplifications to greatly reduce the computational complexity in SBFET modeling. These simplifications do not rely on fitting parameters, and hence preserve the physics-based properties of the semi-classical approach necessary for parameterized circuit design and optimization.

3.1 The transmission coefficients

While evaluating the transmission coefficient for tunneling current, the integral of \( k_z \) in the WKB approach (Equation 1) has to be solved numerically. Traditionally, \( k_z \) is calculated at each grid point in the channel between the two turning points and is computationally expensive. In this paper, we derive linear solutions to replace this integral as follows. Without loss of generality, consider \( k_z \) in the channel is:

\[
N_0 = \int_{E_{\text{bot}}}^{\infty} D(E) f(E - E_F) \, dE
\]

Note that \( E_c(z_{\text{final}}) - E \) monotonically decreases from \( z_{\text{final}} \) to \( z_{\text{init}} \) and \( E_c(z_{\text{peak}}) = E \). Considering the following two cases:

(i) \( E_c(z_{\text{peak}}) - E < E_g/2 \): As shown in Figure 4(a), \( k_z(z) \) decreases monotonically. The integral in Equation 1 is the area between the x-axis, y-axis, and first, then decreases monotonically. The integral in Equation 1 is the area between the two turning points, the transmission coefficients can be evaluated using only one or two expressions for \( k_z \). This reduces the computation time significantly, with negligible impact on accuracy, as presented in Sec. 4.

(ii) \( E_c(z_{\text{peak}}) - E > E_g/2 \): As shown in Figure 4(b), \( k_z(z) \) increases first, then decreases monotonically. The integral in Equation 1, or the area between the x-axis, y-axis, and \( k_z(z) \), can be regarded as the area of a triangle and a trapezoid. The triangle and the trapezoid are separated at \( z_{\text{peak}} \) where \( z_{\text{peak}} \) satisfies \( E_c(z_{\text{peak}}) - E = E_g/2 \) and \( k_z(z_{\text{peak}}) \) reaches its maximum. From the model for the energy band diagram,

\[
z_{\text{peak}} = \frac{t_{\text{fin}}}{2} \ln \frac{\varphi_{SB} - E_{\text{bot}}}{E + E_g/2 - E_{\text{bot}}}
\]

Hence, the integral can be simplified to

\[
\frac{k_z(z_{\text{peak}})}{2} (z_{\text{final}} - z_{\text{peak}}) + \frac{k_z(z_{\text{init}}) + k_z(z_{\text{peak}})}{2} (z_{\text{peak}} - z_{\text{init}})
\]

Therefore, instead of computing \( k_z \) at each grid point in the channel between the two turning points, the transmission coefficients can be evaluated using only one or two expressions for \( k_z \). This reduces the computation time significantly, with negligible impact on accuracy, as presented in Sec. 4.

3.2 Electron and hole densities

In the self-consistent loop, the calculation of \( U_P \) is computationally demanding since the change in both electron density and hole density must be evaluated numerically at each grid point. In our work, we propose a transformation that simplifies the calculation of carrier densities as follows. Without loss of generality, consider electron density. The density of electrons in positive velocity states \( N^+ \) and in negative velocity states \( N^- \) are:

\[
\begin{align*}
N^+ &= \int_{E_{\text{bot}}}^{\infty} D(E) f(E - E_F) \exp\left(-\frac{E - E_F}{k_B T}\right) \, dE \\
N^- &= \int_{E_{\text{bot}}}^{\infty} D(E) f(E - E_F) \exp\left(\frac{E - E_F}{k_B T}\right) \, dE
\end{align*}
\]
respectively. The total electron density is equal to by considering

Similarly,

Here, $f_s$ and $f_D$ are Fermi function of the source and the drain respectively. The total electron density is equal to $N^+ + N^-$. Since both $f_s$ and $f_D$ that include exponential terms appear in both $N^+$ and $N^-$, we rearrange terms to simplify the integrals as follows.

\[
N_1 = \frac{D_0}{2} \int_{E_{bot}}^{\infty} \frac{E - E_{bot} + E_g/2}{\sqrt{(E - E_{bot} + E_g/2)^2 - (E_g/2)^2}} \frac{2T_s f_s - T_s T_D f_D}{T_s + T_D - T_s T_D} dE \\
N_2 = \frac{D_0}{2} \int_{E_{bot}}^{\infty} \frac{E - E_{bot} + E_g/2}{\sqrt{(E - E_{bot} + E_g/2)^2 - (E_g/2)^2}} \frac{2T_D f_D - T_s T_D f_D}{T_s + T_D - T_s T_D} dE
\]

Note that since $N^+ + N^-$ is equal to $N_1 + N_2$, rearranging terms does not change the final result. By making the substitution

\[
E' = \sqrt{(E - E_{bot} + E_g/2)^2 - (E_g/2)^2}
\]

and setting

\[
E = \sqrt{(E')^2 + (E_g/2)^2} - E_g/2 + E_{bot},
\]

$N_1$ and $N_2$ can be written as:

\[
N_1 = \frac{D_0}{2} \int_{E_{bot}}^{\infty} \frac{2T_s f_s - T_s T_D f_D}{T_s + T_D - T_s T_D} dE' \\
N_2 = \frac{D_0}{2} \int_{E_{bot}}^{\infty} \frac{2T_D f_D - T_s T_D f_D}{T_s + T_D - T_s T_D} dE'
\]

The integrals are then simplified as follows, and we illustrate this by considering $N_1$:

\[
N_1 = \frac{D_0}{2} \int_{E_{bot}}^{\infty} \frac{2T_s f_s - T_s T_D f_D}{T_s + T_D - T_s T_D} dE' \\
= \frac{D_0}{2} \int_{E_{bot}}^{\infty} T(E) f_s(E) dE' \\
= \frac{D_0}{2} \int_{0}^{\infty} P(\sqrt{(E')^2 + (E_g/2)^2} - E_g/2 + E_{bot}) dE' \\
= \frac{D_0}{2} \int_{0}^{\infty} P(E') dE'
\]

In order to simplify the integral, it is necessary to investigate the Fermi function. $P(E')$ is the product of two terms: the Fermi function and the transmission coefficient ($T$-term). At low energies, the Fermi function is always close to 1 and the $T$-term dominates the shape of $P(E')$. When the energy increases, the Fermi function has an exponential behavior, and changes in the value of the $T$-term are slow in comparison to the exponential fall-off in the value of the Fermi function. Hence, the shape of $P(E')$ is dominated by the Fermi function in this regime. We assume that Fermi function begins to exhibit exponential behavior at the energy $E' = E_{exp}$ where $f_s(\sqrt{(E')^2 + (E_g/2)^2} - E_g/2 + E_{bot}) \approx 0.90$. With this boundary condition, we divide the problem into the following regimes, as illustrated in Figure 5:

1. $E_{bot} > E_{exp}$

$P(E')$ is monotonically decreasing in this situation. In order to simplify the integral, we use the bisection method to find the point $E' = E_{bot}$ where $P(E_{bot}) = 1/2P(0)$, and approximate the integral in Equation 2 to $2P(E_{bot})E_{bot}$. 

2. $E_{bot} < E_{exp}$ and $E_{bot} < \varphi_{SB} < V_{DS}$

Under these conditions, there are two regions separated by $E_{exp}$. In the first region, the Fermi function is almost constant and the $T$-term dominates the shape of the curve. Upon closer examination, it is clear that the $T$-term is equal to $T_s(E)$ because $T_D(E) = 1$. We use a linear function to simplify the integral by calculating $T_s(E_{exp}/2)$, and simplify the integral in this region to $T_s(E_{exp}/2)E_{exp}$. In the second region, the Fermi function dominates, and the conditions are similar to $E_{bot} > E_{exp}$ above. The total value of the integral in Equation 2 is given by the sum of the two regions.

3. $E_{bot} < E_{exp}$ and $E_{bot} > \varphi_{SB} > V_{DS}$

Under these conditions, there may be two or three regions, depending on whether $\varphi_{SB} - V_{DS}$ is above $E_{exp}$ or not. If $\varphi_{SB} - V_{DS} \geq E_{exp}$, it is similar to condition (2) above. There are two regions, with the $T$-term dominating the first. Although the $T$-term is not equal to $T_s(E)$, it is still possible to use a linear function to simplify the integral. In the second region, the Fermi function dominates and it is equivalent to case (1) above. If $\varphi_{SB} - V_{DS} < E_{exp}$, there are three regions. The first interval is from 0 to the point where $\sqrt{(E')^2 + (E_g/2)^2} - E_g/2 + E_{bot} = \varphi_{SB} - V_{DS}$. If the energy increases to $E_{exp}$, it is in the second region where only the source has SBs. In both regions, we use a linear function to simplify the integral. Finally, the third region uses the same conditions as (1) above.

Although the self-consistent loop is still needed to evaluate $U_{ref}$, simplifying the calculation of the transmission coefficients and the carrier densities reduces the computational burden in the two core
loops significantly. Hence, the overall complexity of the semi-classical SBFET model is reduced without loss in accuracy.

4. Results and discussions

We begin by comparing the results of our proposed semi-analytical model to the original semi-classical model and to the rigorous quantum atomistic simulator NanoTCAD ViDES [10]. We consider a CNTFET with coaxial gate geometry and a 20nm long (13,0) CNT channel. The gate insulator is SiO$_2$ with $t_{\text{ins}} = 1$nm. The SB height is assumed to be half of the band-gap. In Figure 6, we compare the $I$-$V$ curves obtained from our semi-analytical model, the original semi-classical model, and NanoTCAD ViDES, respectively, for several bias points. Ambipolar characteristics due to both electron and hole conduction are clearly shown, and the drain voltage exponentially increases the minimum leakage current. The point of minimum current is at $V_{\text{DS}} = V_{\text{DS}}/2$. As drain voltage increases, SBFETs show linear behavior in the overall range of gate bias. For example, the drain current and the channel charge for $V_{\text{DS}} = 0.8$V are linearly proportional to $V_{\text{GS}}$, whereas those for $V_{\text{DS}} = 0.4$V show exponential behavior in the sub-threshold region. Note that the difference between the results of the proposed semi-analytical model and the original semi-classical model is very small, which demonstrates that our simplification does not result in significant loss of accuracy. In comparison, the difference between the results of the proposed model and NanoTCAD ViDES is slightly higher. This can be attributed to the difference in the calculation of the transmission coefficients between the semi-classical and quantum approaches. NanoTCAD ViDES considers phase coherence of scattering at the two SBs and the energy profile is more rigorous, which explains the oscillating nature of the computed transmission coefficient. However, since this treatment is at the atomic level and extremely computationally intensive, it is not feasible in semi-classical approaches. Table 1 presents the average computational time for 80 bias points for NanoTCAD ViDES, the original semi-classical model, and the proposed model. Our semi-analytical model is one order of magnitude faster than the original semi-classical model and four orders of magnitude faster than NanoTCAD ViDES.

Table 1: Average computational time for NanoTCAD ViDES, original semi-classical SBFET model, and the proposed model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NanoTCAD ViDES</td>
<td>8-10 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-classical SBFET model</td>
<td>20-30 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed semi-analytical model</td>
<td>2-4 seconds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1 Parameter variations

Parameter variations play an important role in CNTFET electronics because they significantly influence both the “on” and “off” current. Typical parameters considered in CNTFET simulation and design include CNT chirality, insulator thickness, and SB height. Our model is able to simulate the effect of parameter variations. Although prior work [9, 15] has investigated these problems in detail using rigorous simulation approaches, our semi-analytical model is able to provide results that are consistent with these more rigorous approaches in a fraction of the time. In this section, we will present the simulation results of variations in CNT chirality (and hence, diameter), insulator thickness, and SB height.

CNT chirality: The diameter of a CNT is determined by the chirality, while the energy band-gap is inversely proportional to the diameter. We simulated (11,0), (13,0), and (17,0) CNTFETs, and the results are shown in Figure 7. As the diameter increases, the band-gap decreases. This allows more electrons and holes in the conduction and valence bands, respectively, thereby increasing the current. However, a small band-gap also increases the “off” current, so the $I_{\text{on}}/I_{\text{off}}$ ratio is lower.

Insulator thickness: The insulator thickness $t_{\text{ins}}$ influences the SB thickness and the gate capacitance. As $t_{\text{ins}}$ increases, the SBs at the two channel ends also become thicker and the gate capacitance decreases. A low gate capacitance means the gate has less control over the drain current, and a thick SB lowers the tunneling probability. Therefore, when $t_{\text{ins}}$ increases, the current decreases. We simulated a CNTFET with gate insulator thickness at 1nm, 2nm, and 3nm, and the results are shown in Figure 8.

SB height: The most commonly studied devices are mid-gap SBFETs, i.e., $\varphi_{\text{SB}} = E_g/2$, and all the simulations so far have only considered mid-gap transistors. Under this condition, the minimum current occurs at $V_{\text{GS}} = V_{\text{DS}}/2$. However, depending on the contact work functions, the SB height can differ from $E_g/2$ [24]. As the SB height increases, the electron current is lowered and hole current is larger, so that the right branch of the curve is shifted down, the left branch shifted up, and the minimum current point moves to the right. When the SB height decreases, the right branch shifts up, the left branch shifts down, and the minimum current point shifts to the left, as shown in Figure 9. Our results for $\varphi_{\text{SB}} = 0$, $E_g/2$, and $E_g$ are shown in Figure 9.

4.2 GNRFET simulation

So far, this paper has only considered CNTFETs. However, our model can also be used to simulate GNRFETs. Since GNRs and
CNTs share many properties, only a few changes are needed. The major changes include: (i) the energy band-gap of a GNR is determined by its width instead of the chiralities, (ii) GNRFETs usually do not have coaxial structures, so the expressions for gate capacitance and energy band diagram need to be changed depending on the structure (double-gate in our case), and (iii) $k_z$ [18] for GNRs has a linear relationship with energy that makes the integral of $k_z$ in the WKB even simpler. By making these changes, our model is compatible with GNRFETs, and the major ideas and simplification approaches mostly remain valid. Figure 10 presents results comparing our model and NanoTCAD ViDES for a double-gated GNRFET with an $N=12$ armchair-edge GNR channel and $t_{ins} = 2$ nm. Further, the proposed model can also incorporate the effects of edge bond relaxation and third nearest neighbor interactions that have been shown to play an important role in GNRs.

5. Conclusions

Current models for Schottky-barrier carbon nanotube and graphene nanoribbon FETs are either computationally expensive or unable to provide physical intuition for device parameter optimization. This paper described a semi-analytical model for such FETs based on physics-based methods to reduce the computational complexity by simplifying the calculation of the transmission coefficient and the carrier densities. When compared to the quantum-theory-based simulator NanoTCAD ViDES and the original semi-classical model, the proposed model is four orders and one order of magnitude faster, respectively, without significant loss of accuracy.
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