

# Surface-state induced inter-electrode isolation of *n*-on-*p* devices in mixed-field and $\gamma$ -irradiation environments

<u>r. Peltola (1, T. Abdilov (1, N. Akchurin (1, M. Harris (1, Y. Kazhykarim (1, V. Kuryatkov (2</u>



Department of Physics and Astronomy, Advanced Particle Detector Laboratory, Texas Tech University, 1200 Memorial Circle, Lubbock, Texas, U.S.A.

<sup>(2</sup> Nanotech Center, Texas Tech University, 902 Boston Ave, Lubbock, Texas, U.S.A.

# **1. Introduction** –

### Inter-strip resistance of hadron/mixed-field vs X-ray irradiated sensors

- □ *N*-on-*p* Si-sensors: Advantages in extreme radiation environments in terms of radiation hardness over the traditional *p*-on-*n* sensors include:
  - Electron collection instead of holes
  - Overlapping maxima of weighting and electric fields at the chargecollecting electrodes
  - Drawback: Radiation-induced accumulation of positive net oxide charges  $(N_{ox})$  under the Si/SiO<sub>2</sub>-interface that at high densities can compromise the position resolution by creating a conduction channel between the electrodes
- **Radiation-induced surface damage:** 
  - Ionizing radiation: X-rays/ $\gamma$ s/charged particles (p, e,...)  $\rightarrow$ accumulation of fixed oxide charge  $(N_f)$  and interface trap (or surface states  $N_{it}$ ) densities
  - **Displacement damage:** Neutral/charged particles  $(n, p,...) \rightarrow$ accumulation of  $N_{\rm it}$
- □ Neutron radiation environment: Mixed field of neutrons with background  $\gamma s$  (n/ $\gamma$ )
- **Previous studies:** 
  - N-on-p sensors with p-stop isolation implant up to ~700 kGy: Dose (D) dependence of inter-strip resistance ( $R_{int}$ ) for X-rays disappears for  $n/\gamma$ +X-ray irradiated [1] • *N*-on-*p* without *p*-stop: Significantly higher  $R_{int}$  for ~3-6 kGy n/ $\gamma$ and ~870 kGy p-irradiated than for 3 kGy X-rays [2]  $\rightarrow$  different introduction rates of  $N_{\rm f}$  and/or  $N_{\rm it}$  at Si/SiO<sub>2</sub>-interface between irradiation types?
- □ Surface-state dynamics [4]:  $\square$  N<sub>f</sub>: always fully occupied **Unoccupied**  $N_{\text{it,don}} \& N_{\text{it,acc}} : Q_{\text{it}} = 0$ **Fully occupied**  $N_{\text{it.don}}$ :  $Q_{\text{it}} = +e$ **Equation 1:**  $Q_{ox} = eN_{ox}$ **Fully occupied**  $N_{\text{it.acc}}$ :  $Q_{\text{it}} = -e$  $= e(N_{\rm f} + \frac{aN_{\rm it,don} - bN_{\rm it,acc}}{8}) [3,5]$  $\rightarrow a \& b$ : fractions of fully occupied  $N_{\rm it,don/acc}$  $\Box$  n/ $\gamma$ - vs  $\gamma$ -irradiated in Fig. 2: •  $N_{\text{it, don/acc}}$ : Substantially higher introduction rate for n/ $\gamma$ -irradiated  $\rightarrow$  reflected by significantly larger  $\Delta V_{dep}$  in Fig. 1 🗕 n/gammas: Nit,don 20°C 🗕 n/gammas: Nit,acc –n/gammas: Nf - gammas: Nit,don 🗢 gammas: Nit,acc •=- gammas: Nf 2 3.0 2.5 Density 2.0 1.5 1.0 0.5 0.0 100 20 30 50 60 70 80 90 10 Dose [kGy]

Figure 2: Simulated evolution of  $N_{\rm f}$  and surface-state densities with dose for mixed-field and  $\gamma$ -irradiations. For clarity, mean values between densities extracted from CV-sweeps starting either from accumulation- or inversionregions of the  $\gamma$ -irradiated MOSs in Figs. 1b, 1d & 1f are considered.



**Figure 5:** Simulated evolution of  $\rho_{int}$  with dose, extracted from Fig. 4 and from a pre-irradiated sensor simulation.

- $\Box$  Mixed-field  $\rho_{int}$  in Fig. 5: Essentially no TID and p-stop dependence  $\rightarrow$  in line with experimental results for p, n/ $\gamma$ , p+n/ $\gamma$ irradiated strip-sensors (with *p*-stop and *p*-spray) [6]
- $\Box$   $\gamma$ -irradiated  $\rho_{int}$  in Fig. 5: Substantial dose dependence  $\rightarrow$  difference between mixed field and  $\gamma s$  in line with measured results for  $n/\gamma + X$ rays vs X-rays in strip-sensors with *p*-stop [1]

### 3.3 $\gamma$ s/X-rays: Influence of p-stop doping on $R_{int}$

# 2. Observations on oxide-charge and surface-state accumulation with dose: Measured and TCAD-simulated MOS CV-

characteristics:  $n/\gamma$ - vs  $\gamma$ -irradiated

### □ Irradiation campaigns of MOS-capacitors [3]:

- **n**/γs: RINSC (Rhode Island) and MNRC reactors (UC Davis)
- γs(<sup>60</sup>Co): GIF (Sandia)



# 3. $R_{int}$ -simulations 3.1 TCAD-modeled devices



(b) Doping profiles of the  $n^+$ -implants and p-stop. (c) Inter-strip region of a strip-sensor with 'individual' p-stops. Doping profiles are identical to Fig. 3b, except for *p*-stop peak doping  $N_{ps}=1.5 \cdot 10^{16} \text{ cm}^{-3}$ .

# 3.2 $R_{int}(V, D)$ with $N_f/N_{it}$ -parameters as input: $n/\gamma$ - vs $\gamma$ -irradiated with and without *p*-stop

 $\square$   $R_{int}$ -results: Normalized to inter-electrode resistivity ( $\rho_{int}$ )  $\rightarrow$ enables comparison with varied geometry devices

$$\rho_{int} = R_{int} \frac{A}{L} = R_{int} \frac{w \cdot d}{L} - \begin{bmatrix} w = \text{strip length (=width)} \\ d = \text{strip-implant depth} \\ L = \text{gap length between strips} \end{bmatrix}$$

**Limits for sufficient strip-solation:**  $\rho_{\text{int.min}}$ (CMS HGCAL)  $\approx 0.9 \text{ k}\Omega \cdot \text{cm} \approx \text{preamplifier } Z_{\text{input}} \cdot 100$  $\rho_{\text{int.min}}$ (CMS Tracker)  $\approx 2.0 \text{ M}\Omega \cdot \text{cm} \approx R_{\text{bias}} \cdot 100 \text{ [2]}$ 

.0E+13	gammas: 7kGy Inv	gammas w/o PS: 7kGy Inv	 1.0E+13	gammas: 23	kGy Inv	gammas w/	o PS: 23kGy Inv
.0E+12	gammas: 7kGy Acc	gammas w/o PS: 7kGy Acc	 1.0E+12	gammas: 23	kGy Acc	gammas w/	o PS: 23kGy Acc
0F+11	—n/gammas: 7.1kGy	n/gammas w/o PS: 7.1kGy	1 0F+11	-n/gammas: 2	23.5kGy	n/gammas v	w/o PS: 23.5kGy
0F+10	rho_int,min(Tracker)	rho_int,min(HGCAL)	1.0E+10	rho_int,min(	Tracker)	rho_int,min	(HGCAL)
00110			- 1 05 00				

 $\Box$  Varied  $N_{ps}$  in Fig. 6a:  $\rho_{int}$  highly sensitive to the level of  $N_{ps} \rightarrow$ comparative  $\rho_{int}$ -evaluations done with  $\gamma s$  or X-rays between sensors can be convoluted by differences in  $N_{ps}$  (e.g. Tracker vs HGCAL sensors)



Figure 6: (a) Simulated influence of  $N_{ps}$  on  $\rho_{int}$  in a  $\gamma$ -irradiated sensor. (b) Comparison of measured and simulated  $\rho_{int}$  of irradiated HGCAL test-strips. The two measured test-strip samples were X-ray irradiated to  $D=100\pm10$  kGy, while the simulation applied the surface-damage parameters for  $D=90\pm5$  kGy from Table 1 and Fig. 2.

 $\Box$  Measured vs TCAD in Fig. 6b: Close agreement with  $N_{\rm f}$  and  $N_{\rm it}$ tuned for CV-sweep starting from negative voltages  $\rightarrow a \rightarrow 1$  in Eq. 1 models more accurately conditions at Si/SiO2-interface between reverse-biased  $n^+$ -electrodes after  $\gamma$ - or X-ray irradiation

# **4.** Conclusions

- $\square$   $R_{int}$  -simulations of *n*-on-*p* pad-sensors: Higher densities of deep  $N_{\rm it,acc/don}$  correlate with higher  $\rho_{\rm int}$ 
  - $\rho_{int}$  of  $\gamma$ -irradiated sensors: Low introduction rates of deep  $N_{\rm it,acc/don} \rightarrow \rm high\ sensitivity\ to\ the\ presence\ and\ N_{\rm ps}\ of\ p-stop$
  - $\rho_{int}$  of n/ $\gamma$ -irradiated sensors: High introduction rates of deep  $N_{\rm it,acc/don} \rightarrow$  no sensitivity to the presence of p-stop  $\rightarrow$  superior  $\rho_{\rm int}$ performance to  $\gamma$ -irradiated for full dose range of about 100 kGy  $\rightarrow$  p-stops not required to maintain high position resolution in mixed-field environment
  - Neutron radiation: Contribution to TID ~negligible  $\rightarrow$  role in  $N_{it}$ introduction decisive

 $n/\gamma$ - or  $\gamma$ -irradiations for a (a) 300-µm-thick initial *n*-bulk (Space Charge Sign-Inverted (SCSI) to p-bulk) MOS-capacitor, (b) 200-µm-thick n-bulk MOS, (c) 120-µm-thick SCSI-p-bulk MOS, (d) 300-µm-thick p-bulk MOS, (e) 120-µmthick SCSI-p-bulk MOS, and (f) 300-µm-thick n-bulk MOS. Measurements included CV-sweeps starting from both inversion (Inv.) and accumulation (Acc.) regions [3].

 $\Box$   $\gamma$ -irradiated MOS in Fig. 1: Substantially shorter depletion region  $(\Delta V_{dep})$  compared to mixed-field irradiated

Hysteresis between Inv./Acc. CV-sweeps: Only observed in  $\gamma$ irradiated MOSs

□ Measured CV-characteristics reproduced by TCAD in Fig. 1: Requires introduction of both donor- and acceptor-type deep  $N_{it}$  at  $Si/SiO_2$ -interface (in addition to  $N_f$ ) in Table 1

• Only  $N_f$  at the Si/SiO<sub>2</sub>-interface in Figs. 1b, c (green dash): Abrupt depletion region that does not reproduce the measured MOS *CV*-characteristics

**Table 1.** The simulation input parameters of radiation-induced  $N_{it}$ .  $E_{a,V,C}$  are the activation energy, valence band and conduction band energies, respectively, while  $\sigma_{e,h}$  are the electron and hole trapping cross sections, respectively [3].

N <sub>it</sub> type	$E_{\rm a}[{\rm eV}]$	$\sigma_{\rm e,h}  [{\rm cm}^2]$	<b>Density</b> [cm <sup>-2</sup> ]
Deep donor $(N_{it,don})$	$E_{V} + 0.65$	1e-15	see Fig. 2
Deep acceptor $(N_{it,acc})$	<i>E<sub>C</sub></i> - 0.60	1e-15	see Fig. 2

TCAD=Technology Computer-Aided Design MOS=Metal-Oxide-Semiconductor TID=Total Ionizing Dose



**Figure 4:** Simulated evolution of  $\rho_{int}$  with reverse bias voltage at T=253 K for  $\gamma$ - or mixed-field irradiated *n*-on-*p* sensors with and without *p*-stop implants ('w/o PS').

#### $\square$ n/ $\gamma$ -irradiated in Fig. 4: High $\rho_{int}$ for all TIDs for full V-range

- *p*-stop: Irrelevant for isolation  $\rightarrow$  beneficial impact to  $\rho_{int}$  from high introduction rate of  $N_{\rm it}$
- $\Box$   $\gamma$ -irradiated in Fig. 4: Low  $\rho_{int}$ /shorted at D>23 kGy  $\rightarrow$  low introduction rate of  $N_{\rm it} \rightarrow$  no benefit to  $\rho_{\rm int}$ 
  - *p*-stop with  $N_{\rm ps}$ =9e15 cm<sup>-3</sup>: Significant benefit to  $\rho_{\rm int}$  only at 23 kGy

Reported saturation of accumulation of N<sub>f</sub> and N<sub>it</sub> at ~100–200 kGy [7,8,9]: N-on-p sensors without p-stops  $\rightarrow$  potentially feasible configuration for future HEP-experiments with radiation environments involving hadrons

- Similar number of lithography and ion-implantation steps to *p*-on-*n*: Reduced processing cost of *n*-on-*p* sensors
- Sensor performance without *p*-stops: Zero probability of discharges or avalanche effects due to excessive electric fields at *p*-stops

## References

[1] V. Mariani, et al., NIM A 980 (2020) 164423. [2] J.-O. Müller-Gosewisch, et al., 2021 JINST 16 P07004. [3] N. Akchurin et al 2023 JINST 18 P08001. [4] E.H. Nicollian and J.R. Brews, John Wiley & Sons (1982). [5] Poehlsen et al., NIM A 700 (2013) 22-39. [6] W. Adam, et al., JINST 12 (2017) P06018. [7] J. Zhang, Ph.D. thesis, University of Hamburg, DESY-2013-00115 (2013). [8] F. Moscatelli et al., IEEE Trans. Nucl. Sci. 64 (8) (2017) 2259-2267. [9] F. Moscatelli, et al., JINST 12 (2017) P12010.