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3D Detectors – a Success Story

- 1997: First idea and devices
- Huge R&D effort
  - Manufacturers, ATLAS+CMS, RD50, ...
- ATLAS IBL
  - First installation of 3D detectors in a HEP experiment
- Forward Detectors: 2\textsuperscript{nd} use of 3D detectors within 1 year
  - ATLAS Forward Proton (AFP)
  - CMS-TOTEM PPS
- HL-LHC Phase-2 Upgrades ~2024
  - New generation of 3D detectors
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Advantages
- Electrode distance decoupled from sensitive detector thickness → lower $V_{\text{depletion}}$
  → less power dissipation, cooling
  → smaller drift distance
  → faster charge collection
  → less trapping
- Active or slim edges are natural feature of 3D technology

Challenges
- Complex production process → long production time
  → lower yields
  → higher costs
- Higher capacitance → higher noise
- Non-uniform response from 3D columns and low-field regions → small efficiency loss at 0°
Different 3D Technologies

**Single-sided process (“Full 3D”)**

- Both column types (n, p) edged from front
  - Needs support wafer → removal needed
  - Bias to be applied at front side → overhanging bias tab or other front-side biasing

- Allows active edges
  - Only few µm dead material

**Double-sided process**

- n columns etched from front, p from back
  - FBK: passing-through columns, p-spray
  - CNM: non-passing-through columns, p-stop
  - No support wafer needed
  - Bias applied at back side → no bias tab needed → reduced process and assembly complexity

- Allows slim edges
  - FBK: p⁺ guard fence → ~10 µm
  - CNM: p⁺ guard fence + 3D guard ring → ~150 µm

---
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Signal efficiency (SE) of 60-70% at $5 \times 10^{15} \text{n}_{\text{eq}}/\text{cm}^2$ and 30% at $2 \times 10^{16} \text{n}_{\text{eq}}/\text{cm}^2$ achieved for moderate $V < 200 \text{ V}$

Signal efficiency (SE) improves with decreasing electrode distance $L$

Charge multiplication at high fluences and $V$ can further boost collected charge

\[ SE = \frac{1}{1 + 0.6L \frac{K_{T}}{V_{D}} \Phi} \]
ATLAS IBL: First Use of 3D Detectors

- First upgrade of ATLAS pixel in long shutdown 1 (2013-2015): new innermost layer at 3.3 cm
- FE-I4: largest pixel front-end chip
- Radiation levels up to $5 \times 10^{15} \text{n}_{\text{eq}}/\text{cm}^2$, 250 Mrad
- 2011 sensor technology decision:
  - 75% n-in-in planar 200 µm (CIS)
  - 25% double-sided 230 µm 3D (CNM+FBK)

See talk by D. Dobos
IBL 3D Production

- **Sensors**
  - FE-I4 geometry: 80x336 pixels of 250x50 µm²
  - 2 n⁺ junction columns per pixel (2E) surrounded by 6 p⁺ ohmic columns in 230 µm p substrate → L=67 µm
  - Slim edge of 200 µm along columns

- **Technology details**
  - **FBK:**
    - Passing-through columns
    - p⁺ guard fence
    - Sensor selection from IV on temporary metal
  - **CNM:**
    - Columns ~20 µm shorter than thickness
    - 3D guard ring+p⁺ guard fence
    - Sensor selection from IV on guard ring (GR) (not ideal)
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IBL 3D Performance – Breakdown and Noise

- **Breakdown voltage**
  - Lower for 3D than planar, but much less bias voltage needed
  - Lower for FBK than CNM due to through-passing junction columns

- **Noise**
  - Larger for 3D than planar due to larger capacitance (170 vs. 110 fF)
  - Larger for FBK than CNM due to larger column overlap

### Measurement in lab during QA
- Calibration: 10ToT@16ke
- Threshold: 3000e
- Temperature: -15 °C
IBL 3D Performance – Radiation Hardness

- Radiation hardness tested up to $5 \times 10^{15} \text{ n}_{\text{eq}}/\text{cm}^2$
- **3D sensors**
  - Fully efficient at **160 V** and $15^\circ$ angle
  - Mean efficiency 1-2% lower at normal incidence due to columns
  - Power dissipation $<15 \text{ mW/cm}^2$ at $T=-15^\circ \text{C}$
- **Planar sensors**
  - Need 1000 V for similar efficiency
  - Power dissipation $\sim90 \text{ mW/cm}^2$ at $T=-15^\circ \text{C}$

→ operational advantage for 3D sensors
IBL Installation and Commissioning

- IBL installed in May 2014
- First 13 TeV collisions!
- Overwhelming fraction of sensors works according to specifications

See talk by D. Dobos

3D is in and working!!!
3D Sensors for Forward Detectors

- ATLAS Forward Proton (AFP) and CMS-TOTEM Precision Proton Spectrometer (PPS) intend to study forward protons scattered under very small angle.
- Tracking and timing detectors very close to the beam (2-3 mm).

AFP TDR submitted to LHCC, LHCC-2015-009
CMS-TOTEM PPS TDR, LHCC-2014-021
AFP and PPS 3D Trackers

- Requirements
  - Good position resolution (full tracker): 10 µm (x), 30 µm (y)
  - Slim edge of side facing beam: 100-200 µm
  - Highly non-uniform irradiation (up to $3 \times 10^{15} n_{eq}/cm^2$)

- Solution
  - Several layers of slim-edged 3D pixel detectors (telescope configuration)

- AFP:
  4 slim-edged IBL 3D FE-I4 single-chip modules, 13° tilt in x

- PPS:
  6 3D modules with PSI46dig, 6 chips/module, 20° tilt in x
AFP: Slim-Edge Efficiency

- **CNM**: Fully sensitive up to last pixel (3D guard ring design)
- **FBK**: Sensitivity extends ~75 µm beyond last pixel (no guard ring)
  - <15 µm insensitive edge: slimmest edge apart from fully active edge
- For both CNM and FBK: <150 µm insensitive edge possible
  - **AFP slim-edge requirements fulfilled**
AFP: FBK Slim-Edge Efficiency – Dependence on V, Side and Fluence

- Dependence on the side
  - Edges that are cut to obtain slim-edges have ~75 µm sensitivity extension, non-cut edges ~110 µm
    → probably cut defects influence depletion growth and increased recombination near cut edge
    → to be followed up in simulations

- Dependence on irradiation
  - Here: non-cut devices
  - Sensitivity extension still present after irradiation, but reduced (increasing with V)

I. Lopez et al., ANIMMA 2015, Lisbon
PPS: Slim-Edge Efficiency

Edge Pixel: 300x100 µm²

- Typical CMS pixel 150x100 µm²
- Here: edge pixel double size in long direction (300 µm) for this prototype (not for PPS)
- Edge-efficiency studies with 1E FBK sensors
  - 50 µm sensitivity extension at 0°, 70 µm at 20°
  - 130-150 µm remaining insensitive edge

→ PPS slim-edge requirements fulfilled

CMS-TOTEM PPS TDR, LHCC-2014-021
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**AFP: Irradiation Studies**

- Radiation hardness for uniform radiation to $5 \times 10^{15} \text{n}_{eq}/\text{cm}^2$ known from IBL
- AFP: Highly non-uniform fluence from diffractive p
  - $3 \times 10^{15} \text{n}_{eq}/\text{cm}^2$ in max. ($\sim$7 TeV p), orders of magnitudes less nearby
- 2 irradiation campaigns with different non-uniformity scenarios

1) Focussed 23 GeV p irradiation (CERN-PS)  
→ fluence spread large

max. $4 \times 10^{15} \text{n}_{eq}/\text{cm}^2$

2) 23 MeV p (KIT) through hole in 5mm Al plate  
→ very localised fluence with abrupt transition

$3.6 \times 10^{15} \text{n}_{eq}/\text{cm}^2$

**Efficiency 96-99% in all regions**

→ AFP radiation-hardness requirements fulfilled
PPS: Irradiation Studies

- Study of uniform irradiation
- Builds on experience of previous CMS 3D radiation hardness studies
  - Problems in past: chip PSI46 (analog) not radiation hard enough
  - New studies with new PSI46dig: more radiation hard, lower threshold
    - Efficiency of 98% after $1 \times 10^{15}$ $n_{eq}$/cm$^2$ and 93% after $3 \times 10^{15}$ $n_{eq}$/cm$^2$
      (only 1E available in first studies, 3 ke threshold)
    - Some remaining non-uniform inefficiencies, expected to improve with 2E configuration

See talk by L. Caminada for chip details
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Efficiency vs Angle After Irradiation

- $1 \times 10^{15}$ $n_{eq}$/cm$^2$, 85 V
- Angle 0°
- Angle 20°
- $V_{bias} = 85$ V
- $V_{bias} = 150$ V
- $V_{bias} = 145$ V
- gone into breakdown during data taking

F. Ravera et al,
AFP and PPS Production

**AFP**

- Production run at CNM finished in July 2014
- 8 lost wafers due to machine malfunctions, 5 wafers successfully finished (40 sensors)
- Slim-edged to 180 µm
- 9 good + 5 medium quality sensors after slim-edging
  → Low yield due to etching problems with DRIE
  → Identified and solved for next runs
- New IBL-like run started at CNM in February 2015
- Module assembly incl. bump- and wirebonding and QA to be done at IFAE Barcelona (on AFP flex from Oslo)

→ Installation of first two AFP stations with 2 x 4 3D FE-I4 pixel modules planned for winter shutdown 2015/16 (tight!)

**PPS**

- First FBK 6” 3D commissioning run had low yield on large sensors due to local defects
- CNM production run for PPS on-going
  - 2E default (also 1E); up to 6-chip sensors; no guard ring

→ Installation of PPS 3D pixel modules planned for 2016
New Developments for HL-LHC

- High-Luminosity LHC (HL-LHC) upgrade 2024
  → increased occupancy
  → unprecedented radiation levels ($1-2 \times 10^{16}$ $n_{eq}/cm^2$ innermost pixels)

- Development of new pixel sensors and front-end (RD53)
  - Reduced cell size: 50x50 $\mu$m$^2$ or 25x100 $\mu$m$^2$
  - Reduced threshold $\sim$1000e (in-time), $C_{det} < 100$ fF/pixel, $I_{leak} < 10$nA/pixel

- Strategy for 3D HL-LHC R&D
  - New generation of 3D productions under way
  - Explore the limits of existing 3D technology and devices from previous productions

See talks by R. Bates & R. Stringer (sensors), M. Garcia-Sciveres (chip)
HL-LHC Studies with Existing Technology

- Radiation-hardness studies on-going
  - With strips, PSI46dig, FE-I3, FE-I4: irradiations at PS, KIT, Ljubljana

- High-eta studies
  - Large clusters → large total charge → efficiency for whole cluster not a problem
  - But for 50 µm pitch very small charge deposition per pixel (almost parallel tracks): 3300 e
  - Testbeam campaign to measure CNM+FBK IBL FE-I4 devices with 80° angle in short pitch direction (50 µm)
    - 1000 e threshold
    - Cluster size 24-27
    - >99% efficiency per pixel before irradiation
    - Analysis on-going for irradiated devices

*IFAE (I. Lopez et al.)*

\[ 80^\circ (\eta=2.4) \rightarrow Q=3300 \text{ e/pixel (50 µm)} \]
New 3D Productions at CNM, FBK, Stanford, SINTEF

- Smaller cell sizes folded into existing FE geometries, also FE-RD53 prototypes
  - Cross-experiment runs: CMS PSI46dig, ATLAS FE-I3/4, LHCb Timepix/Velopix
- Reduced cell size means reduced electrode distance $L$
  - Advantageous for radiation hardness
  - Need to reduce 3D column diameter to $\sim 5 \, \mu m$ to keep dead material low
    - Go to thinner detectors with fixed aspect ratio (column length/diam.) 20:1 → all vendors
    - Increase aspect ratio to 40:1 with cryogenic technique → CNM
- Thinner sensors
  - To reduce 3D column diameter, $C_{det}$ and cluster size at high eta
    - Double-sided: CNM 200 µm
    - Single-sided
      - Si-Si wafer-bonding (FBK 100-130 µm, Stanford 75-150 µm)
      - SOI (SINTEF 50+100 µm, CNM 100+150 µm)
  - 6” wafer production (FBK, SINTEF)
  - Improved on-wafer sensor selection (CNM: poly-Si)
  - Improved breakdown (FBK: non-passing through junction column)
  - Varying depth of junction columns to sense full 3D hit information (Stanford)
  - Active (Stanford, SINTEF) or slim (CNM, FBK) edges

### Layout

| 50x50 1E | 25x100 1E | 25x100 2E |
|-----------------|-----------|-----------|
| El. Dist. $L$   | 35 µm     | 52 µm     | 28 µm |

cf. FE-I4: $L=67 \, \mu m$
Conclusions

- 3D silicon detectors are an intrinsic radiation-hard and active/slim-edge technology
  - Now mature

- First-time use in HEP experiment in ATLAS IBL
  - Successful qualification, production, installation, commissioning and first collision data
  - Operational advantages compared to planar

- Second use in forward detectors imminent
  - ATLAS Forward Physics (AFP)
  - CMS-TOTEM PPS
  - Successful qualifications (slim edge and non-uniform irradiation)
  - Productions on-going

- R&D for HL-LHC pixel detectors on-going
  - New 3D production runs at CNM, FBK, Stanford, SINTEF
  - Smaller cell size, thinner, smaller columns, partly 6”
  - R&D with existing devices on-going
IBL 3D Production

- **Sensors**
  - FE-I4 geometry: 80x336 pixels of 250x50 µm²
  - 2 n⁺ junction columns per pixel (2E) surrounded by 6 p⁺ ohmic columns in 230 µm p substrate → L=67 µm
  - Slim edge of 200 µm along columns

- **Technology details**
  - **FBK:**
    - Passing-through columns
    - p⁺ guard fence
    - Sensor selection from IV on temporary metal → 57% wafer production yield
    - Assembly yield 56% (bump-bonding issues)
  - **CNM:**
    - Columns ~20 µm shorter than thickness
    - 3D guard ring+p⁺ guard fence
    - Sensor selection from IV on guard ring (GR) → 72% wafer production yield
    - Assembly yield 50% (GR IV bad indicator)
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**IBL 3D Assembly Yield**

**$V_{BD}$ COMPARISON AFTER HYBRIDIZATION**

**ATLAS IBL Preliminary**

*FBK: Method works! Good correlation!*

**ATLAS IBL Preliminary**

*CNM: poor correlation*

**CNM 3D-Guard Ring evaluation method not good enough!**

CNM $V_{BD}$ plot is done with a small subset of produced modules, because in the QA too low bias current ($\leq 10 \, \mu A$) limit has been used.

**CNM implementing poly-silicon bias structure for new production**

A. Gaudiello - 10th "Trento" Workshop on Advanced Silicon Radiation Detectors