Journal Publication

Development of Edgeless n-on-p Planar Pixel Sensors for future ATLAS Upgrades

Bomben, M (LPNHE et al)

01 June 2013

The research leading to these results has received funding from the European Commission under the FP7 Research Infrastructures project AIDA, grant agreement no. 262025.

This work is part of AIDA Work Package 9: **Advanced infrastructures for detector R&D.**

The electronic version of this AIDA Publication is available via the AIDA web site
<<http://cern.ch/aida>> or on the CERN Document Server at the following URL:
<<http://cds.cern.ch/search?p=AIDA-PUB-2013-027>>

Development of edgeless n-on-p planar pixel sensors for future ATLAS upgrades

Marco Bomben^{a,*}, Alvisé Bagolini^b, Maurizio Boscardin^b, Luciano Bosisio^c, Giovanni Calderini^{a,d}, Jacques Chauveau^a, Gabriele Giacomini^b, Alessandro La Rosa^e, Giovanni Marchiori^a, Nicola Zorzi^b

^a Laboratoire de Physique Nucleaire et de Hautes Énergies (LPNHE) Paris, France

^b Fondazione Bruno Kessler, Centro per i Materiali e i Microsistemi (FBK-CMM) Povo di Trento (TN), Italy

^c Università di Trieste, Dipartimento di Fisica and INFN, Trieste, Italy

^d Dipartimento di Fisica E. Fermi, Università di Pisa, and INFN Sez. di Pisa, Pisa, Italy

^e Section de Physique (DPNC), Université de Genève, Genève, Switzerland

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 21 November 2012

Received in revised form

8 February 2013

Accepted 9 February 2013

Available online 16 February 2013

Keywords:

Fabrication technology

TCAD simulations

Planar silicon radiation detectors

ABSTRACT

The development of n-on-p “edgeless” planar pixel sensors being fabricated at FBK (Trento, Italy), aimed at the upgrade of the ATLAS Inner Detector for the High Luminosity phase of the Large Hadron Collider (HL-LHC), is reported. A characterizing feature of the devices is the reduced dead area at the edge, achieved by adopting the “active edge” technology, based on a deep etched trench, suitably doped to make an ohmic contact to the substrate. The project is presented, along with the active edge process, the sensor design for this first n-on-p production and a selection of simulation results, including the expected charge collection efficiency after radiation fluence of $1 \times 10^{15} \text{ n}_{\text{eq}}/\text{cm}^2$ comparable to those expected at HL-LHC (about ten years of running, with an integrated luminosity of 3000 fb^{-1}) for the outer pixel layers. We show that, after irradiation and at a bias voltage of 500 V, more than 50% of the signal should be collected in the edge region; this confirms the validity of the active edge approach.

© 2013 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

Planar pixel sensors are nowadays the standard choice for particle tracking and vertex reconstruction in high energy physics experiments. The ATLAS collaboration will upgrade its current Pixel Detector [1] in two phases: in 2013–2014 an additional 4th pixel layer will be inserted (Insertable B-Layer, IBL) [2], while for the High Luminosity phase of LHC (HL-LHC) [3] (beyond 2020) a completely new Pixel Detector is envisaged. The new pixel sensors will integrate a fluence of about $10^{16} \text{ n}_{\text{eq}}/\text{cm}^2$ in the innermost layer, down to a fluence of $\phi = 1 \times 10^{15} \text{ n}_{\text{eq}}/\text{cm}^2$ in the mid-outer layers, for an integrated luminosity of 3000 fb^{-1} , with an instantaneous luminosity of $10^{35} \text{ cm}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$. These harsh conditions demand radiation-hard devices and a finely segmented detector to cope with the expected high occupancy. Several options are under investigation for the upgrade of the ATLAS pixel detector, including diamond [4], silicon 3D [5], HV-CMOS [6] and planar sensors [7].

The new pixel sensors will need to have high geometrical acceptance: the future material budget restrictions and tight

mechanical constraints require a geometry inefficiency below 2.5% [2]. For example, the inactive areas at the device periphery should be less than $450 \mu\text{m}$ wide for IBL sensors [2]. In conventional sensor designs there is a relatively large un-instrumented area at the edge of the sensor to prevent the electric field from reaching the rim, where a large number of defects are present due to the wafer cutting; for example the current ATLAS pixel sensor has an un-instrumented region of 1.1 mm at the edge [1], including Guard Rings (GRs). GRs, placed all around the pixel area, can help to improve the voltage-handling capability.

One way to reduce or even eliminate the insensitive region along the device periphery is offered by the “active edge” technique [8], in which a deep vertical trench is etched along the device periphery throughout the entire wafer thickness, thus performing a damage free cut (this requires using a support wafer, to prevent the individual chips from getting loose). The trench is then heavily doped, extending the ohmic back-contact to the lateral sides of the device: the depletion region can then extend to the edge without causing a large current increase. This is the technology we have chosen for realizing n-on-p pixel sensors with reduced inactive zone.

Since a high bias voltage is required after heavy irradiation to maintain a deep depletion region and to ensure efficient charge collection in the presence of trapping effects, several GRs are commonly used. However, adding one or more GRs spoils the gain

* Corresponding author. Tel.: +33 144278240.

E-mail addresses: marco.bomben@cern.ch,
marco.bomben@lpnhe.in2p3.fr (M. Bomben).

of the active behavior of the sensor edge. Indeed, once carriers are created in the guard ring area, or even outside, electrons are collected by the guard rings, which, since are floating, re-emit the charge toward all the pixels next to them. Such charge, being distributed among a large number of pixels, beyond the fact that it is insufficient to trigger a hit, cannot give any information about the hit position. A compromise should be found between minimization of pixel to trench distance and presence of one or more GRs. In order to gain a better insight into this point, detectors with different termination structures, with and without GRs, have been simulated, designed and fabricated.

In this paper the active edge technology (Section 2) is presented; it has been chosen for a first production of n-on-p planar sensors at FBK (Section 3). Studies performed with TCAD simulation tools (Section 4) helped in defining the layout and making a first estimation of the charge collection efficiency expected after irradiation.

2. The active edge sensor fabrication at FBK

The sensors are fabricated on 100 mm diameter, high resistivity, p-type, Float Zone (FZ), $\langle 100 \rangle$ oriented, 200 μm thick wafers. The active edge technology [8] is used, which is a single sided process, featuring a doped trench, extending all the way through the wafer thickness, and completely surrounding the sensor. For mechanical reasons, a support wafer is therefore needed, making the back inaccessible after wafer-bonding. Thus, as first process steps, a uniform high-dose boron implant has been performed on the back side, followed by a thermal oxide growth on both sides.

The wafers have then been shipped to Sintef [9], to be wafer-bonded to a 500 μm thick silicon substrate. After having received back the wafers, the remaining process has been performed in the FBK clean-room. A solution will be identified to remove the support wafer and separate the devices¹; for the time being all the detectors have been designed in order to allow conventional saw-cut separation and substrate biasing from the front-side, through a dedicated ohmic contact (“bias tab”). In this way, the efficiency of the edge region before and after irradiation can be studied even without removing the support wafer.

Up to the trench definition, the process follows standard steps. Since the read-out electrodes are n-type, they will be shorted together by the electron inversion layer, induced by the positive fixed charge present in the oxide, unless a p-type implant, compensating such charge, surrounds the pixels. Both homogeneous (“p-spray”) and patterned (“p-stop”) implants have been used; the process splittings adopted in the fabrication batch only concern the presence and the doses of these implants, as detailed in Table 1. Electrical tests on irradiated devices will tell which combination can better guarantee both junction isolation and high breakdown voltages (which are competing demands, since they are in favor of high and low boron doses, respectively), even after years of operation in a harsh radiation environment.

Two patterned high dose implants, a phosphorus implant forming the pixel and GR junctions and a boron implant for the ohmic contact to the substrate (“bias tab”), are then performed.

The etching of the trench is accomplished by a Deep Reactive Ion Etching (DRIE) machine, the same used for the fabrication of 3D detectors [10]. In the latter case, a 10 μm diameter and 200 μm deep hole has to be etched; the etching mask is made by multiple stacks of dielectrics (oxide and nitride) plus a thick photoresist. The trenches in an active edge sensor must be fully

Table 1

List of the different isolation solutions adopted in the process.

p-Spray	p-Stop
Low dose	Absent
High dose	Absent
Low dose	Present
High dose	Present
Absent	Present

Fig. 1. SEM picture of a test trench, after cleaving the wafer perpendicularly to the surface and to the trench itself.

passing, i.e. their bottom has to reach the silicon oxide, which separates the active wafer from the support wafer. In the etching of a trench, a problem arises from the fact that the photoresist tends to wear out and/or lift along the sides of the trench, and then to be a less effective mask. Thicker stacks of dielectrics are thus needed.

After the trench is etched, its walls are boron-doped in a diffusion furnace. Thus, a continuous ohmic contact to the substrate is created on the trench wall and to the backside. FBK technology can routinely obtain very uniform, well defined and narrow trenches, as shown for example in Fig. 1. For a 200 μm thick bulk the typical trench width is of 5 μm . Functional planar p-on-n devices with active edge have been already fabricated and reported [11].

The trenches are then oxidized and filled with polysilicon. The remaining processing, arriving at the final device, whose cross-section is sketched in Fig. 2, is quite standard, and includes the following steps:

- contact opening
- metal deposition and patterning
- deposition of a passivation layer (PECVD oxide) and patterning of the same in the pad and bump-bonding regions.

Since some sensors will be bump-bonded to FE-I4 [12] read-out chips, it is necessary to select good sensors at the wafer level, by measuring their I-V characteristics. For this purpose, an additional layer of metal is deposited over the passivation and patterned into stripes, each of them shorting together a row of pixels, contacted through the small passivation openings foreseen for the bump bonding. This solution has already been adopted for the selection of good 3D FE-I4 sensors for the ATLAS IBL [14]. After the automatic current-voltage measurement on each FE-I4 sensor,

¹ The easiest solution is the lapping of the support wafer once the sensors are diced.

Fig. 2. Schematic section of the pixel sensor. The region close to the sensor's edge is portrayed, including the pixel closest to the edge, the edge region, including GRs (when present), the bias tab (present only on one edge of the device), the vertical doped trench, and the support wafer.

Fig. 3. Layout of a detail of an FE-I4 compatible pixel array.

the metal will be removed by wet etching, which does not affect the electrical characteristics of the devices.

3. The wafer layout

FE-I4 compatible pixel sensors consist of an array of 336×80 pixels, at a pitch of $50 \mu\text{m} \times 250 \mu\text{m}$, for an overall sensitive area of $16.8 \text{ mm} \times 20.0 \text{ mm}$. Thus, on a 100 mm wafer, there is space for nine FE-I4 compatible pixel sensors; a detail of one of them is shown in Fig. 3.

The nine FE-I4 sensors differ in the pixel-to-trench distance ($100, 200, 300$, and $400 \mu\text{m}$) and in the number of the guard rings

Table 2

List of FE-I4 sensors. The number of the sensors (first column) is reported for each combination of number of GRs and pixel-to-trench distance. Two different designs are envisaged for the sensor with 3 GRs and $200 \mu\text{m}$ pixel-to-trench distance. See text for more details.

Multiplicity	Number of GRs	Pixel-to-trench distance (μm)
1	0	100
1	1	100
1	2	100
4	3	200
1	5	300
1	10	400

(0, 1, 2, 3, 5, and 10) surrounding the pixel area (see Fig. 2). The sensor with 3 GRs and a $200 \mu\text{m}$ pixel-to-trench distance features two different GR designs, and each of them is repeated twice. A list of the different FE-I4 sensor versions is reported in Table 2.

A bias tab for substrate biasing (either by probing or by wire bonding), located internally to the surface delimited by the trench, is placed at about 1.5 mm from the pixelated area on one of the sides (see also Fig. 2).

The wafer layout also includes four sensors compatible with the FE-I3 read-out chip [13] (array of 160×18 pixels at a pitch of $50 \mu\text{m} \times 400 \mu\text{m}$, for an overall area of about $8 \text{ mm} \times 7.2 \text{ mm}$). The trench-pixel distance is $100 \mu\text{m}$ for all of them, while they differ in the number of GRs (1 or 2). In addition, four sensors compatible with the OmegaPIX read-out chip [15] are present (array of 96×24 pixels at a pitch of $35 \mu\text{m} \times 200 \mu\text{m}$, for an overall area of about $3.4 \text{ mm} \times 4.8 \text{ mm}$).

At the periphery of the wafer, there is room for a large number of test structures, i.e. square diodes and small arrays of FE-I4-like pixels, which differ in the number of GRs surrounding the active area and in the trench-to-pixel distance. Several possible combinations have been implemented, including all those used for the FE-I4 sensors. The aim of these structures is to test the isolation and to measure the high-voltage behavior before and (possibly) after irradiation, in order to find the best sensor configuration to be bump-bonded to the read-out chip and to select the best combination of GR number and trench distance for a possible future production.

To study the charge collection properties of the sensors, particularly in the edge region, “stripixel” arrays have also been designed. They are small 1-D arrays of about 2 mm long strips, which are an elongated version of the FE-I4 pixels with the addition of a pad at one end, so that they can be wire bonded to a read-out chip for strip detectors. Also in this case, there are several combinations of trench distances and number of GRs.

4. TCAD simulation

In order to explore and compare the properties of the design variations considered, numerical simulations were performed with TCAD tools from SILVACO [16]. 2D structures analogous to the one sketched in Fig. 2 have been simulated, varying parameters like the number of GRs and the pixel-to-trench distance. The break down (BD) behavior of the devices, the electrical field distribution and the charge collection efficiency (CCE) were studied, for simulated un-irradiated and irradiated sensors, with a fluence $\phi = 1 \times 10^{15} \text{ n}_{\text{eq}}/\text{cm}^2$. This is the expected fluence for the outer pixel layers of the new tracker at the end of the HL-LHC phase.

In the following, details on dopant parameterization, on device physics models adopted and on the radiation damage parameterization will be presented, followed by a selection of results from simulations.

4.1. Doping parameters

Each of the doped regions (n^+ for the pixel and the GRs, p^+ for the backside, p-stop, p-spray, bias tab and the trench walls) have been modeled with simple functions, depending on a set of parameters like the peak concentration, the reference concentration, i.e. the concentration value at a distance equal to the “rolloff”² from the peak position, and the vertical “rolloff” distance. The values used are summarized in Table 3.

4.2. Physics models and radiation damage parameterization

SILVACO TCAD uses a complete set of physical models for semiconductor device simulation. Among them, models for concentration dependent mobility, field dependent mobility, bandgap narrowing, concentration dependent lifetime, trap-assisted and Auger recombination were used. Oxide fixed charge density (with surface density $Q_{\text{ox}} = 10^{11}/\text{cm}^2$ before irradiation, and $Q_{\text{ox}} = 3 \times 10^{12}/\text{cm}^2$ after), generation–recombination lifetimes and surface recombination velocity have been set according to measured IV and CV characteristics of diodes from previous n-on-p Si^3 productions.

The defects at the edge have been modeled with a 1 μm wide region in which the generation–recombination lifetime was set to a very small value (10^{-12} s ; for comparison, before irradiation the corresponding value for the bulk is of 10^{-5} s). If the trench doping were not effective, a large current would appear as soon as the electric field reaches the edge area.

To describe the radiation damage, an effective model based on three deep levels in the forbidden gap was used [17]. Each of these deep levels is defined as either donor (D) or acceptor (A), and is characterized by its energy (with respect to the closest energy band), its capture cross-sections for electrons (σ_e) and holes (σ_h) and its introduction rate η , which is the proportionality term between defect concentration and radiation fluence,

Table 3

Implant parameters for simulated detectors; A (D) is for acceptor (donor) impurities.

Doped region	Impurity	Function	Peak value (cm^{-3})	Reference value (cm^{-3})	Rolloff (μm)
Pixel and GR	D	Gaussian	2×10^{19}	10^{16}	1.0
Back	A	Gaussian	2×10^{19}	10^{16}	1.0
Trench	A	erf	2×10^{19}	10^{12}	2.0
Bias tab	A	Gaussian	2×10^{19}	2×10^{16}	0.5
p-Spray	A	Gaussian	5×10^{16}	7×10^{15}	0.5
p-Stop	A	Gaussian	5×10^{17}	7×10^{16}	0.5

Table 4

Relevant parameters for acceptors (A) and donor (D) deep levels in the bandgap, describing the radiation damage.

Type	Energy (eV)	$\sigma_e(\text{cm}^2)$	$\sigma_h(\text{cm}^2)$	$\eta(\text{cm}^{-1})$
A	$E_C - 0.42$	9.5×10^{-15}	9.5×10^{-14}	1.613
A	$E_C - 0.46$	5.0×10^{-15}	5.0×10^{-14}	0.9
D	$E_V + 0.36$	3.23×10^{-13}	3.23×10^{-14}	0.9

Table 5

List of simulated sensor layouts.

# of GRs	Pixel-to-trench distance (μm)
0	100
1	100
2	100
0	200
1	200
2	200

expressed as $1 \text{ MeV n}_{\text{eq}}/\text{cm}^2$. In Table 4 these properties are summarized.

The deep level close to the centre of the bandgap is an highly effective generation center affecting the leakage current, while the other two contribute to the change of the effective doping concentration of the bulk and hence the depletion voltage.

Radiation-induced interface traps at the Si-SiO_2 interface are also included in the simulation, as described in Ref. [18].

The model was validated by comparing simulation results to the change in depletion voltage and leakage current in irradiated n-on-p diodes from previous n-on-p Si^3 productions.

4.3. Simulation results

The structure in Fig. 2 was slightly modified in the simulations: the support wafer was not present and the backside p^+ implant was metallized. This was done in order to simulate a sensor ready for use.

The sensors were simulated under reverse bias, applying a negative voltage to the back contact while keeping the pixel at ground potential; the bias tab was left floating. Different geometries were simulated, varying the number of GRs and the pixel-to-trench distance; see Table 5 for the list of simulated geometries. If present, the GRs were left floating during the simulations.

4.3.1. Current–voltage characteristic and break down voltage

Fig. 4 shows the current–voltage curves of all the simulated designs, before irradiation. The depletion voltage has been estimated using AC analysis for simulations, determining the depletion voltage value from the fit to the $\log(C)$ – $\log(V)$ curve; the

² The doping concentration decreases from its peak value to its reference value over a distance equal to the rolloff.

³ Forschungsinstitut für Mikrosensorik und Photovoltaik GmbH.

Fig. 4. Simulated IV curves for the pixel closest to the edge, for several sensor designs before irradiation (see text for details). The simulated current has been scaled to reproduce the behavior of a 50 μm wide pixel in the edge direction. The depletion voltage is indicated by the arrow.

Fig. 5. Simulated IV curves for the pixel closest to the edge, for several sensor designs after a simulated fluence of $10^{15} \text{ n}_{\text{eq}}/\text{cm}^2$ (see text for details). The simulated current has been scaled to reproduce the behavior of a 50 μm wide pixel in the edge direction. The depletion voltage is indicated by the arrow.

result was checked against the aforementioned measurements on n-on-p diodes from a former production. A sensor with a design compatible with the current ATLAS pixel modules was also simulated; it features a pixel-to-trench distance of 1.1 mm and 16 GRs.

From Fig. 4 it can be seen that before irradiation the BD voltage exceeds by at least 100 V the depletion voltage for all the designs we considered. The ATLAS-like sensor shows higher BD voltage with respect to those predicted for our edgeless detectors, but all sensors are largely over-depleted before BD. Increasing the pixel-to-trench distance yields a higher bulk-generated current, since the depleted volume can further extend laterally. Adding more GRs helps greatly in increasing the value of BD voltage, extending the operability range of the sensors. The best performance is obtained from a device with 2 GRs and a 100 μm pixel-to-trench distance. The BD voltage from simulations is in agreement with other active edge productions; see for example [19].⁴

As reported in the literature by different groups (e.g. [20]), after irradiation the BD voltage increases to much larger values. Our simulations of irradiated devices confirm this observation, as it can be seen in Fig. 5 where the same set of sensors of Fig. 4 is now presented after a simulated fluence of $10^{15} \text{ n}_{\text{eq}}/\text{cm}^2$. No BD is observed in any sensor up to 1000 V bias voltage.

4.3.2. Electric field distribution

In Fig. 6 the electric field distribution is shown for an un-irradiated detector with 2 GRs and 100 μm pixel-to-trench distance, for a bias voltage of 50 V. It can be seen that the detector is fully depleted and the electric field is maximum in the region of the p-stops, with a value of some units in 10^4 V/cm . It can also be observed that the electric field in the edge region is non-negligible, hence signal should be collectable from there.

In Fig. 7 the electric field distribution is reported for a sensor with 2 GRs and 100 μm pixel-to-trench distance, after a simulated fluence $\phi = 10^{15} \text{ n}_{\text{eq}}/\text{cm}^2$.

In Fig. 7, top, the detector is biased at 50 V; a large portion of the volume is non-depleted, i.e. the electric field is negligible. An interesting feature is an increase of the high electric field close to the back implant and to the trench: this is a known effect called double peak (DP) [21]. The fact that it is accounted for by our simulation supports the reliability of the simulation itself.

In Fig. 7, bottom, the electric field distribution is reported for the same irradiated detector at a bias voltage of 400 V, well beyond the depletion voltage ($\sim 250 \text{ V}$). The electric field extends all over the bulk, although a small undepleted region is still present at the edge, near the back-side; nonetheless, a large portion of the region between the pixel and the trench shows a sizable electric field, confirming the possibility of charge collection in the edge region, after irradiation too. As before irradiation, the electric field is maximum in the region of the p-stops, but now its value is in the 10^5 V/cm range.

4.3.3. Charge collection efficiency

To study charge collection efficiency (CCE) after irradiation, charge creation in irradiated sensors was simulated. The most interesting case is when the charge is released in the gap between the pixel and the trench, when no GRs are present. If a significant amount of charge can be collected after irradiation in that region, the edgeless concept would be verified to work.

Our sensor was illuminated from the front side with a simulated 1060 nm laser beam, setting its power in order to generate the same charge that would be released by a minimum ionizing particle (MIP) traversing 200 μm of silicon ($\sim 2.6 \text{ fC}$). The laser beam was originating above the front side of the detector, with a 2 μm wide gaussian beamspot. The duty cycle of the laser was 50 ns, with the power ramping up in 1 ns, remaining constant for 10 ns and ramping down in the next nanosecond.

The CCE was studied as a function of the bias voltage for the detector with no GRs and a 100 μm trench-to-pixel distance. Two incidence points of the laser beam have been considered: one within the pixel and the other in the edge region, at 50 μm distance from the pixel. In the following they will be identified as “Pixel” and “Edge”, respectively.

Based on the properties of the laser beam and of the target material, the simulation program determined the charge of carriers photogenerated inside the device by one pulse. The charge collected by the pixel was defined as the integral over the laser duty cycle of the current flowing through the pixel, once the stable leakage current had been subtracted. Finally, the CCE was obtained by dividing this collected charge by the total photogenerated charge.

In Fig. 8 the CCE is presented as a function of the bias voltage for the simulated fluence for the two incidence points of the laser beam.

At a fluence $\phi = 10^{15} \text{ n}_{\text{eq}}/\text{cm}^2$ more than 50% of the signal is collected in the “Edge” region at a bias voltage of 500 V; as a comparison, 70% of the signal is retained in the “Pixel” region. The expected collected charge in the “Edge” region is then of $\sim 8 \text{ ke}$,⁵ which corresponds to a signal large enough to trigger the FEI4 read-out chip. Both in the “Pixel” and in the “Edge” region the

⁴ The trenches are doped with a four-quadrant ion implantation of boron ions.

⁵ The MPV for the charge created by a MIP in 200 μm is 16 ke.

Fig. 6. Electric field distribution for non-irradiated device at $V_{\text{bias}} = 50$ V. The sensor has 2 GRs with a $100 \mu\text{m}$ distance between trench and pixel.

Fig. 7. Electric field distributions for a device irradiated with a fluence $\phi = 10^{15} \text{ n}_{\text{eq}}/\text{cm}^2$. Top: $V_{\text{bias}} = 50$ V; bottom: $V_{\text{bias}} = 400$ V. The sensor has 2 GRs and a $100 \mu\text{m}$ distance between edge and pixel.

Fig. 8. Charge collection efficiency as a function of bias voltage for an irradiated device at a fluence $\phi = 10^{15} \text{ n}_{eq}/\text{cm}^2$. The laser is entering the detector either in the pixel region (“Pixel”) or in the un-instrumented region (“Edge region”). The sensor has no GRs, and a 100 μm distance between edge and pixel.

effect of trapping can be observed: the collected charge reaches a plateau at high voltage, but there the CCE is not of 100%. No charge is collected from the “Edge” region below 100 V: indeed at 100 V bias the electric field is negligible in that region when there are no GRs. It can be seen that while the maximum CCE for a charge created in the pixel region is reached at a bias voltage above ~ 400 V, in the “Edge” region a bias voltage of 600 V is needed: this is consistent with the depletion zone extending laterally.

Calculations based on trapping time experimental data [22] for our sensor thickness and our target fluence produce CCE estimations in agreement with our simulations.

5. Conclusions and outlook

In view of the Large Hadron Collider High Luminosity (HL-LHC) phase, an upgrade of the ATLAS Inner Detector is envisaged. New pixel sensors will have to work in an unprecedentedly harsh environment; moreover, material budget restrictions and tight mechanical constraints demand for a reduction of the inactive region at the edge of sensors.

FBK Trento and LPNHE Paris are developing new planar n-on-p pixel sensors for the ATLAS detector upgrade, characterized by a reduced inactive region at the edge thanks to a vertical doped lateral surface at the device boundary, the “active edge” technology. Simulation studies show the effectiveness of this technique in reducing the dead area while retaining a large margin of

operability in terms of bias voltage, even after simulated fluences comparable to those expected at the end of the HL-LHC phase for the external layers; they also show that after irradiation more than 50% of the signal is retained, even in the “Edge” region for the sensor with 100 μm pixel-to-trench distance.

Next steps will be a full electrical characterization of these “active edge” devices, followed by functional tests of the pixel sensors with radioactive sources and eventually in a beam test, after having bump bonded a number of pixel sensors to the FE-I4 read-out chips.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to express their gratitude to E. Fretwurst for his useful discussions. This work was supported in part by the Autonomous Province of Trento, Project MEMS2, and in part by the Italian National Institute for Nuclear Physics (INFN).

References

- [1] The ATLAS collaboration, JINST 3 P07007, 2008.
- [2] ATLAS TDR 19, CERN/LHCC 2010-013, <<http://cdsweb.cern.ch/record/1291633/files/ATLAS-TDR-019.pdf>>.
- [3] M. Lamont, <http://dx.doi.org/10.3204/DESY-PROC-2010-01/8>.
- [4] D. Asner, et al., Nuclear Instruments and Methods in Physics Research Section A 636 (2011) 125.
- [5] P. Hansson, et al., Nuclear Instruments and Methods in Physics Research Section A 628 (1) (2011) 216.
- [6] I. Peric, Journal of Instrumentation 7 (2012) C08002.
- [7] M. Bomben, et al., Physics Procedia 37 (2012) 940.
- [8] C.J. Kenney, et al., IEEE Transactions on Nuclear Science NS-48 (6) (2001) 2405.
- [9] SINTEF, Stiftelsen SINTEF, Box 4760 Sluppen, NO-7465 Trondheim, Norway.
- [10] C. Da Via, et al., Nuclear Instruments and Methods in Physics Research Section A 694 (2012) 321.
- [11] M. Povoli, et al., Nuclear Instruments and Methods in Physics Research Section A 658 (2011) 103.
- [12] M. Garcia-Sciveres, et al., Nuclear Instruments and Methods in Physics Research Section A 636 (2011) S155.
- [13] I. Peric, et al., Nuclear Instruments and Methods in Physics Research Section A 565 (2006) 178.
- [14] E. Vianello, et al., Nuclear Science Symposium and Medical Imaging Conference (NSS/MIC), 2011 IEEE, 2011, p. 523.
- [15] A. Lounis, et al., Contributed to: Topical Workshop on Electronics for Particle Physics (TWEPP-09), Paris, France, 2009.
- [16] Silvaco, Inc. 4701 Patrick Henry Drive, Bldg 2 Santa Clara, CA 95054.
- [17] D. Pennicard, et al., Nuclear Instruments and Methods in Physics Research Section A 592 (2008) 16.
- [18] J. Schwandt, et al., Journal of Instrumentation 7 (2012) C01006, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1088/1748-0221/7/01/C01006>.
- [19] A. Macchiolo, et al., Nuclear Instruments and Methods in Physics Research Section A. arxiv:hep-th/1210.7933, submitted for publication.
- [20] P. Weigell, et al., Nuclear Instruments and Methods in Physics Research Section A 658 (2011) 36.
- [21] V. Chiochia, et al., Nuclear Instruments and Methods in Physics Research Section A 568 (2006) 51.
- [22] G. Kramberger, et al., Nuclear Instruments and Methods in Physics Research Section A 476 (2002) 645.