Radiation resistant LGAD design
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\textbf{Abstract}

In this paper, we report on the radiation resistance of 50-micron thick LGAD detectors manufactured at the Fondazione Bruno Kessler employing different dopings of the gain layer. LGAD detectors with a gain layer made of Boron, Boron low-diffusion, Gallium, Carbonated Boron and Carbonated Gallium have been designed and successfully produced. These sensors have been exposed to neutron fluences up to $\phi_n \sim 3 \cdot 10^{16}$ n/cm$^2$ and to proton fluences up to $\phi_p \sim 9 \cdot 10^{15}$ p/cm$^2$ to test their radiation resistance. The experimental results show that Gallium-doped LGAD are more heavily affected by the initial acceptor removal mechanism than those doped with Boron, while the addition of Carbon reduces this effect both for Gallium and Boron doping. The Boron low-diffusion gain layer shows a higher radiation resistance than that of standard Boron implant, indicating a dependence of the initial acceptor removal mechanism upon the implant density.
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The Low Gain Avalanche Detector design is an evolution of the standard silicon sensors design that incorporates low, controlled gain \cite{1} in the signal formation mechanism. The overarching idea is to design silicon detectors that have a value of gain such that the signals that are large enough to assure excellent timing performance while maintaining almost unchanged levels of noise \cite{2}.

Charge multiplication in silicon sensors happens when the charge carriers
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(electrons and holes) are in electric fields of the order of \( E \sim 300 \text{ kV/cm} \) (see\[3\]). Under this condition, the electrons (and to less extent the holes) acquire sufficient kinetic energy to generate additional e/h pairs by impact ionization. Field values of \( \sim 300 \text{ kV/cm} \) can be obtained by implanting an appropriate acceptor (or donor) charge density \( N_A \) (of the order \( N_A \sim 10^{16}/\text{cm}^3 \)) that, when depleted, locally generates very high fields. For this reason, an additional doping layer has been added at the \( n-p \) junction in the LGAD design, Figure 1.

![Figure 1: Schematic of a traditional silicon diode (left) and of a Low-Gain Avalanche Diode (right). The additional \( p^+ \) layer underneath the \( n^{++} \) electrode creates, when depleted, a large electric field that generates charge multiplications.](image)

1. Radiation effects on LGAD sensors

It has been shown in previous studies \[4, 5\] that the Boron-doped gain layer in LGAD is susceptible to inactivation when exposed to neutrons and protons irradiations. This effect, called initial acceptor removal, is not specific to the LGAD design and it has been measured before in standard silicon sensors \[6\]. Concurrently with the initial acceptor removal mechanism, irradiation causes also the creation of acceptor-like defects due to deep traps. The combined effects are described by equation \( (1) \) \[2, 7\]

\[
N_A(\phi) = g_{eff}\phi + N_A(\phi = 0)e^{-c\phi},
\]

where \( g_{eff} = 0.02 \text{ [cm}^{-1}] \) (see for example chapter 5 of \[8\]), \( \phi \) the irradiation fluence \( \text{[cm}^{-2}] \), \( N_A(\phi = 0) \) \( (N_A(\phi)) \) the initial (after a fluence \( \phi \)) acceptor density \( \text{[n/cm}^3] \), and \( c \text{ [cm}^2] \) is a constant that depends on the initial acceptor concentration \( N_A(\phi = 0) \) and on the type of irradiation. The first term of equation \( (1) \) accounts for acceptor creation by deep traps while the second term for the initial acceptor removal mechanism. The factor \( c \) can be rewritten as \( \phi_o = 1/c \), making more apparent its meaning: \( \phi_o \) is the fluence needed to reduce \( N_A(\phi = 0) \) to \( 1/e \) of its initial value.
1.1. Acceptor removal mechanism

The microscopic origin of the acceptor removal mechanism has not been fully understood, however, it is plausible that the progressive inactivation of the Boron atoms with irradiation happens via the formation of ion-acceptor complexes. In this model, the active (substitutionals) doping elements are partially removed from their lattice sites due to a 2-step process: the ionizing radiation produces interstitial Si atoms that subsequently inactivate the doping elements via kick-out reactions (Watkins mechanism [9]) that produce ion-acceptor complexes (interstitials) [10]. Secondary Ion Mass Spectrometer (SIMS) measurements support this view: Fig. 2 shows the densities of Boron atoms forming the gain layer in a new (M83) and a heavily irradiated (M80, irradiated to $1 \cdot 10^{16}\ n_{eq}/cm^2$) LGAD. Remarkably, the SIMS results are almost identical, indicating that the decrease of the active gain layer doping in irradiated sensors does not correspond to a disappearance of the Boron atoms, only to their inactivation.

Figure 2: Density of Boron atoms forming the gain layer in a new (M83) and a heavily irradiated (M80, irradiated to $1 \cdot 10^{16}\ n_{eq}/cm^2$) LGAD. Even though the gain layer of the M80 sensor is almost completely deactivated, M83 and M80 have the same gain layer doping profile.

1.2. A parametrization of the acceptor removal mechanism

In a simple model of acceptor removal [11], the number of initial acceptor atoms deactivated by radiation is proportional to the fluence and therefore $\phi_0$ should increase with $N_A(\phi = 0)$: the larger $N_A(\phi = 0)$, the more radiation is needed to reduce it to $1/e$ of its initial value. Following the two-step model
outlined above, we can write the number of initial acceptors removed by a fluence \( \phi_o \) as:

\[
\phi_o N_{Si} \sigma_c = (1 - 1/e) N_A(\phi = 0),
\]

(2)

where \( N_{Si} = 5 \cdot 10^{22} \text{ cm}^{-3} \) is the silicon atomic density, and \( \sigma_c \) is the cross section for an impinging particle to create the interstitial atoms that subsequently deactivate an acceptor. Equation 2 assumes that each interstitial atom created by radiation is in the proximity of acceptors, however this will not be the case at low acceptor density. For this reason, a density factor \( D \) needs to be included in equation 2. The analytic form of \( D \) is not unique, any smooth function that goes to 0 at low densities and to 1 at large densities is acceptable, for example:

\[
D = \frac{1}{1 + \left( \frac{N_{Ao}}{N_A(\phi = 0)} \right)^{N/3}},
\]

(3)

where \( N_{Ao} \) is the density at which an interstitial state has a probability of 0.5 of being in the vicinity of an acceptor and \( N \) is an exponent that needs to be determined experimentally. Figure 3 shows the values of D1, D2 and D3 with \( N_{Ao} = 2.5 \cdot 10^{16} \text{ n/cm}^3 \).

Combining equations 2 and 3, we obtain:

\[
\phi_o N_{Si} \sigma_c \frac{1}{1 + \left( \frac{N_{Ao}}{N_A(\phi = 0)} \right)^{N/3}} = (1 - 1/e) N_A(\phi = 0),
\]

(4)

where \( \sigma_c = 6.3 \cdot 10^{-22} \text{ cm}^2 \) and \( N_{Ao} = 2.5 \cdot 10^{16} \text{ n/cm}^3 \) are fit parameters. Analytic expressions of \( D \) using a linear (D1 with \( N = 1 \)), a surface (D2 with \( N = 2 \)) and a volumetric (D3 with \( N = 3 \)) density factor were tried, finding the best agreement between model and data with \( N = 2 \). The parameterizations of equation 4 without density factor and each of the three density factors (D1,
D2, and D3) are superposed in Figure 4 to experimental points taken from [12, 13, 14, 15]. The effect of the density factor is important at low initial acceptor density, where the overlap probability between interstitial states and acceptors is small and therefore a higher fluence is needed to have initial acceptor removal.

Figure 4: The two plots show the parametrization of $c$ (bottom) and $\phi_o$ (top) from equation 4 together with experimental points as a function of the initial acceptor density. The top plot also shows the parametrization of equation 4 with and without the effect of the density factors. The best agreement data - parametrization is obtained with the D2 density factor.

Acceptor creation and initial acceptor removal mechanisms described by equation 1 happen concurrently in the multiplication layer as well as in the bulk. The evolutions of several initial doping densities as a function of neutron fluence are shown schematically in Figure 5: the initial Boron doping is removed as the fluence increases and in the meantime new acceptor-like states are created. At sufficiently high values of fluence, all initial doping values converge on the doping density of the high resistivity PiN diodes, indicating a complete disappearance of the initial acceptor density.

2. Production of LGAD with different gain layer doping

Three hypotheses have been put forward for the design of more radiation hard LGADs: (i) it has been reported in [14, 16] that Gallium might be less prone than Boron to the Watkins mechanism, (ii) the presence of Carbon atoms might slow down the acceptor removal mechanism by producing ion-carbon complexes instead of ion-acceptor complexes, and (iii) a narrower doping layer with
Figure 5: Evolution of acceptor density as a function of neutron fluence for different initial acceptor densities. The lowest acceptor concentration, $N_A = 10^{12} - 10^{13} N/cm^3$, corresponds to the bulk of a high resistivity PiN sensor. The curves have been obtained with a value of $g_{eff} = 0.02$ and varying values of $c$ (indicated in the legend in unit of $10^{16} cm^2$) as obtained from the parametrization show in Figure 4.

higher initial doping should be less prone to the acceptor removal mechanism than a wider doping layer with a lower initial doping.

To test these hypotheses, 50-micron thick LGAD sensors with 5 different gain layer configurations have been manufactured at the Fondazione Bruno Kessler FBK, Trento, Italy: (i) Boron (B), (ii) Boron low-diffusion (B LD), (iii) Gallium (Ga), (iv) carbonated Boron (B+C), and (v) carbonated Gallium (Ga+C). This production is called UFSD2. It is important to note that carbon enrichment has been done uniquely in the volume of the gain layer to avoid a sharp increase of the leakage current. Details on the production have been presented in [17], a short summary of the UFSD2 production is shown in Table 1. 18 wafers were processed, 10 with a B-doped and 8 with a Ga-doped gain layer. The B-doped gain layer wafers W3-10 have 3 splits of dose, in 2% steps, while the Ga-doped gain layer wafers W11-19 have also 3 splits of dose, however in 4% steps. Two splits of B-doped and one of the Ga-doped gain layers have been co-implanted with Carbon, with two different doses of Carbon. Two wafers with a B-doped gain layer (W1,2) were exposed to a reduced thermal load during production to minimize the diffusion of Boron (Boron low-diffusion). The Ga-doped wafers, given the higher diffusivity of Gallium, were also exposed to a reduced thermal load, however, the width of the resulting Gallium implant is nevertheless wider even than that of the B-doped gain layer with a high thermal load.

UFSD2 layout comprises of many hundreds of devices, from $1 \times 1 \ mm^2$ single

---

1 FBK, Fondazione Bruno Kessler, Trento, Italy
Table 1: Summary of the doping splits in the UFSD2 production. The last column reports the irradiation campaign (p = protons, n = neutrons).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wafer #</th>
<th>Dopant</th>
<th>Gain Dose</th>
<th>Carbon</th>
<th>Diffusion</th>
<th>irradiation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Boron</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Boron</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Boron</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Boron</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Boron</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>p, n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Boron</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Boron</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Boron</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Boron</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Boron</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Gallium</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Gallium</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Gallium</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>p, n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Gallium</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>p, n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Gallium</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Gallium</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Gallium</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Gallium</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Gallium</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

diodes to large arrays of pads and strips [17]. For this irradiation campaign, pairs of $1 \times 1$ mm$^2$ PiN - LGAD diodes were used, as shown in Figure 6. Combined PiN-LGAD irradiation is a very useful tool in assessing the evolution of the LGAD behavior with fluence, as at each irradiation step the PiN diodes is used as a reference.

Figure 6: Example of a pair PiN-LGAD with 4 guard-rings manufactured by FBK used in the analysis presented in this work. Each sensor is 1x1 mm$^2$ and 50-micron thick.

2.1. Properties of LGAD with different gain layer doping

Figure 7 shows representative $1/C^2$-V curves for the diodes used in the irradiation campaign: on the top side for the B and B+C gain layers while on the
buttom part for Ga and Ga+C doped gain layers.

The voltage necessary to deplete the gain layer, \( V_{GL} \), is proportional to the average active doping \( N_A \) in the gain layer:

\[
V_{GL} = \frac{q N_A}{2\epsilon} w^2
\]

where \( w \) is the thickness of the gain layer, normally \( \sim 1\mu m \), and \( q \) the electron electric charge. Assuming a constant value of \( w \), \( V_{GL} \) is directly proportional to \( N_A \). In the \( 1/C^2\)-\( V \) curves, \( V_{GL} \) can be recognized as the point where the \( 1/C^2 \)\(-V \) curve starts a sharp increase, while the voltage of the diode full depletion, \( V_{FD} \), is where the \( 1/C^2 \) becomes constant. The voltage difference between \( V_{FD} \) and \( V_{GL} \), \( \Delta V_{Bulk} = V_{FD} - V_{GL} \), is proportional to the doping of the sensor bulk. For non irradiated sensors, as those shown in Figure 7, \( \Delta V_{Bulk} \) is of the order of a few volts indicating a doping of \( N_{Bulk} \sim 2 - 3 \cdot 10^{12} \) atoms/cm\(^3\). We indicate \( V_{GL} \) measured with the \( 1/C^2\)-\( V \) curves with the symbol \( V_{CGL} \).

Figure 7: Average \( 1/C^2\)-\( V \) curves for each of the wafer used in the irradiation campaign. The labels on the left plot indicate the points where the gain layer and the bulk deplete. Each curve is the average of 40 diodes.

It is visible that Carbon implantation reduces the activated fraction of Gallium, while the Carbon effects on Boron is minimal: \( V_{GL} \) is on average 0.3V
smaller for B+C LGADs with respect that of B LGADs. A discussion of the effects of Carbon co-implantation can be found in [18].

The measurements were taken with the Keysight B1505A parameter analyzer using as the model of the silicon detector a $C_p - R_p$ circuit. The $1/C^2$-V curves were obtained at room temperature with a probing frequency of 1 kHz. The value of the frequency was varied between 1 and 3 kHz finding no dependence of the results on the operating frequency. Analyzing how $R_p$ changes with bias, we noticed that in coincidence with $V_{GL}$ the $R_p$ curve presents a cusp, allowing for an easy identification of the exact voltage of the gain layer depletion. We indicate $V_{GL}$ measured with the $B_p$-V curves with the symbol $V_{GL}^R$. The correspondence between $V_{GL}$ and $V_{GL}^R$ is shown in Figure 8 for a sensor from W1 irradiated to $3 \times 10^{15} \text{n}_{eq}/\text{cm}^2$.

Figure 8: This plot shows the correspondence between $V_{GL}^C$ and $V_{GL}^R$ for a sensor from W1 irradiated to $3 \times 10^{15} \text{n}_{eq}/\text{cm}^2$.

In the following analysis, the gain layer depletion voltage has been determined using a combination of the $V_{GL}^C$ and $V_{GL}^R$ values: at low fluences both $V_{GL}^C$ and $V_{GL}^R$ are easily identifiable, while for fluences above $1 \times 10^{15} \text{n}_{eq}/\text{cm}^2$ the position of $V_{GL}^R$ is easier to identify. The combination of $V_{GL}^C$ and $V_{GL}^R$ allows determining $V_{GL}$ with an uncertainty of 0.5 V.

An interesting parameter to understand the acceptor removal mechanism is the spatial extension of the gain layer. Table 2 reports, in arbitrary unit, the measured FWHM of the gain layer implants for the wafers exposed to irradiation. The implant widths have been extracted from the doping profiles obtained from the $1/C^2$-V curves using the relationship:

$$N(w) = \frac{2}{qA} \frac{1}{d(1/C(V)^2)/dV} = \frac{\epsilon A^2}{C(V)}, \quad (6)$$

where $N(w)$ is the doping density at a depth $w$ and $A$ is the diode’s area.

These widths are consistent with the observation reported in [18] that carbon co-implantation might yield to narrower implant widths.
Table 2: Gain layer FWHM of the wafers used in the irradiation campaign

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wafer #</th>
<th>Dopant</th>
<th>Gain Dose</th>
<th>Width [a.u.]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>B LD</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>B + C</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Ga</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Ga + C</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Irradiation campaign

Table 3 reports the wafers and the irradiation steps used in the irradiation campaign. A set of LGADs was irradiated without bias with neutrons in the JSI research reactor of TRIGA type in Ljubljana. The neutron spectrum and flux are well known [19] and the fluence is quoted in 1 MeV equivalent neutrons per cm$^2$ ($n_{eq}/cm^2$). A different set of LGADs was irradiated with protons at the IRRAD CERN irradiation facility [20]. The IRRAD proton facility is located on the T8 beam-line at the CERN PS East Hall where the primary proton beam with a momentum of 24 GeV/c is extracted from the PS ring. In IRRAD, irradiation experiments are performed using the primary protons, prior reaching the beam dump located downstream of the T8 beam line. After irradiation, the devices were annealed for 80 min at 60 °C. Afterward, the devices were kept in cold storage at -20 °C. The table reports the actual number of protons: the fluences in $n_{eq}/cm^2$ can be obtained by multiplying the proton fluences by the NIEL factor for 24 GeV/c (NIEL = 0.6).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wafer #</th>
<th>Dopant</th>
<th>Gain Dose</th>
<th>n fluence $10^{15}n/cm^2$</th>
<th>p fluence $10^{15}p/cm^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>B LD</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.2, 0.4, 0.8, 1.5, 3.0, 6.0</td>
<td>0.2, 0.9, 3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.2, 0.4, 0.8, 1.5, 3.0, 6.0</td>
<td>0.9, 3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>B + C</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>0.2, 0.4, 0.8, 1.5, 3.0, 6.0</td>
<td>0.9, 3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>0.2, 0.4, 0.8, 1.5, 3.0, 6.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Ga</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.2, 0.4, 0.8, 1.5, 3.0, 6.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Ga + C</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.2, 0.4, 0.8, 1.5, 3.0, 6.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Wafers and fluences used in the irradiation campaign.
4. Simulation of different initial acceptor removal rate

As reported in equation (1), the initial acceptor removal effect is parametrized by the function $c(N_A(\phi = 0))$. Using the simulation program WF2\cite{21}, the effect of larger or smaller values of $c$ on the reduction of the gain has been simulated. Figure 9 reports the bias voltage needed to keep a constant gain value $= 10$ as a function of neutron fluence for the situation where the value of $c(N_A(\phi = 0))$ is twice, a half or a quarter of the presently measured value of $c(N_A(\phi = 0)) = 2 - 3 \cdot 10^{16} \text{ cm}^{-3} \sim 6 \cdot 10^{-16} \text{ cm}^2$. The simulation has been calculated using the parametrization shown in equation (1), with $g_{eff} = 0.02 \text{ cm}^{-1}$ and the $c$ values (in unit of $[10^{-16} \text{ cm}^2]$) shown in the legend. On the plot, the measured points from Hamamatsu LGADs are also reported \cite{5}.

Figure 9: Evolution of the bias voltage needed to obtain a constant value of gain, $G = 10$, as a function of fluence: as the gain layer doping is progressively deactivated by irradiation, the bias voltage is increased to compensate for the reduction of the electric field generated by the gain layer. The figure shows how a change in the value of the $c$ exponent (in unit of $[10^{-16} \text{ cm}^2]$) changes this evolution.

As Figure 9 shows, when the gain layer doping is progressively deactivated by irradiation, the bias voltage should be increased to compensate for the reduction of the electric field generated by the gain layer. Smaller values of $c$ move the need to increase the bias voltage to progressively higher fluences, making LGAD operation more stable.

5. Results

Figure 10 shows the evolution of the foot position ($V_{GL}^C$) with increasing neutrons irradiation. The lowest irradiation level is $\phi = 2 \cdot 10^{14} \text{ n}_{eq}/\text{cm}^2$, and the fluence increases by a factor of 2 in each of the following curves.

\footnote{Shareware at \url{http://cern.ch/nicolo}}
Figure 10: Evolution of the $1/C^2-V$ curve with neutron irradiation for LGAD sensors with different gain layer doping. Irradiation fluence start at $\phi = 2 \cdot 10^{14} n_{eq}/cm^2$ and double at each step up to $\phi = 6 \cdot 10^{15} n_{eq}/cm^2$. Top left: Boron, Top right: Gallium, Bottom left: Boron+Carbon, Bottom right: Gallium+ Carbon
There is a clear difference in the evolution of $V_{GL}^{C}$ as a function of irradiation for carbonated and non-carbonated gain layer doping. This fact indicates that, for equal fluence, carbonated gain layers retain a higher active doping. Comparing the 4 plots in Figure 10, it is evident that the slopes of the $1/C^2$ curves at equal fluence are similar, indicating, via equation 6, that the doping of the bulk is evolving in the same way for all sensors.

The $c(N_A(\phi = 0))$ coefficient can be measured by fitting an exponential function to the fraction of still active gain layer as a function of fluence, as shown in equation 7:

$$
\frac{V_{GL}(\phi)}{V_{GL}(0)} = \frac{N_A(\phi)}{N_A(0)} = e^{-c(N_A(0))\phi}.
$$

The fractions of active gain layer as a function of fluence are shown in Figure 11 for neutron irradiation and in Figure 12 for proton irradiation, together with the exponential fits.

Figure 11: Fraction of gain layer still active as a function of neutron irradiation.

Table 4 reports the compilation of measured values of $c$ for neutron ($c_n$) and proton ($c_p$) irradiation, and their ratios, ordered in decreasing value. The value of each coefficient has been estimated averaging the measurements of 2 irradiated samples. From the spread of the two measurements, and the uncertainty of the fit, an error of $\pm 1.0$ has been assigned to the determination of $c_n$ while, given the presence of only one measurement per fluence, the error on $c_p$ has been evaluated to be $\pm 1.5$. 13
Figure 12: Fraction of gain layer still active as a function of proton irradiation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gain Layer</th>
<th>$c_n , [10^{16} , \text{cm}^2]$ (No NIEL)</th>
<th>$c_p , [10^{16} , \text{cm}^2]$ (No NIEL)</th>
<th>$c_n/c_p$ (NIEL)</th>
<th>$c_p , [10^{16} , \text{cm}^2]$ (NIEL)</th>
<th>$c_n/c_p$ (NIEL)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ga</td>
<td>7.1 ± 1.0</td>
<td>9. ± 1.5</td>
<td>0.79 ± 0.22</td>
<td>15. ± 1.5</td>
<td>0.47 ± 0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>5.4 ± 1.0</td>
<td>6.5 ± 1.5</td>
<td>0.83 ± 0.29</td>
<td>10.8 ± 1.5</td>
<td>0.50 ± 0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B LD</td>
<td>4.7 ± 1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ga + C</td>
<td>4.0 ± 1.0</td>
<td>4.2 ± 1.5</td>
<td>0.95 ± 0.43</td>
<td>7.0 ± 1.5</td>
<td>0.57 ± 0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B + C</td>
<td>2.1 ± 1.0</td>
<td>3.3 ± 1.5</td>
<td>0.63 ± 0.66</td>
<td>5.5 ± 1.5</td>
<td>0.38 ± 0.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Compilation of the initial acceptor removal coefficient for neutron $c_n$ and proton $c_p$ irradiation for an initial doping density of $N(0) \sim 1 - 2 \cdot 10^{16} \, \text{atoms/cm}^3$. The third column shows the ratio $c_n/c_p$. The error on the $c_n$ has been estimated to be ±1.0 while on $c_p$ is ±1.5. The fourth and fifth columns report the $c_p$ values when the NIEL factor has been applied to the proton fluence.

6. Analysis

Several results can be extracted from Table 4:

- The addition of Carbon improves the radiation resistance: the $c_n, c_p$ coefficients are about a factor of two smaller for B+C and Ga+C LGADs with respect of those of B or Ga.

- Considering the real value of proton fluences, the measured $c_p$ and $c_n$ coefficients are compatible with each other, albeit the $c_p$ values are consistently higher. On the other hand, if the NIEL factor is applied to the protons fluence (NIEL = 0.6 for 24 GeV/c protons), the $c_p$ factors are almost twice $c_n$.

- Narrower and more doped gain layer implants are less prone to initial acceptor removal: B LD has a lower $c_n$ coefficient than B.
The measured coefficients \( c_{p}, c_{n} \) for Gallium doping are larger than those for Boron doping. This difference is partly due to the lower Gallium density used in W14 with respect of the Boron density in W3 and W8, however, the difference is larger than what it would be just due to this effect. This fact might indicate a higher acceptor removal rate of Gallium doping with respect of that of Boron doping. In \([14]\), a lower acceptor removal rate of Gallium has been measured with respect of the data reported in this work, however, the reason might be that the initial Gallium density in \([14]\) was higher than that of this work.

The gain in LGADs is required to be 20 - 30: this fact determines that the total amount of doping in the gain layer is roughly a constant in every LGAD. This given amount of doping can be distributed over narrower or wider implants, varying the doping density: equation \([4]\) predicts that in LGADs with wider and less doped implants the initial acceptor removal mechanism is faster. The values of the \( c_{n} \) coefficients as a function of the implant widths reported in Table \(2\) are shown in Figure \(13\): the plot clearly shows that in wider implants the initial acceptor removal mechanism is faster. This effect holds true also for a carbonated gain layer.

A compilation of values of \( \phi_{o} \) for neutron irradiation measured in this work and in \([12, 14]\) is shown in Figure \(14\). All sensors are \(\sim50\)-micron thick, however, they differ slightly in the doping profile as they don’t all have the same gain. The plot reports measurements for LGADs manufactured by CNM with a Gallium or a Boron gain layer, 4 different types of Boron LGADs manufactured by HPK (indicated with the names 50A, 50B, 50C and 50D in order of increasing gain layer doping levels) and several LGADs manufactured by FBK. The carbonated gain layers have clearly the largest values of \( \phi_{o} \), followed by B LD: the 1/e
fluence for B+C LGADs is almost $0.5 \cdot 10^{16} \text{n}_{eq}/\text{cm}^2$.

![Graph of acceptor removal coefficient](image)

Figure 14: Compilation of values of the initial acceptor removal coefficient $\phi_n$ for LGADs manufactured by 3 different foundries (HPK, FBK, and CNM) with different gain layer doping compositions.

Figure 15 updates Figure 4 including the results obtained in this analysis: the new points are indicated with empty symbols and cluster around $N_A(\phi = 0) \sim 2 - 6 \cdot 10^{16}$.
Figure 15: Values of the $\phi_o$ and $c$ coefficients from previous measurements and from this analysis (empty symbols).
7. Measurement of the gain due to the gain-layer after a fluence of \( \phi = 8 \cdot 10^{14}, 1.5 \cdot 10^{15} \) and \( 3 \cdot 10^{15} \) \( \text{n/cm}^2 \).

Using a collimated picosecond laser system with a light spot diameter of \( \sim 20 \) microns and a wavelength of 1064 nm, the gains of B, B LD, B+C, Ga and Ga+C LGADs were measured as a function of bias voltage for 3 neutron irradiation levels: \( \phi = 8 \cdot 10^{14}, 1.5 \cdot 10^{15} \) and \( 3 \cdot 10^{15} \) \( \text{n/cm}^2 \). The value of the gain was obtained as the ratio of the signal areas obtained in an LGAD and in a PiN diode irradiated to the same fluence.

The results are shown in Figure 16, the top left plot shows the gain curves before irradiation, while the following 5 plots show the gain normalized to the respective unirradiated gain at Bias = 150V. As expected, B+C is the most radiation resistant LGAD: after a fluence of \( 8 \cdot 10^{14} \) \( \text{n/cm}^2 \) the gain layer still generate at bias = 500V the same gain as it had when not irradiated at bias = 150V. Likewise, Ga is the weakest retaining at 500V only 10% of the initial gain.

Figure 16: Top left plot: gain curves before irradiation. Following 5 plots: for each gain layer type, the plot shows the fraction of gain at 3 fluences normalized to each respective gain at Bias = 150V.
Confirming the results on the values of the $c_n$ coefficient, carbonated gain layers (B+C and Ga+C) show higher gain values than those without Carbon for the same fluence level. Likewise, B LD maintains higher gain values than B; at $\phi = 3\cdot10^{15}\ n/cm^2$ only B+C gain layer is still active. It is possible that by optimizing the Carbon dose this effect can be further enhanced.

8. Conclusions and outlook

50-micron thick LGADs manufactured by FBK with 5 different types of gain layer doping (B, B+C, Ga, Ga+C and B LD) have been irradiated with neutrons and protons. The results show that (i) carbonated gain layer are at least a factor of two more radiation resistant than the equivalent non-carbonated gain layer, (ii) Gallium doping is less radiation resistant than Boron doping, (iii) narrower gain layer implants are more radiation resistant than wider implants and that (iv) proton irradiation is about a factor of two more harmful than neutron irradiation with respect of the initial acceptor removal mechanism.

Carbonated gain layer holds the possibility of designing silicon sensors with gain with enhanced radiation resistance. We plan to further investigate the property of carbonated gain layer by producing gain layers with several carbon doses, to optimize the radiation resistance of the LGAD design. We are confident that these findings, albeit obtained for LGAD sensors, can be successfully implemented in other silicon sensors with gain such as SiPM and APD.
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