Secondary Electron Emission from Multi-layered TiN/Al$_2$O$_3$ Transmission Dynodes
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ABSTRACT: The transmission secondary electron yields of multilayered Al$_2$O$_3$/TiN membranes/films have been determined for sub-10-keV primary electrons. These membranes will be used as transmission dynodes in novel vacuum electron multipliers. A bi- and tri-layer variant has been manufactured by means of atomic-layer deposition (ALD) of aluminum oxide and sputtering of titanium nitride. Their transmission electron yield has been measured by a collector-based method operated within a scanning electron microscope. The total transmission and reflection yields have been determined for both types of membranes. The results show that the tri-layer membrane, where the conductive TiN layer is sandwiched, performs better in terms of transmission electron emission. A maximum transmission yield of 3.1 is obtained for a 5/2.5/5 nm thick Al$_2$O$_3$/TiN/Al$_2$O$_3$ film with 1.55 keV-electrons. In addition, the transmission characteristics of the bi-layer membranes have been further investigated by separating the transmitted fraction and the transmission secondary electron yield. The latter is then normalized by its maximum yield and energy to obtain a 'universal' transmission yield curve. For thin films with a thickness below 20 µg/cm$^2$, the transmission characteristics deviates from thicker films, which can explain the higher transmission secondary electron yield observed.

KEYWORDS: secondary electron emission; transmission dynode; photomultiplier; vacuum electron multipliers; atomic layer deposited alumina; ultra-thin films

ArXiV ePrint: 1234.56789

$^1$Corresponding author.
1 Introduction

1.1 Novel Vacuum Electron Multipliers

Vacuum electron multipliers, such as photomultiplier tubes (PMTs), employ secondary electron emission (SEE) for photon detection [1]. The detection principle is the conversion of photons into photoelectrons by the photoelectric effect and subsequent electron multiplication in vacuum. A photoelectron, accelerated from the photocathode towards the first dynode, will generated multiple secondary electrons (SEs) upon impact. The SEs are then guided and accelerated towards the next dynode. As they traverse from dynode to dynode, their number increases, until the SEs are collected by the anode. PMTs are one of the most sensitive single-photon detectors that are still widely used for single-photon detection due to its high gain, low noise and large acceptance surface. Though, there are a few disadvantages to the design. First, the timing resolution of the order nanoseconds is poor in comparison with Silicon photomultiplier (SiPM) with single-photon avalanche diodes
(SPADs) [2]. It is due to the large non-uniform electron paths that the SEs need to traverse within the dynode stack that affects the pulse width. Also, the SEs are susceptible to electrostatic and magnetic fields, which exclude PMTs to be used near strong magnetic fields. And lastly, the dynode stack makes PMTs large, fragile and expensive.

The goal of the MEMBrane project is to develop a vacuum electron multiplier that outperforms PMTs in terms of time and spatial resolution [3]. The device, the Timed Photon Counter (TiPC), has the same detection principle as a PMT, but has transmission dynodes (tynodes) as multiplication stages instead of (reflective) dynodes. Tynodes are extremely thin membranes where an impinging primary electron (PE) on the frontside releases multiple secondary electrons from the backside. This distinctive property allows tynodes to be closely stacked on top of each other. The distance between neighbouring stages, in comparison with dynodes in PMTs, is greatly reduced and the electric field is nearly homogeneous. As a result, the time resolution improves: the pulse width and the rise time of the signal will be smaller due to the more uniform electron paths. In addition, the susceptibility to magnetic fields is reduced due to the increased electric field strength. In terms of spatial resolution, 2D spatial information is gained by combining the planar tynode stack with a CMOS-pixelchip (TimePix) as read-out.

A tynode is an ultra-thin membrane that (1) consist of a material with a high secondary electron yield (SEY), (2) is mechanically strong and (3) is electrically conductive. The transmission secondary electron yield is defined as the ratio between the incoming PE, with an energy \( E_0 \), and outgoing SEs in transmission. For TiPC, the goal is to achieve a transmission secondary electron yield of 4 or higher for primary electrons with sub-2-keV energy. As such, mechanically strong and thin membranes are required, since the range of PEs is energy depended. In-plane conductivity is required to replenish the emitted electrons during prolonged operation in order to avoid charge-up effects.

The SEY of a surface depends on its material properties and surface condition. In general, dielectrics have higher yields in comparison with semiconductors and metals [4, 5]. This is attributed to the wide band gap of dielectrics which benefits the transport of internal SEs. Once internal SEs are promoted to the conduction band, they can travel a relatively large distance with few interactions, which increase their overall probability to reach the surface. Surface treatment, such as caesiation and hydrogen-termination, can lower the electron affinity, which will also increase the escape probability of internal SEs. In some cases, even negative electron affinity (NEA) can be achieved; an internal SE that reaches the surface will encounter no barrier and will be pushed into vacuum. This is beneficial to the SEY. The reflection electron yield (REY) of C(100) diamond, for instance, increased from 3 to 60 and 132 by Cs- and H-termination respectively [6].

For transmission SEE, the thickness of the membrane is an additional parameter that affects the transmission electron yield (TEY). The distance that a primary electron with energy \( E_0 \) can travel is defined as the range and is given by \( R = CE_0^n \), where \( C \) is a constant that is material dependent and \( n \) a constant that depends on the energy-range of the primary electrons [7]. The onset of transmission SEE is expected to occur when PEs are expected to penetrate the tynode. This characteristic is defined as the critical energy \( E_c \) for which 1% of the PEs manages to pass through: \( \eta_T(E_c) = 0.01 \) [8]. This coefficient \( \eta_T \) is the forward-scattered electron (FSE) coefficient or the transmitted fraction. A second characteristic (tied to the thickness) is the maximum energy \( E_T^{\text{max}} \) at which the maximum transmission yield \( \sigma_T^{\text{max}} \) is achieved: \( \sigma_T^{\text{max}}(E_T^{\text{max}}) \). Both are unique defining
features of a transmission yield curve correlated to the thickness of the membrane.

One of the first working transmission-type photomultipliers has been built by Sternglass et al [9, 10]. The tynodes consist of porous potassium chloride (KCl) deposited on top of an aluminum foil. The high TEY of porous materials is due to the built-up of charge inside the pores of the material, which results in a strong electric field where (secondary) electrons are accelerated internally causing an avalanche type of SE emission. The typical inter-stage operating voltage is 5 keV with a maximum transmission yield $\sigma_{T,\text{max}}$ of 8. Despite the high TEY, the required high voltage for a multi-stage device limits its applicability. Also, the lifetime of the devices are poor and further research in the aging mechanism was needed [11]. Other alkali halides (CsI, KCl, NaF and LiF) have been measured by Llacer et al [12]. They are deposited onto an Al/Al$_2$O$_3$ membrane as support, which added to the overall thickness. The highest TEY of 8 (8 keV) was measured for cesium iodide. The best performing alkali halide was reported by Hagino et al. on caesium activated CsI. They achieved a TEY of 27 (9 keV) for Al$_2$O$_3$/Al/CsI(Cs) films [13]. A second group of materials that is considered are semiconductors, such as silicon and gallium arsenide, that benefits from negative electron affinity (NEA). A TEY of 725 (25 keV) for a 4-5 µm thick silicon film with NEA was by Martinelli et al [14]. More recently, various types of diamond have been studied as SEE materials for transmission dynodes [15–18]. The highest TEY of 5 (7 keV) was obtained for f-NCD diamond. Although the results are promising, it is unclear whether thinner NCD diamond can be manufactured due to the growth process of NCD diamond.

After reviewing these and other papers on tynodes, it became clear that the tynode needs to be self-supported [19]. Otherwise, it is unlikely that they will perform optimal for sub-2-keV electrons. Therefore, the choice in materials is limited to materials that are mechanically strong and has a high SEY.

Our group approached the problem from a micro-fabrication/engineering point of view by implementing MEMS technology. Silicon nitride tynodes were fabricated by low-pressure chemical vapor deposition (LPCVD) and aluminum oxide tynodes by means of atomic layer deposition (ALD) [20, 21]. Monte-Carlo simulation has shown that the optimum thickness for aluminum oxide tynodes is about 10 nm [3]. Therefore, the ultra-thin membranes, with a diameter of 10 to 30 µm, were suspended within a supporting mesh with an array of 64 by 64 small windows [21]. A TEY of 1.57 (2.85 keV) was measured for TiN/SiN films and a TEY of 2.6 (1.45 keV) for TiN/Al$_2$O$_3$ films.

In this paper we will present the method that was used to determine the transmission yield. Also, new samples with a tri-layer Al$_2$O$_3$/TiN/Al$_2$O$_3$ films with various thicknesses will be presented and compared to the bi-layer TiN/Al$_2$O$_3$ films. Furthermore, the emission characteristics of these films will be discussed more thoroughly. The experimental setup is a collector-based method developed to determine the transmission yield within a scanning electron microscope (SEM). The imaging capability of the SEM is used to locate and to direct the electron beam on the small windows.

A point of concern, for any SEE measurement setup, is the built-up of charge on the surface of dielectrics [22]. The recommended strategy is to limit the electron dose, which can be achieved by using a pulsed electron gun [22, 23] and/or to neutralize the charge with a flood gun between measurements [24]. A different approach is to determine the SEY by measuring the surface charge using the Kelvin probe method [25]. However, charge-up effects were not observed on films/membranes on which TiN was sputtered [21].

TiN was chosen as a conductive layer to provide in-plane conductivity. The added layer does
increase the thickness, but has a relatively low stopping power due to the low Z value of TiN. Other conductive materials were considered, such as metals (Al, Cr), but they will most likely oxidize during the fabrication process. TiN is chemical inert in ambient conditions [26]. Charge-up within the alumina layer was not observed, i.e. the emission current is constant during exposure. The mechanism that provide (normal-to-the-plane) conductivity from the conductive layer to the charged region in the dielectric film can be either explained by electron-beam induced current (EBIC) [27] and/or electron tunnelling [28].

Another caveat of this method is the lack of ultra-high vacuum (UHV) in our SEM, which operates at $1 \times 10^{-6}$ mbar instead of $1 \times 10^{-9}$ mbar or lower. As a result, surface contamination will form after prolonged surface irradiation, which might affect the SEY [29]. The contamination rate depends on the electron dose per unit surface, which can be lowered by scanning the electron beam over the surface. Though, a comparison between this setup and a dedicated UHV system have been made by measuring the reflection SEY of a SiN and an Al$_2$O$_3$ film [3]. The results were in good agreement and contamination effects were not observed. However, for dedicated surface termination studies should be performed in a UHV system.

1.2 Secondary Electron Emission Theory

Secondary electron emission (SEE) is described as a three-step process: generation, transport and escape of internal SEs [4, 5]. This model can be extended to thin membranes by including the exit surface of the membrane in transmission (Figure 1). The first step of the model treats primary electron interaction, energy transfer and secondary electron generation. A primary electron that interacts within a thin membrane will scatter and lose energy. Some of the energy is used to generate internal SEs. The primary electron itself can be reflected, absorbed or transmitted by the membrane. Reflected primary electrons are designated as backscattered electrons (BSE), while transmitted electrons as forward-scattered electrons (FSE). They are distinguished from secondary electrons by their energy, which is $E_{se} > 50$ eV. The second step describes the transport of internal SEs within the material. The band gap model is used to explain the difference in transport in metal, semiconductors and dielectrics [4, 5]. The wide band gap of dielectrics allows SEs that are promoted to the conduction band to travel a relatively large distance with few interactions. This increase the probability of the SEs to reach the surface. The third step models the escape of internal SEs into vacuum at the solid-vacuum boundary. Internal SEs with sufficient energy to overcome the work function or electron affinity can escape into vacuum. Only internal SEs that are generated near the surface have a chance to escape. The escape probability is given as an exponential decay function with $\lambda$ the mean free path of SEs. The secondary electrons that escape from the frontside are designated as reflection secondary electrons (RSE) and from the exit as transmission secondary electrons (TSE).

The elementary theory of secondary electron emission predicts the (reflection) secondary electron yield on the assumption that the production, transport and escape mechanisms of SEs can be treated independently. The advantage of the semi-empirical formula is that it can predict the shape of the secondary electron yield curve by normalization. There are numerous variations depending on the energy loss function used in the model, such as generalised power-law model, constant loss model and Bethe-model [30, 31]. The accuracy of the formula depends on the model, but for the scope of this paper the general form of the formula is sufficient.
Figure 1: Three-step model of SE generation. The three steps are treated independently in the elementary theory of SEE. The first step describes energy transfer of PEs in the film/bulk. The second step models the transport of internal SEs. The last step describes the escape probability of SEs from the material into vacuum.

The production of SEs is given by

$$n(x, E) = \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \frac{dE}{dx}$$

where $\varepsilon$ is the average effective SE excitation energy and $dE/dx$ the energy loss function. The number of SEs that are produced is proportional to the energy deposition at depth $x$. The transport and escape mechanisms of SEs is given by an exponential decay law

$$f(x) = Ae^{-x/\lambda}$$

where $\lambda$ is the attenuation length of the SEs (or the mean free path of the SEs) and $A$ is the escape probability of a SEs at the surface of the material into vacuum, which depends on the electron affinity. The reflection secondary electron yield $\delta_R$ is then given by

$$\delta_R = \int_0^d n(x, E) f(x) = -\frac{A}{\varepsilon} \int_0^d \frac{dE}{dx} e^{-x/\lambda} dx$$

where $d$ is the film thickness. For bulk samples $d \to \infty$. The transmission secondary yield $\delta_T$ is then given by

$$\delta_T = \int_0^d n(x, E) f(x) = -\frac{A}{\varepsilon} \int_0^d \frac{dE}{dx} e^{(x-d)/\lambda} dx$$

Secondary electrons that are generated within the escape depth $\lambda$ have the same escape probability in both reflection and transmission for a membrane consisting of one material.

The threshold energy for transmission SEE $E_{\text{th}}$ is correlated to the critical energy $E_c$. The former is defined as the PE energy at which the first (slow) TSEs starts to emerge, while the latter is
defined as the PE energy at which 1% of the (fast) PE passes through the film. The distance that a PE with energy $E_0$ can travel within a film/bulk material is defined as the range. There are a variety of range-energy relations [32]. The accuracy of these relations depends on the material considered and the energy of the PE. For sub-10-keV electrons and alumina as material, the range-energy relation given by Fitting et al [8] is the most accurate and is given by

$$R = 90 \rho^{-0.8} E_0^{1.3}$$  \hspace{1cm} (1.5)$$

where $R$ is the range in nm, $\rho$ the density given in g/cm$^3$ and $E_0$ the primary beam energy in keV. The range $R$ of a PE in different materials will differ, which makes comparison of composite films to normal films difficult. However, the effective layer method can be applied to films with different materials [33]. The contribution to the stopping power of material 2 can be replaced by material 1 with an effective layer thickness given by

$$d_{1\text{eff}} = \left( \frac{d_1}{R_1} \right)^{p_1/p_2} R_2$$  \hspace{1cm} (1.6)$$

where $p_{1,2}$ is the transmission parameter and $R_{1,2}$ is the range in the first and second material respectively. The total effective film thickness is then given by $d = d_{1\text{eff}} + d_1$. The bi-layer and tri-layer of TiN/Al$_2$O$_3$ films can be represented by a single Al$_2$O$_3$ layer with total effective thickness $d$, so that they can be compared to other Al$_2$O$_3$ films. For low-Z materials, the transmission parameters are assumed to be approximately equal: $p_1 \approx p_2$. The conversion factor is then simply the ratio between the ranges: $R_{\text{Al}_2\text{O}_3}/R_{\text{TiN}} \approx 1.51$, i.e. the TiN layer can be replaced by an Al$_2$O$_3$ layer with an effective thickness that is 1.51 times larger.

2 Experimental

2.1 Preparation of samples

The fabrication process of the ultra-thin composite membranes is similar to the fabrication process of tynodes presented in ref. [21], but the process is simplified by omitting the support mesh. Instead, a single square membrane with a width of 400 $\mu$m is released from the substrate. This basic design is not intended to be used in an actual detector, but is designed with the goal to characterize the transmission secondary electron emission of the multi-layer membranes. In figure 2, the flowcharts of the fabrication process of two types of composites are given: a TiN/Al$_2$O$_3$ bi-layer and a Al$_2$O$_3$/TiN/Al$_2$O$_3$ tri-layer membrane. The conductive layer is applied as a post-process in the former (A5), while it is integrated in the process flow of the latter (B5). The additional alumina layer serves as a protection layer against hydrofluoric (HF) vapor etch.

For TiN/Al$_2$O$_3$ bi-layer membrane, a 4-inch p-type (5-10 $\Omega$ cm) wafer with a thickness of $(500 \pm 15) \mu$m is used as substrate. The Si substrate is oxidized in a wet thermal environment at 1000 $^\circ$C until 300 nm of silicon dioxide is formed. This layer will act as a stopping layer and as a sacrificial layer in the process. ALD alumina is grown on top in a thermal ALD ASM F-120 reactor using trimethyl-aluminum (TMA) and water as a precursor and reactant, respectively (figure 2 A1) at 300 nm. The thickness is varied by choosing different numbers of cycles. Plasma-Enhanced Chemical Vapor Deposition (PECVD) silicon dioxide is then deposited on the front side to protect
Figure 2: (A1-A5) Flow chart of the fabrication process of the TiN/Al$_2$O$_3$ Bi-layer membrane. (B1-B5) Flow chart of the Al$_2$O$_3$/TiN/Al$_2$O$_3$ Tri-layer membrane.

the SEE layer and on the backside as a masking layer (A2). The silicon substrate is removed by Deep-reactive Ion Etching (DRIE) (A3). After this step, the wafer is cleaved into 15-by-15-mm pieces along predefined break lines. For the final release, the silicon dioxide layers are removed in an HF vapor etch chamber (A4). As a last step, titanium nitride is sputtered as a post-process (A5). This allows the thickness of the conductive layer to be varied and optimized. The active area of the samples is 400 µm by 400 µm and has a thickness $[d_{\text{TiN}}/d_{\text{Al}_2\text{O}_3}]$ of 2.5 / 10 nm, 5.7 / 25 nm and 5.7 / 50 nm.

For Al$_2$O$_3$/TiN/Al$_2$O$_3$ tri-layer membranes, the process is the same until after the first ALD alumina deposition (A1). After this step, a small patch of Alumina and silicon dioxide is removed by plasma etching to expose the silicon substrate (B1). Titanium nitride is then sputtered onto the wafer forming a continuous layer that is in contact with the silicon substrate. Another ALD alumina layer is used to encapsulate this layer (B2). This encapsulation is needed to protect the TiN layer against HF vapor in the last step. The next steps are similar to the previous process. PECVD silicon dioxide is applied as protection and masking layer (B3). The silicon is removed by DRIE (B4) and the wafer is cleaved into 15-by-15-mm dies. The membrane is released by HF vapor etching (B5). The active area of the samples is 400 µm by 400 µm and has a thickness $[d_{\text{Al}_2\text{O}_3}/d_{\text{TiN}}/d_{\text{Al}_2\text{O}_3}]$ of 5 / 2.5 / 5 nm and 12.5 / 5.7 / 12.5 nm.

2.2 Experimental method

The experimental setup is designed to be mounted onto the moving stage of a Scanning Electron Microscope (Thermo Fisher NovaNanoLab 650 Dual Beam). A teflon holder is attached to the stage in which the setup is fixed. Teflon insulates the sample holder electrically from the stage and the chamber. The SEM has an electron source that provides a continuous electron beam with energy
ranging from 0.3 keV to 30 keV. The typical beam current for these experiments is in the pA range, but it can be increased to a few nA if necessary. Though, the current is usually kept to a minimum in order to avoid charge-up effects. The operational vacuum level ranges from $1 \times 10^{-5}$ down to $1 \times 10^{-6}$ mbar.

A schematic representation of the experimental setup is given in figure 3. It consists of 3 separate electrodes: a collector, retarding grid and sample holder. They are electrically insulated from each other with sheets of kapton foil. Each electrode is connected via a feedthrough to a Keithley 2450 Source meter. This allows each electrode to be biased from $-200$ V to $200$ V, while measuring the currents simultaneously. The sample is clamped inside the copper sample holder. Silver emulsion is applied on the silicon substrate of the samples to ensure good electrical contact between the sample and holder. The primary beam current $I_0$ is measured inside a Faraday Cup that is drilled into the sample holder close to the sample.

The primary beam current $I_0$ as a function of the electron beam energy $E_0$ is determined before the measurement of the SEY of the samples. The beam is stable over the course of a day, so measuring the current once is sufficient. The beam is then moved towards the membrane in the sample. During the measurement, the SEM is in image acquisition mode. The imaged surface is the only part that is being irradiated, so there is no need for corrections for induced currents on the surrounding ‘inactive’ parts of the sample. Also, charge-up effects are mitigated by distributing the beam over a larger surface. The continuous surface scan has a Horizontal Field width (HFW) of 366 $\mu$m and a vertical field width of 316 $\mu$m with a resolution 1024 x 884 pixels. This is approximately 0.116 mm$^2$ over which the current is spread. The dwell time (per pixel) is 1 $\mu$s. Charge-up effects can be identified with the SEM, as the contrast of the image changes on a charging surface. Additionally, if charge-up occurs, it can also be observed in the measured sample.
current, which will change over time. For each energy \( E_0 \), the surface is therefore scanned for 20 s before shifting to a higher energy. The background current is measured before and after each reading.

This method is a combination of a collector-based and sample-biasing method; the transmission current is measured directly in the collector, while the reflection current is determined indirectly by deducting it from the sample current. The method distinguishes fast electrons \((E_{se} > 50 \text{ eV})\) from true secondary electrons \((E_{se} < 50 \text{ eV})\) by biasing the electrodes in the measurement setup. This requires two separate measurements where the sample is first negatively biased and then positively biased.

For a negative bias, the sample holder, retarding grid and collector are biased to \(-50 \text{ V}, 0 \text{ V} \) and \(0 \text{ V}\), respectively. The negative bias repels fast and slow electrons from the sample on the reflection and transmission side. The transmission coefficient \( \sigma_T(E_0) \) is determined by measuring the transmission current with the retarding grid and collector and is given by:

\[
\sigma_T(E_0) = \frac{I_{RG-} + I_{C-}}{I_0}
\]  

(2.1)

where \( E_0 \) is the electron energy of the primary electron, \( I_0 \) is the primary beam current, \( I_{RG-} \) is the retarding grid current and \( I_{C-} \) collector current. The minus-subscript indicates that the current is measured under a negative sample bias. The total emission \( \sigma(E_0) \), which is the sum of the reflection coefficient \( \sigma_R(E_0) \) and transmission coefficient \( \sigma_T(E_0) \), is determined by measuring the sample current and is given by:

\[
\sigma(E_0) = \frac{I_0 - I_{S-}}{I_0}
\]  

(2.2)

where \( I_{S-} \) is the sample current. The reflection coefficient is then given by:

\[
\sigma_R(E_0) = \sigma(E_0) - \sigma_T(E_0) = \frac{I_0 - I_{S-} - I_{RG-} - I_{C-}}{I_0}
\]  

(2.3)

An additional measurement with a positive biased sample can be performed to separate the fast electrons from the slow ones. The sample holder, retarding grid and collector are biased to \(50 \text{ V}, 0 \text{ V} \) and \(0 \text{ V}\), respectively. The positive voltage retracts the slow electrons to the sample, while allowing fast electrons \((E_{SE} > 50 \text{ eV})\) to escape. The retarding grid prevents tertiary electrons from the collector wall (i.e. unwanted SEs induced within the setup) to flow back towards the sample. The forward scattered electron coefficient \( \eta_T(E_0) \) is determined by measuring the transmission current with the retarding grid and collector and is given by:

\[
\eta_T(E_0) = \frac{I_{RG+} + I_{C+}}{I_0}
\]  

(2.4)

where \( E_0 \) is the electron energy of the primary electron, \( I_0 \) is the primary beam current, \( I_{RG+} \) is the retarding grid current and \( I_{C+} \) collector current, where the plus-subscript indicates a positively biased sample. Since \( \sigma_T(E_0) = \eta_T(E_0) + \delta_T(E_0) \), the transmission secondary electron coefficient \( \delta_T(E_0) \) is given by

\[
\delta_T(E_0) = \frac{I_{RG-} - I_{C-}}{I_0} - \frac{I_{RG+} + I_{C+}}{I_0}
\]  

(2.5)
The sample current $I_{S+}$ is again the sum of the reflection and transmission current. In this case

$$\eta_T(E_0) + \eta_R(E_0) = \frac{I_0 - I_{S+}}{I_0}$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.6)

After substituting $\eta_T(E_0)$, the backscattered electron coefficient $\eta_R(E_0)$ is given by:

$$\eta_R(E_0) = \frac{I_0 - I_{S+} - I_{RG+} - I_{C+}}{I_0}$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.7)

The reflection secondary electron coefficient $\delta_R(E_0)$ can be determined by using the definition of the total emission coefficient: $\sigma(E_0) = \eta_R(E_0) + \delta_R(E_0) + \eta_T(E_0) + \delta_T(E_0)$, from which it follows that

$$\delta_R(E_0) = \sigma(E_0) - \eta_T(E_0) - \delta_T(E_0) - \eta_R(E_0)$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.8a)

$$\delta_R(E_0) = \frac{I_0 - I_{S+} - I_{RG+} - I_{C+}}{I_0} - \frac{I_0 - I_{S+} - I_{RG+} - I_{C+}}{I_0}$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.8b)

With eq. (2.5), (2.6), (2.7) and (2.8b), all relevant yields can be calculated from the measured currents.

### 3 Results

#### 3.1 Bi-layer membrane

In figure 4, a schematic drawing of a bi-layer membrane is given with all the currents that flow to and from the irradiated region. The flat side of the sample with the ALD alumina layer is facing downwards in the transmission direction, while the window in the silicon substrate is facing upwards. The conductive TiN layer is deposited inside the window opening.

The (secondary) electron yield curves as a function of the primary electron energy $E_0$ are given in figure 5 for bi-layer TiN/Al$_2$O$_3$ membranes with thicknesses of 2.5/10, 5.7/25 and 5.7/50 nm, respectively. The total effective film thickness $d$ is calculated with formula (1.6) and listed in table 1 along with the transmission yield curve characteristics; the critical energy $E_c$, max transmission yield $\sigma_T^{max}(E_T^{max})$ and max transmission secondary electron yield $\delta_T^{max}(E_T^{max})$.

The reflection SEE coefficients are represented by the red curves in figure 5. For a bi-layer membrane, the contribution to the reflection yields is from the TiN layer. The back-scattered electron (BSE) coefficient $\eta_R(E_0)$ is close to zero for all three thicknesses. There are two factors that contribute to this low value. First, the BSE yield of membranes and foils are expected to be lower in comparison with their bulk counterpart [34, 35]. Second, the window reduces the field of view for BSEs and some will be recaptured.

The reflection secondary electron (RSE) coefficient $\delta_R(E_0)$ is below 1 and is lower than expected. The reduction in yield can again be attributed to recapture. The maximum reflection yield on a bulk TiN sample can range from 1.4 to 2.8 for primary electron energy of 300 eV depending on the deposition technique and conditions [36, 37].

The transmission SEE coefficients are represented by the black curves in figure 5. The transmission side consists of Al$_2$O$_3$. The forward-scattered electron (FSE) coefficient $\eta_T(E_0)$ is the fraction of the primary electron beam that penetrates through the membrane and retain energy.
Table 1: Summary of important electron emission values of all composite membranes. The total effective thickness $d$ is calculated with eq. (1.6).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>$d_{Al_2O_3}$ (nm)</th>
<th>$d_{TiN}$ (nm)</th>
<th>$d_{Al_2O_3}$ (nm)</th>
<th>$d$ (nm)</th>
<th>$\sigma_{T,\text{max}}^\text{max}$ (keV)</th>
<th>$E_{\text{T,\text{max}}}$ (keV)</th>
<th>$\delta_{T,\text{max}}^\text{max}$ (keV)</th>
<th>$E_{\text{TSE,\text{max}}}$ (keV)</th>
<th>$E_c$ (keV)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bi-layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bi-layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bi-layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>58.6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tri-layer</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tri-layer</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$E > 50$ eV. Thin films become transparent for high energetic electrons. As such, all primary electrons should end up in the collector, i.e. the FSE curve should approach 1 for high primary electron energy. However, the curves converge to 0.8 instead. The discrepancy can be attributed to (back)scattering of transmitted PEs on the retarding grid and the collector wall, which will induce tertiary currents that can lower the net transmission current. The effect of tertiary currents on the transmitted fraction will be discussed in 4.2. In appendix B, a correction factor is estimated by taking scattering events in the collector into account.

The 'true' transmission secondary electron (TSE) coefficient $\delta_T(E_0)$ represents electrons with $E_{se} < 50$ eV, which originates from the $Al_2O_3$ layer within the escape depth. The initial rise of the TSE yield curve starts at the threshold energy $E_{th}$. At this energy, the first (slow) secondary electrons emerges from the membrane in transmission. It is correlated to the critical energy $E_c$ for which 1% of the PEs are transmitted. These are defining yield curve characteristics that depends on the total effective thickness $d$ of the membrane. Another characteristic is the maximum TSE yield $\delta_{T,\text{max}}^\text{max}$ obtained with PEs with electron energy $E_{\text{TSE,\text{max}}}$.

Figure 4: The currents to and from a bi-layer membrane irradiated by an electron beam. TiN is sputtered into the window on the reflection side to provide a conductive path form the sample holder to the irradiated region.
Figure 5: Electron emission coefficients of a bi-layer membrane TiN/Al$_2$O$_3$ with thicknesses $d_{TiN}/d_{Al_2O_3}$

yield $\delta_T^{max}(E_{max})$ of the other membranes are listed in table 1.

The total transmission coefficient $\sigma_T(E_0)$ is the sum of $\delta_T(E_0)$ and $\eta_T(E_0)$. In literature, the distinction between $\delta_T(E_0)$ and $\eta_T(E_0)$ is often not made. Unless specified specifically, usually the total transmission yield $\sigma_T(E_0)$ is given. The performance of a tynode can be expressed by the maximum transmission yield $\sigma_T^{max}(E_{Tmax})$. The highest maximum transmission yield of 2.55 (1.45 keV) was measured on a membrane with $d = 13.6$ nm. The max transmission yield of the other membranes are listed in table 1.

3.2 Tri-layer membrane

In figure 6, a schematic drawing of a tri-layer membrane is shown. The titanium nitride layer is sandwiched between two layers of alumina. The currents flowing to and from the irradiated regions are indicated by the arrows.

In figure 7a, the reflection $\sigma_R(E_0)$ and transmission coefficients $\sigma_T(E_0)$ of a bi-layer membrane TiN/Al$_2$O$_3$ are compared to a tri-layer membrane Al$_2$O$_3$/TiN/Al$_2$O$_3$. The thicknesses of the layers
for the two membranes are 2.5/10 nm and 5/2.5/5 nm, respectively, with a total effective thickness of 13.6 nm for both.

The reflection coefficient $\sigma_R(E_0)$ is significantly smaller for the bi-layer compared to the tri-layer, since the material of the emission surfaces are different. The reflection yield of TiN is lower than that for Al$_2$O$_3$. Therefore, a direct comparison is not useful.

The transmission coefficient $\sigma_T(E_0)$ for both type of membrane has the same threshold energy $E_{th}$. This shows that both membranes have a similar thickness and stopping power. However, the maximum transmission coefficient $\sigma_{T_{\text{max}}}$ of 3.1 (1.55 keV) is higher for the tri-layer membrane compared to the bi-layer yield of 2.6 (1.45 keV). The better performance is also observed for the membrane with $d = 33.6$ nm as shown in figure 7b. The maximum transmission yield $\sigma_{T_{\text{max}}}$ of 2.7 (2.75 keV) for the tri-layer compared to 2.1 (2.55 keV) for the bi-layer. Hence, encapsulating the conductive layer of TiN between two layers of Al$_2$O$_3$ improves the transmission (secondary) electron yield in comparison with the bi-layer membrane.

4 Discussion

4.1 Bi-layer versus Tri-layer

Before a more meaningful comparison can be made, additional data and corrections need to be made. First, the reduction in yield due to reabsorption of SEs by the walls of the window opening needs to be addressed. The aspect ratio of the window and the wall is $\sim 1.2$ as shown in figure 4 and 6. A correction factor for the sample geometry needs to be applied to the (reflection) yield. In appendix A, a p-type silicon membrane with widths of 400 $\mu$m is used to estimate the reduction in yield due to recapture. The emission surface of the silicon membrane is identical, so the difference in yield is solely due to the presence of the window. When the window is facing the electron gun, the reflection yield was reduced by 35 to 45%. When the window opening was facing away, the transmission yield was reduced by 15 to 30 %. Second, the (reflection) yield measured on a TiN
emission surface is not useful for the purpose of electron multiplication. Additional reflection yield measurements on Al$_2$O$_3$ emission surfaces provides more insight. Accordingly, both demands can be fulfilled by performing an additional measurement on the bi-layer membranes and combining the results of the two separate measurements. In the first, Al$_2$O$_3$/TiN/Al$_2$O$_3$-layer is facing downwards, so emission in transmission is unobstructed. In the second, the sample is turned over so that Al$_2$O$_3$/TiN/Al$_2$O$_3$)-layer is facing upwards. In this case, reflection SEE will be from Al$_2$O$_3$ and correction is not needed. The transmission yield from the first measurement is then combined with the reflection yield of the second. The combined yield curves are shown in figure 8 for the bi-layer membranes with $d = 13.68$ nm and $d = 33.6$ nm. The combined results portray the electron emission characteristics of a pure and flat Al$_2$O$_3$ membrane.

The max reflection yield $\sigma_{R}^{\text{max}}(E_{R}^{\text{max}})$ is 3.3 (0.30 keV) and 3.7 (0.35 keV), respectively. This result is close to the maximum reflection yield of an ALD Al$_2$O$_3$-film (12.5 nm) on bulk silicon sample, which has a $\sigma_{R}^{\text{max}}$ of 3.6 (0.4 keV) [3].

Unfortunately, the maximum reflection yield $\sigma_{R}^{\text{max}}$ for the tri-layer membrane was outside the measurement range. Also, a correction needs to be made to the reflection yield, since the window opening is present on that side. If a correction factor of $\sim$40 %, then the highest reflection yield is 4.1 (0.35 keV) and 3.5 (0.75 keV), for $d = 13.8$ nm and $d = 33.6$ nm respectively. Although, the yield of the latter could have a higher peak for lower energies.

When comparing the reflection yields in figure 8, the yield curve of the thinner film with $d = 13.8$ nm is lower for all energies compared to the film with $d = 33.6$ nm. The reflection yield comprises of SEs generated by primary electrons $\delta_{p}$ and back-scattered (primary) electrons $\delta_{b}$: $\delta_{R} = \delta_{p} + \delta_{b}$ [7]. In bulk samples (and thick films), a large contribution to RSE generation comes from back-scattered electrons that dissipate energy when they leave from the interior. In an experiment, where an aluminum target was irradiated with keV-electrons, the back-scattered electrons contributed close to 40% of the generated RSEs [34]. Also, backscattered electrons were found to be 4.9 times as effective in generating SEs compared to incoming PEs. In thin films, the
Figure 8: The combined results obtained from two separate measurement on the same sample, where the flat surface is first facing downwards to obtain $\sigma_T^{\downarrow}$ and then upwards to obtain $\sigma_R^{\uparrow}$. The combined results portray the electron emission characteristic of a flat Al$_2$O$_3$ membrane with a thickness of 13.8 nm and one with 33.6 nm.

Backscatter contribution $\delta_b$ is negligible when $R(E_0) \gg d$, since most will be transmitted through the film. The reflection yield curve or the bi-layer film with $d = 13.8$ nm comprises mostly of $\delta_p$. A similar graph was found for thin Al films and Al bulk material by Kanter [34].

As such, the thickness $d = 13.8$ nm is near the optimal thickness for Al$_2$O$_3$ films. The transmission yield of the tri-layer is almost as large as the reflection yield of the film-on-bulk sample, with $\sigma_T^{\text{max}} = 3.1$ and $\sigma_R^{\text{max}} = 3.6$ respectively. The RSE yield $\delta_R^{\text{max}}$ of a thin film is always larger than its TSE yield $\delta_T^{\text{max}}$ as shown by Ono et al using empirical formulas [38]. Thus, the transmission yield of the tri-layer is already near its optimum. Reducing the thickness further would decrease the interaction volume of the PEs with the material. Both the reflection and the transmission yield would decrease below the optimum thickness. A further reduction of the film thickness is warranted when the focus is on lowering the electron energy $E_T^{\text{max}}$.

4.2 Transmitted fraction

The transmitted fraction is a different name for the FSE coefficient $\eta_T$. In early experiments, the transmitted fraction was measured to determine electron-range relations, such as formula (1.5) [8]. In figure 10a, the transmitted fraction of the bi-layer films are given. A correction factor of 0.2 has been applied to $\eta_T(E_{PE})$ to account for tertiary currents in the semi-spherical collector (see appendix B). In figure 10b, the energy is normalized by using the reduced initial energy $E_0/E_c$. The critical energy $E_c$ is the energy for which 1% of the PEs are transmitted, which is related to the film thickness. This normalization was proposed by Kanter to determine the transmission curve of foils with different materials and thicknesses [39]. The transmission curve approaches a universal transmission curve for large film thickness ($d_c \leq 20$ $\mu$g/cm$^2$) and is unique for each
material. Thinner films deviated from this universal curve as was shown for carbon foils. It is similar to our result in figure 10b in which the curve for \( d = 13.8 \text{ nm} \) deviates, while the thicker films converge towards a universal curve. This is in agreement with the results of Kanter.

**Figure 9:** Transmitted fraction as a function of (a) the primary electron energy, (b) the reduced initial energy \( E/E_c \) and (c) the reduced thickness \( d/R \) of the membranes. The \( p \)-value for the three film thicknesses are 1.25, 1.55 and 1.88, respectively.

The transmitted fraction can also be normalized by using the reduced film thickness \( d/R \) as shown in figure 9c. The transmitted fraction is given by:

\[
\eta_T(E_0) = \exp \left[ -4.605 \left( \frac{d}{R(E_0, Z)} \right)^p(E_0, Z) \right]
\]  

(4.1)

where \( E_0 \) is the PE energy, \( d \) is the film thickness and \( R \) the range and \( p \) the transmission parameter respectively [8]. Transmission curves normalized this way can be characterized by the transmission parameter \( p \). In 9c, the transmission characteristics of different \( p \)-values are plotted as well. Lighter elements have a transmission characteristic similar to the curve with \( p \approx 2 \), while heavier elements have a curve similar to \( p \approx 1.5 \). The \( p \)-value is constant for thick films and is 1.9 for Al2O3. In
Figure 9c, the reduced film thickness $d/R$ is determined for each film thickness by using eq. (1.5) to calculate the range for each $E_0$. The transmission parameter is determined by superimposing curves calculated with (B.1) onto the normalized measurement data. Again, the thicker film with $d = 58.6\, \text{nm}$ has a transmission characteristic as predicted by (B.1) with $p \approx 1.8$. However, the p-value and characteristics deviates for thinner films with $d < d_c$.

Figure 9b and 9c shows the same effect: Thin films with $d < d_c$ have different transmission characteristic. This is relevant for tynodes, since they are operated with sub-2-keV electrons. The transmission characteristic of the film with $d = 13.8\, \text{nm}$ is similar to the profile of heavier elements. Relatively more PEs are absorbed (or reflected) in the film, i.e. it is harder to transmit through the film. A consequence is that more energy is transferred, which can explain the trend of higher TSE yield for thinner films.

### 4.3 Normalized transmission secondary electron yield

The semi-empirical formula (1.3) is used to predict universal reflection secondary electron yield curves by normalizing the yield and energy [5, 30]. Different models have been opted that have varying degrees of success in predicting the universal RSE yield curve for different materials. Though, it is beyond the scope of this paper. A recent review paper discuss the models more extensively [31].

More relevant for this paper is the question whether a universal transmission secondary electron yield can be found. The TSE yield curves are shown in figure 10a. The normalization is done for both the TSE yield $\delta T/\delta T_{\text{max}}$ and the energy $E_0/E_{\text{max}}$ and is shown in figure 10b. The normalized curves have the same resemblance, but differs slightly. A similar result was found for carbon foils by Hääußl et al [35]. They performed a similar experiment in which they treated $\eta R, T(E_0)$ and $\delta R, T(E_0)$ separately. The results hints towards the existence of a universal TSE curve.

If we look at the semi-empirical formula (1.4), the escape probability of SE at depth $x$ is given by formula (1.2). The escape probability $f(x)$ is the same regardless of the film thickness, since the material and the surface conditions are the same. The difference in $\delta T(E_0)$ is solely due to the energy loss function $dE/dx$. There are numerous theoretical models for the energy transfer profiles and it is beyond the scope of this paper to discuss them. However, the shape of the energy transfer profile is the same when they are normalized by using the reduced thickness $d/R$ [40]. Therefore, since a universal energy transfer profile exist, a universal transmission secondary electron yield curve should exist as well. This is true for films with $d > d_c$, as we have seen that the transmission characteristics of PEs converge to the same curve for thick films. However, the transmission characteristics deviates for thinner films with $d < d_c$ and hence the energy transfer profile as well.

Since $\eta T(E_0)$ and $\delta T(E_0)$ are correlated, a logical representation of the data would be plotting the reduced yield $\delta/\delta T_{\text{max}}$ versus the transmitted fraction $\eta T$ as shown in figure 11. The maximum TSEY coincides with a transmitted fraction of approximately 0.4 to 0.5. Transmitted electrons still possess a considerable amount of energy: $E_A(x = R) \approx (0.3 \text{ to } 0.4) E_0$ [40]. Therefore, they should not be neglected when designing a detector, because they can induce tertiary currents and feedback signals.
5 Conclusions & outlook

We have successfully constructed multilayered Al$_2$O$_3$/TiN freestanding films that can be used as tynodes in TiPC. Two types of films have been made, a bilayer TiN/Al$_2$O$_3$ and a tri-layer Al$_2$O$_3$/TiN/Al$_2$O$_3$. The Tri-layer film has the conductive TiN layer encapsulated in order to protect it during manufacturing and to improve the reliability of the manufacturing process. The highest transmission yield was attained for the thinnest tri-layer membrane which have a yield of 3.1 (1.55 keV). The (total effective) thickness of 13.8 nm is near the optimum thickness for alumina membranes. For such thin films, the transmission characteristics deviates from thicker films. Therefore, the range-energy relations might not be accurate for sub-2-keV electrons on ultra-thin...
films. Also, the reduced transmission secondary electron yield curve depends solely on the energy loss profile, i.e. only on the generation function in the three-step model. For films with a thickness \( d > d_c \), a universal transmission yield curve seems to exist. However, for thinner films with \( d < d_c \) the energy transfer profile differs and universality is not to be expected. Although the transmission yield can be further improved, the tri-layer membrane can be used to build a rudimentary/prototype TiPC. Improvement to the transmission yield can be achieved by surface termination, such as caesiation or hydrogen-termination. Also, other materials can be considered as emission material, such as MgO. Magnesia has a higher reflection yield compared to alumina and can be deposited with ALD as well. The same fabrication process can be used as presented in this paper, but replacing the ALD Al\(_2\)O\(_3\) with ALD MgO instead. Lastly, the active surface area of tynodes can be increased by forming meta-materials with ALD Al\(_2\)O\(_3\)/TiN/Al\(_2\)O\(_3\). This can improve the collection efficiency of the Timed Photon Counter.
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Appendices

A Sample geometry correction

Reabsorption by the window opening is estimated by comparing two measurements on a p-type silicon membrane with a thickness of 39 nm. The membrane is symmetric in this case except for the window. The width, height and aspect ratio are the same as the other membranes presented in this paper. In figure 12a, the reflection and transmission curves of two separate measurements are given. The first measurement, with the window facing upwards, shows a reduction in reflection yield, while the transmission yield is unaffected. In the second measurement, the window is facing downwards and the result shows a reduction in the transmission yield, while the reflection yield is unaffected. The ratio between the reduced and unaffected yields is given in figure 12b. Reabsorption decreases the reflection yield by 35 to 45% and the transmission yield by 15 to 30%. A correction can be applied to the obtained results, but the correction factor depends on the beam energy and only holds for these specific samples.

B Measurement setup correction

A transmitted PE can cause tertiary currents on the retarding grid and collector, when the setup is operated with a positive sample bias. The sample holder and collector are positively biased with respect to the retarding grid. First, a transmitted PE that lands on the grid can generate tertiary electrons that will either flow to the collector or the sample holder due to the bias. This induces a tertiary current $I_{\text{tertiary}}$ from the grid. The tertiary current from the grid to the collector will have a zero net effect on the transmitted fraction, since $\eta_T(E_0) = (I_{RG+} - I_{\text{tertiary}}) + (I_{C+} + I_{\text{tertiary}})$.

Second, a transmitted PE has a chance to backscatter on the wall of the collector. Tertiary electrons will be generated as well, but they will be recaptured by the collector due to the bias. The net current from the collector to the sample holder will only consist of the backscatter current $I_{\text{backscatter}}$.  


Figure 12: (a) The influence of reabsorption by the window opening on secondary electron emission of a silicon membrane on a SOI substrate. (b) The ratio between the obstructed and unobstructed yield for reflection and transmission yield.

Overall, the measured transmitted fraction is given by:

\[
\eta_{T,\text{measured}}(E_0) = \frac{I_T - I_{\text{backscatter}} - I_{\text{tertiary}}}{I_0}
\]

(B.1a)

\[
= \frac{I_T}{I_0} - \frac{I_{\text{backscatter}} + I_{\text{tertiary}}}{I_0}
\]

(B.1b)

\[
= \eta_{T,\text{true}}(E_0)) - \frac{I_{\text{backscatter}} + I_{\text{tertiary}}}{I_0}
\]

(B.1c)

\[
\eta_{T,\text{measured}}(E_0) = \eta_{T,\text{true}}(E_0) + \alpha(E_0)
\]

(B.1d)

where \(I_T\) is the (true) transmission current in nA, \(\eta_{T,\text{true}}(E_0)\) is the true transmitted fraction, \(I_{\text{backscatter}}\) is the backscatter current from the collector to the sample holder in nA, \(I_{\text{tertiary}}\) the tertiary current
from the grid to the sample holder in nA and \( \alpha(E_0) \) a correction factor. The tertiary current is given by:

\[
I_{\text{backscatter}} = I_0 \gamma \delta_{R,\text{grid}} \tag{B.2}
\]

where \( I_0 \) is the primary current, \( \gamma \) the opacity of the retarding grid mesh and \( \delta_{R,\text{grid}} \) the reflection yield of the grid mesh material. The backscatter current is given by:

\[
I_{\text{tertiary}} = I_0 (1 - \gamma)^2 \varepsilon_\theta \eta_{R,\text{col}} \tag{B.3}
\]

where \( I_0 \) is the primary current, \( \gamma \) the opacity of the retarding grid mesh, \( \varepsilon_\theta \) the backscatter angle efficiency and \( \eta_{R,\text{col}} \) the backscatter yield of the collector material. The correction factor \( \alpha \) can be estimated by:

\[
\alpha = \frac{I_{\text{backscatter}} + I_{\text{tertiary}}}{I_0} = \frac{I_0 \gamma \delta_{R,\text{grid}} + I_0 (1 - \gamma)^2 \varepsilon_\theta \eta_{R,\text{col}}}{I_0} \tag{B.4a}
\]

\[
= \gamma \delta_{R,\text{grid}} + (1 - \gamma)^2 \varepsilon_\theta \eta_{R,\text{col}} \tag{B.4b}
\]

\[
= 0.1 \times 1.3 + (1 - 0.1)^2 \times 0.5 \times 0.22 \approx 0.22 \tag{B.4c}
\]

with the assumption that \( \delta_{R,\text{grid}} = 1.3 \) for metal, \( \eta_{R,\text{col}} = 0.22 \) for copper and a mesh opacity \( \gamma = 0.1 \). This is a rough estimate, since the exact scattering angles and multiple scattering events are not taken into consideration. Also, the correction factor depends on the primary electron energy \( E_0 \) and the energy after they are transmitted.