Time resolution of 4H-SiC PIN detector
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ABSTRACT

We report the time resolution of 100 \( \mu \)m 4H-SiC PIN detectors which are fabricated by Nanjing University (NJU). The time responses for \( \beta \) particle from \(^{90}\)Sr source are investigated for the detection of the minimum ionizing particles (MIPs). The influences of different reverse voltages which correspond to carrier velocity and device sizes which correlate with capacitance for time resolution are studied. We acquired a time resolution (94 \( \pm \) 1) ps for 100 \( \mu \)m 4H-SiC PIN detector. A fast simulation software - RASER (RAdiation SEMiconductor) has been developed to simulate the time resolution of 4H-SiC detector, and the simulation has been validated by the waveform comparison of RASER simulation and measured data. The simulated time resolution is (53 \( \pm \) 1) ps after consider the intrinsic leading contributions of detector in time resolution.
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1 INTRODUCTION

Searching for the right semiconductor material to be used for the future particle collider and the nuclear reactor in harsh radiation environment (\( \geq 10^{17} \text{neq/cm}^2 \)) is an active frontier in recent years. Owing to potential high radiation hardness about 4H-SiC material such as wide bandgap energy, high atomic displacement energy, and stability at high temperature, it has great potential for application in extreme radiation environments. With the high quality 4H-SiC epitaxy wafer achieved, a handful of studies of charge collection, leakage current, capacitance, deep energy levels have been carried out in 4H-SiC detectors before and after irradiation \cite{1, 2}. The 4H-SiC detector also has fast time response benefited from high saturated carrier velocity, but corresponding time performance is lack.

Due to its wide bandgap energy that is insensitive to visible light, the SiC detector is useful for X-ray and ultraviolet monitor \cite{3}. There are also extensive studies about SiC detector’s application in fusion neutron detection \cite{2, 4}. For the high energy physics application, the detector’s response to the MIPs are more relevant. But the most previous studies focus on energy resolution and charge collection efficiency using \( \alpha \) particles which are distinct from MIPs. So far, only the charge collection features of MIPs have been reported \cite{5}. There is no relevant investigation of time resolution. The only reporting time resolution
of 4H-SiC Schottky barrier diode (SBD) is about $\alpha$ particles for D-T application [6]. Consequently, we investigate the time resolution of the 4H-SiC PIN device using $^{90}$Sr source for the application in high energy physics.

A fast simulation tool for time resolution is beneficial to develop a fast time detector and understand the time response characteristics. Present open source software like Weightfield2 [7] and KDetSim [8] are only available for silicon detectors. The corresponding simulation tool of silicon carbide detectors is lack due to distinct material parameters. Therefore, we develop a fast simulation software - RASER [9] to simulate time resolution for silicon carbide detectors.

2 DEVICE UNDER STUDY

![Figure 1](image)

**Figure 1.** The 5mm×5mm 4H-SiC PIN sample developed in NJU (A) Photography and (B) Cross section. It has 100 $\mu$m 4H-SiC active epitaxy layer and 350 $\mu$m substrate.

The studied 4H-SiC PIN devices are fabricated by Nanjing University which have two different sizes: 5mm×5mm and 1.5mm×1.5mm. Figure 1 shows the 5mm×5mm sample which has two ohmic contacts on the top and bottom. Each type of device has 100 $\mu$m high resistive 4H-SiC epitaxy layer and 350 $\mu$m substrate. The breakdown voltage is larger than 600V for 5mm×5mm size device and 300V for 1.5mm×1.5mm size device which are determined when reverse leakage current exceeds $10^{-6}$ A. The corresponding full depletion voltage is around 200V.

3 EXPERIMENTAL SETUP

3.1 $\beta$ source system

The diagram of the experimental setup is shown in Figure 2 which is used to acquire the time resolution of 4H-SiC detectors. We choose a 33 $\mu$m silicon Low Gain Avalanche Detector (LGAD) as the reference timing device owing to it has 34 ps time resolution operated on U=200V at room temperature. The $^{90}$Sr source emits $\beta$ particles with 0.546 MeV energy that is enough to penetrate the LGAD device and deposit energy in the 4H-SiC detector. The front side readout boards are designed for LGAD devices by University of California, Santa Cruz (UCSC) where each board has a 2 mm diameter hole in the middle. The overall front side electronics are put into a metal box to shield electromagnetic interference with 0.01 mm aluminum foil covering. Two 20 dB broadband amplifiers are implemented before oscilloscope to enhance S/N. There is an additional 1m cable on DUT side to delay the signal (~5 ns) and enhance trigger efficiency. The sampling rate of the oscilloscope is 40 GSa/s and each channel has 20 GSa/s. It means the time fluctuation caused by TDC is $\sigma_{TDC} = \frac{50\text{ps}}{\sqrt{12}}$. 
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3.2 Energy response by GEANT4 simulation

To verify the energy loss in 100 $\mu$m 4H-SiC active layer tallies with the behavior of MIPs, a simulation based on GEANT4 is used to describe the energy deposition. Figure 3 is the energy deposition of $\beta$ particle in 100 $\mu$m 4H-SiC active layer in full system (see Figure 2). The energy loss in aluminum foil could be neglected. The scatter effects for $\beta$ particles in aluminum foil and LGAD strongly decrease the trigger efficiency for the 4H-SiC device. It could be used to interpret the difference of trigger efficiency for 5mm×5mm (4.7 events/min) and 1.5mm×1.5mm (2.1 events/min) size 4H-SiC-PIN where large size has higher trigger efficiency. The MPV of energy deposition in 100 $\mu$m 4H-SiC layer is 55 MeV which is a little higher than the previous experimental result ($\sim$42 MeV) [10] due to scattering effects by aluminum foil and LGAD as well as the ionization track is longer than 100 $\mu$m.

![Energy deposition diagram](image)

**Figure 3.** Energy of $\beta$ particle deposites in 100 $\mu$m 4H-SiC-PIN active layer after penetrates the aluminum foil and LGAD in GEANT4 simulation.
4 TIME RESOLUTION OF 4H-SiC PIN

4.1 Waveform sampling

The two channels are triggered same time with different trigger levels for waveform sampling. The Trigger$^{\text{Ref}} = 25 \text{ mV}$ and Trigger$^{\text{DUT}} = 15 \text{ mV}$ are determined by noise levels to suppress the noise spikes. Figure 4 shows the waveforms from LGAD (Ref) and 4H-SiC-PIN (DUT). The time delay $\sim 5\text{ns}$ caused by an additional 1m cable is to enhance the trigger efficiency. Owing to internal gain in LGAD, the signal of LGAD is higher than 4H-SiC-PIN despite LGAD has a thinner active layer. The time resolution of NDL LGAD is $\sigma_{\text{Ref}} = 34 \pm 1 \text{ ps}$ when bias voltage U=200V.

![Waveform sampling for Si-LGAD (red) and 4H-SiC-PIN (blue) are collected by oscilloscope. The trigger thresholds are determined by noise level to eliminate all noise spikes. $\sim 5\text{ns}$ time delay of 4H-SiC-PIN signals are caused by the one meter cable.](image)

4.2 Time resolution

![Time distributions shows in (A) size=5mm×5mm, U=500V, (B) size=5mm×5mm, U=300V, (C) size=1.5mm×1.5mm, U=300V. The $\sigma_{\Delta T}$ is extracted by gaussian fitting.](image)
The time resolution for different device sizes and reverse voltages are studied considering the influence of capacitance and carrier velocity. For the timing method, the Constant Fraction Discrimination (CFD) is adopted with fraction 0.5. Figure 5 lists the $\Delta T = T_{DUT} - T_{Ref}$ distributions for different device sizes and reverse voltages. The time resolution of DUT could be extracted by $\sigma_{DUT} = \sqrt{\sigma_{\Delta T}^2 - \sigma_{Ref}^2}$ where $\sigma_{5\text{mm} \times 5\text{mm}, U=500V} = 94 \pm 1 \text{ ps}$, $\sigma_{5\text{mm} \times 5\text{mm}, U=300V} = 103 \pm 1 \text{ ps}$, $\sigma_{1.5\text{mm} \times 1.5\text{mm}, U=300V} = 96 \pm 2 \text{ ps}$. For the same size 4H-SiC-PIN (5mm\times5mm), biasing higher reverse voltage acquires better time resolution due to faster carrier velocity; For the same reverse voltage, faster rising time caused by smaller capacitance improves the time resolution. Meanwhile, the mean of $\Delta T$ shifts from 5.03 ns to 4.81ns for different size device due to faster rising time for smaller capacitance device.

5 SIMULATION

5.1 Introduction of fast simulation tool - RASER

We have developed a fast simulation program to study the time resolution performance of SiC detectors, RASER. It is implemented in ROOT framework with python language. We use FEniCS [11], an open-source computing platform for solving partial differential equations (PDEs), to calculate the electric field and weighting potential of SiC detectors. The MIPs with non-uniform charge deposition and amplitude variability are considered. The induced current is calculated by Shockley-Ramo’s theorem [12], where the carrier drift is simulated by 0.1 $\mu$m steps with the magnetic field and thermal diffusion take into account. A simplified charge sensitive amplifier (CSA) is used as the read-out electronics of simulation [13].

5.2 Weighting field potentials and electric fields calculation by FEniCS

The electric potential and the weighting potential for the simulation detector can be computed by solving Poisson’s equations (equation (1)) and Laplace’s equations (equation (2)):

$$\nabla^2 U = -\frac{\rho}{\epsilon} \tag{1}$$

$$\nabla^2 U_w = 0 \tag{2}$$

where U is the electric potential, the $U_w$ is the weighting potential, $\epsilon$ is the electric permittivity of SiC and $\rho$ is the charge density. The electric field and weighting field are calculated by $E = -\nabla U$ and $E_w = -\nabla U_w$ respectively.

5.3 Current calculation

The induced current in the SiC detector is produced by the motion of the electron-hole pairs. The current appears when the electron-hole pairs begin to move and disappears when all electron-hole pairs reach the electrode or the boundary of the detector. The instant induced current by an electron or a hole can be calculated with the Shockley-Ramo’s theorem:

$$I = -q \int \overrightarrow{v}(r) \cdot \overrightarrow{E}_w(r) \tag{3}$$

where $r$ is the position of electron or hole, $v(r)$ is the drift velocity and $E_w(r)$ is the weighting potential. $v(r)$ is equal to $\mu_{\text{SiC}} \cdot E(r)$, and the $\mu_{\text{SiC}}$ is the mobility of SiC. The mobility model of SiC in RASER is based on [14], and the sum of the induced currents of all electrons and holes is the total current.

The non-uniform charge deposition and current amplitude change are considered in the simulation. Geant4 is used to simulate the energy deposited of 5 $\mu$m SiC, and then the energy is divided by 5 to get the
energy per micron, which can be used to achieve non-uniform charge deposition. The energy deposition
distribution of SiC with different thickness is also simulated to show current amplitude change.

5.4 Compare the simulation and measurement of time resolution

The time resolution of SiC detector can be expressed as equation (4) [15]:

$$\sigma_t^2 = \sigma_{\text{Time Walk}}^2 + \sigma_{\text{Landau Noise}}^2 + \sigma_{\text{Distortion}}^2 + \sigma_{\text{Jitter}}^2 + \sigma_{\text{TDC}}^2$$  (4)

where the correlations of each item are ignored. In simulation, non-uniform weighting potential and electric
field cause the signal distortion $\sigma_{\text{Distortion}}$. The non-uniform charge deposition and current amplitude
change cause the time walk $\sigma_{\text{Time Walk}}$ and Landau noise $\sigma_{\text{Landau Noise}}$. The electronics noise which leads
to $\sigma_{\text{Jitter}}$ is also added in simulation, and $\sigma_{\text{TDC}}$ is about 14 ps from measurement setup. These main time
resolution contributions are considered in the simulation process.

We simulated the time resolution of NJU detector with 5 mm $\times$ 5 mm sizes under 500 V bias voltage.
The program has been validated by comparing current for MIP particles of TCAD Sentaurus simulation,
RASER simulation and measured signal. Figure 6 shows the waveform comparison of RASER simulation,
TCAD simulation and measured data, and good consistency was found in all three cases.
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Figure 6. (Color online) The waveform comparison of TCAD simulation (red), measured data (brown)
and RASER simulation (green).

The time resolution simulation result of NJU detector is shown in Figure 7. 2000 events were simulated,
and the same CFD fraction 0.5 as the measurement is used to obtain the time of arrival (ToA). The
time resolution obtained by Gaussian fitting is $(53 \pm 1)$ ps, and the final time resolution of adding TDC
uncertainty is $(68 \pm 1)$ ps which is $(26 \pm 1)$ ps less than the measurement result. The reasons for the
difference in time resolution of simulation and measurement are included: the simulation did not contain
the divergence angle from the scattering of Figure 2 upper PCB board and LGAD detector, and there is no
shielding box of the beta source measurement, which will lead to the increase in time resolution. RASER
software can effectively simulate the time resolution of SiC to some extent, but the measurement and
simulation need further optimization.
Figure 7. (Color online) The time resolution simulation result of 5mm×5mm sizes NJU detector.

6 CONCLUSION

Finally, we acquire the best time resolution $94 \pm 1$ ps for a 5mm×5mm 4H-SiC-PIN detector with $^{90}$Sr source. With high reverse voltage and small capacitance, a better time resolution is obtained. The simulated waveform by RASER is validated with measurements. The simulated time resolution indicates more leading contributions of the test system for time resolution should be considered. The present measured and simulated time resolutions are beneficial to develop the ultra fast 4H-SiC LGAD and 3D 4H-SiC detectors which will have better time resolution in the future.
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