Qualification of a HV-MAPS produced by TSI

Christoph Blattgerste for the Mu3e collaboration

Heidelberg University

26.03.2019



MuPix7

- MuPix7 is first fully monolithic HV-MAPS developed for Mu3e
- Well characterized prototype produced by AMS
- 40 imes 32 pixels with a size of 103 imes 80 μm



Electronics

- Amplifier in each pixel
- \bullet Conversion analog \leftrightarrow digital at comparator in periphery cell
- Digital electronics and state machine in periphery



Motivation

- \bullet AMS process no longer supported & delivery delays
- $\rightarrow\,$ Change to TSI HV as manufacturing process?





- AMS H18 and TSI HV based on same IBM HV process
- Identical design in 180 nm HV-CMOS
- Expect no significant differences between AMS/TSI beside statistical variations

Setup



- MuPix7 sensors bonded on insert (5 AMS & 4 TSI)
- Mupix8 v2 PCB with MuPix7 insert (printed circuit board)
- Data readout via 8b/10b encoded LVDS signal with Stratix IV FPGA



Breakdown Voltage

- I-V-curve for reverse biased diodes
- Clear difference between foundries
- Higher breakdown allows for higher HV
- Hint for TSIs quality



VCO scan



- Same shape for TSI and AMS
- TSI slightly less jitter (not significant)
- same DAC value suitable for TSI chips



VCO scan



AMS vs. TSI

Time resolution

- Latency: Hit TS -Trigger TS
- No significant difference
- Right tail due to time-walk





Power consumption

- VDD: digital part
- VDDA, VSSA: analog pixels
- Most power for digital part
- Big variances for VDD



Power consumption

- TSI VDD about 25% higher than AMS
- TSI VDDA, VSSA about 10% higher than AMS
- TSI has higher power consumption overall



Power consumption for important DACs

| DAC | current (AMS) [<i>mA</i>] | current (TSI) [<i>mA</i>] | TSI/AMS |
|--------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|---------|
| VN2 | 3.9 | 4.4 | 1.13 |
| VNLVDS | 8.0 | 19.1 | 2.39 |
| VPComp | 3.8 | 4.4 | 1.16 |
| VPDac | 11.5 | 12.4 | 1.08 |



Power consumption for important DACs

| DAC | current (AMS) [<i>mA</i>] | current (TSI) [<i>mA</i>] | TSI/AMS |
|--------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|---------|
| VN2 | 3.9 | 4.4 | 1.13 |
| VNLVDS | 8.0 | 19.1 | 2.39 |
| VPComp | 3.8 | 4.4 | 1.16 |
| VPDac | 11.5 | 12.4 | 1.08 |



LVDS output

- Need for high resolution spectrum analyzer
- "Eye" as overlap of differential signals
- VNLVDS affects eye height only
- eye height measured correctly



LVDS scan

- Significant difference AMS/TSI
- higher "eye" for TSI chips
- \rightarrow 4× better signal quality for TSI



LVDS power consumption

- Significant difference AMS/TSI
- better signal quality for TSI needs higher power
- \rightarrow TSI generates higher signal for same power



Summary

comparison

| Area | AMS | TSI |
|-----------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Breakdown | $HV_{AMS} \approx 93 V$ | $HV_{TSI} \approx 96 V$ |
| PLL | $\mu_{AMS}pprox$ 42.0 ns | $\mu_{AMS}pprox$ 35.0 ns |
| Time res. | $\sigma_{AMS}pprox$ 20.7 ns | $\sigma_{TSI}pprox$ 20.8 ns |
| Power | $P_{AMS}pprox 105 mW$ | $P_{TSI} pprox 129 mW$ |
| LVDS | $VNLVDS_{AMS} = 15$ | $VNLVDS_{TSI} = 2$ |



Summary

comparison

| Area | AMS | TSI |
|-----------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Breakdown | $HV_{AMS} \approx 93 V$ | $HV_{TSI} \approx 96 V$ |
| PLL | $\mu_{AMS}pprox$ 42.0 ns | $\mu_{AMS}pprox$ 35.0 ns |
| Time res. | $\sigma_{AMS}pprox$ 20.7 ns | $\sigma_{TSI}pprox$ 20.8 ns |
| Power | $P_{AMS} pprox 105 mW$ | $P_{TSI} pprox 129 mW$ |
| LVDS | $VNLVDS_{AMS} = 15$ | $VNLVDS_{TSI} = 2$ |

results

 $\label{eq:Difference} \begin{array}{l} \text{Difference only in power consumption} \\ \rightarrow \text{ solvable with lower DAC VNLVDS for TSI chips} \end{array}$

Christoph Blattgerste (Uni Heidelberg)

AMS vs. TSI

future measurements

- Signal-to-noise (SNR)
- Efficiency measurements from test-beam
- Evaluation of irradiated chips



Backup slides



Mu3e

- Search for decay $\mu^+ \to e^+ e^- e^+ \to {\rm cLFV}$
- Exclude other decays e.g. $\mu^+
 ightarrow e^+ e^- e^+
 u_e
 u_\mu$

•
$$\sum \vec{p} = 0$$
 & $\sum m_{\mu}c^2$

 $\bullet\,$ multiple layers with recurl $\rightarrow\,$ vertex/momentum resolution



Detector

- Pixel layers provide good vertex resolution
- Scintillating fibers & tiles with precise timing resolution
- $\bullet~$ Recurl through applied magnetic field $\rightarrow~$ momentum measurement

| Scintillator tiles | former minel lawore | | and the second |
|--------------------|----------------------|--------------------|----------------|
| | innes poter tayers | | |
| Εµε | leam) Target | | |
| | Scintillating fibres | | In Later Local |
| | | siter rised lawery | |

Diodes profile

- larger depletion zone for stronger electric field
- depletion over whole diodes profile





HV scan

- scan HV applied to each pixel
- $\bullet~$ higher HV $\rightarrow~$ more hits
- $\bullet~$ higher HV $\rightarrow~$ less noise





Pulse shape

- Detector temperatures $T_{min} = 0^{\circ}C$, $T_{max} = 70^{\circ}C$
- Pulse shape changes with temperature
- Measurements show temperature dependency
- → DAC settings concerned for different temperatures





- quantify injection and source
- injection histogram is gaussian
- Fe55 histogram is gaussian with left tail
- tail caused by hits between pixel cells





- varying injection creates different pulse heights
- readout electronics saturate for higher voltages



- varying injection creates different pulse heights
- readout electronics saturate for higher voltages



- difference due to statistical variations
- different absolute values unimportant



VPPump scan

- exponential shape
- same for TSI and AMS
- TSI slightly less jitter (not significant)
- DAC value are suitable



Time resolution

- Low delay
- High time resolution
- AMS chips perform better
- no significant differences



Time resolution

- Low delay
- High time resolution
- AMS chips perform better
- no significant differences

