

# **Design of QET Phonon Sensors for the CDMS ZIP Detectors**




**T. Saab<sup>1</sup>, R. M. Clarke<sup>1</sup>, B. Cabrera<sup>1</sup>, R. A. Abusaidi<sup>1</sup>, R. Gaitskel<sup>2</sup>**

*<sup>1</sup>Physics Department, Stanford University, Stanford, USA*


*<sup>2</sup>Center for Particle Astrophysics, University of California,  
Berkeley, USA*

8<sup>th</sup> International Workshop on Low Temperature Detectors  
18<sup>th</sup> August 1999, Dalfsen, NL


# Quasiparticle propagation in the QET



# Surface Design of CDMS ZIP (previous design)



# Determination of the Quasiparticle Diffusion Length $L_{\text{diff}}$





## Optimizing the QET...

- Previous Design
  - Area of Al Fins  $> 3 l_{\text{diff}}$  away from TES  $\sim 54\%$
  - Calculated efficiency  $\sim 6.4\%$
  
- Quasiparticle Collection Efficiency can be increased by
  - Longer diffusion length
  - More TES per unit area
  - SMALLER Al fin coverage



## ...Optimizing the QET

- Longer Diffusion Length  $l_{\text{diff}}$ 
  - $l_{\text{diff}}$  is thickness limited
  - Al fins thickness 150 nm  $\rightarrow$  300 nm;  $l_{\text{diff}}$  : 180  $\rightarrow$  360  $\mu\text{m}$
  
- # TES per unit area
  - TES connected in parallel
  - Low TES resistance  $\rightarrow$  Sensor is susceptible to oscillations
  - Long TES length  $\rightarrow$  Sensor susceptible to superconducting/normal phase separation
  - Minimum TES width/thickness imposed by fabrication limitations
  
- Less Al fin coverage
  - Phonons reflect at the bare Ge (Si) surface, probability of down conversion is small
  - Probability of phonon absorption in Al fin  $\sim 30\%$
  - Minimize uninstrumented (dead) features. *e.g.* bonding pads, voltage rails, alignment marks
  - Ballistic phonon mean free path is several times the detectors thickness  $\rightarrow$  Phonons will visit the detector's surface several times before being absorbed in Al fin close to a TES



## More on TESs

### ■ Current design

- 12 TES elements per  $5 \text{ mm}^2$
- TES dimensions :  $250 \mu\text{m}$  (l) x  $2 \mu\text{m}$  (w) x  $35 \text{nm}$  (h)
- $R_{\text{normal}} \sim 1.4 \Omega$ ,  $R_{\text{bias}} \sim 100 \text{ m}\Omega$
- $T_c \sim 60 - 120 \text{ mK}$

### ■ Limits on TES dimensions

- $R_{\text{min}}(\text{TES})$  limit imposed by electrothermal oscillations :  $\tau_{\text{ETF}} > \beta \tau_{\text{L/R}}$   
... **BUT**
- phase stability dictates :  $l_{\text{max}}^2(\text{TES}) < (\pi^2 L / \alpha \Sigma \rho_n T_c^3)$
- photolithography limits :  $w_{\text{min}} > 1 \mu\text{m}$
- W deposition and  $T_c$  control limit :  $h_{\text{min}} \sim 35 \text{ nm}$   
... **Therefore**

for  $w(\text{TES}) = 1 \mu\text{m}$  and 24 TES elements per square  $R_{\text{normal}}$  is maintained

### ■ ...Can going to a two stage squid readout help ?

- Much smaller L allows for an equally smaller  $R(\text{TES}) \sim 100$  times
- Technical difficulties involving fully superconducting squid circuit


# Diffusion Simulation

■ Diffusion Equation:

$$\frac{\partial n(\vec{x},t)}{\partial t} - D\nabla^2 n(\vec{x},t) + \gamma n(\vec{x},t) = 0$$

$$l_{\text{diff}} = \sqrt{D/\gamma}$$

- 2 dimensional simulation of *phonon* collection as a function of Al fin length, with  $l_{\text{diff}} = 360 \mu\text{m}$  gives the following ->
- Al fin width limited to  $50 \mu\text{m}$  in order to exclude magnetic vortices which degrade  $l_{\text{diff}}$ .
- For 24 TES per 5mm square and  $l_{\text{fin}} \sim 400 \mu\text{m}$  efficiency  $\sim 25\%$  (compared with 6.4% for 100% Al coverage)





## How much can we trust simulations

...especially if done on a mac!

### Measured vs. Calculated efficiencies for the previous ZIP design



■ Calculated Efficiency	<u>Si ZIP</u>	<u>Ge ZIP</u>
■ Initial phonon spectrum above $2\Delta$ Al	95%	90%
■ Active Area	80%	80%
■ Cascade phonons (from QP) below $2\Delta$ Al	50%	50%
■ QP collection efficiency	6.4%	6.4%
■ <u>Total Efficiency</u>	<u>2.4%</u>	<u>2.3%</u>
■ <u>Measured Efficiency</u>	<u>2.4%</u>	<u>1.5%</u>



## Sideeffects and drawbacks ?!?

- Phonons will reflect on average 8 times before being absorbed by Al fins
  - Assuming  $v_{\text{ph}} \sim 1 \text{ cm}/\mu\text{s}$   $\rightarrow \tau_{\text{ph}} \sim 15 \mu\text{s}$  is a minimum pulse decay timescale
  
- Phonon reflections at the Ge (Si) surface are equal probability specular or diffuse
  - Phonons are distributed throughout detector more efficiently than in previous design
  - Position localization due to signal contrast amongst the 4 channels is reduced.
  
- First look at phnon pulses with new ZIP design look promising
  - we'll have more quantitative data very soon

## New QET Design for the ZIP Detector





## **Conclusion**

- **Current CDMS ZIP detectors have a phonon energy collection efficiency of  $\sim 2\%$  dominated by the QET 6.4% quasiparticle collection efficiency.**
- **Optimization of QET/TES geometry implies a factor of 4 improvement in quasiparticle collection, with room for improvement.**
- **Preliminary results look promising ... must wait a few weeks for complete results.**