



ELSEVIER

Available online at www.sciencedirect.com

SCIENCE @ DIRECT®

Nuclear Instruments and Methods in Physics Research A 520 (2004) 320–324

**NUCLEAR
INSTRUMENTS
& METHODS
IN PHYSICS
RESEARCH**
Section A

www.elsevier.com/locate/nima

Performance of resistive microcalorimeters and bolometers

M. Galeazzi

University of Miami, Department of Physics, P.O. Box 248046, Coral Gables, FL 33124, USA

Abstract

Despite the impressive results achieved by microcalorimeters and bolometers, their performance is still significantly worse than that predicted by Mather's ideal model (Appl. Opt. 21 (1982) 1125). The difference is due both to non-ideal effects and to excess noise of unknown origin. The non-ideal effects have been recently quantified and include hot-electron effect, absorber decoupling, thermometer non-ohmic behavior, and all related extra noise sources. The excess noise affects primarily Transition Edge Sensors (TES) and is currently under experimental and theoretical investigation. This paper reviews the origin of non-ideal effects in microcalorimeters and bolometers and their effect on energy resolution and noise equivalent power. It also reviews the results on the characterization and suppression of the excess noise in TES, and the recent theoretical investigations to explain its origin in relation to fundamental physics in superconductors.

© 2003 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

PACS: 29.40.Vj; 07.57.Kp; 85.25.Oj

Keywords: Microcalorimeters; Bolometers; Transition edge sensors

1. The ideal model

A complete non-equilibrium theory for the noise in simple bolometers with ideal resistive thermometers was given by Mather in 1982 [1] and extended to microcalorimeter performance 2 years later [2]. An ideal detector can be represented by a discrete absorber of heat capacity C in contact with the heat sink through a thermal conductivity G , and a thermometer always at the temperature of the absorber.

When an external input power W is incident on the detector ($W = E \cdot \delta(t_0)$ for microcalorimeters) the detector temperature rises by an amount ΔT that is assumed to be small compared to the detector temperature T ($\Delta T \ll T$) and therefore all equations can be simplified to first-order approximation. The temperature change ΔT is described

by the equation

$$C \frac{d\Delta T}{dt} + G\Delta T = W + \Delta P \quad (1)$$

where ΔP is the change in the Joule power dissipated into the thermometer due to the temperature change and is referred to as the electro-thermal feedback term.

The energy resolution is limited by the detector noise. Main noise terms are the Johnson noise of the sensor and any excess noise it has, the phonon shot noise produced by the random flow of energy carriers through the weak thermal link (thermal noise), and the electrical noise of the read out electronics [1]. Assuming that the noise is dominated by Johnson and thermal noise, the energy resolution can be written as

$$\Delta E_{\text{RMS}} = \xi \sqrt{k_B T^2 C}, \quad (2)$$

where k_B is the Boltzmann constant and ξ is dimensionless and depends on the detector characteristics, thermometer sensitivity, and bias power [1,3].

2. Non-ideal effects

This result of the ideal model shows that the performance should improve dramatically as the operating temperature is reduced. However, at temperatures below ~ 200 mK, it becomes increasingly difficult to construct a detector that behaves according to the ideal assumptions. The resistance of the thermometer becomes dependent on readout power as well as temperature and equilibration times between different parts of the detector become significant. Thermodynamic fluctuations between internal parts are then an additional noise source [3]. Moreover, in many cases the detector characteristics change rapidly with temperature and the first-order approximation used in the ideal model does not properly describe the detector performance. Excess noise, i.e., noise of (so far) unknown origin is an additional limit to the detector performance.

2.1. Absorber and hot-electron decoupling

The ideal model describes a microcalorimeter as a monolithic device. With currently realized devices this is not always a sufficient approximation. The absorber is often glued to the sensor, or, in any event, it is connected to it through a finite thermal conductivity. Similarly, electrons in the thermometer can get thermally decoupled from the phonon system. This effect is well known in metals at low temperatures and has recently been studied in semiconductors in the variable range-hopping regime [4]. The thermometer is then described as two systems, electrons and phonons, thermally connected by a finite thermal conductivity. The resistance of the thermometer depends directly on the temperature of the electrons, and the bias power dissipated into the electron system, raising the electron temperature above the phonon one. Both absorber and hot-electron decoupling have the effect of changing response of the thermometer

and of introducing additional thermal fluctuations between the different detector components that worsen the detector performance [3].

2.2. Thermometer non-ohmic behavior

Another effect that may change the performance of a detector is the non-ohmic behavior of the thermometer, i.e., the thermometer resistance may not depend only on the thermometer electron temperature, but also on the current (or voltage) that is used to readout the temperature change [3].

This effect is particularly strong when TES thermometers are used [5,6]. It is a known property of TES that their transition temperature can be changed by applying an external magnetic field. Similarly, when a bias current is passed through the TES to read out the resistance, it generates a magnetic field around the TES. This field may affect the transition temperature of the TES. When the detector temperature changes due to external power, the change of sensor resistance changes the current through the sensors which, in turn, changes the transition temperature and thus the resistance value. This non-ohmic behavior of the sensor plays against the temperature dependence of the resistance, reducing the thermometer sensitivity [3]. A similar effect, but on a much smaller scale has also been seen in semiconductor thermistors due to field effects in the doped region [7].

2.3. Detector non-linearity

The ideal model assumes that the changes in detector temperature are small compared with the temperature. A first-order approximation can then be used and the detector is assumed to be linear. In fact, most important detector quantities (heat capacity, thermal conductivity, and thermometer sensitivity) can change significantly when the detector temperature change and higher-order terms become important. Only recently these effects have been included in detector models as they can significantly affect the energy resolution [8,9].

2.4. Excess noise

Both semiconductor thermistors and transition edge sensors seem to be partly affected by excess noise of unclear origin. A major problem that historically affected silicon semiconductor thermistors is $1/f$ noise [10]. An unbiased thermistor typically exhibits the expected noise, but increasing the bias current often results in an increase in the amount of noise. This excess noise can be modeled as $1/f$ fluctuations in the resistance that, for a given device, depend only on the doping density and the resistivity. The presence of $1/f$ noise can introduce degradation of up to 50% in the detector performance. Recently the NASA/Goddard Space Flight Center (GSFC), in collaboration with the University of Wisconsin has developed a deep implant and diffusion technique for silicon [11] with which they can implant very uniform devices more than 5 times thicker than before. The devices produced with this technique do not show any sign of $1/f$ noise and have demonstrated greatly improved performance [12].

Excess noise in TES is also the subject of a massive investigation. Single pixel detectors with TES thermometers have achieved impressive performance [13–16]. These results, though, are still in general more than a factor of two worse than the predicted performance. The reason for this is the presence of an extra noise source of unknown origin in the detectors. When the TES is in the superconducting or normal state, the noise level agrees with that expected, but when the TES is in the transition the measured noise is appreciably higher.

3. Excess noise in TES

3.1. Current progress

In the past couple of years an impressive effort by several groups has been devoted to the understanding and reduction of the excess noise in TES. Several groups have started a theoretical investigation of the possible sources of noise due to the superconducting nature of TES. In particular, two potential major sources of noise have been

identified, magnetic flux motion due to self-field and external field and fluctuations in the order parameter (i.e., fluctuation in the number of Cooper pairs).

Magnetic flux lines perpendicular to the TES surface can penetrate a thin superconducting layer from the edges of the film. In a type II superconductor, the flux lines are quantized and their motion generates a voltage noise in the TES. In type I superconductors the flux penetration generates highly unstable normal metal islands that can change in size and number generating resistance fluctuations in the TES [17]. Excess noise can also arise from the random formation and dissociation of Cooper pairs near the transition temperature of a superconductor. This noise in an ideal superconductor has been quantified by Nagaev in 1991 [18], and an investigation on the implications for TES has recently started [19].

If magnetic flux penetration from the edge of the TES is the cause of the excess noise, it may be expected that edgeless devices should not be affected by it. An edgeless device can be achieved using a Corbino (annular) geometry, with the current flowing radially [20]. The drawback of such geometry is that the device section changes, introducing a change in current density along the device. In the transition the device is therefore clearly divided in a normal metal and a superconducting region. While this device does not show any excess noise of unknown origin, fluctuations in the boundary between normal metal and superconducting region introduce additional noise that has been thoroughly investigated [20].

Similarly, devices fabricated at the Space Research Organization Netherlands (SRON) [21] do not show any excess noise of unknown origin, but are affected by additional noise due to internal thermal fluctuations. These devices differ from devices built elsewhere due to the fact that have higher resistance (and therefore lower thermal conductivity) and have a thick copper absorber deposited in the center of the TES. As a consequence different parts of the TES have different temperature and are weakly coupled with each other. Thermal fluctuations between the different parts of the TES are therefore an

additional source of noise similar to the absorber and hot-electron decoupling previously described.

To reduce the effect of the thermal decoupling, a geometry where the absorber is divided in stripes along the TES has been proposed [22], and recent results have shown that this “zebra” geometry significantly reduces the amplitude of the internal thermal fluctuation noise (ITFN) [21]. Based partly on these results, other groups have also built devices with a zebra-like normal metal pattern deposited on top of the TES. Preliminary results show that the excess noise is either suppressed or drastically reduced [23–25]. Results of detectors built using these devices as thermometers have not been reported so far.

Other methods to reduce the amplitude of excess noise in TES have also been investigated. These include different TES geometries and the use of small external magnetic fields. In particular, results from the National Institute of Standard and Technology (NIST) show that the excess noise is greatly reduced when a small magnetic field (~ 100 mG) is applied perpendicular to the TES surface [24].

3.2. Considerations

Several questions remain open on the nature of the TES excess noise. Answering, at least in part, these questions is mandatory to improve our understanding and prediction capability of TES performance.

First of all, are TES type I or type II superconductors? The physics behind the two different types of superconductors is quite different, as is the expected intrinsic noise. A characterization of the TES superconducting nature is therefore essential to be able to evaluate the expected intrinsic noise [17].

A better characterization of the measured excess noise is also necessary. A more complete, systematic investigation of how the amplitude and other noise characteristics scale with current, thermometer sensitivity, bias power, bias voltage, temperature, critical temperature, etc. is essential to distinguish between different noise models and is paramount to understand the origin of the excess noise. These measurements must be accompanied

by more detailed calculations of the scaling of noise due to intrinsic sources, like magnetic flux penetration and changes in the order parameter.

Another interesting question concerns the understanding of the mechanism of noise reduction in the “zebra” geometry. As pointed out before, this geometry was first proposed by SRON [22] to reduce the effect of the ITFN. The same geometry seems to reduce the effect of excess noise in devices produced by NIST and GSFC [23–25], even though those devices do not seem to be critically affected by ITFN. Is it just a coincidence that the same geometry can reduce excess noise of different origins, or is there something more fundamental behind it?

Can we learn something about the nature of the excess noise from the fact that it is reduced by the “zebra” geometry? The SRON group has already quantified the reduction in ITFN due this geometry [21]. In the case of ITFN the direction of the stripes (parallel or perpendicular to the current flow) should not affect the noise amplitude. Such a test should therefore clearly confirm or reject the ITFN hypothesis. Results from NIST and GSFC indicate that the excess noise in their devices is reduced ONLY if the stripes are perpendicular to the current [23–25], ruling out the hypothesis of ITFN in their devices. Even though it is largely premature to say, the NIST and GSFC results seem to fit quite well in the magnetic flux penetration scenario. The normal metal stripes, in fact, would act as preferential islands for the flux penetration. The number and size of the regions of flux penetration, which could be the cause of excess noise, would therefore be frozen and the noise reduced. Very little can be said, at the moment, about whether the “zebra” geometry results can be explained by fluctuations in the order parameter, as better understanding of the process is necessary.

It has been reported by several groups that in addition to reducing the excess noise, the “zebra” geometry also reduces the thermometer sensitivity α [21,23–25]. It is certainly interesting to understand if the two effects are due to the same physical cause, or are just two unrelated consequences of the “zebra” geometry. This is essential to understand if it is possible to use the “zebra”

geometry to build devices with low excess noise and high sensitivity.

4. Conclusions

In the past few years our understanding of the behavior of microcalorimeters and bolometers has drastically improved. This resulted in a significant improvement in device performance due to a better detector optimization. In particular, semiconductor thermistors are now a relatively well-understood technology with performance that can be quite reliably predicted by models.

On the other hand, we still need to improve our understanding of TES behavior and absorber thermalization [26,27]. If progress in these fields will be as fast as it has been in the past, we may expect drastic improvement in detector performance in the next few years.

References

- [1] J.C. Mather, *Appl. Opt.* 21 (1982) 1125.
- [2] S.H. Moseley, J.C. Mather, D. McCammon, *J. Appl. Phys.* 56 (1984) 1257.
- [3] M. Galeazzi, D. McCammon, *J. Appl. Phys.* 93 (2003) 4856.
- [4] D. Liu, et al., *AIP Conf. Proc.* 605 (2002) 87.
- [5] M.A. Lindeman, Ph.D. Thesis, University of California at Davis, 2000.
- [6] P. Tan, et al., *AIP Conf. Proc.* 605 (2002) 255.
- [7] J. Zhang, et al., *Phys. Rev. B* 57 (1998) 4472.
- [8] W.A. Tillostson, et al., *Nucl. Instr. and Meth. A*, (2004) these Proceedings.
- [9] D.J. Fixen, et al., *Nucl. Instr. and Meth. A*, (2004) these Proceedings.
- [10] D. McCammon, et al., *Phys. Stat. Sol. B* 230 (2002) 197.
- [11] M. Galeazzi, et al., *AIP Conf. Proc.* 605 (2002) 83.
- [12] C.K. Stahle, et al., *Proc. SPIE* 4851 (2003) 1394.
- [13] W. Bergmann Tiest, et al., *AIP Conf. Proc.* 605 (2002) 199.
- [14] K.D. Irwin, et al., *Nucl. Instr. and Meth. A* 444 (2000) 184.
- [15] M.A. Lindeman, et al., *AIP Conf. Proc.* 605 (2002) 215.
- [16] B. Cabrera, et al., *AIP Conf. Proc.* 605 (2002) 565.
- [17] M. Galeazzi, et al., *Nucl. Instr. and Meth. A*, (2004) these Proceedings.
- [18] K.E. Nagaev, *Physica C* 184 (1991) 149.
- [19] G. Seidel, I.S. Beloborodov, *Nucl. Instr. and Meth. A*, (2004) these Proceedings.
- [20] A. Luukanen, et al., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 90 (2003) 238306.
- [21] W. Bergmann Tiest, et al., *Nucl. Instr. and Meth. A*, (2004) these Proceedings.
- [22] B. Tiest, et al., Microcalorimeter performance: absorber geometries, responsivity, noise and energy resolution, First International Workshop on TES, Boulder, CO, April 2002. Available on-line at <http://origins.colorado.edu/~deiker/tes/index.cgi>
- [23] M. Lindeman, et al., *Nucl. Instr. and Meth. A*, (2004) these Proceedings.
- [24] J.N. Ullom, et al., *Nucl. Instr. and Meth. A*, (2004) these Proceedings.
- [25] J.G. Staguhn, et al., *Nucl. Instr. and Meth. A*, (2004) these Proceedings.
- [26] M. Chapellier, *Nucl. Instr. and Meth. A*, (2004) these Proceedings.
- [27] J.E. Vaillancourt, et al., *Nucl. Instr. and Meth. A*, (2004) these Proceedings.