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Abstract
In electronic packaging in recent years, silver (Ag) alloy wires have been widely adopted in wire-bond processes. The bond pads on the device chips are mostly aluminum (Al). Thus, the bonding interface is mainly Ag–Al. In recent Ag alloy wire-bond publications, it is unclear what intermetallic phases form at the interface. In this research, experiments were designed to understand the Ag–Al intermetallic compound (IMC) formation in the Ag–Al system and evaluate its mechanical properties. First, the Ag–Al alloys with compositions from 19 to 43 at.% Al were evaluated to identify the phase equilibrium and crystal structure of the Ag–Al intermetallic phases. Microstructures and phase compositions of the designed Ag–Al alloys are presented. To further study the intermetallic compound formation at the Ag/Al interface, the interfacial reaction of the Ag/Al joints at 200 °C was investigated. The µ-Ag3Al and δ-Ag2Al IMC were identified to form at the Ag/Al interface and stabilize after long-time annealing at 200 °C. At last, deformation and fracture behaviors of the bulk µ-Ag3Al and δ-Ag2Al were analyzed by the micro-indentation. The measured results reveal that µ-Ag3Al exhibits significantly higher hardness and lower fracture toughness as compared to δ-Ag2Al. Indentation crack propagation in µ-Ag3Al demonstrates the fracture characteristics of brittle materials. In the case of δ-Ag2Al, the presence of slip bands exhibits the ductility of δ-Ag2Al to endure plastic deformation prior to fracture. The effect of the mechanical properties of the µ-Ag3Al and δ-Ag2Al IMC on the Ag–Al joint reliability is discussed. New information obtained in this research is important for future study of the joint reliability and failure mechanism of Ag–Al wire bonds.

1 Introduction
Wire bonding technology has been widely used to interconnect chips and substrates of microelectronic packages [1–3]. In the 1980s, both aluminum (Al) and gold (Au) wires were adopted in wire bonding. With increasing demand for high complexity and high reliability packaging, thermosonic ball bonding with Au wires became the dominant wire bonding technique. As the pitch of wire bonds continued to decrease, Al wires were abandoned because of their rapid oxide growth during spark ball formation. However, large diameter Al wires are still used on high power devices with the wedge bonding method [4]. Au wire diameter has continued to decrease to 15 µm due to rising gold prices and shrinking pad size [5, 6]. On the other hand, the rising gold price has motivated the packaging industry to look for alternative wire materials such as silver (Ag) and copper (Cu) [7–11]. Recently, several packaging companies have bonded Cu wires on Al bond-pads in production. The Cu/Al interface reaction and Cu wire bond reliability have been reported [7, 8]. Since Cu wires get oxidized easily and exhibit higher hardness as compared to Au and Ag alloy wires, Cu wires possess a narrower process window for wire bonding. The high hardness of Cu could cause Al pads splashing, and the higher bonding force for Cu wire bonding could induce Si chip cratering [9]. In addition, Cu-Al wire bonds exhibit low corrosion resistance to halogen elements under high humidity. Halogen content, such as chlorine, in molding compound should be controlled to prevent the corrosion at the Cu/Al interface [11].

Recently, Ag alloy wires have been introduced as a new bonding wire alternative [10, 12]. Compared to Cu wires, Ag alloy wires have the advantages of higher oxidation resistance and higher ductility. Thus, Ag alloy wire bonding exhibits a wider process window and can reduce Al pad splash and silicon damage [13]. A concern is intermetallic
compound (IMC) formation at the bonding interface. The IMC layer has often been found to be the weak region due to its brittle nature, leading to a high failure rate of the bonding joints [14–17]. Several research studies have sought to understand the IMC formation and the resulting phases in Ag–Al wire bonds. However, the Ag–Al IMC phases reported are not conclusive. One research group indicated Ag$_4$Al and Ag$_5$Al phases [18] and others showed AgAl$_2$, Ag$_5$Al and Ag$_3$Al phases at the Ag/Al interface [19, 20]. Moreover, although many studies have reported the reliability test results of the Ag–Al wire bonds [18–21], the mechanical properties of the Ag–Al intermetallics are still unclear.

Therefore, this study aims to investigate the Ag–Al intermetallic compound formation in Ag–Al system and further evaluate its mechanical properties. First, the Ag–Al alloys with compositions from 19 to 43 at.% Al were evaluated to identify the phase equilibrium and crystal structure of the Ag–Al intermetallic phases. By studying the interfacial reaction of the Ag/Al joints, µ-Ag$_3$Al and δ-Ag$_2$Al IMC were identified to form at the Ag/Al interface and stabilize after long-time annealing at 200 °C. Finally, deformation and fracture behaviors of the bulk µ-Ag$_3$Al and δ-Ag$_2$Al were analyzed by the micro-indentation. Mechanical properties of the µ-Ag$_3$Al and δ-Ag$_2$Al were probed and discussed.

2 Experimental procedures

Ag–Al alloy ingots were grown through the casting method followed by long-time annealing. Ag and Al shots with 99.99% purity were uniformly mixed and loaded into 150 mm long quartz tubes with 1 cm in inner diameter. After loading, the tubes were evacuated by a vacuum pump and sealed by a hydrogen torch to form capsules. The capsules were brought to and kept at 1000 °C for 2 h, followed by 48-h annealing at 50 °C above the liquidus temperature to ensure complete homogenization. The sealed samples were then water quenched to room temperature to avoid excess phase formation during the cooldown process. Subsequently, solid-state annealing was performed at 200 °C for up to 750 h. After annealing, the ingots (40–45 mm long and 10 mm in diameter) were cut into disks with a thickness of 1 mm and mechanically polished for further examination. The casted ingot and disk samples after annealing at 200 °C for 750 h. After annealing, the ingot samples were cut into disks (10 mm in diameter and 1 mm in thickness) and mechanically polished for further examination.

Al joints at 200 °C was investigated in this study. Ag–Al joints were prepared by bonding Ag disks to Al substrates using the solid-state bonding process. The bonding process was performed at 350 °C with a 1000 psi (6.89 MPa) static pressure for 450 s in the 0.1 torr vacuum. Subsequently, the Ag–Al joints were annealed at 200 °C for 750 h to form the Ag–Al IMC layer. To avoid possible damaging from the conventional mechanical polishing process, the cross-sectional Ag/Al joint specimens were prepared by the using focused ion beam milling technique. The interfacial morphologies and the phase compositions were evaluated by SEM/EDX.

After identifying the intermetallic compound formation in the Ag–Al alloys and Ag/Al joints, the mechanical properties of the two stable intermetallic phases, µ-Ag$_3$Al and δ-Ag$_2$Al, were studied. The hardness, elastic modulus and fracture toughness of bulk µ-Ag$_3$Al and δ-Ag$_2$Al were analyzed by a micro-hardness tester (Buehler, Lake Bluff, IL Micromet II Micro Hardness Tester). Vickers indentaion mode was used with indentation loads ranging between 100 and 1000 gf. SEM observations were conducted after indentation to determine the average lengths of the induced cracks.

3 Results and discussions

In order to understand Ag–Al binary system and study the equilibrium Ag–Al intermetallic phases, the Ag–Al phase diagrams [22–24] are reviewed. In Fig. 2, we put the experimental phase diagram [22] and two calculated phase diagrams [23, 24] together for comparison. Below 873 K (600 °C), all three phase diagrams indicate that there are only two intermetallic phases, δ-Ag$_2$Al and µ-Ag$_3$Al. The experimental and calculated boundaries of the δ-Ag$_2$Al phase are in good agreement. However, the experimental and calculated boundaries of the µ-Ag$_3$Al phase differ
significantly. Below 523 k (250 °C), the crystal structures and boundaries of \( \mu \)-Ag\(_3\)Al and \( \delta \)-Ag\(_2\)Al phases are sparse and incomplete. In industry, the temperature range between 125 and 300 °C has been chosen for the standard thermal storage testing of wire bonds, and the temperature range between 150 and 250 °C is the typical post-mold curing process [25]. It is critical to understand the equilibrium intermetallic phase in the Ag–Al system within this temperature range and further study its crystal structure and mechanical properties. In this study, eleven alloys with compositions from 19 to 43 at.% Al annealed at 200 °C were employed to obtain two single-phase intermetallic phases and three mixed-phase alloys, as listed in Table 1. The experimental results show that both intermetallic phases, \( \mu \)-Ag\(_3\)Al and \( \delta \)-Ag\(_2\)Al, stabilize at 200 °C after long-time annealing. In Fig. 2, the white spots represent a single-phase intermetallic in the sample. The black spots represent a two-phase alloy in the sample. At 200 °C, single-phase \( \mu \)-Ag\(_3\)Al stabilizes in the composition range from 21.6 to 22.9 at.% Al, and single-phase \( \delta \)-Ag\(_2\)Al stabilizes in the composition range from 32.1 to 39.9 at.% Al. In addition, three two-phase alloys, \( \mu \)-Ag\(_3\)Al + (Ag), \( \mu \)-Ag\(_3\)Al + \( \delta \)-Ag\(_2\)Al, and \( \delta \)-Ag\(_2\)Al + (Al), were produced and studied.

In the following section, microstructures and crystal structures of the Ag–Al alloys are presented. Figure 3 exhibits the SEM back-scattered electron images of the representative Ag–Al alloys, including single-phase intermetallics, \( \mu \)-Ag\(_3\)Al and \( \delta \)-Ag\(_2\)Al, and two-phase alloys, \( \mu \)-Ag\(_3\)Al + (Ag), \( \mu \)-Ag\(_3\)Al + \( \delta \)-Ag\(_2\)Al, and \( \delta \)-Ag\(_2\)Al + (Al). Figure 4 displays the corresponding XRD spectra of the Ag–Al alloys. Results show that single-phase \( \mu \)-Ag\(_3\)Al remains as the cubic structure (A13, \( \beta \)-Mn type) when stabilized at 200 °C, and the single-phase \( \delta \)-Ag\(_2\)Al exhibits the hexagonal structure (A3, Mg type) when stabilized at 200 °C. SEM images of the homogeneous \( \mu \)-Ag\(_3\)Al and \( \delta \)-Ag\(_2\)Al are presented in Fig. 3a, b. Microstructures of the two-phase alloys, Ag–19 at.% Al alloy, Ag–27 at.% Al alloy and Ag–43 at.% Al alloy, are shown in Fig. 3c–f. In the Ag–19 at.% Al alloy, it is observed that the brighter (Ag) strips are embedded in the \( \mu \)-Ag\(_3\)Al phase. The Al solubility detected in (Ag) solid solution is approximately 15.5 at.%. The Ag–27 at.% Al alloy exhibits a mixed-phase with \( \mu \)-Ag\(_3\)Al and \( \delta \)-Ag\(_2\)Al intermetallics, as shown in Fig. 3d. The brighter phase is the \( \mu \)-Ag\(_3\)Al phase with 22.8 at.% Al, and the darker phase is the \( \delta \)-Ag\(_2\)Al phase with 31.9 at.% Al. Figure 3e, f exhibit the hypoeutectic microstructures of the Ag–43 at.% Al alloy. The microstructure is formed by the oval-shaped \( \delta \)-Ag\(_2\)Al grains surrounded by the dark intergranular (Al) phase with fine precipitates. The needle-shaped precipitates in (Al) phase, as shown in Fig. 3f, are identified as the \( \delta \)-Ag\(_2\)Al phase by EDX. The Ag concentration detected in (Al) solid solution is approximately 2.2 at.%. The precipitation of the needle-shaped \( \delta \)-Ag\(_2\)Al in (Al) phase is attributed to the decreased Ag solubility in (Al) phase from liquidus temperature to 200 °C. The over-saturated Ag in (Al) phase leads to the formation of
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**Table 1** Equilibrium phase and chemical compositions of the observed Ag–Al alloys as determined in present study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Designed alloy compositions</th>
<th>Microstructure</th>
<th>Chemical compositions</th>
<th>Phases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ag-19 at.% Al</td>
<td>Two-phase</td>
<td>(Ag-15.5 at.% Al) + (Ag-21.5 at.% Al)</td>
<td>(Ag) + ( \mu )-Ag(_3)Al</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ag-21 at.% Al</td>
<td>Two-phase</td>
<td>(Ag-15.4 at.% Al) + (Ag-21.7 at.% Al)</td>
<td>(Ag) + ( \mu )-Ag(_3)Al</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ag-21.5 at.% Al</td>
<td>Single phase</td>
<td>Ag-21.6 at.% Al</td>
<td>( \mu )-Ag(_3)Al</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ag-22 at.% Al</td>
<td>Single phase</td>
<td>Ag-22.0 at.% Al</td>
<td>( \mu )-Ag(_3)Al</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ag-23 at.% Al</td>
<td>Single phase</td>
<td>Ag-22.9 at.% Al</td>
<td>( \mu )-Ag(_3)Al</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ag-23.5 at.% Al</td>
<td>Two-phase</td>
<td>(Ag-22.9 at.% Al) + (Ag-32.0 at.% Al)</td>
<td>( \mu )-Ag(_3)Al + ( \delta )-Ag(_2)Al</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Ag-27 at.% Al</td>
<td>Two-phase</td>
<td>(Ag-22.8 at.% Al) + (Ag-31.9 at.% Al)</td>
<td>( \mu )-Ag(_3)Al + ( \delta )-Ag(_2)Al</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Ag-32 at.% Al</td>
<td>Single phase</td>
<td>Ag-32.1 at.% Al</td>
<td>( \delta )-Ag(_2)Al</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Ag-36 at.% Al</td>
<td>Single phase</td>
<td>Ag-35.8 at.% Al</td>
<td>( \delta )-Ag(_2)Al</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Ag-40 at.% Al</td>
<td>Single phase</td>
<td>Ag-39.9 at.% Al</td>
<td>( \delta )-Ag(_2)Al</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Ag-43 at.% Al</td>
<td>Two-phase</td>
<td>(Al-2.2 at.% Ag) + (Ag-39.8 at.% Al)</td>
<td>(Al) + ( \delta )-Ag(_2)Al</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
secondary \(\delta\)-Ag\(_2\)Al precipitates inside the (Al) solid solution phase as annealing at 200 °C. The XRD spectra of the two-phase alloys, Ag-19 at.% Al alloy, Ag-27 at.% Al alloy, and Ag-43 at.% Al alloy, are shown in Fig. 4 (c) to (e).

The results above reveal that the Ag–Al intermetallic phases, \(\mu\)-Ag\(_3\)Al and \(\delta\)-Ag\(_2\)Al, can stabilize and coexist with (Ag) or (Al) in Ag–Al alloys after long-time annealing at 200 °C. To further study the Ag–Al intermetallic compound formation at the Ag/Al interface, the interfacial reaction of the Ag/Al joints at 200 °C was investigated. The Ag–Al joints were prepared by bonding Ag disks to Al substrates using the solid-state bonding process. Figure 5 shows the microstructure of the Ag–Al joints after annealing at 200 °C for 750 h. On the cross-sectional SEM image, red dots marked 1–5 indicate the EDX analysis location on the interface region. The resulting phase compositions are listed in the table below. During solid-state reaction at 200 °C, the atomic inter-diffusion of Ag and Al leads to the Ag–Al IMC formation at the joint interface. The microstructure shows the Ag–Al IMC grew into both Al and Ag sides from the joint interface. From the EDX results, the scallop-type IMC which grew into the Al side was identified as \(\delta\)-Ag\(_2\)Al. The layer-type IMC which grew into the Ag side was characterized as \(\delta\)-Ag\(_2\)Al and \(\mu\)-Ag\(_3\)Al, while the \(\mu\)-Ag\(_3\)Al IMC layer was detected between the \(\delta\)-Ag\(_2\)Al IMC and the Ag region.

As shown in the table below, at the Ag/Al interface, the \(\delta\)-Ag\(_2\)Al IMC on region 2 and 3 exhibits similar compositions, containing approximately 34.5 at.% Al. The \(\mu\)-Ag\(_3\)Al IMC layer contains 22.1 at.% Al.

As reported above, after annealing the Ag–Al alloys and the Ag–Al joints at 200 °C, the phase equilibrium and crystal
structures of the Ag–Al intermetallics are demonstrated. The Ag–Al joints were examined to study the IMC microstructure at the Ag/Al interface. In the industrial Ag–Al wire bonding process, bonding parameters such as electronic flame off (EFO) process and ultrasonic power could affect the Ag–Al interdiffusion and IMC nucleation at the bonding interface. Therefore, the Ag–Al IMC phases reported at the Ag–Al wire bonds interface are not conclusive. In this study, after long-term annealing the Ag–Al joints, δ-Ag$_2$Al and µ-Ag$_3$Al were identified as the thermodynamically stable phases at the Ag/Al interface. The thickness of δ-Ag$_2$Al and µ-Ag$_3$Al IMC layers in the Ag–Al joint is approximately 2–5 µm, which is in a comparable range to the IMC growth in Ag–Al wire bonds. Since the IMC layer is considered as the weak region within the wire bonds and could lead to brittle failure of the joint, it is important to understand the mechanical properties of the Ag–Al IMCs.

To investigate the mechanical properties of Ag–Al IMCs, the hardness and fracture toughness of the µ-Ag$_3$Al and δ-Ag$_2$Al were analyzed by the micro-indentation. Instead of using Ag–Al joints, bulk µ-Ag$_3$Al and δ-Ag$_2$Al were prepared as the indentation specimens to achieve larger analysis area for Ag–Al IMCs and avoid interface defect in Ag–Al joints. Single-phase µ-Ag$_3$Al with 22.0 at.% Al and δ-Ag$_2$Al with 35.8 at.% Al were produced. The polished intermetallics were analyzed by a Vickers indenter using a loading force ranging between 100 and 1000 gf. The characteristic features of indentation deformation and cracks in bulk µ-Ag$_3$Al and δ-Ag$_2$Al are shown in Fig. 6. The hardness (H), elastic modulus (E), and fracture toughness ($K_{IC}$) of µ-Ag$_3$Al and δ-Ag$_2$Al are listed in Table 2. Bulk µ-Ag$_3$Al exhibits significantly higher hardness than bulk δ-Ag$_2$Al and possesses fracture toughness value of 1.61 ± 0.13 MPa√m. The fracture toughness value is calculated by the equation:

\[
K_{IC} = 0.016 \times \left( \frac{E}{H} \right)^{1/2} \frac{P}{c^{3/2}}
\]

where $c$ implies the length from the center of the contact to the end of the crack, $P$ is the loading force, $H$ is the measured hardness, and $E$ is the measured elastic modulus. Figure 6a, b show the indentation cracks in bulk µ-Ag$_3$Al under a load of 300 gf and 500 gf. It is clearly observed that cracks emanated from all four corners of the indent in µ-Ag$_3$Al. At a higher load of 500 g, larger indent deformation and the longer cracks were detected in µ-Ag$_3$Al. It is clear that the indentation crack propagation in µ-Ag$_3$Al demonstrates the fracture characteristics of brittle materials. In the case of bulk δ-Ag$_2$Al, indentation cracks could not be induced after applying loads up to 1000 gf, as shown in Fig. 6c, d. With higher indent load, the extent of plastic deformation increases as indicated by the presence of slip bands around the indent. At a load of 1000 gf, parallel slip bands of about 10–20 µm wide formed in δ-Ag$_2$Al, as shown in Fig. 6d. Region A shows the slip bands nearly parallel to the indent edge, and region B and C reveal the coarser slip bands connected to the indent edge with an identical orientation. The formation of slip bands is attributed to the plastic deformation induced by the localized stress around the indent. The presence of slip bands exhibits the ability of δ-Ag$_2$Al to endure plastic deformation before fracture. These microstructures imply the significant intrinsic ductility of δ-Ag$_2$Al intermetallic.

As a result, among two Ag–Al intermetallics, µ-Ag$_3$Al demonstrates the brittle fracture characteristics in the micro-indentation analysis. The measured results reveal that µ-Ag$_3$Al exhibits significantly higher hardness and lower fracture toughness as compared to δ-Ag$_2$Al. Therefore, the formation of interfacial µ-Ag$_3$Al IMC could lead to brittle fracture at the Ag–Al wire bonding interface and
degrade the joint reliability. Moreover, as crystal structures of μ-Ag3Al and δ-Ag2Al are demonstrated in this study, it is important to discuss the effect of lattice mismatch between the IMC phases and substrates on the Ag–Al joint reliability. In the Ag–Al system, δ-Ag2Al with hexagonal structure and Al with face-centered-cubic form a well-lattice-matched δ-Ag2Al/Al interface [27]. However, large lattice mismatch between the μ-Ag3Al/Ag interface is expected due to the complex cubic structure of μ-Ag3Al (A13, β-Mn type). In Ag–Al wire bonds, the large lattice mismatch between the μ-Ag3Al and Ag could induce lattice strain and defects at the compound interface, decreasing the interfacial stability. Due to the brittle nature of μ-Ag3Al and the large lattice mismatch at the μ-Ag3Al/Ag interface, suppressing the formation of μ-Ag3Al IMC is extremely important to enhance the Ag–Al joint reliability. For Ag-Al wire bonds, adding some elements to Ag wires might reduce the Ag–Al IMC growth or change the phase compositions of the Ag–Al IMC. Recently, Au and Pd elements have been added to produce Ag alloy wires. Ternary IMC phases, (Ag, Pd)2Al, (Ag, Pd)3Al2 and (Au,Ag)4Al, were probed at the Ag–Pd/Al and Ag–Au-Pd/Al interface [10, 28]. However, the crystal structures and mechanical properties of these ternary phases are still unclear.

### Table 2 Phase compositions, hardness (H), elastic modulus (E), and fracture toughness (Kc) of the μ-Ag3Al and δ-Ag2Al

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Composition</th>
<th>Hardness (MPa)</th>
<th>Elastic modulus (GPa)</th>
<th>Fracture toughness (MPa√m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>μ-Ag3Al</td>
<td>Ag-22 at.% Al</td>
<td>2207 ± 141</td>
<td>110 ± 2.5</td>
<td>1.61 ± 0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δ-Ag2Al</td>
<td>Ag-35.8 at.% Al</td>
<td>1222 ± 94</td>
<td>106 ± 2.1</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4 Summary

In this study, experiments were established to investigate the Ag–Al IMC formation in Ag–Al system and evaluate its mechanical properties. First, the Ag–Al alloys of eleven compositions were grown and evaluated to identify the phase equilibrium and crystal structure of the Ag–Al intermetallic phases. Microstructures and phase compositions of the designed Ag–Al alloys are presented and discussed. The interfacial reaction of the Ag/Al joints at 200 °C was investigated. The μ-Ag3Al and δ-Ag2Al IMC were identified to form at the Ag/Al interface and stabilize after long-time annealing at 200 °C. Finally, deformation and fracture behaviors of the bulk μ-Ag3Al and δ-Ag2Al were analyzed by the micro-indentation. In μ-Ag3Al, the indentation cracks propagation demonstrates the brittle fracture characteristics of μ-Ag3Al. In δ-Ag2Al, the absence of indentation cracks and observed slip bands imply the intrinsic ductility of δ-Ag2Al. The measured results reveal that μ-Ag3Al exhibits remarkably higher hardness and lower fracture toughness as compared to δ-Ag2Al. Correlations between the mechanical properties of the Ag–Al IMC and the Ag–Al joint reliability are discussed. This research reveals the phase equilibrium and crystal structures of the Ag–Al IMCs and quantifies the intrinsic mechanical properties of μ-Ag3Al and δ-Ag2Al.
providing an important reference for securing the Ag–Al wire bonding reliability.
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