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ABSTRACT

The resistance of p-channel junction FETs to electron irradiation in high impedance nanoamp circuit applications is limited by the leakage current across the gate junction. The dependence of the leakage current on electron flux and total dose was investigated by electron irradiation in vacuum. The increase in leakage current was found to be primarily due to an increase in surface recombination velocity. It was independent of the electron flux over the range from $3 \times 10^9$ to $10^{12}$ e/cm$^2$/sec with some indication of a reduction in leakage current at lower fluxes. An anomalously high leakage current due to channel formation developed in some devices at total doses above $10^{14}$ e/cm$^2$.
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I. INTRODUCTION

P-channel junction FETs are more resistant to ionizing radiation than other active semiconductor devices. They are, therefore, exceptionally suitable for high impedance, low level circuits operating in a space radiation environment, limited only by radiation induced gate leakage currents (Ref. 1). In an earth sensor application leakage currents in the nanoampere range were sufficient to cause circuit failure. For this reason it became necessary to establish a radiation quality control check for these devices (Ref. 2). As a result a large number of the devices were irradiated under the conditions listed in Table I. It was noted that there were significant variations in the range of leakage currents developed under ostensibly the same conditions from one day to the next. This was all the more noticeable because the leakage currents of all the devices tested on a given day were well within one order of magnitude. The initial leakage currents always covered the same range, and there was no correlation between the leakage current before and after irradiation. Figure 1 shows some early results obtained on the 3 MeV Van de Graaff at Electronized Chemicals Corporation. A more detailed analysis of the leakage current distribution after irradiation to $5 \times 10^{14}$ e/cm$^2$ is shown in Table II.

It was, therefore, decided to carry out a very careful study on all the parameters affecting the leakage currents of these devices after irradiation. The devices were irradiated in vacuum, since changes in humidity were considered to be one of the main causes of the observed fluctuations. Since the leakage current annealed fairly rapidly after irradiation at large electron fluxes, it was suspected that the leakage current produced by real time irradiation in space to the same total dose might be considerably smaller. A detailed study was, therefore, carried out on the flux dependence of the leakage current. This is believed to be the first study on the flux dependence of surface ionization effects in planar devices, except for work reported by Mitchell (Ref. 3) on Co$^{60}$ irradiation of MOS capacitors.
### TABLE I

**Irradiation of P-Channel Junction FETs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Run</th>
<th>Energy MeV</th>
<th>Electron Flux e/cm²/sec</th>
<th>Total Dose e/cm²</th>
<th>Bias Voltage</th>
<th>No. of Devices</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6-10-65</td>
<td>E.C.C.</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Varied</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.36 x 10¹⁴</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Including real time flux</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-6-65</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>5 x 10¹⁰</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.78 x 10¹⁴</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>5 x 10¹⁰</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.47 x 10¹⁴</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>5 x 10¹⁰</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.39 x 10¹⁴</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-8-65</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>5 x 10¹⁰</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.8 x 10¹⁴</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>5 x 10¹⁰</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.93 x 10¹⁴</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>5 x 10¹⁰</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.17 x 10¹⁴</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-9-65</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>5 x 10¹⁰</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.48 x 10¹⁴</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>5 x 10¹⁰</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.14 x 10¹⁴</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>5 x 10¹⁰</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.48 x 10¹⁴</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-27-65</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>5 x 10¹⁰</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.1 x 10¹⁴</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>5 x 10¹⁰</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.2 x 10¹⁴</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-15-66</td>
<td>L. L. Air Scatter-</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4 x 10¹⁰</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.5 x 10¹⁴</td>
<td>V_DS = 1.5V</td>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-20-66</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>5 x 10¹⁰</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.5 x 10¹⁴</td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-25-66</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>5 x 10¹⁰</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.5 x 10¹⁴</td>
<td></td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-18-66</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>5 x 10¹⁰</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 x 10¹⁴</td>
<td></td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-19-66</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>5 x 10¹⁰</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 x 10¹⁴</td>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-20-66</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>5 x 10¹⁰</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 x 10¹⁴</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-31-66</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>5 x 10¹⁰</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 x 10¹⁴</td>
<td>V_DS = 1.5V</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-1-66</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Varied</td>
<td></td>
<td>7 x 10¹⁴</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-2-66</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>5 x 10¹⁰</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.3 x 10¹⁴</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-17-66</td>
<td>L. L. Vacuum Chamber</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1 x 10¹⁰</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.9 x 10¹³</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Remarks:
- Scatter -
- Dummies and open cct devices
- Real time annealing
- pA measurements
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Run</th>
<th>Energy MeV</th>
<th>Electron Flux e/cm²/sec</th>
<th>Total Dose e/cm²</th>
<th>Bias Voltage</th>
<th>No. of Devices Tested</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9-23-66</td>
<td>L. L. Vacuum Chamber</td>
<td>1.5 and 1.0</td>
<td>1 x 10¹¹</td>
<td>1.26 x 10¹⁵</td>
<td>VGS = 1.5V</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-24-66</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1 x 10¹¹</td>
<td>1 x 10¹⁵</td>
<td>VDS = -4.5V</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-1-66</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1 x 10¹⁰</td>
<td>2.88 x 10¹⁴</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-2-66</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1 x 10¹²</td>
<td>1.08 x 10¹⁶</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-8-66</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1 x 10⁹</td>
<td>2.88 x 10¹³</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-13-66</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3 x 10⁹</td>
<td>8.1 x 10¹³</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-20-66</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3 x 10⁸</td>
<td>8.1 x 10¹²</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Prestressed devices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-28-66</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1 x 10⁹</td>
<td>2.7 x 10¹³</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-29-66</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1 x 10⁹</td>
<td>2.7 x 10¹³</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table II - Gate-Leakage Current Distribution After Electron Irradiation to $5 \times 10^{14}$ e/cm$^2$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Total No. of Devices</th>
<th>Percentage Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$10^{-10}$ Amp. Range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10-65</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-6-65*</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-8-65</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-9-65**</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-27-65**</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-15-66</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-20-66</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-25-66</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-18-66</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-19-66</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-24-66***</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-2-66***</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* includes unknown amount of background noise from facility
** $4 \times 10^{14}$ e/cm$^2$
*** in vacuum
2. EXPERIMENTAL ARRANGEMENT

All the devices were taken from the same batch so as to ensure uniformity of fabrication. Five fresh units were used for each experiment. The TO18 cans of the FETs were inserted into tight fitting countersunk holes on a 3/16 in. copper plate which shielded the underside of the transistor and leads from scattered electrons (see Fig. 2). The copper plate was mounted inside the end dome of the 48 in. vacuum chamber of the Lincoln Accelerator Laboratory (Ref. 4). The temperature of the copper plate was kept constant to within ± 0.5°C by means of the temperature control system shown in Fig. 3. Water from a constant temperature bath was circulated through the copper plate. The bath temperature was controlled by means of a chilled water heat exchanger and a 500W heater. The latter was operated by an on-off temperature controller activated by a thermistor clamped to the underside of the copper plate. During most of the experiments the temperature was set at 25°C.

The terminals of the transistor sockets were connected by polyimide coated wires to specially constructed low leakage octal feed thrus. All wires connected to a given octal were kept at the same voltage as the gate, which in the FETs under test is internally connected to the body of the silicon chip and therefore to the header. This necessitated the test circuit shown in Fig. 4. The devices were kept under bias throughout the experiment. The bias voltages were selected in accordance with the application requirements.

The octal feed thrus were connected to the measuring circuit by means of 40 feet of wire with fiberglass insulation. The experiments were carried out under low humidity conditions in the facility which reduced the system d.c. leakage current to 20 pA. A.C. pickup was removed by means of 0.1 μF by-pass capacitors. All experiments were run with a dummy transistor to measure background noise. The dummy consisted of a TO18 header and can from which the silicon chip had been removed.

During most of the experiments the devices were irradiated with 1.5 MeV electrons from the Lincoln Laboratory Van de Graaff. The electron flux was varied from $3 \times 10^8$ e/cm$^2$ to $1 \times 10^{12}$ e/cm$^2$. The electron beam was
continuously monitored on a Faraday cup placed within 2 in. from the transistor under test and connected to a current integrator. The beam was uniform over an area of more than 6 in. diameter and could be observed on a fluorescent screen by means of closed circuit television. The devices were irradiated continuously to avoid annealing effects. Readings with the beam off were taken at 30 minute intervals and required less than 1 minute off time.

3. EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

A. Total Dose and Electron Flux

Fig. 5 shows the gate leakage current vs. total electron dose as a function of electron flux. The results, which were obtained in a series of experiments over a period of three months, indicate the absolute reproducibility obtainable in a vacuum environment. The leakage current is unchanged up to a total dose of \(10^{13}\) e/cm\(^2\). Between \(10^{13}\) and \(10^{14}\) e/cm\(^2\) it increases linearly and thereafter more slowly reaching saturation at about \(7 \times 10^{15}\) e/cm\(^2\). The percentage spread in values is greatest from \(10^{13}\) to \(5 \times 10^{14}\) e/cm\(^2\).

The leakage current is independent of electron flux over the range from \(3 \times 10^9\) to \(10^{12}\) e/cm\(^2\)/sec. A maximum continuous machine time of 10 hours imposed a limit on the maximum total dose that could be attained at the lower electron fluxes. As a result a total dose of only \(2.7 \times 10^{13}\) e/cm\(^2\) was reached at a flux of \(10^9\) e/cm\(^2\)/sec. At this dose some of the devices remained unchanged while others increased their leakage current in conformity with the values obtained at a flux of \(3 \times 10^9\) e/cm\(^2\)/sec. At still lower fluxes the maximum total dose was insufficient to change the leakage current. The first two measurements carried out at a flux of \(10^{11}\) e/cm\(^2\)/sec show lower readings than the rest of the curve. It appears that over the most steeply increasing part of the curve the leakage current is independent of the flux only after 1 hour of continuous irradiation.

Comparison with the earlier results obtained by irradiation in air (Fig. 1 and Table 2) indicates a slight increase in the mean leakage current
in vacuum. This seems to be due to changes in fabrication, since the vacuum measurements are in good agreement with the results obtained in air on the same batch of devices. The variance in the values obtained at a total dose of $5 \times 10^{14}$ e/cm$^2$ has been very much reduced in the vacuum irradiation.

B. Effect of Electron Beam

All the measurements described above were made with the beam off. Under an electron flux of $\varphi e/cm^2/sec$ an additional gate current of $\sim 7.5 \times 10^{-20}$ $\varphi$amps was produced which obscured the leakage current particularly at high fluxes. This is shown in Fig. 6 for fluxes of $10^{10}$ and $10^{11}$ e/cm$^2$/sec. The on readings exhibited considerable fluctuations caused by changes in the beam intensity. Under real time irradiation in space the electron induced current is insignificant.

The electron beam also produced a negative system leakage current of $\sim 1.5 \times 10^{-21}$ $\varphi$amps. All other currents measured in the circuit of Fig. 4 were positive.

C. Anomalous Leakage Current

The primary purpose of a radiation quality control check is to eliminate devices rendered defective by irradiation. Table III shows that in the FETs under test an anomalously high leakage current developed in some of the devices at total doses above $10^{14}$ e/cm$^2$. The onset of this condition is very sudden as shown in Fig. 7. A certain minimum period of time under irradiation must elapse before the onset of this phenomenon. Hence the total dose was lower at a flux of $10^{11}$ e/cm$^2$/sec than at a flux of $10^{12}$ e/cm$^2$/sec. No anomalous leakage currents were observed at still lower fluxes. It is therefore concluded that none would develop in a space environment.

D. Temperature Dependence

In one of the experiments the temperature under irradiation was varied over the range from 20 to 30°C at a total dose of $10^{15}$ e/cm$^2$. The temperature coefficients shown in Table IV amount to a change of only 4 - 7 per cent per °C for normal devices and to an even smaller change in the anomalous leakage current. All the temperature coefficients are positive.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Device</th>
<th>Flux (e/cm^2/sec)</th>
<th>Onset of Anomalous Leakage Current (e/cm^2)</th>
<th>Time (\text{Minutes})</th>
<th>Maximum Leakage Current (\text{amps})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>724</td>
<td>(1 \times 10^{12})</td>
<td>(3.6 \times 10^{15})</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>(1.3 \times 10^{-6})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>725</td>
<td>(1 \times 10^{12})</td>
<td>(9.6 \times 10^{15})</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>(1.1 \times 10^{-7})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>726</td>
<td>(1 \times 10^{12})</td>
<td>(7.2 \times 10^{15})</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>(1.3 \times 10^{-8})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>714</td>
<td>(1 \times 10^{11})</td>
<td>(1.8 \times 10^{14})</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>(3.9 \times 10^{-7})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>712</td>
<td>(1 \times 10^{11})</td>
<td>(7.2 \times 10^{14})</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>(1.8 \times 10^{-7})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE IV

Temperature Dependence of Source-Gate Leakage Current

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Device</th>
<th>Leakage Current (Amps)</th>
<th>Temp. Coefficient (Amps/°C)</th>
<th>Percentage Change in Temp/°C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Dose: $10^{15}$e/cm²</td>
<td>Flux: $10^{11}$e/cm²/sec</td>
<td>$\frac{100 \cdot \Delta I_R}{I_R \cdot \Delta T}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Type 25.35°C 20.6°C 30.1°C</td>
<td>$\Delta I_R/\Delta T$</td>
<td>$T_o - T_1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>713</td>
<td>Normal 4.1x10⁻⁹ 3.0x10⁻⁹ 5.1x10⁻⁹</td>
<td>2.3x10⁻¹⁰ 2.1x10⁻¹⁰</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>715</td>
<td>6.8x10⁻⁹ 4.9x10⁻⁹ 8.6x10⁻⁹</td>
<td>4.0x10⁻¹⁰ 3.8x10⁻¹⁰</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>716</td>
<td>4.0x10⁻⁹ 3.0x10⁻⁹ 4.9x10⁻⁹</td>
<td>2.1x10⁻¹⁰ 2.0x10⁻¹⁰</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>712</td>
<td>Anomalous 1.6x10⁻⁷ 1.4x10⁻⁷ 1.9x10⁻⁷</td>
<td>5.0x10⁻⁹ 5.4x10⁻⁹</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>714</td>
<td>3.2x10⁻⁷ 2.7x10⁻⁷ 3.8x10⁻⁷</td>
<td>1.1x10⁻⁸ 1.3x10⁻⁸</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
E. Annealing

In a number of experiments an attempt was made to simulate real time irradiation by preirradiating the devices at a flux of $5 \times 10^{10} \text{ e/cm}^2/\text{sec}$ to a total dose of about $10^{14} \text{ e/cm}^2$ and then anneal out the leakage current under real time conditions, i.e. at a flux of $10^8 \text{ e/cm}^2/\text{sec}$ under bias. The attempt failed on account of the time constants involved. Fig. 8 shows that very rapid annealing takes place for the first hour which is followed by very slow annealing with a time constant of days. Furthermore, exactly the same annealing pattern occurred in the absence of the electron irradiation.

F. Effect of Electron Energy

Variation of the electron energy from 1 to 1.5 MeV had no effect on the leakage current. This is to be expected since the stopping power in silicon (Ref. 5) and silicon dioxide (Ref. 6) are constant over this range.

G. Effect of Voltage Prestress

Some devices were kept under bias for one week before irradiation. This lowered the preirradiation leakage current by about 10 per cent but had no effect on the radiation induced leakage current.

H. Current-Voltage Characteristics

The current across the junction was measured as a function of applied voltage both in the reverse and forward direction by shorting source to drain and applying a voltage at the gate contact. The results are shown in Figs. 9 and 10.

Before irradiation the reverse current between 0.5 and 1V and again between 2 and 12V is proportional to the square root of the voltage. After irradiation the I-V characteristics of normal devices are very flat showing a typical voltage saturation curve brought about by saturation effects. In irradiated devices with anomalously high leakage currents there is a rapid rise in reverse current with voltage indicating avalanche breakdown.
The I-V characteristics were also measured in the forward direction in order to determine the nature of the current following the method described by Goben and Smits (Refs. 7, 8). The current I is proportional to \( \exp(qV/kT) \) where \( n \) varies over different current ranges depending on the mechanism involved (see Table V). Only the low current ranges have significance for the reverse leakage current. Brucker et al. (Ref. 9) have shown that for electron irradiation values of \( n \) between 1 and 2 are due both to recombination of minority carriers in the bulk depletion region and to an increase in the surface-recombination velocity. The bulk recombination takes place at defects located on the more lightly doped gate side of the depletion region. The increased surface recombination velocity may be due to the introduction of new interface states and also due to changes in surface potential leading to an increased recombination rate at the interface states already present. \( n \) values greater than 2 are due to the formation of surface channels (Ref. 10).

### TABLE V

**Interpretation of Forward I-V Characteristics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Type</th>
<th>Total Dose e/cm²</th>
<th>Current Range Amps</th>
<th>( n )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Normal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>( 10^{11} - 10^{-6} )</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( 1.8 \times 10^{15} )</td>
<td>( 5 \times 10^{-10} - 10^{-7} )</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>( 10^{-6} - 10^{-4} )</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anomalous</td>
<td>( 1 \times 10^{16} )</td>
<td>( 10^{-8} - 10^{-7} )</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>( 10^{-6} - 10^{-4} )</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. **COMPARISON WITH THEORY**

An idealized structure of a planar p-channel junction FET is shown in Fig. 11. The gate leakage current is the current across the reverse biased p-n junctions from the n type gate and body regions to the p region extending
from the source through the channel to the gate. The n type body is connected internally to the gate.

The reverse characteristics of irradiated silicon junction diodes were first described by Xavier (Ref. 11). The leakage current $I$ measured during irradiation may be expressed as the sum of 4 components:

$$I = I_R + I_P + I_{LR} + I_{LP}$$  \hspace{1cm} (1)

where

$I_R$ is the diode reverse leakage current in the absence of radiation;

$I_P$ is the additional diode leakage current produced by the radiation;

$I_{LR}$ is the system leakage current in parallel with the p-n junction in the absence of radiation. It includes the leakage across the terminals of the transistor header.

$I_{LP}$ is the additional system leakage current produced by the radiation.

A. **Leakage Current in the Absence of Radiation**

The diode leakage current $I_R$ is again the sum of three components:

$$I_R = I_d + I_{rg} + I_s$$  \hspace{1cm} (2)

The diffusion component, $I_d$, also known as the reverse saturation current, is given by (Ref. 12).

$$I_d = q A n_i^2 \left( \frac{1}{N_A} \sqrt{\frac{D_n}{\tau_n}} + \frac{1}{N_D} \sqrt{\frac{D_p}{\tau_p}} \right)$$  \hspace{1cm} (3)

where

$N_A$ = acceptor concentration in p region

$N_D$ = donor concentration in n region

$D_n$ = electron diffusion constant in p region
$D_p = \text{hole diffusion constant in n region}$

$n_i = \text{intrinsic carrier concentration in silicon}$

$\tau_n = \text{electron lifetime in p region}$

$\tau_p = \text{hole lifetime in n region}$

$A = \text{junction area}$

$q = \text{electronic charge}$

The depletion layer recombination generation component $I_{rg}$ at large reverse bias is given by (Ref. 13)

$$I_{rg} = \frac{q A n_i W}{2 \sqrt{\tau_n \tau_p}}$$  \hfill (4)

The depletion layer width $W = \left[ \frac{2 \varepsilon_{si} (V_d + V_a)}{q} \left( \frac{1}{N_a} \right) + \frac{1}{N_d} \right]^{1/2}$ \hfill (5)

where

$V_a = \text{applied voltage}$

$V_d = \text{difference in electrostatic potential between the n and p regions}$

$\varepsilon_{si} = \text{dielectric constant of silicon}$

The character and magnitude of the surface leakage component $I_s$ depends on the formation of an inversion layer. In the structure under discussion an n-type inversion layer could form in the p$^+$ region of source and drain, but is to some extent inhibited by the heavy p doping in this region. In the absence of an inversion layer the surface leakage component is entirely due to electron-hole recombination at the surface of the depletion region and may be expressed in the form (Ref. 10, 14):

$$I_s = q n_i SWL_s$$  \hfill (6)
where \( S \) is the surface recombination velocity and \( L_s \) the junction perimeter.

The presence of an inversion layer gives rise to a channel current, i.e. an excess reverse current which saturates with increasing reverse bias. The inversion layer extends the effective junction area, thus producing the following additional leakage terms (Refs. 15, 16):

1. Recombination-generation current in the depletion region of the junction between the inversion layer and the substrate.

2. Recombination-generation current at the surface of the extended depletion region.

3. Current due to breakdown of the junction between the inversion layer and the underlying \( p^+ \) region. The breakdown proceeds through tunneling if the surface of the \( p^+ \) region is heavily doped and by an avalanche mechanism if it is lightly doped.

4. An ohmic current flows if the inversion region extends to the metallized source or drain.

Before irradiation \( I_R \) is about \( 5 \times 10^{-11} \) A at 6 V bias and consists primarily of a combination of the recombination-generation current \( I_{r\text{q}} \) and the surface component \( I_s \) as shown by the square root dependence on the voltage. From Eqs. (4), (5) and (6)

\[
I_R \sim qn_i \left( \frac{A}{2 \sqrt{n \tau_p}} + SL_s \right) \left[ \frac{2 \varepsilon_s (V_d + V_a)}{q} \left( \frac{1}{N_a} + \frac{1}{N_d} \right) \right]^{1/2}
\]

The system leakage current \( I_{LR} \) during the experiment was \( 2 \times 10^{-11} \) A.

B. Electron Beam Induced Current

The additional diode leakage current \( I_P \) during irradiation also has diffusion, recombination-generation and surface components:

\[
I_P = I_{dP} + I_{rgP} + I_{sP}
\]

The electron flux generates \( G \) hole-electron pairs per unit volume in the silicon which is given by
\[ G = -\frac{dE}{dx} \frac{\varphi}{e_n} \] (8)

where \(-\frac{dE}{dx}\) is the stopping power in silicon in ev/cm

\[ \varphi \] is the electron flux in e/cm\(^2\)/sec

\[ e_n \] is the energy required to generate one hole-electron pair

\[ = 4.2 \text{ eV for silicon (Ref. 17)} \]

Then (Ref. 11)

\[ I_{dP} = qGA \left( \sqrt{D_n \tau_n} + \sqrt{D_p \tau_p} \right) \] (9)

\[ I_{rgP} = qGAW \] (10)

\( I_{sP} \) is rather complex if an inversion layer is formed, but is always proportional to the flux. All three components \( I_{dP}, I_{rgP} \) and \( I_{sP} \) make significant contributions to the electron beam induced current.

C. Radiation Damage

All current components are affected by radiation damage through decrease in the lifetimes, increase in surface recombination velocity and formation of inversion layers. By making measurements only with the electron beam off the number of relevant components is reduced to the recombination-generation component \( I_{rg} \) and the surface component \( I_s \).

\[ I_{rg} \] depends on the lifetimes \( \tau_n \) and \( \tau_p \) which are reduced by the introduction of bulk defects:

\[ \frac{1}{\tau} = \frac{1}{\tau_0} + K \hat{\Phi} \] (12)

where \( \tau_0 \) is the initial lifetime, \( \hat{\Phi} \) the total electron dose and \( K \) a damage constant. The recombination-generation current after irradiation is therefore a function of the total dose:
The surface component $I_s$ depends on the surface recombination velocity $S$ and on the formation of inversion layers. Fitzgerald and Grove (Ref. 18) have shown that $S$ may increase from 5 to 1000 cm/sec by irradiation with moderate doses of X-rays. $I_s$ is usually a non-linear function of $\phi$ and levels off after saturation of the surface traps. Inversion layers produce a large increase in $I_s$ by many orders of magnitude.

The interpretation of the $I_p$ vs. $\phi$ curve shown in Fig. 5 is ambiguous. There is an approximately linear range from $10^{13}$ to $10^{14}$ e/cm$^2$ followed by a square root dependence and ultimate saturation at $10^{16}$ e/cm$^2$. The latter suggests a predominance of the surface component.

D. Temperature Dependence

The temperature dependence of $I_{rg}$ is determined by the intrinsic carrier concentration

$$n_i \sim T^{3/2} \exp \left(-\frac{E_G}{2kT}\right)$$

(14)

where $E_G$, the band gap for silicon, is 1.21 eV.

Then

$$\frac{dI}{dT} = \frac{I}{T^{1/2}} \left( \frac{E_g}{2kT} + \frac{3}{2} \right)$$

(15)

$$\sim 1.4 I \text{ at } 25^\circ C$$

Table IV shows that the temperature coefficient after radiation is more than one order of magnitude smaller than this. The small positive temperature coefficient observed is in agreement with the model of Grove and Fitzgerald (Ref. 16), i.e. a breakdown of the junction between an inversion layer and the underlying $p^+$ region by means of an avalanche mechanism.
5. CONCLUSIONS

The increase in the gate leakage current with electron irradiation is primarily due to an increase in the surface recombination velocity. This is shown by saturation of the current on increasing either the inverse voltage or the total electron dose and by the small positive temperature coefficient. It is also in agreement with the forward I-V characteristics at low current levels and with the very slow annealing behavior at ambient temperatures. An anomalously high leakage current formed in some devices at total electron doses above $10^{14}$ e/cm$^2$ is due to channel formation in the p region resulting in avalanche breakdown.

The gate leakage current was found to be independent of electron flux over the range from $3 \times 10^9$ to $10^{12}$ e/cm$^2$/sec for continuous exposures up to 10 hours. Some indication was found that more prolonged irradiation at still lower fluxes may result in a lower leakage current at a fixed total dose. This is also supported by annealing time constants of the order of days at ambient temperatures.

The above represents a fundamental problem in the simulation of space radiation effects resulting in surface ionization phenomena with long time constants. In order to study such phenomena it is necessary to expose the devices under bias to sources of ionizing radiation continuously for periods of weeks or months. Sr$^{90}$ is the optimum source for this purpose, as it approximates the electron spectrum in the outer Van Allen belt and is uncontaminated by gamma emission. An extension of the experiments using such a source is being planned.
Fig. 1. Gate-source leakage current vs. total dose
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Fig. 2. Transistor mount.
Fig. 3. Constant temperature system.
Fig. 4. Test circuit.
Fig. 5. Gate leakage current vs. total electron dose as function of electron flux

Beam off measurements, including system leakage current 2 x 10^-11 A
Fig. 6. Effect of electron beam on gate leakage current.
Fig. 7. Anomalous gate leakage current.
Fig. 8. Real time annealing experiment
Devices preirradiated at \(5 \times 10^{10}\) e/cm\(^2\)/sec for 60 minutes, annealed at \(10^8\) e/cm\(^2\)/sec under bias at ambient temperature.
Fig. 9. Reverse I-V characteristics.
Fig. 10. Forward I-V characteristics.
Fig. 11. P-channel FET structure.
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