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Abstract— The p-channel charge coupled devices (CCDs) have 
been shown to display improved tolerance to radiation-induced 
charge transfer inefficiency when compared with n-channel 
CCDs. However, the defect distribution formed during irradiation 
is expected to be temperature dependent due to the differences 
in lattice energy caused by a temperature change. This has been 
tested through defect analysis of two p-channel e2v CCD204 
devices, one irradiated at room temperature and one at a 
cryogenic temperature (153 K). Analysis is performed using the 
method of single trap pumping. The dominant charge trapping 
defects at these conditions have been identified as the donor 
level of the silicon divacancy and the carbon interstitial defect. 
The defect parameters are analyzed both immediately post-
irradiation and following several subsequent room-temperature 
anneal phases up until a cumulative anneal time of approximately 
10 months. We have also simulated charge transfer in an 
irradiated CCD pixel using the defect distribution from both 
the room-temperature and cryogenic case, to study how the 
changes affect imaging performance. The results demonstrate 
the importance of cryogenic irradiation and annealing studies, with 
large variations seen in the defect distribution when compared 
to a device irradiated at room-temperature, which is the current 
standard procedure for radiation-tolerance testing.

Index Terms— Carbon, charge coupled devices (CCDs), defect, 
divacancy, p-channel, pocket pumping, radiation damage, trap 
pumping.

I. INTRODUCTION

RADITION-INDUCED defects are responsible for 
charge-transfer performance degradation in charge coupled 
devices (CCDs) because they introduce stable deep-levels 
within the silicon band-gap, which are capable of trapping a 
single charge carrier (\(h^+\) for the p-channel case) for a 
length of time before emission [1]. This time is heavily 
temperature dependent and is defined as the defect emission 
time-constant (\(\tau_e\)). Where the emission time-constant at a 
given temperature is close to the line transfer time of the CCD, 
charge carriers can be moved efficiently between adjacent 
charge-packets, leading to image smearing [2] which is detri-
mental to the science goals of the detector [3].

The p-channel CCDs have demonstrated improved tolerance 
to radiation damage induced image degradation because the 
predominant defects produced, which are the donor level of 
the silicon divacancy and the carbon interstitial defect, both have 
emission time-constants which interfere less with the typical 
CCD operating conditions at nominal space-based detector 
temperatures than in the n-channel case [4]. These two defects 
have been studied extensively with the donor level of the 
divacancy established as having an energy level of around 
\(E_v + 0.20 \text{ eV} \) [5]–[7] and the carbon interstitial an energy 
level of \(E_v + 0.27 \text{ eV} \) [8], [9].

However, previous studies have also shown considerable 
uncertainty in the defect emission time-constants, of up to 
an order of magnitude [10]. It is therefore vital both for 
a complete comparison between n- and p-channel CCDs 
and for future mitigation of radiation-induced charge transfer 
inefficiency (CTI) to study with high precision the parameters 
of defects produced in p-type silicon postirradiation. Another 
important factor to account for is the device temperature during 
irradiation, as this affects the lattice energy and therefore the 
defect formation and interaction rates. An initial analysis of 
the effect of temperature was carried out in [11] and showed 
considerable differences in the initial defect distributions, 
as well as following a room-temperature anneal of up to 
approximately 1 month. Here we continue this analysis to 
investigate the longer term effects of such an irradiation as 
well as the potential impact on device performance.

II. TRAP PUMPING

The charge trapping process is described by Shockley-Read-
Hall kinetics [12], [13] which models the capture and release 
of electrons (or holes) through the use of two exponential 
time constants; the capture time-constant and emission time-
constant, as shown in (1) and (2). These contain terms for the 
thermal velocity of a hole and the effective density of states in 
the valence band, as given in (3) and (4). Here \(\sigma\) is the cross 
section, \(n\) is the electron concentration at the trap location, 
\(E\) is the energy of the level above the valence band edge and 
\(m^*_{\text{DOS,Con}}\) are the effective hole masses for density of states 
and conductivity calculations, respectively. The probability of 
capture or emission before a given time \(t\) is then given by (5)

\[
\tau_c = \frac{1}{\sigma n_0 \tau_{th}} 
\]

(1)
As previously stated, the emission time constant is the defect parameter which governs how destructive the defect can be to charge transfer performance. At the signal levels used throughout this paper, it is acceptable to assume instant capture, i.e., the capture time constant is much smaller than the dwell time for which the signal is under each phase [14]. This is because the signal charge cloud is large enough that it can encounter an empty trap state almost instantly.

To analyze the defect emission time constants, the method of trap pumping is used, which is described fully in [14] and [15]. The technique works by clocking signal charge from beneath an initial collecting phase electrode to beneath the same electrode in the next pixel, and back again. This is repeated over a number of cycles. For a defect beneath a barrier phase electrode, there exists a probability per cycle of carrier capture from one charge packet and release into an adjacent charge packet. This is defined as the probability of pumping (shown in (6)) and depends on the emission time constant of the responsible defect as well as the time period $t_{ph}$ (labeled as the phase time) between each charge transfer

$$P_p = \exp \left( \frac{-t}{\tau_e} \right) - \exp \left( \frac{-2t}{\tau_e} \right).$$

If the probability is large enough then over a number of cycles $N$ an image will be produced containing a signal dipole at the corresponding pixel; where a pixel significantly darker than the average background level neighbors a pixel significantly brighter, or vice versa. The intensity of this signal dipole is defined as $I = N \times P_p$. Differentiation of the expression for signal dipole intensity with respect to phase time gives an expression relating the phase time at maximum intensity to the emission time constant of the underlying defect. Therefore by analyzing the intensity of such dipoles with varying $t_{ph}$ we can probe the emission time constant of individual defects.

The technique also allows for analysis of defect energy levels if the process can be performed at a number of different temperatures. Since pocket pumping shows individual defect locations within the device, the emission time constant of a given defect can be tracked with changing temperature. Plotting $\tau_e$ against $T$ allows for a fit based on (2). Pocket pumping is therefore a powerful technique for defect analysis; specifically as it allows for the study of individual defects as opposed to the average effects of many defects as seen in techniques such as DLTS [16].

### III. CRYOGENIC IRRADIATION

Using the trap pumping method we have analyzed the defects produced in a p-channel CCD204 following irradiation with protons at cryogenic temperature (153 K). Results from a room-temperature proton irradiation of a CCD204 were used for comparison and to identify the most probable defect distribution postirradiation. Under the conditions of this paper two defect species dominate charge-transfer degradation: a donor level of the silicon divacancy ($VV+/0$) and the carbon interstitial defect ($C_i$) [10].

Measurements were performed at 153-K postirradiation and then subsequently after periods of approximately 1 day, 1 week, 1 month, 3 months, and 10 months at room-temperature.

The e2v CCD204 is a $4 \times 1 \text{ k}$ device which utilizes a split output register with two separate output nodes. This device is a development chip toward the Euclid CCD273, with similar pixel architecture. The CCD204 has 12-μm square pixels and a channel width of 50 μm. A schematic of the CCD204 is shown in Fig. 1. For this paper two p-channel CCD204 devices were irradiated at the Synergy Health 5MV Tandem Accelerator (U.K.) [17].

One device was held at room-temperature during irradiation and received a 10-MeV equivalent proton fluence of $2 \times 10^9 \text{ cm}^{-2}$. A second device was held at cryogenic temperature (153 K) and received a 10-MeV equivalent fluence of $1.24 \times 10^9 \text{ cm}^{-2}$. The irradiated regions were chosen such as to leave the output nodes unirradiated. Full details of the irradiation are outlined in [17]. All devices were held at 153 K when not being tested or annealed. All of the results presented here have been scaled to the fluence received by the cryogenically irradiated device.

A cryogenic irradiation was performed in order to more closely mirror the conditions in a typical space-based detector as impinging particles strike the CCD and to monitor the effect this has on the defect distribution which is formed. The room-temperature irradiation results provided a start point for a comparison between the defect distributions formed in each temperature case.

Defect emission time-constant distributions immediately postirradiation for both the room-temperature and cryogenically irradiated devices are presented in [11]. The initial defect distribution at 153 K of the room-temperature irradiated device is shown in Fig. 2(a). Initial results from this device showed the donor level of the divacancy to be by far the most abundant defect produced, with a dominant peak in the emission time constant distribution at 30 μs. Slower defects are also present but there is no clear second peak in the distribution corresponding to another defect species. The defect emission time constant distribution formed in the
Fig. 2. Defect emission time-constant distributions for both devices at various stages throughout the study. All testing were carried out at 153 K. Each anneal stage was performed at room-temperature. (a) Room-temperature irradiated device. Included for reference are the literature value lines for the two defects of relevance at 153 K [10]. (b) Cryogenically irradiated device, immediately postirradiation. (c) Cryo device following 1-day anneal. (d) Cryo device following 1-week anneal. (e) Cryo device following 1-month anneal. (f) Cryo device following 3-month anneal. (g) Cryo device following 10-month anneal.

Room-temperature irradiated device also shows a large spread around the main peak; with a mean emission time constant of approximately 40 ± 20 μs at full width-half maximum (using the nonscaled distribution). The spread is therefore around 50% and relates well to the large emission time constant uncertainties seen in [10]. However, using the method of
trap pumping has allowed for the analysis of individual defect emission time constants with low (approximately 5% [11]) and therefore it is determined that for the case of defects in a CCD the majority of this spread is a genuine and may arise from small fluctuations in temperature, electric field or other local effects such as stress. Another possible explanation is different orientations of the same defect within the lattice.

Initial results from the cryogenic device are shown in Fig. 2(b) and show far fewer defects produced than in the room-temperature case. Although a small peak in the emission time constant distribution is present at typical divacancy range there is no clearly identifiable defect species present in large numbers.

Following analysis of the initial distributions a trap pumping method with a lower temporal resolution was used on the cryogenic device so that the technique could be run over a shorter period of time, allowing for study of the defect evolution in the first few hours after irradiation. The defect distribution was reanalyzed every few hours over a period of several days until the first room-temperature anneal stage, with the number of divacancy defects tracked over time. The results are presented in [11] and are shown here in Fig. 3(a).

For the first few days after irradiation there are small variations in the number of defects found, showing that the situation is still dynamic. This is shown more clearly in Fig. 3(b) which is simply a zoomed in view of the initial hours from Fig. 3(a). Defects may be mobile or able to dissociate/recombine even at cryogenic temperatures. Changes are still visible right up until the point of the first anneal stage, at around 120 h after irradiation. The device was annealed for 26 h at room-temperature before being cooled back down to 153 K for testing. Immediately obvious is the large increase in the number of divacancy defects found after anneal, with the defect distribution more closely resembling the room-temperature device at this stage.

IV. ANNEALING

Several room-temperature anneal stages were carried out resulting in a cumulative anneal time of approximately 10 months. A major advantage of trap pumping is the ability to identify individual defects which are present after each anneal stage and to monitor their emission time constants, energy levels and capture cross sections on an individual basis [14]. The large number of defects present gives good statistics and therefore a highly accurate calculation of defect parameters.

A trap-pumping analysis of the cryogenic device was carried out after each anneal stage, producing the defect emission time-constant distribution for the nominal testing temperature of 153 K. Results up until a total anneal time of 1 month were presented in [11], here we also include additional stages after total anneal times of approximately 3 and 10 months. Further analysis was completed at several temperatures between 143–173 K at each anneal stage where the data was available. The temperature dependence of the emission time constant [see (2)] allows for a calculation of the defect energy level as outlined in the earlier trap pumping section. This can be used to identify the defect species present and confirm the time constant data.

Emission time constant distributions for all fit defects at 153 K following each anneal stage are shown in Fig. 2(c)–(g). Each shows a large peak around the expected divacancy emission time constant; however, the situation is dynamic, with the divacancy distribution being non-Gaussian and containing two or more discernible peaks. From these distributions it appears as though many of the defects are moving and/or reorienting over these time scales, and that the overall defect distribution is tending toward the room-temperature case, i.e., divacancy dominated with a slower second defect species corresponding to the carbon interstitial. The total number of defects found within our time range shows an increase over time even at the final stage tested, showing that the distribution is still changing after this length of time.
Here we have seen that the effect of a room-temperature anneal on the defect distribution formed in a cryogenically irradiated device is significant and irreversible. Therefore a vital element of further work in this area is to study a device irradiated cryogenically and maintained at this temperature, such as a device would experience in space. It may be that given sufficient time the defects in both the room-temperature and cryogenically irradiated devices will reach the same final distribution. However, for the cryogenic case it may be that the lattice does not have enough energy for some processes to take place and so it could be that the final distributions diverge in each case. Further analysis of such devices is required both for improved understanding of the damage process and better context regarding device performance in a space environment.

V. CHARGE TRANSFER SIMULATIONS

As shown in Fig. 1, the initial defect distribution differs greatly between the device irradiated at room-temperature and the device irradiated at 153 K. It is therefore expected that there will be differences in the imaging performance of the two devices. To investigate this a Monte Carlo model of charge transfer in a radiation damaged CCD was used to simulate the effects of each defect distribution. The specific model used was the Open University Monte Carlo model (OUMC) which is described in [18]. The OUMC allows for the direct input of device specific electron density simulations and therefore does not require analytical assumptions about charge cloud density. The model can also take as an input a distribution of individual defect emission time constants; allowing for the defect distributions which have been found in each device through trap pumping to be analyzed directly. A reduced number of defects was used for the device irradiated at room-temperature to account for the higher fluence received by this device.

For this paper, the OUMC modeled the effect of the two different defect distributions on charge transfer in a Euclid pixel (CCD273). Since the analyzed region of each device was 400 rows by 600 columns, charge transfer was modeled using 400 parallel transfers and 600 serial transfers where appropriate. A single parallel shift consists of four steps

\[ t_{ph} = t_{dwell} + t_{shift}, t_{shift}, t_{shift}, t_{shift} \]

where \( t_{dwell} \) is the time taken to read out the serial register, and \( t_{shift} \) is the time between each phase shift [18]. Two different parallel clocking schemes were simulated; a short scheme [0.03313, 2.84 \times 10^{-5}, 2.84 \times 10^{-5}, 2.84 \times 10^{-5}] s and a long scheme [0.0361, 0.003, 0.003, 0.003] s. The serial transfer time is 4.77 \times 10^{-6} s.

The first test uses an initial 5-pixel block of 400 electrons signal. The defect capture time is instantaneous for all defects, in order to simulate the realistic case where the capture time constant is much less than the dwell time. The first pixel response (FPR) and extended pixel edge response (EPER) are modeled after charge transfer simulations in three separate cases; the parallel short clocking scheme, the parallel long clocking scheme and the serial clocking scheme. The results are shown in Fig. 4.

For the long parallel scheme there is only a small amount of deferred charge for both the room-temperature and cryogenic
cases; with little difference between the two. This indicates that defects with longer time constants are the primary cause of CTI at these clocking rates, which is as expected since the transfer time is far apart from the typical divacancy emission time constant at this temperature. This is also shown by the cryogenic case performing slightly worse for this clocking scheme; corresponding to the higher density of defects with long emission time constants.

The short parallel scheme shows significantly more deferred charge; which is expected since the transfer time is far apart from the typical divacancy emission time constant at this temperature. This is also shown by the cryogenic case performing slightly worse for this clocking scheme; corresponding to the higher density of defects with long emission time constants.

**Fig. 5.** FPR and EPER simulation results for a 5-pixel block of charge transferred using 400 parallel transfers for each clocking scheme and 600 serial transfers. Note the discontinuity in the y-axis. (a) Long parallel clocking scheme. (b) Short parallel clocking scheme. (c) Serial clocking scheme.

**Fig. 6.** Simulation results for a Gaussian point source given 400 parallel and 600 serial transfers using both the room-temperature and cryogenic defect distributions. (a) Initial point source. (b) Point source after transfer using the room-temperature defect distribution. (c) Point source after transfer using the cryogenic defect distribution.
Also present is a carbon interstitial defect with an energy $E_0 + 0.26(\pm 0.02)$ eV. This is consistent with the defect distribution formed with a room-temperature irradiation, however, the dominant divacancy species only appears in the cryogenic case after the first room-temperature anneal. A key question for further work is the defect distribution in a device irradiated and kept at cryogenic temperature without further room-temperature anneal.

While the energy distributions show two dominant defect species, the emission time-constant distributions as well as the defect densities and locations show dynamic changes over these time scales. In particular more than one peak is observed in both the divacancy and carbon interstitial time-constant distributions at various times. Further investigation is therefore required in this area, such as analysis of any field or temperature dependencies of individual peaks. We also see small changes in the total number of defects within our detectable range right up until the final anneal stage.

The importance of cryogenic irradiation and annealing studies as opposed to the more standard technique of irradiating at room-temperature is apparent both because of the large differences in initial defect distributions and because of the major changes taking place during each anneal stage. It is also evident that if for a p-channel CCD a cryogenic irradiation results in a more favorable defect distribution than for the room-temperature case, then the device must be kept cold in order to maintain this distribution. Precise knowledge of defect parameters is vital in order to mitigate for radiation-induced CTI and so further analysis in this area provides scope for improved radiation tolerance of space-based detectors.

To analyze the potential impact of the different defect distributions which are produced for irradiation at room-temperature and at cryogenic temperature a model of charge transfer in a radiation damaged CCD was utilized. By simulating the effects of each distribution separately on both a 5-pixel block of charge and a Gaussian point source a comparison between the imaging performance in each case was obtained. It is shown that for certain temperatures and clocking schemes the effect can be significant, further stressing the importance of cryogenic irradiation studies for characterization, particularly in the context of space missions.

Throughout this paper, we have considered only p-channel devices, and hence only hole traps. In n-channel devices, which remain the current standard for space-based detectors, similar studies into the effects of a cryogenic irradiation on the electron trap distribution are ongoing [19]–[21].
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