Secondary electrons production with EUV synchrotron radiation: experiment and modeling

> *Stefano Nannarone IOM-CNR*

The phenomenology of interest in our case

Our group (IOM-CNR, IMEC, UniCam) is currently concentrated on two classes of phenomena both involving non-resonant (i.e. with specific bonds of material) photons absorption and Low Energy Electrons

• photosensitive materials (*solubility switching of photoresists*)

• photon damage of optical elements (typically synchrotron radiation optics/case of BEAR)

The physical picture : isotropic free electron gas ($g(E) \propto m^{\frac{3}{2}}\sqrt{E}$) in stationary conditions

• impinging photon partially fills up the volume elements of p-space $\left| dV_p \simeq p^2 d\theta_V d\phi_H dp \right|$ of the highest reachable p-FEG sub shell

- then emptying processes start including:
- •elastic diffusion maybe toward the surface \rightarrow XPS/UPS (not now)
- radiative de-excitation (not included in the model)
- •multiple scattering and *e*-cascade at issue here

Though it could be instructive to give a look to a dynamical description based on a Boltzmann equation

Boltzmann equation providing the $f^*(E)$ – *some hints*

[e.g*. G. F. Amelio J Vac Sci Technol 7, 593 (1970*)]

FIGURE 1. Typical experimental geometry showing coordinates and energy of a secondary electron.

Over all goal

• The Goal is to get a quantitative – *tough naïve, but manageable* - expression linking the distribution in energy *E* of secondary electrons under illumination involving the experimental parameters and those of the material to the out-of-equilibrium distribution function $f^*(E)$: *just a picture of the sate of things*

• then as a first step to get oriented the difficulties due to complexity have been put aside to concentrate instead on the description of the emission process choosing a stable system - that is a non-photosensitive material

• in doing that also attention to single out difficulties, limits and their origin to get a quantitative expression

in fact things quickly turn to complex

to start with: Au[100] sputtered (not annealed surface)

 $\hbar \omega = 92$ eV #101 $\Delta \hbar \omega$ =20 meV (100 µ) ΔE_k (meV)= 100 (12-15.5 eV)/10 (15.5-16.5)/100(16.5-107) $I_0(92 \text{ eV}) = 8 \times 10^{10} \text{ ph/s}$ $filter = Si$ polarization= ~ linear/horizontal [sel pol = -0.945 mrad; + 0.95 mrad] incidence = 45° / s polarization incidence $S_h = 400 \mu m$ $S_v = 100 \mu m$ $E_p = 5$ eV $\Delta E_k = 38$ meV $V_{bias} = 15 V$ I_{drain} ~

The play ground (the volume problem)

 \bullet the probed volume is divided into elementary slices

the number of states(z) per elementary source to be filled up by cascade

$$
\gamma_p \simeq p^2 d\theta d\phi dp; \rho_p = dz \frac{A_x(z)A_y}{h^3}
$$

[anticipating] each elementary source emits with spherical symmetry emission from p-states is limited by the critical angle of the emission cone

$$
\cos^{-1}(\theta_c) = \sqrt{\frac{\chi}{E}}
$$

probed volume
e^{85}

 $\Omega_{A}(E,\phi_{h},\vartheta_{v})$

! not in scale, but involved !

 $T_A(E, \phi_h, \vartheta_v)$

Equations from emission rate (*the surface problem*) to f^{*}(E)

Experimental distribution function (arbitrary units)

matlab code R.Fallica - IMEC

Thermal fit to experiment (Fermi function)

Summary and open issues

A simple expression (even naïve) for the kinetic energy distribution of secondary electrons has been written in terms of the experimental parameters and of the material properties with the double goals of analyzing the experimental spectra and at contextually testing the difficulties and limits of a quantitative description and where they come from

The model shows that the occupation function of the states above the vacuum level in the presence of photon excitation can be obtained by combining the experimental data with the expression obtained from the calculation

It has been applied to the simple case of a Au crystal

The distribution function was obtained in *arbitrary units* a limit that currently involves both the description of the emission process itself and the electron collection (solid angle and transmission)

Suitable normalizations are need: among others TEY (drain current $\int dE_{k}$...) could be of use

This result, *if confirmed by subsequent experiments*, could be of use, in in application-oriented contexts to monitoring the processes depending on the extent of formation of LEE cloud (e.g. photoresists)

From the emission line-shape a temperature of the electron gas (5000K) was inferred together with the evidence of a disagreement with a thermal excitation

This approach does not allow a direct access to the "hidden tail" of the LEE whose occupancy could anyway described by extrapolating the $f^*(E)$ for $E \le \chi$ or seeking for alternate experimental approaches to test the occupation of the states below the vacuum level up to LUMO or Fermi level (no lack of ideas – but to figure out an experiment numbers are needed).

BEAR overview - IOM-CNR beamline at Elettra

BEAR contributes to the BABE unit (Resp.Elena Magnano - https://babe.iom.cnr.it/about-us) belonging to AHEAD2020 (Integrated Activities in the High Energy Astrophysics Domain)

L.Pasquali(Dept. of Eng.E. Ferrari, Univ.Modena and R.E. leads a number of activity at BEAR related with the electron yield specifically in the field of materials for aerospace

People involved

- Roberto Fallica IMEC-Belgium
- Georghii Tchoudinov UniCam
- Javid Rezvani
- • Angelo Giglia IOM-CNR
- • Nicola Mahne
- • Marco Malvezzi