

Review Article

The edge effect on the EEDF measurements of magnetized DC plasma

Abstract: The localized plasma parameters at the edge of the discharge electrodes cell have been investigated using Langmuir single probe. Plasma parameters (in the three regions of the discharge: - cathode fall, negative glow and positive column) such as the electric field distribution, the electron energy distribution functions (EEDF), the electron temperature (T_e) and the electron density (N_e), have been determined in the different regions of the discharge with and without the applications of external magnetic field. The EEDF was investigated using different methods e.g. the graphical method and the electron current second derivative method. The electron energy distribution functions are Maxwellian only in the positive column region. Two groups of electrons were observed in the cathode fall and the negative glow regions. The diffusion coefficients and the electron temperatures are lower in the presence of the magnetic field. Furthermore the axial potential distribution and the electron density were increased in the presence of the magnetic field, whereas sharp axial increments in the electron density in the border between the cathode fall and the negative glow regions.

Keyword: - Single Langmuir probe- electron energy distribution function - Maxwellian energy distribution-magnetic field

PACS NO.: 52.50.-b

1. Introduction

The electron energy distribution function (EEDF), in most plasma diagnostic techniques, is usually assumed to be Maxwellian. However it is of interest to verify this assumption which helps also for explain the mechanism of the glow discharge in the different discharge regions (i.e. :- cathode fall, negative glow and positive column regions)[1-2] Among the different diagnostic techniques there are the method of Langmuir probes. Basically, an electrostatic probe is merely a small metallic electrode inserted into the plasma. By assuming a Maxwellian velocity distribution, plasma parameters e.g. the electron temperature and electron density can be determined from the current-voltage (I-V) characteristic curve of the probe. The electric probe method has one advantage over all other diagnostic techniques; since it produces local measurements for the different regions in the discharge volume [3].

The plasma is considered to be a quasi-neutral. This quasi-neutrality is, however, distributed by introducing the probe into the plasma. A sheath is formed around the conducting surface of the probe due to the redistribution of charges. However, the bulk of the plasma can be considered to be undisturbed outside the sheath, which is usually very thin. Motion of electrons and ions near the probe are dependent on the polarity as well as the amplitude of the probe potential relative to the plasma potential. When the probe potential is sufficiently negative; only the ions can reach the probe surface. The current is thus equal to the ion random current (I_{ni}) [4].

Kagan and Perel [5] showed that the magnetic field does not disturb the I – V characteristic of a cylindrical Langmuir probe, if the probe radius is too small relative to the electron Larmor radius, and it is placed perpendicular to the magnetic field lines.

The nature of the magnetized DC and RF glow discharges at the edge of a strong hollow magnet around cathode (as target), is a good media for disinfection and inactivation of bacteria such as *Staphylococcus aureus* and *E-coli* [6-7]

In the present work, the edge effect on the EEDF measurements of magnetized dc argon plasma is investigated in the different discharge regions using a single spherical probe. Two methods are used to investigate the energy distribution namely: the semi-log curve of the electron current and the second derivatives of the electron current method. Furthermore electron energy distribution function, electron density, and temperatures measurements are carried out.

2. Experimental setup

Details of the experimental setup and procedures of the work are shown in our previous work [8]. In this study an electric single probe inserted into the plasma, and a potential V_p is applied to the probe. The basic single probe electric circuit is shown in Figure 1(a) [9].

A single spherical probe of 2 mm diameter, made of phosphor bronze was used. The probe diameter was as small as possible to avoid, or at least to minimize, the disturbing influence of its tip on the plasma. The probe was also cleaned, to reduce the surface contamination effects, by electron bombardment. The electron bombardment of the probe was done by connecting it to a steady positive voltage between 60-100 volts. The electrical circuit used for the single probe consists of a DC-power supply, 10 turns potentiometer ($50\text{ K}\Omega$), the load resistor ($R_p = 1\text{ K}\Omega$) and a $10\text{ }\mu\text{F}$ capacitor. The $10\text{ }\mu\text{F}$ capacitor was placed in parallel with the measuring resistor R_p to filter out the noise. The geometry and the dimension of the used magnet are shown in Figure 1(b).

3. Results and discussion

3-1. Axial distribution of the magnetic field strength at edge

Edge of the cathode is our interested fashion region more than the center due to the strong hollow magnet around the cathode, so the effect of the magnetic field at the center is lower than at the edge [10], therefore the electrons are trapped by magnetic field lines at the edge more than at the center, moreover, the space charge density increases, and the electric field values increases due to the increase of the potential values [11]. Figure (2) shows that the magnetic field strength (B) at the edge has its maximum value in the cathode fall region ($B=400$ gauss) and begin to decrease in the axial direction towards the positive column ($B=350$ gauss), passing through the negative glow region.

3-2. The electric field distribution

Values of the electric field are obtained by differentiating the measured potential distribution curves i.e. ($E = dV/dX$). Figure (3) shows the electric field distribution for Ar - discharge, at different gas pressures (1- 4 mbar) and 10 mA discharge current.

The electric field decreased sharply along the cathode – anode space. This is related to the intense positive space charge in the front of the cathode which accelerates the electrons towards the anode. Thus, the electrons emitted from the cathode are then accelerated away, until they reach the negative glow region where the electric field becomes weak (zero and sometimes negative values). In this region, the gained kinetic energy of the electrons is dissipated in collisions with the atoms of the gas and thus secondary electrons would be produced [12]. In the positive column region constant and linear electric field is needed to maintain the discharge along the large length of the column which is required to carry the discharge current.

Figure (4) shows the electric field distribution for Ar discharges in the presence of magnetic fields which are similar to the distribution without magnetic field, although values of the

electric field distribution at the edge are higher by a factor of (2-1.5) in the pressure range of (1-4mbar) at the cathode side and in the negative glow region.

3-3. The (I_a-V_a) characteristic of the single probe

The I-V characteristic curves produced useful information about the electron energy distribution function, electron temperature, and electron density. Figures (5) and (6), show samples of the I-V characteristic curves of the single probe at edge in the cathode fall region, at different pressures, in the presence and the absence of the magnetic field for Ar discharge.

When the magnetic field is applied, the diffusion coefficient of the electron $D_{\perp}$ is reduced due to following equation [13]

$$D_{e\perp} = \frac{D_e}{1 + \omega^2 \tau^2} \quad (1)$$

Where D_e is the electron diffusion coefficient

$$D_e = KT/m_e \nu_p \quad (2)$$

Where KT is the particle temperature in eV, ν_p is the langumer plasma frequency in Hz, where

$$\nu_p = \frac{1}{2\pi} \sqrt{\frac{ne^2}{m_e \epsilon_0}} \quad (3)$$

m_e and n are mass and density of electron respectively

Consequently $D_{e\perp}$ is reduced by a factor of $[1/(1 + (\omega\tau)^2)]$. here ω is the cyclotron frequency of the electron and τ is the mean free time of the electron-atom collision, $\omega = \frac{eB}{m_e}$. Although the current and current density increases in the presence of the magnetic field, the rate of plasma loss by diffusion must decrease in the presence of magnetic field [14],

3-4. EEDF measurements in the cathode fall and negative glow regions

3-4.1 Using the semi-log curve of the electron current method:

The first method depends on the plotting of the semi-log curve of the electron current I_e as a function of the probe voltage V_p . For a Maxwellian energy distribution, a straight line with a slope of $(\frac{-e}{K T_e})$ is expected. A departure from linearity, however, doesn't necessarily mean

that the distribution is not Maxwellian. The departures from linearity could also be caused by a spread in the work function over the surface of the probe, adrift in the work function of the probe can be related to the finite probe size and the fluctuations of electron temperature [15]. Figures [7(a),(b) and (c)] , show the semi-log curves of the electron current for the different glow discharge regions :- cathode fall and negative glow and positive column respectively of Ar discharge. The discontinuity in the semi-log curves may represent the space potential V_s . This is the point at which the electron saturation current starts in an ideal I-V characteristic of a single probe. At this potential, the collector receives the random electron and positive ion currents. The electron current, I_e in the retarding region ($V_p < 0$) is given by :-

$$I_e = I_0 \exp\left(\frac{-e V_p}{K T_e}\right) \quad (4)$$

Where V_p is the probe potential ($=V-V_s$) with respect to the sheath edge, V is the applied potential and V_s is the space potential. When the probe potential reaches the space potential, the current I is equal to a constant value and a horizontal line is obtained. At this point the electron current derivatives with respect to a probe voltage are equal to zero. In practical, secondary effects like reflection from the probe surface may prevent the horizontal line from being obtained. Nevertheless, the straight line in themselves are insufficient to prove the presence of maxwellian distribution. Mott-Swift and Langmuir [16-17] found that, a straight

line may also be obtained when a beam of electrons having a common drift velocity is superimposed on Maxwellian distribution of a relatively low temperature.

3-4.2 The second derivatives of the electron current method

The second method depends on measuring the second derivatives of the electron current $\frac{d^2 I_e}{dV_p^2}$. The energy distribution may be obtained using the relationship [18]:-

$$F(\varepsilon) = -\frac{4}{e^2 A_p} \left(-\frac{m_e V_p}{2e} \right)^{1/2} \frac{d^2 I_e}{dV_p^2} \quad (V_p < 0) \quad (5)$$

The second derivative was estimated by differentiating the probe current I_e twice. The EEDF was thus calculated at different gas pressure and in the different glow discharge regions. The measured electron energy distribution functions were compared with the theoretical Maxwellian distribution function. The latter was computed using the relationship:-

$$F(\varepsilon) = \text{Const.} (\varepsilon_p)^{1/2} \cdot \exp\left(\frac{-\varepsilon_p}{K T_e}\right) \quad (6)$$

Where ε is the electron energy. Moreover, the presence of Maxwellian distribution was tested by plotting the semi-log curves of the second derivative, against V_p . Equations (5) and (6) confirm that a plot of $\ln\left(\frac{d^2 I_e}{dV_p^2}\right)$ as a function of V_p would produce a straight line having a slope of $\left(\frac{-e}{K T_e}\right)$

whenever the distribution is Maxwellian. This method is more sensitive test for the Maxwellian distribution function. By drawing the second derivative $Y'' = \left(\frac{d^2 I_e}{dV_p^2}\right)$ as shown in figures

8(a),(b) and (c), as a function of the probe voltage V_p . Then the semi-log curves of the second derivative of the electron current $\ln\left(\frac{d^2 I_e}{dV_p^2}\right)$ as a function of the probe voltage V_p can be

calculated. Two linear parts are shown in figures [9(a) and (b)], which related to the existence of two groups of electrons of different temperature [19], while a straight line, figure 9(c), is related to one group of electrons.

3-4.3. Electron energy distribution function measurements

The electron energy distribution function $F(E)$ was thus calculated using equation (5). Figures [10(a), (b) and (c)] show $F(E)$ as a function of the probe retarding potential V_p (which can be considered as the electron energy). Two well-defined maxima are observed for Ar glow discharge. The presence of two groups of electrons at the edge of the cathode fall and in the negative glow region can be explained as follows:-

The secondary group of electrons is those which have been ejected after collision between the fast primaries and gas atoms, and that they have not had time to reach thermal equilibrium with the ultimate group "slowest group of electrons " which has the highest number density, and are produced by the degeneration of primary and secondary groups in successive collision to very low energies, before removal by diffusion to the walls [20]. Moreover, the state of non-equilibrium between the electrons and the electric field gives rise to a non-Maxwellian electron energy distribution in both cathode sheath and negative glow regions. Three distinct groups of electrons were detected:-

(I) Primary electrons from the cathode that pass through the cathode sheath region without collisions. (II) Secondary electrons corresponding to the tail of the flux distribution with energies greater than the ionization potential. (III) Ultimate slow electrons with energies below the ionization potential.

3-4.4 The electron temperature and density measurements:

In the cathode fall region, and in the absence of the magnetic field, values of T_e varied from 6.5 to 4.5 eV, and values of N_e varied from $(4 \text{ to } 3) \times 10^9 \text{ cm}^{-3}$. In the presence of the magnetic field, varied from 3 to 2 eV and N_e varied from $(9.5 \text{ to } 7.5) \times 10^9 \text{ cm}^{-3}$. For negative glow region, without magnetic field, T_e values are in the range of 5.18- 4.45 eV, and values of N_e $(4.97 - 4.3) \times 10^9 \text{ cm}^{-3}$. In the presence of the magnetic field, T_e varied from 2.6- 2 eV

and N_e from $(11.6 \text{ to } 8.9) \times 10^9 \text{ cm}^{-3}$. Electrons emitted from the cathode surface were accelerated through the cathode fall edge and enters the negative glow region. They lose some of their energy in collisional excitation processes. The length of the negative glow region is then determined by dissipation of the electron energy due to inelastic collisions with neutral atoms [21]. **For Positive Column Region**, in the absence of the magnetic field values of T_e , varied from 2.5 to 1.1 eV, and N_e were $(5.98 \text{ to } 5.66) \times 10^9 \text{ cm}^{-3}$, and in the presence of the magnetic field, varied from 4.2 to 3.7 eV and N_e were $(5.2 \text{ to } 4.55) \times 10^9 \text{ cm}^{-3}$. Generally, values of T_e decreased by increasing the gas pressure while N_e increased by increasing the gas pressure. This may be attributed to the increase in the number of electron-atom collisions and consequently, increasing the rate of ionization at higher pressure.

All previous values show that the temperature values reduced from cathode fall to the positive column passing through the negative glow region, taking into consideration that the trend of T_e and N_e values are inversely proportional ($T_e \times N_e = \text{constant}$) [22-23]; the maximum value of one is found where the minimum value of the other as shown in figure(11). A sharp axial increment of the electron density in the presence of the magnetic field from the cathode fall region to the negative glow region is related to the confinement of plasma in cathode fall and negative glow regions then more excitation and ionization, and a decrements of the electron density in the positive column region due to the electron capture by the anode in the positive column region.

4. Conclusions

Curves confirmed that the electric discharge was mainly in the abnormal glow discharge region ($I_a = 10 \text{ mA}$) in the pressure range of (0.5-5 mbar).

The axial electric field distribution confirmed the presence of higher field in the cathode fall region, which decreases sharply towards the negative glow and the positive column regions. In the positive column region, the electric field was weak and nearly constant. The strong electric field in the cathode fall region accelerates the electrons inward the glow discharge.

Also, it is concluded that, in the cathode fall and the negative glow regions two groups of electrons were found. The presence of the two groups of electrons was attributed to electrons which have been ejected after collision between the fast primaries and gas atoms. They have not had time to reach thermal equilibrium with the ultimate group "slowest group of electrons, which has the highest number density, and are produced by the degeneration of primary and secondary groups in successive collision to very low energies, before removal by diffusion to the walls.

Finally, the thermalization time between the two groups of electrons was longer than the required time for electrons to leave the cathode fall region. Therefore, electrons have no chance to redistribute themselves in one Maxwellian distribution group. In the positive column region, only one group of electron was detected. Unlike the cathode fall and negative glow regions, the thermalization time was short enough for electrons to redistribute themselves in one Maxwellian distribution group.

References

- [1] B Chapman "Glow Discharges Processes" J.Wiley and Sons, New York, (1980).
- [2] A R Galaly, M A Hassouba and U M Rashed *Plasma physics report journal* **39(3)** 1 (2013)
- [3] Mc Whirter "Plasma Diagnostic Techniques" edited by Huddleston E. and Leonard S.L, Academic Press, P. 201, (1965) .
- [4] Y Kagan and K K Paskalev *Sov. Phys. Tech. Phys.* **19** 1604 (1975).

- [5] Y Kagan, and V I Perel *Sov. Phys. Usp.* **6** 767 (1964).
- [6] A R Galaly and H.H. Zahran *Journal of Modern Physics* **5** 781(2014)
- [7] A R Galaly and H H Zahran *Journal of Physics: Conference Series* (IOP) **431** (2013)
- [8] A R Galaly and F F El Akshar *Phys. Scr.* **88** 7 (2013)
- [9] Desilva “ Plasma Diagnostics”, University of Maryland, (1991).
- [10] Bohm “ The Characteristics of Electrical Discharge in Magnetic Fields” edited by Guthrie A and Wakerling R K, McGraw-Hill, New York, (1949).
- [11] A R Galaly *Physical Science International Journal* **4(7)** 930 (2014).
- [12] F F Chen “Mini-Course on Plasma Diagnostics, IEEE-ICOPS meeting, Jeju, Korea, 27-28, (2003)
- [13] Hutchinson “ Principles of Plasma Diagnostics” Cambridge Univ. Press , (1990) .
- [15] F F Chen “Plasma Diagnostic Techniques” edited by Huddleston E. and Leonard S.L., Academic Press, New York, (1965).
- [16] Mott-Smith and Langmuir *Gen. Electron. Rev.* **27** 449 (1924).
- [17] Mott-Smith and Langmuir *Phys. Rev.* **28** 727 (1926).
- [18] Schott “Plasma Diagnostic”, edited by Lochte-Hogreven W., (1968).
- [20] Godyak V.A., Piejak R.B. and Alexandrovich B.M *J.Appl. Phys.* **73** 3657 (1993).
- [21] H D Pringle and W E Farvis *J. Phys.Rev.* **96** 536 (1955).
- [22] C Heise and M Kock *Plasma Sources Science and Technology* **4** 31(1995).
- [23] H K Yasuda , W H Tao and M A Prelas *Journal of Vacuum Science & Technology A [Vacuum, Surfaces, and Films]* **14** 2113 (1996).









Figure (2) axial distribution of the magnetic field strength




Figure(3) Axial electric field distribution in at edge in the absence of magnetic field at constant current($I=10\text{mA}$)



Figure(4) Axial electric field distribution in at edge in the Presence of magnetic field at constant current($I=10\text{mA}$)



Figure(5) I-V curves of the single probe for cathode fall region at different Ar pressures in the absence of the magnetic field(at the edge)



Figure(6) I-V curves of the single probe for cathode fall region at different Ar pressures in the absence of the magnetic field(at the edge)




Figure 7(a) Semi-Log curve of the electron current for cathode fall region




Figure7(b) Semi-Log curve of the electron current for negative glow region.




Figure7(c) Semi-Log curve of the electron current for Positive column region.




Figure8(a) The second derivative of the electron current for cathode fall




Figure8(b) The second derivative of the electron current for negative glow




Figure8(c) The second derivative of the electron current for Postive column




Figure 9(a) Semi-Log curve of The second derivative of the electron current for cathode fall




Figure 9(b) Semi- Log of the second derivative of the electron current for negative glow




Figure9(c) Semi- Log of the second derivative of the electron current for positive column




Figure 10(a) Comparison between the experimental and theortical of EEDF for cathode fall




Figure 10(b) Comparison between the experimental and theortical of EEDF for negative glow




Figure10(c) Comparison between the experimental and theortical of EEDF for Positive column




Figure (11) axial electron temperature and density distributions at edge in the presence of magnetic field.