Innovating the HP Way

# Double Heterojunction AIGaAs Red Low Current Seven Segment Displays 

## Reliability Data

## Description

The following cumulative test results have been obtained from testing performed at Agilent Technologies in accordance with the latest revision of MIL- STD883.

Agilent Technologies tests parts at the absolute maximum rated conditions recommended for the device. The actual performance you obtain from Agilent parts depends on the electrical and

HDSP-x 100 Series HDSP-x101 Series

## Table 1. Life Tests Demonstrated Performance

|  |  |  | Point Typical <br> Performance |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Test Name | Stress Test <br> Conditions | Total <br> Device Hrs. | Units <br> Tested | Total <br> Failed [1] | Failure Rate <br> (\% /1K Hours) [2] |
| High Temperature <br> Operating Life | $\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{F}}=15 \mathrm{~mA}$ DC <br> $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{A}}=55^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | 435,000 | 435 | 0 | $\leq 0.230$ |

Notes:

1. For purposes of this data sheet, a failure is any device that ( a ) has $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{F}}$ greater than 0.5 V over the maximum data sheet specification or (b) has $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{R}}$ smaller than 3.0 V at $100 \mu \mathrm{~A}$ or (c) degrades in light output more than $75 \%$.
2. Assuming one failure for calculation.

## Failure Rate Prediction

The failure rate given is at elevated operating conditions. The failure rate will depend on the junction temperature of the device. Assuming a package thermal resistance of $430^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ per watt the calculated temperature rise during testing was approximately $14^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ above the ambient temperature. The estimated life at different temperatures is calculated and listed in the following table. Estimations are done using the Arrhenius model
with the activation energy of 0.43 eV in reference to the MIL-HDBK-217 for hybrid products.

## Example of Failure Rate Calculation

Assume a device operating 8 hours/ day, 5 days/week. The utilization factor, given 168 hours/w eek is:

The point failure rate per year ( 8760 hours) at $55^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ambient temperature is:
(0.230\%/1K hours) x $0.25 \times$
( 8760 hours/year) $=0.500 \%$ per year.

Similarly, $90 \%$ confidence level failure rate per year at $55^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ambient temperature is:
(0.529\%/1K hours) x $0.25 \times$ ( 8760 hours/year) $=1.15 \%$ per year.
(8 hours/day) x (5 days/week) /
( 168 hours/week) $=0.25$
environmental characteristics of your application but will probably be better than the performance outlined in Table 1.

Table 2. Failure Rate Prediction

|  |  | Point Typical <br> Performance [3] <br> in Time |  | Performance <br> in Time [4] <br> (90\% Confidence) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ambient <br> Temperature ( ${ }^{\circ} \mathbf{C}$ ) | Junction <br> Temperature ( ${ }^{\circ} \mathbf{C}$ ) | MTBF [1] | Failure Rate <br> (\%/1K Hours) | MTBF [2] | Failure Rate <br> (\%/1K Hours) |
| 85 | 99 | 134,000 | 0.746 | 58,000 | 1.717 |
| 75 | 89 | 194,000 | 0.515 | 84,000 | 1.185 |
| 65 | 79 | 287,000 | 0.348 | 125,000 | 0.801 |
| 55 | 69 | 435,000 | 0.230 | 189,000 | 0.529 |
| 45 | 59 | 675,000 | 0.148 | 293,000 | 0.341 |
| 35 | 49 | $1,077,000$ | 0.093 | 468,000 | 0.214 |
| 25 | 39 | $1,769,000$ | 0.057 | 768,000 | 0.130 |

Notes:
3. The point MTBF (representing a typical MTBF) is simply the total device hours divided by the number of failures. Since no failures occurred during the testing, the point MTBF and failure rate are calculated assuming one failure.
4. This MTBF and failure rate represent the performance level for which there is a $90 \%$ probability of the device doing better than the stated value. This confidence level is based on the statistics of the distribution of failures. The assumed distribution is exponential. This particular distribution is commonly used in describing useful life failures. This methodology is based on MIL-STD-690B.
Table 3. Mechanical and Environmental Tests

| Test Name | MIL-STD-883C Ref | Test Conditions | Units Tested | Units Failed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Physical Dimensions | 2016 | Device profile at 20X | 197 | 0 |
| Solderability | 2003.3 | Sn 60, Pb 40 Solder at $260^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 5 sec . | 536 | 0 |
| Temperature Cycling | 1010.5 | $\begin{array}{r} \hline-55 \text { to } 100^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 15 \mathrm{~min} \text {. dwell, } 5 \text { min. transfer } \\ 20 \text { cycles } \\ 100 \text { cycles } \end{array}$ | 536 | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ 2 \\ (0.37 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| Moisture Resistance | 1004.4 | 10 days, $90-98 \% \mathrm{RH},-10$ to $65^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, non-operating | 392 | 0 |
| Mechanical Shock | 2002.3 (Cond. B) | 5 blows each X1, Y1, Y2 axis 1500 G 0.5 msec. | 369 | 0 |
| Vibration Fatigue | 2005.1 (Cond. A) | $32 \pm 8$ hours each $X, Y, Z, 96$ hours total, $60 \mathrm{~Hz}, 20 \mathrm{Gmin}$. | 190 | 0 |
| Vibration, Variable Frequency | 2007.1 (Cond. A) | 3 cycles, 4 min. for each $X, Y, Z$ axis at 20 G . min., 20 to 2000 Hz | 190 | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (0.53 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| Constant Acceleration | 2001.2 <br> (Cond. D) | 1 min. each X1, Y1, Y2 at 20,000 G | 189 | 0 |
| Lead Fatigue | 2004.4 (Cond. B2) | 3 bends 15 degrees min. | 45 | 0 |
| Terminal Strength | 2004.4 (Cond. A) | 1 lb . for 30 seconds | 149 | 0 |
| Solvent Resistance | 2015.4 | Solvents tested: 1/4 Isopropyl Alcohol and 3/4 mineral spirits | 45 | 0 |
| Salt Atmosphere | 1009.4 | $35^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 24 hrs . | 50 | 0 |

Note:
5. With the exception of solderability and temperature cycling, all data is generic to seven segment display family.

