

Re: Vbe stuff

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.electronics.design/2006-10/msg03165.html>

- *From:* Jonathan Kirwan <jkirwan@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Sun, 15 Oct 2006 20:14:56 GMT
-

On Sun, 15 Oct 2006 12:09:17 -0700, Jim Thompson
<To-Email-Use-The-Envelope-Icon@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Sun, 15 Oct 2006 17:50:26 GMT, Jonathan Kirwan
<jkirwan@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Sun, 15 Oct 2006 09:51:18 -0700, Jim Thompson
<To-Email-Use-The-Envelope-Icon@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Sun, 15 Oct 2006 16:24:30 GMT, Fred Bloggs
<nospam@xxxxxxxx>
wrote:

Jim Thompson wrote:

Density has nothing to do
with vbe change per decade
provided you're
not into where resistance is
affecting the measurement.

...Jim Thompson

I suppose it has more to do with a design
goal minimizing conduction
losses in the high current diode thereby
prohibiting the use of very
large ratios of majority doping material
density as with the transistor.
This will cause a departure from the
simplified minority carrier density
at the transition region boundaries as a
function of forward bias

Re: Vbe stuff

because the minority carrier density on both sides of the transition region change significantly with a coupled dependence.

As someone else pointed out, the 1N4xxx devices are also very lightly doped (almost PIN-diode-like) to get the "high-voltage" performance.

But, Fred, your dissertation sounds just like that...
dissertation out
of the mouth of some _twisted_ PhD ;-)

All the same, it makes some sense to me. Shockley's equation develops from an assumption that the forward current is entirely due to minority carrier diffusion in neutral regions, I think. I need to think more about it, but on first cut it sounds like the right direction.

Jon

Large ratios of doping level are precluded by (primarily) breakdown voltage and forward resistance considerations.

But isn't forward resistance a valid part of this measurement being discussed?

Jon

.