A Reliability Prediction Methodology for LED Arrays
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ABSTRACT In this paper, a physics of failure-based prediction method is combined with statistical models to consider the impact of current crowding and current droop effects on the reliability of LED arrays. Electronic-thermal models of LEDs are utilized to obtain the operation conditions under the influences of current crowding and current droop. A Markov chain-based model is used to calculate the probability distribution of each failure mode, including the lumen decay and catastrophic failure. Two types of LEDs were selected for a numerical study. The proposed prediction method provides the realistic reliability prediction results. It is found that the properties of LEDs have a great impact on their hazard rates of LED arrays. The equivalent resistance, third-order non-radiative coefficient, and radiative coefficient of LEDs are critical to the reliability of an LED array.

INDEX TERMS Catastrophic failure, electronic-thermal model, LED array, Markov chain, reliability prediction.

NOTATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$X(t)$</td>
<td>Probability distribution of a system;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$x_i$</td>
<td>Probability of State $i$;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P$</td>
<td>Transition matrix of an LED array;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$n$</td>
<td>Number of LED strings in parallel;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$m$</td>
<td>Number of LEDs in series;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$h_{i\rightarrow j}$</td>
<td>Probability of State $i$ transfers to State $j$ in $\Delta t$;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$h_s$</td>
<td>Hazard rate of an LED string;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\lambda_0$</td>
<td>LED’s basic hazard rate;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T_A$</td>
<td>Ambient temperature;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$E_a$</td>
<td>LED’s activation energy;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T_j$</td>
<td>LED’s junction temperature;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P_{th}$</td>
<td>LED’s thermal power;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R_{th}$</td>
<td>LED’s thermal resistance;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P_{LED}$</td>
<td>LED’s input power;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P_{Ra}$</td>
<td>LED’s radiative power;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\eta(I)$</td>
<td>Efficiency of LED with Current $I$;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$V_f(I)$</td>
<td>Forward voltage of LED with Current $I$;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$I(i)$</td>
<td>Current of LED in State $i$;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R_s$</td>
<td>Equivalent resistance;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$V_0$</td>
<td>Zero-current voltage;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\eta_0$</td>
<td>Basic efficiency;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A_e$</td>
<td>1st order non-radiative coefficient;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$B_e$</td>
<td>Radiative coefficient;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_e$</td>
<td>3rd order non-radiative coefficient;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$I_a$</td>
<td>Total input current of the array;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\varphi(i)$</td>
<td>Relative radiative power of the array in State $i$;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I. INTRODUCTION

Degradations including lumen depreciation and color shift, are usually considered as major failure modes of LEDs. The LED’s lifetime refers to the time at which an LED’s lumen maintenance degrades to 70% [1]–[3]. Many reliability prediction methods for solid state lighting [4]–[8] focus on LEDs’ degradations. In recent years, many novel technologies have been applied to produce more reliable LEDs. For example, the ultraviolet LEDs have attracted more and more research concern [9], [10]. The under-etching process and glass substrate technology has been developed for GaN-based LEDs [11], [12]. ZnO nano-particles has been used to enhance performance and lifetime of white-light LEDs [13]. Meanwhile, many advanced packaging methods have developed to extend LED’s lifetime. For instance, reliable phosphor materials for white-light LEDs have been studied [14]–[17]. Thin film structure and silicon substrate have been used to reduce LEDs’ thermal resistance [18], [19].
Graphene have been implemented by LED packaging [20], [21]. Remote phosphor technologies have been utilized for LED lamps [22]. Optimization approaches of LED packages have been developed [23], [24]. Via these new technologies, the effect of lumen depreciation has been highly reduced. In 2013, it has reported that the lumen depreciation of an LED lamp is less than 3% after 25000 hours’ operation [25]. Currently, LED often has a lifetime as long as 25,000 hours [2], [26]. If such trend continues, it is reasonable to believe that the lumen depreciation could be reduced to an insignificant level in future solid state lighting products.

Beside the lumen depreciation with aging time, LED’s catastrophic failure, which will result in zero light output and open circuit [27], [28], is seen as one of major failures. In many area lighting applications, the light source is an LED array with many strings. Although the current balancing techniques have been developed [29], mainstream applications still connect paralleled LED strings directly. When one of LEDs is failed, the entire string is disconnect from the array. The current in the remaining strings will redistribute, leading current crowding and current droop. The current crowding effect will bring a higher forward voltage and thus more input power [30]. The current droop will cause a decrease of power efficiency [31]. Under inferences of these two effects, the LED array will produce more heat and have an elevated junction temperature and thus higher failure rate [32], [33]. Due to the large number of LEDs, the reliability test for an LED array is expensive and time-consuming. Conventional system reliability models [33] usually suppose that the failure rate of each LED stay at a constant value. Such an assumption may result significant errors in reliability assessment of LED arrays. It is necessary to develop a reliability prediction approach with consideration of failure rate changing caused by current crowding and current droop for LED arrays.

In this work, a physics of failure-based prediction methodology is combined with statistical models to consider the impact of LED’s catastrophic failure, current crowding and current droop effects on of reliability LED arrays. Electronic-thermal models of LEDs are utilized to obtain conditions of each operation status under influences of current crowding and current droop. LED’s catastrophic failure, current crowding and current droop depend on current operation status, but are independent of the history of operation conditions. The probability degradation of an LED array can consider as a Markov process. Thus, a Markov chain-base model is used to calculate the probability distribution of each operation status based on operation conditions.

This paper is organized as follows. Section II describes the proposed reliability model of LED arrays based on the Markov Chain. In Section III, physics-based models of LED are described. Experiments and model parameter extractions are introduced in Section IV. In Section V, two types of LED are analyzed to predict reliability of an LED array via the proposed methodology. Section VI concludes this work finally.

II. RELIABILITY MODEL OF LED ARRAY

Figure 1 shows a typical LED array. Supposes that the array consists of n LED strings in parallel, each string has m identical LEDs. The driving current distributes evenly in all working LED strings. Each string has the same operation conditions and thus the hazard rate. The catastrophic failure of each LED will be considered, which will lead an open circuit [34].

For a system has n+1 operation states, probability distribution at time t can be denoted as a set X(t) [35]:

$$X(t) = [x_0(t), x_1(t) \ldots x_n(t)]$$

(1)

As discussed in previous works [36], [37], an electronic system with catastrophic failures can be described by the Markov Chain. Probability variations of the system at time t + Δt can be obtained by the following equation [35]:

$$dX(t)/dt = X(t) \cdot P$$

(2)

where P is system’s transition matrix:

$$P = \begin{bmatrix}
    h_{0 \rightarrow 0} & h_{0 \rightarrow 1} & \cdots & h_{0 \rightarrow n} \\
    h_{1 \rightarrow 0} & h_{1 \rightarrow 1} & \cdots & h_{1 \rightarrow n} \\
    \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
    h_{n \rightarrow 0} & h_{n \rightarrow 1} & \cdots & h_{n \rightarrow n}
\end{bmatrix}$$

(3)

where $h_{i \rightarrow j}$ means the probability of State i transfers to State j. In this work, the overall catastrophic failure of an LED is considered. State x represents that the array has x failed strings. Since the overall probability of the array stays unchanged, thus for any certain i:

$$\sum_{j=0}^{n} h_{i \rightarrow j} = 0$$

(4)

The catastrophic failure of the selected LED is unrecoverable, hence for any $i \geq j$:

$$h_{i \rightarrow j} = 0$$

(5)

Therefore, the transition matrix $P$ degrades to:

$$P = \begin{bmatrix}
    h_{0 \rightarrow 0} & h_{0 \rightarrow 1} & \cdots & h_{0 \rightarrow n} \\
    0 & h_{1 \rightarrow 1} & \cdots & h_{1 \rightarrow n} \\
    \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
    0 & 0 & \cdots & h_{n \rightarrow n}
\end{bmatrix}$$

(6)
In the case of \( i = j, h_{i \rightarrow j} \) can be obtained by Eq. (4). For any \( i \leq j \), \( h_{i \rightarrow j} \) in the transition matrix can be obtained by the following equation [38]:

\[
h_{i \rightarrow j} = C_{n-j}^{-i} \cdot h_{s}^{-j}(i) = \frac{(n-i)!}{(n-j)! \cdot (i-j)!} h_{s}^{-j}(i) \tag{7}
\]

where the hazard rate of each LED string \( h_{s} \) depends on LEDs’ physics-based models which will be discussed in the following section.

### III. PHYSICS-BASED MODELS OF LED

For an LED string with \( m \) LEDs, \( h_{s}(i) \) can be obtained by [33]:

\[
h_{s}(i) = m \cdot \lambda_{0} \cdot e^{-\frac{E_{a}}{k T_{j}}} \tag{8}
\]

where, \( \lambda_{0} \) is the basic hazard rate at the ambient temperature \( T_{A} \), \( E_{a} \) is the activation energy of the selected LED, \( T_{j} \) is the LED’s junction temperature. In this work, \( \lambda_{0} \) and \( E_{a} \) are obtained from the empirical models [33], and \( T_{j} \) can be calculated by LEDs’ thermal model.

The interactions of the junction temperature of chips within a package are not significant [39]. Thus, module-level thermal interactions between LEDs may be neglected. Once the LED reaches thermal equilibrium point, the junction temperature \( T_{j} \) are functions of the component’s thermal power \( P_{th} \) [40]:

\[
T_{j} = P_{th} \cdot R_{th} + T_{A} \tag{9}
\]

where, \( R_{th} \) is the thermal resistance of the LED. In this work, \( R_{th} \) can be from data-sheet or experiments of the selected LEDs. Without consideration of the lumen depreciation, the \( P_{th} \) can be obtained by:

\[
P_{th} = P_{LED} - P_{Ra} = P_{LED} \cdot [1 - \eta(i)] \tag{10}
\]

where \( \eta(i) \) is LED’s efficiency at current \( I \), \( P_{Ra} \) is the radiative power of each LED which equals to product of \( P_{LED} \) and \( \eta(I) \), \( P_{LED} \) is the input power:

\[
P_{LED}(I) = V_{f}(I) \cdot I \tag{11}
\]

For ideal diodes, forward voltage \( V_{f}(I) \) can be determined by the following equation [30]:

\[
I = I_{s} \cdot [e^{V_{f}(I)/V_{T}} - 1] \tag{12}
\]

For LED in high-current status, \( V_{f}(I) \) is approximately proportional to driving current \( I \) [30]:

\[
V_{f}(I) = R_{s} \cdot I + V_{0} \tag{13}
\]

where \( V_{0} \) can be seemed as zero-current forward voltage, \( R_{s} \) is equivalent resistance of the LED.

Theoretically, \( \eta(I) \) is determined by both temperature droop and current droop [31], [41]. In comparison with the current droop, the temperature droop becomes negligible. Hence, the \( \eta(I) \) can be described the following function:

\[
\eta(I) = \frac{B_{e}I}{A_{e} + B_{e}I + C_{e}I^{2}} \tag{14}
\]

where \( \eta_{0} \) is basic efficiency, \( A_{e} \) and \( C_{e} \) are the 1st and 3rd order non-radiative power factor, \( B_{e} \) is the radiative power factor. These current droop related parameters are dependent on material and structure properties of the LED, and will be extracted experimentally in the Section IV.

As mentioned before, a current redistribution will be caused by the catastrophic failure. Failure of any of the \( m \) LEDs in the string will lead an open circuit of the entire string. Therefore, current of each working LED string is a function of number of failed LED strings \( i \):

\[
I(i) = I_{a}/(n - i) \tag{15}
\]

where \( I_{a} \) is the input current of the entire LED array which usually keeps at a constant value. Therefore, \( P_{LED}, V_{f}(I) \) and \( \eta(I) \) are also function of number of failed strings \( i \). This work uses the relative radiative power \( \varphi(i) \) as failure criteria, which is approximately proportional to lumen maintenance of the entire LED array. According to Eq.(10) to (14), \( \varphi(i) \) can be calculated by:

\[
\varphi(i) = \frac{m \cdot (n - i) \cdot P_{LED}(i) \cdot \eta(i)}{m \cdot n \cdot P_{LED}(0) \cdot \eta(0)} = \frac{V_{f}(i) \cdot \eta(i)}{V_{f}(0) \cdot \eta(0)} \tag{16}
\]

As discussion above, the basic hazard rate \( \lambda_{0} \) and the activation energy \( E_{a} \) will be obtained from the empirical models [33]. Other parameters, including LEDs’ thermal resistance, parameters of LED’s power and efficiency, will be extracted experimentally in the following section.

---

**FIGURE 2.** (a) The selected LED package and (b) test plat-from.

### IV. EXPERIMENT AND PARAMETER EXTRACTION

This work selects a common-used type of LED package [42], as shown in Figure 2 (a). Two types of LED chips, LED A and B, which have different current and temperature sensitivities, were integrated into the selected LED package. The rated current and CCT of selected LEDs are 20mA and 6000K. Input power of LED A and B are around 56mW and 51mW.

In order to determine to determine \( R_{s}, V_{0}, \eta_{0}, A_{e}, B_{e} \) and \( C_{e} \), two groups of samples were tested in five current levels, from 20mA to 100mA. Simple size of every
group is 15. Each sample was placed on a thermal plate inside a 50cm integrating sphere system as shown in Figure 2 (b). Then, the electronic and optical characteristics of each sample, including current, forward voltage, radiant power and efficiency, are measured at different conditions. For each current level, the temperature of each sample sweeps from 303K to 343K.

Figure 3 displays the forward voltage curves as functions of driving current. The forward voltage curves increase linearly with each driving current. For each certain current, variations of $V_f$ in different temperatures are less than 0.2V. Therefore, $V_f$ is primarily determined by the driving current. Figure 4 shows the efficiency curves as functions of driving current. The power efficiency curves decrease with each driving current. For each certain current, variations of $V_f$ in different temperatures are less than 3%. As a result, the T-droop can be neglected in this work. Then, the measured forward voltage curves were fitted by Eq.(13), whereas the efficiency curves were fitted by Eq.(14) by the least square method, obtaining parameters of the LED models. Table 1 summarizes the averaged values of the model parameters. Goodness of fit for $V_f(I)$ and $\eta(I)$ are larger than 0.85. Therefore, fitting curves have good agreements with tested results.

In order to determine the thermal resistance $R_{th}$ of the selected LED packages experimentally, the same group of samples were tested in room temperature (300K) by the T3Ster system. The junction temperature increments $T_j - T_A$ were measured in different current levels, from 20mA to 100mA. The thermal power can be obtained from Eq.(10).

Figure 5 gives the temperature increment as a function of thermal power. Then, the measured junction temperature increments were fitted by Eq.(9) by the least square method, the average value of $R_{th}$ can be obtained. As shown in Figure 4, $R_{th}$ of the selected LED is about 125.9 $K \cdot W^{-1}$. The $R^2$ value of $R_{th}$ fitting is larger than 0.99. Thus, the thermal model has a good agreement with tested results.

V. CASE STUDIES AND RESULTS

The proposed approach provides a general methodology for an LED array with considerations of current distribution and hazard rate changing. A 7 by 10 LED array (7 LED strings, 10 LEDs per string) has been selected. An ideal constant current power supply provides driving current to the LED array. Since junction temperatures and driving current of LEDs will change with the number of failed LED strings, the actual hazard rate and radiative power of LEDs will be different from the pre-selected values. The LED is pre-selected with the activation energy and pre-factor of $E_{\alpha, \beta} = 0.45eV$ and $\lambda_0 = 2.74 \times 10^{-6}$ ($T_A=300K$), according to the empirical models [33]. The other parameters that appear in Eq. (8) to (14) are listed in Table 1. The relative radiative power is used as the failure criterion. If the relative radiative power drops below 70% of its initial value, lumen maintenance
may degrade below 70%, the entire LED array is considered failed. The catastrophic failure, which refers to all LED strings failed, can be seemed as a special case, owing that the radiative power drops to zero. The details of the results will be discussed below.

As explained in Eq. (13), the current crowding lead by a reduction of working LED strings will bring a higher forward voltage of each LED. Since the total current of the entire array keeps unchanged, input power of the array will be increased. Figure 7 displays the relative input power of the entire LED array as a function of $i/n$ ratio. The input power of the LED array increases exponentially with the $i/n$ ratio. At $i/n = 6/7$, the array relative input power with LED A and B increase about 43% and 15%. According to Eq. (11) and (13), increment of input power is approximately proportional to $R_s$.

Figure 8 displays the relative radiative power of the entire LED array as a function of $i/n$ ratio. The relative radiative power of LED A (Solid Line) decreases to about 65% when the $i=6$, leading lumen decay of the entire array. Meanwhile, for the LED B, the relative radiative power (Dash Line) increases about 3%. The current droop effect has little impact on LED B. The relative radiative power of the LED array will be always larger than 70% in the selected current range.

Due to the effects of current crowding and current droop, input power and thermal power will increase if several LED strings failed, leading a higher LED’s junction temperature. Figure 8 displays the LED’s junction temperature as a function of $i/n$ ratio. The junction temperature of each LED increases exponentially with the number of failed LED strings. When only one of 7 LED strings works, the junction temperature of LED A and B rise to about 380K and 336K respectively.

The elevated junction temperatures will cause a higher hazard rate of each LED string. Figure 9 displays hazard rates of LED strings as a function of $i/n$ ratio. When the junction temperature of LED A and B rise to about 380K and 336K, their hazard rates increase to about $1.249 \times 10^{-3}$ and $2.086 \times 10^{-4}$ respectively. Properties of LEDs have great impact on their hazard rates, the constant hazard rate assumption may bring significant prediction differences.

In Figure 10, cumulated failure rates of both LEDs are illustrated. The failure probability curves rise exponentially with time. In about 20000 hours, failure probabilities increase to about 33.0% and 8.5% for LED A and B respectively. Moreover, consideration of LED’s properties is critical to reliability prediction of LED arrays. LEDs with better over-driving capability can compose a more reliable LED array. Therefore, the proposed prediction method, which considers electronic and thermal characteristic of LEDs, may provide a realistic prediction results of an LED array.

Then, a numerical study has been carried out to investigate impacts of model parameters on the LED array’s failure
probability, including $R_s$, $V_0$, $\eta_0$, $A_e$, $B_e$ and $C_e$. Firstly, each parameter has increased 20% respectively. Table 2 lists failure probability prediction results.

Parameter $B_e$ and $\eta_0$ have negative effects on the LED array’s failure probability. Because increments of these two parameters will reduce thermal power of each LED. Conversely, increasing of Parameter $C_e$ will produce more heat. Hence, it has a positive effect on the array’s failure probability. Similarly, higher Parameter $R_s$ and $V_0$ will bring higher input power, leading a higher junction temperature. As a result, these two parameters have a positive effect on the array’s failure probability either.

Secondly, parameters of LED A will be replaced by relevant ones of LED B respectively, to study their contributions to differences between LED A and B. Table 3 gives the simulation results.

As shown in Table 3, Parameter $C_e$ significantly affects the relative radiative power and failure probability of the LED array. If Parameter $C_e$ drops from $1.642 \times 10^{-3}$ to $2.075 \times 10^{-4}$, the radiative power will always increase with the number of failed LED strings, and array’s failure probability decreases from 33.0% to 13.6%. It contributes about 78% of the differences between LED A and B. Parameter $C_e$ and $R_s$ have combined effects on the failure probability. Replacement of these two parameters contributes about 97.1% of the differences between LED A and B. However, owing to less input power, a less $R_s$ value brings less radiative power. As shown in Table 3, if the $R_s$ value is decreased from 7.352 to 2.354, the $\varphi(6)$ value will reduce from 65.5% to 52.4% ($C_e = 1.642 \times 10^{-3}$), or from 121.2% to 97.0% ($C_e = 2.075 \times 10^{-4}$). Because of the weaken current droop effect, the rise of Parameter $B_e$ partly cancels the influence of Parameter $R_s$ on $\varphi(6)$, and enhances the impact of Parameter $C_e$ and $R_s$ on the failure probability. The combination of LED B’s $B_e$, $C_e$ and $R_s$ contributes more than 99.7% of the differences between LED A and B. In conclusion, as shown in the numerical study, Parameter $B_e$, $C_e$ and $R_s$ have significant impact on reliability of an LED array. Consideration of these parameters may provide a more realistic reliability prediction result.

VI. CONCLUSION

In this work, a physics-based prediction methodology is combined with statistical models to consider the impact of current crowding and current droop effects on of reliability LED arrays. Electronic-thermal models of LEDs are utilized to obtain conditions of each operation status under the influences of LED’s catastrophic failure, current crowding and current droop. Based on operation conditions, a Markov chain-base model is used to calculate the probability distribution of each operation status, including the lumen decay and catastrophic failure. A $7 \times 10$ LED array and two types of LEDs have been selected for case studies. Finally, a numerical study has been carried out to investigate impacts of model parameters on the LED array’s reliability.

For LED A, when 6 of the 7 strings failed, relative input power increases about 43%, relative radiative power decreases to about 65%, junction temperature and hazard rate rise to 380K and $1.249 \times 10^{-3}$ respectively. In 20000 hours, failure probability of the array is 33.0%. For LED B, when 6 of the 7 strings failed, relative input power and relative radiative power increase about 15% and 3% respectively junction temperature rises to 336K and hazard rate rises.
to $2.086 \times 10^{-4}$. In 20000 hours, failure probability of the array is 8.2%. For the numerical study, if $C_e$ drops from $1.642 \times 10^{-3}$ to $2.075 \times 10^{-4}$, the radiative power will always increase with the number of failed LED strings, and array’s failure probability decreases from 33.0% to 13.6%. The combination of LED B’s $B_e$, $C_e$ and $R_e$ contributes more than 99.7% of the differences between LED A and B.

The proposed prediction method provides more realistic prediction results of an LED arrays. It has been found that the properties of LEDs have great impact on their hazard rates. Among LED’s parameters, the 3rd order non-radiative coefficient $C_e$, equivalent resistance $R_e$ and radiative coefficient $B_e$ have significant impact on reliability of the selected LED array.
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