Determination of the Stopping Power and Failure-time of Spacecraft Components due to Proton Interaction Using GOES 11 Acquisition Data^{*}

Jibiri N. N.¹[†], Victor U. J. Nwankwo¹, and Michael Kio² jibirinn@yahoo.com; victornwankwo@yahoo.com

¹ Radiation and Health Physics Research Laboratory, Department of Physics, University of Ibadan, Nigeria

² National Space Research and Development Agency (NASRDA), Abuja, Nigeria

Abstract

One of the several ways to describe the net effect of chargedparticles' interaction is the rate of energy loss along the particles' path. In this study, the mass stopping power (Sp) of selected spacecraft composite materials, through which the particle traverses, its range (R) and the distance (d) traveled (by the particles) through the materials have been calculated and analyzed. The dose (in Gy) as a function of particle flux and deposited energy was also determined. Predictions of their possible effects on space system operations and life-span were made, especially as values exceeded certain threshold (limit). Using GOES 11 acquired data for 3 months, estimations and/or calculations were made to determine the risk and safe period of a satellite in the geosynchronous orbit. Under certain space radiation environmental conditions (without mitigation of any sort), a spacecraft whose body is 20 mm thick and with Al alloy casing, was theoretically estimated to have a safe period of about 3 years and risk period of about 29 years (due to total ionizing dose) within which it would experience a catastrophic failure.

Keywords: Stopping Power; failure time; proton interaction; spacecraft components; GOES 11 satellite

^{*©}International Journal of Engineering Science & Technology (IJEST). ISSN:0975-5462, Vol. 3 Issue 8, pp 6532-6542, August 2011

[†]Corresponding author

1 Introduction

The Space is the void that exists beyond any celestial body including the earth. It is not completely empty but, in reality, the space is both a complex and a dynamic place [1] that is filled with energetic particles, radiation, and trillions of objects both very large and very small. Compared to what we experience on earth, it is a place of extremes. Distances are vast. Velocities can range from zero to the speed of light. Temperatures on the sunny side of an object can be very high, yet extremely low on the shady side, just a short distance away. Charged particles continually bombard exposed surfaces. Some have so much energy that they pass completely through an object in space. Magnetic fields can be intense. The environment in space is constantly changing. All of these factors influence the design and operation of space systems. There is no formal definition of where space begins. International law based on a review of current treaties, conventions, agreements and tradition, defines the lower boundary of space as the lowest perigee attainable by an orbiting space vehicle. A specific altitude is not mentioned. By international law standard aircraft, missiles and rockets flying over a country are considered to be in its national airspace, regardless of altitude. Orbiting spacecrafts are considered to be in space, regardless of altitude [1]. Space radiation consists primarily of ionizing radiation which exists in the form of light-energy and charged particles in space. Sources of radiation in Earth space are categorized into four and include Plasma, Trapped Particles in the earths magnetic field, Solar Particles Events (SPE), Galactic Cosmic Rays (GCR).

Radiation in space is generated by particles emitted from a variety of sources both within and beyond our solar system [13]. These particles (mostly of ionizing radiation) in motion possess enormous energy and can completely pass through an object in space. Spacecraft (including satellites) are subject to bombardment by these nuclear particles and electromagnetic radiations from both external and on-board sources [12]. When they penetrate the surfaces of these space vehicles, the electrical, electronic and electro-chemical components in them may be affected in one form or the other. Among other effects radiation exposure may cause include (i) induction of sporadic and unexplainable errors in sensitive parts in spacecrafts (ii) degrade the critical properties of structural materials (iii) jeopardize flight worthiness of the spacecraft (iv) lead to catastrophic failure and possibly mission ending effect and (v) constitute transient and terminal health hazard to both on-board passengers and astronauts. This research will verify and address these chal-

© International Journal of Engineering Science & Technology (IJEST). 2 ISSN:0975-5462, Vol. 3 Issue 8, pp 6532-6542, August 2011 lenges and offer recipe for successful space mission.

In the last 25 years the National Geophysical Data Centre (located in Boulder Colorado and a part of US Dept of Commerce, NOAA) recorded over 4500 spacecraft anomalies or malfunctions that have been traced to the effects of the space radiation environment [3]. A reset occurred in Hubble Telescope after upgrade in 1996, when the spacecraft flew through South Atlantic Anomaly, a region in space where protons are trapped in earths magnetic field. All parts of Galileo, a space satellite were subjected to thorough radiation testing after its failure. It was discovered that failure did not occur until radiation level was close to design level [4]. These incidents and instances of spacecrafts anomalies and/or failures among host of others, is a challenge and a threat to space technology and calls for attention of researchers and hence a justification for this research. The aims and objectives of this study include an overview of (i) natural space radiation environment (ii) composition and intensity of space radiation (iii) effects of space radiation on life, electrical, electronic and electro-chemical components in spacecrafts. It will further compare materials used in constructing spacecraft and its Electrical, Electronics and Electrochemical Components (EEEC) in order as to assist designers and manufacturers in selection of materials for better design and proper implementation to achieve maximum system efficiency and finally suggest ways of significantly lowering radiation effects and thus system failure time. This will save program cost and resources, through estimations and calculations using energy flux values from GOES 11 satellite in the geosynchronous orbit.

2 Materials and Method

2.1 Collection of Data

Secondary data for solar particle flux and energy in space was collected. This data was primarily collected by a Satellite Geostationary Operational Environmental Satellite (GOES -11), and prepared by the U.S. Department of Commerce, NOAA, Space Weather Prediction Center. GOES 11 is an American weather satellite, which is part of the US National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's Geostationary Operational Environmental satellite system. It was launched in 2000, and as at 2009 it was operating at the GOES-WEST position, providing coverage of the west of the United States. The data consist of proton flux (E = 1 - 100 MeV) and electron flux

© International Journal of Engineering Science & Technology (IJEST). 3 ISSN:0975-5462, Vol. 3 Issue 8, pp 6532-6542, August 2011

Table 1: Aluminum-Sili	con Alloy sheet Composition by weight
MATERIALS/ELEMENTS	COMPOSITION BY WEIGHT (%)
Aluminum	89.4
Copper	0.80
Iron	0.30
Magnesium	0.94
Chromium	0.50
Silicon	8.00
Strontium	0.03
Titanium	0.02

Figure 1: Aluminum-silicon alloy composition by weight

(E = 0.8 - 2MeV) in GEO, taken at five minutes interval on daily basis for the period of three months (April June, 2010).

2.2 Interpretation of Data used

The Label used for particles flux has the following interpretation: P > 1 = Particles at > 1MeV, P > 5 = Particles at > 5MeV, P > 10 = Particles at > 10MeV, P > 30 = Particles at > 30MeV, P > 50 = Particles at > 50MeV, P > 100 = Particles at > 100MeV, E > 0.6 = Electrons at > 0.6MeV, E > 2.0 = Electrons at > 2.0MeV. Units: Particles $= Protons/cm^2 - s - sr$, Electrons $= Electrons/cm^2 - s - sr$

2.3 Analytical Procedures

The mean flux per day was determined for each month; they were compared by means of graphs and logical interpretations. The composite materials of Spacecraft and its electronic components were considered for assessment and analysis (Germanium, Silicon, Aluminum and Aluminum alloy). The constituent elements of the Aluminum alloy considered and their composition (by weight) are presented in Table 1. The mass stopping power of the materials for the particle (with E=1-100MeV) was calculated as well as the Range and distance traveled by the particle as it traverses the materials. The Dose as a function of particles flux and energy was also calculated. Consequently, predictions of possible effects (of solar particles) on space system operations and life-span were made, particularly as values exceeded certain threshold or limit.

A more fundamental way of describing the rate of energy loss is to specify the rate in terms of the density thickness; this is called the Mass Stop-

© International Journal of Engineering Science & Technology (IJEST). 4 ISSN:0975-5462, Vol. 3 Issue 8, pp 6532-6542, August 2011 ping Power and has the unit $MeVcm^2/g$. The empirical relation below was adopted [5].

$$-\frac{dE}{\rho dx} = \frac{a}{A} E^{-b} Z^{clogE+d} \tag{1}$$

The appropriate values of the constants and are a=915, b=0.85, c=0.145, d=0.635

The combined mass stopping power of the Aluminum-Silicon Alloy material in this work was calculated from the expression below:

$$\left(-\frac{dE}{\rho dx}\right)_{combined} = \sum \% \ composition \times \left(-\frac{dE}{\rho dx}\right)_i of constituent \ elements$$

The dose (in Gy) as a function of the particle flux is also important, particularly as the spacecraft spends more time in the space radiation environment. The stopping power is used to determine dose from charged particle by the relationship:

$$D = \phi \frac{dE}{\rho dx}$$

Where ϕ is the particle fluence (the number of particle striking the material over a specified time interval), its unit is cm^{-2} . D is measured in MeV/g. converting this to units of dose in the relation we get;

$$D = \phi \frac{dE}{\rho dx} (1.6 \times 10^{-10}) Gy \tag{2}$$

Where 1Gy = 100rad

The Range, R of a proton with initial kinetic energy E_{\circ} , mass m, is mean distance it traveled before it stops. The range depends upon the type of the particle, its initial energy and the material it traverses. It is expressed in the unit of g/cm^2 or mg/cm^2 . We adopted the empirical relation [5] below;

$$R_p = m_p G_p E^{1.85} Z^{-0.145 \log E} + F_p \tag{3}$$

© International Journal of Engineering Science & Technology (IJEST). 5 ISSN:0975-5462, Vol. 3 Issue 8, pp 6532-6542, August 2011

$$G_p = \left(\frac{A}{915 \times 1.85Z^{0.635} \left(1 - \frac{0.145 \log Z}{1.8}\right)}\right)$$
$$F_p = R_1(E_1) - m_p G_p E^{1.85} Z^{-0.145 \log E_1}$$

The Range is related to the distance, x traveled by the particle (in cm) by the equation:

$$R = \rho x \tag{4}$$

Where ρ is the density of the material through which the particle traverses.

Limitations of equations used

The equations adopted for calculations in this work, particularly the mass stopping power (1) was originally obtained and used for calculation of mass stopping power of low energy region. By way of comparison calculations made using Bethes equation showed that at higher energies (E > 50 MeV) the difference between equation (1) and Bethes equation becomes significant.

3 Theoretical Calculation/Prediction of Spacecraft Failure Time

Satellite and Space Probes typically encounter Total Ionizing Dose between 10 (100Gy) and 100 krad (Si) (1000Gy). A spacecraft made of Al alloy (20mm thick), housing sensitive EEEC in the absence of mitigation of any kind becomes susceptible when particles with $E \geq 78 MeV$ bombards it. Greater percentage of this energy is lost during the process due to the stopping power of the alloy; however the remainder constitutes a significant dose to the EEEC components. The cumulative equivalent dose from this energy spectrum is about 259 rad(Si) in Silicon and 120 rad(Ge) in Germanium. The net effect is that deposited dose builds up with time as exposure continues until the threshold is exceeded and consequently failure occurs due to Total Ionizing Dose (TID). To predict the Mean Time of Failure, the time to failure t (in years) is given by the suggested equation:

$$t_{yrs} = \frac{TID_{threshold}}{Dose/yr} \tag{5}$$

© International Journal of Engineering Science & Technology (IJEST). 6 ISSN:0975-5462, Vol. 3 Issue 8, pp 6532-6542, August 2011



Figure 2: Spacecraft exposure to energetic particles in space environment

4 Results and discussion

Calculation of Parameters

Using the empirical relations in equations 1, 3 and 4, the mass stopping power and particle's Range and distance in Aluminum, Aluminum Alloy, Germanium and Silicon were calculated for proton energy of E=1-100MeV. The results are presented in Tables 2 - 5. The dose deposited by particles as it traverses through the materials (Ge, Si) was also calculated from equation 2 and presented in Tables 6 and 7. The mean particles (Electron and Proton) fluxes per day were determined for each month; they were compared by means of graphs and logical interpretations. Aluminum alloy material gave increased stopping power compared to pure Aluminum. This implies that Al alloy may be a better shield from particles than pure Al (see Figure 3 and Table 2). As could be seen Ge is more prone to particle penetration than Si. Though dose deposited by the particle at same energy is much less in Ge compared to Si, Ge receives twice as Si (Figure 3 and Table 2). Between 2nd and 11th day, electron flux tend to increase with the peak occurring in April (Figure 4). There is a possibility of the spacecraft being in eclipse/shadow between 2nd and 11th. The Satellite/Spacecraft (in GEO) may have experienced negative charging and consequently assume a negative potential. Proton flux $(E \ge 10 MeV)$ climaxed in June between 10 13th (Figures 5 and 6). In addition to trapped radiation in the geostationary orbit a solar particle event (such as CMEs, solar flares) may have occurred leading to an increase in particle flux. This implies increased dose to spacecraft components in the event of particles access to the components. In addition, the probability of Single-event effects occurrence in EEEC is most likely. Aluminum alloy should be used in building the body of spacecrafts. Where the recommendation for the use of Aluminum has been implemented, increase

© International Journal of Engineering Science & Technology (IJEST). 7 ISSN:0975-5462, Vol. 3 Issue 8, pp 6532-6542, August 2011 in percentage composition of constituent elements with high stopping power (such as Mg and Si) should also be considered. However, this should be carefully done so as to avert inherent problem resulting from properties of individual constituent elements such as expansion and contraction during temperature rise/fall, and associated weight of the craft. A multi-layer surface coating should be considered in addition to using materials with high stopping power such as Magnesium, Silicon, Carbon and Beryllium.



Figure 3: Combined Plot of mass stopping power (Al, Al alloy, Ge and Si)



Figure 4: Electron flux (E 0.8) against days of the month (April, May and June)



Figure 5: Proton flux (P 10) against days of the months (April, May, June)

© International Journal of Engineering Science & Technology (IJEST). 9 ISSN:0975-5462, Vol. 3 Issue 8, pp 6532-6542, August 2011



Figure 6: Proton flux (P 30) against days of the month (April, May, June)

5 Conclusion

Aluminum alloy may better shield the spacecraft and its EEEC against particle than pure Aluminum because it high stopping power. Electron flux was at peak between 2nd and 11th of April 2010 considering the three months data. This could result to a negative potential build up on spacecraft surface (depending on it position), of which upon emergence into sunlight could experience a possible discharge effects which can disrupt satellite operations. Proton flux peaked between 10th and 13th of June, an indication that a solar particle event may have occurred. This exposes the space system to high dose rate and susceptibility to Single event Effects. Under these space radiation environmental conditions, in the Geosynchronous orbit and in the absence of mitigation of any kind a spacecraft whose body is made of Al alloy and 20mm thick, housing sensitive EEEC will theoretically experience minimum failure-time threshold after 3 years (10 krad) and continue to be at risk until 29th year when dose build-up equals 100krad (due to Total Ionizing Dose), during which it will experience a catastrophic failure.

Acknowledgments

With a grateful heart we wish to acknowledge Dr. Godstime James of the National Space Research and Development Agency (NARSDA) Abuja, Nigeria, the agency itself and Physics Department, University of Ibadan for the technical assistance during this work.

References

- [1] Military Space *Space Environment and Orbital Mechanics*. Retrieved March 2010. Space Policy Project (SPP). http/www.fas.org/spp/military/
- Holbert (2007). Space Radiation Environmental Effects. EEE 598 Course. Retrieved Dec. 2010. http://holbert.faculty.asu.edu/eee560/spacerad.html
- [3] Hardage, D. M., and Howard, J. W., (1999). Spacecraft Environments Interactions: Space Radiation and Its Effects Electronic Systems. NASA/TP-1999-209373. Marshall Space Flight Centre (MSFC), Alabama 35812. Retrieved February 2010. http://ntrs.nasa.gov/search

© International Journal of Engineering Science & Technology (IJEST). 11 ISSN:0975-5462, Vol. 3 Issue 8, pp 6532-6542, August 2011

- [4] Adams, L. (2003). Space Radiation Effects in Electronic Components. PA and Safety Office, Brunel University. Retrieved March 2010.
- [5] Getachew, A.(2007). Stopping Power and Range of Protons of Various Energies in Different Materials. MSc. Thesis. Dept of Physics. Addis Ababa University, Ethiopia. March 2007.
- [6] Bedingfield, K. L., et al (1996). Spacecraft System Failures and Anomalies Attributed to Natural Space Environment. NASA REF-1390. NASA-Marshall Space flight Centre (MSFC), Alabama 35812.
- [7] David W. Anderson, Absorption of Ionizing Radiation, University Park press, (1984)
- [8] Glenn F. Knoll, Radiation and Measurements. Third Edition, John, Wiley and Sons, Inc. (2000)
- [9] Herr, J. L. and McCollum, M. B., (1994) Space Environments Interactions: Protecting Against the Effects of Spacecraft Charging. NASA RP-1354, Marshall Space Flight Centre, AL, Nov. 1994.
- [10] Kayali, S. Radiation Effects Microelec- et al. Space ontronics. Radiation Effects Group. Retrieved March 2010. http://parts.jpl.nasa.gov/docs/Radcrs_Final.pdf
- [11] National Aeronautics and Space Administration, NASA Single Event Effects Critical Analysis. 431-REF-000273, Goddard Space Flight Centre, Green belt, Mary land. Feb. 16, 1996. Retrieved May 2010. snebulos.mit.edu/projects/reference/NASA/431-REF-000273.pdf.
- [12] National Aeronautics and Space Administration, NASA (1970). Nuclear and Space Radiation Effects on Materials. NASA SP-8053. Retrievd February 2010. www-rsicc.ornl.gov/ANST_site/RadEffectSpMat.pdf

© International Journal of Engineering Science & Technology (IJEST). 12 ISSN:0975-5462, Vol. 3 Issue 8, pp 6532-6542, August 2011

- [13] National Aeronautics and Space Administration, NASA (1996). Space Radiation Effects on Electronic Components in Low-Earth Orbit. NASA PD-ED1258. Retrieved February 2010. klabs.org/DEI/References/design_guidelines/design.../1258jsc.pdf
- [14] Normand, E. (2000).Radiation Effects spacecraft inAircraft. and NASA-Goddard Space Flight Centre. Boe-2010. ing Radiation Effects Laboratory. Retrieved May http://www.esa - spaceweather.net/spweather/workshops/proceedings_w1/SESSION1/d
- [15] Novikov, L. S., Space Radiation Effects Simulation Methods, Institute of Nuclear Physics, 2003. Retrieved May 2010. http://dbserv.sinp.msu.ru:8080/sinp/files/pp-722.pdf
- [16] Shae, R. R. et al (1975) Observation of Electrical Discharges Caused by Differential Satellite Charging by Magnetospheric Plasmas. AIAA symposium on Spacecraft Charging by Magnetospheric Plasma held in Washington, D. C., June 1975, Progress in Astronautics and Aeronautics, Vol. 47, pp. 61-76, MIT press 1976.
- [17] Truscott, P. et al (2000). Development of a spacecraft Radiation Shielding and Effect Toolkit based on Geant4. British Crown. Retrieved March 2010. www.ge.infn.it/geant4/papers/chep2000/pap-a123.pdf
- [18] Tsoline Mikaelian, Spacecraft Charging and Hazard to Electronics in Space. York University, May 2001.Retrieved July 2010. arxiv.org/pdf/0906.3884

© International Journal of Engineering Science & Technology (IJEST). 13 ISSN:0975-5462, Vol. 3 Issue 8, pp 6532-6542, August 2011

-	Aluminum			Trinoy Sheet		Germanian			Sincon			
E MeV	Stopping p MeVcm2/g	Range mg/cm2	L/distance (mm)	Stopping p MeVcm2/g	Range mg/cm2	L/distance (mm)	Stopping p MeVcm2/g	Range mg/cm2	L/distance (mm)	Stopping p MeVcm2/g	Range ms/cm2	L/distance (inm)
1.0	172.75	3.99	0.015	183.34	4.24	0.016	113.83	6.44	0.014	247.02	4.44	0.019
2.0	107.19	11.66	0.043	114.32	12.43	0.046	73.46	17.86	0.041	157.52	12.14	0.052
3.0	81.08	22.58	0.084	86.73	24.16	0.089	56.86	33.67	0.077	121.07	23.14	0.099
4.0	66.51	36.36	0.135	71.30	38.98	0.144	47.41	53.23	0.122	100.45	37.04	0.159
5.0	57.04	52.75	0.195	61 24	56.64	0.210	41.18	76.18	0.175	86.90	53 59	0.230
6.0	50.31	71.57	0.265	54.09	76.95	0.285	36.70	102.23	0.235	77.20	72.61	0.312
7.0	45.25	92.69	0 343	48 70	99.77	0 370	33 29	131.18	0 302	69.85	93.97	0.403
8.0	41.27	116 00	0.430	44 47	124.98	0.463	30.60	162.87	0 3 7 5	64.05	117.57	0.505
9.0	38.06	141.40	0.524	41.04	152.49	0.565	28.41	197.17	0.454	59.34	143 30	0.615
10.0	3539	168.82	0.625	38.20	182.21	0.675	26.58	233.97	0.539	55.42	171.10	0 734
11.0	33.15	198 21	0.734	35.80	214.07	0.793	25.02	273 17	0.630	52.09	200.89	0.862
12.0	31.22	220.40	0.850	33.74	248.02	0.010	23.60	314.60	0.726	40.23	232.63	0.002
13.0	79.55	262.62	0.973	31.05	284.00	1.052	22.07	358.46	0.827	46.74	266.25	1.143
14.0	28.08	297.55	1:102	30.38	321.96	1 192	21.49	404.40	0.933	44:54	301.72	1 295
15.0	26.77	334.25	1.238	28.99	361.86	1 340	20.57	452.47	1 0 4 3	42.59	338.99	1.455
16.0	25.61	372.67	1 380	20.22	403.66	1 495	19.75	502.61	1 1 59	40.85	378.03	1.622
17.0	74.55	412.78	1.520	26.62	447 31	1.657	19.01	554.77	1 2 7 9	30.27	418 79	1 797
18.0	23.61	454.54	1.683	25.60	492.79	1.825	18.33	608.91	1.404	37.84	451.26	1.980
19.0	22.01	497.94	1 844	24.68	540.06	2.000	17.72	664.98	1 534	36.53	505 39	2 169
20.0	21.96	542.94	2 011	23.83	589.10	2 182	17.15	722.94	1.667	35 34	551.17	2 366
21.0	21.24	580.51	2 183	23.05	630.88	2 370	16.63	782.77	1.805	34.24	508.55	2 569
22.0	20.57	637.64	2 362	22.00	697 37	2.576	16.15	844.47	1948	33.22	647 54	2.505
23.0	19.95	687.30	2.546	21.67	746.55	2.564	15 70	907.87	2 094	32.22	698.09	2 996
24.0	10.37	738.47	2.735	21.05	802.30	2.002	15 20	073.00	2 244	31 30	750.18	3 220
25.0	18.83	791.13	2 930	20.47	859.88	3 185	14.90	1040.05	2 2 4 4	30.57	803.81	3 450
25.0	19.22	945.75	2.550	10.02	019.00	3.105	14.50	1108.72	2.557	20.20	858.04	3.696
27.0	17.86	000.83	3.336	10.43	970 71	3 679	14.10	1179.08	2 720	29.00	015 57	3 010
29.0	17.00	057.95	2 5 4 9	19.05	1042.01	3 9 5 9	12.07	1251.11	2.720	29.41	073.67	4170
20.0	17.42	1016.28	3 764	18.50	1105.89	4 096	13.87	1324.79	3.056	20.41	1033.22	4.173
20.0	16.61	1076.12	3.004	10.00	1171.21	4.050	12.00	1400.07	2 220	07.16	10001.22	4 606
21.0	16.74	1127.25	4 212	17.69	1720 77	4.596	12.00	1476.07	2.407	27.10	1156.64	4.020
32.0	15.89	1109.96	4 4 4 4	17.00	1306.76	4.560	12.75	1555.45	3 588	26.05	1220.48	5 238
33.0	15.55	1263.02	4.681	16.05	1376.75	5 000	12.50	1635.40	3 773	25.53	1285 71	5 518
24.0	15.24	1200.02	4 001	16.61	1440.24	5 364	12.50	1717.09	2 0 6 1	25.03	1252.22	5 204
25.0	14.04	1205.90	5:170	16.29	1521.20	5.624	12.04	1900.20	4 152	22.04	1420.22	5.004
26.0	14.65	1353.65	5.422	15.07	1505.62	5.010	11.07	1004.04	4 2 4 0	24.12	1420.55	6 20 2
27.0	14.05	1502.15	5.470	15.57	1671 50	5.910	11.65	1070.07	4.540	24.13	1469.00	6.607
39.0	14.58	1603.74	5.078	15.08	1749.94	6 477	11.03	2058.50	4.047	25.70	1632.42	7.004
20.0	14.12	1675.62	5.740	15.40	1927.60	6.760	11.45	2030.39	4.749	22.30	1032.43	7.000
39.0	13.8/	10/3.62	6.206	15.13	1027.00	0.769	11.25	214/.08	4.954	22.91	1700.80	7.521
40.0	13.03	1/48.//	0.4//	14.87	1907.78	7.000	11.07	2238.22	5.105	22.53	1780.48	7.042
41.0	13.40	1823.20	0.733	14.62	1989.57	7.508	10.90	2550.20	5.503	22.18	1022.74	7.968
42.0	13.18	1898.89	7.033	14.58	2072.35	7.075	10.73	2425.02	5.591	21.85	1935.70	8.299
43.0	12.97	1975.84	7.518	14.15	2156.72	7.988	10.58	2518.44	5 810	21.50	2012.33	8.637

 Aluminum
 Al-Si Alloy Sheet
 Germanium

 Silicon

Figure 7: Mass stopping power, Range and distance of particle in aluminum, Al-Si alloy sheet, Germanium and Silicon

© International Journal of Engineering Science & Technology (IJEST). 14 ISSN:0975-5462, Vol. 3 Issue 8, pp 6532-6542, August 2011

44.0	12.76	2054.02	7.607	13.93	2242.47	8.305	10.42	2614.67	6.032	21.18	2092.19	8.979
45.0	12.57	2133.44	7.902	13.72	2329.59	8.628	10.28	2712.30	6.257	20.88	2173.31	9.327
46.0	12.38	2214.08	8.200	13.52	2418.07	8.956	10.13	2811.30	6.485	20.58	2255.69	9.681
47.0	12.20	2295.93	8.503	13.32	2507.89	9.288	10.00	2911.67	6.717	20.30	2339.32	10.040
48.0	12.02	2379.00	8.811	13.13	2599.06	9.626	9.87	3013.40	6.951	20.02	2424.19	10.404
49.0	11.85	2463 26	9.123	12.95	2691.56	9.969	9.74	3116.48	7.189	19.75	2510.30	10.774
50.0	11.69	2548.72	9.440	12.77	2785.39	10.316	9.61	3220.90	7.430	19.50	2597.64	11.149
51.0	11.53	2635.36	9.761	12.60	2880.53	10.669	9.49	3326.64	7.674	19.25	2686.20	11.529
52.0	11.38	2723.18	10.086	12.44	2976.98	11.026	9.38	3433.70	7.921	19.01	2775.97	11.914
53.0	11.23	2812.17	10.415	12.28	3074.74	11.388	9.27	3542.07	8.171	18.77	2866.95	12.304
54.0	11.08	2902 32	10.749	12.12	3173.78	11.755	9.16	3651.74	8.424	18.55	2959.12	12.700
55.0	10.94	2993.63	11.088	11.97	3274.11	12.126	9.05	3762.70	8.680	18.33	3052.49	13.101
56.0	10.81	3086.10	11.430	11.82	3375.72	12.503	8.95	3874.95	8.939	18.11	3147.04	13.507
57.0	10.68	3179.70	11.777	11.68	3478.60	12.884	8.85	3988.46	9.201	17.91	3242.77	13.917
58.0	10.55	3274.44	12.128	11.55	3582.75	13.269	8.75	4103.25	9.466	17.71	3339.67	14.333
59.0	10.43	3370.32	12.483	11.41	3688.16	13.660	8.66	4219.28	9.733	17.51	3437.73	14.754
60.0	10.31	3467.31	12.842	11.28	3794.81	14.055	8.57	4336.57	10.004	17.32	3536.96	15.180
61.0	10.19	3565.43	13.205	11.16	3902.72	14.455	8.48	4455.10	10.277	17.14	3637.34	15.611
62.0	10.08	3664.66	13.573	11.03	4011.86	14.859	8.39	4574.86	10.554	16.96	3738.86	16.047
63.0	9.97	3765.00	13.944	10.91	4122.23	15.268	8.31	4695.85	10.833	16.78	3841.53	16.487
64.0	9.86	3866.45	14.320	10.80	4233.84	15.681	8.23	4818.06	11.115	16.61	3945.34	16.933
65.0	9.76	3968.99	14.700	10.68	4346.66	16.099	8.15	4941.48	11.400	16.44	4050.28	17.383
66.0	9.65	4072.62	15.084	10.57	4460.70	16.521	8.07	5066.11	11.687	16.28	4156.34	17.838
67.0	9.55	4177.34	15.472	10.47	4575.95	16.948	7,99	5191.94	11.977	16.12	4263.52	18.298
68.0	9.46	4283.14	15.863	10.36	4692.41	17.379	7.92	5318.95	12.270	15.97	4371.82	18.763
69.0	9.36	4390.01	16.259	10.26	4810.06	17.815	7.84	5447.16	12.566	15.82	4481.23	19.233
70.0	9.27	4497,96	16.659	10.16	4928.91	18.255	7.77	5576.54	12.865	15.67	4591.74	19.707
71.0	9.18	4606.98	17.063	10.06	5048.95	18.700	7.70	5707.10	13.166	15.53	4703.35	20.186
72.0	9.09	4717.05	17.471	9.97	5170.17	19.149	7.64	5838.82	13.470	15.39	4816.06	20.670
73.0	9 01	4828.19	17.882	9.87	5292.57	19.602	7.57	5971.70	13.776	15.25	4929.86	21.158
74.0	8.92	4940.38	18.298	9.78	5416.14	20.060	7.51	6105.74	14.085	15.12	5044.75	2 1 .651
75.0	8.84	5053.62	18.717	9.69	5540.89	20.522	7.44	6240.93	14.397	14.98	5160.72	22.149
76.0	8.76	5167.90	19.140	9.61	5666.79	20.988	7.38	6377.26	14.712	14.86	5277.76	22.651
77.0	8.68	5283.22	19.567	9.52	5793.86	21.459	7.32	6514.73	15.029	14.73	5395.88	23.158
78.0	8.60	5399.58	19.998	9.44	5922.08	21.934	7.26	6653.33	15.349	14.61	5515.07	23.670
79.0	8.53	5516.96	20.433	9.36	6051.45	22.413	7.20	6793.06	15.671	14.49	5635.32	24.186
80.0	8.46	5635.38	20.872	9.28	6181.97	22.896	7.14	6933.91	15.996	14.37	5756.63	24.707
81.0	8.38	5754.82	21.314	9.20	6313.63	23.384	7.09	7075.88	16.324	14.25	5879.00	25.232
82.0	8.31	5875.28	21.760	9.12	6446.42	23.876	7.03	7218.96	16.654	14.14	6002.42	25.761
83.0	8.24	5996.76	22.210	9.05	6580.35	24.372	6.98	7363.14	16.986	14.03	6126.89	26.296
84.0	8.18	6119.24	22.664	8.97	6715.41	24.872	6.93	7508.43	17.321	13.92	6252.40	26.834
85.0	8.11	6242.74	23.121	8.90	6851.60	25.376	6.88	7654.81	17.659	13.82	6378.96	27.378
86.0	8.05	6367.24	23.582	8.83	6988.90	25.885	6.83	7802.29	17.999	13.71	6506.55	27.925
87.0	7.98	6492.74	24.047	8.76	7127.32	26.397	6.78	7950.85	18.342	13.61	6635.17	28.477
88.0	7.92	6619.23	24.516	8.69	7266.86	26.914	6.73	8100.50	18.687	13.51	6764.83	29.034
89.0	7.86	6746.72	24.988	8.63	7407.50	27.435	6.68	8251.22	19.035	13.41	6895.50	29.594
90.0	7.80	6875.21	25.464	8.56	7549.25	27.960	6.63	8403.02	19.385	13.31	7027.21	30.160

Table 2 continued...

Figure 8: Mass stopping power, Range and distance of particle in aluminum, Al-Si alloy sheet, Germanium and Silicon

© International Journal of Engineering Science & Technology (IJEST). 15 ISSN:0975-5462, Vol. 3 Issue 8, pp 6532-6542, August 2011

91.0	7.74	7004.67	25.943	8.50	7692.10	28.489	6.59	8555.89	19.738	13.22	7159.93	30.729
9 2.0	7.68	7135.12	26.426	8.43	7836.05	29.022	6.54	8709.82	20.093	13.12	7293.66	31.303
93.0	7.62	7266.55	26.913	8.37	7981.09	29.560	6.50	8864.82	20.451	13.03	7428.41	31.882
94.0	7.57	7398.96	27.404	8.31	8127.23	30.101	6.45	9020.87	20.811	12.94	7564.16	32,464
95.0	7.51	7532.34	27.898	8.25	8274.45	30.646	6.41	9177.97	21.173	12.85	7700.93	33.051
96.0	7.46	7666.69	28.395	8.19	8422.75	31.195	6.37	9336.12	21.538	12.77	7838.69	33.642
97.0	7.41	7802.01	28.896	8.14	8572.14	31.749	6.33	9495.31	21.905	12.68	7977.45	34.238
98.0	7.35	7938.29	29.401	8.08	8722.60	32.306	6.28	9655.55	22.275	12.60	8117.21	34.838
99.0	7.30	8075.53	29.909	8.02	8874.14	32.867	6.24	9816.82	22.647	12.51	8257.96	35.442
100.0	7.25	8213.73	30.421	7.97	9026.74	33.432	6.21	9979.12	23.021	12.43	8399.70	36.050

Figure 9: Mass stopping power, Range and distance of particle in aluminum, Al-Si alloy sheet, Germanium and Silicon

Table 3: E	lectron and	Proton	flux value	in April 2010	
Tuole J. E	rection and	110:001	man vance	m ripm 2010	

Table 2 continued...

			Part	ticles Flux (A	April)			
Day	P>1	P > 5	P >10	P >30	P >50	P>100	E>0.8	E>2.0
1	1.09E+01	3.06E-01	2.13E-01	1.15E-01	8.93E-02	4.67E-02	4.31E+04	2.62E+00
2	9.30E+00	3.08E-01	2.07E-01	1.12E-01	8.74E-02	4.52E-02	1.85E+05	1.39E+02
3	3.07E+01	2.92E-01	1.97E-01	1.01E-01	8.10E-02	4.29E-02	2.60E+05	3.97E+02
4	3.02E+02	3.04E-01	1.89E-01	9.44E-02	7.42E-02	3.77E-02	3.04E+05	8.21E+02
5	3.02E+02	3.04E-01	1.89E-01	9.44E-02	7.42E-02	3.77E-02	3.04E+05	8.21E+02
6	3.06E+02	2.78E-01	1.83E-01	8.76E-02	7.10E-02	3.62E-02	1.07E+06	2.87E+04
7	1.14E+02	3.00E-01	1.98E-01	9.64E-02	7.88E-02	4.15E-02	1.50E+06	6.29E+04
8	5.24E+01	2.83E-01	1.90E-01	9.70E-02	7.85E-02	4.08E-02	1.56E+06	5.27E+04
9	2.48E+01	2.70E-01	1.88E-01	9.78E-02	7.96E-02	4.15E-02	1.46E+06	4.08E+04
10	3.79E+01	2.95E-01	1.98E-01	9.80E-02	7.94E-02	4.16E-02	1.51E+06	5.11E+04
11	4.14E+01	2.89E-01	1.94E-01	9.92E-02	8.02E-02	4.16E-02	1.14E+06	3.22E+04
12	1.03E+01	2.87E-01	1.95E-01	1.00E-01	7.86E-02	4.04E-02	7.45E+04	1.60E+02
13	7.33E+00	3.06E-01	2.22E-01	1.26E-01	9.82E-02	5.16E-02	9.06E+04	2.25E+02
14	1.62E+01	3.16E-01	2.21E-01	1.31E-01	1.01E-01	5.56E-02	1.10E+05	4.18E+02
15	9.02E+00	3.15E-01	2.10E-01	1.16E-01	9.16E-02	5.06E-02	9.42E+04	1.18E+02
16	3.62E+00	3.12E-01	2.21E-01	1.23E-01	9.57E-02	5.02E-02	8.23E+04	9.66E+01
17	6.80E+00	2.88E-01	2.07E-01	1.20E-01	9.43E-02	5.15E-02	9.71E+04	1.64E+02
18	8.00E+00	3.03E-01	2.09E-01	1.19E-01	9.34E-02	5.05E-02	9.94E+04	2.19E+02
19	6.25E+00	2.91E-01	2.09E-01	1.19E-01	9.39E-02	5.18E-02	7.55E+04	2.10E+02
20	6.63E+00	3.18E-01	2.18E-01	1.23E-01	9.72E-02	5.52E-02	6.85E+04	2.10E+02
21	7.50E+00	3.05E-01	2.16E-01	1.27E-01	9.87E-02	5.28E-02	3.72E+04	7.85E+01
22	7.47E+00	3.24E-01	2.21E-01	1.26E-01	9.87E-02	5.26E-02	3.88E+04	8.61E+01
23	2.70E+00	2.90E-01	2.02E-01	1.08E-01	8.43E-02	4.29E-02	5.29E+03	1.06E+01
24	2.73E+00	3.03E-01	2.15E-01	1.11E-01	8.79E-02	4.63E-02	2.87E+04	5.01E+00
25	5.28E+00	2.84E-01	1.98E-01	1.08E-01	8.49E-02	4.37E-02	6.59E+04	1.06E+01
26	9.21E+00	3.38E-01	2.31E-01	1.16E-01	9.07E-02	4.61E-02	6.29E+04	1.29E+01
27	7.96E+00	3.07E-01	2.13E-01	1.14E-01	8.97E-02	4.65E-02	4.40E+04	2.18E+01
28	6.33E+00	3.01E-01	2.07E-01	1.14E-01	8.88E-02	4.46E-02	3.59E+04	1.99E+01
29	4.74E+00	3.24E-01	2.20E-01	1.16E-01	9.04E-02	4.59E-02	2.52E+04	2.57E+01
30	3.72E+00	3.00E-01	2.09E-01	1.14E-01	8.99E-02	4.68E-02	2.38E+04	3.70E+01
Average	4.54E+01	3.01E-01	2.06E-01	1.11E-01	8.74E-02	4.60E-02	3.50E+05	9.09E+03

Figure 10: Electron and Proton flux in April

© International Journal of Engineering Science & Technology (IJEST). 16 ISSN:0975-5462, Vol. 3 Issue 8, pp 6532-6542, August 2011

Table 4: Electron and Proton flux value in May 2010

Particles Flux (May)											
Day	P > 1	P > 5	P >10	P >30	P >50	P>100	E>0.8	E>2.0			
1	5.04E+00	3.23E-01	2.26E-01	1.21E-01	9.59E-02	5.08E-02	3.05E+04	6.03E+01			
2	1.12E+01	3.05E-01	2.10E-01	1.15E-01	9.10E-02	4.71E-02	4.39E+04	2.87E+01			
3	3.82E+01	2.92E-01	1.98E-01	1.03E-01	8.12E-02	4.33E-02	5.11E+05	3.90E+03			
4	3.17E+01	2.92E-01	1.96E-01	1.01E-01	8.09E-02	4.30E-02	1.30E+06	2.03E+04			
5	2.11E+01	2.84E-01	1.98E-01	9.86E-02	8.06E-02	4.32E-02	1.24E+06	2.01E+04			
6	2.19E+01	2.83E-01	1.93E-01	1.00E-01	8.13E-02	4.44E-02	1.15E+06	2.07E+04			
7	1.55E+01	2.78E-01	2.00E-01	1.05E-01	8.52E-02	4.40E-02	9.05E+05	1.34E+04			
8	7.52E+00	2.80E-01	1.99E-01	1.07E-01	8.64E-02	4.56E-02	7.71E+05	1.01E+04			
9	9.22E+00	2.88E-01	2.00E-01	1.07E-01	8.55E-02	4.55E-02	8.73E+05	1.20E+04			
10	1.40E+01	2.93E-01	2.04E-01	1.09E-01	8.85E-02	4.79E-02	7.22E+05	9.91E+03			
11	1.48E+01	2.98E-01	2.06E-01	1.07E-01	8.57E-02	4.69E-02	4.76E+05	5.32E+03			
12	9.24E+00	2.94E-01	2.05E-01	1.08E-01	8.64E-02	4.64E-02	2.88E+05	2.05E+03			
13	1.61E+01	3.12E-01	2.11E-01	1.15E-01	8.99E-02	4.73E-02	3.22E+05	2.58E+03			
14	1.93E+01	3.08E-01	2.09E-01	1.20E-01	9.40E-02	4.93E-02	3.01E+05	2.73E+03			
15	1.23E+01	3.26E-01	2.21E-01	1.25E-01	9.63E-02	5.03E-02	2.70E+05	2.50E+03			
16	2.03E+01	3.19E-01	2.21E-01	1.28E-01	1.00E-01	5.38E-02	2.51E+05	2.68E+03			
17	1.67E+01	3.27E-01	2.25E-01	1.24E-01	9.54E-02	5.09E-02	1.25E+05	9.80E+02			
18	3.62E+00	3.47E-01	2.26E-01	1.24E-01	9.62E-02	5.15E-02	2.73E+04	1.14E+02			
19	7.00E+00	3.30E-01	2.21E-01	1.26E-01	9.69E-02	5.09E-02	1.32E+04	3.87E+01			
20	7.20E+00	3.15E-01	2.14E-01	1.15E-01	8.95E-02	4.75E-02	2.29E+04	3.68E+01			
21	4.76E+00	3.04E-01	2.13E-01	1.18E-01	9.00E-02	4.57E-02	6.00E+04	6.06E+01			
22	6.46E+00	3.29E-01	2.23E-01	1.20E-01	9.21E-02	4.91E-02	7.48E+04	7.20E+01			
23	6.40E+00	3.09E-01	2.12E-01	1.11E-01	8.74E-02	4.61E-02	7.22E+04	8.31E+01			
24	8.56E+00	3.11E-01	2.18E-01	1.17E-01	9.21E-02	4.93E-02	7.87E+04	9.06E+01			
25	8.85E+00	3.07E-01	2.16E-01	1.17E-01	9.37E-02	4.91E-02	4.61E+04	8.86E+01			
26	8.41E+00	3.10E-01	2.13E-01	1.11E-01	8.73E-02	4.52E-02	1.84E+04	2.86E+01			
27	5.99E+00	2.90E-01	2.11E-01	1.13E-01	8.98E-02	4.47E-02	1.01E+04	2.20E+01			
28	1.07E+01	3.01E-01	2.08E-01	1.10E-01	8.69E-02	4.49E-02	6.23E+03	1.35E+01			
29	5.73E+01	2.89E-01	1.93E-01	9.79E-02	7.71E-02	3.96E-02	1.18E+05	1.55E+02			
30	3.00E+01	2.88E-01	1.93E-01	1.02E-01	8.01E-02	4.03E-02	3.14E+05	1.09E+03			
31	2.55E+01	2.89E-01	1.99E-01	1.04E-01	8.29E-02	4.19E-02	5.68E+05	3.68E+03			
Average	1.53E+01	3.04E-01	2.09E-01	1.12E-01	8.86E-02	4.66E-02	3.55E+05	4.35E+03			

Figure 11: Electron and Proton flux in May

Table 5: Electron and Proton flux value in June 2010

			Pai	ticles Flux (June)			
Day	P > 1	P > 5	P >10	P >30	P >50	P>100	E>0.8	E>2.0
1	1.12E+01	2.79E-01	1.92E-01	1.03E-01	8.36E-02	4.27E-02	1.15E+06	1.64E+04
2	1.05E+01	3.07E-01	2.12E-01	1.18E-01	9.62E-02	5.10E-02	1.23E+06	1.89E+04
3	1.63E+01	2.95E-01	2.03E-01	1.10E-01	8.73E-02	4.55E-02	9.07E+05	1.26E+04
4	3.82E+01	2.86E-01	2.01E-01	1.09E-01	8.50E-02	4.37E-02	4.02E+05	1.51E+03
5	1.83E+01	2.91E-01	1.99E-01	1.06E-01	8.49E-02	4.43E-02	9.32E+05	4.86E+03
6	1.58E+01	2.85E-01	1.93E-01	1.06E-01	8.41E-02	4.55E-02	8.28E+05	4.92E+03
7	1.14E+01	2.86E-01	2.08E-01	1.15E-01	9.15E-02	4.69E-02	6.31E+05	4.22E+03
8	1.48E+01	3.03E-01	2.08E-01	1.12E-01	8.74E-02	4.55E-02	6.29E+05	5.28E+03
9	1.53E+01	3.04E-01	2.10E-01	1.15E-01	9.05E-02	4.63E-02	5.09E+05	4.54E+03
10	1.25E+01	3.03E-01	2.05E-01	1.13E-01	8.97E-02	4.57E-02	3.10E+05	1.80E+03
11	9.14E+00	2.96E-01	2.07E-01	1.15E-01	9.05E-02	4.66E-02	2.36E+05	9.38E+02
12	2.13E+01	5.37E-01	3.33E-01	1.47E-01	9.87E-02	5.01E-02	2.40E+05	1.14E+03
13	2.14E+01	5.65E-01	2.79E-01	1.27E-01	9.37E-02	4.73E-02	1.59E+05	7.97E+02
14	1.42E+01	3.65E-01	2.30E-01	1.18E-01	9.24E-02	4.90E-02	1.27E+05	5.90E+02
15	1.66E+01	3.16E-01	2.09E-01	1.13E-01	8.82E-02	4.72E-02	7.09E+04	3.86E+02
16	7.43E+00	3.11E-01	2.11E-01	1.13E-01	8.76E-02	4.67E-02	1.09E+05	1.42E+02
17	1.39E+01	3.08E-01	2.09E-01	1.10E-01	8.57E-02	4.46E-02	3.45E+05	7.55E+02
18	9.62E+00	3.12E-01	2.08E-01	1.07E-01	8.31E-02	4.33E-02	3.92E+05	9.02E+02
19	1.17E+01	3.10E-01	2.16E-01	1.13E-01	8.74E-02	4.51E-02	4.38E+05	1.20E+03
20	1.60E+01	3.04E-01	2.11E-01	1.14E-01	8.85E-02	4.63E-02	4.22E+05	1.23E+03
21	1.78E+01	2.97E-01	2.09E-01	1.12E-01	8.69E-02	4.50E-02	3.27E+05	9.53E+02
22	1.85E+01	2.93E-01	1.96E-01	1.04E-01	8.21E-02	4.41E-02	2.67E+05	8.01E+02
23	1.24E+01	2.91E-01	2.01E-01	1.09E-01	8.50E-02	4.46E-02	2.12E+05	5.23E+02
24	1.61E+01	2.87E-01	2.03E-01	1.16E-01	9.11E-02	4.74E-02	1.82E+05	4.75E+02
25	1.99E+01	3.11E-01	2.12E-01	1.17E-01	9.26E-02	4.98E-02	1.14E+05	3.21E+02
26	8.29E+00	3.05E-01	2.02E-01	1.08E-01	8.40E-02	4.41E-02	2.66E+04	3.99E+01
27	7.69E+00	3.06E-01	2.02E-01	1.07E-01	8.37E-02	4.34E-02	1.45E+05	4.98E+01
28	7.41E+00	2.97E-01	2.06E-01	1.11E-01	8.61E-02	4.58E-02	3.98E+05	4.65E+02
29	9.70E+00	2.98E-01	1.91E-01	1.06E-01	8.43E-02	4.52E-02	4.34E+05	7.23E+02
30	1.88E+01	3.15E-01	2.06E-01	1.07E-01	8.40E-02	4.28E-02	3.80E+05	8.31E+02
Average	1.47E+01	3.19E-01	2.12E-01	1.13E-01	8.79E-02	4.58E-02	4.18E+05	2.94E+03

Figure 12: Electron and Proton flux in June

Table 6: Dose contribution of proton in Silicon Material

Particle's		Dose		Dose	,	Dose		Dose
E	April	rad (Si)	May	rad(Si)	June	rad(Si)	Average	rad(Si)
1.0	14.7402	151.0035	15.3235	156.9793	45.4451	465.5547	25.1696	257.8458
5.0	0.3187	1.1487	0.3039	1.0952	0.3014	1.0862	0.3080	1.1100
10.0	0.2124	0.4880	0.2091	0.4805	0.2063	04739	0.2093	0.4808
30.0	0.1128	0.1272	0.1122	0.1266	0.1109	0.1250	0.1120	0.1263
50.0	0.0879	0.0710	0.0886	0.0716	0.0874	0.0707	0.0879	0.0711
100.0	0.0458	0.0236	0.0466	0.0240	0.0460	0.0236	0.0461	0.0237

Figure 13: Dose contribution of proton in Silicon Material

© International Journal of Engineering Science & Technology (IJEST). 18 ISSN:0975-5462, Vol. 3 Issue 8, pp 6532-6542, August 2011

Table 7: Dose contribution of proton in Silicon Material

Particle's	•	Dose	•	Dose	•	Dose	•	Dose
E	April	rad (Ge)	May	rad(Ge)	June	rad(Ge)	Average	rad(Ge)
1.0	14.740	69.689	15.324	72.45	45.45	214.86	25.17	119.00
5.0	0.3187	0.5444	0.3039	0.5190	0.3014	0.5147	0.3080	0.5260
10.0	0.2124	0.2343	0.2091	0.2307	0.2063	0.2276	0.2093	0.2309
30.0	0.1128	0.0622	0.1122	0.0619	0.1109	0.0611	0.1120	0.0618
50.0	0.0879	0.0350	0.0886	0.0353	0.0874	0.0348	0.0879	0.0350
100.0	0.0458	0.0118	0.0466	0.0120	0.0460	0.0118	0.0461	0.0119

Figure 14: Dose contribution of proton in Germanium Material

This figure "table1.png" is available in "png" format from:

http://arxiv.org/ps/1303.0434v1

This figure "table2.png" is available in "png" format from:

http://arxiv.org/ps/1303.0434v1