
Subject: Re: CCD saturation

Posted by [Wout De Nolf](#) on Tue, 28 Oct 2008 08:56:42 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Mon, 27 Oct 2008 06:27:03 -0700 (PDT), pgrigis@gmail.com wrote:

>
>
> Wox wrote:
>> Marshall Perrin wrote:
>>
>>> Shape detection is not the way to go here, versus detecting the level
>>> at which pixels saturate. There should be some characteristic number of
>>> counts per pixel below which you know data is not saturated.
>>
>> Yes, but this only works for the inner part of a saturated spot +
>> streaks. The edges don't have a value of 65535 (it's a 16bit CCD
>> camera) and can in fact have a lower value than non-saturated spots
>> which I want to preserve.
>
> Does the CCD really behaves this way? Seems pretty bad if
> saturation is spread around that way... Are you sure it is not stray
> light?

I'm sure. And yes it's bad and should be avoided (by lowering acquisition time, putting absorbers in the beam, etc.), but in automated measurements it can happen you only notice it after the experiment.
