Practical aspects of Kelvin probe force microscopy
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We discuss practical aspects of Kelvin probe force microscopy (KFM) which are important to obtain stable images of the electric surface potential distribution at high spatial resolution (<100 nm) and high potential sensitivity (<1 mV) on conducting and nonconducting samples. We compare metal-coated and semiconducting tips with respect to their suitability for KFM. Components of the metal coating can become detached during scanning, introducing sudden offset jumps in the potential maps (typically up to 350 mV between adjacent scan lines). However, n-doped silicon tips show no substantial tip alterations and, therefore, provide a stable reference during the experiment (offset jumps typically up to 40 mV between adjacent scan lines). These semiconducting tips must be electrically connected via contact pads. We use InGa and colloidal silver pads which are easily applied to the substrate supporting the cantilever and have a low enough differential contact resistance (350 Ω and 2.2 kΩ, respectively). Furthermore, we introduce a simple procedure to fine-tune the feedback which detects the electric surface potential and show how the basic KFM setup has to be modified to gain access to the necessary control signals.

I. INTRODUCTION

In both semiconductor devices and biological samples, knowledge of the local electric potential distribution is of significant interest because it helps to link the specimen’s observed function with its local structure and composition. For instance, junctions between different materials, locations of electric short circuits, and the distribution of the electric field intensity are all of major interest in semiconductor device design as well as failure analysis.

Both scanning tunneling microscopy (STM) and atomic force microscopy (AFM) have been modified to obtain high resolution maps of the electric surface potential distribution. Until now scanning tunneling potentiometry (STP)1–3 is the only method which provides near-atomic resolution. However, the application of STP is limited because most active devices are surrounded by an insulator. With the adaptation of the AFM to electric potential measurements4,5 this major disadvantage was overcome, because the tip could now be kept close to the surface without the necessity of a tunneling current. In particular, variations of the Kelvin force microscope6–8 (KFM) have evolved into reliable tools to characterize specimens ranging from semiconductor devices9,10 to biological samples.11,12

All KFM microscopes use the same principle to measure the contact potential difference (CPD) between tip and sample surface: An alternating current (ac) voltage with adjustable direct current (dc) offset is applied between a conducting AFM tip and the sample electrode and the resulting electrostatic force is detected by a lock-in amplifier, and a feedback circuit controls the dc tip potential until the CPD is compensated (see also Fig. 1).

Although this potential measuring principle is identical for all KFM setups, the selected tips and the parameters of the feedback electronics determine whether high resolution and stable potential images are obtained or not. We report here about the advantage of using uncoated semiconducting tips compared to metal-coated ones, and describe a practical procedure for adjusting the feedback electronics to maintain optimum performance.

FIG. 1. KFM principle to measure the surface potential distribution. In the first trace (solid line) the topography of a single line is acquired using standard tapping mode (mechanical excitation of the cantilever). In the second trace (dashed line) this topography is retraced at a set lift height from the sample surface to detect the electric surface potential \( \Phi(x) \). During this second trace the cantilever is no longer excited mechanically but electrically by applying the periodic voltage \( U_{ac}\cos(\omega t) \) to the tip. The feedback then changes the dc tip potential \( \Phi_{dc} \) until the \( \omega \) component of the tip-force vanishes \( [\Phi_{dc}=\Phi(x)] \).

\(^{a}\)Author to whom correspondence should be addressed; electronic mail: stemmer@ifr.mavt.ethz.ch
II. INSTRUMENT SETUP

Our KFM microscope is based on a modified commercial AFM (NanoScope® IIIa Multimode™ with Extender™ Electronics Module, Digital Instruments USA) where topography and CPD are measured sequentially using the lift-mode technique to minimize cross talk (Fig. 1). To this end, we first acquire the surface topography of a single line in TappingMode™ and then immediately retrace this topography over the same line at a set left height from the sample surface to measure the CPD. Images are obtained by repeating this procedure for each line along the slow-scan axis. The CPD is acquired using the standard KFM feedback loop provided by the Extender Electronics Module. All measurements are taken in air at ambient pressure and humidity. Under these conditions the actual value of the CPD is affected by contamination, oxide layers, or trapped surface charges. The humidity plays an important role on charging effects on insulators. At low humidity (10% r.h.) trapped surface charges can be detected in the CPD image. such charging effects become less prominent at high humidity (80% r.h.).

III. TIP EFFECTS, PREPARATION, AND PERFORMANCE

In KFM the tip geometry is the most critical factor defining resolution and accuracy of the acquired potential maps: Long and slender, but slightly blunt tips, on cantilevers of minimal width and surface area are the best choice if no guarding electrode covers the sides of the tip and the cantilever. It is important to note that the measured CPD is always a weighted average, and all surface elements of the tip and the sample affect its value.

Metal-coated AFM tips are most commonly used as they are commercially available and easy to produce. Unfortunately, the metal coats exhibit poor stability and the tip electrode often loses parts of its coating during scanning. As a result, the tip electrode will act as an unstable reference since its surface potential distribution is changing during the measurement. To eliminate this possible source of error (detachment of parts of the metal coating), we use highly doped semiconducting tips which are electrically connected via a contact pad applied prior to the measurements.

To compare metal-coated tips with uncoated ones we modified commercially available Sb-doped silicon tapping-
mode tips (Nanosensors, Dr. O. Wolter GmbH, Germany) as described below. We found these probes preferable for KFM applications since the integrated tips are longer and the cantilevers have a smaller surface area compared to other commercially available ones. Tips were either metal-coated by sputtering 10 nm Pt onto the entire sensor including tip, cantilever, and substrate chip, or left uncoated but equipped with contact pads on both sides of the substrate chip. An electric tilever, and substrate chip, or left uncoated but equipped with tilevers have a smaller surface area compared to other com-
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We found that the phase difference between the reference signal used for the multiplication in the lock-in section and the deflection signal of the cantilever carefully has to be set to the optimum value, i.e., 180° in our case, to achieve highest sensitivity. Besides the increased sensitivity, a phase jitter of the deflection signal becomes less important at 180°, which is not the case when working close to 90°.

The phase \( \varphi \) of the deflection signal relative to the ac-drive voltage depends on the tip and the oscillation frequency, which is set to the cantilever’s resonance to take advantage of the high Q factor at resonance. Hence, each time the tip is changed the phase of the reference, \( \vartheta \), must be adjusted to maximize the output of the lock-in amplifier. However, only when the feedback loop is switched off (SW1 set to GND, Fig. 4), can the effect of the reference phase on the output of the lock-in be detected since in normal KFM operation (SW1 closed, Fig. 4) S3 is controlled to be zero.

To fine tune the feedback we apply an external square-wave voltage \( U_x \) to the sample surface (Fig. 4, S0). First, we set SW1 into the tuning position and monitor the open-loop output of the lock-in amplifier S3 while adjusting the phase \( \vartheta \) until S3 becomes zero. Next, we subtract 90° from \( \vartheta \) to obtain the maximum feedback signal. Finally, we set SW1 back into normal KFM position and monitor the closed-loop dc tip voltage S4 while optimizing the controller gains until S4 tracks the external voltage source. Figure 5 displays a series of open-loop lock-in signals S3 and the corresponding closed-loop tip voltages S4 for different values of \((\varphi - \vartheta)\) as obtained when fine tuning the feedback. The detected open-loop lock-in signal S3 (SW1 connected to GND, hence \( U_{dc} = 0 \)) is proportional to \(-U_x \cos(\varphi - \vartheta)\), and is maximized when the phase difference \((\varphi - \vartheta)\) equals 180°. In closed-loop operation, i.e., normal KFM mode, this phase difference results in S4 tracking the external voltage source best. S4 is the dc voltage applied to the tip and equal to the local CPD.

Operating the feedback at maximum sensitivity ensures that tracking of small changes in the surface potential (\(< 1 \text{ mV}_{pp}\)) becomes possible (Fig. 6).

Nonetheless, one might wonder whether optimization of the feedback loop is not possible based on the appearance of the contact potential image alone. Figure 7 clearly demonstrates that a phase difference \((\varphi - \vartheta)\) off by 45° from the optimum value \((\varphi - \vartheta = 180°)\) still yields reasonable contrast.

\[ \text{FIG. 5. Measured influence of the reference phase } \vartheta \text{ on the open-loop lock-in output signal S3 and the closed-loop dc tip potential S4. Generally } (\varphi - \vartheta) \text{ is unknown; a 90° phase difference } (\varphi - \vartheta) \text{ is indicated when the open-loop signal S3 becomes zero. By subtracting 90° from the corresponding } \vartheta \text{ value the correct reference phase } \vartheta \text{ is found, S3 is maximized, and highest sensitivity is achieved for the closed-loop dc tip potential S4 (CPD).} \]

\[ \text{FIG. 6. Accuracy and noise value of the closed-loop dc tip potential S4. The potential (solid line), measured locally on template stripped gold (Ref. 17) at a lift height of 20 nm, follows the applied square wave voltage (4 mV}_{pp}, 20 Hz, dashed line) with an accuracy of 1 mV. The measured noise value within a bandwidth of 1 kHz is below 1 mV}_{pp}. \]

\[ \text{FIG. 7. CPD image of the perforated metal film at different values } (\varphi - \vartheta) \text{. Even for a phase difference off by 45° from the optimum value reasonable contrast is obtained in the CPD image. Also, the sensitivity of the feedback is reduced by a factor of } \cos(45°). \]
contrast, making it difficult to judge the optimal setting based on the quality of the contact potential, particularly on samples with unknown features. Therefore, we recommend to fine tune the feedback loop via the procedure described above.

After the phase and the controller gains have been optimized, the feedback loop compensates the CPD, and the \( \omega \) component of the cantilever deflection becomes approximately zero, resulting in a reduced total cantilever deflection. As a result, the lift height can further be reduced without touching the surface thereby improving spatial resolution\(^{13,14}\) of the measured potential distribution as can be seen when comparing Fig. 3(e) [lift height 15 nm, \( \varphi - \vartheta = 180^{\circ} \)] with Fig. 7 (lift height 40 nm).
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