Resolution and contrast in Kelvin probe force microscopy
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The combination of atomic force microscopy and Kelvin probe technology is a powerful tool to obtain high-resolution maps of the surface potential distribution on conducting and nonconducting samples. However, resolution and contrast transfer of this method have not been fully understood, so far. To obtain a better quantitative understanding, we introduce a model which correlates the measured potential with the actual surface potential distribution, and we compare numerical simulations of the three-dimensional tip–specimen model with experimental data from test structures. The observed potential is a locally weighted average over all potentials present on the sample surface. The model allows us to calculate these weighting factors and, furthermore, leads to the conclusion that good resolution in potential maps is obtained by long and slender but slightly blunt tips on cantilevers of minimal width and surface area. © 1998 American Institute of Physics.

I. INTRODUCTION

In semiconductor devices and biological samples, knowledge of the local electric potential distribution is of significant interest because it helps in linking the specimen’s observed function with its local structure and composition. With the advent of scanning tunneling microscopy high-resolution mapping of local potential distributions became feasible.1,2 Due to the close proximity of the probe to the sample as required for electron tunneling, potential maps with a lateral resolution on the nanometer scale could be obtained, yet, inevitably, the technique was limited to conductive surfaces. Adaptation of the atomic force microscope (AFM) to electric potential measurements3,4 immediately broadened the application range to nonconducting samples. However, resolution and contrast transfer of this method have not been fully understood, so far. To obtain a better quantitative understanding, we introduce a model which correlates the measured potential with the actual surface potential distribution, and we compare numerical simulations of the three-dimensional tip–specimen model with experimental data from test structures. The observed potential is a locally weighted average over all potentials present on the sample surface. The model allows us to calculate these weighting factors and, furthermore, leads to the conclusion that good resolution in potential maps is obtained by long and slender but slightly blunt tips on cantilevers of minimal width and surface area.

We have already shown that this combination of KFM and lift-mode technique leads to potential maps where features as small as a few ten nanometers in size can be qualitatively distinguished based on variations in chemical composition.12 However, since the magnitude of the measured electric potential critically depends on the size of the feature, its surroundings, and the probe geometry, a clear understanding of the contrast transfer mechanism in KFM is required to enable a quantitative analysis and interpretation of potential images. The knowledge of the contrast transfer mechanism will permit the combination of high-resolution surface topography and electric potential data which is likely to significantly facilitate the development of new and improved semiconductor devices.

To analyze the contrast transfer mechanism in KFM we introduce a model based on a set of ideal conductors with mutual capacitances between them. Using a numerical simulation method we will derive the contrast transfer characteristics of KFM for (i) small spots depending on their size, and (ii) steps in the electric surface potential distribution. The contrast transfer characteristics are evaluated for different probe geometries to establish guidelines for optimal probe design. Finally, we will provide experimental evidence for the postulated contrast transfer characteristics.

II. A MODEL FOR QUANTITATIVE KELVIN PROBE FORCE MICROSCOPY

A. Field energy, force and KFM potential

To establish the correlation between the actual surface potential distribution and the measured quantities, we model our KFM setup as a sample surface consisting of $n$ ideally conducting electrodes of constant potential $\Phi_i$ and a tip of potential $\Phi_t$ (Fig. 1). The electrostatic field energy is then given by

$$W_e = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{n} Q_i \Phi_i + \frac{1}{2} Q_t \Phi_t, \quad (1)$$
Similarly, the total charge on the \( i \)th electrode. According to the generalized theory of capacitance\(^{13} \) there is a linear relationship between the charges \( \{Q_i,Q_t\} \) and the potentials \( \{\Phi_i,\Phi_t\} \), and \( Q_t \) can be expressed as

\[
Q_i = \left( \sum_{j=1}^{n} C_{ij}(\Phi_i - \Phi_j) \right) + C_{it}(\Phi_i - \Phi_t). \tag{2}
\]

Similarly, the total charge \( Q_t \) on the tip is

\[
Q_t = \sum_{i=1}^{n} C_{it}(\Phi_i - \Phi_t), \tag{3}
\]

where the mutual capacitances \( C_{ij} \) and \( C_{it} \) describe the electrostatic coupling between different electrodes on the sample itself and with the tip, respectively.

Introducing Eqs. (2) and (3) into Eq. (1) and using the reciprocity relation \( C_{ij} = C_{ji} \), we obtain

\[
W_e = \frac{1}{2} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left( \sum_{j=1}^{n} C_{ij}(\Phi_i - \Phi_j)^2 \right) \right]
+ \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{n} C_{it}(\Phi_i - \Phi_t)^2. \tag{4}
\]

For a system with two electrodes on the sample surface and a tip of potential \( \Phi_t \), Eq. (4) reduces to

\[
W_e = \frac{1}{2} C_{12}(\Phi_1 - \Phi_2)^2 + \frac{1}{2} C_{1}^{\prime}(\Phi_1 - \Phi_t)^2
+ C_{2}^{\prime}(\Phi_2 - \Phi_t)^2. \tag{5}
\]

To calculate the force acting on the tip we keep the potentials of all the electrodes and the tip fixed by external voltage sources, and move the tip along the \( z \) axis (see Fig. 1). Using the relation\(^{14} \) \( F_z = \partial W_e(z) / \partial z \) and Eq. (4) we obtain

\[
F_z = \frac{1}{2} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \left( \sum_{j=i+1}^{n} C_{ij}^{\prime}(\Phi_i - \Phi_j)^2 \right) \right]
+ \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{n} C_{it}^{\prime}(\Phi_i - \Phi_t)^2, \tag{6}
\]

where \( C_{ij}^{\prime} = \partial C_{ij} / \partial z \) are the derivatives of the capacitances at the actual tip location. Thus, the electrostatic force interaction between tip and sample depends both on the derivatives of the capacitances \( C_{ij} \) between different regions on the surface and the derivatives of the capacitances \( C_{it} \) between tip and sample. Note that when the tip is moved along the \( z \) axis towards the surface (Fig. 1) the electrostatic coupling between different sample regions under the tip is disturbed and the corresponding coefficients \( C_{ij} \) decrease. Hence, the derivatives \( C_{ij}^{\prime} = \partial C_{ij} / \partial z \) are not zero and contribute to the electrostatic force at the actual tip location.

In KFM an external ac voltage with an adjustable dc offset is applied to the conducting tip: \( \Phi_t = \Phi_{DC} + U_{AC}\cos(\omega t) \). Hence, the electrostatic force \( F_z \) acting on the tip has spectral components both at dc and at the frequencies \( \omega \) and \( 2\omega \). It is worth noting that the first harmonic component of the tip force, \( F_{\omega} \), depends only on the mutual capacitances between tip and surface \( C_{it} \) and not on the mutual capacitances between different surface elements \( C_{ij} \):

\[
F_{\omega} = -\sum_{i=1}^{n} C_{it}^{\prime} \cdot (\Phi_i - \Phi_{DC}) \cdot U_{AC}. \tag{7}
\]

In KFM the magnitude of this force component is measured and the feedback electronics adjust the dc potential offset, \( \Phi_{DC} \), until \( F_{\omega} \) vanishes. Setting \( F_{\omega} = 0 \) we obtain

\[
\Phi_{DC} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} C_{it}^{\prime} \cdot (\Phi_i - \Phi_{DC})}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} C_{it}^{\prime}}. \tag{8}
\]

Equation (8) demonstrates that resolution and accuracy in KFM are defined by the electrostatic coupling between the tip and the different surface regions. The measured KFM potential \( \Phi_{DC} \) does not exactly match the surface potential below the tip, rather it is a weighted average over all potentials \( \Phi_i \) on the surface, the derivatives of the capacitances, \( C_{it}^{\prime} \), being the weighting factors.\(^{12} \)

At the tip location shown in Fig. 1 the potential spot (3) on the right has a smaller weighting factor due to its smaller size and its larger distance from the tip compared to electrodes to the left of the tip (1) and below (4). Therefore, it only adds a small contribution to the measured KFM potential. Furthermore, the potential of an isolated area will approach the value of the surrounding surface potential as the area decreases in size. Moving the tip to the left across the potential step, the weighting factor \( C_{it}^{\prime} \) will increase whereas all other weighting factors will decrease. Thus, an ideal potential step on the surface will appear as a smoothed step gradually approaching the value of \( \Phi_1 \) in the KFM potential image.

Subdividing an infinitely large, ideally conducting and perfectly flat surface into equally sized elements of area \( \Delta x \times \Delta y \) at locations \( \{x_i,y_i\} \), the KFM potential [Eq. (8)] can be expressed as

\[
\Phi_{DC}(x_i,y_i) = \frac{\sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} [C'(x_i-x_j,y_i-y_j) \cdot \Phi(x_j,y_j)]}{\sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} [C'(x_i-x_j,y_i-y_j)]}, \tag{9}
\]

where \( \{x_i,y_i\} \) is the tip location. As the denominator of Eq. (9) is independent of the lateral tip location and equal to the derivative of the total tip–surface capacitance, \( C_{tot}^{\prime} \), Eq. (9) simplifies to

\[
\Phi_{DC}(x_i,y_i) = \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{C'(x_i-x_j,y_i-y_j)}{C_{tot}^{\prime}} \cdot \Phi(x_j,y_j), \tag{10}
\]

and
\[
\Phi_{\text{DC}}(x_1, y_1) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} h(x-x_1, y-y_1) \Phi(x, y) dx \, dy,
\]
\[
h(x-x_1, y-y_1) = \lim_{\Delta x, \Delta y \to 0} \left( \frac{C'(x-x_1, y-y_1)}{C_{\text{tot}}^{\prime} \Delta x \Delta y} \right)
\]
for infinitely small surface elements \(\Delta x \times \Delta y\).

Equation (11) shows that KFM potential maps of flat, ideally conducting surfaces are two-dimensional convolutions of the actual surface potential distribution \(\Phi(x, y)\) with the corresponding transfer function \(h(x, y)\).

**B. Calculating tip–sample capacitances \(C_{\text{it}}\)**

We considered two fundamental electrode configurations in the sample plane \(z = 0\) (Fig. 1), the “spot-potential” and the “step-potential.” The spot-potential was modeled as a disk of variable diameter \(d\) and potential \(\Phi_1\) embedded in a plane of potential \(\Phi_2\) with the tip kept above the center of the disk. The step-potential was modeled as the half plane \(x < 0\) with potential \(\Phi_1\) and the half plane \(x > 0\) with potential \(\Phi_2\). For both electrode configurations, Eq. (8) translates into

\[
\Phi_{\text{DC}} = \frac{C_{11}' \Phi_1 + C_{21}' \Phi_2}{C_{11} + C_{21}'},
\]

where the values \(C_{11}'\) and \(C_{21}'\) depend on geometry parameters, i.e., the location of the tip and the diameter \(d\) of the disk for the spot-potential.

According to Eq. (3) the tip’s charge is given by

\[
Q_t = C_{11}(\Phi_1 - \Phi_2) + C_{21}(\Phi_1 - \Phi_2).
\]

Provided \(Q_t(z)\) is known, \(C_{11}\) can be found by selecting the boundary conditions \(\Phi_1 = \Phi_2 = 0, \Phi_1 \neq 0\); similarly, \(C_{21}\) is obtained via the boundary conditions \(\Phi_1 = \Phi_1 = 0\) and \(\Phi_2 \neq 0:\)

\[
C_{11} = -\frac{Q_t(z)}{\Phi_1}, \quad C_{21} = -\frac{Q_t(z)}{\Phi_2}.
\]

The derivatives of the capacitances \(\{C_{11}', C_{21}'\}\) required to predict the potential \(\Phi_{\text{DC}}\) [Eq. (12)] were obtained numerically via the difference in capacitance due to a small height change \(\Delta z\) of the tip:

\[
C_{11}' = \frac{C_{11}(z + \Delta z) - C_{11}(z)}{\Delta z}, \quad C_{21}' = \frac{C_{21}(z + \Delta z) - C_{21}(z)}{\Delta z}.
\]

Thus, the task of determining the derivatives of the mutual capacitances, \(C_{it}'(z)\), reduces to the problem of calculating the tip charge \(Q_t\) for each electrode configuration and each boundary condition. However, this requires a highly accurate knowledge of the three-dimensional electrostatic field distribution.

The multiple multipole program\(^\text{15}\) (MMP) is a powerful tool for solving Maxwell’s equations in piecewise linear and homogeneous materials and allowed us to calculate the charge \(Q_t\) for a given set of electrodes with potentials \(\Phi_i\). For our purposes only the electrostatic module was needed.\(^\text{16}\) MMP uses a linear combination of vector-valued expansion functions which are selected by the user to easily solve the electrostatic field problem. Each expansion function has seven components: three for the electric field, three for the dielectric displacement, and one for the scalar potential. The most simple expansion functions are point charges for spherical geometries or line charges for cylindrical ones. Depending on the geometry and the complexity of the corresponding field distribution, more sophisticated expansion functions are necessary. Before MMP can solve the field problem the user defines the boundary conditions using a mesh of surface elements. In the next step, location and type of each expansion function are chosen. The expansion functions to describe the influence of the tip were multipoles placed on the axis of the tip. A total of 16 multipoles of order 10 (66 unknowns for each multipole) was chosen and resulted in \(N = 1056\) unknowns. Special expansion functions were developed for the exact description of the field of a polygon-shaped potential spot.\(^\text{17}\) Boundary conditions for the continuity of the electric potential, the tangential component of the electric field, and the normal component of the dielectric displacement were evaluated on 3480 surface elements on the tip. Using least-squares fitting techniques MMP calculated the 66 parameters of each multipole by matching the electrostatic field to the boundary conditions. Due to MMP’s symmetry feature the mesh only covered one quadrant of the tip. Nonetheless, each evaluation of a single value \(C_{it}\) for a particular tip position took 346 CPU seconds on a Sun Sparc Ultra1/Creator (167 MHz) computer.

Figure 2 displays particular tip–sample geometries and their associated electrostatic field distributions (plane \(y = 0\)) obtained by MMP for the spot-potential [Figs. 2(a) and 2(c)] and the step-potential [Figs. 2(b) and 2(d)]. The field vectors and the contours of constant potential clearly demonstrate that the boundary conditions are met for the entire electrode configuration.
For our experiments we used commercially available n-doped silicon tapping-mode tips from a single wafer (Nano-probes, Digital Instruments, USA). All investigated tips had the same opening angle $\alpha = 34^\circ$ and tip length $l = 21 \mu m$ as determined by a calibrated scanning electron microscope (Hitachi S900). At the base of the tip the cantilever measured 18 $\mu m$ in width. The apex radius $r_a$ of the tips varied between 10 and 200 nm. Hence we approximated this geometry by a conical tip with apex radius, opening angle, and tip length matching the measured parameters. The cantilever was modeled as a disk of diameter $d_{top} = 18 \mu m$ and all parts were considered to have zero resistivity.

C. Contrast transfer in KFM

To study the total system response a series of simulations was run with different tip locations and different spot diameters. To this end, we calculated the net tip charge and the expected KFM potential from the three-dimensional (3D) electrostatic field using Eqs. (12)–(15). The field distributions shown in Fig. 2 are particular examples corresponding to one point of the response characteristic of spotlike and steplike potentials, respectively. Figure 3 shows the modeled spot-size (b) and step (c) response in KFM for several different tip geometries (a). An immediate conclusion to be drawn from comparing geometries (k) versus (m) and (j) versus (l), respectively, is that the cantilever surface affects the measured potential despite being 15 $\mu m$ above the sample surface. Thus, a minimal cantilever width and surface area is desirable because it results in a steeper response characteristic. A larger apex size as shown with geometries (o) and (p) further steepens this response.

To summarize, optimum performance of KFM is achieved when the sum of local electrostatic interactions predominates the sum of nonlocal ones. This ratio is favored by long and slender tips provided the tip apex is not too small (geometry p).

III. EXPERIMENTAL DATA

Test structures to characterize contrast transfer (Fig. 4) were fabricated using optical and electron beam lithography techniques. GeNiAu ohmic contacts were deposited onto an InP-based depletion-type high electron mobility transistor heterostructure and annealed at 340 °C in a nitrogen environment. The contacts were electrically isolated by a mesa etch using a nonselective H₃PO₄-H₂O₂-H₂O solution. The mesa defines a 100 $\mu m \times 100$ $\mu m$ area of heterostructure material connected to one ohmic contact, which is separated from the second ohmic contact by a 10 $\mu m$ wide gap. Metallic structures with linewidths of 0.2–10 $\mu m$ were fabricated using a two layer PMMA/P(MMA–MAA) electron beam resist and a lift-off metallization technique. Ti and subsequently Au with a total thickness of 150 nm was evaporated and formed a Schottky contact to the underlying semiconductor (In$_{0.53}$Ga$_{0.47}$As).

Figure 4(a) shows a composite light microscope image of our microfabricated test sample with Au lines varying in width from 200 nm to 10 $\mu m$. Typical examples of our experimental data are shown for topography in Figs. 4(b) and 4(d) and for the corresponding KFM potential measured at different tip–sample separations in Figs. 4(c) and 4(e), respectively. For clean surfaces without any surface contaminations, oxides, isolated charges, or condensed water films, the potential difference (contact potential) between two different materials is equal to the difference in work function. The potential difference measured in air at ambient pressure between the large Au pad (P1) and the surrounding InGaAs substrate (P2) is 330 mV which is smaller than the 450 mV ($W_{vac,Au} = 5.1$ eV, $W_{vac,In_{0.53}Ga_{0.47}As} = 4.65$ eV) reported for clean surfaces. To verify our modeled spot-size response, we measured the potential difference between the Au metallization and the substrate for different tip–sample separations and normalized the data with the contact potential measured between P1 and P2 [Fig. 4(a)]. The collected results of all measurements are shown in Fig. 5. The error-bars indicate the standard deviation of the four measurements av-
averaged for each data point. The modeled spot-size response (solid lines) and the observed response are in good agreement although the measurements were taken on lines and not on spots.

To obtain a test structure for the step response we fabricated a perforated metal film on a GaAs substrate following published protocols. To achieve an even distribution of the 30% aqueous NaCl solution on the hydrophobic GaAs surface, the latter was covered with a piece of rice paper before a drop of the salt solution was added. The rice paper helped spread the drop and was removed once the salt solution had completely dried. After evaporation of 8 nm Pt–C the whole structure was rinsed with ultrapure water to dissolve the salt crystals and create the desired structure.

Figure 6 displays topography and KFM potential of such a perforated Pt–C film taken in air at ambient pressure. The measured potential difference between the 8 nm thick Pt–C film and the GaAs substrate is 540 mV which is smaller than the 800 mV $W_{\text{vac},\text{Pt–C}}^P = 5.6$ eV, $W_{\text{vac},\text{GaAs}}^P = 4.8$ V) reported for clean surfaces and thick films. We measured the KFM potential along the three lines indicated in Fig. 6(b), normalized the data using the total measured potential difference of 540 mV, and calculated the mean value of the measured responses. Figure 6(c) compares these mean responses (solid lines) with the modeled step responses (discrete points) for different tip–sample separations $h$. Again, we obtain good agreement between the predicted step response and the measured data. Near the transition ($|s|<500$ nm) the predicted response is slightly steeper than the experimentally observed response. This is not surprising because we used an ideal step potential for our simulations. In an actual potential distribution the transition is defined by the length of the space charge region, which always has a finite length.
IV. CONCLUSION

Kelvin probe force microscopy offers an attractive method to obtain high-resolution maps of the surface potential distribution on conducting and nonconducting samples. The technique is nondestructive and minimally invasive and therefore can be applied as a viable tool in integrated circuit (IC) analysis.\(^8,9,12\) Once the technique becomes quantitative and the actual surface potential distribution can be extracted from the measured values, KFM could substantially facilitate the design and experimental validation of new semiconductor devices. We have taken a first step in this direction by introducing a model which links the actual surface potential distribution to the measured KFM potential on ideally conducting and perfectly clean surfaces. It was shown that the observed KFM potential is a weighted average over all potentials \(\Phi_i\) on the surface, the derivatives of the capacitances between specimen and tip, \(C'_{ij}\), being the weighting factors [Eq. (8)]. Although, measured KFM potential maps can be deconvoluted in the case of perfectly flat and ideally conducting surfaces, such a linear and space-invariant relationship no longer exists for structured surfaces as typically encountered on integrated circuits. Nevertheless for the moderately structured test specimens reported here, our model could accurately predict the experimental data without any additional fitting parameters.

To improve resolution and accuracy of KFM even on highly structured surfaces special attention must be paid to the geometry of the tip and the cantilever. Our numerical simulations have shown that the cantilever surface predominates the local electrostatic interaction when the apex size is too small. In this case the cantilever "arm" will contribute to the observed electrostatic interaction in an orientation dependent manner. In KFM resolution, accuracy of the measured potential can be improved using a long and slender but slightly blunt tip supported by a cantilever of minimal width and surface area.
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