Thin-Film Microsusceptometer With Integrated Nanoloop
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Abstract—We report the design and performance of thin-film microsusceptometers intended for magnetic measurements on samples at variable temperature down to the low mK range and excitation frequencies of up to about 1 MHz. The devices are realized as first-order gradiometers with two circular loops of 60 µm or 30 µm average diameter resulting in a total inductance of 360 pH or 250 pH, respectively. An integrated excitation coil generates a magnetic field with a transfer coefficient of 0.1 T/A at the sample position, whereas the Josephson junctions are located in a field-reduced area. The susceptometers are fabricated by a conventional Nb/AlOx/Nb trilayer process. In order to enhance the sensitivity to the level required for the measurement of sub-µm samples, an extra detection loop of 450 nm inner diameter was integrated into one of the pickup loops by using a focused ion beam (FIB). We show that this device is able of detecting signals from very small permalloy samples. An optimized susceptometer design with a predicted SQUID inductance of 12 pH is also presented, that can achieve an equivalent spin noise of 8 µµµ/Hz at 4.2 K (µ is the Bohr magneton) when being equipped with a nanoloop of 100 nm line width and separation.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Superconducting quantum interference devices (SQUIDs) are sensitive detectors for weak magnetic signals. Commonly, they are designed with microscale dimensions and fabricated using well-established, reliable multilayer thin-film processes. The voltage-vs.-flux characteristic is a periodic function with the period being the flux quantum \( φ_0 = 2.068×10^{-15} \) Vs. A feedback coil is integrated into the device in order to operate it in a flux-locked loop (FLL) that linearizes the transfer function.

The inductance of the SQUID loop is typically around \( L \approx 100 \) pH which results in low flux noise levels of about \( 1 \) µµµ/√Hz. At low frequencies, usually below 10 Hz, 1/f excess noise is observed.

The growing interest in the investigation of nanoscale samples stimulated the development of so-called nanoSQUIDs, i.e., devices with overall loop dimension in the sub-µm regime (see, e.g., [1] and references therein). There are two basic benefits from the down-scaling of the device dimensions: (1) the coupling between sample and sensing loop is improved, and (2) the inductance of the SQUID ring and the capacitance of the Josephson junctions are lowered to \( L < 1 \) pH and \( C < 0.1 \) pF, respectively. Theoretically, with such low values of \( L \) and \( C \), flux noise levels of the order of \( 10 \) nµµµ/√Hz should be possible at \( T = 4.2 \) K. Unfortunately, due to limitations in junction fabrication, the best noise levels of today’s nanoSQUIDs are much higher, \( 0.2 \) µµµ/√Hz with 1/f corner frequencies above 10 Hz [2], [3]. It is interesting to note that the same white noise levels are achieved at 4.2 K both with conventional SQUIDs if the inductance is reduced to about \( 10 \) pH [4] and with SQUIDs read out in a dispersive mode [5]. Furthermore, it is difficult to achieve a good coupling between a feedback coil and a sub-µm loop [6] for which reason nanoSQUIDs are mostly not equipped with a feedback coil. The remaining main benefits of nanoSQUIDs are their good coupling to nanoscale samples and their ability for operation in high magnetic fields. In this paper, we describe how SQUIDs fabricated in conventional technology can be upgraded by a single nanopatterning step to compete with the performance of nanoSQUIDs.

II. BASIC CONCEPT

The basic idea is illustrated in Fig. 1 by three representative pickup loop configurations labeled A-C. Loop A exhibits a minimum line width and spacing of 1.5 µm; it can thus be fabricated with conventional optical lithography. In case B, a quasi-circular nanoloop (approximated by a regular octagon) is added by removing material from the microloop. This nano-loop is connected in series to the microloop. An inner diameter of 300 nm and a minimum line width and spacing of 100 nm are assumed, which require advanced patterning techniques. As shown in case C, the dimension of the nanoloop can be further reduced, resulting in a narrow end piece shaped like loop A but with a minimized gap of 100 nm instead of 1.5 µm.

For a practical susceptometer, two series-connected pickup loops are wired as a first-order gradiometer in order to minimize the output signal without sample [7]-[9]. The net
magnetic flux $\Phi$ in the SQUID is the sum of the fluxes in both pickup loops. To determine the SQUID’s sensitivity to nanoscale samples, we calculate the total flux that a point-like magnetic dipole of magnetic moment $\mu$ couples to the nearby pickup loop $L_p$. The dipole is assumed as a planar current loop with a London penetration depth $\lambda_L = 0$ (solid lines) or by a normal conductor (dashed lines). A film thickness of 100 nm is assumed. The magnetic field is calculated along the horizontal lines in Fig. 1 at a height $z = 50$ nm above the substrate surface; here, due to symmetry, $B_y$ has a $z$-component only.

$$\Phi = \mu \frac{B_y}{I_p}.$$  

Equation (1) shows that the transfer coefficient $B_y/I_p$ is a figure of merit for the coupling between a magnetic dipole and the pickup loop. It may be specified in units of T/A or $\Phi_y/\mu_B$ where $\mu_B = 9.274 \times 10^{-24}$ Am$^2$ is the Bohr magneton.

To demonstrate the gain of the nanoloop, we simulated $B_y/I_p$ for the three cases in Fig. 1 using the COMSOL Multi-physics® finite element program package. To simplify the simulation, we have considered two approximations for the Nb thin-film: ideal diamagnet with zero London penetration depth $\lambda_L$, or normal conductor. For the nanoloops B and C in Fig. 1 the deviations between these two cases are quite moderate, i.e., the “true” result will depend only weakly on $\lambda_L$ (cf. Fig. 2). In contrast, for the microscale pickup loop A the normal conductor approximation significantly underestimates the magnetic field because screening currents in the wide Nb film strongly affect the current distribution. Due to the large loop dimensions as compared to the penetration depth $\lambda_L$, the approximation $\lambda_L = 0$ is expected to yield realistic results if the distance between sample and coil edge is larger than a few $\lambda_L$. With a sample near the coil center, a roughly ten-fold improvement in $B_y/I_p$ is predicted for the smallest nanoloop C compared to loop A.

III. EXPERIMENTAL VERIFICATION

To verify the predictions, the circuit line of one of the loops in a susceptorometer was modified using a 48 pA focused beam of Ga$^+$ ions (FIB) in a Dual-Beam Helios NanoLab$^\text{TM}$ 600 system from FEI. As a result, we obtained a nanoloop with an inner diameter of $\approx 450$ nm and a line width of $\approx 250$ nm (see inset in Fig. 3). The thickness of the bottom Nb was $\approx 250$ nm.

We measured the main characteristics of the SQUID susceptometer (current-voltage and voltage-flux curves, noise) before and after performing the FIB lithography, without noticing any appreciable changes. We only observed a small (0.4%) change in the mutual inductance imbalance of the two pickup loops with respect to the excitation coils, due to the removal of some superconducting material.

In order to fabricate a sufficiently small test sample, we deposited, using electron-beam evaporation, a 125 nm thick permalloy layer on a 50 nm PELO® silicon nitride support film, commonly used for the preparation of transmission electron microscopy samples. Then a small piece of this
sample was cut with the FIB and moved close to the nanoloop using an Omniprobe manipulator working inside the Helios 600 and monitored by SEM.

Fig. 4 shows the result of the test sample measurement performed at 4.2 K. The signal arising from the sample was obtained by subtracting the output of the empty susceptometer, which had been measured previously under identical conditions. The in-phase signal $\chi'$ shows a weak, close to logarithmic, dependence on frequency below 10 kHz, with a partial roll-off above this frequency. In agreement with Kramers-Kronig relations, the out-of-phase signal $\chi''$ increases with frequency. This behavior has been observed for other soft magnetic materials, such as Co based amorphous alloys [10]. It reflects the existence of a variety of magnetic relaxation processes, giving rise to a broad distribution of relaxation times. In nanometer-thick permalloy disks with diameters ranging from 100 nm to 1-2 microns, i.e., close to the dimensions of the sample used in the present experiments, such processes are associated with the depinning, either by thermal activation [11] or quantum tunneling [12], of a magnetic vortex [13,14]. The device reported in this work provides then, because of its geometry and enhanced sensitivity, a unique tool for directly measuring the vortex core transverse magnetization dynamics of individual soft magnetic disks, within a very broad frequency range and down to very low temperatures.

IV. IMPROVED SUSCEPTOMETER DESIGN

Stimulated by the promising experimental results, we designed two miniaturized susceptometers intended for nanoloop integration. The basic characteristics of the new types SN and SU are summarized in Table I along with those of the existing types SM and SS. A common feature of the susceptometers is that the pickup loops $L_p$ are directly forming the SQUID loop. Except for type SU, a separate feedback loop $L_f$ is connected in series to the pickup loops for applying a feedback flux. The separation of feedback and pickup loops ensures that the feedback flux does not affect the magnetic field at the sample position. The total SQUID inductance is given by

$$L = 2 \left( L_p + L_f + L_S \right)$$  \hspace{1cm} (2)

where $L_S$ is the stray inductance of one half of the symmetric SQUID. Note that a second dummy inductance $L_d$ has to be added for maximal symmetry/balance.

The first of the miniaturized devices (type SN) is basically a further development of our previous susceptometers (cf. Figs. 3 and 5). The center part is adopted nearly unmodified, but the large pickup loops are shrunk to a minimum (1.5 µm line width and spacing with our optical lithography), and the 11-turn excitation coils were replaced by single Nb1 lines closely surrounding the pickup loops. As both excitation and pickup loops are implemented in the same layer, effects from mask.

Fig. 5. Design of the miniaturized microsusceptometer (type SN) intended for equipment with a nanoloop. The center part of the existing susceptometers was taken nearly unmodified, but the large 11-turn excitation coils were replaced by small single-turn current loops. The minimum line width is 2.5 µm except for the pickup loop where 1.5 µm wide Nb1 lines are used. The layer NoSiN defines holes in the Si3N4 insulation between Nb1 and Nb2. The contacts of feedback and excitation coils are marked by F and E, respectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE I: NOMINAL SUSCEPTOMETER CHARACTERISTICS AT 4.2 K</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PTB type (main category)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average pickup loop diameter, $d_p$ (µm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pickup loop line width, $w_p$ (µm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excitation coil constant, $B_i/I_i$ (T/A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback coil sensitivity, $1/M_f$ (mA.AΦ0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pickup loop inductance, $L_p$ (pH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback loop inductance, $L_f$ (pH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stray inductance per SQUID half, $L_d$ (pH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total SQUID inductance, $L$ (pH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flux noise in 2stage setup, $\Phi_0$ (µΦ0/Hz)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Predicted performance without nanoloop.
misalignment are suppressed. Due to the minimal gap between the lines, a relatively high excitation coil sensitivity $B_0/I_E$ of about 0.06 T/A is achieved. The excitation coil is designed as a second-order gradiometer such that the magnetic stray field has a zero-crossing at the position of the Josephson junctions (JJs). The coplanar Nb1 interconnect lines are covered with Nb2 plates (separated by the Si$_x$N$_y$ isolation layer) in order to lower the stray inductance contribution $L_S$. The high-field region near the sample was kept free from covers to minimize excitation field distortion and to reduce problems with flux jumps at high fields [4]. The susceptometer is integrated on a 3.3 mm $\times$ 3.3 mm chip together with a 16-SQUID series array for readout in a two-stage (2stage) configuration (cf. Fig. 6). This prevents a noticeable loss in sensitivity caused by the Josephson junctions. The quoted self and mutual inductances are estimated from the layout. The contact pads are labeled with $\pm V$, $\pm E$ and $\pm F1/2$ according to the terminology used for our other SQUID sensors.

V. CONCEPT FOR MINIMUM SQUID INDUCTANCE

With the susceptometer design SN and our current fabrication process, a SQUID inductance $L \approx 50 \mu$H and a flux noise $\sqrt{S_0} \approx 0.5 \mu\Phi_0/\sqrt{Hz}$ are practical lower limits. To obtain a substantially lower noise of 0.2 $\mu\Phi_0/\sqrt{Hz}$, we developed a new susceptometer design SU based on our microSQUIDs (cf. Table I) [4]. These microSQUIDs are realized as first-order series gradiometers like the susceptometers. They have a minimized SQUID inductance $L \approx 10 \mu$H, but just one weakly coupled, quarter-turn coupling coil on each washer. Although it is possible in principle to apply both feedback flux and excitation field via the same coils, it is preferable in practice to have the coupling coils isolated from each other (in particular at high excitation frequencies).

In order to couple two galvanically isolated coils to each pickup loop with a sufficiently high mutual inductance, we introduce a separate coupling transformer. The corresponding layout and equivalent circuit are depicted in Figs. 6 and 7, respectively. Both the feedback current $I_{F1}$ and excitation current $I_E$ are passed through the single-turn primaries of the coupling transformer (right side in Fig. 6). The secondary of the coupling transformer is directly connected to a segment of the pickup loop. The screening current $I_{C1}$ flows through this segment thereby creating a flux in the SQUID. The other coupling transformer (not depicted in Fig. 6 for clarity) is identically constructed. With this concept, as many coils as required can be efficiently coupled to a small pickup loop without increasing the SQUID inductance by a contribution $L_F$ as for the devices described in the previous section.

There are several details considered in the new design. As for the previous devices, there is no material other than bottom Nb in the area intended for nanoloop patterning. The net stray fields of coupling transformers and pickup loops partially cancel at the location of the Josephson junctions. The 55 $\mu$H secondary inductance of the coupling transformer is much higher than the 0.5-1.5 $\mu$H segment of the pickup coil to which it is connected (cf. Fig. 7). This prevents a noticeable loss in sensitivity caused by the parallel connection of the two inductors. The area of the coupling washer is kept small in order to minimize screening currents from applied magnetic fields. For example, the 50 $\mu$T Earth field will cause a tolerable screening current of about 0.7 mA.

VI. CONCLUSION

We have presented a scheme for integrating a nanoscale pickup loop into a microscale SQUID. This combination takes advantage of the high reliability and reproducibility of modern trilayer SQUID fabrication. For the susceptometer with the lowest SQUID inductance, $L \approx 12 \mu$H, a flux noise level of 0.2 $\mu\Phi_0/\sqrt{Hz}$ is predicted at 4.2 K comparable with today’s best nanoSQUIDs. By patterning a nanoloop of 100 nm minimum line width and spacing into the pickup loop, transfer coefficients of up to 25 $n\Phi_0/\mu_0$ can be obtained, which allows for a very low equivalent spin noise down to 8 $\mu_B/\sqrt{Hz}$ at 4.2 K. The
noise level could be further improved by using smaller Josephson junctions, which also reduces the effect of the excitation field on the junctions [3, 17]. Another option is cooling the devices to mK temperatures. For our SQUIDs, the noise levels off below about 300 mK, yielding a minimum rms noise of ≃30% of the 4.2 K value. For the 12 pH susceptometer we expect a minimum flux noise of 60 nΦ0/√Hz, a factor of two above the value recently reported for a SQUID with dispersive readout operated at 25 mK [18]. Combining low operation temperatures with sub-μm junctions could allow for an equivalent spin noise level of 1 μG/√Hz. However, this approach is limited to high signal frequencies due to excess low-frequency noise typically observed at mK temperatures [19].

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors thank S. Bechstein, M. Fleischer-Bartsch, and M. Klemm for susceptorometer characterization, and C. Aßmann for helpful discussions on nanopatterning.

REFERENCES