

# THE UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO

# Brief Intro to Vamsi & Daniel's presentation:

Motivation, hypothesis, and appreciation

**Victor Karpov** 

Dept. of Physics and Astronomy The University of Toledo, Toledo, OH, USA.

#### Motivation

- What determines MW diameters remaining almost the same in the process of longitudinal growth? \*(Note: MW thickness in micron range, much greater than the nano-sizes of the typical nuclei in solids)
- What determines their statistical distributions? \*\*
- \* Thank you Steve Smith pointing to me at the importance of that questions.
- \*\*Thank you Lyudmyla Panashchenko & Mike Osterman and Steph Meschter & Polina Snugovsky for making their data available.

# Motivation (continued)

- Can MW have some internal structure at nano-scale?
  - Motivated by
    - The well known longitudinal striations on MW surfaces
    - Asymmetric random cross-sections strongly deviating from the circular
    - Voids inside MW (hollow whiskers) reported
    - Thermal stability of Sn MW depends on the film deposition, evaporated vs. electro-deposited:
      - Under a focused ion beam, local melting of comparable MW is easier on the evaporated than on electroplated structure pointing at some internal structure inherited from the film \*
    - The electrostatic theory does not describe the facts as is.

\*Thank you Vamsi and Daniel for sharing the observation

# Hypothesis: massive nucleation and co-growth of multiple thin filaments = nanostructure of whiskers



Thank you Vamsi and Daniel for your interesting experiments and effort! Thank you Bill for inviting this talk.

#### Part – 1: Whisker characterization

Vamsi Borra Daniel G. Georgiev

Dept. of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, The University of Toledo, Toledo, OH, USA.

# Outline

- Samples
- Characterization
- Tools
- Whisker FIB and TEM analysis (Part 1)
  Whisker cross-section study
  - TEM sample preparation

#### Characterization **Samples preparation Electroplating:**

- Cu coupons were mechanically • polished with silicon carbide sand paper and machine polished using alumina slurry (50nm).
- Cleaned and then electroplated from • sodium stannate bath.



Before polishing

After polishing

um

#### **Evaporation**:

Sn samples were prepared by evaporating Sn pellets from tungsten boats onto the Cu coated glass substrate.





# Characterization

#### Techniques employed:

- Scanning electron microscopy (SEM)
- Energy-dispersive x-ray spectroscopy (EDS)
- Focused ion beam (FIB)
- Transmission electron microscopy (TEM)





# Characterization

Tools:

- SEM 2nm @ 1kV
- FIB (Dual beam)
  - Ion beam:10nm @ 30 kV (1pA), Ga source
  - Electron beam : 1.2 nm @ 30kV (HV)





- TEM 200 kV 0.203 nm TE, ZC, SE
  - Each instrument is equipped with its own EDS detectors.



2.

FIB-milling:



Two goals:

1. Whisker cross-section analysis.

**TEM sample** 

preparation.



Whisker cross-section Unpublished



Milling (ion-beam) and imaging (electron beam) done simultaneously

Ion-beam can be used to take images (gives more details)

Whisker TEM image Unpublished

FIB illustration: http://www.fibics.com/

#### Whisker FIB-TEM analysis

FIB-milling: cross-section

Imp. notes:

- 1. Au-Pd coating to guard sample and whisker from Platinum.
- 2. Platinum deposition to protect whisker from ion source.



Ga+ sputtering out sample



Whisker starting to bend



FIB-milling: cross-section (Evaporated sample)



Select a whisker

Dep Pt (low current)

Start milling (again low current)

- Small whiskers are better to work with.
- Optimized beam current is used during Pt deposition.
- Milling process is done with low beam current as well.
- Above SE images are taken at an angle (52 deg).

#### Whisker FIB-TEM analysis Cross-section analysis (Evaporated sample)



The smaller SEM image to the left is the original whisker before the FIB work. Red arrows in all the 3 figures point to voids, which should not be confused with IMCs. The bottom one is an ion beam picture (blue box) of the same whisker and it clearly shows the contrast difference between different materials, uniform Cu layer, inherent voids and the layers with no signs of IMCs. The scale bar in all the three images is 1µm.

#### Cross-section analysis (Evaporated sample)



Above are the close-up scans of the cross-section clearly showing the layer separation, no signs of IMCs.

#### Whisker FIB-TEM analysis FIB-milling: cross-section (Electroplated sample)







Whisker before milling

Pt deposition

**Milled whisker** 

 Whiskers in this case sustained a little higher beam currents than whiskers that grew on evaporated sample. This may be due to the oxide layer on the whisker's surface or any other reasons.

#### Cross-section analysis (Electroplated sample)





#### Cross-section analysis (Electroplated sample)



Z-contrast images (BSED)



- Z-contrast and ion images showing more details of the layers.
- Cross-section reveals no signs of IMCs.



lon-beam image

FIB-milling: TEM sample (whisker)

- Transmitted Electrons (TE) are required for our micro-structural examination.
- TEMs need <u>electron transparent</u> samples.
- Typical thickness values ~50nm to ~200nm.
- So, we have to mill our whisker to electron transparent thickness.



**TEM principle** 



TEM transparent sample in red box

#### FIB-milling: general TEM sample preparation steps



- Sample lift-out was carried using a in-situ nano-manipulator.
- After final cleaning, sample is transferred to TEM.

#### FIB-milling: Whisker TEM sample



Success and failures

#### Whisker TEM analysis:

- Part -2: To be presented next week
- TEM analysis
  - TE imaging
  - BS imaging
- EDS analysis
- SAPD
- Discussion
- Conclusions



