#### Repetition

Current-phase and **voltage-phase** relation are classical, but have quantum origin (macroscopic quantum model)

 $\rightarrow$  Primary quantum macroscopic effects

Quantization of conjugate variable pairs such as (I, V) or  $(Q, \varphi)$ 

 $\mathcal{H} = -4E_C \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \varphi^2} + E_{J0}(1 - \cos\varphi)$ 

 $\rightarrow$  Secondary quantum macroscopic effects

Canonical quantization, operator replacement

$$\frac{\hbar}{2e}Q \to -i\hbar\frac{\partial}{\partial\varphi} \qquad \qquad p \to -i\hbar\frac{\partial}{\partial x}$$

$$ightarrow$$
 Hamiltonian for single JJ

Commutation rules  $\rightarrow [\varphi, Q] = i2e$ ;  $[\varphi, N] = i$  or  $[\varphi, \frac{\hbar}{2e}Q] = i\hbar$ 

 $N \equiv Q/2e$ : deviation of the CP number in the electrodes from equilibrium

Heisenberg uncertainty relation  $\Delta N \cdot \Delta \varphi \geq 1$ 

... Motivation



More than quantization effects  $\rightarrow$  Coherence, superposition, entanglement

→ Superconducting circuits offer quantum resources!

Applications in Quantum information processing, simulation & communication Tests of fundamental quantum mechanics





#### $\rightarrow$ Experimental challenges:

Ultralow-power measurements & millikelvin cryotechnology

#### ... Millikelvin temperatures

#### **Dilution refrigerator**

Continuous cooling method using a liquid mixture of <sup>3</sup>He and <sup>4</sup>He

- → Phase separation below  $\simeq 900 \text{ mK}$ (Concentrated & dilute phase)
- → In dilute phase  $\simeq 6\%$  <sup>3</sup>He even for  $T \rightarrow 0$



- $\rightarrow$  Pump on dilute (heavy) phase
- $\rightarrow$  Remove mainly <sup>3</sup>He
- ightarrow 3He has to diffues from concentrated phase over the phase boundary
- $\rightarrow$  Cooling power (heat taken from environment)

 $\rightarrow$  Can easily reach 20 – 50 mK  $\rightarrow$  Suitable for investigating quantum junctions

#### ... Millikelvin temperatures

#### **Dilution refrigerator**

WMI-made microwave-ready dilution refrigerators



Qubit lab wet cryostat → wired and in operation



Cirqus lab wet cryostat → wired and in operation since 2013



K21 lab dry cryostat (very large) → in operation since 2014



Making quantum junctions is demanding from a technological point of view
 Advanced nanofabrication techniques required!

#### Materials for superconducting circuits

#### **Typical superconductors**

#### $\rightarrow$ Nb

- → Type-II superconductor,  $T_{\rm c} \approx 9 {\rm K}$
- ightarrow Fast measurements at 4K possible
- $\rightarrow$  Shadow evaporation for nanoscale junction not possible

#### $\rightarrow$ AI

- ightarrow Type-I superconductor,  $T_{
  m c} \approx 1.5 {
  m K}$
- $\rightarrow$  Measurements require millikelvin temperatures
- $\rightarrow$  Shadow evaporation possible (stable oxide)

#### Normal metals

- $\rightarrow$  Mainly Au (no natural oxide layer)
- ightarrow For on-chip resistors and passivation layers

#### **Dielectric substrates**

- $\rightarrow$  Silicon, sapphire
- $\rightarrow$  Contribute to dielectric losses ( $T_1$ )

#### Micro- and nanopatterning of superconducting circuits

#### Lithography

- $\rightarrow$  Define pattern
- $\rightarrow$  Optical lithography (UV)
- $\rightarrow$  Electron beam lithography (EBL)

#### Thin-film deposition

- $\rightarrow$  Deposit materials
- $\rightarrow$  DC sputtering (metals)
- $\rightarrow$  RF sputtering (insulators)
- $\rightarrow$  Electron beam evaporation (metals)
- $\rightarrow$  Epitaxial growth (Molecular beam epitaxy)

#### Processing

- $\rightarrow$  Positive pattern  $\rightarrow$  Lift-off
  - ightarrow Deposit material only where you want it
- → Negative pattern → Etching
  - $\rightarrow$  Deposit material everywhere
  - $\rightarrow$  Remove what you don't want



#### Submicron dimensions

- ightarrow EBL instead of optical lithography
- ightarrow Same principle, but resist and exposure different

T. Niemczyk, PhD Thesis (2011)

#### **Etching process**

- $\rightarrow$  Example: Superconducting transmission line (Nb)
- $\rightarrow$  Etching technique for well-defined edges  $\rightarrow$  Minimize microwave losses





#### Submicron dimension

- $\rightarrow$  EBL instead of optical lithography
- $\rightarrow$  Same principle, but resist and exposure different

T. Niemczyk, PhD Thesis (2011)

### Lift-off process

 $\rightarrow$  **Example:** Au on-chip wiring for Al junctions and SQUIDs







#### **Etching vs. Lift-off process**

	Lift-off	etching
Well-defined edges (no "teeth")		<b>-</b>
Resist choice independent from film growth process		
Remaining substrate undisturbed		

Challenges in micro- and nanofabrication

- $\rightarrow$  Complex procedure with large parameter space
- ightarrow Optimization requires controlled and reproducible conditions
- $\rightarrow$  Cleanroom
  - $\rightarrow$  Low number of dust particles due to special filters & air conditioning
  - $\rightarrow$  Controlled temperature and humidity

ightarrow Small changes to a working process can have a huge impact on the result

→ Highly systematic step-by-step approach mandatory!

#### Spin coating

Goal  $\rightarrow$  Cover substrate with uniform layer of lithography resist

#### Principle

- ightarrow Distribute resist drop by fast rotation of the substrate
- ightarrow Substrate is held in place by vacuum chuck



#### Simple spin coating model

Complex process  $\rightarrow$  Simplifying assumptions

- $\rightarrow$  No resist solvent evaporation
- $\rightarrow$  Infinitely large substrate
- $\rightarrow$  Applied liquid radially symmetric
- $\rightarrow$  Gravitation and Coriolis effects negligible
- → Newtonian liquid (linear shear forces)
- ightarrow Appreciable shear resistance only in horizontal planes

$$F_{\rm centrifugal} = F_{\rm viscous\,resisting}$$

$$\rho\omega^2 r = -\eta \frac{\partial^2 v_{\eta}}{\partial z^2}$$

 $\begin{array}{l}\rho \rightarrow \text{resist density}\\\eta \rightarrow \text{resist viscosity}\\v_r \rightarrow \text{radial velocity}\\h \rightarrow \text{liquid surface}\end{array}$ 

Integrate with boundary conditions  $v_r(z=0) = 0$  and  $\frac{\partial v_r}{\partial z}\Big|_{z=h} = 0$ 

$$v_r = \frac{\rho \omega^2 r}{\eta} \left( -\frac{z^2}{2} + hz \right)$$

A. G. Emslie et al., J. of Appl. Phys. 29, 858-862 (1958)

#### **Overview**

 $v_r = \frac{\rho \omega^2 r}{\eta} \left( -\frac{z^2}{2} + hz \right)$ 

Radial flow per unit length of circumference

$$q_r = \int_0^h dz \ v_r = Krh^3$$
  $K \equiv \frac{\rho\omega^2}{3\eta}$   $q_\theta = q_z = 0$ 

Equation of continuity (cylindrical coordinates)

$$\frac{\partial h}{\partial t} = -\nabla \begin{pmatrix} q_r \\ q_\theta \\ q_z \end{pmatrix} = -\frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial (rq_r)}{\partial r} = -\frac{K}{r} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} (r^2 h^3) \qquad \nabla F(r,\theta,z) = \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial (rF_r)}{\partial r} + \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial F_\theta}{\partial \theta} + \frac{\partial F_z}{\partial z}$$

Strong tendency to flatten for arbitrary initial surfaces  $\rightarrow h(r,t) = h(t)$ 

$$h(t) = \frac{h_0}{\sqrt{1 + 4Kh_0^2 t}} \qquad h_0 \equiv h(t = 0) \text{ is initial thickness}$$

Include evaporation  $\rightarrow$  Practical importance, more complicated model

Typical thickness  $\rightarrow 50 \text{nm} - 1 \mu \text{m}$ 

A. G. Emslie et al., J. of Appl. Phys. 29, 858-862 (1958)

.4 mm

25.

#### **Resist surface defects**

#### Edge beads

→ Real substrate has finite size
 → Resist thicker near substrate edges
 → Either removal with special mask
 → Or cut small chip after spinnig large substrate



Photograph

# Reflectometry measurement



Fingers → Not enough resist volume



Air pockets

→ Resist not applied smoothly



Comets
 → Dirt particles on the substrate

F. Sterr, Diplom Thesis (2013)

#### **Resist surface defects**

#### Striations

- ightarrow Wavy radially oriented resist thickness fluctuations
- $\rightarrow$  Period: 50 200 $\mu$ m, height: few tens of nm
- → Local evaporation efficiency variations during the transisiton from the flow-dominated to the evaporation-dominated regime
- → Prevention: Increase spin speed, IPA atmosphere, careful resist handling





F. Sterr, Diplom Thesis (2013)

#### Limits of optical lithography

Abbe diffraction limit for far-field imaging systems

$$d = \frac{\lambda}{2(n\sin\theta)} \ge \frac{\lambda}{3}$$
  
Numerical aperture

(1.4 in modern optics)

- $\lambda \rightarrow$  wave length
- $n \rightarrow$  refractive index

 $\theta \rightarrow$  convergence angle

 $d \rightarrow \text{spot size}$ 

UV light  $\rightarrow d$  is few hundreds of nm, in practice often  $1 - 2\mu m$  $\rightarrow$  Use accelerated electrons instead

#### Advantages

→ At 30 kV acceleration voltage  $\lambda_e = h \sqrt{2 e V m_e} \approx 0.007 \mathrm{nm}$ 

- $\rightarrow$  In practice,  $d \approx 1 \text{ nm}$  because electrons interact with the substrate
- $\rightarrow$  "Electron optics" available (magnetic and electrostatic lenses)

#### Disadvantages

- $\rightarrow$  Technical complication
- $\rightarrow$  Lower throughtput
- ightarrow Higher cost of operation

#### Working principle of electron beam lithography (EBL)



Old WMI EBL system: Philipps scanning electron microscope (SEM) XL30sFEG extended with a Raith laser stage



#### F. Sterr, Diplom Thesis (2013)

Working principle of electron beam lithography (EBL)



New WMI EBL system

- $\rightarrow$  Nanobeam nb5
- $\rightarrow$  Up to 100 kV acceleration voltage
  - → Strongly reduced "natural" undercut from backscattered electrons
  - → Undercut now deliberately designed during the process
- $\rightarrow$  Large beam current  $\rightarrow$  Fast
- → Few nm resolution (in practice mostly resist limited)
- → Heavily automated (operated "from the office")
  - → Advantage: fewer user-dependent parameers in the process
  - $\rightarrow$  Better reproducibility

#### **Shadow evaporation**

Key fabrication technique for Al/AlO<sub>x</sub>/Al Josephson junctions with submicron lateral dimensions







J. Schuler, PhD Thesis (2005)



R. Gross, A. Marx, F. Deppe, and K. Fedorov © Walther-Meißner-Institut (2001 - 2020)

# Evaporation of the first Al layer

Courtesy of J. Schuler

R. Gross, A. Marx, F. Deppe, and K. Fedorov © Walther-Meißner-Institut (2001 - 2020)



Evaporation of the second Al layer

Courtesy of J. Schuler



R. Gross, A. Marx, F. Deppe, and K. Fedorov © Walther-Meißner-Institut (2001 - 2020)

# After resist removal (liftoff)



F. Deppe *et al.*, Phys. Rev. B 76, 214503 (2007) T. Niemczyk et al., Supercond. Sci. Technol. 22, 034009 (2009)



2 µm

