Jacquelyn Loven

Notes

12 June 2017

* It doesn’t make sense to not do the reference plane reset on each image because then the software makes you guess where the plane is visually, given a laser intensity profile. Each reference plane has been reset by excluding cracks and possible pileup regions as much as possible (loose) and by choosing the smallest possible rectangle around the indent without touching the indent (tight).
* Areas smaller than 5000 pixels are ignored to get just the indent.
* Just setting the reference plane is not enough to reliably catch indents in microscope slides at loads lower than 1961 mN. Also, primary radial cracks are picked up by the profiler as being part of the indent are when it’s just reference planed: Gaussian blur or height cutoff needed?
* For loads 1961 mN and above, how does where you choose your reference plane matter? Tight is an average of -3.27 ± 7.16 % different in area from loose.

13 June 2017

* Now to remove the effect of cracks in the area, I’m cutting the DCL/ BCL level down. Setting DCL = 1.00% and BCL = 99.5%.
* After doing this, the lower loads (less than 1961 mN) still need some more processing to get an area.
* Some notes about pictures of Caila’s indents:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **39.75 sample** | **Primary radials** | **Secondary radials** | **Median** | **Shallow laterals** | **Cone** |
| **490** |  |  | ? |  |  |
| **980** |  |  | ? | X |  |
| **1961** | X | X | ? | X |  |
| **2942** | X | X | ? | X |  |
| **4903** | X | X | ? | X |  |
| **9807** | X | X | ? | X |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **45.14 sample** | **Primary radials** | **Secondary radials** | **Median** | **Shallow laterals** | **Cone** |
| **490** |  |  | ? |  |  |
| **980** |  | X | ? |  |  |
| **1961** | X | X | ? |  |  |
| **2942** | X | X | ? |  |  |
| **4903** | X | X | ? | X |  |
| **9807** | X | X | ? | X |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **48.51 sample** | **Primary radials** | **Secondary radials** | **Median** | **Shallow laterals** | **Cone** |
| **245** |  |  | ? |  |  |
| **490** |  |  | ? |  |  |
| **980** |  | X | ? |  |  |
| **1961** | X | X | ? |  |  |
| **2942** | X | X | ? | X |  |
| **4903** | X | X | ? | X |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **60.61 sample** | **Primary radials** | **Secondary radials** | **Median** | **Shallow laterals** | **Cone** |
| **980** | X | X | ? |  |  |
| **1961** | X | X | ? | X |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **85.98 sample** | **Primary radials** | **Secondary radials** | **Median** | **Shallow laterals** | **Cone** |
| **980** |  |  | ? | X |  |
| **1961** |  |  | ? | X |  |
| **2942** | X |  | ? | X | X |
| **4903** | X | X | ? | X | X |
| **9807** | X | X | ? | X | X |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **89.93 sample** | **Primary radials** | **Secondary radials** | **Median** | **Shallow laterals** | **Cone** |
| **980** |  |  | ? | X | X |
| **1961** | X | X | ? | X |  |
| **2942** | X | X | ? | X | X |
| **4903** | X |  | ? | X |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **100 sample** | **Primary radials** | **Secondary radials** | **Median** | **Shallow laterals** | **Cone** |
| **245** |  |  | ? | X |  |
| **490** |  |  | ? | X |  |
| **980** | X |  | ? | X |  |
| **1961** | X | X | ? | X | X |
| **2942** | X | X | ? | X | X |
| **4903** | X |  | ? | X |  |
| **9807** | X | X | ? | X |  |

* Cone cracks start at 90% silica at high loads (2942 mN).
* Also I really don’t see the indentation size effect (ISE) upon looking again at old data.

14 June 2017

* I definitely see median cracks, or at least ones that extend to the center of the indent at loads of 1961 on microscope glass. Since they don’t come out the other side, it’s also possible they’re just extended radial cracks.
* 2 nm gold not enough. 8-10 nm carbon on top also not enough. It looks dirty but not opaque. Another 8-10 nm on top still isn’t good enough.

15 June 2017

* When I plane the profiles, the side that had the “largest pileup” changes. Planing looks like it changes the heights a lot.

16 June 2017

* I have no idea why my data is so bad for how planning affects pileup. Possibly the DCL/BCL cut is removing noise, and the pileup that I saw is just noise. But I need to do that in order to remove cracks from the area measurement.
* Today I think it is feasible to get plots of how cutoff height of the plane changes area measured. I don’t need to do any cutoff heights for the larger indents, so perhaps I should just ask for a higher mag lens.
* Exhausting one carbon pencil thing is doing the trick, on top of the other several depositions. If viewed under 10-20x on the microscope, the indent kind of looks black. Much easier to see the edges.
* I have successfully dumped another pencil’s worth of carbon onto the sample. I think the pictures are a little better? Difficult to tell.
* Looks like doing the height cutoff for the smaller indents loses about 10% of their area. I think I need a higher mag lens.
* Discuss w/ Nicole:   
  [DONE] Get a higher mag lens  
  [DONE] How to measure pileup better because how do I know if it’s noise or not? Hold off until you get bigger pileups.  
  Coating with carbon is sort of working- other ideas?  
  Where does it make sense to do the planing, like what’s an estimate for pileup width?  
  [DONE] What do median cracks look like? Like radials.
* TODO:  
  [DONE] Ask Darren about higher mag lens  
  [DONE] Metallize samples 10 nm, try indenting before and after  
  [DONE] Email Steve Kriske, cc Darren about AFM training (Asylum AFM).  
  Use markers to show where indents are. 2 indents, get xyz file, do planing and see if you get the same as the profiler.

19 June 2017

* I put down 10.8 nm of gold on 14 June B. It looks gorgeous! This might work.
* I put down 14.4 nm of gold on Sample June 19. It hasn’t been indented yet.

20 June 2017

* I am indenting sample June 19 that had 14.4 nm gold. 4 mm and 4 mm off each side from the corner is where it starts. 1 mm apart. 5 indents, 5 loads.
* Spraying the sample roughly with 70% isopropanol helps make the gold pileup inside the indent edges go down. Still, there’s some noise on the edges due to the gold.

21 June 2017

* The evaporator is broken today. In the meantime, I will try to code for noise reduction on data from smaller samples. Ideally, this data would look like what the AFM says.
* The evaporator is fixed! I’m thinking 20 - 25 nm of gold should do the trick.
* Woops! I put down an extra 105.5 nm of gold on sample 14 June B (now total 116.3 nm). Christ. I also didn’t rotate it. Well, it looks pretty defined in the optical microscope. Unusually, I don’t really see a pincushion shape and instead see mostly square indents. Possibly it is too thick a layer and is obscuring their shapes?
* I should ask about electroless plating. Asked Phil- now ask John.
* On sample 14 June B I added another 78.6 nm (total 194.9 nm). I don’t really notice a difference in how the optical microscope sees it…
* I sputtered for ~1 min 10 secs onto sample 14 June, Au-Pd. It’s supposed to be a more uniform layer. It’s quite black too.
* Dark field images are GORGEOUS. I need to bring my camera tomorrow and take images and see if my area detector can pick them up. Furthermore, there’s no significant difference in dark field between 10 and 200 nm, which is great, because now I can just make some samples with a lot less gold.

23 June 2017

* Testing the different glasses with indents, I get a different crack threshold from Caila’s data last year, but I get that 85% silica is weirdly crack resistant.

26 June 2017

* My data may be due simply to the fact that the glass is polished a lot nicer than it was for Caila.
* My error analysis shows that area changes linearly with cutoff height. After doing the derivation for a square pyramid with tip angle θ, I get , so it indeed looks like a change in h will make the same change in A.
* [DONE] Plot my crack fraction data like Caila’s data. Just primaries, and also both.  
  [DONE] Do Nicole’s 3 samples and do indentations to see effects of surface roughness, full gamut: [DONE] indent and profile them and update Nicole.  
  [DONE] Profile all new indents. See if roughness is different from Caila’s data.  
  [DONE] Look for new indenter tip.  
  [DONE] Put data on drive.  
  [DONE] Take dark field images.  
  Something useful this weekend would be to write a program to identify cracks.  
  [NEXT WEEK] AFM if possible.  
  See if cracks change over time.

27 June 2017

* This is gross. Caila’s data corresponds to a surface polish of ~1 µm, whereas my samples were polished at 0.5 µm.
* Something I didn’t do to the samples that are polished differently: I didn’t go to the lowest load on all of them, which would be good to have since it could tell me if small indents are affected by surface more than larger ones.

29 June 2017

* Taking gold palladium pictures under 20x in the darkfield microscope yields pretty clear images. I will ask for a camera for the scope.
* I also took pictures of the gold 200 nm. It also looks good.
* The surface of the 12 June carbon sample looks weird, like it’s covered in plates.

30 June 2017

* Before I start AFM, I know I can only do a few samples, so I need to choose. The problem right now is that the laser profiler can’t accurately measure the sizes of small indents due to thermal noise. My job is to see if my correction (moving the plane of reference down about 0.015 microns) alters the result in a linear fashion. I already have profiles of every indent except fused silica. Ideally, I AFM all loads to see the size of the small loads and verify the profiler’s reading of the large loads. I don’t have time for that. I should choose one glass sample, read two indents each of 245.2 and 490.3 mN indents, and maybe two of the 2942 mN indents.
* Okay, well it was impossible to find the small indents. Especially since they were so close to the edge of the sample. I am gonna come in with microscope slides with my small indents in the center for Thursday.
* Looks like the silica sample wasn’t polished? It looks like there are two sets of indents side by side.

4 July 2017

* No difference in hardness between differently polished samples. But cracks differ.

5 July 2017

* So what’s the plan? I need to remember that if my evaporator project isn’t complete in the next week, it doesn’t make it in the paper. I need to prove that it works. So, if I do a sample, laser profile it and get areas, and prove that my evaporator technique gets you closer to the real area than without it then it’s real progress. I also need to prove that this technique gets you closer to the real areas for the smaller indents, which I don’t actually know. AFM will hopefully tell me that tomorrow.
* Remainder of this week’s TODO:  
  [DONE] Check roughnesses of the glass of the 3 polished samples and see how that compares to Caila’s data.  
  Possibly a computer program to detect cracks.  
  Analyze the data I got last week to see how cracks change over time for the newly polished samples from Corning.  
  [DONE] Create samples for AFM tomorrow and for profiling and evaporating for proof of concept.  
  Run new images through original image processing software to see if it picks them up.
* So for the actual samples for AFM, etc.:  
  [DONE] One sample with the two smallest loads and one of the larger loads (maybe just the whole gamut?) on microscope glass. Profile this ahead of time. Mark clearly where the indents are.  
  One fully indented sample (all loads), which is profiled, analyzed with reticule method, and then evaporated for proof of concept. Requires working evaporation technique. Can be done next week.  
  [DONE] Five samples with three indents for each load for evaporator practice. Profile these ahead of time.
* Samples 5 July A, B, C, D, and E and each have 3 indents each for 9807, 4903, 980.7, and 490.3. Sample 5 July is for AFM.
* Roughness parameters in the Keyence software:  
  Sa is mean height. Extension of linear Ra.  
  Sz is max height from lowest part to highest part. Extension of linear Rz.  
  Sdr is how much extra surface area you get from the roughness as opposed to a plane (0).  
  Spc is the inverse of the size of curvature of objects sticking out of the surface.
* Inconclusive what the “real” roughness of Caila’s indents is (it’s hard because I didn’t clean them prior to profiling). My newly polished samples, nominally at 0.5 µm, check out and seem to be between 0.5 µm and 1 µm.
* Samples D and E have yet to be profiled.
* Doesn’t look like there’s anything particularly interesting with the cracks over time on my newly polished samples from Corning. Cracks over time increase for the four highest silica content glasses, and even then they don’t increase by that much. Not sure why it’s so much more dramatic for the older samples.