



# Effect of a Physical Phase Plate on Contrast Transfer in an Aberration-Corrected Transmission Electron Microscope

### <u>B. Gamm<sup>1</sup></u>, K. Schultheiss<sup>1</sup>, D. Gerthsen<sup>1</sup>, R.R. Schröder<sup>2</sup>

1 Laboratorium für Elektronenmikroskopie, Universität Karlsruhe, D-76128 Karlsruhe, Germany 2 CellNetworks, BioQuant, Universität Heidelberg, D-69120 Heidelberg, Germany

### Contact: gamm@lem.uni-karlsruhe.de

# **Motivation**

- Novel TEM imaging techniques by realization of "physical" phase plates (PP) [1]
- Cs-corrector [2,3] allows in principle full correction of aberrations up to the fifth order, but contrast vanishes for weak-phase objects without aberrations
- Combining Cs-correction and an ideal phase plate yields optimal contrast with full correction of aberrations



# **Quantification of Phase Contrast**

 Influence of defocus and Cs-values on phase contrast (PC) quantified by integrating the PCTF

$$PC = \int_{0}^{u_{\inf}} E_{t} E_{s} \left| \sin \left( \chi_{pp} \right) \right| du$$



We apply the weak-phase object approximation to explore ranges for defocus Z and Cs-values resulting in optimal imaging conditions, for both phase plate imaging and conventional Cs-corrected imaging

Fig. 1: Scheme of physical phase plate positioned in the back focal plane (BFP) of the objective lens; phase shifting of either diffracted of undiffracted electrons

Fig. 1: PP positioned in the BFP of the objective lens

# Phase Contrast Transfer

- Imaging of weak-phase objects is commonly described by the phase contrast transfer function (PCTF)
- The object wave function is Fourier transformed and multiplied by the PCTF given as

 $PCTF(u) = E(u) \cdot \sin(\chi) \qquad \qquad \chi = \pi \left( Z\lambda u^2 + \frac{1}{2}C_S\lambda^3 u^4 \right)$ 

 Optimal phase contrast in TEM without Cs-corrector at Scherzer defocus with corresponding Scherzer resolution:

 $Z_{Sch} = -\sqrt{\frac{4}{3}C_{S}\lambda}$   $u_{Sch} = 1.52(C_{s}\lambda^{3})^{-1/4}$ 

• Phase distortion function  $\chi$  with a phase plate in the back focal plane of the microscope:

 $\chi_{PP} = \pi (Z\lambda u^2 + \frac{1}{2}C_S\lambda^3 u^4) + \phi_{PP}$ 

• Optimal phase contrast conditions for uncorrected phase plate imaging

Comparison with optimal phase contrast

 $PC_{id} = \int_{0}^{u_{inf}} E_t E_s du$ 

 Fig. 4: PC for a 200 keV phase plate microscope and a normal 200 keV microscope; black lines denote 5% (10%) reduction with respect to PC<sub>id</sub>.

 $\frac{PC_{id} - PC}{PC_{id}} < 0.05 \ (0.1)$ 

• Consideration of Delocalization R: white lines in Fig. 4 denote delocalization corresponding to Lentzen parameters  $R_{len} = \frac{16}{27}u_{inf}$ 



Fig. 4: Color-coded values of PC for 200keV microscopes, a) with phase plate b) without phase plate. Color represents derivation form optimal PC-value. Black arrow in b) points at Lentzen parameters for the given microscope.



#### are given according to [4] by

 $Z_{Sch,pp} = -0.73\sqrt{C_s\lambda}$   $u_{Sch,pp} = 1.4(C_s\lambda^3)^{-1/4}$ 

# **Cs-Correction & Phase Plates**

- Optimal parameters for imaging without a phase plate but with Cscorrection described by Lentzen et. al. [5]
- Scherzer resolution is not extended far beyond the information limit of the microscope, as well as delocalization is minimized
- Optimal defocus und Cs-value are given as







- Phase contrast microscopes (gray lines) show wider defocus ranges,
  i.e. permitting a rougher samplesurface topography at same resolution and eventually a larger sample region to be imaged.
- 300 keV microscopes show a slight advantage compared to 200keV microscopes.





- Fig. 5: Defocus ranges for 200 keV and 300 keV microscopes fulfilling 5%-criteria for the PC-Integral
- Real Boersch phase plates show an electrode ring completely obstructing information for a certain region of low frequencies (object features larger than approx. 5.5 nm for a typical 200keV microscope)
- Calculations for Fig.4 and Fig. 5 have been done with Boersch geometry considered and it was found that the loss of information sums up to approx. 8% for a 200keV microscope (3% for a 300keV with 0.05 nm information limit)

# Summary

- Almost perfect coincidence of the phase contrast transfer function with the envelope function for partial temporal coherence even for future microscopes with next-generation correctors possible
- In-focus phase contrast with a Boersch phase plate will provide strong and

and envelope function (dashed black line) for 200 keV microscope with an information limit of 0.12 nm

of wave aberration  $sin(\chi)$  (dotted line)

- Fig. 2: Low contrast transfer at small and intermediate spatial frequencies compared to high contrast transfer at these frequencies with the use of a phase plate (Fig. 3 a)
- Optimal theoretical values for defocus and Cs-value are obviously Cs = 0 mm, Z = 0 nm and  $\phi_{pp} = \pi/2$  with phase plate and Cs-correction
- Fig. 3: Contrast transfer for Cs=1 μm and different defoci; phase contrast is reduced and the PCTF starts to oscillate at larger defocus values

- localized object contrast over the entire resolution range in one single image
- Effective interpretable field of view increases for in-focus phase contrast imaging, due to reduced delocalization

## References

[1] K. Schultheiß, F. Pérez-Willard, B. Barton, D. Gerthsen, R.R. Schroeder, Rev. Sci. Instr. 77 (2006) 033701

[2] H. Rose, Optik 85, 19 (1990).

[3] M. Haider, H. Rose, S. Uhlemann, E. Schwan, B. Kabius, K. Urban, Nature 392 (1998) 768.

[4] R. Danev, K. Nagayama, Ultramicroscopy 88 (2001) 243.

[5] M. Lentzen, B. Jahnen, C.L. Jia, A. Thust, K. Tillmann, K. Urban, Ultramicroscopy 92 (2002) 233.

### Acknowledgements

The project is funded by the German Research Foundation (Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft) under Ge 841/16 and Sch 424/11.