

**Record: 1**

**Title:** You May Squeeze the Atoms But Don't Mangle the Surface!  
**Authors:** de Lozanne, Alex  
**Source:** Science; 03/30/2001, Vol. 291 Issue 5513, p2561, 2p, 1 color  
**Document Type:** Article  
**Subject Terms:** ATOMIC force microscopy  
ATOMIC theory

**Abstract:** Evaluates the use of atomic force microscopy (AFM) in atomic theory. Principle underlying AFM; Measurement of the force resulting from an incipient bond between the tip atom and the surface atom; Application of the idea of squeezing microscopic samples with an AFM tip to biological specimens.

**Lexile:** 1300

**Full Text Word Count:** 1399

**ISSN:** 00368075

**Accession Number:** 4377839

**Database:** MAS Ultra - School Edition

**Section:** Science's Compass

**PERSPECTIVES: ATOMIC FORCE MICROSCOPY****YOU MAY SQUEEZE THE ATOMS BUT DON'T MANGLE THE SURFACE!**

Imagine yourself at a fruit stand, with a blindfold over your eyes. You could probably identify various fruits by touching them, even using only one hand. Now imagine that you have a boxing glove over this hand and that you can only move it up and down with your arm outstretched. Identifying fruit is now far more difficult, but you may still be able to distinguish between a crisp apple and a ripe persimmon (without using your sense of smell!). You would do so by pressing on the fruit and feeling the reaction force on your glove. A hard fruit responds with a large force within a short distance, whereas a soft fruit gives in and responds with a smaller force.

On page 2580 of this issue, Lantz et al. ( [1](#) ) report an equivalent experiment at the atomic scale, performed by gently pressing the tip of an atomic force microscope (AFM) on the atoms of a silicon surface. There is one added complication, however: The tip is attracted to the surface at close range (think of sticky fruit). One therefore has to bring the tip to the surface and then quickly snap it back to prevent damage to the tip and/or surface should they stick together. Repetition of this motion produces an oscillatory movement, which is easier to control than a single dip. The oscillation of the AFM cantilever (your arm) changes frequency as the tip (your glove) interacts with the surface. Theoretical modeling is then used to extract information about the stiffness of the surface. This method enables Lantz et al. to measure the force resulting from an incipient bond between the tip atom and the surface atom and to distinguish between different types of silicon atoms (see the figure). For the first time, atomic resolution and a detailed measurement of these forces are obtained on the same surface.

The AFM was born in 1986, when a quintessential "back of the envelope" calculation by Binnig, Quate, and Gerber showed that it should be possible to measure the force between the last atom on a tip and individual atoms on the surface ( [2](#) ). Their first prototype showed a lateral resolution of 3 nm ( [2](#) ). Soon, beautiful AFM images with

atomic resolution graced the covers of prestigious journals. It turned out, however, that these images never showed atomic-scale defects, such as a missing atom. It became clear that the images resulted from the interaction between many atoms on the tip with those on the sample. If the tip has a structure that is congruent with the surface structure, which is likely if the tip picks up some of the material from the surface, a perfect image showing the periodicity of the sample is obtained, but local defects do not show up. This can be easily understood by taking two washboards and sliding one on top of the other. The resulting up/down motion will be the same even if you remove one of the ridges from one washboard.

"True" atomic resolution was not achieved until 1995, when the 7 x 7 reconstruction of silicon (a beautiful rearrangement of the surface atoms) was imaged with an AFM ([3](#), [4](#)). It was the atomic-scale imaging of this surface that gave the scanning tunneling microscope (STM), the older sibling of the AFM, instant fame in 1983 ([5](#)). Lantz et al. chose this classic surface for their experiment. It is ideal for this first demonstration because the atoms are widely spaced and each has a "lone" atomic orbital sticking out of the surface. All the atoms are silicon, but their stiffness differs nevertheless depending on their position, which determines the way they bond to their neighbors underneath. This type of force spectroscopy has been done on surfaces for some time ([6](#)), but this is the first time that the surface is also imaged with atomic resolution in the same experiment (after all, you have to take the blindfold off to check that your identification of the fruit is correct!).

In a recent related study, Foster et al. identified the fluorine atoms in CaF<sub>2</sub> on the basis of the shape of the features in the AFM image, aided by theoretical modeling ([7](#)). The observed triangular shape of the surface fluorine atoms is caused by the contribution to the image from fluorine atoms just below. This result is important because this type of sample, being an insulator, cannot be imaged with STM. Giessibl et al. have also shown that under special conditions, it is possible to image individual orbitals such as those of an atom on the tip ([8](#)). This work has elicited criticism ([9](#)) and a technically compelling response ([10](#), [11](#)). The idea of squeezing microscopic samples with an AFM tip is also being applied to biological specimens. Mahaffy et al. have recently made quantitative viscoelastic measurements on fibroblasts at the submicrometer level and concluded that the response is dominated by the cytoskeleton ([12](#)).

The AFM studies discussed here were performed in the so-called noncontact mode, which uses the weak attractive forces between tip and sample for imaging. The area of noncontact AFM with true atomic resolution is starting to blossom ([13](#), [14](#)). Over the short term, we can expect improvements through the use of stiffer cantilevers and smaller oscillation amplitudes ([8](#)). The use of carbon nanotubes as tips ([15](#)) promises to improve the weakest link in these experiments. Once we have identified surface atoms and their bonding strengths, we will be able to do more atomic manipulation ([16](#)), even at room temperature ([17](#)). The use of sophisticated tactile ("haptic") interfaces ([18](#), [19](#)) will allow us to "feel" the atoms in real time and gently push them to desired locations. We may at last be able to take off the boxing glove.

PHOTO (COLOR): Gently does it. In their AFM experiments, Lantz et al. can distinguish between silicon atoms at different surface locations on the basis of their force response curves (left). Shown here are four unit cells of the silicon 7 x 7 surface, with a corner hole at the center (marked with an x). This site serves as a reference to measure background forces. The corner adatom (green) and the center adatom (red) have different stiffnesses, as indicated by the curves of the same color in the graph. This difference is exaggerated

for clarity. The tip is shown at the point of closest approach, where the chemical bond (yellow cloud) starts to form.

### References and Notes

1. M. A. Lantz *et al.*, *Science* 291, 2580 (2001).
2. G. Binnig, C. F. Quate, Ch. Gerber, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 56, 930 (1986) [APS].
3. F. J. Giessibl, *Science* 267, 68 (1995).
4. S. Kitamura, M. Iwatsuki, *Jpn. J. Appl. Phys.* 34, L145 (1995).
5. G. Binnig, H. Rohrer, Ch. Gerber, E. Weibel, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 50, 120 (1983) [APS].
6. S. P. Jarvis, H. Yamada, S.-I. Yamamoto, H. Tokumoto, J. B. Pethica, *Nature* 384, 247 (1996).
7. A. S. Foster, C. Barth, A. L. Shluger, M. Reichling, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 86, 2373 (2001) [APS].
8. F. J. Giessibl, S. Hembacher, H. Bielefeldt, J. Mannhart, *Science* 289, 422 (2000).
9. H. J. Hug *et al.*, *Science*, 30 March 2001 ([www.sciencemag.org/cgi/content/full/291/5513/2509a](http://www.sciencemag.org/cgi/content/full/291/5513/2509a)).
10. F. J. Giessibl *et al.*, *Science*, 30 March 2001 ([www.sciencemag.org/cgi/content/full/291/5513/2509a](http://www.sciencemag.org/cgi/content/full/291/5513/2509a)).
11. New data supporting Giessibl *et al.*'s response was presented on 14 March 2001 at the Spring meeting of the American Physical Society in Seattle (*Bull. Am. Phys. Soc.* 46, 846 (2001)).
12. R. E. Mahaffy, C. K. Shih, F. C. MacKintosh, J. Kas, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 85, 880 (2000) [APS].
13. S. Morita and M. Tsukada, Eds., *Proceedings of the First International Workshop on Non-Contact Atomic Force Microscopy*, *Appl. Surf. Sci.* 140, 1 (1999).
14. R. Bennewitz, C. Gerber, E. Meyer, Eds., *Proceedings of the Second International Workshop on Non-Contact Atomic Force Microscopy*, *Appl. Surf. Sci.* 157, 1 (2000).
15. V. Barwich *et al.*, *Appl. Surf. Sci.* 157, 269 (2000)
16. D. M. Eigler, E. K. Schweizer, *Nature* 344, 524 (1990) [ADS].
17. T. W. Fishlock, A. Oral, R. G. Egdell, J. B. Pethica, *Nature* 404, 743 (2000).
18. M. Sincell, *Science* 290, 1530 (2000).
19. See also [www.cs.unc.edu/Research/nano](http://www.cs.unc.edu/Research/nano).

~~~~~

By Alex de Lozanne ffrey S. Flier

The author is in the Department of Physics, University of Texas, Austin, TX 78712, USA. E-mail: lozanne@physics.utexas.edu

---

Copyright of Science is the property of American Association for the Advancement of Science and its content may not be copied without the publisher's express written permission except for the print or download capabilities of the retrieval software used for access. This content is intended solely for the use of the individual user. Copyright of Science is the property of American Association for the Advancement of Science and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.