



Trapping and manipulation of individual nanoparticles in a planar Paul trap

I. Alda, J. Berthelot, R. A. Rica, and R. Quidant

Citation: Applied Physics Letters **109**, 163105 (2016); doi: 10.1063/1.4965859 View online: http://dx.doi.org/10.1063/1.4965859 View Table of Contents: http://scitation.aip.org/content/aip/journal/apl/109/16?ver=pdfcov Published by the AIP Publishing

Articles you may be interested in

Optical trapping and control of nanoparticles inside evacuated hollow core photonic crystal fibers Appl. Phys. Lett. **108**, 221103 (2016); 10.1063/1.4953025

Cooling and manipulation of a levitated nanoparticle with an optical fiber trap Appl. Phys. Lett. **107**, 151102 (2015); 10.1063/1.4933180

Engineering of slow Bloch modes for optical trapping Appl. Phys. Lett. **106**, 121110 (2015); 10.1063/1.4916612

Tapered nanofiber trapping of high-refractive-index nanoparticles Appl. Phys. Lett. **103**, 203111 (2013); 10.1063/1.4829659

Linear Paul trap for strontium ions Rev. Sci. Instrum. **73**, 2856 (2002); 10.1063/1.1489073



euse of AIP Publishing content is subject to the terms at: https://publishing.aip.org/authors/rights-and-permissions. Download to IP: 194.167.230.225 On: Fri, 21 Oct 2016



Trapping and manipulation of individual nanoparticles in a planar Paul trap

I. Alda,^{1,a)} J. Berthelot,^{1,a),b)} R. A. Rica,¹ and R. Quidant^{1,2,c)}

¹ICFO-Institut de Ciencies Fotoniques, The Barcelona Institute of Science and Technology,

08860 Castelldefels, Barcelona, Spain

²ICREA—Institució Catalana de Recerca i Estudis Avançats, 08010 Barcelona, Spain

(Received 15 June 2016; accepted 8 October 2016; published online 21 October 2016)

Visualisation and manipulation of nanoscale matter is one of the main and current challenges in nanosciences. To this aim, different techniques have been recently developed to non-invasively trap and manipulate nano-specimens, like nanoparticles or molecules. However, operating in air or vacuum still remains very challenging since most approaches are limited to a liquid environment. In this letter, we design and characterise a planar Paul trap optimised to trap and manipulate individual charged nanoparticles. This configuration offers competitive capabilities to manipulate nano-specimens in air or vacuum, including in-plane integration, high trap confinement along with dynamical trap reconfiguration, pointing towards applications in the field of levitated optomechanics. *Published by AIP Publishing*. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1063/1.4965859]

Current research in nanotechnology demands tools to accurately and non-invasively manipulate objects at the nanoscale. Conventional optical tweezers (OTs) have these capabilities for micrometer sized objects and neutral atoms¹ but are inadequate for the intermediate size range (i.e., 1-100 nm size objects), mainly due to the strong decrease in optical forces with the particles' volume.² As an alternative, researchers have developed near field optical trapping schemes based on nanoplasmonics³ and silicon photonics.⁴ Such approaches allow stable trapping from single proteins⁵ up to nanoparticles of a few tens of nanometers^{6–8} and have recently allowed 3D manipulation.⁹ Other alternatives are surface electrostatic traps¹⁰ and the Anti-Brownian ELetrophoretic trap (ABEL).^{11,12} All of the above remain limited to a liquid environment, and it still represents an important challenge to adapt this technology to other media, i.e., air or vacuum. Interestingly, the optical levitation of nanoparticles in high vacuum has appeared as an exquisite platform for several applications in force sensing and optomechanics.^{13–17} However, photothermal damage strongly limits the nanoparticle's material and typically only silica (very low absorption) is used. Yet, it would be very interesting to levitate other nanoparticles featuring internal energy level like colour centers.¹⁸⁻²⁰

Originally used to trap ions, Paul traps (PTs)²¹ can levitate charged nano-objects.^{22–28} PTs found applications in various fields such as physics,^{29,30} chemistry,^{31,32} and even biology.^{33,34} They are based on a quadrupole potential originating from a RF time varying electrical field created by a set of properly arranged electrodes. The trajectory of the trapped object is described by the superposition of a fast driven oscillation at the frequency of the RF field called micromotion and a slower one called macromotion.³⁵ PTs' electrode designs can be challenging to fabricate and are usually bulky, hence complicating the trap loading and its optical interrogation. An interesting alternative to standard PT are planar PTs (PPTs) whose lithographed electrodes are integrated in a single plane.^{36,37} Their compatibility with Printed Circuit Board (PCB) technology makes their fabrication simple and convenient.^{28,38–40}

In this letter, we report an optimized Planar Paul Trap (PPT) for the 3D manipulation of single charged polystyrene nanoparticles under ambient and atmospheric conditions. The trap enables stable confinement of the nanoparticle for days. Full manipulation capabilities are demonstrated by rotating the trap and modifying the trapping distance to the surface. We also identify a design that maximizes spatial confinement, and we use position quadrant photodetection (QPD) to characterize the 3D dynamics of the trapped nanoparticle.

Our PPT on PCB is formed by two concentric electrodes with radii a (inner electrode) and b (outer electrode), and four corner compensation DC electrodes as shown in Fig. 1(a). This design features an empty central hole, providing an optical access to the trapped specimen.⁴¹ The electrical connections are on the backside of the PCB. Both sides are connected via vertical conducting holes filled with alloy, keeping the topside clear for manipulation. To start with, we use a similar design to the one presented in Ref. 38 with dimensions a = 1.07 mm and b = 3.62 mm (labeled as PPT₁) in the following). We used a suspension of 100 nm diameter polymer spheres dispersed in ethanol. The particles are charged with electrospray⁴² and guided to the PPT with a linear Paul trap at an amplitude of 1000 V and at a frequency of 800 Hz.^{38,43} We use the linear trap as a guide where the nanoparticles are both cooled and transferred towards the integrated trap in a robust, clean, and deterministic way, similarly to what it is done with ions. The PPT is powered by two wave function generators and two high voltage amplifiers. In the simplest operation mode, only the outer electrode is driven by the RF signal (amplitude of 340 V and frequency of 4 kHz) while keeping the inner electrode grounded. Figure 1(b) shows a side view scattering picture from a single particle levitating in the PPT. A four axis stage (x, y, z, z)and θ) moves the PCB, and a 532 nm laser interrogates the

^{a)}I. Alda and J. Berthelot contributed equally to this work.

^{b)}Present address: Aix Marseille University, CNRS, Centrale Marseille, Institut Fresnel, Marseille, France. Electronic mail: johann.berthelot@fresnel.fr.

^{c)}Electronic mail: romain.quidant@icfo.es



FIG. 1. (a) Image of our planar Paul trap (PPT) on PCB. The radius of the inner and outer electrodes are *a* and *b*, respectively. Our design includes compensation DC electrodes on the corners. All connections are on the backside of the PCB. Dimensions reported in previous works³⁸ are a = 1.07 mm and b = 3.62 mm. (b) Levitating 100 nm dielectric nanoparticle trapped with a PPT. (c) Sketch of the setup to measure the PPT's confinement. A 532 nm laser is focused through a 50× objective (0.5 NA). The scattering light is collected by the same objective for monitoring the nanoparticle motion.

trapped object. This light is focused to a $1.23 \,\mu\text{m}$ diameter spot size using a long working distance of $50 \times$ objective (NA = 0.5). The collected back-scattered light propagates through a 45:55 beam splitter and is focused onto a CCD camera (see Fig. 1(c)).

The PPT compactness along with its high trapping stability enables unique manipulation capabilities (see Fig. 2(a)) that could not be achieved with optical tweezers. Further control over the trap features can be reached by applying an additional RF signal V_{in} of the same frequency (4 kHz) to the inner circular electrode. By varying $\epsilon = V_{in}/V_{out}$ (Ref. 38), we are able to adjust the trapping height (see Eq. (3)).^{38,44} Depending on the sign of ϵ , which relates to the phase difference between the two driving fields, the trapping height decreases ($\epsilon > 0$) or increases ($\epsilon < 0$), as shown in Fig. 2(b). The experimental dependence with ϵ of the particle height, plotted in graph Fig. 2(c), for two PPT designs shows that it can be changed by up to 100%.

The studied PPT geometry can be theoretically described using the model of Ref. 38. We consider that the inner and outer electrodes are powered at the same frequency. Given the cylindrical symmetry of our design, the electric potential created by our PPT can be properly described in cylindrical coordinates $\alpha = \tan^{-1}(y/x)$, $\rho = \sqrt{x^2 + y^2}$, and *z*. Trapping occurs at $\rho = 0$, resulting in the potential depending only on *z*. For a single trapped particle, its motion is typically described by a pseudopotential Ψ that accounts for the macromotion. In the absence of defects or a DC bias, it is expressed as³⁸

$$\Psi(z,\rho,\epsilon) = A |\nabla \kappa(z,\rho,\epsilon)|^2.$$
(1)

where $A = \frac{Q^2 V_{out}^2}{4M\Omega^2}$, *M* and *Q* are the mass and charge of the particle, respectively, V_{out} and $\Omega = 2\pi f$ correspond to the amplitude and angular frequency, respectively, of the AC field applied to the outer electrode. All the parameters of the trapped object and the signal applied to the PPT are contained in a single constant *A*, except for V_{in} , which determines the trapping position along *z*. Therefore, we can define a normalised pseudo-potential $\bar{\Psi} = \Psi/A$. The spatial



FIG. 2. (a) Mosaic of images taken from the side showing the manipulation of a single trapped nanoparticle with the PPT (0°–90°). We can also rotate it 180°. (b) Superimposed images for three different $\epsilon = V_{in}/V_{out}$ values: $\epsilon = 0$ in white, $\epsilon > 0$ in blue, and $\epsilon < 0$ in red. (c) Experimental data for trapping height z_0 for different values of ϵ for both PCBs (points) and the corresponding theoretical predictions (solid lines).

dependence of the pseudopotential is given by $\kappa(z, \rho, \epsilon)$, which contains Bessel functions, and simplifies to $\kappa(z, \epsilon)$ at $\rho = 0$, where the trapping occurs³⁸

$$\kappa(z,\epsilon) = \frac{1-\epsilon}{\sqrt{1+\left(\frac{a}{z}\right)^2}} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{1+\left(\frac{b}{z}\right)^2}} + \epsilon.$$
 (2)

An important parameter is the dimensionless Mathieu parameter $q = \frac{8A}{QV_{out}}f(a,b)$, which determines the stability of the PT. Here, f(a, b) is the geometrical factor in units of [length]⁻² that just depends on *a* and *b* (radii of the inner and outer electrodes). In vacuum, stable solutions to the equation of motion of the trapped object exist if the condition $q \le 0.9$ is satisfied.⁴⁵ In the presence of damping, like in our ambient pressure experiments, stable trapping typically occurs at higher *q* values (see supplementary material).^{46,47} The pseudopotential's critical points are the minimum z_0 and the turning-point z_{max}^{38}

$$z_0 = \sqrt{\frac{b^2 a^{4/3} (1-\epsilon)^{2/3} - a^2 b^{4/3}}{b^{4/3} - a^{4/3} (1-\epsilon)^{2/3}}},$$
(3)

$$z_{max} = \sqrt{\frac{b^2 a^{4/5} (1-\epsilon)^{2/5} - a^2 b^{4/5}}{b^{4/5} - a^{4/5} (1-\epsilon)^{2/5}}},$$
(4)



FIG. 3. (a) Theoretical calculation of the pseudopotential $\bar{\Psi}(z)$ for both PPTs. We found $z_{0,1} = 1.33$ mm, $z_{max,1} = 2.45$ mm, $z_{0,2} = 0.44$ mm, and $z_{max,2} = 0.78$ mm. (b) and (c) Temporal averaging of 372 frames for PPT₁ and PPT₂ in (b) and (c), respectively. Measurements were taken with the setup described in Fig. 1(c). The scale bar represents 10 μ m, and the color bar is the same for both images. The resolution of the camera is 0.1 μ m/px.

which only depend on the geometry of the PCB and, in particular, are independent of the damping. The trap depth is defined as $D = \Psi(z_{max}) - \Psi(z_0)$.

To attain a higher trap confinement, we numerically determined the optimum geometrical parameters that yield a maximum pseudo-potential depth D while accounting for the



manufacturing limits (imposing $a > 300 \ \mu$ m). From Equations (1) and (2), we simulated the pseudo-potential for different values of *a* and *b*, with a < b. Under these constraints, the most confined pseudo-potential is obtained for $a = 0.36 \ \text{mm}$ and $b = 1.17 \ \text{mm}$ (labeled as PPT₂ in the following). The simulated pseudo-potentials and their dependence on *z* for both geometries are presented in Fig. 3(a). Using Equations (3) and (4), we determined the depth of the trap $\overline{D} = \overline{\Psi}(z_{max}) - \overline{\Psi}(z_0)$. From Fig. 3(a), PPT₂ has a trap depth of about 10 times greater than PPT₁.

Based on these calculations, we tested experimentally the optimised design (PPT_2) and compared it to the original one (PPT_1) . We recorded through the optical objective videos of the trapped particle (acquisition area $30 \,\mu\text{m} \times 30 \,\mu\text{m}$ at a rate of 15 frames/s) that were converted into an image sequence for analysis. A time average over 372 frames confirms that PPT_2 features much better confinement (Figs. 3(b) and 3(c)), in agreement with the predictions shown in Fig. 3(a). The image acquired from PPT₁ demonstrates that in this case, the particle explores a large region away from the focal spot, with scattering from the particle covering the full field of view (note that the background color is different from zero). On the contrary, the image obtained with PPT_2 shows the nanoparticle's confinement up to a diffraction limited spot. Note that no micromotion compensation was performed in any of the experiments here discussed. Based on the different experiments done on multiple chips, the observed differences in confinement cannot be justified in terms of fabrication defects.

To get further insight in the dynamics of the particle in PPT₂, we implemented a position detection scheme similar to those routinely used in optical tweezers. The trapped nanoparticle is now shined with a 10× objective (NA = 0.25) leading to a spot size $\simeq 2.6 \,\mu$ m to ensure that we observe the full trajectory of the trapped nanoparticle. The backscattering signal

FIG. 4. (a) Normalized position histogram of nanoparticle in PPT₂. The two maxima indicate a driven harmonic motion. Black lines are a guide to the eye. (b) Power spectral density. We observe the driving frequency at 4 kHz and higher harmonics.

from the nanoparticle was measured through the same objective and sent to a quadrant photodetector (QPD).

From the time trace for each axis, we extracted the particle position histograms, shown in Fig. 4(a). The two outer maxima indicate a driven oscillation of the particle. The corresponding power spectral density (PSD) shows a dominating peak at 4 kHz—driving frequency of the PPT—as well as higher harmonics (see Fig. 4(b)). Higher harmonics indicate a not-purely sinusoidal oscillation of the particle inside the trap, as it is expected given our experimental conditions.^{29,30} We estimate the confinement by fitting the low frequency part (up to 1 kHz) of the PSD to an overdamped Lorentzian, similar to what is done in optical tweezers.⁴⁸ Assuming the validity of the equipartition theorem of the nanoparticle in the pseudopotential, we obtain the calibration factor from volts to nanometers for each axis. Our estimated confinement is consistent with the observations in Fig. 4(a), where the particle's trajectory is about $4 \mu m$ in all directions. The two weaker peaks appearing at 150 Hz and 250 Hz are due to electronic noise. Note that there is no peak corresponding to secular motion, since it is completely absent in the overdamped regime, as it is the case of our experimental conditions (supplementary material).

In summary, PPTs are a non-invasive and compact technology to trap and manipulate a single nano-object in three dimensions. We have optimised and characterised the confinement of a PPT in air, which can be easily implemented on any experimental setup at low cost. The presented level of manipulation, rotation, and stability offers original possibilities to study nano-objects in air or vacuum, and in combination with optical traps give rise to potential applications that benefit the field of optomechanics, such as trapping any nano-object with internal energy levels like nanodiamonds hosting NV centers.

See supplementary material for video on how the nanoparticle is kept trapped while rotating the PPT around its *x* axis and for discussions of the over-damped regime.

The authors acknowledge the financial support from the Fundació Privada Cellex Barcelona, the Severo Ochoa program, and CoG ERC QnanoMECA (No. 64790). I.A. acknowledges the Spanish Ministry of Education, Culture, and Sport (Grant No. FPU014/02111).

- ¹A. Ashkin, J. M. Dziedzic, J. E. Bjorkholm, and S. Chu, Opt. Lett. **11**, 288–290 (1986).
- ²K. C. Neuman, G. F. Liou, S. M. Block, and K. Bergman, in *Lasers and Electro-Optics CLEO* (1998), pp. 203–204.
- ³M. L. Juan, M. Righini, and R. Quidant, Nat. Photonics **5**(6), 349–356 (2011).
- ⁴D. Erickson, X. Serey, Y. F. Chen, and S. Mandal, Lab Chip **11**(6), 995–1009 (2011).
- ⁵Y. Pang and R. Gordon, Nano Lett. **12**(1), 402–406 (2012).
- ⁶M. L. Juan, R. Gordon, Y. Pang, F. Efterkhari, and R. Quidant, Nat. Phys. 5(12), 915–919 (2009).
- ⁷Y. Pang and R. Gordon, Nano Lett. 11(9), 3763–3767 (2011).
- ⁸C. Chen, M. L. Juan, Y. Li, G. Maes, G. Borghs, P. Van Dorpe, and R. Quidant, Nano Lett. **12**(1), 125–132 (2012).
- ⁹J. Berthelot, S. Aćimović, M. L. Juan, M. Kreuzer, J. Renger, and R. Quidant, Nat. Nanotechnol. **9**(4), 295–299 (2014).

- ¹⁰J. T. Kim, S. Spindler, and V. Sandoghdar, Nat. Commun. 5, 3380 (2014).
- ¹¹A. E. Cohen and W. Moerner, Appl. Phys. Lett. **86**(9), 093109 (2005).
- ¹²M. Kayci and A. Radenovic, Sci. Rep. 5, 16669 (2015).
- ¹³T. Li, S. Kheifets, and M. G. Raizen, Nat. Phys. 7(7), 527–530 (2011).
- ¹⁴J. Gieseler, B. Deutsch, R. Quidant, and L. Novotny, Phys. Rev. Lett. 109(10), 103603 (2012).
- ¹⁵P. Mestres, J. Berthelot, M. Spasenović, J. Giesler, L. Novotny, and R. Quidant, Appl. Phys. Lett. **107**(15), 151102 (2015).
- ¹⁶G. Ranjit, D. P. Artherton, J. H. Stutz, M. Cunningham, and A. A. Geraci, Phys. Rev. A **91**, 051805 (2015).
- ¹⁷V. Jain, J. Giesler, C. Moritz, C. Dellago, R. Quidant, and L. Novotny, Phys. Rev. Lett. **116**, 243601 (2016).
- ¹⁸L. P. Neukirch, E. von Haartman, J. M. Rosenholm, and A. N. Vamivakas, Nat. Photonics 9(10), 653–657 (2015).
- ¹⁹T. M. Hoang, J. Ahn, J. Bang, and T. Li, Nat. Comm. 7, 12250 (2016).
- ²⁰A. Rahman, A. Frangeskou, M. Kim, S. Bose, G. Morley, and P. Barker, Sci. Rep. 6, 21633 (2016).
- ²¹W. Paul, Rev. Mod. Phys. **62**, 531–540 (1990).
- ²²A. Kuhlicke, A. W. Schell, J. Zoll, and O. Benson, Appl. Phys. Lett. 105(7), 073101 (2014).
- ²³C. R. Howder, D. M. Bell, and S. L. Anderson, Rev. Sci. Instrum. 85(1), 014104 (2014).
- ²⁴D. M. Bell, C. R. Howder, R. C. Johnson, and S. L. Anderson, ACS Nano 8(3), 2387–2398 (2014).
- ²⁵J. Millen, P. Z. G. Fonseca, T. Mavrogordatos, T. S. Monteiro, and P. F. Barker, Phys. Rev. Lett. **114**, 123602 (2015).
- ²⁶A. Kuhlicke, A. Rylke, and O. Beson, Nano Lett. **15**(3), 1993–2000 (2015).
- ²⁷P. Nagornykh, J. E. Coppock, and B. Kane, Appl. Phys. Lett. **106**(24), 244102 (2015).
- ²⁸U. Tanaka, K. Suzuki, Y. Ibaraki, and S. Urabe, J. Phys. B: At., Mol. Opt. Phys. 47, 035301 (2014).
- ²⁹F. G. Major, V. N. Gheorghe, and G. Werth, *Charged Particle Traps: Physics and Techniques of Charged Particle Field Confinement*, Vol. 37 of Springer Series on Atomic, Optical, and Plasma Physics (Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2005).
- ³⁰G. Werth, V. N. Gheorghe, and F. G. Major, *Charged Particle Traps II: Applications* (Springer Science & Business Media, 2009), Vol. 54.
- ³¹D. Gerlich, Inhomogeneous RF Fields: A Versatile Tool for the Study of Processes with Slow Ions (John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 2007).
- ³²S. Willitsch, M. T. Bell, A. D. Gingell, and T. P. Softley, Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys. **10**, 7200–7210 (2008).
- ³³A. Ostendorf, C. Zhang, M. Wilson, D. Offenberg, B. Roth, and S. Schiller, Phys. Rev. Lett. 97(24), 243005 (2006).
- ³⁴D. Offenberg, C. Wellers, C. Zhang, B. Roth, and S. Schiller, J. Phys. B: At., Mol. Opt. Phys. **42**(3), 035101 (2009).
- ³⁵D. J. Berkeland, J. D. Miller, J. C. Bergquist, W. M. Itano, and D. J. Wineland, J. Appl. Phys. 83(10), 5025–5033 (1998).
- ³⁶J. Chiaverini, R. B. Blakestad, J. Britton, J. D. Jost, C. Langer, D. Leibfried, R. Ozeri, and D. J. Wineland, Quantum Inf. Comput. 5(6), 419–439 (2005), available at http://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=2011671.
- ³⁷M. Kumph, P. Holz, K. Langer, M. Niedermayr, M. Brownnutt, and R. Blatt, New J. Phys. 18, 023020 (2016).
- ³⁸T. H. Kim, P. F. Herskind, T. Kim, J. Kim, and I. L. Chuang, Phys. Rev. A 82(4), 043412 (2010).
- ³⁹M. Kumph, M. Brownnut, and R. Blatt, New J. Phys. 13, 073043 (2011).
- ⁴⁰M. Maurice, C. Allen, D. Green, A. Farr, T. Burke, R. Hilleke, and R. Clark, J. Appl. Phys. **118**(7), 074903 (2015).
- ⁴¹A. P. VanDevender, Y. Colombe, J. Amini, D. Leibfried, and D. J. Wineland, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 023001 (2010).
- ⁴²S. J. Gaskell, J. Mass Spectrom. 32(7), 677–688 (1997).
- ⁴³M. Gregor, A. Kuhlicke, and O. Benson, Opt. Express **17**, 24234–24243 (2009).
- ⁴⁴J. H. Wesenberg, Phys. Rev. A **78**(6), 063410 (2008).
- ⁴⁵H. Takahashi, A. Wilson, A. Riley-Watson, F. Orucevic, N. Seymour-Smith, M. Keller, and W. Lange, New J. Phys. **15**(5), 053011 (2013).
- ⁴⁶A. F. Izmailov, S. Arnold, S. Holler, and A. S. Myerson, Phys. Rev. E 52, 1325–1332 (1995).
- ⁴⁷W. B. Whitten, P. T. A. Reilly, and J. M. Ramsey, Rapid Commun. Mass Spectrom. 18(15), 1749–1752 (2004).
- ⁴⁸S. F. Tolić-Nørrelykke, E. Schäffer, J. Howard, F. S. Pavone, Francesco, F. Jülicher, and H. Flyvbjerg, Rev. Sci. Instrum. 77(10), 103101 (2006).