

Optimizing Growth of Niobium-3 Tin Through Pre-nucleation Chemical Treatments SUSPB026

S. Arnold*, L. Shpani, T. Arias, G. Gaitan, M. Liepe, N. Sitaraman, Z. Sun (Cornell University, Ithaca, NY)

Surface chemistry influences the nucleation of SnCl₂ on Nb samples during vapor-diffusion-based Nb₃Sn growth.

Introduction and Setup



The most promising growth method for Nb_3Sn is thermal vapor diffusion, but much improvement is needed for Nb_3Sn grown by this method to reach its full potential. One key obstacle is achieving a consistently smooth and uniformly thick layer of stoichiometric Nb_3Sn . To address this challenge, this research focuses



The niobium oxide structure plays a crucial role in the binding of SnCl₂ to niobium **during nucleation.** DFT calculations suggest that acidic solutions which remove OH groups will generate more SnCl₂ binding sites, **encouraging more uniform nucleation.**

In this sample study, we compare how different pre-



R. D. Porter, Ph.D. thesis, Phys, Dept., Cornell University, Ithaca, United States, 2021

on **optimizing the initial stage** of this growth process, which involves the **nucleation of tin-rich droplets on the oxide surface** of the niobium substrate.



abeled (control sample not shown)

nucleation chemical treatments influence the nucleation of Sn on Nb samples, in order to determine the optimal treatment to promote uniform and dense nucleation.

SEM Analysis: Nucleation Site Formation

To analyze the uniformity of grown nucleation sites, ImageJ plugins were used to process scanning electron microscopy (SEM) images.





Processed SEM

Density and **average six nearest neighbor** calculations were used to **analyze the uniformity of nucleation sites** over many ~65 μm^2 areas of each sample.

To minimize tin depleted regions, we want dense and uniform nucleation sites. Thus, we want high density and a low average six nearest neighbor values. Here, we plotted the inverse of the average distance to six nearest neighbors to better observe each sample's performance. A higher value on both plotted metrics corresponds to a more promising nucleation.

Nucleation Site Uniformity Analysis

Raw SEM



EDS Analysis: Atomic Composition of Droplets

To confirm that the imaged droplets indeed represent tin nucleation sites, we utilize Energy Dispersive Spectroscopy (EDS) to analyze the elemental composition of the surface of our samples.



Point Analysis Scans

Point Analysis scans focus the electron beam on a single point of interest and provide elemental information about the sample at that specific location.

By maintaining a constant accelerating voltage, we can obtain a **relative comparison of the ratio of atomic compositions of Sn and Nb among our samples.**

H₂O₂ has the **lowest density** and **largest distance between average six nearest neighbors**.

Predicted Tin Depleted Regions

0.35

0.3

0.25

0.2

0.15

0.1

0.05

Nb₃Sn grains have a roughly 1 μ m² area, meaning we want **at least 1 droplet (nucleation site) per 1** μ m² area. To see if each treatment held up to this condition, we considered two metrics:

- How many imaged areas had a density of less than one droplet per 1 μm² area?
- How many average six nearest neighbor distances exceed 1 μm?

NHO₃ (low pH) and NaOH (high pH) show sufficiently high density and a uniform distribution, establishing them as promising options for potential treatments.

$\rho < 1 \mu m^{2}$ $(NNs) > 1 \mu m$ $(NNs) > 1 \mu m$ $(NNs) = 1 \mu m$

All samples (except H_2O_2) have tin present even when no droplets are seen in the SEM image!



Area Scans

In an area scan, the electron beam scans a larger region of the surface and provides a more comprehensive analysis of the elemental composition.

We used area scans of 1800 μ m² to compare the overall composition of tin among our samples, sacrificing spatial resolution to achieve broader coverage. H₂O₂ has a negligible amount of tin on its surface, so we see no tin in any of the area scans!



Background

Conclusions and Future Work

From this study, we have found:

- \rightarrow The chemical treatments influenced the distribution of nucleation sites
 - ★ The type of chemical treatment had a greater impact on the quality of nucleation compared to the pH of the treatment
- \rightarrow H₂O₂ treatment showed the **lowest density** of droplets and **lowest overall tin concentration**, suggesting a **significant suppression in nucleation**
- \rightarrow NHO₃ is a **promising treatment** to arise from this study with a **dense and uniform distribution** of nucleation sites after nucleation

Future work:

- \rightarrow Perform another round of sample studies for reproducibility
- \rightarrow Bring samples to full coat
- \rightarrow Apply our most promising treatment to a cavity and perform an RF test

Niobium-3 tin is a promising alternative material for SRF cavities that is close to reaching practical applications. To date, one of the most effective growth methods for this material is vapor diffusion, yet further improvement is needed for Nb₃Sn to reach its full potential. The major issues faced by vapor diffusion are tin depleted regions and surface roughness, both of which lead to impaired performance. Literature has shown that the niobium surface oxide plays an important role in the binding of tin to niobium. In this study, we performed various chemical treatments on niobium samples prenucleation to enhance tin nucleation. We quantify the effect that these various treatments had through scanning electron microscopy (SEM) and energy dispersive spectroscopy (EDS). These methods reveal information on tin nucleation density and uniformity, and a thin tin film present on most samples, even in the absence of nucleation sites. We present our findings from these surface characterization methods and introduce a framework for quantitatively comparing the samples. We plan to apply the most effective treatment to a cavity and conduct an RF test soon.



*sga46@cornell.edu

This research is funded by the National Science Foundation under Grant No. PHY-1549132, the Center for Bright Beams. This work made use of the Cornell Center for Materials Research Shared Facilities which are supported through the NSF MRSEC program (DMR-1719875).

