Applications of the Oxford-JEOL Aberration Corrected Electron Microscope

Peter D Nellist, Angus Kirkland

► To cite this version:

Peter D Nellist, Angus Kirkland. Applications of the Oxford-JEOL Aberration Corrected Electron Microscope. Philosophical Magazine, 2010, 90 (35-36), pp.4751-4767. 10.1080/14786435.2010.516775 . hal-00633211

HAL Id: hal-00633211

<https://hal.science/hal-00633211>

Submitted on 18 Oct 2011

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Applications of the Oxford-JEOL Aberration Corrected Electron Microscope

Journal:	<i>Philosophical Magazine & Philosophical Magazine Letters</i>
Manuscript ID:	TPHM-10-Mar-0102.R1
Journal Selection:	Philosophical Magazine
Date Submitted by the Author:	12-Aug-2010
Complete List of Authors:	Nellist, Peter; University of Oxford, Department of Materials Kirkland, Angus; Oxford University
Keywords:	aberration correction, HRTEM, STEM
Keywords (user supplied):	confocal microscopy

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Applications of the Oxford-JEOL Aberration Corrected Electron Microscope

P.D.Nellist* and A.I.Kirkland*

**Department of Materials, University of Oxford, Parks Road, Oxford, OX1 3PH, UK*

In this contribution we review the use of aberration corrected electron microscopy at Oxford from 2003 to the present day. In particular, the following examples of work carried out in Oxford during this period are described: aberration-corrected exit wavefunction reconstruction is used to examine the surface structure of a catalyst nanoparticle; it is shown that tilt-series reconstruction can retrieve higher spatial resolution information; the Z-contrast nature of annular dark field scanning transmission electron microscopy is used to quantitatively locate dopant atoms in an intergranular film; the recording of annular dark field images on an absolute intensity scale is demonstrated; finally it is shown that confocal trajectories can dramatically improve the depth resolution for optical sectioning.

Keywords: aberration correction, HRTEM, STEM, confocal microscopy

1. Introduction

The appointment of David Cockayne as Professor in the Physical Examination of Materials in 2000 approximately coincided with the availability of commercial electron optical elements for correction of the inherent spherical aberration present in round electromagnetic objective lenses. Under Cockayne's leadership, the Electron Microscopy and Analysis group at Oxford was at the forefront of this revolution having been successful in obtaining funding for a unique instrument fitted, for the first time, with aberration correctors *both before* the sample for scanning transmission electron microscopy (STEM) *and after* the sample for conventional high resolution transmission electron microscopy (HRTEM). The ambitious instrumental development required was undertaken in collaboration with JEOL Ltd and the first instrument, the Oxford-JEOL 2200FS (OJ1), was installed in September 2003 and fully commissioned by the end of that year. This instrument operated successfully until late 2006 when it was replaced with an improved version (the JEOL 2200MCO (OJ2)) which remains in operation.

The detailed configuration, specification and operation of the OJ1 instrument (Figure 1 (a)) have been described previously [1, 2]. This instrument, which was subsequently commercialised by JEOL in a number of optical variants, was fitted with: a thermally-assisted Schottky field-emission gun; pre-specimen optics containing an aberration corrector, capable of illuminating the sample with either plane-wave illumination, for HRTEM, or providing a focused probe for STEM; a large area EDX detector; a post-sample aberration corrector for HRTEM; an in-column omega energy-filter [3]; STEM bright-field and dark-field detectors; a TV-

rate CCD camera; and a 2048 x 2048 pixel high-resolution CCD camera. The replacement OJ2 instrument (Figure 1(b)) embodied a number of design modifications including improvements to the stability of the high-tension source (using twin HT tanks) and objective lens power supplies, a new mechanical frame, pre and post specimen high-speed piezo shutters and additional intermediate and projector lenses in addition to a larger 4096 x 4096 pixel CCD camera.

The purpose of this paper is to provide a review of the operation and application of both instruments. Their performance in both HRTEM and STEM modes will be illustrated with examples taken from research themes addressed by a number of different researchers in the Oxford EM group. Research at Oxford into novel methods that made use of the unique capabilities of these instruments will also be reviewed.

2. Aberration-Corrected High Resolution TEM Imaging and Exit Wavefunction Reconstruction

The aberration correctors fitted to both OJ1 and OJ2 instruments were supplied by CEOS GmbH, based on a design originally due to Rose [4, 5]. In this arrangement, two sextupole elements are used to generate negative spherical aberration, and are coupled *via* a round-lens doublet such that one is conjugate to the other, but with a 180° rotation, produced by the transfer doublet such that the first-order effect of three-fold astigmatism is cancelled. Crucially, the sextupoles are also coupled to the objective lens by a further round-lens doublet so that off-axial aberrations are also corrected in the aplanatic arrangement that is required for HRTEM imaging. Whilst this configuration results in minimal 5th-order aberrations, the need for the sextupole elements to be optically conjugate to the objective lens precludes direct, independent

control of the 5th-order aberrations under aplanatic conditions [6]. In the OJ2 instrument these residual aberrations have been measured to be approximately 2 mm for both the round fifth order aberration (C_5) and six-fold astigmatism (A_5).

Phase contrast imaging in the TEM depends critically on the lens aberrations that form the phase-plate used to generate contrast and hence direct interpretation of images can be challenging. A particular focus of the activity at Oxford is the coupling of techniques to reconstruct the complex wavefunction at the exit-surface of the sample from either a focal-series imaging geometry [7], or an illumination tilt-series [8] using electron optically corrected image data.

Direct electron optical correction offers the advantage that it may be achieved on line in a single image, with no requirement for post acquisition processing or acquisition of extended image series. However, as already noted the correctors fitted to both OJ1 and OJ2 instruments are only able to correct aberrations to third order, with partial compensation of selected higher order terms for real recorded image data. Thus, for aberration corrected instruments computational reconstruction is beneficial as it provides a mechanism for compensation of for higher order aberrations and enables the recovery of the complex specimen exit surface wavefunction.

When used in combination, direct aberration correction and exit wave reconstruction provide additional advantages. For focal series datasets, the elimination of tilt-induced coma relaxes the requirement for using parallel illumination and enables the illumination to be converged onto the specimen area of interest. In this mode, the current density at the sample may be maintained with a reduced source

emitter current and consequently lower energy spread in the illumination, providing an improved information limit. For a tilt series dataset, the elimination of tilt induced coma gives rise to less critical focus conditioning for any given tilt magnitude and multiple tilt magnitudes are feasible without a large induced focus change. For either data acquisition geometry, the reduced delocalisation in corrected images is advantageous for quantitative interpretation. Finally, in aberration corrected instruments the voltage centre and axial coma free axis are coincident and hence the temporal coherence envelope is symmetric.

To illustrate the potential benefits of a combined direct / indirect approach to aberration correction and compensation, Figure 2(a) shows the phase of the specimen exit surface wavefunction of a Pt catalyst nanoparticle, viewed close to a $\langle 110 \rangle$ direction reconstructed from a focal series of aberration corrected images acquired using the OJ1 instrument [9]. Despite the presence of a partially graphitic carbon support, terraces and steps at the edge of the particle are visible and moreover, the visibility, and spatial resolution of these features are improved significantly compared to a conventional HRTEM image. The monatomic steps that are visible in Figure 2 are conventionally termed *A* or *B* type, with either $\{100\}$ or $\{111\}$ microfacet atomic risers that have different catalytic properties. The peaks in the recovered phase can be related to the number of Pt atoms in each atomic column and can thus be used to obtain information about the local atomic arrangement on each surface in projection (Figures 2(b) and (c)). Detailed analysis of these provides evidence that the outermost atomic layers consist of irregular islands of atoms, in contrast to the atomic arrangements that have been proposed on the basis of homoepitaxial growth experiments on extended Pt surfaces.

Our next example demonstrates experimental verification of the resolution improvement possible using aberration corrected tilted illumination images. This requires a specimen with a real space lattice separation beyond the axial information limit and a gold foil oriented along a $\langle 123 \rangle$ direction satisfies this requirement. Figure 3 compares the phases and moduli of exit wavefunctions restored using both focal series and tilt defocus aberration corrected data sets. The only Fourier space detail present in the phase and modulus of the exit wavefunction (Figure 3 (c)) recovered from the focal series dataset relates to the $\{111\}$ planes, with a 0.235 nm lattice spacing. In contrast, the wavefunction recovered using tilted illumination data (Figure 3 (f)) contains information at the positions of the $\{331\}$, $\{420\}$ and $\{242\}$ lattice reflections, corresponding to real space distances of 0.093 nm, 0.091 nm and 0.083 nm .

Although the data presented in this section clearly demonstrates that a combination of direct aberration correction and exit wave reconstruction is advantageous and moreover, that the tilt azimuth acquisition geometry enables super-resolution, it is useful to examine the limiting factors in this approach. At large beam tilt magnitudes partial temporal coherence causes a loss of transfer at the centre of the tilted transfer function. For a beam tilt, $\tau_0 = \lambda \mathbf{k}_0$, beams at the same angle τ_0 with respect to the tilt axis are perfectly transferred and the temporal coherence envelope has no effect. However, for larger beam tilts the transfer falls away significantly inside this ring of perfect transfer (the achromatic circle). Reducing the tilt angle prevents this central transfer loss but reduces the resolution potential improvement. This reduction in transfer for tilted illumination can in principal be overcome either

by increasing the number of azimuthal angles or by including more than one tilt magnitude in the restoration dataset. However, either of these approaches increases the number of images required with consequent implications for experimental stability required and for the overall radiation dose. The second limiting factor is given by the variation in the experimentally measured axial aberration coefficients with illumination tilt which can be estimated by taking the real part of the expansion of the wave aberration function with respect to the complex aberration coefficients and illumination tilt angle. Thirdly, in contrast to exit wavefunction reconstruction using focal series data the individual images within a tilt series data set are not simply different measurements of the same projected specimen potential. For tilted illumination the specimen potential is projected along a slightly different direction compared to the axial case and this introduces an additional phase shift. This can be estimated using a simple geometric parallax model and choosing a maximum phase variation for a resolvable distance, d as $\pm\pi/2$, the maximum parallax allowed between the top and bottom specimen surfaces relative to the middle of the specimen is $d/4$. For a beam tilt, τ_0 , this leads to a maximum specimen thickness of $d/(2\tau_0)$. This simple geometric parallax argument is independent of the imaging conditions but has been found to be more stringent than the tilt limit determined from a full dynamical calculation.

These limits for exit wavefunction reconstruction using tilted illumination images are summarised in Table 1. This clearly demonstrates that the aperture synthesis approach to exit wavefunction reconstruction can be carried out using datasets recorded at larger tilt magnitudes under aberration corrected imaging conditions, giving rise to the possibility of resolution improvement substantially

beyond the axial information limit. However at extremely high resolution, parallax considerations become increasingly significant leading to a new regime in which sample thickness limits the resolution achievable.

3. Aberration Corrected STEM Imaging

The advantages of aberration-correction in a STEM geometry are that it provides smaller illuminating probes together with higher beam currents as has been described previously [10,11]. A sextupole corrector, identical to the one described earlier for HRTEM imaging, is used to correct the pre-specimen optics operating in an effectively inverted configuration. However, for STEM imaging it is not necessary to correct for off-axial aberrations since the image is scanned and the scan coils can be placed between the corrector and the objective lens such that the corrector is always axially aligned relative to the illuminating beam. The relaxation of this constraint allows the round 5th-order aberration (C_5) to be nulled by adjusting the transfer lenses such that the negative C_5 combination aberration [6], generated by the deliberate mis-projection of the corrector with respect to the objective lens, compensates for the inherent C_5 arising from pre-field of the objective lens. The limiting aberration for STEM is thus six-fold astigmatism, as is clearly demonstrated in the Ronchigram shown in Figure 4. In the STEM geometry, alignment of the corrector is achieved using an automated procedure developed by CEOS that relies on annular dark-field (ADF) images of nanoparticles recorded at various, known illumination tilts through the corrector and objective lens system. In practice we have found that 3rd-order aberrations are stable over weeks of operation (as is also the case for alignment of the lower corrector) and consequently day-to-day tuning of the lower order aberrations is generally performed manually by direct observation of the Ronchigram.

In addition to the aberration corrector and associated coupling optics, a three condenser lens system completes the illumination optics of which two are the standard JEOL condenser lenses, with an additional third adaptor lens inserted before the corrector to ensure correct coupling. These three pre-corrector lenses allow independent adjustment of the source demagnification and beam convergence angle enabling beam currents of up to 2 nA and convergence angles of up to 32 mrad to be readily be achieved in the OJ2 instrument.

ADF imaging is the most widely used mode in the STEM geometry as it enables direct incoherent imaging of materials with a recorded intensity that depends strongly on atomic number [12]. This method was successfully applied by Cockayne and co-workers using the 2200FS (OJ1) instrument in an investigation of the distribution of rare earth dopant atoms in intergranular ceramic films [13]. These intergranular films play an important role in controlling the physical properties of many ceramic materials and doping with rare-earth metals has been shown to act as a sintering aid improving crack resistance. In order to explain observed differences in grain anisotropy in Si_3N_4 ceramics doped with different rare-earth elements, Cockayne and co-workers [13] used the 2200FS (OJ1) instrument to record aberration corrected ADF STEM images along different crystallographic directions for sample containing La and Lu (Figure 5). The aim of the study was to explain why La is more effective than Lu in elevating toughness. The Z-contrast nature of the ADF images allow the dopant atoms to be observed in the intergranular film, and preferential sites are seen for the dopants in the notionally amorphous volume. As can be seen in Fig. 5, data was recorded for the same system along two perpendicular directions, thereby allowing the three-dimensional position of the additive elements to be measured

quantitatively. Such quantitative measurements, quoted along with estimated errors, had not achieved before in earlier studies on this system.

More recently, progress has been made in improving the quantification of ADF STEM images. In addition to quantitatively measuring atom positions, there has been progress in making quantitative use of image intensities by calibration of the detector in terms of the fraction of the incident beam detected [14] and using quantitative comparisons with simulations [15]. A crucial step in this approach is to quantitatively map the efficiency of the detector as a function of detection position. In both the OJ1 and OJ2 instruments the STEM detectors are located in the same optical plane as the HRTEM imaging detectors and in order to collect a range of scattering angles, as is required for STEM imaging, the post-specimen optics are adjusted to diffraction mode. However, if the post-specimen optics are changed to imaging mode, a magnified image of the STEM probe is formed in the image plane. In this latter configuration, scanning the STEM probe with suitable adjustment of the magnification enables the probe image can be scanned over the ADF detector allowing its efficiency to be mapped. The OJ2 instrument is fitted with two ADF detectors located before and after the omega energy filter. Operation of the pre-filter detector is more straightforward since high-angle scattering does not need to pass through the energy-filter, obviating the need for accurate filter alignment. An efficiency map of this detector is shown in Figure 6 and as is the case for most ADF detectors, it is evident that the response is non-uniform which must be considered when extracting quantitative information from ADF images.

For quantitative ADF STEM imaging, calibration of the digitized intensity values in terms of the incident beam is necessary. Typical fractions of the incident beam scattered onto the ADF detector are usually around 10%. On the OJ2 instruments, a routine procedure for quantitative ADF STEM imaging has been developed. In this method the condenser optics are adjusted such that the incident beam current is reduced to *ca.* 10% of the nominal value used for imaging and this reduced beam current is used to measure the detector map. If the fractional reduction in current is accurately measured using a Faraday cup, the signal measured in any subsequent experiment will be calibrated in terms of fraction of the incident beam current. This approach is valid as long as the detector amplifier contrast (gain) and brightness (offset) are not altered after the initial calibration because experiments have shown that the detector response is linear with respect to beam current [16]. Under these conditions, images can be recorded that are calibrated such that the intensity of the image is expressed as the fraction of the primary beam electrons that are scattered to the ADF detector. Figure 7 shows such an image of a core-shell catalyst nanoparticle comprising a Pd core and Pt shell. The aim of the synthesis is to generate a monolayer of Pt conformally covering the Pd core. There is clear evidence for the Pt shell in the image, but the relatively straight boundaries to the brighter Pt regions suggest that the Pt shell has coverage only on particular facets. The high signal-to-noise ratio available in aberration-corrected STEM allows the terminating atomic columns and several single atoms decorating the surrounding carbon support, to be readily observed. Recording such calibrated data will now allow a direct comparison with simulation allowing more detailed quantitative analysis

For quantitative comparison between experiments and simulations, a parameter that can be particularly challenging to quantify is the effective source size measured at the sample [17]. By the principle of reciprocity, this parameter plays the same role as the modulation transfer function (MTF) of the detector in HRTEM imaging [18]. However, as already described, in both the Oxford-JEOL instruments the post-specimen optics allow an aberration free image of the STEM probe to be recorded and this may provide a method for the measurement of STEM imaging parameters more accurately. We also note that accurate imaging of the STEM probe can also be a powerful diagnostic tool for the analysis of instabilities where it provides a sample-independent measurement.

4. Confocal Imaging

The ability to form an aberration free image of a STEM probe, as outlined in the previous section, enables confocal imaging using trajectories analogous to those used in confocal light microscopy. Scanning confocal electron microscopy (SCEM) was first demonstrated in uncorrected TEM by Frigo and coworkers [19] in an application to the specific problem of imaging thick samples. One of the key advantages of the confocal scanning optical microscope (CSOM), however, is the retrieval of three-dimensional imaging through the process of optical sectioning.

In general the depth of focus, Δz , for an optical system with a wavelength, λ , is given by [20]

$$\Delta z \approx \frac{\lambda}{\sin^2 \alpha} \quad (1)$$

where α is the semi-angle subtended by the focusing lens at the sample. In the case of light optics this value approaches the wavelength of the light. However, in an uncorrected electron microscope α typically takes values close to 0.01 and hence Δz has values of tens of nanometers, which is larger than the typical thickness of a TEM sample. Aberration correction, however, has a dramatic effect on the depth of focus as an increase of a factor of three in α reduces the depth of focus by a factor of nine, leading to values of just a few nanometers, substantially less than typical sample thicknesses.

Using this reduced depth of focus to retrieve 3D information in STEM has been demonstrated previously [21, 22]. In a non-confocal geometry, however, this approach can only be used for high-resolution imaging as the 3D transfer function for incoherent STEM imaging shows a missing cone which results in significant elongation in 3D images of laterally extended objects [23]. One of the motivations for the development of SCEM is the removal of this out-of-focus blurring in the image. Figure 8 schematically shows that in the confocal configuration, a small collector aperture placed in the detector plane rejects scattering away from the confocal point leading to improve depth resolution and selectivity.

Various authors [24-26] have considered the contrast observed in a confocal geometry and in particular Cosgriff et al. [24] have shown that first-order phase contrast is not transferred in a confocal configuration. Therefore, the conventional “bright-field” imaging mode in the SCEM geometry will have limited application. However, a more promising imaging mode is available in the 2200MCO instrument that makes use of both aberration correctors together with the in-column energy-filter,

whereby it is possible to use the instrument as an energy-filtered scanning confocal electron microscope (EFSCEM). Importantly, it has been shown [25,27] that this mode does not suffer from a missing cone in the transfer function, and therefore extended objects can be imaged with maximum depth resolution.

The instrumental alignment for confocal experiments is challenging. A method for simultaneously tuning the optical elements required to form an aberration-corrected focused probe illuminating the sample and aberration-corrected post-specimen optics subsequently focusing that probe to the detector plane has been previously described [28]. This involves using the electron Ronchigram to achieve tuned STEM optics, then switching the post-column optics to imaging mode such that a probe image is observed on a CCD camera. Making the assumption that the STEM probe is tuned, the post-specimen optics can be adjusted such that no aberrations are observed in the probe image. Figure 9 shows such a probe where some residual three-fold astigmatism can be seen.

A particular difficulty with EFSCEM, however, is that a change in energy of the electrons of interest by inelastic scattering in the sample, combined with the chromatic aberration of the post-sample optics, defocuses the post-specimen optics. A method has been devised [29] in which the incident beam energy is changed by adjusting the high tension supply such that the confocal configuration is regained for electrons that suffer a specific energy loss in the sample (Figure 10), where it is evident that scattering is only brought to focus at the specific energy loss of interest.

Making use of such a configuration, Figure 11 shows the improvement in depth resolution that results from using the EFSCEM mode [29]. A purpose designed

piezo-driven stage-scanning system [30] was used to acquire two-dimensional lateral (x - y) scans, or alternatively to slice in depth by scanning along one lateral direction and the depth direction to form an (x - z) scan. A carbon film decorated with Au nanoparticles was used as a test sample and the microscope was adjusted to the confocal mode for the carbon K-edge scattering. Figures 11(a) and 11(d) compare EFSCM lateral x - y scans acquired with the sample positioned at the confocal height with and without a collector aperture present. Without a collector aperture, all the scattered intensity collected by the post-specimen lens contributes to the image, and this mode is therefore similar to energy-filtered STEM (EFSTEM) imaging and cannot be regarded as being a confocal. Figures 11(b) and 11(e) compare scans in the x - z plane at positions corresponding to $y=0$ nm in Figs. 11(a) and (d) respectively.

The FWHMs of the intensity profiles L1 and L2 collected in EFSTEM modes (Fig. 11c) are more than 1 μ m. In the EFSTEM mode, the out-of-focus scattered electrons are collected so this geometry cannot distinguish the different film thicknesses as expected. In the EFSCM mode, rejection of scattering away from the confocal plane occurs and the data shows a FWHM in the depth direction of 84 ± 21 nm and 42 ± 21 nm at points 1 and 2, respectively (Fig. 11(f)). Thus direct imaging of the change in thickness of the carbon film can be observed using EFSCM, and it can be seen that there are significant variations in the height of the carbon film between points 1 and 2. Work is currently underway to explore the range of application of this new technique.

5. Conclusions

1
2
3 In this paper we have reviewed the ways in which the aberration-corrected electron
4
5
6 microscopes developed in partnership between Oxford and JEOL have been used
7
8 since 2003. We firstly describe the advantages and ultimate limitations of combining
9
10 aberration corrected TEM imaging with exit wavefunction reconstruction with
11
12 particular reference to a tilt azimuth dataset geometry. Subsequently we review the
13
14 use of ADF STEM imaging in studies of ceramic grain boundary interfaces carried
15
16 out by David Cockayne's group and also describe recent progress in quantification of
17
18 the ADF signal. Differences in the optimum way of operating the correctors for
19
20 HRTEM and STEM have been discussed. Finally, the development of a new confocal
21
22 mode of microscopy has been described, making use of the unusual optical
23
24 configuration of the instrument.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 Acknowledgements

34
35 The authors would like to acknowledge financial support from the Leverhulme Trust (F/08 749/B) and
36 the EPSRC (EP/F048009/1) and Intel Ireland. Technical assistance from JEOL Ltd and JEOL (UK) Ltd
37 is also acknowledged.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

References

- [1] J. L. Hutchison, J. M. Titchmarsh, D. J. H. C. Cockayne, R. C. Doole, C. J. D. H. Hetherington, A. I. Kirkland, H. Sawada, *Ultramicroscopy*, **103**, 7 (2005).
- [2] A. I. Kirkland, J. M. Titchmarsh, J. L. Hutchison, D. J. H. Cockayne, C. J. D. Hetherington, R. C. Doole, H. Sawada, M. Haider, P. Hartel, *JEOL News*, **39**(1), 2 (2004).
- [3] K. Tsuno, T. Kaneyama, T. Honda, K. Tsuda, M. Terauchi, M. Tanaka, *J. Electron Microscopy* **46**, 357 (1997).
- [4] H. Rose, *Optik* **85**, 19 (1990).
- [5] M. Haider, H. Rose, S. Uhlemann, E. Schwan, B. Kabius and K. Urban, *Ultramicroscopy* **75**, 53 (1998).
- [6] P. Hartel, H. Müller, S. Uhlemann, and M. Haider, *Proceedings of EMC 2004*, Antwerp, 41 (2004).
- [7] A. I. Kirkland, R. R. Meyer, *Microscopy and Microanalysis* **10**, 1 (2004).
- [8] S. Haigh, H. Sawada, A. I. Kirkland, *Phil. Trans. Proc. Roy. Soc A* **367**, 3755 (2009).
- [9] L. Cervera Gontard, L.-Y. Chang, C. J. D. Hetherington, A. I. Kirkland, D. Ozkaya, and R. E. Dunin-Borkowski, *Angew. Chem.* **46**, 3683 (2007).
- [10] N. Dellby, O. L. Krivanek, P. D. Nellist, P. E. Batson, and A. R. Lupini, *Journal of Electron Microscopy* **50**, 177 (2001).
- [11] M. Haider, S. Uhlemann, and J. Zach, *Ultramicroscopy* **81**, 163 (2000).
- [12] P. D. Nellist, S. J. Pennycook, *Adv. Imaging & Electron Phys.* **113**, 148 (2000).
- [13] G. B. Winkelman, C. Dwyer, T. S. Hudson, D. Nguyen-Manh, M. Dobliger, R. L. Satet, M. J. Hoffmann and D. J. H. Cockayne, *Appl. Phys. Lett.* **87**, 061911 (2005).
- [14] J. M. LeBeau, S. Stemmer, *Ultramicroscopy* **108**, 1653 (2008).
- [15] J. M. LeBeau, S. D. Findlay, L. J. Allen, and S. Stemmer, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **100**, 4 (2008).
- [16] H. E, P. D. Nellist, S. Lozano-Perez and D Ozkaya in *Proc. EMAG2009*, IOP Publishing (2010).
- [17] P. D. Nellist, Chapter 2 (pp 65-132) in *Science of Microscopy*, Ed. P. W. Hawkes, J. C. H. Spence, Springer, New York (2008).
- [18] R. R. Meyer, A. I. Kirkland, *Ultramicroscopy* **75**, 23 (1998).
- [19] S. P. Frigo, Z. H. Levine, N. J. Zaluzec, *Appl. Phys. Lett.* **81**, 2112 (2002).
- [20] M. Born, E. Wolf, *Principles of Optics*. Pergamon Press, Oxford (1980).
- [21] K. Van Benthem, A. R. Lupini, M. Kim, H. S. Baik, S. Doh, J.-H. Lee, M. P. Oxley, S. D. Findlay, L. J. Allen, J. T. Luck, and S. J. Pennycook, *Applied Physics Letters* **87**, 034104 (2005).
- [22] Borisevich, A.Y., Lupini, A.R., and Pennycook, S.J., *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **103** 3044 (2006).
- [23] G. Behan, E. C. Cosgriff, A. I. Kirkland, and P. D. Nellist, *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. Lond., A* **367**, 3825 (2009).

- [24] E. C. Cosgriff, A. J. D'Alfonso, L. J. Allen, S. D. Findlay, A. I. Kirkland, and P. D. Nellist, *Ultramicroscopy* **108**, 1558 (2008).
- [25] A. J. D'Alfonso, E. C. Cosgriff, S. D. Findlay, G. Behan, A. I. Kirkland, P. D. Nellist, and L. J. Allen, *Ultramicroscopy* **108**, 1567 (2008).
- [26] J. J. Einspahr, P. M. Voyles, *Ultramicroscopy*, **106**, 1041 (2006).
- [27] H. L. L. Xin, D. A. Muller, *J. Electron Microsc.*, **58**, 157 (2009).
- [28] P. D. Nellist, G. Behan, A. I. Kirkland, and C. J. D. Hetherington, *Applied Physics Letters* **89**, 124105 (2006).
- [29] P. Wang, G. Behan, M. Takeguchi, A. Hashimoto, K. Mitsuishi, M. Shimojo, A. I. Kirkland and P. D. Nellist, *Physical Review Letters* **104**, 200801 (2010).
- [30] M. Takeguchi, A. Hashimoto, M. Shimojo, K. Mitsuishi and K. Furuya *J. Electron Microsc.*, **57**, 123 (2008).

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1. Tilt limits determined for an object thickness of 2 nm at 200 kV assuming third order aberration correction and a focal spread = 4 nm.

Limiting Factor	Maximum Tilt Magnitude /mrad	Resolution Limit /nm
Incoherent Aberrations	19	0.0629
Coherent Aberrations	25	0.0547
Geometric Parallax	18	0.0645

Figure captions

Figure 1. The Oxford-JEOL aberration corrected microscopes (a) JEM 2200FS installed in 2003, (b) JEM 2200 MCO installed in 2006.

Figure 2. (a) Restored phase of a 6-nm Pt particle obtained by applying spherical aberration correction and through-focus exit wavefunction restoration to a defocus series of 20 images acquired on the OJ1 instrument at 200 kV with $C_3=30\text{ }\mu\text{m}$ (b) Best fitting simulated phase from multislice calculations of the exit plane wavefunction for various terrace structures. The best match is taken to be the one in which the ratio of simulated phase shifts between individual atomic columns in the terraces best matches the experimentally measured ratios at equivalent positions. The magnitudes of the simulated phase shifts, both on the terraces and in the center of the particle, are higher in the simulations than in the experimental data. This difference may provide insight into the poorly understood discrepancy between the contrast of simulated and experimental conventional HRTEM images, known as the Stobbs factor. (c) Three dimensional atomic model used to calculate the best-fitting phase in part (b). The large white arrow indicates the direction of the electron beam. The insets in (a) and (b) show the crystallographic details of the particle. In parts (b) and (c) 1–4 correspond to the same features on the surface of the particle. The notation Pt(S)- $n(x,y,z)K(u,v,w)$ refers to the microfacets for which n is the number of atoms in the terrace, (x,y,z) is the Miller index of the terrace, and (u,v,w) is the Miller index of the step.

Figure 3. Exit wavefunctions for a gold foil oriented along the $\langle 123 \rangle$ direction. (a), (b) (c) phase, modulus and Fourier transform of the exit wavefunction restored using a

16 image focal series with a focal step of 7 nm. (d), (e), (f) phase, modulus and Fourier transform of the exit wavefunction of the same specimen area restored from a 27 image tilt-defocus data set with a maximum tilt magnitude of 18.4 mrad. The axial 10% information limit of 0.1 nm is indicated on both transforms for reference, and the contrast in the transforms has been inverted but not otherwise scaled to improve clarity.

Figure 4. A Ronchigram demonstrating the accuracy of aberration correction in the STEM mode. The radius of the overlaid circle is 40 mrad. The 12-fold rotational symmetry expected when the aberrations are dominated by six-fold astigmatism is apparent.

Figure 5. Experimental HAADF-STEM images of {100} crystal-intergranular film interfaces in rare-earth-containing Si_3N_4 . (a, b) La-containing Si_3N_4 viewed parallel to [001] and [100], respectively. (c, d) Lu-containing Si_3N_4 viewed parallel to [001] and [100], respectively. Reproduced from Ref. [14] with permission of the American Institute of Physics.

Figure 6. The ADF detector efficiency as a function of probe position across the detector surface, scaled to mean value across detector. Variations in efficiency are seen across the detector surface, in particular at low angles.

Figure 7. An ADF STEM image of a Pd core/Pt shell nanoparticle with an intensity scale calibrated as a fraction of the incident electron intensity. The detector inner radius was 90 mrad.

Figure 8. Schematic diagram of the confocal trajectories for SCEM which shows that the beams scattered away from the confocal point, a, are rejected by the collector aperture.

Figure 9. The image recorded in the detector plane when the microscope is aligned for confocal operation with no specimen present. In this mode, the post-specimen optics are forming an image of the STEM probe. The probe current was measured to be 20 pA.

Figure 10. An image of the intensity in the energy dispersion plane with the microscope in a confocal configuration for a desired energy-loss of ~ 100 eV corresponding to Si L-edge. A sample of Si is present and energy-loss features such as plasmon-loss peaks may be seen. The beam can be seen to be coming to a focus, indicating a confocal condition at the energy-loss of interest.

Figure 11. EFSCEM x-y scans acquired from a carbon film positioned at the confocal point (a) without a collector aperture (EFSTEM equivalent) and (d) with a collector aperture corresponding to a diameter of 0.34 nm. (b) and (e) EFSCEM x-z scans along $y=0$ nm in (a) and (d), respectively. (c) and (f) line profiles along the dotted lines L1 (---) and L2 (---) shown in (b) and (e). (Reproduced from Ref [29] with permission of the American Physical Society).

Figure 1

(a)

(b)

Figure 2

Figure 3

Figure 4

Figure 5

Figure 6

Figure 7

Figure 8

Figure 9

Figure 10

Figure 11