





5th IFAST WP9 meeting

2022-05-03

D. Tikhonov





B-2.13 : 35 nm

B-3.19:0 nm

	NN		SIS films tested	Structure	Base test?	Method	place
B – 2.13	B-2.13	5th SIS	NbN – AlN – Nb(film)/Cu	180 nm – 35 nm – 4 μm Nb	No	HiPIMS	SIEGEN
B – 3.19	B-3.19	6th SIS	NbN – Nb(film)/Cu	180 nm – 0 nm – 4 μm Nb	No	HiPIMS	SIEGEN











35 nm insulator sample: additional resistance also have f(T) and f(B) components (417 MHz)





This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 Research and

B-2.13

3

Flux measurements B-3.19 'no insulator'









This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 Research and

B – 3.19 4







Slow cooldown with heater



B – 3.19

5











This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 Research and









Figure 6. Simulated temperature distribution in the lower part of the QPR based on an intentional power insertion using a dedicated heater underneath the sample.

Normalisation was done locally for each plot $B_n = B/(B_{max} - B_{min})$

Changes in flux observed near Nb T_c (9.3 K) and possible NbN T_c (13-14K)

Name	Cooldown speed at Nb Tc	Heater current	Resulting flux probe	Rs at 2.5 K 412 MHz	Rs at 4.5 K 412 MHz
	cross	(mA)	value (µT)	10 mT	10 mT
Heat cycle 1	≈12.4 K/min	0	-0.21	48.5	103
Heat cycle 2	0.5 K/min	55	-1.7	107.8	217.6
VTS warmup	-	0	0.05	-	-





7





Name	Cooldown speed at Nb Tc	Heater current	Resulting flux probe	Rs at 2.5 K 412 MHz	Rs at 4.5 K 412 MHz
	cross	(mA)	value (µT)	10 mT	10 mT
Heat cycle 1	≈12.4 K/min	0	-0.21	48.5	103
Heat cycle 2	0.5 K/min	55	-1.7	107.8	217.6
VTS warmup	-	0	0.05	-	-







Cernox sensors data from test 17 (Nb sample)





Figure 6. Simulated temperature distribution in the lower part of the QPR based on an intentional power insertion using a dedicated heater underneath the sample.













Time





This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 Research and













 Nothing unusual on the Rs vs T plot









Nothing unusual on the Rs • vs T plot









~400 MHz mode: 2 samples identical • at first run

14





 $R_{res} + ABCS \cdot (1/x) \cdot exp(-b/x)$

Table: fit results (test 36) at 10 mT

	412 MHz	842 MHz	1282 MHz
res	44.12 (43.18, 45.06)	76.87 (72.59, 81.15)	204 (201.8, 206.1)
BCS	1.45 (1.02, 1.88) E4	7.79 (3.90, 11.68) E4	2.39 (2.04, 2.74) E5
200	18.3 (17.1, 19.49)	20.05 (18.02, 22.07)	22.06 (21.47, 22.65)

*Nb coated flange used for all tests





This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 Research and





 $R_{res} + ABCS \cdot (1/x) \cdot exp(-b/x)$

Table: fit results (test 36) at 10 mT

	412 MHz	842 MHz	1282 MHz
R _{res}	44.12 (43.18, 45.06)	76.87 (72.59, 81.15)	204 (201.8, 206.1)
ABCS	1.45 (1.02, 1.88) E4	7.79 (3.90, 11.68) E4	2.39 (2.04, 2.74) E5
b	18.3 (17.1, 19.49)	20.05 (18.02, 22.07)	22.06 (21.47, 22.65)

Table: fit results (test 35) at 10 mT (Run 9)

16

	417 MHz	842 MHz	1282 MHz
R _{res}	59.94 (57.29, 62.58)	87.77 (82.17, 93.36)	355 (297.9, 412.1)
A _{BCS}	1.33 (0.63, 2.03) E4	9.78 (7.13, 12.43) E4	14.9 (3.19, 26.61) E4
b	17.14 (14.9, 19.38)	19.98 (18.74, 21.22)	17.52 (13.84, 21.2)

flange used for all tests

This project has received fun h and







Table: fit results (test 36) at 10 mT

	412 MHz	842 MHz	1282 MHz
R _{res}	44.12 (43.18, 45.06)	76.87 (72.59, 81.15)	204 (201.8, 206.1)
A _{BCS}	1.45 (1.02, 1.88) E4	7.79 (3.90, 11.68) E4	2.39 (2.04, 2.74) E5
b	18.3 (17.1, 19.49)	20.05 (18.02, 22.07)	22.06 (21.47, 22.65)

Table: fit results (test 35) at 10 mT (Run 9)

	417 MHz	842 MHz	1282 MHz
R _{res}	59.94 (57.29, 62.58)	87.77 (82.17, 93.36)	355 (297.9, 412.1)
A _{BCS}	1.33 (0.63, 2.03) E4	9.78 (7.13, 12.43) E4	14.9 (3.19, 26.61) E4
b	17.14 (14.9, 19.38)	19.98 (18.74, 21.22)	17.52 (13.84, 21.2)

*Nb coated flange used for all tests

This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 Research and







 $R_{res} + ABCS \cdot (1/x) \cdot exp(-b/x)$

Table: fit results (test 36) at 10 mT

	412 MHz	842 MHz	1282 MHz
R _{res}	44.12 (43.18, 45.06)	76.87 (72.59, 81.15)	204 (201.8, 206.1)
A _{BCS}	1.45 (1.02, 1.88) E4	7.79 (3.90, 11.68) E4	2.39 (2.04, 2.74) E5
b	18.3 (17.1, 19.49)	20.05 (18.02, 22.07)	22.06 (21.47, 22.65)

Table: fit results (test 35) at 10 mT (Run 9)

	417 MHz	842 MHz	1282 MHz
R _{res}	59.94 (57.29, 62.58)	87.77 (82.17, 93.36)	355 (297.9, 412.1)
A _{BCS}	1.33 (0.63, 2.03) E4	9.78 (7.13, 12.43) E4	14.9 (3.19, 26.61) E4
b	17.14 (14.9, 19.38)	19.98 (18.74, 21.22)	17.52 (13.84, 21.2)

*Nb coated flange used for all tests

This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 Research and

18

















35 nm insulator sample: additional resistance also have f(T) and f(B) components (417 MHz)











35 nm insulator sample: additional resistance also have f(T) and f(B) components (417 MHz)











































Rs vs B 35 nm sample









This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 Research and







<i>F</i> , (MHz)	B _o , (mT)
416	169











<i>F,</i> (MHz)	B _o , (mT)
416	169











<i>F</i> , (MHz)	B _o , (mT)
416	169
850	140











<i>F,</i> (MHz)	B _o , (mT)
416	169
850	140
1291	106





ifast Thank you!

Discussion:

- 1. Flux measurements: SIS samples more sensible to the trapped flux?
- 2. What happens with flux at 8.5 K?
- 3. Flux educed Rs = f(B,T)
- 4. Insulator does not give any additional Rs
- 5. Max field? 30 mT Hc1 for NbN?



This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 Research and



~ /	

Test	\mathbf{Q}_{fp1}	Q _{fp2}	Q _{fp3}
35 (35 nm)	(5.0±0.2) · 10 ¹⁰	$(1.44\pm0.02)\cdot10^{10}$	(2.7±0.10) · 10 ¹⁰
36 (0 nm)	$(4.58\pm0.17)\cdot10^{10}$	(1.61±0.03) · 10 ¹⁰	(5.20±0.11) · 10 ⁹













