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M.H. Korayem a,∗, M. Noroozi b,1, Kh. Daeinabi b

a Department of Mechanical Engineering, Center of Excellence in Experimental Solid Mechanics and Dynamics, Iran University of Science and Technology, Tehran, P.O. Box 13114-16846, Iran
b Department of Mechatronics Engineering, Science and Research Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, P.O. Box 14737-87996, Iran

Received 2 March 2012; revised 12 May 2012; accepted 19 June 2012

KEYWORDS

AFM; Chattering; Lyapunov-based stability; Nano-manipulation; Sliding mode control.

Abstract

Nowadays, designing a reliable controller for an Atomic Force Microscope (AFM) during the manipulation process is a main issue, since the tip can jump over the target nanoparticle and, thus, the process can fail. This study aims to design a Sliding Mode Controller (SMC) as a robust chattering-free controller to push nano-particles on the substrate. The first control purpose is positioning the micro cantilever tip at a desired trajectory by the control input force, which can be exerted on the micro cantilever in the Y direction by an actuator located at its base. The second control target is the micro-positioning stage in X, Y directions. The simulation results indicate that not only are the proposed controllers robust to external disturbances and nonlinearities, such as deflection of the AFM tip, but are chattering free SMC laws that are able to make the desired variable state to track a specified trajectory during a nano-scale manipulation.

© 2012 Sharif University of Technology. Production and hosting by Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

Nano-particle manipulation using AFM has created widespread interest over the last few years [1]. In addition, nano-manipulation is a first and critical step for achieving any complex functional nano-device, and its application can also be found in several fields, such as for nano-tribological characterization purposes [2–5]. Thus, some research has been developed to model AFM-based nano-manipulation [1,6,7]. Babahosseini et al. [8] presented a comprehensive and practical model of AFM tip-based nano-manipulation; the proposed model encompasses all effective physical and mechanical phenomena at the nano-scale. This model was also simulated for two prevalent friction models. Korayem and Zakeri [9], using a graphical method, researched the effects of existing parameters in the process of nano-particle pushing on the force and time required for manipulation. Daeinabi and Korayem [10] compared the applied load, adhesion force, contact radius and indentation depth of nano-particles for eight different nano-contact models. The dynamic behavior of a nano-particle during AFM-based pushing is studied in Refs. [11–13]. Using AFM as a nano-robot enables us to locate nano-particles in a desired position for micro/nano assembly in a two dimensional space to build miniaturized structures [14]. The manipulation process should be automated with less human intervention. Also, the need for designing a precise controller that guarantees a stable and accurate nano-manipulation task is obvious. Until now, some control schemes have been designed to make the AFM tip track a certain trajectory for the manipulation task. Hence, Yang and Jagannathan [15] proposed a NN-based controller, where the unknown part of the system dynamics is approximated by using a one-layer NN with an additional force control loop, guaranteeing the applied force to be close to the desired value. Delnavaz et al. [16] proposed a combined classical and second order sliding mode to the vibration control of the AFM tip in nano-manipulation tasks, but their nano-manipulation model was
Nomenclature

\begin{align*}
&L \quad \text{Microcantilever beam length} \\
&w \quad \text{Microcantilever beam width} \\
&t \quad \text{Microcantilever beam thickness} \\
&H \quad \text{Tip height} \\
&E \quad \text{Young's modulus} \\
&G \quad \text{Shear modulus} \\
&v \quad \text{Microcantilever beam Poisson ratio} \\
&\rho \quad \text{Density} \\
&\rho_p \quad \text{Particle density} \\
&R_t \quad \text{Particle radius} \\
&t_i \quad \text{Tip radius} \\
&\psi \quad \text{Pushing force angle} \\
&\theta \quad \text{Torsion angle of cantilever} \\
&K_0 \quad \text{Stiffness coefficient of torsional spring} \\
&K_v \quad \text{Stiffness coefficient of linear spring} \\
&K_z \quad \text{Stiffness coefficient of linear spring} \\
&l_i \quad \text{AFM tip inertia momentum} \\
&m_t \quad \text{Tip mass} \\
&\tau_s \quad \text{Shear strength} \\
&\nu \quad \text{Tip Poisson ratio} \\
&\nu_p \quad \text{Particle Poisson ratio} \\
&\nu_s \quad \text{Substrate Poisson ratio} \\
&\nu_t \quad \text{Tip Young modulus} \\
&E_t \quad \text{Particle Young modulus} \\
&E_p \quad \text{Substrate Young modulus} \\
&\kappa \quad \text{Modulus of elasticity of the material in contact} \\
&\alpha \quad \text{Contact radius} \\
&\gamma_t \quad \text{Tip surface energy} \\
&\gamma_p \quad \text{Particle surface energy} \\
&\gamma_s \quad \text{Substrate surface energy} \\
&\delta \quad \text{Indentation depth} \\
&\gamma \quad \text{Substrate energy density} \\
&\alpha_0 \quad \text{Interatomic separation distance} \\
&H_{tp} \quad \text{Hamaker constant (tip-particle)} \\
&H_{ps} \quad \text{Hamaker constant (particle-substrate)} \\
&\omega \quad \text{Surface energy between the nanoparticle and the tip/substrate} \\
&\mu_s \quad \text{Static coefficient of friction} \\
&\mu_d \quad \text{Dynamic coefficient of friction} \\
&\delta_m \quad \text{Normal tip force} \\
&\delta_t \quad \text{Lateral tip force} \\
&\delta_{t1}, \delta_{t2} \quad \text{Springs (Cantilever bending forces)} \\
&M_\theta \quad \text{Moment} \\
&h_{tp} \quad \text{Tip-particle and particle-substrate friction} \\
&h_{set} \quad \text{Desired tip center height} \\
&D_{set} \quad \text{Initial horizontal distance of the tip/particle centers} \\
&V_{stage} \quad \text{Stage velocity} \\
&V_{sub} \quad \text{Substrate velocity} \\
&z_0 \quad \text{Normal deflection offset} \\
&w \quad \text{Resonant frequency} \\
&Q \quad \text{Amplification factor} \\
&e \quad \text{Error} \\
&s \quad \text{Sliding surface} \\
&V \quad \text{Lyapunov function} \\
&D \quad \text{Disturbance}
\end{align*}

The nonlinear system, the sliding mode approach is proposed in this paper, which displays a satisfactory performance with a simple control structure and which is robust to model imprecision. During manipulation, the tip/particle/substrate system experiences complicated dynamics, and a perfect model of nano-manipulation is useful for successful control. The proposed modeling includes the coupled dynamics of the micro-cantilever and piezo tube actuator. Uncertainties due to the probe/sample contact are considered in the modeling.

The organization of the article is as follows: In Section 2, nano-manipulation and its nonlinear mathematical model are described. Then, in Section 3, the sliding mode control for the AFM-tip is designed and simulation results are provided. In Section 4, the dynamics of the AFM-surface is proposed, and in Section 5, the simulation results are demonstrated. Finally, the conclusion is presented in Section 6.

2. Nano-manipulation model

The AFM system used as a manipulation tool in this paper consists of a micro-cantilever beam with a sharp conical tip. The micro-cantilever is mounted on a piezoelectric actuator with a position sensitive photo detector, which receives a laser beam reflected from the end point of the beam to provide micro-cantilever deflection feedback [8]. The AFM tip moves and pushes the targeted particle on the immobile substrate, which is modeled as one torsional and two linear springs.

\begin{align*}
K_z &= \frac{E_w t^3}{4L^3}, \\
K_y &= \frac{E_w t^3}{4L^3}, \\
K_\theta &= K_{\theta \text{tor} s} = \frac{G w t^3}{3L} = \frac{E w t^3}{6(1 + \nu)},
\end{align*}

AFM geometry and material property are Young’s modulus, E, shear modulus, G, length, L, width, W, and thickness, t.

Normal force, \( F_z \), lateral force, \( F_y \), and moment, \( M_\theta \), of the springs are proportional to the deflection and torsion of the micro-cantilever.

\begin{align*}
F_z &= K_z z_c, \\
F_y &= K_y y_c, \\
M_\theta &= K_\theta \theta.
\end{align*}

Figure 1 depicts a free body diagram of the AFM lumped-parameters model, where the spring force, moment, \( (F_z, F_y, M_\theta) \) and interaction nanoscale force between the tip/particle \( F_{tp}(t) \) are external forces exerted on the tip.

The local coordinates are set up at \( c \) and \( t \), which correspond to the center of the micro-cantilever cross area and the center of the spherical tip apex. \( y_t \) and \( y_c \) are the tip base and the tip apex lateral movements, \( z_t \) and \( z_c \) are the tip base and tip apex vertical movements, \( \psi \) is pushing force angle and \( \theta \) is the tip torsional angle about the x axis.

\begin{align*}
\ddot{\theta} &= \frac{1}{(l_i + l_c)} (F_{tp} \cos \psi \dot{H} \sin \theta - k_\theta \theta + F_{tp} \psi \dot{H} \cos \theta), \\
\ddot{y}_t &= \frac{1}{(m_t + m_c)} \left( -F_{tp} \sin \psi - k_p (y_t + \dot{H} \sin \theta) \\
&- (\ddot{\theta} \dot{H} \cos \theta - \dot{H} \theta \sin \theta) \left( \frac{m_t + 2m_c}{2} \right) \frac{1}{m_t + m_c} \right).
\end{align*}
The interaction force defined as:
\[ F = \frac{1}{m_i + m_c} \left( -F_t \cos \psi - k_c (z_t - \dot{H} \cos \theta) \right) \]
\[ - \left( \frac{m_i + 2m_c}{2} \right) \frac{\ddot{h} \sin \theta + \dot{H} \dot{h} \cos \theta}{1} \right) \]

where \( I_c \) is the effective tip/particle radius. The time-varying separation distance introduced to avoid numerical divergence of \( h \), and \( \dot{h} \) is the effective tip/particle elastic modulus, \( K_{tp} \) is the Hamacker constant, \( \nu_t \) and \( \nu_p \) are the Poisson coefficient of the tip and particle, \( R \) is the effective tip/particle radius. The time-varying separation distance between the tip/particle is \( h(t) \). Also, \( \psi \), the angle of \( F_{tp} \), is defined as [8]:

\[ h(t) = \sqrt{\left( D_{set} - y_t + y_p \right)^2 + \left( h_{set} - R_t - R_p + \delta_p \right)^2 + \delta_p} \]
\[ \psi = \tan^{-1}\left( \frac{D_{set} - y_t + y_p}{h_{set} - R_t - R_p + \delta_p} \right), \]

where \( y_p \) is the total lateral movement of the particle on the substrate in the y-axis, \( D_{set} \) is the initial horizontal distance between the tip and particle centers, and \( h_{set} \) is the tip center height. \( R_t \) is the radius of the spherical tip apex and \( R_p \) is the ball-like particle radius (\( R_p \) assumes 150 nm [8]). \( \delta_p \) are nanoscale penetration depths on the particle/substrate and tip/particle contact surfaces [10].

In Figure 1, nano-particle dynamics and forces are considered and shown, when the particle is pushed by the AFM tip [1].

The motion equation of the nanoparticle in the y direction can be written as follows:
\[ \ddot{y}_p = \frac{1}{m_p} (F_{tp} \sin \psi - \text{sign}(\dot{y}_p) F_{frict}). \]

where \( \dot{y}_p(t) \) is the nanoparticle acceleration, \( F_{tp} \sin \psi \) is the tip/particle lateral interaction force, which we nominate as the pushing force, and \( F_{frict} \) is the nanoscale friction force on the contact surface of the particle/substrate. The AFM mechanical properties and geometric constants are demonstrated in Table 1.

Figure 2 demonstrates the frictional force and the lateral AFM tip force on the particle (or pushing force). Both graphs increase and fluctuate harmonically around a fixed value. During an oscillation, the amplitude of the pushing force is greater than the friction force above a wave, but friction force is greater below the wave. This difference leads to alternative positive and negative particle acceleration during the nano-manipulation. Also, Figure 2 shows that the nano-particle stays at the initial position until time 13 \( \mu \)s, and then, the particle begins to slide on the substrate. The average velocity of the nano-particle is about 0.5 \( \mu \)m/s, which is equal to the velocity of the probe stage as in [8].

3. Design controller

In this section, design of a sliding mode controller [18] as a robust chattering-free control in contact-mode, to control the AFM tip during the nano-manipulation process, for accomplishment of an effective nano-manipulation task, is studied, in order to achieve the main goal of a full automatic nano-manipulation system without direct intervention of an operator. The major aim is to control and position the micro-cantilever tip at a desired trajectory, especially at a constant tip angle and displacement during lateral nano-manipulation by the control input force. The nonlinear system of concern is represented by:
\[ \ddot{Y} = f(Y) + g(Y)U, \]
where \( f(Y) \) and \( g(Y) \) are nonlinear functions. The number of state variables are eight, they are \( \theta, y_1, y_2, z_1 \) and their derivatives, and \( U \) is a control input.

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{dy_1}{dt} &= \dot{\theta} = y_5, \\
\frac{dy_2}{dt} &= \dot{y}_1 = y_6, \\
\frac{dy_3}{dt} &= \dot{y}_2 = y_7, \\
\frac{dy_4}{dt} &= \dot{z}_1 = y_8, \\
\frac{dy_5}{dt} &= \ddot{\theta} = \frac{1}{(l_1 + l_2)} \left( F_{tp} \cos \psi \ddot{y}_1 - F_{tp} \sin \psi \dot{y}_1 - k_\psi (y_2 + \dot{H} \sin y_1) \right), \\
\frac{dy_6}{dt} &= \ddot{y}_1 = \frac{1}{(m_1 + m_c)} \left( -F_{tp} \sin \psi - k_\psi (y_2 + \dot{H} \sin y_1) \right) - \left( \frac{dy_5}{dt} \dot{H} \cos y_1 + \dot{H} \dot{y}_1 \sin y_1 \right) \left( \frac{m_1 + 2m_c}{2} \right), \\
\frac{dy_7}{dt} &= \ddot{y}_2 = \frac{1}{m_p} (F_{tp} \sin \psi - \text{sign}(y_p) F_{\text{frict}}),
\end{align*}
\]

The algorithm of control is shown in Figure 3.

Finding a proper sliding surface for such a system is not a routine task. The sliding surfaces of this system can be defined as:

\[
\begin{align*}
e_1 &= \theta - \theta_{\text{set}}, \\
e_2 &= y_t - y_{t\text{set}}, \\
s_1 &= \dot{\theta} + \lambda_1 e_1, \\
s_2 &= y_t + \lambda_2 e_2.
\end{align*}
\]

In Eqs. (18) and (19), \( e_1 \) and \( e_2 \) are errors, and \( \lambda_1, \lambda_2 > 0 \) are chosen to guarantee that \( e \) tends to zero. To have a stable system with the guarantee of stability of the feedback system, here the Lyapunov function is considered as follows:

\[
V = \lambda_1 |s_1| + \lambda_2 |s_2|.
\]

Here, \( \lambda_2 \) is a positive variable defined real number between 0 and 1, hence, \( V \geq 0 \). In Table 2, the values of controller parameters are presented.

The derivative of Eq. (22) is given by:

\[
\dot{V} = \text{sgn}(V).
\]

The derivative of Eq. (23) is given by:

\[
\dot{V} = \frac{s_1 \dot{s}_1}{|s_1|} + \frac{s_2 \dot{s}_2}{|s_2|} = \text{sgn}(s_1) \dot{s}_1 + \lambda_2 \text{sgn}(s_2) \dot{s}_2.
\]

Taking

\[
\dot{s}_1 = \ddot{y}_3 + \lambda_1 \dot{e}_1 = f_1(y) + g_1(y)u + \lambda_1 y_5,
\]

and

\[
\dot{s}_2 = \ddot{y}_6 + \lambda_2 \dot{e}_2 = f_2(y) + g_2(y)u + \lambda_2 y_6.
\]

For improving the control behavior of AFM tip angle and displacement, and reducing the chattering phenomenon, a saturation function is proposed instead of a sign function (\( V = -\eta \text{sgn}(\frac{V}{\eta}) \)). First, the sign function and, second, the saturation function (sat), are used. This function greatly reduces chattering as shown in Figure 4. The control objective is to choose \( U \) to make \( \theta \) and \( y_t \) track \( \theta_{\text{set}} \) and \( y_{t\text{set}} \) respectively. Using Lyapunov-based stability, control signal \( U \) as a force input controls, is presented as Eq. (25), given in Box I: where \( f_1, f_2 \) and \( g_1, g_2 \) are nonlinear functions in Eq. (16) for two different sliding surfaces (\( s_1, s_2 \)). In Figure 4, the proposed sliding mode controller is shown in the presence of the disturbance that leads the tip angle, which is one of the nonlinearities caused by manipulation force on the desired trajectory. Also, the tip and micro-cantilever move together with the same velocity during nano-manipulation, and as a result the tip cannot jump over the target nano-particle and the process will be continued until the end.

Table 2: Values of the controller used in simulation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \lambda_1 )</td>
<td>1e+08</td>
<td>( \psi )</td>
<td>1e-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \lambda_2 )</td>
<td>1e-1</td>
<td>( K )</td>
<td>1.8e+7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \lambda_3 )</td>
<td>9e+9</td>
<td>( \lambda_4 )</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( \frac{dy_1}{dt} )</th>
<th>( \frac{dy_2}{dt} )</th>
<th>( \frac{dy_3}{dt} )</th>
<th>( \frac{dy_4}{dt} )</th>
<th>( \frac{dy_5}{dt} )</th>
<th>( \frac{dy_6}{dt} )</th>
<th>( \frac{dy_7}{dt} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( k\theta )</td>
<td>( k\psi )</td>
<td>( k\theta )</td>
<td>( k\psi )</td>
<td>( k\theta )</td>
<td>( k\psi )</td>
<td>( k\theta )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2: (a) Pushing and friction forces. (b) Tip and particle position \[8\].
4. Dynamic of surface model

For atomic resolution positioning, piezoelectric actuators are utilized in the AFM system. By denoting the sample position on $x$, $y$, and $z$ directions as $x_s$, $y_s$, and $z_s$, respectively, the dynamics of the stage along each axis are given as [15]:

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{d^2 x_s}{dt^2} &= \frac{1}{w_a^2} \lambda_1 \dot{x}_s + \frac{1}{w_a Q_a} \ddot{x}_s + \lambda_1 f_{pe}(z, z_{sub}) \cos \gamma = \tau_x, \\
\frac{d^2 y_s}{dt^2} &= \frac{1}{w_a^2} \lambda_1 \dot{y}_s + \lambda_1 f_{pe}(z, z_{sub}) \cos \gamma = \tau_y, \\
\frac{d^2 z_s}{dt^2} &= \frac{1}{w_a^2} \lambda_1 \dot{z}_s + \lambda_1 f_{pe}(z, z_{sub}) \cos \gamma = \tau_z.
\end{align*}
\]
\[ U = -\eta \text{sat} \left( \frac{y}{\lambda} \right) - (f_1(y) + \lambda_1 y_5 \text{sgn}(s_1)) - \lambda_2 (f_2(y) + \lambda_3 y_6 \text{sgn}(s_2)) \]
\[
= g_1(y) \text{sgn}(s_1) + \lambda_2 g_2(y) \text{sgn}(s_2) 
\]  
(25)

5. Design controller for stage

At first, a sliding mode controller for the motion of the nanoparticle from the \((0, 0)\) point to the \((0.5 \mu m, 0.5 \mu m)\) position is designed and compared with previous work [4,19], as observed in Figure 5.

\[ e_s = \begin{bmatrix} x_s \\ y_s \\ z_s \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} x_d \\ y_d \\ z_d \end{bmatrix} 
\]  
(30)

\[ \begin{bmatrix} s_x \\ s_y \\ s_z \end{bmatrix} = \dot{e}_s = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_1 & \lambda_2 \\ \lambda_1 & \lambda_2 \\ \end{bmatrix} e_s, \]
\[ \begin{bmatrix} \tau_x \\ \tau_y \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} -k_1 \text{sat}(s_1) \\ -k_2 \text{sat}(s_2) \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_1 & \lambda_2 \\ \lambda_1 & \lambda_2 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \dot{x}_s - \dot{x}_d \\ \dot{y}_s - \dot{y}_d \end{bmatrix} 
\]  
\[ + \begin{bmatrix} \dot{x}_d \\ \dot{y}_d \end{bmatrix} - f - D \right) / g. \]  
(32)
where $[x_s \ y_s]_T$, $[x_d \ y_d]_T$ and $[\tau_x \ \tau_y]_T$ present the system state, the desired trajectory for the stage and control input vector, respectively. $f = \begin{bmatrix} f_1 \\ f_2 \end{bmatrix}$ and $g = \begin{bmatrix} g_1 \\ g_2 \end{bmatrix}$ are nonlinear functions in Eq. (16) for Eqs. (26) and (27). The disturbance is denoted as:

$$D = -\alpha + 2\alpha^*\text{rand}. \quad (33)$$

Comparison of the efficiency of the two controllers applied to AFM-stage system dynamics has shown successful trends in controlling the output of the nonlinear AFM-stage system. The striking feature of the sliding mode control is its robustness, with respect to $f$ and $g$. We only need to know the upper bound during the sliding phase; the motion is completely independent of $f$ and $g$. Also, the output signal achieves good tracking of the desired reference signal with a better settling time.

In this paper, a control strategy is proposed for the nonlinear AFM-stage system based on sliding mode approach, which is faced with external disturbances. This control algorithm is based on the Lyapunov technique, which is able to provide the stability of the system during tracking a circular path, with acceptable precision. The Lyapunov function is considered as follows [18]:

$$V = \frac{1}{2}s^2. \quad (34)$$

The sliding condition is defined by:

$$\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}s^2 \leq -\eta|s|. \quad (35)$$

The desired paths for $x$ and $y$ are:

$$x_d = (-A) \cos \left( \frac{t}{T} \right), \quad (36)$$

$$y_d = (-A) \cos \left( \frac{t}{T} + \pi/2 \right). \quad (37)$$

The values of controllers used in the simulation are presented in Table 3. Simulation results indicate that the sliding mode controller that is proposed in order to control the AFM-stage and the particle within a predefined trajectory can achieve its objective with acceptable tracking accuracy (Figures 6 and 7).

6. Conclusion

Since the task of manipulating nano-objects is complex, due to the nonlinear cantilever and contact dynamics, a sliding mode controller, as a robust and reliable controller, has been presented for guiding the AFM tip and stage, so that the position of the nano-particle follows a predefined trajectory. First, positioning the micro-cantilever tip at a desired trajectory, especially at a constant tip angle and displacement, during lateral nano-manipulation, is controlled by the SMC method. Second, the micro-positioning stage, based on AFM nano-manipulation, is controlled by the SMC method in $X$ and $Y$ directions. The simulation results indicate that not only are the proposed controllers robust under external disturbance, but that they are also chattering free SMC laws, which are able to perform the pushing task successfully in term of tracking during nano-scale manipulation.

![Figure 6](image6.png)

**Figure 6**: AFM-surface in presence of disturbance using SMC controller. (a) $x$ and $y$ surface positions, (b) control input forces.

![Figure 7](image7.png)

**Figure 7**: Input–output path using SMC controller.
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