

Title	Lateral Resolution of an Infrared Visible Optical Sum Frequency Generation Confocal Microscope
Author(s)	Tuan, Nguyen Anh; Miyauchi, Yoshihiro; Mizutani, Goro
Citation	Japanese Journal of Applied Physics, 51(12): 122402-1-122402-6
Issue Date	2012-11-15
Type	Journal Article
Text version	author
URL	http://hdl.handle.net/10119/11437
Rights	This is the author's version of the work. It is posted here by permission of The Japan Society of Applied Physics. Copyright (C) 2012 The Japan Society of Applied Physics. Nguyen Anh Tuan, Yoshihiro Miyauchi, and Goro Mizutani, Japanese Journal of Applied Physics, 51(12), 2012, 122402-1-122402-6. http://jjap.jsap.jp/link?JJAP/51/122402/
Description	

1 **Lateral Resolution of an Infrared Visible Optical Sum**
2 **Frequency Generation Confocal Microscope**

3 **Nguyen Anh Tuan^{1,2}, Yoshihiro Miyauchi^{1,2}, and Goro Mizutani^{1,2,*}**

4 ¹*School of Materials Science, Japan Advanced Institute of Science and Technology,*

5 *Nomi, Ishikawa 923-1292, Japan*

6 ²*Japan Science and Technology Corporation,*

7 *Core Research for Evolutional Science and Technology, Chiyoda, Tokyo 102-8666*

8 **E-mail address: mizutani@jaist.ac.jp*

9
10 We have demonstrated experimentally that an infrared visible sum frequency generation
11 (SFG) confocal microscope with an objective lens of numerical aperture 0.45 has a lateral
12 resolution of $0.48 \pm 0.06 \mu\text{m}$. As samples for the demonstration, we used a ZnS(100) wafer
13 with a structure fabricated by a focused ion beam method and a ZnS polycrystalline pellet.
14 The result was consistent with the theoretical resolution of a confocal microscope.

1. Introduction

Imaging techniques are important in various fields and optical sum frequency generation (SFG) microscopy has been used to monitor molecular vibrational images on surfaces and in biological materials¹⁻³⁾. SFG is one of the lowest-order nonlinear optical processes and it occurs in noncentrosymmetric media^{4,5)}. Other vibrational microscopies, such as infrared and Raman microscopies⁶⁻⁹⁾ do not have such selectivity for asymmetric species. Here molecular vibrational spectra have a lot of useful information. They provide information on local functional groups and their orientation. The fine structure of the spectral peaks gives information on the higher order structures of polymers and the crystalline order state³⁾. Hence, it is important to develop vibrational infrared, Raman, and SFG microscopies in a synchronous and complementary manner to be able to apply them to the development of solid state physics, biology, and their related technologies.

The first SFG microscopy (SFGM) was demonstrated in 1999 by Flörsheimer et al. using a Langmuir-Blodgett film as a sample,¹⁰⁾ and it was followed by other observations of organic-molecular systems¹⁾³⁾¹¹⁻¹⁷⁾ as well as inorganic samples²⁾¹⁸⁾⁻²¹⁾. Cimatu et al. distinguished between different chain-length self-assembled monolayers in microprinted patterns¹⁾. Nakai et al. observed electric field-induced SFG images of organic field-effect transistors¹³⁾. Miyauchi et al. observed an SFG image of a water plant *Chara fibrosa* and detected amylopectin selectively in it utilizing the sensitivity of this method for chirality³⁾. Recently, Inoue and coworkers have reported an SFGM resolution better than 2 μm using an onion root cell as a sample^{14,15)}.

There has also been effort to improve the spatial resolution of SFGM. Infrared visible SFG has been detected by near-field scanning optical microscopy (NSOM) with a spatial resolution of 0.19 μm ¹¹⁾. There has also been a combination of visible SFG and far-field

1 confocal microscopy⁹⁾. Examples of SHG confocal microscopy show that the confocal optics
2 gives nonlinear optical images with a resolution better than the diffraction limit and facilitates
3 three-dimensional scanning^{22,23)}. However, a combination of the confocal optics and infrared
4 visible SFGM has not been attempted except for the works by our group below.

5 Locharoenrat et al proposed the first infrared visible SFG confocal microscope²⁰⁾. In
6 their optical setup, they combined a normal confocal microscope (we call this a linear confocal
7 microscope henceforth) with a loosely focused infrared beam irradiating the sample from an off-
8 axis direction. The overlapped volume of the visible and infrared light beams provided the
9 radiation source of SFG. The radiation source was scanned on the sample and the SFG image
10 was obtained. The collection optical path of the signal light for the linear image observation of
11 the 532 nm light was the same as that for the SFG image observation of the 460 nm light. The
12 optical setup was just the same as the Raman microscopy setup in the anti-Stokes mode. Hence,
13 their equipment had an advantage in that the SFG image would be taken with little or no
14 readjustment of the optical path after the linear image was taken.

15 Images of SFG intensity from ZnS polycrystals were obtained with a spatial resolution of
16 $2\ \mu\text{m}$ ²¹⁾. They also demonstrated the acquisition of images of SFG intensity of ZnS
17 polycrystalline planes at different depths²⁰⁾. Hieu et al. and Li et al. used the same microscopy
18 and obtained SFG images of cellulose fibers and rice grains, respectively^{16,17)}. However, in their
19 observations, the spatial resolution of the confocal SFG microscope was far worse than the
20 minimum theoretical limit of $0.44\ \mu\text{m}$ explained below. In fact, the SFG signal became
21 remarkably weaker as the smaller pinhole was used, and it was difficult to optimize the optical
22 arrangement manually. Thus, those works ended up with only a trial demonstration with a
23 moderate spatial resolution. According to Cox and Sheppard,²⁴⁾ it is practically difficult to reach

1 exactly the theoretically optimum spatial resolution of the confocal microscope. This is
2 especially the case of SFG microscopy for bulky samples. In this context, the optimum lateral
3 resolution of the SFG confocal microscope of the type constructed by Locharoenrat et al. is also
4 worth checking experimentally, which becomes the purpose of this study.

5 As the test sample, we used a single crystal ZnS(100) wafer with a geometrical structure
6 fabricated by focused ion beams. Since the single crystal zinblende ZnS has a macroscopic
7 noncentrosymmetric structure, the infrared and visible beams can couple nonlinearly and will
8 permit an intense SFG from the bulk region of the crystal^{4,5)}. The polycrystalline ZnS used by
9 Locharoenrat et al. was not useful for the present purpose, because the SFG from it is expected to
10 occur in a random direction and may not hit the objective lens, as we will discuss later. Still, we
11 also measured the SFG images of the polycrystalline ZnS and used them to obtain the spatial
12 resolution.

13 As discussed by Cox and Sheppard and other groups, the minimum resolved distance r
14 between two points obtained by confocal microscopy is given by²⁴⁻²⁷⁾

$$15 \quad r = \frac{0.61\lambda}{\sqrt{2NA}} \quad (1)$$

16 Here, λ is the wavelength of the observed light signal and NA is the numerical aperture of the
17 collection optics or the objective lens. The full width half maximum (FWHM) resolution is
18 slightly different from that in eq. (1)²⁴⁾. Furthermore, the resolution in a coherent light emission
19 case such as SFG, is generally worse than that given by eq. (1)²⁴⁾. However, for simplicity, we
20 compare every result in this study with eq. (1), because it is the most popular form of the
21 resolution of confocal microscopy.

22 When we put $\lambda = 460$ nm and $NA = 0.45$ for our confocal SFG microscope into eq. (1),
23 we obtain a resolution of $0.44 \mu\text{m}$. This is the theoretical spatial resolution when an ideally small

1 pinhole is used. In the present case, 1 Airy unit, or the diameter of the Airy disk ²⁸⁾ at the pinhole,
2 is calculated to be $m \times 0.61 \lambda_{exc}/NA = 14.4 \mu\text{m}$ with the magnification factor of the optics $m=20$.
3 A pinhole in front of the photomultiplier tube with a diameter smaller than 1 Airy unit should
4 give a nearly ideal resolution of the confocal optics. The ideal axial resolution of the confocal
5 microscope is given by ²⁹⁾

$$6 \quad Z = \frac{1.41n\lambda}{NA^2} \quad (2)$$

7 Here, n is the refractive index of the medium. When we put the refractive index $n_{ZnS} = 2.29$ at λ
8 $= 460 \text{ nm}$ and $NA = 0.45$ into eq. (2), we obtain $Z = 7.3 \mu\text{m}$.

9

10 **2. Experimental Procedure**

11 Figure 1 shows the optical setup of our sum frequency generation confocal microscopy system.
12 It is basically the same as our previous optical setup ²⁰⁾. The source of the visible light at $\lambda_{VIS} =$
13 532 nm was the doubled-frequency output from a mode-locked neodymium-doped yttrium
14 aluminum garnet (Nd:YAG) laser (EKSPLA PL2143B). The light pulses of 532 nm wavelength
15 with the pulse duration time of 30 ps and at the repetition rate of 10 Hz entered the commercial
16 microscope optics Nikon Eclipse LV100D along its optical axis. The tunable infrared light from
17 an optical parametric generator and amplifier system (EKSPLA PG501/DFG) driven by the
18 fundamental and second harmonic outputs of the same Nd:YAG laser were focused on the same
19 position as the 532 nm light on the sample by a CaF_2 lens of 250 mm focal length. The infrared
20 light source with a bandwidth of 6 cm^{-1} was chosen in order to have a good vibrational spectrum,
21 sacrificing the measurement speed due to the low repetition rate ³⁰⁾. The pulse energies of the
22 visible and infrared beams at the sample surface were 10 and $5 \mu\text{J/pulse}$, respectively. The

1 visible and infrared beams were incident on the sample with incident angles of 0 and 62°,
2 respectively. The angle of 62° was chosen so that the infrared beam was not blocked by the
3 objective lens before it illuminates the sample. The spot size of the infrared light was around 30
4 μm on the sample. The SFG light pulses that travelled back on the optical path of the incident
5 visible light as shown by dashed lines in Fig. 1 were reflected by a dichroic mirror (DCM),
6 focused on the pinhole, and detected by a photomultiplier. The SFG intensity was measured at
7 an infrared wave number of around 2890 cm⁻¹ ($\lambda_{\text{IR}} \sim 3 \mu\text{m}$). This infrared wave number was
8 chosen because it was frequently used in our past analyses of the CH vibrational region of
9 hydrocarbons^{3,16,17}. When the infrared wave number was scanned between 2750 and 3150 cm⁻¹,
10 the beam spot shifted by 300 μm at maximum on the sample plane owing to the change of the
11 oscillation condition in the OPG. Thus, the readjustment of the infrared beam was necessary in
12 order to obtain images at different wave numbers. The SFG signal appeared at $\lambda_{\text{SFG}} \sim 460 \text{ nm}$.

13 Figure 2 shows the details of the optical elements used in the visible incident and
14 collection optics. As a DCM, we used a single-edge dichroic beamsplitter with a nominal edge
15 wavelength of 506 nm (Semrock FF506). The beamsplitter passed the 532 nm light pulses but
16 reflected the 460 nm SFG pulses. The focal lengths of the lenses were chosen so that the beam
17 sizes at the mirrors in the optical paths do not exceed 15 mm. The lenses L23, L24, L25, and
18 L30 were visible achromatic doublets. L23 and L30 were Thorlabs AC254-100-A1 (f=100 mm),
19 and L24 and L25 were Thorlabs AC254-400-A1 (f=400 mm). The objective lens was Nikon
20 LUPlan Fluor 20X/0.45NA and was mounted on z-axis piezo-stage Nano-servo NS7111-C with
21 the travel range of 100 μm. The band pass filters in front of the photomultiplier (Hamamatsu R-
22 585S) were Thorlabs FB460-10 (FWHM bandwidth, 10 nm) for a 460 nm wavelength and
23 Semrock FF01-472/30-25 (FWHM bandwidth, 30 nm) for a 472 nm wavelength. The x-y piezo-

1 stage and the controller were NANO CONTROL NS4213 and NC3301-C, respectively. The
2 travel range of this piezo-stage was $100 \times 100 \mu\text{m}^2$. The pinhole of $10 \mu\text{m}$ diameter
3 corresponding to 0.69 Airy units was Thorlabs P10S. The spatial resolutions should be $\sim 110\%$
4 of those predicted from Eq. (1)²⁴. The image at the sample was magnified 20 times at the
5 pinhole. SFG intensities were normalized by the intensity of the incident infrared light. A linear
6 image with an area of $400 \times 400 \mu\text{m}^2$ was also monitored by a charge-coupled device (CCD)
7 camera (Trinity IUC-130CN2), in addition to linear confocal microscopy images. All SFG
8 experiments were performed in air at room temperature of 24°C .

9 In order to evaluate the spatial resolution of the SFG confocal microscopy, we used a
10 ZnS(100) single crystal wafer with a structure fabricated by a Ga focused ion beam. We
11 purchased a ZnS(100) wafer of $10 \times 10 \times 1 \text{ mm}^3$ size grown by a chemical vapor transport
12 method in hydrogen from RMT Ltd. The focused ion beam (FIB) system SII Technology SMI
13 3050 with a gallium ion source was used to fabricate the pattern. A beam current of $2 \mu\text{A}$ and an
14 acceleration voltage of 30 keV energy were used. The desired pattern was milled by rastering
15 the ion beam. The vertical cross-sectional fabrication design is shown in Fig. 3(a). The real
16 fabrication considered an effect of the three dimensional shape of the focused ion beam waist,
17 and the fabricated edges are inferred to exhibit some roundness. In order to avoid charge up of
18 the wafer, the substrate was coated with 10 to 20 nm amorphous carbon and 20 nm PtPd before
19 fabrication. After the ion beam fabrication, this coating was mostly removed by the Ga ion beam.
20 However, part of it remained as was confirmed by optical microscopy observation. SFG was not
21 observed from the area with this residual coating.

1 The polycrystalline ZnS pellet grown by chemical vapor deposition (CVD) with a
2 diameter of 10 nm and a thickness of 3 mm was purchased from Furuuchi Chemical Co., Ltd.,
3 Japan, and it was used as delivered for both linear and SFG image observations.
4

5 **3. Results and Discussion**

6 First, we evaluated the spatial resolution of the optical microscopy system as a linear confocal
7 microscope using only the 532 nm laser light and the pinhole of 10 μm diameter. We used a ZnS
8 polycrystalline pellet as a sample. Using small pits and scratches on the surface of the ZnS pellet,
9 the lateral resolution was evaluated as 0.49 μm . This is consistent with 110% that of the
10 theoretical prediction of $r=0.51 \mu\text{m}$ obtained from eq. (1). In a similar way, the axial spatial
11 resolution in the depth direction was experimentally evaluated as 5.5 μm . This value is
12 considered to be roughly consistent with 7.3 μm predicted from eq. (2).

13 Figure 3(b) shows a linear confocal image of the fabricated structure on ZnS(100) by
14 using the 532 nm light only. The horizontal positions of Figs. 3(a)-3(d) are adjusted to each
15 other. In Figs. 3(b) and 3(c), the collection optics are focused on the middle terrace of the
16 fabricated structure. In Fig. 3(b), the circumference of the middle terrace is dark because parts of
17 the incident and reflected light are blocked by the vertical walls surrounding the middle terrace.
18 The top substrate face of the structure is out of focus, but it is almost within the focal depth of
19 7.3 μm calculated from eq. (2) from the focal plane and is less clear around the middle terrace.

20 Figure 3(c) shows an SFG confocal image of the sample in the same optical configuration
21 as that in Fig. 3(b). The infrared excitation light irradiated the sample from the right-hand side
22 as shown schematically in Fig. 3(a). The visible excitation light irradiated the sample from its

1 normal direction. The SFG light propagating upward was collected by the objective lens. The
2 incident angle of the infrared light was as large as 62° ; thus, it could not hit all the faces of the
3 sample. The accumulation time of the SFG images in this study 2 h, but we see a very weak
4 image in Fig. 3(c) due to the small pinhole in front of the detection photomultiplier. One may
5 see in Fig. 3(a) that, concerning the middle terrace, the infrared light can irradiate only the left
6 part. Accordingly, in Fig. 3(c), we see weak signals from the left part of the middle terrace, as
7 indicated by a white arrow.

8 We also see a stronger SFG emitting area to the left of the middle terrace. This area
9 corresponds to an edge structure marked A in Fig. 3(a). Here, SFG is suggested to be strong for
10 two reasons. One reason is that amorphous carbon and Pt-Pd coating on the substrate top is
11 removed by the tail of the focused ion beam and the bare ZnS crystal was exposed. Hence this
12 area can emit a strong SFG. Another possible reason is that the fabricated edge A is slightly dull
13 owing to the nonideal FIB fabrication at the beam waist. The infrared beam with the incident
14 angle of 62° may hit the substrate more effectively at point A when the edge is round than when
15 it is sharp, since a wider ZnS surface should be exposed to the infrared beam with a lower
16 incident angle.

17 We evaluated the spatial resolution of the SFG microscope using this stronger signal near
18 edge A. We adjusted the focus of our system to the top face of the sample and obtained the SFG
19 image in Fig. 3(d). In Fig. 3(d), the signal from the middle terrace is weaker, and the image of
20 the strong SFG signal is narrower than that in Fig. 3(c). In Fig. 4, we show the SFG intensity
21 profile along the horizontal line in Fig. 3(d). Fitting the profile to the error function, we
22 estimated the resolution as $0.53 \mu\text{m}$.

1 In order to collect additional data for evaluating the spatial resolution of the confocal
2 SFGM, we used a polycrystalline ZnS pellet as a sample. Figures 5(b)-5(d) show its SFG
3 intensity images, while Fig. 5(a) shows the corresponding linear CCD image. In Figs. 5(b)-5(d),
4 SFG occurs in very small spots on the sample. We also found that some regions showed SFG
5 images with fine structures. These fine structures are due to geometrical structures, such as pits,
6 scratches, or domain boundaries, on the pellet surface.

7 Using the SFG intensity profiles at two selected positions on the fabricated ZnS(100)
8 substrate and at two selected positions on a polycrystalline ZnS pellet, we evaluated the spatial
9 resolution. From Fig. 4, we obtained a resolution of 0.53 μm and, from another SFG profile at
10 the middle terrace edge in Fig. 3(c), we obtained a resolution of 0.55 μm . Figure 6 shows the
11 SFG intensity profile on the ZnS polycrystalline pellet along the straight line shown in Fig. 5(c).
12 By fitting the error function to the data points in Fig. 6, we obtained a resolution of 0.42 μm . On
13 another point on the ZnS polycrystalline pellet, we obtained a resolution of 0.41 μm . From these
14 four resolutions, the statistically evaluated spatial resolution of the current SFGM was 0.48 ± 0.06
15 μm . This result is consistent with the lateral resolution of 0.49 μm predicted from eq. (1)
16 multiplied by 1.1. SFG is a coherent process and the ideal spatial resolution of the SFG confocal
17 microscope should be worse than the value predicted from eq. (1) owing to the interference in
18 signal light²⁴). However, this difference cannot be discussed in this study owing to the
19 experimental error of $\pm 0.06 \mu\text{m}$.

20 In contrast, we could not evaluate the axial resolution of this microscope in the depth
21 direction. This is because in our depth scan, we only moved the objective lens in the z-direction
22 and did not move the infrared light. Accordingly, the focused visible beam moved in the z-
23 direction but the loosely focused infrared beam did not. Thus, the overlapping of the visible and

1 infrared beams became worse as the objective lens was scanned in the z-direction. Hence, an
2 accurate depth resolution could not be obtained. Still, we obtained an apparent depth resolution
3 of 1.5 μm . This resolution is better than that obtained from the theoretical prediction of eq. (2),
4 but it is not a true axial resolution for the reason above.

5 It would be interesting to infer why the polycrystalline ZnS pellet showed weak signals
6 from almost the entire sample area and only spotty SFG images with sizes of around 1 μm , such
7 as those seen in Fig. 5. SFG is a coherent process, and the phase matching among the incident
8 and SFG beams must be optimum for the SFG light to be emitted strongly⁴⁾. Normally, the
9 direction of the optimum phase-matched wave vector is in a narrow solid angle and the SFG light
10 is emitted in a beam. Assuming that the strong beam is oriented in a random direction from each
11 crystalline domain, the probability of this beam to enter the acceptance angle of the objective
12 lens is

$$13 \quad P = \frac{\Delta\Omega}{4\pi} \quad (3)$$

14 Here, $\Delta\Omega$ is the solid angle of the SFG light in ZnS reaching the objective lens. $\Delta\Omega$ is calculated
15 to be 0.12 sr from the numerical aperture of 0.45 of the objective lens and the refractive index of
16 2.29 of ZnS at the wavelength of 460 nm. Using eq. (3), we can estimate P as approximately 1%.
17 On the other hand, the area percentage of the strong SFG in the image in Fig. 5 is approximately
18 0.6%. The rough agreement of these two values can be explained if we assume that the SFG
19 light is generated in a strong beam from bulk ZnS grains with sizes of $\sim 1 \mu\text{m}$. This SFG source
20 size is probably the single crystal domain size in the polycrystalline matrix. In the linear image
21 of the polycrystalline pellet in Fig. 5(a), we see that the pits created by polishing have a size of

1 around 1 μm . We infer that the crystalline particle has this size and is dislocated from the matrix
2 during polishing.

3 In the introduction, we noted that this polycrystalline ZnS pellet was not suitable for the
4 test observation of the SFG confocal microscope with a pinhole size of 10 μm . This was not the
5 case for the lower resolution in ref. 20. This is because the SFG source from a wider and deeper
6 region was within the acceptable range of the objective lens and the larger solid angle from each
7 SFG source was acceptable, for lower resolutions or larger pinholes. However, when we made
8 the pinhole smaller, the signal weakened rapidly at most of the points on the sample, as seen in
9 Fig. 5(b), and we could not optimize the optical setup easily. This was the reason why the
10 polycrystalline ZnS was not simply appropriate as the first test sample for the demonstration of
11 the optimum spatial resolution.

12 **4. Conclusions**

13 We have constructed a confocal sum frequency generation (SFG) microscope and measured its
14 lateral spatial resolution. By observing the SFG images from ZnS(100) fabricated by a focused
15 ion beam method and a polycrystalline ZnS pellet, we obtained the lateral resolution of
16 $0.48\pm 0.06 \mu\text{m}$.

17

18

19

20 **Acknowledgment**

21 The authors would like to thank Dr. Takahiro Ode of Nanophoton Corporation for his helpful
22 advice and guidance.

1 Reference

- 2 1) K. Cimatu, H. J. Moore, T. R. Lee, and S. Baldelli: J. Phys. Chem. C **111** (2007) 11751.
- 3 2) Y. Miyauchi, H. Sano, J. Okada, H. Yamashita, and G. Mizutani: Surf. Sci. **603** (2009) 2972.
- 4 3) Y. Miyauchi, H. Sano, and G. Mizutani: J. Opt. Soc. Am. A **23** (2006) 1687.
- 5 4) Y. R. Shen: *The Principles of Nonlinear Optics* (Wiley, New York, 1984) Chap. 2, p. 28 .
- 6 5) H. Jayathilake: *Vibrational Sum Frequency Generation Spectroscopy* (VDM Verlag,
- 7 Saarbrücken, 2010) p.19.
- 8 6) A. Boskey and N. P. Camacho: Biomaterials **28** (2007) 2465.
- 9 7) P. Yu: J. Struct. Biol. **150** (2005) 81.
- 10 8) S. D. Evans, T. L. Freeman, T. M. Flynn, D. N. Batchelder, and A. Ulman: Thin Solid Films
- 11 **244** (1994) 778.
- 12 9) A. Downes, R. Mouras, and A. Elfick: J. Raman Spectrosc. **40** (2009) 757.
- 13 10) M. Flörsheimer, C. Brillert, and H. Fuchs: Langmuir **15** (1999) 5437.
- 14 11) R. D. Schaller and R. J. Saykally: Langmuir **17** (2001) 2055.
- 15 12) G. Mizutani, T. Koyama, S. Tomizawa, and H. Sano: Spectrochim. Acta, Part A **62** (2005)
- 16 845.
- 17 13) I. F. Nakai, M. Tachioka, A. Ugawa, T. Ueda, K. Watanabe, and Y. Matsumoto: Appl. Phys.
- 18 Lett. **95** (2009) 243304.
- 19 14) K. Inoue, M. Fujii, and M. Sakai: Appl. Spectrosc. **64** (2010) 275.
- 20 15) S. Kogure, K. Inoue, T. Ohmori, M. Ishihara, M. Kikuchi, M. Fujii, and M. Sakai: Opt.
- 21 Express **18** (2010) 13402.
- 22 16) H. C. Hieu, N. A. Tuan, H. Li, Y. Miyauchi, and G. Mizutani: J. Appl. Spectrosc. **65** (2011)
- 23 1254.

- 1 17) H. Li, Y. Miyauchi, N. A. Tuan, G. Mizutani, and M. Koyano: Journal of Biomat. and
2 Nanobiotechnol. **3** (2012) 286.
- 3 18) D. M. P. Hoffmann, K. Kuhnke, and K. Kern: Rev. Sci. Instrum. **73** (2002) 3221.
- 4 19) K. Kuhnke, D. M. P. Hoffmann, X. C. Wu, A. M. Bittner, and K. Kern: Appl. Phys. Lett. **83**
5 (2003) 3830.
- 6 20) K. Locharoenrat, H. Sano, and G. Mizutani: Phys. Status Solidi (C) **6** (2009) 304 [Erratum **6**
7 (2009) 1345].
- 8 21) G. Mizutani and Y. Miyauchi: Tech. Dig. OSA Optics Photonics Congr., 2009, paper
9 JWA23/1-3.
- 10 22) J. Kaneshiro, S. Kawado, H. Yokota, Y. Uesu, and T. Fukui: J. Appl. Phys. **104** (2008)
11 054112.
- 12 23) T. A. Theodossiou, C. Thrasivoulou, C. Ekwobi, and D. L. Becker: Biophys. J. **91** (2006)
13 4665.
- 14 24) G. Cox and C. J. R. Sheppard: Microsc. Res. Technol. **63** (2004) 18.
- 15 25) C. J. R. Sheppard and A. Choudhury: Opt. Acta **24** (1977) 1051.
- 16 26) R. H. Webb: Rep. Prog. Phys. **59** (1996) 427.
- 17 27) C. J. R Sheppard and M. Gu: Appl. Opt. **30** (1991) 3563.
- 18 28) M. Born and E. Wolf: *Principles of Optics* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, U. K.,
19 1980) 6th ed., p. 396.
- 20 29) K. Carlsson and N. Aslund: Appl. Opt. **26** (1987) 3232.
- 21 30) V. Raghunathan, Y. H. O. Korth, N.-H. Ge, and E. O. Potma: Opt. Lett. **36** (2011) 3891.

1 **Figure Captions**

2 Fig. 1. Experimental setup for the measurements of SFG intensity images by optical SFG
3 confocal microscopy. OPG and DFG mean an optical parametric generator and a
4 difference frequency generator, respectively. PMT means a photomultiplier, DCM, a
5 dichroic mirror. CCD camera, a charge-coupled device camera, ND filter, a neutral density
6 filter, and $\lambda/2$, a manually rotatable half-wavelength plate for the 2.33eV light. The visible,
7 infrared, and SFG light pulses travelled on the solid, gray, and dashed lines, respectively.
8 The polarizations of the beams are in the incidence plane of the infrared beam.

9
10 Fig. 2. Optical elements used in the visible incident and collection optics. L23, L24, L25, and
11 L30 are achromatic lenses. BPF means a band pass filter, and PH, a pinhole.

12
13 Fig. 3. (a) Cross sectional design of the fabricated ZnS(100). The fabricated structure does not
14 appear exactly like this design owing to the nonideal fabrication by FIB. (b) Confocal
15 linear image and (c) confocal SFG image of the fabricated ZnS(100). The focus of the
16 objective lens was adjusted to the middle terrace of the fabricated structure for (b) and (c).
17 (d) Confocal SFG image when the focus of the objective lens was adjusted to the top face.
18 The input visible pulses had a wavelength of 532 nm and the input infrared pulses had a
19 wave number of 2890 cm^{-1} . The accumulation time of the SFG images in (c) and (d) was 2
20 h.

21
22 Fig. 4. SFG intensity profile along the horizontal line drawn in Fig. 3(d). The solid curve
23 represents an error function fitting the experimental data. The display range corresponds to

1 that indicated by an arrow in the wider profile shown in the inset.

2

3 Fig. 5 (a) Visible CCD and (b-d) SFG images of a polycrystalline ZnS pellet. The objective lens

4 was focused at $2\mu\text{m}$ above, just on, and at $2\mu\text{m}$ below the pellet surface for (b)-(d),

5 respectively. The input visible pulses had a wavelength of 532nm and the input infrared

6 pulses had a wave number of 2890cm^{-1} . The accumulation time of the SFG images in (b)-

7 (d) was 2 h.


8


9 Fig. 6. SFG intensity profile along the horizontal line in Fig. 5(c). The solid curve represents an





10 error function fitting the experimental data. The display range corresponds to that

11 indicated by an arrow in the wider profile shown in the inset.

12







SFG Intensity (arb. unit)

80

40

0



2.0

Position (μm)

3.0

4.0


$0.53 \mu\text{m}$



μm

20

a



10


0

0

10

20


b



$Z = -2\mu\text{m}$




c



$Z = 0$



d



$Z = 2\mu\text{m}$



