

Absolute Measurement of Rotationally Symmetrical Aspheric Surfaces

Michael F. Kuechel

Zygo Corporation and Subsidiaries, Keplerstrasse 3, D-73447 Oberkochen, Germany

email: mkuechel@zygo.com

Abstract: The surface is scanned along its symmetry axis in a Fizeau cavity with spherical reference surface. The coordinates x,y,z at the (moving) zone of normal incidence are derived from simultaneous phase-measurements at the apex and zone.

© 2006 Optical Society of America

OCIS codes: (120.0120) Instrumentation, measurement and metrology; (220.0220) Optical design and fabrication; (120.3180) Interferometry; (120.4800) Optical standards and testing; (220.1250) Aspherics; (220.3740) Lithography; (220.4610) Optical fabrication; (220.4840) Optical testing.

1. Introduction

Aspheric surfaces, historically used mainly for astronomical mirrors, have now gained high importance in very different fields of optics such as pick-up lenses for CD, DVD and Blue Ray Discs, cameras in mobile phones, zoom-lenses for small digital cameras and camcorders, digital SLRs and Television Cameras, and especially, for lithographic projection lenses. The range of surface diameters spans more than two orders of magnitude for refractive optics, and the aspheric departure can be a few microns or as large as 5mm. The required uncertainty of the measurements can be as small as 0.1nm r.m.s., and the required spatial resolution as high as 2000 points across the diameter of the lens. Without a means to measure these surfaces, they cannot be manufactured!

In addition to uncertainty as a function of spatial resolution, other important factors to be considered are the cost for the measurement tool, the time required for one complete measurement (TACT), as well as the cost and lead-time for the “tools” to be manufactured before a measurement can be performed. Existing optical methods based on null compensation [1,2], point diffraction [3], and stitching [4], are not universally applicable and have limitations even in their most suited applications. As a consequence, mechanically based measurements by stylus type coordinate measurement machines are used today in all but the most demanding applications even though they do not fulfill all demands. Besides high cost, their main drawbacks are long TACT, poor spatial resolution, and their potential to damage the test part. They are not suited for measurements in the production area.

We present here a new scanning method based on Fizeau interferometry with a spherical reference surface [5]. It has the potential to fulfill the requirements stated before in a very satisfactory way: (1) it can be used for lenses of different sizes and numerical apertures (besides very low NA), (2) covers a large range of aspheric departures, (3) has high spatial resolution, very good TACT time, and (4) does not need tooling (like computer generated holograms or refractive null compensators) and little time for pre-measurement preparations. For lithographic applications, it has proven to provide a very nice combination of small uncertainty and high spatial resolution even for aspheric surfaces with extreme diameters and very large aspheric departure. And last but not least: because it is based solely on distance measurements without a physical reference for the aspheric surface to be tested, it is another of the rare examples in interferometry which falls into the category of “absolute tests”.

2. The new method

We restricted ourselves to the measurement of rotationally symmetrical aspheric surfaces. Even though this is still a 3-dimensional problem in the “real world”, we can nicely simplify it for the purpose of this paper by considering only the plane through the symmetry axis of the asphere. We understand the problem described with Cylinder Coordinates: h =lateral coordinate, z =axial coordinate and θ =azimuthal angle, and we take θ as being constant.

It is an interesting fact that, for an “ideal” rotationally symmetrical asphere, every point is a “constant” with respect to the variable θ . As a consequence, even though very important, it is not very difficult to measure the “rotationally variant part” (RV-part) of an aspheric surface with very high accuracy by rotating the surface in front of the measurement device [6]. As the measurement value does not change significantly, the “dynamic range” of the problem is low! The opposite is true for the rotationally invariant part (RI-part), which contains the complete description of the aspheric profile to be compared with the aspheric equation given by the quantities c , k and a_i of the equation:

$$v = z - R_0 + \frac{h}{z'} \quad (6a)$$

$$h = (R_0 + v - p)\sqrt{p'(2-p')} \quad (6b)$$

$$p = z + \frac{1 - \sqrt{1 + z'^2}}{z'} \cdot h \quad (7a)$$

$$z = p + (R_0 + v - p) \cdot p' \quad (7b)$$

$$\frac{dp}{dv} = p' = 1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + z'^2}} \quad (8a)$$

$$\frac{dz}{dh} = z' = \frac{\sqrt{p'(2-p')}}{1-p'} \quad (8b)$$

We see that 3 quantities, h , z and dz/dh are needed to calculate p and v , given the aspheric equation and its derivative, and also 3 quantities v , p and dp/dv must be measured to derive h and z of the actual surface. We measure p_m and v_m and we compute h_m and z_m ; the index m stands for “measurement”.

For dp/dv we shift the point $M(v)$ by a small amount to $M(v+\Delta v)$ and measure the resulting increase Δp of p . Notice the definition for p , which is $p=d-d_0$ as shown in Fig. 1. The difference quotient $\Delta p/\Delta v$ is a good approximation of the differential quotient dp/dv and with the different directions of d and d_0 it becomes clear that

$$dp/dv = p' = 1 - \cos\alpha \quad (9).$$

Notice the fact that the line from $M(0, R_0+v)$ to $Q(h, z)$ is normal to the surface, which has the “slope” $dz/dh = z' = \tan\alpha$. Therefore, we have the choice to compute α either according to (9) or equivalently from (8b). When we use α instead of $p' = dp/dv$ as the third variable, then we can rewrite the equations (6b) and (7b) in a more intuitive (see Fig. 1) manner as:

$$h_m = (R_0 + v_m - p_m) \sin \alpha_m = (R_0 + v_m) \cdot \sin \alpha_m - p_m \cdot \sin \alpha_m \quad (10)$$

$$z_m = (R_0 + v_m) - (R_0 + v_m - p_m) \cos \alpha_m = (R_0 + v_m) \cdot (1 - \cos \alpha_m) + p_m \cdot \cos \alpha_m \quad (11)$$

$$\alpha_m = \arctan\left(\sqrt{p_m'(2-p_m')}, (1-p_m')\right) \quad (12)$$

3. The aspheric surface near the apex

The accuracy with which the zone in the measured phase-map can be located depends on the derivative dp/dh . When the center $E(h_e, z_e)$ of the evolute is close to M , or more precise, if $|R/R_e| \approx 1$, where R_e and R are the distances from Q to M , Q to E , then dp/dh becomes small. For instance, this is the case near the vertex, where the aspheric surface is close to a sphere. In such cases, the zone is very “broad” and the value for p changes only very slowly with α . Then there is no harm in measuring with one value for v_m several different values of p_m at different locations in the phase-map. The associated values for α_m in (10) and (11) can still be found experimentally by shifting v to $v+\Delta v$ and measuring $p+\Delta p$, and using Eq. (9).

4. Why is the new method superior?

The new scanning method based on Fizeau interferometry provides benefits for the user, as it is applicable to steep as well as mild aspheric surfaces, has very good TACT time and needs no tooling like CGH or null-compensation lenses. And, the expert in interferometry will also notice that it is superior by principles generally valid in metrology:

(1) It is solely based on *interferometric distance measurements*, (2) It measures only *relative* distances between two *solid bodies*, the aspheric lens surface and the spherical reference surface, (3) It always automatically measures where the *optical conditions are optimal*, at the zones of *normal incidence*, (4) The “dynamic range” of the problem is *minimized through scanning*, (5) The lateral coordinate is derived from the phase measurement, (6) The magnification or distortion of the imaging optics of the interferometer do *not influence* the result, (7) There are *no additional parts* that must be introduced and *aligned*, (8) It is very obvious what is measured, so it is a “*traceable method*”, (9) It does *not* rely on *secondary* standards and (10) Every measured zone is *independent* from all others; *no stitching* with its inherent errors is used.

5. References

1. J.H. Burge and D.S. Anderson, “Full-Aperture interferometric test of convex secondary mirrors using holographic test plates” Proc. SPIE 2199, pp 181-192, (1994).
2. D. Malacara, *Optical Shop Testing, 2nd Ed.*, “Null Tests Using Compensators”, (Wiley Interscience, 1992), Chapter 12.
3. G. E. Sommargren, D. W. Phillion, M. A. Johnson, N. Q. Nguyen, A. Barty, F. J. Snell, D. R. Dillon, and L. S. Bradsheher, “100-picometer interferometry for EUVL,” in *Emerging Lithographic Technologies VI*, Pts 1 and 2, Proc. SPIE 4688, pp. 316-328, (2002).
4. M.J. Tronolone, J.F. Fleig, C.H. Huang, J.H. Bruning, “Method of Testing Aspherical Optical Surfaces with an Interferometer”, U.S. Patent 5,416, 586.
5. M.F. Kuechel, US Patent Nos. 6,781,700, 6,972,849 and 6,879,402.
6. M.F. Kuechel, “A new approach to solve the three flat problem”. *Optik* 112, No. 9 (2001) 381-391.