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Abstract
Vanadium dioxide (VO₂), one of the most promising phase-change smart materials, has shown strong frequency tuning capabilities in MEMS resonators. In this paper, we demonstrate the potential use of VO₂-based MEMS devices as second-order kilohertz (kHz) bandpass filters with tunable band selectivity and adjustable bandwidth (BW). Two identical on-chip micro resonators are actuated using mechanical excitation and measured using optical detection. One of the resonators is not actuated while the other is tuned by applying electric currents across an integrated resistive heater, which induces the phase transition of the VO₂, and consequently a large stress to the mechanical structure. The responses of both MEMS resonators are combined, resulting in a resonant peak of tunable BW controlled by the input current. The BW can be extended to 2.62 times by using two bridges or 2.39 times by implementing one pair of cantilevers. The results for both devices are discussed.
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1. Introduction
In modern signal processing and transceiver technologies, electromechanical resonators have been widely implemented in RF circuits (e.g. oscillators, mixers, and filters) and sensing (e.g. temperature, mass, and humidity) applications. Their small size is a key advantage, which enables scaling for transceiver miniaturization and sensitivities as high as $7 \times 10^{-21}$ g and 13.89 pm K$^{-1}$ for mass and temperature sensors, respectively [1, 2].

The applications of MEMS resonators have expanded as the technology has matured. Progress in micro-fabrication processes, design, and materials synthesis has made possible the cost-effective integration of micro-electro-mechanical resonators into electronic circuits [3]. In fact, MEMS resonator technologies are commonly preferred over their predecessor technologies that were based on the quartz crystal-based oscillators. Main advantages of MEMS include: (i) small size, (ii) feasibility for on-chip integration of IC active or processing circuitry, (iii) accurate timing synchronization with external devices, and (iv) low power consumption.

MEMS resonators can provide resonant frequencies that extend to ultra high frequency (UHF) range with $Q$-factors as high as $2.2 \times 10^5$ [4]. The high selectivity that comes with narrowband high-$Q$ MEMS resonators is ideal for some applications that require low noise and larger number of communication channels. For broadband circuits in RF circuits, such as band-pass filters, coupled resonators have been used to demonstrate high order MEMS band-pass filters. Coupling techniques can be mechanical or electrical.
Mechanical coupling requires rather complicated fabrication and precise design for generating multiple pole systems [5–7]. Using electrical coupling methods usually involves capacitive coupling or cascading of multiple resonators [8]. The merit of using electrical coupling lies in the flexibility of design, the ability of extending the resonant frequency into UHF range, and a more precise bandwidth (BW) tunability. However, electrical coupling also adds extra complexity to the system.

Most of the advances in MEMS have been made along the lines of using silicon and other common CMOS standard and compatible materials. This trend for technological improvement has been exploited through the use of strategic and complicated geometries, which provides excellent performance for well-defined applications. However, the improvement achieved by using complex structures is ultimately limited by the underlying physical capabilities of the materials used. This is why many recent efforts have been focused on the characterization and integration of non-standard materials in MEMS [9–12]. For example, VO₂ was recently introduced as a smart material in MEMS, demonstrating the highest energy densities [13, 14], programmable mechanical states [15], MEMS mirrors [16], and electro-optical states [17]. In this work, we are now using VO₂ to demonstrate the potential use of its phases transition in MEMS tunable filters.

VO₂ is a phase-change smart multifunctional material with a fast insulator-to-metal transition (IMT) induced upon heating, during which the crystal structure changes from its low temperature monoclinic phase to its high temperature rutile phase. The phase transition typically begins at ∼68 °C and spans ∼10 °C–15 °C. The material’s electrical [18], optical [19], and mechanical [13] properties change drastically during the IMT and show hysteretic behavior. When VO₂ is used as a thin film coating over a micro-mechanical structure, the changes in the mechanical properties generate large stress [13, 20] that has been exploited to demonstrate high-performance MEMS actuators [21] with programmable capability [15]. These large stress levels could also be used to shift the resonant frequency of a micro-mechanical structure [22]. For a cantilever structure, the generated stress would be mostly released and transformed to bending. On the other hand, bridge structures do not have a free-end, and the generated stress is contained within the structure (unless the stress surpasses the Euler buckling limit).

In this paper, we demonstrate the potential use of VO₂ for the development of tunable MEMS bandpass filters. Two identical bridge or cantilever resonators, with similar resonant frequencies are used. The two resonators are driven by the same sweeping electrical AC source signal and the resonant frequencies for both resonators are optically detected simultaneously. In this design, the two resonators can independently respond to the same input at their own eigenfrequencies while producing one signal output. The BW tuning is achieved by actuating one of the resonators using joule heating. The Q-factor enhancement and the BW tunabilities for both structures are compared and analyzed at the end. The main contribution of this work is the demonstration of a new mechanism that can be implemented in MEMS tunable filters, which is based on the solid–solid phase transition of VO₂. The results demonstrate that, in very simple and non-optimized devices, the mechanism produces relatively large simultaneous tunability of BW and center frequency \(f_o\).

2. Experimental procedures

2.1. Design and fabrication of VO₂-based resonators

The VO₂-based resonator structures (cantilevers and bridges) reported in this paper are all within the same chip. Both resonator designs (i.e., cantilevers and bridges) share the same fabrication process flow, which has been described previously and is shown in figure 1 [23, 24]. Uncoated MEMS resonators (before VO₂ deposition) used in this paper are 2 μm thick, with a 200 nm layer of titanium/platinum (50 nm Ti / 150 nm Pt) heater electrode placed in between two 1 μm SiO₂ layers. This symmetric stack of layers was designed to reduce the extrinsic thermal stress during the deposition of the VO₂ thin film, which could produce bending of the structure in the process and an uneven VO₂ thin film deposition. In summary, an SiO₂ layer was deposited on a Si wafer using low thermal oxidation (LTO) method, followed by deposition and patterning of Ti/Pt (Ti only used for adhesion purposes), deposition of a second 1 μm layer of SiO₂ (again, using LTO), and patterning of the resonator structures through both SiO₂ layers. The wafers were then diced, and released, which was done by isotropic etching of the silicon substrate using xenon difluoride (XeF₂) gas. VO₂ thin film was deposited using pulsed laser deposition (PLD). During the deposition process, the chamber was first pumped down to a vacuum level below 10⁻⁶ Torr by using a turbomolecular pump connected with a mechanical scroll pump. Then the oxygen was introduced into the chamber at a flow rate of 20 sccm and a butterfly valve was controlled to keep the chamber oxygen atmosphere pressure at 15 mTorr. A heater located approximately 2 inches behind the sample was preheated to 595 °C. After reaching this temperature, a metallic vanadium target was ablated by a krypton fluoride (KrF) excimer laser with 560 mJ in energy and 10 Hz in frequency for 10 min. After VO₂ deposition, a 30 min annealing step was performed under the same deposition conditions. After the deposition was completed, a resistance measurement was done as the temperature was varied across the phase transition of VO₂. The measured drop in resistance of approximately 3 orders and the hysteretic behavior observed verified the quality of the VO₂ thin film.

At this point, the devices were ready to be mounted on an IC package, wire-bonded and tested. The fabricated and tested resonators, shown in figure 1, include two micro cantilevers (550 μm long and 50 μm wide) and two micro bridges (300 μm long and 45 μm wide).

For the VO₂ coated micro-bridges, the initial first mode resonant frequency can be estimated by the following
equation [25]:

\[
f_b^2 = \frac{1.06}{\pi^2 l^4} \times \left[ E_1^2 h_1^4 + E_2^2 h_2^4 + E_1 E_2 h_1 h_2 \left( 4h_1^2 + 4h_2^2 + 6h_1 h_2 \right) \right],
\]

where \( E_1, h_1, \rho_1 \) and \( E_2, h_2, \rho_2 \) are the Young’s modulus, thickness and density of the SiO\(_2\) and the VO\(_2\) layer, respectively, and \( l \) is the length of the bridge. On the other hand, the initial first mode resonant frequency of the VO\(_2\) coated cantilever can be given by [26]:

\[
f_c^2 = \frac{0.26h_1^2}{\pi^2 l^4} \times \frac{E_1 w h_1 + 12E_2 h_2 \left( w + 2h_2 \right) \left( \frac{h_1}{2} + \frac{h_2}{2h_2} \right) + \frac{h_1}{w}}{\rho_1 h_1 w + 2\rho_2 h_2 \left( w + h_1 + 2h_2 \right)}
\]

with the same variables used for equation (1) and \( w \) is the width of the cantilever. The equations above determine the initial resonant frequencies of the two resonator structures used in this work in the static state (i.e. un-actuated at room temperature). It should be noted that the equations do not take into account the thin metal layer used for Joule heating and tuning; but they do provide a good approximation that can be used for initial device design. As it is explained in more detail in section 3, the demonstration of the potential VO\(_2\) based bandpass filter consisted of two identical resonators, where the resonant frequency of the static resonator remained constant, while the resonant frequency of the active resonator shifted according to the hysteresis curve (figure 3 left and figure 6 left) as the current increased. Thus, \( f_o \) of the bandpass filter can be estimated using equations (1) and (2). The calculated resonant frequencies are shown in figures 4 and 7 along with the experimental value. Here, a 9% under-etching effect [25] was assessed for the bridges and 4.5% for the cantilevers. Thus, the effective length of the bridges and cantilevers were estimated to be 328 \( \mu \)m and 576 \( \mu \)m respectively. The resonant frequency of the bridges determined by equation (1) is about 102.3 kHz, which is far from the measured frequency shown in figure 4-right. This is due to the strong influence of stress in the resonant frequency of a bridge structure. To match the experimental curve, the initial residual stress in the bridge was estimated to be 38.9 MPa—which is within the value found for similar structures [25]. Thus, considering the stress effect, the resonant frequency for the bridge is found to be 237.6 kHz. It should be noted that this thermal residual stress does not play such a strong influence on the resonant frequency of cantilever structures, since the stress is partially released, producing an initial bending. Thus, the estimated resonant frequency of the cantilevers determined by equation (2) is 5.49 kHz, which is not that far from the measured resonant frequency shown in figure 7-right.

2.2. Experimental setup

The measurement setup used in this work is shown in figure 2. An LED white light source and a CCD camera were placed in the setup to help locate the devices on the chip. In this experiment, the resonant frequencies of both of static sample and the active sample were measured optically by monitoring the deflection of a laser beam incident on the mechanical structure. The laser source used here was a
632.8 nm, 5 mW He–Ne laser. Light from the laser was redirected by a silver-coated reflective mirror and beam splitters in the optical path. Since the VO₂ thin film coating is thermally actuated and highly sensitive to temperature (especially in the transition region), light absorption from the laser could increase the film’s temperature. To reduce this unwanted self-heating effect, a neutral density filter (ND = 1.0) was placed into the optical path to lower the power of the measuring laser beam to the minimum power that still provided enough detecting signal [27, 28].

After the first mirror and beam splitter, the beam was split and focused on both samples using two long working distance objectives (10X Mitutoyo MY10X-803 Objective lens). Each sample represented a chip that contained resonator structures that were fabricated simultaneously. A piezoelectric transducer was attached to the back of each sample, and both transducers were driven into mechanical vibration by the output signal of a network analyzer (HP3589A). The laser was focused on identical resonator structures, and the reflected beam was directed to a photodetector through another beam splitter. The output of the photodetector was connected to the input of the network analyzer. In this configuration, the network analyzer would display the voltage output of the photodetector as a function of frequency. The network analyzer drove the piezoelectric transducers at different frequencies, inducing the resonator’s largest vibration amplitude at a frequency close to their natural frequency. Vibrations from the resonator structure produced oscillations in the reflected laser beam (of magnitude proportional to the vibration amplitudes), which were converted to a voltage by the photodetector and sent back to the network analyzer. It should be noticed that in this measurement setup, the input/output characteristics of the system does not require coupling of electrical and mechanical signals. The input signal applied to the filter system was a time-dependent electrical signal, but the actuation signal was the mechanical vibration provided by the piezoelectric transducer. The tuning signal is the current applied to the heater of the active element, which is an electrical signal, but the output is a mechanical vibration detected optically. This method is an adaptation of laser deflection and interferometer techniques commonly used to characterize MEMS—in fact, it also allows for the testing of a single resonator structure by simply blocking the optical path to one of the structures.

In the reported experiments, the temperature for one of the samples (active sample) was increased by applying a current to the integrated resistive heater (i.e. by Joule heating); while the other sample (static sample) remained at room temperature. The current supplied to the active sample was computer-controlled and provided through wire bonding connections to pads at the border of the chip. Both samples were mounted on two individual three-axis moving stages to facilitate alignment of the laser beam on the resonator structure.
3. Results and discussion

Two different structures of micro beam resonators (cantilevers and bridges) were tested in this experiment and the BW tunability of each structure was demonstrated and compared. The maximum BW amplification, Q-factor, and BW tuning window will be discussed in the following sections. The BW was calculated using the 3 dB of the resonant peak method using the following equation:

\[ \text{BW} = f_2 - f_1, \]  

where BW stands for the bandwidth, \( f_1 \) and \( f_2 \) are the two frequencies on each side of the resonant frequency \( f_r \) where the amplitude of the signal is \( 1/\sqrt{2} \) of its maximum value. The Q-factor \( (Q) \) is then calculated based on the BW value using the equation as below \[ 29 \]:

\[ Q = f_r / \text{BW}. \]  

3.1. BW tunability for bridges

First, two identical bridges were used to create the bandpass filter. The active bridge was actuated by Joule heating, and the resonant frequency was measured through the whole heating and cooling cycle (figure 3-left) by blocking the laser beam coming from the static sample. The frequency shift comes as the result of the large amount of stress generated by the VO\(_2\) thin film coating during its phase transition region. When the laser beam coming from the static sample was unblocked, we were able to get two resonant signals, one from the static bridge and the other from the active bridge. These optical signals were routed to the photodetector, and its output to the network analyzer, which showed the resonant peaks for both devices. The top-left plot in figure 4 (Stage ‘a’) shows the output of the spectrum analyzer for both bridges at room temperature i.e. while the active bridge was not actuated (\( I_{\text{act}} = 0 \) mA). The current step is 0.01 mA within the BW tuning window and 0.1 mA for the outside region. It should be noted that, although both bridges are geometrically identical, their resonant frequencies at room temperature are not the same. This could be due to any slight difference between the fabrication processes of both devices; we believe that the most likely cause was a difference in ‘effective length’ [25, 30, 31] for the two structures, which could have occurred during isotropic release step.

When a current was applied to the active bridge (\( I_{\text{act}} \)), its resonant frequency would shift to a certain value according to the hysteresis curve shown in figure 3. Figure 4 shows a sequence of over-imposed resonant frequency peaks for the static and active bridges for different \( I_{\text{act}} \) values. The sequence starts at room temperature (Stage ‘a’), goes through a heating cycle (increasing \( I_{\text{act}} \)), until the transition of VO\(_2\) is completed (Stage e in figure 4). At this point, the cooling cycle begins (reducing \( I_{\text{act}} \)), until we reach room temperature again (Stage ‘j’ in figure 4). Starting at room temperature, the combination of both resonant peaks resembles the behavior of a band-pass
was obtained from equation (1), and it does not take residual thermal stress into account.

Figure 4. Left: resonant frequency versus actuation current through a full heating and cooling cycle for the active bridge. Right: resonant frequency signal for the static bridge at room temperature. The measured \( f_0 \) and calculated \( f'_0 \) resonant frequencies are shown. The value for \( f'_0 \) was obtained from equation (1), and it does not take residual thermal stress into account.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. Bandwidth tunability for bridges.</th>
</tr>
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<tr>
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<td>Q-factor</td>
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<td><strong>Active heating</strong></td>
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<td>Stage</td>
</tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
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<td>( I_{\text{act}} ) (mA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Active cooling</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage</td>
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<td>Bandwidth (Hz)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q-factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( I_{\text{act}} ) (mA)</td>
</tr>
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filter; and its width is tuned by current steps of increasing magnitude that induce the phase transition of VO\(_2\). As the actuation current increases from room temperature, the active peak moves towards the static peak, reducing the filter’s BW. When \( I_{\text{act}} = 2.89 \) mA (Stage ‘A’), the active and static peaks show very similar resonant frequencies, and both responses are merged into one signal peak. Details on the combination of both resonant peaks is provided in the supplementary materials available online at stacks.iop.org/SMS/26/085032/mmedia. As \( I_{\text{act}} \) is further increased, the resonant frequency of the active bridge keeps increasing, and the active peak continues to move to the right of the static peak. At \( I_{\text{act}} = 2.92 \) mA (Stage ‘D’), the resonant frequency of the active bridge begins to separate, and by \( I_{\text{act}} = 3.00 \) mA, the two \( f_i \) curves clearly become two separate peaks. The largest measured BW during the heating cycle was around 1.85 kHz (at \( I_{\text{act}} = 2.92 \) mA). The cooling cycle (Stage ‘I’ through ‘J’) was performed to demonstrate the reversibility of the system. As the actuation current decreases, the active peak moves towards the static peak and the peaks begin to merge at \( I_{\text{act}} \approx 2.57 \) mA. The maximum BW of the cooling cycle is around 2.06 kHz (at \( I_{\text{act}} = 2.57 \) mA), which is 2.62 times larger than a single device. As the current further decreases, the difference in the resonant frequencies become smaller. At \( I_{\text{act}} = 2.52 \) mA (Stage ‘I’), the two peaks become one; and the system goes back to its initial condition when \( I_{\text{act}} \) is turned off. The stages included in figure 4 are displayed for similar frequency measurements between the heating and cooling cycle i.e. the two plots in a single row show similar output. However, the \( I_{\text{act}} \) values are different between these similar stages. This is due to the hysteresis of VO\(_2\) which does not show a linear correspondence between the two cycles (see figure 3).

It can be noticed that at the stages where the signal snaps into two individual peaks (Stages ‘a’, ‘e’, ‘t’, ‘j’), the signal level for each individual peak is of equal amplitude to the signal of a single bridge (figure 3-right). However, for the stages which have extended BW (Stages ‘b’, ‘c’, ‘d’, ‘g’, ‘h’, ‘i’), the signal level is higher than the one generated by the single bridge resonator. This is due to the additive effect of the two individual signals generated by the static resonator and the active resonator, which occurs only during stages with band-pass filter behavior. Also, at Stages ‘b’ and ‘i’, the BWs are smaller and therefore, a higher Q-factor is achieved (see table 1).

The resonant peak of the single static bridge used in this system has a BW of 787 Hz (see figure 3). Thus, a tunable BW amplification up to 2.62 was achieved by using one pair of identical bridges. It should be noted that, in this particular case, the shift in \( f_i \) for the active bridge ‘crossed’ the \( f_i \) of the static bridge. Therefore, the tunable BW could include different range of frequencies by increasing or reducing the separation between the two peaks at room temperature. It is
Figure 5. Sequence of different stages for the VO₂-based tunable band-pass filter using bridge resonators during a heating/cooling cycle. Plots show selected stages with pairs of similar output for each cycle. The resonant peaks for the static and active bridges are represented by the black and red/blue curves, respectively. $I_{act}$ is the actuation current applied to the active bridge.
important to clarify that the applied current $I_{act}$ is the tuning parameter, and not the input to the system that generates oscillation. During the entire heating-cooling cycle, the input is the frequency of the AC signal applied to the piezo-disks (supplied by the network analyzer). The measured output is the combined resonant peaks. The data for actuation current, BW and $Q$-factor is summarized in table 1.

### 3.2. BW tunability for cantilevers

The VO$_2$-based bandpass filter could also be achieved by using a pair of identical cantilever structures. The measurement method and the tuning method are the same as those used for bridges. The BW tunability is shown in figure 5 and all the related data is summarized in table 2. The resonant frequency of the active peak follows the hysteresis curve shown in figure 6-left. The resonant frequency signal for the single static cantilever was measured (figure 6-right) and the BW was calculated to be 135 Hz. The starting stage here is chosen to be the one with an $I_{act} = 3.0$ mA rather than 0 mA. The reason is that the initial bending of this active cantilever cannot produce a signal comparable to that of the static cantilever. Nevertheless, this difference does not affect significantly the results obtained and drawn conclusions, since the difference between the resonant frequency at $I_{act} = 0.0$ mA and at 3.0 mA was found to be only 12 Hz. The maximum BW for this system is reached at $I_{act} = 5.4$ mA and at $I_{act} = 5.2$ mA for the heating and cooling cycles, respectively. The maximum BW obtained by this system is about 322 Hz, which is 2.39 times the BW of a single cantilever.

### 3.3. BW tunability comparison

The room temperature measurement in figure 5 (Stage ‘a’) shows that the $f_r$ for both cantilevers (active and static) are much closer than the $f_r$ for both bridges at room temperature. When both devices were measured independently, the difference in $f_r$ between the active and static devices was found to be about 8% and 1% for the bridges and cantilevers, respectively. This supports the claim that different effective lengths due to irregular under-etching during isotropic release play a major role in the different $f_r$ for the two bridges at room temperature. A bridge structure has two anchors, and therefore, a difference in the effective length due to under-etching difference will have a stronger influence in a bridge structure than in a cantilever structure. Due to the much smaller difference in the $f_r$ for the cantilevers, the measurement at room temperature for both cantilevers (active and static) is simply a slightly broader peak than the single cantilever, shown in figure 6. Unlike the case for the bridges, as the tuning actuation begins for the active cantilever (by increasing $I_{act}$), the BW begins to increase monotonically during the heating cycle. There is no ‘crossing’ between resonant peaks for the cantilevers. This monotonic BW tuning behavior for the cantilever also holds during the cooling cycle. Another striking difference between both results is the required ‘tuning energy’. Starting at the on-set of the phase transition, crossing the entire phase-change to generate maximum deflection in cantilevers requires $I_{act} \sim 3.5$ mA (figure 6-left), while the bridges require less than 0.75 mA (figure 3-left).

The actuation current required to reach the maximum BW for the cantilevers and the bridges (from stage A to stage D for the cantilevers and from stage b to stage d for the bridges) is 2.4 and 0.03 mA, respectively. Considering the resistance of the heater traces of the cantilevers and bridges (285 and 245 Ω, respectively), the power consumption for maximum BW tuning is calculated to be 5.75 mW for the cantilever, and 0.04 mW for the bridge structures.

The main reason for this larger energy requirement for the cantilever relates to two main differences between the device structures: (i) thermal mass, and (ii) heat distribution. Notice that the bridge structures are almost half as long as the cantilever structures. A larger length translates to a larger thermal mass, which means that a larger amount of energy will be required to increase temperature. Thus, it is more energy demanding to induce the phase transition of VO$_2$ in the cantilever structure than in the bridge structure. Also, note that the heater design for the bridge covers a larger surface of the bridge structure, which allows for a more uniform. Finally, there is a significant difference between the change in frequency for the active device per unit current (i.e., sensitivity); and the total tuning range between bridges and cantilevers. The explanation for the different sensitivities and tuning ranges share the thermal mass issue described above—a larger energy is required in a cantilever structure to induce the same temperature increase; but this mechanism does not play a major role. The dominant mechanism (for both larger sensitivity and tuning range) relates to the stronger dependence of resonant frequency with stress for the bridge structure.

In fact, this higher sensitivity of the resonant frequency of a bridge structure to stress is the reason why the pairs of equivalent stages in the heating and cooling cycle look more similar for the cantilevers than for the bridges. The tuning experiments for the cantilevers involved current steps of 0.1 mA, while the bridges required steps 10 times smaller.

The correlation between the resonant frequency and the stress for both structures is now qualitatively discussed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>Snap</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bandwidth (Hz)</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Q$-factor</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$I_{act}$ (mA)</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2. Bandwidth tunability for cantilevers.**
Figure 6. Sequence of different stages for the VO$_2$-based tunable band-pass filter using cantilever resonators during a heating/cooling cycle. Plots show selected stages with pairs of similar output for each cycle. The resonant peaks for the static and active bridges are represented by the black and red/blue curves, respectively. $I_{act}$ is the actuation current applied to the active bridge.
During the VO$_2$ IMT phase transition region, the VO$_2$ crystal structure changes from its low-temperature monoclinic phase to its high-temperature rutile phase with a contraction in the c-axis [13, 32]. Essentially, the area of the crystal planes parallel to the surface of the substrate is reduced during the phase transition (heating cycle). This generates a compressive stress at the surface of the beam material, which in turn will induce elastic deformation and changes in the geometry of the beam. The deformation will then change the dimensions and the density of the beam, which will further shift the resonant frequency of either the bridge or the cantilever. Thus, the influence of the stress on the resonant frequency is not only due to the induced stress (stress effect) but also caused by geometric variations (geometric effect). However, different beam structures have different responses to the same type of axial stress. For the case of a cantilever (clamped-free structure), the deformation along the longitudinal direction is not constrained and the axial stress is released. This results in a zero net axial stress along the longitudinal direction and a net in-plane stress in the clamped end [33]. For the cantilevers used in this paper, where the width is about 30 times larger than the thickness, the resonant frequency shift is then dominated by the geometric effect and can be described by the following expression [34]:

$$\Delta f / f_0 = \frac{1 + 2\nu}{1 - \nu} \frac{\sigma}{E} \left( \frac{L}{h} \right)^2,$$

where $\Delta f$ stands for the relative resonant frequency change, $\nu$ is the Poisson’s ratio, and $\sigma$ is the applied surface stress. The bridges, on the other hand, have more net axial stress than the cantilevers due to their clamped–clamped structure [25, 30]. The resonant frequency shift is mainly dominated by the stress effect and can be estimated by the following expression [34]:

$$\Delta f / f_0 = 0.1475 \left( \frac{L}{h} \right)^2 \sigma,$$

where $L$ and $h$ are the length and thickness of the bridge. Given that the Poisson’s of SiO$_2$ (which makes up for about 90% of the resonator’s structure) is 0.2; and the $(L/h)^2$ for the bridges and cantilevers is in the order of $10^4$, the frequency shift per stress unit is much larger for the bridges. Furthermore, unlike in the case of a cantilever, the added stress during the phase transition in a clamped–clamped structure is not ‘released’ in the form of structural bending—unless it reaches the Euler stress limit, which was not the case for the present structures. The resonant frequency shifts for the cantilevers and bridges reported in this manuscript when transitioned across the entire phase transition were about 3.1% and 7.3%, respectively.

### 3.4. Contributions of the tuning technology

MEMS-based filters have been widely implemented in many applications. Their BW is usually increased by coupling individual resonators into a higher order system. However, most of the devices have BWs and central frequencies that are defined at the time of designing and fabricating the structure, and therefore cannot be adjusted during operation. Thus, tunable filters were proposed for the applications such as channel-selecting [35], WLAN [36], and spectrometers [37], etc. Some tunable MEMS filters focus on the tunability of the central frequency [38, 39], where the tuning operation can be achieved by adjusting the effective length of the resonators that form the filter device. Other devices focus on the tuning of the BW by applying different polarization voltages to the resonators [8]. The present work shows a simple approach to use a new mechanism for simultaneous tuning of the central frequency and BW of a MEMS filter. Although the results are focused on BW tunability, tuning $f_0$ can be achieved by actuation of both resonators. The relative changes in the central frequencies are determined by the hysteresis curves (figures 3-left and 6-left), which are 3.1% for the cantilevers and 7.3% for the bridges. Finally, the crossover of the resonant peaks during actuation in the bridge structure case demonstrates a MEMS filter capable of tuning frequencies.
higher or lower than \( f_0 \) by using an actuation current \( (I_{\text{act}}) \) of only \( \sim 3 \) mA (as shown in the case of the bridge structure—see figure 4, stages ‘a’ and ‘c’).

4. Conclusion

This paper presents VO₂-based tunable MEMS bandpass filters. The resonator structures used in the system were actuated mechanically by piezo-disks driven by the output of a spectrum analyzer; and the mechanical vibrations were monitored optically by using a laser deflection method. The resonant frequency curves of two MEMS structures were measured simultaneously. One of the devices was actuated by current pulses sent through an integrated resistive heater, while the other structure was not actuated. Each current pulse increased the temperature of the mechanical structure, inducing the phase transition of the VO₂ film in the actuated sample. The generated stress during the phase-change of VO₂ induces resonant frequency shifts. Two different resonator structures, cantilevers and bridges, were used to demonstrate fully resonant frequency shifts. Two different resonator structures, generated stress during the phase-change of VO₂ induces optically by using a laser de-trum analyzer; and the mechanical vibrations were monitored mechanically by piezo-disks driven by the output of a specific technical support from the Lurie Nanofabrication facility at University of Michigan for fabricating the devices. The SEM images in figure 1 were taken in the Composite Materials and Structures Center at Michigan State University. The authors are thankful to Professor John Papapolymerou for insightful discussions.
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