Harnessing the properties of vortices in superconductors is crucial for fundamental science as well as technological applications; thus, it has been an ongoing goal to develop experimental techniques that can locally probe and control vortices [1–8]. Here, we present a scanning probe technique that enables studies of vortex dynamics in superconducting systems by leveraging the resonant behavior of a raster-scanned, magnetic-tipped cantilever. Key features of this experimental platform are the high degree of tunability and the local nature of the probe. Applying this technique to lattices of superconductor island arrays on a metal, we obtain a variety of striking spatial patterns that encode information about the energy landscape for vortices in the system. We interpret these patterns in terms of local vortex dynamics, and extract the relative strengths of the characteristic energy scales in the system, such as the vortex-magnetic field and vortex-vortex interaction strengths, as well as the vortex chemical potential. We also demonstrate that the relative strengths of the interactions can be tuned. This experimental setup has the potential for future applications in more complex systems, as well as in the manipulation of vortex-bound Majorana fermions for quantum computation.

Imaging techniques such as scanning SQUID microscopy [1,9], Hall probe microscopy [10,11], scanning tunneling microscopy [12], NV center magnetometry [13,14], and cantilever-based techniques [15,17] have played a central role in studies of vortex lattices and the internal structure...
of individual vortices. However, these techniques are limited in that they do not allow for simultaneous control of the vortices and extraction of important energy scales other than the pinning strength, e.g., they cannot determine the vortex-vortex interaction strength. In this article we describe a technique that overcomes this obstacle: a method we term $\Phi_0$-Magnetic Force Microscopy ($\Phi_0$-MFM) \[18\], which probes the dynamic motion of a small group of vortices (from 1 to $\sim 12$) trapped in the magnetic field generated by the tip of a vertically-oriented cantilever.

$\Phi_0$-MFM is demonstrated on triangular arrays of Nb islands deposited on Au films (Fig. 1a), which form a superconductor-normal metal-superconductor (SNS) array. The SNS arrays serve as a controllable model for superconducting films, and provide a periodic potential for the vortices \[19\,21\]. A resistance vs. temperature measurement showing a superconducting transition for a representative array is shown in Fig. 1c. Measurements are performed using an ultra-soft micromachined Si cantilever, mounted in a pendulum configuration, with a SmCo$_5$ magnetic tip shaped via focused ion beam (Fig. 1b). An estimate of the tip field is obtained by imaging flux entry into superconducting Al rings (see Supplementary Information). A uniform magnetic field applied perpendicular to the SNS array, and anti-parallel to the field of the tip, tunes the number of
vortices trapped underneath the cantilever tip. As the configuration of the trapped vortex droplet changes to minimize the local energy, frequency shifts of the cantilever are generated. The real space maps of the frequency shifts associated with changes in the vortex configuration produces striking geometric patterns (Fig. 2). To generate these frequency shift maps, the cantilever is raster scanned over the surface at a fixed offset height, with a small fixed oscillation amplitude (typically \( \sim 15 \text{ nm} \)), which perturbs the position of the potential well that traps vortices. The cantilever is kept oscillating at its resonant frequency \cite{22}, and is monitored by a phase-locked loop.

Fig. 2 shows a set of representative cantilever frequency shift images for a range of external fields and scan heights. A variety of remarkable geometric patterns emerge from these measurements. In the figure, the external field and tip height are different in each image, showing that the patterns can change dramatically as a function of height of the tip and strength of the external magnetic field. To understand the underlying mechanism that causes the formation of these patterns, we will now discuss how these images encode information about vortex dynamics in the SNS array.
We begin with a heuristic physical picture. The magnetic tip creates a potential well underneath it for vortices with a particular circulation, and at the same time, it repels oppositely-circulating vortices that are naturally generated by the uniform field applied to the SNS array. Hence, underneath the tip a droplet comprised of several vortices will be trapped. The scanning height determines the width and, along with the external field, depth of this potential well. As the external field is changed at a fixed scanning height, the number of vortices trapped underneath the tip is modified. When the cantilever moves across the array at a fixed field (i.e., fixed number of vortices), the energies of two distinct configurations of the vortices can become degenerate at a tip location. While the cantilever is over these degeneracy locations, the oscillations of the cantilever, along with thermal excitations of the vortices, will drive the vortices between the two configurations in resonance with the cantilever, leading to a force on the cantilever and an associated frequency shift. These resonant transitions between the different configurations lead to the geometric patterns observed in the experiment. In the images, the frequency shifts appear as dark lines, and indicate the boundaries between two stable vortex configurations. Lighter areas show tip positions where the vortex configuration is stable. Examples of distinct vortex configurations and corresponding frequency shift patterns are shown in Fig. 3. The diversity of patterns one can obtain from these vortex dynamics depend on parameters such as the geometry of the superconducting array and the magnetic tip height.

To corroborate this physical picture, we performed numerical simulations of a simple phenomenological model of vortices. We model the system as an array of Josephson junctions, approximating the Josephson current as \( I \approx I_c \gamma_{ij} \), where \( \gamma_{ij} \) is the gauge-invariant phase between islands \( i \) and \( j \). This approximation allows for several convenient simplifications to the effective vortex energy (see Supplementary Information). We assume that each vortex is point-like and sits in the center of a plaquette, and the subsequent model for the vortex energy is

\[
E(n) = p_{\text{int}} \sum_{p,q=1}^{N_{\text{plaq}}} V_{pq} n_p n_q + \sum_{p=1}^{N_{\text{plaq}}} [(U_f)_p + \mu_{\text{vort}}] n_p
\]

where \( N_{\text{plaq}} \) is the number of plaquettes, \( p_{\text{int}} \) is a relative scale factor between the vortex-field \( ((U_f)_p) \) energy and vortex-vortex \( (V_{ij}) \) interaction term, \( \mu_{\text{vort}} \) represents the chemical potential of the vortices, and \( n_p \) is the number of vortices in plaquette \( p \). We use a classical Metropolis algorithm Monte Carlo simulation to determine the lowest energy vortex configuration for a fixed vortex number (see Supplementary Information). We then compare the lowest energy vortex configurations for differing vortex numbers to determine the configuration with the lowest overall energy, hence
Figure 3: Images of some patterns seen in this experiment (top) and associated vortex configurations (bottom) as determined by simulated annealing. A slowly varying background was removed from all images to highlight the pertinent features. Configurations are shaded where they are the lowest energy state. The simulation data is darker in areas where the cantilever would experience a larger frequency shift due to the oscillating current. Some dashed vertical lines are added to the simulation to highlight stable regions for a given vortex configuration. One plaquette (red triangle) and associated islands (dashed circles) are drawn for clarity. Experimental and simulations taken for (a) 3 (124 Oe, 350 nm), (b) 4 (85 Oe, 425 nm), (c) 5 (80 Oe, 425 nm), and (d) 6 vortices (68 Oe, 425 nm). All images taken at 3.70 K, except (b), taken at 3.75 K.

identifying the vortex number and its configuration for a given tip location. By tuning the relative strengths of $U_f$, $V_{ij}$, and $\mu_{\text{vort}}$, to fit the data at the correct external field and tip heights, we can extract the relative energy scales of the system.

As an example of these simulations, in Fig. 3a we show the patterns and associated vortex configurations produced by three vortices. As can be seen, there is very good agreement between the simulations obtained from the model we use and the experimental measurement. By increasing the number of vortices by one and running the simulation again, the resulting pattern obtained changes and reproduces another of the experimental scans, as shown in Fig. 3b. Using this technique, we can thus show that Figs. 3a, b, c, and d demonstrate the energy landscapes and corresponding vortex configurations for 3, 4, 5, and 6 vortices, respectively.

We fit patterns at different external fields and tip heights to extract valuable, and previously inaccessible, information about the energy scales that determine vortex dynamics in these systems. Using Eqn. 1, we find that, for a 500 nm center-to-center (inter-island) array, the chemical potential term is approximately $\mu_{\text{vort}} = (1.8 \pm 0.1)V_{pp}$, where $V_{pp}$ is the energy of a lone vortex trapped in the array with no fields applied, as presented in the model described in the Supplementary
Figure 4: Vortex pattern changes with height for 6 vortices underneath the tip. Tip height increases from left to right, as shown below each image. Images are overlaid with data from simulations (red) and the stable vortex configuration in each region. As the tip height is increased, the potential well flattens out, while the associated external field is changed to keep the number of vortices constant. Some stable vortex configurations cover a smaller area as the tip height is increased, with those regions disappearing in the furthest image. In the rightmost image, $\mu_{\text{vort}}$ was decreased to $1.4V_{11}$ to achieve a better fit. The lower images show the field distribution on the surface for 430 nm (left) and 600 nm (right) tip separations with the tip over the central feature of the top images.

Information, and $p_{\text{int}}$ is approximately $1.0 - 1.2$. We do not find any dependence of $\mu_{\text{vort}}$ on the number of vortices underneath the tip for the configurations examined. Separate arrays with spacings of 440 and 560 nm were also imaged, and $\mu_{\text{vort}}$ and $p_{\text{int}}$ were extracted. For the 560 nm array, we found $\mu_{\text{vort}} = (0.9 \pm 0.1)V_{pp}$, with $p_{\text{int}} \sim 0.7 - 0.9$, i.e., showing vortex-vortex interactions are weaker relative to vortex-field interactions. We also find that $p_{\text{int}}$ depends on the external field, and decreases for higher external magnetic field values. The 440 nm array has $\mu_{\text{vort}} = (2.4 \pm 0.1)V_{pp}$, with $p_{\text{int}} \sim 1.2 - 1.4$, indicating stronger vortex-vortex interactions relative to the vortex-field interaction. For this lattice spacing we find that $p_{\text{int}}$ increases for higher field values.

In addition to the extraction of these characteristic parameters, some in-situ control over the vortex configurations is achieved by varying the height of the tip. As the tip moves away from the surface, the potential well flattens out, allowing the vortices to become more spread out. Fig. 4 shows the evolution of configurations of 6 vortices as the scanning height is increased. In the images, the uniform field is tuned to keep the number of vortices constant. These patterns show significant changes as the potential well is changed. Some vortex droplet configurations that are present with a deeper well will cover less area in the image, or can even disappear as the well is made shallower. This is due to the vortex-vortex interactions becoming relatively stronger, and
hence more significant in determining the vortex configurations for these scans. This shows that by constructing an appropriate field profile from the tip, control over the vortex droplet states can be achieved.

In this work, we have demonstrated a robust experimental platform for locally probing and controlling vortex dynamics. By trapping a vortex droplet underneath a magnetic tip, we can characterize transitions between stable vortex configurations and are able to extract the relative energy scales of various interactions. We tune the number and distribution of vortices trapped underneath the tip by modifying the scan height, external field, and array spacing. Using simulations of a simple model of vortices, we are able to reproduce the observed image patterns. The versatility of this experimental platform could prove a powerful tool to obtain a local understanding of, for example, the dominant effects that lead to various forms of vortex matter in superconductors such as vortex glasses and vortex liquids. Furthermore, this technique has the potential of probing non-standard vortex interactions in novel superconducting systems. It may also enable control of vortex motion and states through design of the tip motion, the magnet, and the array. This control may enable braiding of Majorana fermions for quantum computing applications and other studies.

This work was supported by the DOE Basic Energy Sciences under DE-SC0012649, and was carried out in part in the Frederick Seitz Materials Research Laboratory Central Research Facilities, University of Illinois. VC was supported by the Gordon and Betty Moore Foundation EPiQS Initiative through Grant GBMF4305.

1 Supplementary Information

1.1 Sample Fabrication

Electron beam lithography and electron beam evaporation were used to define and deposit several layers of material. The first, an 18 nm Au layer, with an underlying 1 nm Ti adhesion layer was placed onto a Si substrate with 300 nm SiO$_2$ as an insulator. The second layer consists of Al registration marks to aid in determining the location of the tip on the surface. A final round of processing was used to define and deposit the Nb islands. Prior to the Nb deposition, the surface of the Au was Ar$^+$ ion milled to establish a clean interface, and the Nb was evaporated at a pressure of $\sim 10^{-9}$ Torr. For one sample, one 500 nm center-to-center spaced array was made on an Au pad 80 $\mu$m × 80 $\mu$m. For the second sample, two 500 nm spaced arrays were 50 $\mu$m × 50 $\mu$m, with one connected in a four-point configuration. The connected array was used to determine the transition temperatures (Fig. 1) and the magnetoresistance of the 500 nm spaced arrays, while the other
was used for imaging experiments. Further arrays on the same sample, with lattice spacings of 440, 500, and 560 nm were also imaged. These arrays had areas of 50 \( \mu m \times 15 \mu m \).

The cantilevers used in this work are custom-fabricated Si cantilevers of length 110 \( \mu m \), width 4 \( \mu m \), and thickness 100 nm. A SmCo\(_5\) magnetic particle is positioned on the end of each cantilever using a micromanipulator, aligned with the cantilever axis using an external magnet, then epoxied into position. The magnet is then shaped using a Ga focused ion beam with low (\(<\ 10\ pA\)) current to preserve the magnetization of the SmCo\(_5\). Torque cantilever magnetometry is used to measure the magnetic moment of the tip and ensure that it is well aligned with the cantilever axis.

1.2 Measurement

Measurements were taken in a He-3 refrigerator with a base temperature of 300 mK. Cantilever oscillations are measured using a laser interferometer, and the cantilever is self-oscillated using a feedback loop at a small amplitude, typically 15 nm. Frequency is determined using a phase-locked loop running on an FPGA. Images were taken at least 5 \( \mu m \) from the edge of the arrays to minimize edge effects. Images were raster-scanned using an ANSxyz100 (Attocube) piezoelectric scanner, with the fast axis in the \( y \)-direction (vertical), at a rate of less than 300 nm/sec.

1.3 Tip field estimate

To estimate the tip field, the magnetic tip is scanned over superconducting Al rings deposited via e-beam or thermal evaporation. The rings used had radii of 2-5 \( \mu m \), with wall thicknesses of \( \sim\ 200\ nm \). Sufficiently close to the superconducting transition, the fluxoid transitions in the ring become reversible and occur when the tip applies a half-integer number of magnetic flux quanta through the ring. The resulting strong interaction between the magnetic tip and the switching supercurrent shifts the resonant frequency of the cantilever \[18\]. We map the locations of these frequency shifts as positions where the flux through the ring has changed by one flux quantum.

To estimate the tip field, a model of the tip is created consisting of \( 50 \times 50 \times 50 \) nm\(^3\) voxels with a magnetic dipole at the center. The tip magnetization is set to be the measured value, as determined by cantilever magnetometry. A scanning electron micrograph is used to determine where to position the dipoles, and their strength is adjusted to match the observed flux changes as the simulated tip is scanned across a ring. The dipoles are adjusted until the simulated flux changes and observed flux changes line up at multiple scan heights. Estimates of the tip field are then generated from the final dipole configuration.
1.4 The Vortex Model in Monte-Carlo Simulations

In this supplementary section we provide a derivation and some discussion of the simple vortex energy model of equation (1). Recall first the superconducting (SC) Nb island array under the influence of a MFM tip schematically shown in Fig. 1a. Given that measurements are taken below $T_2$ (Fig. 1b), the Au film regions between the Nb islands – the interstitial regions – are superconducting \[21\] but strongly Type II in behavior. Moreover, below $T_2$ we can neglect vortex nucleation due to thermal fluctuations and assume that all phase windings and density suppressions in the superconducting order parameter to be due to external or tip magnetic fields. Vortices will then preferentially choose to avoid the Nb islands and reside in these interstitial regions, but staying close to the magnetic tip. Our goal is to understand the *static* energetics of vortices in a magnetic field landscape produced by:

(a) the MFM tip with a field that penetrates the Au film and sources quantum vortices,

(b) the externally applied out of plane uniform field in the opposing direction that moderates the tip’s field.

Implicit is also the recognition that the vortex dynamics are much faster than the tip oscillations so that we can neglect the tip dynamics entirely.

1.4.1 Josephson Junction Array Model

To this end we start with a phenomenological model based on Josephson junction arrays. This amounts to neglecting the SC condensate in the interstitial regions altogether and focuses only on the Nb islands and their inter-island Josephson couplings. The interstitial regions, which host a weaker SC condensate, then act as Josephson weak links. Vortices that occupy the interstitial regions are essentially Josephson vortices in this picture. Thus we consider the following Josephson junction array quantum Hamiltonian \[19\] \[21\] \[23\]

\[
\hat{H} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j} U_{ij} \hat{Q}_i \hat{Q}_j - \sum_{i \neq j} J_{ij} \cos(\hat{\theta}_i - \hat{\theta}_j - \varphi_{ij} [A])
\] (2)

where the $i, j$ indices label the individual Nb islands. The operators $\hat{Q}_i$ and $\hat{\theta}_i$ refer to the charge $2e$ Cooper pair number, and SC phase operators respectively. They are mutually conjugate and satisfy the commutation relation

\[
[\hat{Q}_i, \hat{\theta}_j] = -i \delta_{ij}.
\] (3)
The first term in $\hat{H}$ is the charging energy with $U_{ij}$ being proportional to the inverse of the capacitance matrix. The second term is the Josephson coupling term with coupling matrix $J_{ij}$ between sites $i,j$. The quantity $\varphi_{ij}[A]$ is an additional phase term that originates from the presence of a magnetic vector potential $A(x)$ associated to a non-zero out of plane magnetic field $B_z$. It ensures that the phase difference

$$\gamma_{ij} = (\hat{\theta}_i - \hat{\theta}_j - \varphi_{ij}[A]) = -\gamma_{ji}$$

on the link between $i$ and $j$ is gauge invariant.

Next we make three simplifying approximations:

1. The charging term, which is typically small for mesoscopically large SC islands, is discounted. Effectively the Nb islands function as charge reservoirs (Cooper pair boxes) with large capacitances. This turns $\hat{H}$ into a classical energy functional on the set of island phases $\{\theta_i\}$.

2. The Josephson couplings are limited to only nearest neighbors $\langle ij \rangle$ of the triangular lattice island array. This is rationalized by the fact that $J_{ij}$ decays with increasing inter-island distance making Cooper pair tunneling between nearest neighbors the dominant interaction. We expect that the reincorporation of the neglected Josephson couplings will not qualitatively change main the results of our analysis.

3. We assume that the value of the phase differences $\gamma_{ij}$ are small, hence legitimizing a Taylor expansion of the cosine. This is equivalent to assuming that the Josephson supercurrents $I_{ij}$ between islands $i,j$ are small enough such that $I_{ij} = I_c \sin(\gamma_{ij}) \approx I_c \gamma_{ij}$, where $I_c$ is the critical supercurrent between nearest neighbors.

With these simplifications, the model is re-interpreted as a static Josephson junction array on a triangular lattice with the Josephson supercurrents $I_{ij}$ defined on nearest neighbor links $\langle ij \rangle$, as the effective degrees of freedom. This has the following effective static energy function

$$E_{\text{eff}}[I] = \frac{E_J}{2I_c^2} \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} (I_{ij})^2$$

where $E_J$ is the Josephson energy between nearest neighbor SC islands and we have dropped an irrelevant constant. It is convenient at this point to choose an orientation convention for the links $\langle ij \rangle$ in organizing the currents $I_{ij}$, and to avoid over-counting. A simple choice is to take a counter-clockwise orientation in the up-pointing triangular plaquettes ($\Delta$) which leads to a clock-
wise orientation on the down-pointing triangular plaquettes (\(\nabla\)).

Magnetic flux penetrates the system through the triangular plaquettes of the lattice by an amount \(\Phi_{\text{ext}}(p)\) externally applied through plaquette \(p\). In the absence of SC vortices, \(-\Phi_{\text{ext}}(p)\) is proportional to the supercurrent density circulation \(\oint j \cdot dl\) enclosing plaquette \(p\) within the Au film. This supercurrent density circulation is proportional to the sum of phase differences which gives

\[-\Phi_{\text{ext}}(p) = \alpha \sum_{(ij) \in p} I_{ij} \approx \frac{\Phi_0}{2\pi} \sum_{(ij) \in p} \gamma_{ij}\]

where \(p\) is a label of the plaquette, \(\Phi_0 = \frac{\hbar}{2e}\) is a flux quanta, and \(\alpha > 0\) is a proportionality constant depending on geometry of the system, the magnetic permeability and the condensate density. The sums are taken in the anti-clockwise (\(\odot\)) sense; for both \(\triangle\) and \(\nabla\) plaquettes. Note that the plaquettes themselves reside in a honeycomb lattice dual to the triangular lattice.

Now, when a SC vortex is present in \(p\), the sum of phase differences \(\sum \gamma_{ij}\) is of order \(2\pi\) and is no longer expected to be small such that the linear approximation \(\sin x \approx x\) (assumption 3. above) holds. Nevertheless, we can perform a (large) gauge transformation which changes sum of phase differences by quantized multiples of \(2\pi\) or fluxoids

\[\sum_{(ij) \in p} \gamma_{ij} \rightarrow \sum_{(ij) \in p} \gamma_{ij} \pmod{2\pi} = \sum_{(ij) \in p} \gamma_{ij} - 2\pi n_p\]

such that the \(\gamma_{ij}\)'s and hence their sum is small once more. Incorporating this into the relation with \(\Phi_{\text{ext}}(p)\) yields

\[\sum_{(ij) \in p} \gamma_{ij} = 2\pi n_p - \frac{2\pi \Phi_{\text{ext}}(p)}{\Phi_0}\]

where \(n_p \in \mathbb{Z}\) is an integer that is non-zero whenever a vortex (anti-vortex) is present in \(p\). The external flux is more conveniently expressed as

\[\Phi_{\text{ext}}(p) = \Phi_0 f_p\]  \(\text{(6)}\)

with \(f_p\) being the local magnetic flux fraction or frustration at \(p\). Thus we have the following constraint equation for each plaquette

\[\frac{1}{I_0} \sum_{(ij) \in p} I_{ij} = n_p - f_p\]  \(\text{(7)}\)

where \(I_0^{-1} \equiv \alpha/\Phi_0\) is a proportionality constant with dimensions of \([\text{Current}]^{-1}\). A second con-
straint on $I_{ij}$ is current conservation, or Kirchoff’s first law, at each site $i$. We express this as

$$\sum_{j \in \langle ij \rangle} I_{ij} = 0 \quad (8)$$

where the symbol $\times(i)$ denotes the fact that orientation convention of $I_{ij}$ is chosen to be pointing into the site $i$. These constraints must hold for all sites $i$. Implicit in these expressions is the neglect of the mutual and self inductance terms due to the supercurrents themselves which are generally expected to be a small effect [20].

### 1.4.2 Counting Independent Currents

Now a unit cell of a triangular lattice has 1 site, 2 plaquettes and 3 links. Hence on average per site, current conservation (Eqn. (8)) removes 1 independent current/link degree of freedom such that the flux conditions (Eqn. (7)) relate 2 independent currents $I_{ij}$ to 2 independent vortex numbers $n_p$ given fixed frustrations $f_p$. In the case of a finite lattice with open boundaries, after a proper accounting of the links at the boundary, and noting that there are only $(N_{node} - 1)$ current conservation constraints for $N_{node}$ sites, we find a 1-1 relation between independent currents and a specified configuration of $n_p$’s on each plaquette. This reduction of the current conservation constraints by one comes from the fact that the entire system must have a net zero current.

This can also been seen by noting the Euler characteristic $\chi = 1$ for a finite planar graph relates $N_{node} - N_{link} + N_{plaq} = 1$ where $N_{node}$ is the number of island sites, $N_{link}$ is the number of nearest neighbor links, and $N_{plaq}$ the number of triangular plaquettes. By rearranging we have $N_{plaq} = N_{link} - (N_{node} - 1)$ which says that $N_{plaq}$ is the same as the number of independent current links. Hence, for fixed frustrations $\{f_p\}$, specifying a configuration of vortex numbers $n_p$ for all plaquettes is equivalent to specifying a current configuration $I_{ij}$ on all links that obey the required constraints.

### 1.4.3 Transforming Currents to Vortex Occupations

By combining the constraints in equations (7) and (8), we can relate a configuration of vortex numbers $n = \{n_p\} \in \mathbb{Z}^{N_{plaq}}$ to a configuration of currents $I = \{I_{ij}\} \in \mathbb{R}^{N_{link}}$. This relation is linear and can be succinctly expressed as

$$\frac{1}{I_0} M I = \begin{pmatrix} n - f \\ 0_{N_{node}-1} \end{pmatrix} \quad (9)$$
where \( \mathbf{f} = \{ f_{\mu} \} \in \mathbb{R}^{N_{\text{plaq}}} \) are the externally applied flux fractions/frustrations and \( \mathbf{0}_{N_{\text{node}}-1} \) is a \((N_{\text{node}} - 1)\) dimensional zero vector. The matrix \( \mathbf{M} \) is \( N_{\text{link}} \times N_{\text{link}} \), dimensionless and invertible due to the counting arguments just mentioned. Taking the inverse yields

\[
\mathbf{I} = I_0 \mathbf{M}^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{n} - \mathbf{f} \\ \mathbf{0}_{N_{\text{node}}-1} \end{pmatrix}.
\] (10)

### 1.4.4 Effective Energy Function

Next, inserting the expression [10] into the effective energy function [5] gives

\[
E_{\text{eff}}[\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{f}] = \frac{E_J}{2(I_c/I_0)^2} (\mathbf{n} - \mathbf{f})^T \mathbf{B}^T \mathbf{B} (\mathbf{n} - \mathbf{f})
\] (11)

where \( \mathbf{B} \) is a submatrix of \( \mathbf{M}^{-1} \) in its first \( N_{\text{plaq}} \) columns. The prefactor on the RHS sets the overall energy scale, and the dimensionless constant \( I_c/I_0 \) encodes geometric information about the lattice. We consider the configuration of local frustrations \( \mathbf{f} \) to be a fixed external knob, and the vortex numbers \( \mathbf{n} \) as variational parameters that are required to minimize \( E_{\text{eff}} \). The frustrations \( \mathbf{f} \) are determined by the total amount of flux through each plaquette, and are set by the \( B_z \) profile induced by the magnetic tip, and the additional uniform field that moderates the tip field.

Then by scaling away the overall energy scale, expanding the brackets, and dropping an irrelevant constant we find the following model energy function dependent on \( \mathbf{n} \) and \( \mathbf{f} \)

\[
F[\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{f}] = \mathbf{n}^T \mathbf{V} \mathbf{n} + \mathbf{U}_f^T \mathbf{n}
\] (12)

where

\[
\mathbf{V} = \mathbf{B}^T \mathbf{B}
\] (13)

\[
\mathbf{U}_f = -2 \mathbf{B}^T \mathbf{B} \mathbf{f} = -2 \mathbf{V} \mathbf{f}.
\] (14)

Note that \( F[\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{f}] \) is determined entirely by the geometry of the lattice and the local flux and current constraints. The first term in \( F[\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{f}] \) represents vortex-vortex interactions while the second is the vortex-field interaction. We note that the matrix \( \mathbf{V} \) is symmetric and is dense in its off-diagonals. This results in long-range, pair-wise interactions between vortices and externally applied fields. For our simulations we calculate the entries of \( \mathbf{V} \) for a roughly circular array of triangular plaquettes with a diameter of 50 lattice constants.
The entries in $\mathbf{n}$ are integers, and due to the large number of possible combinations of vortex positions in $\mathbf{n}$, the minimization of $F[\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{f}]$ is done variationally using Metropolis Monte-Carlo. In practice $n_p$ takes 0, 1 values indicating the absence or presence of a single vortex. We simulate an area consisting of 85 plaquettes in a roughly circular region at the center of the larger, 50 lattice constant array to determine the vortex configurations. Also the total vortex number $\sum_p n_p$ is varied during the search for the energy minimum, but remains fixed during a single Monte-Carlo run.

1.4.5 Further Phenomenological Fitting

As it stands, there are no fitting parameters in the model, which itself depends heavily on all the assumptions previously discussed. However to fit to the observed data, we have found it necessary to modify the above form of $F[\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{f}]$. The modified model energy function that we optimize is

$$E[\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{f}] = p_{\text{int}} \mathbf{n}^T V \mathbf{n} + U_f^T \mathbf{n} + \mu_{\text{vort}} \sum_p n_p$$

$$= p_{\text{int}} \sum_{p,q=1}^{N_{\text{plaq}}} V_{pq} n_p n_q + \sum_{p=1}^{N_{\text{plaq}}} [(U_f)_p + \mu_{\text{vort}}] n_p$$

(15)

where $p_{\text{int}}$ and $\mu_{\text{vort}}$ are the two phenomenologically introduced parameters. The quantity $p_{\text{int}}$ modulates the relative strength between vortex-vortex to vortex-field interactions. While $\mu_{\text{vort}}$ is a chemical potential for the vortices that is added to fine-tune the favored number of vortices and adjusted so that vortex transitions occur at the observed field/heights in the experiment. These two fitting parameters can be thought of as modifications needed to compensate for the limitations of the assumptions and approximations made. For example, the fixed vortex number during a Monte-Carlo run excludes the possibility of fluctuating vortex numbers during a raster scan of the magnetic tip positions.

From this fitting, we find the chemical potential $\mu_{\text{vort}}$ of the 500 nm array, to be approximately $(1.8 \pm 0.1) \times V_{pp}$, where $V_{pp}$ is the on-site vortex energy. For the 440 nm and 560 nm arrays, $\mu_{\text{vort}}$ is approximately $(2.4 \pm 0.1) \times V_{pp}$ and $(0.9 \pm 0.1) \times V_{pp}$, respectively. In this case, $p_{\text{int}}$ is approximately (1.0-1.2) for the 500 nm array, with higher values (1.2-1.4) for the 440 nm array, and lower values (0.7-0.9) for the 560 nm array. These values are dependent on field for the 440 nm and 560 nm arrays. Some uncertainty exists in these values, due to small changes not affecting the patterns generated significantly, as well as possible errors in tip field estimates.
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