Probing hundreds of individual quantum defects in polycrystalline and amorphous alumina
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Quantum two-level systems (TLSs) are present in the materials of qubits and are considered defects because they limit qubit coherence. For superconducting qubits, the quintessential Josephson junction barrier is made of amorphous alumina, which hosts TLSs. However, TLSs are not understood generally, either structurally or in atomic composition, such that better characterization is needed. In this study, we greatly extend the quantitative data available on TLSs by using an Electrical-Bridge Quantum Defect Sensor (EBQuDS) to characterize two alumina types: polycrystalline $\gamma - \text{Al}_2\text{O}_3$ and amorphous $a - \text{AlO}_x$. The EBQuDS is a circuit that electrically tunes individual TLSs close enough to cavity resonance to form a cavity quantum electrodynamical (cQED) system. The sensor furthermore uses the dc-electric field dependence to extract the dipole moments (sizes) of individual TLSs. We find a clear difference in the dipole sizes from the film types, indicating a difference in TLS structures. A large sample of about 400 individual TLSs are analyzed from the polycrystalline film type. Their dipole along the growth direction $p_z$ have a mean value of $2.6(1) \text{Debye} (=0.54\text{eÅ})$ and a standard deviation of $1.6(1) \text{Debye}$. Data from two devices fit well to a single Gaussian distribution, consistent with a single defect type. The dipole analysis allows a comparison to recent structural models simulated by Density Functional Theory (DFT). We find that polycrystalline TLSs are consistent with hydrogen-based defect models. In contrast, about 200 individual TLSs are analyzed from amorphous films. Of these, 11% of the TLSs have a dipole moment larger than 8 Debye. This is quantitatively consistent with a delocalized oxygen model, but contrasts polycrystalline moment data and known hydrogen models.

INTRODUCTION

Long coherence times are essential for quantum information processing and this implies high-quality Josephson junctions (JJs) in superconducting qubits [1–6]. For over a dozen years, quantum tunneling two-level systems (TLSs) have been known to be defects that cause loss and limit coherence of qubits [7, 8]. In addition, TLSs create telegraphic noise and 1/f noise [9–11] in superconducting qubits [12–14], semiconducting qubits [15], and astronomy photon detectors [16, 17]. There are several strategies to improve the qubit coherence time such as material optimization [18–21], surface treatments [21–23], and engineering of the qubit geometry to decrease the participation of TLSs [24–26].

In the quintessential JJ, an amorphous alumina barrier is grown thermally on the surface of aluminum [1, 2, 4]. Loss tangents of amorphous alumina in JJs [18] and in grown films [27] are measured to be approximately $2 \times 10^{-3}$, much higher than that in crystalline alumina from the sapphire substrates used for qubit fabrication [28]. Accordingly, amorphous materials are believed to have higher loss than crystalline ones due to additional tunneling degrees of freedom (TLSs). HBN and other 2D materials are being investigated for JJs [29–31], but a straightforward method to improve the JJ barrier uses annealed crystalline alumina [32, 33]. Crystalline alumina studies show a decrease in both TLS density [32] and TLS-qubit couplings, $g$, relative to amorphous alumina [33].

Recent TLS analysis techniques use dc-tuned electric [34, 35] or strain field [36–38] for the observation of individual nanoscale defects. According to the Standard Tunneling Model (STM) [39, 40], individual TLSs have a dipole moment $p$, transition energy $E$ and tunneling energy $\Delta_0$. Generally, the TLS is described as tunneling charge presumed to be an atom or small group of atoms, though a recent study reports on a possibility of trapped quasiparticles [41]. However, their identification is a 50 year old mystery [42].

TLSs have an ac-coupling to quantum systems,

$$g = \frac{\Delta_0}{E} p_z \frac{E_{\text{rms}}}{\hbar},$$

(1)

which is related to dipole moment $p_z$ and zero-point fluctuation of electric field $E_{\text{rms}}$. However, the most common measurement of $g$ does not allow extraction of $p_z$ because $\Delta_0$ is unknown [8, 32, 33]. On the other hand, static dc-tuned measurements allow measurements of individual $p_z$ [34, 35] and dynamically biased experiments extract averaged $p_z$ [43]. Such dynamical bias can induce Landau-Zener transitions, and recent work shows that a resonator can even exhibit dynamical decoupling using these transitions [44]. However, only small samples of $p_z$ were extracted previously: 13 in amorphous alumina [35]...
and 64 in silicon nitride [34]. To the best of our knowledge, a comparison of $p_z$ in two different materials has not been performed in a single study.

In this letter we study individual TLSs in both polycrystalline alumina $\gamma-Al_2O_3$ and amorphous alumina $a-AlO_x$. We follow the circuit schematic of Ref. [34], and we name it an Electrical-Bridge Quantum-Defect Sensor (EBQuDS). The TLSs were analyzed in films with an approximate thickness of 20 nm. The TLSs in $\gamma-Al_2O_3$ films are relatively stable, and allow us to obtain a large distribution of 394 TLS dipole moments $p_z$. In $a-AlO_x$ films, 189 TLS moments are extracted despite higher TLS noise. Compared to the $\gamma-Al_2O_3$ film, larger moments on average are extracted in $a-AlO_x$ films. Specific TLS structures were proposed using available information from recent work on density functional theory (DFT) analysis of TLSs in alumina, where both hydrogen [45, 46] and oxygen [47–49] based TLS have been proposed as the interstitial defects. A comparison of the dipole moments for both $\gamma-Al_2O_3$ and $a-AlO_x$ film types allows TLS origin identification.

**METHOD**

Fabrication starts by in situ growth of Al/alumina/Al trilayers on a 3-inch Si substrate, where the alumina is the material hosting the TLSs. The in situ method is selected to prevent substantial hydrogen contamination, but diffusion of hydrogen is also difficult to prevent in standard lithographic processing [50]. Then, a first BCl$_3$ etch forms a mesa into the top 2 layers, defining 4 equal capacitors (C$_1$ – C$_4$). Next, a second BCl$_3$ etch forms the base-metal including a resonator inductor L and ground plane. Finally, silicon nitride is deposited as a wiring dielectric, vias are etched by SF$_6$, and an Al wiring layer is defined to connect the inductor to the capacitors. This creates the final resonator structure as shown in Fig 1 (a). Alumina in the dielectric layer is designed to have an approximate thickness $d = 20$ nm and a volume $V = 1.11 \times 10^{-17} m^3$ in each capacitor, regardless of alumina type. The 20 nm thick polycrystalline $\gamma-Al_2O_3$ film was deposited by electron-beam evaporation from 99.99% purity Al$_2$O$_3$ pellets with a base pressure of $< 5 \times 10^{-7}$ torr. The amorphous AlO$_x$ ($a-AlO_x$) film was measured at 14.7 nm thickness and $x = 1.3 \pm 0.1$. It was grown using 8 iterations of 1 nm Al deposition followed by static oxidation at 9.5 mbar of oxygen at 250 °C as described in ref. [51]. Given this oxidation condition, no long-range ordered (crystalline) structure was detected from transmission electron microscopy and only 3% unoxidized aluminum was found inside the $a-AlO_x$ layer.

The resonator inductively couples to the transmission line so that a 2-port microwave transmission measurement can be carried out. The applied voltage from room temperature is filtered by an RC filter, 3dB attenuator and a copper powder filter. It generates an dc biased field $E_{ex}$ across each capacitor. The maximum $E_{ex}$ is 90 kV/m with which we observe no refrigerator heating, thus no significant leakage current. Two resonators were fabricated per chip with nominally the same capacitors, but with different value inductors, giving resonance frequencies of approximately $f_0 = 5.0$ GHz and 4.4 GHz. The resonators were measured at or below 60 mK. A less than 1 probing photon number $\bar{n}$ is used for all the reported data to allow observation of TLSs near their ground state.

With a known external field $E_{ex}$, the asymmetry energy $\Delta$ is shifted as $\Delta' = \Delta + 2p_z E_{ex}$ [34]. Therefore,
the resultant TLS energy is

\[ E = \sqrt{(\Delta + 2 p_z E_{\text{ex}})^2 + \Delta_0^2} \]  

(2)

The resonator constitutes a circuit QED system with a Jaynes-Cummings model modified for many TLSs. TLSs can be resolved individually by the resonator when the cooperativity \( g^2/\gamma_{\text{TLS}} \kappa \geq 1 \) [52], where \( \gamma_{\text{TLS}} \) is the TLS decay rate for the strongly coupled TLS, and \( \kappa = \kappa_e + \kappa_i \) is the resonator decay rate from external coupling and internal loss. We increase the \( g \) and cooperativity by reducing \( V \), since \( E_{\text{rms}} = \sqrt{\hbar f_0/8e \epsilon_0 V} \) in our parallel-plate capacitor resonator [8].

A single transmission trace \( |S_{21}| \) is shown in Fig 1 (b) from a \( \gamma - \text{Al}_2\text{O}_3 \) resonator. Within the bandwidth of the resonator, a few fine resonance dips reveal the energies of individual TLSs. However, the TLSs often only couple weakly to the resonator. Therefore, we obtain an approximate intrinsic material loss tangent \( \tan \delta_0 \) by using the averaged \( S_{21} \) traces from different voltage biases, yielding an ensemble-averaged \( S_{21,\text{avg}} \). The \( |S_{21,\text{avg}}| \) component of the result is shown as the solid black curve in Fig 1 (b). A fit (dashed red curve) to \( S_{21,\text{avg}} \) yields \( \tan \delta_0 = 1.47 \times 10^{-3} \) (\( Q_i = 680 \) in our geometry) and the external (or coupling) quality factor is extracted as \( Q_e = 2\pi f_0/\kappa_e = 590 \). The same procedure performed on a \( -\text{AlO}_x \) gives an intrinsic loss tangent of \( \tan \delta_0 = 0.83 \times 10^{-3} \), which is almost a factor of 2 smaller than that of \( \gamma - \text{Al}_2\text{O}_3 \). Our loss tangents are similar to the previous large-area JJs and ALD alumina, where the loss is measured at \( \tan \delta_0 = 1.6 \times 10^{-3} \) [8, 53] and \( \gamma = 0.7 \times 10^{-3} \) [54]. Below we discuss TLSs measured in both alumina film types using two resonators for each type.

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

Fig 2 (a) shows a TLS spectrum example, \( |S_{21}| \), as a function of frequency \( f \) and the dc-field \( E_{\text{ex}} \) for \( \gamma - \text{Al}_2\text{O}_3 \) measured on one of the two resonators during one cooldown. TLS energies exhibit hyperbolic energies versus \( E_{\text{ex}} \), as shown in Fig 2 (a) in agreement with Eq. 2. Similar spectra have been observed and analyzed in a previous study on silicon nitride [34]. One can estimate the \( \Delta_0 \) from the minimum of the TLS energy (\( h f_m = \Delta_0 \)), and \( p_z \) from the hyperbola – a steeper curvature gives a larger dipole moment. An optimized Monte Carlo fit is performed on each TLS energy to extract \( p_z \) of the specific TLS (see supplementary material for detailed fitting procedure). Only well-defined TLS energy curves are selected for analysis. Example fits are plotted as blue hyperbolas in Fig 2 (b).

TLSs change their energies randomly during cooldowns from room temperature. From different cooldowns, we created different sets of TLSs in the two resonators with one material type. No significant statistical difference in the dipole value is found between the two resonators with a 0.6 GHz difference in frequency (see supplementary material for data). We therefore combine all the data from different runs in the two resonators to enlarge the sampling number and improve the statistics: a total of 394 TLSs from two resonators are analyzed to form the measured \( p_z \) distribution \( H(p_z) \) with an average of 3.5(1) Debye shown in Fig 2 (c). A large amount of individual TLSs allow relatively accurate representation of the TLS moments in polycrystalline alumina.

Though the measured distribution \( H(p_z) \) has a mean value of 3.5(1) Debye, this is not an intrinsic material property. At a given electric field bias range \( \Delta E_{\text{ex}} \), TLSs with larger dipole moments have a larger shift in asymmetry energy \( \Delta' \) relative to smaller moments, and this leads to a higher probability of the former
moments having their energy minimum within the resonator bandwidth (see supplementary for derivation and Ref [34]). However, the intrinsic material TLS dipole distribution \( D(p_z) \) is related to TLS material density \( P_0 = \int D(p_z) \, dp_z \) (in units of \( J^{-1} \text{m}^{-3} \)), and can be calculated from \( D(p_z) = \frac{1}{2} \frac{H(p_z)}{p_z} \frac{1}{\Delta f} \) [see Supplementary Material], where \( f_0 \) is the resonator frequency and \( \Delta f \) is the frequency span of the \( S_{21} \) measurement. The red dashed line in Fig 2 (c) shows a fit using a maximum likelihood estimation (MLE) method. The fitting function is a modified Gaussian distribution, which is a Gaussian distribution multiplied by \( p_z \) [see Supplementary Material]). The TLS material density \( D(p_z) \) is shown in Fig 2 (d), where the red line shows a Gaussian function matching the fit parameters in Fig 2 (c). From the fit, we find that the material distribution \( D(p_z) \) has a fit mean dipole moment of \( p_z = 2.6(1) \) Debye and a standard deviation of \( \sigma_{p_z} = 1.6(1) \) Debye. The computed TLS density \( P_0 = 1.0(1) \times 10^{44}(J^{-1}\text{m}^{-3}) \). This computed value of TLS density along with the dipole moments agrees with the measured loss tangent. As a result we used the material units in panel (d) for the distribution \( D(p_z) \). For amorphous samples or random voids within polycrystallites, we expect TLS dipoles to be random in angle (isotropic). A standard assumption is to have one single dipole magnitude \( p_0 \) and uniform distribution in \( \cos \theta \), where \( \theta \) is the angle of dipole to \( z \)-axis. Therefore, \( D(p_z) \) is expected to be independent of \( p_z \) until the maximum value \( p_0 \). As a guide to the eye, one possible isotropic distribution (random angle) with a maximum dipole moment of \( p_0 = 4.5 \) Debye is shown as a black dashed line in Fig 2 (d). The better agreement of the Gaussian distribution shows that we have a departure from isotropic distribution. Thus, data in Fig 2 (d), shows that alumina polycrystalline film TLSs can be different than the standard model for TLSs (designated for amorphous samples [39, 40]). The anisotropic angular distribution may be caused by the polycrystalline film texture (crystallite orientation) which influences the TLS orientation.

Fig 3 (a) shows transmission spectroscopy results for a \( \text{AlO}_x \) from the same measurement setup as \( \gamma - \text{Al}_2\text{O}_3 \). However, the a \( \text{AlO}_x \) spectrum is not as clear as in \( \gamma - \text{Al}_2\text{O}_3 \) due to higher noise in TLSs. To improve the TLS signal contrast, the transmission (\( S_{21} \)) data is shown after processing, unlike the polycrystalline film data shown earlier. For our first processing step we chose to subtract \( S_{21, \text{avg}} \) from \( S_{21} \), and increase further contrast using the formula \( (S_{21}(dB) - S_{21, \text{avg}}(dB)) \times |S_{21, \text{avg}}| \). As a second and third processing step, we apply a low-pass filter in the frequency direction and then take the derivative with respect to frequency. The final result is plotted in arbitrary unit (AU) and shown in Fig 3 (b) with fit lines to the hyperbolic energy traces from theory of TLSs (blue lines). As we will show in detail below, TLSs within a \( \text{AlO}_x \) are less stable than those in \( \gamma - \text{Al}_2\text{O}_3 \) – the former TLSs show sudden switchings in energy or even become invisible in time within the resonator bandwidth, making it more difficult to identify individual TLSs. This leads to a higher error in the Monte Carlo fit. We also observed energy features that are almost independent of \( E_{ex} \), as indicated by black arrows. They are not expected because all coupled TLSs should be frequency tunable in the device. Surprisingly, one of them seems to be only partially described by hyperbola in Fig. 3(b) as shown as a red-dashed curve. This TLS seems to switch from a regular TLS state (in the hyperbola) to an unknown state which has constant transition energy under bias, and finally back to the TLS, during the field sweep. This indicates an unexpected state near its energy minima \( \Delta_0 \).

Unlike the other sample, the amorphous films show

![Image of processed transmission data](image-url)
most of the hyperbolas from TLSs in the bias range of −30 to 30 kV/m. Outside of this range TLSs tracks are seen, but they don’t trace out a smooth hyperbola. Furthermore, we find that the most TLSs do not appear twice after repeating the voltage scanning within the same cool-down. In a small fraction of TLS hyperbola (< 3%) the extracted dipole is similar and the minimum in energy is within 1 MHz, such that it is regarded as the same TLS and disregarded in distribution.

In a−Al2O3, we identify and analyze a total of 189 TLSs using multiple field sweeps and cool-downs according to the above procedure. The measured distribution $H(p_z)$ with counts and the probability of material distribution $D(p_z)$ are shown in Fig 3 (c). The extracted $p_z$ shows a broad range in value from 0.5 to 16 Debye with an average of 6.0(2) Debye and the interquartile range (range from the 25% to 75% points) of 3.8 Debye. Because of the large deviation, we cannot get a reasonable fitting to a Gaussian from the MLE method. Instead, we calculate the material average dipole moment $\bar{p}_z$ for $D(p_z)$ from $H(p_z)$, using $\bar{p}_z = \int p_z D(p_z) dp_z / \int D(p_z) dp_z = \int H(p_z) dp_z / \int p_z^{-1} H(p_z) dp_z$, and the standard deviation in a similar way. From this we find $p_z = 4.6(1)$ and a standard deviation of 2.5(1) Debye. A Gaussian curve with these parameters are plotted as a red dashed line. The huge variation in $p_z$ is possibly caused by the film growth method. The growth analysis shows that the thickness can vary up to ±5 nm in some rare cases [51], which would also limit the accuracy to ±25% in this film type.

TLSs in a−AlOx sample exhibit strong frequency diffusion during measurement. The loss calculated from the measured distribution is $1.7 \times 10^{-4}$, which is much smaller than the measured loss tangent, and noise prevents us from extracting $P_0$ and $D(p_z)$ accurately. We believe the difficulty to see TLSs at large bias explains this qualitatively: large-dipole TLSs are more likely to be observed in hyperbolic energy traces of this data set than smaller dipoles, which have wider hyperbolas and a larger chance of alteration in energy before both sides of the hyperbola are measured. As a result, small-dipole TLSs should be missing from the distribution and the average dipole value should be slightly overestimated.

To decipher the role of TLS-TLS interaction, we next conduct temporal spectroscopes for the two different film types: $\gamma$−Al2O3 and a−AlOx. Fig 4 shows processed $S_{21}$ traces observed over many hours. As shown in Fig 4 (a), TLSs biased at 0 V in $\gamma$−Al2O3 films near the resonance frequency are strikingly stable— their energies drift by less than 2 MHz over tens of hours. On the contrary, TLSs in a−AlOx behave similar to Ref. [13]. TLSs show irregular drifts of more than 5 MHz, including multiple telegraphic switching events (blue arrows) and abrupt TLS shifts (black arrow), possibly caused by TLS-TLS interactions [13, 55, 56]. Due to the larger dipole moments observed in a−AlOx, we expect a larger interaction than that in $\gamma$−Al2O3 (assuming that the low-frequency thermally activated TLSs are similar to the high frequency ones). The large unstable behaviors shown in the amorphous films occur in a few hours, where we note that a 4 Debye hyperbola track in a−AlOx data took about 5 hours to obtain.

Although we uncovered challenges to extracting $p_z$ in a-AlOx, the mean from a Gaussian fit to 189 TLSs yields 4.6 Debye, and a significant number of moments are above $p_z = 8$ Debye. This is unlike those we measured in $\gamma$−Al2O3. However, comparable results on amorphous alumina exist. One study found $p_z$ in the range of 2.3−7.4 Debye, using a few analyzed TLSs [38]. Other field-tuned measurements in a-AlOx, studying the barrier of JJs, detected several moments with $p_z \leq 4.5$ Debye [35]. Measurements of the transition dipole moments in a-AlOx of JJs indicate that $p_z \leq 6.0$ Debye [8] and $p_z \leq 4.8$ Debye [57] in two TLS dipoles measured. The existing data on amorphous alumina TLSs seems consistent with our observations, though the growth methods are slightly different.

Finally, we return to comment on the origins of TLSs in different alumina. We use DFT simulated TLSs for structural insights. We first compare our results to recent TLS DFT simulations on aluminum oxide defects [45−49]. Holder et al. [45] find that hydrogen aluminum-vacancy defects $V_{Al}−H$ in GHZ regime have a (total) dipole moment $p = 3.0$ Debye. Separately, Gordon et al. [46], find that the interstitial hydrogen in the hydrogen bond, with structure O−H...O, has $p = 4.4$ - 5.5 Debye. Additionally, Paz et al. [49] find natural bi-stable
structures in amorphous alumina and estimate \( p = 4.2 \) Debye. Besides hydrogen-based simulations, DuBois et al. studied models of delocalized oxygen atoms with six neighboring aluminum atoms [47, 48]. They found oxygen deficient \( a - \text{AlO}_x \) with \( x = 1.25 \) by varying distances between O and Al atoms, and yields \( p = 3.8 - 12.7 \) Debye. Overall, simulations based on hydrogen defects give a dipole moment value which centers around 4 Debye, while oxygen defect-based simulations lead to a larger dipole moment and broader range of possible moment.

The material distribution \( D(p_z) \) extracted in \( \gamma - \text{Al}_2\text{O}_3 \) peaks at approximately \( p_z = 3.0 \) Debye. This material also shows only 5.4\% of the TLSs above 5.5 Debye, the largest modeled value of hydrogen-based TLSs, while it is 38.5\% in amorphous alumina. We thus attribute \( \gamma - \text{Al}_2\text{O}_3 \) TLSs to hydrogen related defects. Additionally, the amorphous film shows 11\% dipoles above 8 Debye, where the polycrystalline film has none. Thus, based on the comparison, we conclude that \( a - \text{AlO}_x \) has substantial defects from tunneling oxygen. Also, the quantitative analysis of moments in alumina indicates an advantage of crystalline alumina in comparison to amorphous alumina. The dipole moments in crystalline alumina are smaller than that of amorphous alumina in agreement with expectation. This may relate to a different structure of TLSs, where the oxygen-based TLSs may only appear in the amorphous sample.

CONCLUSION

In summary, alumina in different forms are key materials for improving superconducting qubits. We have extracted the dipole moment \( p_z \) of hundreds of individual TLSs in nanoscale-thick films of (polycrystalline) \( \gamma - \text{Al}_2\text{O}_3 \) and (amorphous) \( a - \text{AlO}_x \) alumina. The quantity of moments is approximately an order of magnitude greater than the previous comparable study, and here we use an Electrical-Bridge Quantum Defect Sensor (EBQuDS). Analysis of the measured histogram of \( p_z \) reveals that polycrystalline alumina fits well to a single Gaussian peak. From the material distribution (algebraically related to the measured one), we obtain that the mean TLS moment of the polycrystalline film is \( p_z = 2.6(1) \) Debye (\( = 0.54 \text{ eÅ} \)) with a standard deviation of 1.6(1) Debye. Furthermore, the material distribution disagrees with the isotropic model commonly used in amorphous materials, indicative of a preferred texture (orientation) of the polycrystalline grains which host TLSs.

The ability to extract an accurate mean value puts constraints on its defect type, and allows us to make first comparisons to new microscopic structures used in DFT calculations. Additionally, TLSs from amorphous alumina switch more rapidly than in the polycrystalline film, which may be related to their larger moments in general. The polycrystalline alumina TLS data is consistent with specific hydrogen-based models: the material distribution of \( \gamma - \text{Al}_2\text{O}_3 \) has 68\% of \( p_z \) in the range of 1.8 to 4.2 Debye. On the other hand, amorphous alumina \( (a - \text{AlO}_x) \) has a larger mean \( p_z = 4.6(1) \) Debye, and is consistent with the small amounts of previous comparable data on this key material. In contrast to polycrystalline alumina, our measurements of amorphous alumina yield the large standard deviation of moments from Gaussian analysis of 2.5(1) Debye, partially due to the much larger moments at the large end of the distribution. In this film type, the moments above 8 Debye comprise 11\% of the distribution, and they are more consistent in value with calculations of delocalized oxygen atoms. However, using guidance from DFT results, the smallest moments of this material may be caused by hydrogen tunneling. In the future, more statistical samples of TLS \( p_z \)'s can be used with the EBQuDS for further material analysis.
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S-I. MATERIAL DENSITY AND LOSS TANGENT

In this section, we derive the relationship between material TLS density, \( D(p_z) \), and the measured histogram, \( H(p_z) \). In the Standard Tunneling Model (STM) \([1, 2]\), the authors assumes that the density of levels per unit volume and energy, \( n(\Delta, \Delta_0) \), depends on tunneling energy \( \Delta_0 \) but is uniform in \( \Delta \) giving

\[
n(\Delta, \Delta_0) \, d\Delta d\Delta_0 = \frac{P_0}{\Delta_0} \, d\Delta d\Delta_0,
\]

(S1)

where \( P_0 \) is a constant in unit of \( 1/(J \, m^3) \). However, the model only considers a single moment \( |\overline{p}| = p \). In our experiments, we notice the dipole moment in \( z \) axis is not uniform and we add dipole direction and magnitude dependence. For a general case, we write

\[
n(\Delta, \Delta_0, \overline{p}) \, d\Delta d\Delta_0 d^3p = \frac{P'_0}{\Delta_0} \, D(\overline{p}) \, d\Delta d\Delta_0 d^3p,
\]

(S2)

where \( D(\overline{p}) \) is a generalized material TLS distribution and \( P'_0 \) is a new constant. However, \( D(\overline{p}) \) depends on 3 Cartesian coordinates, and we only have measurement access to one component, \( p_z \). The full investigation of \( D(\overline{p}) \) is beyond the scope of this paper, but we assume that \( D(\overline{p}) \) is separable in \( p_x, p_y, \) and \( p_z \). Therefore, we consider the case

\[
n(\Delta, \Delta_0, p_z) \, d\Delta d\Delta_0 dp_z = \frac{D(p_z)}{\Delta_0} \, d\Delta d\Delta_0 dp_z,
\]

(S3)

where \( \int D(p_z) \, dp_z = P_0 \) and \( D(p_z) \) is the material density mentioned in the main text. In TLS spectroscopy, \( V_{bias} \) is controlled such that \( p_z, \Delta_0, \) and \( \Delta|_{V_{bias}=0} \) can be extracted for individual TLSs and \( \Delta = \Delta|_{V_{bias}=0} + 2 \frac{p_z V_{bias}}{l_0} \), where \( l_0 \) is the thickness of dielectric. Next, we change variables to include \( V_{bias} \) through Jacobian transformation giving

\[
d\Delta dp_z = dp_z dV_{bias} \frac{\partial \Delta}{\partial p_z} \frac{\partial \Delta}{\partial V_{bias}} = \left( \frac{2}{l_0} \right) dp_z dV_{bias}.
\]

(S4)

\( N_{tot} \) is the total number of observed TLSs from measurement histogram, \( H(p_{zi}) \),

\[
N_{tot} = \sum_i H(p_{zi}) \, \Delta p_{zi},
\]

(S5)

where \( p_{zi} \) is the center value and \( \Delta p_{zi} \) is the bin width of the \( i \)-th bin. \( N_{tot} \) can also be written related to Eq. S3 as

\[
N_{tot} = \mathcal{V} \int n(\Delta, \Delta_0, p_z) \, d\Delta d\Delta_0 dp_z.
\]

(S6)

Substituting Eq. S4 into the above equation, we have

\[
N_{tot} = \mathcal{V} \int_{p_{min}}^{p_{max}} D(p_z) \cdot \left( \frac{2}{l_0} \right) \, dp_z \, \int_{V_i}^{V_2} dV_{bias} \, \int \, d\Delta_0 \, d\Delta.
\]

(S7)

Similarly, we consider the \( i \)-th bin of \( H(p_{zi}) \) and the number of TLSs in this bin

\[
N_i = H(p_{zi}) \, \Delta p_{zi} = \mathcal{V} \int_{p_{zi} - \frac{\Delta p_{zi}}{2}}^{p_{zi} + \frac{\Delta p_{zi}}{2}} D(p_z) \cdot \left( \frac{2}{l_0} \right) \, dp_z \, \int_{V_i}^{V_2} dV_{bias} \, \int \frac{d\Delta_0}{\Delta_0}.
\]

(S8)

In the case of small enough \( \Delta p_{zi} \) and \( \Delta_0 \), we obtain

\[
H(p_{zi}) \, \Delta p_{zi} = \mathcal{V} \left( \frac{2}{l_0} \right) D(p_z) \, \Delta p_{zi} \, \Delta V_{bias} \, \frac{\Delta f_0}{f_0}.
\]

(S9)
or

\[ D(p_z) = \frac{1}{V} \frac{H(p_z)}{2p_z} \frac{l_0}{\Delta V_{bias}} \frac{f_0}{\Delta f_0}, \] (S10)

where \( \Delta f_0 \) is the measurement frequency span. Thus, we prove that \( D(p_z) \) is not proportional to measured histogram \( H(p_z) \), but \( D(p_z) \propto \frac{H(p_z)}{p_z} \).

Next, we derive the loss tangent, \( \tan \delta_0 \), from TLS histogram. Following Ref. [3], loss due to TLSs can be described as

\[ \tan \delta = \int \frac{p_z^2}{\varepsilon} \frac{H_{TLS}}{2k_B T} \left( \frac{1}{T_1^2 + \Omega^2 T_2^2} \right) \left( \frac{1}{T_2^2 + \Omega^2 T_1^2} \right) \left( \frac{E_{TLS}}{h} - 2\pi f_0 \right)^2 d^3 n \]

\[ = \int D(p_z) \frac{p_z^2}{\varepsilon} \frac{H_{TLS}}{2k_B T} \left( \frac{1}{T_1^2 + \Omega^2 T_2^2} \right) \left( \frac{1}{T_2^2 + \Omega^2 T_1^2} \right) \left( \frac{E_{TLS}}{h} - 2\pi f_0 \right)^2 d\Delta \frac{d\Delta_0}{\Delta_0} dp_z, \] (S11)

where \( \varepsilon \) is the permittivity constant, \( \Omega \) is the Rabi frequency, and \( T_1 \) (\( T_2 \)) is TLS relaxation (decoherence) time. The derivation of a similar integral has been presented in reference [3]. In the case when \( \Omega^2 T_1 T_2 \) is much smaller than 1,

\[ \tan \delta = \frac{\pi}{\varepsilon} \int D(p_z)p_z^2 dp_z. \] (S12)

Next, we estimate the loss tangent of \( \gamma - \text{Al}_2\text{O}_3 \). By replacing \( D(p_z) \) from Eq. S10, we get

\[ \tan \delta = \frac{\pi}{\varepsilon} \frac{1}{V} \int \frac{H(p_z)}{2p_z} \frac{l_0}{\Delta V_{bias}} \frac{f_0}{\Delta f_0} p_z^2 dp_z \] (S13)

\[ = \frac{\pi}{2\varepsilon} \frac{l_0}{\sqrt{\Delta V_{bias}}} \frac{f_0}{\Delta f_0} \int \frac{H(p_z)}{p_z} dp_z \]

\[ \approx \frac{\pi}{2\varepsilon} \frac{l_0}{\sqrt{\Delta V_{bias}}} \frac{f_0}{\Delta f_0} \sum \frac{H(p_z)}{p_z} \Delta p_z \]

\[ = \frac{\pi}{2\varepsilon} \frac{l_0}{\sqrt{\Delta V_{bias}}} \frac{f_0}{\Delta f_0} \sum_{i} p_{zi} = 4.3 \times 10^{-4}. \] (S14)

Notice that the loss tangent from the TLS histogram is smaller than the bulk resonator loss tangent, \( \tan \delta_0 = 1.47 \times 10^{-3} \), reported in main text. This can be explained by the requirement of complete hyperbola and how TLS exhibit frequency switching. Last, we estimate the material constant in the same film

\[ P_0 = \int D(p_z) dp_z \]

\[ \approx \sum_{i} \frac{1}{p_{zi}} \frac{l_0}{2 \Delta V_{bias}} \frac{f_0}{\Delta f_0} = 1.03 \times 10^{44} (J^{-1} m^{-3}). \] (S15)

This value is underestimated for the same reason.
FIG. S1. (a) Spectroscopy of DC bias sweep on polycrystalline alumina with voltage noise. (b) One example of $|S_{21}|$ from (a) without proper filtering. Voltage noise obscures TLSs within the spectrum.

S-II. INTERNAL QUALITY FACTOR FITTING AND BIAS FILTERING

In this section, we discuss the effect of bias line filtering and TLS noise on resonator data fittings. Filtering noise in the bias line is essential to study the individual TLSs in both film types. We performed a control experiment with additional bias-line noise. We start from a setup where the bias line has only a low-pass copper powder filter and a 12GHz K&L filter. Fig. S1 (a) shows measurements of $\gamma - \mathrm{Al}_2\mathrm{O}_3$ TLS spectroscopy with low frequency noise and Fig. S1 (b) shows one $|S_{21}|$ at fixed bias. There is no observation of any individual TLS. Surprisingly, the fit gives an internal quality factor, $Q_i = 1600$, which is higher than $Q_i = 680$ reported in the main text. It is believed that without proper noise filtering, the bias voltage noise strongly affects the visibility of the TLSs. The change of TLS frequency due to voltage noise is

$$\delta \omega_{TLS} = \frac{\Delta}{\hbar E_{TLS}} \delta \Delta = \frac{\Delta}{\hbar E_{TLS}} \times 2p_z \delta V_{ex}/l_0.$$  \hfill (S16)

In the case of multiple TLSs coupled to a resonator, the transmission rate \cite{4}

$$S_{21}(\omega) = 1 - \frac{\kappa_c/2}{\kappa_c/2 + \gamma_c/2 + i(\omega - \omega_c) + \sum g_i^2/\gamma_i/2 + i(\omega - \omega_{i,TLS})},$$ \hfill (S17)

where $\kappa_c$ is the cavity’s decay rate to the transmission line, $\gamma_c$ is the cavity decay rate to the environment when no TLSs exist, $\omega_c$ is the cavity resonance, $g_i$ is the coupling strength of each TLS, $\gamma_i$ is the decoherence rate, and $\omega_{i,TLS}$ is the resonant frequency of the i-th TLS. Inspired by Ref. \cite{5}, we assume that every TLS experiences a Gaussian voltage noise and we rewrite transmission rate as

$$S_{21} = 1 - \frac{\kappa_c}{2} \int \ldots \int \sum_i \frac{\sqrt{1/2\pi\sigma_i \exp[-\delta V_{ex}^2/2\sigma_i^2]}}{\gamma_i/2 + \gamma_c/2 + i(\omega - \omega_c) + \sum g_i^2/\gamma_i/2 + i(\omega - \omega_{i,TLS} + \delta \omega_i)} d\delta \omega_i \ldots d\delta \omega_n.$$ \hfill (S18)

The standard deviation, $\sigma_i$, of the i-th TLS depends on $\delta V_{ex}$ and $p_z$ such that the sensitivity to voltage noise is described as an averaged effect. The enhancement of $\sigma_i$ exterminates the effect of the i-th TLS. A simulation of different $\sigma_i$ is shown in Fig. S2 (a). Two TLSs are coupled to the resonator. The upper TLS in the plot is not affected by voltage noise and the lower TLS in the plot has $g$, $\gamma_0$, and a random frequency shift with deviation, $\sigma$. Simulations show that the lower TLS has smaller and smaller effect on the resonator while voltage noise (or $\sigma$) increases. The phenomena of the voltage noise is qualitatively similar to the increasing decoherence $\gamma$ of TLS as shown in Fig. S2 (b).
FIG. S2. Simulation of Eq. S18 with resonator parameters $\kappa_c, \gamma_c = 4$ MHz, $f_c = 4$ GHz, and two TLSs having $g = 0.7$ MHz, $\gamma_0 = 0.5$ MHz. Only one of them is affected by voltage noise (lower one). (a) The solid blue line shows resonator coupled to two TLSs and both have no voltage noise. The colored dashed lines show the enhancement of $\sigma$ from $0.1 \times g$ to $10 \times g$ on the lower TLS. (b) Simulation of the lower TLS under enhanced decoherence rate. The color lines indicate the behavior of the lower TLS are similar to enhancement of $\sigma$ in (a).
In this section, we show spectroscopy data sets from different cooldowns on the two alumina types, which are not shown in the main text. Fig. S3 shows $\gamma$–Al$_2$O$_3$ TLS spectra and Fig. S4 shows $a$–AlO$_x$ TLS spectra in raw data. Note that sometimes there are only a couple of $a$–AlO$_x$ TLSs extracted in the cooldown such as Fig. S4 (b) and (e).
S-IV. \( \gamma - \text{Al}_2\text{O}_3 \) TLS HISTOGRAMS IN TWO DIFFERENT RESONATORS

Fig. S5 and Table. S-IV show the dipole moment measured in two \( \gamma - \text{Al}_2\text{O}_3 \) resonators. The mean values are 3.5(1) and 3.6(1), for Res1 with \( f_0 = 4.35 \) GHz and Res2 with \( f_0 = 4.95 \) GHz, respectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>mean value</th>
<th>standard deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Res1 (4.35 GHz)</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Res2 (4.95 GHz)</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE I. Mean and standard deviation of extracted TLS \( p_z \) for each \( \gamma - \text{Al}_2\text{O}_3 \) resonator.
FIG. S6. Same $a-\text{AlO}_x$ data of Fig. 3 in main text with extra MLE fitting line in yellow curve. MLE fitting yields a mean dipole of 1.4 D and a standard deviation of 6.3 D. (a) Histogram of $a-\text{AlO}_x$ TLS in counts. (b) Probability of material density of $a-\text{AlO}_x$.

S-V. FITTING OF TLS DENSITY BY MAXIMUM LIKELIHOOD ESTIMATION

Here, we show the procedure of applying Fisher’s maximum likelihood estimation (MLE) on our statistics. For simplicity, we choose truncated normal distribution as our target function $f(p_z; \mu, \sigma)$ to fit our material density $D(p_z)$, and

$$f(p_z; \mu, \sigma) = C(\mu, \sigma) \frac{1}{\sigma \sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left(-\frac{(p_z - \mu)^2}{2\sigma^2}\right) \text{ for } p_z \in [0, \infty),$$  \hspace{1cm} (S19)

where $\mu$ is the mean value, $\sigma$ is the standard deviation. The normalized constant

$$C(\mu, \sigma) = \frac{2}{1 - \text{erf}(-\mu/\sigma \sqrt{2})}$$  \hspace{1cm} (S20)

depends only on $\mu$ and $\sigma$, where erf(x) is error function defined as

$$\text{erf}(x) = \frac{2}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_0^x \exp(-t^2)dt.$$  \hspace{1cm} (S21)

The likelihood function

$$L = \prod_i f(p_{zi}; \mu, \sigma).$$  \hspace{1cm} (S22)

The necessary conditions for the occurrence of a maximum (or a minimum) are

$$\frac{\partial \ln(L)}{\partial \mu} = 0, \quad \frac{\partial \ln(L)}{\partial \sigma} = 0.$$  \hspace{1cm} (S23)

As mentioned above in Sec. S-I, $D(p_z)$ is not the direct measurement result, but $H(p_z)$ is. Since there is a weighting factor $p_z$ transferring $D(p_z)$ to $H(p_z)$, we have

$$H(p_z; \mu, \sigma) = N_{tot} C_1(\mu, \sigma)p_z \exp\left(-\frac{(p_z - \mu)^2}{2\sigma^2}\right).$$  \hspace{1cm} (S24)

A new normalization constant is

$$C_1(\mu, \sigma) = \sigma^2 \exp(-\mu^2/2\sigma^2) + \mu \sigma \sqrt{\pi/2}(1 - \text{erf}(-\mu/\sigma \sqrt{2})).$$  \hspace{1cm} (S25)
and $N_{\text{tot}}$ is the total observed TLS. MLE method applied to the amorphous alumina measured histogram does not give the main peak feature adequately in the material distribution $D(p_2)$ (see Fig. S6 (b) yellow line). Thus, we do not use MLE in reporting the amorphous data in the main text, but rather a calculated mean and standard deviation (plot in red dashed lines). The calculation method is described in the main text.