Spectroscopic determination of hole density in the ferromagnetic semiconductor \( \text{Ga}_{1-x}\text{Mn}_x\text{As} \)
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The measurement of the hole density in the ferromagnetic semiconductor \( \text{Ga}_{1-x}\text{Mn}_x\text{As} \) is notoriously difficult using standard transport techniques due to the dominance of the anomalous Hall effect. Here, we report the first spectroscopic measurement of the hole density in four \( \text{Ga}_{1-x}\text{Mn}_x\text{As} \) samples \((x = 0, 0.038, 0.061, 0.083)\) at room temperature using Raman scattering intensity analysis of the coupled plasmon-LO-phonon mode and the unscreened LO phonon. The unscreened LO phonon frequency linearly decreases as the Mn concentration increases up to 8.3%. The hole density determined from the Raman scattering shows a monotonic increase with increasing \( x \) for \( x \leq 0.083 \), exhibiting a direct correlation to the observed \( T_c \). The optical technique reported here provides an unambiguous means of determining the hole density in this important new class of “spintronic” semiconductor materials.

Current interest in the development of a semiconductor “spintronics” technology provides a strong motivation for fundamental studies of diluted magnetic semiconductors (DMS). These are semiconductors that incorporate magnetic ions such as \( \text{Mn}^{2+} \) within the crystal lattice. Paramagnetic (and antiferromagnetic) DMS have traditionally been realized by incorporating isovalent transition metal ions into II-VI semiconductors such as CdTe and ZnSe. The relatively recent discovery of ferromagnetic III-V semiconductor-based DMS with Curie temperatures \((T_c)\) as high as 110 K has now raised interesting fundamental issues regarding the origin of ferromagnetism in materials such as \( \text{Ga}_{1-x}\text{Mn}_x\text{As} \). In these III-V DMS, \( \text{Mn}^{2+} \) acts as an acceptor, generating free holes in the valence band. The ferromagnetism in these materials arises from the exchange interaction between these holes and the \( \text{Mn}^{2+} \) ions, and it is generally believed that there is a direct correlation between \( T_c \) and the hole density \( p \). However, the unambiguous determination of the hole density in \( \text{Ga}_{1-x}\text{Mn}_x\text{As} \) by standard magneto-transport techniques (Hall measurement) is difficult because of the anomalous Hall effect. The extraction of the ordinary Hall effect from the measurement, applied at \( T < T_c \), requires magnetic fields larger than 20 T even at temperatures as low as 50 mK; even under these conditions, the measured Hall data are not completely free from the effect of the negative magnetoresistance, resulting in significant uncertainty in the deduced hole density. In addition, Hall measurements are not applicable to magnetically dilute samples that are insulating.

Finally, we note that the Curie-Weiss law behavior of the magnetic susceptibility determined by the Hall effect clearly indicates the dominance of the anomalous Hall effect over the ordinary Hall effect even at room temperature. Here, we exploit an alternative method (Raman scattering) to determine the hole density in \( \text{Ga}_{1-x}\text{Mn}_x\text{As} \) epilayers for a wide range of temperatures by correlating the hole density to the coupled plasmon-LO-phonon mode (CPLOM). Our results show that this spectroscopic technique provides a reliable method for determining the hole density in ferromagnetic semiconductors over a broad range of sample conductivity, ranging from insulating to highly metallic.

For \( n \)-type GaAs, the coupling between the LO phonon and electron plasmon results in two Raman active coupled plasmon-LO-phonon modes (CPLOM), \( L^+ \) and \( L^- \). For high electron density, \( L^+ \) shows a rapid blue-shift with increasing electron concentration, providing an accurate calibration for the electron concentration, whereas \( L^- \) remains almost stationary near the GaAs TO frequency. On the other hand, only one CPLOM is observed in \( p \)-type GaAs due to a strong hole plasmon damping, moving from the LO to the TO frequency with increasing hole concentration. In this paper, we report the spectroscopic determination of the carrier concentration of four \( \text{Ga}_{1-x}\text{Mn}_x\text{As} \) samples \((x = 0, 0.038, 0.061, 0.083)\) at room temperature using Raman scattering from CPLOM. We find that the unscreened LO (ULO) phonon frequency of \( \text{Ga}_{1-x}\text{Mn}_x\text{As} \) decreases significantly as the Mn concentration increases up to 8.3%. This makes the traditional lineshape analysis for a typical \( p \)-type GaAs, where the doping does not change the ULO frequency, unsuitable for determining the hole density in \( \text{Ga}_{1-x}\text{Mn}_x\text{As} \). By analyzing the relative Raman intensities of the ULO phonon and the CPLOM, however, we were able to determine the carrier concentration up to \( 7 \times 10^{20} \text{ cm}^{-3} \). The monotonic increase of the hole density with increasing \( x \) for \( x \leq 0.083 \) correlates well
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FIG. 1: Raman spectra of Ga$_{1-x}$Mn$_x$As with 6.1% Mn at room temperature for 457 nm excitation in quasi-backscattering geometry with different polarization configurations, where \( z = [001] \), \( x = [100] \), \( y = [010] \), \( X = [110] \), etc. The base lines are vertically shifted for clarity.

FIG. 2: Raman spectra of Ga$_{1-x}$Mn$_x$As for \( x = 0, 0.038, 0.061, 0.083 \) at room temperature for 457 nm excitation in \( z(Y, Y)z \) scattering configuration, where open circles represent experimental data. The shaded area corresponds to the unscreened LO phonon component and the solid curves represent contributions from plasmon LO-phonon coupled mode. The base lines are vertically shifted for clarity and the Raman intensity of the reference sample was scaled down by 1/5.

Typical Raman spectra of Ga$_{1-x}$Mn$_x$As with 6.1% Mn at room temperature in quasi-backscattering geometry with different polarization configurations are displayed in Fig. 1, where \( z = [001] \) is the growth direction and \( x = [100] \), \( y = [010] \), \( X = [110] \), and \( Y = [110] \). According to the Raman selection rule for a zinc-blende crystal, the LO phonon is allowed for \( z(Y, Y)z \) and \( z(x, y)z \) but forbidden for \( z(x, x)z \) and \( z(Y, X)z \) whereas TO phonon is forbidden for all the scattering configurations employed in Fig. 1. The Raman feature near 269 cm$^{-1}$ is very strong in \( z(Y, Y)z \) and \( z(x, y)z \) whereas it is extremely weak in \( z(Y, X)z \) and \( z(x, x)z \) where LO modes are forbidden. This reveals its “LO mode” nature despite its proximity to the GaAs TO frequency. The very weak Raman signal near \( \sim 266 \) cm$^{-1}$ in \( z(Y, X)z \) configuration is the disorder-induced TO phonon that should exist as a weak background Raman intensity for all the other scattering configurations employed in Fig. 1. Thus, the Raman...
man feature at 260 cm\(^{-1}\) is a CPLOM in Ga\(_{0.94}\)Mn\(_{0.06}\)As. We have not observed any Raman signature in the high frequency spectral range up to 1700 cm\(^{-1}\) that can be attributed to \(L^+\). This indicates that the free carrier is a hole. Apart from the strong CPLOM in \(\mathbf{\tau}(Y, Y)z\), there is an unmistakable shoulder on the high frequency side of the CPLOM. This is due to the ULO in the depletion layer near the surface. It is more distinctly observed in \(\mathbf{\tau}(x, x)z\), where the LO mode is forbidden due to Raman selection rules. However, the electric field near the semiconductor surface causes a relaxation of Raman selection rules.

In the \(\mathbf{\tau}(Y, Y)z\) configuration, the superimposed Raman features can be decomposed into CPLOM and ULO parts by fitting the experimental data using two Lorentzian oscillators as shown in Fig. 3, where Raman spectra of Ga\(_{1-x}\)Mn\(_x\)As for \(x = 0, 0.038, 0.061\), and 0.083 in \(\mathbf{\tau}(Y, Y)z\) scattering configuration are displayed. It should be noted that the Raman spectrum of the reference sample (\(x = 0\)) consists of only one Lorentzian oscillator. The Raman intensity of the ULO (shaded area) rapidly decreases as the Mn concentration increases. The peak positions of the CPLOM and ULO determined from the curve fitting are listed in Table I and shown in Fig. 3. The ULO frequency linearly decreases with increasing Mn concentrations up to 8.3%. Since the lattice constant of Ga\(_{1-x}\)Mn\(_x\)As increases with increasing \(x\) the compressive strain in the GaMnAs layer should induce a blue-shift of the ULO frequency. However, the alloying effect appears to be much stronger than the strain effect in Ga\(_{1-x}\)Mn\(_x\)As, leading to the observed ULO frequency red-shift with increasing \(x\).

Traditionally, lineshape analysis of Raman scattering for the CPLOM has been used to deduce carrier concentrations of \(p\)-type GaAs \(\delta\) assuming that the phonon frequencies of the TO and LO phonons do not change with doping. This is valid because conventional dopant concentrations are too small to change most of the physical parameters of GaAs used for the lineshape analysis. However, Mn concentrations in Ga\(_{1-x}\)Mn\(_x\)As samples for \(p > 10^{18} \text{cm}^{-3}\) are high enough to change the frequency of the ULO as shown in Table I, making it incorrect to use the GaAs parameters for the lineshape analysis of the CPLOM. Alternatively the \(p\)-type carrier concentration can be determined by analyzing the relative intensities of ULO and CPLOM. Assuming the Raman scattering efficiency from the ULO is similar to that in an undoped crystal, the integrated intensity \(A_L\) of the ULO can be written as

\[
A_L = A_0 \left[ 1 - \exp(-2\alpha d) \right],
\]

(1)

where \(A_0\) is the integrated intensity in an undoped crystal, \(\alpha\) is the absorption coefficient, and \(d\) is the depletion layer thickness. Since the integrated Raman intensity is proportional to the scattering volume, \(A_0\) is given by

\[
A_0 = \xi_S A_P + A_L,
\]

(2)

where \(A_P\) is the integrated intensity of the CPLOM and \(\xi_S = I_L/I_P\) is the relative Raman scattering efficiencies of the ULO and CPLOM in a unit volume. Using Eqs. (1) and (2), \(d\) can be estimated from the experimental Raman data

\[
d = \frac{1}{2\alpha} \ln \left( 1 + \frac{\xi_A}{\xi_S} \right),
\]

(3)
TABLE I: Peak positions of coupled plasmon-LO-phonon mode (CPLOM) and unscreened LO (ULO) determined from Raman scattering. The depletion layer thickness \( d \) and the hole concentration \( p \) are calculated using Eqs. (3) and (5) with \( \xi_S \simeq 2 \) and \( \phi_B = 0.5 \, V \).

| Mn concentration (%) | ULO \((cm^{-1})\) | CPLOM \((cm^{-1})\) | \( d \) (Å) | \( p \) \((cm^{-3})\) |
|----------------------|-----------------|-----------------|---------|-------------|
| 0                    | 291.7 \pm 1.0   | 276.4 \pm 1.0   | 76 \pm 4 | 1.2 \pm 0.2 \times 10^{19} |
| 3.8 \pm 0.2          | 287.7 \pm 1.0   | 268.7 \pm 1.0   | 16 \pm 1 | 2.8 \pm 0.4 \times 10^{20}  |
| 6.1 \pm 0.2          | 284.8 \pm 1.0   | 265.3 \pm 1.0   | 10 \pm 0.5 | 7.1 \pm 0.7 \times 10^{20}  |
| 8.3 \pm 0.2          | 281.8 \pm 1.0   | 262.8 \pm 1.0   | 7 \pm 0.5 | 5.2 \pm 0.5 \times 10^{20}  |

where \( \xi_A = A_L / A_P \) is the ratio of the integrated intensity of the ULO to that of CPLOM in the Ramaland. The depletion layer thickness \( d \) for \( p > 10^{18} \) can be calculated as a function of hole concentration \( p \) at zero temperature (neglecting transition region)

\[
d = \left( \frac{2\xi_0 \xi_S \phi_B}{e} \right)^{1/2} \frac{1}{p^{1/2}},
\]

where \( \varepsilon_S \) is the static dielectric constant and \( \phi_B \) is the surface potential barrier. Since the values of \( \varepsilon_S \) and \( \phi_B \) for GaMnAs are not available we used those for GaAs, \( \varepsilon_S = 12.8 \) [Ref. 4] and \( \phi_B = 0.5 \pm 0.05 \, V \) [Ref. 4]. By comparing \( I_L \) for \( x = 0 \) and \( I_P \) for \( x = 0.082 \) in Fig. 2 we have obtained \( \xi_S \simeq 2 \) and used this value for the analysis of all \( x \). Since the ULO Raman efficiency in principle could depend on \( x \) there is a small uncertainty introduced by using a constant value of \( \xi_S \simeq 2 \). But a close inspection showed that \( A_0 = (2 A_P + A_L) \) is almost constant for all four samples, making \( \xi_S = 2 \pm 0.1 \) a good approximation. We also used \( \alpha \simeq 2.0 \times 10^5 \mathrm{cm}^{-1} \) for the excitation wavelength 457 nm. By equating Eqs. (3) and (4), \( p \) is given by

\[
p = \frac{8\xi_0 \varepsilon_S \alpha^2 \phi_B}{e \left[ \ln(1 + \frac{\xi_0 \varepsilon_S}{\xi_p}) \right]^2},
\]

and thus calculated hole concentrations are listed in Table 1 with an uncertainty less than 10%. It is worth mentioning here that any possible uncertainty in \( \phi_B \) and \( \varepsilon_S \) would affect only the scaling factor in Eq. 4. In order to check any possible finite temperature correction in our analysis, we have analyzed the Raman spectrum of the 6.1% sample measured at \( T = 8K \) and obtained the same hole concentration within the error bar as shown in Table 1. The hole concentration monotonically increases up to \( 7 \times 10^{20} \) for the 8.3% sample, showing a good correlation with \( T_c \) (Fig. 4). This is different from the results of Matsukura et al. 8 where the hole concentration, measured using Hall effect, and \( T_c \) reached its maximum value 1.5 \times 10^{20} \mathrm{cm}^{-3} \) and 110 K, respectively, for \( x = 0.053 \) and then decreased with increasing Mn concentration for \( x > 0.053 \). The difference between the two results can be attributed to differences in detailed growth conditions. However, the fact that the hole concentration, determined by Raman scattering, and \( T_c \) show a similar monotonic increase with increasing \( x \) provides further confidence in our spectroscopically determined values of the hole density in Ga_{1-x}Mn_{x}As.

In conclusion, we have determined the room temperature carrier concentration in Ga_{1-x}Mn_{x}As for \( x = 0.038, 0.061, \) and 0.083 using Raman intensity analysis of the coupled plasmon-LO-phonon mode and the unscreened LO phonon. This study shows that – unlike standard Hall measurements – Raman scattering provides an unambiguous and reliable method of determining the hole density in Ga_{1-x}Mn_{x}As that can be profitably exploited for gaining a better understanding of the origins of ferromagnetism in ferromagnetic semiconductors.
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