## Oblique Hanle Effect in Semiconductor Spin Transport Devices

Biqin Huang, Jing Li, and Ian Appelbaum

Electrical and Computer Engineering Department, University of Delaware, Newark, Delaware, 19716

Spin precession and dephasing ("Hanle effect") provides an unambiguous means to establish the presence of spin transport in semiconductors. We compare theoretical modeling with experimental data, illustrating the non-trivial consequences of employing oblique magnetic fields (due to misalignment or intentional, fixed in-plane field components) to measure the effects of spin precession. Our model is then used to analyze recent claims of diffusion-driven lateral spin transport in Si.

Spin transport in semiconductors has recently been the subject of vigorous research because it opens possibilities for creating devices and circuits making use of the spin degree of freedom in addition to manipulation of the electron charge.[1, 2, 3] There has been much presentation in the literature of "spin-valve" measurements, where the relative orientation between ferromagnetic "injector" and "detector" magnetization axes is controlled by an external magnetic field in the device plane, but in the past few years it has been firmly established that the only convincing, unambiguous proof of genuine spin transport is clear evidence of spin precession and dephasing ("Hanle effect") in an out-of-plane magnetic field[4, 5, 6, 7, 8].

While a magnetic field entirely perpendicular to the device plane is the easiest geometry to analyze, it is often the case that there are in-plane magnetic field components as well.[9] In addition, it is often desirable to control the relative injector/detector magnetization orientation with an in-plane magnetic bias field in conjunction with a purely perpendicular field.

Here we show how the standard spin precession model (based on drift-diffusion theory) can be modified to incorporate these oblique fields, and compare the resulting calculations to experimental data from silicon spin transport devices.[8] Finally, we use the model to analyze recent claims of diffusion-driven lateral spin transport in Si measured with ferromagnetic nonlocal voltage probes.[10]

We wish to model the device spin detector output, which in linear response is proportional to the projection of final spin direction (after transport) on the measurement axis determined by detector magnetization. Under the influence of an oblique magnetic field  $\vec{B} = B_z \hat{z} + B_y \hat{y}$ , where  $\hat{z}$  is in the direction normal to the device plane, and  $\hat{y}$  is in-plane and along the injector/detector magnetization direction, spin is induced to precess around the magnetic field at frequency  $\omega = g\mu_B \sqrt{B_z^2 + B_y^2}/\hbar$ . In cartesian (x', y', z') coordinates where the magnetic field is along the z' direction, the initial spin direction at the injector is  $\vec{s_i} = (0, \sin \theta, \cos \theta)$ , where  $\theta$  is the altitudinal angle between the injected spin direction in the device plane and the effective magnetic field  $\vec{B}$ . After precession over transit time t, the final spin direction is  $\vec{s_f} = (\sin\theta\sin\phi, \sin\theta\cos\phi, \cos\theta)$ , where the azimuthal  $\phi$  is the precession angle  $\omega t$ . If the injector and detector are in a parallel orientation, the contribution to detected signal from a single precessing electron spin with fixed transit time t is then proportional to  $\vec{s_i} \cdot \vec{s_f} = \sin^2 \theta \cos \phi + \cos^2 \theta$ . This expression can be simplified to

$$\frac{B_z^2 \cos \omega t + B_y^2}{B_z^2 + B_y^2},$$
 (1)

using trigonometric definitions  $\sin \theta = \frac{B_z}{\sqrt{B_z^2 + B_y^2}}$  and  $\cos \theta = B_y$ 

$$\sqrt{B_z^2 + B_y^2}$$

Because the transit time from injector to detector for each electron is affected by random walk induced by diffusion, the expected spin signal is a sum of all the projection contributions at different arrival times, weighted by the arrival time distribution. This distribution function, which describes the spatio-temporal evolution of an ensemble of spins that all originate at the injector with the same spin orientation (at the same time) is determined by the Green's function of the spin drift-diffusion equation.[7, 11, 12] Using Eq. 1, the spin signal measurement should therefore be proportional to

$$\int_0^\infty \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\pi Dt}} e^{-\frac{(t-vt)^2}{4Dt}} e^{-t/\tau_{sf}} \frac{B_z^2 \cos \omega t + B_y^2}{B_z^2 + B_y^2} dt.$$
 (2)

where D is diffusion coefficient, L is transit length, v is drift velocity, and  $\tau_{sf}$  is spin lifetime.

In the case of an oblique magnetic field with constant orientation  $\theta$  and magnitude |B|, Eq. 2 reverts to

$$\int_0^\infty \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\pi Dt}} e^{-\frac{(L-vt)^2}{4Dt}} e^{-t/\tau_{sf}} (\sin^2\theta\cos\omega t + \cos^2\theta) dt.$$
(3)

The magnetic field affects the problem only through the precession frequency  $\omega = g\mu_B |B|/\hbar$ , and the angle  $\theta$  only determines the relative strength of the precession features since integration over the second term in parenthesis yields a constant. The sin<sup>2</sup>  $\theta$  coefficient in the first term means that spin precession measurements in single-axis and nominally perpendicular magnetic fields are robust to (small) misalignments  $\delta\theta$ , with the only consequence (besides injector/detector magnetization switching induced by the in-plane component of the applied field) being a reduction in signal change by a quadratically-small factor of  $\sin^2(\pi/2 \pm \delta\theta) \approx 1 - \delta\theta^2$ .

Experimental results obtained with our silicon spintransport devices at 150K (fully described in previous work[13]) for  $\theta = 50$  and 10 degrees are shown in the top



FIG. 1: Comparison of experimental (a) and simulated (b) Hanle spin precession data in oblique single-axis magnetic fields using devices as described in Ref. [13] at 150K. Plots at the top of each panel are with magnetic field at an angle  $\theta$ =50 degrees from the device plane and plots at the bottom of each panel are with magnetic field at an angle  $\theta$ =10 degrees. Portions of the measurement where the magnetic field magnitude increases from zero (and in-plane components switch the injector and detector magnetization) are in grey.

and bottom of Fig. 1 (a), respectively. The spin signal in these devices is a hot-electron "second collector current" which has traveled ballistically through ferromagnetic injector and detector thin films on either side of the undoped single-crystal Si transport layer (the full thickness of a float-zone Si wafer). In the top and bottom of Fig. 1 (b), we have used Eq. 3 with  $L = 350 \mu \text{m}, D = 200 \text{cm}^2/\text{s}, v = 2.9 \times 10^6 \text{cm/s}$  and  $\tau_{sf}$  = 73ns[13] to calculate the expected spin signal for corresponding magnetic field orientations. The effects of in-plane magnetization switching in the experimental data are prominent, and this is incorporated into the model results by inverting the sign at the appropriate magnetic field values. Despite the predicted (and experimentally confirmed) reduction in signal oscillation magnitude, the extrema are at identical positions regardless of the value of  $\theta$ . This invariance is especially important when the oscillation period is used to determine the electron spin transit time in an unintentionally misaligned magnetic field.[14]

It is sometimes desirable to have a static in-plane bias magnetic field  $(B_{\parallel})$ , in addition to a perpendicular field  $B_{\perp}$ ) to control the relative injector/detector orientations. However, the influence of this field on the measurement results cannot be ignored. In particular, misalignments of  $B_{\perp}$  and  $B_{\parallel}$  at angles  $\eta$  and  $\xi$  from  $\theta = 90$  deg. (*z* axis) and  $\theta = 0$  deg. (*y* axis), respectively, (as shown in the inset to Fig. 2) can make substantial changes to the measured Hanle spin precession signal. In this case, we have



FIG. 2: Comparison of experimental (a) and simulated (b) Hanle spin precession measurements in a fixed magnetic field  $B_{\parallel}$  of 32 Oe (top) and 64 Oe (bottom) that is orthogonal to the varied magnetic field  $B_{\perp}$ . The consequences of a 10 degree misalignment of the device normal from  $B_{\perp}$  are clear from the asymmetry present in the data. Inset: geometry of applied fields relative to device axes, where *z* is the device normal and *y* is in the device plane. Data shown here correspond to  $\eta = -\xi = 10$  deg.

$$B_{z} = B_{\parallel} \sin \xi + B_{\perp} \cos \eta$$
  

$$B_{y} = B_{\parallel} \cos \xi + B_{\perp} \sin \eta.$$
 (4)

The even symmetry with respect to the varied field ( $B_{\perp}$  in this case) in Eq. 2 is then broken, and asymmetric Hanle curves can be obtained.

Fig. 2(a) shows experimental Hanle results in a fixed magnetic field  $B_{\parallel}$  at magnitude 32 Oe (top) and 64 Oe (bottom). Even if  $B_{\perp}$  and  $B_{\parallel}$  are truly orthogonal so that  $\eta = -\xi$ , sample misalignment (here at 10 deg.) has significant influence on the observed Hanle measurement. Because the effective field  $\vec{B}$  forms a very small angle for  $B_z < B_y$ , the low-angle precession oscillations are suppressed. Moreover, a clear asymmetry is evident and the oscillation extrema positions are shifted (unlike simple misalignment of a field with fixed  $\theta$ , as discussed above). Calculations of Eq. 2 using Eqs. 4 as a function of  $B_{\perp}$  with the same transport parameters used above and appropriate values of  $B_{\parallel}$ , as shown in Fig. 2(b), agree with this behavior.

The strong influence of oblique fields seen here with driftdominated spintronics devices[15] are also expected in the diffusion-dominated regime. Evaluating Eq. 2 as a function of  $B_z$  with parameters relevant for nonlocal Si spin-valve devices at low temperature and very high doping ( $D = 1 \text{ cm}^2/\text{s}$ ,  $L = 1\mu\text{m}$ , v = 0, and  $\tau_{sf} = 10\text{ns}$ ) we obtain results for  $B_y$ = 0, 25, 50, and 75 Oe as shown in Fig. 3 from top to bottom. Notably, secondary oscillations at non-zero  $B_z$  (most evident in experiments where drift is the dominant trans-



FIG. 3: Simulated spin precession measurements for diffusion-driven transport across  $1\mu$ m, using Eq. 2 as a function of perpendicular magnetic field  $B_z$ , with a constant magnetic field  $(B_y)$  of 0, 25, 50, and 75 Oe applied in the device plane. Simulation results are offset for clarity.

port mechanism)[7, 8] are not seen here because of the wide arrival-time distribution driven by diffusion and the consequently strong spin dephasing.

The most salient feature of our model results in Fig. 3 is that as the in-plane magnetic bias field  $B_y$  increases, the central Hanle peak increases in width. This can be heuristically understood by considering that when  $B_z < B_y$ , the spin direction has a positive projection on the measurement axis regardless of precession angle  $\phi$ . Therefore, to cause the same amount of dephasing from signal cancellation,  $B_z$  must be increased as  $B_y$  increases.

Incorporating the necessarily non-zero lateral width of the injector and detector introduces a constant source of systematic spin dephasing by adding a fixed transit-length uncertainty that is not expected to affect this trend. Changes in *D* and  $\tau_{sf}$ , or device misalignments (nonzero  $\xi$  and  $\eta$ ) over a wide range do not affect the general behavior seen here either.

These calculations can be compared to recently reported experiments on Si devices with a nonlocal voltage spin detection geometry[10]. Fig. 3 of Ref [10] show central "Hanle" voltage peaks that actually *decrease* in width as in-plane magnetic bias field  $B_y$  increases. In addition, signal oscillations for non-zero  $B_z$  are manifest. These features clearly conflict with our understanding of spin transport and the model that quantitatively agrees very well to the measurements shown in the present work, and in other recent semiconductor spin transport experiments[7, 11, 13]. Based on this conflict with theory, it appears that claims of lateral spin transport in Si as asserted in Ref. [10] are premature.

In summary, the Hanle spin precession signal magnitude is reduced by a factor of  $\sin^2 \theta$  when making measurements in single-axis oblique magnetic fields at an angle  $\theta$  to the device plane. When a fixed in-plane magnetic field is used in conjunction with a varied perpendicular field, Hanle measurements are affected by a suppression of signal at low fields and asymmetry when the device is misaligned. Results from simulations of devices where diffusion is the dominant transport mechanism make clear predictions of Hanle trends which have not been observed in recent experiments using lateral Si devices.

Support from DARPA/MTO and ONR is acknowledged.

- I. Žutič, J. Fabian, and S. Das Sarma, Rev. Mod. Phys 76, 323 (2004).
- [2] D. Awschalom and M. Flatté, Nature Phys. 3, 153 (2007).
- [3] J. Fabian, A. Matos-Abiague, C. Ertler, P. Stano, and I. Žutič, Acta Phys. Slovaca 57, 565 (2007).
- [4] F. Monzon, H. Tang, and M. Roukes, Phys. Rev. Lett. 84, 5022 (2000).
- [5] M. Johnson and R. Silsbee, Phys. Rev. Lett. 55, 1790 (1985).
- [6] M. Johnson and R. Silsbee, Phys. Rev. B 37, 5326 (1988).
- [7] X. Lou, C. Adelmann, S. Crooker, E. Garlid, J. Zhang, S. Reddy, S. Flexner, C. Palmstrøm, and P. A. Crowell, Nature Phys. 3, 197 (2007).
- [8] I. Appelbaum, B. Huang, and D. Monsma, Nature 447, 295 (2007).
- [9] V. Motsnyi, P. Van Dorpe, W. Van Roy, E. Goovaerts, V. Sa-

farov, G. Borghs, and J. de Boeck, Phys. Rev. B 68, 245319 (2003).

- [10] O. van 't Erve, A. Hanbicki, M. Holub, C. Li, C. Awo-Affouda, P. Thompson, and B. Jonker, Appl. Phys. Lett. 91, 212109 (2007).
- [11] F. Jedema, H. Heersche, A. Filip, J. Baselmans, and B. van Wees, Nature 416, 713 (2002).
- [12] I. Appelbaum and D. Monsma, Appl. Phys. Lett. 90, 262501 (2007).
- [13] B. Huang, D. Monsma, and I. Appelbaum, Phys. Rev. Lett. 99, 177209 (2007).
- [14] B. Huang, D. Monsma, and I. Appelbaum, J. Appl. Phys. 102, 013901 (2007).
- [15] B. Huang and I. Appelbaum, condmat/ 0801.1790 (2007).