

Comment on "Weak localization in GaMnAs: evidence of impurity band transport" by L. P. Rokhinson et. al. (Phys. Rev. B, 76, 161201 R; arXivCond-mat:0707.2416)

N.V.Agrinskaya and V.I.Kozub

A.F.Ioffe Physico-Technical Institute, St.-Petersburg, Russia

In the paper [1] a presence of a small peak of negative magnetoresistance at small temperatures and weak magnetic fields (zero field peak) in the samples $Ga_{1-x}Mn_xAs$ was reported. The authors attributed this peak to a manifestation of weak localization within the impurity band. The important features of the effects noted by the authors were the following:

"The height and shape of the zero-field peak is independent of the orientation of magnetic field The overall shape of magnetoresistance is very different for the two field orientations, and exhibits a hysteretic behavior. The zero-field peak, however, has no hysteresis and has a similar height and width for both field orientations, which suggests that its origin is not related to ferromagnetic ordering."

"The height of the peak then gradually increases as the temperature decreases, and approaches 1-2% of the overall resistivity at $T=30$ mK. The peak width also increases with decreasing T , and almost saturates for $T < 1$ K. The height and shape of the zero-field peak is independent"

"Finally, we would like to point out several unusual features observed in our experiments. Typically a negative magnetoresistance in 3D disordered nonmagnetic conductors has B^2 field dependence at low B , which smoothly evolves into $B^{1/2}$ at higher B ... In our samples, however, instead of such gradual change of magnetoresistance with field we observe an abrupt suppression of the effect. A related feature is the T dependence of the width of the magnetoresistance peak ... one expects that the peak will broaden with increasing temperature In our data, however, we observe just the opposite: The magnetoresistance peak narrows as the temperature increases. "

According to the data, the peak disappeared at temperatures higher than 3.4 K and the width of the peak at small temperatures was around 30 mT.

We would like to emphasize that we observed earlier a similar effect on completely different structures of GaAs/AlGaAs doped quantum wells where the weak localization conductivity over impurity band was realized [2]. While this conductivity exhibited antilocalization positive magnetoresistance , the small peak of negative magnetoresistance was observed at temperatures lower

than 3.4 K which was suppressed in magnetic fields higher than 20 mT. We attributed such a behavior to a role of superconducting indium leads with critical temperature T_c around 3.4 K. We assumed that there is a tunnel barrier between the contacts and the sample. Thus, the Josephson tunneling was to some extent suppressed while the single particle tunneling suffered the superconducting gap. Correspondingly, the magnetic field, suppressing the gap, decreased the contact resistance. The saturation magnetic field corresponds to a critical magnetic field of the superconductor which indeed saturates at low temperatures while decreasing with increase of temperature which explains the decrease of the peak width. In its turn, the peak height saturates at temperatures where the single particle tunneling compares with the Josephson tunneling which allowed us to estimate the tunneling transparency which in our case was $\sim 10\%$. Then, we also related the manifestation of the effect to the delocalization within the impurity band decreasing the resistance of the sample and allowing to observe an effect of contact resistance.

Note that our measurements reported in [2] were made by four-probe technique in the current-controlled regime which would be expected to exclude the role of contacts. However the latter suggestion literally holds only for the ideal case of point-like contacts. In reality the contacts have a finite size and in our case this size was only by a factor of 7 smaller than typical in-plane size of the sample. It is important that the probes were metallic and in any case their resistivity was much smaller than the resistivity of the sample. If the contact resistance between the voltage probes and the sample was large (much larger than the resistance of the corresponding region of the sample) the probes did not affect the current flow in the sample and the probes acquire potentials roughly equal to the potentials of the sample in the points corresponding to the centers of the probes. However if the contact resistance becomes smaller than the resistance of the surrounding region of the sample, the probes act as local "shunts" for the sample affecting the current distribution. In particular, the corresponding correction of the potential within the sample at the distance R from the probe can be estimated as $(Ed)d/R$ where E is the electric field, d is the size of the contact. Thus the measured voltage *appears to be sensitive to the contact resistance, the sensitivity depends on the area of the probes*. In our case we believe that the contact resistance in the superconducting state of the probe is large enough to prevent the effect of the probes on the current distribution

within the sample. The magnetic field suppresses this resistance leading to the "shunting" mentioned above which reduces the measured potential drop, the relative reduction is given as $\sim d^2/L^2$ where L is a distance between the probe contacts in the direction of the current flow. In our experiments the corresponding coefficient can be as large as several percents which is in agreement to our data.

Note, that, as far as we know, both in 2-terminal and 4-terminal measurements the experimentalists often register features of weak field magnetoresistance at temperatures around critical temperature of the probes and believe that these features are in some way related to superconducting transition in In probes. However until now most of the experimentalists considered it as parasitic effect. In contrast, in our paper we attracted attention to this interesting phenomenon.

Another important factor noted in [2] is the sensitivity of the effect observed to specific realization of the contacts. It is explained, on the one hand, by a sensitivity of the contact resistance to the tunneling barrier mentioned above, on the other hand, by geometrical factor discussed at the previous paragraph. In particular, the latter factor can explain the fact why the effect of the superconducting leads was in Ref.[3] observed in two-probe measurements and was not in four-probe measurements while we observed this effect in four-probe measurements.

We suspect that the effect observed in [1] may have a similar nature since, as far as we know, the leads to the samples GaAsMn are often fabricated from In. In particular, our model seems to explain all the inconsistencies with weak localization scenario noted by the authors of [1] which were mentioned above. We also note that, on the one hand, the thickness of the sample in [1] was expected to be smaller than the size of the probes (which supports our estimates given above), on the second hand, the sheet resistance of the sample in [1] was less than in our experiments which emphasize the role of the probe contacts.

References

- [1] L. P. Rokhinson, Y. Lyanda-Geller, Z. Ge, S. Shen, X. Liu, M. Dobrowolska, and J. K. Furdyna. Phys. Rev. B **76**, 161201 R (2007)

- [2] N. V. Agrinskaya, V. I. Kozub, A. V. Chernyaev, D. V. Shamshur, and A. A. Zuzin Phys. Rev. B **72**, 085337 (2005)
- [3] B. Grbic R. Leturcq,1 T. Ihn, K. Ensslin, G. Blatter, D. Reuter, and A. D. Wieck Phys. Rev. B, **77** 145307 (2008)