Magnetization and magnetoresistance of Ni/nanoporous-GaN composites

Yonatan Calahorra\textsuperscript{1,2}

Josh Dawson\textsuperscript{1}

Yana Grishchenko\textsuperscript{2}

Saptarsi Ghosh\textsuperscript{1}

Abhiram Gundimeda\textsuperscript{1}

Bogdan F. Spiridon\textsuperscript{1}

Rachel A. Oliver\textsuperscript{1}

Sohini Kar-Narayan\textsuperscript{1}

\textsuperscript{1}Department of Materials Science and Metallurgy, University of Cambridge, CB3 0FS, Cambridge, UK
\textsuperscript{2}Department of Materials Science and Engineering, Technion - IIT, Haifa, 3200003, Israel

E-mail: yc402@cam.ac.uk

\textbf{Abstract.} Multifunctional semiconductors widen the application scope of existing semiconductor devices. Here we report on the ferromagnetic/semiconductor coupling obtained through nickel and porous-GaN composites. We realised nickel-infiltrated and nickel-coated porous-GaN structures, and examined the subsequent magnetic and magnetotransport properties. We found that the magnetization of the porous-GaN/Ni composites strongly depended on the amount of deposited nickel and evolves from relatively isotropic and remanent (up to 90\% remanent-to-saturation magnetization) response to an anisotropic response characteristic of thin-films. The magnetoresistance of nickel sputter-coated porous-GaN structures was measured at 300 and 200 K. The temperature dependant measurements suggested that transport in the GaN layers is dominating the current. Nonetheless, depending on sample pore size, the magnetoresistance displayed high (12-fold) out-of-plane/in-plane anisotropy, and significant hysteresis. These results are uncharacteristic of GaN transport and point towards magneto-piezo-resistive coupling between the nickel and the porous GaN. These results encourage deeper investigation of magnetic nanostructure property tuning and of magnetic property coupling to GaN and similar materials.
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1. Introduction

The coupling between mechanical, electrical and semiconducting properties offered by piezoelectric semiconductors makes them interesting multifunctional materials, and can enhance and add a further dimension to semiconductor applications [1–3]. The piezotronic effect, where the potential barrier height of a semiconductor junction changes with mechanical excitation, is a widely studied manifestation of this coupling [4–8]. The change of barrier height results in a change in the current output (I-V) characteristics. If the junction is light emitting, the mechanical excitation can modulate the emission: the piezophototronic effect [9]. GaN technology is dominant in light emission applications, with electrical polarization playing a hindering role in GaN optoelectronics [10]. Furthermore, polarization is fundamental to GaN high electron mobility transistors (HEMTs) [11] and the piezotronic effect can affect HEMT operation [12,13], extending the basic principle of polarization discontinuity that enables GaN HEMTs. Both aspects make the electromechanical properties of GaN attractive research topics.

Another class of multifunctional materials is magnetoelectric (ME) materials. Magnetoelectric materials increasingly take the form of piezoelectric-magnetostrictive composites, in a practical expansion of the fundamental concept of a multiferroic [14]. The composite is characterised by intimate contact interfaces between constituents, which can take various topologies. The magnetization and applied electric field (or polarization and applied magnetic field), are thus mechanically coupled. ME composites offer exciting possibilities in voltage-controlled magnetism (attractive for spintronics [15]), as well as magnetic-to-electric transduction for sensing and power transfer [16] and miniaturised antennae [17]. The nature of ME composites naturally directs attention to high performing piezoelectric materials such as ceramics, and ME literature is predominantly focused on them. However, the multifunctionality of piezoelectric semiconductor is appealing, and inspires work on ME-semiconductor material composites, where semiconductor device operation can be controlled by external magnetic excitation. For example, the change in the device resistance under magnetic field - magnetoresistance (MR).

III-N material based ME applications are mostly focused on AlN [17–20], as AlN is the best piezoelectric among III-Ns. Correspondingly, GaN is less explored for these applications [21]. However, there is generally no semiconducting aspect to these demonstrations per se, largely stemming from the large band gap of AlN, and the traditional ME mindset, inherited from the ceramic materials world. GaN can mitigate that, and offer true ME-semiconductor applications, while still benefiting from relatively high piezoelectricity (compared to non-nitride III-Vs [22]), wide range of semiconducting real-world applications and silicon compatibility. We are currently aware of no more than a handful of truly III-N based ME-semiconductor applications, focused on ME mediated magneto-optic coupling [23, 24]. These demonstrations, and the ‘non-semiconducting’ ones mentioned above, usually consider laminate structures (2-2 topology); alternatively, there is potential in more complex ME composite topologies, for example matrix embedded particles (0-3) or nanowire structures (1-1) [25]. The composite point of view
could also be considered complementary to that of dilute magnetic semiconductors. Recent examples include efforts to induce magnetic functionality to thin-film or bulk GaN \([26,27]\), as well as nanostructures \([28,29]\).

In the following we describe two methods for fabrication of porous GaN and nickel composites - by electrodeposition and sputtering. We studied the magnetic properties of the composite structures and find a rich magnetic response depending upon the characteristics of the porous layer and amount of deposited nickel, spanning isotropic responses and sharp transitions to thin-film like behaviour. We found evidence for magneto-piezoresistive coupling in some of our samples. This work was inspired by our recent finding of enhanced piezoelectricity in porous GaN, where \(\sim 40\%\) porous GaN (in volume) exhibited a 3-fold enhancement of the piezoelectric charge coefficient \((d_{33})\) \([30]\). A similar approach has been considered for porous InP filled with magnetic material, following a reported enhanced piezoelectric response \([31,32]\); these reports however did not study the ME property coupling. Overall, this study demonstrates a non-laminate nickel/GaN composite, the interplay between synthesis process and magnetic properties and the subsequent magnetic control of electronic properties.

2. Materials and Methods

2.1. GaN growth and electrochemical etching

N-doped GaN \((2 \cdot 10^{18} - 2.3 \cdot 10^{19} \ \text{cm}^{-3}; \ 1 \ \mu\text{m})\) was grown on low-dislocation GaN pseudo-substrate \([33]\) on sapphire by metal-organic vapor phase epitaxy (MOVPE) and porosified, as described previously \([34, 35]\). Electrochemical etching was carried out in a two-electrode configuration. The sample was immersed in oxalic acid \((0.25\text{M})\) with the nitride surface of the doped layer exposed and a DC potential of 10-14 V was applied between the sample and a platinum counter electrode. In our process, porosity degree follows the voltage, the depth follows time and the process as a whole depends upon doping (through the influence on conductivity) \([35]\). The chosen doping level was \(1.85 \cdot 10^{19} \ \text{cm}^{-3}\) and the etching voltage was either 10 or 12 V, see further discussion in Supporting Information S1. In order to reuse the electrochemical sample configuration, the etch was done such that a part of the n-doped layer was intact, with the purpose of acting as a working electrode for subsequent nickel electrodeposition (Figure 1).

2.2. Nickel deposition

Two methods were employed: electrodeposition to realise Ni-infiltrated GaN, and sputtering to realise Ni-coated GaN. Electrodeposition was carried out in a three electrode configuration, as previously reported \([25]\), using a counter Pt electrode, and Ag/AgCl reference electrode and the sample as a working electrode. See complete details in Supporting information S2. Calibration has shown that for the selected working potential \((-1 \ \text{V})\), the deposition rate was linear with time. Following deposition, the
samples were washed with DI water and dried under nitrogen flow.

DC magnetron sputtering was used to deposit nickel layers onto porous GaN, using a 99.99% pure nickel source (Goodfellow Limited). The experimental conditions used were 30 W, 2.15 Pa. A permanent marker pen was used as a lift-off resist on the sample edges and non-etched top: it prevented deposition on the covered areas, and dissolved in acetone. Three depositions were carried out resulting in films of 87 ±8, 185 ±13, 190 ±21 nm, as measured by Dektak profilometer. The nominal thickness of the last deposition was 300 nm, and the cause for the significant deviation of the sputter thickness from nominal value is unclear.

Figure 1 shows a schematic of the samples and fabrication concepts used in this work: electrochemical etching of conductive GaN followed by electrodeposition of nickel (using the same apparatus), or sputtering of nickel on top of GaN. Table 1 lists the samples which underwent vibrating sample magnetometry analysis.

Figure 1: Sample preparation schematic. A highly doped GaN layer was electrochemically etched to form porous structures. The same configuration was used to electrodeposit nickel within the pores. Some of the samples were sputter coated with nickel. The inset shows two electrodeposited samples (top) and one sputtered sample (bottom).

2.3. Electron microscopy

Scanning electron microscopy (SEM) and energy dispersive X-ray (EDX) spectroscopy were carried out, at room temperature (300 K), on an FEI Nova NanoSEM operated at 5 kV by imaging secondary electrons. The SEM is equipped with a silicon Drift Detector Energy Dispersive X-ray spectrometer. SEM was also performed using a Hitachi TM3030 desktop tabletop instrument at 12 kV.
2.4. Magnetic and magnetoresistive characterization

Vibrating sample magnetometry (VSM) was carried out using a Princeton Measurements Corporation electromagnet with an *Applied Magnetics Laboratory Inc.* Precision Bipolar Magnet Controller and a Princeton Measurements Corporation MicroMag Controller. The maximal DC H field applied was about 1 kOe, significantly smaller than the limit of uniform field (about 10 kOe). The probe was vibrated at 83 Hz with an amplitude of 1.0 mm, and a continuous magnetic field sweep was used with a pause of 300 ms after each step increment. The maximum applied magnetic field was 10 kOe (1 T), the field increment of the sweep was 5 Oe, the magnetic moment range was 500 memu, and the averaging time of each measurement was between 0.1-1 s. The empty holder was measured and exhibited a very low diamagnetic response. No demagnetization correction factor was used.

Room temperature magnetotransport measurements were carried out in a Physical Property Measurement System (PPMS) DynaCool (*Quantum Design*) to extract MR. The field was applied both in-plane and out-of-plane (relative to the sample), with a maximum value of 100 kOe (10 T). The resistance between sputtered nickel and the nominally conductive edge of the sample was monitored by measuring the AC voltage response of the device to an AC current source. See further details in Supporting Information S3.

3. Results and discussion

Table 1 lists the samples used in this study which underwent VSM characterization, classified by etching voltage (10 or 12 V) and nickel deposition method (sputtering or electrodeposition). Control samples of nickel electrodeposited on ITO coated polymer (Polyethylene terephthalate) are also shown. This sample distribution allows comparing the effects of deposited layer thickness and pore size on the structural and magnetic properties of the deposited nickel: relative remanence, $M_R/M_S$, coercive field, $H_C$, and the anisotropy between out-of-plane (OOP) saturation and in-plain (IP) saturation, $M_{S,OOP}/M_{S,IP}$. $M_R$ is the remanent magnetization and $M_S$ the saturation magnetization.

Figure 2 shows cross sectional SEM images of 10 and 12 V etched samples with nickel deposited for 100 seconds, and a 12 V etched sample with nickel deposited for 500 seconds. The 10 V sample grew a coat of nickel already at 100 seconds, while the 12 V did not, even after 500 seconds. The over-grown samples had a metallic finish compared to an opaque finish in the infiltrated samples. This directed all electrodeposition experiments towards 12 V etched samples - to properly study infiltration effect. The underlying reason is the increased degree of etching with higher voltage, thereby providing more room for infiltration. This is further shown in Supporting Information Figure S1, with a significant increase in surface pore size for higher etching voltage.
Table 1: Sample list and their magnetic properties: the remanent magnetization, $M_R$, relative to the saturation magnetization, $M_S$, of a single in-plane (IP) or out-of-plane (OOP) hysteresis loop, the coercive field, $H_C$, and the saturation magnetization ratio between OOP and IP measurements for the maximal field applied. Double rows show IP and OOP measurement values.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Etch [V]</th>
<th>Duration/thickness</th>
<th>$\frac{M_R}{M_S}$</th>
<th>$H_C$ [Oe]</th>
<th>$\frac{M_{S,OOP}}{M_{S,IP}}$</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SP1</td>
<td>10 V</td>
<td>87 nm</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>a, b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP2IP</td>
<td>10 V</td>
<td>185 nm</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>a, c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP3IP</td>
<td>10 V</td>
<td>190 nm</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>a, c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP4IP</td>
<td>12 V</td>
<td>185 nm</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>a, c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED1</td>
<td>12 V</td>
<td>150 s</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>214</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED2</td>
<td>12 V</td>
<td>200 s</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>147</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED3</td>
<td>12 V</td>
<td>500 s</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>163</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED4</td>
<td>10 V</td>
<td>1800 s</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED5ITO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1800 s/200 nm</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED6ITO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1800 s/650 nm</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

 Hz - $M_S$ taken at 500 Oe without full saturation.
b - OOP coercivity lower.
c - OOP response not measured.
d - no switching in OOP response
e - Electrodeposited using higher working potential, yielding faster deposition

3.1. Magnetization of infiltrated-Ni/porous-GaN composites

Figure 3 shows the normalised magnetization curves obtained by VSM of several electrodeposited samples. Some appear a few times to allow comparison of in-plane and out-of-plane magnetization. Two results are striking: i) short electrodeposition times (ED1, ED2) result in prominent magnetic remanence - as demonstrated by high $\frac{M_R}{M_S}$ values in table 1; ii) these samples also exhibit low in-plane/out-of-plane anisotropy, as evident by high $\frac{M_{S,OOP}}{M_{S,IP}}$ values in table 1. Samples with longer nickel electrodeposition times, exhibit characteristics approaching those of thin films. In particular, a thick electrodeposited layer on top 10 V etched GaN (ED4) shows no saturation in the hard-axis at 1000 Oe, and a relatively low coercive field in-plane. Noticeably, the 500 second electrodeposited sample (ED3), where no top nickel layer was observed, appears to be an intermediate: where the in-plane curve is similar to the
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Figure 2: Electrodeposited porous samples - the 10 V sample was very easily overgrown: a) Cross-sectional SEM of a 10 V etched, 100 second electrodeposited sample, the red arrow shows a layer of over grown nickel; b) Cross-sectional SEM of a 12 V etched, 100 second electrodeposited sample; c) Optical image of 10 and 12 V etched samples. The 10 V sample had a metallic finish corresponding to an over grown layer. The 12 V sample did not, corresponding to the picture arising from [b,d]. The electrodeposited area was about 0.25 cm$^2$; d) Cross-sectional SEM of a 12 V etched, 500 second electrodeposited sample. The the dashed yellow lines indicate the boundary between etched and non-etched GaN.

out-of-plane, as well as to the in-plane curve of the thicker layer, with coercive fields at intermediate values as well.

Two control electrodepositions (ED5 & ED6, which were part of a larger series of calibration and control electrodepositions - see Supporting Information Figure S2.1) are shown in Figure 3f. Both samples were electrodeposited for 1800 seconds, while different working potentials were used: -1 V for ED5 and -1.5 V for ED6. This translated to more than a 3 fold increase in the ED6 thickness, as electrodeposited layer thickness was found to be linear in time but not with voltage (Supporting Information Figure S2.1). The comparison shows that ED5 demonstrates similar characteristics to ED4, which could be expected as both samples underwent the same electrodeposition process. Furthermore, it shows that ED6 presents similar in-plane characteristics, however with increased remanence in the hard-axis.

We carried out SEM-EDX spectroscopy of the cross-section shown in Figure 2b, to better understand the initial stages of the infiltrated structure, as shown in Figure 4. Electrodeposition lasted 100 seconds and the sample shown was etched using 12 V, similar to most of the electrodeposited samples. It is evident that unlike the expected result of wire-like formation of nickel from the bottom-up, nickel growth nucleates throughout the porous volume. This is most likely a result of maintained conductivity in the porous layer - resulting in multiple conductive pathways for electrodeposition.
Figure 3: Normalised VSM of electrodeposited nickel in porous samples: a) comparison of the in-plane characteristics of four samples with different deposition times. The 1800 second samples was etched at 10 V, hence has smaller pores. Each curve is normalised compared to its maximum value; b,c,d,e) in-plane (solid line) and out-of-plane (dashed line) magnetization of the four GaN samples from [a] (ED1-ED4 in Table 1). All out-of-plane curves are normalised compared to respective in-plane maximum; f) in-plane and out-of-plane magnetization of nickel electrodeposited on ITO covered PET substrate for 1800 seconds at different working potential.

This finding aligns well with the demonstrated symmetry in the short electrodeposition samples (ED1, ED2), which is not characteristic of either a thin film or a vertical wire array [25,36].

If so, the magnetization curve obtained for short electrodeposition times should correspond to assembly of nanoparticles. Thin film (i.e. non-porous) electrodeposition of nickel also demonstrates multiple nucleation points, which exhibit a smeared hysteresis curve, becoming abrupt for the thicker films [37]. This is unlike the observations here - and therefore does not explain well the magnetization of the electrodeposited Ni at the early stages, indicating further complexity in nucleation site interactions and structure.

Ferromagnetic nanoparticles demonstrate competition between single-domain attributes of large coercivity, decreasing with increasing size [38] and a low coercivity limit, which increases with increasing size [39], where the extreme case of small particles is manifested as superparamagnetism [40]. However, our results here show increased coercivity in the samples of the shortest electrodeposition, as well as significant coercive field asymmetry. Both findings could indicate an interaction of nickel with a surrounding surface layer of antiferromagnetic NiO (exchange bias [41]), formed after
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Figure 4: SEM-EDX of 100 second electrodeposited sample. a) SEM cross section showing the porous region; b) nickel distribution; c) oxygen distribution.

the electrodeposition is done. Such a layer, and its proposed interaction, will become less significant as more nickel is electrodeposited, resulting in dominance of the exchange free nickel, and reduction of coercivity due to introduced multiple domains, and increased particle interaction [38] - as was indeed observed. The EDX results support the Ni/NiO interpretation, as an increased presence of oxygen in the porous region was found, where nickel was present. Ferromagnetic/antiferromagnetic interactions, and specifically the Ni/NiO system, are a high interest topic in recent years [42–44], and this encourages future investigation of this aspect in our results.

Apart from the possible ferromagnetic/antiferromagnetic interactions, the in-plane/out-of-plane symmetry in samples of the shortest electrodeposition times, is similar to what has been observed previously in electrodeposition of magnetic material within porous media [45, 46]. This is explained by the formation of relatively symmetric structures. Overall, the electrodeposition of nickel within GaN exhibited a rich magnetic response, and possible tunability between layer-like characteristics and parallel/perpendicular field degeneracy of highly remanent nickel nanoparticles.

3.2. Magnetization of sputtered-Ni/porous-GaN composites

Figure 5 shows the magnetization of nickel thin films sputtered onto porous GaN. These curves show a thickness evolution of the characteristic in-plane magnetization from a relatively sharp and remanent curve for the thinnest layer, to unsaturated diamond-like curves for the thicker layers. There was no significant difference found between the characteristics of nickel deposited on larger pores (SP4 compared to SP2 and SP3) - probably due to most of the layer forming above the surface. The unsaturated curve
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could indicate the presence of stress in the films, which is is typical to sputtering (depending upon conditions used) [47,48]. Interestingly, despite the differences between sputtered and electrodeposited thicker layers, the magnetization of thin sputtered layer is very similar to the magnetization of samples of short electrodeposition times, in increased in/out-of-plane isotropy as well as asymmetry in coercivity, interpreted as an indication of exchange bias interaction with NiO. It is likely that the porosity of the surface allows some nickel to penetrate the structure, forming an infiltrated layer while the thickness is low. Additional material then forms a thin-film, as reflected by the magnetization curve, as reported previously [49]. The exact nature of the effects determining the magnetization of low-thickness (partially infiltrated) samples requires further investigation.

Figure 5: Normalised VSM of nickel sputtered onto porous samples: a) Comparison of the in-plane characteristics of four samples, SP1-SP3 with different deposition times (thicknesses) and SP2, SP4 with the same deposition and different etching voltage. Only SP1, the thinnest layer shows saturation in the range measured; b) in-plane and out-of-plane magnetization of the thinnest sputtering, showing relatively high remanence and in/out-of-plane symmetry.

3.3. Magnetoresistance of sputtered-Ni/porous-GaN composites

The motivation for this work was realizing GaN based ME composites. Nonetheless, we experienced an issue of maintained conductivity in the porous samples (the top layer nickel and remaining conductive GaN where electrically connected, through the porous layer) - this screens piezoelectricity in the porous GaN layer, and subsequently hinders magnetoelectricity. We attribute this to the highly doped sample chosen for these experiments (1.85·10^{19} \text{ cm}^{-3}), compared to the lower value used in our previous work.
on enhanced piezoelectricity in porous GaN (5·10^{18} \text{ cm}^{-3}) [30]), where the porous layer became non-conductive. The maintained conductivity has led the ‘device’ part of the work to focus on MR instead of ME coupling. Table 2 summarises the magnetotransport measurements of SP3 and SP5: two Ni-sputtered samples.

Table 2: The MR properties of two samples sputtered with 190 nm nickel. The resistance value, $R$, is shown with an estimated accuracy of ±0.05 Ω, unless stated otherwise. The $MR$ value is the resistance change at the maximal field compared to initial, zero-field resistance. The anisotropic MR, $AMR = (R_{OOP} - R_{IP}) / R_{IP}$, is calculated at the maximal field.

| Sample | Etch [V] | Temp. [K] | $R_{|H=0}|[Ω]$ | $MR_{max}$ [%] | $AMR_{|H_{max}}$ [%] | Notes |
|--------|----------|-----------|----------------|----------------|---------------------|-------|
| SP3    | 10V      | 300       | 62.34          | 1.77           | 0.75                | a     |
|        |          | 200       | 203.28         | -0.59          | 0.39                | b,c   |
|        |          | 300       | 63.06          | 0.76           | 0.72                | a     |
|        |          | 300       | 285.65         | -              | -                   |       |
| SP5    | 12V      | 200       | 381.5          | ±2             | -                   | d     |
|        |          | 300       | 285 ±3         | -              | -                   |       |

*a* - Maximal MR found OOP.

*b* - Maximal (absolute value) MR found IP.

*c* - OOP MR not monotonic, making AMR non-trivial.

*d* - IP and OOP responses very similar.

Figure 6 shows the in-plane (solid lines) and out-of-plane (dashed lines) MR of two samples, measured between a top sputtered nickel layer (190 nm) and a side contact to the conductive GaN layer. The two samples differed in the etching process of 10 (SP3) and 12 V (SP5), corresponding to smaller and larger pores. We note that the applied field maximum here (10 T) is significantly larger than the normal range of observed saturation in MR [50–52], as well as magnetostriction [50,53,54], of nickel. This allows examining both the low and high field characteristics.

Figure 6a and Figure 6d show the MR of the two samples measured initially at 300 K (RT). Notably, the responses were markedly different, indicating a profound effect of the porous structure on the magnetoresistive properties of the device: SP3 demonstrated a positive response, while SP5 a negative response. There are contradicting reports about the sign of the parallel (field and current direction) MR of nickel [51,52], however, all reports show a decreasing trend with field, even when there is an initial rise to yield a positive value which is - unlike the result in Figure 6a. This is an indication that the MR of SP3 was not dominated by nickel transport, and that possibly, the transport of SP5 was significantly affected by nickel MR. Navarro-Quezada and coworkers studied the high-field (up to 6 T) MR of phase separated (Ga,Fe)N particles on the surface of GaN [55]. Their measurements on a control GaN sample (no iron) showed a similar
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parabolic trend to our out-of-plane RT response (without the initial increase), which supports our assumption. The negative response of SP5, indicating a nickel dominated response could result from the larger pores of this sample - allowing deeper penetration of nickel into the porous structure.

To further investigate the MR, we carried out measurements at 200 K and then again at 300 K. SP5 underwent measurements at considerably higher current in the second and third measurements (from 10 µA initially to 10 mA amplitude). We cannot exclude that joule heating (6 orders of magnitude higher power) altered the device, e.g., by annealing of the Ni/GaN interface [56, 57] (see Supporting Information Section S3 for more SP5 results). Therefore we continue discussing SP3 alone, which was measured consistently by applying an AC current with an amplitude of 50 µA.

Figure 6b shows the MR of SP3 measured at 200 K. The zero-field resistance increased roughly four-fold in the transition from RT to 200 K. This would be expected for a sample where conductance is primarily semiconducting and not metallic. Furthermore, the low field MR was negative, as expected for nickel, indicating that there are parallel current paths in this device. Interestingly, the out-of-plane and in-plane responses were different apart from the low-field negative MR: the out-of-plane response maintained the positive parabolic characteristic, while the in-plane response demonstrated a negative parabolic relation.

Figure 6c shows the MR of SP3 measured again at RT. The zero-field resistance returns to the previous RT value at the end of the first field cycle, as do the general trends of the out-of-plane and in-plane responses. The AMR value is lower compared to the first RT measurement since the initial increase in resistance was no longer exhibited. Furthermore, the AMR value represents the relative difference at maximal field, and does not reflect the considerable difference between the in-plane and out-of-plane MR. The in-plane MR is considerably low, 0.063%, and the out-of-plane/in-plane MR is 12. Such an anisotropic response has not been observed by Navarro-Quezada et al. in their measurements of GaN without iron - indicating that the nickel layer influenced the MR of our device.

Moreover, the curves in the second RT measurement were less symmetric. This is further evident in the low-field region of the out-of-plane response (Figure 6f). The black arrows show the field sweep direction, and the larger blue arrow points to the estimated curve minimum - noticeably away from zero-field. To further examine this point we fitted the positive part of the negative field sweep and the negative part of the positive field sweep to distinct parabolas, as shown in Figure 7. This was driven by the assumption that the minimal resistance value of the two curves would be different if the resistance (while still dominated by the GaN, as established earlier) was indeed coupled to the magnetization. The full results of the fitting process are shown in Supporting Information S3. The results obtained were: -11500 Oe for the negative sweep and -500 Oe (estimated error of 10%). This finding suggests that the magnetization of the nickel layer plays a part in the MR, verifying our assumption, thereby suggesting
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Figure 6: Magnetoresistance of sputtered (190 nm) nickel/porous-GaN devices, measured between the nickel and a side contact to the remaining doped GaN layer. At each measurement field, an AC current (0.05 mA amplitude for [a-c]) was applied and the voltage measured. a,b,c) in-plane (solid) and out-of-plane (dashed) MR of SP3 at RT, 200 K and back at RT, correspondingly; d) the MR of SP5, a sample with larger pores than SP3; e) schematic of the samples and measurements; f) the low-field region of the out-of-plane response shown in [c]. The black arrows show the field sweep direction and the vertical arrow points to the estimated region of minimal resistance while sweeping from positive to negative - clearly away from zero-field.

magnetostriction coupled to GaN conductance, possibly through piezoresistance [58,59]. Such a coupling is akin to the ME effect motivating our work.

Due to the geometrical complexity of the structures and the exact directional relation between the critical current flow and the applied magnetic fields, the full extent of interactions remains unclear. There is also an existing knowledge gap regarding high magnetic field nickel magnetostriction, which has only been studied at cryogenic temperatures [54]. If so, further work is required to explain the full phenomena range exhibited here, in particular the distinctions between out-of-plane and in-plane response, and their full temperature evolution. This would be achieved by clearer device geometry, and additional controls.

4. Summary

In this research we present the nature of the magnetic properties of Ni/porous-GaN composites prepared either by electrodeposition of nickel inside the pores or sputtering onto the porous surface. Our results indicate a rich response, intricately dependent on the deposition method, amount of nickel deposited and the porosity (degree, and
possibly pore size). Due to experimental difficulties, the porous structure remained conductive, leading to multi-point nucleated electrodeposition, and a magnetic response that shifted from interacting nanoparticles, with possible exchange bias effects, to a thin-film-like behaviour in longer deposition times - even though there was no actual layer on the surface. Furthermore, we examined the magnetotransport at high field (up to 10 T) of sputtered samples at 300 and 200 K. The MR exhibited distinct responses depending on underlying GaN pore size. The sample of smaller pores exhibited positive MR, which rules out nickel as the dominant current mechanism - indicating that the current is mostly carried by the GaN at room temperature. This was further confirmed by the increase of the overall resistance observed at 200 K. The MR at 300 K exhibited high anisotropy and hysteresis which are uncharacteristic to GaN transport which indicated coupling between the Ni and GaN, most likely mediated through their magnetostriction and piezoresistance, correspondingly. These results direct further investigations on the ability to control the magnetic properties of nanostructures and magnetic and semiconducting material composites to develop new application coupling these properties.
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Supplementary Information
Section S1. GaN growth and Etching

Figure S1 shows cross-sectional SEM images of about 1 µm porous GaN etched at different voltages, of differently doped samples. Etching is stronger for higher doping and higher voltages, and the resulting effect is visible to the naked eye, in light reflectance properties.

Figure S1. a) Cross-sectional SEM image showing etching efficiency increased with voltage; b) top-view SEM image showing increased etching with voltage; c) optical images of samples similar to the ones reported, doped $1.85 \times 10^{19}$ cm$^{-3}$ and etched at 10 and 12 V. Taken at different angles, the samples reflect light differently, following the different etching.
Section S2. Nickel electrodeposition
Calibration depositions were made using ITO coated PET. The relation between thickness and deposition voltage was found to be highly non-linear, while it was linear with deposition time. This also reflected in magnetization, where the magnetization vs. the total charge passed in the process also showed a linear trend.

Figure S2.1 Thickness of electrodeposited nickel as vs. voltage (top, for 1800 s), and vs. time (bottom, using -1 V).

Figure S2.2 Magnetization vs. electrodeposition charge obtained by integrating over the current.
Figure S2.3 SEM-EDX data obtained from the sample shown in Figure 4 in several locations. No significant distinctions along the sample cross section were found.
Section S3. Magnetoresistance measurements

Figure S3.1 shows the sputtered samples under the bonding stereoscope, as captured by a cellular phone camera. A 4-probe measurement was applied in order to allow very low AC signals to be applied and measured (as the resistance was very low), however the physical connections are in 2-probe, with the current and voltage leads connected to the same pads (the nickel layer and the solder on the sample side). The resistance measured includes therefore contact resistance, which should be very low, if present at all.

![Figure S3.1 The 10 V (left) and 12 V (right) etched samples bonded to the PPMS sample holder. Each pad is connected by two bonds as contingency. Figure S3.2 shows the measured MR of SP5 at 200 K and back at 300 K. Notably, the resistance at 200 K increased as well, however only in about 50% (compared to a 3-fold increase in SP3). The resistance in the return to 300 K was not similar to the first measurement - an indication that the device has indeed changed, possibly due to the higher current applied. The consistent feature is that there was no obvious distinction between the in-plane and out-of-plane measurements.](image-url)
Figure S3.2 Magnetoresistance data of SP5 at 200 K (top) and the second measurement at 300 K (bottom). Out-of-plane data is dashed.

The fitted curves in the main Figure 7 are given by:

\[ R_{\text{right}} = 4.257 \cdot 10^{-3} H^2 + 9.655 \cdot 10^{-3} H + 63.02 \]  \hspace{1cm} (1)
\[ R_{\text{left}} = 4.188 \cdot 10^{-3} H^2 + 4.154 \cdot 10^{-4} H + 62.98 \]  \hspace{1cm} (2)

where \( H \) is in \( 10^4 \) Oe and \( R \) in \( \Omega \). The fitting values are obtained by MATLAB’s cftool, with a 95% confidence. We therefore estimate the error of \( H|_{\text{min}} \left( -b/2a \right) \) as 10% (with \( b \) and \( a \) the 2nd order polynomial coefficients). The R-square values of both fits were > 99.8\%. 

---

The text is properly formatted with equations and diagrams. The image contains two graphs showing magnetoresistance data for SP5 at different temperatures. The equations provided describe the fitted curves for the right and left measurements.