

# **Efect of the bivalent dopant ionic radius, electronegativity and concentration on the physical properties of the sol–gel‑derived ZnO thin flms**

**Rabab Bekkari1  [·](http://orcid.org/0000-0003-0761-7794) Larbi Laânab1 · Boujemaâ Jaber2**

Received: 14 May 2020 / Accepted: 22 July 2020 / Published online: 31 July 2020 © Springer Science+Business Media, LLC, part of Springer Nature 2020

#### **Abstract**

This study deals with the infuence of the concentration and ionic radius of the bivalent dopant on the structural, morphological and optical properties of the sol–gel-derived ZnO thin flms. For that, diferent concentrations of dopants with diferent radii  $(Ni^{2+}$ ,  $Cu^2$ ,  $Fe^{2+}$ ) have been chosen to synthesize many ZnO thin films. The X-ray diffraction confirms that all the obtained flms exhibit a pure hexagonal wurtzite structure. Meanwhile, it appears that both the preferential flm orientation and the crystal quality are strongly afected when varying the ionic radius or the concentration of dopant. We note also that the lattice parameters decrease when the electronegativity of the dopant increases. This behavior has been explained at the light of a simple schematic model, based on the electrostatic forces involved in chemical bonding. The Scherer formula reveals that the average size of the crystallites is ranged between 20 and 35 nm. On the other hand, as confrmed by the SEM analysis, all the deposited flms present a compact, uniform and nanocrystalline morphology. Nonetheless, the optical analysis indicates that the Ni- and Fe-doped flms are highly transparent (greater than 90%) in the visible region, while the Cu-doped ones exhibit the lowest transmission (about 76%). Additionally, a blue shift of the bandgap is noticed when doping with Ni or Fe, whereas the doping with Cu induces a red shift.

# **1 Introduction**

Zinc oxide (ZnO) is an attractive n-type semiconductor and technologically important due to its unique properties as piezoelectric [[1](#page-10-0)], wide bandgap (3.37 eV) [[2\]](#page-10-1), transparent in the visible [[3\]](#page-10-2) and can be made to conduct with suitable dopants [\[4](#page-10-3)]. Its piezoelectric properties are exploited in thin-flm applications for surface acoustic wave devices [\[5\]](#page-10-4) and transducers [[6](#page-10-5)]. Furthermore, its tunable bandgap and high transparency have made ZnO an ideal material useful for short-wavelength and transparent optoelectronic devices including UV lasers [[7](#page-10-6), [8\]](#page-10-7), LED [[9–](#page-10-8)[11](#page-10-9)], transparent electrodes [[12\]](#page-10-10) as well as window layers [\[13](#page-10-11), [14](#page-10-12)] in the solar cells.

 $\boxtimes$  Rabab Bekkari bekkarirabab@gmail.com

<sup>2</sup> UATRS Division, Materials Science Platform, CNRST, Rabat, Morocco

However, in order to enhance the physical behavior of ZnO as a versatile material for the above applications, doping is one of the efective approaches that makes this material an excellent subject for theoretical and experimental studies. In fact, doping ZnO with selective elements offers an efective method to improve and control its electrical, structural, magnetic and optical properties [[15\]](#page-10-13). In general, the efficiency of one dopant depends strongly on its electronegativity, concentration and ionic radius, which need to be optimized to aford diferent industrial criteria.

Recently, a wide variety of 3d transition metals such as Mo [\[16\]](#page-10-14), Ni [[17,](#page-10-15) [18](#page-10-16)], Co [\[19](#page-10-17)], Ti [\[20](#page-10-18)], Cu [\[21](#page-10-19)[–23\]](#page-10-20) and Fe [\[24](#page-10-21)] were tested as dopants in ZnO to improve its optical and electrical behaviors for many applications. Although various deposition methods have been developed to produce doped ZnO, the efect of dopant concentration on ZnO lattice is still not clear and very controverting. Furthermore, it is well known that ZnO thin flms with hexagonal wurtzite structure crystallize preferentially along the *c*-axis orientation which allows the development of transducers operating only in the longitudinal mode. Consequently, many researchers have studied the infuence of diverse parameters on the fnal properties of ZnO thin flms, particularly the doping efect. For

<sup>1</sup> LCS, Faculty of Science, Mohammed V University in Rabat, Rabat, Morocco

instance, Cu-doped ZnO thin flms prepared by the sol–gel method: Gómez-Pozos et al. [[22](#page-10-22)], using two copper precursors, have noticed that the flms were nanocrystalline in nature with a hexagonal phase having (002) preferential orientation. On the contrary, Jongnavakit et al. [[23\]](#page-10-20) by varying Cu concentrations (0.1, 0.3, 0.5, 0.7 and 1%) revealed that all samples were polycrystalline with no preferential orientation whatever the Cu concentration may be. On the other hand, Kim et al. [[18](#page-10-16)] elaborated Ni-doped ZnO thin flms (0.2, 0.4, 0.6 and 0.8%) by sol–gel process. They found that NZO thin flms with a dopant ratio (0.2 and 0.4%) have a preferred orientation in the (002) direction. However, when the Ni doping ratio exceeds 0.6%, flms possessed a non-textured polycrystalline structure. However, as it has been reported, the ZnO piezoelectric properties are directly afected by the crystallite orientation control in the flm [[25,](#page-10-23) [26\]](#page-10-24). Hereafter, when seeking to develop ZnO-based transducers, it is more suitable to drive ZnO growing along orientations other than the habitual c-axis one. In fact, exclusively in this case, both the longitudinal and transverse modes could be excited. Up to now and to our knowledge, the control of the ZnO flms orientation by doping has not yet been studied.

In this framework, the main novelty of this work is to investigate the growth orientation control of sol–gel-derived ZnO thin flms, by varying the ionic radius, electronegativity and concentration of the bivalent dopant. The main objective of this study is to make the excitation of all ZnO vibration modes possible and efficient, which will positively impact the technology and the quality of piezoelectric transducers. Through this work, we project also to understand the efect of the bivalent dopant on the ZnO host lattice parameters. For that, an original schematic model, based on the diference of electronegativity, has been proposed and discussed. In this respect, the infuence of diferent bivalent dopants  $(Ni^{2+}, Cu^{2+}, Fe^{2+})$ , with different ionic radii, electronegativities and concentrations, on the structural, morphological and optical properties of the sol–gel-derived ZnO thin flms, has been investigated and discussed.

# **2 Experimental**

The sol–gel spin coating method has been used to prepare undoped and doped ZnO flms with diferent bivalent elements (Ni, Cu and Fe). In the synthesis process, we have used zinc acetate dihydrate [Zn  $(CH_3CO_2)_2$ <sup>2H<sub>2</sub>O], isopro-</sup> panol  $[C_3H_8O]$ , monoethanolamine [MEA,  $C_2H_7NO$ ] and nickel acetate [Ni  $(CH_3COO)_2$ ·4H<sub>2</sub>O], copper (II) acetate monohydrate  $[Cu (CH<sub>3</sub>COO)<sub>2</sub>·H<sub>2</sub>O]$  as well as iron II Chloride  $[FeCl<sub>2</sub>·6H<sub>2</sub>O]$  as a precursor of zinc, solvent, stabilizer and source of dopants, respectively. Firstly, the zinc acetate dihydrate was dissolved in a mixture of isopropanol and MEA, and then the solution was heated at 60 °C for one hour before adding dopant at chosen concentration. The zinc acetate concentration in solution was kept at 0.5 M and the molar ratio of MEA/Zinc was maintained at 1. A clear homogeneous solution was obtained after one hour of reaction. The ZnO flms were then deposited on the glass substrates by spin coating at 3000 rpm for 30 s under normal conditions of temperature and pressure. The other experimental details are described in our previous work [[27\]](#page-10-25).

The crystalline structure was analyzed by Panalytical Expert Pro X-Ray Difractometer working in Bragg–Brentano geometry with Cu Kα radiation. Surface morphology was examined using a JEOL Scanning Electron Microscopy (JSM-IT100) coupled to a microanalysis EDS system. UV–Vis transmittance spectra were recorded using a Perkin Elmer lambda 900 spectrophotometer at room temperature in the wavelength range of 300–800 nm.

# **3 Results and discussion**

#### **3.1 Efect of the ionic radius and electronegativity**

To investigate the effect of the ionic radius and electronegativity on the physical properties, many ZnO flms, doped with ions of different radii (Ni<sup>2+</sup> (0.69 Å), Cu<sup>2+</sup> (0.72 Å) and Fe<sup>2+</sup> (0.74 Å)) and electronegativity (Ni<sup>2+</sup> (1.91), Cu<sup>2+</sup>  $(1.90)$  and Fe<sup>2+</sup>  $(1.83)$ ) at a fixed concentration of 5%, were synthesized.

## **3.2 Structural properties**

XRD analyses of the undoped and doped ZnO thin flms, presented in Fig. [1a](#page-2-0), show that all the flms are of hexagonal wurtzite structure, without any additional secondary dopantrelated phase (JCPDS card No.: 01-089-7102). In order to show the dopant impact on the ZnO crystal lattice, Fig. [1](#page-2-0)b illustrates the XRD data zoom in the 30° to 38° angular range. As can be seen, when the ionic radius decreases  $(Fe^{2+} \rightarrow Cu^{2+} \rightarrow Ni^{2+})$ , a peak shift towards higher angles is clearly observed, indicating a decrease in the lattice parameters. This kind of shift is likely due to the efective substitution of Zn by dopant atoms in the ZnO matrix [[28](#page-10-26)[–30](#page-10-27)].

To quantify the orientation tendency of the obtained ZnO flms, the peak ratios were used. The variation of the peak ratios as a function of the dopant ionic radius is presented in Fig. [1c](#page-2-0). It is clear that, when compared to the bulk, the intensity of (002) peak increases in detriment of (101) when the dopant ionic radius decreases (Fe<sup>2+</sup> $\rightarrow$ Cu<sup>2+</sup> $\rightarrow$ Ni<sup>2+</sup>). These results confrm that the ZnO growth orientation depends clearly on the bivalent dopant ionic radius.

The crystallite size (*D*) of the films, given in Table [1,](#page-2-1) was calculated from XRD data using the Debye–Scherrer formula:



<span id="page-2-0"></span>**Fig. 1** X-ray difraction diagrams (**a**), the position of the ZnO hexagonal structure difraction peaks (**b**) and the relative intensity ratio (**c**) of undoped and doped ZnO thin films with bivalent elements of different ionic radii  $(Ni^{2+}$ ,  $Cu^{2+}$  and Fe<sup>2+</sup>)

<span id="page-2-1"></span>**Table 1** Structural parameters of the undoped ZnO thin flm as well as Ni-, Cu- and Fe-doped ZnO thin flms

Doping elements	Ionic radius $(A)$	$\chi$	crystallite size (nm)	Lattice parameters (A)		L(A)	$\sigma$ (GPa)
				a	c		
Undoped	0.74	1.65	35	$3.2553 \pm 0.0006$	$5.2128 + 0.0008$	1.9810	$-0.3045$
Fe	0.74	1.83	25	$3.2470 + 0.0006$	$5.2031 + 0.0009$	1.9762	0.1260
Cu	0.72	.90	21	$3.2360 + 0.0006$	$5.1830 + 0.0008$	1.9692	1.0254
Ni	0.69	. 91	20	$3.2330 \pm 0.0006$	$5.1817 \pm 0.0009$	1.9669	1.1320

$$
D = \frac{0.9\lambda}{\beta \cos \theta},\tag{1}
$$

where  $\lambda$  is the wavelength of the used X-ray radiation (1.5406 Å);  $\beta$  is the full width at half maximum (FWHM) and  $\theta$  is the Bragg diffraction angle. According to these values, the crystallites size decreases slightly when the dopant changes in the following sequence:  $Fe \rightarrow Cu \rightarrow Ni$ . Since no signifcant diference in the ionic radius of the dopants, compared to that of  $\text{Zn}^{2+}$ , we think that the observed variation of , crystallites size is rather linked to the electronegativity variation of the doping element. To better clarify this tendency, we present in Fig. [2](#page-3-0), the variation of the obtained Scherrer's crystallite size as a function of the dopant electronegativity. As can be observed, when the electronegativity of the dopant increases the crystallite size decreases linearly. This important result shows that increasing the dopant electronegativity afects negatively the crystallites growth kinetics and then blocks the grain boundary mobility.



<span id="page-3-0"></span>**Fig. 2** Crystallite size variation of undoped and doped ZnO thin flms with Ni, Cu and Fe as a function of electronegativity

For wurtzite phase, *a* and *c* lattice parameters can be calculated by using Bragg's law:

$$
a = \frac{\lambda}{\sqrt{3}\sin\theta_{(100)}}
$$
 (2)

$$
c = \frac{\lambda}{\sin \theta_{(002)}}.\tag{3}
$$

In the same way, the  $Zn-O$  bond length  $(L)$  is given by the equation:

$$
L = \sqrt{\frac{a^2}{3} + \left(\frac{1}{2} - u\right)^2 c^2}
$$
 (4)

with 
$$
u = \frac{a^2}{3c^2} + \frac{1}{4}
$$
. (5)

As reported in Table [1,](#page-2-1) an eminent decrease of the lattice parameters occurs when changing the dopants as follows: Fe→Cu→Ni. As the Fe<sup>2+</sup>, Cu<sup>2+</sup> and Ni<sup>2+</sup> ionic radii are comparable to that of  $\text{Zn}^{2+}$ , we believe that the observed decrease of a and c parameters, when changing the  $Fe \rightarrow Cu \rightarrow Ni$ dopant, is evidently associated to the increase of their electronegativity. As illustrated in Fig. [3,](#page-3-1) a remarkable decrease in the *a* and *c* parameters is noticed when the dopant electronegativity increases from 1.65 to 1.91. To provide more explanation about this behavior, Table [1](#page-2-1) presents also the values of the Zn–O bond length (*L*) calculated for each studied dopant. Since electronegativity is defned as the ability of an atom to attract electrons, the higher the electronegativity, the stronger the attraction of the electrons. Based on this rule, as schematically modeled in Fig. [4](#page-4-0), when the dopant electronegativity increases, the attraction on the electron cloud of oxygen



<span id="page-3-1"></span>**Fig. 3** Variation of lattice parameters *a* and *c* of undoped and doped ZnO thin flms with Ni, Cu and Fe as a function of electronegativity

becomes higher, and therefore the bond length (or the lattice parameter) is reduced as illustrated in Table [1](#page-2-1).

On the other hand, the stresses in ZnO-doped thin flms can be determined using the following equation:

$$
\sigma = (2C_{13}^2 - C_{33}(C_{11} + C_{12})) \times \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{2C_{33}}\right).
$$
 (6)

The elastic constants of single-crystalline ZnO  $C_{11}$ =208.8,  $C_{12}$ =119.7,  $C_{13}$ =104.2 and  $C_{33}$ =213.8 GPa have been used [[31\]](#page-10-28). *ε* is the strain along the *c*-axis. The results presented in Table [1](#page-2-1) show that, as the electronegativity of the dopant changes from 1.65 to 1.91, the value of the stress in the doped ZnO thin flms varies from−0.3045 to 1.1320 GPa. The positive values of the computed stresses for the Ni-, Cu- and Fedoped samples indicate that they are tensile stresses and present lattice constants little than that of the undoped sample.

#### **3.3 Morphological properties**

In order to examine the morphology of pure and doped ZnO thin flms with 5% of Cu or Fe, SEM micrographs are shown in Fig. [5a](#page-4-1)–c. A compact, uniform and nanocrystalline morphology is observed on all the deposited flms, indicating a good crystalline quality.

A typical EDS spectrum of the Fe-doped ZnO thin flm is presented in Fig. [6.](#page-4-2) The atomic percentage of Zn, Fe and O elements, given in Table [2](#page-5-0), confrms an amount of Fe equal to (4.40%) which is very close to the nominal composition (5%).

#### **3.4 Optical properties**

Figure [7](#page-5-1) displays the optical transmittance spectra of the undoped and doped ZnO thin flms with Ni, Cu and Fe. It is clear that the Ni-doped flm is highly transparent (about 96%) in the visible region (400–800 nm) and

<span id="page-4-0"></span>

<span id="page-4-1"></span>**Fig. 5** SEM images of undoped (**a**) and doped ZnO thin flms at 5% with Fe (**b**) and Cu (**c**)



<span id="page-4-2"></span>**Fig. 6** EDS spectrum of a typical 5% Fe-doped ZnO thin flm

presents a sharp falling of the absorption edge in the UV region (350–400 nm), while that doped with Cu exhibits a minimum value of transmission (about 76%) with a net fundamental absorption edge. Meanwhile, the observed decreases of the doped flm transmittance in the visible and in the UV ranges could be attributed to the increase of the

<span id="page-5-0"></span>

<span id="page-5-1"></span>**Fig. 7** UV–Vis transmittance spectra of undoped and doped ZnO thin flms

Wavelength (nm)

flm thickness [\[32,](#page-10-29) [33\]](#page-10-30). It is worth noting that the Ni and Fe spectra present also a blue shift of the absorption edge, indicating a slight widening of the optical window of these flms. Contrarily, this trend ceases to be valid when doping with copper for which a red shift is observed.

The optical bandgap energy of the flms assuming a direct transition is evaluated by the extrapolation of the linear portion of  $(ahv)^2$  versus  $h\nu$  plots using Tauc formula:

$$
\alpha h v = A (h v - Eg)^{1/2},\tag{7}
$$

where  $\alpha$  is the absorption coefficient,  $h\nu$  is the photon energy, *A* is a constant, and  $E<sub>g</sub>$  is the optical bandgap energy. The Tauc plot  $(ahv)^2$  versus  $(hv)$  of undoped and doped ZnO thin flms is presented in Fig. [8.](#page-5-2) From the plots, it is observed that the gap energy changes with the dopants. It increases when doping with Ni or Fe and decreases when doping with Cu. The observed increase of the Eg in the case of Ni- or Fe-doped flms may be ascribed to the small crystallites size. However, despite of the small crystallites size, the observed decrease of the  $E_{\alpha}$  when doping with Cu could be attributed to (i) the strong coupling between the orbital d of Cu and the orbital p of O, and/or (ii) the Cu 3d orbital creates impurity bands overhead the ZnO valence band [\[34](#page-10-31)–[36\]](#page-10-32).

In conclusion of this paragraph, the X-ray difraction patterns show that all undoped and doped deposited flms are polycrystalline with a wurtzite hexagonal structure. In addition, a slight reduction of the dopant ionic radius results in a



<span id="page-5-2"></span>**Fig. 8** Plot of  $(ahv)^2$  versus  $h\nu$  of undoped and doped ZnO thin films with diferent elements

net increase of the (002) peak in detriment of the (101) one. It is then possible to control the growth orientation, through doping, which is beneficial when seeking to design ultrasonic transducers operating in transverse and longitudinal modes. The Ni- and Fe-doped flms are highly transparent (greater than 90%) and exhibit a blue shift, while that doped with Cu has a low transmission (about 76%) with a red shift.

## **3.5 Efect of Cu and Ni concentration**

According to the last study, doping with Ni or Fe presents the same behavior, which is diferent from that related to the Cu doping. To better understand this diference, we study in this section the efect of Ni and Cu doping concentration on the structural and optical properties of ZnO thin flms. For that, Ni- and Cu-doped ZnO samples have been elaborated with different concentrations  $(0, 1, 5, 100)$ .

### **3.6 Structural properties**

Figures [9a](#page-6-0) and [10](#page-7-0)a show the XRD diagrams of the undoped and doped ZnO thin flms with Cu and Ni at diferent concentrations. The polycrystalline nature of the hexagonal wurtzite structure of ZnO is confrmed. The difraction peaks can be identifed as (100), (002) and (101) planes according to JCPDS # 01-089-7102. Except the characteristic peaks of ZnO, no additional peak corresponding to Copper or Nickel has been detected. Additionally, Figs. [9b](#page-6-0) and [10](#page-7-0)b show that the difraction peaks of ZnO samples doped with Cu or Ni are shifted to higher angles if the doping rate is increased beyond 1% for Cu and 5% for the Ni. This shift can be explained by the decrease of the lattice parameters occurred subsequently to the efective substitution of Zn by the doping atoms in the ZnO matrix.



<span id="page-6-0"></span>**Fig. 9** X-ray difraction patterns of CZO (**a**), the position of difraction peaks of CZO (**b**), the relative intensity ratio of CZO (**c**) thin flms with diferent concentrations of Cu doping

Otherwise, the variations of the peak ratios as a function of the concentration of Cu and Ni are presented in Figs. [9c](#page-6-0) and [10c](#page-7-0). When the Cu concentration varies from 0 to 1%, Fig. [9](#page-6-0)c shows a signifcant increase in the intensity of the (100), (002) and (101) peaks. However, for higher concentrations, a slight decreasing trend followed by a remarkable stability of the intensity is observed and this for all the plans. According to the literature [\[37,](#page-10-33) [38\]](#page-10-34), the observed improvement of the crystalline quality at low doping concentrations can be explained through the creation of new nucleation centers involving doping atoms. However, the decrease followed by a stability of the peak intensity observed in higher doping concentrations is probably due to the saturation of these new nucleation centers. In fact, the excess copper undergoes segregation in grain boundaries and thus retards and then blocks the grain growth process [[37,](#page-10-33) [39](#page-10-35)].

Concerning the nickel, we present in Fig. [10](#page-7-0)c the variations of the peak ratios as a function of the concentration.

For the low concentrations of Ni, this figure shows that the intensity of (100), (101) and (002) peaks decreases. However, for the high concentrations, the intensity of (002) increases, while those of (101) and (100) peaks decrease. We can deduce that a high concentration of Ni favors the (002) preferential orientation. This behavior can be understood since the ionic radius of  $Ni^{2+}$  (0.69 Å) is smaller than that of  $\text{Zn}^{2+}$  (0.74 Å), at low concentration, Ni occupies only interstitial sites, and then the peaks intensities decrease [\[40](#page-10-36)]. Meanwhile, at high concentrations these interstitial sites become saturated, the Ni then occupies the substitutional sites which results in the increases of the (002) intensity.

On the other side, based on the XRD results of Figs. [9](#page-6-0) and [10](#page-7-0) the structural characteristics have been estimated for different Cu and Ni concentrations and summarized in Table [3.](#page-7-1)

These calculations show that the crystallites size and lattice parameters exhibit diferent behaviors depending on the Ni and Cu concentration. On one hand, when the dopant



<span id="page-7-0"></span>**Fig. 10** X-ray difraction patterns of NZO (**a**), the position of difraction peaks of NZO (**b**), the relative intensity ratio of NZO (**c**) thin flms with diferent concentrations of Ni doping

concentration increases, a slight decrease in the crystallite size is observed in both Cu- and Ni-doped samples. This retard of growth observed at high concentration may be explained by the fact that the excess doping atoms could exert drag forces on boundary motion and grain growth [[37,](#page-10-33) [41](#page-10-37)], which result in small crystallite sizes.

On the other hand, no remarkable change in the lattice parameters has been observed for Ni at low concentration (1%). However, these parameters exhibit a net decrease at relatively high concentrations (form 5 to 10%) (Table [3](#page-7-1)). We think that, because of its small ionic radius, Ni occupies only interstitial sites at low concentration; its incorporation

Cu and Ni content $(\%)$	Crystallite size (nm)		Lattice parameters (A)					$\sigma$ (GPa)	
	CZO	NZO	CZO		NZO		<b>CZO</b>	NZO	
			a	$\mathcal{C}$	a	$\mathcal{C}$			
$\Omega$	35	35	$3.2553 \pm 0.0006$	$5.2128 + 0.0008$	$3.2553 \pm 0.0006$	$5.2128 + 0.0008$	$-0.3045$	$-0.3045$	
	28	26	$3.2483 + 0.0006$	$5.2018 + 0.0008$	$3.2544 + 0.0006$	$5.2123 + 0.0009$	0.1873	$-0.2857$	
5.	21	20	$3.2399 + 0.0006$	$5.1889 + 0.0008$	$3.2330 + 0.0006$	$5.1807 + 0.0009$	0.7650	1.1320	
10	23	20	$3.2225 + 0.0006$	$5.1772 \pm 0.0008$	$3.2200 + 0.0005$	$5.1717 + 0.0008$	1.2878	1.5353	

<span id="page-7-1"></span>**Table 3** Various structural parameters of ZnO thin flms doped with Cu or Ni

therefore induces no expansion in the ZnO lattice. Contrariwise, the reduction in the lattice parameters observed at high concentration (greater than 5%) indicates clearly that the interstitial sites become saturated and that the excess of Ni passes into substitution. In the case of CZO flms, it is worth noting that the both *a* and *c* parameters decrease even though at low Cu concentration (1%). This reduction can be attributed to the Cu ionic radius which is slightly greater than that of Ni. In fact, contrary to Ni, the Cu atoms, which cannot be hosted in interstitial sites, go directly into substitution even for low concentration. The small diference in the ionic radius between Zn and Cu is at the origin of the observed lattice parameters reduction. Note also that the increase in the concentration of the two dopants induces the increase of the stress, as shown by the results presented in Table [3](#page-7-1).

## **3.7 Optical properties**

In order to understand the doping concentration efect on the optical properties, we have reported in Fig. [11a](#page-8-0) and b the optical transmission spectra of the ZnO flms elaborated at diferent Cu and Ni doping rates. The measured average transmittances and thicknesses of the doped flms are reported in Table [4](#page-8-1). A signifcant reduction of the transmittance (from 92 to  $73\%$ ), in the 400–800 nm range, is observed as the Cu doping rate increases up to 10% (Fig. [11a](#page-8-0)). This reduction of transmittance is due to the observed increase of the flm thickness (Table [4](#page-8-1)). Meanwhile, a slight improvement of the transmittance (from 92) to 96%) associated to a net decrease of the flm thickness (Fig. [11b](#page-8-0) and Table [4\)](#page-8-1) is noticed, in the case of NZO flms, as the Ni concentration is varied similarly up to 10%. This last behavior makes this material quite suitable as a window for solar cells.

<span id="page-8-1"></span>**Table 4** Average optical transmittance of doped ZnO flms in the visible range and flms thickness as a function of doping concentration

Doping	CZO		NZO		
concentration $(\%)$	Film thickness (nm)	Average transmittance $(\%)$	Film thickness (nm)	Average transmit- tance $(\%)$	
	363	92	363	92	
	370	91	322	93	
	419	76	298	94	
10	425	74	275	96	

At this point, we can notice that the transmittance manifests dissimilar behaviors, and that depends on the nature and concentration of the dopant.

The observed reduction of transmittance in the case of CZO flms is attributed to (i) the highest viscosity of the prepared sol, when compared to that of the NZO flms. In fact, the increase in Cu doping induces an augmentation in the solution viscosity that raises the deposition rate and consequently increases the thickness of the flm, which decreases the transmittance of the film  $[35]$  $[35]$  $[35]$ ; and/or (ii) to the crystallographic orientation of the flms. In fact, it has been reported that a maximum optical transmittance is characteristic of a preferentially oriented material along the *c*-axis, because of the reduced amount of optical scattering in the grain boundaries. However, a poly-oriented structure would have reduced transmittance due to the excessive dispersion of light in the joints [\[42\]](#page-10-39).

Figure [12](#page-9-0)a and b displays the variations of  $(ah\nu)^2$  with photon energy *hv* for CZO and NZO films. This figure presents also the variation of bandgap energy with doping concentration. Again, two antagonist tendencies are observed. On one side, increasing the Cu concentration results in a



<span id="page-8-0"></span>**Fig. 11** Transmittance spectra of undoped and doped ZnO thin flms at diferent contents of Cu (**a**) and Ni (**b**)

remarkable reduction of Eg. This reduction may be attributed to (i) the strong coupling between the orbital d of the Cu atom and the orbital p of the O atom, which results in an enlargement of the valence band, (ii) the Cu 3d orbital makes impurity bands overhead the ZnO valence band [\[34](#page-10-31)[–36\]](#page-10-32). On the other, we emphasize that  $E<sub>g</sub>$  does not undergo any variation in the 0–1% doping range in the case of NZO flms. This result is in agreement with the structural study in which we show no variation of the lattice parameters in this doping range because the Ni occupies only the interstitial sites. Beyond 1%, these interstitial sites became saturated and the Ni passes into substitution, which causes a reduction in the lattice parameters associated with an enlargement of the bandgap. In the same way, the observed increase of Eg with increasing the Ni concentration could also be explained through the Burstein–Moss efect [\[43](#page-10-40)]. Indeed, with a high p doping concentration, the semiconductor becomes degenerated and the Fermi level enters the valence band. Since the position of the latter depends on the concentration of the dopants, as the Ni content increases, the highest electronic states in the valence band become vacant and, therefore, shift the absorption edge towards higher photon energy [\[44](#page-10-41)].

At the end of this second comparative study, we conclude that the undoped and doped ZnO thin flms with Cu and Ni have a polycrystalline nature with a hexagonal wurtzite structure without any secondary phase. Low-concentration Cu doping improves the crystalline quality and decreases the lattice parameters. However, low-concentration Ni doping afects negatively the crystalline quality and has no evident efect on the lattice parameters. However, high Cu concentration results in a remarkable decrease in both the crystalline quality and the lattice parameters; contrariwise, a high concentration of Ni improves the crystalline quality by favoring the preferential orientation (002) and reduces the lattice parameters. Optical analysis shows that the doping with Cu results in a reduction of the transmittance in the visible region with a red shift of the optical gap from 3.27 to 3.17 eV, though the doping with Ni improves the transmittance and engenders a blue shift of the gap from 3.27 to 3.33 eV.

# **4 Conclusion**

In conclusion, the efect of diferent bivalent dopants on the structural and optical properties of ZnO thin flms has been studied and discussed. We opted in this study for  $Ni^{2+}$ ,  $Cu^{2+}$ and  $Fe<sup>2+</sup>$ , having ionic radii slightly different from that of  $\text{Zn}^{2+}$ , considering that they have different electronegativities which are clearly higher than that of  $\text{Zn}^{2+}$ . XRD diagrams show that all undoped and doped deposited flms are polycrystalline with a hexagonal wurtzite structure. In addition, as the ionic radius of the dopant slightly increases and/or the electronegativity decreases, the (101) peak intensity drops while that of the (002) peak increases. Accordingly to this observation, we can state that it is possible to control the crystallite growth orientation only by varying the electronegativity and/or the ionic radius of the bivalent dopant. This result is of great interest when seeking to design future acoustic transducers, operating in both transverse and longitudinal modes. In a comparative study between  $Cu^{2+}$  and  $Ni<sup>2+</sup>$  bivalent dopants, based on XRD, low-concentration Cu doping improves the crystalline quality and decreases the lattice parameters, whereas low-concentration Ni doping afects negatively the crystalline quality and has no evident efect on the lattice parameters. However, high Cu concentration results in a remarkable decrease in both the crystalline quality and the lattice parameters; contrariwise, a high concentration of Ni improves the crystalline quality by favoring the preferential orientation (002) and reduces the



<span id="page-9-0"></span>**Fig. 12**  $(\alpha h \nu)^2$  versus  $h \nu$  plots of CZO (**a**) and NZO (**b**) thin films at various Cu and Ni contents

lattice parameters. Moreover, the SEM observations indicate a compact, uniform and nanocrystalline morphology of all the deposited flms. However, optical analysis reveals that Ni- and Fe-doped flms are highly transparent (greater than 90%) with a bandgap blue shift, whereas those doped with  $Cu^{2+}$  show a reduced transmission (about 76%) with a bandgap red shift.

**Acknowledgements** The authors wish to thank the National Center of Scientific and Technical Research (CNRST) and the staff of the UATRS Division, for use of their equipment and technical assistance.

## **References**

- <span id="page-10-0"></span>1. R. Bekkari, L. Laânab, D. Boyer, R. Mahiou, B. Jaber, Mater. Sci. Semicond. Process. **71**, 181–187 (2017)
- <span id="page-10-1"></span>2. D. Sivaganesh, S. Saravanakumar, V. Sivakumar, K.S.S. Ali, E. Akapo, E. Alemayehu, R. Rajajeyaganthan, R. Saravanan, J. Mater. Sci. Mater. Electron. **30**, 2966 (2019)
- <span id="page-10-2"></span>3. X. Wei, B. Man, C. Xue, C. Chen, M. Liu, Jpn. J. Appl. Phys. **45**, 8586 (2006)
- <span id="page-10-3"></span>4. A. Mallick, D. Basak, Prog. Mater. Sci. **96**, 86 (2018)
- <span id="page-10-4"></span>5. V.L. Patil, S.A. Vanalakar, P.S. Patil, J.H. Kim, Sens. Actuators B Chem. **239**, 1185 (2017)
- <span id="page-10-5"></span>6. R. Haarindraprasad, U. Hashim, S.C.B. Gopinath, M. Kashif, P. Veeradasan, S.R. Balakrishnan, K.L. Foo, P. Poopalan, Y.K. Mishra, PLoS ONE **10**, 1 (2015)
- <span id="page-10-6"></span>7. P.S. Shewale, Y.S. Yu, J. Alloys Compd. **654**, 79 (2016)
- <span id="page-10-7"></span>8. V. Kumar, O.M. Ntwaeaborwa, H.C. Swart, J. Colloid Interface Sci. **465**, 295 (2016)
- <span id="page-10-8"></span>9. M. Karimipour, M. Sadeghian, M. Molaei, J. Mater. Sci. Mater. Electron. **29**, 13782 (2018)
- 10. M. Huang, S. Wang, G. Wan, X. Zhang, Y. Zhang, K. Ou, L. Yi, J. Mater. Sci. Mater. Electron. **29**, 7213 (2018)
- <span id="page-10-9"></span>11. M. Xin, J. Theor. Appl. Phys. **12**, 177 (2018)
- <span id="page-10-10"></span>12. M. Murugesan, D. Arjunraj, J. Mayandi, V. Venkatachalapathy, J.M. Pearce, Mater. Lett. **222**, 50 (2018)
- <span id="page-10-11"></span>13. S. Zhang, N.D. Pham, T. Tesfamichael, J. Bell, H. Wang, Sustain. Mater. Technol. **18**, e00078 (2018)
- <span id="page-10-12"></span>14. Z.N. Kayani, H. Bashir, S. Riaz, S. Naseem, Mater. Res. Bull. **115**, 121 (2019)
- <span id="page-10-13"></span>15. S.I. Shanthi, S. Poovaragan, M.V. Arularasu, S. Nithya, R. Sundaram, C.M. Magdalane, K. Kaviyarasu, M. Maaza, J. Nanosci. Nanotechnol. **18**, 5441 (2018)
- <span id="page-10-14"></span>16. M. Wu, S. Yu, G. Chen, L. He, L. Yang, W. Zhang, Appl. Surf. Sci. **324**, 791 (2015)
- <span id="page-10-15"></span>17. T. Wakano, N. Fujimura, Y. Morinaga, N. Abe, A. Ashida, T. Ito, Phys. E Low-Dimens. Syst. Nanostruct. **10**, 260 (2001)
- <span id="page-10-16"></span>18. K.T. Kim, G.H. Kim, J.C. Woo, C.I. Kim, Surf. Coatings Technol. **202**, 5650 (2008)
- <span id="page-10-17"></span>19. M.G. Nair, M. Nirmala, K. Rekha, A. Anukaliani, Mater. Lett. **65**, 1797 (2011)
- <span id="page-10-18"></span>20. H. Chen, J. Ding, S. Ma, Superlattices Microstruct. **49**, 176 (2011)
- <span id="page-10-19"></span>21. S. Singhal, J. Kaur, T. Namgyal, R. Sharma, Phys. B Condens. Matter. **407**, 1223 (2012)
- <span id="page-10-22"></span>22. H. Gómez-Pozos, E.J.L. Arredondo, A.M. Álvarez, R. Biswal, Y. Kudriavtsev, J.V. Pérez, Y.L. Casallas-Moreno, M.L.O. Amador, Materials (Basel) **9**, 87 (2016)
- <span id="page-10-20"></span>23. P. Jongnavakit, P. Amornpitoksuk, S. Suwanboon, N. Ndiege, Appl. Surf. Sci. **258**, 8192 (2012)
- <span id="page-10-21"></span>24. U. Alver, T. Kilinç, E. Bacaksiz, S. Nezir, Mater. Sci. Eng. B Solid-State Mater. Adv. Technol. **138**, 74 (2007)
- <span id="page-10-23"></span>25. D. Ali, M.Z. Butt, B. Arif, A.A. Al-Ghamdi, F. Yakuphanoglu, Phys. B Condens. Matter **506**, 83 (2017)
- <span id="page-10-24"></span>26. O. Dimitrov, D. Nesheva, V. Blaskov, I. Stambolova, S. Vassilev, Z. Levi, V. Tonchev, Mater. Chem. Phys. **148**, 712–719 (2014)
- <span id="page-10-25"></span>27. R. Bekkari, B. Jaber, H. Labrim, M. Ouafi, N. Zayyoun, L. Laânab, Int. J. Photoenergy **2019**, 1 (2019)
- <span id="page-10-26"></span>28. J.P. Mathew, G. Varghese, J. Mathew, S.O.P. Trans, Appl. Phys. **1**, 27 (2014)
- 29. K. Joshi, M. Rawat, S.K. Gautam, R.G. Singh, R.C. Ramola, F. Singh, J. Alloys Compd. **680**, 252 (2016)
- <span id="page-10-27"></span>30. T. Srinivasulu, K. Saritha, K.T.R. Reddy, Mod. Electron. Mater. **3**, 76–85 (2017)
- <span id="page-10-28"></span>31. B.R. Kumar, T.S. Rao, Dig. J. Nanomater. Bios. **6**, 1281 (2011)
- <span id="page-10-29"></span>32. A. Sreedhar, J.H. Kwon, J. Yi, J.S. Kim, J.S. Gwag, Mater. Sci. Semicond. Process. **49**, 8 (2016)
- <span id="page-10-30"></span>33. R. Bekkari, L. Laânab, B. Jaber, J. Chem. **4**, 2289 (2016)
- <span id="page-10-31"></span>34. A.A. Othman, M.A. Ali, E.M.M. Ibrahim, M.A. Osman, J. Alloys Compd. **683**, 399 (2016)
- <span id="page-10-38"></span>35. R. Raji, K.G. Gopchandran, Mater. Res. Express **4**, 025002 (2017)
- <span id="page-10-32"></span>36. K. Ahn, T. Deutsch, Y. Yan, C. Jiang, C.L. Perkins, K. Ahn, T. Deutsch, Y. Yan, C. Jiang, C.L. Perkins, J. Turner, M. Al-jassim, J. Appl. Phys. **102**, 023517 (2007)
- <span id="page-10-33"></span>37. G. Li, X. Zhu, X. Tang, W. Song, Z. Yang, J. Dai, Y. Sun, X. Pan, S. Dai, J. Alloys Compd. **509**, 4816 (2011)
- <span id="page-10-34"></span>38. M. Öztas, M. Bedir, Thin Solid Films **516**, 1703 (2008)
- <span id="page-10-35"></span>39. G. Li, X. Zhu, H. Lei, W. Song, Z. Yang, J. Dai, Y. Sun, X. Pan, S. Dai, J. Alloys Compd. **505**, 434 (2010)
- <span id="page-10-36"></span>40. F. Boudjouan, A. Chelouche, T. Touam, D. Djouadi, Y. Ouerdane, Mater. Sci. Semicond. Process. **41**, 382–389 (2016)
- <span id="page-10-37"></span>41. J.A. Najim, J.M. Rozaiq, Int. Lett. Chem. Phys. Astron. **15**, 137 (2013)
- <span id="page-10-39"></span>42. Y.S. Kim, W.P. Tai, S.J. Shu, Thin Solid Films **491**, 153 (2005)
- <span id="page-10-40"></span>43. R.K. Rajakarthikeyan, S. Muthukumaran, Opt. Mater. (Amst). **69**, 382–391 (2017)
- <span id="page-10-41"></span>44. R.A. Rakkesh, S. Balakumar, Process. Appl. Ceram. **8**, 7–13 (2014)

**Publisher's Note** Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.