Investigation of Pr³⁺ as a sensitizer in quantum-cutting fluoride phosphors

Te-Ju Lee,^{1,2} Li-Yang Luo,¹ Bing-Ming Cheng,² Wei-Guang Diau,¹ and Teng-Ming Chen^{1,a)} ¹Department of Applied Chemistry, National Chiao Tung University, Hsinchu 30010, Taiwan ²National Synchrotron Radiation Research Center, Hsinchu 30076, Taiwan

(Received 3 October 2007; accepted 20 January 2008; published online 26 February 2008)

A quantum-cutting (QC) phosphor K_2GdF_5 : Eu^{3+} shows poor optical absorption and a theoretical quantum efficiency (QE) of 107% in the ultraviolet (UV) and vacuum ultraviolet (VUV) excitation spectral ranges. Pr^{3+} was codoped as a sensitizer in K_2GdF_5 : Eu^{3+} , thus increasing the absorption in the UV and VUV spectral regions; the theoretical QE of K_2GdF_5 : Eu^{3+} , Pr^{3+} was increased to 138%. The spectra indicate that the possible mechanisms of QC and energy transfer differ from those of phosphors containing the Gd^{3+} – Eu^{3+} couple. Temporally resolved measurements of fluorescence decay confirm the proposed QC mechanism for the phosphor containing the Gd^{3+} – Eu^{3+} , Pr^{3+} system. © 2008 American Institute of Physics. [DOI: 10.1063/1.2884690]

High-performance mercury-free lighting and plasma display panels (PDP), which are generally excited with a xenon dimer discharge in broadbands about 147 and 172 nm, rely critically on phosphors that should have great efficiency of luminescence in the vacuum ultraviolet (VUV) region. Most known phosphors still suffer from a poor quantum efficiency (QE) relative to those used in fluorescent lamps or cathoderay tubes found in color television sets. To remedy this deficiency, one strategy involves use of one UV or VUV photon to excite the phosphor, thus, to obtain more than one visible emitted photon; this phenomenon is called a quantum-cutting (QC) effect.

Quantum cutting was reported in YF₃: Pr³⁺ in 1974, but there exists no efficient quantum cutter in the visible spectral region.^{1,2} Wegh *et al.*³ reported the observation of visible QC by down conversion in the LiGdF₄: Eu³⁺ that exhibited a theoretical, rather than empirical QE as great as 198%. Vergeer *et al.*⁴ reported recently that Pr³⁺ acts as a sensitizer, wherein the luminescence of Pr³⁺ was quenched by Eu³⁺. Here, we report photoluminescence (PL) and PL excitation (PLE) spectra of K₂GdF₅: Eu³⁺, Pr³⁺ and relevant transient decay behavior of this phosphor; we propose a mechanism of down conversion and energy transfer (ET) to rationalize the observed visible QC effect.

Samples of K_2 GdF₅:Eu³⁺, Pr³⁺ (5%, x%) in a series with x=0, 0.1, 0.5, 1, 1.5, and 2 as varied Pr^{3+} contents were prepared on reacting KF (Acros, 99%), GdF₃ (Aldrich, 99.99%), EuF₃ (Strem, 99.99%), and PrF₃ (Aldrich, 99.99%) in stoichiometric proportions in an evacuated and sealed silica tube at 600 °C for 8 h. The samples were then examined by x-ray diffraction (Bruker AXS D8 advanced automatic diffractometer). The PL spectra of phosphors were measured with a synchrotron as excitation source; the emission was analyzed with a 0.32 m monochromator and detected with a photomultiplier in a photon-counting mode. The VUV source was the high-flux beamline attached to the 1.5 GeV storage ring at the National Synchrotron Radiation Research Center, Taiwan. Temporally resolved decays of the emission were performed with a tunable nanosecond opticalparametric-oscillator/Q-switch-pumped Nd:yttrium aluminum garnet laser system. Emission transients were collected with a monochromator, detected with a photomultiplier tube connected to a digital oscilloscope, and transferred to a computer for kinetics analysis.⁵ The empirical QE was measured by using a Jobin Yvon-Spex Fluorolog 3 spectrofluorometer equipped with a model FL-PLQY integrating sphere.

For a practical calculation of the extra OE resulting from cross relaxation, some essential premises must be stated. For instance, VUV-UV absorption by phosphors is disregarded; possible nonradiative losses due to energy migration at defects and impurities in the samples are ignored. The QE of K_2GdF_5 : Eu³⁺ (5%), exhibiting a QC mechanism, is consistent with that of LiGdF₄:Eu³⁺ containing the Gd³⁺-Eu³⁺ couple reported previously,³ which was found to be 107%. The samples with Pr^{3+} in varied proportions doped as a sensitizer into K_2GdF_5 : Eu³⁺ with the $Gd^{\bar{3}+}$ -Eu³⁺ couple were prepared. In the PLE spectrum shown in Fig. 1, two broad absorption bands of Pr³⁺ are centered at 172 and 210 nm when monitored at 588 $({}^{5}D_{0} \rightarrow {}^{7}F_{1})$ and 509 nm $({}^{5}D_{2} \rightarrow {}^{7}F_{3})$, respectively. Two broadbands due to K₂GdF₅:5% Eu³⁺, 1% Pr³⁺ are attributed to *f*-*d* transitions of $Pr^{3+,6,7}$ The transitions are from the $Pr^{3+,3}H(4f)$ ground state to the spin-allowed excited state ${}^{3}H(4f5d)$. The absorptions centered at 165 nm or shorter wavelength might be due to a



FIG. 1. (Color online) PLE spectra of K_2GdF_5 : Eu^{3+} , Pr^{3+} monitored at λ_{em} =509 and 588 nm. The spectra were scaled to the ${}^8S_{7/2} \rightarrow {}^6I_J$ excitation intensity (*).

0003-6951/2008/92(8)/081106/3/\$23.00

92. 081106-1

Downloaded 10 Jul 2008 to 140.113.39.201. Redistribution subject to AIP license or copyright; see http://apl.aip.org/apl/copyright.jsp

^{a)}Electronic mail: tmchen@mail.nctu.edu.tw.

^{© 2008} American Institute of Physics



FIG. 2. (Color online) Comparison of PL spectra for K₂GdF₅: Eu³⁺, Pr³⁺ with λ_{ex} =274 nm (no QC effect), 210 nm, and 172 nm (showing QC effect). The spectra were scaled to the ${}^{5}D_{2} \rightarrow {}^{7}F_{3}$ at 509 nm excitation intensity (*).

charge-transfer (CT) transition. The excitation attributed to ${}^{8}S_{7/2} \rightarrow {}^{6}G_{J}$ of Gd³⁺ centered at 195 nm was observed almost to overlap the Pr³⁺ absorption band.

Figure 2 compares the PL spectra for K_2GdF_5 : Eu^{3+} , Pr^{3+} phosphors at three excitation wavelengths (λ_{ex})-274, 210, and 172 nm. The intensity of ${}^{5}D_{1} \rightarrow {}^{7}F_{J}$ and ${}^{5}D_{0} \rightarrow {}^{7}F_{J}$ emissions attributed to the Eu³⁺ multiplet transition was observed to become significantly more intense in the phosphor containing the Gd^{3+} -Eu³⁺-Pr³⁺ system, than for K_2GdF_5 :Eu³⁺, when Pr^{3+} was doped and excited to the 4f5d state at 210 and 172 nm, respectively. A calculation of the theoretical QE $K_2GdF_5:Eu^{3+}, Pr^{3+}$ (5%, x%) (x=0, 0.1, 0.5, 1, 1.5, and 2) phosphors was based on an equation suggested by Wegh et al.³ and later modified by Lee et al.⁸ The theoretical QE was found to increase from 107% for K₂GdF₅:5%Eu³⁺ to an optimal value 138% for $K_2GdF_5:5\%Eu^{3+},1\%Pr^{3+}$ under excitation at 210 nm. This observation indicates that Pr³⁺ plays an important role in sensitizing Eu³⁺ and becomes quenched by neighboring Eu³⁺ ions to enhance the luminescence intensity through a QC effect.

Pr³⁺ showing an intrinsic absorption might thus act as an effective sensitizer for the phosphor system containing Gd³⁺-Eu³⁺-Pr³⁺. The energy level diagrams depicted in Fig. 3 describe the possible mechanisms for QC and ET in the $K_2GdF_5:Eu^{3+}, Pr^{3+}$ phosphors.^{9,10} Figure 3(a) indicates that under excitation at 274 nm, as soon as the Gd³⁺ ion is excited into the ${}^{6}I_{I}$ state, following a nonradiative relaxation to the ${}^{6}P_{J}$ state, direct ET might occur from ${}^{6}P_{J}$ to neighboring Eu³⁺ ions, or a radiative relaxation of Gd³⁺ from ${}^{6}P_{I}$ to the ${}^{8}S_{7/2}$ ground state occurs; consequently, no QC is expected, as indicated in the proposed diagram. In contrast, Fig. 3(b) indicates that under excitation at 210 nm, Pr³⁺ pumping dominates when Pr^{3+} is excited to the 4f5d state, as the energy released from transitions ${}^{1}S_{0} \rightarrow {}^{3}P_{1} + {}^{1}I_{6}$ matches and feeds the excitation transition ${}^{7}F_{J} \rightarrow {}^{5}D_{3}$; ET from Pr³⁺ to neighboring Eu³⁺ ions might proceed by cross relaxation (step 1), which can further induce emission of multiplet transitions ${}^{5}D_{0,1,2,3} \rightarrow {}^{7}F_{J}$ (J=0-6). The remaining energy in ${}^{3}P_{1}$ or ${}^{3}P_{0}$ of Pr^{3+} is subsequently transferred (step 2) directly to nearby Eu³⁺ ions, from which emissions attributed to transitions ${}^{5}D_{0,1} \rightarrow {}^{7}F_{J}$ (J=0-6) occur. This proposal is rationalized by considering that, after the nonradiative decay



FIG. 3. (Color online) Schematic energy levels of K₂GdF₅: Eu³⁺, Pr³⁺ showing possible mechanisms for visible QC with excitation in the VUV with λ_{ex} =(a) 274 and (b) 210 nm (① and ② denote the cross relaxation and direct energy transfer, respectively).

from ${}^{3}P_{1}$ to ${}^{3}P_{0}$ states, the remaining energy in the $Pr^{3+3}P_{0}$ level is insufficient to transfer to levels ${}^{5}D_{2}$ or higher ${}^{5}D_{I}$ of neighboring Eu³⁺ ions.¹¹ The mechanism of ET involved in this K₂GdF₅:Eu³⁺,Pr³⁺ phosphor results in a QE of visible luminescence much increased over that observed in K_2GdF_5 : Eu^{3+}. The QE of K_2GdF_5 : 5 % Eu^{3+} was calculated to be 107%, but that for $K_2GdF_5:5\% Eu^{3+}, 1\% Pr^{3+}$ is 138%.⁸ Table I shows the dependence of Pr^{3+} content on the QE in the visible region of the $K_2GdF_5:5\% Eu^{3+}, x\% Pr^{3+}$ phosphors. The codoping of Pr³⁺ was demonstrated to increase the QE of K_2GdF_5 : 5% Eu³⁺, x% Pr³⁺. The greatest QE attained with excitation at 210 nm was found to be 138% for the sample codoped with 1% Pr3+. For phosphors with proportions of Pr^{3+} dopant greater than 1%, a large fraction of energy feeds the ${}^{1}S_{0} \rightarrow {}^{3}P_{2}$ emission, and the loss of a small fraction of ET is considered to be responsible for the observed decrease of QE. When $K_2GdF_5:5\% Eu^{3+}, x\% Pr^{3+}$ phosphors were excited at 172 nm, the trend of QE versus xindicated in Table I was similar to that observed with 210 nm as the excitation wavelength.

We also measured the time-resolved PL spectra of $K_2GdF_5:5\% Eu^{3+}, 1\% Pr^{3+}$ by monitoring the Eu^{3+} ion at the 5D_1 and 5D_0 states upon excitation of Pr^{3+} at the 4f5d state ($\lambda_{ex}=215$ nm). Figure 4 shows the corresponding decay curves, which were fitted according to a consecutive kinetic model, $A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C \rightarrow D$. In this model, the $A \rightarrow B$ process corresponds to the cross relaxation between the ${}^1S_0 \rightarrow {}^3P_J$ transition of Pr^{3+} and the ${}^7F_J \rightarrow {}^5D_3$ transition of Eu^{3+} ; the $B \rightarrow C$ process corresponds to the energy transfer and the

TABLE I. Variation of QE for K_2GdF_5 : Eu³⁺, Pr³⁺ (5%, *x*%) as a function of Pr³⁺ content (*x*) with excitation at 210 and 172 nm.

	Quantum efficiency (%)	
x	$\lambda_{ex}(nm) = 210$	172
0.1	106	111
0.5	120	133
1.0	123	138
1.5	119	134
2.0	116	131

Downloaded 10 Jul 2008 to 140.113.39.201. Redistribution subject to AIP license or copyright; see http://apl.aip.org/apl/copyright.jsp



FIG. 4. (Color online) Temporally resolved decay curves of ${}^{5}D_{1}$ (533 nm) and ${}^{5}D_{0}$ (588 nm) emissions with excitation into Pr^{3+} ${}^{1}S_{0}$ for K₂GdF₅:5% Eu³⁺, 1% Pr³⁺. Solid lines are fitted with a multiexponential decay.

relaxation of ${}^{5}D_{J}$ state ($J \ge 2$); the C \rightarrow D process corresponds to the relaxation of the ${}^{5}D_{1}$ or the ${}^{5}D_{0}$ state of Eu³⁺. Our time-dependent results indicate that the spike signals represent the rapid cross relaxation (<3 μ s) corresponding to the Pr^{3+} , ${}^{1}S_{0} \rightarrow {}^{3}P_{1}$ down transition together with the Eu³⁺, ${}^{7}F_{J}$ $\rightarrow {}^{5}D_{3}$ up transition. Therefore, the populations in the ${}^{5}D_{1}$ and the ${}^{5}D_{0}$ states of Eu³⁺ were enhanced by two contributions—one is due to the fast relaxation of the Eu³⁺ ${}^{5}D_{3}$ state itself and the other is due to the interionic energy transfer from the $Pr^{3+3}P_I$ states into the 5D_1 state of Eu³⁺. Both relaxation and ET processes take ~ 0.13 ms, which is responsible for the rising part of the transients. The observed 0.96 and 3.52 ms decays of the transients represent the radiative and the nonradiative relaxations of the ${}^{5}D_{1}$ and the ${}^{5}D_{0}$ states, respectively. Our time-dependent results are fully consistent with the mechanistic scheme given in Fig. 3(b), and the results are also similar to those of Vergeer et al. for the LiGdF₄: Eu³⁺ system excited at the ${}^{6}G_{I}$ state of Gd³⁺.¹²

To gain a realistic sense of luminescence efficiency, have determined the empirical OE we of $K_2GdF_5:5\% Eu^{3+}, 1\% Pr^{3+}$ to be 93% when excited at 274 nm (no QC effect) by using an integrating sphere. However, QE under excitation at 210 or 172 nm (with QC effect) can be inferred semiempirically and found to be 180% and 118%, respectively, by considering the proportionality of the observed PL intensity enhancement revealed in Fig. 2 and using 93% (without QC effect) as a basis since the direct determination of QE is not feasible in our laboratory. In conclusion. we have demonstrated that

 $K_2GdF_5:5\% Eu^{3+}, x\% Pr^{3+}$ are red-emitting QC phosphors of which the theoretical QE was improved from 107% to 138% on codoping Pr³⁺ as a sensitizer through mechanisms of cross relaxation and direct energy transfer. According to a comparison of the Gd³⁺-Eu³⁺ couple and the Gd³⁺-Eu³⁺-Pr³⁺ system, Pr³⁺ ion shows intrinsically effective absorption in the UV and VUV spectral ranges, and exhibits a prospectively improved efficiency of phosphors used in PDP and mercury-free lamps that are excited with the Xe₂ discharge.

National Science Council of Taiwan supported this project under Contract No. NSC95-2113-M-009-024-MY3. National Synchrotron Radiation Research Center of Taiwan provided research facilities and resources.

- ¹W. W. Piper, J. A. DeLuca, and F. S. Ham, J. Lumin. 8, 344 (1974).
- ²J. L. Sommerdijk, A. Bril, and A. W. de Jager, J. Lumin. 8, 341 (1974).
 ³R. T. Wegh, H. Donker, K. D. Oskam, and A. Meijerink, Science 283, 663 (1999).
- ⁴P. Vergeer, V. Babin, and A. Meijerink, J. Lumin. 114, 267 (2005).
- ⁵L. Y. Luo, C. F. Lo, C. Y. Lin, I. J. Chang, and E. W. G. Diau, J. Phys. Chem. B **110**, 410 (2006).
- ⁶E. Nakazawa and F. Shiga, Jpn. J. Appl. Phys., Part 1 42, 1642 (2003).
- ⁷E. Nakazawa, J. Lumin. **100**, 89 (2002).
- ⁸T. J. Lee, L. Y. Lou, W. G. Diau, B. M. Cheng, C. Y. Tung, and T. M. Chen, Appl. Phys. Lett. **89**, 131121 (2006).
- ⁹J. C. Krupa and M. Queffelec, J. Alloys Compd. 250, 287 (1997).
- ¹⁰P. Vergeer, V. Babin, and A. Meijerink, J. Lumin. **114**, 267 (2005).
- ¹¹A. M. Srivastava and D. A. Doughty, J. Electrochem. Soc. **143**, 4413 (1996).
- ¹²P. Vergeer, E. van den Pol, and A. Meijerink, J. Lumin. **121**, 456 (2006).