Origin of negative electrocaloric effect in *Pnma*-type antiferroelectric perovskite

Ningbo Fan¹, Jorge Íniguez^{2,3}, Laurent Bellaiche^{4*} and Bin Xu^{1*}

¹School of Physical Science and Technology, Soochow University, Suzhou 215006, China

²Materials Research and Technology Department, Luxembourg Institute of Science and Technology (LIST), Luxembourg

³Department of Physics and Materials Science, University of Luxembourg, Luxembourg

⁴Physics Department and Institute for Nanoscience and Engineering, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, Arkansas 72701, USA



Introduction

Electrocaloric effect (ECE): future cooling technology

Positive and negative ECE can be utilized in combination to improve the performance of cooling/heating devices

Methods

Negative ECE in antiferroelectrics (AFE)

 \succ Dipole canting model^[1]: only taken the dipolar degrees of freedom into account



Most AFE perovskites have octahedral tilting as primary order parameter^[2-3]

Questions:

- Can the dipole canting model explain negative ECE for AFE with antiferrodistortion as primary order parameter? Contribution to ECE from
- each important degree of freedom?
- Effect of electric field direction to ECE?

System: Bi_{0.6}Nd_{0.4}FeO₃ (BNFO) AFE (space group: *Pnma*)



 $\Delta T = -\frac{1}{C_{ph}}\Delta S$

 $\alpha = \frac{\Delta T}{\Delta E} = -\frac{1}{\Delta E \cdot C_{ph}} \Delta S$

 $= \Delta T_{\omega_R} + \Delta T_{\omega_M} + \Delta T_X + \Delta T_P$

Computational Details

Effective Hamiltonian method^[4-7] $E_{\text{tot}} = E_{\text{BFO}}(\{u_i\}, \{\eta_H\}, \{\eta_I\}, \{\omega_i\}, \{m_i\})$ + $E_{\text{alloy}}(\{u_i\}, \{\omega_i\}, \{m_i\}, \{\eta_{\text{loc}}\})$

Monte-Carlo (MC) simulation Supercell: 12×12×12 Electric field: [001], [110], [110] Temperature: 10 K - 1500 K MC sweeps: 20000 + 20000

Landau Model $F = \frac{1}{2}a_{\omega_R}(T)\omega_R^2 + \frac{1}{4}b_{\omega_R}\omega_R^4 + \frac{1}{2}a_{\omega_M}(T)\omega_M^2 + \frac{1}{4}b_{\omega_M}\omega_M^4$ $+\frac{1}{2}a_X(T)X^2 + \frac{1}{4}b_XX^4 + \frac{1}{2}a_P(T)P^2 + \frac{1}{4}b_PP^4$ $-EP - cX\omega_{R}\omega_{M} + \frac{1}{2}d_{1}P^{2}\omega_{R}^{2} + \frac{1}{2}d_{2}P^{2}\omega_{M}^{2}$ $\Delta S = -A_{\omega_R}[\omega_R^2(T, E_2) - \omega_R^2(T, E_1)] - A_{\omega_M}[\omega_M^2(T, E_2) - \omega_M^2(T, E_1)]$ $-A_{X}[X^{2}(T,E_{2})-X^{2}(T,E_{1})]-A_{P}[P^{2}(T,E_{2})-P^{2}(T,E_{1})]$

Perturbative Approach^[8]

$$T(E_{\alpha}) \approx -\frac{T^{(0)}}{C_{E}^{(0)}} \left(\pi_{\alpha}^{(0)} E_{\alpha} + \frac{1}{2} \pi_{\alpha\alpha}^{(1)} E_{\alpha}^{2} + \frac{1}{3} \pi_{\alpha\alpha\alpha}^{(2)} E_{\alpha}^{3} + \cdots \right) = \Delta T^{(1)}(E_{\alpha}) + \Delta T^{(2)}(E_{\alpha}) + \Delta T^{(3)}(E_{\alpha}) + \cdots$$



The contribution of the octahedral tilt (ω_R , ω_M) to the EC temperature is related to the direction of the electric field.

The electric field (direction, magnitude) can be used to regulate the EC temperature.





The sum of the EC temperatures of the dipoles $(\Delta T_X + \Delta T_P > 0)$ is always positive, which cannot explain the overall negative ECE.

The perturbative approach solely based on polarization agrees reasonably well with our predictions at low fields.

- Landau model with multiple important degrees of freedom
- > Main contribution: ω_R / ω_M , P and X
- Octahedral tiltings must be considered explicitly
- $\succ \omega_R / \omega_M$ contribution to ECE sensitive to the direction of the electric field

Summary

- > Max $\Delta T = -29$ K ([001] 0.70 MV/cm)
- \succ Room temperature $\Delta T = -4.7$ K ([001] 1.13 MV/cm)
- > Dipole canting model can not explain the negative ECE in AFE
- Perturbative approach is valid under low electric field

Contact information: binxu19@suda.edu.cn laurent@uark.edu

Acknowledgement:

National Natural Science Foundation of China: No. 12074277 Natural Science Foundation of Jiangsu Province (BK20201404) Office of Naval Research: No. N00014-21-1-2086

Reference:

[1] W. Geng, *et al.*, Adv. Mater. **27**, 3165–3169 (2015) [2] B. Xu, et al., Phys. Rev. B **100**, 020102 (2019) [3] L. Bellaiche, et al., Phys. Rev. B 88, 014104 (2013) [4] S. Prosandeev, et al., Adv. Funct. Mater. 23, 234–240 (2013)

[5] D. Albrecht, et al., Phys. Rev. B 81, 140401 (2010) [6] I. A. Kornev, et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 99, 227602 (2007) [7] S. Lisenkov, et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 103, 047204 (2009) [8] M. Graf, *et al.*, Commun. Mater **2**, 1–7 (2021)