The structure of electronic polarization and its strain dependence

Yanpeng Yao and Huaxiang Fu

Department of Physics, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, AR 72701, USA

(Dated: April 2, 2024)

Abstract

The (k_2) k_2 relation is called polarization structure. By density functional calculations, we study the polarization structure in ferroelectric perovskite PbT iO₃, revealing (1) the k_2 point that contributes most to the electronic polarization, (2) the magnitude of bandwidth, and (3) subtle curvature of polarization dispersion. We also investigate how polarization structure in PbT iO₃ is modiled by compressive inplane strains. The bandwidth of polarization dispersion in PbT iO₃ is shown to exhibit an unusual decline, though the total polarization is enhanced. As another outcome of this study, we formulate an analytical scheme for the purpose of identifying what determ ine the polarization structure at arbitrary k_2 points by means of W annier functions. We

nd that \mathfrak{k}_2) is determined by two competing factors: one is the overlaps between neighboring W annier functions within the plane perpendicular to the polarization direction, and the other is the localization length parallel to the polarization direction. Inplane strain increases the form er while decreases the latter, causing interesting non-m onotonous elects on polarization structure. Finally, polarization dispersion in another paradigm ferroelectric B aT iO₃ is discussed and compared with that of P bT iO₃.

PACS num bers: 77.22 E j, 77.80.-e

I. IN TRODUCTION

E lectric polarization is a key quantity for computing and understanding technologicallyrelevant e ective charges, dielectric and piezoelectric responses that are the derivatives of polarization with respect to atom ic displacement, electric eld, and strain, respectively.[] Polarization also plays an important role in the methodology development of the theory dealing with nite electric elds in in nite solids, by minimization of the free energy F =U = F = P [2, 3, 4, 5]. Total electric polarization consists of electronic contribution (P_{el}) and ionic component (P_{ion}) . Computing the latter component is straightforward using point charges, while calculating the electronic polarization is not. Today P_{el} is calculated using the sophisticated modern theory of polarization [6, 7]. A coording to the theory, P_{el} corresponds to a geometrical phase of the valence electron states,

$$P'_{el} = \frac{2e}{(2)^3} d\tilde{k}_2 (\tilde{k}_2) ;$$
 (1)

where

$$(\tilde{k}_{?}) = i \int_{n=1}^{M} d\tilde{k}_{k} h u_{n\tilde{k}} j \frac{\theta}{\theta k_{k}} j u_{n\tilde{k}} i$$
(2)

is the Berry phase of occupied B both wave functions u_{nk} . Subscripts k and ? m ean parallel and perpendicular to the polarization direction, respectively. Practically, to carry out the P_{el} calculations, the integral in Eq.(1) is replaced by a weighted sum m ation of the phases at sam pled discrete \tilde{k} -points (M onkhorst-Pack schem e[8], for exam ple) in the 2D $\tilde{k}_{?}$ plane, nam ely, $\tilde{P}_{el} = \frac{P_{k_{?}}}{k_{?}}$! ($\tilde{k}_{?}$) ($\tilde{k}_{?}$) with weight $\frac{P_{k_{?}}}{k_{?}}$! ($\tilde{k}_{?}$) = 1. The polarization at individual $\tilde{k}_{?}$, ($\tilde{k}_{?}$), is calculated as the phase of the determ inant form ed by valence states at two neighboring \tilde{k} s on the \tilde{k}_{k} string as [6, 7]

$$(\tilde{k}_{?}) = \operatorname{Im} fln \int_{j=0}^{\sqrt[4]{2}} \det(\operatorname{hu}_{k_{j},m} j_{k_{j+1},n} i)g : \qquad (3)$$

De ned as such, the total polarization $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}_{ion} + \mathcal{P}_{el}$ could be uniquely determ ined and gauge independent up to a modula constant. In Eq.(1) one sees that, it is the $(\mathfrak{K}_{?})$ phases at dimension event $\mathfrak{K}_{?}$ that determ ine the electronic polarization. The purpose of this work is to study the properties of $(\mathfrak{K}_{?})$.

The physical signicance of the \mathfrak{K}_2) quantity can be understood by analogy. It is well known that band structure, which describes the relation between single-particle orbital energy and electron wave vector \mathfrak{K} , is very useful for understanding electronic, photo-excitation, and photoem ission properties in solids[9]. The (K_2) K_2 relation m ay be similarly term ed as \polarization structure", or \polarization-phase structure". Electron states in band structure can be changed by photo-excitation or emission. The K_2 -point polarization phase can be altered by electric elds, which act as a possible excitation source for electrical polarization. Note that electrical elds do not alter the electron wave vector K_2) perpendicular to the direction of the eld, and thus K_2 remains a conserved quantity. The eld-induced variation of (K_2) in fact manifests the K_2 -dependent polarization current. As a result, the relevance of polarization structure to electronic polarization is like the band structure to electronic properties.

Furtherm ore, understanding the (k_2) quantity is of useful value from both fundamental and com putational points of view. Fundam entally, this quantity is determ ined by the B loch wave functions, not in the ordinary sense of spatial distribution, but through the interesting aspects of the Berry's phase of occupied manifold of electron states. Studying how (Ĩč~) depends on \tilde{k}_2 may yield better understanding of electron states, as well as the rather intriguing connection between these states and their contributions to polarization in insulator solids. Computationally, we rst recognize that the k_2 phase computed from Eq.(3) always produces a value within the principal range [0;2]. In reality, depending on the dispersion of (\tilde{k}_{2}) as a function of \tilde{k}_{2} , it is possible that the phases for di erent \tilde{k} points fall in dierent branches. In other words, the true \mathfrak{k}_2) values may fall in the principal range for some \tilde{k}_2 points (Let us denote this set of \tilde{k}_2 points as $\tilde{k}_2^{(I)}$), while falling out of the principal range for other \aleph_2 (to be denoted as $\aleph_2^{(II)}$). We nd num erically that this indeed happens for realm aterials particularly when polarization is large; a speci c example is given in section II. W hen this occurs, one must not articially shift the phases of the $\tilde{k}_{2}^{(II)}$ into the principal range, as computers do according to Eq.(3). Though this shift m akes no di erence to the polarization phase of individual \tilde{k}_2 points, it will alter the total \tilde{P}_{el} polarization, yielding spurious magnitude of polarization. Only when the phase of every K_2 is shifted by a constant 2 will the total P_{el} polarization remain equivalent. To nd out which \tilde{k}_2 may generate a phase not in the principal range, one in principle should compute the whole dispersion structure of polarization and then m ap out the (k_2) for all k_2 points based on the assumption that the $\ensuremath{(}\kappa_2$) phase is a continuous function of wave vector $\ensuremath{\kappa_2}$, which makes it is portant to study the properties of the (k_2) phase as a function of k_2 .

Despite the relevance, the dispersion structure of polarization is nevertheless not com -

pletely understood. M ore speci cally, (1) little is known about what determ ine the \mathfrak{K}_2) phase at individual \mathfrak{K}_2 . In Eq.(3), (\mathfrak{K}_2) is determ ined by the wave functions of a string of \mathfrak{K}_k points, not just a single \mathfrak{K} . A s a result, the answer to the question is highly non-trivial. (2) For a given ferroelectric substance (say, the prototypical PbT iO_3), it is not clear which \mathfrak{K}_2 exhibits the largest polarization contribution. D oes the point always contribute m ost or least? (3) W e do not know if the Berry's phases at di erent \mathfrak{K}_2 s share a similar value or are very di erent from each other, that is, a problem concerning the dispersion width of the polarization structure. Slightly m ore intriguing, one m ay wonder along which direction the \mathfrak{K}_2 curve shows the largest dispersion? (4) Even for two commonly studied ferroelectrics, BaT iO_3 and PbT iO_3, we do not know how di erent or similar their polarization structures are.

Recently, there is another active eld in the study of polarization, which concerns the use of inplane strain to tune the ferroelectric polarization [10, 11, 12, 13]. This tunability stems from the fundamental interest in the strain-polarization coupling. In posed under inplane strain ferroelectrics subject to modi cations of them ical bonds and/or charge transfer, thereby the interaction between atom s is altered. It has been known that a compressive inplane strain tends to enhance the total polarization. But the amplitude of enhancement was found to be highly material dependent.[12, 13] Considering the in portance of the strain elects, one might want to know how the \tilde{K}_2) phase from each \tilde{K}_2 can be in uenced by strain. Strain elects on the polarization dispersion remain largely unknown, however. It would be of interest to exam ine how the strain may tune and modify the dispersion of polarization structure. Speci c questions on this aspect are: in what manner would the inplane strain change the relative contributions and curvatures at dilerent \tilde{K}_2 , and how the band width of the dispersion curve is to be altered.

W ith these questions in m ind, we here study the dispersion structure of the polarization in ferroelectric perovskites, as well as its dependence on inplane strains. Two complementary approaches (rst-principles density functional calculations and analytical form ulations) are used. By means of analytical formulation, we aim at a better understanding on what speci c quantities and/or interactions determ ine the polarization at individual \Re_2 point. Our calculations reveal some useful know ledge on the polarization structure in perovskite ferroelectrics. For example, the largest (\Re_2) contribution is shown not to come from the zone center, but from the zone boundary. We also nd that the polarization curve in PbT iO₃

is notably at along the X_1 direction, and exhibits, however, a strong dispersion along the X_2 axis. Our theoretical analysis further reveals that the at dispersion along the

 X_1 direction is caused by a small amount of participation from the nearest-neighbor interaction between the W annier functions. Finally, the present study also dem onstrates som e rather interesting dimension PbT iO₃ and BaT iO₃, in terms of the polarization structures as well as their strain dependences.

II. THE POLARIZATION STRUCTURE OF LEAD TITANATE

We rst present the density functional calculations on the polarization structure in PbT iO₃. In its ferroelectric phase PbT iO₃ is tetragonal $(ja_1 j = ja_2 j = a; ja_3 j = c)$ and possesses a large spontaneous polarization. The polarization is along the c-axis direction, perpendicular to the K_2 plane. C alculations are performed within the local density approximation (LDA) [14]. We use pseudopotential method with mixed basis set [15]. The Troullier-Martins type of pseudopotentials are employed [16]. D etails for generating pseudopotentials, including atom ic congurations, pseudo/all-electron matching radii, and accuracy checking, were described elsewhere[17]. The energy cuto is 100 Ryd, which is su cient for convergence. The calculations are performed in two steps: the optimized cell structure and atom ic positions are rst determined by minimizing the total energy and H ellmann-Feynman forces, and after the structural optimization. [6, 7] O ur LDA -calculated inplane lattice constant for unstrained PT is a= 3.88A, with c=a = 1.04, both agreeing well with other existing calculations.

Figure 1 (a) shows the reduced 2D B rillouin zone that the $\tilde{k}_{?}$ points sample over. The calculated phases at individual $\tilde{k}_{?}$ points along the $! X_{1} ! X_{2} !$ path are given in Fig.1 (b). Reciprocal-space coordinates of X_{1} and X_{2} are $\tilde{k}_{?} = (=a; 0)$ and (=a; =a), respectively. The dispersion curve is rigidly shifted such that the phase at is taken as the zero reference.

Before we discuss the speci c results in Fig1, we need to point out that the shape of this k_2 -dependent phase curve is translation invariant. As is known, the electronic polarization alone can be an arbitrary value, if the solid is uniform ly translated with respect to a xed origin of coordinates. Though di erent translations will change the absolute location of the

polarization-dispersion curve, the shape of the curve remains una ected, however. This can be easily illustrated by analyzing the change in the (R_2) phase when one displaces the solid arbitrarily. Let the wave function of the original system be $_{n\bar{R}}(\mathbf{r}) = e^{i\bar{R}} \mathbf{r}_{u_{n\bar{R}}}(\mathbf{r})$, where $u_{n\bar{R}}(\mathbf{r}) = u_{n\bar{R}}(\mathbf{r} + R)$. Now, we displace the solid by an arbitrary vector \mathbf{r}_0 while the origin of coordinates is xed. Let us denote the original system using script A and the displaced system using script B, so $\mathbf{r}_{\rm B} = \mathbf{r}_{\rm A} + \mathbf{r}_0$. The wave functions of the displaced system satisfy

$${}^{\mathrm{B}}_{\mathrm{n}\,\mathrm{K}}(\mathbf{x}_{\mathrm{B}}) = {}^{\mathrm{A}}_{\mathrm{n}\,\mathrm{K}}(\mathbf{x}_{\mathrm{A}}) = {}^{\mathrm{A}}_{\mathrm{n}\,\mathrm{K}}(\mathbf{x}_{\mathrm{B}} \mathbf{x}_{\mathrm{B}}) : \qquad (4)$$

Thus we have $u_{nk}^{B}(\mathbf{r}_{B}) = e^{ik \cdot v} u_{nk}^{A}(\mathbf{r}_{B} \cdot v)$. Substituting this relation into Eq.(2) or Eq.(3), one can obtain that the (\mathbf{k}_{2}) of the displaced system is

^B
$$(\mathbf{\tilde{k}}_{2}) = {}^{A} (\mathbf{\tilde{k}}_{2}) + \mathbf{\tilde{r}}_{0} \quad \mathbf{\tilde{G}}_{k} \mathbf{N}_{band}^{occ} ;$$
 (5)

where $N_{band}^{occ} = M$ is the number of bands occupied by electrons. The phase di erences between the A and B systems are thus a constant, independent of k_2 .

Several observations are ready in Fig.1 (b): (1) The largest (K_2) polarization does not come from the zone-center point. Rather surprisingly, the largest (K_2) phase is from the X_2 point which lies at the far end of the BZ. (2) The polarization curve is at along the

 X_1 line, showing only a small dispersion. On the other hand, the dispersion becomes very large along the X_2 direction. (3) At K_2 points of high symmetry (such as , X_1 , or X_2), the curve in Fig.1 (b) has zero slope, similar to the electron band structure. (4) The dispersion of polarization also shows subtle details which could not be easily understood. For example, there is a local (though not very pronounced) maximum along the $_1$ line, making the X_1 point a local minimum in both X_1 and X_1 X_2 directions.

Our calculations further reveal that, despite the fact that the polarization in Fig.1(b) exhibits substantial \aleph_2 dependency, the dispersion width (0.6) is much smaller than 2. This noting is important for the following reason. As described in the introduction, if the dimension of the \aleph_2) phases at dimension of phase are greater than 2, one would encounter a dimension in fig.1 (b) the branch of phase a specific \aleph_2 points are mapped out. Fortunately, the result in Fig.1 (b) tells us that the phase contributions from dimension dimension dimension are fairly close, and the dimension are far less than the critical value of 2 that may

cause the above di culty. Nevertheless, we should point out that even a sm all polarization dispersion as in Fig.1 (b) may still give rise to spurious results on total polarization. To illustrate this, we displace all ve atom s in PbT i O_3 along the polar c-axis by a distance z_0 . Fig.2 (a) shows the total (electronic + ionic) polarization, computed from the geometric phase, as a function of the displacement z_0 (in unit of c). Intuition tells us that the total polarization should be uniquely determ ined and translationally invariant. However, we see in Fig.2 (a) that unphysical discontinuity happens for som e_{z_0} points, and this discontinuity shows up periodically. To understand what causes the discontinuity, we exam ine the phase contributions from individual \aleph_2 (sampled according to the M onkhorst-Pack scheme[8]), depicted in Fig.2 (b). Figure 2 (b) shows that the individual $\frac{1}{2}$, phases indeed are a periodic function of z_0 , explaining why the discontinuity in F ig 2 (a) is periodic. Here it may be useful to comment brie y on the length of the periodicity. One might think that by displacing the solid by a distance of c in the c-axis direction, the (k_2) phase would change by a value of 2. However, the periodicity in Fig2 is much smaller than c. The explanation is simple. As a matter of fact, in real space the individual (\aleph_2) has a periodicity of $\frac{1}{N_{\text{band}}^{\text{occ}}}$ c (instead of c), which for PbT iO $_3$ the periodicity is 0.0455c because N $_{\text{band}}^{\text{occ}}$ = 22. This is indeed consistent with the num erical calculation in PT (Fig.2b). The length of periodicity can be seen from Eq.(5), showing that, whenever $\mathbf{r}_0 = \frac{n}{N_{\text{band}}^{\text{occ}}} \mathbf{\tilde{K}}_k$ (n is an arbitrary integer and $\mathbf{\tilde{K}}_k$ is the lattice vector along the G_k direction), the B (\tilde{K}_2) and A (\tilde{K}_2) di er by B (\tilde{K}_2) = A (\tilde{K}_2) + 2 n. Fig 2 (b) also reveals the reason responsible for the discontinuity of the total polarization. Spurious discontinuity occurs when the (k_2) phases of some (but not all) individual k_2 exceed 2 $[Fig_2(b)]$. Under this situation, computers incorrectly shift the phases of these \tilde{k}_2 points back to the principle range, yielding spurious total polarization. A coording to our experience, spurious polarization often takes place in two circum stances: one is form aterials of very large polarization, such as tetragonal B iSco₃, and another is when atom s in the unit cell are translationally shifted. G iven the small bandwidth of the (\tilde{k}_2) dispersion, it is now straightforward that, by using di erent 13, we can avoid the spurious polarization. However for some materials, if the dispersion width from dierent \tilde{k}_2 points is larger than 2, one may have to rely on the continuity of the (k_2) phases, and map out the phases of individual \tilde{k}_2 points over the whole two-dimensional \tilde{k}_2 plane in order to different differences of the correct phase branch.

III. STRAIN DEPENDENCE OF POLARIZATION STRUCTURE

An important property of ferroelectrics is that the polarization is strongly dependent on strain. W hile strain can change the total polarization, response of the polarization dispersion structure to strain could also be an interesting problem . Here we investigate the response of the polarization structure under inplane strain in PbT iO₃. For each in-plane (a) lattice constant, the out-of-plane c lattice constant and atom ic positions are fully relaxed, by m inim izing the DFT total energy. The polarization structure is then determ ined using the optim al structure.

Figure 3 shows the phase dispersion curves for PbT iO $_3$ at di erent inplane lattice constants. All curves are shifted so that the phase at point is zero, in order to conduct direct comparison. Three conclusions can be drawn from Fig.3: (1) The relative phase, (Ĩ K₂) (), changes drastically for X_2 , but not so signi cantly for X_1 . (2) At increasing strain, (or smaller inplane a constant), the bandwidth of the dispersion initially changes very little when a = 3.84A, and then starts to decrease upon further increasing strain to a = 3:80A. The decline of the dispersion bandwidth is rather surprising, since a compressive inplane strain is known to enhance the total polarization in PT. The decline is also counterintuitive when one considers that the decreasing inplane lattice constant m akes the atom -atom coupling stronger within the inplane directions, and should therefore have increased the bandwidth. One possible reason that may cause the decrease of the bandwidth is given in the next section. As a result of the declining dispersion, the polarization curve becomes notably \setminus at " at small a = 3:65A. (3) The curvature of the dispersion also shows subtle changes, featured by the fact that a new dispersion m in in um appears along the X_2 line at large strain. As a consequence, the dispersion curvature [i.e., the second derivative $5 \frac{2}{\kappa_2} P(\tilde{k}_2)$] at point alters its sign from being positive (at large a) to negative (at small a). Furthermore, the local maximum between X_1 for unstrained PT turns into a new minimum at large inplane strains. Meanwhile, the X₁ point changes from a minimum into a saddle point, when strain increases.

The calculations thus reveal that, while inplane strain has been previously known to introduce interesting modi cations (sometimes markedly enlarged [2] and sometimes remarkably small [13]) to the total c-axis polarization, its elects on the polarization dispersion at individual \tilde{k}_2 points appear to be even richer, showing that the polarization structure

indeed worths studying. The subtle response of the polarization structure, as predicted above, indicate that there is new and rather complex physics behind the results in Fig.3. While we know that the strain-induced changes in the polarization dispersion must be associated with the fundam entalm odi cation of electron wave functions, we also have to admit that the DFT results obtained in our num erical calculations are puzzling, and an intuitive understanding of the results is di cult for two reasons. First, this is an early attempt to investigate the polarization structure, and there is not much previous understanding in the literature. Second, although Eq.(2) and Eq.(3) allow us to compute precisely the polarization of individual \Re_2 , a direct and more intuitive connection between (\Re_2) and B loch wave functions is hard to capture from these equations. As a result, it would be very helpful if one could individual \Re_2 point? In the next section, we attempt a scheme which we wish (\Re_2) maxim izes at the X $_2$ point? In the next section, we attempt a scheme which we wish

IV. WANNIER FUNCTION FORMULATION OF POLARIZATION STRUC-

to be able to o er a more intuitive understanding of the polarization structure.

As mentioned above, Eq.(2) and Eq.(3) give us little intuitive sense on the direct \aleph_2 dependence of the Berry's phase. In order to get m ore insight, we use W annier functions to analyze the polarization structure. P reviously, W annier functions have been found very useful in analyzing real-space local polarization [18, 19]. Here we employ the W annier-function approach for a di erent purpose, namely to understand the \aleph_2 -dependence of the polarization structure. The W annier functions are de ned as

$$W_{n}(\mathbf{r} \quad \mathbf{R}) = \frac{\mathbf{p}_{\overline{\mathbf{N}}}}{(2)^{3}} \sum_{\mathbf{B} \in \mathbf{Z}}^{\mathbf{Z}} d\mathbf{k} e^{i\mathbf{k} \cdot (\mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{R})} u_{nk}(\mathbf{r})$$
(6)

or

$$u_{nk}(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{1}{\mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{N}} \sum_{\mathbf{R}}^{\mathbf{X}} e^{i\mathbf{R} \cdot (\mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{R})} \mathbf{W}_{n}(\mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{R})$$
(7)

where \tilde{R} runs over the whole real-space lattice vectors. By substituting Eq.(7) into Eq.(2) and carrying out analytically the integral over \tilde{k}_k , it is straightforward to derive, for tetrag-

onal perovskites, the polarization at individual \tilde{k}_2 as

$$(\tilde{k}_{?}) = \frac{2}{c} \sum_{\substack{R_{?} \\ R_{?}}}^{X} X^{M} \sum_{n \in I}^{Z} r_{k} W_{n} (r) W_{n} (r R_{?}) e^{i\tilde{k}_{?} R_{?}} dr$$
(8)

where \mathbf{r}_k is the projection of vector \mathbf{r} along the polarization direction, \mathbf{R}_2 is the projection of lattice vector \mathbf{R} onto the plane perpendicular to the polarization direction. For convenience of discussion, we separate the sum over \mathbf{R}_2 into the $\mathbf{R}_2 = 0$ term and the rests,

$$(\mathcal{K}_{2}) = {}_{0} + \frac{2}{c} \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{K}_{2} \in 0}}^{\mathbf{X} \times \mathbf{M}} \sum_{n=1}^{\mathbf{X}} \mathbf{r}_{\mathbf{k}} \mathbb{W}_{n} (\mathbf{r}) \mathbb{W}_{n} (\mathbf{r} \times \mathbf{K}_{2}) e^{i\mathbf{k}_{2} \cdot \mathbf{K}_{2}} d\mathbf{r}$$
(9)

where for $\mathbb{R}_{?} = 0$, $_{0} = \frac{P_{M_{n=1}} \mathbb{R}_{n}}{(\mathbf{r})_{k} \mathbb{W}_{n}} (\mathbf{r}) \mathbb{W}_{n} (\mathbf{r}) d\mathbf{r}$ is the phase contribution from the same unit cell. Eq.(9) is the basis for understanding the polarization structure. From this equation, we observe the following.

First, it is now clear that the \aleph_2 -dependent part of (\aleph_2) comes only from the $\aleph_2 \notin 0$ terms, which correspond to the overlap of the W annier functions in neighboring cells. In other words, the \aleph_2 dependence of the (\aleph_2) phase results from the overlap of the W annier functions of dimensional that are displaced by \aleph_2 from each other within the plane that is perpendicular to the direction of polarization. While the choice of the W annier function is known to be non-unique due to the gauge uncertainty, the sum of the W annier-function overlap over occupied bands is a uniquely de ned quality which does not depend on the gauge. It is this quantity that determ ines the shape of the polarization structure.

Second, Eq.(9) explains why the bandwidth of polarization dispersion is often much smaller than 2. Since only the second term in this equation is \aleph_2 dependent, and since the W annier functions are generally well localized compared to the size of unit cell, one expects the overlap $W_n(r)W_n(r = \Re_2)$ to be much smaller than unity for $\Re_2 \in 0$. This is consistent with our num erical results in Fig.1, namely, $(\aleph_2)_0 = 0.6 = 2$.

Third, since the dispersion in (R_2) comes from the overlap of the W annier functions between cells of di erent R_2 s in the xy-inplane directions, it explains why the polarization structure is very sensitive to inplane strain, where by changing inplane lattice constant, the distances between neighboring cells are electively altered. M eanwhile, we recognize that a precise understanding of how the bandwidth depends on the inplane strain is not as simple as one might think. Naively one tends to think that, with the decline of inplane lattice constant, the dispersion is to increase, since the overlap W_n ($r = R_2$) increases when \mathbb{R}_2 decreases. This will lead to the widening of the polarization dispersion width, which is opposite to what we found in Fig.3. This puzzling contradiction can be resolved by noticing that, in addition to being dependent on the overlap strength between $\mathbb{W}_n(\mathbf{r})$ and $\mathbb{W}_n(\mathbf{r} - \mathbb{R}_2)$ within the perpendicular plane, the dispersion width also hinges on the localization length $(\mathbb{I}_k^{\mathbb{W}})$ of the W annier functions along the direction parallel to the polarization, as a result of the \mathbf{r}_k operator in Eq.(9). W ith the increasing inplane strain, the $\mathbb{I}_k^{\mathbb{W}}$ is to shrink. We thus see that the bandwidth of polarization is determined by the balance of two competing factors between the increasing W annier-function overlap and the decreasing $\mathbb{I}_k^{\mathbb{W}}$ becalization length. W hen the latter dom inates, the bandwidth declines as we have seen in Fig.3 from num erical calculations.

V. CURVE ANALYSIS

W ith the general understanding of the polarization structure in the above section, we next attempt to determ ine analytically the polarization dispersion specifically for PbT iD₃, aim ed to obtain further insight into the important details of the polarization structure. As will become clear later, our analysis in the following also explains what determ ines the (K_2) polarization at special points of $, X_1$ and X_2 . We begin by defining parameters

$$t(\mathcal{R}_{?}) = \frac{2}{c} \sum_{n=1}^{\mathcal{M}} \mathbf{r}_{k} W_{n} (\mathbf{r}) W_{n} (\mathbf{r} - \mathcal{R}_{?}) d\mathbf{r}; \qquad (10)$$

and then,

$$(\tilde{K}_{?}) = \int_{R_{?}}^{X} t(\tilde{R}_{?}) e^{i\tilde{K}_{?} \cdot R_{?}} : \qquad (11)$$

For dielectrics of insulating nature, W annier functions are highly localized, and decay exponentially with the distance [20, 21]. As a result, $t(\mathbb{R}_2)$ also decay quickly with the increase of \mathfrak{R}_2 j so we can adopt the tight-binding like approach and consider only several \mathbb{R}_2 s that correspond to some nearest neighbors (NN). We consider up to the 2nd NN s, where

$$\mathbb{R}_{2} = \begin{cases}
8 & (0 & 0) \text{ on site} \\
(a & 0) & 1NNs \\
(a & 0) & 1NNs \\
(a & a) & 2NNs
\end{cases}$$

Taking advantage of tetragonal sym m etry, we can rewrite Eq.(11) as

$$(\tilde{k}_{2}) = t_{0} + 2t_{1} [\cos(k_{1}a) + \cos(k_{2}a)]$$

$$+ 2t_{2} [\cos(k_{1} + k_{2})a + \cos(k_{1} - k_{2})a];$$
(12)

where t_1 is the ith NNs contribution de ned in Eq.(10), and $\tilde{k}_2 = (k_1; k_2)$. This expression gives us a more direct sense of the (\tilde{k}_2) \tilde{k}_2 polarization dispersion, approximated to the second nearest neighbors. At special \tilde{k}_2 points of , X₁, and X₂, the phases are () = $t_0 + 4t_1 + 4t_2$, $(X_1) = t_0$ $4t_2$, and $(X_2) = t_0$ $4t_2 + 4t_2$, respectively. We could thus clearly see that the t_0 term, corresponding to $\tilde{k}_2 = 0$, acts to rigidly shift the polarization curve as a whole. Meanwhile, the phase relative to the (i.e., the dispersion) is determined by the t_1 and t_2 quantities, and more specifically,

$$(X_1)$$
 () = 4t 8t;
 (X_2) () = 8t : (13)

These equations are useful, since they tell us that (1) the relative height at X_2 (which contributes most to the polarization in PT), (X_2) (), is determined by t, associated with the overlap of the W annier function in the 1st NNs. $t_1 < 0$ for PbT iO₃ in equilibrium. (2) Under the assumption that t_2 is negligible, (X_2) () will be larger than (X_1) () by a factor of 2.

W ithin the second nearest-neighbor approximation, one can further determ ine analytically the dispersion along the $X_1 X_2$ line in the 2D B rillouin zone as

$$\begin{cases} 8 \\ \gtrless \\ t_0 + 2t_1 + (2t_1 + 4t_2)\cos(k_1a); & \text{for } ! X_1 \text{ with } k_2 = 0 \\ \end{cases}$$

$$\begin{cases} k_2 \\ e \\ \end{cases} = \begin{array}{c} t_0 & 2t_2 + (2t_1 & 4t_2)\cos(k_2a); & \text{for } X_1 ! X_2 \text{ with } k_1 = =a \\ \vdots \\ t_0 + 2t_2 + 4t_1\cos(k_1a) + 2t_2\cos(2k_1a); \text{ for } X_2 ! & \text{with } k_1 = k_2 : \end{array}$$

The polarization structure could thus be expressed as a simple combination of cosine functions.

To exam ine whether the second-NN approximation is su cient, we t the analytical results to the numerical DFT calculations to determ ine the t_i (i = 0;1;2) parameters. Note that only (K_2) s at three points (i.e., , X_1 and X_2) are tted. The obtained t_i values are given in Table I. These values are then used to determ ine the whole dispersion curve,

TABLE I: The tting t_1 and t_2 parameters for PbT iO₃ at dierent lattice constants. t_0 is not shown here since it does not a ect dispersion.

a(A)	t_1	t_2
3.88	-0.072	0.031
3.84	-0.072	0.032
3.80	-0.064	0.031
3.72	-0.031	0.023
3.65	-0.010	0.016

shown in Fig.1 (b) for PbT iO₃ in equilibrium structure of a = 3.88A. We could see that the analytical curve agrees well with the DFT result, in plying that the 2nd NN approximation works. On the other hand, some ne structure of the curve (such as the small local maximum along the X₁) can not be reproduced, where for a better thing, approximation beyond the 2nd NN swould be necessary.

From Table I one can also see how the t_i quantities are in unneed by inplane strain. t_1 declines substantially as a decreases below 3.80A, while t_2 shows a less dependence on inplane strain. This makes sense since, by varying the inplane strain, the main e ect lies in altering the nearest-neighbor interaction among W annier functions. For a > 3.80A, $t_1 j$ approximately equals $2t_2 j$ conming the importance of the nearest neighbor interaction. For large strains of a < 3.72A, $t_1 j$ and $t_2 j$ become comparable, for which it is likely that higher orders of NNs are also needed.

VI. COMPARISON W ITH BARIUM TITANATE

It is of interest to com pare the polarization dispersions between $B aT iO_3$ (BT) and PbT iO_3 (PT), since these two substances have rather di erent tetragonality, m agnitude of polarization, and sizes of A-site atom s. For this purpose, we have studied the polarization structure in BT, for which a tetragonal symmetry is enforced so that a direct comparison with PT can be made. Following the same procedure as for PT, we optimize the cell structure and atom ic positions of BT at di erent in plane lattice constants, and calculate the corresponding polarization structures.

Fig.4 displays the polarization structure for BaT iO₃ at dimensional event inplane lattice constants. Let us not focus on the dispersion of the equilibrium BaT iO₃. The LDA -calculated equilibrium inplane lattice constant of BT is a = 3.95A. Apart from similarities to PT (e.g.,

m axim izes at X_2), our calculations reveal some interesting di erences between PT and BT under zero strain: (1) The BT dispersion curve has a signi cantly sm aller bandwidth (0.42) than that of PT (0.57). Since the bandwidth is determined by the di erence

 (X_2) (), i.e., by t, a sm aller bandwidth indicates less overlapping W annier's functions between nearest neighbors in B aT iO₃, which could be explained by the larger inplane lattice constant a for BT at equilibrium. (2) Unlike PT, the polarization in BT is not sm all at X₁. This again can be attributed to the large inplane lattice constant in BT, which leads to a negligible contribution from the 2nd NNs, i.e., t_2 is sm all in BT. Indeed, we num erically found that t_2 is -0.007 in BT, com pared to 0.031 in PT. By Eq.(13), (X₁) is about half of the (X₂) value if t_2 is sm all, which is indeed born out in Fig.4. (3)As a consequence of observation (2), the dispersions of BT and PT along the ! X₁ are not quite sim ilar. There is a local maximum between X₁ for PT, whereas for BT, no local maximum exists and X₁ becomes a saddle point.

Upon strain, BaT iO₃ and PbT iO₃ exhibit sharp di erence in their strain dependence of dispersion bandwidth. As we saw previously in Fig.3, inplane strain causes the bandwidth declining for PbT iO₃. However, for BaT iO₃, a dram atic enlargement in bandwidth occurs, when a decreases from 3.95A to 3.85A. The bandwidth maintains a large value at a=3.75A, after which it starts to drop. In BaT iO₃ the polarization dispersion bandwidth thus shows an interesting non-monotonous dependence on inplane strain. This characteristic non-monotonous dependence strongly supports our conjecture that the two competing factors determ ine the bandwidth, as described above in Section IV.W hen strain is small in BT, the overlapping of W annier functions located at the nearest neighboring R_2 s plays a dom inant role, and the increasing overlap leads to a larger f_1 j and thus larger bandwidth. As inplane strain becomes large (a < 3.85A), the atom -atom interaction along the c-axis is considerably weakened due to elongated c-lattice length. As a consequence, the shrinking $\mathbb{I}^{\mathbb{F}}_{k}$ localization length of W annier functions along the r_{k} direction takes over and becomes dom inant, giving rise to the declining bandwidth. This, once again, reveals that the polarization dispersion contains rich inform ation. To make more quantitative comparison, we replot in Fig.5 the strain dependence of the (K_2) phases at X₁ and X₂, relative to the

point. Fig.5 is of som e useful value since it allow sus to contrast the \aleph_2 -speci-c polarizations in two materials at the same – xed inplane lattice constant. The dimense between BT and PT is thus not related in a signi-cant sense to atom -atom distance, but largely due to the overlap of respective W annier functions. In Fig.5, both (X₁) and (X₂) are seen to be far greater in BaTiO₃ than in PbTiO₃, for a – xed a constant. The greater values of \aleph_2) in BT could possibly originate from the fact that the W annier functions in this material is more spreading due to the larger size of Ba atom.

From the comparison between PT and BT, we could see that the polarization structure has some common features for materials with similar structure, and meanwhile, some distinctions revealing the identities of materials. The common features allow us to understand the polarization structure in general, just as for band structure, most III-V sem iconductors have direct band gaps. Di erences in polarization structure manifest the electron wave functions and interatom ic interactions on microscopic scale.

VII. SUMMARY

Two di erent approaches are employed to study the polarization structure in perovskite ferroelectrics. Numerically we use the density functional total-energy calculations and the modern theory of polarization. A nalytically we form ulate a scheme to describe the \aleph_2 dependence of the polarization phase using W annier functions. By parameterizing the W annierfunction overlapping, we further identify the quantities that determ ine the (\aleph_2) phases at special \aleph_2 points of interest. Our specie c notings are summarized in the following.

For P bT iO₃ at equilibrium, (i) the (R_2) phase maxim izes at the B rillouin zone boundary of the 2D R_2 plane, not the zone center. (ii) The polarization structure shows little dispersion along the X_1 line. However, the dispersion is large along the X_2 . (iii) The bandwidth of the dispersion curve is far below 2. The sm all dispersion considerably eases the disput of in assigning the correct branch of individual R_2 phase, but caution still needs to be taken when the (R_2) phase is approaching 2.

Analytically, (iv) the expression, Eq.(9), is given as the basis for understanding the polarization structure. It also explains why the polarization bandwidth is small compared to 2. (v) The polarization phase at individual \tilde{K}_2 is revealed to depend on the competition of two factors, namely the overlapping strength of W annier functions within the perpendicular

 \mathbb{R}_2 plane and the localization length $\mathbb{I}_k^{W F}$ of these W annier functions. (vi) W ithin the 2NN approximation, the (X₁) and (X₂) values in ferroelectric perovskite are found to be (X₁) () = 4t 8t, (X₂) () = 8t. If t₂ is negligible, the latter is 2 times of the former. (vii) W hen PbT iO₃ is under compressive inplane strain, the polarization bandwidth is found to decrease, whereas the total polarization increases. The declining bandwidth in plies that the localization length $\mathbb{I}_k^{W F}$ of W annier functions plays a dominating role in PbT iO₃.

By comparing BaT iO₃ with PbT iO₃, we show (viii) the equilibrium BT exhibits a smaller bandwidth of 0.42, as compared to the bandwidth of 0.57 in PT. (ix) (X₁) in BaT iO₃ is not small, unlike PT. The di erence comes from the fact that $\frac{1}{2}$ is negligible in BT, leading to the result that (X₁) is about half of the value of (X₂). But in PT, $\frac{1}{2}$ can not be neglected, and acts to o set the $\frac{1}{2}$ contribution, giving rise to smaller (X₁) and at dispersion along the

 X_1 line. (x) A s B aT iO₃ is under increasing inplane strains, its polarization bandwidth displays a characteristic non-m onotonous variation by rst increasing dram atically and then declining. The nding lends a support to the qualitative understanding that two competing factors determ ine the (K_2) phase. (xi) W hen B aT iO₃ and PbT iO₃ are constrained to the same inplane lattice constant, the (X_1) and (X_2) are shown to be signi cantly larger in BT than in PT, unlike the case when two m aterials are in equilibrium.

We conclude by pointing out that there are still m any aspects of polarization structure we do not yet understand. For example, we have not pursued beyond the 2nd nearest neighbors to explain the local maximum between and X_1 in unstrained PT.We also do not know the physical signi cance when (X_1) changes from a local minimum to a saddle point as displayed in Fig.3 for PbTiO₃ under strains. We believe that further analysis of the polarization structure could yield better know ledge on the physics of dielectrics. Like band structure of solids, we hope that the polarization structure can provide us a new tool of studying ferroelectric materials and properties.

This work was supported by the O ce of Naval Research.

M E.Lines and A M.G lass, Principles and Applications of Ferroelectrics and Related M aterials (C larendon, 0 xford, 1979).

- [2] I. Souza, J. Iniquez, and D. Vanderbilt, Phys. Rev. Lett. 89, 117602 (2002).
- [3] P.Um ari and A. Pasquarello, Phys. Rev. Lett. 89, 157602 (2002)
- [4] H.Fu and L.Bellaiche, Phys. Rev. Lett. 91, 057601 (2003).
- [5] O.D ieguez and D.Vanderbilt, Phys. Rev. Lett. 96, 056401 (2006).
- [6] R.D.King-Smith and D.Vanderbilt, Phys. Rev. B 47, 1651 (1993).
- [7] R.Resta, Rev.M od.Phys. 66, 889 (1994).
- [8] H J.M onkhorst and J.D. Pack, Phys. Rev. B 13, 5188 (1976).
- [9] P.Y.Yu and M.Cardona, Fundam entals of Sem iconductors, (Springer, Berlin, 2001).
- [10] K J. Choi, M. Biegalski, Y L. Li, A. Sharan, J. Schubert, R. Uecker, P. Reiche, Y B. Chen, X Q. Pan, V. Gopalan, L.-Q. Chen, D G. Schlom, and C B. Eom, Science 306, 1005 (2004).
- [11] J.H. Haeni, P. Irvin, W. Chang, R. Uecker, P. Reiche, Y.L. Li, S. Choudhury, W. Tian, M.E. Hawley, B. Craigo, A.K. Tagantsev, X.Q. Pan, S.K. Strei er, L.Q. Chen, S.W. Kirchoefer, J. Levy, and D.G. Schlom, Nature (London) 430, 758 (2004).
- [12] C.Ederer and N.A.Spaldin, Phys.Rev.Lett. 95, 257601 (2005).
- [13] H N.Lee, S M. Nakhmanson, M.F. Chisholm, H.M. Christen, K M. Rabe, and D. Vanderbilt, Phys. Rev. Lett. 98, 217602 (2007).
- [14] P.Hohenberg and W.Kohn, Phys. Rev. 136, B864 (1964); W.Kohn and L.J.Sham, Phys. Rev. 140, A 1133 (1965).
- [15] H.Fu and O.Gulseren, Phys. Rev. B 66, 214114 (2002).
- [16] N. Troullier and J.L. Martins, Phys. Rev. B 43, 1993 (1991).
- [17] Details were given in Ref.15 and in Z.A lahm ed and H.Fu, Phys. Rev. B 76, 224101 (2007).
- [18] X.Wu,O.Dieguez, KM.Rabe, and D.Vanderbilt, Phys.Rev.Lett. 97, 107602 (2006).
- [19] M. Stengel and N. A. Spaldin, Phys. Rev. B 75, 205121 (2007).
- [20] J.Des Cloizeaux, Phys. Rev. 135, A 698 (1964).
- [21] N.M arzari and D.Vanderbilt, Phys. Rev. B 56, 12847 (1997).



FIG.1: (a) The 2D Brillouin zone for the $\tilde{k}_{?}$ plane; (b) Berry's phase at di erent $\tilde{k}_{?}$ points for PbT iO₃ at equilibrium (symbols: direct calculation results; curve: analytical results). The ($\tilde{k}_{?}$) phase is in units of radian.



FIG. 2: (C olor online) (a) Total polarization in strained PbT iO₃ of inplane lattice constant a = 3:72A as a function of the uniform displacement z_0 of ve atom s; (b) the \mathfrak{K}_2) phases at six M onhorst-Pack sampling \mathfrak{K}_2 points as a function of z_0 . For each c=N $_{\text{band}}^{\text{occ}}$ change in z_0 , the (\mathfrak{K}_2) phases change by 2 . In (b), the (\mathfrak{K}_2) phase curves are enlarged in the right side of the gure for z_0 between 0.044 and 0.048.



FIG. 3: (Cobr online) The phases of dierent \tilde{k}_2 -points, for PbT iO₃ under dierent inplane lattice constants. Symbols are direct calculation results; curves are guides for eyes.



FIG. 4: (Color online) Polarization dispersions for BaT iO $_3$ at di erent inplane lattice constants. Symbols are direct calculation results; lines are guide for eyes.



FIG.5: Dependencies of the (K_2) phases at X₁ point (left) and at X₂ point (right) as a function of inplane lattice constant, for PT and BT.