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Abstract

MAX phases have attracted increased attention due to their unique combination of ceramic and metallic properties. Point-defects are known to play vital role in the structural, electronic and transport properties of alloys. However, the effects of disorder are not well explored, despite being a key player in this context. This work investigates the alloying effect on structural-stability, energy-stability, electronic-structure, and diffusion barrier of point defects in MAX phase alloys within first-principles density functional framework. The vacancy (V_M, V_A, V_X) and antisite (M-A; M-X) defects are considered with M and A site disorder in (Zr-M)_2(AA')C, where M=Cr,Nb,Ti and AA'=Al, Al-Sn, Pb-Bi. Our calculations suggest that the chemical disorder helps lower the formation energies of V_A compared to V_M and V_X. The V_A diffusion barrier is also significantly reduced for M-site disorder compared to their ordered counterpart. We believe that our study will provide a fundamental understanding and an approach to tailor the key properties that can lead to the discovery of new MAX phase alloys.
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Introduction

Research in high-temperature structural materials is gaining momentum due to increased energy demand. The fast-growing nuclear industry can provide a big renewable source to solve future energy issues. MAX phases are a new class of high-temperature alloy system with the general formula M_{n+1}AX_n [n=1,3; M=transition element; A=A-group, and X=C or N]. The high-temperature structural behavior, such as, damage-tolerance and oxidation-resistance etc., make MAX-phases a potential candidate for the nuclear application [2-5]. Research on MAX phases have also led to the discovery of MXenes based on the selective leaching of the A element [6,7]. All above attributes ensure the possibility of wide technological applications within the MAX phase space. Many MAX phase properties of interest in these materials depend on the nature and behavior of point defects within the lattice. For example, in the context of nuclear applications, e.g., irradiation degrades the material by damage accumulation. This modifies the
overall mechanical and physical properties of MAX phases through point defects. In the past, irradiation has been used to alter the alloy microstructure by creating point defects [8-11]. These defects interact with other defects and atoms within the solid-solution while they migrate through the lattice [12].

Chemical disorder induced alloy complexity is another factor that can significantly impact the defect evolution, energy dissipation, and radiation resistance [13-16] that arises from the interaction of (energetic) ions with solids in a radiation environment. Nevertheless, the investigation of defect physics of disordered MAX phases remains relatively unexplored relative to other materials systems. It becomes desirable to understand the interplay of disorder and the point defects to develop an understanding towards the microstructural changes due to irradiation for the future nuclear structural materials [17-26]. Recent studies show that disorder can be used to tailor alloy properties to achieve desirable physical and chemical properties, e.g., thermoelectric-effects [27], charge-transport [28], and magnetoresistance [29]. Therefore, the effect of disorder on atomic behavior, formation energetics, and vacancy migration are important to understand in order to optimize the use of MAX phases.

In this work, we discuss the impact of chemical disorder on defect dynamics in MAX phase alloys by considerable changes to the energy dissipation pathways. Five MAX phase alloys \( \text{M}_2\text{AlC, M=Ti, Zr, Nb, Cr, Ta (for Ta see supplement)} \), especially of the 211 chemistry, are chosen for defect and disorder investigation as well as their promising oxidation resistance [30] and their potential deployment in nuclear applications (particularly the Zr-based MAX phases). We present a systematic study of minimum energy pathways for M-, A-, and (M- & A-) site disorder. Our calculations also show that tuning the chemical disorder leads to notable changes on defect formation and migration energies. To exemplify, we apply first-principles density functional theory and climbing nudge elastic band (cNEB) scheme to study \( V_M, V_A \) and \( V_C \) vacancy mediated diffusion in \((\text{Zr-M})_2\text{AlC}\) and \((\text{Zr-M})_2(\text{A}-\text{A'})\text{C}\), where \( M=\text{Cr,Nb,Ti}\) and \( \text{A-A'}=\text{Al, Al-Sn, Pb-Bi} \). The detailed discussion about the dependence of the “migration energy” on the alloying elements and defects is provided. We further showcase the electronic-structure origin of defect properties and its connection to elemental properties, such as, atomic-radii and electronegativity.

**Computational details**

We use first-principles density functional theory as implemented in Vienna *Ab-initio* Simulation Package (VASP) [31,32]. The Perdew, Burke and Ernzerhof (PBE) generalized gradient approximation is used with with a cut-off energy of 533 eV [33]. A quasi-random supercell of 200 atoms has been used to mimic disorder on M-, A- and/or X-site sublattices. We use Alloy Theoretic Automated Toolkit (ATAT) [34] to generate disordered special quasi-random supercell structures (SQS) and randomly distribute the defects. Both cationic and anionic vacancy defects are considered in disorder \((\text{M-M'})_2(\text{A-A'})(\text{X-X'})\). The antisite pairs are created by interchanging the M (A) or A (M) atoms within neighboring layers. We perform geometry optimization, electronic
self-consistency and cNEB [35] calculations to calculate structural parameters, formation energies and diffusion barriers, respectively. The gamma-centered Monkhorst-Pack [36] k-mesh of 1x1x1 and 3x3x3 is used for Brillouin zone integration during geometry-optimization and charge self-consistency, respectively. Total energies and forces are converged to $10^{-5}$ eV/cell and -0.001 eV/Å.

We use the chemical potential of an isolated gas-phase atom for defect energy calculations. The defects are considered as charge-neutral because of the metallic nature of MAX phase compounds. The vacancy formation energy ($E_{\text{form}}^{\text{Vac}}$) is defined as:

$$E_{\text{form}}^{\text{Vac}} (V_{M/A/X}) = E_{\text{tot}} (V_{M/A/X}) - E_{\text{tot}}(\text{MAX}) + \mu_{M/A/X}$$

where $M/A/X$, $M (=\text{Ti}, \text{Ta}, \text{Cr}, \text{Nb}, \text{Zr})$, $A=\text{Al}$, $X=\text{C}$. $E_{\text{tot}} (V_{M/A/X})$ is the calculated total energy of a cell with defect and $E_{\text{tot}}(\text{MAX})$ is the total energy of a pure MAX phase without defects, and $\mu_{M/A/X}$ is the chemical potential of $V_{M/A/X}$. Here, $\mu_{M/A/X}$ is chosen as the energy of an isolated atom.

We calculate the defect migration energy barriers using the cNEB method [35]. The cNEB will allows us to understand defect kinetics and plausible mechanisms that lead to defect recovery [37]. The vacancy migration energy is determined by a transition state search, where the initial and final states are relaxed structures with one vacancy, respectively. We use 6 intermediate images to accurately calculate the migration energy barrier of MAX phases [38] from lowest energy position to the other symmetry equivalent position.

Results and discussion

Structural properties and formation energies of ordered MAX phases with and without vacancies: $M_2\text{AlC}$ phase forms a hexagonal structure (space-group=\text{P}6_3/mmc) that consists of edge-sharing $M_6X$ (M=cation, $X$=anion) octahedra interleaved with cation (A)-layer. The octahedra is similar to the rock salt binary carbidies. Here, our interest is on disordered MAX phases, however, before jumping into a complex problem, we present structural and energy stability of ordered MAX phase and vacancy cases. Table I shows the ground-state structural properties and effect of vacancy on $M_2\text{AlC}$, where $M=\text{Cr}, \text{Ta}, \text{Nb}, \text{Ti}, \text{Zr}$. We compute the equilibrium lattice configurations of each case and find good agreement with experimentally known MAX phases [39-42], ensuring the reliability and accuracy of our calculations. We allow the vacancy supercell to relax homogeneously to the ground state energies before evaluating the complete set of the elastic constants. In Table. S1, we enlist elastic constants ($C_{ij}$), bulk modulus (K), shear modulus (G), Young’s modulus I, Poisson ratio (ν) and Pugh ratio $k= G/K$ as obtained by Voigt-Reuss-Hill approximation [43]. The lower Pugh ($k$) ratio for some MAX phases indicates relative brittleness compared to other.

Structural safety and physical properties are an extremely sensitive issue for application as a structural materials of MAX phases. Therefore, the damage tolerance as well as premature-failure should be avoided at any cost. However, it is hard to connect scattered and the sample
dependent fracture energies of the MAX phase with the calculated Pugh’s ratio (k) or Poisson’s ratio (ν). Therefore, it is of growing interest to understand the connection between structural and energy stability of defects structures. For example, comparing the bulk moduli of Zr₂AlC with Nb₂AlC from Table S1 shows that Nb₂AlC is elastically much stiffer than usually known allotropes. This is because Nb₂AlC has larger elastic moduli all across: a bulk modulus of 170 GPa, a shear modulus of 119 GPa and a Young’s modulus of 290 GPa compared to Zr₂AlC.
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**Figure 1.** The formation enthalpy of (a) pure and (b) vacancy (Vₘ,Vₐ,Vₓ) M₂AlC MAX phases, M=Cr,Ta,Nb,Ti,Zr. (c) Volume change of vacancy MAX phase with respect no-vacancy cases.

In Fig. 1, we show (a) the formation enthalpy of ordered MAX phase, (b) defect stability (E_{form}^{Vac}), and (c) relative change in cell volume [ΔV=V_{final}(M₂AlC-vacancy) - V_{initial}(M₂AlC)] between pure and defect cell. Formation energy (E_{form}) in Fig. 1a suggests that Ti- and Zr-based MAX alloys are most stable. The large Vₘ and Vₓ vacancy formation energies in Fig. 1b makes it harder to create M- & C-vacancies for Ti₂AlC and Zr₂AlC. On other hand, the A-site vacancy formation is harder in Nb₂AlC and Ta₂AlC. The volume of the MAX phase, in Fig. 1c, is sensitive to the vacancy with positive ΔV. The Cr₂AlC with Vₓ is the only exception in Fig. 1c that shows either very small or no change in volume (attributed to magnetic character of Cr). If we make a comparison, the stable phases in Fig. 1b have smaller shear and Young’s moduli (see Table. S1). The Poisson’s ratio of most of the ordered and vacancy MAX phases lie within the usual MAX phase range, i.e., from 0.200 to 0.260. The Pugh ratio (k) for crystalline Ti₂AlC (1.29) is smaller than other MAX phases, while some vacancy-containing alloys in Table S1 are fairly large. This indicates that those phases are nearing to the ductile regime.

A major focus of our work is to look at the effect of chemical alloying on the formation energy vacancy stability and vacancy migration of the disordered MAX phase. The fact that MAX phases can be synthesized with solid solutions on the M, A, or X sites greatly increases their chemical versatility. For that, we design an SQS supercell with 50:50 disorder on M-site, and M- & A-site without vacancy to test the E_{form} compared to the order MAX phase. The calculated E_{form} of (Zr-M₂)₂AlC and (Zr-M)₂(A-A’)C are shown in Fig. 2 where M=Cr, Nb, Ti and A-A’ =Sn-Al, Pb-Bi. The horizontal lines in Fig. 2 represents E_{form} of the order phase. For example, alloying M-site in Nb₂AlC with Zr stabilizes the (ZrNb)₂AlC by ~0.2 eV/atom, however, if we think of alloying the M-site in
Zr$_2$AlC with Nb this slightly reduces the stability by + 0.05 eV/atom. This indicates the tendency of C–Nb–Al to order while relative clustering of C–Zr–Al compared to their ordered counterpart. The overall picture of negative formation energy shows the stability of each of disordered MAX phase considered in this study. Our simulations suggest that the compositional dependence of the energy of mixing is complex and non-ideal \[44\]. The minimum in the energy of mixing obtained for ordered (Fig. 1) and disordered (Fig. 2) MAX phases is consistent with the existence of a solubility limit.

![Figure 2](image_url)

**Figure 2.** Formation enthalpy ($E_{\text{form}}$) of MAX phase for M-site disorder and horizontal dashed (black) lines represent order MAX-phase $E_{\text{form}}$. Right-panel shows (top) ordered, M$_2$AlC, and (bottom) disordered (M-M’)$_2$AlC supercell. Note that comparison with formation energies of pure MAX phases is just qualitative as we have not computed the convex hull against all possible phases in these systems.

**Vacancy defects:** In this section, we discuss the effect of vacancies on volume and $E_{\text{form}}^{\text{Vac}}$ of pure and disorder max phase. We investigate three types of vacancies, i.e., V$_M$, V$_A$ and V$_X$. Fig. 3 (a,c,e) shows the trends of positive volume change with respect to no-vacancy disorder max phase. Point-defect can lead to overall change in volume with respect to ideal cell, e.g., the defects in nuclear graphite induced by irradiation increases the $c_{\text{lat}}$ and decreases ($a_{\text{lat}}$ & $d_{\text{lat}}$) in [0001] plane in response to interstitial carbons. The introduction of vacancies increases the volume as shown in Fig. 1c & 3. Present study shows that M-elements from group-VI of the periodic table, i.e. Cr or Nb based MAX phase are the only exceptions that shows drop in relative volume with respect to other cases. Two site-disorder (ZrNb)$_2$(SnAl)C MAX phase shows negative $\Delta V$. The change in volume is very small but a significant drop in $E_{\text{form}}^{\text{Vac}}$ is found compared to one-site disorder. The calculated $E_{\text{form}}^{\text{Vac}}$ in Fig. 3(b,d,f) shows that V$_M$ in (ZrTi)$_2$AlC are harder to be formed.
compared to (ZrNb)\textsubscript{2}AlC and (ZrCr)\textsubscript{2}AlC, i.e., $E_{\text{form}}^{\text{Vac}}[(\text{ZrTi})_{2}\text{AlC}] > E_{\text{form}}^{\text{Vac}}[(\text{ZrNb})_{2}\text{AlC}] > E_{\text{form}}^{\text{Vac}}[(\text{ZrCr})_{2}\text{AlC}]$. However, the $E_{\text{form}}^{\text{Vac}}$ is lower for two-site disorder (ZrM)\textsubscript{2}(AA’)C, where M=Cr,Nb,Ti and AA’= Sn-Al, Pb-Bi, i.e., vacancy creation is easier compared to the single-site disorder. The (ZrCr)\textsubscript{2}(SnAl)C is the only exception, where two site disorder increases $V_{M}$ and $V_{A}$. $E_{\text{form}}^{\text{Vac}}$ of (ZrCr)\textsubscript{2}(SnAl)C and (ZrNb)\textsubscript{2}(SnAl)C. On the other hand, $E_{\text{form}}^{\text{Vac}}$ of (ZrCr)\textsubscript{2}(SnAl)C and (ZrNb)\textsubscript{2}(SnAl)C have competing $E_{\text{form}}^{\text{Vac}}$ as shown Fig. 3d. The $E_{\text{form}}^{\text{Vac}}$ trend in Fig. 3f for (ZrM)\textsubscript{2}(PbBi)C is significantly reduced compared to Fig. 3b: $E_{\text{form}}^{\text{Vac}}[(\text{ZrTi})_{2}(\text{PbBi})\text{C}] > E_{\text{form}}^{\text{Vac}}[(\text{ZrNb})_{2}(\text{PbBi})\text{C}] > E_{\text{form}}^{\text{Vac}}[(\text{ZrCr})_{2}(\text{PbBi})\text{C}]$, i.e., it is easier to create $V_{A}$ vacancies compared $V_{X}$ in (ZrCr)\textsubscript{2}AlC.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{image}
\caption{The effect of vacancy on volume and vacancy formation energy of disorder MAX phase. We consider M- and A-site disorder along with three possible vacancy scenarios: $V_{M}$, $V_{A}$ and $V_{X}$. We consider (Zr-M)\textsubscript{2}AlC and (Zr-M)\textsubscript{2}(A-A’)C cases where M=Cr, Nb, & Ti, and A-A’=Sn-Al & Pb-Bi, respectively.}
\end{figure}

For M=Cr, Nb and Ti in (Zr-M)\textsubscript{2}AlC, the $E_{\text{form}}^{\text{Vac}}$ trend looks like $[E(V_{M}) > E(V_{A}) > E(V_{X})]$, $[E(V_{M}) > E(V_{X}) > E(V_{A})]$ and $[E(V_{M}) > E(V_{X}) > E(V_{A})]$ for M=Ti, respectively. Notably, $E_{\text{form}}^{\text{Vac}}$ depends strongly on choice of atomic $\mu_{M/A/X}$. This is the reason, $E_{\text{form}}^{\text{Vac}}$ for $V_{A}$, and/or $V_{C}$ is lower in (Zr-M)\textsubscript{2}AlC than (Zr-M)\textsubscript{2}(SnAl)C or (Zr-M)\textsubscript{2}(PbBi)C as shown Fig. 3d & 3f. The $V_{Zr}$ is the least affected while $V_{C}$ is the most affected vacancies in disorder MAX phase due to respective atomic $\mu_{Zr/C}$. Therefore, irrespective of the choice of $\mu$ in ordered MAX phase, it is difficult to create $V_{Zr}$ as shown in Fig. 1b. Depending on choice of disorder, $V_{Zr}$ becomes relatively easier to form, while it is harder to create $V_{A}$ compared to $V_{X}$ in Zr\textsubscript{2}AlC. Consequently, the synthesis condition, i.e., choice of $\mu$, decides the relative stability of $V_{Al}$ or $V_{C}$ in Zr\textsubscript{2}AlC. Contrastingly, choice of $\mu$ on other MAX phases has a negligible effect on the $E_{\text{form}}^{\text{Vac}}$, where $V_{C}$ remain the most stable defect configurations.
Antisite defect: The $E_{\text{form}}^{\text{Antisite}}$ indicates the difficulty of antisite defect formation and irradiation incited recovery mechanism, which depends on the vacancy types and the target sublattices. The effect of antisite defects on volume ($\Delta V$), energy stability and charge density difference of pure and defected MAX phases are shown in Fig. 4a & 4b for (Zr-M)$_2$AlC. The $E_{\text{form}}^{\text{Antisite}}$ do not have significant dependence on the atomic configuration as the atomic species are only interchanged, i.e., no atoms are moved in-or-out of the pool. We show in Fig. 4a that M-Al antisite pair does not affect $\Delta V$, but the exchange between M and X increases the volume – with Ti-C as only exception that shows negative $\Delta V$. Antisite defects leads to positive $\Delta V$ for (ZrCr)$_2$AlC while negative $\Delta V$ for (ZrCr)$_2$AlC and (ZrTi)$_2$AlC. Based on $E_{\text{form}}^{\text{Antisite}}$ in Fig. 4b, it is harder to create antisite pairs at Zr (Zr-C or Zr-Al). Comparison of $E_{\text{form}}^{\text{Antisite}}$ (Fig. 4b) with $E_{\text{form}}^{\text{Vac}}$ (Fig. 3b) suggests that antisite defects for M=Cr is favorable and have lower formation energy. We can understand this in terms of empirical parameters, such as, electronegativity ($\chi$) and atomi-radii (R). Here, the electronegativity difference of two atoms can tell us about the movement of charge when two chemical species are mixed together. For example, in (ZrCr)$_2$AlC, $\Delta \chi_{\text{Cr-Al}}$ is less than $\Delta \chi_{\text{Zr-Al}}$ or $\Delta \chi_{\text{Zr-C}}$ for $\chi_{\text{Zr}} = 1.33$, $\chi_{\text{Cr}} = 1.66$, $\chi_{\text{Al}} = 1.61$, and $\chi_{\text{C}} = 2.5$ and $\Delta R$ of Cr-Al is less than Zr-C or Al-C for $R_{\text{Zr}} = 0.86$ Å, $R_{\text{Cr}} = 0.76$ Å, $R_{\text{Al}} = 0.53$ Å, and $R_{\text{C}} = 0.29$ Å, respectively. The large difference in $\Delta R$ (62% vs 43%) and $\Delta \chi$ (21% vs 3%) while comparing Zr-Al with Cr-Al, we see $\Delta R$ and $\Delta \chi$ in (ZrCr)$_2$AlC explains large formation energy of the Zr-Al pair. However, the $\Delta \chi$ and $\Delta R$ suggest that Cr-Al is preferred pair for antisite defect where electronic effects play a pivotal role. Clearly, the C-layer is not energetically favorable for Zr/Cr or Al for antisite defect formation, therefore, it creates a vacancy by migrating into the next available cation M- (or A) layer. This shows that interchanging M- and A-cation position with X-anion costs more energy than anion-anion interchange.

**Figure 4.** Effect of antisite defects on (a) cell volume and (b) formation energies of (ZrM)$_2$AlC, where M=Cr,Nb,Ti. (c-f) Charge density difference between (ZrM)$_2$AlC antisite defect and disorder cells.
The charge density difference between (Zr-M)\textsubscript{2}AlC antisite defect and disorder cells in Fig. 4e shows that the in-plane Zr-\textit{d}/Cr-\textit{d} interactions shows large charge transfer for M= Cr. The Zr-Cr/Zr-Zr/Cr-Cr bonds in (ZrCr)\textsubscript{2}AlC are populated with in-plane Zr-Cr/Zr-Zr/Cr-Cr bonds, respectively, whereas the in-plane Zr-Cr/Zr-Zr/Cr-Cr bonds are emptied in favour of the Zr-Cr/Zr-Zr/Cr-Cr basal bonds. This can help us to understand the reason behind the increased stability of the Zr/Cr-C layers in the (ZrCr)\textsubscript{2}AlC. To exemplify, we plot Ti\textsubscript{2}AlC and Ta\textsubscript{2}AlC band structure in Fig. S7 that shows metallic behavior in the basal plane with multiple bands crossing at the Fermi-level (E\textsubscript{Fermi}) while no bands cross the E\textsubscript{Fermi} in c-direction along (\Gamma^-\textit{A}).

**Electronic properties:** In Fig. 5, we show the total density of state of disordered (Zr-M)\textsubscript{2}AlC MAX phases for M=Cr, Nb and Ti. The transition elements Zr, Cr, Nb and Ti have partially filled bonding \textit{d}-states (also see Fig. S8), which means that the electrons at E\textsubscript{Fermi} are mainly from M elements and form conducting bands. If we look at the partial DOS of the Zr\textsubscript{2}AlC and Cr\textsubscript{2}AlC in Fig. S8, the Zr-\textit{d} and Cr-\textit{d} states in (-5.5 eV to -2.5 eV) and (-8.5 eV to -5 eV) energy range, respectively, overlap significantly with the C-\textit{p} states. Addition of Cr to Zr\textsubscript{2}AlC at the Zr site add more electrons that increase the DOS near the E\textsubscript{Fermi} (Fig. 5), i.e., Cr addition increases the localized \textit{d}-states. This also signifies that Zr-\textit{d}/Cr-\textit{d} & C-\textit{p} in the alloy form strong covalent bonds, while, the Al-\textit{p} with Zr-\textit{d} and Cr-\textit{d} states in the energy range -3eV to 0 eV and -5 eV to -2 eV show a weaker hybridization, respectively. This is suggesting metallic bonding between Al-\textit{p} and M-\textit{d}.

**Figure 5.** The total DOS of the pure (top), antisite (middle) disorder and monovacancy (bottom) defects in (M-M')\textsubscript{2}AlC (M=Zr; M'=Cr,Nb,Ti).

We note on comparing TDOS of (Zr-M)\textsubscript{2}AlC in Fig. 5 with antisite (middle) and vacancy (bottom) defects that the hybridization energy peaks near the E\textsubscript{Fermi} for vacancy cases changes greatly. This also depends on type of vacancy, i.e., V\textsubscript{M}, V\textsubscript{A}, or V\textsubscript{X}, which alters the electronic density and the strength of hybridization near E\textsubscript{Fermi} because V\textsubscript{M} and V\textsubscript{C} reduces the number of M-C bonds. On the contrary, for the A vacancy, the neighboring atoms readjusts itself to maintain the energy stability by charge transfer. Comparing total DOS in the presence of the vacancy (bottom-panel) and no vacancies (top-panel), we could clearly see the hybridization peak in the same energy range near the E\textsubscript{Fermi} for vacancy cases. We attribute this to the reduced numbers of M-A bonds.
Notably, no such changes are observed for the case of antisite defects as systems electronic density (only atomic positions are interchanged) remain conserved.

To further investigate this, we plot the charge density difference between vacancy and no-vacancy cases in the inset **Fig. 5**. The DOS above the $E_{\text{Fermi}}$ is the result of weaker Zr-$d$/Cr-$d$ and Al-$p$ bonding with a little contribution form the C-$p$ states (also see supplementary material). On the other hand, the top of the valance band is formed by Zr-$d$/Cr-$d$, C-$p$ and Al-$p$ **hybridized** states. For the ordered MAX phase, in **Fig. S8**, the states at the $E_{\text{Fermi}}$ are mainly from the Zr-$d$/Cr-$d$, C-$p$ and Al-$p$ with a small contribution of C-$p$.

![Figure 5](image1.png)

**Figure 6.** Charge difference of M-site disorder (ZrCr)$_2$AlC MAX phase with (a-d) antisite disorder and (e) $V_M$, $V_A$ and $V_x$ vacancies. Clearly, antisite and vacancy defect changes the local chemical activity by stronger charge transfer.

**Charge density difference of antisite and vacancy defects with disorder (ZrCr)$_2$AlC:** The MAX phases form M-X, M-A, and A-A bonds, where M-X is the covalent and A-A is the metallic respectively. This is the reason M-X bonds are stronger compared to A-A. If we compare two order MAX phases, e.g., Zr$_2$AlC and Cr$_2$AlC, the Zr-based compounds are weaker than the Cr-based compounds due to significant difference in $\chi$ between Zr and Cr ($\chi_{\text{Zr}} = 1.33$, $\chi_{\text{Cr}} = 1.66$). Large $\chi$ of Cr attracts more charges and makes the bonds in Cr$_2$AlC stronger. This also suggests that Zr$_2$AlC will have more agility towards re-organizing defects compared to Cr-based MAX phases. The local bonds near the vacancy sites are disturbed due to vacancy formation as shown in **Fig. 6** by charge density difference between pure and defect (ZrCr)$_2$AlC. For example, the cationic defects lead to much stronger bonding between M(=Cr/Zr), viz. Zr-Zr/Cr-Cr and Al-C. Therefore, we believe that alloying and defect (antisite/vacancy) can be used as an effective approach in modifying materials properties. The smaller atomic radius of Cr (0.76 Å) compared to Zr (0.86 Å) increases the C-Cr interaction compared C-Zr, which redistributed the electronic-density in and around the A-layer. We believe that this electronic rearrangement plays an important role in the increased
stability of $(\text{ZCr})_2\text{AlC}$. The electronegativity is another factor important to understand the chemical bonding. Following the Pauling electronegativity scale ($\chi_{\text{Cr}} = 1.66$, $\chi_{\text{Zr}} = 1.33$, $\chi_{\text{Al}} = 1.61$ and $\chi_{\text{C}} = 2.55$), we find a significant charge transfer in Fig. 6 from Zr/Cr to C, where the Zr/Cr-C bonding exhibits directionality and therefore the covalent character. The driving force behind the displacement of the bonding charge is the greater ability of C to attract electrons as a result of the difference between atomic electronegativities ($\Delta \chi = \chi_{M} - \chi_{C}$).

**Vacancy migrations energies:** The vacancies are the most common defects at equilibrium that controls the growth behavior as well as the resultant high temperature material properties. For high-temperature application, the vacancy diffusion is an important aspect to explore that controls the kinetics and possibly can dictate stress-response. In spite of extensive efforts in characterizing mechanical response, very little progress has been made towards increasing the understanding of vacancy diffusion mechanism in disordered MAX phases alloys from a theoretical framework—we note that a companion paper from the present group explicitly looks at migration energies of vacancies for a large number of pure 211 MAX phase systems [45].

**Figure 7.** Schematic of $V_M$, $V_A$ and $V_C$ vacancy migration in order and disorder MAX phase alloy.

We study $V_M$, $V_A$, and $V_X$ migration in disordered MAX phase alloys as shown by schematic in Fig. 7. We use cNEB to generate a succession of configurations (images) along the initial band connecting the initial-to-final state and calculate vacancy formation energies. cNEB relaxes each state on the band and provides information for deforming that band towards a lower energy embedding in the potential energy landscape. The band location in the energy landscape after sufficient number of iterations corresponds to the minimum path connecting the reactants and products.
Figure 8. Calculated energy barrier of $V_M$, $V_A$, and $V_C$ vacancy migration energies in (a-c) ordered and (d-f) disorder MAX phase alloys using cNEB method. We consider M-site disorder ($\text{MM}'_2\text{AlC}$, M, M' = Ti, Zr, Nb, Ta, Cr. The vacancy at A-sublattice, $V_A$, shows lower vacancy diffusion barrier compared to $V_M$ and $V_C$. The plot describes the energy variation along the minimum path. The energy threshold (y-axis), i.e., the activation energy, must be overcome for vacancy migration.

In Fig. 8(a-c), we plot the $V_M$, $V_A$, and $V_C$ migration energies for five ordered MAX phase compounds: $M_2\text{AlC}$, M=Ti, Ta, Cr, Nb, Zr. The Zr$_2$AlC shows lowest energy barrier for $V_M$, $V_A$, and $V_C$ in comparison to all other case with smaller $V_A$ diffusion barrier height. The overall order of vacancy migration is $V_M > V_A > V_C$. The Zr$_2$AlC is the only exception where $V_M$ has lower migration energy than $V_C$. Comparing $E_{form}^{V_{vac}}$ in Fig. 1b with barrier energy in Fig. 8a-c of ordered MAX phase, we can make the inference that stable $V_A$ is easier to move within the basal plane than other vacancies. In spite of competing migration energies of $V_M$ and $V_C$ in Zr$_2$AlC, $E_{form}^{V_{vac}}$ is in sharp contrast in term of energy stability in Fig. 1b. Higher $E_{form}^{V_{vac}}$ for Zr$_2$AlC suggest that vacancies are hard to create, while low diffusion barrier suggest easy vacancy migration.

The vacancy migration barrier for disordered (ZrM)$_2$AlC in Fig. 8(d-f) follows the trend of $E_{form}^{V_{vac}}$ in Fig. 3, where A-site migration is easier in (ZrNb)$_2$AlC compared to (ZrCr)$_2$AlC and (ZrTi)$_2$AlC, i.e., $E_{mig}[(\text{ZrCr})_2\text{AlC}] > E_{mig}[(\text{ZrTi})_2\text{AlC}] > E_{mig}[(\text{ZrNb})_2\text{AlC}]$. The barrier energies in Fig. 8(d-f) for the disordered alloys seem to depend greatly on the local environment. This is further established by zero end-point energies in ordered MAX phases, whereas the non-zero end-point energies in disorder MAX phases are configuration dependent. Creating two vacancies at symmetrically related Wycoff-positions changes the neighbor distributions, which affects the total energy of the vacancy supercell. The vacancy formation energies and vacancy concentration can directly be connected. If we compare vacancy formation energies from Fig. 2, e.g., the lower and
comparable formation energies of (ZrNb)$_2$AlC and (ZrTi)$_2$AlC will allow larger vacancy concentration compared to (ZrCr)$_2$AlC. Similarly, for (ZrM)$_2$(AA’)C, the V$_A$ vacancy migration in (ZrM)$_2$AlC within the basal plane is easier and proceeds with an energy barrier of 0.5 to 1.0 eV. This is much lower than the V$_M$ or V$_C$ vacancy migration barrier. However, the high-migration energy makes V$_M$ diffusion unfavorable compared to V$_A$ and V$_X$. Therefore, the significant population of the vacancies created in M-layers may remain intact even after a significant time interval.

![Figure 9](image-url)

**Figure 9.** (a-f) The M-site (V$_M$) vacancy migration barrier for A-site disorder for Zr$_2$(A-A’)C, A=Al, A’=As, Bi, Pb, S, Sb, Sn. The energy threshold (activation energy) must be overcome for vacancy migration. With A-site disorder, vacancy migration at Zr-site becomes harder.

In **Fig. 9** and **Fig. 10**, we present barrier energy for A-site disorder [Zr$_2$(A-A’)C, A=Al, A’=As, Bi, Pb, S, Sb, Sn] and two (M and A)-site disorder ((Zr-M)$_2$(A-A’)C, where M=Cr,Nb,Ti and A-A’=SnAl), respectively. The high vacancy migration energies in **Fig. 9** shows very high barrier of 9-12 eV for A-site disorder with V$_M$. The high barrier makes vacancy diffusion almost impossible, however, once the vacancies are created, the significant population of the vacancies will be intact for a considerable time under the irradiation process. On the other hand, for two-site disorder with V$_M$, V$_A$ and V$_C$ vacancies in **Fig. 10** (also see **Fig. S6**), the diffusion barrier show competing energies for V$_M$ and V$_C$ for M=Nb and Ti. The A-site vacancies for M=Cr show almost barrierless diffusion. If compared to single M-site disorder migration energies as presented in **Fig. 8d-f**, adding more disorder, i.e., to both to M- and A-site, further improves the vacancy diffusion by reducing the barrier height. The V$_M$ and V$_X$ site vacancies show competing $E_{form}^{Vac}$ in **Fig. 3b**, but vacancy migration becomes easier for V$_A$ with small barrier size of 0.40 eV due to increased chemical disorder.
Figure 10. The $V_M$, $V_A$ and $V_C$ vacancy migration energies of MAX alloys with M- and A-site disorder using cNEB method: $(M-M')_2 (A-A')C$, $M=Zr$, $M'=Cr,Nb,Ti$, $A=Sn$ and $A'=Al$.

Conclusion

We perform DFT calculations to understand the effect of point-defects on the structural-/energy-stability, electronic-structure, and diffusion (vacancy) on disordered MAX phase. Our objective is to determine relative tendency for the vacancy formation through alloying, e.g., the $Cr_2AlC$ known to have stronger interatomic bonding compared to $Zr_2AlC$. The lower formation energy of $Zr_2AlC$ suggests the possibility of higher vacancy defect concentration. We considered M-site and A-site alloying of the ordered MAX phase, which shows interesting electronic-behavior and vacancy migration in $(Zr-M')_2 (A-A')X$ ($M = Cr$, $Nb$, $Ti$, $AA' = Al$, $SnAl$, $X = C$). Notably, antisite defects in some cases are easier to form compared to vacancies, e.g., in $(ZrCr)_2AlC$, where $Al$ preferentially goes to $Cr$ compared to $Zr$. The diffusion barrier is usually larger in the strong metal alloys, however, the DFT+cNEB calculations suggests that the chemical disorder significantly reduces the vacancy migration energy barrier compared to the ordered MAX phase. Generally speaking, alloying tends to lower the vacancy migration barrier. The chemical alloying route will surely help the MAX phase community to understand the defect formation and migration mechanism as well as provide ways to manipulate the electronic and mechanical behavior of MAX phase alloys.
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Figure S1. Vacancy dependence change in (a) volume, (b) formation energy in (TiTa)$_2$AlC, Ti$_2$(AlSi)C, and TiAl(CN). (c) Energy barrier of V$_M$, V$_A$ and V$_C$ vacancy migration in (TiTa)$_2$AlC. We calculate vacancy migration minimum energy path at the equilibrium volume in a 200-lattice supercell.

Figure S2. The total DOS of the pure (top), antisite (middle) disorder and monovacancy (bottom) defects in (TiTa)$_2$AlC.
Figure S3. The partial DOS of the pure (left-panel) and vacancy (right-panel) in disorder (TiTa)$_2$AlC. 2D charge density plot showing charge depletion at the vacancy site.

Figure S4. The partial charge-densities of the pure (left-panel) and vacancy (right-panel) in disorder (TiTa)$_2$AlC.
**Figure S5.** The volume and average bond-length change of +0.6% and 2.3% for M-site disorder with M-vacancy with respect to (TiTa)\(_2\)AlC with no vacancies.

**Figure S6.** The \(V_M\), \(V_A\) and \(V_C\) vacancy migration energies of MAX alloys with M- and A-site disorder using cNEB method: \((MM')_2(AA')C\), M=Zr, M'=Cr,Nb,Ti, A=Sn and A'=Al. We use 200 atom supercell to calculate minimum energy path for vacancy migration at the equilibrium volume.
**Electronic structure**: The local feature of the TDOS near the Fermi-level ($E_{\text{Fermi}}$) is indicative of the stability. For example, a valley in DOS at $E_{\text{Fermi}}$ signifies a lower energy barrier for electrons ($E < 0$ eV) to move to the unoccupied states, whereas peak usually implies higher energy barrier ($E > 0$ eV). This criterion works reasonably well for Fig. S7 & S8. Ti$_2$AlC and Ta$_2$AlC have a valley at $E_{\text{Fermi}}$, suggests increased stability. Out of 9-MAX phase ordered alloys in Fig. S7, only Zr$_2$AlC shows a peak at $E_{\text{Fermi}}$ in the TDOS. Our qualitative assumption explains the observation of the early transition metal based MAX phases very well [S1].

![Figure S7. Electronic band-structure and partial density of states of Ti$_2$AlC and Ta$_2$AlC ordered MAX phase alloys.](image)
Figure S8. Partial density of states (PDOS) of M$_2$AlC ordered MAX phase alloys for M=Ti, V, Cr, Zr, Nb, Mo, Hf, Ta, W. Only Zr$_2$AlC shows a peak exactly on Fermi-level, which indicates alloy instability.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>C_{11}</th>
<th>C_{12}</th>
<th>C_{44}</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>ν</th>
<th>k</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Å</td>
<td>Å³</td>
<td>GPa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cr₂AlC</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>12.70</td>
<td>90.2</td>
<td>334.8</td>
<td>74.1</td>
<td>131.1</td>
<td>175.1</td>
<td>126.0</td>
<td>304.9</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ta₂AlC</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>13.92</td>
<td>115.9</td>
<td>323.7</td>
<td>128.6</td>
<td>159.0</td>
<td>194.1</td>
<td>121.5</td>
<td>301.6</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nb₂AlC</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>13.91</td>
<td>118.7</td>
<td>323.9</td>
<td>83.4</td>
<td>141.7</td>
<td>170.1</td>
<td>119.6</td>
<td>290.7</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ti₂AlC</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>13.78</td>
<td>111.2</td>
<td>293.1</td>
<td>65.2</td>
<td>107.7</td>
<td>139.2</td>
<td>107.5</td>
<td>256.6</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zr₂AlC</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>14.63</td>
<td>138.9</td>
<td>253.5</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td>90.5</td>
<td>130.1</td>
<td>87.6</td>
<td>214.7</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zr₂AlC-V_M</td>
<td>6.65</td>
<td>5.76</td>
<td>14.68</td>
<td>561.5</td>
<td>214.5</td>
<td>70.9</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>112.8</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>159.9</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ti₂AlC-V_M</td>
<td>6.12</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>13.81</td>
<td>448.3</td>
<td>257.4</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>75.8</td>
<td>125.4</td>
<td>85.2</td>
<td>208.5</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ta₂AlC-V_M</td>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>13.90</td>
<td>460.1</td>
<td>328.5</td>
<td>111.6</td>
<td>133.4</td>
<td>184.6</td>
<td>114.7</td>
<td>285.1</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nb₂AlC-V_M</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>13.90</td>
<td>470.7</td>
<td>293.5</td>
<td>88.6</td>
<td>116.7</td>
<td>160.8</td>
<td>102.5</td>
<td>253.8</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cr₂AlC-V_M</td>
<td>5.69</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>12.62</td>
<td>353.3</td>
<td>322.3</td>
<td>64.2</td>
<td>122.6</td>
<td>163.2</td>
<td>122.2</td>
<td>293.4</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zr₂AlC-V_X</td>
<td>6.64</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>14.63</td>
<td>559.2</td>
<td>228.9</td>
<td>72.4</td>
<td>82.7</td>
<td>121.9</td>
<td>79.2</td>
<td>195.5</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ti₂AlC-V_X</td>
<td>6.11</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>13.75</td>
<td>445.2</td>
<td>267.7</td>
<td>68.5</td>
<td>101.4</td>
<td>134.0</td>
<td>99.6</td>
<td>239.5</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ta₂AlC-V_X</td>
<td>6.16</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>13.99</td>
<td>459.5</td>
<td>318.8</td>
<td>138.0</td>
<td>141.8</td>
<td>197.0</td>
<td>111.8</td>
<td>282.2</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>1.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nb₂AlC-V_X</td>
<td>6.22</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>14.02</td>
<td>469.7</td>
<td>283.7</td>
<td>120.6</td>
<td>124.7</td>
<td>173.9</td>
<td>99.4</td>
<td>250.5</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cr₂AlC-V_X</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>12.65</td>
<td>349.8</td>
<td>359.3</td>
<td>86.1</td>
<td>138.7</td>
<td>188.6</td>
<td>133.7</td>
<td>324.5</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zr₂AlC-V_A</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>14.45</td>
<td>559.3</td>
<td>243.4</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>118.5</td>
<td>74.1</td>
<td>184.1</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ti₂AlC-V_A</td>
<td>6.16</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>13.61</td>
<td>446.7</td>
<td>277.0</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>70.5</td>
<td>128.7</td>
<td>88.7</td>
<td>216.5</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ta₂AlC-V_A</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>13.85</td>
<td>460.5</td>
<td>324.6</td>
<td>129.8</td>
<td>126.0</td>
<td>186.2</td>
<td>106.7</td>
<td>268.9</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nb₂AlC-V_A</td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>13.72</td>
<td>471.3</td>
<td>301.4</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>105.7</td>
<td>161.8</td>
<td>99.2</td>
<td>247.2</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cr₂AlC-V_A</td>
<td>5.69</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>12.62</td>
<td>353.3</td>
<td>323.2</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td>121.4</td>
<td>166.9</td>
<td>123.3</td>
<td>297.0</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table S1** - Structural properties of pure ordered MAX phases M₂AlC with no-vacancy and with-vacancy (V_M, V_A, V_X).
Table S2- Structural properties of disorder (ZrCr)$_2$AlC MAX phases with no-vacancy and $V_M$, $V_A$, and $V_X$ vacancies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>Zr-C</th>
<th>Cr-C</th>
<th>Al-Al</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Å</td>
<td>Å$^3$/atom</td>
<td>Avg$_{BL}$ (Å)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No-vac</td>
<td>8.174</td>
<td>13.979</td>
<td>25.355</td>
<td>14.077</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$V_A$</td>
<td>8.159</td>
<td>14.001</td>
<td>25.372</td>
<td>14.147</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>2.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$V_X$</td>
<td>8.158</td>
<td>14.000</td>
<td>25.317</td>
<td>14.136</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>2.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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