

Stability of the tetragonal phase of BaZrO₃ under high pressure

Constance Toulouse*,¹ Danila Amoroso*,² Robert Oliva*,¹ Cong Xin,^{3,4} Pierre Bouvier,⁵ Pierre Fertey,⁶ Philippe Veber,^{3,7} Mario Maglione,³ Philippe Ghosez,² Jens Kreisel,¹ and Mael Guennou¹

¹University of Luxembourg, Department of physics and materials science, 41 rue du Brill, 4422 Belvaux, Luxembourg

²Quantum Materials Center (Q-MAT), Complex and Entangled Systems from Atoms to Materials (CESAM), University of Liège, Quartier Agora, Allée du Six Aout, B-4000 Liège, Belgique

³Institut de Chimie de la Matière Condensée de Bordeaux (ICMCB)-UMR 5026, 87 Avenue du Docteur Schweitzer, F-33608 Pessac, France

⁴Materials Research and Technology Department, Luxembourg Institute of Science and Technology (LIST), 41 rue du Brill, 4422 Belvaux, Luxembourg

⁵Université Grenoble Alpes, Institut Néel CNRS, 25 Rue des Martyrs, 38042, Grenoble, France.

⁶Synchrotron SOLEIL, L'Orme des merisiers, Saint-Aubin, Gif-sur-Yvette, France

⁷Institut Lumière Matière (ILM)-UMR 5306, Université Claude Bernard Lyon 1, Campus LyonTech-La Doua, 10 rue Ada Byron, F-69622 Villeurbanne, France

In this paper, we revisit the high pressure behavior of BaZrO₃ by a combination of first-principle calculations, Raman spectroscopy and x-ray diffraction under high-pressure. We confirm experimentally the cubic-to-tetragonal transition at 10 GPa and find no evidence for any other phase transition up to 45 GPa, the highest pressures investigated, at variance with past reports. We re-investigate phase stability with density functional theory considering not only the known tetragonal (*I4/mcm*) phase but also other potential antiferrodistorsive candidates. This shows that the tetragonal phase becomes progressively more stable upon increasing pressure as compared to phases with more complex tilt systems. The possibility for a second transition to another tilted phase at higher pressures, and in particular to the very common orthorhombic *Pnma* structure, is therefore ruled out.

I. INTRODUCTION

The family of perovskite oxides is known for its large variety of structural distortions that is, in turn, crucial for their physical properties. The most common distortions are collective rotations (or tilts) of the corner-sharing oxygen octahedra that lower the crystal symmetry from a simple cubic structure in the absence of tilt to a lower symmetry determined by its tilt pattern. There is a long history of studies of those tilts [1], their classification [2–4], and how they evolve with external parameters. In the most simple tilt systems, octahedra rotate only around one of the pseudo-cubic axes and the rotations in two adjacent layers perpendicular to the rotation axis can be either in-phase ($a^0a^0c^+$, in Glazer's notation [2]), producing a phononic instability at the *M*-point of the cubic Brillouin zone (BZ), or anti-phase ($a^0a^0c^-$), with the instability appearing at *R*-point [5]. General rules for the evolution of tilts under hydrostatic pressure have been formulated [6–10]: for most $A^{2+}B^{4+}O_3$ perovskites, it is established that the tilt angle should increase and, if starting from a cubic structure, cause a phase transition towards a low-symmetry tilted phase. This has been investigated very early on with studies of the cubic-to-tetragonal ($Pm\bar{3}m \rightarrow I4/mcm$) phase transition in the classical perovskite SrTiO₃ [6] and confirmed in many subsequent studies (Ref. [11–13] and references therein). A similar scenario has been observed in other cubic perovskites including the oxide BaZrO₃ [14, 15] and the fluorite KMnF₃ [16, 17].

As much as this first phase transition under pressure is known, the behavior at higher pressures is still very unclear. It is natural to expect that the tetrago-

nal phase observed under pressure in SrTiO₃, KMnF₃ or BaZrO₃ becomes unstable above some critical pressure, i.e. when the tilt angle reaches some critical value. This intuition partly originates from the observation of phase sequences with varying temperature that may display multiple transitions bridging different tilt systems. Particularly relevant examples are CaTiO₃ [18] and SrZrO₃ [19], which undergo phase sequences with increasing temperature $Pnma \rightarrow I4/mcm \rightarrow Pm\bar{3}m$ and $Pnma \rightarrow Imma \rightarrow I4/mcm \rightarrow Pm\bar{3}m$ respectively. In both cases, the cubic-to-tetragonal transition is continuous and involves a single tilt angle whereas the tetragonal-to-orthorhombic transition is discontinuous. Even richer sequences may be found in perovskites with competing polar instabilities such as NaNbO₃ [20]. Since pressure induces much stronger reduction in bond length than temperature, we might expect $cubic \rightarrow tetragonal \rightarrow orthorhombic$ phase sequences for BaZrO₃, SrTiO₃ and similar perovskites under pressure.

Experimentally, it was indeed proposed in several instances that a second phase transition occurs, usually to an orthorhombic phase [11, 13, 14], but the experimental results remain controversial. In SrTiO₃, the existence of a second phase transition has been hypothesized based on the observation of a Raman peak splitting [11], or changes in the Ti pre-edge features in x-ray absorption measurements [21, 22]. However, this proposition was discarded by Raman spectroscopy and single-crystal x-ray diffraction measurements [12]. In BaZrO₃, splitting of Raman peaks was also observed and invoked to propose a transition to an orthorhombic phase, also inspired from phases found in the phase diagram of the (Ba,Ce)ZrO₃ system. [14]. This was not confirmed by

the high-pressure x-ray study in Ref. [15]. At the theoretical level, we are not aware of studies of the competition between different AFD phases. Instead, predictions have been made for the appearance of ferroelectricity in combination with tilts in BaZrO₃ at high enough pressures [23–25]. Also, the possibility for transitions to completely different polymorphs has been considered [26, 27]. A transition to a post-perovskite phase in particular was predicted to occur at pressures as low as 70 GPa and cause a first-order transition into a semiconducting orthorhombic phase with a 7.9% volume collapse. These two predictions have not found experimental confirmation yet.

BaZrO₃ is a particularly relevant model system to study the evolution of tilts under pressure. It is experimentally cubic at ambient pressure and down to 0 K, but has an antiferrodistortive instability revealed by density functional theory (DFT) that has been attracting a great deal of attention from a theoretical point of view [28–32]. This stirred discussions about its true ground state and the possible consequences of this instability on physical properties, such as the existence of locally distorted nanodomains, which were recently observed by electron diffraction and pair distribution function [33] or the anomaly of its dielectric constant [28, 29]. Besides, unlike in SrTiO₃ and CaTiO₃ [34, 35] where the polar instability at the zone center plays a major role, only the zone boundary tilt mode is unstable in BaZrO₃ which makes it a comparatively “pure” tilt system. Finally it has been shown that several antiferrodistortive phases are nearly degenerate at ambient pressure [36], specifically the tetragonal $I4/mcm$ ($a^0a^0c^-$ in Glazer notation), the orthorhombic $Imma$ ($a^-b^0a^-$) and the rhombohedral $R\bar{3}c$ ($a^-a^-a^-$). This situation leaves the energy landscape particularly open for the stabilization of multiple phases and the existence of multiple phase transitions under pressure.

In this paper we revisit the behavior of BaZrO₃ under hydrostatic pressure with the objective to clarify its phase sequence. We show experimental data by Raman spectroscopy and x-ray diffraction, discuss their interpretations and comparisons with the literature. Our measurements provide strong arguments for excluding other transitions than the known cubic-to-tetragonal, and by this challenge past claims in the literature. We then present results of first-principle calculations to get in-depth understanding of these results and discuss them in the light of general considerations on the energetics of octahedra tilts in perovskites. The similar case of SrTiO₃ is also discussed for comparison.

II. METHODS AND EXPERIMENTAL DETAILS

Single crystal samples were prepared from a crystal purchased from Crystal Base Co. Ltd. and grown by the tri-arc Czochralski method, as described and characterized in Ref. [37].

We performed single crystal Raman measurements under pressure up to 20 GPa in a membrane-type diamond anvil-cell (DAC) with a 600 μm culet size using a 4:1 methanol-ethanol solution as pressure-transmitting medium. Pressure was measured in situ with two ruby balls inserted in the chamber together with the BaZrO₃ single crystal sample. The two ruby were giving the same pressure up to the highest pressures showing good hydrostaticity. The spectra were recorded using a 532 nm laser line and a Renishaw inVia confocal Raman spectrometer calibrated using the 521 cm⁻¹ phonon mode of Silicon.

Two sets of powder x-ray measurements were performed at the ID27 beamline of the ESRF synchrotron facility. Both measurements were performed using Neon as a pressure transmitting medium. A monochromatized x-ray radiation source of wavelength 0.3738 Å and a two dimensional charge-coupled device detector (MAR-CCD) with a pixel size of 79 μm were used. A Silicon powder standard was used to calibrate the distance of the detector and other geometry parameters. For the first set, powdered BaZrO₃, referred to here as sample S1, was loaded on a DAC with a culet size of 300 μm and diffraction patterns up to 16.5 GPa with pressure steps of 0.7 GPa were obtained. The second set of measurements were performed up to 45 GPa using a DAC with a culet size of 250 μm and a second powder sample of BaZrO₃, called S2, prepared as before. The pressure was determined from the ruby calibration method [38] and the standard deviation in pressure measurement was of less than 1%, ensuring a good hydrostaticity [39]. The data was analyzed by full Rietveld refinements using FULLPROF software [40]. The refined parameters are; *i*) the scale factor, *ii*) manually chosen linearly interpolated background at 15 points, *iii*) lattice parameters *a* and *c*, *iv*) fractional coordinates, *v*) isotropic thermal parameters and *vi*) shape and broadening parameters. The peak shapes were described with a pseudo-Voigt function. The profile parameters *u*, *v*, *w*, *lx* and *ly*, which determine the resolution function (see FULLPROF manual), were obtained from the refinement of a high-purity silicon standard.

For single crystal XRD measurements, two small crystals with different orientations were loaded into a DAC and gave essentially identical results; the corresponding data will be labelled as sample S3 in the following. Measurements were performed in the CRISTAL beamline of the SOLEIL synchrotron facility. A monochromatized x-ray radiation source of wavelength of 0.41579 Å and a two dimensional charge-coupled device (2D CCD, Rayonix SX165) with a pixel size of 79 μm and a diameter of 165 mm were used. A ruby single crystal and Lanthanum hexaboride (LaB₆) powder were used to calibrate the geometrical parameters of the diffractometer and the wavelength respectively. The pressure inside the 600 μm culet-sized DAC was determined from the diffraction of powdered gold included near the samples and its reported equation of state (EoS) [41, 42]. Helium was used a pressure-transmitting medium. The experiment

was conducted up to 12.5 GPa at which point the diamonds got damaged, impeding to carry out a full structural refinement at higher pressures.

First-principle calculations of structural and dynamical properties rely on DFT and density functional perturbation theory (DFPT)[43], as implemented in the ABINIT package [44–46]. The exchange-correlation potential was evaluated within the generalized gradient approximation (GGA) using the Wu-Cohen (WC) functional [47], which provides us with good description of the structural properties of the cubic phase and a lattice parameter a_0 of about 3.184 Å – cf. experimental $a_0 \simeq 3.195$ Å (Fig. 2.c) and lattice dynamics reported in our previous work [36] – correcting the reported overestimation within the more conventional Perdew-Burke-Ernzerhof (PBE) functional [31]. Norm-conserving pseudopotentials [48] have been employed with the following orbitals considered as the valence states: 5s, 5p, and 6s for Ba 4s, 4p, 4d, and 5s for Zr, and 2s and 2p for O. The energy cutoff for the expansion of the electronic wave functions has been fixed to 45 Ha and we used a $6 \times 6 \times 6$ k-point mesh for the Brillouin zone sampling. Phonon calculations have been performed on the fully relaxed cubic and antiferrodistortive (AFD) structures, for which the structural optimization reached values of below $\sim 10^{-4}$ eV/Å. The \mathbf{q} -points for the phonon dispersion curves of the 5-atom cubic BaZrO₃ included Γ , X , M , R , and the Λ point from Γ to R of the simple cubic Brillouin zone. For the comparison with the Raman data and analysis, phonon frequencies of the AFD structures have been calculated at the Γ point. Symmetry analysis of the phonon modes was done with the help of programs from the Bilbao crystallographic server [49, 50] and the ISOTROPY Software Suite [51].

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A. Raman spectroscopy

The Raman spectra collected under pressure up to 21 GPa are shown in Fig. 1.a and 1.c. At ambient pressure, in the cubic phase, BaZrO₃ has no Raman active phonon modes but nonetheless exhibits an intense Raman spectrum consisting in broad second-order bands as described in Ref. [36] and references therein. Upon increasing pressure, this second-order spectrum weakens. At 10 GPa, some additional sharp peaks emerge, revealing the activation of Raman modes due to the structural phase transition. In addition, a soft mode comes into view from lower frequencies with high intensity (Fig.1.a), followed by a second soft mode at lower wavenumbers only visible when measuring very close to the quasi-elastic line (Fig.1.c). The frequency evolution under pressure of the Raman peaks, fitted with Lorentzian functions, is shown in Fig. 1.b and 1.d. The hard modes exhibit slopes ranging from 0.9 cm⁻¹ GPa⁻¹ to 2 cm⁻¹ GPa⁻¹ (see Fig.1.b and 1.d).

An assignment of the modes appearing at the transition can be done with the help of the analysis detailed in our previous paper [36] and partially reproduced in Table I. The mode that appears at 124 cm⁻¹ is assigned to Ba motion and the mode appearing at 384 cm⁻¹ to oxygen octahedra shearing modes, while the soft modes are known to correspond to tilts of the octahedra. Only the totally symmetric soft mode can be followed with accuracy, the lower energy soft mode (visible in Fig.1.c and fitted in Fig.1.d) gets lost in the quasi-elastic line at low pressures. Note that the hard mode appearing at 124 cm⁻¹ (at 140 cm⁻¹ at 20 GPa) has an asymmetric profile at higher pressures, which may indicate the presence of two close overlapping bands.

Our single crystal spectra are overall in agreement with the powder spectra previously reported by Chemarin et al. [14], but also differ in some aspects. The major difference is that an intense peak appears in the powder spectrum at the phase transition and reaches 680 cm⁻¹ at 20 GPa. On our single crystal spectra, we do observe a feature that becomes visible at 634 cm⁻¹ around 11-12 GPa and hardens up to 670 cm⁻¹ at 19 GPa (Fig. 1.a) which can correspond to the third hard mode observed in Ref. [14], but with significantly less intensity. This difference in intensity presumably arises from orientation effects due to selection rules, as will be discussed in the following.

Next, we focus on the identification of the symmetry of the high pressure phase. In Ref. [14], the first high pressure phase is identified as $R\bar{3}c$ by analogy with the Raman spectrum of Ba_{0.9}Ce_{0.1}ZrO₃, and because the Raman modes appear first as single peaks. It is then proposed that a second phase transition occurs at higher pressures based on the splitting of the hard Raman modes located around 150 and 380 cm⁻¹. However, as stated in our previous study, identifying the high pressure structure from Raman spectra may not be as easy an anticipated. This is because, even though the number of Raman active modes is theoretically different, they all originate from the same degenerate modes at the R point of the cubic phase, so that differences between the tetragonal, orthorhombic and rhombohedral structures are only revealed by small peak splittings that scale with the very small distortion of the unit cell, and mode polarizations that are difficult to appreciate without performing polarized experiments. In such a context, identifying the correct number of Raman active modes can be troublesome.

In order to properly identify the high-pressure phase, we provide in Table I the wavenumbers of the Raman active modes computed by DFPT at 20 GPa for the three considered phases with antiphase tilts (tetragonal $I4/mcm$, orthorhombic $Imma$ and rhombohedral $R\bar{3}c$) together with our experimental Raman values at 20 GPa. From this table, we make the following observations. First, the orthorhombic phase can be easily distinguished from the two others mainly by three criteria; *i*) splitting of the soft mode into three modes instead of two,




FIG. 1. Raman spectra of BaZrO₃ single crystals under pressure (a) from 0 to 19 GPa, when increasing the pressure, and (c) between 21 and 12 GPa, when releasing the pressure. The spectra in (a) are classical Stokes spectra, while the spectra in (c) are collected without cutting off the Rayleigh scattering of the laser line, allowing for observation of lower energies. An example of the Lorentzian fits performed on the Raman modes is shown in blue. (b) Pressure dependence of the wavenumbers of the phonon modes derived from the spectra obtained from 0 to 19 GPa, the solid symbols show the modes appearing above the transition at 10 GPa. (d) Behaviour of the two soft modes (and first hard mode) appearing above 10 GPa, these frequencies are derived from the spectra shown in (c), fitted with Lorentzian functions.

TABLE I. Wavenumbers (in cm⁻¹ units) at 20 GPa of the Raman-active phonon modes calculated through DFPT for the three tilted phases considered here as well as values measured experimentally. The full table including Raman inactive modes is included in the supplementary material. The modes are grouped together based on the mode they originate from in the cubic phase.

Cubic ($Pm\bar{3}m - 221$)	Vibrational pattern	Tetragonal ($I4/mcm - 140$)	Orthorhombic ($Imma - 74$)	Rhombohedral ($R\bar{3}c - 167$)	Experimental Frequencies	
R_4^+	oxygen octahedra rotations	76	E_g	23	E_g	48
		189	A_{1g}	177	A_{1g}	115
R_5^+	antiparallel Ba motion	138	E_g	142	E_g	137
		145	B_{2g}	139	A_g	
R_5^+	oxygen octahedra shearing modes	374	E_g	383	E_g	394
		385	B_{2g}	390	A_g	
R_3^+	Jahn-Teller-like distortions of oxygen octahedra	665	B_{1g}	665	E_g	672
R_1^+	oxygen octahedra breathing mode		896	B_{3g}		

ii) large splitting of the second hard mode with a totally symmetric mode given here at 390 cm⁻¹, and *iii*) Raman activation of the octahedron breathing mode at 896 cm⁻¹. The latter cannot be verified from our data due to the strong signal originating from the pressure transmitting medium (not shown), but the two remaining criteria suffice to exclude the presence of an orthorhombic phase, as evidenced from our data and the data by Chemarin et al. [14]. Second, distinguishing between the rhombohedral and the tetragonal phase is more delicate.

They differ only in mode symmetries and with very moderate peak splitting (smaller than 10 cm⁻¹), which can be easily overlooked given the observed peak widths. A detailed examination of mode symmetries strongly supports polarization effects as the origin for the differences observed between the powder spectra from Ref. [14] and our single crystal spectra. Hard modes split into modes of different symmetries, which is more easily observed with the orientational average of a powder than on single crystals. Interestingly, the hard mode appearing at

672 cm^{-1} is predicted to have a B_{1g} symmetry in the tetragonal phase, which makes it particularly difficult to observe on single crystal measurements if the tetragonal c axis is in the plane of the DAC. In contrast, it has the same symmetry (E_g) as the other hard modes in the rhombohedral phase, and no particular reason to be less visible. Therefore, comparison between our single crystal and the powder spectra from Ref. [14] points towards the tetragonal phase as the most probable. This assignation becomes in turn perfectly compatible with the peak splitting reported at higher pressures: at low pressures close to the transitions, peak splitting is very weak and these doublets $E_g \oplus B_{2g}$ appear as a single peak; the splitting is resolved only at higher pressures when the distortion become sizeable (at 30 GPa in Chemarin et al. [14]).

In summary, Raman spectroscopy supports the hypothesis of a single phase transition towards a tetragonal $I4/mcm$ phase, and no further transition takes place up to the maximum pressure of 30 GPa reached by Chemarin et al.

The exact same discussion can be made about SrTiO_3 and the conflicts on its Raman spectrum, with the additional simplicity that literature agrees on a single tetragonal phase. The splittings of the hard modes at 185 and 470 cm^{-1} reported in Ref. [11] and interpreted as a possible phase transition towards an orthorhombic phase remain in fact compatible with a tetragonal symmetry. Also, the mode around 600 cm^{-1} is seen less clearly on a single crystal [12] than on powder [13]. Even though this mode is not clearly assigned in those past studies, it is now clear that it follows the behavior and polarization effects described above and in Table I. We also note that the Raman signatures (gradual vanishing of the second-order Raman bands, emergence of the E_g soft mode) are essentially identical to the signatures reported for SrTiO_3 in Ref. [12] and are all compatible with the tetragonal structure. Altogether, SrTiO_3 and BaZrO_3 appear as perfectly isostructural in their high-pressure behavior from the Raman point of view.

B. X-ray diffraction

Diffraction patterns measured for sample S2 are shown in Fig. 2.a up to a pressure of 45.1 GPa. A splitting of the peaks corresponding to the pseudo-cubic $(200)_{pc}$ and $(310)_{pc}$ reflections around 10.6° and 17° respectively is particularly visible from a pressure of 25.8 GPa. Other pseudo-cubic reflections show broadening with potentially unresolved peak splitting. The splitting of the $(200)_{pc}$ reflection is not compatible with a rhombohedral structure but tetragonal and orthorhombic structures could be considered – if one considers the possibility that the full splitting of $(200)_{pc}$ into three peaks cannot be resolved entirely (see Fig. S5 in the SM for more details). The tetragonal and orthorhombic structures are more easily distinguished by checking the low-angle region where a $(011)_o$ reflection is expected for the

orthorhombic phase only. The inset in Fig. 2.a shows an enlarged view of this low angle region with peak positions as obtained from fittings of the whole diffraction pattern measured at 45.1 GPa. The absence of any feature around 4.7° and the arguments from Raman spectroscopy allow us to discard the orthorhombic phase and retain the tetragonal $I4/mcm$ as the only high-pressure phase. Let us point out that the $(011)_o$ reflection is not a weak superstructure due to oxygen tilting but reflects off-centering of the heavy Ba ion that would yield non negligible intensity.

Rietveld refinement of the patterns were performed in the cubic and tetragonal phases. As illustrated in the top panel of Fig. 2.b, the diffraction pattern of S1 can be perfectly fitted at 1.34 GPa in the cubic phase. Refinements are less satisfactory at higher pressures, as illustrated with the pattern at 45.1 GPa shown in the bottom panel of Fig. 2.b. This is expected due to a general degradation of the pattern quality at high pressure following inter-grain stress, loss of hydrostaticity, etc. Unfortunately, the quality of the pattern was not sufficient to determine reliably the oxygen positions, it is therefore not possible to give a value for the tilt angle itself. For completeness, we also performed a Rietveld refinement of the pattern at 45.1 GPa in the orthorhombic phase (also displayed in Fig. 2.b), only to note that it does not improve the quality of the refinement as compared to the tetragonal case (reliability factors are, for $Imma$, $R_p = 16.3$, $R_{wp} = 13.0$ and $\chi^2 = 0.58$ while slightly better values are found for $I4/mcm$ $R_p = 12.8$, $R_{wp} = 12.3$ and $\chi^2 = 0.59$) which further validates the tetragonal assignation.

The pressure-volume relation of S1, S2 and S3 are shown in Fig. 2.d. All data were adequately fitted using the 3rd-order Birch-Murnaghan (BM) EoS (a discussion on the choice of EoS is provided in Fig. S6 of the SM based on finite-strain analysis [52]), fitted volumes at zero pressure as well as bulk moduli and its pressure derivative are provided in the figure. For the tetragonal phase, very small deviations (i.e. volume deviations smaller than 0.1%, as shown in the supplementary material, SM, Fig. S7) are found from the fitted EoS up to the highest pressure, which is another indication that no other phase transition takes place and that only the $I4/mcm$ structure remains stable at least up to 45.1 GPa. There is no measurable volume jump at the transition. The pressure dependence of the bulk modulus in both phases has been included as an inset to Fig. 2.d in order to better illustrate the changes of second derivative of the Gibbs energy at the transition pressure. As it can be seen in the inset, at the transition pressure the bulk modulus exhibits a decrease of slope (due to the decreased K' for the high-pressure phase) together with a small variation ($\Delta K = -5.5\text{ GPa}$), which is consistent with a second-order transition.

From the Rietveld refinements we extracted the lattice parameters for both phases for samples S1 and S2. The tetragonality c/a is plotted versus pressure in Fig. 2.c. It is more insightful to use symmetry-adapted spontaneous




FIG. 2. (a) Diffraction patterns of sample S2. Inset: Zoom of the low-angle region. Low-angle fitted peak positions at 45.1 GPa are included as red and blue ticks corresponding to *I4/mcm* and *Imma* structures, respectively. Note that no diffraction peak is visible where the reflection (011) of an *Imma* phase would be expected. (b) Top: Rietveld fit (grey line) to a diffraction pattern (black line) acquired at 1.34 GPa. Bottom: Rietveld fit assuming tetragonal and orthorhombic phases (red and blue dashed lines, respectively) to a pattern acquired at a pressure of 45.1 GPa. Fitted positions for all reflections are included at the bottom as colored ticks. Both panels use the same intensity scale and residuals of the *Imma* fit are vertically shifted for a better comparison. (c) Pressure dependence of the volume per formula unit ABO₃ for the cubic and tetragonal phases (black and red, respectively). Lines are fits to BM EoS (for the cubic phase a high pressure extrapolation is included as a black dashed line). Inset: Bulk modulus as a function of pressure. (d) Top: Tetragonality (c/a ratio) as a function of pressure as obtained from the fitted x-ray diffraction (XRD) patterns of sample S2 (crosses) and adapted DFT calculations (circles). Bottom: Volume (e_a) and tetragonal (e_t) spontaneous strains as obtained from the experiments (crosses), our calculations (open symbols) and calculations published by Granhed et al. [31]. Our reported DFT-values include a pressure shift (+10 GPa) as discussed in the text; this is not the case for values taken from Ref. [31] calculated through the hybrid Heyd-Scuseria-Ernzerhof (HSE) functional, which provides a slight larger volume than the one obtained from the WC-functional employed here (cf. Table I in Ref. [31]).

strains defined as $e_a = (2e_1 + e_3)$ (volume strain) and $e_t = 2(e_3 - e_2)/\sqrt{3}$ (tetragonal strain), where e_1 and e_3 are the spontaneous strain components of the tetragonal phase with respect to the cubic phase, $e_1 = e_2 = (a_{pc} - a_0)/a_0$ and $e_3 = (c_{pc} - a_0)/a_0$ [53]. Here we took $a_0 = V^{1/3}$ where V is a cubic volume extrapolated from the EoS of the cubic phase while the pseudocubic lattice constants were calculated from the tetragonal lattice constants, $a_{pc} = a_t/\sqrt{2}$ and $c_{pc} = c_t/2$. As it can be seen in the lower panel of Fig. 2.c the tetragonal strain e_t is positive and linear with pressure with a slope of $7.5 \cdot 10^{-4} \text{ GPa}^{-1}$. The volume strain e_a is negative and exhibits comparatively large errors due to the increasing uncertainty of the extrapolated EoS at higher pressure. Good agreement is found with respect to the DFT-prediction, as shown in Fig. 2.d. Noteworthy, both e_a and e_t values are very similar to those reported for SrTiO₃ [12].

Overall, the combination of XRD and Raman spectroscopy data confirms that BaZrO₃ undergoes a phase transition from cubic to tetragonal but also show that no other transition happens up to the maximum experimental pressure investigated of 45.1 GPa.

The value of the transition pressure varies slightly depending on the method used. From the powder diffraction data, it can be determined by an extrapolation of the tetragonality to its ideal cubic value of $\sqrt{2}$, or of the tetragonal strain to zero, which gives a value of 12 GPa. This is in line with the emergence of superstructure reflections observed in the single crystal diffraction patterns only slightly above the noise level at 11.2 GPa and much more conclusively at 12.5 GPa (Fig. S4 in the SM). In the Raman data, the first-order peaks appear at 10 GPa, which is consistent with the ≈ 11 GPa measured from Raman spectroscopy in Ref. [14]. The slightly lower value found by Raman spectroscopy as compared to XRD is consistent with the smaller coherence length of this technique and its sensitivity to small structural changes. We note that our values are significantly lower than the 17.2 GPa given in Ref [15] where it was determined only from the observation of the peak splitting in a powder XRD pattern. In the following, we chose to retain the value of 10 GPa measured by Raman spectroscopy.

C. First-principle calculations

The propensity of BaZrO₃ to undergo a pressure-induced structural phase transition can be inferred from the inspection of phonon frequencies calculated in the compressed cubic reference structure, as well as from the DFPT-calculated phonon dispersion curves shown in Fig. 3.a-c (and Fig. S1; cf. also Ref. [25]). As it can be seen in the figure, an increase of external hydrostatic pressure (P) results in enhanced instabilities of the high-symmetry cubic phase arising from oxygen motion. In fact, increasing P enhances the antiferrodistortive (AFD) instabilities associated with the cooperative rotations of the oxygen octahedral cage (Fig. 3.d). For a wide range

of pressure, up to 40 GPa, the main driving instability is the one at R , accompanied by that at M , which is its continuation in the phonon spectrum. Higher pressure destabilize the system further, making polar and antipolar instabilities appearing at the Γ and X points.

It should be noted that, from DFT calculations, the cubic phase is already unstable at 0 GPa [28–31, 36], while a negative pressure of about ~ -10 GPa - should be applied to get a cubic ground state (Fig. S1). Such behaviour should be ascribed to the fact that first-principles simulations do not account for temperature effects. On the one hand, the thermal expansion is not strong here; in fact, the relaxed lattice parameter (by DFT) of the cubic structure at 0 K–0 GPa ($\simeq 4.184 \text{ \AA}$) perfectly reproduces the low-temperature ($T = 4.2 \text{ K}$) experimental value ($\simeq 4.188 \text{ \AA}$), but is also very similar to that measured at room temperature ($\simeq 4.193 \text{ \AA}$) [54]. A good agreement is also found for the volume and lattice parameters of the antiferrodistortive structures upon external pressure, with respect to those experimentally estimated via the Rietveld refinements of the XRD data (Fig. S3.a-b). This also suggests that no pressure shifting should be applied when comparing PBE-WC-calculated structural parameters with those measured, as opposed to typical arguments for LDA-calculations [23, 25]. On the other hand, temperature can strongly affect the critical pressure (P_c) at which the phase transition occurs, shifting it towards a higher value, that is $P_c \simeq 12$ GPa at room temperature experimentally. Indeed, the phase diagram of a similar compound, SrTiO₃, exhibits a P-T slope of 0.054 GPa/K, or an increase of transition pressure from the cubic to the tetragonal phase of $\Delta P_c = 16.2$ GPa for a temperature increase of 300 K, consistent with our pressure-shift correction [12]. Accordingly, a shift of +10 GPa has been applied to the DFT data, when comparing the calculated c/a ratio and spontaneous strains with the experimental ones. The evolution of these structural quantities, reported in Fig. 2.c, are indeed the supporting signature of the occurrence of the phase transition. In any case, we are interested here in trends rather than in the accurate and absolute values of transition pressures, and this point is not deemed essential in the present study.

Next, we compared the energetics associated to the different possible AFD phases in order to evaluate the possible phase transitions. An analysis of the computed and measured Raman active modes for candidate structures was addressed in Sec. III A. In Fig. 3.d, we show the evolution of the thermodynamic potential energy, the enthalpy $H = U + PV$, where U is the DFT-calculated internal energy of the system associated with the relaxed volume V of the AFD-structures under the constraint of given hydrostatic stress (σ_{ij}), corresponding to the external hydrostatic pressure P . We see that there is a continuous increase of the energy gain as a function of pressure for the considered AFD structures with respect to the reference cubic. In particular, the tetragonal $I4/mcm$ phase, to which corresponds the biggest oxygen rotation angle Θ (Fig. 3.e), is the lowest energy configura-




FIG. 3. **(a,b,c)** DFPT phonon dispersion curves in the cubic phase for 20, 40 and 60 GPa applied hydrostatic pressure (corresponding lattice parameters a are 4.049 Å, 3.955 Å and 3.883 Å, respectively). Red, green and blue phononic branches involve mostly Ba, Zr and O vibrations, respectively. **(d)** Computed enthalpies (H), with respect to the cubic phase taken as reference at each pressure. **(e)** Evolution of the oxygen octahedra rotation angle Θ (in degree, $^{\circ}$) with isotropic external pressure for different rotation patterns.

rotation at all studied pressures. Noteworthy, the in-phase ($a^0a^0c^+$) rotation pattern, which define the tetragonal partner $P4/mbm$, produces a much lower gain of energy. In particular, in the compressed cubic cell, it can be seen that, there is a significant imbalance between the energy gain brought by the condensation of the c^+ rotation and by the c^- ones, in favor of the latter, as shown in Fig. S3.c. This behavior is similar to what also observed in SrTiO₃ and PbTiO₃ [55, 56], and thus it could be a typical feature of perovskite oxides with a tolerance factor t close to 1. Clearly, the interplay between pressure and strain relaxation stabilize the $a^0a^0c^-$ -AFD tetragonal phase with $I4/mcm$ space group at the expense of all other candidates. Moreover, the phonon spectrum of the $I4/mcm$ phase ($a^0a^0c^-$), calculated at 20 GPa, does not display any instability or any mode softening (cf. Table SI and Fig. S2), confirming that the tetragonal phase is dynamically stable and suggesting that no further phase transition is expected in the investigated pressure range.

We also considered the possibility for a transition to the ($a^-b^+a^-$) tilt system, corresponding to the very common and stable orthorhombic $Pnma$ structure. For this case, the system relaxes back to the orthorhombic $Imma$ ($a^-b^0a^-$) phase suppressing the b^+ rotation, also in line with past studies [27, 57]. Therefore, this highlights that, in BaZrO₃, the condensation of one rotational mode suppresses the partner one. It can be surprising at first sight, given how common the $Pnma$ structure is in per-

ovskite systems and the various tilt instabilities appearing at high pressure (e.g. at 60 GPa). Nevertheless, a careful analysis of the phonon dispersion and character of the modes at the different high-symmetry q -points of the cubic-BZ zone reveals crucial features. In $Pnma$ perovskites such as CaTiO₃ and SrZrO₃ at 0 GPa [5, 34], it is the competition and coexistence of in-phase and anti-phase rotations together with the trilinear coupling of the latter modes with the A-cation antipolar displacement, in turn also linked to the existence of an unstable polar zone-center mode in the parent cubic phase, mainly driven by the A-cation, to lower the ground state energy [5, 58, 59]. Instabilities involving displacements of the A cation is therefore a key ingredient that is missing in BaZrO₃ at high pressure, and a fortiori at ambient pressure. At ambient pressure, cubic BaZrO₃ displays neither the unstable in-phase tilt mode nor any polar instability. Under pressure, these modes become indeed unstable but (i) the pattern of distortion associated to the unstable Γ -mode is mainly characterized by a polar motion of the zirconium atoms at the B-site against the oxygen cage; (ii) the phonon branch related to the Ba-displacements stay higher in energy with respect to the CaTiO₃ and SrZrO₃ cases. As a result, the $Pnma$ phase is never stabilized.

IV. CONCLUSION

In summary, we have reported a combination of Raman spectroscopy, x-ray diffraction and first-principle calculations aimed at clarifying the high-pressure behaviour of BaZrO₃. We confirm the picture according to which BaZrO₃ undergoes a single phase transition around 10 GPa to a tetragonal *I4/mcm* phase and retains this structure until the highest pressures investigated – here 45.1 GPa. We have reconciled this result with previous claims for the existence of a second phase transition, and in particular clarified the Raman mode assignment of the high-pressure phase. From our analysis, it turns out that a second transition to an orthorhombic phase or any other tilted phase is, in fact, not expected. Instead, our study draws a picture where the stability and dominance of the tetragonal phase with its single anti-phase tilt is reinforced with high pressure, with a tilt angle that can reach values as large as 13° at 60 GPa according to DFT. The question of its stability limit at even higher pressures therefore remains an open question. Following recent theoretical studies, two candidate phase transitions can be considered. The first is a transition to a polar phase combining tilts and polar cation displacements. The second is a direct transition to a post-perovskite phase. We anticipate that measurements in the 100 GPa (MBar) range,

possibly complemented by in-situ heating to overcome energy barriers, will be necessary to find out which of those two possible options prevail.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

C.T., D.A. and R.O. contributed equally to this paper and are therefore sharing first authorship. The authors are grateful to M. Mezouar and W.A. Crichton (ESRF ID27) for in-house beamtime allocation and for their help during Neon gas loading of the DACs. We acknowledge SOLEIL for provision of synchrotron radiation facilities under proposal N. 20191842. This work was supported by the Innovative Training Networks (ITN) Marie Skłodowska-Curie Actions-European Joint Doctorate in Functional Material Research (EJDFunMat) (Project No. 641640). DFT-based calculations have been performed on the NIC4 and NIC5 clusters hosted at the University of Liège, within the ‘Consortium des Équipements de Calcul Intensif’ (CÉCI), funded by F.R.S-FNRS (Grant No. 2.5020.1) and by the Walloon Region. C.T., M.G., J.K. acknowledge financial support from the Fond National de Recherche Luxembourg through a PEARL Grant (No. FNR/P12/4853155/Kreisel). D.A. is grateful to S. Picozzi (CNR-SPIN) and to M. Verstraete and B. Dupé (ULiege) for the time allowed to work on the writing of this paper.

-
- [1] A. M. Glazer, *Phase Transitions* **84**, 405 (2011).
 - [2] A. M. Glazer, *Acta Crystallographica Section B* **28**, 3384 (1972).
 - [3] A. M. Glazer, *Acta Crystallogr. A* **31**, 756 (1975).
 - [4] C. J. Howard and H. T. Stokes, *Acta Cryst. A* **61**, 93 (2005).
 - [5] S. Amisi, E. Bousquet, K. Katcho, and P. Ghosez, *Phys. Rev. B* **85**, 064112 (2012).
 - [6] G. A. Samara, T. Sakudo, and K. Yoshimitsu, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **35**, 1767 (1975).
 - [7] W. Zhong and D. Vanderbilt, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **74**, 2587 (1995).
 - [8] T. Tohei, A. Kuwabara, T. Yamamoto, F. Oba, and I. Tanaka, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **94**, 035502 (2005).
 - [9] R. J. Angel, J. Zhao, and N. L. Ross, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **95**, 025503 (2005).
 - [10] H. J. Xiang, M. Guennou, J. Íñiguez, J. Kreisel, and L. Bellaiche, *Phys. Rev. B* **96**, 054102 (2017).
 - [11] A. Grzechnik, G. H. Wolf, and P. F. McMillan, *J. Raman Spectrosc.* **28**, 885 (1997).
 - [12] M. Guennou, P. Bouvier, J. Kreisel, and D. Machon, *Phys. Rev. B* **81**, 054115 (2010).
 - [13] T. Yamanaka, M. Ahart, H.-K. Mao, and H. Yan, *Journal of Physics: Condensed Matter* **30**, 265401 (2018).
 - [14] C. Chemarin, N. Rosman, T. Pagnier, and G. Lucazeau, *Journal of Solid State Chemistry* **149**, 298 (2000).
 - [15] X. Yang, Q. Li, R. Liu, B. Liu, H. Zhang, S. Jiang, J. Liu, B. Zou, T. Cui, and B. Liu, *Journal of Applied Physics* **115**, 124907 (2014).
 - [16] S. Åsbrink and A. Waśkowska, *Phys. Rev. B* **53**, 12 (1996).
 - [17] M. Guennou, P. Bouvier, G. Garbarino, J. Kreisel, and E. K. H. Salje, *J. Phys.: Condens. Matter* **23**, 485901 (2011).
 - [18] S. A. T. Redfern, *J. Phys.: Condens. Matter* **8**, 8267 (1996).
 - [19] C. J. Howard, K. S. Knight, B. J. Kennedy, and E. H. Kisi, *Journal of Physics: Condensed Matter* **12**, L677 (2000).
 - [20] S. K. Mishra, N. Choudhury, S. L. Chaplot, P. S. R. Krishna, and R. Mittal, *Phys. Rev. B* **76**, 024110 (2007).
 - [21] D. Cabaret, B. Couzinet, A.-M. Flank, J.-P. Itié, P. Lagarde, and A. Polian, *AIP Conference Proceedings* **882**, 120 (2007).
 - [22] M. Fischer, B. Bonello, J.-P. Itié, A. Polian, E. Dartyge, A. Fontaine, and H. Tolentino, *Phys. Rev. B* **42**, 8494 (1990).
 - [23] E. Bousquet and P. Ghosez, *Phys. Rev. B* **74**, 180101 (2006).
 - [24] I. A. Kornev and L. Bellaiche, *Phase Transitions* **80**, 385 (2007).
 - [25] C. Zhu, K. Xia, G. R. Qian, C. L. Lu, W. Z. Luo, K. F. Wang, and J.-M. Liu, *Journal of Applied Physics* **105**, 044110 (2009).
 - [26] E. Rahmatizad Khajehpasha, S. Goedecker, and S. A. Ghasemi, *Journal of Computational Chemistry* **42**, 699 (2021).

- [27] H. Tian, X.-Y. Kuang, A.-J. Mao, Y. Yang, C. Xu, S. O. Sayedaghaee, and L. Bellaiche, *Phys. Rev. B* **97**, 020103 (2018).
- [28] A. R. Akbarzadeh, I. Kornev, C. Malibert, L. Bellaiche, and J. M. Kiat, *Physical Review B* **72**, 205104 (2005).
- [29] J. W. Bennett, I. Grinberg, and A. M. Rappe, *Phys. Rev. B* **73**, 180102 (2006).
- [30] A. Bilić and J. D. Gale, *Phys. Rev. B* **79**, 174107 (2009).
- [31] E. J. Granhed, G. Wahnström, and P. Hyldgaard, *Phys. Rev. B* **101**, 224105 (2020).
- [32] A. I. Lebedev and I. A. Sluchinskaya, *Phys. Solid State* **55**, 1941 (2013).
- [33] I. Levin, M. G. Han, H. Y. Playford, V. Krayzman, Y. Zhu, and R. A. Maier, *Phys. Rev. B* **104**, 214109 (2021).
- [34] D. Amoroso, A. Cano, and P. Ghosez, *Phys. Rev. B* **97**, 174108 (2018).
- [35] D. Amoroso, A. Cano, and P. Ghosez, *Applied Physics Letters* **114**, 092902 (2019).
- [36] C. Toulouse, D. Amoroso, C. Xin, P. Veber, M. C. Hatnean, G. Balakrishnan, M. Maglione, P. Ghosez, J. Kreisel, and M. Guennou, *Phys. Rev. B* **100**, 134102 (2019).
- [37] C. Xin, P. Veber, M. Guennou, C. Toulouse, N. Valle, M. C. Hatnean, G. Balakrishnan, R. Haumont, R. S. Martin, M. Velazquez, A. Maillard, D. Rytz, M. Josse, M. Maglione, and J. Kreisel, *CrystEngComm* **21**, 502 (2019).
- [38] H. K. Mao, J. Xu, and P. M. Bell, *J. Geophys. Res.* **91**, 4673 (1986).
- [39] S. Klotz, J.-C. Chervin, P. Munsch, and G. L. Marchand, *Journal of Physics D: Applied Physics* **42**, 075413 (2009).
- [40] J. Rodriguez-Carvajal, *Physica B: Condensed Matter* **192**, 55 (1993).
- [41] D. L. Heinz and R. Jeanloz, *J. Appl. Phys.* **55**, 885 (1984).
- [42] A. Dewaele, P. Loubeyre, and M. Mezouar, *Phys. Rev. B* **70**, 094112 (2004).
- [43] X. Gonze and C. Lee, *Phys. Rev. B* **55**, 10355 (1997).
- [44] X. Gonze, J.-M. Beuken, R. Caracas, F. Detraux, M. Fuchs, G.-M. Rignanese, L. Sindic, M. Verstraete, G. Zerah, F. Jollet, M. Torrent, A. Roy, M. Mikami, P. Ghosez, J.-Y. Raty, and D. Allan, *Computational Materials Science* **25**, 478 (2002).
- [45] X. Gonze, B. Amadon, P.-M. Anglade, J.-M. Beuken, F. Bottin, P. Boulanger, F. Bruneval, D. Caliste, R. Caracas, M. Côté, T. Deutsch, L. Genovese, P. Ghosez, M. Giantomassi, S. Goedecker, D. Hamann, P. Hermet, F. Jollet, G. Jomard, S. Leroux, M. Mancini, S. Mazevet, M. Oliveira, G. Onida, Y. Pouillon, T. Rangel, G.-M. Rignanese, D. Sangalli, R. Shaltaf, M. Torrent, M. Verstraete, G. Zerah, and J. Zwanziger, *Computer Physics Communications* **180**, 2582 (2009).
- [46] X. Gonze, B. Amadon, G. Antonius, F. Arnardi, L. Baguet, J.-M. Beuken, J. Bieder, F. Bottin, J. Bouchet, E. Bousquet, N. Brouwer, F. Bruneval, G. Brunin, T. Cavignac, J.-B. Charraud, W. Chen, M. Côté, S. Cottenier, J. Denier, G. Geneste, P. Ghosez, M. Giantomassi, Y. Gillet, O. Gingras, D. R. Hamann, G. Hautier, X. He, N. Helbig, N. Holzwarth, Y. Jia, F. Jollet, W. Lafargue-Dit-Hauret, K. Lejaeghere, M. A. Marques, A. Martin, C. Martins, H. P. Miranda, F. Naccarato, K. Persson, G. Petretto, V. Planes, Y. Pouillon, S. Prokhorenko, F. Ricci, G.-M. Rignanese, A. H. Romero, M. M. Schmitt, M. Torrent, M. J. van Setten, B. Van Troeye, M. J. Verstraete, G. Zerah, and J. W. Zwanziger, *Computer Physics Communications* **248**, 107042 (2020).
- [47] Z. Wu and R. E. Cohen, *Phys. Rev. B* **73**, 235116 (2006).
- [48] D. R. Hamann, *Phys. Rev. B* **88**, 085117 (2013).
- [49] E. Kroumova, M. I. Aroyo, J. M. Perez-Mato, A. Kirov, C. Capillas, S. Ivantchev, and H. Wondratschek, *Phase Transitions* **76**, 155 (2003).
- [50] L. Elcoro, B. Bradlyn, Z. Wang, M. G. Vergniory, J. Cano, C. Felser, B. A. Bernevig, D. Orobengoa, G. de la Flor, and M. I. Aroyo, *Journal of Applied Crystallography* **50**, 1457 (2017).
- [51] H. T. Stokes, D. M. Hatch, and B. J. Campbell, *ISOTROPY Software Suite*, iso.byu.edu.
- [52] R. Jeanloz and R. M. Hazen, *American Mineralogist* **76**, 1765 (1991).
- [53] M. A. Carpenter, *American Mineralogist* **92**, 309 (2007).
- [54] K. S. Knight, *Journal of Materials Science* **55**, 6417 (2020).
- [55] H. Sharma, J. Kreisel, and P. Ghosez, *Phys. Rev. B* **90**, 214102 (2014).
- [56] H. Sharma, *Doctoral thesis* <http://hdl.handle.net/2268/173315> (2014).
- [57] P. Chen, M. N. Grisolia, H. J. Zhao, O. E. González-Vázquez, L. Bellaiche, M. Bibes, B.-G. Liu, and J. Íñiguez, *Phys. Rev. B* **97**, 024113 (2018).
- [58] N. A. Benedek and C. J. Fennie, *The Journal of Physical Chemistry C* **117**, 13339 (2013).
- [59] N. Miao, N. C. Bristowe, B. Xu, M. J. Verstraete, and P. Ghosez, *Journal of Physics: Condensed Matter* **26**, 035401 (2013).