

"Madelung model" prediction for dependence of lattice parameter on nanocrystal size.

Vasili Perebeinos

Department of Physics, Brookhaven National Laboratory, Upton, New York
1973-5000

Siu-Wai Chan and Feng Zhang

Department of Applied Physics and Applied Mathematics, Columbia University,
New York, NY 10027

Abstract

The competition between the long range Coulomb attractive and the short range repulsive interaction in ionic nanocrystals creates an effective negative pressure, which causes the lattice parameter a to increase with decreasing nanoparticle size d . A simple "Madelung model" is used to predict the dependence of the lattice parameter for CeO_2 and BaTiO_3 on d , $a = a_0 + \frac{C}{d}$, for $C = 0.22 \text{ \AA}$ and 0.18 \AA respectively. The model predictions are compared with experimental results.

Key words: A. Nanostructures, A. Surfaces and interfaces

PACS: 61.50.Ah, 61.82.Rx, 68.35.Md, 79.60.Jv

How properties of ionic crystals change when their surface to volume ratio becomes large is an active area of research [1-7]. The ceria nanoparticles CeO_2 have been studied experimentally using Raman, X-ray diffraction, photoabsorption, high resolution transmission electron microscopy (HRTEM) [1,2], and transmission electron microscopy [3-5]. The fascinating property of ionic nanoparticles is the lattice parameter increase with nanoparticle decreasing size [1,4,5]. Intuitively one would expect the lattice parameter to decrease as a result of surface stress as was observed in gold nanoparticles [8].

Nanocrystal properties are significantly different from their bulk counterparts. Previous theoretical treatments [6,7] used realistic potentials for small Ce_nO_{2n}

Corresponding author.

Email address: vasili@bnl.gov (Vasili Perebeinos).

URL: <http://cmth.phy.bnl.gov/~perebein> (Vasili Perebeinos).

cluster calculations. It was shown that fluorite structure for ceria was not achieved for n smaller than 50. In the present work we investigate lattice parameter dependence on a cluster size for $d = 4 - 20$ nm or $n = 10^3 - 10^5$. Charge neutral octahedra nanocrystals are surface terminated with oxygen anion layers along the eight filling faces. The balance between the long range Coulomb and the short range atomic interactions leads to the optimal lattice parameter a_0 dependent on the size of the cluster. The volume energy per formula unit in the bulk material is usually modeled as

$$E_v = \frac{B V_0}{2} \left(\frac{V}{V_0} - 1 \right)^2; \quad (1)$$

where B is the bulk modulus and $E_v = N E_v$ is the volume energy of N formula units of CeO_2 , each filling volume space $V_0 = a_0^3/4$. In the infinite crystal Eq. (1) is the total free energy which is minimum at the bulk lattice parameter a_0 . In the nanocrystal the balance between the Coulomb and short range forces is altered due to the surface. The surface Coulomb energy creates a negative pressure which leads to the lattice parameter expansion in the nanocrystal in accord with observation [1].

To calculate the Coulomb energy in ionic nanoparticles we use the same procedure as Madelung energy calculation in bulk material [9]. In the fluorite (CaF_2) structure the Ce^{4+} ions occupy a fcc sublattice and O^{2-} ions occupy the tetrahedral interstitial sites forming a simple cubic sublattice of length $a_0/2$. This gives a Madelung energy per formula unit $E_{\text{M ad}} = \epsilon_{\text{bulk}} e^2/a$, where $\epsilon_{\text{bulk}} = -46.55$. The value of $\epsilon = M z_i z_j / r_0$ is related to the Madelung constant $M = 2.52$ for the CaF_2 crystal structure [10], where ionic charges are $z_i = 2$, $z_j = 4$ and the nearest neighbor distance is $r_0 = a_0/3 = 4$ in units of a . To calculate the surface Madelung energy we use a finite size cluster of Ce^{4+} and O^{2-} ions terminated by the oxygen layers along the eight (111) planes. The surface energy is proportional to the area of nanoparticle $N^{2/3}$. The diameter $d = (3N/2)^{1/3} a_0$ is related to the number of Ce atoms N such that the sphere of equal diameter contains an equal volume $N V_0$. The Madelung energy of a cluster (with a uniform lattice parameter) can be calculated for different diameters. The results are shown on Fig. 1 (a), which are well fitted by

$$\frac{E_{\text{M ad}}}{N} = \epsilon_{\text{bulk}} + \frac{\epsilon_{\text{sur}}}{d} \frac{e^2}{a}; \quad (2)$$

with two parameters $\epsilon_{\text{bulk}} = -46.55$ and $\epsilon_{\text{sur}} = 4.13$ nm.

The uniform lattice parameter expansion reduces the surface Madelung energy creating the stress in the nanocrystal estimated with Eq. (1). The total energy per Ce atom on the nanoparticle is




Fig. 1. Closed circles are model calculations of the Madelung energy on ionic (a) CeO_2 and (b) BaTiO_3 nanocrystals. The CeO_2 nanocrystal was terminated by eighth (111) planes and BaTiO_3 by six (100) planes. The solid lines are the best fits using Eq. (2).

$$\frac{E_{\text{tot}}}{N} = \frac{B V_0}{2} \frac{a^3}{a_0^3} - \frac{1}{2} + \frac{\beta_{\text{sur}}}{d} \frac{e^2}{a} : \quad (3)$$

Here the first term is the volume contribution, which includes the Madelung energy of the infinite crystal, and the second term is the surface Coulomb energy from Eq. 2. Minimization of the total energy with respect to the lattice parameter for fixed N gives

$$\frac{a}{a_0} = \frac{1}{9B V_0} \frac{e^2}{a_0} \frac{\beta_{\text{sur}}}{d} = \frac{\beta_{\text{sur}}}{d} : \quad (4)$$

The bulk modulus $B = 230 \pm 10$ GPa has been measured by high-pressure x-ray diffraction [11]. Taking $a_0 = 5.409$ Å we obtain the relation $a = a_0 + 0.22$ Å = d for the lattice parameter expansion shown on Fig. 2. The experimental lattice parameter (also shown on Fig. 2) expands with a larger slope $\alpha = 0.37$ Å. Our model predicts 60% of the measured value of α . The missing 40% of the lattice parameter expansion might be assigned to the formation of point defects. These defects are oxygen vacancies and simultaneous reduction of two ions of Ce^{4+} to Ce^{3+} for each oxygen vacancy formed, maintaining charge neutrality. Electron spectroscopy [12] and X-ray photoelectron spectroscopy [3] show the presence of a Ce^{3+} component in nanocrystals. Since Ce^{3+} has a larger radius compared to Ce^{4+} there may be a lattice expansion accompanying the replacement of $(\text{Ce}^{4+})_2\text{O}_2$ by Ce^{3+}V where V is a neutral oxygen vacancy. An upper limit in the Ce^{3+} contribution to expansion was estimated [1] by interpolation of published results of the variation in ceria lattice parameter with RE^{3+} radii from doping with different rare earth oxides (RE_2O_3) [13,14]. Recent neutron diffraction measurements on nano-scale powder of CeO_2 [15]




Fig. 2. Filled circles are experimental lattice parameters versus inverse diameter of CeO_2 nanoparticle. Dashed line is the best fit for the experimental data [1]. Solid line is a Madelung model prediction $\Delta a/a = 0.22 \text{ \AA}/d$.

suggest associated oxygen defect formation (involving oxygen vacancies and self-interstitials) in the fluorite structure. Such defects are not included in our model and may alter the surface Madelung energy estimation.

The Madelung model is valid for any ionic nanocrystal. We apply it for the BaTiO_3 nanoparticles to calculate the competition between the long range Coulomb and the short range atomic interactions. The results are shown on Fig.1 (b). Ionic charges Ba^{2+} , Ti^{4+} and O^{2-} were used to calculate the surface energy of the nanoparticle. To preserve charge neutrality the cubic nanocrystal with size d was terminated by the three BaO and three TiO_2 f100g planes. The calculated value of $\gamma_{\text{sur}} = 3.6 \text{ nm}$ along with the experimental lattice parameter $a_0 = 3.996 \text{ \AA}$ and bulk modulus $B = 196 \text{ GPa}$ [16] predicts $\Delta a/a_0 = 0.18 \text{ \AA}/d$. Existing data [5] on BaTiO_3 nanoparticles are not sufficient to verify the relationship Eq. (4) and further experiments are needed.

In conclusion we propose a mechanism for lattice parameter expansion of ionic nanocrystals due to the effective negative Madelung pressure. Using the experimental bulk modulus we quantitatively explain a lattice parameter expansion in ionic materials. A discrepancy between the model prediction and observed effect in CeO_2 can be attributed to the Ce^{3+} component [3,4] and other defects not included in our model. The Ce^{3+} concentration deduced from magnetic measurements [4] suggests a much smaller value than expected from lattice expansion measurements in accord with our theory. A non-uniform lattice parameter expansion and structural defect formation [15] would change the quantitative answer, but not the conclusion that an effective negative Madelung pressure is significant in ionic nanocrystals.

Acknowledgments

We are grateful to Philip B. Allen for critical reading of the manuscript,

Michael Weinert for valuable discussions, and Stephen O'Brien for taking our attention on BaTiO₃ nanocrystals. This work was supported in part by DOE Grant No. DE-AC-02-98CH10886. S.-W. C. and F.Z. acknowledge support by the MRSEC program of the National Science Foundation under DMR-9809687.

References

- [1] F. Zhang, S.-W. Chan, J. E. Spanier, E. Apak, Q. Jin, R. D. Robinson, and I. P. Herman, Appl. Phys. Lett. 80, 127 (2002).
- [2] J. Spanier, R. D. Robinson, F. Zhang, S.-W. Chan, and I. P. Herman, Phys. Rev. B 64, 245407 (2001).
- [3] S. Tsunekawa, T. Fukuda, and A. Kasuya, Surf. Sci. Lett. 457, L437 (2000).
- [4] S. Tsunekawa, R. Sivamohan, S. Ito, A. Kasuya, and T. Fukuda, Nanostructured Materials, 11, 141 (1999).
- [5] S. Tsunekawa, K. Ishikawa, Z.-Q. Li, Y. Kawazoe, and A. Kasuya, Phys. Rev. Lett 85, 3440 (2000).
- [6] T. X. T. Sayle, S. C. Parker, and C. R. A. Catlow, Surf. Sci. 316, 329 (1994).
- [7] H. Cordatos, D. Ford, and R. J. Gorte, J. Phys. Chem. 100, 18128 (1996).
- [8] C. W. Mays, J. S. Vermaak, and D. Kuhlmann-Wilsdorf, Surf. Sci. 12, 134 (1968).
- [9] C. Kittel, in Introduction to Solid State Physics, (J. Wiley & Sons Inc, New York, 1996) p. 634.
- [10] D. R. Lide, in CRC Handbook of Chemistry and Physics, (CRC Press, Boca Raton, 82 Ed. 2001-2002) p. 12-36.
- [11] S. J. Duclos, Y. K. Vohra, A. L. Ruoff, A. Jayaraman, and G. P. Espinosa, Phys. Rev. B 38, 7755 (1988).
- [12] D. R. Mullins, S. H. Overbury, and D. R. Huntley, Surf. Sci. 409, 307 (1998).
- [13] L. Eyring, in Handbook on the Physics and Chemistry of Rare Earths, edited by K. A. Gschneider and L. Eyring (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1979), Vol. 3, Chap. 27.
- [14] J. R. McBride, K. C. Hass, B. D. Poindexter, and W. H. Weber, J. Appl. Phys. 76, 2435 (1994).
- [15] E. Mamontov and T. Egami, J. of Phys. Chem. Sol. 61, 1345 (2000).
- [16] G. J. Fischer, Z. Wang, and S. Karato, Phys. Chem. Minerals 20, 97 (1993).