

# Zero-temperature generalized phase diagram of the 4d transition metals under pressure

C. Cazorla<sup>1,2,3</sup>, D. Alfè<sup>1,2,3,4</sup>, and M. J. Gillan<sup>1,2,3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*London Centre for Nanotechnology, UCL, London WC1H 0AH, U.K.*

<sup>2</sup>*Department of Physics and Astronomy, UCL, London WC1E 6BT, U.K.*

<sup>3</sup>*Materials Simulation Laboratory, London WC1E 6BT, U.K.*

<sup>4</sup>*Department of Earth Sciences, UCL, London, WC1E 6BT, U.K.*

## Abstract

We use an accurate implementation of density functional theory (DFT) to calculate the zero-temperature generalized phase diagram of the 4d series of transition metals from Y to Pd as a function of pressure  $P$  and atomic number  $Z$ . The implementation used is full-potential linearized augmented plane waves (FP-LAPW), and we employ the exchange-correlation functional recently developed by Wu and Cohen. For each element, we obtain the ground-state energy for several crystal structures over a range of volumes, the energy being converged with respect to all technical parameters to within  $\sim 1$  meV/atom. The calculated transition pressures for all the elements and all transitions we have found are compared with experiment wherever possible, and we discuss the origin of the significant discrepancies. Agreement with experiment for the zero-temperature equation of state is generally excellent. The generalized phase diagram of the 4d series shows that the major boundaries slope towards lower  $Z$  with increasing  $P$  for the early elements, as expected from the pressure induced transfer of electrons from  $sp$  states to  $d$  states, but are almost independent of  $P$  for the later elements. Our results for Mo indicate a transition from bcc to fcc, rather than the bcc-hcp transition expected from  $sp-d$  transfer.

## I. INTRODUCTION

The transition metals are among the most intensively studied families of elements, and there has been an effort going back several decades to map and interpret systematic trends in their properties. Some of these trends are of fundamental importance to our understanding of the energetics and electronic structure of transition metals. Examples include: the parabolic dependence of cohesive energy and bulk modulus on  $d$ -band filling;<sup>1</sup> the sequence of most stable crystal structures associated with increasing band filling at ambient pressure;<sup>2</sup> and the pressure induced increase of  $d$ -band width going roughly as the fifth inverse power of the atomic volume.<sup>3</sup> However, our knowledge of transition-metal systematics is still very far from complete, as is evident from the current major controversies over high-pressure melting curves.<sup>4,5,6,7</sup> Even at low temperatures, there are sizable gaps in the map of transition-metal phase diagrams, and new crystal structures continue to be discovered.<sup>8</sup> We report here a systematic investigation of the zero-temperature phase diagram of all the  $4d$  transition metals over a wide range of pressures, based on one of the most accurate implementations of density functional theory (DFT) currently available.

There have, of course, been very many previous detailed studies of transition metals based on DFT, some of which investigated the relative stability of different crystal structures at high pressures. However, most previous work has been designed to address particular questions relating to particular metals. Here, by contrast, the aim is to obtain a coherent overall view of an entire transition-metals series. Specifically, using  $Z$  to denote atomic number, we wish to use DFT to map out the generalized  $(P, Z)$  phase diagram of the  $4d$  series at  $T = 0$  K at pressures  $P$  up to  $\sim 500$  GPa<sup>9</sup>. In order to substantiate the accuracy of the calculations, we shall compare our calculated results for  $P$  as a function of volume  $V$  with all available experimental data. The calculations are all performed using the FP-LAPW implementation of DFT (full-potential linearized augmented plane waves),<sup>10,11,12,13</sup> which for a given exchange-correlation functional is among the most accurate ways of calculating the total energy. We use the exchange-correlation functional recently developed by Wu and Cohen,<sup>14</sup> which appears to reproduce the experimental energetics of  $4d$  transition metals more accurately than other functionals.<sup>15</sup>

There are several motivations for wishing to obtain the  $(P, Z)$  phase diagram of a transition-metal series at  $T = 0$  K. One motivation is the possibility of discovering hitherto

unknown crystallographic phase boundaries for particular metals. Another motivation is to probe our basic understanding of transition-metal energetics. At ambient pressure, the most stable crystal structures of the  $4d$  and  $5d$  series follow the sequence hexagonal close packed (hcp) to body-centred cubic (bcc) to hcp to face-centred cubic (fcc) with increasing  $Z$ , and the  $3d$  series nearly follows this sequence, the deviations being caused by magnetic effects.<sup>16</sup> This sequence is entirely explained by band energies, and can be reasonably well reproduced using a canonical  $d$ -band tight-binding model with some modifications due to hybridization with  $sp$  bands.<sup>17,18,19</sup> The main effect of pressure is to shift the relative energies of the  $d$ -band centroid and the bottom of the  $sp$  band, and hence increase the  $d$ -band filling.<sup>17</sup> This leads one to expect that the same sequence of structures will be found at high  $P$ , but with the boundaries shifted to the left (towards lower  $Z$ ).<sup>20,21</sup> We shall confirm that this is the case, though the reality is slightly more complicated.

In addition to the motivations we have mentioned, there is another that is important to us. Current controversies over the high-pressure melting curves of transition metals stem from apparent disagreements between melting temperatures deduced from static compression and shock experiments, these disagreements amounting to several thousand K at megabar pressures.<sup>6,7</sup> DFT calculations of transition-metal melting curves<sup>4,5,22</sup> support the correctness of the shock results, and one of the proposed resolutions of the conflicts is that the transitions identified as melting in static compression are in fact solid-solid transitions. It would clearly help to reduce the confusion if we had a better understanding of the generalized  $(P, T, Z)$  phase diagram of transition-metal series<sup>9</sup>. At present, we have a fairly complete knowledge of this only at low  $P$ , and, to a lesser extent, at low  $T$ . We see the present attempt to complete the low- $T$   $(P, Z)$  diagram as an essential step towards mapping the full  $(P, T, Z)$  diagram.

Earlier DFT work has already given much information about the energetics of transition metals at  $T = 0$  K. Particularly important here is the work of Pettifor<sup>17,23,24</sup> and others, which provided a systematic understanding of the structural trends across all the transition-metal series in terms of the electronic densities of states of different crystal structures. Their work also gave important insights into the pressure induced transfer of electrons from  $sp$ -states to  $d$ -states. Also important was the first-principles work of Skriver<sup>25</sup> on structural trends across transition metal series at zero pressure. The pioneering work of Moriarty, Johansson and others on the high-pressure energetics of transition metals will be cited below.

The information from all this previous work could be assembled to produce a substantial part of the  $(P, Z)$  diagram, but there would be inconsistencies from the use of different DFT implementations and exchange-correlation functionals. Here, we avoid such inconsistencies by using a single high-accuracy method for all the calculations.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. In Sec. II, we summarize the essential ideas underlying the methods used in this work and the results of our convergence tests. Then (Sec. III), we present for each of the transition metals from Y to Pd our calculated energy differences between different crystal structures and the equation of state (EOS)  $P(V)$  for pressures from ambient to  $\sim 500$  GPa, comparing our results with experiments and previous calculations where possible. At the end of Sec. III, we present the zero-temperature  $(P, Z)$  phase diagram of the  $4d$  transition-metal series. Discussion and conclusions are in Sec. IV.

## II. TECHNIQUES AND TESTS

There are several implementations of DFT that can be used to calculate the total energy per atom of a crystal, including pseudopotential techniques,<sup>26</sup> the projector augmented wave technique,<sup>27,28</sup> the full-potential augmented plane-wave (FP-LAPW) technique,<sup>10,11,12,13</sup> etc. We have chosen to use FP-LAPW here, because for a given exchange-correlation functional it can give values for the total energy that are closer to the exact value than most other implementations. There are a number of technical parameters in FP-LAPW that control convergence towards the exact value. We recall in this Section the main ideas of FP-LAPW, summarize the parameters that control convergence, and report tests that guide our setting of these parameters. The exchange-correlation functional used for all the present work is that due to Wu and Cohen.<sup>14</sup> Later in this Section, we outline briefly what this functional is, and we report tests indicating that it should be particularly accurate for present purposes.

### A. Full-potential linearized augmented plane waves

In APW methods, space is divided into non-overlapping muffin-tin spheres (radius  $R_{\text{MT}}$ ) centred on the atoms, and the interstitial region between the spheres. Each Kohn-Sham orbital is represented as a sum of radial functions multiplied by spherical harmonics up to a maximum angular momentum  $l_{\text{orb}}^{\text{max}}$  in each sphere, and as a sum of plane waves (maximum

wavevector  $K_{\max}$ ) in the interstitial region; the coefficients are adjusted to achieve continuity at the sphere boundaries. The Kohn-Sham eigenstates are divided into core and valence states; core states are treated as being non-zero only inside the muffin-tin spheres, while valence states extend over all space. The radial functions used as basis sets are solutions of the Schrödinger equation inside the atomic spheres, and are therefore energy dependent. In linearized APW (LAPW), the energy dependence is treated in a linear approximation. In full-potential implementations (FP-LAPW), the Kohn-Sham potential is also represented as a sum over angular momentum functions within the spheres (maximum angular momentum  $l_{\text{pot}}^{\max}$ ) and a sum over plane waves (maximum wavevector  $G_{\max}$ ) in the interstitial region. As it stands, this scheme is not accurate if there are semi-core states, i.e. low-lying states that are not adequately treated by linearization. One solution to this problem is to linearize the basis functions using different reference energies for valence and semi-core states. Alternatively one can augment the basis set with “local orbitals”, this procedure being known as the “APW+lo” method. We use the full-potential version of the latter method here in order to treat all the valence and semi-core states. A fully relativistic treatment is used for core states, and a scalar relativistic treatment for all other states. The wavevectors  $\mathbf{k}$  for which the Kohn-Sham equations are self-consistently solved must be sampled over the Brillouin zone of the crystal, and the well-known Monkhorst-Pack  $k$ -point sampling scheme is used for this purpose.<sup>29</sup> All the calculations were performed using the WIEN2k code.<sup>30</sup>

Throughout the present calculations, we aim to achieve convergence of the total energy to within 1 meV/atom with respect to all the parameters we have just mentioned. All states having principal quantum number  $n \leq 3$  are treated as core states, and all higher states as valence states. This choice is based on the fact that the states with  $n = 3$  lie at least 200 eV below the Fermi level so they will not respond significantly to compression even at megabar pressures. Provided the muffin-tin spheres do not overlap, and provided the calculations are fully converged with respect to all parameters, the choice of  $R_{\text{MT}}$  should not affect the results, but it does affect the efficiency of the calculations. We used the default setting of  $R_{\text{MT}}$  provided by the WIEN2k algorithm, which ensures that  $R_{\text{MT}}$  varies appropriately as the volume per atom is varied. To determine the settings required for the technical parameters  $K_{\max}$ ,  $G_{\max}$ ,  $l_{\text{orb}}^{\max}$  and  $l_{\text{orb}}^{\text{pot}}$ , and for  $k$ -point sampling, we have conducted systematic tests on bcc, fcc and hcp Mo; we assume that the settings that give the required accuracy for Mo will also serve for all the  $4d$  transition metals in all the structures of interest.

Our tests on Mo indicate that the choices  $R_{\text{MT}}K_{\text{max}} = 9.5$ ,  $G_{\text{max}} = 18 \text{ bohr}^{-1}$ ,  $l_{\text{orb}}^{\text{max}} = 10$  and  $l_{\text{pot}}^{\text{max}} = 4$ , together with  $14 \times 14 \times 14$   $k$ -point sampling ( $14 \times 14 \times 7$  for hcp), give convergence to within  $\sim 1 \text{ meV/atom}$ . To demonstrate that this is the case, we have set all of these parameters except one to the values just quoted, and studied the effect of varying the free parameter. The values of total energy per atom  $E_{\text{tot}}$  obtained when we vary in turn  $R_{\text{MT}}K_{\text{max}}$ ,  $G_{\text{max}}$ ,  $l_{\text{orb}}^{\text{max}}$ ,  $l_{\text{pot}}^{\text{max}}$  and  $k$ -point sampling are reported in Table I, from which we see that the required convergence is indeed achieved with the quoted values. These are the values used for all the calculations reported later. We note that, although we have paid careful attention to convergence, there remain small errors due to the linearization inherent in the FP-LAPW scheme.

## B. Wu-Cohen exchange-correlation functional

The Wu-Cohen exchange-correlation functional is a particular form of generalized gradient approximation (GGA). In GGAs, the total exchange-correlation energy is the integral over the volume of the system of a density of exchange-correlation energy, this density being expressed in terms of the number density  $n(\mathbf{r})$  of electrons as  $n(\mathbf{r})\epsilon_{\text{xc}}(n(\mathbf{r}), s(\mathbf{r}))$ . Here,  $\epsilon_{\text{xc}}$ , the exchange-correlation energy per electron at position  $\mathbf{r}$ , depends not only on  $n(\mathbf{r})$  itself but also on the magnitude of its dimensionless gradient  $s(\mathbf{r}) = |\nabla n|/[2(3\pi^2)^{1/3}n^{4/3}]$ . The energy  $\epsilon_{\text{xc}}$  is expressed as  $\epsilon_{\text{xc}}(n(\mathbf{r}), s(\mathbf{r})) = \epsilon_{\text{xc}}^{\text{unif}}(n(\mathbf{r}))F_{\text{xc}}(s(\mathbf{r}))$ , where  $\epsilon_{\text{xc}}^{\text{unif}}(n)$  is the exchange-correlation energy per electron in the uniform electron gas of density  $n$ , and  $F_{\text{xc}}$  is the so-called enhancement factor.

In the widely used Perdew-Burke-Ernzerhof (PBE) form of GGA,<sup>31</sup> a parameter-free formula expressing the dependence on  $s$  of  $F_{\text{xc}}(s)$  was derived by requiring that certain exact conditions be satisfied. The WC functional takes the same GGA form as PBE for the correlation part of  $F_{\text{xc}}$ , but modifies the exchange part. The modification was done with the intention of improving the functional for condensed matter, at the expense of a somewhat worse description of atoms and molecules. Specifically, the modification was based on the idea that the exchange part of  $F_{\text{xc}}$  should be constructed so as to reproduce the fourth-order gradient expansion of the exact exchange-energy functional of the electron gas in the limit of slowly varying density.<sup>33</sup> The detailed form of the exchange enhancement factor in the WC functional can be found in the original paper,<sup>14</sup> which also presents the results of tests

$k$ -points	$E_{\text{tot}}$
$10 \times 10 \times 10$	-110132.5640
$14 \times 14 \times 14$	-110132.5669
$16 \times 16 \times 16$	-110132.5658
$18 \times 18 \times 18$	-110132.5664
$G_{\text{max}}$ (bohr $^{-1}$ )	$E_{\text{tot}}$
14	-110132.5668
18	-110132.5669
20	-110132.5669
$l_{\text{pot}}^{\text{max}}$	$E_{\text{tot}}$
4	-110132.5669
6	-110132.5669
$R_{\text{MT}}K_{\text{max}}$	$E_{\text{tot}}$
8.0	-110132.5250
9.0	-110132.5613
9.5	-110132.5669
10.5	-110132.5671
$l_{\text{orb}}^{\text{max}}$	$E_{\text{tot}}$
10	-110132.5669
12	-110132.5662

TABLE I: Tests on convergence of FP-LAPW total energy per atom  $E_{\text{tot}}$  (eV units) for bcc Mo. Variation of  $E_{\text{tot}}$  is reported with respect to  $k$ -point sampling, plane-wave cut-off  $G_{\text{max}}$  (bohr $^{-1}$  units) and angular momentum cut-off  $l_{\text{pot}}^{\text{max}}$  in representation of Kohn-Sham potential, and plane-wave cut-off  $K_{\text{max}}$  and angular momentum cut-off  $l_{\text{orb}}^{\text{max}}$  in representation of orbitals ( $R_{\text{MT}}$  is muffin-tin radius). In each section of the Table, only a single parameter is varied, the other parameters being fixed as  $14 \times 14 \times 14$  ( $k$ -point sampling),  $G_{\text{max}} = 18$  bohr $^{-1}$ ,  $l_{\text{pot}}^{\text{max}} = 4$ ,  $R_{\text{MT}}K_{\text{max}} = 9.5$  and  $l_{\text{orb}}^{\text{max}} = 10$ .

suggesting that the functional gives better results than LDA and PBE for the equilibrium lattice parameter and bulk modulus of a range of materials. Subsequently, tests of WC were reported on a much more extensive set of materials using the FP-LAPW implementation of DFT.<sup>15</sup> These tests supported the claim that WC is on average more accurate than LDA or PBE, but they showed that the improvement over these other functionals is by no means uniform. However, for  $4d$  transition metals at ambient pressure, the WC predictions of equilibrium lattice parameter and bulk modulus are, with a few exceptions, better than both PBE and LDA.

To confirm that the quality of WC is maintained at high pressures, we compare in Fig. 1 our calculated results for pressure  $P$  as a function of volume  $V$  at zero temperature for Mo obtained with WC, LDA (Ceperley-Alder)<sup>34</sup> and PBE with experimental results up to  $P = 300$  GPa. The experimental measurements were performed at room temperature but were corrected for thermal effects so that they refer to  $T = 0$  K.<sup>35</sup> The comparisons show that WC is in almost perfect agreement with experiment over the entire pressure range, while both LDA and PBE show significant deviations. Comparisons of calculated  $P(V)$  curves with experimental data for other  $4d$  transition metals presented in the next section further confirm the quality of WC.

### III. RESULTS

For each of the  $4d$  transition metals from Y to Pd, we have calculated the total energy at a closely spaced series of atomic volumes for the body-centred cubic (bcc), face-centred cubic (fcc) and hexagonal close-packed (hcp) structures. In some cases, we have also studied other crystal structures. The pressure as a function of volume is then obtained for each structure by fitting the total energy results with a 3rd-order Birch-Murnaghan equation of state.<sup>36</sup> From these results, we straightforwardly obtain the most stable crystal structure at each pressure, as well as the pressures of the structural transitions and the volumes of the coexisting phases at these transitions. In the following, we present first for each element the difference between the energy per atom in each structure and the energy in bcc structure, as a function of  $V$ . We then present  $P(V)$  of the stable structures over the pressure range from ambient to typically 500 GPa. Where possible, we compare  $P(V)$  and the transition pressures with experimental measurements, and we indicate the relation with






FIG. 1: Zero-temperature equation of state of Mo up to  $P \sim 400$  GPa calculated with GGA(WC), GGA(PBE) and LDA(CA) exchange-correlation functionals. Dots show experimental data.<sup>35</sup>

transition	$V_1$	$V_2$	$P_t$	
			DFT	expt
hcp - $\alpha$ Sm	32.44	31.88	-1.3 ( $-3^a$ )	$\sim 15^c$
$\alpha$ Sm - dhcp	28.30	28.21	4.2 ( $3^a$ )	$\sim 30^c$
dhcp - fcc	20.49	20.32	32.7	$\sim 44^d$
fcc - bcc	8.61	8.57	513 ( $283^b$ )	—

TABLE II: Calculated volumes  $V_1$ ,  $V_2$  (units of  $\text{\AA}^3/\text{atom}$ ) and transition pressures  $P_t$  (units of GPa) from present work (earlier DFT results in parentheses), and experimental  $P_t$  for structural phase transitions in Y. Values from earlier work: a: Lei *et al.*<sup>41</sup>; b: Melsen *et al.*<sup>42</sup>; c: Vohra *et al.*<sup>38</sup>; d: Grosshans and Holzapfel<sup>39</sup>.

previous theoretical results.




FIG. 2: *Top*: Energy differences  $\Delta E$  of the hcp,  $\alpha$ Sm (C19), dhcp (A3') and fcc structures with respect to bcc in Y as function of volume per atom. *Bottom*: Equation of state of Y up to  $P \sim 700$  GPa.

### A. Yttrium

Experimentally, Y has the hcp structure at ambient pressure, and with increasing pressure passes successively to the  $\alpha$ -samarium ( $\alpha$ Sm), double hcp (dhcp) and fcc structures.<sup>37,38,39</sup> This is the same sequence of structures observed in the lanthanides under pressure, as has often been discussed.<sup>40</sup> Earlier DFT calculations on Y have correctly predicted these structures,<sup>41</sup> and also indicated a transition to bcc at very high pressure.<sup>42</sup> Fig. 2 reports

our calculated energies of the hcp,  $\alpha$ Sm, dhcp and fcc structures relative to bcc as a function of  $V$ . This shows the sequence of stable structures in the experimentally observed order. The resulting EOS is reported in Fig. 2, and the transition pressures and volumes are given in Table II. Although the calculated sequence of crystal structures is the same as that observed experimentally, we significantly underestimate the transition pressures by at least 10 GPa. The difference is considerably greater for the transition  $\alpha$ Sm  $\rightarrow$  dhcp, but it is clear from Fig. 2 that the energy curves of these two structures follow each other so closely that the prediction of this transition pressure is likely to be very challenging. Possible reasons for our underestimation of the transition pressures are discussed in Sec. IV.

We also report in Table II the results of very recent DFT work on Y up to  $\sim 150$  GPa by Lei *et al.*<sup>41</sup>, as well as those of the older work of Melsen *et al.*<sup>42</sup>. The hcp- $\alpha$ Sm and  $\alpha$ Sm-dhcp transition pressures  $P_t$  of Lei *et al.*, who used FP-LAPW based on LDA, are within 2 GPa of ours. It is known that some transverse phonons of fcc Y are unstable at pressures below 90 GPa.<sup>43</sup> Based on this fact, Lei *et al.* analyze a distorted fcc structure which they find to be more stable than fcc. In order to save effort, however, we consider here the fcc structure directly. It is striking that the fcc-bcc  $P_t$  of Melsen *et al.*, obtained from FP-LMTO calculations based on LDA is below ours by over 200 GPa. It appears to us that their treatment of semi-core states was much more approximate than the one used here, and this may account for the large difference. The very small volume change of only  $\sim 0.04 \text{ \AA}^3/\text{atom}$  that we find for this transition will magnify the effect of any technical errors in the prediction of  $P_t$ . We return to this question in Sec. IV.

## B. Zirconium

Experimentally, the stable structure of Zr at ambient pressure is hcp, but measurements show a transition to the  $\omega$  phase at the rather low pressure of 2.8 GPa, followed by a transition to bcc at  $P \simeq 30$  GPa.<sup>44</sup> Our calculated energies of the  $\omega$ , hcp and fcc structures relative to bcc as a function of volume (Fig. 3) show the same sequence, and our calculated  $P(V)$  in the  $\omega$  structure is in close agreement with experimental data. However, as in the case of Y, our calculations appear to underestimate the transition pressures (see Table III). We find that at  $P = 0, T = 0$ , the  $\omega$  structure is most stable, the transition between hcp and  $\omega$  occurring at the negative pressure of  $-8.4$  GPa. Our calculated transition pressure between

transition	$V_1$	$V_2$	$P_t$ (DFT)			$P_t$ (expt)
			WC	LDA	PBE	
hcp- $\omega$	25.47 <sup>a</sup>	24.57 <sup>a</sup>	-8 <sup>a</sup>			3 <sup>e</sup>
$\omega$ -bcc	19.07 <sup>a</sup>	18.43 <sup>a</sup>	22 <sup>a</sup>	24 <sup>b</sup>	32 <sup>b</sup>	30 <sup>f</sup>
				16 <sup>c</sup>	28 <sup>c</sup>	
				5 <sup>d</sup>		

TABLE III: Calculated volumes  $V_1$ ,  $V_2$  (this work, units of  $\text{\AA}^3/\text{atom}$ ) and calculated and experimental transition pressures  $P_t$  (units of GPa) for structural transitions in Zr. Calculated  $P_t$  values are listed according to the exchange-correlation function (WC, LDA or PBE) used. Sources: a: present work; b: Ostanin *et al.*<sup>46</sup>; c: Schnell and Albers<sup>47</sup>; d: Jona and Marcus<sup>48</sup>; e: Zhao *et al.*<sup>44</sup>; f: Hui *et al.*<sup>45</sup>.

$\omega$  and bcc of 22.2 GPa is also significantly below the experimental value of 30(2) GPa.<sup>45</sup> The underestimation by  $\sim 10$  GPa is similar to what we found for Y, and will be discussed in Sec. IV.

Previous theoretical estimates of the  $\omega$ -bcc transition pressure  $P_t$  show considerable variation (Table III). It seems that  $P_t$  from LDA is lower than that from PBE by  $\sim 10$  GPa, but there are significant differences between results obtained with the same DFT functional. The results of Jona and Marcus<sup>48</sup> seem to be seriously out of line with both experiment and other calculations. We shall comment further in Sec. IV

### C. Niobium

Experimentally, the observed structure of Nb is bcc over the entire pressure range from ambient to  $\sim 145$  GPa. Our total-energy results (Fig. 4) show that hcp, fcc and  $\omega$  are all less stable than bcc by at least 0.2 eV/atom over the pressure range up to over 400 GPa. A possible phase transition at pressures above 400 GPa may be suggested by the downturn in the energy difference between hcp and bcc at  $\sim 400$  GPa, but we have not pursued this possibility. The agreement of our calculated  $P(V)$  curve with the recent experimental data of Kenichi and Singh<sup>49</sup> obtained at room temperature is excellent. Our calculated equilibrium volume  $V_0 = 17.94 \text{ \AA}^3/\text{atom}$ , agrees closely with the experimental value at




FIG. 3: *Top:* Energy differences  $\Delta E$  of the hcp,  $\omega$  (C32) and fcc structures with respect to bcc in Zr as function of volume. *Bottom:* Equation of state of Zr up to  $P \sim 600$  GPa; dots represent experimental data from Ref. [44].

ambient conditions<sup>50</sup> of  $17.98 \text{ \AA}^3/\text{atom}$ .

#### D. Molybdenum

The properties of Mo have been intensively studied both experimentally and theoretically over the last decade. We mentioned in the Introduction the continuing controversy over its high-pressure melting curve. At low temperatures, experiments show that Mo has the bcc




FIG. 4: *Top*: Energy differences  $\Delta E$  of the  $\omega$ , hcp and fcc phases with respect to bcc in Nb as function of volume. *Bottom*: Calculated EOS of Nb compared with experimental data of Ref. [49].

structure for all pressures up to  $\sim 400$  GPa. There have been at least seven previous DFT studies on its phase transitions at higher pressures, and all agree that there is a transition to either hcp or fcc, but there is no consensus about which high- $P$  form is more stable. There is also considerable variation of the predicted transition pressures. Our calculated energy differences fcc - bcc and hcp - bcc (Fig. 5) show clearly that bcc is the stable phase up to a pressure of nearly 660 GPa. Above this, both fcc and hcp fall below bcc, but fcc is below hcp, and the fcc - hcp difference becomes more negative with increasing pressure. Our calculated  $P(V)$  curve is in excellent agreement with experimental data over the whole




FIG. 5: *Top:* Energy differences  $\Delta E$  of the fcc and hcp phases with respect to bcc in Mo as function of volume. *Bottom:* Equation of state of Mo compared with experimental data.<sup>35</sup>

pressure range up to 300 GPa for which there are data.<sup>35</sup>

We summarize in Table IV all DFT calculations on the high- $P$  transition in Mo, noting the predicted high- $P$  structure and transition pressure  $P_t$  to that structure, together with the DFT implementation and exchange-correlation functional. In general, we believe that work in which careful attention has not been given to convergence with respect to all technical parameters and the treatment of semi-core states must be regarded as less reliable. However, it remains difficult to draw conclusions about the causes of the very large differences between predictions, in some cases based on exactly the same exchange-correlation functional.

	high- $P$ phase	DFT Method	$E_{xc}$	$P_t$
Moriarty <sup>20</sup>	hcp	LMTO-ASA	LDA(HL)	420
Söderlind <i>et al.</i> <sup>55</sup>	hcp	FP-LMTO	LDA(HL)	520
Smirnova <i>et al.</i> <sup>56</sup>	hcp	FP-LMTO	LDA(PZ)	620
Jona and Marcus <sup>52</sup>	hcp	FP-LAPW	GGA(?)	620
Christensen <i>et al.</i> <sup>53</sup>	fcc	FP-LMTO	LDA(BH)	580
Boettger <sup>54</sup>	fcc	LCGTO-FF	LDA(HL)	660
Belonoshko <i>et al.</i> <sup>22</sup>	fcc	PAW	GGA(PW)	720
This work	fcc	FP-LAPW	GGA(WC)	660

TABLE IV: DFT predictions of the high-pressure phase of Mo, with DFT method and exchange-correlation functional used, and transition pressure  $P_t$  (GPa units) from works cited in first column. Forms of LDA are due to Hedin-Lundqvist<sup>57</sup> (HL), Perdew-Zunger<sup>58</sup> (PZ) and von Barth-Hedin<sup>59</sup> (BH), and of GGA to Perdew-Wang<sup>32</sup> (PW) and Wu-Cohen<sup>14</sup> (WC); the form of GGA used by Jona and Marcus was unspecified.

Further comments will be made in Sec. IV.

### E. Technetium

Tc has the hcp structure at ambient pressure, but little seems to be experimentally known about its behaviour under pressure. Our results for the energies of the fcc, hcp and simple hexagonal structures relative to bcc (Fig. 6) show that hcp is the most stable up to pressures of at least 500 GPa, and there is no indication that any of the other structures will become more stable at higher pressures than this. The calculated  $P(V)$  curve of hcp Tc is reported in Fig. 6, but there appear to be no experimental data to compare it with. Our value for the equilibrium volume of 14.21 Å<sup>3</sup>/atom agrees closely with the experimental value<sup>62</sup> 14.26 Å<sup>3</sup>/atom.






FIG. 6: *Top*: Energy differences  $\Delta E$  of the fcc, hcp and simple hexagonal ( $A_f$ ) structures with respect to bcc in Tc as function of volume. *Bottom*: Equation of state of Tc up to 500 GPa.

## F. Ruthenium

At ambient pressure, the structure of Ru is hcp. Experiments have been performed up to 56 GPa, and no phase transition has been found. Our results for the energies of the fcc and hcp structures relative to bcc (Fig. 7) show that hcp is the most stable up to pressures of at least 400 GPa. As can be seen in Fig. 7, our calculated EOS of hcp Ru is in very good agreement with recent experimental data.<sup>63</sup> In particular, we obtain an equilibrium volume of  $13.42 \text{ \AA}^3/\text{atom}$  which is close to the experimental value<sup>65,66</sup> of  $13.47 \text{ \AA}^3/\text{atom}$ .




FIG. 7: *Top*: Energy differences  $\Delta E$  of the hcp and fcc structures with respect to bcc in Ru as function of volume. *Bottom*: Equation of state of Ru up to  $P \sim 400$  GPa compared with experimental data.<sup>63</sup>

(An earlier calculated equilibrium volume<sup>64</sup> of  $13.57 \text{\AA}^3/\text{atom}$  is in rather poor agreement with our value.) We also note that our calculated  $c/a$  value of 1.58 is exactly the value found experimentally.<sup>63</sup>

## G. Rhodium and Palladium

The last two elements treated here, Rh and Pd, both have the fcc structure at ambient pressure, and retain this structure up to the highest pressures reached so far experimentally<sup>70,71</sup> ( $\sim 50$  and  $77.4$  GPa, respectively). Our results for the energy differences fcc - bcc and hcp - bcc (Figs. 8 and 9) give no indication that any phase transition will be found in the range up to  $\sim 500$  GPa. As for most of the other  $4d$  elements, our calculated EOS results (Figs. 8 and 9) are in close agreement with experiment. Our calculated equilibrium volumes of  $13.71$  and  $14.73$   $\text{\AA}^3/\text{atom}$  for Rh and Pd respectively agree closely with the experimental values<sup>70,71</sup> of  $13.75$  and  $14.72$   $\text{\AA}^3/\text{atom}$ .

## H. Zero-temperature phase diagram

The pressures of the transitions for each element (atomic number  $Z$ ) reported above can be regarded as points on phase boundaries drawn in the  $(P, Z)$  plane. These boundaries are described by the dependence of  $P$  on  $Z$  treated as a continuous, rather than a discrete variable. In the real world, the elements form a discrete series, and only integer values of  $Z$  are available, but in DFT theory there is no difficulty in treating  $Z$  as continuous. (In tight-binding theories of transition-metal energetics, it is common practice to treat the number of electrons per atom as continuous.) However, to save effort, we have not actually attempted to perform FP-LAPW calculations for non-integer  $Z$ , preferring to obtain the phase boundaries by simple interpolation.

To perform the interpolation, we note that at  $T = 0$  K the enthalpies  $H \equiv E + PV$  of coexisting phases must be equal. To take an example, the hcp - bcc energy differences for Mo ( $Z = 42$ ) and Tc ( $Z = 43$ ) at  $P = 400$  GPa are  $0.62$  and  $-0.22$  eV/atom, and the hcp - bcc volume differences are  $-0.14$  and  $-0.12$   $\text{\AA}^3/\text{atom}$ , so that the hcp - bcc enthalpy differences are  $0.27$  and  $-0.52$  eV/atom. By linear interpolation, we estimate  $Z = 42.34$  as the coexistence value between bcc and hcp at  $400$  GPa. We have used this interpolation scheme to estimate the bcc - hcp boundary between Mo and Tc, and the hcp - fcc boundary between Ru and Rh. For the complicated region Y - Zr - Nb, we have performed interpolation only for the fcc - bcc boundary passing through the Y - Zr region; in the other cases, the boundaries have been drawn approximately by means of straight




FIG. 8: *Top:* Energy differences  $\Delta E$  of the fcc and hcp structures with respect to bcc in Rh as function of volume. *Bottom:* Equation of state of Rh up to  $P \sim 500$  GPa compared with experimental data.<sup>72</sup>

lines. The resulting generalized phase diagram is shown in Fig. 10 .

#### IV. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

We noted in the Introduction the general expectation that the sequence of crystal structures across a transition-metal series will be the same at high  $P$  as at low  $P$ , but that the phase boundaries should slope to the left ( $dP/dZ < 0$ ). The well-known ideas behind this ex-




FIG. 9: *Top:* Energy differences  $\Delta E$  of the fcc and hcp structures with respect to bcc in Pd as function of volume. *Bottom:* Equation of state of Pd up to  $P \sim 450$  GPa compared with experimental data.<sup>72</sup>

pectation are that (a) the sequence of stable structures depends mainly on the band energy, i.e. the sum of single-electron energies; (b) the band energy depends mainly on the  $d$ -band densities of states in the different crystal structures, and on the number of  $d$ -electrons; (c) for given atomic number  $Z$ , increase of  $P$  causes the bottom of the  $d$ -band to rise with respect to the  $d$ -band centroid, so that the effective number of  $d$ -electrons increases. Because of this last effect, increase of  $P$  should cause a given element to become more like its neighbour on the right. This is expected to be a stronger effect for early transition metals, since the




FIG. 10: Calculated zero-temperature phase diagram of the  $4d$  transition metals series. Solid squares correspond to phase transitions obtained directly from the FP-LAPW calculations while open squares show results obtained by interpolation (see text).

increase of the effective number of  $d$ -electrons with compression is larger for them.<sup>17</sup>

These expectations are confirmed most clearly by the major boundary separating bcc from more close-packed structures on the left of the phase diagram. This boundary causes Zr at rather moderate pressures to adopt the low- $P$  structure of Nb, and Y to do the same at much higher pressures. However, the boundary separating bcc and hcp in the middle of the diagram is almost vertical up to  $P \sim 100$  GPa, and it is only at much higher pressures that it slopes to the left; furthermore, it appears that Mo never adopts the low- $P$  structure of its neighbour Tc. Similarly, the boundary between hcp and fcc on the right of the diagram is practically vertical up to  $P \sim 500$  GPa.

DFT predictions of the many transitions shown by Y and Zr already give evidence that DFT provides reasonably good quantitative accuracy for the pressure dependence of band structures. The bcc-fcc transition in Mo will probably remain out of reach of experiment for some time. On the controversial question of whether the high- $P$  transition in Mo is

really bcc-fcc or bcc-hcp, our results support the former. The reason for this controversy is clearly that the hcp and fcc energies are very close to each other, so that the calculations have to be converged to high accuracy to yield reliable conclusions. We have taken pains to ensure that our prediction of bcc-fcc is robust with respect to all convergence parameters. Consequently, we believe that the small and unexpected field of fcc at high  $P$  and roughly half band filling is a real effect.

The bcc-fcc transition in Mo is relevant to the interpretation of the shock experiments mentioned in the Introduction. When this transition was first studied theoretically, the predicted transition pressure was 420 GPa,<sup>20</sup> which is much lower than our value of 660 GPa. At that time, it seemed likely that the transition is closely related to the transition seen in shock experiments<sup>51</sup> on Mo at  $P \simeq 210$  GPa and an (estimated) temperature of 3100 K. Our confirmation of earlier work giving a much higher transition pressure makes it much less likely that there is a direct connection with the shock transition. The only way of maintaining this connection would be to postulate that the transition pressure decreases strongly with increasing temperature. However, our DFT calculations of phonon frequencies in the two structures<sup>73</sup> show that the transition pressure actually *increases* with temperature, so that a direct connection with the shock transition is completely ruled out.

Turning now to detailed comparisons with experiment, we have shown that all our calculated equations of state  $P(V)$  agree very closely with experiment. The sequences of stable structures with increasing pressure are always correctly predicted, where experimental data are available, but our calculations have a clear tendency to underestimate transition pressures  $P_t$  by typically  $\sim 10$  GPa. This can be attributed to a relative shift  $\delta E$  of the energies of coexisting phases. Since at  $T = 0$  K, the enthalpies  $H$  of coexisting phases are equal, a shift of  $P_t$  is related to  $\delta E$  by:

$$\delta E = \delta P_t ((\partial H_1/\partial P)_T - (\partial H_2/\partial P)_T) , \quad (1)$$

where  $H_1(P)$  and  $H_2(P)$  are the enthalpies of the two phases. Since  $(\partial H/\partial P)_T = V$ , the shift  $\delta P_t$  can be estimated as  $\delta P_t = \delta E/(V_1 - V_2)$ , where  $V_1$  and  $V_2$  are the coexisting volumes. Then a shift  $\delta P_t = 10$  GPa equates to a ratio  $\delta E/(V_1 - V_2) = 60 \text{ meV}/\text{\AA}^3 \text{ atom}$ . Taking an example, the volume change  $V_1 - V_2$  at the hcp- $\omega$  transition of Zr was calculated to be  $0.1 \text{ \AA}^3/\text{atom}$ , so it would require a relative shift of  $6 \text{ meV}/\text{atom}$  to account for the error in  $P_t$ . On the other hand, for the  $\omega$ -bcc transition of Zr, for which  $V_1 - V_2 = 0.6 \text{ \AA}^3/\text{atom}$ ,

the relative shift would have to be 36 meV/atom. It is easy to see that room-temperature thermal effects are unlikely to be the cause. Estimating the vibrational free energy per atom  $F_{\text{vib}}$  as  $3k_{\text{B}}T \ln(\hbar\bar{\omega}/k_{\text{B}}T)$ , with  $\bar{\omega}$  the geometric-mean phonon frequency, a difference  $\delta\bar{\omega}$  between coexisting phases causes a relative free energy shift  $\delta F_{\text{vib}} \simeq 3k_{\text{B}}T\delta\bar{\omega}/\bar{\omega}$ . With  $3k_{\text{B}}T = 80$  meV at room temperature, unreasonably large  $\delta\bar{\omega}/\bar{\omega}$  values would be required. On the other hand, we have cited evidence (Table III) that differences between density functionals can lead to  $P_t$  shifts of order 10 GPa in the  $\omega$ -bcc transition of Zr. However, there is a third possible cause, namely errors of DFT implementation. We have made efforts to ensure that our FP-LAPW energies are converged to  $\sim 1$  meV/atom with respect to plane-wave and angular-momentum cut-offs, but there remain possible linearization errors, whose size is difficult to estimate. It seems clear that implementation errors must be the reason for some of the very large differences between DFT predictions of  $P_t$  values. We think this explains the difference of over 200 GPa in the predicted  $P_t$  of the fcc-bcc transition in Y (Table II), because the earlier DFT work was done at a time when the treatment of semi-core states was less well developed. The range of  $\sim 300$  GPa in predicted  $P_t$  values for the high- $P$  transition in Mo must also be attributed to implementation errors in early work.

We conclude by recalling that the present calculations on the zero-temperature ( $P, Z$ ) phase diagram are intended as a prelude to the systematic mapping of the ( $P, T, Z$ ) diagram, including the solid-liquid coexistence surface as a function of  $P$  and  $Z$ . In spite of major progress in the first-principles calculation of melting curves over the past 10 years,<sup>22,74,75,76</sup> the computation of the entire ( $P, T, Z$ ) phase diagram is clearly a major challenge, which will need to be tackled in stages. The use of DFT to calculate harmonic vibration frequencies<sup>77</sup> will allow quite rapid progress at temperatures up to about one third of the melting temperature, and we have already reported systematic calculations of this kind for Fe, Ta and Mo over a wide range of pressures.<sup>78,79</sup> For melting curves, several first-principles methods are available.<sup>75,76</sup> However, we believe it will also be valuable to make rapid and more approximate surveys using tight-binding methods, and we plan to report on this approach in the near future.



## Acknowledgments

The work was supported by EPSRC-GB Grant No. EP/C534360, which is 50% funded by DSTL(MOD). The work was conducted as part of a EURYI scheme award to DA as provided by EPSRC-GB (see [www.esf.org/euryi](http://www.esf.org/euryi)).

- 
- <sup>1</sup> J. Friedel, in *The Physics of Metals*, ed by J. M. Ziman (London: Cambridge University Press, 1969).
  - <sup>2</sup> J. C. Duthie and D. G. Pettifor, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **38**, 564 (1977).
  - <sup>3</sup> V. Heine, *Phys. Rev.* **153**, 673 (1967).
  - <sup>4</sup> C. Cazorla, M. J. Gillan, S. Taioli and D. Alfè, *J. Chem. Phys.* **126**, 194502 (2007).
  - <sup>5</sup> S. Taioli, C. Cazorla, M. J. Gillan and D. Alfè, *Phys. Rev. B* **75**, 214103 (2007).
  - <sup>6</sup> D. Errandonea, *Physica B* **357**, 356 (2005).
  - <sup>7</sup> M. Ross, D. Errandonea and R. Boehler, *Phys. Rev. B* **76**, 184118 (2007).
  - <sup>8</sup> Y. Ding, R. Ahuja, J. Shu, P. Chow, W. Luo and H-K. Mao, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **98**, 085502 (2007).
  - <sup>9</sup> We refer to a phase diagram in which atomic number  $Z$  is one of the variables as a “generalized phase diagram”, following B. Johansson and A. Rosengren, *Phys. Rev. B*, **11**, 2836 (1975).
  - <sup>10</sup> O. K. Andersen, *Phys. Rev. B* **12**, 3060 (1975).
  - <sup>11</sup> D. D. Koeling and G. O. Arbman, *J. Phys. F* **5**, 2041 (1975).
  - <sup>12</sup> D. D. Koeling and B. N. Harmon, *J. Phys. C: Sol. St. Phys.* **10**, 3107 (1977).
  - <sup>13</sup> D. Singh, in *Planewaves, Pseudopotentials and the LAPW method* (Kluwer Academic Publishing, Boston 1994).
  - <sup>14</sup> Z. Wu and R. E. Cohen, *Phys. Rev. B* **73**, 235116 (2006).
  - <sup>15</sup> F. Tran, R. Laskowski, P. Blaha and K. Schwarz, *Phys. Rev. B* **75**, 115131 (2007).
  - <sup>16</sup> L. Brewer, in *Batelle Institute Materials Science Colloquia*, ed by P. S. Rudman, J. Stringer and R. I. Jaffee (McGraw-Hill, New York, 1967), pp. 39-67.
  - <sup>17</sup> D. G. Pettifor, *J. Phys. F* **7**, 613 (1977).
  - <sup>18</sup> N. W. Dalton and R. A. Deegan, *J. Phys. C* **2**, 2369 (1969).
  - <sup>19</sup> F. Ducastelle and F. Cyrot-Lackmann, *J. Phys. Chem. Solids* **32**, 285 (1971).
  - <sup>20</sup> J. A. Moriarty, *Phys. Rev. B* **45**, 2004 (1992).

- <sup>21</sup> A. K. McMahan, *Physica B* **139**, 31 (1986).
- <sup>22</sup> A. B. Belonoshko, S. J. Simak, A. E. Kochetov, B. Johansson, L. Burakovsky and D. L. Preston, *Phys. Rev. Lett* **92**, 195701 (2004).
- <sup>23</sup> D. G. Pettifor, *J. Phys. C* **3**, 367 (1970).
- <sup>24</sup> D. G. Pettifor, in *Metallurgical Chemistry*, edited by O. Kubashewski (Her Majesty's Stationery Office, London, 1972).
- <sup>25</sup> H. L. Skriver, *Phys. Rev. B* **31**, 1909 (1985).
- <sup>26</sup> D. Vanderbilt, *Phys. Rev. B* **41**, 7892 (1990).
- <sup>27</sup> P. E. Blöchl, *Phys. Rev. B* **50**, 17953 (1994).
- <sup>28</sup> G. Kresse and D. Joubert, *Phys. Rev. B* **59**, 1758 (1999).
- <sup>29</sup> H. J. Monkhorst and J. D. Pack, *Phys. Rev. B* **13**, 5188 (1976).
- <sup>30</sup> P. Blaha, K. Schwarz, G. K. Madsen, D. Kvasnichka and J. Luitz, *WIEN2k: An Augmented Plane Wave plus Local Orbital Program for Calculating Crystal Properties*, Technical University of Vienna (2001).
- <sup>31</sup> J. P. Perdew, K. Burke and M. Ernzerhof, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **77**, 3865 (1996).
- <sup>32</sup> Y. Wang and J. P. Perdew, *Phys. Rev. B* **44**, 13298 (1991).
- <sup>33</sup> P. S. Svendsen and U. von Barth, *Phys. Rev. B* **54**, 17402 (1996).
- <sup>34</sup> D. M. Ceperley and B. I. Alder, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **45**, 566 (1980).
- <sup>35</sup> R. S. Hixson and J. N. Fritz, *J. Appl. Phys.* **71**, 4 (1992).
- <sup>36</sup> F. Birch, *Phys. Rev.* **71**, 809 (1947).
- <sup>37</sup> The dhcp and  $\alpha$ Sm structures are both variations of close packing. Whereas hcp and fcc have the sequences ABAB... and ABCABC..., dhcp goes ABACABAC... and  $\alpha$ Sm goes ABCBCACAB...
- <sup>38</sup> Y. K. Vohra, H. Olijnik, W. Grosshans and W. B. Holzapfel, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **47**, 1065 (1981).
- <sup>39</sup> W. A. Grosshans and W. B. Holzapfel, *Phys. Rev. B* **45**, 5171 (1992).
- <sup>40</sup> B. Johansson and A. Rosengren, *Phys. Rev. B* **11**, 2836 (1975).
- <sup>41</sup> S. Lei, D. A. Papaconstantopoulos and M. Mehl, *Phys. Rev. B* **75**, 024512 (2007).
- <sup>42</sup> J. Melsen, J. M. Wills, B. Johansson and O. Eriksson, *Phys. Rev. B* **48**, 15574 (1993).
- <sup>43</sup> P. Yin, S. Y. Savrasov and W. E. Pickett, *Phys. Rev. B* **74**, 094519 (2006).
- <sup>44</sup> Y. Zhao, J. Zhang, C. Pantea, J. Qian, L. Daemen, P. A. Rigg, R. S. Hixson, G. T. Gray III, Y. Yang, L. Wang, Y. Wang and T. Uchida, *Phys. Rev. B* **71**, 184119 (2005).
- <sup>45</sup> X. Hui, S. J. Duclos, A. L. Ruoff and Y. K. Vohra, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **64**, 204 (1990).

- <sup>46</sup> S. A. Ostanin and V. Yu. Trubitsin, Phys. Rev. B **57**, 13485 (1998).
- <sup>47</sup> I. Schnell and R. C. Albers, J. Phys.: Condens. Matter **18**, 1483 (2006).
- <sup>48</sup> F. Jona and P. M. Marcus, J. Phys.: Condens. Matter **15**, 5009 (2003).
- <sup>49</sup> T. Kenichi and A. K. Singh, Phys. Rev. B **73**, 224119 (2006).
- <sup>50</sup> J. Donohue, *The Structures of the Elements*, Wiley (New York, 1974).
- <sup>51</sup> R. S. Hixson, D. A. Boness, J. W. Shaner and J. A. Moriarty, Phys. Rev. Lett. **62**, 637 (1989).
- <sup>52</sup> F. Jona and P. M. Marcus, J. Phys.: Condens. Matter **17**, 1049 (2005).
- <sup>53</sup> N. E. Christensen, A. L. Ruoff and C. O. Rodriguez, Phys. Rev. B **52**, 9121 (1995).
- <sup>54</sup> J. C. Boettger, J. Phys.: Condens. Matter **11**, 3237 (1999).
- <sup>55</sup> P. Söderlind, R. Ahuja, O. Eriksson, B. Johansson and J. M. Wills, Phys. Rev. B **49**, 9365 (1994).
- <sup>56</sup> E. A. Smirnova, R. Ahuja, Y. Kh. Vekilov, B. Johansson, Y. K. Vohra and I. A. Abrikosov, Phys. Rev. B **66**, 024110 (2002).
- <sup>57</sup> L. Hedin and B. Lundqvist, J. Phys. C: Solid State Phys. **4**, 2064 (1971).
- <sup>58</sup> J. P. Perdew and A. Zunger, Phys. Rev. B **23**, 5048 (1982).
- <sup>59</sup> U. von Barth and L. Hedin, J. Phys. C: Solid State Phys. **5**, 1629 (1972).
- <sup>60</sup> J. C. Boettger, Phys. Rev. B **57**, 8743 (1998).
- <sup>61</sup> U. Birkenheuer, J. C. Boettger and N. Rösch, J. Chem. Phys. **100**, 6826 (1994).
- <sup>62</sup> M. I. McMahon and R. J. Nelmes, Chem. Soc. Rev. **35**, 943 (2006).
- <sup>63</sup> H. Cynn, J. E. Klepeis, C-S. Yoo and D. A. Young, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 135701 (2002).
- <sup>64</sup> V. A. Finkel, M. I. Palatnik and G. P. Kovtun, Phys. Met. Metallogr. **32**, 231 (1971).
- <sup>65</sup> *Structure Data of Elements and Intermetallic Phases*, edited by K.-H. Hellwege and A. M. Hellwege, Landolt-Börnstein, New Series, Group 3 **14**, Pt. a (Springer, Berlin, 1988).
- <sup>66</sup> C. Kittel, *Introduction to Solid State Physics* (John Wiley and Sons, New York, 1976).
- <sup>67</sup> J. R. Chelikowsky, C. T. Chan and S. G. Louie, Phys. Rev. B **34**, 6656 (1986).
- <sup>68</sup> R. Heid, L. Pintschovius, W. Reichardt and K.-P. Bohnen, Phys. Rev. B **61** 12059 (2000).
- <sup>69</sup> A. B. Belonoshko, S. Li, R. Ahuja and B. Johansson, J. Phys. Chem. Solids **65**, 1565 (2004).
- <sup>70</sup> E. A. Perez-Albuerné, K. F. Forsgren and H. G. Drickamer, Rev. Sci. Instrum. **35**, 29 (1964).
- <sup>71</sup> H. K. Mao, P. M. Bell, J. Shaner and D. J. Steinberg, J. Appl. Phys. **49**, 3276 (1978).
- <sup>72</sup> M. H. Rice, R. G. McQueen and J. H. Walsh, Solid State Phys. **6**, 1 (1958).
- <sup>73</sup> C. Cazorla and M. J. Gillan, *unpublished*.

- <sup>74</sup> D. Alfè, M. J. Gillan and G. D. Price, *Nature (London)* **401**, 462 (1999).
- <sup>75</sup> D. Alfè, M. J. Gillan and G. D. Price, *J. Chem. Phys.* **116**, 6170 (2002).
- <sup>76</sup> D. Alfè, G. D. Price and M. J. Gillan, *J. Phys. Chem. Sol.* **65**, 1573 (2004).
- <sup>77</sup> P. Souvatzis and O. Eriksson, *Phys. Rev. B* **77**, 024110 (2008).
- <sup>78</sup> L. Vočadlo, D. Alfè, M. J. Gillan, I. G. Wood, J. P. Brodholt and G. D. Price, *Nature* **424**, 536 (2003).
- <sup>79</sup> C. Cazorla, M. J. Gillan, S. Taioli and D. Alfè, *J. Phys. Condens. Matt.: Conference Series*, *in press*.