First principles thermodynamical modeling of the binodal and spinodal curves in lead chalcogenides†
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High-throughput ab initio calculations, cluster expansion techniques, and thermodynamic modeling have been synergistically combined to characterize the binodal and the spinodal decompositions features in the pseudo-binary lead chalcogenides PbSe–PbTe, PbS–PbTe, and PbS–PbSe. While our results agree with the available experimental data, our consolute temperatures substantially improve with respect to previous computational modeling. The computed phase diagrams corroborate that in ad hoc synthesis conditions the formation of nanostructure may occur justifying the low thermal conductivities in these alloys. The presented approach, making a rational use of online quantum repositories, can be extended to study thermodynamical and kinetic properties of materials of technological interest.

1 Introduction

For decades, the physical properties of lead chalcogenides have generated substantial interest in a number of fields, in particular for applications in semiconductor technology.1 PbS, PbSe, and PbTe have distinct structural and electronic properties compared to III–V and II–VI compounds. These include high carrier mobilities, narrow band gaps with negative pressure coefficients, high dielectric constants, and a positive temperature coefficient.2–4 In addition, PbS, PbSe, and PbTe were predicted to be weak topological insulators, with a band inversion observed at the point of the distorted body-centered tetragonal Brillouin zone.5 These important and varied properties have allowed lead chalcogenides to be used extensively in optoelectronic devices such as lasers and detectors, thermophotovoltaic energy converters, and thermoelectric materials.1,6–10

As thermoelectric materials, lead chalcogenides may exhibit electrical conductivities, σ, in excess of $2\times10^{-4}$ $\Omega^{-1}$ cm$^{-1}$, thermopowers, $S$, around 150 $\mu$V K$^{-1}$, and thermal conductivities, $\kappa$, on the order of 1–2 W m$^{-1}$ K$^{-1}$. This leads to figures of merit $ZT = \sigma S^2 k / T$ larger than 1 at high temperatures, $T$. Such outstanding performances are due on the details of the electronic structure,11–15 and on the ability to dramatically reduce the thermal conductivity with alloying and nanostructuring.16–19 While pure lead chalcogenides are attractive on their own, their alloys are even more interesting. The appeal arises from their mechanical and electronic tunability, which can be optimized for specific technological needs.20–22 For example, the PbTe$_{1-x}$Sn$_x$ pseudo-binary system has a higher $ZT$ value than its corresponding binary forms.23,24 Thallium doping in PbTe causes changes in the electronic density of states, increasing the $ZT$ value to 1.5 at 773 K.11 Similarly, a $ZT$ of 1.3 at 850 $K$ was reported for aluminum doped PbSe.25 Furthermore, Pb$_{0.8}Sb$_{0.2}Te$_{1–x}$Sb$_x$ is known to exhibit lower thermal conductivity and a higher $ZT$ than PbSe$_{1–x}$Te$_x$.26 This is also true for nanostructured Pb$_{0.95}$Sn$_{0.05}$Te$_{0.95}$Pb$_{0.05}$, as the low thermal conductivity leads to a $ZT = 1.5$ at 642 K.27 The properties of this group of pseudo-binaries depend greatly on the atomic details of the material’s morphology. This can be partially understood in terms of thermodynamical features. The excellent thermoelectric performances, for example, were tentatively ascribed to the limited miscibility of the components. This gives rise to
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structural inhomogeneities that lower the thermal conductivity without damaging the electronic transport. Such control over the morphology could be also used to optimize functionalities associated with topological effects.

In this work we study the phase diagram of lead chalcogenide pseudo-binaries. We predict quantitatively the boundary of the solid solution (the binodal curve that defines the region of miscibility), as well as the spinodal region. These features are key for rationalizing and honing synthesis and characterization of optimized systems. To the best of our knowledge, our study is the first to completely and accurately report such characterizations. The phase diagram is essential for properly establishing the morphology could be also used to optimize functionalities associated with topologicaleffects.

The enantio of formation, $\Delta H$, is defined as:

$$\Delta H = E_{(A,B)} - x_A E_{A} - x_B E_{B}$$

(4)

where $E_{(A,B)}$, $E_{A}$, and $E_{B}$ are the total energies of compounds $(A,B)$, $A$, and $B$, respectively. These energies can be found from the fully relaxed structures using density functional theory (DFT).

A combination of high throughput ab initio calculations and thermodynamic modelling are used to predict the interaction parameter, $k(x)$. The result is a zero temperature approximation of the actual value. The most common method to describe the composition dependent interaction parameter is the Redlich-Kister equation, where the interaction parameter is written in a polynomial form:

$$L(x) = \sum_{i=0}^{n} L_i (x_A - x_B)^i$$

(5)

We fit this polynomial to the formation enthalpy data obtained from DFT and/or CE calculations. We checked that an $n = 2$ polynomial is enough to obtain a good fit to the data, so that only $L_0$, $L_1$, and $L_2$ need to be determined:

$$L(x) \approx L_0 + xL_1 + x^2L_2$$

(6)

to compute the interaction parameter.

The main computational challenge lies in characterizing many configurations for many compositions. Some authors have attempted to address the issue, by generating, few configurations and/or few compositions which is computationally really demanding. Here, we challenged the problem more drastically; by relying on the advantages of a hybrid cluster expansion (CE)–high throughput approach which features an exhaustive exploration of different configurations for all the different compositions. Cluster expansion is widely used to describe phase diagrams, in which A and B belong to the same sublattice, by making the exploration of multi configurational space computationally affordable. The automatic generation of hundreds or thousands of configurations for whole composition range and the prediction of their energy only computing some tens of DFT structures make CE the ideal and most reliable in lattice technique to avoid a large set of DFT supercell calculations. The computational efficiency was achieved with HT methods, and rational use of online repositories (AFLOWLIB.org).

2 Methodology

2.1 Thermodynamic modeling

Pseudo-binary systems are represented by the formula $(A_x B_{1-x})_C$ or $A_{x_1} x_2 C$ with mole fractions $x_A$ and $x_B$ of elements A and B respectively, related by $x_A + x_B = 1$. The small letters $a$ and $c$ represent number of sites per formula.

The Gibbs energy of such iso-structural pseudo-binary systems can be written as:

$$G_{(A,B)} = x_A G_{A_{x_1}} + x_B G_{B_{x_2}} + k T (x_A \ln(x_A) + x_B \ln(x_B)) + x_A x_B J_{A_{x_1} B_{x_2}}$$

(1)

where $G_{A_{x_1}}$ and $G_{B_{x_2}}$ represent the Gibbs free energy of $A_{x_1}$ and $B_{x_2}$ materials. These two variables can be computed at any temperature by fitting available experimental data to the polynomial form shown in eqn (2):

$$G(T) = a + bT + cT \ln T + dT^2 + eT^{-1} + fT^3$$

(2)

The third term in the eqn (1) is the entropy of mixing, and the last term is the excess energy of mixing that parameter can take negative or positive values. If $L_{A_{x_1} B_{x_2}}$ is negative, it indicates that the system tends to create a solid solution. A positive value of $L_{A_{x_1} B_{x_2}}$ indicates a repulsive interaction between phases, penalizing formation of intermediate alloys. To find the excess mixing energy, the composition-dependent interaction parameter $L_{A_{x_1} B_{x_2}}$ can be calculated with eqn (3):

$$\Delta H = x_A x_B L_{A_{x_1} B_{x_2}}$$

(3)

The enthalpy of formation, $\Delta H$, is defined as:

$$\Delta H = E_{(A,B)} - x_A E_{A} - x_B E_{B}$$

(4)

2.2 Cluster expansion

In the cluster expansion technique, the configurational energy of an alloy as written as a sum of many-body occupation variables $\{\sigma\}$:

$$E(\sigma) = J_0 + \sum_i J_i \sigma_i + \sum_{ij} J_{ij} \sigma_i \sigma_j + \ldots \ldots$$

(7)

where $J_0$, $J_i$, $J_{ij}$ etc. are known as effective cluster interactions and must be determined.

The above equation can be rewritten into symmetrically distinct sets of clusters, $x$:

$$E(\sigma) = \sum_x m_x J_x \left( \prod_{i \in x} \sigma_i \right)$$

(8)
where \( m_a \) represents symmetrically equivalent clusters \( a \) in a given reference volume.\(^{30}\) The \( J_a \) parameters are obtained by fitting a relatively small number of DFT calculated energies.

The reliability of the predicted energy may be determined using the cross-validation score \( CV \):

\[
(CV)^2 = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{S=1}^{N} (E_S - \hat{E}_S)^2,
\]

where \( E_S \) represents the calculated energies from DFT and \( \hat{E}_S \) is the predicted energies from CE. A small CV score guarantees that CE predicted energies are in agreement with DFT computed energies. The enumeration of configurations, calculation of the effective interaction parameters, determination of ground state structures, and prediction of more structures was performed with the Alloy Theoretic Automated Toolkit (ATAT).\(^{49}\) Calculated phase diagrams were obtained with Monte Carlo (MC) simulations performed with phb code. The algorithm automatically follows a given phase boundary and is provided by the ATAT package.\(^{49–51}\)

### 2.3 High-throughput \textit{ab initio} calculations

All DFT calculations were carried out by using the Automatic-Flow for Materials Discovery (AFLOW)\(^{47,52,53}\) and DFT Vienna \textit{ab initio} simulation program (VASP).\(^{54}\) Calculations were performed using AFLLOW standards.\(^{55}\) We use the projector augmented wave (PAW) pseudopotentials\(^{56}\) and the exchange and correlation functionals parametrized by the generalized gradient approximation proposed by Perdew–Burke–Ernzerhof.\(^{57}\) All calculations use a high energy-cutoff, which is 40% larger than the maximum cutoff of all pseudopotentials used. Reciprocal space integration was performed using 8000 \( k \)-points per reciprocal atom. Spin–orbit coupling was not treated in the calculations due to its minimal influence in \( \Delta H \) (smaller than 1.5 meV per atom). Structures were fully relaxed (cell volume and ionic positions) such that the energy difference between two consecutive ionic steps was smaller than \( 10^{-4} \) eV.

PbS, PbSe and PbTe crystallize in the NaCl structure and belong to the \( Fm\bar{3}m \) space group (\# 225). We used the bulk primitive cell (2 atoms per cell) as input for the cluster expansion calculations. The number of atoms for each configuration depend on the alloy concentration, \( x \), however, supercells of 20 atoms were chosen as the limit size for structures generated by ATAT package.

For each system, we used 100 DFT calculated energies and 250 CE predicted energies for 19 different compositions. While the number of DFT calculation is based on obtaining a CV score below 5 meV, the number of predicted energies was converged until no significance changes were observed in the consolute temperature of the systems (see Fig. S1, ESI†). This exhaustive multiconfigurational screening is the main difference compared with previous studies for this systems.\(^{28}\) Space and point group symmetries of intermediate composition structures were determined using AFLLOW.

### 3 Results and discussions

#### 3.1 The PbSe\(_{1-x}\)Te\(_x\) alloy

In agreement with experimental data, we found that PbSe and PbTe are immiscible systems at 0 K. This is shown in Fig. 1(a), where formation enthalpies are positive for all compositions (\( 0 < x < 0.1 \)). The CE predicted energies (\( \square \)) are in excellent agreement with DFT calculated structures (\( \bigcirc \)) providing a cross validation score of \( 4 \times 10^{-4} \). Eqn (3) is used to fit the interaction parameters \( L_0 \), \( L_1 \), \( L_2 \) to the highly symmetric...
structures (HSS)\textsuperscript{58,59} included HSS have a larger degeneracy and thus greater weight in the properties of the ensemble; particularly at high temperatures. In order to emphasize the importance of HSS with respect to other structures that contribute with a smaller weight, we computed interaction parameters by averaging over the whole data set (see Fig. S3(b), ESI\textsuperscript{†}). This approach drastically decreases the consolute temperature (346 K) and it is far from experimental or MC results and closer to previous theoretical results.\textsuperscript{28} These effects may be ascribed to an incorrect averaging methods that does not take into account properly the weight of the HSS with respect to the other structures. The comparison with experimental data demonstrate the relevance of the HSS and their large contribution to the properties of the alloy.

Our quantitative results confirm the Hume–Rothery rules.\textsuperscript{60} These rules qualitatively predict the miscibility of two metals based on four properties: atomic radius, crystal lattice, valence and electronegativity. Amongst the chalcogens, the atomic radius changes from 1.04 Å in S, to 1.17 Å in Se, to 1.37 Å in Te. These size variations create a mismatch between the lattice parameters of PbTe and PbSe, causing incoherence in the interface and phase decomposition, eventually. $\Delta G(x)$ diagrams at different temperatures are plotted in Fig. 1(b). It can be seen the $\Delta G$ function has two minima and a single maximum at low temperatures. At high temperatures close to $T_c$, it becomes convex, with one minimum.

The binodal curve $T_c(x)$ is defined by the horizontal tangent points of the Gibbs free energy, $G$. When $T < T_c$, the alloy starts decomposing. Additionally, our calculations let us determine the spinodal curve that discriminates metastable and unstable regions in the pseudo-alloy phase diagram. The spinodal curve is the locus of the points where the second derivative of $G$ is equal to 0:

$$\frac{\partial^2 G_{(AB)_xC_{1-x}}}{\partial x^2} = 0. \quad (10)$$

We computed first and second derivatives of the Gibbs free energy within our thermodynamical model. In order to obtain the $L_0$, $L_1$, $L_2$ that are necessary to compute $L(x)$ at any composition, we use HSS to fit eqn (3). After computing the $L_n$ constants, $\Delta G_{(Se,Te)_xPb_{1-x}}$ is obtained via eqn (1). The results obtained from the thermodynamic model are compared with our MC results, previous theoretical predictions,\textsuperscript{28} and experimental data.\textsuperscript{29,61}

Our calculations encompass the entire range of concentrations, and reproduce the asymmetry observed experimentally in the binodal curve. In order to quantitatively compare all data, we analyzed the consolute temperature or upper critical solution temperature ($T_c$) describing the lowest temperature at which both phases are miscible at any composition. Experimentally PbSe$_{1-x}$Te$_x$ alloy presents, at $x = 0.4$, a $T_c$ closer to 623 K.\textsuperscript{29,61} This quantity is far from the value predicted by Boukhris \textit{et al.},\textsuperscript{28} which is around 106 K. The consolute temperature predicted by our thermodynamic model at 520 K (16.5% error) is around $x = 0.34$ (see Fig. 1(c)). Our results quantitatively improve the prediction of $T_c$ with of Boukhris \textit{et al.}\textsuperscript{28} because of the exhaustive multiconfigurational exploration allowed by CE technique.

We emphasize that the CE approximation only reduces the computational cost of the method, making it more affordable for a wider exploration of the multiconfigurational space (see Fig. S2, ESI†). Moreover, this value approaches the results obtained by much more expensive techniques such as MC, in which we obtain a value close to 550 K (11.7% error). Discrepancies between MC and TM at larger Te (Se) concentrations arise from difficulties in converging MC calculations in the dilute limit of Se (Te).

The experimental miscibility gap presents a slight asymmetric form that is reproduced by MC and our TM. This asymmetry is observed in experiments, but was not seen in previous theoretical work.\textsuperscript{28} This phenomenon will be discussed in the next section.

In contrast to the binodal curve, the spinodal curve is quite symmetric. The combination of the symmetric spinodal and asymmetric binodal curves at the Se-rich region causes nucleus of PbSe$_{1-x}$Te$_x$ at higher temperatures and nucleation cause a Se-rich nano-structuring. This information is very important for fine tuning synthesis protocols to obtain the desired morphologies.

### 3.2 The PbS$_{1-x}$Te$_x$ alloy

The atomic radius of Te is 24% larger than the S radius. Thus, the PbS–PbTe system follows the same trend as PbSe–PbTe, and they are immiscible at 0 K.

Our $\Delta H$ values are greater than 0 eV for the whole range of concentrations (see Fig. 2(a)). CE predicted energies are again in agreement with DFT calculations, obtaining a CV score of about $3 \times 10^{-3}$. The fitting for $L(x)$ is also depicted in Fig. 2(a) using highly symmetric points. Similarly to PbSe–PbTe, the $\Delta G$ function changes to a convex shape at high temperatures (Fig. 2(b)).

The calculated phase diagram of the PbS$_{1-x}$Te$_x$ alloy is shown in Fig. 2(c). Experimental results show again a slight asymmetry with a maximum around $x = 0.3$. This is in agreement with our results, while MC simulations fail to show this asymmetry. The predicted consolute temperatures for PbS–PbTe follow the same trend as PbSe–PbTe. Results published by Boukhris \textit{et al.}\textsuperscript{29} considerably underestimate the experimental value for $T_c$ (1083 K). Our prediction of the consolute temperature is slightly larger than experiments,\textsuperscript{29} being 1385 and 1365 K using MC simulations and TM, respectively. As seen from Fig. 1(c) and 2(c) PbSe–PbTe and PbS–PbTe systems show a very similar trend of a slightly asymmetric spinodal curve, and considerably asymmetric binodal curve. This trend shows formation of the Te-rich alloy starts at lower temperatures than Se-rich compositions.

### 3.3 The PbS$_{1-x}$Se$_x$ alloy

Our methodology was also applied to the PbS–PbSe system. All positive energies in Fig. 3 indicate that PbS and PbSe systems are not miscible at 0 K. As far as we know, there are no experimental data available below 573 K for this system.\textsuperscript{61} However, it has been shown that MC simulations predict the $T_c$ for different systems quite well, and can describe the miscibility gap.\textsuperscript{30,31} For this alloy, thermodynamic modelling predicts a $T_c$ slightly below 200 K and MC predicts a $T_c$ slightly lower than 250 K.
3.4 General considerations

The lattice mismatch between the two solids (PbS, PbSe, or PbTe) is a good descriptor to analyze the trends observed experimentally (see Fig. 4). Lattice mismatch, $\varepsilon$, is defined as:

$$\varepsilon = \left( \frac{a_{(A,B)C_x} - a_{\text{solvent}}}{a_{\text{solvent}}} \right) \times 100,$$

where $a_{(A,B)C_x}$ denotes the lattice constant of intermediate alloys and $a_{\text{solvent}}$ is the lattice constant of the most abundant binary alloy. There is a correlation between the lattice mismatch of the alloy, $\Delta H$, and the consolute temperature. The higher the mismatch, the higher $\Delta H$ becomes and thus, a higher $T_c$ is obtained. For instance, the larger mismatch corresponds to the PbS–PbTe system, which presents a maximum enthalpy of formation at $x = 0.5$, with 80 meV per atom and a $T_c$ of 1083 K. For the PbSe–PbTe system, the maximum $\Delta H$ is around 22 meV per atom and the consolute temperature is 623 K. Following this trend, PbS–PbSe system presents a smaller mismatch and a smaller $\Delta H$ 8 meV per atom. Thus, a consolute temperature
As discussed above, mismatch between lattices is directly related to the magnitude and size of the spinodal curve. Mismatch is the driving force in the three systems we are studying. Thus, we propose a second asymmetry descriptor, $e_r$, based on the ratio between the lattice mismatch at two points equidistant to $x = 0.5$:

$$e_r = \frac{\varepsilon(x = 0.8)}{\varepsilon(x = 0.2)}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (13)

The asymmetry descriptor values for the three systems are shown in Table 1. $e_T$ shows PbS--PbSe as the most asymmetric spinodal curve, then PbS--PbTe, and finally the PbSe--PbTe system. This trend is exactly the same for $e_r$, emphasizing the importance of the lattice strain in the structure of these systems. The ability of the method to explore a large configurational space guarantees the correct description of the asymmetry of the spinodal curve.

**Table 1** Asymmetric descriptors for spinodal curves for lead chalcogenides

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PbS--PbTe</th>
<th>PbS--PbSe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$e_T$</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$e_r$</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4 Conclusions

A hybrid approach, comprising high-throughput *ab initio* and cluster-expansion techniques is used to create a thermodynamic model for calculating binodal and spinodal decompositions in pseudo binary lead chalcogenides (PbSe--PbTe and PbS--PbTe). The model overcomes the limitations of previous theoretical studies, where too few compositions and/or configurations were taken into account. The obtained thermodynamical features are very close to the experimentally obtained data, when available. We also capture the asymmetry of the binodal curve, experimentally observed and previously computationally unresolved. Additionally, phase diagrams for systems without experimental characterization, such as the PbS--PbSe alloy, are suggested. The results have been validated by using MC simulations, and lattice mismatch between the binary solids descriptors.

Overall the approach is suitable for the high-throughput characterization of miscibility gaps, spinodal and other decomposition phenomena.
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