

First-principles calculations of thermodynamic properties and planar fault energies in Co₃X and Ni₃X L12 compounds

Breidi, Abed Al Hasan; Allen, Joshua; Mottura, Alessandro

DOI:

[10.1002/pssb.201600839](https://doi.org/10.1002/pssb.201600839)

License:

None: All rights reserved

Document Version

Peer reviewed version

Citation for published version (Harvard):

Breidi, AAH, Allen, J & Mottura, A 2017, 'First-principles calculations of thermodynamic properties and planar fault energies in Co₃X and Ni₃X L12 compounds', *Physica Status Solidi B-Basic Solid State Physics*, vol. 254, no. 9, 1600839. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pssb.201600839>

[Link to publication on Research at Birmingham portal](#)

Publisher Rights Statement:

Eligibility for repository: Checked on 10/4/2017

General rights

Unless a licence is specified above, all rights (including copyright and moral rights) in this document are retained by the authors and/or the copyright holders. The express permission of the copyright holder must be obtained for any use of this material other than for purposes permitted by law.

- Users may freely distribute the URL that is used to identify this publication.
- Users may download and/or print one copy of the publication from the University of Birmingham research portal for the purpose of private study or non-commercial research.
- User may use extracts from the document in line with the concept of 'fair dealing' under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (?)
- Users may not further distribute the material nor use it for the purposes of commercial gain.

Where a licence is displayed above, please note the terms and conditions of the licence govern your use of this document.

When citing, please reference the published version.

Take down policy

While the University of Birmingham exercises care and attention in making items available there are rare occasions when an item has been uploaded in error or has been deemed to be commercially or otherwise sensitive.

If you believe that this is the case for this document, please contact UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk providing details and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate.

First-principles calculations of thermodynamic properties and planar fault energies in Co_3X and $\text{Ni}_3\text{X L1}_2$ compounds

A. Breidi,* J. Allen, and A. Mottura

School of Metallurgy and Materials, University of Birmingham, Edgbaston B15 2TT, United Kingdom

(Dated: April 3, 2017)

We do Density Functional Theory based total-energy calculations of the L1_2 phase in Co_3X and Ni_3X compounds, X being a transition metal element. The lattice parameters, magnetic moments, formation enthalpies, are determined and compared with the available experimental data. The (111) superlattice intrinsic stacking fault energy (SISF), a crucial factor affecting materials strength and their mechanical behavior is calculated using the axial interaction model. We have applied the quasiharmonic Debye model in conjunction with first-principles in order to establish the temperature dependence of the lattice parameters and the (111) SISF energies. We investigate our prediction of a low formation enthalpy in the system Ni-25 at.%Zn by doing auxiliary simulations for the fcc random alloy at the composition 25 at.%Zn. Our simulations indicate that the elements: Ti, Zr, Hf, Nb and Ta can help stabilizing the promising and extremely important $\text{Co}_3\text{Al}_{0.5}\text{W}_{0.5}$ alloy.

I. INTRODUCTION

Superalloys are very significant to a wide array of industries including aerospace¹, nuclear² and fossil fuel³⁻⁵. The main application for these alloys is in turbine blades, as there is a desire for alloys that function in more extreme environments, namely higher temperatures. Superalloys were traditionally based off nickel because of the high temperature strength and creep resistance that derives from the two phase γ/γ' microstructure⁶⁻⁸. Older Co based alloys were less successful as they relied on carbides for strengthening⁴⁻⁶, but the discovery in 2006 by Sato *et al.*⁹ of the γ' phase in the $\text{Co}_3(\text{Al,W})$ system has led to a renewed interest in Co based alloys which have the potential to be used at higher temperatures and to experience greater creep¹⁰ and oxidation resistance⁵. A greater understanding of the consequences of adding solutes to Co and Ni based alloys is necessary in order to improve their mechanical properties such as increasing planar fault energies, as well as increasing the γ' solvus temperature as this is the upper limit in operating temperature in these alloys^{3,11,12}.

Despite the fact that the lattice parameters and the formation enthalpies of the stable L1_2 phases in cobalt and nickel based compounds are available in the literature, there is no sys-

tematic calculation of these properties for the whole set of these compounds. In fact, most of the 3, 4, and 5d elements are used in superalloys as solutes. A possible dependence of the formation enthalpies and lattice parameters on the position of the element in the periodic table can be helpful in understanding the role of a given element, when added as an alloying element, on affecting these properties in alloys.

The knowledge of the geometrical stacking fault energies, known as *superlattice intrinsic stacking fault* (SISF) energies is of prime interest since they consist together with antiphase boundary (APB) and complex stacking fault (CSF) energies an indispensable set of values, where the relative difference in magnitude between these fault energies controls the equilibrium configuration of glissile superlattice dislocations and the relative stability of different dissociation modes, which in turn have the strongest impact on the mechanical behaviour of L1_2 compounds¹³.

There are two main ways to assess stacking fault energies (SFE), the first is by the use of experimentation and the second is by the use of first-principles density functional theory (DFT) simulations^{14,15}. Experimental measurements are typically conducted by measuring the width of the stacking fault ribbon. Considering that the width of this ribbon is inversely proportional to the fault energy^{5,16,17}, this technique

is typically fraught with difficulties such as: (a) thin film effects, (b) short length ribbons can be comparable to the errors, (c) uncertainty about how to apply corrections, and (d) dislocations can interact with other dislocations resulting in non-equilibrium scenarios^{13,18–20}.

The abovementioned measurement problems are not encountered with first-principles simulations. DFT-based simulations have the advantage that they can be used to compute wide variety of properties for phases that are metastable. In addition, they are characterized by high accuracy^{21,22}.

Within the context of a larger study, we investigate in this paper the variation of the ground state properties *i.e.*, lattice parameter, magnetic moment, formation enthalpies, and (111) SISF in Co_3X and $\text{Ni}_3\text{X L1}_2$ compounds, where X belongs to most of $3d$ (Ti through Zn), $4d$ (Zr through Cd), and $5d$ (Hf through Hg). We do spin-polarized (SP) and spin-restricted (non spin-polarized – non-SP) calculations. Our simulations demonstrate the instrumental role of magnetism in rendering L1_2 compounds stable or unstable.

The paper is organized as follows: the next section (II) presents the calculating methodology and the first-principles technique. In section III we present and discuss the ground state properties: lattice parameter, magnetic moment, and formation enthalpies. In section IV, the (111) SISF formation energies of selected systems are presented and discussed. In section V we conclude, highlighting key outcomes from the new results.

II. COMPUTATIONAL METHOD

A. Methodology: Axial Interaction Model

The AIM model is used to calculate the energy of a structure of N close packed planes^{17,23}. According to this model, each plane is assigned a value of a spin variable S_i , where the layer at $(i + 1)$ assumes the value of $+1$ (known as spin up) if it follows the nature stacking sequence, otherwise a value of -1 (spin down). This al-

lows the total energy of the system (E) to be defined using the following expansion¹⁷

$$E = J_0 - J_1 \sum_i S_i S_{i+1} - J_2 \sum_i S_i S_{i+2} - J_3 \sum_i S_i S_{i+3} - J_4 \sum_i S_i S_{i+4} - \dots, \quad (1)$$

where the J 's are expansion coefficients. The occurrence of a stacking fault causes a layer or a series of layers to deviate from the original stacking sequence^{10,17,24}, for example the formation of an Intrinsic Stacking fault (ISF) in the (111) plane of an FCC structure leads to the stacking sequence ABCACABC. The energy of the faulted structure can be expressed in terms of the expansion coefficients J_i and the area of the fault A . The ISF formation energy γ_{ISF} , where the expansion coefficients up to J_4 are taken into account¹ is

$$\gamma_{ISF} = \frac{4(J_1 + J_2 + J_3 + J_4)}{A} . \quad (2)$$

The expansion coefficients J 's used in Eq. 2 are calculated from ordered structures using electronic band structure methods¹,

$$E_{FCC}(N) = J_0 - NJ_1 - NJ_2 - NJ_3 - NJ_4 \dots, \quad (3a)$$

$$E_{HCP}(N) = J_0 + NJ_1 - NJ_2 + NJ_3 - NJ_4 \dots, \quad (3b)$$

$$E_{DHCP}(N) = J_0 + NJ_2 - NJ_4 + \dots \quad (3c)$$

Considering up to term J_1 in Eq. 1, reduces the model to its first-order approximation, the axial nearest-neighbor Ising model (ANNI), and γ_{ISF} in this case takes the following form^{1,25},

$$\gamma_{ISF} = \frac{2E_{HCP} - 2E_{FCC}}{A} . \quad (4)$$

Otherwise, if terms up to J_4 terms are taken into account, the model is reduced to the axial next-nearest-neighbor model (ANNNI) and the double hexagonal close packed (DHCP) structure having the sequence ABACABAC needs to

be considered. Consequently, the γ_{ISF} is now given as¹,

$$\gamma_{ISF} = \frac{E_{HCP} - 3E_{FCC} + 2E_{DHCP}}{A} . \quad (5)$$

In metals, generally, the ANNNI model is sufficient as interactions are generally very short in range^{1,18}. The AIM model does not perfectly account for all the effects as the supercell approach does, but it has been found to produce similar results^{1,25}.

AIM applied to L1₂

The (111) SISF formation energy of L1₂ compounds can be calculated using the ANNI and ANNNI models using variants of Eqs. 4&5, due to the analogy of stacking sequences between FCC and L1₂, HCP and D0₁₉, DHCP and D0₂₄¹. Hence, the (111) SISF formation energy of L1₂ compounds using the ANNI model becomes,

$$\gamma_{ANNI}^{L12} = \frac{8(E_{D019} - E_{L12})}{V_{L12}^{2/3} \cdot \sqrt{3}} . \quad (6)$$

where V_{L12} is the volume of 4-atoms L1₂ unit cell and $V_{L12}^{2/3} \cdot \sqrt{3}$ is the area of 4-atoms in the L1₂ (111) plane over which the stacking fault extends. E_{L12} and E_{D019} are the energies per atom of the L1₂ and D0₁₉ structures. Similarly, the (111) SISF formation energy of L1₂ compounds according to the ANNNI model is,

$$\gamma_{ANNNI}^{L12} = \frac{4(E_{D019} - 3E_{L12} + 2E_{D024})}{V_{L12}^{2/3} \cdot \sqrt{3}} . \quad (7)$$

where E_{D024} is the energy per atom of the D0₂₄ structure calculated at V_{L12} equilibrium volume.

B. Quasiharmonic Debye Model

In order to get the equation of state EOS, particularly $V = f(T)$, of the different crystalline phases considered here, we employ the

quasiharmonic Debye Model²⁶. At any given temperature and pressure, the system (crystal phase) is described thermodynamically by the general Gibbs function, denoted as non-equilibrium Gibbs,

$$G^*(T, P, a) = E_e(a) + PV(a) + A_{vib}(T, w(a)) . \quad (8)$$

E_e is the total-energy of the system at a lattice parameter a . PV is the constant hydrostatic pressure condition, where P is the pressure and V is the volume. $A_{vib}(T, w(a))$ is the Helmholtz vibrational energy term. The dependence of E_e on the lattice parameter a is explicit, while A_{vib} depends on a , implicitly, through the frequencies of vibration $w(a)$. Since the volume is dependent on a , this gives the desired interdependence between temperature and volume. At a given set of temperature and pressure (T, P), the equilibrium state is the one that minimizes G^* of the crystal phase with respect to volume. The Helmholtz vibrational energy is

$$A_{vib}(T, V) = U_{vib} - TS_{vib} . \quad (9)$$

According to Debye model U_{vib} and S_{vib} are:

$$U_{vib} = \frac{9}{8}nk_B\Theta_D + 3nk_BTD(\Theta_D/T) , \quad (10)$$

$$S_{vib} = 4nk_B D(\Theta_D/T) - 3nk_B \ln(1 - e^{-\Theta_D/T}) , \quad (11)$$

$$D(x) = \frac{3}{x^3} \int_0^x \frac{\zeta^3 d\zeta}{e^\zeta - 1} , \quad (12)$$

$$\zeta = \frac{\hbar w}{k_B T} , \quad (13)$$

$$x = \frac{\hbar w_D}{k_B T} = \frac{\Theta_D}{T} . \quad (14)$$

n is the number of atoms per formula unit and Θ_D is the Debye temperature of the solid which can assume this expression after some assumptions²⁷,

$$\Theta_D = \frac{\hbar}{k_B} f(\nu) \left(6\pi^2 n V^{1/2} \right)^{\frac{1}{3}} \sqrt{\frac{B_{static}}{M}} \quad (15)$$

M is the molecular mass per formula unit, \hbar is the reduced Planck's constant, k_B is Boltzmann




FIG. 1. The change in Co_3X (panel a) and Ni_3X (panel b) 0 K L_{12} lattice parameter as a function of X position in the periodic table.

constant, ν is the Poisson ratio of the solid, $f(\nu)$ is given by²⁷

$$f(\nu) = \left\{ 3 \left[2 \left(\frac{2}{3} \frac{1+\nu}{1-2\nu} \right)^{3/2} + \left(\frac{1}{3} \frac{1+\nu}{1-\nu} \right)^{3/2} \right]^{-1} \right\}^{1/3} \quad (16)$$

B_{static} the static bulk modulus,

$$B_{static}(V) = V \left(\frac{\partial^2 E_e(V)}{\partial V^2} \right). \quad (17)$$

Thus the volume dependence of Debye temperature Θ is established. The volume that makes $G^*(T, P; V)$ minimum *i.e.*,

$$\left(\frac{\partial G^*}{\partial V} \right)_{T,P} = 0. \quad (18)$$

is the equilibrium volume for given conditions of T and P , and the set of equilibrium volumes at different temperatures and pressures provides the equation of state (EOS) of solid, $V(T, P)$. The minimization of G^* is implemented in the **gibbs** code²⁷.

C. First-principles calculations

The calculations reported in this work are based on the density-functional theory^{14,15} DFT. The total energies inasmuch they are needed for optimization of the volume were calculated using the projector augmented wave (PAW) method²⁸ implemented in the Vienna first-principles simulation package (VASP)^{29–31}. The exchange correlation energy was treated in the *generalized gradient approximation* (GGA) with the PBE96 functional^{32,33}. After necessary tests to control the stability of energy, the energy cut-off was set to 400 eV. A mesh of 165, 192 and 96 special k -points for L_{12} , D_{019} and D_{024} , respectively, were taken in the irreducible wedge of the Brillouin zone for the total-energy calculation. The selected number of k -points was determined using the Monkhorst-Pack scheme³⁴. We emphasize that convergence tests for the plane-wave cutoff and the number of k -point were essential to assure reliable total-energy differences. The electronic minimisation




FIG. 2. The variation of the lattice parameters of stable Ni_3X and Co_3X L_{12} systems due to thermal expansion. The plotted temperature range of every system corresponds to approximately its critical point (order-disorder phase transition).

was judged complete when the energy difference between steps was less than $1 \cdot 10^{-5} \text{eV}$. For 7 elements (Mo, Tc Nb, Rh, Ta, W Os) semi-core states were modelled as valence states using the correspondent potentials.

Regarding the D_{019} and D_{024} phases, we emphasize that the total energy was minimized, through performing only local atomic relaxations at the corresponding L_{12} equilibrium volume-per-atom and at fixed D_{019} and D_{024}

ideal c/a ratios, in this way we guaranteed that $(a_{\text{D}_{019}}$ and $c_{\text{D}_{019}})$ and $(a_{\text{D}_{024}}$ and $c_{\text{D}_{024}})$ correspond to the underlying L_{12} lattice *i.e.*, $(a_{\text{D}_{019}}/a_{\text{L}_{12}} = \sqrt{2}$ and $c_{\text{D}_{019}}/a_{\text{L}_{12}} = \sqrt{4/3})$ and $(a_{\text{D}_{024}}/a_{\text{L}_{12}} = \sqrt{2}$ and $c_{\text{D}_{024}}/a_{\text{L}_{12}} = 4/\sqrt{3})$. The atomic positions for both phases were relaxed using the conjugate gradient algorithm³⁵, a highly recommended scheme to relax the atoms into their instantaneous groundstate, especially in case atomic relaxation is problematic.

III. GROUND STATE PROPERTIES

A. Lattice parameters

The change in the lattice parameter of the L_{12} phase in Co_3X and Ni_3X compounds, as a function of X element position in the periodic table, predicted with and without spin-polarized calculations is plotted in Fig. 1. Our lattice constant predictions corresponding to the compounds where L_{12} phase has been experimentally evidenced to exist, together with the experimental findings and previous theoretical works, are compared in Table I.

The spin-restricted (non-SP) lattice parameters exhibit an ideal parabolic variation with minimum occurring around the column Fe/Ru/Os. In fact, this minimum at the center of the d -band series is attributed to the maximum cohesive energies⁵¹⁻⁵⁵ of these half d -band filled elements.

Comparatively, the SP lattice parameter variation deviates from the ideal parabolic shape due to magnetism, especially compounds with X belonging to the $3d$ series in general, and X belonging to $4-5d$ series for Co_3X compounds. It is worth mentioning that our SP lattice parameters are actually very close to the room temperature experimental values, as manifested in Table I. For instance, the difference ranges from 0.03 % for Ni_3Fe to 0.38 % for Ni_3Pt .

We have calculated the lattice parameter temperature-dependence using a quasiharmonic Debye model for the L_{12} stable compounds. In Fig. 2(a,b), we present a comparison between

TABLE I. Theoretical (0 K) and room temperature RT experimental lattice parameters of Co_3X and Ni_3X L_{12} compounds. The unit is Angstrom (\AA).

Compound	Our Calculation (0 K)		Other Calculations (0 K)		Experiments (RT)
	SP	non-SP	Method	Value	
Co_3Ta	3.636	3.635	PAW-GGA-PW91	3.637 ⁴	3.647 ³⁶
			PAW-GGA	3.64 ³⁷	3.65 ³⁷
Co_3Ti	3.602	3.571	PAW-GGA-PW91	3.601 ⁴	3.67 ³⁸
			LMTO-ASA-LDA	3.58 ⁴⁰	3.612 ³⁹
$\text{Co}_3\text{V}^{\text{a}}$	3.505	3.505	PAW-GGA-PW91	3.514 ⁴	—
			LMTO-ASA-LSDA	3.54 ⁴²	
			LMTO-ASA-LDA	3.51 ⁴³	
Ni_3Fe	3.544	3.492	LMTO-ASA-LSDA	3.54 ⁴²	3.545 ⁴⁴
Ni_3Mn	3.57	3.507	LMTO-ASA-LSDA	3.55 ⁴²	3.555 ⁴⁵
Ni_3Pt	3.66	3.648	PP-PW-GGA-PBE	3.667 ⁴⁷	3.59 ⁴⁶
Ni_3Al	3.5689	3.5687			3.646 ⁴⁸
					3.5635 ⁴⁹
					3.5718 ⁵⁰

^a Metastable

our work and other theoretical calculations and experimental findings. Let us mention here that the Poisson ratios used in calculating the EOS for the L_{12} compounds are 0.4 ($\text{Ni}_3\text{Al}, \text{Ni}_3\text{Mn}$), 0.301 (Ni_3Pt), 0.38 (Ni_3Fe) and 0.39 (Co_3Ti). Concerning Ni_3Al it is a weak itinerant ferromagnet with very low Curie temperature ($T_c=41.5$ K) and it retains an ordered structure until it melts (1660 K⁵⁶). Our results are in good agreement with the quasi harmonic phonon calculations⁵⁷. Between RT and 1000 K, the differences between our results and the experimental data are 0.19 %⁵⁶ and 0.47 %⁵⁰, not very different from the difference between the experimental data themselves (0.26 %). At 1400 K the difference between our data (non-SP) and the experimental data⁵⁶ increases to 0.31 %. This relative increase, in spite of its small magnitude, can be explained by the fact that at high temperatures there is a dramatic increment due to anharmonicity which is not accounted for in Debye model. it's worth noting that at high temperatures our SP and non-SP lattice parameters diverge, where the non-SP data are closer to the available experimental data⁵⁶. We find the maximum increase (non-SP) in the lattice parameter due to thermal ex-

pansion between RT and 1400 K to be 2 % comparing to 1.88 % experimental increase⁵⁶.

Ni_3Fe undergoes a second-order ferromagnetic-to-paramagnetic transition at $T_C=870$ K and a first-order phase transition from an ordered L_{12} to a disordered face centered cubic phase at $T_o=780$ K. Thus L_{12} is ferromagnetic through the whole stable temperature range. Unfortunately, the available experimental data are limited in temperature-range⁵⁸. The agreement between our results and the experiment is less pronounced in comparison with Ni_3Al case, where the difference ranges from 0.46 % (at 375 K) to 0.89 % (at 740 K).

In Ni_3Mn system, atomic ordering to L_{12} structure takes place around 753 K accompanied by a ferromagnetic ordering at $T_C \sim 700$ K for a perfectly ordered alloy⁵⁹. Our prediction for the temperature dependence of L_{12} Ni_3Mn lattice parameter agrees well (maximum difference is 0.08 %) with the experiment⁶⁰ as shown in Fig. 2(b).

The system Ni_3Pt remains ferromagnetic below $T_c=373$ K⁶¹ and crystallizes in the L_{12} structure until about 850 K⁶². On the other hand, Co_3Ti is paramagnetic⁶³ through whole its temperature stability range (~ 1400 K⁶⁴). Unfortu-

nately, for these two systems, there is no available experimental data to compare with.

B. Magnetic moment

While few $3d$ elements are ferromagnetic (Fe, Co, Ni), $4d$ and $5d$ elements are all bulk nonferromagnets⁷¹, they are paramagnetic, however, Pd is very close to the Stoner criterion for ferromagnetic ordering but remains only paramagnetic – see Ref. 72 and references therein. As shown in Fig. 4(e & f), many of the 4 and $5d$ elements develop significant local magnetic moments as they occupy the X inequivalent sublattice and all have a strong effect on cobalt or nickel local magnetic moments. However, among the 4 - $5d$ series only Co_3Ta and Ni_3Pt appear as stable L1_2 phases in the phase diagram. Table II shows our 0 K determined magnetic moments, together with calculations from literature and the experimental results. Our predictions are in reasonable agreement with the experiment for the system Ni_3Fe , however we overestimate the local magnetic moment on Ni for the compounds Ni_3Mn , Ni_3Pt , and Ni_3Al , by 30-70%. This is due to the fact that the GGA, as well as *local density approximation* LDA, of the exchange-correlation potential cause the exaggerated increase in the magnetism of these compounds^{69,73}

C. Formation enthalpies

A_3B and AB_3 binary compounds can be crystallized in, around, 20 different ordered structures: A15, Ae, D0₂, D0₃, D0₉, D0₁₁, D0₁₈, D0₁₉, D0₂₀, D0₂₁, D0₂₂, D0₂₃, D0₂₄, D0_a, D0_b, D0_c, D0_d, L1₂, L1_a, and L6₀. L1₂ and D0₁₉ are the most simple ones in comparison to the other structures as they have small number of atoms per unit cell. They can be easily formed, as metastable phases, in non-equilibrium processing techniques (solid-state interfacial reaction or ion beam mixing) in contrast to the other relatively larger complicated structures. In fact, even if the formation of some of these compli-

cated structures are thermodynamically favorable *i.e.*, they are characterized by low formation enthalpies relative to the other structures, their experimental observation is not straight forward, since they need long high-temperature treatment to improve the atomic mobility in order for the atoms to arrange themselves into an ordered configuration⁸⁰.

In this study we are concerned with the formation enthalpies exclusively of the L1_2 phase for Co_3X and Ni_3X compounds. The enthalpies of formation ΔH of Co_3X compounds were calculated using

$$\Delta H_{\text{L1}_2}^{\text{Co}_3\text{X}} = E_{\text{L1}_2}^{\text{Co}_3\text{X}} - \frac{3}{4}E_{hcp}^{\text{Co}} - \frac{1}{4}E_{\phi}^{\text{X}}, \quad (19)$$

and those of Ni_3X compounds,

$$\Delta H_{\text{L1}_2}^{\text{Ni}_3\text{X}} = E_{\text{L1}_2}^{\text{Ni}_3\text{X}} - \frac{3}{4}E_{fcc}^{\text{Ni}} - \frac{1}{4}E_{\phi}^{\text{X}}. \quad (20)$$

where E_{ϕ}^{X} is the total energy of the X element in its ground state structure ϕ .

As shown in Fig. 4, the compounds that appear to be L1_2 phase-forming ones are: $\text{Co}_3(\text{X}=\text{Ti}, \text{Zr}, \text{Hf}, \text{V}, \text{Nb}, \text{Ta}, \text{W}, \text{Pt})$ and $\text{Ni}_3(\text{X}=\text{Ti}, \text{Zr}, \text{Hf}, \text{V}, \text{Nb}, \text{Ta}, \text{Cr}, \text{Mn}, \text{Fe}, \text{Zn}, \text{Pt})$, as they have negative formation enthalpies. However, in the absence of the enthalpies of the aforementioned competent ordered phases and the random solid solutions, the negative sign here is not enough to make these compounds stable *i.e.*, to appear on the phase diagram. Our purpose from plotting the L1_2 enthalpies as a function of the X position in the periodic table is to check a possible dependence of the enthalpy on the d -band filling. Indeed, we find the $3d$ (non-SP calculations) and 4 - $5d$ band series to manifest a clear dependence on the X position, where X situated to the left of the column Cr/Mo/W results in negative enthalpies, while X to the right produces positive values, Pt and Zn stand out as an exception to this observation. Furthermore to be noted, SP calculation of the $3d$ series changes substantially the enthalpies, making L1_2 Ni_3Mn and Ni_3Fe phase-forming, also Ni_3Cr albeit has small negative enthalpy (-0.3 KJ/mol.atom).




FIG. 3. (a,b) Total magnetization per atom, (c,d) Co/Ni local magnetic moment, and (e,f) local magnetic moment on the element X, in Co_3X and Ni_3X compounds. The blue solid line in panels (c) and (d) designates the local magnetic moment on Co and Ni in the fcc structure, respectively.

TABLE II. Theoretical and experimental total magnetization (per atom) and local magnetic moment on Co, Ni and X element, in Bohr magneton (μ_B), for experimentally observed Co_3X and Ni_3X L1_2 phases.

Compound	Our calculation			Other Calculations			Experiments		
	Tot	Co/Ni	X	Tot	Co/Ni	X	Tot	Co/Ni	X
Co_3Ti	0.6875	1.1077	-0.572	—	—	—	—	—	—
Ni_3Fe	1.1905	0.6183	2.906	1.23 ^{65a}	0.66 ⁶⁵	2.94 ⁶⁵	1.2075 ⁶⁶	0.62 ⁶⁶	2.97 ⁶⁶
Ni_3Mn	1.2025	0.5247	3.236	1.25 ^{65b}	0.57 ⁶⁵	3.31 ⁶⁵	1.02 ⁶⁶	0.30 ⁶⁶	3.18 ⁶⁶
Ni_3Pt	0.6335	0.7245	0.3625	0.60 ^{67c}	—	—	0.424 ^{68†}	0.48 ^{68†}	0.254 ^{68†}
Ni_3Al	0.19	0.256	-0.008	0.236 ^{69d}	—	—	0.0575 ⁷⁰	0.077 ⁷⁰	—

[†]interpolated values

^a FLAPW-GGA-PBE

^b FLAPW-GGA-PBE

^c PAW-GGA-PBE

^d FLAPW-LDA




FIG. 4. 0 K formation enthalpies of L_{12} phase in (a) Co_3X and (b) Ni_3X compounds

Experimentally, the L_{12} phase has been observed only in these compounds: Co_3X ($X=Ti^{39,41,75}, Ta^{36,37}$) and Ni_3X ($X=Mn^{77}, Fe^{44,45}, Pt^{48}$). It is worth mentioning that Ref. 67 has shown that L_{12} phase of Ni_3Pt is not the most stable phase at 0 K, though it is stabilized around 413 K due to vibrational entropy. Within the same context, let us note that the Co_3V L_{12} ordered-phase was observed in the quenched alloys with a composition around 25 at.%V^{81–83}, moreover, Refs. 81 and 82 claimed that there is a single L_{12} ordered-phase region between (αCo) and Co_3V phase. Nevertheless, the phase with L_{12} ordered-structure was confirmed to be metastable, and the formation of L_{12} ordered-phase was probably caused by quenching⁸⁴. The fact that the lowest formation enthalpies of Co_3X compounds correspond to X element belonging to Ti/Zr/Hf and V/Nb/Ta columns and the fact that these elements, except V, strongly partition to the W sublattice⁸⁵ in a L_{12} $Co_3(W,X)$ alloy, indicate that these elements, with fine-tuning of their compositions,

can enhance the low stability of the extremely important L_{12} $Co_3(Al,W)$ alloy^{86,87}. Indeed, Ref. 88 has shown that a small additions of Hf stabilizes the L_{12} at a composition around $Co_{0.772}Al_{0.102}W_{0.123}Hf_{0.003}$. Ref. 8 has also shown that Ti and Ta additions are found to strongly partition to the γ' phase and greatly increase its volume fraction.

L_{12} Ni_3Zn

It is interesting to point out to the low formation enthalpy (-11.5 KJ/mol.atom) of the L_{12} Ni_3Zn phase, using SP and non-SP schemes. This phase is not known to appear in the actual Ni-Zn phase diagram⁸⁹. The solubility range of Zn in Ni ranges from ~ 23 at.% Zn at ~ 250 K to ~ 37 at.% Zn at ~ 1250 K⁸⁹. The stable phase is fcc solid solution (α phase). The experimental formation enthalpy of the α phase at the composition 25 at.% Zn is -8.5 KJ/mol.atom measured at 1100 K⁸⁹. In order to investigate this issue, we perform calculations to de-

TABLE III. Theoretical (0 K) and experimental formation enthalpies of L1₂ phase in Co₃X and Ni₃X compounds. The unit is KJ/mol.atom.

Compound	Our Calculation (0 K)		Other Calculations (0 K)		Experiments
	SP	non-SP	Method	Value	
Co ₃ Ta	-21.56	-21.56	PAW-GGA	-30.875 ³⁷	—
			PAW-GGA-PBE	-22 ⁷⁴	
			PAW-GGA-PW91	-24.844 ⁴	
Co ₃ Ti	-22.51	-22.51	PAW-GGA-PW91	-25.843 ⁴	-26.18 ⁷⁵ (298 K)
			LMTO-ASA-LDA	-26.5 ⁴⁰	
			PAW-GGA-PBE	-24.9 ⁷⁴	
Co ₃ V ^a	-15.20	-15.20	PAW-GGA-PW91	-18.38 ⁴	—
Ni ₃ Fe	-8.2	17.32	FLAPW-GGA-PW91	-8.65 ⁷⁶	—
Ni ₃ Mn	-10.35	14.74	—	—	-7.93 ^{77b}
Ni ₃ Pt	-7.54	-4.6	PAW-LDA	-6.31 ⁷⁸	—
Ni ₃ Al	-42.1	-41.8	PAW-GGA	-41.1 ⁷⁹ (300K)	-47 ⁷⁹ (300K)
					-41.31 ⁷⁹ (300K)
					-40.59 ⁷⁹ (300K)
					-38.24 ⁷⁹ (300K)

^a Metastable

^b Corresponds to 76.2 at. % Ni

termine the formation enthalpy of the fcc random solid solution alloy at the composition 25 at.% Zn. The alloy was modeled by constructing two different supercells: the first of 32 atoms $2 \times 2 \times 2 (\times 4\text{-atoms})$ and the second of 256 atoms $4 \times 4 \times 4 (\times 4\text{-atoms})$. To get a random distribution of atoms we minimize the Warren-Cowley short-range order (SRO) parameters^{90,91} at several nearest neighbor coordination shells. We employ a calculating set-up identical to that used in L1₂ Ni₃Zn *i.e.*, same energy cut-off (400 eV) and high number of k -points. Restricting the relaxation to the supercells volume gives -8.56 KJ/mol.atom for the 32-atom supercell and -8.853 KJ/mol.atom for the 256-atom supercell. Allowing local atomic relaxations for the 32-atom supercell reduces the formation enthalpy to -10.62 KJ/mol.atom. Hence, the formation enthalpy of the ordered L1₂ phase is still lower than the disordered fcc phase by ~ 1 KJ/mol.atom. In fact, even if the L1₂ phase has a lower formation enthalpy than the α phase, that does not automatically mean it can be observed at low temperature (if there are no kinetic restrictions). In principle, one needs to study the Helmholtz energy difference ΔF be-

tween the two phases as a function of temperature. This includes the enthalpy and Helmholtz energy due to thermal vibrations (phonons) and to thermally excited electrons. The Helmholtz energy of the fcc phase has an additional configurational entropy term due to atomic disorder to be considered.

IV. SISF ENERGIES

Depending on the stability and energies of the APB, CSF and SISF in the octahedral slip plane in L1₂ alloys, the superdislocation can assume this configuration: dissociation into two super Shockley partials bounded by a SISF, known as SISF-type or type-II dissociation

$$\langle \bar{1}10 \rangle \longrightarrow \frac{1}{3} \langle 121 \rangle + \text{SISF} + \frac{1}{3} \langle 21\bar{1} \rangle. \quad (21)$$

In fact Paidar *et al.*¹⁰⁰, within the frame of the linear theory of elasticity of an isotropic continuum, proposed that SISF-type dissociation (Eq. 21) occurs if the following condition is sat-




FIG. 5. SISF energies on the (111) plane of stable Co_3X and Ni_3X L1_2 compounds variation as a function of temperature. The curves of different compounds are delimited to the stability temperature of the ordered L1_2 phase.

ified – written conveniently as^{93,101}

$$\ln \left(\frac{8\pi\gamma_{SISF}^{111}}{C_{44}a_0} \right) < 2 \ln \left(\frac{4\pi\gamma_{APB}^{111}}{C_{44}a_0} \right) + 1 \quad (22)$$

$$\delta < 2\pi eC \quad (23)$$

where the defect energy ratio $\delta = \gamma_{SISF}^{111}/\gamma_{APB}^{111}$ and $C = \gamma_{APB}^{111}/(C_{44}a_0)$ are dimensionless quantities; a_0 is L1_2 lattice parameter. γ_{SISF}^{111} and γ_{APB}^{111} are the SISF and APB formation energies on the (111) plane, respectively. Eq. (23) gives the condition for an (111) APB instability with respect to the formation of an (111) SISF.

According to the condition present above (Eq. 23), the knowledge of (111) SISF energies are of extreme importance to judge whether SISF-type dissociation would take place. As a matter of fact, a special type of deformation behaviour has been observed, particularly at low temperatures in some materials: a dramatic increase of flow stress with decreasing temperature. This behaviour is characteristic of compounds and alloys having low SISF energies, favouring thus the dissociation into two super Shockley partials bounded by a SISF. For instance, the plastic flow of Co_3Ti single crystals¹⁰² at low temperatures (< 500 K) is due

TABLE IV. A comparison of the SISF formation energies for the stable Co_3X and Ni_3X L_{12} compounds between our work (0 K), other theoretical investigations done with supercell method (0 K), and available experimental data. The unit is mJ/m^2 .

Compound	Our Calculation (0 K)				Other Calculations (0 K)		Experiments
	ANNNI		ANNI		Method	Value	
Co_3Ti	SP	non-SP	SP	non-SP	—	—	—
	144	208	197	196	TB-LMTO	175^{92}	—
Ni_3Fe	29	5	34	15	PP-PAW	210^{93}	—
	Ni_3Mn	165	-194	169	-204	—	—
Ni_3Pt	119	162	128	173	—	—	
Ni_3Al	117	114	55	49	TB-LMTO	147^{92}	$5-15^{94}$ (623 K)
					FLAPW	40^{95}	6 ± 0.5^{13} (673 K) ^a
					FP-LMTO	60^{96}	
					Empirical Potential	11^{97}	
					PP-PAW	43^{93}	
					FP-LMTO	80^{98}	
					PP-PAW	66.81^{99}	

^a The prepared alloy is non-stoichiometric: $\text{Ni}_{0.78}\text{Al}_{0.22}$.

to the dislocation movement of the superpartials dissociated on the (111) plane bounded by a SISF.

We have calculated the (111) SISF energies of the L_{12} phase for the compounds where L_{12} is stable. The calculation was done by employing the ANNI and ANNNI models, described earlier in section II A, and using the spin-polarized and spin-restricted schemes. We present in table IV a comparison between our results, other theoretical work, and the available experimental data. It seems that there are very few experimental efforts to determine the different planar fault energies in general and none to determine the (111) SISF energies for the compounds considered in this study, apart from Ni_3Al compound, of course. Let us note once more that the transmission electron microscopy technique used to determine the planar fault energies is known to involve incorrect assumptions, and consequently produces sometimes inaccurate values, particularly for the superlattice intrinsic stacking fault energies – see Ref. 103 and references therein. Furthermore, the experimental determination of fault energies depends heavily on the type of elasticity theory applied. Our predictions agree with some theoretical re-

ports and disagree with some others. This is due to the fact that the different reported data on SISF are calculated with different *ab initio* methods, as well as different methodologies to get the SISF energies (supercell vs. AIM). Concerning Co_3Ti compound, we find the (111) SISF formation energy, calculated using the SP and nonSP ANNI model, to be 197 and 196 mJ/m^2 respectively, close to the value reported by Ref. 92 and 93. The low (111) SISF value relative to the high (001) and (111) APB experimental¹⁰⁴ energies 210 and 270 mJ/m^2 respectively, and relative to the theoretical⁹² energies 280 and 301 mJ/m^2 respectively, explains the increase in the flow stress with decreasing temperature in this compound¹⁰⁵. In fact, low SISF (relative to ABP energies) leads to sessile SISF dissociated superdislocations^{105,106}. Furthermore, the difference between SP and non-SP calculations of the SISF formation energy for Ni_3Mn , shows the importance of magnetism in determining correctly the SISF fault in this compound. An improper treatment of this compound discounting magnetism produces negative SISF formation energy. This observation is in contrast to the other presently studied magnetic compounds, where both SP and non-SP

calculations yield different values but same sign. Theoretical investigations of the temperature dependence of SISF energies for $L1_2$ Co_3X and Ni_3X are almost absent in the literature. Hence, we find it necessary to study the SISF energies change as a function of temperature. To this end, we use a quasistatic approach to calculate SISF temperature dependence. It is based on the assumption that the change in SISF upon temperature increase is solely caused by thermal expansion. This approach has been successfully used to calculate the elastic constants of Ni_3Al ^{107,108}. There are plentiful experimental evidences^{109–111} supporting this approximation. It has been as well successfully used to calculate SISF energies in unaries¹¹² and alloys¹¹³ characterized by complex magnetic structures. The SISF temperature dependence was established using Eqs. 6&7, by determining the energies of $L1_2$, $D0_{19}$ and $D0_{24}$ phases at $L1_2$ equilibrium volume V corresponding to a temperature T . The volume temperature-dependence $V(T)$ was already established in section III A. As shown in Fig. 5, the tendency of SISF, using both approximations of the AIM model, is to decrease with temperature for the all compounds except for Ni_3Fe where it shows a small increase. The overall decrease in SISF as a function of temperature is $\sim 20\%$ (Ni_3Al), $\sim 15\%$ (Co_3Ti), $\sim 12\%$ (Ni_3Mn), $\sim 4\%$ (Ni_3Pt). All the compounds don not exhibit a sharp or abrupt decrease towards zero. This is understood since according to the relevant phase diagrams, the present $L1_2$ compounds either undergo a phase transition to fcc random phase or remain stable and ordered until melting such as Ni_3Al and Co_3Ti , but not to an hcp-like phase. Note that there is a small difference between the 0 K results in Table IV and their counterparts in Fig. 5, which is attributed to the zero point thermal expansion.

The increase in SISF for the system Ni_3Fe can not be related to its ferromagnetic nature since also Ni_3Mn is ferromagnetic yet the SISF energy decreases with temperature. The SISF increase in Ni_3Fe is purely related to thermal expansion. As the volume increases due to temperature, the presence of Fe on the sec-

ond sublattice increases the stability of $L1_2$ lattice with respect to hexagonal close packed like-environment, thus SISF increases. This scenario is not similar when Al, Mn and Pt, occupy the second sublattice, where a thermally expanded volume results in decreasing the 0 K SISF value. The increasingly expanded volume improves the bonding energy between Ni and Fe in the $L1_2$ structure in comparison with that in $D0_{19}$, while it lowers the bonding energy between Ni and Mn, also between Ni and Al.

For the system Ni_3Al (Fig. 5(a)), our SP ANNI results are in accordance with the SP quasiharmonic phonon supercell method values⁵⁷, while the SP ANNNI results greatly disagree. We have as well calculated the SISF at the experimental volumes⁵⁶, this technique has shown to produce values close to the experiment¹¹³. Unfortunately, there is no experimental data to compare with. The only available experimental values are $5-15$ ⁹⁴ mJ/m^2 (623 K) and 6 ± 0.5 ¹³ mJ/m^2 (673 K), and they are closer to the nonSP ANNI results.

On the other hand, there is a significant difference between ANNI and ANNNI results for the systems Ni_3Al and Co_3Ti , which persists with temperature. This can not be related to magnetism, as the difference is also present, in Ni_3Al compound, between nonSP ANNI and ANNNI approximations. Considering the fact that the ANNI results of Ni_3Al are closer to a completely different theoretical approach⁵⁷ and relatively closer to the available experimental data^{13,94}, we suggest that the current implementation²³ of the AIM model restricted to pair interaction is not sufficient to reproduce the supercell method values, at least for some systems, and thus a triple interaction implementation is necessary to converge the AIM to the supercell results.

V. CONCLUSIONS

We have performed first-principles calculations for the $L1_2$ phase in Co_3X and Ni_3X compounds. We find the studied properties of several compounds to show a strong dependence on

magnetism. The different addressed properties show a systematic dependence on the X element position in the periodic table. Our results suggest that the elements Ti, Zr, Hf, Nb and Ta are potential stabilizers for the $\text{Co}_3\text{Al}_{0.5}\text{W}_{0.5}$ alloy. First-principles calculations are highly encouraged to be performed on $\text{Co}_3\text{Al}_{0.5-x}\text{W}_{0.5-x}\text{X}_{2x}$ alloy at a single low composition x in order to test this hypothesis. Our simulation sheds light on the small energetic difference between the ordered L1_2 and the disordered fcc phase of Ni-25 at.%Zn alloy.

(<http://www.archer.ac.uk>), University of Birmingham's BlueBEAR HPC service (<http://www.birmingham.ac.uk/bear>), and computing resources through the MidPlus Regional HPC Centre, we therefore would like to acknowledge them. Also, we would like to acknowledge the EPSRC (grant EP/M021874/1) and EU FP7 (grant GA109937) for financial support.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work used the ARCHER UK National Supercomputing Service

-
- * corresponding author; a.breidi@hotmail.com
- ¹ A. Mottura, A. Janotti, and T. M. Pollock. *Intermetallics*, 28:138–143, 2012. doi: 10.1016/j.intermet.2012.04.020. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.intermet.2012.04.020>.
 - ² J. R. Davis. *Heat-Resistant Materials*, volume 113. ASM International, Almere, Netherlands, 1997.
 - ³ Y. M. Eggeler, M. S. Titus, A. Suzuki, and T. M. Pollock. *Acta Materialia*, 77:352–359, 2014. doi: 10.1016/j.actamat.2014.04.037. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.actamat.2014.04.037>.
 - ⁴ W. W. Xu, J. J. Han, Z. W. Wang, C. P. Wang, Y. H. Wen, X. J. Liua, and Z. Z. Zhu. *Intermetallics*, 32:303–311, 2013. doi: 10.1016/j.intermet.2012.08.022.
 - ⁵ A. Suzuki and T. M. Pollock. *Acta Materialia*, 56:1288–1297, 2008. doi: 10.1016/j.actamat.2007.11.014.
 - ⁶ C. T. Sims. *Superalloys 1984*. The Minerals, Metals and Materials Society, Glassport, Pennsylvania, United States, 1984. doi: 10.7449/1984/Superalloys{_}1984{_}399{_}419.
 - ⁷ D. Hull and D. J. Bacon. *Introduction to Dislocations*. Elsevier, Amsterdam, Netherlands, 5 edition, 2011. ISBN 978-0-08-096672-4.
 - ⁸ I. Povstugar, P. P. Choi, S. Neumeier, A. Bauer, C. H. Zenk, M. Göken, and D. Raabe. *Acta Materialia*, 78:78–85, 2014. doi: 10.1016/j.actamat.2014.06.020.
 - ⁹ J. Sato, T. Omori, K. Oikawa, I. Ohnuma, R. Kainuma, and K. Ishida. *Science*, 312:90–91, 2006. doi: 10.1126/science.1121738.
 - ¹⁰ M. S. Titus, A. Mottura, G. B. Viswanathan, A. Suzuki, M. J. Mills, and T. M. Pollock. *Acta Materialia*, 89:423–437, 2015. ISSN 13596454. doi: 10.1016/j.actamat.2015.01.050. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.actamat.2015.01.050>.
 - ¹¹ N. L. Okamoto, T. Oohashi, H. Adachi, K. Kishida, H. Inui, and V. Patrick. *Philosophical Magazine*, 91:3667–3684, 2011. doi: 10.1080/14786435.2011.586158.
 - ¹² A. Bauer, S. Neumeier, F. Pyczak, and M. Göken. *Scripta Materialia*, 63:1197–1200, 2010. doi: 10.1016/j.scriptamat.2010.08.036.
 - ¹³ H. P. Karnthaler, E. TH. Mühlbacher, and C. Rentenberger. *Acta Materialia*, 44(2):547–560, 1996. doi: 10.1016/1359-6454(95)00191-3.
 - ¹⁴ P. Hohenberg and W. Kohn. *Phys. Rev.*, 136: B864–B871, Nov 1964. doi: 10.1103/PhysRev.136.B864. URL <http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRev.136.B864>.
 - ¹⁵ W. Kohn and L. J. Sham. *Phys. Rev.*, 140:A1133–A1138, Nov 1965. doi: 10.1103/PhysRev.140.A1133. URL <http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRev.140.A1133>.

- ¹⁶ G. Schoeck, S. Kohlhammer, and M. Fahnle. *Philosophical Magazine Letters*, 79:849–857, 1999. doi: 10.1080/095008399176544.
- ¹⁷ M. Chandran and S. K. Sondhi. *Journal of Applied Physics*, 109:1–6, 2011. doi: 10.1063/1.3585786.
- ¹⁸ L. Vitos, J. O. Nilsson, and B. Johansson. *Acta Materialia*, 54:3821–3826, 2006. doi: 10.1016/j.actamat.2006.04.013.
- ¹⁹ Y. Qi and R. K. Mishra. *Physical Review B*, 75:224105, 2007. doi: 10.1103/PhysRevB.75.224105. URL <http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.75.224105>.
- ²⁰ Kenneth A. Green, Tresa M. Pollock, and Robert D. Kissinger. *Superalloys 2000*. The Minerals, Metals and Materials Society, Glassport, Pennsylvania, United States, 2000.
- ²¹ J. Hafner. *Computer Physics Communications*, 177:6–13, 2007. doi: 10.1016/j.cpc.2007.02.045.
- ²² J. Yan, C. Wang, and S. Wang. *Physical Review B*, 70:174105–174110, 2004. doi: 10.1103/PhysRevB.70.174105.
- ²³ P. J. H. Denteneer and W. van Haeringen. *Journal of Physics C: Solid State Physics*, 20(32):L883, 1987. URL <http://stacks.iop.org/0022-3719/20/i=32/a=001>.
- ²⁴ K. Ishida. *Physica Status Solidi (a)*, 36:717–728, 1976.
- ²⁵ A. Dick, T. Hickel, and J. Neugebauer. *Steel Research International*, 80:603–608, 2009. doi: 10.2374/SRI09SP015. URL <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.2374/SRI09SP015/abstract>.
- ²⁶ Alexei A. Maradudin. *Theory of lattice dynamics in the harmonic approximation*. New York, Academic Press, 1963. doi: <http://hdl.handle.net/2027/mdp.39076006406289>.
- ²⁷ M.A. Blanco, E. Francisco, and V. Luaña. *Computer Physics Communications*, 158(1):57–72, 2004. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.comphy.2003.12.001>. URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0010465503005472>.
- ²⁸ P. E. Blöchl. *Phys. Rev. B*, 50:17953–17979, Dec 1994. doi: 10.1103/PhysRevB.50.17953. URL <http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.50.17953>.
- ²⁹ G. Kresse and J. Hafner. *Phys. Rev. B*, 47:558–561, Jan 1993. doi: 10.1103/PhysRevB.47.558.
- ³⁰ G. Kresse and J. Hafner. *Phys. Rev. B*, 49:14251–14269, May 1994. doi: 10.1103/PhysRevB.49.14251.
- ³¹ G. Kresse and J. Furthmüller. *Computational Materials Science*, 6(1):15–50, 1996. doi: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0927-0256\(96\)00008-0](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0927-0256(96)00008-0).
- ³² John P. Perdew, Kieron Burke, and Matthias Ernzerhof. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 77:3865–3868, Oct 1996. doi: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.77.3865. URL <http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.77.3865>.
- ³³ J. P. Perdew, K. Burke, and M. Ernzerhof. *Physical Review Letters*, 78(7):1396, 1997. doi: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.78.1396.
- ³⁴ J. D. Pack and H. J. Monkhorst. *Physical Review B*, 16(4):1748–1749, 1977. doi: 10.1103/PhysRevB.16.1748.
- ³⁵ W.H. Press, S.A. Teukolsky, W.T. Vetterling, and B.P. Flannery. Cambridge University Press, 2007. ISBN 9780521880688. URL <http://books.google.fr/books?id=1aA0dzK3FegC>.
- ³⁶ R. D. Dragsdorf. *Acta Cryst*, 15:531–536, 1962. doi: 10.1107/S0365110X62001371.
- ³⁷ Xiang He, Ling-Ti Kong, and Bai-Xin Liu. *Journal of the Physical Society of Japan*, 74:2501–2505, 2005. doi: 10.1143/JPSJ.74.2501.
- ³⁸ V.V. Petkov, Y.A. Kocherzhinskii, and V.Y. Markiv. *Dopov. Akad. Nauk Ukr. RSR, Ser. A*, pages 852–854, 1971.
- ³⁹ A. K. Sinha. *Trans. AIME*, 245:911, 1969.
- ⁴⁰ J. Xu and W. Lin. *Physical Review B*, 48(7):4276–4286, 1993.
- ⁴¹ F. Cruz-Gandarilla, R. Gayosso-Armenta, M. Hesquino-Gardu no, J. G. Caba nas Moreno, and R. Martínez-Sánchez. *Materials Science Forum*, 442:109–114, 2003. doi: 10.4028/www.scientific.net/MSF.442.109.
- ⁴² Y. Tanaka, S. Ishida, and S. Asano. *Materials Transactions*, 46(2):355–360, 2005.
- ⁴³ J. Xu and A. J. Freeman. *Physical Review B*, 45(19):863–871, 1992.
- ⁴⁴ M. King, W. F. McClune, L. C. Andrews, M. A. Holomany, T. M. Kahmer, B. Lawyer, L. Zwell, B. Post, S. Weissmann, H. F. McMr-die, P. Bayliss, and M. E. Mrose. *Mineral Powder Diffraction File Databook: Sets 1-42*. JCPDS-International Centre for Diffraction Date 1601 Park Lane, Swarthmore, Pennsylvania 19081-2389 U.S.A, 1993.
- ⁴⁵ A. Lutts and P. M. Gielen. *physica status solidi (b)*, 41(1):K81–K84, 1970. doi: 10.1002/pssb.19700410169.
- ⁴⁶ E. A. Brandes and G. B. Brook, editors. *Smithells Metals Reference Book*. Butterworth-Heinemann, London, UK, 7th edition, 1992.

- ⁴⁷ Q. Chen, Z. Huang, Z. Zhao, and C. Hu. *Applied Physics A*, 116:1161–1172, 2014. doi: 10.1007/s00339-013-8201-6.
- ⁴⁸ A. Pisanty, C. Amador, Y. Ruiz, and M. de la Vega. *Zeitschrift für Physik B Condensed Matter*, 80(2):237–239, 1990. doi: 10.1007/BF01357508. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF01357508>.
- ⁴⁹ K. Aoki, , and O. Izumi. *physica status solidi (a)*, 32(2):657–664, 1975. doi: 10.1002/pssa.2210320240. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/pssa.2210320240>.
- ⁵⁰ P V Mohan Rao, S V Suryanarayana, K Satyanarayana Murthy, and S V Nagender Naidu. *Journal of Physics: Condensed Matter*, 1(32):5357, 1989. URL <http://stacks.iop.org/0953-8984/1/i=32/a=004>.
- ⁵¹ A. Breidi, S. G. Fries, and A. V. Ruban. *Phys. Rev. B*, 93:144106, Apr 2016. doi: 10.1103/PhysRevB.93.144106. URL <http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.93.144106>.
- ⁵² M. Cyrot and F. Cyrot-Lackmann. *Journal of Physics F: Metal Physics*, 6(12):2257, 1976. URL <http://stacks.iop.org/0305-4608/6/i=12/a=012>.
- ⁵³ F. Cyrot-Lackmann. *Journal of Physics and Chemistry of Solids*, 29(7):1235 – 1243, 1968. doi: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0022-3697\(68\)90216-3](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0022-3697(68)90216-3).
- ⁵⁴ J. Friedel. In J. M. Ziman, editor, *Physics of Metals*. Cambridge University Press, New York, 1969.
- ⁵⁵ D.G. Pettifor. *solid State Physics*, 40:43 – 92, 1987. doi: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0081-1947\(08\)60690-6](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0081-1947(08)60690-6). URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0081194708606906>.
- ⁵⁶ Hai-Peng Wang, Peng Lü, Kai Zhou, and Bing-Bo Wei. *Chinese Physics Letters*, 33(4):046502, 2016. URL <http://stacks.iop.org/0256-307X/33/i=4/a=046502>.
- ⁵⁷ Liu Li-Li, Wu Xiao-Zhi, Wang Rui, Li Wei-Guo, and Liu Qing. *Chinese Physics B*, 24(7):077102, 2015. URL <http://stacks.iop.org/1674-1056/24/i=7/a=077102>.
- ⁵⁸ A. O. Mekhrabov. *Acta Physica Polonica A*, 85:571, 1994.
- ⁵⁹ N. Thompson. *Proc. Phys. Soc.*, 52:217, 1940.
- ⁶⁰ Goutam Dev Mukherjee, C. Bansal, and Ashok Chatterjee. *International Journal of Modern Physics B*, 12(22):2233–2246, 1998. doi: 10.1142/S0217979298001307. URL <http://www.worldscientific.com/doi/abs/10.1142/S0217979298001307>.
- ⁶¹ P. Nash and MF Singleton. *Bull Alloy Phase Diagrams*, 10:258, 1989.
- ⁶² Xiao-Gang Lu, Bo Sundman, and John Ågren. *Calphad*, 33(3):450 – 456, 2009. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.calphad.2009.06.002>. URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0364591609000492>.
- ⁶³ Y. Aoki. *Journal of the Physical Society of Japan*, 28(6):1451–1456, 1970. doi: 10.1143/JPSJ.28.1451. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1143/JPSJ.28.1451>.
- ⁶⁴ A. V. Davydov, U. R. Kattner, D. Josell, R. M. Waterstrat, W. J. Boettinger, J. E. Blendell, and A. J. Shapiro. *Metallurgical and Materials Transactions A*, 32(9):2175–2186, 2001. doi: 10.1007/s11661-001-0193-8. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11661-001-0193-8>.
- ⁶⁵ S.E Kulkova, D.V Valujsky, Jai Sam Kim, Geunsik Lee, and Y.M Koo. *Physica B: Condensed Matter*, 322(34):236 – 247, 2002. doi: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0921-4526\(02\)01188-2](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0921-4526(02)01188-2). URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0921452602011882>.
- ⁶⁶ C.G. Schull and M.K. Wilkinson. *Phys. Rev.*, 97:305, 1955.
- ⁶⁷ Shun-Li Shang, Yi Wang, Yong Du, and Zi-Kui Liu. *Intermetallics*, 18(5):961 – 964, 2010. ISSN 0966-9795. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.intermet.2010.01.011>. URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0966979510000221>.
- ⁶⁸ R. E. Parra and J. W. Cable. *Phys. Rev. B*, 21:5494–5504, Jun 1980. doi: 10.1103/PhysRevB.21.5494. URL <http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.21.5494>.
- ⁶⁹ A. Aguayo, I. I. Mazin, and D. J. Singh. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 92:147201, Apr 2004. doi: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.92.147201. URL <http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.92.147201>.
- ⁷⁰ F. R. de Boer, C. J. Schinkel, J. Besterbos, and S. Proost. *Journal of Applied Physics*, 40(3):1049–1055, 1969. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1063/1.1657528>. URL <http://scitation.aip.org/content/aip/journal/jap/40/3/10.1063/1.1657528>.
- ⁷¹ A. J. Cox, , J. G. Louderback, and L. A. Bloomfield. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 71:923–926, Aug 1993. doi: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.71.923. URL <http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.71.923>.

- ⁷² H. Chen, N. E. Brener, and J. Callaway. *Phys. Rev. B*, 40:1443–1449, Jul 1989. doi: 10.1103/PhysRevB.40.1443. URL <http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.40.1443>.
- ⁷³ L. Ortenzi, I. I. Mazin, P. Blaha, and L. Boeri. *Phys. Rev. B*, 86:064437, Aug 2012. doi: 10.1103/PhysRevB.86.064437. URL <http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.86.064437>.
- ⁷⁴ J. Koßmann, T. Hammerschmidt, S. Maisel, S. Müller, and R. Drautz. *Intermetallics*, 64:44–50, 2015. doi: 10.1016/j.intermet.2015.04.009.
- ⁷⁵ M. Balarin and K. Bartsch. *Zeitschrift für anorganische und allgemeine Chemie*, 622(5):919–921, 1996. doi: 10.1002/zaac.19966220529. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/zaac.19966220529>.
- ⁷⁶ Y. Mishin, M.J. Mehl, and D.A. Papaconstantopoulos. *Acta Materialia*, 53(15):4029 – 4041, 2005. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.actamat.2005.05.001>. URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1359645405002843>.
- ⁷⁷ A. Stephen, F. Rossi, L. Nasi, C. Ferrari, N. Ponpandian, M. Ananth V., and V. Ravichandran. *Journal of Applied Physics*, 103(5):053511, 2008. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1063/1.2844211>. URL <http://scitation.aip.org/content/aip/journal/jap/103/5/10.1063/1.2844211>.
- ⁷⁸ M. Sanati, L. G. Wang, and A. Zunger. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 90:045502, Jan 2003. doi: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.90.045502. URL <http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.90.045502>.
- ⁷⁹ Y. Wang, Z.-K. Liu, and L.-Q. Chen. *Acta Materialia*, 52(9):2665 – 2671, 2004. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.actamat.2004.02.014>. URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1359645404000965>.
- ⁸⁰ Xiang He, Wen-Chao Wang, and Bai-Xin Liu. *Phys. Rev. B*, 77:012401, Jan 2008. doi: 10.1103/PhysRevB.77.012401. URL <http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.77.012401>.
- ⁸¹ E.T. Peters and L.E. Tanner. *Trans. Met. Soc. AIME*, 233:2126–2128, 1965.
- ⁸² Y. Aoki, K. Asami, and M. Yamamoto. *physica status solidi (a)*, 23(2):K167–K169, 1974. ISSN 1521-396X. doi: 10.1002/pssa.2210230260. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/pssa.2210230260>.
- ⁸³ Y. Aoki and J. Echigoya. *Scripta Metallurgica*, 19(5):639 – 642, 1985. ISSN 0036-9748. doi: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0036-9748\(85\)90352-7](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0036-9748(85)90352-7). URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/0036974885903527>.
- ⁸⁴ L. J. Nagel, B. Fultz, and J. L. Robertson. *Journal of Phase Equilibria*, 18:21, 1997. doi: 10.1007/BF02646756. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF02646756>.
- ⁸⁵ Sri Raghunath Joshi, K.V. Vamsi, and S. Karthikeyan. *MATEC Web of Conferences*, 14:18001, 2014. doi: 10.1051/mateconf/20141418001. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1051/mateconf/20141418001>.
- ⁸⁶ James E. Saal and C. Wolverton. *Acta Materialia*, 61(7):2330 – 2338, 2013. ISSN 1359-6454. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.actamat.2013.01.004>. URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S135964541300013X>.
- ⁸⁷ Robert K. Rhein, Philip C. Dodge, Min-Hua Chen, Michael S. Titus, Tresa M. Pollock, and Anton Van der Ven. *Phys. Rev. B*, 92:174117, Nov 2015. doi: 10.1103/PhysRevB.92.174117. URL <http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.92.174117>.
- ⁸⁸ Satoru Kobayashi, Yuki Tsukamoto, and Takayuki Takasugi. *Intermetallics*, 31:94 – 98, 2012. ISSN 0966-9795. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.intermet.2012.06.006>. URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0966979512002208>.
- ⁸⁹ George Vassilev Penev, Tomas Gomez-Acebo, and Jean-Claude Tedenac. *Journal of Phase Equilibria*, 21(3):287–301, 2000. ISSN 1054-9714. doi: 10.1361/105497100770340075. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1361/105497100770340075>.
- ⁹⁰ J. M. Cowley. *Journal of Applied Physics*, 21:24–30, 1950. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1063/1.1699415>. URL <http://scitation.aip.org/content/aip/journal/jap/21/1/10.1063/1.1699415>.
- ⁹¹ B.E. Warren. *X-ray diffraction*. New York, Dover, United States, 1990.
- ⁹² N. M. Rosengaard and H. L. Skriver. *Phys. Rev. B*, 50:4848–4858, 1994. doi: 10.1103/PhysRevB.50.4848. URL <http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.50.4848>.
- ⁹³ J. B. Liu and D. D. Johnson. *Materials Research Innovations*, 18:S4–1021–S4–1025, 2014. doi: 10.1179/1432891714Z.000000000872. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1179/1432891714Z.000000000872>.

- 1179/1432891714Z.000000000872.
- ⁹⁴ P. Veyssi re, J. Douin, and P. Beauchamp. *Philosophical Magazine A*, 51(3):469–483, 1985. doi: 10.1080/01418618508237567. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01418618508237567>.
- ⁹⁵ I. Baker, R. Darolia, and J. D. Whittenberger, editors. Materials Research Society Symposium Proceedings No. 288, Boston, Massachusetts, USA, 1993. Materials Research Society.
- ⁹⁶ A. T. Paxton. Point, line and planar defects. In D. G. Pettifor and A. H. Cottrell, editors, *Electron Theory in Alloy Design*, page 158. The Institute of Materials, London, 1992.
- ⁹⁷ G. M. Stocks, D. P. Pope, and A. F. Giamei, editors. Materials Research Society Symposium Proceedings No. 186, Pittsburgh, USA, 1991. Materials Research Society.
- ⁹⁸ O.N. Mryasov, Yu.N. Gornostyrev, M. van Schilfgaarde, and A.J. Freeman. *Acta Materialia*, 50(18):4545 – 4554, 2002. ISSN 1359-6454. doi: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1359-6454\(02\)00282-3](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1359-6454(02)00282-3). URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1359645402002823>.
- ⁹⁹ Yu feng Wen, Jian Sun, and Jian Huang. *Transactions of Nonferrous Metals Society of China*, 22(3):661 – 664, 2012. doi: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1003-6326\(11\)61229-6](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1003-6326(11)61229-6). URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1003632611612296>.
- ¹⁰⁰ V. Paidar, D.P. Pope, and M. Yamaguchi. *Scripta Metallurgica*, 15(9):1029 – 1031, 1981. doi: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0036-9748\(81\)90248-9](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0036-9748(81)90248-9). URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/0036974881902489>.
- ¹⁰¹ J.B. Liu, D.D. Johnson, and A.V. Smirnov. *Acta Materialia*, 53(13):3601 – 3612, 2005. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.actamat.2005.04.011>. URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1359645405002260>.
- ¹⁰² T. Takasugi, S. Hirakawa, O. Izumi, S. Ono, and S. Watanabe. *Acta Metallurgica*, 35(8):2015 – 2026, 1987. doi: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0001-6160\(87\)90030-7](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0001-6160(87)90030-7). URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/0001616087900307>.
- ¹⁰³ G. Vanderschaeve. *Philosophical Magazine A*, 56(6):689–701, 1987. doi: 10.1080/01418618708204482. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01418618708204482>.
- ¹⁰⁴ P. Veyssi re. Properties of surface defects in intermetallics. In C. T. Liu, R. W. Cahn, and G. Sauthoff, editors, *Ordered Intermetallics — Physical Metallurgy and Mechanical Behaviour*, pages 165–175. Springer Netherlands, Dordrecht, 1992. ISBN 978-94-011-2534-5. doi: 10.1007/978-94-011-2534-5_13. URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-94-011-2534-5_13.
- ¹⁰⁵ Yi Liu, Takayuki Takasugi, Osamu Izumi, and Takeshi Takahashi. *Philosophical Magazine A*, 59:423–436, 1989. doi: 10.1080/01418618908205067. URL <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/01418618908205067>.
- ¹⁰⁶ D.M. Wee, D.P. Pope, and V. Vitek. *Acta Metallurgica*, 32:829 – 836, 1984. ISSN 0001-6160. doi: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0001-6160\(84\)90019-1](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0001-6160(84)90019-1). URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/0001616084900191>.
- ¹⁰⁷ Y Wang, J J Wang, H Zhang, V R Manga, S L Shang, L-Q Chen, and Z-K Liu. *Journal of Physics: Condensed Matter*, 22(22):225404, 2010. URL <http://stacks.iop.org/0953-8984/22/i=22/a=225404>.
- ¹⁰⁸ Shun-Li Shang, Hui Zhang, Yi Wang, and Zi-Kui Liu. *Journal of Physics: Condensed Matter*, 22(37):375403, 2010. URL <http://stacks.iop.org/0953-8984/22/i=37/a=375403>.
- ¹⁰⁹ C.A. Swenson. *Journal of Physics and Chemistry of Solids*, 29(8):1337 – 1348, 1968. ISSN 0022-3697. doi: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0022-3697\(68\)90185-6](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0022-3697(68)90185-6). URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/0022369768901856>.
- ¹¹⁰ E.F. Wasserman. Chapter 3 invar: Moment-volume instabilities in transition metals and alloys. In *Handbook of Ferromagnetic Materials*, volume 5 of *Handbook of Ferromagnetic Materials*, pages 237 – 322. Elsevier, 1990. doi: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1574-9304\(05\)80063-X](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1574-9304(05)80063-X). URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S157493040580063X>.
- ¹¹¹ Orson L. Anderson and Donald G. Isaak. *Elastic Constants of Mantle Minerals at High Temperature*, pages 64–97. American Geophysical Union, 2013. ISBN 978118668191. doi: 10.1029/RF002p0064. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1029/RF002p0064>.
- ¹¹² I. Bleskov, T. Hickel, J. Neugebauer, and A. Ruban. *Phys. Rev. B*, 93:214115, Jun 2016. doi: 10.1103/PhysRevB.93.214115. URL <http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.93.214115>.

- ¹¹³ Vsevolod I. Razumovskiy, Andrei Reyes-Huamantínco, Peter Puschnig, and A. V. Ruban. *Phys. Rev. B*, 93:054111, Feb 2016. doi: 10.1103/PhysRevB.93.054111. URL <http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.93.054111>.