1 AUGUST 1999-II

Low-temperature dielectric relaxation peaks involving proton tunneling in $Ba_{1-x}Nd_xCeO_3$

I. Kuskovsky, B. S. Lim, and A. S. Nowick*

Materials Science Division, School of Mines, Columbia University, New York, New York 10027

(Received 25 February 1999)

An investigation of dielectric relaxation at relatively low-temperature (55–225 K) of the protonic conductor $Ba_{1-x}Nd_xCeO_3$, for x = 0.05, has revealed a major dielectric relaxation peak, as well as an associated smaller peak, with characteristics that strongly suggest proton tunneling. In particular, the relaxation rate is almost constant between 55 and 85 K. The nature of the dipolar defect that can give rise to such a peak is considered. [S0163-1829(99)50630-9]

Due to the low mass of the hydrogen atom, tunneling by protons or by hydrogen atoms plays a role in the behavior of a wide range of systems.¹⁻⁴ These include the following: diffusion of hydrogen in metals,^{3,5} O-H defects in Y and Nb metals,^{6,7} the B-H complex in silicon,⁸ hydrogen in polymers,⁹ proton transfer in organic molecules, especially benzoic acid,^{10,11} and ferroelectric-type materials known as "hydrogen glasses."¹²

The present study provides one of the most striking manifestations of quantum-mechanical tunneling of protons in a relatively simple system, showing a Debye-type relaxation peak whose relaxation time is almost temperature independent up to relatively high temperatures (\sim 85 K), as well as a secondary smaller peak with similar characteristics. It involves the perovskite-structured oxide, BaCeO₃, which, when doped with lower-valent cations on the Ce⁴⁺ sites and heat treated in water vapor, is known to become an excellent protonic conductor.¹³⁻¹⁵ The proton enters the lattice in the form of an OH^- ion occupying an O^{2-} site, and conduction occurs by proton transfer or hopping from one O^{2-} ion to a nearest neighboring one.¹⁶ In the case of Nd³⁺ doping, the basic defects then present at low dopant concentrations are (in Kroger-Vink notation): Nd'_{Ce} and OH_{O} . The present work investigates the low-temperature dielectric relaxation of a 5% Nd-doped sample of BaCeO₃ (i.e., Ba_{0.95}Nd_{0.05}CeO₃) following pretreatment in water vapor at 600 °C, which results in a proton uptake of close to 3 mol %. For this material, an activation energy for the protonic conductivity of 0.53 eV is observed at temperatures above 240 K; this energy is attributed to the hopping process.¹⁴ This same material has been shown to display two anelastic relaxation peaks with activation energies of 0.51 and 0.63 eV, respectively.¹⁷ These peaks, which also occur at relatively high temperatures, are attributed to variously associated defects. The fact that the peak heights increase with the Nd concentration faster than linearly supports this claim.

The electrical relaxation measurements are carried out using an ac bridge covering the frequency range 10 Hz to 100 kHz, and over the temperature range 55–235 K. Data for the conductivity, $\sigma(\omega)$, as a function of angular frequency in this range show steplike behavior suggestive of a relaxation process. Accordingly, we converted these data into ε'' , the imaginary part of the complex dielectric constant, through the relaxation¹⁸

$$\varepsilon'' = [\sigma(\omega) - \sigma(0)] / \varepsilon_0 \omega, \qquad (1)$$

where $\sigma(0)$ is the dc conductivity, extrapolated from higher temperatures, and ε_0 is the permittivity of vacuum. The results, given in Fig. 1, show the presence of a distinct Debyelike relaxation peak, with a second smaller peak at the highfrequency end for the lower temperatures. A striking feature of Fig. 1 is that the curves are nearly identical for the temperatures from 55 to 85 K, including both peaks. Unfortunately, the high-frequency side of the smaller peak is not visible because of the limiting range of the present equipment, and this peak also moves entirely out of range above ~135 K.

In addition to the peaks, these curves show a negative power-law type of variation at low frequencies suggestive of the well-known UDR ("universal dynamic response") behavior.^{18,19} Accordingly, we have carried out least-squares fitting of the data to the following equation:



FIG. 1. Data for ε'' as a function of frequency: (a) the lower temperature curves, (b) the full range of measurements. The lines drawn are merely to connect the points.

R3713



FIG. 2. Data of Fig. 1 at four temperatures fitted to Eq. (2) with parameters given in Table I.

$$\varepsilon'' = A \,\omega^{-p} + (\delta \varepsilon) (\omega \tau) / (1 + \omega^2 \tau^2) \tag{2}$$

ignoring the smaller high-frequency peak. The exponent p is equal to 1-s, where s is the power exponent of the conductivity in the UDR region, while the second term represents a Debye relaxation peak. Equation (2) gives a good fit to the data, as is shown in Fig. 2, and the parameters obtained from this fitting are listed in Table I. The fact that Eq. (2) fits as well as it does implies that our principal relaxation peak is close to a Debye peak. The results of Table I show that the peak magnitude $\delta \varepsilon$ varies only slowly, if at all, over most of the temperature range of the measurements (above 106 K). The values of the relaxation rate τ^{-1} are plotted vs reciprocal absolute temperature in Fig. 3; they show a striking near independence of temperature below about 85 K, which is, of course, suggestive of a tunneling process. Figure 3 is quite similar to the Arrhenius curves for other, more complex, systems, which involve proton transfer at low temperatures.^{1,9,10} Finally, the parameter A of Eq. (2) varies with temperature in a manner similar to τ^{-1} .

Low-temperature Debye relaxation peaks have also been observed in other solid electrolytes that are *oxygen-ion* conductors, notably in CeO₂ doped with trivalent dopants, including Y^{3+} , Gd^{3+} , and Sc^{3+} , and in CaTiO₃ doped with

TABLE I. Results of the fitting to Eq. (2) for alternate temperatures. The exponent p is equal to 0.513.

<i>T</i> (K)	$\delta \epsilon$	$ au^{-1}$ (sec ⁻¹)	$A (\sec^{-1})^p$
55.0	0.26	135	0.85
75.2	0.27	144	0.86
96.1	0.32	185	0.87
115.9	0.39	342	1.04
135.5	0.40	622	1.45
155.3	0.39	1407	2.55
175.3	0.37	3421	4.92
195	0.36	9096	9.93
214	0.39	21450	18.6
235.1	0.43	53700	42.0

FIG. 3. Plot of relaxation rate τ^{-1} obtained from the peaks of Fig. 1, versus reciprocal temperature. The solid line is the fit to Eq. (3), with parameters given in the text.

 Al^{3+} .^{20–22} In these cases, the relaxation rate shows strictly classical Arrhenius behavior, involving activation energies well below those for diffusion or the dc ionic conductivities, but with preexponentials $\sim 10^{12}$ to 10^{13} sec⁻¹, i.e., comparable to phonon frequencies. The low-temperature peaks in variously doped CeO₂ have been attributed to off-symmetry defect configurations that undergo limited ionic movements over small potential barriers.^{21,23} To describe such processes, one invokes the well-known diagram of an asymmetric double-well potential, also known as a "two-level system," with Δ as the asymmetry energy and V, the mean barrier height.²⁴ In the present case, where non-Arrhenius behavior is a manifestation of proton tunneling, we must therefore consider proton tunneling through, as well as hopping over, such a barrier. At the lowest temperatures, one expects coherent tunneling, that is, not assisted by phonons, involving a relaxation rate, τ^{-1} , independent of temperature. For a one-phonon process, τ^{-1} varies as $\operatorname{coth}(\Delta/2kT)$, which, for small Δ will not deviate much from a constant.²⁵ At higher temperatures, one may anticipate multiphonon assisted tunneling. A two-phonon process will asymptotically (at higher temperatures) obey a power law, e.g., T^7 , depending on the type of potential.²⁵⁻²⁷ Finally at higher temperatures, one may expect over-the-barrier hopping, giving an Arrhenius temperature dependence.

To simplify the description, we have fitted data of Fig. 3 to the following relation:

$$\tau^{-1} = \tau^{-1}(0) + \alpha T^n + \nu_0 \exp(-E/kT).$$
(3)

The results, given in Fig. 3, show an excellent fit to this rather crude function, indicating that all stages of tunneling behavior are present. The values obtained are: n=5.3, $\alpha = 2.6 \times 10^{-9}$, $\tau^{-1}(0)=123$ sec⁻¹, and E=0.20 eV, while

R3715

the low value of the preexponential, $\nu_0 \sim 10^9 \text{ sec}^{-1}$, indicates that the classical range may not yet be reached at the highest temperatures of our measurements (~200 K). This is not surprising, since multiple phonon processes can give rise to Arrhenius expression for the transition rate with an anomalous preexponential.²⁵⁻²⁸ For example, low values of the preexponential are observed for hydrogen diffusion in metals at low temperatures.^{3,5}

The observation of a Debye relaxation peak means that a unique dipolar defect is involved. The central question is, then, what is that defect. Further information may be derived from the peak magnitude $\delta \varepsilon$, from which it is possible to estimate the concentration of contributing dipoles c_d . The classical relation involved is²⁹

$$\delta \varepsilon = c_d \mu^2 / 3\varepsilon_0 v_0 kT \tag{4}$$

in which μ is the appropriate dipole moment, and v_0 is the volume of the unit cell (= a^3 , where a is the lattice param-

- ¹R. P. Bell, *The Tunnel Effect in Chemistry* (Chapman and Hall, London, 1980).
- ²V. I. Gol'danskii, *Tunneling Phenomena in Chemical Physics* (Gordon and Breach, New York, 1989).
- ³*Hydrogen in Metals I*, edited by G. Alefeld and J. Volkl (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1978).
- ⁴Proceedings of Meeting: *Hydrogen Transfer: Theory and Experiment* [Ber. Bunsenges. Phys. Chem. **102**, 289 (1988)].
- ⁵Y. Fukai and H. Sugimoto, Adv. Phys. **34**, 263 (1985).
- ⁶P. E. Zapp and H. K. Birnbaum, Acta Metall. 28, 1523 (1980).
- ⁷G. Cannelli, R. Cantelli, F. Cordero, F. Trequattrini, I. S. Anderson, and J. J. Rush, Phys. Rev. Lett. **67**, 2682 (1991).
- ⁸Y. M. Cheng and M. Stavola, Phys. Rev. Lett. 73, 3419 (1994).
- ⁹W. A. Phillips, Proc. R. Soc. London, Ser. A **319**, 565 (1970).
- ¹⁰A. Heuer and U. Haeberlen, J. Chem. Phys. **95**, 4201 (1991).
- ¹¹A. Stockli, B. H. Meier, R. Kreis, R. Meier, and R. R. Ernst, J. Chem. Phys. **93**, 1502 (1990).
- ¹²S. Dattagupta, B. Tadic, R. Pirc, and R. Blinc, Phys. Rev. B 44, 4387 (1991).
- ¹³H. Iwahara, T. Esaka, H. Uchida, and N. Maeda, Solid State Ionics **3/4**, 359 (1981).
- ¹⁴J. F. Liu and A. S. Nowick, Solid State Ionics **50**, 131 (1992); A. S. Nowick and Yang Du, *ibid.* **77**, 137 (1995).
- ¹⁵N. Bonanos, K. S. Knight, and B. Ellis, Solid State Ionics **79**, 161 (1995).

eter). We choose the value $\delta \varepsilon = 0.42$ at 225 K to represent, most nearly, the classical range, and $\mu = ea/\sqrt{2}$, where *e* is the electronic charge, to obtain $c_d = 1.4 \times 10^{-3}$, or 0.14%. This value is considerably smaller than the dopant concentration of 5%, indicating that only special configurations of defects are involved.

Further experiments will be required in order to determine the defects responsible for the observed relaxation peaks. Three such experiments immediately come to mind. First, the peaks should be studied as a function of the Nd concentration, particularly going to lower concentrations. Second, study of the isotope effect, in which deuterons replaces protons, can be very enlightening.^{1–3} Finally, to explore the second, smaller, peak more fully, measurements at higher frequencies will be required.

The authors are grateful to Dr. A. V. Vaysleyb for helpful discussions and to the U.S. Department of Energy for support of this work.

- ¹⁶W. Munch, G. Seifert, K-D Kreuer, and J. Maier, Solid State Ionics 86-88, 647 (1996).
- ¹⁷Yang Du, J. Phys. Chem. Solids 55, 1485 (1994).
- ¹⁸A. K. Jonscher, *Dielectric Relaxation in Solids* (Chelsea Dielectrics, London, 1983).
- ¹⁹A. S. Nowick, A. V. Vaysleyb, and W. Liu, Solid State Ionics 105, 121 (1998).
- ²⁰R. Gerhardt, W. K. Lee, and A. S. Nowick, J. Phys. Chem. Solids 48, 563 (1987).
- ²¹A. S. Nowick, A. V. Vaysleyb, H. Jain, and X. Lu, in *Electrically Based Microstructural Characterization*, edited by R. A. Gerhardt, S. R. Taylor, and E. J. Garboczi, MRS Symposia Proceedings No. 411 (Materials Research Society, Pittsburgh, 1996), p. 99.
- ²²A. S. Nowick, Solid State Ionics (to be published).
- ²³A. N. Cormack, C. R. A. Catlow, and A. S. Nowick, J. Phys. Chem. Solids **50**, 177 (1989).
- ²⁴P. W. Anderson, B. I. Halperin, and C. M. Varma, Philos. Mag. 25, 1 (1972).
- ²⁵J. A. Sussmann, J. Phys. Chem. Solids **28**, 1643 (1967).
- ²⁶H. Bottger and V. Bryskin, in *Hopping Conduction in Solids* (Akademie, Berlin, 1985), Chap. IV.
- ²⁷A. M. Stoneham, J. Chem. Soc., Faraday Trans. 86, 1215 (1990).
- ²⁸G. E. Matthews, B. J. Faraday, N. D. Wilsey, and J. H. Crawford, Phys. Rev. B 23, 5011 (1981).
- ²⁹A. S. Nowick, in *Diffusion in Crystalline Solids*, edited by G. M. Murch and A. S. Nowick (Academic, Orlando, 1985), Chap. 3.

^{*}Author to whom correspondence should be addressed.