inorganic compounds

Acta Crystallographica Section C Crystal Structure Communications

ISSN 0108-2701

High- and low-temperature La₂RuO₅ by powder neutron diffraction

Stefan G. Ebbinghaus

Lehrstuhl für Festkörperchemie, Institut für Physik, Universität Augsburg, Universitätsstraße 1, D-86159 Augsburg, Germany Correspondence e-mail: stefan.ebbinghaus@physik.uni-augsburg.de

Received 9 February 2005 Accepted 11 May 2005 Online 31 August 2005

The structure of dilanthanum ruthenium pentoxide was solved by powder neutron diffraction at room temperature and 1.5 K. High-temperature La₂RuO₅ crystallizes in the monoclinic space group $P2_1/c$. Upon cooling, the sample undergoes a phase transition to the triclinic low-temperature form (space group $P\overline{1}$). This transition leads to pronounced changes in the Ru-O-Ru bond distances, resulting in a dimerization of the ruthenium ions.

Comment

Among the various modifications of the perovskite structure, compounds belonging to the so-called [110]-phases are quite special. In these oxides, the three-dimensional perovskite framework can be considered to be cut along the [110] direction, resulting in blocks of different possible thicknesses. Many of the [110]-phases have the general composition $A_nB_nO_{3n+2}$, in which *n* represents the number of BO_6 octahedra within the blocks (Lichtenberg *et al.*, 2001). The thinnest possible blocks correspond to zigzag chains of single BO_6 octahedra, which are isolated by the *A*-type cations. This arrangement is found, for example, in LaTaO₄ (*n* = 2, corresponding to La₂Ta₂O₈; Cava & Roth, 1981).

The title compound is closely related to the $A_n B_n O_{3n+2}$ family of oxides. It can be described formally as an n = 2member, in which the perovskite slabs are separated by one additional AO unit. Fig. 1 shows the structural relationship between the cubic perovskite archetype structure, La₂RuO₅, and the [110]-phases. La₂RuO₅ was discovered independently by two groups. Boullay et al. (2003) published an ab initio structural determination based on powder X-ray diffraction data, while Khalifah et al. (2002) reported electrical and magnetic properties. In the latter paper, a structural phase transition at 160 K was also described. This transition is accompanied by strong changes in the magnetic susceptibility and electrical resistivity. Khalifah et al. (2002) used powder neutron diffraction for their investigations, but unfortunately no structural details were given and to the best of our knowledge this information has not been published so far. In the course of our own research on the physical properties of ruthenates, we came across the need for structural data for both the high-temperature (ht) and the low-temperature (lt) modification of La₂RuO₅. As a starting model for ht-La₂RuO₅, the atomic coordinates given by Boullay *et al.* (2003) were used. For the triclinic lt-phase, possible new positions were generated using the program *PowderCell* (Kraus & Nolze, 1996). Figs. 2 and 3 show the results of the refinements. A graphical presentation of the crystal structures at 293 and 1.5 K is given in Fig. 4.

In the high-temperature modification, atom La1 is coordinated by nine O atoms, with bond distances ranging from



Figure 1

Structural similarities between the [110]-phases and La₂RuO₅. The cubic perovskite (top left) can be considered the ∞ member of the $A_nB_nO_{3n+2}$ series. The representatives for the n = 4 and n = 2 compounds are SrTaO_{3.5} and LaTaO₄, respectively.



Figure 2

Rietveld refinement plot of La₂RuO₅ at 293 K.

2.325 (6) to 2.968 (6) Å. The coordination geometry is rather irregular and cannot be described in terms of a simple polyhedron. For atom La2, an irregular ninefold O-atom coordination is observed, with bond distances ranging from 2.342 (7) to 2.836 (6) Å. It is noteworthy that the shortest La–O distances are found for atom O5, *i.e.* the O atom in between the perovskite blocks. The RuO₆ moieties can be described as slightly distorted octahedra. The difference between the longest and shortest bonds is 0.13 (1) Å. The O–Ru–O bond angles range from 82.5 (4) to 95.2 (4)°. The Ru–Ru distances in the zigzag chains are, within experimental error, identical to the Ru…Ru distances along the crystallographic *c* axis. Additionally, the Ru1^{iv}–O3–Ru1^v (zigzag chain) and Ru1^v– O4–Ru1ⁱⁱⁱ (along *c*) bond angles are very similar [155.4 (5) and 152.8 (4)°, respectively; symmetry codes as in Table 1].

For the low-temperature modification, the coordination geometries change significantly, although the dimensions of the unit cell remain very similar. For atoms La1 and La1A, the bond lengths lie in the ranges 2.320(7)–3.054(6) and 2.352(6)–3.000(6) Å, respectively. Interestingly, the La1–



Figure 3

Rietveld refinement plot of La₂RuO₅ at 1.5 K.



Figure 4

The structure of ht- (left) and lt-La2RuO5 (right), viewed along [001].

O1A bond becomes rather short [2.381 (7) Å]. The interatomic distances for atoms La2 and La2A are 2.332 (6)-2.820 (7) and 2.346 (7)-2.834 (7) Å, respectively. The most interesting changes concern the ruthenium-oxygen coordination. Within the zigzag chains, the $Ru1^{i}$ -O3A-Ru1A^{ix} distance is 0.23 (2) Å shorter than the $Ru1-O3-Ru1A^{ix}$ distance. A similar, although less pronounced, effect was found for the distances parallel to the c direction; here, the $Ru1^{vii}$ -O4-Ru1 A^{ix} distance is 0.12 (2) Å shorter than the $Ru1^{i}-O4A-Ru1A^{xi}$ distance. These changes in the interatomic distances can be described as a dimerization of the ruthenium ions, which apparently occurs both within the zigzag chains and along c. In addition, the bond angles differ significantly in the ht- and lt-modifications. The Ru-O-Ru angles within the zigzag chains are 153.2 (5)° for Ru1-O3- $Ru1A^{ix}$ and 160.2 (6)° for $Ru1^{i}$ -O3A-Ru1 A^{ix} . The corresponding angles along the c axis $(Ru1^{vii}-O4-Ru1A^{ix})$ and $Ru1^{i}-O4A-Ru1A^{xi}$), on the other hand, are almost identical $(151^\circ;$ symmetry codes as in Table 2). It is worth noting that within the zigzag chains the shorter Ru...Ru distance is accompanied by a bond angle closer to 180°. Both effects are expected to increase the superexchange interaction between

Experimental

where.

Polycrystalline La_2RuO_5 was prepared from La_2O_3 and RuO_2 . La_2O_3 was dried at 1173 K for 6 h prior to use. The thoroughly ground stoichiometric mixture was heated in an alumina crucible at 1423 K for 48 h with one intermediate grinding. Phase purity was checked by preliminary X-ray diffraction measurements.

these neighbouring ruthenium ions. Calculations of the electronic band structure based on our Rietveld results are

currently in progress and the results will be reported else-

High-temperature phase

Crystal data	
La ₂ RuO ₅	$D_x = 7.285 \text{ Mg m}^{-3}$
$M_r = 458.89$	Neutron radiation
Monoclinic, $P2_1/c$	$\lambda = 1.4935 \text{ Å}$
a = 9.1850 (4) Å	$\mu = 0.29 \text{ mm}^{-1}$
b = 5.8294 (2) Å	T = 293 K
c = 7.9552 (3) Å	Specimen shape: cylinder
$\beta = 100.79 \ (2)^{\circ}$	$35 \times 8 \text{ mm}$
V = 418.42 (4) Å ³	Particle morphology: irregular
Z = 4	powder, black
Data collection	
SINO HRPT diffractometer	Absorption correction: for a

Specimen mounting: vanadium can Specimen mounted in transmission mode Scan method: fixed

Refinement

Refinement on I_{net} $R_p = 0.023$ $R_{wp} = 0.029$ $R_{exp} = 0.018$ S = 1.61Wavelength of incident radiation: 1.4935 Å Absorption correction: for a cylinder mounted on the φ axis $2\theta_{\min} = 4.6, 2\theta_{\max} = 164.9^{\circ}$ Increment in $2\theta = 0.05^{\circ}$

Profile function: Thompson–Cox– Hastings pseudo-Voigt 46 parameters Weighting scheme based on measured s.u.'s $(\Delta/\sigma)_{max} < 0.001$ Preferred orientation correction: none

Table 1

Selected geometric parameters (Å, °) for the high-temperature phase.

$\begin{array}{l} Ru1{-}O1 \\ Ru1{-}O2^{i} \\ Ru1{-}O3^{i} \\ Ru1{-}O3^{ii} \end{array}$	1.939 (7) 1.954 (7) 2.065 (8) 2.004 (7)	$\begin{array}{l} Ru1{-}O4^{ii} \\ Ru1{-}O4^{iii} \\ Ru1{-}Ru1^{ii} \\ Ru1{-}Ru1^{xii} \end{array}$	2.048 (8) 2.044 (8) 3.975 (8) 3.978 (7)
$\begin{array}{c} O1-Ru1-O2^{i}\\ O1-Ru1-O3^{i}\\ O1-Ru1-O3^{ii}\\ O1-Ru1-O4^{ii}\\ O1-Ru1-O4^{iii}\\ O2^{i}-Ru1-O3^{i}\\ O2^{i}-Ru1-O3^{ii}\\ O2^{i}-Ru1-O4^{iii}\\ O2^{i}-Ru1$	95.2 (4) 177.2 (5) 87.2 (4) 92.6 (4) 87.2 (4) 82.5 (4) 177.3 (5) 93.0 (4) 88.1 (4)	$\begin{array}{l} O3^{i}-Ru1-O3^{ii}\\ O3^{i}-Ru1-O4^{ii}\\ O3^{i}-Ru1-O4^{ii}\\ O3^{ii}-Ru1-O4^{ii}\\ O3^{ii}-Ru1-O4^{iii}\\ O4^{ii}-Ru1-O4^{iii}\\ Ru1^{iv}-O3-Ru1^{v}\\ Ru1^{v}-O4-Ru1^{iii} \end{array}$	95.1 (5) 86.0 (4) 94.2 (4) 88.1 (4) 90.8 (5) 178.9 (6) 155.4 (5) 152.8 (4)

Symmetry codes: (i) x, y + 1, z; (ii) $-x, y + \frac{1}{2}, -z + \frac{1}{2}$; (iii) -x, -y + 1, -z + 1; (iv) $x, y - 1, z; (v) - x, y - \frac{1}{2}, -z + \frac{1}{2}; (xii) x, \frac{3}{2} - y, \frac{1}{2} - z.$

Low-temperature phase

Crystal data

 $La_4Ru_2O_{10}$ Z = 2 $M_r = 917.78$ $D_x = 7.337 \text{ Mg m}^{-3}$ Triclinic, $P\overline{1}$ Neutron radiation a = 9.1614 (8) Å $\lambda = 1.4935 \text{ Å}$ $\mu = 0.30 \text{ mm}^{-1}$ b = 5.8075 (5) Å c = 7.9584 (8) Å T = 1.5 (1) K $\alpha = 89.78 \ (8)^{\circ}$ Specimen shape: cylinder $\beta = 101.00$ (8) $35 \times 8 \text{ mm}$ $\gamma = 91.76 \ (8)^{\circ}$ V = 415.45 (13) Å³ powder, black

Data collection

SINQ HRPT diffractometer Specimen mounting: vanadium can Specimen mounted in transmission mode Scan method: fixed

Refinement

Refinement on Inet $R_{\rm p} = 0.019$ $R_{\rm wp}=0.023$ $R_{\rm exp} = 0.014$ S = 1.62Wavelength of incident radiation: 1.4935 Å

Particle morphology: irregular

Absorption correction: for a cylinder mounted on the φ axis $2\theta_{\min} = 4.6, 2\theta_{\max} = 165.0^{\circ}$ Increment in $2\theta = 0.1^{\circ}$

Profile function: Thompson-Cox-
Hastings pseudo-Voigt
68 parameters
Weighting scheme based on
measured s.u.'s
$(\Delta/\sigma)_{\rm max} < 0.001$
Preferred orientation correction:
none

To reduce the number of free parameters, isotropic displacement parameters were used for all atoms. Attempts to refine the displacement parameters for the various O-atom positions independently led to unreasonable values for some of the atoms (especially for the lt phase) and only slightly reduced the residual parameters. We therefore decided to use one common displacement parameter for all O atoms. Because there was a strong correlation between refinement

Table 2

Selected geometric parameters (Å, °) for the low-temperature phase.

Ru1 01	1 888 (8)	$\mathbf{Pu} 1 \mathbf{A} = \mathbf{O} 3^{ix}$	2 007 (8)
Ku1=01	1.000 (0)	KulA=03	2.097 (0)
$Ru1 - O2A^{vi}$	2.042 (8)	$Ru1A - O3A^{ix}$	1.969 (8)
Ru1-O3	2.062 (8)	$Ru1A - O4^{ix}$	2.049 (8)
Ru1–O3A ^{vi}	1.957 (8)	$Ru1A - O4A^{x}$	2.050 (8)
Ru1-O4 ^{vii}	2.007 (8)	Ru1–Ru1A ^{ix}	4.045 (8)
$Ru1 - O4A^{vi}$	2.118 (8)	Ru1 ⁱ -Ru1A ^{ix}	3.868 (8)
Ru1A - O1A	1.979 (8)	Ru1 ^{vii} -Ru1A ^{ix}	3.923 (8)
$Ru1A - O2^{viii}$	1.873 (8)	Ru1 ⁱ -Ru1A ^{xi}	4.036 (8)
Ru1–O3–Ru1A ^{ix}	153.2 (5)	Ru1 ^{vii} -O4-Ru1A ^{ix}	150.6 (5)
$Ru1^{i}-O3A-Ru1A^{ix}$	160.2 (6)	$Ru1^{i}-O4A-Ru1A^{xi}$	151.0 (5)

Symmetry codes: (i) x, y + 1, z; (vi) x, y - 1, z; (vii) -x, -y, -z + 2; (viii) x, y + 1, z + 1; (ix) -x, -y + 1, -z + 2; (x) x, y, z + 1; (xi) x, y, z - 1.

parameters, it was furthermore necessary to use a common displacement parameter for the La atoms in the lt phase.

For both compounds, data collection: SINQ Instrument Control System (SICS) (Fischer et al., 2000); cell refinement: FULL-PROF2000 (Rodríguez-Carvajal, 1990); data reduction: SINQ Instrument Control System (SICS); structure refinement: FULL-PROF2000; molecular graphics: ATOMS for Windows (Dowty, 1995); publication software: PLATON (Spek, 2003) and FULPROF2000.

This work was partially performed at the spallation neutron source SINQ, Paul Scherrer Institut, Villigen, Switzerland. Technical assistance by Dr Denis Sheptyakov is gratefully acknowledged. Thanks are expressed to the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft for financial support (SFB 484) and to Mr B. Wunderlich for his help with the preparation of the sample of the title compound.

Supplementary data for this paper are available from the IUCr electronic archives (Reference: TY1006). Services for accessing these data are described at the back of the journal.

References

Boullay, P., Mercurio, D., Bencan, A., Meden, A., Drazic, G. & Kosec, M. (2003). J. Solid State Chem. 170, 294-302.

Cava, R. J. & Roth, R. S. (1981). J. Solid State Chem. 36, 139-147.

Dowty, E. (1995). ATOMS for Windows. Version 3.2. Shape Software, 521 Hidden Valley Road, Kingsport, TN 37663, USA.

- Fischer, P., Frey, G., Koch, M., Könnecke, M., Pomjakushin, V., Schefer, J., Thut, R., Schlumpf, N., Bürge, R., Greuter, U., Bondt, S. & Berruyer, E. (2000). Phys. B: Condens. Matter, 276-278, 146-147.
- Khalifah, P., Osborn, R., Huang, Q., Zandbergen, H. W., Jin, R., Liu, Y., Mandrus, D. & Cava, R. J. (2002). Science, 297, 2237-2240.

Kraus, W. & Nolze, G. (1996). J. Appl. Cryst. 29, 301-303.

Lichtenberg, F., Herrnberger, A., Wiedenmann, K. & Mannhart, J. (2001). Prog. Solid State Chem. 29, 1–70.

Rodríguez-Carvajal, J. (1990). Abstracts of the Satellite Meeting on Powder Diffraction of the XVth Congress of the IUCr, p. 127.

Spek, A. L. (2003). J. Appl. Cryst. 36, 7-13.