Received 20 April 2001

Accepted 6 June 2001

Acta Crystallographica Section B Structural Science

ISSN 0108-7681

### S. C. Abrahams

Physics Department, Southern Oregon University, Ashland, OR 97520, USA

Correspondence e-mail: sca@mind.net

# Ferroelectricity and structure in the YMnO<sub>3</sub> family

The 1963 discovery of ferroelectricity in YMnO<sub>3</sub> was accompanied by an experimental Curie temperature  $(T_c)$ reported as 913 K; this value was revised to 1270 K in the following decade. Subsequently, YInO3 was shown to be isostructural with YMnO<sub>3</sub> and later demonstrated to satisfy the structural criteria for ferroelectricity; recent unpublished measurements give  $T_c$  (YInO<sub>3</sub>) = 835 (15) K. The experimental  $T_c$  value of 913 K for YMnO<sub>3</sub> is in satisfactory agreement with the calculated 1220 (100) K value as derived from a very recent structural refinement, the experimental  $T_c$ of 835 (15) K for YInO<sub>3</sub> with the calculated 760 (120) K. The full YMnO<sub>3</sub> family includes the AMnO<sub>3</sub> subfamily with A = Y, Ho, Er, Tm, Yb, Lu, Sc, In; the  $A InO_3$  subfamily with A = Y, Gd, Dy, Ho, Tb; and the  $AGaO_3$  subfamily with A = Y, Ho, Er. The  $T_c$  values of six family members with known structure, in addition to YMnO<sub>3</sub> and YInO<sub>3</sub>, have been structurally derived as 1310 (110) K for ErMnO<sub>3</sub>, 1290 (165) K for LuMnO<sub>3</sub>, 1270 (110) K for YbMnO<sub>3</sub>, 1220 (105) K for ScMnO<sub>3</sub>, 540 (375) K for InMnO<sub>3</sub> and 1020 (100) K for YGaO<sub>3</sub>. The agreement between predicted and experimental  $T_c$  values for ErMnO<sub>3</sub>, LuMnO<sub>3</sub> and YbMnO<sub>3</sub>, in addition to that for YMnO<sub>3</sub> and YInO<sub>3</sub>, leads to the confident prediction that ScMnO<sub>3</sub>, InMnO<sub>3</sub> and YGaO<sub>3</sub> are new ferroelectrics. The remaining six members of the full YMnO<sub>3</sub> family are also expected to be new ferroelectrics.

## 1. Introduction

The discovery by Bertaut *et al.* (1963) that YMnO<sub>3</sub> and YbMnO<sub>3</sub> are both antiferromagnetic and ferroelectric, following the determination by Yakel (1955) and Bertaut & Forrat (1956) that these manganites have a structure described as that of a distorted perovskite (but see §2), led to substantial interest in their properties. Yakel *et al.* (1963) undertook a single-crystal structure determination of LuMnO<sub>3</sub> and showed, from the powder patterns, that it was isostructural with YMnO<sub>3</sub> and YbMnO<sub>3</sub>. They reported the *a* axis length in the *A*MnO<sub>3</sub> family as ranging between 6.136 and 6.042 Å at ~300 K for *A* = Y, Ho, Er, Tm, Yb and Lu, with a range for the *c* axis between 11.42 and 11.37 Å.

YGaO<sub>3</sub> was also found to be isostructural with the YMnO<sub>3</sub> family by Geller *et al.* (1975) as well as, probably, HoGaO<sub>3</sub> and ErGaO<sub>3</sub> with similar unit-cell parameters. Soon after, the crystal structure of YInO<sub>3</sub> was reported by Pistorius & Kruger (1976) to be isostructural with YMnO<sub>3</sub>, as were the *A*InO<sub>3</sub> subfamily members with A = Eu, Gd, Tb, Dy and Ho. Additional members of the YMnO<sub>3</sub> family were identified by searching release 2000/2 of the Inorganic Crystal Structure Database (ICSD; Bergerhoff *et al.*, 1983). The atomic coor-

 ${\rm (\!C\!\!\!\!C\!\!}$  2001 International Union of Crystallography Printed in Great Britain – all rights reserved

dinates of isostructural YbMnO<sub>3</sub> (Isobe *et al.*, 1991), InMnO<sub>3</sub> and ScMnO<sub>3</sub> (Greedan *et al.*, 1995) were thereby retrieved, together with redeterminations of the ScMnO<sub>3</sub> structure (an X-ray powder diffraction study by Xu *et al.*, 1995, and a neutron powder diffraction study by Bieringer & Greedan, 1999).

The very recent refinements of the YMnO<sub>3</sub> and ErMnO<sub>3</sub> atomic coordinates by van Aken *et al.* (2001*a,b*) were of particular interest in view of the prediction (Abrahams, 1988) that isostructural YInO<sub>3</sub> is ferroelectric with Curie temperature  $T_c = 810$  (90) K.

The structurally derived values of  $T_c$  in YMnO<sub>3</sub>, ErMnO<sub>3</sub>, YbMnO<sub>3</sub> and LuMnO<sub>3</sub>, a reanalysis of the YInO<sub>3</sub> coordinates leading to a revised value for its  $T_c$ , and the structural prediction of ferroelectricity in ScMnO<sub>3</sub>, InMnO<sub>3</sub> and YGaO<sub>3</sub> with corresponding values for their calculated  $T_c$ , are presented hereafter. Eight additional family members with structures not yet fully refined are also expected to be ferroelectric.

## 2. Ferroelectric YMnO<sub>3</sub>

Prompt confirmation of Bertaut et al.'s (1963) discovery was made by Bokov et al. (1964) and by Smolenskii & Bokov (1965); they reported an inflection at  $\sim$ 750 K in the inverse magnetic susceptibility thermal dependence, ascribing it to a structural phase transition, but found no ferroelectric transition below 825 K. Ismailzade & Kizhaev (1965) observed a sharp maximum at  $T_c$  (YMnO<sub>3</sub>)  $\simeq$  935 K in the pyroelectric current thermal dependence with discontinuities at approximately the same temperature in the a and c axial parameters by powder diffractometer measurement; they also found a small discontinuity in the c-axis parameter at  $\sim$ 500 K. Small discontinuities in the thermally dependent dielectric permittivity and loss led Coeuré *et al.* 1966) to report  $T_c$  (YMnO<sub>3</sub>) = 913 K. Other determinations, however, gave discrepant results for the value of  $T_c$ . An Arrhenius plot (Peuzin, 1965) of electric resistance (log R, in  $\Omega$ , versus 1/T) for 295 < T  $\lesssim$ 930 K was without significant departures from linearity and hence not indicative of a dielectric change in this thermal range.

Łukaszewicz & Karat-Kalicińska (1974) showed, by singlecrystal diffractometry, that YMnO<sub>3</sub> reflections with  $h + k \neq 3n$ are weak at room temperature and decrease with increasing temperature to become zero at  $T_c$  (YMnO<sub>3</sub>)  $\simeq$  1270 K. They note these reflections are observable at 1258 K, but not at 1283 K. The dimensions of the hexagonal unit cell above  $T_c$  in phase I correspond to  $a_I \simeq 3.61$  Å,  $c_I \simeq 11.39$  Å. The polar unit cell in phase II, with space group  $P6_3cm$  and dimensions  $a_{II} \simeq$ 6.14 Å,  $c_{II} \simeq 11.41$  Å, undergoes reorientation at  $T > T_c$  to a cell with space group  $P6_3/mmc$  and  $a_I = a_{II}/2\cos 30^\circ$ ; the resulting volume is one-third that at  $T < T_c$ , see Fig. S1.<sup>1</sup> Łukaszewicz & Karat-Kalicińska's (1974) data, taken provisionally as more reliable, clearly show a *decrease* ( $\sim 0.028$  Å) in the *c* axis between 300 and 1075 K, with much smaller lattice constant discontinuities in the range 895–955 K, in contrast to Ismailzade & Kizhaev's (1965) results, which indicate a discontinuous *increase* ( $\sim 0.021$  Å) in the *c*-axis dimension between 300 and 935 K. The recommended nomenclature of Tolédano *et al.* (1998) for the prototype and ferroelectric phases of YMnO<sub>3</sub>, on the basis on these results, is hence shown below.



The atomic coordinates for phase II  $\mid$  < 1270 K of van Aken et al. (2001a)<sup>2</sup>, or their symmetry equivalents, are given in Table 1 with an origin shift in z of 0.2505 to minimize  $\Sigma \Delta z$  [by setting  $\Delta z(Y1) + \Delta z(Y2) + \Delta z(Mn) = 0$ ;  $\Delta z$  as used in (1) is defined below. A view of the YMnO3 structure, which differs significantly from that of perovskite, may be found in Fig. S2. It is notable that reorientation of the phase I unit cell, see Fig. S1, is accompanied by a symmetry change at the Y2 site from a rotation triad to an inversion hexad screw axis as the Y1 site symmetry changes from a hexad to an inversion hexad screw axis. The coordinate relationship between a given atom in phase I | >1270 K and phase II | < 1270 K is  $x_I = 2x_{II} - y_{II}$ ,  $y_I =$  $x_{II} + y_{II}$ ,  $z_I = z_{II}$ . The coordinates 2/3, 1/3, z of atom Y2 at Wyckoff position 4(*b*) in phase II thus transform to  $0,0,z; 0,0,\overline{z};$  $0,0,\frac{1}{2} + z; 0,0,\frac{1}{2} - z$  in phase I. Since  $z(Y2) = \overline{z}(Y2)$  in phase I, both coordinates necessarily become zero as the coordinates of Y2 achieve identity with those of Y1 in the resulting 2(a)position of phase I, see Table 1. The two independent Y atoms below  $T_c$  hence define the unit-cell origin at  $T > T_c$ .

The  $x_{I}$ ,  $y_{I}$ ,  $z_{I}$  coordinates in phase I derived from the symmetry operators of space group  $P6_{3}/mmc$ , see Table 1, are identical to those of Łukaszewicz & Karat-Kalicińska (1974), except for  $z_{I}(O1)$  and  $z_{I}(O2)$  which these authors estimated at 0.415 and 0.585, respectively. An inability to refine the structure of YMnO<sub>3</sub> from measurements at 1005 K in space group  $P6_{3}/mmc$  was noted as possibly due to disorder.

Table 1 shows there is no difference between corresponding coordinates in phases I and II greater than 0.28 Å. With all atomic displacements significantly larger than their thermal/ static displacements but less than an upper limit of ~1 Å, the structural criteria for the prediction of ferroelectricity (Abrahams, 1988) are clearly satisfied. It has been shown that  $T_c$  may be estimated from (1) below with acceptable accuracy in the case of well determined structural refinement of oxygen or fluorine octahedral ferroelectrics (Abrahams & Ravez,

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Supplementary data for this paper are available from the IUCr electronic archives (Reference: BR0107). Services for accessing these data are described at the back of the journal.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Following initial use of the recommended nomenclature, including all six information fields, Tolédano *et al.* (1998) advise that subsequent use in a paper be reduced to two of the first three fields.

#### Table 1

Atomic coordinates of YMnO<sub>3</sub> at 290 K (van Aken *et al.*, 2001*a*), hypothetical  $x_1y_1z_1$  coordinates above  $T_c$  and atomic ( $\Delta x$ ,  $\Delta y$ ,  $\Delta z$ ) and thermal/static ( $u_{eq}$ ) displacements in Å.

 $a_{\rm II} = 6.1387$  (3),  $c_{\rm II} = 11.4071$  (9) Å at 290 K;  $a_{\rm I} \simeq 3.61$ ,  $c_{\rm I} \simeq 11.39$  Å at ~1285 K. Wyckoff position 6(c) in  $P6_3cm$  is  $x_0, z; \bar{x}, \bar{x}, z; \bar{x}, 0, \frac{1}{2} + z; 0, \bar{x}, \frac{1}{2} + z; 1$ . In position 4(b), it is  $1/3, 2/3, z; 2/3, 1/3, z; 1/3, 2/3, \frac{1}{2} + z; 2/3, 1/3, \frac{1}{2} + z; 1$  and in position 2(a) it is 0, 0, z and  $0, 0, \frac{1}{2} + z$ . Atomic coordinates in the unit cell with space group  $P6_3/mmc$  are given in italies on the line below, as transformed by the relationship between polar cell II and nonpolar cell I:  $x_{\rm I} = 2x_{\rm II} - y_{\rm II}, y_{\rm I} = x_{\rm II} + y_{\rm II}, z_{\rm I} = z_{\rm II}$ .

In the unit cell at ~1285 K with space group  $P_{6_3/mmc}$  (Łukaszewicz & Karat- Kalicińska, 1974), see §2, Wyckoff position 4(*f*) in phase I is  $1/3, 2/3, z; 2/3, 1/3, \bar{z}; 2/3, 1/3, \frac{1}{2} + z; 1/3, 2/3, \frac{1}{2} - z$ . In position 2(*c*), it is  $1/3, 2/3, \frac{1}{4}; 2/3, 1/3, \frac{3}{4};$  in 2(*b*),  $0, 0, \frac{1}{4}; 0, 0, \frac{3}{4};$  and in 2(*a*), 0, 0, 0 and  $0, 0, \frac{1}{2}$ .

		Phase II				Phase I						
	Wyckoff position in <i>P</i> 6 <sub>3</sub> <i>cm</i>	x <sub>II</sub>	Уп	* Z	Wyckoff position in <i>P</i> 6 <sub>3</sub> / <i>mmc</i>	x <sub>I</sub>	y <sub>I</sub>	$z_{I}$	$\Delta x$	$\Delta y$	$\Delta z^{*}$	$U_{ m eq}$
<b>Y</b> 1	2( <i>a</i> )	0	0	0.52172(12) 0.52172(12)	2( <i>a</i> )	0	0	1/2	0	0	0.247	0.062
Y2	4(b)	2/3 0	1/3 0	0.98091 (3) 0.98091 (3)	2( <i>a</i> )	0	0	0	0	0	-0.217	0.064
Mn	6( <i>c</i> )	0.3352 (4) 0.6704	0 0 3352	0.24738(12) 0.24738(12)	2(d)	2/3	1/3	1/4	0.023	0.007	-0.030	0.076
O1	6( <i>c</i> )	0.3083 (12) 0.6166	0	0.4101(7) 0.4101(7)	4( <i>f</i> )	2/3	1/3	0.4127	-0.181	-0.090	-0.030	0.089
O2	6( <i>c</i> )	0.6413 (10) 0.2826	0 0.6413	0.5846(6) 0.5846(6)	4( <i>f</i> )	1/3	2/3	0.5873	-0.181	-0.092	-0.030	0.070
O3	2( <i>a</i> )	0	0	0.7256(12) 0.7256(12)	2(b)	0	0	3/4	0	0	-0.278	0.073
O4	4( <i>b</i> )	2/3 0	1/3 0	$\begin{array}{c} 0.2660 \ (11) \\ 0.2660 \ (11) \end{array}$	2(b)	0	0	1/4	0	0	0.182	0.095

1992). In ferroelectric YMnO<sub>3</sub>, however, the Y1 and Y2 cations occupy distorted monocapped oxygen octahedra, the Mn distorted oxygen trigonal bipyramids, with two-dimensional arrays of Y separating sheets of  $MnO_5$  groups that share equatorial oxygen corners resulting in a net  $MnO_3$  composition, see Fig. S2. Since ferroelectricity is found in the  $AMnO_3$  subfamily and also in the  $AGaO_3$  and  $AInO_3$  subfamilies, all A atoms may be considered as *i*th atoms in (1) below.

The largest metal atom displacement  $\Delta z$  [where  $\Delta z = (z^* - z_I)c$ , for  $z^*$  the atomic  $z_{II}$  coordinate in phase II after an origin shift along the polar axis and  $z_I$  the hypothetical z coordinate in the phase I unit cell] between the two phases is  $\Delta z(Y1) = 0.247$  Å, see Table 1. Using (1) to estimate  $T_c$ 

$$T_c = (\kappa/2k)(\Delta z_i)^2 \,\mathrm{K},\tag{1}$$

where  $\kappa$  is a force constant, k is Boltzmann's constant,  $\Delta z_i$  is the largest displacement along the polar c axis by the *i*th atom and  $\kappa/2k = 2.00 (9) \times 10^4 \text{ K} \text{ Å}^{-2}$  (Abrahams *et al.*, 1968), which gives  $T_c$  as 1220 (100) K. The uncertainty in  $T_c$  includes both that in the atomic position polar coordinate and in the force constant  $\kappa = 5.52$  (25) kPa. All values of  $T_c$  calculated herein from (1) are rounded to the nearest 5 K.

The theoretical basis for (1) is the double-well potential model (*cf.* Kurtz, 1975) in which each atom occupies a minimum at a distance  $\Delta z$  from the intervening potential barrier, see §6. The barrier height associated with the *i*th atom is proportional to  $T_c$  (*cf.* Kurtz *et al.*, 1991). Equation (1) has also been derived from mean field theory (Eisenreigler, 1974) and by the use of pseudospin formalism (Elliot, 1971).

Application of a reliable correction to  $\Delta z$ (Y1) for the mean polarization displacement of the monocapped oxygen octahedron is not possible in view of the latter's high asymmetry with respect to the mirror plane at  $z = \frac{1}{4}$ . It is hence noteworthy that the use of the metal-atom displacement without such a correction in (1) gives a value of  $T_c$  in acceptable agreement with experiment, although the force constant in capped octahedra is not necessarily identical to that in uncapped octahedra.

## 3. Ferroelectric ErMnO<sub>3</sub>

The unit cell and atomic arrangement reported for ErMnO<sub>3</sub> by van Aken *et al.* (2001*b*), as presented in Table S1, closely resembles that in YMnO<sub>3</sub> and the other members of the YMnO<sub>3</sub> family, see Tables 1 and S1–S7. Unpoled ferroelectric crystals generally have a domain distribution that minimizes the net polarization; a 2:1 ratio of domains with opposite polarity is reported in the ErMnO<sub>3</sub> crystal studied. Examination of the resulting atomic coordinates shows the metal atoms are displaced by  $\Delta z$ (Er1) = 0.256 (1),  $\Delta z$ (Er2) = -0.231 (1) and  $\Delta z$ (Mn) = -0.025 (2) Å, with polar displacements for oxygen that range from -0.29 (3) Å in the case of O3 to 0.010 (8) Å for O1 and O2. The corresponding value of  $T_c$ from (1), based on  $\Delta z$ (Er1), is 1310 (110) K, see §2 and Table 2.

# 4. Ferroelectric YInO<sub>3</sub>

The prediction that YInO<sub>3</sub> is a new ferroelectric with  $T_c$  calculated as 810 (90) K (Abrahams, 1988) was based on an assumed phase transition to a paraelectric phase in space group  $P6_3/mcm$  without an integral change in cell volume. This assumption led to its high-temperature preparation and the preliminary measurement of its dielectric properties (Hall *et al.*, 1998). A reproducible calorimetric anomaly was observed at 835 (15) K, followed by melting at 1820 (20) K. Dielectric

#### Table 2

AMnO<sub>3</sub> and YBO<sub>3</sub> family with maximum cation displacements (Å) and Curie temperatures ( $T_c$ , K), both from (1) and experimentally.

Neither the structure nor the physical properties of GdInO<sub>3</sub>, TbInO<sub>3</sub>, DyInO<sub>3</sub>, HoInO<sub>3</sub> (Pistorius & Kruger, 1976), HoGaO or ErGaO<sub>3</sub> (Geller *et al.*, 1975) have been reported but, with unit cells of  $a_{II} \simeq 6.0$ ,  $c_{II} \simeq 11.4$  Å and space group  $P6_3cm$  at ~300 K, all six materials are also likely to be ferroelectric, see §6.

Column headed 'Calculated  $T_c$  from (1)': joint uncertainty in  $T_c$  as calculated from (1) is based on the uncertainty both in the atomic coordinate and the force constant.

	$ \Delta z(A)_{\rm max} $	Calculated $T_c$ from (1)	Experimental $T_c$	Reference
			I c	
YMnO <sub>3</sub>	0.247 (1)	1220 (100)	1270, 915, 935	(a), (b), (c), (d)
LuMnO <sub>3</sub>	0.254†	1290 (165)	>750	(e), (f)
YbMnO <sub>3</sub>	0.252 (1)	1270 (110)	995	(g), (c)
ScMnO <sub>3</sub>				
SC	0.247 (2)	1220 (105)	-	(h)
XRPD	0.246 (34)	1210 (365)	-	<i>(i)</i>
NPD	0.280 (13)	1570 (235)	-	(j)
InMnO <sub>3</sub>	0.164 (57)	540 (375)	-	(h)
TmMnO <sub>3</sub>	-	-	>750	(f)
ErMnO <sub>3</sub>	0.256 (1)	1310 (110)	835	(k), (c)
HoMnO <sub>3</sub>	-	-	875	(c)
YInO <sub>3</sub>	0.195 (10)	760 (120)	835 (15)	(l), (m)
YGaO <sub>3</sub>	0.226 (6)	1020 (100)	-	<i>(n)</i>

(a) van Aken et al. (2001a); (b) Łukaszewicz & Karat-Kalicińska (1974); (c) Coeuré et al. (1966); (d) Ismailzade & Kizhaev (1965); (e) Yakel et al. (1963); (f) Bertaut et al. (1963); (g) Isobe et al. (1991); (h) Greedan et al. (1995); (i) Xu et al. (1995); (j) Bieringer & Greedan (1999); (k) van Aken et al. (2001b); (l) Pistorius & Kruger (1976); (m) Hall et al. (1998); (n) Geller et al. (1975). † Uncertainty in z(Lu2) assumed to be 0.012 Å.

permittivity and loss anomalies were observed at ~880 K and frequencies to 100 kHz, with the reproducible demonstration of a.c. dielectric hysteresis at room temperature confirming the prediction; the spontaneous polarization was ~ $0.5 \times 10^{-2}$  C m<sup>-2</sup>. Dielectric and associated property measurement methods used to characterize new ferroelectrics may be found in Bauer *et al.* (2001).

Reanalysis of the atomic coordinates reported by Pistorius & Kruger (1976), on the basis that phase II of YInO<sub>3</sub> undergoes a transition to space group  $P6_3/mmc$  as in the case of YMnO<sub>3</sub>, shows that Y1 must undergo a displacement of 0.195 Å, Y2 of -0.187 Å, in the course of the transition, see Table S2. These displacements, and those of the remaining atoms, are close to the original values obtained (Abrahams, 1988) on the assumption that the transition was to the space group  $P6_3/mcm$ .

The resulting calculated value of  $T_c$  from (1), based on  $\Delta z(Y1) = 0.195$  (10) Å, is 760 (120) K in good agreement with experiment.

## 5. Predicted ferroelectric YMnO<sub>3</sub> family members

The 16 members of the YMnO<sub>3</sub> family presented in Table 2 include seven known ferroelectrics; eight members have structures still to be determined in detail and, if confirmed as isostructural with YMnO<sub>3</sub>, each is most likely ferroelectric, see §6. Both ScMnO<sub>3</sub> and InMnO<sub>3</sub> are predicted to be new ferroelectrics, with calculated  $T_c$  values close to 1220 (105) and 540 (375) K, respectively. With the exception of InMnO<sub>3</sub>, the

remaining seven known structures have predicted or experimental values of  $T_c \gtrsim 800$  K. The origin of ferroelectricity in YMnO<sub>3</sub> has long been a subject of speculation, see §6, much of which has centered on the ability of the Mn<sup>3+</sup> ion to occupy the trigonal bipyramidal site. The role of  $dsp^3$  hybrid bonding with likely high-spin configuration, for example, was discussed by Yakel et al. (1963); this, and related models based on the Mn<sup>3+</sup> cationic  $d^4$  configuration, are clearly inapplicable to  $In^{3+}$  with a filled shell in ferroelectric YInO3. Hill (2000) has suggested the stability of YMnO<sub>3</sub> is ionic size related. The radii of  $Y^{3+}$ (VII) and the rare-earth ions from  $Tb^{3+}$  (VII) to  $Lu^{3+}$  (VII) listed by Shannon (1976) fall within the range 1.10-1.066 Å; the interpolated radius of  $\text{Sc}^{3+}$  (VII) is ~0.95 Å, that of  $\text{In}^{3+}$ (VII) is ~1.00 Å. The magnetic moment of 4.78  $\mu_B$  for the Mn<sup>3+</sup> ion in ScMnO<sub>3</sub> (Xu et al., 1995) corresponds to the high spin state; the interpolated radius of Mn<sup>3+</sup> (V, HS) is ~0.70 Å with that of  $In^{3+}$  (V) at ~0.85 Å and  $Ga^{3+}$  (V) at 0.69 Å. The metal ion radius thus has a lower limit at the monocapped oxygen octahedral site of  $\sim 0.95$  Å and an upper limit at the trigonal bipyramidal site of ~0.85 Å. These restrictions are satisfied by In<sup>3+</sup> at both sites; however, neither Mn<sup>3+</sup> nor Ga<sup>3+</sup> with respective radii of  $\sim 0.86$  and  $\sim 0.82$  Å satisfy the lower limit at the seven coordination site, in accord with observation.

The largest  $\Delta z(A)$  displacements are by cations in the 2(*a*) and 4(*b*) sites of phase II. Except for LuMnO<sub>3</sub> and InMnO<sub>3</sub>,  $|\Delta z(A)|$  for cations in 2(*a*) sites exceed those in the 4(*b*) sites, see Tables 1 and S1–S7. In all family members  $|\Delta z(A)_{max}| \gtrsim$ 0.2 Å; the apparent anomaly in the case of InMnO<sub>3</sub> is without significance. Displacements at these two sites are of opposite sense in all members. The reliability of the  $\Delta z$  magnitudes and their derivative  $T_c$  values in Table 2 is dependent on the reliability of the underlying structural determination. Structures not discussed in §§2–4 are hence briefly considered here.

Yakel *et al.* (1963) measured 1186 independent absorptioncorrected LuMnO<sub>3</sub>  $F_{obs}^2$  values to determine and refine the structure to a final R = 0.13. Refinement was accompanied by large correlations among the variables, with negative (unrealistic) atomic displacement parameters. Uncertainties in the atomic positions, see Table S3, were unavailable and the resulting reliability is likely to be lower than normal. Remeasurement and new refinement is strongly advisable.

A single crystal of YbMnO<sub>3</sub> ground into a 'rough' sphere gave 742 unique  $F_{obs}^2 > 1.5\sigma(F_{obs}^2)$ ; refinement with unit weights led to the atomic coordinates in Table S4, with R = 0.036, wR =0.053 (Isobe *et al.*, 1991). Comparison with the following results on ScMnO<sub>3</sub>, see Figs. S3 and S4, suggests the value of  $\sigma[\Delta z(Yb)_{max}]$  in Table 2 may be similarly underestimated.

Three separate studies of ScMnO<sub>3</sub> have been reported. Greedan *et al.* (1995) used a triangular crystal plate in the measurement of 378 averaged absorption-corrected independent reflections; a rejection limit on  $F^2$  was unspecified. Refinement gave the atomic coordinates in Table S5(*a*) with final R = 0.0283,  $wR(F^2) = 0.0731$ . Independently and simultaneously, Xu *et al.* (1995) subjected the powder diffraction pattern of ScMnO<sub>3</sub> to refinement by the Rietveld method, resulting in the atomic coordinates of Table S5(*b*). Neutron diffraction powder patterns of ScMnO<sub>3</sub> were measured by Bieringer & Greedan (1999) at room temperature and at 5 K intervals between 130 and 10 K. Rietveld refinement of the crystal structure at 300 K gave the nuclear coordinates in Table S5(c); the magnetic structure was also investigated at low temperatures.

Normal probability analysis (Abrahams & Keve, 1971) of the ranked experimental deviates  $|\xi_1 - \xi_2|/[\sigma^2(\xi_1) + \sigma^2(\xi_2)]^{1/2}$ , where  $\xi_1$  and  $\xi_2$  are the coordinates of a given atom in Tables S5(a) and (c), allows direct comparison of the refinement results. Fig. S1 reveals a difference of 59.5 joint standard uncertainties between the values of x(O1) reported in the two studies; the value in Table S5(c) is likely in error, with d(Sc1 -O(1) = 2.662 and d(Sc2-O1) = 1.944 Å compared with normal distances of ~2.14 Å. Neglecting this deviate, the remaining nine exhibit a slope of 5.79 by linear regression against their normal probabilities. If the joint uncertainties are equally distributed between the two refinements, each given uncertainty is then underestimated in the least-squares fit by a factor of approximately four. The corresponding analysis of the atomic coordinates in Tables S5(a) and (b) reveals a discrepancy in the deviate for x(Mn) with a value of 6.06; the source of its error is unknown but, excluding the deviate, see Fig. S3, the slope of 1.10 indicates the large uncertainties assigned by Xu et al. (1995) suffice to produce realistic joint uncertainties in the remaining coordinates.

The crystal structure of InMnO<sub>3</sub> at 295 K was determined by Greedan *et al.* (1995) by the use of neutron powder profile analysis, taking 134 independent points on the profile. The refinement resulted in the nuclear coordinates presented in Table S6, with  $R_P = 0.071$  and  $R_{WP} = 0.091$ . The stated uncertainties are larger, by factors between two and four, than those in Table S5(*c*) and are hence less likely, with an average of ~0.05 Å, to be underestimated; consequently, they result in a large uncertainty for the predicted  $T_c$  value.

Refinement of the YGaO<sub>3</sub> structure determination by Geller *et al.* (1975) suffered from parameter correlations comparable to those reported in LuMnO<sub>3</sub> (Yakel *et al.*, 1963). A total of 266 independent reflections were measured, of which 91 were less than an unspecified threshold value. Failure to achieve convergence if all 29 positional and thermal parameters were simultaneously varied led to the setting of  $u^{22}$ (Ga) and the 8 thermal parameters for O1 and O2 at the average of previously obtained values. The assigned uncertainties in the resulting atomic coordinates of Table S7, corresponding to R = 0.04, R2 = 0.072, are most likely significantly underestimated.

## 6. Ferroelectricity in the YMnO<sub>3</sub> family

Spontaneous polarization reversibility in the YMnO<sub>3</sub> family, as demonstrated by dielectric hysteresis loop formation at room temperature, depends, in terms of the double-well potential model outlined in §2, on a separation between minima  $\lesssim 0.6$  Å along the polar axis for all atoms in the structure. In each case, the intervening potential barrier can be crossed under the application of electric fields greater than the coercive field.

Values of measured and calculated  $T_c$  in Table 2 are in satisfactory agreement for four of the ferroelectrics: YMnO<sub>3</sub>, LuMnO<sub>3</sub>, YMnO<sub>3</sub>, ErMnO<sub>3</sub> and YInO<sub>3</sub> in which both temperature values are known; the difference in the fifth case, ErMnO<sub>3</sub>, loses its possible significance if the (unstated) experimental uncertainty in  $T_c \ge 120$  K. The  $T_c$  values for YMnO<sub>3</sub>, ErMnO<sub>3</sub>, HoMnO<sub>3</sub> and YbMnO<sub>3</sub> determined from dielectric permittivity measurements were regarded as approximate by the authors, Coeuré et al. (1966), hence redetermination is appropriate. The wide experimental range reported in Table 2 for  $T_c$  (YMnO<sub>3</sub>) is indicative of difficulties both in preparing single-phase ceramic samples and with the high temperature of the phase transition. In addition to redetermining the experimental values of  $T_c$ , as stated for seven family members in Table 2, the undetermined values for ScMnO<sub>3</sub>, InMnO<sub>3</sub> and YGaO<sub>3</sub> should be measured together with  $T_c$  for GdInO<sub>3</sub>, TbInO<sub>3</sub>, DyInO<sub>3</sub>, HoInO<sub>3</sub>, HoGaO<sub>3</sub> and ErGaO<sub>3</sub>.

The expectation that each member of the  $A \text{ InO}_3$  subfamily, with A = Gd, Tb, Dy or Ho, is a new ferroelectric rests entirely upon a shared space group and unit cell similar to that of the known ferroelectric YInO<sub>3</sub> (Hall *et al.*, 1998), see §4. Likewise, both members of the  $A \text{GaO}_3$  subfamily with A = Ho or Er are expected to be ferroelectric in view of their comparability with the structurally predicted ferroelectric YGaO<sub>3</sub>, see §5. If preparation and dielectric measurement confirm these six family members to be ferroelectric, then the YMnO<sub>3</sub> family will rank among the largest to exhibit this important property.

Access to the ICSD has been through the CD-ROM DOS products and WWW Windows versions issued by Fachinformationszentrum Karlsruhe in cooperation with the International Union of Crystallography and the Institute Laue Langevin. The kindness of the Co-editor in securing the permission of Drs B. B. van Aken, A. Meetsma and T. T. Palstra to make a copy of their paper on ErMnO<sub>3</sub> available before publication is greatly appreciated, as are the discerning comments of the referees. Support of this work by the National Science Foundation (DMR 9708246) is gratefully acknowledged.

## References

- Abrahams, S. C. (1988). Acta Cryst. B44, 585-595.
- Abrahams, S. C. & Keve, E. T. (1971). Acta Cryst. A27, 157-165.
- Abrahams, S. C., Kurtz, S. K. & Jamieson, P. B. (1968). *Phys. Rev.* **172**, 551–553.
- Abrahams, S. C. & Ravez, J. (1992). Ferroelectrics, 135, 21-37.
- Aken, B. B. van, Meetsma, A. & Palstra, T. T. M. (2001*a*). *Acta Cryst.* C**57**, 230–232.
- Aken, B. B. van, Meetsma, A. & Palstra, T. T. M. (2001*b*). *Acta Cryst.* E**57**, i38–40.
- Bauer, M. R., Pugmire, D. L., Paulsen, B. L., Christie, R. J., Arbogast, D. J., Gallagher, C. S., Raveane, W. V., Nielson, R. M., Ross, C. R. II, Photinos, P. & Abrahams, S. C. (2001). J. Appl. Cryst. 34, 47–54.
- Bergerhoff, G., Hundt, Z. R., Sievers, R. & Brown, I. D. (1983). J. Chem. Inf. Comput. Sci. 23, 66–69.
- Bertaut, E. F. & Forrat, E. F. (1956). J. Phys. Radium, 20, 404-406.

- Bertaut, E. F., Forrat, E. F. & Fang, P. H. (1963). C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris, 256, 1958–1961.
- Bieringer, M. & Greedan, J. E. (1999). J. Solid State Chem. 143, 132–139.
- Bokov, V. A., Smolenskii, G. A., Kizhaev, S. A. & Myl'nikova, I. E. (1964). Sov. Phys. Solid State, 5, 2646–2647.
- Coeuré, Ph., Guinet, P., Peuzin, J. C., Buisson, G. & Bertaut, E. F. (1966). *Proceedings of the International Meeting on Ferroelectricity*, edited by V. Dvorák, A. Fousková & P. Glogar, Vol. 1, pp. 332–340. Prague: Institute of Physics, Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences.

Eisenreigler, E. (1974). Phys. Rev. B, 9, 1029-1040.

- Elliot, R. J. (1971). Structural Phase Transitions and Soft Modes. Proceedings of the NATO Advanced Study Institute at Geilo, Norway, 13–20 April 1971, pp. 235–254. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget. Geller, S., Jeffries, J. B. & Curlander, P. J. (1975). Acta Cryst. B31, 2770–2774.
- Greedan, J. E., Bieringer, M., Britten, J. G., Giaquinta, D. M. & zur Loye, H.-C. (1995). J. Solid State Chem. 116, 118–130.
- Hall, A. D., Arbogast, D. J., Gallagher, C. S., Ungana, M., Photinos, P., Nielson, R. M. & Abrahams, S. C. (1998). Unpublished report, Southern Oregon University.
- Hill, N. A. (2000). J. Phys. Chem. 104, 6694-6709.

- Ismailzade, I. G. & Kizhaev, S. A. (1965). Sov. Phys. Solid State, 7, 236–238.
- Isobe, M., Kimizuka, N., Nakamura, M. & Mohri, T. (1991). Acta Cryst. C47, 423–424.
- Kurtz, S. K. (1975). Trans. Am. Cryst. Assoc. 11, 63-86.
- Kurtz, S. K., Bhalla, A. & Cross, L. E. (1991). Ferroelectrics, 117, 261– 276.
- Łukaszewicz, K. & Karat-Kalicińska, J. (1974). Ferroelectrics, 7, 81– 82.
- Peuzin, J. C. (1965). C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris, 261, 2195-2197.
- Pistorius, C. W. F. T. & Kruger, G. J. (1976). J. Inorg. Nucl. Chem. 38, 1471–1475.
- Shannon, R. D. (1976). Acta Cryst. A32, 751-771.
- Smolenskii, G. A. & Bokov, V. A. (1965). J. Appl. Phys. 35, 915-918.
- Tolédano, J.-C., Glazer, A. M., Hahn, Th., Parthé, E., Roth, R. S., Berry, R. S., Metselaar, R. & Abrahams, S. C. (1998). Acta Cryst. A54, 1028–1033.
- Xu, H. W., Iwasaki, J., Shimizu, T., Satoh, H. & Kamegashira, N. (1995). J. Alloys Compd, 221, 274–279.
- Yakel, H. L. (1955). Acta Cryst. 8, 394-398.
- Yakel, H. L., Koehler, W. C., Bertaut, E. F. & Forrat, E. F. (1963). Acta Cryst. 16, 957–962.