This is the accepted manuscript made available via CHORUS. The article has been published as:

Understanding and revisiting the most complex perovskite system via atomistic simulations

Yali Yang, Bin Xu, Changsong Xu, Wei Ren, and Laurent Bellaiche

Phys. Rev. B **97**, 174106 — Published 29 May 2018

DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevB.97.174106](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevB.97.174106)

Understanding and revisiting the most complex perovskite system via atomistic simulations

Yali Yang,^{1,2} Bin Xu,² Changsong Xu,² Wei Ren,^{1,2,*} and Laurent Bellaiche^{2,†}

¹*International Centre for Quantum and Molecular Structures,
Physics Department, Shanghai University, Shanghai 200444, China*

²*Physics Department and Institute for Nanoscience and Engineering,
University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, Arkansas 72701, USA*

Abstract

A first-principles-based effective Hamiltonian is developed and used, along with direct *ab-initio* techniques, to investigate finite-temperature properties of the system commonly coined the most complex perovskite, that is NaNbO_3 . Such simulations successfully reproduce the existence of seven different phases in its phase diagram. The decomposition of the total energy of this effective Hamiltonian into different terms, altogether with the values of the parameters associated with these terms, also allow to shed some lights into puzzling features of such compound. Examples include revealing the microscopic reasons of why $R3c$ is its ground state, and why it solely adopts in-phase tiltings at high temperatures *versus* complex nanotwins for intermediate temperatures. The results of the computations also call for a revisiting of the so-called P , R and S states, in the sense that an unexpected and previously overlooked inhomogeneous electrical polarization is numerically found in the P state while novel complex tiltings associated with the simultaneous condensation of *several* k-points are predicted for the controversial R and S phases.

I. INTRODUCTION

ABX_3 (where X are, e.g., O or F ions) perovskites constitute an important family of materials since it can exhibit various important phenomena, such as ferroelectricity, magnetism, multiferroicity and superconductivity. (see, e.g., Refs. [1–5] and references therein). Out of all the perovskites known to date, a particular one has been dubbed the most complex perovskite system,⁵ which is NaNbO_3 . Such compound has been extensively studied during the past decades, partly because of its optical property⁶ and its design as high output piezoelectric nanogenerator (when grown in nanowires' form)⁷ but also because of the possibility to generate lead-free materials having large piezoelectricity when mixed with KNbO_3 .^{8–11} NaNbO_3 owes its nickname to the unusual large number of states appearing in its phase transition sequence when varying the temperature.^{12–14} As a matter of fact, it is commonly accepted that NaNbO_3 has seven major phases with the highest temperature state being cubic ($Pm\bar{3}m$, above 913 K) and being typically denoted as U . Upon cooling down, this material undergoes a sequence of phase transitions which were introduced in the classic work of Megaw *et al.* in 1974¹⁴ as: tetragonal T_2 phase ($P4/mbm$, 913-848 K), orthorhombic T_1 phase ($Cmcm$, 848-793 K), orthorhombic S phase ($Pmmn$, 793-753 K), orthorhombic R phase ($Pmmn$, 753-633 K), orthorhombic P phase ($Pbcm$, 633-173 K) and finally rhombohedral N phase ($R3c$, below 173 K).

However, controversies still exist nowadays about such sequence and some of these phases. For instance, an additional room temperature Q state of $Pmc2_1$ symmetry was suggested to coexist with the P phase in some NaNbO_3 samples, depending on their processing (such coexistence arises from the proposed first-order nature of the transition between these P and Q phases^{15–17}). Similarly, a novel monoclinic structure with Pm symmetry was proposed at ambient temperature in Ref. [18], and an original quantum paraelectric phase was even suggested below 200 K.¹⁹ Moreover, new refined solutions for the R and S phases can further be found in the literature. For example, R and S phases of $Pbnm$ symmetry were given by Mishra *et al.* based on a high-resolution powder neutron diffraction study,¹² while Peel *et al.* proposed two possible structural models for the R phase between 643 K to 743 K: one being of $Pbnm$ symmetry while the other is of $Pmmn$ space group, with each of these two solutions having a $2 \times 2 \times 6$ periodic cell and differing only by the nature of the complex tilt system along the long axis. The difficulty of fully characterizing these R and S phases

likely mostly resides, in fact, in the challenging task of determining their precise complex and long-period tilting pattern of the oxygen octahedra along some particular axis.

Several first-principles studies have been carried out in the past to better understand NaNbO_3 (see, e.g., Refs. [20–22]). However, the fact that *ab-initio* simulations are typically performed at zero Kelvin and on small supercells render the task of, e.g., determining the precise transition sequence and the characterization of complex phases (such as R and S) dantesque or can even thought to be impossible. On the other hand, shedding light into the complexity of NaNbO_3 via the use of first-principles-based atomistic schemes (such as effective Hamiltonian approaches,^{23–26} bond valence models,^{27–29} shell models^{30–32} or all-ions “second principles” techniques^{33,34}) rather than direct first-principles techniques can still be hoped, especially once recalling that such schemes naturally incorporate temperature effects as well as are able to treat rather large supercells. Moreover, effective Hamiltonians have led to remarkable successes in handling rather complex issues in the past, such as (1) confirming the existence of a monoclinic phase in $\text{Pb}(\text{Zr},\text{Ti})\text{O}_3$ (PZT) that was experimentally discovered for a narrow range of Ti compositions,³⁵ and providing a successful explanation for a long-standing problem, namely why ceramics of PZT exhibit a so large piezoelectric response;²⁵ and (2) reproducing and understanding³⁶ the striking nanostripes experimentally found in ultrathin films,^{37,38} as well as, leading to predictions of novel phenomena – such as ferroelectric vortices³⁹ and bubbles⁴⁰ that were then experimentally confirmed more than 10 years later after the predictions.^{41,42} However, it is the authors’ belief that being able to demonstrate that atomistic simulations are able to reproduce the various numerous phases of NaNbO_3 and capture the unusual complexity of this system is probably the most challenging test ever asked to them. In other words, succeeding in doing so will put such simulations at a new and unprecedented predictive level, in addition to provide a novel probe into this complex system.

The goal of this manuscript is to build and employ an effective Hamiltonian scheme for NaNbO_3 , and to indeed demonstrate that such technique does reproduce the existence of seven important phases in the phase diagram of this material. It even provides novel solutions for the R and S phases that emerge from the simultaneous condensation of several k-points (rather than an unique one) and that result in rather complex tilting patterns. Strikingly, the use of this effective Hamiltonian, and the confirmation by additional direct first-principles calculations we further performed, also call for a revisiting of the P phase. Finally, the

decomposition of the total energy of this effective Hamiltonian into several different terms is presently found to be rather useful for the quest of understanding specific features that make NaNbO_3 unique and worth of its nickname of the most complex perovskite system.

The article is organized as follows. Section II reports in details the developed effective Hamiltonian and its parameters, as well as details about direct *ab-initio* computations employed here. Sections III.A and III.B give and analyze in length results at small and finite temperatures, respectively. Section IV provides a discussion aimed at better understanding NaNbO_3 by pointing out specific interactions as well as the sign and magnitude of parameters characterizing the strength of these interactions. Finally, Section V concludes this article.

II. METHODS

A. Effective Hamiltonian

Here, we develop an effective Hamiltonian (H_{eff}) to mimic and understand properties of NaNbO_3 bulk. It has four degrees of freedoms, namely (1) the Na-centered local soft mode $\mathbf{u}_i$, which is directly proportional to the electric dipole of the 5-atom cell i ; (2) the homogenous strain tensor, $\{\eta_H\}$; (3) the Nb-centered dimensionless variable $\mathbf{v}_i$, that is related to the inhomogeneous strain within the 5-atom cell i ²⁶ (note that the total strain, that includes both homogeneous and inhomogeneous contributions, will be denoted here as η_l and will be expressed using the Voigt notation, and that the zero of strain corresponds to the equilibrium 0K cubic state of NaNbO_3); and (4) the Nb-centered pseudo-vector $\boldsymbol{\omega}_i$ that quantifies oxygen octahedral tiltings⁴³ (also commonly termed antiferrodistortive (AFD) distortions) in the 5-atom unit cell i . For instance, $\boldsymbol{\omega}_i = 0.1 (\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y} + \mathbf{z})$, where $\mathbf{x}$, $\mathbf{y}$ and $\mathbf{z}$ are the unit vectors along the x-, y- and z-axes (that are aligned along the pseudo-cubic [100], [010] and [001] directions, respectively), characterizes a tilting of the oxygen octahedron centered around the Nb site i by $0.1\sqrt{3}$ radians about the pseudo-cubic [111] direction.

The total energy of the H_{eff} of NaNbO_3 is the sum of two main energies:

$$E^{\text{tot}} = E^{\text{FE}}(\{\mathbf{u}\}, \{\eta_l\}) + E^{\text{AFD}}(\{\mathbf{u}\}, \{\eta_l\}, \{\boldsymbol{\omega}\}) \quad (1)$$

where E^{FE} is the energy involving the local modes, elastic deformations and their mutual

couplings, while E^{AFD} includes the AFD motions and their interactions with strains and local modes.

E^{FE} contains the following five terms, as proposed in Ref. [26]:

$$E^{\text{FE}} = E^{\text{self}}(\{\mathbf{u}\}) + E^{\text{dpl}}(\{\mathbf{u}\}) + E^{\text{short}}(\{\mathbf{u}\}) + E^{\text{elas}}(\{\eta\}) + E^{\text{int}}(\{\mathbf{u}\}, \{\eta\}) \quad (2)$$

where E^{self} is the local mode self energy, E^{dpl} is the long-range dipole-dipole interaction, E^{short} represents the short-range interactions between neighboring local modes excluding dipole-dipole interactions, E^{elas} is the elastic energy, and E^{int} is the interaction between elastic deformation and local modes. Explicitly, each term of E^{FE} reads:

$$\begin{aligned} E^{\text{self}} &= \sum_i \{ \kappa_2 u_i^2 + \alpha u_i^4 + \gamma (u_{ix}^2 u_{iy}^2 + u_{iy}^2 u_{iz}^2 + u_{ix}^2 u_{iz}^2) \} \\ E^{\text{dpl}} &= \frac{Z^{*2}}{\epsilon_\infty} \sum_{i < j} \frac{\mathbf{u}_i \cdot \mathbf{u}_j - 3(\hat{\mathbf{R}}_{ij} \cdot \mathbf{u}_i)(\hat{\mathbf{R}}_{ij} \cdot \mathbf{u}_j)}{R_{ij}^3} \\ E^{\text{short}} &= \sum_{i \neq j} \sum_{\alpha\beta} J_{ij\alpha\beta} u_{i\alpha} u_{j\beta} \\ E^{\text{elas}} &= \frac{1}{2} B_{11} (\eta_1^2 + \eta_2^2 + \eta_3^2) + B_{12} (\eta_1 \eta_2 + \eta_2 \eta_3 + \eta_3 \eta_1) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} B_{44} (\eta_4^2 + \eta_5^2 + \eta_6^2) \\ E^{\text{int}} &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_i \sum_{l\alpha\beta} B_{l\alpha\beta} \eta_l(\mathbf{R}_i) u_\alpha(\mathbf{R}_i) u_\beta(\mathbf{R}_i) \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where $\mathbf{R}_{ij} = \mathbf{R}_i - \mathbf{R}_j$ with $\mathbf{R}_i$ being the lattice vector of site i . The sums on i run over all Na-sites, and α and β are Cartesian components along the x-, y-, and z-axes. Moreover, the sum on j in E^{dpl} runs over all the Na sites that are different from i , while that on E^{short} runs over the first, second and third nearest Na neighbors of the Na site i .

Furthermore, the interaction matrix $J_{ij\alpha\beta}$ in E^{short} can be simplified for different nearest neighbor (NN) shells as:

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{first NN: } J_{ij\alpha\beta} &= (j_1 + (j_2 - j_1)|\hat{\mathbf{R}}_{ij,\alpha}|)\delta_{\alpha\beta}; \\
\text{second NN: } J_{ij\alpha\beta} &= (j_4 + \sqrt{2}(j_3 - j_4)|\hat{\mathbf{R}}_{ij,\alpha}|)\delta_{\alpha\beta} \\
&\quad + 2j_5 \hat{\mathbf{R}}_{ij,\alpha} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{R}}_{ij,\beta} (1 - \delta_{\alpha\beta}); \\
\text{third NN: } J_{ij\alpha\beta} &= j_6 \delta_{\alpha\beta} + 3j_7 \hat{\mathbf{R}}_{ij,\alpha} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{R}}_{ij,\beta} (1 - \delta_{\alpha\beta}), \tag{4}
\end{aligned}$$

where $\hat{\mathbf{R}}_{ij,\alpha}$ is the α -component of $\mathbf{R}_{ij}/R_{ij}$ and δ is the Kronecker symbol.

Moreover, the energy related to the oxygen octahedral tiltings and their couplings with the Na-centered $\{\mathbf{u}_i\}$ local modes and η_l strains is given by the expression provided in Ref. [44], that is:

$$\begin{aligned}
E^{\text{AFD}}(\{\mathbf{u}_i\}, \{\eta_l\}, \{\omega_i\}) &= \sum_i [\kappa_A \omega_i^2 + \alpha_A \omega_i^4 + \gamma_A (\omega_{ix}^2 \omega_{iy}^2 + \omega_{iy}^2 \omega_{iz}^2 + \omega_{ix}^2 \omega_{iz}^2)] \\
&\quad + \sum_{ij} \sum_{\alpha\beta} K_{ij\alpha\beta} \omega_{i\alpha} \omega_{j\beta} + \sum_i \sum_{\alpha} K' \omega_{i,\alpha}^3 (\omega_{i+\alpha,\alpha} + \omega_{i-\alpha,\alpha}) \\
&\quad + \sum_i \sum_{\alpha\beta} C_{l\alpha\beta} \eta_l(i) \omega_{i\alpha} \omega_{i\beta} \\
&\quad + \sum_{i,j} \sum_{\alpha,\beta} D_{ij,\alpha\beta} u_{j,\alpha} \omega_{i,\alpha} \omega_{i,\beta} + \sum_{i,j} \sum_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta} E_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta} \omega_{i\alpha} \omega_{j\beta} u_{j\gamma} u_{i\delta} \quad , \tag{5}
\end{aligned}$$

where the sums on i run over all the Nb sites, and α and β are, once again, Cartesian components along the x-, y-, and z-axes coinciding with the pseudocubic [100], [010], and [001] directions, respectively. The first sum of E^{AFD} gathers the onsite contributions associated with the oxygen octahedral tiltings. It was proposed and/or used in Refs. [44–47]. The second and third terms characterize the short-range interactions between AFD motions, with j running over the Nb ions being first nearest neighbors of the Nb site i , and were given in Refs. [46] and [44], respectively. In this third term, $\omega_{i+\alpha,\alpha}$ is the α -component of the AFD mode at the site shifted from the Nb site i to its nearest Nb neighbor along the α axis. The fourth term of E^{AFD} describes the coupling between strain and AFD, as provided in Ref. [46]. The fifth and sixth terms of Eq. (5) comprise the coupling between AFD motions and local modes, that include trilinear contributions (that are dependent on the $D_{ij,\alpha\beta}$ coefficients) as well as bi-quadratic terms (that are quantified by the $E_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}$ parameters). In these fifth and sixth terms, j runs over the eight Na atoms that are first nearest neighbors of the Nb-site i . These fifth and sixth terms were introduced in Refs. [44] and [46], respectively.

Moreover, the $K_{ij\alpha\beta}$ parameters entering the second energy of E^{AFD} can be simplified as:

$$\text{first NN: } K_{ij\alpha\beta} = (k_1 + (k_2 - k_1)|\hat{\mathbf{R}}_{ij,\alpha}|)\delta_{\alpha\beta} \quad (6)$$

All the parameters of Eqs. (3-6) are determined by performing several first-principle calculations on relatively small cells (typically, up to 40 atoms) using the local density approximation (LDA)⁴⁸ within density functional theory and the CUSP code⁴⁹ that takes advantage of the ultrasoft-pseudopotential scheme⁵⁰ (note that the same pseudopotentials than those given in Ref. [51] were used here, that is we consider the following valence electrons for Na ($2s^2 2p^6 3s^1$), Nb ($4s^2 4p^6 4d^4 5s^1$) and O ($2s^2 2p^4$) ions, with a 25 Ry plane-wave cutoff). These parameters are listed in Table 1, and we will often pay a close attention to them in the following to understand but also revisit properties of NaNbO₃. Note that such parameters are extracted by considering small perturbations with respect to the cubic state, and therefore do not rely on the full relaxation of any phase (see, e.g., Ref. [26] and references therein for more details on such extraction in the case of the coefficients entering E^{FE}). As a result, the fact that we used LDA to obtain the parameters of H_{eff} of NaNbO₃ does not automatically imply that our results for *relaxed* structures predicted by the effective Hamiltonian will be closer to those resulting from the direct use of LDA than to those of other functionals such as the generalized gradient approximation (GGA) in the form of revised Perdew-Burke-Ernzerhof⁵² (PBEsol), especially if employing these two functionals within first-principles calculations provide similar results in term of structure and minute differences between total energy of different relaxed phases – as it is, in fact, known in NaNbO₃ bulk.⁵³

Once the different terms of the H_{eff} of NaNbO₃ are identified and their parameters determined, we then employ this effective Hamiltonian within Monte-Carlo (MC) simulations on a $12 \times 12 \times 12$ supercell (which corresponds to 8,640 atoms). Note that we deliberately chose a length of 12 lattice constants along any Cartesian axis because this is the maximal periodicity ever reported for any phase in NaNbO₃ bulk¹² and because it is also commensurate with the periodicity of 4 and 6 lattice constants often suggested for some states of this system.^{13,54–56} **Such choice therefore cannot lead to (presently unseen and unknown) phases for which the periodicity is not commensurate with 2, 3, 4, 6 or 12 lattice constants. For instance, a periodicity of, e.g., 16 lattice constants will not be captured by this choice.**

For each temperature, 40,000 MC sweeps are performed, with the first 20,000 allowing the

system to equilibrate and the subsequent 20,000 being used to compute statistical averages.

B. Direct first-principles calculations

We also conducted direct 0 K first-principles calculations, mostly to check the predictions of the aforementioned H_{eff} at low temperature but also to gain a deeper insight into NaNbO_3 . For these latter calculations, we also used LDA⁴⁸ as well as GGA within the PBEsol functional,⁵² as implemented in the VASP package.⁵⁷ The projector augmented wave⁵⁸ (PAW) is applied to describe the core electrons. Seven electrons for Na ($2p^63s^1$), 13 electrons for Nb ($4s^24p^64d^45s^1$) and 6 electrons for O ions ($2s^22p^4$) are treated as valence electrons. The plane-wave cutoff is set to be 550 eV. Different crystal structures (to be discussed below) within the perovskite lattice are fully relaxed until the Hellmann-Feynman force on each atom is converged to be less than 0.001 eV/Å. The transition path from one state to another was obtained using the variable-cell nudged elastic band method (VCNEB)⁵⁹ which is an extension of the nudged elastic band (NEB) technique included with the USPEX code^{60–62} in combination with the VASP package. Phonon dispersion curves are calculated using the density functional perturbation theory (DFPT), as implemented in the ABINIT package.^{63–65} Exchange and correlation functional is treated with optimized norm-conserving pseudopotentials,⁶⁶ with the Perdew-Burke-Ernzerhof (PBE) parametrization. The wave functions are expanded using plane-wave basis sets with a kinetic energy cutoff of 30 Hartree. The self-consistent calculations are performed with an unshifted $4 \times 4 \times 2$ k -point grid. The same grid is used for q-point in the phonon calculation.

III. RESULTS

A. Results at small temperature

Running simulations at low temperature (namely, 10 K) within the effective Hamiltonian described above, along with its parameters given in Table 1, provides a $R3c$ ground state, as consistent with measurements.^{21,67} Such $R3c$ state is characterized by a polarization lying along the pseudo-cubic [111] direction altogether with oxygen octahedra tilting in antiphase about this polarization axis (its oxygen tilting pattern is thus described by $a^-a^-a^-$ in Glazer notation.⁶⁸) Table 2 provides the total energy (with respect to the equilibrium paraelectric

$Pm\bar{3}m$ phase) of this $R3c$ state, as well as that of two specific other states that the effective Hamiltonian predicts to be of rather low energy, namely a $Pnma$ state and a state that we will refer here as Phase 1.

The $Pnma$ state is one of the most common phases of perovskites, and possesses three main finite order parameters⁶⁹: (1) an antiphase tilting of the oxygen octahedra about the pseudo-cubic $[110]$ direction (such tilting is associated with the R-point of the cubic first Brillouin zone); (2) an in-phase tilting of the oxygen octahedra about the pseudo-cubic $[001]$ direction (the corresponding k-point is the M-point of the the cubic first Brillouin zone) – therefore yielding the $a^-a^-c^+$ Glazer notation⁶⁸ for the whole tilting pattern; and (3) an antipolar vector corresponding to displacements of Na ions being along the pseudo-cubic $[110]$ direction in one of every other (001) planes and along the opposite $[\bar{1}\bar{1}0]$ direction in the other subsequent (001) planes (this antipolar vector is therefore associated with the X-point of the cubic first Brillouin zone). These three order parameters are coupled via a trilinear coupling whose strength is related to the $D_{ii,xy}$ coefficient of Table 1, as demonstrated in Ref. [70].

Phase 1 is, to the best of our knowledge, a phase that has been overlooked in NaNbO_3 . It has a spontaneous polarization along the pseudo-cubic $[001]$ axis, but which is not fully homogeneous. For instance, doing a Fourier transform of the z-component of the local dipoles⁷¹ in our $12 \times 12 \times 12$ supercell leads to a 88% weight on the Γ -point (which is associated with the polarization) but also to an additional 10% on the X-point (which corresponds to antipolar motions along the $[001]$ axis) at 10 K. Furthermore, Phase 1 also exhibits antiphase tilting of the oxygen octahedra about the pseudo-cubic $[110]$ direction. It further possesses a complex oxygen octahedral tilting about the $[001]$ direction, that is associated with the reciprocal k-point lying half-way between the M and R points. As a result, a periodic series of “++--” occur for the tilting pattern about the z-axis when moving along any $[001]$ line, implying that Phase 1 is a *nanotwin* or a long-period modulated state^{44,72} having a periodicity of four lattice constants. Antipolar displacements of the Na ions along $[110]$ and that are indexed by the k-point being half-way between the Γ and X-points also emerge in this Phase 1, because of a trilinear coupling (also involving the $D_{ii,xy}$ coefficient of Table 1) between these antipolar displacements, the antiphase oxygen octahedral tiltings about the $[110]$ direction and the more complex tilting pattern about the $[001]$ direction.⁷⁰ The periodic pattern of the x- and y-components of these antipolar displacements is of the type

“+0–0” when moving along the z-axis. All these polar, antipolar and tilting patterns features likely implies that Phase 1 adopts the $Pca2_1$ space group. It is interesting to realize that (i) $Pca2_1$ can be thought as being derived from the $Pbcm$ state (that is well known in pure NaNbO_3 ^{54,73}), but when superposing a spontaneous (inhomogeneous) polarization along the [001] axis; and (ii) that a $Pca2_1$ phase has been reported near room temperature when slightly doping NaNbO_3 by Li such as to make the $(\text{Li}_{0.02}\text{Na}_{0.98})\text{NbO}_3$ compound.⁵⁴ Furthermore, we numerically find that starting the H_{eff} simulations with a pure $Pbcm$ state at low temperatures results in the formation of Phase 1 after relaxation, mostly because of the large negative value of the E_{xyxy} coefficient of Table 1 – which favors a coupling between the out-of-plane polarization, in-plane antipolar displacements, antiphase tiltings and the more complex tilting pattern about the [001] direction. Interestingly, direct 0K first-principles calculations predict that (1) the phonon spectrum of $Pbcm$ exhibits unstable modes (especially around the Γ zone-center), unlike that of $Pca2_1$, as depicted in Fig. 1; and (2) $Pca2_1$ has a lower energy than $Pbcm$ by 0.12 meV per 5 atoms (when using the PBEsol functional). Items (1) and (2) therefore further strongly suggest the possibility of finding Phase 1/ $Pca2_1$ rather than $Pbcm$ in NaNbO_3 at low temperature. The polarization of Phase 1 is predicted to be about 0.18 C/m² at 10 K by our effective Hamiltonian, which is about 2.5 smaller than the the predicted polarization of the $R3c$ state by the H_{eff} method (note that this smaller value of the polarization of Phase 1 may explain the previous overlooking of this state at low temperatures, especially in samples for which coexistence of phases with the $R3c$ state are known to occur²²). Interestingly, the direct use of first-principles calculations using the PBEsol functional provides a polarization of the order of 0.13 C/m² for $Pca2_1$, which indicates that our current effective Hamiltonian yields the right order of magnitude of the spontaneous polarization of Phase 1 (note that our fully *ab-initio calculations* within LDA functional basically gives the same energy for $Pbcm$ and $Pca2_1$, and yields a smaller polarization of 0.05 C/m² for the $Pca2_1$ state. However, the LDA functional is also previously known to wrongly predict that $Pbcm$ has a lower internal energy than $R3c$ in NaNbO_3 ⁵³ – therefore casting some doubts about direct 0 K LDA results for some relaxed states).

Moreover, Table 2 indicates that the effective Hamiltonian with the parameters listed in Table 1 yields internal energies for $R3c$, $Pnma$ and Phase 1/ $Pca2_1$ that are basically all half-way between those of our direct LDA and PBEsol calculations. It also reveals that the energies of $R3c$ and Phase 1/ $Pca2_1$ are very close to each other (namely, within 2 meV/5-

atom), while that of $Pnma$ is further away but by less than 17 meV per 5-atom, in all types of calculations. It is also interesting to notice that the direct LDA calculations incorrectly predict that $Pca2_1$ is the ground state of NaNbO_3 , which contradicts experimental results but which is consistent with previous LDA computations indicating that $Pbcm$ has a lowest energy than $R3c$.⁵³ On the other hand, both the H_{eff} and PBEsol calculations correctly give a $R3c$ ground state, with the (negative) difference in energy between $R3c$ and Phase 1 arising from the effective Hamiltonian being about -0.4 meV per 5-atom – which is therefore (once again) in-between the positive difference in energy between $R3c$ and $Pca2_1$ of +1.7 meV per 5-atom given by LDA simulations and the corresponding negative difference in energy of -1.2 meV per 5-atom provided by the PBEsol computations.

Furthermore, Figs. 2a and 2b reveal that the hierarchy between the H_{eff} energies of these three phases can be dramatically altered by varying the E_{xyxy} and $D_{ii,xy}$ coefficients, respectively, therefore demonstrating the crucial importance of coupling between cation displacements and oxygen octahedral tiltings in NaNbO_3 . More precisely, making the E_{xyxy} parameter less negative with respect to its value given in Table 1 first results in Phase 1 and then $Pnma$ becoming the states of lowest energy (see Fig. 2a) – which indicates that having a large and negative E_{xyxy} coefficient is essential to make $R3c$ the (experimental) ground state of NaNbO_3 . Such evolution from $R3c$ to $Pnma$, via Phase 1, can also be accomplished by making the $D_{ii,xy}$ trilinear coupling parameter more negative, as shown in Fig. 2b, since the energy of $Pnma$ is rather sensitive to it, unlike that of $R3c$, while that of Phase 1 also depends on $D_{ii,xy}$ but to a smaller extent than $Pnma$ – as consistent with the energetic term of Eq. (5) involving $D_{ii,xy}$ (and that is provided and analyzed in detail in Ref. [70]).

Interestingly, Figures 2 can also be thought as indicating that a small uncertainty in the determination of the E_{xyxy} and $D_{ii,xy}$ coefficients can lead to a change in ground state, which may further explain why our effective Hamiltonian method (with its LDA-determined coefficients) yields a $R3c$ ground state, unlike fully relaxed direct LDA calculations.

B. Results as a function of temperature

The temperature behavior of NaNbO_3 is experimentally known to be extraordinarily complex since it involves several phases, including some being under intense discussion – as evidenced by the facts that different experimental groups proposed different space groups

for, e.g., the R and S phases,^{12,13,55,74} and even suggested that the P state can consist of three different phases.⁷⁵ Such complexity is encountered in our Monte-Carlo simulations using the effective Hamiltonian. For instance, if we cool the system from high to low temperatures, the H_{eff} calculations provide a $Pnma$ state for the lowest temperatures, despite the fact that the energy of $R3c$ is lower than that of $Pnma$ by more than 5 meV per 5 atom (see Table 2). Similarly, if we start from the $R3c$ ground state and heat up NaNbO_3 bulk, neither $Pbcm$ state nor $Pbcm$ -like phases (such as Phase 1/ $Pca2_1$) emerge in the simulations up to the highest investigated temperatures, at which the system is paraelectric cubic, while such latter phases are well known to exist in the phase diagram of pure and slightly-doped NaNbO_3 compounds.^{14,54,56} Such difficulties arise from the facts that several and rather crystallographically-different phases have very close free energies in NaNbO_3 , and that the barrier between such phases is rather high. For instance, we numerically found (not shown here) that the energetic barrier between $R3c$ to $Pca2_1$ is as large as 14 meV/5-atom when using the PBEsol functional within direct *ab-initio* calculations, with this barrier being associated with a state of Pc symmetry – while $R3c$ and $Pca2_1$ have very similar internal energy, as indicated in Table 2.

As a result, we adopt the following strategy here: we start our MC calculations with the aforementioned Phase 1 at 10 K and progressively heat up the system until it transforms into the $Pm\bar{3}m$ paraelectric cubic state. We extract the following quantities from the outputs of the MC simulations at any investigated temperature: (1) all six components of the homogeneous strain tensor; (2) the $\langle \mathbf{u} \rangle$ supercell average of the local mode vectors $\{\mathbf{u}_i\}$, which is directly proportional to the spontaneous electric polarization; (3) the $\langle \omega_{\mathbf{R}} \rangle$ vector that characterizes *antiphase*-tilting of the oxygen octahedra⁴³ and that is defined as $\omega_{\mathbf{R}} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_i \omega_i (-1)^{n_x(i)+n_y(i)+n_z(i)}$, where the sum runs over the N sites i and $n_x(i)$, $n_y(i)$ and $n_z(i)$ are integers locating the cell i [in the ideal perovskite structure, and denoting the 5-atom cubic lattice constant by a_{lat} , this cell i is centered at $a_{\text{lat}}(n_x(i)\mathbf{x}+n_y(i)\mathbf{y}+n_z(i)\mathbf{z})$]; and (4) the $\langle \omega_{\mathbf{M}_x} \rangle$, $\langle \omega_{\mathbf{M}_y} \rangle$ and $\langle \omega_{\mathbf{M}_z} \rangle$ vectors that represent *in-phase* oxygen octahedral tiltings and that are given by $\omega_{\mathbf{M}_x} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_i \omega_i (-1)^{n_y(i)+n_z(i)}$, $\omega_{\mathbf{M}_y} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_i \omega_i (-1)^{n_x(i)+n_z(i)}$, and $\omega_{\mathbf{M}_z} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_i \omega_i (-1)^{n_x(i)+n_y(i)}$. The strain, $\langle \mathbf{u} \rangle$ and $\langle \omega_{\mathbf{R}} \rangle$ are shown in Figures 3, 4 and 5, respectively, as a function of temperature up to 320 K (no in-phase tiltings are found up to 320 K, which explains why we do not display $\langle \omega_{\mathbf{M}_x} \rangle$, $\langle \omega_{\mathbf{M}_y} \rangle$ or $\langle \omega_{\mathbf{M}_z} \rangle$ in this temperature range). They are also depicted in Figures 6, 7 and 8, respectively, but

within the smaller temperature window ranging between 320 K and 390 K, because, as we will see below, various phase transitions are predicted there. Note that Fig. 9 further reports the y-component of $\langle \omega_{\mathbf{M}_y} \rangle$ in this smaller interval because it is the only component out of those of all in-phase pseudo-vectors that is numerically found to be finite for some temperatures there. We also performed Fourier transform of the last MC configuration of both the local modes and tilting patterns⁷¹ at any temperature, in order to identify possible significant k-points that are associated with the phases presently numerically found and to be discussed below. Note that such phases can be complex, implying that some of these k-points are neither at the zone-center nor at the zone boundary of the cubic first Brillouin zone. For instance, in our aforementioned Phase 1/ $Pca2_1$ state, such k-points are $\frac{2\pi}{4a_{lat}}\mathbf{z}$ for the pattern of the x- and y-components of the $\mathbf{u}_i$ local modes, and $\frac{2\pi}{a_{lat}}(\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{x} + \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{y} + \frac{1}{4}\mathbf{z})$ for the configuration of the z-component of the ω_i AFD pseudo-vectors. All significant k-points are reported in Table 3 for the phases that the MC simulations numerically found and that we are going to discuss in details below. We adopt here the convention that $\mathbf{k}_{\mathbf{u},\mathbf{x}}$, $\mathbf{k}_{\mathbf{u},\mathbf{y}}$, $\mathbf{k}_{\mathbf{u},\mathbf{z}}$ correspond to the significant k-point(s) found in the Fourier transform of the configuration of the x-, y- and z-components of the local modes, respectively. Similarly, $\mathbf{k}_{\text{AFD},\mathbf{x}}$, $\mathbf{k}_{\text{AFD},\mathbf{y}}$ and $\mathbf{k}_{\text{AFD},\mathbf{z}}$ are the k-points having significant weights in the Fourier transform of the pattern of the x-, y- and z-components of the ω_i AFD pseudo-vectors, respectively. In some cases, several k-points occur for the same pattern, some of them having a major weight while others are minor, but all the k-points having a weight larger than 5% are reported in Table 3. Note that we can not practically determine the space group of the phases to be discussed below, mostly due to the significant fluctuations experienced by the tiltings between the different sites of the supercells at finite temperature as well as because of the large supercell used in our simulations. We nevertheless hope that all the structural information we are providing below can be useful to experimentalists when trying to fit their data by some specific space groups.

Figures 3, 4 and 5 indicate that NaNbO_3 bulk is predicted to stay within Phase 1 at least up to 320 K, with the degrees of freedom of this phase decreasing in magnitude when the temperature increases. For instance and as seen in Fig. 4, the z-component of $\langle \mathbf{u} \rangle$ (which is directly related to the out-of-plane polarization of Phase 1) decreases from 0.0181 atomic units at 10 K to a value as small as 0.0025 atomic units at 300 K, which corresponds to a rather small polarization of $\simeq 0.02$ C/m² and which may thus explain why Phase 1 has

been overlooked in favor of $Pbcm$ in previous measurements of the P phase of NaNbO_3 ^{12,56} (recall that $Pbcm$ has no polarization). Similarly and as indicated in Fig. 5, the antiphase tilting about the $[110]$ pseudo-cubic is reduced as the temperature increases up to 320K. The negative $\eta_{H,1} = \eta_{H,2}$ elements of the homogeneous strain tensor, as well as the slightly less negative $\eta_{H,1}$ and the shear strain $\eta_{H,6}$, also all get reduced in magnitude during that heating within Phase 1, as displayed in Fig. 3. Note that such strain tensor is indicative of an orthorhombic symmetry for Phase 1, as consistent with a $Pca2_1$ space group.

On the other hand, Figures 6-9, along with Table 3, are full of new information (note, in particular, that Table 3 is going to be rather useful to analyze tilting patterns, especially because Fig. 8 demonstrates that $\langle \omega_{\mathbf{R}} \rangle$ experiences rather large fluctuations, likely because several phases have similar free energies). For instance, at about 332 K, a transition from Phase 1 to a state coined here as Phase 2 is happening in the MC simulations. Phase 2 is characterized by $\eta_{H,2}$ being now the smallest-in magnitude (but still negative) diagonal element of the strain tensor, while the (negative too) $\eta_{H,3}$ becomes now equal to $\eta_{H,1}$ and the only non-zero shear strain is now $\eta_{H,5}$. Such change in strain is linked to modifications of the tilting patterns: the antiphase tiltings are now about both the x and z axes, with these two tiltings being not necessarily equal to each other anymore in magnitude (see Fig. 8), while the tilting about the y -axis has now the $\frac{2\pi}{a_{lat}}(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{6}, \frac{1}{2})$ k-point as its majority k-point. However, Table 3 further informs us that two other k-points, namely $\frac{2\pi}{a_{lat}}(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{2})$ and the M-point, are also involved to a fewer extent in the oxygen octahedral pattern about the y -axis in Phase 2 (note that the occurrence of this M-point is fully consistent with the small but finite and nearly constant value of $\langle \omega_{\mathbf{M}_y} \rangle$ shown in Fig. 9 between 332 K and 338 K). The resulting pattern of oxygen octahedral tilting about the y -axis is found to be of the periodic form “ $--++++--++++$ ” when moving along any $[010]$ line. Phase 2 is therefore also a nanotwin phase⁴⁴, but now having a periodicity of twelve lattice constants along the y -direction. One can then propose to characterize such tilting pattern by extending the Glazer notation as $a^-b^{complex,12}c^-$ to indicate that the x - and z -axis experience antiphase tiltings that are not necessarily of the same magnitude while there is a complex tilting of 12-lattice constant periodicity about the y -axis in Phase 2. Note that in that extension of the Glazer notations, the tilting pattern of Phase 1 (which is our P phase) is described as $a^-a^-c^{complex,4}$, and that we will use such extended notations to characterize other phases to be discussed soon. On the other hand, no overall long-range polar or antipolar cation

motions occur in Phase 2, as evidenced by the “N/A” wording ascribed to $\mathbf{k}_{u,x}$, $\mathbf{k}_{u,y}$, $\mathbf{k}_{u,z}$ in Table 3. We propose that Phase 2 is the R state of NaNbO_3 , especially since its majority k-point is $\frac{2\pi}{a_{lat}}(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{6}, \frac{1}{2})$ and thus will imply a periodicity of six lattice constants (when taken alone), as indeed proposed in Refs. [12,55,74]. Note that it is the additional $\frac{2\pi}{a_{lat}}(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{2})$ of Table 3 that, altogether with $\frac{2\pi}{a_{lat}}(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{6}, \frac{1}{2})$, makes our Phase 2 adopting a periodicity of 12 rather than 6 lattice constants along its long axis. It is also important to realize that the P -to- R transition has been observed to be of first order,¹² which is also in-line with the predicted jump of some strain components at about 332 K in our Fig. 6.

Moreover, Phase 2 is found to persist up to 338 K, at which it makes way to a novel state that we denote as Phase 3 and that remains stable until 340 K. Some changes between Phases 2 and 3 are rather subtle, in the sense that (i) all the three significant k-points characterizing the tilting pattern about the y-axis of Phase 2 are still there in Phase 3 but with the difference that the majority point is now the M-point, as evidenced by the sudden increase of $\langle \omega_{\mathbf{M}_y} \rangle$ when increasing the temperature from 338 K to 341 K, as shown in Fig. 9; and (ii) an additional k-point emerges in such tilting pattern, that is $\frac{2\pi}{a_{lat}}(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{12}, \frac{1}{2})$, therefore further emphasizing an overall periodicity along the y-axis of 12 lattice constants. Note that the tilting pattern of Phase 3 about the y-axis varies from that of Phase 2, via the formation of the “--+++++--++” periodic serie along any [010] line, that is by replacing the – sign in the eight site of the tilting sequence in Phase 2 by an opposite sign in Phase 3. Phase 3 differs also from Phase 2 by the vanishing of antiphase tiltings about the x-axis, unlike for the z-axis. In other words, Phase 3 is still a nanotwin state (likely of orthorhombic or monoclinic symmetry, according to the finite strain elements depicted in Fig. 6) but with a description being of the form $a^0b^{\text{complex},12}c^-$. Such Phase 3 is presently suggested to be the documented S state of NaNbO_3 , which has also been reported to have a 12-lattice constant periodicity along a pseudo-cubic $\langle 100 \rangle$ axis¹² (note that the longer periodicity is along the y-axis in our case while it is about the z-axis in Ref. [12], but such axes are symmetrically equivalent – that is, we can also found in our simulations a Phase 3 for which the longer axis is along the pseudo-cubic [001] direction). It is also interesting to realize that Refs. [13,55] rather proposed that the S structure is of the type $a^-b^+c^+$, $a^+b^+c^{\text{complex},4}$ or $a^0b^+c^{\text{complex},4}$, that is either having an in-phase tilting or a complex tilting of four-lattice constant periodicity about the z-axis, and that such tiltings are in fact related to k-points appearing in Table 3 for Phase 3 too when interchanging the y and z-axes (i.e.,

$\frac{2\pi}{a_{lat}}(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, 0)$ and $\frac{2\pi}{a_{lat}}(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{4})$). However, as indicated above, the overall periodicity about the long axis of Phase 3 is presently found to be of 12 lattice constants because of the presence of the minority $\frac{2\pi}{a_{lat}}(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{12}, \frac{1}{2})$ k-point, as well as the existence of $\frac{2\pi}{a_{lat}}(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{6}, \frac{1}{2})$ in addition to $\frac{2\pi}{a_{lat}}(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{2})$. The fact that $\frac{2\pi}{a_{lat}}(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{12}, \frac{1}{2})$ and $\frac{2\pi}{a_{lat}}(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{6}, \frac{1}{2})$ are of minority rather than of majority may explain why Refs. [13,55] did not report an overall periodicity of 12 lattice constants for the S state.

A novel phase, termed as Phase 4, emerges at about 340 K and is stable up to 342 K. Phase 4 differs from Phase 3 by the occurrence of “only” in-phase tiltings about the y-axis. In other words, Phase 4 is not a nanotwin anymore but is rather a state that is described by the conventional Glazer notation⁶⁸ as $a^0b^+c^-$. Such simpler state is consistent with the $a^-b^0c^+$ phase proposed for the so-called T_1 phase of NaNbO_3 ,¹³ which is orthorhombic and of C_{2mm} space group. Note that the new tilting pattern of Phase 4 with respect to Phase 3 leads to the stabilization of $\langle \omega_{\mathbf{M}_y} \rangle$ to a fixed value (see Fig. 9).

Another transition occurs at about 342 K, resulting in the vanishing of the antiphase tilting about the z-axis and in the formation of Phase 5. Such latter phase therefore adopts the rather simple $a^0b^+a^0$ Glazer notation⁶⁸ and is the known T_2 state of NaNbO_3 ⁷⁶ having the $P4/mbm$ symmetry. This state is thus tetragonal, as consistent with the non-zero strain components depicted in Fig. 6. As shown in Fig. 9, the magnitude of the in-phase tilting is decreasing as the temperature increases from 342 K to 373 K, until Phase 5 transforms into the $Pm\bar{3}m$ paraelectric cubic state (which is the so-called U state of NaNbO_3 ^{12,14}) at this latter temperature.

One should also realize that the simulated transition temperatures are smaller than the experimental ones, as typical of effective Hamiltonian techniques **for some systems,**²⁶ **including KNbO_3** ⁷⁷ **(one possible reason for such underestimation is discussed in the footnote/Reference⁷⁸).** For instance, the temperature of the transition from Phase 5 to $Pm\bar{3}m$ is about 373 K in the MC computations while the corresponding transition from T_2 to U occurs at about 914 K in measurements.⁷⁶ Similarly, the stability range of some phases is too small with respect to observations. For instance, our Phase 4 has only a temperature window of about 2 K while it is nearly 55 K in experiments for the corresponding T_1 state.^{12–14} On the other hand, it is rather remarkable that the currently developed effective Hamiltonian is not only able to find $R3c$ to be the ground state of NaNbO_3 (see Section III.A) but also to correctly predict the existence of five other states (namely, Phases 1 to

5), with some of them being rather complex, in the phase transition sequence of NaNbO_3 , before reaching $Pm\bar{3}m$ at high temperature. It thus appears that this presently developed H_{eff} can rather well qualitatively describe the enormous complexity inherent to NaNbO_3 . Let us thus take advantage of it, and more precisely of its parameters listed in Table 1, to better understand subtle features of NaNbO_3 that make such compound deserving its nickname of “the most complicated perovskite system”. We may also wonder which other perovskites systems can have effects that are similar to the ones described above, in general, and that can be well described by the analytical form of our developed effective Hamiltonian (see Eqs. (1)-(6)), in particular.

IV. DISCUSSION

For that, we will mostly proceed by asking questions that are not trivial in our minds, and then will answer them by pointing out some specific important parameters of the effective Hamiltonian.

1) *Why does NaNbO_3 first adopt in-phase tilting rather than antiphase tilting when reducing the temperature from the cubic paraelectric state, that is in Phase 5?* The answer to this question, in fact, resides in the *negative* sign of the k_2 AFD short-range parameter that does favor in-phase tilting with respect to antiphase tilting. A further proof of such fact is numerically found by increasing by hand the magnitude of this coefficient while keeping it negative. In that case, the temperature range of stability of Phase 5 gets enhanced with respect to the one shown in Figs 6-9.

2) *Why does NaNbO_3 exhibit antiphase and/or complex tilting associated with the k -point being half-way between the R and M points in its two lowest-in-energy phases (i.e., $R3c$ and Phase 1) at low temperature, while it prefers to exhibit in-phase tilting in the higher-temperature Phase 5?*

As documented in Section III.A, some subtle interactions (e.g., those involving E_{xyxy} and $D_{ii,xy}$) coefficients between antiphase oxygen octahedral tiltings, the complex tilting inherent to $\frac{2\pi}{a_{\text{lat}}}(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{4})$ and cation displacements do help to stabilize, at low temperature, $R3c$ and Phase 1 – that do not possess in-phase tilting (unlike, e.g., $Pnma$).

3) *Why do antipolar or polar motions only become important at low temperatures in NaNbO_3 ?* As indicated in Table 3, we only found that cation displacements are long-range

ordered in Phase 1, that is below 338 K in our calculations. Cation displacements are also seen in all the low-temperature (10 K) phases of Table 2. The reason that such cation displacements do not play a large role at higher temperatures (e.g., in Phases 2-5) is that the internal energy of purely polar or antipolar phases is much smaller than that of pure AFD phases, as one can interfere from the rather small values of the coefficients entering Eq. (3) with respect to those appearing in the first four energetic terms of Eq (5). For instance, we numerically found that the purely ferroelectric $R3m$ state (that has a polarization along [111]) has an internal energy higher by an order of 0.1 eV/5-atom from the purely AFD $R\bar{3}c$ state (that solely exhibits antiphase tilting about [111]) at 10 K, when using the H_{eff} parameters of Table 1. Moreover, some interactions between cation displacements and AFD pseudo vectors are repulsive in nature (see, e.g., the positive sign and large values of E_{xxxx} and E_{xxyy}), therefore making the condensation of local modes even more difficult in some phases. On the other hand, once low-enough temperatures are reached and as aforementioned, some specific couplings between local modes and oxygen octahedral tiltings result in the stabilization of some phases exhibiting both cation displacements and AFD vectors.

4) *Why does NaNbO_3 exhibit nanotwins in Phases 2 and 3, that are characterized by some k -vectors being in-between the R and M points of the cubic first Brillouin zone but not equal to $\frac{2\pi}{a_{lat}}(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{4})$?*

The competition between item 1) (favoring in-phase tilting) and item 2) (that wishes to make NaNbO_3 possessing antiphase and/or the complex tiltings associated with $\frac{2\pi}{a_{lat}}(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{4})$ at low temperature) can make the system adopting a compromise and therefore having k -points being in-between the zone border M and R points but not equal to $\frac{2\pi}{a_{lat}}(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{4})$. Such possibility becomes even more probable when realizing that the k_2 parameter of Table 1 is of very small magnitude, which automatically implies that the phonon branch bridging the R to M points in the cubic state is very flat. Note that such flatness has in fact been seen in previous works.⁸¹

5) *What other systems can be well described by the analytical form of the proposed effective Hamiltonian?*

It is very likely that examples of such systems are AgTaO_3 and AgNbO_3 , because they are experimentally known to exhibit various similar complex phases.⁸³⁻⁹⁰ Interestingly, NaNbO_3 , AgTaO_3 and AgNbO_3 all share an almost identical tolerance factor, which is of the order of 0.97 (see Ref. [91] for the computation of the tolerance factor). Such fact therefore suggests

a strong connection between the existence of complex phases (and/or complicated phase transition sequence) and the value of the tolerance factor.

V. SUMMARY

In summary, we have developed an effective Hamiltonian, and further used direct first-principles calculations, to shed some lights into the extraordinary complexity of NaNbO_3 . This effective Hamiltonian indicates that the ground state of NaNbO_3 (which is the state called N) is ferroelectric $R3c$ rather than purely simple or more complex tilting phases, because of some subtle and delicate couplings involving cation displacements and oxygen octahedral tiltings. Moreover, both effective Hamiltonian computations and direct *ab-initio* calculations predict that the so-called P state of NaNbO_3 should be revisited, in the sense that it is likely of $Pca2_1$ rather than $Pbcm$ symmetry, and therefore has an additional (inhomogeneous) polarization along the $[001]$ axis in addition to antiphase tilting about $[110]$ and a “ $++--$ ” tilting pattern about the z -axis when moving along any $[001]$ line. Our simulations for the T_1 , T_2 and U states are consistent with some phases previously proposed in the literature, that are simple tilting pattern $a^0b^+c^-$ and $a^0b^+a^0$ for T_1 and T_2 , respectively, *versus* the paraelectric $Pm\bar{3}m$ state for U . Moreover, our effective Hamiltonian computations also lead to the prediction of novel phases for the controversial R and S states, both of them being nanotwins of large periodicity along the long axis, namely 12-lattice constants in our case, and involving several k -points for the complex tiltings occurring along such long axis. Interestingly, the coexistence of several k -points to fully describe complex tilting patterns has also been suggested in a recent article on Li-doped NaNbO_3 compound.⁸²

Finally, by pointing out some specific important parameters of the effective Hamiltonian listed in Table 1, we further elucidate non-trivial issues pertaining to the complexity of NaNbO_3 . We therefore hope that this work leads to a revisiting and a better understanding of the most complex perovskite system, and will encourage experimentalists to confirm some of our novel predictions. We also humbly but strongly believe that the present study firmly establishes that atomistic effective Hamiltonians are nowadays able to treat incredibly complicated compounds. They are therefore promising to tackle and understand other complex materials such as, e.g., AgTaO_3 ^{83–85} and AgNbO_3 ^{86–90}, and, for instance, explain why $R3c$ is the ground state of the former and not of the latter. Effective Hamiltonians can thus

be used hand-in-hand with experimentalists in order to extract, confirm and understand unusual phases from measured data.

This paper was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (NSFC) (Grants No. 51672171, No. 51372149, and No. 11274222), the National Key Basic Research Program of China (Grant No. 2015CB921600), the Eastern Scholar Program from the Shanghai Municipal Education Commission. The Special Program for Applied Research on Super Computation of the NSFC-Guangdong Joint Fund (the second phase) and the China Scholarship Council are also acknowledged. B.X. and L.B. acknowledge the U.S. AFOSR Grant No. FA9550-16-1-0065. C.X. thanks the Department of Energy, Office of Basic Energy Sciences, under Award # DE-SC0002220. The authors also acknowledge useful discussions with Drs Philip Lightfoot and Charles Paillard.

This paper is dedicated to Dr. Jean-Michel Kiat who enjoyed and mastered crystallography and tilting phases.

* Corresponding author: renwei@shu.edu.cn

† Corresponding author: laurent@uark.edu

- ¹ H. J. Zhao, J. Íñiguez, X. M. Chen, and L. Bellaiche, Phys. Rev. B **93**, 014417 (2016).
- ² W. Ren, Y. Yang, O. Diéguez, J. Íñiguez, N. Choudhury, and L. Bellaiche, Phys. Rev. Lett. **110**, 187601 (2013).
- ³ R. J. Cava, B. Batlogg, J. J. Krajewski, R. Farrow, L. W. Rupp Jr, A. E. White, K. Short, W. F. Peck, and T. Kometani, Nature **332**, 814 (1988).
- ⁴ A. Stroppa, C. Quarti, F. De Angelis, and S. Picozzi, J. Phys. Chem. Lett. **6**, 2223 (2015).
- ⁵ M. E. Lines and A. M. Glass, *Principles and Applications of Ferroelectrics and Related Materials* (Clarendon, Oxford, 1977).
- ⁶ E. L. Falcão-Filho, C. A. C. Bosco, G. S. Maciel, L. H. Acioli, C. B. de Araújo, A. A. Lipovskii, and D. K. Tagantsev, Phys. Rev. B **69**, 134204 (2004).
- ⁷ J. H. Jung, M. Lee, J.-I. Hong, Y. Ding, C.-Y. Chen, L.-J. Chou, and Z. L. Wang, ACS Nano **5**, 10041 (2011).
- ⁸ Y. Saito, H. Takao, T. Tani, T. Nonoyama, K. Takatori, T. Homma, T. Nagaya, and M. Nakamura, Nature **432**, 84 (2004).

- ⁹ J.-F. Li, K. Wang, F.-Y. Zhu, L.-Q. Cheng, F.-Z. Yao, and D. J. Green, *J. Am. Ceram. Soc.* **96**, 3677 (2013).
- ¹⁰ X. Wang, J. Wu, D. Xiao, J. Zhu, X. Cheng, T. Zheng, B. Zhang, X. Lou, and X. Wang, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **136**, 2905 (2014).
- ¹¹ J. Wu, D. Xiao, and J. Zhu, *Chem. Rev.* **115**, 2559 (2015).
- ¹² S. K. Mishra, R. Mittal, V. Y. Pomjakushin, and S. L. Chaplot, *Phys. Rev. B* **83**, 134105 (2011).
- ¹³ M. Ahtee, A. M. Glazer, and H. D. Megaw, *Philos. Mag.* **26**, 995 (1972).
- ¹⁴ H. D. Megaw, *Ferroelectrics* **7**, 87 (1974).
- ¹⁵ I. Lefkowitz, K. Lukaszewicz, and H. D. Megaw, *Acta Crystallogr.* **20**, 670 (1966).
- ¹⁶ L. A. Reznichenko, L. A. Shilkina, E. S. Gagarina, I. P. Raevskii, E. A. Dul'kin, E. M. Kuznetsova, and V. V. Akhnazarova, *Crystallogr. Rep.* **48**, 448 (2003).
- ¹⁷ L. M. Chao, Y. D. Hou, M. P. Zheng, and M. K. Zhu, *Appl. Phys. Lett.* **108**, 212902 (2016).
- ¹⁸ C. I. Cheon, H. W. Joo, K. W. Chae, J. S. Kim, S. H. Lee, S. Torii, and T. Kamiyama, *Mater. Lett.* **156**, 214 (2015).
- ¹⁹ S. I. Raevskaya, I. P. Raevski, S. P. Kubrin, M. S. Panchelyuga, V. G. Smotrakov, V. V. Eremkin, and S. A. Prosandeev, *J. Phys.: Condens. Matter* **20**, 232202 (2008).
- ²⁰ I. Tomeno, Y. Tsunoda, K. Oka, M. Matsuura, and M. Nishi, *Phys. Rev. B* **80**, 104101 (2009).
- ²¹ L. Jiang, D. C. Mitchell, W. Dmowski, and T. Egami, *Phys. Rev. B* **88**, 014105 (2013).
- ²² S. K. Mishra, N. Choudhury, S. L. Chaplot, P. S. R. Krishna, and R. Mittal, *Phys. Rev. B* **76**, 024110 (2007).
- ²³ U. V. Waghmare and K. M. Rabe, *Phys. Rev. B* **55**, 6161 (1997).
- ²⁴ H. Krakauer, R. Yu, C.-Z. Wang, and C. LaSota, *Ferroelectrics* **206-207**, 133 (1998).
- ²⁵ L. Bellaiche, A. García, and D. Vanderbilt, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **84**, 5427 (2000).
- ²⁶ W. Zhong, D. Vanderbilt, and K. M. Rabe, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **73**, 1861 (1994); W. Zhong, D. Vanderbilt, and K. M. Rabe, *Phys. Rev. B* **52**, 6301 (1995).
- ²⁷ I. Grinberg, V. R. Cooper, and A. M. Rappe, *Nature* **419**, 909 (2002).
- ²⁸ I. Grinberg, V. R. Cooper, and A. M. Rappe, *Phys. Rev. B* **69**, 144118 (2004).
- ²⁹ S. Liu, I. Grinberg, H. Takenaka, and A. M. Rappe, *Phys. Rev. B* **88**, 104102 (2013).
- ³⁰ M. G. Stachiotti and R. L. Migoni, *J. Phys.: Condens. Matter* **2**, 4341 (1990).
- ³¹ M. G. Stachiotti, R. L. Migoni and U. T. Höchli, *J. Phys.: Condens. Matter* **3**, 3689 (1991).
- ³² S. Koval, M. G. Stachiotti, R. L. Migoni, M. S. Moreno, R. C. Mercader, and E. L. Peltzery

- Blancá, Phys. Rev. B **54**, 7151 (1996).
- ³³ P. García-Fernández, J. C. Wojdeł, J. Íñiguez, and J. Junquera, Phys. Rev. B **93**, 195137 (2016).
- ³⁴ C. Escorihuela-Sayalero, J. C. Wojdeł, and J. Íñiguez, Phys. Rev. B **95**, 094115 (2017).
- ³⁵ B. Noheda, D.E. Cox, G. Shirane, J.A. Gonzalo, L.E. Cross, and S-E. Park, Appl. Phys. Lett. **74**, 2059 (1999).
- ³⁶ I. Kornev, H. Fu and L. Bellaiche, Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 196104 (2004).
- ³⁷ S.K. Streiffer, J.A. Eastman, D.D. Fong, C.Thompson, A. Munkholm, M.V.Ramana Murty, O. Auciello, G.R.Bai, and G.B. Stephenson, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 067601 (2002).
- ³⁸ D.D. Fong, G.B. Stephenson, S.K. Streiffer, J.A. Eastman, O. Auciello, P.H. Fuoss, and C. Thompson, Science **304**, 1650 (2004).
- ³⁹ Ivan I. Naumov, L. Bellaiche and Huaxiang Fu, Nature (London) **432**, 737 (2004).
- ⁴⁰ Bo-Kuai Lai, Inna Ponomareva, I. I. Naumov, Igor A. Kornev, Huaxiang Fu, L. Bellaiche and G. J. Salamo, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 137602 (2006).
- ⁴¹ A. K. Yadav *et al.*, Nature **530**, 198 (2016).
- ⁴² Q. Zhang, L. Xie, G. Liu, S. Prokhorenko, Y. Nahas, X. Pan, L. Bellaiche, A. Gruverman, N. Valanoor, Adv. Mat. **29**, 1702375 (2017).
- ⁴³ I. A. Kornev, L. Bellaiche, P. E. Janolin, B. Dkhil, and E. Suard, Phys. Rev. Lett. **97**, 157601 (2006).
- ⁴⁴ S. Prosandeev, D. Wang, W. Ren, J. Íñiguez, and L. Bellaiche, Adv. Funct. Mater. **23**, 234 (2013).
- ⁴⁵ D. Albrecht, S. Lisenkov, W. Ren, D. Rahmedov, I. A. Kornev, and L. Bellaiche, Phys. Rev. B **81**, 140401 (2010).
- ⁴⁶ I. A. Kornev, S. Lisenkov, R. Haumont, B. Dkhil, and L. Bellaiche, Phys. Rev. Lett. **99**, 227602 (2007).
- ⁴⁷ S. Lisenkov, I. A. Kornev, and L. Bellaiche, Phys. Rev. B **79**, 012101 (2009).
- ⁴⁸ P. Hohenberg and W. Kohn, Phys. Rev. **136**, B864 (1964); W. Kohn and L.J. Sham, Phys. Rev. **140**, A1133 (1965).
- ⁴⁹ L. Bellaiche and D. Vanderbilt, Phys. Rev. B **61**, 7877 (2000).
- ⁵⁰ D. Vanderbilt, Phys. Rev. B **41**, 7892 (1990).
- ⁵¹ R. D. King-Smith and D. Vanderbilt, Phys. Rev. B **49**, 5828 (1994).
- ⁵² J. P. Perdew, A. Ruzsinszky, G. I. Csonka, O. A. Vydrov, G. E. Scuseria, L. A. Constantin, X.

- Zhou, and K. Burke, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 136406 (2008).
- ⁵³ R. Machado, M. Sepliarsky, and M. G. Stachiotti, Phys. Rev. B **84**, 134107 (2011).
- ⁵⁴ R. Von der Mühll, A. Sadel, and P. Hagenmuller, J. Solid State Chem. **51**, 176 (1984).
- ⁵⁵ M. D. Peel, S. P. Thompson, A. Daoud-Aladine, S. E. Ashbrook, and P. Lightfoot, Inorg. Chem. **51**, 6876 (2012).
- ⁵⁶ A. C. Sakowski-Cowley, K. Lukaszewicz, and H. D. Megaw, Acta Crystallogr. B **25**, 851 (1969).
- ⁵⁷ G. Kresse and D. Joubert, Phys. Rev. B **59**, 1758 (1999).
- ⁵⁸ P. E. Blochl, Phys. Rev. B **50**, 17953 (1994); G. Kresse and D. Joubert, Phys. Rev. B **59**, 1758 (1999).
- ⁵⁹ G.-R. Qian, X. Dong, X.-F. Zhou, Y. Tian, A. R. Oganov, and H.-T. Wang, Comput. Phys. Commun. **184**, 2111 (2013).
- ⁶⁰ A. R. Oganov and C. W. Glass, J. Chem. Phys. **124**, 244704 (2006).
- ⁶¹ A. R. Oganov, A. O. Lyakhov, and M. Valle, Acc. Chem. Res. **44**, 227 (2011).
- ⁶² A. O. Lyakhov, A. R. Oganov, H. T. Stokes, and Q. Zhu, Comput. Phys. Commun. **184**, 1172 (2013).
- ⁶³ X. Gonze, G.-M. Rignanese, M. Verstraete, J.-M. Beuken, Y. Pouillon, R. Caracas, F. Jollet, M. Torrent, G. Zerah, M. Mikami, Ph. Ghosez, M. Veithen, J.-Y. Raty, V. Olevano, F. Bruneval, L. Reining, R. Godby, G. Onida and D.R. Hamann and D.C. Allan, Zeit. Kristallogr. **220**, 558-562 (2005).
- ⁶⁴ X. Gonze, B. Amadon, P.-M. Anglade, J.-M. Beuken, F. Bottin, P. Boulanger, F. Bruneval, D. Caliste, R. Caracas, M. Ct, T. Deutsch, L. Genovese, Ph. Ghosez, M. Giantomassi, S. Goedecker, D.R. Hamann, P. Hermet, F. Jollet, G. Jomard, S. Leroux, M. Mancini, S. Mazevet, M.J.T. Oliveira, G. Onida, Y. Pouillon, T. Rangel, G.-M. Rignanese, D. Sangalli, R. Shaltaf, M. Torrent, M.J. Verstraete, G. Zerah and J.W. Zwanziger, Comp. Phys. Comm. **180**, 2582-2615 (2009).
- ⁶⁵ X. Gonze, F. Jollet, F. Abreu Araujo, D. Adams, B. Amadon, T. Applencourt, C. Audouze, J.-M. Beuken, J. Bieder, A. Bokhanchuk, E. Bousquet, F. Bruneval, D. Caliste, M. Ct, F. Dahm, F. Da Pieve, M. Delaveau, M. Di Gennaro, B. Dorado, C. Espejo, G. Geneste, L. Genovese, A. Gerossier, M. Giantomassi, Y. Gillet, D.R. Hamann, L. He, G. Jomard, J. Laflamme Janssen, S. Le Roux, A. Levitt, A. Lherbier, F. Liu, I. Lukacevic, A. Martin, C. Martins, M.J.T. Oliveira, S. Ponc, Y. Pouillon, T. Rangel, G.-M. Rignanese, A.H. Romero, B. Rousseau, O. Rubel,

- A.A. Shukri, M. Stankovski, M. Torrent, M.J. Van Setten, B. Van troeye, M.J. Verstraete, D. Waroquier, J. Wiktor, B. Xu, A. Zhou and J.W. Zwanziger, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **205**, 106 (2016).
- ⁶⁶ D. R. Hamann, *Phys. Rev. B* **88**, 085117 (2013).
- ⁶⁷ C. N. W. Darlington and H. D. Megaw, *Acta Crystallogr. Sect. B: Struct. Crystallogr. and Crystallogr. Chem.* **29**, 2171 (1973).
- ⁶⁸ A. M. Glazer, *Acta Crystallogr. Sect. B: Struct. Crystallogr. and Crystallogr. Chem.* **28**, 3384 (1972).
- ⁶⁹ O. Diéguez, O. E. González-Vázquez, Jacek C. Wojdel, and Jorge Íñiguez, *Phys. Rev. B* **83**, 094105 (2011).
- ⁷⁰ L. Bellaiche, and J. Íñiguez, *Phys. Rev. B* **88**, 014104 (2013).
- ⁷¹ A.M. George, J. Íñiguez and L. Bellaiche, *Phys. Rev. B* **65**, 180301 (R) (2002).
- ⁷² B. N. Rao, D. K. Khatua, R. Garg, A. Senyshyn, and R. Ranjan, *Phys. Rev. B* **91**, 214116 (2015).
- ⁷³ W. L. Zhong, P. L. Zhang, H. S. Zhao, Z. H. Yang, Y. Y. Song, and H. C. Chen, *Phys. Rev. B* **46**, 10583 (1992).
- ⁷⁴ A. C. Sakowski-Cowley, Ph.D. Thesis, University of Cambridge, (1967).
- ⁷⁵ Y. I. Yuzyuk *et al.*, *J. Phys.: Condens. Matter* **17**, 4977 (2005).
- ⁷⁶ A. M. Glazer and H. D. Megaw, *Philos. Mag.* **25**, 1119 (1972).
- ⁷⁷ H. Krakauer, R. Yu, C.-Z. Wang, K. M Rabe and U. V. Waghmare, *J. Phys.: Condens. Matter* **11**, 3779 (1999).
- ⁷⁸ One may wonder what is the origin of the underestimation of transition temperatures from the effective Hamiltonian method. One possible reason is that the main degrees of freedom of KNbO_3 and NaNbO_3 (namely, local electric dipoles and local oxygen octahedral tiltings, respectively) may couple, in a *collaborative* fashion, with other degrees of freedom. Such latter degrees of freedom never condense at any temperature but can fluctuate at high temperatures, with such fluctuations and aforementioned collaborative coupling resulting in the main degrees of freedom of KNbO_3 and NaNbO_3 surviving at higher temperatures. As a result, neglecting this coupling in our effective Hamiltonian, as done here, can lead to an underestimation of the transition temperatures while providing the correct phase transition sequence. Note that such possible aforementioned coupling⁷⁹ is consistent with recent measurements showing the

manipulation of the polarization in LiNbO_3 via light-induced excitation of high-in-frequency modes⁸⁰.

- ⁷⁹ A. Subedi, Phys. Rev. B **92**, 214303 (2015).
- ⁸⁰ R. Mankowsky, A. von Hoegen, M. Forst, and A. Cavalleri, Phys. Rev. Lett. **118**, 197601 (2017).
- ⁸¹ S. K. Mishra, M. K. Gupta, R. Mittal, M. Zbiri, S. Rols, H. Schober, and S. L. Chaplot, Phys. Rev. B **89**, 184303 (2014).
- ⁸² C.A. L. Dixon and Philip Lightfoot, arXiv (2018).
- ⁸³ M. Wolczyr and M. Łukaszewski, Z. Kristallogr. **177**, 53 (1986).
- ⁸⁴ G. E. Kugel, M. D. Fontana, M. Hafid, K. Roleder, A. Kania, and M. Pawelczyk, J. Phys. C **20**, 1217 (1987).
- ⁸⁵ A. Kania and A. Ratuszna, Phase. Transit. **2**, 7 (1981).
- ⁸⁶ I. Grinberg and A. M. Rappe, AIP Conf. Proc. **677**, 130 (2003).
- ⁸⁷ P. Sciau, A. Kania, B. Dkhil, E. Suard, and A. Ratuszna, J. Phys.: Condens. Matter **16**, 2795 (2004).
- ⁸⁸ I. Levin, V. Krayzman, J. C. Woicik, J. Karapetrova, T. Proffen, M. G. Tucker, and I. M. Reaney, Phys. Rev. B **79**, 104113 (2009).
- ⁸⁹ M. Yashima, S. Matsuyama, R. Sano, M. Itoh, K. Tsuda, and D. Fu, Chem. Mater. **23**, 1643 (2011).
- ⁹⁰ M. Hiroki, A. J. F. Craig, K. Akihida, and F. Desheng, Jpn. J. Appl. Phys. **51**, 09LE02 (2012).
- ⁹¹ [http : //www.me.utexas.edu/ ~ benedekgroup/ToleranceFactorCalculator/#home](http://www.me.utexas.edu/~benedekgroup/ToleranceFactorCalculator/#home)

FIG. 1: (Color online) Phonon spectrum of the $Pbcm$ (Panel a) and $Pca2_1$ (Panel b) states, as predicted by the direct use of first-principle DFPT calculations. Notice the unstable modes (having negative frequencies) around Γ for the $Pbcm$ state.

FIG. 2: (Color online) Dependency of the H_{eff} internal energy of the *R3c*, *Pnma* and *Phase1/Pca2₁* phases at 10 K, as a function of the E_{xyxy} (Panel a) and $D_{ii,xy}$ (Panel b) coefficients. The other effective Hamiltonian parameters of those given in Table 1 during these two variations and energies are given in meV-per-5-atom, with the zero in energy referring to the equilibrium cubic paraelectric $Pm\bar{3}m$ state (i.e., having a lattice parameter of 7.388 Bohr).

FIG. 3: (Color online) Temperature dependency of the components of the homogeneous strain tensor between 10 and 320 K, as predicted by the presently developed effective Hamiltonian. The zero of strain corresponds to the equilibrium cubic paraelectric $Pm\bar{3}m$ state (i.e., having a lattice parameter of 7.388 Bohr). The error bars on the finite elements of the strain tensor range between 5.5 and 8.3×10^{-4} at 300 K, that is at least one order of magnitude smaller than the average values of such strain elements.

FIG. 4: (Color online) Temperature dependency of the supercell average of the local mode vectors between 10 and 320 K, as predicted by the presently developed effective Hamiltonian. The error bar on $\langle u_z \rangle$ is equal to 6×10^{-4} at 300 K, that is about one order of magnitude smaller than $\langle u_z \rangle$.

FIG. 5: (Color online) Temperature dependency of the $\langle \omega_{\mathbf{R}} \rangle$ antiphase tilting vector between 10 and 320 K, as predicted by the presently developed effective Hamiltonian. The error bars on $\langle \omega_{R,x} \rangle$ and $\langle \omega_{R,y} \rangle$ are about 5×10^{-3} at 300 K, that is about two orders of magnitude smaller than $\langle \omega_{R,x} \rangle$ and $\langle \omega_{R,y} \rangle$.

FIG. 6: (Color online) Temperature dependency of the components of the homogeneous strain tensor between 320 and 390 K, as predicted by the presently developed effective Hamiltonian. The zero of strain corresponds to the equilibrium cubic paraelectric $Pm\bar{3}m$ state (i.e., having a lattice parameter of 7.388 Bohr). The vertical solid lines depict transition temperatures, and the ‘1’, ‘2’, ‘3’, ‘4’, ‘5’ and ‘cubic’ notations refer to the Phases 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5, as well as the paraelectric cubic state, discussed in the text. The same vertical scale is used than in Figure 3, for comparison. The error bars on the diagonal elements of the strain tensor are about 7×10^{-4} at 335 K, that is at least one order of magnitude smaller than the average values of such strain elements. The error bar on $\eta_{H,5}$ is about 10^{-3} at 335 K, which is about three times smaller than the average value of this shear strain component.

FIG. 7: (Color online) Temperature dependency of the supercell average of the local mode vectors between 320 and 390 K, as predicted by the presently developed effective Hamiltonian. The vertical solid lines depict transition temperatures, and the ‘1’, ‘2’, ‘3’, ‘4’, ‘5’ and ‘cubic’ notations refer to the Phases 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5, as well as the paraelectric cubic state, discussed in the text. The same vertical scale is used than in Figure 4, for comparison. The error bar on $\langle u_y \rangle$ is equal to 6×10^{-4} at 335 K, which is of the same order than $\langle u_y \rangle$ itself, implying that $\langle u_y \rangle$ is statistically null – as consistent with the ‘N/A’ wording used for $\mathbf{k}_{\mathbf{u},\mathbf{y}}$ in Table 3.

FIG. 8: (Color online) Temperature dependency of the $\langle \omega_{\mathbf{R}} \rangle$ antiphase tilting vector between 320 and 390 K, as predicted by the presently developed effective Hamiltonian. The vertical solid lines depict transition temperatures, and the ‘1’, ‘2’, ‘3’, ‘4’, ‘5’ and ‘cubic’ notations refer to the Phases 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5, as well as the paraelectric cubic state, discussed in the text. The same vertical scale is used than in Figure 5, for comparison. The error bars on $\langle \omega_{R,x} \rangle$ and $\langle \omega_{R,z} \rangle$ range between 1 and 2×10^{-2} at 335 K, that is about three to four times smaller than $\langle \omega_{R,x} \rangle$ and $\langle \omega_{R,z} \rangle$.

FIG. 9: (Color online) Temperature dependency of the y-component of the $\langle \omega_{\mathbf{M}_y} \rangle$ in-phase tilting pseudovector between 320 and 390 K, as predicted by the presently developed effective Hamiltonian. The vertical solid lines depict transition temperatures, and the ‘1’, ‘2’, ‘3’, ‘4’, ‘5’ and ‘cubic’ notations refer to the Phases 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5, as well as the paraelectric cubic state, discussed in the text. The same vertical scale is used than in Figures 5 and 8, for comparison. The error bar on $\langle \omega_{My,y} \rangle$ is about 10^{-2} at 370 K, that is about one order of magnitude smaller than $\langle \omega_{My,y} \rangle$.

TABLE 1: Expansion parameters of the effective Hamiltonian for NaNbO_3 . Atomic units are used here. The reference cubic lattice parameter is 7.388 Bohr.

Dipole	Z^*	8.8005	ϵ_∞	5.945		
u on-site	κ_2	0.005112	α	0.11975	γ	-0.22342
u short range	j_1	-0.0101264	j_2	0.0335433	j_5	0.0051405
	j_3	0.0036363	j_4	-0.0020866		
	j_6	0.0005655	j_7	0.00028274		
Elastic	B_{11}	6.211	B_{12}	1.0818	B_{44}	1.032
$u\eta_l$ coup.	B_{1xx}	-1.4939	B_{1yy}	0.43861	B_{4yz}	-0.020843
ω on-site	κ_A	-0.073538	α_A	2.69108	γ_A	-2.38182
ω short-range	k_1	0.01838372	k_2	-0.000065656	K'	-0.0236641
$\omega\eta_l$ coup.	C_{1xx}	0.3093224	C_{1yy}	3.047636	C_{4yz}	-1.230160178
ωu coup. (trilinear)	$D_{ii,xy}$	-0.0139585				
ωu coup. (bi-quadratic)	E_{xxxx}	0.381915	E_{xxyy}	0.0968329	E_{xyxy}	-0.799544

TABLE 2: Internal energies, in meV per 5 atoms, of the $R3c$, $Pnma$ and Phase 1/ $Pca2_1$ states of NaNbO_3 at 10 K, as predicted from the presently developed H_{eff} , LDA and PBEsol simulations. The zero of energy corresponds to the equilibrium cubic paraelectric $Pm\bar{3}m$ state.

State	H_{eff}	LDA	PBEsol
$R3c$	-155.93	-199.69	-108.70
$Pnma$	-150.24	-198.61	-91.66
Phase 1/ $Pca2_1$	-155.53	-201.41	-107.46

TABLE 3: Significant k-points associated with the phases numerically found by the MC simulations using the presently developed effective Hamiltonian, in $\frac{2\pi}{a_{lat}}$ unit. The wordings “maj” and “min” refer to k-points having majority and minority weights, respectively. The value in percentage corresponds to the weight of the Fourier component of the corresponding pattern on these k-points for the temperature of 10 K in Phase 1, 335 K in Phase 2, 339 K in Phase 3, 341.5 K in Phase 4 and 370 K in Phase 5. Note also that the weight on $\frac{2\pi}{a_{lat}}(0, 0, \frac{1}{4})$ is identical to that on the opposite $\frac{2\pi}{a_{lat}}(0, 0, -\frac{1}{4})$ k-point for the pattern associated with the x-component or y-component of the local modes. Similarly, the eight k-points defined by $\frac{2\pi}{a_{lat}}(\pm\frac{1}{2}, \pm\frac{1}{n}, \pm\frac{1}{2})$ (respectively, $\frac{2\pi}{a_{lat}}(\pm\frac{1}{2}, \pm\frac{1}{2}, \pm\frac{1}{n})$), with n being 4, 6 or 12, all have the same weight for the pattern inherent to the y-component (respectively, z-component) of the AFD pseudo-vectors.

State	$\mathbf{k}_{u,x}$	$\mathbf{k}_{u,y}$	$\mathbf{k}_{u,z}$	$\mathbf{k}_{AFD,x}$	$\mathbf{k}_{AFD,y}$	$\mathbf{k}_{AFD,z}$
Phase 1	$(0, 0, \frac{1}{4})$, 48.2%	$(0, 0, \frac{1}{4})$, 48.2%	$\mathbf{0}$ (maj, 87.8%) $(0, 0, \frac{1}{2})$ (min, 9.6%)	$(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2})$, 99.8%	$(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2})$, 99.8%	$(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{4})$, 49.9%
Phase 2	N/A	N/A	N/A	$(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2})$, 45.5%	$(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{6}, \frac{1}{2})$ (maj, 17.9%) $(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{2})$ (min, 9.1%) $(\frac{1}{2}, 0, \frac{1}{2})$ (min, 7.5%)	$(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2})$, 50.6%
Phase 3	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	$(\frac{1}{2}, 0, \frac{1}{2})$ (maj, 19.5%) $(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{2})$ (min, 10.4%) $(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{6}, \frac{1}{2})$ (min, 9.2%) $(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{12}, \frac{1}{2})$ (min, 5.6%)	$(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2})$, 52.6%
Phase 4	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	$(\frac{1}{2}, 0, \frac{1}{2})$, 57.9%	$(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2})$, 11.5%
Phase 5	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	$(\frac{1}{2}, 0, \frac{1}{2})$, 71.9%	N/A