

This is a repository copy of *First-principles calculations of the lattice thermal conductivity of the lower mantle.* 

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper: http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/87481/

Version: Supplemental Material

## Article:

Stackhouse, S, Stixrude, L and Karki, BB (2015) First-principles calculations of the lattice thermal conductivity of the lower mantle. Earth and Planetary Science Letters, 427. 11 - 17. ISSN 0012-821X

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.epsl.2015.06.050

© 2015 Elsevier. This manuscript version is made available under the CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 license http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/

#### Reuse

Unless indicated otherwise, fulltext items are protected by copyright with all rights reserved. The copyright exception in section 29 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 allows the making of a single copy solely for the purpose of non-commercial research or private study within the limits of fair dealing. The publisher or other rights-holder may allow further reproduction and re-use of this version - refer to the White Rose Research Online record for this item. Where records identify the publisher as the copyright holder, users can verify any specific terms of use on the publisher's website.

#### Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



1	First-principles calculations of the lattice thermal conductivity of the lower mantle
2	- Supplementary Material
3	Stephen Stackhouse <sup>a,</sup> *, Lars Stixrude <sup>b</sup> , Bijaya, B. Karki <sup>c</sup>
4 5 6 7	<ul> <li><sup>a</sup> School of Earth and Environment, University of Leeds, Leeds LS2 9JT, United Kingdom.</li> <li><sup>b</sup> Department of Earth Sciences, University College London, Gower Street, London WC1E 6BT, United Kingdom.</li> <li><sup>c</sup> School of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, Department of Geology and Geophysics, and Center for Computation and Technology, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, LA70803, United States of America.</li> </ul>
8 9	*E-mail addresses: s.stackhouse@leeds.ac.uk; l.stixrude@ucl.ac.uk; karki@csc.lsu.edu
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	

## 29 S1 Lattice Thermal Conductivity Model

In order to derive additional physical insight into our results and relate them to experiments
 at lower temperatures and pressures, we develop a simple model of the variation of lattice
 thermal conductivity with density and temperature

33 
$$k(\Omega,T) = Ak_{LS}f\left(\frac{T}{BT_S}\right)C$$
 (S1)

34 where  $k(\Omega,T)$  is the lattice thermal conductivity at the mean atomic volume  $\Omega$  and 35 temperature *T*,

36 
$$k_{LS} = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{6\pi^3 (6\pi^2)^{2/3}} \left(\frac{k_B}{\hbar}\right)^3 \frac{M\Omega^{1/3}\theta^3}{\gamma^2 T}$$
(S2)

is the Liebfried-Schlömann relation, with *M* the mean atomic mass,  $\theta$  the Debye temperature,  $\gamma$  the Grüneisen parameter,  $k_B$  the Boltzmann constant, and  $\hbar$  the Planck constant divided by  $2\pi$  (Roufosse and Klemens, 1974). Since different derivations yield different values for the numerical pre-factor, but equivalent functional dependencies of the physical properties, we retain the coefficient *A* as a parameter of order unity to be determined (Roufosse and Klemens, 1973; Julian, 1965). The function *f* is based on the theory of Roufosse and Klemens (1974) and accounts for saturation. It is given by

44 
$$f(x) = \frac{2}{3}x^{-1/2} + \frac{1}{3}x$$
 (S3)

for x>1 and is equal to unity for x<1.  $T_S$  is the temperature at which the phonon mean free path approaches the inter-atomic spacing

47 
$$T_{S} = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{3\pi (6\pi^{2})^{4/3}} \left(\frac{k_{B}}{\hbar}\right)^{2} \frac{M\Omega^{2/3}\theta^{2}}{\gamma^{2}k_{B}}$$
(S4)

48 We determine the values of the coefficients A=1.60 and B=0.91 by fitting to our first 49 principles results and take values of all other parameters from a thermodynamic model (Stixrude and Lithgow-Bertelloni, 2011). For example, we find  $T_s = 960$  K for MgSiO<sub>3</sub> 50 perovskite at the density of the core-mantle boundary (5.29 gcm<sup>-3</sup>) and a saturated value 51 for the lattice thermal conductivity in the limit  $T >> T_s$  of 5.7 Wm<sup>-1</sup>K<sup>-1</sup>. The isochoric heat 52 capacity C accounts for the temperature dependence of phonon population at 53 54 temperatures below the Debye temperature, and is important for comparing with experimental data near room temperature. 55

## 56 S2 Scaling Relation

57 To estimate the lattice thermal conductivity of CaSiO<sub>3</sub> perovskite, FeSiO<sub>3</sub> perovskite and 58 FeO wüstite from our values for the magnesium end-members, we use the scaling derived 59 from the Liebfreid-Schlömann relation

60 
$$k_{2} = k_{1} \left(\frac{M_{2}}{M_{1}}\right) \left(\frac{v_{2}}{v_{1}}\right)^{3} \left(\frac{\gamma_{1}}{\gamma_{2}}\right)^{2} \left(\frac{\Omega_{1}}{\Omega_{2}}\right)^{2/3}$$
(S5)

where *v* is the Debye velocity, subscript 2 refers to the phase whose lattice thermal conductivity is being estimated and subscript 1 refers to a magnesium end-member: MgSiO<sub>3</sub> perovskite in the case of CaSiO<sub>3</sub> perovskite and FeSiO<sub>3</sub> perovskite and MgO periclase in the case of FeO wüstite. Values of all physical parameters were computed using a thermodynamic model (Stixrude and Lithgow-Bertelloni, 2011). For illustration, the values of  $k_2/k_1$  obtained at core-mantle boundary conditions are: CaSiO<sub>3</sub> perovskite (1.02), FeSiO<sub>3</sub> perovskite (0.65), and FeO wüstite (0.41).

# 68 S3 Influence of Iron Impurities

The influence of iron impurities on lattice thermal conductivity is approximated using the
 theory of Klemens (1960) and Padture and Klemens (1997), which estimates the lattice

71 thermal conductivity of a binary solid solution as

72 
$$k_s = k_v \left(\frac{\omega_s}{\omega_D}\right) \arctan\left(\frac{\omega_D}{\omega_s}\right)$$
 (S6)

where  $\omega_S$  is the phonon frequency where the mean free path is equal to that due to the solute atoms,  $\omega_D$  the Debye frequency and  $k_V$  the lattice thermal conductivity of the solid solution in the absence of impurity scattering (i.e. the Voigt average of the two endmember values) given by

77 
$$k_v = (1-x)k_1 + xk_2$$
 (S7)

where  $k_1$  and  $k_2$  are the lattice thermal conductivities of the component end-members, and *x* the mole fraction of component 2.

Based on Eq. (17) of Klemens (1960) and replacing the Debye frequency with the
appropriate expression involving the Debye velocity and atomic volume we obtain

82 
$$\left(\frac{\omega_s}{\omega_D}\right)^2 = \frac{k_B v}{(6\pi^2)^{1/3} \Omega^{2/3} \varepsilon k_V}$$
(S8)

83 where  $\varepsilon$  is related to the difference in the masses of the two component end-members  $M_1$ 84 and  $M_2$ 

85 
$$\varepsilon = \frac{(M_2 - M_1)^2}{\overline{M}^2} x(1 - x)$$
 (S9)

86 where  $\overline{M}$  is the mean atomic mass of the solid solution. Substituting Eq. (S2) [LARS: 87 Please check this the original Eq. S5 no longer exists] for  $k_V$  into (S8)

88 
$$\left(\frac{\omega_s}{\omega_p}\right)^2 = \frac{\pi (6\pi^2)^{1/3}}{\sqrt{2}} \frac{k_B \gamma^2}{M v^2} \frac{T}{\varepsilon}$$
(S10)

where the second ratio on the right-hand side is related to  $T_S$  (S4 is no longer the same expression, so is this true? Yes.)

91 
$$\left(\frac{\omega_s}{\omega_D}\right)^2 = \frac{1}{(6\pi^2)^{1/3}} \frac{T}{3\varepsilon T_s}$$
(S11)

92 Eqs. (S6) and (S11) show that the effect of scattering due to impurities increases with 93 decreasing temperature, increasing mass difference and increasing impurity 94 concentration. In the lower mantle impurity scattering is weak, because the temperature is high:  $T >> T_S$  so that  $\omega_S >> \omega_D$ ,  $\arctan(\omega_D/\omega_S) \approx \omega_D/\omega_S$  and  $k_S \approx k_V$  (Eq. (S6)). We note that, 95 in his application, Klemens (1960) focused on the opposite, low-temperature, strong-96 scattering limit, for which  $\arctan(\omega_D/\omega_S) = \pi/2$  and  $k_S \propto T^{1/2}$ , assuming  $k_V \propto T^1$ . 97 98 Taken together, Eqs. (S6), (S7) and (S11) can be used to estimate the lattice thermal 99 conductivity of iron-bearing mineral phases. For example, using this method the lattice 100 thermal conductivity of (Mg<sub>0.94</sub>Fe<sub>0.06</sub>)SiO<sub>3</sub> perovskite is estimated to be 3 % less than that 101 of the pure magnesium end-member. The effect of impurity scattering is somewhat larger 102 for (Mg<sub>0.8</sub>Fe<sub>0.2</sub>)O ferropericlase, because of the larger mass difference and more 103 concentrated solution. Its lattice thermal conductivity is found to be 21 % less than that of 104 the pure magnesium end-member. We note that while our knowledge of the influence of 105 impurities on thermal conductivity is still uncertain and requires further experiments, the 106 model outlined here has been tested on similar systems including garnets (Padture and Klemens, 1997, Marguardt et al., 2009), and predicts a value for (Mg<sub>0.8</sub>Fe<sub>0.2</sub>)O at 2000 K 107 and 14 GPa (7. W m<sup>-1</sup> K<sup>-1</sup>) that is identical to that of a more elaborate model that contains 108 109 a free parameter fit to experimental data (Dalton et al., 2013).

110 S4 Heat-flux Analysis

The properties of the thermal boundary layer are related by (Jeanloz and Richter, 1979;Davaille and Jaupart, 1993)

113 
$$Q = bk \left(\frac{\alpha g}{\kappa v}\right)^{1/3} \Delta T^{4/3} = \frac{k\Delta T}{\delta}$$
(S12)

where *k* is the thermal conductivity,  $\alpha$  the thermal expansivity, *g* the gravitational acceleration,  $\kappa$  the thermal diffusivity, and *v* the kinematic viscosity,  $\Delta T$  the temperature contrast across and  $\delta$  the thickness of the thermal boundary layer. The coefficient *b* is empirically determined and equal to 0.1636. Thermodynamic properties at core-mantle boundary conditions were determined from a thermodynamic model (Stixrude and Lithgow-Bertelloni, 2011), while values for the kinematic viscosity were taken from recent first-principles calculations (Ammann et al., 2010).

121 Constraints on the temperature contrast across the core-mantle boundary are based on estimates of the mantle isentrope (derived from extrapolation of the mantle temperature 122 123 from constraints at 660 km depth to the core-mantle boundary (Brown and Shankland, 124 1981; Stixrude and Lithgow-Bertelloni, 2011)) and the temperature at the top of the core 125 (from knowledge of the melting point of iron alloys, and extrapolation from the inner core boundary to the core-mantle boundary (Brown and McQueen, 1986; Pozzo et al., 2012)). 126 127 Constraints on the heat-flux at the core-mantle boundary are based on: 1. The heat-flux 128 carried by plumes and plume heads (3.5 TW) (Davies, 2007) and accounting for the 129 increase in plume heat with depth due to the steeper isentrope in the plume (Stixrude and Lithgow-Bertelloni, 2011) and possible sub-adiabaticity in the background mantle 130 131 (Schuberth et al., 2009), factors that may increase the heat-flux by a factor of three. This is 132 a lower bound because mantle convection models show that not all the heat-flux from the core-mantle boundary is expressed as plumes (Lay et al., 2008). 2. The heat conducted 133 134 down the core adiabat according to first principles calculations of the thermal conductivity and the adiabatic gradient of the outer core (de Koker et al., 2012; Pozzo et al., 2012). 135 136 This is an upper bound because the top of the outer core may have a sub-adiabatic 137 gradient (stably stratified).

## 139 **References**

- Ammann, M.W., Brodholt, J.P., Wookey, J., Dobson, D.P., 2010. First-principles
- 141 constraints on diffusion in lower-mantle minerals and a weak D" layer. Nature 465,
  142 462–465.
- Brown, J., McQueen, R., 1986. Phase-Transitions, Gruneisen-Parameter and Elasticity for
   Shocked Iron Between 77 GPa and 400 GPa. J. Geophys. Res. 91, 7485–7494.
- Brown, J., Shankland, T., 1981. Thermodynamic Parameters in the Earth as Determined
  from Seismic Profiles. Geophys. J. R. astr. Soc. 66, 579–596.
- 147 Dalton, D.A., Wen-Pin, H., Hohensee, G.T., Cahill, D.G., Goncharov, A.F., 2013. Effect of
- mass disorder on the lattice thermal conductivity of MgO periclase under pressure.
  Sci. Rep., 3, 2400.
- Davaille, A., Jaupart, C., 1993. Transient high-Rayleigh-number thermal-convection with
   large viscosity variations. J. Fluid Mech. 253, 141–166.
- Davies, G.F., 2007. Mantle regulation of core cooling: A geodynamo without core
   radioactivity? Phys. Earth Planet. Inter. 160, 215–229.
- de Koker, N., Steinle-Neumann, G., Vlcek, V., 2012. Electrical resistivity and thermal
- 155 conductivity of liquid Fe alloys at high P and T, and heat flux in Earth's core. Proc.
  156 Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A. 109, 4070–4073.
- Jeanloz, R., Richter, F., 1979. Convection, composition, and the thermal state of the lower
   mantle. J. Geophys. Res. 84, 5497–5504.
- Julian, C., 1965. Theory of heat conduction in rare-gas crystals. Phys. Rev. 137, A128–A137.
- 161 Klemens, P., 1960. Thermal resistance due to point defects at high temperatures. Phys.
  162 Rev. 119, 507–509.
- Lay, T., Hernlund, J., Buffett, B.A., 2008. Core-mantle boundary heat flow. Nat. Geosci. 1,
   25–32.

- Marquardt, H., Ganschow, S., Schilling, F.R., 2009a. Thermal diffusivity of natural and
   synthetic garnet solid solution series. Phys. Chem. Miner. 36, 107–118.
- Padture, N.P., Klemens, P.G., 1997. Low thermal conductivity in garnets. J. Am. Ceram.
  Soc. 80, 1018–1020.
- Pozzo, M., Davies, C., Gubbins, D., Alfe, D., 2012. Thermal and electrical conductivity of
  iron at Earth's core conditions. Nature 485, 355–358.
- Roufosse, M., Klemens, P., 1973. Thermal-conductivity of complex dielectric crystals.
  Phys. Rev. B 7, 5379–5386.
- Roufosse, M., Klemens, P., 1974. Lattice thermal-conductivity of minerals at hightempeatures. J. Geophys. Res. 79, 703–705.
- 175 Schuberth, B.S.A., Bunge, H.-P., Ritsema, J., 2009. Tomographic filtering of high-
- resolution mantle circulation models: Can seismic heterogeneity be explained by
  temperature alone? Geochem. Geophys. Geosyst. 10.
- Stixrude, L., Lithgow-Bertelloni, C., 2011. Thermodynamics of mantle minerals II. Phase
  equilibria. Geophys. J. Int. 184, 1180–1213.

- 182
- 183



Fig. S1. Time average of the temperature gradient (a) heat-flux (b) and thermal
 conductivity (c), as a function of simulation length. Values are shown for calculations of the

188 thermal conductivity in the [100] direction at 75 GPa and 2500 K. The first 10 ps of each

189 simulation is allowed for equilibration. d, Corresponding temperature profiles for each

190 simulation. The temperatures of the hot and cold sections (shown as an ×) are not

191 included in the fit (solid line), used to estimate the temperature gradient. The labels refer to

192 the dimensions of the simulations cells i.e. *n*×2×1 refers to a simulation cell with

193 dimensions  $na \times 2b \times c$ , where *a*, *b* and *c* are the unit cell parameters of perovskite.



**Fig. S2.** Influence of exchange-frequency. Calculated thermal conductivity as a function of simulation length, for different exchange periods (40, 60 and 80 fs). Values are shown for the calculation of the thermal conductivity in the [100] direction, at 145 GPa and 4000 K, using a simulation cell with the dimensions  $6a \times 2b \times c$ , where *a*, *b* and *c* are the unit cell parameters of perovskite. All the simulations converge on the same value, irrespective of exchange period, indicating that Fourier's law is valid.

204





Fig. S3. Extrapolation to infinite simulation cell length. (a) At 75 GPa and 2500 K back extrapolation suggests that the thermal conductivity of MgSiO<sub>3</sub> perovskite is isotropic. (b) For all other temperature and pressure conditions studied the thermal conductivity was determined only in the [100] direction. Thermal conductivity is almost identical at 145 GPa and 2500 K and 145 GPa and 4000 K, suggesting saturation.





Fig. S4. Influence of cross-sectional area on calculated thermal conductivity. Doubling the cross-sectional perpendicular to the direction of the heat-flux appears to have only a minor influence on the estimated thermal conductivity values. The legends refer to the dimensions of the simulations cells i.e.  $n \times m \times 1$  refers to a simulation cell with dimensions  $na \times mb \times c$ , where *a*, *b* and *c* are the unit cell parameters of perovskite.

Table S1 Thermal conductivity (*k*) calculated by extrapolation to infinite simulation cell length and phonon mean free path (*l*) calculated from Equation 6, at each pressure and temperature condition. At 110 GPa and 1000 K and 110 GPa and 3250 K values are reported for simulation cells with different cross-sectional areas, giving an indication of finite-size effects.

228

P (GPa)	T (K)	Direction	Cross-Section	$k (Wm^{-1}K^{-1})$	<i>l</i> (nm)
26	1000	[100]	<b>2</b> <i>b</i> × <i>c</i>	7 ± 1.4	0.8 ± 0.3
75	2500	[100]	$2b \times c$	5.3 ± 0.7	0.3 ± 0.1
75	2500	[010]	$2a \times c$	5.2 ± 0.7	$0.2 \pm 0.2$
75	2500	[001]	<b>2</b> <i>a</i> × <b>2</b> <i>b</i>	5.3 ± 0.7	0.2 ± 0.1
75	4000	[100]	$2b \times c$	4.7 ± 0.8	$0.2 \pm 0.2$
110	1000	[100]	$b \times c$	16 ± 5	1.4 ± 0.6
110	1000	[100]	$2b \times c$	13 ± 3	1.5 ± 0.5
110	3250	[100]	$b \times c$	6 ± 1	$0.2 \pm 0.2$
110	3250	[100]	$2b \times c$	5.8 ± 0.8	$0.3 \pm 0.2$
145	2500	[100]	$2b \times c$	9 ± 1	$0.9 \pm 0.2$
145	4000	[100]	$2b \times c$	9 ± 2	0.8 ± 0.4

Table S2 Time average of the temperature gradient ( $\langle dT/dx \rangle$ ), heat-flux ( $\langle J(t) \rangle$ ) and thermal conductivity  $\langle k \rangle$  for each simulation cell (*x*, *y* and *z*), at each pressure and temperature condition. *t<sub>ex</sub>* is the time period between energy exchanges.

x (nm)	v (nm)	<i>z</i> (nm)	$t_{ex}$ (fs)	$\langle dT/dx \rangle$ (TKm <sup>-1</sup> )	$\langle J(t) \rangle$ (TWm <sup>-2</sup> )	$\langle k \rangle$ (Wm <sup>-1</sup> K <sup>-1</sup> )	time (ps)				
26 GPa and 1000 K in the [100] direction											
2 779	0.960	0.665	80	0 148 + 0 011	-0 515 + 0 006	3 480 + 0 273	112				
3 706	0.960	0.665	80	$0.140 \pm 0.011$ 0.127 + 0.007	$-0.498 \pm 0.005$	3 921 + 0 232	134				
4 632	0.960	0.665	80	$0.127 \pm 0.007$ 0.119 + 0.006	-0.487 + 0.005	4 083 + 0 243	85				
5 559	0.960	0.665	80	$0.113 \pm 0.000$ 0.102 + 0.004	$-0.480 \pm 0.000$	4.602 ± 0.243	97				
75 GPa and	2500 K in the	e [100] directio	on	0.102 ± 0.004	-0.400 ± 0.000	4.052 ± 0.155	01				
2.690	0.934	0.647	40	0 676 + 0 048	-2 490 + 0 024	3 682 + 0 265	68				
3 586	0 934	0 647	40	$0.586 \pm 0.056$	-2 493 + 0 084	$4257 \pm 0.433$	50				
4 483	0.934	0.647	40	$0.519 \pm 0.020$	-2 247 + 0 041	4 328 + 0 181	51				
5 379	0.934	0.647	40	$0.010 \pm 0.020$ $0.490 \pm 0.013$	-2 148 + 0 026	$4.380 \pm 0.131$	51				
75 GPa and 2500 K in the [010] direction											
0.897	2.800	0.647	40	0 679 + 0 074	-2 569 + 0 036	3 786 + 0 417	50				
0.897	3 734	0.647	40	$0.531 \pm 0.025$	$-2.454 \pm 0.036$	4 623 + 0 229	56				
0.897	4 668	0.647	40	$0.001 \pm 0.020$ 0.511 + 0.017	$-2.381 \pm 0.000$	4 657 + 0 174	54				
0.897	5 601	0.647	40	$0.071 \pm 0.017$ 0.475 ± 0.015	$-2.201 \pm 0.001$	4 659 ± 0.174	50				
75 GPa and	1 2500 K in the	e [001] directio	on	0.470 ± 0.010	2.210 ± 0.040	4.000 ± 0.110	00				
0.897	0.934	1 941	40	0 578 + 0 066	-1 963 + 0 027	3 303 + 0 300	114				
0.897	0.004	2 588	40	$0.370 \pm 0.000$ 0.487 ± 0.032	$-1.000 \pm 0.027$ -1.076 ± 0.021	$4.058 \pm 0.000$	53				
0.007	0.004	3 235	40	$0.460 \pm 0.032$	$-1.804 \pm 0.021$	$4.030 \pm 0.272$	52				
0.007	0.004	3 882	40	$0.409 \pm 0.023$	$-1.854 \pm 0.022$	$4.042 \pm 0.220$	50				
75 GPa and	1.000 K in the	a [100] directi	07	$0.432 \pm 0.013$	$-1.004 \pm 0.000$	4.033 ± 0.141	50				
2 722	0 937	0.653	80	0.645 \ 0.002	2 206 \ 0.040	3 4 10 + 0 405	73				
3 630	0.937	0.055	80	$0.045 \pm 0.092$	$-2.200 \pm 0.049$	$3.419 \pm 0.493$	53				
J.030 4 538	0.937	0.053	80	$0.514 \pm 0.046$	$-2.173 \pm 0.000$	$4.220 \pm 0.414$	58				
5 4 4 5	0.037	0.055	80	$0.340 \pm 0.023$	$-2.044 \pm 0.043$	$3.732 \pm 0.100$	20				
110 CBc or	0.937	0.000	tion	0.465 ± 0.015	$-1.991 \pm 0.034$	4.124 ± 0.145	00				
2 506	0.459		00	0.150 . 0.025	0.002 . 0.012	E 666 . 0 996	122				
2.590	0.450	0.020	80	$0.159 \pm 0.025$	$-0.903 \pm 0.013$	$0.000 \pm 0.000$	132				
2.590	0.450	0.020	00 80	$0.149 \pm 0.028$	$-0.905 \pm 0.013$	$6.079 \pm 1.162$	12				
3.401	0.450	0.020	00 80	$0.138 \pm 0.009$	$-0.800 \pm 0.010$	$6.259 \pm 0.394$	109				
5.401	0.450	0.020	00 80	$0.151 \pm 0.010$	$-0.853 \pm 0.014$	$5.055 \pm 0.399$	03				
5.191	0.450	0.020	00 80	$0.115 \pm 0.004$	$-0.819 \pm 0.009$	$7.126 \pm 0.275$	141				
5.191	0.456	0.020	80 80	$0.100 \pm 0.007$	$-0.854 \pm 0.029$	8.528 ± 0.075	37				
2.596	0.916	0.628	80	$0.148 \pm 0.016$	$-0.580 \pm 0.006$	3.926 ± 0.423	181				
2.596	0.916	0.628	80	$0.121 \pm 0.024$	$-0.577 \pm 0.010$	$4.768 \pm 0.958$	116				
3.461	0.916	0.628	80	$0.134 \pm 0.007$	$-0.573 \pm 0.011$	4.264 ± 0.247	108				
4.326	0.916	0.628	80	$0.103 \pm 0.005$	$-0.565 \pm 0.009$	$5.428 \pm 0.251$	117				
5.191	0.916	0.628	80	$0.100 \pm 0.004$	$-0.555 \pm 0.011$	5.549 ± 0.257	109				
5.191	0.916	0.628	80	$0.078 \pm 0.005$	$-0.551 \pm 0.008$	$7.079 \pm 0.498$	73				
110 GPa ar	nd 3250 K in ti	ne [100] direct	tion								
2.636	0.459	0.635	60	$0.774 \pm 0.080$	$-3.605 \pm 0.059$	$4.659 \pm 0.488$	108				
3.514	0.459	0.635	60	$0.694 \pm 0.047$	$-3.448 \pm 0.108$	$4.969 \pm 0.376$	53				
5.271	0.459	0.635	60	0.594 ± 0.026	-3.138 ± 0.070	5.286 ± 0.260	50				
2.636	0.919	0.635	60	0.595 ± 0.081	-2.424 ± 0.046	4.073 ± 0.562	50				
3.514	0.919	0.635	60	0.547 ± 0.023	-2.331 ± 0.022	4.263 ± 0.180	142				
4.393	0.919	0.635	60	0.462 ± 0.016	-2.267 ± 0.037	4.901 ± 0.188	78				
5.271	0.919	0.635	60	0.456 ± 0.013	-2.135 ± 0.033	4.686 ± 0.152	65				
145 GPa ar	nd 2500 K in th	he [100] direct	tion								
2.562	0.907	0.622	40	0.674 ± 0.031	-2.692 ± 0.023	3.997 ± 0.189	110				
3.416	0.907	0.622	40	0.541 ± 0.029	-2.551 ± 0.031	4.718 ± 0.264	74				
4.270	0.907	0.622	40	0.491 ± 0.015	-2.475 ± 0.026	5.043 ± 0.167	58				
5.124	0.907	0.622	40	0.423 ± 0.031	-2.389 ± 0.025	5.644 ± 0.163	62				
145 GPa ar	nd 4000 K in th	he [100] direct	tion								
2.586	0.909	0.626	80	0.548 ± 0.063	-2.355 ± 0.021	4.301 ± 0.493	137				
3.448	0.909	0.626	80	$0.493 \pm 0.038$	-2.349 ± 0.033	$4.765 \pm 0.375$	56				
4.310	0.909	0.626	80	$0.457 \pm 0.030$	-2.228 ± 0.023	4.879 ± 0.325	104				
5.172	0.909	0.626	80	0.391 ± 0.018	-2.271 ± 0.040	5.805 ± 0.282	52				