

## LIST OF FIGURES

- Fig.1.1.** Publications on lead-free piezoceramics in refereed journals for the time span from 1950 to November 2008. 3
- Fig.1.2.** Relative cost and toxicity of the elements of the periodic Table. 3
- Fig.1.3.** Cubic prototype perovskite oxide  $ABO_3$  unit cell. 6
- Fig.1.4.** Diagram of polarization process of ferroelectrics and hysteresis of polarization (P) vs. electric field (E) loop. 8
- Fig.1.5.** Electric-field induced polarization hysteresis loop of Anti-Ferroelectrics. 8
- Fig.1.6.** Temperature dependent real and imaginary part of dielectric permittivity measured at different frequency in a crystal of the prototypical relaxor  $Pb(Mg_{1/3}Nb_{2/3})O_3$ . 13
- Fig.1.7.** (a) Phase diagram of PZT piezoceramics (b) dielectric constant and planar coupling coefficient vs. composition. 17
- Fig.1.8.** (a) Phase diagram of PZT and (b) PMN-PT. 18
- Fig.1.9.** Observed (circles), calculated (continuous curve), and difference (solid line below the spectrum) room temperature powder XRD pattern of BMT synthesised at high pressure. The vertical bars correspond to the peak positions. 20
- Fig.1.10.** Temperatures vs. compositions Phase diagram of BMT-PT system. 21
- Fig.1.11.** (a) Room temperature variation of  $k_{33}$  as a function of composition for BMT-PT, (b) Piezoelectric coefficient  $d_{33}$  for BMT-PT. 22
- Fig.1.12.** Dielectric constant measured at several frequencies plotted as a function of temperature for various compositions in the BMT-PT system. 23

- Fig.1.13.** Dielectric permittivity and losses at 500 kHz as a function of temperature for BMT-PT ceramics sintered at 1100°C. 24
- Fig.1.14.** Variation of lattice parameters vs composition for  $\text{Bi}(\text{Mg}_{1/2}\text{Zr}_{1/2})\text{O}_3\text{-PbTiO}_3$  system. Shaded area indicates the MPB region. 27
- Fig.1.15.** Phase diagram of the BMZ-PT ceramics constructed from the impedance (stars) and dielectric (open circles) data. Inset shows room temperature value of the dielectric constant vs  $\text{PbTiO}_3$  concentration. 28
- Fig.1.16.** P-E hysteresis curve for the 0.45BMZ-0.55PT ceramics measured at room temperature. 29
- Fig.1.17.** Frequency dependence of the real ( $\epsilon'$ ) and imaginary ( $\epsilon''$ ) parts of the complex dielectric constant of BMZ-PT ceramics at room temperature for (a)  $x=0.57$  and (b)  $x=0.56$ . 30
- Fig.1.18.** Dielectric constant measured at several frequencies as a function of temperature for various compositions in the  $(1-x)\text{Bi}(\text{Mg}_{1/2}\text{Zr}_{1/2})\text{O}_3\text{-}x\text{PbTiO}_3$  system. 31
- Fig.2.1.** Schematic diagram of X-ray diffraction. 35
- Fig.2.2.** The XRD patterns of starting ingredients (a)  $\text{Bi}_2\text{O}_3$ , (b)  $\text{ZrO}_2$ , (c)  $\text{PbO}$ , (d)  $\text{MgO}$  and (d)  $\text{TiO}_2$ . 39
- Fig.2.3.** XRD profiles of BMT-PT ceramic with  $x=0.37$  calcined at 750°C, 800°C and 850°C for 6h. 41
- Fig.2.4.** XRD patterns of 0.45BMZ-0.55PT piezoceramic calcined at 700°C, 750°C and 775°C for 6h. 42
- Fig.2.5.** (a) XRD patterns of BMT-PT for different compositions sintered at 950°C for 3h. 44

- Fig.2.5.** (b) XRD patterns of BMZ-PT for different compositions sintered at 975°C for 3h. 45
- Fig.2.6.** (a) SEM image of BMT-PT for composition  $x=0.40$ , and (b) SEM image of BMZ-PT for composition  $x=0.56$ . 47
- Fig.2.7.** (a) SEM image and EDS spectrum of BMT-PT for the composition with  $x=0.35$ . 47
- Fig.2.7.** (b) SEM image and EDS spectrum of BMZ-PT for the composition with  $x=0.56$ . 49
- Fig.3.1.** Powder x-ray diffraction patterns of BMT-PT piezoceramics with compositions  $x=0.28, 0.30, 0.31, 0.32, 0.33, 0.34, 0.35, 0.36, 0.37, 0.38, 0.40,$  and  $0.45$ , sintered at 950°C. 59
- Fig.3.2.** Evolution of the XRD profiles of the pseudocubic (110), (111) and (200) reflections (corresponding to Cu  $K_{\alpha 1}$  radiation) for various compositions of BMT-PT at room temperature. 61
- Fig.3.3.** Experimentally observed (dots), Rietveld calculated (continuous line) and their difference (continuous bottom line) XRD profiles obtained after Rietveld analysis of the powder XRD data for pseudocubic (110), (111), and (200) reflection of  $0.68\text{Bi}(\text{Mg}_{1/2}\text{Ti}_{1/2})\text{O}_3\text{-}0.32\text{PbTiO}_3$  using monoclinic (Pm), monoclinic (Cm) and rhombohedral (R3m) structures. The vertical tick-marks above the difference plot show the peak positions. 63
- Fig.3.4.** Experimentally observed (dots), Rietveld calculated (continuous line) and their difference (continuous bottom line) profiles obtained after Rietveld analysis of the powder XRD data for  $0.68\text{Bi}(\text{Mg}_{1/2}\text{Ti}_{1/2})\text{O}_3\text{-}0.32\text{PbTiO}_3$  using monoclinic (Pm), structures. The vertical tick-marks above the difference plot show the peak positions. 64
- Fig.3.5.** Experimentally observed (dots), Rietveld calculated (continuous line) and their difference (continuous bottom line) profiles obtained after Rietveld

analysis of the powder XRD data for pseudocubic (110), (111), and (200) reflection of  $0.65\text{Bi}(\text{Mg}_{1/2}\text{Ti}_{1/2})\text{O}_3\text{-}0.35\text{PbTiO}_3$  using monoclinic+tetragonal ( $\text{Pm}+\text{P4mm}$ ) and rhombohedral+tetragonal ( $\text{R3m}+\text{P4mm}$ ) structures. The vertical tick-marks above the difference plot show the peak positions. 67

**Fig.3.6.** Experimentally observed (dots), Rietveld calculated (continuous line) and their difference (continuous bottom line) profiles obtained after Rietveld analysis of the powder XRD data for  $0.65\text{Bi}(\text{Mg}_{1/2}\text{Ti}_{1/2})\text{O}_3\text{-}0.35\text{PbTiO}_3$  with  $x=0.35$  using monoclinic+tetragonal ( $\text{Pm}+\text{P4mm}$ ), structures. The vertical tick-marks above the difference plot show the peak positions. 68

**Fig.3.7.** Experimentally observed (dots), Rietveld calculated (continuous line) and their difference (continuous bottom line) profiles obtained after Rietveld analysis of the powder XRD data for  $0.55\text{Bi}(\text{Mg}_{1/2}\text{Ti}_{1/2})\text{O}_3\text{-}0.45\text{PbTiO}_3$  using tetragonal ( $\text{P4mm}$ ), structures. The vertical tick-marks above the difference plot show the peak positions. 70

**Fig.3.8.** Variation of lattice parameters with composition for BMT-PT ceramics. 72

**Fig.3.9.** Variation of monoclinic phase fraction with composition for BMT-PT ceramics. 72

**Fig.3.10.** Powder XRD patterns of  $0.65\text{BMT}\text{-}0.35\text{PT}$  ceramics with heat treatment temperature. 74

**Fig.3.11.** Evolution of XRD profile for pseudocubic (110), (111) and (200) reflections of  $0.65\text{BMT}\text{-}0.35\text{PT}$  piezoceramics with heat treatment temperature. 75

**Fig.3.12.** Experimentally observed (dots), Rietveld calculated (continuous line), and their difference (continuous bottom line) profiles for pseudocubic (110), (111) and (200) reflections obtained after Rietveld analysis of XRD data for  $0.65\text{BMT}\text{-}0.35\text{PT}$  using coexistence monoclinic+tetragonal

(Pm+P4mm) structures for various heat treatment temperatures. The vertical tick marks above the bottom line show peak position. 77

**Fig.3.13.** Variation of lattice parameter with heat treatment temperature for 0.65BMT-0.35PT. 79

**Fig.3.14.** Variation of monoclinic phase fraction with increasing heat treatment temperature for 0.65BMT-0.35PT. 80

**Fig.3.15.** SEM images of 0.65BMT-0.35PT ceramics heat treated at temperatures (a) 850°C, (b) 900°C, (c) 950°C, and (d) 1000°C. 83

**Fig.3.16.** Powder XRD patterns of  $(1-x)\text{Bi}(\text{Mg}_{1/2}\text{Zr}_{1/2})\text{O}_3-x\text{PbTiO}_3$  ceramics with  $x=0.55, 0.56, 0.57, 0.58, 0.59$  and  $0.60$  sintered at  $975^\circ\text{C}$ . Weak reflections marked by an asterisk are due to the impurity phase. Miller indices are given for tetragonal structure with  $x=0.60$ . 85

**Fig.3.17.** Pseudocubic (110), (111) and (200) powder XRD profiles of  $(1-x)\text{Bi}(\text{Mg}_{1/2}\text{Zr}_{1/2})\text{O}_3-x\text{PbTiO}_3$  ceramics for the compositions with  $x=0.55, 0.56, 0.57, 0.58, 0.59$  and  $0.60$ . The peaks marked with "C" and "T" correspond to cubic and tetragonal phases, respectively. 86

**Fig.3.18.** Experimentally observed (dots), Rietveld calculated (continuous line) and difference (continuous bottom line) profiles for  $(1-x)\text{Bi}(\text{Mg}_{1/2}\text{Zr}_{1/2})\text{O}_3-x\text{PbTiO}_3$  with  $x=0.56$  obtained after Rietveld analysis of the powder XRD data using cubic (Pm3m) structures. The vertical tick marks above the difference plot show the peak positions. The insets illustrate the goodness of fit. 89

**Fig.3.19.** Experimentally observed (dots), Rietveld calculated (continuous line) and difference (continuous bottom line) profiles for  $(1-x)\text{Bi}(\text{Mg}_{1/2}\text{Zr}_{1/2})\text{O}_3-x\text{PbTiO}_3$  with  $x=0.59$  obtained after Rietveld analysis of the powder XRD data using tetragonal+cubic (P4mm+Pm3m) structures. The

vertical tick marks above the difference plot show the peak positions. The insets illustrate the goodness of fit. 92

**Fig.3.20.** Experimentally observed (dots), Rietveld calculated (continuous line) and difference (continuous bottom line) profiles for  $(1-x)\text{Bi}(\text{Mg}_{1/2}\text{Zr}_{1/2})\text{O}_3-x\text{PbTiO}_3$  with  $x=0.60$  obtained after Rietveld analysis of the powder XRD data using tetragonal ( $P4mm$ ) structures. The vertical tick marks above the difference plot show the peak positions. The insets illustrate the goodness of fit. 94

**Fig.3.21.** Compositional variation of cubic ( $a_c$ ), tetragonal ( $a_T$ ,  $c_T$ ) lattice parameters and tetragonal phase fraction ( $P_T$ ) for  $(1-x)\text{Bi}(\text{Mg}_{1/2}\text{Zr}_{1/2})\text{O}_3-x\text{PbTiO}_3$  ceramics obtained after Rietveld analysis. Continuous lines are guides for the eyes. 96

**Fig.4.1.** Evolution of the pseudocubic (110), (111) and (200) XRD profile with varying poling field strength for 0.72BMT-0.28PT ceramics. 105

**Fig.4.2.** Experimentally observed (dots), Rietveld calculated (continuous line) and their difference (continuous bottom line) profiles obtained after Le-Bail analysis for XRD data of 0.72BMT-0.28PT poled at 30kV/cm using monoclinic structure in the space group  $Pm$ . The vertical tick marks above the bottom line show peak positions. 106

**Fig.4.3.** Evolution of the pseudocubic (110), (111) and (200) XRD profile with varying the poling field strength for 0.62BMT-0.38PT ceramics. 108

**Fig.4.4.** Experimentally observed (dots), Rietveld calculated (continuous line) and their difference (continuous bottom line) profiles obtained after Le-Bail analysis of XRD data for 0.62BMT-0.38PT poled at 30kV/cm using coexisting monoclinic and tetragonal structures with space group  $Pm+P4mm$ . The vertical tick marks above the bottom line show peak positions. 109

**Fig.4.5.** Evolution of the pseudocubic (110), (111) and (200) XRD profile with varying poling field strength for 0.65BMT-0.35PT ceramics. 111

**Fig.4.6.** Experimentally observed (dots), Rietveld calculated (continuous line) and their difference (continuous bottom line) profiles obtained after Le-Bail analysis of XRD data for 0.65BMT-0.35PT using coexisting monoclinic and tetragonal structures with space group  $Pm\bar{4}2_1$ . The vertical tick marks above the bottom line show peak positions. 112

**Fig.4.7.** Polarization (P) - Electric (E) field hysteresis loops for the unpoled samples of  $(1-x)\text{Bi}(\text{Mg}_{1/2}\text{Ti}_{1/2})\text{O}_3-x\text{PbTiO}_3$  ceramics with  $x=0.28, 0.35, 0.38,$  and  $0.40$ . 114

**Fig.4.8.** Polarization (P) - Electric (E) field hysteresis loops for the  $(1-x)\text{Bi}(\text{Mg}_{1/2}\text{Ti}_{1/2})\text{O}_3-x\text{PbTiO}_3$  ceramics with  $x=0.28, 0.35, 0.38,$  and  $0.40$  poled at  $30\text{ kV/cm}$ . 114

**Fig.4.9.** Variation in the electromechanical coupling coefficient ( $k_p$ ) with composition for  $(1-x)\text{Bi}(\text{Mg}_{1/2}\text{Zr}_{1/2})\text{O}_3-x\text{PbTiO}_3$  ceramics. The continuous line is a visual guide. 117

**Fig.4.10.** Evolution of the pseudocubic (111), (200) and (220) XRD profile with varying poling field strength for 0.45BMZ-0.55PT ceramics. 119

**Fig.4.11.** Experimentally observed (dots), Rietveld calculated (continuous line) and their difference (continuous bottom line) profiles obtained after Le-Bail analysis of XRD data for 0.45BMZ-0.55PT. The vertical tick marks above the bottom line show peak positions. 120

**Fig.4.12.** Evolution of the pseudocubic (111), (200) and (220) XRD profile with varying the poling field strength for 0.39BMZ-0.61PT ceramics. 122

**Fig.4.13.** Experimentally observed (dots), Rietveld calculated (continuous line) and their difference (continuous bottom line) profiles obtained after Le-

- Bail analysis of XRD data for 0.39BMZ-0.61PT. The vertical tick marks above the bottom line show peak positions. 122
- Fig.4.14.** Evolution of the pseudocubic (110), (200) and (220) XRD profile with varying the poling field strength for 0.42BMZ-0.58PT ceramics. 124
- Fig.4.15.** Experimentally observed (dots), Rietveld calculated (continuous line) and their difference (continuous bottom line) profiles obtained after Le-Bail analysis of XRD data for 0.42BMZ-0.58PT. The vertical tick marks above the bottom line show peak positions. 124
- Fig.4.16.** Variation of lattice parameter with composition (x) of BMZ-PT piezoceramics poled at an electric field 30kV/cm along with the unpoled sample. 126
- Fig.4.17.** P-E hysteresis loop for the BMZ-PT ceramics with (a) x=0.56, (b) x=0.58 and (c) x=0.60 recorded at 50Hz. 128
- Fig.4.18.** Temperature dependent Polarization (P) - Electric field (E) hysteresis loops of unpoled BMZ-PT piezoceramics with the compositions (a) x=0.55, (b) x=0.58 and (c) x=0.60. 131
- Fig.5.1.** Evolution of XRD profiles for 0.68BMT-0.32PT piezoceramics with temperature. 142
- Fig.5.2.** Evolution of pseudocubic (110), (111) and (200) XRD profiles for 0.68BMT-0.32PT below room temperature. 143
- Fig.5.3.** Evolution of XRD profiles for 0.65BMT-0.35PT piezoceramics with temperature. 145
- Fig.5.4.** Evolution of pseudocubic (110) and (111) XRD profiles for 0.65BMT-0.35PT with temperature. 146
- Fig.5.5.** Temperature dependence of real parts ( $\epsilon'$ ), of dielectric constant and loss tangent ( $\tan\delta$ ) in the temperature range 5K to 300K measured at various

frequency from 5Hz to  $7 \times 10^5$ Hz in BMT-PT piezoceramics for the compositions with  $x=0.32, 0.37,$  and  $0.40$ . 148

**Fig.5.6.** Arrhenius fits for the relaxation time, as obtained from anomaly in the loss tangent ( $\tan\delta$ ) data in BMT-PT for the compositions with  $x=0.32, 0.37$  and  $0.40$  BMT-PT. 150

**Fig.5.7.** Temperature dependence of real parts ( $\epsilon'$ ), of dielectric constant and loss tangent ( $\tan\delta$ ) in the temperature range 5K to 300K measured at various frequency from 5Hz to  $7 \times 10^5$ Hz in BMZ-PT piezoceramics for the compositions with  $x=0.55, 0.58,$  and  $0.60$ . 152

**Fig.5.8** Arrhenius fits for the relaxation time, as obtained from anomaly in loss tangent ( $\tan\delta$ ) data in BMZ-PT for the compositions with  $x=0.58,$  and  $0.60$ . 153