



Institute for

Shock Physics

WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY

**“DYNAMIC COMPRESSION OF [100] MgF₂
SINGLE CRYSTALS: SHOCK-INDUCED
POLYMORPHISM TO HIGHLY
COORDINATED STRUCTURES”**

I. K. Ocampo, J. M. Winey, Y. Toyoda and T. S. Duffy

DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevB.106.144108

Published: October 25, 2022

Physical Review B

Dynamic compression of [100] MgF₂ single crystals: Shock-induced polymorphism to highly coordinated structures

Authors:

I. K. Ocampo^{1*}, J. M. Winey², Y. Toyoda², T.S. Duffy¹

Affiliations:

¹Department of Geoscience, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ, USA

²Institute for Shock Physics, Washington State University, Pullman, WA, USA

*Corresponding author email: iocampo@princeton.edu

Abstract

AX₂-type compounds exhibit a rich and complex series of phase transitions under compression. The high-pressure polymorphism of rutile-type AX₂ difluorides can be characterized by a typical sequence from rutile-type → CaCl₂-type → HP-PdF₂-type → cotunnite-type. Relative to dioxides, the reduced valence and ionic radius of the F⁻ anion in rutile-type MgF₂ (sellaite) results in lowered transition pressures, making it a useful analogue for SiO₂ and other dioxides. In this study, MgF₂ single crystals were shock compressed along the [100] direction to 24 – 120 GPa using plate impact techniques and wave profiles were measured using laser interferometry. At low stresses (24-44 GPa), we observe features consistent with an elastic-inelastic response, followed by a phase transformation. Peak stress-density states in this stress range are consistent with those expected for the modified fluorite-type (HP-PdF₂) phase or a related structure. At higher stresses (69-91 GPa), we observe a two-wave structure with peak stress-density states consistent with transformation to a denser and likely more highly coordinated phase such as the cotunnite-type structure. At 120 GPa, only a single wave structure is observed, indicating that the wave profile features observed at lower stresses are overdriven.

1. Introduction

Magnesium difluoride (MgF₂) is an archetypal, simple ionic solid and as such, has been extensively studied using theory and experiments to determine its pressure-induced polymorphism [1–6]. Exhibiting wide optical transmission (UV to infrared) and low refractive

index, MgF₂ is commonly used for optical windows and anti-reflective coatings [7]. MgF₂ occurs naturally as the mineral sellaite with the rutile-type ($P4_2/mnm$) structure at ambient conditions. Under quasi-hydrostatic loading at room temperature, MgF₂ has been observed to transform to a CaCl₂-type structure ($Pnmm$) at 9 GPa, a modified fluorite-type structure (HP-PdF₂-type, $Pa\bar{3}$) at 14 GPa, and a α -PbCl₂ or cotunnite-type structure ($Pnma$) above 35 GPa resulting in an increase in cation coordination from 6 (rutile-type) to 9 (cotunnite-type) [1,2,8]. A α -PbO₂-type (distorted rutile) structure has been reported upon pressure release, and at high temperatures (600-750 °C) has been reported to exhibit a narrow region of stability at ~13 GPa [2].

In previous literature, the so-called modified fluorite-type structure with the $Pa\bar{3}$ space group has been described by a variety of names (i.e., pyrite, distorted fluorite, HP-PdF₂), especially in the context of the high-pressure cubic polymorph of SiO₂ [3,9,10]. The pyrite (FeS₂) and high-pressure PdF₂ (HP-PdF₂) structures adopt a face-centered cubic arrangement of cations, but exhibit deviations in the anion lattice position from the ideal fluorite structure. The pyrite-type structure is characterized by anion-anion bonding which is distinctly absent in AX₂-type oxides and difluorides such as SiO₂ and MnF₂ [11,12]. As a result, we refer to the modified fluorite-type cubic structure as the HP-PdF₂-type hereafter.

This observed family of phase transformations is common amongst AX₂ compounds, making MgF₂ isostructural with geophysically relevant materials such as stishovite, a high-pressure polymorph of SiO₂, and rutile, TiO₂ [9,13]. Both stishovite and rutile (along with its high-pressure polymorphs: riesite, akaogiite, and srilankaite) are products recovered at meteorite impact sites [14]. Sellaite has also been observed as inclusions in deep mantle-derived diamonds [15]. To better understand the shock, release, and recovery of mineral assemblages used to characterize the shock conditions during meteorite impacts, knowledge of the response of AX₂-type solids to the pressures, temperatures, and strain rates of meteorite impacts is required.

Relative to dioxides, the reduced valence and ionic radius of the F⁻ anion in difluorides results in elastic weakening, lower melting temperature, and lower phase transition pressures, making them useful analogs for dioxides under the extreme pressure-temperature conditions associated with exoplanetary interiors [1,16]. For example, NaMgF₃ and its breakdown products, NaF and MgF₂,

have recently been proposed as an analogue system for the dissociation of MgSiO_3 , Mg_2SiO_4 , and $\text{Mg}_2\text{Si}_2\text{O}_5$ to $\text{MgO} + \text{SiO}_2$ [8,16,17]. As silica is predicted to undergo a HP-PdF₂-type to cotunnite-type phase transformation at pressures greater than 600 GPa [10,16,18], far exceeding those accessible using standard static loading techniques, low-pressure analogues such as MgF_2 can be used to study these transformation pathways at more readily accessible laboratory conditions.

Limited data are available for the response of MgF_2 to dynamic loading. Bugaeva et al. [19] reported explosively driven plate impact experiments on polycrystalline MgF_2 where shock wave arrivals were measured using an electrical shorting pin method. Although shorting pin methods have been used extensively in the past to measure single-wave Hugoniot states, they do not provide wave profile information. In particular, multi-wave structures – such as those arising due to elastic-inelastic response and/or phase transformations – cannot be properly characterized using this method. Previous continuum-level measurements of the shock response of fluorite-structured difluorides (CaF_2 , PbF_2 , BaF_2) show volume changes suggestive of phase transformations [20–24]. In addition, a recent *in situ* x-ray diffraction study on dynamically compressed porous CaF_2 reported observation of the fluorite-to-cotunnite transformation on nanosecond timescales [22]. Therefore, wave profile measurements are needed to examine phase stability in shock-compressed MgF_2 . Here, we present the results of plate impact experiments to measure wave profiles in MgF_2 shock compressed along the [100] direction to better understand the response of this fundamental material to dynamic loading.

2. Experimental Methods

Magnesium difluoride [100] single crystals were obtained from Optocity (Raleigh, NC). This crystal orientation was chosen due to the low elastic stiffness relative to that along the symmetry axis ($c_{11} = 143.5$ GPa, $c_{33} = 208.8$ GPa) [4]. The samples were double-side polished to a mirror finish with a high degree of flatness and parallelism (< 2 μm variation over the surface). The orientation of each crystal was measured using Laue back reflection imaging and confirmed to be within 1° of the [100] axis. The ambient density (ρ_0) was determined to be 3.179(5) g/cm^3 using the Archimedean method, consistent with values from the literature [1,4]. Ambient longitudinal (C_L) and shear (C_{s1} , C_{s2}) sound speeds were measured to be 6.67(2), 5.50(1), and 4.23(1) km/s, respectively, using the pulse-echo method with 20 MHz transducers. These values are consistent

with those calculated from elastic constants measured at ambient conditions (6.72, 5.52, 4.26 km/s) [25].

A schematic illustration of the target configuration is shown in Fig. 1. A ~100-nm aluminum mirror was vapor deposited on the impact surface of the MgF₂ single crystals. The MgF₂ samples were bonded to [100]-oriented LiF windows. A thin, partially diffuse aluminum mirror was vapor deposited onto the center of the LiF window prior to bonding. Epoxy bonds for all targets were measured to be < 1 μm thick. The sample assemblies were impacted with either an OFE (oxygen free electronic) C101 copper or 1050 aluminum impactor mounted in a polymethylpentene (TPX) projectile and launched by either a powder gun or a two-stage gas gun at the Institute for Shock Physics at Washington State University. Projectile velocities were measured using a velocity optical beam block system with typical precisions of <0.3%. Three non-colinear PDV (Photon Doppler Velocimetry, 1550 nm) [26] probes were radially positioned at 120° intervals and focused onto the sample front surface to record the impact time and projectile tilt as well as transparency of the sample throughout the duration of the experiment. Particle velocity histories at the sample-LiF interface were recorded using a combination VISAR (Velocity Interferometer System for Any Reflector, 532 nm) [27] and PDV probe. Two VISAR channels with differing velocity sensitivities (0.423 km/s/fringe and 1.036 km/s/fringe) were used to unambiguously resolve any discontinuities in the particle velocity history. Wave profiles measured using PDV showed good agreement with those from VISAR. Sample dimensions were chosen to maintain the uniaxial strain condition at the position of the wave profile measurement until the end of the experiment.

3. Results and Discussion

Eight plate impact experiments were performed. The experimental parameters for each shot are shown in Table 1. Wave profiles were measured at the sample-LiF interface and were corrected for the changes in the refractive index of LiF due to shock compression [28]. Figure 2 shows the results from the VISAR measurements; the PDV results are similar. At lower stresses, the measured profiles show three distinct waves, whereas two waves are observed at higher stresses. Only a single wave is observed at the highest stress. To quantitatively analyze the measured wave profiles, the following procedures are used.

Lagrangian shock wave velocities for the different waves in the profiles were determined using the measured thickness of each MgF₂ sample and the transit times as measured using the PDV probe array. *In situ* particle velocities in the MgF₂ sample were determined from the measured MgF₂-LiF interface velocities using an impedance matching analysis [29,30], described below, that incorporated the published LiF Hugoniot curve [28]. Because MgF₂ and LiF have similar shock impedances (Fig. S1 in Supplemental Material [31]), differences between the measured interface velocities and the in-material MgF₂ velocities are small. For profiles exhibiting a multi-wave structure, we approximated the particle velocity history using a sequence of step functions (Fig. S2 [31]) where the jump in particle velocity at each step is positioned at the approximate mid-point of each shock wave arrival. Longitudinal stress (σ_x) – chosen to be positive in compression – and density (ρ) at each step were calculated using the Rankine-Hugoniot jump conditions for the conservation of mass and momentum:

First shock:

$$U_{S,1} = \frac{h}{t_1}, \quad (1)$$

$$\rho_0 U_{S,1} = \rho_1 (U_{S,1} - u_1), \quad (2)$$

$$\sigma_{x,1} = \rho_0 U_{S,1} u_1, \quad (3)$$

Ensuing shocks:

$$U_{S,i} = \frac{\rho_0}{\rho_{i-1}} \left(\frac{h}{t_i} \right), \quad (4)$$

$$\rho_{i-1} U_{S,i} = \rho_i [U_{S,i} - (u_i - u_{i-1})], \quad (5)$$

$$\sigma_{x,i} - \sigma_{x,i-1} = \rho_{i-1} U_{S,i} (u_i - u_{i-1}). \quad (6)$$

In equations 1-6, ρ_0 is the initial density, h is the initial sample thickness, t is the shock wave arrival time, and U_S is the Eulerian shock velocity, which accounts for the sample thickness change due to compression from preceding shock waves. The particle velocities (u) are expressed in the laboratory reference frame and the index (i) is used to denote the arrival times and continuum variables associated with each successive shock in the multi-step analysis. A graphical schematic of this multi-step impedance match analysis is shown in Fig. S3 for the case of a two-step wave [31]. Uncertainties in sample metrology, projectile velocity, transit time, and the measured

interface particle velocities are propagated using a *Monte Carlo* multi-step (MCMS) impedance-match algorithm with 1000000 simulations per experiment. Table 2 summarizes these results.

As shown in in Fig. 2, for wave profiles with peak stresses ranging from 24-44 GPa, we observe an elastic-inelastic response, followed by structure indicating a phase transformation. The speed of the first wave (corresponding to the reciprocal of the arrival time in Fig. 2) in the four experiments in this stress range is consistent with elastically compressed rutile-type MgF₂. The elastic wave amplitude is observed to range from 8.69 – 15.1 GPa, depending on the peak shock stress. After arrival of the elastic wave, the particle velocity decreases significantly prior to the arrival of the intermediate or inelastic wave, indicating considerable stress relaxation. Subsequent to the inelastic wave, the arrival of a third wave suggests the onset of a phase transformation; at the lowest stresses (24 – 27 GPa) the third wave involves significant ramping behavior (Fig. 2). At 44 GPa, the elastic precursor is nearly overdriven and at 59 GPa only a single wave is observed. At 69 GPa, a two-wave structure is again observed. The arrival of the first wave at this stress corresponds to a sharp rise, followed by a second wave that exhibits a ramp-like, time-dependent structure (Fig. 2). The gradual increase in particle velocity associated with the second wave is observed up to 91 GPa (Fig. S4 [31]). At 120 GPa, only a single flat-top wave is observed indicating that the wave profile features observed at lower stress have been overdriven.

The σ_x - V states ($V = 1/\rho$) for the elastic, inelastic, and final shock states from this study are shown in comparison to previous shock and static experiments in Fig. 3. We observe two distinct regions exhibiting multi-wave structured wave profiles. In the lower stress region (24-44 GPa), the first wave is consistent with elastically compressed rutile-type MgF₂ and shows good agreement with results reported for shocked polycrystalline MgF₂ by Bugaeva et al. [19] and reasonable agreement with results obtained under static loading [1,2]. The inelastic (or intermediate) wave in this lower stress region is nearly overdriven at 35 GPa and is entirely overdriven at 44 GPa. The peak σ_x - V states for all four experiments in the low stress region are largely consistent with the HP-PdF₂-type structure reported in both room temperature and laser-heated DAC experiments [1,2,8]. The peak σ_x - V states presented here differ somewhat from those reported previously for polycrystalline MgF₂ [19]. As noted above, the previous Hugoniot measurements used techniques that are insensitive to multi-wave features, likely resulting in errors

in the reported Hugoniot states. Our wave profile measurements provide a more complete characterization of the material response under dynamic loading and yields a more accurate reporting of the final σ_x - V states in the sample.

From 44 to 59 GPa, the final Hugoniot state becomes clearly denser than the room-temperature static data for the HP-PdF₂-type structure suggesting that MgF₂ undergoes a transformation to a denser phase or mixed phase assemblage. Further evidence for a phase change is observed at higher stresses (69-91 GPa), where the two-wave profiles are indicative of a large volume collapse (~4%) phase change as shown in Fig. 3. Candidate crystal structures for this higher density phase include the cotunnite-type structure observed under static loading above 35 GPa at room temperature and the proposed SrI₂ or baddeleyite-type “phase X” observed in laser heated DAC experiments between the stability fields of the HP-PdF₂ and cotunnite-type structures at temperatures above 1500 K [1,8,17]. Grocholski et al. [8] report that no orthorhombic solutions satisfy the expected lattice parameter ratios for the SrI₂-type structure indicating that the monoclinic baddeleyite-type structure (cation coordination of 7) may be the likely structure of phase X. The calculated peak densities from 59 to 120 GPa are greater than those reported for the baddeleyite-type phase X therefore precluding phase X as the high-stress phase. While there is disagreement as to the density of the cotunnite structure from static compression at 38-64 GPa (see Fig. 3), our data are generally consistent with the pressure-volume trend of the cotunnite-type structure [1,8,17], considering the higher temperatures of shock experiments compared to static compression experiments. A single datum for MgF₂ cotunnite reported by Dutta et al. [17] at 160 GPa from decomposition of NaMgF₃ demonstrates the stability of the cotunnite structure to higher stresses and provides additional constraints on the compression curve. Although the HP-PdF₂ to cotunnite-type phase transition requires a large cation coordination increase from 6 to 9 and as a result may be kinetically inhibited, this reconstructive transformation has previously been observed to take place using *in situ* x-ray diffraction in dynamically compressed CaF₂ under the ~hundred nanosecond timescales of plate impact shock compression [22]. Furthermore, when compared to the density-compression behavior of CaF₂ under shock loading (Fig. S5 [31]), our data show remarkable similarity further bolstering the idea that the cotunnite-type structure may also be synthesized in MgF₂ under shock loading. It is worth noting that the rounding observed near the peak of the 91 GPa wave profile (Fig. S4 [31]) is similar to that reported previously for shock compressed silver [32], where the

feature was associated with the melting transition. To determine whether the observed wave profile features at 91 GPa and the associated densification are indicative of a crystalline solid-solid phase transition, melting, or amorphization, *in situ* x-ray diffraction measurements on shock compressed MgF₂ are required. In comparison to the previous shock measurements, our peak σ_x - ρ states are less compressible than those reported in Bugaeva et al. [19] from 60 – 120 GPa, but the divergence between these two datasets decreases with increasing stress. As the accuracy of the experimental and analytical methods reported in Bugaeva et al. [19] is expected to increase at higher stresses where the effects of multi-wave structures are reduced, the high stress convergence of our results and theirs may perhaps imply formation of the same phase for both polycrystalline and single crystal MgF₂ at high shock stresses.

Lastly, our experimental configuration allowed us to monitor the transparency of [100] MgF₂ using the PDV probe array discussed in Section 2. We find that MgF₂ remains transparent at 1550 nm wavelength at stresses up to 120 GPa (see Fig. S6 [31]), which is a surprising finding considering the likely solid-solid phase transformations encountered at lower stresses. Experiments at stresses above 120 GPa are needed to determine the stress limit for transparency in shock compressed MgF₂. Fluorides have long been used as transparent tamper and optical window materials in laser interferometry diagnostics during dynamic compression experiments [28,33–35]. However, the birefringent optical response evident in Fig. S6 [31] likely limits the usefulness of [100] MgF₂ as an optical window for interferometry at high stresses.

3. Summary

Plate impact experiments were conducted on [100] MgF₂ single crystals, reaching peak stresses of 24-120 GPa. Wave profiles were measured using laser interferometry, providing highly accurate stress-density states for dynamically compressed single-crystal MgF₂. We find that between 24-44 GPa, a multi-wave structure is observed, suggesting transformation to a high-pressure phase; the peak stress-density states are most consistent with the HP-PdF₂-type structure (modified fluorite). Above 69 GPa, we observe a time dependent two-wave structure, with peak stress-density states most consistent with the cotunnite-type structure. To definitively identify these high-stress phases, *in situ* x-ray diffraction on shock-compressed MgF₂ is required. We also find that, despite evidence

for multiple phase transitions, [100] MgF₂ remains transparent under shock compression to 120 GPa.

Acknowledgements

We thank N. Arganbright and K. Zimmerman for their invaluable assistance with the plate impact experiments. This work was supported by the U.S. Department of Energy, National Nuclear Security Administration under Cooperative Agreement DE-NA0003957.

Figures




Figure 1. Schematic illustration of the experimental configuration used in the plate impact experiments. (a) Side view and (b) back view of sample assembly and probe configuration.




Figure 2. Particle velocity histories at the MgF₂/LiF interface, corrected for the refractive index change in LiF due to shock compression [28]. Velocity profiles shown are obtained from the VISAR channel having higher velocity resolution (0.423 km/s/fringe). Time is normalized to the sample thickness, so that wave arrivals equate to the reciprocal of the Lagrangian shock velocity. The peak stresses shown are from Table 2.




Figure 3. Longitudinal stress-specific volume states determined in this study are shown as unfilled (initial shocked states), unfilled with crosshairs (intermediate shocked states), and filled (final shocked states) red circles. The dashed red ellipses connect the initial and final states for experiments 4 and 6. For the present data, the error bars are smaller than the size of the marker. Previous shock wave results [19] are shown as filled black circles (uncertainties were not reported). Static compression results are shown as unfilled black markers [1,2,8]. As the static compression experiments are performed under quasi-hydrostatic conditions, they correspond to pressure states. The grey filled region illustrates a range of possible pressure-volume states for quasi-statically compressed cotunnite-type MgF_2 based on existing data.

Table 1. Summary of experimental parameters

Experiment	MgF ₂ thickness (mm) ^a	Impactor	Impactor thickness (mm) ^a	Projectile velocity (km/s) ^b
1 (21-606)	2.074	1050 Al	1.333	2.479
2 (21-608)	2.041	OFE Cu	1.372	1.995
3 (21-607)	2.076	OFE Cu	1.409	2.400
4 (20-2SH60)	2.078	1050 Al	1.426	4.010
5 (21-2SH06)	2.041	1050 Al	1.375	4.967
6 (20-2SH57)	2.077	1050 Al	1.393	5.582
7 (20-2SH61)	2.077	1050 Al	1.411	6.708
8 (21-2SH07)	2.039	OFE Cu	0.971	5.845

^aUncertainties in thickness measurements are 1-2 μm .

^bUncertainties in projectile velocities are < 0.3%.

Table 2. Results from shock wave profile measurements on [100]-oriented MgF₂ single crystals. The particle velocity (u), longitudinal stress (σ_x), and density (ρ) states are determined using the MCMS impedance match algorithm. Eulerian shock velocities (U_s) are determined using PDV transit time measurements and the density compression (ρ_0/ρ) ratio. Numbers shown in parentheses are the one-standard-deviation uncertainty in the last digit(s) in the reported value as determined by the MCMS analysis.

Experiment	Elastic wave				Inelastic wave				Final wave			
	u (km/s)	U_s (km/s)	σ_x (GPa)	ρ (g/cm ³)	u (km/s)	U_s (km/s)	σ_x (GPa)	ρ (g/cm ³)	u (km/s)	U_s (km/s)	σ_x (GPa)	ρ (g/cm ³)
1 (21-606)	0.404(2)	6.77(2)	8.69(5)	3.381(2)	0.839(10)	5.89(2)	17.4(2)	3.651(9)	1.214(9)	4.70(4)	23.8(2)	3.968(11)
2 (21-608)	0.461(3)	6.92(2)	10.1(1)	3.406(2)	0.858(8)	5.96(2)	18.2(2)	3.649(8)	1.351(10)	5.20(2)	27.5(2)	4.031(11)
3 (21-607)	0.524(3)	6.95(2)	11.6(1)	3.438(2)	-	-	-	-	1.630(12)	6.09(2)	34.7(3)	4.200(13)
4 (20-2SH60)	0.667(4)	7.10(3)	15.1(1)	3.509(3)	-	-	-	-	1.975(15)	6.37(2)	44.3(3)	4.415(15)
5 (21-2SH06) ^a	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2.420(19)	7.66(4)	59.0(5)	4.647(23)
6 (20-2SH57) ^a	-	-	-	-	2.523(20)	7.92(3)	63.5(5)	4.666(21)	2.747(22)	5.20(3)	69.0(5)	4.876(26)
7 (20-2SH61) ^a	-	-	-	-	3.106(25)	8.83(4)	87.2(7)	4.904(27)	3.229(26)	5.68(4)	90.6(7)	5.013(29)
8 (21-2SH07) ^a	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3.851(32)	9.72(5)	119.0(10)	5.265(38)

^aElastic wave was overdriven in experiments 5-8.

References

- [1] J. Haines, J. M. Léger, F. Gorelli, D. D. Klug, J. S. Tse, and Z. Q. Li, *X-Ray Diffraction and Theoretical Studies of the High-Pressure Structures and Phase Transitions in Magnesium Fluoride*, Phys. Rev. B **64**, 134110 (2001).
- [2] K. Kusaba and T. Kikegawa, *Stable Phase with the α -PbO₂-type Structure in MgF₂ under High Pressure and High Temperature*, Solid State Communications **148**, 440 (2008).
- [3] J. R. Nelson, R. J. Needs, and C. J. Pickard, *High-Pressure Phases of Group-II Difluorides: Polymorphism and Superionicity*, Phys. Rev. B **95**, 054118 (2017).
- [4] I. S. Zouboulis, F. Jiang, J. Wang, and T. S. Duffy, *Single-Crystal Elastic Constants of Magnesium Difluoride (MgF₂) to 7.4GPa*, Journal of Physics and Chemistry of Solids **75**, 136 (2014).
- [5] K. Nishidate, M. Baba, T. Sato, and K. Nishikawa, *Molecular-Dynamics Studies on the Shock-Induced Phase Transition of a MgF₂ Crystal*, Phys. Rev. B **52**, 3170 (1995).
- [6] V. Kanchana, G. Vaitheeswaran, and M. Rajagopalan, *High-Pressure Structural Phase Transitions in Magnesium Fluoride Studied by Electronic Structure Calculations*, Journal of Alloys and Compounds **352**, 60 (2003).
- [7] M. Motamedi, F. Crisostomo, Y. Yao, S. S. Mofarah, W.-F. Chen, P. Koshy, and R. A. Taylor, *Single-Layer, Anti-Reflective Thin Films of Porous MgF₂ for Solar Thermal Applications*, J. Phys. D: Appl. Phys. **52**, 315501 (2019).
- [8] B. Grocholski, S.-H. Shim, and V. B. Prakapenka, *Stability of the MgSiO₃ Analog NaMgF₃ and Its Implication for Mantle Structure in Super-Earths: Stability of post-perovskite in NaMgF₃*, Geophys. Res. Lett. **37**, n/a (2010).
- [9] S. Wu, K. Umemoto, M. Ji, C.-Z. Wang, K.-M. Ho, and R. M. Wentzcovitch, *Identification of Post-Pyrite Phase Transitions in SiO₂ by a Genetic Algorithm*, Phys. Rev. B **83**, 184102 (2011).
- [10] T. Tsuchiya and J. Tsuchiya, *Prediction of a Hexagonal SiO₂ Phase Affecting Stabilities of MgSiO₃ and CaSiO₃ at Multimegabar Pressures*, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. **108**, 1252 (2011).
- [11] E. Stavrou, Y. Yao, A. F. Goncharov, Z. Konôpková, and C. Raptis, *High-Pressure Structural Study of MnF₂*, Phys. Rev. B **93**, 054101 (2016).
- [12] Y. Kuwayama, K. Hirose, N. Sata, and Y. Ohishi, *Pressure-Induced Structural Evolution of Pyrite-Type SiO₂*, Phys Chem Minerals **38**, 591 (2011).
- [13] O. Tschauner, *High-Pressure Minerals*, American Mineralogist **104**, 1701 (2019).
- [14] M. Miyahara, N. Tomioka, and L. Bindi, *Natural and Experimental High-Pressure, Shock-Produced Terrestrial and Extraterrestrial Materials*, Prog Earth Planet Sci **8**, 59 (2021).
- [15] O. Tschauner, S. Huang, E. Greenberg, V.B. Prakapenka, C. Ma, G.R. Rossman, A.H. Shen, D. Zhang, M. Newville, A. Lanzirrotti et al., *Ice-VII Inclusions in Diamonds: Evidence for Aqueous Fluid in Earth's Deep Mantle*, Science **359**, 1136 (2018).
- [16] K. Umemoto, R. M. Wentzcovitch, D. J. Weidner, and J. B. Parise, *NaMgF₃: A Low-Pressure Analog of MgSiO₃*, Geophys. Res. Lett. **33**, L15304 (2006).
- [17] R. Dutta, E. Greenberg, V. B. Prakapenka, and T. S. Duffy, *Phase Transitions beyond Post-Perovskite in NaMgF₃ to 160 GPa*, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. **116**, 19324 (2019).
- [18] A. R. Oganov, M. J. Gillan, and G. D. Price, *Structural Stability of Silica at High Pressures and Temperatures*, Phys. Rev. B **71**, 064104 (2005).

- [19] V. A. Bugaeva, M. A. Podurets, G. V. Simakov, S. Telegin, and R. F. Trunin, *Dynamic Compressibility and Equations of State of Rutile Structure Minerals*, *Izvestiya, Earth Phys.* L **5**, 19 (1979).
- [20] R. F. Trunin, L. F. Gudarenko, M. V. Zhernokletov, and G. V. Simakov, *Experimental Data on Shock Compressibility and Adiabatic Expansion of Condensed Substances*, RFNC-VNIIEF (RFNC, Sarov, Russia, 2001).
- [21] L. V. Al'tshuler, M. A. Podurets, G. V. Simakov, and R. F. Trunin, *High-Density Forms of Fluorite and Rutile*, *Fiz. Tverd. Tela* **15**, 1436 (1973).
- [22] P. Kalita, P. Specht, S. Root, N. Sinclair, A. Schuman, M. White, A. L. Cornelius, J. Smith, and S. Sinogeikin, *Direct Observations of a Dynamically Driven Phase Transition with in Situ X-Ray Diffraction in a Simple Ionic Crystal*, *Physical Review Letters* **119**, 255701 (2017).
- [23] X. Liu, C. Gao, T. Mashimo, N. Ozaki, W.J. Nellis, G. Yang, H. Huang, S. Morioka, K. Miyanishi, T. Sano et al., *Shock-Induced Polymorphic Transitions of PbF₂ up to 1 TPa and Their Implications for the Universal Behavior of Shocked AX₂ Compounds*, *Phys. Rev. B* **103**, 094106 (2021).
- [24] S. P. Marsh, *LASL Shock Hugoniot Data* (University of California Press, Berkeley, CA, 1980).
- [25] S. Haussühl, *Elastisches und thermoelastisches Verhalten von MgF₂ und MnF₂*, *Phys. Stat. Sol. (b)* **28**, 127 (1968).
- [26] O. T. Strand, D. R. Goosman, C. Martinez, T. L. Whitworth, and W. W. Kuhlow, *Compact System for High-Speed Velocimetry Using Heterodyne Techniques*, *Review of Scientific Instruments* **77**, 083108 (2006).
- [27] L. M. Barker and R. E. Hollenbach, *Laser Interferometer for Measuring High Velocities of Any Reflecting Surface*, *Journal of Applied Physics* **43**, 4669 (1972).
- [28] P. A. Rigg, M. D. Knudson, R. J. Scharff, and R. S. Hixson, *Determining the Refractive Index of Shocked [100] Lithium Fluoride to the Limit of Transmissibility*, *J. Appl. Phys.* **116**, 033515 (2014).
- [29] J. W. Forbes, *Shock Wave Compression of Condensed Matter: A Primer* (Springer Berlin, Heidelberg, Germany, 2012).
- [30] S. J. Turneaure, J. M. Winey, and Y. M. Gupta, *Response of a Zr-Based Bulk Amorphous Alloy to Shock Wave Compression*, *Journal of Applied Physics* **100**, 063522 (2006).
- [31] See Supplemental Material at [URL will be inserted by publisher] for additional figures relevant to the discussion.
- [32] M. K. Wallace, J. M. Winey, and Y. M. Gupta, *Shock Compression of Silver to 300 GPa: Wave Profile Measurements and Melting Transition*, *Phys. Rev. B* **104**, 014101 (2021).
- [33] Y. M. Gupta, *Shock Waves in Condensed Matter* (Springer US, Boston, MA, 1986).
- [34] L. E. Kirsch, S. J. Ali, D. E. Fratanduono, R. G. Kraus, D. G. Braun, A. Fernandez-Pañella, R. F. Smith, J. M. McNaney, and J. H. Eggert, *Refractive Index of Lithium Fluoride to 900 Gigapascal and Implications for Dynamic Equation of State Measurements*, *Journal of Applied Physics* **125**, 175901 (2019).
- [35] D. E. Fratanduono, T. R. Boehly, P. M. Celliers, M. A. Barrios, J. H. Eggert, R. F. Smith, D. G. Hicks, G. W. Collins, and D. D. Meyerhofer, *The Direct Measurement of Ablation Pressure Driven by 351-Nm Laser Radiation*, *Journal of Applied Physics* **110**, 073110 (2011).

- [36] S. Root, M. Desjarlais, R. Lemke, P. Kalita, and S. Alexander, *Sandia National Laboratory Report No. SAND2018-0182C*, (2018).

Supplementary material:

Dynamic compression of [100] MgF₂ single crystals: Shock induced polymorphism to highly coordinated structures

Authors:

I. K. Ocampo^{1*}, J. M. Winey², Y. Toyoda², T.S. Duffy¹

Affiliations:

¹Department of Geoscience, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ, USA

²Institute for Shock Physics, Washington State University, Pullman, WA, USA

*Corresponding author email: iocampo@princeton.edu




Fig. S1. Comparison between the measured shock compressed states in MgF_2 (red circles, *This study*) and LiF Hugoniot curve [28] in the σ_x - u_p plane, demonstrating that the two materials have very similar shock impedance.




Fig. S2. Selected wave profiles and corresponding step functions used in the impedance matching analysis, discussed in Section 3.




Fig. S3. Schematic illustration of the impedance matching analysis [29,30] discussed in Section 3 for the case of a two-step wave profile. The Eulerian shock velocity, U_s , and sample/LiF interface particle velocity, u_{int} , for each step in the two-wave structure are measured and used to determine the in-material stress and particle velocity states in MgF₂. As the particle velocity and stress across the sample/LiF interface must be continuous, the in-material particle velocity, u_1 , and stress, P_1 , behind the first shock can be determined directly via the intersection of the measured Rayleigh line (slope = $\rho_0 U_{s,1}$, shown with the solid red line) with the unloading path which must pass through the measured interface particle velocity, $u_{\text{int},1}$, on the known LiF Hugoniot [28]. We assume that MgF₂ unloads along the same Rayleigh line as the corresponding shock, but with negative slope. Because MgF₂ and LiF have very similar shock impedances (Fig. S1), this is a very good approximation. The density behind the first shock, ρ_1 , is determined using Eq. 2 from the main text. The measured Eulerian shock velocity of the second wave, $U_{s,2}$, and the density behind the first shock ρ_1 define the slope of the Rayleigh line for the second shock (solid green line) which initiates at (u_1, P_1) . Similarly to the case of the first wave, the intersection of the Rayleigh line for the second wave with its unloading path which must pass through the measured interface particle velocity, $u_{\text{int},2}$, on the LiF Hugoniot, provides the in-

material particle velocity, u_2 . The stress and density behind the second shock are calculated as described in Eqs. 5 and 6 in the main text.




Fig. S4. Expanded view of the wave profiles from experiments 5-8 highlighting the two-wave structure at both 68.9 and 90.6 GPa.




Fig. S5. Comparison of the stress-density responses of selected AF₂ compounds (A = Mg, Ca, Pb, Ba) under shock loading [8,20,21,23,36]. Results from this study are shown in the unfilled and filled red circles, similar to Fig. 3. The inset shows the relative size of the Mg²⁺, Ca²⁺, Pb²⁺, and Ba²⁺ cations in the rutile-type MgF₂ and fluorite-type CaF₂, PbF₂, and BaF₂.




Fig. S6. Spectrogram of PDV signal obtained from a short-time Fourier transform of the PDV signal recorded at the impact surface in experiment 21-2SH07 (119 GPa). The uncorrected/apparent particle velocity profile at the front surface is shown in the solid blue line. The arrival of this wave corresponds to impact at the probe position. Oscillations at the peak state are likely due to optical birefringence from the unshocked MgF₂. Shockwave breakout and the ensuing wave profiles as recorded by the MgF₂/LiF interface PDV and VISAR probes shown in the solid black and green lines, respectively. PDV and VISAR are in very good agreement with one another. The transit time of the shock wave in the sample is denoted by Δt .