



HAL
open science

The structure and possible origins of stacking faults in gamma-yttrium disilicate

Ian Maclaren, Gunther Richter

► **To cite this version:**

Ian Maclaren, Gunther Richter. The structure and possible origins of stacking faults in gamma-yttrium disilicate. *Philosophical Magazine*, 2009, 89 (02), pp.169-181. <10.1080/14786430802562132>. <hal-00513989>

HAL Id: hal-00513989

<https://hal.science/hal-00513989v1>

Submitted on 1 Sep 2010

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



HAL Authorization



The structure and possible origins of stacking faults in gamma-yttrium disilicate

Journal:	<i>Philosophical Magazine & Philosophical Magazine Letters</i>
Manuscript ID:	TPHM-08-Aug-0284
Journal Selection:	Philosophical Magazine
Date Submitted by the Author:	12-Aug-2008
Complete List of Authors:	MacLaren, Ian; University of Glasgow, Physics and Astronomy Richter, Gunther; Max-Planck-Institut für Metallforschung
Keywords:	ceramics, HRTEM, image simulation, planar defects, TEM
Keywords (user supplied):	yttrium silicates



The structure and possible origins of stacking faults in gamma-yttrium disilicate

I. MacLaren^{a*} and G. Richter^b

^a*Department of Physics and Astronomy, Faculty of Physical Sciences, University of Glasgow, Glasgow G12 8QQ, UK;* ^b*Max-Planck-Institut für Metallforschung, Heisenbergstr. 3, D-70569 Stuttgart, Germany*

Parallel stacking faults on (010) planes are frequently observed in hot-pressed $\text{Y}_2\text{Si}_2\text{O}_7$. A combination of conventional dark-field imaging and high-resolution transmission electron microscopy was used to investigate the structure of these faults and it was found that they consist of the repeat of one layer of the two layer γ - $\text{Y}_2\text{Si}_2\text{O}_7$ structure with an associated in-plane rigid body displacement. The resulting structure was confirmed by image simulation of high-resolution images from two perpendicular projections. A model for the formation of the stacking faults is proposed as a consequence of a transformation from β - $\text{Y}_2\text{Si}_2\text{O}_7$ to γ - $\text{Y}_2\text{Si}_2\text{O}_7$ in the hot pressing.


Keywords: Yttrium silicates; stacking faults, TEM; image simulation

* Corresponding author, email: ian.maclaren@physics.org
Formerly at *Institut für Materialwissenschaft, TU-Darmstadt, Petersenstr. 23, D-64287 Darmstadt, Germany* and *Max-Planck-Institut für Metallforschung, Heisenbergstr. 5, D-70569 Stuttgart, Germany* where large portions of the work reported in this paper were carried out

1. Introduction

Yttrium silicates have excellent high temperature mechanical properties and display these until very close to their melting points. They are also fully oxidised and do not contain volatile components and thus are suitable for use in highly oxidising environments. For this reason, they have been investigated as possible matrix materials for oxide-oxide ceramic matrix composites [1,2] and as oxidation barrier coatings for non-oxide ceramic matrix composites [3-6].

Yttrium disilicate, along with the rare-earth disilicates, displays a remarkable polymorphism and this is well reviewed by Liddell and Thompson [7] and by Felsche [8]. Four well-characterised phases: α (triclinic), β (monoclinic), γ (monoclinic), and δ (orthorhombic) are known to exist. Furthermore, another less well characterised phase, normally denoted γ , is also known [7,9], and often occurs in Y-doped SiAlONs [10,11]. Lastly, two different forms of δ were distinguished by Dinger *et al.* [12] using high-resolution TEM. The four well-characterised phases have been shown to be in the relation:



by Ito and Johnson [13]. These temperatures are however affected by preparation techniques and may vary somewhat [10]. Moreover, impurities or doping elements may affect the phase equilibria since in Si_3N_4 and SiAlONs, the main observed phases are normally γ , β and δ [11,12,14] and other phases such as α and γ are not seen.

One major problem, however, with yttrium disilicate is that the yttria and silica react very slowly with one another and it is therefore difficult to achieve phase equilibrium, especially when prepared by mixed oxide methods. Thus, the precursor powder for the ceramic studied in this work was prepared by a chemical synthesis

1
2
3 route [1], to ensure atomic scale mixing of the SiO_2 and Y_2O_3 complexes prior to
4
5 calcination and sintering. In view of the difficulty in sintering such materials, as for
6
7 instance typified in the work of Aparicio *et al.* [4] hot pressing was used to produce
8
9 $\text{Y}_2\text{Si}_2\text{O}_7$ ceramics. This study then concentrates on the structure and origins of the
10
11 frequently observed planar faults in the resulting material, using transmission electron
12
13 microscopy as the primary experimental tool.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 **2. Materials preparation and experimental procedure**

22 Amorphous yttrium disilicate precursor powders were prepared from yttrium
23 acetate and tetraethylorthosilicate as described previously [1,2]. These were then
24 mixed with 3 wt. % LiF and then hot pressed at 10 MPa and 1600 °C resulting in the
25 formation of a dark-coloured plate with a density of 3.48 g cm^{-3} corresponding to 86
26
27 % of the theoretical density of $\gamma\text{-Y}_2\text{Si}_2\text{O}_7$.
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 The material was prepared for transmission electron microscopy (TEM) using
35 a standard procedure of cutting, grinding and polishing from both sides, doubled-
36 sided dimpling, and argon ion milling (Gatan PIPS, 5 kV, $\pm 4^\circ$), followed by carbon
37 coating to prevent charging. Conventional diffraction contrast TEM observations
38 were performed with a JEOL 2000FX and a Philips CM20, both operated at 200 kV
39 (both Stuttgart). High-resolution TEM (HRTEM) was performed with a JEOL
40 4000EX operated at 400 kV (MPI-Stuttgart), the Stuttgart ARM operated at 1250 kV
41 and a JEOL 3010 equipped with a Gatan Image Filter (GIF) operated at 297 kV (TU-
42 Darmstadt).
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54 Approximate defocus values for HRTEM images were determined at the
55 microscope using the deviation from the minimum contrast condition and from
56 analysis of the contrast at amorphous regions at the specimen edges using the NCEM
57
58
59
60

Focus Determination Package [15] for the Gatan Digital Micrograph software package. These and other parameters were then refined using the Iterative Digital Image Matching method [16] where the cross-correlation between experimental and simulated images of perfect crystal is maximised by iteratively varying the various electron optical parameters. Once the parameters had been optimised, experimental defect images were compared with those simulated from a model defect structure, and atoms were then allowed to relax using a similar iterative procedure to maximise the cross-correlation, thus making possible the determination of the atomic structure of defects.

3. Structural details of the yttrium disilicates

As stated above the four well-characterised phase of $Y_2Si_2O_7$. These are briefly summarised in Table 1 below. The structural parameters are taken from Liddell and Thompson [7], with the exception of those for γ - $Y_2Si_2O_7$, which are taken from a more recent study of Leonyuk *et al.* [17]. The information on bonding was derived from the earlier review article of Felsche [8]. Since the majority of this paper concerns the γ - $Y_2Si_2O_7$ phase, two important projections of this crystal structure, [100] and [001], are shown in Figure 1. This shows two layers of Si_2O_7 double tetrahedra along the length of the long b-axis alternating in a zigzag fashion.

Structure	α - $Y_2Si_2O_7$	β - $Y_2Si_2O_7$	γ - $Y_2Si_2O_7$	δ - $Y_2Si_2O_7$
Symmetry	Triclinic	Monoclinic	Monoclinic	Orthorhombic
Space group	$P\bar{1}$	C2/m	$P2_1/c$	$Pna2_1$

a	6.59 Å	6.875 Å	4.694 Å	13.66 Å
b	6.64 Å	8.970 Å	10.856 Å	5.020 Å
c	12.25 Å	4.721 Å	5.588 Å	8.152 Å
α	94.0°	90°	90°	90°
β	89.2°	101.74°	96°	90°
γ	93.1°	90°	90°	90°
Si-O bonding	Si ₃ O ₁₀ triple corner sharing tetrahedra and SiO ₄ single tetrahedra	Si ₂ O ₇ double corner sharing tetrahedra	Si ₂ O ₇ double corner sharing tetrahedra	Si ₂ O ₇ double corner sharing tetrahedra

Table 1: Crystal structure details for the main crystalline Y₂Si₂O₇ polymorphs

4. Results and analysis

4.1. Long parallel faults

As reported previously [18], the microstructure of the hot-pressed compact consists of grains having the γ -Y₂Si₂O₇ structure, containing approximately spherical glassy inclusions and crossed by numerous planar faults, all of which lie predominantly on the same crystallographic plane. The grains have a composition close to the stoichiometric Y₂Si₂O₇ composition, with perhaps a slight tendency to small Si excesses, and the glassy inclusions are primarily SiO₂ with about 2.5 cat % Y present. This microstructure is shown in Figure 2, which shows clearly the frequent

1
2
3
4 parallel planar faults as fine lines. In every case examined, the grains displayed the γ -
5
6 $\text{Y}_2\text{Si}_2\text{O}_7$ structure as for instance illustrated by the indexed diffraction pattern of
7
8 Figure 3.
9

10
11 Figure 4 shows dark field TEM images of a stacking fault in an yttrium disilicate
12 grain. In Figure 4a taken using the $20\bar{2}$ diffraction vector, the fault is clearly visible
13 and inclined to the beam direction. The majority of the fault lies on one
14 crystallographic plane, although two steps on other planes can be seen (A and B).
15 The fault terminates at a partial dislocation (D). A silica-glass inclusion is also visible
16 (G). When the fault is imaged with the 040 diffraction vector as shown in Figure 4b it
17 is edge-on, out-of-contrast and lies perpendicular to the diffraction vector. The partial
18 dislocation is, however, still in contrast, and some residual contrast is shown at step
19 A, suggesting a different local relaxation at the fault on this plane. Other studies
20 confirm this and show that the faults lie primarily on the (010) planes and that $\mathbf{g}\cdot\mathbf{R}$ is
21 integer or near-integer for $\mathbf{g} = 040$.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36
37 In order to understand why the faults arise on the (010) planes it is necessary to
38 revisit the crystal structure. As may be seen in Figure 1, the structure of gamma
39 yttrium disilicate consists of a zigzag structure of Si_2O_7 double tetrahedra along the b-
40 axis. Perpendicular to this, there are gaps every half unit cell. Thus, it would be easy
41 to remove one of the sets of double tetrahedra resulting in the repeat of the same
42 orientation of double tetrahedra. In this case, no significant disruption would be
43 caused to the double tetrahedra and all that would be required would be a suitable
44 rigid body displacement at the fault in order to maintain good bonding and minimise
45 electrostatic repulsion across the fault.
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56

57
58 To determine the details of the stacking fault structure, it is most convenient to use
59 high-resolution transmission electron microscopy to image the stacking faults edge-on
60

1
2
3 at atomic resolution. Figure 5a shows an HRTEM image of a stacking fault taken
4 along the [100] zone axis of the crystal. The unit cells are shown in outline along
5 with the zigzag structure of the layers. It is clear to see that a layer is repeated at the
6 fault core, as expected. The rigid body displacement at the interface in the plane
7 perpendicular to [100] could also be measured by measuring the displacement of the
8 unit cells on the one side of the fault with respect to those on the other side. Figure 5b
9 shows an HRTEM image of the same boundary taken along the almost perpendicular
10 [001] zone axis. Again a zigzag structure is shown and again the rigid body
11 displacement in this plane could be measured. Combining these two measurements of
12 the rigid body displacement the fault displacement vector, \mathbf{R} , was determined to be
13 [0.26, 0.48, -0.73]. This diffraction vector would also give $\mathbf{g}\cdot\mathbf{R} \approx \text{integer}$ for $\mathbf{g} = 040$,
14 thus giving the contrast extinction in diffraction contrast noted in Fig 4b. Thus, the
15 diffraction contrast TEM and HRTEM results are in good agreement. Using this \mathbf{R}
16 vector a model structure for the fault could be constructed and this is shown in Figure
17 6, once again using the two projections [100] and [001].

18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39 In order to test this stacking fault structure, image simulations were performed
40 for each of the images of Figs 5a and 5b. Firstly, the image simulation was compared
41 with the experimental image for an area of perfect crystal near the fault and the
42 electron optical parameters iteratively changed to optimise the cross-correlation. The
43 resulting parameters are shown in Table 2.

	Fig 5a – [100] projection	Fig 5b – [001] projection
Microscope	JEOL 4000EX (Stuttgart)	JEOL 3010 (Darmstadt)
Sample thickness	9.1 nm	11.4 nm
Defocus	-72 nm	-52 nm

2-fold astigmatism	7.5 nm @ 10.3°	4.3 nm @ 104°
3-fold astigmatism	71 nm @ 6.5°	249 nm @ 32°
Coma	0.3 nm @ 0.8°	299.6 nm @ 118.4°

Table 2: Iteratively determined electron optical parameters for the images of Figures 5a and 5b.

The tabulated parameters were then used in the simulation of the fault images. In both cases 10 unit cells along the fault were averaged from the experimental images to provide a better signal to noise ratio for the comparison. The experimental and simulated images were then compared with one another and in both cases showed extremely high cross-correlation coefficients, demonstrating that the model structure and displacement vector, \mathbf{R} , are extremely good. Some attempts were made to change \mathbf{R} slightly but these always resulted in reduced cross-correlation coefficient. The Y and Si atoms close to the fault were then allowed to relax in the simulation until the cross-correlation was maximised resulting in cross-correlations of 94.3 % and 92 % for the images of Figures 5a and 5b, respectively. The experimental, simulated and difference images are then shown in Figures 7a and 7b, respectively. A colour representation was used to enhance the otherwise very low contrast difference images. These show the extremely good match between the simulated structures and the experimental images and demonstrate that we can have confidence in the measured \mathbf{R} vector and associated model structure of Figure 6.

4.2. Steps on the stacking faults

The steps A and B in Figure 3a were also studied by stereographic trace analysis to determine their habit planes. Figure 8 shows a picture of another arrangement of steps on some stacking faults and their habit planes were also determined in the same manner. The results are summarised in Table 3 below. It should be noted that the steps are generally rather short and this leads to large errors in orientation determination by trace analysis. Thus errors in the determination of the habit plane of 5-10° would not be surprising.

Step	Habit plane	Angular Deviation	From low-index plane
A	(0.99, -0.21, -0.03)	5.3°	(100)
B	(0.03, 1.83, -0.73)	6.9°	(02 $\bar{1}$)
C	(-0.91, -0.97, 0.09)	4.5°	($\bar{1}$ $\bar{1}$ 0)

Despite the large errors in the determination of the habit planes, it is very clear that each step has a distinctly different habit and no clear pattern seems to emerge. It can only be concluded that there are several possible habit planes for steps and that there is no obvious low energy choice for a step if the stacking fault has to deviate from the (010) plane. Now if we examine the diagrams of the γ -Y₂Si₂O₇ structure shown in Figure 1 it is plain that there is little opportunity to shift the structure or remove layers of any planes perpendicular to the [100] direction without cutting through the double tetrahedra or introducing corrugations. The (02 $\bar{1}$) plane can be represented in this projection and it would necessarily be rather corrugated to avoid cutting the double tetrahedra. This is shown in Figure 9. It is perhaps more

1
2
3 straightforward to imagine shifts or missing planes on the (100) plane by looking at
4
5 the [001] projection, and this is also indicated on Figure 9. Similarly, the
6
7 ($\bar{1}\bar{1}0$) plane seems to cut between the double tetrahedra and seems also to represent a
8
9 way of shifting the plane off (010) without causing too much structural disruption.
10
11

12
13 Whatever the precise structure of the steps, it is clear that they are relatively
14
15 high energy in comparison to the (010) plane stacking faults, since they account for
16
17 only a small proportion of the stacking fault surface area. The relatively high energy
18
19 is not surprising in view of the amount of structural disruption caused by losing planes
20
21 and introducing shifts on any plane other than (010) since this may disrupt the double
22
23 tetrahedra, or place or tetrahedra at energetically unfavourable distances from one
24
25 another.
26
27

28
29 Stacking faults are occasionally observed to end within grains, rather than at
30
31 grain boundaries, and this always occurs at partial dislocations as seen in Fig 3a, as is
32
33 crystallographically necessary. The density of either partial or lattice dislocations is
34
35 uniformly low in all samples observed, and this suggests that there was no significant
36
37 plastic deformation of the grains by slip during hot pressing. Thus, the partial
38
39 dislocations are unlikely to be the result of slip processes. Rather they seem to have
40
41 arisen from the same process that formed the stacking faults, as discussed below.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 ***4.3. Possible formation mechanism for the stacking faults***

51
52 It was previously observed that the precursor powder behaved much as in
53
54 earlier reports of the crystallisation of pure yttrium disilicate [13] in that it crystallised
55
56 to the α , β and γ phases at successively higher temperatures [1]. Furthermore,
57
58 previous work has shown that the crystallisation of the amorphous precursor to α -
59
60 $Y_2Si_2O_7$ occurs very rapidly on heating in just a narrow temperature window, and that

1
2
3 this is a highly exothermic reaction [2]. Thus, we can be sure that the ceramic was
4
5 initially transformed to α - $\text{Y}_2\text{Si}_2\text{O}_7$ and it is highly likely that this transformed to β -
6
7
8 $\text{Y}_2\text{Si}_2\text{O}_7$ prior to the formation of γ - $\text{Y}_2\text{Si}_2\text{O}_7$.
9

10
11 Now the α - $\text{Y}_2\text{Si}_2\text{O}_7$ and β - $\text{Y}_2\text{Si}_2\text{O}_7$ structures are totally different in that α -
12
13 $\text{Y}_2\text{Si}_2\text{O}_7$ consists of Si_3O_{10} triple tetrahedra and SiO_4 single tetrahedra whereas the β -
14
15 $\text{Y}_2\text{Si}_2\text{O}_7$ just contains Si_2O_7 corner sharing double tetrahedra. Thus, any
16
17 transformation from α - $\text{Y}_2\text{Si}_2\text{O}_7$ to β - $\text{Y}_2\text{Si}_2\text{O}_7$ is completely reconstructive involving
18
19 bond-breaking and new bond formation. Consequently no crystallographic
20
21 correspondence is expected between the two phases, and we expect few
22
23 microstructural relics of this the transformation. A similar argument would also apply
24
25 if the α - $\text{Y}_2\text{Si}_2\text{O}_7$ transformed directly to γ - $\text{Y}_2\text{Si}_2\text{O}_7$ since this, like β - $\text{Y}_2\text{Si}_2\text{O}_7$ contains
26
27 only Si_2O_7 corner sharing double tetrahedra. Thus, no microstructural relics such as
28
29 stacking faults would be expected from transformations from α - $\text{Y}_2\text{Si}_2\text{O}_7$ to β - $\text{Y}_2\text{Si}_2\text{O}_7$
30
31 or even α - $\text{Y}_2\text{Si}_2\text{O}_7$ direct to γ - $\text{Y}_2\text{Si}_2\text{O}_7$ without first passing through the β - $\text{Y}_2\text{Si}_2\text{O}_7$
32
33 phase.
34
35
36
37
38
39

40
41 Now in some systems, a structure can order from a higher symmetry to a
42
43 lower symmetry such as in an ordering transition or in a ferroelastic phase transition.
44
45 Crystallographically, the ordered phase has a low symmetry space group, which is a
46
47 sub-group of the space group of the original higher symmetry phase. Now if the
48
49 transformation starts at two different places in a grain with different orientational or
50
51 translational states related by a symmetry operator of the higher symmetry parent
52
53 phase (which is suppressed in the lower symmetry phase) then some form of domain
54
55 boundary must form. A general crystallographic discussion of this effect is given by
56
57 Van Tendeloo and Amelinckx [19]. The present transformation does not, however,
58
59 fulfil this above criterion; the γ - $\text{Y}_2\text{Si}_2\text{O}_7$ phase has a *higher* symmetry (space group
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

number 14, $P2_1/c$) than the parent β - $Y_2Si_2O_7$ phase (space group number 12, $C2/m$) and there is no simple subgroup-supergroup relationship.

Nevertheless, there are definite correspondences between the two phases in that both consist of corner sharing Si_2O_7 double tetrahedra with Y atoms between. Therefore one could be transformed to the other by shuffles of the Y atoms and movement and/or rotation of the double tetrahedra. One model that could lead to this is shown in Figure 10 where $[010]_\gamma//[010]_\beta$ and $[100]_\gamma//[100]_\beta$. The double tetrahedra would have to be rotated from the beta phase orientation to the gamma phase orientation, but the sense of rotation adopted in different parts of the prior beta crystal could be opposite. Thus, we would end up with two gamma crystals that differ just by being half a unit cell out of phase. This could be represented by one region with the double tetrahedra in a zig-zag-zig-zag order, and another having the double tetrahedra in a zag-zig-zag-zig order. Thus, inevitably at the boundary there will be two zigs or two zags adjacent to one another, resulting in the formation of a stacking fault.

Whilst a model has been presented for how the frequent stacking faults could arise, and it does seem likely that they are a relic of the β - $Y_2Si_2O_7$ to γ - $Y_2Si_2O_7$ transformation, it is not yet possible to confirm this hypothesis. To do so would require the production of samples at just the right sintering temperature so that the two phases coexist. Then it would be possible to determine the orientation relationship between the two and if stacking faults are really arising as a consequence of the transformation.

5. Conclusions

Parallel stacking faults on (010) planes are a common feature of γ - $Y_2Si_2O_7$. High resolution transmission electron microscopy was used along different projections in

1
2
3 the (010) plane to determine the structure of the faults and the displacement vector
4
5 could be readily determined from the unit cell displacement across the fault in two
6
7 perpendicular projections along [100] and [001]. The structure of γ - $\text{Y}_2\text{Si}_2\text{O}_7$ is a two
8
9 layer structure and the fault was found to correspond to the repeat of one layer, with
10
11 an associated rigid body shift in the plane of the boundary. Image simulations of the
12
13 fault corresponded very well with the experimental images, thus confirming the
14
15 structure model.
16
17
18

19
20 Occasional deviations from the (010) plane are also noted for the stacking faults
21
22 and the resulting steps were analysed and found to lie on various planes. No single
23
24 preferred step plane could be found and it was concluded that all steps are
25
26 energetically unfavourable and only adopted where necessity forces the fault plane
27
28 away from (010). Stacking faults were also occasionally observed to end at partial
29
30 dislocations, but their density was very low and there was little evidence for any
31
32 dislocation slip at any time in the preparation of the sample.
33
34
35

36
37 A possible formation mechanism for the faults was proposed, as a consequence of
38
39 the β - $\text{Y}_2\text{Si}_2\text{O}_7$ to γ - $\text{Y}_2\text{Si}_2\text{O}_7$ transformation during hot-pressing, but further
40
41 experiments would be needed to confirm both the transformation mechanism and the
42
43 fault formation mechanism.
44
45
46
47
48

49 **Acknowledgements**

50
51 Thanks are due to Dr Paul Trusty and Dr Clive B. Ponton for the provision of
52
53 hot-pressed $\text{Y}_2\text{Si}_2\text{O}_7$ specimens and to Mrs Maria Sycha for preparing TEM
54
55 specimens from the ceramic. Helpful discussions with Prof. H. Fuess, Dr Thomas
56
57 Weirich and Dr. G. Mieke are gratefully acknowledged. This work would have been
58
59 impossible without the provision of laboratory facilities (specifically access to high-
60

specification transmission electron microscopes) by Prof. Manfred Rühle and Prof Hartmut Fuess. IM is indebted to the Alexander von Humboldt foundation for provision of a research fellowship at the MPI in Stuttgart.

References

- [1] P.A. Trusty, K.C. Chan, and C.B. Ponton, *J. Mater. Res.* 13 (1998) p.3135.
- [2] I. MacLaren, P.A. Trusty, and C.B. Ponton, *Acta Mater.* 47 (1999) p.779.
- [3] J.D. Webster, M.E. Westwood, F.H. Hayes et al., *J. Eur. Ceram. Soc.* 18 (1998) p.2345.
- [4] M. Aparicio, R. Moreno, and A. Duran, *J. Eur. Ceram. Soc.* 19 (1999) p.1717.
- [5] M. Aparicio and A. Duran, *J. Am. Ceram. Soc.* 83 (2000) p.1351.
- [6] M. Aparicio and A. Duran, *Ceram. Int.* 31 (2005) p.631.
- [7] K. Liddell and D.P. Thompson, *Brit. Ceram. Trans. J.* 85 (1986) p.17.
- [8] J. Felsche, *Struct. Bond.* 13 (1973) p.99.
- [9] N.G. Batalieva and Yu.A. Pyatenko, *Sov. Phys. Crystallography* 16 (1972) p.786.
- [10] J. Parmentier, P.R. Bodart, L. Audoin et al., *J. Sol. Stat. Chem.* 149 (2000) p.16.
- [11] I. MacLaren, L.K.L. Falk, A. Díaz et al., *J. Eur. Ceram. Soc.* 21 (2001). p.2937
- [12] T.R. Dinger, R.S. Rai, and G. Thomas, *J. Am. Ceram. Soc.* 71 (1988) p.236.
- [13] J. Ito and H. Johnson, *Am. Mineral.* 53 (1968) p.1940.
- [14] W.E. Lee, C.H. Drummond, G.E. Hilmas et al., *J. Am. Ceram. Soc.* 73 (1990) p.3575.
- [15] R. Kilaas, NCEM Focus Determination Package . Available online at:
<http://ncem.lbl.gov/frames/software.htm> (accessed July 2005).
- [16] G. Möbus and M. Rühle, *Ultramicroscopy*, 56 (1994) 54.

- 1
2
3 [17] N.I. Leonyuk, E.L. Belokoneva, G. Bocelli et al., Cryst. Res. Technol. 34 (1999)
4
5 p.1175.
6
7
8 [18] I. MacLaren, R. Schierholz, P. A. Trusty et al., J. Am. Ceram. Soc. 90 (2007)
9
10 p.3307.
11
12
13 [19] G. Van Tendeloo and S. Amelinckx, Acta Cryst. A30 (1974) p.431.
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 Figure Captions

21
22
23
24
25 Figure 1: Representations of the γ -Y₂Si₂O₇ crystal structure for the [100] and [001]
26
27 projections. The Si₂O₇ double tetrahedra are clearly seen. The isolated atoms
28
29 between the tetrahedra are the Y atoms.
30
31

32
33
34 Figure 2: Bright field TEM image of the structure of a typical yttrium disilicate grain
35
36 showing stacking faults (SF) and glassy inclusions (G).
37
38

39
40
41 Figure 3: [100] zone axis selected area diffraction pattern of γ -Y₂Si₂O₇.
42
43

44
45
46 Figure 4: Dark field images of the same stacking fault, SF, recorded with two
47
48 different diffraction conditions, a grain boundary, GB, and a glassy inclusion, G, are
49
50 also shown: a) was recorded with $\mathbf{g} = 20\bar{2}$ and shows all parts of the fault in strong
51
52 contrast; b) was recorded with $\mathbf{g} = 040$ and shows the main part of the fault and the
53
54 step B out of contrast, but step A still shows some weak contrast. C is a partial
55
56 dislocation at the end of the fault
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Figure 5: HRTEM images of the structure of stacking faults recorded using different projections with unit cells and dot pairs (which approximately correspond to Y atom positions) indicated. The repeated layer at the stacking fault is clear in both images: a) [100] recorded on the JEOL 4000EX at Stuttgart; b) [001] recorded on the JEOL 3010 at Darmstadt

Figure 6: Models of the stacking fault structure for the [100] and [001] projections.

Figure 7: Image matching for the HRTEM images along a) the [100] and b) the [001] projections. From left to right, average of 10 atomic cells of the experimental image, best simulated image, difference plot. The stacking fault plane is indicated by a dotted line in each image.

Figure 8: Dark field TEM image of steps on stacking faults in γ -Y₂Si₂O₇.

Figure 9: Schematic diagram of how different step planes could fit through the unit cell.

Figure 10: Schematic diagram of how the beta to gamma transformation could proceed.




Figure 1
83x82mm (470 x 470 DPI)

only




Figure 2
74x66mm (600 x 600 DPI)

Only

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Figure 3
59x59mm (600 x 600 DPI)






Figure 4a
80x55mm (300 x 300 DPI)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Figure 4b
80x55mm (300 x 300 DPI)

view Only




Figure 5a

83x49mm (250 x 250 DPI)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Figure 5b

Review Only




Figure 6
84x99mm (475 x 475 DPI)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Figure 7a
42x68mm (305 x 305 DPI)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Figure 7b
42x50mm (410 x 410 DPI)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Figure 8
84x44mm (500 x 500 DPI)

Review Only




Figure 9

83x82mm (470 x 470 DPI)

AMU




Figure 10
77x65mm (300 x 300 DPI)