Low-Pressure Mechanical Switching of Ferroelectric Domains in $\text{PbZr}_{0.48}\text{Ti}_{0.52}\text{O}_3$

Gaurav Vats^{*, #, a}, Ravikant^{#, b, c}, Peggy Schoenherr^{a, d}, Ashok Kumar^{*, b} and Jan Seidel^{*, a, d}

^a*School of Materials Science and Engineering, University of New South Wales, Sydney 2052, Australia*

^b*CSIR-National Physical Laboratory, Dr. K. S. Krishnan Marg, New Delhi 110012, India and Academy of Scientific and Innovative Research (AcSIR), CSIR-National Physical Laboratory Campus, Dr. K. S. Krishnan Marg, New Delhi 110012, India*

^c*Department of Physics, Government College Sailana, Vikram University, Ujjain, Madhya Pradesh 456010, India*

^d*ARC Centre of Excellence in Future Low-Energy Electronics Technologies, UNSW Sydney, Sydney NSW 2052, Australia*

^{*}*Email: g.vats@unswalumni.com; ashok553@nplindia.org; jan.seidel@unsw.edu.au*

[#]*Authors contributed equally.*

Abstract: Low-energy switching of ferroelectrics is currently being investigated for energy-efficient nanoelectronics. While conventional methods employ electrical fields to switch the polarization state, mechanical switching has been investigated as an interesting alternative low-energy switching concept, if low enough pressures could be achieved. Here, we report on the thickness-dependent mechanical and electrical switching behavior of ferroelectric $\text{PbZr}_{0.48}\text{Ti}_{0.52}\text{O}_3/\text{YBa}_2\text{Cu}_3\text{O}_{7-\delta}$ (PZT/YBCO) epitaxial heterostructures grown on single crystalline LaAlO_3 -(001)_{pseudo-cubic} (LAO) substrate. We find mechanical switching under relatively low force (600 nN; estimated pressure ~ 0.21 GPa) in atomic force microscopy-based measurements. Mechanically switched domains can be erased by small electric fields and, interestingly, exhibit a surface potential change similar to electrically poled areas. The feasibility of switching these heterostructures with very low pressure makes them promising candidates for nanoscale electromechanical devices.

Keywords: low-pressure mechanical switching, ferroelectric domains, ferroelectric/superconductor heterostructures, scanning probe microscopy

1. Introduction

Mechanical control of ferroelectric domains¹ is a less explored phenomenon in contrast to more conventional electrical and optical switching.^{2, 3} Scientific reports on various aspects of mechanical switching of ferroelectric domains suggest that the mechanically switched domains in ferroelectrics could either occur individually or by the cumulative effect of the several mechanisms⁴ including flexoelectric effect¹, ferroelectric-ferroelastic switching^{5, 6} and chemical modifications on the surface⁷ and in the bulk^{8, 9}. The electrochemical effect in the bulk can be induced by diffusion of oxygen vacancies¹⁰, which in turn can lead to electrostatic or Vegard strain.⁴ The contribution of the aforementioned mechanisms in depicting mechanical switching of ferroelectrics has been discussed recently^{4, 11}, while further work is still required to gain a more complete understanding. Scanning probe-based investigations of mechanical behavior in ferroelectrics¹², especially localized mechanical writing of nanoscale domains and mechanical erasing of electrically written domains¹ provide a suitable platform for further investigation of mechano-electric devices^{13, 14} and concepts^{15, 16}. Ultra-low pressure mechanical writing and non-contact reading might lead to new low energy electronics concepts and information storage energy costs of attojoule/bit, which has been explored for example through electrical control of magnetism concepts.¹⁷

Mechanical switching has been reported in a range of ferroelectric materials from single crystals (BaTiO_3 ¹⁸, $(1-x)\text{Pb}(\text{Mg}_{1/3}\text{Nb}_{2/3})\text{O}_3$ - $x\%\text{PbTiO}_3$ ¹⁹) to thin films ($\text{Pb}(\text{Zr}_{0.2}\text{Ti}_{0.8})\text{O}_3$ ^{20, 21}, BaTiO_3 ^{1, 22}, BiFeO_3 ²³⁻²⁵). Among these, $\text{Pb}(\text{Zr}_{0.2}\text{Ti}_{0.8})\text{O}_3$ thin films have shown promising mechanical switching properties with anticipated memory storage capacities of the order of 110 Gb/cm^3 reported using atomic force microscope (AFM) tip forces down to 300 nN .²⁰ Such tip force leads to an estimated pressure of 3.8 GPa with a tip radius of 5 nm under the assumption that the tip-sample contact is represented by a disc of radius equivalent to the tip radius.^{1, 26} This pressure is considerably lower than the reported values in one of the first studies on mechanical writing of ferroelectric domains in BaTiO_3 .¹ In a related attempt Edwards *et al.*⁶ reported the mechanical switching threshold (1000 nN : estimated tip pressure = 0.8 GPa ; tip radius = 20 nm) of polycrystalline $\text{PbZr}_{0.53}\text{Ti}_{0.47}\text{O}_3$, which lays at the morphotropic phase boundary (MPB) of the $\text{Pb}(\text{Zr}_x\text{Ti}_{1-x})\text{O}_3$ family. Compositions close to the MPB of $\text{Pb}(\text{Zr}_x\text{Ti}_{1-x})\text{O}_3$ offer the possibility of transitions between tetragonal and rhombohedral phases due to small strains²⁷⁻³¹ as well as the co-existence of tetragonal and rhombohedral phases,^{5, 32} and have been investigated with respect to thickness-dependent flexoelectric fields,³²-making them ideal for pressure-induced polarization switching.

Therefore, in this work, we explore the ferroelectric and mechanical switching properties of epitaxially grown $\text{PbZr}_{0.48}\text{Ti}_{0.52}\text{O}_3$ (PZT) thin films on $\text{YBa}_2\text{Cu}_3\text{O}_{7-\delta}$ (YBCO), where PZT is a member of the MPB $\text{Pb}(\text{Zr}_x\text{Ti}_{1-x})\text{O}_3$ family.

2. Materials and methods

To fabricate PZT/YBCO heterostructures, YBCO and PZT targets were prepared using the conventional solid-state reaction route.³³ Afterward, PZT/YBCO heterostructures were deposited on one-side-polished single-crystalline LaAlO_3 -(001)_{pseudo-cubic} (LAO) substrates (Crystal GmbH-company, $a = 3.789 \text{ \AA}$) using pulsed laser deposition (PLD). Firstly, 100 nm YBCO thin films were deposited as a bottom electrode by using a KrF excimer laser ($\lambda = 248 \text{ nm}$) with an energy density of 1.2 J/cm^2 , repetition rate 3 Hz and substrate temperature 800°C . During the growth of YBCO, oxygen gas partial pressure was maintained at 160 mTorr. Grown YBCO/LAO thin films were cooled down to 550°C and annealed for one hour to allow domain re-crystallization. Then, the substrate temperature was increased to 650°C and PZT layers with thicknesses of 6 nm (S1), 8 nm (S2), and 10 nm (S3) were deposited at an oxygen partial pressure of 80 mTorr with a laser energy density and repetition rate of 1 J/cm^2 and 5 Hz, respectively. The grown heterostructures were finally cooled down to room temperature at 20°C per minute. The thickness of the films was measured with a Stylus Profilometer. To analyze the crystal structure and confirm the epitaxial growth throughout all layers, high-resolution X-ray diffraction (HR-XRD) was performed in a parallel beam setting. The HR-XRD measurement was accomplished by using monochromatic Cu-K_α radiation ($\lambda = 1.54 \text{ \AA}$) in a co-planar geometry with a horizontal sample stage.

Thereafter, nanoscale measurements were performed to determine the local properties of the PZT/YBCO films using a commercial AIST-NT Smart SPM 1000 room-temperature atomic force microscopy (AFM) system in a nitrogen environment. MikroMasch NSC35/Pt tips were used for the electrical poling and Kelvin probe force microscopy (KPFM) measurements on the electrically poled area. Diamond-coated (spring constant = 28 to 91 N/m) Si cantilevers (model no. DCP20) were utilized for the mechanical switching and PFM measurements. PFM resonant mode measurements were performed using an ac imaging voltage of 1.0 V (peak-to-peak) with frequencies in the range of 600 to 1200 kHz under a mechanical load of 97 nN. KPFM measurements of the mechanically switched areas were performed using the same diamond tips with a lift height of 40 nm.

3. Results and discussion

Figure 1 (a) shows the room temperature (297 K) HR-XRD patterns of the PZT/YBCO/LAO heterostructures. The HR-XRD data shows two peaks at 21.3° and 23.6° corresponding to LAO (001), one broad peak belonging to PZT (001) and another one to YBCO (003). The absence of Bragg planes other than 00 l confirms the unidirectional crystal growth of the as-grown heterostructures. A substantial shift in the broad PZT (001) peaks towards higher Bragg angles with decreasing PZT film thickness is observed, which may be due to an enhanced out-of-plane compressive strain and in-plane tensile strain³⁴. It has been reported that twin domains in the LAO substrate (evident from a shoulder in the LAO XRD peak as seen for samples S1-S3 in Fig. (a)) can cause a variation in the lattice strain and properties of the top YBCO layer.³⁵ This is also likely to influence the properties of the PZT layers deposited on YBCO.

Figure 1: Structural characterization. (a) X-ray diffraction patterns of the PZT/YBCO/LAO heterostructures with PZT thickness of 6 nm (S1), 8 nm (S2) and 10 nm (S3). Reciprocal space maps (RSM) of S2 around the (b) (002) and (c) (101) reflection of the LAO substrate.

The out-of-plane compressive strain (ϵ) is defined by the equation³⁴

$$\epsilon = \frac{c_{film} - c_{bulk}}{c_{bulk}} \quad (1)$$

with c_{film} and c_{bulk} being the PZT film and PZT bulk out-of-plane lattice constant, respectively (c_{bulk} is calculated from XRD of the PZT target; not shown here). The strain values are summarized in Table 1. It is found that the out-of-plane compressive strain on PZT decreases with an increase in film thickness.

Table 1: Calculated out-of-plane compressive strain in PZT/YBCO/LAO heterostructures.

PZT film thickness (nm)	Bragg angle (°)	c_{bulk} (Å)	c_{film} (Å)	$c_{film}-c_{bulk}$ (Å)	$\varepsilon \times 100$
6	21.92	4.140	4.055	-0.085	-2.0
8	21.84	4.140	4.070	-0.070	-1.7
10	21.78	4.140	4.081	-0.059	-1.4

Further detailed analysis of the epitaxial relationship in PZT/YBCO and YBCO/LAO is performed using reciprocal space mapping (RSM) data. Figure 1 (b) and (c) show the RSM images for S2 in the symmetric and asymmetric direction along the LAO (002) and (101) orientation. The RSM data along the (002) direction reveals the growth direction along the c -axis (perpendicular to the substrate surface). The three observable reciprocal points belong to PZT (002), YBCO (006), and LAO (002), respectively (Figure 1 (b) left to right). From these reciprocal points, the out-of-plane c lattice parameter is determined as 4.050 Å and 11.759 Å corresponding to PZT and YBCO, respectively. This PZT value is close to the out-of-plane lattice parameters calculated from the θ -2 θ XRD data for S2 (Table 1). In the case of the asymmetric scan (Figure 1 (c)), two reciprocal points other than the substrate with q -vectors 2.456 nm^{-1} (4.066 Å⁻¹) and 2.558 nm^{-1} (3.797 Å⁻¹) are assigned to the PZT (101) and YBCO (103) planes, respectively. The presence of symmetric and asymmetric reciprocal points in the RSM data³⁶ confirms the epitaxial nature of our PZT/YBCO films on LAO.

To investigate the mechanically induced nanoscale ferroelectric switching behavior of the PZT/YBCO/LAO heterostructures, we firstly perform electrical poling experiments and image the ferroelectric domains using PFM. Figure 2 (a)-(c) depict a typical polarization reversal experiment where the dark and bright areas correspond to a downward and upward polarization, respectively. As grown polarization of Samples S1 and S2 switch with a tip voltage of +3 V and S3 with a voltage of -2 V. We mostly detect a full reversal of polarization in all three films (180° phase change in the PFM image; see supporting information S1.1). Additionally, the in-plane signals (Figures S1.2. (j)-(o)) are rather weak, likely because of the very small thickness of the films and a predominantly out-of-plane polarization. The area outside the poled boxes in Figure 2 (a)-(c) corresponds to the

polarization direction of the as-grown PZT. In PZT films below 8 nm, the as-grown polarization direction is ‘up’ (i.e. pointing out of the surface), while it is pointing ‘down’ for the 10 nm film (S3). A reversal of as-grown polarization direction dependent on film thickness has also been found in other reports on ferroelectric heterostructures, including MPB members of $\text{Pb}(\text{Zr}_x\text{Ti}_{1-x})\text{O}_3$ ^{28, 32} and BFO ^{37, 38}. In these reports, the reversal is explained by a competition between a flexoelectric effect induced by the strain in the film and an electric field due to band bending at the interface. Our experiments show an opposite thickness-dependent as-grown polarization than the one detected by Yu *et al.*³² on $\text{La}_{0.67}\text{Sr}_{0.33}\text{MnO}_3/\text{PbZr}_{0.52}\text{Ti}_{0.48}\text{O}_3$ heterostructures, which have a Zr/Ti ratio quite close to the composition of our samples. Zr/Ti in our samples is 48/52 which brings them relatively closer to the MPB in the $\text{Pb}(\text{Zr}_x\text{Ti}_{1-x})\text{O}_3$ phase diagram³⁹. The difference in the as-grown state of polarization could also result from a different strain in our PZT films and a different bottom electrode. Experiments by Yu *et al.*³² suggested that $\text{PbZr}_{0.52}\text{Ti}_{0.48}\text{O}_3$ films with a thickness of 8 nm (epitaxial strain 1.47% estimated from lattice constant values in reference³²) show a nominal out-of-plane flexoelectric field. The flexoelectric field in their films achieves a maximum for a film with a thickness of 48 nm (epitaxial strain 0.62%).³² Finally, they observed a decrease in the flexoelectric field with a reduced epitaxial strain (0.36%) on further increasing film thickness (130 nm). Though in the present case, the composition and bottom electrode are different, but the strain calculations presented in Table 1 could be used to provide an estimated comparison of the possible flexoelectric field in our films. Strains of 1.4 to 2% in our case are comparable to 8 nm films presented by Yu *et al.*³².

In order to quantify the strain gradients in our films, we performed Williamson-Hall analysis⁴⁰ (see supplementary Note 1 and corresponding Figure for more information). The highest (0.44%) inhomogeneous strain (ε_i) is found for the 10 nm film followed by 0.30% in 6 nm and 0.25% in 8 nm films. The inhomogeneous strain values were used to calculate the strain gradients $\left(\frac{\partial u_i}{\partial x_i}\right)$ ³⁸ followed by an estimate for the flexoelectric field $\left(E_{\text{Flexoelectric}} = \frac{\gamma e}{a_j \varepsilon_0} \frac{\partial u_i}{\partial x_i}\right)$ ³⁷. Here, γ is a scaling factor (assumed=1), e is the charge on electron, a_j is the lattice constant and ε_0 is the permittivity of the free space. The strain gradients are found to be $-15.35 \times 10^5 \text{ m}^{-1}$, $-11.15 \times 10^5 \text{ m}^{-1}$, and $-17.34 \times 10^5 \text{ m}^{-1}$ in 10, 8 and 6 nm thin PZT films, respectively. The flexoelectric field values in 6 nm, 8 nm and 10 nm PZT films were found to be 77 MVm^{-1} , 49.5 MVm^{-1} and 69 MVm^{-1} , respectively. The strain gradient are similar in all films and agree with the reported values of $\text{PbZr}_{0.52}\text{Ti}_{0.48}\text{O}_3$ films with similar thickness³².

This insinuates that the difference in polarization orientation and reversal is dominated by the interface effect that varies due to different bottom electrodes in reference³² and our heterostructures.

We investigated the above-mentioned switched areas by contact potential difference (CPD) measurements using KPFM with an AFM tip lift height of 40 nm. CPD mapping of the samples S1, S2, and S3 can be seen in Figure 2(d)-(f). The light yellow color in the KPFM images shows that the CPD is higher in the positively poled areas than in the negatively poled areas. This is due to the screening of electrostatic charges at the tip-sample interface.⁴¹ Thus, the positively poled area is likely to have positive charges accumulated on the PZT surface and vice versa for a negatively poled area. The magnitude of the accumulated charge depends on the as-grown polarization and the applied switching voltage. CPD value for negatively poled areas are -50 mV, -100 mV, and -150 mV for S1, S2, and S3, respectively (see line profiles in Figure 2(g)-(i)). On the other hand, the average CPD values for the areas poled with a positive bias are +200 mV, +210 mV, and +180 mV for S1, S2, and S3, respectively. Note that the negative bias poling (resulting in polarization pointing up) lowers CPD in all cases, but more so for increasing film thickness, which could originate from thickness-dependent changes in the polarization of the films.

Figure 2: Electrical switching behavior. (a)-(c) PFM phase images, (d)-(f) KPFM images and (g)-(i) line profiles (of blue lines in (d)-(f)) for samples S1, S2, and S3 respectively. Two bright orange lines in (f) are artifacts.

After analyzing the electrical switching behavior for samples with different thickness of the PZT layer on YBCO, mechanical switching experiments were performed. All samples showed unidirectional mechanical switching i.e. upwards polarisation (bright) is switched downwards (dark) as demonstrated in supporting Figure S.2.1. This means that the flexoelectric effect works analogously to an applied positive bias. It has to be noted that the 10 nm PZT sample (S3) has an as-grown downward polarization, which needs to be poled upwards with -3 V prior to mechanical switching. Figure 3(a) shows a PFM image of mechanical switching on S2 with a force of 1648 nN exerted by an AFM tip on a prior electrically written domain (tip voltage -3 V). The PFM image in Fig. 3(a) was acquired with an amplitude of 1 V (peak-to-peak) under an intentional low mechanical loading of 97 nN (tip pressure: 0.03 GPa) to avoid further mechanical influence during the PFM scan. The bright contrast in the mechanical influenced area shows a polarization reversal towards the substrate. This unidirectional mechanical switching is also found in the other two PZT films (see Supplementary information S2.1 for a comparison of S1, S2, and S3 films). The exerted tip pressure can be roughly estimated by assuming a disk-shaped contact area of the same size as the tip radius.^{26, 42-44} In our case this leads to a tip pressure of ~ 0.5 GPa (tip radius = 30 nm), although the actual contact area can vary significantly from the AFM tip radius.

In the next step, the mechanically written domain is manipulated with a voltage of ± 3 V (see Figure 3 (b)). A consecutive PFM image reveals that a tip voltage of -3 V (dotted red box) erases the mechanically written domain (dotted white square), while $+3$ V has no impact (dotted cyan box). Thus, it can be concluded that the mechanically induced domains in sample S2 are fully reversible with applied negative bias and behave analogously to domains created with a positive bias.

Figure 3: Electro-mechanical writing and erasing with non-contact reading using AFM.

(a) Mechanically written domain (shown by white dotted square) with 1698 nN on an electrically poled area with -3 V (sample S2). (b) Effect of an electric field (± 3 V) on a mechanically written domain (white dotted square). Area poled with -3 V (red dotted box) is found to be capable of erasing mechanically written domains while the area poled with +3 V (cyan dotted box) remains unchanged. (c) KPFM mapping and (d) CPD line profile of mechanically written domain in the image (a).

To further highlight the similarities between the mechanical and electrical poling, Figure 3(c) shows the KPFM image of the mechanical switched area in Figure 3(a). The mechanically switched area exhibits similar, albeit slightly lower CPD change compared to the electrically switched region with positive bias (see Fig. 2h). This is highlighted by the line cut of the CPD image in Figure 3(d) (along the blue line in Figure 3(c)), which shows a CPD change of nearly 250 mV from the negatively poled area to the mechanically switched region. This indicates that the analog outcomes are generated by mechanical poling as by applying a positive bias. This is only possible if both (electrical and mechanical poling) have a similar impact on the state of polarization. Mechanical switching and KPFM measurements

performed on samples S1 and S3 (supplementary Figure S2.2) show similar results supporting the conclusions made above. However, it is to be noted that sample S3 needs to be first electrically poled with -3 V to observe mechanical switching. This is expected as S2 and S3 have opposite as-grown polarization. Consequently, our PFM, as well as KPFM images, clearly show that mechanical poling/de-poling is possible in PZT/YBCO heterostructures.

Figure 4: Mechanical writing of ferroelectric domains. (a) PFM phase images of mechanically written domains on S2 with different tip force (600 to 1600 nN). (b) PFM phase images of mechanical written domains under different scanning angles with an applied force of 1400 nN. (c) KPFM mapping and (d) line profile of the image (a). (Scale bar = 1 μm)

Due to the sample composition being close to the MPB, a pressure-induced transition from the tetragonal to the rhombohedral phase or vice-versa could also be envisaged to cause such a polarization reversal.^{5, 6} The application of a mechanical strain has been reported to lead to a change in the in-plane and the out-of-plane response of MPB members of $\text{Pb}(\text{Zr}_x\text{Ti}_{1-x})\text{O}_3$.^{5, 6} However, these experiments only found polarization changes $<90^\circ$ ⁶ in contrast to the 180° switching found in this report (no in-plane phase or amplitude signal in the PFM measurements could be detected indicating an in-plane polarization below our measuring sensitivity). Another indicator that the polarization reversal in our experiments is not driven by a pressure-induced phase transition is the absence of pressure-induced kinks in

the force-distance curves. Such kinks in the force-distance curves have been reported in other ferroelectrics with morphotropic phases to confirm phase transitions.^{23, 24} However, the pressure of the tip can directly impact the polarization through the ferroelastic mechanism or flexoelectric effect³² as discussed before. It can also manipulate the local screening charges or induce local shifts in electrochemical potential due to vacancies diffusion.

Flexoelectricity has been reported to play an important role in polarization reversal in thin $\text{Pb}(\text{Zr}_{0.2}\text{Ti}_{0.8})\text{O}_3$ films (5-20 nm)⁴ and the presence of an in-built flexoelectric field³² can influence tip-generated flexoelectricity through mechanical loading. Flexoelectric trailing fields⁴⁵ have also been reported to influence ferroelastic switching, which can be seen in scanning direction-dependent mechanical switching. This effect can easily be tested as shown in Figure 4 (b), where we mechanically poled S2 with 1400 nN force at different scan angles. The consecutive PFM image shows no difference for different scan directions and thus a mechanical trailing field can be excluded.

To further investigate the mechanical switching mechanism, we studied the force-dependent mechanical switching behavior. Figure 4 (a) and (c) show PFM and CPD images of S2 with forces of 600 nN, 800 nN, 1000 nN, 1200 nN, 1400 nN, and 1600 nN. All six force values induce a full polarization reversal with a similar CPD value change (Figure 4 (d)). The CPD values are in accordance with values measured in Figure 3. The observation of nearly similar CPD values for applied forces larger than 600 nN suggests that a force threshold is required to switch the polarization, but more force does not influence the polarization further. Also, especially due to the YBCO bottom electrode, pressure-induced oxygen vacancies diffusion in PZT could have an influence, as YBCO is well known for oxygen vacancies^{46, 47}, and pressure-induced conductivity⁴⁸ changes. Poling of our sample leads to changes in local conductivity, as seen in the c-AFM measurement (see supplementary information S2.3), pointing to the possibility of changes in local oxygen vacancy content as reported in other materials^{49, 50}. In addition, the delta in our films is between 0.2 and 0.7, as the YBCO was found to be superconducting in other measurements⁵¹. In addition to its superconducting properties it is also an ideal heterostructure electrode at room temperature.⁵²⁻⁵⁴ Changes of oxygen content, i.e. delta after electrical or mechanical poling are possible, but could not be quantified with available methods in our case. We note that conductive AFM measurements of poled areas show variations of conductivity (supplementary Fig. S2.3), which could be influenced by oxygen content variations. Therefore, favourable epitaxial strain conditions for a tip-induced flexoelectric effect together

with potential oxygen vacancy contributions are the most likely reasons for mechanical switching in our films.

4. Conclusions

In conclusion, this study reports novel $\text{PbZr}_{0.48}\text{Ti}_{0.52}\text{O}_3/\text{YBa}_2\text{Cu}_3\text{O}_{7-\delta}$ (PZT/YBCO) epitaxial heterostructures grown on single crystalline LaAlO_3 -(001)_{pseudo-cubic} (LAO) substrate. Thickness dependent electrical switching behavior in 6 nm (S1), 8 nm (S2), and 10 nm (S3) PZT films suggest that it is possible to achieve different as-grown states of polarization by merely controlling the epitaxial strain and film thickness. We found that films exhibit a low pressure (~ 0.21 GPa) mechanical switching of the ferroelectric polarization. The depicted switching pressure is significantly lower than previously reported tip pressures used for mechanical switching in BaTiO_3 .¹ Interestingly, even though the films have different directions of polarization in the as-grown state, the mechanical poling/switching is found to work analogous to an applied positive bias. Low-pressure switching of ferroelectrics without electrical bias presents new opportunities for next-generation low-energy electronics and domain wall electro-mechanical applications.

Acknowledgments

GV, PS, and JS acknowledge support from the Australian Research Council (ARC) through Discovery Grants and the ARC Centre of Excellence in Future Low-Energy Electronics Technologies (FLEET). AK and Ravikant would like to thank Rajib K. Rakshit, Manju Singh, V. R. Reddy, Dr. R. P. Pant, and Dr. Chhemendra Sharma for PLD, XRD and RSM measurement.

References

1. H. Lu, C.-W. Bark, D. E. De Los Ojos, J. Alcala, C.-B. Eom, G. Catalan and A. Gruverman, *Science*, 2012, **336**, 59-61.
2. G. Vats, Y. Bai, D. W. Zhang, J. Juuti and J. Seidel, *Advanced Optical Materials*, 2019, **7**, 1800858.
3. Y. Bai, G. Vats, J. Seidel, H. Jantunen and J. Juuti, *Advanced Materials*, 2018, **30**, 1803821.
4. Y. Cao, A. Morozovska and S. V. Kalinin, *Physical Review B*, 2017, **96**, 184109.
5. K. Kim and J. E. Huber, *Journal of the European Ceramic Society*, 2015, **35**, 1459-1468.
6. D. Edwards, S. Brewer, Y. Cao, S. Jesse, L. Q. Chen, S. V. Kalinin, A. Kumar and N. Bassiri-

- Gharb, *Advanced Materials Interfaces*, 2016, **3**, 1500470.
7. S. M. Yang, A. N. Morozovska, R. Kumar, E. A. Eliseev, Y. Cao, L. Mazet, N. Balke, S. Jesse, R. K. Vasudevan and C. Dubourdieu, *Nature Physics*, 2017, **13**, 812-818.
 8. I. S. Vorotiahin, E. A. Eliseev, Q. Li, S. V. Kalinin, Y. A. Genenko and A. N. Morozovska, *Acta Materialia*, 2017, **137**, 85-92.
 9. Y. Kim, S. J. Kelly, A. Morozovska, E. K. Rahani, E. Strelcov, E. Eliseev, S. Jesse, M. D. Biegalski, N. Balke and N. Benedek, *Nano Letters*, 2013, **13**, 4068-4074.
 10. S. Das, B. Wang, Y. Cao, M. R. Cho, Y. J. Shin, S. M. Yang, L. Wang, M. Kim, S. V. Kalinin and L.-Q. Chen, *Nature Communications*, 2017, **8**, 615.
 11. L. Ma, W. Chen, Y. Liu, B. Wang and Y. Zheng, *Journal of Physics: Condensed Matter*, 2019.
 12. Y. Heo, P. Sharma, Y. Liu, J. Li and J. Seidel, *Journal of Materials Chemistry C*, 2019, **7**, 12441-12462.
 13. G. Catalan, J. Seidel, R. Ramesh and J. F. Scott, *Reviews of Modern Physics*, 2012, **84**, 119.
 14. R. Pandey, G. Vats, J. Yun, C. R. Bowen, A. W. Ho-Baillie, J. Seidel, K. T. Butler and S. I. Seok, *Advanced Materials*, 2019, **31**, 1807376.
 15. G. Vats, S. Patel, A. Chauhan and R. Vaish, *International Journal of Applied Ceramic Technology*, 2015, **12**, 765-770.
 16. G. Vats, J. Peräntie, J. Juuti, J. Seidel and Y. Bai, *Energy Technology*, 2020.
 17. R. Ramesh, *International Society for Optics and Photonics, Spintronics IX*, 2016, **9931**, 99312K.
 18. D. Fang, Y. Jiang, S. Li and C. Sun, *Acta Materialia*, 2007, **55**, 5758-5767.
 19. J. Bian, Y. Wang, R. Zhu, L. Wang, B. Yang, J. Wang, D. Zhang, C. Xu, T. Li and D. Viehland, *ACS Applied Materials & Interfaces*, 2019, **11**, 40758-40768.
 20. E. Guo, R. Roth, S. Das and K. Dörr, *Applied Physics Letters*, 2014, **105**, 012903.
 21. A. Alsubaie, P. Sharma, G. Liu, V. Nagarajan and J. Seidel, *Nanotechnology*, 2017, **28**, 075709.
 22. A. Gómez, J. M. Vila-Fungueiriño, R. Moalla, G. Saint-Girons, J. Gázquez, M. Varela, R. Bachelet, M. Gich, F. Rivadulla and A. Carretero-Genevriar, *Small*, 2017, **13**, 1701614.
 23. P. Sharma, Y. Heo, B. K. Jang, Y. Liu, V. Nagarajan, J. Li, C. H. Yang and J. Seidel, *Advanced Materials Interfaces*, 2016, **3**, 1600033.
 24. P. Sharma, K. R. Kang, B. K. Jang, C. H. Yang and J. Seidel, *Advanced Electronic Materials*, 2016, **2**, 1600283.
 25. P. Sharma, K. R. Kang, Y. Liu, B.-K. Jang, J. Li, C.-H. Yang and J. Seidel, *Nanotechnology*, 2018, **29**, 205703.
 26. S. V. Kalinin, S. Jesse, B. J. Rodriguez, E. A. Eliseev, V. Gopalan and A. N. Morozovska, *Applied Physics Letters*, 2007, **90**, 212905.
 27. W. Cao and L. E. Cross, *Japanese Journal of Applied Physics*, 1992, **31**, 1399.
 28. A. Kumar, D. Barrionuevo, N. Ortega, A. Shukla, S. Shannigrahi, J. Scott and R. S. Katiyar, *Applied Physics Letters*, 2015, **106**, 132901.
 29. G. Vats, S. Kumari, D. K. Pradhan, R. S. Katiyar, V. Ojha, C. R. Bowen and A. Kumar, *Journal of Magnetism and Magnetic Materials*, 2019, **473**, 511-516.
 30. G. Vats, A. Kumar, N. Ortega, C. R. Bowen and R. S. Katiyar, *Energy & Environmental Science*, 2016, **9**, 2383-2391.
 31. G. Vats, A. Kumar, N. Ortega, C. R. Bowen and R. S. Katiyar, *Energy & Environmental Science*, 2016, **9**, 1335-1345.
 32. X. Yu, L. Wu, B. Zhang, H. Zhou, Y. Dong, X. Wu, R. Kou, P. Yang, J. Chen and C.-J. Sun, *Physical Review B*, 2019, **100**, 104405.
 33. A. R. West, *Solid state chemistry and its applications*, John Wiley & Sons, 2014.
 34. B. D. Cullity, *Elements of X-ray Diffraction*, Addison-Wesley Publishing, 1956.
 35. Z.-X. Ye, Q. Li, Y. Hu, W. Si, P. Johnson and Y. Zhu, *Applied Physics Letters*, 2005, **87**, 122502.
 36. A. Panchwanee, V. Raghavendra Reddy, R. Choudhary, D. Phase, V. Ganesan and A. Gupta, *Journal of Applied Physics*, 2019, **125**, 234102.
 37. B. C. Jeon, D. Lee, M. H. Lee, S. M. Yang, S. C. Chae, T. K. Song, S. D. Bu, J. S. Chung, J. G. Yoon

- and T. W. Noh, *Advanced Materials*, 2013, **25**, 5643-5649.
38. D. Lee, B. C. Jeon, A. Yoon, Y. J. Shin, M. H. Lee, T. K. Song, S. D. Bu, M. Kim, J. S. Chung and J. G. Yoon, *Advanced Materials*, 2014, **26**, 5005-5011.
 39. T. R. Shrout and S. J. Zhang, *Journal of Electroceramics*, 2007, **19**, 113-126.
 40. G. Williamson and W. Hall, *Acta metallurgica*, 1953, **1**, 22-31.
 41. M. Nonnenmacher, M. o'Boyle and H. K. Wickramasinghe, *Applied Physics Letters*, 1991, **58**, 2921-2923.
 42. U. Celano, T. Hantschel, G. Giammaria, R. C. Chintala, T. Conard, H. Bender and W. Vandervorst, *Journal of Applied Physics*, 2015, **117**, 214305.
 43. M. Lantz, S. O'shea, M. Welland and K. Johnson, *Physical Review B*, 1997, **55**, 10776.
 44. D. Maugis, *Journal of Colloid and Interface Science*, 1992, **150**, 243-269.
 45. S. M. Park, B. Wang, S. Das, S. C. Chae, J.-S. Chung, J.-G. Yoon, L.-Q. Chen, S. M. Yang and T. W. Noh, *Nature Nanotechnology*, 2018, **13**, 366.
 46. T. Tomita, J. Schilling, L. Chen, B. Veal and H. Claus, *Physical Review Letters*, 2006, **96**, 077001.
 47. S. T. Hartman, B. Mundet, J.-C. Idrobo, X. Obradors, T. Puig, J. Gázquez and R. Mishra, *Physical Review Materials*, 2019, **3**, 114806.
 48. M. Tomita, M. Murakami, S. Nariki and K. Sawa, *Superconductor Science and Technology*, 2002, **15**, 846.
 49. M. L. Scullin, J. Ravichandran, C. Yu, M. Huijben, J. Seidel, A. Majumdar and R. Ramesh, *Acta Materialia*, 2010, **58**, 457-463.
 50. M. L. Scullin, C. Yu, M. Huijben, S. Mukerjee, J. Seidel, Q. Zhan, J. Moore, A. Majumdar and R. Ramesh, *Applied physics letters*, 2008, **92**, 202113.
 51. E. Fradkin and S. A. Kivelson, *Nature Physics*, 2012, **8**, 864-866.
 52. Ravikant, C. Singh, A. Panchwanee, R. K. Rakshit, M. Singh, V. Reddy, R. J. Choudhary, V. Ojha and A. Kumar, *AIP Advances*, 2020, **10**, 075206.
 53. R. Ramesh, A. Inam, W. Chan, B. Wilkens, K. Myers, K. Remschnig, D. Hart and J. Tarascon, *Science*, 1991, **252**, 944-946.
 54. R. Ramesh, T. Sands and V. Keramidas, *Applied physics letters*, 1993, **63**, 731-733.