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The purpose of this study was to develop a generalized Kinetic Monte Carlo code to study oxygen mobility in lanthanum-doped cerium oxide, and to demonstrate this code as a validation tool by simulating oxygen diffusion and comparing the results with experimental data to confirm the so-called lanthanum trapping effect. Molecular Statics simulations were performed using interatomic potentials for cerium oxide provided by Gotte et al., Minervini et al. and Sayle et al. to calculate local configuration-dependent oxygen vacancy migration energies. Kinetic Monte Carlo simulations of oxygen vacancy diffusion were performed at varying lanthanum dopant concentrations using the developed generalized Kinetic Monte Carlo code and the calculated configuration-dependent migration energies. All three interatomic potentials were found to confirm the lanthanum trapping effect. The results of these simulations were compared with experimental data and the Gotte potential was concluded to yield the most realistic diffusivity curve.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Fundamental understanding of nuclear fuel materials is of major interest in order to predict fuel performance. One major area of work is the study of defect diffusion, as defects can affect the mechanical properties of fuel elements. Conventional methods and fuel performance codes have relied mostly on chemical rate theories and experimental data to model fuel performance. More recently, as computational power has evolved, modeling work on nuclear fuel materials at the atomic level has been carried out. However, this subject remains a big challenge today, due to the unavailability of reliable interatomic potentials. These potentials can be used to predict multiple mechanical and thermodynamic properties, defect chemistry, and defect transport phenomena. However, because of the way they are derived (often by fitting parameters to experimental data, or from first principles calculations), they are often unable to accurately predict multiple material properties simultaneously. For example, using a potential derived by fitting parameters to experimentally determined lattice constants in an atomic scale simulation might very accurately reproduce measured lattice constants for different systems, but might fail to accurately reproduce the measured specific heat for the same systems. When attempting to simulation defect diffusion, it is therefore critical that the interatomic potential used be validated before it is used to predict results.

The goal of this study is to develop a generalized kinetic Monte Carlo (KMC) code to simulate defect diffusion, which can be used both as a validation tool and as a predictive tool. This code uses migration energies that depend on the migrating particle’s local atomic environment. These migration energies are calculated in advance, using Molecular Statics (MS) simulations with the desired interatomic potential. As a validation tool, the code would be run using migrations energies generated from the desired interatomic potential and the results would be compared to experimental data.
As a predictive tool, the code would be run using migration energies generated from a validated interatomic potential in order to predict data that has not yet been obtained experimentally.

Uranium oxide (UO$_2$) is the primary fuel used in most nuclear power plants in the United States today. However, since it is radioactive, there are many practical difficulties involved with studying it experimentally. Cerium oxide (CeO$_2$) has attracted a lot of attention as a surrogate for uranium oxide because it exhibits many of the same material properties, but is not radioactive. Thus, but studying defect transport and interactions in cerium oxide, similar insight can be gained into defect transport and interactions in uranium oxide. To demonstrate this code as a validation tool, the effect of dopant concentration on oxygen diffusivity in lanthanum-doped cerium oxide is calculated using three different interatomic potentials and compared to experimental data. Lanthanum was chosen as the dopant species mainly because lanthanum is a common fission product created by nuclear fission, so understanding the effects of lanthanum in cerium oxide helps in the understanding of the effects of lanthanum in uranium oxide fuel. Lanthanum was also chosen because, as will be explained Section 2.1, lanthanum introduces a controllable level of oxygen vacancies, which can help clarify the hypostoichiometric effects in cerium oxide and uranium oxide.
CHAPTER 2

BACKGROUND

Most of the past interest in pure ceria (CeO$_2$) and doped ceria materials has involved their applications in the automotive industry. Ceria has been studied extensively for its use in catalysis and oxygen sensing in automobile exhaust/emissions systems [1]. It has also gained recent attention as a candidate for fuel cell electrodes [1] because of its high electrical conductivity and high thermal stability. These studies have provided significant insight into the understanding of material properties and defect chemistry of ceria and doped ceria materials.

2.1 Material Properties and Defect Chemistry of Ceria

Cerium(IV) oxide (CeO$_2$) crystallizes in the fluorite crystal structure with lattice constant $a = 5.41134(12)$ Å. The fluorite structure consists of a face-centered cubic (f.c.c.) unit cell of cations with anions occupying the tetrahedral interstitial sites. This can also be seen as a superposition of an f.c.c. lattice of cations (Ce$^{4+}$) with lattice constant $a$, and a simple cubic (s.c.) lattice of anions (O$^{2-}$) with lattice constant $a/2$. In this structure (shown schematically in Figure 2.1), each cerium cation is coordinated by eight nearest-neighbor oxygen anions, while each oxygen anion is coordinated by four nearest-neighbor cerium cations.

Fluorite structure oxides exhibit similar material properties, such as high radiation tolerance and high thermal stability. Cerium oxide is attractive as a surrogate for uranium oxide because it has the same fluorite crystal structure and many similar material properties, including melting temperature (UO$_2$ : $\sim$ 2870 °C, CeO$_2$ : $\sim$ 2600 °C) and thermal diffusivity, and has been well characterized experimentally up to 700 °C [2][3][4][5][6].

While ionic conductivity is believed to be negligible in pure ceria, it in-
creases significantly when ceria is doped with an aliovalent oxide like yttrium(III) oxide ($Y_2O_3$) and lanthanum(III) oxide ($La_2O_3$). The open structure of the fluorite lattice is able to tolerate the high level of atomic disorder that would be introduced by this type of doping. When ceria is doped with a trivalent ion like lanthanum which forms $La_2O_3$, a local charge imbalance is created. The lattice must compensate for this excess negative charge using one of three mechanisms: vacancy compensation, dopant interstitial compensation, and cerium interstitial compensation [7]. These mechanisms can be represented in Kröger-Vink notation as follows:

$$M_2O_3 \xrightarrow{CeO_2} 2M'_Ce + V_O^- + 3O_O^\times$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.1)

$$2M_2O_3 \xrightarrow{CeO_2} 3M'_Ce + M_i^- + 6O_O^\times$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.2)

$$Ce_{Ce}^\times + 2O_O^\times + 2M_2O_3 \xrightarrow{CeO_2} 4M'_Ce + Ce_i^{\times\times} + 8O_O^\times$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.3)

In vacancy compensation (Equation 2.1), an anion vacancy is produced for every two dopant ions placed on the host cation sites. In dopant interstitial compensation (Equation 2.2), one dopant cation is placed on an interstitial site for every three dopant cations that are placed on the host cation sites. In cerium interstitial compensation (Equation 2.3), a cerium Frenkel pair is pro-
duced with the displaced cerium cation placed on an interstitial site for every four dopant cations placed on the host cation sites. Empirical calculations performed by Minervini et al. show that for large dopant cations (cation radius \( > 0.8 \, \text{Å} \)), vacancy compensation is the preferred charge compensation mechanism [7]. Blumenthal et al. also ruled out the formation of interstitial as the compensation mechanism by measuring true density and comparing it with calculated values [8]. In terms of dopant solute concentration, the vacancy compensation mechanism can be represented by:

\[
xMO_{1.5} + (1-x)CeO_2 \leftrightarrow xM'_Ce + 0.5xV'O + (1-x)Ce + (2-0.5x)O_O \quad (2.4)
\]

This reaction implies that when \( x \) moles of dopant oxide (\( MO_{1.5} \)) are added, cation sites are filled with \( x \) moles of dopant cations (\( M^{3+} \)) and \( (1-x) \) moles of host cations (\( Ce^{4+} \)), while anion sites are filled with \( (2-x/2) \) moles of host anions (\( O^{2-} \)) and \( x/2 \) moles of anion vacancies (\( V'O \)). Therefore, a predictable concentration of oxygen vacancies can be introduced into the crystal by controlling the concentration of the lanthanum dopant added. This process can be used to create an oxygen vacancy environment that is similar to the hypostoichiometric configuration of pure ceria.

2.2 Previous Computational Work on Ceria related Materials

Simulation techniques have been used to study a wide range of material properties over a wide range of length and time scales, including thermodynamic properties, defect structures, defect clustering, and transport phenomena. Techniques ranging from Density Functional Theory (DFT), a quantum mechanical theory used to study electron structure over a couple of atoms for a matter of picoseconds, to Finite Element Method (FEM), which can used to study structures as large as a reactor core over a matter of years, each have their own applications and advantages/disadvantages. Figure 2.2 shows the classic illustration of the application of various modeling techniques over the vast time and length scales of interest. This study links the results from several different time/length scales. At the lowest level, the starting point, are the potentials for the La-doped ceria system that have been devel-
Figure 2.2: Visualization of computational modeling techniques shown over the length and time scales that they apply to [9].

opened, either through DFT calculations or from fitting to experimental data. These potentials are fed into Molecular Statics (MS) simulations to calculate local configuration-dependent oxygen vacancy migration energies. These migration energies are then fed into KMC simulations to calculate oxygen diffusivity.

Since their development in the 1970s, Molecular Statics and Molecular Dynamics have been widely used to predict various material properties. However, while they have been used extensively in metal and metal alloy systems, their use in ceramic oxide systems has been comparatively lacking. This is likely due to a lack of confidence in available interatomic potentials. While the potentials in metal and metal alloy systems have been well developed and validated by experimental results, the potentials for ceramic alloys generate results that are not always consistent with experimental data.

Since the understanding of atomic level interactions is very important in nuclear fuel research, a series of studies have been done to model and understand the thermodynamics and defect chemistry of uranium oxide (UO$_2$) [10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19]. An extensive literature review was
provided by Grovers et al. [20][21], where all of the available interatomic potentials on UO$_2$ were compared. They found that none of the potentials reviewed could predict all of the thermodynamic, mechanical, and defect transport properties. For example, they found that oxygen vacancy migration energies obtained from simulations ranged from 0.1 eV to 0.7 eV, while the experimentally measured energy was found to be 0.5 eV. Similarly, oxygen interstitial migration energies obtained from simulations ranged from 0.1 eV to 3.6 eV, while the experimentally measured energies ranged from 0.9 eV to 1.3 eV. These discrepancies could be attributed to the fact that all of the potentials reviewed were obtained by fitting parameters to experimentally measured properties, such as lattice constant, lattice energy, dielectric constants, etc. As most of these potentials were fitted without considering defect energetics, their inability to accurately predict these values is possibly unavoidable. This survey also demonstrated the importance of testing and validating potentials before using them for predictive purposes.

While there are nineteen interatomic potentials available for UO$_2$, there are only a few potentials available for CeO$_2$, and even fewer with dopant parameters. Through an extensive literature survey conducted by Dr. Di Yun, only eight potentials for CeO$_2$ were found. From those eight, three were selected for comparison in this study. Similar to what was found in Grovers’ literature review for UO$_2$ [20][21], all of the potentials found for CeO$_2$ were in two forms.

The first potential form consists of the addition of a Buckingham term to the basic Coulomb potential. This form can be described by:

$$U_{ij}(r) = \frac{q_i q_j e^2}{4\pi\epsilon_0 r} + A_{ij} \exp\left(-\frac{r}{\rho_{ij}}\right) - \frac{C_{ij}}{r^6}$$

(2.5)

where $U_{ij}$ is the pair potential between atoms $i$ and $j$, $r$ is the distance between atoms $i$ and $j$, and $q_i, q_j$ are the charges of atoms $i$ and $j$, respectively. The pair parameters $A_{ij}, \rho_{ij}$, and $C_{ij}$ are free parameters that are obtained by fitting to material properties as discussed earlier. This potential can be extended to take the polarization effects of the nucleus and electron shell into account by using the shell-core model developed by Dick and Overhauser [22]. In this model, the charged nucleus and electron cloud are treated as a massless, negatively charged shell bound by a spring to a massive, positively charged core. The spring constant for this model is determined by the
polarizability of the atoms being modeled.

The second potential form consists of the addition of a Morse potential to the Buckingham potential form in Equation 2.5, which is used to describe the covalent bonding between the anions and cations. This form can be described by:

\[ U_{ij}(r) = \frac{q_i q_j e^2}{4 \pi \varepsilon_0 r} + f_0 (b_i + b_j) \exp \left( \frac{a_i + a_j - r}{b_i + b_j} \right) - C_i C_j \frac{1}{r^6} \]  \hspace{0.5cm} (2.6)

where \(a_i, a_j, b_i, b_j, c_i\), and \(c_j\) are the free parameters that are obtained by fitting to material properties as discussed earlier. Table 2.1 lists the fitted parameters for the potentials considered in this study.

Table 2.1: Shell-core parameters for Buckingham form pair potentials in \(\text{CeO}_2\).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O shell charge</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>-6.5667</td>
<td>-2.04</td>
<td>-6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O core charge</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>4.5667</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O spring constant</td>
<td>eV/Å²</td>
<td>1759.8</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>419.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ce shell charge</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>4.6475</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ce core charge</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>-0.6475</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>-3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ce spring constant</td>
<td>eV/Å²</td>
<td>43.451</td>
<td>177.84</td>
<td>291.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O - O interactions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>eV</td>
<td>9533.421</td>
<td>9547.96</td>
<td>22764.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\rho)</td>
<td>Å</td>
<td>0.234</td>
<td>0.2192</td>
<td>0.149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Å⁶</td>
<td>224.88</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>43.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O - Ce interactions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>eV</td>
<td>755.1311</td>
<td>1809.68</td>
<td>1986.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\rho)</td>
<td>Å</td>
<td>0.429</td>
<td>0.3547</td>
<td>0.35107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Å⁶</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O - La interactions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>eV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2088.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\rho)</td>
<td>Å</td>
<td>0.346</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Å⁶</td>
<td></td>
<td>23.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Previous work has been done using both modeling and experimental techniques to investigate the clustering of oxygen vacancies around dopant ions in ceria doped with trivalent ions (in this system, the so-called lanthanum trapping effect). Wang et al. showed that in the dilute range, charged dimers \((M'_\text{Ce} : V_\text{O})\) form [25]. Gerhardt-Anderson and Nowick extended this work to other \(\text{CeO}_2 : M_2\text{O}_3\) systems, and suggested that conductivity and
dimer binding energy vary inversely with dopant cation radius [26]. Kilner and Brook found that due to the size mismatch between the host and dopant cations, elastic strain energy makes a large contribution to the binding energy of the dimer [27]. Subsequent theoretical studies also showed the importance of defect clustering in the determination of free charge carrier concentration in fluorite oxides [28][29][30].

Previous work has also been carried out to validate this type of local configuration-dependent kinetic Monte Carlo technique. Murray et al. carried out one of the earliest investigations modeling oxygen vacancy conductivity in yttria-doped cerium oxide [31]. They showed that the oxygen vacancy barrier is sensitive to the local dopant environment and that a first nearest neighbor approximation could generate ionic conductivity results that are somewhat consistent with experimental results. Pornprasertsuk et al. used a similar KMC approach by calculating the binding energies of the oxygen vacancies and dopant ions in Yttria-stabilized zirconia [32]. They showed that the association energy of oxygen vacancies and dopant ions was large enough compared to the oxygen vacancy migration barrier to make the vacancy migration energy depend on the local dopant environment. These studies helped to validate the use of local configuration-dependent migration energies in kinetic Monte Carlo simulations, but these codes were written specifically for the systems in question. The goal of this study is to create a generalized code that could be used to simulate arbitrary systems with arbitrarily complex local configurations, as long as the migration energies for these configurations are known.
CHAPTER 3
MOLECULAR STATICS

The primary goal of this work is to develop a generalized KMC code, however it is also important to verify and demonstrate the functionality of this code after it is completed. In this study, the code is demonstrated by comparison of diffusivity results generated from KMC simulations of three different interatomic potentials. This requires not only an explanation of the KMC code developed, but also an explanation of the Molecular Statics simulations carried out to produce migration energies from the selected potentials.

For this study, molecular statics simulations were performed to determine local configuration dependent migration energies using the selected interatomic potentials.

3.1 Background

In Molecular Statics, an atomic system is relaxed at 0 $K$ in order to find the minimum total energy of the system. In most cases, this will be a local minimum on the global energy surface that the starting coordinates lies closest to, as attempting to find the global minimum is far more challenging and has no guarantee of success. Since the simulation is performed at 0 $K$ (i.e. with no kinetic energy), the total energy of the system is given by the potential energy of the system, calculated from the potential energy function $U(\vec{r})$. In general, the form of this potential energy function can be arbitrarily complex, but in most cases the potential is simplified to a spherically symmetric, two or three particle interaction. This is done primarily because of the computational expense of evaluating the potential energy function, but also because more complex potentials are difficult to derive. In this study, the selected interatomic potentials are all pairwise interactions. The form of these potentials is given in Equation 2.5, with the corresponding fitted
parameters given in Table 2.1.

At any given point in space, the potential energy function $U(r)$ can be expanded as a Taylor series:

$$ U(r + \delta r) = U(r) + \frac{\partial U}{\partial r} \delta r + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial^2 U}{\partial r^2} (\delta r)^2 + \cdots $$

(3.1)

where the first derivatives can be written collectively as the gradient vector $g$, and the second derivative matrix as the Hessian matrix, $H$. This expansion is generally truncated at either first or second order, since close to the minimum energy configuration the system behaves harmonically. If the energy is expanded to second order, a Newton-Raphson procedure can be used to find the the local minimum. The second order Taylor series expansion in Equation 3.1 attains its extremum when $\delta r$ solves the linear system:

$$ \frac{\partial U}{\partial r} + \frac{\partial^2 U}{\partial r^2} \delta r = 0 $$

(3.2)

or using the gradient vector and Hessian matrix:

$$ g + H\delta r = 0 $$

(3.3)

Thus, provided an initial guess $r_0$ sufficiently close to the energy extremum, the sequence $r_n$ defined by:

$$ r_{n+1} = r_n - H^{-1} g \quad n > 0 $$

(3.4)

will converge towards the energy extremum. If the potential energy surface is harmonic, the solution to Equation 3.3 will be exact, and the extremum can be found in a single step. However, most realistic potentials, including the ones selected for this study, are not perfectly harmonic, so multiple iterations will be required. Also, in order to ensure that the extremum found is a minimum, the Newton-Raphson scheme in Equation 3.4 is generally modified to use a scaled step size:

$$ r_{n+1} = r_n - \alpha H^{-1} g \quad n > 0 $$

(3.5)

where $\alpha$ is a scalar parameter determined by performing a line search along the search direction to find the one-dimensional minimum.
3.2 Migration Energy Calculations

In order to calculate the oxygen vacancy migration energies, a simulation volume consisting of $4 \times 4 \times 4$ conventional unit cells of CeO$_2$ (768 atoms) is used. Periodic boundary conditions are applied to this volume to extend the system infinitely in each direction, allowing for the calculation of bulk material properties by eliminating boundary surface effects. A local dopant environment is created by substituting La dopant atoms as necessary at the appropriate neighboring cation sites (shown schematically in Figure 3.1) and oxygen vacancy and interstitial defects are generated and placed according to the progress of the migrating oxygen atom along the migration pathway (shown in Figure 3.2). The migrating oxygen atom is fixed in place and the system is relaxed around it. The defect energy is calculated for the system at varying points along the migration pathway so that the minimum (stable) energy and maximum (saddle-point) energy for the migration can be found. The migration energy for the configuration is then calculated as the difference between the saddle point energy and stable configuration energy.

![Figure 3.1: Schematic representation of the migrating vacancy and local dopant environment used to model vacancy migration in La-doped CeO$_2$ [32]. The arrow shows the migration pathway of the oxygen atom (opposite pathway of the oxygen vacancy), the square shows the initial position of the vacancy before migration, and the six numbered cation sites show the local configuration sites that are considered.](image-url)
3.3 GULP Defect Energy Calculations

The MS simulations in this study are performed using the GULP (General Utility Lattice Program) code [33], which uses the Mott-Littleton approach [34] to estimate defect energies. In this approach, the environment around the defects is broken up into three regions by two concentric spheres. In the smallest concentric sphere (Region I), the ions are assumed to be strongly perturbed by the presence of defect and are explicitly relaxed with respect to their Cartesian coordinates. In the second concentric sphere (Region IIa), the ions are assumed to be weakly perturbed by the presence of the defect, so their displacements can be approximated. The area outside the second concentric sphere (Region IIb) is treated as a dielectric medium. Using this approach, both the energy minimum (corresponding to stable defect configurations) and energy maximum (corresponding to the migration saddle point plane) can be considered. Since the migration energy is the difference between the saddle point energy and the stable configuration energy, the Mott-Littleton approach is very convenient for this work.

Since varying the Region I and Region II sizes strongly affects the defect energy calculation, it is important to be sure that these sizes are chosen correctly. As the region sizes increase, the approximations made will become
Table 3.1: Defect energies for varying Mott-Littleton Region I and II sizes. Region sizes are in Å, energies are in eV. Results courtesy of Dr. Di Yun [9].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sizes</th>
<th>Defect energy</th>
<th>Migration Energy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no dopant</td>
<td>6 dopants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>minimum</td>
<td>saddle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-21</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>15.864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-23</td>
<td>15.488</td>
<td>15.8462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-24</td>
<td>15.4737</td>
<td>15.8273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-25</td>
<td>15.4695</td>
<td>15.8209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-30</td>
<td>15.4654</td>
<td>15.8165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-31</td>
<td>15.4616</td>
<td>15.8136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-33</td>
<td>15.4623</td>
<td>15.8114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-35</td>
<td>15.4624</td>
<td>15.8168</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Increasingly valid, but at the same time the computational cost will increase substantially. It is important to find a compromise between these two, as region sizes must be large enough that the defect energies are converged, but small enough to be computed in a reasonable amount of time. To find the best region sizes, the defect minimum and saddle point energies were calculated with varying region sizes in the two extreme dopant cases: with no nearest neighbor sites occupied by dopant ions and with all six nearest sites occupied by dopant ions. These simulations were performed by Dr. Di Yun [9], using yttrium as the dopant, but the results are transferable to other dopant cases. The results of these simulations are given in Table 3.1. These results show that defect energy drops with increasing region sizes, as long as the region size is small. After the region sizes reach 12Å-25Å, the energies converge to reasonably stable values and stay stable with further region size increases. The results also show that the oxygen vacancy migration energies become stable above region sizes of 12Å-25Å. Increasing the Region I size from 12Å to 13Å results in an almost 43% increase in computational time, so the final region sizes of 12Å-25Å were selected for calculating the migration energies.

3.4 Migration Energy Results

With the optimal Region I and II sizes determined, the defect energies and resulting oxygen vacancy migration energies were calculated using the three
selected interatomic potentials. These simulations were performed by Dr. Di Yun [9]. The calculated migration energies are provided in Table 3.2. There is a significant amount of symmetry in this system, so there are only 30 unique configurations that need to be calculated, but the results for all 64 configurations are presented here for the sake of consistency. These configuration-dependent migration energies can now be used in KMC simulations.

Table 3.2: Calculated oxygen vacancy migration energies for all nearest-neighbor cation configurations. Positional numbers are based on the schematic shown in Figure 3.1, energies are in eV. Results courtesy of Dr. Di Yun [9].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>0.3276</td>
<td>0.3063</td>
<td>0.7489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>0.1477</td>
<td>0.1278</td>
<td>0.5366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>0.1477</td>
<td>0.1278</td>
<td>0.5366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>1.0259</td>
<td>1.1403</td>
<td>1.4723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>1.0259</td>
<td>1.1403</td>
<td>1.4723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>0.5232</td>
<td>0.3758</td>
<td>0.6324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>0.5232</td>
<td>0.3758</td>
<td>0.6324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>0.0666</td>
<td>0.0928</td>
<td>0.1889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>0.7812</td>
<td>0.9167</td>
<td>1.4425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>0.7812</td>
<td>0.9167</td>
<td>1.4425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>0.3461</td>
<td>0.1885</td>
<td>0.4775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>0.3444</td>
<td>0.2181</td>
<td>0.8875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>0.7812</td>
<td>0.9167</td>
<td>1.4425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>0.7812</td>
<td>0.9167</td>
<td>1.4425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>0.3444</td>
<td>0.2181</td>
<td>0.8875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>0.3461</td>
<td>0.1885</td>
<td>0.4775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>1.789</td>
<td>2.1444</td>
<td>1.0307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>1.193</td>
<td>1.1141</td>
<td>2.231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>1.193</td>
<td>1.1141</td>
<td>2.231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>1.193</td>
<td>1.1141</td>
<td>2.231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>0.7604</td>
<td>0.4723</td>
<td>1.0875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>0.487</td>
<td>0.6244</td>
<td>0.8691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>0.487</td>
<td>0.6244</td>
<td>0.8691</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued on Next Page...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>La</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>0.1307</td>
<td>0.1646</td>
<td>0.2703</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>0.1307</td>
<td>0.1646</td>
<td>0.2703</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>1.4549</td>
<td>1.8173</td>
<td>1.7113</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>0.9503</td>
<td>0.8765</td>
<td>1.0021</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>0.9539</td>
<td>0.9127</td>
<td>1.0109</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>0.9503</td>
<td>0.8765</td>
<td>1.0021</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>0.9539</td>
<td>0.9127</td>
<td>1.0109</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>0.9539</td>
<td>0.9127</td>
<td>1.0109</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>1.4549</td>
<td>1.8173</td>
<td>1.7113</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>0.9503</td>
<td>0.9127</td>
<td>1.0109</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>0.9539</td>
<td>0.9127</td>
<td>1.0109</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>0.9539</td>
<td>0.9127</td>
<td>1.0109</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>0.5811</td>
<td>0.2754</td>
<td>0.4875</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>1.8705</td>
<td>1.949</td>
<td>1.9202</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>1.8705</td>
<td>1.949</td>
<td>1.9202</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>1.3835</td>
<td>1.0907</td>
<td>1.3448</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>1.3835</td>
<td>1.0907</td>
<td>1.3448</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>1.0656</td>
<td>1.4646</td>
<td>1.3181</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>0.6648</td>
<td>0.6118</td>
<td>0.7476</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>0.6648</td>
<td>0.6118</td>
<td>0.7476</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>0.6648</td>
<td>0.6118</td>
<td>0.7476</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>0.3634</td>
<td>0.1166</td>
<td>0.3282</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>1.559</td>
<td>1.6416</td>
<td>1.4669</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>1.6403</td>
<td>1.4692</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>1.1541</td>
<td>0.881</td>
<td>1.0491</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>1.1541</td>
<td>0.881</td>
<td>1.0491</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>1.6403</td>
<td>1.4692</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>1.559</td>
<td>1.6416</td>
<td>1.4669</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>1.1541</td>
<td>0.881</td>
<td>1.0491</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>1.1541</td>
<td>0.881</td>
<td>1.0491</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>1.8676</td>
<td>1.6653</td>
<td>1.7879</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>1.5779</td>
<td>1.3804</td>
<td>1.3728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>1.5779</td>
<td>1.3804</td>
<td>1.3728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>0.8811</td>
<td>0.6319</td>
<td>0.7995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>0.8811</td>
<td>0.6319</td>
<td>0.7995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>1.1748</td>
<td>1.2985</td>
<td>1.0975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>1.1748</td>
<td>1.2985</td>
<td>1.0975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>1.245</td>
<td>1.0795</td>
<td>1.0531</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These calculated energies already provide some confirmation of the lanthanum trapping effect. For example, comparing the 2nd and 3rd configurations (which correspond to an oxygen vacancy moving towards a lanthanum cation) with the 6th and 7th configurations (which correspond to an oxygen vacancy moving away from a lanthanum cation) shows that in all three potentials it is easier (i.e. the migration energy is lower) for the oxygen vacancy to move toward a lanthanum cation than it is to move away from a lanthanum cation. These energies confirm the tendency of oxygen vacancies to cluster around the lanthanum ions.
4.1 Background

The conventional methods for validating interatomic potentials are mainly through Molecular Dynamics (MD) simulations. The potentials are used to evolve a system in MD, and the results are compared with experimental data such as lattice expansion/contraction with varying temperatures or with varying dopant concentrations. However, due to the time scale limitations of MD simulations (usually limited to evolving on the order of picoseconds), it is difficult to use MD results to compare with experimental results for longer term diffusion or defect structure evolution. Kinetic Monte Carlo (KMC) provides a way to solve this problem. By simulating the atomic jumps between lattice sites as unit events, the time scale can be extended by orders of magnitude compared to the small atomic vibrations simulated in MD.

Kinetic Monte Carlo simulations follow a relatively straightforward algorithm. For a system where some $N$ processes (in this case atomic migrations) can occur with known rates $r_i$, the KMC evolution of the system is governed by the following algorithm:

1. Initialize simulation time to $t = 0$.

2. Form a list of all possible rates in the system $r_i$.

3. Calculate the cumulative function $R_i = \sum_{j=1}^{i} r_i$ for each rate $i = 1, \ldots, N$. Let $R = R_N$ be the total rate sum. (This can be thought of as calculating a discrete cumulative distribution function from the discrete probability density function $r_i$, although this is not technically true because the probability density function is not normalized.)

4. Generate a uniform random number $\rho_1 \in (0, 1]$. 


5. Find the event to carry out $i$ by finding the $i$ such that $R_{i-1} < \rho_1 R \leq R_i$. (This can be thought of as inverting the previously calculated cumulative distribution function.)

6. Carry out event $i$.

7. Recalculate all rates $r_i$ that may have changed due the event that was carried out. If necessary, remove or add any new rates to the list of possible rates.

8. Generate a new random number $\rho_2 \in (0, 1]$.

9. Update the simulation time with $t = t + \Delta t$, where $\Delta t = -\ln(\rho_2)/R$.

10. Return to step 2 and repeat until the desired number of steps have been carried out.

In this context, the rates in question are the oxygen vacancy migration rates. These migration events are thermally activated, with a migration rate given by [35]:

$$r_i = \nu_0 \exp\left(\frac{-\Delta E^i_{m}}{k_B T}\right)$$  \hspace{1cm} (4.1)

where $r_i$ is the rate of migration for the event $i$, $\nu_0$ is the migration attempt frequency, taken to be $1.0 \times 10^{13} Hz$, $\Delta E^i_{m}$ is the migration energy for the event $i$, $k_B$ is the Boltzmann constant, and $T$ is the absolute temperature of the system.

4.2 Original Code

In order to facilitate the development of the generalized code, a very basic KMC simulation code was provided by Dr. Chaitanya Deo at the Georgia Institute of Technology. This code was written specifically to study oxygen interstitial diffusion in uranium oxide. The design of this code was such that attempting to extend it would have been more trouble than it was worth, so a new code was written based loosely on the structure of the original code. In order to better explain the work done in this study, the structure of this original code is explained here. In these explanations certain words
Listing 4.1: Original code configuration input file.

```plaintext
## kmc control input file
size   X  15
size   Y  15
size   Z  15
Temperature  1073
number_vacancy  0
number_hydrogen  0
number IOx  34
monte_carlo_steps  500000
boltzmann       8.61738e−5
lattice        1
```

are capitalized to indicate that they refer to the corresponding data object in the code: Entity, Action, Event, Arrangement, Restriction.

This code starts by reading in the system parameters from an input file. These include values like simulation system dimensions, system temperature, number of steps to run, and particle populations, and are specified as key-value pairs (see Listing 4.1). A list is created for the particle objects, and for each particle, a random initial position is generated such that the position falls on the required sublattice for that particle. Both the lattice type and sublattice types for each particle type are hard-coded, which presents a problem for generalization. If a new interacting particle is to be added to the system, the code must be modified and rebuilt so the input parsing routine can read the particle’s population and so the initial position generator can tell which sublattice the particle should be placed on.

After the list of particles objects is created, the list of possible migration actions is read in from an input file. This includes the associated particle type/sublattice, attempt frequency, migration direction, and migration energy, and is specified in a multicolumn format (see Listing 4.2). When this data is read in, it is stored as a list of Action objects, which contain the specified information, as well as the migration rate for this action. Since these migration actions are assumed not to depend on the local configuration, once the action has been read in, all of the required information to calculate the migration rate from Equation 4.1 is known, so the migration rates are calculated and stored with the Action object. This presents a problem for generalization, as when the energy is allowed to depend on the local
configuration, the migration rates could potentially change value at every
time step for each particle in the system.

After both the Entity list and Action list have been initialized, the system
is ready to be evolved. An event catalog of all of the possible migration
events (step 2 of the general KMC algorithm in Section 4.1) is generated by
scanning through the Entity list and Action list and checking each possible
combination. For each combination of Entity and Action, a list of checks is
performed to see if the pair is a valid migration event. This includes checking
that the particle type that the action acts upon and the particle type of the
paired Entity match and checking that the sublattice that the actions acts
upon and the sublattice of the paired particle match. This is necessary as
the lists can contain Entities and Actions for different particles on different
sublattices, and it is important that the Entity and Actions selected for an
Event are compatible. For example, attempting to apply an oxygen vacancy
migration action on the fluorite tetrahedral interstitial sublattice to an oxygen
interstitial on the fluorite octahedral interstitial sublattice would be a
mistake. A check is also performed on the proposed final position of the
particle to ensure that the final position is currently unoccupied, as moving
a particle to a position where a particle already exists is not possible in this
model. As it will be shown later, this step, while necessary, is very computa-
tionally expensive because of the way the Entity objects are stored. If an
Entity/Action pair passes all of the checks, it is considered a possible event,
and an Event object consisting of the Entity/Action pair is added to the

---

**Listing 4.2: Original code actions input.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Entity</th>
<th>Sublattice</th>
<th>v0</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Migration</td>
<td>3 1</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1e13</td>
<td>2 0 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migration</td>
<td>3 1</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1e13</td>
<td>2 0 -2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migration</td>
<td>3 1</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1e13</td>
<td>2 2 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migration</td>
<td>3 1</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1e13</td>
<td>2 -2 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migration</td>
<td>3 1</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1e13</td>
<td>0 -2 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migration</td>
<td>3 1</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1e13</td>
<td>0 2 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migration</td>
<td>3 1</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1e13</td>
<td>0 -2 -2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migration</td>
<td>3 1</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1e13</td>
<td>0 2 -2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migration</td>
<td>3 1</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1e13</td>
<td>-2 0 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migration</td>
<td>3 1</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1e13</td>
<td>-2 0 -2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migration</td>
<td>3 1</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1e13</td>
<td>-2 -2 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migration</td>
<td>3 1</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1e13</td>
<td>-2 2 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Once the list of all possible events has been generated, a single event is chosen to be carried out. Since the migration energy for each event was assumed to be constant, the rates for all of these events are already known, so the partial sums of these rates are calculated and an event is randomly selected (steps 3-5 of the general KMC algorithm in Section 4.1). The event is carried out (step 6 of the general KMC algorithm in Section 4.1) by applying the Action to the Entity’s position and updating the Entity object’s internal position information. The simulation time is then updated according to steps 8-9 of the general KMC algorithm in Section 4.1. At this point, the event catalog is no longer consistent with the system, so it is emptied in preparation for the next time step. The system loops over this process for the desired number of time steps.

Once the system has finished its evolution (i.e. the specified number of time steps have been carried out), the diffusion coefficient is calculated by:

\[ D = \frac{\langle x^2 \rangle}{6t} \quad (4.2) \]

where \( D \) is the diffusion coefficient, \( \langle x^2 \rangle \) is the average squared displacement of the diffusing particles, and \( t \) is the calculated simulation time.

### 4.3 Generalized KMC Code

While the overall idea behind the original code was well thought out, the implementation of the idea was not going to be sufficient for extension in the areas this work was looking to study. As a result, a new code was written that used the same overall idea from the original code (representing particles and actions as Entity and Action objects, selectively pairing them into Events, then picking one and evolving the system), but restructured in a way that corrected the limitations described in Section 4.2, along with other implementational details. The major changes and extensions are outline here.
4.3.1 Positional Grid

Of primary concern was the handling of the particle positions. In the original code, while it was straightforward to find the position of a specific particle, finding which particle, if any, was occupying a specific position was not so straightforward. This caused a significant increase in computational complexity in the overall code run, specifically because of the Event validation checks. After a specific Entity and Action are confirmed to be a compatible pair, a check is performed to see if the final position after migration is already occupied. If it is occupied, the move is rejected, and if it is not, the move is accepted. Unfortunately, in the original code there is no direct way to resolve an Entity object from a given lattice position. Thus, in order to verify that a given position is unoccupied, the list of Entities must be scanned sequentially, with each Entity’s position compared to the position in question. If the position is indeed unoccupied, this method requires iteration of the entire list to confirm it as such. Because of this, the occupancy check is considered to have linear complexity with respect to the particle count. This check is performed while the event catalog is being constructed, which in itself is of linear complexity with respect to the particle count, as each Entity must be checked against each Action. As a result, the construction of the Event catalog ends up being of quadratic complexity with respect to the particle count. Since the event catalog is reconstructed at each KMC time step, this quadratic complexity significantly impacts the overall performance of the code.

This quadratic complexity problem is addressed in the new KMC code by the addition of a bookkeeping data structure. As the code is written in C++, access to data structures’ memory addresses (pointers) is permitted. With this capability available, what is essentially a map from 3-dimensional positions to Entity pointers is constructed. Since the code is Lattice Kinetic Monte Carlo, particles can only exist on specific lattice sites. As such, the lattice positions can be scaled in such a way as to make all the lattice coordinates non-negative integers. This allows the position map to be created as a 3-dimensional matrix (technically a vector of vectors of vectors) of Entity pointers, with vector indices corresponding to lattice positions. Since C++ STL vector access is constant time with respect to its length, this reduces the occupancy check complexity from linear to constant time with respect to
particle count, which reduces the overall code complexity from quadratic to linear with respect to particle count. This structure is initialized as the particles are added to the Entity list at the beginning of the simulation, and with the constant time access can be easily updated after each migration event. This results in a huge performance gain compared to the original code, as simulations that would take hours in the original code could finish in minutes in the new code. This performance gain is shown explicitly in Section 5.1.

4.3.2 Per-Event Migration Rates

A major limitation in the design of the original code was the lack of proper per-event rates. In the original code, it was assumed that migration energies were constant for a given Action. For example, a oxygen vacancy attempting to jump to the neighboring interstitial site in the +z direction will have the same migration energy regardless of the migrating vacancy’s local environment. Since the migration energy associated with a given action is assumed never to change, the migration rate is only calculated once while the system is being initialized, and both the migration energy and the resulting migration rate for each action are stored as properties of the Action. This limitation is a major problem for this study, as the ability to change migration energies based on the local environment is what this study is all about.

Since actions in the new code are allowed to have different energies based on the local environment, the data structures and the main algorithm need to be changed in the new code. The Event class is extended to hold a migration energy and migration rate, in addition to the references to the Entity and Action it is associated with. As the migration energy and migration rate are now associated with the Events in the event catalog, they need to be calculated each time the event catalog is populated. An additional step is added to the original code algorithm after the event catalog is populated to iterate over the events in the catalog and for each Event, determine the correct migration energy and calculate the corresponding migration rate.
4.3.3 XML Input/Output

In order to facilitate the generalization both to allow arbitrary particle types to be placed in the system and to allow arbitrarily complex local environments and corresponding energies to be specified, the systems for reading and writing data needs to be modified. In the original code, configuration entries were specified as key/value pairs (see Listing 4.1), while the action entries were specified in a multicolumn format (see Listing 4.2). These formats are sufficient for the simplified system the original code was designed for, but it is not sufficient for the complex interactions that need to be specified for this study. Attempting to use these simple tab-delimited formats for complex specifications would result in extremely complex input specifications and even more complex parsers and generators to write them. As I/O specification becomes more complicated it becomes very difficult to read/write input/output files without making mistakes. It also becomes more difficult to access these files programmatically, which makes both generating series of input files and analyzing the resulting output files more difficult.

This problem is solved by the introduction of XML as the method of data transport. XML schemas can be written for arbitrary data transport, which makes it ideal for customized data transport in custom codes such as this. The XML protocol is also very well supported, with XML interfaces either built into or readily available for almost every commonly used programming language. As such, it becomes almost trivial to read and write data from the program. For example, instead of reading the system temperature from the output file by iterating down the lines of the file to the third line, then reading the fifth column of data or something similar, the entire data file can be automatically loaded into a data structure and the temperature can be obtained by some logical data structure accessors like $data->{config}->{temperature}.$

Customized XML schemas for the various input and output files were developed, so input can be generated easily from any programming language with an XML module (almost every commonly used language). An additional input file for Entity naming and sublattice maps was also developed so that arbitrary particle types can be specified and properly added to the system without any modification of the code (see Listing 4.3). Also, when combined with bi-directional maps added to the code, this allows for logical
particle names to be used in the input and output files instead of their internal numerical representation (e.g. the tetrahedral vacancy particle type can be represented by the logical name `tet_vacancy` instead of its internal numerical identifier 4). The configuration input file specifies all of the system configuration parameters like the original code (see Listing 4.4). The actions input file specifies the information related to each migration action (see Listing 4.5), and is extended in the next section to support arbitrary local configuration dependent migration energies. Finally, the output file contains the calculated diffusion coefficient of each of the particle types in the system, along with various runtime statistics (see Listing 4.6).

Listing 4.3: Generalized code sample entities input.

```xml
<?xml version="1.0" encoding="utf-8"?>
<entities>
  <entity>
    <name>sub_lanthanum</name>
    <sublattice>substitutional</sublattice>
  </entity>
  <entity>
    <name>tet_vacancy</name>
    <sublattice>tetrahedral</sublattice>
  </entity>
</entities>
```
Listing 4.4: Generalized code sample configuration input.

```xml
<?xml version="1.0" encoding="utf-8"?>
<configuration>
  <boltzmann_constant>8.61738e−5</boltzmann_constant>
  <dimensions>
    <x>15</x>
    <y>15</y>
    <z>15</z>
  </dimensions>
  <initial_populations>
    <population>
      <count>200</count>
      <entity>sub_lanthanum</entity>
    </population>
    <population>
      <count>100</count>
      <entity>tet_vacancy</entity>
    </population>
  </initial_populations>
  <lattice_parameter>5.411e−8</lattice_parameter>
  <lattice_type>face_centered_cubic</lattice_type>
  <simulation_steps>10000</simulation_steps>
  <temperature>1073</temperature>
</configuration>
```
Listing 4.5: Generalized code sample actions input (truncated to save space).

```xml
<?xml version="1.0" encoding="utf-8" ?>
<actions>
  <action>
    <direction>
      <x>0</x>
      <y>0</y>
      <z>2</z>
    </direction>
    <energy>0.7489</energy>
    <entity>tet.vacancy</entity>
    <frequency>1.0e13</frequency>
    <sublattice>tetrahedral</sublattice>
    <type>migration</type>
  </action>
  <action>
    <direction>
      <x>0</x>
      <y>0</y>
      <z>-2</z>
    </direction>
    <energy>0.7489</energy>
    <entity>tet.vacancy</entity>
    <frequency>1.0e13</frequency>
    <sublattice>tetrahedral</sublattice>
    <type>migration</type>
  </action>
  <action>
    <direction>
      <x>2</x>
      <y>0</y>
      <z>0</z>
    </direction>
    <energy>0.7489</energy>
    <entity>tet.vacancy</entity>
    <frequency>1.0e13</frequency>
    <sublattice>tetrahedral</sublattice>
    <type>migration</type>
  </action>
</actions>
```
Listing 4.6: Generalized code sample output.

```xml
<?xml version="1.0" encoding="utf-8"?>
<results>
  <configuration>
    <temperature>1073</temperature>
    <lattice_type>face_centered_cubic</lattice_type>
    <lattice_parameter>5.411e-008</lattice_parameter>
    <dimensions>
      <x>15</x>
      <y>15</y>
      <z>15</z>
    </dimensions>
  </configuration>
  <entities>
    <entity>
      <name>sub_lanthanum</name>
      <initial_population>200</initial_population>
      <diffusivity>0</diffusivity>
      <square_displacement>0</square_displacement>
      <rms_displacement>0</rms_displacement>
    </entity>
    <entity>
      <name>tet_vacancy</name>
      <initial_population>100</initial_population>
      <diffusivity>8.821e-007</diffusivity>
      <square_displacement>1.570e-012</square_displacement>
      <rms_displacement>1.253e-007</rms_displacement>
    </entity>
  </entities>
  <time_series />
  <run_statistics>
    <run_time>552</run_time>
    <simulation_steps>10000</simulation_steps>
    <simulation_time>2.96782e-009</simulation_time>
    <average_time_step>2.96782e-013</average_time_step>
    <max_time_step>3.69887e-012</max_time_step>
    <min_time_step>2.8271e-017</min_time_step>
    <action_list_size>6</action_list_size>
    <arrangement_count>756</arrangement_count>
    <avg_event_catalog_size>520</avg_event_catalog_size>
    <max_event_catalog_size>594</max_event_catalog_size>
    <min_event_catalog_size>500</min_event_catalog_size>
  </run_statistics>
</results>
```
4.3.4 Arbitrary Local Environments

In order to support migration energies that depend on a local environment, there needs to be a mechanism to check these local environments. Since this involves looking for particles that may or may not occupy various local lattice sites, this procedure will have the same lookup efficiency issues as the migration site occupancy check. Fortunately, the implementation of the positional grid map discussed in Section 4.3.1 makes this lookup relatively efficient. While it is possible to hardcode specific neighbor sites and entity types in the code without too much additional work, this requires the code be modified every time different local configurations are to be simulated. Thus, a more general approach needed to be determined.

Many different ideas were considered to implement this, but only one was sufficiently general to allow an arbitrary number of arbitrary configurations to be specified completely in the action input file without the need to modify or rebuild the code. This method is described here.

To begin, in a given local configuration (referred to as an Arrangement), each position to be considered is specified (referred to as a Restriction). A Restriction consists of a position/entity-type pair, where the position specifies the 3-dimensional position relative to the initial position of the migrating particle, and the entity-type is the type of Entity that should be present in that position. Each Arrangement contains an arbitrary length list of these Restrictions, along with the migration energy that corresponds to this set of Restrictions. An Arrangement can thus consider any arbitrary local configuration that is specified. The Action class is extended to contain an arbitrary length list of these Arrangements. Each Action can thus consider any number of arbitrary local configuration specified. For the local environment used in this study (Figure 3.1), there are six cation sites that influence the migration energy, so each Action contains 64 Arrangements corresponding to the 64 different possible configurations of the six cation sites, where each of these Arrangements contains six Restrictions that specify the positions and entity-types of the configuration, along with the migration energy that correspond to that configuration. A sample Action containing a local arrangement is shown in Listing 4.7 (note that since only the defects are simulated, not the background CeO$_2$ lattice, an “empty” cation site corresponds to a Ce atom). Constructing such an action file can be quite daunting if done manually, but
since it is written in XML, it can be constructed logically in a programming
language data structure and then exported to XML using the language’s
XML interface.

After this information is loaded into the Action data structure, it can be
used during the migration rate calculation step discussed in Section 4.3.2.
During this step, rather than just taking the base migration energy specified
in the action file, the code first checks the associated Arrangements to see
if any of them apply. It does this by iterating over the list of Arrangements
sequentially, and using the energy associated with the first Arrangement
that applies to the event. It checks each Arrangement by iterating over
the list of Restrictions for the Arrangement and checking the positions and
entity types specified by these Restrictions. If any of the Restrictions do not
match, then the Arrangement does not apply to the Event, and if all of the
Restrictions match, then the Arrangement does apply to the Event. If after
checking all of the Arrangements none of them are found to match, the base
migration energy (this can thought of as the “default” energy) for the Action
is used. Once the migration energy has been determined, the migration rate
is calculated in the normal way from Equation 4.1.
Listing 4.7: Generalized code sample action with arrangement.

```xml
<?xml version="1.0" encoding="utf-8"?>
<actions>
  <action>
    <arrangements>
      <arrangement>
        <energy>0.5366</energy>
        <restrictions>
          <restriction>
            <direction>
              <x>-1</x>
              <y>1</y>
              <z>-1</z>
            </direction>
            <entity>no_entity</entity>
          </restriction>
          <restriction>
            <direction>
              <x>1</x>
              <y>-1</y>
              <z>-1</z>
            </direction>
            <entity>sub_lanthanum</entity>
          </restriction>
          <restriction>
            <direction>
              <x>-1</x>
              <y>-1</y>
              <z>1</z>
            </direction>
            <entity>no_entity</entity>
          </restriction>
          <restriction>
            <direction>
              <x>0</x>
              <y>0</y>
              <z>2</z>
            </direction>
            <energy>0.7489</energy>
            <entity>tet_vacancy</entity>
            <frequency>1.0e13</frequency>
            <sublattice>tetrahedral</sublattice>
            <type>migration</type>
          </restriction>
        </restrictions>
      </arrangement>
    </arrangements>
    <direction>
      <x>0</x>
      <y>0</y>
      <z>2</z>
    </direction>
  </action>
</actions>
```
5.1 Computational Complexity

As was discussed in Section 4.3.1, because of the way positions are stored in the original code, there is no direct way to resolve a lattice position to a particle, which results in quadratic complexity with respect to the particle count. This is solved in the generalized code by the introduction of a position-entity map, which reduces position lookups to constant time, and overall code complexity to linear time. To demonstrate this, the generalized code is used to run the same simulation environment that the original code is capable of running. This is a fluorite UO$_2$ lattice with interstitial oxygen atoms added in various concentrations to study hyperstoichiometric effects. The migration energy and attempt frequency are taken to be the same as what was provided with the original code ($E_m = 1.1$ eV, $\nu_0 = 1 \times 10^{13}$ Hz). The simulation system was taken to be a $15 \times 15 \times 15$ unit cell cubic system with periodic boundary conditions. The runtime results for these simulations are provided in a linear scale in Figure 5.1 to show the complexity trends, and in a logarithmic scale in Figure 5.2 for a more useful comparison of the actual time values. These results show the enormous improvement in complexity and runtime, which is critical to the performance of the local configuration-dependent simulations. Without this improvement the more complex simulations would take extraordinary long times to complete.
Figure 5.1: Comparison of computational complexity with respect to the particle count (shown here as a function of the stoichiometric parameter) shown on a linear scale to demonstrate complexity trends.

Figure 5.2: Comparison of computational complexity with respect to the particle count (shown here as a function of the stoichiometric parameter) shown on a logarithmic scale for accurate comparison of runtime values.
5.2 Code Verification

First, it is important to verify that the generalized code is able to reproduce the results of the original code, to confirm that the core functionality of the generalized code is consistent with that of the original code. To confirm this, the diffusivity results from the computation complexity simulations are compared. These simulations provided the oxygen interstitial diffusion coefficient $D_i$ from Equation (4.2). The oxygen self-diffusivity is then calculated by:

$$D_O = [O''_i]D_i$$  \hspace{1cm} (5.1)

where $D_O$ is the oxygen self-diffusivity, $[O''_i]$ is the oxygen interstitial mole fraction, and $D_i$ is the oxygen interstitial diffusivity. The computed results from the original code and from the generalized code are compared with each other, and with experimentally measured values provided by Contamin [36] and Murch [37]. The results are given in Figure 5.3. These results show excellent agreement between the calculated results from the original code and generalized code, and between the calculated results and the experimentally measured values.

![Figure 5.3: Comparison of calculated and experimentally measured oxygen self-diffusivities in hyperstoichiometric UO$_2$.](image)
With the core functionality verified, it is also important to verify the most important extension to the original code: the local configuration dependent energies. The code to read the complex XML input data and store it in the Action data structures, as well as the code to scan for these configurations during migration energy determination are quite extensive. It is important to confirm that these configurations are being recognized correctly by the code as it checks through them. To verify this, the code was modified to output the configuration found as it scans through the local environment of each particle. These counts were aggregated for several different non-stoichiometric values $x$ in $La_xCe_{1-x}O_{2-x/2}$. The distribution of these configuration changes as the system evolves, so in order to confirm the expected initial random distributions, only the configurations for the initial time step are considered. These results are given in Figure 5.4. The configuration number in these figures corresponds to the row number of the configuration as specified in Table 3.2, and can be thought of as increasing with increasing number of neighbor lanthanum cations. These results show that as expected, for low dopant concentrations the configurations found are concentrated around the 0-1 neighbor lanthanum cation configurations, and as the dopant concentration increases, the configuration distribution spreads out to include the higher neighbor lanthanum cation configurations.
Figure 5.4: Configuration distribution verification for initial configurations at increasing non-stoichiometries. The configuration number corresponds to the row number of the configuration at specified in Table 3.2.
5.3 Potential Comparison

To analyze the validity of the potentials described in Table 2.1, KMC simulations are performed using the local configuration dependent migrations energies calculated from these potentials. These simulations are performed on a fluorite CeO$_2$ lattice with lanthanum added to the system in various concentrations to study hypostoichiometric effects. The simulation system is taken to be a $15 \times 15 \times 15$ unit cell cubic system with periodic boundary conditions at $800^\circ$C. Oxygen tetrahedral vacancies and lanthanum substitutional atoms are added according to the vacancy compensation mechanism in Equation 2.4. The local configuration dependent vacancy migration energies for each potential are taken from Table 3.2. Oxygen vacancy diffusion is simulated for various non-stoichiometries, and the oxygen self-diffusivity is calculated from the oxygen vacancy diffusivity by [32]:

$$D_O = [V_O]D_v$$  \hspace{1cm} (5.2)

where $D_O$ is the oxygen self-diffusivity, $[V_O]$ is the oxygen vacancy mole fraction, and $D_v$ is the oxygen vacancy diffusivity. The simulations are repeated for ten different random initial configurations.

To be sure that the event catalog and migration energies are properly sampled, it is important to select a sufficiently large number of simulations steps to run, especially for high dopant concentrations. In order to ensure that a sufficiently large number of steps is used in the validation study, the simulations for one of the potentials were run with increasing simulation steps until the solutions converged. The results are shown in Figure 5.5, and indicate that 500,000 KMC steps is sufficient to get converged results for this system. While this study was only performed for one potential (Gotte [23]), it is assumed that the conclusion can be transferred to the other potentials since the simulations for these potentials use the same particle concentrations and configurational complexity.

With the sufficiently large number of KMC steps determined, the KMC simulations for varying dopant concentrations are performed using the migration energies derived for each of the three potentials (Table 3.2). The same simulations are performed using a constant migration energy that corresponds to the case of zero neighbor lanthanum cations (pure hypostoicho-
Figure 5.5: KMC simulation steps comparison using migration energies derived from the Gotte [23] potential.

metric ceria) in order to demonstrate the effect of the lanthanum interactions. The results of these simulations are shown in Figure 5.6 (Gotte [23]), Figure 5.7 (Minervini [7]), and Figure 5.8 (Sayle [24]).
Figure 5.6: KMC simulation results for migration energies derived from the Gotte [23] potential.

Figure 5.7: KMC simulation results for migration energies derived from the Minervini [7] potential.
Figure 5.8: KMC simulation results for migration energies derived from the Sayle [24] potential.

Figure 5.9: Effective activation energy as a function of non-stoichiometry in La-doped ceria [38].
Diffusivity results from all three potentials clearly show the observed lanthanum trapping effect, as increased lanthanum concentrations reduced the oxygen diffusivity significantly compared to the non-lanthanum interaction case, so in this sense they are all reasonable potentials. However, each potential shows peak oxygen diffusivity at different dopant concentrations. To see which produces the most realistic result, the peak diffusivities are compared to experimental results by Faber et. al [38]. Faber et al. studied ionic conductivity in ceria doped with several different dopant species. From the ionic conductivity, they calculated the effective activation energy for diffusion. These calculated values for lanthanum doped ceria are shown in Figure 5.9.

The overall effective activation energy essentially determines how easy it is for ions to diffuse, so from this it is inferred that the minimum overall activation energy should roughly correspond to the peak oxygen diffusivity. The minimum activation energy as found by Faber occurs at around 4% lanthanum concentration, while the peak diffusivities from Gotte, Minervini, and Sayle occur around 3%, 13%, and 3% respectively. Thus, both the Gotte and the Sayle potentials produce peak diffusivities that are very close to the experimentally determined minimum activation energy. Also interesting to note is the shape of the diffusion curve produced by the Sayle potential. While the Gotte potential produced a diffusion curve that appears to mirror the behavior of the activation energy curve, the diffusion curve produced by the Sayle potential matches behavior only at low dopant concentrations. At approximately 9%, the Sayle diffusivity reaches a local minimum and begins to rise again, which does not match the trend of activation energy curve. This is possibly due to the narrow migration energy distribution produced by the Sayle potential. At higher dopant concentrations, the migration energies for moving towards lanthanum and moving away from lanthanum are closer together for the Sayle potential than for the Gotte or Minervini potentials. The pure ceria migration energy is also much larger and closer to the doped migration energies for Sayle compared to Gotte and Minervini. This could result in a weaker lanthanum trapping effect at higher dopant concentrations and allows the diffusivity to increase with increasing dopant concentration, instead of decreasing as expected from the experimental activation energy results. Based on these results, it is concluded that out of the three, the Gotte potential yielded the most realistic diffusion curve with the most realistic peak oxygen diffusivity.
To conclude, a Kinetic Monte Carlo code has been developed and has been used in validation studies on several interatomic potentials. The following provides a brief summary of the conclusions drawn from this study:

1. A generalized Kinetic Monte Carlo code has been developed to simulate diffusion of defects whose migration energies can vary according to arbitrarily complex specified local atomic configurations.

2. The Molecular Statics/Dynamics code GULP has been used to calculate local configuration-dependent migration energies from three different interatomic potentials for lanthanum doped ceria.

3. Kinetic Monte Carlo simulations have been carried out on oxygen vacancy diffusion in lanthanum doped ceria.

4. The lanthanum trapping effect in lanthanum doped ceria has been confirmed both from Molecular Statics results and from Kinetic Monte Carlo results.

5. Diffusion results from three different interatomic potentials have been compared to each other and to experimental activation energy data.

There are also several places for improvement and extension in the KMC simulation and the generalized KMC code. The following provides a brief list of possible future work:

- Neighbor tables could be added to each Entity that would contain the atoms that that could be affected by a migration event. This would allow the Event catalog to be selectively modified at the end of each time step instead of being completely rebuilt.
- Oxygen vacancies have a tendency to cluster and form voids. A similar series of Molecular Statics calculations could be performed on vacancy-vacancy interactions and these interactions could be added to the simulation.

- Support for additional event types such as particle production (e.g. as a result of radiation damage or fission events) or particle recombination (e.g. Frenkel pair recombination) could be added.

- The use of memory pointers makes parallelization in non-shared memory paradigms difficult. Alternatives that require more work and bookkeeping could be considered in an effort to allow parallelization.
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