

Toward the unified image of the spin transition of iron in the lower mantle minerals

K. FUJINO^{1*} AND T. IRIFUNE¹²

¹GRC, Ehime University, Matsuyama 790-8577, Japan
(*correspondence: fujino@sci.ehime-u.ac.jp)

²Earth-Life Science Institute, Tokyo Institute of Technology,
Tokyo 152-8550, Japan (irifune@dpc.ehime-u.ac.jp)

Pressure-induced spin transition of iron in the lower mantle minerals is important to understand the dynamics of the lower mantle. However, we still do not have the unified image of the spin transition of iron in Mg-perovskite (Pv) and post-Mg-perovskite (PPv). The prolonged controversy of the spin state of Fe²⁺ in Pv and PPv seems to have settled down that Fe²⁺ remains high spin (HS) at the dodecahedral site (A site). However, there is still a controversy about the preferred site and the spin state of Fe³⁺ in Al-bearing Pv and PPv. Some experimental results indicate that Fe³⁺ becomes low spin (LS) at the octahedral site (B site) in Al-bearing Pv and PPv that involve no Fe²⁺ [1] [2]. On the other hand, other experimental results indicate that Fe³⁺ prefers to occupy the A site and remains HS in Pv and PPv that involve a certain amount of Fe²⁺ [3] [4]. First-principles calculations also indicate that Fe³⁺ remains HS at the A site [5].

In an attempt to resolve these situations, we are trying to find the reasons to explain these discrepancies. So far, in the previous reports, Fe³⁺ is assumed to occupy the regular A or B site with space group *Pbnm* (Pv) or *Cmcm* (PPv). However, there is a possibility that Fe³⁺ may occupy the locally distorted site although the space group remains *Pbnm* (Pv) or *Cmcm* (PPv), and these possibilities have not yet been fully examined experimentally or theoretically. Also, coexisting Fe²⁺ at the A site may affect the preferred site and thereby the spin state of Fe³⁺ in Pv and PPv. In the presentation, these possibilities are discussed to resolve the above discrepancies and obtain the unified image of the spin transition of iron in the lower mantle minerals.

[1] Catalli et al. (2011) *EPSL* **310**, 293-302. [2] Fujino et al. (2014) *PEPI* **228**, 186-191. [3] Mao et al. (2014) *EPSL* **403**, 157-165. [4] Dorfman et al. (2014) *2014 AGU Fall Meeting*, MR24A-01. [5] Hsu et al. (2012) *EPSL* **359-360**, 34-39.