No question that in predominantly ionic crystals cation or anion size may influence, greatly, unit cell dimensions and choice of structure type. We show here theoretical indications of significant cation-size tuning of a metal–metal bond in a partially ionic crystal.

We have been studying a $P4/mmm$ ABX$_2$ structural type (Figure 1) suggested by M. J. Bucknum, who termed it “Kentuckia”. Its already realized examples are CaCuO$_2$ and SrFeO$_2$. In the course of exploring variants of this structure, we came upon a hypothetical SrTiO$_2$ compound.

The undercoordinated Ti (and Sr) is obvious. What emerged from DFT calculations was a locally stable structure (confirmed by computation of phonon modes; details provided in the Supporting Information (SI)) with an optimized lattice parameter $c = 3.647$ Å. That is also the Ti–Ti distance, and it is long, beyond what one would normally associate with a bond. But in the electronic structure of SrTiO$_2$ (formally Ti$^{2+}$) a surprise awaited us—a pattern of bands characteristic of a one-dimensional metal along $c$ and a Ti–Ti overlap population (OP, calculated with the extended Hu¨ckel (eH) method) of 0.29, despite that long Ti–Ti separation.

Thinking the Ti atoms along $c$ “wanted” to be closer together, we decided to let them, by trying three smaller alkaline earth (Ae) cations (Be, Mg, and Ca). For good measure, we also tried a larger one (Ba). Given the formal $d^2$ configuration, one should consider the magnetism of these structures. Using a supercell, we computed antiferromagnetic (AFM) and ferromagnetic (FM) structures for all the magnetism of these structures. Using a supercell, we computed antiferromagnetic (AFM) and ferromagnetic (FM) structures for all the phases: the structures emerged nonmagnetic for Ae = Be, Mg, Ca, and Sr. In the barium analogue, however, the FM BaTiO$_2$ (0.26 $\mu_B$) is 0.06 eV per formula unit more stable than the AFM variant.

The results of structure optimization in the series are shown in Table 1. Not all of these compounds may be dynamically stable; in phonon calculations, the Be and Mg compounds show imaginary frequencies. On the other hand, AeTiO$_2$ with large counterions, Ae = Ca, Sr, or Ba, are all stable. There is a dramatic effect of the alkaline earth cation, Ae, on the $c$ dimension in these compounds and a direct dependence on the cation size. For the smallest cations, the $c$ axis length is in the range of typical Ti–Ti bonds; for the largest cations, it is very long. Yet there is still some Ti–Ti bonding at these long distances, as indicated by the overlap population (OP).

Where does the Ti–Ti bonding come from in this structure? The band structure of CaTiO$_2$ (Ti–Ti 3.332 Å) is shown in Figure 2. Notice the high dispersion band crossing the Fermi level ($\Gamma$–Z); it is largely made up of $d_z^2$ orbitals. Another band made up of $d_{xz}$ is partially occupied. The behavior of the levels along the $\Gamma$–Z direction is characteristic of a one-dimensional metallic chain: $d_z^2$ band going sharply up, $d_{xz}$ going down. This bonding pattern is present in all five Kentuckia phases studied.

Representative orbitals at the top and bottom of the $d_z^2$ and $d_{xz}$ bands are shown in Scheme 1. Since the bottom portions of each band are filled, we effectively have both $\sigma$ and $\pi$ bonding along $z$, an approach to a Ti=Ti double bond.

**Table 1.** Computed Lattice Constants (DFT) and the Ti–Ti Overlap Population Values (OP, eH) in Five Kentuckia AeTiO$_2$ Structures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ae</th>
<th>$a$ (Å)</th>
<th>$c$ (Å)</th>
<th>Ti–Ti OP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BeTiO$_2$</td>
<td>3.911</td>
<td>2.856</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MgTiO$_2$</td>
<td>3.958</td>
<td>3.105</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CaTiO$_2$</td>
<td>3.993</td>
<td>3.332</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SrTiO$_2$</td>
<td>4.036</td>
<td>3.647</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BaTiO$_2$</td>
<td>4.075</td>
<td>4.129</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 1.** Left: The $P4/mmm$ Kentuckia structure (ABX$_2$), atoms specified for SrTiO$_2$. The relationship to the perovskite structure is emphasized in this view; a true perovskite would also include the atoms indicated by the dotted red empty circles. Right: An ordered rock-salt type CaTiO$_2$ structure.

**Scheme 1**

Ti(II) compounds, extended or molecular, are rare. Apart from TiO (defect rock-salt, much nonstoichiometry in this structure) and the titanium halides TiX$_2$ ($X = Cl, Br, I$) which crystallize in the CdI$_2$ structure, there are very few other well-established Ti(II) extended structures.
Are the AeTiO$_2$ structures we propose realistic? We investigated computationally the potential decomposition or combustion reaction energy ($\Delta E$) of five pretty straightforward reactions shown in Table 2.

The first two simple alternative decomposition pathways, (1) and (2), are endothermic, which is encouraging. (3) is exothermic only for CaTiO$_2$. We also looked at two reactions, (4) and (5), involving O$_2$, the latter being the perovskite formation. These reactions were exothermic. Nothing surprising here, perovskites and Ti$^{4+}$ compounds are common structures. Before the synthesis of SrFeO$_3$ from its parent perovskite SrFeO$_3$ in 2007, three one might have viewed the great perovskite stability as an impediment to the existence of AeTiO$_2$ compounds. No longer; we think these compounds might be possible to make.

But one should think of other structural possibilities for AeTiO$_2$. Both TiO$_2$ and CaO have a rock-salt structure, and Ca and Ti have similar ionic radii. So a rock-salt CaTiO$_2$ phase is a possibility.

We optimized the ordered rock-salt type CaTiO$_2$ structure shown in Figure 1 (right). This structural variant is 0.21 eV per CaTiO$_2$ more stable than Kentuckia (Figure 1, left) and is dynamically stable (no imaginary frequencies in phonon spectrum). The Ti–O distances are longer than a typical Ti–O bond: Ti–O bonds range from 1.92 to 1.98 Å in rutile, anatase and brookite TiO$_2$. The nearest four Ti distances are long 3.290 Å, but the computed Ti magnetic moment is 1.3 eV. An analysis of the phonon modes for these structures is given in the SI.

The rock-salt structure is not strictly a rock-salt phase, this structure was not strictly the Kentuckia structure (see SI). The AFM rock-salt structure (using a $\sqrt{2} \times \sqrt{2} \times 2$ supercell) is preferred to the FM alternative by 0.06 eV per CaTiO$_2$; the calculated Ti magnetic moment is 1.3 $\mu_B$.

The calculated energies per formula unit were significantly higher (>0.30 eV) for these structural alternatives, compared to the Kentuckia structure (see SI).

We moved next to evolutionary structure prediction, utilizing USPEX. A USPEX search for SrTiO$_2$ and BaTiO$_2$ leads to the Kentuckia structures. For CaTiO$_2$, the lowest energy structure (~0.40 eV per CaTiO$_2$ relative to Kentuckia) was of rock-salt type, but one different from the previous rock-salt structure. Going along an –O–M–O–M– chain, this structure was not strictly alternating –Ti–O–Ca–O–Ti–O–Ca– but a less symmetrical variant. Clearly there are going to be many “polymorphs” of the rock-salt structure; it is not easy to examine them all. Annotating molecular dynamics (MD) calculations undertaken on the Kentuckia AeTiO$_2$, Ae = Ca, Sr, or Ba, structures (2000–100 K) did not alter the phase.

To our knowledge, there are no AeTiO$_2$ phases known. The reaction of TiO$_2$ with Ae metals (Ae = Mg, Ca, Sr, and Ba) at 950 °C for 7 days gave AeO, AeTiO$_3$, Ae$_2$TiO$_5$, and Ti$_2$O phases but not the computed Kentuckia or rock-salt AeTiO$_2$ phases. The corresponding powder X-ray diffraction (pXRD) patterns (experimental and simulated) are shown in the SI. Perhaps a low-temperature synthetic method provides a better pathway to the preparation of AeTiO$_2$.

Rock-salt or Kentuckia in structure, this would be an interesting set of compounds.
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Table 2. Computed Reaction Energy ($\Delta E$) for Five Hypothetical Reactions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reaction</th>
<th>$\Delta E$ (eV)</th>
<th>CaTiO$_2$</th>
<th>SrTiO$_2$</th>
<th>BaTiO$_2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) AeTiO$_2$ $\rightarrow$ Ae+TiO$_2$</td>
<td>+1.57</td>
<td>+1.46</td>
<td>+1.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) AeTiO$_2$ $\rightarrow$ Ae+Ti+O$^-$</td>
<td>+0.20</td>
<td>+0.69</td>
<td>+0.98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) 3AeTiO$_2$ $\rightarrow$ 3Tio+2Aeo+3AeTiO$_3$</td>
<td>−0.08</td>
<td>+0.29</td>
<td>+0.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) AeTiO$_2$ $\rightarrow$ Ae+TiO$_2$</td>
<td>−4.69</td>
<td>−4.30</td>
<td>−4.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) AeTiO$_2$ $\rightarrow$ Ae+TiO$_3$</td>
<td>−4.96</td>
<td>−6.39</td>
<td>−5.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>