

ARTICLE

DOI: 10.1038/s41467-017-02263-z

OPEN

Viscosity jump in the lower mantle inferred from melting curves of ferropericlase

Jie Deng 1 & Kanani K.M. Lee 1

Convection provides the mechanism behind plate tectonics, which allows oceanic lithosphere to be subducted into the mantle as "slabs" and new rock to be generated by volcanism. Stagnation of subducting slabs and deflection of rising plumes in Earth's shallow lower mantle have been suggested to result from a viscosity increase at those depths. However, the mechanism for this increase remains elusive. Here, we examine the melting behavior in the MgO-FeO binary system at high pressures using the laser-heated diamond-anvil cell and show that the liquidus and solidus of $(Mg_xFe_{1-x})O$ ferropericlase (x = -0.52-0.98), exhibit a local maximum at ~40 GPa, likely caused by the spin transition of iron. We calculate the relative viscosity profiles of ferropericlase using homologous temperature scaling and find that viscosity increases 10-100 times from ~750 km to ~1000-1250 km, with a smaller decrease at deeper depths, pointing to a single mechanism for slab stagnation and plume deflection.

¹Department of Geology and Geophysics, Yale University, New Haven, CT 06511, USA. Correspondence and requests for materials should be addressed to J.D. (email: <u>ije.deng@yale.edu</u>)

ecently, Rudolph et al.¹ observed a jump in viscosity by a factor of 10-100 at 800-1200 km depths based on a reanalysis of the long-wavelength nonhydrostatic geoid, indicating a possible correlation between this viscosity variation and slab stagnation² and plume deflection^{3,4} in the shallow lower mantle. Assuming an initially silica-rich lower mantle, a recent geodynamic modeling study⁵ argued that a 20-fold change in viscosity associated with large-scale heterogeneity is sufficient to prevent efficient mantle mixing and generate the intrinsically strong bridgmanite-enriched domains in the shallow lower mantle, which in turn can explain the present day radial viscosity jump at those depths. However, the prescribed relationship between silica concentration and bulk viscosity of materials is rough as viscosity is not only sensitive to the major element chemistry but also many other factors including deformation mechanism, strain, and grain size. Alternatively, a change in the redox state of bridgmanite at pressures of 40-70 GPa may alter the Fe partitioning between bridgmanite and ferropericlase and result in an iron-depleted bridgmanite zone in the shallow lower mantle⁶. However, the effects of Fe on the melting temperatures of bridgmanite are controversial^{7,8} and consequently the viscosity increase induced by the high melting temperatures of irondepleted bridgmanite inferred from the homologous temperature scaling remains poorly constrained. Thus, although seismic tomography, geoid inversion and geodynamic modeling provide robust evidence for the viscosity jump in the mid-mantle, the corresponding mechanism remains enigmatic.

The viscosity of the lower mantle is suggested to be strain dependent⁹. In regions where large shear strain occurs (e.g., near subducting slabs and defected plumes), the weakest phase, (Mg, Fe)O ferropericlase, would form an interconnected weak layer (IWL) and therefore is expected to dominate the viscosity. Using homologous temperature scaling, the rheology of the lower mantle can be further assessed. The rate of plastic deformation of ferropericlase is proportional to the effective self-diffusion coefficients of the slowest species, i.e., Mg and Fe⁹, which, in turn, are related to the melting temperature by the homologous temperature scaling relation. Using the melting curve of MgO reported by Zerr and Boehler¹⁰, Yamazaki and Karato⁹ derived a nearly depth-independent viscosity of ferropericlase. But recent experiments¹¹⁻¹³, first-principles calculations¹⁴ and thermodynamic modeling¹⁵ consistently favor a much higher melting curve of MgO with a much larger zero pressure melting slope (dT_m/dP) , where T_m is the melting temperature under pressure *P*). Additionally, because ferropericlase in the lower mantle likely contains 15-20% iron depending on the iron partitioning between bridgmanite¹⁶, a linear reduction of melting temperature based on the percentage of iron is often carried out when calculating the melting curve of iron-bearing ferropericlase¹⁷ without any physical basis. Therefore, better-constrained melting curves of iron-bearing ferropericlase are important to understand the variation of viscosity of ferropericlase at high pressures and temperatures.

Here, using the laser-heated diamond-anvil cell (LHDAC), we study the melting phase relations of the MgO–FeO binary system up to ~80 GPa. We use both ideal and regular solution models fit our experimental data and both suggest that the liquidus and solidus curves of $(Mg_xFe_{1-x})O$ ferropericlase (x = ~0.52-0.98), exhibit a local maximum at ~40 GPa. Based on these melting curves, the relative viscosity profiles of ferropericlase of Earth-relevant compositions are calculated using homologous temperature scaling. We find that the viscosity of ferropericlase shows a 10–100 times increase from ~750 km to ~1000–1250 km, and a subsequent smaller scale decrease at deeper depths, irrespective of deformation mechanism or mantle heterogeneity.

Results

Laser heating and chemical characterization. We performed high-pressure melting experiments using the LHDAC on finegrained (Mg_xFe_{1-x})O ferropericlase (x=0.20, 0.23, 0.81, 0.82, 0.88, 0.90, 0.91) at pressures up to 80 GPa (see "Methods" for details). Temperatures were determined using the inverse modeling method (see "Methods" for details). Samples were recovered from the LHDAC and examined with an analytical scanning electron microscope (ASEM) using wavelength dispersive spectroscopy (WDS). Sample cross-sections, chemical characterization of the run products, and determined temperatures can be found in Fig. 1, Supplementary Fig. 1, Supplementary Table 1, and Supplementary Note 1.

Phase diagram calculation. The mixing of MgO and FeO at low pressures (e.g., 3-7 GPa) has been described by the ideal solution model¹¹ for both liquid and solid states, whereas Frost¹⁸ resolved non-zero interaction parameters (Margules parameters), $W_{\rm FeO-MgO}^{\rm solid}$ for MgO–FeO solid solution. Therefore, we used both the ideal solid solution and symmetric regular solution models to fit our data to avoid any inherent biases in the models. The biases are, for example, that the ideal solution model is incapable of producing inflection points in phase loops.

The equations we used to fit our data at each pressure are

$$\begin{split} \Delta H_{\rm m,FeO} & \left(1 - \frac{T}{T_{\rm m,FeO}}\right) + W_{\rm FeO-MgO}^{\rm liquid} \left(X_{\rm MgO}^{\rm liquid}\right)^2 \\ & - W_{\rm FeO-MgO}^{\rm solid} \left(X_{\rm MgO}^{\rm solid}\right)^2 + RT \ln \frac{1 - X_{\rm MgO}^{\rm liquid}}{1 - X_{\rm MgO}^{\rm solid}} = 0, \end{split} \tag{1}$$

$$\Delta H_{\rm m,MgO} \left(1 - \frac{T}{T_{\rm m,MgO}} \right) + W_{\rm FeO-MgO}^{\rm liquid} \left(1 - X_{\rm MgO}^{\rm liquid} \right)^2 - W_{\rm FeO-MgO}^{\rm solid} \left(1 - X_{\rm MgO}^{\rm solid} \right)^2 + RT \ln \frac{X_{\rm MgO}^{\rm liquid}}{X_{\rm MgO}^{\rm solid}} = 0,$$
⁽²⁾

where *R* is the gas constant, *T* is temperature, $\Delta H_{m,FeO}$ and ΔH_{m} , MgO are the enthalpy of melting of pure FeO and MgO, respectively. $T_{m,FeO}$ and $T_{m,MgO}$ are the melting temperatures of pure FeO and MgO and are directly taken from refs. ^{14,19} respectively. $X_{i}^{liquid/solid}$ is the component i (FeO or MgO) in the liquid or solid phase. $W_{FeO-MgO}^{solid}$ and $W_{FeO-MgO}^{FeO}$ the Margules parameters for the solid and liquid MgO–FeO solution, respectively. For the ideal solution models, the Margules parameters are assumed to be zero and only two paraeters, $\Delta H_{m,FeO}$ and $\Delta H_{m,MgO}$ are free fitting parameters. The regular solution models, in contrast, have four undetermined parameters. As the data set available for each pressure is limited, direct fitting for four parameters leads to large non-uniqueness. Therefore, extra constraints on the fitting parameters are necessary. $W_{FeO-MgO}^{solid}$ is informed by previous studies^{20,21}. Frost et al.²⁰ gives the following equation:

$$W_{\rm FeO-MgO}^{\rm solid}({\rm kJ\,mol^{-1}}) = 11 + 0.11P,$$
 (3)

where *P* is pressure in GPa (the uncertainty is not given in the source). However, we note that this relation is based on only one experimentally determined $W_{\rm FeO-MgO}^{\rm solid}$ value at 18 GPa¹⁸. As such, we combine this value and another available experimentally determined $W_{\rm FeO-MgO}^{\rm solid}$ value for olivine²¹ at 1 bar and fit them together with respect to pressure to get the following relation:

$$W_{\rm FeO-MgO}^{\rm solid}(\text{kJ}\,\text{mol}^{-1}) = 2.60(\pm 0.50) + 0.59(\pm 0.03)P,$$
 (4)

V



Fig. 1 SEM images of representative cross sections of recovered ferropericlase melted samples. Samples melted at **a** 60 GPa (Jul0415) and **b** 27 GPa (Fp2002). Both images show a clearly quenched melt (I), co-existing solid that is relatively iron depleted (II), and starting material (III) regions. The starting material used in the left panel [($Mg_{0.20}$, Fe_{0.80})O] was self-insulated whereas the starting material used in the right panel [($Mg_{0.20}$, Fe_{0.80})O] was insulated by pure MgO. ($Mg_{0.20}$, Fe_{0.80})O reacted with MgO, generating a more Mg-rich melt and coexisting solid compared with the starting material



Fig. 2 The phase diagrams of ferropericlase. Curves in **a-e** show the ideal (red, dashed) and regular solid solution models (black, solid) at 27, 40, 50, 60, and 80 GPa, respectively. The solid symbols represent the composition of melt and coexisting ferropericlase (solid circles, triangles and diamonds represent data from this study, refs. ^{12,49} respectively). Uncertainties (95% confidence interval) for temperatures and compositions are shown and listed in the Supplementary Table 1. Temperatures are measured and corrected using the multi-layer inverse modeling method (Supplementary Table 1)⁴⁹. FeO and MgO melting temperatures (open squares) are taken from refs. ^{14,19} respectively

where *P* is pressure in GPa. We use Eqs. (3) and (4) as the bounds for $W_{\rm FeO-MgO}^{\rm solid}$ values used in the fitting of the phase diagrams. The other Margules parameter $W_{\rm FeO-MgO}^{\rm liquid}$ has not been studied before in MgO–FeO system at high pressures and thus it is treated as a free fitting parameter.

As for the remaining two parameters, $\Delta H_{m,FeO}$ and $\Delta H_{m,MgO}$, we emphasize that they are the enthalpy change of endmembers at reference states. For example, $\Delta H_{m,FeO}$ is the enthalpy difference between the liquid and solid FeO at the melting temperature (here the reference temperature is the melting temperature of FeO). According to previous studies^{22,23}, FeO remains in the B1 structure along its melting temperatures to pressures well above our experimental range. Therefore, the structural phase transitions of FeO at low temperatures²⁴ are not relevant in fitting the solidus and liquidus loops. There are no direct experimental studies of $\Delta H_{m,FeO}$ at high pressures. Previous thermodynamic modelings^{20,25} yield the equation of states of liquid FeO, which combined with the experimentally determined equation of states of solid FeO²³ enable us to calculate the $\Delta H_{m,FeO}$ at elevated pressures. The resolved $\Delta H_{m,FeO}$ values based on refs. ^{20,25} are almost identical at pressure lower than 11 GPa but become gradually discrepant with pressure and are different by ~20 kJ mol⁻¹ at 80 GPa. We adopt both $\Delta H_{m,FeO}$ values as the bounds in phase diagram modeling using the regular solution model. In contrast, both $\Delta H_{m,MgO}$ values and their trends with respect to pressure reported by first-principles

calculation^{14,26,27} at pressures greater than 1 bar are extremely discrepant and the discrepancies increase with pressure. For example, at 90 GPa the smallest $\Delta H_{m,MgO}$ value reported by the calculation study is only ~75 kJ mol⁻¹²⁰ in contrast to the largest value of ~180 kJ mol⁻¹¹⁴. Therefore, we set $\Delta H_{m,MgO}$ as a free fitting parameter.

The best fitting parameters are shown in Supplementary Tables 2 and 3 for the ideal and regular solution model, respectively. Although the ideal and regular solution models yield similar phase diagrams, the ideal solution model gives unrealistically high $\Delta H_{m,FeO}$. This is because $\Delta H_{m,FeO}$ is related $\Delta V_{m,FeO}$, the volume change of melting by $\Delta H_{m,FeO} = \Delta V_{m,FeO} \times T_m \frac{dP}{dT_m}$. The $\Delta H_{m,FeO}$ at 1 bar has been experimentally determined to be ~35 kJ mol^{-1 28}, corresponding to $\Delta V_{m,FeO}$ of ~0.52 cm³ mol⁻¹. A $\Delta H_{m,FeO}$ of 105 kJ mol⁻¹at 27 GPa indicates that $\Delta V_{m,FeO}$ is ~1.2 cm³ mol⁻¹, which is unlikely considering that the compression of both solid and liquid FeO at high pressures. Therefore, a regular solution model might be more appropriate to describe the MgO–FeO solution in the pressure range we examined.

The phase diagrams at 27, 40, 50, 60, and 80 GPa constructed using the best fitting parameters are shown in Fig. 2. The ideal solution model and regular solution model yield overall similar phase diagrams, especially at higher pressures. Additionally, we also apply our parameters fitted at high pressures but interpolated to low pressures, to existing literature data at 3 GPa¹²



Fig. 3 Melting curves of ferropericlase. Liquidus (L) and solidus (S) temperatures of **a** ($Mg_{0.75}Fe_{0.25}$)O (triangles), **b** ($Mg_{0.8}Fe_{0.2}$)O (circles), **c** ($Mg_{0.85}Fe_{0.15}$)O (inverted triangles), and **d** ($Mg_{0.9}Fe_{0.1}$)O (squares) assuming the ideal (red, open symbols) and regular solution models (black, solid symbols), respectively. Uncertainties (95% confidence interval) on the temperatures are ~±10% as indicated by the red and gray shaded regions for the ideal and regular solution models, respectively. The blue shaded regions correspond to the composition-dependent spin transition pressure range at 300 K (-35-70 GPa)³³. The spin transition pressure ranges at corresponding high temperatures are likely broader but begin at pressures similar to those at 300 K^{65,66}. The curves are drawn as a guide for the eye

and find good agreement (Supplementary Fig. 2 and Supplementary Note 2), helping to validate our solution models.

Melting curves of ferroepericlase. Based on the phase diagrams, we infer the solidus and liquidus curves for (Mg,Fe)O with different Earth-relevant iron contents (Fig. 3). Four consistent features of the solidus and liquidus curves of ferropericlase are noticeable. First, the solidus temperatures of ferropericlase are much smaller (more than 1000 K) than those extrapolated by a linear reduction of melting curves of pure MgO and FeO¹⁴ (Supplementary Fig. 3 and Supplementary Note 3). Second, the melting temperatures (both solidus and liquidus) locally peak at ~40 GPa and the difference between the melting temperatures at 27 and 40 GPa is as high as ~900 K. Third, the magnitude of the melting temperature (both solidus and liquidus) increase from 27 to 40 GPa (i.e., melting slope) is larger than that of the melting temperature decrease from 40 to 50 GPa. Fourth, between 50 and 60 GPa, the melting slope becomes positive again. It should be noted that most of our experimental data set is concentrated in the Mg-rich end. Therefore, the ferropericlase melting temperatures with Earth-relevant compositions (Mg#=100×Mg/(Mg+Fe) by mol=75-90) are robustly constrained by the experimental data regardless of the solution models implemented (Fig. 2).

Discussion

Our preferred way to interpret the observed unusual melting behavior of (Mg,Fe)O is the spin crossover of Fe²⁺ in (Mg,Fe)O. The spin transition of iron in the lower mantle is generally expected to result in considerable changes including: physical (e.g., density and elastic moduli), chemical (e.g., element partitioning), and transport properties (e.g., electrical conductivity)²⁹. While it is unknown how the spin transition affects the melting of (Mg,Fe)O, a qualitative estimate can be obtained based on Lindemann's law, which provides a simple relationship between the melting temperature and the thermoelastic properties of materials, $T_m \propto C/\rho$, where C is some combination of elastic moduli and ρ is the density^{9,30}. Both experiments and first principles computations have shown that the spin transition softens and densifies (Mg,Fe)O^{31,32}. Therefore, we can expect that the spin transition will tend to lower the melting temperatures based on Lindemann's law (see Supplementary Fig. 4 and Supplementary Note 4 for further discussion), setting up a local

maximum in each melting curve. However, after the mid-point of the spin crossover, the moduli will again monotonically increase^{31,32}, thus causing the melting temperatures to again increase. For Earth-relevant compositions, the local maximum in $T_{\rm m}$ occurs at ~40 GPa based on the spin-state crossover region³³. Additionally, the varying signs of melting slopes for the melting curves of ferropericlase is unexpected but not unique³⁴ and is consistent with the spin crossover of Fe²⁺ in both (Mg,Fe)O solid³⁵ and liquid^{36,37} (Supplementary Note 5).

With the melting curves of ferropericlase, we further calculated the effective diffusion coefficients using homologous temperature scaling. As has been argued for multi-component systems, we use the solidus as the melting temperature in the homologous temperature scaling³⁰. The radial relative viscosity profiles of ferropericlase based on its solidus curves are shown in Fig. 4 using both a "cool" geotherm³⁸ and a relatively "hot" geotherm³⁹. We also calculate the radial relative viscosity profiles of ferropericlase based on the liquidus curves and find similar results (Supplementary Fig. 5).

Our results are in contrast to early high-pressure, roomtemperature deformation experiments^{40,41} on $(Mg_{0.83}Fe_{0.17})O$ and MgO which show negligible rheological variations with pressure. More recently, a deformation experiment on $(Mg_{0.9}Fe_{0.1})O$ and $(Mg_{0.8}Fe_{0.2})O$ at elevated temperatures (up to 770 K), found that the strength of ferropericlase increases by a factor of three at pressures from 20 to 65 GPa¹⁷. Further modeling based on this strength increase suggests a viscosity jump by ~2.3 orders of magnitude in regions of large shear strain in the shallow lower mantle. While their result¹⁷ is roughly consistent with our results, at least until ~40-50 GPa, it is dependent on deformation mechanism and the data are collected at low temperatures, which makes the results difficult to apply to Earth's interior. Additionally, we also suggest the viscosity of ferropericlase should decrease between ~40 and 50 GPa, while Marquardt and Miyagi¹⁷ indicate that the viscosity of ferropericlase will continue to increase, likely due to the low temperatures achieved in their experiments.

It is noted that the viscosity profile of ferropericlase calculated in this study is in excellent agreement with that proposed by Wentzcovitch et al.⁴², where viscosity was estimated based on the elastic strain energy model. The viscosity is a function of the effective diffusivity (see Eqs. (8) and (9) in "Methods") which is further related to the shear and bulk moduli by the elastic strain



Fig. 4 The radial relative viscosity profiles of ferropericlase inferred from homologous temperature scaling and the solidus melting curves. Profiles based on the ideal (red, open symbols) and regular solution models (black, solid symbols) for $(Mg_{0.75}Fe_{0.25})O$, $(Mg_{0.85}Fe_{0.2})O$, $(Mg_{0.85}Fe_{0.15})O$ and $(Mg_{0.9}Fe_{0.1})O$ assuming a **a** "cool" geotherm³⁸ and a relatively **b** "hot" geotherm³⁹. Symbol identification is the same as in Fig. 3. Viscosity values are scaled relative to the viscosity at 27 GPa. For these curves, the non-dimensional constant *g* in the homologous temperature scaling is given a value of 12 (Methods). Uncertainties on the viscosity are approximately enveloped by the values given by the solidus and liquidus (Supplementary Fig. 5) and two different solid solution models under two different geotherms. The blue shaded regions include spin transition pressure range for Mg#75-90 at 300 K (-35-70 GPa)³³. The spin transition pressure ranges at corresponding high temperatures are likely broader but begin at pressures similar to those at 300 K^{65,66}. The curves are drawn as a guide for the eye

energy model because ionic diffusion shears and stretches the chemical bonds on the diffusion path⁴². Using the elastic constants obtained by first-principle computations, a local peak viscosity was found at ~40 GPa⁴². The consistency between ref. ⁴² and this study is not fortuitous. Both studies suggest that the viscosity of ferropericlase is correlated with its thermoelastic properties. Although our observation is only directly concerned with the melting behavior of ferropericlase, melting has been suggested to be closely related to the thermoelastic properties in general by both the shear instability model and the vibrational instability model (see ref. 43 for a review). Based on the latter instability model, Lindemann's law mentioned earlier is one example that relates the elastic constants to melting temperatures. As such, the viscosity profile of ferropericlase by ref.⁴² and this study indicate that the viscosity peaking at ~40 GPa is a necessary result of the thermoelastic anomaly induced by the spin crossover of Fe²⁺ for Earth-relevant ferropericlase.

Note that in our analysis, diffusion creep and dislocation creep yield identical relative viscosity profiles. This is because we do not include the strength variation suggested by the low temperature deformation experiments for dislocation creep¹⁷ and consequently for both dislocation creep and diffusion creep, the resultant viscosity of ferropericlase is $\eta \propto T/D_{\rm eff}$ where $D_{\rm eff}$ is the effective diffusion coefficient of Mg or Fe and T is temperature. While the specific values of the viscosity of ferropericlase depends on the values we use for the input parameters in the homologous temperature scaling and in the formula for different deformation mechanisms ("Methods"), a viscosity jump by one to two orders of magnitude from 27 GPa (~750 km) to ~40–50 GPa (~1000–1250 km) is a necessary result of the corresponding increase in melting temperature of ferropericlase with the compositions examined here regardless of the dominant

deformation mechanisms and geotherms used. Likewise, a viscosity drop of smaller scale at deeper depths is also a necessary result stemming from the ferropericlase melting curves.

In large strain regions where ferropericlase likely forms an IWL framework⁴⁴, a one to two orders of magnitude jump in viscosity of ferropericlase results in nearly the same scale of jump in the viscosity of the lower mantle. This offers a simple mechanism for the sharp viscosity increase in the shallow lower mantle and the corresponding depth of the maximum viscosity is in excellent agreement with the maximum depth at which most actively subducting slabs stagnate². Since the viscosity jump predicted by this study does not rely on the deformation mechanism of ferropericlase, if we include the contribution of an elastically strengthened ferropericlase to the viscosity¹⁷ assuming the deformation mechanism is dislocation creep as suggested by ref. ⁴⁵, the viscosity further increases to two to four orders of magnitude, up from one to two.

For the majority of the shallow lower mantle away from stagnant slabs and deflected plumes where the shear strain is likely relatively small and seismic anisotropy is generally not observed⁴⁶, our analysis suggests that the viscosity of ferropericlase still increases by at least one to two orders of magnitude. But whether this jump in viscosity for ferropericlase results in the bulk mantle viscosity increase by a similar scale strongly depends on the strain partitioning between bridgmanite and ferropericlase. The IWL framework is an extreme case in which most of the strain preferentially partitions into the weak phase, and thus the weak phase dominates the deformation rate of the aggregate. In contrast, strain equally partitions between the strong and weak phases in a load-bearing framework (LBF) where the strong phase containing isolated pockets of the weak phase. The degree of strain partitioning into a weaker phase has been suggested to increase with the strain under plastic deformation^{4/}.

If the shear strain in the majority of the shallow lower mantle is relatively small so that LBF dominates, the viscosity is dominated by the dominant and more viscous phase (bridgmanite) and the viscosity jump of ferropericlase in this region will be overshadowed.

Our conclusion is comparable with Marquardt and Miyagi¹⁷ in that both studies predict a sudden jump of the viscosity of ferropericlase in the shallow lower mantle. As such, each can explain the broadening and stagnation of subducting slabs at those depths. The difference between our results and the previous study's¹⁷ is at pressures greater than 40 GPa and is likely due to the fact that their experiment is conducted at relatively low temperatures and is not directly applicable to the hightemperature rheology of ferropericlase in Earth's deep interior. Additionally, our results yield a natural explanation for plume deflection at depths of ~1000 km^{3,4} because of viscous resistance for upwelling plumes also peaks at this depth. These conclusions do not hinge on the assumption that the dominant deformation mechanism in large strain areas in the shallow lower mantle is dislocation creep. Additionally, our results show the existence of this viscosity peak is relatively insensitive to the major element chemistry of ferropericlase for plausible lower mantle ferropericlase compositions. Therefore, the intrinsic viscosity profile inferred from the melting curve of ferropericlase likely affects the pattern of mantle convection in the Earth.

Methods

Sample synthesis and laser heating experiments. (Mg_{1-x}Fe_x)O ferropericlase (x = 0.09, 0.2, 0.23, 0.82, 0.88, 0.90, 0.91) were synthesized from powders of Fe₂O₃ and fired MgO which were annealed for 14 h at 1473 K at an oxygen fugacity of 10^{-5} Pa^{12,48}. In order to minimize chemical reactions between widely used pressure media and ferropericlase, Mg-rich ferropericlase starting materials were loaded without any pressure transmitting medium into LHDACs equipped with either matched 150, 200, or 300 µm culets. For example, using a noble gas such as argon may cause lowered melting temperatures due to incorporation in to melts of this composition¹². Additionally, due to the high temperatures anticipated for ferropericlase melting, we avoided alkali halides because of strong changes in the optical properties⁴⁹, which cause a rapid increase in temperature near their melting points⁵⁰. See Supplementary Note 6 for a thorough discussion about the absence of the pressure medium for some experiments in this study. For Fe-rich ferropericlase samples, ferropericlase must be insulated in order to protect the diamond anvil on the heated side. We therefore loaded a layer of pure MgO powder between the diamond anvil and the Fe-rich ferropericlase on the heated side, which also helped to minimize axial temperature gradients⁴⁹ and contamination from other potential pressure media. In order to minimize moisture contamination, the starting materials were kept in a vacuum oven (80 °C) except when taken out for sample loading. Additionally, the sample assembly was also oven-dried after cell loading and prior to pressurization. Pressurized samples were heated from one side with a near-infrared laser (100 W, 1070 nm SPI water-cooled fiber laser). We used predefined ramped laser heating¹² to melt the sample: the laser is set to a low power for 2 s and then linearly ramped up to a peak power every 20 ms within 1 s and kept at the peak power for 0.4-1 s before turned off. A mechanical shutter is opened ~40-100 ms before the laser is quenched to allow the temperature measurement of the sample at peak power.

Chemical analyses. Quenched samples were cut and polished through the center of the heated region by electrical discharge machining and focused ion beam (FIB) techniques (Fig. 1 for representative cross-section images), and then quantitatively analyzed by an ASEM (JEOL 7600F) using WDS. Both pure iron (purity > 99.95%) and (Mg,Fe)O samples with known compositions were selected as reference standards for WDS measurements. Chemical analyses were performed using an accelerating voltage of 10 KeV and a beam current of 6.5 nA, with spatial resolution of ~1 µm in diameter⁵¹.

The measurement totals of our quenched samples are mostly within the range of 97–103%, suggesting that contamination from carbon, if it exists, is likely small. In addition, previous studies suggest a negligible solubility of carbon in (Mg,Fe)O. Shcheka et al.⁵² found that the maximum carbon solubility in most mantle silicates, including wadsleyite, ringwoodite, MgSiO₃—ilmenite and MgSiO₃—bridgmanite is below their limit of detection of 40–110 ppb by weight. Because (Mg,Fe)O does not have tetravalent cation, we expect that the solubility of carbon in ferropericlase should be lower than the above silicates and therefore negligible. Indeed, the solubility of carbon in FeO and MgO solid was reported under the detection limit (0.01 ppm by weight) at 1 bar⁵³. Although the effects of carbon on the melting of

ferropericlase is unknown, a carbon concentration <0.01 ppm is unlikely to have any pronounced effects on the melting of (Mg,Fe)O ferropericlase.

Temperature determination. Accurate temperature measurements using spectroradiometric approaches⁵⁴ or multi-wavelength two-dimensional imaging radiometry^{55,56} for semi-transparent materials in LHDAC experiments is difficult, because wavelength-dependent absorption/emission and temperature gradients at elevated pressures may drastically deviate the apparent temperature from the real highest temperature attained during the experiments⁴⁹. The optical absorption spectra of (Mg,Fe)O ferropericlase exhibit strong wavelength dependency which varies significantly with Fe content, pressure and temperature⁵⁷. Consequently, the wavelength-dependent absorption must be taken into account when determining temperatures of (Mg,Fe)O samples in LHDAC experiments. The wavelengthdependent absorption issue cannot be simply solved by using thin samples within a thick and inert insulating medium. On the contrary, a thin sample will make the situation worse because the temperature deviation can easily be very large when the optical thickness of the sample $\tau_{\lambda} = \int_{0}^{d} k_{\lambda} dz$ is small, where k_{λ} is the absorption coefficient and d is the thickness of materials that participate in the radiative heat transfer at the wavelengths of interest. A thinner sample is characterized by a smaller optical thickness and therefore a large temperature deviation is more likely (see Fig. 4 in ref. 49). Here, we implemented the multi-layer inverse modeling method in which the geometry and optical properties of the sample and detected thermal radiation intensities during each experiment are integrated to rigorously constrain the melting temperatures of ferropericlase⁴⁹. The results (inverse modeling T_m) are tabulated in Supplementary Table 1. Apparent temperatures (T_a) calculated by averaging the temperatures along the loop encompassing the molten region (region I in the Supplementary Fig. 1a) in 2D optical images (perimeter T_a) and apparent temperatures of position with strongest thermal radiation intensities (hottest point T_a) are also shown for comparison.

At first glance, the differences between $T_{\rm m}$ and $T_{\rm a}$ do not exhibit any obvious systematic trends with respect to pressure or composition (Supplementary Table 1). However, there is a qualitative prediction of the trend. For example, samples Jul0415 ($T_{\rm m} - T_{\rm a} = 670 \text{ K}$) and 14_0506_45G ($T_{\rm m} - T_{\rm a} = -660 \text{ K}$) have opposite temperature corrections. It is worth noting that in the wavelength range of thermal radiation we measured (580, 640, 766, and 905 nm), (1) the optical absorption coefficients of (Mg,Fe)O ferropericlase generally decrease with wavelength, and (2) both the absorption coefficients and the slopes of the optical absorption spectra exponentially increase with Fe concentration of ferropericlase⁵⁷. For sample Jul0415, the melt is very iron rich and relatively thick so that the optical thickness in the four wavelengths measured (580, 640, 766, and 905 nm) are very large and the melt can be treated as a blackbody. Therefore, the radiation emitted from the melt is nearly intact. But after the radiation penetrates through the overlaying coexisting solid and starting materials and is recorded, the short wavelength radiation signal (high energy) is preferentially absorbed, yielding a radiation spectrum with the intensities at short wavelengths undermined. Consequently, the later Wien or Planck fitting based on this biased spectrum gives a cooler apparent temperature. However, for sample 14_0506_45G, the melt is not as iron rich and relatively thin as compared to Jul0415, such that the optical thickness in 580, 640, 766, and 905 nm is relatively smaller. According to Kirchoff's law, the thermal radiation from the melt itself is biased in the way that high-energy signals (short wavelength) are relatively enhanced because of the large absorptivity at short wavelengths. Although the preferential absorption of short wavelength radiation by the overlying coexisting solid and the starting material can mitigate the effects to some extent, the coexisting solid and the starting material are too transparent (Mg#93 and 90, respectively) and thin to make a big difference. Consequently, the overall effect is dominated by the melt and the thermal radiation detected exhibits a hotter apparent temperature.

While the above qualitative analysis can explain the general trend of $T_{\rm m}-T_{\rm a}$, a rigorous evaluation of temperature requires careful inverse modeling taking into account the geometry, optical properties of the sample and temperature gradients, as shown in Supplementary Fig. 1. The best fitting horizontal intensity of radiation curves (thin lines in Supplementary Fig. 1d) are generally very consistent with the detected data (thick lines) except that the fitted results are overall slightly higher than the detected values, which might be a result of inaccurate interpolation or extrapolation of the absorption coefficients at a particular wavelength. Additionally, the fitted curves become increasingly disparate from the real data at the ends. This is reasonable since the white lines in Supplementary Fig. 1 c do not delineate the layer boundaries at the two ends very well and are only an approximation to the actual shape.

Viscosity calculation using homologous temperature scaling. Homologous temperature scaling relates the effective diffusion coefficients at high pressures to melting temperatures by,

$$D(P,T) = D_0 \exp(-gT_m(P)/T), \qquad (5)$$

where the pre-exponential factor D_0 is a constant, $T_m(P)$ is the melting temperature at pressure P, and g is a non-dimensional constant and is given by

$$g = H^{*}(P)/RT_{m}(P),$$
 (6)

where $H^*(P)$ is the activation enthalpy at a given pressure *P*. Following previous studies^{9,17}, we derive the *g* values by taking the zero pressure $H^*(P)$ from computational studies^{58–61} and zero pressure solidus melting temperature of $(Mg_{0.80}Fe_{0.20}O)$ by phase diagram calculation using the regular solution model. The resultant *g* values are 10–14. Taking the derivative of $H^*(P)$ with respect to pressure yields the activation volume,

$$V^* = gR(dT_m/dP). \tag{7}$$

For Earth-relevant compositions (Mg#75, 80, 85, 90), our inferred average activation volumes at pressures 3–27 GPa and 60–80 GPa are consistent self-diffusion activation volumes of Mg in pure MgO^{58,59,62} (Supplementary Fig. 6). As discussed above the spin transition of Fe²⁺ in solid (Mg,Fe)O of those compositions at 300 K starts and completes at ~35 and ~70 GPa, respectively^{11,63} and the spin transition pressure range in solid (Mg,Fe)O counterparts might be smaller³⁷. The overall effects of spin transition in both liquid and solid (Mg,Fe)O is that the V* at ~40 and 50 GPa is strongly affected as shown in Supplementary Fig. 6. Nevertheless, the general good agreement between the activation volumes of self-diffusion in (Mg,Fe)O inferred based on homologous temperature scaling and those in MgO resolved by experiments and computations strongly validates the use

of the homologous temperature scaling method in this study. As such, we use homologous temperature scaling to infer viscosity in the mantle as shown below. Under dielection group, the viscosity of forenersidaes is approved $a_{1}^{1/54}$.

Under dislocation creep, the viscosity of ferropericlase is expressed as^{17,64}

$$\eta = A_{\rm dis} \frac{RT}{D\tau_{\rm p} \mathbf{b}} \left(\frac{\tau_{\rm p}}{\sigma}\right)^n,\tag{8}$$

where $A_{\rm dis}$ is a pre-exponential factor, D is the lattice diffusion coefficient of the slowest species, $\tau_{\rm p}$ is Peierls stress, **b** is Burgers vector, σ is stress, and n is the stress exponent.

Under diffusion creep, the viscosity of ferropericlase is expressed as⁹

$$\eta = A_{\rm dif} \frac{RT}{D\Omega} d^2, \tag{9}$$

where A_{dif} is a pre-exponential factor, Ω is the molar volume, and d is the grain size of the constituent materials.

Here we only focus on the ratio of viscosities since the absolute value of viscosity is highly sensitive to the specific values of input parameters, e.g. $A_{\rm dis}$, $A_{\rm dif}$, $\tau_{\rm p}$, σ , n, and d of which most are poorly understood at lower mantle conditions. We therefore assume $A_{\rm dis}$, $A_{\rm dif}$, $\tau_{\rm p}$, σ , n, and d are constant from 27 to 80 GPa. The molar volume of ferropericlase, Ω slightly decreases with pressure (~10% reduction from 27 to 80 GPa for ferropericlase of the composition we examine here). We use the equation of state of (Mg_{0.80}Fe_{0.20})O to calculate Ω^{36} . With above set-up, the viscosity ratio of ferropericlase at high pressure over the viscosity at reference state P_0 is

$$\frac{\eta(P)}{\eta(P_0)} = \frac{T(P)/D(P)}{T(P_0)/D(P_0)} = \frac{T(P)}{T(P_0)} \frac{\Omega(P_0)}{\Omega(P)} \exp\left(g\left(\frac{T_{\rm m}(P)}{T(P)} - \frac{T_{\rm m}(P_0)}{T(P_0)}\right)\right),\tag{10}$$

where T(P) is the geotherm.

Here we use a typical lower mantle geotherm³⁸ and set $P_0 = 27$ GPa. Taking the solidus as $T_{\rm m}$, the radial relative viscosity profile of $(Mg_{0.80}Fe_{0.20})O$ is shown in Supplementary Fig. 5. The ratio of viscosity at ~1000 km over viscosity at ~750 km increases with g and is ~20 at g = 10 and is ~70 at g = 14. The relative viscosity profiles inferred from liquidus curves rather than solidus curves by both ideal and regular solution models are also shown in Supplementary Fig. 5, which in general, are in good agreement with those inferred from the solidus curves.

Data availability. The data sets generated during and/or analyzed during the current study are available as Supplementary Information and from the corresponding authors.

Received: 6 July 2017 Accepted: 16 November 2017 Published online: 08 December 2017

References

- Rudolph, M. L., Lekić, V. & Lithgow-Bertelloni, C. Viscosity jump in Earth's mid-mantle. *Science* 350, 1349–1352 (2015).
- Fukao, Y., Widiyantoro, S. & Obayashi, M. Stagnant slabs in the upper and lower mantle transition region. *Rev. Geophys.* 39, 291–323 (2001).
- Rickers, F., Fichtner, A. & Trampert, J. The Iceland–Jan Mayen plume system and its impact on mantle dynamics in the North Atlantic region: evidence from full-waveform inversion. *Earth Planet. Sci. Lett.* 367, 39–51 (2013).
- French, S. W. & Romanowicz, B. Broad plumes rooted at the base of the Earth's mantle beneath major hotspots. *Nature* 525, 95–99 (2015).

- Ballmer, M. D., Houser, C., Hernlund, J. W., Wentzcovitch, R. M. & Hirose, K. Persistence of strong silica-enriched domains in the Earth's lower mantle. *Nat. Geosci.* 10, 236–240 (2017).
- Shim, S.-H. et al. Stability of ferrous-iron-rich bridgmanite under reducing midmantle conditions. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA 114, 6468–6473 (2017).
- Zerr, A. & Boehler, R. Melting of (Mg,Fe)SiO₃-perovskite to 625 kilobars indication of a high-melting temperature in the lower mantle. *Science* 262, 553–555 (1993).
- Sweeney, J. S. & Heinz, D. L. Melting of iron-magnesium-silicate perovskite. Geophys. Res. Lett. 20, 855–858 (1993).
- Yamazaki, D. & Karato, S. Some mineral physics constraints on the rheology and geothermal structure of Earth's lower mantle. *Am. Mineral.* 86, 385–391 (2001).
- Zerr, A. & Boehler, R. Constraints on the melting temperature of the lower mantle from high-pressure experiments on MgO and magnesioustite. *Nature* 371, 506–508 (1994).
- Zhang, L. & Fei, Y. W. Melting behavior of (Mg,Fe)O solid solutions at high pressure. *Geophys. Res. Lett.* 35, L13302 (2008).
- Du, Z. & Lee, K. K. M. High-pressure melting of MgO from (Mg,Fe)O solid solutions. *Geophys. Res. Lett.* 41, 8061–8066 (2014).
- Kimura, T., Ohfuji, H., Nishi, M. & Irifune, T. Melting temperatures of MgO under high pressure by micro-texture analysis. *Nat. Commun.* 8, 15735 (2017).
- Alfe, D. Melting curve of MgO from first-principles simulations. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 94, 235701 (2005).
- de Koker, N. & Stixrude, L. Self-consistent thermodynamic description of silicate liquids, with application to shock melting of MgO periclase and MgSiO₃ perovskite. *Geophys. J. Int.* **178**, 162–179 (2009).
- Auzende, A.-L. et al. Element partitioning between magnesium silicate perovskite and ferropericlase: new insights into bulk lower-mantle geochemistry. *Earth Planet. Sci. Lett.* 269, 164–174 (2008).
- 17. Marquardt, H. & Miyagi, L. Slab stagnation in the shallow lower mantle linked to an increase in mantle viscosity. *Nat. Geosci.* 8, 311–314 (2015).
- Frost, D. J. Fe²⁺-Mg partitioning between garnet, magnesiowustite, and (Mg,Fe)₂SiO₄ phases of the transition zone. *Am. Mineral.* 88, 387–397 (2003).
- Fischer, R. A. & Campbell, A. J. High-pressure melting of wüstite. *Am. Mineral.* 95, 1473–1477 (2010).
- Frost, D. J. et al. Partitioning of oxygen between the Earth's mantle and core. J. Geophys. Res.: Solid Earth 115, B02202 (2010).
- O'Neill, H. S., Pownceby, M. I. & McCammon, C. A. The magnesiowustite: iron equilibrium and its implications for the activity-composition relations of (Mg,Fe)₂SiO₄ olivine solid solutions. *Contrib. Mineral. Petrol.* 146, 308–325 (2003).
- Ohta, K. et al. Highly conductive iron-rich (Mg,Fe)O magnesiowüstite and its stability in the Earth's lower mantle. J. Geophys. Res.: Solid Earth 119, JB010972 (2014).
- Fischer, R. A. et al. Phase transition and metallization of FeO at high pressures and temperatures. *Geophys. Res. Lett.* 38, L24301 (2011).
- 24. Fei, Y. & Mao, H.-k. In situ determination of the NiAs phase of FeO at high pressure and temperature. *Science* 266, 1678–1680 (1994).
- Komabayashi, T. Thermodynamics of melting relations in the system Fe-FeO at high pressure: implications for oxygen in the Earth's core. J. Geophys. Res.: Solid Earth 119, 4164–4177 (2014).
- 26. Cohen, R. E. & Weitz, J. S. The Melting Curve and Premelting of MgO. in Properties of Earth and Planetary Materials at High Pressure and Temperature (eds Manghnani, M. H. & Yagi, T.) (American Geophysical Union, 1998).
- Vočadlo, L. & Price, G. D. The melting of MgO—computer calculations via molecular dynamics. *Phys. Chem. Miner.* 23, 42–49 (1996).
- Darken, L. S. & Gurry, R. W. The system Iron—Oxygen. II. Equilibrium and thermodynamics of liquid oxide and other phases. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 68, 798–816 (1946).
- Badro, J. Spin transitions in mantle minerals. Annu. Rev. Earth Planet. Sci. 42, 231–248 (2014).
- Karato, S. I. Deformation of Earth Materials: An Introduction to the Rheology of Solid Earth 168–198 (2008).
- Marquardt, H., Speziale, S., Reichmann, H. J., Frost, D. J. & Schilling, F. R. Single-crystal elasticity of (Mg0.9Fe0.1)O to 81 GPa. *Earth Planet. Sci. Lett.* 287, 345–352 (2009).
- Wu, Z., Justo, J. F. & Wentzcovitch, R. M. Elastic anomalies in a spin-crossover system: ferropericlase at lower mantle conditions. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 110, 228501 (2013).
- 33. Glazyrin, K., Miyajima, N., Smith, J. S. & Lee, K. K. M. Compression of a multiphase mantle assemblage: effects of undesirable stress and stress annealing on the iron spin state crossover in ferropericlase. *J. Geophys. Res.: Solid Earth* 121, 2015JB012321 (2016).
- Gregoryanz, E., Degtyareva, O., Somayazulu, M., Hemley, R. J. & Mao, H. K. Melting of dense sodium. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 94, 185502 (2005).

ARTICLE

- 35. Fei, Y. et al. Spin transition and equations of state of (Mg, Fe)O solid solutions. Geophys. Res. Lett. 34, L17307 (2007).
- Holmstrom, E. & Stixrude, L. Spin crossover in liquid (Mg,Fe)O at extreme conditions. *Phys. Rev. B* 93, 195142 (2016).
- Ghosh, D. B. & Karki, B. B. Solid-liquid density and spin crossovers in (Mg, Fe) O system at deep mantle conditions. *Sci. Rep.* 6, 37269 (2016).
- Brown, J. M. & Shankland, T. J. Thermodynamic parameters in the earth as determined from seismic profiles. *Geophys. J. R. Astron. Soc.* 66, 579–596 (1981).
- Anderson, O. L. The Earth's core and the phase-diagram of iron. *Philos. Trans.* R. Soc. A 306, 21–35 (1982).
- 40. Lin, J. F. et al. Deformation of lower-mantle ferropericlase (Mg,Fe)O across the electronic spin transition. *Phys. Chem. Miner.* **36**, 585–592 (2009).
- Merkel, S. et al. Deformation of polycrystalline MgO at pressures of the lower mantle. J. Geophys. Res.-Solid Earth 107, 2271 (2002).
- Wentzcovitch, R. M. et al. Anomalous compressibility of ferropericlase throughout the iron spin cross-over. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* 106, 8447–8452 (2009).
- Poirier, J. P. Introduction to the Physics of the Earth's Interior, 2nd edn (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000).
- Kaercher, P. et al. Two-phase deformation of lower mantle mineral analogs. Earth Planet. Sci. Lett. 456, 134–145 (2016).
- McNamara, A. K., Karato, S. I. & van Keken, P. E. Localization of dislocation creep in the lower mantle: implications for the origin of seismic anisotropy. *Earth Planet. Sci. Lett.* 191, 85–99 (2001).
- Karato, S., Zhang, S. Q. & Wenk, H. R. Superplasticity in Earth's Lower Mantle —evidence from seismic anisotropy and rock physics. *Science* 270, 458–461 (1995).
- Bloomfield, J. P. & Covey-Crump, S. J. Correlating mechanical data with microstructural observations in deformation experiments on synthetic twophase aggregates. J. Struct. Geol. 15, 1007–1019 (1993).
- Otsuka, K., McCammon, C. A. & Karato, S.-i Tetrahedral occupancy of ferric iron in (Mg,Fe)O: implications for point defects in the Earth's lower mantle. *Phys. Earth Planet. Inter.* 180, 179–188 (2010).
- Deng, J., Du, Z., Benedetti, L. R. & Lee, K. K. M. The influence of wavelength-dependent absorption and temperature gradients on temperature determination in laser-heated diamond-anvil cells. *J. Appl. Phys.* **121**, 025901 (2017).
- Boehler, R., Ross, M. & Boercker, D. B. High-pressure melting curves of alkali halides. *Phys. Rev. B* 53, 556–563 (1996).
- Kanaya, K. & Okayama, S. Penetration and energy-loss theory of electrons in solid targets. J. Phys. D. Appl. Phys. 5, 43 (1972).
- Shcheka, S. S., Wiedenbeck, M., Frost, D. J. & Keppler, H. Carbon solubility in mantle minerals. *Earth Planet. Sci. Lett.* 245, 730–742 (2006).
- Wolf, I. & Grabke, H. J. A study on the solubility and distribution of carbon in oxides. Solid State Commun. 54, 5–10 (1985).
- Jeanloz, R. & Kavner, A. Melting criteria and imaging spectroradiometry in laser-heated diamond-cell experiments. *Philos. Trans.: Math., Phys. Eng. Sci.* 354, 1279–1313 (1996).
- Campbell, A. J. Measurement of temperature distributions across laser heated samples by multispectral imaging radiometry. *Rev. Sci. Instrum.* 79, 015108 (2008).
- Du, Z., Amulele, G., Benedetti, L. R. & Lee, K. K. M. Mapping temperatures and temperature gradients during flash heating in a diamond-anvil cell. *Rev. Sci. Instrum.* 84, 075111 (2013).
- Goncharov, A. F., Struzhkin, V. V. & Jacobsen, S. D. Reduced radiative conductivity of low-spin (Mg,Fe)O in the lower mantle. *Science* **312**, 1205–1208 (2006).
- Ita, J. & Cohen, R. E. Effects of pressure on diffusion and vacancy formation in MgO from nonempirical free-energy integrations. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 79, 3198–3201 (1997).
- Ito, Y. & Toriumi, M. Pressure effect of self-diffusion in periclase (MgO) by molecular dynamics. J. Geophys. Res.: Solid Earth 112, B04206 (2007).

- Yang, M. H. & Flynn, C. P. Intrinsic diffusion properties of an oxide—MgO. Phys. Rev. Lett. 73, 1809–1812 (1994).
- Sempolinski, D. R. & Kingery, W. D. Ionic conductivity and magnesium vacancy mobility in magnesium oxide. J. Am. Ceram. Soc. 63, 664–669 (1980).
- 62. Van Orman, J. A., Fei, Y. W., Hauri, E. H. & Wang J. H. Diffusion in MgO at high pressures: constraints on deformation mechanisms and chemical transport at the core-mantle boundary. *Geophys. Res. Lett.* **30**, 1056 (2003).
- Speziale, S. et al. Iron spin transition in Earth's mantle. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA 102, 17918–17922 (2005).
- Wang, J. N. & Nieh, T. G. Role of Peierls stress in power law dislocation creep. Mater. Sci. Eng. A 202, 52–56 (1995).
- Tsuchiya, T., Wentzcovitch, R. M., da Silva, C. R. S. & de Gironcoli, S. Spin transition in magnesiowustite in earth's lower mantle. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 96, 198501 (2006).
- Lin, J.-F. et al. Spin transition zone in Earth's lower mantle. Science 317, 1740–1743 (2007).

Acknowledgements

We thank Z. Du, M. Long, S. Karato and J. Korenaga for helpful discussions; M. Rooks and F. Camino for FIB help at YINQE at Yale University and CFN at Brookhaven National lab, respectively; Z. Jiang for SEM assistance; J. Girard for laser heating assistance; Z. Liu for assistance in the collection of optical spectra of ferropericlase. This work was supported by NSF (EAR-1321956, EAR-1551348). FIB use was supported by YINQE and NSF MRSEC DMR 1119826 and by the Center for Functional Nanomaterials, and National Synchrotron Light Source II at Brookhaven National Laboratory, a U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) Office of Science User Facility operated for the DOE Office of Science under Contract No. DE-SC0012704. This research was also partially supported by COMPRES, the Consortium for Materials Properties Research in Earth Sciences under NSF Cooperative Agreement EAR 1606856.

Author contributions

J.D. executed the experiments and analyses. J.D. and K.K.M.L. contributed equally to the design of the study and writing of the manuscript.

Additional information

Supplementary Information accompanies this paper at https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-017-02263-z.

Competing interests: The authors declare no competing financial interests.

Reprints and permission information is available online at http://npg.nature.com/ reprintsandpermissions/

Publisher's note: Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Open Access This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commonslicense, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article'sCreative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this license, visit http://creativecommons.org/ licenses/by/4.0/.

© The Author(s) 2017



Supplementary Figure 1. Illustration of temperature calculation and correction methods. (a) Optical image; Regions I, II, and III are molten area, coexisting solid, and starting material, respectively. Dashed lines in optical images are the cross section position. (b) Two-dimensional temperature map. (c) FIB'd cross section of heated area corresponding to the vertical dashed line in (a). (d) Corresponding inverse modeling results. The thick lines are the horizontal intensities of radiation detected, and the thin lines are the fitted results with the corresponding wavelength labeled. Figure is modified from ref. 1.



Supplementary Figure 2. The phase diagram of ferropericlase at 3 GPa calculated based on the symmetric regular solution model. Both the original data² (red) and after temperature correction¹ (black) are shown for comparison. The input parameters for the regular solution model are $T_{m,FeO} = 1750$ K, $T_{m,MgO} = 3460$ K, $\Delta H_{m,FeO} = 36$ kJ mol⁻¹, $\Delta H_{m,MgO} = 87$ kJ mol⁻¹, $W_{FeO-MgO}^{solid} = 11$ kJ mol⁻¹, $W_{FeO-MgO}^{liquid} = -30$ kJ mol⁻¹.



Supplementary Figure 3. The difference of solidus temperatures obtained by linear extrapolation from melting temperatures of the pure end-members to those obtained in this study. Red, open symbols represent ideal solution model and black, solid symbols represent the regular solution model.



Supplementary Figure 4. Linearly extrapolated temperature increments compared with temperature increments determined from phase diagrams from 40 to 50 GPa. Comparison between the linearly extrapolated temperature increments from 40 to 50 GPa (black, solid curve) and those from the phase diagram calculation based on both the regular solution model and the ideal solution model with (solid curves) and without (dashed curves) including the 10% uncertainty in the solidus melting temperature at 50 GPa. The shaded region highlights the region where extra solidus temperature depression at 50 GPa occurs likely due to the spin crossover.



Supplementary Figure 5. The relative radial viscosity profiles of ferropericlase inferred from homologous temperature scaling. (a) relative viscosity profiles calculated based on the solidus melting curve of $(Mg_{0.80}Fe_{0.20})O$ for a range of plausible g values (i.e., g = 10-14). (b) relative viscosity profiles calculated based on the liquidus of ferropericlase of different Mg# assuming g = 12. Red open (black solid) markers represent the relative viscosity calculated using the melting temperatures assuming ideal (regular) solution model. Uncertainties on the viscosity are approximately enveloped by the values given by the solidus (Fig. 4) and liquidus, and two different solid solution models under two different geotherms. The blue shaded regions include spin transition pressure range for Mg#75-90 at 300 K (~35-70 GPa)³. The spin transition pressure ranges at corresponding high temperatures are likely broader but begin at pressures similar to those at 300 K^{4,5}. Curves are drawn as a guide for the eye.



Supplementary Figure 6. Activation volume of self diffusion of Mg in (Mg,Fe)O ferropericlase. Here g = 12 and Mg# = 75 (blue), 80 (red), 85 (pink) and 90 (green) compared with activation volume of self diffusion of Mg in pure MgO obtained in previous studies^{6,7,8}.

Supplementary Table 1. Summary of the experimental conditions and results. Compositions are measured for the quenched samples after laser heating and the standard deviations of multiple measurements at each region are shown in parentheses. Uncertainties in pressure (95% confidence level) are given in parentheses. Temperature uncertainties are ~7% for perimeter and hottest point values and is ~10% for inverse modeling (95% confidence level)¹. Temperatures used in the phase diagrams are those computed by the inverse modeling.

	D	Starting	Melt	Coexisting	Temperature (K)		
Run#	ı (GPa)	Material	(Mg#)	Solid	Perimeter	Hottest	Inverse
	(014)	(Mg#)	(1415")	(Mg#)	$T_{\rm a}$	point T_{a}	modeling $T_{\rm m}$
13-0814 ^{a,b}	27(1)	91(1)	73(1)	94(1)	4300	4655	3790
140610 ^b	27(1)	91(1)	68(1)	95(1)	3650	3840	3450
Fp2002B ^a	27(1)	20(1)	59(1)	87(1)	3000	3204	3100
Fp200140G_D	40(1)	20(1)	36(1)	62(1)	2600	3047	3150
Fp200140G_B	40(1)	20(1)	37(3)	69(1)	2700	3056	3200
14-0506_45G ^b	40(1)	90(1)	67(3)	93(1)	5000	5505	4400
14-0426 ^b	40(1)	90(1)	55(2)	92(1)	4300	4517	3910
May2715C ^{a, c}	51(1)	88(1)	71(1)	91(1)	4250	4500	3800
Jan311650GC ^a	50(1)	81(1)	51(3)	84(1)	3000	3209	3200
Fp2006C ^d	60(1)	20(1)	10(5)	75(4)	2700	3076	2990
Jul0415 ^c	60(1)	81(1)	59(1)	90(1)	2600	2750	3270
Jun1115A	60(1)	88(1)	71(2)	95(1)	4100	4355	4070
Fp800180GA ^e	80(1)	82(1)	62(1)	91(1)	-	-	4150
Fp800180GB ^f	80(1)	82(1)	50(5)	88(2)	3200	3455	3550
Fp201283G ^g	83(1)	23(1)	<9	76(1)	2800	3405	3450

^aIntensity data of thermal radiation saturated in one wavelength. Three-color temperature fit was implemented, see ref. 1 for more details.

^bData taken from ref. 2. Note the temperatures are re-calculated using mutli-layer inverse modeling, which show a large contrast with the temperatures used in the ref. 2. ^cData taken from ref. 1.

^dData taken from The melt composition is from semi-quantitative analysis by Energy Dispersive Spectroscopy (EDS).

^eIntensity data of thermal radiation saturated in all four wavelengths. Temperature calculated by the power ratio used for Fp800180GA and Fp800180GB and the inverse modeling $T_{\rm m}$ of Fp800180GB.

^fThe chemical composition of the melt is estimated from the degree of melting which is determined by the areas of coexisting solid and melt from the optical images.

^gThe melt is too small (< 1 µm) to measure precisely using WDS. In order to get a estimate of the composition, we compare the melt and $(Mg_{0.09}Fe_{0.81})O$ under BSE. The melt tends to be "brighter" than $(Mg_{0.09}Fe_{0.81})O$, which indicates that it is more iron-rich than $(Mg_{0.09}Fe_{0.81})O$.

 $Mg# = 100 \times Mg/(Mg+Fe)$

Supplementary Table 2. Best-fitting thermodynamic parameters using the ideal solution model. Uncertainties in pressure and fitted parameters at each region are shown in parentheses.

Pressure (GPa)	27(1)	40 (1)	50(1)	60(1)	80(1)
$\Delta H_{\rm MgO} (\rm kJ mol^{-1})$	31(10)	43(14)	25(7)	26(10)	32(9)
$\Delta H_{\rm FeO}$ (kJ mol ⁻¹)	105(30)	100(40)	160(56)	244(35)	280(43)

Supplementary Table 3. Best fitting thermodynamic parameters using the regular solution model. Uncertainties in pressure and fitted parameters at each region are shown in parentheses.

Pressure (GPa)	27(1)	40 (1)	50(1)	60(1)	80(1)
$\Delta H_{\rm MgO} ({ m kJ}{ m mol}^{-1})$	33(11)	55(15)	23(7)	24(9)	24(7)
$\Delta H_{\rm FeO} ({\rm kJ}~{\rm mol}^{-1})$	47(13)	49(14)	49(21)	58(25)	75(18)
$W_{\text{FeO-MgO}}^{\text{liquid}}$ (kJ mol ⁻¹)	-16(4)	-10(8)	10(5)	12(5)	23(6)
$W_{\rm FeO-MgO}^{\rm solid}$ (kJ mol ⁻¹)	18(6)	25(6)	32(5)	35(6)	39(7)

Supplementary Note 1: Attainment of chemical equilibrium

(Mg,Fe)O melt is thought to be homogenized instantaneously due to the fast diffusion rate of elements^{2,9}. In contrast, the Mg-Fe interdiffusivities in (Mg,Fe)O solid are relatively sluggish and are strongly dependent on temperature, pressure and chemical compositions^{10, 11, 12}. We calculated the length scales corresponding to our experiment durations using the experimentally determined chemical diffusion relation. The length scales are overall larger than the maximum dimensions of the coexisting solid observed (~1-4 μ m). Therefore, the chemical equilibrium at least between melt and coexisting solid is achieved during the experiment. Following ref. 2, we also measured the chemical composition within the melts and coexisting solids and found the standard deviation is generally smaller than 3% as indicated in the Supplementary Table 1.

As noted above, we use pure MgO as an insulation layer for iron-rich starting materials. Consequently, the reaction between the starting materials and the MgO insulation layer are inevitable due to the large chemical gradient. But chemical equilibrium between the melt and coexisting solid is not affected. As argued above, what determines the chemical equilibrium is the Fe-Mg inter-diffusion rate. And both the inter-diffusion rate and chemical characterization confirm that chemical homogenization occurs within the length scale of melt and coexisting solids in our experiments. The only effect is that the starting materials are diluted and the melt is more Fe depleted than the initial starting materials for samples Fp2002B, Fp200140G_D and Fp200140G_B.

Supplementary Note 2: Comparison with the low pressure melting data of ferropericlase

Both Zhang and Fei¹³ and Du and Lee² conducted (Mg,Fe)O melting experiments at pressures lower than 27 GPa. However, the results are in sharp contrast with each other, with ref. 13 being around several hundreds of K higher. As pointed out by Du and Lee², this discrepancy is likely due to the indirect temperature measurements beyond the limit of thermocouples (typically for temperatures > 2300 K) and therefore the extrapolation of a linear temperature and power relationship for the heater may be an invalid assumption at the high temperatures like those reported in ref. 13. In addition, both inferred FeO and MgO melting temperatures by ref. 13 at evaluated pressures are several hundreds of K higher than the direct experiment measurements¹⁴ and many other first principle computations^{9, 15, 16}. As such, we do not include the melting data by ref. 13 for comparison.

In order to compare our results with the low pressure melting experiments by Du and Lee², extrapolation and interpolation of thermodynamic parameters are necessary. As discussed above, the regular solution model might be more appropriate to describe the MgO-FeO system in the pressure range we examined. We therefore use the regular solution model to calculate the phase diagram at low pressures in case the ideal solution model is insufficient to describe the mixing of MgO and FeO. As described above, six parameters ($T_{m,FeO}$, $T_{m,MgO}$, $\Delta H_{m,FeO}$, $\Delta H_{m,MgO}$, $W_{FeO-MgO}^{solid}$, $W_{FeO-MgO}^{liquid}$) are needed to construct a phase diagram using the symmetric regular solution model. $T_{m,FeO}$ and $T_{m,MgO}$ are taken from previous studies following our convention. Both thermodynamic models^{17, 18} suggest the same $\Delta H_{m,FeO}$ of 36 kJ mol⁻¹ at 3 GPa. Following our convention $W_{FeO-MgO}^{solid}$ is set as fitting parameters with bounds 4.4–11.4 kJ mol⁻¹ defined by the equations (3) and (4) of the main text. The remaining question is how to constrain the $\Delta H_{m,MgO}$ and $W_{FeO-MgO}^{liquid}$ at pressures less than 27 GPa based on our fitted values at high pressures and available literature data. For $W_{FeO-MgO}^{liquid}$, we follow refs.17, 19 and fit $W_{FeO-MgO}^{liquid}$ as a linear function of pressure,

$$W_{\text{FeO-MoO}}^{\text{liquid}}(\text{kJ/mol}) = -35.92(\pm 6.49) + 0.78(\pm 0.12)P$$
(11)

Experimental data of $\Delta H_{m,MgO}$ is only available at 1 bar (87 kJ mol⁻¹)²⁰. As discussed above, the reported $\Delta H_{m,MgO}$ values at elevated pressures show large discrepancies. But interestingly, most computations yield very similar melting curves of MgO, which indicates that quantification of entropy/volume of melting for MgO is difficult and controversial in first-principles computations. Specifically, the difficulties may come from the size of ensembles, effects of the surface energy and so on (see more discussion in refs. 9, 15). Our inferred $\Delta H_{m,MgO}$ values slightly decrease with pressures from 27 GPa to 50 GPa and then remain roughly constant upon increasing pressures with $\Delta H_{\rm m,MeO}$ at 40 GPa being exceptionally higher. Nevertheless, this trend is generally consistent with ref. 20. To avoid the large influence of uncertainty of $\Delta H_{\rm m,MgO}$ on the phase diagram, it is optimal to compare with the data of (Mg,Fe)O melting at lowest available pressure (i.e., 3 GPa). $\Delta H_{m,MeO}$ at 3 GPa should be reasonably close to $\Delta H_{m,MeO}$ at 1 bar, which is rigorously constrained. For simplicity, we adopt the 1 bar value of $\Delta H_{\rm m,MeO}$. Following this analysis, the calculated phase diagram at 3 GPa together with the temperature-corrected experimental data by Du and Lee² are consistent (Supplementary

Fig. 2).

Supplementary Note 3: Comparison with linearly extrapolated solidus melting temperatures of ferropericlase

As pointed out in the main text, the solidus temperatures of ferropericlase that we measure are much smaller than those extrapolated by a linear reduction of melting curves of pure MgO and FeO by up to ~3000 K. We plot the temperature differences in Supplementary Fig. 3 for $(Mg_{0.75}Fe_{0.25})O$, $(Mg_{0.8}Fe_{0.2})O$, $(Mg_{0.85}Fe_{0.15})O$ and $(Mg_{0.9}Fe_{0.1})O$.

Supplementary Note 4: Interpretation of local maxima in melting temperatures

In order to interpret the melting temperature variations in ferropericlase, we look to the spin transition of Fe²⁺ in (Mg,Fe)O. While it is unknown how the spin transition in iron affects the melting of (Mg,Fe)O, the spin transition has been found to influence many physical, chemical and transport properties including density²¹, elastic moduli²¹, element partitioning²² and thermal/electrical conductivities^{23, 24}. Nevertheless, we can make a qualitative estimate based on Lindemann's law²⁵. Lindemann's law provides a simple relationship between the melting temperature and thermo-elastic properties of materials, $T_m \propto C/\rho$, where *C* is some combination of elastic moduli and ρ is the density ^{26, 27}. Both experiments and first principles computations have shown that the spin transition softens and densifies (Mg,Fe)O^{28, 29}. Therefore, we expect that the spin transition tends to lower the melting temperatures based on Lindemann's law. We take (Mg_{0.9}Fe_{0.10})O as an example and use the bulk modulus as the elastic constant of interest for simplicity which has been shown to decrease over a broad range (40 – 70 GPa) due to

the spin transition and reach a local minimum at ~50 GPa²⁸. The local minimum bulk modulus is ~220 GPa compared with ~360 GPa if there were no spin transition. Additionally, the spin transition also increases the density of ferropericlase by ~2.4% in this pressure range²⁸. As such, an overall decrease in T_m will occur between 40 – 70 GPa with the decrease peaking at ~50 GPa. After the mid-point of the spin crossover, the moduli will monotonically increase at values greater than those in the high-spin state, thus setting up a local maximum in the melting curves^{28, 29}. For Earth-relevant compositions, this local maximum in T_m occurs at ~40 GPa based on the spin-state crossover range³. Note that the above spin-state crossover pressure range is experimentally obtained at 300 K and so high temperatures may additionally influence this analysis^{30,31,32}.

Previous ambient temperature experimental studies suggest that the elasticity of (Mg,Fe)O with Mg# between 60-94 is affected by the spin transition between 35–70 GPa and the pressures corresponding to the local minima of elastic constants are likely to increase with Fe content³. Assuming 1) the solidus melting temperatures at 40 GPa is only marginally affected by the spin transition compared with those at 50 GPa and 2) the increment of solidus melting temperatures of (Mg,Fe)O from 40 to 50 GPa without the effects of spin transition is a linear combination between the increments of melting temperatures of endmembers ($\Delta T = 70 - 280$ K for Mg# 0-100), we can discriminate the amount of temperatures depressed due to spin crossover (Supplementary Fig. 4). It is clear from Supplementary Fig. 4 that the depression in solidus melting temperatures for (Mg,Fe)O with Mg# between 52 to 98 cannot merely be explained by the ±10% measurement uncertainty in the solidus melting temperature at 50 GPa. As mentioned

above, the bulk moduli of (Mg,Fe)O with those compositions are depressed by the spin transition at pressures between 35 and 70 GPa and local minimal of this depression likely located at pressures > 40 GPa^{3, 33}, suggesting that the extra depression in the solidus melting temperatures at 50 GPa is due to the spin transition.

To sum up, we demonstrate that the spin transition of Fe^{2+} in (Mg,Fe)O with an Mg# between 60 - 94 can at least qualitatively account for the local maximum in melting temperatures at ~40 GPa observed in this study. As the spin transition of Fe^{2+} in (Mg,Fe)O is a composition-sensitive phenomenon, pressures corresponding to the peak melting temperatures should vary with composition, which are not be observed in this study because of the coarse pressure steps.

Supplementary Note 5: Volume change upon the melting of ferropericlase

According to the Clausius–Clapeyron relation, $dT_m/dP = \Delta V/\Delta S$, a negative melting slope (dT_m/dP) means that the ratio of molar volume change ΔV and molar entropy change ΔS upon melting is negative. As ΔS is generally thought to be positive during melting, our melting curves (Fig. 3 in the main text) indicate that the volume change is small and even negative during the transition of $(Mg_xFe_{1,x})O$ (x = ~0.52-0.98) from solid to liquid at a pressure between 40 GPa to 50 GPa. Note that the specific pressure range for this negative volume change is unknown because of the lack of fine pressure steps between 40 to 50 GPa. Nevertheless, this pressure range is almost coincident with the pressures at which over half of the Fe in liquid (Mg,Fe)O become stable in the low-spin state based on a recent first-principles molecular dynamics (FPMD) simulations study³⁰, which indicates that the negative volume change observed in this study might be due to the spin transition of Fe in liquid (Mg,Fe)O. Since the negative volume change only occurs between 40 and 50 GPa might imply that the population of the low-spin state Fe in liquid (Mg,Fe)O surpasses that in solid (Mg,Fe)O at the same P, T conditions. In other words, the initiation of the spin transition of Fe in solid (Mg,Fe)O might be more sluggish. This is consistent with ref. 30, which shows that at ~3000 K and 50 GPa, the fraction of low-spin state Fe in liquid (Mg_{0.75}Fe_{0.25})O is ~70% (3000 K is out of the temperature range considered in ref. 30 and 70% is an estimate based on their Fig 2), larger than that in (Mg_{0.75}Fe_{0.25})O solid, which is ~40% (see their Fig. 2). Indeed, at 3000 K low-spin state (Mg_{0.75}Fe_{0.25})O solid although at a pressure (90 GPa) ³⁰ higher than what we observed in our experiments (40–50 GPa). Additionally, the possible stronger softening of the adiabatic bulk modulus of (Mg,Fe)O liquid than that observed and predicted in solid (Mg,Fe)O might partly account for the large volume reduction upon melting^{34,35}.

However, in contrast to the spin transition pressures and positive Clapeyron slopes for the spin crossovers reported by ref. 30, another FPMD simulations study³¹ predict ~20 to 30 GPa higher spin crossover pressure for iron in liquid ($Mg_{0.75}Fe_{0.25}$)O with a negative Clapeyron slopes for the spin transition. This discrepancy in transition pressure has been attributed to the use of the Hubbard *U* term and the sharp differences in Clapeyron slopes has mainly been attributed to entropy factors³⁰. Nevertheless, the lack of knowledge about Hubbard *U* and entropy of liquid (Mg,Fe)O at high pressures and temperatures precludes the assessment of the conflicting results given by different studies. In addition to the Hubbard *U* and entropy, other simplifications made in FPMD simulations³¹ such as ideal mixing between FeO and MgO liquid end-members may also introduce some uncertainty in those computational results. To conclude, the negative

volume variation of (Mg,Fe)O during melting between 40 to 50 GPa observed in this study may be the result of the spin transition of Fe in liquid (Mg,Fe)O. More studies are needed to fully understand the spin crossover of Fe in the (Mg,Fe)O liquid and the associated thermoelastic variation. More discussion concerning this topic will be included in a coming paper.

Supplementary Note 6: Pressure medium

The purpose of not using any pressure media for Mg-rich samples is to minimize the possible contamination introduced by the pressure medium. In addition, for Mg-rich samples, even if a pressure medium is used, large temperature gradients still exists due to the small absorption coefficient of the materials to laser radiation. This means that the laser can easily penetrate through the Mg-rich (Mg,Fe)O and melting would still begin from the interior of the samples, setting up temperature gradients.

For the Fe-rich samples, we use MgO as insulation and a pressure media so that we are able to heat, without which, laser heating would be difficult. We find diffusion between the MgO and Fe-rich ferropericlase and therefore do need to take this into account when applying the temperature correction due to wavelength-dependent absorption. Fortunately, in terms of contamination, MgO is fine since it is already part of the binary system we are investigating. Using a noble gas such as argon, for example, may cause lowered melting temperatures due to incorporation in to melts of this composition². Additionally, due to the high temperatures anticipated for ferropericlase melting, we avoided alkali halides due to strong changes in the optical properties, which cause a rapid increase in temperature near their melting points³⁶.

Although there exists large temperature gradients within the sample during the laser heating due to the absence pressure media for some experiments, the correction of the effects of temperature gradients on temperature deviation is already incorporated in our inverse modeling method (See Temperature determination in main text). To summarize the consideration in Deng *et al* 1 , the steady heat flow equation is solved with proper boundaries conditions to obtain the 1D axial temperature gradient. More rigorous temperature profiles can be calculated using the TempDAC code³⁷ with the knowledge of thermodynamic properties of materials at corresponding conditions. But unfortunately, those parameters are poorly constrained for most Earth materials at elevated pressures and temperatures. Nevertheless, the fine structure of the temperature profile obtained by rigorous thermodynamic simulation is not expected to change the axial temperature distribution within the melt much while it does alter the fine structure of the temperature profile of the solid part. As such, temperature correction will not be influenced largely by the rigorous temperature profile calculation since the hottest part (melt) dominates the effects of the temperature.

Supplementary References

- 1. Deng J, Du Z, Benedetti LR, Lee KKM. The influence of wavelength-dependent absorption and temperature gradients on temperature determination in laser-heated diamond-anvil cells. *J Appl Phys* **121**, (2017).
- 2. Du Z, Lee KKM. High-pressure melting of MgO from (Mg,Fe)O solid solutions. *Geophysical Research Letters* **41**, 8061-8066 (2014).
- 3. Glazyrin K, Miyajima N, Smith JS, Lee KKM. Compression of a multiphase mantle assemblage: Effects of undesirable stress and stress annealing on the iron spin state crossover in ferropericlase. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Solid Earth* **121**, 2015JB012321 (2016).
- 4. Tsuchiya T, Wentzcovitch RM, da Silva CRS, de Gironcoli S. Spin transition in magnesiowustite in earth's lower mantle. *Phys Rev Lett* **96**, (2006).
- 5. Lin J-F, *et al.* Spin Transition Zone in Earth's Lower Mantle. *Science* **317**, 1740-1743 (2007).
- 6. Van Orman JA, Fei YW, Hauri EH, Wang JH. Diffusion in MgO at high pressures: Constraints on deformation mechanisms and chemical transport at the core-mantle boundary. *Geophysical Research Letters* **30**, (2003).
- 7. Ito Y, Toriumi M. Pressure effect of self-diffusion in periclase (MgO) by molecular dynamics. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Solid Earth* **112**, B04206 (2007).
- 8. Ita J, Cohen RE. Effects of Pressure on Diffusion and Vacancy Formation in MgO from Nonempirical Free-Energy Integrations. *Phys Rev Lett* **79**, 3198-3201 (1997).
- 9. Cohen RE, Weitz JS. The Melting Curve and Premelting of MgO. In: *Properties of Earth and Planetary Materials at High Pressure and Temperature* (ed^(eds). American Geophysical Union (1998).
- 10. Yamazaki D, Irifune T. Fe-Mg interdiffusion in magnesiowustite up to 35 GPa. *Earth and Planetary Science Letters* **216**, 301-311 (2003).
- 11. Mackwell S, Bystricky M, Sproni C. Fe–Mg Interdiffusion in (Mg,Fe)O. *Physics* and Chemistry of Minerals **32**, 418-425 (2005).
- 12. Holzapfel C, Rubie DC, Mackwell S, Frost DJ. Effect of pressure on Fe–Mg interdiffusion in (FexMg1–x)O, ferropericlase. *Physics of the Earth and Planetary Interiors* **139**, 21-34 (2003).

- 13. Zhang L, Fei YW. Melting behavior of (Mg,Fe)O solid solutions at high pressure. *Geophysical Research Letters* **35**, (2008).
- 14. Fischer RA, Campbell AJ. High-pressure melting of wüstite. *American Mineralogist* **95**, 1473-1477 (2010).
- 15. Vočadlo L, Price GD. The melting of MgO computer calculations via molecular dynamics. *Physics and Chemistry of Minerals* **23**, 42-49 (1996).
- 16. Alfe D. Melting curve of MgO from first-principles simulations. *Phys Rev Lett* **94**, (2005).
- 17. Frost DJ, *et al.* Partitioning of oxygen between the Earth's mantle and core. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Solid Earth* **115**, B02202 (2010).
- 18. Komabayashi T. Thermodynamics of melting relations in the system Fe-FeO at high pressure: Implications for oxygen in the Earth's core. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Solid Earth* **119**, 4164-4177 (2014).
- 19. Frost DJ. Fe2+-Mg partitioning between garnet, magnesiowustite, and (Mg,Fe)(2)SiO4 phases of the transition zone. *American Mineralogist* **88**, 387-397 (2003).
- 20. JANAF. *Thermochemical Tables* 2nd edn. NSRDS- NBS 37 (1971).
- 21. Badro J. Spin Transitions in Mantle Minerals. *Annual Review of Earth and Planetary Sciences, Vol 42* **42**, 231-248 (2014).
- 22. Badro J, *et al.* Iron partitioning in Earth's mantle: Toward a deep lower mantle discontinuity. *Science* **300**, 789-791 (2003).
- 23. Ohta K, Hirose K, Onoda S, Shimizu K. The effect of iron spin transition on electrical conductivity of (Mg,Fe)O magnesiowüstite. *Proceedings of the Japan Academy Series B, Physical and Biological Sciences* **83**, 97-100 (2007).
- 24. Goncharov AF, Struzhkin VV, Jacobsen SD. Reduced Radiative Conductivity of Low-Spin (Mg,Fe)O in the Lower Mantle. *Science* **312**, 1205-1208 (2006).
- 25. Lindemann FA. über die Berechnung Molecular Eigenfrequnzen. *Physikalische Zeitschrift* **11**, 609-612 (1910).
- 26. Karato SI. Effects of pressure and water. *Deformation of Earth Materials: An Introduction to the Rheology of Solid Earth*, 168-198 (2008).

- 27. Yamazaki D, Karato S. Some mineral physics constraints on the rheology and geothermal structure of Earth's lower mantle. *American Mineralogist* **86**, 385-391 (2001).
- 28. Marquardt H, Speziale S, Reichmann HJ, Frost DJ, Schilling FR. Single-crystal elasticity of (Mg0.9Fe0.1)O to 81 GPa. *Earth and Planetary Science Letters* **287**, 345-352 (2009).
- 29. Wu Z, Justo JF, Wentzcovitch RM. Elastic Anomalies in a Spin-Crossover System: Ferropericlase at Lower Mantle Conditions. *Phys Rev Lett* **110**, 228501 (2013).
- 30. Ghosh DB, Karki BB. Solid-liquid density and spin crossovers in (Mg, Fe)O system at deep mantle conditions. *Sci Rep-Uk* **6**, 37269 (2016).
- 31. Holmstrom E, Stixrude L. Spin crossover in liquid (Mg,Fe)O at extreme conditions. *Phys Rev B* **93**, (2016).
- 32. Wentzcovitch RM, Justo JF, Wu Z, da Silva CRS, Yuen DA, Kohlstedt D. Anomalous compressibility of ferropericlase throughout the iron spin cross-over. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **106**, 8447-8452 (2009).
- 33. Crowhurst JC, Brown JM, Goncharov AF, Jacobsen SD. Elasticity of (Mg,Fe)O Through the Spin Transition of Iron in the Lower Mantle. *Science* **319**, 451-453 (2008).
- 34. Wu Z, Justo JF, da Silva CRS, de Gironcoli S, Wentzcovitch RM. Anomalous thermodynamic properties in ferropericlase throughout its spin crossover (vol 80, 014409, 2009). *Phys Rev B* **80**, (2009).
- 35. Fei Y, *et al.* Spin transition and equations of state of (Mg, Fe)O solid solutions. *Geophysical Research Letters* **34**, L17307 (2007).
- 36. Boehler R, Ross M, Boercker DB. High-pressure melting curves of alkali halides. *Phys Rev B* **53**, 556-563 (1996).
- 37. Rainey ESG, Hernlund JW, Kavner A. Temperature distributions in the laserheated diamond anvil cell from 3-D numerical modeling. *J Appl Phys* **114**, 204905 (2013).