2–2 composites based on [011]-poled relaxor-ferroelectric single crystals: from the piezoelectric anisotropy to the hydrostatic response
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1. INTRODUCTION

Piezo-active composites based on perovskite-type single crystals (SCs) of solid solutions of relaxor-ferroelectrics with high piezoelectric activity show outstanding electromechanical properties1–3 that enable effective conversion of mechanical energy into electric energy and vice versa. In the last decade the effective electromechanical properties and related parameters have been studied in these materials to determine the optimum applications of the composites in piezoelectric transducer, sensor, hydroacoustic, medical, and energy-harvesting applications. The opportunity here is to further improve the performance by creating composites based on relaxor-ferroelectric SCs with optimum crystallographic orientation. These effects have been studied for SC / polymer composites with 2–24,6 and 1–37 connectivity patterns (in terms of work8 by Newnham et al.) and enabled the improvement of hydrostatic parameters by optimising the rotations of the main crystallographic axes of the SC component. The relaxor-ferroelectric SC systems of particular interest as a potential component of advanced composites are domain-engineered samples poled along [011] of the perovskite unit cell. Full sets of electromechanical constants have been measured on the [011]-poled SCs of (1 – x)Pb(Mg1/3Nb2/3)O3–xPbTiO3 (PMN–xPT)9,10, (1 – x)Pb(Zn1/3Nb2/3)O3–xPbTiO3 (PZN–xPT)11,12 and xPb(1/2Nb1/2)O3–yPb(Mg1/3Nb2/3)O3–(1 – x – y)PbTiO3 (PIN–x–yPT)13 from the mm2 symmetry class. In this paper we consider examples of 2–2 composites based on the [011]-poled relaxor-ferroelectric SCs to demonstrate the piezoelectric anisotropy and hydrostatic performance of the composites.
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2. MODEL CONCEPTS AND AVERAGING PROCEDURE

2.1 Piezo-active 2–2 composites

It is assumed that the piezo-active 2–2 composite represents a system of parallel-connected SC and the polymer layers form a regular laminar structure (Fig. 1). The main crystallographic axes \( X, Y, \) and \( Z \) of each single-domain SC layer in the initial state are parallel to the co-ordinate axes \( OX_1, OX_2, \) and \( OX_3 \). This means that rotation angles in the initial state obey the conditions \( \alpha = 0^\circ \) (inset 1 in Fig. 1), \( \beta = 0^\circ \) (inset 2 in Fig. 1) and \( \gamma = 0^\circ \) (inset 3 in Fig. 1). Hereafter we consider independent rotations that are described in terms of one of the aforementioned angles, \( \alpha, \beta \) or \( \gamma \). Such modes of rotation make it possible to maintain a polydomain state in the SC layer. It is assumed that at these rotations, the spontaneous polarisation vectors of domains \( P_{s,1}, P_{s,2}, \ldots \) in the SC layer (insets 1–3 in Fig. 1) are situated either over or in the \((X_1X_2X_3)\) plane. Hereby the rotation angles obey inequalities

\[
-14 \leq \alpha \leq 14, \quad -45^\circ \leq \beta \leq 45^\circ \quad \text{and} \quad 0^\circ \leq \gamma \leq 360^\circ.
\]

The electromechanical properties of the SC on rotation of its main crystallographic axes are determined in the \((X_1X_2X_3)\) system by taking into account the rotation matrices and tensor ranks of the properties.

Figure 1. Schematic of the 2–2 SC / polymer composite. \((X_1X_2X_3)\) is the rectangular co-ordinate system of the composite sample. \( \alpha, \beta \) and \( \gamma \) are angles of rotation of the main crystallographic axes \( X, Y \) and \( Z \) (insets 1–3) in each SC layer. \( P_{s,1}, P_{s,2}, \ldots \) are spontaneous polarisation vectors of domains in each SC layer.

2.2 Averaging procedure

The effective electromechanical properties of the 2–2 composite are predicted on the basis of the matrix approach\(^3\) that is applied to composites with planar microgeometry. The \( 9 \times 9 \) matrix of the effective properties of the composite is represented in the rectangular co-ordinate system \((X_1X_2X_3)\) as

\[
\| C^* \| = \left( \| s^E \| \quad \| d^* \| \quad \| \varepsilon^\sigma \| \right)^T
\]

where \( \| s^E \| \) is the \( 6 \times 6 \) matrix of elastic compliances at electric field \( E = \text{const} \), \( \| d^* \| \) is the \( 3 \times 6 \) matrix of piezoelectric coefficients, \( \| \varepsilon^\sigma \| \) is the \( 3 \times 3 \) matrix of dielectric permittivities measured at mechanical stress \( \sigma = \text{const} \),
and superscript “T” denotes the transposed matrix. The $\| C^* \|$ matrix from Eq. (1) is determined by averaging the electromechanical properties of the components $^3$ based on the volume fraction $m$ and given by

$$\| C^* \| = \left\| \left( C^{(1)} \right)^{-1/2} \left( \| M \| + \| C^{(2)} \| (1 - m) \right) \left( \| M \| + \| I \| (1 - m) \right)^{-1/2} \right\|_F,$$

(2)

where $\| C^{(1)} \|$ and $\| C^{(2)} \|$ are matrices of the electromechanical properties of the SC and polymer, respectively, $\| M \|$ is concerned with the electric and mechanical boundary conditions at interfaces $x_1 = \text{const}$ (Fig. 1), $\| I \|$ is the identity 9 x 9 matrix, and $\| C^{(n)} \|$ has a form similar to that shown in Eq. (1). The $\| M \|$ matrix from Eq. (2) is written as $\| M \| = \| m_1 \|^{-1} \| m_2 \|$, where

$$\| m_n \| = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ s_{12}^{(n),E} & s_{22}^{(n),E} & s_{24}^{(n),E} & s_{25}^{(n),E} & s_{26}^{(n),E} & d_{12}^{(n)} & d_{22}^{(n)} & d_{12}^{(n)} \\ s_{13}^{(n),E} & s_{23}^{(n),E} & s_{34}^{(n),E} & s_{35}^{(n),E} & s_{36}^{(n),E} & d_{13}^{(n)} & d_{23}^{(n)} & d_{13}^{(n)} \\ s_{14}^{(n),E} & s_{24}^{(n),E} & s_{24}^{(n),E} & s_{45}^{(n),E} & s_{46}^{(n),E} & d_{14}^{(n)} & d_{24}^{(n)} & d_{14}^{(n)} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ d_{11}^{(n)} & d_{12}^{(n)} & d_{13}^{(n)} & d_{14}^{(n)} & d_{15}^{(n)} & d_{16}^{(n)} & e_{11}^{(n),\sigma} & e_{12}^{(n),\sigma} & e_{13}^{(n),\sigma} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

is represented in terms of the electromechanical constants of either SC ($n = 1$) or polymer ($n = 2$) in accordance with the boundary conditions at $x_1 = \text{const}$.

### 2.3 Effective parameters of the composite

Based on matrix elements of $\| C^* \|$ from Eq. (2) it is possible to determine the volume-fraction ($m$) and orientation ($\alpha$, $\beta$ or $\gamma$) dependences of effective parameters of the 2–2 composite. Of interest for a variety of applications are:

(i) electromechanical coupling factors

$$k_{3j}^* = d_{3j}^* (e_{33}^{*E} s_{33}^{*E})^{1/2},$$

(3)

($j = 1, 2$ and 3) and their hydrostatic analog

$$k_h^* = d_h^* (e_{33}^{*E} s_{33}^{*E})^{1/2},$$

(4)

(ii) anisotropy factors

$$\zeta_{31} = d_{33}^* / d_{31}^*, \ \zeta_{32} = d_{33}^* / d_{32}^*, \ \zeta_{33} = k_{33}^* / k_{31}^* = \zeta_{33} (s_{33}^{*E} / s_{13}^{*E})^{1/2},$$

and (iii) squared figures of merit

$$Q_{3j}^* = d_{3j}^* g_{3j}^*,$$

(6)

($j = 1, 2$ and 3) and their hydrostatic analog

$$Q_h^* = d_h^* g_h^*.$$

(7)

Electromechanical coupling factors $k_{3j}^*$ and $k_h^*$ from Eqs. (3) and (4), respectively, characterise the effectiveness of the conversion of mechanical energy into electric energy and vice versa. The anisotropy factors from Eqs. (5) enable us
to estimate the possibility of a considerable piezoelectric effect along the \(OX_3\) axis in comparison to the effect along the remaining co-ordinate axes, as well as to find a direction of the preferential conversion of energy in the composite sample. The anisotropy factors from Eqs. (5) are of value for highly-anisotropic piezo-active elements that are used, for instance, in medical diagnostic devices with ultrasonic antennae based on pulse-echo principles and control of the preferred direction, in hydrophones, and other acoustic devices. The squared figures of merit \((Q_{ab}^2)\) from Eq. (6) are related to power densities, off-resonant energy harvesting\(^{15}\) and signal-to-noise ratios in piezoelectric transducers\(^{3}\) and other piezo-technical devices. It should be noted, that contrary to the conventional poled ferroelectrics,\(^{6,7}\) it is possible to utilise the effective strains (e.g. \(\varepsilon_{32}^e\)) characterising the piezoelectric \(\varepsilon_{32}\) ceramics with \(-\varepsilon_{31}\). This means that in the general case, the conventional relations for piezoelectric coupling get modified. For instance, the anisotropy factors from Eqs. (5) we observe in Table 2 a wide range of volume fractions \((m)\) wherein conditions (9) and (10) are valid simultaneously. The strong elastic anisotropy of the PIN–0.27–0.40 SC influences \(\zeta_{31}\) stronger than \(\zeta_{32}\), and this influence leads to a narrower range of \(\gamma\) (see Table 2). This angle is associated with the rotation of the main crystallographic axes about \(Z\) (or the co-ordinate axis \(OX_5\) in Fig. 1), and such a rotation mode strongly influences \(d_{31}^*\) and \(d_{31}^*\) of the composite. Fig. 2 suggests that conditions \(d_{31}^* = 0\) and \(d_{32}^* = 0\) are valid when the \(\gamma\) values are close to those listed in Table 2. This means that the large piezoelectric anisotropy of the PIN–0.27–0.40-based \(2–2\) composite is a result of the orientation effects of the crystallographic axes, the considerable elastic anisotropy of the SC component and the negative Poisson’s ratio of the polymer component.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1. Anisotropy Factors \(\zeta_{31}\) and \(\zeta_{32}\)

When comparing the data on the [011]-poled SCs in Table 1 we observe that the PIN–0.27–0.40 SC exhibits a more pronounced anisotropy of elastic compliances and piezoelectric coefficients compared to PZN–0.07PT. The PIN–0.27–0.40 SC also exhibits larger shear piezoelectric coefficients (e.g. \(d_{15}\) and \(d_{23}\)) than the longitudinal coefficients (e.g. \(d_{33}\), \(d_{31}\) and \(d_{32}\)). On examination of the anisotropy factors from Eqs. (5) we observe in Table 2 a wide range of volume-fractions \((m)\) and orientations \((\gamma)\) wherein conditions (9) and (10) are valid simultaneously.

Electromechanical constants of the SC and polymer components are listed in Table 1. As a comparison, we choose two polymer components of interest, we choose an auxetic polyethylene (with a Poisson’s ratio equal to \(-0.83\)). In recent work\(^{8}\) this auxetic polymer component was considered in the context of providing anisotropic electromechanical properties in SC / polymer composites. Hereafter we examine the following conditions for a large anisotropy of the piezoelectric coefficients and electromechanical coupling factors of the 2–2 composite:

\[
|\zeta_{31}| \geq 5 \text{ and } |\zeta_{32}| \geq 5
\]  

(9)

and

\[
|\zeta_{31}| \geq 5 \text{ and } |\zeta_{32}| \geq 5.
\]  

(10)
Table 1. Room-temperature elastic compliances $s_{ab}^E$ (in $10^{-12}$ Pa$^{-1}$), piezoelectric coefficients $d_{ij}$ (in pC / N) and dielectric permittivities $\varepsilon_{pp}^e$ of [011]-poled PZN–0.07PT$^{12}$ and PIN–0.27–0.40$^{13}$ SCs and auxetic PE$^{18}$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composition</th>
<th>$s_{11}^E$</th>
<th>$s_{12}^E$</th>
<th>$s_{22}^E$</th>
<th>$s_{23}^E$</th>
<th>$s_{33}^E$</th>
<th>$s_{44}^E$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PZN–0.07PT</td>
<td>67.52</td>
<td>-60.16</td>
<td>3.355</td>
<td>102.00</td>
<td>-54.47</td>
<td>62.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIN–0.27–0.40</td>
<td>9.20</td>
<td>-8.38</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>-14.4</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxetic PE</td>
<td>5260</td>
<td>4360</td>
<td>4360</td>
<td>5260</td>
<td>4360</td>
<td>5260</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composition</th>
<th>$s_{15}^E$</th>
<th>$s_{26}^E$</th>
<th>$d_{15}$</th>
<th>$d_{24}$</th>
<th>$d_{31}$</th>
<th>$d_{32}$</th>
<th>$d_{33}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PZN–0.07PT</td>
<td>291.55</td>
<td>14.08</td>
<td>1823</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>-1460</td>
<td>1150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIN–0.27–0.40</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>4550</td>
<td>4100</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>-346</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxetic PE</td>
<td>1.92 $10^4$</td>
<td>1.92 $10^4$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composition</th>
<th>$\varepsilon_{11}^e$</th>
<th>$\varepsilon_{22}^e$</th>
<th>$\varepsilon_{33}^e$</th>
<th>$\varepsilon_{15}^e$</th>
<th>$\varepsilon_{26}^e$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PZN–0.07PT</td>
<td>8240</td>
<td>1865</td>
<td>3180</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIN–0.27–0.40</td>
<td>8070</td>
<td>30000</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxetic PE</td>
<td>2.3$^*$</td>
<td>2.3$^*$</td>
<td>2.3$^*$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^*$ It is assumed that relative dielectric permittivity equals 2.3, as is known for monolithic PE samples$^{19}$

Figure 2. Volume-fraction dependences of piezoelectric coefficients $d_{31}^*$ (a, in pC / N) and $d_{32}^*$ (b, in pC / N) of the PIN–0.27–0.40 SC / auxetic PE composite at $\gamma =$ const.

3.2. Squared Figures of Merit ($Q_{3j}^*$)$^2$

The obvious anisotropy of the piezoelectric coefficients $d_{3j}^*$ and, therefore, $g_{3j}^*$ of the 2–2 composite influence its squared figures of merit ($Q_{3j}^*$)$^2$ from Eqs. (6). To the best of our knowledge, there are no publications devoted to a comparative analysis of ($Q_{3j}^*$)$^2$ related to different crystallographic directions and/or orientation effects in the SC / polymer composites. The macroscopic mm2 symmetry of the [011]-poled SCs$^{9–13}$ enables us to compare the piezoelectric response and, therefore, the figures of merit of the composite (Fig. 1) along the different co-ordinate axes $OX_j$. 
Table 2. Volume-fraction ranges \([m_1; m_2]\) wherein conditions (9) and (10) are valid for the 2–2 PIN–0.27–0.40 SC / auxetic PE composite at variations of the rotation angle \(\gamma\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(\gamma), deg</th>
<th>([m_1; m_2]) related to the valid condition (9)</th>
<th>([m_1; m_2]) related to the valid condition (10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>([0.031; 0.037])</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>([0.238; 0.759])</td>
<td>([0.033; 0.049])</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>([0.236; 0.765])</td>
<td>([0.035; 0.070])</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>([0.239; 0.745])</td>
<td>([0.037; 0.124])</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>([0.242; 0.726])</td>
<td>([0.039; 0.484])</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>([0.245; 0.709])</td>
<td>([0.041; 0.950])</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>([0.248; 0.693])</td>
<td>([0.043; 0.945])</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>([0.250; 0.679])</td>
<td>([0.045; 0.940])</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>([0.252; 0.666])</td>
<td>([0.047; 0.936])</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>([0.254; 0.654])</td>
<td>([0.049; 0.929])</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>([0.256; 0.643])</td>
<td>([0.051; 0.924])</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>([0.257; 0.632])</td>
<td>([0.053; 0.919])</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>([0.259; 0.623])</td>
<td>([0.055; 0.913])</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>([0.260; 0.614])</td>
<td>([0.056; 0.908])</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>([0.262; 0.606])</td>
<td>([0.116; 0.903])</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>([0.263; 0.598])</td>
<td>([0.826; 0.898])</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>([0.264; 0.591])</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>([0.265; 0.585])</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>([0.266; 0.579])</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A simple comparison of \(d_{3j}^*\), \(g_{3j}^*\), and \((Q_{3j}^*)^2\) enables us to observe that the largest values of \((Q_{3j}^*)^2\) are related to \(j = 3\) and variations of \(\gamma\) (see inset 3 in Fig. 1): for instance, in the PZN–0.07PT-based composite absolute max([\(Q_{33}^*\)]\(^2\)) and max \(g_{33}^*\) are observed at \(\gamma = 90^\circ\) and \(0 < m < 0.01\) (Fig. 3). The small volume fractions \(m\) of SC allow the composite to reach high piezoelectric sensitivity (increasing \(g_{3j}^*\)) due to its small dielectric permittivity \(\varepsilon_{33}^{*\sigma}\), i.e., when the inequality \(\varepsilon_{33}^{*\sigma} < \varepsilon_{33}^{(1)\sigma}\) holds. However these very small \(m\) values make it problematic to manufacture a 2–2 composite with \((Q_{3j}^*)^2 > 10^9\) Pa\(^{-1}\) (Fig. 3, a) and \(g_{33}^* > 1\) V m / N. As a compromise between performance and manufacturability we examine in Fig. 4 the performance of the composite at \(m = 0.05\) and various angles of rotation. Due to the orientation

![Figure 3](image-url)
Figure 4. Orientation dependences of squared figures of merit \((Q_3^+)^2\) and \((Q_3^-)^2\) (a–c, in \(10^{-12}\) Pa\(^{-1}\)) and piezoelectric coefficients \(g_{53}^+\) and \(g_{53}^-\) (d–f, in mV m / N) of the PZN–0.07PT SC/auxetic PE composite at \(m = 0.05\).
effect we see a series of extreme points of \((Q_{ij}^*)^2\) (see curves 1–3 in Fig. 4, a–c) which correlate with extreme points of \(g_{ij}^*\) (see curves 1–3 in Fig. 4, d–f). It is seen that the anisotropy of the squared figures of merit \((Q_{ij}^*)^2\) stems from the anisotropy of \(g_{ij}^*\) and is varied due to the orientation effect.

3.3. Hydrostatic Parameters \(d_h^*, g_h^*, (Q_h^*)^2, \) and \(k_h^*\)

Data on the hydrostatic parameters of the PZN–0.07PT-based 2-2 composite are shown in Fig. 4 (curves 4) and Fig. 5. We also see the correlation between \(g_{ij}^*\) and \((Q_{ij}^*)^2\) at relatively small volume fractions of SC (see curves 4 in Fig. 4). An important observation is the large values of \((Q_h^*)^2\) when varying the rotation angle \(\gamma\) (Fig. 4, c). In Section 3.1 we mentioned the role of the rotation mode (see inset 3 in Fig. 1) in producing a large piezoelectric anisotropy. In this case the inequality

\[(Q_h^*)^2 > (Q_{33}^*)^2\]  \(11\)

takes place in a wide range of \(\gamma\) (cf. curves 3 and 4 in Fig. 4, c), and \(max(Q_h^*)^2 \approx 3 \times 10^9\) Pa\(^{-1}\) is very important for hydrophone and related applications. An increase in \((Q_h^*)^2\) is a result of the favourable anisotropy of the piezoelectric coefficients \(d_{ij}^*\) from Eqs. (8) and the auxetic polymer component with a negative Poisson ratio that also influences the degree of anisotropy.

It should be added that absolute \(max d_h^*\) and \(max k_h^*\) are also achieved at \(\gamma = 90^0\). Examination of the hydrostatic parameters near absolute maximum points (Fig. 5) show that a correlation between \(k_h^*\) and \(d_h^*\) is observed. The large values of \(k_h^*\) and \(d_h^*\) and volume fractions \(m\) at which these values are achieved highlight the advantage of these particular composite structures over the conventional ceramic / polymer composites [3]. The aforementioned correlation may be a result of the strong influence of the piezoelectric properties of the composite on its hydrostatic electromechanical coupling factor from Eq. (4). An additional advantage of the studied composite is also related to the considerable increase in \(d_h^*\) (Fig. 5, b) in comparison to \(d_h^{(1)}\) of the SC component: according to data from Table 1, \(d_h^{(1)} = 168\) pC / N for the PZN–0.07PT SC.

Figure 5. Correlation between the hydrostatic electromechanical coupling factor \(k_h^*(m, \gamma)\) (a) and hydrostatic piezoelectric coefficient \(d_h^*(m, \gamma)\) (b, in pC / N) of the PZN–0.07PT SC / auxetic PE composite.
4. CONCLUSION

In the present paper we have analysed the performance of the 2–2 composites based on relaxor-ferroelectric SCs poled along [011] of the perovskite unit cell. Various orientations of the main crystallographic axes in the SC layers (see insets 1–3 in Fig. 1) have been analysed to study the polarisation orientation effect on the piezoelectric anisotropy and hydrostatic response of the composites.

Changes in the piezoelectric anisotropy of the SC component due to the polarisation orientation effect influence the anisotropy factors (5) of the composite. An additional influence is caused by the auxetic polymer component with a negative Poisson’s ratio that is important for a re-distribution of internal mechanical and electric fields in the composite structure. The anisotropy of the piezoelectric coefficients $d'_{3j}$ is important for predicting the behaviour of the squared figures of merit ($Q_{3j}^2$) and the hydrostatic piezoelectric response of the studied composites. Conditions (9) and (10) for the large anisotropy of $d'_{3j}$ and $k'_{3j}$, respectively, are valid in the PIN–0.27–0.40 SC-based composite (Table 2). The anisotropy factors obeying conditions (9) and (10), the anisotropy of the squared figures of merit ($Q_{3j}^2$) and correlations between ($Q_{3j}^2$) and $g'_{3j}$ (Figs. 3 and 4) are important for sensor and energy-harvesting applications. Of particular note for these applications is that in a wide range of composite volume-fractions the values of ($Q_{3j}^2$) (Figs. 3, a and 4, a–c) are larger than $d_{33,20}$ of conventional poled ferroelectric ceramics. It should be underlined that in the present paper the anisotropy of ($Q_{3j}^2$) has first been discussed for the piezo-active composites based on relaxor-ferroelectric SCs with mm2 symmetry. Large values of ($Q_{3j}^2$) = $3 \times 10^{-9}$ Pa$^{-1}$, $d_{33} = 2000$ pC / N and $k_{33} = 0.8$ (see curves 4 in Fig. 4 and Fig. 5), as well as validity of condition (11) are of interest for a variety of hydroacoustic applications.

In conclusion, the high performance of the 2–2 SC / polymer composites studied in this paper is highly dependent on the orientation of the main crystallographic axes in the SC layers, and the anisotropy factors, squared figures of merit and hydrostatic parameters of these composites vary at different rotation modes and in wide volume-fraction ranges.
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