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Abstract

Phase field approach (PFA) to the interaction between phase transformations (PTs) and dislocations is developed at large strains as a nontrivial combination of our recent advanced PFAs to martensitic PTs and dislocation evolution. Finite element method (FEM) simulations are performed to solve the coupled phase-field and elasticity equations and are applied to study of the growth and arrest of martensitic plate for temperature-induced PTs, the evolution of dislocations and high pressure phase in a nanograined material under pressure and shear, and the dislocation inheritance for stress-induced PT.
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1. Introduction

Interaction between martensitic PTs and dislocations is of great importance for various applications such as transformation-induced plasticity [1], plastic shear induced PTs under high pressure [2,3], martensite nucleation and growth [4,5,6], and heat and thermomechanical treatments of steels. The main focus of the current paper is on PFA to interaction between evolving martensitic PTs and discrete dislocations at the nanoscale. Martensitic nucleation in the presence of stationary dislocations was studied in [7]. Evolution of martensite (M) with dislocations located at the moving phase interface was treated in [8]. A simplified version of a PFA for discrete dislocation theory with
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martensitic PTs is presented in [9]. Here, we combine the most advanced and the only available large-strain PFA to multivariant martensitic PTs [10] and dislocation evolutions [9] and include their nontrivial interactions. For compactness, single martensitic variant is treated. The FEM simulations applied to study the growth and arrest of martensitic plate for temperature-induced PTs, the evolution of dislocations and high pressure phase in a nanogranered material under pressure and shear, and inheritance of dislocations of martensite in austenite for stress-induced PT. Some preliminary results are presented in [11,12].

2. Complete system of equations

2.1. Kinematics

The following multiplicative decomposition of the deformation gradient $\mathbf{F}$ into elastic $\mathbf{F}_e$, transformational $\mathbf{U}_t$, and plastic $\mathbf{F}_p$ contributions is justified: $\mathbf{F} = \mathbf{F}_e \cdot \mathbf{U}_t \cdot \mathbf{F}_p$. In order to satisfy thermodynamic equilibrium and instability conditions, $\mathbf{U}_t$ vs. the order parameter $\eta$ for a single martensitic variant is accepted as in [10]

$$\mathbf{U}_t = I + [a\eta^2(1 - \eta)^2 + (4\eta^3 - 3\eta^4)]\mathbf{e}_c; \quad 0 < a < 6,$$

where $\mathbf{e}_c$ is the transformation strain tensor and $I$ is the unit tensor. For multiple slip systems, an additivity of the plastic velocity gradients for different slip systems is accepted, like in crystal plasticity:

$$\mathbf{F}_p = \mathbf{F}_p^{\alpha} \cdot \mathbf{F}_p^{-1} := \sum_{\alpha=1}^{P} \frac{1}{\mu_{\alpha}} \mathbf{b}^\alpha \otimes \mathbf{m}^{\alpha} \ddot{\mathbf{Y}}(\xi_{\alpha}) = \sum_{\alpha=1}^{P} \gamma_{\alpha} \mathbf{m}^{\alpha} \otimes \mathbf{m}^{\alpha} \ddot{\mathbf{Y}}(\xi_{\alpha}), \quad \ddot{\mathbf{Y}} = (\xi_{\alpha})^2(3 - 2\xi_{\alpha}) + \ln(\xi_{\alpha}).$$

Here $\xi_{\alpha}$ is the order parameter for a dislocation in a slip system $\alpha$, which varies between $n - 1$ and $n$ when $n - 1$ complete dislocations exist and the $n_{th}$ dislocation appears; $\ln(\xi_{\alpha})$ and $\xi_{\alpha}$ are the integer and the fractional parts of $\xi_{\alpha}$, respectively; $\mathbf{b}^\alpha$ is the Burgers vector of the slip system $\alpha$, $H^\alpha$ is the height of dislocation, $n^\alpha$ is the unit vector normal to the slip system, $\mathbf{m}^{\alpha}$ is the unit vector in the direction of $\mathbf{b}^\alpha$, and $\gamma_{\alpha} = \frac{b^\alpha}{n^\alpha}$ is the plastic shear strain.

2.2. Helmholtz free energy

The Helmholtz free energy per unit mass can be expressed as the sum of elastic energy $\psi^e$, thermal energy for PT $\psi^\theta$, crystalline energy for dislocations $\psi^\xi$, the energy of interaction of dislocation cores belonging to different slip systems $\psi^{int}$, and gradient energies related to martensitic PT $\psi^\eta$ and dislocations $\psi^\xi$ as follows

$$\psi = J_t \psi^e + \psi^\theta + \psi^\xi + \psi^{int} + \psi^\eta + \psi^\xi.$$

The elastic energy is

$$\rho_0 \psi^e = \frac{1}{2} E_e : \mathbf{C} : \mathbf{E}_e,$$

where $\mathbf{C}$ is the fourth-rank elastic moduli tensor and $\mathbf{E}_e = \frac{1}{2} (\mathbf{F}_e^T \cdot \mathbf{F}_e - I)$ is the Lagrangian elastic strain tensor. Also, $J_t = \det \mathbf{U}_t$ is the determinant of $\mathbf{U}_t$. The thermal energy is derived as

$$\rho_0 \psi^\theta = A_0 (\theta - \theta_c) \eta^2 (1 - \eta)^2 - \Delta S (\theta - \theta_e) (4\eta^3 - 3\eta^4),$$

where $\theta_c$ is critical temperature at which stress-free $A$ loses its stability, $\theta_e$ is equilibrium temperature, $\Delta S$ is the jump in entropy, and $A_0$ is a parameter. The crystalline energy for dislocations is accepted as follows

$$\rho_0 \psi^\xi = \sum_{\alpha=1}^{P} A_\alpha (\eta, y^{\alpha}) (\xi_{\alpha})^2(1 - \xi_{\alpha})^2; \quad A_\alpha(\eta) = A_\alpha + (A_\alpha^M - A_\alpha^A) \eta^2 (3 - 2\eta);$$

$$A_\alpha(y^{\alpha}) = \begin{cases} A_\alpha, & y^{\alpha} \leq H^\alpha; \\ \frac{A_\alpha}{k_{\alpha}} y^{\alpha}, & y^{\alpha} > H^\alpha; \end{cases} \quad \gamma^{\alpha} = y^{\alpha} - \ln \left( \frac{y^{\alpha}}{H^\alpha + d^\alpha} \right) (H^\alpha + d^\alpha),$$

in which PTs and the inheritance of slip systems during PTs are taken into account. The coefficient $A_\alpha(\eta, y^{\alpha})$ characterizes the phase dependent theoretical yield strength. It is a periodic step-wise fuction of the coordinate $y^{\alpha}$.
along the normal to the corresponding slip plane \( \alpha \). The parameter \( A_{\alpha} \) is equal to its normal value \( \bar{A}_{\alpha} \) within each dislocation band of the height \( H^\alpha \) and \( k\bar{A}_{\alpha} \) \((k > 1)\) in a thin boundary layer between dislocations of the width \( d^\alpha \).

Thus, it excludes the spreading of the dislocation outside the desired dislocation band.

The energy of interaction of dislocation cores belonging to different slip systems is expressed in the following form

\[
\rho_0 \psi^{\text{int}}_\xi = \sum_{\alpha=1}^{p} A_{\alpha k}(\eta)(\xi_{\alpha})^2(1 - \xi_{\alpha})^2 (\xi_{\alpha})^2(1 - \xi_{\alpha})^2; \quad A_{\alpha \alpha} = 0; \\
A_{\alpha k}(\eta) = A_{\alpha k}^A + (A_{\alpha k}^M - A_{\alpha k}^A)\eta^2(3 - 2 \eta),
\]

where \( A_{\alpha k}^A \) and \( A_{\alpha k}^M \) are the coefficients of the energy of interaction of dislocation cores in the austenite (A) and M, respectively. This interaction energy term ensures that dislocations do not simultaneously pass through the same material point. For PTs with only one martensitic variant, the gradient energy can be written as

\[
\rho_0 \psi^\eta = \frac{\beta^\eta}{2} |\nabla \eta|^2,
\]

where \( \beta^\eta \) is the coefficient of the gradient energy for PT. For dislocations, the gradient energy can be written based on the form in [9] but with considering different coefficients for different phases

\[
\rho_0 \psi^\xi = \frac{\beta^\xi(\eta)}{2} \sum_{\alpha=1}^{p} ((\xi_{\alpha})^2 + M (1 - \xi_{\alpha})^2 (\nabla_{\alpha} n_{\alpha})^2); \quad \beta^\xi(\eta) = \frac{\beta^\xi}{2} + \frac{\beta^\xi}{2} - \beta^\xi M(3 - 2 \eta),
\]

where \( \beta^\xi \) and \( \beta^\xi M \) are the coefficient of the gradient energy for dislocations in A and M, respectively; \( M \) is the ratio of the coefficients for the gradient energy normal to and along the slip plane; \( \nabla^m \) and \( \nabla^m \) are the gradient operators along and normal to the slip system \( \alpha \), respectively.

2.3. The Ginzburg-Landau equations for PTs and dislocations

The Ginzburg-Landau equations for PTs and dislocations at large strains are expressed as

\[
\dot{\eta} = L^\eta \left( \frac{1}{\rho_0} P^T \cdot F_e \cdot \frac{\partial U^\xi}{\partial \eta} \cdot F_p + \nabla \cdot \left( \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial \nabla \eta} \right) - \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial \eta} \right); \\
\dot{\xi}_{\alpha} = L^\xi_{\alpha}(\eta) \left( \frac{1}{\rho_0} \tau_{\alpha \alpha} \frac{\partial Y}{\partial \xi_{\alpha}} + \nabla \cdot \left( \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial \nabla \xi_{\alpha}} \right) - \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial \xi_{\alpha}} \right); \\
L^\xi_{\alpha}(\eta) = L^A_{\alpha} + (L^M_{\alpha} - L^A_{\alpha})\eta^2(3 - 2 \eta); \quad \tau_{\alpha} = n^\alpha \cdot F_p \cdot P^T \cdot F_e \cdot U^\xi \cdot m^\alpha,
\]

where \( P = \rho_0 j_e F_e \cdot \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial \nabla e} \cdot U^\xi \cdot F_p^{-1} \) is the first Piola-Kirchhoff stress; \( L^A_{\alpha} \) and \( L^M_{\alpha} \) are the kinetics coefficients for dislocations in A and M, respectively. Momentum balance equation is expressed as \( \nabla \cdot \mathbf{P} = 0 \). The boundary conditions for PTs and dislocations are \( \nabla \eta \cdot \mathbf{k} = 0 \) and \( \nabla \xi_{\alpha} \cdot \mathbf{b}^\alpha = 0 \), respectively, where \( \mathbf{k} \) is the unit normal.

Both parts of the theory that describe PTs and dislocations satisfy some important requirements related to equilibrium and instability conditions, constant (stress- and temperature independent) thermodynamically equilibrium transformation deformation gradient and Burgers vector, and allow one to include all thermomechanical properties of both austenite and martensitic variants [9,10]. PFA to dislocation evolution also defines dislocation height by equations (like in [9]) rather than by computational mesh in previous approaches [13]. Thus, it leads to a well-posed formulation and mesh-independent dislocation height \( H \) for any dislocation orientation. The gradient energy for dislocations contains an additional term, which excludes localization of dislocation within height smaller than \( H \) without producing interface energy. The interaction between dislocations and PT occurs also through stress fields and is determined by solution of coupled phase field and nonlinear mechanical problems.

3. Numerical solutions

FEM approach and code COMSOL with embedded remeshing procedure have been utilized. Plane strain problems and straight edge dislocations are considered. All size and time parameters are normalized by 1nm and 1ps,
respectively. All results are shown in the deformed configuration. The following material parameters are used unless stated different [11,12]: $H = 0.7 \text{nm}$, $|b| = 0.35 \text{nm}$, $\beta_{1}^{M} = \beta_{1}^{T} = 7.5 \times 10^{-11} \text{N}$, $A_{1}^{M} = 3A_{1}^{T} = 2.25 \text{GPa}$, $\gamma_{1} = 0.5$, $\beta_{2}^{M} = \beta_{2}^{T} = 2.59 \times 10^{-10} \text{N}$, $t_{2}^{M} = t_{2}^{T} = 2600(Pa \cdot s)^{-1}$, $A_{0} = 20.6 \text{MPa/K}$, $\Delta s = 5.05 \text{MPa/K}$, $\theta = 298 \text{K}$, $\theta_{e} = -90 \text{K}$, $\theta_{h} = 100 \text{K}$, $a = 4$, $\varepsilon_{t}^{x} = \varepsilon_{t}^{y} = -0.05$, $\varepsilon_{t}^{xy} = 0.1$, shear modulus $\mu = 71.5 \text{ GPa}$, bulk modulus $K = 112.6 \text{ GPa}$.

3.1. Evolution of dislocations and high pressure phase in a nanograin material under pressure and shear

For the chosen material parameters, the phase equilibrium pressure between low and high pressure phases is 10 GPa. With one dislocation, PT starts and occurs to a significant extend at hydrostatic pressure of $P_{h} = 15 \text{ GPa}$. A rectangular sample with the size of $50 \times 20$ is considered which includes two nanograins surrounded by two areas at the top and bottom of the sample, each with the size of $50 \times 5$, which play role as elastic accommodators (Fig. 1). A horizontal dislocation band is located in the middle of the left grain. Two dislocation systems inclined at $\pm 30^\circ$ from the horizontal line are located in the right grain. The lower side of the sample is fixed in both directions, the periodic boundary conditions are applied at the lateral sides, and a vertical stress is applied to the upper side in the deformed state, which results in the initial average pressure in the nanograins. The upper side is also subjected to a horizontal displacement $u$ (which is given in terms of prescribed macroscopic shear $\gamma = u/h$, with the height of grains $h = 20$). In the first problem, dislocation activity in the right grain is forbidden. Under the applied shear, dislocations of opposite signs are nucleated from both grain boundaries in the left grain and create dislocation pile ups. The pile-ups produce strong concentration of the stress tensor near their tips, which significantly increase the local transformation work. Thus, the external pressure required for PT can be drastically decreased. For example, in this problem due to the generation of 3 dislocation piled ups due to applied $\gamma = 0.2$, the PT pressure is reduced from $P_{h} = 15 \text{ GPa}$ to $1.2 \text{ GPa}$ (an averaged pressure over grains after PT). This explains drastic reduction of the PT pressure due to applied shear in experiments for various materials [2,3]. Figs. 2a and b show the coupled solutions for PT and dislocations at some initial stage ($t=0.5$) and the stationary solution in the right grain, respectively. The phase concentration, i.e. the ratio of the transformed area to the initial area in the right grain, reaches $c=0.51$. Such a significant transformation progress is due to the small distance between stress concentrators, which leads to a coalescence of nuclei and corresponding morphological transition.

When dislocations in the right grain are included, besides the promoting effect of plasticity on PT, it also suppresses PT by relaxing stresses at other concentrators. The solutions for PT and dislocations with two dislocation systems in the transformed grain are presented in Figs. 2c and d. Several dislocations nucleated at the tip of the pile up and propagated through the right grain. Due to stress relaxation, almost no high pressure phase appears at the left side of the right grain. For the same reason, PT is also suppressed in the right side of the right grain and the transformed region (Fig. 2c) is smaller than that in Fig. 2b. Therefore, while the number of dislocations increases, coalescence does not occur and the stationary solution is reached with $c=0.19$ and 6 and 3 dislocations in the lower and the upper dislocation systems, respectively.

![Fig. 1. Schematics of the sample under pressure and shear and stationary solution. Dislocations in the left grain cause transformation from the low-pressure (blue) to the high (red) pressure phases.](image)

![Fig. 2. The solution for PT without plasticity in the right grain at $t=0.5$ (a) and for the stationary state (b). The coupled PT and dislocation solutions at $t=0.5$ (c) and for the stationary state (d).](image)
3.2. Growth and arrest of a martensitic plate

A rectangular sample with the size of $67 \times 20$ is considered, which is divided into two grains. The transformation strain in the right grain is rotated by $15^\circ$ counter clockwise with respect to the left grain. The lower and upper straight sides are fixed in the $y$ direction; the lateral sides are stress-free. A martensitic rectangular nucleus with the size of $5 \times 3$ is initially located at the lower left corner of the sample. Two dislocation systems inclined at $\pm 60^\circ$ are included in the left grain with initial conditions $\xi^L = 0, \xi^X = -0.13, \xi^S = 0.137$ for the left grain, and $\xi^R = 0.063, \xi^X = -0.147, \xi^S = 0.074$ for the right grain. Without plasticity, the M propagates through the entire left grain and below the critical temperature $T=50K$, the M plate passes through the grain boundary and propagates through the entire right grain (Fig. 3a). With plasticity, dislocation pairs in both slip planes nucleate at the tip of the growing plate. For the coupled dislocations and PT problem, dislocations of one sign propagate toward upper boundary of the sample and dislocations of the opposite sign remain within the M plate. For $40 < T < 50K$, the M plate is arrested by one dislocation in the middle of a sample (Fig. 3b). This results in an athermal friction of 10K in terms of overcooling temperature. For $T < 40K$, the growth continues through the right grain similar to that of Fig. 3a. Obtained results are in qualitative agreement with experiments on plate-lath martensite morphological transition due to plastic M growth [4].

Fig. 3. Stationary solutions for (a) completed martensitic plate without dislocations at $T=50K$ and (b) arrested martensitic plate due to dislocations in the left grain at $T=50K$.

3.3. Inheritance of martensitic dislocations in the austenite

A rectangular grain of the size of $30 \times 5.6$ is considered inside a rectangular sample of the size of $36 \times 15$ under the applied shear $\gamma = 0.2$. The coupled PT and plasticity problem is solved inside the grain and the rest of the sample is used for elastic accommodation. In shape memory alloys, the yield strength in shear is significantly higher for A than for M. Thus, we assume a limit case when dislocation evolution is completely arrested in A by using $\xi^A = L^A \eta$. The following material parameters are used [12]: $A_0 = 4.4MPa/K, \theta_c = -183K, \theta_e = 215K, a = 3, \xi^L = -0.13, \xi^X = 0.137$ for the left grain, and $\xi^R = 0.063, \xi^X = -0.147, \xi^S = 0.074$ for the right grain. Initially, a sharp vertical A–M interface is located at the center of the sample. Under applied horizontal shear, dislocations nucleate and propagate in M while no dislocations appear in A. Also, the interface is reoriented. The coupled PT and dislocations solutions for two different times are shown in Fig. 4. The dislocation inheritance can be seen in the left upper side of the sample, where martensite transforms back and austenite appears while the dislocations, which are generated in M, remain in A.

Fig. 4. Coupled evolution of dislocations and PTs demonstrating inheritance by austenite of the dislocations in martensite.
To summarize, a PFA to the interaction between PTs and dislocations at large strains is presented, which includes the following main features of the interaction event: (a) multiplicative kinematic decomposition of the deformation gradient into elastic, transformational, and plastic contributions; (b) inheritance of dislocations of austenite in martensite during martensitic PT and dislocations of martensite in austenite during reverse PT; (c) dependence of all material parameters for dislocations on the order parameters for PT. Problems for temperature and stress-induced PTs interacting with dislocation evolution are solved and several effects including the dual effect of plasticity on PT, athermal interface resistance caused by dislocations, and inheritance of dislocations of martensite in austenite for stress-induced PT are presented. A similar approach can be developed for the interaction of dislocations with twins and diffusive PTs, as well as electromagnetic and reconstructive PTs. For multivariant martensitic PTs, the thermodynamic potential should include a thermodynamically consistent expression for interface tension (stresses) [14-16] and a mixed term of the gradients of different order parameters, which allows us to control the energy of a martensite-martensite interface independent of the energy of the austenite-martensite interface. Also, the effect of the variable surface energy and finite width of the external surface should be included [17], which may lead to multifaceted effects similar to those revealed in [17] without plasticity.
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