Phase Field Models Elastic Stress Effects

T. A. Abinandanan

Department of Materials Engineering Indian Institute of Science

J.A. Krumhansl School on Unifying Concepts in Materials Science JNCASR, January 2012



Outline

- Elastic stress effects
- Phase field models
- Modulus mismatch: Rafting
- Modulus mismatch: Thin film instability
- Multiple domains: Anisotropic misfit
- Summary





Outline

- Elastic stress effects
- Phase field models
- Modulus mismatch: Rafting
- Modulus mismatch: Thin film instability
- Multiple domains: Anisotropic misfit
- Summary



Origin of elastic stresses



Schematic from Porter and Easterling

- 1. Misfit: Lattice parameter mismatch
- 2. Externally applied stress
- 3. Interfacial stress
- 4. Thermal stresses



Long range interactions



(Ardell and Nicholson (Eshelby), 1966)

- Particle shape transitions
 Sphere \rightarrow Cuboid \rightarrow Plate
- Particle alignment



Stresses may overwhelm capillarity



(Yeon et al and Kaufmann et al - 1989)





Coupling with an applied stress



(Ichitsubo et al, 2003)

- Rafting or directional coarsening
- When misfit is isotropic, rafting is possible only when elastic moduli are different.



Stresses could break thin films



(Cullis et al, 1992: 40 nm $Si_{0.79}Ge_{0.21}$ on (001) Si)

Asaro-Tiller-Grinfeld instabilities



Elastic stress effects

- Misfit
- Elastic moduli
- Mismatch in elastic moduli
- Applied stresses

Effects can be highly anisotropic due to anisotropy in misfit, moduli and applied stress.



Competition between surface and elastic energies

- Surface energy scales with interfacial Area Dominates at small sizes.
- Elastic energy scales with precipitate volume Becomes more important at large sizes.

For example, in nickel-base superalloys, small particles have compact shapes, transitioning at large sizes to cuboids or plates.



Outline

- Elastic stress effects
- Phase field models
- Modulus mismatch: Rafting
- Modulus mismatch: Thin film instability
- Multiple domains: Anisotropic misfit
- Summary



Phase field models

- Essentially, models of migrating interfaces.
 - Describe a configuration
 - Define the energy of a configuration
 - Define transition from one configuration to the next
- Complex geometries: there is no interface tracking.
- Versatile: easy to incorporate effects due to electric, magnetic and stress fields (multi-ferroics).
- Multiple levels of detail.
- Regimes beyond analytical theories. Thin film instability: from onset and growth all the way up to break up.



Phase field models: Configuration



- Field variables $c(\mathbf{r}, t)$ and $\eta_i(\mathbf{r}, t)$ change smoothly (continuously) from one phase (domain) to the other.
- Within a phase, c and η have little or no gradients.
- Interface is the region with large gradients in c and η .



Phase field model: Energetics

Free energy:

$$F = F^{\text{chemical}} + F^{\text{elastic}}$$

$$F^{\text{chemical}} = \int \left[f_0(c) + \kappa_c (\nabla c)^2 + \kappa_i (\nabla \eta_i)^2 \right] dV$$

- κ_c and κ_i are gradient energy coefficients
- f_0 is the bulk free energy density (phase diagram)



Elastic stress σ obeys equation of mechanical equilibrium:

 $\nabla \cdot \sigma = 0,$ $\sigma_{ij} = C_{ijkl}(u_{k,l} - \varepsilon_{kl}^0)$ $F^{\text{elastic}} = \frac{1}{2} \int \sigma \varepsilon^{el} dV$

• Elastic strain:
$$\varepsilon^{el} = \varepsilon - \varepsilon^{0}$$

9 ε_{kl}^0 - misfit strain



Phase field model: Elastic energy

- The misfit strain, ε_{kl}^0 , depends on local composition or orderparameter or both.
- It can be:
 - Isotropic (modulus mismatch effects)
 - Anisotropic (multiple variant microstructures)



Phase field model: Kinetics

Cahn-Hilliard equation:

$$\frac{\partial c}{\partial t} = \nabla \cdot M \nabla \frac{\delta \left\{ \frac{F}{N_V} \right\}}{\delta c}$$

Cahn-Allen (Ginzburg-Landau) equation:

$$\frac{\partial \eta_i}{\partial t} = -L \frac{\delta \left\{ \frac{F}{N_V} \right\}}{\delta \eta_i}$$

- M = atomic mobility; L relaxation coefficient.
- The variational derivative $(\delta F/\delta c)$ is the generalized chemical potential μ (whose gradient drives diffusion)



Outline

- Elastic stress effects
- Phase field models
- Modulus mismatch: Rafting
- Modulus mismatch: Thin film instability
- Multiple domains: Anisotropic misfit
- Summary



Elastic inhomogeneity

- If we assume elastic homogeneity (same elastic moduli in the two phases) we can explain:
 - Shape changes
 - Particle alignment
- However, elastic inhomogeneity is essential for explaining
 - Rafting (dilatational misfit)
 - Morphological instabilities in thin films



Phase field model: Model system



Phase separation and Spinodal Decomposition

- Binary A-B alloy system
- Miscibility gap at low temperatures
- Phase separation



Phase field model: Energetics

$$f_0(c) = Ac^2(1-c)^2$$

A sets the free energy barrier between the p and m phases





Single particle rafting

Uniaxial stress



(a) Tensile along x (b) Compressive along y



Single particle rafting

- Directions of elongation consistent with those of Schmidt and Gross.
- Inhomogeneity effect: Hard particles prefer compact shapes, while soft particles prefer plate-like shapes.
- Stress effect: Same sign of stress and eigenstrain favours the particle phase.
- Conclusion: Inhomogeneity determines extent of elongation, while sign of stress (vis a vis that of eigenstrain) determines growth rate.



Multi-particle: Rafting

$c_0 = 0.34$; $A_Z = 3$; $\delta = 0.5$; Uniaxial stress





(a) Tensile along x

(b) Compresive along y

- Direction of rafting is the same as in single particles.
- Coalescence and particle migration also contribute to rafting.



Outline

- Elastic stress effects
- Phase field models
- Modulus mismatch: Rafting
- Modulus mismatch: Thin film instability
- Multiple domains: Anisotropic misfit

Summary



Thin film stability

- Hard film sandwiched between soft substrates;
 Isotropic elasticity (A_Z=1) and dilatational eigenstrain;
 Volume diffusion control.
- The hard (film) phase, which prefers compact shapes, is unstable.
- Types of break-up:



Symmetric

Antisymmetric

Depends on θ , the ratio of interfacial and elastic energies, and δ . The break-up is antisymmetric for higher δ .



Symmetric onset ($\delta = 2$)

• For the fastest growing wave, $\lambda_{theory} = 97$ and $\lambda_{sim} = 102$.

Onset (t=115000)

Break-up (t=122000)



Late-stage (t=143000)





Antisymmetric onset ($\delta = 4$)

Onset (t=20000)



Break-up (t=25000)



Late-stage (t=34000)





Outline

- Elastic stress effects
- Phase field models
- Modulus mismatch: Rafting
- Modulus mismatch: Thin film instability
- Multiple domains: Anisotropic misfit

Summary



Multiple variants



Ti-28.5Al-13Nb: three-sided star with \mathbf{O} phase variants in α_2 phase (Muraleedharan et al., 1994)



Orientational variants





For the first variant:

$$\epsilon_{ij} = \epsilon \left(\begin{array}{cc} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & t \end{array} \right)$$

- Magnitude of misfit: ϵ
- Anisotropy in misfit: $\epsilon_{xx} \neq \epsilon_{yy}$; $-1 \leq t \leq 1$

Isotropy when t = 1.

Misfit tensors for the other variants are obtained by rotating this tensor by 120° and 240°.



Special anisotropy: t = -1

- When t = -1 (the two principal misfits are equal and opposite):
- Sum of the misfits from the three variants is zero!
- During nucleation, the three variants can be formed in close proximity so as to minimize the elastic strain energy.



Special anisotropy: t = -1





t = -0.5





t = 0: Misfit along y is zero





t = +0.5





Outline

- Elastic stress effects
- Phase field models
- Modulus mismatch: Rafting
- Modulus mismatch: Thin film instability
- Multiple domains: Anisotropic misfit
- Summary



Summary

- Elastic stresses have a strong influence on microstructures.
- Phase field models as a tool for studying stress effects.
- Elastic modulus mismatch: Rafting (directional coarsening) under an uniaxial stress.
- Elastic modulus mismatch: Thin film instabilities.
- Microstructures with multiple variants.



Thank you!

