

On Slip Transmission Criteria in Experiments and Crystal Plasticity Models

E. Bayerschen^{a,*}, A.T. McBride^b, B.D. Reddy^b, T. Böhlke^{a,**}

^a*Institute of Engineering Mechanics (ITM), Chair for Continuum Mechanics, Karlsruhe Institute of Technology (KIT), Kaiserstr. 10, D-76131 Karlsruhe, Germany*

^b*Centre for Research in Computational and Applied Mechanics (CERECAM), University of Cape Town (UCT), 7701 Rondebosch, South Africa*

Abstract

A comprehensive overview is given on the slip transmission criteria for grain boundaries in the experimental literature, with a focus on slip system and grain boundary orientation. The use of these geometric criteria in continuum crystal plasticity models is briefly discussed. Perspectives on additional experimentally motivated criteria used in computational simulations are given. The theoretical framework of Gurtin (2008, *J. Mech. Phys. Solids* 56, p. 640) is reviewed for the single slip case with the aim of showing explicitly the connections to the experimentally developed criteria for slip transmission that are not discussed in the work itself.

Keywords: Slip transmission, Slip system interaction, Grain boundary modeling

1. Introduction

The plastic deformation of metals is significantly influenced by the presence of grain boundaries (GBs) [15], where dislocations are, for example, transmitted to adjacent grains [8, 21, 32, 33], or, e.g., pile up. Modeling these mechanisms is an ongoing challenge in the development of continuum models such as gradient crystal plasticity, e.g., [14, 39, 41].

Transmission of dislocations across GBs is influenced by both, the orientation of the GBs [33], and the orientation of the slip systems (see, e.g., [27]). The better the alignment of two adjacent slip systems, the more likely a transmission event is to occur between grains [7]. This geometric criterion seems to be the most substantial one [13]. Additional transmission criteria [19], however, have been proved to be essential, as well. These include minimizing the residual Burgers vector (RBV) remaining in the GB upon a transmission as well as maximizing the resolved shear stress (RSS) on the outgoing

*Corresponding author

**Principal corresponding author

Email addresses: eric.bayerschen@kit.edu (E. Bayerschen), andrew.mcbride@uct.ac.za (A.T. McBride), daya.reddy@uct.ac.za (B.D. Reddy), thomas.boehlke@kit.edu (T. Böhlke)

URL: <http://www.itm.kit.edu/cm/>, <http://www.cerecam.uct.ac.za/> ()

slip plane. The latter three criteria have been successfully applied in experiments on metals of various crystal structures [16]. They need, however, to be supplemented by further criteria for cases of increasing complexity [9], e.g., slip transfer over bimetallic interfaces [4].

Existing continuum grain boundary models that account for experimentally developed slip transmission criteria across GBs are limited. Many models are only two-dimensional in nature, e.g., [12, 39], or in their implementation [28]. Researchers trying to incorporate slip transmission criteria in continuum models are faced with the challenge that there are several geometric slip transmission criteria, e.g., [7, 23, 24, 32]. Related articles commonly include a brief overview on selected works from the experimental literature (see for example [6, 13, 16, 26]). A comprehensive overview, however, that includes all geometrical slip transmission criteria in a unified and compact notation to ease the comparability of the concepts is still missing in the literature to date. This overview is given in the work at hand. In addition, in the literature on computational modeling of grain boundary slip transmission and slip system interaction, e.g., [14], the connections to the experimental criteria are often addressed rather brief, or not at all. Therefore, the sophisticated GB theory of [14] is analyzed for the single slip case and the connections to the experimental criteria are discussed in detail, in the work at hand.

2. Slip transmission criteria in experiments

Criteria that account for slip system orientations Livingston and Chalmers [23] were among the first to use geometric slip transmission criteria to predict the activated slip system in a grain adjacent to a dislocation pile-up. Their geometric criterion accounts for the orientations of the slip directions $\mathbf{d}_\alpha^A, \mathbf{d}_\beta^B$, and the orientations of the slip plane normals $\mathbf{n}_\alpha^A, \mathbf{n}_\beta^B$, respectively. Here, $\alpha = 1, \dots, N$ are the incoming slip systems of grain A at the GB Γ , with N , the number of slip systems, and $\beta = 1, \dots, N$ are the outgoing slip systems at Γ to grain B, see Fig. 1. The used transmission factor matrix reads

$$\hat{N}_{\alpha\beta} = (\mathbf{n}_\alpha^A \cdot \mathbf{n}_\beta^B)(\mathbf{d}_\alpha^A \cdot \mathbf{d}_\beta^B) + (\mathbf{n}_\alpha^A \cdot \mathbf{d}_\beta^B)(\mathbf{n}_\beta^B \cdot \mathbf{d}_\alpha^A), \quad (1)$$

The full transmission factor matrix \hat{N} has $N \times N$ components. With this criterion, the




Figure 1: Nomenclature for slip systems α, β in adjacent grains A, B, separated by grain boundary Γ .

activation stress of the outgoing slip system is calculated [23]. This purely geometric

criterion is also used in [8]. A slightly modified version is employed in [24]. The second term of (1) is dropped, and the transmission factor then reads

$$\hat{N}_{\alpha\beta}^{\text{mod}} = (\mathbf{n}_{\alpha}^{\text{A}} \cdot \mathbf{n}_{\beta}^{\text{B}})(\mathbf{d}_{\alpha}^{\text{A}} \cdot \mathbf{d}_{\beta}^{\text{B}}). \quad (2)$$

This factor is combined with the Schmid factors [31] and a stress intensity factor resulting from pile-ups (based on [11]) in the transmission evaluation of [13]. It was found that a lower stress intensity factor (leading to a lower RSS) on the emission slip system correlated to larger RBVs. For controlling the slip system activation, good alignment of slip systems has proved to be more important than a high Schmid factor.

Criteria that account for slip system orientations and grain boundary orientation In [32], applying criterion (1) is compared to a different transmission factor incorporating the grain boundary orientation via

$$\hat{M}_{\alpha\beta} = \underbrace{(\mathbf{n}_{\alpha}^{\text{A}} \times \mathbf{n}_{\Gamma})}_{\mathbf{l}_{\alpha}^{\text{A}}} \cdot \underbrace{(\mathbf{n}_{\beta}^{\text{B}} \times \mathbf{n}_{\Gamma})}_{\mathbf{l}_{\beta}^{\text{B}}} (\mathbf{d}_{\alpha}^{\text{A}} \cdot \mathbf{d}_{\beta}^{\text{B}}) = (\mathbf{l}_{\alpha}^{\text{A}} \cdot \mathbf{l}_{\beta}^{\text{B}})(\mathbf{d}_{\alpha}^{\text{A}} \cdot \mathbf{d}_{\beta}^{\text{B}}). \quad (3)$$

Here, \mathbf{n}_{Γ} denotes the GB normal, and $\mathbf{l}_{\alpha}^{\text{A}}, \mathbf{l}_{\beta}^{\text{B}}$ are the lines of intersection, see Fig. 1. In combination with a stress criterion based on the Peach-Koehler force, (3) was shown to successfully predict all slip system activations, whereas the purely geometric criterion (1) did not. These criteria were also used to predict the activation of slip systems in [33]. The criteria for slip transmission were further extended in [19] to account for the RBV, where

$$\hat{M}_{\alpha\beta}^{\text{mod}} = \mathbf{l}_{\alpha}^{\text{A}} \cdot \mathbf{l}_{\beta}^{\text{B}} \quad (4)$$

was used instead of (3). This approach removed remaining inconsistencies highlighted in the approach of [33], and was used by [1]. In [20], it is proposed that the criteria of maximum RSS and minimum RBV need to be combined as they are competitive in nature (see also [21]). It was found, however, that minimizing the RBV is of dominant influence for the slip transmission. In [7], it is outlined, with reference to [3], that this combined criterion is not applicable to multiple active slip systems. The purely geometric criterion (3) is applied in [36], while in [38], it is both applied and combined with investigations regarding the RBV criterion and incompatibility stresses. The importance of considering the RBV in the slip transmission prediction is emphasized in [29], as well.

Criteria that consider threshold values for the slip system and grain boundary angles In [40], the mismatch between slip systems in adjacent grains is introduced via a weighted sum of the form

$$\lambda = \sum_{\alpha=1}^N \sum_{\beta=1}^N \cos\left(\frac{90^{\circ}}{\epsilon_c} \arccos(\mathbf{n}_{\alpha}^{\text{A}} \cdot \mathbf{n}_{\beta}^{\text{B}})\right) \cos\left(\frac{90^{\circ}}{\kappa_c} \arccos(\mathbf{d}_{\alpha}^{\text{A}} \cdot \mathbf{d}_{\beta}^{\text{B}})\right). \quad (5)$$

The mismatch between slip plane normals was taken into account, rather than the mismatch between lines of intersection on Γ , as the GB orientation was difficult to measure. Furthermore, it is argued that the angle of lines of intersection for a pair of slip systems on adjacent sides of a GB cannot exceed the angle between adjacent slip plane normals,

i.e., $\delta \leq \epsilon \rightarrow \mathbf{l}_\alpha^A \cdot \mathbf{l}_\beta^B \leq \mathbf{n}_\alpha^A \cdot \mathbf{n}_\beta^B$. Thus, ϵ is used in place of δ , see Fig. 1. The critical angles, above which slip transmission is not expected to occur, are taken to be $\kappa_c = 45^\circ$ and $\epsilon_c = 15^\circ$. The latter limit value was motivated by the work of [8] using (1), where the critical angle δ_c between the lines of intersection is estimated to be in the range of $10^\circ - 20^\circ$. The approach of [40] confirmed the experimental behavior of phase / grain boundaries with regard to their slip permeability.

In [18], (5) was used in combination with the Schmid factors to investigate both criteria regarding the tensile strength of the considered material. It was found that the trend of the tensile strength was opposite to that of the calculated λ , i.e., a high value of λ did not lead to an increased yield strength.

In [4], the angle δ between the lines of intersection is taken into account, rather than the angle ϵ between the slip plane normals. Furthermore, instead of the summation in (5), individual components

$$\hat{\chi}_{\alpha\beta} = \cos\left(\frac{90^\circ}{\delta_c} \arccos\left(\mathbf{l}_\alpha^A \cdot \mathbf{l}_\beta^B\right)\right) \cos\left(\frac{90^\circ}{\kappa_c} \arccos\left(\mathbf{d}_\alpha^A \cdot \mathbf{d}_\beta^B\right)\right) \quad (6)$$

are considered. The same critical angles, however, were utilized as in the previous works. The geometrical criterion was combined with the Schmid factors and further considerations regarding the interface shear strength.

Criteria that consider weighted sums of geometric transmission factors The transmission factor (2) is also used in the combined experimental and computational approach in [6], however no clear correspondence to the transmission events could be established using (2). In addition, several weighted sum approaches for a slip transmission factor are proposed. These scalar measures take into account (combinations of) the above described geometric factors. They are obtained by summing over all slip systems and weighting each geometric transmission factor with plastic slips γ_α^A , and the Schmid factors, respectively. These criteria are given by

$$m'_\gamma = \sum_{\alpha,\beta} \hat{N}_{\alpha\beta}^{\text{mod}} \gamma_\alpha^A \gamma_\beta^B / \sum_{\alpha,\beta} \gamma_\alpha^A \gamma_\beta^B, \quad m'_m = \sum_{\alpha,\beta} \hat{N}_{\alpha\beta}^{\text{mod}} m_\alpha^A m_\beta^B / \sum_{\alpha,\beta} m_\alpha^A m_\beta^B. \quad (7)$$

Obviously, (7)₂ connects a criterion of geometric mismatch with RSS due to the employed weighting with the Schmid factors. The other two criteria read

$$LRB_\gamma = \sum_{\alpha,\beta} \hat{M}_{\alpha\beta} \gamma_\alpha^A \gamma_\beta^B / \sum_{\alpha,\beta} \gamma_\alpha^A \gamma_\beta^B, \quad s_\gamma = \sum_{\alpha,\beta} \hat{M}_{\alpha\beta}^{\text{mod}} \hat{N}_{\alpha\beta}^{\text{mod}} \gamma_\alpha^A \gamma_\beta^B / \sum_{\alpha,\beta} \gamma_\alpha^A \gamma_\beta^B. \quad (8)$$

For the sample investigated in [6], all four weighted sum factors gave similar distributions along the grain boundaries.

The experimentally developed slip transmission criteria are summarized in Tab. 1.

3. Computational modeling

Confirmation of experimentally motivated criteria The experimental criteria of combining a geometric transmission factor (GTF), RSS, and RBV were confirmed in

Table 1: Slip transmission criteria in the experimental literature. Abbreviations used are RSS: Resolved shear stress / Schmid factors, RBV: Residual Burgers vector, PKF: Peach-Koehler force, IBS: Interface barrier strength, SIF: Stress intensity factor, SW: Slip weights, SFW: Schmid factor weights.

Transmission factor (TF)	Additional criteria Reference	TF	Additional criteria Reference		
$\hat{N}_{\alpha\beta}$	- [8, 23]	$\hat{N}_{\alpha\beta}^{\text{mod}}$	- [24]	RSS / RBV / SIF [13]	RSS [6]
$\hat{M}_{\alpha\beta}^{\text{mod}}$	RSS / RBV [1, 7, 19, 20]	$\hat{M}_{\alpha\beta}$	- [36]	PKF [32, 33]	RBV [38]
$\hat{\chi}_{\alpha\beta}$	RSS / IBS [4]	λ	- [40]	RSS [18]	
m'_γ, m'_m	SW, SFW [6]	LRB_γ, s_γ	SW, SW [6]		

atomistic simulations (see [37] and [5] for an overview) and molecular dynamics simulations [17]. In the atomistic simulations of [30], the importance of the RBV for the slip transmission is demonstrated. The coupled atomistic / discrete dislocation framework [9] also confirms the experimentally motivated criteria. It is proposed there, however, that they should be supplemented by additional criteria for the case of GB dislocation nucleation.

Crystal plasticity models taking into account geometrical slip transmission criteria The previously described criteria offer the possibility to evaluate the results of, e.g., dislocation based crystal plasticity models with regard to their ability to predict the correct slip transmission [42]. It is common, as well, to try to explicitly incorporate them in continuum models to account for the transmission mechanisms. This is done, e.g., in the model of [10], where a functional relationship is proposed for the GB (slip transmission) strength, dependent on the minimum angle between the slip directions of slip systems in adjacent grains via

$$\tan(\varphi_\alpha^{\text{AB}}) = \tan(\min(\arcsos(|\mathbf{d}_\alpha^{\text{A}} \cdot \mathbf{d}_\beta^{\text{B}}|))). \quad (9)$$

The higher the minimum angle $\varphi_\alpha^{\text{AB}}$, the higher is the GB strength. This criterion, however, does not take into account the orientations of the GB normal and slip plane normals.

In [34, 35], (3) is utilized in combination with the RSS criterion. The thermally activated transmission approach of [25] assumes that the slip lines of dislocations align with the GB during transmission. They propose a criterion that is based on the minimization of the energy for a transmission event. This takes into account the RBV in the GB as well as the slip system and GB orientation.

The GB model [14] has recently been implemented within a two-dimensional setting in [28]. In this model, so-called *inter*-action coefficients describe the interaction of slip

systems in adjacent grains. They read

$$\hat{C}_{\alpha\beta}^{AB} = (\mathbf{d}_{\alpha}^A \cdot \mathbf{d}_{\beta}^B)(\mathbf{l}_{\alpha}^A \cdot \mathbf{l}_{\beta}^B). \quad (10)$$

In fact, the *inter*-action coefficients in (10) are the same as the geometric slip transmission factor (3). The latter theory, furthermore, accounts for the RBV criterion and the RSS criterion, as well. Details of this are presented in Section 4. The superscripts {A,B} are used here to distinguish the *inter*-action coefficients from the so-called *intra*-action coefficients. These determine the interaction of slip systems within each grain based on (10), applied to each grain {A,B}, individually. They read $\hat{C}_{\alpha\beta}^{AA}$, and $\hat{C}_{\alpha\beta}^{BB}$, respectively.

Criteria that consider threshold values for the slip system and grain boundary angles In [2], (4) is extended to account for the slip plane normals intersection angle via an additional term

$$\hat{\zeta}_{\alpha\beta} = (\mathbf{l}_{\alpha}^A \cdot \mathbf{l}_{\beta}^B)(\mathbf{n}_{\alpha}^A \cdot \mathbf{n}_{\beta}^B). \quad (11)$$

Critical angles (motivated by [8] and [40]) are used with $\epsilon_c = 35^\circ$ and $\delta_c = 15^\circ$. The slip transmission criterion used is purely geometric, but it is combined with the dislocation densities and their evolution on the adjacent sides of GBs.

In the work of [26], (6) is used to penalize slip transfer on geometrically unfavorable slip system combinations across bimetallic interfaces by increasing the corresponding slip resistances depending on the mismatch. The slip resistance enters the flow rule and thus connects the geometrical factors to the RSSes. The used slip transmission criteria in continuum models are summarized in Tab. 2.

Table 2: Slip transmission / interaction criteria in crystal plasticity models. Abbreviations used are RSS: Resolved shear stress / Schmid factors, RBV: Residual Burgers vector. The approaches by [14, 28] utilize $\hat{M}_{\alpha\beta}$ rather as an *inter*-action coefficient than as a classic transmission factor.

Transmission factor	$\tan(\varphi_{\alpha}^{AB})$	$\hat{M}_{\alpha\beta}$	$\hat{M}_{\alpha\beta}$	-	$\hat{\zeta}_{\alpha\beta}$	$\hat{\chi}_{\alpha\beta}$
Additional criteria	-	RSS	RBV / RSS	RBV / RSS	-	RSS
Reference	[10]	[34, 35]	[14, 28]	[25]	[2]	[26]

4. A connection between Gurtin's grain boundary theory and experimental slip transmission criteria

Although one might expect Gurtin's theory of grain boundaries [14] to be connected to criteria of slip system interaction that have been developed experimentally, the framework used in the mentioned work is discussed from a rather theoretical point of view. The relations to existing experimental criteria are not discussed. Therefore, a single slip case is considered in the work at hand to show the connections between [14] and the commonly experimentally used criteria of GTF / RSS / RBV. For convenience, in the following, the single slip systems in grain A and B are labeled A and B, respectively. For brevity, the slip plane normals of the two slip systems on adjacent sides of the GB are considered to be coinciding, i.e., $\mathbf{n}^A = \mathbf{n}^B = \mathbf{n}$, and to be perpendicular to the GB

normal \mathbf{n}_Γ . Thus, the angles $\delta = \epsilon = 0$, while $\kappa \neq 0$, see also Fig. 1. The RBV can be defined as the difference between the Burgers vectors of interacting, i.e., transmitting slip systems, $\mathbf{b}_r + \mathbf{b}^B = \mathbf{b}^A$ [22]. Its magnitude can be approximated by the magnitude of the difference between the two slip directions $\mathbf{d}^A, \mathbf{d}^B$, i.e., $|\mathbf{b}_r| = |\mathbf{d}^A - \mathbf{d}^B|$ [1]. Furthermore, the definition [14] of the jump of the plastic distortion $\mathbf{H}^P = \sum_\alpha \gamma_\alpha \mathbf{d}_\alpha \otimes \mathbf{n}_\alpha$ across the GB is considered. For the single slip transmission case at hand, this jump reads

$$[[\mathbf{H}^P]] = \gamma^B \mathbf{d}^B \otimes \mathbf{n} - \gamma^A \mathbf{d}^A \otimes \mathbf{n} = (\gamma^B \mathbf{d}^B - \gamma^A \mathbf{d}^A) \otimes \mathbf{n}. \quad (12)$$

This gives a GB Burgers tensor \mathbf{G} [14] of

$$\mathbf{G} = (\gamma^B \mathbf{d}^B - \gamma^A \mathbf{d}^A) \otimes (\mathbf{n} \times \mathbf{n}_\Gamma) = (\gamma^B \mathbf{d}^B - \gamma^A \mathbf{d}^A) \otimes \mathbf{l}. \quad (13)$$

In [14], $|\mathbf{G}|$ is used as a measure of defect in the GB free energy. From the GB energy, internal (energetic) microforces can be derived. These, in turn, are balanced on the GB with the projection of a vector of gradient stresses from each grain. Furthermore, these gradient stresses enter a microforce balance for each slip system α in which the RSSes enter.

Assuming for simplicity the same slip on both slip systems, i.e., $\gamma^A = \gamma^B = \gamma$, gives

$$|\mathbf{G}|^2 = \gamma^2 (\mathbf{d}^B - \mathbf{d}^A) \cdot (\mathbf{d}^B - \mathbf{d}^A) \mathbf{l} \cdot \mathbf{l} = \gamma^2 |\mathbf{b}_r|^2. \quad (14)$$

Note that the GB free energy with respect to $|\mathbf{G}|$ can, thus, be expressed in dependence of $|\mathbf{b}_r|$, the magnitude of the RBV \mathbf{b}_r , for the special case under consideration. Consequently, Gurtin's GB theory takes into account the residual dislocation content of the GB.

The quantity $|\mathbf{G}|^2$ can most generally be expressed by (cf. [14])

$$|\mathbf{G}|^2 = \sum_{\alpha, \beta} (C_{\alpha\beta}^{AA} \gamma_\alpha^A \gamma_\beta^A + C_{\alpha\beta}^{BB} \gamma_\alpha^B \gamma_\beta^B - 2C_{\alpha\beta}^{AB} \gamma_\alpha^A \gamma_\beta^B), \quad (15)$$

which depends on the *intra*-action coefficients $C_{\alpha\beta}^{AA}, C_{\alpha\beta}^{BB}$ and on the *inter*-action coefficients $C_{\alpha\beta}^{AB}$. Following from (15) and from the discussion below (10), it can be concluded that Gurtin's theory of GBs has a mechanism to account for the geometric slip transmission criterion (3).

For the case under consideration, the *intra*-action coefficients are $C^{AA} = C^{BB} = 1$ while all other *intra*-action coefficients vanish. The *inter*-action coefficients vanish, as well, except for $C^{AB} = C^{BA} = \mathbf{d}^A \cdot \mathbf{d}^B$. Equation (15) now reads

$$|\mathbf{G}|^2 = 2\gamma^2 \left(1 - (\mathbf{d}^A \cdot \mathbf{d}^B)\right). \quad (16)$$

Combining Eq. (16) with Eq. (14) yields $|\mathbf{b}_r|^2 = 2 \left(1 - (\mathbf{d}^A \cdot \mathbf{d}^B)\right)$. For the special case of coinciding slip directions $\mathbf{d}^A = \mathbf{d}^B$, this gives $|\mathbf{b}_r|^2 = 0$, and for the case of perpendicular slip directions, $|\mathbf{b}_r|^2 = 2$ is obtained. Thus, the GB RBV magnitude is obviously a function of the mismatch between slip systems in adjacent grains. The GB Burgers tensor magnitude $|\mathbf{G}|$ is a function of the mismatch as well, as is the GB free energy of [14] formulated with respect to this quantity.

Concluding, it can be stated that Gurtin’s GB theory accounts for the experimentally developed slip transmission criterion of maximizing a geometrical transmission factor (*inter*-action coefficients). In addition, the RSSes on the outgoing slip systems (micro-force balance / flow rule) are considered in the theory, as is the RBV left in the GB upon a transmission event (GB free energy).

5. Summary

In the past, geometric criteria have been shown to be the most substantial ones in predicting the slip transmission across grain boundaries in experiments. They are widely used in both experimental investigations and computational continuum models. An -up to date still missing- comprehensive overview on both the experimental criteria and the computational models using these is given in the work at hand. The detailed comparison of Gurtin’s grain boundary model [14] to the experimental criteria shows that this theory can be interrelated to the three main experimentally developed slip transmission criteria.

Funding

The authors acknowledge the following support:

T. Böhlke and E. Bayerschen: German Research Foundation (DFG) under Grant BO1466/5-1, part of the DFG Research Group 1650 ”Dislocation based Plasticity”, and Karlsruhe House of Young Scientists (KHYS) for a stay of the first author at CERECAM, UCT.

B.D. Reddy and A.T. McBride: National Research Foundation of South Africa (SA) through the SA Research Chair in Computational Mechanics.

References

- [1] Abuzaid, W. Z., Sangid, M. D., Carroll, J. D., Sehitoglu, H., Lambros, J., 2012. *J. Mech. Phys. Solids* 60 (6), 1201–1220.
- [2] Ashmawi, W., Zikry, M., 2002. *J. Eng. Mater. Tech.* 124 (1), 88–96.
- [3] Bamford, T., Clark, W., Wagoner, R., 1988. *Scripta Metallurgica* 22 (12), 1911–1916.
- [4] Beyerlein, I., Mara, N., Wang, J., Carpenter, J., Zheng, S., Han, W., Zhang, R., Kang, K., Nizolek, T., Pollock, T., 2012. *JOM* 64 (10), 1192–1207.
- [5] Bieler, T., Eisenlohr, P., Roters, F., Kumar, D., Mason, D., Crimp, M., Raabe, D., 2009. *Int. J. Plasticity* 25 (9), 1655–1683.
- [6] Bieler, T., Eisenlohr, P., Zhang, C., Phukan, H., Crimp, M., 2014. *Curr. Opin. Solid State Mater. Sci.* 18 (4), 212–226.
- [7] Clark, W., Wagoner, R., Shen, Z., Lee, T., Robertson, I., Birnbaum, H., 1992. *Scripta Metallurgica et Materialia* 26 (2), 203–206.
- [8] Davis, K., Teghtsoonian, E., Lu, A., 1966. *Acta Metallurgica* 14 (12), 1677–1684.
- [9] Dewald, M., Curtin, W., 2007. *Model. Simul. Mater. Sci. Eng.* 15 (1), S193.
- [10] Ekh, M., Bargmann, S., Grymer, M., 2011. *Acta Mechanica* 218 (1-2), 103–113.
- [11] Eshelby, J., Frank, F., Nabarro, F., 1951. *The London, Edinburgh, and Dublin Philosophical Magazine and Journal of Science* 42 (327), 351–364.
- [12] Evers, L., Brekelmans, W., Geers, M., 2004. *Int. J. Solids Struct.* 41 (18), 5209–5230.
- [13] Guo, Y., Britton, T., Wilkinson, A., 2014. *Acta Mater.* 76, 1–12.
- [14] Gurtin, M. E., 2008. *J. Mech. Phys. Solids* 56 (2), 640–662.
- [15] Hirth, J. P., 1972. *Metallurgical Transactions* 3 (12), 3047–3067.
- [16] Kacher, J., Eftink, B., Cui, B., Robertson, I., 2014. *Curr. Opin. Solid State Mater. Sci.* 18 (4), 227–243.
- [17] Koning, M. d., Miller, R., Bulatov, V., Abraham, F. F., 2002. *Phil. Mag. A* 82 (13), 2511–2527.
- [18] Kumar, B. R., 2010. *Journal of Materials Science* 45 (10), 2598–2605.

- [19] Lee, T., Robertson, I., Birnbaum, H., 1989. *Scripta Metallurgica* 23 (5), 799–803.
- [20] Lee, T., Robertson, I., Birnbaum, H., 1990. *Phil. Mag. A* 62 (1), 131–153.
- [21] Lim, L., Raj, R., 1985. *Le Journal de Physique Colloques* 46 (C4), C4–581.
- [22] Lim, L., Raj, R., 1985. *Acta Metallurgica* 33 (12), 2205–2214.
- [23] Livingston, J., Chalmers, B., 1957. *Acta Metallurgica* 5 (6), 322–327.
- [24] Luster, J., Morris, M., 1995. *Metallurgical and Materials Transactions A* 26 (7), 1745–1756.
- [25] Ma, A., Roters, F., Raabe, D., 2006. *Acta Mater.* 54 (8), 2181–2194.
- [26] Mayeur, J., Beyerlein, I., Bronkhorst, C., Mourad, H., 2015. *Int. J. Plasticity* 65, 206–225.
- [27] Miura, S., Saeki, Y., 1978. *Acta Metallurgica* 26 (1), 93–101.
- [28] Özdemir, İ., Yalçinkaya, T., 2014. *Computational Mechanics* 54 (2), 255–268.
- [29] Patriarca, L., Abuzaid, W., Sehitoglu, H., Maier, H. J., 2013. *Mater. Sci. Eng. A* 588, 308–317.
- [30] Sangid, M. D., Ezaz, T., Sehitoglu, H., 2012. *Mater. Sci. Eng. A* 542, 21–30.
- [31] Schmid, E., Boas, W., 1935. *Kristallplastizität*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- [32] Shen, Z., Wagoner, R., Clark, W., 1986. *Scripta Metallurgica* 20 (6), 921–926.
- [33] Shen, Z., Wagoner, R., Clark, W., 1988. *Acta Metallurgica* 36 (12), 3231–3242.
- [34] Shi, J., Zikry, M., 2009. *International Journal of Solids and Structures* 46 (21), 3914–3925.
- [35] Shi, J., Zikry, M. A., 2011. *Journal of Materials Research* 26 (14), 1676–1687.
- [36] Soer, W., De Hosson, J. T. M., 2005. *Materials Letters* 59 (24), 3192–3195.
- [37] Spearot, D. E., Sangid, M. D., 2014. *Curr. Opin. Solid State Mater. Sci.* 18 (4), 188–195.
- [38] Tiba, I., Richeton, T., Motz, C., Vehoff, H., Berbenni, S., 2015. *Acta Mat.* 83, 227–238.
- [39] van Beers, P., McShane, G., Kouznetsova, V., Geers, M., 2013. *J. Mech. Phys. Solids* 61 (12), 2659–2679.
- [40] Werner, E., Prantl, W., 1990. *Acta Metallurgica et Materialia* 38 (3), 533–537.
- [41] Wulfinghoff, S., Bayerschen, E., Böhlke, T., 2013. *Int. J. Plasticity* 51, 33–46.
- [42] Zikry, M., Kao, M., 1996. *J. Mech. Phys. Solids* 44 (11), 1765–1798.