

Extending phase field models of grain boundaries to three dimensions

Ryo Kobayashi¹, James A. Warren²

¹Department of Mathematical and Life Sciences, Hiroshima University,
Higashi-Hiroshima, 739-8526 Japan

²Center for Theoretical and Computational Materials Science and Metallurgy
Division
National Institute of Standards and Technology, Gaithersburg, MD 20899,
USA

Subject Categories: Modeling and Simulation, Molten Metal and
Solidification, Fundamentals

1 Abstract

In this letter we describe a method of extending an existing phase field model of polycrystalline solidification from two to three dimensions (3D).

2 Introduction and Preliminaries

There have been a number of approaches to the modeling of grain boundaries, all of which have limitations and advantages. Of particular interest are phase field models, which have gained popularity as their ability to compute realistic microstructures has been demonstrated. For an overview of this approach, the reader is recommended some of the review articles on this topic. [1]

A basic model of grain boundaries in 2D (see [2, 3]) can be derived from the total free energy

$$\mathcal{F} = \int dV [f(\phi, T) + \frac{\alpha^2}{2} |\nabla \phi|^2 + sg(\phi) |\nabla \theta| + \frac{\epsilon^2}{2} h(\phi) |\nabla \theta|^2],$$

where $f(\phi, T) + \frac{\alpha^2}{2} |\nabla \phi|^2$ are the terms found in classical phase field models of solidification, namely the bulk free energy density, which depends on the phase field ϕ and the temperature T , with minima in the liquid and solid phases $\phi = 0, 1$ plus a gradient penalty for interfaces. For this discussion we have omitted terms accounting for interface energy anisotropy, although such effects are both important and can be accounted for with well known extensions to this theory. [2]

The final terms in the free energy are functions of the gradient in the orientation, θ ; introduced to allow for grain boundary energy misorientation penalties. These terms inclusion also provides a realistic description of related phenomena such as polycrystalline growth and nucleation.[4],[5] The couplings $g(\phi)$ and $h(\phi)$ are chosen so there are no energy penalties in the liquid (i.e. $g(0) = h(0) = 0$.) The dynamics of the system are found by imposing the thermodynamic requirement that ϕ and θ evolve so as to minimize the free energy F .

3 Extension to 3D: Formulation and Solution

We note that a single angle cannot represent an orientation in 3D, and thus this concept must be replaced with a more robust mathematical description of orientation. Specifically, θ must be replaced with an object that captures the three rotational degrees of freedom available in 3D. Additionally, we must also define the norm of this object. With these two mathematical concepts the transition to three dimensions is fully posed.

3.1 Formulation

There are many ways to represent orientations in 3D, most quite familiar to crystallographers: Euler angles, rotation vectors, Rodrigues vectors, quaternions, etc. All of these representations are mathematically equivalent representations of the group $SO(3)$ (special orthogonal group 3D), but retain advantages and disadvantages, depending on the application. If we call a member of this group P , then P is a 3×3 orthogonal matrix ($P^T P = I$, where I is the identity matrix), and P has a positive determinant $\det P = 1$. Thus, we say $SO(3)$ is naturally embedded in \mathbf{R}^9 , as it can be represented as a nine-dimensional object (with 6 constraints originating from the orthogonality condition).

To proceed, we must find the 3D analog to the fundamentally 2D quantity $|\nabla\theta|$. A gradient is simply a difference over an infinitesimal distance, thus we need to compute the *norm of the difference, in some sense, between two 3D orientations*. We consider two possible choices for this measure, employing a function of two $SO(3)$ matrices $\rho(P, Q)$:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Type I} & : \quad \rho(P, Q) = |P - Q| = |PQ^{-1} - I| \\ \text{Type II} & : \quad \rho(P, Q) = \sqrt{2} \cos^{-1} \frac{\text{tr} PQ^{-1} - 1}{2} \end{aligned}$$

Note that, PQ^{-1} is the *misorientation* between two crystals. The meaning of the Type I measure is trivial, as it measures the distance between two matrices in \mathbf{R}^9 . The Type II measure, on the other hand, measures the length of the geodesic in $SO(3)$ connecting two matrices. These two measures coincide when P and Q are infinitesimally close, but they will yield different values when there is a discontinuity between P, Q as is often the case for discrete computations on a lattice

With these definitions we can now write down our model, by simply substituting $|\nabla\theta| \rightarrow |\nabla P|$ in Eqn. 1:

$$\mathcal{F} = \int dV [f(\phi, T) + \frac{\alpha^2}{2} |\nabla\phi|^2 + sg(\phi) |\nabla P| + \frac{\epsilon^2}{2} h(\phi) |\nabla P|^2],$$

A more explicit form can be obtained using $|\nabla P| = \sqrt{|\nabla P|^2} = \sqrt{\sum_{i,j=1}^3 |\nabla p_{i,j}|^2}$, where $p_{i,j} = [P]_{i,j}$.

3.2 Solution

Having posed the above free energy, we must now perform a minimization, to derive equations of motion for both the phase field ϕ and the orientation. We must proceed with care to ensure that the equations of motions keep the variables in $SO(3)$. There are several ways to proceed: (1) Derive equations for the constrained free energy, which has only 3 degrees of freedom or (2) derive equations on \mathbf{R}^9 , and project the results back into $SO(3)$. For both methods we need to derive the variational derivative of the free energy with respect to orientation, which is simply

$$\frac{\delta \mathcal{F}}{\delta P} = -\nabla \cdot \left(sg(\phi) \frac{\nabla P}{|\nabla P|} + \epsilon^2 h(\phi) \nabla P \right).$$

In deriving the equations of motion for the constrained free energy, an element of $SO(3)$ is written in the form $P = P(u, v, w)$ where the triplet (u, v, w) is some local coordinate, for example, the Rodrigues vector. The equations of motion for these variables should be

$$\tau_u \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} = \left\langle -\frac{\delta \mathcal{F}}{\delta P}, \frac{\partial P}{\partial u} \right\rangle \quad (1)$$

with identical equations for $u \rightarrow v, w$. Note that the quantity $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ is the usual inner product in \mathbf{R}^9 (a fully contracted matrix product), and τ_u is an inverse mobility.

Alternatively, to use a projective formulation, we develop 9 equations of motion in \mathbf{R}^9 keeping the solution within $SO(3)$ by taking a projection of driving force onto the tangential plane of $SO(3)$. It is given in the form $\tau_P \partial P / \partial t = \pi_P (-\delta \mathcal{F} / \delta P)$ where π_P is the projection operator. This approach allows for substantially improved numerical efficiency. However, we reserve discussion of this technique for a later publication.

Following the preceding arguments we can derive the evolution equation for ϕ and P , implement the equations in computer code and solve. Our first calculations were for a thin film where the grains are nearly 2D objects, but *their orientation is 3D, and the dynamics will be governed by the evolution of all of these angles*. There are numerous experimental systems analogous to this calculation (see Fig.1.) Our results showing growth, impingement and coarsening are given in Fig. 2.

Herein, we have extended our previous work in 2D to 3D. For a complete formulation to be obtained, we must also include the *important* consequences of anisotropy. In other words we have examined the consequences of misorientation, but not the consequences of inclination on the statics and dynamics of grain boundaries. Additionally, we have yet to account for the underlying crystal symmetries. These effects can be included, and will be discussed in future work.




Figure 1: Coarsening process of grain structure of succinonitrile. The grain structure is almost 2D, while the orientation of each grain is necessarily 3D. (courtesy of Drs. Lee and Losert, U. Maryland)




Figure 2: Simulation of solidification and coarsening process (the color indicates one of the three Euler angles (all of which were solved for)).

References

- [1] L. Gránásy, T. Pusztai, and J. A. Warren, *J. Phys.-Cond. Mat.*, vol. 16, pp. R1205–R1235, 2004; W. J. Boettinger, J. A. Warren, C. Beckermann, and A. Karma, *An. Rev. Mat. Res.*, vol. 32, pp. 163–194, 2002; L. Q. Chen, *An. Rev. Mat. Res.*, vol. 32, pp. 113–140, 2002.
- [2] J. A. Warren, R. Kobayashi, A. Lobkovsky, and W. C. Carter, *Acta Mat.*, vol. 51, pp. 6035–6058, 2003;
- [3] R. Kobayashi, J. A. Warren, and W. C. Carter, *Physica D*, vol. 140, pp. 141–150, 2000.
- [4] L. Gránásy, T. Pusztai, T. Börzsönyi, J. A. Warren, and J. F. Douglas, *Nature Mat.*, vol. 3, pp. 645–650, 2004.
- [5] L. Gránásy, T. Börzsönyi, and T. Pusztai, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 88, pp. 206105–1–4, 2002.