

A comment on the article ” *Ab initio* calculations of pressure-dependence of high-order elastic constants using finite deformations approach” by I. Mosyagin, A.V. Lugovskoy, O.M. Krasilnikov, Yu.Kh. Vekilov, S.I. Simak and I.A. Abrikosov [Computer Physics Communications 220 (2017) 2030]

Marcin Maździarz*

Institute of Fundamental Technological Research Polish Academy of Sciences, Warsaw, Poland

Keywords: Ab initio calculations, Elastic moduli, Pressure effects in solids and liquids, Finite deformations, Solid mechanics, Deformation gradient

Recently, I. Mosyagin, A.V. Lugovskoy, O.M. Krasilnikov, Yu.Kh. Vekilov, S.I. Simak and I.A. Abrikosov [1] presented a description of a technique for *ab initio* calculations of the pressure dependence of second- and third-order elastic constants. Unfortunately, the work contains serious and fundamental flaws in the field of finite-deformation solid mechanics.

Finite strain tensor η_{ij} in Ref.[1, Eq.(6)] is incorrectly defined and even wrongly rewritten from Ref.[2, Eq.(1.5)]. In nonlinear continuum mechanics it is known as Green-Lagrange strain tensor and is correctly defined as:

$$\boldsymbol{\eta} = \frac{1}{2}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}^T \boldsymbol{\alpha} - I) \quad \text{or} \quad \eta_{ij} = \frac{1}{2}(\alpha_{ki} \alpha_{kj} - \delta_{ij}), \quad (1)$$

see Ref.[3, Eq.(2.67)].

The quantity α_{ij} called in Ref.[1] ”tensor of transformation coefficients of the system” is crucial in nonlinear continuum mechanics and is a primary measure of deformation, called the deformation gradient. In general, tensor $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ is non-symmetric and has nine components, see Ref.[3, Eq.(2.39)].

Deformation gradient $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ cannot be expressed by a function of $\boldsymbol{\eta}$:

- Tensor $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ is in general non-symmetric while $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ is symmetric, thus the right sides of this equations in Ref.[1, Eq.(13) and Eq.(18)] are always symmetric and in general ***LHS* \neq *RHS***

*Corresponding author

Email address: mmazdz@ippt.pan.pl (Marcin Maździarz)

- Let's take so-called simple shear deformation, where the deformation gradient can be expressed as in Ref.[4, Eq.(2.2.54)]:

$$\boldsymbol{\alpha} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \gamma & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & 1 & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (2)$$

and thus $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ (1) for the simple shear deformation (2) will be:

$$\boldsymbol{\eta} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} & \frac{\gamma}{2} & \mathbf{0} \\ \frac{\gamma}{2} & \frac{\gamma^2}{2} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (3)$$

and now apply **RHS** of the third order expansion defined in Ref.[1, Eq.(13)] to our simple shear deformation(2):

$$\mathbf{RHS} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{16-2\gamma^2+\gamma^4}{16} & \frac{8\gamma-\gamma^3+\gamma^5}{16} & \mathbf{0} \\ \frac{8\gamma-\gamma^3+\gamma^5}{16} & \frac{16+6\gamma^2+\gamma^6}{16} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (4)$$

and **RHS** of the 4th order expansion defined in Ref.[1, Eq.(18)]:

$$\mathbf{RHS} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{128-16\gamma^2+3\gamma^4-5\gamma^6}{128} & \frac{64\gamma-8\gamma^3-2\gamma^5-5\gamma^7}{128} & \mathbf{0} \\ \frac{64\gamma-8\gamma^3-2\gamma^5-5\gamma^7}{128} & \frac{128+48\gamma^2-5\gamma^4-7\gamma^6-5\gamma^8}{128} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (5)$$

and we see that **RHS** in Eq.(4) as well in Eq.(5) $\not\rightarrow$ Eq.(2).

- Let's now take the deformation gradient $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ expressed as

$$\boldsymbol{\alpha} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & \mathbf{0} \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & 1 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (6)$$

It is easy to check that $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ (1) for this deformation (6) will be:

$$\boldsymbol{\eta} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (7)$$

and thus expansions defined in Ref.[1, Eqs.13&18] equal to \mathbf{I} and again $\not\rightarrow$ Eq.(2). This will be the case for all deformation gradients being proper orthonormal tensors, simply a rigid rotations, see Ref.[4, Eq.(2.2.23)]. We see that $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ is not an objective strain measure since it does not vanish if the body is subjected to a rigid body motion, see Ref.[5, Sec.(2.2)]. Since a rigid rotation should not induce any stresses in a deformable body, strains should be based on deformations without being influenced by a pure rotations.

- Tensor α has 9 components (not 6) which has been forgotten in Ref.[1, Appendix B], S1,...,S11

To conclude, the authors have forgotten about the non-objectivity of the deformation gradient and its non-symmetry. In their expansions they should use symmetric and objective tensors of deformation, such as stretch tensor \mathbf{U} , see Ref.[5, Sec.(2.4)].

References

References

- [1] I. Mosyagin, A. Lugovskoy, O. Krasilnikov, Y. Vekilov, S. Simak, I. Abrikosov, *Ab initio* calculations of pressure-dependence of high-order elastic constants using finite deformations approach, Computer Physics Communications 220 (Supplement C) (2017) 20 – 30. doi:10.1016/j.cpc.2017.06.008.
- [2] D. C. Wallace, Thermoelastic theory of stressed crystals and higher-order elastic constants*, Vol. 25 of Solid State Physics, Academic Press, 1970, pp. 301 – 404. doi:10.1016/S0081-1947(08)60010-7.
- [3] G. Holzapfel, Nonlinear Solid Mechanics: A Continuum Approach for Engineering, Wiley, 2000.
- [4] R. W. Ogden, Non-Linear Elastic Deformations, Dover Publications, 1984.
- [5] Y. Basar, D. Weichert, Nonlinear Continuum Mechanics of Solids: Fundamental Mathematical and Physical Concepts, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2013.