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Abstract

We present a novel efficient implementation of the flexible boundary condition (FBC) method, initially proposed by Sinclair et al., for large single-periodic problems. Efficiency is primarily achieved by constructing a hierarchical matrix (H-matrix) representation of the periodic Green matrix, reducing the complexity for updating the boundary conditions of the atomistic problem from quadratic to almost linear in the number of pad atoms. In addition, our implementation is supported by various other tools from numerical analysis, such as a residual-based transformation of the boundary conditions to accelerate the convergence. We assess the method for a dislocation bow-out problem and compare its performance with the state-of-the-art method for this class of problems, the periodic array of dislocations (PAD) method. The main result of our analysis is that the FBC method is up to two orders of magnitude more efficient than the PAD method in terms of the required number of per-atom force computations when both methods give similar accuracy. This opens new prospects for large-scale atomistic simulations—without having to worry about spurious image effects that plague classical boundary conditions.
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1. Introduction

The advancements in hard- and software technology during the past decades have shifted the field of materials science towards a computer-assisted discipline making use of, in particular, atomistic simulations. Atomistic simulations can be used to study the nucleation, motion, and interaction of crystalline defects, e.g., vacancies, dislocations, grain boundaries, voids, or cracks. In general, the goal of such studies is then to relate the behavior of those defects to macroscopic mechanical properties, e.g., yield strength, ductility, etc.

One major class of defects are line defects: the dislocations. It is well-understood that dislocations are the main carrier of plasticity in metals and their behavior is therefore intrinsically tied to any of the underlying strengthening and hardening mechanisms for this class of materials [3]. A representative behavior of long dislocations on the atomic-scale can be simulated with the periodic array of dislocations (PAD) method [12, 30], where the periodic length in the dislocation line direction defines the intrinsic material length scale via the spacing of, e.g., obstacles (precipitates, voids, etc.). In addition to periodic boundary conditions in the dislocation line direction, the PAD method uses periodic boundary conditions in the dislocation glide direction and free surfaces in the direction normal to the glide plane. However, this particular choice of boundary conditions can introduce large image stresses, with spurious effects on the dislocation motion, as demonstrated by Szajewski and Curtin [41]. In particular, Szajewski and Curtin [41] have shown that, for a dislocation bowing around periodic obstacles, all side lengths of the simulation cell must be increased equally when varying the periodic length—but keeping the maximum bow-out constant—in order to maintain comparable accuracy in the final position of the dislocation. This implies that the PAD method scales cubically with the number of atoms which is very inefficient. To reduce this computational burden, conventional atomistic/continuum coupling methods (e.g., [23, 42, 21, 11, 47, 35, 48, 22, 29, 13]) can be used to restrict atomistic resolution to some small part around the dislocation core, but scaling the side lengths of the computational domain with the periodic length is still required.

A natural approach that avoids the scaling issue of PAD boundary conditions is to use atomistic/continuum coupling methods with semi-infinite continuum domains, notably the flexible boundary condition (FBC) method developed by Sinclair and coworkers [36, 37, 38]. In a nutshell, the FBC method can be classified as a domain decomposition solver which iterates between a local anharmonic problem, the atomistic problem, and a global harmonic (continuum) problem domain. The atomistic problem is solved at the local level, whereas the global harmonic problem is solved at the continuum level. The interaction between these two levels is captured by the FBC, which allows for efficient solution of large-scale atomistic problems without the need for periodic boundary conditions in the dislocation line direction.
Thereby, the atomistic problem interacts with the harmonic problem through the displacements in the pad domain, the boundary of the atomistic problem. Vice versa, the harmonic problem interacts with the atomistic problem through incompatibility forces which arise at the artificial interface due to the mismatch between both models. In every iteration the solution of the harmonic problem \( u(\xi) \) at a pad atom \( \xi \) can then be directly obtained by summing up the solutions due to the incompatibility forces \( f(\eta) \) at all interface atoms \( \eta \), i.e.,

\[
u(\xi) = \sum G(\xi - \eta) f(\eta) \tag{1}
\]

making use of the lattice Green function \( G(\xi - \eta) \) of the harmonic problem. Evidently, the FBC method converges when the incompatibility forces become sufficiently small. As such, the FBC method shares analogies with boundary element methods since the incompatibility forces are the only actual additional degrees of freedom.

Hitherto, the FBC method has yet primarily been be applied to problems requiring only a rather small number of atoms of \( \mathcal{O}(10^3) \)–\( \mathcal{O}(10^5) \), such as straight or kinked dislocations (e.g., in \([38,33]\)); additionally, it has seen pronounced attention in context of quantum-mechanical/molecular mechanics coupling (e.g., \([16,43,10]\)). This is primarily due to the fact that the Green matrix obtained from (1) is dense and, thus, storing and multiplying it by a vector both scale quadratically with the number of pad atoms. This is problematic for two reasons: i) storing the Green matrix rapidly requires much more atoms (cf. \([4]\)), and ii) computing the matrix-vector multiplication (1) can become more costly than solving the atomistic problem. Combined with the fact that domain decomposition solvers require several back-and-forth iterations between the subproblems and, so, more force computations than monolithic solvers makes the FBC method potentially so inefficient that any advantage over the PAD method disappears—even though the PAD method requires much more atoms (cf. \([4]\)).

In this work we develop an efficient implementation of the FBC method for single-periodic problems which does not suffer from any of the aforementioned drawbacks. Our implementation consists of three additional building blocks compared with the original implementation of Sinclair. First, we develop a highly accurate and efficient algorithm for computing the periodic lattice Green function from a summation of the fundamental lattice Green functions over only a few periodic images based on series acceleration. Second, using the periodic lattice Green functions, we construct an approximate Green matrix using the framework of hierarchical matrices \( \mathcal{H} \)-matrices, \([44,10]\). \( \mathcal{H} \)-matrices approximate admissible off-diagonal matrix blocks using low-rank representations reducing the storage and arithmetic complexity from quadratic to linear-logarithmic without sacrificing the accuracy of the coupled problem, thanks to asymptotic smoothness of the lattice Green function \([19]\). Third, to reduce the number of domain decomposition iterations and speed-up the convergence, we integrate a residual-based relaxation method for the incompatibility forces \([32]\).

We assess the accuracy of our implementation of the FBC method using a periodic dislocation bow-out as a test problem and demonstrate its superior efficiency over the PAD method.

**Notation**

We denote zeroth-order tensors/scalars by normal letters, e.g., \( a, \Pi \), first-order tensors/vectors by lowercase bold letters, e.g., \( \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \), and second-order tensors by uppercase bold letters, e.g., \( \mathbf{L}, \mathbf{K} \). The Euclidean inner product between two tensorial quantities is denoted by \( \langle \bullet, \bullet \rangle \) and its induced norm is \( ||\bullet|| \). All tensorial quantities are defined with respect to the usual orthonormal basis system \( \{e_1 \in \mathbb{R}^3 \mid \langle e_i, e_j \rangle = \delta_{ij}\}_{i=1,...,3} \). Non-tensorial vectors/matrices are denoted by underlined/double-underlined normal letters \( \underline{u}, \underline{\underline{u}} \), etc.

Since we primarily work with discrete problems, we adopt the notation from \([17,19,18]\) specifically developed for this purpose. Following \([17,19,18]\), let \( \mathbf{u}, f \) be functions defined on a discrete domain (lattice) \( \Lambda \) with \(|\Lambda|\) elements (atoms). For operators \( a : \Lambda \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \) acting on \( \mathbf{u} \) we use the calligraphic symbols \( \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{G} \). In general, we have \( f \) given and are looking for \( \mathbf{u} \) such that \( \forall \xi \in \Lambda \mathcal{L}[\mathbf{u}](\xi) = f(\xi) \), or in short form \( \mathcal{L}[\mathbf{u}] = f \) in \( \Lambda \). If \( \Lambda \) is decomposed into subdomains \( \Lambda^a, \Lambda^c \) we write \( \mathcal{L}[\mathbf{u}] \equiv \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{L}^a[\mathbf{u}] \\ \mathcal{L}^c[\mathbf{u}] \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} f^a \\ f^c \end{pmatrix} \), where the superscripted indicators “a”, “c” imply that \( \mathcal{L} \) is acting on functions defined on \( \Lambda^a \), \( \Lambda^c \). If, furthermore, \( \mathcal{L} \) is a linear operator it holds \( \forall \xi \in \Lambda \mathcal{L}[\mathbf{u}](\xi) = \sum_{\eta \in \Lambda} \mathcal{L}(\xi - \eta) u(\eta) \), where \( \mathcal{L}(\xi - \eta) \) denotes the kernel of \( \mathcal{L} \). In the linear case we may split \( \mathbf{u} \) into contributions \( \mathbf{u}^a, \mathbf{u}^c \) defined on \( \Lambda^a, \Lambda^c \) and write \( \mathcal{L}[\mathbf{u}] = \mathcal{L}^a[\mathbf{u}] + \mathcal{L}^c[\mathbf{u}] \), where the superscripted indicators “a”, “c” imply that \( \mathcal{L} \) is acting on \( \mathbf{u}^a, \mathbf{u}^c \) and produces functions defined on \( \Lambda^a, \Lambda^c \). Using both splittings then yields the matrix notation \( \mathcal{L}[\mathbf{u}] = \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{L}^a[\mathbf{u}] \\ \mathcal{L}^c[\mathbf{u}] \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{L}^a_{\mathbf{u}^a}[\mathbf{u}] + \mathcal{L}^c_{\mathbf{u}^c}[\mathbf{u}] \\ \mathcal{L}^a_{\mathbf{u}^a}[\mathbf{u}] + \mathcal{L}^c_{\mathbf{u}^c}[\mathbf{u}] \end{pmatrix} \equiv \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{u}^a \\ \mathbf{u}^c \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} f^a \\ f^c \end{pmatrix} \). All domains and their associated indicators will be properly defined in Section 2.2.2.

Additional notation is introduced on-demand throughout the manuscript.

\(^2\) additional to the anharmonic/atomistic degrees of freedom
2. Flexible boundary condition method

2.1. Reference atomistic problem

We let \( \Lambda_\infty \) be a Bravais lattice
\[ \Lambda_\infty := \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^3 a_i b_i + c \mid a_i \in \mathbb{Z} \right\}, \]
(2)
where \( \{b_i \in \mathbb{R}^3 \}_{i=1,...,3} \) is the set of basis vectors defining the lattice type, e.g., body-centered cubic (bcc) or face-centered cubic (fcc), and \( c \) is some constant. The computational problem we consider in this work is periodic in one direction (here: \( x_3 \)-direction) and, therefore, our computational domain shown in Figure 1 is the subset
\[ \Lambda := \{ \xi \in \Lambda_\infty \mid 0 \leq \xi_3 < l_3 \} \subset \Lambda_\infty, \]
(3)
where the periodic length \( l_3 \) is chosen to meet the periodicity of the lattice.

Figure 1: Schematic illustration of the atomistic reference problem

Every atom \( \xi \) in \( \Lambda \) is associated with a site energy \( E_\xi \) which depends on the periodic displacement \( u(\xi) \) of atom \( \xi \) relative to the displacements \( u(\eta) \) of all other atoms \( \eta \) within its local neighborhood \( R_\xi \) which usually extends to 1–2 lattice constants. We abbreviate this collection of differential displacements as \( \{ u(\eta) - u(\xi) \}_{\eta \in R_\xi \setminus \xi} = \{ u(\eta) - u(\xi) \} \) and, hence, we write \( E_\xi = E_\xi(\{ u(\eta) - u(\xi) \}) \). We note that, besides the assumption of locality, there are no other restrictions on the structure of \( E_\xi \). The total energy of the system then reads
\[ \Pi(u) = \Pi_{\text{int}}(u) + \Pi_{\text{ext}}(u), \]
(5)

neglecting the cohesive energy, with the internal and external contributions, \( \Pi_{\text{int}} \) and \( \Pi_{\text{ext}} \), to the total energy given by
\[ \Pi_{\text{int}}(u) = \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda} E_\xi(\{ u(\eta) - u(\xi) \}), \quad \Pi_{\text{ext}}(u) = -\sum_{\xi \in \Lambda} f_{\text{ext}}(\xi) \cdot u(\xi), \]
(6)
where \( f_{\text{ext}} \) is an external force.

With the above-stated definitions, we now define the computational problem. We will focus on quasi-static problems in the following. In general, we initialize the problem with an initial guess \( u_0 \) which carries infinite energy, e.g., the elastic solution of a dislocation, as shown in Figure 1. We then seek for (local) minimizers \( u' \) of the (finite) energy difference (cf. \[28\])
\[ u' := \arg \left\{ \min_v \Pi(u_0 + v) - \Pi(u_0) \right\} \]
(7)
such that the full solution is given by \( u = u_0 + u' \). We remark that problem (7) is not computable (unless being linear) and, so, additional approximations are required, typically truncating the infinite computational domain \( \Lambda \) to one of finite dimension.

In what follows we will mostly work with the equivalent formulation of problem (7) using the force balance
\[ \mathcal{L}[u] = f_{\text{ext}} \quad \text{in} \, \Lambda, \]
(8)
with $L[u](\xi) = \delta \Pi_{\text{int}}(\xi)$, where $\delta \Pi_{\text{int}}(\xi)$ is the derivative of $\Pi_{\text{int}}(u)$ with respect to $u$ at atom $\xi$. The additional requirement for $[5]$ being equivalent to $[7]$ is the stability of the solution $u$, that is, $\forall v \langle \delta^2 \Pi_{\text{int}}(u)[v], v \rangle > 0$, which we assert to hold throughout this work.

2.2. Coupled problem

In our atomistic problem, introduced in the previous section, we expect that significant nonlinearities arise only in the vicinity of a defect, such as a dislocation. To avoid evaluating the expensive fully atomistic model in a very large computational domain motivates an atomistic/continuum (A/C) coupling which approximates the fully atomistic problem by restricting atomic resolution to some small part of the computational domain around the defect, and using a cheaper continuum model in the remainder domain.

2.2.1. Continuum model

In the present work we use a local continuum model. This choice is justified when the far-field is sufficiently smooth, which is the case for crystalline defects. More precisely, it was shown in [18] that, given the reference solution $u_{\text{ref}}$ to [7] and the solution of the coupled problem $u$, the error can be bounded by $\|u_{\text{ref}} - u\| \lesssim f(\nabla^2 u_{\text{ref}}, ...)$, where $f$ is a function which depends on gradients of degree higher or equal than two. This result is independent of the amount of “nonlocality” of the interatomic potential; however, we note that the degree of nonlocality in the continuum model can, on the other hand, influence the convergence rate of the coupled solver (cf. Remark 1).

The continuum model we employ is based on a linearization around the defect free reference lattice $A_\infty$. Therefore, in order to derive the continuum model, we assume that every atom “sees” a perfect environment and the site energy $E_{\text{int}}$ of an atom $\xi$ is thus independent of $\xi$. Expanding $E_{\text{int}}$ around $u(\xi) = 0$ to second order then gives the nonlocal harmonic site energy

$$E_{\text{int}}(\{u(\eta) - u(\xi)\}) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\eta \in R_\xi} K_{\text{int}}(\xi - \eta) \cdot (u(\xi) \otimes u(\eta)),$$

(9)

where $K_{\text{int}}(\xi - \eta) = \sum_{\zeta \in R_\xi} \frac{\partial^2 E_{\text{int}}(u(\zeta) - u(\eta))}{\partial u(\zeta) \partial u(\eta)}$ is the interatomic force constant tensor. In addition, we consider a linearization of $u(\xi)$ around $\xi$ such that $u(\eta) \approx u(\xi) + \nabla u(\xi) (\eta - \xi)$.

(10)

The latter approximation is commonly denoted as the Cauchy-Born hypothesis. Using [9] and [10] leads to the local harmonic site energy

$$E_{\text{h},\xi}(\{u(\eta) - u(\xi)\}) = \frac{1}{2} C \cdot (\nabla u(\xi) \otimes \nabla u(\xi)) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\eta \in R_\xi} K_h(\xi - \eta) \cdot (u(\xi) \otimes u(\eta)),$$

(11)

where $C$ is the fourth-order material stiffness tensor and $K_h(\xi - \eta)$ is the local version of $K_{\text{int}}(\xi - \eta)$ which is nonzero only for $\eta$ in the interaction range $R^\xi_h$ typically comprising nearest neighbors. Note that in [11], the central term transforms into the term on the right hand side when using the definition of the gradient $\nabla u$ (for further details see Appendix A in [19]).

With $K_h(\xi - \eta)$, we now define the linearization of $L$

$$\forall \xi \in A_\infty \quad L_h[u](\xi) = \sum_{\eta \in R_\xi^h} K_h(\xi - \eta) u(\eta)$$

(12)

of which we will make use of in the following.

2.2.2. Problem formulation

The flexible boundary condition (FBC) method uses a force-based A/C coupling scheme (see, e.g., [23]) which is described in the following. To that end, we decompose the computational domain $A$ into an atomistic domain $A^a \subset A$ and a continuum domain $A^c := A \setminus A^a$ as shown in Figure 2.

In the vicinity of the artificial interface, atoms in $A^a$ can interact with continuum nodes from the pad domain $A^p \subset A^c$. Thereby, the size of $A^p$ must depend on the interaction range $R^a_c$ of the atomistic model to avoid spurious free surface effects. On the other hand, the continuum model is local and, therefore, the continuum nodes can only interact with atoms on the interface layer $A^i$. This further implies that displacements of interface atoms do not exert forces in the entire pad domain but only in the subset $A^p \subset A^p$, schematically depicted by the cubical-shaped atoms in Figure 2.
Figure 2: Schematic illustration of the coupled problem decomposed into an atomistic problem \((P^a)\) and a continuum problem \((P^c)\).

Note that Figure 2 is only a schematic illustration and we do not impose any restrictions on the size and shape of the atomistic domain. Nevertheless, we emphasize that our focus here is mainly on problems where the periodic length \(l_3\) is of the same order than the diameter of \(\Lambda^a\) (see Section 4). In fact, this is the realm of applications where we expect our implementation of the FBC method to be most useful and more efficient than other existing methods.

The reader familiar with the original works of Sinclair et al. recognizes that the domains defined above correspond to the regions 1, 2 and 3, as defined in [38]. We nevertheless recall that

\[
\begin{align*}
\Lambda^a & \iff \text{region 1}, \\
\Lambda^i & \iff \text{region 2}, \\
\Lambda \setminus \Lambda^i & \iff \text{region 3},
\end{align*}
\]

with the only difference that in [38] the continuum model is nonlocal. If we would use a nonlocal continuum model as well, which is not essential for reasons described in the previous section, the domain \(\Lambda^i\) would be equivalent to \(\Lambda^p\).

Having the notation well-defined, we now write the coupled problem seeking for solutions \(u := \{u^a, u^c\}\) as follows

\[
\begin{align*}
(P^a) \quad \{ \mathcal{L}([u^a, u^p]) = f_{\text{ext}} \text{ in } \Lambda^a, \\
& \quad u = u^c \text{ in } \Lambda^p, \}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
(P^c) \quad \{ \mathcal{L}_h([u^c, u^i]) = f_{\text{ext}} \text{ in } \Lambda^i, \\
& \quad u = u^a \text{ on } \Lambda^i. \}
\end{align*}
\]

(13)

2.3. Domain decomposition algorithm

2.3.1. Sinclair’s iteration equation

The FBC method belongs to the class of domain decomposition solvers but stands out from other representatives of this class, e.g., the popular alternating Schwarz method, by offering significantly improved convergence rates [19]. The origin of the improved convergence behavior stems from its particular domain decomposition into a local anharmonic domain, i.e., the atomistic domain, and a global harmonic domain. In this case, it has been shown in [18] that the convergence rate of the FBC method depends on the mismatch between the nonlocal atomistic and the local continuum model. That is, if the atomistic model is not "too nonlinear and nonlocal", the FBC method converges fast.

To derive Sinclair’s iteration equation we follow the procedure described in [19, 18]. To that end, we split the operator associated with the coupled problem (13), that we denote as \(\mathcal{L}_{\text{cpl}}\), and the solution \(u\) into anharmonic and harmonic parts as follows

\[
\mathcal{L}_{\text{cpl}} = \mathcal{L}_{\text{ah}} + \mathcal{L}_h, \quad u = u_{\text{ah}} + u_h. \quad (14)
\]

For the anharmonic parts we require that

\[
\mathcal{L}_{\text{ah}} = \begin{cases} 
\mathcal{L} - \mathcal{L}_h & \text{in } \Lambda^a, \\
0 & \text{else},
\end{cases} \quad u_{\text{ah}} = 0 \quad \text{in } \Lambda \setminus \Lambda^a. \quad (15)
\]

Otherwise the splitting (14) is arbitrary and primarily used here as a means to construct the iteration equation—in practice we never need to compute neither \(u_{\text{ah}}\) nor \(u_h\) in \(\Lambda^a\) as we shall see in the following.
Using the anharmonic/harmonic operator split, we rewrite the coupled problem in matrix notation as follows

\[
\mathcal{L}_{\text{cpl}}[u] = \mathcal{L}_{ah}[u] + \mathcal{L}_{h}[u] = \begin{pmatrix}
\mathcal{L}_{bh}^{[a]}[u] - \mathcal{L}_{bh}^{[c]}[u] + f^{[a]}_0 \\
0
\end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix}
\mathcal{L}_{bh}^{[a]}[u] + \mathcal{L}_{bh}^{[c]}[u] \\
\mathcal{L}_{bh}^{[a]}[u] + \mathcal{L}_{bh}^{[c]}[u]
\end{pmatrix} u_{ah} = f^{[a]}_0
\]

(16)

and, after moving \( f^{[a]}_0 \) to the left hand side and regrouping some terms, we obtain

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
\mathcal{L}_{bh}^{[a]}[u] \\
0
\end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix}
0 \\
\mathcal{L}_{bh}^{[a]}[u] + \mathcal{L}_{bh}^{[c]}[u]
\end{pmatrix} u_{ah} = 0
\]

(17)

The parts denoted by (AH) and (H) are the anharmonic and the harmonic problem, respectively.

The FBC method solves those two parts separately, that is, given the iteration index \( k \in \mathbb{N}_0 \) and some initial guess \( u_0 \), we obtain Sinclair’s iteration equation

\[
(\text{AH})_{k+1} \quad \begin{cases}
\mathcal{L}[[u_{ah,k+1/2}, u_{ah,k+1/2}]] = f^{[a]}_0 \quad \text{in } A^a, \\
u_{ah,k+1/2} = u_{ah,k} \quad \text{in } A^0
\end{cases}
(18)

(\text{H})_{k+1} \quad \begin{cases}
\mathcal{L}_h[u_{h,k+1}] = \mathcal{L}_h^{[a]}[u_{h_0}] + \mathcal{L}_h^{[c]}[u_0] \quad \text{in } A^a, \\
\mathcal{L}_h[u_{h,k+1}] = -\mathcal{L}_h^{[a]}[u_{ah,k+1}] + f^{[a]}_0 \quad \text{in } A^c.
\end{cases}
\]

A natural choice for the initial guess is the solution to the pure harmonic problem \( -\mathcal{L}_h^{[a]}[u_{ah,k+1}] = 0 \). If it is not available, or too cumbersome to compute, other classical choices are the continuum elasticity solution, or simply \( u_0 = 0 \). In any of these cases, we may, for practical reasons, universally choose \( u_{h,0} = 0 \), thanks to the nonunique splitting—the right hand side of (H)\(_{k+1}\) in \( A^a \) is then always zero.

Remark 1 (Convergence rate of the FBC method). The asymptotic convergence rate of the FBC method is neither impacted by the precise choice of the initial guess nor the choice of the right hand side of (H)\(_{k+1}\), but only depends on the choice of \( \mathcal{L}_h \) [158]. In fact, if \( \mathcal{L}_h \) and \( \mathcal{L} \) coincide, the FBC method is guaranteed to converge in two steps (cf. Corollary 1 in [158]).

3.2.3. Practical algorithm

Since the harmonic problem \( (\text{H})_{k+1} \) is infinite, we can conveniently obtain the solution \( u_{h,k+1} \) using the lattice Green function. Therefore, let \( G \) be the lattice Green operator corresponding to the periodic harmonic problem such that

\[
\forall \xi \in A \land \forall v \quad (G \mathcal{L}_h)[v](\xi) = \sum_{\eta \in A} \sum_{\zeta \in A^\circ} G(\xi - \zeta) K_h(\zeta - \eta) \quad v(\eta) = I[v](\xi),
\]

(19)

where \( I \) is the identity operator and \( G \) the lattice Green function. We postpone the details concerning the computation of \( G \) to Section 3.1 and proceed under the assumption that \( G \) is given.

Then, using the Green operator \( G \), we compute the solution \( u_{h,k+1} \) as

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
u_{h,k+1}^n \\
u_{h,k+1}^c
\end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix}
\mathcal{L}_{bh}^{[a]}[u] + \mathcal{L}_{bh}^{[c]}[u] \\
-\mathcal{L}_{bh}^{[a]}[u_{ah,k+1}] + f^{[a]}_0
\end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix}
G_{bh}^{[a]}[u] + G_{bh}^{[c]}[u] \\
-\mathcal{L}_{bh}^{[a]}[u_{ah,k+1}] + f^{[a]}_0
\end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix}
\mathcal{L}_{bh}^{[a]}[u_{h_0}] + \mathcal{L}_{bh}^{[c]}[u_0] \\
0
\end{pmatrix}.
\]

(20)

Further, by subtracting \( u_{h,k} \) from \( u_{h,k+1} \), we obtain the more convenient representation

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
u_{h,k+1}^n \\
u_{h,k+1}^c
\end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix}
u_{h,k}^n \\
u_{h,k}^c
\end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix}G_{bh}^{[a]}[u] & G_{bh}^{[c]} \\
G_{bh}^{[a]} & G_{bh}^{[c]} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix}0 \\
\mathcal{L}_{bh}^{[a]}[u_{ah,k+1}] - u_{ah,k}
\end{pmatrix}.
\]

(21)

since the constant source term is now contained in \( u_{h,0} \). In addition, to avoid computing \( u_{ah} \), we rewrite \( \mathcal{L}_{bh}^{[a]}[u_{ah,k+1} - u_{ah,k}] \)
as follows
\begin{equation}
\mathcal{L}_h^{|a} [u_{ah,k+1} - u_{ah,k}] = \mathcal{L}_h^{|a} [u_{ah,k+1}] - \mathcal{L}_h^{|a} [u_{ah,k}]
= \mathcal{L}_h^{|a} [u_{ah,k+1}] + \mathcal{L}_h^{[a]} [u_{h,k}] + \mathcal{L}_h^{[c]} [u_k]
= \mathcal{L}_h^{[a]} [u_{k+1/2}] + \mathcal{L}_h^{[c]} [u_k],
\end{equation}
where only the full solution appears. Note that the expression (22) is what Sinclair et al. named the “incompatibility force” (or inhomogeneous force) \( f_{in} \) which arises after the atoms in \( A^* \) have been relaxed.

Recognizing that our continuum model is local, we never need to evaluate \( f_{in} \) in the entire continuum domain since only the continuum nodes in \( A^* \) interact with the real atoms (cf. Section 2.2.2). For the same reason we do not require \( u \) to be computed in the entire continuum domain—it suffices that we know it in the domain \( A^{*\star} \) containing the \( A^* \)-atoms and its nearest neighbors. Hence, we only need to compute \( f_{in,k+1}^{*+} = \mathcal{L}_h^{[*+]} [u_{k+1/2}] + \mathcal{L}_h^{[*+]} [u_k] \) and subsequently update the pad displacements as follows
\begin{equation}
\mathbf{u}^{p}_{k+1} = \mathbf{u}^{p}_k - \mathcal{G}^{[p*]} [f_{in,k+1}].
\end{equation}

Our implementation of the FBC method is summarized in Algorithm 1 with another two additions. First, to improve the convergence rate, we rescale \( f_{in,k+1}^{*+} \) after solving (AH) using residual-based relaxation, as described in the following section. Second, we have found that, since the problem is not fixed in space, the domains may start drifting rigidly from one iteration to another due to some numerical inaccuracies, possibly leading to a divergence of the solution. Simply subtracting the average from the pad displacements component-wise resolved this issue in all our numerical experiments.

Algorithm 1: Flexible boundary condition method with relaxation

**Input:** initial guess \( \mathbf{u}_0 \)

1. \( k \leftarrow 0, \) optional: \( \alpha_2 \leftarrow 1; \)
2. while \( \| \delta \Pi (\mathbf{u}_k) \| < TOL \) do
3. \( \mathbf{u}^{k+1/2}_k \leftarrow \arg \min_{\mathbf{v}^p} \| \Pi^*(\{\mathbf{v}^p, \mathbf{u}^{p}_k\}) \| ; \) // solve (AH)\( _{k+1} \)
4. \( f_{in,k+1}^{*+} \leftarrow \mathcal{L}_h^{[*+]} [u_{k+1/2}] + \mathcal{L}_h^{[*+]} [u_k] ; \) // compute incompatibility force
5. if relaxation and \( k \geq 2 \) then
6. \( \alpha_{k+1} \leftarrow \text{Relax}(f_{in,k+1}^{*+}, f_{in,k+1}^{*+}; \alpha_k); \) // residual-based relaxation
7. \( f_{in,k+1}^{*+} \leftarrow \alpha_{k+1} f_{in,k+1}^{*+}; \)
8. end
9. \( \mathbf{u}^{p}_{k+1} \leftarrow \mathbf{u}^{p}_k - \mathcal{G}^{[p*]} [f_{in,k+1}]; \) // solve (H)\( _{k+1} \)
10. \( \mathbf{u}^{p}_{k+1} \leftarrow \mathbf{u}^{p}_{k+1} - (1/|\mathcal{L}|) \sum_{\xi \in \mathcal{L}} u_{i,k+1}(\xi); \)
11. \( k \leftarrow k + 1; \)
12. end

**Output:** global solution \( \mathbf{u}_k \)

### 2.3.3. Residual-based relaxation

One option to accelerate the convergence of domain decomposition methods is relaxation which aims at rescaling the transmission conditions between the subproblems. For the FBC method, Hodapp [18] proposed a relaxation of the incompatibility force which resets \( f_{in,k+1}^{*+} \) to \( \alpha_{k+1} f_{in,k+1}^{*+} \), where \( \alpha_{k+1} \) is the relaxation parameter, each time after solving the atomic problem. In [18] the optimal \( \alpha_{k+1} \) was considered to be the one minimizing the difference between a linear trial solution for the \( k+2 \)-th iteration in \( A^* \) and the solution from the current iteration \( k+1 \). However, this approach is more complicated to implement (efficiently) and is most useful in situations when solving a linearized problem in \( A^* \) is significantly cheaper than solving the nonlinear problem (such as in the case of quantum mechanics/molecular mechanics coupling schemes, e.g., [46]).

Here, we propose to use a residual-based method [32] which only requires to compute a couple of inner products between the incompatibility force from the current and previous iteration and is thus far easier to implement. To that end, we reconsider the problem of solving \( f_{in} = 0 \) as a sequence \( (f^P_k)_{k \geq 1} \), where \( \sum_{l=1}^{k} f_{in,l} \) is the “total incompatibility force”, which converges to \( f^{*+} \). Using relaxation, the iteration equation for this sequence is
\begin{equation}
f^{P}_{k+1} = f^{P}_k + \alpha_{k+1} f^{P}_{in,k+1},
\end{equation}
in which, obviously, $f^{i*}_{in,k+1}$ plays the role of the residual. Now, to obtain a good $\alpha_{k+1}$ which accelerates the sequence, we pose the assumptions that i) $(f^{i*}_{k})_{k \geq 1}$ converges linearly to $f^{i*}$, and ii) $f^{i*}_{k-1}$, $f^{i*}_{k}$ and $f^{i*}_{k+1}$ are sufficiently close to $f^{i*}$ in the direction of some vector $v$ that we define momentarily. Then,

$$\frac{\langle \hat{f}^{i*}_{k-1} - f^{i*}, v \rangle}{\langle \hat{f}^{i*}_{k+1} - f^{i*}, v \rangle} \approx \frac{\langle f^{i*}_{k-1} - f^{i*}, v \rangle}{\langle f^{i*}_{k+1} - f^{i*}, v \rangle},$$

(25)

where $\hat{f}^{i*}$ and $\hat{f}^{i*}_{k+1}$ are the solutions obtained without relaxation in the $k$-th and $k+1$-th iteration, respectively. By solving (25) for $\langle f^{i*}, v \rangle$ we get

$$\langle f^{i*}, v \rangle \approx \frac{\langle \hat{f}^{i*}_{k+1}, v \rangle}{\langle f^{i*}_{k+1} - f^{i*}, v \rangle} \frac{\langle \hat{f}^{i*}_{k}, v \rangle}{\langle f^{i*}_{k} - f^{i*}, v \rangle} \frac{\langle f^{i*}_{k-1}, v \rangle}{\langle f^{i*}_{k+1} - f^{i*}, v \rangle},$$

(26)

and with assumption ii) it follows that

$$\langle f^{i*}, v \rangle \approx \langle f^{i*}_{k+1}, v \rangle \langle f^{i*}_{k}, v \rangle \langle f^{i*}_{k-1}, v \rangle.$$

(27)

Equating the latter relation and solving for $\alpha_{k+1}$ yields

$$\alpha_{k+1} := -\frac{\langle f^{i*}_{k+1} - f^{i*}_{k-1}, v \rangle}{\langle f^{i*}_{k+1} - f^{i*}, v \rangle} = -\frac{\langle f^{i*}_{k+1}, v \rangle}{\langle f^{i*}_{k+1} - f^{i*}, v \rangle} \frac{\langle f^{i*}_{k}, v \rangle}{\langle f^{i*}_{k} - f^{i*}, v \rangle} \frac{\langle f^{i*}_{k-1}, v \rangle}{\langle f^{i*}_{k+1} - f^{i*}, v \rangle}.$$

(28)

We now choose $v = f^{i*}_{in,k+1} - f^{i*}_{in,k}$, which is commonly referred to as Aitken’s or Lemaréchal’s method [1 25 32]. Intuitively the method can be understood as follows: if the residual between two subsequent iterations does not change too much its direction, the right hand side of (28) will become $>1$ if the projected residual reduces, or $<1$ if the projected residual increases. Thus, the hope is to accelerate the convergence by moving faster ($\alpha_{k+1} > 1$) in the direction of the residual, or slower ($\alpha_{k+1} < 1$) in order to prevent oscillations. We found this a convenient choice for defect propagation to escape the danger of the atomistic problem getting trapped around saddle points for too long as will be demonstrated in Section 4.3.

In practice, we need to put bounds, $\alpha_{\text{min}}$ and $\alpha_{\text{max}}$, on $\alpha_{k+1}$, in particular for nonlinear problems, to avoid premature convergence ($\alpha_{k+1}$ close to zero) or divergence ($\alpha_{k+1}$ too large or negative) as shown in Algorithm 2.

**Algorithm 2: Residual-based relaxation (Relax)**

**Input:** incompatibility forces $f^{i*}_{in,k+1}$, $f^{i*}_{in,k}$ and relaxation parameter $\alpha_{k}$ from the previous iterations

1. $\alpha_{k+1} \leftarrow -\frac{\langle f^{i*}_{in,k+1}, f^{i*}_{in,k} \rangle - \langle f^{i*}_{in,k}, f^{i*}_{in,k} \rangle}{\|f^{i*}_{in,k+1} - f^{i*}_{in,k}\|^2}$;
2. if $\alpha_{k+1} < \alpha_{\text{min}}$ then
3. $\alpha_{k+1} \leftarrow 1$;
4. else if $\alpha_{k+1} > \alpha_{\text{max}}$ then
5. $\alpha_{k+1} \leftarrow \alpha_{\text{max}}$;
6. end

**Output:** relaxation parameter $\alpha_{k+1}$

3. **Implementation of the harmonic problem**

3.1. **Periodic lattice Green functions**

We now turn to the computation of the periodic lattice Green function $G$. While it is possible to compute $G$ directly for a given periodicity, it appears not practical since a new Green function would have to be computed each time the periodic length $l_3$ changes. Therefore, the strategy we will pursue in this work is as follows: we first construct a computable version of the lattice Green function $G^\infty$ for the infinite (non-periodic) lattice $A_\infty$, and then approximate $G$ by summing up the $G^\infty$’s from the periodic images.
It usually not practical to compute \( G^\infty(\mathbf{r}) \) at all points. Therefore, we adopt the construction of \(^{[19]}\) which approximates \( G^\infty(\mathbf{r}) \) with the continuum Green function \( G^{\text{cgf}} \) outside some cut-off radius \( r_{cut} \), i.e.,

\[
G^\infty(\mathbf{r}) \approx \tilde{G}(\mathbf{r}) = \begin{cases} 
G^\infty(\mathbf{r}) & \|\mathbf{r}\| \leq r_{cut}, \\
G^{\text{cgf}}(\mathbf{r}) & \text{else}.
\end{cases}
\]

(29)

Details on how we compute \( G^\infty(\mathbf{r}) \) are given in Appendix \(^{[3]}\).

With \( \tilde{G}(\mathbf{r}) \), we now approximate the periodic lattice Green function as

\[
G(\mathbf{r}) \approx \tilde{G}(\mathbf{r}) = \sum_{i=-\infty}^{\infty} \tilde{G}^\infty(r_1, r_2, r_3 + \Delta r_{3,i})
\]

\[
= \sum_{i=-m_1}^{m_2} G^\infty(r_1, r_2, r_3 + \Delta r_{3,i}) + \sum_{i=-\infty}^{-m_1-1} G^{\text{cgf}}(r_1, r_2, r_3 + \Delta r_{3,i}) + \sum_{i=m_2+1}^{\infty} G^{\text{cgf}}(r_1, r_2, r_3 + \Delta r_{3,i}),
\]

(30)

with \( \Delta r_{3,i} = i \cdot l_3 \); the indices \( m_1 \) and \( m_2 \) depend on the precise choice of \( r_{cut} \). However, those last two sums cannot be computed due to the fact that the Green function is proportional to \( \|\mathbf{r}\|^{-1} \), and so they diverge. On the other hand, \( G^\infty \approx G^{\text{cgf}} + C \), that is, the Green function is unique only up to an otherwise arbitrary constant \( C \). So, we can subtract \( G^\infty(0) \) without changing \( \nabla \mathbf{u}^0 \). Hence, we set

\[
\tilde{G}(\mathbf{r}) = \sum_{i=-\infty}^{\infty} \tilde{G}^\infty(r_1, r_2, r_3 + \Delta r_{3,i}) - \tilde{G}^\infty(0, 0, \Delta r_{3,i}).
\]

(31)

To see why the sum (31) is convergent, we recall that the continuum Green function can be written as a function \(^{[5]}\)

\[
G^{\text{cgf}}(\mathbf{r}) = \|\mathbf{r}\|^{-1} F(\hat{\mathbf{r}}),
\]

(32)

where \( F(\hat{\mathbf{r}}) \) is a tensor-valued function depending only on the direction \( \hat{\mathbf{r}} = \mathbf{r}/\|\mathbf{r}\| \) of \( \mathbf{r} \), so the first term \( \|\mathbf{r}\|^{-1} \) characterizes the asymptotic behavior. For \( i \leq -m_1 - 1 \) and \( i \geq m_2 + 1 \), expanding (32) around \( \mathbf{r} = 0 \) yields

\[
G^{\text{cgf}}(r_1, r_2, r_3 + \Delta r_{3,i}) = G^{\text{cgf}}(0, 0, \Delta r_{3,i}) + \Delta r_{3,i}^{-2} F'(\hat{\mathbf{r}}) + O(\Delta r_{3,i}^{-3}),
\]

(33)

where \( F'(\hat{\mathbf{r}}) \) is some other tensor-valued function depending only on \( \hat{\mathbf{r}} \). Since the sums \( \sum_{i=-m_1-1}^{\infty} \Delta r_{3,i}^{-2} \) and \( \sum_{i=m_2+1}^{\infty} \Delta r_{3,i}^{-2} \) are convergent, the representation (31) is also convergent.

To evaluate (31) in practice, we need to truncate the sum after a finite number of terms. However, a direct summation converges rather slow and does not exploit the regularity properties of the asymptotic Green function. Therefore, we will make use of a series acceleration method in order to reduce the number of required terms to be computed. A method which is known to work well for series with terms \( \propto \Delta r_{3,i}^{-2} \) is the Richardson extrapolation which assumes that any partial sum \( \tilde{G}_n(\mathbf{r}) \) admits the series expansion

\[
\tilde{G}_n(\mathbf{r}) = \sum_{i=-n}^{n} \tilde{G}^\infty(r_1, r_2, r_3 + \Delta r_{3,i}) - \tilde{G}^\infty(0, 0, \Delta r_{3,i}) = Q_0 + Q_1 n^{-1} + Q_2 n^{-2} + Q_3 n^{-3} + \ldots
\]

(34)

such that \( \bar{G} = \lim_{n \to \infty} \tilde{G}_n(\mathbf{r}) = Q_0 \). Then, the Richardson extrapolation attempts to approximate \( \bar{G}(\mathbf{r}) \) by truncating the right hand side of (34) after the term \( Q_N n^{-N} \), and fitting the terms \( \tilde{G}_n(\mathbf{r}), \ldots, \tilde{G}_{n+N}(\mathbf{r}) \) to the series expansion of order \( N \). This yields a linear system of \( N+1 \) equations from which \( Q_0 \) can be deduced as (cf. \(^{[1]}\))

\[
Q_0 = \sum_{i=0}^{N} \frac{\tilde{G}_{n+i}(\mathbf{r})(n+i)^N (-1)^{i+N}}{i!(N-i)!} \approx \bar{G}(\mathbf{r}).
\]

(35)

The relative errors in the first component of the Green function, corresponding to the embedded-atom potential from Section \(^{[1]}\), are shown in Figure \(^{[3]}\) for some collection of points. The points are chosen to be representative for the problem studied in Section \(^{[1]}\). It can be seen that the error decays much faster when using the Richardson extrapolation in comparison with the direct summation. In all cases, a total number of six images is already sufficient for the relative
We point out that there are situations where we require a highly accurate approximation of \( \tilde{G} \). One example is a dislocation subject to a very small applied stress so that small errors in the pad displacements can strongly impact the motion of the dislocation (see the example in Section 5.3 in [19]). In such cases series acceleration is valuable given the fact that \( \tilde{G} \) may have to be evaluated millions of times while building the Green matrix (cf. following section).

### 3.2. Hierarchical matrix approximation of the Green matrix

An efficient implementation of Algorithm 1 requires an efficient computation of the harmonic problem (H). To see this, let us denote the matrix-vector multiplication associated with (39) as

\[
\mathbf{u}^P = \tilde{G}^{p[i]} f^i, \quad \text{with } \mathbf{u}^P \in \mathbb{R}^{3|A^i|}, \ \tilde{G}^{p[i]} \in \mathbb{R}^{3|A^i| \times 3|A^i|}, \ f^i \in \mathbb{R}^{3|A^i|},
\]

using the approximate periodic lattice Green functions. The Green matrix \( \tilde{G}^{p[i]} \) is then assembled as follows

\[
\tilde{G}^{p[i]} = \begin{pmatrix}
\tilde{G}(r_{1,1}) & \cdots & \tilde{G}(r_{1,\lceil A^i \rceil}) \\
\vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
\tilde{G}(r_{\lceil A^i \rceil,1}) & \cdots & \tilde{G}(r_{\lceil A^i \rceil,\lceil A^i \rceil})
\end{pmatrix}, \quad \text{where } r_{i,j} = \eta_j - \xi_i, \ \xi_i \in A^P, \ \eta_j \in A^i.
\]

Thus, \( \tilde{G}^{p[i]} \) is dense and the complexity of computing (36) is of \( \mathcal{O}(|A^i||A^P|) \). To relate this complexity to the atomistic problem, we first note that for basic geometries, such as the rectangular domain in Figure 2, we have that \( |A^i| \leq |A^+|^{3/2} \), and so \( |A^i| \geq |A^+|^{2/3} \). Therefore, solving the harmonic problem is at least of \( \mathcal{O}(|A^+|^{4/3}) \). Thus, assuming that solving the atomistic problem scales linear with \( |A^+| \), the harmonic problem will become more expensive than the atomistic problem. Another issue is the cost for storing the \( \tilde{G}^{p[i]} \)-matrix. Due to the quadratic complexity the memory requirement quickly grows to orders of several hundred gigabytes and beyond. This is inefficient, even on larger computing clusters, and also eliminates the possibility of using the method on laptops and smaller workstations. In other works on the FBC method (e.g., [32]), eq. (36) has been computed by looking up \( \tilde{G} \) “on-the-fly” without storing the matrix \( \tilde{G}^{p[i]} \) explicitly—but in this case the computing complexity is even higher and so this is only adequate for small problems.

Fortunately, all these aforementioned issues can be remedied by using a hierarchical matrix (H-matrix, [44]) approximation of \( \tilde{G}^{p[i]} \), in the following denoted by \( \tilde{G}^{p[i]}_H \). H-matrices are data-sparse approximations of the original matrix with controllable accuracy, exploiting the asymptotic smoothness of the off-diagonal entries \( \tilde{G}_{kl}(r_{i,j}) \) [8], i.e.,

\[
\forall a, b \in \mathbb{N}_0^3 \quad |\nabla_a \nabla_b \tilde{G}_{kl}(r_{i,j})| \leq C ||r_{i,j}||^{-|a|+|b|} |\tilde{G}_{kl}(r_{i,j})|,
\]

where \( C \) is some constant independent of \( r_{i,j} \), but depending on \( a, b \). Approximating \( \tilde{G}^{p[i]} \) with \( \tilde{G}^{p[i]}_H \) ensures that all
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**Figure 3:** Relative error \( | \tilde{G}_{00}(p_i) - \tilde{G}^{\text{trunc}}_{00}(p_i) | / | \tilde{G}_{00}(p_i) | \) in the truncated sum \( \tilde{G}^{\text{trunc}}_{00}(p_i) \) as a function of the number of periodic images \( n_{\text{img}} \) when using direct summation (continuous lines) and Richardson extrapolation (dashed-dotted lines) for the selected points \( p_1 \cdots p_7 \).
relevant matrix operations, that is, building $C^p|\mathcal{H}|^*$, storing $\tilde{C}^p|\mathcal{H}|^*$ and multiplying $\tilde{C}^p|\mathcal{H}|^*$ by a vector, scale linear-logarithmic with the number of pad atoms $|A^p|$. We will demonstrate this below using a rectangular domain exemplified in Figure 2 (which will also be used in the computational results section). Our construction of $\tilde{C}^p|\mathcal{H}|^*$ is largely standard and we therefore refer the reader to Appendix C for those details.

In the following we use a $\tilde{C}^p|\mathcal{H}|^*$ with a relative error in the Frobenius norm $\|C^p|\mathcal{H}|^* - \tilde{C}^p|\mathcal{H}|^*\|_{fro}/\|C^p|\mathcal{H}|^*\|_{fro}$ of the order of $10^{-5}$. The linear scaling of the matrix size as a function of the number of pad atoms $|A^p|$ is shown in Figure 4 (a). Therein, the last point corresponds to a total number of roughly 170 000 pad atoms and 1 mio. real atoms. Extrapolating therefore refer the reader to Appendix C for those details. Further, the linear scaling of the elapsed times for building $\tilde{C}^p|\mathcal{H}|^*$ and computing $\tilde{C}^p|\mathcal{H}|^* f^i|$ as a function of $|A^p|$ is shown in Figure 4 (b). Thereby, for the considered data points, the time for computing $\tilde{C}^p|\mathcal{H}|^* f^i|$ is of the order of 0.1 ms. This is approximately the same amount of time as required for computing the forces on all real atoms using the embedded-atom method potential from Section 4.1. Therefore, the time spent for solving the harmonic problem is negligible compared to one energy minimization (which usually requires $O(100)$ or more force computations). While we remark here that the time required for building the matrix is roughly two orders of magnitude higher than for computing $\tilde{C}^p|\mathcal{H}|^* f^i$, it should be noted that this operation is only carried out once before the beginning of the simulation. Hence, this cost is not significant, also with respect to the fact that the same matrix can be reused for many simulations.

4. Computational results

4.1. Bow-out problem

In order to validate the proposed methodology, we have selected the problem of an initially straight [121] edge dislocation in an fcc lattice periodically bowing between obstacles, mimicked here by two pinning points as shown in Figure 5 (a). This is a well-defined quasi-static problem and therefore ideally suited for testing purposes, but also relevant from a practical point of view in order to, e.g., compute the line tension of a dislocation, a parameter that is significant, also with respect to the fact that the same matrix can be reused for many simulations.
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Figure 4: (a) Matrix size vs. number of pad atoms. (b) Elapsed times for building $\tilde{C}^p|\mathcal{H}|^*$ and computing $\tilde{C}^p|\mathcal{H}|^* f^i$ for a random $f^i$.

As an interatomic potential, we use the isotropic average aluminum-magnesium embedded-atom method potential from 19 $E^\xi_\eta(u_\eta - u_\xi) = \sum_{\eta \in R_\xi} \phi_{\text{av}}^\xi(u_\eta - u_\xi) + \sum_X c_X F_X(\tilde{\rho}_\xi(X, \{u_\eta - u_\xi\}))$, (39)

where $\phi_{\text{av}}^\xi$ is the average pair potential, $E^\xi_\eta$ is the concentration of atom type $X$, and $F_X$ is the embedding function of the average electron density $\tilde{\rho}_\xi(X, \{u_\eta - u_\xi\})$ of atom $\xi$. The potential has the lattice constant $a_0 = 4.109$ Å, the shear
modulus $\mu = 21$ GPa, and the Poisson ration $\nu = 0.41$. For details concerning the computation of the periodic lattice Green function the reader is referred to Section 3.1.

As an atomistic domain we use a rectangular cell of size $l_1 \times l_2 \times l_3$. Our simulation setup is then as follows: We first apply the elastic solution of a straight dislocation and relax the core structure. Subsequently, we fix a cluster of atoms of size $26 \times 14 \times 8 \, \text{Å}^3$ near the periodic boundaries (cf. Figure 5 (a)) to pin the dislocation. Next, we take the relaxed solution, denoted by $u_{\text{edge}}$, and superimpose it with the solution $\tilde{u}$ for a constant applied shear stress $\tau_{\text{app}}$ to obtain the initial guess $u_0 = u_{\text{edge}} + \tilde{u}$, with $\tilde{u}(\xi) = (\tau_{\text{app}}/\mu) \xi e_1$.

Our version of the FBC method (Algorithm 1) is implemented in an in-house code, with interface to LAMMPS [lammps.sandia.gov, 31] that we employ to relax the atoms in $\Lambda$ using its Hessian-free Newton-Raphson solver. In each iteration $k+1$ we solve the atomistic problem in line 3 up to a tolerance of $0.05 \cdot \|\delta \Pi^a(u_k)\|$. Algorithm 1 terminates when $\|\delta \Pi^a(u_k)\| < 10^{-2} \text{eV/Å}$ after updating the pad atoms.

We investigate the bow-out problem for two periodic lengths/applied stresses: i) $l_3 = 100 \, \text{Å}/\tau_{\text{app}} = 140 \, \text{MPa}$, and ii) $l_3 = 200 \, \text{Å}/\tau_{\text{app}} = 35 \, \text{MPa}$. In both cases the dislocation bows over a distance of $\approx 20 \, \text{Å}$.

We will compare the FBC method with the periodic array of dislocations (PAD) method [12, 30]. The PAD method uses periodic boundary conditions in the $x_1$-direction and free surfaces on the upper and lower boundaries on the $x_2$-direction (see Figure 5 (b)). Additional details of our setup can be found in Appendix D.

4.2. Accuracy

We judge the accuracy of the FBC method based on the final position of the dislocation line as this is the quantity of interest when performing such a study in practice, e.g., for computing the dislocation line tension. A detailed analysis of the error in the energy norm can be found in several preceding publications [17, 19, 18].

First, we investigate the necessary size of the atomistic domain in terms of $l_1$ and $l_2$. We therefore compare the results when using a large cell size with $l_1 = 120 \, \text{Å}$ and $l_2 = 115 \, \text{Å}$ and a minimal cell size with $l_1 = 90 \, \text{Å}$ and $l_2 = 50 \, \text{Å}$. The origin of the cells is thereby shifted along the $x_1$-direction so that the distance of the bowing dislocation line and both interfaces is approximately equal.

To compare the dislocations lines, we have taken the nodes obtained from a dislocation detection algorithm [39, 40] and fitted a polynomial to them. There is almost no visual difference between the final positions of the dislocations for both cell sizes as shown in Figure 6. The small gap in the nodes for $l_3 = 200 \, \text{Å}/\tau_{\text{app}} = 35 \, \text{MPa}$ is likely due to minor inaccuracies in the lattice Green function (due to a too small $r_{\text{cut}}$) which must be very precise for lower applied stresses (cf. [19]). Since the gap is less than one fifth of the Burgers vector, i.e., the dislocations are essentially in the same position, we are not further concerned with it and refer for all following considerations to the results obtained with the minimal cell.

Next, we compare the FBC method to a “pure atomistic” calculation using the PAD boundary conditions. Choosing the right cell size for the PAD method is, however, far more involved than for FBCs. This is due to the fact that in the PAD method spurious image stresses arise due to the free surface and the periodic images in the $x_1$-direction. Szajewski and Curtin [11] have derived an effective image stress on a dislocation bowing into a circular arc as a function of $h$

$$\tau_{\text{img,eff}}(h) = C_1 V^{-1} l_3^{-2} h,$$

(40)
\[ \tau_{\text{app}} = 140 \text{ MPa} \] (a) \[ \tau_{\text{app}} = 35 \text{ MPa} \] (b)

Figure 6: Comparison of the dislocation lines when using a large atomistic cell size with \( l_1 = 120\,\text{Å} \) and \( l_2 = 115\,\text{Å} \), and a minimal atomistic cell size with \( l_1 = 90\,\text{Å} \) and \( l_2 = 50\,\text{Å} \). (a) \( l_3 = 100\,\text{Å} \). (b) \( l_3 = 200\,\text{Å} \)

\[ \bar{V} = 0.48 \] \[ \bar{V} = 1.78 \] \[ \bar{V} = 3.89 \] \[ \bar{V} = 6.82 \]

Figure 7: Comparison of the dislocation lines when using i) the FBC method, or ii) the PAD method for different normalized volumes \( \bar{V} = l_1 l_3 / l_2^3 \). (a) \( l_3 = 100\,\text{Å} \). (b) \( l_3 = 200\,\text{Å} \)

where \( C_1 \) is a constant depending on the elastic constants, the Burgers vector and the relative length \( \bar{L} = l_1 / l_2 \), and \( \bar{V} = l_1 l_2^2 / l_3^2 = l_1 l_2 / l_3^2 \) is a normalized volume. In their work, Szajewski and Curtin have shown that \( \tau_{\text{img,eff}}(h) \) is minimal for edge dislocations when \( \bar{L} \approx 0.8 \). Thus, we henceforth assume tacitly that \( \bar{L} = 0.8 \equiv \text{constant} \).

In the following we investigate the impact of \( \tau_{\text{img,eff}}(h) \) and, in particular, \( \bar{V} \) on the difference between the dislocation line obtained with the PAD method and the exact (image-stress-free) FBC solution. Therefore, we recall that the relation between the applied stress and \( h \) is, according to linear elasticity (cf. [34]),

\[ \tau_{\text{app}}(h) = C_2 l_3^{-2} h, \] (41)

where \( C_2 \) is another constant which depends on the elastic constants and the Burgers vector. Hence, the ratio \( \tau_{\text{img,eff}}(h) / \tau_{\text{app}}(h) \) scales as \( \bar{V}^{-1} \). To keep this ratio constant when increasing the cell length \( l_3 \), we need to keep \( \bar{V} \) constant—simply extending the cell in the \( x_3 \)-direction, as we have done for the FBCs, can lead to large errors, even though the dislocation moves in essence over the same distance regardless of the value of \( l_3 \).

The results are shown in Figure 7. Comparing the dislocation lines confirms the previously stated estimate (compare, e.g., the dislocation lines for \( \bar{V} = 3.89 \) in (a) and \( \bar{V} = 3.78 \) in (b)).

To make this dependence on \( \bar{V} \) more precise, we estimate the relative error in the maximum bow-out using (40) and
by

\[ \frac{h - \tilde{h}}{\bar{h}} \approx \frac{h - (h - h_{\text{img}})}{\bar{h}} = \frac{h_{\text{img}}}{\bar{h}} \approx \bar{V}^{-1}, \]  

(42)

where \( h_{\text{img}} = \tau_{\text{img,eff}} l_3^2 / C_2 \) is the portion of the bow-out due to the effective image stress. The dependence of the error on \( \bar{V} \) is manifested in Figure 8 where the error in the maximum bow-out \( h \) is shown as a function of the normalized volume \( \bar{V} \): The two curves for \( l_3 = 100 \, \text{Å} \) and \( l_3 = 200 \, \text{Å} \) more or less coincide. The preasymptotic scaling of the error is even slightly worse than \( \bar{V}^{-1} \), but note that the estimates are based on continuum linear elasticity and do not take intrinsically atomistic effects into account (e.g., Peierls stress, partial dislocations, etc.).

So, to fully ensure that the error of the PAD method remains constant when increasing \( l_3 \), we need to increase the product \( l_1 l_2 \) such that \( \bar{V} \) remains constant. We will see in the following section that keeping \( \bar{V} \) constant can drastically degrade the efficiency of the PAD method.

![Figure 8: Relative error of the PAD method in the maximum dislocation bow-out as a function of the normalized volume \( \bar{V} = l_1 l_2 / l_3^2 \).](image)

### 4.3. Efficiency

We first compare the efficiency of the FBC method with and without residual-based relaxation. For clarity we will denote the FBC method with relaxation by \( \text{rFBC method} \).

In Figure 9 (a) the force norm is shown as a function of the iteration index for both problems (\( l_3 = 100 \, \text{Å} \) and \( l_3 = 200 \, \text{Å} \)) using FBCs and \( \text{rFBCs} \). Overall, \( \text{rFBCs} \) require much fewer iterations compared to FBCs, 18 vs. 26 for \( l_3 = 100 \, \text{Å} \), and 42 vs. 71 for \( l_3 = 200 \, \text{Å} \). This can be rationalized by looking at the oscillatory parts corresponding to situations when the dislocations are about to cross a Peierls barrier, i.e., saddle points of the atomistic Hessian. The \( \text{rFBC-curves} \) show fewer, but more pronounced and more frequent, oscillations and, so, the \( \text{rFBC method} \) overcomes these saddle points faster. The oscillations are intimately linked to the relaxation parameter \( \alpha \) which steadily increases when the dislocation glides smoothly through a Peierls valley (compare the peaks in the curves in Figure 9 (b) with the ones from (a)). This elevates the incompatibility force, and thus the pad nodes advance more rapidly. In addition, \( \text{rFBCs} \) prevent oscillations around the equilibrium state (we have checked that both methods converge to the same result).

Next, we assess the efficiency of the \( \text{rFBC method} \) with respect to the PAD method. Since the most time consuming part is usually the computation of the interatomic forces, we assess the efficiency of the \( \text{rFBC method} \) using the efficiency index \( \chi(l_3) \) as the ratio of the required number of \textit{per-atom} force computations (i.e., the total number of atoms \( N_a \) times the total number of \textit{global} force computations \( N_{\delta \Pi} \)) per required number of \textit{per-atom} force computations when using the \( \text{rFBC method} \). We thus define

\[
\chi(l_3 = 100 \, \text{Å}) = \frac{N_a \cdot N_{\delta \Pi}}{11520 \cdot 2582},
\]

\[
\chi(l_3 = 200 \, \text{Å}) = \frac{N_a \cdot N_{\delta \Pi}}{23040 \cdot 5764},
\]  

(43)

in accordance with the values reported in Table 1 and 2.

From Table 1 and 2 it can be seen that the efficiency of the \( \text{rFBC method} \) is remarkable. To reach an error of \( \approx 6-7\% \) (half a Burgers vector) in the maximum amount of bow-out, the PAD method requires a normalized volume of \( \bar{V} \approx 3.8 \), and this leads to \( \approx 27 \) (\( l_3 = 100 \, \text{Å} \)) and \( 80 \) (\( l_3 = 200 \, \text{Å} \)) more per-atom force computations for the PAD method. To reach essentially the same accuracy than the \( \text{rFBC method} \) for \( l_3 = 200 \, \text{Å} \), a normalized volume of \( \bar{V} = 6.68 \) is required.
corresponding to more than 3 mio. atoms. In the latter case the PAD method requires more than two orders of magnitude more force computations!

We remark that the exact speed-ups can be \( \approx 50-60\% \) less than \( \chi \) (which is still very efficient!). This can likely be attributed to additional setup times when restarting the energy minimization via LAMMPS in every iteration. We are planning to optimize this, together with exploring possibly more efficient variants of Algorithm 1 (cf. Section 6), and report the results in a future publication. Nevertheless we point out that, when using more expensive interatomic potentials with cluster functionals, the reported \( \chi \)'s can indeed be considered as the speed-ups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>( l_1 ) [Å]</th>
<th>( l_2 ) [Å]</th>
<th>( V ) [Å]</th>
<th>( N_a )</th>
<th>( N_{s,\Pi} )</th>
<th>( \chi )</th>
<th>( (h - \tilde{h})/h ) [%]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FBC</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>11 520</td>
<td>4 454</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rFBC</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>11 520</td>
<td>2 582</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAD</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>29 240</td>
<td>1 751</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>33.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAD</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>106 240</td>
<td>2 235</td>
<td>7.98</td>
<td>13.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAD</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>231 240</td>
<td>3 501</td>
<td>27.22</td>
<td>7.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAD</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>6.82</td>
<td>404 240</td>
<td>4 511</td>
<td>61.31</td>
<td>6.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Numerical results for \( l_3 = 100\) Å

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>( l_1 ) [Å]</th>
<th>( l_2 ) [Å]</th>
<th>( V ) [Å]</th>
<th>( N_a )</th>
<th>( N_{s,\Pi} )</th>
<th>( \chi )</th>
<th>( (h - \tilde{h})/h ) [%]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FBC</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>23040</td>
<td>12 896</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rFBC</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>23040</td>
<td>5 764</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAD</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>58 480</td>
<td>4 160</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>39.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAD</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>212 480</td>
<td>3 908</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>21.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAD</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>462 480</td>
<td>3 746</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>14.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAD</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>808 480</td>
<td>4 751</td>
<td>28.92</td>
<td>15.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAD</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>1 788 480</td>
<td>5 952</td>
<td>80.16</td>
<td>5.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAD</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>6.68</td>
<td>3 152 480</td>
<td>8 397</td>
<td>199.33</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Numerical results for \( l_3 = 200\) Å
5. Discussion

We have presented an efficient implementation of the flexible boundary condition (FBC) method for single-periodic problems. Our implementation is supported by various tools from numerical analysis, in particular, a hierarchical matrix algebra rendering the computational cost for updating the “flexible boundary” negligible small compared to an atomistic energy minimization—an issue that previously hindered applying the method to large-scale problems.

To assess the performance of the FBC method we have considered a dislocation bow-out problem in an fcc lattice. The currently most commonly used method for computing such problems is, to the author’s best knowledge, the periodic array of dislocations (PAD) method. However, for an atomistic cell of periodic length $l_1$ and lateral lengths $l_1$ and $l_2$, the PAD method requires to keep the normalized volume $\bar{V} = l_1l_2/l_3^2$ constant to ensure the same level of accuracy for a constant bowing distance. In contrast, we have shown that, with FBCs, it suffices to vary the periodic length $l_3$, and keeping $l_1$ and $l_2$ constant. Hence, the necessary number of real atoms for the FBC method scales linearly with $l_3$ whereas the necessary number of real atoms for the PAD method scales cubically. This leads to an orders of magnitude higher efficiency of the FBC method over the PAD method.

This implies in a wider sense that studies to be performed by using the FBC method can be done more intuitively than by using the PAD method: as there are no spurious image effects, expect for the coupling error, it is sufficient to place the atomistic domain where nonlinear material behavior is expected, that is, in vicinity of the dislocation(s) and possibly other defects (voids, precipitates, etc.). Additionally, the PAD method requires more preliminary convergence tests before the actual study can be performed, further increasing the computational cost.

For potential future users we point out that the FBC method can be virtually used in a block box fashion as there are, in principle, no crucial parameters other than the standard tolerances which have to be touched. Using FBCs would then not differ from using any of the conventional boundary conditions (fixed, free, or periodic). Moreover, the decomposition into an atomistic and a continuum problem which are solved separately allows for an easier integration into existing molecular dynamics codes as with concurrent atomistic/continuum solvers.

6. Further improvements and extensions

We conclude by mentioning some interesting further improvements and extensions of the present work.

An obvious approach to further accelerate the FBC method is to replace the domain decomposition algorithm with a monolithic Newton-Krylov solver as proposed in [19]. However, a non-symmetric force-based coupling limits the realm of suitable linear solvers to generalized minimal residual methods, although switching to one of the state-of-the-art energy-based schemes (e.g., [13]) could bypass this requirement. Moreover, the solver proposed in [19] requires an efficient representation of the inverse of $\mathcal{L}_h^{ci}$. One could relax this requirement by weakening (14) and, in lieu thereof, minimize $u^a - u^a_{ah} - u^i_{ah}$ together with the atomistic energy, leading to the linear system (cf. [19])

$$\begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{L}^{ai} & -\mathcal{L}^{ai}\mathcal{G}^{ii}\mathcal{L}^{*i} \\ \mathcal{I}^{ij} & -(\mathcal{I}^{ij} + \mathcal{G}^{ij}\mathcal{L}^{*i}) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} u^a \\ u^i_{ah} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} f^a_{ext} \\ 0^i \end{pmatrix}$$ (44)

which would have to be solved in every Newton iteration with respect to $u^a$ and the anharmonic interface displacements $u^i_{ah}$. Integrating any of the mentioned techniques into existing molecular dynamics codes is nevertheless challenging and requires further investigation.

A natural extension of the FBC method is to include adaptive refinement techniques to evolve the atomistic domain in case the equilibrium position of a dislocation lies outside the prechosen boundaries [27]. In this context, an alternative option would be to use the coupled atomistic/discrete dislocations (CADD) method [2, 20, 9] in which the atomistic domain is coupled to a discrete dislocation dynamics domain. The CADD method does not require adaptive refinement since atomistic dislocations would transform into discrete dislocations (and vice versa) when approaching the artificial interface.

Another possible extension would be to include a finite outer domain boundary [26, 18] to allow for other types of boundary conditions, e.g., free surfaces. One appealing application for this could be long periodic cracks nucleating curved dislocations.
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Appendix

A. Continuum model

To define the displacement field, we construct a periodic partition of the fcc lattice into simplices (tetrahedrons) as shown in Figure 10. The partition of atom $\xi$ is then the set of simplices adjacent to $\xi$ and the set of nodes of those simplices is the local interaction range $R_h^\xi$. Let then $\varphi_\xi$ be the standard $P_1$ nodal interpolant with compact support on the partition of $\xi$. The displacement $u$ and its gradient are then defined $\forall x \in \mathbb{R}^3$ as

$$u(x) = \sum_{\xi \in R_h^\xi} \varphi_\xi(x) u(\xi), \quad \nabla u(x) = \sum_{\xi \in R_h^\xi} \nabla \varphi_\xi(x) \otimes u(\xi).$$

Equation (45) is then used to construct the local force constant tensor $K_h$ in (11).

We remark that such a partitioning is not unique, but results (solution, convergence rates, etc.) do not alter qualitatively.

Figure 10: Partitioning of the fcc lattice into simplices

B. Computation of the lattice Green function $G^\infty(r)$

The fundamental lattice Green function is the set of solutions $u_k^k : \Lambda_\infty \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$, $k = 1, \ldots, 3$, to

$$\mathcal{L}_h[u_k^k](\xi) = \sum_{\eta \in R_h^\xi} K_h(\xi - \eta) u_k^k(\eta) = f_k^k(\xi) \quad \text{in } \Lambda_\infty,$$

with $f_k^k(\xi) = \delta_{ik} \delta(\xi) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } (i = k) \wedge (\xi = 0), \\ 0 & \text{else}, \end{cases}$

or component-wise

$$\forall k = 1, \ldots, 3 \quad \delta_{ik} \delta(\xi) = \sum_{\xi \in R_h^\xi} K_h,ij(\xi - \eta) u_j^k(\eta) = K_h,ij * u_j^k,$$

where $*$ is the convolution operator.

To solve this problem, we make use of the semi-discrete Fourier transform $\mathcal{F}$ and its inverse $\mathcal{F}^{-1}$ defined for lattice functions $f(r)$ such that

$$\forall k \in \mathcal{B} \quad \mathcal{F} \{ f \} (k) = \sum_{r \in \Lambda_\infty} f(r) e^{-i(k^T r)},$$

$$\forall r \in \Lambda_\infty \quad \mathcal{F}^{-1} \{ \mathcal{F} \{ f \} \} (r) = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{B}|} \int \mathcal{F} \{ f \} (k) e^{i(k^T r)} \, d\mathcal{B} = f(r),$$

where $\mathcal{B}$ is the Brillouin zone of $\Lambda_\infty$ and $|\mathcal{B}|$ its volume.

We now apply $\mathcal{F}$ on both sides of (47) such that

$$\mathcal{F} \{ \delta_{ik} \delta(\xi) \} = \delta_{ik} = \mathcal{F} \{ K_h,ij * u_j^k \} = \mathcal{F} \{ K_h,ij \} \cdot \mathcal{F} \{ u_j^k \},$$

where we have used the fact that the convolution operator is a multiplication in Fourier space. Inverting $\mathcal{F} \{ K_h,ij \}$ and
applying $F^{-1}$ then yields the components of the lattice Green (tensor) function

$$G^\infty_i(r) = F^{-1}\left\{ F\left\{ K_{h,ij}\right\}^{-1}\right\}.$$  \hfill (51)

For the numerical examples presented here we compute $G^\infty(r)$ for all $r$ up to a cut-off radius $r_{\text{cut}}$ of five lattice constants using numerical integration over the Brillouin zone as described in \[19\]. Outside of $r_{\text{cut}}$ we replace $G^\infty(r)$ with the continuum Green function $G^{\text{cglf}}(r)$. Assuming that lattice and continuum Green functions are asymptotically equivalent, we ensure a sufficiently smooth transition from $G^\infty(r)$ to $G^{\text{cglf}}(r)$ by computing their difference

$$C(r') \approx C = G^\infty(r') - G^{\text{cglf}}(r')$$  \hfill (52)

for some large enough $\|r'\| > r_{\text{cut}}$ such that $C$ is (approximately) independent of $r'$, and subtracting $C$ from all the computed $G^\infty,s$.

We further note that $G^\infty$ is typically not rotational invariant due to anisotropy or a nonsymmetric partitioning (cf. Figure 10). Therefore, we need to rotate $G^\infty$ to the frame of the computational domain. Let $A$ and $A'$ be the normalized basis tensors of $A^\infty$, and the rotated lattice $A'^\infty$, respectively. The rotation tensor $Q$ is then defined through the requirement $Q\mathbb{A}\mathbb{Z} = A'\mathbb{Z}$. The lattice Green function (and likewise the continuum Green function) with respect to the rotated lattice thus reads $G^{\infty'} = Q^T G^\infty Q$.

C. Construction of $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}^l_{s,s}$

$\mathcal{H}$-matrices approximate off-diagonal matrix blocks via low-rank representations using sums of outer (vector) products. That is, for any off-diagonal block $t \times s$ of size $N_l \times N_s$ with numerical rank $k$ we write

$$\left(\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{s,s}^{(p)|s}\right)^{t \times s} \approx \left(\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{s,s}^{(p)}\right)^{t \times s} = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \mathbf{v}_i \otimes \mathbf{w}_i,$$

where $\mathbf{v}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{N_l}$, $\mathbf{w}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{N_s}$, the best rank-$k$ approximation being the well-known singular value decomposition (SVD). Then, if $k$ can be made much smaller compared to the dimensions of $\left(\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{s,s}^{(p)}\right)^{t \times s}$ without sacrificing accuracy, the complexity for storing this block shrinks from $O(N_l N_s)$ to $O(k(N_l + N_s))$, ultimately leading to linear scaling algorithms for approximating $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{s,s}$. We illustrate the necessary steps to achieve this in the following.

To that end, let $I_p$ and $I_s$ be the index sets corresponding to the rows and columns of $\left(\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{s,s}^{(p)}\right)^{t \times s}$, respectively. Further, we associate each index in $I_p, I_s$ with atoms from $A^p, A^s$. For example, the first index in $I_p$ is associated with atom $\xi_1 \in A^p$, and the first index in $I_s$ is associated with atom $\eta_1 \in A^s$.

In the first step, we construct a hierarchy for each index set $I$, a so-called cluster tree $T(I)$, as shown in Figure 11 (a). Each level in this hierarchy represents the same index set, but as a division into subsets. The higher the level, the more subdivisions. Thereby, each subset corresponds to possible row or column indices of a matrix block. The subsets are chosen based on how close the indices are geometrically, using the associate atomic positions. That is, the index sets on the first level corresponds to all the atoms in $A^s$, while the two index sets on the second level would correspond to two halves. This subdivision is repeated a number of times until the desired minimum matrix block dimension $b_{\text{min}}$ is reached. For example, for the cluster tree in Figure 11 the lowest depicted level is level 3 and the element $s \in T(A^s)$ on this level corresponds to the atoms in the lower right corner in the domain above.

In the second step we construct the partition $P$ of the $\mathcal{H}$-matrix from the two cluster trees $T(I_p)$ and $T(I_s)$. To that end, we iteratively retrieve elements $t \in T(I_p)$ and $s \in T(I_s)$ (i.e., subsets of the index sets) to form a potential matrix block $t \times s$ and assess its admissibility for being low-rank, starting from level 0. From the smoothness of the lattice Green function $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{s,s}$ it can be deduced that the admissibility criterion must be (cf. \[8\])

$$\forall s' \in \{s, s^+, s^-\} \quad \min(\text{diam}(t), \text{diam}(s')) \leq \gamma \text{dist}(t, s'),$$  \hfill (54)

with $\gamma$ being a free parameter, where $s^+$ and $s^-$ correspond to the index sets associated with nodes from the neighboring periodic images. Criterion (54) ensures that i) $t$ and $s$ are sufficiently far from each other and ii) the $i$ row vectors formed by all $r_{i,1} = \eta_1 - \xi_i, r_{i,2} = \eta_2 - \xi_i$, etc. are sufficiently close. Thus, when (54) is met, we expect that many of the row vectors of $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{s,s}$ are approximately linear dependent. A physical interpretation of this behavior is given by St. Venant’s principle.

In the final third step we need to build the low-rank representation. In principle, this could be achieved by computing the SVD of every block $t \times s$. However, this requires to diagonalize a matrix and, additionally, all the values of the
matrix \((G^{\text{p}i^*})^{t \times s}\) of \((G^{\text{p}i^*})^{t \times s}\). Step 1. Construction of the cluster trees for the pad and \(i^*\)-atoms. Step 2. Partitioning of \((G^{\text{p}i^*})^{t \times s}\). Step 3. Computation of the low-rank representations for all matrix blocks in the partition; the numbers are the ranks of the matrix blocks and the dark blocks represent dense blocks.

The CUR decomposition given by

\[
(G^{\text{p}i^*})^{t \times s} = (G^{\text{p}i^*})^{t \times s}_{I,J} (G^{\text{p}i^*})^{t \times s-1}_{I,J} (G^{\text{p}i^*})^{t \times s}_{I,J};
\]

where \(I,J\) are well-chosen index sets of length \(k\). The best approximation, which is not too far from the SVD approximation, is attained when the absolute value of the determinant of \((G^{\text{p}i^*})^{t \times s}_{I,J}\) is maximal over all possible \(I\)'s and \(J\)'s \([13]\). What makes CUR attractive is its composition of matrices which are formed from rows and columns of the original matrix \((G^{\text{p}i^*})^{t \times s}\), and so there exist fast algorithms to compute it. Here, we use the adaptive cross approximation [ACA, \([6]\)] which iteratively performs the rank-1 update \(^4\)

\[
R^k = R^{k-1} - \frac{(G^{\text{p}i^*})^{t \times s}_{(i_k,j_k)} (G^{\text{p}i^*})^{t \times s}_{(i_k,j_k)}}{(R^{k-1})_{i_k,j_k}},
\]

with \(R^0 = (G^{\text{p}i^*})^{t \times s}\), up to some \(k\) where the norm of the remainder \(R^k\) is smaller than a prespecified tolerance \(\epsilon\). The approximate matrix is then given by \((G^{\text{p}i^*})^{t \times s}_{(i_k,j_k)} = \sum_k (1/(R^{k-1})_{i_k,j_k}) (G^{\text{p}i^*})^{t \times s}_{(i_k,j_k)} (G^{\text{p}i^*})^{t \times s}_{(i_k,j_k)}\). The crucial point in the ACA to achieve fast convergence (or convergence at all) is the computation of \(i_k\) and \(j_k\). Ideally they should be chosen so that \((R^{k-1})_{i_k,j_k}\) is the maximum element of \((R^{k-1})_{i_k,j_k}\). But this, again, requires the computation of all matrix elements, which scales quadratically. For this purpose, we use the linear-scaling algorithm for approximating \(\max_{i_k,j_k}(R^{k-1})_{i_k,j_k}\) from \([6]\) which heuristically chooses \(i_k\), and then only searches for the maximum element of the row vector \((R^{k-1})_{i_k,:}\) to determine \(j_k\). We found this to work well for our problems.

Our implementation uses HLIBpro [www.hlibpro.com] \([8, 24, 15]\) which has all of the previously described functionalities. Further, all numerical experiments conducted in this work use the minimal block size \(b\text{_{min}} = 20\), the admissibility constant \(\gamma = 2\), and the accuracy bound \(\epsilon = 10^{-5}\).

### D. PAD method

We begin by defining the computational domain of the PAD method as a subset of \(\Lambda\) of size \(l_1 + b/2 \times l_2 \times l_3\), where \(b\) is the magnitude of the Burgers vector. From the lower half-crystal we remove a rectangular cluster of atoms of size

---

[^4]: we iteratively cross out the \(i_k\)-th row and the \(j_k\)-th column of \((G^{\text{p}i^*})^{t \times s}\)
b \times l_1 \times l_2 \times l_3$ next to one of the $x_1$-boundaries. Now we linearly displace the atoms along the $x_1$-direction in the upper half-crystal from 0 to $b/2$ and, vice versa, in the lower half-crystal from 0 to $b/2$. This procedure creates an edge dislocation in the center of a computational domain of size $l_1 \times l_2 \times l_3$. We then apply periodic boundary conditions in the $x_1$-direction and leave free surfaces in the $x_2$-direction.

Upon relaxation of the dislocation core, we fix the pinning points as for the FBC method (cf. Section 4.1). To invoke a bowing of the dislocation under some homogeneous applied shear stress $\tau_{app}$, we set the external force on all atoms $\xi$ on the upper and lower surface to $f_{ext}(\xi) = ((l_3/N)\tau_{app}e_1$ and $f_{ext}(\xi) = -(l_3/N)\tau_{app}e_1$, respectively, where $N$ is the number of upper/lower surface atoms. We terminate the simulation when $|\delta \Pi|^2 | < 10^{-2} \text{eV/Å}.$
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