Metastability as a mechanism for yielding in amorphous solids under cyclic shear
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Considering a recently proposed model for the yielding of amorphous solids under cyclic shear deformation, we show that it can be analysed by mapping it, in the simplest case, to a random walk in a confining potential with an absorbing boundary. The dynamics is governed by the first passage time into the absorbing state, which captures the essential features of the original model, thereby providing insight into the observed robustness of earlier results. Including the possibility of activated escape from absorbing states leads to a unique determination of a threshold energy and yield strain, and further, suggests an appealing approach to understanding fatigue failure.

Yielding in amorphous solids is of importance in understanding their behaviour under applied stress in a variety of materials science and soft matter contexts \cite{1,2}, and has been investigated actively in recent years through a variety of theoretical approaches and computer simulations \cite{3,19}. Simulations have been performed most often employing the athermal quasistatic (AQS) shear \cite{11,14,20,21}, although not exclusively \cite{12,22,23}. Several studies have focused on yielding behaviour of model glasses under cyclic shear deformation \cite{1,11,12,21,24,25,26}, and indicate that yielding occurs as a sharp, discontinuous transition. As in the case of uniform shear \cite{13,16,18}, the yielding behavior displays a strong dependence on the degree of annealing \cite{14,21} and has led to the following “phase-diagram”: With repeated cycles of strain, the energies, as well as other properties, of glasses change and reach a steady state. As a function of applied strain amplitude, the steady state energies of initially poorly annealed glasses first decrease towards a common threshold energy, and then increases discontinuously upon yield. The number of cycles to reach steady states increases as the yielding transition is approached. For higher degrees of annealing, \textit{i.e.} lower energies, the energies do not change until yielding where an abrupt transition to the steady-state occurs. This transition becomes more discontinuous for larger annealing. The properties of the yielded glasses do not depend on the initial degree of annealing, and display strain localisation \cite{12}.

Simplified models for yielding under cyclic shear, particularly AQS shear, have recently been investigated \cite{27,28,29,31}. In \cite{29}, one of us considered the behaviour under athermal cyclic shear of a family of \textit{mesostate} models, meant to describe shear induced changes of state within a single mesoscale block. Remarkably, key features of yielding under cyclic AQS shear and its dependence on the degree of annealing observed in simulations are reproduced robustly by these models.

Two observations in \cite{29} motivate the present study. (1) Starting with a state of some initial energy and considering the outcome of a single cycle of shear there are two possibilities. If the energy at the end the cycle is lower than a limit value that is set by the amplitude of shear, the system is stable with respect to further cycles of shear. Otherwise, subsequent cycles of shear will induce further transitions. In the latter case it was observed that the distribution of energies reached at the end of a cycle does not depend significantly on their values at the beginning of the cycle. (2) Below the yielding point, the average time to reach a stable final state could be accurately predicted by evaluating the time required to reach an absorbing boundary, under stochastic dynamics governed by such an invariant distribution.

These observations suggest that it is useful to model the evolution of the state of an amorphous solid, from cycle to cycle, as a stochastic process that is governed by an invariant distribution, and in the presence of an absorbing region whose extent is determined by the applied shear. We present such a minimal model, that reproduces key qualitative features of the phase diagram of a sheared amorphous solid under cyclic shear. As we discuss, the observed behaviour arises as a manifestation of metastability: The system resides in a steady-state determined by the invariant distribution, with a low but finite transition probability into an absorbing state which is tuned by the imposed shear.

The advantages of studying minimal models are two-fold: (i) It permits a rigorous evaluation of emergent properties of the cyclic shear process and provides insights into the origin of their robust features. (ii) It also permits the inclusion of other features of dynamics in a systematic way. We demonstrate this by considering the role of activated processes that may destabilize the absorbing state, and argue that this offers an appealing approach to understand fatigue failure, a phenomenon of great practical importance, wherein a solid may fail after a large but finite number of cycles of deformation well below the yielding point. We make these considerations more precise below.

\textit{Mesostate Model of a Sheared Amorphous Solid:} To motivate our approach, we consider the \textit{regular model} that was introduced in \cite{29}. The set of possible states for the amorphous solid is labeled by \((\epsilon, n)\), where \(\epsilon \geq 0\) is an
energy and \( n = 0, \pm 1, \pm 2, \ldots \) label distinct states of energy \( \epsilon \). Each pair \((\epsilon, n)\) describes an elastic branch of the system and the net energy of the system subject to a shear strain \( \gamma \) is given by

\[
E_{\epsilon,n}(\gamma) = -\epsilon + \frac{\kappa}{2} (\gamma - \gamma_{\epsilon,n})^2, \quad \gamma_{\epsilon,n} < \gamma < \gamma_{\epsilon,n}^+,
\]

where \( \kappa \) is a constant, \( \gamma_{\epsilon,n} = 2n\sqrt{\kappa} \) the strain at which the energy is minimum, and \( \gamma_{\epsilon,n}^+ = \gamma_{\epsilon,n} \pm \sqrt{\kappa} \) mark the range in strain over which the system in state \((\epsilon, n)\) responds purely elastically. In [22] we termed the elastic branches \((\epsilon, n)\) mesostates and we therefore call this model a mesostate model. Under athermal oscillatory strain, the energy of the system in mesostate \((\epsilon, n)\) will vary according to Eq. (1), as long as the applied shear remains within the stability interval \( \gamma_{\epsilon,n}^-, \gamma_{\epsilon,n}^+ \). When the boundary \( \gamma_{\epsilon,n}^+ \) is reached a (plastic) transition to a new mesostate \((\epsilon', n')\) has to occur. For athermal dynamics, \( E_{\epsilon',n'}(\gamma) < E_{\epsilon,n}(\gamma) \) but transitions with \( \epsilon' > \epsilon \) are not excluded, and are indeed essential for non-trivial dynamics [29]. Considering the mesostates attained at the end of each cycle, the dynamics is effectively one-dimensional (since states stable at zero strain have \( n = 0 \)), and continues until a mesostate \((\epsilon_f, n_f = 0)\) is reached such that \( \gamma_f^2 < \epsilon_f \), and the system will respond purely elastically to subsequent cycles of shear and no further transitions occur. We shall call this the absorption condition. The particular sequence of transitions depends on the details of the dynamics of the mesostate model. As motivated earlier, however, we assume that it is governed by a stationary stochastic process, along the energy axis.

The Ehrenfest model: As an idealisation of the mesostate dynamics described above, we consider a reversible nearest-neighbour Markov chain, having a finite state space \( \mathcal{E} \) of \( 2N + 1 \) mesostates, with energies \( \epsilon_k = \frac{\kappa}{2N} k \), \( k = 0, 1, 2, \ldots, 2N \). The one-step transition probability of the Markov chain are assumed to be independent of \( \gamma \),

\[
P(X_{t+1} = \epsilon_j | X_t = \epsilon_k) = p(\epsilon_k, \epsilon_j) = \mu_{k,j} \text{ with}
\]

\[
p_{k,j} = \left( 1 - \frac{k}{2N} \right) \delta_{k+1,j} + \frac{k}{2N} \delta_{k-1,j}.
\]

Taking \( k \) to represent the number of balls (out of \( 2N \)) in one of two urns, the Markov chain generated by Eq. (2) is a description of the Ehrenfest Urn model [33, 34]; at each time step we pick one of the \( 2N \) balls uniformly and at random and transfer it to the other urn. The reversibility of the Markov chain ensures that a unique invariant measure \( \mu(\epsilon_k) \) exists, the binomial distribution

\[
\mu_k = \mu(\epsilon_k) = \binom{2N}{k} \frac{1}{2^{2N}},
\]

as is readily checked. \( \mu_k \) is unimodular with mean \( \epsilon_{ss} = 1/2 \), the steady-state energy (see below), and typical fluctuations around \( \epsilon_{ss} \) being of order \( 1/\sqrt{N} \). Given \( \gamma \), the absorption condition is obeyed by the set of states \( A_\gamma = \{ \epsilon_j : \gamma_j^2 < \epsilon_j \} \). For the nearest-neighbour random walk initialized outside \( A_\gamma \), the absorbing condition is satisfied when the mesostate in \( A_\gamma \) with smallest energy is reached. We denote this mesostate as \( \gamma = k/\sqrt{2N} \approx \gamma \), for \( N \) large.

Assuming that the initial state \( \epsilon \) is not in the absorbing region, the qualitative features of the dynamics depends on whether \( \epsilon_\gamma \) is less or larger than the steady-state energy \( \epsilon_{ss} \). When \( \epsilon_\gamma < \epsilon_{ss} \), the evolution is “downhill”, and therefore fast, moving the mesostate energy \( \epsilon \) towards larger values. Conversely, when \( \epsilon_\gamma > \epsilon_{ss} \), reaching the absorbing region requires moving “uphill”, since the dynamics on average tends to move the state away from the absorbing region and towards the steady-state \( \epsilon_{ss} \). Consequently, the “uphill” relaxation times into the absorbing region are larger, and display characteristics of metastability, namely a fast evolution towards the region around \( \epsilon_{ss} \), followed by a slower, “uphill” relaxation to the absorbing region. These features are illustrated in Fig. 1(a).

We turn next to the mean first-passage time \( \tau_{abs}(\gamma) \) to reach \( \epsilon_\gamma \) from the steady-state \( \epsilon_{ss} \) in the “uphill” regime,
when $\epsilon_y > \epsilon_{ss}$. For the nearest-neighbour Markov chain it is given in general by \[ (\text{SM}) \] (See Supplemental Material (SM) for further details and derivation)

$$\tau_{abs}(\gamma) = \frac{k_{\gamma}-1}{1+\gamma/2} \frac{\mu_j}{c(j,k_{\gamma})} + \frac{1}{c(\gamma/2,k_{\gamma})} \sum_{j=0}^{\gamma/2} \mu_j, \tag{4}$$

where $\mu_j = \mu(\epsilon_j)$ is the invariant measure, and

$$c(m,n) = \sum_{j=m}^{n-1} \frac{1}{\mu_j p_{j,j+1}} \tag{5}$$

is called the capacitance between $m$ and $n$ \[ (\text{SM}) \]. Metastability emerges when the invariant measure $\mu_j$ is sharply peaked around $\epsilon_{ss}$ and the capacitances in Eq. (4), due to their reciprocal dependence on $\mu_k$, are consequently dominated by the terms furthest away from $\epsilon_{ss}$. This means that (i) in the regime $\epsilon_y > \epsilon_{ss}$, the mean first-passage time $\tau_{abs}(\gamma)$ grows rapidly with $\gamma$, and more importantly (ii) that to leading order this growth depends little on the specific form of the invariant distribution. Consequently, to a good approximation the first passage time itself is exponentially distributed with mean $\tau_{abs}(\gamma)$ \[ (\text{SM}) \].

For the Ehrenfest model the mean hitting time $\tau_{abs}(\gamma)$ can be calculated directly from Eq. (4) and is given for $\epsilon > \epsilon_{ss}$ and $\gamma$ large by \[ (\text{SM}) \] (see SM for a derivation)

$$\tau_{abs}(\gamma) = 2\sqrt{2N} \sqrt{\epsilon_{ss} (1-\epsilon_{ss}) e^{2N I(\epsilon_{ss})} \gamma + 1}, \tag{6}$$

where $I(x) = \ln 2 + x \ln x + (1 - x) \ln(1 - x)$.

We turn next to the phase diagram of the Ehrenfest model. Given a fixed number $\tau$ of driving periods, a strain amplitude $\gamma$ and an initial state $\epsilon_0$, we consider whether the absorbing region $A_\gamma$ is reached within $\tau$-steps or not. The phase diagram can then be expressed in terms of the ensemble average of final energies $\epsilon_f$ reached, given $(\epsilon_0, \gamma)$, which becomes:

$$\epsilon_f = \begin{cases} 
\epsilon_0, & \epsilon_\gamma \leq \epsilon_0, \\
\epsilon_\gamma, & \epsilon_0 < \epsilon_\gamma \leq \epsilon_{ss}, \\
\epsilon_\gamma - (\epsilon_\gamma - \epsilon_{ss}) e^{-\gamma/\tau_{abs}(\gamma)}, & \epsilon_\gamma > \epsilon_{ss},
\end{cases} \tag{7}$$

The first line in Eq. (7) describes the case when the initial state is already in the absorbing region, while the second line corresponds to the case when the (fast) evolution towards steady-state pushes the system into the absorbing region. The third line describes the regime of metastability, where the system almost certainly is in the steady-state with $\epsilon \approx \epsilon_{ss}$, and the probability to reach the absorbing region within the duration of the driving is given by $\exp(-\gamma/\tau_{abs}(\gamma))$.

Combining Eq. (6) with Eq. (7), we obtain an analytical expression describing the phase diagram $\epsilon_f(\epsilon_0, \gamma)$. Fig. 2 shows the phase diagram $\epsilon_f(\epsilon_0, \gamma)$ obtained from a simulation of the Ehrenfest model with $N = 50$ and $\tau = 1000$. The theoretical prediction reproduces the qualitative results obtained from AQS simulations \[ (\text{SM}) \] of a cyclically sheared amorphous solid rather well, including the non-monotonic behavior of $\epsilon_f(\epsilon_0, \gamma)$ for $\epsilon_0 \lesssim 0.6$. The local minimum at $(\gamma_y, \epsilon_{ss})$ is interpreted as the onset of the yielding transition \[ (\text{SM}) \]. Note that for $\epsilon_0 > \epsilon_y$ and $\gamma \geq \gamma_y$, the numerical data points deviate from the theoretical prediction. The reason for this is that in Eq. (7) we have ignored the possibility that states sufficiently close to the absorbing region have an appreciable chance to reach the absorbing state before relaxing to the steady state.

The inset of Fig. 2 shows $\epsilon_f$ as a function of $\gamma$ for $\tau = 10^3, 10^4, \ldots, 10^{10}$ (from left to right and increasingly darker gray shade). We note that the point of upturn of $\epsilon_f$, which we identified as the yield point, shifts to higher $\gamma$ values with increasing $\tau$ but exceedingly slowly. Indeed, from Eq. (7) it is clear that at the yielding point $\tau \sim \tau_{abs}(\gamma_y)$. Using Eq. (7), and employing the quadratic
approximation of $I(x)$ in Eq. (6), we thus obtain, to leading order,
\[ \gamma^2 = \frac{1}{2} \left( 1 + \frac{1}{N} \ln \left( \frac{\pi^{-\frac{1}{2}} \tau}{N} \right) \right), \]
which is consistent with the result derived in [29]. Improved estimates are discussed in the SM. The theoretical prediction of the yielding point are shown in the inset of Fig. 2 (filled circles). The dynamics of the mesostate models can be cast in the form of a Fokker-Planck equation in the continuum limit, as described in the SM.

**Activated Processes**: In the discussion so far, we have treated states with energies $\epsilon > \epsilon_f$ as being stable with respect to cycles of shear, and thus, once such a state is reached, the system remains in that state. This situation changes qualitatively if we consider the possibility of activated escape from such stable states. We first consider the case of a fixed activation time $\tau_{\text{esc}}$. Denoting by $P_A(t)$ and $P_S(t)$ the probabilities that the system is in an absorbing state $A$, respectively steady-state $S$, given that it was initially in state $S$, the evolution of this pair of probabilities follows a two-state continuous-time Markov process,
\[ \dot{P}_S = -\frac{1}{\tau_{\text{abs}}(\gamma)} P_S + \frac{1}{\tau_{\text{esc}}} P_A, \]
\[ \dot{P}_A = -\frac{1}{\tau_{\text{esc}}} P_A + \frac{1}{\tau_{\text{abs}}(\gamma)} P_S, \]
with transition rates $\tau_{\text{esc}}^{-1}$ and $\tau_{\text{abs}}^{-1}(\gamma)$, where $\tau_{\text{abs}}(\gamma)$ is given by [6]. Solving these with the initial condition $P_S(0) = 1$ and $P_A(0) = 0$, the last line of [7] for $\epsilon_f(\epsilon_0, \gamma)$ can now be written as
\[ \epsilon_f = \mu_S \epsilon_{ss} + \mu_A \left[ \epsilon_f - (\epsilon_f - \epsilon_{ss}) e^{-\tau_{\text{eff}}/\tau_{\text{esc}}} \right], \]
where $\tau_{\text{eff}} = \tau_{\text{esc}}^{-1} + \tau_{\text{abs}}^{-1}(\gamma)$ and $\mu_S = \frac{\tau_{\text{abs}}(\gamma)}{\tau_{\text{esc}}} \mu_A = \frac{\tau_{\text{esc}}}{\tau_{\text{esc}} + \tau_{\text{abs}}(\gamma)}$ are the $t \to \infty$ values of $P_S(t)$ and $P_A(t)$ respectively. The inset of Fig. 2 shows the behaviour of $\epsilon_f$ for $\tau_{\text{esc}} = 10^8$ (red curve). The corresponding yield strain (red box), which becomes fixed by $\tau_{\text{esc}}$, turns out to be given simply by Eq. [8] but with $\tau_{\text{esc}}$ in place of $\tau$ (see SM). Eq. [8] suggests that, generically, yielding will be accompanied by a discontinuous change in energy, since the location of yield is determined by $\gamma$ or $\tau_{\text{esc}}$.

Rather than assume $\tau_{\text{esc}}$ arbitrarily, it can be computed by the dynamics of the model under the assumption that an absorbing state $\epsilon_j$ will become unstable on a time scale given by
\[ \tau_j = \tau_0 e^{\beta \Delta E_j}, \]
Here $\Delta E_j = \frac{1}{2} (\epsilon_j - \epsilon_f)$ is the difference between the energy $E = -\epsilon_j + \frac{1}{2} \epsilon_j$ of state $j$ at its stability limit $\gamma^j = \pm \sqrt{\epsilon_j}$ and the energy at strain $\gamma$, $E = -\epsilon_j + \frac{1}{2} \gamma^2$. $\Delta E_j$ is thus the energy barrier that must be overcome by activated processes for the state $\epsilon_j$ to become unstable and $\beta$ is the inverse temperature that determines activation rates. While we write the activation time in a form that corresponds to thermal activation, we do not make any specific assumptions in this work about the origin of the activation. Indeed, the idea of activation as arising from mechanical noise has been extensively studied, as also thermal noise [37,40].

Considering the steady state $S$ with measure $\mu_S$, defining the absorbing region as the set $A = \{ \epsilon_j : \gamma^2 < \epsilon_j \}$, and setting $\epsilon_k = \gamma^2$, the detailed balance conditions, as illustrated in Fig. 2(d), become
\[ \frac{p_{k,j-1}}{\tau_j} \mu_k - \frac{\mu_S}{\tau_{abs}(\gamma)} = 0, \]
\[ \frac{p_{j+1,k}}{\tau_{j+1}} \mu_{j+1} - \frac{p_{j+1,k}}{\tau_j} \mu_j = 0, \]
where $j \geq k$, and $\mu_j, \mu_{j+1}$ are given in terms of $\mu_k$ by
\[ \mu_j = \mu_k \eta^{j-k} \left( \frac{2N}{j} \right) \left( \frac{2N}{k} \right)^{-1}, \]
where $\eta = e^{\frac{2N}{\tau_0}}$, and $\mu_k$ is determined by normalization. Expressed in energies, $\mu_k$ nominally has a maximum at $\epsilon_{\text{max}} = \frac{\beta_0}{16N} + \epsilon_{ss}$. In the case $\epsilon_{\text{max}} < \epsilon_f$, which we do not consider further, $\tau_{\text{esc}}$ is determined by the time scale $\tau_0$ (see SM). Instead, we assume $\epsilon_f < \epsilon_{\text{max}} < 1$. Under this assumption, the probability $\mu_A = \sum_{j \geq k} \mu_j$ that the system is in one of the absorbing states can be evaluated as (see SM for details)
\[ \mu_A = \mu_k \sqrt{\pi N} e^{N \epsilon_f(\epsilon_{\text{max}} - \epsilon_f)^2}. \]
Coarse-graining the Markov process by considering only transitions between $A$ and $S$, the dynamics reduces to (9) and (10) with the $\gamma$-dependent escape rate given by (see SM)
\[ \tau_{\text{esc}} = \tau_0 \sqrt{\pi N} e^{N \epsilon_f(\epsilon_{\text{max}} - \epsilon_f)^2}, \]
and providing thereby an explicit expression for $\tau_{\text{esc}}$ used in Eq. (11). Note that $\tau_{\text{esc}}$ is a decreasing function of $\gamma$ whereas $\tau_{\text{abs}}(\gamma)$ is an increasing function, and thus, their crossing uniquely determines the yielding point.

We finally note that a finite $\tau_{\text{esc}}$ provides a mechanism by which the system may yield also well below the yielding point. This suggests the possibility that the present analysis could be extended to investigate fatigue failure, a phenomenon wherein a material may fail when subjected to repeated, cyclic loading, below the yield point. The number of cycles to such failure is known to increase exponentially with the distance away from the yielding point, a possibility supported by the results here. Extending the present analysis in that direction is the subject of future work.
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