Predicting the failure of two-dimensional silica glasses

Francesc Font-Clos,^{1†}, Marco Zanchi,^{1†} Stefan Hiemer,^{2†}, Silvia Bonfanti^{1,3}, Roberto Guerra¹, Michael Zaiser², Stefano Zapperi,^{1,2,3*}

 ¹ Center for Complexity and Biosystems, Department of Physics, University of Milan, via Celoria 16, 20133 Milano, Italy
 ² Institute of Materials Simulation, Department of Materials Science Science and Engineering, Friedrich-Alexander-University Erlangen-Nuremberg, Dr.-Mack-Str. 77 90762, Fürth, Germany
 ³ CNR - Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche, Istituto di Chimica della Materia Condensata e di Tecnologie per l'Energia

Via R. Cozzi 53, 20125 Milano, Italy

*To whom correspondence should be addressed; E-mail: stefano.zapperi@unimi.it [†] These authors contributed equally.

Being able to predict the failure of materials based on structural information is a fundamental issue with enormous practical and industrial relevance for the monitoring of devices and components. Thanks to recent advances in deep learning, accurate failure predictions are becoming possible even for strongly disordered solids, but the sheer number of parameters used in the process renders a physical interpretation of the results impossible. Here we address this issue and use machine learning methods to predict the failure of simulated two dimensional silica glasses from their initial undeformed structure. We then exploit Gradient-weighted Class Activation Mapping (Grad-CAM) to build attention maps associated with the predictions, and we demonstrate that these maps are amenable to physical interpretation in terms of topological defects and local potential energies. We show that our predictions can be transferred to samples with different shape or size than those used in training, as well as to experimental images. Our strategy illustrates how artificial neural networks trained with numerical simulation results can provide interpretable predictions of the behavior of experimentally measured structures.

Introduction

Predicting material failure based on structural information is a central challenge of materials science and engineering. The issue is particularly thorny in the case of disordered solids where the internal amorphous structure prevents a straightforward identification of isolated defects that could become the seeds for crack nucleation. Guided by molecular dynamics simulations of idealized models of glasses, it is possible to define empirical structural indicators and assess their predictive value by correlation analysis,^{1,2} but using them to make predictions on realistic disordered solids, such as silica glasses or polymer networks, is extremely challenging. Modern machine learning methods provide a promising alternative pathway for the systematic development of structure-based predictions,³ as has been shown in the context of molecular properties,^{4–6} density functional theory force fields,^{7–9} governing equations for dynamical systems and flow¹⁰⁻¹² and dislocation models for crystal plasticity.¹³⁻¹⁵ Applications to glasses have been so far restricted to idealized models, so-called Lennard-Jones glasses, that were analyzed with support vector machines (SVM),¹⁶⁻¹⁸ graph neural networks (GNN)¹⁹ and deep learning.^{20,21} Predictions based on deep learning methods are becoming increasingly accurate but they are also hard to interpret. In the context of glasses, this means that although deep learning may accurately predict when a material will fail, the structural determinants of failure often remain obscure.

Two-dimensional silica glass,²² first observed by depositing a single bilayer of SiO₂ molecules

on a graphene substrate,²³ provides perhaps the simplest example of a disordered solid. Its atomic structure and defect dynamics can be directly observed by electron microscopy²⁴ or atomic force microscopy²⁵ while molecular dynamics simulations can be used to accurately reproduce its structural features and investigate its mechanical properties.^{26–28} Here, we analyze the structure and failure behavior of two-dimensional silica glasses by machine learning methods and illustrate how accurate failure prediction can be achieved while preserving qualitative interpretability of the the results. This is achieved thanks to the use of Gradient-weighted Class Activation Mapping (Grad-CAM)²⁹ which allows us to visualize where the deep neural network focuses its attention when developing a prediction (see Fig. 1).

Results

Atomwise rupture prediction by support vector machine

To obtain training and test sets for the machine learning approaches, we first generate a large number of realistic atomic configurations of silica bilayers with controlled in-plane disorder (see Fig. 1), which is quantified by the standard deviation s^2 of the ring size distribution as in previous studies^{27,30} (see Materials and Methods for details). We consider three sets of data, the first two obtained in such a manner that all samples have the same level of disorder ($s^2 = 0.2$ and $s^2 = 0.3$, respectively), whereas the third contains samples of different disorder, $s^2 \in [0.25, 1]$. Each configuration is composed of N = 3456 atoms arranged in a square box of edge length $L \sim 85$ Å with periodic boundary conditions along the x, y plane. In our molecular dynamics simulations, atomic interactions are described by the Watanabe interatomic potential^{31,32} described in the Materials and Methods section. Starting from the initial configuration, we progressively stretch the simulated sample along the x direction by small displacement steps and subsequent relaxation using the athermal quasistatic (AQS) protocol (see Materials and Methods for details). The configuration is stretched until the system fractures (see Fig. 1 for typical

configurations and Fig. 2 for stress strain curves). For each configuration, we record the fracture strain, the location of the first broken bond, and the final fracture path (for definition of these terms see the Materials and Methods). These quantities will be the targets of our failure predictions.

Following previous machine learning approaches to glasses,^{16–19} we first consider an atomiclevel prediction strategy in which we evaluate atoms one by one, assessing whether their bonding state and atomic surrounding are going to change irreversibly under applied load. In the following, we say that an atom deforms irreversibly when its bonding state changes upon straining, otherwise we define the local deformation as elastic. To take into account systematically all the system symmetries, we do not work directly with atomic positions but compute radial symmetry functions associated with the atomic positions both in the initial configuration and in configuration obtained after application of an affine transformation corresponding to the applied strain. We then apply SVM classification to this data set (see Materials and Methods). In previous approaches,^{16–19} no affine transformation was applied so that the algorithm would yield the same results independently on the loading condition, which is unphysical. Our classification strategy turns out to be quite accurate, with a sensitivity of 99.4% and a specificity of 96%. As shown in Fig. 3A, the SVM is thus able to correctly classify almost 96% of the atoms that deform elastically (true negatives, TN), but since only less than 0.1% atoms deform irreversibly in each configuration (see Fig. 3B for two examples), the problem is heavily unbalanced and thus, despite the high specificity of the method, the rate of false positives (FP) is relatively high (more than 4%). This reflects a generic problem of fracture prediction as the fraction of atoms that participate in the actual fracture process may approach zero in the thermodynamic limit of large samples.

Nevertheless, in the present case the predictor identifies a subset of particles which contains almost all irreversibly deforming atoms, while discarding the vast majority of those deforming elastically. The local approach proves to be fairly robust against specific choice of hyperparameters (see Fig. S1 and the Supplementary Information for more detail) which just leverage a different trade-off between sensitivity and specificity (i.e., true negative and true positive predictions).

Residual neural networks predict disorder

Because of the nature of fracture as a multiscale problem that is equally influenced by local configurations and by system-scale interactions and correlations, methods that focus exclusively on local atomic environments have intrinsic limitations. To overcome the limitations of local methods such as SVM, we resort to global image-based predictions. To this end we generate images of a large number of particle configurations. Together with the corresponding fracture characteristics these images provide training and test sets used by a residual neural network (ResNet) for image-based recognition of structural features such as degree of disorder, and of failure-related features such as fracture strain, fracture initiation location and final crack path (see Materials and Methods for details on the ResNet).

We first train the ResNet to characterize the structure of different samples by identifying the disorder level associated with a given configuration taken from the variable disorder set. As shown in Fig. 3D, the ResNet is then able to accurately predict the disorder level for configurations in the test set. Next, we employ Grad-CAM to draw attention maps associated with the predictions. The example shown in Fig. 3E highlights that the ResNet is focusing on the structural defects in the configuration (i.e. cells that are not hexagonal), which we highlight in Fig. 3F where we color the non-hexagonal cells through a modified Voronoi construction as described in the Materials and Methods. A cross-correlation between the Grad-CAM attention maps and images with colored defects indicates a high Pearson correlation coefficient that decreases for large disorder (see Fig. 3G)). As illustrated in Fig. 1, Grad-CAM maps can be produced for different layers of the ResNet, corresponding to different resolutions r for the images. The best correlation with structural defects is found at higher resolutions (r = 32, Fig. S3).

Residual neural networks predict failure strain

Next, we train the ResNet to predict the failure strain given the image of the undeformed configuration. The results indicate again a high prediction accuracy for weakly disordered samples (Fig. 4A) which then slightly decreases as the disorder level increases (Fig. 4B). We have also investigated how the quality of the prediction degrades as a function of the quality of the training images (see Fig. S2). We then exploit again Grad-CAM to show that for low disorder, accurate fracture strain predictions are obtained by the ResNet by focusing its attention on the region where failure will initiate (see Fig. 4C). This is remarkable since the ResNet was not provided with any information regarding failure location and yet it can predict it after training with failure strains only. We notice, however, that when attention maps become less localized (Fig. 4D), the prediction accuracy decreases.

In general, we observe that a high degree of localization of the Grad-CAM map is typical of samples with low failure strain while delocalized maps are found for samples with high failure strain (Fig. 4E). If we compare the peak of the attention map with the true failure initiation location, we find a small location error for small failure strains which increases with failure strain (Fig. 4E). The maps in Fig. 4C and 4D are obtained at a coarse resolution (r = 4). We also inspect Grad-CAM maps at a fine grained resolution (r = 32) (Fig. 4G) and find they correlate with the local potential energy U of the configurations (see Fig. 4H), particularly in samples with low failure strain (Fig. 4I).

Residual neural networks predict location of failure initiation and crack path

We then train our ResNet on the dataset at fixed disorder to predict the spatial location of fracture initiation (first bond breaking). To this end, we train the ResNet separately using the xand y coordinates, which produces accurate predictions (Fig. 5A). In order to understand which features of the input images are most relevant for predicting the fracture location, we combine the information of the two Grad-CAM maps G_x and G_y to obtain a vector field (G_x, G_y) as shown in 5B). We find that the vector points towards the fracture location and that the divergence field produces band regions parallel to the crack direction. We calculate the error for each location prediction e_r and plot its cumulative distribution for three different levels of fracture strain. We note that again the prediction is more accurate for samples that break at low rather than at medium and high fracture strains (see Fig. 5C and S4).

As a further target for the ResNet, we consider the complete crack path which we represent as an image (see Materials and Methods). We use an image-to-image algorithm inspired by colorization models ³³ so that the ResNet learns the correspondence between an image of the undeformed configuration and an image of the crack obtained after stretching. Fig. 5D shows four examples of model predictions (green shaded areas) overlaid with images of the unstretched configuration where the atoms involved in the crack are highlighted in magenta (see Fig. S5 for more examples). In all cases, the prediction matches very well the actual fracture path. To quantify the accuracy of the predictions, we compute the Matthews correlation coefficient (MCC) as explained in Materials and Methods (Fig. 5E).

Transfer learning

Having demonstrated the capabilities of our ResNet in predicting a series of characteristic features of the failure process, we show how these results can be generalized. Ideally we would like to train the ResNet with a data set and make predictions on slightly different types of data. Consider for instance the issue of predicting the fracture strain and the failure location for a sample that is considerably larger than the samples used for training. This is important since artificial neural networks have memory limitations associated with the size of the images used for training. To illustrate this point, we make predictions on samples four time larger than those used for testing (see Fig. 6A) We then slide a square window over the entire sample and predict the failure strain for each position of the sliding window, defined as the center of the window. The predicted strain is not uniform along the sample and we conjecture that regions of low predicted failure strain are more likely to contain the actual fracture location. The correctness of this assumption can be clearly seen in the examples shown in Fig. S6. We then select the fraction of the sample with lowest predicted strain (green shade) and compute the probability that the actual fracture location is included within the selected area. Selecting only 25% of the area, the probability of a correct prediction is close to 75% (see Fig. 6B).

We can employ a similar *transfer learning* strategy to data extracted from *experimental* TEM images of 2D silica glasses ²³ available from the literature (see Fig. 6CDE). Since fracture tests were not performed experimentally, we use the ResNet model that was trained to predict disorder and apply it to experimental data. Fig. 6CDE displays the associated Grad-CAM attention maps that highlight again the topological defects. The predicted values of the disorder are also in good agreement with direct measurements of the ring size distributions. We also use the experimental data to perform SVM classification and display in Fig. 6CDE the atom that are likely to deform irreversibly upon strain in the horizontal direction. Notice that the atoms predicted to be prone to failure according to the SVM are clustered in area of high attention according to the Grad-CAM. Similar results are obtained considering strain in the vertical direction.

Conclusions

In conclusion, we have exploited different machine learning strategies to predict the failure behavior of silica glasses. Our results highlight the limitations of commonly used atom-level local models that in the case of fracture unavoidably give rise to a large number of false positive predictions, but have clear advantages in terms of algorithmic scalability. Global image based models provide instead reliable predictions and thanks to Grad-CAM maps allow us to visually inspect the structural determinants of failure and to correlate them with physical and topological signatures of the atomic microstructure. Our results illustrate that it is possible to link the failure properties of glasses to their structure by using machine learning models trained on large scale atomistic simulations. In particular, it is possible to reliably identify 'zones of interest' where cracks are likely to nucleate and propagate. This may pave the way for novel hybrid multi-scale simulation schemes which combine numerical efficiency with high accuracy: The capability to *a priori* identify those regions of a sample (here fracture initiation site and fracture path) which require a physically accurate description allows to use hybrid simulation schemes which combine such accurate descriptions with coarser ones of the rest of the sample, such as to significantly reduce numerical cost without compromising numerical accuracy.

Materials and Methods

Generation of glassy configurations

Glassy configurations are generated in two steps: First, a two-dimensional network of Si-only atoms with pre-fixed target ring-size distribution is created using spring-like potentials in dual space. Then, the full silica bilayer is formed and relaxed using the Watanabe potential.³¹ The disorder of the silica sample is therefore controlled by a single parameter s^2 , the variance of the ring-size distribution, which we call simply "disorder level" throughout the manuscript. We

create three datasets of 1000 configurations each with three different levels of disorder: two at a fixed disorder levels $s^2 = 0.2$ and $s^2 = 0.3$, and one with varying levels of disorder, with s^2 uniformly distributed between 0.25 and 1. Below we include details of the two-step procedure. The variable disorder dataset has been divided into three groups of increasing disorder level, labeled as Low ($s^2 \in [0.25, 0.5)$), Medium ($s^2 \in [0.5, 0.75)$) and High ($s^2 \in [0.75, 1]$) along the manuscript. The fixed disorder dataset, instead, has been divided according to the fracture strain into three groups of the same size. Since in this case the distribution of fracture strain is not uniform, the obtained intervals are of unequal bin size, and have been labelled as Low ($\epsilon < 0.16$), Medium ($0.16 \le \epsilon \le 0.18$), and High ($\epsilon > 0.18$).

We use a Monte Carlo dual-switch procedure^{27,30} to generate a two-dimensional network representing Si atoms with a preset ring-size distribution and nearest-neighbour ring-size correlations (known as Aboav-Weaire law, the experimetally observed tendency of large rings to be close to small rings). Following,^{27,30} the position of the Si atoms is adjusted by minimizing a spring-like potential in the dual space of ring-to-ring interactions after each Monte Carlo step. We use a Monte Carlo temperature of 10^{-4} and $N = 10^4$ Monte-Carlo steps and a value of $\alpha = 1/3$ for the Aboav-Weaire law, which corresponds to experimental observations.²⁷

After the above preparation, oxygen atoms are added midway each Si-Si bond, and the resulting structure is then isotropically rescaled so that the average Si-O bond-length becomes close to the rest length of ~ 1.65 Å. The 2D silica is finally formed by duplicating the soobtained layer and by connecting the Si atoms in the two layers with oxygen atoms, see Fig. 1A. Each structure typically consists of 3456 atoms arranged in a box of side $L \sim 85$ Å, slightly variable with the amount of disorder. Periodic boundaries were applied along the x, y directions, corresponding to the silica sheet plane. Finally, the whole configuration is relaxed using the Watanabe potential,³¹ see the details in the following section. All the simulations were performed using LAMMPS.³⁴ We then calculate the coordination number for each atom using a cutoff of 2.2 Å, and verify that it is equal to 4 for Si atom and 2 to for O atom. We discard from the analysis the few samples where some atoms are incorrectly coordinated. This ensures that all the bonds are of the Si-O-Si type.

Interatomic potential

The Watanabe potential for the silica class has the advantage of implicitly replacing the usual Coulomb interaction term with a coordination-based bond softening function for Si-O atoms that accounts for environmental dependence, which is of particular importance for surface effects which are prominent in quasi-2D systems.

The general form of the potential consists of two terms: a two-body interaction that depends on distance and a Stillinger-Webber like three-body interaction. Specifically, the total potential energy Φ is written as:

$$\Phi = \sum_{i} \sum_{j>i} \epsilon f_2 + \sum_{i} \sum_{j\neq i} \sum_{k>j,k\neq i} \epsilon f_3 \tag{1}$$

The two-body interaction term between the *i*-th and *j*-th atom is given by:

$$f_2(r_{ij}) = g_{ij}A_{ij}\left(\frac{B_{ij}}{r_{ij}^{p_{ij}}} - \frac{1}{r_{ij}^{q_{ij}}}\right)\exp\left(\frac{1}{r_{ij} - a_{ij}}\right)$$
(2)

where r_{ij} is the distance between the *i*-*j* pairs.

The detailed parameter values are reported in Ref. 35. g_{ij} is the softening function depending on the coordination numbers of the *i* and *j* atoms:

$$g_{ij} = \begin{cases} g_{Si}(z_i)g_O(z_j) & i = \mathrm{Si}, j = \mathrm{O} \\ g_{Si}(z_j)g_O(z_i) & i = \mathrm{O}, j = \mathrm{Si} \\ 1 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$
(3)

and

$$g_{Si}(z) = \begin{cases} (p_1\sqrt{z+p_2} - p_4) \exp[p_3/(z-4)] + p_4 & z < 4\\ p_4 & z \ge 4 \end{cases}$$
(4)

$$g_O(z) = \frac{p_5}{\exp[(p_6 - z)/p_7] + 1} \exp[p_8(z - p_9)^2]$$
(5)

where z_i and z_j are the coordination numbers of atoms *i* and *j*. The coordination number z_i is defined by a cutoff function f_c :

$$z_i = \sum_{j \text{ s.t. } i \neq j} f_c(r_{ij}) \tag{6}$$

with

$$f_c(r) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } r < R - D \\ 1 - \frac{r - R + D}{2D} + \frac{\sin[\pi(r - R + D)/D]}{2\pi} & \text{if } R - D \le r < R + D \\ 0 & \text{if } r \ge R + D \end{cases}$$
(7)

with R and D parameters.

The three-body interaction term depending on the positions of i-th, j-th, and k-th atoms, has the following form:

$$f_3(r_{ij}, r_{ik}, \theta_{jik}) = \Lambda_1(r_{ij}, r_{ik})\Theta_1(\theta_{jik}) + \Lambda_2(r_{ij}, r_{ik})\Theta_2(\theta_{jik})$$
(8)

where r_{ik} is the distance between *i*-*k* pairs. θ_{jik} is the bond angle between r_{ij} and r_{ik} . For n = 1, 2 we can write

$$\Lambda_{n} = \lambda_{n,jik}(z_{i}) \exp\left[\frac{\gamma_{n,jik}^{ij}}{r_{ij} - a_{n,jik}^{ij}} + \frac{\gamma_{n,jik}^{ij}}{r_{ik} - a_{n,jik}^{ik}}\right] \Theta_{n} = (\cos\theta_{jik} - \cos\theta_{n,jik}^{0})^{2} + \alpha_{n,jik}(\cos\theta_{jik} - \cos\theta_{n,jik}^{0})^{3} \lambda_{n,jik}(z) = \mu_{n,jik}(1 + \nu_{n,jik}\exp[-\xi_{n,jik}(z - z_{n,jik}^{0})^{2}])$$
(9)

Straining of samples

After an initial atomic relaxation of the silica structures (see Fig. 1B left panel), in which the cell vectors length was allowed to vary in order to minimize pressure, fracture tests were simulated by performing iterative expansion and relaxation, via the athermal quasistatic (AQS) protocol as following. The silica structure was expanded in the x direction by $\Delta x = 5 \cdot 10^{-5} L_x^0$, with L_x^0 the initial size of the box along x. Subsequently, a damped dynamics with viscous rate of 1 ps⁻¹ was performed until the maximum force was below the threshold of 10^{-8} eV/Å . Such procedure was repeated while monitoring the potential energy of each atom in order to detect any

drop > 0.1 eV, corresponding to a bond breaking. The potential energy per atom is computed considering its interaction with all other atoms in the simulation. When the energy contribution is produced by a set of atoms (e.g. 3 atoms for the 3-body interaction term), that energy is divided in equal portions among each atom in the set. For a covalent system subject to strain, the potential energy per atom must always grow with the strain unless some bond breaking occurs. We also verify that for the atom associated to the first bond breaking, in the terms discussed above, the distance from its nearest neighbors suddenly changes after the energy drop. In particular, we check that the O atom remains bound to a single Si atom, with a bond length that we verify to be < 1.7 Å, corresponding to the rest length, while the other Si is located at much larger distance, > 2.2 Å. The fact that an O atom, initially equidistant between two Si atoms suddenly moves towards one of the two is an unequivocal sign of bond breaking. We refer to that situation whenever the 'bond breaking' concept is recalled in the text.

Configurations were saved in the correspondence of the first bond breaking (see Fig. 1B central panel) and in the correspondence of the full fracture formation (see Fig. 1B right panel).

Generation of images of silica configurations

To generate images from the silica configurations for the machine learning tasks, we add Gaussian noise at the Si atom positions and a uniform background noise over all the sample, to then create a two-dimensional heatmap of the required pixel dimensions, in our case 128 pixels per side.

Data augmentation

We use standard data augmentation techniques on our generated images to increase the sample size of our datasets. Beyond the standard horizontal and vertical flips, we leverage the periodic boundary conditions (PBC) of the system under study, which allow us to use translations over

PBC as well. To be precise, we apply 64 random translations over PBC to each original image. Of these, 32 are flipped horizontally and 32 are flipped vertically (so that 16 are flipped both vertically and horizontally). The data augmentation has two advantages: first: it increases the number of images we can feed to the machine learning algorithms, which otherwise would be a limitation since AQS simulations are computationally expensive; and second, it allows to average predictions over the 64 copies of each image, taking care of the inverse transformations if the prediction is a position. We denote averages of predictions over data augmentation as $\langle \cdot \rangle_{DA}$). Taking the average of predictions over data augmentation can be seen as a form of noise cancelling trick that leads to more robust predictions.

Reconstruction of silica configurations from experimental TEM images

We reconstruct a silica glass configuration from the experimental TEM image shown in Fig. 6CDE, taken from Ref. 23, as follows:

- 1. We manually select a region of interest where the Si atoms can be clearly seen.
- 2. We use the trackpy python package to detect the position of Si atoms, since they are brighter than O atoms. In particular, we use the function trackpy.locate with a diameter parameter of 11.
- 3. We manually add (remove) missing (spurious) Si atoms.
- 4. We infer the bonds using a modified version of the Voronoi diagram that takes into account the coordination number of Si atoms.

In this way, from an experimental TEM image we obtain a collection of Si atom positions and pairs of atoms that form bonds, which can be used in molecular dynamics simulations as well as for our Grad-CAM analysis, as shown in Fig. 6C,D,E.

Voronoi-like method

In order to quantify the spatial distribution of defected cells in the silica lattice, we propose an algorithm that is able to automatically visualize those particular cells starting only from the collection of the coordinates of the Si atoms. In particular, this algorithm exploits the Voronoi diagram and the Delaunay triangulation. At first we build the Voronoi diagram for the set of the Si atoms coordinates. Taking into account the fact that the coordination number for Si is three in a silica monolayer, we notice that a Si atom shares the three widest sides of its Voronoi cell with the three Si atoms which are physically bonded to it. This allows to reconstruct all the physical Si-Si bonds in the silica configuration. Then we build the Delaunay triangulation for the set of the Si atoms coordinates. Some of the sides of those triangles are the physical Si-Si bonds. We notice that an ensamble of triangles, which is enclosed only by physical Si-Si bonds and which does not contain any of the physical Si-Si bonds inside it, is a silica lattice cell. So, merging those triangles with an iterative process, we find the list of Si atoms which realize each real lattice cell. This new knowledge allows us to recognize which cells are defected or not.

Machine learning models

We use custom architectures based on residual neural networks (ResNet)³⁶ and image-to-image algorithms inspired by colorization models³³ to tackle four different learning tasks: disorder learning, fracture strain learning, fracture location learning and full fracture path learning. In what follows, we list technical details of each architecture and associated parameters, as well as details on the training procedure.

For the disorder, fracture strain and fracture location learning tasks we use a ResNet50 model as implemented in the keras python library modified to perform regression instead of classification, as explained in.³⁷ The modification, in short, consists in substituting the last standard "softmax" layer typical of classification tasks by a fully dense layer, allowing the

model to be trained on regression tasks. Data is randomly split into training set (72% of data), validation set (10% of data) and test set (20% of data). Data augmentation is performed after data splitting, which leads to a total of 41 792 images for the train test, 4 608 images for the validation set and 11 584 images for the test set for the fixed disorder $s^2 = 0.2$ dataset. For the case of variable disorder $s^2 \in [0.25, 1]$, we work with a total of 27 968 images for the train set, 3 136 images for the validation set and 7 808 images for the test set. In all three tasks we train the model for 100 epochs using the ADAM optimizer, saving the validation loss at each step, and keep the model weights of the epoch with lowest validation loss. We do not tune any additional parameter. All figures shown in the manuscript correspond to the test set, unused during training. The loss function is a simple mean squared error for the disorder and strain test. The location prediction, however, requires a custom loss function \mathcal{L} that has an additional bias term and that takes into account periodic boundary conditions when computing distances. In particular, we use a two-term loss function $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_1 + \mathcal{L}_2$, where the first term

$$\mathcal{L}_1 = \left\langle \left\| y - \hat{y} \right\|_{\text{PBC}}^2 \right\rangle \tag{10}$$

is the mean squared error between the targets y and the predictions \hat{y} , and $\|\cdot\|_{PBC}$ is an Euclidean norm taking into account the periodic boundary conditions of the system, that is, along both the x and y coordinates. The second term

$$\mathcal{L}_2 = \left(\langle y \rangle - \langle \hat{y} \rangle \right)^2 \tag{11}$$

is an overall bias term, the (squared) difference between the average target and the average position. In practice, we have observed faster model convergence when adding this term to the loss function.

For the fracture path prediction task, instead, we use an image-to-image model inspired by image colorization algorithms.³³ To be precise, we couple the ResNet50 model with upsampling and convolutional layers, see Fig. S7 for details. In summary, the image-to-image model starts

with a 128x128 pixels image, has a central core of 4x4 pixels with 2048 filters, and then grows again to build the target 128x128 pixels image. The target images are a noisy version of the input silica image where only fracture atoms are shown. The noisy modification consists in applying a gaussian filter of standard deviation $\sigma = 4$ in the x and y directions, and then adding random uniform noise in the range (0, 0.25). Fig. S7 shows some examples of noisy targets and associated predictions. The use of noisy targets avoids that the image-to-image model to concentrates on the uniform background (most of the image) instead of the fracture atoms, as would happen otherwise.

Additional to the ResNet approach, we use support vector machines (SVM) to predict the atoms involved in the first bond break. The SVM gets fed a vector of symmetry functions encoding the neighborhood of an atom to decide wether it is involved in the first bond break. The rational behind this approach is to see how good one can perform in this setting with a simple model and straight forward physics guided local descriptors. The descriptors are radial symmetry functions calculated from the undeformed initial configuration as well as the affine transformed initial configuration in order to incorporate the underlying physical symmetries. The affine transformation is applied by scaling the atoms with the cell in order to mimic the loading. Without this transformation the symmetry functions are entirely rotation invariant which is wrong in the context of mechanics, as the local atomic neighborhood is highly anisotropic with regards to different load directions. As the SVM makes prediction for a single atom and receives information about the local neighborhood of a single atom, it may end up suggesting more than two atoms within the same simulation box to undergo bond breaking. In plain words, this estimator has no concept of an atomic system, just single atoms.

Grad-CAM Attention

Grad-CAM was first introduced in²⁹ in order to understand the decisions made in Convolutional Neural Networks (ResNet) with visual explanations. The basic idea of Grad-CAM is to highlight which parts of an image are of importance to obtain the prediction. Let us summarise here how Grad-CAM works. Denoting the input image as $\vec{\gamma}$, the target as t, and the whole ResNet simply as $F(\cdot)$, we can write:

$$t = F(\vec{\gamma}) \tag{12}$$

The target t can represent both a qualitative or a quantitative variable, depending on the problem at hand. While Grad-CAM was first introduced and applied to classification problems (where t would be a qualitative variable), in the present work we modify the standard Grad-CAM algorithm to deal with regression problems. Therefore, in what follows t represents a quantitative variable and is a scalar quantity. Let be $f_{ij}^k(\vec{\gamma})$ the i, j pixel of the filter k of a certain convolutional layer in the ResNet. Usually one takes f as the last convolutional block, since it tends to collect the most important features, but the following treatment can be extended to any convolutional block of the ResNet. We can define the global importance I^k of the filter f^k for the prediction y as:

$$I^{k} = \frac{\sum_{ij} \frac{\partial t}{\partial f_{ij}^{k}}}{Z}$$
(13)

where the gradient is obtained with back-propagation and Z is a normalization constant. Summing over all filters and averaging over data augmentation, we obtain the Grad-CAM Attention for a given pixel (i, j):

$$G_{ij} = \left\langle \left| \sum_{k} I^{k} f_{ij}^{k} \right| \right\rangle_{\mathrm{DA}}$$
(14)

Throughout the manuscript we also use G to denote Grad-CAM Attention of an unspecified pixel, omitting the (i, j) sub-index for simplicity.

Resolution of Grad-CAM Attention heatmaps

A Grad-CAM Attention heatmap G has an associated resolution value r, which depends on the convolutional block being used. For instance, when using the last convolutional block to compute G we obtain a heatmap G_{ij} of 4×4 possibly different values, so the Grad-CAM resolution in that case is r = 4. Figure 1D shows the resolution of some example Grad-CAM heatmaps, from r = 32 to r = 8. Figure S3 shows correlation coefficients between cell defects D and Grad-CAM attention values G computed at different resolution levels r, from r = 32(first convolutional block) to r = 4 (last convolutional block).

Grad-CAM attention fields

The Grad-CAM attention *field* shown in Figure 5B, (G_x, G_y) , is a two-dimensional vector field build from the Grad-CAM attention values G_x, G_y of two independent ResNet models: one was trained on the x component of the fracture location and the other trained on the y component.

Definition of participation ratio

We define the participation ratio ϕ^{38} of a Grad-CAM map G_{ij} as

$$\phi = \frac{\left[\sum_{i,j=1}^{N} G_{ij}^{2}\right]^{2}}{N^{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^{N} G_{ij}^{4}}$$
(15)

where G_{ij} is the Grad-CAM attention value of pixel (i, j) and N^2 is the number of pixels of the image, (in our case N = 128). The participation ratio, in this context, can be understood as a measure of "globalization" of the attention map, so that low ϕ values correspond to very localized attention maps G_{ij} , that is, to cases where the Grad-CAM model focuses on a particular region of the image to make its predictions; and conversely high values of ϕ correspond to cases of high globalization, where the model needs to make use of the entire image to reach a prediction.

Correlation coefficients

The correlations between Grad-CAM attention G and cell defects D shown in Figure 3G and Figure S3 are computed as the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient across pixels. That is, for each pixel (i, j) we associate a Grad-CAM attention value G_{ij} and a cell defect value D_{ij} , which is 1 if the pixel is part of a defected cell, and 0 otherwise. The correlation between Grad-CAM attention G and potential energy U shown in Figure 4I, instead, is computed at the atom level, where for each atom we associate a potential energy U and a Grad-CAM value G at the corresponding location.

To quantify the agreement between the prediction of the colorization model and the fracture atoms in the fracture path prediction task, we first need to threshold the image prediction to obtain a per-atom binary prediction. That is, each atom is either a fracture atom or not (ground truth), and is either predicted as fracture or not. The threshold is chosen so that atoms that lie on the top 10% prediction intensity (brightest green area) are classified as fracture atoms. Then, the Matthews correlation coefficient is computed as implemented in the scikit-learn python package.

Symmetry Functions and Support Vector Machines

We compute the radial symmetry functions

$$\psi_i(\mu) = \sum_{j}^{N} e^{(r_{ij} - \mu)^2 / \delta^2}$$
(16)

for particles of the initial undeformed configuration and for particles of an affine transformed configuration according to the deformation gradient. The off-diagonal elements of the deformation gradient are zero while the diagonals are $(1 + \epsilon, 1, 1)$ since we apply uniaxial strain to our samples. The affine deformation causes this approach to be sensitive to the orientation of the atomic neighborhood with respect to the external loading while remaining independent to translation and rotation. We calculate the symmetry functions separately for each particle type relation (Si-Si, Si-O, O-O) as is common in this approach.¹⁶ To perform predictions with these newly created features, support vector machines are used.

Code and data availability

The codes used in this paper are available at https://github.com/ComplexityBiosystems.

Acknowledgments

SH, MZ and SZ acknowledge support from the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) Grant no. 1 ZA 171/14-1. SH also acknowledges participation in the training programme of the FRASCAL graduate school (DFG, German Research Foundation) -377472739/GRK 2423/1-2019.

References

- ¹Richard, D., Ozawa, M., Patinet, S., Stanifer, E., Shang, B., Ridout, S., Xu, B., Zhang, G., Morse, P., Barrat, J.-L., et al. Predicting plasticity in disordered solids from structural indicators. *Physical Review Materials* **4**(11), 113609 (2020).
- ² Schwartzman-Nowik, Z., Lerner, E., and Bouchbinder, E. Anisotropic structural predictor in glassy materials. *Physical Review E* **99**(6), 060601 (2019).
- ³ Hiemer, S. and Zapperi, S. From mechanism-based to data-driven approaches in materials science. *Materials Theory* **5**(1), 1–9 (2021).
- ⁴ Rupp, M., Tkatchenko, A., Müller, K.-R., and Von Lilienfeld, O. A. Fast and accurate modeling of molecular atomization energies with machine learning. *Physical review letters* **108**(5), 058301 (2012).

- ⁵ Schütt, K. T., Kindermans, P.-J., Sauceda, H. E., Chmiela, S., Tkatchenko, A., and Müller, K.-R. Schnet: A continuous-filter convolutional neural network for modeling quantum interactions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1706.08566* (2017).
- ⁶ Gastegger, M., Schütt, K. T., and Müller, K.-R. Machine learning of solvent effects on molecular spectra and reactions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.14942* (2020).
- ⁷ Behler, J. and Parrinello, M. Generalized neural-network representation of high-dimensional potential-energy surfaces. *Physical review letters* **98**(14), 146401 (2007).
- ⁸ Unke, O. T., Chmiela, S., Sauceda, H. E., Gastegger, M., Poltavsky, I., Schütt, K. T., Tkatchenko, A., and Müller, K.-R. Machine learning force fields. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.07067* (2020).
- ⁹ Chmiela, S., Tkatchenko, A., Sauceda, H. E., Poltavsky, I., Schütt, K. T., and Müller, K.-R. Machine learning of accurate energy-conserving molecular force fields. *Science advances* **3**(5), e1603015 (2017).
- ¹⁰ Champion, K., Lusch, B., Kutz, J. N., and Brunton, S. L. Data-driven discovery of coordinates and governing equations. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **116**(45), 22445– 22451 (2019).
- ¹¹ Brunton, S. L., Proctor, J. L., and Kutz, J. N. Discovering governing equations from data by sparse identification of nonlinear dynamical systems. *Proceedings of the national academy of sciences* **113**(15), 3932–3937 (2016).
- ¹² Rudy, S., Alla, A., Brunton, S. L., and Kutz, J. N. Data-driven identification of parametric partial differential equations. *SIAM Journal on Applied Dynamical Systems* 18(2), 643–660 (2019).

- ¹³ Salmenjoki, H., Alava, M. J., and Laurson, L. Machine learning plastic deformation of crystals. *Nature communications* 9(1), 1–7 (2018).
- ¹⁴ Salmenjoki, H., Laurson, L., and Alava, M. J. Probing the transition from dislocation jamming to pinning by machine learning. *Materials Theory* 4(1), 1–16 (2020).
- ¹⁵ Steinberger, D., Song, H., and Sandfeld, S. Machine learning-based classification of dislocation microstructures. *Frontiers in Materials* 6, 141 (2019).
- ¹⁶ Cubuk, E. D., Schoenholz, S. S., Rieser, J. M., Malone, B. D., Rottler, J., Durian, D. J., Kaxiras, E., and Liu, A. J. Identifying structural flow defects in disordered solids using machine-learning methods. *Physical review letters* **114**(10), 108001 (2015).
- ¹⁷ Cubuk, E. D., Ivancic, R., Schoenholz, S. S., Strickland, D., Basu, A., Davidson, Z., Fontaine, J., Hor, J. L., Huang, Y.-R., Jiang, Y., et al. Structure-property relationships from universal signatures of plasticity in disordered solids. *Science* **358**(6366), 1033–1037 (2017).
- ¹⁸ Du, T., Liu, H., Tang, L., Sørensen, S. S., Bauchy, M., and Smedskjaer, M. M. Predicting fracture propensity in amorphous alumina from its static structure using machine learning. *ACS nano* (2021).
- ¹⁹ Bapst, V., Keck, T., Grabska-Barwińska, A., Donner, C., Cubuk, E. D., Schoenholz, S. S., Obika, A., Nelson, A. W., Back, T., Hassabis, D., et al. Unveiling the predictive power of static structure in glassy systems. *Nature Physics* **16**(4), 448–454 (2020).
- ²⁰ Swanson, K., Trivedi, S., Lequieu, J., Swanson, K., and Kondor, R. Deep learning for automated classification and characterization of amorphous materials. *Soft matter* **16**(2), 435–446 (2020).

- ²¹ Fan, Z. and Ma, E. Predicting orientation-dependent plastic susceptibility from static structure in amorphous solids via deep learning. *Nature communications* **12**(1), 1–13 (2021).
- ²² Heyde, M., Shaikhutdinov, S., and Freund, H.-J. Two-dimensional silica: Crystalline and vitreous. *Chemical Physics Letters* 550, 1–7 (2012).
- ²³ Huang, P. Y., Kurasch, S., Srivastava, A., Skakalova, V., Kotakoski, J., Krasheninnikov, A. V., Hovden, R., Mao, Q., Meyer, J. C., Smet, J., et al. Direct imaging of a two-dimensional silica glass on graphene. *Nano letters* **12**(2), 1081–1086 (2012).
- ²⁴ Huang, P. Y., Kurasch, S., Alden, J. S., Shekhawat, A., Alemi, A. A., McEuen, P. L., Sethna, J. P., Kaiser, U., and Muller, D. A. Imaging atomic rearrangements in two-dimensional silica glass: watching silica's dance. *Science* **342**(6155), 224–227 (2013).
- ²⁵ Lichtenstein, L., Heyde, M., and Freund, H.-J. Atomic arrangement in two-dimensional silica: from crystalline to vitreous structures. *The Journal of Physical Chemistry C* **116**(38), 20426–20432 (2012).
- ²⁶ Bamer, F., Ebrahem, F., and Markert, B. Athermal mechanical analysis of stone-wales defects in two-dimensional silica. *Computational Materials Science* **163**, 301–307 (2019).
- ²⁷ Ebrahem, F., Bamer, F., and Markert, B. Vitreous 2D silica under tension: From brittle to ductile behaviour. *Materials Science and Engineering: A* 780, 139189 (2020).
- ²⁸ Ebrahem, F., Bamer, F., and Markert, B. Stone–wales defect interaction in quasistatically deformed 2d silica. *Journal of Materials Science* 55(8), 3470–3483 (2020).
- ²⁹ Selvaraju, R. R., Cogswell, M., Das, A., Vedantam, R., Parikh, D., and Batra, D. Grad-cam: Visual explanations from deep networks via gradient-based localization. In *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*, 618–626, (2017).

- ³⁰ Morley, D. O. and Wilson, M. Controlling disorder in two-dimensional networks. J. Phys. Condens. Matter 30(50), 50LT02 (2018).
- ³¹ Watanabe, T., Yamasaki, D., Tatsumura, K., and Ohdomari, I. Improved interatomic potential for stressed si, o mixed systems. *Applied surface science* **234**(1-4), 207–213 (2004).
- ³² Bonfanti, S., Guerra, R., Mondal, C., Procaccia, I., and Zapperi, S. Elementary plastic events in amorphous silica. *Physical Review E* **100**(6), 060602 (2019).
- ³³ Baldassarre, F., Morín, D. G., and Rodés-Guirao, L. Deep koalarization: Image colorization using CNNs and Inception-ResNet-v2. arXiv preprint arXiv:1712.03400 (2017).
- ³⁴ Plimpton, S., Crozier, P., and Thompson, A. Lammps-large-scale atomic/molecular massively parallel simulator. *Sandia National Laboratories* 18, 43 (2007).
- ³⁵ Bonfanti, S., Guerra, R., Mondal, C., Procaccia, I., and Zapperi, S. Universal low-frequency vibrational modes in silica glasses. *Physical Review Letters* **125**(8), 085501 (2020).
- ³⁶ He, K., Zhang, X., Ren, S., and Sun, J. Deep residual learning for image recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 770–778, (2016).
- ³⁷ Bonfanti, S., Guerra, R., Font-Clos, F., Rayneau-Kirkhope, D., and Zapperi, S. Automatic design of mechanical metamaterial actuators. *Nat. Commun.* **11**(1), 4162 (2020).
- ³⁸ Lerner, E., Düring, G., and Bouchbinder, E. Statistics and properties of low-frequency vibrational modes in structural glasses. *Physical review letters* **117**(3), 035501 (2016).



Figure 1: Schematic of system and algorithms. A) Perspective view of the silica glass bilayers: silica atoms are colored in cyan and oxygen ones in red. B) Schematic representation of the fracture formation under increasing tensile strain from left to right: non-strained (left panel), first plastic event corresponding to a bond breaking fracture (central panel) and fracture path (right panel). C) Local learning approach that uses Support Vector Machine to predict the elastic/plastic nature of individual atoms. D) Global learning approach which uses a Resent model to predict fracture strain, location and the full fracture path. The approach also allows for the interpretation of the model decisions using attention maps (right side of panel).



Figure 2: Straining of silica samples A) Example strain-stress curves for ten silica samples. The stress values are computed assuming a volume of the system of $L_x \cdot L_y \cdot H$, where L_x and L_y are the cell longitudinal and transversal size of the initially relaxed (unstrained) configuration, while the vertical size H was taken as the distance between the two Si-O₂ layers. B) Distribution of fracture strain ϵ , defined by the first bond breaking event, for the dataset of silica samples with disorder $s^2 = 0.2$, see Methods for details.



Figure 3: **Machine learning classifies local and global disorder**. A) Confusion matrix for the prediction of particles involved in the first bond fracture done by the support vector classifier. It can be clearly seen that a subset of particles is identified by the ML algorithm which includes almost all particles involved in the first bond fracture. B, C) Prediction of an atomistic system with disorder level $s^2 = 0.2$, with coloring scheme according to the confusion matrix in A. D) Prediction by the ResNet matches the true disorder level s^2 of Silica glass sheets. E) Example of silica sample (black-and-white image) superimposed with the Grad-CAM Attention map G (orange shades). F) Same example sample as in E, showing the defected regions (non-hexagonal cells, D = 1, colored in orange) and the non-defected ones (hexagonal cells, D = 0, colored in gray). G) Boxplot of correlation between Grad-CAM attention G and cell defects D in the variable-disorder dataset, for low ($s^2 \in [0.25, 0.5)$), medium ($s^2 \in [0.5, 0.75)$) and high ($s^2 \in [0.75, 1]$) disorder silica samples. The panel shows that, particularly for low-disorder samples, the ResNet model is effectively focusing on the disordered regions in order to predict the disorder level of the samples, as expected. The scalebar of the images of silica is 10 Å.



Figure 4: Machine learning predicts fracture strain. A) Scatter plot of the true fracture strain (defined as the first bond breaking event) versus the prediction of the ResNet model. Black dots correspond to silica samples generated at a fixed disorder level of $s^2 = 0.2$, see Methods for details. A linear fit yields $R^2 = 0.79$. B) Same, for silica samples generated at variable disorder levels $s^2 \in [0.25, 1]$, grouped into three classes for simplicity (low disorder for $s^2 \in [0.25, 0.5)$ (green coloring, $R^2 = 0.8$); medium disorder for $s^2 \in [0.25, 0.5)$ (orange coloring, $R^2 = 0.68$); and high disorder for $s^2 \in [0.75, 1]$ (red coloring, $R^2 = 0.52$). As it is apparent, linear regression fits yield decreasing R^2 values for increasing disorder, suggesting that the fracture strain of high-disorder silica samples is harder to predict. C) Example of a low fracture strain silica sample (black-and-white image) superimposed with the Grad-CAM attention heatmap G (transparent-to-yellow shading) derived from the strain-trained ResNet model, see Methods for details. The white square indicates the true fracture location. The panel shows that the model focuses its attention to the region close to the fracture location. D) Same, for a silica sample with high fracture strain. In this case, high Grad-CAM attention values G(bright yellow regions) do not correspond to the true fracture location (white square), suggesting that the model predicts the fracture strain using global visual patterns of the image of the silica sample. E) Scatter plot of participation ratio ϕ versus predicted fracture strain showing that samples that break at low strain have a localized Grad-CAM Attention heatmap (low ϕ) while those that break at high strain show a more globalized heatmap (high ϕ). Notice that the highattention region in panel C (colored in yellow) coincides with the fracture location, the first bond breaking, which is identified with a white square box in the figure. The pink, purple and gray lower bands indicate the regions of low, medium and high predicted fracture strain used in panels F and I. F) Boxplot of location errors, defined as the distance between the highest intensity point of Grad-CAM heatmap and the true fracture location; for different levels of the predicted fracture strain following the coloring of panel E. G) Example of silica sample (blackand-white image) super-imposed with Grad-CAM attention G (black-red-yellow colorscale). High G regions are colored with bright yellow and correspond to the parts of the image that the ResNet model mostly uses to make the strain prediction of the shown sample. H) Same sample, with atoms colored according to their potential energy U. The visual similarity between panels G and H is stunning. I) Correlation between Grad-Cam attention G and potential energy U, over the entire dataset, for different levels of predicted fracture strain: samples that break at low strain show better correlation than those that break at higher strain. The ranges that corresponds to low, medium and high predicted fracture strain are show in panel E using the same coloring. The scalebar of the images of silica is 10 Å.



Figure 5: Machine learning predicts failure locations. A) ResNet prediction matches the true rupture location on x and y coordinate (top and bottom panels respectively) in stretched silica glass samples. Rupture location is defined as the location of the first breaking bond. B) Grad-CAM attention field G_x, G_y obtained from the two models shown in panel A: the first component of the vectors G_x represents the Grad-CAM attention value for the x prediction, whereas the second is the value G_y corresponds to the y prediction. The overlapped colormap reports the divergence of the field, from negative (blue) to positive (red) values. The circle indicates the true fracture location of the sample, while the star marks the predicted one. The arrows point towards the fracture location while the divergence colormap recalls band-like paths in the direction perpendicular to the applied strain. C) Cumulative distribution of the total location error e_r for the three different fracture strain levels defined in Fig. 4E. D) Examples of full *fracture path* prediction. The predicted pixel intensity is shown as a black to green shaded background. The unstretched silica is overlayed in white and the atoms involved in the actual fracture path are colored in bright magenta. E) Distribution of the Matthews correlation coefficient (MCC) across the entire test set. The MCC quantifies the agreement between the location of crack initiation and predicted pixel intensity in panel D, see Methods for details. The scalebar of the images of silica is 10 Å.



Figure 6: Going beyond: Transfer learning to tackle larger samples and real experiments. A) Transfer learning on sample of larger size. The ResNet model, originally trained on 128x128 pixels samples to predict fracture strain, is used to predict the fracture strain of different regions of the shown larger silica sample, of size 512x128 pixels. When this sample is stretched by MD it produces the fracture event (bond breaking) indicated by the red dot and vertical dotted line. In this example, the fracture location lies inside the green prediction area, a region of lowest predicted strain. The predicted strain is computed by sliding the orange window over the whole sample. The shaded grey band corresponds to the standard deviation of the failure strain computed over all the possible images obtained from the same configuration by data augmentation. B) Probability of correct prediction (finding the fracture location inside the prediction area) as a function of the size of the prediction area. The diagonal dashed line corresponds to a random guess. The model is able to identify the fracture location with accuracy well beyond the random guess baseline. C, D, E) Experimental TEM images of two dimensional silica glass samples from²³ are analyzed by the ResNet model trained on simulated data to predict disorder and by SVM classification. Grad-CAM attention maps G highlight the topological defects. Atoms predicted by SVM to be deforming irreversibly after straining in the horizontal direction are reported in red. Scalebars are 20 Å.

Supplementary materials

Hyper-paramter investigation of the SVM results

We have three different set of parameters in the SVM analysis: The parameters for the symmetry functions (δ, μ) , the affine strain ϵ and the hyper-parameter of the support vector machine. δ is chosen as 0.1 Å. μ lies between 0.2 Å and some upper bound μ_{up} in steps of 0.2 Å. Atoms 2.5 Å larger than the upper bound away from the central atom are neglected. μ_{up} as well as the affine strain ϵ are varied along a set of possible values listed in table S1. The SVM is optimized with respect to its regularization parameter C and two kernels (linear, radial basis function). The investigated parameter choices for C and can be seen in Table S1 as well as the investigated parameter range of kernel width γ for the radial basis function kernel. To investigate whether feeding symmetry functions of the initial configuration has any benefits, we train models also with just the features from the affine transformed state and compare them with models trained from features of the initial and affine deformed state.

For every combination of δ , μ , ϵ , the SVM hyper-parameter are optimized via five fold cross validation on the training set, retraining for the optimal SVM parameters and judge the final mode by its performance on the test set. We perform and 80/20 split to generate the training and test set (total samples 913/910/737 for disorder levels 0.2/0.3/variable). As SVM do not scale well computationally with the size of the training set, we have to down-sample the training set to perform the training. We perform two different subset selections. For the first subset we choose all atoms which are part of the first bond breaking and an equal number of atoms from the rest of the population thus creating a balanced training set. For the second subset we again choose all atoms which are part of the first bond breaking and add enough atoms from the remaining (unbroken) population to reach final size of 10000 training samples thus generating an unbalanced training set. The weights are adjusted to rebalance the training set.

The biggest difference in model performance can be seen for the different construction of the training set (Fig. S1 A, E and I) where the balancing leads to a shift from overall correct predictions to the percentage of captured plastic events. For samples of variance 0.2 it can also be seen that the optimal kernel for models trained on the unbalanced training set is always the radial basis function kernel. The other model parameters are less obvious in terms of model impact. Models trained on symmetry functions of the initial undeformed and the affine deformed state come closer to the desired case of all correct predictions, the differences are small to models trained just on the affine deformed state (Fig. S1 B, F and J). Different values of the affine strain seem not to have a clearly distinguishable impact on the model performance (Fig. S1 C, G and K). This makes sense as the affine strain is arbitrary in this application case as every sample has the first bond break at a different strain. The upper bound for the calculation of the symmetry functions does not have a strong impact on the final model performance (Fig. S1 D, H and L). This is coherent with the literature where it was found that as long as the upper bound includes several neighbor shells, its influence on model performance quickly drops.¹⁶

Supplementary Figures



Figure S1: Comparison of model hyper-parameters for disorder 0.2, 0.3 and variable disorder. A,E and I investigate different kernels with regards to differently constructed training sets. B,F and J highlight sensitivity with regards to the initial untransformed features. C, G and K show different strains used for the affine transformation. D, H and L examines the influence of the upper bound until which the symmetry functions are calculated.



Figure S2: A) Example of TEM-like generated image at different definition levels, from 36x36 pixels (i) up to 256x256 pixels (vi). The images show a subset of the full image only for clarity. B) R^2 coefficient of the strain-learning task as a function of the coarsening degree of the generated images. The panel shows that further increasing the coarsening beyond 128 pixels does not lead to better learning, as measured by the R^2 coefficient, while below 128 pixels the R^2 values sharply decrease. The roman numbers mark the corresponding example in panel A. We therefore use 128 pixel images along the rest of the manuscript. Training of the Resnet model for this figure included a dropout layer before the final dense layer with rate 0.2.



Figure S3: Correlation between Grad-CAM attention values G and cell defects D in the variable disorder dataset $s^2 \in [0.25, 1]$. The Grad-CAM attention heatmap G is computed at four different resolution levels r. The panel shows that the Grad-CAM values G correlate positively with cell defects for r = 32 and r = 4, while for r = 8, 16 the correlation is negative. The disorder level spans three groups: low disorder ($s^2 \in [0.25, 0.5)$, green coloring), medium disorder ($s^2 \in [0.5, 0.75]$, yellow coloring), and high disorder ($s^2 \in [0.75, 1]$, red coloring), and shows that correlations are stronger in absolute value for low-disorder samples.



Figure S4: Error analysis of fracture location prediction A) Two examples of fracture location prediction. The model prediction (green cross), its confidence intervals (green ellipsis), and the real fracture location (red dot) are shown on top of two non-strained images used in the machine learning prediction. B) Cumulative probability of the total error e_r , for different disorder levels (see Methods for details). C, D) Scatter plot of the confidence intervals σ_{px} , σ_{py} , computed from the different predictions obtained from data augmentation, versus the absolute prediction errors $|e_x|$, $|e_y|$. The panels show that when the confidence interval is small, the prediction error tends to be small as well. E, F) Ratio of prediction error versus confidence interval, showing that for almost all samples the error is equal to or less than the confidence interval (one standard deviation of the predictions over data augmentation).



Figure S5: **Fracture path prediction** The first 36 samples in the test set of the full fracture path prediction task, see Figure 5 for details (notice that samples are assigned to train/test sets randomly, not sequentially). For each panel, the fracture atoms are shown as magenta dots, and the model prediction as a black-to-green background, with greener area corresponding to more likely fracture positions according to the model.



Figure S6: **Transfer learning: predicting location from a strain-trained model** First 20 samples of the strain-to-location task, where the strain-trained model is used to predict the fracture strain of different regions of a larger sample. By sliding a square window over different parts of the sample (horizontal axis), different fracture strains are predicted (vertical axis). The real fracture location is marked as a vertical dashed line. The figure shows that, in most cases, the fracture location tends to be on a region of lower predicted fracture strain.



Figure S7: **Fracture path target construction** A) Example of silica sample where only the atoms that are part of the full fracture are shown. B) Target image for the fracture path prediction image-to-image algorithm. The show image is constructed starting from panel A and adding noise as detailed in Methods. C) Predicted image of the fracture path prediction image-to-image algorithm. The algorithm correctly predicts the main shape of the fracture.

Supplementary tables

| μ_{up} [Å] | 5.0, 7.4, 10.0 |
|----------------|---|
| ϵ [%] | 2.5,5,7.5,10,15,20 |
| С | 0.01,0.1,0.5,1.0,2.0,10,100 |
| γ | 1.e-05, 5.e-05, 1.e-04, 5.e-04, 1.e-03, |
| | 5.e-03, 1.e-02, 5.e-02, 1.e-01, 5.e-01, |
| | 1.e+00, 5.e+00, 1.e+01, 5.e+01, |
| | 1.e+02, 5.e+02, 1.e+03, 5.e+03, |
| | 1.e+04, 5.e+04, 1.e+05 |

Table S1: Hyper-parameters of the symmetry functions and the support vector classifier which were investigated in this study.