

Dislocation constriction and cross-slip in Al and Ag: an ab initio study

Gang Lu,¹ Vasily V. Bulatov,² and Nicholas Kioussis³

¹Department of Physics and Division of Engineering and Applied Science,
Harvard University, Cambridge, MA 02138

²Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, CA 94550

³Department of Physics, California State University Northridge, Northridge, CA 91330

Abstract

A novel model based on the Peierls framework of dislocations is developed. The new theory can deal with a dislocation spreading at more than one slip planes. As an example, we study dislocation cross-slip and constriction process of two fcc metals, Al and Ag. The energetic parameters entering the model are determined from ab initio calculations. We find that the screw dislocation in Al can cross-slip spontaneously in contrast with that in Ag, which splits into partials and cannot cross-slip without first being constricted. The dislocation response to an external stress is examined in detail. We determine dislocation constriction energy and critical stress for cross-slip, and from the latter, we estimate the cross-slip energy barrier for the straight screw dislocations.

The cross-slip process by which a screw dislocation moves from one slip plane to another, plays an important role for plastic deformation in materials. For example, cross-slip is responsible for the onset of stage III of the stress-strain work-hardening curve; it is also responsible for the anomalous high temperature yield stress peak observed in $L1_2$ intermetallic alloys. However cross-slip has been a tough problem to tackle because it contains both long-ranged elastic interactions between dislocation segments and short-ranged atomic interactions due to the constriction process, in which the two partial dislocations have to be recombined into a screw dislocation before cross-slip takes place.

There are currently two theoretical approaches to study cross-slip. One is based on the line tension approximation which completely ignores atomic interactions [1, 2]. The other approach is direct atomistic simulations employing empirical potentials [3, 4]. Although the second approach is quite powerful in determining cross-slip transition path and estimating the corresponding activation energy barrier, it is time-consuming and critically depends on the accuracy and availability of the empirical potentials employed in the simulations. In this Letter, we present an alternative approach to study cross-slip process based on the Peierls framework with *ab initio* calculations of relevant energetics. In fact, there has been a resurgence of interest recently in applying the simple and tractable Peierls-Nabarro (P-N) model to study dislocation core structure and mobility in conjunction with *ab initio* - surface calculations [5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10]. This approach represents a combination of atomistic (*ab initio*) treatment of interactions across the slip plane and elastic treatment for the continua that are away from the slip plane. Therefore this approach is particularly useful for studying interactions of impurities and dislocations, when empirical potentials are either not available or not reliable to deal with such multi-elements systems. However, to date all the models based on the Peierls framework are only applicable to single slip plane while cross-slip process requires at least two active intersecting slip planes, i.e., the primary and cross-slip planes. It is the purpose of this Letter to introduce a novel P-N model that involves two intersecting slip planes. This development represents the first effort to extend the P-N model, one of the central themes of dislocation theory, to more than one slip planes, which opens doors to many exciting applications. As an example, we shall apply this new model to study dislocation constriction and cross-slip process in Al and Ag. Not only can this model be used to study dislocation cross-slip, it can also be applied to examine dislocation junctions and other processes involved in multiple slip planes.

We begin by developing an appropriate energy functional for a Peierls dislocation at two intersecting slip planes. To facilitate presentation, we adopt the following conventions : In Fig. 1, a screw dislocation placed at the intersection of the primary (plane I) and cross-slip plane (plane II) is allowed to spread into the two planes simultaneously. The X (X^0) axis represents the glide direction of the dislocation at the plane I (II). For an fcc lattice, the two slip planes are (111) and ($\bar{1}\bar{1}\bar{1}$), forming an angle 71° . The dislocation line is along the $[101]$ (Z axis) direction and L represents the outer radius of the dislocation beyond which the elastic energy is ignored. In the spirit of P-N model, the dislocation is represented as a continuous distribution of infinitesimal dislocations with densities of $^I(x)$ and $^{II}(x^0)$ on the primary and cross slip planes respectively. Here x and x^0 are the coordinates of the atomic rows at the two planes. Following the semidiscrete Peierls framework developed earlier [7, 9], we can write the total energy of the dislocation as $U_{\text{tot}} = U_I + U_{II} + \bar{U}$. Here U_I and U_{II} are the energies associated with the dislocation spread on the plane I and II, respectively and \bar{U} represents the elastic interaction energy between the dislocation densities on planes I and II. U_I and U_{II} are essentially the same expression given earlier for the single plane case [7, 9], while \bar{U} is a new term and can be derived from Nabarro's equation for general parallel dislocations [11],

$$\begin{aligned}
 U_{I(II)} = & \sum_{i,j}^X \frac{1}{2} f K_e [\frac{I(II)}{1} (i) \frac{I(II)}{1} (j) + \frac{I(II)}{2} (i) \frac{I(II)}{2} (j)] + K_s \frac{I(II)}{3} (i) \frac{I(II)}{3} (j) g \\
 & + \sum_{i,j}^X x_3 f_1^{I(II)} (i); f_2^{I(II)} (i); f_3^{I(II)} (i) \sum_{i,j}^X \frac{x(i)^2 - x(i-1)^2}{2} \frac{I(II)}{1} (i) \frac{I(II)}{1} (j) + K b^2 \ln L; \\
 \bar{U} = & \sum_{i,j}^I K_s \frac{I}{3} (i) \frac{P}{3} (j) A_{ij} \sum_{i,j}^X K_e [\frac{I}{1} (i) \frac{P}{1} (j) + \frac{I}{2} (i) \frac{P}{2} (j)] B_{ij} \\
 & \sum_{i,j}^X K_e [\frac{I}{2} (i) \frac{P}{2} (j) B_{ij} + \frac{I}{1} (i) \frac{P}{1} (j) C_{ij} \frac{I}{2} (i) \frac{P}{1} (j) D_{ij} \frac{I}{1} (i) \frac{P}{2} (j) D_{ij}] :
 \end{aligned}$$

Here $f_1^{I(II)}(i)$, $f_2^{I(II)}(i)$ and $f_3^{I(II)}(i)$ represent the edge, vertical and screw component of the general dislocation displacement at the i -th nodal point in the plane I(II), respectively, while the corresponding component of dislocation density in plane I(II) is defined as $^I(II)(i) = f^{I(II)}(i) - f^{I(II)}(i-1) = (x(i) - x(i-1))$. The projected dislocation density $^P(i)$ is the projection of density $^{II}(i)$ from plane II onto plane I in order to deal with non-parallel components of displacement. The γ -surface, γ_3 , which in general includes shear-tension coupling can be determined from ab initio calculations. $\frac{I(II)}{1}$ is the external stress components interacting with corresponding $\frac{I(II)}{1}(i)$ ($i = 1, 2, 3$), which contributes to the to-

tal energy as elastic work done by the stress [7]. Dislocation response to the external stress is achieved by optimization of $\Gamma_1^{(III)}$ (i) at a given value of $\Gamma_1^{(III)}$, but dislocation core energy as an internal energy does not include the contribution from the external work. K_e and K_s are the edge and screw components of the general prelogarithmic elastic energy factor K . Γ_{ij} , A_{ij} , B_{ij} , C_{ij} and D_{ij} are double-integral kernels defined as following:

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma_{ij} &= \int_{x_{j-1}}^{x_j} \int_{x_{i-1}}^{x_i} \ln |\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^0| dx dx^0; \\ A_{ij} &= \int_{x_{j-1}}^{x_j} \int_{x_{i-1}}^{x_i} \frac{1}{2} \ln (x_0^2 + y_0^2) dx dx^0; \\ B_{ij} &= \int_{x_{j-1}}^{x_j} \int_{x_{i-1}}^{x_i} \ln \frac{x_0^2}{x_0^2 + y_0^2} dx dx^0; \\ C_{ij} &= \int_{x_{j-1}}^{x_j} \int_{x_{i-1}}^{x_i} \ln \frac{y_0^2}{x_0^2 + y_0^2} dx dx^0; \\ D_{ij} &= \int_{x_{j-1}}^{x_j} \int_{x_{i-1}}^{x_i} \ln \frac{x_0 y_0}{x_0^2 + y_0^2} dx dx^0;\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{x}_0 = L \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{x}^0 \cos \theta$, and $y_0 = \mathbf{x}^0 \sin \theta$. The equilibrium structure of the dislocation can be obtained by minimizing the total energy with respect to the dislocation density.

To contrast and understand different cross-slip behavior in Al and Ag, we have carried out ab initio calculations for the $\bar{1}11$ -surface of Ag while the $\bar{1}11$ -surface of Al has been published elsewhere [9]. A supercell containing six layers in the $[111]$ direction is used to calculate the $\bar{1}11$ -surface for Ag. The ab initio calculations are based on the pseudopotential plane-wave method [12] with a kinetic energy cutoff of 55 Ry for the plane-wave basis and a k-point grid consisting of (16,16,4) divisions along the reciprocal lattice vectors. Owing to the planar nature of dislocation core structure of fcc metals, we disregard the displacement perpendicular to the slip planes and partially consider the shear-tension coupling by performing volume relaxation along the $[111]$ direction in the $\bar{1}11$ -surface calculations. We present the complete $\bar{1}11$ -surface for Ag in Fig. 2. The most striking difference between the $\bar{1}11$ -surface of Ag and Al is the vast difference in intrinsic stacking fault energy, which is 165 mJ/m² for Al and 14 mJ/m² for Ag. This dramatic difference in $\bar{1}11$ -surface gives rise to very different dislocation core structures and cross-slip behavior that we are going to explore.

The model calculation is set up by introducing a screw dislocation at the intersection of the two slip planes without applying external stress to the system at first. The initial configuration of the dislocation is specified by a step function for the screw displacement $f_3^I(x) = 0$ for $x < L$ and $f_3^I(x) = b$ for $x \geq L$. All other displacement components including those on the cross-slip plane are set to zero initially. This corresponds to a pure screw dislocation with a zero width "spread" on the primary plane. We then relax the dislocation structure according to the energy functional. The Burgers vector of Ag, $b = 2.84 \text{ \AA}$ is determined from ab initio calculations and elastic constants are chosen from experimental values [13]. The corresponding parameters of Al have been given elsewhere [9]. Having determined all the parameters entering the model, we obtain the equilibrium structure of the dislocations, represented by their density $\rho(x)$ shown in Fig. 3. The screw dislocation in Al which starts out at the primary plane spontaneously spreads into the cross-slip plane, as the density peak at the cross-slip plane indicates. As expected, the edge component of the density is zero at the cross-slip plane because only screw displacement can cross-slip. On the other hand, the screw dislocation in Ag dissociates into two partials, separated by $7.8 b$ (22 \AA) distance. These partial dislocations cannot cross-slip, as the arrows indicate, without first annihilating their edge components, and the dislocation density on the cross-slip plane is essentially zero. The partial separation distance we obtained from the model calculation is in excellent agreement with the TEM measurement for that in Ag, which is about 20 \AA [14]. Apparently, the lack of obvious dissociation in Al stems from the fact that Al has a much higher intrinsic stacking fault energy than that of Ag.

In order to examine the stress effect on dislocation core structure and cross-slip process, we apply external Eshelby stress to the dislocation. The Eshelby stress with pure edge component interacts only with the edge component of dislocation densities, extending or shrinking the stacking fault width depending on its sign. The results of the partial separation as a function of Eshelby stress are summarized in Fig. 4. Without external stress, the partial separation is $7.8 b$ for Ag and zero for Al. Under positive Eshelby stress, the partial separation rises rapidly for Ag whereas it remains zero in Al until the stress reaches the threshold to separate the overlapping partials. To activate cross-slip, however, one needs to apply a negative Eshelby stress to annihilate the edge components of the partials' displacement, known as constriction process. Upon application of negative stress, the partials in Ag move towards each other and reduce the width of stacking fault. During this process, the edge components of displacement

from the two partials annihilate each other while the screw components are being built up. However there is a lower limit for the separation that one can achieve, which is $1.7b$ for Ag. This is in agreement with the atomistic simulations for Cu, reporting a corresponding value of $1.6b$ [15]. In the wake of the (partial) constriction process, a pure screw dislocation segment is formed at the intersection of the two planes, which can cross-slip. On the other hand, further increasing the negative stress does not complete the constriction but rather increases the partial separation. This is due to the fact that the remaining edge components of the partials interact with the stress, and as a result the two partials exchange signs and move away from each other until the lattice breaks down.

We have also estimated critical energetics that are relevant to cross-slip. For example, we calculated constriction energy defined as the difference in dislocation core energy between the normal and constricted states. By approximating the state with $1.7b$ separation between partials as the constricted state, we were able to estimate the constriction energy for Ag to be $0.05 \text{ eV}/b$. Obviously the constriction energy for Al is zero because its normal state is fully constricted. We have also calculated the critical stress for cross-slip which is defined as the glide stress in the cross-slip plane to move a partially constricted dislocation from the primary plane to the cross-slip plane [15]. The critical stress for cross-slip in Ag is found to be $0.0105 \text{ eV}/A^3$, comparing to $0.0020 \text{ eV}/A^3$ in Al. Finally we estimated cross-slip energy barrier which in the context of our calculations is defined as the difference in dislocation core energy before and after cross-slip takes place by applying the above mentioned critical stress for cross-slip. In other words, we calculate the core energy difference for the dislocation between its normal state and the state that the dislocation just starts to cross-slip under the critical cross-slip stress. Under this definition, we find the cross-slip energy barrier for Ag as $0.31 \text{ eV}/b$, much greater than that of Al, which is $0.05 \text{ eV}/b$. Our result for the cross-slip energy barrier should not be compared directly to the corresponding experimental value because the dislocations are assumed to be straight in our current implementation of the Peierls-Nabarro model. However it is possible to extend the present formalism to deal with an arbitrarily curved dislocation where a more realistic cross-slip energy barrier can be obtained. Nevertheless the present model is still sufficient to provide reliable energetics for straight dislocations.

To conclude, we have presented a novel model that can treat dislocation cross-slip and constriction based on the Peierls-Nabarro framework. The γ -surface entering the model is

determined from ab initio calculations which provide reliable atomic interactions across the slip plane. Using this model, we find that the screw dislocation in Al can spontaneously spread into cross-slip plane while the same dislocation in Ag splits into partials and cannot cross-slip. The dislocation response to external stresses is studied, and in particular negative Escaig stresses are applied to the dislocation to simulate constriction process. We find that it is impossible to achieve 100% constriction for straight partial dislocations. By computing dislocation core energy in different stress states, we are able to estimate dislocation constriction energy for Al and Ag. We have also calculated critical stress and energy barrier for dislocation cross-slip, and from which we confirm that dislocation cross-slip is much easier in Al than in Ag. Since our ab initio model calculation is much faster than direct ab initio atomistic simulations, the model will be invaluable for alloy design where the goal is to select "elements with " composition for an alloy to have desired dislocation properties, such as cross-slip properties.

Acknowledgments

Two of us (G.L. and N.K.) acknowledge the support from Grant No. DAAD19-00-1-0049 through the U.S. Army Research Office. G.L. was also supported by Grant No. F49620-99-1-0272 through the U.S. Air Force Office for Scientific Research. We thank E. Kaxiras for suggesting this interesting problem to us.

-
- [1] J. Friedel, in Dislocations and Mechanical properties of Crystals, edited by J.C. Fisher (Wiley, New York, 1957).
 - [2] B. Escaig, in Dislocation Dynamics, edited by A.R. Rosenfeld et al. (McGraw-Hill, New York, 1968).
 - [3] T. Rasmussen, K.W. Jacobsen, T. Leers, O.B. Pederson, S.G. Srinivasan, and H. Jonsson, Phys. Rev. Lett. 79, 3676 (1997).
 - [4] S. Rao, T.A. Parthasarathy, and C. Woodward, Philos. Mag. A 79, 1167 (1999).
 - [5] B. Joos, Q. Ren and M.S. Duesbery, Phys. Rev. B 50, 5890 (1994).
 - [6] Y.M. Juan and E. Kaxiras, Philos. Mag. A 74, 1367 (1996).




FIG .1: Cartesian set of coordinates showing the directions relevant to the screw dislocation located at the intersection of the two slip planes.

- [7] V . V . Bulatov and E . K axiras, Phys. Rev. Lett. 78, 4221 (1997).
- [8] J. Hartford, B . von Sydow , G . W ahnstrom , and B . I. Lundqvist, Phys. Rev. B 58, 2487 (1998).
- [9] G . Lu, N . K ioussis, V . V . Bulatov, and E . K axiras, Phys. Rev. B 62, 3099 (2000); Philos. Mag. Lett. 80, 675 (2000).
- [10] G . Lu, Q . Zhang, N . K ioussis and E . K axiras, Phys. Rev. Lett. 87, 095501 (2001).
- [11] F R N . Nabarro, Adv. Phys., 1, 269 (1952).
- [12] M . C . Payne, M . P . Teter, D . C . Allan, T . A . Arias and J D . Joannopoulos, Rev. Mod. Phys., 64, 1045 (1992).
- [13] J P . Hirth and J. Lothe, Theory of Dislocations, 2nd ed. (W iley, New York, 1992).
- [14] D . J H . Cockayne, M . L Jenkins and I L F . Ray, Philos. Mag. 24, 1383 (1971).
- [15] M . S . Duesbery, Modelling Simul. Mater. Sci. Eng. 6, 35 (1998).




FIG. 2: The γ -surface (J/m^2) for displacements along a (111) plane for Ag. The corners of the plane and its center correspond to identical equilibrium configuration, i.e., the ideal lattice. The γ -surface is truncated to emphasize the more interesting region.




FIG . 3: Dislocation displacement density (x) for Al (Fig 3(a)) and Ag (Fig. 3(b)). The peaks in the density plot represent (partials) dislocations.




FIG .4: Partial separation as a function of applied Escaig stress. The vertical dashed line represents the zero stress separating the compress and stretch regions. The horizontal dashed line indicates the minimal separation distance for Ag.