Damage distribution in f.c.c. and b.c.c. metals from molecular dynamics and its influence on microstructure evolution

M. J. Caturla

¹Universidad de Alicante, Spain



Technical Meeting on A Database of Atomic Configurations Formed in Collision Cascades, IAEA, Vienna, Nov. 2017

Collaborators and co-authors

- T. Diaz de la Rubia, M. Fluss, LLNL, USA
- Naoki Soneda, CRIEPI, Japan
- C. Björkas, A. Sand, K. Nordlund, University of Helsinki
- M. J. Aliaga, UA
- Anna Prokhodtseva, R. Schaeublin, ETH-Zurich
- M. Hernández-Mayoral, CIEMAT



Outline

- Effect of crystal structures: collision cascades in f.c.c. vs. b.c.c. materials Cu vs. Fe and microstructure evolution
- Bulk and surface effects: collision cascades in Fe and microstructure evolution
- Outlook: modeling MeV damage distribution



MD database + DFT data \rightarrow OKMC \rightarrow Experiments



Universitat d'Alacant Universidad de Alicante

Primary damage: influence on microstructure evolution



f.c.c. Cu



Fe 30keV, 66 defects

Cu 30keV, 69 defects

Similar number of defects but more vacancy clustering in Cu than in Fe This has important consequences in the subsequent damage evolution



Universitat d'Alacant Universidad de Alicante

Transfer of data from MD to OKMC



Capture radius for individual defects selected to reproduce the isolated number of defects obtained in MD







Capture radius: 0.4 nm



Damage accumulation in Cu and Fe

Damage accumulation in Cu and Fe compared to experiments



Simulations explain the basic differences observed experimentally in Cu and Fe: nucleation of vacancy clusters in Cu together with fast migration of self-interstitials, the presence of traps in Fe and the visibility under TEM

M. J. Caturla, N. Soneda, et. al, JNM 276, 12 (2000)

Fe calculations – N. Soneda

Long term evolution of He-V clusters depends on initial damage state



KMCO reproduce qualitatively the experimental swelling dependence with temperature for fcc and bcc



Void swelling in FCC and BCC metals irradiated with fission neutrons B. N. Singh, J. H. Evans, JNM 226 (1995) 277-285

M. J. Caturla, N. Soneda, T. Diaz de la Rubia, M. Fluss, J. Nucl. Mat. 2006, 351, 78

Influence of initial cascade damage distribution on damage accumulation (Carolina Björkas, Univ. Helsinki)

<u>Question addressed</u>: Is the long term evolution of defects affected by the picosecond cascade damage distribution or does it only depend on migration and binding energies?

30keV Fe in bcc Fe



OKMC calculations using cascade damage distributions from 3 different interatomic potentials, AMS [1], DD-BN [2,3] and MEA-BN [3, 4]

[1] G. J. Ackland, M. I. Mendelev, et al. J. Physics: Condens. Matter, 16 (2004) [2] S. L. Dudarev and P. M. Derlet. J. Phys.: Condens. Matter, 17 (2005) [3] C. Bjorkas and K. Nordlund, Nucl. Instrum. & Meth. B 259 (2007) [4] M. Muller, P. Erhart, and K. Albe, J. Phys.: Condens. Matter, 19 (2007)

NO EXPERIMENTAL VALIDATION OF MD RESULTS ON SINGLE CASCADE DAMAGE



Universitat d'Alacant Universidad de Alicante

C. Björkas, et. al. Phys. Rev. B 85, 024105 (2012)

Influence of initial cascade damage distribution on damage accumulation (Carolina Björkas, Univ. Helsinki)

OKMC simulations

TOTAL DEFECT CONCENTRATION:

no significant difference between the three potentials





Influence of initial cascade damage distribution on damage accumulation (Carolina Björkas, Univ. Helsinki)

VISIBLE DEFECT CONCENTRATION:

only those clusters of interstitials > 55 (loop of 1nm radius)

only those clusters of vacancies > 350 (void of 1nm radius)



Large differences are now observed between the three potentials

Differences in cluster size distribution with int. potential (Carolina Björkas, Univ. Helsinki)

Experimental validation of models

Multiscale modeling can only work with the proper experimental validation

Model validation with ion sources - extrapolation to neutron irradiation conditions

Univers

niversidad de Alicante

Z. Yao, et al., Phil. Mag. 88, 2851 (2008)

- Many of these experiments are performed using thin foils (less than 100nm)
- In pure and UHP Fe at low doses most of the loops are of type <100>
- Loops near the surface have been identified as of <100> vacancy type (for irradiation with Ga+)

Effect of free surfaces on cascade damage formation in Au M. Ghaly, R. S. Averback & K. Nordlund

K. Nordlund et al., "Coherent displacement of atoms during ion irradiation", Nature 398, 1999

Effect of free surfaces on cascade damage formation in Mo Sergey V. Starikov et al.

Vacancy loop formation

5.5 ps

89.3 ps

Sergey V. Starikov et al.,

"Radiation-induced damage and evolution of defects in Mo," Phys. Rev. B 84, 2011.

Ion implantation in thin films for in situ TEM Cascade damage for **50keV Fe in Fe** with AMS potential

50nm thickness

- Interstitials
- Vacancies

79% of all vacancies are in clusters 57% are in large clusters (>55 defects = 1nm loop)

98% of all interstitials in clusters21% in large clusters

296 ad-atoms

Larger clustering of vacancies compared to bulk cascades

Ion implantation in thin films for in situ TEM Cascade damage for **50keV Fe in Fe** with AMS potential

50nm thickness

- Interstitials
- Vacancies

83% of all vacancies are inclusters67% are in large clusters

100% of all interstitials in clusters 0 in large clusters

312 ad-atoms

Larger clustering of vacancies compared to bulk cascades

Universitat d'Alacant Universidad de Alicante

MD simulations of irradiation in Fe thin films Enhanced production of vacancy loops, mostly <100>

Irradiation of thin films at low energies (50-150keV) show the formation of large (~1nm radius) <100> vacancy loops. Mostly square loops as expected from energy considerations (Gilbert et al J.Phys:Cond.Mat. 2008)

M. J. Aliaga, et. al, Acta Mat. (2015)

Damage produced by Ga ions in Fe at low energies (30keV)

Heavier ion (Ga) produces much larger vacancy clusters also of <100> type even at lower energies (30 keV), in agreement with experiments, M. L. Jenkins Nature (1976) & Z. Yao Phil. Mag. 2008

M. J. Aliaga, et. al, Acta Mat. (2015)

Ion implantation in thin films for in situ TEM Cascade damage for **100keV Fe in Fe** with the AMS potential

Simulated HRTEM image to compare to experiments – Robin Schaeublin

TEM image simulations: 50 keV cascade in Fe

~ 50 nm

(a)

(b)

- Bulk irradiation shows the formation of self-interstitial loops
- Some large vacancy loops are also observed.
- Note the sub-cascade formation

M. J. Aliaga, et. al, Acta Mat. (2015)

Cluster size differences between bulk and thin films

- Significant difference between the size of the clusters in bulk and thin films for the same energy
- Vacancy clusters much larger in thin films (> 100 defects)
- Self-interstitial clusters significantly larger in bulk irradiation

Correlation between experiments and simulations: Tungsten (Yi et al)

Very good correlation between cluster sizes from MD simulations and experimental measurements with TEM

The case of W: A. E. Sand, et al., EPL (2016)

The case of Fe

Interstitial cluster sizes obtained In cascades in Fe are very small (not visible under TEM)

Building MeV recoils from SRIM/MDRANGE + MD database

Reference experiments for MeV ion implantation

Prokhodtseva, Schäublin, Acta Mat (2013)

- 500 keV Fe in Fe, 22°, RT
- Thickness ~ 50nm 180nm
- In-situ experiments

UHP Fe:

At very low dose: $3x10^{15}$ m⁻² ~ 0.0015 dpa

only 1/2<111> loops

At higher doses: 2x10¹⁸ m⁻² ~ 1 dpa mostly <100> loops

Brimbal et al. (2014)

- 1 MeV Fe in Fe, 61°, **500°C**
- Thickness ~ 150nm
- In-situ experiments
- Pure Fe:
- ~ 0.8 dpa only <100> loops

Building MeV recoils from SRIM/MDRANGE + MD database

Individual cascades

Building MeV recoils from SRIM/MDRANGE + MD database

Comparison to full MD / MD + BCA (C. Ortiz) / A. DeBacker

Model applied to low energy ion implantation (100 keV)

Fraction (%)

Including Carbon impurities

- Concentration of DL increases in Model A & B
- ► Large increase of both <100> and ½ <111> concentrations and size in **Model A** from low doses
- Model B: better agreement with experimental data

[Exp: Z. Yao, M. Hernández-Mayoral, M.L. Jenkins and M.A. Kirk. 2008]

Do all these mechanisms just add up? 1 + 1 = 2 ?

500 kev cascade in Fe

E. Zarkadoula et al, J. Phys. Condense. Matter 25 (2013) 125402

Conclusions

- Initial defect distribution affects significantly microstructure evolution
- Cascade damage database for Fe irradiation at 50 keV, 100 keV and 150 keV irradiation of Fe thin films and 50 keV and 100 keV for bulk Fe.
- Quantified damage in terms of cluster size and type and total number of defects.

Open questions

- Can we validate further the results from the first few picoseconds of the collision cascade with experiments?
- Is it enough with a cascade database below subcascade splitting to build the whole energy spectrum?
- Is there a need for higher energy cascades?
- Is there a need for cascade damage in alloys?
- How do we share this information? (Gigabytes of data)

