The Neper/FEPX Framework and its Application to the Study of Intra-grain Orientation Distributions in Deformed Aluminium

Romain Quey¹, Loïc Renversade¹ and Matthew Kasemer²

New Opportunities in Diffraction Microscopy Workshop, ESRF, Grenoble, 08–11 January 2024

¹ CNRS, MINES Saint-Étienne, France ² University of Alabama, USA





Scientific Context: Polycrystal Plasticity Studies by Experiment and Simulation, involving Grain Tracking



Microtexture tracking (Quey, Dawson and Driver, 2010–2015)



2

The Neper/FEPX Framework

Intra-grain Orientation Distributions in Deformed Aluminium (Acta Materialia, 2024)

The Neper/FEPX Framework

Intra-grain Orientation Distributions in Deformed Aluminium (Acta Materialia, 2024)

Neper/FEPX History



Focus on the French Plan for Open Science

4 Colleges

- 1. Publications
- 2. Data
- 3. Software
- 4. Practices

Open-Source Software Award (2021, 2023): Scientific / Documentation / Community





Publishing is very important for a software

Focus on the French Plan for Open Science

4 Colleges

- 1. Publications
- 2. Data
- 3. Software
- 4. Practices

Open-Source Software Award (2021, 2023): Scientific / Documentation / Community

	Crashing Code on GitHub (!)	Neper 2020	Neper 2024
Diffusion	V	1	1
Open-source license	X	1	
SaaS mode	X	×	×
Published	X	×	1
Jsed in research	X	1	1
Jsed in other projects	X	×	×
Lited in publications	X	1	
Publication list	X	\checkmark	<i>s</i>
Forge used	\checkmark	1	1
Development workflow	×	×	1
Tests	×	×	\checkmark
Code versioning	\checkmark	1	1
Bug tracking	×	1	1
Package	×	×	×
Documentation generation	×	×	×
Stable vs devel branch	×	1	\checkmark
Continuous integration	×	\checkmark	✓
Reference manual	X	 Image: A set of the set of the	✓
Example data	X	×	×
Dn-line demos	X		
Multilingual documentation	X	×	×
Developers' documentation	X	×	
Fasks for new developers	×	×	<i>✓</i>
Norldwide use	×	1	1
Standard software	X		
Society impact	X	×	×
Jsed by companies	X		
Jsers' workshop, forum, blog, chat	X		
Developers' conferences, management	X	×	×
Decision making	X	×	×
External modules	X	<i>✓</i>	✓





Publishing is very important for a software

https://neper.info





Wide array of resources

Hosted on GitHub (source code, forum, etc.)

Run on personal computer (Neper) / cluster (FEPX)

6

Simulation (from Experiment)



Neper modules / FEPX to run successively

Standalone "concept" file formats

tess: Tessellation/polycrystal file (full info.)
tesr: Experimental polycrystal file (full info.
msh: Mesh file (full info.)
config: Material + loading file
sim: Simulation <u>database</u>

 \rightarrow fits different needs

Simulation (from Experiment)

Experiment



Neper modules / FEPX to run successively

Standalone "concept" file formats

tess: Tessellation/polycrystal file (full info.)
tesr: Experimental polycrystal file (full info.)
msh: Mesh file (full info.)
config: Material + loading file
sim: Simulation database

 \rightarrow fits different needs

Polycrystalline Microstructures

Single-Scale Microstructures



(Rowenhorst et al., 2010)

Multiscale Microstructures



Carbide-free bainitic steel (Hell, 2011)

Lamellar Ti64 & parent β grains (Wielewski et al., 2015)

 \rightsquigarrow Single-scale and multiscale have different topologies

Different Types of Experimental Inputs









Grain Maps (DCT)

Objective: one general method for all microstructures and inputs

Note: Vectorial Geometry

Definition (E. Laguerre, 1834–1886)

- Domain of space, D
- N seeds, S_i , of positions x_i and weights w_i

•
$$C_i = \{P(\mathbf{x}) \in D \mid d(P, S_i) < d(P, S_j) \; \forall j \neq i\}$$

 $d(P, S_i) = d_E(P, S_i)^2 - w_i \quad (\text{"Power distance"})$

<u>In general</u>, the larger the weight, the bigger the cell. The weight is equivalent to a sphere radius: $w_i = r_i^2$.





Common Use: Dense Sphere Packing



However, Laguerre Tessellations are <u>General</u> (Lautensack, 2007) Every normal tessellation of \mathbb{R}^3 is a Laguerre tessellation \downarrow Laguerre tessellations = general parameterization of (convex-grain) polycrystals (N grains require 4 N <u>uncorrelated</u> parameters)

(Chen and Zhao, 2022) for a powder

Optimization of Laguerre Tessellations

Optimization Problem

- Variables: for each seed, 3 coordinates + 1 weight $(4 \times N)$
- Objective function: application dependent (grain size distributions, grain centroids, ...)
- Nature: Non-linear, unknown gradient, large-scale, local

Resolution

- Optimization algorithm from the literature (Subplex, from NLopt)
- $\cdot\,$ Tessellation algorithm: cell-based, with \underline{update}



Red seed modified

General optimization ↓ Retained Laguerre tessellation generality

Any (convex-grain) polycrystal can be generated given proper definition of the objective function

Microstructure Properties



Initial Solution: Voronoi Tessellation

 x_i : random w_i : constant = $\langle r \rangle^2$

Objective Function

Adaptation of the Anderson-Darling test (1952)

For each variable: $O = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \frac{(F_s^*(x) - F_s(x))^2}{F_s(x) (1 - F_s(x))} dx$ $F_s^{(*)}(x) = F^{(*)} \circ S, S: \text{ normal distribution}$



All variables $O = \sqrt{O_{size}^2 + O_{sphericity}^2}$

Microstructure



Microstructure Properties



DCT data → ff-3DXRD data Grain centroids and volumes → spheres (courtesy H. Proudhon)

Initial Solution

x_i = grain centroid
w_i = (grain radius)²

Objective Function



$$\mathcal{O} = \frac{1}{N \langle d \rangle} \sum_{i} (d_1^2 + d_2^2)$$

Microstructure



Initial solution: $\mathcal{O} = 0.0149$

Final solution: $\mathcal{O} = 0.00263$



Particularly interesting for 1/ convex grains (or approximation acceptable), 2/ large polycrystals and 3/ noisy data

Principle: Replicating Material's Processing (Example of Bainitic Steel)

- Scale 1: grain-growth statistics, random orientations
- Scale 2, in each cell:
 - Morphology: seeds on GBs + Voronoi tessellation
 - Orientations: KS, NW relationships, ...
- Scale 3, in each cell: lamellae





Before Meshing: Flattening





Flattening of a 2-scale tessellation

Principle: Replicating Material's Processing (Example of Bainitic Steel)

- Scale 1: grain-growth statistics, random orientations
- Scale 2, in each cell:
 - Morphology: seeds on GBs + Voronoi tessellation
 - Orientations: KS, NW relationships, ...
- Scale 3, in each cell: lamellae





Before Meshing: Flattening





Flattening of a 2-scale tessellation

Principle: Replicating Material's Processing (Example of Bainitic Steel)

- Scale 1: grain-growth statistics, random orientations
- Scale 2, in each cell:
 - Morphology: seeds on GBs + Voronoi tessellation
 - Orientations: KS, NW relationships, ...
- Scale 3, in each cell: lamellae





Before Meshing: Flattening





Flattening of a 2-scale tessellation

-0.25

-0.5.

-0.75

Y (mm

0.26

05

(uuu) Z -0.5

-0.75

Y (mm)



Deformation of Ti64 (Kasemer et al, 2017)



(Left) Sedimentary rocks, (right) intra-grain cracking path (Ghazvinian et al, 2014)



Subgrain structures (Kutsal, Poulsen et al, 2022), ID03

Regularization: $\varepsilon = 1-3\% \rightarrow \varepsilon = 30-40\%$



Multimeshing: $N \simeq 1000 \text{ grains} \rightarrow N = 100,000 \text{ grains}$



Mesher 1 (Delaunay), Mesher 2 (Frontal), Multimeshing (60% mesher 1, 40% mesher 2)





Deformation Simulation using <u>FEPX</u>

Principle





Anisotropic plasticity

Specifics

• Elasto-viscoplastic behavior

$$\dot{\gamma}^{\alpha} = \dot{\gamma}_0 \left(\frac{|\tau^{\alpha}|}{g^{\alpha}}\right)^{1/m} \operatorname{sgn}(\tau^{\alpha})$$

+ Different hardening models (isotropic, anisotropic, precipitation-based, cyclic, etc.)

- Multiphase (cubic, hexagonal, tetragonal)
- General or RVE-type loadings
- Nonlinear kinematics for large strains and large rotations
- State variable evolution for lattice orientation and slip strengths
- Standard and advanced outputs



Can simulate deformation of polycrystals with 1000+ grains discretized 10⁶ nodes/elements to small or large plastic strain routinely

The Neper/FEPX Framework

Intra-grain Orientation Distributions in Deformed Aluminium (Acta Materialia, 2024)

Sample and Analysis at ESRF / ID11



- Aluminium alloy (Al0.3Mn), $\bar{d} = 200 \ \mu m$
- Uniaxial tension to ε = 1.0, 1.5, 2.0, 2.5 and 4.5%
- DCT at initial state, ${\sim}2000~{\rm grains}$ ${\sim}{\rightarrow}$ Initial microstructure
- 3DXRD at deformed states, ~700 grains
 → Spot shapes (azimuthal projection)

ODF Determination from 3DXRD Spots

Reduced ODF



$$P(\mathbf{w}) = \prod_{i=1}^{3} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2 \pi \theta_i^2}} \exp\left(-\frac{(\mathbf{w} \cdot \mathbf{v}_i)^2}{2 \theta_i^2}\right)$$

Forward Modelling



$$r = \frac{\sum_{i,j} \left(l_{\exp}^{ij} - l_{\exp} \right) \left(l_{gen}^{ij} - l_{gen} \right)}{\sqrt{\sum_{i,j} \left(l_{\exp}^{ij} - l_{\exp} \right)^2} \sqrt{\sum_{i,j} \left(l_{gen}^{ij} - l_{gen} \right)^2}},$$
$$R = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N r_k$$
see also (H

see also (Hansen et al, 2009)

ODF Determination from 3DXRD Spots: Example of a Grain

Spots (Azimuthal Projection)



End Result = Orientation Distribution

$$\mathbf{v}_{1} = \begin{bmatrix} 0.96\\ 0.06\\ -0.26 \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{v}_{2} = \begin{bmatrix} 0.03\\ 0.94\\ -0.34 \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{v}_{3} = \begin{bmatrix} 0.27\\ 0.33\\ -0.90 \end{bmatrix}$$
$$\theta_{1} = 0.56^{\circ} \quad \theta_{2} = 0.25^{\circ} \quad \theta_{3} = 0.15^{\circ}$$



Forward Modelling

Metrics

• Angular extent ("GOS"): $\bar{\theta} = \sqrt{2/\pi} (\theta_1{}^p + \theta_2{}^p + \theta_3{}^p)^{\frac{1}{p}}$, p = 1.58

• Anisotropy factor:
$$\theta_a = \theta_1 / \sqrt[3]{\theta_1 \theta_2 \theta_3} \ (\geq 1)$$

• Preferential disorientation axis: v_1

tri-variate normal distribution

Finite Element Simulation



Crystal Behaviour

• {111} (110) systems

•
$$\dot{\gamma}^{\alpha} = \dot{\gamma}_0 \left| \frac{\tau^{\alpha}}{g^{\alpha}} \right|^{\frac{1}{m}} \operatorname{sgn}(\tau^{\alpha})$$

with $\dot{g}^{\alpha} = h_0 \left(\frac{g_s - g^{\alpha}}{g_s - g_0} \right)^{n'} \dot{\gamma}$
and $\dot{\gamma} = \sum_{\alpha} |\dot{\gamma}^{\alpha}|$
 $\dot{\gamma}_0 = 1, m = 0.03, h_0 = 47 \text{ MPa}, n' = 2.6,$
 $g_0 = 6 \text{ MPa}, g_s = 455 \text{ MPa}$

Results

(Glez and Driver, 2001) (Barton and Dawson, 2001)



$$\begin{split} \mathbf{S} &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\alpha} \left(\mathbf{w}^{\alpha} \otimes \mathbf{w}^{\alpha} \right) \\ \mathbf{S} &= \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_{1} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda_{2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \lambda_{3} \end{pmatrix} \\ \text{in } (\mathbf{v}_{1}, \, \mathbf{v}_{2}, \, \mathbf{v}_{3}) \text{ with } \lambda_{1} \geq \lambda_{2} \geq \lambda_{3} \end{split}$$

 $ightarrow \overline{ heta}$, $heta_a$ and $oldsymbol{v}_1$

Angular Extent and Anisotropy

Angular Extent ($\bar{\theta}$)





Grain-by-grain comparison







 $\epsilon = 1.5\%$

 $\epsilon = 2.0\%$

 \bullet $\epsilon = 2.5\%$

 $\bullet \epsilon = 4.5\%$

1.2 1.4 1.6





Grain-by-grain comparison

Preferential Disorientation Axis (v₁)

 $\varepsilon = 1.0\%$

 $\epsilon = 1.5\%$ $\epsilon = 2.0\%$ $\epsilon = 2.5\%$ $\epsilon = 4.5\%$

30

40

 $a\cos(v_1^{exp} \cdot v_1^{sim})$ [degrees]

50

60

70

80 90



Preferential Disorientation Axis (v_1) — Correlation to the Grain Orientation (arepsilon=4.5%)



Experiment



Simulation



Summary of the Results

Angular extent $(\overline{ heta})$:	regular increase, simulation goes faster	good correlation
Anisotropy factor (θ_a):	similar, self-similar distributions	no correlation
Preferential disorientation axis (v ₁):	similar RD–TD distribution	good correlation

 \sim First-order agreement between experiment and simulation (cross-validation)

To Go Further

\cdot Option #1: Improve the agreement between experiment and simulation

- Experiment: microstructure reconstruction, reduced ODF reconstruction, ...
- Simulation: microstructure meshing, material model (slip law, slip parameters, interaction matrix, ...) ...

• Option #2: Learn from the current level of agreement (especially on v_1)

Simulation <u>particularly useful</u> (v_1 and σ , $\dot{\gamma}^{\alpha}$, τ^{α} , etc.)

- How does the preferential disorientation axis (v_1) relate to deformation (slip)?
- What controls the preferential disorientation axis (v_1) ?

Summary of the Results

Angular extent $(\overline{ heta})$:	regular increase, simulation goes faster	good correlation
Anisotropy factor (θ_a):	similar, self-similar distributions	no correlation
Preferential disorientation axis (v ₁):	similar RD–TD distribution	good correlation

 \sim First-order agreement between experiment and simulation (cross-validation)

To Go Further

• Option #1: Improve the agreement between experiment and simulation

- Experiment: microstructure reconstruction, reduced ODF reconstruction, ...
- Simulation: microstructure meshing, material model (slip law, slip parameters, interaction matrix, ...) ...

• Option #2: Learn from the current level of agreement (especially on v_1)

Simulation particularly useful (v₁ and σ , $\dot{\gamma}^{\alpha}$, τ^{α} , etc.)

- How does the preferential disorientation axis (v_1) relate to deformation (slip)?
- What controls the preferential disorientation axis (v_1) ?

$$F = V^* R^* F^p \qquad V^* = I + \varepsilon^e \qquad \tau = \mathbb{C} : \varepsilon^e \qquad \tau = \det(I + \varepsilon^e) \sigma$$

$$\hat{L}^p = \dot{\hat{F}}^p \hat{F}^{p-1} \qquad \hat{L}^p = \hat{D}^p + \hat{W}^p \qquad \hat{D}^p = \sum_{\alpha} \dot{\gamma}^\alpha \hat{P}^\alpha \qquad \hat{W}^p = \dot{R}^* R^{*T} + \sum_{\alpha} \dot{\gamma}^\alpha \hat{Q}^\alpha$$

$$\dot{\gamma}^\alpha = \dot{\gamma}_0 \left| \frac{\tau^\alpha}{g^\alpha} \right|^{\frac{1}{m}} \operatorname{sgn}(\tau^\alpha) \qquad \tau^\alpha = \hat{P}^\alpha : \tau \qquad \dot{g}^\alpha = h_0 \left(\frac{g_s - g^\alpha}{g_s - g_0} \right) \dot{\gamma}, \quad \text{where } \dot{\gamma} = \sum_{\alpha} |\dot{\gamma}^\alpha|$$

 $\varepsilon^e = \mathbf{0}, \quad \hat{W}^p = \mathbf{0}, \quad \mathbf{R}^* = \mathbf{I}$

$$\frac{\partial \dot{\boldsymbol{r}}^{*}}{\partial \boldsymbol{\sigma}_{\boldsymbol{V}}} = -\sum_{\alpha} \frac{\partial \dot{\gamma}^{\alpha}}{\partial \tau^{\alpha}} \left(\boldsymbol{t}^{\alpha} \otimes \boldsymbol{p}^{\alpha} \right) \qquad \text{with } \frac{\partial \dot{\gamma}^{\alpha}}{\partial \tau^{\alpha}} = \frac{\dot{\gamma}_{0}}{m \, g^{\alpha}} \left| \frac{\tau^{\alpha}}{g^{\alpha}} \right|^{\frac{1}{m}-1}$$
(1)
$$\frac{\partial \dot{\boldsymbol{r}}^{*}}{\partial \sigma_{\boldsymbol{V}}} = \boldsymbol{U} \boldsymbol{S} \boldsymbol{V}^{T}$$
(2)

 $\frac{\partial \dot{r}^*}{\partial \sigma_v}$ can be (i) evaluated for different (nominal) stresses and (ii) associated to different stress distributions

Influence of the Stress (Distribution) on the Preferential Disorientation Axis

(Renversade and Quey, 2024)



Preferential disorientation axis sensitive to average grain stress, not stress distribution

Neper/FEPX

- Convergence between two "established" codes
- Complete workflow, especially for experiment-simulation comparisons (.tesr, .sim, etc.)

Application to Intra-Grain Orientation Distributions

- Various approximations made along the way, in both experiment and simulation...
- 1st-order agreement between experiment and simulation (validation)
- Simulation results (stresses, slip rates, strengths, etc.) used to go further
- \cdot Preferential disorientation axis sensitive to stress, not so much to stress distribution

Example of how experiment and simulation can be used to improve our understanding of material deformation