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Introduction: first order phase transitions

simple fluid

Uniaxial ferromagnet

$T_c, H_c = 0$

Martensitic transformation (MT)

Shape memory alloys

Oxford, September 19th, 2016
Microstructures: optical microscopy

Transformed sample of Cu-Zn-Al (after cooling, no external stress)

Optical microscope with polarized light

3mm x 2mm

Absence of a characteristic scale of the transformed domains
Microstructures: lack of characteristic scales

Radially averaged Fourier power spectrum: power-law behaviour

Large scale region: related to the impossibility of the different variants to penetrate each other


Fe-Mn-Si


Cu-Al-Ni
First-order phase transitions hardly occur in equilibrium:

- low T: high energy barriers

Hysteresis


- disorder & long range elastic forces

Inhomogeneous behaviour

Extended FOPT

Thermoelastic equilibrium

Martensitic phase transition is a sequential process

The microstructure is not built instantaneously as assumed by some models that are based on energy minimization. On the contrary it is built sequentially.

The final microstructure is not the one that minimizes some energy functional, but the one that results from the “sequential path” that minimizes the energy at every instant of time.

Experimental examples

- Video by Robert Niemann PhD Thesis: NiMnGa epitaxial film on a substrate
  
  http://www.ifw-dresden.de/about-us/people/dr-robert-niemann/

- Acoustic emission & high sensitivity calorimetry studies

  Talk by A.Planes on Wednesday afterlunch
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Martensitic phase transition is a sequential process
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Experimental results from AE and calorimetry studies (1)

Ex: CuZn-Al  M.C.Gallardo et al. PRB 81, 174102 (2010)

Acoustic Emission activity
(number of events per temperature interval)

Calorimetry:
Heat power exchange per temperature interval
Experimental results from AE and calorimetry studies (2)

Criticality: Energies and amplitudes of AE events recorded during the full transition are power-law distributed

\[
p(E)dE = \frac{1}{Z_\varepsilon} E^{-\varepsilon} dE \quad \quad p(A)dA = \frac{1}{Z_\alpha} A^{-\alpha} dA
\]

Ex: FePd

Bonnot et al. PRB 78, 184103 (2008)
Weak universality Materials transforming to the same structure show the same exponents

Carrillo et al PRL81, 1889 (1998)

Cu-based alloys:

Two families:

Transformation Cubic-18R
(12 variants)

Transformation Cubic-2H
(6 variants)
Results from AE and calorimetry studies

The critical exponents increase with the number of equivalent variants.

When an external field or stress is applied, the number of possible variants is reduced and, correspondingly, the exponents decrease.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mart. phase</th>
<th>Variant(s)</th>
<th>$\alpha$</th>
<th>$\varepsilon$</th>
<th>$z$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monoclininc</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.8 – 3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthorrombic</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.4-2.6</td>
<td>1.7-1.8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tetragonal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.2-2.4</td>
<td>1.6-1.5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$$E \propto A^z$$

$$z = 2$$

$$\alpha = 2\varepsilon - 1$$
Spin-like models with disorder: Zero Temperature RFIM with metastable dynamics

Equation of motion for the strain field
R.Ahluwalia & G.Amanthakrishna, PRL 86, 4076 (2001)

Phase field models
O.U.Salman, PhD dissertation

Connection spin-models – strain field models

Molecular dynamics

Competition between tip speed and nucleation rate
Simple models
Sequential partitioning model (1)

Frontera et al., PRE 52, 5671 (1995)

Minimal model that illustrates the consequences of the sequential character of the athermal phase transitions

Single variant transition (transformed/untransformed)

Excluded volume interaction only (no back transformations)

Scalar model: s size (volume) of an individual transformation event (avalanche)

Question: Is there a power-law distribution of “avalanches”?
**Sequential partitioning model (2)**

**Scaling hypothesis:** probability of choosing a certain fraction $s/V$ of the remaining volume $V$

\[
p(s;V)ds = g\left(\frac{s}{V}\right)\frac{ds}{V}
\]

Let the probability of extracting a fragment of size $s$ in the $k$-step, from a system with original size $V$, be: $p_k(s;V)$

**Recurrence**

\[
p_1(s;V) = p(s;V)
\]

\[
p_2(s,V) = \int_0^{V-s} ds_1 p(s_1,V)p(s,V-s_1)
\]

\[
p_3(s,V) = \int_0 ds_2 \int_0^{V-s_2} ds_1 p(s_1,V)p(s_2,V-s_1)p(s,V-s_1-s_2)
\]

Doing some algebra one can obtain the recurrence:

\[
p_k(s;V) = \int_0^{V-s} p(r;V)p_{k-1}(s;V-r) \, dr
\]
Expected number of fragments with size between \( s \) and \( s + ds \) after \( M \) extractions

\[
n_M(s;V) = \sum_{k=1}^{M} p_k(s;V)
\]

\[
n_M(s;V) = p(s;V) + \int_{0}^{V-s} p(r;V)n_{M-1}(s;V - r)
\]

If the limit \( n(s;V) \equiv n_{M \rightarrow \infty}(s;V) \) exists, it must satisfy:

\[
n(s;V) = p(s;V) + \int_{0}^{V-s} p(r;V)n(s;V - r)
\]

And should be “normalizable”

\[
\int_{0}^{V} s n(s;V) ds = V
\]
Solution for uniform: \( g(x) = 1 \) \quad \text{and} \quad n(s;V) = 1 / s \\

Solution for restricted \( \beta \): \( g(x) = (\beta + 1)(1 - x)^\beta \) \quad \beta > -1 \\

\[
n(s;V) = \frac{\beta + 1}{s} \left(1 - \frac{s}{V}\right)^\beta \approx \frac{1}{s} \quad s \ll V
\]

There are also analytical solutions for general \( \beta \)-distributions: \( g \propto x^\alpha (1 - x)^\beta \).

In general there are arguments based on the computations of the momenta of \( n(s;V) \) that indicate that:

\[
n(s;V) \approx s^{-1} \quad s \ll V
\]
Sequential partitioning model: solutions

- a) Uniform
- b) Triangular
- c) Restricted $\beta$-distribution for $\beta=3$
- d) $g(x)=1/2\sqrt{x}$
- e) Beta distribution with $\alpha=1$, $\beta=5$
- f) Beta distribution with $\alpha=3$, $\beta=2$
Ball & Planes model (PLKK model?)

G. Torrents, X. Illa, E. Vives & A. Planes, submitted to PRE

Elongated martensitic domains (needle like) grow sequentially, nucleating at random sites in untransformed regions and growing linearly.

Domains grow along few directions fixed by the symmetries of the problem.

Retransformations are not possible (domains cannot cross).

Example: 2d, 2 “variants”, 90°, parallel to the sample boundaries.
Two formulations: continuum and discrete versions

**Continuum:**
- Needle domains are 1d-lines in a continuum rectangle \([0,1] \times [0,1]\)
- The system is never fully transformed
- Question: After many draws, what will be the average number (density) \(H(\ell)\) of horizontal segments with length between \(\ell\) and \(\ell + d\ell\)?

- \(\ell\) will be a continuum variable taking values in \((0,1]\

**Discrete** (convenient for simulations)
- Needle domains with width “a”, are placed at discrete positions on a \(L \times L\) grid
- The sample fully transforms.

Question: What is the average number \(H(\ell)\) of variants with a certain size \(\ell\)?

- \(\ell\) will be a discrete variable taking values \(1,2,\ldots,L\)
Analytic treatment will be done in the case in which the probabilities of every variant are not equal:

\( p_v \) - probability of drawing a vertical variant
\( p_h \) - probability of drawing a horizontal variant

We will not assume \( p_v = 1 - p_h \), but we will solve a generic case with:

\[ p_v + p_h \leq 1 \]

Moreover, for the continuum case, we will assume that the system has dimensions \( L_h \times L_v \).
Numerical simulations

Fortran code that generates final configurations, until complete fill-up. In the initial steps it chooses sites at random on the lattice and in the final steps it keeps a list of empty sites and chooses at random from the list.

Example 1: 2 variants: (1,0) & (0,1)

500x500 subset from a 2000x2000 system
Numerical simulations

The code can be easily adapted to different cases: orientation of variants, number of variants, etc...

Example: 2 variants: (1,1) & (-1,1)
Numerical simulations

Example: 4 variants (1,2) (-1,2) (2,1) (2,-1)
Numerical simulations

Hexagonal lattice: 3 variants (1,0), (0,1), (-1,1)
Numerical simulations

Hexagonal lattice: 6 variants
Dipolar and boundary effects

Square sample, (1,0)&(0,1) \( p_h=p_v=1/2 \)

The distribution of variants is not homogeneous, but influenced by the system boundaries.

There exist and effective correlation between domains belonging to the same variant.

It can be interpreted as a dipolar/ferroelastic effective interactions.

8192x8192 system
Dipolar and boundary effects: why?

Between two vertical domains (yellow) that are close one to the other it is more probable to find points associated to vertical variants (yellow) than horizontal variants (black). Why?

Despite $p_h = p_v$, the vertical lines will be much longer than the horizontal ones, thus creating an effective attractive dipolar/ferroelastic interaction.
Boundary effects: order parameter

Coarse-grain the lattice in small cells (8x8) and measure:

\[ \frac{n_{\text{vertical sites}} - n_{\text{horizontal sites}}}{n_{\text{sites in the cell}}} \]

1024x1024 cells
8192x8192 system
Numerical simulation of distributions of lengths

Histograms corresponding to the full LxL system (irrespective of the spatial position)

Average number of horizontal variants

$H(\ell)$

Length $\ell$

Prob $P_h$

- $p=0.002$
- $p=0.020$
- $p=0.200$
- $p=0.300$
- $p=0.400$
- $p=0.500$
- $p=0.600$
- $p=0.700$
- $p=0.800$
- $p=0.900$
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Analytic solution of the continuum case

Let us consider the continuum case: a square \([0,1] \times [0,1]\).

Let \(p_h\) and \(p_v\) be the probabilities of drawing a horizontal and a vertical line respectively.

Let \(H(\ell)\) be the average number (density) of horizontal lines (a.n.h.l.) with length within \((\ell, \ell + d\ell)\)

We can assume that:

\[
H(\ell) = A\delta(\ell - 1) + h(\ell)
\]

where \(h(\ell)\) is continuum and non-zero on the interval \(\ell = (0,1)\)

After drawing the first line, the system splits into two subsystems equivalent to the first one, but eventually re-scaled. Let us consider the first draw, \(H(\ell)\) will have two contributions:

\[
H(\ell) = p_h \times H^{[h]}(\ell) + p_v \times H^{[v]}(\ell)
\]

where \(H^{[h,v]}(\ell)\) are conditional probabilities.

Let us analyze the two problems separately:
Analytical solution of the continuum case

a.n.h.l. given the first line is horizontal

\[ H^{[h]}(\ell) = 1 \delta(\ell - 1) + 2\left[ A\delta(\ell - 1) + h(\ell) \right] \]

a.n.h.l. given the first line is vertical

\[ H^{[v]}(\ell) = 2 \int_0^1 \Theta(z - \ell) dz \left[ A \frac{1}{z} \delta\left(\frac{\ell}{z} - 1\right) + \frac{1}{z} h\left(\frac{\ell}{z}\right) \right] = \]

... changing variables \((t = \ell/z, \ dt = -\ell \ dz/z^2)\)

\[ = 2 \int_\ell^1 dt \left[ A \frac{1}{t} \delta(t - 1) + \frac{1}{t} h(t) \right] \]

Putting things together:

\[ A\delta(\ell - 1) + h(\ell) = p_h \left[ (1 + 2A)\delta(\ell - 1) + 2h(\ell) \right] + p_v \left[ 2A + 2 \int_\ell^1 h(t) \frac{dt}{t} \right] \]
Analytical solution of the continuum case

By comparing the terms that multiply the δ-function

\[ A = \frac{p_h}{1 - 2p_h} \]

and for the continuum part:

\[ h(\ell)(1 - 2p_h) = \frac{2p_hp_v}{1 - 2p_h} + 2p_v \int_\ell^1 h(t) \frac{dt}{t} \]

Differentiating:

\[ \frac{dh(\ell)}{d\ell} = - \frac{2p_v}{1 - 2p_h} \frac{h(\ell)}{\ell} \rightarrow \frac{dh}{h} = - \frac{2p_v}{1 - 2p_h} \frac{d\ell}{\ell} \]

Solving:

\[ h(\ell) = \frac{2p_vp_h}{\left(1 - 2p_h\right)^2} \ell^{\frac{2p_v}{1 - 2p_h}} \]

The continuum part is a power-law with an exponent that depends on \( p_h \) and \( p_v \), but it only makes sense for \( p_h < 1/2 \).

For \( p_h \geq 1/2 \), the assumption of infinitely thin domains makes non-sense: one can generate too many horizontal lines. We need a cutoff!

For \( p_h \to 0 \) the size distribution “of the very minoritary variant” is a power-law with an exponent \(-2\) (if \( p_h + p_v = 1 \))
Analytical solution of the discrete case (Genís Torrents)

In this case, we want to compute the average number of horizontal lines in a system with size $L_h \times L_v$

$$H(\ell; L_h, L_v)$$

where the variable $\ell$ is now discrete and ranges from 1 to $L_h$

Following the same arguments as before, we can write:

$$H(\ell; L_h, L_v) = p_h \delta(\ell - L_h) + \frac{2p_h}{L_v} \sum_{j=1}^{L_v-1} H(\ell; L_h, j) + \frac{2p_v}{L_h} \sum_{j=\ell}^{L_h-1} H(\ell; j, L_v)$$
Construction of recurrence

\[ H(\ell; L_h, L_v) = p_h \delta(\ell - L_h) + \frac{2p_h}{L_v} \sum_{j=1}^{L_v-1} H(\ell; L_h, j) + \frac{2p_v}{L_h} \sum_{j=\ell}^{L_h-1} H(\ell; j, L_v) \]

In a \( L_h \times L_v \) diagram, this equation involves summing many terms:

For \( \ell < L_h - 1 \)

\[ H(\ell; L_h, L_v) = \frac{2p_h + L_v - 1}{L_v} H(\ell; L_h, L_v - 1) + \frac{2p_v + L_h - 1}{L_h} H(\ell; L_h - 1, L_v) \]
\[ - \frac{(2p_v + L_h - 1)(2p_h + L_v - 1) - 2p_h 2p_v}{L_h L_v} H(\ell; L_h - 1, L_v - 1) \]
In general, it is possible to write an equation as a sum of 4 terms that equals to a inhomogeneous term independent of $H$

\[
H(\ell; L_h, L_v) - \frac{2p_h + L_v - 1}{L_v} H(\ell; L_h, L_v - 1) - \frac{2p_v + L_h - 1}{L_h} H(\ell; L_h - 1, L_v)
+ \frac{(2p_v + L_v - 1)(2p_h + L_h - 1) - 2p_h 2p_v}{L_h L_v} H(\ell; L_h - 1, L_v - 1) = \frac{p_h}{L_v} \left( \delta(\ell - L_h) - \frac{L_h - 1}{L_h} \delta(\ell - L_h + 1) \right)
\]

(Note that this equation is linear in $H$ and that mixes problems corresponding to different sizes)

Let us start by finding some simple solutions, corresponding to the cases $\ell = L_h$ and $\ell = L_h - 1$

For $L_v = 1$, the only way to get a horizontal line of size $\ell = L_h$ is to be lucky and choose first to draw horizontal:

\[
H(L_h; L_h, L_v = 1) = p_h
\]

Then, applying the above recurrence one gets

\[
H(L_h - 1; L_h, L_v = 1) = \frac{2p_v p_h}{L_h}
\]
Solution for the cases $\ell = L_h \& \ell = L_h - 1 \quad (1)$

It is also simple to extend these two cases $\ell = L_h$ and $\ell = L_h - 1$ to any generic $L_v$, By rewriting the recurrence, imposing $\ell = L_h$

$$H(L_h; L_h, L_v) - \frac{2p_h + L_v - 1}{L_v} H(L_h; L_h, L_v - 1) = \frac{p_h}{L_v}$$

Which can be rewritten as an homogeneous recurrence for a $[H\text{-const}]$ term

$$\left[ H(L_h; L_h, L_v) - \frac{p_h}{1 - 2p_h} \right] = \frac{2p_h + L_v - 1}{L_v} \left[ H(L_h; L_h, L_v - 1) - \frac{p_h}{1 - 2p_h} \right]$$

The solution is:

$$H(L_h; L_h, L_v) = \frac{p_h}{1 - 2p_h} \left( 1 - \frac{2p_h}{L_v} \frac{\Gamma(2p_h + L_v)}{\Gamma(2p_h + 1)} \right)$$

This term should be compared with the term multiplying the $\delta$-function in the continuum case

$$H(\ell) = \frac{p_H}{1 - 2p_H} \delta(\ell - 1) + h(\ell)$$

It corresponds to the limit $L_v \rightarrow \infty$. The parenthesis corresponds to the finite size correction.
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Solution for the cases $\ell = L_h$ & $\ell = L_h - 1$ (2)

Similarly one can also solve the case $\ell = L_h - 1$.

After some algebra one gets

$$H(L_h - 1; L_h, L_v) = \frac{2 p_h p_v}{L_h (1 - 2 p_h)^2} \left\{ 1 + \frac{\Gamma(2 p_h + L_v)}{L_v ! \Gamma(2 p_h + 1)} 2 p_h \left[ (2 - 2 p_h) + (1 - 2 p_h) \sum_{k=1}^{L_v-1} \frac{1}{k + 2 p_h} \right] \right\}$$
Construction of a general solution

These two solutions give some clues in order to find the general solution. In order to do it, it is convenient to construct the objects:

$$A_{k;\ell_h,\ell_v}^{L_h,L_v} \equiv A_{k;\ell_h,\ell_v}^{L_h,L_v} (2p_h,2p_v)$$

defined from the functions

$$A_{k;\ell_h,\ell_v}^{L_h,L_v} (x_h,x_v) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \frac{x_h^j x_v^{j+k}}{j!(j+k)!} \frac{d^{2j+k} \Delta_{\ell_h,\ell_v}^{L_h,L_v}}{dx_h^j dx_v^{j+k}}$$

where

$$\Delta_{\ell_h,\ell_v}^{L_h,L_v} (x_h,x_v) \equiv \frac{\ell_h ! \Gamma(x_h + L_h)}{L_h ! \Gamma(x_h + \ell_h)} \frac{\ell_v ! \Gamma(x_v + L_v)}{L_v ! \Gamma(x_v + \ell_v)}$$

It must be understood that $k$ is an integer, and when $k$ is negative, only terms with positive or zero factorial in the divisor contribute to the sum. Note also that the $\Delta$'s are polynomials with finite degree,

$$\Delta_{\ell_h,\ell_v}^{L_h,L_v} (x_h,x_v) \propto (x_h)^{L_h-\ell_h} (x_v)^{L_v-\ell_v} + ....$$

so that the sum $j=0,\ldots,\infty$ will have a finite number of terms.
Properties of A’s

Symmetry

\[ A_{k; \ell_h, \ell_v}^{L_h, L_v} (x_h, x_v) = A_{-k; \ell_v, \ell_h}^{L_h, L_v} (x_h, x_v) \]

Sum completion

\[
\sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} a^k A_{k; \ell_h, \ell_v}^{L_h, L_v} (x_h, x_v) = \Delta_{\ell_h, \ell_v}^{L_h, L_v} (x_h + \frac{x_h}{a}, x_v + ax_v)
\]

Recurrence in L

\[
A_{k; \ell_h, \ell_v}^{L_h, L_v} (x_h, x_v) = \left[ x_h x_v - (x_h + L_h - 1)(x_v + L_v - 1) \right] A_{k; \ell_h, \ell_v}^{L_h-1, L_v-1} (x_h, x_v) + \\
\frac{(x_h + L_h - 1)}{L_h} A_{k; \ell_h, \ell_v}^{L_h-1, L_v} (x_h, x_v) + \\
\frac{(x_v + L_v - 1)}{L_v} A_{k; \ell_h, \ell_v}^{L_h, L_v-1} (x_h, x_v)
\]

That corresponds exactly to the homogeneous part of the recurrence
General solution

The general solution is built by a linear combination of \( A_{k;\ell_h,\ell_v}^{L_h,L_v}(2p_h,2p_v) \) with different \( k, \ell_h \) and \( \ell_v \) that vanishes when \( L_v=0 \) and that matches the appropriate boundary conditions at \( \ell=L_h-1 \).

\[
H(\ell; L_h, L_v) =
\]

\[
= \frac{2p_h p_v}{(\ell+1)(1-2p_h)^2} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \left( \frac{1}{2p_h} - 1 \right)^j A_{j;\ell+1,1}^{L_h,L_v} - 2p_h \left( (2-2p_h) A_{0;\ell+1,1}^{L_h,L_v} + (1-2p_h) A_{1;\ell+1,1}^{L_h,L_v} \right)
\]

when \( \ell < L_h \)
Comparison with the continuum limit when $p_H$ is small

Using the completion property one can make more explicit the divergence cancellations and get:

$$H(\ell < L_h; L_h, L_v) = \frac{2p_h p_v \left[ \Delta_{\ell,1}^{L_h, L_v} \left( \frac{2p_v}{1-2p_h}, 1 \right) + \theta(p_h) \right]}{(1-2p_h)^2 (\ell + 1)}$$

Using Stirling approximation

$$H(\ell < L_h; L_h, L_v) = \frac{2p_h p_v}{L_h \left( 1-2p_h \right)^2} \left( \frac{\ell_H}{L_H} \right)^{-\frac{2p_v}{1-2p_h}}$$

That can be directly compared with the continuum case when $p_H$ is small, taking into account that now $\ell = 1, 2, \ldots, L_h$ and before $0 < \ell \leq 1$

$$h(\ell) = \frac{2p_v p_H}{\left( 1-2p_H \right)^2} \ell^{-\frac{2p_v}{1-2p_H}}$$
Numerical algorithm for computing the exact solution

Usually one is interested in the solution for a system with a certain size $L_h \times L_v$

The use of the general recurrence is tedious because one has to solve all the problems with sizes smaller than $L_h \times L_v$

There is a tricky way for avoiding lots of sums. The idea is to use another recurrence for the $A$’s in which instead of decreasing the index $L$’s we have an increase of the index $\ell$’s

$$A^{L_h, L_v}_{k; \ell_h, \ell_v} (2p_v, 2p_h) = \frac{[2p_h 2p_v - (2p_v + \ell_h)(2p_h + \ell_v)]}{(\ell_h + 1)(\ell_v + 1)} A^{L_h, L_v}_{k; \ell_h+1, \ell_v+1} (2p_v, 2p_h) +$$

$$+ \frac{(2p_v + \ell_h)}{\ell_h + 1} A^{L_h, L_v}_{k; \ell_h+1, \ell_v} (2p_v, 2p_h) + \frac{(2p_h + \ell_v)}{\ell_v + 1} A^{L_h, L_v}_{k; \ell_h, \ell_v+1} (2p_v, 2p_h)$$
Graphical results

Solutions for systems with two different sizes $L_x L_y$ and different $p_h$

$2^{13} \times 2^{13} = 8192 \times 8192 \approx 67 \times 10^6$

$2^{17} \times 2^{17} = 131072 \times 131072 = 17 \times 10^9$
Graphical results

Solutions for a fixed \( p_h = 0.3 < 0.5 \) and different system sizes
Graphical results

Solution for a fixed $p_h = 0.5$ and different system sizes
Estimation of the effective power-law exponent

From the values $H(\ell = L_H - 1; L_H, L_V)$ and $H(\ell = L_H - 2; L_H, L_V)$ one can estimate an effective exponent by approaching the logarithmic derivative as:

$$\alpha = -\left.\frac{d \log H}{d \log \ell}\right|_{\ell=L-1} \approx (L-1) \left[ \frac{H(\ell = L - 2)}{H(\ell = L - 1)} - 1 \right]$$

$\quad$

$L_V = L_H = L$

$p_V = 1 - p_h$
PLKK model


In the present paper we also propose and analyze a simple fractal model for microstructure formation during martensitic transformation. We follow an idea that the fractality and scaling behavior observed in SMA microstructure can be explained as a direct result of impossibility for each new martensitic crystal appeared at any stage of transformation to penetrate the other variant crystals formed before. Therefore the model algorithm is based on the sequence of thin crystals of two possible orientations growing subsequently from randomly distributed “embryo” points up to the intersection with the system of early formed crystals. The resulting microstructure containing about 3000 crystals is shown in Fig. 1(b). Correspondent Fourier spectrum, correlation function and power spectrum radial distribution are presented in Fig. 2(b), 3(b) and 4(b) respectively.

They conclude that the power-law scaling in the large scale region is related to the impossibility of the different variants to penetrate each other.
Conclusions

Simple geometrical models including only the excluded volume interaction explain the power-law behaviour of the distribution of avalanche sizes.

Moreover, if the model includes the acicular geometry and the existence of symmetrically equivalent variants, the power-law exponents depend on the probability of the variants (thus on the number of variants in case of equal probability).

More technical conclusion:

It is unusual to find a solution of a non-trivial model that can be computed analytically for any finite size $L$ and that exhibits a “critical” (power-law) behaviour in the $L \rightarrow \infty$ limit.

We are able to sum all the terms of the “partition function” and discover how the length scale $a$ becomes irrelevant.

Future: more than 2 variants in 2D
3 variants (planar) in 3D: cubic-tetragonal transformation
RG approach
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