

Microarticle

On plastic dislocation density tensor

Bohua Sun

Institute of Mechanics and Technology and College of Civil Engineering, Xi'an University of Architecture and Technology, Xi'an 710055, China

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Elasto-plasticity
Deformation gradient
Plastic dislocation density tensor

ABSTRACT

This article attempts to clarify an issue regarding the proper definition of plastic dislocation density tensor. This study shows that the Ortiz's and Berdichevsky's plastic dislocation density tensors are equivalent with each other, but not with Kondo's one. To fix the problem, we propose a modified version of Kondo's plastic dislocation density tensor.

Plastic deformation is everywhere, from bending a fork to panel beating a car body. It is a subject that pervades so many aspects of peoples' daily lives.

Taylor [1] realized that plastic deformation could be explained in terms of the theory of dislocations, even since this view has become a consensus that mechanism of plastic deformation is the result of dislocation accumulation [1–19,22–24]. Accordingly, some plastic dislocation density tensors have been proposed [2–8]. However, they are totally different from each other and no any consensus in terms of definition of the plastic dislocation density tensor has been reached. The majority of past and contemporary authors following the original idea of Kondo [2,5,6] and Bilby et al. [4], adopted the following definition of the resultant Burgers vector $\mathbf{b}_{\text{Kondo}} = \mathbf{F}^e \oint_c \mathbf{F}^{e-1} d\mathbf{x} = -\mathbf{F}^e \iint (\mathbf{F}^{e-1} \times \nabla) \cdot d\mathbf{A}$, where c is any close contour in the current configuration. Ortiz and Repetto [7] defined the resultant Burgers vector in a completely different way $\mathbf{b}_{\text{Ortiz}} = \oint_c \mathbf{F}^p \cdot d\mathbf{x} = -\iint \mathbf{F}^p \times \nabla \cdot d\mathbf{A} = \iint \mathbf{T}_{\text{Ortiz}} \cdot d\mathbf{A}$. Reina et al. [11–14] did a comprehensive and in depth studies on the Ortiz's definition $\mathbf{T}_{\text{Ortiz}} = -\mathbf{F}^p \times \nabla$. Berdichevsky [8] introduced a measure of the resultant closure failure leading to the dislocation density tensor $\mathbf{T}_{\text{Berdichevsky}} = -\mathbf{F}^{p-1} \cdot (\mathbf{F}^p \times \nabla)$. Le et al. [15–19] recommended to use the Berdichevsky's definition.

It is clear that unification of the definition for plastic dislocation density tensor is still an open issue. which is the proper definition? What is the relationship between those definitions? If the definition is not well defined, how to fix it?

Phenomenologically the total elasto-plastic deformation gradient $\mathbf{F} = \mathbf{g}_i \otimes \mathbf{G}^i = F_{ij}^p \mathbf{e}^i \otimes \mathbf{G}^j = F_{ij}^e \mathbf{g}^i \otimes \mathbf{G}^j$ can be decomposed into the multiplication of elastic gradient namely $\mathbf{F} = \mathbf{F}^e \cdot \mathbf{F}^p$, is due to Bilby et al [3], Kröner [6], Lee and Liu [20], and Lee [21]. The elastic deformation gradient $\mathbf{F}^e = \mathbf{g}_i \otimes \mathbf{e}^i = F_{ij}^e \mathbf{g}^i \otimes \mathbf{e}^j = F_{ij}^e \mathbf{g}^i \otimes \mathbf{e}^j$ and plastic gradient

$\mathbf{F}^p = \mathbf{e}_i \otimes \mathbf{G}^i = F_{ij}^p \mathbf{e}^i \otimes \mathbf{G}^j = F_{ij}^p \mathbf{e}^i \otimes \mathbf{G}^j$, where $\mathbf{e}_i, \mathbf{g}_i$ are the base vectors corresponding to the reference, intermediate and current configuration, respectively. The deformation decomposition is shown in Fig. 1.

It should be noted that the elastic deformation $\mathbf{F}^e$ and plastic deformation $\mathbf{F}^p$ cannot be gradients of global maps, they are therefore called incompatible, namely $\mathbf{F}^e \times \nabla \neq \mathbf{0}$ and $\mathbf{F}^p \times \nabla \neq \mathbf{0}$ as well, where the operator $\nabla = \mathbf{G}^k \nabla_k$ is gradient operator, and ∇_k is covariant derivative defined in reference configuration. Nevertheless, both $\mathbf{F}^e$ and $\mathbf{F}^p$ are orientation preserving so that $J_p = \det(\mathbf{F}^p) > 0$ and $J_e = \det(\mathbf{F}^e) > 0$. This means, $\mathbf{F}^p$ and $\mathbf{F}^e$ have inverse deformations, denoted correspondingly by $(\mathbf{F}^p)^{-1}$ and $(\mathbf{F}^e)^{-1}$.

In this short article, we will show that the Ortiz's and Berdichevsky's plastic dislocation density tensor are equivalent, while not equivalent with Kondo's one. To fix Kondo's problem, we can change Kondo's definition to following form

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{b}_{\text{Modified-Kondo}} &= \oint_c \mathbf{F}^e \cdot d\mathbf{x} \\ &= -\iint (\mathbf{F}^{e-1} \times \nabla) \cdot d\mathbf{A} \\ &= \iint \mathbf{T}_{\text{Modified-Kondo}} \cdot d\mathbf{A}, \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

Thus, we have modified Kondo's plastic dislocation density tensor as follows

$$\mathbf{T}_{\text{Modified-Kondo}} = -\mathbf{F}^{e-1} \times \nabla. \quad (2)$$

With this modified definition, later we will show that the modified Kondo's definition can be equivalent with both Ortiz's and Berdichevsky's plastic dislocation density tensor. To verify these, we need to prove a tensor identity at first.

Lemma 1. Giving two 2nd order tensors $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{g}_i \otimes \mathbf{e}^i = A_{ij} \mathbf{g}^i \otimes \mathbf{e}^j$

E-mail address: sunbohua@xauat.edu.cn.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rinp.2018.12.045>

Received 16 October 2018; Received in revised form 4 December 2018; Accepted 10 December 2018

Available online 16 December 2018

2211-3797/ © 2018 The Author. Published by Elsevier B.V. This is an open access article under the CC BY license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).




Fig. 1. Elasto-plastic deformation configuration: elastic deformation F^e , plastic deformation F^p and total deformation F .

$= A_{ij} g^i e^j$ and $B = e_i \otimes G^i = B_{ij} e^i \otimes G^j = B_{ij} e^i G^j$, then we have tensor identity: $(A \cdot B) \times \nabla = A \cdot (B \times \nabla) + (A \times \nabla) \cdot B$.

Proof

$$\begin{aligned} (A \cdot B) \times \nabla &= (A \cdot B) \times G^m \nabla_m \\ &= [(A \nabla_m) \cdot B + A \cdot (B \nabla_m)] \times G^m \\ &= A \cdot (B \nabla_m) \times G^m + (A \nabla_m) \cdot B \times G^m, \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where $A \cdot (B \nabla_m) \times G^m = A \cdot (B \times \nabla)$, and

$$\begin{aligned} (A \nabla_m) \cdot B \times G^m &= [(A \nabla) \cdot G_m] \cdot [B_{kl} e^k G^l \times G^m] \\ &= A \nabla \cdot B_{kl} (e^k \cdot G_m) (G^l \times G^m) \\ &= A \nabla \cdot B_{kl} (e_k G^l) \cdot (G_m G^m) = A \nabla \cdot B \cdot \dot{\times} I \\ &= -A \nabla \cdot \dot{\times} B = -A \nabla \cdot \dot{\times} (I \cdot B) \\ &= - (A \nabla \cdot \dot{\times} I) \cdot B = (A \times \nabla) \cdot B, \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where the unit tensor $I = G_m G^m = \delta_{ij} G^i G^j$ in reference configuration. Therefore, we have proven the tensor identity, which has never been seen in literature.

Despite the incompatibility of elastic and plastic deformation, namely, F^e and F^p , the total deformation F is compatible, it means that the total deformation must be gradient of global maps, thus it must satisfy compatible condition [23], namely, the incompatible tensor $Inc(F) = F \times \nabla = 0$, which leads to $Inc(F) = (F^e \cdot F^p) \times \nabla = 0$.

Applying the identity of tensor proved in the Lemma, we have

$$Inc(F) = F \times \nabla = (F^e \cdot F^p) \times \nabla = F^e \cdot (F^p \times \nabla) + (F^e \times \nabla) \cdot F^p = 0. \quad (5)$$

Using the previous definitions of plastic dislocation density tensor, the above expression can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} Inc(F) &= F^e \cdot (-T_{Ortiz}) + (-T_{Modified-Kondo}) \cdot F^p \\ &= F^e \cdot (-T_{Berdichevsky}) + (-T_{Modified-Kondo}) \cdot F^p \\ &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

Therefore, we have their relationships:

$$F^e \cdot T_{Ortiz} + T_{Modified-Kondo} \cdot F^p = 0, \quad (7)$$

$$F \cdot T_{Berdichevsky} + T_{Modified-Kondo} \cdot F^p = 0, \quad (8)$$

$$F \cdot T_{Berdichevsky} - F^e \cdot T_{Ortiz} = 0. \quad (9)$$

Clearly the relations (7)–(9) reveal that three definition of the plastic dislocation density tensor are equivalent.

In summary, this study shows that both Ortiz's and Berdichevsky's plastic dislocation density tensors are equivalent, and are proper definition. Although Kondo's definition is not proper one, it can be fixed by the modified version in Eq. (2).

Appendix A. Supplementary data

Supplementary data associated with this article can be found, in the online version, at <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rinp.2018.12.045>.

References

- [1] Taylor GI. The mechanism of plastic deformation of crystals. Part I. Theoretical. Proc R Soc London, Ser A 1934;145(855):362–87.
- [2] Kondo K. Geometry of elastic deformation and incompatibility. Memoirs of the Unifying Study of the Basic Problems in Engineering Science by Means of Geometry, (K. Kondo, ed.), 1, Division C, Gakujutsu Bunken Fukyo-Kai, (1955) 5–17.
- [3] Bilby BA, Gardner LRT, Stroh AN. Continuous distributions of dislocations and the theory of plasticity. Proceedings of the 9th International Congress of Applied Mechanics, vol 8. Université de Bruxelles; 1957. p. 35–44.
- [4] Bilby BA, Bullough R, Smith E. Continuous distributions of dislocations: a new application of the methods of non-Riemannian geometry. Proc R Soc London, A 1995;231(1185):263–73.
- [5] Kröner E. Das Fundamentalintegral der anisotropen elastischen Versetzungsdichte und Spannungsfunktionen. Z Phys 1955;142:463–75.
- [6] Kröner E. Allgemeine kontinuumstheorie der versetzungen und eigenspannungen. Arch Rational Mech Anal 1960;4(4):273–334.
- [7] Ortiz M, Repetto EA. Nonconvex energy minimization and dislocation structures in ductile single crystals. J Mech Phys Solids 1999;47:397–462.
- [8] Sedov LI, Berdichevsky VL. A dynamic theory of continual dislocations. In: Kröner E, editor. Mechanics of generalized continua. Berlin: Springer-Verlag; 1967. p. 215–38.
- [9] Gairola BKD. Chapter 4: Nonlinear elastic problems. Dislocations in Solids, Edited by F.R.N. Nabarro, North-Holland Publishing Co. (1979).
- [10] Aifantis EC. The physics of plastic deformation. Int J Plasticity 1987;3:211–47.
- [11] Conti S, Dolzmann G, Kreisbeck C. Asymptotic behavior of crystal plasticity with one slip system in the limit of rigid elasticity. SIAM J Math Anal 2011;43:2337–53.
- [12] Reina C, Conti S. Kinematic description of crystal plasticity in the finite kinematic framework: a micromechanical understanding of $F = F^e \cdot F^p$. J Mech Phys Solids 2014;67:40–61.
- [13] Reina C, Schlömerkemper A, Conti S. Derivation of $F = F^e \cdot F^p$ as the continuum limit of crystalline slip. J Mech Phys Solids 2016;89:231–54.
- [14] Reina C, Conti S. Incompressible inelasticity as an essential ingredient for the validity of the kinematic decomposition. J Mech Phys Solids 2017;107:322–42.
- [15] Le KC, Stumpf H. Nonlinear continuum theory of dislocations. Int J Eng Sci 1995;34:339–58.
- [16] Le KC, Stumpf H. On the determination of the crystal reference in nonlinear continuum theory of dislocations. Proc R Soc London, A 1996;452:359–71.
- [17] Le KC, Stumpf H. A model of elastoplastic bodies with continuously distributed dislocations. Int J Plasticity 1996;12:611–27.
- [18] Le KC, Günther C. Nonlinear continuum dislocation theory revisited. Int J Plasticity 2014;53:164–78.
- [19] Le KC. Three-dimensional continuum dislocation theory. Int J Plasticity 2016;76:213–30.
- [20] Lee EH, Liu DT. Elasticplastic theory with application to plane-wave analysis. J Appl Phys 1967;38:19–27.
- [21] Lee EH. Elastic-plastic deformation at finite strains. J Appl Mech 1969;36(1):1–6.
- [22] Sun B. Rational interpretation of the postulates in plasticity. Res Phys 2014;4:10–1.
- [23] Sun B. Incompatible deformation field and Riemann curvature tensor. Appl Math Mech 2017;38(3):311–32.
- [24] Sun B. On plastic dislocation density tensor. Preprints 2018, 2018100330 (doi: <https://doi.org/10.20944/preprints201810.0330.v1>).