



**HAL**  
open science

# Dislocation-Density Crystalline Plasticity Modelling of Lath Martensitic Microstructures in Steel Alloys

Tarek Hatem, Mohammed Zikry

► **To cite this version:**

Tarek Hatem, Mohammed Zikry. Dislocation-Density Crystalline Plasticity Modelling of Lath Martensitic Microstructures in Steel Alloys. *Philosophical Magazine*, 2009, 89 (33), pp.3087-3109. 10.1080/14786430903185999 . hal-00529578

**HAL Id: hal-00529578**

**<https://hal.science/hal-00529578>**

Submitted on 26 Oct 2010

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



**Dislocation-Density Crystalline Plasticity Modelling of Lath  
Martensitic Microstructures in Steel Alloys**

Journal:	<i>Philosophical Magazine &amp; Philosophical Magazine Letters</i>
Manuscript ID:	TPHM-09-Feb-0052.R1
Journal Selection:	Philosophical Magazine
Date Submitted by the Author:	16-Jun-2009
Complete List of Authors:	Hatem, Tarek; North Carolina State University, Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering Zikry, Mohammed; North Carolina State University, Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering
Keywords:	deformation mechanisms, dislocations, finite-element modelling, martensites, martensitic transformations, microstructure, shear bands, steel
Keywords (user supplied):	lath martensite, microstructure, crystal plasticity



# Dislocation-Density Crystalline Plasticity Modelling of Lath Martensitic Microstructures in Steel Alloys

T. M. HATEM, and M. A. ZIKRY\*†

†Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, North Carolina 27695-7910, USA.

\*M. A. Zikry. Email: zikry@eos.ncsu.edu

A three-dimensional multiple-slip dislocation-density-based crystalline formulation, specialized finite-element formulations, and Voronoi tessellations adapted to martensitic orientations, were used to investigate large strain inelastic deformation modes and dislocation-density evolution in martensitic microstructures. The formulation is based on accounting for variant morphologies and orientations, retained austenite, and initial dislocations-densities that are uniquely inherent to martensitic microstructures. The effects of parent austenite orientation and retained austenite were also investigated for heterogeneous f.c.c./b.c.c. crystalline structures. Furthermore, the formulation was used to investigate microstructures mapped directly from SEM/EBSD images of martensitic steel alloys. The analysis indicates that variant morphology and orientations have a direct consequence on dislocation-density accumulation and inelastic localization in martensitic microstructures, and that lath directions, orientations, and arrangements are critical characteristics of high strength martensitic deformation and behaviour.

*Keywords:* lath martensite; dislocation-densities; finite element; high strength steel; Voronoi tessellation.

## 1. Introduction

Martensitic microstructures, such as lath, plate, and butterflies, have been commonly observed in several morphologies in steel [1, 2]. These morphologies are generally controlled by alloying elements, such as carbon and nickel. Lath martensitic steels due to their high strength, wear resistance, and toughness have myriad military and civilian applications. These properties are uniquely inherent to martensitic steels, as a result of its lath microstructure that has distinct orientations, distributions, and morphologies pertaining to martensitic transformations, see, for example, [3-16]. Specifically, the effects of lath martensite (b.c.c.) morphology, parent austenite (f.c.c.) orientation, strains related to transformations from f.c.c. to b.c.c. structures, and retained austenite all have interrelated effects on deformation and failure.

Due to the fine microstructure of lath martensite, it has been difficult to fully characterize lath martensite and understand its effect on overall behaviour. Wayman [7-9] conducted a series of pioneering experiments that identified lath martensite's characteristics, such as the habit plane of lath martensite and martensite Orientation Relations (ORs); the lath microstructure in

1  
2  
3 successive layers; the internal and interfacial dislocation microstructure in lath martensite. Kelly  
4 [15] utilized Wayman's work to interpret lath martensite microstructure using phenomenological  
5 theory to elucidate how martensitic diffusionless transformation occurs. In recent years, Morito  
6 and his colleagues [10-14] have conducted significant experiments, utilizing TEM, SEM and  
7 EBSD characterization to classify how martensitic structures can be characterized in categories  
8 of laths, blocks (variants with low angle mismatch) and packets (collection of blocks with the  
9 same habit plane) microstructures and to characterize their orientation relations and distributions.  
10 Spanos *et al.* [16] have used EBSD and serial sectioning to construct a 3D morphology of coarse  
11 martensite lath, which provided further detailed insights on lath orientations, distributions, and  
12 shapes.

13  
14  
15 Most finite-element investigations pertaining to martensitic steels utilize  
16 phenomenological plasticity models, see, for example, [17, 18]. These approaches do not account  
17 for the crystalline structure and the inherent anisotropy of martensite. Furthermore, critical  
18 martensitic characteristics, such as ORs, morphologies, parent austenite orientations, initial  
19 dislocation-densities, and retained austenite are not accounted for in these studies. Molecular  
20 dynamic (MD) simulations [19-21] have been invaluable for predicting defect nucleation and  
21 transformation at the molecular level. However, there are severe limitations related to temporal  
22 and spatial scales that minimize understanding or predicting behaviour at the relevant  
23 microstructural level.

24  
25  
26 Therefore, to address these limitations, we extend the dislocation-density based  
27 crystalline models proposed by Zikry and Kao [22] and Ashmawi and Zikry [23] to b.c.c.  
28 crystalline microstructures. Within this formulation, we account for martensitic transformations  
29 and parent austenite crystalline orientations for an accurate OR description of lath  
30 microstructure. This representation is based on arranging variants within packets and blocks that  
31 are categorized in terms of habit planes and orientations. Furthermore, the current study accounts  
32 for retained austenite and the effects of initial dislocation-densities. An  $L_\infty$  Voronoi tessellation  
33 algorithm, see [24, 25], is also used to generate physically representative microstructures that  
34 have been adapted to account for the orientation of blocks parallel to the habit plane for an  
35 accurate representation of martensitic morphologies. These are coupled with specialized finite-  
36 element formulations for a predictive framework related to martensitic steels.

37  
38  
39 This paper is organized as follows: the dislocation-density crystalline plasticity  
40 formulation is given in Section 2, the martensitic microstructure representation in terms of  
41 orientation, morphology, retained austenite and initial dislocation-density is outlined in Section  
42 3, the computational techniques are given in Section 4, the results are given in Section 5, and a  
43 summary of the results is discussed in Section 6.

## 44 45 46 47 **2. Dislocation-Density Based Multiple-Slip Constitutive Formulation**

48  
49 The formulation for the multiple-slip crystal plasticity rate-dependent constitutive  
50 relations, and the derivation of the evolutionary equations for the mobile and immobile  
51 dislocation-densities, which are coupled to the multiple-slip crystalline formulation, are outlined  
52 here. A detailed formulation is given by Zikry and Kao [22] and Ashmawi and Zikry [23].

53  
54 It is assumed that the velocity gradient can be decomposed into a symmetric part, the  
55 deformation rate tensor,  $D_{ij}$  and an anti-symmetric part, the spin tensor,  $W_{ij}$ . It is further  
56 assumed that the total deformation rate tensor, and the total spin tensor,  $D_{ij}$  can be then additively  
57 decomposed into elastic and plastic components as  
58  
59  
60

$$D_{ij} = D_{ij}^* + D_{ij}^P, \quad W_{ij} = W_{ij}^* + W_{ij}^P \quad (1a-b)$$

in which  $W_{ij}$  includes the rigid body spin. The inelastic parts are defined in terms of the crystallographic slip rates as

$$D_{ij}^P = P_{ij}^{(\alpha)} * \dot{\gamma}^{(\alpha)}, \quad W_{ij}^P = \omega_{ij}^{(\alpha)} * \dot{\gamma}^{(\alpha)}, \quad (2a-b)$$

where  $\alpha$  is summed over all slip-systems, and  $P_{ij}^{(\alpha)}$  and  $\omega_{ij}^{(\alpha)}$  are second order tensors, and are defined in terms of the unit normals to the slip planes and the unit slip vectors to the slip directions.

For rate-dependent inelastic materials, the constitutive description on each slip-system can be characterized by a power law relation as

$$\dot{\gamma}^{(\alpha)} = \dot{\gamma}_{ref}^{(\alpha)} \left[ \frac{\tau^{(\alpha)}}{\tau_{ref}^{(\alpha)}} \right] \left[ \frac{\tau^{(\alpha)}}{\tau_{ref}^{(\alpha)}} \right]^{\left(\frac{1}{m}\right)-1} \quad \text{no sum on } \alpha, \quad (3)$$

where  $\dot{\gamma}_{ref}^{(\alpha)}$  is the reference shear strain rate which corresponds to a reference shear stress,  $\tau_{ref}^{(\alpha)}$  and  $m$  is the rate sensitivity parameter. The reference stress that is used here is a modification of widely used classical forms [26] that relate the reference stress to a square root dependence on the dislocation-density as

$$\tau_{ref}^{(\alpha)} = \tau_y^{(\alpha)} + Gb \sum_{\xi=1}^{12} a_{\xi} \sqrt{\rho_{im}^{(\xi)}}, \quad (4)$$

where  $G$  is the shear modulus,  $b$  is the magnitude of the Burgers vector,  $\tau_y^{(\alpha)}$  is the static yield stress, and the coefficients,  $a_{\xi}$  are interaction coefficients, and generally have a magnitude of unity, and  $\rho_{im}^{(\xi)}$  are the immobile dislocation-densities as defined in the next section.

## 2.1. The Evolution of Mobile and Immobile Dislocation-Densities

It is assumed that at a given state for a deformed material, the dislocation structure of total dislocation-density,  $\rho^{(\alpha)}$ , can be assumed to be additively decomposed, into a mobile dislocation-density,  $\rho_m^{(\alpha)}$ , and an immobile dislocation-density  $\rho_{im}^{(\alpha)}$  as

$$\rho^{(\alpha)} = \rho_m^{(\alpha)} + \rho_{im}^{(\alpha)}. \quad (5)$$

It is assumed that during an increment of strain, an immobile dislocation-density rate is generated and an immobile dislocation-density rate is annihilated for statistically stored dislocation-densities (see for example, [27]). The balance between dislocation generation and annihilation equations is the basis for the evolution of mobile and immobile dislocation-densities as a function of strain. Based on these arguments, it can be shown [28] that the coupled set of nonlinear evolutionary equations of mobile and immobile dislocation-densities can then be given by

$$\frac{d\rho_m^{(\alpha)}}{dt} = \dot{\gamma}^{(\alpha)} \left( \frac{g_{sour}}{b^2} \left( \frac{\rho_{im}^{(\alpha)}}{\rho_m^{(\alpha)}} \right) - \frac{g_{minter}}{b^2} \exp\left(-\frac{H}{kT}\right) - \frac{g_{immob}}{b} \sqrt{\rho_{im}^{(\alpha)}} \right), \quad (6)$$

$$\frac{d\rho_{im}^{(\alpha)}}{dt} = \dot{\gamma}^{(\alpha)} \left[ \frac{g_{minter}}{b^2} \exp\left(-\frac{H}{kT}\right) + \frac{g_{immob}}{b} \sqrt{\rho_{im}^{(\alpha)}} - g_{recov} \exp\left(-\frac{H}{kT}\right) \rho_{im}^{(\alpha)} \right], \quad (7)$$

where  $g_{sour}$  is a coefficient pertaining to an increase in the mobile dislocation-density due to dislocation sources,  $g_{minter}$  is a coefficient related to the trapping of mobile dislocations due to forest intersections, cross-slip around obstacles, or dislocation interactions,  $g_{recov}$  is a coefficient related to the rearrangement and annihilation of immobile dislocations,  $g_{immob}$  is a coefficient related to the immobilization of mobile dislocations,  $H$  is the activation enthalpy, and  $k$  is Boltzmann's constant. As these evolutionary equations indicate, the dislocation activities related to recovery and trapping are coupled to thermal activation.

The evolutionary equations are coupled to the multiple-slip crystal plasticity formulation, the four  $g$  coefficients in equations (6-7), and the enthalpy,  $H$ , must be determined as functions of the deformation mode. The enthalpy,  $H$ , is determined by defining an exponential ratio of the current temperature to the reference temperature. The four  $g$  coefficients are determined by using the following two general conditions, pertinent to the evolution of dislocation-densities in crystalline materials that the mobile and immobile dislocation-densities saturate at large strains, and that the relaxation of the mobile dislocation-density to a quasi-steady state value occurs much faster than the variation of the immobile density [26, 29, 30].

### 3. Martensitic Microstructural Representation

The martensitic microstructure has to be accurately represented in terms of orientation, morphology, retained austenite, and transformation dislocation-densities. As experimentally noted by several investigators [3-6], these dominant interrelated four characteristics are needed to account for the martensitic microstructure, since they collectively have a significant interrelated role in understanding and predicting behaviour at different physical scales. The representation of each of these characteristics is outlined in the following subsections.

The austenite phase will be represented as a f.c.c. structure with twelve potential slip-systems with habit planes of  $\{111\}$  and slip directions of  $\langle 110 \rangle$ , see for example Taylor [31], and Franciosi and Zaoui [32]. The martensitic phase will be represented as (b.c.t./b.c.c. with twenty four potential slip-systems with  $\{110\}$  and  $\{112\}$  slip-planes of for easy and pencil glide, and slip directions of  $\langle 111 \rangle$ , see, for example, Franciosi [33], Ortiz *et al.* [34].

### 3.1. Martensitic Orientation

For the crystalline plasticity formulation, the product phase martensite must be related to the global coordinates through a parent austenite grain orientation and variant orientations. Commonly accepted ORs for lath martensitic steels are Kurdjumov-Sachs (K-S) and Nishiyama-Wassermann (N-W) ORs as given by [35].

K-S ORs are based on a  $\gamma$  austenite transformation to an  $\alpha'$  martensitic transformation as  $(111)_\gamma // (011)_{\alpha'}$ ,  $[\bar{1}01]_\gamma // [\bar{1}\bar{1}\bar{1}]_{\alpha'}$ . For an N-W OR, the transformation is based on  $(111)_\gamma // (011)_{\alpha'}$ ,  $[\bar{1}\bar{1}2]_\gamma // [0\bar{1}\bar{1}]_{\alpha'}$  relation, which is a K-S OR with a  $5.12^\circ$  degree rotation around the  $[011]_\gamma$  direction. Investigations by Wayman [7-9] and Morito [10, 11] have clearly indicated that martensitic steel alloys generally have intermediate ORs that are between K-S and N-W ORs. As can be seen from Table 1, twenty four variants can be obtained for K-S ORs.

A martensitic transformation is a military transformation, where atoms have a fixed relation to each other during the transformation. Martensitic transformations are diffusionless, as it usually occurs at high speed and/or low temperatures, which mandate glissile interfaces between parent and product phases. This interface is the habit plane [35]. The orientation of the habit planes is critical in determining the appropriate martensitic orientations relative to the parent austenite phase. Wayman [9], Kelly [15] and Maki *et al.* [10,11] have identified  $(557)_\gamma$  plane as lath martensite's habit plane.

As noted earlier, an essential aspect of representing martensitic texture is to relate the martensitic b.c.c. local grain orientation to the global orientation. Three transformations are needed. The first transformation,  $[T]_1$ , relates an observed OR to a theoretical OR, such as K-S and N-W ORs. The second transformation,  $[T]_2$ , relates a martensite OR to the parent austenite grain orientation. The third transformation,  $[T]_3$ , relates the austenite grain orientation to the global coordinates. These transformations are given by

$$[X]_{\text{Global}} = [T]_3 * [T]_2 * [T]_1 * [X]_{\alpha'} \quad (8)$$

Variants are usually deviated from theoretical ORs with random or fixed angles. The first transformation transforms observed martensitic coordinates to a martensitic orientation, such as KS or NW, as

$$[X]_{\text{th } \alpha'} = [T]_1 * [X]_{\text{Ob } \alpha'} \quad (9)$$

For example, observed orientations for lath martensite [9-11] can be represented as a misorientation from  $[011]_\gamma$  in K-S OR with an angle  $\phi$ , and can be represented as

$$\begin{bmatrix} t/2 + c & -s/\sqrt{2} & t/2 \\ s/\sqrt{2} & c & -s/\sqrt{2} \\ t/2 & s/\sqrt{2} & t/2 + c \end{bmatrix} \quad (10)$$

where  $s = \sin(\phi)$ ,  $c = \cos(\phi)$ , and  $t = 1 - \cos(\phi)$ , and  $\phi$  generally varies between  $0^\circ$  and  $5.12^\circ$  degree for lath martensitic steels.



The second transformation is the theoretical transformation between the product martensitic phase and the parent austenitic phases, such as the KS OR. The second order tensor for the transformation is obtained utilizing the OR for the invariant plane and axis for each variant. A matrix with an orthogonal parallel system of axes can be used for both parent and product phases since  $[X]_{\gamma} = [T]_2 * [X]_{\alpha}$  and therefore  $[T]_2 = [X]_{\alpha}^{-1} * [X]_{\gamma}$ . For the first variant in Table 1, we have

$$[X]_{\gamma} = \begin{bmatrix} 1/\sqrt{3} & -1/\sqrt{2} & 1/\sqrt{3} \\ 1/\sqrt{3} & 0 & -2/\sqrt{6} \\ 1/\sqrt{3} & 1/\sqrt{2} & 1/\sqrt{2} \end{bmatrix}, \text{ and } [X]_{\alpha} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -1/\sqrt{3} & 2/\sqrt{6} \\ 1/\sqrt{2} & -1/\sqrt{3} & -1/\sqrt{6} \\ 1/\sqrt{2} & 1/\sqrt{3} & 1/\sqrt{2} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (11)$$

and,

$$[T]_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0.7416 & 0.6498 & 0.1667 \\ -0.6667 & 0.7416 & 0.0749 \\ -0.0749 & -0.1667 & 0.9832 \end{bmatrix} \quad (12)$$

Similar transformations can be obtained for all 24 variants related to K-S ORs as presented in Table 1.

The third transformation pertains to the austenite orientation relative to the global axis and the loading directions. Such a transformation is usually represented as three independent Euler angles, where  $[T]_3$  can be obtained. Another approach is similar to the approach utilized to obtain  $[T]_2$ ;  $[X]_G = [T]_3 * [X]_{\gamma}$ , and  $[T]_3 = [X]_{\gamma}^{-1} * [X]_G$ . For example, to align the load with  $(111)_{\gamma}$  and  $[-110]_{\gamma}$ , where  $[010]_G // [111]_{\gamma}$ ,  $[001]_G // [-110]_{\gamma}$ , and  $[-110]_{\gamma} \times [111]_{\gamma} // [100]_G$ , the transformation would be

$$[X]_{\gamma} = \begin{bmatrix} 1/\sqrt{6} & 1/\sqrt{3} & -1/\sqrt{2} \\ -1/\sqrt{6} & 1/\sqrt{3} & 1/\sqrt{2} \\ -2/\sqrt{6} & 1/\sqrt{3} & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \text{ and } [X]_G = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (13)$$

then

$$[T]_3 = \begin{bmatrix} -0.4083 & -0.4083 & 0.8165 \\ 0.5774 & 0.5774 & 0.5774 \\ -0.7071 & 0.7071 & 0.0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (14)$$

and the final transformation to the global axis can be calculated as in equation 8.

### 3.2. Morphology: Variant Arrangement and Distribution

Another unique characteristic of martensitic microstructure is the fine structure of laths, which are the building cells of the martensitic microstructure. The lath long direction is oriented



1  
2  
3 along  $[011]_{\gamma}$ , as illustrated in Figure 1. A typical lath geometry is  $0.3 \times 2.8 \times 100 \mu\text{m}$  [8]. The  
4 change in lath width is small relative to the change in the parent austenite grain [14].

5  
6 To characterize the complex martensitic microstructure that occurs on different length  
7 scales, we will follow what Morito *et al.* [10-14] have proposed based on SEM and EBSD  
8 characterization. Specifically, we will designate a block as a group of laths with low angle  
9 misorientations, and a packet as a collection of blocks with the same habit plane (Figure 2).  
10 Blocks will have irregular shapes, although it can be observed that the smallest dimension will be  
11 in the direction normal to the habit plane, and block widths can vary between  $0.7\text{-}8 \mu\text{m}$  [7, 14].  
12 Using this methodology, we can use the ORs and original austenite orientations to model  
13 different variant orientations for different blocks and packets arrangements. Packets can have  
14 irregular shapes as well, although the stacking direction of variants is assumed parallel to the  
15 habit plane direction. Packet sizes can be approximated as a linear function of prior austenite  
16 grain size, and can vary between  $0.7\text{-}150 \mu\text{m}$ , see [14] for more details. Due to the  
17 microstructural scale that we use in this investigation, the martensitic block is assumed as the  
18 smallest scale. Furthermore, as noted by Morito *et al.* [4] martensitic properties are more likely  
19 to be related to block size interfacial orientations. In this study, a single parent austenite grain  
20 will be considered to further elucidate how grain orientation, packets, and blocks affect  
21 mechanical properties and large strain deformation response.  
22  
23  
24

### 25 26 **3.3. Retained Austenite**

27  
28 As it is well known, a small amount of retained austenite (approximately 5%) is  
29 frequently observed between the martensitic aggregates after the martensitic transformation, see,  
30 for example, [5, 7, 36]. In the current study, these effects will be investigated by a random  
31 distribution of f.c.c. retained austenite within the b.c.c. aggregate.  
32  
33  
34

### 35 36 **3.4. Transformation Dislocations Densities**

37  
38 Martensitic transformation is usually accompanied by large dislocation-densities, see, for  
39 example, [13]. These high dislocation-densities are necessary to accommodate the phase  
40 transformation and the subsequent glissile interface. Wayman [9] classified the dislocations in  
41 martensitic microstructure as two basic types, transformation and interface dislocations. The  
42 transformation dislocations are screw dislocation in all four  $\langle 111 \rangle_{\alpha'}$  direction, with  $a/2 [\bar{1}\bar{1}\bar{1}]_{\alpha'}$   
43 as the dominant direction. Morito *et al.* [13] conducted several experimental studies to  
44 characterize the dislocation-densities in nickel and carbon based steels with varying composition.  
45 Approximate dislocation-densities of the value of  $3.8 \times 10^{14} \text{ m}^{-2}$  were obtained for low-nickel lath  
46 martensitic steels (Fe-11Ni) [13].  
47

48 The percentages of mobile to immobile dislocation-densities ratio were not obtained by  
49 these studies, as it is difficult to obtain these values experimentally. The initial mobile and  
50 immobile dislocations incorporated in the current study were obtained from numerical models  
51 based on a proposed transformation crystalline plasticity model [37].  
52  
53

## 54 55 **4. Computational Techniques**

56 The total deformation rate tensor,  $D_{ij}$ , and the plastic deformation rate tensor,  $D_{ij}^p$  are  
57 needed to update the material stress state. The method used here is the one developed by Zikry  
58  
59  
60

[38] for rate-dependent crystalline plasticity formulations, and only a brief outline will be presented here. An implicit finite element method is used to obtain the total deformation rate tensor,  $D_{ij}$ . To overcome numerical instabilities associated with stiffness, a hybrid explicit-implicit method is used to obtain the plastic deformation rate tensor,  $D_{ij}^p$ . This hybrid numerical scheme is also used to update the evolutionary equations for the mobile and immobile densities.

To physically represent realistic grain shapes, an  $L_\infty$  Voronoi tessellation is used. Voronoi tessellations are widely used techniques to generate random grain shapes, as it generates equally distanced boundaries between a random set of points, which can be thought as nucleation sites, see for example [39]. Although, ordinary Voronoi tessellations can be used to generate equilibrium-transformed structures, it may not be appropriate for martensitic steels, since it cannot be used to account for habit plane orientations pertaining to the appropriate martensitic transformation. In this study,  $L_\infty$  Voronoi algorithms (Hwang [24] and Lee [25]) are used for the representation of martensitic microstructures. The algorithm is based on determining the distances from  $L_\infty$  bases, which can be used to orient the blocks along the specified habit planes. The technique can be used to generate orientations around general planes, such as (100) and irrational planes such as (557) by applying needed transformations. Furthermore, smoothing techniques were used to avoid sharp corners along grain and packet interfaces, as illustrated in Figure 3.

## 5. Results and Discussion

The multiple-slip dislocation-density based crystal plasticity formulation, the specialized finite element algorithm, and the  $L_\infty$  Voronoi scheme were used to investigate the large strain inelastic behaviour of martensitic steel. The martensite orientation is represented as outlined in section 3.1. The parent austenite grain is oriented based on the loading plane of  $(001)_\gamma$ , and two loading directions  $[010]_\gamma$  and  $[110]_\gamma$ . The K-S relation is adopted as the martensite OR, and  $\{111\}_\gamma$  is assumed as the habit plane. The martensite morphology is generated by the  $L_\infty$  Voronoi tessellation to generate block and packet microstructures relative to the parent austenite grain. A representative aggregate size was determined by modelling the response of aggregates with different aggregate sizes. In this study, 40 martensitic grains are used with 10 packets, with an average of 4 blocks per packet as shown in figure 4. It is assumed that the parent austenite grain has an initial cube orientation.

Using the method outlined by Kameda and Zikry [28], the initial coefficient values, needed for the evolution of the immobile and mobile dislocation-densities given by equations (6-7) were obtained as

$$\begin{aligned} g_{\text{minter}} = 5.53, \quad g_{\text{recov}} = 6.67, \quad g_{\text{immob}} = 0.0127, \quad g_{\text{sour}} = 2.7 \times 10^{-5}, \quad \text{and} \\ H/K = 3.289 \times 10^3 \text{ } ^\circ\text{K}. \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

A mobile and immobile dislocation-densities saturation values were obtained for the previous values, and found to be:

$$\rho_{im,s}^{(\alpha)} = 1.16 \times 10^{16} \text{ m}^{-2}, \quad \rho_{m,s}^{(\alpha)} = 6.86 \times 10^{14} \text{ m}^{-2}, \quad (16)$$

1  
2  
3 To validate the modelling scheme, comparisons were made with experiments conducted  
4 by Kumar [40] on 10% Ni steel alloy. Comparisons were made for axial compression strain rates  
5 of 0.01/s, and 0.0001/s by applying normal axial loads, with symmetry boundary conditions, as  
6 shown in figure 4. Based on a convergence analysis, 2485 four node quadrilateral elements were  
7 used with a plane strain analysis for a specimen size of 4.2 mm by 6.3 mm. The material  
8 properties (Table 2) that are used here are representative of low nickel alloy steel.  
9

10 The global nominal stress-strain curve of a comparison between the predictions and the  
11 experimental results is shown in figure 5. As seen, there is excellent agreement between the  
12 predicted and measured values for both strain-rates for nominal strains up to 30%. These results  
13 validate the computational framework and constitutive formulation that has been developed.  
14

15 As noted earlier, the representation of the morphological martensitic microstructures by  
16 tessellation is critical. If ordinary tessellation had been used instead of the adapted  $L_\infty$  Voronoi  
17 scheme, the results would have been different and inaccurate. Figure 6 compares the results of  
18  $L_\infty$  Voronoi and the ordinary Voronoi tessellations with the experimental measurements. Both  
19 models have the same set of points and material properties, and the only difference is in the  
20 tessellation algorithm. It is clearly obvious that the ordinary Voronoi scheme differs significantly  
21 from the experimental results, and that the  $L_\infty$  Voronoi has excellent comparison with the  
22 experimental measurements. This is due to the incorporation of accurate representations of habit  
23 planes, slip-system orientations, and lath long direction within the  $L_\infty$  Voronoi scheme. As these  
24 microstructural characteristics, as will be seen, have an important effect on deformation and  
25 localization.  
26  
27

28 To further elucidate the local microstructural mechanisms, the contours for the mobile  
29 dislocation-densities (figure 7), and the immobile dislocation-densities (figure 8) corresponding  
30 to the three most active slip-systems, at a nominal strain of 15% are shown. The maximum  
31 normalized (the mobile densities are normalized by the saturated mobile dislocation-density)  
32 mobile dislocation-densities are 0.44 for  $(\bar{1}\bar{1}2)/[1\bar{1}\bar{1}]$ , 0.22 for  $(112)/[11\bar{1}]$ , and 0.08 for  $(1\bar{1}2)/$   
33  $[\bar{1}\bar{1}\bar{1}]$ . The maximum normalized (the immobile densities are normalized by the saturated  
34 immobile dislocation-density) immobile dislocation-densities for the three slip-systems are 0.55  
35 for  $(\bar{1}\bar{1}2)/[1\bar{1}\bar{1}]$ , 0.33 for  $(112)/[11\bar{1}]$ , and 0.17 for  $(1\bar{1}2)/[\bar{1}\bar{1}\bar{1}]$ . The evolution of dislocation-  
36 densities along selected blocks and along low-angle grain boundaries (as noted earlier grain  
37 boundaries are equivalent to block boundaries) result in an increase in dislocation-densities  
38 values and a localization of shear slip as shown in figure 9. These increases in dislocation-  
39 density are due to an alignment of the load towards  $[010]_\gamma$ .  $[011]_\gamma$  is a maximum resolved shear  
40 stress direction for this load, since it is  $45^\circ$  from the loading direction.  $[011]_\gamma$  is also parallel to  
41 the long direction of laths and blocks, and parallel to the slip direction  $[111]_\alpha$  based on the K-S  
42 OR.  
43  
44  
45

46 To further underscore the orientation relation between loading direction, slip-systems,  
47 and the lath long directions, the stereographic projection of the slip-systems of variant #11  
48 relative to the loading direction, the locus of maximum resolved shear stress (a circle that is  $45^\circ$   
49 from the loading direction), and the long direction of the variant are plotted as in figure 10. As  
50 can be seen, the slip direction  $[11\bar{1}]_\alpha$  aligns with  $[0\bar{1}\bar{1}]_\gamma$ , which is the long direction of the laths  
51 inside the block and the maximum resolved shear direction for the uniaxial loading direction of  
52  $[010]_\gamma$ . Furthermore, slip-plane  $(112)_\alpha$  is almost coincident with the maximum resolved shear  
53 locus. This would activate slip-system  $(112)/[11\bar{1}]$  in this variant as was confirmed by the  
54 results shown in figures 6(b) and 7(b).  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 Similarly for variant #4, the slip direction  $[1\bar{1}1]_{\alpha}$  aligns with the direction  $[0\bar{1}1]_{\gamma}$ . Slip-  
5 plane  $(\bar{1}12)$  is nearly adjacent to the maximum resolved shear stress direction. This activates slip-  
6 system  $(\bar{1}12) / [1\bar{1}1]$  as confirmed by figures 6(a) and 7(a). Similar behaviour can be obtained for  
7 other variants. Furthermore, systems  $(112) / [1\bar{1}1]$  in variant #4 and  $(112) / [1\bar{1}1]$  in variant #11  
8 are continuous, which lead to shear-strain localization as shown in figure 9. This special  
9 configuration aligns the slip-systems with the maximum resolved shear stress direction with the  
10 long direction of the blocks, and when combined with the low angle boundaries between blocks,  
11 it acts as shear pipes for the localization of dislocation-densities and shear strains.

12 As shown in figure 9(a), the accumulated maximum plastic shear is 2.21 at a nominal  
13 strain of 15%. This large value is due to geometrical softening and the orientation effects  
14 associated with the shear pipes. The geometrical softening occurs due to the large lattice rotation  
15 that is high as  $31.1^{\circ}$  (figure 11(a)), reaching its maximum at the kink on the free surface. The  
16 maximum normalized (stress values are normalized by the static yield stress) normal stress is -  
17 5.23 (figure 11(b)), and the maximum normalized shear stress is 0.85 (figure 11(c)). These  
18 maximum values occur at the blocks boundaries.

19 It should also be noted that the immobile dislocation-density associated with slip-system  
20  $(\bar{1}12) / [1\bar{1}1]$  saturates at a nominal strain of approximately 21%, which is the unloading strain of  
21 the experimental specimen. At this strain, several inactive slip-systems are activated due to  
22 lattice rotation, and at 30% nominal strain, 21 slip-systems are active through the specimen.

### 23 **5.1 Parent Austenite Orientation**

24 In this section, we investigate the effects of initial austenite orientation on large strain  
25 inelastic deformation in martensitic steels microstructures. For this analysis, we assumed, as  
26 before, one austenite grain would result in 40 blocks and 10 packets, and the microstructure is  
27 generated by the  $L_{\infty}$  Voronoi tessellation algorithm using the same set of points used in the  
28 previous analyses. The parent austenite grain is oriented based on a loading plane of  $(001)_{\gamma}$ , and a  
29 loading direction of  $[110]_{\gamma}$ , by applying a transformation angle of  $45^{\circ}$ . The Euler angles and the  
30 relations with the global axes were determined from the previously presented relation,  $[T]_3 = [X]_{\gamma}^{-1} * [X]_G$ .

31 The contours for the mobile dislocation-densities (figure 12), and the immobile  
32 dislocation-densities (figure 13) corresponding to the two most active slip-systems, at a nominal  
33 strain of 15%, are shown. The maximum normalized mobile dislocation-densities for the two  
34 slip-systems are 0.11 for  $(110) / [1\bar{1}1]$ , and 0.08 for  $(011) / [1\bar{1}1]$ , while the maximum normalized  
35 immobile dislocation-densities are 0.22 for  $(110) / [1\bar{1}1]$ , and 0.18 for  $(011) / [1\bar{1}1]$ .  
36 Furthermore, both dislocation-densities and shear slip (figure 14(a)) are uniformly distributed  
37 throughout the specimen with no evident of localization. This can be due to the orientation  
38 effects of the austenite grain, since the blocks and the lath long directions are inclined, and not  
39 coincident, with the maximum shear stress orientation (figure 14(a)). The maximum shear slip is  
40 0.64, which is three times less than the previous model, and the maximum lattice rotation is  
41  $30.73^{\circ}$  (figure 14(b)).

### 42 **5.2 Retained Austenite**

43 It has frequently been observed that there are small percentages of retained austenite  
44 between laths and blocks in lath martensite, see, for example, [5, 36]. To investigate these  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52

1  
2  
3 effects, we modelled a heterogeneous crystalline structure with f.c.c. for the retained austenite  
4 structure and b.c.c. for the martensitic structure. We assumed that 10% of the volume is retained  
5 austenite. The retained austenite was assumed to be parallel to the long direction of the blocks in  
6 two configurations; inside the martensitic blocks (Model 1), and between blocks/packets (Model  
7 2).  
8

9  
10 The shear slip and lattice rotation for both models are presented in figure 15. The  
11 maximum shear slip is 1.66 for Model 1 and 1.85 for Model 2. The maximum lattice rotation is -  
12  $30.71^\circ$  for Model 1 and  $-34.79^\circ$  for Model 2. In both cases, there is a considerable decrease in the  
13 values of shear slip in comparison with cases with no retained austenite. This difference in  
14 behaviour can be due to the interaction of martensitic (b.c.c.) slip-systems with the retained  
15 austenitic (f.c.c.) regions. Slip-systems in austenite (f.c.c.) are  $\{111\}_\gamma / \langle 110 \rangle_\gamma$ , which would be  
16 aligned with the  $\{110\}_\alpha / \langle 111 \rangle_\alpha$  based on the KS OR between parent austenite and martensitic  
17 systems. However, active slip-systems in the martensitic (b.c.c.) blocks are of the  $\{112\}$  family  
18 of planes, which would make it incompatible with f.c.c. slip-systems. This incompatibility  
19 between both slip-systems can impede and block dislocation-density transmission and shear-slip  
20 accumulation at f.c.c.-b.c.c. interfaces. On the other hand, if we had active slip-systems  
21 corresponding to the  $\{110\}$  family of planes, the slip-systems would be compatible with the f.c.c.  
22 slip-systems of the retained austenite, and that can enhance plastic strain accumulation and  
23 localization.  
24

25  
26 These results are consistent with experimental observations pertaining to the stabilizing  
27 effects of retained austenite, see, for example, [5-6]. Moreover, the proposed approach can be an  
28 effective tool in predicting the mechanical behaviour for a wide range of microstructures in steels  
29 such as dual phase steels and carbide free bainite steels.  
30

#### 31 32 **5.4 Physically Representative Microstructure: SEM/EBSD Steel Microstructures**

33  
34 To further validate the proposed approach, the previous models used experimentally  
35 SEM/EBSD characterized lath martensite variant orientations and morphologies of low carbon  
36 steel (0.2 wt.% C steel), see Kitahara *et al.* [41]. Figure 16, shows the model mapped directly  
37 from SEM/EBSD by extrapolating the geometrical coordinates. These images were then  
38 discretized into a finite-element mesh.  
39

40 Figure 17 shows shear slip and lattice rotation at two nominal strains of 5% (a, b) and  
41 15% (c, d). The maximum shear slip is 0.07 at a nominal strain of 5% and 1.92 at nominal strain,  
42 of 15% combined with maximum lattice rotation of  $-2.92^\circ$  at 5% nominal strain and  $-37.31^\circ$  at  
43 15% nominal strain. Due to crystal rotations and geometrical softening inside the blocks, the  
44 shear slip is highly localized, as seen in figure 17. These results indicate how physical  
45 microstructures can be used with the proposed framework to accurately predict behaviour at the  
46 relevant martensitic microstructural scale.  
47

#### 48 49 **6. Summary**

50  
51 This investigation provides detailed validated predictive capabilities that have been used  
52 to understand complex interrelated physical mechanisms that relate to martensitic  
53 microstructures at different physical scales. A physically based microstructure representation of  
54 variants, blocks, packets, retained austenite, and initial dislocations was developed. A multiple-  
55 slip rate-dependent crystalline constitutive formulation that is coupled to the evolution of mobile  
56 and immobile dislocation-densities, and specialized computational schemes have been developed  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 to investigate the effects of variant shapes, orientations, retained austenite, parent austenite grain  
4 orientations, and initial dislocation-densities associated with transformation strains with different  
5 orientations relative to the loading direction.  
6

7 For a loading direction of  $[010]_{\gamma}$ , significant increases in dislocation activities occur  
8 along the blocks, and slip-systems  $(1\bar{1}2)/[\bar{1}11]$ ,  $(\bar{1}12)/[1\bar{1}1]$ , and  $(112)/[11\bar{1}]$  are the dominant  
9 systems. This configuration is almost coincident with the maximum resolved shear stress  
10 direction and with the long direction of blocks. When combined with low angle boundaries  
11 between blocks it acts as shear pipes that increase the dislocation-densities and shear strains  
12 within highly localized regions. This behaviour was also evident for the mapped SEM/EBSD  
13 images, where the loading was oriented on the same direction, which is a further indication of the  
14 validity of the proposed predictive methodology.  
15

16 For the  $[110]_{\gamma}$  loading direction,  $(110)/[1\bar{1}1]$ , and  $(011)/[1\bar{1}1]$  are the most active slip-  
17 systems. The shear slip is three times less than the previous loading direction. This can be due to  
18 the incompatibility between slip directions, the long direction of laths and the maximum resolved  
19 shear stresses, where more grain boundaries are available to impede the dislocation transmission  
20 between blocks.  
21

22 The effects of retained austenite on dislocation activities and behaviour of martensitic  
23 steels was also investigated by incorporating f.c.c structures (retained austenite) within b.c.c  
24 structures (martensitic blocks) The results clearly show the stabilizing effect of retained austenite  
25 and crystalline heterogeneities in reducing plastic strains and lattice rotations in critical regions.  
26

27 This general methodology underscores the importance of accurately representing  
28 martensitic microstructure on different microstructural scales. This predictive framework can be  
29 used to model other steel phases and alloys, such as bainite and dual phase steels and to  
30 potentially control behaviour at the microstructural scale.  
31

### 32 33 **Acknowledgments**

34  
35 Support from the Office of Naval Research through Grant N000140510097, is gratefully  
36 acknowledged.  
37

### 38 39 **7. References**

- 40  
41  
42 [1] G.B. Olson and W.S. Owen, *Martensite: A Tribute to Morris Cohen*, ASM International,  
43 USA, 1992.  
44 [2] K. Otsuka and C.M. Wayman, *Shape Memory Alloys*, Cambridge University Press,  
45 Cambridge, 1999.  
46 [3] G. Krauss, *Metall. Mater. Trans. A* 32B (2001) p. 205.  
47 [4] S. Morito, H. Yoshida, *et al.*, *Mater. Sci. Eng A-Struct.* 438-40 (2006) p. 237.  
48 [5] G. Thomas, *Metall. Trans. A* 9A (1978) p. 439.  
49 [6] H. Nakagawa and T. Miyazaki, *J. Mater. Sci.* 34 (1999) p. 3901.  
50 [7] W. Wasaka and C.M. Wayman, *Acta Metall.*, 29 (1981). p. 973, 991, 1013.  
51 [8] W. Wasaka and C.M. Wayman, *Metallography* 14 (1981) p. 49.  
52 [9] B.P.J. Sandvik and C.M. Wayman, *Metall. Trans. A* 14A (1983) p. 809, 823, 835.  
53 [10] S. Morito, X. Huang, *et al.*, *Acta Mater.* 54 (2006) p. 5323.  
54 [11] S. Morito, H. Tanaka, *et al.*, *Acta Mater.* 51 (2003) 1789-1799.  
55 [12] S. Morito, I. Kishida and T. Maki, *J. Phys. IV France* 112 (2003) p. 453.  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 [13] S. Morito, J. Nishikawa, *et al.*, ISIJ Int. 43(9) (2003) p. 1475.  
4 [14] S. Morito, H. Saito *et al.*, ISIJ Int. 45(1) (2005) p. 91.  
5 [15] P.M. Kelly, Metall. Trans. 33(3) (1992) p. 235.  
6 [16] D. J. Rowenhorst, A. Gupta, C.R. Feng and G. Spanos, Scripta Mater. 55 (2006) p. 11.  
7 [17] C. McVeigh, F. Vernerey, *et al.*, J. Mech. Phys. Solids 55 (2007) p. 225.  
8 [18] J. Zhai, V. Tomar, *et al.*, J. Eng. Mater-T ASME 126 (2004) p. 179.  
9 [19] M. Grujicic and P. Dang, Mater. Sci. Eng A-Struct. 201 (1995) p. 194.  
10 [20] T. Suzuki, M. Shimono, *et al.*, Mater. Sci. Eng A-Struct. 438-440 (2006) p. 95.  
11 [21] Marian J., Wirth B. D., *et al.*, J. Nucl. Mater. 323 (2003) p. 181.  
12 [22] M.A. Zikry, and M. Kao, J. Mech. Phys. Solids 44(11) (1996) p. 1765.  
13 [23] W.M. Ashmawi, and M.A. Zikry, J. Comput.-Aided Mater. Des. 7 (2000) p. 55.  
14 [24] F.K. Hwang, J. Assoc.for Comput. Mach. 26(2) (1979) p. 177.  
15 [25] D.T. Lee, J. Assoc.for Comput. Mach. 27(4) (1980) p. 604.  
16 [26] H. Mughrabi, Mater. Sci. Eng. 85(1-2) (1987) p. 15.  
17 [27] Q. Liu, D.J. Jensen, *et al.*, Acta Mater. 46(16) (1998) p. 5819.  
18 [28] T. Kameda, and M.A. Zikry, Scripta Mater. 38(4) (1996) p. 631.  
19 [29] B. Bay, N. Hansen, *et al.*, Acta Metall. Mater. 40 (1992) p. 205.  
20 [30] N. Hansen, Mater. Sci. Technol. 6 (1990) p. 1039.  
21 [31] G.I. Taylor, Proc. R. Soc. Lond. A 145 (1934) p. 362, 388.  
22 [32] P. Franciosi and A. Zaoui, Acta Metall. 30 (1982) p. 1627.  
23 [33] P. Franciosi, Acta Metall. 31(9) (1983) p. 1331.  
24 [34] L. Stainier, A.M. Cuitino and M. Ortiz, J. Mech. Phys. Solids 50 (2002) p. 1511.  
25 [35] H.K.D.H. Bhadeshia, *Worked examples in the geometry of crystals*. The institute of metals,  
26 London, 2001.  
27 [36] J.A. McMahon and G. Thomas, Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference on the  
28 Strength of Metals and Alloys, Institution of Metals, London, 1973, p. 180.  
29 [37] T.M. Hatem and M.A Zikry, Scripta Mater., to be submitted (2009).  
30 [38] M.A. Zikry, Comput. Struct. 50 (1994) p. 337.  
31 [39] S. Torquato, Random heterogeneous materials: Microstructure and Macroscopic Properties,  
32 Springer, New York, 2002.  
33 [40] P.Wang, K.S. Kumar, Mater. Sci. Eng. A (2009), in press.  
34 [41] H. Kitahara, R. Ueji, *et al.*, Acta Mater. 54 (2006) p. 1279.  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

For Peer Review Only

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60




Fig 1  
83x62mm (600 x 600 DPI)

View Only




Fig 2  
173x130mm (600 x 600 DPI)

new Only

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60




Fig 3a  
38x58mm (600 x 600 DPI)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60




Fig 3b  
38x58mm (600 x 600 DPI)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60




Fig 3c  
38x58mm (600 x 600 DPI)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60




Fig 3d  
38x58mm (600 x 600 DPI)



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60




Fig 4  
173x134mm (600 x 600 DPI)

Manuscript Only




Fig 5  
173x125mm (600 x 600 DPI)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60




Fig 6  
83x76mm (600 x 600 DPI)

Only

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60





Fig 7a  
73x134mm (600 x 600 DPI)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60





Fig 7b  
73x134mm (600 x 600 DPI)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60




Fig 7c  
73x134mm (600 x 600 DPI)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60





Fig 8a  
73x125mm (600 x 600 DPI)



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60





Fig 8b  
73x125mm (600 x 600 DPI)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60





Fig 8c  
73x125mm (600 x 600 DPI)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

# Shear Slip





Fig 9a  
83x150mm (600 x 600 DPI)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60




Fig 9b  
120x117mm (600 x 600 DPI)

AMU

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60




Fig 10a  
83x83mm (600 x 600 DPI)

AM

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

$[0\ 1\ 0]_{\gamma}$





Fig 10b  
83x83mm (600 x 600 DPI)

AM

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

# Lattice rotation





-31.73      -3.17      25.39

Fig 11a  
73x132mm (600 x 600 DPI)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

$$\sigma_{yy}$$



-5.32    -2.74    -0.16

Fig 11b  
73x132mm (600 x 600 DPI)



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

$$\sigma_{xy}$$





Fig 11c  
73x132mm (600 x 600 DPI)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60





Fig 12a  
83x134mm (600 x 600 DPI)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60





Fig 12b  
83x134mm (600 x 600 DPI)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60







Fig 13a  
83x134mm (600 x 600 DPI)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60





0.01      0.04      0.08

Fig 13b  
83x134mm (600 x 600 DPI)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

# Shear Slip




0.04      0.34      0.64

Fig 14a  
83x153mm (600 x 600 DPI)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

# Lattice rotation



-14.09      8.32      30.73

Fig 14b  
83x153mm (600 x 600 DPI)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

# Shear Slip





Fig 15a  
83x148mm (600 x 600 DPI)



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

# Lattice rotation




Fig 15b  
83x148mm (600 x 600 DPI)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

# Shear Slip





Fig 15c  
83x148mm (600 x 600 DPI)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

# Lattice rotation





Fig 15d  
83x148mm (600 x 600 DPI)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60




Fig 16  
83x66mm (600 x 600 DPI)

View Only

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

# Shear Slip




Fig 17a  
83x83mm (600 x 600 DPI)



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

### Lattice rotation



Fig 17b  
83x83mm (600 x 600 DPI)



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

# Shear Slip





Fig 17c  
83x83mm (600 x 600 DPI)



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

# Lattice rotation




Fig 17d  
83x83mm (600 x 600 DPI)





1  
2  
3  
4 List of Tables

5 Table 1: The 24 variants corresponding to K-S OR and their numbering

6 Table 2: Properties of martensitic and austenitic grains, isotropic elasticity have been assumed

7  
8  
9 **List of Figures**

10 Figure 1. Variant alignments, three main relations can be identified: flat, sharp, and extended  
11 inward.

12  
13 Figure 2. Lath martensite hierarchical microstructure for four scale architecture; parent austenite  
14 grains, packets, blocks, and laths.

15  
16 Figure 3. Proposed  $L_\infty$  Voronoi tessellations (a) ordinary Voronoi tessellations. (b)  $L_\infty$  Voronoi  
17 tessellations to the same set of points. (c) Applying the same algorithm with tilt angle of  $30^\circ$ . (d)  
18 modified  $L_\infty$  Voronoi tessellation algorithms (no sharp corners).

19  
20 Figure 4. Microstructural model used in the current study, the distribution of variants in blocks  
21 and packets (variants numbered as indicated in Table 1), and loading, geometry, and boundary  
22 conditions.

23  
24 Figure 5. Global stress-strain curve for experimental and predicted results for low nickel  
25 martensitic steel (Stresses values are normalized by the static yield stress).

26  
27 Figure 6. Global stress-strain curve for experimental results for low nickel martensitic steel,  
28 compared with numerical results obtained using ordinary Voronoi algorithms and proposed  $L_\infty$   
29 Voronoi algorithm.

30  
31 Figure 7. Normalized mobile dislocation-densities for most active slip-systems; (a) slip-system  
32  $(\bar{1}12)/[1\bar{1}1]$ , (b) slip-system  $(112)/[11\bar{1}]$ , and (c) slip-system  $(1\bar{1}2)/[\bar{1}11]$  at a nominal strain  
33 of 15%. Values normalized by mobile dislocation-densities saturation values,  $\rho_{m,s}^{(\alpha)} = 6.86 \times$   
34  $10^{14} \text{m}^{-2}$ .

35  
36 Figure 8. Normalized immobile dislocation-densities for most active slip-systems; (a) slip-  
37 system  $(\bar{1}12)/[1\bar{1}1]$ , (b) slip-system  $(112)/[11\bar{1}]$ , and (c) slip-system  $(1\bar{1}2)/[\bar{1}11]$  at a nominal  
38 strain of 15%. Values normalized by immobile dislocation-densities saturation values,  $\rho_{im,s}^{(\alpha)} =$   
39  $1.16 \times 10^{16} \text{m}^{-2}$ .

40  
41 Figure 9. Results obtained for the modelled specimen, at a nominal strain of 15% (a) Shear slip  
42 contours  $\gamma$ , (b) schematic of the specimen with shear localization region highlighted.

43  
44 Figure 10.  $[010]_\gamma$  stereographic projection for variant #11 slip-systems relative to the loading  
45 direction, the locus of maximum resolved shear stress (the inner circle) and the long direction of  
46 the variants (presented as \* in figure a) (a) the slip directions, (b) the slip planes.

47  
48 Figure 11. Results obtained for the modelled specimen, at a nominal strain of 15%; (a) lattice  
49 rotation in degrees; (b) normalized normal stresses; (c) normalized shear stresses. Stresses  
50 values are normalized by the static yield stress.

51  
52 Figure 12. Normalized mobile dislocation-densities for most active slip-systems for  $[011]_\gamma$   
53 loading direction; (a) slip-system  $(011)/[11\bar{1}]$ , (b) slip-system  $(011)/[111]$ , at a nominal strain  
54 of 15%.

55  
56 Figure 13. Normalized immobile dislocation-densities for most active slip-systems for  $[011]_\gamma$   
57 loading direction, (a) slip-system  $(011)/[11\bar{1}]$ , (b) slip-system  $(011)/[111]$ , at a nominal strain  
58 of 15%.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Figure 14. Results obtained for the modelled specimen for  $[011]_{\gamma}$  loading direction, at a nominal strain of 15%, (a) shear slip  $\gamma$ , (b) lattice rotation in degrees.

Figure 15. Results obtained for the modelled specimen with 10% of retained austenite, at a nominal strain of 15%. (a) shear slip  $\gamma$ , (b) lattice rotation in degrees, both for retained austenite placed inside the blocks (Model 1). (c) shear slip  $\gamma$ , (d) lattice rotation in degrees, both for retained austenite placed at block boundary (Model 2).

Figure 16. Physically representative microstructure mapped from SEM/EBSD steel microstructure and the distribution of variants [41].

Figure 17. Results obtained from mapped experimental specimens, at nominal strains of 5% and 15%. (a) shear slip  $\gamma$ , (b) lattice rotation in degrees, both at nominal strain of 5%. (c) shear slip  $\gamma$ , (d) lattice rotation in degrees, both at a nominal strain of 15