



HAL
open science

Ductile fracture of materials with randomly distributed voids

Clément Cadet, Jacques Besson, Sylvain Flouriot, Samuel Forest, Pierre Kerfriden, Victor de Rancourt

► **To cite this version:**

Clément Cadet, Jacques Besson, Sylvain Flouriot, Samuel Forest, Pierre Kerfriden, et al.. Ductile fracture of materials with randomly distributed voids. *International Journal of Fracture*, 2021, 230, pp.193-223. 10.1007/s10704-021-00562-7 . hal-03372371

HAL Id: hal-03372371

<https://hal.science/hal-03372371>

Submitted on 16 Oct 2021

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.

Ductile Fracture of Materials with Randomly Distributed Voids

Clément Cadet · Jacques Besson · Sylvain Flouriot · Samuel Forest* · Pierre Kerfriden · Victor de Rancourt

December 3rd, 2020

Abstract A reliable determination of the onset of void coalescence is critical to the modelling of ductile fracture. Numerical models have been developed but rely mostly on analyses on single defect cells, thus underestimating the interaction between voids. This study aims to provide the first extensive analysis of the response of microstructures with random distributions of voids to various loading conditions and to characterize the dispersion of the results as a consequence of the randomness of the void distribution. Cells embedding a random distribution of identical spherical voids are generated within an elastoplastic matrix and subjected to a macroscopic loading with constant stress triaxiality and Lode parameter under periodic boundary conditions in finite element simulations. The failure of the cell is determined by a new indicator based on the loss of full rankedness on the average deformation gradient rate. It is shown that the strain field developing in random microstructures and the one in unit cells feature different dependencies on the Lode parameter L owing to different failure modes. Depending on L , the cell may fail in extension (coalescence) or in shear. Moreover the random void populations lead to a significant dispersion of failure strain, which is present even in simulations with high numbers of voids.

Keywords Ductile Fracture · Void coalescence · Homogenization

* *Corresponding author*, E-mail: samuel.forest@mines-paristech.fr

C. Cadet · J. Besson · S. Forest · P. Kerfriden
MINES ParisTech, PSL University, MAT - Centre des Matériaux, CNRS UMR 7633, BP 87, 91003 Évry, France
E-mail: clement.cadet@mines-paristech.fr, jacques.besson@mines-paristech.fr, pierre.kerfriden@mines-paristech.fr

C. Cadet · S. Flouriot · V. de Rancourt
CEA Valduc, Is-sur-Tille, France
E-mail: sylvain.flouriot@cea.fr, victor.derancourt@cea.fr

1 Introduction

Predicting the failure of a structural part subjected to monotonous loading requires a good understanding of the ductile fracture behavior of the material. However ductile fracture is a complex phenomenon involving a variety of mechanisms, strongly dependent on the material and involving large strain at least on a local level (Besson, 2004). Voids are first nucleated within the material, especially near second phase inclusions. Depending on the loading conditions, the voids may or may not grow. Finally the material fails when voids coalesce, either by internal necking or by the nucleation of secondary voids (mostly for shear-dominated loading). Softening due to void growth may also be sufficient to initiate failure without coalescence *per se* (Tekoğlu et al., 2015). Although a large body of literature on ductile fracture has already been published, accurate failure prediction is still a research problem, as evidenced by the Sandia fracture challenges (Boyce, Kramer, Fang, et al., 2014; Boyce, Kramer, Bosiljevac, et al., 2016; Kramer et al., 2019): besides the difficulty of calibrating modelling parameters from experimental data, predicting ductile failure requires to take into account many strongly nonlinear physical processes.

Experimental studies have shown that the failure behavior strongly depends on the stress state to which the material is subjected. The effects of the stress triaxiality (ratio of the von Mises equivalent stress to the mean stress) and the Lode parameters (reflecting the third stress invariant) have been extensively investigated (for instance by Helbert et al. (1996), Bao and Wierzbicki (2004), Barsoum and Faleskog (2007), Gao et al. (2009), Dunand and Mohr (2011), Gilioli et al. (2013), Zhai et al. (2016), Xiao et al. (2018), and Zhang, Badreddine, et al. (2020)). Models representing ductile failure should therefore account for the effect of these two parameters.

Analytic and computational approaches at a micromechanical level have also been developed to investigate the mechanisms of ductile fracture, to model ductile fracture and provide microscale-informed failure prediction. Following Gurson's (1977) results from limit analysis, increasingly precise analytic models have been developed by explicitly representing approximate strain fields near voids in a plastic material. Besson (2010) provides a review of such models but more recent ones have been developed to represent void growth and coalescence either by necking or in shear (Benzerga and Leblond, 2014; Morin, Leblond, Benzerga, and Kondo, 2016; Torki, 2019; Nguyen et al., 2020), and can be used for practical applications (Keralavarma et al., 2020). The limit analysis approach was also extended by Leblond and Mottet (2008) to random distribution of voids. Computational studies of ductile fracture may help validate these models or provide valuable insights in the failure mechanisms on their own, for example by quantifying the effect of stress triaxiality and Lode parameter (Barsoum and Faleskog, 2011; Zhu, Engelhardt, et al., 2018) or by distinguishing strain localization from coalescence (Wong

31 and Guo, 2015; Guo and Wong, 2018; Zhu, Ben Bettaieb, et al., 2020). However these studies are mostly carried
32 out on unit cells: the global behavior of the material is summarized by that of a meshed cell containing a single
33 void. Even though this approach was proven useful to analyze fundamental mechanisms at the void level at a
34 low computational cost, it oversimplifies the interaction between voids, whose influence increases with porosity,
35 by assuming that voids are regularly distributed as a cubic lattice.

36 Some studies have investigated the interaction of voids in simplified configurations, involving only a couple
37 of voids. For instance Bandstra and Koss (2008) considered three-voids clusters with rotational symmetry
38 in an hexagonal volume element; Tvergaard (2016) and Tvergaard (2017) considered 2D clusters with three
39 aligned pores, whereas Trejo Navas et al. (2018) systematically studied 3D three pore clusters. Khan and
40 Bhasin (2017) investigated the interaction between two populations of voids, in the simplified context of a
41 high symmetry periodic arrangement. However, in a real material, a large number of voids, with complex
42 spatial distribution interact with each other. Shakoor et al. (2015) considered 2D microstructures with a random
43 population of voids and showed that increased triaxiality accelerates coalescence. Shakoor et al. (2018) also
44 provided a very fine description of the mechanisms of ductile fracture from nucleation up to coalescence,
45 between randomly distributed voids. All these studies evidence the role of clusters but do not allow to compute
46 coalescence properties depending on loading conditions, as a model of ductile fracture would require, because
47 they investigate too few void configurations and loading cases.

48 Analytical approaches can take random void distributions into account. For instance, Leblond and Mottet
49 (2008) developed a limit analysis model coupling coalescence and shear band formation initially for a periodic
50 distribution, but proposed a method to extend it to the random case by considering all possible orientations of
51 the shear bands. Moreover, works by Danas and Ponte Castañeda (2009) or Vincent et al. (2009) for instance,
52 considered random void populations within the context of a nonlinear variational homogenization scheme:
53 the porous medium was compared to a linear composite, whose stiffness is based on Ponte Castañeda and
54 Willis's (1995) bounds, an effective method to represent a population of random elliptical voids. This variational
55 technique was subsequently used by Danas and Ponte Castañeda (2012) to investigate the influence of stress
56 triaxiality and Lode parameter. However, such analytical approaches should be compared to simulations to check
57 the validity of their assumptions. For instance, Danas and Ponte Castañeda's (2012) predictions for the behavior
58 at low triaxiality were found to be unrealistic by Hutchinson and Tvergaard's (2012) FEM simulations on unit
59 cells with the same loading conditions.

60 Explicit simulations of random void distributions have been carried out in a limited number of works.
61 Bilger, Auslender, Bornert, Michel, et al. (2005) and Bilger, Auslender, Bornert, Moulinec, et al. (2007) using

62 Fast Fourier Transform then Fritzen, Forest, Böhlke, et al. (2012) with Finite Elements Analysis proposed a
63 computational homogenization method to determine an effective yield surface. Several microstructures consisting
64 of a random void distribution embedded in a plastic matrix are simulated up to overall plastic yield for several
65 loading conditions. The results are averaged over the several microstructures to determine an homogenized
66 yield surface (represented for Fritzen, Forest, Böhlke, et al. (2012) by a GTN criterion). This approach was
67 extended to a Green-type porous matrix (Fritzen, Forest, Kondo, et al., 2013), to multiple void populations of
68 different size (Khdiret al., 2014) and to non-spherical voids (Khdiret al., 2015). However these studies were
69 focused on yield surface and did not address coalescence. Recently, Hure (2021) did perform FFT simulations
70 on cells with multiple voids up to coalescence, and illustrated the influence of the number of voids on the stress
71 at coalescence. Yet this study was limited to the simple case of axisymmetric loading.

72 To the authors' knowledge, a description of coalescence for various loading conditions and at the level of a
73 representative volume element with multiple voids, has not been done yet. We therefore propose here to extend
74 the methodology of Fritzen, Forest, Böhlke, et al. (2012) and Hure (2021) to the study of coalescence under
75 various stress states. We aim to assess the effect of the interaction between randomly distributed voids on the
76 macroscopic failure response of a cell, depending of the stress state. The results should be compared to those of
77 unit cells to identify how they differ from cells with multiple voids. Moreover the statistical dispersion in failure
78 results linked to the random distribution should be quantified.

79 To this end, cells composed of a random population of identical spherical voids are generated and subjected
80 to various loading conditions, characterized by constant stress triaxiality and Lode parameter levels, in finite
81 element simulations with Z-set software (Besson and Foerch, 1998). We then propose a coalescence indicator
82 based on the loss of full rankedness of the macroscopic deformation gradient rate. The identification of
83 coalescence during the simulation allows to extract several quantities of interest at the onset of coalescence.
84 Our main results show that the evolution of the onset of coalescence with respect to the Lode parameter is
85 qualitatively different between random microstructures and unit cells. This difference is associated to a change
86 of coalescence modes for random microstructures. Finally, dispersion of the results due to the randomness of the
87 void distribution is studied.

88 Section 2 describes the methodology used to generate random microstructures and to prescribe the loading
89 conditions within the FE simulation. In section 3 typical numerical simulation results are presented and an
90 indicator is defined to identify failure. Section 4 applies the methodology of sections 2 and 3 to compare the
91 response of random microstructures to that of a unit cell, both on the evolution of macroscopic (cell-level)
92 quantities, and on plastic strain field patterns. The dispersion of the results is also investigated. Finally, we

93 discuss in section 5 the simulation hypotheses chosen in this work, and verify to what extent the results can be
94 generalized.

95 An intrinsic notation is used for tensors: vectors, as first order tensors, are represented as $\underline{v} = v_i \underline{e}_i$ and
96 second order tensors as $\underline{A} = A_{ij} \underline{e}_i \otimes \underline{e}_j$, where (\underline{e}_i) is an orthonormal frame. The subscript 0 in the notation A_0
97 refers to the value of A in the initial configuration at time $t = 0$. The position of a material point initially at \underline{x}_0
98 evolves with time t as $\underline{x} = \underline{\Phi}(\underline{x}_0, t)$; the deformation gradient is then defined as $\underline{F} = \frac{\partial \underline{\Phi}}{\partial \underline{x}_0}$. Quantities decorated
99 with an overlying bar, such as \bar{A} , refer to the macroscopic counterpart (at the level of a cell) of a quantity A
100 defined locally. For instance $\bar{\underline{F}}$ is the average deformation gradient (defined more precisely in section 2.3), and
101 $\bar{J} = \det(\bar{\underline{F}})$.

102 2 Methodology

103 2.1 Generation of random microstructures and finite element meshing

104 The methodology to create the elementary volumes follows that of Fritzen, Forest, Böhlke, et al. (2012). These
105 cells consist of a cubic matrix containing a population of identical non overlapping spherical defects. As all the
106 $N_{defects}$ spheres have the same radius r , the porosity of the cell (of size L_{cube} and therefore of volume $V_0 = L_{cube}^3$)
107 is defined as:

$$f = \frac{4\pi}{3} N_{defects} \left(\frac{r}{L_{cube}} \right)^3 \quad (1)$$

108 The radius of the voids is fully determined once the porosity and the number of voids are chosen. The initial
109 porosity was chosen as $f_0 = 6\%$, to be compared to the range of porosity levels $f_0 \in [0.1\%, 30\%]$ considered
110 by Fritzen, Forest, Böhlke, et al. (2012). However unit cell analyses frequently study lower porosities, with
111 $f_0 \sim 0.1\%$ (Wong and Guo, 2015; Vishwakarma and Keralavarma, 2019; Guo and Wong, 2018). For low porosity
112 values, interactions between defects can indeed be neglected (Koplik and Needleman, 1988), at least for the
113 growth phase. Fritzen, Forest, Böhlke, et al., 2012 showed for instance that unit cells and random microstructures
114 with sufficiently low porosity levels have a similar growth behavior, which can be represented by a GTN criterion.

115 Nonetheless, high porosity levels of 6% are possible in sintered materials (Becker, 1987), nodular cast iron
116 (Zhang, Bai, et al., 1999), irradiated stainless steel (Cawthorne and Fulton, 1967). Moreover, overall porosity of
117 0.5% to 2% can be found in weld joints (Li et al., 2003; Sarre, 2018; Lacourt, 2019), but porosity values defined
118 at a smaller scale, near void clusters, can be higher. A high initial porosity level can also provide insight for
119 coalescence at lower initial porosity levels. Coalescence starts after a sufficient phase of growth so that voids

120 begin interacting with each other and can no longer be considered isolated, which means that the porosity is no
 121 longer negligible. Notwithstanding the change of void shape which will play a significant role, starting at high
 122 porosity is equivalent, to some extent, to considering the end of a simulation at lower porosity.

123 The position of the defects is chosen according to a Poisson sphere process (Matern, 1986). As the target
 124 porosity is significantly lower than the jamming porosity levels that characterize such processes (around 38 %
 125 according to Gamito and Maddock (2009)), a dart-throwing method is sufficient for the sampling. The position
 126 of the center of a sphere is chosen according to a uniform distribution on the cube. If the distance between the
 127 resulting spheres and the already built defects is larger than 10% of the radius of a sphere, the new sphere is
 128 included in the list of defects. Otherwise it is rejected and a new possible center is chosen randomly. Introducing
 129 a repulsion distance between the defects allows a better mesh quality. During the FEM simulations, periodic
 130 boundary conditions are applied (see section 2.3). Therefore a periodic microstructure and in turn a periodic
 131 mesh should be used. In order to ensure the periodicity of the population of defects, each time a new defect
 132 intersects a side of the cube, it is copied on the other side (thus there are four copies if an edge is intersected,
 133 and eight if the defect contains a vertex of the cube). All of these copies are taken into account to determine
 134 intersections between defects. Fritzen, Forest, Böhlke, et al. (2012) verified several statistical properties of the
 135 representativeness of this process.

136 The cell with the preceding defect population is meshed with NETGEN software (Schöberl, 1997). This
 137 tool first meshes surfaces, then volumes, and generates a non structured tetrahedral mesh. Periodicity of the
 138 mesh is imposed so that opposite sides of the cube have identical surface meshes. A maximum element size of
 139 $h_{cell} = r$ is imposed globally on the cell, but on the surface meshes of the defects the maximum element size is
 140 reduced to $h_{void} = r/5$. The mesh is thus refined on the part of the surface mesh corresponding to the surface of
 141 voids. Finally, tetrahedral second-order 10-nodes elements with reduced integration are used to limit volume
 142 locking (due to large strain plasticity) in the FEA simulations. An example of the meshing of a microstructure
 143 with 27 cells is shown in figure 1a.

144 As cells are cubic, they define a canonical orthonormal frame $(O, \underline{e}_1, \underline{e}_2, \underline{e}_3)$ where O is a vertex of the
 145 cube and the unit vectors $\underline{e}_1, \underline{e}_2, \underline{e}_3$ are parallel to edges of the cube (in the initial configuration). All tensor
 146 components will be expressed in this frame.

147 Although a diversity of microstructures were used in this study, several are repeatedly referred to in this
 148 article; they are shown in figure 1. The microstructures $R1$ and $R2$ are two random microstructures with 27-voids
 149 of radius $r = 0.08L_{cube,R1}$. The one-pore cell *unit* is defined as a cubic matrix of size $L_{cube,unit} = L_{cube,R1}/3$
 150 containing a unique defect of radius $r = 0.08L_{cube,R1}$ (same radius as before, and thus same volume fraction). It

151 is meshed with the same procedure and same parameters as the larger cells with a random population. Finally
 152 the microstructure *lattice* consists in $3 \times 3 \times 3$ defects arranged on a cubic lattice; it is meshed in the same way
 153 as the random microstructures, so the mesh is not the assemblage of 27 small identical meshes of the unit cells.

154 2.2 Material behavior law at finite strain

Finite element simulations are carried out using Zset software (Besson and Foerch, 1998; www.zset-software.com
 2020). As the matrix can undergo large deformation before coalescence, the simulations are performed in a finite
 strain framework. A local objective frame approach is adopted to formulate the constitutive law of the matrix
 (Besson, Cailletaud, et al., 2009). The strain rate $\underline{\underline{D}}$ and Cauchy stress $\underline{\underline{\sigma}}$ tensors are convected in a corotational
 frame:

$$\dot{\underline{\underline{e}}} = \underline{\underline{Q}}^T \underline{\underline{D}} \underline{\underline{Q}} \quad (2)$$


$$\dot{\underline{\underline{s}}} = J \underline{\underline{Q}}^T \underline{\underline{\sigma}} \underline{\underline{Q}} \quad (3)$$

155 where $\underline{\underline{Q}}$ is a rotation matrix verifying $-\underline{\underline{Q}}^T \dot{\underline{\underline{Q}}} = \underline{\underline{Q}}^T \underline{\underline{Q}} = \underline{\underline{W}}$ ($\underline{\underline{W}} = \text{skew}(\dot{\underline{\underline{F}}} \underline{\underline{F}}^{-1})$ is the material spin tensor). This
 156 choice of corotational frame is equivalent to using the Jaumann derivative of the stress in the hypo-elasticity law.


157 The constitutive law is then defined by a classical additive decomposition of convected strain rates in a
 158 isotropic elastic part and a plastic part. Isotropy and time-independent perfect plasticity (absence of hardening)
 159 with a von Mises yield criterion are assumed for the matrix material:

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\underline{\underline{e}}} &= \dot{\underline{\underline{e}}}_e + \dot{\underline{\underline{e}}}_p \\ \underline{\underline{e}}_e &= \frac{1+\nu}{E} \underline{\underline{s}} - \frac{\nu}{E} (\text{tr} \underline{\underline{s}}) \underline{\underline{1}} \\ s_{vm} &= \sqrt{\frac{3}{2} \underline{\underline{s}}^{dev} : \underline{\underline{s}}^{dev}} \\ f(\underline{\underline{s}}) &= s_{vm} - R_0 \leq 0 \\ \dot{\underline{\underline{e}}}_p &= \dot{p} \frac{\partial f}{\partial \underline{\underline{s}}} \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$


160 with $\underline{\underline{s}}^{dev}$ the deviatoric part of the rotated Cauchy stress tensor $\underline{\underline{s}}$, s_{vm} the equivalent von Mises stress and
 161 $\dot{p} = \sqrt{\frac{2}{3} \dot{\underline{\underline{e}}}_p : \dot{\underline{\underline{e}}}_p}$ playing the role of the plastic multiplier. The Young modulus, the Poisson ratio and the yield
 162 strength are respectively chosen as $E = 200 \text{ GPa}$, $\nu = 0.3$ and $R_0 = 500 \text{ MPa}$, hence $R_0/E = 0.0025$. The




(a) Random microstructure $R1$ with 27 voids (FE mesh with 255628 nodes).



(b) Random microstructure $R2$ with 27 voids (FE mesh with 176982 nodes).



(c) Unit cell with one void.



(d) Microstructure *lattice* with 27 voids on a cubic lattice.

Fig. 1: Meshes of some microstructures repeatedly used in the study.

163 cumulative plastic strain is defined as:

$$p = \int_0^t \dot{p} dt \quad (5)$$

164 where t is actually a fictitious time in rate-independent plasticity, acting as an increasing loading parameter.

165 During the finite element analysis, this constitutive law is integrated at each quadrature point of the finite
166 element mesh by an implicit Euler method, then the global static equilibrium is solved in total Lagrangian
167 formulation by a Newton-Raphson scheme with a consistent tangent matrix.

168 2.3 Boundary and loading conditions

169 The boundary and loading conditions follow that of Ling et al. (2016). Periodic boundary conditions are applied
170 on the sides of the cube (Besson, Cailletaud, et al., 2009). The displacement field \underline{u} should therefore have the
171 form:

$$\underline{u} = (\bar{\underline{F}} - \underline{1}) \cdot \underline{x}_0 + \underline{v}(\underline{x}_0) \quad (6)$$

with $\bar{\underline{F}}$ the average deformation gradient, and \underline{v} a displacement fluctuation field, periodic and with zero average
over the cell. The periodicity of \underline{v} and the anti-periodicity of traction vectors mean that:

$$\underline{v}(\underline{x}_0^+) = \underline{v}(\underline{x}_0^-) \quad (7)$$

$$\underline{\sigma} \cdot \underline{n}(\underline{x}_0^+) = -\underline{\sigma} \cdot \underline{n}(\underline{x}_0^-) \quad (8)$$

172 if \underline{x}_0^+ and \underline{x}_0^- represent two homologous points on opposite sides of the periodic mesh and $\underline{n}(\underline{x}_0)$ represent the
173 outward-pointing normal to the mesh boundary at \underline{x}_0 . In this formulation, the degrees of freedom are the three
174 components of the displacement fluctuation field for each node of the mesh and the nine components of $\bar{\underline{F}}$ (or
175 rather of $\underline{E} = \bar{\underline{F}} - \underline{1}$).

The macroscopic Boussinesq (or first Piola-Kirchhoff) and Cauchy stress tensors are defined by:

$$\bar{\underline{S}} = \frac{1}{V_0} \int_{V_0} \underline{S} dV_0 = \frac{1-f_0}{V_0} \int_{V_0^{matrix}} \underline{S} dV_0 \quad (9)$$

$$\bar{\underline{\sigma}} = \frac{1}{\bar{J}} \bar{\underline{S}} \cdot \bar{\underline{F}}^T \quad (10)$$

176 where $\bar{J} = \det(\bar{\underline{F}})$ and V_0 is the volume of the cell (matrix and defects) in the initial configuration. The integration
177 on V_0 implicitly considers that stress is well-defined and identically zero in the voids.

The simulations are carried out at constant (macroscopic) stress triaxiality and Lode parameter. These quantities are here defined as:

$$T = \frac{\text{tr } \bar{\sigma}}{3\bar{\sigma}_{vm}} \quad (11)$$

$$L = \frac{2\bar{\sigma}_2 - \bar{\sigma}_1 - \bar{\sigma}_3}{\bar{\sigma}_1 - \bar{\sigma}_3} \quad (12)$$

178 where $\bar{\sigma}_{eq}$ is the von Mises equivalent stress calculated from $\bar{\sigma}$ and $\bar{\sigma}_1 \geq \bar{\sigma}_2 \geq \bar{\sigma}_3$ (with $\bar{\sigma}_1 > \bar{\sigma}_3$) are the three
 179 eigenvalues of $\bar{\sigma}$. $L = -1$, $L = 0$ and $L = 1$ respectively correspond to states of generalized tension, shear and
 180 compression. An alternative definition of a Lode parameter with $L = 1$ for tension and $L = -1$ for compression
 181 can also be found in literature (*e.g.* Barsoum and Faleskog (2011) and Wong and Guo (2015))

182 To ensure that T and L remain constant during the simulation, a special macroscopic spring element was
 183 developed by Ling et al. (2016). It acts on the E_{ij} degrees of freedom, and its reaction forces are calculated so
 184 that $\bar{\sigma}$ keeps the following diagonal form throughout the simulation:

$$\bar{\sigma} = \begin{bmatrix} \bar{\sigma}_1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \bar{\sigma}_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \bar{\sigma}_3 \end{bmatrix} = \bar{\sigma}_1 \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \eta_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \eta_3 \end{bmatrix} \quad (13)$$

185 where $\eta_2 = \bar{\sigma}_2/\bar{\sigma}_1$ and $\eta_3 = \bar{\sigma}_3/\bar{\sigma}_1$ are prescribed constants which define the stress state. Therefore the
 186 eigenvectors of $\bar{\sigma}$ are collinear to the three axes of the cube.

187 Unlike Barsoum and Faleskog (2011), Dunand and Mohr (2014), Wong and Guo (2015), and Zhu, Engelhardt,
 188 et al. (2018) but like Zhu, Ben Bettaieb, et al. (2020) and Guo, Ling, et al. (2020), we chose not to consider
 189 the effect of a shear stress component (for instance $\bar{\sigma}_{12}$) for computational cost reasons. However the cubic
 190 cell exhibits cubic symmetry and has an anisotropic behavior. The additional stress component could allow
 191 different loading orientations with identical T and L values. The consequences of this choice will be discussed
 192 in section 5.1.

193 To prevent degeneracy of solutions due to rigid body motion, a global translation and a global rotation of the
 194 cube should be fixed. The translation is taken care of by fixing a vertex of the cube. For the rotation, a possible
 195 method is to impose three additional constraints on the average deformation gradient \bar{F} . For instance \bar{F} can be
 196 supposed symmetric, as done by Ling et al. (2016):

$$\bar{F}_{12} = \bar{F}_{21} \quad \bar{F}_{23} = \bar{F}_{32} \quad \bar{F}_{13} = \bar{F}_{31} \quad (14)$$

197 Another method is presented and discussed in appendix B.2.

198 With the aforementioned conditions, the simulation can be strain-controlled by specifying only the average
199 strain along the first axis $E_{11} = \bar{F}_{11} - 1$. We impose $E_{11} = \dot{\epsilon}t$, with $\dot{\epsilon}$ an arbitrary strain rate (the value can be
200 arbitrarily chosen, as the plasticity is time-independent). At the beginning of the simulation $t = 0$, the cell is
201 undeformed, and $\bar{F} = 1$.

202 3 Description of a coalescence indicator

203 3.1 Typical results of a computation

204 With the method described in the previous subsection, simulations can be carried out for several loading
205 conditions. In this study, we are interested in the evolution of several quantities at failure. However defining
206 ductile failure and detecting it during the simulation is not straightforward. To illustrate this issue, some
207 enlightening simulation results will be described first.

208 Three simulations on the microstructure RI were carried out in generalized tension ($L = -1$) at three
209 triaxiality levels $T = 0.8$, $T = 1$ and $T = 1.4$. The figure 2a compares the macroscopic Cauchy and Boussinesq
210 stress components along the main loading axis (the marker on the curves corresponds to the indicator described
211 later in section 3.3). The three loading conditions lead to a similar evolution of stress. The stress maximum is
212 reached shortly after the beginning of the computation (for $E_{11} < 0.01$) then the stress decreases monotonously
213 and almost linearly. However, at a critical strain that depends on the loading condition, the decrease in stress
214 suddenly accelerates and the unit cell quickly loses all its load-bearing capacity (at approximately $E_{11} = 0.5$,
215 0.35, 0.18 for $T = 0.8$, 1, 1.4 respectively). This event can be thought as the failure of the cell. Moreover, at the
216 same strain as the onset of stress drop, the transverse strain E_{22} stabilizes (fig. 2b). This macroscopic failure is
217 also related to the behavior at a more microscopic level. Figure 2 shows the cumulative strain field p shortly
218 after this failure, for $T = 1$: plastic strain is concentrated in a band, mostly parallel to a side of the cube (and
219 perpendicular to the main loading axis) but its exact shape fits closely the distribution of voids.

220 Although the stress decrease acceleration is clearly visible on the stress-strain plots in generalized tension, it
221 is difficult to define its exact location so as to determine the precise failure onset and compute relevant physical
222 quantities at this instant. Moreover the stress decrease does not generalize to shear-dominated loading conditions.
223 Therefore a more precise failure indicator remains to be determined.




Fig. 2: Typical computation results for the RI microstructure.

224 3.2 Available failure indicators in the literature

225 Several criteria for ductile failure in a unit cell have been developed, and are reviewed for instance by Zhu,
 226 Ben Bettaieb, et al. (2020). The earliest approaches were purely geometrical: Brown and Embury's (1973)
 227 criterion determines when strain bands are oriented at 45° relative to the main loading axis, whereas McClintock
 228 (1968) and Tvergaard and Needleman (1984) (who modified Gurson's (1977) model) consider a critical porosity.
 229 Following Needleman and Tvergaard's (1992) work, a class of criteria determines the instant when strain is
 230 no more homogeneous and concentrates in the ligaments between voids. These criteria compare the norm
 231 of the strain rate in a localization band and its value outside the band (or the average value throughout the
 232 unit cell): if the ratio is higher than an arbitrarily chosen value, failure is said to have been reached. Such
 233 criteria are used for example by Barsoum and Faleskog (2007) or Dunand and Mohr (2014). Similarly, Luo
 234 and Gao (2018) and Vishwakarma and Keralavarma (2019) consider unit cells composed of several layers and
 235 force strain localization to happen in the central one (because the external layers contain smaller voids or no

voids at all): failure can then be monitored by comparing the behavior of the layers. Another class of criteria determines when a maximum stress or force is reached. Such criteria can be derived by limit analyses, for instance Thomason (1985), Benzerga and Leblond (2014) or Morin, Leblond, Benzerga, and Kondo (2016). Guo and Wong (2018) interpreted the maximum of an effective force in terms of Rice's (1976) criterion on strain localization. Another approach, adopted by Koplik and Needleman (1988) and used for example by Ling et al. (2016) defines coalescence as the transition to a specific strain state: in coalescence, ligaments are in a state of uniaxial straining (whereas the rest of the cell is rigid and hardly deforms). Coalescence could also be interpreted in terms of plastic and elastic energy, as done by Wong and Guo (2015). A last approach was proposed by Zhu, Ben Bettaieb, et al. (2020) and involves computing the macroscopic acoustic tensor in order to directly apply Rice's (1976) criterion on strain localization.

However, as pointed for instance by Tekoğlu et al. (2015), Guo and Wong (2018) or Zhu, Ben Bettaieb, et al. (2020), the above criteria actually described two different physical processes: strain localization and coalescence. During strain localization, strain concentrates in narrow bands, which can be interpreted as a loss of ellipticity, according to Rice's (1976) analysis. As stated previously, Guo and Wong (2018) establish a link between strain localization (through Rice's criterion) and maximum force criteria. Nonetheless, the more direct application of Rice's criterion by Zhu, Ben Bettaieb, et al. (2020) detects localization significantly later than Guo and Wong's (2018) interpretation. On the other hand, coalescence represents the fusion of several voids into a unique larger void during ductile failure. However the material model described in this article contains no ingredient to represent explicitly this process of coalescing voids. The state of coalescence can be deduced nevertheless from the FEM results: at some point in the loading, the cell stops thinning and the plastic flow inside becomes macroscopically uniaxial according to Koplik and Needleman (1988).

As the figure 2a shows, the cell's failure, defined by the sudden acceleration of the stress decrease, is incorrectly predicted by the instant of maximum force applied on the cell (with our choice of periodic boundary conditions, this force is here represented by S_{11}). Due to the absence of hardening, the maximum of S_{11} happens at the beginning in the simulation, much earlier than the sudden stress drop. On the other hand, this stress drop occurs simultaneously with the stabilization of deformation in the 2-direction transverse to the main loading 1-axis, and can thus be associated with coalescence: the stabilization of the average transverse deformation indicates that the macroscopic strain becomes purely uniaxial. Coalescence thus seems an accurate failure indicator in this situation. According to Zhu, Ben Bettaieb, et al. (2020), an ellipticity loss approach based on the computation of the macroscopic acoustic tensor could also give sensible values of failure strains. This criterion was found to predict slightly earlier failure than a coalescence indicator. However Morin, Blystad Dæhli, et al.

267 (2019) tried to apply coalescence and strain localization approaches to match experimental results; both gave
 268 acceptable results, with slightly better results for coalescence. Therefore we will focus on the coalescence
 269 approach.

270 3.3 Failure indicator based on the loss of full rankedness of $\dot{\tilde{F}}$

271 The criterion of the stabilization of transverse displacement, as used by Ling et al. (2016), suffers from two main
 272 drawbacks. In a random population of voids, strain localization bands might not be parallel to a face of the cube,
 273 so monitoring E_{22} with respect to E_{11} might not detect coalescence. Moreover, this criterion is limited to the
 274 detection of coalescence by internal necking where voids coalesce in the plane orthogonal to the main loading
 275 axis. However, for shear dominated loading conditions (when the Lode parameter is close to zero), coalescence
 276 is known to occur in shear bands (Barsoum and Faleskog, 2007; Barsoum and Faleskog, 2011). We generalize
 277 here the stabilization of transverse deformation by noting that for both internal necking and shear, deformation
 278 gradient has a specific form during coalescence. After coalescence, there exist orthogonal unit vectors \underline{e} and \underline{e}'
 279 such that $\tilde{F} = \underline{1} + \dot{\epsilon}t \underline{e} \otimes \underline{e}$ for uniaxial straining and $\tilde{F} = \underline{1} + \dot{\epsilon}t (\underline{e} \otimes \underline{e}' + \underline{e}' \otimes \underline{e})$ for pure shear. In both cases,
 280 $\det(\dot{\tilde{F}}) = 0$. Therefore, as coalescence takes place, $\det(\dot{\tilde{F}})$ should vanish.

281 This behavior of $\det(\dot{\tilde{F}})$ should be compared to the homogeneous plastic deformation case (which is an
 282 approximation, since strain may be concentrated in some ligaments). Let us then consider the function:

$$\delta(t) = \dot{\epsilon}^{-3} (1 + \dot{\epsilon}t)^3 \det(\dot{\tilde{F}}) \quad (15)$$

283 which compares the evolution of $\det(\dot{\tilde{F}})$ to its theoretical evolution in the case of homogeneous compressible
 284 plastic flow. A derivation of the expression of δ and an example can be found in appendix A. Therefore,
 285 if $\delta(t) \rightarrow 0$, $\det(\dot{\tilde{F}})$ decreases faster than expected by homogeneous plastic flow, and localization can be
 286 considered to have taken place.

287 The onset of failure can then be defined as the first instant t_c such that:

$$\delta(t_c) \leq \min(A \max_{t < t_c} \delta(t), B) \quad (16)$$

288 where $A = 0.05$ is a threshold comparing the maximal and current values of δ and $B = 0.005$ is an absolute
 289 threshold. As shown by the α_2 factor in equation (33), δ keeps smaller values for simulations with L close to
 290 zero. In these cases, the relative threshold (depending on A) was found to be inappropriate due to numerical

291 errors, and an absolute threshold B (consistent with the value of A) was implemented; it is only needed for
292 loading conditions with $|L| < 0.3$. A sensitivity analysis with respect to the empirically chosen values A and B
293 is carried out in appendix A and shows that the results which will be presented in section 4 are not strongly
294 influenced by the values chosen for A and B . The indicator is therefore robust with respect to the choice of these
295 parameters.

296 As this criterion using the δ function relies only on macroscopic quantities (at cell-level), it is easy to
297 compute and does not make any assumption on the position and orientation of the possible strain localizations.
298 Moreover it can be used as a landmark in order to stop the simulations shortly after failure in order to spare
299 computation time. However, the indicator detects a loss of full rank of the deformation gradient rate, and is
300 therefore not adapted to loading conditions where the deformation gradient rate is intrinsically of rank 1 or
301 2. This is especially the case for $L = 0$ for which the material is initially in shear, so that the indicator is
302 activated in the elastic regime and predicts an early failure. This is acceptable for a perfectly plastic von Mises
303 matrix, but leads to an underestimation of the strain at failure for materials whose hardening behavior delays
304 coalescence. Moreover it is not able to represent a third and rarer form of coalescence known as necklace
305 coalescence. This form was studied by Gologanu et al. (2001) for a cylindrical unit cell with an axisymmetric
306 loading corresponding to our $L = 1$ situation. The coalescence between voids takes place along the cylinder axis,
307 which corresponds in our situation to the third and least stressed axis. Necklace coalescence is not associated to
308 a loss of full rank, so the δ indicator cannot be activated. However for the loading conditions involving overall
309 stress triaxiality considered in this work, the proposed indicator has been found to be relevant in all cases.

310 The failure onset t_c can be determined with this method for the different loading conditions, and allows
311 to define several quantities at the onset of coalescence: deformation at coalescence $E_c = E_{11}(t_c)$, stress at
312 coalescence $\sigma_c = \bar{\sigma}_{11}(t_c)$ and porosity at coalescence $f_c = f(t_c)$. In the following, the evolution of those
313 quantities and their dispersion due to the randomness of microstructures will be studied with respect to T and L
314 parameters.

315 4 Results

316 4.1 Response of a microstructure subjected to proportional loading with different stress triaxiality and Lode 317 parameter values

318 The random microstructures constructed in section 2.1 have two main differences in comparison to standard
319 unit cells: they contain several voids and these voids are located irregularly within the cell. In this section, the

effect of these differences on the behavior of cells is investigated. Several microstructures are considered and subjected to various loading conditions (defined by T and L). Their failure behavior (evolution of E_c , f_c and σ_c with respect to T and L) are then compared. The four microstructures shown on figure 1 are analysed: two random 27-void cells $R1$ and $R2$, a *unit* cell, and a 27-void cell, *lattice*, where the voids are distributed following a $3 \times 3 \times 3$ cubic cell. The four microstructures have the same porosity 6%, the same pore size and are meshed with identical mesh size requirements in order to limit the influence of mesh convergence on the comparison (the mesh of the unit cell is thus composed of significantly fewer elements than the other three microstructures). Mesh size will be further discussed in section B.1. The *lattice* cell allows to separate effects due to the presence of several voids in the cell from those due to the irregular void distribution.

Although the failure behavior on the whole $T - L$ space should be explored, it is instructive to first consider constant triaxiality or constant Lode parameter slices of this space. Let us concentrate first on axisymmetric loading cases characterised by fixed $L = -1$, as in Ling et al. (2016). We focus on the zone of intermediate triaxiality $T \in [0.7, 2.0]$, as usual in unit cell studies (Guo and Wong, 2018; Vishwakarma and Keralavarma, 2019). We did not study the very low triaxiality regime $T < 0.4$ where the phenomenon of void collapse takes place (Bao and Wierzbicki, 2004; Liu et al., 2016). Triaxiality levels $T \in [0.4, 0.7]$ were not studied so as to limit the duration of simulations: coalescence generally happens with the same mechanisms as for $T > 0.7$, but at significantly higher strain values.

The evolution of E_c , f_c , and σ_c with respect to T are shown on the left side of figure 3. The four microstructures display globally similar responses: E_c decreases monotonously with increasing T while σ_c increases linearly with T . f_c behaves similarly to E_c , except for the microstructure $R2$: f_c is still a mainly decreasing function of T but a local maximum is found at $T = 1.2$. Note that the evolution of E_c with respect to T is smoother and less noisy than that of σ_c (for $T = 0.8$, the stress value for the *lattice* cell is for instance particularly low, when compared to the values at $T = 0.6$ or $T = 1.0$). A possible explanation is that, unlike E_{11} which is linearly increasing with time, $\bar{\sigma}_{11}$ and f vary rapidly around the instant of coalescence: $\bar{\sigma}_{11}$ decreases sharply around the coalescence (as evidenced by figure 15). Note also that for $R2$, the porosity at coalescence for $T = 1.2$ is larger than for $T = 1.1$, in contradiction to the overall evolution. Coalescence is detected at approximately the same strain in these two conditions, but as the porosity grows faster with increasing triaxiality, the porosity at coalescence is larger for $T = 1.2$ than for $T = 1.1$. This slight deviation from the overall evolution with T seems due to the randomness of the void population.

The evolution of strain at coalescence E_c was plotted in a logarithmic scale, so as to illustrate the exponential decrease for each microstructure. According to Rice and Tracey's (1969) results, a spherical void typical growth




Fig. 3: Evolution of strain E_c (top), porosity f_c (center) and stress σ_c (bottom) at coalescence for various microstructures, with respect to T in generalized tension $L = -1$ (left column) or with respect to Lode parameter, at constant triaxiality $T = 1$ (right column). The points with arrows at $L = 1$ (right column) correspond to the last data point from simulations that diverged or for which the indicator was not reached: these points correspond to lower bounds (for E_c and f_c) and upper bounds (for σ_c , as $\bar{\sigma}_{11}$ is decreasing with E_{11}) for the values at failure, if it does exist.

351 rate varies as $\exp(3T/2)$. If we assume that coalescence happens at a given porosity (as for Tvergaard and
 352 Needleman (1984)), E_c should vary as $\exp(-3T/2)$. The evolution of strain at coalescence for the random
 353 microstructures, the unit and the lattice cell can be well represented by this simple relation, as shown by the
 354 comparison with the straight line of slope $-3/2$.

355 The evolution of failure-related quantities with respect to triaxiality, at fixed $L = -1$ is thus very similar
 356 for the various studied microstructures, although some differences are visible. The situation is different if the
 357 triaxiality $T = 1$ is fixed and the coalescence behavior is studied with respect to the Lode parameter (the whole
 358 range $L \in [-1, 1]$ is explored). The results of the simulations are shown on the right side of figure 3. Values
 359 for $L = 1$ are indicated with superimposed arrows but should be taken with caution because, for these loading
 360 cases, the simulations diverged or the failure indicator was not reached; the data for the last computed point
 361 is indicated to serve as lower or upper bounds for the real value at coalescence, if it exists. The case $L = 1$,
 362 which corresponds to an axymmetric loading where the two largest principal stress components are equal, is
 363 associated by Gologanu et al. (2001) to the necklace coalescence. Our criterion described in section 3 is not able
 364 to represent this type of coalescence, which is not associated to a loss of full rank of the deformation gradient
 365 rate. Examining the stress strain curve of the unit cell in the case $L = 1$ (not shown here for brevity) shows a
 366 stabilization of stress which could be linked indeed to a coalescence event, undetected by the δ indicator.

367 If we do not consider anymore the values for $L = 1$, the *unit* and *lattice* cells behave in a similar way (the
 368 difference between these two types of cells, which should represent the same void configuration, is due to the
 369 meshing): E_c increases slowly with L . This type of evolution was reported by Zhu, Ben Bettaieb, et al. (2020)
 370 and Zhu, Engelhardt, et al. (2018) and by Guo and Wong's (2018) localization indicator (when $\bar{\sigma}$ does not have
 371 shear components). However, Barsoum and Faleskog (2011), Wong and Guo (2015), Dunand and Mohr (2014),
 372 Guo, Ling, et al. (2020), Zhu, Engelhardt, et al. (2018), and Guo and Wong (2018) (for the latter two, in more
 373 general loading cases), report that E_c is a convex function of L , with a minimum near $L = 0$. Yet, in our case, a
 374 sharp decrease in ductility is observed for L close to zero. This behavior in generalized shear corresponds to the
 375 expected behavior of a perfectly plastic von Mises material which localizes immediately in shear.

376 However the random microstructures *R1* and *R2* do not exhibit the same evolution as the unit cell. Three
 377 zones can be observed on the $E_c - L$ plot for the *R1* microstructure (schematized in figure 4). The first zone
 378 corresponds to $L \in [-1, -0.7]$, in which E_c increases up to a maximum value on a cusp. For $L \in [-0.7, 0.4]$, E_c
 379 is convex in L and minimal for $L = 0$. The third zone corresponds to $L \in [0.4, 1[$, where E_c decreases from its
 380 maximum at $L = 0.1$ and stabilizes. The zone boundaries correspond to local maxima (significantly higher than
 381 the rest of the data points) of E_c . They are associated to slope discontinuities, although E_c remains continuous.

382 In the following, these three zones will be referred to as: Low Lode parameter Extension Mode Zone (LLEMZ),
 383 Shear Mode Zone (SMZ) and High Lode parameter Extension Mode Zone (HLEMZ); the rationale behind
 384 these names will be made clearer after section 4.2. A similar decomposition in three zones can be seen for
 385 the microstructure *R2* although for different zone boundaries ($L = -0.9$ and $L = 0.55$). To the knowledge of
 386 the authors, such an evolution of E_c with respect to L was not found in literature. Although Guo and Wong's
 387 (2018)'s coalescence criterion yields a non-smooth evolution of E_c , there is only one local maximum, for $L > 0$
 388 (with our definition of L). An explanation for the existence of these three zones will be proposed in section 5.1.

389 An asymmetry between positive and negative values of L can also be observed: ductility E_c is higher in
 390 generalized compression than in tension. This asymmetry is present in previously mentioned studies, but the
 391 sign of the difference varies among them. Our results are consistent with Zhu, Ben Bettaieb, et al. (2020) and
 392 Dunand and Mohr (2014) but Barsoum and Faleskog (2011), Wong and Guo (2015), and Guo and Wong (2018)
 393 have found cells more ductile in generalized tension than in compression (taking into account the different
 394 definitions of L).




Fig. 4: Identification of three ductility zones, with respect to L (*R1* microstructure, constant triaxiality $T = 1$).

395 Similar behaviors and differences between the *unit* and *lattice* cells on the one hand and the random
 396 microstructures on the other hand can be observed on the results for porosity at coalescence. For the stress at
 397 coalescence, the asymmetry between $L < 0$ and $L > 0$ is clear. There is no significant difference between the
 398 microstructures at $L > 0$, for $L < 0$; σ_c is almost constant for the *lattice* and *unit* cells, whereas it increases
 399 slightly with L for the random microstructures. No zone boundaries can be easily identified. The theoretical
 400 values for σ_c obtained for a von Mises material failing when $\sigma_{vm} = R_0$ are also represented. The type of evolution

401 agrees with the results for the unit cells, but due to the porosity and the complex coalescence behavior, stress
 402 levels are significantly lower for the cells, and the slope of σ_c with respect to T for the simulations at constant
 403 $L = -1$ also differs.

404 In contrast to the *unit* and *lattice* cells, the random microstructures display several zones on their $E_c - L$
 405 curve, which could be linked to different coalescence behaviors. The different zones for the microstructure *RI*
 406 are also shown in the $T - L$ space in figure 5. Multiple simulations were carried out for $T \in [0.7, 1.1]$. A simple
 407 interpolation using Gaussian Process Regression (as implemented in Scikit-learn (Pedregosa et al., 2011)) is
 408 proposed and allows for an easier visualization in the $E_c - T - L$ space, although cusps at zone boundaries are
 409 smoothed. The results of the simulations are also projected in the $E_c - L$ plane. The triaxiality has two effects on
 410 E_c : E_c globally decreases with higher triaxiality levels, in agreement with the previous study at fixed $L = -1$,
 411 and the position of the zone boundaries is modified (at $T = 1.1$, the central zone is wider than at $T = 0.7$).




Fig. 5: Strain at coalescence in the $T - L$ space, for the *RI* microstructure. Left: Coalescence surface interpolated by Gaussian process regression for multiple loading cases (simulations shown as red points). Right: Projection of the simulation results on the $L - E_c$ plane.

412 4.2 Relation to localization modes

413 Several ductility zones were identified on the strain at failure curves for the random microstructure cells, in
 414 contrast to unit cells. However the E_c curves only give macroscopic information and shed no light on the


415 mechanisms inside the cell responsible for the drastic changes in strain at coalescence. We now investigate the
 416 relation between the presence of these zones and the aspect of strain fields inside the cell.

417 The figure 6 shows, for each microstructure, the cumulative plastic strain field p shortly after coalescence
 418 (for $E_{11} \simeq 1.1E_c$). Each image corresponds to a different L value ($T = 1$ is fixed). The images are inserted on
 419 $E_c - L$ curves in order to better correlate macroscopic and field information.


420 All the p fields display zones of higher strain or even strain localization (as localization is known to happen
 421 before coalescence (Guo and Wong, 2018)). These zones are organized along approximately planar bands. For
 422 both the *unit* and *lattice* cells, these bands are exactly planar and correspond to a crystallographic plane of
 423 the void lattice. In the *lattice* cells, the three rows of voids are equivalent, but this symmetry is broken after
 424 coalescence. For random microstructures, the bands are more complex: a base plane can be identified but bands
 425 are distorted by void distribution so as to include more voids.

426 For a given microstructure, the orientation of the bands is not constant with L . Two different orientations can
 427 be distinguished. In the first one the band is roughly parallel to a face of the cell (and perpendicular to the main
 428 loading axis). For the cases with $L \simeq 1$, the localization pattern is more complex and is composed of several
 429 bands. The second type of orientations is characterized by strain bands of overall direction approximately 45°
 430 relative to the faces of the cell (although their precise shape is more complex). These two orientations are partly
 431 constrained by the periodic boundary conditions because strain localization bands should be compatible with the
 432 periodicity of the cell. Notice that bands oriented at 45° are only found for Lode parameters close to zero (and
 433 only for $L = 0$ in the regular unit and lattice cells) whereas parallel orientation is found for higher values of $|L|$.
 434 Observing more carefully the relation between the orientation of the bands and the macroscopic $E_c - L$ curves
 435 for the random microstructures shows that strain band orientation is systematically associated with ductility
 436 zones: the 45° orientation is only found in the SMZ whereas parallel orientations are found in the LLEMZ and
 437 HLEMZ. Therefore the transition between ductility zones can be linked to a change in strain localization mode:
 438 between extension mode, with strain bands at parallel orientation, and shear mode characterized by the 45°
 439 orientation.


440 To better characterize the transition between ductility zones, as explained by p fields, the similarity between
 441 the p field at coalescence for a given value of L and three reference coalescence p fields for $L \in \{-1, 0, 0.9\}$
 442 is here quantified for the *R1* microstructure. Each loading case is considered a paragon of its ductility zone
 443 (respectively the LLEMZ, the SMZ, and the HLEMZ). If two p fields are similar, they should represent a similar
 444 coalescence mechanism. A similarity indicator is defined as follows. The p field after coalescence (at strain
 445 $E_{11} = 1.1E_c$), as produced by a FEM computation, is represented by the vector $[P]$ of p values at all Gauss



(a) Microstructure R1



(b) Microstructure R2



(c) unit cell




Fig. 6: Link between E_c evolution with respect to L and cumulative plastic strain field shortly after coalescence (at strain $E_{11} = 1.1E_c$, which depends on the simulation). Fixed triaxiality $T = 1$

446 points (for the RI microstructure, the $[P]$ vectors are around 7×10^5 components long). The relative spatial
 447 position of Gauss points is irrelevant here. For two vectors $[P]$ and $[P']$ representing p fields on the same mesh
 448 and with the same ordering of Gauss points, the similarity can then be defined as the angle (or rather its cosine)
 449 between $[P]$ and $[P']$:

$$\cos(\theta_{pp'}) = \frac{[P] \cdot [P']}{\| [P] \| \cdot \| [P'] \|} \quad (17)$$

450 with $\| [P] \|$ the standard euclidean 2-norm of $[P]$. If $[P]$ and $[P']$ are proportional, $\cos(\theta_{pp'}) = 1$. This quantity is
 451 extracted from Z-set computations using tools developed by Lacourt et al. (2020).

452 The evolution of the similarity indicator $\cos(\theta)$ to the reference strain fields $L = -1, L = 0, L = 0.9$ is plotted
 453 in figure 7. The three reference strain fields are not orthogonal, so significant overlap between the indicators is
 454 possible. As strain fields at $L = -1$ and $L = 0.9$ are similar ($\cos(\theta) = 0.85$), their similarity indicator shows
 455 comparable behavior. However the evolution of the indicator for $L = 0$ is reversed. The three ductility zones
 456 defined earlier are apparent on the figure. For the LLEMZ $L \in [-1, 0.7]$, the contributions of $L = -1$ and $L = 0.9$
 457 are high and almost constant whereas the contribution of $L = 0$ is lower but increasing. On the contrary, in the

458 SMZ $[-0.7, 0.5]$, strain fields are predominantly linked with $L = 0$ and little with $L = -1$ or $L = 0.9$. In the last
 459 zone, HLEMZ, above $L = 0.5$, the similarity to the $L = 0$ strain field decreases, whereas $L = -1$ and $L = 0.9$
 460 contributions are higher. Notice however that the $L = -1$ similarity indicator is high at $L = 0.5$ and decreases
 461 with L , unlike the $L = 0.9$ indicator. For $L \simeq 0.5$, the situation is close to that of $L = -1$, whereas at very high L ,
 462 another mechanism could come into play, especially the competition between two perpendicular strain bands
 463 observed earlier at very high L . Around the ductility zone boundaries, strain fields quickly change from one
 464 mode to the other. This competition between modes could explain the cusps in strain at failure observed at zone
 465 boundaries.




Fig. 7: For the R/I microstructure, similarity between the coalescence p field at varying L ($T = 1$ is fixed) and three reference p fields obtained at $L = -1$, $L = 0$, $L = 0.9$.

466 4.3 Dispersion due to microstructure sampling

467 In the previous two sections, two random microstructures were considered and the evolution of coalescence-
 468 related quantities with respect to loading conditions were studied, showing significant differences when compared
 469 to the unit cell. Rather than choosing fixed microstructures and varying T and L , another approach is to treat E_c ,
 470 f_c and σ_c as random variables (depending on the microstructure), and study their statistics.

471 $N = 20$ microstructures with 27 voids and initial porosity $f_0 = 6\%$ (f_0 is not a random variable) were
 472 randomly and independently generated. Each of them was subjected to the same loading conditions $(T, L) \in$
 473 $\{(1, -1), (1, -0.5), (1, 0.5), (1.5, -0.5)\}$. The results for E_c , f_c and σ_c are shown in figure 8 as box plots, and
 474 are compared to the values for the unit cell. A strong relative dispersion is present for all loading cases: the
 475 ratio of the standard deviation to the average is 34%, 59%, 55% and 62% respectively. This indicates a strong
 476 influence of the microstructure on the coalescence behavior. The results from unit cells do not represent well
 477 the behavior of the multiple void cells, and lead for instance to an overestimation of the stress at coalescence.
 478 Dispersion also depends on the loading conditions: for $T = 1$, the case $L = -1$ shows lower interquartile range
 479 than the cases $L = \pm 0.5$. This can be linked to the proximity of zone boundaries for the latter cases, as E_c
 480 was shown to vary sharply near those boundaries. Moreover, and especially for $L = 0.5$, some microstructures
 481 coalesce in tensile mode whereas others coalesce in shear mode (compare for instance the strain fields of $R1$
 482 and $R2$ in figure 6); the possibility of different coalescence modes may increase dispersion. At higher triaxiality
 483 $T = 1.5, L = -0.5$, the dispersion is reduced for E_c and f_c when compared to $T = 1, L = -0.5$ but the relative
 484 dispersion is not. This is due to the overall effect of coalescence appearing earlier at high triaxiality. Besides, the
 485 interquartile range for σ_c is comparable for both triaxiality levels.

486 The previous results dealt with a small number of loading conditions. In order to determine an effective
 487 model of coalescence in random multiple-void cells for all loading conditions, the $T - L$ space should be explored
 488 more extensively, while still keeping a large enough set of microstructure realizations. As in section 4.1, multiple
 489 simulations were carried out for $T \in [0.7, 1.1]$ and $L \in [-1, 1]$ on five random microstructures among which $R1$
 490 and $R2$ (keeping 20 realizations would have been computationally too expensive). The same loading conditions
 491 were tested for each microstructure. The results for E_c are shown in figure 9. The minimal, maximal and average
 492 values are first plotted for $T = 1$. In agreement with the preceding results, significant relative dispersion is
 493 present, and its extent depends on L : dispersion is particularly strong near $L = 0.5$, whereas it is negligible
 494 for $L = 0$ (all the microstructures agree on almost immediate localization for generalized shear). Despite the
 495 dispersion, the overall aspect of the E_c curve, as described in the previous section, and its decomposition in




Fig. 8: Dispersion of strain, porosity and stress at coalescence for different loading conditions, when considering multiple ($N=20$) random populations of 27 defects (\star : comparison with the results for unit cell)

496 ductility zones, are still observable. An interpolation by Gaussian Process Regression of the results in the $T-L$
 497 space is also proposed, based on the average value of the five microstructures at each loading conditions. The
 498 aspect is similar to that of figure 5.




Fig. 9: Strain at coalescence results for five different microstructures. Left: For $T = 1$, evolution of the average, minimum and maximum value of E_c (over the size-5 sample) with respect to L (earlier results from 20 realizations are also plotted). Right: averaged behavior with respect to $T-L$ interpolated using Gaussian Process Regression.

5 Discussion

In this section, we discuss the significance of the results presented up to now, and assess how representative the results are and how far they can be generalized. First we compare the failure indicator proposed in section 3 to Wong and Guo's (2015) coalescence criterion, in order to interpret the difference between unit and random cells. The dispersion due to the random microstructures is then statistically studied with increasingly large void populations. Finally the influence of a work-hardening material is also addressed.

5.1 Interpretation of the proposed failure indicator

In order to better understand the failure mechanism identified by the δ indicator and the observed difference between the unit cells and the random microstructures, the δ indicator is compared to another failure criterion reported in the literature. We focus on Wong and Guo's (2015) energy-based coalescence indicator, although Zhu, Ben Bettaieb, et al.'s (2020) and Dæhli et al.'s (2020) approach with Rice's (1976) criterion could also be useful. According to the former indicator, coalescence is associated to concentration of the plastic deformation in the ligament whereas elastic unloading takes place elsewhere. Therefore coalescence can be detected by monitoring the evolution of the plastic \dot{W}_p and elastic \dot{W}_e work rates and the onset corresponds to the minimum of the ratio \dot{W}_e/\dot{W}_p .

For our cells, the corresponding work rates can be computed by the following equations:

$$\dot{W}_p = \int_V \sigma_{vm} \dot{p} dV \quad (18)$$

$$\dot{W}_{tot} = V_0 \bar{\mathcal{Q}} : \dot{\bar{\mathcal{E}}} \quad (19)$$

$$\dot{W}_e = \dot{W}_{tot} - \dot{W}_p \quad (20)$$

The plastic power can be computed either on the cell (with voids) or more easily on the matrix, since stress is zero in the voids. The total power, sum of the plastic and elastic parts, can be computed by only using macroscopic quantities, according to the results of homogenization theory (Besson, Cailletaud, et al., 2009).

The figure 10 compares the failure onsets, as determined by the δ and the energy-based criteria, with respect to L , for the unit cell and the microstructure R1. For the unit cells, the energy criterion identifies a coalescence onset for all the simulations, and the trend is typical of E_c vs. L curves in the literature (for instance Zhu, Ben Bettaieb, et al. (2020)). Moreover the two criteria yield similar values of E_c , except for $L = 0$ where the δ -criterion predicts early failure as previously. The situation is more complex for the random microstructure. For

522 the extension mode zones of the curves, the two criteria also yield very similar results, so they can be thought to
 523 represent the same failure mechanism. On the other hand, the energy-based criterion fails to activate in the SMZ,
 524 so no coalescence is detected, according to Wong and Guo's (2015) definition. The evolution of the power ratio
 525 \dot{W}_e/\dot{W}_p for the unit and the R1 cells, at $L = -1$ and $L \simeq 0.2$ (in the SMZ for R1), is shown on the figure 11a:
 526 contrary to the unit cell and the $L = -1$ case for R1, the $L = 0.2$ does not show any minimum of the power ratio.
 527 In all simulations, the elastic power does not become negative because, unlike Wong and Guo's (2015) unit
 528 cell, our microstructures do not possess large void-free regions, in which an elastic unloading can take place.
 529 Moreover the simulations also differ by the evolution of porosity (fig. 11b): unlike the other three cases, the
 530 random microstructure with $L = 0.25$ does not show any acceleration of void growth during failure, which is
 531 typically observed for coalescence. This comparison shows that the δ criterion acts as a coalescence indicator
 532 in the LLEMZ and the HLEMZ, and correctly predicts failure in the SMZ according to another mechanism:
 533 localization along 45° bands in shear. As failure should happen quickly in the SMZ for a von Mises matrix, the
 534 results obtained for the δ indicator appear more accurate than those for a pure coalescence criterion.




Fig. 10: Comparison of the coalescence onset, as determined by the δ -indicator and the energy-based criterion. All computations at triaxiality $T = 1$. The hatched zones correspond to simulations for which no minimum of \dot{W}_e/\dot{W}_p was observed, and therefore no coalescence was identified by the energy-based criterion.

535 The existence of the three ductility zones and the lower ductility in the SMZ could actually be due to
 536 boundary conditions. As noted previously, two evolutions of E_c with respect to L are reported in the literature:
 537 in Barsoum and Faleskog (2011), Dunand and Mohr (2014), and Wong and Guo (2015), strain at coalescence is




Fig. 11: Comparison of the evolution of power ratio \dot{W}_e/\dot{W}_p (left) and of porosity f (right), for the unit and R1 cells in two loading cases: $T = 1, L = -1$ and $T = 1, L = 0.25$

538 minimal for $L = 0$ whereas it increases almost linearly for Zhu, Engelhardt, et al. (2018) and Zhu, Ben Bettaieb,
 539 et al. (2020). The difference between these two groups of studies is that the former consider a shear stress
 540 component in equation (13). Several loading conditions therefore correspond to the same triaxiality and Lode
 541 parameter, and the reported strain at coalescence is the minimum value over all tests at a given (T, L) couple.
 542 Coalescence therefore happens earlier than in the absence of shear stress, and this might lead to different
 543 responses, as pointed by Zhu, Ben Bettaieb, et al. (2020). Another point of view is that the cubic unit cells have
 544 an anisotropic localization behavior. Although the cubic cell paves space when periodic boundary conditions
 545 are enforced, the axes parallel to the sides of the cube remain privileged, and the response of the homogenized
 546 material displays anisotropy. As localization bands should be compatible with the periodic boundary conditions,
 547 they are always parallel or around 45° to one face of the cube (Coenen et al., 2012). Adding a shear stress
 548 component amounts to changing the principal loading directions relatively to the cube, and coalescence occurs
 549 when the most favorable band activates.

550 In the present study, shear stress was not considered but for the random microstructures, it was shown
 551 that coalescence can happen either by a localization band perpendicular (corresponding to the LLEMZ and
 552 HLEMZ) or oriented at 45° to the main loading axis (for the SMZ). Therefore the random microstructures appear
 553 softer than the unit cells in that they allow several localization band orientations. The resulting response of the
 554 cell is then due to a competition between a limited number of coalescence modes (instead of the theoretical
 555 infinity of orientations considered by Barsoum and Faleskog (2011) for instance). The LLEMZ and the HLEMZ

556 correspond then to the evolution shown by Zhu, Engelhardt, et al.'s (2018) study, whereas the response of
557 random microstructures in the SMZ near $L = 0$ is closer to that of unit cells in Barsoum and Faleskog (2011)'s
558 study.

559 5.2 Influence of the number of voids

560 The microstructures considered in the above sections were composed of 27 voids. A small number of voids
561 allows to investigate the effect of a cluster of pores whereas a sufficiently large number can provide results
562 for an effective homogenized material. As pointed by Morin, Leblond, Benzerga, and Kondo (2016), the
563 homogenization theory does not *stricto sensu* apply to coalescence, which takes place in a small area in the
564 immediate vicinity of voids.

565 For computational homogenization with a volume element (VE) approach, random microstructures should
566 contain enough voids to reduce the uncertainty due to sampling and limit the influence of boundary conditions
567 (as there is no intrinsic length scale, the size of the VE is only determined by the number of voids it contains).
568 However the computation power required to simulate large cells with many voids, which lead to FEM problems
569 with millions of degrees of freedom, is prohibitive if carried on dozens of loading conditions and microstructures.
570 This problem is in part mitigated by the use of periodic boundary conditions: Kanit et al. (2003) showed
571 that homogenized properties converge faster with VE size in this case than with kinematic or static uniform
572 boundary conditions. Their study dealt however with elasticity and the extrapolation to coalescence properties
573 is not possible yet. Hure (2021), who carried out simulations of cells with random voids up to coalescence,
574 compared cells with different number of voids (up to 64) and reported that the maximum stress reached during
575 the simulation stabilizes with the number of voids (indicating the existence of a representative volume element),
576 but the stress at coalescence still shows dispersion between realizations. However only five simulations were
577 performed for each number of voids, which is limiting for a statistical analysis of dispersion.

578 In a complementary approach, we compare the strain at coalescence results for cells with different numbers
579 of voids: 27, 64, 125. All cells are generated with the process described in section 2.1 and their porosity is
580 always 6%; the meshing parameters are however adapted so that the ratio between void radius and maximum
581 element size remains constant for all cells. There are typically 2×10^5 , 6×10^5 and 1×10^6 nodes for meshes
582 of cells embedding 27, 64 and 125 voids respectively. As the computational cost of the simulations increases
583 with the number of voids, we only considered two loading conditions $T = 1, L = -1$ and $T = 1, L = -0.5$ and a
584 smaller number of 125-void cells than the twenty 27-void cells already used in section 4.3. Examples of p fields

585 after coalescence for a microstructure with 125 voids (fig. 12) display very complex localization paths between
 586 voids, but still show a principal direction parallel to or at 45° from the faces.

587 Dispersion results are shown in figure 13. For the $T = 1, L = -1$ case, dispersion is comparable for the
 588 three types of cells: a Brown-Forsythe test (Brown and Forsythe, 1974) was carried out to verify the equality of
 589 variances for the 27, 64 and 125-void groups of cells (this test and the following one use the Scipy implementation
 590 (Virtanen et al., 2020)). The statistical p-value is 0.19 so the hypothesis of equal variances cannot be rejected.
 591 The mean failure strain is significantly lower for 64 and 125-void cells than for 27-void cells, as proven by a
 592 one-way ANalysis Of VAriance (Heiman, 2001) between the three groups (p-value of 0.002). However for the
 593 $T = 1, L = -0.5$ loading case, the dispersion is significantly lower for the 64-void cell (Brown-Forsythe test
 594 between the three groups: p-value of 0.026). The average failure strain seems to decrease with the number of
 595 voids (an ANOVA test could not be performed due to the unequal variances)

596 Therefore failure seems to begin earlier for cells with more voids. This could be explained by the higher
 597 probability of a favorable path for a localization bands when the number of voids grows. Variance remains high
 598 for all groups of cells, but it is possible that the number of voids reduces dispersion. The simulations evidence
 599 that the size of the volume element can exert an influence on the failure results. The above simulations therefore
 600 extend Hure's (2021) study with the results from larger and more numerous cells (allowing a statistical analysis)
 601 and are in agreement with his findings. More simulations at an even higher number of voids could be carried out
 602 to reinforce the statistical significance of the previous conclusions.

603 5.3 Influence of material behavior

The results previously described hold for a perfectly plastic material. However hardening can mitigate the effects of softening due to void growth, and delay coalescence. We here consider two other types of material behavior characterised by their flow stress functions $R(p)$ replacing the constant R_0 used for perfect plasticity in equation (4):

$$R(p) = R'_0 + Kp^n \quad (\text{power law hardening}) \quad (21)$$

$$R(p) = R_\infty - (R_\infty - R'_0) \exp(-bp) \quad (\text{saturating exponential}) \quad (22)$$

604 with $R'_0 = 350$ MPa, $R_\infty = 500$ MPa, $K = 343.5$ MPa, $n = 0.58$, $b = 10$ or $b = 200$. The different yield functions
 605 are shown in figure 14a.




Fig. 12: Cumulative plastic strain fields after coalescence for a microstructure with 125 voids




Fig. 13: Dispersion in the strain at coalescence for cells containing 27, 64, 125 voids, in two loading cases

606 For the *R1* microstructure, at fixed $T = 1$ and varying L , a comparison of the strain at coalescence E_c
 607 between the three hardening behaviors is shown in figure 14b. On the one hand, for the power law hardening
 608 and the slow saturating exponential hardening $b = 10$, no central SMZ is observed (except a sudden drop near
 609 $L = 0$), and the evolution is quite similar to that observed for unit cells in section 4.1. On the other hand, if
 610 hardening saturates more rapidly, as for $b = 200$, the same response as in the perfectly plastic matrix case is

611 obtained. Therefore, hardening seems able to prevent the change of coalescence mode for intermediate values of
 612 L , at least if it does not saturate too quickly so as to provide a stabilization effect throughout the deformation
 613 process.




Fig. 14: Comparison of different hardening behaviors. (a): yield function for each hardening type. (b): Comparison of the $E_c - L$ curves for each hardening type on the microstructure RI . All computations at fixed triaxiality $T = 1$.

614 6 Conclusion

615 In the present study, random microstructures made of identical spherical voids within an elastoplastic matrix were
 616 generated, and simulated at constant stress triaxiality and Lode parameter with periodic boundary conditions.
 617 The FEM simulations were carried out in a large strain framework up to coalescence. The major findings are the
 618 following:

- 619 1. Failure was identified using an indicator based on the loss of full rank of the average deformation gradient
 620 rate, while taking into account the response in case of homogeneous deformation. The results of this indicator
 621 are consistent with other indicators reported by the literature but better captures shear dominated localization
 622 modes.
- 623 2. Random microstructures show two failure modes, that differ by the orientation of the localization band:
 624 perpendicular to the main loading axis for an extension mode, or oriented around 45° for a shear mode.

625 Unlike unit and lattice cells, the shear mode is not limited to the immediate neighborhood of $L = 0$. The
626 competition between these two modes leads to a non-smooth evolution of the strain at coalescence with
627 respect to the Lode parameter, showing three zones on the $E_c - L$ curve, with reduced ductility near $L = 0$.
628 The difference between unit cells and random microstructures is reduced when the matrix is no more
629 perfectly plastic, due to a stabilizing effect of hardening. However, the response with respect to T is similar
630 for unit cells and random microstructures.

631 3. When applying the same loading state to microstructures with similar characteristics, a significant dispersion
632 is found in the results (up to 60% of relative dispersion for strain at coalescence). This strong dispersion is
633 also found in simulations with a higher number of voids.

634 If a model expressing coalescence quantities with respect to loading conditions is desired, using unit cells
635 therefore appears to misrepresent the effective behavior of a material with a complex void distribution, with
636 differences in the general evolution and oversight of the statistical aspects. Care should therefore be taken when
637 applying results on unit cells to more complex applications.

638 The present work could be extended in several ways. Firstly larger population sizes will be considered
639 based on parallel computing, in order to improve the statistical representativeness of the presented results.
640 Secondly a broader description of the mechanisms of coalescence in random microstructures will be reached by
641 adding a macroscopic shear stress component to the loading state, so as to explore a greater variety of loading
642 paths. Moreover the link between the proposed coalescence indicator and strain localization criteria such as
643 macroscopic or local loss of ellipticity will also be investigated. Finally this work can be the basis to develop
644 and calibrate an effective damage and plasticity model for materials containing randomly distributed pores. Hure
645 (2021) proposed an example of such a homogenized model, but a new model could integrate the effects of the
646 Lode parameter and the dispersion. However simulating enough loading cases and with sufficient statistical
647 representativeness to completely explore the space of parameters is computationally expensive, especially as the
648 effect of initial porosity should be taken into account. Therefore a strategy to construct a surrogate model with
649 as reduced a number of required simulations as possible should be developed.

650 **Acknowledgements** The authors would like to thank L. Lacourt for valuable discussion and his help in the analysis of localization
651 modes.

652 **Conflict of interest**

653 The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

654 A About the δ indicator

655 This appendix provides several complements about the δ indicator. Its expression is first derived by computing the homogeneous
656 deformation of Green matrix. An example of application is then presented. Finally a sensitivity analysis regarding the threshold
657 coefficients is carried out.

658 A.1 Derivation of the expression for δ

659 Consider a perfectly plastic volume element (neglecting here the elasticity) which deforms homogeneously when subjected to the
660 loading conditions (13). In order to simply represent the porous nature of the cell, the material behavior will obey Green's (1972)
661 isotropic yield criterion (also used by Fritzen, Forest, Kondo, et al. (2013)):

$$\begin{aligned} f(\underline{\sigma}) &= \sigma_{eq} - R_0 \\ \sigma_{eq} &= \sqrt{\frac{3}{2} \underline{\sigma}^{dev} : \underline{\sigma}^{dev} + C(\text{tr } \underline{\sigma})^2} \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

662 with C a constant ($C = 0$ corresponds to a von Mises material, and for $C = 1/2$, there is no lateral contraction of the cube in tension).
663 The other equations in equations (4) are unchanged, but they are applied here to macroscopic quantities.

664 As the material behavior is isotropic, \tilde{F} stays diagonal in the diagonalizing basis of $\underline{\sigma}$. Then \tilde{F} can be written as:

$$\tilde{F} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 + \nu t & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & b_2(t) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & b_3(t) \end{bmatrix} \quad (24)$$

665 where b_2 and b_3 are functions to be determined. As $\bar{D} = \text{sym}(\dot{\tilde{F}} \tilde{F}^{-1})$, and \tilde{F} is diagonal, \bar{D} can be written as:

$$\bar{D} = \tilde{F} \dot{\tilde{F}} \tilde{F}^{-1} = \text{diag} \left(\frac{\dot{\epsilon}}{1 + \dot{\epsilon} t}, \frac{\dot{b}_2}{b_2}, \frac{\dot{b}_3}{b_3} \right) \quad (25)$$

666 For a perfectly plastic Green material, the behavior law in (4) reads:

$$\bar{D} = \frac{\dot{p}}{\sigma_{eq}} \left(\frac{3}{2} \underline{\sigma}^{dev} + C(\text{tr } \underline{\sigma}) \underline{1} \right) = \frac{\dot{p}}{\sigma_{eq}} \left(\frac{3}{2} \underline{\sigma} + \left(C - \frac{1}{2} \right) (\text{tr } \underline{\sigma}) \underline{1} \right) \quad (26)$$

\bar{D} is diagonal so there are three constants α_1 , α_2 and α_3 such that:

$$\bar{D} = \text{diag}(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3) \quad (27)$$

$$\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \alpha_3 = \frac{3C \text{tr } \underline{\sigma}}{\sigma_{eq}}. \quad (28)$$

Combining (25) and (28) yields the system:

$$\frac{\dot{\varepsilon}}{1+\dot{\varepsilon}t} = \dot{p}\alpha_1 \quad (29)$$

$$\dot{b}_2 = \dot{p}\alpha_2 b_2 \quad (30)$$

$$\dot{b}_3 = \dot{p}\alpha_3 b_3 \quad (31)$$

667 The plastic multiplier is then $\dot{p} = \frac{\dot{\varepsilon}/\alpha_1}{1+\dot{\varepsilon}t}$ and the differential equations can be solved with the initial conditions $b_2(0) = 1$, $b_3(0) = 1$:

$$b_2 = (1+\dot{\varepsilon}t)^{\alpha_2/\alpha_1} \quad b_3 = (1+\dot{\varepsilon}t)^{\alpha_3/\alpha_1} \quad (32)$$

668 Finally,

$$\det(\tilde{F}) = \dot{\varepsilon} b_2 b_3 = \dot{\varepsilon}^3 \frac{\alpha_2 \alpha_3}{\alpha_1^2} (1+\dot{\varepsilon}t)^{\frac{\alpha_2+\alpha_3}{\alpha_1}-2} = \dot{\varepsilon}^3 \frac{\alpha_2 \alpha_3}{\alpha_1^2} (1+\dot{\varepsilon}t)^{-3-3C\frac{\text{tr}\sigma}{\sigma_{eq}\alpha_1}} \quad (33)$$

669 The function comparing the behavior of $\det(\tilde{F})$ should and the homogeneous plastic deformation case is then:

$$\delta_C(t) = \dot{\varepsilon}^{-3} (1+\dot{\varepsilon}t)^{3-3C\frac{\text{tr}\sigma}{\sigma_{eq}\alpha_1}} \det\left(\frac{\dot{\varepsilon}}{\tilde{F}}\right) \quad (34)$$

670 The δ criterion used throughout the article is recovered by setting $C = 0$, which corresponds to the simplified case of a von Mises
671 material. In this case, the criterion depends no more on the applied σ .

672 The evolution of δ for a simulation with $T = 1$ and $L = -1$ (coalescence in uniaxial strain state) is shown in figure 15, for two
673 values of C : 0 and 1/2. For both values of C , the vanishing of δ_C is simultaneous with the stabilization of transverse displacement.
674 However the sharp drop of δ_C allows a more precise numerical determination of the onset of coalescence than the more progressive
675 stabilization of the transverse strain. For $C = 1/2$, $\delta_{1/2}$ is approximately constant at the beginning of the simulation, so that the
676 hypothesis of homogeneous flow in a Green volume element (taking into account the porosity) well represents the overall behavior
677 of the cell with a von Mises matrix. However, with $C = 0$, δ_0 does not depend anymore on the stress state, while still keeping the
678 sudden drop of δ_C necessary for the determination of the coalescence onset.




Fig. 15: Detection of failure through simple extension criterion (stabilization of the transverse strain) or vanishing of δ function. Microstructure RI under the loading condition $T = 1$, $L = -1$

679 **A.2 Sensibility analysis regarding the threshold coefficients**

680 Finally we verify that the δ indicator is a reliable indicator of failure by assessing its sensitivity to the choice of the empirically
 681 chosen threshold values. As the equation (16) shows, the determination of the onset of coalescence relies on two thresholds: a relative
 682 one A , which compares the current value of δ to its maximum, and an absolute one B mostly active in shear-like conditions. The
 683 values for those were chosen as $A = 0.05$ and $B = 0.005$ but a robust indicator should not be too sensitive to these values.

684 Figure 16 compares the effect of different A and B values on the $E_c - L$ curve (common triaxiality $T = 1$, microstructure $R1$). At
 685 constant B , the effect of A is only visible in the HLEMZ and the LLEMZ, and generally negligible. At constant A , B only affects
 686 the coalescence strain values in the SMZ. Although a change in B can modify the strain by 0.05, the global aspect of the curve is
 687 preserved. The determination of failure by the indicator therefore appears robust with respect to changes in the coefficients.




Fig. 16: Effect of varying threshold conditions for the failure indicator on the $E_c - L$ curve. All simulations on the $R1$ microstructure, at $T = 1$.

688 **B Effect of different meshing parameters and boundary conditions**

689 In this section, we review the simulation hypotheses and assess their influence on the results presented up to now, showing therefore
 690 how representative the results are and how far they can be generalized. First we verify that finite element discretization effects can be
 691 neglected, and investigate the effect of different boundary conditions.

692 **B.1 Effect of the meshing parameters**

693 All the simulations described up to now were carried out on meshes of cells with the same meshing parameter. To determine
 694 the influence of mesh size on coalescence results, the same microstructure $R1$ was meshed with different meshing parameters
 695 $h_{cell}/r_0 \in \{1.25, 1, 0.875, 0.625\}$ (with the notation of section 2.1). The maximum element size near the voids is also adapted to keep
 696 the ratio $h_{cell}/h_{void} = 5$ constant. The same loading condition $T = 1, L = -1$ is applied to the four meshes. Figure 17 shows that

697 stress values during the simulations differ between the meshes, but the relative difference between the finest and coarsest meshes is
 698 about 5%, which remains acceptable. The onset of coalescence \bar{E}_c which is our main quantity of interest, is almost identical between
 699 the meshes, at $E_c = 0.33 \pm 1\%$. Therefore the influence of mesh refinement for random microstructure cells appear limited (although
 700 there was only a ratio of 2 between the element sizes of the coarsest and the finest mesh), which justifies the value $h_{cell} = 0.08$
 701 adopted throughout this study.




Fig. 17: Cauchy stress during the simulation for several meshes of the RI random microstructure with different meshing parameters. Loading condition: $T = 1, L = -1$

702 B.2 Effect of the boundary conditions

703 We here investigate the influence of boundary conditions. The results from section 4 are first compared to those obtained with different
 704 boundary conditions. Namely we investigate the influence of conditions on the average gradient, and of planar faces conditions. The
 705 consistency of results at $L = -1$ is also checked by a comparison with simulations on axisymmetric cells.

706 The conditions imposed on the average gradient $\bar{\mathcal{F}}$ to prevent rigid body motion are first investigated. In section 2.3 we imposed
 707 $\bar{\mathcal{F}}$ symmetric, as for Ling et al. (2016). However another reasonable choice would be to fix some degrees of freedom at the vertices of
 708 the cubic cell, as depicted in figure 18, which is the standard method for boundary value problems. A vertex is already fixed in order
 709 to prevent translations, but by fixing two degree of freedom on a second one, and a last one on a third vertex, all rotations are fixed.
 710 This can be reformulated as:

$$\bar{F}_{12} = \bar{F}_{13} = \bar{F}_{23} = 0 \quad (35)$$

711 *i.e.* $\bar{\mathcal{F}}$ is an upper triangular matrix. Due to the mixed conditions imposed by the macroscopic spring element, the results from the
 712 symmetric $\bar{\mathcal{F}}$ case cannot be easily transposed to the triangular $\bar{\mathcal{F}}$ case. These two choices lead to distinct proportional loading path
 713 classes and should therefore be compared.




Fig. 18: Conditions on average deformation gradient obtained by fixing some degrees of freedom on vertices of the cubic cell.

714 On the microstructure $R1$, at fixed triaxiality $T = 1$, simulations were performed for several Lode parameters to compare the
 715 two sets of conditions on \bar{F} (figure 19a). The evolution of E_c is close between the two types of conditions, and the same ductility
 716 zones can be identified for the triangular gradient condition. However, in that case, cusps seem to be less pronounced than for a
 717 symmetric gradient; this may be due to the different treatment of shear components by the two conditions. Therefore the influence of
 718 the conditions on \bar{F} remains limited.




Fig. 19: Influence of boundary conditions on the response of the cell. All computations at triaxiality $T = 1$.

719 We then compare the effects of periodic and parallel faces boundary conditions. Parallel faces conditions mean that the cubic cell
 720 retains parallel flat faces throughout the computation (for instance all the points on the $x_0 = 0$ face have the same x -displacement).
 721 This condition is more constraining than periodic boundary conditions. As the comparison in figure 19b shows, the two types
 722 of conditions lead to qualitatively different responses. For the parallel faces, no separation between three ductility zones can be
 723 seen (except near $L = 0$) and the response of the random microstructure is closer to that typical of the unit cell. Moreover no
 724 decrease of ductility near $L = 0$ is observed for the unit cell. Results for the unit cell differ between the parallel faces and periodic

725 boundary conditions, because in the periodic case, faces are allowed not to remain strictly parallel and planar. On the contrary,
 726 boundary conditions made of parallel sides strongly hinder the shear mode failure and only the extension mode remains possible.
 727 The competition between these two modes tends to postpone failure (see the cusps on figure 4). Therefore, the reduced competition
 728 between modes may explain an earlier coalescence for parallel unit cells. The preceding results show that boundary conditions exert
 729 a strong influence on the response of the cell.

730 Finally, the consistency of results obtained at $T = 1$ is checked. As this type of loading is axisymmetric, a computation with a 2D
 731 axisymmetric unit cell was also performed for comparison. Such unit cells are frequent in ductile fracture studies (Morin, Leblond,
 732 and Benzerga (2015) for instance). The diameter and the height of the cylinder were chosen equal to L_{cube} . The porosity is still 6%,
 733 so the radius of the void was modified to $0.22L_{cube}$. The boundary conditions for this cell differ slightly from those described in
 734 section 2.3: they are no more periodic and are replaced by straight edges conditions. Besides the virtual constant triaxiality element is
 735 not linked to the average deformation gradient but to the displacement of the top left node.

736 Figure 20 compare results for the unit cell and the 2D axisymmetric cell at varying stress triaxiality for $L = -1$. In this type of
 737 loading, the unit cell was shown in section 4 to exhibit the same behavior as random microstructures, compatible with a Rice-Tracey
 738 evolution. At initial porosity $f_0 = 6\%$, the axisymmetric cell presents however a significantly higher exponent (in absolute value) for
 739 the evolution of E_c with respect to T . This effect seems due to the relatively high porosity in the axisymmetric cell: as depicted in
 740 figure 20, the evolution of E_c with respect to T for the low porosity $f_0 = 1\%$ axisymmetric cell is much closer to the one predicted by
 741 Rice and Tracey.




Fig. 20: Evolution of the strain at coalescence with respect to T for the cubic and 2D axisymmetric unit cells for porosity values $f_0 = 6\%$ and 1% (constant Lode parameter $L = -1$).

742 **References**

- 743 Bandstra, JP and Koss, DA (2008). “On the influence of void clusters on void growth and coalescence during
744 ductile fracture”. *Acta Materialia* 56: 4429–4439. DOI: [10.1016/j.actamat.2008.05.009](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actamat.2008.05.009).
- 745 Bao, Y and Wierzbicki, T (2004). “On fracture locus in the equivalent strain and stress triaxiality space”.
746 *International Journal of Mechanical Sciences* 46: 81–98. DOI: [10.1016/j.ijmecsci.2004.02.](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijmecsci.2004.02.006)
747 [006](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijmecsci.2004.02.006).
- 748 Barsoum, I and Faleskog, J (2007). “Rupture mechanisms in combined tension and shear—Micromechanics”.
749 *International Journal of Solids and Structures* 44: 5481–5498. DOI: [10.1016/j.ijsolstr.2007.01.](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijsolstr.2007.01.010)
750 [010](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijsolstr.2007.01.010).
- 751 Barsoum, I and Faleskog, J (2011). “Micromechanical analysis on the influence of the Lode parameter on void
752 growth and coalescence”. *International Journal of Solids and Structures* 48: 925–938. DOI: [10.1016/j.](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijsolstr.2010.11.028)
753 [ijsolstr.2010.11.028](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijsolstr.2010.11.028).
- 754 Becker, R (1987). “The effect of porosity distribution on ductile failure”. *Journal of the Mechanics and Physics*
755 *of Solids* 35: 577–599. DOI: [10.1016/0022-5096\(87\)90018-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-5096(87)90018-4).
- 756 Benzerga, AA and Leblond, JB (2014). “Effective Yield Criterion Accounting for Microvoid Coalescence”.
757 *Journal of Applied Mechanics* 81: 031009. DOI: [10.1115/1.4024908](https://doi.org/10.1115/1.4024908).
- 758 Besson, J, ed. (2004). *Local Approach to Fracture*. Paris: Les Presses de l’École des Mines.
- 759 Besson, J (2010). “Continuum models of ductile fracture : A review”. *International Journal of Damage*
760 *Mechanics* 19: 3–52. DOI: [10.1177/1056789509103482](https://doi.org/10.1177/1056789509103482).
- 761 Besson, J, Cailletaud, G, Chaboche, JL, Forest, S, and Blétry, M (2009). *Non-Linear Mechanics of Materials*.
762 Solid Mechanics and its Applications. Springer.
- 763 Besson, J and Foerch, R (1998). “Object-Oriented Programming Applied to the Finite Element Method Part
764 I. General Concepts”. *Revue Européenne des Éléments Finis* 7. Publisher: Taylor & Francis _eprint:
765 <https://doi.org/10.1080/12506559.1998.10511321>: 535–566. DOI: [10.1080/12506559.1998.](https://doi.org/10.1080/12506559.1998.10511321)
766 [10511321](https://doi.org/10.1080/12506559.1998.10511321).
- 767 Bilger, N, Auslender, F, Bornert, M, Michel, JC, Moulinec, H, Suquet, P, and Zaoui, A (2005). “Effect of a
768 nonuniform distribution of voids on the plastic response of voided materials: a computational and statistical
769 analysis”. *International Journal of Solids and Structures* 42: 517–538. DOI: [10.1016/j.ijsolstr.](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijsolstr.2004.06.048)
770 [2004.06.048](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijsolstr.2004.06.048).

- 771 Bilger, N, Auslender, F, Bornert, M, Moulinec, H, and Zaoui, A (2007). “Bounds and estimates for the effective
772 yield surface of porous media with a uniform or a nonuniform distribution of voids”. *European Journal of*
773 *Mechanics - A/Solids* 26: 810–836. DOI: [10.1016/j.euromechsol.2007.01.004](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.euromechsol.2007.01.004).
- 774 Boyce, BL, Kramer, SLB, Bosiljevac, TR, et al. (2016). “The second Sandia Fracture Challenge: predictions of
775 ductile failure under quasi-static and moderate-rate dynamic loading”. *International Journal of Fracture*
776 198: 5–100. DOI: [10.1007/s10704-016-0089-7](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10704-016-0089-7).
- 777 Boyce, BL, Kramer, SLB, Fang, HE, et al. (2014). “The Sandia Fracture Challenge: blind round robin predictions
778 of ductile tearing”. *International Journal of Fracture* 186: 5–68. DOI: [10.1007/s10704-013-9904-6](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10704-013-9904-6).
- 779 Brown, L and Embury, J (1973). “Initiation and growth of voids at second phase particles”. *Inst Met (London)*
780 *Monogr Rep Ser* 1: 164–169.
- 781 Brown, MB and Forsythe, AB (1974). “Robust Tests for the Equality of Variances”. *Journal of the American*
782 *Statistical Association* 69: 364–367. DOI: [10.1080/01621459.1974.10482955](https://doi.org/10.1080/01621459.1974.10482955).
- 783 Cawthorne, C and Fulton, EJ (1967). “Voids in Irradiated Stainless Steel”. *Nature* 216. Number: 5115 Publisher:
784 Nature Publishing Group: 575–576. DOI: [10.1038/216575a0](https://doi.org/10.1038/216575a0).
- 785 Coenen, EWC, Kouznetsova, VG, and Geers, MGD (2012). “Novel boundary conditions for strain localization
786 analyses in microstructural volume elements”. *International Journal for Numerical Methods in Engineering*
787 90. _eprint: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1002/nme.3298>: 1–21. DOI: [10.1002/nme.3298](https://doi.org/10.1002/nme.3298).
- 788 Dæhli, LEB, Morin, D, Børvik, T, Benallal, A, and Hopperstad, OS (2020). “A Numerical Study on Ductile
789 Failure of Porous Ductile Solids With Rate-Dependent Matrix Behavior”. *Journal of Applied Mechanics* 87:
790 031014. DOI: [10.1115/1.4045524](https://doi.org/10.1115/1.4045524).
- 791 Danas, K and Ponte Castañeda, P (2009). “A finite-strain model for anisotropic viscoplastic porous media: I
792 – Theory”. *European Journal of Mechanics - A/Solids* 28: 387–401. DOI: [10.1016/j.euromechsol.](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.euromechsol.2008.11.002)
793 [2008.11.002](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.euromechsol.2008.11.002).
- 794 Danas, K and Ponte Castañeda, P (2012). “Influence of the Lode parameter and the stress triaxiality on the
795 failure of elasto-plastic porous materials”. *International Journal of Solids and Structures* 49: 1325–1342.
796 DOI: [10.1016/j.ijsolstr.2012.02.006](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijsolstr.2012.02.006).
- 797 Dunand, M and Mohr, D (2011). “On the predictive capabilities of the shear modified Gurson and the modified
798 Mohr–Coulomb fracture models over a wide range of stress triaxialities and Lode angles”. *Journal of the*
799 *Mechanics and Physics of Solids* 59: 1374–1394. DOI: [10.1016/j.jmps.2011.04.006](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmps.2011.04.006).

- 800 Dunand, M and Mohr, D (2014). “Effect of Lode parameter on plastic flow localization after proportional
801 loading at low stress triaxialities”. *Journal of the Mechanics and Physics of Solids* 66: 133–153. DOI:
802 [10.1016/j.jmps.2014.01.008](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmps.2014.01.008).
- 803 Fritzen, F, Forest, S, Böhlke, T, Kondo, D, and Kanit, T (2012). “Computational homogenization of elasto-plastic
804 porous metals”. *International Journal of Plasticity* 29: 102–119. DOI: [10.1016/j.ijplas.2011.08.](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijplas.2011.08.005)
805 [005](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijplas.2011.08.005).
- 806 Fritzen, F, Forest, S, Kondo, D, and Böhlke, T (2013). “Computational homogenization of porous materials of
807 Green type”. *Computational Mechanics* 52: 121–134. DOI: [10.1007/s00466-012-0801-z](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00466-012-0801-z).
- 808 Gamito, M and Maddock, S (2009). “Accurate Multidimensional Poisson-Disk Sampling”. *ACM Trans. Graph.*
809 *29*: 8. DOI: [10.1145/1640443.1640451](https://doi.org/10.1145/1640443.1640451).
- 810 Gao, X, Zhang, T, Hayden, M, and Roe, C (2009). “Effects of the stress state on plasticity and ductile failure of
811 an aluminum 5083 alloy”. *International Journal of Plasticity* 25: 2366–2382. DOI: [10.1016/j.ijplas.](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijplas.2009.03.006)
812 [2009.03.006](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijplas.2009.03.006).
- 813 Gilioli, A, Manes, A, Giglio, M, and Allahverdizadeh, N (2013). “Effect of Triaxiality and Lode Angle on the
814 Plasticity Behaviour of a Ti-6Al-4V Titanium Alloy”. *Key Engineering Materials* 577-578: 413–416. DOI:
815 <https://doi.org/10.4028/www.scientific.net/KEM.577-578.413>.
- 816 Gologanu, M, Leblond, JB, and Devaux, J (2001). “Theoretical models for void coalescence in porous ductile
817 solids. II. Coalescence in columns”. *International Journal of Solids and Structures* 38: 5595–5604. DOI:
818 [10.1016/S0020-7683\(00\)00355-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0020-7683(00)00355-3).
- 819 Green, RJ (1972). “A plasticity theory for porous solids”. *International Journal of Mechanical Sciences* 14:
820 215–224. DOI: [10.1016/0020-7403\(72\)90063-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/0020-7403(72)90063-X).
- 821 Guo, HJ, Ling, C, Busso, EP, Zhong, Z, and Li, DF (2020). “Crystal plasticity based investigation of micro-void
822 evolution under multi-axial loading conditions”. *International Journal of Plasticity* 129: 102673. DOI:
823 [10.1016/j.ijplas.2020.102673](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijplas.2020.102673).
- 824 Guo, TF and Wong, WH (2018). “Void-sheet analysis on macroscopic strain localization and void coalescence”.
825 *Journal of the Mechanics and Physics of Solids* 118: 172–203. DOI: [10.1016/j.jmps.2018.05.002](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmps.2018.05.002).
- 826 Gurson, AL (1977). “Continuum Theory of Ductile Rupture by Void Nucleation and Growth: Part I—Yield
827 Criteria and Flow Rules for Porous Ductile Media”. *Journal of Engineering Materials and Technology* 99:
828 2–15. DOI: [10.1115/1.3443401](https://doi.org/10.1115/1.3443401).
- 829 Heiman, GW (2001). *Understanding research methods and statistics: An integrated introduction for psychology*.
830 Boston: Houghton, Mifflin and Company.

- 831 Helbert, AL, Feaugas, X, and Clavel, M (1996). “The influence of stress triaxiality on the damage mechanisms
832 in an equiaxed Ti-6Al-4V alloy”. *Metallurgical and Materials Transactions A* 27: 3043–3058. DOI: [10.1007/BF02663853](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02663853).
833
- 834 Hure, J (2021). “Yield criterion and finite strain behavior of random porous isotropic materials”. *European
835 Journal of Mechanics - A/Solids* 85: 104143. DOI: [10.1016/j.euromechsol.2020.104143](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.euromechsol.2020.104143).
- 836 Hutchinson, JW and Tvergaard, V (2012). “Comment on “Influence of the Lode parameter and the stress triaxi-
837 ality on the failure of elasto-plastic porous materials” by K. Danas and P. Ponte Castañeda”. *International
838 Journal of Solids and Structures* 49: 3484–3485. DOI: [10.1016/j.ijsolstr.2012.07.009](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijsolstr.2012.07.009).
- 839 Kanit, T, Forest, S, Galliet, I, Mounoury, V, and Jeulin, D (2003). “Determination of the size of the representative
840 volume element for random composites: statistical and numerical approach”. *International Journal of Solids
841 and Structures* 40: 3647–3679. DOI: [10.1016/S0020-7683\(03\)00143-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0020-7683(03)00143-4).
- 842 Keralavarma, SM, Reddi, D, and Benzerga, AA (2020). “Ductile failure as a constitutive instability in porous
843 plastic solids”. *Journal of the Mechanics and Physics of Solids* 139: 103917. DOI: [10.1016/j.jmps.
844 2020.103917](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmps.2020.103917).
- 845 Khan, IA and Bhasin, V (2017). “On the role of secondary voids and their distribution in the mechanism of
846 void growth and coalescence in porous plastic solids”. *International Journal of Solids and Structures* 108:
847 203–215. DOI: [10.1016/j.ijsolstr.2016.12.016](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijsolstr.2016.12.016).
- 848 Khdir, YK, Kanit, T, Zaïri, F, and Naït-Abdelaziz, M (2014). “Computational homogenization of plastic
849 porous media with two populations of voids”. *Materials Science and Engineering: A* 597: 324–330. DOI:
850 [10.1016/j.msea.2013.12.095](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.msea.2013.12.095).
- 851 Khdir, YK, Kanit, T, Zaïri, F, and Naït-Abdelaziz, M (2015). “A computational homogenization of random
852 porous media: Effect of void shape and void content on the overall yield surface”. *European Journal of
853 Mechanics - A/Solids* 49: 137–145. DOI: [10.1016/j.euromechsol.2014.07.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.euromechsol.2014.07.001).
- 854 Koplik, J and Needleman, A (1988). “Void growth and coalescence in porous plastic solids”. *International
855 Journal of Solids and Structures* 24: 835–853. DOI: [10.1016/0020-7683\(88\)90051-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/0020-7683(88)90051-0).
- 856 Kramer, SLB et al. (2019). “The third Sandia fracture challenge: predictions of ductile fracture in additively
857 manufactured metal”. *International Journal of Fracture* 218: 5–61. DOI: [10.1007/s10704-019-
858 00361-1](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10704-019-00361-1).
- 859 Lacourt, L (2019). “Étude numérique de la nocivité des défauts”. Thèse de doctorat. Paris: Paris Sciences &
860 Lettres.

- 861 Lacourt, L, Ryckelynck, D, Forest, S, Rancourt, Vd, and Flouriot, S (2020). “Hyper-reduced direct numerical
862 simulation of voids in welded joints via image-based modeling”. *International Journal for Numerical
863 Methods in Engineering* 121: 2581–2599. DOI: [10.1002/nme.6320](https://doi.org/10.1002/nme.6320).
- 864 Leblond, JB and Mottet, G (2008). “A theoretical approach of strain localization within thin planar bands in
865 porous ductile materials”. *Comptes Rendus Mécanique* 336: 176–189. DOI: [10.1016/j.crme.2007.
866 11.008](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.crme.2007.11.008).
- 867 Li, XY, Hao, Q, Shi, YW, Lei, YP, and Marquis, G (2003). “Influence of mechanical mismatching on the failure
868 of welded joints by void nucleation and coalescence”. *International Journal of Pressure Vessels and Piping*
869 80: 647–654. DOI: [10.1016/S0308-0161\(03\)00094-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0308-0161(03)00094-2).
- 870 Ling, C, Besson, J, Forest, S, Tanguy, B, Latourte, F, and Bosso, E (2016). “An elastoviscoplastic model for
871 porous single crystals at finite strains and its assessment based on unit cell simulations”. *International
872 Journal of Plasticity* 84: 58–87. DOI: [10.1016/j.ijplas.2016.05.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijplas.2016.05.001).
- 873 Liu, ZG, Wong, WH, and Guo, TF (2016). “Void behaviors from low to high triaxialities: Transition from
874 void collapse to void coalescence”. *International Journal of Plasticity* 84: 183–202. DOI: [10.1016/j.
875 ijplas.2016.05.008](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijplas.2016.05.008).
- 876 Luo, T and Gao, X (2018). “On the prediction of ductile fracture by void coalescence and strain localization”.
877 *Journal of the Mechanics and Physics of Solids* 113: 82–104. DOI: [10.1016/j.jmps.2018.02.002](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmps.2018.02.002).
- 878 Matern, B (1986). *Spatial Variation*. 2nd ed. Lecture Notes in Statistics. New York: Springer-Verlag. DOI:
879 [10.1007/978-1-4615-7892-5](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4615-7892-5).
- 880 McClintock, FA (1968). “A Criterion for Ductile Fracture by the Growth of Holes”. *Journal of Applied
881 Mechanics* 35. Publisher: American Society of Mechanical Engineers Digital Collection: 363–371. DOI:
882 [10.1115/1.3601204](https://doi.org/10.1115/1.3601204).
- 883 Morin, D, Blystad Dæhli, LE, Børvik, T, Benallal, A, and Hopperstad, OS (2019). “Numerical study of ductile
884 failure under non-proportional loading”. *European Journal of Mechanics - A/Solids* 74: 221–241. DOI:
885 [10.1016/j.euromechsol.2018.11.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.euromechsol.2018.11.001).
- 886 Morin, L, Leblond, JB, and Benzerga, AA (2015). “Coalescence of voids by internal necking: Theoretical
887 estimates and numerical results”. *Journal of the Mechanics and Physics of Solids* 75: 140–158. DOI:
888 [10.1016/j.jmps.2014.11.009](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmps.2014.11.009).
- 889 Morin, L, Leblond, JB, Benzerga, AA, and Kondo, D (2016). “A unified criterion for the growth and coalescence
890 of microvoids”. *Journal of the Mechanics and Physics of Solids* 97: 19–36. DOI: [10.1016/j.jmps.
891 2016.01.013](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmps.2016.01.013).

- 892 Needleman, A and Tvergaard, V (1992). “Analyses of plastic flow localization in metals”. *Applied Mechanics*
893 *Reviews* 45: 3–18. DOI: [10.1115/1.3121390](https://doi.org/10.1115/1.3121390).
- 894 Nguyen, VD, Pardoën, T, and Noels, L (2020). “A nonlocal approach of ductile failure incorporating void
895 growth, internal necking, and shear dominated coalescence mechanisms”. *Journal of the Mechanics and*
896 *Physics of Solids* 137: 103891. DOI: [10.1016/j.jmps.2020.103891](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmps.2020.103891).
- 897 Pedregosa, F et al. (2011). “Scikit-learn: Machine Learning in Python”. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*
898 12: 2825–2830.
- 899 Ponte Castañeda, P and Willis, JR (1995). “The effect of spatial distribution on the effective behavior of
900 composite materials and cracked media”. *Journal of the Mechanics and Physics of Solids* 43: 1919–1951.
901 DOI: [10.1016/0022-5096\(95\)00058-Q](https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-5096(95)00058-Q).
- 902 Rice, JR and Tracey, DM (1969). “On the ductile enlargement of voids in triaxial stress fields”. *Journal of the*
903 *Mechanics and Physics of Solids* 17: 201–217.
- 904 Rice, JR (1976). “The localization of deformation”. In: *Theoretical and Applied Mechanics, Proceedings of the*
905 *14th IUTAM congress, Delft*. Ed. by WT Koiter. Delft: North-Holland Publishing Company: 207–220.
- 906 Sarre, B (2018). “Influence du soudage laser Nd:YAG sur les propriétés métallurgiques et mécaniques de
907 l’alliage de titane TA6V”. Thèse de doctorat. Troyes: Université de Technologie de Troyes.
- 908 Schöberl, J (1997). “NETGEN - An advancing front 2D/3D-mesh generator based on abstract rules”. *Computing*
909 *and Visualization in Science* 1: 41–52.
- 910 Shakoor, M, Bernacki, M, and Bouchard, PO (2015). “A new body-fitted immersed volume method for
911 the modeling of ductile fracture at the microscale: Analysis of void clusters and stress state effects on
912 coalescence”. *Engineering Fracture Mechanics* 147: 398–417. DOI: [10.1016/j.engfracmech.2015.](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.engfracmech.2015.06.057)
913 [06.057](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.engfracmech.2015.06.057).
- 914 Shakoor, M, Bernacki, M, and Bouchard, PO (2018). “Ductile fracture of a metal matrix composite studied
915 using 3D numerical modeling of void nucleation and coalescence”. *Engineering Fracture Mechanics* 189:
916 110–132. DOI: [10.1016/j.engfracmech.2017.10.027](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.engfracmech.2017.10.027).
- 917 Tekoğlu, C, Hutchinson, JW, and Pardoën, T (2015). “On localization and void coalescence as a precursor
918 to ductile fracture”. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and*
919 *Engineering Sciences* 373: 20140121. DOI: [10.1098/rsta.2014.0121](https://doi.org/10.1098/rsta.2014.0121).
- 920 Thomason, PF (1985). “Three-dimensional models for the plastic limit-loads at incipient failure of the intervoid
921 matrix in ductile porous solids”. *Acta Metallurgica* 33: 1079–1085. DOI: [10.1016/0001-6160\(85\)](https://doi.org/10.1016/0001-6160(85)90201-9)
922 [90201-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/0001-6160(85)90201-9).

- 923 Toriki, ME (2019). “A unified criterion for void growth and coalescence under combined tension and shear”.
924 *International Journal of Plasticity* 119: 57–84. DOI: [10.1016/j.ijplas.2019.02.002](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijplas.2019.02.002).
- 925 Trejo Navas, VM, Bernacki, M, and Bouchard, PO (2018). “Void growth and coalescence in a three-dimensional
926 non-periodic void cluster”. *International Journal of Solids and Structures* 139-140: 65–78. DOI: [10.1016/
927 j.ijsolstr.2018.01.024](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijsolstr.2018.01.024).
- 928 Tvergaard, V (2016). “Effect of void cluster on ductile failure evolution”. *Meccanica* 51: 3097–3105. DOI:
929 [10.1007/s11012-016-0537-5](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11012-016-0537-5).
- 930 Tvergaard, V (2017). “Nucleation from a cluster of inclusions, leading to void coalescence”. *International
931 Journal of Mechanical Sciences* 133: 631–638. DOI: [10.1016/j.ijmecsci.2017.09.027](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijmecsci.2017.09.027).
- 932 Tvergaard, V and Needleman, A (1984). “Analysis of the cup-cone fracture in a round tensile bar”. *Acta
933 Metallurgica* 32: 157–169. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.1016/0001-6160\(84\)90213-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/0001-6160(84)90213-X).
- 934 Vincent, PG, Monerie, Y, and Suquet, P (2009). “Porous materials with two populations of voids under internal
935 pressure: I. Instantaneous constitutive relations”. *International Journal of Solids and Structures* 46: 480–506.
936 DOI: [10.1016/j.ijsolstr.2008.09.003](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijsolstr.2008.09.003).
- 937 Virtanen, P et al. (2020). “SciPy 1.0: fundamental algorithms for scientific computing in Python”. *Nature Methods*
938 17. Number: 3 Publisher: Nature Publishing Group: 261–272. DOI: [10.1038/s41592-019-0686-2](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41592-019-0686-2).
- 939 Vishwakarma, V and Keralavarma, SM (2019). “Micromechanical modeling and simulation of the loading path
940 dependence of ductile failure by void growth to coalescence”. *International Journal of Solids and Structures*
941 166: 135–153. DOI: [10.1016/j.ijsolstr.2019.02.015](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijsolstr.2019.02.015).
- 942 Wong, WH and Guo, TF (2015). “On the energetics of tensile and shear void coalescences”. *Journal of the
943 Mechanics and Physics of Solids* 82: 259–286. DOI: [10.1016/j.jmps.2015.05.013](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmps.2015.05.013).
- 944 www.zset-software.com (2020).
- 945 Xiao, X, Mu, Z, Pan, H, and Lou, Y (2018). “Effect of the Lode parameter in predicting shear cracking of
946 2024-T351 aluminum alloy Taylor rods”. *International Journal of Impact Engineering* 120: 185–201. DOI:
947 [10.1016/j.ijimpeng.2018.06.008](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijimpeng.2018.06.008).
- 948 Zhai, J, Luo, T, Gao, X, Graham, SM, Baral, M, Korkolis, YP, and Knudsen, E (2016). “Modeling the ductile
949 damage process in commercially pure titanium”. *International Journal of Solids and Structures* 91: 26–45.
950 DOI: [10.1016/j.ijsolstr.2016.04.031](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijsolstr.2016.04.031).
- 951 Zhang, KS, Bai, JB, and François, D (1999). “Ductile fracture of materials with high void volume fraction”.
952 *International Journal of Solids and Structures* 36: 3407–3425. DOI: [10.1016/S0020-7683\(98\)
953 00157-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0020-7683(98)00157-7).

- 954 Zhang, K, Badreddine, H, and Saanouni, K (2020). “Ductile fracture prediction using enhanced CDM model
955 with Lode angle-dependency for titanium alloy Ti-6Al-4V at room temperature”. *Journal of Materials
956 Processing Technology* 277: 116462. DOI: [10.1016/j.jmatprotec.2019.116462](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmatprotec.2019.116462).
- 957 Zhu, JC, Ben Bettaieb, M, and Abed-Meraim, F (2020). “Investigation of the competition between void
958 coalescence and macroscopic strain localization using the periodic homogenization multiscale scheme”.
959 *Journal of the Mechanics and Physics of Solids* 143: 104042. DOI: [10.1016/j.jmps.2020.104042](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmps.2020.104042).
- 960 Zhu, Y, Engelhardt, MD, and Kiran, R (2018). “Combined effects of triaxiality, Lode parameter and shear stress
961 on void growth and coalescence”. *Engineering Fracture Mechanics* 199: 410–437. DOI: [10.1016/j.
962 engfracmech.2018.06.008](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.engfracmech.2018.06.008).