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Abstract

The origin of a large elastic stress within an interface between martensitic variants (twins) within a finite strain phase field approach has been determined. Notably, for a sharp interface this stress is absent. Three different constitutive relations for the transformation stretch tensor versus order parameters have been considered: a linear combination of the Bain tensors (kinematic model-I, KM-I), an exponential-logarithmic combination (KM-II) of the Bain tensors, and a stretch tensor corresponding to simple shear (KM-III). An analytical finite-strain solution has been found for an infinite sample for tetragonal martensite under plane stress condition. In particular, explicit expression for the stresses have been obtained. The maximum interfacial stress for KM-II is more than twice that which corresponds to KM-I. Stresses are absent for KM-III, but it is unclear how to generalize this model for multivariant martensitic transformation. An approximate analytical solution for a finite sample has been found as well. It shows good correspondence with numerical results obtained using the finite element method. The obtained results are important for developing phase field approaches for multivariant martensitic transformations coupled to mechanics, especially at the nanoscale.
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1. Introduction

Interfacial stresses. Interfacial stresses play an important role in the formation of the nanostructures, causing martensitic phase transformations (PTs) in the nanowires [1,2], and influencing the nucleation condition and evolution in the multivariant martensitic microstructures [3,4]. Interfacial stresses can also reduce the activation energy for intermediate melt nucleation within solid-solid interface by more than an order of magnitude [5]. Interfaces may have a complex internal structure, including the intermediate phases [6–9]. They may appear as an intermediate state during PTs, e.g., solid-solid PT via intermediate melting [10–15]. Interfacial stresses have been determined for external surfaces [1] and solid-melt interfaces [16–18] using atomistic simulations.

It is well-known [19] that each material surface is subjected to biaxial interface stresses. For phases that do not support deviatoric stresses at the equilibrium (liquids and gases), the interfaceal force per unit length $\gamma$ in both directions is equal to the surface energy $\gamma$. For interfaces in solids, or for solid-liquid and solid-gas interfaces, the magnitude of the surface stresses is determined by the Shutterworth equation [20] $\gamma = \frac{\partial G}{\partial \delta}$, where $\delta$ is the mean interface strain. Thus, interfacial stress consists of two parts: the tensile structural stress, $\sigma_{st}$, which is the same as for a liquid-gas interface, and another, $\sigma_{el}$, which is caused by elastic deformation of an interface and which may be tensile or compressive.

Within the sharp interface approach, the constitutive equations and balance laws for elastic interfaces were derived in Refs. [20–27]. The challenges are (a) in finding the material parameters and (b) in the concern for whether the resultant interfacial stresses can be formalized through simple constitutive equations due to strongly heterogeneous interfacial fields like elastic moduli, transformation strains, and total strains across the interface.

Phase field approach. The phase field approach, which for the
conserved order parameters is also known as the Ginzburg-Landau approach, is broadly applied for studying the microstructure evolution during various first-order PTs. The most relevant to the current paper are works on modeling austenite - multivariant martensite and twinned microstructure evolution in crystalline solids [42–41]. We also mention works on transformations in liquids [42] and melting/solidification [43–45], in which interfacial stresses have been included. In the phase field models, the interface has a finite width, and its structure (i.e., distribution of all fields within an interface) is resolved. Interfacial stresses \( \sigma_{int} \) (here, force per unit length \( \sigma_{int} \)) equal to the interfacial energy \( \gamma \) have been introduced in Refs. [42–44], but are not fully consistent; see the discussion in Ref. [46]. The problem of introducing of the interfacial stresses \( \sigma_{int} \) was solved for melting [47,48] and the solid-solid interface for small [3,46,49] and large [50,51] strains, including cases with anisotropic interface energy [51]. The interfacial stresses were also introduced and studied for a complex solid-melt-solid interface [52], which appears during solid-solid PT via the intermediate melt.

Elastic interfacial stresses \( \sigma^e_{int} \) (with resultant force per unit interface length \( \sigma^e_{int} \)) appear automatically (i.e., without extra terms in the constitutive equations) as a result of solution of the coupled Ginzburg-Landau and elasticity equations, due to heterogeneity of the transformations strain and the elastic properties within interface. They were found numerically for a solid-melt interface [45,47,48], for the austenite-martensite [3] and martensite-martensite [4,33] interfaces, as well as for a complex solid-melt-solid interface [5,52,53]. In contrast, the theory in Ref. [54] introduces the explicit dependence of the gradient energy on the interfacial strain. This results in the additional interfacial stresses that depend on the gradient of the order parameter. In the sharp interface limit, this theory reduces to the theory in Ref. [23], in which interfacial energy depends on the interfacial strain. The theory in Ref. [54] does not include structural interfacial stresses \( \sigma_{str} \). Since the boundary-value problem for stresses was not solved in Ref. [54], elastic stresses due to heterogeneity of material parameters within the interface were not discussed. At the same time, it is argued in Ref. [50] that it is not evident that such an additional dependence of the gradient energy on the interfacial strain is necessary, because stresses due to heterogeneous distribution of material parameters across an interface (neglected in Ref. [54]) may be large, exceeding what one wants to introduce. This was shown for the solid-melt interface in Refs. [47,48]. In this case, volumetric transformation strain (more precisely, the biaxial part of the transformation strain along the interface) determines the elastic interfacial stresses [47,48]. They appeared to be too large and unrealistic (they are significantly larger than stresses determined using molecular dynamic simulations in Refs. [16,17]). These stresses artificially suppress melting, and in order to restore consistency with experimental data on the size-dependence of the melting temperature for Al nanoparticles, various methods of their relaxation (in particular, introducing an additional equation for stress relaxation) have been proposed in Refs. [47,48]. This led to the conclusion that for melting it is not necessary to introduce additional elastic interfacial stresses. However, there have been only limited attempts to understand which parameters affect elastic interfacial stresses for a solid-solid interface and how they can be controlled; see, e.g., [4,55,56].

In the current paper, we have found a complete analytical solution for the simplest case of a solid-solid interface between two martensitic variants, or a twin interface. Since transformation strain for twinning is a simple shear, internal stresses do not appear within the sharp interface between martensitic variants or twins. It is intuitively expected that they should not appear within a phase field approach also. However, we will see that this is not the case. Multivariant martensitic PTs. Microstructure evolution during martensitic PTs plays the central role in determining mechanical, electrical, and other properties in a broad range of materials, e.g. shape memory alloys, ferroelectric materials, and multiferroic materials. The microstructures in such materials usually consist of mixture of austenite, A, and N martensitic variants, \( M_\nu \), where \( \nu = 1, 2, \ldots, N \); see, e.g., [57,58]. Some of the martensitic variants can form twins that are coherent interfaces. Across a twin boundary, one variant can be obtained by simple shear deformation of the other. In experiments, one rarely sees interfaces between A and a single martensitic variant, since the stress-free lattices of A and \( M_i \) in most of the materials are not geometrically compatible (in the sense of Hadamard’s compatibility) to form a coherent stress-free interface. The system prefers to form microstructures consisting of A separated from twinned martensite by a plane interface, which minimizes the elastic energy of the system [57,58].

Various continuum theories [57–63] have been used to study twinned microstructures within sharp interface approaches. On the other hand, various aspects of the phase field approach to martensitic PTs and twinning have been developed and used for simulations in various papers; see e.g., [42–41]. The main concept is related to the order parameters \( \gamma \) that describe material instabilities during PTs from A to \( M_i \) in a continuous way.

The necessary conditions for the Landau (local) potential and transformation strain, which are functions of the order parameters, have been formulated and utilized in Refs. [30,33,64–66] for small strains and in Refs. [30,67] for large strains. They, in particular, introduce the conditions that the thermodynamically equilibrium values of the order parameters are fixed (i.e., 0 or 1) for A and \( M_i \) for any stress and temperature and that the crystal lattice instability conditions should be included in the theory. This results in a much more complex expression for the thermodynamic potential and transformation strain tensor as compared to those used in the other theories [34–39]. Large strain formulation for multivariant martensitic PTs were developed in Refs. [30–32,38,39,67]. Three different kinematic assumptions are currently used in various papers.

(a) Kinematic model-I (KM-I): Symmetric right transformational stretch \( U_i \) is considered as a linear combination of the Bain stretch tensors \( U_{hi} \) of all the martensitic variants multiplied with a corresponding nonlinear interpolation function of the order parameters [30,67]. Such an expression satisfies all of the conditions formulated in Refs. [30,67]. However, as it was shown in Refs. [38,39], it does not conserve the determinant of the transformation strain (i.e., volumetric transformation strain) within the transition region between the variants where \( 0 < \eta < 1 \). In particular, this means that while all martensitic variants have the same specific volume, the transformation process \( M_1 \leftrightarrow M_j \) is not isochoric. This requirement is not a mandatory one, because, for dislocation slip, for example, there is a volume change along the shearing process between two stable atomic configurations [68]. In fact, defect cores in dislocations and twin boundaries may induce change in volume (see Chapter 7 and 8 of [69] and the references therein). However, the requirement for volume conservation sounds reasonable, at least, for the simplest model; it is good to have such a model. If volume change is observed during a transformation process between two martensitic variants, in principle, it could be included as a correction to the isochoric model.
(b) Kinematic model-ll (KM-II): Recently, an alternative expression for the transformation stretch was proposed, which is given by exponential of a linear combination of the natural logarithm of the Bain tensors [38,39]. In this case, the volume remains always preserved along the entire path of the $M_1 \leftrightarrow M_2$ transformations. However, numerical simulations demonstrated large elastic stresses within twin boundaries, which were suppressed by some computational tricks [38,39]. It is necessary to mention that the order parameters in Refs. [38,39] are the volume fractions of various phases and all interpolation functions are linear in order parameters, in contrast to [30,67]. The requirements formulated in Refs. [30,67] were not considered [38,39].

Note that even for small strains, while the difference between two of the above models would be expected to be vanishing, large elastic stresses within the $M_1 - M_2$ interfaces have been reported in Refs. [4,33]. An unambiguous explanation for the reason of such large elastic stresses within twin boundaries is still missing. Needless to say, a proper understanding of the origin and nature of such stresses in twin boundaries is very important in order to use those models for further study and/or to develop a more suitable theory. Interfacial stresses can cause martensitic and variant-transformations [1,2]. Also, in a fine mixture of martensitic variants, their thickness is only a few nanometers and they possess sharp tips [70]. Large stresses within nanometer wide interfaces may cause significant stresses of the opposite sign in the bulk twin phases, which should strongly affect nucleation and evolution of a martensitic nanostructure [3,4].

(c) Kinematic model-lll (KM-III): When single twinning was studied, a simple shear assumption for the non-symmetric transformation deformation gradient $F_1 = I + \gamma_1(n) m \otimes n$ was used [40,64,71]. Here, $\gamma_1(n) = \gamma_0 \phi(n)$ is a smooth function of the order parameter $0 \leq \eta \leq 1$ such that the interpolation function $\phi$ satisfies the conditions $\phi(0) = 0$, $\phi(1) = 1$, and $\phi/\|\phi\|(n) = \phi(n) = 0$ within the two variants, which were derived as the conditions for thermodynamic equilibrium of phases. Hence clearly, $F_1 = I$ and $F_1 = I + \gamma_0 m \otimes n$ within two respective variants, where $\gamma_0$ is the shear strain along the unit direction $m$ in the plane with the unit normal $n$ (called the twinning plane), and $\otimes$ stands for the dyadic product between two vectors. This model cannot be easily generalized for multiple martensitic variants; see Ref. [30]. To the best of our knowledge, the interfacial stresses for this model has not yet been studied.

Our goal is to investigate the origin of large elastic stresses within a variant $M_1$ - variant $M_2$ interface for all three phase field models, and to analyze the results in details. To accomplish this goal, an analytical finite strain solution has been obtained for all the fields within the plane $M_1 - M_2$ interface in an infinite sample under plane stress condition. Cubic $A$ and tetragonal $M_1$ have been considered. While for KM-III stresses within the interface were zero, significantly large stresses have been observed for KM-I and KM-II due to the heterogeneity in the components of the transformation deformation gradient tensor across the interface. In fact, for KM-II, the maximum value of the interfacial stress is more than twice of that for KM-I. Thus, if the goal is to develop a model with stress-free interfaces, one has to find a way of generalizing KM-III for multivariant transformations, and this is a challenging task. If one can tolerate interfacial stresses, but wants to minimize them, then the KM-I, which involves variation of the volumetric strain during $M_1 - M_2$ transformation, is better than the KM-II, which preserves volumetric strain. It also shows that the requirements to the phase field theories should be formulated not only for conditions when one phase homogeneously transforms into another one, but also for the case of coexistent phases divided by an interface. Furthermore, the effect of the finite size of a sample on the solutions has been investigated. An approximate analytical solution has been obtained for KM-I, and the finite element (FE) results for both KM-I and II have been presented. Analytical and numerical solutions for KM-I are in very good agreement.

The paper has been organized in the following manner. A system of coupled mechanics and phase field equations, and various constitutive relations have been listed in Section 2. We have presented our results for an infinite sample in Section 3 and for a finite sample in Section 4. We conclude our paper with Section 5.

We denote multiphase and inner product between two second order tensors as $(A \cdot B)_{ij} = A_{ij}B_{ij}$ and $A : B = A_{ij}B_{ij}$, respectively, where repeated indices denote summation as per Einstein’s convention; $A_{ij}$ and $B_{ij}$ are the components of the tensors in a right handed orthonormal Cartesian basis $\{e_1, e_2, e_3\}$; determinant and trace of tensor $A$ are denoted by $\det A$, and $tr A$, respectively; subscript $0$ means that the quantity is defined in the reference configuration $\Omega^0$; superscripts $T$ and $-1$ denote tensor transpose and inversion; the gradient operators in reference $\Omega^0$ and deformed $\Omega$ configurations have been denoted by $\nabla^0$ and $\nabla$, respectively; $I$ is the second order identity tensor; $\nabla^0 \cdot v^0$ denotes the Laplacian operator in $\Omega^0$: $\cdot$ stands for equality by definition.

2. Coupled mechanics and phase field equations

We begin Section 2.1 by summarizing the standard kinematic relations, constitutive relations, and the Ginzburg-Landau equation for $M_1 - M_2$ transformations. Stress-free $A$ will be chosen as the reference configuration. A general theory for $A$ and two martensitic variants requires at least two order parameters. Let us consider that one order parameter describes austenite $\leftrightarrow$ martensitic transformation such that it is $0$ in $A$ and $1$ in $M$, and the other describes $M_1 - M_2$ transformations (see Ref. [30] for a similar description). Hence if a system contains martensitic variants only and austenite is completely absent, then the order parameter related to austenite $\leftrightarrow$ martensitic transformation is equal to unity everywhere, and we just need a single order parameter for describing $M_1 - M_2$ transformations. The system under study in the present paper primarily evolves with two variants, where the residual austenite is fully absent. We denote the later order parameter by $\eta$, where $\eta = 1$ in $M_1$ and $\eta = 0$ in $M_2$. Obviously, there would be only a single Ginzburg-Landau equation for the system under study. Next, specialized kinematic and constitutive relations based on plane stress assumption have been summarized in Section 2.2. Finally, the constitutive relations for the transformation stretch tensor $U\ell$ for cubic to tetragonal transformations have been collected in Section 2.3.

2.1. General theory and system of equations

2.1.1. Kinematics

The deformation of a transforming material is described by the smooth function $r = r(\rho_0, t)$, where $r$ and $\rho_0$ are the position vectors of a particle in the deformed $\Omega$ and the reference $\Omega^0$ configurations, respectively, and $t$ denotes time. The deformation gradient $F = \nabla r$ is multiplicatively decomposed into elastic part $F_\varepsilon = V \cdot R$ and the symmetric transformation stretch tensor $U\ell$ (see Ref. [50] for details):
\[ F = F_e \cdot U_t = V_e \cdot R \cdot U_t = V_e \cdot F_t; \quad F_t = R \cdot U_t, \]  
(2.1)

where \( V_e \) is the symmetric left elastic stretch tensor and \( R \) is the lattice rotation. The deformation gradient \( F \) maps an infinitesimal line element from \( \Omega_0 \) to \( \Omega \); \( U_t \) is the mapping from \( \Omega_0 \) to an intermediate stress-free configuration \( \Omega_i \); \( F_e \) maps \( \Omega_i \) to the deformed configuration \( \Omega \). We define an Eulerian elastic strain tensor

\[ b_e = 0.5(b_{ei} - I) = 0.5 \left( V_e^2 - I \right), \]  
(2.2)

where \( b_{ei} := F_e \cdot F_e^T \) is the left Cauchy-Green elastic strain tensor. The ratios of specific volumes in various configurations are defined as \( J = \text{det} F, J_l = \text{det} U_t, \) and \( J_o = \text{det} F_o \) with \( J = J_l J_o \). We define

\[ \epsilon = V - I, \quad e_t = U_t - I, \quad \text{and} \quad e_e = V_e - I, \]  
(2.3)

where \( V = \sqrt{F \cdot F^T} \) is the symmetric left total stretch tensor. The compatibility condition for the deformation gradient \( F \) is (see, e.g., Chapter 2 of [72])

\[ \nabla_0 \times F = 0, \quad \text{where} \quad (\nabla_0 \times F)_ij = \epsilon_{ijn} \frac{\partial F_{mj}}{\partial x_{0im}} \]  
(2.4)

denotes curl of \( F \) and \( \epsilon_{ijn} \) is the third order permutation tensor.

### 2.1.2. Constitutive relations and governing equations

We now collect the constitutive relations and the system of equations to be solved.

(i) Mechanical equilibrium equation for neglected body forces

\[ \nabla_0 \cdot P = 0 \quad \text{in} \ \Omega_0, \]  
(2.5)

where \( P \) is the nonsymmetric first Piola-Kirchhoff stress tensor.

(ii) Helmholtz free energy density: Neglecting the interfacial structural stresses \( \sigma_{st} \) we consider the Helmholtz free energy per unit mass as (see Ref. [50] for a more general form)

\[ \psi(F_e, \eta, \theta; \nabla_0 \eta) = \frac{J}{\rho_0} \psi_e(F_e, \eta, \theta) + A \eta^2 (1 - \eta)^2 + 0.5b |\nabla_0 \eta|^2, \]  
(2.6)

where \( \psi_e \) is the elastic free energy density per unit volume of \( \Omega_i \); the second term is the double-well barrier energy; and the third term is the gradient energy density, with \( A \) and \( b \) being corresponding parameters. For simplicity, isotropic St. Venant-Kirchhoff elastic material (see Chapter 5 of [72]) will be considered:

\[ \psi_e = 0.5 \lambda (tr \ b_e)^2 + \mu b_e : b_e, \]  
(2.7)

where \( \psi_e(b_e) = \psi_e(F_e) \) and \( \lambda \) and \( \mu \) are the Lamé constants, which are the same for both martensitic variants. Since elastic stresses in the problems below are quite small, linear stress-strain relation is justified. All derivations can be repeated for a linear anisotropic material; however, this will complicate equations without changing the main results significantly. Also, not all elastic constants for tetragonal martensite in NiAl alloy considered here are known; those which are known, are far from being precise, because they were found using molecular dynamics at zero temperature [73].

(iii) Stress-strain relations: Using the standard relations for the first Piola-Kirchhoff \( P \) and the Cauchy stress \( \sigma \) for isotropic materials, given by \( P = J \sigma F^{-T} \) and \( \sigma = \frac{J}{2} V_e^2 (\partial^2 \psi_e/\partial b_e) \) [50], we obtain

\[ \sigma = J^{-1} V_e^2 (\lambda (tr \ b_e) I + 2 \mu b_e). \]

\[ P = J^{-1} V_e^2 (\lambda (tr \ b_e) I + 2 \mu b_e) \cdot F^{-T}. \]  
(2.8)

(iv) The stationary Ginzburg-Landau equation for the order parameter \( \eta \) (see Ref. [50] for a detailed derivation)

\[ \frac{\partial}{\partial \sigma_{01}} \left( F^T \cdot F_e - J \psi_e \right) = \frac{dU_t}{d\eta} - 2 \rho_0 A \eta (1 - 3 \eta + 2 \eta^2) + b \frac{\partial^2 \eta}{\partial \sigma_{01}^2} = 0, \]  
(2.9)

where \( L > 0 \) is the kinetic coefficient. We have assumed that \( \eta \) depends on the single coordinate \( \sigma_{01} \); see Section 3.

(v) Boundary condition: Assuming a phase-independent energy of the external surface \( S_0 \) of the body in \( \Omega_0 \) we obtain

\[ \nabla_0 \eta \cdot n_0 = 0 \quad \text{on} \quad S_0, \]  
(2.10)

where \( n_0 \) is the outward unit normal to \( S_0 \). All external surfaces are traction-free.

### 2.2. Plane stress condition: stresses and strains

For our goal, it is sufficient to consider the plane stress condition, i.e. \( \sigma_{13} = \sigma_{23} = \sigma_{33} = 0 \). As a consequence, all out-of-plane components of \( T \) are also vanishing, and in \( F, F_e, V_e, R, \) and \( U_t \) all the off-diagonal out-of-plane (i.e. 13, 31, 23, and 32) components are identically zero. Using a standard procedure, the in-plane Cauchy stresses can be obtained as (see Chapter 7 of [74] for similar derivation with small strains)

\[ \sigma_{ij} = \frac{J}{2} V_e^2 \delta_{ik} T_{kj}; \quad \text{where} \quad T_{kj} = \lambda (b_{el}) \delta_{kj} + 2 \mu b_{e kj}. \]  
(2.11)

\[ \lambda' = 2 \mu \lambda / (\lambda + 2 \mu), \]  
\[ \delta_{kj} \] denotes the Kronecker delta, and the indices \( i, j, k = 1, 2, 3 \). Also, it can be shown that \( b_{e23} = -b_{e13} \lambda / (\lambda + 2 \mu) \). The relation \( b_{e33} = 0.5(V_{e33}^2 - 1) = 0.5(V_{e33}^2 - 1) \) thus yields

\[ F_{e33} = V_{e33} = \sqrt{1 - \lambda' b_{e11}/\mu}, \quad \text{and} \quad F_{e33} = V_{e33} U_{e33}. \]  
(2.12)

### 2.3. Constitutive relation for \( U_t \)

Recall that our austenite and martensitic phases have cubic and tetragonal lattices, respectively. The Bain tensors for three variants are diagonal matrices of the form \( \text{diag}(\beta, \alpha, \alpha) \), \( \text{diag}(\alpha, \beta, \alpha) \), and \( \text{diag}(\alpha, \alpha, \beta) \), where \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \) are constant parameters (see Chapter 4 of [58]). Here we consider the transformation between only two variants of martensites. Without loss of generality we will choose the first two Bain tensors. For convenience of analysis, we assume that the Bain tensors are rotated about \( e_1 \) by \( \pi/4 \) (simply to get a twin boundary perpendicular to \( e_1 \)-axis, see Fig. 1(a));
in terms of the interpolation function

\[ \phi = \eta^2(3 - 2\eta). \]  

(2.15)

Other higher degree polynomials formulated in Refs. [64,65,67], satisfying the requirements \( \phi(0) = 0, \ \phi(1) = 1, \) and \( \phi'(0) = \phi'(1) = 0, \) can also be used in the current paper without complications. Obviously, \( U_t = U_{t1} + U_{t2} \) for \( \eta = 1 \) \( (M_1) \) and \( \eta = 0 \) \( (M_2) \), respectively. Using Eq. (2.13) in Eq. (2.14) we get an explicit form:

\[ U_t = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{2}(\alpha + \beta) & \frac{1}{2}(\beta - \alpha)(1 - 2\phi) & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{2}(\alpha + \beta) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \alpha \end{bmatrix}. \]  

(2.16)

The normal components of \( U_t \) given by Eq. (2.16) are constants, but the shear component \( U_{t12} \) is heterogeneous across the interface. Obviously, \( \det U_t = \alpha(\beta + \alpha)^2 - (\beta - \alpha)^2(1 - 2\phi)^2 \) is also heterogeneous across the interface, thereby indicating that the volume will not remain conserved during variant-variant transformation.

**KM-II:** In \( U_t \) based transformation rule. Alternatively, following [38,39], we assume \( U_t \) as exponential of linear combination of natural logarithm of the Bain tensors:

\[ U_t = \exp[\phi \ln U_{t1} + (1 - \phi) \ln U_{t2}]. \]  

(2.17)

The definitions of logarithm and exponential of tensors can be found, for example, in Chapter 1 of [72]. It is easy to verify from Eq. (2.17) that in pure \( M_1 \) and \( M_2, \ U_t = U_{t1} \) and \( U_t = U_{t2} \), respectively. Using the properties \( \det(\exp U_t) = \exp(\text{tr} \ U_t) \) and \( \ln(\det U_t) = \text{tr}(\ln U_t) \) (see Chapter 1 of [72]) one can show that

\[ \det U_t = \det(\exp[\phi \ln U_{t1} + (1 - \phi) \ln U_{t2}]) = \exp[\phi \ln(\det U_{t1}) + (1 - \phi) \ln(\det U_{t2})] = \det U_{t0}. \]  

(2.18)

where we have used the fact that \( \det U_{t1} = \det U_{t2} \). Obviously, Eq. (2.18) proves that the transformation rule Eq. (2.17) conserves the volume during \( M_1 \to M_2 \) transformations. Using Eq. (2.13) in Eq. (2.17) and simplifying we write

\[ U_t = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{2}(\alpha + \beta) & \frac{1}{2}(\beta - \alpha)(1 - 2\phi) & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{2}(\alpha + \beta) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \alpha \end{bmatrix}. \]  

(2.19)

From Eqs. (2.19) and Eq. (2.18) it is clear that \( \det U_t = \alpha U_{t11} U_{t22} - U_{t12}^2 = \alpha^2 \beta \) is a constant.

**KM-III:** simple shear. In Refs. [40,64,71] and several other papers devoted to twinning, a simple shear model \( F_s = I + \gamma_{1} \mathbf{m} \otimes \mathbf{n} \) was utilized, where \( F_s \) is obviously non-symmetric. For martensitic variants, this corresponds to considering one of them as the reference configuration. This description is volume preserving, since \( \det F_s = 1 \). Using \( \mathbf{m} = \mathbf{e}_2 \) and \( \mathbf{n} = \mathbf{e}_1 \), for the sample considered in this paper, we calculate the transformation stretch tensor

\[ U_t = \begin{bmatrix} F_s & F_s^{-1} \end{bmatrix}^{1/2} \]  

(2.20)

where \( q_1 = \sqrt{4 + \gamma_1^2}, \ q_2 = q_1 - \gamma_1, \ q_3 = q_1 + \gamma_1, \ q_4 = \sqrt{2 - q_2 \gamma_1}, \) and \( q_5 = \sqrt{2 + q_2 \gamma_1} \). Note that \( U_{t11} \) and \( U_{t22} \) in Eq. (2.20) satisfy the equality \( U_{t11}^2 + U_{t22}^2 = 1 \), which as we will see, is a crucial condition for having a stress-free interface.

3. Analytical solution for an interface between martensitic variants in an infinite sample

3.1. Kinematic models I and II

We consider an infinite stress-free austenite sample, as depicted
in Fig. 1(a), as the reference body $\Omega_0$. Let us apply transformation stretches $U_{01}^a$ and $U_{01}^b$ on the left and right sides of the reference sample about $e_2$-axis, so that we obtain a fully twinned body consisting of variants $M_1$ and $M_2$. In a schematic of the deformed configuration with stationary distribution of $\eta$ shown in Fig. 1(b), $\eta$ varies between 0 and 1 within the interface and $\eta \to 1$ and 0 in $M_1$ and $M_2$, respectively. All deformations are symmetric about the $e_2$-axis, and for the zero external stresses the interface remains stationary. Furthermore, we assume that all fields are functions of $r_{01}$ only (i.e., independent of $r_{02}$) and, thereby, reducing down the problem to one-dimensional (1D). This imposes the constraint

$$F_{12} = 0 \quad \text{in the entire body.} \tag{3.1}$$

The solution of the Ginzburg-Landau equation (2.9) should asymptotically match with the solution in the bulk, which is the stress-free pure martensitic variants (see Ref. [75] for a similar treatment); i.e., $\eta$ should satisfy the following boundary conditions:

$$\eta \to 1 \text{ as } r_{01} \to -\infty, \quad \text{and } \eta \to 0 \text{ as } r_{01} \to \infty. \tag{3.2}$$

Consequently,

$$U_{ij} \to U_{11}^{ij} \text{ as } r_{01} \to -\infty, \quad \text{and } U_{ij} \to U_{12}^{ij} \text{ as } r_{01} \to \infty. \tag{3.3}$$

Also, all the stresses are vanishing far away from the interface:

$$P_{11}, P_{12}, P_{21}, P_{22}, \sigma_{11}, \sigma_{12}, \sigma_{22} \to 0 \text{ as } r_{01} \to \pm \infty. \tag{3.4}$$

Obviously, the elastic stretch $V_{eij} \to \delta_{ij}$:

$$V_{e11}, V_{e22} \to 1 \quad \text{and} \quad V_{e12} \to 0 \text{ as } r_{01} \to \pm \infty. \tag{3.5}$$

The stresses and strains are therefore now known in the bulk at $r_{01} \to \pm \infty$.

To obtain the solutions in the interface we will use the kinematic decomposition Eq. (2.1) and the compatibility condition Eq. (2.4). Also, we will consider that the entire sample is in mechanical equilibrium; hence the total traction at each cross-section of the sample parallel to $e_2$-axis, and $e_1$-axis are vanishing:

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} P \cdot e_1 \ dr_{02} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} P \cdot e_2 \ dr_{01} = 0, \tag{3.6}$$

at the respective cross-sections. Since $P_{11}$ and $P_{21}$ do not vary along $e_2$ direction, they must vanish in the entire sample so that Eq. (3.6)1 is respected:

$$P_{11} = P_{21} = 0. \tag{3.7}$$

Using Eq. (3.1) and the relation $P = j \sigma F^T$ the components of first Piola-Kirchhoff stress tensor are obtained in terms of the Cauchy stresses as

$$P_{11} = \frac{\sigma_{11}}{F_{11}}, \quad P_{12} = \frac{\sigma_{12}}{F_{11}}, \quad P_{21} = \frac{\sigma_{12}}{F_{11}}, \quad P_{22} = \frac{\sigma_{22}}{F_{11}}. \tag{3.8}$$

It is obvious from Eq. (3.8) that

$$\sigma_{11} = \sigma_{12} = P_{12} = 0. \tag{3.9}$$

The solutions in Eq. (3.8) and Eq. (3.9) obviously satisfy the equilibrium equation (2.5). Considering Eq. (3.9) in Eq. (3.6)2, we simplify it to

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} P_{22} \ dr_{01} = 0. \tag{3.10}$$

Calculating $\sigma_{11}$ and $\sigma_{12}$ using Eq. (2.11), and then applying Eq. (3.9) we solve $V_{e12}$ and $V_{e11}$ which are given by Eqs. (3.22)2 and (3.22)3, respectively, in Box-I. It is to be mentioned that while solving $\sigma_{12} = 0$, we obtained two other roots given by $V_{e12} = \pm \sqrt{(\lambda+\mu)/(\lambda+2\mu) - 0.5(V_{e11}^2 + V_{e22}^2)}$. However, assuming $V_{e11}$ and $V_{e22}$ are within 15% deviation from unity (even with such an assumption the magnitude of maximum stresses still can be several tens of GPa), one can easily verify that for NiAl, $(\lambda+\mu)/(\lambda+2\mu) = 0.63$ (see Table 1 for material properties), and hence these roots are imaginary, and are not considered here.

Since the lattice rotation takes place about $e_1$-axis, expressing $R_{ij}$ as

$$R_{ij} = \begin{bmatrix} \cos \theta & -\sin \theta \\ \sin \theta & \cos \theta \end{bmatrix}, \tag{3.11}$$

and substituting Eq. (3.11) in Eq. (2.1) we obtain

$$V_{e11}(U_{11} \cos \theta - U_{12} \sin \theta) = F_{11}, \quad V_{e12}(U_{11} \cos \theta + U_{12} \sin \theta) = F_{12} = 0, \quad V_{e22}(U_{11} \sin \theta + U_{12} \cos \theta) = F_{21}, \quad V_{e22}(U_{11} \sin \theta - U_{12} \cos \theta) = F_{22}. \tag{3.12}$$

where we have used Eqs. (3.22)2 and (3.1). Since $V_{e11} \neq 0$, Eq. (3.12)2 yields

$$\tan \theta = U_{11}/U_{12} \Rightarrow \sin \theta = U_{12}/\sqrt{U_{11}^2 + U_{12}^2}, \quad \text{and} \quad \cos \theta = U_{22}/\sqrt{U_{11}^2 + U_{12}^2}. \tag{3.13}$$

Substituting Eq. (3.13)2,3 in Eq. (3.12) we obtain the total stretches:

$$F_{11} = \frac{V_{e11}(U_{11}^2 + U_{12}^2)}{\sqrt{U_{11}^2 + U_{12}^2}}, \quad F_{21} = \frac{V_{e22}(U_{11} + U_{12})}{\sqrt{U_{11}^2 + U_{12}^2}}, \quad \text{and} \quad F_{22} = \frac{V_{e22}(U_{11}^2 + U_{12}^2)}{\sqrt{U_{11}^2 + U_{12}^2}}. \tag{3.14}$$

Since $F$ is independent of $r_{02}$ and $r_{03}$, and $F_{12} = F_{13} = F_{21} = F_{23} = F_{22} = 0$, the compatibility condition (2.4) reduces to a single equation $\partial F_{22}/\partial r_{01} = 0$. Hence by Eq. (3.14)3 we have

$$F_{22} = \frac{V_{e22}(U_{11}^2 + U_{12}^2)}{\sqrt{U_{11}^2 + U_{12}^2}} = k_1 = \sqrt{0.5(a^2 + \beta^2)}, \tag{3.15}$$

where $k_1$ is the integration constant. It is obtained from the condition that for $\eta \to 1$ and $\eta \to 0$, Eqs. (2.16) and (2.19) for KM-I and KM-II yield $U_{11}^2 + U_{12}^2 \to 0.5(a^2 + \beta^2)$ and $V_{e22} \to 1$ in those regions. Utilizing Eqs. (3.15), (2.16) and (2.19) in Eq. (3.12)4 we obtain $V_{e22}$ given by Eq. (3.22)5 in Box-I. Eqs. (3.22)5 and (3.22)6 are the desired solutions for $V_{e22}$ vs. $\eta(r_{01})$ corresponding to KM-I and KM-II, which obviously approach unity as $r_{01} \to \pm \infty$. It is clear that they (and all the other fields) depend on the single parameter $\delta/\alpha$, and for $\delta = \alpha$ one has $V_{e22} = 1$ and that all strains and stresses are
zero. Using Eqs. (3.22)\textsubscript{i} and (3.22)\textsubscript{ii} in combination with the interface profile \(\eta(r_0)\) for the chosen interpolation function \(\phi(\eta)\) (see Eq. (3.27)), we obtain the spatial distribution of \(V_{e22}\). Given \(V_{e22}\) by Eq. (3.22)\textsubscript{i} or (3.22)\textsubscript{ii}, we can now calculate \(V_{e11}\) using Eq. (3.22)\textsubscript{i}, and \(V_{e33}\) using Eq. (2.12). Finally, substituting Eq. (3.22)\textsubscript{ii} in Eq. (2.11), we obtain the desired \(\sigma_{22}\) as a function of \(V_{e22}\):

\[
\sigma_{22} = \frac{2\mu(\lambda' + \mu)V_{e22}}{2(\lambda' + \mu) - \lambda V_{e22}^2}.
\]

We can now substitute Eq. (3.22)\textsubscript{i} or (3.22)\textsubscript{ii} and (3.22)\textsubscript{iii} back into Eq. (3.14) to obtain the unknown components of the total deformation gradient \(F_{11}, F_{22}\), and \(F_{21}\). Since \(V_{e22} \to 1\) in the bulk at \(r_{01} \to \pm \infty\), we can easily verify from Eq. (3.16) that \(\sigma_{22} \to 0\). Also, by Eq. (3.14), \(F_{21} \to R_{21,1} U_{21}^0\) as \(r_{01} \to -\infty\) and \(F_{21} \to R_{21,2} U_{21}^0\) as \(r_{01} \to \infty\) in the bulk. Components \(F_{223}\) and \(F_{23}\) can be obtained using Eq. (2.12).

**Stationary solution for Ginzburg-Landau equation.**

It seems impossible to solve Eq. (2.9) for \(\sigma\) analytically. However, we have estimated the order of magnitude of various terms in the Ginzburg-Landau equations and have shown that the transformation work related term can be neglected (see supplementary material [76]). Then the traditional solution [33,77] of Eq. (2.9) with the remaining terms is presented in Eq. (3.27), where \(r_{0k}\) is the location within the interface where \(\eta = 0.5\), \(\delta\) is the interfacial width (defined as the distance between points where \(\eta = 0.05\) and \(\eta = 0.95\)), and \(\gamma\) is the interfacial energy.

Finally, all the solutions for the infinite sample are summarized in **Box-I**.

*Interfacial force (tension) for KM-I*

The resultant interfacial force, or interface tension is

\[
f = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} F_{22} d\tau_{01}.
\]

Since \(F_{22}\) is highly nonlinear in \(\eta\) (compare with Eqs. (3.8) and (3.16)), the integration is performed using an approximate analytical expression for KM-I:

\[
f = \frac{4\mu(\lambda' + \mu)}{\lambda' + 2\mu} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} g(\phi) d\tau_{01}, \quad \text{where}
\]

\[
g(\phi) = \frac{\sqrt{2(\alpha^2 + \beta^2)}}{\alpha + \beta}
\]

\[
\left[1 - \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\alpha - \beta}{\alpha + \beta}\right)^2 (1 - 2\phi)^2 + \frac{3}{8} \left(\frac{\alpha - \beta}{\alpha + \beta}\right)^4 (1 - 2\phi)^4\right] - 1.
\]

We obtained the integrand \(g(\phi)\) in Eq. (3.17) by using Eq. (3.22)\textsubscript{i} in Eq. (3.16) and expanding it in the series of \((1 - 2\phi)^2(\beta - \alpha)^2/(\beta + \alpha)^2\), whose maximum value is \((\beta - \alpha)^2/(\beta + \alpha)^2 \ll 1\) for NiAl (see Table 1). Using Eq. (3.27)\textsubscript{i} we calculate \(\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} (1 - 2\phi)^2 d\tau_{01} = 0.5823 \delta\) and \(\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} (1 - 2\phi)^4 d\tau_{01} = 0.4530 \delta\), and by substituting them in Eq. (3.17) we get the resultant interfacial force \(f\) (see Eq. (3.28)) in **Box-I** which depends on the material constants. An important consequence of Eq. (3.28)\textsubscript{i} is that in the sharp interface limit, i.e. as \(\delta \to 0\), the interfacial force also vanishes.

**3.2. Kinematic model III**

The transformation stretches given by Eq. (2.20) satisfy \(U_{12}^0 + U_{22}^0 = 1\). Hence, according to Eq. (3.15), \(V_{e22} = \text{const}\). Using Eq. (3.16) and the condition on \(\sigma_{22}\) in Eq. (3.4) we conclude that \(V_{e22} = 1\) and \(\sigma_{22} = 0\) in entire sample.

\[
(3.19)
\]

**Box-I**

List of results for finite strain

1. Transformation stretches:

\[
U_{111} = U_{122} = 0.5(\alpha + \beta) \quad \text{and} \quad U_{112} = 0.5(\beta - \alpha)(1 - 2\phi) \quad \text{for KM - I};
\]

\[
U_{111} = U_{122} = 0.5(\alpha^0\beta^1 - \phi + a^{1-\phi} \beta^0) \quad \text{and} \quad U_{112} = 0.5(\alpha^0\beta^1 - \phi - a^{1-\phi} \beta^0) \quad \text{for KM - II};
\]

\[
U_{111} = \frac{q_2q_4 + q_3q_5}{2\sqrt{q_1}} \quad \text{and} \quad U_{112} = \frac{q_2q_4 + q_3q_5}{2\sqrt{q_1}} \quad \text{for KM - III},
\]

where \(q_1 = \sqrt{4 + \gamma^2}, \quad q_2 = q_1 - \gamma_1, \quad q_3 = q_1 + \gamma_1, \quad q_4 = \sqrt{2 - q_2\gamma_1}, \quad q_5 = \sqrt{2 + q_3\gamma_1}.
\]

2. Lattice rotation and elastic stretches:

\[
\tan \vartheta = \frac{U_{112}}{U_{122}} \quad \text{and} \quad V_{e12} = 0 \quad \text{for KM - I, II, III};
\]

\[
V_{e11} = \sqrt{1 - \frac{\lambda'}{\lambda'}(\frac{V_{e22}^2}{V_{e22}^2} - 1)} \quad \text{for KM - I, II}; \quad V_{e11} = 1 \quad \text{for KM - III};
\]

\[
V_{e22} = \frac{2(\alpha^2 + \beta^2)}{\sqrt{(\alpha + \beta)^2 + (\alpha - \beta)^2(1 - 2\phi)^2}} \quad \text{for KM - I};
\]

\[
V_{e22} = \frac{\alpha^2 + \beta^2}{\alpha^2 + \beta^2 + \alpha^2 - 2\phi \beta^2} \quad \text{for KM - II};
\]

\[
V_{e22} = 1 \quad \text{for KM - III};
\]
Since all stresses are zero within the sample, the resultant force $f$ defined in Eq. (3.17) is zero as well. Results are listed in Box-I for finite deformation and in Box-II for small strains. Some other arguments are given in Ref. [30].

Although, $U$, given by Eq. (2.20) successfully describes a stress-free twinning solution, there are several difficulties in using it for a more general study: (i) For multivariable PTs, it is not trivial to include simple shear transformations between all variants. In particular, each pair of twin-related variants has two possible twin parameters $\mathbf{n}$ and $\mathbf{m}$; the number of order parameters hence will be doubled. Also, a proper orientation of variants should be provided. Also, relation (2.20) is for a plane interface, and it is not clear how to treat curved interfaces. (ii) Not all martensitic variants in a material are in twin relationship (e.g., for cubic to monoclinic transformation); hence the transformation rule (2.20) cannot be applied to all martensitic transformations.

3. Total stretches

$$F_{11} = V_{e11} U_{111} U_{122} - U_{122} U_{111}, F_{22} = \sqrt{0.5 (a^2 + b^2)}, F_{12} = 0. \quad \text{and}$$
$$F_{21} = V_{e22} U_{111} (U_{111} + U_{122}) \quad \text{for KM - I, II;}$$
$$F_{11} = F_{22} = 1, \quad F_{12} = 0, \quad \text{and} \quad F_{21} = \gamma_t \quad \text{for KM - III.}$$

4. The expressions for $V_{e22} - 1$ and their maximum values:

$$V_{e22} - 1 = \frac{4(a - \beta)^2 \phi (1 - \phi)}{(a + \beta)^2 + (a - \beta)^2 (1 - 2\phi)^2}, \quad \max \left(\left|V_{e22} - 1\right|\right) = \frac{(a - \beta)^2}{(a + \beta)^2} \quad \text{for KM - I;}$$
$$V_{e22} - 1 = \frac{a^2 + b^2 - a^2 b^2 - a^2 b^2}{a^2 b^2 - a^2 b^2}, \quad \max \left(\left|V_{e22} - 1\right|\right) = \frac{(a - \beta)^2}{2a\beta} \quad \text{for KM - II.}$$

5. Cauchy stresses

$$\sigma_{11} = \sigma_{12} = 0 \quad \text{for KM - I, II, III;}$$
$$\sigma_{22} = 2\mu(\lambda' + \mu)V_{e22} (V_{e22} - 1) \quad \text{for KM - I, II;} \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma_{22} = 0 \quad \text{for KM - III.}$$

6. Order parameter, interpolation function, interface width and energy

$$\eta = \frac{1}{1 + \exp[-6(r_{01} - r_{0c})/\delta]}, \quad \phi = \eta^2 (3 - 2\eta); \quad \delta = \sqrt{18b/A}; \quad \gamma = b/\delta.$$

7. Resultant interfacial force

$$f = \tilde{f} \delta, \quad \text{for KM - I,} \quad \text{and} \quad f = 0 \quad \text{for KM - III, where}$$

$$\tilde{f} = \frac{4\mu(\lambda' + \mu)}{\lambda' + 2\mu} \left[ \sqrt{\frac{2(a^2 + b^2)}{a + \beta}} \left( 1 - 0.2912 \left( \frac{a - \beta}{a + \beta} \right)^2 + 0.1699 \left( \frac{a - \beta}{a + \beta} \right)^4 \right) \right].$$

3.3. Small strain approximation

Under small strain and rotation assumption, $|\varepsilon_{ij}| \ll 1$, $|\varepsilon_{ij}| \ll 1$, $|\varepsilon_{ij}| \ll 1$, $|\varepsilon_{ij}| \ll 1$, $|\varepsilon_{ij}| \ll 1$, and $|\theta| \ll 1$. Expanding all the equations in Box-I into Taylor’s series about strain-free state we obtain the results in Box-II. For small strains, the transformation strains for KM-I and KM-II coincide (see Eq. (3.30)). Lattice rotation is proportional to $\varepsilon_{11} - \varepsilon_{22}$ and the normal elastic strains and stresses are proportional to $(\varepsilon_{11} - \varepsilon_{22})^2$, i.e., they are square of the difference in transformation strains (see Eq. (3.31)), where $\varepsilon_{11} = \alpha - 1$ and $\varepsilon_{22} = \beta - 1$. 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\lambda$</td>
<td>74.62 GPa</td>
<td>[4]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\mu$</td>
<td>72 GPa</td>
<td>[4]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$a$</td>
<td>0.922</td>
<td>[4]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>1.215</td>
<td>[4]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\gamma$</td>
<td>0.05 J/m$^2$</td>
<td>typical (see e.g. Ref. [38])</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\delta$</td>
<td>0.75 mm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A$</td>
<td>1.2 GPa</td>
<td>using Eq. (3.27)$_3$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$b$</td>
<td>$3.75 \times 10^{-11}$ N</td>
<td>using Eq. (3.27)$_4$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Transformation strains

\[ \varepsilon_{t11} = \varepsilon_{t22} = 0.5(\varepsilon_{t1} + \varepsilon_{t2}) \quad \text{and} \quad \varepsilon_{t12} = 0.5(\varepsilon_{t2} - \varepsilon_{t1})(1 - 2\phi) \quad \text{for KM-I, II;} \]

\[ \varepsilon_{t11} = \varepsilon_{t22} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \varepsilon_{t12} = 0.5\gamma_t \quad \text{for KM-III;} \]  

(3.30)

2. Lattice rotation and elastic strains

\[ \vartheta = 0.5(\varepsilon_{t2} - \varepsilon_{t1})(1 - 2\phi) \quad \text{for KM-I, II;} \quad \vartheta = 0.5\gamma_t \quad \text{for KM-III} \]

\[ \varepsilon_{t12} = 0, \quad \varepsilon_{t11} = -\frac{\lambda'\vartheta(1 - \phi)(\varepsilon_{t1} - \varepsilon_{t2})^2}{2(\lambda' + 2\mu)}, \quad \text{and} \quad \varepsilon_{t22} = \frac{1}{2}\vartheta(1 - \phi)(\varepsilon_{t1} - \varepsilon_{t2})^2 \quad \text{for KM-I;} \]

\[ \varepsilon_{t12} = 0, \quad \varepsilon_{t11} = -\frac{\lambda'\vartheta(1 - \phi)(\varepsilon_{t1} - \varepsilon_{t2})^2}{\lambda' + 2\mu}, \quad \text{and} \quad \varepsilon_{t22} = \vartheta(1 - \phi)(\varepsilon_{t1} - \varepsilon_{t2})^2 \quad \text{for KM-II;} \]

\[ \varepsilon_{t12} = \varepsilon_{t11} = \varepsilon_{t22} = 0 \quad \text{for KM-III.} \]

(3.31)

3. Total strains

\[ \varepsilon_{s11} = \varepsilon_{s11} = 0.5(\varepsilon_{s1} + \varepsilon_{s2}), \quad \varepsilon_{s22} = 0.5(\varepsilon_{s1} + \varepsilon_{s2}), \quad \text{and} \quad \varepsilon_{s12} = 0.5(\varepsilon_{s1} + \varepsilon_{s2})(1 - 2\phi) \quad \text{for KM-I, II;} \]

\[ \varepsilon_{s11} = \varepsilon_{s22} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \varepsilon_{s12} = 0.5\gamma_t \quad \text{for KM-III.} \]

(3.32)

4. Cauchy stresses

\[ \sigma_{s11} = \sigma_{s11} = 0 \quad \text{for KM-I, II;} \quad \sigma_{s22} = \frac{2\mu(\lambda' + \mu)}{\lambda' + 2\mu}\vartheta(1 - \phi)(\varepsilon_{s1} - \varepsilon_{s2})^2 \quad \text{for KM-I;} \]

\[ \sigma_{s22} = \frac{4\mu(\lambda' + \mu)}{\lambda' + 2\mu}\vartheta(1 - \phi)(\varepsilon_{s1} - \varepsilon_{s2})^2 \quad \text{for KM-II;} \]

\[ \sigma_{s11} = \sigma_{s12} = \sigma_{s22} = 0 \quad \text{for KM-III.} \]

(3.33)

5. Resultant interfacial force

\[ f = \bar{f} \delta \quad \text{for KM-I, and} \quad f = 0 \quad \text{for KM-III. where} \quad \bar{f} = \frac{0.2088\mu(\lambda' + \mu)}{\lambda' + 2\mu}(\varepsilon_{s2} - \varepsilon_{s1})^2. \]

(3.34)

For small strains, the interface stress for KM-II is twice that which corresponds to KM-I (see Eq. (3.33)). An estimation for the interface force is given by Eq. (3.34). For KM-III, only \( \varepsilon_{t12} \) is non-trivial, which is listed in Eq. (3.30). All elastic strains are vanishing, and so are the stresses and the interface force (see Eqs. (3.31), (3.33) and (3.34)). Normal components of the total strain are zero, and the shear component is same as \( \varepsilon_{t12} \) (see Eq. (3.32)).

3.4. Discussion

It is thus clear from Eq. (3.15), which is obtained from the strain compatibility relation, that the constitutive relations for \( U_t \) given by Eqs. (2.16) and (2.19) are not compatible with unit elastic stretch \( V_{22} \) (or equivalently, vanishing elastic strains) across the twin boundary. Such incompatibility is accommodated by the large elastic stress \( \varepsilon_{t22} \) in the twin boundary. Our analytical treatment in a twinned sample has clearly shown the reason for elastic stresses in a diffused twin boundary in phase field studies in Refs. [30,38,39] and has quantified them.

We now present a detailed quantitative analysis showing the non-trivial stresses and strains. We have plotted only the non-trivial component of stress, lattice rotation, and other strains \( \varepsilon_{t1}, \varepsilon_{t12}, \) and \( \varepsilon_{t11} \) (see Eq. (2.3) for their definitions) along the line \( r_{02} = 0 \) in \( \Omega_0 \). Results for NiAl have been presented. The material parameters are listed in Table 1.

In Fig. 2(a) \( \varepsilon_{t11} \) and \( \varepsilon_{t22} \) are compared for \( U_t \) given by models KM-I and KM-II. Normal elastic strains within the interface are larger for KM-II compared to those for KM-I. Fig. 2(b) shows that \( \sigma_{t22} \) for both models reaches several GPa; that is to say, it is quite large. The maximum value of the elastic strain and stress is attained at the middle of the interface where \( \eta = 0.5 \) (compare with Eqs. (3.25), (3.23), (3.26), and (3.27) in Box-I). The ratio of \( V_{22} \) for those two models at \( \eta = 0.5 \) is \( V_{22}^{0.5}\sigma_{t22}^{0.5} = 0.5(\alpha + \beta)/\sqrt{ab} \), which is always greater than unity for all positive \( \alpha \neq \beta \). Consequently, the maximum stress (calculated at \( \eta = 0.5 \)) is also larger for KM-II. We have shown the variation of maximum stress (non-dimensionalized by \( \mu \)) with the stretch ratio \( \beta/\alpha \) for both the models in Fig. 2(c). For all \( \beta/\alpha \), \( \max(\sigma_{t22}) \geq 2 \max(\sigma_{t22}) \), and the maximum stress ratio...
approaches 2 as $\beta/\alpha \rightarrow 1$. It should be mentioned that the net elastic energy stored within the interface per unit area of the cross-section of the reference sample perpendicular to $e_1$-axis, i.e., $\int_{m}^{\infty} h_v R_0 dr_0$ has been calculated to be $1.7 \times 10^{-3}$ J/m$^2$ for KM-I and $6.8 \times 10^{-3}$ J/m$^2$ for KM-II, where $h_v$ is given by Eq. (2.7). This energy is obviously much smaller than the structural energy of the interface $\gamma = 0.05$ J/m$^2$. This means that the elastic stresses defined in the paper and corresponding resultant force are not described by the second term $\gamma_1/\beta_0$ in the Shuttleworth equation [20] but related to the heterogeneity of the transformation strain within a finite-width interface. Since these stresses are independent of the reference sample, and do not affect the force $F = 0$.

Variations of the components of $e_{ij}$, $\vartheta$, and $\tan \vartheta$ are shown in Fig. 3. In some of the plots the components have been scaled up for better readability. The component $e_{11} = e_{22}$ is constant everywhere for KM-I. However, for KM-II we see that it decreases within the interface, which can be easily explained by looking at $\det U = (U_{11} - U_{12})^2 \alpha = \text{const.}$, as shown in Eq. (2.18), where we have considered $U_{111} = U_{222}$ and $U_{33} = \alpha$. Since $U_{122}$ is heterogeneous across the interface, $U_{11}$ and $U_{22}$ also must vary appropriately to maintain the constancy of $\det U$. Variations of the components of $e_{ij}$ are shown in Fig. 3(b). Since $e_{22}$ for both models are identical constants (see Eq. (3.15)), just a single curve has been shown. The other components $e_{11}$ and $e_{21}$ vary heterogeneously across the interface. Plots for $\tan \vartheta$ are shown in Fig. 3(c); for both models they are almost coincident.

4. Analytical and FE solutions for an interface between martensitic variants in a finite sample

We will now consider a finite sample, which is more realistic configuration, to show the effect of external surfaces on stresses and strains. A stress-free austenite sample is considered as the reference body (see the shape in Fig. 4(a)). We denote the width (along $e_1$ direction) of the reference sample by $W \gg \delta$. The following boundary conditions for the mechanics problem are assumed: all external surfaces are traction-free; the bottom-left corner point is fixed, and $e_1$ component of displacement at left surface is zero. The reference sample is deformed to obtain a twinned body in a way similar to how it was obtained in the infinite sample. Here the deformed sample is rectangular (see Fig. 4(b)). An approximate analytical solution for KM-I has been derived and compared with FE results. Numerical solution have been presented for KM-II and compared with the results for KM-I.

4.1. Analytical treatment for KM-I

We utilize the St. Venant principle and restrict our analysis to the region away from the upper and lower free surfaces. We assume that in that region the solutions are independent of $r_{02}$ and are functions of $r_{01}$ only. Hence the condition (3.1) $F_{12} = 0$ is valid in that region. Repeating the same steps as for an infinite sample, we see that the expressions for elastic stretches $V_{e_{11}}$ and $V_{e_{12}}$, total stretches $F_{11}$, $F_{21}$, and $F_{22}$, lattice rotation $\vartheta$, stresses $P_{11} = F_{11} = F_{21} = \sigma_{11} = \sigma_{12} = 0$, and $\sigma_{22}$ for finite sample are identical to those obtained for the infinite sample listed in Box-I. The force equilibrium condition (see Eq. (3.6))

$$\int_{-w/2}^{w/2} P_{22} dr_{01} = 0$$

must be satisfied at each cross-section along the width of the sample. This condition will determine $V_{e_{22}}$ for a finite sample. Once $V_{e_{22}}$ is known, all other solutions can be easily computed. For the finite sample we consider that stationary $\eta$ is given by Eq. (3.27). Since $w \gg \delta$, the stresses and strains within the finite sample differ slightly from that in the infinite sample, and do not affect $\eta$.

![Fig. 2](image-url) Plots for infinite sample: (a) $e_{11}$ and $e_{22}$; (b) stress $\sigma_{12}$; (c) variation of max $(\sigma_{22})/\mu$ at the mid point of the interface where $\eta = 0.5$ for KM-I and KM-II. In the legends ‘I’ and ‘II’ indicate KM-I and KM-II, respectively.

![Fig. 3](image-url) Plot for infinite sample: (a) $2e_{11} = -2e_{22}$ and $e_{12}$; (b) $3e_{11}$, $F_{21}$, and $e_{22}$; (c) $\tan \vartheta$. 

Let us now determine \( \sigma_{22} \) and \( V_{e22} \). We have seen that for an infinite sample, \( \sigma_{22} \) within the interface is tensile (see Fig. 2(b)). Hence we expect that for a finite sample, the force equilibrium at the cross-section along the width of the sample would require that the bulk to be under compression. Since we consider \( J \) for the finite sample superposed by \( \Sigma \), we note that the integral has already been evaluated in Eq. (4.2) for the finite sample and we use it in Eq. (4.4) away from the interface (where \( V_{e22} = 1 \)) and linearize it about \( \chi = 0 \) to obtain

\[
\sigma_{22}^w = \sigma_{22}^w + \Sigma. \tag{4.2}
\]

Both \( \sigma_{22}^w \) and \( \sigma_{22}^h \) have the same expression given by Eq. (3.26)2, but, \( V_{e22} \) are different in these samples. In the infinite sample \( V_{e22} \) is given by Eq. (3.22)5 for KM-I and KM-II, respectively, and in the finite sample it is yet to be determined. Since \( \sigma_{22}^w = 0 \) outside the interface, using Eq. (4.2) we can rewrite the force equilibrium condition Eq. (4.1) as

\[
\frac{\delta}{2} \int_{-\delta/2}^{\delta/2} J\sigma_{22}^h dr_0 + \sum_{-w/2}^{w/2} Jdr_0 = 0, \tag{4.3}
\]

where we have used Eq. (3.8)4 and \( F_{22} = \text{const} \). The integral in Eq. (4.3) is not analytically tractable when \( \sigma_{22} \) given by Eq. (3.26)2. If we assume \( J = \text{const} \), we note that the integral has already been evaluated in Eq. (3.29)1 for KM-I, which can be used here to obtain

\[
\frac{\Sigma}{\text{max}(\sigma_{22})} = \frac{\delta}{w} \left( \sqrt{2(\alpha^2 + \beta^2)} / (\alpha + \beta) \right) \left\{ 1 - 0.2912(\alpha - \beta)^2 / (\alpha + \beta)^2 + 0.1699(\alpha - \beta)^4 / (\alpha + \beta)^4 \right\} - 1.
\]

In summary, \( V_{e22} \) in finite sample can be obtained using Eqs. (4.5) and (4.6); \( \sigma_{22}^w \) is calculated using Eq. (4.4), where \( \sigma_{22}^h \) is given by Eq. (3.26)2; all other stresses, rotation, and stretches are identical to those listed in Box-I, where \( V_{e22} \) therein is for the infinite sample.
4.2. Discussions on analytical and FE results

We will analyze the following results: for KM-I both analytical (derived in Section 4.1) and FE results, and for KM-II FE results only will be discussed. For FE simulations, a 12 nm wide and 24 nm long (length along any cross-section in the $e_1$ direction) sample ($\Omega_0$), as shown in Fig. 4(a), has been discretized uniformly with 2160 fourth order quadrilateral elements. The total degrees of freedom is 104835. Displacement and traction boundary conditions, as outlined in the beginning of the subsection, have been applied. FE computations have been carried out using an open source deal.II library [78], where we have written a nonlinear FE code for solving the coupled mechanics and phase field equations. Detailed computational algorithm will be presented elsewhere. The deformed body with the stationary field equations. Detailed computational algorithm will be presented elsewhere. The deformed body with the stationary field equations. Detailed computational algorithm will be presented elsewhere. The deformed body with the stationary field equations.

In the sharp interface approach, the boundary between two martensitic variants, which are in a twin relationship, is stress-free, i.e., it does not generate elastic stresses because of the lack of lattice incompatibility. However, in the phase field approach, a finite width interface generates elastic stresses [4,33,38,39], but the reason was unclear. There had been only limited attempts to find out which parameters affect elastic interfacial stresses for solid-solid interface and how they can be controlled. Here, the origin of a large elastic stress within an interface between martensitic variants (twins) within a finite strain phase field approach has been determined by obtaining an analytical finite-strain solution for an infinite sample. Example with cubic austenite and tetragonal martensite has been treated under plane stress condition. Three different constitutive relations for the transformation stretch tensor versus order parameters have been considered: (a) a linear combination (KM-I) of the Bain tensors for the martensitic variants [30,67]; (b) an exponential-logarithmic combination (KM-II) of the Bain tensors [38,39], which preserves volume for any intermediate state along the transformation path between martensitic variants; and (c) simple shear (KM-III) in one variant with respect to another [40,64,71]. Stresses are absent for KM-III, but it is unclear how to generalize this model for a multivariant martensitic transformation. The first two models generate elastic stresses within the interface, which are along the interface, because of the variable component of the transformation deformation gradient along the interface normal. Stress distribution depends on the interpolation function for the transformation deformation gradient $\phi(\eta)$ and $r_{01}/\delta$, and resultant force per unit interface length $f$ (surface tension) is proportional to the interface width $\delta$. Thus, for the sharp interface approach, $f$ is independent of $\delta$.

5. Concluding remarks

In the sharp interface approach, the boundary between two martensitic variants, which are in a twin relationship, is stress-free, i.e., it does not generate elastic stresses because of the lack of lattice incompatibility. However, in the phase field approach, a finite width interface generates elastic stresses [4,33,38,39], but the reason was unclear. There had been only limited attempts to find out which parameters affect elastic interfacial stresses for solid-solid interface and how they can be controlled. Here, the origin of a large elastic stress within an interface between martensitic variants (twins) within a finite strain phase field approach has been determined by obtaining an analytical finite-strain solution for an infinite sample. Example with cubic austenite and tetragonal martensite has been treated under plane stress condition. Three different constitutive relations for the transformation stretch tensor versus order parameters have been considered: (a) a linear combination (KM-I) of the Bain tensors for the martensitic variants [30,67]; (b) an exponential-logarithmic combination (KM-II) of the Bain tensors [38,39], which preserves volume for any intermediate state along the transformation path between martensitic variants; and (c) simple shear (KM-III) in one variant with respect to another [40,64,71]. Stresses are absent for KM-III, but it is unclear how to generalize this model for a multivariant martensitic transformation. The first two models generate elastic stresses within the interface, which are along the interface, because of the variable component of the transformation deformation gradient along the interface normal. Stress distribution depends on the interpolation function for the transformation deformation gradient $\phi(\eta)$ and $r_{01}/\delta$, and resultant force per unit interface length $f$ (surface tension) is proportional to the interface width $\delta$. Thus, for the sharp interface approach, $f$ is independent of $\delta$. In legend, ‘A’ and ‘F’ stand for analytical and FE results, respectively.

![Fig. 5. Plots for finite sample along $r_{02} = 0$ for KM-I and II: (a) $\varepsilon_{111}$ and $\varepsilon_{222}$; (b) $\sigma_{22}$. In legend, ‘A’ and ‘F’ stand for analytical and FE results, respectively.](image-url)

![Fig. 6. Plots for finite sample along $r_{02} = 0$ for KM-I and II: (a) $\varepsilon_{111}$, and $\varepsilon_{112}$; (b) $F_{21}$, and $\varepsilon_{222}$; (c) $\tan \vartheta$. In legend, ‘A’ and ‘F’ mean analytical and FE results, respectively.](image-url)
interface surface tension is zero. However, for an alternating twin structure with a traditional several nanometers spacing between interfaces [70], comparable with the finite interface width, the effect of surface tension can be significant. The magnitude of the interfacial stresses for NiAl alloy is several GPa, which is significantly large. The maximum interfacial stress for KM-II is more than twice that which corresponds to KM-I. Note that for small transformation strains, expressions for the transformation deformation gradient for KM-I and KM-II coincide, and the lattice rotation and stress are proportional to \((e_{11}^f - e_{22}^f)^2\), meaning they are higher order terms. Even for small strains, the interface stress for KM-II is double that which corresponds to KM-I.

An approximate analytical solution for a finite sample has also been found. It contains small compressive stresses in bulk to equilibrate tensile interface tension. The analytical solution is in good correspondence with numerical results obtained using the FE method.

The main question is whether elastic interfacial stresses are real or just an artifact of the model. The magnitude of the interfacial stresses within a twin interface should be determined with the help of atomistic simulations, similar to [16,17] for other interfaces. Then the difference between the atomistic results and the structural stresses \(\sigma_{\text{str}}\) will represent elastic stresses. Intuitively, stresses obtained here are too high for both KM-I and KM-II. From this point of view, KM-I is better that KM-II, and also simpler. The requirement of volume preservation during twinning is plausible but not mandatory. There are data indicating that that dislocational slip is also not isochoric process between two stable atomic configurations [68]. Also, other defects such as stacking fault and twin boundaries may induce volume change (Chapter 7 and 8 of [69] and references therein).

On the other hand, based on the parameter values for NiAl, the interfacial force \(f\) is estimated to be 0.6 N/m for KM-I, and 1.2 N/m for KM-II. To the best of our knowledge, there is no experimental data or atomistic simulations for the interfacial stresses for twin interface. However, there are estimation for \(f\) for the external surfaces of nanowires [1], which was in the range of 1–3.5 N/m. The variant-variant interfacial stresses are expected to be smaller than the stresses within external surfaces. Hence our interfacial stress values are reasonable and should be close to reality.

The obtained results also demonstrate that the requirements of the phase field theories should be formulated not only for conditions when one phase homogeneously transforms into another one, but also for the case with coexistence of both phases divided by an interface. That is why the obtained results are important for developing phase field approaches for multivariant martensitic PTs coupled to mechanics, especially at the nanoscale.
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