GRAIN-BOUNDARY SCATTERING OF SURFACE ACOUSTIC WAVES: EXPERIMENT, THEORY, AND SIMULATION

Tomáš Grabec, Martin Ryzy, Petr Sedlák, István A. Veres

Institute of Thermomechanics, Czech Acad Sci, Prague, Czechia RECENDT GmbH, Linz, Austria

(grabec@it.cas.cz)



Paris, 2022

5th LUS4Metals Workshop

Outline



2

Grain-Boundary Scattering of Longitudinal Bulk Waves

□ Grain-Boundary Scattering of Surface Acoustic Waves

FEM simulation of L-wave scattering



[M. Ryzy et al., J. Acoust. Soc. Am. 143, 219 (2018)]

 Virtual polycrystal: Voronoi tessellation
 Time-domain FEM simulation of L-wave propagation



Tessellation Software: Neper FEM Software: PzFlex

FEM simulation of L-wave scattering

Virtual polycrystal: Voronoi tessellation
 Time-domain FEM simulation
 of L-wave propagation



Tessellation Software: Neper FEM Software: PzElex



Time-domain FEM simulation of longitudinal-wave propagation



Coherent wave and attenuation





Coherent wave and attenuation







Scattering Regimes & Asymptotes



8

e.g.: Weaver's model
[Weaver, J. Mech. Phys. Solids 38 (1990)]



Simulation vs Experiment



[M. Ryzy et al., J. Acoust. Soc. Am. 143, 219 (2018)]

- Weak agreement with the model
 - Microstructure description?

Mean grain size d

9

and assumed two-point correlation function (TPCF)

$$W(r) = e^{-r/d}$$



Simulation vs Experiment

10

- Weak agreement with the model
 - Microstructure description?

Mean grain size d and assumed two-point correlation function (TPCF)

 $W(r) = e^{-r/d}$

Not in agreement with the TPCF of the tessellation!



ŔÖ

[M. Ryzy et al., J. Acoust. Soc. Am. 143, 219 (2018)]

<u>Two-point correlation function:</u> the probability that two points separated by r are within the same grain



Simulation vs Experiment



[M. Ryzy et al., J. Acoust. Soc. Am. 143, 219 (2018)]

- Weak agreement with the model
 - Microstructure description?

Mean grain size d and assumed two-point correlation function (TPCF)

 $W(r) = e^{-r/d}$

 Not in agreement with the TPCF of the tessellation!
 Modified Weaver's model with TPCF of the tessellation

TPCF as the crucial statistical parameter to describe the microstructure with respect to the scattering-induced attenuation!







12

Grain-Boundary Scattering of Longitudinal Bulk waves

Grain-Boundary Scattering of Surface Acoustic Waves



L. Braile, Purdue University http://web.ics.purdue.edu/~braile/edumod/waves/WaveDemo.htm

Why SAW?

13

Bulk-wave attenuation measurement at end points only





Why SAW?

- Bulk-wave attenuation measurement at end points only
- SAW attenuation can be scanned!Similar information as from simulation
 - Information from a near-surface layer
 OK if homogeneous microstructure
 ... Allows to study surface properties if not
 Penetration depth depends on wavelength





Frequency-domain laser-ultrasonic setup

[M. Ryzy et al., AIP Advances 8 (2018)]



Excitation

- □ Electro-absorption modulated Laser diode (EML), $\lambda = 1.55 \mu m$ → P=0.2W
- Erbium doped fiber amplifier (EDFA) → P < 1.2W
- □ Point-source

Detection

- Michelson interferometer
- Vector network analyzer (phase sensitive detection)
- □ Point-probe (λ = 532nm)



[M. Ryzy et al., AIP Advances 8 (2018)]



Get attenuation?

Spatial scan
Scan detection-point





Get attenuation?

Spatial scan
Scan detection-point

Get averaged attenuation?

- Spatial averaging
- Scan radial lines

Frequency-domain experiment





Frequency range: $10 \dots 130$ MHz ($\Delta f = 2$ MHz) Spatial resolution: 15μ m



 $\approx 80 \times 80 \times 12 \text{ mm}^3$



mean grain size $d \approx 94.5 \mu m$

Frequency-domain attenuation



[M. Ryzy et al., AIP Advances 8 (2018)]



Experimental results



[M. Ryzy et al., AIP Advances 8 (2018)]



Results (linear)

Two scattering-regimes?

Stochastic

Geometric

... but the higher frequencies already strongly attenuated

Experimental results



[M. Ryzy et al., AIP Advances 8 (2018)]



Results (logarithmic)

Two scattering-regimes?

Stochastic
Geometric
but the higher
frequencies already
strongly attenuated

 $c = (2892.8 \pm 4.0) \mathrm{ms}^{-1}$

Simple theoretical model for SAW



[M. Ryzy et al., AIP Advances 8 (2018)]

- Assume that attenuation combined in a way similar to velocity
 - Simple model:

- Modified Weaver's model
 - \rightarrow bulk-wave attenuation
- Rayleigh equation for surface wave in complex wavenumbers

Simple theoretical model for SAW

TPCF of the sample

necessary!



- Assume that attenuation combined in a way similar to velocity
 - Simple model:
 - Modified Weaver's model
 - \rightarrow bulk-wave attenuation
 - Rayleigh equation for surface wave in complex wavenumbers





Experiment vs simple model



- Assume that attenuation combined in a way similar to velocity
 - Simple model:
 - Modified Weaver's model
 - \rightarrow bulk-wave attenuation
 - Rayleigh equation for surface wave in complex wavenumbers
- Slightly different power-law dependence in stochastic regime (1.65 vs. 2.0)
 - Oversimplified analytical model or large experimental error?



25



[T. Grabec et al., Ultrasonics 119 (2022)]

□ FEM simulation directly comparable to the experiment? (in a statistical way)
 ■ Model of the sample → Statistical digital twin (Laguerre tessellation)





[T. Grabec et al., Ultrasonics 119 (2022)]

- □ FEM simulation directly comparable to the experiment? (in a statistical way)
 □ Model of the sample → Statistical digital twin (Laguerre tessellation)
 □ Broadband excitation:
 - Temporal and spatial gaussian profile









[T. Grabec et al., Ultrasonics 119 (2022)]

□ FEM simulation directly comparable to the experiment? (in a statistical way)
 □ Model of the sample → Statistical digital twin (Laguerre tessellation)
 □ Broadband excitation → gaussian 3 (t=0.92ns) (x10⁻¹⁷)



elem. size 1.25 µm, time step 0.9 ns



[T. Grabec et al., Ultrasonics 119 (2022)]

- □ FEM simulation directly comparable to the experiment? (in a statistical way)
 - \square Model of the sample \rightarrow Statistical digital twin
 - \blacksquare Broadband excitation \rightarrow gaussian

28

Large number of repetitive runs to obtain

the averaged response





Simulation vs Experiment vs Model



[T. Grabec et al., Ultrasonics 119 (2022)]

- Simulation in great agreement with the experiment!
 - \rightarrow better than with the model

- Both experiment and FEM suggest different slope (power-law exponent) than 10⁴ for bulk waves
 - → more complex analytical description necessary!
- Apparent geometric region in experiment not shown by FEM
 → probably a result of large error in experiment at higher frequencies



Conclusion

30

□ Analysis of L-wave attenuation:

- Importance of two-point correlation function (TPCF) for microstructure description:
 - Excellent fit of TPCF-corrected analytical model with FEM simulation





□ SAW attenuation:

- Simple model proposed
 - combining Weaver's model with Rayleigh equation in complex wavenumbers
- Frequency-dependent attenuation measured experimentally
 - using laser-ultrasonic setup
- FEM simulations on sample-mimicking tessellation
- Excellent agreement between simulation and experiment







Conclusion





using laser-ultrasonic setup

- FEM simulations on sample-mimicking tessellation
- Excellent agreement between simulation and experiment



