***Ab initio* Based Modeling of Radiation Effects in Multi-Component
Alloys**

Assistant Professor Dane Morgan
University of Wisconsin – Madison

Final Scientific/Technical Report
Project number 06-006, Active from March 13, 2006 to March 12, 2010
Report completed June 6, 2010

Prepared for the Department of Energy under award number DE-FC07-
06ID14747

NERI Final Report
Ab initio Based Modeling of Radiation Effects in Multi-Component Alloys
Project No. 06-006, Final Scientific/Technical Report

Project Title: *Ab initio* Based Modeling of Radiation Effects in Multi-Component Alloys

Covering Period: January 1, 2010 through March 31, 2010

Date of Report: June 10, 2010

Recipient: University of Wisconsin
1509 Engineering Dr
Madison, WI 53705

Award Number: DE-FC07-06ID14747

Project Number: 06-006

Principal Investigator: Dane Morgan, 608-265-5879, ddmorgan@wisc.edu

Project Start date: March 13, 2006

Project Objectives

The objective of this project is to develop a highly accurate thermokinetic model for austenitic stainless steels based on fundamental quantum mechanical calculations. The model will incorporate the true temperature- and composition-dependence of the diffusion constants and provide missing information on interstitial motion. The model will be used to predict, and be benchmarked against, Radiation Induced Segregation (RIS) data.

In order to establish the critical data and computer programs to build the model this project will pursue the following specific objectives:

- Perform initial *ab initio* calculations of atomic-scale properties in pure elements and limited alloys
- Develop Ni-Fe-Cr RIS simulation and validation/refinement
- Perform more complete *ab initio* calculations of atomic-scale properties in Ni-Fe-Cr alloy
- Develop Monte Carlo codes; Ni-Fe-Cr RIS simulation based on *ab-initio* values and Monte Carlo; further validation and refinement
- Calculate diffusion constants and Ni-Fe-Cr RIS simulation
- Perform final validation/refinement by comparison to experiments

Table of Contents

1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	6
2 BACKGROUND	6
3 DILUTE ALLOY RESULTS FOR NI-CR AND NI-FE	7
3.1 INTRODUCTION.....	7
3.2 METHODOLOGY	9
3.2.1 Overview of Approach.....	9
3.2.2 <i>Ab initio</i> Methods	9
3.3 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION.....	10
3.3.1 Vacancy Mediated Diffusion.....	10
3.3.2 Interstitial Mediated Diffusion.....	14
3.3.3 Implications for Radiation-Induced Segregation	16
3.4 SUMMARY	18
3.5 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	20
3.6 APPENDICES.....	20
3.6.1 APPENDIX A: Atomic Hopping rates for diffusion	20
3.6.2 APPENDIX B: Calculating Phenomenological coefficients from atomic Rates	24
3.6.2.1 Vacancy Phenomenological Coefficients.....	24
3.6.2.2 Interstitial Phenomenological Coefficients	26
3.6.2.3 Intrinsic Diffusion Coefficients.....	27
3.6.3 APPENDIX C: Tracer Diffusion Coefficients.....	29
3.6.3.1 Vacancy Mediated Diffusion	29
3.6.3.2 Interstitial Mediated Diffusion	32
3.6.4 APPENDIX D: Thermokinetic data obtained by first principles	35
3.6.4.1 Lattice parameter.....	35
3.6.4.2 Electronic Contributions	36
3.6.4.3 Vibrational Contributions.....	36
3.6.4.4 Defect concentration parameters.....	37
3.6.4.5 Migration Barrier Contributions.....	38
3.6.4.6 Binding Enthalpy	40
3.7 FIGURES AND TABLES	41
4 CONCENTRATED ALLOY RESULTS FOR NI-CR.....	70
4.1 THE ON-LATTICE CLUSTER EXPANSION AND PHASE DIAGRAM	70
4.2 THE VACANCY CLUSTER EXPANSION.....	71
4.3 THE ACTIVATED STATE CLUSTER EXPANSION.....	72
4.4 KINETIC MONTE CARLO PREDICTION OF DIFFUSION	73
4.5 SUMMARY	73
4.6 ACKNOWLEDGEMENT.....	74
4.7 APPENDICES – NONE	74
4.8 FIGURES AND TABLES	74
5 CONTINUUM LEVEL RIS MODELING	84
5.1 RATE THEORY MODELING OF RIS	84
5.1.1 Description of the Model.....	84
5.1.2 Thermodynamic Parameterization of Model Equations	86
5.1.3 Kinetic Parameterization of Model Equations.....	88

NERI Final Report
Ab initio Based Modeling of Radiation Effects in Multi-Component Alloys
Project No. 06-006, Final Scientific/Technical Report

5.2	RIS MODEL PREDICTIONS.....	89
5.2.1	<i>Dilute Alloy</i>	89
5.2.2	<i>Concentrated Alloy</i>	89
5.3	ACKNOWLEDGEMENT.....	90
5.4	APPENDICES – NONE	90
5.5	FIGURES AND TABLES	90
6	SUMMARY	93
7	BIBLIOGRAPHY	93
8	PUBLICATIONS FROM PROJECT	98
8.1	JOURNAL PAPERS.....	98
8.2	CONFERENCE PAPERS AND PUBLISHED EXTENDED ABSTRACTS	99
8.3	INVITED PRESENTATIONS.....	99
8.4	CONTRIBUTED PRESENTATIONS.....	100
9	PATENTS	100
10	MILESTONE STATUS	100
11	BUDGET DATA (AS OF JUNE 1 2010).....	103
12	COST PERFORMANCE	103

NERI Final Report
Ab initio Based Modeling of Radiation Effects in Multi-Component Alloys
 Project No. 06-006, Final Scientific/Technical Report

FIG. 1. NI SELF-DIFFUSION COEFFICIENTS [24,27].	41
FIG. 2. CR IN NI TRACER DIFFUSION COEFFICIENTS [24,25,30].	42
FIG. 3. FE IN NI TRACER DIFFUSION COEFFICIENTS [24,25,27].	43
FIG. 4. <i>AB INITIO</i> AND AVERAGED EXPERIMENTAL NI, CR AND FE TRACER DIFFUSION COEFFICIENTS IN NI [27,30].	44
FIG. 5. TEMPERATURE DEPENDENCE OF THE <i>AB INITIO</i> $D_0(T)$ FOR VACANCY TRACER DIFFUSION.	45
FIG. 6. RATIOS OF TRACER DIFFUSION COEFFICIENTS A) CR/NI B) FE/NI C) CR/FE WITH EXPERIMENTAL DATA FROM MILLION [27] AND RUZICKOVA [30].	46
FIG. 7. RATIO OF ARRHENIUS FIT AND <i>AB INITIO</i> DIFFUSION COEFFICIENTS FOR NI, CR AND FE DIFFUSION COEFFICIENTS FOR VACANCY DIFFUSION.	47
FIG.8. VACANCY WIND FOR NI-CR AND NI-FE.	48
FIG. 9. <i>AB INITIO</i> NI, CR AND FE INTERSTITIAL AND VACANCY TRACER DIFFUSION IN NI.	49
FIG. 10. THERMAL CONCENTRATIONS OF VACANCIES AND INTERSTITIALS.	50
FIG. 11. RATIOS OF INTERSTITIAL TRACER DIFFUSION COEFFICIENTS CR/NI, CR/FE AND FE/NI.	51
FIG. 12. TEMPERATURE DEPENDENCE OF THE <i>AB INITIO</i> D_0 FOR INTERSTITIAL TRACER DIFFUSION.	52
FIG. 13. TEMPERATURE DEPENDENT TERMS IN D_0 FOR INTERSTITIAL TRACER DIFFUSION.	53
FIG. 14. RATIO OF ARRHENIUS FIT AND <i>AB INITIO</i> DIFFUSION COEFFICIENTS FOR NI, CR AND FE DIFFUSION COEFFICIENTS FOR INTERSTITIAL DIFFUSION.	54
FIGURE 15: SCHEMATIC FOR APPROACH TO MODELING DIFFUSION COEFFICIENTS IN A CONCENTRATED ALLOY.	75
FIGURE 16: NI-CR CONVEX HULL FROM AB INITIO.	76
FIGURE 17: NI-CR PHASE DIAGRAM BASED ON MONTE CARLO SIMULATION OF A CLUSTER EXPANSION HAMILTONIAN FIT TO AB INITIO ENERGIES.	77
FIGURE 18: CLUSTER EXPANSION VS. AB INITIO NI-CR VACANCY FORMATION ENERGIES. VALUES ARE REFERENCED TO THE NI VACANCY FORMATION ENERGY.	78
FIGURE 19: GEOMETRY OF FIRST TWO NEIGHBOR SHELLS OF A VACANCY MEDIATED MIGRATING ATOM IN THE FCC STRUCTURE.	79
FIGURE 20: CLUSTER EXPANSION VS. AB INITIO CR ΔE_{KRA} VALUES.	80
FIGURE 21: RATIO OF CR TO NI TRACER DIFFUSION COEFFICIENTS DETERMINED BY AB INITIO BASED THERMOKINETIC MODELING (T = 1473 K). BASED ON PRELIMINARY DATA.	81
FIGURE 22: CR RIS PROFILES IN A NI-1CR (AT.%) ALLOY. 0.5 DPA, 5 NM PROBE DIAMETER. ZERO REPRESENTS THE POSITION OF THE GRAIN BOUNDARY.	90
FIGURE 23: CR RIS PROFILES IN A NI-18CR (AT.%) ALLOY. 0.5 DPA, 5 NM PROBE DIAMETER. ZERO REPRESENTS THE POSITION OF THE GRAIN BOUNDARY.	92

1 Executive Summary

The project began March 13, 2006, allocated for three years, and received a one year extension from March 13, 2009 to March 12, 2010. It has now completed 48 of 48 total months. The project was focused on using *ab initio* methods to gain insights into radiation induced segregation (RIS) in Ni-Fe-Cr alloys. The project had the following key accomplishments

- Development of a large database of *ab initio* energetics that can be used by many researchers in the future for increased understanding of this system. For example, we have the first calculations showing a dramatic stabilization effect of Cr-Cr interstitial dumbbells in Ni.
- Prediction of both vacancy and interstitial diffusion constants for Ni-Cr and Ni-Fe for dilute Cr and Fe. This work included generalization of widely used multifrequency models to make use of *ab initio* derived energetics and thermodynamics.
- Prediction of qualitative trends of RIS from vacancy and interstitial mechanisms, suggesting the two types of defect fluxes drive Cr RIS in opposite directions.
- Detailed kinetic Monte Carlo modeling of diffusion by vacancy mechanism in Ni-Cr as a function of Cr concentration. The results demonstrate that Cr content can have a significant effect on RIS.
- Development of a quantitative RIS transport model, including models for thermodynamic factors and boundary conditions.

Section 2 contains a brief background summary. The results of this report are then divided into 3 major sections. Section 3 is *ab initio* based modeling of dilute Cr and Fe in Ni-Cr and Ni-Fe to calculate tracer diffusion coefficients. Section 4 is kinetic Monte Carlo simulation of tracer diffusion in Ni-Cr for the concentrated alloy. Finally, Section 5 is the formalism development and results from continuum RIS equations. Section 6 give a concluding summary.

Notes on formatting: Figures and Tables are numbered sequentially throughout the document except for those associated with the appendices in Section 3, whose figures and tables are labeled by the appendix letter. Figures and Tables for a given top-level section are placed in a subsection at the end of the corresponding top-level section. Equation numbers are specific to each top-level section and no top-level sections refer to equations in any other top-level section. There is a single set of references for all top-level sections, which are listed in Section 7. Each top-level section has its own acknowledgements subsection related to funding, support, and collaborations for that top-level section.

2 Background

Radiation induced segregation (RIS) refers to the change of composition that occurs at defect sinks in multicomponent alloys under irradiation. In fcc Ni-Fe-Cr steels it is well documented that Cr depletes from grain boundaries due to RIS. This effect is of

significant concern due to possible increased corrosion and materials degradation associated with Cr composition changes. RIS of other elements can also be of concern as impurity segregation can cause unwanted changes in grain boundary and bulk properties. For example, local enrichment can cause precipitation of new phases near grain boundaries.

RIS modeling has been attempted on a number of occasions with varying levels of success. Simple empirical models have had limited predictive ability for Cr RIS in fcc steels and there is interest in developing more models from atomically resolved energetics. This work represents one of the first efforts to use *ab initio* energetics to inform RIS models. We have constructed RIS models from *ab initio* input parameters for both dilute Fe and Cr in Ni and for concentrated alloy diffusion in Ni-Cr through the vacancy mechanism. Please see original proposal for a more extensive background on RIS.

3 Dilute Alloy Results for Ni-Cr and Ni-Fe

In this section *ab initio* modeling is used to predict diffusion relevant thermodynamic and kinetic information for dilute Ni-Cr and Ni-Fe alloys. The modeling results are then used to determine the phenomenological coefficient matrices and the tracer diffusion coefficients for both vacancy and interstitial mediated diffusion. In addition to predicting diffusion coefficients, this *ab initio*-based approach provides information typically inaccessible to experiments, including the different contributions to diffusion (e.g., electronic excitation effects), the species dependence of interstitial diffusion, and the deviations from Arrhenius-type relations, which are often used to describe and extrapolate experimental diffusion data. It is found that: 1) Cr is the fastest diffusing species in Ni by both vacancy and interstitial diffusion, followed by Fe and then Ni. The enhanced diffusivity of Cr is primarily due to differences in migration barriers and binding energies, not pre-exponential factors. 2) Fe and Cr solutes in Ni have weak interactions with vacancies but Cr solutes bind strongly to interstitial defects. 3) Cr exhibits non-Arrhenius behavior in both vacancy and interstitial mediated diffusion. 4) Temperature dependent electronic contributions have a significant impact on the diffusion in some cases. 5) The vacancy diffusion mechanism in Ni-Cr changes as a function of temperature resulting in vacancy-solute drag below 460 K.

3.1 Introduction

Ab initio techniques provide a powerful method for obtaining detailed point defect energetics and are increasingly used to study the diffusion of elements in pure metals and multi-component alloys [1,2]. In this work *ab initio* techniques are used to calculate tracer diffusion coefficients, for both vacancy and interstitial mediated diffusion, in the dilute Ni-Cr and Ni-Fe alloys. The Ni-Cr-Fe system is an important model alloy for Ni-based alloys and austenitic steels and, despite many years of study, there is still significant uncertainty about the diffusion coefficients in these systems. Point defect diffusion is particularly important in Ni-Cr-Fe steels as these materials are commonly used in the nuclear industry, where irradiation creates both vacancy and interstitial defects in the matrix. The diffusion of these defects then leads to many microstructural and microchemical changes [3,4], from

void growth [5] to radiation-induced segregation [6], the effects of which must be understood for reliable application of these materials in next generation reactors.

The purpose of this paper is two-fold. The first purpose is to provide tracer diffusion coefficients and point defect thermokinetic data in the technologically important Ni-Cr-Fe system. *Ab initio* based modeling allows for the determination of diffusion properties that are challenging to investigate experimentally. For vacancy diffusion there is extensive experimental data, but generally only at high temperatures. Extrapolation to lower temperature is typically done by fitting to an Arrhenius expression of the form $D=D_0 e^{-Q/kT}$, where the pre-exponential factor, D_0 , and activation energy, Q , are assumed to be constants. *Ab initio* modeling can be used to determine accurate temperature dependent values of D_0 and Q , reducing uncertainty in the experimental determination and allowing much more reliable extrapolation to lower temperatures. *Ab initio* modeling can predict coupling between the transport of solute and defect species (e.g., vacancy-solute drag) that is difficult to assess experimentally. Finally, experimental self-interstitial diffusion properties in Ni-Cr-Fe alloys are rare and *ab initio* techniques are increasingly being utilized to provide these data [7,8].

The second purpose of this paper is to provide a framework for propagating point defect energetics through a rate expression and into statistical mechanics models to determine the kinetic phenomenological coefficient matrix (e.g., propagating vibrational excitations through Lidiard and LeClaire's five-frequency model [9,10]). The phenomenological coefficient matrix can be used to calculate diffusion coefficients and fluxes, which are needed to study various transport related phenomena. The methods used in this framework have all been derived separately in different contexts, and are integrated here for clarity and application to irradiated materials. The individual steps in this framework are often approximated in order to compensate for insufficient experimental data. *Ab initio* techniques provide detailed information that was unavailable experimentally, and statistical mechanics based models can now be parameterized with complete sets of energetic data, removing the approximation needed in the past.

Section 3.2 discusses the overall methodology in which the tracer diffusion coefficients were obtained, with the details provided in Appendices A-D. The *ab initio* techniques used in this work and the settings associated with them are also discussed in Section 3.2. Section 3.3.1 presents the results for vacancy-mediated diffusion. The diffusion coefficients are compared to experimental results and the differences are discussed. The temperature dependence of pre-exponential factor terms in the diffusion coefficients are illustrated and explained. This section also presents the results of the vacancy wind calculation, which describes the temperature dependence of the migration mechanism. Finally, an assessment of the error associated with the Arrhenius fit to diffusion data is presented. Section 3.3.2 presents the calculated interstitial-mediated diffusion coefficients and provides comparison with the vacancy-mediated results. This section also assesses the temperature dependence of pre-exponential factor terms and the error of the Arrhenius fit for interstitial diffusion data. Section 3.3.3 presents a brief discussion of implications of the *ab initio* predictions for radiation-induced segregation. Finally, Section 3.3.3 gives a summary of the key results. Numerous technical details have been excluded from the main text for clarity, but are provided in the appendices.

3.2 Methodology

3.2.1 Overview of Approach

In this work, tracer diffusion coefficients for vacancy and interstitial mediated diffusion are calculated in the Ni-Cr and Ni-Fe binaries through a multi-step process. The process to obtain these diffusion coefficients uses *ab initio* methods to calculate migration rates and thermodynamic parameters. These rates are then used to calculate phenomenological coefficients, which are kinetic quantities that describe the mobility of the elemental species and point defects. The phenomenological coefficients are, in turn, used to calculate tracer diffusion coefficients and the vacancy wind, which identifies the coupling between vacancy and solute fluxes.

The coupling between migration rates, phenomenological coefficients and diffusion coefficients, the *ab initio* generated thermokinetic data, and the approximations used throughout the process of obtaining the diffusion coefficients, have been provided in the appendix for the interested reader. For derivations of the relationships used the reader is referred to the original references. Appendix A provides a rate expression, based on the Eyring-Polanyi equation [11,12] and transition state theory, which includes vibrational and electronic excitation contributions. Appendix B outlines the process of using the rates of various hopping events to obtain the phenomenological coefficients. The phenomenological coefficients describe the mobility of each species in a dilute binary alloy and are used to calculate intrinsic diffusion coefficients. The steps to obtain the tracer diffusion coefficient from the intrinsic diffusion coefficient and the method to incorporate the vibrational and electronic excitation contributions of defect-solute binding in the tracer diffusion coefficients are given in Appendix C. The thermokinetic data generated by *ab initio* calculations needed to calculate the phenomenological coefficient matrix and the tracer diffusion coefficients are given in Appendix D.

3.2.2 *Ab initio* Methods

Ab initio calculations are used in this work to determine migration barriers, binding enthalpies, electronic density of states, lattice constants, vibrational frequencies and defect formation enthalpies for the Ni-Cr and Ni-Fe systems. While some *ab initio* defect properties in Ni systems have been calculated in the past [1,15,16], additional defect properties are needed for this work and the properties available in the literature have been recalculated for consistency.

All *ab initio* calculations were performed with the Vienna *Ab initio* Simulation Package (VASP) [17,18], a quantum mechanical code based on density functional theory. All VASP calculations were performed with the generalized gradient approximation (GGA) for the exchange-correlation energy, the Perdew-Burke-Ernzerhof exchange-correlation functional [19] and the projector-augmented wave method [20,21] unless stated otherwise. The calculations were performed with a 96($\pm$ 1) or 108($\pm$ 1) atom periodic simulation cell. The volume and shape of each simulation cell was fixed but ionic relaxations were allowed within the cell. Migration barriers and vibrational frequencies were calculated with a 270 eV energy cutoff and a 3x3x3 k-point mesh. Binding energies and electronic density of

states calculations were computed with a 479 eV cutoff and a 4x4x4 k-point mesh. The cumulative errors associated with k-point mesh, energy cutoff and cell size convergence are estimated to be less than 35 meV for migration barriers, defect formation energies and binding energies when added in quadrature [22]. All calculations were spin polarized and allow for magnetic ordering. Interstitial migration barriers are determined by the nudged elastic band method [23]. Vacancy migration barriers are determined from constrained calculations with the hopping atom restricted to a plane perpendicular to the migration pathway but all other ionic relaxations are allowed. This method gives comparable results to the nudged elastic band method for all cases tested.

3.3 Results and Discussion

The methods outlined in Section 3.2 and the data presented in Appendix D have been used to calculate both vacancy and interstitial mediated tracer diffusion coefficients for Ni self-diffusion and dilute Cr and Fe impurity diffusion in Ni.

3.3.1 Vacancy Mediated Diffusion

The parameters needed for vacancy mediated tracer diffusion are summarized in Table I. All values are determined using *ab initio* methods, as discussed in more detail in the appendices. The Ni self-diffusion and Cr and Fe tracer diffusion coefficients in Ni have been calculated from Eqs. C.10 and C.14, using the parameters from Table I. Each *ab initio*-based diffusion constant is compared to multiple sets of Arrhenius fits to experimental diffusion data in Figs. 1-3. The experimental data contains both single crystal and polycrystalline diffusion data and the reported purities of the Ni in Askill [24] and Smithells [25] are 99.9% and above for both self and impurity tracer diffusion.

Figs. 1-3 show that the *ab initio* diffusion data predict values lower than the main cluster of experimental diffusion coefficients by approximately an order of magnitude. However, the temperature dependence of the diffusion coefficients and the relative ordering between the different species is represented well. The differences between the *ab initio* calculated and experimental diffusion coefficients may be partly attributed to the approximate treatment of vibrations in this work (in particular, the local vibrational model used and the neglecting of anharmonic vibrational contributions such as thermal expansion) and to contributions associated with magnetic excitations, which have not been included in the model (*e.g.*, the ferromagnetic to paramagnetic transition in Ni). Approximations made to simplify many-electron interactions in *ab initio* methods also introduce error that is not easy to quantify.

It is likely that the disagreement between the experimental and calculated diffusion data comes from multiple sources. However, based on the data in Figs. 1-3 it appears that the largest difference between the *ab initio* and the experimental diffusion coefficients comes from the pre-exponential factor, since the calculated slopes for the three cases are in good agreement with most of the experimental data. In order to understand which variables could account for an order of magnitude disagreement, each variable in the Ni self-diffusion coefficient (see Eqs. C.14-C.16) has been varied independently until agreement with the experimental diffusion coefficient is reached. Table II presents a variable in the diffusion coefficient expression, its original *ab initio* value and the value required to

account for the error in the Ni self-diffusion coefficient at 1650 K. For the purposes of this table the experimental Ni self-diffusion coefficient is set to an average over 19 experiments [27] (shown in Fig. 1) and has a value of $1.81 \times 10^{-9} \text{ cm}^2/\text{s}$ at 1650 K (the unaltered *ab initio* value is $9.80 \times 10^{-11} \text{ cm}^2/\text{s}$ at 1650 K).

Here we consider the changes in each variable needed to match the experimental Ni diffusion. The *ab initio* vacancy formation and migration enthalpies, H_{vf} and H_{mig} , are in good agreement with the experimental values of 1.79 eV and 1.04 eV [28], respectively. Furthermore, the altered values of the vacancy formation and migration enthalpies are significantly less than both experimental and *ab initio* values. In addition, the work of De Koning *et al.* [29] in Ni shows that the vacancy formation enthalpy is expected to increase with temperature, not decrease. Together these results suggest that the vacancy formation and migration enthalpies are not a primary source of error in the diffusion coefficient calculations. The altered attempt frequency is above the typical phonon frequency range of 10^{12} - 10^{13} and therefore seems unlikely to be a primary source of disagreement between the diffusion coefficients. The change needed in the Ni DOS for the electronic migration contribution, EC_{mig} , seems unphysical as it is much larger than seen in any of the calculations. The altered value of the vacancy formation entropy, S_{vf} , is comparable with other values reported for Ni in ref. [29], which are 3.3 k_B between 1200-1650 K from differential-dilatometry measurements and 5 k_B at the melting point, calculated from EAM potentials. The literature data suggests that the temperature dependence of vacancy formation entropy was not well represented by the classical high temperature approximation used in Eq. D.5, and that this value is likely to be the main source of disagreement between the experimental and *ab initio* diffusion coefficients.

In order to provide the most accurate possible model for Ni-Fe-Cr diffusion we here use an empirical fit to provide a small modification of the *ab initio* based model. Based on the results in Table II and the above discussion, the disagreement between the calculated and experimental diffusion data can be largely attributed to errors in the temperature dependence of the Gibbs free energy of vacancy formation, G_{vf} , containing contributions from both S_{vf} and H_{vf} . To provide an optimized model a new high temperature G_{vf} is determined by using the experimental H_{vf} value and fitting S_{vf} to reproduce the averaged experimental diffusion data from Ref. [27] at 1650 K. Both S_{vf} and H_{vf} are assumed to be constant with temperature. The experimental H_{vf} value of 1.79 eV is now used because it was determined from measurements taken at elevated temperature and is more appropriate for high temperature fitting than the 0 K *ab initio* value. The value of S_{vf} determined from the fit is 5.71 k_B , which is different from the value in Table II due to the use of the experimental H_{vf} value.

In Fig. 4, the Ni, Fe and Cr calculated tracer diffusion coefficients, using both the *ab initio* and the new G_{vf} value with fitted S_{vf} , are compared to experimental tracer diffusion data. The *ab initio* diffusion coefficients use values from Table I only and the diffusion coefficients with the new G_{vf} use the same values from Table I but H_{vf} and S_{vf} are set to 1.79 eV and 5.71 k_B , respectively. The experimental values and their error bars in Fig. 4 are from Refs. [27,30] and consist of averages over multiple experimental data sets. Both sets of calculated diffusion coefficients capture the relative relationships between migrating species quite well. This suggests that the unaltered *ab initio* data could be used

NERI Final Report
Ab initio Based Modeling of Radiation Effects in Multi-Component Alloys
Project No. 06-006, Final Scientific/Technical Report

as is for studies involving relative behavior between diffusing species. Using the new G_{vf} value with fitted S_{vf} , improves the agreement with experiment to within the experimental error bars for all species. The values of H_{vf} and S_{vf} used to give the new G_{vf} are used here to provide an optimized model for the diffusion coefficients for practical applications, but are not used for any later calculations unless explicitly stated.

Table III provides a comparison between the *ab initio* diffusion coefficients, with and without S_{vf} fitting, and the experimental diffusion coefficients by partitioning between the pre-exponential factor, D_0 , and the activation energy, Q defined in Eqs. C.11, C.12, C.15 and C.16. The *ab initio* pre-exponential factors are temperature dependent. In order to have a direct comparison with experimental data, Q and D_0 have been determined by fitting an Arrhenius equation to the *ab initio* diffusion predictions in the temperature range of 1250-1650 K. The order of the calculated activation energies is consistent with the ordering of the calculated diffusion coefficients in Fig. 4. In particular, Cr has a significantly lower migration barrier than Fe or Ni (0.83 eV compared to 0.97 eV or 1.09 eV, respectively, from Table I), which drives faster diffusion. The identification of a low migration barrier as the source for fast Cr vacancy-mediated diffusion diverges from the interpretation of some previous authors who identified the pre-exponential factors as being the source of fast Cr diffusion [31]. It should be noted that the spread in experimental tracer diffusion coefficient data for Cr and Fe, as shown by error bars in Fig. 4, are relatively large and therefore it is possible that the experimentally derived ordering may change with further experimental work.

The temperature dependence of the pre-exponential factor, $D_0(T)$ of each species is illustrated in Fig. 5 using the unaltered *ab initio* diffusion coefficients data. The relative changes with temperature are the same for the S_{vf} -fit data but using the unaltered data allows for a more straightforward comparison with the interstitial results, where experimental data is not available for fitting. The pre-exponential factor for solute diffusion has temperature dependent contributions from electronic excitations due to migration and binding (EC_{mig} and EC_{bind}) and from the correlation factor (f_2). In Fig. 5 the Ni pre-exponential factor varies mildly with temperature due to the fact that the electronic excitation contribution due to migration is the only temperature dependent variable in the pre-exponential factor. The electronic excitation contribution has a weak temperature dependence and varies only 20% from 100-1700 K. The pre-exponential factors for Cr and Fe exhibit strong temperature dependence, largely due to the correlation factor, which has a value near 0.5 at 1700 K and goes to zero at low temperature. This change in correlation factor is due to the fact that the vacancy-solute exchange hop has the lowest migration barrier for both alloys (as shown by $\Delta H_{mig} w_2$ in Table I) and at low temperature the back and forth vacancy-solute exchange dominates and does not contribute to diffusion. The electronic contributions to $D_0(T)$ for Cr and Fe vary 10-20% over the temperature range studied and also contribute to the temperature dependence of the pre-exponential factor.

The temperature dependence of $D_0(T)$ is especially important when low temperature diffusion information is needed. For example, the temperature range 450-900 K is often of interest for studies of diffusion by radiation-induced defect concentrations [6]. The Arrhenius fit to experimental data typically does not account for the known physical temperature dependence of the pre-exponential factor. Arrhenius fits to experimental data

that appear identical on log plots can have very different low temperature extrapolation due to the partitioning between D_0 and Q and the lack of temperature dependence in those values. To demonstrate the possible errors associated with using an Arrhenius fit to only high-temperature data we extrapolate Cr/Ni, Fe/Ni and Cr/Fe tracer diffusion coefficient ratios to low temperature for four cases (Fig. 6): 1) an experimental data set by Million [27] and Ruzickova [30], 2) an average of several similar experimental data sets [27,30], 3) the *ab initio* data fit with an Arrhenius equation at 1250-1650 K, and 4) the temperature dependent *ab initio* data. The difference between the Ruzickova/Million data and the averaged experimental data sets gives an indication of the disagreement within the existing experimental data, which is largely due to different partitioning between D_0 and Q in the diffusion coefficients. The difference between the *ab initio* sets indicates the error associated with the Arrhenius fit that lacks a temperature dependence pre-exponential factor. The difference between the Arrhenius fit *ab initio* data and the averaged experimental data indicates the error in the calculations and different partitioning of D_0 and Q . However, much of the error of the calculations cancels when the ratio is taken.

The experimental data sets in Fig. 6a have different trends due to the relative values assigned to Q_{Cr} and Q_{Ni} . The Arrhenius fit *ab initio* data would over predict the low temperature diffusion ratio but the temperature dependent D_0 suppresses this behavior. In Fig. 6b, both the *ab initio* and the experimental data sets agree fairly well at high temperature but have different low temperature trends due to the relative value of the activation energies. The *ab initio* curve has some non-Arrhenius behavior at low temperature, although it has a small quantitative effect over the temperatures considered. Figure 6c shows good agreement for all data sets at high temperature. However, all sets over predict the temperature dependent *ab initio* values at low temperature, due to the Arrhenius fit.

The deviation from Arrhenius behavior of each species can be analyzed by taking the ratio of the *ab initio* diffusion coefficients fit to the Arrhenius form and the *ab initio* diffusion coefficients with the full temperature dependent pre-exponential factor. Figure 7 shows this ratio for Ni, Cr and Fe tracer diffusion coefficients. Figure 7 shows that Cr has the largest error associated with the Arrhenius fit, which explains the larger differences in the *ab initio* diffusion coefficient ratios containing Cr in Fig. 6a and 6c. For vacancy mediated diffusion in Ni, the Arrhenius fit is not a significant source of error. The error for Cr diffusion is near a factor of 2 at 450 K and the Fe and Ni errors are small. Significantly larger errors from high temperature Arrhenius fitting are found for interstitials and will be discussed in Sec. 3.3.2.

In addition to calculating diffusion coefficients, the values in Table I can be used to calculate the vacancy wind parameter, G . The vacancy wind parameter is a function of the phenomenological coefficients and determines the diffusion mechanisms present in dilute Ni-Cr and Ni-Fe alloys. The vacancy wind parameter is defined mathematically in Eqs. C.19 and C.20. When $G > -1$ it denotes that the vacancies and solute atoms are moving in opposite directions, which is expected from a simple exchange mechanism. When $G < -1$, it indicates that the drag mechanism is dominant and the vacancies and solutes are diffusing as a complex. This can occur when the rate of a vacancy to circle the solute is favored over dissociation from the solute. The migration barriers for dissociation (ΔH_{mig}

w_3) and first nearest-neighbor (circling) hops ($\Delta H_{mig} w_1$) are provided in Table I for both the Ni-Cr and Ni-Fe system. Figure 8 below shows the vacancy wind as a function of temperature for Ni-Cr and Ni-Fe.

For Ni-Fe, the rate of dissociation is higher than the rate of circling the solute due to the migration barriers associated with these hops. Therefore, the drag mechanism will not be favorable at any temperature in this system. Figure 8 confirms this and shows that G for Ni-Fe is always greater than -1. In the Ni-Cr system the migration barrier of circling the solute is lower than that of dissociation, which makes a mechanism change possible. Figure 8 shows that G drops below -1 for Ni-Cr around 460 K. This means that at temperatures below 460 K the vacancy drag mechanism would be the dominant diffusion mechanism for the Ni-Cr system. Vacancy drag is generally associated with strong vacancy-solute binding, where the vacancy and solute move collectively due to the high energy cost of dissociation. However, in the case of Ni-Cr, the vacancy drag mechanism is due to the balance of the migration barriers and is not associated with vacancy-solute binding (in fact, the Cr-vacancy first nearest-neighbor interaction is about 50 meV and repulsive (Fig. D.1)).

3.3.2 Interstitial Mediated Diffusion

The tracer diffusion coefficients for interstitials can also be determined using *ab initio* methods. The *ab initio* data needed for modeling interstitial diffusion is given in Appendix D. We were not able to determine the value of the formation entropy, S_{if} , from *ab initio* methods (see Appendix D for details) and instead we use a value determined by Debiaggi *et al.* [32] using an EAM potential. The interstitial tracer diffusion coefficients have been calculated using Eqs. C.22 and C.30 and the parameters summarized in Table IV. The tracer diffusion coefficients for Ni, Cr and Fe in Ni by an interstitial flux are shown in Fig. 9. Experimental data is not available for comparison with the calculated diffusion coefficients. The *ab initio* vacancy tracer diffusion coefficients (without S_{vf} fitting) are included on Fig. 9 for comparison in the temperature range of 1220-1700 K.

The order of the tracer diffusion coefficients are the same for the interstitials as for the vacancies, with Cr being the fastest diffuser, then Fe, and then Ni. However, while Cr and Fe are quite close by the vacancy mechanism, Ni and Fe are quite close by the interstitial mechanism. The interstitial diffusion coefficients near the melting temperature are the same order of magnitude as the vacancy case, an effect that has been observed previously in Ref. [32]. However, the interstitial diffusion coefficients drop rapidly with temperature due to the large interstitial formation energy. The thermal concentration of interstitials is often assumed to be negligible due to their large formation enthalpy. However, dumbbell interstitials in fcc metals are known to have large formation entropies that can increase the thermal population. In some metals, the calculated concentrations of interstitials have been shown to rival divacancy concentrations at temperatures near the melting point [32]. The concentration of interstitials is still several orders of magnitude below the vacancy concentration at high temperature but the diffusion coefficients are similar due to the low migration barriers of the interstitials that enhance transport. Figure 10 compares the calculated vacancy and interstitial concentrations as a function of temperature.

NERI Final Report
Ab initio Based Modeling of Radiation Effects in Multi-Component Alloys
Project No. 06-006, Final Scientific/Technical Report

The ratios of the *ab initio* interstitial tracer diffusion constants (D_{Cr}/D_{Ni} , D_{Cr}/D_{Fe} and D_{Fe}/D_{Ni}) are shown in Fig. 11. The much faster diffusion of Cr is clear, with a tracer diffusion constant over 25 times that of Ni and 50 times that of Fe at 500 K. At high temperatures Fe is a faster diffuser than Ni but Ni becomes faster at 1180 K due to the temperature dependent pre-exponential factor of Fe, which decreases with decreasing temperature (see below for more discussion of this temperature dependence).

The interstitial diffusion coefficients have been fit with an Arrhenius equation over the temperature range of 1250-1650 K for comparison with the vacancy case and to assess the role of the pre-exponential factor and activation energy in the diffusion coefficient values. The values of the pre-exponential frequency factor and activation energy are given in Table V for both the vacancy and interstitial *ab initio* diffusion coefficients.

The ordering of Cr relative to Ni and Fe is due to the large difference in activation energy. The migration barriers of Ni and Cr in a Ni matrix only differ by 60 meV (w_0 and w_I in Table IV) but the large binding energy of Cr and a first nearest neighbor a-type dumbbell (H_{bind} in Table IV) further reduces Cr interstitial activation energy by 180 meV, providing a large contribution to the overall 310 meV difference in the activation energies (see Table V). The ordering of Ni and Fe depends largely on the pre-exponential factor since their activation energies are similar. While Fe has a larger pre-exponential factor in Table V, it drops rapidly as a function of temperature due to the correlation factor and the electronic migration contributions. The temperature dependent pre-exponential factor of each species is shown in Fig. 12 and the contributing terms to this temperature dependence are shown in Fig. 13.

Comparing the vacancy diffusion data in Fig. 5 to that of the interstitials in Fig. 12 shows that the pre-exponential factor for interstitials is several orders of magnitude larger than that of vacancies. This can be attributed to the large formation entropy of interstitials, which appears in an exponential term in D_0 . Similar to the vacancy case, the Ni interstitial pre-exponential factor varies relatively little with temperature, due to the fact that the electronic migration contribution is the only temperature dependent variable in the pre-exponential factor and has weak temperature dependence. The pre-exponential factors for Cr and Fe vary dramatically with temperature because the correlation factors approach zero at low temperature (Fig. 13). As in the vacancy case, the back and forth hopping of the solute in the interstitial dominates at low temperature because the solvent has a lower migration barrier than the Ni host (Cr and Fe ΔH_{mig} w_I in Table IV). Such back and forth hops do not contribute to long range diffusion and cause the correlation factor to become very small at low temperature.

The shape of D_0 for each species in Fig. 12 can be explained by the individual contributions of each temperature dependent variables in D_0 , shown in Fig. 13. For Fe, there are strong temperature dependent contributions from the electronic excitation contributions to the binding energy and to a lesser extent, the correlation factor. These contributions are reflected in the pre-exponential factor in Fig. 12 by a steep increase with increasing temperature. In the case of Cr, the pre-exponential factor increases with increasing temperature until around 1100 K and then begins to decrease due to the electronic excitation contributions that decrease with increasing temperature. The inversion

of the D_0 curve is what leads to the anomalously low pre-exponential factor value for Cr in Table V. The Cr diffusion curve tends to deviate from Arrhenius behavior at high temperature due to this D_0 inversion. For most contributions to D_0 a larger temperature dependence is observed for the interstitials than the vacancies. For interstitials, the contributions of electronic excitations to the interstitial binding energetics vary more with temperature than the other temperature dependent contributions for both Ni-Cr and Ni-Fe.

Similar to the vacancy case, the Arrhenius behavior of each species can be analyzed by taking the ratio of the *ab initio* diffusion coefficients fit to the Arrhenius form and the *ab initio* diffusion coefficients with the temperature dependent pre-exponential factor. The Arrhenius fit was performed over the temperature range of 1250-1650 K. Figure 14 shows this ratio for Ni, Cr and Fe tracer diffusion coefficients.

Figure 14 reveals that the Cr diffusion coefficient significantly deviates from Arrhenius behavior at low temperatures but the Fe and Ni diffusion coefficients are in good agreement with the Arrhenius fit. In the case of vacancies, the error in the diffusion coefficient ratios introduced by the Arrhenius fit was approximately a factor of 2 at 450 K. For interstitials the error for Cr is a factor of 25 at 450 K, indicating strong non-Arrhenius behavior. For both vacancies and interstitials, cases involving Cr showed the largest errors, which implies that the diffusion of Cr through either defect has a non-Arrhenius temperature dependence.

For completeness we point out that, similar to the vacancy wind, one can define an interstitial wind, G_I , which determines relative direction of the solute and interstitial fluxes. The expression for G_I is given in Eq. C.34. For the interstitial case, $G_I > -1$ means that the solute and interstitial fluxes are moving in the same direction and $G_I < -1$ means they are moving in opposite directions. Based on equations B.15 and B.16 it is clear that within the model used in this work $G_I \geq 0$. This constraint yields $G_I > -1$, which implies that the solute moves with the interstitial flux, as expected.

3.3.3 Implications for Radiation-Induced Segregation

Radiation-induced segregation (RIS) is a phenomenon that results in changes in the local composition near point defect sinks (*i.e.*, grain boundaries) in irradiated alloys. RIS has been widely studied in both fcc Ni based alloys and austenitic stainless steels [6] and bcc ferritic-martensitic Fe-Ni-Cr alloys [33]. RIS is caused by different diffusion rates of the major alloying elements (Ni, Cr, and Fe), potentially through both vacancy and interstitial mechanisms. RIS generally takes place in the approximate temperature range of $0.2-0.5T_{melt}$. At lower temperatures there is limited mobility of point defects that mitigates RIS by enhanced recombination and at higher temperatures deviations in local composition are eliminated by back diffusion of vacancies. Unfortunately, due to limited experimental data, it has been difficult to rigorously determine the mechanisms governing RIS and build accurate models. The *ab initio* results in this work provide valuable insights into the mechanisms of coupled solute and point defect diffusion in fcc based Ni-Cr-Fe alloys.

The RIS at grain boundaries in fcc steels generally consists of Cr depletion, Ni enrichment, and possible compensating Fe enrichment or depletion. Here we focus on the Cr depletion effect, as it is the most robust, well documented, and of particular interest due to possible

associated changes in materials properties (*e.g.*, grain boundary sensitization). Cr depletion in fcc steels is generally believed to be caused by a vacancy-solute exchange mechanism (inverse Kirkendall effect), in which vacancies moving to sinks swap preferentially with Cr, depleting Cr at the sinks. This vacancy-exchange mechanism underlies the influential models of Perks *et al.* [34,35], the similar model of Watanabe *et al.* [36], the extensive analysis of Simonen and Bruemmer [37], and the more atomistic-based model of Allen *et al.* [38]. However, competing models to explain RIS in Fe-Cr-Ni have proposed significant roles for other mechanisms. In particular, a number of authors have proposed mechanisms that involve interstitial contributions. Lam *et al.* [39,40] invoked Ni interstitial binding as a key mechanism of RIS in Ni-Cr-Fe. Later, in an attempt to model RIS in Fe-15Cr-20Ni irradiated with electrons at low and high temperature, Watanabe *et al.* [41], concluded that the introduction of a Ni-interstitial binding energy and different vacancy migration energies at different temperatures were required to accurately predict the segregation. Nastar *et al.* [42] modeled RIS in Ni-Cr-Fe ternary alloys by including expressions for both vacancy and interstitial contributions. Nastar's model resulted in multiple possible self-consistent solutions due to the existence of many more unknown parameters than equations. A final solution, which contained both vacancy and interstitial contributions, was determined by comparison to the RIS data. Faulkner [43,44] concluded that repulsive interactions between interstitials and oversized Cr drive Cr from the grain boundary, which would imply that RIS is entirely due to interstitials and a negative defect-solute interaction with Cr.

The results of this work suggest that both vacancy and interstitial mechanisms could play a role in Cr depletion in Ni based Ni-Cr-Fe steels. The predicted vacancy-mediated tracer diffusion coefficients show that Cr is a significantly faster diffuser than Ni (see Fig. 6), implying that vacancy-mediated diffusion will deplete Cr from sinks by the inverse Kirkendall effect at higher temperatures. At lower temperatures, Cr depletion would be expected to decrease, and eventually change toward enrichment, as the vacancy-drag mechanism begins to dominate around 460 K (see Fig. 8). However, this is below the temperature range of interest for most RIS experiments. The interstitial-mediated tracer diffusion coefficients in this work also predict that Cr is a faster diffuser, implying that the interstitial diffusion mechanism will enrich Cr at sinks. Interstitial wind calculations confirm that the solute is expected to move with the interstitial flux.

Thus, this work suggests that the vacancy and interstitial mechanisms are driving Cr diffusion in opposite directions. The magnitude of the tracer diffusion coefficient ratio D_{Cr}/D_{Ni} for vacancies and interstitials at 450 K are about 11 and 33, respectively, suggesting very strong RIS tendencies for both depletion and enrichment. The actual RIS observed could therefore be a balance between these two mechanisms. Atomistic modeling has recently been used to demonstrate a similar balance between vacancy- and interstitial-mediated Cr RIS tendencies in dilute Cr bcc Fe-Cr alloys [33]. The difference between Fe and Ni diffusion coefficients is small for both vacancy and interstitial mediated transport. At 450 K the magnitude of the tracer diffusion coefficient ratio D_{Fe}/D_{Ni} for vacancies and interstitials are about 3.5 and 0.5, respectively. Both ratios indicate Fe depletion at grain boundaries and sinks but the overall effect is smaller than for Cr, consistent with the greater RIS of Cr compared to Fe observed in experiments.

The larger value of DCr/DNi might suggest that the interstitial mechanism should play a dominant role, leading to Cr enrichment at sinks. However, a number of other factors that could affect RIS behavior must be considered. A particularly important factor is that the present work is only for dilute concentrations. The diffusion coefficients in this work do not account for solute-solute interactions so the diffusion coefficient ratios may not apply at higher solute concentrations. Other more subtle effects may also occur at higher solute composition. For example, additional calculations published elsewhere demonstrate that Cr-Cr dumbbells are 0.92 eV more stable than Ni-Ni dumbbells,[45]. Thus Cr-Cr dumbbells could form traps for Cr, slowing its transport and providing opportunities for increased vacancy interstitial recombination. Cr-Cr trapping effects are not present in the dilute model described in this work. Additionally, the diffusion coefficients in this work assume transport through isolated defects and do not account for the effect of defect clusters. It has been shown with molecular dynamics simulations in Fe [46] and Fe-Cr [47] that a large fraction of interstitials, and to a lesser extent vacancies, form in clusters of two or more defects. Interstitial clusters are reported to be quite mobile with activation energies on the order of mono-interstitials [46]. The effect of these clusters on RIS could be significant, depending on their coupling with solutes. Finally, other factors besides intrinsic bulk transport properties may impact the composition of the flux reaching the grain boundaries. For example, it is well known that edge dislocations will preferentially absorb interstitials [48,49]. Perhaps biased absorption of interstitials over vacancies at some defect sinks reduces the overall interstitial flux to grain boundaries, where RIS is typically measured.

In summary, the calculated tracer diffusion coefficient values in this work suggest the observed RIS at grain boundaries in Ni-based (and perhaps Fe-based) Ni-Cr-Fe alloys could involve a balance between two large and opposing RIS tendencies, with Cr depletion being driven by vacancy-mediated diffusion and Cr enrichment being driven by interstitial-mediated diffusion. The observed RIS may therefore be affected by additional factors that alter the balance between these two intrinsic bulk mechanisms, such as overall composition or the fraction of point vs. cluster defect diffusion, and the concentration and absorption bias of sinks in the alloy. In particular, the observed Cr depletion at grain boundaries suggests that Cr interstitials flux is reduced compared to the values predicted in our dilute solute model and that vacancies introduce the dominant species dependent point defect flux at the grain boundary.

3.4 SUMMARY

In this part of the work tracer diffusion coefficients were calculated for Ni, Cr and Fe in a Ni host. Both vacancy and interstitial-mediated diffusion coefficients were determined with an *ab initio*-based approach that utilizes existing statistical mechanics models for calculating correlation effects. The vacancy tracer diffusion coefficients were compared to existing experimental tracer diffusion data. The *ab initio* diffusion coefficients were fit with an Arrhenius form to assess the impact of the temperature dependent pre-exponential factor for low temperature diffusion extrapolations.

New observations and findings for dilute Cr and Fe in Ni include:

1. The calculated vacancy mediated tracer diffusion coefficients under-predicted the experimental tracer diffusion data but predicted the relative relationship between species well. The discrepancy between experimental and *ab initio* data was attributed to the temperature dependence of the vacancy formation free energy, G_{vf} , and in particular, the entropy contribution to the free energy, within the harmonic assumption for extending zero temperature *ab initio* calculations to finite temperatures. It was shown that fitting the entropy of formation, S_{vf} , to the experimental Ni self-diffusion coefficient at 1650 K improved the agreement between experiment and calculated tracer diffusion coefficients for all species.
2. Cr was found to be the fastest diffusing species followed by Fe and then Ni for both vacancy and interstitial mediated diffusion above 1250 K. The ordering of the species is mainly attributed to the activation energies, and Cr has the lowest activation energy for both vacancy and interstitial diffusion. The pre-exponential factors (D_0 values in the relationship $D = D_0 e^{-Q/kT}$) have an effect on ordering when the activation energies are similar, which is the case for Fe and Ni interstitial diffusion.
3. The Fe and Cr pre-exponential factors were found to be strongly temperature dependent for both vacancy and interstitial mediated diffusion due to the electronic excitation and correlation factor contributions to the diffusion coefficients. The electronic excitations due to binding, which are often neglected, proved to be significant in the interstitial case, where the temperature dependence was more dramatic than the correlation factor.
4. The calculation of the vacancy wind revealed that the vacancy-drag mechanism is the dominant vacancy-mediated diffusion mechanism in Ni-Cr below 460 K. Above 460 K for Ni-Cr and at all temperatures for Ni-Fe, vacancy-solute exchange is the dominant diffusion mechanism.
5. The tracer diffusion coefficient of each species through interstitials, near the melting temperature, is comparable to the vacancy-mediated diffusion coefficients. The concentration of thermal interstitials is a few orders of magnitude smaller than the vacancy concentration but the migration barriers are lower and compensate for the smaller number of interstitials present.
6. The Arrhenius fit to the high-temperature diffusion coefficients introduced errors of up to a factor of 2 in the vacancy case and a factor of 25 in the interstitial case at 450 K. Cr had the largest errors indicating possible non-Arrhenius diffusion behavior through both interstitial and vacancy mediated diffusion. Errors of the magnitude introduced by the Arrhenius fit to high-temperature diffusion results would have a strong affect on RIS predictions at lower temperature.
7. For the first time calculated diffusion coefficients suggest that Cr radiation-induced segregation in fcc Ni-Cr-Fe alloys may include competing tendencies for depletion by vacancies and enrichment by interstitials. The experimentally observed Cr depletion at grain boundaries suggests that the Cr bias of the interstitial flux is being reduced by composition or microstructure effects not included in the model.

3.5 Acknowledgements

The authors would like to acknowledge George Young, Frédéric Soisson and Jean-Louis Bocquet for helpful comments on early versions of the paper and Alain Barbu and Maylise Nastar for helpful discussions. This research was performed under appointment to the Naval Nuclear Propulsion Fellowship Program sponsored by Naval Reactors Division of the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE). We gratefully acknowledge financial support from the DOE Nuclear Engineering Research Initiative Program (NERI), award number DE-FC07-06ID14747 and computing support from the National Science Foundation (NSF) National Center for Supercomputing Applications (NCSA), award number DMR060007.

3.6 Appendices

3.6.1 APPENDIX A. Atomic Hopping rates for diffusion

Beginning from the Eyring-Polanyi equation [11,12] one can derive the rate of a diffusive jump of an atom in a crystal lattice. The Eyring-Polanyi equation for the rate of a hop is given in general form as:

$$w = \frac{1}{\tau} = \frac{k_B T}{h} \exp\left(\frac{-\Delta G}{k_B T}\right) \quad (\text{A.1})$$

In Eq. A.1, $1/\tau$ is the mean rate of hopping, ΔG is the Gibbs free energy of activation, k_B is Boltzmann's constant, T is temperature and h is Planck's constant.

Note that this equation is derived based on the assumption that the initial state is in equilibrium with the activated state. It also assumes that if an atom reaches the transition state of a diffusive jump, then it will complete the hop to the final state and will not fall back into the well from which it came. This assumption, which is common for transition state theory, will result in a rate that is an upper limit.

It is convenient to write the total Gibbs free energy as a summation of the Gibbs free energy for a reference state plus the contributions of excitations to that reference state [53]. The reference state has been selected to be $H_o(\sigma)$, the zero temperature enthalpy for atomic configuration σ , which is also the output of most *ab initio* codes. The reference state is selected to be a system that contains no temperature dependence, no vibrational contributions (even zero-point energy) and has a fixed reference magnetic order. The reference state can contain defects and solute species in any configuration. The Gibbs free energy of a specific configuration is the zero temperature enthalpy of that configuration plus any free energy added due to excitations of the system. The electronic, vibrational, and magnetic excitations will be modeled as a function of volume and therefore written as Helmholtz free energies, F . Rigorously, the excitation thermodynamics will depend on volume, or equivalently, pressure. However, since it is only differences between on-lattice

and transition state values that will contribute to the final hopping rates, it is likely that cancellation effects will cause the volume to have only a minor influence on the excitation energetics. Therefore, in order to keep the calculations practical, the volume dependent contributions to the excitations will not be included in this study. Furthermore, it is assumed that the relevant excitations are electronic, vibrational and magnetic. Within these approximations the Gibbs energy of the solid is written:

$$G(\sigma) = H_0(\sigma) + G_{excite}(\sigma) \approx H_0(\sigma) + F_{excite}(\sigma) = H_0 + F_{Elec} + F_{Vib} + F_{Mag} \quad (A.2)$$

The σ notation is now dropped on the right hand side since all parameters that are configuration dependent will be determined for a specific configuration.

Each contribution to the Gibbs free energy can be calculated with existing *ab initio* techniques. As mentioned above, H_0 is a direct output of *ab initio* codes. F_{Elec} accounts for energy contributions due to thermal excitation of electron states. The Sommerfeld approximation [54] is used to calculate F_{elec} by Eq. A.3

$$F_{Elec} = E_{Elec} - TS_{Elec} = -\frac{\pi^2}{6}(k_B T)^2 n(\epsilon_F) \quad (A.3)$$

In Eq. A.3, the term, $n(\epsilon_F)$, is the density of states (DOS) at the Fermi energy and has units of number of states per unit energy. The Sommerfeld approximation is applicable when the density of states is temperature independent and nearly constant within $k_B T$ of the Fermi energy [55], although the latter constraint can be removed by integrating numerically with the full density of states. A more accurate self-consistent treatment of the electronic thermodynamics at finite temperature is relatively straightforward with modern electronic structure codes but would require a separate *ab initio* calculation for each temperature. Using such an approach in temperature dependent diffusion coefficient expressions requires fitting a function for interpolating the electronic contributions as a function of temperature and has not been attempted here.

F_{Vib} accounts for the zero point energy and the temperature dependence of the vibrational energy in the system. Vibrations in solids are commonly treated with the harmonic approximation, where the potential energy is expanded to second order in the displacements of the atoms from their equilibrium positions and higher-order terms are ignored. In the harmonic approximation the basic thermodynamic quantities for lattice vibrations can be expressed [56]:

$$F_{Vib} = k_B T \sum_{m=\text{all modes}} \ln[2 \sinh(x_m)] \approx k_B T \left(\ln \prod_{m=\text{all modes}} x_m + \sum_{m=\text{all modes}} O\left(\frac{\theta_D}{T}\right) k_B \theta_D \right) \quad (A.4)$$

where, $x_m = \frac{h\nu_m}{2k_B T}$, θ_D is the Debye temperature and ν is the frequency in Hertz. The

approximation on the right hand side is valid for higher temperatures, where $T > \theta_D$. Thermal expansion due to vibrations is zero in this purely harmonic approach.

F_{Mag} accounts for changes in electron spins from the reference magnetic state due to temperature. In some cases the magnetic free energy can be approximated by a Heisenberg

model. but this approximation is best when the spins behave as stable localized moments on each atom. Efforts by the Authors to calculate the quantized spins have revealed that the moments are not clearly localized in the Ni-based systems and further work is needed to develop a validated model for treating magnetic excitations in this system. Therefore, no magnetic contributions to the excitations are included in this work (although zero temperature spin polarized energetics are used for all the reference states).

By combining Eqs. A.1-A.4 a practical rate expression for migration is obtained and presented in Eq A.5. The change in Gibbs free energy is the difference between configurations where the migrating atom is at the transition state (TS) and in the on-lattice (OL) state adjacent to the TS. The difference between the TS and OL will be denoted $_{mig}$ for migration.

$$w = \frac{k_B T}{h} \exp\left(\frac{-\Delta G}{k_B T}\right) = \frac{k_B T}{h} \frac{\exp\left(\frac{-(H_0^{TS} + F_{Elec}^{TS} + F_{Vib}^{TS})}{k_B T}\right)}{\exp\left(\frac{-(H_0^{OL} + F_{Elec}^{OL} + F_{Vib}^{OL})}{k_B T}\right)} = v_{mig} EC_{mig} \exp\left(\frac{-\Delta H_{mig}}{k_B T}\right) \quad (A.5)$$

Since H_o contains no temperature dependence or vibrational contributions and assumes a fixed magnetic order, the only contribution to the Gibbs free energy is the difference in enthalpy at the TS and OL. ΔH_{mig} is the zero temperature migration enthalpy.

The expressions v_{mig} and EC_{mig} are derived from excitations at the OL and TS positions due to vibrational and electronic contributions, respectively. The electronic contribution reduces to the exponential of a term proportional to the difference between the electronic density of states for the TS and OL states.

$$EC_{mig} = \frac{\exp\left(\frac{\pi^2}{6}(k_B T)n^{TS}(\epsilon_F)\right)}{\exp\left(\frac{\pi^2}{6}(k_B T)n^{OL}(\epsilon_F)\right)} = \exp\left(\frac{\pi^2 k_B T}{6}(n^{TS}(\epsilon_F) - n^{OL}(\epsilon_F))\right) \quad (A.6)$$

Applying the truncated high temperature expansion in Eq. A.4, the ratio of the vibrational contributions can be written:

$$v_{mig} = \frac{k_B T}{h} \frac{\exp\left(-\ln \prod_{3N-1} x_m^{TS}\right)}{\exp\left(-\ln \prod_{3N} x_m^{OL}\right)} = \frac{\prod_{3N} v^{OL}}{\prod_{3N-1} v^{TS}} \quad (A.7)$$

where, N is the number of atoms and $3N$ is the number of degrees of freedom. For solids, $3N$ is replaced by $3N-5$ to exclude translational and rotational degrees of freedom.

NERI Final Report
Ab initio Based Modeling of Radiation Effects in Multi-Component Alloys
Project No. 06-006, Final Scientific/Technical Report

Parameters needed to evaluate Eq. A.5 for a given system include vibrational frequencies, electronic density of states and zero temperature enthalpies. The migration enthalpy term is generally the dominant term since the rate depends on it in an exponential manner and there is usually a significant energy barrier associated with diffusion events. The magnitudes of the other contributions are system dependent and will be examined in Appendix D for the Ni-Cr and Ni-Fe systems.

3.6.2 APPENDIX B: Calculating Phenomenological coefficients from atomic Rates

Phenomenological coefficients describe the mobility of atoms and are the link between migration rates and diffusion coefficients. Analytical expressions of phenomenological coefficients are available for some simple systems, such as dilute binary systems with short range interactions. These expressions can be calculated directly with various atomic rates and interactions that define the solute-defect thermokinetics (multi-frequency models). These multi-frequency models will be this used in this appendix to calculate of phenomenological coefficients for both vacancy and interstitial mediated diffusion in dilute fcc systems. The relationship between the phenomenological coefficients and the intrinsic diffusion coefficients for each species will also be given.

3.6.2.1 Vacancy Phenomenological Coefficients

The rates of various atom-vacancy exchanges relative to a solute atom are needed to obtain the phenomenological coefficients. The model used in this work for the vacancies in the fcc lattice requires five rates and is commonly known at the five-frequency model, originally developed by Lidiard and Le Claire [9,10,57]. The rates of the five-frequency model are used to calculate the phenomenological coefficient expression given by Allnatt [58]. It should be noted that other phenomenological coefficients expressions have been developed and are reviewed in Refs. [59,60].

Figure B.1 illustrates the various diffusion events, w_i , of the five-frequency model. The fifth hop, not shown, is the hop and is the rate of a vacancy hopping in the pure solvent. The labels on the atoms in Fig. B.1 denote their nearest-neighbor distance from the solute.

The phenomenological coefficients expressions are given in Eqs. B.1 to B.3:

$$L_{AA} = \left(\frac{ns^2}{6k_B T} \right) \left[12c'_v (1 - 7c'_B) w_0 + c_p A_{AA}^{(0)} + c_p A_{AA}^{(1)} \right] \quad (B.1)$$

$$L_{AB} = L_{BA} = \left(\frac{ns^2}{6k_B T} \right) c_p A_{AB}^{(1)} \quad (B.2)$$

$$L_{BB} = \left(\frac{ns^2}{6k_B T} \right) \left[c_p w_2 + \frac{-2c_p w_2^2}{\Omega} \right] \quad (B.3)$$

where,

$$A_{AA}^{(0)} = 4w_1 + 14w_3 \quad (B.4)$$

$$A_{AA}^{(1)} = \left[\frac{-2(3w_3 - 2w_1)^2 + 28w_3(1-F)(3w_3 - 2w_1)\left(\frac{w_0 - w_4}{w_4}\right) - 14w_3(1-F)(2w_1 + 2w_2 + 7w_3)\left(\frac{w_0 - w_4}{w_4}\right)^2}{\Omega} \right] \quad (B.5)$$

$$A_{AB}^{(1)} = \frac{w_2 \left[2(3w_3 - 2w_1) + 14w_3(1-F)\left(\frac{w_0 - w_4}{w_4}\right) \right]}{\Omega} \quad (B.6)$$

and

$$\Omega = 2w_1 + 2w_2 + 7w_3F \quad (B.7)$$

In addition to the five jump frequencies illustrated in Fig. B.1, there are a number of additional parameters that appear in Eqs. B.1-B.3 and will be defined here. The number of lattice sites is denoted n , s is the nearest-neighbor jump distance ($s = a/\sqrt{2}$, where a is the lattice constant), c_p is the site fraction of solute atoms that have a vacancy among their nearest-neighbor sites (solute-vacancy pairs), c_v is the number of unbound vacancies (given by $c_v = c_v - c_p$), and c_B is the number of unbound solutes (given by $c_B = c_B - c_p$).

Equation B.8 is a mass-action equation that defines the relationship between the paired and unpaired vacancies and solutes. It is derived from the chemical potential, μ , relationship between secondary and primary species, $\mu_{Bv} = \mu_B + \mu_v$ and is a function of the coordination number, z , and the binding energy of the solute and vacancy, Δg_{Bv} . In the one-shell approximation of the five-frequency model the binding energy can be related to the ratio w_4/w_3 by detailed balance [59]. This approximation is only rigorously true when the vacancy and solute do not interact beyond the first shell and is therefore not recommended.

$$\frac{c_p}{c_v' c_B'} = z \exp\left(\frac{-\Delta g_{Bv}}{k_B T}\right) \quad (B.8)$$

The binding energy of a nearest-neighbor solute-vacancy pair is calculated using Eq. B.9. Equation B.9 compares the energy of a configuration in which the vacancy and solute are first nearest-neighbors (nn) to configurations where the vacancy and solute are isolated or infinitely far apart (∞). When Δg_{Bv} is negative, there is an attraction between the solute and vacancy and the concentration of solute-vacancy pairs will be enhanced.

$$\Delta g_{Bv} = g_{B-v}^{1st\ nn} - g_{B-v}^{\infty} \quad (B.9)$$

The free vacancy concentration (site fraction) in pure solvent can be expressed in terms of the Gibbs free energy of formation at equilibrium (if the vacancy concentration is out of equilibrium, as for an irradiated system, then it must be obtained by other methods).

$$c'_v = \exp\left(\frac{-G_{vf}}{k_B T}\right) = \exp\left(\frac{-H_{vf}}{k_B T}\right) \exp\left(\frac{S_{vf}}{k_B}\right) \quad (\text{B.10})$$

The enthalpy and entropy of formation are often known experimentally for pure materials or can be calculated. In pure materials the concentration of free vacancies and the total concentration of vacancies are equal, $c'_v = c_v$.

The factor F is a function of the ratio of w_4 and w_0 jumps as shown in Eq. B.11:

$$7(1-F) = \frac{10\xi^4 + B_1\xi^3 + B_2\xi^2 + B_3\xi}{2\xi^4 + B_4\xi^3 + B_5\xi^2 + B_6\xi + B_7} \quad (\text{B.11})$$

where, $\xi = w_4/w_0$.

The B_i coefficients have been determined using perturbation theory by Koiwa and Ishioka [61] and are also given in Ref. [59].

With five rates, the binding energy of the solute-vacancy complex and the concentrations of vacancies and solutes, one can apply Eqs. B.1-B.3 to calculate the phenomenological coefficients for any dilute fcc binary alloy. The necessary parameters for Ni-Fe and Ni-Cr alloys will be obtained in this work with *ab initio* methods and are given in Appendix D.

3.6.2.2 Interstitial Phenomenological Coefficients

The phenomenological coefficients for dumbbell interstitials in a dilute fcc system have been determined by Allnatt, *et al.* [13] and Barbu [14] in the one-shell approximation that bears strong resemblance to the five-frequency model of the vacancy case. These expressions were derived under the assumption that the solute species is dilute enough to neglect solute-solute interactions. See Ref. [59] for a complete review.

The rates needed to determine the phenomenological coefficients are illustrated in Fig. B.2. The phenomenological coefficients are given in terms of the hopping rates by Eqs. B.12-B.16.

$$L_{AA} = L_{AA}^f + L_{AA}^p \quad (\text{B.12})$$

$$L_{AA}^f = \frac{4ns^2 c'_I w_0}{3k_B T} \quad (\text{B.13})$$

$$L_{AA}^p = \left(\frac{ns^2 c_{pa} w_3}{6k_B T} \right) \left(-\frac{7w_0}{w_4} + \frac{16(w_3 + 2w_1 + w'_2)}{(5w_3 + 2w_1 + w'_2)} + \frac{12[(w_R + w_I)(2w_3 + w'_2) + 2w_3 w_2]}{[(w_R + w_I)(5w_3 + w'_2) + 5w_3 w_2]} + \frac{6w'_4(w'_3 + 2w'_1)}{w_4(2w'_3 + w'_1)} \right) \quad (\text{B.14})$$

$$L_{AB} = L_{BA} = \left(\frac{ns^2 c_{pa}}{6k_B T} \right) \left(\frac{6w_I w'_2 w_3}{A} \right) \quad (\text{B.15})$$

$$L_{BB} = \left(\frac{ns^2 c_{pa}}{6k_B T} \right) \left(\frac{w'_2 w_I}{w_2 A} \right) (w_R (5w_3 + w'_2) + 5w_3 w_2) \quad (\text{B.16})$$

where,

$$A = (w_R + w_I)(5w_3 + w'_2) + 5w_3 w_2 \quad (\text{B.17})$$

c_{pa} is the site fraction of a-type solute interstitial pairs (n_{pa}/n) and c'_I is the site fraction of unbound interstitials and c_B is the site fraction of unbound solutes. The site fraction of b-type solutes does not contribute to the phenomenological coefficients directly since they are not oriented properly to become part of the interstitial dumbbell. The a- and b-type solute interstitial pairs are shown in Fig. B.2. The total and bound solute and interstitial concentrations are related by $c'_I = c_I - c_{pa}$ and $c'_B = c_B - c_{pa}$. These concentrations are related by the following mass-action equation:

$$\frac{c_{pa}}{c'_I c'_B} = 8 \exp \left(\frac{-\Delta g_{pa}}{k_B T} \right) \quad (\text{B.18})$$

where, Δg_{pa} is the binding energy of the solute-interstitial pair. The binding energy is taken by comparing the free energy of a system where the solute, B is an a-type nearest-neighbor of an A-A dumbbell interstitial (*int*) to a system where the solute and the A-A dumbbell are infinitely apart.

$$\Delta g_{pa} = g_{B-\text{int}}^{a-\text{type}} - g_{B-\text{int}}^{\infty} \quad (\text{B.19})$$

The coefficient in front of the exponential in Eq. B.18 coincides with the number of distinct configurations that lead to a c_{pa} pair. Only 8 of the 12 nearest-neighbor sites of a dumbbell are a-type sites, the other four sites are orthogonal to the dumbbell axis and form b-type pairs.

The concentration (site fraction) of interstitials formed thermally in pure solvent is written using the same expression as for vacancies but now the enthalpy and entropy of formation are that of the dumbbell interstitial. In Eq. B.20 it is implicitly assumed that there is only one interstitial configuration per lattice site. Additional configurations that are sampled at higher temperatures will appear as contributions to the entropy.

$$c'_I = \exp \left(\frac{-G_{If}}{k_B T} \right) = \exp \left(\frac{-H_{If}}{k_B T} \right) \exp \left(\frac{S_{If}}{k_B} \right) \quad (\text{B.20})$$

3.6.2.3 Intrinsic Diffusion Coefficients

The phenomenological coefficients derived in Sections 3.6.2.1 and 3.6.2.2 above contain the kinetic properties of the alloy and are closely related to the intrinsic diffusion coefficients. Diffusion coefficients are conveniently defined to allow one to describe the thermodynamic driving force in terms of gradients in concentration rather than gradients in chemical potential. This conversion allows for give the flux of a species to be written in the

NERI Final Report
Ab initio Based Modeling of Radiation Effects in Multi-Component Alloys
 Project No. 06-006, Final Scientific/Technical Report

conventional form of Fick's law where, J_i is the flux, D_i is the intrinsic diffusion coefficient and n_i is the total number of atoms per unit volume of species i .

$$J_A = -D_A \nabla n_A; \quad J_B = -D_B \nabla n_B \quad (\text{B.21})$$

The relationship between the intrinsic diffusion coefficients and the phenomenological coefficients is given in Eq. B.22.

$$D_A = \frac{k_B T}{n} \left(\frac{L_{AA}}{c_A} - \frac{L_{AB}}{c_B} \right) \left(1 + \frac{\partial \ln \gamma_A}{\partial \ln c_A} \right); \quad D_B = \frac{k_B T}{n} \left(\frac{L_{BB}}{c_B} - \frac{L_{BA}}{c_A} \right) \left(1 + \frac{\partial \ln \gamma_B}{\partial \ln c_B} \right) \quad (\text{B.22})$$

In Eq. B.22, γ_i is the activity coefficient of species i , c_i is the atomic fraction given by $c_i = n_i/n$, where n is the total number of atoms per unit volume. The second term in parenthesis is the thermodynamic factor that describes the change in chemical potential of one species with respect to the concentration of another species. The thermodynamic factor is equal to $\partial \mu_i / \partial c_j$, where the chemical potential is defined by $\mu_i = \mu_i^0(T, P) + k_B T \ln(c_i \gamma_i)$.

The expressions in Eq. B.22 apply to both vacancy and interstitial mediated diffusion. The expressions can be further simplified in the dilute limit, where the thermodynamics factor is unity, in order to express the tracer diffusion coefficients in terms of the phenomenological coefficients. This derivation of the tracer diffusion coefficients is given in detail in Appendix C.

3.6.3 APPENDIX C: Tracer Diffusion Coefficients

Tracer diffusion coefficients can be determined for alloys with any concentration of solute species but the following discussion only applies to alloys with dilute solute concentrations (typically less than 1%). This section addresses binary alloys only but could also be applied to multi-component alloys where all of the solute concentrations are dilute and non-interacting. Tracer diffusion coefficients of dilute species are determined by taking the limit of the intrinsic diffusion coefficients, defined in Appendix B, as the concentration of tracer species goes to 0. In the dilute limit, tracer diffusion coefficients offer an opportunity for experimental validation of the phenomenological coefficient expressions because the only factor that can lead to a net flow of tracer atoms is the concentration gradient of the tracer itself [65].

In this section, the tracer diffusion expressions are derived from the intrinsic diffusion coefficients and partitioned into pre-exponential frequency factors and activation energies to match the Arrhenius form of experimentally determined tracer diffusion coefficients.

3.6.3.1 Vacancy Mediated Diffusion

The tracer diffusion coefficient of solute B in the solvent A is determined by taking the limit of intrinsic diffusion coefficient, D_B , (Eq. B.22) as the concentration of species B goes to 0 (note that this will give $\gamma=1$ in the dilute limit).

$$D_B^*(0) = \lim_{c_B \rightarrow 0} D_B = k_B T \frac{L_{BB}}{n_B} \quad (C.1)$$

To obtain the solute tracer diffusion coefficient, Eq. B.8 for c_p is substituted into Eq. B.3, which in turn is used for L_{BB} in Eq. C.1 to yield:

$$D_B^*(0) = \frac{s^2}{6} w_2 c'_v z \exp\left(\frac{-\Delta g_{Bv}}{k_B T}\right) \left[\frac{2w_1 + 7w_3 F}{2w_1 + 2w_2 + 7w_3 F} \right] = a^2 w_2 c_v \exp\left(\frac{-\Delta g_{Bv}}{k_B T}\right) f_B \quad (C.2)$$

In the limit of $c_B \rightarrow 0$, $c'_v = c_v$, which is given by Eq. B.10. The term in brackets in Eq. C.2 is the correlation factor of the solute, f_B .

$$f_B = \frac{2w_1 + 7w_3 F}{2w_1 + 2w_2 + 7w_3 F} \quad (C.3)$$

The correlation factor is a measure of the extent to which the solute deviates from a perfect random walker. The correlation factor ranges from zero to one, where a perfect random walker has a value of unity.

The binding energy is described as the change in free energy associated with bringing the solute and vacancy from a non-interacting position to a first nearest-neighbor position. Returning to the original definition of the Gibbs free energy, the binding energy can be described by the changes in the different contributions to the free energy, which can be written as:

$$\Delta g_{Bv} = \Delta H_0 + \Delta F_{Elec} + \Delta F_{Vib} \quad (C.4)$$

First, the change in zero temperature enthalpy simply compares the enthalpy of a configuration where the vacancy and solute are first nearest-neighbors (OL2) to a configuration where they are considered infinitely far apart (∞). OL2 denotes the on lattice position of the w_2 jump of the five-frequency model and ∞ denotes infinitely far apart or non-interacting. Note that, in general we will use OL_i and TS_i to refer to the state with the hopping atom in its on lattice or transition state position associated with hopping event i in Fig. B.1. The difference in enthalpy between these two configurations is the binding enthalpy and is given in Eq. C.5.

$$\Delta H_0 = H^{OL_2} - H^\infty = H_{bind} \quad (C.5)$$

Similarly, the electronic and vibrational contributions to the change in Gibbs free energy are found by subtracting the state where the vacancy and solute are non-interacting (∞) from the first nearest-neighbor position (OL2).

$$\Delta F_{Elec} = -\frac{\pi^2}{6} (k_B T)^2 \left(n^{OL_2}(\epsilon_F) - n^\infty(\epsilon_F) \right) \quad (C.6)$$

$$\Delta F_{Vib} \approx k_B T \left(\ln \prod_{3N} v^{OL_2} - \ln \prod_{3N} v^\infty \right) \quad (C.7)$$

Now the binding energy contribution to $D_B^*(0)$ in Eq. C.2 is written by combining Eqs. C.4-C.7 to obtain:

$$\exp\left(\frac{-\Delta g_{Bv}}{k_B T}\right) = \exp\left(\frac{-\Delta H_0}{k_B T}\right) \exp\left(\frac{-\Delta F_{Elec}}{k_B T}\right) \exp\left(\frac{-\Delta F_{Vib}}{k_B T}\right) = v_{bind} EC_{bind} \exp\left(\frac{-H_{bind}}{k_B T}\right) \quad (C.8)$$

where, v_{bind} is the vibrational contribution to binding and EC_{bind} is the electronic contribution.

All of the rates in the five-frequency model are needed to calculate $D_B^*(0)$. Each rate expression is obtained by inserting the corresponding TS and OL configuration into Eq. A.5. For example, the rate expression for a solute-vacancy exchange, w_2 , uses the OL2 state (illustrated in Fig. B.1), where the solute and the vacancy are first nearest-neighbors, and the TS2 state, which has the solute atom at the transition state.

$$w_2 = v_{mig}^{TS_2-OL_2} EC_{mig}^{TS_2-OL_2} \exp\left(\frac{-\Delta H_{mig}^{TS_2-OL_2}}{k_B T}\right) \quad (C.9)$$

Here EC_{mig} and v_{mig} are as defined in Eq. A.6 and A.7, respectively. Equation C.9 is used to calculate the correlation factor in Eq. C.3 and is applied directly in Eq. C.2 to calculate $D_B^*(0)$. All of the terms needed to determine the tracer diffusion coefficient of the solute B, $D_B^*(0)$, in Eq. C.2 have been defined in Eqs. B.10, C.3, C.8 and C.9. It is helpful to partition terms between the pre-exponential factor and activation energy to express the solute tracer diffusion coefficient in the Arrhenius form of Eq. C.10:

$$D_B^*(0) = D_{0A}^B \exp\left(\frac{-Q_A^B}{k_B T}\right) \quad (C.10)$$

where, D_{0A}^B is the pre-exponential factor and Q_A^B is the activation energy, given by

$$D_{0A}^B = a^2 f_B v_{bind} EC_{bind} v_{mig}^{TS_2-OL_2} EC_{mig}^{TS_2-OL_2} \exp\left(\frac{S_{vf}}{k_B}\right) \quad (C.11)$$

$$Q_A^B = \Delta H_{mig}^{TS_2-OL_2} + H_{vf} + H_{bind} \quad (C.12)$$

The activation energy contains the migration and formation enthalpy of the vacancy and a binding enthalpy of the solute. The pre-exponential factor contains the correlation factor and many contributions associated with migration and binding, some of which are temperature dependent and cannot be easily resolved experimentally.

It is often useful to know the self-diffusion coefficient of a species. For pure A the self-diffusion coefficient is also a tracer diffusion coefficient for a species B but now species B is considered an isotope of species A. The self-diffusion coefficient of A can be determined from Eq. C.2 by setting all of the jump rates equal to w_0 and $\Delta g_{Bv} = 0$. Note that $7F = 5.15$ for a w_4/w_0 ratio of unity. The self-diffusion coefficient can be written as:

$$D_A^*(0) = 2s^2 w_0 c_v \left[1 - \frac{2}{9.15}\right] = a^2 w_0 c_v f_0 \quad (C.13)$$

Again, the term in brackets is the correlation factor, f_0 . For pure fcc metals, $f_0 = 0.7815$ [59].

Applying the rate definition in Eq. A.5 to w_0 , the full self-diffusion coefficient expression is obtained. The self-diffusion coefficient can be partitioned into the Arrhenius form of Eq. C.14.

$$D_A^*(0) = D_{0A}^A \exp\left(\frac{-Q_A^A}{k_B T}\right) \quad (C.14)$$

where,

$$D_{0A}^A = a^2 f_0 v_{mig}^{TS_0-OL_0} EC_{mig}^{TS_0-OL_0} \exp\left(\frac{S_{vf}}{k_B}\right) \quad (C.15)$$

$$Q_A^A = \Delta H_{mig}^{TS_0-OL_0} + H_{vf} \quad (C.16)$$

While the tracer diffusion coefficients provide essential information about A and B atom kinetics, they do not describe the kinetic cross terms between A and B and vacancies. A quantity of interest that does describe some of these cross term couplings is L_{vB} , which is useful for studying the relationship between the solute and the vacancy mobilities. L_{vB} is defined in terms of the phenomenological coefficients L_{AB} and L_{BB} .

$$L_{vB} = -(L_{AB} + L_{BB}) = -L_{BB}(G + 1) \quad (C.17)$$

where,

$$G = \frac{L_{AB}}{L_{BB}} = \frac{-2w_1 + 3w_3 + 7w_3(1-F)\left(\frac{w_0 - w_4}{w_4}\right)}{w_1 + 3.5w_3F} \quad (C.18)$$

G is called the *vacancy wind* and accounts for the coupling between J_A and J_B through the vacancy flux J_v [60]. It can be seen from Eq. C.17 that if $G < -1$, then the sign of L_{vB} changes. A sign change denotes a change in the relative direction of solutes and vacancy.

In the five-frequency model the w_1 jump is one where the vacancy moves from one first nearest-neighbor position to another, relative to the solute. The w_3 jump is the rate of dissociation between the solute and vacancy. In the fcc crystal structure it is possible for a vacancy to circle around the solute through a series of w_1 jumps without dissociation. If the rate of circling around the solute is much greater than the rate of dissociation it is possible to have a cooperative motion between the solute and the vacancy where they are traveling in the same direction. This mechanism is commonly referred to as the vacancy-solute drag mechanism. If L_{vB} is negative ($G > -1$), it indicates the solute and vacancy are moving in opposite directions, if positive ($G < -1$), it indicates that the drag mechanism is dominant and the vacancies and solutes are moving in the same direction. Note that the diffusion mechanism can change as a function of temperature since the rates are temperature dependant. The vacancy wind has been calculated for the Ni-Cr and Ni-Fe binaries as a function of temperature and the results are presented and discussed in Sec. 3.3.1.

3.6.3.2 Interstitial Mediated Diffusion

The interstitial tracer diffusion coefficient is obtained by taking the limit of D_B from Eq. B.22 as $c_B \rightarrow 0$, as in the vacancy case. In this case the phenomenological coefficients in Eq. B.22 refer to those of the interstitial model in Eqs. B.12-B.16.

$$D_B^I(0) = \lim_{c_B \rightarrow 0} D_B = k_B T \frac{L_{BB}}{n_B} \quad (C.19)$$

Inserting Eq. B.16 for L_{BB} and Eq. B.18 for c_{pa} results a tracer diffusion expression given by Eq. C.20:

$$D_B^I(0) = \frac{2}{3} a^2 c_I \exp\left(\frac{-\Delta g_{pa}}{k_B T}\right) w_I f_B \quad (C.20)$$

c_I is the total concentration of interstitials and $c_I = c'_I$ in this limit. The correlation factor, f_B , is given by:

$$f_B = \frac{w'_2 (w_R (5w_3 + w'_2) + 5w_3 w_2)}{w_2 ((w_R + w_I)(5w_3 + w'_2) + 5w_3 w_2)} \quad (C.21)$$

The definitions of the migration rates of interstitials have the same form as in the vacancy case. The activated state and the adjacent pre-hop configuration are now that of the interstitial dumbbell (illustrated in Fig. C.1a). The rate of dumbbell rotation is also needed to obtain the phenomenological coefficients. Assuming rotation in the $\{100\}$ family of planes, the OL and TS states for rotation are shown in Fig. C.1b.

The rate of each event is determined by using the appropriate TS and OL configuration energetics in Eq. A.5. The change in enthalpy for rotation is denoted rot . Equations C.22 and C.23 provide examples for the rates in Fig. C.1.

$$w_0 = v_{mig}^{TS_0-OL_0} EC_{mig}^{TS_0-OL_0} \exp\left(\frac{-\Delta H_{mig}^{TS_0-OL_0}}{k_B T}\right) \quad (C.22)$$

$$w_{R0} = v_{mig}^{TS_{R0}-OL_{R0}} EC_{mig}^{TS_{R0}-OL_{R0}} \exp\left(\frac{-\Delta H_{rot}^{TS_{R0}-OL_{R0}}}{k_B T}\right) \quad (C.23)$$

Like the vacancy case, the binding energy is calculated by comparing the free energy change between the solute and dumbbell as a-type first nearest-neighbors and infinitely far apart.

$$\Delta g_{pa} = \Delta H_0 + \Delta F_{Elec} + \Delta F_{Vib} \quad (C.24)$$

$$\exp\left(\frac{-\Delta g_{pa}}{k_B T}\right) = v_{bind} EC_{bind} \exp\left(\frac{-H_{bind}}{k_B T}\right) \quad (C.25)$$

Each term in the interstitial tracer diffusion coefficient expression in Eq. C.20 has been defined and can now be partitioned into Arrhenius form with a pre-exponential factor, D_{0A}^B and activation energy, Q_A^B , given by

$$D_{0A}^B = \frac{2}{3} a^2 f_B v_{bind} EC_{bind} v_{mig}^{TS_I-OL_I} EC_{mig}^{TS_I-OL_I} \exp\left(\frac{S_{If}}{k_B}\right) \quad (C.26)$$

$$Q_A^B = \Delta H_{mig}^{TS_I-OL_I} + H_{If} + H_{bind} \quad (C.27)$$

The expression for the interstitial solute tracer diffusion coefficient is identical to that of the vacancy solute tracer diffusion coefficient except for the factor of 2/3 in front. The factor of 2/3 comes from the fact that there are 8 nearest-neighbors oriented properly for diffusion (a-type) out of the total 12 nearest-neighbors. The coupling of neighbors and diffusion reduces the diffusion constant by $8/12 = 2/3$.

To obtain the interstitial self-diffusion coefficient, the solute B is treated as an isotope of species A. In Eq. C.20, we set $\Delta g_{pa}=0$ and all rates to their pure solvent values, w_0 and w_{R0} . The self-diffusion coefficient becomes:

$$D_A^I(0) = \frac{2}{3} a^2 c_I w_0 f_0 \quad (C.28)$$

where,

$$f_0 = \frac{6w_{R0} + 5w_0}{6w_{R0} + 11w_0} \quad (C.29)$$

and w_{R0} and w_0 are given in Eqs. C.22 and C.23.

The interstitial tracer self-diffusion coefficient expression partitioned into Arrhenius form yields a pre-exponential factor, D_{0A}^A and activation energy, Q_A^A , with expressions

$$D_{0A}^A = \frac{2}{3} a^2 f_0 v_{mig}^{TS_0-OL_0} EC_{mig}^{TS_0-OL_0} \exp\left(\frac{S_{If}}{k_B}\right) \quad (C.30)$$

$$Q_A^A = \Delta H_{mig}^{TS_0-OL_0} + H_{If} \quad (C.31)$$

Again, the expression for interstitial self-diffusion coefficient is identical to that of the vacancy self-diffusion coefficient except for the factor of 2/3.

Similar to the case of vacancy, we can define an interstitial wind G_I by the relations:

$$L_{IB} = L_{AB} + L_{BB} = L_{BB}(G_I + 1); G_I = \frac{L_{AB}}{L_{BB}} \quad (C.32)$$

For the vacancy case $G < -1$ ($L_{vB} > 0$) implies that the vacancy will drag the solute along with it. For the interstitial case, it is also useful to consider the region of G_I near -1. $G_I > -1$ ($L_{IB} > 0$) implies that the solute moves with the interstitial flux and $G_I < -1$ ($L_{IB} < 0$) implies that the solute moves opposite the interstitial flux. It is this latter case that would be considered unusual, analogous to the occurrence of vacancy drag, as the solute would be moving opposite the direction expected for a single component system with interstitial mediated transport. Based on equations B.15 and B.16 it can be seen that, within the models used in this work, $G_I \geq 0$ and the solutes flux will be in the same direction as the interstitial flux.

3.6.4 APPENDIX D : Thermokinetic data obtained by first principles

Each contribution to the diffusion equation expressions (except where stated explicitly) is calculated using *ab initio* methods. However, there are 17 different hop types for the multi-frequency models being applied here (see Figs. B.1 and B.2 for hop types). In order to keep the number of calculations practical and consistent with the multi-frequency models, a few approximations must be made. For each hop the barrier is calculated explicitly. However, only approximate contributions from the excitations will be included. The primary approximation is to assume that the excitations are dependent on the hopping species only and independent of local configuration. This approximation implies that in calculating the Ni-Cr or Ni-Fe vacancy tracer diffusion coefficients, any Ni hop will be treated as a w_0 -type Ni hop for all contributions except the migration barriers. For example, the vibrational frequencies at TS_1 and TS_3 are all assumed to be equal to TS_0 . Recall that OL_i and TS_i refer to the state with the hopping atom in its on lattice or transition state position associated with hopping event i in Fig. B.1. The migration barrier will make up the dominant contribution for differences in hopping rates and the migrating species type should capture the main effect of the excitations. The states that are treated explicitly for all excitations, *i.e.*, for which the excitation contributions are calculated from *ab initio* methods, are listed in Table D.I for Ni-Cr or Ni-Fe. All other states are treated as equivalent to one of the states that are treated explicitly, as discussed above. The OL_2 and OL_∞ states are needed to calculate the binding energies of vacancies and solutes (the ∞ state refers to the case where the vacancy and solute are infinitely far apart).

For interstitial diffusion, an analogous approximation to that of the vacancy case would be to consider the excitations of every Ni hop as a w_0 hop for the interstitials. Again, the migration barriers for each type of hop are treated explicitly since they will make the largest contribution to the rate expression. The explicit treatment of excitations associated with dumbbell rotations are neglected because, as will be seen later, the rotation barrier is prohibitively high compared to the other possible events. This high barrier drives the rate of rotation events to zero and any contribution from excitations would become insignificant. The TS state of a Ni-Ni rotation is treated as a w_0 hop and a Ni-Cr/Fe rotation as a w_l Cr or Fe hop. The states that will be treated explicitly for all excitations are listed in Table D.II for Ni-Cr or Ni-Fe. The OL_2' and OL_∞ states are needed to calculate the binding energies of a-type dumbbells.

3.6.4.1 Lattice parameter

The lattice parameter for pure Ni has been experimentally measured at room temperature to be 0.35238 nm [28] and 0.35157 nm at 50 K [67]. The *ab initio* calculated value in this work is 0.35239 nm, which is considered to be at 0 K. Since the models are appropriate when there is only a dilute amount of solute present ($\sim 1\%$ or less), the pure Ni lattice constant is used for all tracer diffusion calculations. The *ab initio* calculated lattice parameter value will be used in order to be consistent with the other *ab initio* determined values.

3.6.4.2 Electronic Contributions

In order to determine the electronic contributions, F_{elec} , in Eq. A.3, the density of states at the Fermi energy is needed for each configuration. Table D.III displays the density of states (DOS) at the Fermi energy, $n(\epsilon_F)$, for pure Ni and solute cases at the TS, OL and ∞ state for both interstitials and vacancies. The OL state has a solute atom as a first nearest-neighbor to a vacancy or an a-type first nearest-neighbor to an interstitial dumbbell. In the case of pure Ni, the OL and ∞ states are indistinguishable from each other. The DOS difference is taken and to calculate the electronic contribution associated with migration and binding. Recall that the DOS at the Fermi energy, $n(\epsilon_F)$ is related to EC_{mig} and EC_{bind} as stated in Eqs. D.1 and D.2.

$$EC_{mig} = \exp\left(\frac{\pi^2}{6} k_B T (n^{TS}(\epsilon_F) - n^{OL}(\epsilon_F))\right) \quad (D.1)$$

$$EC_{bind} = \exp\left(\frac{\pi^2}{6} k_B T (n^{OL}(\epsilon_F) - n^{\infty}(\epsilon_F))\right) \quad (D.2)$$

EC_{mig} and EC_{bind} are temperature dependent quantities and their impact on the hopping rate can be significant. The electronic contributions due to migration and binding will be included in the rate expression as a function of temperature.

3.6.4.3 Vibrational Contributions

The vibrational contributions of migration have been calculated using a local harmonic approximation [68]. A Hessian matrix is constructed and diagonalized to obtain frequencies, ν_j , for the OL and TS configurations. For a complete model the full dynamical matrix should be determined for the different states. However, an approximation that treats only the atom directly involved in the relevant processes is used here. For vacancies a single atom is displaced 0.01 angstroms along each of the Cartesian coordinates to determine the second derivatives of energy with respect to atomic position. In the OL state, a Ni or solute atom as a first nearest-neighbor to a vacancy is displaced. At the transition state, the hopping atom is displaced. The TS has one negative eigenvalue of the Hessian matrix, corresponding to an imaginary frequency. The ratio of the products of the real frequencies at the OL and TS are used to determine the vibrational migration contribution, also known as the attempt frequency, which is given by Eq. D.3 (where N is the number of atoms displaced, which is one in this case).

$$\nu_{mig} = \frac{\prod_{j=1}^{3N} \nu_j^{OL}}{\prod_{j=1}^{3N-1} \nu_j^{TS}} \quad (D.3)$$

This approach of treating vibrations locally has often been used for the diffusion of light atoms in a matrix of heavier atoms [69-71], where the mass difference helps make the local approach accurate. This method is used in this work to provide only approximate attempt frequencies since Ni, Cr and Fe are of similar mass. The attempt frequencies of vacancy-

atom exchange for Ni, Cr and Fe migrating in a Ni host are calculated to be 4.48, 4.92 and 4.14 THz, respectively. These values are summarized in Table I.

For the interstitial dumbbell migration, it was not possible to obtain an imaginary frequency at the TS by displacing a single atom. This is due to the fact that the dumbbell hop is a cooperative motion between three atoms and many more are displaced in the process. Therefore, an analogous equation to D.3 for the attempt frequency for interstitials has not been constructed and instead the interstitial attempt frequencies are estimated as follows. Compared to vacancy hopping, the interstitial migration barriers are lower and the distances traveled during a migration event are shorter. These two effects contribute opposite changes in the curvature of the energy surface as compared to a vacancy. Therefore, as a first approximation, the attempt frequencies to hop a given species by the vacancy mechanism will be used for the interstitial attempt frequencies for that species as well.

The vibrational contributions due to binding are also calculated using the local harmonic approximation. A single atom is displaced along each of the Cartesian coordinates to determine the second derivative of energy with respect to atomic positions. The values are determined by comparing the frequencies of a solute atom as a first nearest-neighbor to the defect and in pure solvent with no defect present (to simulate the ∞ state).

$$v_{bind} = \frac{\prod_{3N} v^{\infty}}{\prod_{3N} v^{OL}} \quad (D.4)$$

Values of v_{bind} are unitless because both states are normal lattice sites, not transition states, and they have the same number of frequencies. The values for Cr and Fe solutes in Ni are 1.25 and 1.29, respectively. The vibrational contributions due to binding for the interstitial dumbbells were not calculated due to problems obtaining converged values, which seemed to require a very large number of atoms around the interstitial. A value of unity is used for vibrational contributions to interstitial binding in the diffusion coefficient calculations.

3.6.4.4 Defect concentration parameters

In order to calculate the concentration of thermally created interstitial and vacancy defects the entropy and enthalpy of formation must be determined. The entropy of formation for a single vacancy or interstitial can be expressed in the harmonic approximation by:

$$S_i^f = k_B \sum_{\alpha=1}^{3N} \ln \left(\frac{v_{\alpha}^0}{v_{\alpha}} \right) = k_B \ln \left(\frac{\prod_{\alpha=1}^{3N} v_{\alpha}^0}{\prod_{\alpha=1}^{3N} v_{\alpha}} \right) \quad (D.5)$$

where, v_{α}^0 are the eigenfrequencies of the ideal lattice and v_{α} are those of the defected lattice. Note that Eq. D.5 is the classical high temperature limit but is applied to zero-temperature defect calculation following standard practices [32,72]. Equation D.5 is generally assumed to be accurate for the Debye temperature and above. The *ab initio* result

for the vacancy formation entropy is $1.82 k_B$, which is converged for temperatures above 100 K in the classical high temperature limit. The interstitial formation entropy was not calculated in this work but a value has been previously reported in the literature. Debiaggi *et al.* [32] have calculated the formation entropy of a <100> type interstitial in pure Ni at 0 K to be $12.7 k_B$ using EAM potentials and the harmonic approximation. This value will be used in the calculation of interstitial diffusion coefficients to be consistent with other harmonic approximations used in this work.

The defect formation enthalpy is calculated in pure Ni by comparing the energy of a cell containing the defect to that of an undefected cell (scaled to conserve the appropriate number of atoms). The *ab initio* vacancy and interstitial formation enthalpies are calculated using both the generalized gradient approximation (GGA) and the local density approximation (LDA).

The Authors are unaware of any existing experimental values reported for H_f in Ni. Other calculated results for the formation enthalpy of a <100> interstitial in pure Ni range from 4.08 eV to 5.58 eV using pair potentials and EAM potentials [32,73--76]. The *ab initio* results are 4.07 eV for GGA and 4.60 eV for LDA .

The enthalpy of vacancy formation, H_{vf} in pure Ni has been measured experimentally. The experimental observations tend to fall into two groups, one around 1.5-1.6 eV and another around 1.7-1.8 eV (see ref. [28] for a summary). Most measurements are performed using positron annihilation spectroscopy with various techniques of determining the vacancy formation enthalpy. Other values are reported from resistivity quenching measurements. Smedskjaer *et al.* [77] suggest that the discrepancy between the different experimental results could be due to uncontrolled metallurgical variables such as positron interactions with impurities or dislocations present in the sample. In light of the work by Smedskjaer *et al.*, the commonly suggested experimental value is 1.79 ± 0.05 eV [28].

The *ab initio* results for vacancy formation enthalpies are 1.43 eV for GGA and 1.65 eV for LDA. An EAM potentials calculation of H_{vf} in Ni resulted in a value of 1.63 eV [76]. The significant disparity between the GGA *ab initio* value and the experimental value for the vacancy formation energies is well known and likely due to surface effects, a problem that has been studied in detail by Mattson *et al.* [78] and Carling *et al.* [79]. It is known that the LDA parameterization for the exchange-correlation energy minimizes these surface effects and better predicts vacancy formation energies. The LDA vacancy formation energy will therefore be used for a low temperature value to provide as accurate an *ab initio* value as possible. For the interstitial formation energy we will use the GGA value since interstitials do not create effective surfaces like vacancies and therefore should not have the same errors. All other *ab initio* parameters are calculated using GGA.

3.6.4.5 Migration Barrier Contributions

The migration barriers typically make the largest contribution to differences in diffusion coefficients due to the exponential dependence of diffusion on migration barriers. For this reason, the migration/rotation barriers are treated explicitly for all hops.

In the five-frequency model any associative or dissociative jump is assigned to the w_4 or w_3 rate, respectively. Since there are associative and dissociative jumps to and from the 2nd, 3rd and 4th nearest-neighbor positions, each with their own barrier, an effective rate is assigned to the associative and dissociative events. The effective rate is weighted by the number of pathways to each nearest-neighbor distance. Table D.IV contains the nearest-neighbor position, distance, multiplicity and different barriers for each distinct associative and dissociative pathway in the Ni-Cr and Ni-Fe system.

The separate w_3 and w_4 rates are each replaced with a single effective rate for application in the five-frequency model framework. An effective rate for the w_3 and w_4 events are calculated based on the discussion of KMC rate constants by Voter [80]. First consider dissociation (w_3). There are 7 pathways for vacancy-solute dissociation, two to the 2nd nearest-neighbors, four to the 3rd nearest-neighbors and one to the 4th nearest-neighbors. The effective rate, w_3^{eff} , is determined by assigning the same rate to the 7 dissociation pathways, which equals the sum of the rates for the 3 distinct dissociation pathways as shown in Eq. D.6.

$$7w_3^{eff} = 2w_3^{2nn} + 4w_3^{3nn} + w_3^{4nn} \quad (D.6)$$

This effective rate still maintains the total escape rate of the vacancy, w_{tot} , but by combining the dissociation events into a single rate allows for use in the five-frequency model. The total rate of escape is given by Eq. D.7.

$$w_{tot} = 4w_1 + w_2 + 2w_3^{2nn} + 4w_3^{3nn} + w_3^{4nn} = 4w_1 + w_2 + 7w_3^{eff} \quad (D.7)$$

The same approach can be used to determine an effective rate of association as well.

$$7w_4^{eff} = 2w_4^{2nn} + 4w_4^{3nn} + w_4^{4nn} \quad (D.8)$$

Table D.V presents the migration barriers associated with the various frequencies for the vacancy tracer diffusion model. Note that we no longer explicitly write w^{eff} for effective rates but it is assumed that for any case with multiple hops a single effective rate is used. Table D.V shows that the effective migration barrier for the w_3 and w_4 jumps would have been well approximated by the barriers of the most frequent pathway, the 3rd nearest-neighbor w_3^{3nn} and w_4^{3nn} , presented in Table D.IV.

Table D.VI presents the migration/rotation barriers associated with the various rates needed to obtain the phenomenological coefficient of the interstitial model. Only a subset is needed to calculate tracer diffusion coefficients but all are given here for completeness. Note that the w'_2 barrier for Ni-Cr (hop from a-type first nearest neighbor Cr to a Ni-Cr mixed dumbbell) is given as zero. There is essentially no barrier for this event, meaning that, any Ni-Ni dumbbell that becomes an a-type neighbor to a Cr atom would immediately collapse into a mixed dumbbell. The w_1 hop, which migrates from one a-type configuration to another, is therefore unstable in the Ni-Cr alloy and collapses into a mixed Ni-Cr dumbbell before it reaches the neighboring a-type site. Therefore, since the w_1 hop is not a viable pathway in the Ni-Cr alloy, it is assigned a barrier of ∞ , corresponding to a rate of 0.

The diffusion models by Barbu [14] and Allnatt *et al.* [13] assume the associative and dissociative jumps, w_4 and w_3 , respectively, to be between a first nearest-neighbor and a third nearest-neighbor (see Fig. B.2). The third nearest-neighbor has the highest multiplicity for interstitial association and dissociation. In the vacancy case the jump type with the highest multiplicity served as a good approximation for the effective rate. Therefore, for the interstitial case, the associative and dissociative jump barriers are approximated with the barriers between first and third nearest-neighbors and are given in Table D.VI.

3.6.4.6 Binding Enthalpy

The solute-defect binding enthalpies are calculated using what is sometimes called the indirect method. The indirect method calculates the binding energy with four different *ab initio* calculations where the energy of the defect and solute atom are subtracted separately from the energy of the system where they interact as first nearest-neighbors, and the method is described in detail in Refs. [81,82]. In this definition of binding enthalpy, a negative value denotes binding.

The binding enthalpy is shown in Fig. D.1 for both Cr and Fe solutes as a function of nearest-neighbor distance from the vacancy. Note that most solute-vacancy interactions are repulsive but in general all interactions are relatively weak and comparable to thermal energies even at room temperature. The first nearest-neighbor solute-vacancy binding enthalpies are 0.5 eV for Cr and 0.2 eV for Fe (see Table I). From Fig. D.1, it can be seen that the binding energy becomes quite small for the 5th and 6th nearest neighbor but the 2nd, 3rd and 4th nearest-neighbors, which contribute to the effective rate, still have some interaction energy with the solute.

The binding enthalpies of solutes and interstitial dumbbells are also calculated using the indirect method. Figure D.2 shows that there is significant binding between Cr and the interstitial in the mixed and first nearest-neighbor configurations. The a-type first nearest-neighbor solute-enthalpies binding enthalpies are used in calculating the diffusion coefficients. The binding between Cr and the interstitial is strong, with a value of -0.18 eV, and Fe-interstitial binding is weak, with a value of -0.01 eV for Fe (see Table I).

3.7 Figures and Tables

FIG. 1. Ni self-diffusion coefficients [24,27].

NERI Final Report
Ab initio Based Modeling of Radiation Effects in Multi-Component Alloys
 Project No. 06-006, Final Scientific/Technical Report

FIG. 2. Cr in Ni tracer diffusion coefficients [24,25,30].

NERI Final Report
Ab initio Based Modeling of Radiation Effects in Multi-Component Alloys
 Project No. 06-006, Final Scientific/Technical Report

FIG. 3. Fe in Ni tracer diffusion coefficients [24,25,27].

NERI Final Report
Ab initio Based Modeling of Radiation Effects in Multi-Component Alloys
 Project No. 06-006, Final Scientific/Technical Report

FIG. 4. *Ab initio* and averaged experimental Ni, Cr and Fe tracer diffusion coefficients in Ni [27,30].

FIG. 5. Temperature dependence of the *ab initio* $D_0(T)$ for vacancy tracer diffusion.

FIG. 6. Ratios of tracer diffusion coefficients a) Cr/Ni b) Fe/Ni c) Cr/Fe with experimental data from Million [27] and Ruzickova [30].

FIG. 7. Ratio of Arrhenius fit and *ab initio* diffusion coefficients for Ni, Cr and Fe diffusion coefficients for vacancy diffusion.

FIG.8. Vacancy wind for Ni-Cr and Ni-Fe.

FIG. 9. *Ab initio* Ni, Cr and Fe interstitial and vacancy tracer diffusion in Ni.

FIG. 10. Thermal concentrations of vacancies and interstitials.

FIG. 11. Ratios of interstitial tracer diffusion coefficients Cr/Ni, Cr/Fe and Fe/Ni.

FIG. 12. Temperature dependence of the *ab initio* D_0 for interstitial tracer diffusion.

FIG. 13. Temperature dependent terms in D_0 for interstitial tracer diffusion.

FIG. 14. Ratio of Arrhenius fit and *ab initio* diffusion coefficients for Ni, Cr and Fe diffusion coefficients for interstitial diffusion.

FIG. B.1. Illustration of five-frequency model.

FIG. B.2. Illustration of different interstitial hopping events.

FIG. C.1. a) OL₀ and TS₀ states for an interstitial migration event in pure solvent and b) OL_{R0} and TS_{R0} for a w_{R0} type (see Fig. B.2) interstitial rotation event in pure solvent

FIG. D.1. Solute-vacancy binding enthalpy vs. nearest neighbor position.

FIG. D.2. Solute-interstitial binding energy vs. nearest neighbor position.

NERI Final Report
Ab initio Based Modeling of Radiation Effects in Multi-Component Alloys
 Project No. 06-006, Final Scientific/Technical Report

TABLE I. Parameters for vacancy mediated tracer diffusion.

Ni Parameters		
Parameter	Value	Units
a	0.35239	nm
S_{vf}	1.82	k_B
H_{vf}	1.65	eV
$\nu_{mig} Ni$	4.48×10^{12}	Hz
Ni DOS (TS-OL)	-0.66	states/eV/cell
$\Delta H_{mig} w_0$	1.09	eV
Cr in Ni Parameters		
$\nu_{mig} Cr$	4.92×10^{12}	Hz
Cr DOS(TS-OL)	0.61	states/eV/cell
$H_{bind} Crv$	0.05	eV
$\nu_{bind} Crv$	1.25	N/A
Cr DOS(OL- ∞)	0.76	states/eV/cell
$\Delta H_{mig} w_1$	0.98	eV
$\Delta H_{mig} w_2$	0.83	eV
$\Delta H_{mig} w_3$	1.04	eV
$\Delta H_{mig} w_4$	1.06	eV
Fe in Ni Parameters		
$\nu_{mig} Fe$	4.14×10^{12}	Hz
Fe DOS (TS-OL)	-0.43	states/eV/cell
$H_{bind} Fev$	0.02	eV
$\nu_{bind} Fev$	1.29	N/A
Fe DOS (OL- ∞)	0.44	states/eV/cell
$\Delta H_m w_1$	1.13	eV
$\Delta H_m w_2$	0.97	eV
$\Delta H_{mig} w_3$	1.07	eV
$\Delta H_{mig} w_4$	1.07	eV

NERI Final Report
Ab initio Based Modeling of Radiation Effects in Multi-Component Alloys
 Project No. 06-006, Final Scientific/Technical Report

TABLE II. *Ab initio* values and adjusted values required to match *ab initio* and experimental Ni self-diffusion values.

Parameter	<i>Ab initio</i> value	Value needed to fit experiment
S_{vf} (k _B)	1.82	4.72
H_{vf} (eV)	1.65	1.24
H_{mig} (eV)	1.09	0.67
ν_{mig} (Hz)	4.48×10^{12}	8.25×10^{13}
Ni DOS (TS-OL) (states/eV/cell)	-0.66	11.80
EC_{mig}	0.86	15.80

NERI Final Report
Ab initio Based Modeling of Radiation Effects in Multi-Component Alloys
 Project No. 06-006, Final Scientific/Technical Report

TABLE III. Arrhenius fit of *ab initio* and experimental data averaged over 1250-1650 K.

Tracer Species	D_0 (m ² /s) <i>ab initio</i> <i>Arrhenius</i> <i>fit</i>	D_0 (m ² /s) S_{vf} <i>fit</i> <i>Arrhenius fit</i>	D_0 (m ² /s) Averaged exp.[27,30]		Q (eV) <i>ab initio</i> <i>Arrhenius</i> <i>fit</i>	Q (eV) S_{vf} <i>fit</i> <i>Arrhenius fit</i>	Q (eV) Averaged exp.[27,30]
Ni	2.03×10^{-6}	1.00×10^{-4}	1.85×10^{-4}	$+ 0.76 \times 10^{-4}$ $- 0.53 \times 10^{-4}$	2.72	2.86	2.95 ± 0.08
Cr	4.52×10^{-6}	2.23×10^{-4}	2.26×10^{-4}	$+ 2.56 \times 10^{-4}$ $- 1.20 \times 10^{-4}$	2.64	2.78	2.89 ± 0.09
Fe	5.18×10^{-6}	2.56×10^{-4}	4.14×10^{-4}	$+ 4.0 \times 10^{-4}$ $- 2.0 \times 10^{-4}$	2.71	2.85	2.98 ± 0.09

NERI Final Report
Ab initio Based Modeling of Radiation Effects in Multi-Component Alloys
 Project No. 06-006, Final Scientific/Technical Report

TABLE IV. Parameters for interstitial mediated tracer diffusion in Ni.

Ni Parameters		
Parameter	Value	Units
a	0.35239	nm
S_{if}^*	12.7	k_B
H_{if}	4.07	eV
$\nu_{mig} Ni$	4.48×10^{12}	Hz
Ni DOS(TS-OL)	-0.36	states/eV/cell
$\Delta H_{mig} w_0$	0.14	eV
$\Delta H_{mig} w_{R0}$	0.92	eV
Cr in Ni Parameters		
$\nu_{mig} Cr$	4.92×10^{12}	Hz
Cr DOS(TS-OL)	-0.77	states/eV/cell
$H_{bind} Cr$	-0.18	eV
$\nu_{bind} Cr$	1.00	N/A
Cr DOS (OL- ∞)	2.07	states/eV/cell
$\Delta H_{mig} w_I$	0.08	eV
$\Delta H_{mig} w_R$	0.75	eV
$\Delta H_{mig} w_2$	0.31	eV
$\Delta H_{mig} w'_2$	0	eV
$\Delta H_{mig} w_3$	0.26	eV
$\Delta H_{mig} w_4$	0.15	eV
Fe in Ni Parameters		
$\nu_{mig} Fe$	4.14×10^{12}	Hz
Fe DOS (TS-OL)	2.09	states/eV/cell
$H_{bind} Fe$	-0.01	eV
$\nu_{bind} Fe$	1.00	N/A
Fe DOS (OL- ∞)	-7.13	states/eV/cell
$\Delta H_{mig} w_I$	0.11	eV
$\Delta H_{mig} w_R$	0.87	eV
$\Delta H_{mig} w_2$	0.15	eV
$\Delta H_{mig} w'_2$	0.2	eV
$\Delta H_{mig} w_3$	0.14	eV
$\Delta H_{mig} w_4$	0.2	eV

*From ref. [32]

NERI Final Report
Ab initio Based Modeling of Radiation Effects in Multi-Component Alloys
 Project No. 06-006, Final Scientific/Technical Report

TABLE V. *Ab initio* pre-exponential factors and activation energy for interstitial and vacancy diffusion.

Tracer Species	D_0 (m ² /s)	D_0 (m ² /s)	Q (eV)	Q (eV)
	<i>Interstitial</i>	<i>Vacancy</i>	<i>Interstitial</i>	<i>Vacancy</i>
	<i>Arrhenius fit</i>	<i>Arrhenius fit</i>	<i>Arrhenius fit</i>	<i>Arrhenius fit</i>
Cr	1.10×10^{-2}	4.52×10^{-6}	3.89	2.64
Fe	1.02×10^{-1}	5.18×10^{-6}	4.28	2.71
Ni	4.81×10^{-2}	2.03×10^{-6}	4.20	2.72

Table D.I. States treated explicitly to calculate vacancy tracer diffusion coefficients.

On Lattice States	Transition States
OL ₀ Pure Ni with vacancy	TS ₀ Ni hop
OL ₂ Cr/Fe next to vacancy	TS ₂ Cr/ Fe hop
OL _∞ Vacancy with Cr/Fe far	

NERI Final Report
Ab initio Based Modeling of Radiation Effects in Multi-Component Alloys
 Project No. 06-006, Final Scientific/Technical Report

Table D.II. States treated explicitly to calculate interstitial tracer diffusion coefficients.

On Lattice States	Transition States
OL ₀ Ni-Ni <100>	TS ₀ Ni hop
OL ₁ Ni-Cr or Fe mixed <100>	TS ₁ Cr or Fe hop
OL ₂ ,	
OL _∞	

NERI Final Report
Ab initio Based Modeling of Radiation Effects in Multi-Component Alloys
 Project No. 06-006, Final Scientific/Technical Report

TABLE D.III. DOS (number states/eV per cell) for electronic contribution to the rate equation.

Material	DOS (TS)	DOS (OL)	DOS (∞)	DOS (TS-OL)	DOS (OL- ∞)
$^{107}\text{Ni} + \text{v}$	198.64	199.30	199.30	-0.66	0.00
$^{106}\text{Ni}^1\text{Fe} + \text{v}$	196.15	195.55	194.78	0.61	0.76
$^{106}\text{Ni}^1\text{Cr} + \text{v}$	200.93	201.36	200.93	-0.43	0.44
^{109}Ni w/int	209.15	209.51	209.51	-0.36	0.00
$^{108}\text{Ni}^1\text{Fe}$ w/int	206.09	206.85	204.79	-0.77	2.07
$^{108}\text{Ni}^1\text{Cr}$ w/int	206.88	204.79	211.92	2.09	-7.13

NERI Final Report
Ab initio Based Modeling of Radiation Effects in Multi-Component Alloys
 Project No. 06-006, Final Scientific/Technical Report

Table D.IV. Migration barrier of associative and dissociative jumps.

Jump Type	Nearest Neighbor Position	Distance from Solute (nm)	Multiplicity	Ni-Cr Migration Barrier (eV)	Ni-Fe Migration Barrier (eV)
w_3^{2nn}	2	0.351	2	1.02	1.07
w_3^{3nn}	3	0.430	4	1.04	1.08
w_3^{4nn}	4	0.496	1	1.04	1.05
w_4^{2nn}	2	0.351	2	1.05	1.07
w_4^{3nn}	3	0.430	4	1.06	1.07
w_4^{4nn}	4	0.496	1	1.14	1.11

NERI Final Report
Ab initio Based Modeling of Radiation Effects in Multi-Component Alloys
 Project No. 06-006, Final Scientific/Technical Report

TABLE D.V Five–frequency model for vacancy diffusion in Ni-Cr and Ni-Fe.

Jump Type	Ni-Cr Migration Barrier (eV)	Ni-Fe Migration Barrier (eV)
w_0	1.09	1.09
w_1	0.98	1.13
w_2	0.83	0.97
w_3	1.04*	1.07*
w_4	1.06*	1.07*

* Denotes an effective barrier

NERI Final Report
Ab initio Based Modeling of Radiation Effects in Multi-Component Alloys
 Project No. 06-006, Final Scientific/Technical Report

TABLE D.VI. Barriers for <100> interstitial model for tracer diffusion in Ni-Cr and Ni-Fe.

Jump type	Ni-Cr Migration/Rotation Barrier (eV)	Ni-Fe Migration/Rotation Barrier (eV)
w_0	0.14	0.14
w_{R0}	0.92	0.92
w_I	0.08	0.11
w_R	0.75	0.87
w_l	∞ (this state is not stable so the path through it is removed with an infinite barrier)	0.16
w'_1	0.16	0.15
w_2	0.31	0.15
w'_2	0.00	0.20
w_3	0.26	0.14
w_4	0.15	0.20
w'_3	0.21	0.17
w'_4	0.10	0.15

4 Concentrated alloy results for Ni-Cr

This section describes our work to extend the modeling from Sec. 3 to concentrated alloys. As discussed in Sec. 3, dilute models allow analytic expressions (multifrequency models) for kinetic coefficients in terms of *ab initio* parameters. However, such analytic expressions are not available for general concentrated alloys and here we explore a more general approach that makes use of cluster expansions and kinetic Monte Carlo (kMC) methods. The approach is as follows. *Ab initio* energetics are used to find hopping rates, just as in Sec. 3. However, now the hopping rate migration (or activation) energies are dependent on local chemical environment in a complex manner that must be represented in a useful form. The local environment dependence is modeled using a technique called the cluster expansion, which allows a compact Ising like effective Hamiltonian to be written to describe the activation energies. It should be noted that to describe the activation energies one must also be able to describe the on-lattice energies of the Ni, Cr, and vacancies interacting with each other. This requires multiple cluster expansions, including on-lattice Ni-Cr, on-lattice Ni-Cr-Va, and activated state energies. In order to time evolve the system it is necessary to use a numerical method, as the local environment dependent barriers make analytical treatment of the kinetics of the system intractable. The system is time evolved using kinetic Monte Carlo, from which the phenomenological coefficients (L_{ij}) can be extracted. The diffusion coefficients can be written in terms of the L_{ij} and a thermodynamic factor, which can be found from the on-lattice cluster expansions and standard (i.e., not kinetic) Monte Carlo. The details of this approach are worked out in Refs [83-87]. The Monte Carlo simulations were performed with the CASM code . This code was primarily developed by Prof. Van der Ven at University of Michigan with some contributions from personnel on this grant. A schematic of the approach for calculating diffusion coefficients in a concentrated alloy is shown in Figure 15.

4.1 The on-lattice cluster expansion and phase diagram

The on-lattice cluster expansion develops a Hamiltonian of effective cluster interactions (ECI) for Ni-Cr interactions on the fcc lattice. The ECI are fit to *ab initio* energies. The *ab initio* convex hull is shown in Figure 16. The *ab initio* values predict the correct stable phases, including fcc Ni, bcc Cr, and the MoPt₂ phase for Ni₂Cr. We have performed a cluster expansion of the Ni-Cr energies shown in Figure 16. Only Ni_{1-x}Cr_x alloys with stoichiometry $x \leq 0.5$ are considered as higher Cr content are not stable. We obtained a root mean square (RMS) error between *ab initio* and cluster expansion energies of 23 meV/atom, and a leave-one-out cross validation (CV) score of 39 meV/atom. The CV score is determined by fitting all the data except one data point and predicting that data point, and then taking the RMS error in those predictions of left-out data points compared to true values. The CV score is therefore a measure of the predictive ability of the cluster expansion. The standard deviation (σ) of the formation energies is 42 meV/atom. The fraction error of CV/ σ is therefore 0.93. This error too large for the cluster expansion to provide quantitative modeling, but the cluster expansion is including many of the key energetics and yields the correct convex hull. The significant errors in the cluster

expansion may be due to magnetic effects between Ni and Cr and the relaxations associated with the desire of Cr to be bcc that are not easily represented by the cluster expansion.

The cluster expansion was combined with Monte Carlo simulation and thermodynamic integration to predict the phase diagram for Ni-Cr in the Ni rich region. The result is shown in Figure 17. The phase diagram looks similar to that observed in experiment [88] but has some important differences. First, the model yields a higher transition temperature to ordering in the MoPt₂ structure (our prediction is about 1100K vs. 863K from experiment). This difference is not uncommon in cluster expansion results and can arise from quite small differences in energy. In order to produce an optimal cluster expansion we will simply rescale all the interactions down to match the experimental ordering temperature. Another interesting feature is that our phase diagram has a wider two-phase region for higher temperatures than in experiment. The source of this difference is not clear at this time but it is actually the model predicted shape that looks the most reasonable. Finally, the model predicted phase diagram predicts a very wide two-phase region for temperatures below about 830 K. While the exact shape of this wide region is model dependent the formation of a very wide two-phase region at low temperature is required by thermodynamics. This wide region has not been seen experimentally but this is presumably due to the lack of any low-temperature phase stability data.

Now that the on-lattice energetics has been discussed the vacancy energetics will be considered.

4.2 The vacancy cluster expansion

In order to model alloy kinetics it is necessary to know how the vacancies interact with the host Ni-Cr alloy. These interactions impact the migration energetics (e.g., through vacancy-solute binding) and determine the vacancy concentration (through determining the vacancy formation energy). We have fit the vacancy formation energy with the cluster expansion. Through using the occupation basis formalism [84, 89] and Ni as the reference element the vacancy energetics can be written entirely in terms of a constant null term, a vacancy and Cr point term, and Va-Cr interactions. The cluster expansion vs. *ab initio* vacancy formation energies are shown in Figure 18. These values are all referenced to the *ab initio* Ni vacancy formation energy, which is 1.65 eV. Only local environments of up to 4 Cr atoms are included as these are the most common to occur for realistic Cr concentrations ($x < 0.2$ in Ni_{1-x}Cr_x). The positive values show that Cr has a repulsive interaction with vacancies, which will reduce the overall vacancy concentration with addition of Cr and cause vacancies to avoid Cr locally, somewhat slowing its vacancy mediated diffusion. The cluster expansion yields an RMS of 37 meV/Vac using 3 ECI, compared to a standard deviation of 76 meV/Vac. Additional ECI did not seem to provide a significantly improved fit. This is a quite large error, again suggesting that large relaxations or complex magnetic effects may be playing a role. Given the size of the RMS error no CV score was determined. However, the vacancy cluster expansion clearly reproduces the general trends of the *ab initio* numbers, and in particular, captures the low-energy structures the most accurately. Accuracy for the low-energy structures is important as these are by far the most prevalent under thermodynamic equilibrium. Given

the good overall trends and accurate low-energy structures, this cluster expansion should yield reasonable predictions for the effects of concentrated Cr on overall vacancy concentration and local vacancy short-range-order with Ni and Cr.

Now that the on-lattice and vacancy energetics has been discussed the activation energetics will be considered.

4.3 **The activated state cluster expansion**

The final energetics necessary to model diffusion energetics in Ni-Cr is a way to represent the changes in migration barriers as a function of local Cr content. The activated state is defined as the state where a Ni or Cr is at the highest energy along a migration hop and has energy E_{act} . The activated state energy can be conveniently represented by the kinetically resolved activation energy (ΔE_{KRA}). ΔE_{KRA} is defined by

$$\Delta E_{KRA} = E_{act} - 0.5(E_i + E_f) \quad (1)$$

where E_i and E_f are the initial and final energies of system before and after the atom hops. The migration barrier, E_{mig} , can be determined from ΔE_{KRA} by

$$E_{mig} = \Delta E_{KRA} + 0.5(E_f - E_i) \quad (2)$$

The values of E_i and E_f for any configuration of Ni, Cr, and vacancies can be found from the cluster expansions described in Secs 4.1-4.2. Therefore, in order to determined migration energies from a cluster expansions all that is needed is an expansion of ΔE_{KRA} . The expansion for ΔE_{KRA} assumed that the changes in migration energy were dependent on only the first two neighbor shells of the activated state. These neighbor shells are shown in Figure 19. The ΔE_{KRA} values for migrating Ni and Cr are shown in

TABLE VI. The cluster expansion can capture how these values change with local environment. Here we focus on Cr migration as it has the largest dependence on local environment, but the Ni migration is treated analogously. The optimal cluster expansion of ΔE_{KRA} for Cr contained 10 ECI (fit to 17 energies) and gave errors of RMS = 34 meV/atom and CV = 176 meV/atom. The standard deviation in the data is about 180 meV/atom. These results demonstrate that the cluster expansion is not robust against leaving out certain structures, which is in part due to the use of 10 ECI to fit only 17 energies (using more like 2-3 times as many energies as ECI is typically necessary for a robust cluster expansion). However, the migration energies require too much computational effort to calculate significantly more than shown here. The predicted vs. *ab initio* ΔE_{KRA} values are shown in Figure 20. The results are quite encouraging, and show that the present set of interactions can represent the ΔE_{KRA} values accurately. It is interesting to note that the ΔE_{KRA} values range over more than 0.6 eV, demonstrating that local Cr environment can have a strong effect on Cr migration energies.

Based on the on-lattice, vacancy, and activated state cluster expansions, it is now possible to calculate diffusion properties of Ni and Cr in the concentrated Ni-Cr alloy.

4.4 **Kinetic Monte Carlo prediction of diffusion**

The cluster expansions just discussed can be combined with Monte Carlo Simulations to predict vacancy concentrations, thermodynamic factors, phenomenological (Onsager) coefficients, and diffusion coefficients for the $\text{Ni}_{1-x}\text{Cr}_x$ alloy for Cr concentrations up to $x \sim 0.3$. These calculations are still running but we have performed a preliminary study to obtain tracer diffusion coefficients for the concentrated alloy. The results discussed here will change when the final cluster expansions are used but we expect the present preliminary results are close to the final answer. In Sec. 3.3.1 the tracer diffusion coefficients through a vacancy mechanism for Ni and Cr were derived in the dilute Cr limit. Here we integrated the above cluster expansions and Monte Carlo to derive the tracer diffusion coefficients in the concentrated alloy. The key quantity for determining RIS is the ratio of tracer diffusion values for Cr and Ni, and this ratio is shown as a function of concentration at 1473 K in Figure 21. Note that the dilute value of this ratio (approximately 2.8) differs somewhat from the value obtained in the five frequency analysis (see FIG. 6). This difference is due to the use of a more complex Hamiltonian in the cluster expansion based analysis, which includes longer-range Cr-vacancy interactions and slightly different migration energies. The results in Figure 21 suggest that the ration of tracer diffusion coefficients do not change dramatically with Cr content at high-temperatures. However, even the 30% increase in the ratio observed here could have an impact on RIS, and would lead to increased Cr depletion at grain boundaries with increasing Cr content. Furthermore, much more dramatic diffusion coefficient changes may occur at lower temperatures. Detailed comparison to experiments will be made when the final data has been analyzed.

4.5 **Summary**

We have combined *ab initio*, cluster expansion and Monte Carlo methods to obtain concentration dependent diffusion coefficients in Ni-Cr as a function of Cr content. Preliminary results show a relatively weak concentration dependence of the ratio of tracer diffusion coefficients at high temperature but the changes are on a scale significant for RIS. Lower temperatures will show more dramatic concentration dependence. We are presently double checking the cluster expansion fits to make sure all the data used in the fits was calculated correctly and consistently. We will then use Monte Carlo to determine the diffusion coefficients vs. concentration, as done in for preliminary data in Figure 21, and expect to obtain similar results. The diffusion coefficients vs. concentration of Cr and temperature will be determined and their implication for RIS will be discussed. This work is presently being completed and a manuscript is in preparation.

4.6 Acknowledgement

The authors would like to acknowledge Anton Van der Ven for helpful detailed discussions and the generous sharing of his CASM code suite for Monte Carlo modeling of diffusion. We gratefully acknowledge financial support from the DOE Nuclear Engineering Research Initiative Program (NERI), award number DE-FC07-06ID14747 and computing support from the National Science Foundation (NSF) National Center for Supercomputing Applications (NCSA), award number DMR060007.

4.7 Appendices – none

4.8 Figures and Tables

Figure 15: Schematic for approach to modeling diffusion coefficients in a concentrated alloy.

NERI Final Report
Ab initio Based Modeling of Radiation Effects in Multi-Component Alloys
Project No. 06-006, Final Scientific/Technical Report

Figure 16: Ni-Cr convex hull from ab initio.

Figure 17: Ni-Cr phase diagram based on Monte Carlo simulation of a cluster expansion Hamiltonian fit to ab initio energies.

Figure 18: Cluster expansion vs. ab initio Ni-Cr vacancy formation energies. Values are referenced to the Ni vacancy formation energy.

Figure 19: Geometry of first two neighbor shells of a vacancy mediated migrating atom in the fcc structure.

Figure 20: Cluster expansion vs. ab initio Cr ΔE_{KRA} values.

Figure 21: Ratio of Cr to Ni tracer diffusion coefficients determined by ab initio based thermokinetic modeling ($T = 1473$ K). Based on preliminary data.

NERI Final Report
Ab initio Based Modeling of Radiation Effects in Multi-Component Alloys
 Project No. 06-006, Final Scientific/Technical Report

TABLE VI. ΔE_{KRA} values for Ni and Cr for different local environments.

Location of Cr atoms in 1nn and 2nn	Ni ΔE_{KRA} (eV)	Cr ΔE_{KRA} (eV)
0 Cr total	(eV)	(eV)
1 Cr total: 1 Cr on 1NN(A)	1.08	0.82
2 Cr total: 2 Cr on 1NN(B,D)	0.98	0.64
2 Cr total: 2 Cr on 1NN(A,B)	1.13	0.84
2 Cr total: 2 Cr on 1NN(A,D)	1.10	0.56
3 Cr total: 3 Cr on 1NN(A,B,C)	1.18	0.93
4 Cr total: 4 Cr on 1NN(A,B,C,D)	1.16	0.70
1Cr total: 1Cr on 2NN(X)	1.28	0.76
2 Cr total: 2Cr on 2NN (X,Z)	1.05	0.82
2 Cr total: 2Cr on 2NN (Y,Z)	1.00	0.88
2 Cr total: 2Cr on 2NN (X,Y)	1.00	1.13
3Cr total: 3Cr on 2NN(X,Y,Z)	1.02	0.50
4Cr total: 4Cr on 2NN (W,X,Y,Z)	0.92	0.96
4 Cr total: 2 Cr on 1NN(A,C) + 2Cr on 2NN (X,Z)	0.85	1.17
4 Cr total: 2 Cr on 1NN(B,D) + 2Cr on 2NN (X,Z)	1.13	0.81
4 Cr total: 2 Cr on 1NN(A,D) + 2Cr on 2NN (X,Y)	1.19	0.77

NERI Final Report
Ab initio Based Modeling of Radiation Effects in Multi-Component Alloys
 Project No. 06-006, Final Scientific/Technical Report

4 Cr total: 3 Cr on 1NN(B) + 1Cr on 2NN (X,Y,W)	1.01	0.65
--	------	------

5 Continuum level RIS modeling

Sections 3 and 4 discussed our work developing models for thermokinetic parameters necessary to model RIS in Ni-Fe-Cr alloys. We have obtained all necessary values for the dilute Fe and Cr limits, and have almost completed a study of the concentrated thermokinetic parameters for vacancy transport in Ni-Cr. In this section we complete our *ab initio* RIS model development through establishing the continuum level transport equation framework needed to model RIS. It is this framework into which the *ab initio* based thermokinetic parameters will be input for RIS modeling. Section 5.1 gives the formalism for the continuum RIS equations, including the flux modeling, and Section 5.2 describes the RIS predictions we have obtained from the continuum model with input parameters from the *ab initio* modeling described in Section 3.

5.1 Rate theory modeling of RIS

5.1.1 Description of the Model

The rate theory RIS model is based on solving the following set of coupled equations to obtain spatial concentration profiles for each of the species in the system: Ni, Cr, single vacancies, and single interstitials.

$$\frac{dC_{Ni}}{dt} = -\frac{dJ_{Ni}}{dx} \quad (1)$$

$$\frac{dC_{Cr}}{dt} = -\frac{dJ_{Cr}}{dx} \quad (2)$$

$$\frac{dC_{vac}}{dt} = G - R_{iv} C_{vac} C_{Int} - \frac{dJ_{vac}}{dx} \quad (3)$$

$$\frac{dC_{Int}}{dt} = G - R_{iv} C_{vac} C_{Int} - \frac{dJ_{Int}}{dx} \quad (4)$$

In the above, C_i is the site fraction of species i , J_i is the flux of species i , R_{iv} is the rate coefficient for recombination of vacancies and interstitials, and G is the production rate of Frenkel pairs. The fluxes J_i are evaluated using the following equations

$$J_{Ni} = -L_{NiNi}^V \frac{d\tilde{\mu}_{NiV}}{dx} - L_{NiCr}^V \frac{d\tilde{\mu}_{CrV}}{dx} - L_{NiNi}^I \frac{d\tilde{\mu}_{NiI}}{dx} - L_{NiCr}^I \frac{d\tilde{\mu}_{CrI}}{dx} \quad (5)$$

$$J_{Cr} = -L_{CrCr}^V \frac{d\tilde{\mu}_{CrV}}{dx} - L_{CrNi}^V \frac{d\tilde{\mu}_{NiV}}{dx} - L_{CrCr}^I \frac{d\tilde{\mu}_{CrI}}{dx} - L_{CrNi}^I \frac{d\tilde{\mu}_{NiI}}{dx} \quad (6)$$

$$J_{vac} = - \left(-L_{NiNi}^V \frac{d\tilde{\mu}_{NiV}}{dx} - L_{NiCr}^V \frac{d\tilde{\mu}_{CrV}}{dx} - L_{CrCr}^V \frac{d\tilde{\mu}_{CrV}}{dx} - L_{CrNi}^V \frac{d\tilde{\mu}_{NiV}}{dx} \right) \quad (7)$$

$$J_{Int} = -L_{NiNi}^I \frac{d\tilde{\mu}_{NiI}}{dx} - L_{NiCr}^I \frac{d\tilde{\mu}_{CrI}}{dx} - L_{CrCr}^I \frac{d\tilde{\mu}_{CrI}}{dx} - L_{CrNi}^I \frac{d\tilde{\mu}_{NiI}}{dx} \quad (8)$$

where L_{ij}^k is the phenomenological coefficient relating the flux of species i to a driving force acting on species j through diffusion of defect species k . The driving forces for diffusion are written here as the gradient in diffusion potentials, defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mu}_{iV} &= \mu_i - \mu_{vac} \\ \tilde{\mu}_{iI} &= \mu_i + \mu_{Int} \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

where μ_i is the chemical potential of species i [90].

We apply the above set of equations to a physical system that consists of a one dimensional, semi-infinite fcc Ni crystal with an ideal free surface on one side, which acts as a sink for the radiation induced vacancies and interstitials. To treat this system numerically, we bin the system by lattice planes and evaluate the site fraction of each species in each lattice plane. The gradients of fluxes and diffusion potentials in Equations (1-8) then become finite difference equations, as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dJ_i^n}{dx} &= - \left[\frac{J_i^{n+1} - J_i^n}{\Delta x} \right] \\ \frac{d\tilde{\mu}_i^n}{dx} &= \left[\frac{\tilde{\mu}_i^n - \tilde{\mu}_i^{n-1}}{\Delta x} \right] \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

where $\tilde{\mu}_i^n$ is the diffusion potential of species i in plane n , J_i^n is the flux of species i between plane $n-1$ and n , and Δx is the interplanar distance between adjacent $\{111\}$ planes in a Ni crystal.

We solve the resulting set of finite difference equations subject to the following set of boundary conditions. Plane 1 of the system is the adatom plane, which may be thought of as containing mostly empty space with a very small concentration of adatoms. Plane 2 is then the first true lattice plane. This formalism treats the sink as an ideal flat surface, and provides at least an approximate treatment of a true surface, void surface, or grain boundary sink, subject to the following thermodynamically consistent boundary condition [91]: by observing that, on the time scale of bulk diffusion, surface diffusion is nearly instantaneous, we couple the 1st and 2nd planes such that they remain in instantaneous equilibrium, yielding:

$$\mu_i^1 = \mu_i^2, \frac{d\mu_i^1}{dt} = \frac{d\mu_i^2}{dt} \quad (11)$$

By rewriting the derivatives in (11) as

$$\frac{d\mu_i^n}{dt} = \frac{d\mu_i^n}{dC_i^n} \frac{dC_i^n}{dt} \quad (12)$$

we can rearrange (12) as

$$\frac{dC_i^2}{dt} = \left(\frac{d\mu_i^1}{dC_i^1} \bigg/ \frac{d\mu_i^2}{dC_i^2} \right) \frac{dC_i^1}{dt} \quad (13)$$

We next observe that there is no exchange between the adatom plane and the vacuum to write $\frac{dC_i^1}{dt}$ as:

$$\frac{dC_i^1}{dt} = -\frac{dJ_i^1}{dx} = -\left[\frac{J_i^2 - J_i^1}{\Delta x} \right] = -\left[\frac{J_i^2}{\Delta x} \right]. \quad (14)$$

Similarly, we may write $\frac{dC_i^2}{dt}$ as:

$$\frac{dC_i^2}{dt} = -\frac{dJ_i^2}{dx} = -\left[\frac{J_i^3 - J_i^2}{\Delta x} \right] = -\left[\frac{J_i^3}{\Delta x} + \frac{dC_i^1}{dt} \right]. \quad (15)$$

Equations (13) and (15) may be combined to solve for $\frac{dC_i^1}{dt}$ and $\frac{dC_i^2}{dt}$, allowing us to place a Neumann boundary condition on all species. The deep boundary is far enough from the sink that the total fluxes of all species are zero, resulting in the following trivial boundary condition:

$$J_i^{DB} = 0. \quad (16)$$

For the initial condition of the system, we set the concentration of the vacancies and interstitials equal to their thermal equilibrium composition in all lattice planes, and we set the Ni and Cr concentrations equal to their nominal alloy compositions. We then evolve the system in time using a modified implicit multistep Newton method, implemented using the DLSODE solver package [92].

5.1.2 Thermodynamic Parameterization of Model Equations

The thermodynamic components of the model equations are contained within the chemical potential terms μ_i . These are evaluated for each species in each system plane as a function of mole fraction, based the following expression for molar free energy [93]:

NERI Final Report
Ab initio Based Modeling of Radiation Effects in Multi-Component Alloys
 Project No. 06-006, Final Scientific/Technical Report

$$G_m = C_{Cr}C_{Vac}W_{CrVac} + C_{Cr}C_{Int}W_{CrInt} + C_{Vac}E_{Vac} + C_{Int}E_{Int} + k_bT \sum_i C_i \ln C_i \quad (16)$$

where C_i is the mole fraction of species i , E_i is the formation energy of defect species i , W_{ij} is the DFT-calculated 1st nn interaction parameter of species i and j . This Hamiltonian is consistent with the calculation of the dilute alloy phenomenological coefficients as described in Section 3, which include the effects of Cr-vacancy and Cr-interstitial binding.

To calculate chemical potentials μ_i from the free energy as defined in Equation (16), we first consider the molar Gibb's free energy[94]:

$$G = nG_m \quad (17)$$

for n moles of system. To find the partial molar Gibbs energy $\bar{G}_i$ for any component (which is identical to the chemical potential μ_i), we take the partial derivative of G with respect to mole number of that component n_i :

$$\bar{G}_i = \left(\frac{\partial G}{\partial n_i} \right)_{n_k} = \mu_i \quad (18)$$

Applying the product rule to $G = nG_m$ yields

$$\bar{G}_i = \left(\frac{\partial G}{\partial n_i} \right)_{n_k} = G_m + n \left(\frac{\partial G_m}{\partial n_i} \right)_{n_k} \quad (19)$$

To express μ_i in terms of mole fraction C_i , rather than mole number n_i , we must consider the change of variables:

$$(n_1, n_2, \dots, n_j, \dots, n_r) \rightarrow (n, C_2, C_3, \dots, C_j, \dots, C_r) \quad (20)$$

where we have r species and only $r-1$ independent mole fraction variables. $\bar{G}_i$ then becomes:

$$\bar{G}_i = \left(\frac{\partial n}{\partial n_i} \right)_{n_k} G_m + n \left(\frac{\partial G_m}{\partial n} \right)_{C_i} \left(\frac{\partial n}{\partial n_i} \right)_{n_k} + n \sum_{j=2}^r \left(\frac{\partial G_m}{\partial C_j} \right)_{n, C_k} \left(\frac{\partial C_j}{\partial n_i} \right)_{n_k} \quad (21)$$

Because G_m depends only on composition, and not on size,

$$\left(\frac{\partial G_m}{\partial n} \right)_{C_i} = 0 \quad (22)$$

and because the sum of all $n_i = n$,

$$\left(\frac{\partial n}{\partial n_i} \right)_{n_k} = 1 \quad (23)$$

and

$$\left(\frac{\partial C_i}{\partial n_i} \right)_{n_k} = \frac{\delta_{ij} - C_j}{n} \quad (24)$$

where δ_{ij} is the Kronecker delta. Combining Equations (21-24) yields

$$\bar{G}_i = \mu_i = G_m + \sum_{j=2}^r (\delta_{ij} - C_j) \frac{\partial G_m}{\partial C_j} \quad (25)$$

Applying to our system of Cr, Ni, vacancies, and interstitials yields

$$\mu_{Ni} = G_m - C_{Cr} \frac{\partial G_m}{\partial C_{Cr}} - C_{Vac} \frac{\partial G_m}{\partial C_{Vac}} - C_{Int} \frac{\partial G_m}{\partial C_{Int}} \quad (26)$$

$$\mu_{Cr} = G_m + (1 - C_{Cr}) \frac{\partial G_m}{\partial C_{Cr}} - C_{Vac} \frac{\partial G_m}{\partial C_{Vac}} - C_{Int} \frac{\partial G_m}{\partial C_{Int}} \quad (27)$$

$$\mu_{Vac} = G_m - C_{Cr} \frac{\partial G_m}{\partial C_{Cr}} + (1 - C_{Vac}) \frac{\partial G_m}{\partial C_{Vac}} - C_{Int} \frac{\partial G_m}{\partial C_{Int}} \quad (28)$$

$$\mu_{Int} = G_m - C_{Cr} \frac{\partial G_m}{\partial C_{Cr}} - C_{Vac} \frac{\partial G_m}{\partial C_{Vac}} + (1 - C_{Int}) \frac{\partial G_m}{\partial C_{Int}} \quad (29)$$

These expressions are now straightforward to evaluate given the expression for G_m in Equation (16).

5.1.3 Kinetic Parameterization of Model Equations

The diffusion kinetics of the model system are contained in the phenomenological coefficients L_{ij} . For the dilute alloy, these are calculated according to the methods described in Section 3.6.2. For the concentrated alloy the L_{ij} can be determined by the approaches described in Section 4. However, these approaches have only been implemented for vacancy transport, and we wish to study the combined effects of vacancy and interstitial contributions. An approximate method for obtaining the phenomenological coefficients as a function of composition based on the dilute alloy result is provided by the Manning random alloy theory[95]. By this method, we calculated concentration dependent phenomenological coefficients using the following expressions:

$$L_{ii} = \left(\frac{C_i D_i^*}{k_b T} \right) \left(1 + \frac{(1-f_0)}{f_0} \frac{C_i D_i^*}{\sum_m C_m D_m^*} \right) \quad (30)$$

$$L_{ij} = L_{ji} = \frac{(1-f_0)}{f_0} \left(\frac{C_i C_j D_i^* D_j^*}{k_b T \sum_m C_m D_m^*} \right)$$

where C_i is the concentration of species i , f_0 is a correlation factor for diffusion, and D_i^* is the tracer diffusion coefficient of species i as calculated in the dilute limit.

5.2 RIS Model Predictions

5.2.1 Dilute Alloy

The model predicted segregation profiles of Cr in a dilute Ni-1Cr (at.%) alloy are depicted in Figure 22. The probe diameter, set at 5nm, is used as length scale over which the data is averaged to simulate the effective resolution of experimental probes.

At all temperatures, the model predicts Cr enrichment. This is consistent with the qualitative predictions made in Section 3.3.3 based on the ratios of D_{Cr}^*/D_{Ni}^* for interstitials and vacancies: although Cr is the faster diffuser by both vacancies and interstitials, the difference is more substantial for interstitials. As a result, the interstitial diffusion dominates RIS and leads to enrichment of Cr. This result is inconsistent with experimental results, which uniformly find Cr depletion at grain boundaries under irradiation [96].

5.2.2 Concentrated Alloy

The predicted segregation profiles of Cr in a Ni-18Cr (at.%) alloy are shown in Figure 23.

Once again, the model predicts strong Cr enrichment at all temperatures. As in the dilute case, this is due to the diffusivity difference between Cr and Ni being larger for interstitials than for vacancies.

The large qualitative discrepancy between our model prediction's and experimental results indicates that there are key pieces yet missing from our model and indeed our understanding of RIS. For example, the Manning random alloy method used to calculate concentration dependent phenomenological coefficients implicitly assumes that D_i^* is independent of concentration. However, as discussed in Section 4, the cluster expansion and kinetic Monte Carlo results for vacancy diffusion in Ni-Cr alloys indicate that D_i^* can change significantly as a function of concentration. An analogous treatment of interstitial diffusion would provide a much more accurate parameterization for the model, as energetic features such as Cr-Cr interstitial dumbbell trapping would be implicitly included in the kinetics.

Because our model erroneously predicts strong Cr enrichment due to fast Cr interstitial diffusion, we hypothesize that interstitial diffusion in a real system is suppressed by certain complicating features that are left out of our present model. One such feature is the presence of complex defect sinks such as dislocations or large interstitial clusters which

exhibit a bias toward interstitial capture and may reduce the amount of long-range interstitial diffusion. Another feature missing from the model are mobile defect clusters. In our present formulation, all radiation produced defects are assumed to be single isolated defects. However it is known that a significant fraction of interstitials migrate not as a single species, but as mobile interstitial clusters. If these clusters include different coupling to species than mono-interstitials then they may alter the interstitial contribution to RIS significantly.

5.3 Acknowledgement

We gratefully acknowledge financial support from the DOE Nuclear Engineering Research Initiative Program (NERI), award number DE-FC07-06ID1474 and DOE Nuclear Engineering Research Initiative Consortium Program (NERI-C), award number DE-FG07-07ID14894.

5.4 Appendices – none

5.5 Figures and Tables

Figure 22: Cr RIS Profiles in a Ni-1Cr (at.%) alloy. 0.5 dpa, 5 nm probe diameter. Zero represents the position of the grain boundary.

NERI Final Report
Ab initio Based Modeling of Radiation Effects in Multi-Component Alloys
Project No. 06-006, Final Scientific/Technical Report

Figure 23: Cr RIS Profiles in a Ni-18Cr (at.%) alloy. 0.5 dpa, 5 nm probe diameter. Zero represents the position of the grain boundary.

6 Summary

This study has provided the first effort to start from *ab initio* energetics and progress all the way to continuum transport modeling of RIS in fcc Fe-Ni-Cr alloys. The project essentially completed this multiscale effort for dilute Fe and Cr in Ni and the work is presently being written up for journal publications. For vacancy transport, these studies validated the inverse Kirkendall mechanisms for Cr RIS in this system. The work further demonstrated that vacancy drag was absent at relevant temperatures and established the previously unexpected result that Cr had a significantly lower migration barrier than Ni. This work provided the first results for species dependent fcc Ni-Fe-Cr diffusivities through interstitial transport. These results demonstrate that species couple strongly to the interstitial flux. However, the coupling was so strong that the final dilute model predicted Cr enrichment RIS, inconsistent with experiment. The cause of this inconsistency is not yet clear, and the discrepancies demonstrate the need for proper modeling of the concentrated alloys. We have performed concentrated modeling of vacancy diffusion and found an increase in Cr RIS with increasing Cr content. Modeling of interstitial diffusion in the concentrated alloy was not completed but is an important area for further work.

7 Bibliography

- [1] E. Wimmer, W. Wolf, J. Sticht, P. Saxe, C.B. Geller, R. Najafabadi, G.A. Young, Temperature-dependent diffusion coefficients from *ab initio* computations: Hydrogen, deuterium, and tritium in nickel, *Physical Review B (Condensed Matter and Materials Physics)*, 77 (2008) 134305-1.
- [2] A. Van der Ven, J.C. Thomas, Q.C. Xu, B. Swoboda, D. Morgan, Nondilute diffusion from first principles: Li diffusion in Li_xTiS_2 , *Physical Review B*, 78 (2008).
- [3] G.S. Was, *Fundamentals of Radiation Materials Science*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin Heidelberg, 2007.
- [4] D.R. Olander, *Fundamental Aspects of Nuclear Reactor Fuel Elements*, Technical Information Center Energy Research and Development Administration, 1976.
- [5] L.K. Mansur, Void Swelling in Metals and Alloys under Irradiation - Assessment of Theory, *Nuclear Technology*, 40 (1978) 5-34.
- [6] T.R. Allen, J.T. Busby, G.S. Was, E.A. Kenik, On the mechanism of radiation-induced segregation in austenitic Fe-Cr-Ni alloys, *J. Nucl. Mater.*, 255 (1998) 44-58.
- [7] C. Domain, *Ab initio* modelling of defect properties with substitutional and interstitial elements in steels and Zr alloys, *J. Nucl. Mater.*, 351 (2006) 1-19.
- [8] P. Olsson, *Ab initio* study of interstitial migration in Fe-Cr alloys, *J. Nucl. Mater.*, 386-388 (2009) 86-89.
- [9] A.B. Lidiard, Impurity diffusion in crystals (mainly ionic crystals with the sodium chloride structure), *Philosophical Magazine*, 46 (1955) 1218-1237.
- [10] A.D. LeClaire, A.B. Lidiard, Correlation effects in diffusion in crystals, *Philosophical Magazine*, 1 (1956) 518-527.
- [11] H. Eyring, M. Polanyi, Simple gas reactions, *Zeitschrift für Physikalische Chemie*, 12 (1931) 279-311.

NERI Final Report
Ab initio Based Modeling of Radiation Effects in Multi-Component Alloys
Project No. 06-006, Final Scientific/Technical Report

- [12] H. Eyring, Activated complex in chemical reactions, J. Chem. Phys., 3 (1935) 107-115.
- [13] A.R. Allnatt, A. Barbu, A.D. Franklin, A.B. Lidiard, Atomic transport in dilute alloys containing interstitial defects, Acta Metallurgica, 31 (1983) 1307-13.
- [14] A. Barbu, EXPRESSIONS MICROSCOPIQUES DES FLUX DE SOLUTE ET D'INTERSTITIELS DANS DES GRADIENTS DE CONCENTRATION DE SOLUTE ET D'INTERSTITIELS POUR UN CRISTAL DE STRUCTURE C. F. C. left bracket
Microscopic Expressions for Solute and Interstitial Flux in Concentration Gradients of F. C. C. Crystals right bracket, Acta Metallurgica, 28 (1980) 499-506.
- [15] A. Janotti, M. Krcmar, C.L. Fu, R.C. Reed, Solute Diffusion in Metals: Larger Atoms Can Move Faster, Phys. Rev. Lett., 92 (2004) 85901-1.
- [16] M. Krcmar, C.L. Fu, A. Janotti, R.C. Reed, Diffusion rates of 3d transition metal solutes in nickel by first-principles calculations, Acta Materialia, 53 (2005) 2369-76.
- [17] G. Kresse, J. Furthmuller, Efficient iterative schemes for *ab initio* total-energy calculations using a plane-wave basis set, Physical Review B (Condensed Matter), 54 (1996) 11169-86.
- [18] G. Kresse, J. Hafner, *Ab initio* molecular dynamics for liquid metals, Physical Review B (Condensed Matter), 47 (1993) 558-61.
- [19] J.P. Perdew, K. Burke, M. Ernzerhof, Generalized gradient approximation made simple, Phys. Rev. Lett., 77 (1996) 3865-8.
- [20] P.E. Blochl, Projector augmented-wave method, Physical Review B (Condensed Matter), 50 (1994) 17953-79.
- [21] G. Kresse, D. Joubert, From ultrasoft pseudopotentials to the projector augmented-wave method, Physical Review B (Condensed Matter), 59 (1999) 1758-75.
- [22] J. D. Tucker, *Ab initio-Based Modeling of Radiation Effects in the Ni-Fe-Cr System* (University of Wisconsin - Madison, 2008).
- [23] G. Mills, H. Jonsson, G.K. Schenter, Reversible work transition state theory: application to dissociative adsorption of hydrogen, Surf Sci, 324 (1995) 305-337.
- [24] J. Askil, Tracer Diffusion Data for Metals, Alloys, and Simple Oxides, IRI/Plenum Data Corporation, New York, NY, 1970.
- [25] C.J. Smithells, Smithells Metals Reference Book, 8th, Elsevier Inc., 2004.
- [26] N. L. Peterson, in *The International Conference on the Properties of Atomic Defects in Metals*, 02, Argonne, IL, USA, 1978), p. 3.
- [27] B. Million, J. Ruzickova, J. Velisek, J. Vrestal, Diffusion processes in the Fe-Ni system, Material Science and Engineering, 50 (1981) 43-52.
- [28] P. Ehrhart, *Atomic Defects in Metals* (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, New York, 1991), 25, p. 88.
- [29] M. De Koning, S. Ramos de Debiaggi, A.M. Monti, Vacancy-Formation Thermodynamics in Aluminium and Nickel: A Computational Study, Diffusion and Defect Data. Pt A Defect and Diffusion Forum, 224-225 (2004) 59-74.
- [30] J. Ruzickova, B. Million, Self-diffusion of the components in the FCC phase of binary solid solutions of the Fe-Ni-Cr system, Material Science and Engineering, 50 (1981) 59-64.

NERI Final Report
Ab initio Based Modeling of Radiation Effects in Multi-Component Alloys
Project No. 06-006, Final Scientific/Technical Report

- [31] S.J. Rothman, L.J. Nowicki, G.E. Murch, Self-diffusion in austenitic Fe-Cr-Ni alloys, *Journal of Physics F (Metal Physics)*, 10 (1980) 383-98.
- [32] S.R. de Debiaggi, M. de Koning, A.M. Monti, Theoretical study of the thermodynamic and kinetic properties of self-interstitials in aluminum and nickel, *Physical Review B (Condensed Matter and Materials Physics)*, 73 (2006) 104103-1.
- [33] K.L. Wong, H.J. Lee, J.H. Shim, B. Sadigh, B.D. Wirth, Multiscale modeling of point defect interactions in Fe-Cr alloys, *Journal of Nuclear Materials*, 386 (2009) 227-230.
- [34] J. M. Perks, A. D. Marwick, and C. A. English, *Computer code to calculate radiation-induced segregation in concentrated ternary alloys* (UKAEA, Harwell, UK, 1986), AERE-R-12121, p. 48.
- [35] J. M. Perks and S. M. Murphy, *Modelling the major element radiation-induced segregation in concentrated Fe-Cr-Ni alloys* (BNES, London, 1987), 1, p. 165.
- [36] S. Watanabe, H. Kinoshita, N. Sakaguchi, H. Takahashi, Concentration dependence of radiation-induced segregation in Fe-Cr-Ni alloy, *J. Nucl. Mater.*, 226 (1995) 330-1.
- [37] E. P. Simonen and S. M. Bruemmer, *Radiation-induced grain boundary segregation in austenitic stainless steels*, 1999), p. 755.
- [38] T.R. Allen, G.S. Was, Modeling radiation-induced segregation in austenitic Fe-Cr-Ni alloys, *Acta Materialia*, 46 (1998) 3679-3691.
- [39] N. Q. Lam, A. Kumar, and H. Wiedersich, in *Effects of Radiation on Materials: Eleventh Conference, Scottsdale, Arizona*, edited by H. R. Brager and J. S. Perrin (American Society for Testing and Materials, 1982), p. 985.
- [40] N.Q. Lam, Compositional Changes in Fe-Cr-Ni Alloys under Proton-Bombardment at Elevated-Temperatures, *Journal of Nuclear Materials*, 117 (1983) 106-112.
- [41] S. Watanabe, N. Sakaguchi, K. Kurome, M. Nakamura, H. Takahashi, On the mechanism of radiation-induced segregation, *J. Nucl. Mater.*, 240 (1997) 251-253.
- [42] M. Nastar, P. Bellon, G. Martin, and J. Ruste, in *Proceedings of the 1997 MRS Fall Symposium, Dec 1-5 1997* (MRS, Warrendale, PA, USA, Boston, MA, USA, 1998), p. 383.
- [43] R. G. Faulkner, in *International Workshop on Defect Production, Accumulation and Materials Performance in an Irradiation Environment, 11* (Elsevier, Davos, Switzerland, 1997), p. 269.
- [44] R. G. Faulkner, S. Song, D. Meade, and C. C. Goodwin, *Radiation-induced grain boundary segregation*, 1999), p. 67.
- [45] J. D. Tucker, R. Najafabadi, T. R. Allen, and D. Morgan, in *International Conference on Mathematics, Computational Methods & Reactor Physics (M&C 2009), Saratoga Springs, New York, May 3-7, 2009* (American Nuclear Society, LaGrange Park, IL, 2009).
- [46] R.E. Stoller, Role of cascade energy and temperature in primary defect formation in iron, *J. Nucl. Mater.*, 276 (2000) 22-32.
- [47] Jae-Hyeok Shim, Hyon-Jee Lee, B.D. Wirth, Molecular dynamics simulation of primary irradiation defect formation in Fe-10%Cr alloy, *J. Nucl. Mater.*, 351 (2006) 56-64.
- [48] G.R. Odette, M.J. Alinger, B.D. Wirth, Recent developments in irradiation-resistant steels, *Annual Review of Materials Research*, 38 (2008) 471-503.

NERI Final Report
Ab initio Based Modeling of Radiation Effects in Multi-Component Alloys
Project No. 06-006, Final Scientific/Technical Report

- [49] W.G. Wolfer, L.K. Mansur, The capture efficiency of coated voids, *J. Nucl. Mater.*, 91 (1980) 265-76.
- [50] C. Zener, Theory of D_0 for atomic diffusion in metals, *J. Appl. Phys.*, 22 (1951) 372-375.
- [51] C. Wert, C. Zener, Interstitial atomic diffusion coefficients, *Physical Review*, 76 (1949) 1169-1175.
- [52] G.H. Vineyard, Frequency factors and isotope effects in solid state rate processes, *J. Phys. Chem. Solids*, 3 (1957) 121--.
- [53] G. Ceder, A derivation of the Ising model for the computation of phase diagrams, *Computational Materials Science*, 1 (1993) 144-50.
- [54] N.W. Ashcroft, N.D. Mermin, *Solid State Physics* 1st Ed., Brooks Cole, 1976.
- [55] C. Wolverton, A. Zunger, First-principles theory of short-range order, electronic excitations, and spin polarization in Ni-V and Pd-V alloys, *Physical Review B (Condensed Matter)*, 52 (1995) 8813-28.
- [56] J. Callaway, *Quantum theory of the solid state*, Student, Academic Press, 1974.
- [57] A. D. Le Claire, in *The International Conference on the Properties of Atomic Defects in Metals, 18-22 Oct. 1976, 02/*, Argonne, IL, USA, 1978), p. 70.
- [58] A.R. Allnatt, Phenomenological coefficients for matter transport by vacancies from linear response theory: II. Completion of the five-frequency model, *Journal of Physics C (Solid State Physics)*, 14 (1981) 5467-77.
- [59] A.R. Allnatt, A.B. Lidiard, *Atomic Transport in Solids*, Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- [60] J. - Bocquet, G. Brebec, and Y. Limoge, *Diffusion in Metals and Alloys* (Elsevier Science BV, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, 1996), p. 535.
- [61] M. Koiwa, S. Ishioka, INTEGRAL METHODS IN THE CALCULATION OF CORRELATION FACTORS FOR IMPURITY DIFFUSION, *Philosophical Magazine A: Physics of Condensed Matter, Defects and Mechanical Properties*, 47 (1983) 927-938.
- [62] A. Van der Ven and G. Ceder (unpublished).
- [63] A. Van der Ven, G. Ceder, M. Asta, P.D. Tepesch, First-principles theory of ionic diffusion with nondilute carriers, *Physical Review B (Condensed Matter and Materials Physics)*, 64 (2001) 184307-1.
- [64] A.R. Allnatt, Einstein and linear response formulae for the phenomenological coefficients for isothermal matter transport in solids, *Journal of Physics C (Solid State Physics)*, 15 (1982) 5605-13.
- [65] J.R. Manning, *Diffusion Kinetics for Atoms in Crystals*, Van Nostrand, 1968.
- [66] R.E. Howard, J.R. Manning, Kinetics of solute-enhanced diffusion in dilute face-centered-cubic alloys, *Physical Review*, 154 (1967) 561-568.
- [67] J. Bandyopadhyay, K.P. Gupta, Low temperature lattice parameter of nickel and some nickel-cobalt alloys and Gruneisen parameter of nickel, *Cryogenics*, 17 (1977) 345-7.
- [68] S.M.I. Foiles, Evaluation of harmonic methods for calculating the free energy of defects in solids, *Physical Review B (Condensed Matter)*, 49 (1994) 14930-8.

NERI Final Report
Ab initio Based Modeling of Radiation Effects in Multi-Component Alloys
Project No. 06-006, Final Scientific/Technical Report

- [69] D.E. Jiang, E.A. Carter, Carbon dissolution and diffusion in ferrite and austenite from first principles, *Physical Review B (Condensed Matter and Materials Physics)*, 67 (2003) 214103-1.
- [70] D.E. Jiang, E.A. Carter, Diffusion of interstitial hydrogen into and through bcc Fe from first principles, *Physical Review B (Condensed Matter and Materials Physics)*, 70 (2004) 64102-1.
- [71] D.E. Jiang, E.A. Carter, Carbon atom adsorption on and diffusion into Fe(110) and Fe(100) from first principles, *Physical Review B (Condensed Matter and Materials Physics)*, 71 (2005) 45402-1.
- [72] W. Schilling, SELF-INTERSTITIAL ATOMS IN METALS, *J. Nucl. Mater.*, 69- (1978) 465-489.
- [73] F. Gao, D.J. Bacon, G.J. Ackland, Point-defect and threshold displacement energies in Ni₃Al. I. Point-defect properties with an Appendix entitled Calculating defect energies in [alloys], *Philosophical Magazine A (Physics of Condensed Matter, Defects and Mechanical Properties)*, 67 (1993) 275-88.
- [74] H. Sharma, S. Prakash, Strain field due to self-interstitial impurity in Ni, *Pramana, Journal of Physics*, 60 (2003) 159-66.
- [75] R.A. Johnson, Point-defect calculations for fcc lattice, *Physical Review*, 145 (1966) 423-433.
- [76] S.M. Foiles, M.I. Baskes, M.S. Daw, Embedded-atom-method functions for the FCC metals Cu, Ag, Au, Ni, Pd, Pt, and their alloys, *Physical Review B (Condensed Matter)*, 33 (1986) 7983-91.
- [77] L.C. Smedskjaer, M.J. Fluss, D.G. Legnini, M.K. Chason, R.W. Siegel, The vacancy formation enthalpy in Ni determined by positron annihilation, *Journal of Physics F (Metal Physics)*, 11 (1981) 2221-30.
- [78] T.R. Mattsson, A.E. Mattsson, Calculating the vacancy formation energy in metals: Pt, Pd, and Mo, *Physical Review B (Condensed Matter and Materials Physics)*, 66 (2002) 214110-1.
- [79] K. Carling, G. Wahnstrom, T.R. Mattsson, A.E. Mattsson, N. Sandberg, G. Grimvall, Vacancies in metals: from first-principles calculations to experimental data, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 85 (2000) 3862-5.
- [80] A. F. Voter, *Introduction to the Kinetic Monte Carlo Method* (Springer, Dordrecht, The Netherlands, 2005), -, p. -.
- [81] C. Domain, C.S. Becquart, *Ab initio* calculations of defects in Fe and dilute Fe-Cu alloys, *Physical Review B (Condensed Matter and Materials Physics)*, 65 (2002) 024103-1.
- [82] J. D. Tucker, T. R. Allen, and D. Morgan, in *Proceedings of the 13th International Symposium on Environmental Degradation of Materials in Nuclear Power Systems, August 19 - 23, 2007*, 2007).
- [83] A. Van der Ven, H.-C. Yu, G. Ceder, and K. Thornton, *Vacancy mediated substitutional diffusion in binary crystalline solids*, *Progress in Materials Science* (2009).
- [84] A. Van der Ven, J. C. Thomas, Q. C. Xu, B. Swoboda, and D. Morgan, *Nondilute diffusion from first principles: Li diffusion in Li_xTiS₂*, *Physical Review B* 78 (2008).

- [85] A. Van der Ven and G. Ceder, *First principles calculation of the interdiffusion coefficient in binary alloys*, Physical Review Letters **94**, 045901 (2005).
- [86] A. Van der Ven and G. Ceder, *Vacancies in ordered and disordered binary alloys treated with the cluster expansion*, Physical Review B **71** (2005).
- [87] A. Van der Ven, G. Ceder, M. Asta, and P. D. Tepesch, *First-principles theory of ionic diffusion with nondilute carriers*, Physical Review B **64**, 184307 (2001).
- [88] T. B. Massalski ed., *Binary Alloy Phase Diagrams* (ASM International, Materials Park, OH, 1990).
- [89] F. Zhou, G. Grigoryan, A. Keating, G. Ceder, S. Lustig, and D. Morgan, *Coarse Graining Protein Energetics with Cluster Expansion*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 148103 (2005).
- [90] A. Van der Ven, H. C. Yu, G. Ceder, and K. Thornton, *Vacancy mediated substitutional diffusion in binary crystalline solids*, Progress in Materials Science (2009).
- [91] M. Nastar, *Segregation at grain boundaries: from equilibrium to irradiation induced steady states*, Philosophical Magazine **85**, 641 (2005).
- [92] K. Radhakrishnan, Hindmarsh, A., *Description and Use of LSODE, the Livermore Solver for Ordinary Differential Equations*, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory Report **UCRL-ID-113855** (1993).
- [93] B. Swoboda, A. Van der Ven, and D. Morgan, *Assessing Concentration Dependence of FCC Metal Alloy Diffusion Coefficients Using Kinetic Monte Carlo*, (2009).
- [94] C. H. P. Lupis, *Chemical thermodynamics of materials* (North-Holland, New York, 1983).
- [95] J. R. Manning, *Correlation Factors for Diffusion in Nondilute Alloys*, Physical Review B **4**, 1111 (1971).
- [96] T. R. Allen, L. Tan, G. S. Was, and E. A. Kenik, *Thermal and radiation-induced segregation in model Ni-base alloys*, Journal of Nuclear Materials **361**, 174 (2007).

8 Publications from Project

8.1 Journal papers

1. **Ab-Initio Based Modeling of Diffusion Coefficients in Concentrated Ni-Cr**, B. Swoboda, S. Choudhury, J.D. Tucker, T.R. Allen, D. Morgan [in preparation].
2. **Ab-Initio Based Modeling of Radiation Induced Segregation in Ni-Cr Alloys**, L. Barnard, S. Choudhury, J.D. Tucker, T.R. Allen, D. Morgan [in preparation].
3. **Ab-Initio Based Modeling of Diffusion in BCC Fe-Ni-Cr Alloys and Implications for Radiation Induced Segregation**, S. Choudhury, L. Barnard, J.D. Tucker, T.R. Allen, B. Wirth, M. Asta, D. Morgan (2010). [Submitted to *J. Nuc. Materials*]
4. **Ab initio-based diffusion theory and tracer diffusion in Ni-Cr and Ni-Fe alloys**, J.D. Tucker, R. Najafabadi, T.R. Allen, D. Morgan (2010). [submitted to *J. Nuclear Materials*]

5. **Assessing Concentration Dependence of FCC Metal Alloy Diffusion Coefficients Using Kinetic Monte Carlo**, B. Swoboda, A. Van der Ven, D. Morgan, *Journal of Phase Equilibria and Diffusion* **31** (3), 250 (2010).

8.2 Conference papers and Published Extended Abstracts

1. **Determination of Solute-Interstitial Interactions in Ni-Cr by First Principles**, J.D. Tucker, T.R. Allen, R. Najafabadi, D. Morgan, International Conference on Advances in Mathematics, Computational Methods and Reactor Physics, M and C, Saratoga Springs, New York, May 3-7 2009, v2, p.891-901 (2009).
2. **Ab initio Based Determination of Diffusion in Ni-Cr**, J.D. Tucker, T. Allen, D. Morgan, *American Nuclear Society Transactions* 98, 1026-1027, June 8-11 (2008).
3. **Ab initio Defect Properties for Modeling Radiation-Induced Segregation in Fe-Ni-Cr Alloys**, J. D. Tucker, T. R. Allen, R. Najafabadi and D. Morgan, *13th Environmental Degradation Of Materials In Nuclear Power Systems*, Eds., T. R. Allen, J. T. Busby, and P.J. King, Canadian Nuclear Society, August 19 - 23 (2007).

8.3 Invited presentations

1. **Modeling and Simulation of Point Defect Kinetics: Rethinking RIS - New Insights on Radiation Induced Segregation from Atomistic Modeling**, D. Morgan, UCSB, Santa Barbara, CA, USA, March 24 (2010).
2. **Ab initio Modeling of Diffusion in Nuclear Materials**, D. Morgan, I Szlufarska, T. Allen, Idaho National Laboratory, March 18 (2009).
3. **Ab initio-Based Diffusion Properties for Radiation-Induced Segregation Modeling in Ni-Fe-Cr alloys**, D. Morgan, J. Tucker, and T. Allen, Fourth International Conference on Multiscale Materials Modeling (MMM-2008), Tallahassee, FL, USA, Oct. 27-31 (2008).
4. **Ab initio-Based Diffusion Properties for Radiation-Induced Segregation Modeling in Ni-Fe-Cr alloys**, D. Morgan, J. Tucker, and T. Allen, MS&T, Pittsburg, PA, USA, October 6 (2008).
5. **Ab initio Based Thermokinetic Modeling for Diffusion Constants**, D. Morgan, J. Tucker, T. Allen, Computational Materials Science Network (CMSN) Symposium, Salt Lake City, UT, USA, September 13-15 (2007).
6. **Ab initio-Based Modeling of Ni-Cr (fcc) Thermokinetics**, D. Morgan, J. Tucker, T. Allen, Workshop for Advanced Materials for Global Nuclear Energy Partnership, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, TN, USA, July 11-13 (2007).
7. **Ab initio – Based Modeling of Radiation Effects in Multi-Component Alloys**, 5th APCI/Gen IV Materials Working Group Meeting, Santa Fe, NM USA (2006).
8. **Ab initio based Thermokinetic Modeling of Radiation Induced Segregation in Fe-Ni-Cr alloys**, D. Morgan, XV International Materials Research Congress, Cancun, Mexico (2006).

9. *Ab initio* Based Thermokinetic Modeling of Radiation Induced Segregation in Fe-Ni-Cr Alloys, D. Morgan, MS&T '06, Cincinnati, OH, USA (2006).

8.4 Contributed presentations

Work from this grant has been presented in over 15 contributed talks at national and international conferences, including such widely attended meetings as the annual TMS and MRS meetings.

9 Patents

None

10 Milestone Status

Year 1:

Milestone/Task Description	Planned Completion Date	Actual Completion Date	Percent Complete	Notes
Initial <i>ab initio</i> calculations of atomic scale properties (defect energies, hopping barriers, attempt frequencies, interaction energies) in fcc pure elements (Fe, Cr, Ni) and limited alloyed environments.	December 2006	March 2007	100%	
Fe-Cr-Ni RIS simulation based on <i>ab initio</i> values and a modified Perk's model	March 2007	Dec. 2009	100%	Decided to use full rate theory model rather than Perks
Validation/refinement by comparison of atomic scale properties and Perk's model RIS simulations to experimental data.	March 2007	Dec. 2009	100%	Decided to use full rate theory model rather than Perks

Year 2:

Milestone/Task Description	Planned Completion	Actual Completion	Percent Complete	
----------------------------	--------------------	-------------------	------------------	--

NERI Final Report
Ab initio Based Modeling of Radiation Effects in Multi-Component Alloys
 Project No. 06-006, Final Scientific/Technical Report

	Date	Date		
More complete <i>ab initio</i> calculations of atomic scale properties (defect energies, hopping barriers, attempt frequencies, interaction energies) in Fe-Cr-Ni alloy.	March 2008	Dec. 2009	100%	Decided to focus on only Ni-Cr for concentrated alloy
Cluster expansion parametrization of alloy atomic scale properties.	March 2008	NA	100%	Decided to focus on only Ni-Cr for concentrated alloy
Development of Monte Carlo (MC) and Kinetic Monte Carlo (KMC) codes.	March 2008	Sept. 2009	100%	
Fe-Cr-Ni phase diagram based on <i>ab initio</i> values and MC.	March 2008	NA	90%	Decided to focus on only Ni-Cr for concentrated alloy

Year 3/4:

Milestone/Task Description	Planned Completion Date	Actual Completion Date	Percent Complete	Notes
Calculation of diffusion constants based on <i>ab initio</i> values and MC/KMC.	March 2010	NA	90%	Decided to focus on only vacancies in Ni-Cr for concentrated alloy
Void growth modeling with derived diffusion constants.	March 2010	Dec. 2009	0%	Decided not to pursue in this proposal
Fe-Cr-Ni RIS simulation based on diffusion constants and solution of continuum diffusion equation.	March 2010	NA	90%	Decided to focus on only Ni-Cr for concentrated alloy

NERI Final Report
Ab initio Based Modeling of Radiation Effects in Multi-Component Alloys
 Project No. 06-006, Final Scientific/Technical Report

Final validation/refinement by comparison of atomic scale properties, phase diagram, diffusion constants, KMC and continuum RIS simulations, and void swelling to experiments.	March 2010	NA	90%	Decided to focus on only Ni-Cr for concentrated alloy
--	------------	----	-----	---

Issues/Concerns: Due to the calculations being more time consuming than anticipated we restricted ourselves to Ni-Cr for the concentrated alloy work and did not perform the void growth modeling, which was something of an extension of the core work. With these changes the bulk of the tasks have been completed. Final analysis of the incomplete tasks will be done after the end of the funding period and published in journal articles.

11 Budget Data (as of June 1 2010)

			Approved Spending Plan	Actual Spent to Date
Phase / Budget Period			Total	Total
	From	To		
Year 1	Mar 2006	Mar 2007	\$183,537	\$61,355
Year 2	Mar 2007	Mar 2008	\$139,523	\$139,207
Year 3/4	Mar 2008	Mar 2010	\$145,757	\$268,255
Totals			\$468,817	\$468,817

Issues/Concerns: None.

12 Cost Performance

Issues/Concerns: None.