Nucleation and growth of domains near crack tips in single crystal ferroelectrics
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Abstract

The nucleation and growth of domains is investigated near a stationary crack tip in a single crystal of ferroelectric material. The phase-field approach, applying the material polarization as the order parameter, is used as the theoretical modeling framework and the finite element method is used for the numerical solution technique. The electromechanical form of the \( J \)-integral is appropriately modified to account for the polarization gradient energy terms, and analyzed to illustrate the amount of shielding, or lack thereof, due to domain switching at the crack tip. It is shown that the nucleation of domains near the crack tip due to applied electric field is affected by applied stress. However, the crack-tip energy release rate can change significantly between the instant of domain nucleation and the final equilibrium domain configuration. Implications of these results for ferroelectric single crystal fracture criteria are discussed.

1. Introduction

The phase-field modeling approach has been used successfully to study several different features of ferroelectric domain switching behavior including the structure of domain walls [1], switching of polycrystals and single crystals [2–4], switching in micro/nanostructures [5–10], the interactions of domain walls with charge defects and dislocations [11–14], and domain switching near crack tips [15–17]. The phase-field modeling approach allows for a detailed accounting of the electromechanical processes that occur during domain nucleation and growth. This modeling technique is useful in uncovering the coupled processes that occur during the fracture of ferroelectric materials. In order to obtain a better understanding of the energetics of fracture within the phase-field setting we modify the \( J \)-integral [18–20] to include the energies associated with the polarization order parameter, and demonstrate how the \( J \)-integral can be applied to determine the crack-tip energy release rate for common sets of electromechanical crack-face boundary conditions. We also present simulations of domain nucleation and the path-(in)dependence of the \( J \)-integral under equilibrium and non-equilibrium conditions.

2. Phase-field theory

Here we review the fundamental governing phase-field equations. For a detailed description of these equations the reader is referred to the work of Su and Landis [12]. Standard index notation is used with summation implied over repeated indices, the overdot represents the first derivative with respect to time, and, \( j \) represents partial differentiation with respect to the \( x_j \) coordinate direction.
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The static equilibrium equations in any arbitrary volume $V$ and its bounding surfaces $S$ yield,

$$\sigma_{ij} + b_i = 0 \quad \text{in } V$$

$$\sigma_{ij} = \sigma_{ij} \quad \text{in } V$$

$$\varphi_n = t_i \quad \text{on } S$$

where $\sigma_{ij}$ are the Cartesian components of the Cauchy stress, $b_i$ the components of a body force per unit volume, $n_i$ the components of a unit vector normal to a surface element, and $t_i$ the tractions applied to a surface. Under the assumptions of linear kinematics, the strain components $\epsilon_{ij}$ are related to the displacements $u_i$ as

$$\epsilon_{ij} = \frac{1}{2} (u_{ij} + u_{ji}) \quad \text{in } V$$

The electrical quantities of electric field, $E_i$, electric potential, $\phi$, electric displacement, $D_i$, volume charge density, $q$, and surface charge density, $\omega$, are governed by the quasi-static forms of Maxwell’s equations. Specifically,

$$D_{ii} - q = 0 \quad \text{in } V$$

$$D_i n_i = -\omega \quad \text{on } S$$

$$E_i = -\phi_j$$

within the phase-field modeling approach the free energy will also be required to depend on an order parameter and its gradient. Mathematically, the order parameter is used to describe the different variant types, i.e. the spontaneous states that are possible. For the case of ferroelectrics, the physically natural order parameter is the electrical polarization $P_i$. Note that the relationship between electric field, electric displacement and polarization in matter is given as

$$D_i = P_i + \kappa_0 E_i$$

Here $\kappa_0$ is the permittivity of free space. Given that the free energy is permitted to depend on an order parameter, a set of micro-forces are introduced that are work-conjugate to the order parameter and its gradient. The micro-force balance is written as,

$$\tilde{\zeta}_{ij} + \pi_i + \gamma_i = 0$$

where we have introduced a micro-force tensor $\tilde{\zeta}_{ij}$ such that $\tilde{\zeta}_{ij} n_i P_j$ represents the power density expended across surfaces, an internal micro-force vector $\pi_i$, such that $\pi_i P_i$ is the power density expended by the material internally (this micro-force accounts for dissipation in the material), and an external micro-force vector $\gamma_i$ such that $\gamma_i P_i$ is the power density expended by external sources. After the introduction of the Helmholtz free energy $\psi = \psi(\epsilon_{ij}, D_i, P_i, \pi_i)$, and an analysis of the second law of thermodynamics, the following constitutive relationships result.

$$\sigma_{ij} = \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial \epsilon_{ij}}, \quad E_i = \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial D_i}, \quad \tilde{\zeta}_{ij} = \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial \pi_i}, \quad \text{and } \pi_i = -\eta_i - \beta_{ij} P_j \text{ with } \beta_{ij} \text{ positive definite, where } \eta_i \equiv \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial P_i}$$

The form of the Helmholtz free energy that is chosen to mimic the behavior of ferroelectric single crystals is,

$$\psi = \frac{1}{2} a_{ijkl} P_i P_k P_j + \frac{1}{4} a_{ijkl} P_i P_k P_j + \frac{1}{6} a_{ijklmn} P_i P_k P_m P_n + \frac{1}{8} a_{ijklmnn} P_i P_k P_m P_n + \frac{1}{4} a_{ijkl} \epsilon_i \epsilon_j + \frac{1}{2} g_{ijklmnn} \epsilon_i \epsilon_j \epsilon_k \epsilon_m P_n P_m + \frac{1}{2} g_{ijkl} \epsilon_i \epsilon_j \epsilon_k \epsilon_l + \frac{1}{2} \kappa_0 (D_i - P_i)(D_i - P_i)$$

The specific values for the constants that are used to model barium titanate are listed in the Appendix. The representation of this free energy contains a few important material parameters to be used for the normalization of the results in this paper, including the spontaneous polarization $P_0$, the spontaneous strain $\epsilon_0$, the critical electric field for homogeneous $180^\circ$ switching $E_0$, the characteristic stress $\sigma_0 = E_0 P_0/\epsilon_0$, and the domain wall length scale $l_0$.

### 3. The $J$-integral

We now proceed to the specification of the $J$-integral (for two-dimensional crack problems) for materials described with this phase-field theory. $J$ is given as,

$$J = \int_G \left( \sigma_{ij} n_i u_{i+1} + D_i n_i E_1 - \tilde{\zeta}_{ij} n_i P_{1j} \right) d\Gamma$$

Here we have introduced the electrical enthalpy $h$ which can be related to the Helmholtz free energy through the Legendre transformation

$$h(\epsilon_{ij}, P_i, P_{ij}, E_i) = \psi - E D_i$$

Note that through $h$ the constitutive relationships become

$$\sigma_{ij} = \frac{\partial h}{\partial \epsilon_{ij}}, \quad D_i = -\frac{\partial h}{\partial \epsilon_i}, \quad \tilde{\zeta}_{ij} = \frac{\partial h}{\partial \epsilon_j}, \quad \text{and } \pi_i = \frac{\partial h}{\partial P_i}$$

We first demonstrate that $J$ is equal to zero around any closed contour not enclosing a singularity.
\[
J = \int_A \left( h_{\mu
u} - \sigma_{\mu\nu} u_{\mu | 1} + D_{\mu\nu} E_{\mu | 1} - \xi_{\mu\nu} \eta_{i} P_{i | 1} \right) d\Gamma = \int_A \left( h_{\mu
u} - \sigma_{\mu\nu} u_{\mu | 1} + D_{\mu\nu} E_{\mu | 1} - \xi_{\mu\nu} \eta_{i} P_{i | 1} \right) dA
\]

\[
= \int_A \left( h_{\mu
u} - \sigma_{\mu\nu} u_{\mu | 1} + D_{\mu\nu} E_{\mu | 1} - \xi_{\mu\nu} \eta_{i} P_{i | 1} \right) dA
\]

if \( b_i = 0, \ q = 0, \) and \( \dot{P}_i = 0 \) in \( A \)

\[
= \int_A \left( \frac{\partial h_{\mu
u}}{\partial x_{\mu}} \xi_{\mu\nu} + \frac{\partial h_{\mu
u}}{\partial E_{\mu | 1}} + \frac{\partial h_{\mu
u}}{\partial P_{i | 1}} \eta_{i} + \frac{\partial h_{\mu
u}}{\partial \xi_{\mu\nu}} \eta_{i} \right) dA = 0
\]

Note that this result only holds under the conditions where \( b_i = 0, \ q = 0, \) and \( \dot{P}_i = 0 \) in the area within the closed contour \( A. \)

Most notably this result requires that the micro-force balance associated with the order parameter must be in equilibrium, and specifically the “viscous” term \( \beta P_i \) must vanish.

Next, we recognize that the crack-tip energy release rate \( \mathcal{G} \) is equal to the \( J \)-integral for an infinitesimally small contour about the crack tip. Proof of this fact follows similar argument due to Rice [20]. Then, by computing \( J \) about the contour illustrated in Fig. 1, it can be shown that,

\[
\mathcal{G} = J_{\text{tip}} = J_{\Gamma} + J_{\Gamma_1} + J_{\Gamma_2}
\]

\[
J_{\Gamma} = \int_{\Gamma} \left( h_{\mu
u} - \sigma_{\mu\nu} u_{\mu | 1} + D_{\mu\nu} E_{\mu | 1} - \xi_{\mu\nu} \eta_{i} P_{i | 1} \right) d\Gamma
\]

(15)

\[
J_{\Gamma_1} = \int_{\Gamma_1} \left( \sigma_{21} u_{\mu | 1} + \sigma_{22} u_{\mu | 1} - D_{2} E_{\mu | 1} \right) dx_1 \quad \text{assuming} \ \xi_{\mu\nu} \eta_{i} = 0 \ \text{on the crack faces}
\]

(16)

\[
J_{\Gamma_2} = \int_{\Gamma_2} \left( -\sigma_{21} u_{\mu | 1} - \sigma_{22} u_{\mu | 1} + D_{2} E_{\mu | 1} \right) dx_1 \quad \text{assuming} \ \xi_{\mu\nu} \eta_{i} = 0 \ \text{on the crack faces}
\]

(17)

The assumption of \( \xi_{\mu\nu} \eta_{i} = 0 \) is a reasonable assumption on any free surface, but this restriction is easily relaxed for other assumptions. The remaining crack-face boundary conditions are less well-defined. Two very popular sets of crack-face boundary conditions are the permeable and impermeable boundary conditions [21–24]. Both of these sets of boundary conditions assume that the crack faces are traction free. For the impermeable boundary conditions it is assumed that the normal component of the electric displacement is zero, and for the permeable boundary conditions it is assumed that both the electric potential and the normal component of the electric displacement are continuous across the crack. For the impermeable boundary conditions \( J_{\Gamma_1} = J_{\Gamma_2} = 0 \) and for the permeable boundary conditions \( J_{\Gamma_1} + J_{\Gamma_2} = 0 \) if \( x_1^* = x_1 = x_1^\prime \). In either case the \( J \)-integral around any remote contour, with \( x_1^* = x_1 = x_1^\prime \), is equal to the crack-tip energy release rate, \( \mathcal{G} = J_{\Gamma}. \)

The impermeable boundary conditions are generally too strong in situations where the single crystal has some initial polarization with a component normal to the crack faces. In such situations it is possible and perhaps likely that charge layers will reside on the crack faces to balance the normal component of the polarization. Hence, a modified form of the impermeable boundary conditions would allow for these charge layers such that \( D_{2} = \omega_0 \), where \( \omega_0 = P_2^\prime \) is the surface charge density required to balance the initial spontaneous polarization in the material. For the sake of simplicity we will assume that this spontaneous polarization is homogeneous throughout the crystal (or at least on the crack faces), although more complicated distributions could also be envisioned and analyzed. We will also retain the traction free conditions. Under these circumstances we can show that,

\[
J_{\Gamma_1} + J_{\Gamma_2} = \omega_0 \int_{x_1^*}^{0} \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial x_1} dx_1 - \omega_0 \int_{x_1^*}^{0} \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial x_1} dx_1 = -\omega_0 \left[ \phi(0, 0) - \phi(0, 0) \right]
\]

(18)

**Fig. 1.** The closed contour used to evaluate the crack-tip energy release rate.
Then, the crack-tip energy release rate is,

\[ G_f = J_f - \omega_0 \left[ \phi \left( x_t^0, 0 \right) - \phi \left( x_t^1, 0 \right) \right]. \tag{19} \]

In addition to these linear boundary conditions there have also been two sets of non-linear crack-face boundary conditions. The semi-permeable boundary conditions due to Hao and Shen \cite{25–28}, and the energetically consistent boundary conditions due to Landis \cite{29–32}. Since it has been shown that the semi-permeable boundary conditions lead to a discrepancy between the total and crack-tip energy release rates \cite{28,29}, we will focus only on the energetically consistent boundary conditions here. The energetically consistent boundary conditions postulate that the medium within the crack gap can be described by an electrical enthalpy \( h_e = h_e(E_c) \), where \( E_c \) is the electric field within the crack gap. This approximation assumes that the crack gap can be treated as a one-dimensional capacitor where the tangential components of the electric field are neglected. Then \( E_c \) is given as,

\[ E_c = -\frac{\Delta \phi}{\Delta u_2} \tag{20} \]

where \( \Delta u_2 = u_2^+ - u_2^- \) is the crack opening displacement and \( \Delta \phi = \phi^+ - \phi^- \) is the electric potential jump across the crack faces. The electric displacement and the stress within the crack gap are derived from the crack gap electrical enthalpy as,

\[ D_c = -\frac{dh_e}{dE_c} \text{ and } \sigma_c = h_e + E_c D_c \tag{21} \]

Allowing for the initial charge layers on the crack faces the energetically consistent crack-face boundary conditions become,

\[ \sigma_{21}^0 = 0, \quad \sigma_{22}^+ = \sigma_c, \quad \text{ and } \quad D_c^0 = \omega_0 + D_c \]

Then, using \( x_t^+ = x_t^1 = x_t^0 \) the analysis of the crack-face \( J \) paths follows as,

\[ J_f = \int_{x_t^0}^{x_t^1} \left[ \sigma_c \Delta u_{2,1} + \left( \omega_0 + D_c \right) \Delta \phi \right] dx_1 = \int_{x_t^0}^{x_t^1} \left[ \left( h_e + E_c D_c \right) \Delta u_{2,1} + \left( \omega_0 + D_c \right) \Delta \phi \right] dx_1 \]

\[ = \int_{x_t^0}^{x_t^1} \left[ \left( h_e + D_c \frac{\Delta \phi}{\Delta u_2} \frac{\Delta u_2}{\Delta u_2} \right) \Delta u_{2,1} + \left( \omega_0 + D_c \right) \Delta \phi \right] dx_1 \]

\[ = \int_{x_t^0}^{x_t^1} \left[ \left( h_e \Delta u_2 + \Delta \phi \Delta D_c \right) + \frac{\Delta \phi}{\Delta u_2} \Delta u_2 \Delta D_c, \Delta \phi, \Delta u_2, \Delta D_c, \Delta \phi \right] dx_1 \]

\[ = \int_{x_t^0}^{x_t^1} \left[ \left( h_e \Delta u_2 + \omega_0 \Delta \phi \right) - D_c \left( \frac{\Delta \phi}{\Delta u_2} - \frac{\Delta \phi \Delta u_{2,1}}{\Delta u_2} \right) \Delta u_2 + \Delta \phi \Delta D_c, \Delta \phi, \Delta u_2, \Delta D_c, \Delta \phi \right] dx_1 \]

\[ = \int_{x_t^0}^{x_t^1} \left( h_e \Delta u_2 + \omega_0 \Delta \phi \right) dx_1 = \Delta h_c \Delta u_2^2 - \omega_0 \Delta \phi \]

Hence, the crack-tip energy release rate is,

\[ G = J_f - \frac{\Delta h_c}{2} \Delta u_2^2 - \omega_0 \Delta \phi. \tag{22} \]

We note that there are limiting representations of \( h_e \) that can be used to reproduce both the impermeable and permeable boundary conditions. Notably, when the dielectric breakdown strength of the crack gap medium is small (rigorously in the limit as this strength goes to zero) the permeable boundary conditions are recovered, giving a possible physical mechanism for this model of the crack-face boundary conditions.

4. Simulation results

In this section we present simulation results to demonstrate under what conditions a remote \( J \) path can be used to determine the crack-tip energy release rate. The governing equations were solved using the finite element method described in Ref. \cite{12}. We first study two-dimensional square geometries with the length of the side of the square equal to 600 or 2000 and the crack length equal to 300 or 1000. The characteristic thickness of a domain wall within the theory is 200. The material properties used are characteristic of barium titanate and are listed in the Appendix. In all cases we use the generalized impermeable boundary conditions on the crack faces such that the crack faces are traction free and there is a fixed surface charge density on the crack faces that exactly balances the normal component of the initial spontaneous polarization.

The first set of simulations is for a material with initial spontaneous polarization \( P_0 \) normal to the crack faces in a \( 2000 \times 2000 \) domain. The entire boundary of the square region is traction free, and the left and right sides of the region have no surface charge density and the top and bottom surfaces have an applied surface charge density of \( \omega^+ = \mp \left( P_0 - \omega_A \right) \). Note that
when the surface charge increment $\Delta \omega$ is equal to zero, the stresses and electric fields in the sample are also equal to zero. The normalized rates of charge loading investigated were $\beta \dot{\omega}/E_0 = 0.0.1$, and 1, with $\beta \dot{\omega}/E_0 = 0$ corresponding to equilibrium calculations. The parameter $E_0$ is the characteristic level of electric field required to cause homogeneous 180° switching of a spontaneously polarized sample. Fig. 2 illustrates the path-dependence of the apparent energy release rate computed from $\tilde{G} = f - \omega_{0}[\phi(x_1^+, 0) - \phi(x_1^-, 0)]$ for a small charge load level $\omega_0|P_0 = 0.05$ for the three loading rates. The far-field value of $G$ is $G_0/E_0 = \frac{-1.8, -3.5 and -18.2}{E_0}$. Note that for the equilibrium case the calculation of $G_t$ is path-independent and a valid result for the crack-tip energy release rate is obtained for any path. For the two non-equilibrium cases the calculation is not path-independent and cannot be interpreted as the crack-tip energy release rate except in the limit as $x^+_l \to 0$. Finally, this path-dependent behavior cannot be interpreted as shielding due to domain switching, since no domain switching has occurred in these calculations. The path-dependence is due to the dissipative behavior of the term $\beta P_1$ in the micro-force balance.

Generating domain switching zones in these calculations for the equilibrium cases with $\beta \dot{\omega}/E_0 = 0$ is not a trivial task. For the $200l_0 \times 200l_0$ region it is not possible to find equilibrium solutions for $\omega_0|P_0 > 0.08$ by simply incrementing the electrical loading with $\beta = 0$. This suggests an instability in the solution which is due to a new domain structure nucleating at the crack tip. Such conditions for domain nucleation at a crack tip can be studied under small-scale-switching conditions where in the material region near the crack tip experiencing loadings of sufficient magnitude to cause considerable non-linear response is small in comparison to any other length scales associated with the specimen like crack size or ligament length. For such situations the electromechanical fields in a so-called K-annulus will be dominated by the linear piezoelectric $K_t - K_0$ fields. The $K_t - K_0$ fields are generated with the Stroh formalism and the mechanical displacements and electric potential associated with these fields are applied to the outer boundary of the $200l_0 \times 200l_0$ region. The mode 1 stress intensity factor, $K_0$, and the electric displacement intensity factor, $K_0$, are increased proportionally until an instability in the solution is found. This instability is associated with the nucleation of a new domain from the crack tip. The growth of such a domain will be presented next. Fig. 3 shows a schematic of the crack loaded by the $K_t - K_0$ fields and then a plot of the critical combinations of $K_0$ and $K_0$ required to nucleate a new domain in a material with initial spontaneous polarization perpendicular to the crack faces. The generalized impermeable crack-face boundary conditions are applied in these simulations. First note that the orientation of range of the $K_0$ fields plotted in Fig. 3 is such that the initial spontaneous polarization in the sample tends to be reversed. Also note that the intensity factors are normalized by material specific properties including the domain wall length scale $l_0$. The results displayed in Fig. 3 show that the mechanical loading plays very little role in the nucleation of a new domain from the crack tip for these material properties. These results are in qualitative theories based upon energetic considerations which postulate that 90° switching occurs when the work due to the applied stresses and electric fields on a switching process attain a critical level. Roughly, without accounting for all of the details of the near-tip fields, such an approximation yields,

$$\frac{K_1}{\sigma_0 \sqrt{l_0}} + \frac{K_0}{P_0 \sqrt{l_0}} = \text{constant.}$$

The dashed line in Fig. 3 shows this approximation when the constant is fit to the point when $K_0 = 0$. When considering (23), note that $E_0$ is the critical field for homogeneous 180° switching, not the field required to move existing domain walls which is considerably smaller.

Next, the growth of a new domain from a crack tip during purely electrical loading is simulated. To generate the solution for a final equilibrium domain configuration, the domain was nucleated at the crack tip and then allowed to evolve with a non-zero polarization viscosity term. The loading is applied by first ramping up a uniform charge load on the top and bottom surfaces with a charging rate of $\beta \dot{\omega}/E_0 = 0.1$ to a total charge of $\omega_0|P_0 = 0.12$ in a $60l_0 \times 60l_0$ domain. The charge was then fixed at $\omega_0|P_0 = 0.12$ and the domain structure was allowed to evolve until the solution was sufficiently close to the

![Fig. 2](image_url) The apparent crack-tip energy release rate computed using $\tilde{G} = f - \omega_{0}[\phi(x_1^+, 0) - \phi(x_1^-, 0)]$ at a charge loading level of $\omega_0|P_0 = 0.05$. The $f$-contour used to compute $\tilde{G}$ is a square contour with sides of length 2$x^+_l$. 
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equilibrium configuration, at which point the polarization viscosity term was set to $\beta = 0$ to find the true equilibrium solution. Thereafter additional charge is applied to the surface to a final value of $\omega_A/P_0 = 0.2$ and finally the charge is removed from the surface to return to the initial uncharged state. Note that in order to ensure accuracy of the computations at least five finite element nodes span any domain wall, and the path-independence of the $J$-integral is verified for all cases of equilibrium. If the mesh is too coarse then mesh-pinning of the domains occurs and significant but artificial path-dependence appears at equilibrium in the $J$-integral. Fig. 4 shows contour plots of the $y$ component of the polarization distributions at four different times in the domain evolution. Fig. 4 shows that the $90^\circ$ domain needle is nucleated at the crack tip and propagates through the entire domain until it reaches the charged boundary. This non-equilibrium propagation of the domain supports the hypothesis that an instability in the equilibrium solution exists at the domain nucleation threshold. Additionally, the equilibrium configurations just prior to the domain nucleation with no domain and that shown in Fig. 4b both occur at a charge loading level of $\omega_A/P_0 = 0.12$, and are sufficiently distinct from one another. This unstable growth of domains is in contrast to domain switching zones predicted using phenomenological constitutive laws [33–38]. The explanation for the discrepancy is that these phase-field simulations assume a defect-free material. In such a material domain walls do not become pinned and are free to move at vanishingly small levels of electromechanical driving force [12].

Fig. 3. A semi-infinite crack loaded by a combination of electrical and mechanical loads characterized by the mode I stress intensity factor, $K_0$, and the electric displacement intensity factor, $K_D$. The graph plots the critical combination of intensity factors required to nucleate a new domain at the crack tip. The solid line is calculated from the full model equations and the dashed line is from Eq. (23) with the constant fit to the point at $K_0 = 0$. Note that the mechanical stress intensity has little effect on the nucleation process for this configuration of crack face and spontaneous polarization orientation.

Fig. 4. Contour plots of the $y$ component of the polarization normalized by $P_0$ in the vicinity of the crack tip for (A) $\omega_A/P_0 = 0.12$ during the non-equilibrium evolution of the domain, (B) $\omega_A/P_0 = 0.12$ at the final equilibrium state for the domain, (C) equilibrium at $\omega_A/P_0 = 0.2$, and (D) equilibrium at $\omega_A/P_0 = 0.11$. Only the upper half of the region is displayed. The $x$ and $y$ distances are normalized distances $x/l_0$ and $y/l_0$, and the polarization scale is normalized by the spontaneous polarization $P_0$. 
Next, results for the apparent crack-tip energy release rate calculation are presented. Fig. 5a plots the apparent energy release rate as a function of the applied charge loading for the sample. Note that points A–D on Fig. 5a correspond to the domain structures illustrated in Fig. 4A–D respectively. Initially, as the charge is applied the energy release rate is negative and approximately quadratic in the applied charge. These features of the energy release rate are in accord with linear piezoelectric fracture mechanics solutions [22–24].

Furthermore, prior to the nucleation of the new domain, the solutions are carried out at equilibrium and the energy release rate calculation is path-independent. At the charge load level of \( \omega_A/P_0 = 0.12 \), nucleation of the new domain occurs, and at this point the crack-tip energy release rate is approximately \( G = -3E_0P_0l_0 \). The charge is held fixed at this point and as the new domain grows the energy release rate increases from \( G = -3E_0P_0l_0 \) to \( G = 0.5E_0P_0l_0 \). Note that the domain evolution at \( \omega_A/P_0 = 0.12 \) is a non-equilibrium process during which the apparent energy release rate calculation is path-dependent. Specifically, path-dependence of the apparent energy release rate calculation for domain structure A is plotted as the blue curve in Fig. 5b. Domain structure B is again an equilibrium configuration and the energy release rate calculation is path-independent. After domain structure B stabilizes, additional charge is applied and the domain structure is allowed to evolve at equilibrium to domain structure C. During this loading process the energy release rate increases in an approximately linear fashion. Upon reaching structure C the applied charge is removed and the domain structures and the energy release rate “unload” along their original loading paths to structure B. At this point the unloading path diverges from the original loading path and a hysteresis appears in the energy release rate versus applied charge response. Domain structure D is arrived at during the equilibrium unloading process and the energy release rate calculation is path-independent as shown by the red curve in Fig. 5b. Further unloading of the charge causes the domain to vanish and the original negative quadratic branch of the energy release rate response is followed.

The most interesting aspect of this simulation is the departure from the results of linear piezoelectric fracture mechanics. Specifically, this calculation is the first that we are aware of that predicts that the crack-tip energy release rate can be positive under purely electrical loading for impermeable crack-face boundary conditions. Furthermore, the calculation shows that an existing domain structure near the crack tip can cause a qualitatively different behavior for the energy release rate, positive and increasing with applied charge, from what is expected in linear piezoelectricity, negative and decreasing with applied charge. Since the domain structure introduces spatial dependence in the material properties its effect on the energy release rate is to some degree connected with the results generated by Oates [39]. Oates found that by introducing a heterogeneity near the crack and using the semi-permeable crack-face boundary conditions of Hao and Shen [25], a positive crack-tip energy release rate could be generated by purely electrical loading when the heterogeneity is close the crack tip. In the work presented here the domain is a heterogeneity and it is located at the crack tip. We do note that large scale switching does occur in this simulation and so a direct comparison to linear piezoelectric fracture mechanics concepts is tenuous. However, these simulations demonstrate the effects that near tip domain structures can have on the fracture process in ferroelectric crystals. Specifically, the negative contribution of the energy release rate from applied electric fields may in fact be positive for certain domain structures near crack tips. Hence, the modeling of crack tip domain structures and large scale domain switching behavior in fracture specimens may be a key to understanding the plethora of seemingly disparate experimental observations on electromechanical fracture of ferroelectrics [40–42]. Kuna [43] has recently provided an excellent review of these issues.

5. Discussion

In this paper a method for evaluating the crack-tip energy release rate using the \( J \)-integral within the phase-field modeling framework for ferroelectric domain evolution has been presented. Calculations were presented to investigate the
path-dependence of the method under both equilibrium and non-equilibrium conditions. The calculations indicate that only true equilibrium states exhibit path-independence, and that domain structures near crack tips may be responsible for allowing positive energy release rates during purely electrical loading.
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**Appendix A**

Eq. (11) presented the general form of the Helmholtz free energy used in this paper. For a coordinate system aligned with the (100) directions, the specific form used to fit the dielectric, piezoelectric and elastic properties of ferroelectric single crystals that undergo a cubic to tetragonal phase transformation is given in Eq. (A1).

\[
\psi = \frac{a_0}{2} \left( p_{11}^2 + p_{22}^2 + p_{33}^2 + p_{12}^2 + p_{13}^2 + p_{23}^2 + p_{14}^2 + p_{24}^2 + p_{34}^2 \right) + \frac{a_1}{2} \left( p_{11}^2 + p_{22}^2 + p_{33}^2 \right) + \frac{a_2}{4} \left( p_{11}^2 + p_{22}^2 + p_{33}^2 \right)
\]

\[
+ \frac{a_3}{6} \left( p_{11}^2 p_{22} + p_{22}^2 p_{33} + p_{33}^2 p_{11} + p_{12}^2 p_{13} + p_{13}^2 p_{23} + p_{23}^2 p_{12} \right) + \frac{a_4}{6} \left( p_{11}^2 p_{22} + p_{22}^2 p_{33} + p_{33}^2 p_{11} + p_{12}^2 p_{13} + p_{13}^2 p_{23} + p_{23}^2 p_{12} \right)
\]

\[
+ \frac{a_5}{6} \left( p_{11}^2 p_{22} + p_{22}^2 p_{33} + p_{33}^2 p_{11} + p_{12}^2 p_{13} + p_{13}^2 p_{23} + p_{23}^2 p_{12} \right) - \frac{b_1}{2} \left( e_{11} p_{11}^2 + e_{22} p_{22}^2 + e_{33} p_{33}^2 \right) - \frac{b_2}{2} \left( e_{11} p_{11}^2 + e_{22} p_{22}^2 + e_{33} p_{33}^2 \right)
\]

\[- b_3 \left( e_{11} p_{11}^2 + e_{22} p_{22}^2 + e_{33} p_{33}^2 \right) + c_1 \left( e_{11}^2 + e_{22}^2 + e_{33}^2 \right) + c_2 \left( e_{11} e_{22} + e_{11} e_{33} + e_{22} e_{33} \right) + c_3 \left( e_{11} e_{22} + e_{11} e_{33} + e_{22} e_{33} \right)
\]

\[
+ \frac{c_4}{2} \left( e_{11} + e_{22} \right)^2 + \left( e_{11} + e_{33} \right)^2 + \left( e_{22} + e_{33} \right)^2
\]

\[
+ \frac{f_1}{2} e_{11}^2 + \frac{f_2}{2} e_{22}^2 + e_{33}^2 + f_3 \left( e_{11} e_{22} + e_{11} e_{33} + e_{22} e_{33} \right) + f_4 \left( e_{11} e_{22} + e_{11} e_{33} + e_{22} e_{33} \right) + \frac{f_5}{2} \left( e_{11} + e_{22} \right)^2 + \left( e_{11} + e_{33} \right)^2 + \frac{f_6}{2} \left( e_{22} + e_{33} \right)^2
\]

\[
+ \left( \frac{g_1}{4} e_{11} + \frac{g_2}{4} e_{22} \right) \left( e_{11} e_{22} + e_{11} e_{33} + e_{22} e_{33} \right) + f_7 \left( e_{11} e_{22} + e_{11} e_{33} + e_{22} e_{33} \right) + f_8 \left( e_{11} e_{22} + e_{11} e_{33} + e_{22} e_{33} \right) + \frac{g_9}{4} \left( e_{11} + e_{22} \right)^2 + \frac{g_{10}}{4} \left( e_{11} + e_{33} \right)^2 + \frac{g_{11}}{4} \left( e_{22} + e_{33} \right)^2
\]

\[
+ \frac{g_{12}}{4} \left( e_{11} + e_{22} \right) \left( e_{11} e_{22} + e_{11} e_{33} + e_{22} e_{33} \right) + f_9 \left( e_{11} e_{22} + e_{11} e_{33} + e_{22} e_{33} \right) + f_{10} \left( e_{11} e_{22} + e_{11} e_{33} + e_{22} e_{33} \right) + \frac{1}{2 \kappa_0} \left( D_1 - P_1 \right)^2 + \left( D_2 - P_2 \right)^2 + \frac{D_3 - P_3}{\kappa_0}
\]

(A1)

In the equation above \( \kappa_0 = 8.854 \times 10^{-12} \) \( \text{V m/C} \), and

\[
a_0 = -0.668325E_0/P_{00}, \quad a_2 = -3.80653E_0/P_{00}, \quad a_3 = 0.78922E_0/P_{00}
\]

\[
a_4 = 12.4421E_0/P_{00}, \quad a_5 = 368E_0/P_{00}, \quad a_6 = 0.134226E_0/P_{00}
\]

\[
b_1 = 2.54138E_0/e_0P_0, \quad b_2 = 1.74267E_0/e_0P_0, \quad b_3 = 0.399353E_0/e_0P_0
\]

\[
c_1 = 0.249999E_0/e_0, \quad c_2 = 0.971673E_0/e_0, \quad c_3 = 1.27976E_0/e_0
\]

\[
f_1 = 0.663581E_0/e_0P_0, \quad f_2 = 0.841326E_0/e_0P_0, \quad f_3 = -0.170635E_0/e_0P_0
\]

\[
f_4 = 0.687281E_0/e_0P_0, \quad f_5 = 0.106647E_0/e_0P_0, \quad f_6 = 0.213294E_0/e_0P_0
\]

\[
g_1 = -3.66149E_0/e_0P_0, \quad g_2 = 6.27442E_0/e_0P_0, \quad g_3 = -1.21644E_0/e_0P_0
\]

where \( e_0 = E_0/\kappa_0 = 692 \times 10^6 \) \( \text{N/m}^2 \). In addition, \( P_0 = 0.26 \text{ C/m}^2 \), \( e_0 = 0.0082 \) and \( E_0 = 2.182 \times 10^7 \text{ V/m} \) correspond to properties of monodomain single crystal barium titanate at room temperature.

The parameter \( \kappa_0 \) appearing in Eq. (A1) determines the domain wall thickness. If \( a_0 = 1 \times 10^{-10} \text{V m}^3/\text{C} \) then \( \kappa_0 = 1 \text{ nm} \), and therefore the 180° domain wall has thickness equal to 2 nm which is in general agreement with experimental observations [44].
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