A Comparison of Interatomic Potentials for Modeling Tungsten–Hydrogen– Helium Plasma–Surface Interactions

Mary Alice Cusentino,¹ Karl D. Hammond, Faiza Sefta, Niklas Juslin, and Brian D. Wirth*

Department of Nuclear Engineering, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tennessee, 37996

Abstract

We compare the hydrogen and helium clustering characteristics of three interatomic potential energy models intended for simulation of plasma-facing materials for fusion applications. Our simulations compare a Finnis–Sinclair potential and two different Tersoff-style bond order potentials created by Juslin [N. Juslin et al., J. Appl. Phys. 98 (2005) 123520] and Li [X.-C. Li, et al., J. Nucl. Mater. 408 (2011) 12–17], respectively, with respect to both helium and hydrogen clustering behavior in tungsten. We find significant differences between the Juslin and Li potentials in terms of both hydrogen and helium clustering behavior as well as the spatial distribution of hydrogen below the surface. These simulations are an important test on the road to more accurate models of gas clustering and surface evolution of tungsten divertors in ITER and other plasma devices.

PACS: 25.52.Fa, 89.30.Jj

PSI-2014 keywords: Divertor material, Helium, Hydrogen, Molecular Dynamics, Tungsten

**Corresponding author address:* 303 Pasqua Engineering Building, Knoxville, TN 37996 (USA)

**Corresponding author email:* bdwirth@utk.edu

¹*Presenting author:* Mary Alice Cusentino

¹*Presenting author e-mail:* mcusenti@utk.edu

1. Introduction

Tungsten is currently the material of choice for the divertor in prototype fusion reactors such as ITER due to its high melting temperature, high thermal conductivity, and low sputtering yield [1]. However, experiments in linear plasma devices [2–4] and tokamaks [5] have shown that a fuzz-like structure forms on the tungsten surface between approximately 900 K and 2000 K after exposure to helium-containing plasma with helium energies as low as 12 eV [3,6]. Such “fuzz” is absent at surface temperatures outside this range and/or much higher incident helium energies above hundreds of electron-volts [6,7]. The precise mechanisms involved in tungsten fuzz formation remain the target of significant research. Understanding this phenomenon will require a combination of high- and low-flux and fluence experiments combined with insights from both atomistic and coarse-grained modeling.

Molecular dynamics (MD) is a useful simulation tool that has been used by several research groups, including ours, to investigate this tungsten surface deformation phenomenon [8–12]. Previous MD simulations have involved pure helium as well as mixed helium/hydrogen exposure conditions, though most work to date has focused on the helium–tungsten system. Sefta [13] observed that these two types of simulations differed: in mixed hydrogen/helium simulations, the helium clusters were notably smaller and more numerous than in pure helium plasma simulations. The most obvious explanation for this was the interatomic potential, because the helium/hydrogen simulations used a different tungsten–tungsten potential: a Tersoff bond order potential (BOP) [14] created by Juslin et al. [15] was used to model the tungsten–tungsten interactions in the mixed helium/hydrogen simulations, while a Finnis–Sinclair potential [16] was used in the helium simulations. The differences in helium clustering seen with the Juslin BOP relative to that seen with the Finnis–Sinclair potential may indicate a deficiency in one or both of these potentials for the purposes of simulating gas clustering.

Recently, another hydrogen–tungsten Tersoff-style potential was developed by Li et al. [19] which was designed to yield hydrogen–tungsten interactions more consistent with density functional theory calculations, particularly near defects, by re-fitting with a longer cutoff distance for both the W–W and W–H parts of the model. There are many differences that emerge as a result, the most notable being the hydrogen interstitial formation energies. This work attempts to compare these three different tungsten–tungsten potentials with respect to gas clustering in the bulk as well as sub-surface clustering dynamics for pure helium, pure hydrogen, and a 90% hydrogen/10% helium mixture. We find that the two BOP models give drastically different hydrogen clustering behavior, especially near surfaces, suggesting the need for further work to determine which behavior, if any, are physically meaningful and/or relevant to experimental results.

2. Simulation Method

All molecular dynamics (MD) simulations were performed using LAMMPS [20]. Three tungsten potentials were compared: a Finnis–Sinclair potential [16] modified at short range by Ackland and Thetford [17] and by Juslin and Wirth [18]; and two different Tersoff-type [14] bond-order potentials (BOP), one developed by Juslin et al. [15] and one developed by Li et al. [19]. The Finnis–Sinclair potential was not used in simulations containing hydrogen. **Table Error! No sequence specified.** shows the formation energies of hydrogen interstitials and tungsten vacancies with these potentials. A helium–tungsten potential fit by Juslin [18] and Beck's potential for helium–helium [21] as modified at short distances by Morishita et al. [22] were used in all helium-containing simulations. Helium–hydrogen interactions were described by a Lennard-Jones 12–6 potential [23] with $\sigma = 1.333 \text{ \AA}$ and $\epsilon = 5.9225 \times 10^{-4} \text{ eV}$ [24].

We performed two different types of simulations to study clustering with each interatomic potential. The first simulates clustering in the bulk, and was started by creating a BCC tungsten ($a = 0.31689$ nm) block with periodic boundary conditions in all three dimensions. Thermal equilibrium was established by selecting velocities from a Maxwell–Boltzmann distribution at 1200 K and running for 5 ps with a 1 fs time step using velocity re-scaling every 100 time steps, followed by 15 ps without temperature control. Gas atoms (helium and/or hydrogen) were inserted at random positions every 6–8 ps. After a gas atom was inserted, the system was evolved without a thermostat for 30,000 time steps followed by 5,000 time steps with velocity using the same parameters used during equilibration. A variable time step was used during the simulations in case an atom was inserted very close to another one, producing a large force. The step size was recomputed to a value between 10^{-5} fs and 1 fs every ten time steps so that no atom would move farther than 0.001 nm during one step (a typical step size is 0.1 fs). The size of the simulation cell was $20a$ (about 6.3 nm) in each dimension.

~~The pressure in the box increases as gas atoms are added. To maintain pressure, interstitial tungsten atoms were deleted as they were created. This was done before each insertion by looking for off-lattice tungsten atoms and deleting the first one encountered (usually one on the first process). At most, one tungsten atom was deleted per insertion. This simulates the process of a cluster punching out tungsten self-interstitials, which then leave the bulk to annihilate at sinks such as dislocations, surfaces or grain boundaries.~~

The second type of simulation was used to evaluate differences between the two Tersoff potentials related to free surfaces. Simulation conditions were identical to the bulk simulations, except that the z (001)-direction was a free surface; the box was $40a$ (12.6 nm) long in the z -direction, and the gas implantation profile in the z -coordinate was sampled from the SRIM [25] depth distribution for 60 eV. This method saves considerable time over direct energetic implantation because direct

bombardment requires much smaller time steps and results in most of the atoms reflecting from the surface, as well as requiring significant temperature control due to the kinetic energy dissipation of the energetic gas atom. The results should be comparable to direct bombardment studies provided the flux and fluence are corrected for reflected atoms. This approximation is possible because 60 eV is well below the sputtering threshold (105-110 eV for helium and roughly twice as much for deuterium). The first nine insertions in a sequence of ten were hydrogen, with the tenth being helium, so as to mimic a 90% hydrogen, 10% helium plasma. The nominal flux is $3.6 \times 10^{27} \text{ m}^{-2}\text{s}^{-1}$ (excluding reflected ions). At this flux, 1000 insertions corresponds to a fluence of $3.6 \times 10^{19} \text{ m}^{-2}$ (again excluding reflections).

3. Results and Discussion

Figures 1 and 2 show the observed differences in both helium and hydrogen clustering for the three different potentials. The helium clustering appears qualitatively similar across all three potentials, but the Juslin BOP does seem to produce more small helium clusters than either the Finnis–Sinclair or the Li BOP. The cluster size distributions are shown in Figure 3, and provide a more quantitative assessment of the differences in helium clustering behavior. Atoms are considered to be in the same cluster if they are within 0.32 nm of each other. As seen in Figure 3a, the Juslin BOP has over three times as many helium monomers as either the Finnis–Sinclair potential or the Li BOP. While the Li BOP does not produce helium clusters as large as those with the Finnis–Sinclair potential, the results with the Li potential are more comparable to the Finnis–Sinclair results than to the Juslin BOP results. On the other hand, the hydrogen clustering shown in Figure 2 is drastically different between the Juslin and Li BOPs. There are obvious hydrogen clusters in the simulation using the Juslin BOP that are oriented in the $\langle 111 \rangle$ direction, while there is virtually no clustering with the Li BOP. The hydrogen cluster size distributions are shown in Figure 3b, which confirm the visual observation:

the Juslin BOP gives a varied distribution of different sized clusters while the Li BOP hydrogen clustering consists almost entirely of individual hydrogen atoms mixed with a few two and three atom clusters.

The only differences between the three helium simulations were the choices of tungsten–tungsten potential, and therefore the variability in the cluster size distribution is attributable to the tungsten–tungsten interactions. One explanation for the helium clustering behavior is the tungsten vacancy formation energy, which is 1.68 eV for the Juslin BOP, 3.63 eV for the Finnis–Sinclair potential, and 3.52 eV for the Li BOP. Combined with the slightly higher tungsten interstitial formation energy for the Juslin BOP of 9.59 eV versus 9.33 eV for the Li BOP; this leads to a Frenkel pair formation energy of 11.27 eV for the Juslin BOP and 12.85 eV for the Li BOP. The lower vacancy/Frenkel pair formation energy from the Juslin potential means it is easier for the trap mutation process (see, for example, Ref. 11) to “punch out” a tungsten atom from its lattice site to create a vacancy. It is therefore more likely for helium to create vacancies using the Juslin BOP than one of the other two potentials, producing a higher number of vacancies and therefore smaller, but more numerous and more spatially distributed helium-vacancy clusters.

The differences in the hydrogen clustering behavior are harder to explain, as both tungsten and hydrogen interactions differ between the Juslin and Li BOPs. Again, we posit that the Frenkel pair formation energy differences may influence the ease of the trap mutation process. The hydrogen clusters that form with the Juslin BOP are oriented along $\langle 111 \rangle$ directions which appears to be consistent with this hypothesis: the vacancy formation energy is much lower for the Juslin BOP, and it is therefore easier to form a Frenkel pair. In our simulations, the hydrogen will cluster around these defects, in turn punching out more tungsten atoms and allowing the cluster to grow a long $\langle 111 \rangle$

directions. Since the vacancy and Frenkel pair formation energies are higher with the Li BOP, it is harder to punch out a tungsten self-interstitial and allow the hydrogen clusters to grow.

The free surface simulations also indicate differences between the two Tersoff potentials. As seen in Figure 4, the final depths of the hydrogen atoms were quite different. For the Juslin BOP, a majority of the hydrogen atoms cluster in a layer just below the surface. However, most of the hydrogen atoms are located directly on the surface at hollow sites when using the Li BOP. With the Juslin BOP, the hydrogen seems to cluster more, which is consistent with the results from the periodic simulations. A difference in hydrogen retention is also observed: after 1000 atom insertions, about 87% of the hydrogen atoms are still in the simulation box for the Juslin BOP, but only 62% remain when using the Li BOP. The helium retention is also lower for the Li potential, about 42% as opposed to 80% with the Juslin BOP (see supporting information). With the Li potential, the hydrogen retention as a function of time (and fluence) is fairly steady until a few hundred atoms are inserted, at which point the retention starts decreasing. This may indicate that the accumulated hydrogen has formed a monolayer on the surface, and hydrogen atoms inserted later will force one or more atoms to desorb, therefore reducing the percent retention.

In general, the Li potential better reproduces formation energies obtained from density functional theory but takes significantly longer to run the simulation due to the longer cutoff distance. Clustering behavior is absent from the simulations with the Li potential, and we do not know whether this behavior is consistent with actual hydrogen behavior. Further analysis of this feature of the model is necessary to conclude which potential is better for simulating helium – hydrogen clustering behavior in tungsten. Potential energy models, including those studied here, are typically fit to bulk material properties. In light of the surface behavior shown in figure 4, we recommend including near surface behavior and possibly larger clusters/bubbles in the fitting process. It should be noted that the model of

Li et al. inverts the i and j indices in the definition of the three body terms in comparison to how the model is typically parameterized. New users should be aware of this when implementing the model.

4. Conclusions

We have performed molecular dynamics simulations to compare three different tungsten potentials for mixed helium/hydrogen plasma studies. We observed that both the helium and hydrogen clustering varied between the potentials. The helium clusters with the Juslin BOP were both smaller and more numerous compared to the Finnis–Sinclair potential and the Li BOP. On the other hand, the hydrogen clusters were larger with the Juslin BOP than with the Li BOP. Large hydrogen clusters oriented in $\langle 111 \rangle$ directions formed with the Juslin BOP, while almost no hydrogen clustering occurred below the surface with the Li BOP. In addition, the depth distributions differed between the two BOPs. Hydrogen tended to cluster in sub-surface regions when using the Juslin potential, while the hydrogen mostly sat on the surface at hollow sites with the Li potential. These differences may be attributed to differences in the potentials that also manifest as differences in some of the tungsten and hydrogen bulk properties, such as vacancy formation energies. We find that both models give drastically different clustering behaviors, especially near surfaces, suggesting the need for further work to determine which behaviors, if any, are physically meaningful and/or relevant to experimental results.

Acknowledgments

Partial support for this research was provided through the Plasma-Surface Interactions Science Center, funded by the U. S. Department of Energy, Office of Fusion Energy Sciences under award number DE–SC00–02060. Additional funding was provided through the Scientific Discovery through Advanced Computing (SciDAC) program on Plasma Surface Interactions, funded by the U. S.

Department of Energy, Office of Science, Advanced Scientific Computing Research, and Fusion Energy Sciences under award number DE-SC00-08875.

References

1. G. Janeschitz, J. Nucl. Mater. 290–293 (2001) 1–11.
2. H. Iwakiri, K. Yasunaga, K. Morishita, N. Yoshida, J. Nucl. Mater. 283–287 (2000) 1134–1138.
3. S. Takamura, N. Ohno, D. Nishijima, S. Kajita, Plasma Fusion Res. 1 (2006) 051.
4. M.J. Baldwin, R.P. Doerner, J. Nucl. Mater. 404 (2010) 165–173.
5. G.M. Wright, D. Brunner, M.J. Baldwin, K. Bystrov, R.P. Doerner, B. Labombard, B. Lipschultz, G. Detemmerman, J.L. Terry, D.G. Whyte, K.B. Woller, J. Nucl. Mater. 438 (2013) S84–S89.
6. S. Kajita, W. Sakaguchi, O. Noriyasu, N. Yoshida, T. Saeki, Nucl. Fusion 49 (2009) 095005.
7. K. Tokunaga, R.P. Doerner, R. Seraydarian, N. Noda, Y. Kubota, N. Yoshida, T. Sogabe, T. Kato, B. Schedler, J. Nucl. Mater. 313–316 (2003) 92–96.
8. A. Lasa, C. Björkas, K. Vörtler, K. Nordlund, J. Nucl. Mater. 429 (2012) 284–292.
9. A. Lasa, K.O.E. Henriksson, K. Nordlund, Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res. B 303 (2013) 156–161.
10. F. Sefta, N. Juslin, K.D. Hammond, B.D. Wirth, J. Nucl. Mater. 438 (2013) S493–S496.
11. F. Sefta, K.D. Hammond, N. Juslin, B.D. Wirth, Nucl. Fusion 53 (2013) 073015.
12. L. Hu, K.D. Hammond, B.D. Wirth, D. Maroudas, J. Appl. Phys. 115 (2014) 173512.
13. F. Sefta, Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 2013.

14. J. Tersoff, Phys. Rev. B 37 (1988) 6991–7000.
15. N. Juslin, P. Erhart, P. Träskelin, J. Nord, K.O.E. Henriksson, K. Nordlund, E. Salonen, K. Albe, J. Appl. Phys. 98 (2005) 123520.
16. M.W. Finnis, J.E. Sinclair, Phil. Mag. A 50 (1984) 45–55.
17. G.J. Ackland, R. Thetford, Phil. Mag. A 56 (1987) 15–30.
18. N. Juslin, B.D. Wirth, J. Nucl. Mater. 432 (2013) 61–66.
19. X.-C. Li, X. Shu, Y.-N. Liu, F. Gao, G.-H. Lu, J. Nucl. Mater. 408 (2011) 12–17.
20. S.J. Plimpton, J. Comput. Phys., 117 (1995) 1–19. <http://lammmps.sandia.gov/>
21. D.E. Beck, Mol. Phys. 14 (1968) 311–315. *ibid.* 15 (1968) 332.
22. K. Morishita, R. Sugano, B.D. Wirth, T. Diaz de la Rubia, Nucl. Instrum. Meth. Phys. Res. B 202 (2003) 76–81.
23. J.E. Lennard-Jones, Proc. R. Soc. London A 106 (1924) 463–477.
24. D.K. Belashchenko, Russ. J. Phys. Chem. 80 (2006) S31–S39.
25. J.F. Ziegler, J.P. Biersack, M.D. Ziegler, *The Stopping and Range of Ions in Solids*, Lulu Press, Morrisville, 2008. <http://srim.org/>

Captions

Table 1: Select hydrogen properties for the Juslin BOP, Li BOP, and DFT (data from Li et al. [19]).

Figure 1: Snapshots of simulations of for helium implantation in a periodic box at 1.5 atom% for (a) Finnis–Sinclair, (b) Juslin BOP, and (c) Li BOP. Helium atoms were randomly inserted every 10 ps into a $20 \times 20 \times 20$ lattice unit box with periodic boundary conditions.

Figure 2: Snapshot of simulations of hydrogen implantation in a periodic box at 5.9 atom% for (a) Juslin BOP and (b) Li BOP. Hydrogen atoms were randomly inserted every 10 ps into a $20 \times 20 \times 20$ lattice unit box with periodic boundary conditions. The Juslin BOP generates $\langle 111 \rangle$ -oriented hydrogen clusters, compared to the diffuse, non-clustered hydrogen of the Li BOP.

Figure 3: Cluster size distributions for (a) helium and (b) hydrogen periodic simulations. Two atoms are considered to be in the same cluster if they are within 0.32 nm of each other. Single hydrogen atoms are not shown; there were 53 with the Juslin BOP and 834 with the Li BOP.

Figure 4: Snapshots of hydrogen implantation simulations with a free surface at a flux of $3.6 \times 10^{27} \text{ m}^{-2}\text{s}^{-1}$ for the (a) Juslin BOP and (b) Li BOP. Gas atoms are inserted into the $20a \times 20a \times 40a$ box every 10 ps based on the SRIM depth distribution for 60 eV ions. There are periodic boundary conditions in the x - and y -directions and a free surface in the z -direction. Green, blue, and magenta atoms denote hydrogen, helium, and above-surface tungsten atoms (adatoms), respectively.

Table Error! No sequence specified.

Potential	H Tetra. (eV)	H Oct. (eV)	H Sub. (eV)	W Vac. (eV)
Juslin	1.03	1.39	4.05	1.68
Li	0.85	1.17	4.02	3.52
DFT	0.88	1.26	4.08	3.56

Figure 1

Figure 2

Figure 3

Figure 4