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Abstract

We develop a long-time, large-domain moving window atomistic framework using Molecular Dynamics (MD) to model shock wave propagation through a one-dimensional system. We implement ideas of control volume on a MD framework where a moving window follows a propagating shock. This circumvents issues such as boundary reflections and transient effects typically observed in conventional MD shock simulations. We model shock wave propagation through a one-dimensional chain of copper atoms using the Lennard-Jones, modified Morse, and Embedded Atom Model (EAM) interatomic potentials. The domain is divided into purely atomistic “window” atoms flanked by boundary, or continuum, atoms which incorporate either a Nose-Hoover or Langevin thermostat. The propagating shock wave is contained within the window region, while continuum shock conditions are imposed on the boundary atoms. The moving window effect is achieved by adding/removing atoms to/from the window and boundary regions. We perform verification studies to ensure proper implementation of the thermostats, potential functions, and moving window respectively. We then track the propagating shock and compare the actual shock velocity and average particle velocity to their corresponding input values. From these comparisons, we make corrections to the linear shock Hugoniot relation for the developed one-dimensional framework. Finally, we perform one-dimensional moving window simulations of a propagating stable-structured shock up to a few nanoseconds.

1. Introduction

The propagation of shock waves in materials is an important scientific phenomenon that has been studied extensively for many decades; see, for example, [1, 2] and the references therein. Typically, shock waves occur in a material under high strain rate loading conditions such as a high speed impact. The shock response of a material at any length scale is inextricably linked to its response at lower length scales. At the macroscopic scale, shock waves can lead to damage, plastic deformation, and fracture of the material. At the micro- and meso-scale, shock waves can interact with the microstructure leading to complex behavior including scattering, grain rotations, pore collapse, phase transformations, dislocation and void generation, and grain crushing [3–5].

Shock response of a material has been modeled using purely atomistic methods [6–9]. These simulations typically involve a large number of atoms (∼ O(10⁵ – 10⁹)) subjected to flyer-plate loading scenarios. These simulations have been used to study void nucleation, dislocation generation [10], twinning [11] and even shock induced spallation [4, 9, 12]. However, purely atomistic methods suffer from domain boundary effects and unwanted wave reflections from boundaries. Additionally,
purely atomistic shock simulations typically lead to unrealistic strain rates \((10^{10} - 10^{13} \text{s}^{-1})\) [1]. Such strain rates are rare and orders of magnitude higher than those observed in experiments and practical scenarios \((10^6 - 10^8 \text{s}^{-1})\). From a purely atomistic perspective, the multiscale shock technique (MSST), which has been developed in the past decade [13], performs long-time shock simulations on a small atomistic domain for a much lower computational cost than conventional MD simulations. MSST also allows for multiple shock waves. While this technique permits the shock to be controlled based on prescribed continuum constraints, it does not allow the information to communicate from atomistic to continuum and back.

Concurrent multiscale methods have been developed in the past few decades where the domain is divided into a coarse-scaled (continuum) region and a fine-scaled (atomistic) region [14]. The atomistic region is typically the region of interest where information from lower length scales is needed. In developing concurrent multiscale methods, it is imperative to ensure the compatibility of the interface region between fine-scaled and coarse-scaled regions [15]. One of the primary issues with concurrent atomistic/continuum methods is the phenomenon of spurious wave reflections at the interface. A few prominent reasons for spurious wave reflections are as follows: i) a difference in governing equations in the continuum and atomistic regions, ii) the continuum region (due to its lower resolution) being unable to support all the waves from the atomistic region, and iii) an incompatible interface region that doesn’t support thermal vibrations of atoms [15]. Existing concurrent schemes such as quasi-continuum (QC) method [16–19] and coupled atomistic discrete dislocation (CADD) [20–23] implement a pad region which acts as a boundary condition for the both atomistic and continuum regions.

While existing concurrent schemes have been very successful in modeling material defects and their motion, they haven’t been extended to model shock wave propagation through a material. To model shock wave propagation using concurrent multiscale schemes, the atomistic region of interest must move along with the shock. This motion of the atomistic region requires simultaneous refinement of the continuum region as well as coarsening of the atomistic region at the speed at which the shock wave is moving. At the same time, the scattered elastic waves and resulting microstructural defects must consistently cross the interface to the continuum region. Additionally, material behavior under shock loading is governed by a highly nonlinear equation of state adding more complications into the formulation.

In the present work, we use ideas of control volume to develop a long-time, large-domain moving window atomistic framework to model shock wave propagation through a one-dimensional chain of copper atoms. The formulation is inspired from [24] and the supplemental material of [25]. The domain is divided into an inner ‘window’ region containing the shock wave flanked by a ‘boundary’ region on both sides. The atoms in the boundary region are governed by continuum shock equations and act as boundary conditions for the window region. The motion of the window is achieved by consistently adding and removing atoms to and from the boundary and window regions. The framework, in its current state, is not a truly concurrent atomistic/continuum scheme in that it lacks a continuum region with finite element type mesh points. The scope of this work is therefore limited to ensuring that the formulation can follow a shock wave for a long time without artificial wave generation and reflection.

In addition to developing the moving window-atomistic/continuum (MW-A/C) method for use in shock propagation modeling, the present paper also utilizes this method to calculate a relation between the particle velocity and shock wave velocity in one dimension. Much work has been done on shock kinetic relations and the linear Hugoniot relationship between shock speed and particle speed. This includes extensive experimental calibration of the linear relation [26], as well as theoretical investigations into the origins of the shock kinetic relation [27]. This paper starts with the experimentally known linear law for copper and performs steady state simulations using
shock speeds obtained from the known kinetic relation. Next, the paper provides corrections to the linear law for a one-dimensional case to ensure steady shock speed.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 outlines a classic shock Riemann problem of a single propagating shock wave with constant states across it. Section 3 and 4 describe the one-dimensional framework and its components, including thermostats, potentials, integration algorithms, and the moving window. Section 5 presents detailed verifications of every component of the framework. Finally, Section 6 presents the results from the moving window framework including steady state shock simulations, calculations of a new equation of state in the one-dimensional setting, and effects of domain size.

2. Problem Statement

We study shock wave propagation through an idealized, one-dimensional chain of copper (Cu) atoms along the close packed [110] direction. In a three-dimensional sense, this case corresponds to a planar shock propagating along the close packed direction. For the purpose of simplicity, shock induced plastic effects, defect generation, and phase transformations are ignored in this work. At the continuum level, the one-dimensional shock equations in the Lagrangian frame are given by the following jump conditions [2]:

\[
\begin{align*}
\sigma + \rho U_s[v] &= 0 \\
[v] + U_s[e] &= 0
\end{align*}
\] (1)

where \( \sigma, \epsilon, \rho \) and \( v \) denote stress, strain, Lagrangian density and particle velocity respectively. The speed of the propagating shock front in the Lagrangian frame is \( U_s \) and \([\cdot]\) denotes the change in quantity across the shock. The shock jump equations are supplemented by an empirically observed linear relation between shock velocity and particle velocity,

\[ U_s = C_B + S[v]. \] (3)

Here, \( S \) is a dimensionless, empirical parameter (1.49 for Cu [26]), and \( C_B \) is the sound velocity in the material at zero stress (3.94 km/sec for Cu [1]). Finally, this leads to the standard Hugoniot stress-strain relationship given by

\[ \sigma = \frac{\rho C_B \epsilon}{(1 - S \epsilon)^2} \] (4)

where compression strain is considered positive. The Hugoniot stress-strain relationship forms the basis of modern equations of state (EOS). In this work, we use the Hugoniot EOS (Eq. 4) for sake of simplicity and to quickly compute shocked states. Finally, the temperature change across the shock can be calculated by solving the following differential equation:

\[ C_V \left( \frac{dT}{d\epsilon} \right)_H - \frac{\gamma TCV}{1 - \epsilon} = \frac{\epsilon}{2} \left( \frac{d\sigma}{d\epsilon} \right)_H - \frac{\sigma}{2} \] (5)

where \( C_V \) is the volumetric specific heat capacity, and \( \gamma \) is the Mie-Gruneisen parameter for the material (2.0 for Cu [2]).

The state of the material is described by the state variables \( (v, \epsilon, \theta) \) on either side of the shock, where \( \theta \) denotes temperature. Given a shock velocity \( U_s \) and state \( (v^- , \epsilon^- , \theta^-) \) of the unshocked material, equations (1),(2),(4) and (5) can be used to compute the state \( (v^+ , \epsilon^+ , \theta^+) \) and stress \( \sigma \) of the shocked material. In this paper, we present a moving window framework to simulate long-time steady state shock wave propagation using atomistics given continuum shock states ahead and behind the shock. We study a classic Riemann problem of a single shock wave with constant states on either side as shown in Fig. 1.
3. Development of the Atomistic Framework

The one-dimensional framework is implemented using an in-house C++ code. We utilize a chain of $N$ Cu atoms of mass $m = 63.55$ amu with $x_i$ denoting the instantaneous position of the $i^{th}$ atom at time $t$.

3.1. Geometry and boundary conditions

The atomistic chain is split into three sections as illustrated in Fig. 2. The outer atoms (in blue) are called continuum atoms (CA) while the inner atoms containing the shock wave front (SWF) are called window atoms (WA). The continuum Reimann states $(v, \epsilon, \theta)$ are imposed on the CA regions using standard algorithms for applying strain, mean particle velocity, and temperature (thermostats) [14]. The WA region is governed by classic MD equations. To ensure semi-infinite regions on either side of the shock wave, a semi-periodic boundary condition method is employed. To achieve this, the continuum atoms at the ends of the chain ($x_0$ and $x_F$) are made neighbors with the continuum atoms at the WA/CA interfaces ($x_{WA,0}$ and $x_{WA,F}$ respectively). The continuum atoms and window atoms near the WA/CA (A/C) interfaces interact with each other. A two-dimensional representation of the atomistic framework can be seen in Fig. 2.

Figure 1: Riemann problem of a shock wave with constant states ahead of and behind the shock front.

Figure 2: Schematic of the atomistic framework.
3.2. Interatomic potentials

In this work, we utilize three different interatomic potential functions: Lennard-Jones (LJ), modified Morse, and Embedded Atom Model (EAM). The LJ potential only considers nearest-neighbor interactions and is represented most commonly as [28, 29],

$$V(x_{ij}) = 4\epsilon \left[ \left( \frac{\sigma}{x_{ij}} \right)^{12} - \left( \frac{\sigma}{x_{ij}} \right)^{6} \right] = \epsilon \left[ \left( \frac{x_0}{x_{ij}} \right)^{12} - 2 \left( \frac{x_0}{x_{ij}} \right)^{6} \right]$$ \hspace{1cm} (6)

where $\epsilon$ is the depth of the potential well, $\sigma$ is the finite distance at which the inter-particle potential is zero, $x_{ij} = |x_i - x_j|$ is the absolute distance between particle $i$ and $j$, and $x_0$ is the distance at which the potential reaches the minimum. The parameters for Cu are given by $\epsilon = 0.4093$ eV and $\sigma = 2.338$ Å [30].

Like LJ, the modified Morse potential [31, 32] only considers nearest neighbor interactions. The expression is given by

$$V(x_{ij}) = D_0 \frac{2}{2B - 1} \left[ e^{-2A\sqrt{B}(x_{ij} - x_0)} - 2Be^{-A(x_{ij} - x_0)/\sqrt{B}} \right].$$ \hspace{1cm} (7)

Here, we use the following parameters for Cu: $x_0 = 2.5471$ Å, $A = 1.1857$ Å$^{-1}$, $D_0 = 0.5869$ eV, and $B = 2.265$ [32]. MacDonald and MacDonald [31] modified the standard Morse potential to improve the agreement with experimental values for the thermal expansion of Cu [32].

Finally, the Embedded Atom Model (EAM) potential [33], is given by the expression

$$V(x_{ij}) = F \left( \sum_{i \neq j} \rho(x_{ij}) \right) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \neq j} \phi(x_{ij}).$$ \hspace{1cm} (8)

In this case, the total energy of a particular atom is a function of all the atoms within a cutoff radius $r_c = 5.507$ Å. Here, $\phi$ is a pair-wise potential function, $\rho$ is the contribution to the electron charge density from atom $j$ at the location of atom $i$, and $F$ is an embedding function that represents the energy required to place atom $i$ into the electron cloud [34]. As shown in [35], the EAM potential works very well for purely metallic systems with no directional bonding and thus provides a robust means of calculating approximate structure and energetics of materials. In our case, we use the EAM potential file produced by [36].

3.3. Thermostats

The continuum atoms are subjected to continuum states $(v^+, \epsilon^+, \theta^+)$ and $(v^-, \epsilon^-, \theta^-)$. Temperatures $\theta^+$ and $\theta^-$ are imposed using thermostatting algorithms. Two well-known examples of very distinct thermostats are considered in this paper: the Langevin thermostat [37, 38], and the Nose-Hoover thermostat [37, 39, 40].

3.3.1. Langevin thermostat and stadium damping

The Langevin thermostat is a stochastic thermostat which adds a random force to the particle motion along with a damping term, $\zeta$. The one-dimensional equations of motion of the Langevin thermostat for a particle $i$ are as follows:

$$f_{i}^{\text{tot}}(t) = f_i(t) - \zeta m_i v_i(t) + \sqrt{\frac{2k_B T}{\delta t}} \tilde{h}_i(t)$$

$$\langle \tilde{h}_i(t) \rangle = 0$$

$$\langle \tilde{h}_{i,\alpha} \tilde{h}_{i,\beta}(t) \rangle = \delta_{\alpha\beta}$$ \hspace{1cm} (9)
where $\alpha$ and $\beta$ denote Cartesian components, $k_B$ is Boltzmann’s Constant, and $\tilde{h}_i$ is a Gaussian random variable with mean zero and variance one. The Langevin thermostat is local in nature, in that it allows for a target temperature to be specified for every atom.

To ensure force matching across the WA and CA regions, we specify the damping factor $\zeta$ to be a function of position relative to the A/C interface for the Langevin thermostat. To this end, we utilize the equation developed in [41] which linearly ramps the damping in the CA regions as the distance from the A/C interface increases. This equation is given as follows:

$$\zeta = \zeta_0 \left[ 1 - \frac{d(x)}{\omega} \right]$$

(10)

where $\zeta_0$ equals the maximum damping of 1/2 the Debye frequency of Cu, and $\omega$ is the length of the CA region. Here, $d$ is the minimum distance from the atom at position $x$ to the end of the chain (either point $x_0$ or $x_F$),

$$d(x) = \text{abs}(x_i - x_0), \text{abs}(x_i - x_F)$$

(11)

Hence, for atoms in the CA regions, the damping coefficient varies linearly from zero at the A/C interfaces to $\zeta_0$ at the ends of the chain. This “stadium” damping allows waves of a variety of wavelengths to enter the CA region and slowly be absorbed as they propagate to the end of the chain. This reduces spurious wave reflections and artificial waves introduced at the A/C interface.

3.3.2. Nose-Hoover thermostat

The Nose-Hoover thermostat is a deterministic thermostat that introduces a fictitious dynamical friction variable, $\zeta$, which either increases or decreases the particle velocity until the desired temperature is achieved. The Nose-Hoover thermostat is used for many NVT simulations because of its symplectic, volume-conserving, time-reversible Hamiltonian structure [42]. The one-dimensional equations of motion are as follows:

$$m \frac{d^2x_i}{dt^2} = f_i - \zeta mv_i$$

(12)

$$\frac{d\zeta(t)}{dt} = \frac{1}{Q} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{1}{2}mv_i^2 - \frac{N+1}{2}k_B T \right]$$

(13)

where $Q$ in Eq. (13) determines the relaxation of the dynamics of friction $\zeta(t)$, and $T$ is the target temperature. This thermostat preserves the average kinetic energy of the particle ensemble over time and hence is a global thermostat. Unlike the Langevin thermostat, Nose-Hoover cannot control the temperature distribution within the CA regions but rather preserves the average temperature [43]. This can be advantageous since the temperature is controlled by a feedback between the calculated and target temperatures, and thus even non-equilibrium simulations will achieve an average temperature.
3.4. Integration algorithm

To integrate the equations of motion, we utilize the well-known velocity Verlet algorithm [44] as seen below for 1D:

\[
\begin{align*}
  x_i(t + \delta t) &= x_i(t) + v_i(t) \delta t + \frac{f_i(t)}{2m} \delta t^2 \\
  v_i\left(t + \frac{\delta t}{2}\right) &= v_i(t) + \frac{\delta t f_i(t)}{m} \\
  f_i(t + \delta t) &= f_i(x_i(t + \delta t)) \\
  v_i(t + \delta t) &= v_i\left(t + \frac{\delta t}{2}\right) + \frac{\delta t f_i(t + \delta t)}{m}
\end{align*}
\]

where \(x_i, v_i,\) and \(f_i\) denote the position of the \(i^{th}\) particle, its velocity, and the net force acting on it respectively. The time step used in the integration algorithm was chosen to be \(\delta t = 0.001\) ps.

4. Moving Window Formulation

Purely MD simulations of shock wave propagation are limited by small domain sizes and the resulting reflections from the boundaries. To circumvent these issues, we implement a moving window formulation inspired from [24] and [25] into the proposed framework. Such a formulation allows for a detailed investigation of the shock wave jump conditions and EOS from an atomistic scale with minimal influence from spurious wave reflections. The MW-A/C method is outlined in Fig. 3.

![Figure 3: Schematic of the moving window mechanism for a shock wave propagating through a 1D chain of atoms.](image)

The proposed work feeds a constant flux of material with mean unshocked particle velocity, strain, and temperature of \((v^-, \epsilon^-, \theta^-)\) into the simulation window by inserting atoms at the right boundary \(x_F\) with a frequency of \(\tau^{-1} = U_S/a_0\), where \(a_0\) is the equilibrium spacing of Cu. In other words, after the shock wave has traveled a distance of one lattice constant, the program adds a single Cu atom to the right CA region while simultaneously removing a single Cu atom from the left CA region. At the same time, the window atom at \(x_{WA,0}\) is added to the left CA region while the boundary atom at \(x_{WA,F}\) is added to the rightmost position within the WA region. In effect, every atom in the chain shifts to the left by one equilibrium lattice spacing when \(\tau = N(a_0/U_S)\), where \(N\) increases by one each time the shock travels a distance of \(a_0\). Fig. 3 shows a schematic of this process of adding, removing, and shifting atoms. Local atomic energy fluctuations induced
near the right boundary of the chain from the atom addition are damped by either the Langevin or Nose-Hoover thermostat to establish the prescribed temperature $\theta^-$ as described previously.

An $x-t$ diagram of the moving window process is presented in Fig. 4. An idealized shock wave with speed $U_S$ originates at $(x, t) = (0, 0)$ and travels into the initially undisturbed material. When the simulation begins, the SWF is located at the center of the WA region. We start the simulation with atoms in the WA regions ahead of and behind the shock initialized with $(v^-, \epsilon^-, \theta^-)$ and $(v^+, \epsilon^+, \theta^+)$ respectively, and in CA regions ahead of and behind the shock with $(v^-, \epsilon^-, \theta^-)$ and $(v^+, \epsilon^+, \theta^+)$ respectively. As the simulation evolves in time, the shock wave propagates forward through the material. During this time, the moving window process occurs with a frequency $\tau^{-1} = U_S/a_0$, and the A/C domain “follows” the propagating shock. This ensures that the SWF remains at the center of the WA region. Ordinarily, the shock would propagate forward towards the A/C interface and eventually travel out of the whole domain, thus limiting the simulation time. In contrast, the moving window formulation allows us to perform extremely long-time shock simulations.

![Figure 4: X-t diagram representation of the moving window formulation.](image)

Semi-infinite boundary conditions are implemented as stated in Sec. 3.1, and the process by which the A/C domain “follows” a propagating shock limits the number of interactions from transient waves. Many of these transient waves will be absorbed into either of the CA regions and thus damped out of the system. Those that are reflected off the left A/C interface will have to travel at a speed greater than the insertion frequency of the moving window to eventually interact with the shock wave. Hence, while this framework does not completely eliminate effects from spurious wave reflections, the implementation of a moving window within an A/C framework drastically limits their influence on the shock.

5. Verification

5.1. NVT Ensemble

We perform constant temperature simulations for systems of 10,000 Cu atoms using both the Langevin and Nose-Hoover thermostat. We test the performance of each of these thermostats using all three potential functions (LJ, modified Morse, and EAM) at temperatures ranging from 250 K - 1,250 K. Since the melting temperature of Cu is 1,358 K, we do not perform simulations with higher input temperatures. The total run-time for each simulation is 3,000 ps (3 ns) with an equilibration time of 5 ps. In this case, each atom is treated as a continuum atom, and standard periodic boundary conditions are enforced such that the leftmost atom interacts with the rightmost atom in the chain and vice versa. These MD results can be seen in Fig. 5.
Figure 5: Constant temperature NVT results for the Langevin and Nose-Hoover thermostats using (a) Lennard Jones, (b) modified Morse and (c) EAM potentials.

For all three potential functions, the average temperatures oscillate around their corresponding initial input values for the entire run-time of 3,000 ps. However, we notice that for each thermostat, the variance in the average temperature increases with increasing input temperature. This effect occurs regardless of which potential function is used. Such a phenomenon makes physical sense because the frequency of oscillation of the particles in a solid increases as the temperature in the solid is raised. Additionally, we observe that at higher temperatures, the Nose-Hoover thermostat equilibrates the system to the initial input temperature slightly faster than the Langevin thermostat. This effect is seen for all three potential functions, and it is most prominent at an input temperature of 1,250 K. This effect is attributed to the local and global nature of Langevin and Nose-Hoover thermostats respectively.

5.2. Mechanical properties

Verification of the Lennard-Jones and modified Morse potentials is carried out by computing the tangent modulus of the system over a range of temperatures, while verification of the EAM potential is achieved by computing the cohesive energy and bulk modulus of the system at 0 K. In each case, we compare the simulated mechanical properties to their corresponding literature values for Cu.
5.2.1. LJ and Morse potentials

To compute the isothermal elastic modulus in 1D (tangent modulus), we utilize the microscopic elasticity tensor derived in [14]. The conventional expression for the microscopic elasticity tensor at a temperature $T$ is given as follows [14]:

$$c_{ijkl} = \frac{1}{V} \left[ 2Nk_B T \left( \delta_{il} \delta_{jk} + \delta_{jl} \delta_{ik} \right) + \langle c^0_{ijkl} \rangle - \frac{V^2}{k_B T} Cov \left( \sigma_{ij}^{\text{inst}}, \sigma_{kl}^{\text{inst}} \right) \right]$$

(15)

where $\langle \cdot \rangle$ refers to a phase average, $k_B$ is Boltzmann’s Constant, $V$ is the volume, and the covariance operator is defined by

$$Cov \left( A, B \right) \equiv \langle AB \rangle - \langle A \rangle \langle B \rangle.$$  

(16)

Additionally, $c^0_{ijkl}$ is defined as

$$c^0_{ijkl} = \frac{1}{V} \left[ \frac{1}{4} \sum_{\alpha \neq \beta} \sum_{\gamma \neq \delta} \kappa_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta} \frac{r_i^{\alpha\beta} r_j^{\beta\gamma} r_k^{\gamma\delta} r_l^{\delta\gamma}}{r^{\alpha\beta} r^{\beta\gamma} r^{\gamma\delta} r^{\delta\gamma}} - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\alpha \neq \beta} \phi_{\alpha\beta} \frac{r_i^{\alpha\beta} r_j^{\beta\gamma} r_k^{\gamma\delta} r_l^{\delta\gamma}}{r^{\alpha\beta} \left( r^{\alpha\beta} \right)^3} \right]$$

(17)

where $\phi_{\alpha\beta}$ is the interatomic force depending only on the distance $r^{\alpha\beta}$ between the atoms and $\kappa_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}$ is the bond stiffness defined by

$$\kappa_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta} \equiv \frac{\partial \phi_{\alpha\beta}}{\partial r^{\gamma\delta}} = \frac{\partial^2 V^{\text{int}}}{\partial r^{\alpha\beta} \partial r^{\gamma\delta}}.$$  

(18)

This bond stiffness is interpreted for a simple pairwise potential, where the force on atom $\alpha$ due to atom $\beta$ depends only on the distance $r^{\alpha\beta}$. Equation (15) can be further simplified by splitting the instantaneous stress terms into kinetic and potential parts as seen below:

$$\sigma_{ij}^{K,\text{inst}} = -\frac{1}{V} \sum_{\alpha} \frac{p_i^{\alpha} p_j^{\alpha}}{m^\alpha}$$

$$\sigma_{ij}^{V,\text{inst}} = \frac{1}{2V} \sum_{\alpha \neq \beta} \phi_{\alpha\beta} \frac{r_i^{\alpha\beta} r_j^{\beta\gamma} r_k^{\gamma\delta} r_l^{\delta\gamma}}{r^{\alpha\beta} \left( r^{\alpha\beta} \right)^3}.$$  

(19)

Substituting $\sigma^{\text{inst}} = \sigma^{K,\text{inst}} + \sigma^{V,\text{inst}}$ into the third term of Eq. (15) and noting that the cross-terms cancel,

$$\langle \sigma_{ij}^{K,\text{inst}} \sigma_{ij}^{K,\text{inst}} \rangle = \langle \sigma_{ij}^{V,\text{inst}} \rangle \langle \sigma_{ij}^{V,\text{inst}} \rangle$$  

(20)

we get the following:

$$Cov \left( \sigma_{ij}^{\text{inst}}, \sigma_{kl}^{\text{inst}} \right) = Cov \left( \sigma_{ij}^{K,\text{inst}}, \sigma_{kl}^{K,\text{inst}} \right) + Cov \left( \sigma_{ij}^{V,\text{inst}}, \sigma_{kl}^{V,\text{inst}} \right).$$  

(21)

Then, as shown in [14], the kinetic terms can be reduced as follows:

$$Cov \left( \sigma_{ij}^{K,\text{inst}}, \sigma_{kl}^{K,\text{inst}} \right) = \left( \delta_{ik} \delta_{jl} + \delta_{il} \delta_{jk} \right) N \left( k_B T \right)^2.$$  

(22)

Substituting Eqs. (21) and (22) into Eq. (15), we get the simpler form of the elasticity tensor:

$$c_{ijkl} = \frac{1}{V} \left[ \langle c^0_{ijkl} \rangle - \frac{V^2}{k_B T} Cov \left( \sigma_{ij}^{V,\text{inst}}, \sigma_{kl}^{V,\text{inst}} \right) + Nk_B T \left( \delta_{ik} \delta_{jl} + \delta_{il} \delta_{jk} \right) \right].$$  

(23)
The method just described to calculate the spatial elastic modulus is known as the stress fluctuation method \([45–47]\). We use this stress fluctuation method to calculate the microscopic elastic (tangent) modulus of a one-dimensional chain of Cu atoms with constant length \(L\) and constant temperature \(T\). For the 1D case, Eq. \((23)\) reduces to the following \([32]\):

\[
c = \frac{1}{L} \left[ 2Nk_BT + L \langle c^0 \rangle - \frac{L^2}{2k_BT} \text{Cov}(\sigma_{V,\text{inst}}, \sigma_{V,\text{inst}}) \right]
\]

(24)

where \(L\) is the chain length, and “Cov” is the covariance operator given by Eq. \((16)\). Then, the \(c^0\) Born term in 1D is

\[
c^0 = \frac{1}{L} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{j=i+1}^{N} [\phi''(x_{ij})(x_{ij})^2 - \phi'(x_{ij})x_{ij}]
\]

(25)

where \(x_{ij} = x_j - x_i\). Finally, the potential part of the instantaneous stress in 1D is given as follows:

\[
\sigma_{V,\text{inst}} = \frac{1}{L} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{j=i+1}^{N} \phi'(x_{ij})x_{ij}.
\]

(26)

We compare the tangent modulus obtained from MD to the tangent modulus obtained from the Quasi-Harmonic (QH) approximation. The QH approximation for the temperature-dependent stress-free spatial tangent modulus of a 1D chain of atoms is \([14, 32]\)

\[
c = a \left[ \phi''(a) + \frac{k_BT}{2} \frac{\phi^{(4)}(a)\phi''(a) - (\phi'''(a))^2}{(\phi''(a))^2} \right]
\]

(27)

where \(a = a(T)\) is the stress-free equilibrium lattice constant at temperature \(T\). In this case, the temperature dependence of the equilibrium lattice constant is obtained through the following equation \([14]\):

\[
\phi'(a) + \frac{k_BT}{2} \frac{\phi'''(a)}{\phi''(a)} = 0.
\]

(28)

This requires calculation of third and fourth derivatives of the potential function \(\phi\), making calculations for EAM cumbersome. We use Eq. \((27)\) to obtain the analytic tangent modulus values for the Lennard-Jones and modified Morse potentials.

We utilize Eq. \((24)\) to calculate the microscopic tangent modulus of a one-dimensional chain of 10,000 Cu atoms using the LJ and modified Morse potential functions. We test the performance of each of these potentials for both of the thermostats at various temperatures. For each of the input temperatures, we calculate the corresponding equilibrium lattice spacing using Eq. \((28)\). Using these temperature-dependent lattice spacings, we can obtain the tangent modulus from MD simulations with Eq. \((24)\) and compare this to the value obtained analytically with Eq. \((27)\).

A plot showing the MD and analytic tangent modulus results can be seen in Fig. 6. Here, we present the analytic tangent modulus values (blue line) for temperatures ranging from 0 - 900 K, but we limit the MD calculations for LJ and Morse to 400 K and 450 K respectively. As shown in [32], the MD-derived tangent modulus of the system becomes non-physical for input temperatures above \(\approx 450\) K. The total run-time for each MD simulation is 3,000 ps (3 ns) with an equilibration time of 10 ps. As in Sec. 5.1, each atom is treated as a continuum atom, and normal periodic boundary conditions are enforced such that the leftmost atom interacts with the rightmost atom and vice versa. In Fig. 6, we observe that the calculated tangent modulus values from MD are in close agreement with the analytic values obtained from the QH approximation. This validates the implementation of Lennard-Jones and Morse potentials in the code.
Figure 6: Tangent modulus results for the Langevin and Nose-Hoover thermostats using the (a) Lennard-Jones and (b) modified Morse potentials.

5.2.2. EAM potential

To verify the EAM potential, we calculate the cohesive energy $E_0$ as well as the bulk modulus $B$ of the system at 0 K. Again, the cutoff radius for the EAM potential is 5.507 Å, and we consider a periodic chain of 500 atoms where each atom is treated as a continuum atom. The experimental value of the equilibrium lattice spacing of Cu is 3.615 Å, so we vary the lattice constant from 3.605 Å to 3.625 Å in steps of 0.001 Å. The potential energy per atom as a function of the cubic lattice spacing is plotted in Fig. 7, and the data can be fitted to a parabola. The minimum of this parabola corresponds to the cube of the equilibrium lattice spacing, $a_0 = 3.615$ Å. This matches the experimental data perfectly because $a_0$ is one of the fitted parameters of the EAM potential. The energy per atom at $a_0$ is the cohesive energy, $E_{coh} = -3.540$ eV, which is another fitted parameter [36]. Hence, our implementation of the EAM potential gives an accurate representation of the cohesive energy of Cu.

As discussed in [48], the curvature of the parabola at $a_0$ can be used to calculate the bulk modulus using

$$B(V) = V \left( \frac{\partial^2 E}{\partial V^2} \right)_{T,S} = 4(a_0)^3(2a)$$

(29)
where \( a \) is the parabola coefficient, and we multiply by four to account for every atom in the given lattice volume. Applying this equation to the data in Fig. 7, we obtained a bulk modulus value of \( B = 135.4 \) GPa, which is not very accurate when compared to the literature value of 140 GPa [36]. To obtain a more accurate bulk modulus, we compute the \( E(V) \) curve again in the range of \(|a - a_0| < 10^{-4}\) Å. Specifically, we perform the calculations in steps of 0.0008 Å. This plot can be seen in Fig. 8. The curvature of this new parabola at \( a_0 \) gives a bulk modulus value of \( B = 140.6 \) GPa, which is the fitted bulk modulus of this potential model.

![Energy per Atom vs. Cubic Lattice Spacing at 0 K (EAM)](image)

Figure 8: Potential energy per atom vs. cubic lattice spacing in steps of 0.0008 Å. Circles are data computed from the EAM potential, and the line is a parabola fitted to the data.

5.3. Steady State

To ensure that the WA/CA interfaces are not introducing spurious waves into the WA region, we prescribe the same continuum states to both CA regions. In other words, the problem has now moved either to the left of the shock or the right of the shock in Figure 4. As the simulation evolves, there should be no traveling waves after a reasonable interval of time. Such artifacts would mean that waves are not being smoothly absorbed into the CA regions and instead impinging off the WA/CA interface, and/or the periodic boundary conditions are improperly implemented. Additionally, the average particle velocity of the system should remain equal to the initial input value with little to no increase in the average amplitude. A change in the average particle velocity would indicate that the system is not reaching equilibrium, while a large increase in amplitude would mean that energy is being artificially added to the system.

We perform steady state simulations for one-dimensional systems of 10,000 Cu atoms using all three potential functions and both thermostats. We utilize the MW-A/C framework described in Sections 3 and 4 with 100 atoms in each CA region and 9,800 atoms in the WA region. Placing 100 atoms in each CA region ensures that waves impinging on the WA/CA interfaces can fully dissipate into the CA regions. This improves the absorption of energetic pulses into the CA regions and thus helps reduce the number of wave reflections into the WA region. We test the implementation of these interfaces for various mean particle velocities: 0, 3, 6, 9, and 12 Å/ps. The results from these simulations can be seen in Fig. 9, where we plot the average particle velocity of the 1D system vs. time. As before, the total run-time for each simulation is 3,000 ps (3 ns), and we enforce periodic boundary conditions as explained in Sec. 3.1. It is apparent that regardless of the potential function or thermostat used, the system maintains the initial mean particle velocity for the duration of the simulation. From these results, we conclude that the WA region achieves steady state for long-time simulations.
Finally, we confirm that the average amplitude of the particle velocities remains relatively constant and no large traveling waves appear throughout the duration of the simulation. Figs. 10, 11, and 12 show six different particle velocity vs. particle number plots for all three potentials using both thermostats. In each of these graphs, we plot the velocity of each particle at 0 ps and overlay that with the velocity of each particle at 3,000 ps for each input velocity (0, 3, 6, 9, and 12 Å/ps). We overlay these sets of data from the beginning and end of the simulation to observe how the average amplitude changes over time. We observe that in each case, the amplitude of the particle velocities does not increase as the simulation evolves. In fact, the two sets of data overlap each other almost identically indicating that no artificial energy is being introduced into the WA region. (We also note that no large traveling waves were observed in the WA region over the entire run-time). These results confirm that any spurious waves encountering the WA/CA interfaces are traveling smoothly into the CA regions and eventually dissipating. Additionally, the data establish that the periodic boundary conditions used in the CA regions are implemented correctly.

6. Results

6.1. Moving window simulations with original EOS

Having verified different aspects of the framework, we conduct long-time, large-domain shock simulations for various input shock wave velocities in the [110] close packed direction of a one-dimensional chain of Cu atoms. As before, we use all three potentials and both thermostats. In each simulation, the domain contains a total of 10,000 atoms with 100 atoms in each CA region. Hence, we have a central WA region containing 9,800 atoms and two CA regions each containing 100 atoms. As stated in [41], the width of the CA region should be at least the range of the forces, typically around 10 Å. We choose a much larger width of 100 atoms (≈ 256 Å) to ensure a sufficient distance for any wave traveling from the WA region to the CA regions to be fully absorbed. Additionally, we perform each of these simulations for 3,000 ps (3 ns) in order to track the motion and evolution of the fully-developed wave.
Figure 10: Steady state plots for Lennard-Jones potential with (a) Langevin and (b) Nose-Hoover thermostat.

Figure 11: Steady state plots for modified Morse potential with (a) Langevin and (b) Nose-Hoover thermostat.

Figure 12: Steady state plots for EAM potential with (a) Langevin and (b) Nose-Hoover thermostat.
We perform a given simulation by choosing the shock wave velocity $U_S$ and initializing the unshocked state of $v^- = 0 \, \text{Å/ps}$, $\epsilon^- = 0$, and $\theta^- = 298$ K. Then we use the jump equations, thermodynamic relationship, and linear shock EOS presented in Sec. 2 to compute the state $(v^+, \epsilon^+, \theta^+)$ of the shocked material. In Fig. 13, we present simulations for an input shock velocity of $U_S = 50 \, \text{Å/ps}$ using the EAM potential and incorporating the Langevin thermostat (the other potentials/thermostats produce similar results). In this case, we overlay the initial shock wave with its later positions in 100 ps increments, so we see the evolution in time of the shock over a period of 1,000 ps. We employ the moving window formulation as explained in Sec. 4 with an atomic replacement frequency of $\tau^{-1} = U_S/a_0$.

![Shock Wave Evolution (Us = 50 Å / ps)](image)

Figure 13: Propagation of a shock wave front using the EAM potential with the Langevin thermostat for an input shock velocity of 50 Å/ps. This simulation was produced using the shock EOS parameters from literature [1].

The moving window framework should maintain the SWF at the center of the WA region throughout the entire simulation. However, in Fig. 13, we observe two discrepancies in the simulated shock wave. First, the SWF continues traveling forward through the chain as the simulation evolves in time despite the moving window implementation. Additionally, the particle velocities in the shocked material ($v^+$) oscillate around a mean value which is lower than their initial mean value. Hence, we observe that the shock parameters $U_S$ and $v^+$ obtained from MD are different than their corresponding analytical input values. If we recall the linear relation between shock velocity and particle velocity,

$$U_s = C_B + S[v]$$

we deduce that such discrepancies indicate that the empirical parameters for this equation ($C_B$ and $S$) are not optimized for our one-dimensional framework. It should be emphasized that this does not imply that the EOS parameters are incorrect in general. It merely means that the the EOS parameters are not applicable to our one-dimensional framework. In Sec. 6.2, we will obtain the necessary EOS parameters to obtain a stable and steady shock.

We also present a graph of the SWF position vs. time using the EAM potential and Langevin thermostat for the following input shock velocities: 47, 50, 54, 58 and 60 Å/ps. From Fig. 14, it can be observed that in each case, the shock wave travels to the right, and the speed of this forward motion increases with increasing input shock velocity, $U_S$. Such a phenomenon implies that the moving window replacement frequency is essentially “under-predicting” the shock wave frequency,
and thus the WA region is “falling behind” the forward moving shock. This lack of agreement between the shock wave and moving window becomes more pronounced as the input shock velocity increases. These results again show that the empirical linear EOS parameters are ill-suited for our 1D framework.

Figure 14: Position vs. time of the SWF for various input shock velocities using the EAM potential and Langevin thermostat. These were produced using the shock EOS parameters from literature [1].

A final plot showing the discrepancy between the input and MD shock velocity can be seen in Fig. 15. Here, we plot the average momentum of the entire domain vs. time for the five different input shock velocities mentioned earlier. We display the average momentum of the five trials with solid lines up until the point where the shock wave impinges upon the right WA/CA interface. After this point, the data becomes invalid. We then extrapolate the average momentum up to 3,000 ps (assuming an infinite domain) using a linear fit which is represented in the plot by the dotted lines. From this linear fit, we obtain a linear relation between the average momentum and time for each shock wave trial. We observe that the slopes of the linear equations are non-zero and increase with increasing shock input velocity. Ideally, these slopes would be zero because the shock front would remain at the center of the WA region, and thus the average particle velocity of the domain would remain constant. Since this is not the case, we conclude that the shocks are propagating forward as the simulation evolves in time. In the next section, we produce a 1D linear relation between the SWF velocity and particle velocity to counteract these issues.

6.2. New EOS calculations

To derive new empirical parameters for the linear shock EOS, we analyze moving window shock simulations using all three potentials and both thermostats for the following input shock velocities: 47, 50, 54, 58, and 60 Å/ps. Specifically, we track the position of the SWF as well as the mean particle velocity behind the SWF until the shock impinges upon the right WA/CA interface (analysis is invalid after this point). In Fig. 16, we observe a snapshot at 35 ps of a propagating shock with an input velocity of 60 Å/ps. We observe four main components to this shock plot: the mean particle velocity behind the SWF \((v^+)\) derived from Eq. 3, the actual mean particle velocity behind the SWF, the position of the SWF, and the mean particle velocity input by the user in the un-shocked material \((v^-)\). It can be observed that the actual \(v^+\) is slightly higher than the analytical \(v^+\) which results in the actual \(\epsilon^+\) in the shocked material being higher than the analytical \(\epsilon^+\). This phenomenon causes the moving window replacement frequency to under-predict the shock wave frequency, and this results in a forward propagating shock wave. Therefore, because of the
incorrect linear EOS parameters, the actual shock parameters ($v^+$, $\epsilon^+$, and $U_S$) are different from their corresponding analytical values.

![Image](image1.png)

**Figure 15:** Average momentum vs. time of the A/C domain for various input shock velocities using the EAM potential and Langevin thermostat. These simulations were produced using the EOS parameters from literature [1].

![Image](image2.png)

**Figure 16:** Snapshot at 35 ps of a propagating shock with an input shock velocity of 60\text{Å}/ps.

We plot the average shock velocity vs. particle velocity of the five shock wave trials for each of the potentials and thermostats. These results can be seen in Fig. 17. The slope of each linear fit is the new $S$ value while the y-intercept is the new $C_0$ value. The Langevin and Nose-Hoover thermostats produce nearly identical results, so we will only analyze the results obtained using the Langevin thermostat. We observe that the EAM and modified Morse potentials produce the most accurate values when compared to the original EOS parameters. EAM produces $C_0$ and $S$ values of approximately 35.77 \text{Å}/ps and 2.84 respectively while Morse produces values of 43.56 \text{Å}/
ps and 2.57 respectively. Hence, EAM slightly under-predicts while Morse slightly over-predicts the original $C_0$ value of 39.4 Å/ps. The S value for materials is typically between 1 and 2, so we attribute the difference in our calculations to 1D effects. In contrast to EAM and Morse, the LJ potential produces very inaccurate results, giving $C_0$ and S values of 55.68 Å/ps and 4.01 respectively. Therefore, we discard the LJ results and conclude that both the EAM and modified Morse potentials are best suited for this framework. Moving window shock simulations using the new EOS parameters for the EAM potential and Langevin thermostat are presented in Sec. 6.3.

![Figure 17: Calculations of the new empirical EOS parameters for all three potentials with (a) Langevin and (b) Nose-Hoover thermostats. The slope of each equation is the new $S$ value and the y-intercept is the new $C_0$ value.](a) (b)

6.3. Moving window simulations with new EOS

In Fig. 18, we present still shots for a propagating shock with an input shock velocity of 50Å/ps. This simulation uses the EAM potential with the Langevin thermostat, and we introduce the new

![Figure 18: Propagation of a shock wave using the EAM potential with the Langevin thermostat and incorporating the new EOS parameters ($U_s = 50$ Å/ps).](a)
As before, we overlay the initial shock wave with its later positions at 100 ps increments and thus show the evolution in time of the shock wave over a period of 1,000 ps. With these simulations, we observe much better agreement between the input shock velocity and simulated shock velocity from the MW-A/C method. Comparing Fig. 18 with Fig. 13, it is apparent that when using the new EOS parameters, the midpoint of the shock front maintains its position at the center of the WA region for a much longer time than when using the original EOS parameters. Therefore, the A/C domain is now properly “following” the propagating shock.

This increased agreement between the moving window atom replacement frequency and the shock wave frequency can also be represented by plotting the average momentum of the 1D chain vs. time as seen in Fig. 19. As before, the solid lines represent the calculated momenta while the dotted lines represent the linear fits. From Fig. 19, we observe that each shock wave initially drifts to the left before either maintaining its position in the center or drifting steadily to the right. Comparing this plot to Fig. 15, it is apparent that the slopes of the linear fits for all five shock wave trials have decreased significantly, and thus the average particle velocity of the system is noticeably more constant over time than previously observed. This indicates that the shocks simulated using the new EOS parameters remain relatively stationary in the WA region much longer than the shocks presented in Sec. 6.1. Therefore, the empirical EOS parameters derived in Sec. 6.2 produce shock speeds which closely match their corresponding input shock speed ($U_S$). We are thus able to model steady state shock wave propagation through the A/C framework for a protracted amount of time.

For each of these shock wave simulations, we do observe an increase in the shock thickness over time. This effect is evident in Fig. 18. Although the midpoint of the shock front remains relatively stationary, the shock “spreads out” across the WA region at higher time steps. This is a consequence of the shock developing a structure as it propagates. A structured shock wave is a well-established and characterized phenomenon [49]. As such, care must be taken to ensure that the WA region is sufficiently large to account for the entire structured shock. Otherwise, the shock wave could potentially ‘leak’ out of the WA region and start impinging on the WA/CA interface. To understand this phenomenon further, we increase the size of the WA region and perform additional shock simulations with the new EOS parameters. These results are presented in Sec. 6.4.
6.4. Effect of domain size

As we saw in Sec. 6.3, the shock wave was developing a structure and exhibiting a length scale. In [49], Chhabildas and Assay calculate an upper limit of 3.0 $\text{ns}$ and a lower limit of 0.03 $\text{ns}$ for the shock rise time ($RT_s$) in Cu. Using the new EOS, we perform shock simulations using the following shock input velocities: 48, 50, 54, 58, and 60$\text{Å}/\text{ps}$. Assuming the upper limit of 3.0 $\text{ns}$ for the shock rise time as well as the highest shock wave velocity of 60$\text{Å}/\text{ps}$, we can obtain a maximum value for the shock thickness ($T_S$) as follows:

$$T_S = U_S \times RT_S = 60\text{Å}/\text{ps} \times 3,000\text{ps} = 180,000\text{Å}$$

Since our previous framework contained only 10,000 atoms with an equilibrium spacing of 2.556$\text{Å}$ between atoms, the domain may not have been large enough to allow the shock to completely equilibrate. Hence, we increase the A/C domain size to 80,000 atoms ($\sim$ 204,500$\text{Å}$) and perform shock simulations with the new EOS. Results for input shock velocities of 50 and 60$\text{Å}/\text{ps}$ respectively can be seen in Fig. 20.

![Figure 20: Propagation of the SWF using the EAM potential with the Langevin thermostat for input shock velocities of 50 and 60 $\text{Å}/\text{ps}$. The A/C domain contains 80,000 total atoms.](image)

For both shock wave trials, we clearly observe the shock wave maintaining its position at the center of the WA region over time. We can also see the efficacy of the moving window in Fig. 21. Here, we plot the average momentum of the 80,000 atom A/C domain vs. time for the first 2 $\text{ns}$. It can be observed that the average momentum stabilizes within 750 – 1000 $\text{ps}$ for all the shock speeds. This is when the shock is achieving a structure. After the initial stabilization period, the shock achieves a steady state with the moving window adding and removing atoms at regular intervals. A very slow decline in average momentum is observed after the initial stabilization period. This damping is attributed to the numerical errors in the algorithm and second-order errors in the new equation of state. Further corrections to the equation of state as well as a reduction in the time step for the integration algorithm should reduce this slow damping.

7. Conclusion

In this paper, we developed a one-dimensional moving window framework to model long-time steady state shock wave propagation. The framework is composed of a window region governed by classic MD equations containing the shock wave. This is flanked by boundary regions governed
by continuum shock states. The motion of the window region is achieved by adding/removing atoms from/to the boundary region to/from the window region. In the first part of the paper, we introduced the one-dimensional formulation and a classic single wave Riemann problem. We implemented two thermostats and three potentials within the framework and extensively validated each component.

In the second part of the paper, we used the moving window framework to study steady state shock wave propagation in copper. The state of the unshocked material was chosen to be unstressed, at rest, and at room temperature. Using an experimentally observed linear law, Hugoniot equation of state, and a prescribed shock velocity, the state of the shocked material was obtained. It was observed that the even with the prescribed window speed being equal to the chosen shock speed, the actual shock contained within the window region nevertheless drifted. Next, we used the framework to obtain corrections to the linear law in a one-dimensional setting. These corrections were then used to obtain a new equation of state and new continuum states for the boundary regions. Finally, large-domain simulations were conducted to ensure that the entire shock width was contained within the window region. It was observed that the framework was successful in capturing long-time steady state motion of the shock wave.

It should be emphasized that this work is not truly atomistic/continuum due to the absence of a classical continuum region with finite element type mesh points. Rather, it serves as a proof of concept of a moving window technique that can be extended to a classic concurrent multiscale scheme in three dimensions. Additionally, it provides evidence for the ability of the MW-A/C framework to simulate propagating shock waves. More work is needed to understand the efficacy of this type of MD shock wave modeling in higher dimensions. Such a multi-dimensional MW-A/C framework could be used to study shock wave scattering and microstructural changes upon a shock’s interaction with an interface. Finally, this work also demonstrates the ability to use such a framework to obtain shock kinetic relations.

Figure 21: Average momentum vs. time of the A/C domain for five different input shock velocities using the EAM potential and Langevin thermostat. The A/C domain contains 80,000 total atoms.
8. Acknowledgments

This work was made possible by the financial support of the US Department of Defense through the National Defense Science and Engineering Graduate (NDSEG) Fellowship Program. Simulations were performed using the Hopper computing cluster at Auburn University. Authors also thank Kaushik Bhattacharya for valuable discussion during the development of the framework.

References

[1] M. A. Meyers, *Dynamic behavior of materials*. John wiley & sons, 1994.

[2] L. Davison, *Fundamentals of shock wave propagation in solids*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2008.

[3] G. T. (Rusty) Gray, “High-Strain-Rate Deformation: Mechanical Behavior and Deformation Substructures Induced,” *Annual Review of Materials Research*, vol. 42, no. 1, pp. 285–303, 2012.

[4] S. J. Fensin, J. P. Escobedo, G. T. Gray, B. M. Patterson, C. P. Trujillo, and E. K. Cerreta, “Dynamic damage nucleation and evolution in multiphase materials,” *Journal of Applied Physics*, vol. 115, no. 20, 2014.

[5] J. F. Bingert, R. M. Suter, J. Lind, S. F. Li, R. Pokharel, and C. P. Trujillo, “High-Energy Diffraction Microscopy Characterization of Spall Damage,” pp. 397–403, 2014.

[6] E. M. Bringa, J. U. Cazamias, P. Erhart, J. Stölken, N. Tanushev, B. D. Wirth, R. E. Rudd, and M. J. Caturla, “Atomistic shock Hugoniot simulation of single-crystal copper,” *Journal of Applied Physics*, vol. 96, pp. 3793–3799, oct 2004.

[7] S. G. Srinivasan, M. I. Baskes, and G. J. Wagner, “Atomistic simulations of shock induced microstructural evolution and spallation in single crystal nickel,” *Journal of Applied Physics*, vol. 101, no. 4, 2007.

[8] G. E. Norman, A. Y. Kuksin, V. V. Stegailov, A. V. Yanilkin, M. Elert, M. D. Furnish, R. Chau, N. Holmes, and J. Nguyen, “Atomistic simulation of plasticity and fracture of crystalline and polycrystalline metals under high strain rate,” in *AIP conference Proceedings*, vol. 955, pp. 329–334, 2008.

[9] S. J. Fensin, J. P. Escobedo-Diaz, C. Brandl, E. K. Cerreta, G. T. Gray, T. C. Germann, and S. M. Valone, “Effect of loading direction on grain boundary failure under shock loading,” *Acta Materialia*, vol. 64, pp. 113–122, 2014.

[10] D. R. Tramontina, E. N. Hahn, M. A. Meyers, and E. M. Bringa, “Simulation of tantalum nanocrystals under shock-wave loading: Dislocations and twinning,” in *AIP Conference Proceedings 1793*, p. 070002, 2017.

[11] A. Higginbotham, M. J. Suggit, E. M. Bringa, P. Erhart, J. A. Hawreliak, G. Mogni, N. Park, B. A. Remington, and J. S. Wark, “Molecular dynamics simulations of shock-induced deformation twinning of a body-centered-cubic metal,” *Physical Review B*, vol. 88, p. 104105, sep 2013.
[12] S. J. Fensin, S. M. Valone, E. K. Cerreta, J. P. Escobedo-Diaz, G. T. Gray, K. Kang, and J. Wang, “Effect of grain boundary structure on plastic deformation during shock compression using molecular dynamics,” Modelling and Simulation in Materials Science and Engineering, vol. 21, no. 1, 2013.

[13] E. J. Reed, L. E. Fried, and J. D. Joannopoulos, “A Method for Tractable Dynamical Studies of Single and Double Shock Compression,” Physical Review Letters, vol. 90, no. 23, p. 235503, 2003.

[14] E. B. Tadmor and R. E. Miller, Modeling materials: continuum, atomistic and multiscale techniques. Cambridge University Press, 2011.

[15] S. Xu and X. Chen, “Modeling dislocations and heat conduction in crystalline materials: atomistic/continuum coupling approaches,” International Materials Reviews, pp. 1–32, 2018.

[16] J. Knap and M. Ortiz, “An analysis of the quasicontinuum method,” Journal of the Mechanics and Physics of Solids, vol. 49, no. 9, pp. 1899–1923, 2001.

[17] Y. Kulkarni, J. Knap, and M. Ortiz, “A variational approach to coarse graining of equilibrium and non-equilibrium atomistic description at finite temperature,” Journal of the Mechanics and Physics of Solids, vol. 56, no. 4, pp. 1417–1449, 2008.

[18] J. S. Amelang, G. N. Venturini, and D. M. Kochmann, “Summation rules for a fully nonlocal energy-based quasicontinuum method,” Journal of the Mechanics and Physics of Solids, vol. 82, pp. 378–413, 2015.

[19] W. Kim, M. Luskin, D. Perez, A. Voter, and E. Tadmor, “Hyper-QC: An accelerated finite-temperature quasicontinuum method using hyperdynamics,” Journal of the Mechanics and Physics of Solids, vol. 63, pp. 94–112, feb 2014.

[20] L. E. Shilkrot, R. E. Miller, and W. A. Curtin, “Coupled Atomistic and Discrete Dislocation Plasticity,” Physical Review Letters, vol. 89, p. 025501, jun 2002.

[21] G. Anciaux, T. Junge, M. Hodapp, J. Cho, J.-F. Molinari, and W. Curtin, “The Coupled Atomistic/Discrete-Dislocation method in 3d part I: Concept and algorithms,” Journal of the Mechanics and Physics of Solids, vol. 118, pp. 152–171, sep 2018.

[22] M. Hodapp, G. Anciaux, J.-F. Molinari, and W. Curtin, “Coupled atomistic/discrete dislocation method in 3D Part II: Validation of the method,” Journal of the Mechanics and Physics of Solids, vol. 119, pp. 1–19, oct 2018.

[23] J. Cho, J.-F. Molinari, W. A. Curtin, and G. Anciaux, “The coupled atomistic/discrete-dislocation method in 3d. Part III: Dynamics of hybrid dislocations,” Journal of the Mechanics and Physics of Solids, vol. 118, pp. 1–14, sep 2018.

[24] V. V. Zhakhovskii, K. Nishihara, and S. I. Anisimov, “Shock wave structure in dense gases,” Journal of Experimental and Theoretical Physics Letters, vol. 66, pp. 99–105, Jul 1997.

[25] V. V. Zhakhovsky, M. M. Budzevich, N. A. Inogamov, I. I. Oleynik, and C. T. White, “Two-zone elastic-plastic single shock waves in solids,” Physical review letters, vol. 107, no. 13, p. 135502, 2011.

[26] S. P. Marsh, LASL shock Hugoniot data, vol. 5. Univ of California Press, 1980.
[27] J. Knowles, “On the relation between particle velocity and shock wave speed for thermoelastic materials,” *Shock Waves*, vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 137–144, 2002.

[28] J. E. Jones, “On the determination of molecular fields. ii. from the equation of state of a gas,” *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series A, Containing Papers of a Mathematical and Physical Character*, vol. 106, no. 738, pp. 463–477, 1924.

[29] L. Verlet, “Computer” experiments” on classical fluids. i. thermodynamical properties of lennard-jones molecules,” *Physical review*, vol. 159, no. 1, p. 98, 1967.

[30] J. Lv, M. Bai, W. Cui, and X. Li, “The molecular dynamic simulation on impact and friction characters of nanofluids with many nanoparticles system,” *Nanoscale research letters*, vol. 6, no. 1, p. 200, 2011.

[31] R. A. MacDonald and W. M. MacDonald, “Thermodynamic properties of fcc metals at high temperatures,” *Physical review B*, vol. 24, no. 4, p. 1715, 1981.

[32] M. Wen, S. Whalen, R. S. Elliott, and E. B. Tadmor, “Interpolation effects in tabulated interatomic potentials,” *Modelling and Simulation in Materials Science and Engineering*, vol. 23, no. 7, p. 074008, 2015.

[33] S. Foiles, M. Baskes, and M. S. Daw, “Embedded-atom-method functions for the fcc metals cu, ag, au, ni, pd, pt, and their alloys,” *Physical review B*, vol. 33, no. 12, p. 7983, 1986.

[34] M. S. Daw and M. I. Baskes, “Embedded-atom method: Derivation and application to impurities, surfaces, and other defects in metals,” *Physical Review B*, vol. 29, no. 12, p. 6443, 1984.

[35] M. S. Daw, S. M. Foiles, and M. I. Baskes, “The embedded-atom method: a review of theory and applications,” *Materials Science Reports*, vol. 9, no. 7-8, pp. 251–310, 1993.

[36] Y. Mishin, M. Mehl, D. Papaconstantopoulos, A. Voter, and J. Kress, “Structural stability and lattice defects in copper: Ab initio, tight-binding, and embedded-atom calculations,” *Physical Review B*, vol. 63, no. 22, p. 224106, 2001.

[37] S. Lepri, R. Livi, and A. Politi, “Thermal conduction in classical low-dimensional lattices,” *Physics reports*, vol. 377, no. 1, pp. 1–80, 2003.

[38] W. K. Liu, E. Karpov, S. Zhang, and H. Park, “An introduction to computational nanomechanics and materials,” *Computer methods in applied mechanics and engineering*, vol. 193, no. 17-20, pp. 1529–1578, 2004.

[39] K. Binder, J. Horbach, W. Kob, W. Paul, and F. Varnik, “Molecular dynamics simulations,” *Journal of Physics: Condensed Matter*, vol. 16, no. 5, p. S429, 2004.

[40] W. G. Hoover, K. Aoki, C. G. Hoover, and S. V. De Groot, “Time-reversible deterministic thermostats,” *Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena*, vol. 187, no. 1-4, pp. 253–267, 2004.

[41] S. Qu, V. Shastry, W. Curtin, and R. E. Miller, “A finite-temperature dynamic coupled atomistic/discrete dislocation method,” *Modelling and simulation in materials science and engineering*, vol. 13, no. 7, p. 1101, 2005.

[42] S. Gill, Z. Jia, B. Leimkuhler, and A. Cocks, “Rapid thermal equilibration in coarse-grained molecular dynamics,” *Physical Review B*, vol. 73, no. 18, p. 184304, 2006.
[43] S. Nose, “Constant-temperature molecular dynamics,” Journal of Physics: Condensed Matter, vol. 2, no. S, p. SA115, 1990.

[44] W. C. Swope, H. C. Andersen, P. H. Berens, and K. R. Wilson, “A computer simulation method for the calculation of equilibrium constants for the formation of physical clusters of molecules: Application to small water clusters,” The Journal of Chemical Physics, vol. 76, no. 1, pp. 637–649, 1982.

[45] J. R. Ray, M. C. Moody, and A. Rahman, “Calculation of elastic constants using isothermal molecular dynamics,” Physical Review B, vol. 33, no. 2, p. 895, 1986.

[46] J. R. Ray, “Elastic constants and statistical ensembles in molecular dynamics,” Computer Physics Reports, vol. 8, no. 3, pp. 109–151, 1988.

[47] G. Gao, K. Van Workum, J. D. Schall, and J. A. Harrison, “Elastic constants of diamond from molecular dynamics simulations,” Journal of Physics: Condensed Matter, vol. 18, no. 32, p. S1737, 2006.

[48] W. Cai, J. Li, and S. Yip, “1.09 molecular dynamics,” Compr. Nucl. Mater., edited by JMK Rudy (Elsevier, Oxford, 2012), pp. 249–265, 2012.

[49] L. C. Chhabildas and J. R. Asay, “Rise-time measurements of shock transitions in aluminum, copper, and steel,” Journal of Applied Physics, vol. 50, no. 4, pp. 2749–2756, 1979.