



# CHORUS

This is the accepted manuscript made available via CHORUS. The article has been published as:

## Stress-induced strain glass to martensite (R) transition in a $\text{Ti}_{\{50\}}\text{Ni}_{\{44.5\}}\text{Fe}_{\{5.5\}}$ alloy

Jian Zhang, Yu Wang, Xiangdong Ding, Zhen Zhang, Yumei Zhou, Xiaobing Ren, Kazuhiro Otsuka, Jun Sun, and Minghui Song

Phys. Rev. B **83**, 174204 — Published 16 May 2011

DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevB.83.174204](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevB.83.174204)

## Stress-induced strain glass to martensite (R) transition in a $\text{Ti}_{50}\text{Ni}_{44.5}\text{Fe}_{5.5}$ alloy

Jian Zhang<sup>1,2,4</sup>, Yu Wang<sup>1,2</sup>, Xiangdong Ding<sup>1,2</sup>, Zhen Zhang<sup>1,2</sup>, Yumei Zhou<sup>1,2</sup>,

Xiaobing Ren<sup>1,2,\*</sup>, Kazuhiro Otsuka<sup>1,2</sup>, Jun Sun<sup>1</sup>, Minghui Song<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Multi-disciplinary Materials Research Center, Frontier Institute of Science and Technology, State Key Laboratory for Mechanical Behavior of Materials, Xi'an Jiaotong University, Xi'an 710049, China

<sup>2</sup> Ferrous Physics Group, National Institute for Materials Science, Tsukuba 305-0047, Ibaraki, Japan

<sup>3</sup> Advanced Electron Microscopy Group, National Institute for Materials Science, Tsukuba 305-0047, Ibaraki, Japan

<sup>4</sup> Institute of Materials, Ruhr University Bochum, Bochum 44801, Germany

\*To whom the correspondence should be addressed. Email address: [Ren.Xiaobing@nims.go.jp](mailto:Ren.Xiaobing@nims.go.jp)

### ABSTRACT

Strain glass (STG) in Ni-rich binary Ti-Ni possesses an R-like (rhombohedral) local strain order, but it transforms into B19' martensite under stress. It remains a puzzle why the local strain order in STG yields a different long-range strain order. Here, we systematically investigated a ternary  $\text{Ti}_{50}\text{Ni}_{44.5}\text{Fe}_{5.5}$  STG, which exhibited the same STG features as the binary STG, and the local strain order is also an R-like one. Being different from the binary STG, under stress this ternary STG transforms into a *normal* R-phase rather than B19'. By considering that both systems have bi-instability with respect to both R and B19' martensites in the schematic free energy landscape, we provide a unified explanation for the different products of the stress-induced STG to martensite (STG-M) transition between Ti-Ni binary system and the present ternary system. We show that the difference stems from the competing thermodynamic stability between R-phase and B19' martensites.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Glass is a frozen metastable state exhibiting high frustration, which leads to the inability of the system to reach the ground state, a long-range order<sup>1</sup>. Hence it exhibits the breaking of ergodicity<sup>2-4</sup>; this challenges the basic assumption of statistical mechanics. Glassy phenomena have been discovered in various systems, such as ferroelectric, magnetic, superconductive and biological systems, etc.<sup>5-9</sup>, and have been well investigated for both fundamental and practical interest.

Recently, a “strain glass” (STG) was discovered in a binary ferroelastic/martensitic system of  $\text{Ti}_{50-x}\text{Ni}_{50+x}$  ( $x \geq 1.5$ ) alloy, which originates from the random local stresses of point defects<sup>10-12</sup>. These random local stresses dictate the local strain orders and hence prohibit the formation of long-range strain ordering. Thus, spontaneous martensitic transition becomes inaccessible kinetically, although martensite is favored thermodynamically at low temperature<sup>13</sup>. The STG transition was proved experimentally by frequency dispersion<sup>10</sup> in its AC mechanical properties and breaking down of ergodicity<sup>3</sup>. These key glassy features of STG were recently reproduced theoretically by Landau-Ginsburg simulations<sup>14, 15</sup>. Microscopically, the Ti-Ni binary STG transforms (freezes) into a configuration of random nano-clusters with local R(rhombohedral)-like phase, distributed randomly in parent B2 matrix<sup>10</sup>.

Being physically parallel to cluster-spin glass and relaxor, STG also shows some novel properties. Very recently, it was found that the binary Ti-Ni STG exhibit a new shape memory effect and superelasticity, which is originated from a stress-induced transition from STG (with R-like local order) to a long-range strain ordered phase, B19' (monoclinic) martensite<sup>11</sup>. It shares the same physical origin as the field-induced transition in relaxor, whereas the order parameter is polarization<sup>16-18</sup>.

For binary Ti-Ni STG, although it is conceivable that a local order can be changed into a long-range order by stress, it remains a puzzle why the R-like local order does not transform into an R-phase (with the same strain order), and why it changes into a B19' martensite (with different strain order). To uncover the origin of this abnormal behavior, we seek a STG system showing a normal behavior, i.e., a stress-induced transition from an R-like STG to R-phase; a comparison between the abnormal system and the normal system is expected to provide the answer for the above puzzle.

From the recent STG phase diagram of Ti-Ni-Fe as shown in Fig. 9 in Ref. 19, we notice that this ternary system has a strong tendency to form R-phase, as there is a large portion of R-phase in the phase diagram. Then we expect that this system may have a chance to transform from an R-like local order into an R-phase, thus providing a chance to understand both the normal behavior of Ti-Ni-Fe STG and the abnormal behavior of the Ti-Ni STG.

In the present paper, we report the existence of a normal situation: a stress-induced STG (with R-like local strain order) to martensite (R) transition in a ternary STG alloy  $\text{Ti}_{50}\text{Ni}_{44.5}\text{Fe}_{5.5}$ . A comparison of the different behavior of the stress-induced STG-M transition between the ternary Ti-Ni-Fe and binary Ti-Ni systems suggests that the relative thermodynamic stability of competing martensite phases determines which martensite should appear under stress. Our interpretation also well answers the question about why Ti-Ni binary STG transforms directly into B19' martensite rather than passing through the R martensite.

## II. EXPERIMENT

In the present study, the Ti-Ni-Fe ternary alloy with nominal composition

Ti<sub>50</sub>Ni<sub>44.5</sub>Fe<sub>5.5</sub> was prepared by induction melting and casting with a mixture of 99.9% pure Ti, 99.9% pure Ni and 99.9% pure Fe in the flow of argon gas. As Ti is highly active metal<sup>20</sup>, CaO crucibles instead of graphite ones were employed in order to avoid the reaction between container and Ti during the induction melting at high temperatures. The obtained cast ingot was spark cut and solution-treated at 1000°C for 1h before the subsequent experiments. Quantitative chemical analysis using EDX (JSM 7000F) showed that the actual composition was Ti<sub>50.7</sub>Ni<sub>43.7</sub>Fe<sub>5.6</sub>.

To characterize the STG transition in the Ti-Ni-Fe samples, three sets of experiments were performed. Firstly, differential Scanning Calorimetry (DSC) test was performed in Rigaku 822e DSC to detect whether the martensitic transformation exists or not. The heating-cooling rate of DSC measurement was 5K/min. Secondly, the temperature dependence of X-ray diffraction (XRD) profiles of Ti<sub>50</sub>Ni<sub>44.5</sub>Fe<sub>5.5</sub> sample was measured to identify the possible structure change with temperature. The XRD experiment was done by using Rigaku 2000 XRD equipped with a heating-cooling stage. Thirdly, dynamical mechanical analysis (DMA) measurement was carried out within 3-point bending mode with TA Q800 DMA to characterize the STG transition in our sample. The internal friction and storage modulus were recorded at four frequencies (0.1/0.2/0.4/0.8Hz) as a function of temperature with a cooling rate of 1K/min. In addition, TEM observation was performed at 213K, 163K, with a Hitachi H-1500 equipped with a cooling holder. The TEM specimens were mechanically polished, and then punched into discs with diameter 3mm. Finally, the small discs were electro-polished using a twin-jet apparatus operating at 260 K. The electrolytic solution consisted of 10 vol% HClO<sub>4</sub> and 90 vol% CH<sub>3</sub>CH<sub>2</sub>OH.

To observe the stress-induced STG-M transition in Ti<sub>50</sub>Ni<sub>44.5</sub>Fe<sub>5.5</sub> sample, tensile testing and in-situ XRD were performed. Tensile testing (stress-strain measurement)

was performed on the same specimen as used in the DMA measurement at four selected temperatures (185K, 182K, 173K and 165K) encompassing the STG transition temperature, using a SHIMAZU AG-20KNIT tensile machine. Strain gauge was used to precisely monitor the strain change during the test. Furthermore, to identify the structure change during the stress-induced STG-M transition, in-situ XRD was carried out in the above-mentioned diffractometer with a self-made tensile stage at 185K and 165K, respectively.

### III. RESULTS

#### A. The existence of STG transition with local R-like strain order in $\text{Ti}_{50}\text{Ni}_{44.5}\text{Fe}_{5.5}$

As shown in the Ti-Ni-Fe ternary phase diagram<sup>19</sup>, the  $\text{Ti}_{50}\text{Ni}_{44.5}\text{Fe}_{5.5}$  alloy is at the border between a normal R-phase and STG. In the following, by a combination of DSC, XRD, DMA and TEM observations we will show that the  $\text{Ti}_{50}\text{Ni}_{44.5}\text{Fe}_{5.5}$  alloy does not undergo martensitic transition but undergoes STG transition with local R-like strain order.

The nonexistence of long-range strain ordering or martensitic (R) transformation in this alloy is confirmed with DSC and XRD measurements in a wide temperature range. As shown in Fig. 1, the DSC result shows no signature of martensitic (R) transformation, since there is no thermal peak over a wide temperature range from 163K to 250K. Furthermore, as shown in Fig. 2(a), the non-splitting of  $110_{\text{B2}}$  XRD peak during cooling down to 163K further confirms the B2 remains down to the lowest temperature and the nonexistence of R transition. Nevertheless, a gradual broadening of the  $110_{\text{B2}}$  peak occurs at the temperature range from 213K down to 163K, and this will be discussed later.

In contrast to the DSC and XRD results, the DMA results of  $\text{Ti}_{50}\text{Ni}_{44.5}\text{Fe}_{5.5}$  in Fig.

3 show an anomaly around 182K, where there is a dip in the storage modulus and a peak in internal friction. This clearly demonstrates the existence of a transition. Furthermore, the dip temperature of storage modulus and peak temperature of internal friction show clear frequency dependent behavior, following Vogel-Fulcher law  $\omega = \omega_0 \exp[-E_a / k(T_g - T_0)]$  (see inset of Fig. 3) with an ideal freezing temperature  $T_0 = 179\text{K}$ <sup>10, 11</sup>. Thus Fig. 3 is a critical evidence for a STG transition, being similar to other STG systems<sup>10, 19</sup>.

The microstructure and the corresponding diffraction pattern of  $\text{Ti}_{50}\text{Ni}_{44.5}\text{Fe}_{5.5}$  at 213K ( $\gg T_0$ ) and 163K ( $\ll T_0$ ) are shown in Fig. 2(b) and Fig. 2(c). As shown in Fig. 2(b), although  $\text{Ti}_{50}\text{Ni}_{44.5}\text{Fe}_{5.5}$  STG is unfrozen at 213K ( $\gg T_0$ )<sup>3</sup>, it is not in an ideal B2 state; it consists of “dilute” tiny nano-domains (<10nm in size), whose diffraction pattern shows faint diffuse streaks along three  $\langle 110 \rangle_{B2}$  directions. In the frozen STG state ( $T=163\text{K} \ll T_0$ ),  $\text{Ti}_{50}\text{Ni}_{44.5}\text{Fe}_{5.5}$  is fully occupied by random nano-domains with a larger size (~12nm); and the diffraction pattern shows in addition to the diffuse streaks along  $\langle 110 \rangle_{B2}$ , faint diffuse spots close to  $1/3 \langle 110 \rangle_{B2}$  positions (Fig. 2(c)) appear, being similar to that of a normal R-phase. Thus it seems that the local strain order in the nano-domains is an R-like structure, being the same as the binary Ti-Ni STG<sup>10</sup>. The above TEM observation demonstrates during a STG transition there is a gradual increase in the size and in volume fraction of the nano-domains, which have an R-like structure<sup>21, 22</sup>. It is the origin of the gradual broadening of the  $110_{B2}$  peak during the cooling as shown in Fig. 2(a).

Based on the above results, it can be concluded that the  $\text{Ti}_{50}\text{Ni}_{44.5}\text{Fe}_{5.5}$  alloy does not undergo martensitic transition but a STG transition ( $T_0 = 179\text{K}$ ) with local R-like strain order. It should be mentioned that a nominal  $\text{Ti}_{50}\text{Ni}_{44.5}\text{Fe}_{5.5}$  alloy was previously

reported to undergo a normal martensitic (R) transition<sup>23</sup>, being different from our observation. This is likely to be caused by a difference in actual composition, since this composition is close to the R/STG crossover composition (see the phase diagram in Ref. 19) and a small composition difference is sufficient to change a STG into a normal R-phase.

### **B. Stress-induced STG to R martensite transition in $\text{Ti}_{50}\text{Ni}_{44.5}\text{Fe}_{5.5}$ alloy**

In this section, we will present that  $\text{Ti}_{50}\text{Ni}_{44.5}\text{Fe}_{5.5}$  STG shows superelasticity and shape memory effect, caused by a stress-induced transition from STG (with local R-like strain order) to R martensite.

Figure 4 shows the stress-strain curves of  $\text{Ti}_{50}\text{Ni}_{44.5}\text{Fe}_{5.5}$  STG from 185K to 165K, a temperature range encompassing  $T_0=179\text{K}$ . At  $T > T_0$  the stress-strain curves (Fig. 4(a) and (b)) show a superelastic behavior with a small hysteresis (which increases with lowering temperature). After an initial linear elastic behavior, the stress-strain curve shows a deviation from linearity, which is associated with a hysteresis. The deviation from linear elasticity appears around 80MPa at 185K (Fig. 4(a)) and about 40MPa at 182K (Fig. 4(b)) upon loading. At  $T < T_0$  the stress-strain curves (Fig. 4(c) and (d)) show a plastic deformation behavior with a remnant strain after unloading, and the remnant strain increases with lowering temperature, from 0.025% to 0.063% with temperature decreasing from 173K to 165K. Moreover, on subsequent heating the remnant strain vanishes around  $T_0$ . This is a shape memory effect. The plastic deformation of  $\text{Ti}_{50}\text{Ni}_{44.5}\text{Fe}_{5.5}$  STG also shows nonlinearity upon loading. The onset stress of the nonlinearity upon loading increases from  $\sim 40\text{MPa}$  to  $\sim 50\text{MPa}$  with temperature decreasing from 173K to 165K.

It is noted that the  $\text{Ti}_{50}\text{Ni}_{44.5}\text{Fe}_{5.5}$  STG does not undergo a normal R-phase

transition down to 163K; however, it shows superelasticity and shape memory effect. This is different from a normal martensitic alloy in which these effects originate from the martensitic transformation. Such situation is analogous to the stress-induced STG-M transformation reported recently for a binary Ti-Ni STG<sup>11</sup>. However, the maximum strains for the superelasticity and shape memory effect of  $\text{Ti}_{50}\text{Ni}_{44.5}\text{Fe}_{5.5}$  STG is less than 1%, much smaller than that of Ti-Ni STG. The reason for such a difference is revealed by the in-situ XRD measurement of  $\text{Ti}_{50}\text{Ni}_{44.5}\text{Fe}_{5.5}$  STG shown in Fig. 5(a) and (b).

Figure 5(a) shows the structure change of a STG alloy  $\text{Ti}_{50}\text{Ni}_{44.5}\text{Fe}_{5.5}$  during a shape memory process, which corresponds to the stress-strain curve in Fig. 4(d). In a stress-free frozen STG state at 165 K ( $<T_0$ ), XRD pattern (Fig. 5(a)) showed a normal B2 spectrum as expected by a frozen STG. As the stress increased to about 80 MPa, the intensity of the  $110_{\text{B2}}$  peak decreased and two new peaks appeared, which can be indexed as  $112_{\text{R}}$  and  $300_{\text{R}}$ , being the same as those of the normal R martensite in  $\text{Ti}_{50}\text{Ni}_{48}\text{Fe}_2$  alloys<sup>21</sup>. When the stress reached 180 MPa [the maximum stress point in Fig. 4(a)], the  $110_{\text{B2}}$  peak disappeared. The intensity of  $300_{\text{R}}$  peaks reached maximum, while  $112_{\text{R}}$  peak remained as a small shoulder. It indicates that the  $300_{\text{R}}$  planes of the stress-induced R-phase are aligned mostly along the specimen surface. Since the d-space of  $300_{\text{R}}$  plane is shorter than that of  $110_{\text{B2}}$ , the cross section of the specimen shrinks by the above alignment, which corresponds to the elongation of the specimen because of the volume invariance. Subsequently, after the stress was unloaded, the  $112_{\text{R}}$  peak reappeared, which corresponds to a partial strain recovery upon unloading in Fig. 4(d). When the sample was heated to 190 K ( $>T_0$ ), the R peaks disappeared and the  $110_{\text{B2}}$  peak reappeared; this demonstrates the stress-induced stable R-phase below  $T_0$  transforms back to B2 parent phase on heating to above  $T_0$ . This explains the

shape recovery/memory of the sample. We shall further discuss the physics of the whole process in the discussion section.

Figure 5(b) shows the structure change of the  $\text{Ti}_{50}\text{Ni}_{44.5}\text{Fe}_{5.5}$  STG during a superelastic process. At 185 K ( $T_0 + 6$  K), the sample showed a B2 diffraction pattern, as expected for an unfrozen STG<sup>11</sup>. When applied with a stress of 100 MPa, both the  $112_{\text{R}}$  and  $300_{\text{R}}$  peaks of R martensite appear and the B2 peak becomes smaller. This indicates that R martensite was induced from the unfrozen STG, corresponding to stress-strain curve in Fig. 4(a). When the stress reached 180 MPa, the B2 reflection vanished, indicating the unfrozen STG transformed completely into the R martensite with the alignment of  $300_{\text{R}}$  planes along the surface as the previous case. Upon stress unloading, the R martensite reflections disappeared and the B2 reflection reappeared, suggesting that the stress-induced R martensite is unstable above  $T_0$ , and transformed back to the B2 unfrozen glassy state. Therefore, the superelasticity of STG above  $T_0$  is attributed to a stress-induced reversible transformation from unfrozen STG state to the R martensite.

The above in-situ XRD result demonstrates the shape memory effect and superelasticity of  $\text{Ti}_{50}\text{Ni}_{44.5}\text{Fe}_{5.5}$  STG stem from the stress-induced STG to R martensite transition, which is different from the STG to B19' transition in the binary  $\text{Ti}_{48.5}\text{Ni}_{51.5}$  STG. As the transformation strain of R martensite is much smaller than that of B19' martensite, this explains why the maximum strain of the shape memory effect and superelasticity for  $\text{Ti}_{50}\text{Ni}_{44.5}\text{Fe}_{5.5}$  STG is much smaller than that of Ti-Ni STG. It is noted that in the present ternary system, an R-like local order (the STG) transforms into an R long-range order (R-phase) under stress-field. This contrasts sharply with the situation observed in Ti-Ni STG, where an R-like local order (the STG) transforms into a different long-range order, B19' martensite. The difference is intriguing and

may indicate something important for the nature of STG. In the following section, we discuss this important issue and try to provide an answer by considering the features of the schematic free energy landscape of STG.

#### IV. DISCUSSION

##### A. Phenomenological free energy landscape for Ti-Ni binary and Ti-Ni-Fe ternary STGs

The schematic Landau free energy landscape for STG, firstly proposed in Ref. 24, describe the state of a system in terms of both configuration coordinate and average order parameter (average strain). Such a description has two main features: (1) it enables the formation of STG and martensite; (2) it introduces the local free energy barriers to describe the local strain ordering effect. Such a scheme well explained many fundamental properties of STG such as the origin of STG transition and stress-induced STG-M transition. But this model has a limitation that it assumes the instability with respect to only one kind of martensite; thus it cannot explain why the same R-like local order can result in different martensites for  $\text{Ti}_{48.5}\text{Ni}_{51.5}$  and  $\text{Ti}_{50}\text{Ni}_{44.5}\text{Fe}_{5.5}$  STGs.

Now we modify this schematic free energy landscape by assuming the system has instability with respect to two different martensites, R-phase and B19'. This assumption has gained support from known experimental observations in Ti-Ni and Ti-Ni-Fe systems, where not only B19', but also R, has been observed to appear depending on different composition, temperature, and themomechanical conditions<sup>25</sup>,<sup>26</sup>. A typical example is the phase diagram of Ti-Ni-Fe<sup>19</sup>, where both R and B19' exist, suggesting that these two phases are competing low temperature phases of the system, and the system has instability with respect to both phases.

The modified schematic free energy landscape (3D) projected to free energy vs. average strain plane is shown in Fig. 6, where both Ti-Ni STG and Ti-Ni-Fe STG with bi-instability are shown. Details of the description of the schematic free energy landscape should be referred to Ref. 24. Here the strain coordinate should be viewed as the strain along the transition path of the system.

Being different from the previous single instability model, the modified schematic free energy landscape has two pairs of wells: one for R-phase and the other for B19'. This picture is true for both Ti-Ni and Ti-Ni-Fe alloys, but with a difference in the relative stability of the two phases, indicated with the depth of the corresponding wells. As shown in Fig. 6, Fe doping to Ti-Ni destabilizes both R and B19', but has much stronger effect to destabilize B19' martensite<sup>25</sup>; this can also be inferred from the Ti-Ni-Fe phase diagram<sup>19</sup>.

## **B. Origin of STG transition and stress-induced STG to R-phase transition in Ti-Ni-Fe ternary alloys**

Using the schematic free energy landscape of Ti-Ni-Fe shown in Fig. 6, we now discuss the origin of STG transition in this ternary system and its stress-induced transition into R-phase.

Figure 7(I) [short for Fig. 7 column (I)] shows the variation of the schematic free energy landscape during cooling, from which we can see why the system can be frozen into a STG by carefully describing four important temperature regimes as follows.

(1) At  $T > T_0 \gg T_R^*$ , (where  $T_0$  is the ideal glass transition temperature and  $T_R^*$  is the instability temperature of R-phase). (Fig. 7(I)a)

Both R and B19' martensitic states are metastable and  $k_B T > \text{local barrier}$ . In

such a state the system is ergodic and behaves like a normal parent phase.

(2) At  $T = T_0 > T_R^*$ . (Fig. 7(I)b)

R and B19' are still metastable, but  $k_B T \sim$  local barrier (caused by point defects, Fe dopant). The system begins to be trapped by local barriers and thus starts to freeze into a state with small local order parameter, an R-like local order. However the average structure is still B2.

(3) At  $T = T_R^* < T_0$ . (Fig. 7(I)c)

$F(\epsilon_R) = F(0)$ , i.e., R reaches its instability, but B19' is still metastable. As  $k_B T <$  local barrier, R-phase cannot be formed kinetically and thus the system remains a frozen STG with local R structure.

(4) At  $T < T_R^* \ll T_0$ . (Fig. 7(I)d)

R state is thermodynamically favored, while B19' martensitic state is still metastable. As  $k_B T \ll$  local barrier, R-phase cannot be formed and the system still remains to be a frozen STG with local R structure.

Now using Fig. 7(I) ( $\sigma = 0$ ) and Fig. 7(II) ( $\sigma > \sigma_C$ ), we provide an explanation for the superelasticity ( $T \geq T_0$ ) and shape memory effect ( $T < T_0$ ) in  $\text{Ti}_{50}\text{Ni}_{44.5}\text{Fe}_{5.5}$ . At  $T > T_0$ , the  $\text{Ti}_{50}\text{Ni}_{44.5}\text{Fe}_{5.5}$  STG is in unfrozen or ergodic state, and R-phase is metastable. During stress loading, the schematic free energy landscape is tilted as shown in Fig. 7(II)a. When  $\sigma > \sigma_C$ , the R-phase becomes stable, and the system transforms into R-phase. But it cannot further transform into B19' martensite as the latter is metastable even under stress. Upon unloading, the R-phase becomes unstable again, and the system reverts to the unfrozen STG. This results in the superelasticity observed in Fig. 4(a).

At  $T = T_0 > T_R^*$ , i.e., the freezing temperature, the system starts to freeze. Like the above case, loading beyond a critical stress can also transform the system into an R-phase (Fig. 7(II)b). On the other hand, stress also lowers the freezing temperature  $T_0$ <sup>24</sup>, so that the stressed system becomes unfrozen. This leads to a shape recovery upon unloading, i.e., the superelasticity.

At  $T = T_R^* < T_0$ , i.e, the instability temperature of the R-phase, the system is frozen due to the kinetic limitation shown in Fig. 7(I)c. When the system is loaded with an external stress  $\sigma > \sigma_C$ , the local barriers can be overcome, and R-phase now can be achieved, as shown in Fig. 7(II)c. As the R-phase has the same thermodynamic stability as the STG at  $T_R^*$ , it remains stable after removing the external stress. Therefore, at  $T = T_R^* < T_0$ , the STG exhibits a plastic deformation.

At  $T < T_R^* \ll T_0$ , the STG is strongly frozen (Fig. 7(I)d). Stress-loading can overcome the local barrier (but with a higher  $\sigma_C$ ) and change the local R order into a long-range R-phase (Fig. 7(II)d)), but the induced R-phase cannot recover to the original STG state because R-phase is a thermodynamically stable phase at such temperature. This explains the observed plastic deformation behavior at such temperature (Fig. 4(c,d)).

For the above two plastic deformation cases (Fig. 7(II)c,d), if the system is heated up to  $T > T_0$  after unloading, the schematic free energy landscape will change into the one in Fig. 7(I)a, where the R state becomes unstable. Hence the system will transform back to the unfrozen STG with zero average strain and then the original shape is recovered. This explains the shape memory effect of  $\text{Ti}_{50}\text{Ni}_{44.5}\text{Fe}_{5.5}$  STG below  $T_0$  as shown in Fig. 4(c,d).

### C. Phenomenological explanation for the difference in stress-induced STG-M transition between Ti-Ni STG and Ti-Ni-Fe STG

In the following, we shall explain why the product phase of stress-induced STG-M is R-phase in the  $\text{Ti}_{50}\text{Ni}_{44.5}\text{Fe}_{5.5}$  STG, while it is B19' in  $\text{Ti}_{48.5}\text{Ni}_{51.5}$ , and why the formed R-phase can not be further induced into B19' in  $\text{Ti}_{50}\text{Ni}_{44.5}\text{Fe}_{5.5}$ .

As shown in Fig. 6, there is a large difference in relative stability of R and B19' for the two systems. B19' is quite unstable for  $\text{Ti}_{50}\text{Ni}_{44.5}\text{Fe}_{5.5}$ . Such a difference is responsible for the different transition behavior of the two systems. As shown in Fig. 8, for  $\text{Ti}_{48.5}\text{Ni}_{51.5}$  STG, at  $\sigma > \sigma_C$  the system directly transforms into B19', because B19' is more stable than R-phase and the free energy barrier between these two phases is very low. Furthermore, from Fig. 6 it can be seen that the free energy of B19' martensite in  $\text{Ti}_{50}\text{Ni}_{44.5}\text{Fe}_{5.5}$  STG is very high compared with the parent phase; this means that B19' is very unstable. Thus in this system stress can induce the formation of R-phase but cannot further induce a B19'. Therefore, it becomes clear that the relative thermodynamic stability of the competing martensite phases (like R-phase and B19') determines the product phase of stress-induced STG-M transition.

### V. CONCLUSIONS

1.  $\text{Ti}_{50}\text{Ni}_{44.5}\text{Fe}_{5.5}$  was proved to undergo a STG transition with  $T_0=179\text{K}$  and possesses a local R-like strain order.
2. During the tensile testing,  $\text{Ti}_{50}\text{Ni}_{44.5}\text{Fe}_{5.5}$  STG exhibited shape memory effect below  $T_0$  and superelasticity above  $T_0$ . These effects originate from a new stress-induced STG (local R-like strain order) to R-phase transition, which is different from that found in  $\text{Ti}_{48.5}\text{Ni}_{51.5}$  (local R-like STG  $\rightarrow$  B19'). Our findings suggest that the stress-induced STG-M transition may be a general phenomenon for many STG

systems.

3. A modified phenomenological model has been proposed and used to explain the origin of STG transition and stress-induced STG-M transition in Ti-Ni-based STG. The competition of thermodynamic stabilities between different martensite phases is responsible for different product phases of the stress-induced STG-M transition, which may shed the light on the understanding of the field-induced long-range transition in other ferroic glass systems, such as relaxor ferroelectrics.

### **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

The present work was supported by Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (B) of JSPS, National Science Foundation of China (50720145101 and 50771079) and National Basic Research Program of China under Grant No.2010CB631003 as well as NCET and 111 project of China (B06025). J. Zhang acknowledges funding by the research center of SFB 459 (“Shape Memory Technology”) at the Ruhr-University Bochum, and also the funding by Alexander von Humboldt Foundation. The authors thank T. Suzuki, D. Wang, and G.L. Fan for technical support and helpful discussions.

## REFERENCES

- <sup>1</sup>J. A. Mydosh, *Spin glasses* (Taylor & Francis, Philadelphia, 1993).
- <sup>2</sup>J. Hessinger and K. Knorr, Phys. Rev. Lett. **65**, 2674 (1990); Phys. Rev. B **47**, 14813 (1993).
- <sup>3</sup>Y. Wang, X. Ren, K. Otsuka, and A. Saxena, Phys. Rev. B **76** (2007).
- <sup>4</sup>Z. Kutnjak, C. Filipicaron, R. Pirc, A. Levstik, et al., Phys. Rev. B **59**, 294 (1999).
- <sup>5</sup>B. Jerome and J. Commandeur, Nature **386**, 589 (1997).
- <sup>6</sup>K. Binder and A. P. Young, Rev. Mod. Phys. **58**, 801 (1986).
- <sup>7</sup>L. Santen and W. Krauth, Nature **405**, 550 (2000).
- <sup>8</sup>C. A. Angell, Science **267**, 1924 (1995).
- <sup>9</sup>S. R. Shenoy and T. Lookman, Phys. Rev. B **78**, 17 (2008).
- <sup>10</sup>S. Sarkar, X. Ren, and K. Otsuka, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 205702 (2005).
- <sup>11</sup>Y. Wang, X. B. Ren, and K. Otsuka, Phys. Rev. Lett. **97**, 225703 (2006).
- <sup>12</sup>S. Semenovskaya and A. G. Khachaturyan, Acta Mater. **45**, 4367 (1997).
- <sup>13</sup>A. G. Khachaturyan, *Theory of structural transformation in solids* (Wiley Interscience, New York, 1983).
- <sup>14</sup>P. Lloveras, T. Castan, M. Porta, A. Planes, and A. Saxena, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 165707 (2008).
- <sup>15</sup>P. Lloveras, T. Castan, M. Porta, A. Planes, and A. Saxena, Phys. Rev. B **80**, 054107 (2009).
- <sup>16</sup>E. V. Colla, N. K. Yushin, and D. Viehland, J. Appl. Phys. **83**, 3298 (1998).
- <sup>17</sup>J. L. Dellis, M. ElMarssi, P. Tilloloy, R. Farhi, and D. Viehland, Ferroelectrics **201**, 167 (1997).
- <sup>18</sup>A. A. Bokov and Z. G. Ye, J. Mater. Sci. **41**, 31 (2006).

- <sup>19</sup>D. Wang, Z. Zhang, J. Zhang, Y. Zhou, Y. Wang, X. Ding, Y. Wang, and X. Ren, *Acta Mater.* **58**, 6206 (2010).
- <sup>20</sup>J. Zhang, G. L. Fan, Y. M. Zhou, X. D. Ding, K. Otsuka, K. Nakamura, J. Sun, and X. B. Ren, *Acta Mater.* **55**, 2897 (2007).
- <sup>21</sup>M. S. Choi, T. Fukuda, T. Kakeshita, and H. Mori, *Philos. Mag.* **86**, 67 (2006).
- <sup>22</sup>Y. Murakami and D. Shindo, *Philos. Mag. Lett.* **81**, 631 (2001).
- <sup>23</sup>M. S. Choi, T. Yamamoto, T. Fukuda, T. Kakeshita, et al., *Philos. Mag.* **88**, 2449 (2008).
- <sup>24</sup>Y. Wang, X. Ren, K. Otsuka, and A. Saxena, *Acta Mater.* **56**, 2885 (2008).
- <sup>25</sup>X. Ren, N. Miura, J. Zhang, K. Otsuka, et al., *Mater. Sci. Eng., A* **312**, 196 (2001).
- <sup>26</sup>K. Otsuka and X. Ren, *Prog. Mater Sci.* **50**, 511 (2005).

## FIGURE CAPTIONS

**FIG. 1.** DSC curve for  $\text{Ti}_{50}\text{Ni}_{44.5}\text{Fe}_{5.5}$  shows no thermal peak in the whole temperature range from 163K to 250K with the heating/cooling rate of 5K/min.

**FIG. 2. (a)** XRD line profiles for  $\text{Ti}_{50}\text{Ni}_{44.5}\text{Fe}_{5.5}$  show that it keeps an average B2 structure of parent phase (P) over the entire temperature range from 213K to 163K (the small peaks  $511_{\text{Ti}_4\text{Ni}_2\text{O}}$  are used for normalization of the results); **(b)** and **(c)** show bright field images of  $\text{Ti}_{50}\text{Ni}_{44.5}\text{Fe}_{5.5}$  observed at 213K and 163K, and the insets are the corresponding diffraction patterns with  $[1\bar{1}1]$  zone axis.

**FIG. 3.** (Color online) Dynamic mechanical measurement of  $\text{Ti}_{50}\text{Ni}_{44.5}\text{Fe}_{5.5}$  shows an anomalous, frequency-dependent modulus dip around  $T_g$  (STG transition temperature of specific frequency) and a corresponding internal friction peak at a lower temperature. Inset shows “Non-Arrhenius”  $T_g$  vs  $\ln \omega$  curve, fitted by the Vogel-Fulcher equation, with which  $T_0$  is obtained to be 179K.

**FIG. 4.** Stress-strain curves for  $\text{Ti}_{50}\text{Ni}_{44.5}\text{Fe}_{5.5}$  strain glass tested at four selected temperatures (pointed with arrows in Fig. 3) : two above  $T_0$  (185K in (a) and 182K in (b)) represents superelasticity (SE), and two below  $T_0$  (173K in (c) and 165K in (d)) represents shape memory effect (SME), respectively. The dashed lines in (c) and (d) denote the shape recovery process of heating above  $T_0$ .

**FIG. 5.** *In-situ* XRD evidence for the structure change during (a) a shape memory process (tensile tested at 165 K ( $<T_0$ ) and followed by heating to 190 K ( $>T_0$ )), and (b) a superelasticity process (tensile loading and unloading at 185 K ( $>T_0$ )) for  $\text{Ti}_{50}\text{Ni}_{44.5}\text{Fe}_{5.5}$  strain glass. (The straight dashed lines are drawn for eye-guiding).

**FIG. 6.** (Color online) Modified schematic free energy landscape at  $\sigma = 0$  for both Ti-Ni STG and Ti-Ni-Fe STG with two martensite valleys at  $\varepsilon_R$  and  $\varepsilon_{B19'}$  in a microscopic configuration-average strain( $\varepsilon$ ) space.  $F$  is the free energy;  $k_B T$  is the thermal activation energy. The valleys with average strain  $\varepsilon_R$  denote the R-phase, while the valleys  $\varepsilon_{B19'}$  correspond to the B19' phase. The red ball denotes the current

position of system in phase space. The curved solid line is for the average strain ( $\varepsilon$ ) dependence of the average free energy ( $F$ ) of all the microscopic configurations corresponding to a given macroscopic strain state; and the difference between the upper dashed curve and the bottom solid curve represents the average energy barrier as a function of average strain ( $\varepsilon$ ), which is the essential characteristic of the STG free energy landscape.

**FIG. 7.** (Color online) Phenomenological explanation for the STG transition and stress-induced STG-M (R-phase) transition in  $\text{Ti}_{50}\text{Ni}_{44.5}\text{Fe}_{5.5}$  STG.  $T_0$  is the deal freezing temperature at zero stress;  $T_R^*$  is the temperature where R-phase starts to stable; and  $\sigma_C$  is the critical stress of the stress-induced STG-M (R phase) transition. **(I)** column (including four curves **(I)a**, **(I)b**, **(I)c** and **(I)d**) shows the schematic free energy landscape of the  $\text{Ti}_{50}\text{Ni}_{44.5}\text{Fe}_{5.5}$  STG at zero stress for  $T > T_0 \gg T_R^*$ ,  $T = T_0 > T_R^*$ ,  $T = T_R^* < T_0$  and  $T < T_R^* \ll T_0$ , respectively. **(II)** column (including four curves **(II)a**, **(II)b**, **(II)c** and **(II)d**) shows the projected schematic free energy landscape of strain glass at  $\sigma > \sigma_C$  for  $T > T_0 \gg T_R^*$ ,  $T = T_0 > T_R^*$ ,  $T = T_R^* < T_0$  and  $T < T_R^* \ll T_0$ , respectively.

**FIG. 8.** (Color online) Phenomenological explanation for the phase difference of stress-induced STG-M transition in different strain glass systems: B19' in  $\text{Ti}_{48.5}\text{Ni}_{51.5}$  (blue ball) and R-phase in  $\text{Ti}_{50}\text{Ni}_{44.5}\text{Fe}_{5.5}$  (green ball) at certain temperature. It shows the schematic free energy landscape for both Ti-Ni STG and Ti-Ni-Fe STG at  $\sigma > \sigma_C$ .

# FIGURES




FIG. 1




FIG. 2




FIG. 3




FIG. 4




FIG. 5




FIG. 6




FIG. 7




FIG. 8