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1 Introduction

Microscale laser shock peening (μLSP), which aims to improve fatigue performance by imparting a compressive residual stress into the target material surface layer using laser induced shock waves, has been the focus of several recent investigations [1,2]. This process is desirable for metallic components of microdevices, which encounter cyclic loading, such as microswitches, microblades of a microturbine, etc. Previous work has shown [1,2] through both numerical analyses and experiments that through μLSP, one can manipulate the compressive residual stress distribution in a region close to the shocked surface with micron spatial resolution.

Recent experiments in both bending and indentation have shown that the apparent material hardening increases as the size of specimen decreases to micron level [3,4] where classical plasticity theory has been unable to account for the observed phenomena. It is well known now [5–7] that this hardening is due to length scale effects. Therefore, when the laser beam spot size is reduced to several microns, i.e., the same order of grain size, the size scale will have significant influence on mechanical behavior and the conventional plasticity theory must be re-examined as well. However, the numerical models developed before [1,2] to predict the material response to the μLSP process are simplified and approximated without considering length scale effects and all based on the conventional plasticity theory. In order to better understand the μLSP process and to more accurately simulate the process, it is necessary to understand the length scale effect on the process and integrate this into the simulation model.

In microscale deformation, strain gradient effects may be large enough such that the yield strength of a material depends not only on the strain, but also on the strain gradient. The motivation behind the use of strain gradients is based on the framework of geometrically necessary dislocations (GNDs), which were first introduced by Nye [8] and furthered by Ashby [9], who have given a physical basis for strain gradient dependent material behavior. Strain gradient theories have been physically motivated by developments in dislocation mechanics. More details about geometrically necessary dislocations in single crystals and polycrystalline materials can be found in Ref. [6]. In particular, several strain gradient models have been developed to numerically capture length scale effects where the underlying physics is sometimes related to the geometrically necessary dislocation [5,10].

There have been a number of investigations on geometrically necessary dislocation density under constant loading or punch configurations for anisotropic materials [11,12]. For example, Kysar et al. [12] estimated the distribution of geometrically necessary dislocation density on a cross section of a wedge indented aluminum single crystal via electron backscatter diffraction (EBSD) measurement. As lattice curvature induced by μLSP is relatively small compared with those of a constant load or a punch, length scale effects are not obvious in μLSP and cannot simply be copied from their works. The objective of the present work is to find the spatial distribution of the geometrically necessary dislocation density after the μLSP process from both numerical and experimental results for a single crystal aluminum under plane strain condition. Gaussian pressure loading, corresponding to the pressure caused by laser shock peening, was assumed in the numerical simulation and the resulting plastic deformation was analyzed to find the distribution of the geometrically necessary dislocation density.

The remainder of the chapter is organized as follows. Section 2 gives details about experimental conditions and postpeening material characterization, which includes lattice rotation quantification by EBSD. Principles of the evaluation of geometrically necessary dislocations density are described in Sec. 3. In Sec. 4, finite element simulation employed to study the length scale effect in...
the target material after μLSP is presented. Section 5 gives the results and discussion. Following are concluding marks.

2 Experimental Conditions and Postpeening Material Characterization

A frequency tripled Q-switched Nd:YAG laser (λ=355 nm) in TEM00 mode was used for the μLSP experiments with a 50 ns pulse duration and a 12 μm beam diameter, as shown in Fig. 1. A thin layer of high vacuum grease (about 10 μm thick) was spread evenly on the sample surface, and a 16 μm thick polycrystalline aluminum foil, chosen for its relatively low threshold of vaporization, was tightly pressed onto the grease. The sample was placed in a shallow container filled with distilled water approximately 3 mm above the sample's top surface. A line of LSP shocks were created on the sample surface with a 25 μm spacing along the [110] direction as shown in Fig. 1. A pulse energy of 228 J was used, which corresponded to a laser intensity of 4.03 GW/cm². After shock processing, the coating layer and the vacuum grease were manually removed.

A single crystal aluminum with the orientation (114) is chosen because when shocks applied along the [110] direction approximate plane strain condition is achieved [13] and under the Gaussian pressure loading only one slip system is activated. Furthermore, aluminum is a popular material used in micrometallic devices so it is of interest to study its mechanical behavior under μLSP. In preparation for laser shock peening, the sample surface was polished mechanically by using grit 600 sandpaper and then repeated by using grit 1200 sandpaper. After sandpaper polish, the specimen was polished using diamond paste with lapping oil as lubricant, first 6 μm paste and then 1 μm with minimum pressure was used until no directionally preferential scratches were visible under optical microscope with 100× magnification. In order to remove any residual stress induced during the mechanical polish process, the sample was electropolished before shocking.

The shocked region was measured using scanning probe microscopy (SPM, Digital Instruments Nanoscope Inc., Santa Barbara, CA) as shown in Fig. 2 for a scanning area of 80 × 80 μm². After the shock peening, EBSD data were collected using a system supplied by HKL Technology and attached to a JEOL JSM 5600LV scanning electron microscope (SEM). All data were acquired in the automatic mode, using external beam scanning and employing a 3 μm step size as the preliminary investigation revealed negligible levels of orientation difference at finer scales of inquiry. The scan area chosen was 150 μm(width) ×100 μm(depth) on the cross section as the effected area by μLSP is usually smaller than this area. The EBSD results from each individual scan comprise the data containing the position coordinates and the three Euler angles, which describe the orientation of the particular interaction volume relative to the orientation of the specimen in the SEM allowing in-plane and out-of-plane lattice rotations to be calculated relative to the known undeformed crystallographic orientation, which serves as a reference state.

3 Evaluation of Geometrically Necessary Dislocation Density and Its Hardening Effect

Based on the work by Kysar et al. [12], the evaluation principles of the geometrically necessary dislocation density are briefly summarized here as follows. First, the lattice curvature; the
Following the work of Kysar et al. where for the plane strain condition with three effective slip systems, the effective length of Burgers vector of the slip system to Nye’s dislocation tensor.

Assuming the elastic strain gradient is negligible compared to the yield surface. Also, the induced GND will be smaller than that of [001] or other symmetrical orientations under the same conditions, as there are two active slip systems for these orientations. Thus, if the hardening caused by GND for the orientation [114] cannot be neglected, it follows that it cannot be ignored for symmetrical orientations either.

Based on Eq. (5), the geometric parameters $s_{ij}^{(n)}$ and $t_{ij}^{(n)}$ are different from the [001] and must be determined first. From Fig. 4, the parameters can be found according to the geometrical relationship listed in Table 1.

<p>| Table 1 Geometrically necessary dislocation parameters of FCC crystals for Al [114] sample |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Slip system</th>
<th>Slip angle (deg)</th>
<th>Unit vector of slip, $s$</th>
<th>Dislocation line vector, $t$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>$(-\sqrt{2}/3, 1, -\sqrt{1}/3, 0)$</td>
<td>$0, 0, -1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>$(-\sqrt{2}/3, 1, -\sqrt{1}/3, 0)$</td>
<td>$0, 0, -1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>74.1</td>
<td>$(-\sqrt{2}/3, 1, -\sqrt{1}/3, 0)$</td>
<td>$0, 0, -1$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the two equations with three unknowns, a solution may be found by optimizing the variables in a certain sense, such as the least norm solution by minimizing $||\rho^{(1)}||^2 + ||\rho^{(2)}||^2 + ||\rho^{(3)}||^2$ through singular value decomposition [6]. By summing the density of each slip system, the total GND density can be found. The approximate strength of the single crystal in the shocked region can be calculated using the Taylor hardening model in which the yield strength of a material $\sigma_y$ is proportional to the square root of the geometrically necessary dislocation density $\rho$. By assuming that all slip systems harden at the same rate, the enhanced strength is related to the square root of GND [9] as follows: 

$$\rho = \rho^{(1)}b^{(1)} \sqrt{\frac{1}{3} + \rho^{(2)}b^{(2)} - \rho^{(3)}b^{(3)}}, \quad \rho = \rho^{(1)}b^{(1)} \sqrt{\frac{1}{3} + \rho^{(3)}b^{(3)}}, \quad \rho = \rho^{(1)}b^{(1)} \sqrt{\frac{1}{3} + \rho^{(3)}b^{(3)}}$$

The above is a brief summary of the GND evaluation principles employed in this paper. It should be pointed out that there are differences between that of Kysar et al. [12] and the presented work. Kysar et al. [12] employed the above evaluation to characterize the GND induced by wedge indentation on a single crystal aluminum with low index orientation [001], which corresponds to symmetrical deformation with respect to the yield surface. Also,
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Fig. 5 The scheme FEM simulation of spatially resolved GND dependent deformation

\[ \tau = c \mu b \sqrt{p} \]  

(7)

where \( c \) is a constant related to the crystal and grain structures, usually ranging from 0.1 to 0.5 [9], \( \tau \) is the enhanced flow stress by GND in each slip system, \( \mu \) is shear modulus, \( b \) is the Burger’s vector, and \( p \) is the total GND density.

4 Finite Element Simulation of Spatially Resolved GND Dependent Deformation

In order to estimate length scale effects on microscale laser shock peening, a simulation strategy depicted by the flow chart in Fig. 5 is followed. First, based on the evaluation principles discussed above, the geometrically necessary dislocation density is found according to Eqs. (6a) and (6b) from the lattice rotation of the simulation without considering length scale effects and is validated by the experimental result of EBSD measurement. Then, the enhanced strength due to the geometrically necessary dislocations is calculated at each material point or node in finite element simulation by using Eq. (7). The current strength in each step is updated by combining the local enhanced strength with the global initial strength. The enhanced strength is applied in a linear manner, that is, it increases from zero to the final strength during the loading step and remains constant in the relaxation step as the plastic deformation is unrecoverable during the relaxing.

In the simulation, the theory of single crystal plasticity [14] was integrated into finite element simulation by a user-material subroutine (UMAT), written by Huang [15] and modified by Kysar [16]. It is incorporated into the finite element analysis using the general purpose finite element program ABAQUS/STANDARD. In the UMAT, the \{111\}/\{110\} slip systems in FCC metal are employed and an initial critical resolved shear stress \( \tau_{\text{CRSS}} \approx 1 \text{ MPa} \) is assumed for each of the slip systems, which is a reasonable value for high purity single crystals employed (e.g., Ref. [17]). The element used in the simulation was plane strain reduced integration hybrid element (CPE4RH) for a total simulated area: \( 384 \times 192 \mu m^2 \) (thickness \times width). As for the boundary conditions of the plane strain model, the applied surface tractions correspond to the applied pressure on the shocked surface. At the bottom surface, the vertical displacement is specified as zero and the outer edges are traction-free. The pressure distribution on the surface follows a Gaussian as

\[ P(x) = P_0 \exp\left(-\frac{x^2}{2R^2}\right) \]

where \( x \) is the radial distance from the center of the laser beam and \( R \) is the radius of plasma, which is assumed to be equal to 6 \( \mu m \) here. The peak value of pressure is assumed to be \( P_0/\tau_{\text{CRSS}} = 7 \).

5 Results and Discussion

5.1 Lattice Rotation Field. From the measurement mentioned above, the resulting lattice rotation due to laser shock peening was obtained. In order to measure the lattice rotation below the sample surface and study the spatial distribution in the depth direction, the sample was sectioned on a (110) plane via wire electrical discharge machining and the crystallographic orientation of the newly exposed surface was mapped using EBSD. The lattice rotation obtained in this manner is called “in-plane” because the experimental results indicate an approximate two-dimensional deformation state. Figure 6 shows the lattice rotation in the cross section, which shows that the lattice rotation varies between \( \pm 2 \) deg in the region of up to 60 \( \mu m \) below the sample surface. In the center of the shock line, the lattice rotation is nearly zero (green) and the rotation direction reversed across the shocked line, which is consistent with the result from the sample surface. The maximum lattice rotation occurs near the sample surface and the value decays as depth increases. The lattice rotation from FEM simulation shown in Fig. 7 indicates two distinct misorientation regions on each side, which is similar to the EBSD result. Also, there is a misorientation-free region in the middle, which can be seen from the experimental result as well. It can be seen from lattice rotation field of EBSD measurement that the plastic deformation zone is about 100 \( \mu m \), while the FEM simulations predict a 50 \( \mu m \) zone. This may be due to lateral expansion of plasma as this effect...
is a more significant concern for a small beam size [1]. Also, in the simulation quasistatic loading is assumed and the peak pressure is only 7 MPa, but in microscale LSP, the peak pressure is usually above 2 GPa [1].

5.2 GND Density and Its Hardening

5.2.1 Geometrically Necessary Dislocation Density. Based on the evaluation principles of GND, its distribution can be found from both simulation and experiments for the shocked specimen. Figure 8 shows the geometrically necessary dislocation density from the EBSD measurements. It can be seen that the magnitude of GND is about $9 \times 10^{13}$ m$^{-2}$, which is coincident with large lattice rotation and the rotation-free region at the shock line center. The distribution consists of the regions, denoted as A, B, and C, corresponding to the negative rotation, zero rotation and positive rotation of the lattice rotation field in Fig. 6. The geometrically necessary dislocation density by FEM simulation is shown in Fig. 9. It indicates that the magnitude of GND is about $1.4 \times 10^{14}$ m$^{-2}$, which is almost twice of the experimental result. This is due to the fact that the plastic deformation size predicted by FEM is only half of the experimental result but the magnitudes of rotation are almost the same. Similarly, GND contour from FEM simulation can be divided into three distinctive regions, corresponding to the experimental results of the A, B, and C regions. Compared with the experiment, the GND distribution area by FEM is quite smaller. This is again due to the assumptions in the simulation, such as quasistatic loading and no radial expansion of plasma. From the contour of lattice rotation by both experiment and FEM simulation, region B (transition zone from negative lattice rotation to positive lattice rotation) has the maximum dislocation though the rotation is about zero. This is because the lattice rotation mismatch is most pronounced in this area. In order to preserve lattice compatibility in the case of unevenly distributed plastic slip, a large GND dislocation will be accumulated.

Figure 10(b)–10(d) give the geometrically necessary dislocation density by FEM in each active slip system as shown in Fig. 10(a). A detailed description of three slip systems under plane strain condition can be found in Ref. [18]. It can be seen from Fig. 10 that GND in slip system $i$ have the biggest magnitude, and that slip system $iii$ is the weakest among the three. The difference can be explained by considering the Schmidt factor in each active slip system. Suppose the loading direction is $l$, the slip plane normal is $n$, the slip direction is $s$, then the Schmidt factor can be represented as $\cos \phi \times \cos \Lambda \times (n \times l) \times s \times l$, where $\phi$ is the angle between $n$ and $l$, and $\Lambda$ is the angle between $s$ and $l$. From Fig. 10(a), we can find that the Schmidt factors for slip systems $i$, $ii$ and $iii$ are 0.472, 0.315, and 0.263, respectively. Therefore, GND in slip system $i$ is greater than that of slip system $ii$; and slip system $ii$ is larger than slip system $iii$. Besides the spatial distribution, temporal evolutions for both lattice rotation and GND were presented in Fig. 11 for different material points. The material point of node 1 corresponds to the origin (0, 0), which is located on the top surface at the shock line center. The material point of node 3 (3 $\mu$m, −10 $\mu$m) corresponds to the largest GND, which is located 10 $\mu$m below the top surface and 3 $\mu$m right from the shock line center. The other two points are randomly selected. From Fig. 11, we can see that GND increases almost linearly after a very short time (0.1 s) and has no direct relationship with the time history of lattice rotation. For the origin (0, 0), the lattice rotation remains almost zero, but GND in this point increases constantly.

5.2.2 Comparison With Conventional Indentation. Compared with laser shock peening, geometrically necessary dislocation density has been well studied in the conventional indentations [3, 12, 19, 20]. Furthermore, lattice rotation of indentation is relative large. Therefore, it is interesting to compare laser shock peening with indentation to get some idea of the extent of the effects of GND.

The following shows the comparison with the work by Kysar et al. [12] for wedge indentation. In their work, wedge indention was performed on aluminum single crystal specimens with a wedge apex angle of 90 deg. The indenter was made of tungsten carbide bonded by a ferrous alloy. The indentation process was under the load control condition using a materials testing system (MTS 810) with a 548 controller. The loading direction was along [001] crystallographic orientation and the indenter axis were parallel to the [110]. The magnitude of in-plane lattice rotation ranges from −10 deg to 10 deg and the plastic deformation zone is quite large, which is about $500 \mu$m(depth) $\times$ 400 $\mu$m(width). The magnitude of lattice rotation is about five times of that by laser shock peening while the average GND density is about $1 \times 10^{14}$ m$^{-2}$ for the indentation and about $5 \times 10^{13}$ m$^{-2}$ for $\mu$LSP, which is half of the indentation. Thus, though the magnitude of lattice rotation is relatively small for $\mu$LSP comparing with the indentation, the GND density is still comparable with that of the indentation. Therefore, like in the indentation, length scale effects are also needed to be considered in $\mu$LSP.

5.2.3 GND Enhanced Strength Distribution. In order to integrate the GND hardening into the FEM simulation, the yield strength increment for each slip system under plane strain condition must be calculated from the GND distribution of each slip system. From the load control condition using a materials testing system (MTS 810) with a 548 controller. The loading direction was along [001] crystallographic orientation and the indenter axis were parallel to the [110]. The magnitude of in-plane lattice rotation ranges from −10 deg to 10 deg and the plastic deformation zone is quite large, which is about $500 \mu$m(depth) $\times$ 400 $\mu$m(width). The magnitude of lattice rotation is about five times of that by laser shock peening while the average GND density is about $1 \times 10^{14}$ m$^{-2}$ for the indentation and about $5 \times 10^{13}$ m$^{-2}$ for $\mu$LSP, which is half of the indentation. Thus, though the magnitude of lattice rotation is relatively small for $\mu$LSP comparing with the indentation, the GND density is still comparable with that of the indentation. Therefore, like in the indentation, length scale effects are also needed to be considered in $\mu$LSP.
system based on Eq. (7). For a FCC crystal, the Burgers vector is
\[ \mathbf{b} = \frac{a}{2}[110] \]
and the magnitude is
\[ |\mathbf{b}| = \frac{a}{2}(h^2 + k^2 + l^2)^{1/2} = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}a \]  

where \( a \) is the lattice constant, which is 0.405 nm for aluminum. Thus the magnitude of Burgers vector is \( b = 0.28 \) nm for single crystal aluminum. By projecting Burgers vector into the activated slip system, the effective length of Burgers vector of each slip system can be found. From Kysar et al. [18] and Wang et al. [21], only three slip systems should be considered under the plane strain condition. Slip system i, \([11\bar{1}]|[\bar{1}1\bar{2}]\), is the combination of \((11\bar{1})[011]\) and \((11\bar{1})[\bar{1}01]\); slip system ii is the combination of slip systems \((11\bar{1})[1\bar{1}0]\) and \((1\bar{1}1)[\bar{1}10]\); and slip system iii, \((1\bar{1}1)[1\bar{1}2]\), is the combination of \((1\bar{1}1)[101]\) and \((\bar{1}1\bar{1})[0\bar{1}1]\). By geometry, the effective lengths of Burgers vector are \( \sqrt{3}/2|\mathbf{b}| \), \(|\mathbf{b}| \), and \( \sqrt{3}/2|\mathbf{b}| \) for the three slip systems, respectively.

Figure 12 shows the results of hardening by geometrically necessary dislocation density for the three slip systems. It can be seen that the magnitude of the enhanced strength is about 15 MPa and the affected area is around \( 40 \times 60 \) \( \mu \)m. Beyond that area, there is almost no length scale effect. Thus length scale effects are localized and also vary within this area. According to the Schmid law, the slip system starts to glide when \( \tau \) reaches the critical shear stress of the crystal \( \tau_0 \). This glide causes plastic deformation of the crystal. Shear stress on this active slip system is kept at \( \tau^d \).
as long as the slip system is gliding. Due to hardening caused by geometrically necessary dislocation density, the material is difficult to deform.

5.3 Effects of GND Hardening by FEM Results. In FEM simulation, the strength increment of each material point as shown in Fig. 12 was implemented at the corresponding node for each slip system during the loading step and kept constant during the unloading step. Initially, the strength increment is zero and increases linearly to the maximum at the end of the first step. This agrees quite well with the time history of strength increment as shown in Fig. 13. Also, the simulation parameters, such as the loading pressure, element type and mesh size, etc. are kept the same before and after considering GND hardening.

Figure 14 shows the comparison of normal displacement of the shocked surface. It is found by SPM measurement that the deformation is approximately uniform along the shocked line, which is indicative of a 2D deformation state. The detailed cross section profile in Fig. 14 shows that the deformation depth is about 2 \( \mu \text{m} \) and plastic deformation size is about 125 \( \mu \text{m} \). Without the GND hardening, the magnitude is 3.75 \( \mu \text{m} \) by FEM with the assumptions of quasistatic loading with a fixed plasma radius. Through the implement of the yield increment by GND, the magnitude of the normal displacement is reduced to 2 \( \mu \text{m} \), which is the same as the SPM measurement. However, the only conclusion that may be drawn is that the hardening caused by GND plays an important role in plastic deformation and cannot be ignored.

Figures 15(a) and 15(b) show the total shear strain distribution, the summation of shear strain in three slip systems, in the cross section for both cases. The magnitude of the case without considering the GND hardening is about 6.6% and 3.7% for the simulation with the GND hardening term. In addition, there is almost no plastic deformation in the two side regions for the case with GND hardening. According to anisotropic slip line theory [13], the Gaussian loading can be approximated as a nonuniform “punch” and the plastic deformation zone can be divided into three regions. One is right beneath the punch, the other two are on the two sides, respectively. For details, one can refer to the work by Wang et al. [21]. In these three regions, only slip system \( iii \) is active. The stress status in these two side regions has \( \sigma_{11}/\tau_0 = -\sqrt{6}, \sigma_{12}/\tau_0 = 0, \) and \( \sigma_{22}/\tau_0 = 0, \) where direction 1 is along the surface and direction 2 is perpendicular to the surface. Because \( \tau_0 \) is increased along the time quickly in the case considering GND hardening, the yield surface will expand and \( \tau_0 \) will exceed \( \sigma_{11} \) at some point.
in time. If the shear stress is smaller than \(\tau_0\), the slip system does not glide, and only elastic deformation is possible. Thus, there is almost no plastic deformation in the two side regions Q and H.

5.4 Comparison of GND Hardening and Statistically-Stored Dislocation Hardening. The hardening caused by statistically-stored dislocation (SSD) includes self-hardening and latent hardening and occurs in both macro- and microworlds. It has been well investigated and is basic to the constitutive crystal plasticity framework [22]. Usually, the local continuum constitutive models implicitly assume that the accumulation of SSD is the only driving force behind work hardening. Thus, it is of interest to compare the hardening effects caused by SSD and GND.

In the simulation considering SSD hardening, Asaro’s [14] hardening theory of single crystal has been applied, in which the critical shear stress \(\tau_0\) of the Schmid law is determined by the current SSD and represents variation in hardiness of material due to work hardening by SSD. Since work hardening of the slip system depends on shear deformation of the slip systems, the variation in \(\tau_0\) may be estimated by

\[
\Delta \tau_0^k = \sum_i h_i^k |\Delta \gamma_i^k|
\]

where \(h_i^k\) expresses hardening rate against increment of shear deformation \(\Delta \gamma_i^k\) on each slip system. When \(k\) equals \(i\), \(h_i^k\) represents hardening by glide on its own slip system. When \(k\) does not equal \(i\), \(h_i^k\) represents hardening by glide on other slip systems. The former is called self-hardening, and the latter is called latent hardening. The values of \(h_i^k\) can be found in Ref. [21]. Figure 15(c) shows the FEM result for the total shear strain distribution considering only SSD hardening. It is seen that the magnitude is close to that of GND hardening. Also, the spatial distribution is comparable with that without any hardening, that is, slip system iii is active in both regions H and Q.

6 Conclusions

In this study, length scale effects for microscale laser shock peening on a single crystal aluminum with orientation [1 1 4] are investigated with EBSD measurement and FEM simulation with single crystal plasticity. Given the laser beam size at 12 \(\mu m\) with intensity of 4 GW/cm\(^2\), EBSD measurement shows that the induced crystal lattice rotation is about \(\pm 2\) deg. The magnitude of the corresponding geometrically necessary dislocation density is \(9 \times 10^{13} m^{-2}\). The spatial distribution of the geometrically necessary dislocation density shows the density right underneath the shock center is high though the lattice rotation is close to zero. In addition, the GND induced by \(\mu\)LSP is comparable with that of the conventional indentation induced severe plastic deformation, which has a rotational magnitude of 10 deg. The average GND density is about \(1 \times 10^{14} m^{-2}\) for the indentation while it is about \(5 \times 10^{13} m^{-2}\) for \(\mu\)LSP. By implementing the GND hardening into the FEM simulation, it is found that length scale effects cannot be neglected. The plastic deformation size is significantly decreased from 80 \(\mu m\) to 30 \(\mu m\) after considering GND hardening. From the spatial total shear strain distribution, the plastic deformation is mainly concentrated right underneath the punch. Beyond the punch radius, there is almost no plastic deformation. Also, the comparison with the hardening effects of SSDs shows that these two hardenings are comparable with each other. The experimental methodology and results of the work present a systematic study of the length scale effects for the microscale laser shock peening process. It is now possible to integrate length scale effects into the single crystal based FEM model to conduct more realistic simulation for the microscale LSP process.
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