28<sup>th</sup>/May/2025 @ IAEA 7<sup>th</sup> International Workshop on Models and Data for Plasma–Material Interactions in Fusion Devices: MoD-PMI 2025 (26-28 May, 2025)

> Applying machine learning potential models to the study of hydrogen in metals: accurate property calculations, complex dynamics simulations, and challenges

Takuji Oda\*, Sojeong Yang, Hyukjoon Kwon (oda@snu.ac.kr) Department of Nuclear Engineering, Seoul National University

# Introduction - Needs of accurate data of hydrogen isotopes-

✓ Efficient use of hydrogen isotopes (HIs), particularly tritium (T), is essential for safe/economic/sustainable operation of fusion reactors.

 $\rightarrow$  Accurate data on HIs, such as diffusivity (D) and solubility (S) are needed.

- ✓ Experiment should be the first choice; however, there are intrinsic limitations/difficulties:
  - ✓ H lattice diffusivity at low temperatures.
    - ✓ Tritium data
  - ✓ Sticking coefficient of low-energy hydrogen (<100 eV).



# Introduction - Limitations of DFT and classical MD-

- ✓ Atomistic simulations can be an alternative.
  - ✓ **Quantum mechanics** (e.g., DFT) for high accuracy
  - ✓ Empirical potential models (e.g., classical MD) for computational efficiency
- ✓ Accuracy–efficiency trade-offs limit applicability, especially in engineering.



# Introduction - What machine learning potentials can do?-

- Machine-learning potentials (MLPs), trained on high-accuracy QM data, have substantially improved the accuracy–efficiency trade-off.
- MD simulations using MLPs (ML-MD) enables virtual experiments, minimizing the need for experimental validation.



### Contents

#### < Application of advanced theoretical methods for accurate property calculations >

(Topic-1) Accurate simulations of hydrogen diffusivity in W, including isotope effects.



- We adopt the Moment Tensor Potential (MTP), as it can achieve high computational efficiency with satisfactory accuracy.
- ✓ DFT by VASP; classical MD by LAMMPS; PI methods by PIMD code.

\*[Moment Tensor Potential (MTP)] A.V. Shapeev, Multiscale Model. Simul. 14 (2016) 1153. \*[ML potential comparison] Y. Zuo et al., J. Phys. Chem. A 124 (2020) 731.

## (1) HI diffusivity calculations - Path-integral methods for nuclear quantum effects-

Classical MD

DFT + transition state theory

Quantum dynamics

- ✓ MLPs allow to use path-integral (PI) methods to deal with nuclear quantum effects.
- ✓ If MLPs are as accurate as experiment, we can achieve accurate properties.

 $\rightarrow$ 



(e.g., anharmonicity)

#### (1) HI diffusivity calculations - H diffusivity in bcc-W: comparison with experiments-



\*[Experiments] Frauenfelder, J. Vac. Sci. Technol. 6 (1969) 388; G. Holzner et al., Phys. Scr. T171 (2020) 014034; T. Otsuka et al., Phys. Scr. T138 (2009) 014052.

\*[Simulations] H. Kwon et I., , M. Shiga, H. Kimizuka, T. Oda, Acta Mater. 247 (2023) 118739.

## (1) HI diffusivity calculations - Isotope effects: H/D/T diffusivity in bcc-W -

- ✓ Good agreement with experiment in H/D isotope effect.
  - ✓ Not square root of mass (1.44) but ~1.26 even in the classical regime (i.e., high temp.).
- ✓ Significant deviation at low temperatures (<  $T_{NQEs}$ ) due to NQEs.



\*H. Kwon, M. Shiga, H. Kimizuka, T. Oda, Acta Mater. 247 (2023) 118739.

(1) HI diffusivity calculations - for engineering applications -

- ✓ At high temperatures (>  $T_{NQEs}$ ), the isotope effect model using inverse isotope masses is fairly accurate (~20% error in bcc).
- ✓ For W and Fe, we have derived equations for H/D/T diffusivity for a wide temperature range.



\*H. Kwon, M. Shiga, H. Kimizuka, T. Oda, Acta Mater. 247 (2023) 118739.



### (2) HI implantation behavior - MLP extension for surface processes-

- ML potentials were retrained to simulate the behavior of implanted HI atoms.
  - ✓ H solution/adsorption.
  - ✓ H diffusion on surfaces.
  - ✓ H-V interaction.
  - ✓  $H_2$  absorption.
  - ✓ Short range collision (<100 eV).</p>



\*S. Yang, et al., (2025) [http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5115095]

#### (2) HI implantation behavior - Competition between adsorption/absorption/reflection-

#### ML-MD of H implantation to W(110) at 0.1-100 eV

- ✓ At low energies, an implanted H cannot escape from the surface. -> adsorption
- ✓ At high energies, an implanted H cannot come back to the surface. -> absorption
- ✓ At intermediate energies -> reflection



\*S. Yang, et al., (2025) [http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5115095]

#### (2) HI implantation behavior - Electronic stopping, comparison with BCA and empirical MD-

- ✓ Electronic stopping (ES) effects are significant.
- ✓ Classical MD using the bond order potentials (BOPs) are accurate at high incident energies, but not at low.
- ✓ BCA (by SDTrimSP) needs an accurate surface binding energy mode ("isbv").



\*S. Yang, et al., (2025) [http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5115095]

### (2) HI implantation behavior - Isotope effects of sticking coefficient-

- Isotope effects of nuclear process and electronic process are cancelled out, leaving only negligible isotope effects.
  - ✓ Nuclear: Larger energy loss with a heavier isotope.
  - ✓ Electronic: Larger energy loss with a lighter isotope.



\*S. Yang, et al., (2025) [http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5115095]

### (2) HI implantation behavior - Effects of surface coverage (SC)-

#### ML-MD of surface coverage effects at 0.1-100 eV

- ✓ The surface coverage is likely to reduce SC due to abstraction & blocking.
- ✓ However, SC is less sensitive to the surface coverage; even increases.



\*[right figure] S. Yang, et al., (2025) [http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5115095]

### (2) HI implantation behaviors by ML-MD - Effects of surface coverage-

- ✓ Abstraction probability is not very high.
- Reflection probability decreases due to an additional nuclear stopping with preexisting surface H atoms.



\*S. Yang, et al., (2025) [http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5115095]



ML-MD can evaluate material properties that cannot be directly measured by experiments ( H diffusivity, sticking coefficients) at DFT accuracy.

✓ (Question) Can we rely on "virtual experiments" using ML-MD?

- ✓ Depending on DFT accuracy, which is often not equal to experimental accuracy.
- ✓ In our experiences,
  - ✓ Diffusivity: Overestimation with Mo, V / Underestimation with Fe (a factor of 2-3).
  - $\checkmark$  Solubility: Overestimation (up to 0.2 eV) with W, Fe.



✓ For simulations of complex phenomena, careful assessment is needed. (but how?)

Preparing benchmark cases for complex phenomena