

$$df = -\theta(.93-f) d(G_{21}) , \quad (5.18)$$

which corresponds closely with the relation found by Magee<sup>47</sup> to describe athermal results for the gamma to alpha transformation, Eq. (5.3). Although there is no obvious connection, Magee found, for carbon alloys with less than 1.2 percent carbon, a value for  $\theta$  which is 14 times larger than  $\theta$  from Fig. 5.6.

Due to the large uncertainties in  $1-f$  for large values of  $P$  shown in Fig. 5.6, one might consider data only for stresses less than or equal to 204 kbar. These data are well fitted by a linear relation between  $\ln(1-f)$  and  $G_{21}$ . They yield a value of  $\theta$  equal to 4,048 gm/Mbar  $\text{cm}^3$ , less than two-thirds the previous value.

Equation (5.17) can be interpreted in the following way:  $G_{21}$  is driving force which causes the transformation to proceed. It must exceed a threshold value,  $A$ , before the transformation is initiated. For unknown reasons the transformation proceeds only as  $G_{21}$  is increased. If, for example, nucleation sites exist which are activated at different stress levels, increases in  $P$  produce increases in  $G_{21}$ , more nucleation sites are activated, and the transformation proceeds incrementally. The calculation of nucleation sites described in Section 5.3 provides a detailed model of such a situation, Eq. (5.14). In that case, however, the proportionality parameter  $\theta$  is not constant but varies over a wide range of values in the mixed phase region. If this transformation is martensitic and transformation occurs with constant average plate volume,  $V_D$ , of  $10^{-8} \text{ cm}^3$ , then

values of  $\theta$  are obtained by multiplying  $V_p$  by entries in the last column of Table 5.2. This gives  $\theta \approx 7 \times 10^{-23}/\text{Mbar cm}^3$  for  $G_{21} = A$  and  $\theta = 1.2 \times 10^{14} \text{ gm/Mbar cm}^3$  for  $G_{21} = 2A$ . These values are far from observed values, which is not surprising considering the unreality of the basic assumption that nucleation is occurring in the homogeneous lattice.

Values for  $\theta$  calculated from Eq. (5.14) come much closer to the measured value when the homogeneous model is modified by assuming spherical pre-existing embryos of phase 2. For this case, if martensitic plate volume  $V_p = 10^{-8} \text{ cm}^3$  is 1 percent of the grain volume for 0.1-mm-diameter grains,  $N_0$  can be calculated by dividing values of  $dN^*/dG_{21}$  in the last column of Table 5.2 into  $-N/V_p \theta = 6.4 \times 10^{34}$ . This gives  $N_0 = 8.3 \times 10^{48}/\text{cm}^3$  for  $G_{21} = A$ ,  $N_0 = 5.3 \times 10^{12}/\text{cm}^3$  for  $G_{21} = 2A$ , and  $N_0 = 1.28 \times 10^9/\text{cm}^3$  for  $G_{21} = 3A$ . These values for  $N_0$  approach seemingly realistic values for pre-existing sites since the number of twins required to account for all the plastic strain in shocked iron at 130 kbar was inferred from Johnson and Rhode<sup>56</sup> to be about  $10^7/\text{cm}^3$ .

The above calculations show how a relation between  $dN$  and  $dG_{21}$  can be established, and although a detailed model to explain the form of Eq. (5.17) has not been produced, its similarity to the Magee equation strengthens the link between the alpha to epsilon, shock-induced transformation and the athermal, martensitic, gamma to alpha transformations in iron. The calculation also suggests a basis for understanding of both athermal gamma to alpha and shock-induced alpha to epsilon transformations.