

ARCHIVES of FOUNDRY ENGINEERING

ISSN (1897-3310) Volume 8 Issue 3/2008

117 - 120

21/3

Published quarterly as the organ of the Foundry Commission of the Polish Academy of Sciences

Solidification with back-diffusion of irregular eutectics

M. Trepczyńska-Łent*

Faculty of Mechanical Engineering, University of Technology and Life Sciences, s. Kaliskiego 7, 85-796 Bydgoszcz, Poland * Corresponding author. E-mail address: trema@utp.edu.pl

Received 18.04.2008; accepted in revised form 29.04.2008

Abstract

The definition of the α - parameter back-diffusion has been introduced in the work. The alternative models of solidification were described taking into consideration back-diffusion process. The possibility of using those models for eutectic alloys solidification is worthy of interest.

Keywords: Solidification; Back-diffusion; Eutectic

1. Introduction

Most of the eutectic alloys of practical interest (Fe–C, Al–Si) are irregular eutectics. These and other irregular faceted-nonfaceted (f–nf) eutectics are widely employed in industry and are of greater practical importance than the regular eutectics [1].

Directional solidification of binary or pseudo-binary eutectics, may result in regular structures of fibrous or lamellar type. In fibrous growth, one of the phases grows in the form of fibres embedded into a continuous matrix of the other phase, while in the case of lamellar growth, two phases grow cooperatively side by side, in the form of lamellae. When two solid phases *a* and *b* growing from a liquid of eutectic composition ΔE , the average undercooling ΔT at the interface results from three contributions:

$$\Delta T = T_E - T_L = \Delta T_c + \Delta T_r + \Delta T_k \tag{1}$$

where ΔT is the average interface undercooling, T_E is the eutectic temperature and T_L is the local interface temperature, and ΔT_c , ΔT_r , ΔT_k are the chemical, capillary and kinetic undercooling, respectively [2].

During the solidification of a dendritic alloy, the solute rejected at the solid/liquid interface is redistributed, by mass diffusion or convection. This process, referred to as microsegregation, controls the composition of the microstructure and the fraction of eutectic or other phases that form. The closedform, limiting models are the lever rule (complete mixing in the solid and liquid phases) and the Gulliver-Scheil equation (complete mixing in the liquid no diffusion in the solid. When the microstructure can be characterized by a fixed length scale (usually a secondary arm spacing), modifications of the Gulliver-Scheil equation that account for finite-rate diffusion in the solid phase (so called back-diffusion) have been presented in the literature [3].

2. The classical Brody and Flemings model

The definition for the α - back-diffusion parameter worked out by Brody and Flemings is introduced in the analysis [4]. D_s - coefficient of diffusion in the solid, t_f - local solidification time and L - half the cell or dendrite spacing all together are deciding on a value of the α - parameter.

$$\alpha = \frac{D_s t_f}{I^2} \tag{2}$$

The α - parameter defined by equation (2) can be considered as the ratio of local solidification time t_f and diffusion time t_d necessary to ensure the homogeneity of the solid. Taking into account that diffusion time is expressed as a function of diffusion distance:

 $t_d = L^2/D_s$ the back-diffusion parameter α , equation (2), now becomes:

$$\alpha = \frac{t_f}{t_d} \tag{3}$$

The situation at the liquid–primary solid phase with backdiffusion is depicted schematically in Fig. 1.



Distance (mass of phases)

Fig. 1. Schematic illustration of mass distribution of element *i* with back- diffusion between the primary solid phase ($\varphi = I$) and the liquid phase ($\varphi = 0$). The x axis is distance but the scale is

factorized to be linear with mass of phases, where:

- m mass of the system,
- m_i mass of element *i* in the system,
- m^{φ} mass of phase φ in the system,

 w_i - nominal composition or mass fraction of element *i* in the system ($w_i = m_i/m$),

 w_i^{φ} - mass fraction of element *i* in phase $\varphi(w_i^{\varphi} = m_i^{\varphi} / m^{\varphi})$,

 φ - index of phases ($\varphi = 0$ for the liquid phase, $\varphi = 1$ for the primary solid phase and other indices are for the secondary solid phases) [5].

The liquid behavior during solidification is described by $N_L(x;a)$ - solute content. Thus, two extreme cases of solidification are known due to intensity of the solid state diffusion:

 non-equilibrium solidification with complete mixing of solute in the liquid and no diffusion in the solid known as *Scheil's* model for microsegregation,

$$N_L (; 0) = N_o (-x)^{k-1}$$
(4)

where, $\alpha = 0$ denotes no diffusion of solute into the solid,

 equilibrium solidification where diffusion in solid and liquid are completed at each stage of directional solidification (cellular or dendritic)

$$N_L (\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{l}) = N_o (\mathbf{l} + kx - x)^{-1}$$
(5)

where, $\alpha = 1$ denotes complete diffusion of solute into the solid [4].

3. Some alternative growth models

It is worthwhile to describe some alternative models to provide a point of comparison.

3.1. The Voller and Beckermann model

The effect of coarsening can be accounted for in a conventional microsegregation model (*i.e.*, without coarsening) by an additional back-diffusion term. This results in a net diffusion process characterized by the following back-diffusion parameter:

$$a^+ = a + a^c \tag{6}$$

where α^c is an additive enhancement to the standard Fourier number a that accounts for the back-diffusion like contribution from coarsening. Equation (6) is important because the effect of coarsening can be included in any microsegregation model by simply replacing the Fourier number α with the parameter α +. Across a wide range of solidification conditions, when the coarsening process goes as t^{U3} , the additive enhancement of the Fourier number is constant, taking a value close to $\alpha^c = 0, I$ [6].

3.2. The Ohnaka model

The model is based upon the assumption that the solute concentration profile can be described by a quadratic expression.

If a parabolic growth law is assumed for the solid phase then:

$$2\alpha = \frac{1}{1 + \frac{LdL}{GDdt}} \tag{7}$$

$$2L\frac{dL}{dt} = \frac{\langle l/2 \rangle}{t_f}$$
(8)

where t_f is the solidification time and λ is the dendrite arm spacing, which corresponds to twice the size of the model system.

Rewriting the equation, one obtains after inserting Eq. (8) into Eq.(7):

$$2\alpha = \frac{\beta}{1+\beta} \tag{9}$$

where:

$$\beta = \frac{8GDt_f}{\lambda^2} \tag{10}$$

where D is the solute mass diffusivity and G is a geometrical parameter in Ohnaka's model [5].

Equation for Ohnaka model is:

$$\frac{C_s}{C_o} = k \left[-f \left(-\beta k \right)^{-\frac{1}{2} - \beta k} \right]$$
(11)

3.3. The Wang–Beckermann model

The back-diffusion given Wang and Beckermann [7] introduce an alternative representation that, under the assumption of a parabolic growth rate, leads to a specific microsegregation model.

If the solid growth is parabolic and a quadratic solute profile (n = 2) is assumed the back-diffusion form can be used in a mass balance to arrive at the following microsegregation model:

$$\frac{C_s}{C_o} = \frac{6\alpha \left(-f \right)^{\frac{1}{2} + \alpha \frac{1}{2} - 1}}{f^{6\alpha}} \cdot \int \phi^{6\alpha - 1} \left(-\phi \right)^{\frac{1}{2} \left(+6\alpha \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}} d\phi$$
(12)

For a given value of solid fraction f, this model can be readily evaluated using a mathematical analysis package [7].

3.4. The Nastac–Stefanescu model

Under the assumption that the solid interface concentration, C_s^i varies slowly with the diffusion time so that a quasi-steady state is rapidly achieved Nastac and Stefanescu arrive at analytical model for microsegregation. This model can account for mass diffusion in both the solid and liquid and can also deal with an arbitrary prescription of the solid growth rate; the model performs well when $\alpha > 1$. Under the restrictions of complete liquid diffusion and a parabolic growth rate the general model of Nastac and Stefanescu reduces to:

$$\frac{C_s}{C_o} = k \left[1 - \frac{\left(-k \int f \right)}{1 - kI} \right]^{-1}$$
(13)

where:

$$I = \frac{2f}{n^2} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\left(\boldsymbol{\psi} - 0.5\right)^2} \exp\left[-\frac{\boldsymbol{\psi}}{n^2} - 0.5\right] \boldsymbol{\varphi}^2 \boldsymbol{\alpha}^2$$
(14)

can be readily evaluated using a mathematical analysis package [7,10].

3.5. Voller's specific microsegregation model for parabolic growth

In the case of parabolic solid growth:

$$\beta = \frac{\gamma \alpha}{\alpha + \gamma f \, \langle \! df \, / \, d\tau \, \rangle} \tag{15}$$

With $f = \sqrt{\tau}$, fdf / dt = 0.5 becomes

$$\beta = \frac{2\gamma\alpha}{2\alpha + \gamma} \tag{16}$$

If a quadratic solid solute profile, $C_s = a\zeta^2 + b$, with constant coefficients is assumed, the rate of change $\delta C_s = \delta \tau$ will be constant at each point in the solid, and the integration parameter will take the value $\gamma = 1$. Comparison with the exact analytical treatment of the parabolic growth, however, shows that this model and its close relative proposed by Clyne and Kurz perform poorly at low *k* and *a*. A more reasonable model for γ , which is a function of both the Fourier number α and partition coefficient *k* is:

$$\gamma = \frac{A\alpha k}{A\alpha k + 1} \tag{17}$$

where a crude fit with the analytical solution indicates that the constant A~4. Note that the model in Eq. (17) restricts $0 \le \gamma \le 1$ and matches the required limit values i.e. $\gamma \rightarrow I$ as $\alpha \rightarrow \infty$, and $\gamma \sim 0$ as $\alpha \rightarrow 0$. The dependence on *k* in this model, which is somewhat arbitrary, is driven by the observation that the analytical solution, indicates an increase in the value of *k* has the same effect as increasing the Fourier number α [7].

3.6. The Wołczyński model

Conservation of solute within the volume element, which can be created in oriented cellular or dendritic morphology is:

$$d \left(-x \overline{N}_L \right) + d \left(\overline{N}_s \right) = 0 \tag{18}$$

The amount of solute, which leaves the liquid, is:

$$d \langle \langle -x \rangle N_L \rangle = \langle -x \rangle N_L - N_L dx$$
⁽¹⁹⁾

and that, which causes the growth of crystal is:

$$d\left(\overline{N_s}\right) = \overline{N_s}dx + xd\overline{N_s}$$
(20)

The product $\overline{N_s} dx$ determines an amount of solute within currently solidifying layer dx and $xd\overline{N_s}$ expresses an amount of the solute within the *x* - solid due to back-diffusion. The following assumption is introduced into the present model:

$$\overline{N_s}dx + xd\overline{N_s} = N_sdx + \alpha \langle x \rangle dN_s$$
(21)
with $N_s \ge \overline{N_s}$ and $\alpha \langle x \ge 1$

Additionally, it is assumed that a(x)=a to relate the current analysis with the *a* - back-diffusion parameter known in *Brody-Flemings'* theory, N_s is the concentration of solute within currently solidifying layer dx, (at the s/l interface).

Combining the above assumption with (19) and (20) the following equation is obtained:

$$(-x \partial N_L - N_L dx + N_s dx + \alpha x dN_s = 0$$
⁽²²⁾

It describes the behavior of the formerly existing layers including the current one for which $N_s = kN_L$ is applied. Eventually, equation (22) is transformed into:

$$\frac{dN_L}{dx} = \frac{\left(-k\right) \tilde{y}_L}{1 + \alpha k x - x}$$
(23)

with $N_L (\mathbf{x}; \alpha) = N_{\alpha}$

The equation (23) is a fundamental formula to describe the solute microsegregation for cellular/dendritic growth during which back-diffusion takes place. The equation (23) shows how the behavior of liquid is influenced by the phenomenon of back-diffusion [4,8,9].

The thermodynamic interpretation of α - back-diffusion parameter is displays in Fig.2.



Fig. 2. Thermodynamic interpretation of the α - back-diffusion parameter and the β - solute redistribution parameter on the basis of equilibrium phase diagram. The x - axis plotted for $\alpha > 0$ is related to current model and for $\alpha = 0$ to Scheil's model, $x=x_m < x_K$ is distinguished to explain the meaning

of both α – parameter and β – parameter [4,9].

Let $N_L(x;\alpha)$ be the solution to equation (23) with initial condition $N_L(0; \alpha) = N_o$, that is:

$$N_{L}(;\alpha) = N_{o}(+\alpha kx - x)^{(-1)(-\alpha k)}$$
(24)

The α - parameter satisfies the condition $0 < \alpha < 1$ as it results from the mentioned assumption. In consequence, equation (24) is educed to *Scheil's* approach (4), for $\alpha = 0$, and to lever role (equilibrium solidification) (5), while introducing $\alpha = 1$ [4,9].

4. Conclusion

The solidification models presented here, consider different ways of using the α -parameter in the concentration of the component calculations. The usefulness of the given model is essential for applying in the Fe-C eutectic alloys.

References

- M. Gunduz, H. Kaya, E.Cadirli, A. Ozmen, Interflake spacings and undercoolings in Al-Si irregular eutectic alloy, Material Science and Engineering A369 (2004) 215-229.
- [2] E. Cadirli, H. Kaya, M. Gunduz, Effect of growth rates and temperature gradients on the lamellar sparing and the undercooling In the directionally solidified Pb-Cd eutectic alloy. Materials Research Biulletin 38 (2003) 1457-1476.
- [3] V. R Voller, C.Beckermann, A unified model of microsegregation and coarsening. Metallurgical and Materials Transactions A, v.30A (august 1999) 2183-2189.
- [4] W. Wołczyński, J. Krajewski, R. Ebner, W. Kloch. The use equilibrium chase diagram for the calculation of nonequilibrium precipitates in dendritic solidification. Theory., Calphad: Computer Coupling of Phase Diagrams and Thermochemistry, v 25, n 3 (September 2001) 401- 408.
- [5] D. Larouche, Computation of solidification paths in multiphase alloys with back-diffusion. Computer Coupling of Phase Diagrams and Thermochemistry 31(2007) 490-504.
- [6] V. R. Voller, C.Beckermann, A unified model of microsegregation and coarsening. Metallurgical and Materials Transactions A, v.30A (august 1999) 2183-2189.
- [7] V. R.Voller, On a general back-diffusion parameter, Journal of Crystal Growth 226 (2001) 562-568.
- [8] W.Wołczyński, J.Kloch, Mass conversation for microsegregation and solute redistribution in cellular/dendritic solidification with back-diffusion, Material Science Forum, v.329-330 (2000) 345-350.
- [9] W. Wołczyński, Effect of the back-diffusion onto doublet structure formation and solute redistribution within alloys solidifying directionally, with or without convection, Polish Academy of Sciences, Institute of Metallurgy and Materials Science, Kraków 2002.
- [10] D. M. Stefanescu, Methodologies for modeling of solidification microstructure and their capabilities, ISIJ International, vol. 35, no. 6, (1995) 637-650.