

Outline:

Precipitation of θ' in α Al-Cu

•Kinetics of precipitate lengthening •The diffusion field•Roles of elastic energy •Classical force-balance analysis

Conclusion

Update; Widmanstätten Project:

(i.e. current status)

Experiment and Phase-field Classical Modeling Modeling *Yan Li*

Michael Greenwood

Objective: "evaluation of the roles of interfacial energy, elastic energy, diffusion and interface mobility in the formation of Widmanstätten precipitates."

Lengthening of θ*' precipitates in an Al-2.75 mass% Cu monocrystal*

Purdy and Hirth Phil. Mag., let., 2006, **86**, 147

Type B: $(+0.45\%$ misfit)

Early stages of θ' growth in Al-2.75Cu

Lengths of the largest plates, 2.0 and 1.2 nm thickness; (data derived from observations of many samples).

Growth kinetics; classical approach.

$$
\frac{V}{M} = P_i = P_{th} + P_{\sigma} + P_{el} + P_{s.d.} + P_{Z}
$$

A local force balance is employed to relate velocity *v* to a set of forces:

 \bullet Intrinsic drag, \boldsymbol{P}_i related to interfacial structure, mobility \boldsymbol{M} \bullet <u>A thermodynamic driving force,</u> \boldsymbol{P}_{th} = $\varDelta G_{int}/V_{m}$ •<u>A capillary force \boldsymbol{P}_σ due to interfacial energy,</u> •An elastic force, *Pel* due to coherency strains, misfit, interactions \bullet A solute drag force, $\textit{\textbf{P}}_{\textit{sd}}$ due to solute diffusion within interface, •A Zener drag, due to particle interactions with interface.

For the analysis of lengthening kinetics, require:

- •Diffusion data (extrapolated,very uncertain)
- •Solubility of metastable phase (uncertain)
- •Solution thermodynamics (OK)
- •Elastic constants (OK)
- •Vegard's law slope (OK)
- •Interfacial energy (low, but not well known)
- •"Burgers vectors" of precipitates (OK)

To proceed, determine solubility of θ' in α , then compare rates of growth of 1.2 (strained) and 2 nm thick (essentially unstrained) precipitates.

The metastable solubility is obtained from a measurement of the fraction of θ' in long time equilibrated samples (no other phases present) at 230ºC.

The result, obtained via measurement of images from 20 areas in [100] ZA:

0.26 (+/- 0.025) at.% Cu

(note approximation for discs in plane of foil.)

Thermodynamic driving force, P_{th}

 $P_{\sigma} = 2\sigma/h$

Self strain energy:

$$
E_{el}^{\quad \ self}=\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon _{ij}\int_{\nu }\sigma _{ij}d\nu
$$

Khachaturyan; particularized to a [100] disc:

$$
E_{el} = \frac{\left[\frac{1}{3}(C_{11} + 2C_{12})(2\frac{C_{12}}{C_{11}} + 1)\varepsilon - \frac{1}{3}(C_{11} - C_{12})(1 - \frac{C_{12}}{C_{11}})\varepsilon\right]^2}{2C_{11}}
$$

$$
P_{el}^{\text{self}} = \frac{\partial E_{el}}{\partial L}
$$

Force/unit length on a migrating θ' edge/ledge due to atomic misfit in the diffusion field

Purdy and Brechet 2005:

$$
f_x = \frac{\partial^2 \Psi}{\partial x^2} \approx -2\mu \eta (c_\beta^i - c_\beta^\infty) \left\{ 1 + \frac{2.3}{K_0 \left[\frac{vb}{2D} \right]} \right\}
$$

$$
\mu: \text{ shear modulus of matrix}
$$
\n
$$
\eta: = \frac{d \ln a}{dc}
$$
\n
$$
b: \text{ Burgers vector}
$$

Using a balance of the estimated thermodynamic force, elastic (self) and elastic (diffusion field) forces, as well as the capillary term, the concentrations at the plate tips are estimated as:

For the 2 nm plates: $X^i_\alpha \approx 0.00265$ ≈

And for the 1.2 nm plates: $X^i_\alpha \approx 0.0088$ ≈

The relative rates of growth can now be estimated:

Diffusion field near the plate tip:

After Jones and Trivedi^{(1971):}

$$
\Gamma(x, y) = \frac{X_{\alpha}^0 - X(x, y)}{X_{\alpha}^0 - X_{\alpha}^i}
$$

$$
\nabla^2 \Gamma(x, y) + 2p \frac{\partial \Gamma}{\partial x} = 0
$$

$$
v=-\frac{D}{r}\Omega\frac{\partial\Gamma}{\partial x}\big|_{x=0}
$$

$$
\text{Yielding:} \quad \frac{\mathcal{V}_{2nm}}{\mathcal{V}_{1.2nm}} \approx 1.4
$$

.•Modeling, summary results:

```
•Experimentally,
```

$$
\frac{v_{2nm}}{v_{1.2nm}} = 1.5
$$

•A model that takes into account the elastic stresses, thermodynamic and capillary forces yields

$$
\frac{v_{2nm}}{v_{1,2nm}} \approx 1.4
$$

From the modeling exercise:

The dominant forces in migration are the thermodynamic driving force and the elastic (self-energy) resistive force. The results are very sensitive to the values of the input parameters.

The solute field elastic term is much smaller than the elastic self-energy term. This is due in part to the reduced gradient at the transformation front of the more highly strained precipitate.