



## Outline:

Precipitation of  $\theta'$  in  $\alpha$  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 Classical Modeling Yan Li

#### <u>Phase-field</u> <u>Modeling</u>

Michael Greenwood

<u>Objective:</u> "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







Type B: (+0.45% misfit)

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









Early stages of  $\theta$ ' growth in Al-2.75Cu



## 1.2 and 2.0 nm thick precipitates, 20 min., 230°C.



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

### Growth kinetics; classical approach.

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

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

•Intrinsic drag,  $P_i$  related to interfacial structure, mobility M•A thermodynamic driving force,  $P_{th} = \Delta G_{int} / V_m$ •A capillary force  $P_{\sigma}$  due to interfacial energy, •An elastic force,  $P_{el}$  due to coherency strains, misfit, interactions •A solute drag force,  $P_{sd}$  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  $\theta$ ' in  $\alpha$ , 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  $\theta$ ' in long time equilibrated samples (no other phases present) at 230°C.

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*<sub>th</sub>







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

Self strain energy:

$$E_{el}^{self} = \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon_{ij} \int_{v} \sigma_{ij} dv$$

Khachaturyan; particularized to a [100] disc:

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

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



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

Purdy and Brechet 2005:

$$f_{x} = \frac{\partial^{2} \Psi}{\partial x^{2}} \approx -2\mu\eta (c_{\beta}^{i} - c_{\beta}^{\infty}) \left\{ 1 + \frac{2.3}{K_{0} \left[ \frac{vb}{2D} \right]} \right\}$$

μ: shear modulus of matrix  

$$\eta$$
: =  $\frac{d \ln a}{dc}$   
*b*: 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:  $X_{\alpha}^{i} \approx 0.00265$ 

And for the 1.2 nm plates:  $X_{\alpha}^{i} \approx 0.0088$ 

The <u>relative</u> rates of growth can now be estimated:

Diffusion field near the plate tip:



#### After Jones and Trivedi (1971):

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

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

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

Yielding: 
$$\frac{v_{2nm}}{v_{1.2nm}} \approx 1.4$$

•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.