

# **A Few Progress in Predicting Solidification Kinetics Using the Time-Dependent Ginzburg-Landau Solidification Theory**

Yashen Wang, Zun Liang, Xin Zhang, Xianqi Xu and Yang Yang School of Physics and Electronic Science, East China Normal University



## Introduction

The crystal–melt interface (CMI) kinetic coefficient  $\mu_{\hat{n}}$  is one of the key parameters govern the solidification process. It is defined as the constant of proportionality between the steady-state solidification interface velocity  $V_{\hat{n}}$  and the degree of the interface undercooling  $\Delta T$ . The anisotropy of kinetic coefficient among different CMI orientations, plays a leading role in the solidification microstructure evolution.





## The TDGL Theory

Wu et al [Phys. Rev. B 91, 014107 (2015)] developed the time-dependent Ginzburg-Landau (TDGL) theory of solidification kinetics to quantitatively predict  $\mu_{\hat{n}}$  for BCC systems,

$$\mu_{\hat{n}} = \frac{L}{k_B T_m^2 A_{\hat{n}}}, \quad A_{\hat{n}} = \int dz \left[ \varsigma \sum_{\vec{K}_i} \left( \frac{du_i}{dz} \right)^2 \right] \text{ (for BCC)}$$

where L is the latent heat of fusion per particle,  $A_{\hat{n}}$  is the anisotropy factor,  $u_i$  is called the Ginzburg–Landau (GL) order parameter, and the dissipative time constant  $\varsigma = \tau(\left|\vec{K}_{\langle 110\rangle}\right|)/S(\left|\vec{K}_{\langle 110\rangle}\right|).$ 

FIG.1 Dendrite morphology for the crystal grown from melt, predicted by phase field simulations in [Interface Sci. 10, 121 (2002)], employing different magnitudes of CMI kinetic and thermodynamic anisotropy.

#### **Progress I : Theoretical Extension**

We extended the TDGL theory to FCC and BCO CMI systems and verified it by comparing with the non-equilibrium molecular dynamics (NEMD) simulations of a model dipolar particles.[*Cryst. Growth Des.* 20, 7862 (2020)].  $\mu_{\hat{n}} = \frac{L}{k_B T_m^2 A_{\hat{n}}}$ 

$$A_{\hat{n}} = \int dz \left[ \zeta_{1a} \sum_{\vec{K}_{i}, u_{a}} \left( \frac{du_{i}}{dz} \right)^{2} + \zeta_{1b} \sum_{\vec{K}_{i}, u_{b}} \left( \frac{du_{i}}{dz} \right)^{2} + \zeta_{2a} \sum_{\vec{G}_{i}, v_{a}} \left( \frac{dv_{i}}{dz} \right)^{2} + \zeta_{2b} \sum_{\vec{G}_{i}, v_{b}} \left( \frac{dv_{i}}{dz} \right)^{2} + \zeta_{3} \frac{1}{\varepsilon_{0}(\varepsilon_{r} - 1)n_{0}k_{B}|T_{C} - T_{m}|} \left( \frac{do}{dz} \right)^{2} \right]$$

Represents our formalism of TDGL theory for the crystal growth kinetic coefficients for the dipolar particle system.  $\varsigma$  are the dissipative time constants, u, v, o are the Ginzburg–Landau (GL) order parameters. The vacuum and relative dielectric permittivities, are included to count the free energy dissipation due to polarization concurrently process with the solidification.  $T_C$  is the Curie temperature.

$$\overline{\xi}$$
 4.4

	${ m SS^{MD}}\ k_{ m B}/\sqrt{marepsilon}$	Fe <sup>MD</sup> cm s <sup>-1</sup> K <sup>-1</sup>	${ m Mo^{MD}} { m cm} { m s}^{-1} { m K}^{-1}$	$V^{MD}$ cm s <sup>-1</sup> K <sup>-1</sup>	Fe <sup>GL</sup> cm s <sup>-1</sup> K <sup>-1</sup>	${ m SS^{GL}} \ k_{ m B}/\sqrt{marepsilon}$
$\mu_{100}$	2.59(9)	78(5)	11(1)	9(2)	67(6)	2.4(1)
<i>u</i> <sub>110</sub>	2.54(9)	62(4)	16(3)	12(5)	60(5)	2.2(1)
$\iota_{111}$	2.13(7)	62(2)	12(3)	10(1)	51(5)	1.9(1)
$u_{100}/\mu_{110}$	1.02(5)	1.3(1)	0.7(2)	0.8(3)	1.1(1)	1.1(1)
$\mu_{100}/\mu_{111}$	1.2(1)	1.26(9)	0.9(2)	0.9(2)	1.3(2)	1.2(1)
$\mu_{110}/\mu_{111}$	1.2(1)	0.99(8)	1.3(4)	1.2(5)	1.2(1)	1.2(1)

 TABLE 1 MD and GL prediction of the kinetic coefficients for a few BCC materials



Left: method by [Acta Mater. 198, 281 (2020)], Right: our method



### **Progress II : Kinetic Anisotropy of BCC**

We predicted the kinetic coefficients for the BCC soft-sphere (SS) model systems with inverse-power repulsive potential through NEMD simulations and the TDGL theory respectively, and compared the results with the previous reported data of BCC metal systems, see in TABLE I.[J. Phys.: Condens. Matter 34, 264004 (2022)]



We introduce an algorithm for determining the density for relaxation times the interfacial liquids at CMI and its benefit in levitating the precision in the TDGL theory prediction of  $\mu_{\hat{n}}$  and the kinetic both anisotropy.[J. Chem. Phys. 157, 084709 (2022)]

> FIG.7 Local density relaxation time profiles

	$\mu_{\hat{n}}^{ ext{MD}}$	$\mu^{ m GL}_{\hat{n},{ m M}}$	$\mu^{ m GL}_{\hat{n},{ m I}}$	$\mu^{\dagger { m GL}}_{\hat{n},{ m I}}$
$\mu_{100}({ m cm/s/K})$	78(5)	65(6)	90(4)	82(4)
$\mu_{110}({ m cm/s/K})$	62(4)	60(5)	59(4)	58(4)
$\mu_{111}({ m cm/s/K})$	62(2)	51(5)	50(2)	63(3)
$\mu_{100}/\mu_{110}$	1.27(16)	1.08(13)	1.53(12)	1.41(12)
$\mu_{100}/\mu_{111}$	1.26(12)	1.27(17)	1.80(10)	1.30(9)
$\mu_{110}/\mu_{111}$	0.99(8)	1.18(15)	1.18(9)	0.92(7)



TABLE 2Summary of BCC Fe CMI the kinetic coefficients and its anisotropy

The calculations show the universality of the Ginzburg-Landau (GL) order parameter in same cubic structure systems. And a hypothesis that the density relaxation times for the interface melt phases to be anisotropic and material-dependent is then proposed.

#### **Future Directions**

- To examine whether the local collective dynamics is material dependent, for the ulletfinal clarification for the reason why a similar solidification kinetic anisotropy is generally hold for FCC CMIs, yet not for BCC CMIs.
- Extend TDGL solidification theory to binary alloy system.
- Through the quantitative TDGL solidication theory, link the interatomic interaction to the CMI kinetic coefficients.

# Acknowledgements

NSFC (11504110 and 11874147), State Key Laboratory of Advanced Special Steel in Shanghai U (SKLASS 2021-10), State Key Laboratory of Solidification Processing in NWPU (SKLSP202105).

Email : 1422715338@qq.com

