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Abstract—A rigorous numerical model of peritectic transformation kinetics based on the solution of unsteady state diffusion equations in moving phase fields has been presented. The overall and interface mass balance equations are solved to calculate the rate of movement of the interfaces. The predictions of the present formulation show a better agreement with the experimental kinetic data from the Cd–Ag and Pb–Bi systems, compared to those of the earlier proposed models based on quasi-static interface or quasi-steady state approximations. It is predicted that the presence of coring in the primary solid (β) would not have any appreciable effect on the kinetics of peritectic transformation, especially, prior to the consumption of the liquid phase unless the product phase (γ) has a restricted composition range. Furthermore, the kinetics remain practically unaltered irrespective of a linear or cored initial concentration gradient in the γ-phase. However, the assumption of a linear concentration gradient in γ throughout the course of the transformation may significantly underestimate the kinetics.

1. INTRODUCTION

Peritectic change may be described as [1]: liquid + primary/reactant solid (β) → secondary/product solid (γ). The phase change occurring during cooling through the peritectic isotherm involves three different stages [2]. The first stage (i.e. peritectic reaction) is governed by solute diffusion through the liquid when γ forms and quickly envelopes the primary β-particles. As a consequence, the reactant phases lose contact with each other. Subsequently, the second stage (i.e. peritectic transformation) proceeds by solute diffusion through the γ-layer. Besides the peritectic transformation, the remnant liquid may often directly solidify into γ in the third stage. The second or peritectic transformation stage is the slowest step involved in this phase change that seldom reaches completion, and thus, results in microsegregation [3]. Peritectic change has so far been utilized mainly for grain refinement in some Al-based alloys [4–7], liquid route processing of YBCO superconductors [8–13] and development of magnetic materials [14–17]. Though peritectic change is a common invariant reaction in the metallic/ceramic systems, a comprehensive understanding of its mechanism and kinetics is still lacking. An extremely slow reaction kinetics and the presence of liquid in the microstructure pose difficulties in experimental investigations. Moreover, a microstructural distinction between the γ formed through peritectic transformation and through direct solidification of the remnant liquid often becomes too difficult. As an alternative, mathematical modelling has been attempted in the past to elucidate the kinetics of different stages of the peritectic change, especially, the peritectic transformation. From the results of solid–liquid diffusion couple experiments, Titchner and Spittle [18] concluded that a power relationship of the type \( w = A t^n \) is valid for the thickening of γ-rim \( w \) as a function of time \( t \), where \( A \) is related to the different equilibrium concentration terms and \( n \) is the time exponent varying from 0.35 to 0.57 depending on the alloy system chosen. Similar expressions have been derived by St. John and Hogan [19] utilizing the Wagner expression [20] for intermediate phase growth to describe \( w \) as a function of \( t \) in the form: \( w = B \sqrt{2t} \) where \( B \) is another function of the concentration values.

Maxwell and Hellawell [6] have used Laplacian approximation to represent the solute distribution profiles in γ and liquid phases, and solved mass balance equations to calculate the rate of displacement of the concerned interfaces assuming nearly invariant γ–β interface position. However, it may be noted that the Maxwell and Hellawell model is restricted only to dilute alloys and, if a prior diffusion layer in the liquid is assumed to exist, peritectic transformation seems to be analogous to γ-crystallization from the melt.

In a more rigorous analytical treatment, Lopez [21] attempted to consider a cored concentration profile in the β-phase for the first time while predicting the peritectic transformation kinetics.
The Lopez model considers quasi-static interface locations and a time-invariant profile in the \(\beta\)-phase. However, it has previously been demonstrated that the quasi-static interface approximation may significantly overestimate the kinetics of precipitate dissolution [22] and, hence it is essential to examine whether this is an appropriate assumption for predicting the peritectic transformation kinetics.

In a recent formulation, Das et al. [23, 24] have applied the linearized gradient approximation of Zener [25] to formulate an analytical model and demonstrated that this assumption is better suited than the quasi-static interface or Laplacian approximation. However, the former model neglects the effects of initial concentration gradient in the solid phases on the kinetics. It may be pointed out that an analytical solution is severely restricted by the assumption of specific concentration gradients in the different phases. Thus, a numerical solution is essential to consider the effect of time modulation of concentration profiles in the finite diffusion fields with moving boundaries.

Chuang et al. [3] have attempted numerical solutions of peritectic transformation in steel by combining the unsteady state diffusion equation with material balance across the \(\beta\)-\(\alpha\) and \(\alpha\)-liquid interfaces. Although the solution was worked out for continuous cooling, it did not take into account the effect of freezing rate. Furthermore, the pro-peritectic phase was assumed to be homogeneous in this calculation.

Another model for peritectic transformation in low alloy steels was proposed by Fredriksson [26] assuming dilute alloy behavior and considering a complete equilibrium distribution of carbon. However, the formulation neglected the time modulation of concentration profiles and the effects of impingement of the diffusion fields in the course of the transformation. Fredriksson and Nylen [27] also formulated a more general numerical solution for peritectic transformation assuming a homogeneous \(\beta\) and liquid, and a linear concentration gradient in the \(\alpha\)-phase.

It appears that most of the models presented earlier employ several simplifying assumptions to solve the peritectic kinetics, which may not be realistic. Moreover, the solids are assumed to be homogeneous in the majority of cases and the effect of pre-existing concentration gradients in the solids has been ignored. Therefore, a more rigorous numerical treatment for peritectic transformation kinetics is presented that takes into account the effects of unsteady state diffusion in finite diffusion fields and the coring in the solids. The results predicted by the present model have been compared with the experimental kinetic data from the Cd–Ag and Pb–Bi systems, as well as, predictions from the models proposed earlier.

2. THE NUMERICAL MODEL

2.1. Formulation of the problem

Consider the schematic binary phase diagram in Fig. 1 illustrating a typical peritectic change below the peritectic isotherm at \(T_p\). For uniformly sized and equispaced \(\beta\)-particles, the overall kinetics may be represented by the transformation in an isolated and spherically symmetrical cell of radius \(R_i = (3/4N_b)^{1/3}\), where \(N_b\) is the number of \(\beta\) nuclei per unit volume [Fig. 2(a)]. Concentration–distance
profiles in the respective phases at an isothermal transformation temperature, $T_I$ ($< T_p$) are represented in Fig. 2(b).

The concentration profile inside the $\beta$-phase formed on cooling a liquid of composition $C_0$ to the peritectic temperature ($T_p$) may be described by Scheil’s equation as

$$C_\beta = K_1 C_0 [1 - (r/R_p)^3]^{K_1 - 1}$$  

where $K_1$ is the equilibrium solute distribution coefficient between $\beta$ and liquid, and $r$ is the spatial variable. Therefore, the $\beta$-phase radius ($S_{1p}$) at the onset of the transformation at $T_p$ may be obtained from

$$S_{1p} = R_p [1 - (C_{0p}/K_1 C_0)^1/(K_1 - 1)]^{1/3}.$$  

On further cooling to the transformation temperature $T_1$ ($< T_p$), $z$ is assumed to form through solidification of liquid in concentration $C_{1p}$ at $T_p$. This assumption is in agreement with St. John’s [28] observation that $z$ more likely forms through solidification rather than the peritectic reaction for most peritectic systems. Again, a normal segregation profile is expected to exist in $z$, so that the composition in $z$ may be represented as

$$C_z = K_2 C_{1p} [1 - (r^3 - S_{1p}^3)/((R_p^3 - S_{1p}^3)]^{K_2 - 1}$$  

where $K_2$ is the equilibrium solute distribution coefficient between $z$ and liquid. The outer radius of $z$ ($S_{2p}$), when $z$ fully envelopes $\beta$, i.e. at the onset of the transformation may then be calculated as

$$S_{2p} = [S_{1p}^3 + (R_p^3 - S_{1p}^3)]^{1/3}.$$  

It may be noted that $S_{1p}$ and $S_{2p}$ are the locations of the respective moving interfaces $S_1$ and $S_2$ at transformation time $t = 0$.

For a diffusion controlled transformation the respective concentrations in the $\beta$- and $z$-phases at the $\beta$-$z$ interface ($S_1$) at $T_1$ are given by $C_{\beta s}$ and $C_{zs}$ (Fig. 1). Similarly, the concentrations of $z$ and liquid at the $z$-liquid interface ($S_2$) at $T_1$ are given by $C_{zl}$ and $C_{z l}$ respectively. Furthermore, mass transfer rate in the liquid phase is considered to be much faster than either of the solid phases to make the liquid phase homogeneous with composition $C_1$ during the isothermal transformation at $T_1$.

Concentration profiles in the solid phases during the course of the transformation ($t > 0$) are given by the field equations

$$\frac{\partial C_\beta}{\partial t} = \frac{1}{r^2} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \left( r^2 D_\beta \frac{\partial C_\beta}{\partial r} \right)$$  

and

$$\frac{\partial C_z}{\partial t} = \frac{1}{r^2} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \left( r^2 D_z \frac{\partial C_z}{\partial r} \right)$$  

where $D_\beta$ and $D_z$ are the interdiffusion coefficients in $\beta$ and $z$, respectively. The $\beta$-$z$ interface position is expressed through the interface mass balance equation

$$(C_{\beta s} - C_{zs}) \frac{dS_1}{dt} = -D_\beta \left( \frac{\partial C_\beta}{\partial r} \right)_{r = S_1} + D_z \left( \frac{\partial C_z}{\partial r} \right)_{r = S_1}.$$  

On the other hand, the $z$-liquid interface location is solved through the following overall mass balance equation:

$$4\pi \int_{S_1}^{S_2} C_{\beta l} r^2 \, dr + 4\pi \int_{S_1}^{R_p} C_{zl} r^2 \, dr + 4\pi \int_{S_1}^{R_p} C_{zl} r^2 \, dr = 4\pi \int_{0}^{R_p} C_{z l} r^2 \, dr.$$  

An exact analytical solution of the coupled equations (5)-(8) is not feasible. However, they may be solved numerically to yield the solute distribution in $\beta$ and $z$, and the location of the respective interfaces as a function of $t$.

2.2. Numerical analysis

A direct finite difference representation of equations (5)-(8) is difficult because the thickness of each phase changes throughout the course of the transformation. Tanzilli and Heckel [29] have earlier used the variable grid space transformation (VGST) of Murray and Landis [30] to overcome a similar moving boundary problem in the case of precipitate dissolution. In the present analysis, such VGST is adopted to transform the differential equations.

The rate of change of concentration ($C_a$) at a point $(n)$ at a radial distance $r_n$ from the center of the transformation cell may be represented as

$$\frac{dC_a}{dr} = \frac{\partial C_a}{\partial r_n} \left( \frac{dr_n}{dt} \right) + \frac{\partial C_a}{\partial t}.$$  

Combining equation (9) with the general form of the diffusion field equation

$$\frac{\partial C}{\partial t} = \frac{1}{r^2} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \left( r^2 D \frac{\partial C}{\partial r} \right)$$  

it is found that

$$\frac{dC_a}{dr} \left( \frac{dr_n}{dt} \right) + D \left[ \frac{\partial^2 C_a}{\partial r_n^2} + \frac{2}{r_n} \frac{\partial C_a}{\partial r_n} \right] = 0.$$  

where the interdiffusion coefficient $D$ is taken to be independent of composition. The finite difference nomenclature for the spherical cell in Fig. 2 is described in Fig. 3. The $\text{n}$th grid point in the $\beta$-phase is defined as $r_n = MS_1$, where $M$ is a constant. Accordingly, equation (10) is rewritten for the $\beta$-phase as follows:
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$$\frac{dC_a}{dr} = \frac{\partial C_a}{\partial r_n} \left( \frac{dr_n}{dt} \right) + \frac{\partial C_a}{\partial t}.$$  

Combining equation (9) with the general form of the diffusion field equation

$$\frac{\partial C}{\partial t} = \frac{1}{r^2} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \left( r^2 D \frac{\partial C}{\partial r} \right)$$  

it is found that
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where the interdiffusion coefficient $D$ is taken to be independent of composition. The finite difference nomenclature for the spherical cell in Fig. 2 is described in Fig. 3. The $\text{n}$th grid point in the $\beta$-phase is defined as $r_n = MS_1$, where $M$ is a constant. Accordingly, equation (10) is rewritten for the $\beta$-phase as follows:
Fig. 3. Schematic concentration–distance profiles illustrating the finite difference nomenclature adopted for the spherical cell in Fig. 2.

In the z-phase the nth grid point may be expressed as \( r_n = S_1 + M'(S_2 - S_1) \), where \( M' \) is another constant. Therefore, the field equation (10) takes the following form for the z-phase:

\[
\frac{dC^z}{dr} = \frac{\partial C^z}{\partial r} \left[ \frac{dS_1}{dr} + \frac{r_n - S_1}{S_2 - S_1} \left( \frac{dS_2}{dr} - \frac{dS_1}{dr} \right) \right] + D_z \left[ \frac{\partial^2 C^z}{\partial r^2} + \frac{2 \partial C^z}{r \partial r} \right].
\] (12)

2.3. Finite difference scheme

Rewriting equation (11) in the finite difference form leads to the following expression for the \( \beta \)-phase:

\[
\frac{C_{i+1}^\beta - C_i^\beta}{\Delta t} = \frac{(n-1)(C_{i+1}^\beta - C_{i+1}^\beta) + (S_{i+1}^\beta - S_i^\beta)}{2 \Delta t} + D_\beta (R - 1)^2 \left( \frac{C_{i-1}^\beta - 2C_i^\beta + C_{i+1}^\beta}{(S_i^\beta)^2} \right) + D_\beta (R - 1)^2 \left( \frac{C_{i+1}^\beta - C_i^\beta}{(n-1)(S_i^\beta)^2} \right).
\] (13)

However, the concentration at the first grid point located at the center of the \( \beta \)-phase may be approximated as [31]

\[
\frac{C_{i+1}^\beta - C_i^\beta}{\Delta t} = 6D_\beta (R - 1)^2 \left( \frac{C_{i+1}^\beta - C_i^\beta}{(S_i^\beta)^2} \right)
\] (14)

since the corresponding concentration profile is symmetric about this point. For the \( \alpha \)-phase, the finite difference representation of the diffusion field equation (12) is given by

\[
\frac{C_{i+1}^\alpha - C_i^\alpha}{\Delta t} = \frac{N - R (C_{i+1}^\alpha - C_{i+1}^\alpha)}{S_i^\alpha - S_i^\alpha} \times \left[ \frac{(S_{i+1}^\alpha - S_i^\alpha)}{\Delta t} + \frac{n - R}{N - R} \times \left( \frac{S_{2i}^\alpha - S_{i+1}^\alpha}{\Delta t} - \frac{S_{i}^\alpha - S_{1}^\alpha}{\Delta t} \right) \right] + D_\alpha \left( \frac{N - R}{S_{2i}^\alpha - S_i^\alpha} \right)^2 (C_{i-1}^\alpha - 2C_i^\alpha + C_{i+1}^\alpha) + D_\alpha \left( \frac{N - R}{S_{2i}^\alpha - S_i^\alpha} \right) \left[ \frac{n - R}{N - R} (S_{2i}^\alpha - S_i^\alpha) \right].
\] (15)

2.3.1. Location of the \( \alpha-\beta \) interface. The \( \alpha-\beta \) interface mass balance equation (7) transforms to the following finite difference equation:

\[
\frac{S_{i+1}^{\alpha-\beta} - S_i^\alpha}{\Delta t} = \frac{1}{(C_{\alpha\beta} - C_{\alpha\beta})} \left[ D_\alpha \left( \frac{N - R}{S_i^\alpha - S_{i+1}^\alpha} \right) \times \left( -C_{i+2}^\alpha + 4C_{i+1}^\alpha - 3C_{i+1}^\beta \right) \right] - D_\beta \left( \frac{R - 1}{S_{i+1}^\alpha} \right) \times \left( C_{i+1}^\alpha - 4C_{i+1}^\beta + 3C_{i+1}^\beta \right). \] (16)

2.3.2. Location of \( \alpha-\)liquid interface. At a given instance, the \( \alpha \)-liquid interface position can be found by solving equation (8). The total solute content in the transformation cell of radius \( R_i \) is given by

\[
4\pi \int_0^{R_i} C \rho r^2 \, dr = \frac{4\pi}{3} C_0 R_i^3.
\] (17)

Similarly, the amount of solute in the liquid at a given \( t \) at \( T_1 \) may be calculated as

\[
4\pi \int_{S_1}^{R_i} C \rho r^2 \, dr = \frac{4\pi}{3} C_0 (R_i^3 - S_1^3).
\] (18)

Total solute content in the \( \beta \)-phase may be evaluated numerically using Simpson’s formula [32] as

\[
4\pi \int_0^{S_1} C \rho r^2 \, dr = \frac{4\pi}{3} \left( \frac{S_1^{\beta+1}}{R_1 - 1} \right)^3 \left[ (R_1 - 1)^2 C_{\beta\alpha}^\beta + 2 \sum_{n=3,5}^{R_2-2} (n - 1)^2 C_{n+1}^\beta + 4 \sum_{n=2,4}^{R_2-1} (n - 1)^2 C_{n+1}^\beta \right]
\] (19)

if \( (R_1 - 1) \) is even (cf. Fig. 3). Similarly, the net
amount of solute present in the $\alpha$-phase can be estimated from the following expression:

$$
4\pi \int_{S_i} C_i r^2 dr = \frac{4\pi}{3} \left( S_i^{(1)} \right)^2 \left( \frac{S_i^{(1)} - S_i^{(1+1)}}{N - R} \right) \times \left[ C_{2i} + C_{3i} + 2 \sum_{n=R+1,R+4,...}^{N-2} C_{n+1} \right] + 4 \times \sum_{n=R+1,R+3,...}^{N-1} C_{n+1} + 4 \times \sum_{n=R+1,R+4,...}^{N-2} C_{n+1} + 2 \times \sum_{n=R+2,R+4,...}^{N-2} (n - R)^2 C_{n+1} + 4 \times \sum_{n=R+1,R+3,...}^{N-1} (n - R)^2 C_{n+1}
$$

The following equation is obtained by substituting equations (17)-(20) in equation (8) and rearranging:

$$
(S_i^{(1+1)} - S_i^{(1+1)+})A - (S_i^{(1+1)} - S_i^{(1+1)})B + (S_i^{(1+1)} - S_i^{(1+1)})E + (S_i^{(1+1)})^2 F = 0
$$

The value of $S_1$ at the ($i + 1$)th time sequence is determined through the finite difference scheme (16). The calculated $S_1$ value is utilized to find out the internal node concentration values in $\beta$, applying equations (13) and (14). Similarly, $S_2$ is calculated solving equation (21). Due to the non-availability of concentration values in the $\alpha$-phase nodes at the ($i + 1$)th time sequence, an iteration scheme is adopted as follows. Initially these values are replaced by the $i$th time sequence values. The estimated value of $S_2$ (say $S_2^*$) is substituted in equation (15) to find out the concentration values at the internal nodes of $\alpha$ at the ($i + 1$)th time sequence. These values are again substituted in equation (21) to obtain a new estimate of $S_2$. The process is continued until $|S_2 - S_2^*| < 10^{-6}$.

2.4. $\beta \rightarrow \alpha$ transformation

When the composition of the liquid lies between $C_p$ and $C_{\beta\alpha}$ (Fig. 1), the liquid is consumed earlier than $\beta$. The entire amount of liquid is considered to be consumed when $S_2$ reaches 0.999$R_a$. Beyond this point, the transformation proceeds entirely by the growth of $\alpha$ into $\beta$. Figure 4 illustrates the finite difference nomenclature applicable to this stage. Concentration inside the $\beta$-phase may still be obtained through equations (13) and (14). In the modified configuration of the transformation cell, the diffusion field equation (10) for the $\alpha$-phase takes the form
The corresponding finite difference representation is as follows:

\[
\frac{dC^*_a}{dt} = \frac{\partial C_a}{\partial t} + D_a \left[ \frac{\partial^2 C_a}{\partial \tau^2} - 2 \frac{\partial C_a}{\partial \tau} \right].
\]

(22)

The corresponding finite difference representation is as follows:

\[
\frac{C^*_a + C^*_i}{\Delta t} = \left( \frac{N - n}{R_i - S_i} \right) \left( \frac{C^*_a + C^*_i}{2} \right)
+ \left( \frac{S^*_i + S^*_i}{\Delta t} \right)
+ D_a \left( \frac{N - R}{R_i - S_i} \right)^2
\]

× \left( C^*_a - 2C^*_i + C^*_i \right) + D_b \left( \frac{N - R}{R_i - S_i} \right)

× \left( \frac{S^*_i + S^*_i}{\Delta t} \right)
+ D_b \left( \frac{N - R}{R_i - S_i} \right)

× \left( C^*_a + C^*_i \right) \left( \frac{C^*_a + C^*_i}{S^*_i + n - R (R_i - S_i)} \right).
\]

(23)

Due to the impingement of diffusion fields, concentration at the outer boundary of \( z \) at a particular time instant is calculated through \( C^*_i, n \) by considering a virtual \((N + 1)\)th grid outside the zero mass transfer boundary (cf. Fig. 4). The \( \beta \)-boundary position is determined through the modified equation

\[
\frac{S^*_i + S^*_i}{\Delta t} = \left( \frac{N - n}{R_i - S_i} \right) \left( \frac{S^*_i + S^*_i}{2} \right)
+ \left( -\frac{C^*_i + 4C^*_i}{2} \right)
+ D_b \left( \frac{R - 1}{S_i} \right) \left( \frac{C^*_i + 4C^*_i + 3C^*_i}{2} \right).
\]

(24)

The \( \beta \)-phase is assumed to be depleted when \( S_i \) reaches 0.001\( R_i \). At this point the calculations are terminated.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1. Comparison with the experimental data

Figures 5 and 6 compare the predictions of the present model with the experimentally determined \( \beta \) dissolution rate from the Cd–5 at.% Ag [33] and Pb–33.3 wt% Bi [34] alloys, respectively. Parametric values used for the calculations are presented in Table 1. For comparison, the results predicted by the models of Maxwell and Hellawell [6], Lopez [21], and Das et al. [23] are also incorporated in Figs 5 and 6. In both the systems, the kinetics predicted by the present model have deviated from the experimental data beyond about 65–85% \( \beta \)-dissolution, perhaps, due to the isolation and expulsion of the liquid leading to cavity formation and/or the variation in shape and size of the \( \beta \)-particles in the microstructure, as pointed out in the earlier publications by the authors [23, 24]. It may initially appear from Figs 5 and 6 that the predictions of the Lopez model are in close agreement with the present numerical analysis. However, when the Lopez model assumes a cored profile in \( \beta \), the predicted results exhibit wide deviation from the experimental kinetics right from the onset of the transformation. As the Pb-rich \( \beta \)-phase in the Pb–Bi system is usually cored, this perhaps, indicates that the quasi-static interface approach of the

![Fig. 5. Volume fraction of the \( \beta \)-phase as a function of normalized time \((D_{\alpha}t/R_i^2)\) for isothermal peritectic transformation in a Cd–5 at.% Ag alloy at 608 K.](image)

![Fig. 6. Kinetics of peritectic transformation in a Pb–33.3 wt% Bi alloy at 443 K.](image)
Lopez model may not be appropriate for predicting the kinetics. Considerable deviation from experimental results is also observed for the Maxwell–Hellawell model (Fig. 6) apparently because it overlooks the effect of diffusional impingement. The present analysis thus appears to be somewhat better in predicting the kinetics of peritectic transformation as compared to the earlier proposed models of Lopez [21], and Maxwell and Hellawell [6].

Figures 5 and 6 also show that the analytical model of Das et al. produces a relatively slower kinetics compared to that by the more rigorous numerical model. In spite of this, both the models are in remarkable agreement in predicting the kinetic trend of peritectic transformation [33].

3.2. Effect of concentration profile

To investigate the effect of coring in the solid phases, transformation kinetics have been calculated for the phase diagrams presented in Fig. 7 at a given temperature, $T_1$. In the numerical calculations, the diffusivities in both the solids are assumed to be identical and equal to $10^{-11}$ m$^2$/s. Other parametric values used in the calculations are reported in Table 2 against the corresponding serial number of the curves. Figure 8 illustrates the effect of $\alpha$-phase concentration profile on the kinetics of peritectic transformation at $T_1$ in an alloy of composition $C_0 = 0.35$ in Fig. 7(a). For this alloy, the equilibrium microstructure would consist of ($\alpha$ + liquid) at $T_1$, so that the peritectic transformation continues until $\beta$ is entirely consumed. It is assumed that $\beta$ inherits a cored profile at $t = 0$, while the concentration profile in $\alpha$ is allowed to be cored or linear initially or linear throughout the transformation. The time and distance scales are normalized by the respective multipliers $D_{\alpha}/R_1^2$ and $1/R_1$ for an effective comparison between different calculations. Figure 8 reveals that the kinetics predicted for an initially linear or cored composition profile in $\alpha$ are almost identical. Therefore, it is apparent that a cored profile in $\alpha$ may not produce much difference in the rate of the peritectic transformation. In contrast, when $\alpha$ is assumed to retain a linear compositional gradient throughout the transformation, considerable reduction in the rate of both $\beta$-$\alpha$ and $\alpha$-liquid interface migration results, i.e. it underestimates the transformation kinetics. This, perhaps, explains the divergence between the kinetics predicted by the present numerical model and the analytical model of Das et al. in Figs 5 and 6 as the latter approximates a linearized gradient in the $\alpha$-phase throughout the transformation.

Earlier, Lopez [21] proposed that coring in $\beta$ may result in a significantly slower transformation kinetics, when the volume fraction of $\beta$ in the microstructure is substantial. Figures 5 and 6 display this trend in the results from the calculation based on the Lopez model. Furthermore, the Lopez model predicted an inexplicable enhancement in the kinetics due to coring when the volume fraction of $\beta$ in

![Fig. 7. (a, b) Schematic peritectic phase diagrams utilized to calculate the effect of coring in the solids on the peritectic transformation kinetics.](image-url)
the microstructure was smaller. To estimate the effect of concentration gradient in $\beta$, calculations were performed through the present numerical model for compositions $C_0 = 0.4$ and 0.5 corresponding to the phase diagram in Fig. 7(a) at $T_1$. The former alloy composition allows estimation of the effect of $\beta$-coring on the kinetics of peritectic transformation and, the latter on the kinetics of $\beta$–$\alpha$ transformation following an early liquid consumption. The results are presented in Figures 9 and 10. In all the calculations, initially a cored composition profile has been assigned to $\alpha$, while $\beta$ is assumed to be initially cored or homogeneous. Contrary to the predictions of Lopez, Figs 9 and 10 demonstrate that coring in $\beta$ has almost no effect on the kinetics of the $\alpha$–liquid interface migration. On the other hand, the effect of the same on the $\beta$–$\alpha$ interface movement is negligible during the peritectic transformation (Fig. 9). After the consumption of the liquid, coring produces a marginal retardation of this interface migration kinetics (Fig. 10). It may be noted that in Fig. 10 (and in the subsequent figures) the liquid consumption is complete when the $\alpha$–liquid interface position reaches the value 1.0 in the normalized interface position scale. Figures 11 and 12 present similar plots for the phase diagram in Fig. 7(b) for the compositions $C_0 = 0.23$ and 0.3, respectively, at $T_1$. In this case, coring produces a steeper concentration gradient in $\beta$, and consequently, its effect on the kinetics should be relatively more pronounced. Here, a cored profile in $\beta$ produces a slower kinetics from the beginning of the transformation, although the effect is relatively more pronounced after the consumption of the liquid (cf. Fig. 11 with Fig. 12). Nevertheless, the effect of $\beta$-coring on the peritectic transformation kinetics is not as significant as that described earlier [21]. It may be pointed out that in addition to the pre-existing concentration gradient in $\beta$, $D_\beta$ also determines the solute flux from $\beta$ to $\alpha$. However, calculations through the present model indicate that a change in $D_\beta$ produces a negligible change in the kinetics [33].

In summary, the present investigation shows that contrary to the earlier predictions [21], no significant deviation in kinetics arises out of coring in $\beta$ (Figs 9–12). Moreover, the effect of $\beta$-coring on the kinetics is relatively more pronounced for alloy compositions where the liquid is consumed earlier during the transformation (Figs 10 and 12) as diffu-
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### Table 2. Input variables for the numerical calculations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Run No.</th>
<th>$C_b$ (at. fr.)</th>
<th>$K_1$</th>
<th>$K_2$</th>
<th>Equilibrium compositions (at. fr.)</th>
<th>$R_i$ (m)</th>
<th>$D_\beta$ (m$^2$/s)</th>
<th>$D_\alpha$ (m$^2$/s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.286</td>
<td>1.667</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.286</td>
<td>1.667</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.286</td>
<td>1.667</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.706</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.706</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.240</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Fig. 8.** Effect of concentration profile in $\alpha$ on the kinetics of the peritectic transformation shown in Fig. 7(a) at $T_1$.

**Fig. 9.** Influence of concentration profile in $\beta$ on the kinetics of peritectic transformation illustrated in Fig. 7(a) for an alloy composition $C_0 = 0.45$ at $T_1$. 

---

**Fig. 10.** Normalized interface position ($S/R_i$) vs. normalized time ($D_\alpha t/R_i^2$) for different interface positions. Lines indicate different profiles: solid line for linear, dashed line for cored at $t = 0$, and square for linear at $t = 0$. The $\beta$–$\alpha$ interface and $\alpha$–liquid interface are marked for reference.
sional impingement brings down the concentration gradient in the $\alpha$ layer. Therefore, it appears that the concentration profile in $\beta$ affects the peritectic transformation kinetics only when it can dominate over the effect of concentration gradient existing at the $\alpha$-side of the $\beta$-$\alpha$ boundary. Consequently, a more restricted compositional field in $\alpha$ is expected to enhance the effect of coring in $\beta$ and calculations through the present numerical model have shown a similar trend [33]. Thus, the composition range in $\alpha$ determines the effect of $\beta$-coring on the peritectic transformation kinetics in contrast to the volume fraction of $\beta$ in the microstructure as predicted earlier by Lopez [21]. It appears that the approximations of quasi-static interface and time-invariant concentration profile as in the Lopez analysis may not be always realistic for the calculation of the peritectic transformation kinetics.

4. CONCLUSIONS

1. A rigorous numerical model on the kinetics of peritectic transformation has been presented that is capable of considering unsteady state diffusion in finite moving phase fields. Predictions from the present model show a better agreement with the experimental kinetic data from the Cd–Ag and Pb–Bi systems, when compared to those obtained from the existing theoretical formulations based on quasi-static interface position, time-invariant concentration profile, and Laplacian profile approximations.

2. The calculated kinetics deviate from the experimental one approximately beyond 65–85% of $\beta$-dissolution, possibly due to the latter deviating from the idealized configuration of the transformation cell considered in the theoretical calculations.

3. Both cored and linear initial concentration profiles in $\alpha$ appear to have a similar effect on the transformation kinetics. However, the kinetics

![Fig. 10. Kinetics of peritectic and $\beta$-$\alpha$ transformation following liquid consumption in the presence of cored or homogeneous $\beta$-phase for an alloy of peritectic composition in Fig. 7(a) at $T_1$.](image1)

![Fig. 11. Effect of coring in $\beta$ on the kinetics of peritectic transformation for an alloy of composition $C_0 = 0.23$ in Fig. 7(b) at $T_1$.](image2)

![Fig. 12. Influence of solute segregation in $\beta$ on the kinetics of peritectic and $\beta$-$\alpha$ transformation following liquid consumption for an alloy of peritectic composition in Fig. 7(b) at $T_1$.](image3)
may be underestimated if the concentration gradient in $a$ is assumed to be linear throughout the transformation.

4. Coring in the $\beta$-phase has no appreciable effect on the migration of the $\alpha$-liquid interface. On the other hand, the effect of the same on the $\beta$–$\alpha$ interface movement is marginal and assumes significance only after the consumption of the liquid and in the presence of a shallower composition gradient in $a$.
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