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Abstract

Mechanical properties of castings are dependent on their microstructure, e.g. dendrite arm spacing. To improve the prediction of the microstructural evolution in cast parts, an approach is presented which couples a microscopic model, a macroscopic model and a programmable interface for calculating thermodynamic equilibria. The macroscopic calculations were performed by means of the in-house 3D-FEM-program CASTS. It permits the simulation of the temperature distribution during solidification for complex shaped castings. The micro model predicts the dendritic solidification of ternary alloys using a plate model. It characterizes important microstructural features such as dendrite arm spacing and the amount of eutectic fraction. Effects such as solid state back diffusion, dendrite arm coarsening and tip undercooling are considered. Phase diagram information for the multi-component system is provided on-line by ChemApp™. Both the macro and micro calculation are fully coupled via the release of latent heat at each node of the finite element mesh. Permanent mold casting experiments with different ternary aluminum alloys are performed to validate the complex simulation.
Introduction

Nowadays, numerical investigations of casting processes can be performed on both the macroscopic and microscopic level, but most common (especially for industrial applications) are still simulations on the macro level. They allow the global prediction of mold filling, solidification and stress formation. A rough estimation of the microstructure can be made e.g. by means of criterion functions [1]. Many numerical techniques on the micro level have also been developed to predict the local evolution of microstructure and the formation of microsegregation as a function of the global cooling conditions. Recent reviews of analytical, semi-empirical and numerical methods can be found in [2, 3]. The most advanced models take into account various effects such as solid state diffusion, dendrite arm coarsening and undercooling. As demonstrated by Boettinger et al. [4, 5], the on-line use of thermodynamic programs is advisable to enhance the accuracy of thermodynamic data for multi-component alloys. Micro and macro models should ideally be strongly coupled to take into account mutual influences between microstructural evolution and temperature changes. This paper presents such a fully two-way coupled modeling. The goal is to develop a general three-dimensional method of simulation which is not restricted to certain alloy systems.

Method of Simulation

A. Macro Model

The described simulations on the macro level are performed by means of the in-house package CASTS, a 3D finite element code. Detailed descriptions and application examples can be found in [6-8]. The mesh can be generated with the commercial software IDEAS-superdeal. To realize the interfacial heat flow, additional elements are meshed between different materials. After defining temperature-dependent thermophysical properties and setting appropriate initial (e.g. pouring temperature) and boundary conditions (convection, insulation and radiation including view factors) all information is stored in a command file. During the mainprocessing the program calculates the temperature evolution iteratively, taking into account the release of latent heat, which is evaluated by the micro model.

B. Micro Model

Figure 1: The scheme of the plate model is shown on the left. A qualitative concentration profile of both alloy components B and C is depicted on the right.

The microsegregation model predicts primary dendrite trunk spacing, secondary dendrite arm spacing and phase amounts based on an approach of Koos and Eicker [9] where the complex dendritic structure is approximated by a plate morphology (see Fig. 1). Although this poor approximation of a part of dendrite, it has been shown that this model yields good agreement between calculation and measurement [9-12]. Coarsening is calculated by the semi-empirical power-cube equation for the time evolution of \(x_2\) [9]. Complete mixing is assumed in the liquid and the volume element is thought to be at a uniform temperature \(T\). All information concerning the phase diagram was calculated with the aid of the programmable thermodynamic calculation interface ChemApp\textsuperscript{TM}. It consists of a library of FORTRAN subroutines that allows the calculation of thermodynamic coordinates and constitution by minimizing the Gibbs free energy. The definition of the thermodynamic equilibrium in combination with the thermodynamic data file of the concerned system serves as an input for ChemApp\textsuperscript{TM}. As a result it returns the equilibrium values of various quantities, e.g. temperature, amounts of phases, phase compositions, thermodynamic potentials, heat capacity etc.

The concentration profiles of the alloying elements B and C in the solid are calculated by a fully implicit FEM scheme. To ensure the fulfillment of the mass balance during the simulation two iteration loops are necessary. The resulting scheme is shown in Fig. 2.

I. The interfacial concentration value of element B in the liquid \(c_B^L\) of the preceding time step remains unchanged, which allows the calculation of \(c_B^{eq}, c_C^{eq}\).

II. In the inner iteration loop the advance of the solidification front is calculated iteratively using the mass
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Nowadays, numerical investigations of casting processes can be performed on both the macroscopic and microscopic level, but most common (especially for industrial applications) are still simulations on the macro level. They allow the global prediction of mold filling, solidification and stress formation. A rough estimation of the microstructure can be made e.g. by means of criterion functions [1]. Many numerical techniques on the micro level have also been developed to predict the local evolution of microstructure and the formation of microsegregation as a function of the global cooling conditions. Recent reviews of analytical, semi-empirical and numerical methods can be found in [2, 3]. The most advanced models take into account various effects such as solid state diffusion, dendrite arm coarsening and undercooling. As demonstrated by Boettinger et al. [4, 5], the on-line use of thermodynamic programs is advisable to enhance the accuracy of thermodynamic data for multi-component alloys. Micro and macro models should ideally be strongly coupled to take into account mutual influences between microstructural evolution and temperature changes. This paper presents such a fully two-way coupled modeling. The goal is to develop a general three-dimensional method of simulation which is not restricted to certain alloy systems.

Method of Simulation

A. Macro Model
The described simulations on the macro level are performed by means of the in-house package CASTIS, a 3D finite element code. Detailed descriptions and application examples can be found in [6-8]. The mesh can be generated with the commercial software IDEAS-supertab™. To realize the interfacial heat flow, additional elements are enmeshed between different materials. After defining temperature-dependent thermophysical properties and setting appropriate initial (e.g. pouring temperature) and boundary conditions (convection, insulation and radiation including view factors) all information is stored in a command file. In the main processing the program calculates the temperature evolution iteratively, taking into account the release of latent heat, which is evaluated by the micro model.

B. Micro Model
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Figure 1: The scheme of the plate model is shown on the left. A qualitative concentration profile of both alloy components B and C is depicted on the right.

The microsegregation model predicts primary dendrite trunk spacing, secondary dendrite arm spacing and phase amounts based on an approach of Rosse and Exner [9] where the complex dendrite structure is approximated by a plate morphology (see Fig. 1). Although this poor approximation of a part of a dendrite, it has been shown that this model yields good agreement between calculation and measurement [9-12]. Coarsening is calculated by the semi-empirical power-cube equation for the time evolution of $\lambda$ [9]. Complete mixing is assumed in the liquid and the volume element is thought to be at a uniform temperature $T$. All information concerning the phase diagram was calculated with the aid of the programmable thermodynamic calculation interface ChemApp™. It consists of a library of FORTRAN subroutines that allow the calculation of thermodynamic equilibria by minimizing the Gibbs free energy. The definition of the thermodynamic equilibrium in combination with the thermodynamic data file of the concerned system serves as an input for ChemApp™. As a result it returns the equilibrium values of various quantities, e.g. temperature, amounts of phases, phase compositions, thermodynamic potentials, heat capacity etc.

The concentration profiles of the alloying elements B and C in the solid are calculated by a fully implicit FD scheme. To ensure the fulfillment of the mass balance during the simulation two iteration loops are necessary. The resulting scheme is shown in Fig. 2.

1. The interfacial concentration value of element B in the liquid $c_B$ of the preceding time step remains unchanged, which allows the calculation of $c_B^T$.
2. In the inner iteration loop the advance of the solidification front is calculated iteratively using the mass...
balance for element \( C \) and solving the respective diffusion equation.

III. After the convergence of this loop, the diffusion equation for \( B \) is solved and the second mass balance is proved. If it is not fulfilled within a given error limit, the procedure is resumed again in \( I \) with a new value of \( \varepsilon^2 \).

In both iteration loops the method of Anderson/Björck [13] is used. The resulting solid fraction \( f_i \) is calculated as the ratio \( \varepsilon_i / \varepsilon \) (see Fig. 1). In the eutectic groove, the growth of primary α-dendrites is assumed to be completed while the secondary α- and β-phases solidify with a Gulliver-Scheil-like behavior. This implies a dispersed distribution of both eutectic phases within the remaining melt. The undercooling of the dendrite tip \( \Delta T \), consisting of curvature, solutal and gradient undercoolings, is calculated on the basis of the KGT-model and considered in the micro-model by applying a truncated level-approximation.

The thermal gradient \( G \) and the solidification velocity \( V = \frac{T}{G} \), which are needed in the KGT-model, are taken at each FEM-node at \( T_i \) from a conventional macrocalculation (latent heat release due to Gulliver-Scheil), performed in advance. Undercooling of the binary and ternary eutectic has been neglected. The primary spacing is calculated using the approximate equation given in [14]. In this equation one has to specify \( \Delta T \), \( R \) and \( G \). \( \Delta T \) is taken as the difference between \( T_i - \Delta T \) and the temperature where the calculated solidification path enters the eutectic groove. The dendrite tip radius \( R \) is calculated from the KGT-model and \( G \) is approximated as described above.

C. Method of Coupling

Micro and macro program are linked via the local release of latent heat at each node of the mesh. The scheme of this coupling is illustrated in Fig. 3 and is similar to the method of Sasikumar [15] who has shown the necessity of the iterative coupling for a simple case. At the beginning of each time step \( t \) the iteration loop starts with an estimated fraction solid \( \varepsilon_i \) for all nodes \( i \). It determines the release of latent heat from the macro calculation. With this evaluated temperature distribution \( T_{\varepsilon_i}(t) \) the micro model simulates the microstructural evolution, leading to a better approximation of \( f_i \) which is again input for a repeated macro calculation. This procedure is repeated until sufficient correlation between the temperature distribution of the actual and previous iteration is obtained.

Experimental Investigations

In order to validate the described course of procedure a step wedge was cast in a permanent mold. Several casting experiments were performed with different AlCuSi-alloys, table I. The outer dimensions of the selected casting system are shown in Fig. 4. This experimental setup permits the observation of both fine and coarse microstructures due to different cooling conditions. Furthermore, it allows reproducible results. The rectangles in Fig. 4 reveal the positions of the samples where microstructural measurements were taken. Furthermore thermocouples were installed at ten positions to monitor solidification. The pouring temperature was 700 °C.

| Table I: Composition of the three different AlCuSi-alloys used for the test castings |
|----------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|
| Alloy 1                          | 5.0     | 2.0     | 5.0     |
| Alloy 2                          | 5.0     | 5.0     | 2.0     |

Figure 4: Geometry of the step wedge. Lengths are given in mm. Microstructure investigation was performed at the positions P1 - P8.

Results and Discussion

Figure 5 shows the calculated microstructure parameters \( \lambda_1 \) and \( \lambda_2 \) for an AlCu5wt.%Si5wt.% alloy. Because of the symmetry of the problem, only half of the cast part was simulated. The FEM-net contains 1276 nodes including the mold. 340 nodes are needed for the step wedge. As expected, in the parts of the step wedge solidifying at large velocities, i.e. the thinner steps or the corners of the four steps, a fine microstructure develops, whereas in the thick step a coarse microstructure occurs. This behavior is also reflected in Fig. 6, showing three micrographs taken from different steps of the casting. It turned out to be very difficult to identify and measure the volume fraction of the different phases, especially to distinguish between binary and ternary eutectic. Thus there are no experimental values for the ternary eutectic fraction \( f_e \). Presently we are working on the development of an adequate metallurgical method which en-
balance for element $C$ and solving the respective diffusion equation.  
III. After the convergence of this loop, the diffusion equation for $B$ is solved and the second 
mass balance is proved. If it is not fulfilled within a given error limit, the procedure is 
repeated again in I with a new value of $\epsilon_{\tau}$. 

In both iteration loops the method of Anderson/Björck [13] is used. The resulting solid fraction 
$f_s$ is calculated as the ratio $\alpha_s/(\alpha_s+\beta_s)$ (see Fig. 1). In the eutectic groove, the growth of primary 
dendrites is assumed to be completed while the secondary $\alpha$- and $\beta$-phases solidify with a 
Gulliver-Scheil like behaviour. This implies a disperse distribution of both eutectic phases within the 
remaining melt. The undercooling of the dendrite tip $\Delta T$, consisting of curvature, solutal and 
gradient undercoolings, is calculated on the basis of the KGT-model and considered in the 
micro-model by applying a truncated lever-approximation. 

The thermal gradient $\nabla T$ and the solidification 
velocity $V_s (= T_s / G)$, which are needed in the KGT-model, are taken at each FEM-
node at $T_i$ from a conventional macro-
calculation (latent heat release due to Gulliver-Scheil), performed in advance. Under-
cooling of the binary and ternary eutectic 
has been neglected. The primary spacing is 
calculated using the approximate equation 
given in [14]. In this equation one has to 

determine $\Delta T$, $R$ and $G$. $\Delta T$ is taken as the 
difference between $T_i - \Delta T$ and the 
temperature where the calculated solidification 
path enters the eutectic groove. The 
dendrite tip radius $R$ is calculated from the 
KGT-model and $G$ is approximated as de-
scribed above. 

C. Method of Coupling 

Micro and macro program are linked via the 
local release of latent heat at each node of the 
mesh. The scheme of this coupling is 
illustrated in Fig. 3 and is similar to the 
method of Saikumar [15] who has shown 
the necessity of the iterative coupling for a 
simple case. At the beginning of each time 
step $t$ the iteration loop starts with an esti-
imated fraction solid ($\beta$) for all nodes $i$. It 
determines the release of latent heat from the 
macro calculation. With this evaluated 
temperature distribution $T_{\text{calc.}}(t)$ the micro 
model simulates the microstructural evolution, 
leading to a better approximation of $f_s$ which is again input for a repeated macro 
calculation. This procedure is repeated until sufficient correlation between the temperature dis-
tribution of the actual and previous iteration is obtained. 

Experimental Investigations 

In order to validate the described course of procedure a step wedge was cast in a permanent 
mold. Several casting experiments were performed with different AlCuSi-alloys, table I. The 
outer dimensions of the selected casting system are shown in Fig. 4. This experimental setup 
permits the observation of both fine and coarse microstructures due to different cooling condi-
tions. Furthermore, it allows reproducible results. The rectangles in Fig. 4 reveal the positions 
of the samples where macrostructural measurements were taken. Furthermore thermocouples 
were installed at ten positions to monitor solidification. The pouring temperature was 700 °C. 

| Table I: Composition of the three different AlCuSi-alloys used for the test castings. |
|-----------------|------|------|------|
| Alloy 1 | Alloy 2 | Alloy 3 |
| $C_{Cu}$ [wt. %] | 5.0 | 2.0 | 5.0 |
| $C_{Si}$ [wt. %] | 5.0 | 5.0 | 2.0 |

Figure 4: Geometry of the step wedge. Lengths are given in mm. Microstructure investigation 
was performed at the positions P1 - P8. 

Results and Discussion 

Figure 5 shows the calculated microstructure parameters $\lambda_1$ and $\lambda_2$ for an AlCu5wt.%Si5wt.% 
alloy. Because of the symmetry of the problem, only one half of the cast part was simulated. 
The FEM-net contains 1276 nodes including the mold, 340 nodes are needed for the step 
wafer. As expected, in the parts of the step wedge solidifying at large velocities, i.e., the thinner 
steps or the corners of the four steps, a fine microstructure develops, whereas in the thick step a 
coarse microstructure occurs. This behavior is also reflected in Fig. 6, showing these micro-
graphs taken from different steps of the casting. It turned out to be very difficult to identify and 
measure the volume fraction of the different phases, especially to distinguish between binary 
and ternary eutectic. Thus there are no experimental values for the ternary eutectic fraction $f_e$. 

Presently we are working on the development of an adequate mathematical method which en-
ables the measurement of \( f \). Therefore the comparison between simulation and experiment is
still reduced to the values of the dendrite trunk and dendrite arm spacing.
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Figure 5: The simulated distribution of the microstructure parameters \( \lambda_1 \) (a.) and \( \lambda_2 \) (b.) for an AlCu5wt.%Si5wt.% alloy.

![Image](image.png)

Figure 6: Micrographs of AlCu5wt.%Si5wt.% alloy, showing the microstructure occurring in different steps of the casting (positions P3, P5, P6 (see Fig 4)).

Table I shows the comparison of experimental and simulated values for different samples. It is obvious that the simulation shows good agreement with the experimental values for the dendrite arm spacing \( \lambda_2 \). The reasons for the disagreement in the dendrite trunk spacing \( \lambda_1 \) are as follows. The expression used for the calculation of \( \lambda_1 \) considers a simplified geometry of the dendritic morphology for directional solidification. In our experiments, however, only partial columnar growth occurs. Further, the used expression is valid only for steady state solidification. Therefore the simulated dendrite trunk spacing can only be interpreted as a rough estimation of the order of magnitude.

As expected, the consideration of dendrite tip undercooling has no decisive influence on the results of the simulation for the considered experimental situation. The values of the dendrite arm and trunk spacing are reduced by not more than about 5 to 10%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>P1</th>
<th>P2</th>
<th>P3</th>
<th>P4</th>
<th>P5</th>
<th>P6</th>
<th>P7</th>
<th>P8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sim.</td>
<td>14.75</td>
<td>16.63</td>
<td>16.72</td>
<td>22.41</td>
<td>22.95</td>
<td>27.85</td>
<td>26.17</td>
<td>31.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exp.</td>
<td>14.67</td>
<td>15.12</td>
<td>16.82</td>
<td>24.07</td>
<td>29.09</td>
<td>33.23</td>
<td>29.75</td>
<td>34.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>P1</th>
<th>P2</th>
<th>P3</th>
<th>P4</th>
<th>P5</th>
<th>P6</th>
<th>P7</th>
<th>P8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sim.</td>
<td>22.07</td>
<td>24.18</td>
<td>25.13</td>
<td>33.07</td>
<td>34.11</td>
<td>41.67</td>
<td>35.28</td>
<td>46.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exp.</td>
<td>25.07</td>
<td>16.93</td>
<td>20.58</td>
<td>32.66</td>
<td>29.36</td>
<td>43.09</td>
<td>31.94</td>
<td>37.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>P1</th>
<th>P2</th>
<th>P3</th>
<th>P4</th>
<th>P5</th>
<th>P6</th>
<th>P7</th>
<th>P8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sim.</td>
<td>15.20</td>
<td>17.21</td>
<td>17.52</td>
<td>23.11</td>
<td>23.76</td>
<td>28.25</td>
<td>27.02</td>
<td>32.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exp.</td>
<td>13.01</td>
<td>19.75</td>
<td>24.62</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The simulations were run on an SGI™ work station with R10000 processor using about 20 h CPU time. A conventional simulation of the respective simulation, which means estimating \( f(T) \) with Gulliver-Schell and no microstructure simulation, takes about 0.5 h CPU time. The main reason for the long computation time is that the iteration loops are necessary in the micro program. With a more sophisticated method of iteration or parallel computation on different processors the necessary computation time might be drastically reduced.

**Conclusion and Outlook**

A full coupling of a 3D-macro model with a micro model was used to simulate the microstructural development during solidification. A thermodynamic calculation interface was used to calculate the phase diagram information. The results show good agreement with the experiment for the dendrite arm spacing \( \lambda_2 \). The expression used for the calculation of \( \lambda_2 \) turned out to be unsuitable for the description of the experiments. The shown method of simulation is quite complex, but with the increasing computational capacities the needed computation time will be drastically reduced. Furthermore the on-line calculation of thermodynamic phase equilibria can easily be applied to different alloy systems.

In ongoing studies an improved model for the calculation of the primary spacing \( \lambda_1 \) of the dendrites will be implemented and an experimental procedure for the determination of \( f \) developed. Furthermore, a more complex treatment for the solidification in the eutectic groove could be used if there is a deeper insight in the multiphase solidification of the respective alloy. Effects such as solute trapping or the consideration of kinetic and eutectic undercooling can easily

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>P4</th>
<th>P5</th>
<th>P6</th>
<th>P7</th>
<th>P8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sim.</td>
<td>180.70</td>
<td>217.7</td>
<td>220.79</td>
<td>274.16</td>
<td>128.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exp.</td>
<td>133.00</td>
<td>164.30</td>
<td>289.70</td>
<td>235.00</td>
<td>136.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ables the measurement of $f_c$. Therefore the comparison between simulation and experiment is still reduced to the values of the dendrite trunk and dendrite arm spacing.
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**Figure 5:** The simulated distribution of the microstructure parameters $\lambda_1$ (a.) and $\lambda_2$ (b.) for an AI/Cu5wt.%Si5wt.% alloy.
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**Figure 6:** Micrographs of AI/Cu5wt.%Si5wt.% alloy, showing the microstructure occurring in different steps of the casting (positions P3, P5, P6 (see Fig 4)).

**Table II:** Comparison of the simulated and the experimentally measured microstructure parameters $\lambda_1$ and $\lambda_2$ in $\mu$m.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>P1</th>
<th>P2</th>
<th>P3</th>
<th>P4</th>
<th>P5</th>
<th>P6</th>
<th>P7</th>
<th>P8</th>
<th>P9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sim.</strong></td>
<td>14.75</td>
<td>16.63</td>
<td>16.72</td>
<td>22.41</td>
<td>22.95</td>
<td>27.85</td>
<td>26.17</td>
<td>31.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exp.</strong></td>
<td>14.67</td>
<td>15.12</td>
<td>16.82</td>
<td>26.07</td>
<td>29.09</td>
<td>33.29</td>
<td>29.75</td>
<td>34.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AI/Cu5wt.%Si5wt.%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Position</strong></td>
<td>P1</td>
<td>P2</td>
<td>P3</td>
<td>P4</td>
<td>P5</td>
<td>P6</td>
<td>P7</td>
<td>P8</td>
<td>P9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sim.</td>
<td>22.07</td>
<td>24.18</td>
<td>25.13</td>
<td>33.07</td>
<td>34.11</td>
<td>41.67</td>
<td>35.28</td>
<td>46.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exp.</td>
<td>25.07</td>
<td>16.93</td>
<td>20.58</td>
<td>32.68</td>
<td>29.36</td>
<td>43.09</td>
<td>31.94</td>
<td>37.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AI/Cu5wt.%Si5wt.%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Position</strong></td>
<td>P1</td>
<td>P2</td>
<td>P3</td>
<td>P4</td>
<td>P5</td>
<td>P6</td>
<td>P7</td>
<td>P8</td>
<td>P9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sim.</td>
<td>15.20</td>
<td>17.21</td>
<td>17.52</td>
<td>23.11</td>
<td>23.76</td>
<td>28.25</td>
<td>27.02</td>
<td>32.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exp.</td>
<td>13.01</td>
<td>19.75</td>
<td>24.62</td>
<td>26.07</td>
<td>27.65</td>
<td>29.07</td>
<td>29.75</td>
<td>34.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AI/Cu5wt.%Si5wt.%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Position</strong></td>
<td>P4</td>
<td>P5</td>
<td>P6</td>
<td>P7</td>
<td>P8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sim.</td>
<td>180.70</td>
<td>217.7</td>
<td>220.79</td>
<td>274.16</td>
<td>128.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exp.</td>
<td>133.00</td>
<td>164.30</td>
<td>289.70</td>
<td>225.00</td>
<td>136.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The simulations were run on a SGI™ work station with R10000 processor using about 20 h CPU time. A conventional simulation of the respective simulation, which means estimating $f_c(T)$ with Gulliver-Schel and no microstructure simulation, takes about 0.5 h CPU time. The main reason for the long computation time is that two iteration loops are necessary in the micro program. With a more sophisticated method of iteration or parallel computation on different processors the necessary computation time might be drastically reduced.

**Conclusion and Outlook**

A full coupling of a 3D-macro model with a micro model was used to simulate the microstructural development during solidification. A thermodynamic calculation interface was used to calculate the phase diagram information. The results show good agreement with the experiment for the dendrite arm spacing $\lambda_2$. The expression used for the calculation of $\lambda_2$ turned out to be unsuitable for the description of the experiments. The shown method of simulation is quite complex, but with the increasing computational capacities the needed computation time will be drastically reduced. Furthermore the online calculation of thermodynamic phase equilibria can easily be applied to different alloy systems.

In ongoing studies an improved model for the calculation of the primary spacing $\lambda_1$ of the dendrites will be implemented and an experimental procedure for the determination of $f_c$ developed. Furthermore, a more complex treatment for the solidification in the eutectic groove could be used if there is a deeper insight in the multiphase solidification of the respective alloy. Effects such as solute trapping or the consideration of kinetic and eutectic undercooling can easily
be implemented. Finally a more sophisticated iteration method will be used to reduce the computation time to allow the simulation of more complex geometries.
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Abstract

The ALSTRUC microstructure model simulates the solidification path in the phase diagram for the most common commercial aluminum alloys, with compensation for the solid state diffusion and for the nucleation difficulties of some of the intermetallic particles. The rate of cooling is input. The phase diagram description is given as a liquidus slope polynomial, composition dependent distribution coefficients, and solubility limits or composition dependent solubility products for the intermetallic phases.

One of the most popular applications of the program is to provide alloy dependent input data for thermal solidification models. Examples of measured and calculated cooling curves, electrical conductivities and volume fractions of the particles are given for AISI casting alloys.