

Interactive Effects of Interfacial Energy Anisotropy and Solute Transport on Solidification Patterns of Al-Cu Alloys

Ghavam Azizi, Sepideh Kavousi, and Mohsen Asle Zaeem*

Department of Mechanical Engineering, Colorado School of Mines, Golden, CO 80401, USA

*Corresponding author: zaeem@mines.edu (M. Asle Zaeem)

Abstract

Combined effects of the cooling rate, alloy composition, and crystal-melt (CM) interfacial anisotropy on solidification of Al-Cu alloys are studied by integrating molecular dynamics and phase-field simulations. Capillary fluctuation method is used to determine the CM interfacial energy properties by molecular dynamics simulations for alloys ranging from 3 to 11 at% Cu. While the average CM interfacial energy decreases with increasing Cu content, its anisotropy does not present a clear trend with composition change. Primary and secondary dendrite arm spacings as well as θ -phase fraction are calculated by phase-field simulations, and validated against experimental measurements and analytical solutions at cooling rates ranging from 1 to 1250 K/s. Results show that the θ -phase fraction decreases with increasing the cooling rate, and this reduction is more drastic in alloys with a higher Cu content. Also, the microstructure features are influenced by the growth dynamics, where seaweed structure formation results in a more homogenous distribution of θ -phase and a finer microstructure. The effects of temperature gradient, Cu concentration gradient, and interfacial energy properties on the dendritic growth morphology of Al-Cu alloys are summarized by a map of supercooling versus the CM interfacial anisotropy to predict pattern formation. The results show that, irrespective of Cu content and cooling rate, the seaweed structure formation is halted at CM interfacial anisotropies larger than 0.004. As the anisotropy decreases, different seaweed structures can form regarding the constitutional supercooling. At low anisotropies (Al-3 and Al-8.4 at% Cu) and low supercooling (Al-3 at% Cu) fractal or degenerate seaweed is dominant while at high supercooling (Al-8.4 at% Cu) compact seaweed forms. This difference in supercooling stems from different solute atom transport rate.

Keywords: Al-Cu alloys; Solidification microstructure; Interfacial energy anisotropy; Molecular dynamics; Multi-phase field modeling.

1. Introduction

The crystal-melt (CM) interfacial energy is an intrinsic material property that plays a critical role in solidification pattern formation [1]. It influences the solidification microstructures in two ways; first, dendrites grow during solidification along the directions with the highest CM interfacial energy, and second, the instability of interface affecting the dendrite patterns, is controlled by the CM interfacial energy [2-4]. The CM interface energy has an anisotropic nature with respect to the crystallographic directions. Despite the unknown atomistic origin of interfacial energy anisotropy, for most alloys, the anisotropy is very small resulting in only a couple of percentage change in the interfacial energy in different crystallographic directions [1]. However,

it governs the nucleation and growth kinetics [5-7], morphology [8-10], and crystallographic growth direction of the dendrites [11].

The instability of CM interface, which is influenced by the CM interfacial energy, controls microstructure evolution, dendrite arm spacing, and microsegregation patterns [3]. Coriell and Sekerka [12] added surface tension and surface kinetic anisotropy effects into the perturbation linear stability analysis and showed that the capillary term, that contributes in interface stability, is direction dependent [9, 13, 14]. Trivedi [15] compared experimental results with linear and weakly nonlinear analyses of the planar interface stability and showed that when a material is directionally solidified beyond the threshold of planar stability condition [16], the anisotropy of interface properties not only affects the planar to cellular and cellular to dendritic transitions, but also causes tilting of cells and dendrite against the heat flow direction [17-19].

Besides dendritic microstructures, diverse types of morphologies can be formed during solidification of metallic alloys, including seaweed, dense-branched, fractal-like, and variations between these patterns [20]. These morphologies result from interactive effects of thermal diffusion, mass diffusion, and inherent interfacial anisotropy on interface stability. Amooezaei et al. [20] showed that in a directionally solidified Mg alloy with low interfacial energy anisotropy, any change in processing condition considerably alters the solidification morphology. Their results indicated that at a low pulling velocity, seaweed structure is dominant, while by increasing pulling velocity compacted seaweed is the main morphology. In another study, Xing et al. [21] investigated the dynamics of growing dendrites and showed that the seaweed is the dominant morphology at weaker interfacial energy anisotropies, lower pulling velocities, and higher thermal gradients. It is believed that the instability at the tips, which stems from low surface energy anisotropy, is responsible for the formation of such a morphology [22, 23]. Chen et al. [24] showed that tip splitting takes place during the solidification of Al-4 wt% Cu with low interfacial energy anisotropy, which leads to seaweed structure. They argued that the seaweed regime is formed by morphological instability occurring when the cell/dendrite tip becomes too wide.

Despite its importance in predicting the microstructure, experimental measurements of the CM interfacial free energy and the anisotropy terms are very challenging and often not possible [25]. Because of the recent availability of reliable embedded interatomic potentials for metals, molecular dynamics (MD) has become a popular method for calculating the CM interface free energy. Among the two well-known methods, namely Cleavage [26] and the capillary fluctuation method (CFM) [27], the latter results in a more accurate anisotropy parameter calculations, which is used in this study. CFM has been extensively used for interface energy calculations of metals [28-33], compounds [34], and binary alloys [35, 36].

The interface energy for an alloy depends on the working temperature and alloy composition. There are different MD simulations that discuss how the change in chemical composition alters the interface free energy and its anisotropy. Becker et al. [37] used CFM to show that the CM interface energy in Ni-5at%Cu alloy is 7.4% less than pure Ni. Furthermore, the addition of 5 at% Cu decreases δ_1 (Fourfold anisotropy parameter) from 0.09 to 0.072 and increases δ_2 (Six-fold anisotropy parameter) from -0.011 to -0.007 [38]. Potter and Hoyt [39] applied the CFM to the Cu-rich Cu-Ag-Au system; they indicated that species with a high enthalpy of mixing tend to

destabilize the dendrites growing in the $\langle 100 \rangle$ direction and promote a transition to the growth of hyper-branched and $\langle 110 \rangle$ -oriented dendrites.

There are very limited experimental studies that support the computationally-predicted change in interface free energy and the corresponding anisotropy due to change in alloy composition. Using experimental observation [40] and phase-field modeling [41], it was shown that in Al-Zn alloys (Zn < 25 wt%) with high values of ϵ_1 (four-fold anisotropy parameter) and low values of $|\epsilon_2|$ (six-fold anisotropy parameter), $\langle 100 \rangle$ -oriented dendrites are dominant. When Zn concentration is more than 55 wt%, the value of ϵ_1 is low and the absolute value of ϵ_2 is high. Under this condition, $\langle 110 \rangle$ is found to be the favorable growth direction. In the intermediate regions, surface energy anisotropy becomes very small and leads to the formation of seaweed structures or hyper-branched dendrites [42]. Recently, Wang et al. [1] showed that in Al-Sm alloy system, increasing Sm content drastically reduces anisotropy strength while increasing the average interface energy (γ_0). The aforementioned studies indicate that chemical composition is the main factor that controls CM interfacial energy and its anisotropy. Also, it was shown that since the equilibrium composition at CM interface changes by temperature, its energy and anisotropy are a function of temperature [43-45].

While the impact of CM interfacial anisotropy on the orientation selection and the interface stability is well established, there is a gap in the literature regarding its influence on the final phase fractions, arm spacing, and microsegregation. Furthermore, the combined effects of the CM interfacial anisotropy and alloying element content on growth dynamic are not well-understood. In this work, we performed an atomistic-informed phase-field study to investigate the microstructure evolution during solidification of Al-Cu binary alloys under different solidification conditions. First, MD simulations are performed to reveal the relationship between CM interfacial energy properties and Cu content. Subsequently, a multi-phase field model is utilized to explore how Cu concentration gradient ahead of growing dendrite (G_c) and CM interfacial anisotropy collaborate to generate different solidification patterns and consequently different solidification features, such as dendrite arm spacings, and θ -phase fraction and distribution. The simulation results are validated by comparison to experimental measurements and analytical solutions in a wide range of cooling rates from 1 to 1250 K/s.

2. Computational Models and Simulation Procedures

We use multi-phase field modeling to study microstructure evolution and pattern formation during solidification of different compositions of Al-Cu binary system. MD simulations were completed to determine the CM interface energy and its anisotropy for different compositions.

2.1. Molecular dynamic simulations

In CFM [27], the interface stiffness is obtained based on the interface's fluctuation amplitude, cross-section, and target temperature. Fig. 1(a) demonstrates a snapshot of the simulation system. The simulation system contains the coexistence of solid-and liquid, where the central part is in the liquid phase, and the CM interface normal is considered parallel to the z-direction. The interface is quasi-two dimensional (2D), where the interface width along y-direction, b , is much shorter than its length along x-direction, W . The simulation size along z-

direction is considered very large to avoid any interactions between the interfaces. The position of atoms located at the CM interface, as presented by orange color in Fig. 1(b), is used to determine the position of interface, $p(x)$, for each time frame. The deviation of the interface position from its mean value, $\langle p \rangle$, can be written as a summation of Fourier Modes, $p(x) - \langle p \rangle = \sum_k A(k) e^{ikx}$. Based on the equipartition of energy and considering the Fourier modes as the degrees of freedom, Equation (1) relates the interface stiffness to the amplitudes and modes of Fourier transform.

$$\gamma + d^2 \gamma / d \theta^2 = \frac{k_B T}{bW \langle |A(k)|^2 \rangle k^2}, \quad (1)$$

where k_B is Boltzmann constant, T is the temperature, $\langle |A(k)|^2 \rangle$ is the mean squared amplitude of the Fourier modes, and k is the mode wave number. γ is the CM interface free energy and $\gamma + d^2 \gamma / d \theta^2$ is the interface stiffness, where θ is the angle between instantaneous local interface normal and the average orientation of interface. Interface free energy is an anisotropic property, and one can calculate the anisotropy term by considering different crystallographic orientations for the CM interface in the CFM. The spherical harmonic expansion of interface energy, which depends on interface normal orientation ($\hat{n}$), is represented:

$$\gamma(\hat{n}) = \gamma_0 \left[1 + \delta_1 \left(4 \sum_{i=1}^3 n_i^4 - 3 \right) + \delta_2 \left(\sum_{i=1}^3 n_i^6 + 30 n_1^2 n_2^2 n_3^2 \right) \right], \quad (2)$$

where n_i ($i = 1, 2, 3$) are the components of normal to the interface vector, $\hat{n}$ in x and y and z-directions, γ_0 is the mean CM interface free energy, and δ_1 and δ_2 are the anisotropy parameters, [46]. γ_0 , δ_1 , and δ_2 can be estimated by fitting the stiffness calculated from MD simulations to the analytical stiffness expression calculated from Equation (2). Details on obtaining the analytical stiffness expressions for each orientation can be found in our previous works [30-33, 35, 36].




Fig. 1. (a) Snapshot of MD simulation system demonstrating the two-phase coexistence slab. The red and blue colors represent the solid and liquid phases, respectively. The atoms located at the interface are colored as orange. (b) Order parameters, ψ and β , as a function of z . They are used to identify the solid and liquid phases.

All the MD simulations are performed using LAMMPS (Large-scale Atomic/Molecular Massively Parallel Simulator) [47], and the Al-Cu interatomic potential used in this study is developed by Avik and Asle Zaeem [48], which is based on the second nearest neighbor modified embedded atomic method (2NN-MEAM). This potential is specifically developed to reproduce the high temperature thermophysical and transport properties of the binary Al-Cu system. It should be mentioned that we have recently performed in depth nanoscale solidification study of metals and performed uncertainty calculations to show the accuracy of MD simulations with 2NN-MEAM potentials [49, 50].

Since fluctuations of CM interface must be performed on the fully equilibrated coexistence of CM, the equilibrium CM phase boundary compositions for different temperatures are required. Thus, the first step is performing MD simulations to calculate the phase diagram. The details of phase-diagram calculations are explained in our previous work [35]. We calculate the phase diagram for temperatures ranging between 925 K (melting point of pure Al) and 860 K.

For [100]-oriented CM interface, first the interface energy is calculated by MD simulations using $50 \times 4 \times 80$ face-centered cubic (fcc) unit cells (6400 atoms) of pure Al with [001] orientation along the z-direction. The simulation systems with [110] and [111] interface orientations have similar dimensions and number of atoms. First, the simulation system is equilibrated under NPT ensemble at the target temperature for 100 ps. Then, the central half of the system is melted by performing an NVT ensemble, at $T=2000$ K, for 40 ps, while keeping the rest of system unchanged. The temperature of the system is reduced to the target temperature, and to determine the interface energy of Al-Cu systems, some of Al atoms in the solid and liquid phases are replaced by Cu alloys such that the final solute concentration in each phase is consistent with the phase diagram. The simulation box sizes in x and y-directions are adjusted to obtain the correct lattice parameter of the solid phase at the target temperature and composition. This lattice parameter is obtained from a separate MD simulation on a system having solute concentration corresponding to the target temperature.

After proper size scaling of the simulation box, the system is equilibrated under a hybrid NPzzT (isothermal-isobaric) MD/MC ensemble. During this process, the box size is only allowed to change in the z-direction, and the equilibration of concentration is performed using MC to randomly attempt swapping 3000 Al and Cu atoms every 5000 steps. The overall equilibration time considered ranges between 1 ns and 2. During this process, the potential energy of the system should approximately stay constant during the last 200 ps of the equilibration time. At the final step, an NPH ensemble (isoenthalpic-isobaric) is performed for 240 ps. During this step, the system configuration is saved every 1 ps for further analysis of the interface fluctuations.

Further analysis of the trajectory files is required to determine the local interface position, $p(x)$. This is performed by introducing an order parameter, β , for each atom, which identifies the solid and liquid phases by comparing the positions of its 12 first neighbors with its perfect crystal, $\vec{r}_{FCC}$ [29].

$$\beta = \frac{1}{12} \sum_i |\vec{r}_i - \vec{r}_{FCC}|^2. \quad (3)$$

This order parameter fluctuates a lot, as presented in Fig. 1(b), which makes the determination of interface position challenging. Thus, a new order parameter, ψ , was introduced by Asadi et al. which uses a smoothing function, w_d , to reduce fluctuations of β [31]:

$$\psi(x, z) = \frac{\sum_i w_d r_i \beta_i}{\sum_i w_d r_i}, \quad (4)$$

where $w_d = [1 - (r_i/d)^2]^2$, $r_i = \sqrt{(x_i - x)^2 + (z_i - z)^2}$. The smoothing is performed over cylinders perpendicular to the y-direction with the radius of d . Fig. 1(b) shows the change of ψ and β along the z-direction. The initial order parameter, β , fluctuates a lot, therefore the smoothed order parameter, ψ , is used, which approximately takes constant values in solid and liquid, and the location of the interface is defined to be where ψ is halfway between those values. By performing Fourier transform on the interface position data and averaging the Fourier amplitude over all the time frames, we use Equation (1) to calculate the interface stiffness.

2.2. Multi-phase field modeling

In this paper, a multicomponent multiphase-field model presented by Eiken et al. [51] is used, which is implemented in the software MICRESS[®] (version 6.4) [52]. Three non-conserved order parameters were assigned for liquid, α -phase (fcc-Al) and Al₂Cu, and one conserved order parameter, c , was assigned for Cu concentration. The phase-field equation governing the interface kinetics is expressed as [53],

$$\dot{\phi}_\alpha = \sum_{\beta \neq \alpha}^v M_{\alpha\beta}^\phi \left[b\Delta G_{\alpha\beta} - \sigma_{\alpha\beta}(K_{\alpha\beta} + A_{\alpha\beta}) + \sum_{\gamma \neq \beta \neq \alpha}^9 J_{\alpha\beta\gamma} \right]. \quad (5)$$

$\dot{\phi}_\alpha$ is the time derivative of order parameter, where, α , β , and γ represent three different phases, and v is the number of grains in the system. The subscripts $\alpha\beta$ and $\alpha\beta\gamma$ represent the interface between grains with α and β phases, and the triple point junction between grains with α , β , and γ phases, respectively. Parameter $M_{\alpha\beta}^\phi$ represents the phase-field mobility of the interface $\alpha\beta$ and is related to the kinetic coefficient in the Gibbs-Thomson equation, $\mu_{\alpha\beta}^G$ (also known as the sharp interface mobility), through Eq. (6) [53].

$$M_{\alpha\beta}^\phi = \frac{\mu_{\alpha\beta}^G}{1 + \frac{\mu_{\alpha\beta}^G \eta \Delta s_{\alpha\beta}}{8} \left\{ \sum_i m_i^l \sum_j [(D_{\alpha}^{ij})^{-1} (1 - k_j) c_{j\alpha}] \right\}}. \quad (6)$$

η is the interface thickness in the phase-field simulations, $\Delta s_{\alpha\beta}$ is the entropy change during α to β phase transformation, m_i^l is the slope of the liquidus line, D_{α}^{ij} is the diffusion matrix in α phase, and k_j is the partition coefficient of solute atom j . For alloys where η is finite, the equation will result in a phase-field mobility that is smaller than the sharp interface mobility.

The first ($b\Delta G_{\alpha\beta}$), second ($\sigma_{\alpha\beta}(K_{\alpha\beta} + A_{\alpha\beta})$), and third ($\sum_{\gamma \neq \beta \neq \alpha}^9 J_{\alpha\beta\gamma}$) terms on the right-hand-side of Equation (5) represent the bulk, interface, and high order junction energy terms, respectively. In the first term, b is the pre-factor and $\Delta G_{\alpha\beta}$ is the molar Gibbs free energy density calculated by Equations (7) and (8), respectively.

$$b = \frac{\pi}{\eta} (\varphi_\alpha + \varphi_\beta) \sqrt{\varphi_\alpha \varphi_\beta}. \quad (7)$$

$$\Delta G_{\alpha\beta} = \frac{1}{v^m} [\mu_\beta^i(\vec{c}_\beta) - \mu_\alpha^i(\vec{c}_\alpha)]. \quad (8)$$

v^m is the molar volume of the phases, $\vec{c}_\alpha$ and $\vec{c}_\beta$ are concentration of solvent in α and β phases, $\mu_\beta^i(\vec{c}_\beta)$ and $\mu_\alpha^i(\vec{c}_\alpha)$ are the chemical potential of component i in α and β phases, which are defined as the increment in the Gibbs free energy of the phases, G_α or G_β , when a very small moles of species i , n^i , is added to these phases, while all other variables of the phase are kept constant.

In the second term of Equation (5), $\sigma_{\alpha\beta}$, $K_{\alpha\beta}$, and $A_{\alpha\beta}$ represent the interfacial energy, pairwise curvature, and anisotropy of the interface $\alpha\beta$, respectively. While $\sigma_{\alpha\beta}$ is a constant value, $K_{\alpha\beta}$ is calculated by

$$K_{\alpha\beta} = \frac{\pi^2}{2\eta^2} (\varphi_\beta - \varphi_\alpha) + \frac{1}{2} (\nabla^2 \varphi_\beta - \nabla^2 \varphi_\alpha). \quad (9)$$

And the anisotropy of the interface for cubic symmetry is given by

$$A_{\alpha\beta} = 1 + \varepsilon_4 \cos(4\varphi). \quad (10)$$

ε_4 is the strength of anisotropy, $\varepsilon_4 \in (0, 1)$, and φ is the azimuthal angle measured from a reference direction.

The high order triple junction term in the third term of Equation (5), $J_{\alpha\beta\gamma}$, is calculated from equation (11) as

$$J_{\alpha\beta\gamma} = \frac{1}{2} (\sigma_{\beta\gamma} - \sigma_{\alpha\gamma}) \left(\frac{\pi^2}{\eta^2} \varphi_\gamma + \nabla^2 \varphi_\gamma \right). \quad (11)$$

Solute diffusion is described by [53]:

$$\dot{c}^i = \nabla \sum_{\alpha=1}^v \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \varphi_\alpha D_\alpha^{ij} \nabla c_\alpha^j. \quad (12)$$

For a system with n species, $c^{i=1, \dots, n-1}$ are the concentrations of the solute species. Diffusion coefficients D_α^{ij} are function of temperature individually for each phase in an Arrhenius approach. Simulations are executed on 2D domains of $200 \mu\text{m} \times 200 \mu\text{m}$ and $600 \mu\text{m} \times 1000 \mu\text{m}$ with grid spacing of $\Delta x = \Delta y = 0.2 \mu\text{m}$. Furthermore, a 3D simulation was performed with $150 \mu\text{m} \times 150 \mu\text{m} \times 150 \mu\text{m}$ domain size and the same grid spacing as in 2D to show there is not a noticeable difference between 2D and 3D results. The simulations started from 100% liquid phase at liquidus temperatures. The liquidus temperatures for Al-Cu alloys with 3, 6, 8.4 and 10.6 at% Cu were obtained from Thermo-Calc simulations, and they are 915.35K, 897.8K, 883.13K, and 869.3 K, respectively. Heat is extracted from the bottom boundary to an external medium with a fixed temperature of 298K and different heat transfer coefficients (h) of 0.5, 2, and 4 W/cm²K. We used an embedded model for heterogeneous nucleation that creates randomly oriented initial seeds of the solid phase α at the bottom boundary (with $1 \mu\text{m}$ thickness) whenever the local undercooling exceeded the required critical value (1 K for all simulations), while further nucleation is prohibited. Al₂Cu nucleation takes place at the interfaces of α /liquid with the same undercooling criterion [54]. The interaction between Al₂Cu with liquid and alpha phases was considered to be isotropic. The interfacial energies of Al₂Cu/liquid and Al₂Cu/alpha were set to 9.2×10^{-6} [55] and 3.7×10^{-5} [56], respectively.

The set of multi-phase-field equations are solved using finite-difference method to simulate the growth of the phases [57]. Solute redistribution is evaluated at all phase interfaces under the constraint of equal diffusion potentials [51]. Diffusion of Cu is solved in the liquid and α -phase under consideration of a numerical anti-trapping current within the diffuse interface regions [58]. Temperature is evaluated in the direction of heat flow (1-D temperature field). The conductivities of liquid and α -phase are set to 1.5 and 1.9 W/cm.K, respectively [59-61]. All thermodynamic materials properties such as driving forces, local undercooling, interface concentrations, heat capacity, enthalpy, and latent heat as well as the diffusion kinetics required for the phase-field simulation are calculated using Thermo-Calc and are passed to MICRESS through the TQ-interface (Thermodynamic Calculation Interface). The thermodynamic and mobility databases used for the current study are TCAL7 (Thermo-Calc database for Al-based alloy, version 7) and MOBAL5 (Al-based alloy mobility database, version 5).

Boundary conditions for phase-field order parameters and concentration are periodic at the left and right boundaries of the 2D domain, and the Neumann boundary condition (no-flux) is applied at the top and bottom boundaries. Boundary conditions for temperature are as follows: fixed at the bottom and the Neumann boundary condition (no-flux) at the top, left, and right boundaries.

3. Results and Discussion

Al-Cu alloys with 3, 6, 8.4, and 10.6 at% Cu are studied in this work. Solidification takes place by removing the heat from the bottom surface of the 2D domains under different heat transfer coefficients of 0.5, 2, and 4 W/cm²K. First, the effect of Cu content on CM interfacial energy and its anisotropy is investigated through MD simulations. Then, multi-phase modeling is used to study microstructure evolution and solidification pattern formation in the aforementioned Al-Cu alloys.

3.1. Crystal-melt interfacial free energy and related anisotropy calculations

The first step for calculating CM interfacial free energy is obtaining the equilibrium crystal-melt phase boundary compositions for different temperatures. Interface energy calculations are performed on systems with Cu compositions ranging between 3 and 11 at%; the corresponding portion of the Al-Cu phase diagram, calculated by MD simulations and Thermo-Calc, is presented in Fig. 2.




Fig. 2. Cu-rich composition-temperature phase diagram for Al-Cu alloy calculated by MD simulations and Thermo-Calc. The symbols L and S denote the liquid and solid phases, respectively.

MD simulations are performed considering different orientations for the interface normal and interface width, given by $[\]$ and $\langle \ \rangle$, respectively. Table 1 summarizes the details of the investigated orientations and the corresponding interface energy and stiffness expressions using Equation (2). For the interface planes with three-fold or higher symmetry, the stiffness value does not depend on the orientations in which the interface is curved [62]. $[110]$ oriented interface is an example that includes a two-fold symmetry. Thus, as demonstrated in Table 1, considering two different orientations ($\langle 001 \rangle$ and $\langle 00\bar{1} \rangle$) in the x-direction alters both the stiffness expression and its value. For the $[110]$ CM interface, we performed two separate simulations, and one can distinguish the difference in their stiffness expressions presented in Table 1.

For each orientation, the interface stiffness is estimated by the slope of line fitting $k_B T / (bW \langle |A(k)|^2 \rangle)$ versus k^2 . The stiffness values calculated by MD simulations are fitted to the stiffness expressions using Equation (2) to calculate the average CM interface free energy and the anisotropy parameters. Fig. 3 shows the variation of $k_B T / bW \langle |A(k)|^2 \rangle$ versus k^2 for the CM interface energy of the Al-Cu binary system at $T = 888$ K with the solidus and liquidus Cu compositions equal to 1.16 and 6 at%.

Table 1. The expressions of interface free energy, γ , and stiffness, $\gamma + d^2 \gamma / d \theta^2$, for various interface orientations, as given by Equation (2).

orientation	γ	$\gamma + d^2 \gamma / d \theta^2$
$\langle 100 \rangle [001]$	$\gamma_0 [1 + \delta_1 + \delta_2]$	$\gamma_0 [1 - 15 \delta_1 - 5 \delta_2]$
$\langle 001 \rangle [110]$	$\gamma_0 [1 - \delta_1 + 0.25 \delta_2]$	$\gamma_0 [1 - 9 \delta_1 + 13.75 \delta_2]$
$\langle 1\bar{1}0 \rangle [110]$	$\gamma_0 [1 - \delta_1 + 0.25 \delta_2]$	$\gamma_0 [1 + 15 \delta_1 + 6.25 \delta_2]$
$\langle 1\bar{1}0 \rangle [111]$	$\gamma_0 [1 - 1.67 \delta_1 + 1.22 \delta_2]$	$\gamma_0 [1 + 9 \delta_1 - 9.45 \delta_2]$




Fig. 3. The variation of $k_B T / (bW(|A(k)|^2))$ versus k^2 for different orientations as obtained by MD simulations of Al-Cu binary system at $T=888$ K with solidus and liquidus Cu compositions equal to 1.16 and 6 at.%. The dotted lines are linear fits to symbols with the same color.

It should be mentioned that Equation (1) fails for small wavelengths, and a logarithmic behavior is expected for large values of k [38]. Thus, in the fitting process and stiffness calculations, only the portion of the MD results related to the linear section is used in the analysis. The fitting process results in $\gamma_0=96.11 \pm 7.4$ mJ/m², $\delta_1=0.014$, and $\delta_2=-0.0042$. Considering $\delta_1 > 0$ and a small value for δ_2 , Equation (2) produces either [100] and [110] dendrites. Larger δ_1 results in the growth of [100]-oriented dendrites, but when $\delta_2 < 0$, [110] dendrites can also grow [41].

A similar process is repeated for all the other binary systems. The interface energy and anisotropy parameters are summarized in Table 2. where ε_4 is the anisotropy parameter in 2D, and φ is the azimuthal angle. Using trigonometric relations, ε_4 is calculated as a function of 3D anisotropy parameters (δ_1 and δ_2) and presented in Table 2. The details of calculating ε_4 is presented in Appendix 1.

Table Each binary system is presented by a temperature and the corresponding equilibrium liquidus and solidus concentrations. The results do not reveal a trend line for the anisotropy changes, but the mean CM interface free energy decreases by a decrease of temperature (an increase of solute concentration). In 2D, the interfacial energy is:

$$\gamma = \gamma_0 (1 + \varepsilon_4 (\cos 4\varphi)), \quad (13)$$

where ε_4 is the anisotropy parameter in 2D, and φ is the azimuthal angle. Using trigonometric relations, ε_4 is calculated as a function of 3D anisotropy parameters (δ_1 and δ_2) and presented in Table 2. The details of calculating ε_4 is presented in Appendix 1.

Table 2. The average interface free energy, γ_0 (mJ/m²), anisotropy parameters, δ_1 and δ_2 , defined in Eq. (2), and ε_4 , defined in Eq. (13), for four Al-Cu binary systems. Each binary system is identified by the solidus, C_s , and liquidus, C_L , compositions at temperature T , which are obtained from the phase diagram, Fig. 2.

				γ_0	δ_1	δ_2	ε_4
Case I:	$T=905$ K	$C_s=0.96$ at%	$C_L=3.05$ at%	110 ± 4.9	0.0045	-0.0026	0.0035
Case II:	$T=888$ K	$C_s=1.16$ at%	$C_L=6.0$ at%	96.11 ± 7.4	0.014	-0.0042	0.0124
Case III:	$T=874$ K	$C_s=1.93$ at%	$C_L=8.2$ at%	92.24 ± 7.3	0.008	-0.0044	0.0050
Case IV:	$T=860$ K	$C_s=2.2$ at%	$C_L=10.6$ at%	89.8 ± 6.9	0.01	-0.0079	0.0071

3.2. Grid convergence Study

Grid convergence study was conducted for directional solidification of Al-3 at% Cu with different heat transfer coefficients (h), to demonstrate that the solution is independent of the discretization at different growth rates. Grid spacing is not the only numerical parameter that influences simulation results, and proper interface mobility (IM) values need to be determined to guarantee diffusion-controlled growth without kinetically slowing down the interface [63]. In order to determine appropriate grid size and IM, simulations should be run with different IM values for a constant grid size, and phase fraction versus time should be plotted for quantitative grid resolution study [52]. By increasing IM value two behaviors can be observed: (1) If grid size is large, by increasing IM, the growth rate increases until numerical instability takes place, or (2) If grid spacing is fine enough, by increasing IM, the growth rate will reach a constant value and remains constant even for higher IM values. In this study, heat transfer coefficients were set to $h=0.5$, $h=2$, and $h=4$ W/cm²K, and for each heat transfer coefficient a grid resolution study was conducted where domain size was 100 μm by 120 μm . Fig. 4(a)-(c) show α -phase fraction as a function of time for grid size of 200, 100, and 50 nm at different IM values for $h=0.5$ W/cm²K. In this figure for all grid sizes, the growth rate of α -phase increases by increasing IM. While for grid

spacing of 200 nm, numerical instability takes place at IM of $0.8 \text{ cm}^4/\text{Js}$ and no instability was observed in the case of grid sizes of 100 and 50 nm. The solidification microstructure for different grid size at IM of $0.8 \text{ cm}^4/\text{Js}$ are shown in Fig. 4(d)-(f). These results prove that by choosing a grid size of 100 nm and an IM value of $0.4 \text{ cm}^4/\text{Js}$ when heat transfer coefficient is $h=0.5 \text{ W}/\text{cm}^2\text{K}$, the solution is independent of grid size. Furthermore, the minimal interface curvature radius (minimum tip radius) at $h=0.5 \text{ W}/\text{cm}^2\text{K}$ is 600 nm which is much higher than the selected grid size.

The same procedure was followed to perform grid convergence studies for heat transfer coefficients of 2 and $4 \text{ W}/\text{cm}^2\text{K}$. The results demonstrated that the results are independent of grid size for both heat transfer coefficients when the grid size and IM value are 50 nm and $0.4 \text{ cm}^4/\text{Js}$, respectively. The minimal radius of curvature of interface at $h=2$ and $h=4 \text{ W}/\text{cm}^2\text{K}$ is 350 and 300 nm, respectively, which is much higher than the selected grid size.




Fig. 4. Grid convergence data (a-c) α -Phase fraction as a function of time for different grid size and IM values at heat transfer coefficient of $h=0.5 \text{ W}/\text{cm}^2\text{K}$, (d-f) Related microstructure at IM of $0.8 \text{ cm}^4/\text{Js}$ and different grid size, (d) 200 nm, (e) 100 nm, and (f) 50 nm. Numerical instability takes place when grid size is 200 nm while no instability was observed when grid size is set to 100 and 50 nm, even for very high IM values.

3.3. Comparison of predicted primary dendrite arm spacing to experiments

Simulation results of the primary dendrite arm spacing (λ_1) of Al-3 at% Cu (Al-6.9 wt% Cu) are validated by experimental measurements [64-70] and analytical solutions [71, 72]. We performed 2D phase-field simulations of solidification for cooling rates ranging between 3.2 and $165^\circ\text{C}/\text{s}$. Also, a 3D phase-field simulation is completed to show there is only a negligible difference between 2D and 3D simulations in this study. Fig. 5(a)-(f) presents the dendritic microstructure at different cooling rates, and the overall comparison of the phase-field results with the experimental measurements and analytical solutions is summarized in Fig. 5(g). The model predictions are in a

good agreement with the experimental measurements. Also, it is evident that at low cooling rates, long secondary arms are developed in directions that are not necessarily perpendicular to primary arms; while by increasing the cooling rate, secondary arms get shorter and are perpendicular to primary dendrites. This change of secondary arm features with cooling rate has been observed in both experimental [73] and simulation [74] studies. It should be noted that in the case of 3D simulation, the primary dendrite arm spacing was obtained using the Voronoi Warnken–Reed approach with α parameter equals to 1.8 [75]. It can be seen in Fig. 5(f) that 9 dendrites are formed in the domain. The traditional approach for measuring λ_1 , is given by $\lambda_1 = c \sqrt{\frac{A}{n}}$, where n is the number of dendrites, A is the area normal to growth direction, and c is coefficient equals to 1.075 for hexagonal array of points [76] which is the case for 3D simulation. Considering this approach, $\lambda_1 = 53.75$ which is very close to the obtained value from the 2D simulation with the same cooling rate (52 °C/s).




Fig. 5. Predicted microstructure using 2D phase-field simulations at different cooling rates (a) 3.2 °C/s, (b) 7 °C/s, (c) 17 °C/s, (d) 52 °C/s, and (e) 165 °C/s; (f) 3D phase-field simulation at cooling rate of 52 °C/s; orange and green colors show solid and liquid phases, respectively; and (g) Comparison of the experimentally measured primary dendrite arm spacing with phase-field simulation results.

3.4. Microstructures characteristics

We investigate the microstructural features and how they are related to solidification conditions. The microstructures of solidified Al-Cu alloys with different heat transfer coefficients (different h) predicted by phase-field simulations are presented in Fig. 6. In this figure, green, white and red colors represent α -phase, θ -phase, and liquid, respectively. The solidified microstructures are different in many aspects, including primary and secondary arm spacing, phase fractions, and phase distribution. These diverse microstructures stem from different growth dynamics of dendrites during solidification, which is influenced by solute atom redistribution, the anisotropy of CM interface energy, and cooling conditions. We will focus on the solidification pattern formation in the following sub-section (3.5), and here we focus on analyzing the microstructural features.

For all investigated alloys, when the heat transfer coefficient is $0.5 \text{ W/cm}^2\text{K}$, dendrites are tilted against the heat transfer direction (HTD). By increasing h to 2 and $4 \text{ W/cm}^2\text{K}$ they get aligned with HTD. In addition to the change in dendrite growth direction, dendritic morphologies in different alloys show different behavior by increasing h , especially for Al-3 and Al-8.4 at% Cu. Due to low CM interfacial energy anisotropy, a morphology known as seaweed structure forms during solidification with a morphology very sensitive to cooling condition (discussed in section 3.5). On the other hand, in alloys with 6 and 10.6 at% Cu dendritic morphology is dominant in all heat transfer coefficients.




Fig. 6. Microstructures of Al-Cu alloys solidified with different heat transfer coefficients. The temperature of top surface is 397 K for all cases.

In order to gain further insights into the effect of Cu content and cooling condition on the solidification microstructure of Al-Cu alloys, it is necessary to quantitatively show how

microstructure characteristics change with these parameters. Fig. 7(a) and Fig. 7(b) compare simulations and analytical results of primary dendrite arm spacing (λ_1) and secondary dendrite arm spacing (λ_2) at different heat transfer coefficients.

A few analytical models have been proposed for predicting λ_1 [72, 77-79] and all of them have a similar form to the model presented by Dantzig and Rappaz [3]:

$$\lambda_1 = \left(\frac{72\pi^2 \Gamma_{sl} D_l \Delta T_0}{k_e} \right)^{\frac{1}{4}} (v^*)^{-\frac{1}{4}} (G)^{-\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (14)$$

Γ_{sl} is the Gibbs-Thomson coefficient, D_l is diffusion coefficient of solute atom in liquid, and ΔT_0 is freezing range. For the analytical solutions presented in Fig. 7, the material properties are obtained from MD and Thermo-Calc simulations. In addition, the processing conditions, namely the interface velocity (v^*) and the temperature gradient (G), are obtained from phase-field simulation results. The required data and the procedure for calculation of dendrite arm spacings via analytical solutions are represented in appendix 2.

In Fig. 7(a), λ_1 decreases by increasing the heat transfer coefficient and Cu content. These results agree with the experimental measurements [64, 80, 81] and analytical solutions presented in Fig. 7(a). Furthermore, it can be seen from this figure that the effect of Cu content on λ_1 is more pronounced at a lower cooling rate ($h=0.5$ W/cm²K) and decreases with an increase in h . Based on Eq. (14), the parameters affecting λ_1 are divided into two main groups: material properties and processing conditions. Considering the data in Table A.2 (in the Appendix), for $h=0.5$ W/cm²K, the net effect of the processing condition $((v^*)^{-\frac{1}{4}} (G)^{-\frac{1}{2}})$ considerably decreases with Cu content. But for other two h values, the decrease of $(v^*)^{-\frac{1}{4}} (G)^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ with the increase of Cu content is minor. In addition, material properties effect in Eq. 14 show a decreasing behavior by increasing Cu content. Both D_l and ΔT_0 decrease with increasing Cu content [82] and their values are presented in Table A.1 (in the Appendix). Also, for a 2D simulation of a crystal with four-fold symmetry, the Gibbs-Thomson coefficient is given by [83]:

$$\Gamma_{sl} = \frac{\gamma_0(1 - 15\epsilon_4(\cos 4\varphi))}{\rho \Delta S_f}, \quad (15)$$

where ρ is alloy density, and ΔS_f is entropy of fusion. The value of Γ_{sl} for alloys with 3, 6, 8.4, and 10.6 at% Cu are 6.63×10^{-8} , 4.83×10^{-8} , 5.25×10^{-8} , and 5.16×10^{-8} Km, respectively. (presented in the Appendix). Overall, the decrease of D_l and ΔT_0 , and the oscillating change of Γ_{sl} with the increase of Cu lead to decrease of λ_1 with Cu.

The analytical model for calculation of λ_2 was presented by Dantzig and Rappaz [3]:

$$\lambda_2 = 5.5 \left(-\frac{\Gamma_{sl} D_l \ln\left(\frac{C_{eut}}{C_0}\right)}{m_l(1-k_e)(C_{eut}-C_0)} \right)^{\frac{1}{3}} \left(\frac{\Delta T_0}{G v^*} \right)^{\frac{1}{3}}, \quad (16)$$

where C_{eut} is the final composition of liquid just before solidification, and m_l is the local temperature-concentration slope at the liquidus line of the given alloy, which are both extracted from Thermo-Calc simulation.

Fig. 7(b) shows that λ_2 decreases by increasing h and Cu content, but again the rate of change is higher with Cu at $h=0.5$ W/cm²K. In all cases, increasing Cu content decreases λ_2 indicating that finer microstructures are obtained at higher Cu contents, which is in agreement with experimental observations [80] and analytical models [3, 84, 85].




Fig. 7. Effect of heat transfer coefficient content on (a) λ_1 , (b) λ_2 , and (c) θ -phase fraction for different alloys.

Fig. 7(c) shows the effect of heat transfer coefficient on the θ -phase fraction (θ -PF) in the investigated alloys. The results show that by increasing h , the amount of θ -phase for all alloys decreases linearly. This behavior has been observed in experimental work too [80]. In all alloys, θ -phase forms via eutectic reaction but at different undercooling which is imposed by different heat transfer coefficients. Fig. 8 shows the phase fraction change as a function of time for different alloys and heat transfer coefficients. This figure indicates that in equilibrium conditions (obtained from Thermo-Calc) eutectic reaction takes place at 820.75 K. When $h=0.5$ W/cm²K, eutectic reaction takes place at 819.4 K (1.3 undercooling) in all alloys and results in the formation of a eutectic structure. In this condition, the amount of θ -phase is less than equilibrium for all alloys because more α -phase has formed before the nucleation of θ -phase. For example, in the case of Al-6at% Cu, nucleation of θ -phase in equilibrium condition takes place when the amount of liquid

is equal to 23% but at $h=0.5$ W/cm²K the amount of liquid is 21% before θ -phase nucleation. The eutectic structure is shown in Fig. 9 for Al-10.6 at% Cu, where it is obvious that $\theta+\alpha$ phases simultaneously grow within the liquid phase. The eutectic structure is not completely lamellar and consists of both lamellar and wavy structures, which was also observed in experimental studies [86, 87]. The lamellar spacing is 1.2 ± 0.2 μm for all alloys at $h=0.5$ W/cm²K.




Fig. 8. Effect of heat transfer coefficient and Cu content on solidification path of Al-Cu alloys.

By increasing h to 2 W/cm²K, eutectic reaction starts at 813.6 K (7.15 K undercooling). In this situation, a higher amount of α -phase forms before nucleation of θ -phase and less liquid will transform into a $\alpha+\theta$ structure via eutectic reaction (18% liquid in the case of Al-6 at% Cu). Also, due to higher cooling rates, all Cu atoms cannot segregate from the α -phase into interdendritic region and coring takes place [88, 89], and consequently the amount of θ -phase decreases. In this condition, the lamellar spacing is 0.7 ± 0.1 μm for all alloys. By increase h to 4 W/cm²K, θ -phase starts to form at 803 ± 4 K (17-21 K undercooling) through both eutectic reaction and direct solidification from enriched liquid. In this situation, the amount of liquid phase before eutectic reaction has decreased even more (14.5% in the case of Al-6 at% Cu) and coring is more severe, which results in a reduction of θ -phase. It is obvious from last row in Fig. 8 that the θ -phase doesn't form at a constant temperature (eutectic reaction) which implies that eutectic reaction is partly suppressed at this high cooling rate.




Fig. 9. (a) The solidified structure of Al-10.6 at% Cu solidified at $h=0.5$ W/cm²K. (b-e) different snapshots that show sequence of eutectic structure formation via eutectic reaction.

In addition to the variation of θ -phase fraction with Cu content and heat transfer coefficient, its distribution also changes considerably with these parameters. It can be seen in Fig. 6 that at a constant heat transfer coefficient, θ -phase distribution is more homogenous in Al-3 and Al-8.4 at% Cu alloys than Al-6 and Al-10.6 at% Cu. In the latter cases, dendritic morphology is dominant and θ -phase forms in interdendritic regions, while in the former cases, primary α -phase solidifies as a seaweed structure and θ -phase forms between seaweed branches. The underlying reasons for the different structures of α -phase during solidification have been discussed in the next section. In all investigated alloys by increasing heat transfer coefficient, the distribution of phase becomes more homogenous but this homogenization is more noticeable in alloys with 3 and 8.4 at% Cu. In these alloys, tip splitting frequency increases considerably by heat transfer coefficient. As a consequent, the distribution of the θ -phase becomes more homogenous. By comparison of the two left columns in Fig. 6, it is completely obvious that θ -phase distribution is more homogenous in seaweed structures (Al-8.4 at% Cu) than dendritic structures (Al-10.6 at% Cu), and θ -phase distribution is more sensitive to heat transfer coefficient in alloys with seaweed structure.

3.5. Solidification pattern formation

Fig. 10 shows the dendritic morphology of the investigated alloys at different cooling conditions when the α -phase fraction in the simulation system is 30%. It can be seen that at $h=0.5$ W/cm²K different morphologies are formed for different alloys. In the case of alloys with 3 and 8.4 at% Cu, tip splitting occurs during the solidification and results in seaweed structure formation, a common phenomenon during solidification of alloys with weak CM interfacial energy anisotropy [23, 24, 90-98]. While, in alloys with 6 and 10.6 at% Cu, dendritic solidification takes place without any tip splitting. By increasing the heat transfer coefficient to 2 and 4 W/cm²K, the only change in the microstructure of alloys with 6 and 10.6 at% Cu is reduction of dendrite arm spacings, while two other alloys experience significant changes regarding the morphology of

dendrites. CM interfacial energy anisotropy of Al-6 and Al-10.6 at% Cu are equal to 0.0122 and 0.0071, respectively, which are considerably higher than Al-3 at% ($\epsilon_4=0.0035$) and Al-8.4 at% Cu ($\epsilon_4=0.0028$). These results imply that weak interfacial energy anisotropy is the root of sensitivity to cooling conditions, which is in agreement with the results of other studies [20].




Fig. 10. Morphology of solidifying α -phase for investigated alloys at different cooling condition when solid phase fraction is 30%.

Since the anisotropy of CM interfacial energy is high for Al-6 and Al-10.6 at% Cu alloys, dendritic growth is dominant in these alloys at all investigated cooling conditions. On the other hand, in the case of Al-3 and Al-8.4 at% Cu, the anisotropy of interfacial energy is much lower, which results in the formation of different seaweed structures like stabilized [23], degenerate or fractal seaweed (FS) [23, 95], and compact seaweed (CS) [95] at different cooling conditions.

Fig.10 (a-c) show the structures of solidifying Al-3 at% Cu at different cooling conditions. In Fig. 10 (a), the tips of growing dendrites split off center in such a way that the larger tip keeps growing as the other falls behind. This growth mode results in the formation of a structure called stabilized seaweed [23]. By increasing heat transfer coefficient to 2 W/cm²K (Fig. 10 (b)), the tip splits to alternate sides producing tips of comparable size which grow as main branches and the

splitting will keep happening in each one of them. This structure is called degenerate or FS which is formed by alternating tip splitting [23, 91, 95]. The same structure is formed at $h=4$ W/cm²K (Fig.10 (c)) but the tip splitting frequency (f) is much higher. It has been shown that the tip splitting frequency in FS structure is related to growth velocity (V) as a power law $f \propto V^{1.5}$ [23, 91]. In this study, at $h=2$ and 4 W/cm²K, f is 334 and 538 s⁻¹, respectively, and the related growth velocities are 2900 and 6100 $\mu\text{m/s}$.

Fig. 10 (g-i) show structures of solidifying Al-8.4 at% Cu at investigated cooling conditions. At $h=0.5$ W/cm²K (Fig.10 (g)), a mixture of stabilized and FS is observed. By increasing the heat transfer coefficient to 2 W/cm²K (Fig.10 (h)), tip splitting takes place in a nonfractal mode, which results in a structure known as compact seaweed morphology [90, 95, 99] or dense branching [94]. By further increase of heat transfer to 4 W/cm²K, CS forms with higher splitting frequency.

During the solidification, dendrites tend to grow in the direction of maximum CM interfacial energy. On the other hand, thermal noises can lead to the destabilization of interface and formation of seaweed structures [90, 100]. When the strength of CM interfacial energy is high, the interface is stable against thermal noises and dendritic morphology with a parabolic tip is dominant, which is the case for Al-6 and Al-10.6 at% Cu. In the case of Al-3 and Al-8.4 at% Cu, the interfacial energy anisotropy is low, and interface destabilizes due to the thermal noise and consequently tip flattens and widens before splitting (Fig. 11). The details of the tip flattening and splitting mechanisms have been discussed elsewhere [23, 90, 91, 95-97].




Fig. 11. Tip flattening and splitting phenomena during solidification of Al-3 at% Cu at $h=0.5$ W/cm²K.

As it was elucidated, FS is dominant in Al-3 at% Cu and CS is the dominant structure in Al-8.4 at% Cu, while the strength of interfacial energy anisotropy is weak in both. This difference stems from different constitutional supercooling during solidification. Fig. 12 (a) and Fig. 12 (b) show concentration profile and corresponding liquidus line at ahead of growing seaweed for Al-3 and Al-8.4 at% Cu, respectively, for the heat transfer coefficient of 4 W/cm²K. For Al-3 at% Cu, the constitutional supercooling is 5.1K exactly at ahead of growing tip and increases to almost 25 K in 6 μm from it. For Al-8.4 at% Cu supercooling is 9.85 K ahead of growing tip and reaches 68 K in 9 μm . At the limit of diffusion control growth, it has been shown that at a low interfacial

energy anisotropy and a low supercooling, FS is dominant and with increasing supercooling, a transition is observed and CS becomes dominant [90, 99].




Fig. 12. Concentration profile at ahead of growing tip and corresponding constitutional supercooling for (a) Al-3 at% Cu, and (b) Al-8.4 at% Cu.

Based on the patterns obtained from phase-field simulations and considering the aforementioned analysis, we construct a map of strength of anisotropy parameter (ϵ_4) versus constitutional supercooling (Δ) in Fig. 13 that shows solidification morphology formation in Al-Cu alloys. Regardless of Cu content and supercooling, when the anisotropy parameter value is larger than 0.004 dendritic morphology is dominant and seaweed structure is halted. At a lower anisotropy and supercooling less than 8K, fractal seaweed forms during solidification. While at anisotropies less than 0.004 and supercooling higher than 8K, compact seaweed structure is dominant.




Fig.13. Map of morphology formation in Δ - ε_4 plane during solidification of Al-Cu alloys. The dotted lines show the expected trends at higher constitutional supercooling.

4. Conclusions

Solidification of four Al-Cu alloys with 3%, 6%, 8.4%, and 10.6 at% Cu was investigated using atomistic-informed multi-phase field modeling. We investigated the combined effects of cooling condition, alloy composition and interfacial energy anisotropy on θ -phase fraction and its distribution, and growth dynamics and morphology of solidification structures. First, the CM interfacial energies and its anisotropy were determined using molecular dynamic simulations. These values were used in phase-field simulations to quantitatively investigate the interactive effects of Cu content, CM interfacial properties, and cooling condition on growth dynamics and solidification patterns. Specific findings include the following:

- 1- Molecular dynamics simulation results showed that the CM interfacial energy decreases linearly with increasing Cu content while its anisotropy does not show a specific trend.
- 2- Phase-field simulation results showed that with increasing the cooling rate, the dendrite arm spacing and the amount of θ -phase decrease, and this reduction is more pronounced in alloys with higher Cu content. Also, the θ -phase fraction decreases by increasing the heat transfer coefficient. This reduction is due to the higher undercooling needed for eutectic reaction, which results in the formation of higher α -phase, and less liquid transforms into α + θ phase via eutectic reaction. Furthermore, the coring phenomenon is more noticeable at higher cooling rates which results in a reduction in Cu content in the interdendritic regions and a decrease in θ -phase.
- 3- Distribution of θ -phase is more homogenous in alloys with seaweed structures (Al-3 and Al-8.4 at% Cu) than the alloys with dendritic structures. In all investigated alloys, the distribution

of θ -phase becomes more homogenous by increasing the heat transfer coefficient, but it is more sensitive to the value of heat transfer coefficient with seaweed structures.

- 4- Anisotropy of CM interfacial energy has a significant effect on solidification patterns and their growth dynamic. At the limit of diffusion control growth, when the strength of anisotropy is higher than 0.005 dendritic morphology is dominant at all cooling rates. At lower CM interfacial energy anisotropy different seaweed structures can form regarding constitutional supercooling at ahead of growing tip. When supercooling is less than 8K degenerate or fractal seaweed form while at higher supercoolings compact seaweed is dominant microstructure.

Appendix 1

Eq. A1 was used to calculate the anisotropy parameters in 3D:

$$\gamma(\hat{n}) = \gamma_{0(3D)} [1 + \delta_1 (4 \sum_{i=1}^3 n_i^4 - 3) + \delta_2 (\sum_{i=1}^3 n_i^6 + 30n_1^2 n_2^2 n_3^2)]. \quad (A.1)$$

The following 2D equation (Eq. A2) is used for PF simulations:

$$\gamma = \gamma_{0(2D)} (1 + \varepsilon_4 (\cos 4\varphi)). \quad (A.2)$$

Using a series of trigonometric relations, we can calculate ε_4 in 2D as a function of δ_1 and δ_2 . Having $n_1 = \cos \varphi$, $n_2 = \sin \varphi$, and $n_3 = 0$, we can rewrite Eq. A1 as follow:

$$\frac{\gamma(\hat{n})}{\gamma_{0(3D)}} = [1 + 4\delta_1 (\cos^4 \varphi + \sin^4 \varphi - 3/4) + \delta_2 (\cos^6 \varphi + \sin^6 \varphi)]. \quad (A.3)$$

From trigonometric relations we have:

$$\cos^4 \varphi + \sin^4 \varphi = (\cos^2 \varphi + \sin^2 \varphi)^2 - 2\sin^2 \varphi \cos^2 \varphi = 1 - 2\sin^2 \varphi \cos^2 \varphi, \quad (A.4)$$

$$\cos^6 \varphi + \sin^6 \varphi = (\cos^2 \varphi + \sin^2 \varphi)^3 - 3\sin^2 \varphi \cos^2 \varphi = 1 - 3\sin^2 \varphi \cos^2 \varphi, \quad (A.5)$$

$$\sin \varphi \cos \varphi = \frac{1}{2} \sin 2\varphi \Rightarrow \sin^2 \varphi \cos^2 \varphi = \frac{1}{4} \sin^2 2\varphi, \quad (A.6)$$

$$\sin^2 2\varphi = \frac{1 - \cos 4\varphi}{2}. \quad (A.7)$$

By substituting Eq. A.4-A.7 into Eq. A.3 we have:

$$\frac{\gamma(\hat{n})}{\gamma_{0(3D)}} = \left[1 + 4\delta_1 \left(1 - \frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{4} \cos 4\varphi - \frac{3}{4} \right) + \delta_2 \left(\frac{5}{8} + \frac{3}{8} \cos 4\varphi \right) \right]. \quad (A.8)$$

Then:

$$\frac{\gamma(\hat{n})}{\gamma_{0(3D)}} = 1 + \frac{5}{8} \delta_2 + \left(\delta_1 + \frac{3}{8} \delta_2 \right) \cos 4\varphi. \quad (A.9)$$

We define $X = 1 + \frac{5}{8} \delta_2$ and $Y = \delta_1 + \frac{3}{8} \delta_2$ and divide all terms by X . then we have:

$$\frac{\gamma(\hat{n})}{\gamma_{0(3D)} X} = 1 + \frac{Y}{X} \cos 4\varphi. \quad (A.10)$$

Comparing Eq. A.2 and A.10 we have $\varepsilon_4 = \frac{Y}{X}$ and $\gamma_{0(2D)} = \gamma_{0(3D)}X$. Since $X \sim 1$ for all alloys, $\gamma_{0(2D)} = \gamma_{0(3D)}$.

Appendix 2

The analytical solutions for λ_1 and λ_2 (Equation 13 and 14) include material properties which are obtained from MD simulations and Thermo-Calc databases. The first parameter is Gibbs-Thomson coefficient which is calculated using Eq. A.11.

$$\Gamma_{sl} = \frac{\gamma_{sl} + \gamma_{sl}''}{\rho \Delta s_f} \quad (\text{A.11})$$

where γ_{sl} and γ_{sl}'' are CM interfacial energy and its second derivative, respectively. ρ is density and Δs_f is the entropy of fusion. Almost all the dendrites of investigated Al-Cu alloys have $\langle 100 \rangle [001]$ orientation. So, based on Table 1 we can use Eq. A.12 to calculate numerator of Eq. A.11.

$$\gamma_{sl} + \gamma_{sl}'' = \gamma_0(1 - 15\delta_1 - 5\delta_2) \quad (\text{A.12})$$

Entropy of fusion, Δs_f , is extracted from Thermo-Calc simulations and $\rho = \frac{wt\%_{Al} + wt\%_{Cu}}{V}$ where $wt\%_{Al}$ and $wt\%_{Cu}$ are weight percent of Al and Cu, respectively. V is the volume of 1 kg alloy and is calculated as: $V = \left(\frac{wt\%_{Al}}{\rho_{Al}} \right) + \left(\frac{wt\%_{Cu}}{\rho_{Cu}} \right)$. ρ_{Al} and ρ_{Cu} are equal to 2710 kg/m³ and 8950 kg/m³, respectively.

Interdiffusion coefficient of Cu atoms at the liquidus temperatures ($\tilde{D}_{CuCu}^{Al}$), freezing range (ΔT_0), slope of liquidus line (m_l), and final composition of liquid before freezing (c_{eut}) are extracted from Thermo-Calc. All these parameters are presented in Table A.1.

Table A.1- Material properties of investigated alloys.

$c_0(\text{at}\%)$	$c_0(\text{wt}\%)$	$c_{eut}(\text{wt}\%)$	$\Delta T_0(K)$	$m_l(K/\text{wt}\%)$	$\tilde{D}_{CuCu}^{Al}(\text{m}^2/\text{s})$	$\Delta s_f(\text{J/K.kg})$	$\rho(\text{kg/m}^3)$	$\gamma_{sl} + \gamma_{sl}''(\text{J/m}^2)$	$\Gamma_{sl}(\text{K.m})$
3	6.9	33.49	99	-3.07	5.12E-09	551	2847	0.104	6.63E-08
6	13	33.49	77	-2.93	5.05E-09	541.73	2980	0.0779	4.83E-08
8.4	17.76	33.49	63	-2.91	4.9E-09	512.29	3092	0.0832	5.25E-08
10.6	21.83	33.49	50	-2.89	4.88E-09	484.11	3196	0.0799	5.16E-08

Interface velocity (v^*) and temperature gradient (G) were extracted from phase-field simulations at steady state condition and are presented in Table A.2. Also, in this study the equilibrium partition coefficient, $k_e = 0.185$, is used.

Table A.2- Process dependent parameters of investigated alloys at different heat transfer coefficients.

Cu (at%)	h (W/cm ² .K)	v^* (m/s)	$G \times 10^3$ (K/m)	λ_1 (μ m)	λ_2 (μ m)
3	0.5	0.0024	19.9	107.5	13.7
	2	0.0029	73.5	53.6	8.5
	4	0.0061	16.5	29.7	5
6	0.5	0.0027	21.6	86.9	9.83
	2	0.0038	74.2	43	5.9
	4	0.0072	17.3	24	3.7
8.4	0.5	0.0027	25.2	76.5	8.6
	2	0.0035	75.05	41.6	5.4
	4	0.0068	17.3	23.2	3.3
10.6	0.5	0.0027	29.3	66.5	7.3
	2	0.0037	79.6	37.3	4.7
	4	0.0069	175	21.5	2.93

Acknowledgment

This study was supported by the National Science Foundation, NSF-CMMI 2031800, and by NASA, 80NSSC19K0569. We are grateful for supercomputing time allocation provided by the Extreme Science and Engineering Discovery Environment (XSEDE), award number TG-DMR140008.

CRedit Author Statement

Ghavam Azizi: Conceptualization, Methodology, Software, Formal analysis, Writing- Original draft preparation. **Sepideh Kavousi:** Conceptualization, Methodology, Formal analysis, Writing- Reviewing and Editing. **Mohsen Asle Zaeem:** Supervision, Conceptualization, Methodology, Formal analysis, Writing- Reviewing and Editing, Funding Acquisition.

Data availability

All necessary data generated or analyzed during this study are included in this published article, and other auxiliary data are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

Declaration of Competing Interest

The authors declare no competing interests.

References:

- [1] L. Wang, J.J. Hoyt, N. Wang, N. Provatas, C.W. Sinclair, Controlling solid-liquid interfacial energy anisotropy through the isotropic liquid, *Nature communications* 11(1) (2020) 1-7.
- [2] S.H. Davis, *Theory of solidification*, Cambridge University Press 2001.
- [3] J.A. Dantzig, M. Rappaz, *Solidification: -Revised & Expanded*, EPFL press, New York, 2016.
- [4] M.E. Glicksman, *Principles of solidification: an introduction to modern casting and crystal growth concepts*, Springer Science & Business Media 2010.
- [5] J. Yang, W. Hu, Nucleation and solid-liquid interfacial energy of Li nanoparticles: a molecular dynamics study, *physica status solidi (b)* 253(10) (2016) 1941-1946.
- [6] Y. Shibuta, S. Sakane, E. Miyoshi, S. Okita, T. Takaki, M. Ohno, Heterogeneity in homogeneous nucleation from billion-atom molecular dynamics simulation of solidification of pure metal, *Nature communications* 8(1) (2017) 1-9.
- [7] M. Rappaz, J. Friedli, A. Mariaux, M. Salgado-Ordorica, The influence of solid-liquid interfacial energy anisotropy on equilibrium shapes, nucleation, triple lines and growth morphologies, *Scripta Materialia* 62(12) (2010) 904-909.
- [8] W.J. Boettinger, S.R. Coriell, A. Greer, A. Karma, W. Kurz, M. Rappaz, R. Trivedi, Solidification microstructures: recent developments, future directions, *Acta materialia* 48(1) (2000) 43-70.
- [9] J.S. Langer, Instabilities and pattern formation in crystal growth, *Reviews of modern physics* 52(1) (1980) 1.
- [10] J. Hoyt, M. Asta, T. Haxhimali, A. Karma, R. Napolitano, R. Trivedi, B.B. Laird, J.R. Morris, Crystal-melt interfaces and solidification morphologies in metals and alloys, *MRS bulletin* 29(12) (2004) 935-939.
- [11] T. Haxhimali, A. Karma, F. Gonzales, M. Rappaz, Orientation selection in dendritic evolution, *Nature materials* 5(8) (2006) 660-664.
- [12] S. Coriell, R. Sekerka, The effect of the anisotropy of surface tension and interface kinetics on morphological stability, *Journal of crystal growth* 34(2) (1976) 157-163.
- [13] P. Koczyski, W.-J. Rappel, A. Karma, Critical role of crystalline anisotropy in the stability of cellular array structures in directional solidification, *Physical review letters* 77(16) (1996) 3387.
- [14] A.A. Golovin, S.H. Davis, Effect of anisotropy on morphological instability in the freezing of a hypercooled melt, *Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena* 116(3-4) (1998) 363-391.
- [15] R. Trivedi, Effects of anisotropy properties on interface pattern formation, (1990).
- [16] W.W. Mullins, R. Sekerka, Stability of a planar interface during solidification of a dilute binary alloy, *Journal of applied physics* 35(2) (1964) 444-451.
- [17] G. Young, S. Davis, K. Brattkus, Anisotropic interface kinetics and tilted cells in unidirectional solidification, *Journal of crystal growth* 83(4) (1987) 560-571.
- [18] H. Xing, L. Zhang, K. Song, H. Chen, K. Jin, Effect of interface anisotropy on growth direction of tilted dendritic arrays in directional solidification of alloys: insights from phase-field simulations, *International Journal of Heat and Mass Transfer* 104 (2017) 607-614.
- [19] F. Yu, Y. Wei, Effect of surface tension anisotropy and welding parameters on initial instability dynamics during solidification: a phase-field study, *Metallurgical and Materials Transactions A* 49(8) (2018) 3293-3305.
- [20] M. Amooezaei, S. Gurevich, N. Provatas, Orientation selection in solidification patterning, *Acta Materialia* 60(2) (2012) 657-663.
- [21] H. Xing, X. Dong, H. Wu, G. Hao, J. Wang, C. Chen, K. Jin, Degenerate seaweed to tilted dendrite transition and their growth dynamics in directional solidification of non-axially oriented crystals: a phase-field study, *Scientific reports* 6 (2016) 26625.
- [22] H. Xing, M. Ji, X. Dong, Y. Wang, L. Zhang, S. Li, Growth competition between columnar dendrite and degenerate seaweed during directional solidification of alloys: Insights from multi-phase field simulations, *Materials & Design* 185 (2020) 108250.

- [23] B. Utter, E. Bodenschatz, Dynamics of low anisotropy morphologies in directional solidification, *Physical Review E* 66(5) (2002) 051604.
- [24] Y. Chen, B. Billia, D.Z. Li, H. Nguyen-Thi, N.M. Xiao, A.-A. Bogno, Tip-splitting instability and transition to seaweed growth during alloy solidification in anisotropically preferred growth direction, *Acta materialia* 66 (2014) 219-231.
- [25] G.W. Lee, S. Jeon, C. Park, D.-H. Kang, Crystal–liquid interfacial free energy and thermophysical properties of pure liquid Ti using electrostatic levitation: Hypercooling limit, specific heat, total hemispherical emissivity, density, and interfacial free energy, *The Journal of Chemical Thermodynamics* 63 (2013) 1-6.
- [26] J.Q. Broughton, G.H. Gilmer, Molecular dynamics of the crystal–fluid interface. v. structure and dynamics of crystal–melt systems, *The Journal of chemical physics* 84(10) (1986) 5749-5758.
- [27] J. Hoyt, M. Asta, A. Karma, Method for computing the anisotropy of the solid-liquid interfacial free energy, *Physical review letters* 86(24) (2001) 5530.
- [28] J. Hoyt, M. Asta, Atomistic computation of liquid diffusivity, solid-liquid interfacial free energy, and kinetic coefficient in Au and Ag, *Physical Review B* 65(21) (2002) 214106.
- [29] D. Sun, M. Asta, J. Hoyt, Kinetic coefficient of Ni solid-liquid interfaces from molecular-dynamics simulations, *Physical Review B* 69(2) (2004) 024108.
- [30] E. Asadi, M. Asle Zaeem, The anisotropy of hexagonal close-packed and liquid interface free energy using molecular dynamics simulations based on modified embedded-atom method, *Acta Materialia* 107 (2016) 337-344.
- [31] E. Asadi, M. Asle Zaeem, S. Nouranian, M.I. Baskes, Quantitative modeling of the equilibration of two-phase solid-liquid Fe by atomistic simulations on diffusive time scales, *Physical Review B* 91(2) (2015) 024105.
- [32] E. Asadi, M. Asle Zaeem, S. Nouranian, M.I. Baskes, Two-phase solid–liquid coexistence of Ni, Cu, and Al by molecular dynamics simulations using the modified embedded-atom method, *Acta Materialia* 86 (2015) 169-181.
- [33] S. Kavousi, B.R. Novak, M. Asle Zaeem, D. Moldovan, Combined molecular dynamics and phase field simulation investigations of crystal-melt interfacial properties and dendritic solidification of highly undercooled titanium, *Computational Materials Science* 163 (2019) 218-229.
- [34] R. Ramakrishnan, R. Sankarasubramanian, Crystal-melt kinetic coefficients of Ni₃Al, *Acta Materialia* 127 (2017) 25-32.
- [35] S. Kavousi, B.R. Novak, M.I. Baskes, M. Asle Zaeem, D. Moldovan, Modified embedded-atom method potential for high-temperature crystal-melt properties of Ti–Ni alloys and its application to phase field simulation of solidification, *Modelling and Simulation in Materials Science and Engineering* 28(1) (2019) 015006.
- [36] A. Mahata, T. Mukhopadhyay, M. Asle Zaeem, Modified embedded-atom method interatomic potentials for Al–Cu, Al–Fe and Al–Ni binary alloys: From room temperature to melting point, *Computational Materials Science* 201 (2022) 110902.
- [37] C. Becker, D. Olmsted, M. Asta, J. Hoyt, S. Foiles, Atomistic underpinnings for orientation selection in alloy dendritic growth, *Physical review letters* 98(12) (2007) 125701.
- [38] M. Asta, J. Hoyt, A. Karma, Calculation of alloy solid-liquid interfacial free energies from atomic-scale simulations, *Physical Review B* 66(10) (2002) 100101.
- [39] A. Potter, J. Hoyt, A molecular dynamics simulation study of the crystal–melt interfacial free energy and its anisotropy in the Cu–Ag–Au ternary system, *Journal of crystal growth* 327(1) (2011) 227-232.
- [40] J. Friedli, J. Fife, P. Di Napoli, M. Rappaz, Dendritic growth morphologies in Al–Zn alloys—Part I: X-ray tomographic microscopy, *Metallurgical and Materials Transactions A* 44(12) (2013) 5522-5531.
- [41] J. Dantzig, P. Di Napoli, J. Friedli, M. Rappaz, Dendritic growth morphologies in Al–Zn alloys—Part II: phase-field computations, *Metallurgical and Materials Transactions A* 44(12) (2013) 5532-5543.

- [42] F. Gonzales, M. Rappaz, Dendrite growth directions in aluminum-zinc alloys, *Metallurgical and Materials Transactions A* 37(9) (2006) 2797-2806.
- [43] J. Hoyt, S. Raman, N. Ma, M. Asta, Unusual temperature dependence of the solid-liquid interfacial free energy in the Cu-Zr system, *Computational Materials Science* 154 (2018) 303-308.
- [44] C. Qi, B. Xu, L. Kong, J. Li, Solid-liquid interfacial free energy and its anisotropy in the Cu-Ni binary system investigated by molecular dynamics simulations, *Journal of Alloys and Compounds* 708 (2017) 1073-1080.
- [45] G. Kaptay, On the solid/liquid interfacial energies of metals and alloys, *Journal of Materials Science* 53(5) (2018) 3767-3784.
- [46] J. Rahman, Atomistic Simulations for computing solid liquid interface properties of the Al-Mg system, 2009.
- [47] S. Plimpton, Fast parallel algorithms for short-range molecular dynamics, *Journal of computational physics* 117(1) (1995) 1-19.
- [48] A. Mahata, M.A. Zaeem, Effects of solidification defects on nanoscale mechanical properties of rapid directionally solidified Al-Cu Alloy: A large scale molecular dynamics study, *Journal of Crystal Growth* 527 (2019) 125255.
- [49] A. Mahata, M. Asle Zaeem, M.I. Baskes, Understanding homogeneous nucleation in solidification of aluminum by molecular dynamics simulations, *Modelling and Simulation in Materials Science and Engineering* 26(2) (2018) 025007.
- [50] A. Mahata, M. Asle Zaeem, Size effect in molecular dynamics simulation of nucleation process during solidification of pure metals: investigating modified embedded atom method interatomic potentials, *Modelling and Simulation in Materials Science and Engineering* 27(8) (2019) 085015.
- [51] J. Eiken, B. Böttger, I. Steinbach, Multiphase-field approach for multicomponent alloys with extrapolation scheme for numerical application, *Physical review E* 73(6) (2006) 066122.
- [52] E. Asadi, M.A. Zaeem, S. Nouranian, M.I. Baskes, Quantitative modeling of the equilibration of two-phase solid-liquid Fe by atomistic simulations on diffusive time scales, *Physical Review B* 91(2) (2015) 024105.
- [53] J. Eiken, Phase-field simulation of microstructure formation in technical magnesium alloys, *International journal of materials research* 101(4) (2010) 503-509.
- [54] B. Böttger, J. Eiken, I. Steinbach, Phase field simulation of equiaxed solidification in technical alloys, *Acta materialia* 54(10) (2006) 2697-2704.
- [55] M. Gündüz, J. Hunt, The measurement of solid-liquid surface energies in the Al-Cu, Al-Si and Pb-Sn systems, *Acta Metallurgica* 33(9) (1985) 1651-1672.
- [56] V. Kokotin, U. Hecht, Molecular dynamics simulations of Al-Al₂Cu phase boundaries, *Computational materials science* 86 (2014) 30-37.
- [57] J. Eiken, Numerical solution of the phase-field equation with minimized discretization error, *IOP Conference Series Materials Science and Engineering*, 2012, p. 012105.
- [58] A. Carré, B. Böttger, M. Apel, Implementation of an antitrapping current for a multicomponent multiphase-field ansatz, *Journal of crystal growth* 380 (2013) 5-13.
- [59] M. Leitner, T. Leitner, A. Schmon, K. Aziz, G. Pottlacher, Thermophysical properties of liquid aluminum, *Metallurgical and Materials Transactions A* 48(6) (2017) 3036-3045.
- [60] S. Choi, H. Cho, S. Kumai, Effect of the precipitation of secondary phases on the thermal diffusivity and thermal conductivity of Al-4.5 Cu alloy, *Journal of Alloys and Compounds* 688 (2016) 897-902.
- [61] J. Zhao, Y. Yuan, F. Cui, Relationship between the Cu content and thermal properties of Al-Cu alloys for latent heat energy storage, *Journal of Thermal Analysis and Calorimetry* 129(1) (2017) 109-115.
- [62] D. Du, H. Zhang, D.J. Srolovitz, Properties and determination of the interface stiffness, *Acta materialia* 55(2) (2007) 467-471.
- [63] https://micress.rwth-aachen.de/files/documentation/Vol2_Running_MICRESS.pdf.

- [64] A.S. Barros, I.A. Magno, F.A. Souza, C.A. Mota, A.L. Moreira, M.A. Silva, O.L. Rocha, Measurements of microhardness during transient horizontal directional solidification of Al-Rich Al-Cu alloys: Effect of thermal parameters, primary dendrite arm spacing and Al₂Cu intermetallic phase, *Metals and Materials International* 21(3) (2015) 429-439.
- [65] K. Young, D. Kerkwood, The dendrite arm spacings of aluminum-copper alloys solidified under steady-state conditions, *Metallurgical Transactions A* 6(1) (1975) 197-205.
- [66] J. Sarreal, G. Abbaschian, The effect of solidification rate on microsegregation, *Metallurgical Transactions A* 17(11) (1986) 2063-2073.
- [67] M. Gündüz, E. Çadırılı, Directional solidification of aluminium–copper alloys, *Materials Science and Engineering: A* 327(2) (2002) 167-185.
- [68] E.S. Meza, F. Bertelli, P.R. Goulart, N. Cheung, A. Garcia, The effect of the growth rate on microsegregation: Experimental investigation in hypoeutectic Al–Fe and Al–Cu alloys directionally solidified, *Journal of Alloys and Compounds* 561 (2013) 193-200.
- [69] X. Lin, W. Huang, J. Feng, T. Li, Y. Zhou, History-dependent selection of primary cellular/dendritic spacing during unidirectional solidification in aluminum alloys, *Acta materialia* 47(11) (1999) 3271-3280.
- [70] J. Kaneko, Dendrite coarsening during solidification of hypo-and hyper-eutectic Al-Cu alloys, *Journal of Materials Science* 12(7) (1977) 1392-1400.
- [71] J. Hunt, *Solidification and casting of metals*, The Metal Society, London 3 (1979).
- [72] W. Kurz, D. Fisher, Dendrite growth at the limit of stability: tip radius and spacing, *Acta Metallurgica* 29(1) (1981) 11-20.
- [73] Y. Wang, L. Peng, Y. Ji, X. Cheng, C. Wang, Y. Wu, Y. Fu, L.-Q. Chen, Effect of cooling rates on the dendritic morphology transition of Mg–6Gd alloy by in situ X-ray radiography, *Journal of materials science & technology* 34(7) (2018) 1142-1148.
- [74] M. Amooezaei, S. Gurevich, N. Provatas, Spacing characterization in Al–Cu alloys directionally solidified under transient growth conditions, *Acta materialia* 58(18) (2010) 6115-6124.
- [75] M.A. Tschopp, J.D. Miller, A.L. Oppedal, K.N. Solanki, Characterizing the local primary dendrite arm spacing in directionally solidified dendritic microstructures, *Metallurgical and Materials Transactions A* 45(1) (2014) 426-437.
- [76] D. McCartney, J. Hunt, Measurements of cell and primary dendrite arm spacings in directionally solidified aluminium alloys, *Acta Metallurgica* 29(11) (1981) 1851-1863.
- [77] J. Hunt, S.-Z. Lu, Numerical modeling of cellular/dendritic array growth: spacing and structure predictions, *Metallurgical and Materials Transactions A* 27(3) (1996) 611-623.
- [78] V. Laxmanan, Cellular and primary dendritic spacings in directionally solidified alloys, *Scripta materialia* 38(8) (1998) 1289-1297.
- [79] Q. Li, C. Beckermann, Evolution of the sidebranch structure in free dendritic growth, *Acta materialia* 47(8) (1999) 2345-2356.
- [80] D. Eskin, Q. Du, D. Ruvalcaba, L. Katgerman, Experimental study of structure formation in binary Al–Cu alloys at different cooling rates, *Materials Science and Engineering: A* 405(1-2) (2005) 1-10.
- [81] J.M. Quaresma, C.A. Santos, A. Garcia, Correlation between unsteady-state solidification conditions, dendrite spacings, and mechanical properties of Al-Cu alloys, *Metallurgical and Materials Transactions A* 31(12) (2000) 3167-3178.
- [82] D. Liu, L. Zhang, Y. Du, H. Xu, S. Liu, L. Liu, Assessment of atomic mobilities of Al and Cu in fcc Al–Cu alloys, *Calphad* 33(4) (2009) 761-768.
- [83] W. Kurz, J. Fisher, *Fundamentals of Solidification*, ed, Trans Tech Publications Ltd., Uetikon-Zuerich, Switzerland (1998).
- [84] D. Bouchard, J.S. Kirkaldy, Prediction of dendrite arm spacings in unsteady-and steady-state heat flow of unidirectionally solidified binary alloys, *Metallurgical and Materials Transactions B* 28(4) (1997) 651-663.

- [85] V. Ronté, A. Roólsz, The effect of cooling rate and composition on the secondary dendrite arm spacing during solidification. Part I: Al-Cu-Si alloys, *International Journal of Cast Metals Research* 13(6) (2001) 337-342.
- [86] S. Sahoo, S. Ghosh, Microstructure evolution of eutectic Al-Cu strips by high-speed twin-roll strip casting process, *Applied Physics A* 121(1) (2015) 45-50.
- [87] Q. Lei, J. Wang, A. Misra, Mechanical Behavior of Al-Al₂Cu-Si and Al-Al₂Cu Eutectic Alloys, *Crystals* 11(2) (2021) 194.
- [88] A.B. Michael, M.B. Bever, Solidification of aluminum-rich aluminum-copper alloys, *JOM* 6(1) (1954) 47-56.
- [89] J.-L. Fattebert, M. Wickett, P. Turchi, Phase-field modeling of coring during solidification of Au-Ni alloy using quaternions and CALPHAD input, *Acta materialia* 62 (2014) 89-104.
- [90] E. Brener, H. Müller-Krumbhaar, D. Temkin, Structure formation and the morphology diagram of possible structures in two-dimensional diffusional growth, *Physical Review E* 54(3) (1996) 2714.
- [91] B. Utter, R. Ragnarsson, E. Bodenschatz, Alternating tip splitting in directional solidification, *Physical review letters* 86(20) (2001) 4604.
- [92] S.-C. Huang, M. Glicksman, Overview 12: fundamentals of dendritic solidification—II development of sidebranch structure, *Acta Metallurgica* 29(5) (1981) 717-734.
- [93] T. Ihle, H. Müller-Krumbhaar, Diffusion-limited fractal growth morphology in thermodynamical two-phase systems, *Physical review letters* 70(20) (1993) 3083.
- [94] E. Ben-Jacob, G. Deutscher, P. Garik, N.D. Goldenfeld, Y. Lareah, Formation of a dense branching morphology in interfacial growth, *Physical review letters* 57(15) (1986) 1903.
- [95] T. Ihle, H. Müller-Krumbhaar, Fractal and compact growth morphologies in phase transitions with diffusion transport, *Physical Review E* 49(4) (1994) 2972.
- [96] S. Akamatsu, G. Faivre, T. Ihle, Symmetry-broken double fingers and seaweed patterns in thin-film directional solidification of a nonfaceted cubic crystal, *Physical Review E* 51(5) (1995) 4751.
- [97] M. Georgelin, A. Pocheau, Onset of sidebranching in directional solidification, *Physical Review E* 57(3) (1998) 3189.
- [98] S. Akamatsu, G. Faivre, Anisotropy-driven dynamics of cellular fronts in directional solidification in thin samples, *Physical Review E* 58(3) (1998) 3302.
- [99] E. Brener, H. Müller-Krumbhaar, D. Temkin, Kinetic phase diagram and scaling relations for stationary diffusional growth, *EPL (Europhysics Letters)* 17(6) (1992) 535.
- [100] E. Brener, T. Ihle, H. Müller-Krumbhaar, Y. Saito, K. Shiraishi, Fluctuation effects on dendritic growth morphology, *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications* 204(1-4) (1994) 96-110.