1. Introduction

Eutectic alloy systems offer specific advantages such as ease of processing, isothermal or near-isothermal freezing and beneficial mechanical properties of a self-assembling composite material. Our understanding of regular eutectic solidification microstructure formation is quite far progressed. Within the operation limits of quasi-planar near-isothermal interface propagation, the pattern selection that defines the eutectic growth morphologies is fairly well described by the Jackson–Hunt model, and more recent extensions to this, e.g., by phase field simulations and experiments with transparent analogs, for growth behavior beyond the basic state interface stability limits. Our understanding of irregular eutectic solidification, however, has not progressed to the same extent. Presumably this can be ascribed to substantially more complex growth conditions and behavior, which by the simultaneous progress of a faceted and a non-faceted phase, is bound to yield distinctively non-isothermal eutectic fronts, where the faceted phase tends to lead the growth. Furthermore, since changes in growth direction by side branching generally is more difficult for a strongly anisotropic faceted phase, compared to the typical weakly anisotropic non-faceted component, filling of space by a progressing irregular eutectic is considerably more cumbersome than with the regular systems.

Irregular eutectics are the backbone of two of the most common alloy systems used to produce castings, Al–Si and Fe–C. In both cases, the cast products usually contain in excess of 50% eutectic and, therefore, understanding and controlling the eutectic is an important basis for product performance optimization. Interestingly, common to both Al–Si alloys and cast irons is that trace elements can be added to produce large changes in the eutectic microstructure. The modification treatment of Al–Si alloys, typically by adding 50–300 ppm of Sr or Na, has been known for about a century. Yet, the mechanisms behind the strong element assisted eutectic refinement is still not fully understood, although recent studies point in the direction that the modifying elements strongly alters the Si-nucleation process, and thereby the formation of eutectic colonies. Retarded Si-nucleation together with potential growth restrictions imposed by impurity element rejection has been suggested as an alternative to impurity induced twinning, for being the most decisive formation mechanisms behind the typical fibrous and highly refined modified Al–Si eutectic mi-
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While *in situ* experimental observations in various transparent analogue systems have been invaluable in the establishment of theory and models to describe regular eutectic growth,\(^1\,^4\,^5\) only a few studies have been reported with transparent irregular eutectics,\(^7\) and their analogy to metal alloys is severely limited since system specific properties such as nucleation mechanisms, crystalline anisotropy, solid solubilities, *etc.* become far more critical factors under non-isothermal growth conditions. In this paper we report the first real-time studies of irregular eutectic growth in both unmodified and Sr-modified Al–Si–Cu by X-ray transmission video microscopy of directional solidification (DS) experiments in a Bridgman furnace.

2. **Experiment**

A challenge with Al and Si is that their K X-ray absorption edges are at too low energies to be utilized for X-ray transmission contrast with any meaningful sample thickness. Therefore, an X-ray absorbing element must be added to generate adequate contrast at the solid–liquid interface. The contrast element addition is likely to influence the overall solidification behaviour. Moreover, since X-ray absorption contrast mainly varies as \(\Delta \rho(\Delta Z)^p\), where \(\Delta \rho\) is the density difference and \(\Delta Z\) the element difference, the necessity of heavier atom addition to the Al–Si alloy would also tend to alter its segregation pattern. Obviously, the contrast-aiding element should be chosen with care not to form any reaction products with the other alloy constituents at temperatures above or near the Al–Si reactions. Also, since it is of interest to study eutectic modification, it is important that the contrasting agent itself is not an active eutectic modifier or nucleant, *e.g.* by forming intermetallics, or by reacting with potent eutectic nucleant particles or modifiers. Typically, the identification of an ideal contrast element will be by trial and error. Here results are reported from an initial experiment carried out with Cu as a contrasting agent.

Alloys were prepared from high-purity Al, Cu, Si and Sr molten in an alumina crucible and cast in an insulated bottom-chilled Cu-mould. Two alloys of eutectic composition, Al–8wt%Si–15wt%Cu (unmodified) and Al–9wt%Si–15wt%Cu–0.015wt%Sr (Sr-modified), were made. Samples were taken from the castings, prepared in 135 \(\mu\)m thin rectangular slices and placed inside quartz glass containers following the procedures established in previous studies.\(^{15–17}\)

The experiments were carried out at the micro-optics test bench\(^18\) on beamline ID6 of the European Synchrotron Radiation Facility, where eminent conditions are available for fast real-time high-resolution X-ray absorption and phase contrast imaging. The experimental setup and procedure were identical to those used in our previous *in situ* studies of DS\(^{15–17}\) except for the X-ray camera, which was a SensiCam QE CCD with a 1376×1040 pixel array, 12 bit dynamic range and camera read-out at 16 MHz, corresponding to a dead time of \(\sim 90\) ms between consecutive frames. In the experiments reported here, the camera was mounted with 10× magnification optics that gave an effective pixel size of \(\sim 0.7\) \(\mu\)m. The image frame grabbing rates employed were 6.25–7.15 Hz. The temperature gradient, \(G\), imposed by the Bridgman furnace system was varied in the range 23–43 K/mm and sample translation velocity, \(v_s\), was in the range 6–17 \(\mu\)m/s.

3. **Results and Discussion**

Figure 1 shows the evolution of the eutectic in the unmodified alloy (Al–8wt%Si–15wt%Cu) in a DS-experiment with \(G\) gravity, \(g\). Although \(\alpha\)-Al and Si-crystals cannot be distinguished directly from the X-ray transmission contrasts, they are easily identified by large differences in growth dynamics and interface morphologies. Because this sample had already undergone three repeated cycles of solidification and re-melting prior to the particular sequence shown in Fig. 1, a negative segregation had developed in the sample region studied, altering the local composition to become hypereutectic, evidenced by the presence of two faceted primary Si-crystals in the image sequence. These crystals had formed at higher temperatures before appearing in the camera field of view, perhaps already inside the hot compartment of the Bridgman furnace operated at 858 K.

In Fig. 1 it can be observed that, as the eutectic front reaches the upper primary Si-crystal from above the field of view, new non-faceted Al-crystals start to nucleate at the interfaces of the primary Si-crystals and proceed to grow dendritically into the intercolonial melt. This is consistent with the observation of halo formation of \(\alpha\)-Al surrounding primary silicon crystals in Al–Si alloys, and it confirms Si to be a viable nucleant for \(\alpha\)-Al.\(^{14,19}\) Nevertheless, it is worth noticing that in other locations, the eutectic front has already progressed further to higher temperatures, evidenced by the Al-dendrite tip to the left located further ahead into the melt region. Evidently, the presence of Si is not in itself sufficient to initiate the eutectic reaction when the eutectic temperature is reached. Additional undercooling seems to be required for Al to start forming on the pre-existing Si crystal, and apparently the required undercooling can be provided locally by the solute boundary of the dendrite approaching from above. Further on in the image sequence, new Si-needles are seen to form at irregular interfaces and shoot off quickly in different directions. From video analysis the growth velocities of the Si-needles are highly transient. Initial needle velocities are up to 5 times the reasonably steady Al-dendrite tip velocities \(\sim 2\) \(\mu\)m/s, and gradually retarding to zero. The Si-needles always appear in the vicinity of the \(\alpha\)-Al dendrites. It is however not possible to determine directly from the images whether the Si-needles really are new crystals or if they have orientation relationships with pre-existing needles or the primary Si crystals. In principle they could nucleate directly on the \(\alpha\)-Al at adequately high undercooling, but they were never observed to form in regions adequately far away from pre-grown Si-branches to rule out that Si forms as a connected crystal within each colony. Previous studies have shown that eutectic silicon in unmodified Al–Si alloys exhibit a large degree of interconnectivity in the as-cast microstructure, suggesting branching to be an important part of the Si growth mechanism.\(^{14,19}\) Separate nucleation of Si outside established colonies was never observed in the \(G\parallel g\) DS-
configuration. However, since the alloys have been made from high purity base materials, they potentially contain a lower number of heterogeneous substrates than what would be the case with commercial purity variants. The number of Si needles that appear in this and similar sequences with the unmodified alloys is notable, despite the limited field of view and relatively short time it takes for the non-isothermal front to progress beyond it.

Other striking features are the disordered nature of the eutectic growth in this alloy, as well as the highly irregular morphology of the solid liquid interface, including the liquid pockets surrounding the Al–Si eutectic colonies which remain open as solidification progresses. Clearly, these features are not well governed for by current irregular eutectic growth models, which strictly only holds for binary systems where silicon crystals are leading a massive eutectic interface, and departure from isothermal growth conditions can be assumed to be modest. With the addition of Cu, the non-facetted interface progress under the restriction of solute transport in the melt, attaining dendritic morphologies where the departure from isothermal eutectic interface propagation becomes substantially more pronounced. The open pockets also stem from the ternary alloy composition, as the remaining melt gradually enriches from hypoeutectic to eutectic Al–Cu as the Al–Si eutectic mush cools down. Eventually, the final liquid solidifies into a regular lamellar

Fig. 1. Unmodified eutectic microstructure formation during DS/ of Al–Si–Cu alloy. $G=23.0$ K/mm, $v_0=17 \mu$m/s, $\Delta t=160$ ms. Times given in the images are relative to the first frame captured at $t=0$ s.
Al–Al$_2$Cu eutectic, which has been evidenced by post-experiment metallographic investigations.

Figure 2 shows images taken with the Sr-modified sample for DS with $G||g$. The first inset image is a montage taken from five frames of the video sequence by following a particular image region over a period of roughly 10 s. A black arrow can be seen pointing at a $\sim 10 \mu m$ particle in horizontal motion towards the $\alpha$-Al dendrite on the left. In the final frame, at $t=3.78$ s, the particle has reached a position inside the box region fixed over the same dendrite side branch in all the five frames. The next frame, at $t=0$ s, is when eutectic nucleation can be confirmed by visual examination of full resolution images. The box region is drawn over the same side branch as in the previous 5-frame montage of suspended particle motion ahead of the eutectic nucleation event. The eutectic nucleation undercooling is estimated as $\sim 16$ K relative to the Al–Si eutectic reaction in Al–9wt%Si–15wt%Cu. This estimate is based on $G$ and the $\alpha$-Al dendrite tip undercooling, after having confirmed later by in situ monitoring, with the sample motion stopped, that the latter indeed grows with tip undercooling relative to the nominal eutectic reaction temperature for this alloy constitution. In the following images, a fine coral-like modified eutectic colony is seen to form, evolving into a six-folded equiaxed cellular rosette. The cellular branches propagate quite uniformly in all directions with near steady tip velocities $\sim v_s=11.4 \mu m/s$, leaving the rosette to spread evenly over the surface of the columnar $\alpha$-Al dendrite and into the intercolumnar melt regions, eventually bridging over to the nearest neighbor columnar dendrite.

The modified eutectic growth shown in Fig. 2 was confirmed by very similar observations from five additional DS sequences collected with the same alloy. In all events of Sr-modified eutectic nucleation within the camera field of view, it appeared in the immediate vicinity of the $\alpha$-Al surfaces. From the sequence illustrated in Fig. 2, the particle shown in motion at $t<0$ s is assumed to be a Si-crystal which has formed on a potent inoculant suspended in the melt, and then grown to a size of $\sim 10$ mm. Presumably, the horizontal motion is caused by thermo-solutal convection at the scale of the full sample size, verified to occur quite frequently with these experiments in the $G||g$ DS configuration.$^{16,21}$ Just as for the unmodified alloy sequence in Fig. 1, this is taken to support the statement that nucleation or
presence of Si-particles could be inadequate to facilitate the eutectic reaction, and that additional undercooling beyond Si-formation may be required. This result is quite surprising for the Sr-modified system, since, to our knowledge, previous studies exclusively have assumed the eutectic reaction to occur as soon as Si-crystals were able to form.\textsuperscript{6,10–13} Despite the novel result, the main influence of Sr on eutectic nucleation remains unaltered, namely to initiate precipitation of intermetallic phases considerably less potent for Si nucleation than those that would form with impurity level constituents in its absence.

Post-experimental metallography of another sample solidified with the same parameters in the same furnace reveal a fibrous Al–Si eutectic very similar to those found in modified binaries,\textsuperscript{11} with the exception of a few tiny Al\textsubscript{2}Cu regions that may have formed in open liquid channels with trapped solute or by back-diffusion of Cu from $\alpha$-Al upon cooling to room temperature. Finally, the reason for the Mullis–Sekerka type instabilities to form at the modified eutectic interface is a discrepancy between the short wave-length periodic Cu redistribution profile along the fibrous Al–Si composite interface, and the long range diffusion field of rejected Cu building up parallel to its growth direction. The long range boundary layer builds up gradually as the Al–Si eutectic evolves, since Cu solubility is about zero in Si and only 4–5 wt\% in Al over the full freezing range of the ternary alloy.
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