Explicit solutions related to the Rubinstein binary-alloy solidification problem with a heat flux or a convective condition at the fixed face

Lucas D. Venturato | Mariela B. Cirelli | Domingo A. Tarzia

CONICET - Depto. Matemática, FCE, Universidad Austral, Santa Fe, Argentina

Correspondence
Domingo A. Tarzia, CONICET - Depto. Matemática, FCE, Universidad Austral, Paraguay 1950, Rosario, S2000FZF, Santa Fe, Argentina.
Email: DTarzia@austral.edu.ar

Communicated by: P. Colli

Funding information
European Unions Horizon 2020, Grant/Award Number: 823731

Similarity solutions for the two-phase Rubinstein binary-alloy solidification problem in a semi-infinite material are developed. These new explicit solutions are obtained by considering two cases: A heat flux or a convective boundary conditions at the fixed face, and the necessary and sufficient conditions on data are also given in order to have an instantaneous solidification process. We also show that all solutions for the binary-alloy solidification problem are equivalent under some restrictions for data. Moreover, this implies that the coefficient that characterizes the solidification front for the Rubinstein solution must verify an inequality as a function of all thermal and boundary conditions.
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1 | INTRODUCTION

Heat transfer during the solidification of alloys has been of particular interest in many engineering applications, especially in the field of casting, welding, thermal energy storage systems, and crystal growth in semiconductors.

A semi-infinite material of a binary alloy consisting of two components $A$ and $B$ is considered. Let $C$ be the concentration of component $B$, and $T$ the temperature. We assume that the solidification of the alloy is governed by a phase equilibrium diagram consisting of a “liquidus” curve $C = f_l(T)$ and a “solidus” curve $C = f_s(T)$. We suppose that $f_s$ and $f_l$ are increasing functions in the variable $T$ assuming that they verify the following inequalities:

$$f_l(T_A) = f_s(T_A) < f_l(T) < f_s(T) < f_l(T_B) = f_s(T_B),$$

where $T_A$ and $T_B$ are the melting temperatures of $A$ and $B$, respectively. The material is in the solid phase if $C > f_s(T)$ and in the liquid phase if $C < f_l(T)$. When $C$ is between $f_s(T)$ and $f_l(T)$, the state of the material is not well defined and it is known by mushy region according to the description of the model proposed in [1–4], which can be appreciated in Figure 1.

The alloy is considered to be initially in a liquid state at constant temperature $T_0$ and constant concentration $C_0$. Then, a heat flow characterized by the constant $q_0$ is imposed on the fixed face $x = 0$ and a front of solidification $x = s(t)$ begins instantly separating the alloy in solid state ($0 < x < s(t)$) and liquid state ($x > s(t)$). The mathematical formulation of this crystallization process consists of finding the temperature $T = T(x, t)$ and the concentration $C = C(x, t)$, both defined for
FIGURE 1 Concentration versus temperature (phase equilibrium diagram with liquidus and solidus curves). [Colour figure can be viewed at wileyonlinelibrary.com]

\( x > 0 \) and \( t > 0 \), the free boundary \( x = s(t) \), defined for \( t > 0 \), and the critical solidification temperature \( T_k \) such that the following conditions are satisfied (problem \((P_1)\)):

\[
\begin{align*}
\begin{array}{ll}
i. \quad \alpha_s T_{ss} &= T_s, \quad 0 < x < s(t), \quad t > 0, \\
ii. \quad a_l T_{ls} &= T_l, \quad s(t) < x, \quad t > 0, \\
iii. \quad d_s C_{ss} &= C_s, \quad 0 < x < s(t), \quad t > 0, \\
iv. \quad d_l C_{ls} &= C_l, \quad s(t) < x, \quad t > 0, \\
v. \quad k_s T_s(0, t) &= \frac{q_0}{\sqrt{t}} \quad (q_0 > 0), \quad t > 0, \\
vi. \quad T_l(s(t), t) &= T_k, \quad \text{for } t > 0, \\
vii. \quad T_l(x, 0) &= T_0, \quad 0 < x < T_0 < T_B, \quad x > 0, \\
viii. \quad T_l(\infty, t) &= T_0, \quad 0 < x < T_0 < T_B, \quad t > 0, \\
ix. \quad C_s(0, t) &= 0, \quad t > 0, \\
x. \quad C_l(s(t), t) &= f_l(T_k), \quad t > 0, \\
xi. \quad C_s(x, 0) &= C_0, \quad x > 0, \\
xii. \quad C_l(s(t), t) &= f_l(T_k), \quad t > 0, \\
xiii. \quad k_s T_s(s(t), t) - k_l T_l(s(t), t) &= \gamma \rho s'(t), \quad t > 0, \\
xiv. \quad d_l C_{ls}(s(t), t) - d_s C_{ls}(s(t), t) &= [f_s(T_k) - f_l(T_k)] s'(t), \quad t > 0,
\end{array}
\]

where \( \rho, k, a, d, \gamma \) represent the mass density, the thermal conductivity, the thermal diffusivity, the mass diffusion, and the latent heat of fusion, with \( s \) and \( l \) denoting the solid and the liquid phase, respectively. When the condition on the fixed boundary \( x = 0 \) is given by a constant temperature \( T_A < T_0 < T_B \) (instead of condition \((1.v)\)), the corresponding solidification problem was solved in [1, 2, 4].

A study of binary-alloy problems can be seen in [5–12]. Recent works on the solidification of a binary alloy are [6, 8, 13–24]. The heat flux condition \((1.v)\) imposed at the fixed face was first considered in [25] for a two-phase Stefan problem for a semi-infinite homogeneous material. In [26], the same heat flux condition was considered when a density jump is supposed for the two-phase Stefan problem.

We can also consider the problem \((P_2)\), which consists in finding the temperature \( T = T(x, t) \) and the concentration \( C = C(x, t) \), both defined for \( x > 0 \) and \( t > 0 \), the free boundary \( x = s(t) \), defined for \( t > 0 \), and the critical solidification
temperature \( T_k \), such that the following conditions (1)(i)-(iv),(vi)-(xiv), and (v') are verified, where

\[
v' \cdot k_i T_x(0, t) = \frac{h_0}{\sqrt{t}}(T_s(0, t) - T_1), \quad (h_0 > 0), \quad t > 0.
\]

The convective condition \( (1.\, v') \) imposed at the fixed face was considered in [27] for a two-phase Stefan problem for a semi-infinite homogeneous material.

The goal of this paper is to find the necessary and/or sufficient conditions for data (initial and boundary conditions, and thermal coefficients of the binary alloy) in order to obtain an instantaneous phase-change process with the corresponding explicit solution of the similarity type. A review of explicit solution for Stefan-like problems is [28].

In Section 2, we obtain the necessary and sufficient condition (2) for problem \((P_1)\) in order to obtain the explicit solution (3)–(8). In Section 3, we deduce the inequality (39) for the coefficient \( \mu \) that characterizes the Rubinstein free boundary \( x = s(t) \) for problem \((P_1)\) defined in (3). In Section 4, we obtain the necessary and sufficient condition (41) for problem \((P_2)\) in order to obtain the explicit solution (42)–(47). Finally, in Section 5, we deduce the inequality (52) for the coefficient \( \mu \) that characterizes the Rubinstein free boundary \( x = s(t) \) for problem \((P_2)\) defined in (42).

2 | EXPLICIT SOLUTION FOR THE SOLIDIFICATION OF A BINARY ALLOY WITH A HEAT FLUX BOUNDARY CONDITION

In this section, we consider the problem \((P_1)\) defined by differential equations and conditions (1) (i)–(xiv).

**Theorem 1.** If \( q_0 \) verifies the following inequality:

\[
\frac{(T_0 - T_{ol})k_l}{\sqrt{\pi a_l}} \leq q_0 < \frac{(T_0 - T_{os})k_l}{\sqrt{\pi a_l}},
\]

where \( T_{ol} = f_1^{-1}(C_0) \) and \( T_{os} = f_s^{-1}(C_0) \), with \( f_1^{-1}(C) = T \) is the inverse function of \( f_1 \) and \( f_s^{-1}(C) = T \) is the inverse function of \( f_s \) respectively, then there exists a unique solution of the similarity type for the free boundary problem \((P_1)\), which is given by

\[
s(t) = 2\lambda \sqrt{\alpha_l t}, \quad t > 0,
\]

\[
T_s(x, t) = \left( T_k - \frac{q_0}{k_s} \sqrt{\pi \alpha_serf(\lambda)} \right) + \frac{q_0}{k_s} \sqrt{\pi \alpha_serf \left( \frac{x}{2\sqrt{\alpha_l t}} \right)} \cdot 0 < x < s(t), \quad t > 0,
\]

\[
T_l(x, t) = T_0 + \frac{T_k - T_0}{erfc \left( \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{\alpha_l}} \lambda \right)} + \frac{T_0 - T_k}{erfc \left( \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{\alpha_l}} \lambda \right)} erfc \left( \frac{x}{2\sqrt{\alpha_l t}} \right), \quad s(t) < x, \quad t > 0,
\]

\[
C_s(x, t) = f_s(T_k), \quad 0 < x < s(t), \quad t > 0,
\]

\[
C_l(x, t) = C_0 + \frac{f_l(T_k) - C_0}{erfc \left( \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{\alpha_l}} \lambda \right)} erfc \left( \frac{x}{2\sqrt{\alpha_l t}} \right), \quad s(t) < x, \quad t > 0,
\]

where the unknowns \( T_k \) and \( \lambda \) (coefficient that characterizes the free boundary \( x = s(t) \)) must satisfy the following equations:

\[
T_k = F(\lambda), \quad M(\lambda) = \phi(T_k), \quad \lambda > 0, \quad T_A < T_k < T_B.
\]
where the real functions $F$, $M$, and $\phi$ are defined as follows:

\[
\quad \text{erf}(x) = \frac{2}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_0^x e^{-t^2} \, dt; \quad \text{erf}(x) = 1 - \text{erf}(x).
\]

\[
Q(x) = \sqrt{\pi}xe^{x^2} \text{erf}(x), \quad F_1(x) = \text{erf}(x)e^{x^2}, \quad x > 0
\]

\[
F(x) = T_0 + \frac{\gamma \rho a_1}{k_l} Q \left( \frac{\sqrt{a_s} x}{\sqrt{a_l}} \right) - \frac{q_0}{k_l} \sqrt{a_l \pi} e^{-x^2} F_1 \left( \frac{\sqrt{a_s} x}{\sqrt{a_l}} \right), \quad x > 0,
\]

\[
M(x) = \left[ Q \left( \frac{\sqrt{a_s} x}{\sqrt{d_l}} \right) \right]^{-1}, \quad x > 0, \quad \phi(x) = \frac{f_s(x) - f_1(x)}{C_0 - f_1(x)}, \quad x \in (T_A, T_0) \cup (T_0, T_B).
\]

The proof of the theorem is based on the next proposition, which will be done below.

**Proposition 1.** The following properties are valid,

(a) $\text{erf}(x)$ is an strictly increasing function, with $\text{erf}(0^+) = 0$ and $\text{erf}(+\infty) = 1$.

(b) $Q$ is an strictly increasing function, with $Q(0^+) = 0$ and $Q(+\infty) = 1$.

(c) $F_1$ is an strictly decreasing function, with $F_1(0^+) = 1$ and $F_1(+\infty) = 0$.

(d) $F$ is an strictly increasing function, with $F(0^+) = T_0 - \frac{\sqrt{\pi} \rho a_0}{k_l}$ and $F(+\infty) = T_0 + \frac{\gamma \rho a_1}{k_l}$.

(e) $\phi$ is an strictly increasing function on $[T_{0s}, T_{0l})$, with $\phi(T_{0s}) = 1$ and $\phi(T_{0l}^-) = \lim_{x \to T_{0l}^-} \phi(x) = +\infty$.

**Proof.** (a), (b), and (c) follow from the definition of $\text{erf}$ function, [25] and [3].

(d) Since $Q$ is an increasing function and $F_1$ is a decreasing function, $F$ is an increasing function. Further,

\[
F(0) = T_0 + \frac{\gamma \rho a_1}{k_l} Q(0) - \frac{q_0}{k_l} \sqrt{a_l \pi} e^{-0^2} F_1(0) = T_0 - \frac{q_0}{k_l} \sqrt{a_l \pi},
\]

and

\[
F(+\infty) = \lim_{x \to +\infty} T_0 + \frac{\gamma \rho a_1}{k_l} Q \left( \frac{\sqrt{a_s} x}{\sqrt{a_l}} \right) - \frac{q_0}{k_l} \sqrt{a_l \pi} e^{-x^2} F_1 \left( \frac{\sqrt{a_s} x}{\sqrt{a_l}} \right)
\]

\[
= T_0 + \frac{\gamma \rho a_1}{k_l}.
\]

(e) We have,

\[
\phi(x) = \frac{f_s(x) - C_0}{C_0 - f_1(x)} + 1,
\]

and $f_s(x) \geq C_0$ for all $x \geq T_{0s}$, $f_1(x) < C_0$ for all $x < T_{0l}$. Consequently, since $f_s$ and $f_1$ are increasing functions, $\phi$ is increasing on $[T_{0s}, T_{0l})$. Moreover,

\[
\phi(T_{0s}) = \frac{f_s(T_{0s}) - f_1(T_{0s})}{C_0 - f_1(T_{0s})} = 1,
\]

and since $f_s(x) > f_1(x)$ for all $x \in (T_A, T_B)$, in particular $f_s(T_{0l}) > f_1(T_{0l})$, from where

\[
\phi(T_{0l}) = \lim_{x \to T_{0l}^-} \frac{f_s(x) - f_1(x)}{C_0 - f_1(x)} = +\infty.
\]

We now prove Theorem 1.
Proof. The similarity solutions to the heat equation \( au_{xx} = u_t \) has the form \( u(x, t) = A + Ber \left( \frac{x}{2\sqrt{at}} \right) \) with \( A \) and \( B \) real numbers to be determined. Then, we can suppose that

\[
T_s(x, t) = A_s^T + B_s^T \text{erf} \left( \frac{x}{2\sqrt{a_s t}} \right) \quad T_l(x, t) = A_l^T + B_l^T \text{erf} \left( \frac{x}{2\sqrt{a_l t}} \right),
\]

\[
C_s(x, t) = A_s^C + B_s^C \text{erf} \left( \frac{x}{2\sqrt{d_s t}} \right) \quad C_l(x, t) = A_l^C + B_s^C \text{erf} \left( \frac{x}{2\sqrt{d_l t}} \right). \tag{10}
\]

By (1) (vi), it results

\[
T_s(s(t), t) = A_s^T + B_s^T \text{erf} \left( \frac{s(t)}{2\sqrt{a_s t}} \right) = T_k,
\]

where \( T_k \) is a constant to be determined. Then it follows that \( s(t) = 2\lambda \sqrt{a_s t} \) for some \( \lambda > 0 \), and again by (1) (vi), we have

\[
T_s(s(t), t) = A_s^T + B_s^T \text{erf} \left( \frac{2\lambda}{2\sqrt{a_s}} \right) = T_k, \tag{11}
\]

\[
T_l(s(t), t) = A_l^T + B_l^T \text{erf} \left( \frac{\sqrt{a_s}}{\sqrt{a_l}} \lambda \right) = T_k. \tag{12}
\]

On the other hand, from (1) (v), we obtain that

\[
k_s T_s(0, t) = \frac{k_s B_s^T}{\sqrt{\pi a_s t}} = \frac{q_0}{\sqrt{t}},
\]

from where

\[
B_s^T = \frac{q_0}{k_s} \sqrt{\pi a_s}. \tag{13}
\]

Then, replacing (13) in (11), we have

\[
A_s^T = T_k - \frac{q_0}{k_s} \sqrt{\pi a_s} \text{erf} \left( \lambda \right).
\]

From (1) (viii), it follows that

\[
T_l(x, 0) = A_l^T + B_l^T = T_0. \tag{14}
\]

Subtracting (12) and (14), we obtain that

\[
B_l^T \text{erf} \left( \frac{\sqrt{a_s}}{\sqrt{a_l}} \lambda \right) = T_0 - T_k,
\]

or equivalently,

\[
B_l^T = \frac{T_0 - T_k}{\text{erf} \left( \frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{\sqrt{a_l}} \lambda \right)} \tag{15}
\]

Replacing (15) in (14), we conclude that

\[
A_l^T = T_0 - \frac{T_0 - T_k}{\text{erf} \left( \frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{\sqrt{a_l}} \lambda \right)}.
\]

Therefore, we obtain (4) and (5). Similarly, considering the equalities ix–xii from (1), we deduce that

\[
C_s(0, t) = \frac{B_s^C}{\sqrt{\pi a_s t}} = 0.
\]
from where \( B_s^C = 0 \), and
\[
C_s(s(t), t) = A_s^C + B_s^C \text{erf} \left( \frac{\sqrt{\alpha_s}}{\sqrt{d_l}} \lambda \right) = A_s^C = f_s(T_k).
\]

Hence, \( C_s \equiv f_s(T_k) \). On the other hand,
\[
C_l(x, 0) = A_l^C + B_l^C = C_0.
\]

and
\[
C_l(s(t), t) = A_l^C + B_l^C \text{erf} \left( \frac{\sqrt{\alpha_l}}{\sqrt{d_l}} \lambda \right) = f_l(T_k),
\]
from where
\[
A_l^C = C_0 - \frac{C_0 - f_l(T_k)}{\text{erf} \left( \frac{\sqrt{\alpha_l}}{\sqrt{d_l}} \lambda \right)} = \frac{C_0 - f_l(T_k)}{\text{erf} \left( \frac{\sqrt{\alpha_l}}{\sqrt{d_l}} \lambda \right)}.
\]

Therefore,
\[
C_l(x, t) = C_0 - \frac{C_0 - f_l(T_k)}{\text{erf} \left( \frac{\sqrt{\alpha_l}}{\sqrt{d_l}} \lambda \right)} + \frac{C_0 - f_l(T_k)}{\text{erf} \left( \frac{\sqrt{\alpha_l}}{\sqrt{d_l}} \lambda \right)} \text{erf} \left( \frac{x}{2\sqrt{d_l}t} \right)
\]
\[
= C_0 + \frac{f_l(T_k) - C_0}{\text{erf} \left( \frac{\sqrt{\alpha_l}}{\sqrt{d_l}} \lambda \right)} \text{erf} \left( \frac{x}{2\sqrt{d_l}t} \right),
\]
that is, (7).

From (1) (xiii), we have
\[
q_0 e^{-x^2} + k_1 \frac{T_k - T_0}{\text{erf} \left( \frac{\sqrt{\alpha_l}}{\sqrt{d_l}} \lambda \right)} = \gamma \rho \lambda \sqrt{\alpha_s},
\]
Thus,
\[
T_k = T_0 + \left( \gamma \rho \lambda \sqrt{\alpha_s} - q_0 e^{-x^2} \right) \frac{\sqrt{\alpha_l} \pi \text{erf} \left( \frac{\sqrt{\alpha_l}}{\sqrt{d_l}} \lambda \right)}{k_1 e^{-\left( \frac{\sqrt{\alpha_l}}{\sqrt{d_l}} \lambda \right)^2}}
\]
\[
= T_0 + \frac{\gamma \rho a_l q_0}{k_1} Q \left( \frac{\sqrt{\alpha_s}}{\sqrt{\alpha_l}} \lambda \right) - q_0 e^{-x^2} \frac{\sqrt{\alpha_l} \pi}{k_1} F_1 \left( \frac{\sqrt{\alpha_s}}{\sqrt{\alpha_l}} \lambda \right)
\]
\[
= F(\lambda),
\]
where \( Q, F_1 \) y \( F \) are given by (9).

From (1) (xiv), we obtain
\[
\frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi} \sqrt{\alpha_l} e \text{erf} \left( \frac{\sqrt{\alpha_l}}{\sqrt{d_l}} \lambda \right)} = \frac{f_s(T_k) - f_l(T_k)}{C_0 - f_l(T_k)},
\]
that is,
\[
M(\lambda) = \phi(T_k).
\]

By Proposition 1, \( Q \) and \( F \) are increasing functions. Then, \( M \) is a decreasing function, and
\[
M(0^+) = \lim_{x \to 0^+} \frac{1}{Q(x)} = +\infty, \quad M(+\infty) = \frac{1}{Q(+\infty)} = 1,
\]

\[
F(0^+) = T_0 - \frac{\sqrt{\alpha_l} a_l q_0}{k_1}, \quad F(+\infty) = T_0 + \frac{\gamma \rho a_l}{k_1}.
\]

By (16) and (17), we have
\[
M(\lambda) = \phi(F(\lambda)).
\]
Then, taking into account (19), (20), and Proposition 1(e), we can assure the existence and uniqueness of \( \lambda \) verifying (21), if \( T_{0s} \leq F(0) < F(+\infty) < T_{0l} \), or equivalently (2).

**Remark 1.** Define \( T_1 = T_s(0, t) \). Then,

\[
T_1 = T_k - \frac{q_0}{k_s} \sqrt{\alpha_s} \text{erf}(\lambda),
\]

which is a constant independent of time \( t \). Moreover,

\[
T_1 \leq T_s(x, t) < T_k, \quad 0 < x < s(t), \quad t > 0.
\]

In fact, since \( \text{erf}(x) \) is an increasing function, and for \( x \in (0, s(t)) \),

\[
0 < \text{erf} \left( \frac{x}{\sqrt{2\alpha_s t}} \right) < \text{erf}(\lambda),
\]

we have

\[
T_1 = T_s(0, t) < T_s(x, t) < T_s(s(t), t) = T_k, \quad 0 < x < s(t), \quad t > 0.
\]

**Corollary 1.** Define \( C_{1I} = f_l(T_1) \) and \( C_{2I} = f_l(T_0) \). Then, \( C_0 \in [C_{1I}, C_{2I}] \).

**Proof.** By definition, \( C_0 = f_l(T_{0l}) \). By hypothesis, \( f_l(T_1) \geq C_l \). Hence

\[
C_{2I} = f_l(T_0) = f_l(T_l(x, 0)) \geq C_l(x, 0) = C_0.
\]

On the other hand, there are values \( x_0 \) and \( t_0 \), with \( 0 < x_0 < s(t_0) \), such that

\[
T_{0s} = f_s^{-1}(C_0) = T_s(x_0, t_0).
\]

and since \( f_l(T) < f_s(T) \), it results \( T_{0s} = f_s^{-1}(C_0) < f_l^{-1}(C_0) = T_{0l} \).

Thus, by Remark 1, it results \( T_1 \leq T_s(x_0, t_0) = T_{0s} \leq T_{0l} \), from where, taking into account that \( f_l \) is an increasing function, we obtain that

\[
C_{1I} = f_l(T_1) \leq f_l(T_{0l}) = C_0.
\]

By (22) and (23) we conclude that \( C_0 \in [C_{1I}, C_{2I}] \).

**Remark 2.** Following the steps on [4, Section 4] we can obtain that a mushy region will appear for the free boundary problem \((P_1)\) if the condition

\[
\frac{T_0 - T_k}{C_0 - f_l(T_k)} < (f_l^{-1})(f_l(T_k)) \frac{a_l}{d_l} Q \left( \frac{\sqrt{\alpha_s}}{\sqrt{\alpha_l}} \lambda \right).
\]

From Proposition (1)-(b), it follows that

\[
\frac{a_l}{d_l} Q \left( \frac{\sqrt{\alpha_s}}{\sqrt{\alpha_l}} \lambda \right) > \frac{a_l}{d_l} Q \left( \frac{\sqrt{\alpha_s}}{\sqrt{\alpha_l}} \lambda \right).
\]

Then the condition (24) will hold if \( d_l \) is sufficiently small.

### 3 An Inequality for the Coefficient \( \mu \) of the Rubinstein Free Boundary

For the solution given in Theorem 1, the temperature on the fixed face \( x = 0 \) is given by

\[
\tilde{T}_1 = T_s(0, t) = T_k - \frac{q_0}{k_s} \sqrt{\alpha_s} \text{erf}(\lambda).
\]
Since $\tilde{T}_1 < T_k$, we can consider the problem $(P_R)$ given by (1) (i)–(iv), (v), (vi)–(xiv), where

$$\tilde{v}. T_i(0, t) = T_1, \ t > 0.$$  \hfill (27)

Problem $(P_R)$ has a unique solution, known as Rubinstein solution, given by [1], that is

$$T_s(x, t) = A_s^T + B_s^T \text{erf} \left( \frac{x}{2 \sqrt{a_s t}} \right), \ T_l(x, t) = A_l^T + B_l^T \text{erf} \left( \frac{x}{2 \sqrt{a_l t}} \right).$$  \hfill (28)

$$\tilde{C}_s(x, t) = A_s^C + B_s^C \text{erf} \left( \frac{x}{2 \sqrt{d_s t}} \right), \ \tilde{C}_l(x, t) = A_l^C + B_l^C \text{erf} \left( \frac{x}{2 \sqrt{d_l t}} \right).$$  \hfill (29)

$$\tilde{s}(t) = 2\mu \sqrt{a_s t},$$  \hfill (30)

where

$$A_s^T(\mu) = T_1, \ B_s^T(\mu) = \frac{T_k - T_1}{\text{erf}(\mu)},$$  \hfill (31)

$$A_l^T(\mu) = T_0 + \frac{T_k - T_0}{\text{erf} \left( \frac{\sqrt{a_l}}{\sqrt{a_l} \mu} \right)}, \ B_l^T(\mu) = \frac{T_0 - T_k}{\text{erf} \left( \frac{\sqrt{a_l}}{\sqrt{a_l} \mu} \right)}.$$  \hfill (32)

$$A_s^C(\mu) = f_s(\tilde{T}_k), \ B_s^C(\mu) = 0,$$  \hfill (33)

$$A_l^C(\mu) = C_0 + \frac{f_l(T_k) - C_0}{\text{erf} \left( \frac{\sqrt{a_l}}{\sqrt{a_l} \mu} \right)}, \ B_l^C(\mu) = \frac{C_0 - f_l(\tilde{T}_k)}{\text{erf} \left( \frac{\sqrt{a_l}}{\sqrt{a_l} \mu} \right)},$$  \hfill (34)

and the unknowns $\tilde{T}_k$ and $\mu$ (coefficient that characterizes the free boundary $x = s(t)$) satisfy the following equations:

$$T_k = G(\mu), \ M(\mu) = \phi(\tilde{T}_k), \ \mu > 0, \ T_A < \tilde{T}_k < T_B,$$  \hfill (35)

where $G$ is defined as follows:

$$G(x) = \gamma \rho a_t a_Q \left( \frac{\sqrt{a_l}}{Q} x \right) + T_k a_t a_Q \left( \frac{\sqrt{a_l}}{Q} x \right) + T_0 a_t a_Q \left( \frac{\sqrt{a_l}}{Q} x \right) + k_s a_t a_Q \left( \frac{\sqrt{a_l}}{Q} x \right) + k_l a_t a_Q \left( \frac{\sqrt{a_l}}{Q} x \right), \ x > 0,$$

$$Q_1(x) = \sqrt{\pi x e^x} \text{erf}(x).$$  \hfill (36)

**Theorem 2.** If in the Rubinstein solution (28)–(35) we take $T_1 = T_1$, under condition (2) and (26), we obtain that the two free boundaries problems $(P_1)$ and $(P_R)$ are equivalents, that is,

$$\mu = \lambda, \ \tilde{T}_k = T_k.$$  \hfill (37)

$$T_s(x, t) = \tilde{T}_s(x, t), \ T_l(x, t) = \tilde{T}_l(x, t), \ C_s(x, t) = \tilde{C}_s(x, t), \ C_l(x, t) = \tilde{C}_l(x, t).$$  \hfill (38)

**Corollary 2.** Under the hypothesis of Theorem 2, the coefficient $\mu$ of the free boundary $\tilde{s}(t)$ and the initial temperature $T_k$ of solidification corresponding to the Rubinstein solution to the free boundary problem $(P_R)$ satisfies the inequalities

$$\frac{\sqrt{a_l} \tilde{T}_k - T_1}{\sqrt{a_k} T_0 - T_{1k}} k_s < \text{erf}(\mu) < \frac{\sqrt{a_l} \tilde{T}_k - T_1}{\sqrt{a_k} T_0 - T_{1k}} k_i.$$  \hfill (39)
Proof. From the solution to problem \( P_R \), equivalent to problem \( P_1 \), by using condition (1) (v), we have (26), from where

\[
q_0 = \frac{k_s(T_k - T_1)}{\sqrt{\alpha_s \pi r f(\mu)}},
\]

where \( T_1 \) is the temperature boundary condition for the Rubinstein solution.

By the equivalence between problems \( (P_1) \) and \( (P_R) \), \( q_0 \) must satisfy condition (2). Then, the next inequalities hold:

\[
\frac{(T_0 - T_{0l})k_l}{\sqrt{\pi \alpha_l}} < \frac{k_s(T_k - T_1)}{\sqrt{\alpha_s \pi r f(\mu)}} < \frac{(T_0 - T_{0o})k_l}{\sqrt{\pi \alpha_l}},
\]

or equivalently (39).

\[\square\]

Remark 3. The inequalities (39) has a complete physical meaning for the solution to problem \( P_R \) when the corresponding parameters verifies the inequality

\[
\frac{\sqrt{\alpha_l} T_k - T_1 k_s}{\sqrt{\alpha_s} T_0 - T_{0l}} < 1.
\]

Remark 4. The results in this section generalizes [25]. In fact, if \( C(x, t) \) is constant and if we consider only the thermal problem, then condition (2) is the inequality given in [25, Lemma 1] obtained for the two-phase Stefan problem with a heat flux condition at \( x = 0 \).

4 | EXPLICIT SOLUTION FOR THE BINARY ALLOY SOLIDIFICATION PROBLEM WITH A CONVECTIVE BOUNDARY CONDITION

In this section, we consider the next two-phase Rubinstein type binary-alloy solidification problem defined by (Problem \( (P_2) \)):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{i.} & \quad \alpha_s T_{sx} = T_{sx}, & 0 < x < s(t), & t > 0, \\
\text{ii.} & \quad \alpha_l T_{lx} = T_{lx}, & s(t) < x, & t > 0, \\
\text{iii.} & \quad d_s C_{sx} = C_{sx}, & 0 < x < s(t), & t > 0, \\
\text{iv.} & \quad d_l C_{lx} = C_{lx}, & s(t) < x, & t > 0, \\
\text{v.} & \quad k_s T_x(0, t) = k_0 \sqrt{\frac{h_0}{l}} (T_x(0, t) - T_\infty) & (h_0 > 0), & t > 0, \\
\text{vi.} & \quad T_x(s(t), t) = T_k & & t > 0, \\
\text{vii.} & \quad T_l(x, 0) = T_0 & T_A < T_0 < T_B, & x > 0, \\
\text{viii.} & \quad T_l(\infty, t) = T_0 & T_A < T_0 < T_B, & t > 0, \\
\text{ix.} & \quad C_s(0, t) = 0 & & t > 0, \\
\text{x.} & \quad C_s(s(t), t) = f_s(T_k) & & t > 0, \\
\text{xi.} & \quad C_l(x, 0) = C_0 & x > 0, \\
\text{xii.} & \quad C_l(s(t), t) = f_l(T_k) & & t > 0, \\
\text{xiii.} & \quad k_s T_x(s(t), t) - k_l T_{lx}(s(t), t) = \gamma \rho s'(t) & & t > 0, \\
\text{xiv.} & \quad d_s C_{sx}(s(t), t) - d_l C_{lx}(s(t), t) = [f_s(T_k) - f_l(T_k)] s'(t) & & t > 0,
\end{align*}
\]

where \( T_\infty \) is the bulk temperature at a large distance from the fixed face \( x = 0 \).

Following the study done in Section 2, we can obtain the next result.

Theorem 3. If the coefficient \( h_0 \), which characterized the convective boundary condition (40) (v), verifies the following inequalities:

\[
\frac{(T_0 - T_{0l})k_l}{(T_{0l} - T_\infty)\sqrt{\pi \alpha_l}} < h_0 < \frac{(T_0 - T_{0o})k_l}{(T_{0o} - T_\infty)\sqrt{\pi \alpha_l}}.
\]
where $T_{0l} = f_l^{-1}(C_0)$ and $T_{0s} = f_s^{-1}(C_0)$, where $f_l^{-1}(C) = T$ is the inverse function of $f_l$ and $f_s^{-1}(C) = T$ is the inverse function of $f_s$ respectively, the free boundary problem (40) has a unique similarity type solution given by

$$\hat{s}(t) = 2\delta \sqrt{a_0 l}, \ t > 0,$$

$$\hat{T}_l(x, t) = \hat{T}_k + \frac{h_0 \sqrt{\pi a_l} (\hat{T}_k - T_\infty)}{k_s + h_0 \sqrt{\pi a_l \text{erf}(\delta)}} \left( \text{erf} \left( \frac{x}{2 \sqrt{a_l t}} \right) - \text{erf}(\delta) \right), \ 0 < x < \hat{s}(t), \ t > 0,$$

$$\hat{T}_l(x, t) = T_0 + \frac{\hat{T}_l - T_0}{\text{erf} \left( \frac{\sqrt{\pi} \delta}{\sqrt{a_l}} \right)} \text{erfc} \left( \frac{x}{2 \sqrt{a_l t}} \right), \ \hat{s}(t) < x, \ t > 0,$$

$$\hat{C}_s(x, t) = f_2(\hat{T}_k), \ 0 < x < \hat{s}(t), \ t > 0,$$

$$\hat{C}_l(x, t) = C_0 + \frac{f_1(\hat{T}_k) - C_0}{\text{erf} \left( \frac{\sqrt{\pi} \delta}{\sqrt{a_l}} \right)} \text{erfc} \left( \frac{x}{2 \sqrt{d_l t}} \right), \ \hat{s}(t) < x, \ t > 0,$$

where the unknowns $\hat{T}_k$ and $\delta$ (coefficient that characterizes the free boundary $x = s(t)$) satisfy the following equations:

$$\hat{T}_k = W(\delta), \ M(\delta) = \phi(\hat{T}_k), \ \delta > 0, \ T_A < \hat{T}_k < T_B,$$

where the real function $W$ is defined as follows:

$$W(x) = T_\infty + \frac{T_0 - T_\infty}{F_2(x) + 1} + \frac{\gamma \rho \sqrt{\pi a_s a_l}}{H(x)},$$

$$F_2(x) = \frac{h_0 k_s \sqrt{\pi a_l e^{-x^2} F_1 \left( \frac{\sqrt{\pi} x}{\sqrt{a_l}} \right)}}{k_i \left( k_s + h_0 \sqrt{\pi a_l \text{erf}(x)} \right)},$$

$$H(x) = \frac{h_0 k_s \sqrt{\pi a_l}}{xe^{a_l^2} \left( k_s + h_0 \sqrt{\pi a_l \text{erf}(x)} \right)} + \frac{k_i \sqrt{\pi a_s}}{\sqrt{a_l} Q \left( \frac{\sqrt{\pi} \delta}{\sqrt{a_l}} \right)}.$$

The proof of the theorem is based on the next proposition.

**Proposition 2.** The following properties are valid,

(a) $F_2$ is an strictly decreasing function, with $F_2(0^+) = \frac{h_0}{k_i} \sqrt{a_l \pi}$ and $F_2(+\infty) = 0$.

(b) $H$ is an strictly decreasing function, with $H(0^+) = +\infty$ and $H(+\infty) = \frac{\sqrt{\pi \alpha}}{\sqrt{a_l}} k_i$.

(c) $W$ is an strictly increasing function, with $W(0^+) = T_\infty + \frac{T_0 - T_\infty}{1 + \frac{h_0 \sqrt{\pi \alpha}}{k_i}}$ and $W(+\infty) = T_0 + \frac{\gamma \rho a}{k_i}$.

**Proof.** We obtain (a) and (b) by Proposition 1, and (c) by using properties (a) and (b). □
Remark 5. Similarly to Remark 2, we can obtain analogous inequalities to (24) and (25) for the appearance of a mushy region of the free boundary problem \( (P_2) \). Then, a mushy region appears if \( d_i \) is sufficiently small.

5 | AN INEQUALITY FOR THE COEFFICIENT \( \mu \) OF THE RUBINSTEIN FREE BOUNDARY

For the solution given in Theorem 3, the temperature in the fixed face \( x = 0 \) is given by

\[
\tilde{T}_1 = \tilde{T}_s(0, t) = \tilde{T}_k - \frac{h_0 \sqrt{\pi \alpha} e r f(\sigma)(\tilde{T}_k - T_{\infty})}{k_s + h_0 \sqrt{\pi \alpha} e r f(\sigma)}. \tag{48}
\]

Since \( \tilde{T}_1 < \tilde{T}_k \), we can consider the problem \( (P_R) \) defined by (40) (i)–(iv), (v), (vi)–(xiv), where

\[
\tilde{v}, \ \tilde{T}_s(0, t) = T_1, \ t > 0,
\]

which has a unique solution, known as Rubinstein solution, and was given by (28)–(35).

**Theorem 4.** If \( T_1 = \tilde{T}_1 \), under condition (41) and (48), we obtain that the two free boundaries problems \( (P_2) \) and \( (P_R) \) are equivalents, that is,

\[
\mu = \delta, \ \tilde{T}_k = \tilde{T}_k, \tag{50}
\]

\[
\tilde{T}_s(x, t) = \tilde{T}_s(x, t), \ \tilde{T}_l(x, t) = \tilde{T}_l(x, t), \ \tilde{C}_s(x, t) = \tilde{C}_s(x, t), \ \tilde{C}_l(x, t) = \tilde{C}_l(x, t). \tag{51}
\]

**Corollary 3.** Under the hypothesis of Theorem 4, the coefficient \( \mu \) of the free boundary \( \tilde{v}(t) \) and the initial temperature \( \tilde{T}_k \) of solidification, corresponding to the Rubinstein solution to the free boundary problem \( (P_R) \) satisfies the inequalities

\[
\frac{\sqrt{\alpha_1} k_2}{\sqrt{\alpha_s} k_1} \frac{T_k - T_1}{T_0 - T_{\infty}} < e r f(\mu) < \frac{\sqrt{\alpha_1} k_2}{\sqrt{\alpha_s} k_1} \frac{T_k - T_1}{T_0 - T_{\infty}}. \tag{52}
\]

**Proof.** From the solution to problem \( P_R \) equivalent to problem \( P_2 \), by using condition (40) (v), we obtain

\[
h_0 = \frac{k_s}{\sqrt{\alpha_s} \pi e r f(\mu)} \frac{\tilde{T}_k - T_1}{T_1 - T_{\infty}}.
\]

By the equivalence between problems \( (P_2) \) and \( (P_R) \), \( h_0 \) must satisfy inequalities (41). Then, the next inequality holds:

\[
\frac{(T_0 - T_{\infty}) k_l}{(T_0 - T_{\infty}) \sqrt{\pi \alpha_l}} < \frac{k_s}{\sqrt{\alpha_s} \pi e r f(\mu)} \frac{T_k - T_1}{T_1 - T_{\infty}} < \frac{(T_0 - T_{\infty}) k_l}{(T_0 - T_{\infty}) \sqrt{\pi \alpha_l}}.
\]

or equivalently (52).

If we wish to obtain an inequality for the coefficient \( \mu \) of the Rubinstein solution, we must eliminate the dependence on \( T_{\infty} \). Taking the maximum of \( \frac{T_k - T_1}{T_1 - T_{\infty}} \) respect to \( T_{\infty} \) on the left hand side, and the minimum of \( \frac{T_0 - T_{\infty}}{T_k - T_1} \) respect to \( T_{\infty} \) on the right hand side in (52), we get

\[
\frac{\sqrt{\alpha_1} k_2}{\sqrt{\alpha_s} k_1} \frac{T_k - T_1}{T_0 - T_{\infty}} < e r f(\mu) < \frac{\sqrt{\alpha_1} k_2}{\sqrt{\alpha_s} k_1} \frac{T_k - T_1}{T_0 - T_{\infty}}. \tag{54}
\]

which is the same inequalities given by (39). Therefore, Remark 3 holds.
Remark 7. The results in this section generalize [27]. In fact, if \( C(x, t) \) is constant and if we consider only the thermal problem, then condition (41) is the inequality given in [27, Theorem 1] obtained for the two-phase Stefan problem with a heat flux condition at \( x = 0 \).

6 | CONCLUSION

Two explicit solutions of a similarity type for the temperature and the concentration in the two-phase binary-alloy solidification problem in a semi-infinite material were obtained for two different boundary conditions at the fixed face \( x = 0 \). When the boundary condition is the heat flux condition given by (1) (\( v \)), then there exists an instantaneous solidification process if and only if the coefficient \( q_0 \) satisfies the inequalities

\[
\frac{(T_0 - T_{0l})k_l}{\sqrt{\pi \alpha_l}} < q_0 < \frac{(T_0 - T_{0s})k_l}{\sqrt{\pi \alpha_l}}.
\]

When the boundary condition is a convective condition given by (40) (\( v \)), then there exists an instantaneous solidification process if and only if the coefficient \( h_0 \) satisfies the inequalities

\[
\frac{(T_0 - T_{0l})k_l}{(T_{0l} - T_1)\sqrt{\pi \alpha_l}} < h_0 < \frac{(T_0 - T_{0s})k_l}{(T_{0s} - T_1)\sqrt{\pi \alpha_l}}.
\]

Moreover, if \( \mu \) is the coefficient of the free boundary corresponding to the Rubinstein solution (28)–(35) to the free boundary problem (PR), then it satisfies the inequalities

\[
\frac{\sqrt{\alpha_l}}{\sqrt{\alpha_s}} \frac{T_k - T_1}{T_0 - T_{0s} k_l} < \text{erf}(\mu) < \frac{\sqrt{\alpha_l}}{\sqrt{\alpha_s}} \frac{T_k - T_1}{T_0 - T_{0l} k_l}.
\]  

NOMENCLATURE

- \( C_0 \) initial concentration
- \( d \) mass diffusion
- \( f_l \) liquidus curve
- \( f_s \) solidus curve
- \( h_0 \) coefficient that characterizes the heat transfer condition at \( x = 0 \)
- \( k \) thermal conductivity
- \( q_0 \) coefficient that characterizes the heat flux at \( x = 0 \)
- \( s(t) \) position of the solidification front at time \( t \)
- \( t \) time
- \( T_0 \) initial temperature
- \( T_k \) critical temperature of solidification
- \( \alpha \) thermal diffusivity
- \( \gamma \) latent heat of fusion by density of mass
- \( \lambda \) constant which characterizes the moving boundary for heat flux boundary condition
- \( \delta \) constant which characterizes the moving boundary for convective boundary condition
- \( \rho \) mass density

SUBSCRIPT

- \( s \) solid phase
- \( l \) liquid phase
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APPENDIX A

A.1 | Proof of Theorem 2

Proof. By (8), we have that $M(\lambda) = \phi(T_k)$. Taking into account that $T_1 = \tilde{T}_1$ is given by (26), we have

$$
G(\lambda) = \frac{\gamma \rho a_i a_i Q_1(\lambda) Q \left( \frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{\sqrt{\alpha}} \lambda \right) + \tilde{T}_1 k_s a_i Q \left( \frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{\sqrt{\alpha}} \lambda \right) + T_0 k_s a_i Q_1(\lambda)}{k_s a_i Q \left( \frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{\sqrt{\alpha}} \lambda \right) + k_s a_i Q_1(\lambda)}
$$

Then,

$$
\begin{cases}
    M(\lambda) = \phi(T_k), \\
    G(\lambda) = \tilde{T}_k
\end{cases}
$$

and by the uniqueness of the pair $\tilde{T}_k, \mu$ in (35), we have $\lambda = \mu$, and $T_k = \tilde{T}_k$. 

---
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On the other hand, taking into account that \( \lambda = \mu \), we have

\[
A_T^I(x) = A_T^C(x), \ \forall x > 0, \quad A_S^I(x) = A_T^C(x), \ \forall x > 0, \\
A_S^C(x) = A_S^I(x), \ \forall x > 0, \quad A_I^C(x) = A_I^C(x), \ \forall x > 0, \\
B_T^I(x) = B_T^C(x), \ \forall x > 0, \quad B_I^C(x) = B_T^C(x), \ \forall x > 0, \\
B_S^C(x) = B_S^C(x), \ \forall x > 0, \quad B_I^C(x) = B_S^C(x), \ \forall x > 0.
\]

that is, (38). \( \square \)

### A.2 Proof of Theorem 3

**Proof.** The similarity solutions to the heat equation \( \alpha u_{xx} = u_t \) has now the form \( u(x, t) = D + E \text{er} \left( \frac{x}{2\sqrt{\alpha t}} \right) \), where the real coefficients \( D \) and \( E \) must be determined. Then, we can write

\[
\hat{T}_s(x, t) = D_T^s + E_T^s \text{er} \left( \frac{x}{2\sqrt{\alpha_s t}} \right), \quad \hat{T}_l(x, t) = D_T^l + E_T^l \text{er} \left( \frac{x}{2\sqrt{\alpha_l t}} \right),
\]

(A2)

By (40) \((vi)\), it results

\[
\hat{T}_s(s(t), t) = D_T^s + E_T^s \text{er} \left( \frac{s(t)}{2\sqrt{\alpha_s t}} \right) = \hat{T}_k,
\]

where \( \hat{T}_k \) is a constant to be determined. Then it follows that \( s(t) = 2\delta \sqrt{\alpha_s t} \) for some \( \delta > 0 \), and again by (1) \((vi)\), we get

\[
\hat{T}_s(s(t), t) = D_T^s + E_T^s \text{er} \left( \frac{\sqrt{\alpha_s \delta}}{\sqrt{\alpha_l}} \right) = \hat{T}_k,
\]

(A3)

\[
\hat{T}_l(s(t), t) = D_T^l + E_T^l \text{er} \left( \frac{\sqrt{\alpha_s \delta}}{\sqrt{\alpha_l}} \right) = \hat{T}_k.
\]

(A4)

On the other hand,

\[
\hat{T}_s(0, t) = D_T^s,
\]

and then, from (40) \((v)\), we obtain that

\[
k_s T_s(0, t) = k_s E_T^s \frac{2}{\sqrt{\pi}} \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\alpha_s t}} = \frac{k_s E_T^s}{\sqrt{\pi \alpha_s t}} = \frac{h_0}{\sqrt{t}} \left( D_T^s - T_\infty \right),
\]

that is,

\[
D_T^s = T_\infty + \frac{k_s E_T^s}{h_0 \sqrt{\pi \alpha_s}}.
\]

(A5)

Then, replacing (A5) in (A3), we have

\[
E_T^s = \frac{h_0 \sqrt{\pi \alpha_s} (\hat{T}_k - T_\infty)}{k_s + h_0 \sqrt{\pi \alpha_s} \text{er} \left( \delta \right)}.
\]
and then we have
\[ D_1^T = T_\infty + \frac{k_s(\hat{T}_k - T_\infty)}{k_s + h_0 \sqrt{\pi \alpha_s} e r f(\delta)}. \]

From (40) (vii), it follows that
\[ T_0 = \hat{T}_l(x, 0) = D_1^T + E_1^T. \tag{A6} \]

Subtracting (A4) and (A6), we obtain that
\[ E_1^T = \frac{T_0 - \hat{T}_k}{e r f c\left(\frac{\sqrt{\pi \alpha_s}}{\sqrt{\alpha_i} \delta}\right)}. \tag{A7} \]

Replacing (A7) in (A6), we conclude that
\[ D_1^T = T_0 + \frac{\hat{T}_k - T_0}{e r f c\left(\frac{\sqrt{\pi \alpha_s}}{\sqrt{\alpha_i} \delta}\right)}. \]

Therefore,
\[ \hat{T}_s(x, t) = \hat{T}_k + \frac{h_0 \sqrt{\pi \alpha_s}(\hat{T}_k - T_\infty)}{k_s + h_0 \sqrt{\pi \alpha_s} e r f(\delta)} \left( e r f\left(\frac{x}{2\sqrt{\alpha_s t}}\right) - e r f(\delta)\right), \]
and
\[ \hat{T}_l(x, t) = T_0 + \frac{\hat{T}_k - T_0}{e r f c\left(\frac{\sqrt{\pi \alpha_s}}{\sqrt{\alpha_i} \delta}\right)} \left(\frac{x}{2\sqrt{\alpha_i t}}\right). \]

that is, (43) and (44).

Similarly, considering the equalities ix–xii from (1), we deduce that
\[ D_s^C = f_s(\hat{T}_k), \quad E_s^C = 0, \]
\[ D_l^C = C_0 + \frac{f_l(\hat{T}_k) - C_0}{e r f c\left(\frac{\sqrt{\pi \alpha_s}}{\sqrt{\alpha_i} \delta}\right)}, \quad E_l^C = \frac{C_0 - f_l(\hat{T}_k)}{e r f c\left(\frac{\sqrt{\pi \alpha_s}}{\sqrt{\alpha_i} \delta}\right)}, \]
that is, (45) and (46).

From (40) (xiii), we have
\[ k_s \frac{h_0}{k_s + h_0 \sqrt{\pi \alpha_s} e r f(\delta)} e^{-\delta^2} + k_l \frac{\hat{T}_k - T_0}{e r f c\left(\frac{\sqrt{\pi \alpha_s}}{\sqrt{\alpha_i} \delta}\right)} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi \alpha_l}}e^{-\left(\frac{\sqrt{\pi \alpha_s}}{\sqrt{\alpha_i} \delta}\right)^2}\right) = \gamma \rho \delta \sqrt{\alpha_i}, \tag{A8} \]
from where
\[
\hat{T}_k = \frac{\gamma \rho \sqrt{\pi \alpha \alpha_0} \left( k_s + h_0 \sqrt{\pi \alpha \sigma f(\delta)} \right) \delta \text{erf} \left( \frac{\sqrt{\pi} \delta}{\sqrt{\alpha_0}} \right)}{h_0 k_s \sqrt{\pi \alpha \sigma e^{-\delta^2} \text{erf} \left( \frac{\sqrt{\pi} \delta}{\sqrt{\alpha_0}} \right)} + k_i e^{-\left( \frac{\sqrt{\pi} \delta}{\sqrt{\alpha_0}} \right)^2} (k_s + h_0 \sqrt{\pi \alpha \sigma f(\delta)}) + h_0 k_s T_\infty \sqrt{\pi \alpha \sigma e^{-\delta^2} \text{erf} \left( \frac{\sqrt{\pi} \delta}{\sqrt{\alpha_0}} \right)} + k_i T_0 (k_s + h_0 \sqrt{\pi \alpha \sigma f(\delta)}) e^{-\left( \frac{\sqrt{\pi} \delta}{\sqrt{\alpha_0}} \right)^2} + h_0 k_s \sqrt{\pi \alpha \sigma e^{-\delta^2} \text{erf} \left( \frac{\sqrt{\pi} \delta}{\sqrt{\alpha_0}} \right)} + k_i (k_s + h_0 \sqrt{\pi \alpha \sigma f(\delta)}) e^{-\left( \frac{\sqrt{\pi} \delta}{\sqrt{\alpha_0}} \right)^2} + k \left( k_s + h_0 \sqrt{\pi \alpha \sigma f(\delta)} \right) \delta}
\]
\[= \frac{\gamma \rho \sqrt{\pi \alpha \alpha_0} (k_s + h_0 \sqrt{\pi \alpha \sigma f(\delta)}) \delta}{H(\delta)^{-1} + T_\infty + \frac{T_0 - T_\infty}{F_2(\delta) + 1}}
\]
\[= W(\delta).\]

From (40) (xiv), we obtain
\[
\frac{C_0 - f_i(\hat{T}_k)}{\sqrt{\alpha_0} \text{erf} \left( \frac{\sqrt{\pi} \delta}{\sqrt{\alpha_0}} \right) \sqrt{\pi}} = \left[ f_s(\hat{T}_k) - f_i(\hat{T}_k) \right] \delta \sqrt{\alpha_0}
\]
that is,
\[
\frac{1}{Q \left( \frac{\sqrt{\pi} \delta}{\sqrt{\alpha_0}} \right)} = \phi(\hat{T}_k),
\]
and then (47) holds.

By (A9) and (A10), we have
\[
M(\delta) = \phi(W(\delta)).
\]

We know that \(M\) is a strictly decreasing function with \(M(0^+) = +\infty, M(+\infty) = 1\). On the other hand, by Proposition 2(c), \(W\) is an strictly increasing function. Then, taking into account Proposition 1(e), we can assure the existence and uniqueness of \(\delta\) verifying (47), if \(T_{0b} \leq W(0) < W(+\infty) < T_{0d}\), or equivalently (41), and the thesis holds.

\[\Box\]

A.3  Proof of Theorem 4

Proof. By (47), we obtain that \(M(\delta) = \phi(\hat{T}_k)\). We prove now that \(G(\delta) = \hat{T}_k\).

Observe that
\[
\hat{T}_k = \frac{k_s \alpha_0 Q \left( \frac{\sqrt{\pi} \delta}{\sqrt{\alpha_0}} \right) \hat{T}_k + k_i \alpha_0 Q_1(\delta) \hat{T}_k}{k_s \alpha_0 Q \left( \frac{\sqrt{\pi} \delta}{\sqrt{\alpha_0}} \right) + k_i \alpha_0 Q_1(\delta)} = \frac{A + B}{C}.
\]

(A11)
Now, we work with $B$.

$$B = k_1 a_s Q_1(\delta) \hat{T}_k = k_1 a_s Q_1(\delta) \hat{T}_k + \frac{h_0 k_s a_s \sqrt{\pi a_s}}{k_s + h_0 \sqrt{\pi a_s}} E \left( \frac{\sqrt{\alpha_s}}{\sqrt{a_s}} \delta \right) \frac{h_0 k_s a_s \sqrt{\pi a_s}}{k_s + h_0 \sqrt{\pi a_s}} E \left( \frac{\sqrt{\alpha_s}}{\sqrt{a_s}} \delta \right) \hat{T}_k$$

$$= \frac{k_1 a_s Q_1(\delta) \left[ k_s + h_0 \sqrt{\pi a_s} E(\delta) \right] + h_0 k_s a_s \sqrt{\pi a_s} E(\delta) \left( \frac{\sqrt{\alpha_s}}{\sqrt{a_s}} \delta \right)}{k_s + h_0 \sqrt{\pi a_s} E(\delta)} \hat{T}_k - \frac{h_0 k_s a_s \sqrt{\pi a_s} E(\delta) \left( \frac{\sqrt{\alpha_s}}{\sqrt{a_s}} \delta \right)}{k_s + h_0 \sqrt{\pi a_s} E(\delta)} \hat{T}_k$$

Then, by (A11) and (A12) and taking into account that $T_1 = \hat{T}_1$ is given by (48), we have

$$\hat{T}_k = k_1 a_s Q_1(\delta) \hat{T}_k + k_1 a_s Q_1(\delta) \hat{T}_k$$

$$= \frac{h_0 k_s a_s \sqrt{\pi a_s} E(\delta) \left( \frac{\sqrt{\alpha_s}}{\sqrt{a_s}} \delta \right)}{k_s + h_0 \sqrt{\pi a_s} E(\delta)} \hat{T}_k - \frac{h_0 k_s a_s \sqrt{\pi a_s} E(\delta) \left( \frac{\sqrt{\alpha_s}}{\sqrt{a_s}} \delta \right)}{k_s + h_0 \sqrt{\pi a_s} E(\delta)} \hat{T}_k$$

$$= \frac{k_1 a_s Q_1(\delta) \hat{T}_k + k_1 a_s Q_1(\delta) \hat{T}_k}{k_1 a_s Q_1(\delta) + k_1 a_s Q_1(\delta)}$$

Then, taking into account that $T_1 = \hat{T}_1$ is given by (48), we have

$$\hat{T}_1 = k_1 a_s Q_1(\delta) \hat{T}_1 + k_1 a_s Q_1(\delta) \hat{T}_1$$

$$= \frac{h_0 k_s a_s \sqrt{\pi a_s} E(\delta) \left( \frac{\sqrt{\alpha_s}}{\sqrt{a_s}} \delta \right)}{k_s + h_0 \sqrt{\pi a_s} E(\delta)} \hat{T}_1 - \frac{h_0 k_s a_s \sqrt{\pi a_s} E(\delta) \left( \frac{\sqrt{\alpha_s}}{\sqrt{a_s}} \delta \right)}{k_s + h_0 \sqrt{\pi a_s} E(\delta)} \hat{T}_1$$

$$= \frac{k_1 a_s Q_1(\delta) \hat{T}_1 + k_1 a_s Q_1(\delta) \hat{T}_1}{k_1 a_s Q_1(\delta) + k_1 a_s Q_1(\delta)}$$

$$= G(\delta).$$
Thus, by the uniqueness of the pair $\hat{T}_k, \mu$ in (35), $\mu = \delta$, and $\hat{T}_k = \hat{T}_k$.

On the other hand, taking into account that $\delta = \mu$, we have

$$D^T_s(x) = \mathcal{A}^T_s(x), \forall x > 0, \quad D^T_l(x) = \mathcal{A}^T_l(x), \forall x > 0,$$

$$D^C_s(x) = \mathcal{A}^C_s(x), \forall x > 0, \quad D^C_l(x) = \mathcal{A}^C_l(x), \forall x > 0,$$

$$E^T_s(x) = \mathcal{B}^T_s(x), \forall x > 0, \quad E^T_l(x) = \mathcal{B}^T_l(x), \forall x > 0,$$

$$E^C_s(x) = \mathcal{B}^C_s(x), \forall x > 0, \quad E^C_l(x) = \mathcal{B}^C_l(x), \forall x > 0,$$

that is, (51). □