

Sharp phase-field modeling of isotropic solidification with a super efficient spatial resolution

Michael Fleck^{✉*} and Felix Schleifer[✉]

Metals and Alloys, University of Bayreuth, Prof.-Rüdiger-Bormann-Straße 1, 95447 Bayreuth, Bavaria, Germany

The numerical resolution efficiency of phase-field models is limited by grid friction, grid anisotropy and pinning. The 1D sharp phase-field model eliminates grid friction and pinning by a global restoration of Translational Invariance (TI) in the discretized phase-field equation (Phys. Rev. Lett. 121, 025501, 2018). In 3D global TI restricts the beneficial modeling properties to a finite number of fixed interface orientations. We propose an accurate scheme to restore TI locally in the local interface normal direction. At one-grid-point interface resolutions, the new model captures the formation of isotropic seaweed structures without spurious dendritic selection by grid anisotropy.

Diffuse interface descriptions, such as phase-field models, are widely used for the microscopic modeling of solidification as well as related microstructure evolution problems [1–3]. Quantitative simulations require a proper numerical resolution of the diffuse solid/liquid interface, i.e. the diffuse interface profile has to be resolved by a certain minimal amount of grid points. In case of numerical under-resolution, the simulation is subjected to spurious grid anisotropy as well as grid friction, which in the worst case leads to the “pinning” of the diffuse interface on the computational grid. In conventional phase-field models the minimal number of grid points used to resolve the profile is about 4 [4]. In our notation this corresponds to the dimensionless grid resolution number $\tilde{\lambda} = 2$. However, depending on the accuracy demands of the simulation, the double, triple or even quadruple amount of grid points can be required.

Recently, Finel et al. found a striking new way to eliminate grid friction and pinning in one dimension, called the sharp phase-field model [5]. This method is conceptually related to other techniques to improve the performance of phase-field models based on the phase-field profile function [6–11]. The 1D sharp phase-field model operates at one-grid-point profile resolutions ($\tilde{\lambda} = 0.5$) and below without the occurrence of grid pinning!

However, beside the profile resolution, there is one other important aspect that limits the spatial resolution efficiency of phase-field models in general: They cannot operate at arbitrarily small interface energy densities Γ . Consider an interface between two phases at different bulk free energy density levels. The latter, also called the driving force μ , induces an interface motion lowering the total free energy of the system. For too small interface energies or too large driving forces either the high energy phase turns unstable (phase stability limit) or the phase-field profile is spuriously altered. The alternation is accompanied by strong grid friction effects. We define the dimensionless driving force $\tilde{\mu} = \mu\Delta x/\Gamma$, which relates to the spatial resolution of the simulation via the grid spacing Δx . Imposing constant driving forces, we consider the simulation of stationary interface motion in 1D at different dimensionless spatial resolution numbers

$\tilde{\lambda}, \tilde{\mu}$. Reasonable model operation at the resolution $\tilde{\lambda}, \tilde{\mu}$ is said to require phase stability and less than 10% relative deviations from the energetically exact interface velocity. Further details on this study are given in the supplementary material. In Fig. 1, we compare the resulting parameter windows of reasonable model operation for the most frequently used conventional phase-field model (blue) and the sharp phase-field model (green). The elimination of spurious grid friction in the sharp phase-field model allows for orders of magnitude more efficient simulations than possible with the conventional phase-field model.

During diffusion limited solidification the complex evolution of the solid/liquid interface undergoes a branching instability [12]. In a fully isotropic system, this leads to the self-organized formation of so-called isotropic dense branching or seaweed microstructures [13], as visible in the inset of Fig. 1. The structure shows a characteristic distance between branches, which nontrivially relates to the atomistically small capillary length d_0 , that is proportional to the interface energy density Γ [1]. A fundamental challenge in solidification modeling is the fact that the microscopic distance between branches is typically several orders of magnitude larger than a central aspect




Figure 1. Comparison of the parameter windows of reasonable model operation (stationary interface motion with relative errors < 0.1) for two different phase-field models: The most frequently used conventional model (blue area) and the new sharp phase-field model (green area).

of its cause, i.e. the atomistically small capillary length. If, however, the phase-field model is able to stably operate at a certain small interface energy or, in other words, a certain large dimensionless driving force, then the grid spacing Δx can exceed d_0 in a respective proportion [14].

Here, we propose a new sharp phase-field model, which captures the 3D formation of isotropic dense branching even at one-grid-point profile resolutions ($\tilde{\lambda} = 0.5$), see Fig. 1! The absence of any spurious dendritic selection by the computational grid indicates quite high degrees of isotropy [15, 16]. In this simulation the driving forces are largely inhomogeneous. In Fig. 1, we visualize the respective driving force distribution by a boxplot with whiskers to the maximal and minimal value. In this work, we show that the sharp phase-field model provides quantitative interface velocities within the full range of different driving forces! To achieve a comparable accuracy over a similarly wide range of driving forces, the conventional phase-field model would require profile resolutions of $\tilde{\lambda} = 5$, as shown in Fig. 1. In this regard, the new sharp phase-field model allows for 3D simulations of isotropic solidification with a $10^3 \times$ more efficient spatial resolution.

The new sharp phase-field model The derivation of the new sharp phase-field formulation is started from a discrete Helmholtz free energy functional $F[\phi_{\mathbf{p}}] = \sum_{\mathbf{p}} f_{\mathbf{p}} \Delta x^3$, where \mathbf{p} denotes the locations of the grid points within the simple cubic 3D numerical lattice with a grid spacing Δx . The discrete Helmholtz free energy density $f_{\mathbf{p}}$ associated with the grid point \mathbf{p} is

$$f_{\mathbf{p}} = \frac{\Gamma}{C_{\Gamma} \lambda} \sum_{j,k} \gamma_j \nu_j \left(\frac{\lambda^2}{2} (\partial_k^+ \phi_{\mathbf{p}})^2 + g_k(\phi_{\mathbf{p}}) \right) + \mu_{\mathbf{p}} h(\phi_{\mathbf{p}}). \quad (1)$$

We restrict the interaction between grid points to the first three neighboring shells $j = 1, 2, 3$, with $|\mathbf{r}_k|_j = \sqrt{j} \Delta x$ and \mathbf{r}_k being a numerical lattice vector that connects two neighboring grid points along the direction k . $\partial_k^+ \phi_{\mathbf{p}}$ denotes the discrete directional derivative, which is approximated by the forward finite difference expression $\partial_k^+ \phi_{\mathbf{p}} \equiv (\phi_{\mathbf{p}+\mathbf{r}_k} - \phi_{\mathbf{p}}) / |\mathbf{r}_k|$. For a given neighboring shell with m_j neighboring nodes, the coefficients $\nu_j = 3/m_j$ correct for the multiplicity of the shell. Similar to [5], the ponderation coefficients γ_j are chosen to get best possible energetic equality of differently oriented ideal interfaces.

The equilibrium potentials $g_k(\phi)$ are minimal at $\phi = 0$ and $\phi = 1$, which corresponds to the two distinct phases of the system. λ denotes the width of the diffuse interface, Γ is the interface energy density, and C_{Γ} is the interface energy calibration parameter. A positive bulk free energy density difference $\mu_{\mathbf{p}}$ favors the growth of phase $\phi = 0$ on the expanse of phase $\phi = 1$. Concerning the interpolation function $h(\phi)$, we focus on the natural interpolation $h_3 = \phi^2(3-2\phi)$ [5] and the most frequently used polynomial $h_5 = \phi^3(10-15\phi+6\phi^2)$ [17–22].

The functional phase-field derivative of the discrete Helmholtz free energy is given by $\delta_{\phi} F =$

$\partial_{\phi} f_{\mathbf{p}} - \sum_{j,k} \partial_k^- (\partial_k^+ \phi_{\mathbf{p}}) f_{\mathbf{p}}$, where the second directional derivative ∂_k^- is approximated by $\partial_k^- (\partial_{\phi} f_{\mathbf{p}}) \equiv (\partial_{\phi} f_{\mathbf{p}} - \partial_{\phi} f_{\mathbf{p}-\mathbf{r}_k}) / |\mathbf{r}_k|$. The phase-field evolution equation demands that the time derivative $\partial_t \phi_{\mathbf{p}}$ is proportional to $-\delta_{\phi} F$. We write, $3\lambda \Gamma \partial_t \phi_{\mathbf{p}} = -2M \delta_{\phi} F$, where M is a kinetic coefficient with the dimension $[M] = \text{m}^2 \text{s}^{-1}$ [23]. During stationary interface motion, driven by a constant μ , total energy conservation demands $v_{\text{th}} = -M\mu/\Gamma$. The phase-field profile function is

$$\phi_{\mathbf{p}} = (1 - \tanh 2(\mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{n} - c_n) / \lambda) / 2, \quad (2)$$

which is an analytic solution of the continuum phase-field equation, if $g(\phi) = \sum_{j,k} g_k \equiv 8\phi^2(1-\phi)^2$ and $h(\phi) = h_3 = \phi^2(3-2\phi)$. \mathbf{n} is the unit normal interface vector and $c_n = v_{\text{th}} t$ denotes the central interface position, moving with the velocity v_{th} . The profile width of 2λ is understood as 96.4% of the total transition from $\phi = 0$ to $\phi = 1$ ($\tanh 2 \simeq 0.964$) [24].

For vanishing driving forces $\mu = 0$ and no phase-field motion $\partial_t \phi = 0$ and the phase-field equation reduces to

$$\sum_{j,k} \gamma_j \nu_j \{ \lambda^2 (\phi_{\mathbf{p}+\mathbf{r}_k} - 2\phi_{\mathbf{p}} + \phi_{\mathbf{p}-\mathbf{r}_k}) / \mathbf{r}_k^2 - \partial_{\phi} g_k \} = 0, \quad (3)$$

where $\partial_{\phi} = \partial/\partial\phi$ denotes the partial phase-field derivative. The condition holds, if all individual k -components are simultaneously satisfied. Those can be satisfied at any real time during the propagation of the interface using the addition property of the hyperbolic tangent profile (2) $\phi_{\mathbf{p} \pm \mathbf{r}_k} = (1 \pm a_k) \phi_{\mathbf{p}} / (1 \pm (2\phi_{\mathbf{p}} - 1)a_k)$, where the grid coupling parameters $a_k(\mathbf{n})$ are defined as $a_k = \tanh(2\mathbf{r}_k \cdot \mathbf{n} / \lambda)$. Inserting this property into the phase-field equilibrium condition, we obtain the k -th component of the modified equilibrium potential

$$g_k(\phi) \frac{\mathbf{r}_k^2}{\lambda^2} = \phi(1-\phi) + \frac{1-a_k^2}{4a_k^2} \ln \left(\frac{1-a_k^2}{1-a_k^2(1-2\phi)^2} \right), \quad (4)$$

which further satisfies $g_k(\phi = 0, 1) = 0$, to allow an easy calculation of the system's total interface energy by $F_{\text{int}}(\phi_{\mathbf{p}}) = \sum_{\mathbf{p}} f_{\mu=0}$ using an arbitrary phase-field [25, 26]. In the continuum limit $|\mathbf{r}_k| \rightarrow 0$, Eq. (4) converges to the conventional Continuum Field (CF) potential $g_k^{\infty} = 8\phi^2(1-\phi)^2$.

Translational Invariance (TI) in the phase-field equation is restored based on properties of the profile function (2). Without TI, the system integral over Eq. (3) oscillates, when the ideal profile (2) is moved on the grid, as plotted in Fig. 2. To determine the grid coupling parameters $a_k(\mathbf{n})$ Finel et al. proposed to represent the interface normal vector \mathbf{n} by a constant unit vector \mathbf{u} , perpendicular to a properly chosen lattice plane [5]. This globally restores TI for interface orientations that agree to one of the equivalent lattice orientations $\langle \mathbf{u} \rangle$, as shown in Fig. 2 for different $\text{TI}_{\langle \mathbf{u} \rangle}$ -models. Further details are given in the supplementary material. The newly proposed $\text{TI}_{\langle \mathbf{n} \rangle}$ -




Figure 2. Test of Translational Invariance (TI) of the ideal profile (2) within the equilibrium condition (3). We plot the oscillation amplitude A of the system integral over Eq. (3) during profile motion for different interface orientation angles $\vartheta_{[001]}$ and $\vartheta_{[011]}$. Profile resolution $\tilde{\lambda} = \lambda/\Delta x = 0.5$; system size $300 \times 1 \times 1$.

model (green curve) uses grid coupling parameters calculated from the local interface normal direction, leading to very small oscillations regardless of the interface orientation.

For the sufficiently accurate determination of $a_k(\mathbf{n})$, we proceed as follows: First, we calculate preliminary grid coupling parameters by $\hat{a}_k = (\hat{a}_k^+ + \hat{a}_k^-)/2$, where

$$\hat{a}_k^\pm = \frac{\pm(\phi_{\mathbf{p} \pm \mathbf{r}_k} - \phi_{\mathbf{p}})}{\phi_{\mathbf{p}} - 2\phi_{\mathbf{p} \pm \mathbf{r}_k} \phi_{\mathbf{p}} + \phi_{\mathbf{p} \pm \mathbf{r}_k}}. \quad (5)$$

Using the modified equilibrium potentials the explicit dependence of the phase-field equation on the profile width λ cancels out. Then, λ is solely controlled by the preliminary grid coupling parameters, which also contain the a priori unknown interface normal vector $\hat{\mathbf{n}}$. Thus, without length control of $\hat{\mathbf{n}}$ the profile width λ wouldn't be defined in the model. Thus, we locally calculate all components of the interface normal vector $\hat{\mathbf{n}}_k = \lambda \text{arctanh}(\hat{a}_k)/|2\mathbf{r}_k|$, restore unit length via $\mathbf{n} = \hat{\mathbf{n}}/|\hat{\mathbf{n}}|$ and calculate corrected grid coupling parameters $a_k(\mathbf{n})$.

The advancing solidification is accompanied by a release of latent heat at the solid/liquid interface [27]. Thus, the dimensionless temperature field $U_{\mathbf{p}} = C(T_{\mathbf{p}} - T_M)/L$ is introduced, where T_M , L and C denote the melting temperature, latent heat and heat capacity, respectively [28]. The driving force for solidification is given by $\mu_{\mathbf{p}} = -U_{\mathbf{p}}\Gamma/d_0$, where $d_0 = \Gamma T_M C/L^2$ denotes the capillary length. The temperature obeys a diffusion equation, $\partial_t U_{\mathbf{p}} = D\nabla^2 U_{\mathbf{p}} + R(\phi_{\mathbf{p}})\partial_\phi h \partial_t \phi_{\mathbf{p}}$, with equal diffusion coefficients D in the solid and liquid phase. For small phase-field widths, $\lambda/\Delta x \leq 2$, and $R=1$, we observe spuriously inhomogeneous releases of latent heat, whenever a grid point is close to the interface center. The spurious heat release provides oscillations in the solidification velocity as well as some degree of kinetic anisotropy. Therefore, we propose the regularization $R(\phi_{\mathbf{p}})$ in the diffusion equation

$$R(\phi_{\mathbf{p}}) = \frac{3C_R}{4} \frac{a_{\langle 100 \rangle} \lambda}{\Delta x} \left(1 - a_{\langle 100 \rangle}^2 (1 - 2\phi_{\mathbf{p}})^2\right)^{-2}, \quad (6)$$




Figure 3. Plot of the different calibration parameters C_Γ (solid green), C_Γ^{CF} (dashed green), C_R (red) and the ponderation coefficients γ_2 (violet) and γ_3 (blue) as a function of the phase-field width $\tilde{\lambda}$. $\gamma_1 = 1 - \gamma_2 - \gamma_3$

where the grid coupling parameter is $a_{\langle 100 \rangle} = \tanh 2\Delta x/\lambda$ and C_R denotes a calibration constant, which is required to maintain total energy conservation during solidification. The dependence of C_R as a function of the dimensionless profile resolution is plotted in Fig. 3.

Model calibration The interface energy calibration C_Γ is calculated via $C_\Gamma = \sum_{\mathbf{p}_{[100]}} \mathbf{e}_{[100]} \cdot \mathbf{n} f(\phi_{\mathbf{p}}(\mathbf{n}))_{\mu=0}/\Gamma$, where $\mathbf{e}_{[100]}$ denotes a unit vector pointing in the $[100]$ -direction of the computational grid, $\sum_{\mathbf{p}_{[100]}}$ denotes the sum in the $[100]$ -direction, \mathbf{n} is again the direction normal to the interface, and the phase-field values $\phi_{\mathbf{p}}(\mathbf{n})$ are given by the ideal profile (2) with orientation \mathbf{n} . For the determination of C_Γ we chose the $[100]$ -direction as interface orientation. The determination of the energy calibration factor is independent from the choice of the ponderation coefficients. Fig. 3 shows the phase-field width dependence of the different calibration factors. The continuum limit for the calibration factor, $C_\Gamma^\infty = 2/3$, is indicated by the solid black line in Fig. 3. For sharp diffuse interfaces with a phase-field width below $\tilde{\lambda} < 2$, we obtain substantially smaller values for the calibration line integral as compared to the limiting value.

For the determination of the ponderation coefficients an optimization procedure similar to the one proposed by Finel et al. [5] has been developed. The ponderation coefficients γ_j should be chosen such that the interface energy becomes as isotropic as possible, i.e. the discrete interface energy integral $\Gamma(\mathbf{n}) = \langle \sum_{\mathbf{p}_{[100]}} \mathbf{e}_{[100]} \cdot \mathbf{n} f(\phi_{\mathbf{p}}(\mathbf{n}))_{\mu=0} \rangle_{r_n}$ should depend on the interface orientation \mathbf{n} as little as possible. Since at least some of these line integrals may not be Translationally Invariant, we further average over a number of different values obtained for different positions r_n of the interface center, as denoted by the angle brackets with index r_n . Given a starting set for the ponderation coefficients γ_j , we calculate the following three different interface energy densities: $\Gamma([100]) = \Gamma_{j=1}$, $\Gamma([110]) = \Gamma_{j=2}$ and $\Gamma([111]) = \Gamma_{j=3}$. As a measure for interface energy isotropy and as the minimization target, the square root of the sum of the deviations from the average interface energy value in square of these three




Figure 4. Comparison of the heat release range of the source term $S(\phi) = \partial_\phi h \partial_t \phi \sim \partial_\phi h^2(\phi)$ with ($\tilde{\lambda}=0.4$) and without ($\tilde{\lambda}=2$) the regularization factor $R(\phi)$ Eq. (6). The comparison is based on the ideal phase-field profile function (2)

energy densities is chosen. i.e.

$$\{\gamma_j\} : \min \sqrt{\sum_j (\bar{\Gamma} - \Gamma_j)^2}, \quad (7)$$

with $\bar{\Gamma} = \sum_j \Gamma_j / 3$. The optimal choice for the ponderation coefficients $\{\gamma_j\}$, with respect to this minimization target and under the constraint $\sum_j \gamma_j = 1$, has been calculated by a simple steepest decent algorithm. In Fig. 3, the optimal ponderation coefficients are plotted as function of the phase-field width for the $\text{TI}_{\langle n \rangle}$ -model (solid curves) as well as for the $\text{TI}_{\langle 100 \rangle}$ -model (dashed curves). The ponderation coefficients obtained for the CF-model are nearly identical to those of the $\text{TI}_{\langle 100 \rangle}$ -model.

The idea behind the source term regularization $R(\phi)$ Eq. (6) is to distribute the latent heat release over a slightly enlarged range, involving more than just a single grid point. The different ranges of heat release of different source term variants are compared in Fig. 4. The regularization requires a phase-field width dependent calibration procedure. For a given phase-field width the calibration parameter C_R has to take a specific value in order to ensure the conservation of the total energy in the system. Using some arbitrary starting value for C_R , we perform a long term simulations of solidification until quasi two phase equilibrium in a small, thermally isolated, one-dimensional system with an initially homogeneous undercooling temperature of $U_0 = -0.7$. Then, based of the deviation of the measured solid phase fraction from the expected outcome of 0.7, we successively optimize the C_R value.

Quantitative stationary solidification In Fig. 5a), the configuration of stationary solidification is shown. An animation of this figure is provided in the supplementary material. Far in front of the solid/liquid interface the temperature is $U(L) = -2.0$. When the system reaches a stationary state, the solid phase is found at the minimal undercooling temperature of $U_{\text{int}} = -1.0$. Then, the theoretically expected solidification velocity is given by $v_{\text{th}} = MU_{\text{int}}/d_0$, where M denotes the kinetic coefficient, and d_0 is the capillary length [29]. We restrict to the comparison with the sharp interface equation and omit more sophisticated thin interface corrections [30]. The




Figure 5. Stationary solidification using (i) the Continuum Field model (CF+ h_5) for $\tilde{\lambda}=2$ in blue, (ii) the Translationally Invariant model (TI+ h_3) for $\tilde{\lambda}=0.4$ in red and (iii) the TI-model with regularization (TI+ h_3 + R) in green. a) Exemplary simulation results and a plot of the velocity as function of the interface center ($\tilde{\mu}_{\text{int}} = 100$). The temperature U is given by colored lines and the phase-field values by black full symbols. b) Plot of the interface velocity error as function of the dimensionless driving force $\tilde{\mu}_{\text{int}} = \mu_{\text{int}} \Delta x / \Gamma$.

ratio between the total system length and the theoretic stationary diffusion length $l_D = 2D/v_{\text{th}}$ is chosen to be $L/l_D = 5$. The system is resolved by 200 grid points, i.e. $L/\Delta x = 200$, with a solid phase fraction of 12%. The fraction is kept constant by incremental shifting of the whole system [31].

In Fig. 5b) the relative error in the solidification velocity is plotted as function of the dimensionless driving force $\tilde{\mu}_{\text{int}} = \mu_{\text{int}} \Delta x / \Gamma$. The CF+ h_5 -model (blue color) is subjected to strong spurious grid friction for both small as well as large dimensionless driving forces. In case of $\tilde{\mu}_{\text{int}} = 100$, the observed solidification velocity is 90 % smaller than the expectation. The TI-models are limited by phase stability only. This limit is indicated by the vertical dashed line in Fig. 5b). The TI+ h_3 -model (red curve) provides large oscillations in the interface velocity. These result from spuriously inhomogeneous heat release at the solid/liquid interface, as visible in Fig. 5a). It can be avoided by employing the newly proposed source term regularization R Eq. (6), see the green curves in Fig. 5.

Diffusion limited solidification For dimensionless undercooling temperatures U smaller than unity, we obtain




Figure 6. Time series of phase-field simulations of diffusion limited solidification using four different models: The $\text{TI}_{\langle \mathbf{n} \rangle} + h_3$ model (i) with and (ii) without regularization R , (iii) the $\text{TI}_{\langle 100 \rangle} + h_3$ model each with $\tilde{\lambda} = 0.5$, and (iv) the $\text{CF} + h_5$ -model with $\tilde{\lambda} = 2.0$. The temperature U is visualized by the coloring and the phase-field is represented by the $\phi = 1/2$ -contour. Further parameters: $d_0/\Delta x = 2 \cdot 10^{-3}$, $D/M = 5 \cdot 10^{-3}$, domain size $120 \times 60 \times 60$.

diffusion limited solidification. Four comparable simulations are performed using four different phase-field models, as shown in Fig. 6. An animation showing the full courses of all four simulations is provided in the supplementary material. The simulations are started from the same initial state at $U = -0.3$. All boundaries are thermally insulating, except for the boundary at the $[100]$ -end of the simulation domain on the right hand side, which is held at $U_{\max} = -0.3$. The initial quasi planar solid/liquid interface has small bumps at regular intervals of $10\Delta x$. In the beginning, the interface develops the Mullins-Sekerka instability [12], since the dimensionless capillary length is chosen to be sufficiently small $\tilde{d}_0 = 0.002$ ($\tilde{\mu}_{\max} = U_{\max}/\tilde{d}_0 = 150$). As soon as the most advanced point of the solid/liquid interface exceeds the fraction of 0.7 of the simulation domain along the $[100]$ -direction, the whole system is shifted back by one grid point [31].

In later stages, the disordered seaweed or dense-branching morphology develops [13, 32, 33], if the residual grid anisotropy is sufficiently small. For super efficient one-grid-point profile resolutions of $\tilde{\lambda} = 0.5$, this requires the local restoration of TI in the local interface normal direction as well as the inclusion of the source term regularization Eq. (6), as shown in first row in Fig. 6. Without regularization the simulation shows a spurious dendritic selection in the $\langle 110 \rangle$ -directions of the computational grid, which originates from the inhomogeneous temperature release via the source term in the diffusion equation. The simulations using the $\text{TI}_{\langle 100 \rangle}$ - and CF- model show spurious dendritic selection in the $\langle 100 \rangle$ -directions. For the $\text{TI}_{\langle 100 \rangle}$ model, the selection originates from anisotropic interface kinetics [15, 16],

which result from residual grid friction for interface orientations that differ from the $\langle 100 \rangle$ -directions [34]. In case of the CF-model, it results from strong grid friction.

Conclusion A new sharp phase-field model is proposed: Instead of using global grid dependent equilibrium potentials (4), that restore the Translational Invariance (TI) for a finite amount of fixed interface orientations, the newly proposed model restores TI locally for the local interface normal direction \mathbf{n} . Furthermore, we propose a source term regularization Eq. (6) to effectively suppress spurious inhomogeneous temperature releases by diffuse interfaces as sharp as $\tilde{\lambda} = 0.4$, see Fig. 5. Compared to the conventional phase-field model with the resolution limits $\tilde{\lambda} > 2.0$ and $\tilde{\mu} < 1.0$, the sharp phase-field model allows for super efficient quantitative simulations of stationary solidification with phase-field profile resolutions of $\tilde{\lambda} = 0.4$ and dimensionless driving forces up to $\tilde{\mu} = 7200$! The new sharp phase-field model with source term regularization ($\text{TI}_{\langle \mathbf{n} \rangle} + h_3 + R$) provides extremely high degrees of isotropy. It provides the expected isotropic seaweed or dense-branching morphology using extraordinary efficient spatial resolutions: $\tilde{\lambda} = 0.5$ and $\tilde{\mu}_{\max} = U_{\max}/\tilde{d}_0 = 150$!

We thank B. Böttger and J. Eiken from ACCESS, Aachen, Germany as well as A. Finel from ONERA, Châtillon, France for fruit-full discussions on this issue. The work is funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG) – 431968427.



© 2022. This version of the manuscript is made available under the CC-BY 4.0 license <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

* michael.fleck@uni-bayreuth.de

- [1] W. Kurz, M. Rappaz, and R. Trivedi. Progress in modelling solidification microstructures in metals and alloys. part ii: dendrites from 2001 to 2018. *Int. Mater. Rev.* **66**, 30–76 (2021), [\[link\]](#).
- [2] D. Tourret, H. Liu, and J. LLorca. Phase-field modeling of microstructure evolution: Recent applications, perspectives and challenges. *Prog. Mater. Sci.* 100810 (2021), [\[link\]](#).
- [3] M.R. Tonks and L.K. Aagesen. The phase field method: Mesoscale simulation aiding material discovery. *Annu. Rev. Mater. Res.* **49**, 79–102 (2019), [\[link\]](#).
- [4] A.M. Jokisaari, P. W. Voorhees, J. E. Guyer, J. A. Warren, and O. Heinonen. Phase field benchmark problems for dendritic growth and linear elasticity. *Comp. Mater. Sci.* **149**, 336–347 (2018), [\[link\]](#).
- [5] A. Finel, Y. Le Bouar, B. Dabas, B. Appolaire, Y. Yamada, and T. Mohri. Sharp phase field method. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **121**, 025501 (2018), [\[link\]](#).
- [6] K. Glasner. Nonlinear preconditioning for diffuse interfaces. *J. Comp. Phys.* **174**, 695–711 (2001), [\[link\]](#).
- [7] M. Weiser. Pointwise nonlinear scaling for reaction–diffusion equations. *Appl. Num. Math.* **59**, 1858–1869 (2009), [\[link\]](#).
- [8] J. Eiken. Numerical solution of the phase-field equation with minimized discretization error. *IOP Conf. Ser.: Mater. Sci. Eng.* **33**, 012105 (2012), [\[link\]](#).
- [9] Jean-Marc Debierre, Rahma Guérin, and Klaus Kassner. Phase-field study of crystal growth in three-dimensional capillaries: Effects of crystalline anisotropy. *Phys. Rev. E* **94**, 013001 (2016), [\[link\]](#).
- [10] J. Shen, J. Xu, and J. Yang. A new class of efficient and robust energy stable schemes for gradient flows. *SIAM Review* **61**, 474–506 (2019), [\[link\]](#).
- [11] K. Ji, A. Molavi Tabrizi, and A. Karma. Isotropic finite-difference approximations for phase-field simulations of polycrystalline alloy solidification. *J Comput. Phys.* 111069 (2022), [\[link\]](#).
- [12] W.W. Mullins and R.F. Sekerka. Stability of a planar interface during solidification of a dilute binary alloy. *J. Appl. Phys.* **35**, 444–451 (1964), [\[link\]](#).
- [13] E.A. Brener, H. Müller-Krumbhaar, D.E. Temkin, and T. Abel. Morphology diagram of possible structures in diffusional growth. *Physica A* **249**, 73–81 (1998), [\[link\]](#).
- [14] M. Fleck, F. Querfurth, and U. Glatzel. Phase field modeling of solidification in multi-component alloys with a case study on the Inconel 718 alloy. *J. Mater. Res.* **32**, 4605–4615 (2017), [\[link\]](#).
- [15] T. Ihle. Competition between kinetic and surface tension anisotropy in dendritic growth. *Euro. Phys. J B* **16**, 337–344 (2000), [\[link\]](#).
- [16] J. Bragard, A. Karma, Y. H. Lee, and M. Plapp. Linking Phase-Field and Atomistic Simulations to Model Dendritic Solidification in Highly Undercooled Melts. *Interf. Sci.* **10**, 121 (2002), [\[link\]](#).
- [17] M. Plapp. Unified derivation of phase-field models for alloy solidification from a grand-potential functional. *Phys. Rev. E* **84**, 031601 (2011), [\[link\]](#).
- [18] M. Ohno, T. Takaki, and Y. Shibuta. Variational formulation of a quantitative phase-field model for nonisothermal solidification in a multicomponent alloy. *Phys. Rev. E* **96**, 033311 (2017), [\[link\]](#).
- [19] L.K. Aagesen, Y. Gao, D. Schwen, and K. Ahmed. Grand-potential-based phase-field model for multiple phases, grains, and chemical components. *Phys. Rev. E* **98**, 023309 (2018), [\[link\]](#).
- [20] M. Greenwood, K. N. Shampur, N. Ofori-Opoku, T. Pinomaa, L. Wang, S. Gurevich, and N. Provatas. Quantitative 3d phase field modelling of solidification using next-generation adaptive mesh refinement. *Comp. Mater. Sci.* **142**, 153 (2018), [\[link\]](#).
- [21] L. Gránásy, G. I. Tóth, J. A. Warren, F. Podmaniczky, G. Tegze, L. Rátkai, and T. Pusztai. Phase-field modeling of crystal nucleation in undercooled liquids – a review. *Progress in Materials Science* **106**, 100569 (2019), [\[link\]](#).
- [22] K. Kim, Q.C. Sherman, L.K. Aagesen, and P.W. Voorhees. Phase-field model of oxidation: Kinetics. *Phys. Rev. E* **101**, 022802 (2020), [\[link\]](#).
- [23] M. Fleck, H. Federmann, and E. Pogorelov. Phase-field modeling of li-insertion kinetics in single LiFePO₄-nano-particles for rechargeable li-ion battery application. *Comp. Mater. Sci.* **153**, 288–296 (2018), [\[link\]](#).
- [24] A. Dimokrati, Y. Le Bouar, M. Benyoucef, and A. Finel. S-pfm model for ideal grain growth. *Acta Mater.* **201**, 147–157 (2020), [\[link\]](#).
- [25] F. Schleifer, M. Holzinger, Y.-Y. Lin, U. Glatzel, and M. Fleck. Phase-field modeling of a γ/γ'' microstructure in nickel-base superalloys with high γ'' volume fraction. *Intermetallics* **120**, 106745 (2020), [\[link\]](#).
- [26] F. Schleifer, M. Fleck, M. Holzinger, Y.-Y. Lin, and U. Glatzel. *Phase-field modeling of γ' and γ'' precipitate size evolution during heat treatment of Ni-base superalloys*, chap. 49, 500–508. *Superalloys 2020* (Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2020), [\[link\]](#).
- [27] K. Kassner, R. Guérin, T. Ducouso, and J.-M. Debierre. Phase-field study of solidification in three-dimensional channels. *Phys. Rev. E* **82**, 021606 (2010), [\[link\]](#).
- [28] M. Fleck, C. Hüter, D. Pilipenko, R. Spatschek, and E. A. Brener. Pattern formation during diffusion limited transformations in solids. *Phil. Mag.* **90**, 265 (2010), [\[link\]](#).
- [29] G. Caginalp. Stefan and hele-shaw type models as asymptotic limits of the phase-field equations. *Phys. Rev. A* **39**, 5887–5896 (1989), [\[link\]](#).
- [30] A. Karma and W.-J. Rappel. Quantitative phase-field modeling of dendritic growth in two and three dimensions. *Phys. Rev. E* **57**, 4323–4349 (1998), [\[link\]](#).
- [31] M. Fleck, E. A. Brener, R. Spatschek, and B. Eidel. Elastic and plastic effects on solid-state transformations: A phase field study. *Int. J. Mater. Res.* **4**, 462 (2010), [\[link\]](#).
- [32] T. Ihle and H. Müller-Krumbhaar. Fractal and compact growth morphologies in phase transitions with diffusion transport. *Phys. Rev. E* **49**, 2972–2991 (1994), [\[link\]](#).
- [33] B. Utter and E. Bodenschatz. Double dendrite growth in solidification. *Phys. Rev. E* **72**, 011601 (2005), [\[link\]](#).
- [34] M. Fleck and F. Schleifer. Frictionless motion of marginally diffuse interfaces by sharp phase-field modelling (2022), [\[link\]](#). Revision in preparation.

Supplementary material for: Sharp phase-field modeling of isotropic solidification with a super efficient spatial resolution

In the supplementary material, we provide additional technical information about the modeling and the simulations presented in the manuscript.

1. Description of the supplementary animations

1. `Supplementary_material_1_stationary_-solidification.mpg`: This movie is an animation showing the different simulations of stationary solidification presented in Figure 5. It shows the time evolution of three different simulations of stationary solidification, for a dimensionless undercooling temperature of $U_{\max.} = -2$ and a dimensionless driving force of $\tilde{\mu}_{\min} = 100$.
2. `Supplementary_material_2_diffusion_-limited_solidification.mpg`: This animation shows the four different simulations of diffusion limited solidification presented in Figure 6 using the four different models: (i) $TI_{(n)} + h_3 + R$ with $\tilde{\lambda} = 0.5$, (ii) $TI_{(n)} + h_3$ with $\tilde{\lambda} = 0.5$, (iii) $TI_{(100)} + h_3$ with $\tilde{\lambda} = 0.5$ and (iv) $CF+h_5$ with $\tilde{\lambda} = 2.0$. The temperature U is indicated by the coloring and the phase-field is visualized via a $\phi = 1/2$ -contour plot. The capillary length is $d_0/\Delta x = 0.002$, undercooling: $U(\mathbf{x}, 0) = -0.3$, kinetics: $D/M = 0.01$.

2. Stationary interface motion

We consider the constantly driven stationary motion of a planar interface in one dimension. In Fig. 7, we compare mean errors in the interface velocities and widths (solid lines) as well as their relative oscillation amplitudes (colored areas) for different models. As illustrated in the lower panel of Fig. 5a), the colored areas start from the oscillation amplitude value and end at the mean value. When the colored area is found above the mean value, we have the “healthy” situation that the measured value oscillates around the theoretic expectation. In contrast, colored areas below the mean value denote the “unhealthy” case, when the theoretic expectation is located outside the oscillation interval. While the conventional Continuum Field (CF) model is subjected to pinning, the sharp phase-field model allows for arbitrarily small driving forces.

The condition of phase stability demands the driving force to be small enough to guarantee meta-stability of the high energy phase: The two local minima of the potential energy density at $\phi = 0, 1$ have to be separated by a maximum. The $TI+h_3$ -model provides a phase-field width dependent stability limit, which can be surpris-

ingly high. For instance, imposing the phase-field width $\tilde{\lambda} = 0.4$, then the limiting driving force is $|\mu|_{\tilde{\lambda}=0.4} \lesssim 7200$! The theoretic stability limits for the different profile resolutions $\tilde{\lambda} = \lambda/\Delta x = 4.0, 3.0, 2.5, 0.5$ have been indicated by the vertical dashed green lines in Fig. 7. These theoretical limits nicely reflect the behavior of the sharp phase-field model.

Switching the interpolation function changes the phase stability limits. The most common choice for the interpolation function is $h_5 = \phi^3(10 - 15\phi + 6\phi^2)$. The $CF+h_5$ -model provides phase stability for infinitely large driving forces! However, using interpolation functions other than the natural one leads to altered nonequilibrium phase-field profiles. The resulting deviation of fitted phase-field width λ_{fit} from the theoretic expectation λ is plotted in the middle row of Fig. 7. The profile alternation increases with increasing driving force. Increasingly stronger alternations lead to increasingly stronger grid friction effects. Consider the phase-field width $\tilde{\lambda} = 3.0$ and $\tilde{\mu} = 100$, then the diffuse interface is compressed down to 22% of its original width. Grid friction drops the interface velocity down to about 5% of the theoretic expectation. Thus, for large dimensionless driving forces the CF-model h_5 is effectively limited by spurious grid friction. In the lower part of Fig. 7, we plot the parameter window of reasonable model operation. We define the range of reasonable operation to end when the relative velocity error exceeds 0.1.

3. Translational Invariance of the ideal profile

Testing the Translational Invariance (TI), we calculate the system integral over the equilibrium condition (3). We consider a discrete 3D system with a phase-field as represented by an array of 64bit floating point numbers, each associated with a grid point within the simple cubic numerical lattice of size $300 \times 1 \times 1$ (excluding the one stencil boundary halo). The phase-field values are initialized according to the ideal profile function (2), such that the interface is sitting in the middle of the system. Then the total grid friction forces are defined as the system integral over (3). This integral value may oscillate, when the ideal profile is moved in such a way that the interface center c_n passes several grid points. In Fig. 2, we plot the oscillation amplitude A of these forces for different interface orientations. Large oscillation amplitudes indicate broken Translational Invariance (TI). The conventional model without restoration of TI




Figure 7. Errors plots of the stationary interface velocity (top row) and the fitted interface width (middle row) as a function of the dimensionless driving force $\tilde{\mu} = \mu\Delta x/\Gamma$, for different phase-field widths: $\tilde{\lambda} = \lambda/\Delta x = 4.0, 3.0, 2.5, 0.5$. Two models are compared: (i) Continuum Field (CF) model with h_5 (blue) and (ii) the sharp phase-field model with Translational Invariance (TI+ h_3) (green). Solid lines denote the mean relative errors and the oscillations are indicated as transparently colored areas. The time resolution is $M\mu\Delta t/(\Gamma\Delta x) = 1.6 \cdot 10^{-7}$.

is shown by the black curve. Restoring TI using constant grid coupling parameters $a_k(\mathbf{u})$ based on a globally constant unit vector \mathbf{u} , as proposed by Finel et al., provides vanishing force oscillations for those interface orientations, that match with one of the equivalent numerical lattice directions $\langle \mathbf{u} \rangle$: When the grid coupling parameters are, for instance, chosen based on the unit lattice vector \mathbf{u} parallel to the $[110]$ -direction (TI $_{\langle 110 \rangle}$, see dark blue curve in Fig. 2), then vanishing force amplitudes are found for interface orientations with normal vectors pointing in all the $\langle 110 \rangle$ -directions. The vanishing force amplitudes are restricted to very sharp interface orientation windows, as visible in Fig. 2. The new TI $_{\langle \mathbf{n} \rangle}$ -model (green curve) uses grid coupling parameters, that are determined by means of the local interface normal direction. This leads to very small oscillation amplitudes,

regardless of the interface orientation.

Translational Invariance (TI) of the ideal planar front solution can also be tested with regard to oscillations in the total interface energy. Then the system integral over the interface energy density (1) has to be evaluated instead. However, in contrast to the forces, theoretically, only the total interface energy, i.e. the density integral over the full, infinite profile, provides a TI value. The interface energy density alone does not need to show this property. For a single direction k , the new sharp phase-field formulation provides TI total interface energies for arbitrarily oriented ideal phase-field profiles, as long as the full profile function is evaluated in that direction.

4. Construction of the models

Here, we explain how the different models are constructed from the given finite difference equations. An overview over all the different models is given in Tab. I. The models differ by different choices for the equilibrium potentials $g_k(\phi)$ and for the interpolation function $h(\phi)$. Further, the source term regularization factor $R(\phi)$ can be either imposed or otherwise set to unity. All models are separately calibrated. Thus, the imposed calibra-

tion parameters, C_Γ , γ_j , can be different for the different models. The Continuum Field (CF) model is obtained in the limit $\lim_{|\mathbf{u}_k| \rightarrow 0}$. In this limit the equilibrium potentials (4) converge to the classical quartic double-well potential. For the CF-model, we impose the equilibrium potentials $g_k^\infty = \bar{\nu} 8\phi^2(1-\phi)^2$, where the multiplicity correction $\bar{\nu} = 1/3$ equilibrates for the overweighting by the sum in the equilibrium potentials within each neighboring shell j .

Table I. The construction of the different models.

model	equilibrium potential	interpolation function	regularization	calibration
CF+ h_5	$g_k^\infty = \bar{\nu} 8\phi^2(1-\phi)^2$	$h_5 = \phi^3(10-15\phi+6\phi^2)$	—	$C_\Gamma^{\text{CF}}, \gamma_j^{\text{CF}}$
TI $_{\langle 100 \rangle} + h_3$	g_k : Eq. (4), $a_k(\mathbf{u}_{\langle 100 \rangle})$	$h_3 = \phi^2(3-2\phi)$	—	$C_\Gamma, \gamma_j^{\text{TI}_{\langle 100 \rangle}}$
TI $_{\langle \mathbf{n} \rangle} + h_3$	g_k : Eq. (4), $a_k(\mathbf{n})$	$h_3 = \phi^2(3-2\phi)$	—	$C_\Gamma, \gamma_j^{\text{TI}_{\langle \mathbf{n} \rangle}}$
TI $_{\langle \mathbf{n} \rangle} + h_3 + R$	g_k : Eq. (4), $a_k(\mathbf{n})$	$h_3 = \phi^2(3-2\phi)$	R : Eq. (6)	$C_\Gamma, \gamma_j^{\text{TI}_{\langle \mathbf{n} \rangle}}, C_R$

Translational Invariance (TI) is obtained when the new equilibrium potentials Eqs. (4) are imposed in conjunction with the natural interpolation function h_3 . When all the grid coupling parameters a_k in the equilibrium potentials are set as fixed, based on the globally fixed lattice vector $\mathbf{u} = [100]$, then TI is restored for all equivalent $\langle 100 \rangle$ -directions of the computational grid. This model is denoted as TI $_{\langle 100 \rangle} + h_3$. A combination of the new equilibrium potentials with the other interpolation function is not useful, because the nonequilibrium phase-field profile alternation destroys the carefully restored TI again. In case of the TI $_{\langle \mathbf{n} \rangle}$ -models, the locally calculated and length corrected grid coupling parameters $a_k(\mathbf{n})$ (see Eq. (5) ff.) are used in the equilibrium potentials $g_k(\phi)$ Eq. (4).

5. Additional information on the modeling

The phase-field equation of motion is given as

$$\partial_t \phi_{\mathbf{p}} = \frac{2M}{3C_\Gamma} \sum_{j,k} \gamma_j \nu_j \left(\partial_k^- (\partial_k^+ \phi_{\mathbf{p}}) - \frac{1}{\lambda^2} \partial_\phi g_k(\phi_{\mathbf{p}}) \right) - \frac{2M}{3\lambda\Gamma} \mu \partial_\phi h(\phi_{\mathbf{p}}), \quad (8)$$

where M is a kinetic coefficient comparable to a diffusion coefficient with dimension $[M] = \text{m}^2 \text{s}^{-1}$. We know that the phase-field equation promotes solution of the form of Eq. (2). The hyperbolic tangent function provides the following addition property,

$$\tanh(p \pm q) = \frac{\tanh(p) \pm \tanh(q)}{1 \pm \tanh(p) \tanh(q)}. \quad (9)$$

This property can be reformulated in terms of the phase-field profile function, and we obtain the relation

$$\phi_{\mathbf{p} \pm \mathbf{r}_k} = \frac{(1 \pm a_k) \phi_{\mathbf{p}}}{1 \pm (2\phi_{\mathbf{p}} - 1) a_k}, \quad (10)$$

where the grid coupling parameter a_k has been introduced as $a_k = \tanh(2\mathbf{r}_k \cdot \mathbf{n}/\lambda)$. The equilibrium condition (3) holds, if all 1D k -components are simultaneously satisfied. The individual k -component can be satisfied at any real time during the propagation of the interface by using the addition property of the hyperbolic tangent profile. Inserting (10) into the k -th component of the equilibrium condition (3) yields

$$\partial_\phi g_k(\phi) = a_k^2 \frac{\lambda^2}{\mathbf{r}_k^2} \frac{4\phi(1-\phi)(1-2\phi)}{1 - a_k^2(1-2\phi)^2}. \quad (11)$$