


Irene Moreno^{1, 2*}, Leo Lue¹ and Javier Cardona^{1, 2, 3}

¹ Department of Chemical and Process Engineering, University of Strathclyde, Glasgow, UK.

² EPSRC Future Manufacturing Research Hub for Continuous Manufacturing and Advanced Crystallization (CMAC), Glasgow, UK.

³ Department of Electronic and Electrical Engineering, University of Strathclyde, Glasgow, UK.



irene.moreno@strath.ac.uk

Can we model composition pathways through phase diagrams more accurately during crystallization processes?




Figure 1. Ternary phase diagram illustrating that the mixing path dictates the outputs.

Poor understanding of **mixing** in crystallization (Fick's law as the standard)

Oiling out, unexpected polymorphs (Figure 1)

Need for a better-suited **mass transfer model**

- Scope**
- Combine the nucleation KKS [1] phase-field model (PFM) with a Cahn-Hilliard-like model (CaHiMaS) in a **2D binary system**.
 - Expand to **2D ternary systems** (working towards antisolvent crystallization systems).
 - Include **temperature dependency** (working towards cooling crystallization systems).

Description of the phase-field models

CaHiMaS PFM

$$\frac{\partial x_A}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot (\mathbf{v}x_A) = \nabla \cdot [D_{AB} \cdot \nabla x_A] + \nabla \cdot [D_{AB}x_A \cdot \nabla [A(1-x_A)^2 - \epsilon^2 \nabla^2 x_A]]$$

- Margules parameter
- Interface free E coef.

- Chemical potential gradient + Maxwell-Stefan
- Margules activity model (Figure 2)
- Interface free energy ($\epsilon^2 \nabla^2 x_A$)
- Implemented with FiPy [2]




Figure 2. Behaviour of the Margules model for different values of A/RT [3].

Kim-Kim-Suzuki PFM


$$\frac{\partial c}{\partial t} = \nabla \cdot (M/f, cc \cdot \nabla \mu_c); \mu_c = f_{\alpha,c}(1-H) + f_{\beta,c}H$$

$$\frac{\partial \eta}{\partial t} = -L\mu_\eta; \mu_\eta = [f_\beta - f_\alpha - (c_\beta - c_\alpha)f_{\beta,c\beta}]H + Wf_{Land} - \kappa\eta$$

- Mobility (CH and KKS)
- Barrier height for η double well
- Interpolation function ($H(\eta)$)
- Penalty coefficient for the α - β interface

- c corresponds with composition, and η with the phase variable
- Chemical potential gradient as the driving force
- Double-well potential for η
- Probability of nucleation depends on local supersaturation [4, 5]
- Implemented with PRISMS-PF [6]

How would these models be validated?



Case study: Fick vs CaHiMaS (LLPS)




Figure 3(a) Fick's law – top: example of steady state mixing map, obtained with Fick's law; bottom and (b): composition profiles at the marked mixing map points for Fick and CaHiMaS, respectively.

If $A/RT < 2$ the final system will be homogeneous (Figure 2), and if $A/RT > 2$, it will phase split. For higher ϵ , the interface will be more diffuse.

Case study: KKS nucleation model




Figure 4(a) top and bottom: composition and phase variable evolution (X vs Y 2D map), respectively, of a default system with $M_\eta = M_c = 1$. (b) Composition evolution of a system with reduced mobility.

Phase-field models hold a clear potential for the modelling of crystallization processes.

Acknowledgements: EPSRC Future Continuous Manufacturing and Advanced Crystallisation Research Hub (EP/P006965/1) and the University of Strathclyde. References: QR on top.