

**therm0chimica acta** 

ELSEVIER Thermochimica Acta 291 (1997) 59-64

# **A method for determination of Avrami parameters directly from isothermal calorimetry data**

George W. Smith $1$ 

*Physics and Physical Chemistry Department, 2-211 RAB-480-106-224, Research and Development Center, General Motors Corporation, 30500 Mound Road, Bldg. 1-6, Warren MI 48090-9055, USA* 

Received 24 June 1996; received in revised form 2 October 1996; accepted 8 October 1996

## **Abstract**

A method for determining Avrami parameters directly from isothermal calorimetry data has been developed. Using the method, we have determined values of the time constant  $\tau$  and exponent n. The  $\tau$  values agree reasonably well with results from a previous, more cumbersome graphical method of analysis. There are greater discrepancies between the  $n$  values derived using the two techniques, presumably due to differences in the magnitudes of time increments by which the data fits are shifted in the two methods. The method is illustrated by analysis of isothermal calorimetry curves for precipitation in several aluminum alloy samples. © 1997 Elsevier Science B.V.

*Keywords:* Aluminum alloys; Avrami parameters; Calorimetry; Differential isothermal calorimetry; Precipitation

diffusion-controlled precipitation, are frequently well equilibrium conditions following rapid sample warm-

$$
X(t) = 1 - \exp[-(t/\tau)^n]
$$
 (1)

precipitated, t the time,  $\tau$  the time constant, and n a typical differential isothermal calorimetry (DIC) constant [1-4]. Eq. (1) is often called the Avrami experiment, the sample temperature is rapidly equation [4]. Although the exponent n can take on increased from ambient to the desired heat-treatment values as high as 4 (or even greater) for various temperature. While the sample is held at temperature, transformations [3,4], it generally lies near 1 for the calorimeter measures  $dQ/dt$ , the rate of heat precipitation [1,2,4]. Previously [5], we developed a absorption or emission by the sample as a function

**1. Introduction n n** from calorimetric experiments for which early-time data are invalid or unavailable, a situation which may The kinetics of phase transformations, including arise in certain experimental circumstances (e.g. nondescribed by the empirical equation up to a heat-treatment temperature). In our studies we determine the kinetics (and energetics) of heat treatment using a Perkin-Elmer DSC2 differential scanwhere  $X(t)$  is the fraction of material transformed or ning calorimeter operated isothermally [5]. In a method for determining the Avrami parameters  $\tau$  and of time. The resulting dO/dt plot can be either endothermic (positive) or exothermic (negative), <sup>1</sup>Tel.: 810 986 0614; fax: 810 986 3091; e-mail: gsmith@cm- depending on the nature of the thermal process

sa.gmr.com. **involved.** The presence of an endotherm indicates

<sup>0040-6031/97/\$17.00 © 1997</sup> Elsevier Science B.V. All rights reserved *PII* S0040-603 1 (96)03096- 1

the occurrence of a heat-absorbing event, such as shows  $dQ/dt$  at 225°C for a sample which had been melting or dissolution of a species in a solid matrix, air-cooled after casting. As expected, the curve is An exotherm is due to some sort of heat-releasing exothermic, reaching an extremum (minimum) at event, such as solidification, precipitation, or an  $\sim$  2 min and then increasing monotonically toward exothermic chemical reaction,  $\qquad \qquad$  zero over the next hour or so. In Fig. 2 is plotted dO/dt

cipitation in two samples of an aluminum alloy 339 [6] after casting. In this case the extremum is not reached (data are shown as points; the solid curves are fits until 4.8 min after the start of the experiment. From which will be discussed later). The plot in Fig.  $1$  plots like those of Figs. 1 and 2 the total heat absorbed



aluminum alloy 339. Curve is best fit of the new Avrami-type shifting the  $dQ/dt$  data downward in time by an analysis directly to calorimetric data for  $\Delta t = 2.21$  min.



Fig. 2.  $dQ/dt$  vs. t at 200°C for precipitation in water-quenched aluminum alloy 339. Curve is best fit of new Avrami-type analysis The slope of the best fit of Eq. (3) yielded n, and the directly to calorimetric data for  $\Delta t = 4.8$  min. intercept n ln  $\tau$ . In principle, the most reliable results

Figs. 1 and are plots of  $dQ/dt$  vs. time for pre- at  $200^{\circ}$ C for a sample which had been water-quenched or released by the sample,  $\Delta Q$ , can be determined by integrating  $dQ/dt$  over the duration of the experiment o.o F **EXAMERISABLE CONTRACT CONT** thermal event is complete). During the first minute -0.02 or so of these calorimetry experiments, data are lost or  $-0.1$   $-4$   $\frac{25}{20.02}$  invalid due to non-equilibrium sample conditions. The  $\frac{26}{8}$  method described in ref. [5], developed to correct for<br>this loss of data is briefly described in the next section this loss of data, is briefly described in the next section,  $\frac{2}{5}$  as a basis for discussing an improved Avrami analysis<br>echnique which is the subject of this paper  $\frac{1}{2}$ <sup>0.06</sup>  $\frac{Q}{2}$  technique which is the subject of this paper.

 $\begin{array}{ccc}\n\hline\n\text{1} & \text{1} & \text{1} & \text{1} & \text{1} & \text{1} \\
\hline\n\text{20} & 40 & 60 & 80 & 100 \\
\hline\n\end{array}$  O.10 In our previous method [5], determination of *X(t)*  $^{20}$   $^{20}$   $^{40}$   $^{60}$   $^{80}$   $^{100}$  from dQ/dt curves was accomplished by integration of  $dO/dt$  curves after compensating for missing or invalid Fig. 1. dQ/dt vs. t at 225°C for precipitation in air-cooled early-time data. The compensation method involved amount  $\Delta t$  (or shifting of the time zero upward by  $\Delta t$ ) to place the first valid point at  $t=0$ . That is, if data were missing or invalid for an interval  $\Delta t_0$ , we set  $o.0$   $\Delta t = \Delta t_0$ .  $X(t)$  could then be calculated from the timeshifted data using the equation

$$
X(t) = \int_{0}^{t} (dQ/dt)dt / \int_{0}^{\infty} (dQ/dt)dt
$$

$$
= \int_{0}^{t} (dQ/dt)dt / \text{const.} \qquad (2)
$$

 $\ddot{r}$   $\frac{1}{r^2}$ =0.9972 using the graphical method [1] in which  $\ln(\ln(1/(1 - X)))$  is plotted vs. In t. From Eq. (1) this

$$
\ln(\ln(1/(1-X))) = n \ln t - n \ln \tau \tag{3}
$$



Fig. 1. Two plots are shown for  $\Delta t = 1.02$  and 2.21 min.

for the Avrami parameters were found from the timeshifted data by determining  $X$ -values from Eq. (2) for several different  $\Delta t$ ;  $\tau$  and n values were then calcu- This latter point is illustrated in Fig. 4, where we show lated for each  $\Delta t$  and plotted vs.  $\Delta t$ . The best values of two plots of  $\ln(\ln(1/(1 - X)))$  vs. In t derived from  $\tau$  and n were obtained by extrapolating to  $\Delta t = 0$  [5]. the dQ/dt curves of Fig. 2 for  $\Delta t$  values of 1.2 and However, we found that a single determination for 4.8 min. As in the previous case, the smaller value of which  $\Delta t$  was equal to the time interval over which  $\Delta t$  corresponds to the time interval for which data are data were invalid, yielded parameters within roughly lost/invalid and the larger to the time of the dO/dt  $\pm 10\%$  of their extrapolated values. This method is extremum. In this case it is apparent that the larger illustrated in Fig. 3, where we plot  $\ln(\ln(1/(1 - X)))$  value of  $\Delta t$  gives much better results: a good straight vs. In t derived from the data of Fig. 1 for two different line fit of Eq. (3) is obtained, yielding Avrami paratime-shifts,  $\Delta t$ : 1.02 and 2.21 min. The shorter value meters  $\tau = 5.7$  min and  $n = 0.902$ . For  $\Delta t = 1.2$  min of  $\Delta t$  corresponds to the interval of lost/invalid data, the curvature of the plot is so great that it is difficult to the longer is a time increment slightly greater than the determine an appropriate time interval over which to position of the extremum of dQ/dt. Although the two perform a fit to Eq. (3); indeed, a cubic fits the data plots give comparable values for  $\tau$ , it appears that the better than a straight line [7]. linear regression fit of Eq. (3) is marginally better for In the next section we shall describe a method (also  $\Delta t = 2.21$  min than for  $\Delta t = 1.02$  min (as can be seen involving a time-shift) which compensates for the two from the correlation coefficients,  $r^2$ , for the two drawbacks of the previous method. We shall also curves). **present an argument to justify the choice of**  $\Delta t$  **values** 

least two major drawbacks:

- 1. Since it involves integration of time-shifted  $dQ/dt$  3. New method: Fit of time-shifted Avrami curve data in Eq. (2) plus a solution of Eq. (3), it is directly to  $dQ/dt$ rather time consuming.
- 2. Furthermore, inasmuch as the fit involves an inte-<br>grad of  $dQ/dt$  rather than  $dQ/dt$  itself, the user of the straightform and  $Q/dt$  is a straightform and  $Q/dt$  itself, the user of the straightform and  $Q/dt$  itself. method does not obtain an impression of the 'goodness of fit' to the actual calorimetric curves.



Fig. 3. Graph of  $\ln\ln(1/(1 - X))$  vs.  $\ln(t - \Delta t)$  for sample of Fig. 4. Graph of  $\ln\ln(1/(1 - X))$  vs.  $\ln(t - \Delta t)$  for sample of Fig. 2. Two plots are shown for  $\Delta t = 1.2$  and 4.8 min. Curvature of lower curve shows the importance of proper choice of  $\Delta t$ .

The method described in ref. [5] suffers from at comparable to the positions of the  $dO/dt$  extrema.

ward. If we take the derivative of Eq.  $(2)$ , we obtain

$$
dX/dt = (dQ/dt)/const
$$
 (4)

$$
dQ/dt = -\text{constexp}(-(t/\tau)^n)(nt^{n-1}/\tau^n) \qquad (5)
$$

form for determination of the Avrami parameters. We calorimeter signal is weak, baseline drift may also recall that the best values are obtained from data which contribute to dQ/dt: that is, thermal imbalances is time-shifted. Therefore, we rewrite Eq. (5) to between the sample and reference pans of the caloriincrease the time zero by  $\Delta t$ : **meter can lead to modest changes (drift) in baseline** 

$$
IQ/dt = -\text{const} \exp(-( (t - \Delta t)/\tau)^n)
$$
  
 
$$
\times (n(t - \Delta t)^{n-1}/\tau^n)
$$
 (6)

While this equation is formidable in appearance, it long-time baseline back to  $t = 0$ .<br>can be quickly and accurately fit directly to experi-<br> $\frac{1}{2}$  and the same back to  $t = 0$ . can be quickly and accurately in directly to experi-<br>mental  $dQ/dt$  curves by means of appropriate soft-<br>the distributed dO/dt date are transformed from the mental dQ/dt curves by means of appropriate soft-<br>ware, such as TableCurve [8]. One parameter must be a considerate a DC wins file attention and transfer determined by inspection of the raw  $dO/dt$  data: the time shift,  $\Delta t$ . In the previous method  $\Delta t$  was taken to<br>be appropriately manipulated (including correction<br>be appropriately manipulated (including correction be equal to the time interval for which data are missing for baseline drift) and copied to the curve fitting or invalid. In the present method it is preferable to or invalid. In the present method it is preferable to program for determination of *n* and  $\tau$ . In the next pick  $\Delta t$  to be comparable to or greater than the program for determination of *n* and  $\tau$ . In the next time for which the greatest value of the  $dQ/dt$  pre-<br>cipitation exotherm occurs. It can be argued that cipitation exotherm occurs. It can be argued that In Fig. 1 the fit of Eq. (6) to  $dQ/dt$  for this extremum occurs after an incubation time this extremum occurs after an incubation time  $\Delta t = 2.21$  min (shown as a solid curve) passes nicely required for dissolved species to diffuse to a common required for dissolved species to diffuse to a common through the data points, yielding Avrami parameters site where they can react to initiate precipitation. Thus site where they can react to initiate precipitation. Thus  $\tau = 17.85$  min and  $n = 0.967$ . These values are in  $\Delta t$  can be taken to be a measure of the incubation At can be taken to be a measure of the included reasonable agreement with those derived by the time, and the increase of the time zero by  $\Delta t$  corretime, and the increase of the time zero by  $\Delta t$  corre-<br>species are the same  $\Delta t$  (see Fig. 3). sponds to shifting the origin to the end of the incuba-<br>similarly, the data of Fig. 2 are also well described<br>tion period. Once  $\Delta t$  has been substituted into Eq. (6) tion period. Once  $\Delta t$  has been substituted into Eq. (6) by Eq. (6) for  $\Delta t = 4.8$  min. The resulting Avrami in the curve-fitting program, a best fit is obtained in the curve-fitting program, a best fit is obtained parameters,  $\tau = 5.6$  min and  $n = 0.902$ , agree well which yields the three parameters, n,  $\tau$ , and const which yields the three parameters, n,  $\tau$ , and const<br>(we are primarily interested in n and  $\tau$ , and do not (The small discrepancies in the  $\tau$  and n velues (we are primarily interested in *n* and  $\tau$ , and do not (The small discrepancies in the  $\tau$  and *n* values report values of const which does not appear in found by the two mathods are mimorily due to differ Eq.  $(1)$ ). In the next section we shall illustrate the method by analyzing several isothermal  $dQ/dt$  curves process.) for aluminum alloys.<br>When the signal-to-noise ratio for a calorimetry

As aforementioned, our experiments are carried out the data. using a Perkin-Elmer DSC2 in its isothermal mode.  $Eq. (6)$  does not always provide good fits to  $dQ/dt$ . All samples are run in a nitrogen-filled dry box Two examples in which poorer results were obtained with nitrogen as the purge gas. In a DIC experiment, are seen in Figs. 6 and 7. In Fig. 6, the fit clearly does the sample temperature is increased rapidly not pass through all of the data points. A better fit is the sample temperature is increased rapidly not pass through all of the data points. A better fit is  $(320^{\circ} \text{C min}^{-1})$  from ambient to the desired heat-treat-<br>obtained by the two-exponential expression discussed

Substitution of Eq. (1) into Eq. (4) then yields ment temperature (generally between 200 and 300 $^{\circ}$ C). After the sample has equilibrated at the selected temperature, the calorimeter records  $dQ/dt$ , the rate This equation, as it stands, is not in the desired final of heat emission due to precipitation. However, if the  $dQ/dt = -\text{const} \exp(-(t - \Delta t)/\tau)^n)$  position over the course of an experiment. We can correct for drift by allowing the experiment to con tinue longer than the time required for completion of the precipitation process and then extrapolating the

> calorimeter to a PC, using file extraction and transfer programs written in our laboratory. The data can then paragraphs we discuss several examples illustrating

> found by the two methods are primarily due to differences in the number of data points used in the fitting

experiment is low (as may be the case for a slow rate of precipitation or a small amount of precipitate), 4. Experimental methods and results a good fit may still be obtained. Such a case is of new method seen in Fig. 5. Although the correlation coefficient is small, the best fit of Eq. (6) adequately represents

obtained by the two-exponential expression discussed



aluminum alloy 339. Although the signal-to-noise ratio is low, fit 9456 with two sequential precipitation events. Fit of new Avrami-



aluminum alloy 339. Best fit of new Avrami analysis is not good.<br>Fit of Eq. (7) is better (two exponentials with  $\alpha_1 = 1.188$ . Tanging from 210 to 300°C. All the resulting isother-Fit of Eq. (7) is better (two exponentials with  $\alpha_1 = 1.188$ ,



for simultaneous precipitation of two different species hand, the  $n$  values found by the new method vary much of solute. A fit of Eq. (7) is shown in Fig. 6 as the less than those determined by the older method. The dashed curve. In this case the two-exponential fit older method gives smaller, more scattered  $n$  values



Fig. 5.  $dQ/dt$  vs. t at 200°C for precipitation in air-cooled Fig. 7.  $dQ/dt$  vs. t at 180°C for solution-treated aluminum alloy of new Avrami-type analysis to calorimetric data is good. type analysis is poorer than that obtained from two single exponentials with time constants of 18.5 and 38.0 min.

-0.2 ~' -0.05 obviously represents the data better than does the Avrami fit.

t=2.50 min  $\begin{array}{ccc} -0.15 & \frac{\omega}{20} \\ -0.05 & \frac{\omega}{20} \end{array}$  is seen in Fig. 7. Here we plot an isothermal dQ/dt  $\begin{array}{ccc} -0.15 & \frac{\omega}{20} \\ -0.20 & \frac{\omega}{20} \end{array}$  curve for solution-treated alloy 9456 [9] in which  $\sum_{t=2.58 \text{ min}}^{\infty}$ <br>  $\sum_{t=2.58 \text{ min}}^{\infty}$ <br>  $\sum_{t=0.7890}^{\infty}$ <br>  $\sum_{t=0.7890}^{\infty}$ <br>  $\sum_{t=0.26 \text{ min}}^{\infty}$ <br>  $\sum_{t=0.25 \text{ min}}^{\infty}$ <br>  $\sum_{t=0.25 \text{ min}}^{\infty}$ <br>  $\sum_{t=0.25 \text{ min}}^{\infty}$ <br>  $\sum_{t=0.25 \text{ min}}^{\infty}$ <br>  $\sum_{t=0.7890}^{\infty}$  $\begin{array}{ccc}\n -1.0 & +1 \\
 \hline\n \end{array}$  + 1.0  $\begin{array}{ccc}\n +1.0 & +1.0 \\
 \hline\n \end{array}$  + 1.0  $\begin{array}{ccc}\n +1.0 & +1.0 \\
 \hline\n \end{array}$  + 1.0  $\begin{array}{ccc}\n +1.0 & +1.0 \\
 \hline\n \end{array}$  + 1.0  $\begin{array}{ccc}\n +1.0 & +1.0 \\
 \hline\n \end{array}$  + 1.0  $\begin{array}{ccc}\n +1.0 & +1.0 \\
 \hline\n \end{array}$  + 1.0  $\begin{array}{ccc$ The fit of Eq.  $(6)$  does not coincide with the data: the  $t_{\text{1.4}}$  +  $\begin{bmatrix} \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \end{bmatrix}$  + -0.30 derived  $\tau$  and *n* values (58.4 min and 0.8619) are rough averages for both precipitation events. A better rough averages for both precipitation events. A better -1.6- 2-exponentialfiI !\_040 representation of dQ/dt is obtained by fitting two  $\frac{1.8}{1}$   $\frac{1}{1}$   $\frac{1}{1}$ 

*time/min* **A** useful comparison of the two methods was Fig. 6.  $dQ/dt$  vs. t at 220°C for precipitation in water-quenched by recording  $dQ/dt$  curves for precipitation pluminum allow 339 Fee fit of new Avrami analysis is not good in air-cooled samples of alloy 339 [6] at temper  $\alpha_2 = 0.1400$ ,  $\tau_1 = 2.07$  min, and  $\tau_2 = 22.8$  min). mal curves exhibited a single precipitation event, like that of Fig. 1, but with time constants which, as expected, decreased with increasing temperature. We evaluated Avrami parameters using both the old  $dQ/dt = -\alpha_1 \exp(-t/\tau_1) - \alpha_2 \exp(-t/\tau_2)$  Fig. 8 where we plot n vs.  $\tau$  obtained by the two methods. The Avrami time constants,  $\tau$ , from the new (7) method are comparable to those obtained using the Here  $\tau_1$  and  $\tau_2$  are assumed to be time constants more cumbersome previous analysis [5]. On the other



Fig. 8. Plots of *n* vs.  $\tau$  derived from new (Eq. (6)) and old (Eq. (3)) Avrami-type analyses. Values of  $n$  from the new method lie much closer to 1 and are much less scattered than those from the old The author thanks A.K. Sachdev for useful discusmethod. The contract of the sign of the sign of the signs, for initial information about TableCurve, and

to the fact that the older method uses  $\Delta t$  values smaller programs. than the incubation period, leading to greater curvature in plots of  $ln(ln(1/(1 - X)))$  vs.  $ln t$  (as in Fig. 4) [but see also ref. [7] ]. The newer method gives  $n$  **References** values close to 1 over the entire time constant range. This is satisfying since, as pointed out previously [5], [1] M.E. Fine, Phase Transformations in Condensed Systems, the derived value of  $\tau$  is less sensitive to the choice of MacMillan, New York (1964) p. 62.  $\Delta t$  when n is nearly equal to 1. [2] J.W. Christian, The Theory of Transformations in Metals and

# **5. Discussion** p. 96.

The new Avrami analysis described here is often Press, Orlando (1985) p. 22. adequate for fitting  $dQ/dt$  curves when it appears that  $\frac{13}{357}$ there is only a single precipitating species. When two  $\frac{61 \text{ Alloy 339 contains } \sim 1\% \text{ Cu}, \sim 1\% \text{ Mg}, \text{ and } \sim 12\% \text{ Si}.$ species are precipitating, it may be better to use a two- [7] It has been pointed out [J. Malek, Thermochimica Acta, 267 exponential analysis for simultaneous precipitation (1995) 81] that the double logarithmic plot used to determine events and two single exponentials when the species Avrami constants is rather insensitive to subtle changes in the precipitate sequentially. The choice of analysis to be cannot be considered to be a general proof of validity of used can be made by comparison of the correlation  $E_{\text{G}}(1)$ . coefficients and by visual inspection. If a value of [8] Jandel Scientific, 2591 Kerner Blvd., San Rafael, CA 94901,  $r^2 > 0.99$  is found using the fit of Eq. (6), the USA.<br>improved Avrami mathod is probably appropriate: [9] Alloy 9456 contains 3.5% Cu and ~ 0.05% Sn. The solution improved Avrami method is probably appropriate;<br> $\frac{19}{2}$  Alloy 9456 contains 3.5% Cu and ~ 0.05% Sn. The solution<br>teatment consisted of heating at 527°C for 16 h, followed by otherwise it may be preferable to use one or the other of the exponential fits. Two factors relevant to the

•  $\frac{1}{2}$  choice of methods should be kept in mind: (1) the two- $1.0 \div 1.0 \div 1.0$  o exponential analysis is probably more physically meaningful than the Avrami analysis in describing  $\bullet$   $\bullet$   $\bullet$   $\bullet$   $\bullet$  precipitation by two species; and (2) the two-exponential analysis is capable of giving a better fit because

 $\frac{1}{\text{Old Analysis}}$  is  $\frac{1}{\text{Old Analysis}}$  Given the facts that the new Avrami analysis  $\overline{0.7}$  or  $\overline{0.7}$  or  $\overline{0.0}$  method is considerably faster than the previous one,  $\circ$  that it allows direct comparison with calorimetric curves, and that derived values of  $n$  generally lie near  $\begin{array}{c|c}\n\circ \\
\circ \\
\hline\n\end{array}$  1, we conclude that the new method is an improvement Increasing temperature  $\vert$  over the old one.

### **Acknowledgements**

for providing samples; W.J. Baxter for suggestions; T.H. VanSteenkiste, S.M. Willett, and R.B. Hall for for  $\tau$  < 5 min. We believe that this discrepancy is due technical assistance; and D.B. Hayden for computer

- 
- Alloys, Pergamon, Oxford (1965) p. 487.
- [3] V. Raghavan and M. Cohen, in N.B. Hannay (Ed.), Treatise on Solid State Chemistry, Vol. 5, Plenum, New York (1975)
- [4] R.H. Doremus, Rates of Phase Transformations, Academic
- [5] G.W. Smith, Scripta Metallurgica et Materialia 31 (1994)
- 
- fraction of material transformed. Therefore, its linearity
- 
- a water quench.