Solution of Temperature Field in DC Cast Aluminum Alloy Slab by the Diffuse Approximate Method

B. Šarler[1], R.Vertnik, J. Perko

Summary

The steady-state convective-diffusive solid-liquid phase change problem associated with temperature fields in direct-chill, semi-continuously cast billets and slabs from aluminum alloys has been solved by the Diffuse Approximate Method (DAM). The solution is based on formulation, which incorporates the one-phase physical model, nine-noded support, second order polynomial trial functions, and Gaussian window weighting functions. Realistic boundary conditions and temperature variation of material properties are included. Two-dimensional test case solution is shown, verified by comparison with the Finite Volume Method (FVM) results.

Introduction

Direct-chill (DC) casting is currently the most common [1] semi-continuous casting practice in production of aluminum alloys. The process involves molten metal being feed through a bottomless water-cooled mould where it is sufficiently solidified around the outer surface that it takes the shape of the mould and acquires sufficient mechanical strength to contain the molten core at the center. As the strand emerges from the mould, water impinges directly from the mould onto the surface (direct-chill), falls over the cast surface and completes the solidification. Related transport, solid-mechanics, and phase change kinetics phenomena are extensively studied [2] and many different numerical methods have been used in the past to solve the transport phenomena in the casting. The proper prediction of the temperature, velocity, species, and phase fields in the product is one of the prerequisites for automation of the process and related optimization with respect to its quality and productivity. The FVM represents one of the most widely used techniques [3] for solving the discussed problem. Even when using this classical numerical method in involved coupled transport phenomena context, i.e. prediction of the macrosegregation, several not sufficiently understood iteration scheme issues [4] surprisingly appear. Several mesh-reduction techniques such as the Boundary Element Method (BEM) have been used in the past to solve the heat transfer in respective DC casting model. The use of classical BEM in the two-domain context of solidification has been developed in [5]. The use of Dual Reciprocity Boundary Element Method (DRBEM) in the framework of the one-domain context has been developed in [6]. The use of Radial Basis Function Collocation Method (RBFCM) in present context has been

[1] Laboratory for Multiphase Processes, Nova Gorica Polytechnic, Vipavska 13, SI-5000, Nova Gorica, Slovenia.

pioneered in [7]. In this paper, the DAM [8,9] is upgraded to nonlinear convective-diffusive transport phenomena problems with nonlinear material properties and phase change, and applied to the posed industrial problem. The present research has been incited by the need for straightforward numerical resolution refinement in areas with high gradients and difficulties in application of the FVM in macrosegregation problems.

Governing Equations

The heat transfer in DC casting can be reasonably represented in the framework of the one-phase continuum formulation [10] which assumes local thermodynamic equilibrium between the phases. This formulation can in solidification context involve quite complicated constitutive relations. However, because of the conference paper limitations, these have to be introduced here in its most simplified form in order to point out the computational methodology instead of the physics. Consider a connected fixed domain Ω with boundary Γ occupied by a phase change material described with the temperature dependent density ρ_φ of the phase φ, temperature dependent specific heat at constant pressure c_φ, effective thermal conductivity k, and the specific latent heat of the solid-liquid phase change h_m. The one-phase continuum formulation of the enthalpy conservation for the assumed system is

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\left(\rho h\right)+\nabla\cdot\left(\rho\vec{v}h\right)=\nabla\cdot\left(k\nabla T\right)+\nabla\cdot\left(\rho\vec{v}h-f_S^V\rho_S\vec{v}_S h_S-f_L^V\rho_L\vec{v}_L h_L\right) \tag{1}$$

with mixture density defined as $\rho=f_S^V\rho_S+f_L^V\rho_L$, mixture velocity defined as $\rho\vec{v}=f_S^V\rho_S\vec{v}_S+f_L^V\rho_L\vec{v}_L$, and mixture enthalpy defined as $h=f_S^V h_S+f_L^V h_L$. The constitutive mixture temperature- mixture enthalpy relationships are

$$h_S=\int_{T_{ref}}^{T}c_S dT \qquad h_L=h_S\left(T\right)+\int_{T_S}^{T}\left(c_L-c_S\right)dT+h_m \tag{2,3}$$

with T_{ref} and T_S standing for the reference temperature and solidus temperature, respectively. Thermal conductivity and specific heat of the phases can arbitrarily depend on temperature. The liquid volume fraction f_L^V is assumed to vary from 0 to 1 between solidus T_S and liquidus temperature T_L. We seek for mixture temperature at time $t_0+\Delta t$ by assuming known temperature and velocity fields at time t_0, and boundary conditions.

Solution Procedure

The solution of the problem is demonstrated on the general transport equation defined on fixed domain Ω with boundary Γ, standing for a reasonably broad spectra of mass,

energy, momentum and species transfer problems (and includes also equation (1) as a special case).

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\left[\rho \mathrm{C}(\Phi)\right]+\nabla\cdot\left[\rho\vec{v}\,\mathrm{C}(\Phi)\right]=-\nabla\cdot\left(-\mathbf{D}\nabla\Phi\right)+S \tag{4}$$

with $\rho,\Phi,t,\vec{v},\mathbf{D},$ and S standing for density, transport variable, time, velocity, diffusion matrix and source, respectively. Scalar function C stands for possible more involved constitutive relations between conserved and diffused quantities. The solution of the governing equation for the transport variable at the final time $t_0+\Delta t$ is sought, where t_0 represents the initial time and Δt the positive time increment. The solution is constructed by the initial and boundary conditions that follow. The initial value of the transport variable $\Phi\left(\vec{p},t\right)$ at point with position vector $\vec{p}$ and time t_0 is defined through the known function Φ_0

$$\Phi\left(\vec{p},t\right)=\Phi_0\left(\vec{p},t\right);\ p\in\Omega+\Gamma \tag{5}$$

The boundary Γ is divided into not necessarily connected parts $\Gamma=\Gamma_D\cup\Gamma_N\cup\Gamma_R$ with Dirichlet, Neumann and Robin type boundary conditions, respectively. These boundary conditions are at the boundary point $\vec{p}$ with normal $\vec{n}_\Gamma$ and time $t_0\le t\le t_0+\Delta t$ defined through known functions $\Phi^D_\Gamma,\ \Phi^R_\Gamma,\ \Phi^R_{\Gamma ref}$

$$\Phi=\Phi^D_\Gamma;\ \vec{p}\in\Gamma_D \qquad \frac{\partial}{\partial n_\Gamma}\Phi=\Phi^N_\Gamma;\ p\in\Gamma_N \qquad \frac{\partial}{\partial n_\Gamma}\Phi=\Phi^R_\Gamma\left(\Phi-\Phi^R_{\Gamma ref}\right);\ p\in\Gamma_R \tag{6,7,8}$$

The involved parameters of the governing equation and boundary conditions are assumed to depend on the transport variable, space and time. The solution procedure is in this paper based on the combined explicit-implicit scheme. The discretisation in time can be written as

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\left(\rho \mathrm{C}(\Phi)\right)\approx\frac{\rho\mathrm{C}-\rho_0\mathrm{C}_0}{\Delta t}\approx\frac{\bar{\rho}\,\bar{\mathrm{C}}+\bar{\rho}\dfrac{d\bar{C}}{d\Phi}\left(\Phi-\bar{\Phi}\right)-\rho_0\mathrm{C}_0}{\Delta t} \tag{9}$$

by using the two-level time discretisation and Taylor expansion of the function $\mathrm{C}(\Phi)$. The known quantities are denoted with overbar. The source term can be expanded as

$$S(\Phi)\approx\bar{S}+\frac{d\bar{S}}{d\Phi}\left(\Phi-\bar{\Phi}\right) \tag{10}$$

The unknown Φ can be calculated from the equation

$$\Phi = \frac{\frac{\rho_0}{\Delta t}\mathrm{C}_0 - \frac{\overline{\rho}}{\Delta t}\overline{\mathrm{C}} + \frac{\overline{\rho}}{\Delta t}\frac{d\overline{C}}{d\Phi}\overline{\Phi} + \nabla\cdot\left(\mathbf{D}_0\nabla\Phi_0\right) - \nabla\cdot\left(\rho_0\vec{v}_0\,\mathrm{C}_0\right) + \overline{S} - \frac{d\overline{S}}{d\Phi}\overline{\Phi}}{\frac{\overline{\rho}}{\Delta t}\frac{d\overline{C}}{d\Phi} - \frac{d\overline{S}}{d\Phi}} \tag{11}$$

The value of the transport variable Φ_n is solved in as set of nodes $\vec{p}_n; n = 1,2,...,N$ of which N_Ω belong to the domain and N_Γ to the boundary. The iterations over one timestep are completed when the equation (12) is satisfied, and the steady-state is achieved when the equation (13) is achieved

$$\max\left|\Phi_n - \overline{\Phi}_n\right| \le \Phi_{itr} \qquad \max\left|\Phi_n - \Phi_0\right| \le \Phi_{ste} \tag{12,13}$$

The value of the unknown derivatives of the variable Φ_n in point $\vec{p}_n$ is approximated by the moving least squares method which uses the values of Φ_i at I points $\vec{p}_i; i = 1,2,...,I$, situated in the vicinity of and including $\vec{p}_n$. One can write the following approximation of the function and its first and second order partial derivatives

$$\Phi\left(\vec{p}\right) \approx \sum\nolimits_{k=1\ n}^{K} \alpha_k \psi_k\left(\vec{p} - \vec{p}_n\right) \qquad \frac{\partial}{\partial p_\varsigma}\Phi\left(\vec{p}\right) \approx \sum\nolimits_{k=1\ n}^{K} \alpha_k \frac{\partial}{\partial p_\varsigma}\psi_k\left(\vec{p} - \vec{p}_n\right) \tag{14,15}$$

$$\frac{\partial^2}{\partial p_{\varsigma\xi}}\Phi\left(\vec{p}\right) \approx \sum\nolimits_{k=1\ n}^{K} \alpha_k \frac{\partial^2}{\partial p_{\varsigma\xi}}\psi_k\left(\vec{p} - \vec{p}_n\right); \quad \varsigma,\xi = x,y; \tag{16}$$

Functions ψ_k have been chosen as polynomials $\psi_1 = 1,\ \psi_2\left(\vec{p}\right) = p_x,\ \psi_3 = p_y,$ $\psi_4\left(\vec{p}\right) = p_x p_y, \psi_5\left(\vec{p}\right) = p_x^2,\ \psi_6 = p_y^2$, i.e. $K = 6$. The initial conditions are assumed to be known in all nodes $\vec{p}_n$. The coefficients ${}_n\alpha_k$ can be calculated from the minimization of the following functional

$$\begin{aligned}\Im\left(\alpha_n\right) = &\sum_{i=1}^{I} \Upsilon_{\Omega i}\omega_n\left(\vec{p}_i - \vec{p}_n\right)\left[\Phi_i - \sum\nolimits_{k=1\ n}^{K}\alpha_k\psi_k\left(\vec{p}_i - \vec{p}_n\right)\right]^2 \\ &+ \sum_{i=1}^{I} \Upsilon_{\Gamma i}^{D}\omega_n\left(\vec{p}_i - \vec{p}_n\right)\left[\Phi_{\Gamma i}^{D} - \sum\nolimits_{k=1\ n}^{K}\alpha_k\psi_k\left(\vec{p}_i - \vec{p}_n\right)\right]^2 \\ &+ \sum_{i=1}^{I} \Upsilon_{\Gamma i}^{N}\omega_n\left(\vec{p}_i - \vec{p}_n\right)\left[\Phi_{\Gamma i}^{N} - \sum\nolimits_{k=1\ n}^{K}\alpha_k\frac{\partial}{\partial n_\Gamma}\psi_k\left(\vec{p}_i - \vec{p}_n\right)\right]^2\end{aligned}$$

$$+\sum_{i=1}^{I}\Upsilon_{\Gamma i}^{R}\omega_n\left(\vec{p}_i-\vec{p}_n\right)\left[\Phi_{\Gamma i}^{R}\left(\sum_{k=1}^{K}{}_n\alpha_k\psi_k\left(\vec{p}_i-\vec{p}_n\right)-\Phi_{\Gamma refi}^{R}\right)-\sum_{k=1}^{K}{}_n\alpha_k\frac{\partial}{\partial n_\Gamma}\psi_k\left(\vec{p}_i-\vec{p}_n\right)\right]^2 \tag{17}$$

This leads to the following system of $K\times K$ equations for calculation of the unknown coefficients ${}_n\alpha_k$ in each of the points $\vec{p}_n$

$$\sum_{k=1}^{K}{}_nA_{jk}\,{}_n\alpha_k={}_nb_j;\ j=1,2,...,K \tag{18}$$

$$\begin{aligned}{}_nA_{jk}=&\sum_{i=1}^{I}\Upsilon_{\Omega i}\psi_j\left(\vec{p}_i-\vec{p}_n\right)\omega_n\left(\vec{p}_i-\vec{p}_n\right)\psi_k\left(\vec{p}_i-\vec{p}_n\right)\\&+\sum_{i=1}^{I}\Upsilon_{\Gamma i}^{D}\psi_j\left(\vec{p}_i-\vec{p}_n\right)\omega_n\left(\vec{p}_i-\vec{p}_n\right)\psi_k\left(\vec{p}_i-\vec{p}_n\right)\\&+\sum_{i=1}^{I}\Upsilon_{\Gamma i}^{N}\frac{\partial}{\partial n_\Gamma}\psi_j\left(\vec{p}_i-\vec{p}_n\right)\omega_n\left(\vec{p}_i-\vec{p}_n\right)\frac{\partial}{\partial n_\Gamma}\psi_k\left(\vec{p}_i-\vec{p}_n\right)\\&+\sum_{i=1}^{I}\Upsilon_{\Gamma i}^{R}\left(\Phi_{\Gamma refi}^{R}\psi_j\left(\vec{p}_i-\vec{p}_n\right)+\frac{\partial}{\partial n_\Gamma}\psi_j\left(\vec{p}_i-\vec{p}_n\right)\right)\omega_n\left(\vec{p}_i-\vec{p}_n\right)\times\\&\times\left(\Phi_{\Gamma refi}^{R}\psi_k\left(\vec{p}_i-\vec{p}_n\right)+\frac{\partial}{\partial n_\Gamma}\psi_k\left(\vec{p}_i-\vec{p}_n\right)\right)\end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

$$\begin{aligned}{}_nb_j=&\sum_{i=1}^{I}\Upsilon_{\Omega i}\psi_j\left(\vec{p}_i-\vec{p}_n\right)\omega_n\left(\vec{p}_i-\vec{p}_n\right)\Phi_i+\sum_{i=1}^{I}\Upsilon_{\Gamma i}^{D}\psi_j\left(\vec{p}_i-\vec{p}_n\right)\omega_n\left(\vec{p}_i-\vec{p}_n\right)\Phi_{\Gamma i}^{D}\\&+\sum_{i=1}^{I}\Upsilon_{\Gamma i}^{N}\frac{\partial}{\partial n_\Gamma}\psi_j\left(\vec{p}_i-\vec{p}_n\right)\omega_n\left(\vec{p}_i-\vec{p}_n\right)\Phi_{\Gamma i}^{N}\\&+\sum_{i=1}^{I}\Upsilon_{\Gamma i}^{R}\left(\left(\Phi_{\Gamma i}^{R}\right)^2\Phi_{\Gamma refi}^{R}\psi_j\left(\vec{p}_i-\vec{p}_n\right)+\Phi_{\Gamma i}^{R}\Phi_{\Gamma refi}^{R}\frac{\partial}{\partial n_\Gamma}\psi_j\left(\vec{p}_i-\vec{p}_n\right)\right)\omega_n\left(\vec{p}_i-\vec{p}_n\right)\end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

The following point condition indicators have been used in equations (17,19,20)

$$\Upsilon_{\Omega i}^{D}=\begin{cases}1;\vec{p}\in\Omega\\0;\vec{p}\notin\Omega\end{cases}\quad\Upsilon_{\Gamma i}^{D}=\begin{cases}1;\vec{p}\in\Gamma^D\\0;\vec{p}\notin\Gamma^D\end{cases}\quad\Upsilon_{\Gamma i}^{N}=\begin{cases}1;\vec{p}\in\Gamma^N\\0;\vec{p}\notin\Gamma^N\end{cases}\quad\Upsilon_{\Gamma i}^{R}=\begin{cases}1;\vec{p}\in\Gamma^R\\0;\vec{p}\notin\Gamma^R\end{cases} \tag{21}$$

The following weighting function has been chosen

$$w_n\left(\vec{p}\right)=\exp\left(-c_n\vec{p}\cdot\vec{p}/\sigma_n^2\right);\left|\vec{p}\right|\le\sigma_n;\ w_n\left(\vec{p}\right)=0;\left|\vec{p}\right|>\sigma_n \tag{22}$$

according to the recommendations from [7] with $c_n = 7$. The size of support σ_n is chosen to contain 9 nodes. The calculation over one timestep involves the following operations: I) coefficients ${}_n\alpha_k$ are calculated from initial conditions in the domain nodes from system (18), II) Equation (11) is used to calculate unknowns in the domain nodes at $t_0 + \Delta t$, III) unknowns at the Dirichlet boundary at time $t_0 + \Delta t$ are determined from the Dirichlet boundary conditions, IV) ${}_n\alpha_k$ at time $t_0 + \Delta t$ are calculated in the domain and boundary nodes from system (18), V) finally, the unknowns at time $t_0 + \Delta t$ in the Neumann and Robin boundary points are determined from equation (14).

Numerical Example

This section elaborates the solution of a simplified model of the DC casting process by the developed DAM in two dimensions. The steady state solution is shown in this paper, approached by a false transient calculation using a fixed timestep of $0.5s$. The temperature iteration error T_{itr} has been set to $0.001K$ and the steady state criterion T_{ste} to $0.01K$. The enthalpy reference temperature T_{ref} has been set to $0K$. The following simplified DC casting case is considered. The computational domain is a rectangle (coordinates p_x, p_y) $-1.25m \le p_x \le 0m$, $0m \le p_y \le 0.25m$. The boundary conditions on the top at $p_x = 0m$ are of the Dirichlet type with $T_\Gamma^D = 980K$, and the boundary conditions at the bottom at $p_x = -1.25m$ are of the Neumann type with $F_\Gamma^N = 0W/m^2$. The boundary conditions at the outer surface are of the Robin type with $T_{\Gamma ref}^R = 298K$. The heat transfer coefficients between $0m \le p_z \le -0.01m$, $-0.0m \le p_z \le -0.06m$, $-0.06m \le p_z \le -0.1m$, and $-0.1m \le p_z \le -1.25m$, are $T_\Gamma^R = 0W/m^2K$, $T_\Gamma^R = 3000W/m^2K$, $T_\Gamma^R = 150W/m^2K$, and $T_\Gamma^R = 4000W/m^2K$, respectively. Material properties correspond to a simplified Al4.5%Cu alloy [6]: $\rho_S = \rho_L = 2982kg/m^3$, $k_S = 120.7W/mK$, $k_L = 57.3W/mK$, $k = f_S^V k_S + f_L^V k_L$, $c_S = 1032W/mK$, $c_L = 1179W/mK$, $h_M = 348.2kJ/kgK$, $T_S = 775K$, $T_L = 911K$. The liquid fraction increases linearly between T_S and T_L The initial temperature grows linearly with the p_x coordinate from $298K$ at the bottom to $980K$ at the top. of the cylinder. The uniform casting velocity is $v_{Sx} = v_{Lx} = -0.000633m/s$, $v_{Sy} = v_{Ly} = 0m/s$. The DAM solution has been obtained on equidistant 25×125 node arrangement. The calculated results are shown in Figure 1, together with the reference FVM results, calculated in the same nodes. Visual comparison of the results on finer grid

arrangement 50×250 shows no difference between the two methods. The DAM calculation requires approximately two times more CPU time than the FVM calculation.



Figure 1: Calculated temperature distribution in the slab. Solid curve: FVM, dashed curve: DAM. Upper curve – centerline, center curve – mid thickness, and lower curve – surface temperature.

Conclusions

The present paper demonstrates the successful use of the DAM for numerical evaluation of a physical model that could be previously efficiently solved only by more established numerical methods. It probably represents the first industrial use of this type of mesh-free method for solving convective-diffusive solid-liquid phase change problems with temperature dependent material properties and complex boundary conditions. All types of technically relevant boundary conditions have been introduced in a systematic way. The accuracy of the method is similar to the FVM. When compared with other mesh-free methods used in present context one can conclude: The method can cope with physically more involved situations than the front tracking BEM [5], where the calculations are limited to a uniform velocity field, constant material properties of the phases, and isothermal phase-change. When compared with the DRBEM [6], the method does not need any integrations and boundary polygonisation. The method appears much more efficient as the RBFCM [7], because it does not require a solution of the large systems of

equations. Instead, small (in our case 6x6) systems of linear equations have to be solved in each timestep for each node. The method is going to be used in coupled transport phenomena context in our future work.

Acknowledgement The authors would like to acknowledge the aluminium enterprise IMPOL Slovenska Bistrica, Slovenia, and the Slovenian Ministry of Education, Science and Sport for support in the framework of the project Modeling and Optimization for Competitive Continuous Casting. The present paper forms a part of the EU project COST-526: APOMAT, and US National Research Council project COBASE.

Reference

1 Altenpohl, D. G. (1998): *Aluminum: Technology, Applications, and Environment: A profile of a Modern Metal*, Aluminium Association & TMS.

2 Beckermann, C. (2002): ``Modeling of Macrosegregation: Applications and Future Needs'', *International Matarials Reviews*'', Vol. 47, pp. 243-261.

3 Versteeg, H. K. and Malalasekera, W. (1995): *Computational Fluid Dynamics: The Finite Volume Method,* Prentice Hall.

4 Venneker, B. C. H. and Katgerman, L. (2002): ``Modelling Issues in Macrosegregation Predictions in Direct-Chill Casting'', *Journal of Light Metals*, Vol. 2, pp. 149-159.

5 Fic, A., Nowak, AJ. and Białecki, R. (2000): ``Heat Transfer Analysis of the Continuous Casting Process by the Front Tracking BEM'', *Engineering Analysis with Boundary Elements*, Vol. 24, pp. 215-223.

6 Šarler, B. and Mencinger, J. (1999): ``Solution of Temperature Field in DC Cast Aluminium Alloy Billet by the Dual Reciprocity Boundary Element Method'', *International Journal of Numerical Methods in Heat and Fluid Flow*, Vol. 9, pp. 267-297.

7 Šarler, B., Kovačević, I. and Chen, C.S. (2003): ``A Radial Basis Function Collocation Solver for Transport Phenomena in Direct Chill Casting of Aluminium Alloys'', Šarler, B. and Gobin, D. (Eds.): *Eurotherm 69: Heat and Mass Transfer in Solid-Liquid Phase Change Processes*, Nova Gorica Polytechnic Publisher, pp. 215-223.

8 Nayroles, B., Touzot, G. and Villon, P. (1991): ``The Diffuse Approximation'', *C.R.Acad.Sci.Paris,* , Vol. 313-II, pp. 293-296.

9 Sadat, H., Prax, C. (1996): ``Application of the Diffuse Approximation for Solving Fluid Flow and Heat Transfer Problems'', *International Journal of Heat and Mass Transer*, Vol. 39, pp. 214-218.

10 Bennon, W.D. and Incropera, F.P. (1987): ``A Continuum Model for Momentum, Heat and Species Transport in Binary Solid-Liquid Phase Change Systems- I. Formulation'', *International Journal of Heat and Mass Transer*, Vol. 30, pp. 2161-2170.