OCT 19 1962

UCRL-10433

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
Lawrence Radiation Laboratory
Berkeley, California

Contract No. W-7405-eng-48

MASTER

Facsimile Price \$ 3.60
Microfilm Price \$ 1.13

Available from the
Office of Technical Services
Department of Commerce
Washington 25, D. C.

PURE DIFFUSIONAL MASS TRANSFER IN ZONE MELTING

W. R. Wilcox and C. R. Wilke

August 1962

LEGAL NOTICE

This report was prepared as an account of Government sponsored work. Neither the United States, nor the Commission, nor any person acting on behalf of the Commission:
A. Makes any warranty or representation, expressed or implied, with respect to the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of the information contained in this report, or that the use of any information, apparatus, method, or process disclosed in this report may not infringe privately owned rights; or
B. Assumes any liabilities with respect to the use of, or for damages resulting from the use of any information, apparatus, method, or process disclosed in this report.
As used in the above, "person acting on behalf of the Commission" includes any employee or contractor of the Commission, or employee of such contractor, to the extent that such employee or contractor of the Commission, or employee of such contractor prepares, disseminates, or provides access to, any information pursuant to his employment or contract with the Commission, or his employment with such contractor.

This paper was submitted for publication in the open literature at least 6 months prior to the issuance date of this Microcard. Since the U.S.A.E.C. has no evidence that it has been published, the paper is being distributed in Microcard form as a preprint.

1a

DISCLAIMER

This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by an agency of the United States Government. Neither the United States Government nor any agency Thereof, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or any agency thereof. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof.

DISCLAIMER

Portions of this document may be illegible in electronic image products. Images are produced from the best available original document.

PURE DIFFUSIONAL MASS TRANSFER IN ZONE MELTING

W. R. Wilcox and C. R. Wilke

Lawrence Radiation Laboratory and Department of Chemical
Engineering
University of California, Berkeley, California

August 1962

ABSTRACT

The differential equation and boundary conditions for pure diffusional mass transfer in zone melting are derived. Numerical solutions are obtained and approximated algebraically for eutectic-forming systems. An analytical solution for constant distribution coefficient is obtained. Graphs are given which permit rapid approximation of concentration profiles resulting from one zone pass. Example problems are provided which illustrate the use of the calculation techniques developed.

PURE DIFFUSIONAL MASS TRANSFER IN ZONE MELTING

W. R. Wilcox* and C. R. Wilke

Lawrence Radiation Laboratory and Department of Chemical
Engineering
University of California, Berkeley, California

August 1962

INTRODUCTION

In the derivation of theoretical expressions for separation in zone melting it is usually assumed that the bulk of the molten zone is well mixed.⁵ Under some conditions, and especially in capillary tubes below about 3mm I. D., this is not true.¹⁰ In the limit, mass transfer may even proceed entirely by molecular diffusion. This limit is the situation examined in detail here.

DERIVATION OF THE DIFFERENTIAL EQUATION AND BOUNDARY CONDITIONS

The most convenient coordinate system for analysis of this problem is one in which the position of the zone is fixed and material flows through it. This is illustrated in Figure 1.

The interface at which crystallization is taking place is chosen as the origin. The interfaces are assumed planar and the cross-section uniform, so that the problem becomes a one-dimensional one. Furthermore the density and diffusivity are assumed to be independent of concentration and temperature, although the density may be different in the solid and liquid. The diffusivity in the solid, of course, is assumed to be negligible. With these assumptions the fluxes in and out of a cross-sectional element of the zone are shown in Figure 2. A material balance over this element of the zone yields:

$$DA\rho_l \left[\left(\frac{\partial w}{\partial x} \right)_{x+\Delta x} - \left(\frac{\partial w}{\partial x} \right)_x \right] + G(w_{x+\Delta x} - w_x) = A\rho_l \left(\frac{\partial w}{\partial t} \right) \Delta x, \quad (1)$$

Present address: Aerospace Corp., El Segundo, California

where:

- D = diffusivity, cm^2/sec .
- A = cross sectional area, cm^2 .
- ρ_l = density of liquid, g/cc .
- w = weight fraction of concerned component.
- G = mass rate of flow through zone, g/sec .
- t = time, sec .
- Δx = elemental distance along zone, cm .
- x = distance from freezing interface into zone, cm .

Dividing Equation (1) by Δx and taking the limit as Δx goes to zero, there results:

$$DA\rho_l \left(\frac{\partial^2 w}{\partial x^2} \right) + G \left(\frac{\partial w}{\partial x} \right) = A\rho_l \left(\frac{\partial w}{\partial t} \right) \quad (2)$$

Making the following substitutions,

$$\begin{aligned} \eta &= \frac{xG}{DA\rho_l} \quad , \\ \phi &= \frac{w}{w_0} \quad (w_0 = \text{initial concentration, uniform}), \\ \tau &= \frac{t}{D} \left(\frac{G}{A\rho_l} \right)^2 \quad , \end{aligned}$$

we obtain:

$$\frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial \eta^2} + \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial \eta} = \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial \tau} \quad (3)$$

which is the desired differential equation governing diffusive mass transfer in zone melting.

Boundary conditions.

Figures (3) and (4) show the fluxes at the freezing and melting interfaces of the zone. Making material balances at these interfaces we obtain:

$$\text{at } x = 0, \quad -D\rho_l A \frac{dw}{dx} = G(w - w_s); \quad (4)$$

$$\text{at } x = L, \quad -D\rho_l A \frac{dw}{dx} = G(w - w_0); \quad (5)$$

where w_s is the weight fraction of component in the recrystallized material at the freezing interface.

Note that no assumption as to the relationship between w_s and w at $x = 0$ has been made yet. Also note that w does not necessarily equal w_0 at $x = L$, the melting interface.

Making the substitutions for η , ϕ , and τ , and letting:

$$p = \frac{LG}{DA \rho_l}, \quad \phi_s = \frac{w_s}{w_0},$$

the boundary conditions become:

$$\text{at } \eta = 0, \quad \frac{d\phi}{d\eta} = \phi_s - \phi; \quad (6)$$

$$\text{at } \eta = p, \quad \frac{d\phi}{d\eta} = 1 - \phi. \quad (7)$$

In addition, there is the condition that the initial concentration in the zone is the same as the over-all initial solid concentration, or:

$$\text{at } t = 0, \quad \phi = 1. \quad (8)$$

Equations (6), (7), and (8) are therefore the general boundary conditions for diffusion in zone melting.

Constant distribution coefficient.

It is the usual assumption in zone melting theory that the solid concentration is always proportional to the liquid concentration when solid and liquid are in equilibrium. It is further assumed that equilibrium is attained at the freezing interface. Hence, at $x = 0$, $w_s = k w_l$, where k is the constant distribution coefficient. With this, Equation (6) becomes:

$$\text{at } \eta = 0, \quad \frac{d\phi}{d\eta} = \phi(k-1). \quad (9)$$

Equations (3), (7), (8), and (9) constitute the mathematical statement of the problem for constant distribution coefficient.

Eutectic-forming systems

As a basis for establishing the proper boundary conditions for the zone melting of a binary mixture which forms a simple eutectic, it is necessary to consider what a eutectic is and how it physically crystallizes. Figure 5 is a schematic phase diagram for this type of system. The eutectic point, e , is usually taken to be the point at which solid and liquid in equilibrium have the same composition.

Compounds which form a eutectic do so because their basic crystal structure is sufficiently different that molecules of one cannot fit into a crystal of the other. In other words, a eutectic mixture of the two is not really a homogeneous mixture, but instead consists of microscopic crystals of the separate components.^{2, 8}

Therefore when a liquid mixture of eutectic composition e begins to crystallize, a microscopic crystal of one component must form first. This event, however, depletes the adjacent melt of that component. The melt, being richer in the other component, then yields a microscopic crystal of it. This in turn makes the adjacent melt richer in the first component, and so the process repeats. It is thus seen, that on the microscopic scale, this type of crystallization is not a continuous and smooth process, but actually a cyclic one. Note that the concentration fluctuations in the melt are unobservably minute and extend only an extremely short distance into the melt which surrounds the growing solid.

Consider now the behavior of the system when a eutectic-forming mixture is subjected to zone melting. Referring again to the schematic phase diagram, assume that the initial composition is w_0 . If equilibrium is attained at the freezing interface, the first solid to come out will be pure B (0% A). This will cause the liquid to become richer in A. Thus while pure B comes out, the liquid composition moves towards the eutectic composition e . When the liquid composition at the freezing interface reaches e it might be expected that the solid would deposit at composition e , and that this would be the steady state condition. This, however, would require that material of composition e was being supplied to the zone and material of composition e was being removed. This would be impossible as a steady state condition. What must happen is that when the liquid composition at the interface first exceeds e a small amount of pure A comes out. When this happens, however, the liquid composition moves slightly below e , and so pure B comes out. Again we have the cyclic crystallization process. The difference here is that we have a convective flux of material to the interface and a diffusive flux away. The balance between these two regulates the relative amounts of A and B that come out. In the steady state the average concentration coming out must be w_0 .

The foregoing discussion requires revision of the meaning customarily attached to the eutectic point of the phase diagram. Since liquid at the eutectic composition can yield solid of virtually any average composition, the eutectic point e on the diagram must not indicate a point at which a solid and liquid in equilibrium have the same composition.

Instead it is a point above which one component comes out and below which the other component comes out, the relative amount of each being determined by the mass transfer conditions.

It is now possible to state the boundary conditions for the zone melting of a system of this type. The average conditions at $\eta = 0$ are obviously:

$$\text{for } \phi < \frac{e}{wb}; \quad \frac{d\phi}{d\eta} = -\phi; \quad \phi_s = 0. \quad (10)$$

$$\text{for } \phi = \frac{e}{w_0}; \quad \frac{d\phi}{d\eta} = \phi_s - \frac{e}{w_0}. \quad (11)$$

This means that until ϕ at $\eta = 0$ reaches e/w_0 , ϕ_s is zero and ϕ is calculated from the expression for the differential. When ϕ reaches e/w_0 it remains at that value, on the average, and the average ϕ_s is given by the differential expression above. The other boundary conditions are the same as for constant distribution coefficients, namely Equations (7) and (8).

SOLUTIONS

Steady-state.

At steady-state equation (3) becomes:

$$\frac{d^2\phi}{d\eta^2} + \frac{d\phi}{d\eta} = 0. \quad (12)$$

The general solution is:

$$\phi = a + be^{-\eta} \quad (13)$$

where a and b are constants to be determined. For constant distribution coefficient the boundary conditions, Equations (9) and (7), yield:

$$\text{at } \eta = 0; \quad -b = (a + b)(k - 1);$$

$$\text{at } \eta = p; \quad -be^{-p} = 1 - a - be^{-p};$$

from which, $a = 1$, $b = (1 - k)/k$.

Therefore the steady state solution is:

$$\phi = 1 + \frac{1-k}{k} e^{-\eta}. \quad (14)$$

For eutectic-forming systems the steadystate solution is found in a like manner to be:

$$\phi = 1 - \left(\frac{e}{w_0} - 1 \right) e^{-\eta}. \quad (15)$$

Several conclusions of particular importance may be reached from these solutions:

1. Equation (15) is the same for variable distribution coefficient, provided that the k for $w_s = w_0$ is used.
2. The concentration profile in the zone does not depend on the size of the zone at steady state.
3. The concentration w at the melting interface does not equal w_0 , although it approaches w_0 as the size of the zone increases.

Computer Solutions for unsteady state.

The unsteady state problem may be solved analytically only for constant distribution coefficient (see following section). In order to solve the problem for a eutectic-forming system, a finite difference technique was employed with an IBM 650 digital computer. The corresponding problem for constant distribution coefficient was also solved numerically by Landau for the case of progressive freezing (infinite zone size)!

The finite difference equation corresponding to the differential Equation (3) is:

$$\phi_{\eta, \tau + \Delta\tau} = \frac{\Delta\tau}{(\Delta\eta)^2} \left[\phi_{\eta + \Delta\eta, \tau} (1 + \Delta\eta) + \phi_{\eta, \tau} \left(-2 - \Delta\eta + \frac{(\Delta\eta)^2}{\Delta\tau} \right) + \phi_{\eta - \Delta\eta, \tau} \right] \quad (16)$$

where $\phi_{\eta, \tau} = \phi$ at any particular η and τ .

$\Delta\tau$ = size of interval of τ .

$\Delta\eta$ = size of interval of η .

For simplicity set

$$-2 - \Delta\eta + \frac{(\Delta\eta)^2}{\Delta\tau} = 0.$$

Then Equation (16) becomes:

$$\phi_{\eta, \tau + \Delta\tau} = \frac{1}{2 + \Delta\eta} \left[\phi_{\eta + \Delta\eta, \tau} (1 + \Delta\eta) + \phi_{\eta - \Delta\eta, \tau} \right] \quad (17)$$

The boundary conditions result in a similar manner. For constant distribution coefficient they are:

$$\text{at } \eta = 0; \quad \phi_{0, \tau} = \frac{\phi_{\Delta\eta, \tau}}{1 + (k-1) \Delta\eta} \quad (18)$$

$$\text{at } \eta = p, \quad \phi_{p, \tau} = \frac{\phi_{p - \Delta\eta, \tau} + \Delta\eta}{1 + \Delta\eta} \quad (19)$$

In carrying out a solution ϕ was initially set equal to 1.0 over the entire interval of the zone. The $\phi_{\eta, \tau}$ were all calculated by Equation (17) except for the end points, which were found by Equations (18) and (19). This process was repeated over and over until a sufficient amount of τ had been covered. ϕ_s was calculated from the fact that $\phi_s = k\phi_{0, \tau}$ at any particular τ .

To develop the computer program test calculations were made for constant distribution coefficient and compared with the analytical solution. Calculations were made for k from 0.1 to 5 and for p from 0.1 to 10. It was found necessary, in general, to make $\Delta\eta$ approximately 0.05, since solutions for larger values were unsatisfactory.

A correct solution to any mass transfer problem must satisfy an over-all material balance. For the case of zone melting this means that the total amount of a component added to the zone must equal the total amount of that component removed from it. At the steady state, this is expressed by the condition that:

$$\int_0^p (1-\phi) d\eta = \int_0^\infty (\phi_s - 1) d\tau. \quad (20)$$

It was found that the computer results of the previous paragraph did not satisfy this condition. Suspecting that the cause of the deviation may have been the assumption of a linear concentration profile at the freezing interface (which was the basis for Equation (18)) a cubic profile was tried instead. This did yield results which satisfied Equation (20) and compared very well with the analytical results.

In a like manner numerical solutions were made for eutectic-forming systems. A typical result is shown in Figure 6. The curved portion of the plot was found to be exponential, as shown in Figure 7. These solutions were found to satisfy the over-all material balance very well. Using this fact, and several other observations from the computer results, the results can be summarized in a more convenient form.

It has been found that after $\phi = e/w_0 = \epsilon$ is obtained at the freezing interface the following is approximately true:

$$(\phi - 1) = (\epsilon - 1)e^{-r\eta}, \quad (21)$$

where $r = r(\tau)$.

Noting from the boundary condition at $\eta = 0$ that:

$$\frac{d\phi}{d\eta} = \phi_s - \epsilon \quad (22)$$

we obtain:

$$\phi_s = -r(\epsilon - 1) + \epsilon \quad (23)$$

However at the time parameter, τ_0 , when at $\eta = 0$, $\phi = \epsilon$ for the first time, $\phi_s = 0$, and so

$$r(\tau_0) = \frac{\epsilon}{\epsilon - 1} \quad (24)$$

But we know that $\phi_s = 0$ for $\tau \leq \tau_0$,

that

$$(1 - \phi_s) = e^{-(\tau - \tau_0)q} \quad (25)$$

and that at the steady state $(\phi - 1) = (\epsilon - 1)e^{-\eta}$.

With these facts an overall material balance for $\tau \geq \tau_0$ yields:

$$\int_{\tau_0}^{\infty} e^{-q(\tau - \tau_0)} d\tau = \int_0^P (\epsilon - 1)(e^{-\eta} - e^{-r(\tau_0)\eta}) d\eta \quad (26)$$

From Equations (24) and (26), we find:

$$\frac{1}{q} = (\epsilon - 1) \left[(1 - e^{-P}) - \left(\frac{\epsilon - 1}{\epsilon} \right) \left(1 - e^{-\frac{\epsilon}{\epsilon - 1}P} \right) \right] \quad (27)$$

Likewise a material balance for $0 \leq \tau \leq \tau_0$ yields

$$\tau_0 = \int_0^P (\epsilon - 1)e^{-r(\tau_0)\eta} d\eta = \frac{(\epsilon - 1)^2}{\epsilon} \left(1 - e^{-\frac{\epsilon}{\epsilon - 1}P} \right) \quad (28)$$

With these expressions approximate concentration profiles can be drawn for a single zone melting pass of an initial uniform eutectic-forming mixture.*

Analytical solution for constant distribution coefficient.

In order to solve the unsteady state problem exactly by separation of variables, the differential equation and boundary conditions must form a Sturm-Liouville system. As they stand, they do not. The following transformation, however, will remedy this, i.e., let:

$$\phi = e^{-\eta/2} \psi \quad (29)$$

Then Equations (3), (7), (9) become:

$$\frac{\partial^2 \psi}{\partial \eta^2} - \frac{1}{4} \psi = \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial \tau} \quad (30)$$

* Note that since $z = tV$, and $V = G/A \rho_s$, $\frac{\tau}{p} = \frac{z}{L} \left(\frac{\rho_s}{\rho_l} \right)$, by definition.

$$\text{at } \eta = 0, \quad \frac{d\psi}{d\eta} = \psi(k - 1/2), \quad (31)$$

$$\text{at } \eta = p, \quad \frac{d\psi}{d\eta} = -1/2 \psi. \quad (32)$$

The solution to this is:¹⁰

$$\begin{aligned} \phi &= 1 + \frac{1-k}{k} e^{-\eta} \\ &+ e^{-\eta/2} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} C_j (\cos m_j \frac{\eta}{p} + b_j \sin m_j \frac{\eta}{p}) e^{-\left(\frac{1}{4} + \frac{m_j^2}{p^2}\right)\tau} \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} C_j &= \frac{16 p m_j (k - 1)}{(p^2 + 4m_j^2) [2m_j (1+b_j^2) + \sin 2m_j (1-b_j^2) + 4b_j \sin^2 m_j]} \\ + \text{an } m_j &= \frac{4m_j p k}{4m_j^2 - p^2 (2k-1)}. \end{aligned}$$

$$b_j = p(k - 1/2)/m_j.$$

For the concentration profile of the recrystallized solid, note that $\phi_s = k\phi(0, \tau)$, to obtain:

$$(\phi_s - 1) = k \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} C_j e^{-\left(\frac{1}{4} + \frac{m_j^2}{p^2}\right)\tau} \quad (34)$$

As the size of the zone gets larger, i.e., p increases, the number of terms needed for the exact solution increases rapidly. It would be convenient, therefore to have a solution for an infinite sized zone, i.e., for progressive freezing into an infinite body of liquid. Fortunately this problem has already been solved by Pohl,⁶ Hulme,³ Smith, et al.,⁷ and by Memelink.⁴ Pohl's solution, however, holds only for small k , which is given quite well anyway by the approximate solution of Tiller, et al.⁹ The solutions of Hulme, Smith, and Memelink are basically the same, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_s &= 1/2 \left\{ 1 + \operatorname{erf} \left(\frac{\sqrt{\tau}}{2} \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + (2k-1) e^{-k(1-k)\tau} \operatorname{erfc} \left(\frac{2k-1}{2} \sqrt{\tau} \right) \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

Smith⁷ also gives solutions for a sudden change in the rate of solidification in infinite progressive freezing, and for the terminal transient in finite progressive freezing.

In a sample calculation it was found that Equation (34) for zone melting is approximately the same as Equation (35) for $p = 8$. This was suspected from the computer calculations for zone melting, which showed that the concentration change in the zone did not reach the melting interface for $p \geq 8$, and gave very little change for $p = 5$.

Calculations based on analytical results.

It is apparent that the calculation of concentration profiles in zone melting can be a tedious process. Consequently, certain characteristics of these profiles have been calculated and plotted to make them conveniently available. A schematic profile of $|\phi_s - 1|$ vs τ is shown in Figure 8. All curves begin at $\tau = 0$ with $(\phi_s - 1) = (k - 1)$ and infinite slope (except for $p = 0$, perfect mixing). After sufficient time, all but the first term in the infinite series of the analytical solution, Equation (34), become negligible. At this time the equation of the profile simplifies to

$$(\phi_s - 1) = (\phi_{s, \text{ext}} - 1) e^{-s\tau} \quad (36)$$

$|\phi_{s, \text{ext}} - 1|$ is the intercept at $\tau = 0$ of the straight line portion of a semi-logarithmic plot of $|\phi_s - 1|$ vs τ . By comparison with the analytical solution,

$$(\phi_{s, \text{ext}} - 1) = kC_1, \quad (37)$$

and $s = (1/4 + m_1^2/p^2)$.

As $p \rightarrow \infty$, however, $s \rightarrow 0$, and the usefulness of this approach vanishes. Instead, the value of s , the slope of the semi-log plot, at some low value of $|\phi_s - 1|$ would be of the most use. This was chosen to be $(\phi_s - 1) = 0.1(k - 1)$.

Another valuable parameter is the value of τ at which the concentration profile first deviates significantly from an exponential form. For convenience, this was chosen as the value of τ at which the constant C_2 of the second term of the infinite series is equal to 0.1% of C_1 . τ at this point is designated as $\tau_{us, 0.1\%}$. It is given by:

$$\tau_{us, 0.1\%} = \left[\frac{p^2 \ln(C_2/0.001 C_1)}{m_2^2 - m_1^2} \right] \quad (38)$$

Values of these various parameters were calculated for $k = 0.1, 0.5, 1.00, 1.85$, and 5.00 . They are plotted in various fashions vs p in Figures (9), (10), (11), and (12). It is readily seen that the analytical solution reduces to

perfect mixing for $p < 0.01$ and effectively to infinite progressive freezing for $p > 6$.

These plots enable one to make a quick sketch of the expected concentration profile for a single zone melting pass.

In making these calculations it was noted that the first eigen value m_1 becomes imaginary under certain conditions, namely for

$$k < 0.5 \text{ when } p > (4k)/(1-2k).$$

Example Calculations.

Problem: It is desired to produce a 2 cm zone of composition 3% w β -naphthol in naphthalene. The starting mixture is 5% w β -naphthol. Assume that the cross section is sufficiently small that convection is negligible. What zone travel rate is necessary to achieve this separation? What will be the resulting concentration profile in the zoned solid?

Data:

$$w_0 = 0.05$$

$$\frac{1}{L} \int_0^L w dx = 0.03 \quad (39)$$

$$L = 2 \text{ cm}$$

From Reference 10, the physical properties are:

$$k = 1.85$$

$$D = 2.9 \times 10^{-5} \text{ cm}^2/\text{sec}$$

$$\rho_s = 1.15 \text{ g/cm}^3$$

$$\rho_l = 0.97 \text{ g/cm}^3$$

Solution:

Substituting Eq. (14) and (Eq. 40) into Eq. (39), we obtain

$$\frac{0.03}{w_0} = 1 - \frac{k-1}{k} \frac{1-e^{-p}}{p}$$

$$\text{or } p = \frac{1-e^{-p}}{0.87}$$

$$\text{By trial and error } p = \frac{LV}{D} \frac{\rho_s}{\rho_l} = 0.29$$

$$\text{or } V = 1.28 \times 10^{-2} \text{ cm/hr.}$$

This is the minimum velocity that is necessary to achieve this separation.

If convective mixing occurred in the zone much higher velocities could be used.

Now we estimate the concentration profile. From Fig. 10 with $p = 0.29$ we obtain

$$\frac{SP}{k} = 0.99, \text{ or } S = \frac{(0.99)(1.85)}{(0.29)} = 6.32$$

From Fig. 11,

$$\frac{(\phi_{s, \text{ext}} - 1)}{k-1} = 0.8; (\phi_{s, \text{ext}} - 1) = (0.8)(0.85) = 0.68$$

$$\frac{\tau_{\text{us}, 0.1\%}}{p} \approx 0.1; \tau_{\text{us}, 0.1\%} = (0.1)(0.29) = 0.029.$$

With these three numbers a plot of the type of Fig. 8 was prepared. The data is transposed to a linear plot of w_s vs z by noting that

$$w_s = w_0 [1 + (\phi_s - 1)] \text{ and that}$$

$$z = \frac{L}{p} \frac{\rho_l}{\rho_s} \tau = \frac{2}{.29} \frac{.97}{1.15} \tau = 5.82 \tau \text{ cm}$$

It was noted that the curve is exponential past 0.17 cm, because of the low $\tau_{\text{us}, 0.1\%}$. The result is shown in Fig. 13. The concentration profile for the zone is also shown as calculated from (Eq. 14),

$$w = w_0 \left[1 + \frac{1-k}{k} \exp \left(- \frac{xv}{D} \frac{\rho_s}{\rho_l} \right) \right]$$

$$= 0.05 [1 - 0.46 e^{-0.145 x}] \quad (40)$$

Problem 2:

Zone refining is performed on a 10% w mixture of benzoic acid in naphthalene using a 1 cm zone with $p = 1$. How far must the zone travel for the average concentration in the recrystallized solid to be half the initial concentration?

Data:

$$p = 1$$

$$w_0 = 0.1$$

$$L = 1 \text{ cm}$$

From Reference 10:

$$e = 0.317, \text{ so } \epsilon = 3.17$$

$$\rho_l = 0.98 \text{ g/cm}^3$$

$$\rho_s = 1.16 \text{ g/cm}^3$$

Solution:

We want the z for

$$\frac{1}{z} \int_0^z w_s dz = \frac{w_0}{2}$$

Up to τ_0 the concentration of benzoic acid is zero. The value of z corresponding to this is from Eq. (28),

$$z = \frac{(2.17)^2}{3.17} \left[1 - \exp \left(- \frac{3.17}{2.17} \cdot 1 \right) \right] \cdot \frac{1}{1} \cdot \frac{.98}{1.16} = 0.962 \text{ cm.}$$

From Eq. (27),

$$\frac{1}{q} = (2.17) \left[(1 - e^{-1}) - \frac{2.17}{3.17} \right] \left[1 - \exp \left(- \frac{3.17}{2.17} \cdot 1 \right) \right] = 0.232$$

or $q = 4.3$,

so that for $z > 0.962$,

$$\frac{w_s}{w_0} = 1 - \exp [-5.1(z - 0.962)].$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{w_0}{2} &= \frac{w_0}{z} \int_{.962}^z 1 - \exp [-5.1(z - .962)] \, dz \\ &= \frac{w_0}{z} \left[z - .962 + \frac{1}{5.1} \exp [-5.1(z - .962)] - 1 \right]. \end{aligned}$$

But $1 \gg \exp [-5.1(z - .962)]$, so $1/2 = 1 - \frac{.962}{z} - \frac{1}{5.1z}$, or $z = 2.32 \text{ cm.}$

CONCLUSIONS

Rapid methods have been given for the approximate calculation concentrations profiles resulting from a single zone pass for eutectiv-forming systems and for constant distribution coefficients. A method of numerical solution is given whereby the profile resulting from (1) arbitrary phase behavior, (2) non-uniform initial profile, (3) multi-passes, can be calculated.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

A. Acrivos suggested the transformation which made possible the analytical solution. W. R. Wilcox is grateful to the National Science Foundation and to the General Electric Foundation for their financial assistance.

This work was performed under the auspices of the U. S. Atomic Energy Commission.

NOMENCLATURE

a	--	arbitrary constant.
A	--	cross-sectional area of solid and of zone. cm^2 .
b	--	arbitrary constant.
b_j	--	jth constant in Equation (33).
C_j	--	jth constant in Equation (33).
D	--	molecular diffusivity. cm^2/sec .
d	--	differential operator.
e	--	eutectic composition. weight fraction.
G	--	mass rate of flow of material through zone. g/sec .
k	--	equilibrium distribution coefficient. w_s/w at freezing interface.
L	--	length of zone. cm .
m_j	--	jth eigen value in Equation (32).
p	--	$(LG)/(DA\rho_l) = (LV\rho_s)/(D\rho_l)$.
q	--	negative slope of $\ln(1-\phi_s)$ vs $(\tau-\tau_0)$ plot.
r	--	negative slope of $\ln(\phi-1)$ vs η plot.
s	--	negative slope of $\ln(\phi_s-1)$ vs τ plot.
t	--	time. sec .
x	--	distance from freezing interface into zone. cm .
V	--	$G/(A\rho_s)$, velocity of zone travel. cm/sec .
w	--	weight fraction of component in zone at x.
w_0	--	initial concentration throughout. weight fraction.
w_s	--	weight fraction in solid at zone.
w_z	--	average weight fraction in zone.
z	--	distance from the first material to freeze out of the zone, tV . cm .
Δ	--	signifies small interval.
∂	--	partial differential operator.
ϵ	--	e/w_0 .
η	--	$(xG)/(DA\rho_l) = xV\rho_s/D\rho_l$
ρ_l, ρ_s	--	density of liquid and solid, respectively. g/cm^3 .
τ	--	$\frac{t}{D} \left(\frac{G}{A\rho_l} \right)^2 = p \frac{z}{L} \left(\frac{\rho_s}{\rho_l} \right)$.
τ_0	--	τ at which ϕ first equals ϵ at freezing interface.
$\tau_{us, 0.1\%}$	--	value of τ at which $C_2 = 0.001 C_1$.
ϕ	--	w/w_0 .
ϕ_s	--	w_s/w_0 .
$(\phi_{s, \text{ext}}-1)$	--	intercept at $\tau = 0$ of straight line portion of semi-logarithmic plot of (ϕ_s-1) vs τ .

REFERENCES

1. Rost Kristallov, First Conference on Crystal Growth (Academy of Sciences, USSR Press, Moscow, 1957). Translated by Consultants Bureau, Inc., New York, 1958, p. 58.
2. ibid., p. 109.
3. K. R. Hulme, Proc. Phys. Soc. B68, 393 (1955).
4. O. W. Memelink, Philips Res. Rep. 11, 183 (1956).
5. W. G. Pfann, Zone Melting, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, (1958), pp. 24, 57.
6. R. G. Pohl, J. Appl. Phys. 25, 1170 (1954).
7. Smith, Tiller, Rutter, Can. J. Phys. 33, 723 (1955).
8. C. H. Sorum, E. A. Eurand, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 74, 1071 (1952).
9. Tiller, Jackson, Rutter, Chalmers, Acta. Met. 1, 428 (1953).
10. W. R. Wilcox, Ph.D. Dissertation, University of California Lawrence Radiation Laboratory report UCRL-9213, Berkeley (1960).

MU-16315

Fig. 1. Concentrations (in weight fractions) and coordinate system for zone-melting mass-transfer theory.

MU - 20442

Fig. 2. Differential element of zone showing material fluxes in pure diffusional mass transfer.

MU-16317

Fig. 3. Freezing interface showing material fluxes in pure diffusional mass transfer.

MU-16318

Fig. 4. Melting interface showing material fluxes in pure diffusional mass transfer.

MU-16322

Fig. 5. Schematic solid-liquid phase diagram for systems forming simple eutectics, showing original weight fraction, w_0 , and eutectic weight fraction, e .

MU-16320

Fig. 6. Sample finite-difference solution for pure diffusional mass transfer in zone melting of eutectic formers.

ϕ_s vs τ for $\epsilon = 3.2$ and $p = 1.0$.

MU-16325

Fig. 7. Exponential portion of a finite-difference solution for pure diffusional mass transfer in zone melting of eutectic formers.
 $\ln(1 - \phi_s)$ vs τ for $\epsilon = 3.2$, $p = 1.0$.

MU - 20447

Fig. 8. Schematic sketch of a concentration profile for a single zone pass of a material with constant distribution coefficient, with pure diffusional mass transfer, showing the parameters characterizing the curve.

$$\ln |\phi_s - 1| \text{ vs } \tau.$$

MU-20448

Fig. 9. Plot of $\ln s$ vs $\ln p$.

Fig. 10. Plot of $\ln (sp/k)$ vs $\ln p$.

Fig. 11. Plot of $(\phi_{s, \text{ext}} - 1) / (k - 1)$ vs $\ln p$.

Fig. 12. Plot of $\tau_{us, 0.1\%}/p$ vs $\ln p$.

MU-27981

Fig. 13. Concentration profile calculated for example problem, using Fig. 8, 10, 11, 12, and Eq. (40).

*Do not
reproduce*

This report was prepared as an account of Government sponsored work. Neither the United States, nor the Commission, nor any person acting on behalf of the Commission:

- A. Makes any warranty or representation, expressed or implied, with respect to the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of the information contained in this report, or that the use of any information, apparatus, method, or process disclosed in this report may not infringe privately owned rights; or
- B. Assumes any liabilities with respect to the use of, or for damages resulting from the use of any information, apparatus, method, or process disclosed in this report.

As used in the above, "person acting on behalf of the Commission" includes any employee or contractor of the Commission, or employee of such contractor, to the extent that such employee or contractor of the Commission, or employee of such contractor prepares, disseminates, or provides access to, any information pursuant to his employment or contract with the Commission, or his employment with such contractor.