Determination of the intrinsic α/γ interface mobility during massive transformations in interstitial free Fe-X alloys

Zhu, Jianing; Luo, Haiwen; Yang, Zhigang; Zhang, Chi; van der Zwaag, Sybrand; Chen, Hao

DOI
10.1016/j.actamat.2017.05.045

Publication date
2017

Document Version
Accepted author manuscript

Published in
Acta Materialia

Citation (APA)

Important note
To cite this publication, please use the final published version (if applicable). Please check the document version above.
Determination of the intrinsic $\alpha/\gamma$ interface mobility during massive transformations in interstitial free Fe-X alloys

Jianing Zhu$^1$, Haiwen Luo$^2$, Zhigang Yang$^1$, Chi Zhang$^1$, Sybrand van der Zwaag$^3$, Hao Chen$^1$*

(1- Key Laboratory for Advanced Materials of Ministry of Education, School of Materials Science and Engineering, Tsinghua University, Beijing, China
(2- School of Metallurgical and Ecological Engineering, University of Science and Technology, Beijing, China
(3- Faculty of Aerospace Engineering, Delft University of Technology, Delft, the Netherlands)

Abstract

Kinetics of the austenite ($\gamma$) to ferrite ($\alpha$) transformation and the reverse ferrite ($\alpha$) to austenite ($\gamma$) transformation in a series of Fe-X (X=Ni, Mn and Co) binary alloys has been experimentally and theoretically investigated. A transition from partitioning to partitionless transformation has been predicted to occur during both the $\gamma \rightarrow \alpha$ and $\alpha \rightarrow \gamma$ transformations by a so called Gibbs Energy Balance (GEB) model, in which the chemical driving force is assumed to be equal to the energy dissipation due to interface friction and diffusion of X inside the migrating interfaces. The transition temperature is found to depend on the kind of X and its concentration, which is in good agreement with experimental results. The intrinsic mobility of the $\alpha/\gamma$ interface has been derived from the kinetic curves of both the $\gamma \rightarrow \alpha$ and $\alpha \rightarrow \gamma$
transformations in the investigated alloys, and its value seems to be marginally affected by the transformation direction and alloying elements.
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1. Introduction

Over the past decades, the austenite (γ) to ferrite (α) transformation and the ferrite (α) to austenite (γ) transformation in the Fe-based alloys have received extensive concern due to their theoretical and practical importance [1-7]. In general, the diffusional phase transformations involve at least two process, the rearrangement of the crystal lattice and the redistribution of solute elements in the parent phase and new phase, and both of them could be the rate decisive process of the transformation, known as the diffusion-controlled transformation and the interface-controlled transformation, respectively [8]. However, the $\gamma \rightarrow \alpha$ and $\alpha \rightarrow \gamma$ transformations in the Fe-based alloys are usually situated between the pure diffusion-controlled and the pure interface-controlled transformation, e.g. a so called mixed-mode transformation, and deviation from the two extreme cases is strongly dependent on the value of the intrinsic $\alpha/\gamma$ interface mobility, which is a key physical parameter of phase transformations. Abundant effort has been made to determine the value of the intrinsic $\alpha/\gamma$ interface mobility during the $\gamma \rightarrow \alpha$ transformation due to its fundamental importance [9-13]. However, its exact value is still highly controversial, and the discrepancies among the values obtained by different research groups could be up to several orders of magnitude [14]. Furthermore, the value of the intrinsic $\alpha/\gamma$
interface mobility during the $\alpha \rightarrow \gamma$ transformation has much less investigated. Theoretically speaking, the value of the intrinsic $\alpha/\gamma$ interface mobility should not depend on the transformation direction, e.g. the values of the intrinsic $\alpha/\gamma$ interface mobility during the $\gamma \rightarrow \alpha$ transformation and its reverse transformation should be the same, which needs to be further validated by experiments.

In order to derive the value of the $\alpha/\gamma$ interface mobility, much effort has been made to investigate the kinetics of the $\gamma \rightarrow \alpha$ transformation in the Fe-X (X is substitutional alloying element, e.g. Mn, Ni, et.al) alloys [15-18], during which a kinetic transition from the diffusion-controlled mode to the interface controlled mode (e.g. massive transformation) is expected to possibly occur [19-21]. In the diffusion-controlled mode, interface migration is expected to be extremely sluggish due to the very low diffusivity of the substitutional elements, while transformation kinetics should be significantly accelerated when the transformation shifts into the massive mode. Interface velocity during massive transformation is proportional to the available chemical driving force, and the proportionality is the intrinsic $\alpha/\gamma$ interface mobility. Kinetic transition during the $\gamma \rightarrow \alpha$ transformation in the Fe-Ni alloys has been investigated in reference [22-23], however, the effect of alloying elements and its concentration on the kinetic transition is still not well understood [24-26]. Compared with the $\gamma \rightarrow \alpha$ transformation, kinetic transition during the reverse $\alpha \rightarrow \gamma$ transformation upon heating has been relatively less discussed [27].

In this study, kinetics of the $\gamma \rightarrow \alpha$ and $\alpha \rightarrow \gamma$ transformations in a series of Fe-X (X=Ni, Mn, Co) alloys will be experimentally and theoretically investigated. A
so called Gibbs Energy Balance (GEB) model based on the solute drag theory, in which the energy dissipation due to interface friction and diffusion of alloying elements inside the migrating interface is assumed to be equal to the available chemical driving force, is utilized to predict kinetic transition during the $\gamma \rightarrow \alpha$ and $\alpha \rightarrow \gamma$ transformations. The value of the intrinsic mobility of the $\alpha/\gamma$ interface will be derived, and its dependence on transformation direction and alloying elements is discussed.

2. Experimental

A series of binary Fe-Ni, Fe-Mn and Fe-Co alloys are investigated in this study. Chemical composition of these alloys is shown in Table 1. Standard cylinder samples (4 mm in diameter and 10 mm in length) were machined for dilatometry experiments. A Bahr 805A dilatometer was used to measure the dilation of the specimens during the heat treatments. The samples were first heated to 950 °C for full austenization with a heating rate of 1 K/s, then held at 950 °C for 10 min and finally cooled down to room temperature with a cooling rate of 1 K/s. Kinetics of the austenite to ferrite transformation upon cooling and the ferrite to austenite transformation upon heating is derived from the dilatation curves using the level rule method. The heat treated samples were fine grinded and then etched using 2% Nital for optical microscopy observation. The EBSD specimens were fine grinded and electrolytic polished with 20% HClO$_4$ and 80% C$_2$H$_5$OH for 20 s.

All thermodynamic data for the Fe-Ni, Fe-Mn and Fe-Co alloys used in this
study is calculated using ThermoCalc with TCFE6 database.

3. Model

A general mixed-mode model based on the principle of Gibbs Energy Balance (GEB) at the migrating interface is utilized to describe the kinetics of the austenite to ferrite and the ferrite to austenite transformations in the Fe-X binary alloys. The main assumption of the GEB approach is that at the migrating interfaces the available chemical driving force has to be balanced by the Gibbs energy dissipation due to diffusion of alloying elements inside the interface and interface friction during the transformation.

2.1 Chemical Driving Force

Chemical driving force at the migrating $\alpha/\gamma$ interfaces during the $\gamma \rightarrow \alpha$ transformation can be calculated as:

$$
\Delta G_{chem}^m = \sum_{i} n_{i} x_{i}^{0} \left[ \mu_{i}^{\gamma/\alpha} \left( x_{i}^{\gamma/\alpha} \right) - \mu_{i}^{\alpha/\gamma} \left( x_{i}^{\alpha/\gamma} \right) \right]
$$

Where $x_{i}^{0}$ is the composition of the material transferred over the interface, $n$ is the number of elements, $x_{i}^{\gamma/\alpha}$ and $x_{i}^{\alpha/\gamma}$ are the mole fractions of the element $i$ at the interface on the austenite and ferrite side, respectively. $\mu_{i}^{\gamma/\alpha}$ and $\mu_{i}^{\alpha/\gamma}$ are the chemical potential of $i$ in austenite and ferrite. For the binary Fe-X alloys, the chemical driving force for the $\gamma \rightarrow \alpha$ transformation can be simplified as:

$$
\Delta G_{chem}^m = G_{m}^{\gamma} - G_{m}^{\alpha}
$$

Where $G_{m}^{\gamma}$ and $G_{m}^{\alpha}$ are the mole Gibbs energy of ferrite and austenite with the nominal composition, respectively. The chemical driving force at the migrating $\alpha/\gamma$ interface during the $\alpha \rightarrow \gamma$ transformation can be calculated in the same way.
2.2 Dissipation of Gibbs energy

The dissipation of Gibbs energy can be divided into two parts: (i) Dissipation due to diffusion inside the interface and (ii) Dissipation due to the movement of atoms responsible for the change of crystalline structure, which is also called as the interface friction.

During the $\gamma \rightarrow \alpha$ and $\alpha \rightarrow \gamma$ transformations, substitutional alloying elements tend to segregate into the migrating interfaces. The degree of segregation depends on binding energy of the substitutional alloying element, chemical potential difference of the substitutional alloying elements in $\gamma$ and $\alpha$ phase, and interface velocity. In this work, a triangular potential well, as proposed by Purdy and Bréchet [28], is assumed inside the interface. $\mu_0^\alpha$ and $\mu_0^\gamma$ are the chemical potential of the substitutional alloying elements in ferrite and austenite, respectively; $E_0$ is the binding energy; $\Delta E$ is half of chemical potential difference of substitutional alloying elements in austenite and ferrite, and its value depends on temperature and the partition coefficient of the substitutional element; $\delta$ is the half thickness of the interface.

The governing equation for alloying elements diffusion inside the interface migrating with a quasi-steady velocity $v$ is [28]:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left[ D \frac{\partial X}{\partial x} + \frac{DX}{RT} \frac{\partial E}{\partial x} + vX \right] = 0$$  \hspace{1cm} (3)

where $X$ is the concentration of substitutional alloying elements, $x$ is distance, $D$ is the diffusion coefficient of substitutional alloying elements inside the $\alpha/\gamma$ interface, $R$ is gas constant, $T$ is temperature, $v$ is the interface velocity, and $E$ is the free energy of
interaction of the substitutional alloying elements with the interface.

The solution of equation (3) is as follows:

$$\frac{X}{X_0} = 1, \text{ for } S < -1$$

(4)

$$\frac{X}{X_0} = \frac{1 + ae^{-(V(1 + a)(1 + S))}}{1 + a}, \text{ for } -1 < S < 0$$

(5)

$$\frac{X}{X_0} = 1 + \left(\frac{a(1 + b)e^{-(V(1 + a))}}{1 + a} + \frac{b - a}{1 + a} e^{-(V(1+b)S)}\right), \text{ for } 0 < S < 1$$

(6)

$$\frac{X}{X_0} = 1 + e^{-VS}\left(\frac{ae^{-(V(1+a+b))}}{1 + a} + \frac{(b-a)e^{-(Vb)}}{(1+a)(1+b)} - \frac{be^v}{1+b}\right), \text{ for } 1 < S$$

(7)

where $X_0$ is the nominal concentration of the substitutional alloying elements in the alloys and $S$, $v$, $a$, $b$ are all dimensionless quantities defined as:

$$a = \frac{D(\Delta E - E_0)}{RTv\delta}, \quad b = \frac{D(\Delta E + E_0)}{RTv\delta}, \quad V = \frac{v\delta}{D}, \quad S = \frac{X}{\delta}$$

Dissipation due to diffusion of substitutional alloying elements inside the $\alpha/\gamma$ interface can be calculated using Cahn’s equation [29]:

$$\Delta G_{\text{diff}} = -\int_{-\delta}^{\delta} (X - X_0) \left(\frac{dE}{dx}\right) dx$$

(8)

Particularly, at ultra-low interface velocity $v \rightarrow 0$, the interfacial dissipation is given by:

$$\Delta G_{\text{diff}} = 2X_0\Delta E + RTX_0(e^{\frac{-2\Delta E}{RT}} - 1)$$

(9)

which is not dependent on the interface thickness, diffusion coefficients of substitutional alloying elements and binding energy.

The energy dissipation due to interface friction is given by:

$$\Delta G_{\text{fri}} = v / M_{\text{int}}$$

(10)
where \( \nu \) is interface velocity and \( M_{\text{int}} \) is the intrinsic interface mobility.

2.3 Gibbs Energy Balance at the interface

According to the GEB concept, the chemical driving force has to be equal to the energy dissipation during the transformation.

\[
\Delta G_{m}^{\text{chem}} = \Delta G_{\text{diff}} + \Delta G_{\text{fri}}
\]  

(11)

It should be mentioned that for all the mathematical expressions in the model, no restriction on the transformation direction is presumed. In other words, this model can be applied to both the \( \alpha \to \gamma \) and the \( \gamma \to \alpha \) transformation.

4. Results and Discussion

4.1 Experimental results

4.1.1 Microstructures

Microstructures of the specimens were observed by optical microscope and EBSD. Figure 1a and 1b show the EBSD maps of the Fe-3Mn alloy before and after the heat treatment respectively. For all the investigated samples, the microstructure was massive ferrite and it was found that after one cycle of heat treatment, both the morphology and average grain size of the sample did not change much.

4.1.2 Kinetics of the austenite to ferrite transformation

In Fig. 2, the overall kinetics of the \( \gamma \to \alpha \) transformation upon cooling at a rate of 1 K/s in a series of Fe-Ni, Fe-Mn and Fe-Co alloys is shown (data for Fe-1Mn and Fe-2Mn alloys is obtained from [9], and the cooling rate is 20 K/min, however, cooling rate does not significantly affect the onset temperature of the transformation). The \( \gamma \to \alpha \) transformation is very fast, and it is finished in about one minute. Ni
and Mn concentration significantly affects the starting temperature of the $\gamma \rightarrow \alpha$ transformation ($F_s$), which is found to decrease with increasing Ni and Mn concentration and be lower than both $A_{e3}$ and $T_0$. However, it is interesting that the effect of Co concentration on the $F_s$ is negligible. In Fig. 3, deviation of $F_s$ from $T_0$ for the Fe-Ni, Fe-Mn and Fe-Co alloys is plotted as a function of solute concentration, which will be discussed in the following sections.

The interface velocity during the $\gamma \rightarrow \alpha$ transformation can be estimated from the transformation curves using the following equation [30]:

$$\frac{df}{dt} = 3(N^* g)^{\frac{1}{3}} (1 - f^2) v_{\alpha/\gamma} \arctanh^{\frac{2}{3}}(f)$$  \hspace{1cm} (12)

where $f$ is the fraction of ferrite; $N^*$ is the density of nuclei per volume, it can be estimated as $d^{-3}$, and $d$ is the average grain size of the ferrite; $g$ is the geometrical factor ($g=1$ for cubic growth and $g=4\pi/3$ for spherical growth), $v_{\alpha/\gamma}$ is the velocity of the $\alpha/\gamma$ interface. In Fig. 4a, the derived interface velocity as a function of ferrite fraction in the Fe-1.5Ni alloys is indicated. It is found that interface velocity is almost constant during the entire transformation, which is regarded as a typical feature of massive transformation. In Fig. 4b, the derived average interface velocities during the $\gamma \rightarrow \alpha$ transformation in the Fe-Ni, Fe-Mn and Fe-Co alloys as a function of solute concentration are shown. In general, the average interface velocity decreases slightly with increasing solute concentration. Some of this reduction may also be due to the fact that for higher concentrations the transformation takes place at lower temperatures as shown in figure 2.

4.1.3 Kinetics of the ferrite to austenite transformation
In Fig. 5, overall kinetics of the ferrite to austenite transformation upon heating at a rate of 1 K/s in a series of Fe-Ni, Fe-Mn and Fe-Co alloys is shown. Similar as the $\gamma \rightarrow \alpha$ transformation, Ni and Mn have a significant effect on the starting temperature for the $\alpha \rightarrow \gamma$ transformation ($A_s$), which is experimentally found to increase with decreasing Mn or Ni concentration and is much higher than $T_0$ and $A_{e1}$. Co has a negligible effect on the $A_s$. Deviations of $A_s$ from $T_0$ for the Fe-Ni, Fe-Mn and Fe-Co alloys are plotted as a function of Ni, Mn and Co concentration in Fig. 3 as well.

The interface velocities during the $\alpha \rightarrow \gamma$ transformation in the Fe-Ni, Fe-Mn and Fe-Co alloys are also calculated using equation (12). The average grain size of austenite was estimated as 50 μm in the calculation. Fig. 6a. shows the interface velocity as a function of austenite fraction in the Fe-1.5Ni and Fig. 6b shows the average interface velocities in all the investigated alloys. It is found that the interface velocities during the $\alpha \rightarrow \gamma$ transformation are in the same order as those during the $\gamma \rightarrow \alpha$ transformation and also decrease with increasing solute concentration.

4.2 Theoretical analysis

In principle, the austenite to ferrite transformation in the substitutional binary alloys could proceed in either partitioning or partitionless mode. Thermodynamically speaking, the partitioning transformation upon cooling is expected to start once temperature is lower than $A_{e3}$, while the partitionless transformation should start below $T_0$. However, the experimental results indicate that the starting temperatures for the partitionless austenite to ferrite transformation (e.g. massive transformation) in the
Fe-Ni and Fe-Mn alloys are significantly lower than $T_0$, and the magnitude of deviation is Ni and Mn concentration dependent.

In this section, the GEB model is applied to simulating the kinetic transition from partitioning to partitionless mode during the austenite to ferrite transformation and the ferrite to austenite in the binary alloys. In the simulations, the $\alpha/\gamma$ interface thickness $2\delta$ is assumed to be 0.5 nm. Diffusion coefficients of the substitutional elements inside the $\alpha/\gamma$ interface are assumed to be the geometric average of diffusion coefficients in austenite and in ferrite [31-33], which are calculated from DICTRA. The values of chemical potential of the substitutional elements in $\alpha$ and $\gamma$ are calculated by ThermoCalc with TCFE6 database. The binding energies of Ni, Mn and Co are chosen to be 5 kJ/mol, 9.9 kJ/mol and 3 kJ/mol, respectively [34-35]. The interface mobility is assumed to be 0.058$\exp(-140000/RT)$ mmol/J·s suggested by Krielaart [9].

In Fig. 7, the energy dissipations due to Ni diffusion inside the migrating interface and interface friction as a function of interface velocity for the $\gamma\to\alpha$ transformation in the Fe-3Ni alloy at 715 °C are shown. The energy dissipation due to Ni diffusion inside the interface is almost constant when interface velocity is lower than $10^{-9}$ m/s. It starts to decrease rapidly when interface velocity is higher than $10^{-9}$ m/s and finally approaches almost zero when interface velocity is about $10^{-6}$ m/s. Dissipation due to interface friction is proportional to interface velocity, and the proportionality is the interface mobility. The dissipation due to the interfacial diffusion and interface friction are the dominant constituents of the total energy
dissipation at the low interface velocity zone and the high interface velocity zone, respectively. However, the chemical driving force at the migrating α/γ interface is constant at a given temperature.

In Fig. 8a and 8b, the total energy dissipation and chemical driving force as a function of interface velocity for the γ→α transformation in the Fe-3Ni alloy at 730 °C and 715 °C are indicated. According to the GEB concept, at the migrating interface the available chemical driving force has to be balanced by the total energy dissipation. In other words, the intersection between the chemical driving force curve and the total dissipation curve yields the interface velocity at that moment of the transformation.

At 730 °C, although there is large chemical driving force available for the γ→α transformation, it is not large enough to exceed the dissipation barrier. Therefore, it is predicted that at 730 °C the γ/α interface has to migrate in a mode that involves the long range diffusion of Ni. The kinetics of interface migration is controlled by Ni diffusion and is extremely sluggish. By solving Ni diffusion and mass balance equations, interface velocity can be estimated as [36]:

\[
\nu = \frac{D_N^\gamma (C_N^\gamma - C_N^0)^2}{2(C_N^\gamma - C_N^0)(C_N^\alpha - C_N^\gamma)\lambda}
\]

(13)

where \(D_N^\gamma\) is the diffusion coefficient of Ni in austenite, \(\lambda\) is the half thickness of ferrite, \(C_N^0\) is the nominal Ni concentration, \(C_N^\gamma\) and \(C_N^\alpha\) are the equilibrium Ni concentration in austenite and ferrite, respectively. Assuming \(\lambda\) is 100 nm, interface velocity is estimated to be in the order of \(10^{-11}\sim10^{-12}\) m/s, which is too sluggish to be detected in the current dilatometry experiments.

At 715 °C, chemical driving force at the migrating interface is large enough to
overcome the dissipation barrier, and it intersects with the total energy dissipation curve at a very high interface velocity (around $10^{-7}$ m/s). There is no diffusion of Ni inside the interface, and chemical driving force is fully dissipated by the interface friction. In other words, the $\gamma \rightarrow \alpha$ transformation at 715 °C is partitionless. The value of the $\gamma/\alpha$ interface mobility is still very controversial, and there is a large discrepancy among those measured by different research groups. Two other values of $M$ are assumed in the calculations of Figure 8b, e.g. (i) $M=5 \times 10^3 \exp(-147000/RT)$ mmol/J·s suggested by Hillert; and (ii) $M=2.4\exp(-140000/RT)$ mmol/J·s suggested by Wits. The predicted interface velocity at 715 °C is strongly dependent on the assumed value of interface velocity, and it is ranged from $10^{-7}$ to $10^{-3}$ m/s depending on the selection of $M$. The predicted features of the austenite to ferrite transformation at 715 °C is fit with the definition of massive transformation.

In Fig. 9a, the predicted interface velocities as a function of temperature are shown for the Fe-Ni alloys with different Ni concentration, and the corresponding $T_0$ temperatures are labelled with the solid arrows. In the simulations, the value of interface mobility is assumed to be $M=0.058\exp(-140000/RT)$ mmol/J·s. Kinetic transition from partitioning to partitionless upon cooling is predicted to occur at a critical temperature ($T_c$), which is lower than $T_0$ and depends on Ni concentration. It is well known that $T_0$ is regarded as the thermodynamic limit for partitionless transformation. In other words, extra chemical driving force is required to activate the partitionless austenite to ferrite transformation in the Fe-Ni alloys. The magnitude of the extra chemical driving force required to initiate the partitionless transformation
increases with increasing Ni concentration, which is because the energy dissipation caused by Ni diffusion inside the interface is proportional to Ni concentration. Similar calculations have also been made for the austenite to ferrite transformation in the Fe-Mn and Fe-Co alloys, as shown in Fig. 9b and 9c. Increment of Mn concentration significantly reduces \( T_c \) while Co concentration has almost no effect on \( T_c \).

The kinetics of austenite reversion in the Fe-Ni alloys can be calculated based on the GEB model as well. Fig. 10 show the total energy dissipation together with the available chemical driving force at the migrating interface at 800 °C and 810 °C for the \( \alpha \rightarrow \gamma \) transformation in the Fe-3Ni alloy, respectively. At 800 °C, although there is available chemical driving force for the \( \alpha \rightarrow \gamma \) transformation, it is not large enough to overcome the dissipation barrier. Thus the transformation has to proceed in the mode that involves the long range diffusion of Ni in austenite and ferrite. The interface velocity is controlled by Ni diffusion, and the transformation kinetics is expected to be too sluggish to be detected in the current experiments. However, at 810 °C, the chemical driving force is large enough to overcome the dissipation barrier. The \( \alpha \rightarrow \gamma \) transformation is able to proceed in a partitionless mode, and the interface velocity is determined by interface mobility. In Fig. 11a, the predicted interface velocities during the ferrite to austenite transformation in the Fe-Ni alloys are shown as a function of temperature. Similar as the \( \gamma \rightarrow \alpha \) transformation, a kinetic transition is predicted to occur at a critical temperature \( (T_c) \), which is higher than \( T_0 \) and is Ni concentration dependent.

The predicted interface velocities as a function of temperature during the ferrite
to austenite transformation for the Fe-Mn and Fe-Co alloys are calculated as well and are shown in Fig. 11b and 11c. It is predicted that Co has a very marginal effect on $T_c$, which is in good agreement with experimental results.

4.3 Discussion

4.3.1 Kinetic transition

As mentioned in section 4.2, kinetic transition from partitioning to partitionless transformation during the austenite to ferrite transformation and the ferrite to austenite transformation has been predicted by the GEB approach, and the critical temperature ($T_c$) at which the transition occurs is regarded as the starting temperature for the massive transformation. In Fig. 12a-12c, a comparison between the predicted and measured onset temperatures for the austenite to ferrite and ferrite to austenite transformation in the Fe-Ni, Fe-Mn and Fe-Co alloys are plotted in their phase diagrams. It shows that the GEB predictions are in good agreement with the experimental results, while the experimentally determined transformation starting temperatures deviate from $T_0$.

Nucleation incubation could also be argued to be a possible reason for the deviation between experiments and $T_0$. In order to rule out nucleation effect, a specific experiment has been designed to study ferrite or austenite formation from a mixture of austenite and ferrite, and its temperature program is shown in Fig. 13a. In the first temperature cycle, the $\alpha \rightarrow \gamma$ transformation upon heating was interrupted at 795 °C to obtain a mixture of ferrite and austenite, which was then cooled down to 450 °C (AB) for the $\gamma \rightarrow \alpha$ transformation. The measured dilation is indicated in Fig. 13b.
It shows that the starting temperature of the partitionless $\gamma \rightarrow \alpha$ transformation from a mixture of austenite and ferrite is almost the same as that of the partitionless $\gamma \rightarrow \alpha$ transformation from full austenite, which means that the deviation between the experimentally determined starting temperature and $T_0$ should not be caused by nucleation incubation. In the second temperature cycle, the $\gamma \rightarrow \alpha$ transformation upon cooling was interrupted at 600 °C to obtain a mixture of austenite and ferrite, and the sample is then heated to 900 °C (CD) for the $\alpha \rightarrow \gamma$ transformation. Similarly, the starting temperature for the $\alpha \rightarrow \gamma$ transformation is not affected by reserved austenite.

Both experiments and model predictions have indicated that the effects of Ni, Mn and Co on the kinetic transition are different. Based on thermodynamic calculations, it has been found that the $\Delta E$ for Mn and Ni is much larger than Co. Therefore, it is expected that the energy dissipation by the interfacial diffusion of Mn or Ni should be much larger than Co, which well explains why the starting temperatures for the partitionless transformation in the Fe-Ni and Fe-Mn alloys deviate significantly from $T_0$ for the $\gamma \rightarrow \alpha$ or $\alpha \rightarrow \gamma$ transformation while in the Fe-Co alloys the starting temperature for partitionless transformation is close to $T_0$.

4.3.2 The $\alpha/\gamma$ interface mobility

Two kinds of interface mobility have been discussed in literature: the effective interface mobility $M_{\text{eff}}$ and the intrinsic interface mobility $M_{\text{int}}$ [37-38]. The intrinsic interface mobility corresponds to the Gibbs energy dissipated by lattice rearrangement only, hence reflects the intrinsic feature of the migrating interface itself.
It is believed that the intrinsic mobility has an Arrhenius relationship with temperature:

\[
M_{\text{i}} = M_0 \exp \left( -\frac{Q}{RT} \right) = v \sqrt[3]{G_{\text{fr}}} 
\]  

(14)

where \( M_0 \) is a pre-exponential constant, \( Q \) is the activation energy, \( R \) is the gas constant, \( T \) is the temperature and \( \Delta G_{\text{fr}} \) is the Gibbs energy dissipated by lattice rearrangement. On the other hand, the effective interface mobility includes the effects of various dissipative processes such as lattice rearrangement, solute drag effect, etc. As a result, its value could change with alloying elements concentration, transformation directions or some other factors.

The value of the effective or intrinsic interface mobility is usually obtained by fitting transformation curves with kinetic models in the literature. In the current study, both the austenite to ferrite transformation and the ferrite to austenite transformation occur in a partitionless mode, which means that the energy dissipation is fully owing to lattice arrangement. The intrinsic \( \alpha/\gamma \) interface mobility is derived by fitting the current experiments with the GEB model, as shown in Fig. 14. Because the transformation starting temperatures for the ferrite to austenite transformation in the Fe-0.5Co and Fe-1.5Co alloys are slightly lower than \( T_0 \), the derived mobility for these two alloys during the \( \alpha \rightarrow \gamma \) transformation is not shown. It can be concluded from the diagram that (1) the logarithm of the intrinsic \( \alpha/\gamma \) interface mobility has an approximate linear function with \( 10000/T \). Therefore, the intrinsic \( \alpha/\gamma \) interface mobility follows the Arrhenius relationship assumption. (2) The \( \alpha/\gamma \) interface mobility in the investigated Fe-Ni, Fe-Mn and Fe-Co alloys can be estimated as \( M = 2.7 \times \)
10^{-6}\exp\left(-145000/RT\right) \text{ m}^4/\text{J·s}. (3) The value of the intrinsic $\alpha/\gamma$ interface mobility is found to be marginally dependent on migration direction of the interface, the kind of substitutional alloying element and its concentration, which is in accordance with the “intrinsic” definition of the intrinsic mobility.

**Conclusion**

Kinetics of the austenite to ferrite transformation upon cooling and the ferrite to austenite transformation upon heating in a series of Fe-Ni, Fe-Mn and Fe-Co alloys have been investigated in order to shed new light on the mechanism of kinetic transition from partitioning to partitionless transformation and the intrinsic $\alpha/\gamma$ interface mobility. The following conclusions can be drawn:

1) The transition from partitioning to partitionless transformation could occur during both the $\gamma \rightarrow \alpha$ and $\alpha \rightarrow \gamma$ transformations, and the transition temperature is found to deviate from $T_0$ to some degree depending on the nature of alloying element and its concentration. The GEB model can well describe the kinetic transition for both the $\alpha \rightarrow \gamma$ and $\gamma \rightarrow \alpha$ transformation.

2) Intrinsic mobility of the $\alpha/\gamma$ interface is derived based on the transformation curves of a series of Fe-Ni, Fe-Mn and Fe-Co alloys, and it is found that the value of intrinsic interface mobility depends marginally on the transformation direction, the kind of alloying element and its concentration. The intrinsic interface mobility can be written as $2.7 \times 10^{-6}\exp(-145000/RT) \text{ m}^4/\text{J·s}$. 
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**Figure Captions**

Figure 1. EBSD maps of the Fe-3Mn alloy (a) before and (b) after the heat treatment.

Figure 2. Overall kinetics of the austenite to ferrite transformation upon cooling at a rate of 1 K/s in the Fe-Ni, Fe-Mn and Fe-Co alloys.

Figure 3. Deviations of $F_s$ and $A_s$ from $T_0$ upon cooling and heating in the Fe-Ni, Fe-Mn and Fe-Co alloys as a function of the solute concentration.

Figure 4. (a) The interface velocity as a function of ferrite fraction in the Fe-1.5Ni alloy. (b) The average interface velocities during the austenite to ferrite transformation as a function of solute concentration.

Figure 5. Overall kinetics of the ferrite to austenite transformation upon heating at a rate of 1 K/s in the Fe-Ni, Fe-Mn and Fe-Co alloys.

Figure 6. (a) The interface velocity as a function of austenite fraction in the Fe-1.5Ni alloy. (b) The average interface velocities during the ferrite to austenite transformation as a function of solute concentration.

Figure 7. The energy dissipation at the migrating interface as a function of interface velocity during the austenite to ferrite transformation in the Fe-3Ni alloy at 715 °C.

Figure 8. Total Gibbs energy dissipation and the available chemical driving force as a function of interface velocity for the $\gamma \rightarrow \alpha$ transformation in an Fe-3Ni alloy (a) at 730 °C and (b) at 715 °C.

Figure 9. The predicted interface velocities as a function of temperature for the $\gamma \rightarrow \alpha$ transformation in (a) Fe-Ni (b) Fe-Mn and (c) Fe-Co alloys. The corresponding $T_0$ temperatures are labelled with the solid arrows.
Figure 10. Total Gibbs energy dissipation and the available chemical driving force as a function of interface velocity for the $\alpha \rightarrow \gamma$ transformation in Fe-3Ni (a) at 800 °C and (b) at 810 °C.

Figure 11. The predicted interface velocities as a function of temperature for the $\alpha \rightarrow \gamma$ transformation in (a) Fe-Ni (b) Fe-Mn and (c) Fe-Co alloys with different solute concentration. The corresponding $T_0$ temperatures are labelled with the solid arrows.

Figure 12. Comparison between model predictions and experimental measurements of the onset temperatures for the austenite to ferrite transformation and ferrite to austenite transformations in the (a) Fe-Ni (b) Fe-Mn and (c) Fe-Co alloys.

Note: (1) Experimental data of the Fe-1Mn and Fe-2Mn alloys are obtained from [9].

(2) The $A_{el}$, $A_{e3}$ and $T_0$ lines overlap in the Fe-Co diagram so that only one solid line is visible.

Figure 13. (a) Sketch of heat treatment (b) Dilatation curve of the specimen as a function of temperature.

Figure 14. The derived intrinsic interface mobility as a function of temperature.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alloy</th>
<th>Solute concentration, wt.%</th>
<th>$A_{el}$, °C</th>
<th>$T_0$, °C</th>
<th>$A_{e3}$, °C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fe-0.5Ni</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>874</td>
<td>884</td>
<td>890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe-1Ni</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>838</td>
<td>859</td>
<td>871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe-1.5Ni</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>835</td>
<td>853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe-3Ni</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>706</td>
<td>775</td>
<td>809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe-1Mn</td>
<td>0.88[9]</td>
<td>834</td>
<td>855</td>
<td>868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe-2Mn</td>
<td>1.98[9]</td>
<td>754</td>
<td>806</td>
<td>831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe-3Mn</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>761</td>
<td>798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe-0.5Co</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>912</td>
<td>912</td>
<td>912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe-1.5Co</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>913</td>
<td>913</td>
<td>913</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note: Data for the Fe-1Mn and Fe-2Mn alloys is obtained from [9].
Fig. 1 EBSD maps of the Fe-3Mn alloy (a) before and (b) after the heat treatment
Fig. 2 Overall kinetics of the austenite to ferrite transformation upon cooling at a rate of 1 K/s in the Fe-Ni, Fe-Mn and Fe-Co alloys.
Fig. 3 Deviations of $F_s$ and $A_s$ from $T_0$ upon cooling and heating in the Fe-Ni, Fe-Mn and Fe-Co alloys as a function of the solute concentration.
Fig. 4 (a) The interface velocity as a function of ferrite fraction in the Fe-1.5Ni alloy.

(b) The average interface velocities during the austenite to ferrite transformation as a function of solute concentration.
Fig. 5 Overall kinetics of the ferrite to austenite transformation upon heating at a rate of 1 K/s in the Fe-Ni, Fe-Mn and Fe-Co alloys.
Fig. 6 (a) The interface velocity as a function of austenite fraction in the Fe-1.5Ni alloy. (b) The average interface velocities during the ferrite to austenite transformation as a function of solute concentration.
Fig. 7 The energy dissipation at the migrating interface as a function of interface velocity during the austenite to ferrite transformation in the Fe-3Ni alloy at 715 °C.
Fig. 8 Total Gibbs energy dissipation and the available chemical driving force as a function of interface velocity for the γ→α transformation in an Fe-3Ni alloy (a) at 730 °C and (b) at 715 °C.
Fig. 9 The predicted interface velocities as a function of temperature for the $\gamma \rightarrow \alpha$ transformation in (a) Fe-Ni (b) Fe-Mn and (c) Fe-Co alloys. The corresponding $T_0$ temperatures are labelled with the solid arrows.
Fig. 10 Total Gibbs energy dissipation and the available chemical driving force as a function of interface velocity for the $\alpha \rightarrow \gamma$ transformation in Fe-3Ni (a) at 800 °C and (b) at 810 °C.
Fig. 11 The predicted interface velocities as a function of temperature for the $\alpha \rightarrow \gamma$ transformation in (a) Fe-Ni (b) Fe-Mn and (c) Fe-Co alloys with different solute concentration. The corresponding $T_0$ temperatures are labelled with the solid arrows.
Fig. 12 Comparison between model predictions and experimental measurements of the onset temperatures for the austenite to ferrite transformation and ferrite to austenite transformations in the (a) Fe-Ni (b) Fe-Mn and (c) Fe-Co alloys.

Note: (1) Experimental data of the Fe-1Mn and Fe-2Mn alloys are obtained from [9].
(2) The $A_{c1}$, $A_{c3}$ and $T_0$ lines overlap in the Fe-Co diagram so that only one solid line is visible.
Fig. 13 (a) Sketch of heat treatment (b) Dilatation curve of the specimen as a function of temperature.
Fig. 14 The derived intrinsic interface mobility as a function of temperature.