Methods to estimate the number of surface nucleation sites on glass particles
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Based on the Johnson–Mehl–Avrami–Kolmogorov (JMAK) theory, we propose two new models to describe the crystallisation kinetics of glass particles and use them to determine the density of nucleation sites, \( N_s \), on glass powders. We tested these models with sintered compacts of diopside glass particles using sinter-crystallisation treatments at 825°C (\( T_g \approx 727^\circ C \)), that covered from null to almost 100% crystallised volume fraction. We measured and compared the evolution of the crystallised volume fractions by optical microscopy and x-ray diffraction. Then we fit our expressions to experimental data using \( N_s \) and \( R \) (the average particle radius) as adjustable parameters. For comparison, we also fit to our data existing expressions that describe the crystallised volume fraction in glass powders. We demonstrate that all the methods allow one to estimate \( N_s \), with reasonable accuracy. For our ground and water washed diopside glass powder, \( N_s \) is between \( 10^{10} - 10^{11} \) sites.m\(^{-2}\). The reasonable agreement between experimental and adjusted \( R \) confirms the consistency of all five models tested. However, one of our equations does not require taking into account the change of crystallisation mode from 3-dimensional to 1-dimensional, and this is advantageous.

1. Introduction

Viscous flow sintering of glass powder compacts with simultaneous or subsequent surface crystallisation is an exciting alternative for the development of new glass-ceramics\(^1\) because this method avoids the search for and complications that appear when adding nucleating agents. However, it is quite challenging to simulate and model\(^1\) these two complex processes due to the difficulty of measuring some key parameters that control the crystallisation kinetics, such as the surface density of nucleation sites, \( N_s \).

In the vast majority of glasses, crystallisation starts on athermal surface sites, such as scratches, solid impurities, etc. In this case, the kinetics of overall crystallisation of monodispersed spherical glass particles was long ago treated by Mampel\(^4\) and Todes\(^5\), but no analytical solution is available so far.

Muller’s\(^6\) approach for the crystallisation kinetics of glass powders considers cuboidal crystals growing at a rate \( u \) on the surface and towards the interior of cubic particles of edge 2\( R \). If 2\( d \) is the distance between neighbouring nucleation sites, for \( R\geq d \) Muller\(^6\) obtained the following approximation for the first stage of 3-dimensional crystal growth

\[
\alpha(t) = \frac{B \left( ut \right)^3}{8 \sqrt{R}}
\]

where \( \alpha(t) \) is the crystallised volume fraction and \( t \) is the treatment time. Considering further that the nucleation sites are regularly distributed on the vertices, edges and faces of the cubic particles, \( B \) is given by

\[
B = 24 \left[ \frac{R}{d} - \frac{1}{2} \right]^2 + 2
\]

Such crystals can grow on the glass particle surfaces up to a maximum length \( \text{r}_{\text{m}} = \text{ut}_{\text{m}} = d \), when they impinge at time \( t_{\text{m}} \). Subsequent growth would follow the kinetics given by

\[
\alpha(t) = 1 - \left( 1 - \frac{ut}{R} \right)^3
\]

Kinetics expressed by Equation (3) are observed when the crystal/glass boundaries move at constant velocity, \( u \), and the reaction product has neither a retarding nor a catalytic effect, i.e. the reaction rate is constant. This equation is known as “Jander’s law”\(^7,8\) and is
not valid for time intervals such that \((ut)/R>1\).

For \(R<d\), Muller\(^{46}\) developed an expression for the crystallisation kinetics considering that not all particles in the sample have surface nucleation sites, but some have only a single site that is located on a vertex. In this case, the average number of nucleation sites per cubic particle is

\[ A = 8 \left( \frac{R}{d} \right)^3 \]

Thus the crystallised volume fraction is

\[ \alpha(t) = \frac{A}{8} \left( \frac{ut}{R} \right)^3 \]

In this case, \(\alpha(t)\) evolves until \(r_m=ut_m=2R\), when total surface transformation occurs at \(t_m\). The usefulness of this simple model was demonstrated for surface induced crystallisation of cordierite glass powders.\(^{46}\)

The classical model of Johnson, Mehl, Avrami & Kolmogorov\(^{14,19,20}\) describes the transformation kinetics of some given area or volume, which is given by

\[ \alpha(t) = 1 - \exp\left[ -\alpha^*(t) \right] \]

where \(\alpha^*(t)\) is the fictitious extended area or volume, i.e. the total fraction transformed without taking into account the overlapping of the growing units. \(\alpha^*(t)\) can be calculated for several geometries.

Using this equation, Gutzow et al\(^{46}\) proposed a way to describe the kinetics of overall crystallisation of powdered glasses. They assumed a fixed concentration \(N_s\) of nucleation sites on the surface of spherical particles having radius \(R\), and that the process occurs in two main stages. In the initial stage, three dimensional growth of semi-spherical crystals from the surface leads to

\[ \alpha^*(t) = \frac{2\pi N_s ut^3}{R} \]

with growth spreading over the particle surfaces and towards their interior. After some critical period of time, further growth on the surface is limited because the crystals impinge. They thus stop growing on the surface and only those whose fastest growing direction is perpendicular to the glass grain surface keep growing towards the particle interior. After this intermediate period of crystal selection, a final stage starts when cylindrical crystals grow perpendicularly from the surface towards the glass grain centre. The extended volume transformed of such cylindrical crystals is given by

\[ \alpha^*(t) = \frac{3\pi ut}{4R} \]

Equation (8) was derived considering a regular and quadratic array of nucleation sites on the surface of the particles. Semi-spherical crystals could start growing from them and would impinge at a period of time, \(t_m\) given by

\[ t_m = \frac{1}{2u\sqrt{N_s}} \]

At \(t_m\) the crystallisation kinetics change from that of Equation (7) to that of Equation (8). Considering the quadratic array of crystals supposed by Gutzow et al.,\(^{46}\) we estimate that the surface of the glass particles would be about 80% crystallised at \(t_m\).

Vazquez et al\(^{44}\) performed a derivation similar to that of Gutzow et al\(^{46}\) but instead of considering that the extended volume of cylindrical crystals is given by Equation (8), for the final stage of crystal growth they considered

\[ \alpha^*(t) = \frac{3ut}{R} \]

that starts at

\[ t_m = \frac{1}{u\sqrt{\pi N_s}} \]

Equations (10) and (11) are obtained supposing a circular section through the centre of spherical glass particles with equidistant semicircular crystals having the centre on the particle surface and growing towards the particle centre. At impingement, the crystals have maximum diameter, \(2r_m\). However, this situation can not be generalised to 3-dimensions (3D). The resulting numerical value for \(t_m\) differs from that of Gutzow by a factor \([\sqrt{\pi}]/2\).

Theory

In the present work we also assume semi-spherical crystals nucleated on athermal sites on the surface \(N_s\) of spherical glass particles of radius \(R\), which grow towards the particle centres, as did Gutzow et al\(^{46}\) and Vazquez et al\(^{44}\) for the first stage of crystallisation. The adequate expression to describe this stage is Equation (7). Later on the crystals impinge and occupy the particles surface.

We then consider a second stage with prismatic crystals growing inwards the glass grain centre. An expression for this stage is derived below. Considering glass particles with prismatic crystals having their longitudinal axis normal to the particle surface and that grow inwards the bulk, if the nuclei density is so high that a crystallised layer covers the particles \((d<<R)\), an expression for the extended volume is

\[ \alpha^*(t) = \frac{V_c}{V_p} = \frac{3na ut}{NS_p R} \]

where \(V_c\) is the (extended) crystallised volume, \(V_p\) the volume of particles, \(n\) the number of crystals or nucleation centres on the particles surface, \(a\), the base area of each prismatic crystal of height \((ut)\) growing in the bulk, \(N\) is the number of glass particles in the...
assembly, and \( S_p \) is the surface area of one particle (thus \( NS_p \) is the total glass powder surface area). An estimate of the prism base area \( a_\ell \) is

\[
a_\ell = \frac{S_c}{n} \quad (13)
\]

where \( S_c \) is the crystallised area on the particle surface, and \( n \) is the number of nucleation centres on the same surface. In this way we are also assuming a uniform distribution of crystals on that surface. If

\[
N_s = \frac{n}{NS_p} \quad (14)
\]

and the surface crystallised fraction as is given by

\[
\alpha_s = \frac{S_c}{NS_p} \quad (15)
\]

substituting Equations (14) and (15) into Equation (13) one arrives at

\[
a_\ell = \frac{\alpha_s}{N_s} \quad (16)
\]

Substituting Equations (14) and (16) into Equation (12), the extended volume can be approximated by

\[
\alpha^*(t) = \frac{3\alpha_s ut}{R} \quad (17)
\]

The maximum time interval, \( t_{rw} \) for 3D growth, i.e. in Equation (6) when the growth kinetics change from that given by Equation (7) to that given by the Equation (17), can be estimated knowing the growth velocity of crystals on the particle surface, as follows.

The surface fraction of circular crystals during the 3D growth stage, \( \alpha_s \) is given by the JMAK expression

\[
\alpha_s(t) = 1 - \exp\left(-\pi N_s u t^3 \right) \quad (18)
\]

To exactly calculate \( t_m \) we should make \( \alpha_s(t_m)=1 \) in Equation (18) and solve it for \( t \), but this procedure does not yield a solution. We thus consider \( \alpha_s(t_m)=1-d\alpha_m \) where \( d\alpha_m \) is a small fraction remaining to achieve total crystallisation of the particle surface, such that in the limit, when \( d\alpha_m \to 0, \alpha_s(t_m) \to 1 \). We can then assume a practical \( d\alpha_m \) remaining to achieve total crystallisation (e.g. as small as 1%). In doing that, from Equation (18) we have

\[
t_m = \sqrt{\frac{\ln d\alpha_m}{-\pi N_s u t^3}} \quad (19)
\]

In this way, we assume that the surface of each particle is almost totally occupied by crystals that started growing on that surface in a circular mode. Herein in the text we will refer to this approach as the semi-spherical model. To further extend the crystallisation kinetics proposed in this work, cylindrical crystals can be supposed to grow from the beginning of crystallisation, and then we only need Equations (6), (17) and (18) for the whole kinetics. In this way it is not necessary to consider the changing kinetics from 3D to 1D growth mode and calculate the time interval for the crystals to impinge, \( t_{rw} \). Herein in the text we will refer to this second approach as the cylindrical model.

Based on the above described assumptions, our aim is thus to obtain \( N_s \) for a powdered glass. In our approach one needs to know the crystal growth rate at the heat treatment temperature, \( u \), and the volume fraction crystallised, \( \alpha_s(t) \). We then compare ours with previous approaches.

2. Experimental

A glass having the stoichiometric composition of diopside (CaO-MgO.2SiO\(_2\)) was prepared by mixing the correct proportion of high grade chemicals. We use diopside as a suitable model glass, due to: (i) the high confidence we have on the values of crystal growth rate \( u \) as a function of temperature for this system and the insensitivity of \( u \) to small compositional differences between different glass melts; (ii) because only one crystal phase develops on heating; and (iii) because of its high chemical durability, which prevents formation of extra nucleation sites (by chemical attack) after sample preparation.

The chemicals were mixed in a Fritsch Pulverisette 6 high impact mill with Si\(_3\)N\(_4\) jar and balls. The batch was then melted in a Pt crucible at 1500°C for 4 h. The liquid was poured into a stainless steel mould and let to cool down in air. Minor devitrification patches formed on the surface of the glass plaque, which were ground off. The glass block was hammered and the ground pieces were further milled in the high impact mill for short time periods (30 s at 350 rpm) to keep the particle sizes in the desired range without introducing too many defects on the newly created surfaces. The glass powder was sieved through a 38–75 \( \mu \)m polymer mesh. The collected powder was washed in water to eliminate most of the fine particles that usually attach to the coarse ones.

To prepare compacts for sintering the collected powder was mixed with 20 wt% oleic acid. This powder was subsequently heated to 500°C for some seconds to remove the excess acid, acquiring a gray colour, which indicated that burning was only partial and that some residue remained. We proceeded in this way to enhance particle packing when pressing the powder into discs. Approximately 25 mg of powder were pressed under 2500 kgf in a stainless steel die into 1·5 mm thick discs having 10 mm in diameter. The acid was totally eliminated by subsequent heating the samples at 500°C for 1 h, resulting in white discs. Two sets of samples were independently produced following the above procedure. The samples were labelled \( D, E, F, G, H \), and \( I \), each
latter indicating a particular position in the sample holder during heat treatment in an attempt to test its possible effect, which was afterwards considered insignificant. The samples D, E, F originated from a different batch from G, H, I. The samples D, E, F were heat treated together; the same is true for set G, H, I. The crystallised fraction for samples G, H, I was only determined by XRD. All these samples were heat treated at 825°C, for 30 min to 8 h, for simultaneous sintering and crystallisation. For each sintering experiment the samples were heated together. It should be stressed that the change in the crystal/glass front temperature due to the release of the crystallisation heat, as given by the expression of Herron & Bergeron\(^{(16)}\) is not important at this temperature for diopside.

The sintered discs were sectioned through half the diameter and one of the sectioned faces was polished for microscopy. We used a Leica DMRX optical microscope having digital image capture and a Zeiss KS200 software for image analysis. Ten images of each section, randomly taken, were analysed. Samples treated for time periods shorter than 2 h presented too thin surface crystallised layers, and it was thus difficult to analyse them in an optical microscope. Therefore, such samples were only analysed by XRD to estimate their crystallised volume fraction.

The experimental crystallised volume fraction \(\alpha_v(t)\) relative to the solid part (without taking the pores into account) was determined by measuring the porosity \(P(t)\) and the crystallised fractions \(C(t)\) in the micrographs, as given below

\[
\alpha_v(t) = \frac{C(t)}{1 - P(t)}
\]  

(20)

By using a square grid, the parameters \(C(t)\) and \(P(t)\) were determined counting the number of intersections of horizontal and vertical lines within the crystallised and porous phases, respectively, and dividing the results by the total number of points of the grid.

Although this method can give precise results, it requires several micrographs and is quite time consuming. Alternatively, x-ray diffraction has the advantage of sampling a large area on a single test, allowing a rapid determination of \(\alpha_v(t)\). There are several XRD techniques for quantitative determination of phase proportions in multicomponent glass-ceramics, as reviewed by Kim et al.\(^{(17)}\) Here we used a calibration curve by measuring the intensity of a particular diopside peak, relative to the \((211)\) plane that diffracts at \(2\theta=2.781^\circ\) (ICPDF 86-0932).\(^{(15,16)}\) Its position varied in our experiments from 29-800° to 29-850°. The peak intensity was determined from a straight line that was built by linking the average background intensity at 29-125° and 31-500°.

The crystallised volume percent, \(\alpha_v\), of the calibration samples were calculated by using the diopside glass and crystal densities, respectively \(\rho_g\) and \(\rho_r\) following Equation (21). The results are shown in Table 1:

\[
\alpha_v = \frac{m_r \rho_g}{(m_g \rho_g + m_r \rho_r)} \times 100
\]  

(21)

The glass density was measured by the Archimedes method using a Mettler Toledo AX 204 balance coupled with a kit for density measurement. The diopside crystal density was obtained from the literature.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>(m_g) (g)</th>
<th>(m_r) (g)</th>
<th>(X_v) (%)</th>
<th>(\alpha_v) (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CS-1</td>
<td>0.1590</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS-2</td>
<td>0.1423</td>
<td>0.0076</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS-3</td>
<td>0.1225</td>
<td>0.0136</td>
<td>9.99</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS-4</td>
<td>0.1176</td>
<td>0.0306</td>
<td>20.64</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS-5</td>
<td>0.1074</td>
<td>0.0447</td>
<td>29.39</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS-6</td>
<td>0.0903</td>
<td>0.0600</td>
<td>39.92</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS-7</td>
<td>0.0760</td>
<td>0.0764</td>
<td>50.13</td>
<td>46.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS-8</td>
<td>0.0624</td>
<td>0.0926</td>
<td>59.74</td>
<td>56.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS-9</td>
<td>0.0487</td>
<td>0.1064</td>
<td>68.60</td>
<td>65.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS-10</td>
<td>0.0227</td>
<td>0.1278</td>
<td>84.92</td>
<td>82.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS-11</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.1772</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(C\) plane that diffracts at 28° from 28° to 32°, with step size of 0·0250° and measurement time period of 10 s for each step. We then determined the intensity of the most intense diopside peak, relative to the \((211)\) plane that diffracts at 2θ=2.781° (ICPDF 86-0932).\(^{(15,16)}\) Its position varied in our experiments from 29-800° to 29-850°. The peak intensity was determined from a straight line that was built by linking the average background intensity at 29-125° and 31-500°.

The crystallised volume percent, \(\alpha_v\), of the calibration samples were calculated by using the diopside glass and crystal densities, respectively \(\rho_g\) and \(\rho_r\) following Equation (21). The results are shown in Table 1:

\[
\alpha_v = \frac{m_r \rho_g}{(m_g \rho_g + m_r \rho_r)} \times 100
\]  

(21)
pestle to pass completely through a 22 µm nylon sieve. Unfortunately, most of the obtained sample masses were not enough to completely fill the XRD sample holder. To avoid underexposure of the samples to the x-rays, we added a known mass of diopside glass particles, with 22 µm in diameter, to complete the amount needed to fill the sample holder (around 0·15 g). Precisely weighted amounts of sintered and glassy powders were mixed in an agate mortar and pestle with isopropyl alcohol and dried. To account for the crystallised fraction, \( \alpha_v \), of the sample before adding more glass, we corrected the crystallised volume fraction obtained from the calibration curve, \( F_v \), through the equation

\[
\alpha_v = \frac{F_v \rho_g (m_{sg} + m_u)}{m_u + F_v m_{sg} \rho_g - F_v m_{sg} \rho_c}
\]

where \( m_{sg} \) is the mass of glass added and \( m_u \) is the mass of the sintered sample. One can see that when \( m_{sg} \) is zero, \( \alpha_v = F_v \).

3. Results and Discussion

The JCPDF card no. 86-0932 \(^{(18,19)} \) closely fits the powder diffraction pattern of the totally crystallised sample. The density of crystalline diopside from that JCPDF card is 3·261 g/cm\(^3\). Our measured density for a non-annealed diopside glass piece was 2·805±0·005 g/cm\(^3\) (within 95% confidence limits).

Figure 1 shows an example of the microstructure of a heat treated sample. This figure shows sectioned sintered grains whose centres are still glassy but their surfaces have crystallised. The thickness of the crystallised surface layer increased with the time interval of heat treatment time up to a point when the glass grains were completely consumed by the crystals. A significant amount of spherical pores appear inside the grains, especially after the longest heat treatments, which can be a result of degassing (i.e. dissolved gases in the glass grains come out during crystallisation) and large mismatch between the diopside glass and crystal densities. Other pores with irregular shapes indicate that full densification through viscous flow sintering is hindered by surface crystallisation.

Figure 1 confirms that the original glass grains are not spherical and have a size distribution, thus deviating from the assumptions of the theoretical models used here. The particle size distribution of the powder used was between 38 µm and 75 µm, and thus, nominally, it has “diameters” within such range. Nevertheless, the experimental size distributions of the powders before and after pressing in a die were characterised in a Horiba LA-930 laser scattering particle size analyser. The after pressing powder was obtained by gently pulverising a pressed disc and washing it into water. For measuring, suitable suspensions were prepared in water by adding one drop of a deflocculating agent and letting the materials under ultrasound waves for 10 min. The results are shown in Figure 2.

Figure 2 shows that the initial powder (before pressing) had average diameter of 56 µm, and agree with the nominal average aperture of the sieves. However, the diameters of such powder range from under 38 µm to over 75 µm, reaching approximately 150 µm. This is probably because some particles had high aspect ratio (the ratio between the largest and smallest diameters), in such way that the smallest diameter of the particle passed through the 75 µm sieve, but the largest one was so large that, in average, such particles show equivalent spherical diameters over 75 µm.

Figure 2 also shows the particles fractured during pressing into discs at 320 MPa. The size distribution still ranges from zero to approximately 150 µm, but the average diameter decreased to 22 µm after pressing. Efforts to simplify the experimental procedure by using mono-size glass beads are in progress.

Table 2 shows results of \( \alpha_v \), determined by microscopy (\( \alpha_v \), MIC) and the associated error (\( E_{\alpha_v} \), MIC)
Table 2: Sintered sample parameters: sample names indicating the sintering time interval in hours and sample label (D,E,F,G,H or I); sample weight (m); added glass weight (m<sub>a</sub>); XRD (2θ) peak intensities (I); crystallised volume fraction from the XRD calibration curve (E<sub>v</sub>), crystallised volume fraction from the XRD calibration curve after correcting for the added glass (α, XRD); crystallised volume fraction from microscopy (α, MIC); and respective crystallised volume fraction errors (E<sub>α</sub>, XRD, E<sub>α</sub>, MIC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>m</th>
<th>m&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>F&lt;sub&gt;v&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
<th>E&lt;sub&gt;v&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
<th>α&lt;sub&gt;cr&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
<th>Ex&lt;sub&gt;α&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
<th>α&lt;sub&gt;cr&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
<th>Ex&lt;sub&gt;α&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
<th>α&lt;sub&gt;cr&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
<th>Ex&lt;sub&gt;α&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5/G</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-5/H</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-5/I</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/G</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/H</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/I</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/G</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/H</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>739</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/I</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>691</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/D</td>
<td>0-1042</td>
<td>0-0493</td>
<td>1339</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/E</td>
<td>0-0634</td>
<td>0-0860</td>
<td>842</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/F</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1875</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/G</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1596</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/H</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1581</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/I</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1526</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/D</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2269</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/E</td>
<td>0-0933</td>
<td>0-0608</td>
<td>1384</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/F</td>
<td>0-0736</td>
<td>0-0757</td>
<td>1129</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/D</td>
<td>0-0495</td>
<td>0-1037</td>
<td>776</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/E</td>
<td>0-0758</td>
<td>0-0893</td>
<td>1029</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/F</td>
<td>0-0659</td>
<td>0-0887</td>
<td>894</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/D</td>
<td>0-0568</td>
<td>0-1528</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/E</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2350</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/F</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>0-0728</td>
<td>0-0712</td>
<td>1237</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* We considered m<sub>a</sub>=1 g and m<sub>a</sub>=0 g when no glass was added to complete the sample

– within 95% confidence interval for the average).

Figure 3 shows the crystallised volume fraction of the calibration samples, obtained by Equation (21), as a function of the XRD peak intensity after baseline correction. One observes that α<sub>v</sub>, of the calibration samples follow a straight line with the XRD peak intensities. The prediction limits, shown in the graph, are approximately ±3 vol% for any crystallised volume fraction predicted by the linear model: F<sub>v</sub>=A+Bi, where I (counting per second, cps) is the maximum intensity of the peak at around 2θ=2-825°, A=−1.60422 and B=0-04055 are regression constants.

The crystallised volume fraction, F<sub>v</sub>, obtained by measuring by XRD and substituting the value in the calibration curve of Figure 3, are also shown in Table 2, together with the respective 95% error, E<sub>v</sub>. Table 2 also shows the masses of the sintered compacts and of glass powder used to prepare the XRD samples. These data inserted into Equation (22) resulted in the crystallised volume fractions for the sintered samples, α<sub>v</sub>, XRD, shown in the Table 2. The error in the α<sub>v</sub>, XRD values, Ex<sub>v</sub>, XRD, was estimated considering that it only depends on the error in F<sub>v</sub>, despite additional errors in m<sub>a</sub>, m<sub>a</sub>, ρ<sub>g</sub> and ρ<sub>c</sub> and making

\[ E_{\alpha, XRD} = \frac{\partial \alpha_{XRD}}{\partial F_v} \cdot EF_v \]  

(23)

where α<sub>v</sub>, is given by the Equation (22). The results for Ex<sub>v</sub>, XRD are shown in Table 2.

The preparation of XRD samples by adding a known mass of diopside glass to the sintered powder induces high errors. The correctness of this procedure was checked by measuring F<sub>v</sub>, in additional samples (that had enough mass) before and after adding more glass to them. In the first case α<sub>v</sub>, and in the second α<sub>v</sub>, is given by Equation (22). The results are shown in Table 3, the samples having added glass are labelled 2 after identification. One observes that for samples 4/F and 10/E the results with and without added glass closely agree. However, samples 6/D, 6/E, 6/F, 8/D, 8/E, 8/F, 10/D and 10/E show high errors.
which had an exaggerated glass mass added, aiming to test this effect, present the highest deviation and error, indicating that the error is dependent on the fraction of glass added. By plotting the $\alpha_{\text{XRD}}$, XRD (%) as a function of the mass fraction of added glass ($m_g/(m_g+m_w)$) (Figure 4), one clearly observes that the error increases as this fraction increases. But, in general, the results of crystallised volume fraction determined by microscopy and XRD agree within the error limits (Table 2).

The reproducibility of the XRD measurements was also evaluated by repeating the test for two additional samples, labeled 2/B and 8/C, whose $\alpha_x$, XRD presented high deviation from $\alpha_{\text{MIC}}$, MIC (results not presented). Table 4 shows the results, where the replicas are labelled b. The $\alpha_x$, XRD repeatability, $\Delta\alpha_x$, DRX (the difference between $\alpha_x$, XRD for the sample and the replica), was sufficient for the aims of the present work.

The good agreement between the results of XRD and microscopy confirms the crystallised volume fractions determined in the present work. The results from microscopy, however, look more consistent because they never reach 100 vol%, which occurs for the XRD technique due to its inherent errors. From now on, we take the XRD and the microscopy data to estimate $N_x$ using all crystallisation models presented in the Introduction.

Figure 5 shows the experimental volume fraction crystallised in sintered diopside glass-ceramic compacts as a function of the time interval at 825°C. We omit the error bars for simplicity. Part of the potential experimental variation could be eliminated by heat treating the samples together, but the results can be strongly affected by the surface condition of the particles, whose effect on $N_x$ has been reported.\(^\text{(20)}\)

To test the effect of oleic acid on the surface crystallisation kinetics of the glass particles, we measured the crystallisation peak by differential scanning calorimetry (DSC) as a function of temperature of powders treated with and without oleic acid. DSC can be used to gauge the crystallisation tendency of glasses [e.g., Ref. 21]. To exaggerate the effect of oleic acid, 0.25 g of glass powder were soaked in 0.25 g of

![Figure 4. $\alpha_x$, XRD (%) as a function of the mass fraction of added glass](image)

### Table 4. Identical parameters of Table 2 for samples measured twice (the replica is identified by “b” after the sample label). The difference between two $\alpha_x$, XRD is shown as $\Delta\alpha_x$, DRX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>$m_g$ (g)</th>
<th>$m_w$ (g)</th>
<th>$l$ (cps)</th>
<th>$F_x$ (%)</th>
<th>$E_{\alpha_x}$</th>
<th>$\alpha_x$</th>
<th>$E_{\alpha_x}$</th>
<th>$\Delta\alpha_x$, DRX (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2/B</td>
<td>0.0765</td>
<td>0.0752</td>
<td>754</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/Bb</td>
<td>0.0765</td>
<td>0.0752</td>
<td>729</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/C</td>
<td>0.0670</td>
<td>0.1145</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/Cb</td>
<td>0.0671</td>
<td>0.1145</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* We considered $m_g=1$ g and $m_w=0$ g when no glass was added to prepare the sample.
oleic acid (enough to immerse the powder into the acid) for 25 h at room temperature. After this time, the acid was poured away and the powder was heated up at 10°C/min to approximately 500°C, left at this temperature for 2 h, and subsequently cooled down in the furnace. A Netzsch DSC 404 was used to get the DSC curve by heating at 10°C/min to 1000°C. The DSC curve for the untreated sample was measured twice to evaluate the DSC repeatability. The onset \( \left( T_{onset}\right) \) and the maximum \( \left( T_{max}\right) \) temperatures of the crystallisation peak were obtained from the resulting curves (not shown).

The characteristic temperatures of crystallisation shown in Table 5 indicate that the crystallisation behaviour of acid treated and untreated glass are about the same. Thus we can disregard the effect of oleic acid and consider the different powder granularity after pressing (effect shown in Figure 2) as the main source of the data scatter observed in Figure 5.

Despite the significant scatter, Figure 5 shows that, on average, the experimental volume fraction crystallised increases with the time period at 825°C, and achieves about 100% after 10 h of heat treatment at this temperature. The micrograph of Figure 1 shows that there are many crystals on the particle surfaces, and thus \( d<R \). We then considered Muller’s model for \( d<R \), given by Equations (1) to (3). Allowing only \( d \) or \( N_s \) as a free parameter to fit the models to the experimental data, we do not always obtain a good fit. We thus let \( d \) and \( R \) act as free parameters to fit to Muller’s model, and \( N_s \) and \( R \) as free parameters to fit to the other models. One may expect a variation of \( N_s \) with particle size (for instance, the smallest particles may have more surface defects per unit area than the largest particles). In our approach we determine an average value of \( N_s \) for all particle sizes. By comparing \( R \) from the fittings with the experimental values (Figure 2), one can check the resulting parameters and evaluate the different models.

The continuity of each function of the crystallised volume fraction as a function of the time interval of transformation forces the crystallised volume fraction to have the same value at \( t_m \) calculated by the 3D and the 1D crystallisation expressions. To account for this, we first calculate \( \alpha(t_m) \) using the expression for each model in the 3D stage, using \( t_m \) calculated by the corresponding expression. We then calculate the time \( t_0 \) to achieve the thus obtained \( \alpha(t_0) \), considering the expression for each crystallisation model in the 1D stage. The crystallised volume fraction values are further obtained making \( t_0=t+t_0-t_m \) in \( \alpha(t_0-t_m) \), using the respective expression of each different model in the 1D stage, such that when \( t=t_0 \), \( \alpha(t_0)=\alpha(t_0) \). In the special case assumed by Muller, \( t=t_0 \).

Figure 5 shows several curves calculated by the different models described in the Introduction, including ours, fitted to the experimental data letting \( d \) or \( N_s \) and \( R \) as free parameters. We used \( u(825°C)=2×10^{-4} \text{m/s} \) and \( \Delta \alpha=0.0001 \). Our cylindrical model best fits the experimental data. The poor fit of the experimental data to the other models, especially for small crystallised fractions, probably arises due to finite size effects, as demonstrated by Levine et al. Muller’s model best fits the very beginning of crystallisation.

The fittings with the models of Gutzow et al. and Vazquez et al. coincide within the error limits. The resulting \( N_s \) and \( R \) for each case are given in Table 6. In the case of Muller’s model, \( N_s \) is calculated from \( d \) and \( R \), using the following expression deduced from his assumed geometry

\[
N_s = \frac{1}{4d^2} + \frac{1}{12R^2}
\]

Table 6 shows that the resulting value of \( R \) from the semispherical model is larger than the average radius (after pressing), which is approximately 11 \( \mu \text{m} \), from Figure 2. From Muller’s model \( R=9.4±0.4 \) \( \mu \text{m} \) and this is thus the one that best estimates the experimental average radius. However, the results for \( R \) and \( N_s \) from the semi-spherical model depend on the choice of \( \Delta \alpha \). Table 7 shows values for \( R \) and \( N_s \) calculated using the semi-spherical model for different \( \Delta \alpha \), from 1% to 1 ppm. Using the experimental \( R \) to gauge \( \Delta \alpha \) in that model, one can see that considering 1% residual glass on the particles surface, the fitted \( R \) closely agrees with the experimental value. With \( \Delta \alpha \) in such level, the semi-spherical model and Muller’s model closely agree. This result gives a consistency test for the geometry and calculation procedure proposed here and by Muller.

Nevertheless, the values of \( R \) obtained by the other models are not too discrepant, but fall slightly below the expected range. This small discrepancy could perhaps be taken into account if we recall that the glass particles have a relatively wide size distribution and their shape is not spherical. The models from Gutzow et al., Vazquez et al. and our semispherical model have near the same \( \alpha(t) \) behaviour. An explanation for this result probably rests on Equation (6).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>( T_{onset}(°C) )</th>
<th>( T_{max}(°C) )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Untreated powder</td>
<td>876</td>
<td>906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untreated powder</td>
<td>877</td>
<td>907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treated powder</td>
<td>876</td>
<td>910</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. DSC characteristic temperatures of the crystallisation peaks of oleic acid treated and untreated samples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>( N_s \times 10^{12} \text{(m}^2\text{)} )</th>
<th>( R \text{(μm)} )</th>
<th>( r^2 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Muller</td>
<td>1×10^6</td>
<td>9.4±0.4</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gutzow et al</td>
<td>3×1</td>
<td>3.6±0.5</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vazquez et al</td>
<td>4×1</td>
<td>4.5±0.7</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-spherical model, this work</td>
<td>22±2</td>
<td>30±2</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cylindrical model, this work</td>
<td>8±2</td>
<td>6±0.4</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. Resulting \( N_s \) R, and regression coefficients (\( r^2 \)) from the different models
Table 7. Resulting N_s and R_s from the semi-spherical model for different fractions of residual glass on the surface of the particles when the growth mechanism changes

d_a R (µm) N_s x 10^11 (m^-2) 
0.01 (1%) 10±2 12±2 
0.001 20±2 17±2 
0.0001 30±3 22±3 
0.00001 30±3 27±3 
0.000001 (1 ppm) 40±4 32±4

Besides different extended volumes (α*) considered, different u, R or N_s have a stronger effect than the geometries of the crystals and glass particles assumed. Despite the slightly smaller R, the experimental data for α(t) is best described assuming cylindrical crystals growing from the beginning of the crystallisation (cylindrical model), as shown by the respective curve in Figure 5.

The values of N_s from Muller’s model and the two models presented here (considering da.=1% for the semi-spherical model) closely agree into the error limits. But N_s from the models of Gutzow et al and Vazquez et al are only slightly smaller. The N_s values calculated here have the same order of magnitude than those for a cordierite glass powder (10^9 to 10^11 m^-2). [23]

Unfortunately, optical determination of N_s is a very difficult and not practical task, especially in the case of small jagged particles prepared for sintering (as in the present case). That is exactly why we and other authors came up with some models that allow an indirect estimation of N_s. In this paper we found reasonable agreement between experimental and fitted average R and compared then to check the models. We are now in an advanced stage working on directly measuring N_s on sintered and partially crystallised glass particle compacts by optical microscopy, this way keeping intact the processing effects on N_s. We will publish the results presently.

4. Conclusions

The models of Muller, Gutzow et al, Vazquez et al and ours are more sensitive to N_s, R, and u than to the crystal and glass particle morphology. This fact explains why all these different models work relatively well. The models of Gutzow et al and Vazquez et al show almost the same behaviour, and give the same N_s within the error limits. Our model with cylindrical crystals growing from the beginning to the final stages of crystallisation best fits the experimental data, and the resulting N_s and R are not too discrepant from the other models.

Overall, all the methods allow one to estimate N_s with reasonable accuracy. Our methods provide a step forward for modelling heterogeneous nucleation on glass particles surface because they do not assume any geometrical arrangement of nucleation sites on the surface. Additionally, our cylindrical model has a unique equation and does not need to account for changing growth mechanisms from 3D to 1D.
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