Modeling short-range-ordering in liquids: the Mg-Al-Sn system
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Abstract:

A liquid solution of components A and B may often exhibit a tendency towards short-range-ordering (SRO). This may be modeled by the Modified Quasichemical Model (MQM) which attributes the SRO to the preferential formation of nearest-neighbor A-B pairs or, alternatively, by an associate model which attributes the ordering to the formation of $A_n B_m$ associates or molecules. Although both models can often provide similar and equally good fits to experimental thermodynamic and phase equilibrium data in a binary system, the MQM provides significantly better predictions of the thermodynamic properties of ordered ternary liquid phases A-B-C solely from the optimized model parameters of the A-B, B-C and C-A binary sub-systems. This is illustrated through coupled thermodynamic/phase diagram optimization of the Mg-Al-Sn system. Similar examples for the Mg-Al-Sc and AlCl$_3$-NaCl-KCl systems are also presented.
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1. Introduction

A thermodynamic model for a solution should not only reproduce the data for binary systems, but should also predict as closely as possible the properties of ternary and higher-order solutions from the optimized binary parameters.

As is well-known, short-range-ordering (SRO) in binary liquid solutions is evidenced by enthalpy of mixing curves which exhibit a relatively sharp negative peak, as opposed to the more parabolic shape characteristic of solutions with no appreciable SRO. An example, for Mg-Sn liquid solutions, is shown in Fig. 1; the composition of maximum SRO occurs near the mole fraction $X_{Sn} = 1/3$. The corresponding entropy of mixing curve, typical of SRO, is shown in Fig. 2. The corresponding partial excess Gibbs energy curves are shown in Fig. 3; these typically exhibit inflection points near the composition of maximum SRO. Such solutions have been modeled by the Modified Quasichemical Model (MQM) or by “associate” models.
In the MQM, which has been used extensively in the authors' research group, the SRO is modeled as a preference for the formation of (Mg-Sn) nearest-neighbor pairs. That is, the Mg and Sn atoms are distributed on a quasilattice, and the following exchange reaction among nearest-neighbor pairs is at equilibrium:

\[
(Mg - Mg)_{\text{pair}} + (Sn - Sn)_{\text{pair}} = 2(Mg - Sn)_{\text{pair}}; \quad \Delta g_{MgSn}
\]  

(1)

The principal model parameter is the Gibbs energy change, \( \Delta g_{MgSn} \) of this reaction. If this parameter is negative, then reaction (1) is displaced to the right and (Mg-Sn) pairs are favored. In order to set the composition of maximum SRO at the observed composition of \( X_{Sn} = 1/3 \), the ratio of the coordination numbers of Sn and Mg is set to \( Z_{Sn}/Z_{Mg} = 2 \). (In the limit of a very large negative \( \Delta g_{MgSn} \), the solution is fully ordered at \( X_{Sn} = 1/3 \), with Mg atoms surrounded only by Sn atoms and Sn atoms only by Mg atoms.)

In the associate model, the SRO is modeled as due to the formation of Mg\(_2\)Sn “associates” or molecules. That is, Mg atoms, Sn atoms and Mg\(_2\)Sn molecules are randomly distributed over the sites of a single quasilattice. The principal model parameter is the Gibbs energy change for the formation of Mg\(_2\)Sn associates from unassociated Mg and Sn atoms:

\[
2Mg + Sn = Mg_2Sn(\text{associate})
\]  

(2)

If this parameter is negative, then reaction (2) is displaced to the right. (In the limit of a very large negative parameter, the solution would be fully ordered at \( X_{Sn} = 1/3 \) where it would consist of only Mg\(_2\)Sn associates, each occupying one lattice site.)

Although, in our opinion, the MQM is the more physically realistic, in many binary systems the two models can provide very similar and equally good fits to the experimental thermodynamic and phase diagram data with approximately the same number of model parameters. That is, the two models are mathematically very similar in binary solutions.

However, this is no longer true in ternary and higher-order solutions. Consider for example the Mg-Al-Sn ternary phase diagram shown in Fig. 4. In this system, the Mg-Sn binary liquid solution exhibits appreciable SRO as discussed above, while the Mg-Al and Al-Sn binary liquid solutions exhibit relatively little. Along the join from the Al-corner to the Mg-Sn side of the composition triangle, positive deviations from ideal mixing of the liquid phase are evident as witnessed by the widely-spaced liquidus isotherms and by the appearance of a liquid-liquid immiscibility gap. Such behavior is typical of ternary systems in which one binary liquid exhibits large negative deviations from ideality relative to the other two binary liquids.

The MQM predicts this behaviour. Since (Mg – Sn) nearest-neighbor pairs are energetically favored, the model predicts a tendency for the liquid phase to separate into clusters rich in (Mg – Sn) pairs and clusters rich in Al. The associate model, on the other hand, fails entirely to predict this behavior. Along the Al-Mg\(_2\)Sn join, the associate model predicts an approximately ideal mixture of Al atoms and Mg\(_2\)Sn associates, and the observed positive deviations in the ternary system can only be reproduced by introducing additional adjustable ternary model parameters optimized to fit ternary experimental data.
The present article begins with a brief summary of the model equations. Following this, an optimization of the Mg-Sn binary system is presented with the MQM used for the liquid phase. A new optimization of the Al-Sn binary system is also presented. Thereafter it is shown that all available experimental phase equilibrium and thermodynamic data in the Mg-Al-Sn ternary system are predicted by the MQM solely from the binary model parameters with no additional ternary terms, and comparison is made with predictions using the associate model.

A second example is then given for the similar Mg-Al-Sc system, where again it is shown that the ternary phase diagram is predicted with good precision solely from the optimized binary MQM parameters for the liquid phase. Finally, an example for a molten salt system is presented.

All calculations in the present study were performed using the FactSage software and databases [1,2].

2. Model equations

2.1 The Modified Quasichemical Model

The detailed development of the MQM has been given previously for binary [3] and for multicomponent [4] solutions. Only an outline will be presented here.

The quasichemical model, in the pair approximation first proposed by Fowler and Guggenheim [5] and later extended by Blander, Pelton, Chartrand and co-workers [3, 4, 6], models SRO as the preferential formation of first-nearest-neighbor (A–B) pairs. In the simplest case, the A and B atoms or molecules are assumed to be distributed on a quasilattice, and the following exchange reaction among nearest-neighbor pairs is at equilibrium:

\[
\Delta g_{AB} = \Delta G_{(A - A)_{pair} + (B - B)_{pair} = 2(A - B)_{pair}}
\]

where \( \Delta g_{AB} \) is the Gibbs energy change of this quasichemical reaction for the formation of two moles of (A–B) pairs. Let \( Z_A \) and \( Z_B \) be the nearest-neighbor coordination numbers of A and B. Hence, each A or B atom forms \( Z_A \) and \( Z_B \) pairs respectively, and so for one mole of solution:

\[
Z_AN_A = 2n_{AA} + n_{AB}
\]

\[
Z_BN_B = 2n_{BB} + n_{AB}
\]

where \( n_A \) and \( n_B \) are the numbers of moles of A and B and \( n_{AA} \), \( n_{BB} \) and \( n_{AB} \) are the numbers of moles of pairs. Pair fractions \( X_{ij} \) are defined as:

\[
X_{ij} = n_{ij}/(n_{AA} + n_{BB} + n_{AB})
\]
The Gibbs energy of mixing is assumed to be given by:

\[ \Delta G = (n_{AB}/2) \Delta g_{AB} - T \Delta S_{\text{config}} \tag{7} \]

The configurational entropy \( \Delta S_{\text{config}} \) is given by randomly distributing the first-nearest-neighbor pairs over “pair positions”. In three dimensions the exact mathematical expression is unknown; an approximate expression is obtained as follows. If the pairs are distributed with no regard for overlap, then a molar entropy of

\[ -R [(Z_A X_A + Z_B X_B) / 2] (X_{AA} \ln X_{AA} + X_{BB} \ln X_{BB} + X_{AB} \ln X_{AB}) \]

results (where \( X_A \) and \( X_B \) are the mole fractions and where the factor \([(Z_A X_A + Z_B X_B) / 2]\) is the number of moles of bonds per mole of solution.) This expression clearly overestimates the number of possible configurations because, for example, an \((A−A)\) and a \((B−B)\) pair cannot both contain the same central atom. A correction is applied by considering that when \( \Delta g_{AB} = 0 \), the solution should be a random mixture with an ideal configurational entropy and with \( X_{AA} = Y_A^2 \), \( X_{BB} = Y_B^2 \) and \( X_{AB} = 2Y_A Y_B \), where:

\[ Y_A = Z_A X_A / (Z_A X_A + Z_B X_B) = (1 - Y_B) \tag{8} \]

As shown previously [3], the following expression results:

\[ \Delta S_{\text{config}} = -R (n_A \ln X_A + n_B \ln X_B) \]

\[ -R [n_{AA} \ln \left( \frac{Y_A^2}{X_{AA}} \right) + n_{BB} \ln \left( \frac{Y_B^2}{X_{BB}} \right) + n_{AB} \ln \left( \frac{X_{AB}}{2Y_A Y_B} \right)] \tag{9} \]

Minimizing the Gibbs energy subject to the constraints of Eqs. (4,5) yields the following “quasichemical equilibrium constant” for reaction (3):

\[ \frac{X_{AB}^2}{X_{AA} X_{BB}} = 4 \exp \left( -\frac{\Delta g_{AB}}{RT} \right) \tag{10} \]

At a given composition and for a given value of \( \Delta g_{AB} \), Eqs. (4,5,10) can be solved to give \( X_i \) which can then be substituted back into Eqs. (7,9). When \( \Delta g_{AB} = 0 \), the solution is a random ideal solution. As \( \Delta g_{AB} \) becomes progressively more negative, reaction (3) is displaced progressively to the right and the degree of SRO increases.

For purposes of optimization, \( \Delta g_{AB} \) is expanded [3] as a polynomial in the bond fractions:

\[ \Delta g_{AB} = \Delta g_{AB}^* + \sum_{i=1} g_{AB}^{0i} X_{AA}^i + \sum_{j=1} g_{AB}^{0j} X_{BB}^j \tag{11} \]
where $\Delta g_{AB}^*, g_{AB}^{0i}$ and $g_{AB}^{0j}$ are the adjustable model parameters. Alternatively [3], $\Delta g_{AB}$ may be expanded as a polynomial in the component fractions $Y_A$ and $Y_B$.

Eq. (9) for the entropy can be shown [6, 7] to be exact only for a one-dimensional lattice ($Z = 2$). In three dimensions the equation is only approximate as no exact solution of the “three-dimensional Ising model” is known. As discussed previously [3, 7], the error introduced by this approximation can be offset through the choice of somewhat non-physical values of $Z$. From our experience in applying the MQM to many liquid metallic solutions, we have found that a value of approximately $Z = 6$ generally yields the best results, although the calculations are not highly sensitive to this parameter. Of course, if the composition of maximum SRO is observed at a composition other than $X_A = X_B = 1/2$, then $Z_A$ and $Z_B$ cannot both be equal. For example, as discussed in the previous section, the composition of maximum SRO in the Mg-Sn system occurs at $X_{Sn} = 1/3$, such that the ratio $Z_{Sn}/Z_{Mg}$ should be set equal to 2.0. For greater flexibility, we permit $Z_A$ and $Z_B$ to vary with composition as follows [3]:

$$\frac{1}{Z_A} = \frac{1}{Z_{AA}} \left( \frac{2n_{AA}}{2n_{AA} + n_{AB}} \right) + \frac{1}{Z_{AB}} \left( \frac{n_{AB}}{2n_{AA} + n_{AB}} \right)$$

(12)

$$\frac{1}{Z_B} = \frac{1}{Z_{BB}} \left( \frac{2n_{BB}}{2n_{BB} + n_{AB}} \right) + \frac{1}{Z_{BA}} \left( \frac{n_{AB}}{2n_{BB} + n_{AB}} \right)$$

(13)

where $Z_{AA}^A$ and $Z_{AB}^A$ are the values of $Z_A$ respectively when all nearest neighbors of an A are A’s and when all nearest neighbors of an A are B’s, and where $Z_{BB}^B$ and $Z_{BA}^B$ are defined similarly.

In order to set the composition of maximum SRO at $X_{Sn} = 1/3$, it is only required that $Z_{Sn}/Z_{Mg} = 2.0$. Hence, we set $Z_{Mg}/Z_{Sn} = Z_{Mg}/Z_{Sn} = 6.0$ for the pure elements, while setting $Z_{Mg}/Z_{Sn} = 4.0$ and $Z_{Sn}/Z_{Sn} = 8.0$ (such that their average is 6.0). The choice of values for $Z_{ij}$ has been discussed in detail previously [7].

For a ternary liquid solution A-B-C, the Gibbs energy of mixing is given by [4]:

$$\Delta G = (n_{AB}/2) \Delta g_{AB} + (n_{BC}/2) \Delta g_{BC} + (n_{CA}/2) \Delta g_{CA} - T\Delta S_{\text{config}} + \text{(ternary terms)}$$

(14)

where $\Delta g_{AB}$, $\Delta g_{BC}$ and $\Delta g_{CA}$ are the binary parameters obtained from optimization of the three binary sub-systems, and where the expression for $\Delta S_{\text{config}}$ is given by randomly distributing all $(i - j)$ pairs $(i, j = A, B, C)$ over the pair positions, resulting in an entropy expression similar to Eq. (9). Detailed equations for calculating the values of the parameters $\Delta g_{ij}$ at a composition point in the ternary system from their optimized values in the binary sub-systems have been given previously [4]. The parameters of the additional (ternary terms) in
Eq. (14) are obtained by optimization using ternary experimental data. Ideally, these terms should be zero or small.

### 2.2 Associate Model

Consider as example an associate model for the Mg-Al-Sn liquid solution. Mg atoms, Al atoms, Sn atoms and Mg$_2$Sn associates are randomly distributed on a quasilattice: (Mg, Sn, Al, Mg$_2$Sn). That is, the ternary solution is formally treated, using the usual Compound Energy Formalism [8], as a single-lattice 4-component solution with end-members Mg, Sn, Al and Mg$_2$Sn, where the Gibbs energy of formation from the elements of the pure end-member Mg$_2$Sn is a composition-independent model parameter obtained during optimization of the Mg-Sn binary system. Binary interaction terms $L_{ij} (i, j = \text{Mg, Sn, Al, Mg}_2\text{Sn})$ between the species are included and are obtained during optimization of binary systems except for the parameters $L_{\text{Al,Mg}_2\text{Sn}}$ which are ternary parameters which cannot be obtained from the binary data and which must either be set to zero or obtained by optimization using ternary experimental data.

### 3. The Mg-Sn binary system

An optimization of this binary system, using the MQM for the liquid phase, has been presented by Jung et al. [9]. All available experimental data were reviewed by these authors. Experimental data for the enthalpy of liquid mixing, the excess Gibbs energy of the liquid phase, and the phase diagram are shown in Figs. 1, 3 and 5.

In the present re-optimization the properties of the pure elements are taken from Dinsdale [10]. We have retained the values of $H_{298}^e$ and $C_p^e$ used by Jung et al. [9] for the line compound Mg$_2$Sn, but have taken the entropy $S_{298}^c$ from Jelinek et al. [11] who derived the value from their low-temperature $C_p^e$ measurements. The (Mg)$_{\text{hcp}}$ solution was modeled by a simple substitutional model, with the lattice stability of pure hcp Sn taken from Dinsdale [10]. The solubility of Mg in solid Sn was assumed negligible. The liquid phase parameters were re-optimized. All optimized parameters are listed in Table 1. As can be seen in Figs. 1, 3, 5, the experimental data are well reproduced. The calorimetrically determined enthalpy of fusion of Mg$_2$Sn as measured by Sommer et al. [12] (19.6 kJ/g-atom) is also well reproduced (calculated value = 19.4 kJ/g-atom.) The calculated entropy of the liquid solution is shown in Fig. 2.

This system was optimized, using the associate model for the liquid phase, by Fries and Lukas [13] and the model parameters for the liquid are found in Ref. [14]. The optimized thermodynamic properties and phase diagram are shown in Figs. 1, 2, 3 and 5. It can be seen that the MQM and the associate model yield very similar optimizations for the binary system.

### 4. The Al-Sn binary system

The phase diagram and enthalpy of liquid mixing are shown in Figs. 6 and 7. The solubility of Sn in solid (Al)$_{\text{fcc}}$ was assumed negligible. The solubility of Al in solid (Sn)$_{\text{bct}}$ was treated as a simple ideal substitutional solution [15] using the lattice stability of pure bct Al given by Dinsdale [10]. The liquid solution was modeled with the MQM. All model parameters are
shown in Table 1. As can be seen in Figs. 6 and 7, the experimental data are well reproduced. The liquid exhibits small positive deviations from ideal mixing. As a result, the parameter $\Delta g_{\text{AlSn}}$ is slightly positive and the model predicts a small degree of clustering of Sn and Al. That is, reaction (3) is displaced slightly to the left.

5. The Mg-Al binary system

The Mg-Al binary phase diagram, as optimized by Chartrand [16] is shown in Fig. 8. For the liquid phase, the MQM was used. Optimized parameters for the liquid are given in reference [17]. (The parameters for the (Al)$_{\text{fcc}}$ and (Mg)$_{\text{hcp}}$ phases of the Mg-Al binary system given in reference [17] were in error. The correct parameters for these phases from Chartrand [16] are reproduced in Table 1). The parameter $\Delta g_{\text{MgAl}}$ for the liquid is small and negative, indicating a small degree of SRO. The terminal solid solutions were treated as simple substitutional solutions. The $\beta$, $\epsilon$, and $\gamma$ phases were modeled as described by Chartrand [16].

6. The Mg-Al-Sn ternary system

Various phase diagram sections of the ternary Mg-Al-Sn system are shown in Figs. 9 to 11. The data of different authors can be seen to be in good agreement. Experimental enthalpies of liquid mixing [18] are shown in Figs. 12 and 13.

The phase diagram was calculated with the liquid properties predicted by the MQM with no ternary parameters. (The “symmetric approximation” as described in reference [4] was used.) All solid phases were assumed to have only unary or binary phase fields except for the (Mg)$_{\text{hcp}}$ solution which was modeled as a simple substitutional solution using only the binary parameters in Table 1; the interaction parameters $^L L_{\text{AlSn}}$ were assumed to be negligible. The predicted phase diagram sections and enthalpies of liquid mixing are compared to the experimental data in Figs. 9-13. The agreement is very good. The calculated projection of the liquidus surface is shown in Fig. 4.

The phase diagram was calculated by Doernberg et al. [19] who used the associate model of Fries and Lukas [13] for the liquid Mg-Sn solution, while modeling the Al-Sn [15] and Mg-Al [20] liquid solutions as simple substitutional solutions with ideal configurational entropies. Calculated phase diagram sections and enthalpies of liquid mixing are shown in Figs. 9, 10, 12(a) and 13 for the cases where (1) no ternary parameters were used, and (2) where one ternary parameter $L_{\text{AlMgSn}}$, optimized by Doernberg et al. [19] to fit the ternary data, was employed. As can be seen in these figures, the associate model with no ternary terms fails to predict the positive deviations from ideal mixing in the ternary liquid, as was discussed in Section 1. With the inclusion of the positive ternary parameter, the phase diagram is reproduced reasonably well in the central composition regions (Fig. 9). However, as can be seen in Fig. 10, even with a ternary parameter the agreement with the experimental data in other composition regions is not as good as that obtained with the MQM with no ternary parameters.
7. The Mg-Al-Sc ternary system

The projection of the liquidus surface of the Mg-Al-Sc system is shown in Fig. 14 and various sections of the phase diagram are shown in Figs. 15-17.

The Mg-Al [16], Al-Sc [21], and Mg-Sc [21] binary systems have been optimized previously using the MQM for the liquid solutions. The Al-Sc liquid exhibits a high degree of SRO with the composition of maximum ordering near the composition AlSc. The Mg-Al and Mg-Sc liquid solutions exhibit only relatively small degrees of SRO.

The ternary phase diagram was calculated using only the binary MQM model parameters [16, 21] for the liquid. (The symmetric approximation as described in reference [4] was used.) The terminal solid solutions: (Mg)$_{hcp}$, (Al)$_{fcc}$, (Sc)$_{hcp}$ and (Sc)$_{bcc}$ were modeled as substitutional solutions using only the binary model parameters [16, 21]. (The Mg-rich and Sc-rich hcp solutions were modeled as a single phase with an immiscibility gap.) The solution of Mg$_3$Sc in Al$_3$Sc was modeled as a simple substitutional solution (Al, Mg)$_3$Sc with the Gibbs energy of the Mg$_3$Sc end-member ($G_{Mg,Sc}$) and an interaction parameter ($L_{Al,Mg,Sc}$) chosen (see Table 1) so as to reproduce the measured solubility at 350°C as shown in Fig. 15. The solution of MgSc in AlSc was modeled with a two-sublattice Compound Energy Formalism (Mg, Al)[Sc, Mg] so as to reproduce the measured solubility at 350°C as shown in Fig. 15. The optimized parameters are shown in Table 1. The solubility of Mg$_2$Sc in Al$_2$Sc is negligible (~1 at.% Mg) [22]. Al$_2$Sc was thus treated as a stoichiometric (line) compound.

Calculated phase diagram sections are compared with the experimental data in Figs. 15 to 18. The agreement is very good. The calculated liquidus projection is shown in Fig. 14. The observed positive deviations along joins between the Mg-corner and the Al-Sc edge of the ternary composition triangle are predicted by the model, as discussed in Section 1. This is most clearly seen in Figs. 14 and 16.

The three binary sub-systems were re-optimized using an associate model for the binary Al-Sc liquid solution assuming AlSc associates. The Mg-Al and Mg-Sc binary liquids were modeled using a simple substitutional model with ideal configurational entropies of mixing with available model parameters [20, 23]. The ternary Mg-Al-Sc phase diagram was then calculated using only the binary model parameters. As is evident in Fig. 16, the positive deviations in the ternary liquid solution are not predicted by the associate model.

8. The AlCl$_3$-NaCl-KCl ternary system

A final example for a ternary molten salt system is shown in Figs. 19 and 20. An optimization of this system was reported previously [54]. All parameters and details can be found in this reference. The MQM was used for the liquid phase. Strong SRO occurs around the composition KAlCl$_4$ in the KCl–AlCl$_3$ binary liquid. Similar SRO occurs in the NaCl–AlCl$_3$ binary liquid, but to a lesser degree. Consequently, positive deviations are observed along the NaCl–KAlCl$_4$ section as can be seen in Figs. 19 and 20. The liquidus along the join, calculated with no ternary parameters, compares favorably with the experimental data as can be seen in Fig. 20.
9. Conclusions

In Mg-Sn liquid alloys there is a relatively strong tendency towards SRO about the Mg$_2$Sn composition. This SRO has been modeled by the MQM which attributes the SRO to the preferential formation of nearest-neighbor Mg-Sn pairs. Similar optimizations of the Al-Sn and Mg-Al systems have also been performed using the MQM for the liquid phases. These binary liquids show a much lower tendency towards SRO. When the thermodynamic properties of the ternary liquid Mg-Al-Sn solutions are subsequently estimated using the MQM, excellent agreement with measured ternary phase diagram and thermodynamic data is obtained with no additional ternary parameters being required. In particular, the observed tendency to positive deviations from ideal mixing (tendency to immiscibility) along the Mg$_2$Sn-Al join are correctly predicted by the MQM as being due to the formation of clusters rich in Mg-Sn pairs and clusters rich in Al. If the SRO in the Mg-Sn liquid alloys is modeled using an associate model which attributes the SRO to the formation of Mg$_2$Sn associates or molecules, then equally good fits to the experimental data in the binary system can be obtained. However, the associate model does not correctly predict the properties of the Mg-Al-Sn liquid. In particular, it fails entirely to predict the observed positive deviations along the Mg$_2$Sn-Al join. Along this join the associate model predicts an approximately ideal mixture of Al atoms and Mg$_2$Sn associates, and the observed positive deviations can only be reproduced by introducing additional adjustable ternary model parameters optimized to fit the ternary experimental data.

Similar examples have also been presented for the Mg-Al-Sc and AlCl$_3$-NaCl-KCl systems.
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Table 1. Model parameters of the Mg-Al-Sn and Mg-Al-Sc systems optimized in the present study (J/mol). Major species in each sublattice are in bold.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coordination Numbers</th>
<th>Gibbs energies of pair exchange reactions (J/mole of pairs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$i$</td>
<td>$j$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mg</td>
<td>Sn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al</td>
<td>Sn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al</td>
<td>Mg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Liquid‡**

\[(\text{Al}, \text{Mg})_3\text{Sc}\]

$G_{\text{Al:Sc}} = G^{\circ}_{\text{AlSc}}$ from reference [27]

$G_{\text{Mg:Sc}} = 3 \times G(\text{Mg}, \text{HCP}) + G(\text{Sc}, \text{HCP}) - 12,552$

$L_{\text{Al:Sc:Sc}} = -37,656$

HCP: (Mg, Al, Sn)

$L_{\text{Al:Al}} = 2,510.4$ (from reference [16])

$L_{\text{Mg:Sn}} = -48,116(X_{\text{Mg}} - X_{\text{Sn}})$

FCC: (Al, Mg)

$L_{\text{Al:Al}} = 4,144.03 - 4.3793T + (-207.44 + 3.0546T)(X_{\text{Al}} - X_{\text{Mg}})$ (from reference [16])

BCT: (Sn, Al)

$L_{\text{Al:Al}} = 14136.95 - 4.7123T$ (from reference [15])

\[(\text{Al, Mg})_2\text{Sc} \]‡

$G_{\text{Al:Sc}} = G^{\circ}_{\text{AlSc}}$ from reference [27]

$G_{\text{Al:Mg}} = G(\text{Al,FCC}) + G(\text{Mg,HCP}) + 41,840$

Mg$_2$Sn

$G^{\circ}_{\text{Mg2Sn}} = -102589.83 + 367.50166T - 68.3317lnT - 0.0178986T^2 + 3.33829 	imes 10^{-7}T^3 - 95970/T$

‡ For all pure elements (Al, Mg, Sc and Sn), $Z_{ii}^i = 6$

‡ All other parameters are given in Reference [21].
Figure Captions

Figure 1: Enthalpy of mixing in Mg-Sn liquid alloys as optimized by the MQM or the associate model compared to experimental data [12, 24, 25].

Figure 2: Entropy of mixing in Mg-Sn liquid alloys at 800°C calculated from the optimizations using the MQM or the associate model.

Figure 3: Partial excess Gibbs energies of mixing in Mg-Sn alloys at 800°C as optimized by the MQM or the associate model compared to experimental data [26-29].

Figure 4: Calculated liquidus projection of the Mg-Al-Sn system using the MQM for the liquid phase. Temperatures in °C.

Figure 5: Phase diagram of the Mg-Sn system as optimized using the MQM or the associate model for the liquid phase compared to experimental data [30-41].

Figure 6: Phase diagram of the Al-Sn system optimized using the MQM for the liquid phase compared to experimental data [42-47].

Figure 7: Enthalpy of mixing in Al-Sn liquid alloys as optimized by the MQM compared to experimental data [24, 48, 49].

Figure 8: Optimized phase diagram of the Mg-Al system [16].

Figure 9: Calculated section of the Mg-Al-Sn system along the Mg_{0.6667}Sn_{0.3333}-Al (Mg_{2}Sn-Al) join using the MQM (with no ternary parameters), or the associate model without ternary parameters, or the associate model with a ternary parameter, compared to experimental data [19, 50].

Figure 10: Calculated section of the Mg-Al-Sn system along the Mg_{0.9777}Sn_{0.0223}-Al join using the MQM (with no ternary parameters), or the associate model without ternary parameters, or the associate model with a ternary parameter, compared to experimental data [50].

Figure 11: Calculated sections of Mg-Al-Sn system using the MQM (with no ternary parameters) for the liquid phase, compared to experimental data [19] (Δ, V), [50] (○), [51](◊), [52]( ).

Figure 12: Calculated enthalpy of mixing in the Mg-Al-Sn liquid alloy along the (a) Mg_{0.6667}Sn_{0.3333}-Al, (b) Mg_{0.5}Sn_{0.5}-Al, and (c) Mg_{0.3}Sn_{0.7}-Al joins using the MQM (with no ternary parameters), or the associate model without ternary parameters, or the associate model with a ternary parameter, compared to experimental data [18].

Figure 13: Calculated enthalpy of mixing of Mg-Al-Sn liquid alloy along the Mg_{0.5}Al_{0.5}-Sn section using the MQM (with no ternary parameters), or the associate model without
ternary parameters, or the associate model with a ternary parameter, compared to experimental data [18].

Figure 14: Calculated liquidus projection of the Mg-Al-Sc system using the MQM (with no ternary parameters) for the liquid phase. Temperatures in °C.

Figure 15: Calculated isothermal section of the Mg-Al-Sc system at 350°C compared with experimental data [22].

Figure 16: Calculated section of the Mg-Al-Sc system along the Al_{0.6667}Sc_{0.3333}-Mg (Al_{2}Sc-Mg) join using the MQM (with no ternary parameters), or the associate model without ternary parameters, compared to experimental data [19, 50].

Figure 17: Calculated sections of the Mg-Al-Sc system along the (a) (Al-22wt%Mg) -(Al-2wt%Sc), (b) (Al-17wt%Mg)-(Al-1wt%Sc) joins compared with experimental data [53].

Figure 18: Calculated section of the Mg-Al-Sc system at \( X_{Mg} = 0.36 \) compared with experimental data [22].

Figure 19: Calculated [54] liquidus projection of the (NaCl + KCl + AlCl_3) system (the calculated isobar at 0.1MPa is shown).

Figure 20: Calculated (NaCl + KAlCl_4) quasibinary phase diagram compared with experimental data [55].
Figure 1: Enthalpy of mixing in Mg-Sn liquid alloys as optimized by the MQM or the associate model compared to experimental data [12, 24, 25].
Figure 2: Entropy of mixing in Mg-Sn liquid alloys at 800°C calculated from the optimizations using the MQM or the associate model.
Figure 3: Partial excess Gibbs energies of mixing in Mg-Sn alloys at 800°C as optimized by the MQM or the associate model compared to experimental data [26-29].
Figure 4: Calculated liquidus projection of the Mg-Al-Sn system using the MQM for the liquid phase. Temperatures in °C.
Figure 5: Phase diagram of the Mg-Sn system as optimized using the MQM or the associate model for the liquid phase compared to experimental data [30-41].
Figure 6: Phase diagram of the Al-Sn system optimized using the MQM for the liquid phase compared to experimental data [42-47].
Figure 7: Enthalpy of mixing in Al-Sn liquid alloys as optimized by the MQM compared to experimental data [24,48,49].
Figure 8: Optimized phase diagram of the Mg-Al system [16].
Figure 9: Calculated section of the Mg-Al-Sn system along the Mg$_{0.6667}$Sn$_{0.3333}$-Al (Mg$_2$Sn-Al) join using the MQM (with no ternary parameters), or the associate model without ternary parameters, or the associate model with a ternary parameter, compared to experimental data [19, 50].
Figure 10: Calculated section of the Mg-Al-Sn system along the Mg$_{0.9777}$Sn$_{0.0223}$-Al join using the MQM (with no ternary parameters), or the associate model without ternary parameters, or the associate model with a ternary parameter, compared to experimental data [50].
Figure 11: Calculated sections of Mg-Al-Sn system using the MQM (with no ternary parameters) for the liquid phase, compared to experimental data [19] (Δ, ▽), [50] (○), [51] (◊), [52] ( ).
Figure 11: Calculated sections of Mg-Al-Sn system using the MQM (with no ternary parameters) for the liquid phase, compared to experimental data [19] (Δ, ∇), [50] (○), [51] (◊), [52] ( ).
Figure 11: Calculated sections of Mg-Al-Sn system using the MQM (with no ternary parameters) for the liquid phase, compared to experimental data [19] (Δ, V), [50] (○), [51] (◊), [52] ( ).
Figure 11: Calculated sections of Mg-Al-Sn system using the MQM (with no ternary parameters) for the liquid phase, compared to experimental data [19] (Δ, □, [50] (○), [51](◊), [52](•)).
Figure 12: Calculated enthalpy of mixing in the Mg-Al-Sn liquid alloy along the (a) Mg$_{0.6667}$Sn$_{0.3333}$-Al, (b) Mg$_{0.5}$Sn$_{0.5}$-Al, and (c) Mg$_{0.3}$Sn$_{0.7}$-Al joins using the MQM (with no ternary parameters), or the associate model without ternary parameters, or the associate model with a ternary parameter, compared to experimental data [18].
Figure 13: Calculated enthalpy of mixing of Mg-Al-Sn liquid alloy along the Mg$_{0.5}$Al$_{0.5}$-Sn section using the MQM (with no ternary parameters), or the associate model without ternary parameters, or the associate model with a ternary parameter, compared to experimental data [18].
Figure 14: Calculated liquidus projection of the Mg-Al-Sc system using the MQM (with no ternary parameters) for the liquid phase. Temperatures in °C.
Figure 15: Calculated isothermal section of the Mg-Al-Sc system at 350°C compared with experimental data [22].
Figure 16: Calculated section of the Mg-Al-Sc system along the Al$_{0.6667}$Sc$_{0.3333}$-Mg ($\text{Al}_2\text{Sc}$-Mg) join using the MQM (with no ternary parameters), or the associate model without ternary parameters, compared to experimental data [19, 50].
Figure 17: Calculated sections of the Mg-Al-Sc system along the (a) (Al-22wt%Mg) -(Al-2wt%Sc), (b) (Al-17wt%Mg)-(Al-1wt%Sc) joins compared with experimental data [53].
Figure 18: Calculated section of the Mg-Al-Sc system at $X_{Mg} = 0.36$ compared with experimental data [22].
Figure 19: Calculated [54] liquidus projection of the (NaCl + KCl + AlCl₃) system (the calculated isobar at 0.1MPa is shown).
Figure 20: Calculated (NaCl + KAlCl₄) quasibinary phase diagram compared with experimental data [55].