



HAL
open science

Finite-Time Thermodynamics and the Optimal Control of Chemical Syntheses

Christian Schoen

► **To cite this version:**

Christian Schoen. Finite-Time Thermodynamics and the Optimal Control of Chemical Syntheses. Journal of Inorganic and General Chemistry / Zeitschrift für anorganische und allgemeine Chemie, 2009, 635 (12), pp.1794. 10.1002/zaac.200900207 . hal-00507771

HAL Id: hal-00507771

<https://hal.science/hal-00507771>

Submitted on 31 Jul 2010

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

**Finite-Time Thermodynamics and the Optimal Control of
Chemical Syntheses**

Journal:	<i>Zeitschrift für Anorganische und Allgemeine Chemie</i>
Manuscript ID:	zaac.200900207.R1
Wiley - Manuscript type:	Article
Date Submitted by the Author:	02-Jun-2009
Complete List of Authors:	Schoen, Christian; MPI fuer Festkoerperforschung Stuttgart, Abteilung Jansen, Chemie III
Keywords:	Finite-time thermodynamics, optimal control, nucleation-and-growth, chemical syntheses



1
2
3 **Finite-Time Thermodynamics and the Optimal Control of Chemical Syntheses**
4
5
6

7
8 J. Christian Schön*
9

10
11
12 Max-Planck-Institut für Festkörperforschung, D-70569 Stuttgart
13
14

15
16
17 Dedicated to Profesor Dr. Dr. h.c. Martin Jansen on his 65th birthday
18
19

20
21
22
23
24 *Prof. Dr. J. Christian Schön
25

26 Max-Planck-Institut für Festkörperforschung
27

28 Heisenbergstr. 1
29

30 D-70569 Stuttgart
31

32 e-mail: schoen@fkf.mpg.de
33
34
35
36
37

38 Keywords: Finite-time thermodynamics, optimal control, nucleation-and-growth,
39
40 chemical syntheses
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 Abstract:

9
10 The optimization of chemical processes that take place in a finite time constitutes an
11 important application of finite-time thermodynamics. In this study we investigate two
12 generic optimal control problems for nucleation-and-growth based syntheses: the
13 maximization of the amount of a crystalline solid phase generated via cooling from the
14 melt within a finite time τ , and the maximization of the difference between two
15 metastable crystalline modifications again synthesized by crystallization from a
16 supercooled melt. In both cases the optimal temperature program consists in a bang-
17 bang solution with constant values of the temperature, where a switch from a
18 temperature T_1 , where nucleation rates are high, to a temperature $T_0 > T_1$, where the
19 growth rates of the crystallites are maximal, occurs. The location of the switching time
20 t_s^* , $0 \leq t_s^* \leq \tau$, is analyzed as function of the parameters of the models describing the
21 chemical systems, and an application to the synthesis of glycerol crystals is given.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 Inhaltsübersicht:

42 Die Optimierung chemischer Prozesse, die in endlicher Zeit ablaufen, stellt eine
43 wichtige Anwendung der „Thermodynamik in endlicher Zeit“ dar. In dieser Arbeit
44 untersuchen wir zwei generische Probleme der optimalen Kontrolle für Synthesen, die
45 auf Keimbildung und –wachstum basieren: Die Maximierung der Menge einer
46 kristallinen festen Phase, die durch Abkühlung einer Schmelze in einer endlichen Zeit τ
47 entsteht, sowie die Maximierung der Differenz zweier metastabiler Modifikationen, die
48 ebenfalls durch Kristallisierung aus einer unterkühlten Schmelze gewonnen werden. In
49 beiden Fällen ergibt sich für das optimale Temperaturprogramm eine Bang-Bang-
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Lösung mit konstanten Temperaturwerten, bei der ein Sprung von einer Temperatur T_1 ,
4
5 bei der die Keimbildungsraten hoch sind, zu einer Temperatur $T_0 > T_1$, bei der die
6
7 Wachstumsraten der Keime maximal sind, auftritt. Der Zeitpunkt des Sprungs t_s^* ,
8
9 $0 \leq t_s^* \leq \tau$, wird als Funktion der Modellparameter der chemischen Systeme analysiert,
10
11 und eine Anwendung auf die Synthese von Glycerolkristallen wird gegeben.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1. Introduction

The major task of experimental chemistry has been, and still is, the synthesis of new compounds, molecules and solids, closely followed by the determination of the mechanisms that underlie the individual reactions and the whole synthesis process. Optimizing these syntheses with regard to an increased yield or a decreased work consumption is usually a secondary issue to the ability to synthesize the compound in the first place.

In contrast, the optimization of chemical processes constitutes one of the major tasks in the field of chemical engineering [1]. Besides the straightforward task of optimizing individual chemical reactions [2-6] or a sequence of reactions [7], the most common examples are the increase in the efficiency of various distillation procedures [8-10], the design of chemical plants [11], where complex syntheses take place that include e.g. heat exchanger networks [12] or the recycling of chemicals, and the transformation between different phases of a given substance with a minimal loss of availability [13]. Typically, the objective(s) or cost function(s) with respect to which a chemical process is to be optimized are the yield of the desired product, the amount of chemicals needed and the energy required for the production, the total monetary cost, or the environmental impact of the process.

In many, perhaps most, instances, such an optimization is based on empirical rules of thumb, where one is often guided by simple estimates and models that capture (at least qualitatively) some basic features of the reactions involved. Similarly, one often proceeds by systematically varying the process parameters in the laboratory where

1
2
3 efficient combinatorial schemes and correlation tables are employed to reduce the
4 amount of test syntheses needed [14] and to control multivariate processes [15]. An
5 example of such systematic variations of process parameters are the so-called high-
6 throughput syntheses [16,17]. They are most efficient, if one wants to optimize some
7 property within a well-defined class of molecular or solid compounds; in this way they
8 nicely complement the theoretical scanning of the energy landscapes of chemical
9 systems, where the primary goal is to discover the possible types of compounds that can
10 serve as synthesis targets in a given chemical system [18-21].
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 Alternatively, one can address this issue on the level of theory. The general
25 mathematical theory that underlies such an optimization is the so-called optimal control
26 theory [22]. Here, one describes the system by a set of „internal“ variables $\bar{x}(t)$ plus a
27 set of controls $\bar{u}(t)$ that can be adjusted within certain limits to achieve an optimal
28 outcome of the process. This optimal control problem is then usually solved using the
29 calculus of variations or dynamical programming methods.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 One notes that for many chemical processes the objective function is a thermodynamic
42 quantity such as the total amount of a substance, the entropy produced or the work
43 consumed in the process. On a very general level, the optimal control of such processes
44 falls into the purview of the field of finite-time thermodynamics (FTT) [23]. Finite-time
45 thermodynamics deals with the implications for thermodynamic processes of having
46 only a finite time available to achieve a certain task, e.g. performing a complete cycle of
47 a thermodynamic engine such as the Carnot- [24] or the Otto-engine [25]. In particular,
48 a FTT-analysis yields both a lower (or upper) bound on the thermodynamic quantity of
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 interest and the optimal path (in control variable space, and thus in internal variable
4
5 space) that achieves this limit value.
6
7
8
9

10 In this paper, we will give an introduction to the field of finite-time thermodynamics
11 and optimal control, and show some applications in the field of chemistry. In particular,
12 we will discuss the application of optimal control to the optimization of the outcome of
13 a generic synthesis that proceeds via nucleation-and-growth processes, where one or
14 two (metastable) compounds can be the outcome of the synthesis.
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 2. Finite-Time Thermodynamics

27
28
29
30

31 Classical thermodynamics deals with the analysis of thermodynamic processes, which
32 are defined as the movement of a chemical or physical system between thermodynamic
33 equilibrium states. Using the first and second law of thermodynamics and the concept of
34 reversible and irreversible quasi-static processes, it is possible to define state functions
35 in the thermodynamic space and to derive bounds on thermodynamic processes, in
36 particular on cyclic processes. However, one of the basic assumptions behind this
37 analysis is that an infinite time is available for the processes to take place, together with
38 the ability to perform the process in infinitesimally small increments along the path.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 The driving force behind the development of the so-called finite-time thermodynamics
52 was the recognition that these bounds on the efficiency or maximum power of an ideal
53 cyclic process are of only limited relevance for real processes where only a finite time
54 (and / or a finite number of steps) is available for completing the cycle. Until the middle
55 of the seventies of the last century, the focus was on the so-called second-law analysis
56
57
58
59
60

[26,27] that was employed predominantly in the engineering sciences, in order to develop (economically) efficient procedures. This changed with the work by Curzon & Ahlborn [28], who considered the (global) optimization of thermodynamic processes in a finite time interval.

In nearly all application-oriented questions in finite-time thermodynamics, one deals with an optimal control problem [22], where a quantity $J[\bar{x}(t), \bar{u}(t), t]$ is to be optimized that is given as a functional of the internal (thermodynamic) variables of the system $\bar{x}(t)$ and the control parameters $\bar{u}(t)$. The time evolution of these variables is usually described by differential equations

$$dx/dt = f(x, u, t) \quad (1)$$

that often represent phenomenological rates of change or dissipation equations. In addition, the process has to obey certain boundary conditions, which often take the form

$$\dot{x}(t_f) = \dot{x}_f, \dot{x}(t_0) = \dot{x}_0; t_0 = 0, t_f = \tau. \quad (2)$$

A short introduction into the concepts of optimal control theory is given in the supplementary material. By now a large number of thermodynamic processes have been analysed, e.g. Carnot-cycles [24,29,30], Diesel-cycles [31], Otto-cycles [25], heat exchange [12], diffusion [32], energy conversion [30], phase conversion [33], distillation [8-10], heat pumps and refrigerators [34-36], thermal insulation [37], solar energy [38], chemical reactions [6,7] and chemical converters [1]. Over the past two decades, this analysis has been performed for engines that use not only classical gases as

1
2
3 medium but also Bose- and Fermi-gases [39,40], and has been extended to a large
4
5 variety of multi-source systems and complicated dissipative systems [41]. Furthermore,
6
7 spatially dispersed systems have been investigated, where both the thermodynamic
8
9 variables and the control parameters can vary in space [42], and the performance of
10
11 computer algorithms has been optimized [43].¹
12
13
14
15
16

17 One reason for the broad applicability of finite-time thermodynamics are some very
18
19 general and generalizable concepts that were introduced in the early eighties. These are
20
21 based on the insight that one can compute very general bounds on the quantities to be
22
23 minimized [47], e.g. the increase of entropy $\Delta S''$ or the loss of availability $-\Delta A''$,
24
25
26
27
28

$$29 \Delta S'' \geq \frac{\bar{r}}{\tau} L_S^2 \text{ and } -\Delta A'' \geq \frac{\bar{r}}{\tau} L_U^2, (3)$$

30
31
32
33
34
35 which depend only on the thermodynamic path length
36
37
38
39

$$40 dL_S(d\vec{X}) = \sqrt{\sum_{i,j} dX_i \frac{\partial^2 S(\vec{X})}{\partial X_i \partial X_j} dX_j} \text{ and } dL_U(d\vec{X}) = \sqrt{\sum_{i,j} dX_i \frac{\partial^2 U(\vec{X})}{\partial X_i \partial X_j} dX_j} \quad (4)$$

41
42
43
44
45
46 between the initial and final point in thermodynamic space defined via the matrix of
47
48 second partial derivatives of $U(S, V, \dots)$ and $S(U, V, \dots)$, respectively, [48,49] and the
49
50 various parameters in the phenomenological evolution equations such as the relaxation
51
52 time \bar{r} and the total time τ of the process. For more details we refer the reader to the
53
54 supplementary material.
55
56
57
58
59
60

¹ Even outside the fields of physics, chemistry and engineering, a variety of topics ranging from economics [44,45] over ecology [45] to coding theory [46] have been investigated using finite-time thermodynamics concepts.

3. Examples

In this section, we present two examples for the optimization of chemical syntheses that proceed via nucleation and growth, e.g. from a melt. In the first example, the quantity to be maximized is the amount of desired product (only one solid modification exists). In the second example, two different solid modifications can form, and the quantity to be optimized is the difference in the amounts of the two products.

In both cases, we attempt to reduce the very complicated syntheses to their most elementary features. This allows us to construct highly simplified but at the same time quite generic models for the time evolution of the chemical system, such that the solutions of the optimal control problem can be derived analytically. While this simplification reduces the amount of realistic details of the model description, we can understand how the optimal control and the system interact, and furthermore we can analyze the influence of the parameters of the model on the behaviour of the optimal solution. Although the resulting solutions of the optimization problem usually are not very accurate in a quantitative sense, they typically represent the qualitative aspects of the optimal control of the real system correctly and can be used as guidance both in fine-tuning experiments and in the numerical solution of the optimal control problem when using much more realistic models of the synthesis process.

3.1 Optimal control of a generic synthesis based on nucleation and growth

The generic synthesis we are going to optimize is the production of the solid (crystalline) phase of a compound via cooling from the melt. However, the general

1
2
3 analysis is also applicable to all syntheses that are based on nucleation-and-growth
4
5 processes exhibiting the kind of temperature dependence described below. In contrast to
6
7 e.g. a chemical reaction in the gas phase, two processes occur during the formation of a
8
9 solid phase from the melt that exhibit very different dependences on the control
10
11 parameters, here temperature: the nucleation of the desired phase and the subsequent
12
13 growth of the nuclei. Their temperature dependence is opposite [50]: a reduction in
14
15 temperature increases the rate of nucleation (down to the glass transition where the
16
17 whole system freezes and no nuclei of critical size can be formed anymore), while an
18
19 increase in temperature enhances diffusive processes and thus the growth of the nuclei
20
21 and the product phase (up to the melting temperature, where the solid modification
22
23 begins to fall apart again).² Clearly, just choosing a single fixed temperature below the
24
25 melting temperature and letting the system evolve for a time τ is very unlikely to yield
26
27 the maximal amount of product within the finite time τ .
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 3.1.1 Mathematical model description 37 38 39 40

41 In order to construct a model amenable to analytical analysis, the following simplifying
42
43 assumptions are being made:
44

45 1. The amount of melt/volume n_{melt} is assumed to greatly exceed the amount of solid
46
47 material n throughout the process. We lump all the material in the solid phase together
48
49 in one variable $n(t)$, i.e. neither a cluster size distribution³ nor individual clusters are
50
51 being considered in this averaged description. Since $n \ll n_{melt} = n_{total} - n \approx n_{total}$, the
52
53 supercooled melt does not change due to transfer of material into the solid phase, and
54
55
56
57
58

59 ² We consider only homogeneous nucleation, i.e. no externally induced heterogeneous nucleation takes
60 place.

³ Experience with modeling coarsening processes [51] has shown that many of the relevant features can be captured in averaged quantities such as the mean cluster size.

we do not need to keep track of the amount of material in the supercooled melt explicitly but can treat it as an external constant that is implicitly included in the parameters of the model.

2. The increase of the amount of desired product is governed by two processes, nucleation and growth. The growth rate is supposed to depend on the amount of material n already present in the solid (crystalline) phase, in form of a power law n^r ($0 < r \leq 1$),⁴ while the nucleation rate is independent of n .

3. The temperature dependences of nucleation and growth follow power laws in a range between two reference temperatures $T_1 < T < T_0$, $(T_0 - T)^m$ and $(T - T_1)^l$, respectively.

No additional temperature dependence is assumed to be present. $T = T_1$ is the reference point (e.g. corresponding to the glass transition temperature), below which the nucleation rate rapidly drops from a maximum to zero because even local diffusion processes stop or become logarithmically slow and furthermore the thermodynamic barriers against the formation of critical nuclei rapidly increase. Similarly, below $T = T_1$, no significant growth can take place due to the slowness of diffusion processes at low temperatures. Without loss of generality, we can set $T_1 = 0$ for mathematical convenience. $T = T_0$ is the reference temperature (e.g. the melting point) above which no nucleation can take place. We also assume that above T_0 no growth can take place either. Thus the permitted temperature interval for the control is $T \in [0, T_0]$.

Taking assumptions 2 and 3 together, the formula for the growth rate is given by

$$\frac{dn}{dt} = f(n, T) = A(T_0 - T)^m + BT^l n^r, \quad (5)$$

⁴ If only one cluster were present, i.e. all the material were really accumulated in one single cluster, the most natural choice of r would be $r = 2/3$ reflecting the dependence of the growth rate on the size of the cluster surface. However, in reality, the total surface is the sum of the surface of many individual clusters, and this quantity is larger than the surface of a single big cluster, suggesting a larger value of r .

1
2
3
4
5
6 with $m, l \geq 1$ and $0 < r \leq 1$.

7
8 4. We assume that the internal temperature $T(t)$ of the system can nearly
9
10 instantaneously adjust to changes in the control parameter, the external temperature
11
12 $T_{ext}(t)$, i.e. we can set

13
14
15
16
17
$$T(t) = T_{ext}(t) \quad (6)$$

18
19
20
21
22 in the formulation of the problem and treat $T(t)$ as the control.

23
24 5. Only homogeneous nucleation takes place. Also, we ignore effects due to preferred
25
26 surfaces of the crystal for the growth processes. Furthermore, we ignore effects like the
27
28 local depletion of the liquid phase (melt) or local changes of temperature due to the
29
30 formation of the solid phase – the system is assumed to react quickly enough to adjust
31
32 both the temperature and the local density of the liquid to the externally prescribed
33
34 values.
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 The next step is the definition of the state variables of the system: In our simplified
42
43 description, there are only two variables, T and n . The external control variable is the
44
45 applied temperature T_{ext} , which we can set equal to the internal temperature T . The
46
47 quantity to be optimized is the total amount of (crystalline) solid phase
48
49
50
51

52
53
$$J = n(\tau) \quad (7)$$

54
55
56
57
58
59
60

On the other hand, there exist some empirical growth laws that are better represented by smaller values of r .

generated in the interval $[0, \tau]$, where we assume that initially only melt was present ($n(0) = 0$). This means that we must maximize the integral of the growth rate of the solid phase $f(n, T)$,

$$J = \int_0^{\tau} f(n(t), T(t)) dt, \quad (8)$$

with respect to the function $T(t)$. In addition, we need to add the constraint

$$c \left(\frac{dn}{dt}, n, T \right) = \frac{dn}{dt} - f(n, T) = 0 \quad (9)$$

that describes the time evolution of n . This is included by augmenting the integral (c.f. supplementary material),

$$J \rightarrow J_{aug} = \int_0^{\tau} f(n(t), T(t)) + p(t) \left(\frac{dn}{dt} - f(n(t), T(t)) \right) dt. \quad (10)$$

Thus we can formulate the optimal control problem as follows: *Maximize the amount of product at the end of the duration of the synthesis, $n(\tau) = J$, by adjusting the temperature along the path, where the temperature is restricted to the interval $T \in [0, T_0]$, the time evolution of n is given by eq. (5), and the initial amount of product $n(0)$ equals zero.*

3.1.2 Solution of the optimal control problem

The variation of J_{aug} yields

$$\delta J_{aug} = \int_0^{\bar{t}} \left[\delta p (dn/dt - f) + \delta T \left(\frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial T} - p \frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial T} \right) + \delta n \left(\frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial n} - p \frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial n} - dp/dt \right) \right] dt, \quad (11)$$

where we have taken care of the variation of dn/dt by performing an integration by parts, $p \delta (dn/dt) = pd\delta n/dt = -(dp/dt)\delta n +$ vanishing surface terms. This yields for the optimization the following set of equations:

$$\frac{dn}{dt} = f(n, T), \quad (12a)$$

$$(1 - p(t)) \frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial T} = 0, \quad (12b)$$

and

$$\frac{dp}{dt} = (1 - p(t)) \frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial n}. \quad (12c)$$

Clearly, a trivial solution of eqs. (12b) and (12c) would be $p(t) \equiv 1$ for the whole time interval; however, in this case, there would be no constraint at all on the system's time evolution since then $\delta p (dn/dt - f(n, T)) = 0$ for all trajectories $n(t)$. Thus, we find that a non-trivial solution leads to

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial T} = -Am(T_0 - T)^{m-1} + BT^{l-1}n^r = 0. \quad (13)$$

Note, however, that since T is restricted to the interval $[0, T_0]$, the term associated with the variation of the control $T(t)$ can vanish either by fulfilling equation (13), or by $T(t)$ being piecewise constant on the boundary,

$$T(t) = T_0 \text{ or } T(t) = 0, \quad (14)$$

such that $\delta T = 0$ along these time intervals, with one or more switches between these values (a so-called bang-bang-type solution, c.f. supplementary material). Solving eq. (13) yields

$$n = \left(\frac{mA}{lB} \frac{(T_0 - T^*)^{m-1}}{T^{*l-1}} \right)^{\frac{1}{r}}. \quad (15)$$

In order to decide, whether T^* constitutes a local minimum or maximum of f , we next compute the second derivative

$$\frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial T^2} = m(m-1)A(T_0 - T)^{m-2} + l(l-1)BT^{l-2}n^r \quad (16)$$

and insert the value of n from eq. (15), i.e. we set $T = T^*$. We find $\frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial T^2} \Big|_{T^*} > 0$,

and thus, $T^*(n)$ is a minimum for every value of n . In particular, we find for the initial value $T^*(t=0) = T^*(n=0) = T_0$, and thus no production of the solid phase would take

place. This result of solving the necessary conditions of the optimal control problem has produced the global minimum and not the maximum of the objective $n(\tau)$.⁵

As a consequence, the optimal solution must be a bang-bang-type of solution, where T switches between $T = 0$ and $T = T_0$, and dn/dt between the two boundary maxima of $f(n, T)$,

$$f(T = 0, n) = AT_0^m \text{ and } f(T = T_0, n) = BT_0^l n^r, \quad (17)$$

respectively, at the value of

$$n = n_s = \left(\frac{A}{B} T_0^{m-l} \right)^{\frac{1}{r}} \quad (18)$$

where $f(T = 0, n) = f(T = T_0, n)$.

For $T = 0$,

$$\frac{dn}{dt} = AT_0^m, \quad (19)$$

and thus

$$n(t) = n^{(1)}(t) = n(t_0) + AT_0^m (t - t_0). \quad (20)$$

⁵ Since $f \geq 0$ for all permitted values of T and n , and $n(0) = 0$, $n(\tau) \geq 0$ for every choice of the control $T(t)$. Thus, the solution found is obviously a global minimum.

Similarly, for $T = T_0$,

$$\frac{dn}{dt} = BT_0^l n^r, \quad (21)$$

and

$$n(t) = n^{(2)}(t) = \left((1-r)BT_0^l(t-t_0) + (n(t_0))^{1-r} \right)^{\frac{1}{1-r}}. \quad (22)$$

Note that for the initial condition $n(t_0) = 0$, the differential equation for $n^{(2)}(t)$ is singular for $r < 1$, and the appropriate solution is

$$n^{(2)}(t) = 0 \quad (23a)$$

instead of

$$n^{(2)}(t) = \left((1-r)BT_0^l(t-t_0) \right)^{\frac{1}{1-r}}. \quad (23b)$$

However, for any other value of $n(t_0)$, arbitrary close to 0, eq. (23b) applies. A special case is $r = 1$, where we find⁶

$$n^{(2)}(t) = n(t_0) \exp\left(BT_0^l(t-t_0)\right). \quad (24)$$

⁶ Note that eq. (24) is the limiting case of eq. (22) for $r = 1$.

Clearly, the initial choice of the temperature should be $T = 0$, else we are just wasting valuable time. Since there should be only one switch to $T = T_0$, we can compute the optimal switching time

$$t_s^* = \left(\frac{BT_0^l}{(AT_0^m)^{1-r}} \right)^{\frac{1}{1-r}} \quad (25)$$

by equating $n^{(1)}(t = t_s) = n_s$. From this follows the optimal trajectory for the amount of product

$$n^*(t) = \begin{cases} AT_0^m t, & 0 \leq t \leq t_s^* \\ \left((1-r)BT_0^l(t - t_s^*) + (AT_0^m t_s^*)^{1-r} \right)^{\frac{1}{1-r}}, & t_s^* < t \leq \tau \end{cases} \quad (26)$$

Table 1 shows t_s^* , $n_s = n^*(t = t_s^*)$, and the final amount of product $n^*(t = \tau)$ for some useful choices of l , m and r .

We note that after having realized that only one switch takes place from $T = 0$ to $T = T_0$ at a time t_s , we could have first computed the general form of $n(t)$ parametrized by t_s ,

$$\hat{n}(t, t_s) = \begin{cases} AT_0^m t, & t \leq t_s \\ \left((1-r)BT_0^l(t - t_s) + (AT_0^m t_s)^{1-r} \right)^{\frac{1}{1-r}}, & t > t_s \end{cases} \quad (27)$$

and then derived t_s^* by maximizing the function

$$\tilde{n}(t_s) = \hat{n}(t = \tau, t_s) = \left((1-r)BT_0^l(\tau - t_s) + (AT_0^m t_s)^{1-r} \right)^{\frac{1}{1-r}} \quad (28)$$

1
2
3
4
5 with respect to t_s . From this we can then compute the value of $n^*(t)$ at the switching
6
7 time $n^*(t = t_s) = \hat{n}(t = t_s^*, t_s = t_s^*)$. In general, the derivative of $\hat{n}(t, t_s)$ with respect to t
8
9 is not defined at $t = t_s$; only for $t_s = t_s^*$ the left- and right-derivative agree at $t = t_s$,
10
11 since we now have $(dn/dt)^{(1)}(t = t_s) = (dn/dt)^{(2)}(t = t_s)$. For $t < t_s^*$,
12
13 $(dn/dt)^{(2)}(t) < (dn/dt)^{(1)}(t)$, and for $t > t_s^*$, $(dn/dt)^{(2)}(t) > (dn/dt)^{(1)}(t)$, i.e. the optimal
14
15 choice of switching time ensures that the growth rate f is maximized throughout the
16
17 process for every value of n , a fact we have already indirectly exploited when choosing
18
19 the bang-bang-type solution as the optimal one.⁷ In this context, we also note that
20
21 exponential temperature dependences of the nucleation and/or growth rate would have
22
23 led to the same kind of bang-bang-solution for the optimal control, as long as these
24
25 exponential laws had exhibited the same monotonic decrease and increase, respectively,
26
27 as the power laws for nucleation and growth we had assumed above. Furthermore, if
28
29 $T_1 \neq 0$, then we just have to replace T_0 by $T_0 - T_1$ in all the formulas.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 3.2 Optimal control of a generic nucleation-and-growth synthesis from the melt with 43 competition between two different modifications 44 45 46 47 48 49

50 An interesting variation of the previous problem is the following one: Given a system,
51
52 where two different modifications 1 and 2 are known to exist side-by-side in the solid
53
54 state, how can one select the optimal temperature control such that modification 1 will
55
56 be the preferred product of the synthesis via solidification from the melt? For
57
58

59 ⁷ The fact that $f \geq 0$ for all values of n and $n(t)$ grows monotonically would allow us to solve the optimal
60 control problem given by eq. (8) in an alternative fashion using Tsirlin's "averaged optimal control"

1
2
3 concreteness, we will define as the quantity that is to be maximized the difference in the
4
5 amounts of the two products $n_1(t)$ and $n_2(t)$
6
7

$$\Delta(t) = n_1(t) - n_2(t) \quad (29)$$

8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15 after a finite time τ , $\Delta(\tau) = n_1(\tau) - n_2(\tau)$. If both nucleation and growth rates of
16
17 modification 1 are larger than the ones of modification 2, a decent heuristic might
18
19 consist in just maximizing $n_1(\tau)$ and ignoring $n_2(\tau)$, thus reducing the task to the
20
21 previously solved problem. But even in this special case, the optimal solution is more
22
23 efficient, and we are clearly in trouble if modification 2 either nucleates or grows more
24
25 quickly than modification 1.
26
27
28
29
30

31 32 3.2.1 Formulation of the optimal control problem 33

34
35
36 We will employ the same approximations as in the previous example. In particular, we
37
38 assume that the general dependence of the nucleation and growth rates is the same for
39
40 the two polymorphs, i.e., $m, l \geq 1$ and r ($0 < r \leq 1$) are the same for the two
41
42 modifications. Thus, the difference between the two modifications resides only in the
43
44 different rate parameters A_i and B_i , $i = 1, 2$. Again, we assume that the total amount of
45
46 starting material/volume, the (supercooled) melt, is essentially infinite compared to
47
48 $n_1(t)$ and $n_2(t)$. A more subtle assumption is that the total time τ , although potentially
49
50 very large, should be smaller than the typical time scales where coarsening would take
51
52 place and the thermodynamically stable modification would devour the unstable one.
53
54
55
56
57 Taking these two assumptions together, we can assume that the two polymorphs

58
59
60

approach. [52] This leads again to the condition that at each moment of time, i.e. for each value of $n(t)$,

nucleate and grow independently such that the amount of product of each modification never decreases during the process,

$$\frac{dn_i}{dt} = f_i(n_i, T) = A_i(T_0 - T)^m + B_i T^l n_i^r \geq 0 \quad (i=1,2) \quad (30)$$

for all permitted values of $T \in [0, T_0]$ and $n_i \geq 0$.

The state variables of the problem are the amounts of the two solid phases n_1 and n_2 , and the temperature T of the system that at the same time serves as the control variable. Thus we can formulate the optimal control problem as follows: *Maximize the difference of the two products $\Delta = n_1 - n_2$ at the end of the duration of the synthesis,*

$$\Delta(\tau) = J = \int_0^{\tau} f_1(n_1(t), T(t)) - f_2(n_2(t), T(t)) dt, \quad (31)$$

by adjusting the temperature along the path, where the temperature is restricted to the interval $T \in [0, T_0]$, the time evolution of n_i is given by eq. (30), and the initial amount of product $n_i(0)$ equals zero ($i=1,2$).

The two constraints $dn_i/dt = f_i(n_i, T)$ can again be included via the two Lagrange-multiplier functions $p_i(t)$ in an augmented functional

$$J_{aug} = \int_0^{\tau} \left[(f_1(n_1(t), T(t)) - f_2(n_2(t), T(t))) + p_1(t)(dn_1/dt - f_1(n_1(t), T(t))) + p_2(t)(dn_2/dt - f_2(n_2(t), T(t))) \right] dt. \quad (32)$$

we should chose T such that f is maximized.

3.2.2. Solution of the optimal control problem

The variation of J_{aug} proceeds analogously to the previous example, and yields the following set of equations:

$$\frac{dn_i}{dt} = f_i(n_i, T); (i=1,2), (33a)$$

$$\frac{dp_i}{dt} = (1-p_i) \frac{\partial \mathcal{F}_i}{\partial n_i}; (i=1,2), (33b)$$

and

$$(1-p_1(t)) \frac{\partial \mathcal{F}_1}{\partial T} = (1-p_2(t)) \frac{\partial \mathcal{F}_2}{\partial T}. (33c)$$

We note that the presence of two independent Lagrange-multiplier functions in eq. (33c) prevents us from applying the simple approach of the previous example, where the optimal solution could be directly identified by maximizing the function $f(T, n)$ for every value of n with respect to T . Thus, we need to analyze the function

$$\frac{d\Delta}{dt}(n_1, n_2, T) = f_1(n_1, T) - f_2(n_2, T), (34)$$

whose integral is to be maximized with the constraints $dn_i/dt = f_i(n_i, T)$, in detail. In particular, we are interested in whether the optimal control $T^*(t)$ is an interior point in function space (in this case, we need to solve the full boundary value problem of the five coupled differential equations (33)) or whether we again are dealing with a bang-bang-type solution.

1
2
3
4
5
6 The analysis proves to be rather lengthy, and thus we just outline the procedure. We
7
8 consider a set of points $n_i(t_0) = \tilde{n}_i > 0$ at some time $t_0 > 0$ that belong to the hypothetical
9
10 optimal solution for $\Delta^*(t) = n_1^*(t) - n_2^*(t)$. What is now the temperature for which a
11
12 maximal/minimal growth rate $(d\Delta/dt)(\dot{n}_1, \dot{n}_2, T)$ is found? Computing $\partial(d\Delta/dt)/\partial T$ and
13
14 $\partial^2(d\Delta/dt)/\partial T^2$, we find that three cases can occur: 1. no interior extremum exists, i.e.
15
16 we obviously have to choose one of the boundary values to increase $\Delta(t)$. 2. The
17
18 interior extremum is a local minimum, and thus again $T^* = 0$ or $T^* = T_0$. 3. The interior
19
20 extremum is a local maximum. But in this case, we find that $\Delta(t_0)$ is negative and both
21
22 the nucleation and the growth rate of n_2 are larger than the ones for n_1 . In this situation,
23
24 the global optimal solution would have been to keep $T = T_0$ for the whole time interval
25
26 $[0, \tau]$, i.e. we should not have attempted a synthesis in the first place since $n_2(\tau) > n_1(\tau)$
27
28 for all other choices of $T(t)$. Thus, the global solution to the optimal control problem
29
30 that maximizes $\Delta(\tau) = n_1(\tau) - n_2(\tau)$ consists in a bang-bang-type solution where only
31
32 one switch from $T = 0$ to $T = T_0$ occurs.⁸
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 The general solution to the optimal control problem is thus given by:

$$43$$

$$44$$

$$45$$

$$46$$

$$47 T^*(t) = \begin{cases} 0, & 0 \leq t \leq t_s^* \\ T_0, & t_s^* < t \leq \tau \end{cases}, \quad (35a)$$

$$48$$

$$49$$

$$50$$

$$51$$

$$52 n_i^*(t) = \begin{cases} A_i T_0^m t, & 0 \leq t \leq t_s^* \\ \left((1-r) B_i T_0^l (t - t_s^*) + (A_i T_0^m t_s^*)^{1-r} \right)^{1/(1-r)}, & t_s^* < t \leq \tau \end{cases}; \quad (i=1,2). \quad (35b)$$

$$53$$

$$54$$

$$55$$

$$56$$

$$57$$

$$58$$

$$59$$

$$60$$

⁸ Note that $\Delta^*(t)$ does not necessarily grow monotonically for the whole time interval (see supplementary material for more details).

We still have to identify t_s^* . To do so, we investigate $\hat{n}_i(t, t_s)$ and $\tilde{n}_i(t_s)$, and determine the value of t_s that maximizes

$$\tilde{\Delta}(t_s) = \tilde{n}_1(t_s) - \tilde{n}_2(t_s). \quad (36)$$

Several issues complicate the solution: For one, t_s^* can usually only be determined numerically by solving the equation

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\tilde{n}_1(t_s)}{dt_s} &= \frac{d\tilde{n}_2(t_s)}{dt_s} \Leftrightarrow \\ & \left((1-r)B_1T_0^l(\tau-t_s) + (A_1T_0^m t_s)^{1-r} \right)^{\frac{r}{1-r}} (-B_1T_0^l + (A_1T_0^m)^{1-r} t_s^{-r}) = . \quad (37) \\ & = \left((1-r)B_2T_0^l(\tau-t_s) + (A_2T_0^m t_s)^{1-r} \right)^{\frac{r}{1-r}} (-B_2T_0^l + (A_2T_0^m)^{1-r} t_s^{-r}) \end{aligned}$$

This equation can have 0, 1 or 2 solutions t_s^* in the interval $[0, \tau]$, and furthermore $\tilde{\Delta}(t_s^*)$ have to be compared with the value of $\tilde{\Delta}(t_s)$ at the boundary of the time interval, $\tilde{\Delta}(t_s = 0)$ and $\tilde{\Delta}(t_s = \tau)$. A further subtle complication arises from the singularity of the differential equation (21): we need to distinguish between $t_s^* = 0$ (which implies that $T = T_0$ for the whole time and no solid is produced) and $t_s^* = \varepsilon$ ($1 \gg \varepsilon > 0$) (which implies that we have tiny initial nuclei of modifications 1 and 2 that grow for the whole time interval). Finally, the type and number of solutions t_s^* depends on the relative size of A_1 , A_2 , B_1 and B_2 characterizing the two nucleation and growth rates in general. Thus, eight different cases must be studied individually: $B_1 = B_2, A_1 > A_2$ (1); $B_1 = B_2, A_1 < A_2$ (2); $B_1 > B_2, A_1 = A_2$ (3); $B_1 < B_2, A_1 = A_2$ (4); $B_1 > B_2, A_1 > A_2$ (up to 3 subcases) (5); $B_1 > B_2, A_1 < A_2$ (up to 6 subcases) (6); $B_1 < B_2, A_1 > A_2$ (up to 6 subcases) (7), $B_1 < B_2, A_1 < A_2$ (8). The subcases reflect the values of these rates, and their rates of

1
2
3 change, at $t = 0$ and $t = \tau$, and also the total time τ available. Some of the general types
4
5 of solutions one finds are: 1) $t_s^* \approx t_s^{(1)*}$ (essentially maximize the amount of
6
7 modification 1; especially if $B_1 > B_2$ and τ large), 2) $t_s^* = 0$ (perform no synthesis at
8
9 all), 3) $t_s^* \approx \tau$ (essentially permit only nucleation, especially if $B_1 \leq B_2, A_1 > A_2$), 4)
10
11 $t_s^* = \varepsilon$ (after an extremely short nucleation phase switch to the growth phase, especially
12
13 if $B_1 > B_2, A_1 < A_2$). Note that we only have one switch in temperature along the optimal
14
15 trajectory: If $B_1 > B_2$, then we will stay in the growth phase once it became
16
17 advantageous to switch to higher temperature, and if $B_1 < B_2$, then we time the switch to
18
19 the growth phase (if we switch at all!) in such a fashion that a possible switch back to
20
21 low temperature would occur precisely once the total allotted time has been used up
22
23 (and thus no further switch is needed).
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 Tables 2 and 3 summarize the results for $m = l = 1, r = 1$ and $m = l = 1, 0 < r < 1$,
33
34 respectively. Since interior values of t_s^* must be computed numerically, in the general
35
36 case we can only give their location relative to the optimal switching times $t_s^{(1)*}$ and
37
38 $t_s^{(2)*}$ we would obtain if we wanted to maximize the amount of modification 1 and 2,
39
40 respectively, regardless of the amount of the competing phase (regarding the formulas
41
42 for $t_s^{(1)*}$ and $t_s^{(2)*}$, c.f. eq. (25)). In the supplementary material, we discuss the
43
44 simplest case, $m = l = 1, r = 1$, in some more detail to illustrate the procedure, and
45
46 similarly address the case $m = l \neq 1, r \neq 1$. Note that the rich solution structure shown in
47
48 the tables can make it difficult to design simple heuristic guidelines for achieving the
49
50 objective: even relatively small changes in the various parameters in eq. (30) or the total
51
52 synthesis time can lead to a switch to a different regime of optimal solutions.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Note that we can use the same basic approach to address the more general case, where $m_1 \neq m_2$, $l_1 \neq l_2$, and/or $r_1 \neq r_2$. We find the same kind of bang-bang-type solutions, but the number of cases to be analyzed grows enormously, and even a tabular overview is not very helpful. Thus we are not presenting the detailed results for this general case; for specific systems with given experimental values of m_i , l_i and r_i , the most efficient way would be to treat the optimal control problem analogously to the case $m_1 = m_2$, $l_1 = l_2$ and $r_1 = r_2$ analyzed above, and then numerically solve the analogue to eq. (37) for the switching time.

4. Discussion

4.1. Summary of results and application to a real system (glycerol)

In the previous section, we have formulated two optimal control problems for a nucleation-and-growth based synthesis using a simplified but nevertheless quite general model for the nucleation and growth rates of the product phase as function of temperature and product already present. We have shown that these problems, the maximization of the yield of one solid phase and the maximization of the difference between the amounts of two solid phases, can be solved and that we obtain solutions of the bang-bang-type, with a switch from $T = T_1 (\approx T_{glass})$ to $T = T_0 (\approx T_{melt})$, in both cases. To make these problems analytically accessible, many simplifying assumptions were required. But the fact that we were able to reach a quite general solution that holds for very generic laws describing the temperature dependence of nucleation and growth of

1
2
3 the nuclei, yields much insight into the general optimal control problem of this type of
4
5 syntheses and the qualitative aspects of its solution.
6
7

8
9
10 A natural question is to what extent this „phenomenological“ optimal control result can
11
12 be applied in a quantitative fashion: Can we plug numbers based on experiments into
13
14 the solutions in tables 1 – 3 and e.g. find t_s^* anywhere near realistic values?
15
16

17 Obviously, the first step would be a fit of the model parameters, $A_i, B_i, T_0, T_1, m, l, r$, to
18
19 experimental data describing nucleation and growth rates as function of temperature.
20
21 Next we would calculate the appropriate switching time, either by inserting the
22
23 parameters into the formulas in table 1 or by numerically solving eq. (37).
24
25
26
27

28
29 As a specific example, we consider the application of the optimal control formalism to
30
31 the synthesis of glycerol crystals. Here, the goal is to maximize the yield of the
32
33 crystalline phase within the finite time τ . From the literature [50], we find that the
34
35 nucleation rate in the supercooled melt increases very rapidly upon cooling to a
36
37 maximum at $T_1 \approx -65^\circ C$ and then rather abruptly drops to zero even before the glass
38
39 transition temperature $T_{glass} \approx -85^\circ C$ is reached [53]. The growth rate of the crystallites
40
41 increases quickly with increasing temperature to a maximum at about $T_0 \approx 0^\circ C$, and
42
43 then rapidly decreases towards the melting temperature $T_{melt} \approx +18^\circ C$ [54]. Fitting
44
45 power laws to the data yields for the model parameters: $A \approx 2.4 \times 10^{-13} / \text{sec cm}^3 K^9$,
46
47 $B \approx 0.3 / \text{sec cm} K^3$, $T_0 - T_1 \approx 65 K$, $m \approx 9$, $l \approx 3$, and $r \approx 2/3$. If we plug these values
48
49 into the formulas in table 1, we find a switching time of $t_s^* \approx 2 \text{ sec}$. Thus, the optimal
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 solution consists of keeping the melt for about 2 seconds at about -65°C , and then let
4
5 the nuclei generated grow at the maximum rate at a temperature of about 0°C .⁹
6
7
8
9

10 11 12 13 4.2 Analysis of the approximations 14 15 16

17 As mentioned above, several approximations and simplifications had been necessary, in
18 order to make the optimal control problem analytically accessible. Perhaps the most
19 drastic one is the description of the product phase by a single variable $n(t)$, ignoring the
20 fact that we are actually dealing with a distribution of clusters of various sizes.
21
22
23
24
25

26 However, in the past it has proven to be quite successful to focus on the time evolution
27 of an „average“ cluster while modeling processes involving nucleation of clusters
28 instead of trying to follow the full distribution, e.g. in various models of primary
29 crystallization [55], coarsening [51] or in the optimization of the gas-liquid transition
30 [13]. Thus only two variables would be needed to describe the solid phase, the total
31 amount of crystalline material $n(t)$ and the number of clusters generated, $N_c(t)$. Since
32 the N_c clusters are treated as identical, they obey the same growth law. As a
33 consequence, the fact that $n(t)$ represents not only one cluster but several ones can be
34 included in a heuristic fashion by choosing the parameter r in the model (see eq. (5)) to
35 be different from $r = 2/3$. In particular, we note from the glycerol example that less
36 than 10 nuclei / cm^3 have been generated by the time t_s^* is reached, and thus treating
37 the system as if all the solid material were combined into one effective crystallite should
38 be quite reasonable. Having to modify r is only a small price to pay for eliminating
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

⁹ There is some uncertainty about the size of the critical nuclei. We assumed a critical cluster size of 1000 atoms when determining the parameter A . If a critical cluster contains only 100 atoms (a lower bound), A would be smaller by about a factor 10, and t_s^* would be reduced by a factor of about 3.

1
2
3 $N_c(t)$ as an independent variable. The situation is slightly different in the case of two
4
5 competing modifications where $t_s^* = \tau$ can be the optimal solution, and thus the
6
7 exponent r would vary as a function of $n(t)$ since $N_c(t)$ ranges from one to many
8
9 nuclei. However, in this case the optimal solution is independent of the value of r (the
10
11 growth phase of the nuclei is actually never reached), and thus the model again
12
13 describes the features of the growth process relevant for the optimal control problem.
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 The second approximation concerns the use of power laws to model the nucleation and
21
22 growth rates. Of course, these rates do not drop infinitely fast to zero for $(T_{glass} <)T < T_1$
23
24 and $(T_{melt} >)T > T_0$, respectively. However, we note that for $T < T_1$, the growth rate
25
26 remains zero, and analogously the nucleation rate is zero for $T > T_0$. From the point of
27
28 view of optimizing the amount of final product, there is clearly nothing to be gained
29
30 from ever selecting a temperature below T_1 or above T_0 , and thus we can restrict the
31
32 range of feasible values of the control, i.e. the temperature, to the interval $[T_1, T_0]$. In
33
34 particular, we note that as long as the rates are monotonic in the interval $[T_1, T_0]$, the
35
36 general solution will be of the bang-bang-type, and one usually can find some
37
38 reasonable power-law approximation for the temperature dependence of the rates within
39
40 the relevant interval.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 The situation is more subtle if the two competing modifications should exhibit different
50
51 values for $T_1^{(i)}$ and $T_0^{(i)}$, e.g. $T_1^{(1)} < T_1^{(2)} < T_0^{(1)} < T_0^{(2)}$. While the models as such are still
52
53 an appropriate description of the rates of each of the two polymorphs within $[T_1^{(i)}, T_0^{(i)}]$,
54
55 it is not clear, whether we still have a bang-bang-type of solution of the optimal control
56
57 problem. In principle, we need to consider the large interval $[T_1^{(1)}, T_0^{(2)}]$ as the range of
58
59
60

feasible values of the control parameter, but then the peaks in the nucleation rate for modification 2 and in the growth rate for modification 1 do not occur at the boundaries.

But if we choose the small interval $[T_1^{(2)}, T_0^{(1)}]$, it can happen that at $T_1^{(2)}$ and $T_0^{(1)}$ the growth rate of modification 1 or the nucleation rate for modification 2, respectively, are still substantially different from zero while on the other hand the nucleation rate of modification 1 at $T_1^{(2)}$ and the growth rate of modification 2 at $T_0^{(1)}$ are still far from their maximum values. Clearly, for neither of the two intervals we would expect a straightforward bang-bang solution where the boundaries of the interval could serve as the optimal temperature values. Thus, a full re-analysis of the optimal control problem is called for if $T_0^{(1)} \neq T_0^{(2)}$ or $T_1^{(1)} \neq T_1^{(2)}$. In contrast, slightly different power laws of the temperature dependence of the nucleation and growth rates, $l_1 \neq l_2$ and/or $m_1 \neq m_2$, do not pose big problems, and even different values of $r_1 \neq r_2$ will only complicate the equations (e.g. lead to additional solutions in the analogue to eq. (37) for $r_1 \neq r_2$). But these changes would not preclude an analytical analysis, as long as $T_0^{(1)} = T_0^{(2)}$ and $T_1^{(1)} = T_1^{(2)}$, because we can still expect that a bang-bang-type solution is the optimal one.

Another important approximation is the range of allowed synthesis times τ . Clearly, if $\tau \rightarrow \infty$, the amount of melt n_{melt} will decrease and $n(t)$ will become comparable unless we keep adding supercooled melt to the system effectively keeping the density of solid material small compared to n_{melt} inside the synthesis chamber. Similarly, for large times, coarsening of the cluster size distribution will take place. However, the neglect of coarsening effects is not critical in the context of our model because the average cluster size still keeps increasing, and thus the lumped approximation that only considers the total amount of solid phase $n(t)$ encompasses and averages out possible coarsening

1
2
3 effects, with the consequence that coarsening does not have much of an influence on the
4
5 optimal control problem. Regarding the decrease of n_{melt} , we note that if we are
6
7 maximizing the amount of a single solid phase, the transition to a pure growth stage
8
9 takes place rather early independent of the total synthesis time. Thus, the decrease in
10
11 n_{melt} does not affect the optimal control problem as such, and it will only be noticeable
12
13 in the fact that $n(t)$ reaches a limiting value corresponding to the intrinsic density of the
14
15 solid phase itself (instead of growing to infinity as the formulas in section 3.1 suggest).
16
17
18
19

20
21
22 Again, additional complications arise for two competing modifications. Here, cases can
23
24 occur (c.f. tables 2 and 3), where the switching time equals τ or is relatively close to τ .
25
26 These situations only occur if we need to stay for a very long time in the nucleation
27
28 stage that favors modification 1, in order to balance the faster growth of the nuclei
29
30 belonging to modification 2. This fact will not change much if the amount of melt is
31
32 being depleted, and it will still be favorable to stay at $T = T_1$ for nearly the whole time if
33
34 we want to maximize $n_1 - n_2$. Much more critically, coarsening processes can be of
35
36 great importance when two modifications compete, since for sufficiently large synthesis
37
38 times and/or sufficiently unstable nuclei/crystallites, the thermodynamically stable
39
40 modification will eliminate the metastable solid phase even in finite time. If such effects
41
42 are to be taken into account, one would need to construct a considerably more
43
44 sophisticated model of the nucleation-and-growth synthesis with competing
45
46 modifications (possibly including an approximate cluster size distribution). It is very
47
48 likely that such a model can only be solved numerically.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56

57 Finally, we have assumed that the system reacts instantaneously both to changes in the
58
59 applied external temperature and to local changes in temperature and melt-density
60

1
2
3 caused by the nucleation of clusters of critical size or by the attachment of atoms from
4 the melt to the crystallites. Taking these effects into account will lead to optimal control
5 solutions that are approximately of the bang-bang-type, as long as the relaxation times
6 are much smaller than t_s^* . This can be expected to hold for so-called microreactors,
7 e.g. in the increasingly popular "lab-on-a-chip". If the relaxation times are rather large,
8 however, a full re-analysis of the optimal control problem is required taking the flow
9 properties and the thermal conductivity of the melt into account, and the more
10 complicated set of differential equations one would derive using the variational
11 approach would most likely have to be solved numerically.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 4.3 Outlook

28
29
30
31 The discussion of the various approximations in the previous subsection implicitly
32 suggests a number of future projects in the optimal control of nucleation-and-growth
33 based syntheses. Most straightforward is the analysis of the optimal control problem
34 with competing polymorphs for $l_1 \neq l_2$, $m_1 \neq m_2$ and/or $r_1 \neq r_2$. Similarly, one could
35 replace the power laws in eqs. (5) and (30) by more general functions involving
36 exponentials such as $\exp[-\Delta G(T)/k_B T]$ that are often used to describe activation
37 barriers to the nucleation of clusters of critical size [50]. As we mentioned earlier, the
38 general type of solution is not going to change as long as these functions are
39 monotonically increasing and decreasing with temperature, respectively, although the
40 case-by-case analysis is going to be much more complicated and numerical solutions
41 will be unavoidable.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Next, one would want to address the case where the maxima of growth and nucleation
4 rates of different modifications do not occur at the same temperature. A more
5
6 substantial extension of the model would be the inclusion of coarsening processes
7
8 between the competing polymorphs, where one probably will need to add at least the
9
10 number of clusters or equivalently the average size of the clusters for each modification
11
12 to the state variables describing the system. Furthermore, one would add conversion
13
14 terms between the two modifications as function of cluster size in the rate equations for
15
16 $(dn_i/dt)(t)$ and $(dN_c/dt)^{(i)}(t)$.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 A further issue that deserves to be studied is the competition between homogeneous and
25
26 heterogeneous nucleation. As a first step, one might want to study purely heterogeneous
27
28 nucleation-and-growth on the same level of complexity as was done in this work for
29
30 homogeneous nucleation, followed by a combination of both nucleation processes.
31
32
33 Another level of sophistication of the models involves the homogeneity of the spatial
34
35 distribution of the solid clusters within the supercooled melt. In contrast to the gas
36
37 phase where a well-stirred reactor approximation is quite realistic, the condensed phases
38
39 are rather slow in relaxing to (thermodynamic) equilibrium after e.g. the external
40
41 temperature has been changed or latent heat has been released during a nucleation event.
42
43 Modeling these delays is clearly important but also quite challenging, in particular with
44
45 regard to the solution of the associated optimal control problems.
46
47
48
49
50

51
52 Clearly, many more possible extensions of the models employed here can be proposed
53
54 and investigated. However, another very interesting question is to what extent the
55
56 optimal control problems we have studied can be applied to other nucleation-and-
57
58 growth based syntheses besides the growth of a solid phase from a melt. In particular, it
59
60

1
2
3 would be worthwhile to investigate the growth of crystals from solution, or the
4
5 crystallization inside an amorphous matrix e.g. during the synthesis of metastable
6
7 crystalline modifications via the low-temperature atom deposition method [56,57].
8
9

10
11
12 Finally, one might want to consider the place of our two optimal control problems in the
13
14 framework of finite-time thermodynamics. The generic laws and guidelines
15
16 incorporated in eq. (3), and in eqs. (9) and (10) in the supplementary material, are based
17
18 on the assumption that we are moving between two equilibrium states within a finite
19
20 time that is still large enough for the system to stay close to the equilibrium path it
21
22 would follow in the infinite-time limit. Such considerations would be applicable e.g.
23
24 when one tries to refine our simple model by taking the delays in the relaxation to local
25
26 equilibrium into account. However, the generic aspect of the type of problems we
27
28 consider in this work is that they are „open-ended“, i.e. we want to produce as much of
29
30 a solid crystalline phase as possible within the given time, and not minimize the amount
31
32 of work needed to transform a certain amount of melt into solid in finite time while
33
34 staying close to the melting (i.e. equilibrium) temperature. In particular, we note that
35
36 both for loss of availability and entropy dissipation, the Hessian of the energy and the
37
38 entropy, respectively, can serve as a positive definite metric and this allows the
39
40 definition of a proper thermodynamic distance (c.f. eq. (4)). This is not the case for the
41
42 processes studied in this work, where the analogous quantity, the second derivative of
43
44 the amount of product with respect to the temperature, $\partial^2 n / \partial T^2$, is not necessarily
45
46 positive or negative definite for the whole process and thus no thermodynamic length
47
48 can be computed.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

The optimal control problems we consider are more similar to the maximization of the
product of a chemical reaction in the gas phase studied in earlier work [6,7]. For the

1
2
3 optimization of the reactions $nA \leftrightarrow mB$ [6] it was found that the distance between the
4
5 optimal and the equilibrium curves, $T^*(N_{product})$ and $T_{eq}(N_{product})$, respectively, in
6
7 $(N_{product}, T)$ -space was approximately constant. In contrast to those finite-time
8
9 thermodynamics problems where entropy production or loss of availability were
10
11 minimized, this distance did not go to zero for $\tau \rightarrow \infty$, however. But while in the gas
12
13 phase reaction there existed a well-defined equilibrium curve for the amount of product
14
15 as function of temperature to serve as a reference, an analogous quantity is more
16
17 difficult to discern in a nucleation-and-growth synthesis, since three (metastable)
18
19 „equilibrium states“ of the system have to be taken into account, each of which might
20
21 serve as a reference point: the (supercooled) melt, the (macroscopic) crystal and the
22
23 clusters (of critical or larger size). Clearly, if one could establish that such a constancy
24
25 in ΔT also holds in optimally controlled nucleation-and-growth processes, this would
26
27 allow us to employ this information in determining an optimal path for those systems
28
29 that do not easily yield to the optimal control methods described in section 3 and the
30
31 supplementary material.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 To a certain degree, a comparison can be drawn with two consecutive chemical
42
43 reactions $A \leftrightarrow B \leftrightarrow C$, where the melt, the critical nuclei and the crystalline solid would
44
45 correspond to the chemical species "A", "B" and "C", respectively. Such a system has
46
47 been studied [7] using Tisrlin's averaged optimal control [52] to maximize the
48
49 intermediary species "B". In contrast to this study, the model presented in section 3.1
50
51 assumes that no back-reactions take place, and due to the bang-bang-type of solution
52
53 nucleation and growth processes do not take place in appreciable amounts at the same
54
55 time. Furthermore, unless one were to specify individual large crystals instead of the
56
57 total amount of crystalline phase as the objective, the species "B" and "C", i.e. the
58
59
60

1
2
3 critical nuclei and the larger crystals, both contribute to the objective of the optimal
4 control $n(\tau)$. Thus, the analogy does not hold in all details. As a consequence, we never
5 encounter a "maximal useful time" that is less than the total time available. Due to the
6 non-reversibility of the processes incorporated in the model and the fact that in the
7 optimal solution either nucleation or growth takes place, the same holds true even if we
8 were to maximize only the number of critical nuclei since obviously the maximum
9 would be achieved by remaining in the nucleation phase for the whole duration τ . But
10 in general, it should be possible to pursue this analogy further, especially once one
11 includes the number of clusters N_C as an independent state variable and modifies the
12 objective to be the amount of crystalline phase that is present in the form of large
13 crystals.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 Similarly, one might try to compare the second optimization problem with the case of
32 two competing chemical reactions, $A \leftrightarrow B$ and $A \leftrightarrow C$. Again, no back-reactions are
33 included in the melt-to-crystalline material system, in contrast to a standard e.g. gas
34 phase reaction, where both a possible transformation $C \leftrightarrow B$ (via $C \leftrightarrow A \leftrightarrow B$) and the
35 existence of equilibrium concentrations for "A", "B", and "C" at a given temperature are
36 implied. Furthermore, eq. (30) describes a rather unusual pair of reaction rates, since
37 each is a sum of two terms, one of which increases (monotonically) with the amount of
38 product present, and thus represents a positive feedback built into the reaction, in
39 contrast to the usual slowing down of the net reaction rate due to the increase of the
40 back-reaction rate with increasing amount of product. Thus, while such a comparison
41 would be valid in principle, this unusual reaction rate and general set-up makes it
42 difficult to apply one's intuition based on competing gas phase reactions.¹⁰
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

¹⁰ This problem of competing gas phase reactions does not appear to have been treated within the context of finite-time thermodynamics so far.

1
2
3
4
5
6 The rather mathematical study presented here might appear to be far removed from the
7
8 everyday cares and worries of the experimental synthetic chemist. But even in the non-
9
10 industrial context greater efficiency is something to be strived for; e.g., achieving large
11
12 differences in the amount of the two competing phases might greatly simplify the
13
14 subsequent purification stage. And the purposeful synthesis of only one of several
15
16 different metastable modifications is one of the great challenges of experimental solid
17
18 state chemistry.[19,20] It is hoped that the results obtained in this investigation will
19
20 provide a starting point for further analyses of the optimal control of nucleation-and-
21
22 growth based syntheses, where the construction of more detailed models and their
23
24 solution by theory needs to be complemented by robust, quantitative measurement data
25
26 that only experiment can supply.
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 Bibliography

- 39
40
41
42
43 [1] S. Sienutycz, *Optimization in Process Engineering*, WNT, Warsaw **1991**.
44
45 [2] K. G. Denbigh, *Chem. Eng. Sci.* **1958**, 8, 125.
46
47 [3] R. Aris, *Z. Elektrochem.* **1961**, 65, 229.
48
49 [4] F. Horn, U. Troltenier, *Chemie-Ing.-Tech.* **1960**, 32, 382.
50
51 [5] B. Mansson, B. Andresen, *I&EC Process Design & Development* **1986**, 25, 59.
52
53 [6] J. C. Schön, B. Andresen, *J. Phys. Chem.* **1996**, 100, 8843.
54
55 [7] T. A. Bak, P. Salamon, B. Andresen, *J. Phys. Chem. A* **2002**, 106, 10961.
56
57 [8] O. C. Mullins, R. S. Berry, *J. Phys. Chem.* **1984**, 88, 723.
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 [9] J. C. Schön, B. Andresen, *Ind. Eng. Chem. Res.* **1996**, *35*, 2327.
4
5
6 [10] E. S. Jimenez, P. Salamon, R. Rivero, C. Rendon, K. H. Hoffmann, M. Schaller, B.
7
8 Andresen, *Ind. Eng. Chem. Res.* **2004**, *43*, 7566.
9
10 [11] C. A. O. Nascimento, R. Giudici, R. Guardani, *Comp. & Chem. Eng.* **2000**, *24*,
11
12 2303.
13
14 [12] A. Bejan, *Heat and Fluid Flow* **1987**, *8*, 258.
15
16 [13] M. Santoro, J. C. Schön, M. Jansen, *Phys. Rev. E* **2007**, *76*, 061120.
17
18 [14] L. Mutihac, R. Mutihac, *Analyt. Chim. Acta* **2008**, *612*, 1.
19
20 [15] J. F. MacGregor, T. Kourti, *Control Eng. Pract.* **1995**, *3*, 403.
21
22 [16] S. M. Senkan, *Nature* **1998**, *394*, 350.
23
24 [17] M. A. R. Meier, R. Hoogenboom, U. S. Schubert, *Macromol. Rapid Comm.* **2004**,
25
26 25, 21.
27
28 [18] J. C. Schön, M. Jansen, *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **1996**, *35*, 4025.
29
30 [19] M. Jansen, *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2002**, *41*, 3746.
31
32 [20] M. Jansen, in: *Turning Points in Solid-State, Materials and Surface Science*, Eds.
33
34 K. M. Harris and P. P. Edwards, RSC Publ., Cambridge **2008**, p. 22.
35
36 [21] J. C. Schön, M. Jansen, *Int. J. Mater. Res.* **2009**, *100*, 135.
37
38 [22] D. E. Kirk, *Optimal Control Theory*, Prentice Hall, Englewood **1970**.
39
40 [23] S. Sienutycz, P. Salamon, Eds., *Finite-Time Thermodynamics and*
41
42 *Thermoeconomics*, Taylor&Francis, New York **1990**.
43
44 [24] B. Andresen, R. S. Berry, A. Nitzan, P. Salamon, *Phys. Rev. A* **1977**, *15*, 2086.
45
46 [25] M. H. Rubin, *Phys. Rev. A* **1979**, *19*, 1272&1279.
47
48 [26] R. A. Giaggoli, *Thermodynamics: Second Law Analysis*, Amer. Chem. Soc.
49
50 Washington, D.C. **1980**.
51
52 [27] R. C. Tolman, P. C. Fine, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **1948**, *20*, 51.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 [28] F. L. Curzon, B. Ahlborn, *Amer. J. Phys.* **1975**, *43*, 22.
4
5
6 [29] P. Salamon, A. Nitzan, B. Andresen, R. S. Berry, *Phys. Rev. A* **1980**, *21*, 2115.
7
8 [30] J. M. Gordon, *Amer. J. Phys.* **1991**, *59*, 551.
9
10 [31] K. H. Hoffmann, S. J. Watowich, R. S. Berry, *J. Appl. Phys.* **1985**, *58*, 2125.
11
12 [32] G. R. Brown, S. Snow, B. Andresen, P. Salamon, *Phys. Rev. A* **1986**, *34*, 4370.
13
14 [33] J. M. Gordon, I. Rubinstein, Y. J. Zarmi, *J. Appl. Phys.* **1990**, *67*, 81.
15
16 [34] R. K. Pathria, P. Salamon, J. D. Nulton, *J. Phys. A* **1998**, *31*, 3171.
17
18 [35] A. Kodal, B. Sahin, T. Yilmaz, *Energy Convers. Managem.* **2000**, *41*, 607.
19
20 [36] S. Wu, J. Chen, *Appl. Energy* **2005**, *80*, 349.
21
22 [37] A. Bejan, *Entropy Generation through Heat and Fluid Flow*, Wiley-Interscience,
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
- [37] A. Bejan, *Entropy Generation through Heat and Fluid Flow*, Wiley-Interscience,
New York **1982**.
- [38] J. M. Gordon, *Solar Energy* **1988**, *40*, 457.
- [39] F. Wu, L. Chen, F. Sun, C. Wu, G. Guo, Q. Li, *Open Syst. Inform. Dyn.* **2006**, *13*,
55.
- [40] B. Lin, J. Chen, *Phys. Scripta* **2008**, *77*, 055005.
- [41] A. Durmayaz, O. S. Sogut, B. Sahin, H. Yavuz, *Prog. Energy Comb. Sci.* **2004**, *30*,
175.
- [42] V. N. Orlov, R. S. Berry, *Phys. Rev. A* **1990**, *42*, 7230.
- [43] J. C. Schön, *J. Chem. Phys.* **1996**, *105*, 10072.
- [44] P. Salamon, J. Komlos, B. Andresen, J. D. Nulton, *Math. Soc. Sci.* **1987**, *13*, 153.
- [45] G. Lebon, D. Jou, J. Casas-Vazquez, *Finite-Time Thermodynamics: Economy,
Ecology, and Heat Engines*, Springer, Berlin **2008**.
- [46] J. D. Flick, P. Salamon, B. Andresen, *Inform. Sci.* **1987**, *42*, 239.
- [47] P. Salamon, R. S. Berry, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **1983**, *51*, 1127.
- [48] F. Weinhold, *J. Chem. Phys.* **1975**, *63*, 2479&2484&2488.

- 1
2
3 [49] P. Salamon, J. D. Nulton, E. Ihrig, *J. Chem. Phys.* **1984**, *80*, 436.
4
5 [50] I. Gutzow, J. Schmelzer, *The Vitreous State: Thermodynamics, Structure,*
6
7 *Rheology, and Crystallization*, Springer, Berlin **1995**.
8
9 [51] I. M. Lifshitz, V. V. Slyozov, *J. Phys. Chem. Solids* **1961**, *19*, 35.
10
11 [52] L. Rozonoer, A. M. Tsirlin, *Avtom. Telemekh.* **1983**, *1*, 70 (Autom. Remote
12
13 Control (Engl. Transl.) **1983**, *44*, 55).
14
15 [53] A. A. Chernov, *Formation of Crystals, in: Modern Crystallography*, vol. 3, Nauka
16
17 Publishers, Moscow **1980**.
18
19 [54] M. Volmer, M. Marder, *Z. Phys. Chem. A* **1931**, *154*, 97.
20
21 [55] P. Bruna, D. Crespo, R. Gonzalez-Cinca, E. Pineda, *J. Appl. Phys.* **2006**, *100*,
22
23 054907.
24
25 [56] D. Fischer, M. Jansen, *J. Amer. Chem. Soc.* **2002**, *124*, 3488.
26
27 [57] D. Fischer, M. Jansen, *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2002**, *41*, 643.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Tables:

Table 1: t_s^* , $n^*(t_s^*)$, $n^*(\tau)$ for the maximization of the one-component system, for different choices of m , l and r .

	t_s^*	$n^*(t_s^*)$	$n^*(\tau)$
$m = l = 1, r = 1$	$\frac{1}{BT_0}$	$\frac{A}{B}$	$\left(\frac{A}{B}\right) \exp[BT_0 \tau - 1]$
$m = l = 1, 0 < r < 1$	$\frac{A^{(1-r/r)}}{T_0 B^{(1/r)}}$	$\left(\frac{A}{B}\right)^{(1/r)}$	$\left[(1-r)BT_0 \tau + r \left(\frac{A}{B}\right)^{(1-r/r)} \right]^{(1/r)}$
$m, l \geq 1, r = 1$	$\frac{1}{BT_0^l}$	$\left(\frac{A}{B}\right) T_0^{m-l}$	$\left(\frac{A}{B}\right) T_0^{m-l} \exp[BT_0^l \tau - 1]$
$m, l \geq 1, 0 < r < 1$	$\left(\frac{A^{(1-r/r)}}{B^{(1/r)}} \right) T_0^{(m-l/r-m)}$	$\left[\left(\frac{A}{B}\right) T_0^{m-l} \right]^{(1/r)}$	$\left[(1-r)BT_0^l \tau + r \left(\frac{A}{B} T_0^{m-l}\right)^{(1-r/r)} \right]^{(1/r)}$

Table 2: Case-by-case list of the approximate location of t_s^* , $\tilde{\Delta}'(0)$, $\tilde{\Delta}'(\tau)$, and $\Delta^*(\tau \rightarrow \infty)$, where applicable, for the maximization of the difference between the two modifications, $\Delta(\tau) = n_1(\tau) - n_2(\tau)$, for $m = l = 1, r = 1$. The results for $m, l > 1$ can be found by replacing $A_i T_0$ and $B_i T_0$ by $A_i T_0^m$ and $B_i T_0^l$, respectively, both in the conditions defining the various cases and subcases, and in the actual results. Subcases (i), (ii) and (iii) are defined in the supplementary material. Note that subcases (i) and (ii) are only applicable for short values of τ .

	$\tilde{\Delta}'(0)$	$\tilde{\Delta}'(\tau)$	t_s^*	$\Delta^*(\tau \rightarrow \infty)$	Comment
$B_1 = B_2, A_1 > A_2$	> 0	< 0	$\frac{1}{BT_0}$	$\Delta^*(\tau) \rightarrow \frac{A_1 - A_2}{B_1} \exp[B_1 T_0 \tau - 1]$	
$B_1 = B_2, A_1 < A_2$	< 0	> 0	0	0	No syntheses.
$B_1 > B_2, A_1 = A_2$	> 0	< 0	$0 < t_s^* < t_s^{(1)*}$	$\Delta^*(\tau) \rightarrow A_1 T_0 t_s^* \exp[B_1 T_0 (\tau - t_s^*)]$	
$B_1 < B_2, A_1 = A_2$	< 0	> 0	$0; \tau$	0	No syntheses. / only nucl.
$B_1 > B_2, A_1 > A_2$	> 0	< 0	$0 < t_s^* < t_s^{(1)*} < t_s^{(2)*}$	$\Delta^*(\tau) \rightarrow A_1 T_0 t_s^* \exp[B_1 T_0 (\tau - t_s^*)]$	
$B_1 > B_2, A_1 < A_2$ i) (see suppl.)	< 0	> 0	0	$\tau \rightarrow \infty$ not applicable; $\Delta^*(\tau) = 0$	No syntheses. (increase τ to reach case iii)
$B_1 > B_2, A_1 < A_2$ ii) (see suppl.)	> 0	> 0	$t_s^* = t_{s1}^* < t_s^{(1)*} < t_s^{(2)*}$	$\tau \rightarrow \infty$ not applicable; $\Delta^*(\tau) > 0$	
$B_1 > B_2, A_1 < A_2$ iii) (see suppl.)	> 0	< 0	$0 < t_s^* < t_s^{(1)*} < t_s^{(2)*}$	$\Delta^*(\tau) \rightarrow A_1 T_0 t_s^* \exp[B_1 T_0 (\tau - t_s^*)]$	
$B_1 < B_2, A_1 > A_2$ i) (see suppl.)	> 0	< 0	$t_s^{(2)*} < t_s^{(1)*} < t_s^* < \tau$	$\tau \rightarrow \infty$ not applicable; $\Delta^*(\tau) > (A_1 - A_2) T_0 \tau > 0$	
$B_1 < B_2, A_1 > A_2$ ii) (see suppl.)	< 0	< 0	$t_s^{(2)*} < t_s^{(1)*} < t_s^* = t_{s2}^*$	$\tau \rightarrow \infty$ not applicable; $\Delta^*(\tau) = \tilde{\Delta}(t_{s2}^*) > (A_1 - A_2) T_0 \tau > 0$	
$B_1 < B_2, A_1 > A_2$ iii) (see suppl.)	< 0	> 0	τ	$(A_1 - A_2) T_0 \tau > 0$	Only nucl.

44

$B_1 < B_2, A_1 < A_2$	< 0	> 0	0	0	No syntheses.
------------------------	-------	-------	---	---	---------------

Table 3: Case-by-case list of the approximate location of t_s^* , $\tilde{\Delta}'(0)$, $\tilde{\Delta}'(\tau)$, and $\Delta^*(\tau \rightarrow \infty)$, where applicable, for the maximization of the difference between the two modifications, $\Delta(\tau) = n_1(\tau) - n_2(\tau)$, for $m = l = 1, 0 < r < 1$. The results for $m, l > 1$ can be found by replacing $A_i T_0$ and $B_i T_0$ by $A_i T_0^m$ and $B_i T_0^l$, respectively, both in the conditions defining the various case and subcases, and in the actual results. Subcases (i), (ii) and (iii) and their subcases are defined in the supplementary material. Note 1: A priori, it is not possible to decide, whether the global maximum occurs at the boundary ($t_s^* = \varepsilon$) or at the interior maximum. Note 2: A priori, it is not possible to decide, whether the global maximum occurs at the boundary ($t_s^* = \tau$) or at the interior maximum (if an interior maximum exists at all).

	$\tilde{\Delta}'(0)$	$\tilde{\Delta}'(\tau)$	t_s^*	$\Delta^*(\tau \rightarrow \infty)$	Comment
$B_1 = B_2, A_1 > A_2$	> 0	< 0	$t_s^{(2)*} < t_s^{(1)*} < t_s^*$	$((1-r)B_1 T_0 \tau)^{1/(1-r)} [(A_1 T_0 t_s^*)^{1-r} - (A_2 T_0 t_s^*)^{1-r}] / (1-r)$	
$B_1 = B_2, A_1 < A_2$	< 0	> 0	0	0	No syntheses.
$B_1 > B_2, A_1 = A_2$	> 0	< 0	$t_s^* < t_s^{(1)*} < t_s^{(2)*}$	$> (B_1^{1/(1-r)} - B_2^{1/(1-r)}) [(1-r)T_0 \tau]^{1/(1-r)}$	
$B_1 < B_2, A_1 = A_2$	< 0	> 0	$0, \tau$	0	No syntheses. / only nucl.
$B_1 > B_2, A_1 > A_2$ i) (see suppl.)	> 0	< 0	$t_s^{(2)*} < t_s^{(1)*} < t_s^*$	$> (B_1^{1/(1-r)} - B_2^{1/(1-r)}) [(1-r)T_0 \tau]^{1/(1-r)}$	
$B_1 > B_2, A_1 > A_2$ ii) (see suppl.)	> 0	< 0	$t_s^* < t_s^{(1)*} < t_s^{(2)*}$	$> (B_1^{1/(1-r)} - B_2^{1/(1-r)}) [(1-r)T_0 \tau]^{1/(1-r)}$	
$B_1 > B_2, A_1 > A_2$ iii) (see suppl.)	> 0	< 0	$t_s^* = t_s^{(1)*} = t_s^{(2)*}$	$> (B_1^{1/(1-r)} - B_2^{1/(1-r)}) [(1-r)T_0 \tau]^{1/(1-r)}$	
$B_1 > B_2, A_1 < A_2$ i) (see suppl.)	< 0	> 0	ε	$(B_1^{1/(1-r)} - B_2^{1/(1-r)}) [(1-r)T_0 \tau]^{1/(1-r)}$	Infinitesimal nucl. + growth
$B_1 > B_2, A_1 < A_2$ ii) (see suppl.)	< 0	> 0	ε	$(B_1^{1/(1-r)} - B_2^{1/(1-r)}) [(1-r)T_0 \tau]^{1/(1-r)}$	Infinitesimal nucl. + growth
$B_1 > B_2, A_1 < A_2$ iii)a) (see suppl.)	< 0	> 0	ε	$(B_1^{1/(1-r)} - B_2^{1/(1-r)}) [(1-r)T_0 \tau]^{1/(1-r)}$	Infinitesimal nucl. + growth
$B_1 > B_2, A_1 < A_2$ iii)b) (see suppl.)	> 0	< 0	$t_s^* < t_s^{(1)*} < t_s^{(2)*}$	$> (B_1^{1/(1-r)} - B_2^{1/(1-r)}) [(1-r)T_0 \tau]^{1/(1-r)}$	

$B_1 > B_2, A_1 < A_2$ iii)c) (see suppl.)	> 0	> 0	$t_s^* = t_{s1}^* < t_s^{(1)*} < t_s^{(2)*} < t_{s2}^*$	$> (B_1^{1/(1-r)} - B_2^{1/(1-r)}) [(1-r)T_0\tau]^{1/(1-r)}$	
$B_1 > B_2, A_1 < A_2$ iii)d) (see suppl.)	< 0	< 0	$t_s^{(1)*} < t_s^{(2)*} < t_{s1}^* < t_{s2}^* = t_s^*$ or $t_s^* = \varepsilon$	$\geq (B_1^{1/(1-r)} - B_2^{1/(1-r)}) [(1-r)T_0\tau]^{1/(1-r)}$	Note 1
$B_1 < B_2, A_1 > A_2$ i) (see suppl.)	> 0	< 0	$t_s^* = t_s^{(1)*} = t_s^{(2)*}$	$> (A_1 - A_2)T_0\tau$	
$B_1 < B_2, A_1 > A_2$ ii) (see suppl.)	> 0	< 0	$t_s^* < t_s^{(1)*} < t_s^{(2)*}$	$> (A_1 - A_2)T_0\tau$	
$B_1 < B_2, A_1 > A_2$ iii)a) (see suppl.)	> 0	< 0	$t_s^* > t_s^{(1)*} > t_s^{(2)*}$	$> (A_1 - A_2)T_0\tau$	
$B_1 < B_2, A_1 > A_2$ iii)b) (see suppl.)	< 0	> 0	τ	$(A_1 - A_2)T_0\tau$	Only nucl.
$B_1 < B_2, A_1 > A_2$ iii)c) (see suppl.)	> 0	> 0	$t_s^{(2)*} < t_s^{(1)*} < t_{s1}^* = t_s^* < t_{s2}^*$ or $t_s^* = \tau$	$\geq (A_1 - A_2)T_0\tau$	Note 2
$B_1 < B_2, A_1 > A_2$ iii)d) (see suppl.)	< 0	< 0	$t_s^{(1)*} < t_s^{(2)*} < t_{s1}^* < t_{s2}^* = t_s^*$	$> (A_1 - A_2)T_0\tau$	
$B_1 < B_2, A_1 < A_2$	< 0	> 0	0	0	No syntheses.