UNCLASSIFIED

Report No. BMI-1230

Special Distribution

This document consists of 16 pages

A

Contract No. W-7405-eng-92

HIGH-TEMPERATURE OXIDATION RESISTANCE OF
THIN IRON-CHROMIUM-ALUMINUM ALLOY SHEET

by

Edward J. Jablonowski
Frederic R. Shober
Ronald F. Dickerson

October 22, 1957

RESTRICTED DATA

This document contains restricted data as defined by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954. Its transmittal or disclosure of its contents in any form to an unauthorized person is prohibited.

BATTELLE MEMORIAL INSTITUTE
505 King Avenue
Columbus 1, Ohio

UNCLASSIFIED

DISCLAIMER

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

DISCLAIMER

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

<u>Copy No.</u>	<u>Distribution</u>
1-3	Aerojet-General Corporation
4	Aeroprojects, Inc.
5	AFPR, Boeing, Seattle
6	AFPR, Curtiss-Wright, Clifton
7	AFPR, General Electric, Schenectady
8	AFPR, Lockheed, Burbank
9-10	AFPR, Lockheed, Marietta
11	AFPR, North American, Canoga Park
12	Air Technical Intelligence Center
13	Alco Products, Inc.
14-19	Argonne National Laboratory
20	Assistant Secretary of Defense, R & D
21-26	Atomic Energy Commission, Washington
27-28	Atomics International
29-30	Babcock and Wilcox Company (NY00-1940)
31	Babcock and Wilcox Company (S00-274)
32-35	Bettis Plant (WAPD)
36	Bridgeport Brass Company
37-38	Brookhaven National Laboratory
39	Brush Beryllium Company
40	Bureau of Aeronautics
41	BAR, Aerojet-General, Azusa
42	BAR, Convair, San Diego
43	Bureau of Mines, Albany
44	Chicago Operations Office
45	Chicago Patent Group
46-47	Combustion Engineering, Inc. (CERD)
48	Curtiss-Wright Corporation
49	Dow Chemical Company (Rocky Flats)
50-52	Du Pont Company, Aiken
53	Du Pont Company, Wilmington
54	Engineer Research and Development Laboratories
55	Fluor Corporation
56	Foster Wheeler Corporation
57	General Atomic Division
58-63	General Electric Company (ANPD)
64-75	General Electric Company, Richland
76	General Nuclear Engineering Corporation
77	Hanford Operations Office
78	Iowa State College
79-82	Knolls Atomic Power Laboratory
83-85	Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory
86-91	Mallinckrodt Chemical Works
92	Marquardt Aircraft Company
93	Martin Company
94	Metals and Controls Corporation
95	Mound Laboratory
96	National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, Cleveland
97	National Bureau of Standards
98-99	National Lead Company of Ohio
100	Naval Air Development Center
101	Naval Air Material Center
102	Naval Research Laboratory
103	New Brunswick Area Office
104	New York Operations Office
105	Nuclear Development Corporation of America
106	Nuclear Metals, Inc.
107	Office of Naval Research
108	Olin Mathieson Chemical Corporation
109	Patent Branch, Washington
110-113	Phillips Petroleum Company (NRTS)
114	Pratt & Whitney Aircraft Division
115	Sandia Corporation
116	Southern California Area Office
117	Special Devices Center
118	Sylvania-Corning Nuclear Corporation
119	Technical Research Group
120	Union Carbide Nuclear Company (C-31 Plant)
121-122	Union Carbide Nuclear Company (ORGDP)
123-127	Union Carbide Nuclear Company (ORNL)
128	Union Carbide Nuclear Company (Y-12 Plant)
129	USAF Project RAND
130	U. S. Naval Postgraduate School
131-132	University of California Radiation Laboratory, Berkeley
133-134	University of California Radiation Laboratory, Livermore
135	Vitro Engineering Division
136	Vitro Laboratories
137-144	Wright Air Development Center (WCOSI-3)
145-169	Technical Information Service
170-177	Battelle Memorial Institute

SECRET

5 and 6

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
ABSTRACT	7
INTRODUCTION	7
ALLOY PREPARATION AND TESTING	8
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	9
Tests at 2100 F.	9
Tests at 2300 F.	9
Metallography	10
CONCLUSIONS	10
REFERENCES	15

2
SECRET

SECRET

7

HIGH-TEMPERATURE OXIDATION RESISTANCE OF THIN
IRON-CHROMIUM-ALUMINUM ALLOY SHEET

Edward J. Jablonowski, Frederic R. Shober, and Ronald F. Dickerson

The oxidation resistance of thin sheets of iron-28 w/o chromium-2.67 to 10.0 w/o aluminum alloys, nominally 0.004, 0.006, 0.008, 0.012, and 0.016 in. thick, was determined by exposure in static air for 100 hr at 2100 and 2300 F. A minimum of 3.67 and 9.37 w/o aluminum was necessary to prevent excessive oxidation of 0.004-in.-thick sheet material at 2100 and 2300 F, respectively. Correspondingly, specimens of lower aluminum content and greater thickness withstood the oxidation attack. Oxidation of iron-chromium-aluminum alloys appeared to be related to the diffusion of aluminum to surfaces of the sheet to form an adherent protective layer of Al_2O_3 .

INTRODUCTION

Iron-chromium-aluminum alloys possess good high-temperature oxidation resistance and utilization of these alloys for high-temperature service in air is based on this property, since their strength decreases rapidly above 1100 F because of their ferritic nature. A desirable property of iron-chromium-aluminum alloys for reactor application is their relatively low thermal-neutron-absorption cross section. Hence, thin sheet of iron-chromium-aluminum alloy is attractive as a cladding material for high-temperature reactor service in air or other oxidizing gases.

The fundamentals of the theory of oxidation of iron-chromium-aluminum alloys have been set forth by Kornilov. (1, 2)* The process of oxidation of such alloys has been assumed to take the form of two successive and interconnected reactions, i. e., a primary process, the oxidation of all three metals, aluminum, chromium, and iron, and a secondary process, the diffusion of aluminum caused by the latter's preferred oxidation at the surface of the alloy. The oxidation resistance of the alloy is a function of the rate of oxidation of aluminum, the nature of the oxide film, and the rate of diffusion of aluminum from the inner zones to the surface zone.

The heat resistance of the ternary alloys depends chiefly on the formation of an adherent aluminum oxide scale. For example, the scale formed on oxidizing an iron-25 w/o chromium-5 w/o aluminum alloy for 240 hr in air at 2190 F is substantially pure alumina, which is replenished during such exposure by the preferential oxidation of the aluminum. (3) While both aluminum and chromium increase the oxidation resistance of the iron-chromium-aluminum alloys, it has been shown that aluminum is the more effective. (3, 4, 5)

The present investigation was undertaken to determine the effect of sheet thickness on the oxidation resistance of iron-28 w/o chromium-2.67 to 10.0 w/o aluminum alloys. Oxidation tests were conducted in still air at 2100 and 2300 F. All surfaces of

*References at end.

SECRET

13

SECRET

8

duplicate sheet specimens of each alloy were exposed and the data reported and analyzed on the basis of weight gain per unit surface area per 100 hr at temperature. The average and maximum depths of oxide penetration were also evaluated.

ALLOY PREPARATION AND TESTING

The iron-chromium-aluminum alloys were prepared from electrolytic iron, electrolytic chromium, and 2S aluminum. The alloys were induction melted in the following manner: the iron was melted first, then chromium was added and melted. SiMn and CaSi were added as bath deoxidizers. Chromium was recovered from the slag by the addition of NiMn. Sheet or rod aluminum was added, and the melt was poured as soon as the aluminum became molten. Pouring temperatures were in the 2750 F range and the molds were preheated to approximately 1000 F.

The alloy ingots were hammer forged at 2300 F. Some edge cracking occurred in the ingots containing 8 w/o or more aluminum. This condition was remedied during forging by hot grinding to remove the edge cracks soon after formation. The thickness of the as-forged billets varied from 1.13 to 0.70 in.

The billet material was hot rolled at 2100 F to 0.350-in. sheet with approximately 7 per cent reduction per pass. The sheet was reheated after every pass. Hot rolling continued at 2000, 1800, 1600, and 1500 F with corresponding sheet reduction to 0.250, 0.175, 0.110, and 0.020 in., respectively. An average of 10 per cent reduction per pass was taken. The sheet was then annealed at 1500 F for 15 min and water quenched.

The thinner sheets were fabricated by cold reduction in steps to 0.016, 0.012, 0.008, 0.006, and 0.004 in. Samples of the sheet to be tested were taken at each step. The sheets were annealed at 1500 F and water quenched between each step and vapor blasted after each anneal. Prior to oxidation testing, the thin sheet was annealed at 1400 F for 15 min, water quenched, and vapor blasted.

Test specimens, 0.75 by 0.40 in., were cut from the nominal 0.016-, 0.012-, 0.008-, 0.006-, and 0.004-in.-thick iron-chromium-aluminum sheet. The length, width, and thickness of each specimen were accurately measured and the dimensions subsequently used to calculate the surface area and volume. The specimens were cleaned in acetone, dried, and weighed. They were placed in glazed porcelain crucibles and the crucible and specimen were weighed together.

Oxidation tests were conducted in horizontal open-tube Globar furnaces at 2100 and 2300 F. Two specimens of each alloy and thickness were exposed for 100 hr in air at temperature. At the conclusion of the 100-hr run, each oxidized specimen was air cooled and weighed together with all the oxide that had spalled into the crucible, and a weight-gain value was determined. Each tested specimen was mounted in Bakelite such that one edge was exposed and polished. The maximum and average thicknesses of the unaffected metal, measured with a filar eyepiece at suitable magnification, were subtracted from the before-test thickness of the specimen. The differences, divided by two, were the maximum and average oxide penetrations into one side of the sheet specimen. A photomicrograph was taken of the as-polished edge of each partially

SECRET

4

SECRET

9

oxidized specimen after exposure at elevated temperatures. Only weight-gain data were available from specimens which had completely oxidized.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results of the oxidation tests have been evaluated on the basis of weight gain per unit area per 100 hr at test temperature. In all cases, failure in test is termed to mean the complete loss of the metallic properties of the sheet specimens. Likewise, specimens termed "oxidation resistant" maintained their metallic properties under a protective oxide coating.

Tests at 2100 F

With the exception of the nominal 0.004-in. -thick specimens of the iron-28.90 w/o chromium-2.67 w/o aluminum alloy, sheet specimens of all thicknesses tested at 2100 F were oxidation resistant. The failure of the thin-sheet specimen indicated a lack of sufficient aluminum to form and maintain a protective oxide coating during high-temperature exposure. The rate at which aluminum content diminishes in the process of oxidation is highest in the alloy having the lowest aluminum content in the initial state.⁽³⁾ The probable failure of the next thickest sheet specimen (nominally 0.006 in.) of the iron-28.90 w/o chromium-2.67 w/o aluminum alloy is indicated by the relatively high weight-gain values of 0.0028 g/(cm²)(100 hr). Weight-gain values of the remaining alloys were in the range 0.0009 to 0.0021 g/(cm²)(100 hr), which resulted from the formation of an oxide coating of practically pure alumina. Higher weight-gain values were associated with higher aluminum contents in the alloys. No apparent correlation existed between specimen thickness and weight-gain values of the oxidation-resistant iron-chromium-aluminum alloys tested at 2100 F. Penetration data indicated that some growth had occurred in the alloys during oxidation.⁽⁶⁾ The growth factor was prevalent in the alloys containing less than 5 w/o aluminum and very possibly obscured a correlation between oxide penetration and weight-gain values and/or oxidation resistance of the alloys. Oxide penetration into these specimens did not exceed 0.0020 in. and averaged about 0.0012 in.

Tests at 2300 F

Failure after 100 hr at 2300 F was predominant in iron-chromium-aluminum sheet containing less than 9.37 w/o aluminum. An aluminum content of 8.07 w/o insured oxidation resistance of the nominally 0.006 in. or thicker alloy sheet while 9.37 w/o aluminum was needed to maintain oxidation resistance of the nominally 0.004 in. or thicker sheet. Increased rates of aluminum diffusion and oxidation were associated with the higher exposure temperature of 2300 F in comparison with exposure at 2100 F. This was indicated by higher weight-gain values of the oxidation-resistant sheet tested at 2300 F, which were in the range 0.0019 to 0.0105 g/(cm²)(100 hr). Generally, oxide penetration was of the same order for specimens tested at both 2100 and 2300 F. Only

SECRET

5

SECRET

10

the iron-28.60 w/o chromium-5.86 w/o aluminum alloy exhibited growth during 100-hr exposure at 2300 F. The same alloys which exhibited growth in tests at 2100 F had completely oxidized in tests at 2300 F and, hence, penetration (or growth) measurements could not be taken. Excessive oxidation, though not to failure, was evident for the alloys containing 9.37 and 10.05 w/o aluminum. Apparently, 100-hr exposure at 2300 F substantially depleted the aluminum content of the alloy sheet; hence, constant replenishment of the protective alumina coating could not be maintained and failure was imminent. No correlation existed between specimen thickness and weight-gain values of the oxidation resistant iron-chromium-aluminum alloys tested at 2300 F.

A summary of the constant-temperature oxidation tests at 2100 and 2300 F is given in Tables 1 and 2, respectively.

Metallography

Photomicrographs were taken of the as-polished surface edge of each specimen which had survived high-temperature exposure.

As seen in Figures 1 and 2, the oxidation of the test specimens proceeded from the surface to the interior in a rather uniform manner. In ferritic alloys, the grain boundaries play a very minor role for the attack by oxygen.

CONCLUSIONS

The ferritic iron-chromium-aluminum alloys show excellent oxidation resistance at 2100 F. An iron-28 w/o chromium-3.67 w/o aluminum alloy, nominally 0.004-in. thick, will sustain 100 hr at 2100 F without failure. As little as 2.67 w/o aluminum is needed to insure oxidation resistance of nominally 0.006 in. or thicker alloy sheet at 2100 F.

At 2300 F, however, specimens thinner than a nominal 0.008 in. and containing less than 5.31 w/o aluminum were susceptible to complete oxidation. A 9.37 w/o aluminum content insured the oxidation resistance of the nominally 0.004-in.-thick specimen for 100 hr at 2300 F.

The excellent oxidation resistance of the iron-chromium-aluminum alloys at high temperature would appear to warrant a study of the rate of oxidation and time to failure of alloys undergoing oxidation.

SECRET

86

SECRET

11

TABLE 1. OXIDATION TESTS OF VARIOUS SHEET THICKNESSES OF IRON-CHROMIUM-ALUMINUM ALLOYS AT 2100 F IN AIR

Chemical Analysis (Balance Iron), w/o		Sheet Thickness, in.	Weight Gain ^(a) , g/(cm ²)(100 hr)	Penetration ^(a) , in.	
Chromium	Aluminum			Maximum	Average
28.90	2.67	0.0037	0.0149	(b)	(b)
		0.0058	0.0028	(c)	(b)
		0.0081	0.0009	0.0007	(b)
		0.0118	0.0011	0.0002	(b)
		0.0166	0.0011	(c)	(b)
27.45	3.67	0.0040	0.0011	0.0003	(b)
		0.0060	0.0009	0.0002	(b)
		0.0078	0.0011	(c)	(b)
		0.0118	0.0010	(c)	(b)
		0.0168	0.0011	(c)	(b)
25.00	5.00	0.0040	0.0013	0.0004	0
		0.0061	0.0013	0.0002	0
		0.0080	0.0015	0	(c)
		0.0120	0.0014	0.0003	0.0002
		0.0160	0.0014	0.0004	0.0001
28.90	5.31	0.0040	0.0009	0.0011	0.0006
		0.0063	0.0009	0.0008	0.0007
		0.0082	0.0011	0.0010	0.0005
		0.0132	0.0010	0.0012	0.0010
		0.173	0.0011	0.0011	0.0007
28.60	5.86	0.0039	0.0012	0.0011	0.0005
		0.0065	0.0012	0.0012	0.0007
		0.0080	0.0013	0.0016	0.0007
		0.0125	0.0013	0.0018	0.0012
		0.0172	0.0014	0.0016	0.0010
27.90	7.00	0.0040	0.0013	(b)	(b)
		0.0060	0.0016	(b)	(b)
		0.0080	0.0014	(b)	(b)
		0.0120	0.0017	(b)	(b)
		0.0163	0.0015	(b)	(b)
26.80	8.07	0.0044	0.0018	0.0004	0.0001
		0.0057	0.0018	0.0010	0.0007
		0.0083	0.0019	0.0007	0.0005
		0.0120	0.0016	0.0011	0.0009
		0.0161	0.0014	0.0014	0
26.95	9.37	0.0042	0.0021	0.0007	0.0002
		0.0059	0.0020	0.0011	0.0006
		0.0078	0.0020	0.0015	0.0008
		0.0128	0.0021	0.0010	0.0006
		0.0171	0.0013	0.0010	0.0005
26.55	10.05	0.0049	0.0017	0.0009	0.0006
		0.0060	0.0016	0.0009	0.0005
		0.0085	0.0015	0.0008	0.0005
		0.0124	0.0016	0.0008	0.0004
		0.0165	0.0018	0.0005	0.0002

Footnotes for Table 1.

(a) Average of two tested specimens.

(b) No penetration measurements were made on the iron-27.90 w/o chromium-7.00 w/o aluminum alloy. No penetration measurements could be obtained on the specimens which had been oxidized severely and were subsequently too brittle to mount in Bakelite.

(c) The specimen had grown during oxidation.

SECRET

A7

SECRET

12

TABLE 2. OXIDATION TESTS OF VARIOUS SHEET THICKNESSES OF IRON-CHROMIUM-ALUMINUM ALLOYS AT 2300 F IN AIR

Chemical Analysis (Balance Iron), w/o		Sheet Thickness, in.	Weight Gain ^(a) , g/(cm ²)(100 hr)	Penetration ^(a) , in.	
Chromium	Aluminum			Maximum	Average
28.90	2.67	0.0039	0.0152	(b)	(b)
		0.0059	0.0228	(b)	(b)
		0.0081	0.0087	(b)	(b)
		0.0118	0.0019	0.0008	0.0004
		0.0166	0.0021	0.0013	0.0009
27.45	3.67	0.0040	0.0166	(b)	(b)
		0.0060	0.0234	(b)	(b)
		0.0073	0.0193	(b)	(b)
		0.0122	0.0030	0.0013	0.0009
		0.0165	0.0034	0.0007	0.0004
25.00	5.00	0.0039	0.0150	(b)	(b)
		0.0058	0.0229	(b)	(b)
		0.0078	0.0036	0.0017	0.0014
		0.0121	0.0036	0.0026	0.0010
		0.0159	0.0040	0.0010	0.0005
28.90	5.31	0.0039	0.0140	(b)	(b)
		0.0061	0.0017	0.0010	0.0007
		0.0078	0.0018	0.0007	0.0003
		0.0120	0.0023	0.0014	0.0008
		0.0160	0.0021	0.0017	0.0009
28.60	5.86	0.0040	0.0143	(b)	(b)
		0.0060	0.0127	(b)	(b)
		0.0078	0.0023	0.0003	(b)
		0.0121	0.0022	0.0001	(b)
		0.0161	0.0029	0	(b)
27.90	7.00	0.0037	0.0137	(b)	(b)
		0.0060	0.0223	(b)	(b)
		0.0080	0.0169	0.0007	0.0002
		0.0123	0.0039	0.0005	0.0003
		0.0166	0.0045	0.0017	0.0010
26.80	8.07	0.0046	0.0118	(b)	(b)
		0.0058	0.0044	0.0010	0.0007
		0.0082	0.0034	0.0007	0.0004
		0.0121	0.0032	0.0011	0.0009
		0.0161	0.0029	0.0013	0.0006
26.95	9.37	0.0039	0.0072	0.0007	0.0002
		0.0057	0.0031	0.0011	0.0006
		0.0082	0.0031	0.0010	0.0008
		0.0122	0.0030	0.0010	0.0006
		0.0167	0.0026	0.0010	0.0005
26.55	10.05	0.0045	0.0105	0.0009	0.0005
		0.0055	0.0035	0.0012	0.0009
		0.0076	0.0043	0.0012	0.0005
		0.0125	0.0033	0.0006	0.0003
		0.0168	0.0047	0.0012	0.0005

(a) Average of two tested specimens.

(b) No penetration measurements could be obtained on the specimens which had been oxidized severely and were subsequently too brittle to mount in Bakelite.

SECRET

FIGURE 1. OXIDATION OF IRON-CHROMIUM-ALUMINUM ALLOYS
IN AIR AT 2100 F

Exposure time, 100 hr; original magnification 250X, re-
duced for presentation.

N43247

FIGURE 2. OXIDATION OF IRON-CHROMIUM-ALUMINUM ALLOYS
IN AIR AT 2300 F

Exposure time, 100 hr; original magnification 250X, re-
duced for presentation.

~~SECRET~~

15 and 16

REFERENCES

- (1) Kornilov, I. I., Bulletin De L' Academie Des Sciences De L'URSS, Classe des Sci. Techn., No. 5, 751 (1940).
- (2) Kornilov, I. I., Reports of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 42 (4), 185 (1944).
- (3) Kornilov, I. I., and Shpihelman, A. J., "Rate of Oxidation of Iron-Chromium-Aluminum Alloys with High Chromium Content", Doklady Akad. Nauk S.S.S.R., 53 (9), 813-816 (1946). (H. Bruchter Translation No. 1965.)
- (4) Kornilov, I. I., Mikheyev, V., and Kovenko-Grachewa, O., "Constitution Diagram of Ternary System of Iron-Chromium-Aluminum Alloys", Stahl, 10 (5-6), 57-59 (1940). (H. Bruchter Translation No. 1231.)
- (5) Scheil, E., and Schutz, E. H., "Heat Resistant Chromium-Aluminum Steels", Arch. Eisenhsttenew, 6 (4), 155-160 (1932-1933).
- (6) Saller, H. A., Stacy, J. T., and Eddy, N. S., "Investigation of Wrought Iron-Chromium-Aluminum Alloy for Service at 2200 F", BMI-922 (June 28, 1954).

EJJ/FRS/RFD:rr