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Introduction

- Porcelain enamels are selected for use as protective coatings for their heat resistance, hardness, and abrasion resistance but are brittle.

- New developments are driving a need to better quantify and optimize the enamel fracture resistance:
  - Usage of thinner gauge steel
  - Adoption of water-cleaning cover coats on oven cavities
  - New color pyrolytic enamels
Residual Compressive Stress

- Enamel is a bilayer composite of metal and glass with the strength coming from being in a state of residual compression that develops on cooling.
- Compressive stresses are caused by a mismatch of thermal expansion.
- Stress in the enamel can be theoretically calculated by:
  \[ \sigma_e = \frac{E_e (\alpha_e - \alpha_s) (\Delta T)}{t_e * E_e + 1} \]
  
- Stress \( \sigma \) varies with thickness t, Young’s modulus E, CTE mismatch \( \Delta \alpha \), and temperature drop during cooling \( \Delta T \).
Project Description

- There is ongoing sponsorship of senior research projects at Case Western Reserve University by the Ferro Corporation.

- The residual stress states of cover and ground coat combinations were modeled with FEA (Finite Element Analysis).
  - FEA is a numerical technique for finding approximate solutions to boundary value problems for differential equations.
  - Define a mesh geometry, materials properties, apply a gradient, and software calculates the result.

- Compared the models with theoretical and experimental results.

- Allowed the validity of standard models to be assessed to optimize the enamel durability.
Goals

- Model the stress states in combinations of hard and soft ground coats and cover coats for quantitative understanding
- Compare models with and without added geometries
  - PEI 101 design guidelines
  - Parts that will be enameled
- Have models for reference when comparing to experimental results
Previous Work

- The PEI T-5 torsion test was used to study the strain resistance of different ground coat/cover coat combinations.
- One end of the sample is fixed and the other is rotated at 100 degrees per minute.
- Failure identified by visual inspection.
- Test stopped when spalling begins.
- Angle to failure is measured.
# Material Selection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Steel</th>
<th>Enamel</th>
<th>$\alpha$ (°C)</th>
<th>$T_g$ (°C)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>$10.4 \times 10^{-6}$</td>
<td>445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>$8.9 \times 10^{-6}$</td>
<td>486</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ground Coat</th>
<th>Enamel</th>
<th>$\alpha$ (°C)</th>
<th>$T_g$ (°C)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>$10.7 \times 10^{-6}$</td>
<td>408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>$8.5 \times 10^{-6}$</td>
<td>471</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Cover Coats</th>
<th>Enamel</th>
<th>$\alpha$ (°C)</th>
<th>$T_g$ (°F)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>$10.7 \times 10^{-6}$</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>$8.8 \times 10^{-6}$</td>
<td>477</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- C – AquaRealEase®; D – Evolution®
- Expectation: low $\alpha$ → large compressive stress, stronger coatings
A larger difference in enamel and steel expansion did not increase enamel strain resistance

Suggested different chemistries played a role by changing the Young’s Modulus
Second DOE Result

- Ran with soft and hard white titanium cover coats to reduce the influence of confounding variables
- A larger CTE difference had a higher torsion angle
Young’s Modulus Calculation and Measurement

- Theoretical calculations with Yamane and Sakaino approach

\[ E = \frac{0.0093 \cdot \rho}{M} \cdot \sum (T_{m,i} \cdot X_i) \]

- \( E = \text{GPa} \quad \rho = \text{g/cc} \quad M = \text{g/mol} \quad T = \text{K} \quad X = \text{mol/mol} \)
- Measured density using Archimedes Principle
- Used weighted averages of frit chemistry oxide molar percentages

  - A singular elastic strike with an impulse tool creates a mechanical resonance within a test sample from which the modulus can be determined
CTE Bars

- Frit for cover coats E and F were mixed and milled
- 6 CTE bars were made from the 2 ground coats A and B as well as the 4 cover coats C, D, E, and F
- Expansion measurements were run on each bar
- Began machining the bars for sonic measurement testing at NASA Glenn for Young’s modulus with ASTM C1259

CTE bar D compared for size to machined bar A
# Model Inputs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>CTE (x 10⁻⁶/°C)</th>
<th>Calculated Young’s Modulus (GPa)</th>
<th>Young’s Modulus Experimental (GPa)</th>
<th>Tg (°C)</th>
<th>Density (g/cc)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Soft ground coat</td>
<td>A 10.4</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard ground coat</td>
<td>B 8.9</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AquaRealEase®</td>
<td>C 10.7</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stainless Evolution®</td>
<td>D 8.5</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft white cover coat</td>
<td>E 10.7</td>
<td>56.9</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard white cover coat</td>
<td>F 8.8</td>
<td>61.2</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poisson’s ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Steel 12.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- A larger difference in CTE between enamels should lead to a higher compressive stress in the coatings.
- A larger Young’s Modulus should increase the compressive stresses \[ \sigma = E \times \Delta \alpha \times \Delta T \]
- Cooling considered from 768°F (409°C) to 77°F (25°C)
Lab Procedure

- Step by step process modeling using commercially available software
  - Begin with 2D 1 coat
  - 2D 2 coatings
  - 3D square 1 coating
  - 3D square 2 coatings
  - 3D rectangle 1 coating
  - 3D rectangle 2 coatings
  - 3D rectangle with hole 2 coatings – compare to PEI 101 design recommendations

- At each step evaluated whether the models agreed with existing theory and experimental results
Modeling Assumptions and Inputs

- Perfect adhesion
- No imperfections or bubbles in the glasses
- Sharp edges
- Coatings are thin to ignore thermal gradients
- Each model had the same temperature drop
- All layer ratios were the same
- All layer interfaces were at the same nodes on all of the models
## 2D Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tension</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Compression</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The diagrams illustrate different models under tension and compression conditions, with variations in each model (A, B, C, D, E, F) exhibiting distinct stress distributions.
2D Model Vs Literature Data

Paul Smith – Cover Coat  
Abeele and Goes – Ground Coat  
BF 2D FEA model

• 2D model result comparable to theory
• Extended to 2 x 1 rectangles approximating lab 6” x 12” (15 cm x 30 cm) test plates
# 2x1 Models 3D

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tension</strong></td>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Image A" /></td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Image B" /></td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Image C" /></td>
<td><img src="image4.png" alt="Image D" /></td>
<td><img src="image5.png" alt="Image E" /></td>
<td><img src="image6.png" alt="Image F" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Compression</strong></td>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Image A" /></td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Image B" /></td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Image C" /></td>
<td><img src="image4.png" alt="Image D" /></td>
<td><img src="image5.png" alt="Image E" /></td>
<td><img src="image6.png" alt="Image F" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Highest Stress Locations

- Maximum compressive stress is in different locations depending on the coating combination.
- With AC, AE, BC, BE there are 4 locations each in the ground coat layer above the steel on the Z plane edge.
- With AD and AF there are 2 locations each in the cover coat right above the ground coat.
- For BD and BF there are 2 locations each in the ground coat just above the steel.
FEA

- Compressive stresses determined in 3 dimensions: x (width), y (cross-section), z (length)
- BE, which had a low stress, is compared to BF, which had a high stress
- The decrease in stress near edges on BF correlates with the known susceptibility of enamel to edge chippage, particularly sharp edges
Center vs Edge Stresses 2x1 Models

- Stresses decreased at the edges for all combinations
Center Hole

- Addition of a center hole reduced the maximum stress near the hole and at the edges
Areas under the curves were used to compare the total stress in the 8 ground coat/cover coat combinations in the 2 x 1 3D model.
Combination of hard ground coat B and hard ground coat F had the greatest residual compressive stress
Conclusions

- **Modeling**
  - There was good agreement in theoretical and experimental Young’s Modulus measured via ASTM C1259.
  - Stress distribution agreed with prior literature and was able to quantify the stress through a sample.
  - Some combinations had different locations for their maximum compressive stresses; reduced compression at edges agreed with experience.
  - Was able to drive geometry changes such as holes into the model.

- **Enamels**
  - Any combination with a harder ground coat or cover coat increased the residual compression.
  - Highest overall totaled stress is BF.
  - Trade-offs could be bond, strain lines, less flow during firing.
  - Coating strength is influenced by:
    - \( \Delta \alpha \rightarrow \text{direct relationship} \)
    - \( E \rightarrow \text{direct relationship} \)
Future Work

- Machining of CTE bars for experimental confirmation of modulus data
  - Sonic resonance testing
- Investigation of strain resistance at edges experimentally
- Final goal to expand the simulations to a more in-depth geometry
  - Expanding to a coating using a CAD file of a part that is enameled
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