

REFRACTORY AND LIGHT WEIGHT HIGH ENTROPY ALLOYS FOR INDUSTRIAL APPLICATIONS

Félix Royer, Marie Erbeia, Jaâfar Ghanbaja, Abdelkrim Redjaïmia

► To cite this version:

Félix Royer, Marie Erbeia, Jaâfar Ghanbaja, Abdelkrim Redjaïmia. REFRACTORY AND LIGHT WEIGHT HIGH ENTROPY ALLOYS FOR INDUSTRIAL APPLICATIONS. 11-th EEIGM IC-AMR Barcelone, Jun 2022, Barcelone, Spain. hal-04128997

HAL Id: hal-04128997 https://hal.univ-lorraine.fr/hal-04128997

Submitted on 1 Sep 2023

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.

Public Domain



REFRACTORY AND LIGHT WEIGHT HIGH ENTROPY ALLOYS FOR INDUSTRIAL APPLICATIONS

<u>Félix Royer^{1,2}, Marie Erbeia^{1,2}, Jaâfar Ghanbaja¹, Abdelkrim Redjaïmia^{1,2}</u>

¹Institut Jean Lamour UMR CNRS 7198, Université de Lorraine, F-54011 Nancy, France

²Ecole Européenne d'Ingénieurs en Génie des Matériaux, F-54010 Nancy, France

Introduction and objectives:

Since 2004, with the creation of the first recorded *High Entropy Alloy* (HEA) by simultaneously Cantor *et al.* [1] *and Yeh et al.* [2], numerous studies have shown the potential of such alloys, from nuclear applications to high ductility in cryogenic conditions. In this study, the objective is to manufacture new HEAs which would include light and refractory elements in order to bring high resilience and ultimate tensile strength to



industrial components, while keeping a low density.

Ideally, the HEA should not exhibit intermetallic precipitates due to their brittle behavior, however, despite containing a low fraction of refractories, the HEAs still exhibited intermetallic phases, leading to the need for a model predicting the creation of intermetallics in HEAs.

Basics of HEAs: An HEA, as the name suggests, must possess a fundamental parameter to be labelled as such a high entropy of mixing $\Delta S_{mix} = -R \sum_i c_i lnc_i$ and must be equal to at least 13.38 *J*. (*mol*. *K*)⁻¹ (Figure 1), which is the result for a quinary, equimolar alloy.

Core properties of HEAs: According to Yeh et al., giving an alloy such a high entropy of mixing would yield three effects: A distorted lattice, a sluggish diffusion, a « cocktail effect » depicting the hardship of foreseeing the phases and properties of HEAs. Figure 1: Evolution of the entropy versus the number of metallic elements.

PSFE

 \dot{O}

Thermodynamic (Ω), steric (δr), parameters	electronic ([<i>VEC</i>], $\delta \chi$) and chemical (<i>PSFE</i>) of the HEA alloys [3-5]:	Criteria predicting the microstructure of the HEA Alloys [3-5] based on: $\Omega, \delta r, [VEC], \delta \chi$ and $PSFE$ parameters:					
$\boldsymbol{\Omega} = \frac{T_m \Delta S_{mix}}{ \Delta H_{mix} } \text{ with:} \begin{cases} \Delta H_{mix.} = \sum_{i=1, i \neq j}^n 4\Delta H_{i,j}^{mix.} c_i c_j = \text{Enthalpy of mixing} \\ T_m = \sum_{i=1}^n c_i (T_m)_i = \text{Averaged melting temperature} \\ \Delta S_{mix.} = -R \sum_{i=1}^n c_i \ln(c_i) = \text{Entropy of mixing (Fig1a)} \end{cases}$		 Solid solution (SS): −20 kJ.mol⁻¹ ≤ ΔH_{mix} < 5 kJ.mol⁻¹ and δr < 6.2 %. Solid solution (SS only): −5 kJ.mol⁻¹ ≤ ΔH_{mix} < 5 kJ.mol⁻¹ δr < 3 %. Solid solution (only): Ω ≥ 1.1 and δr ≤ 6.6%. Intermetallic phases (IP): ΔH_{mix} > 5 kJ.mol⁻¹ and δr > 3 %. (SS) + (IP) (or only IP): 11 ≤ ΔH ≤ 10 kL mol⁻¹ and δr > 38 %. 					
$\delta r = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{n} c_i (1 - r_i / \bar{r})^2}$ Lattice distorsion	$\delta \chi_A = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n c_i (1 - \chi_i / \overline{\chi})^2}$ Allen's Electronegativity	 (<i>IP</i>) (or only <i>I</i>): If ≤ Δ<i>H</i>_{mix} ≤ 10 kJ mot what or > 5.6 %. (<i>IP</i>) (only): Δ<i>H</i>_{mix} > 20 kJ mol⁻¹. No (<i>IP</i>): Ω ≫ 10 and δr < 3.8%. 					
$[VEC] = \sum_{i=1}^{n} c_i [VEC]_i$ Valence Electron Concentration	PSFE = 2p (p = atomic % of [A] σ – forming elements) Paired Sigma Forming Elements	★ VEC : (IP) if: 6.88 < [VEC] < 7.84; (SS) if ([VEC] > / < 6.88). ★ PSFE: For σ - phase: [σ] = [A]p[B]a; A ∈ [VB - VIB] groups: PSFE = 2p/2q [p at.%],					
c_i, r_i, χ_i and $[VEC]_i = \text{Composition}$, Atomic size, Electronegativity and Valence Electron Concentration of the i^{th} element, respectively. \bar{r} and $\bar{\chi}$ are Average atomic radius and electronegativity		Frank – Kasper σ – phase and Laves – phase will form respectively with high probabilit					

of the HEA elements, respectively.

Material and procedures: Two alloys (refractory and light weight HEA, labelled RHEA-1 and LWHEA-1, respectively) were manufactured using high purity (> 99.95 wt.%) metallic flakes or powders (in which case they were pressed in pelleted form), arc-melted in Arc Furnace, in Argon atmosphere, and re-melted at least 5 times to ensure homogeneity. The two High Entropy Alloys, *RHEA* – 1 and *LWHEA* – 1 were substantially analyzed via XRD, ultra nano-indentation, SEM/EDS and TEM techniques.

(at.%)

Results and discussion (RHEA – 1 and LWHEA – 1 Alloys): $\frac{50 \, \mu m}{50 \, \mu m}$



Figure 3: a) $(V, Al)_{20}(Ti, Ni, Ta)_{20}$ (*LWHEA* – 1) BSE-SEM image of the sample showing zones with clear and dark contrasts. Clearer contrast indicate that observed area is rich in heavy elements. b) BF-TEM image and the associated SAED pattern recorded along [2110] of the C14 –Laves Phase (\in to $P6_3/mmc$ with $a_{C14} = 4.5$ Å and $c_{C14} = 7.1$ Å).

c) STEM-BF image showing dislocations and planar defects in different Laves phase grains.

 ΔH_{mix} .

 ΔS_{mix} .





Figure 2: a) $(Cr_{24}W_7)(Mn_{21}Co_{24}Ni_{24}) - (RHEA - 1)$: BSE-SEM image of the alloy: Clearer dendrites indicate their rich composition in heavy elements.

b) STEM-BF image of the sample showing the matrix and two minor intermetallic phases (*IP*): the Frank and Kasper phases: σ and μ – phases.

c) TEM image and associated Selected Area of Diffraction (SAED) along the

[001] of the σ – phase (\in to *P*42/*mnm* with a_{σ} = 8.8 Å and c_{σ} = 4.5 Å).

d) Dark-field TEM image and associated SAED pattern of the μ – phase

(\in to $R\overline{3}m$ with a = 4.72 Å), recorded along (110).

The stright and brighter lines correspond to twins as established

by electron diffraction characterisation, inserted SAED pattern in Figure 2d.

<i>RHEA</i> — 1	1940	12.82	-4.6	5.4	3.72	1.76	7.89	62		
	(K)	$J(mol. K)^{-1}$	kJ.mol ⁻¹	(—)	(—)	(—)	(—)	(%)		
<i>LWHEA</i> – 1	2015	13.38	—27.36	0.99	5.98	1.65	5.4	80		
	(K)	J(mol.K) ⁻¹	kJ.mol ⁻¹	(-)	(—)	(—)	(-)	(%)		
Conclusion and discussion : Bringing in HEA selection: $RHEA - 1: \begin{cases} \Omega = 5.4 \text{ and } \delta = 3.72\%: \text{ Solid solution } (SS) \text{ predicted and found,} \\ [VEC] = 7.89; \text{ PSFE: } 48\%: \sigma \text{ predicted } (IP) \text{ and found.} \end{cases}$										
<i>LWHEA</i> – 1	$\mathbf{I}: \begin{cases} \Omega = 0\\ \Delta \chi_A = 0 \end{cases}$	$0.99 \text{ and } \delta = 5.$ = 19.3% and δ	98%: Solid so = 5.98%: Lav	olution ves pha	(SS) no ise (IP)	ot predi predict	cted, ed.			

Empirical criteria are useful in HEA design but not conclusive when phases are in competition.

References:

Im

- 1. B. Cantor et al.; Mater. Sci. Eng. A.; 375–377 (2004) 213–218.
- 2. J.W. Yeh et al.; Adv. Eng. Mater.; 6 (2004) 299–303.
- 3. 3. M.H. Tsai et al.; Mater. Res. Lett.; 4 (2016) 90–95.
- 4. 4. D.B. Miracle et al.; Acta Mater.; 122 (2017) 448–511.
- 5. N. Yurchenko et al.; Mater. Sci. Technol., 33 (2017) 17-22.