### Concept of nanocomposite:

- dispersion of nanometric particles (from 10 nm to less than 500 nm)
- inside or outside the matrix grains (at grain boundaries)
- need sourcing nanopowders
- adapt the process to control nanostructure



#### Niihara et Nakahira 1991

(2010) EU definition: from 1 to 100 nm





# Alumina based nanocomposites (after annealing): matrix ~ 350 to 400 MPa – ~ 3.7 MPa $\sqrt{m}$

Year	Authors	Dispersion (% - type - nm)	Matrix GS (µm)	Strength (MPa)	Toughness (MPam <sup>1/2</sup> )	Density
1991	Niihara	5 – SiC – 40		1520	4.8	
		- Si <sub>3</sub> N <sub>4</sub>		850	4.7	
1997	Zhu et al	$15 - Si_3N_4 - 80$	1.0	820	6.0	98.7
	Davidge et al	5 – SiC – 200	2.5	780	3.5	~100
	Bhaduri et al	$10 - ZrO_2 - 25$	0.04		8.4	98.0
1999	Anya et al	5 – SiC – 200	2.9	646	4.6	99.8
2001	Siegel et al	10 – MWCNT	0.50		4.2	~100
2002	Maensiri and Roberts	5 – SiC – 200	2.8	417	2.6	99.9
2005	Choi	3 – SiC – 80 ?	0.4 ?	760	5.06	
2006	Hae et al	5 – SiC – 20 20 – SiC – 20	0.2 ?	620 810	2.9 3.7	~100 ~100
2011	Lv et al	5 – SiC - 200	2,1	536	2.9	99.6

Even 20 years after, performances of Niihara's composites have not yet been achieved





# Alumina based nanocomposites (after annealing): matrix ~ 350 to 400 MPa – ~ 3.7 MPa $\sqrt{m}$

Year	Authors	Dispersion (% - type - nm)	Matrix GS (µm)	Strength (MPa)	Toughness (MPam <sup>1/2</sup> )	Density
1991	Niihara	5 – SiC – 40		1520	4.8	
		- Si <sub>3</sub> N <sub>4</sub>	00.0			
1997	Zhu et al	$15 - Si_3N_4 - 80$	99.9 -		1	
	Davidge et al	5 – SiC – 200	90	Ó		
	Bhaduri et al	10 – ZrO <sub>2</sub> – 25	-	Q	Ê	
1999	Anya et al	5 – SiC – 200	(°/°)	Q	Ë	
2001	Siegel et al	10 – MWCNT	10-	9	Ē	-
2002	Maensiri and Roberts	5 – SiC – 200	F(0	9	†	-
2005	Choi	3 – SiC – 80 ?		⊖Al2O3 □Al2O3/5	SIC	
2006	Hae et al	5 – SiC – 20 20 – SiC – 20	1	1 (Annealed)		
2011	Lv et al	5 – SiC - 200	100	500 0 <sub>f</sub> (MPa)	) 1000 3	000

But reliability is highly improved !



# From micro- to nano- ceramic composites

Dispersion of nano- is difficult:

#### dispersion is the consequence of: (DLVO theory)

- Vander Waals attraction forces
- electrostatic repulsion force
- steric shielding: function of the adsorbed species sizes
- a "potential barrier" impedes the particles to flocculate
- resulting level of repulsion depends also on particle size !





### From macro- to nano- ceramic composites

#### Influence of particle size





### From micro- to nano- ceramic composites







### Still controversial:

a number of possible mechanisms have been proposed

• Niihara (91): - Nano-sized dispersions restrain the grain growth

-Thermal mismatch between matrix and dispersoids  $\rightarrow$  tensile stresses in the matrix  $\rightarrow$  dislocation movements  $\rightarrow$  dislocation pin and pile up by nanoparticles  $\rightarrow$  subgrain boundaries within the matrix  $\rightarrow$  refinement of matrix induces strengthening









Many authors **did not agree** with Niihara proposal:

- calculated tensile stresses ( $\Delta \alpha$ ) too low to form substructure, but strengthening is due to matrix grain refinement (Fang 97)
- strengthening effect is still present at high temperature (Deng 98)
- flaws healing (Wu 98 ; Anya 98 2000)

#### Other proposals:

- near surface compressive stress strengthening (Wu 2008)
- dislocation network strengthening (Zhang 2007)
- strengthening via reduction in process defect size (Sternitzke 97)
- calculation of internal stress fields during cooling ( $\Delta \alpha$ )  $\rightarrow$  reduction of flaw size  $\rightarrow$  crack penetrates into the matrix grain (Pezzoti et al 2001 02)

#### Stresses were calculated:

- ~147 MPa (Lv, Zhang 2010)
- > 1 GPa (Choi 2005)





However, all authors **agree** on:

- residual stresses relaxation is much more difficult in nanocomposites
- the rupture mode changes from inter- to trans-granular







#### **Other proposals:**

Grain boundary strengthening through:

- pinning effect (Deng 98-Anya 97-Ohji 99)
- inter-granular fracture energy > trans-granular fracture energy (Jiao 97)
- crack deflection by SiC particles (Honglai-Tan 98)
- compression of the grain boundaries (Pezzotti 2001)

Dislocation network blocked by SiC movement impedes the movement of new dislocations (Anya 2000)











### Lab processing of ceramic nanocomposites



 $\zeta$  potential measurement - adjustment (acoustic method)





ceramic beads (from 50 to 300 µm)







Some examples of enhanced behaviours:

#### **Typical microstructure (TEM)**

 $\begin{array}{l} \text{Al}_2\text{O}_3-\text{SiC} \text{ nano } 40\text{nm} \mbox{ (7.5 wt\%)} \\ \text{Hot Pressing} \\ \sigma_{\text{F}} \mbox{ up to} \sim 1000 \mbox{ MPa} \end{array}$ 







### Creep resistance (flexural tests)







### Creep resistance (flexural tests)

#### nanocomposite





matrix

#### For a same test temperature, a lot of cavitations can be seen in the matrix





Wear resistance (erosion)

- · It has to be noted that wear increases with matrix grain size
- · But SiC addition limits also the grain growth





Courtesy R. Todd





### **Corrosion resistance**



crystallisation of the amorphous phase







Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> – metal particles : Ni, Cu, Co, Fe, Cr, Mo, Nb...



### Processing

- liquid precursors (nitrates...)
- + alumina powder,
- calcination under reducing atmosphere sintering



 $Al_2O_3$  / Ni

F. Petit





Literature data							
				σ <sub>F</sub> MPa	K <sub>IC</sub> MPa√m		
	1995	Sekino	5% W	$528 \rightarrow 645$	$3.2 \rightarrow 3.8$		
	1996	Sekino	5% Ni	683 →1090	3.5  ightarrow 3.5		
	1999	Chen	5% Ni	$390 \rightarrow 526$	3.6  ightarrow 4.2		
	2001	Oh	5%Cu	$536 \rightarrow 953$	$3.6 \rightarrow 4.8$		
	2002	Ji	5% Cr	$475 \rightarrow 736$	3.6  ightarrow 4.8		
	2003	Li	5% Ni	<b>420</b> → <b>530</b>	$3.3 \rightarrow 5.2$		

• many reported works consider high (5 to 20 %) metal particles additions

• a recent paper shows only 0.69 % Mo give rise to an large increase of strength (from 320 to over 700 MPa) and toughness (from 4.0 to 6.3 MPa $\sqrt{m}$ ) • even for so limited additions, fracture changes from inter- to transgranular mode





Matrix :  $AI_2O_3 \alpha = 8,6 \ 10^{-6} \ K^{-1}$ 

 $\Delta \alpha = \alpha_{m} - \alpha_{p} < 0 \quad (nickel, iron, cobalt)$  $\alpha_{Ni} = 13 \ 10^{-6} \ \text{K}^{-1} \quad \alpha_{\text{Fe and Co}} = 12 \ 10^{-6} \ \text{K}^{-1}$ 



matrix

matrix



 $\rightarrow \leftarrow$ 

 $\Delta \alpha = \alpha_m - \alpha_p > 0 \quad (molybdenum, chromium)$ 

 $\alpha_{Mo}=~$  5 10^{-6} K^{-1} ~~  $\alpha_{Cr}=~$  6.2 10^{-6} K^{-1}







### From micro- to nano- ceramic composites

### Lab data











From micro- to nano- ceramic composites

Compared to microcomposites:

- increase of strength (up to 100%)
- creep resistance
- wear behaviour improvement
- high reliability
- high temperature resistance

BUT no increase of toughness lack of reproducibility! processing difficult to control

Despites this, today applications:





#### Wheel grinding nanocomposite grains

Treibacher Schleifmittel – UVHC patent

mixing of SiC particles slurry into a boehmite sol gelling \_\_\_\_\_calcination \_\_\_\_\_milling \_\_\_\_\_sintering



Schleifbedingungen:

ion







### **Biomaterials**



Biomaterials Biolox® delta Ceramtec

- alumina alumina friction pair is the most couple used today
- Y-TZP could decompose in wet atmosphere
- alumina zirconia composites and close control of the micro- nanostructure allow to imagine new applications







Stress intensity factor (MPa.m<sup>1/2</sup>)





### **Biomaterials**

The process allows to limit the grain size

J. Chevalier INSA Lyon (F) with Politecnico Torino

#### alumina-zirconia nano-composites



micro – nano







nano – nano





# And the future?





#### crack bridging in alumina matrix by multiwall CNT





# And the future?



### New hybrid nanocomposites?

	K <sub>IC</sub> (MPa√m)	σ <sub>F</sub> (MPa)	H <sub>V</sub> (GPa)
$AI_2O_3$	3.1	340	17.0
1% SiC	4.0	550	16.5
1% SiC, 5% MWNT	6.4	480	16.3
1% SiC, 7% MWNT	6.9	470	16.0
1% SiC , 10% MWNT	5.6	450	14.5

Ahmad, Pan 2008



# Conclusion

Positive points:

- Increase of wear resistance
- Increase of creep resistance
- Either better strength or better toughness
- Possibility to use classical process (cost effective)
- Very limited additive content (low cost increase)

Negative points:

- It is difficult to optimise both strength and toughness
- Reproducibility!