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Evaluation of Oxidation-Resistant Coatings in a Water-Stabilized Electric Arc at Temperatures to 2325°C (4215°F)

By Domenic J. Molella
Picatinny Arsenal, Dover, New Jersey

ABSTRACT:

Twelve oxidation-resistant coatings on molybdenum and graphite pressure sensing probe models were evaluated. These evaluations were made in an atmosphere simulating re-entry trajectory heating conditions experienced at a Mach No. of 8.5. A water-stabilized electric arc was used to simulate heat input of 450 BTU/ft²·sec. to be reached in 25 seconds. Duration of test was 60 seconds.

Under conditions of equal heat input, the surface temperatures of the probes, as observed with a calibrated optical pyrometer, varied due to differences in the physical and thermodynamic properties of the coatings. The highest surface temperature, 2325°C (4215°F), was attained by a molybdenum probe with a zirconium diboride coating.

Out of nine coatings tested on molybdenum, a flame-sprayed coating of 90% W and 10% ZrO₂ exhibited the least damage. Other coatings, Al-Cr-Si, MoSi₂, graduated ZrO₂ and ZrB₂ protected the molybdenum against catastrophic oxidation.

Out of three coatings tested on graphite, a vapor-deposited, silicon carbide coating showed the least damage. American Lava Corp proprietary coating and a 90% W and 10% ZrO₂, flame-sprayed coating eroded but still protected the graphite against catastrophic oxidation.

INTRODUCTION:

The probe configuration evaluated was that which was proposed for possible use on a theoretical Mach 8.5 missile. The pressure sensing probe system must have the capability of measuring total and static pressure for velocity determination. From the known velocity, the maximum allowable movement of the aerodynamic control surfaces are determined so that the maneuvering "C" limits of the missile are not exceeded. The probe also performs certain warhead functions.

Numerous experimental probes were subjected to wind tunnel and simulated flight tests in order to determine the most suitable aerodynamic design for this probe. In this design aerodynamic heating must also be considered since the maximum Mach number will be 8.5. When such Mach numbers are involved, it is customary to ascertain the trajectory that yields the greatest aerodynamic missile heat input and then design the system to meet the heat requirements of this trajectory. Such a trajectory is called the "Thermodynamic Design Trajectory".
From this design trajectory, which results in maximum heating, heat fluxes expected at the forward portion of the probes to be tested were determined (1). These flux calculations were based on the assumption of a cold wall. Since it was known that the flow field of the electric arc was subsonic, the flow away from the stagnation point would not be similar to that which exists when supersonic flow is present on the probe during flight. However, the flow at the stagnation point in the arc subsonic flow field was similar to the flow field present on the probe during flight. From these assumptions and calculations a heat flux vs time testing program on the probe models was proposed, as follows:

- initial input - 65 BTU/ft$^2$-sec
- maximum input - 450 BTU/ft$^2$-sec to be reached in 25 seconds
- final input - 225 BTU/ft$^2$-sec at the end of 60 seconds

If a probe material or a material with a protective coating could withstand the maximum service heat inputs without ablating, oxidizing, burning or softening, the probe geometric configuration would be maintained throughout the trajectory and the probe would then perform its functions satisfactorily. In order to assure maintenance of the geometric configuration, only materials having high thermal conductivities, heat capacities and mechanical strengths at low and elevated temperatures should be considered. In the final selection of the best material, availability, fabricability and cost of the material should also be considered. This investigation was conducted to evaluate various materials and coatings to find a suitable combination to fulfill the above requirements.

Since a water stabilized electric arc can simulate the heat flux vs time that are obtained from the maximum trajectory, this apparatus was used for determining the most suitable probe material.

**SYMBOLS:**

- Mo: molybdenum
- W$^{90.0_{\text{O}_2}}$: 90% tungsten + 10% zirconia
- Ti: titanium
- Al-Cr-Si: aluminum-chromium-silicon
- MoSi$_2$: molybdenum disilicide
- ZrB$_2$: zirconium diboride
- SiC: Silicon carbide

**APPARATUS AND EXPERIMENTAL PROCEDURE:**

**HEAT TESTS:**

A water-stabilized electric arc was used in the evaluation of the materials for resistance to high temperature gas flow. The arc operates in the vortex formed by a rapidly swirling body of water. Extremely high temperatures up to 25,000$^\circ$F. and high heat inputs (2500 BTU/ft$^2$-sec) are developed due to the increased current density arising from the restricted cross sectional area of the vortex and the cooling of the outer arc regions, which forces most of the current to flow in the center (2). The arc is struck in a vortex of water...
between a \( \frac{3}{4} \)" dia graphite disk with a \( \frac{3}{16} \)" dia hole in the center as the cathode. The cathode is mounted in a water-cooled horizontal metal plate at ground potential, while the anode is vertically held by a collet directly below the cathode cavity. Figure 1 shows a schematic diagram of this apparatus. A lucite "swirl chamber" surrounds the anode. During operation water is introduced tangentially into the chamber at 36 psi and forms the vortex in which the arc burns.

The power supply for the arc consists of four welding generators connected in series. For stable operation about one half of the power is dissipated by a ballast resistor connected in series with the arc. Constant arc voltage is maintained by controlling a hydraulic mechanism which feeds the lower electrode at the proper rate by means of a voltage sensing device connected across the arc. Under these conditions, a power dissipation of 33 kw results at the arc. A water-cooled parabolic cathode nozzle was developed for testing the probes in order to provide optimum reproducibility in the arc environment.

The models were mounted on an adjustable support and positioned so that when swung into the arc, the heat flux on the model simulated approximately the heat flux expected within a second or so of zero time (missile at rest). Figure 2 shows the water-stabilized electric arc apparatus before operation or prior to swinging the model into the jet. The power was then turned on and the arc flow field was set to the same voltage and amperage that was used to determine the steady temperature that would occur on the probe tip vs distance from the nozzle exit. These calibrations were previously made by using a black body (graphite) probe. When stable arc operation was attained, the probe model was positioned in the flow field. It was then moved axially towards the arc nozzle so that the heat flux vs time simulated the thermodynamic design trajectory and so that the maximum heat flux input (450 BTU/ft²-sec) on the model occurred at 25 seconds. Figure 1 shows the electric arc in operation with a model under test.

High speed color motion pictures were made of the entire test run to show the heat input effects on the models.

PROBE MODELS:

The materials selected for evaluation on the models were based on current availability and fabricability and were also based on the results of a previous investigation of available high temperature materials (3). The materials and coatings selected to the probe configurations (Figure 4) at Picatinny Arsenal. The models had a concave nose-cylinder geometric shape with a pressure cavity at the nose. These to be coated were sent to private concerns for application of the various oxidation-resistant coatings. Identical coatings were also applied to flat specimens so that the characteristics of the coatings on the models prior to the heat tests could be determined. All of the coated and uncoated models and the coated flat specimens were ground to a RMS-16 surface finish.

Some of the coatings, listed below, were proprietary; therefore, very little was known about their compositions.
W-2 - Chromalloy Corp vapor-deposited coating on molybdenum believed to consist mostly of chromium along with some aluminum and silicon.

DURAK-MG - Chromizing Corp coating believed to be similar to the W-2 coating.

LM-5 - Linde Co flame-sprayed, modified molybdenum disilicide coating on molybdenum with additions of chromium carbide and aluminum.

Gradated Zirconia - Linde Co flame-sprayed, multi-layer coating on molybdenum consisting of a metal-rich zirconia undercoat and zirconia-rich-metal overcoat.

Am. Lava - American Lava Corp coating on graphite believed to consist of runtmsten and silicon carbide.

SURFACE TEMPERATURE DETERMINATIONS:

A calibrated optical pyrometer was used to determine the highest surface temperature that was attained by each model during the electric arc heat test. The time (seconds) when this maximum temperature was reached was recorded.

Caution must be exercised in interpreting the optical pyrometer observations (6). The pyrometer measures a luminescence temperature, T_S, which is related to the true temperature, T, by the equation, as follows:

\[ \frac{1}{T} - \frac{1}{T_S} = \frac{\ln \varepsilon_{\lambda}}{C_2} \]

where \( \varepsilon_{\lambda} \) is the spectral emissivity at wave length, \( \lambda \) (microns) and \( C_2 \) is the constant in the Wien equation for distribution of energy in the spectrum and has a value of 1.438 cm degrees. It was decided that correcting the optical pyrometer readings for emissivity differences was unnecessary since the same heat input flow field was repeated for each heat test and therefore, subjected the probes to the maximum heating trajectory. Also, little or no data were available on the emissivities of the various coatings and base materials used.

METALLURGICAL EXAMINATIONS:

Visual examinations were made on the models before and after subjecting them to the arc heat tests in order to determine the extent of damage, if any, to the surfaces. The naked eye and standard low power (below 10X) optical magnifiers were used for these inspections. Still photographs were taken before and after heat testing the models.

Microscopic examinations were conducted on the flat specimens to determine the metallurgical characteristics of the coating before the arc tests. Microscopic examinations were also conducted on all the models after the heat tests to determine the effects of the heat inputs. These examinations were made at magnifications up to 1000 times on polished specimens cut from the flat sheets.
and at the nose portions of the probes. Standard metallographic procedures and microscopes were used. Photomicrographs showing the heat effects on the coatings and base materials were taken.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION:

WATER-STABILIZED ELECTRIC ARC TESTS:

Descriptions of the various materials and coatings used on the probe models and the heat effects on them are shown in Table 1. These effects were determined by viewing color motion pictures of the models taken during the electric arc tests. Also included in the table are the maximum surface temperatures attained by the models, as determined with a calibrated optical pyrometer, and the time (seconds) to reach these temperatures.

TABLE 1. Optical Pyrometer and Motion Picture Observation of Probes During Electric Arc Heat Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Probe Material</th>
<th>Max Temp (°C)</th>
<th>Time to Reach Max Temp (sec)</th>
<th>Color Motion Picture Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mo with 90W+10ZrC₂</td>
<td>2030</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Excellent preservation of probe tip contour throughout test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mo with Al-Cr-Si flame-sprayed coating, .010&quot; thick</td>
<td>1790</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Excellent preservation of probe tip contour throughout test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mo with gradated Zirconia flame-sprayed coating, .015&quot; thick</td>
<td>2180</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Flaking started immediately but protection was very good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mo with flame-sprayed ZrB₂ coating, .010&quot; thick</td>
<td>2325</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Coating flaked at 15 sec. Slight erosion and oxidation apparent at 35 sec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mo + .5 Ti with MoSi₂ vapor-deposited coating, .0014&quot; thick</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Excellent preservation of probe tip contour throughout test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mo with MoSi₂ vapor-deposited coating, .0014&quot; thick</td>
<td>2155</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Coating failed at 20 sec. Erosion and oxidation apparent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probe Material</td>
<td>Max Observed Temp. (°C)</td>
<td>Time to Reach Max Temp (sec)</td>
<td>Color Motion Picture Observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mo with DURAK-MG vapor-deposited coating, .0014&quot; thick</td>
<td>2120</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Coating failure at 34 sec. Leading edge exposed at 40 sec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mo with DURAXNG 2160 35 Coating failure at vapor-deposited 20 sec. some Mo coating, .0014&quot; thick</td>
<td>2160</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Coating failure at 20 sec. some Mo oxidation apparent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mo with Al-Si flame-sprayed, oxidised coating, .010&quot; thick</td>
<td>2160</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Coating failure at 28 sec. with oxidation of Mo apparent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mo with W-2 vapor-deposited coating, .0014&quot; thick</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Full size probe. Excellent preservation of probe tip contour throughout test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mo with W-2 vapor-deposited coating, .0014&quot; thick</td>
<td>2180</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Coating failure at 22 sec. Catastrophic oxidation of Mo apparent at 27 sec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mo with LM-5 flame-sprayed coating, .015&quot; thick</td>
<td>2110</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Rapid flaking of coating at 22 sec. Catastrophic oxidation of Mo evident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graphite with SiC vapor-deposited coating, .010&quot; thick</td>
<td>1840</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Excellent preservation of probe tip contour throughout test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graphite with Am. Lava coating, .005&quot; thick</td>
<td>2075</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Slight oxidation and erosion apparent at 26 sec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graphite with 90W+10ZrO2 Flame-sprayed coating, .015&quot; thick</td>
<td>2260</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Coating failure on rim at 25 sec. Slight erosion apparent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above results show that one model with a W-2 coating and another with a MoSi2 coating withstood the heat inputs well; whereas, other probes having identical coatings exhibited poor heat resistance. These discrepancies in performance were attributed to differences in quality or workmanship of the
coatings. Other coatings that failed, stripped or flaked-off within 35 seconds as a result of brittleness or poor erosion and thermal shock resistance. The main causes for poor heat resistances of the uncoated models were melting, erosion and oxidation.

Although subjected to the same heat inputs, the maximum surface temperatures at the tips of the models varied considerably. These variances were due to the different emissivities, decomposition rates, densities, thermal conductivities and heat capacities of the various materials and coatings. A molybdenum probe with a zirconium diboride ($ZrB_2$) coating attained the highest surface temperature, $2325^\circ C (4215^\circ F)$, due to lower thermal conductivity and less heat capacity compared with most of the other coatings.

METALLURGICAL EXAMINATIONS:

Heat effects on the electric arc-tested probes, which were determined by visual or macroscopic examinations at magnifications up to 10 times, are shown in Figures 5 and 6. The results from these examinations and subsequent microscopic examinations at magnifications up to 1000 times corroborated the results previously disclosed by observations of the color motion pictures taken during the electric arc heat tests. These results are shown below.

COATED MOLYBDENUM PROBES:

Out of nine oxidation-resistant coatings tested on molybdenum, the first probe model, Figure 5, which had a 90% tungsten + 10% zirconia coating exhibited the least damage. Subsequent microscopic examination disclosed that, except for some slight oxidation and erosion, this coating had virtually remained intact with no apparent damage to the base metal, as shown on the photomicrographs in Figure 7. The next four molybdenum probes (Fig.5) containing aluminum-chromium-silicon, gradated zirconia, zirconium and molybdenum disilicide coatings exhibited about the same degree of damage. These probes were slightly eroded and some oxidation products in powder form had redeposited at the rear. Even though the gradated zirconia coating on the molybdenum was cracked and had flaked-off somewhat at the leading edge radius, this model had still maintained its basic configuration. Subsequent microscopic examination revealed that the metal-rich undercoat remained intact and evidently was able to protect the base metal from catastrophic oxidation.

As previously mentioned, one molybdenum probe with a molybdenum disilicide ($MoSi_2$) coating and another full-size probe with a W-2 coating performed well. On the other hand, another probe model with an identical $MoSi_2$ coating exhibited a considerable amount of scaling at the nose tip and pressure cavity. The other model with an identical W-2 coating as the full-size probe showed visible evidences of scaling and catastrophic oxidation. These discrepancies were evidently due to differences in the quality or workmanship of the coatings. According to the findings of others (5), the capability of a coating is dependent on its quality structure of the coatings before and after the heat tests are shown in Figures 7 thru 16. The coatings which performed poorly were found to be blistered and contained numerous microcracks prior to being subjected to the heat tests. These defects were found by examining flat specimens having
these identical coatings. No microscopic examination was made on the full-size probe with the W-2 coating which performed well. This probe was coated at a later date than the probe model which performed poorly and therefore, probably did not contain any microcracks or other detrimental defects. This improvement was most likely due to optimization in the quality or workmanship of the W-2 coating. MoSi₂ and W-2 coatings are vapor-deposited coatings that contain certain amounts of silicon. Other molybdenum probes with vapor-deposited and/or silicon-bearing coatings, such as DURAK-MG, aluminum-silicon (AL-Si) and LM-5 coatings also exhibited visible evidences of scaling at the nose tips and pressure cavities. No microcracks were visible upon microscopic examination of flat specimens having these identical coatings. Since it was impossible to examine all areas of the coatings microscopically, microcracks could still have been present in the coatings before the heat tests. Thermal cracks could develop during the heat tests which would cause subsequent scaling and oxidation of the exposed surface of the base metal. In addition to the scaling, the model with the LM-5 had oxidized catastrophically. This was attributed to the poor mechanical bond between the coating and the base metal, as shown in Figure 8.

COATED GRAPHITE PROBES:

Metallurgical examination of three graphite probes with oxidation-resistant coatings disclosed that the probe with the self-bonded, silicon carbide (SiC) coating exhibited the least damage (slight erosion), as shown in Figure 6. This model, however, fractured when accidentally dropped during transportation. Microscopic examination revealed that this probe was virtually unaffected by the heat test as shown in Figure 17. The other two models containing the 90% tungsten + 10% zirconia (Fig. 18) and the Am Lava coatings (Fig. 19) exhibited about the same degree of erosion and oxidation damage. As previously mentioned, the graphite probe with the 90%W + 10%ZrO₂ coating broke at the threads when swung out of the arc. This susceptibility to fracturing at such low stress values indicates that graphite, by itself, is too brittle at low temperatures to be a suitable, basic probe material.

CONCLUSIONS:

1. Molybdenum when adequately protected against oxidation was found to be superior to graphite for structural use on the probe.

2. The 90%W + 10%ZrO₂, flame-sprayed coating was the best coating tested for use on a molybdenum probe.

3. Al-Cr-Si, MoSi₂, gradated zirconia, and ZrO₂ coatings on molybdenum were slightly inferior to the above coating.

4. Self-bonded, vapor-deposited silicon carbide coating was the best coating tested for use on a graphite probe.

5. American Lava Corp. coating and a 90%W + 10% ZrO₂ flame-sprayed coating on graphite eroded, but still offered protection against oxidation of the graphite.
6. The following silicon-bearing and/or vapor-deposited coatings on molybdenum were subject to scaling of the nose tip and pressure cavity:

a. Durak - Mg  
b. W-2  
c. Al-Si, oxidized  
d. LM-5

7. Optimization and improvement in the quality and workmanship of the MoSi₂ and MoSi coatings were evidently the reasons for improved performances of these coatings.

8. Although subjected to the same heat inputs, the maximum observed surface temperatures on the models varied considerably from 1790°C (3255°F) to 2325°C (4215°F). This variance was attributed to the different emissivities, thermal conductivities, heat capacities, decomposition rates and densities of the various coatings and materials.

9. Vapor-deposited coatings exhibited excellent metallurgical or chemical bonds between the coatings and the base metals; whereas, flame-sprayed coatings contained poor to good mechanical or mechanical-chemical bonds.

10. The effects of a slight amount of ablation, deformation, erosion or deposit on the nose tip of the probe on the efficiency of the probe should be investigated.

REFERENCES:


FIGURES 1 through 19
Figure 1. Schematic diagram of water-stabilized electric arc

Figure 2. Water-stabilized electric arc apparatus before operation.

Figure 3. Electric arc during operation.
NOTE: FINISH ALL OUTSIDE SURFACES AFTER COATING

FIGURE 4

PROBE EXPERIMENTAL

THIS AREA TO BE COATED TO .120-.005" BM
Figure 5 Photographs of molybdenum arc-tested probes with various protective coatings.
Before Plasma-Arc Jet test. Note slight porosity of cermet coating and excellent mechanical bond at interface.

1. Cermet (90% W+10% ZrO2) coating
2. Porosity
3. Interface
4. Base metal

After Plasma-Arc Jet test 0.50 inch from nose tip. Note very slight erosion and/or sublimation of coating. Interface and base metal remained intact.

1. Coating
2. Erosion and/or sublimation
3. Interface
4. Base metal

After Plasma-Arc Jet test at nose tip. Note that traces of eroded, sublimed and oxidized coating still remain. Also note that base metal was not affected.

1. Coating
2. Eroded, sublimed and oxidized areas
3. Base metal

Figure 7  Microstructure of Linde LW-6Z10 Cermet (90% W+10% ZrO2) coating on Molybdenum.
Etchant - NaOH + K3Fe (CN)6  
Magnification - 1000X
Before Plasma-Arc Jet test. Note wide interfacial zone and good bond between coating and base metal at interface.

1. Coating
2. Interfacial zone
3. Interface
4. Base metal

After Plasma-Arc Jet test 0.50 inch from nose tip. Note erosion of coating and slight oxidation along interface. Interfacial zone and base metal remained relatively intact.

1. Eroded coating
2. Interfacial zone
3. Oxidized interface
4. Base metal

After Plasma-Arc Jet test at nose tip. Note that coating was almost completely eroded away and that base metal was eroded and slightly oxidized at the surface.

1. Remainder of eroded coating
2. Eroded and slightly oxidized surface of base metal
3. Base metal

Figure 8  Microstructure of Aluminum-Chromium-Silicon coating on Molybdenum
Etchant - NaOH + K$_3$Fe(CN)$_6$

Magnified - 1000X
Photomicrograph of nose tip radius.
Note complete removal of overcoat and oxidation and erosion of undercoat. Also note that base metal remained intact.

1. Undercoat
2. Base metal

Figure 10  Microstructure of gradated Zirconia on Molybdenum after Plasma-Arc Jet test.
Etchant - NaOH + K₃Fe(CN)₆
Figure 11  Microstructure of Zirconium Diboride Coating on Molybdenum.
Etchant - NaOH + K$_3$Fe(CN)$_6$
Magnification - 1000X

A  Before Plasma-Arc Jet Test. Note good mechanical bond between coating and base metal. Also note slight porosity of coating and interface.

B  After Plasma-Arc Jet Test 0.50 inch from nose tip. Note cracking of coating and oxidation of interface with no apparent damage of base metal.

C  After Plasma-Arc Jet Test at nose tip. Note erosion of coating and apparent damage of base metal.
Before Plasma-Arc Jet test. Note excellent metallurgical bond at very thin interfacial zone.

1. Coating
2. Interfacial zone
3. Base metal

After Plasma-Arc Jet test 0.50 inch from nose tip. Note growth of interfacial zone and also note that coating and base metal remained intact.

1. Coating
2. Interfacial zone
3. Base metal

After Plasma-Arc Jet test at nose tip. Note uniform oxidation of base metal and slight amount of floating of base metal to the surface.

1. Oxidation
2. Floated base metal
3. Base metal

Figure 12 Microstructure of Molybdenum Disilicide coating on molybdenum +0.5% of Titanium alloy.
Etchant - NaOH + K₃Fe (CN)₆
Figure 13  Microstructure of DURAK-MG coating on molybdenum. Etchant - NaOH + K₃Fe(CN)₆
Before Plasma-Arc Jet test. Note complex interfacial zone and equi-axed grain structure of coating.

1. Coating
2. Interfacial zone
3. Base metal

After Plasma-Arc Jet test. Representative microstructure at and 0.50 inch from nose tip. Note uniform oxidation of the base metal and slight traces of metallic coating.

1. Oxide
2. Traces of metallic coating
3. Base metal

Figure 14 Microstructure of Aluminum Silicon Oxidized coating on molybdenum.
Etchant - NaOH + K₃Fe(CN)₆
Magnification - 1000X
Before Plasma-Arc Jet test. Note cracking and columnar structure of coating and thin interfacial zone.

1. Coating
2. Interfacial zone
3. Base metal

After Plasma-Arc Jet test 0.50 inch from nose tip. Note oxidation of coating and base metal and floating of coating to the oxide surface.

1. Oxide
2. Coating
3. Base metal

After Plasma-Arc Jet test at nose tip. Note lack of coating, catastrophic oxidation of base metal and floating of base metal to the oxide surface.

1. Oxide
2. Float metal base
3. Base metal

Figure 15 Microstructure of Chromalloy W-2 coating on molybdenum
Etchant - NaOH + K₃Fe(CN)₆
Magnification - 1000X
Figure 16. Microstructure of Linde LM-5 coating on Molybdenum
Exhant - NaOH + K3Fe(CN)6

A. Before Plasma-Arc Jet test. Note slight porosity at coating and interface and mechanical bond at interface.
1. Coating
2. Porosity
3. Interface
4. Base metal

B. After Plasma-Arc Jet test 0.50 inch from nose tip. Note oxidation and melting of coating and base metal.
1. Coating
2. Base metal

C. After Plasma-Arc Jet test at nose tip. Note irregular catastrophic oxidation of the base metal and floating of the base metal to the surface.
1. Oxide
2. Float base metal
3. Base metal

Magnification - 1000X
Before Plasma-Arc Jet test. Note dense coating and excellent chemical bond at interface. Also note porosity of base material.

1. Coating
2. Interface
3. Base material

After Plasma-Arc Jet test 0.50 inch from nose tip. Note that thin layer of sublimed coating still remains. Base material was only slightly eroded at surface.

1. Thin layer of coating
2. Slightly eroded base material
3. Base material

After Plasma-Arc Jet test at nose tip. Note that slight traces of sublimed coating still remain. Also note eroded surface of base material.

1. Traces of coating
2. Eroded surface of base material
3. Base material

Figure 17  Structure of Crystolon "C" self-bonded Silicon Carbide coating on graphite.

Unetched
Before Plasma-Arc Jet Test. Note excellent bonding of coating to base material. Also note porosity of base material.

1. Coating
2. Porosity
3. Base material

After Plasma-Arc Jet Test 0.50 inch from nose tip. Note oxidation and/or erosion of surface of coating.

1. Oxidation and/or erosion
2. Coating
3. Base material

After Plasma-Arc Jet Test. Note erosion of base material and traces of coating.

1. Erosion of base material
2. Coating
3. Base material

Figure 18 Microstructure of American Lava coating on graphite.

Magnification - 250X
Unetched 250X
Before Plasma-Arc Jet test. Note excellent bond of tantalum undercoat and Linde LW-6Z10 overcoat and porosity of base material.
1. Overcoat
2. Undercoat
3. Base material
4. Porosity

Unetched 500X
After Plasma-Arc Jet test. Representative structure at and 0.50 inch from nose tip. Note complete oxidation of remainder of overcoat and undercoat. Base material remained intact.
1. Complete oxidation of overcoat
2. Partial oxidation of overcoat and undercoat.
3. Base material

Figure 19 Structure of Linde LW-6Z10 coating on graphite.