

Study of the Origins of Toughness in Amorphous Metals

A Thesis by
Glenn Robert Garrett

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for
the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy



CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

Pasadena, California

2013

(Defended September 27, 2012)

© 2013
Glenn R. Garrett
All Rights Reserved

To my loving family,

Ronald, Linda, Allison, Brad, Evan, Anna

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank Professor W. L. Johnson for accepting me as a graduate student at Caltech and giving me the opportunity to travel the winding path of research. The journey can often be confusing, and it is easy to get disoriented, but he was always there, a constant reminder that science is ultimately fun and the process of discovery should be enjoyed wholeheartedly. We are lucky to solve puzzles for a living. Take a stroll on the roof, the truth shall make you free. Yes, it can, it does, it will. However, the truth does not come easy. You have to hunt for it, with great skill and even greater persistence. For this truth, I must thank Dr. M. D. Demetriou. He has been an unparalleled motivator and a fantastic collaborator. I will always be indebted to him for the help and encouragement he has given me. I feel extremely lucky to have been advised by such a great team.

Next, I would like to thank Professor B. Fultz for encouraging me to attend Caltech and giving me great advice on navigating the first two years of graduate school. I also want to thank him for participating in both my candidacy and thesis committee. It was a pleasure to be his teaching assistant and even more fun to chat in the hallway. I also want to thank Professor G. Ravichandran for taking time out of his schedule to encourage me to attend Caltech, as well as participating in both my candidacy and thesis committee. He is also extremely kind to allow the Johnson group to use his lab, we are very grateful. I want to thank Professor W. A. Goddard III for a crash course in how to do the best science possible with computer simulations. His clarity, strategic thinking, and passion for science made the weekly meetings for cavitation research thrilling. I also want to thank him for participating on my thesis committee. I also want to thank Professor S. Haile for

participating on my candidacy committee; her interesting questions and kindness that day are deeply appreciated. While Professor K. Samwer will not be able to make my thesis defense, I cannot blame him for it, it is my own fault for taking so long to graduate. I will consider him there in spirit (or maybe Skype). I want to thank him for all the enlightening, encouraging, and lively discussions during his work-cations at Caltech, both scientifically and personally.

I want to thank Jin-Yoo Suh for patiently getting me started on annealing and fracture toughness measurements. I also want to thank Dr. Mary Laura Lind for her friendship and indomitable spirit, as well as transferring her ultrasonic measurement knowledge to me. I must thank Joseph Schramm for being my long time officemate and a great friend. I especially appreciate his support through the fallow years, and am thrilled to have him here for the fertile ones. He also knew where everything was in lab. I could not have asked for a better follow-up officemate and collaborator than Dr. Jyong-Hun Na, his fantastic work, great knowledge, and kind words are especially appreciated. I also want to thank Georg Kaltenboeck for his friendship and all of his support and expertise whenever I was having trouble, not to mention the cookies. I want to express my gratitude to Qi An for all the hard work he did bringing the cavitation simulations to fruition. I am extremely grateful to him for breathing new life into a project that I thought was finished.

I want to acknowledge all of the fun conversations and assistance that I have enjoyed with Dr. Dale Conner and Pamela Albertson; they are a big part of the Johnson group and are greatly appreciated. I want to acknowledge my senior Johnson group collaborators, Dr. Douglas Hofmann, Scott Roberts, Xiao Liu, and Henry Kozachkov for their hard work and support in making this a great lab. I also want to mention just a few of

the people that have made Keck Labs a fun place to work: Dr. Channing Ahn, B. Lohwangwatana, Aaron Wiest, Lisa Mauger, Hillary Smith, Matthew Lucas, Alexander Papandrew, Mike Vondrus, Allison Kunz, and Andrew Hoff.

I want to recognize the great contributions of Professor Robert Ritchie, Dr. Maximillien Launey, and Dr. Bernd Gludovatz on expanding the state of knowledge of fracture toughness in metallic glass. Their expertise on the subject is critical, and I am thankful to have them as collaborators. I also want to recognize the contributions of several people who helped me immensely, either through collaborations or advice: Jason Chen, Kaitlyn Fritz, Julie Monohan, Petros Arakelian, Rick Gerhart, Mike Roy, Dr. Chi Ma, Michael Floyd, and Chase Crewdson. I would also like to acknowledge my two most influential advisors at the Georgia Institute of Technology, Professor Naresh Thadhani and Professor Robert Speyer. Their encouragement and support at a crucial time in my academic development has brought me to where I am now, thank you.

Of course, none of this would have been possible without the love and support of my family. I love you all dearly and am eternally grateful for your wonderful support when I decided to move across the country. I have dedicated this thesis to you as a show of my appreciation. I promise I will have more time to visit after I graduate. I especially want to thank Oksana for her caring and support; our time together has been my happiest.

There are many wonderful people that I am lucky to have been part of my Caltech community. I attempt an incomplete list as a miniscule token of my appreciation: Andy Downard, Drew May, Justus Brevik, Vanessa Jönsson, John Delacruz, Anne Dekas, Ken Diest, Krista Langeland, Nick Heinz, Mike Shearn, Leslie O'Leary, Jane Khudyakov,

Marcos Costa, Mary Louie, Elitza Tocheva, Liliya Kharevych, Morgan Putnam, Russ
Ernst, Will Ford, Ronnie Bryan, Evans Boney, Agatha Hodsman, Drew Kennedy.

ABSTRACT

Amorphous metals that form fully glassy parts over a few millimeters in thickness are still relatively new materials. Their glassy structure gives them particularly high strengths, high yield strains, high hardness values, high resilience, and low damping losses, but this can also result in an extremely low tolerance to the presence of flaws in the material. Since this glassy structure lacks the ordered crystal structure, it also lacks the crystalline defect (dislocations) that provides the micromechanism of toughening and flaw insensitivity in conventional metals. Without a sufficient and reliable toughness that results in a large tolerance of damage in the material, metallic glasses will struggle to be adopted commercially. Here, we identify the origin of toughness in metallic glass as the competition between the intrinsic toughening mechanism of shear banding ahead of a crack and crack propagation by the cavitation of the liquid inside the shear bands. We present a detailed study over the first three chapters mainly focusing on the process of shear banding; its crucial role in giving rise to one of the most damage-tolerant materials known, its extreme sensitivity to the configurational state of a glass with moderate toughness, and how the configurational state can be changed with the addition of minor elements. The last chapter is a novel investigation into the cavitation barrier in glass-forming liquids, the competing process to shear banding. The combination of our results represents an increased understanding of the major influences on the fracture toughness of metallic glasses and thus provides a path for the improvement and development of tougher metallic glasses.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Figures and Tables	xi
Chapter 1: Introduction	1
Bibliography	3
Chapter 2: An Exceptionally Damage-Tolerant Glass	4
Abstract.....	4
Introduction	5
Glass Development and Processing.....	8
Glass Characterization	9
Uniaxial Tension Testing	11
Fracture Toughness Characterization	13
Toughness Correlation	26
Ashby Damage Tolerance Map	29
Bibliography	32
Chapter 3: Influence of Configurational Disorder on the Intrinsic Fracture Toughness of Metallic Glasses.....	35
Abstract.....	35
Introduction	36
Sample Preparation and Configurational State Characterization.....	39
Fracture Toughness Testing	45
Bibliography	57
Chapter 4: Effect of Microalloying on the Toughness of Metallic Glass	59
Abstract.....	59
Introduction	60

Sample Preparation and Characterization.....	61
Notch Toughness Testing.....	64
Fracture Surfaces and Toughness Correlations	65
Bibliography	71
 Chapter 5: Investigation of Cavitation in Glass-Forming Liquids	 73
Abstract.....	73
Introduction	74
Experimental Methods	76
Early results with Pd ₄₃ Cu ₂₇ P ₂₀ Ni ₁₀ , Glycerol, and Boron Oxide	81
Results and Discussion for Zr _{41.2} Cu _{12.5} Ti _{13.8} Be _{22.5} Ni ₁₀	85
Bibliography	101
 Chapter 6: Summary and Future Directions	 103
Summary	103
Future Directions.....	106
Bibliography	109
 Appendix A: Debye-Grüneisen Thermal Expansion	
Effect of Zr ₃₅ Ti ₃₀ Cu _{8.25} Be _{26.7}	110
 Appendix B: Bulk Modulus, Poisson Ratio, and	
Fracture Toughness of Zr ₃₅ Ti ₃₀ Cu _{8.25} Be _{26.75}	113
 Appendix C: Determination of Enthalpy Recovery by Differential	
Scanning Calorimetry for Zr ₃₅ Ti ₃₀ Cu _{8.25} Be _{26.75}	116

LIST OF FIGURES AND TABLES

Chapter 2: An Exceptionally Damage Tolerant Glass

Figure 2.1 - Characterization of amorphous structure	10
Figure 2.2 - Results of tensile testing	12
Figure 2.3 - SEM micrographs of unnotched three-point bending test.....	16
Figure 2.4 - Results of unnotched three-point bending test.....	17
Figure 2.5 - Defining the crack-tip opening displacement	18
Figure 2.6 - <i>J</i> -integral vs. CTOD R-curve comparison	20
Figure 2.7 - CTOD fracture toughness results and SEM micrographs	23
Figure 2.8 - Shear-sliding mechanism of metallic glass toughness	25
Table 2.1 - Data for metallic glass toughness correlation	28
Figure 2.9 - Metallic glass toughness correlation example	28
Figure 2.10 - Ashby damage tolerance map of many materials.....	30

Chapter 3: Influence of Configurational Disorder on the

Intrinsic Fracture Toughness of Metallic Glasses

Figure 3.1 - Characterization of the configurational state	44
Figure 3.2 - Fracture surface micrographs of relaxed glasses	47
Figure 3.3 - Fracture surface micrographs of as-cast glasses.....	48
Table 3.1 - Summary of values for all results.....	49
Figure 3.4 - Correlation of the configurational state with toughness.....	51
Figure 3.5 - Relaxation map of metallic glass configurational modes.....	54
Figure 3.6 - Ashby damage tolerance map for metals.....	56

Chapter 4: Effect of Microalloying on the Toughness of Metallic Glass

Figure 4.1 - X-ray diffraction patterns	63
Figure 4.2 - Differential calorimetry scans	63
Table 4.1 - Summary of all measured results	66

Figure 4.3 - SEM micrographs of notch toughness fracture surfaces	69
Figure 4.4 - Notch toughness correlations with T_g , σ_y , G , and ν	70
Chapter 5: Investigation of Cavitation in Glass-Forming Liquids	
Figure 5.1 - Fused silica ampule design, Pd-based glass sphere	82
Figure 5.2 - Cavities in glycerol ($C_3H_8O_3$) and boron oxide (B_2O_3)	85
Figure 5.3 - Exterior of Vitreloy 1 cavitation ampule	88
Figure 5.4 - Cross section of a heterogeneously nucleated cavity	88
Figure 5.5 - Cross sections of a heterogeneously nucleated cavity	89
Figure 5.6 - Maximum potential negative pressure vs. sphere volume	92
Figure 5.7 - Ratio of cavity volume to sphere volume vs. sphere volume	95
Table 5.1 - Summary of all cavitation results	98
Figure 5.8 - Pressure and volume of homogeneously nucleated cavities	99
Appendix A: Debye-Grüneisen Thermal Expansion Effect of $Zr_{35}Ti_{30}Cu_{8.25}Be_{26.7}$	
Figure A.1 – Thermal expansion of $Zr_{35}Ti_{30}Cu_{8.25}Be_{26.7}$ with T	110
Figure A.2 – Vibrational change in bulk modulus with T	111
Figure A.3 – Vibrational change in shear modulus with T	112
Appendix B: Bulk Modulus, Poisson Ratio, and Fracture Toughness of $Zr_{35}Ti_{30}Cu_{8.25}Be_{26.75}$	
Figure B.1 – Correlation of bulk modulus with T_R and K_Q	113
Figure B.2 - Correlation of Poisson ratio with T_R and K_Q	114
Appendix C: Determination of Enthalpy Recovery by Differential Scanning Calorimetry for $Zr_{35}Ti_{30}Cu_{8.25}Be_{26.75}$	
Figure C.1 – DSC scans of $Zr_{35}Ti_{30}Cu_{8.25}Be_{26.75}$	116

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

When engineers choose materials and design components for bridges, airplanes, and other applications where human lives are at risk, they no longer use the static strength of the material as the sole criteria for safety. Advances in fracture mechanics have shown that the best way to ensure the safety of a critical component is to design around the damage tolerance (the combination of yield strength and fracture toughness) of the material. Materials in the real world will always contain some potential flaw or crack, introduced during processing, regular use, or even mishandling. The important question to ask of a material is how much stress can this material withstand before any potential flaws cause it to fail quickly and catastrophically. This idea is the essence of fracture toughness, the measurement of a material's resistance to fracture. For metallic glass, even with an impressive strength, a lack of confidence in its fracture toughness, it will prevent it from being used for any but the least strenuous of applications (e.g., as excellent soft magnets).

M. F. Ashby and A. L. Greer have assessed both the strengths and weaknesses of metallic glasses as structural materials [1]. Naturally, the lack of a crystalline structure and its associated defects, i.e., dislocations and grain boundaries, is the source of both the most interesting advantages (high strength, high yield strain, high elastic energy storage, low damping, soft-magnetic properties, forming of the supercooled liquid) and deeply consternating disadvantages (zero tensile ductility, toughness values that can be as low as $5 \text{ MPa}\cdot\text{m}^{1/2}$ [2] and sometimes as high as $100 \text{ MPa}\cdot\text{m}^{1/2}$ [3], plastic zone sizes that range

from microns [2] to a millimeter [3], and sometimes severe annealing embrittlement [4]) when comparing metallic glass to conventional crystalline engineering metals [1]. Ashby and Greer correctly conclude that given the circumstances one must identify applications where the disadvantages of metallic glass can be marginalized and the strengths can be maximized. However, the fracture toughness is such a crucial parameter for the wider adoption of metallic glass that we seek to shed light on the origins of its fracture toughness and identify the salient properties that control this important material parameter.

Specifically, in chapter 2 we address the fundamental source of toughness and thus damage tolerance in metallic glass, the development of the plastic zone in front of the crack tip. We introduce a Pd-based glass of excellent damage tolerance and show that the competition between extensive shear band growth and crack propagation via cavitation in the shear band lies at the heart of fracture toughness. In chapter 3 we explore the variability in the as-cast state of a highly processable Zr-based glass, and demonstrate that the fracture process of a pre-cracked specimen is a local process that is sensitive to the local environment of the crack. We show how annealing reduces the variability in toughness, and that toughness can be increased by increasing the potential energy of the glass. In chapter 4 we investigate the effect of minor alloying additions ($\leq 2\%$) on the configurational state and notch toughness of a Cu-based glass. In chapter 5 we present a study on the nucleation of cavities in glass-forming liquids due to the dynamic application of negative hydrostatic pressure. Glass-forming liquids are metastable to negative pressure on laboratory timescales, giving insight to the cavitation process that opposes shear band growth in metallic glass and thus plays an important role in limiting fracture toughness.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- [1] M. F. Ashby and A. L. Greer, *Scripta Materialia* **54**, 321 (2006).
- [2] A. Shamimi Nouri, X. J. Gu, S. J. Poon, G. J. Shiflet, and J. J. Lewandowski, *Philosophical Magazine Letters* **88**, 853 (2008).
- [3] J.Y. Suh, R. D. Conner, C. P. Kim, M. D. Demetriou, and W. L. Johnson, *Journal of Materials Research* **25**, 982 (2010).
- [4] P. Murali and U. Ramamurty, *Acta Materialia* **53**, 1467 (2005).