

LA-UR-96-3565

CONF-9609269--3

Title:

ADHERENT DIAMOND LIKE CARBON COATINGS ON METALS VIA PLASMA SOURCE ION IMPLANTATION

RECEIVED

DEC 25 1996

OSTI

Author(s):

KEVIN C. WALTER
MICHAEL NASTASI
CARTER P. MUNSON

MST-4
MST-4
P-24

Submitted to:

3rd. International Workshop on Plasma-Based Ion Implantation, September 15-18, 1996, Dresden, Germany

DISTRIBUTION OF THIS DOCUMENT IS UNLIMITED

MASTER

Los Alamos
NATIONAL LABORATORY



DISCLAIMER

This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by an agency of the United States Government. Neither the United States Government nor any agency thereof, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or any agency thereof. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof.

DISCLAIMER

**Portions of this document may be illegible
in electronic image products. Images are
produced from the best available original
document.**

Adherent Diamond-Like Carbon Coatings on Metals via Plasma Source Ion Implantation

K.C. Walter, M. Nastasi, and C. Munson

Los Alamos National Laboratory, MS-K762, Los Alamos, NM 87545 USA

ABSTRACT

Various techniques are currently used to produce diamond-like carbon (DLC) coatings on various materials. Many of these techniques use metallic interlayers, such as Ti or Si, to improve the adhesion of a DLC coating to a ferrous substrate. An alternative processing route would be to use plasma source ion implantation (PSII) to create a carbon composition gradient in the surface of the ferrous material to serve as the interface for a DLC coating. The need for interlayer deposition is eliminated by using such a graded interface. A PSII approach has been used to form adherent DLC coatings on magnesium, aluminum, silicon, titanium, chromium, brass, nickel, and tungsten. A PSII process tailored to create a graded interface allows deposition of adherent DLC coatings even on metals that exhibit a positive heat of formation with carbon, such as magnesium, iron, brass and nickel.

INTRODUCTION

DLC coatings are of technological interest for enhancing wear resistance [1,2] and corrosion resistance [3,4] of metals. Sputter cleaning of the surface [5,6] and interlayer deposition are two major surface preparation methods used to improve the adhesion of DLC coatings to metals. Interlayers, such as Si [7], Ti [8,9], TiC [8,10], TiN [8], TiCN [8], Mo [11], and Cu/Cr [12] are chosen for their ability to form strong bonds to the substrate and also to the DLC coating. As applications for DLC coating technologies expand to require coating of larger areas with more complex surface geometries of a wide range of metals, more versatile and universally applicable processing methods need to be developed [13, 14]. This work details an effort to use methane (CH_4) and PSII to produce an interface, graded in carbon composition, to improve the adherence of DLC coatings to a wide range of metals.

EXPERIMENTAL DETAILS

Coupons of Mg alloy AM60, 99.999% Al and Al alloy A390, Si, Ti, Ti-6Al-4V, electrodeposited hard Cr ($> 2 \mu\text{m}$) on 304 stainless steel, steel 1018, steel A36, steel 4340, stainless steels 303 and 304, tool steel M2, Ni, brass (Cu-Zn), Cu, WC(Co), and W were used to test the adhesion of DLC on a wide range of metals. Both polished (mirror finish) and unpolished coupons were used for each material, except for A390, Ti, 304, brass and Cu for which only unpolished coupons were included. Portions of the polished coupons were masked so that a surface profilometer could be used to measure the DLC coating thickness.

The ion implantation and DLC deposition experiments were conducted using the Los Alamos PSII facility [15] and the experimental conditions are shown in Table I. The first sputter cleaning step is to remove metal oxides and other surface contaminants that could interfere with subsequent steps. A carbon composition gradient, needed to enhance the adhesion of the DLC coating, is produced by the carbon implantation step. During carbon implantation, neutral radicals from the methane plasma can deposit on the metal surface. This carbon coating is generally graphitic and not strongly adherent to the metal. The graphitic layer can reduce the adherence of DLC, so it is removed by the second sputter cleaning step. The experiments are concluded with DLC deposition. The main difference between Experiments I & III is the increased implantation bias which, by virtue of the higher ion range, gives a thicker graded interface. Experiment II did not include the carbon implantation step or the second sputter cleaning step.

Ion beam analysis [16], nanoindentation, and adhesion tests were performed to characterize the composition, hardness and adhesion strength of each coating. Nanoindentation measurements were accomplished using a Nanoindenter[®] II and the continuous stiffness mode. The adhesion strength of the DLC coatings was measured in tension using the Sebastian[®] II stud pull test.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The deposition conditions of all experiments produced a DLC coating consisting of 70 at% carbon and 30 at % hydrogen and a hardness of ~20 GPa. The thickness of each coating is included in Table 1.

Table 2 contains a listing of the metals with both adherent and non-adherent DLC coatings for each experiment. The Ti sample in Experiment I was unpolished. It is believed that the sputter-cleaning and 20 kV PSII steps were insufficient to clean the machined surface and produce a graded interface extending into the bulk metal. Experiments II and III show that carbon implantation allows a DLC coating to adhere to brass and Ni. The DLC coating on A36 did not adhere when including a carbon implantation step, but the coating did adhere when the implantation step was omitted. It is believed that the A36 coupons were not in good thermal contact with the stage and the implantation step resulted in sample heating that interfered with DLC adhesion. RBS analysis of the DLC coated tungsten samples (Fig. 1) shows the differences between the W spectra for Experiments II & III. First, the W-edge at channel 705 is shifted to the left for the DLC coated samples. The DLC coatings are of different thickness, so the W spectra are shifted different amounts. The RBS spectra for the carbon implanted and DLC coated W exhibit a region (channel 595-620) with a reduced yield. The reduced yield indicates an interface of graded C composition, approximately 50 nm thick, between the bulk W metal and the DLC coating. A similar reduction in yield is not observed for the DLC coated W that was not C implanted. The results show that PSII biases of 20 to 50 kV are sufficient to produce a graded interface between DLC and metals without the use of interlayers. Note that DLC adhesion is achieved even for metals, such as Mg, Fe, and Ni, whose carbides are not thermodynamically favored [17,18].

The results of the adhesion tests are shown in Fig. 2. The adhesion of the epoxy to Al is included as an estimate of the strength of the epoxy. The adhesion of DLC to W and Mg are improved, but the result is less clear for M2. A more informative comparison is shown in Fig. 3-5 which includes SEM micrographs of the adhesion tested coatings. In all cases, the adhesion of the DLC coating improved as shown by the significant reduction in delaminated area for M2, and the complete absence of delaminated area for W and Mg. Considered

together, the adhesion tests results and SEM micrographs show that enhanced DLC adhesion can be achieved by using ion implantation to create a graded interface between DLC and the metal. The SEM micrographs also confirm the epoxy generally forms the weakest interface for the adhesion test. Therefore, the reported adhesion strengths for the carbon implanted and DLC coated metals (Experiments I & III) can be viewed as a minimum estimate of the coating adhesion strength.

CONCLUSIONS

Carbon implantation using PSII can result in enhanced adherence of DLC coatings to metals. The enhanced adherence is due to graded interface, produced by carbon implantation, between the DLC coating and the metal substrate. DLC coatings can be deposited on metals with and without a thermodynamic driving force to form carbides because the carbon implantation process, on which coating adherence depends, is independent of thermodynamics. However, care must be taken to choose correct processing parameters for materials with thick oxides and proper cooling of components should not be neglected. This work shows that PSII can be used to produce adherent DLC coatings on a wide range of metals including Mg, Al, Si, Ti, Cr, Fe, Ni, Cu-Zn (brass), and W without the use of interlayers.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors are grateful to the Ion Beam Materials Laboratory, Los Alamos National Laboratory, for assistance with the ion beam analysis. This work was supported by the US Department of Energy through the Office of Basic Energy Sciences and the Los Alamos National Laboratory Directed Research and Development Program.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. B. Bhushan, B.K. Gupta, Handbook of Tribology: Materials, Coatings, and Surface Treatments, McGraw-Hill, Inc., New York, 1991, pgs. 14.103-14.148.
2. K. Holmberg, A. Matthews, Coatings Tribology: Properties, Techniques and Applications in Surface Engineering, edited by D. Dowson, Elsevier, Amsterdam, 1994, p. ??.

3. D.P. Butt, *Phil. Mag. Lett.* 70(1994)385.
4. R.S. Lillard, D.P. Butt, K.C. Walter, M. Nastasi, "The breakdown mechanism of diamond-like carbon coated nickel in chloride solution," *Journal of Corrosion Science*, 1997.
5. A.A. Voevodin, S.D. Walck, J.S. Solomon, P.J. John, D.C. Ingram, M.S. Donley, J.S. Zabinski, *J. Vac. Sci. Technol.* A14(1996)1927.
6. B.F. Coll, M. Chhowalla, *Surf. Coat. Technol.* 79(1996)76.
7. Y. Liu, A. Erdemir, E.I. Meletis, *Surf. Coat. Technol.* 82(1996)48.
8. J.G. Deng, M. Braun, *Diamond and Related Materials* 4(1995)936.
9. K. Taube, M. Grischke, K. Bewilogua, *Surf. Coat. Technol.* 68(1994)662.
10. H. Ronkainen, J. Likonen, J. Koskinen, S. Varjus, *Surf. Coat. Technol.* 79(1996)87.
11. X.M. He, W.Z. Li, H.D. Li, *Mat.Sci. Engin.* B31(1995)269.
12. M.D. Bentzon, K. Mogensen, J.B. Hansen, C. Barholmhansen, C. Traeholt, P. Holiday, S.S. Eskildsen, *Surf. Coat. Technol.* 68(1994)651.
13. J.V. Mantese, I.G. Brown, N.W. Cheung, G.A. Collins, *MRS Bulletin*, August 1996, pg. 52.
14. G.W. Malaczynski, Xiaohong Qiu, J.V. Mantese, A.A. Elmoursi, A.H. Hamdi, B.P. Wood, K.C. Walter, M.A. Nastasi, 1995, US Patent 5,458,927.
15. B.P. Wood, I. Henins, R.J. Gribble, W.A. Reass, R.J. Faehl, M.A. Nastasi, D.J. Rej, *J. Vac. Sci. Technol.* B12(1994)870.
16. J.R. Tesmer and M. Nastasi (eds), *Handbook of Modern Ion Beam Materials Analysis*, Materials Research Society, Pittsburgh, PA, 1995, pg. 83, 498.
17. *Smithells Metals Reference Book*, 7th edition, E.A. Bandes, G.B. Brooks, Butterworth-Heinemann, Boston, MA, 1992, pg. 8-23.
18. *CRC Handbook of Chemistry and Physics*, CRC Press, Inc., Boca Raton, FL, 1984, pgs. D52, D76.

Table 1. PSII processing parameters for each experiment. The parameters listed are working gas pressure (p), pulsed bias magnitude (V), pulse width (τ), pulse frequency (f), duration of the step (T), processed area (A), and DLC coating thickness (t).

PSII processing steps	Experiment I A:3 m ²	Experiment II A:0.26 m ²	Experiment III A:0.26 m ²
Sputter cleaning (Ar)	p:1.3 Pa V:2 kV τ :20 μ s f:4 kHz T:2.25 hours	p:1.3 Pa V:2 kV τ :30 μ s f:5 kHz T:2.5 hours	p:1.3 Pa V:2 kV τ :30 μ s f:5 kHz T:2.2 hours
Carbon implantation (CH ₄)	p:0.04 Pa V:20 kV τ :20 μ s f:700 Hz T:4.75 hours	none	p:0.07 Pa V:50 kV τ :20 μ s f:2 kHz T:1.2 hours
Sputter cleaning (Ar)	same as above T:8 minutes	none	same as above T:10 minutes
DLC deposition (C ₂ H ₂)	p:0.07 Pa V:1.5 kV τ :20 μ s f:4 kHz T:48.5 hours t:6.8 μ m	p:0.05 Pa V:1.5 kV τ :30 μ s f:5 kHz T:3.5 hours t:0.5 μ m	p:0.04 Pa V:1.5 kV τ :30 μ s f:5 kHz T:3.5 hours t:0.3 μ m

Table 2. Tabulation of materials with and without adherent DLC coatings from each experiment. Coatings that delaminated after exposure to air, are listed as *NOT* adherent.

Coating outcome	Experiment I	Experiment II	Experiment III
Adherent	M2, 4340, 1018, 303, Cr, Si, Al-A390	Mg, Al, Cr, 304, WC(Co), Si, M2, A36, Ti-6Al-4V, W	Mg, Al, Cr, 304, WC(Co), Si, M2, W, Ni, Ti-6Al-4V, brass
<i>NOT</i> adherent	Ti	Cu, brass, Ni	Cu, A36

Figure Captions

Fig. 1. Rutherford Backscattering Spectroscopy results for uncoated and DLC coated tungsten. The spectra show that carbon ion implantation, prior to DLC deposition, results in a interface graded in carbon composition. The presence of the graded interface is indicated by the reduced W yield in channels 595-620.

Fig. 2. Adhesion strengths of DLC coatings on M2 tool steel, W, and Mg. Results from samples that included carbon implantation to strengthen the interface are labeled with "(imp)". The "Epoxy on Al" strength is included as an estimate of the strength of the epoxy.

Fig. 3. SEM micrograph of DLC coated M2. (a) Without carbon implantation (Experiment II), the DLC coating is completely removed; (b) with carbon implantation (Experiment I), the DLC coating is more adherent and only partially removed. The tested area is ~2.8 mm in diameter.

Fig. 4. SEM micrograph of DLC coated W. (a) Without carbon implantation (Experiment II), the DLC coating is partially removed; (b) with carbon implantation (Experiment III), the DLC coating is more adherent and no area of delamination is observed. The tested area is ~2.8 mm in diameter.

Fig. 5. SEM micrograph of DLC coated Mg (AM60). (a) Without carbon implantation (Experiment II), the DLC coating is partially removed; (b) with carbon implantation (Experiment III), the DLC coating is more adherent and no area of delamination is observed. The tested area is ~2.8 mm in diameter.




FIG 1




Fig 2




Fig 3A.




Fig 3B




Fig ~~3A~~ 4A




Fig ~~3B~~ 4B




Fig ~~4B~~ 5A




Fig ~~4B~~ 5B