

# Mechanical Evaluation of Titanium-nitride-coated Tool Steel

## Application Note

Jennifer Hay



The Agilent G200 Nanoindenter.

### Introduction

Products are often subject to environments where friction and wear can degrade performance. In such environments, hard coatings can enhance performance and extend product life. In tooling applications, hard coatings are often used to protect cutting edges, thereby extending tool life. In automotive applications, hard coatings lower the friction between moving parts, thus reducing energy requirements and extending part life. Other specific applications for hard coatings include computer hard-drives and displays for portable electronic devices. In this note, we explain the methods and results of testing a titanium-nitride coating intended to improve the performance and extend the life of a utility blade.

### Theory

Instrumented indentation testing (IIT) is a technique for measuring the mechanical properties of materials. It is a development of traditional hardness tests such as Brinell,

Rockwell, Vickers, and Knoop. Instrumented indentation testing is similar to traditional hardness testing in that a hard indenter, usually diamond, is pressed into contact with the test material. However, traditional hardness testing yields only one measure of deformation at one applied force, whereas during an IIT test, force and penetration are measured for the entire time that the indenter is in contact with the material. Nearly all of the advantages of IIT derive from this continuous measurement of force and displacement. Instrumented indentation testing is particularly well suited for testing small volumes of material such as thin films, particles, or other small features. It is most commonly used to measure Young's modulus ( $E$ ) and hardness ( $H$ ) [1-2]. The Young's modulus for a material is the relationship between stress and strain when deformation is elastic. If an engineer knows the Young's modulus for his design material, then he can predict strain for a known stress, and vice-versa. In metals, hardness depends directly on the flow stress of the material at the strain




Figure 1a. Commercial utility blades tested.




Figure 1b. Utility blade as mounted for testing in the G200.

caused by the indentation. In other words, hardness is an indirect but simple measure of flow stress; within a class of metals, the metal with the higher hardness will also have the higher flow stress.

Using the continuous measurements of force and penetration from a single instrumented indentation test, hardness ( $H$ ) is calculated as

$$H = P/A, \quad (\text{Eq. 1})$$

where  $P$  is the applied force, and  $A$  is the contact area. Young's modulus ( $E$ ) depends directly on the reduced modulus ( $E_r$ ) which is calculated as

$$E_r = \frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{2} \frac{S}{\sqrt{A}}, \quad (\text{Eq. 2})$$

where  $S$  is the elastic stiffness of the contact. The elastic stiffness of the contact may be determined in two different ways. It may be determined semi-statically as the change in force with respect to displacement when the indenter is first withdrawn from the sample, as this part of the test manifests purely elastic recovery. It may also be determined dynamically by oscillating the indenter [3]. If  $S$  is determined by the first (semi-static) method, then hardness and Young's modulus can only be realized at the maximum penetration. But if  $S$  is determined by the second (dynamic) method, then these same properties can be determined as a continuous function of penetration depth. Both types of tests were performed in this work.

Often, the surfaces of real products are so rough that the contact area,  $A$ , cannot be determined with sufficient accuracy. In such circumstances, the parameter  $S^2/P$  is useful, because it depends directly on the square of reduced modulus divided by hardness, but is independent of contact area [4, 5]. This is easily shown by dividing Eq. 2 by Eq. 1:

$$\frac{(E_r)^2}{H} = \frac{\pi}{4} \frac{S^2}{A} \cdot \frac{A}{P} \propto \frac{S^2}{P}.$$

It should be noted here that the parameter  $S^2/P$  has the dimensions of stress; we shall express the value of this parameter in units of GPa. Actually, dimensional analysis and finite-element analysis reveal that in contact mechanics, it is not the modulus or flow stress independently that determines permanent damage as a result of stress, but rather the ratio of the two [6]. Therefore, we expect the parameter  $S^2/P$  to be a good predictor of resistance to permanent damage: lower values of  $S^2/P$  correspond to higher resistance to permanent damage.

### Experimental Method

For this work, we purchased utility blades from a local hardware store and tested one to determine the extent to which a titanium-nitride (TiN) coating should be expected to improve the performance and longevity of the blade. The blade is shown in Figure 1a. The base material of the blade is M42 tool steel. The cutting edge of the blade has a



Figure 2. Image of test surface (10X objective). Eight residual impressions from tests on the TiN coating are visible.

Material	Method	Pmax, mN	Number of tests (N)
Bare M42 steel	CSM	650	20
TiN coating	CSM	650	15
TiN coating	ISO 14577	0.5	20
TiN coating	ISO 14577	5.0	15
TiN coating	ISO 14577	50.0	15
TiN coating	ISO 14577	500.0	15
Bare M42 steel	ISO 14577	0.5	20
Bare M42 steel	ISO 14577	500.0	20

Table 1. Summary of tests on utility blade.

titanium-nitride coating that is gold in color, and this coating extends up onto the main body of the blade as shown in Figure 2. Tests of the coating were placed on this part of the blade where the coating extends up onto the flat surface. For comparison, uncoated parts of the blade were also tested.

An Agilent G200 Nanoindenter fitted with a diamond Berkovich indenter was used for all testing. Semi-static tests were performed according to the method prescribed by ISO 14577 [7]. For all ISO 14577 tests, the force-time algorithm was: 10-second load, 5-second hold, 10-second unload. The CSM option was employed for dynamic testing in order to achieve depth profiles of properties. For all CSM tests, loading was controlled such that the loading rate divided by the load ( $P/P$ ) remained constant at 0.1/sec. The excitation frequency was 45Hz, and the excitation amplitude was controlled such that the displacement amplitude remained constant at 2nm. Table 1 summarizes all the tests that were performed on the utility blade.

Every G200 is supplied with two reference materials: Pyrex and fused silica. To be sure that everything is working properly, it is good practice to test at least one of these materials every time the instrument is used. In this work, Pyrex was tested using both the semi-static (ISO 14577) and dynamic (CSM) methods; these results are also presented.

## Results and Discussion

The results for Pyrex are shown in Figures 3 and 4. These results confirm that the testing instrument is in good working order:

- The two techniques (ISO 14577 and CSM) give results that are sufficiently close to each other.
- Both hardness and Young's modulus are sufficiently constant with depth.
- Measured Young's modulus is sufficiently close to the literature value for Pyrex (62 GPa).

The results in Figures 3 and 4 show what is possible with good surface preparation. The CSM data points represent window averages over 20 tests. Error bars representing one standard deviation are shown, but these bars are so small as to be contained within the data points. (ISO 14577 data points do not have error bars, because each data point represents only one test; nevertheless, extreme repeatability is evident.) The slight discrepancy at small depths is due to thermal drift; CSM tests are more sensitive to thermal drift than ISO 14577 tests are.

Figure 5 shows a residual impression from one CSM test on the TiN coating. The peak force for this test was




Figure 3. Modulus of Pyrex as a function of surface penetration using two test methods. Area function for this Berkovich diamond tip is  $A(d) = 24.5037d^2 + 281.7d$ , where  $d$  is the distance along the diamond axis from the apex to the contact plane.




Figure 4. Hardness of Pyrex as a function of surface penetration using two test methods.




Figure 5. Residual impression from 650 mN indent on the TiN coating (40X objective).




Figure 6. Modulus vs. penetration depth for coated and uncoated regions of utility blade. Error bars span one standard deviation.




Figure 7. Hardness vs. penetration depth for coated and uncoated regions of utility blade. Error bars span one standard deviation.

650 mN, yet it is difficult to distinguish the residual impression amid other surface features. Thus, the degree of scatter in Figures 6 and 7, which show modulus and hardness for the blade, is disappointing but not surprising. For the near-surface data, error bars span a range that is comparable to the measured value! Such scatter makes it impossible to draw meaningful conclusions about the value of the TiN coating from the independent measurements of Young's modulus and hardness. At a force of 500 mN, the ISO 14577 test method gave a modulus of  $238 \pm 6.5$  GPa for the uncoated surface. Steels normally have Young's moduli between 200 GPa and 220 GPa, so this value is slightly higher than expected. However, AISI M42 is a complex alloy of iron and nine different alloying metals. The alloying metals comprise about 25% of the material by weight [8].

However, the parameter  $S^2/P$  does allow us to draw meaningful conclusions about the value of the TiN coating, because this parameter is independent of contact area. The

parameter  $S^2/P$  is plotted against surface penetration in Figure 8. The scatter in this plot is much lower than the scatter in the plots of Young's modulus and hardness. It is reasonable to attribute the scatter in Figure 8 to real point-to-point variation in material properties.

Two important conclusions can be drawn from the data in Figure 8. First, the blade surface does have an improved resistance to damage, as evidenced by the significantly lower value of the parameter  $S^2/P$  at small penetration depths. However, this resistance does not seem to depend on the presence of the TiN coating, as both the coated and uncoated regions manifest similar depth profiles for the parameter  $S^2/P$  over the range of 10 nm to 2 microns. Other mechanical tests might reveal an advantage conferred by the coating. For example, the lateral-force option of the G200 might be used to measure the friction coefficient of the coated and uncoated regions. However, the tests performed in this work reveal no mechanical advantage conferred by the TiN coating.

Both test methods are useful in their own way. CSM is useful, because every individual test returns complete depth profiles of modulus, hardness, and  $S^2/P$ . Testing according to ISO 14577 is useful, because it is a standardized test method, and because scatter is generally lower, relative to CSM under identical conditions. If it is important to measure properties according to a




Figure 8.  $S^2/P$  vs. penetration depth for coated and uncoated regions of the utility blade. Lower value of this parameter means greater resistance to damage. These results do not reveal any mechanical advantage conferred by the TiN coating.

standard test method, then CSM can be used for preliminary testing in order to determine the ideal peak force or depth that should be used for the standard measurements.

### Conclusions

As manufactured, the surface of this product was too rough to draw meaningful conclusions about the value of the TiN coating from the independent measurements of hardness and Young's modulus. However, the parameter  $S^2/P$ , which is proportional to the parameter  $E_r^2/H$  but independent of contact area, had much lower scatter. This parameter revealed no mechanical advantage conferred by the TiN coating.

Instrumented indentation testing (IIT) is an essential tool for evaluating films, coatings, and surface layers which are used to improve mechanical performance and longevity. Although the contact-mechanics theory behind instrumented indentation testing is complex, the Agilent G200 Nanoindenter makes IIT one of the simplest and fastest types of mechanical testing, because sample preparation is relatively easy, and hundreds of tests can be performed on a single sample. Continuous stiffness measurement (CSM) is a valuable addition to basic IIT; it is used to measure properties of thin films and surface layers as a continuous function of penetration depth.

## References

1. I.N. Sneddon, "The Relation Between Load and Penetration in the Axisymmetric Boussinesq Problem for a Punch of Arbitrary Profile," *Int. J. Eng. Sci.*, Vol. 3, pp. 47–56, 1965.
2. W.C. Oliver and G.M. Pharr, "An Improved Technique for Determining Hardness and Elastic Modulus Using Load and Displacement Sensing Indentation Experiments," *J. Mater. Res.*, Vol. 7 (No. 6), pp. 1564–1583, 1992.
3. W.C. Oliver and J.B. Pethica, "Method for continuous determination of the elastic stiffness of contact between two bodies," U.S. Patent 4848141, 1989.
4. D.L. Joslin and W.C. Oliver, "A new method for analyzing data from continuous depth-sensing microindentation tests," *J. Mater. Res.*, Vol. 5 (No. 1) pp. 123–126, 1990.
5. T.F. Page, G.M. Pharr, J.C. Hay, W.C. Oliver, B.N. Lucas, E.G. Herbert, and L. Riester, "Nanoindentation characterization of coated systems: P:S2—A new approach using the continuous stiffness technique," in *Fundamentals of Nanoindentation and Nanotribology*, MRS Symposium Proc., Vol. 522, pp. 53–64, 1998.
6. Y.T. Cheng and C.M. Cheng, "Relationships between hardness, elastic modulus, and the work of indentation," *Applied Physics Letters*, Vol. 73 (No. 5), pp. 614–616, 1998.
7. "Metallic materials — Instrumented indentation test for hardness and materials parameters," ISO 14577, 2002.
8. [http://www.efunda.com/Materials/alloys/tool\\_steels/show\\_tool.cfm?ID=AISI\\_M42&show\\_prop=all&Page\\_Title=AISI%20M42](http://www.efunda.com/Materials/alloys/tool_steels/show_tool.cfm?ID=AISI_M42&show_prop=all&Page_Title=AISI%20M42)

## Nano Mechanical Systems from Agilent Technologies

Agilent Technologies, the premier measurement company, offers high-precision, modular nano-measurement solutions for research, industry, and education. Exceptional worldwide support is provided by experienced application scientists and technical service personnel. Agilent's leading-edge R&D laboratories ensure the continued, timely introduction and optimization of innovative, easy-to-use nanomechanical system technologies.

[www.agilent.com/find/nanoindenter](http://www.agilent.com/find/nanoindenter)

### Americas

---

Canada	(877) 894 4414
Latin America	305 269 7500
United States	(800) 829 4444

### Asia Pacific

---

Australia	1 800 629 485
China	800 810 0189
Hong Kong	800 938 693
India	1 800 112 929
Japan	0120 (421) 345
Korea	080 769 0800
Malaysia	1 800 888 848
Singapore	1 800 375 8100
Taiwan	0800 047 866
Thailand	1 800 226 008

### Europe & Middle East

---

Austria	43 (0) 1 360 277 1571
Belgium	32 (0) 2 404 93 40
Denmark	45 70 13 15 15
Finland	358 (0) 10 855 2100
France	0825 010 700*
	*0.125 €/minute
Germany	49 (0) 7031 464 6333
Ireland	1890 924 204
Israel	972-3-9288-504/544
Italy	39 02 92 60 8484
Netherlands	31 (0) 20 547 2111
Spain	34 (91) 631 3300
Sweden	0200-88 22 55
Switzerland	0800 80 53 53
United Kingdom	44 (0) 118 9276201

Other European Countries:

[www.agilent.com/find/contactus](http://www.agilent.com/find/contactus)

Product specifications and descriptions in this document subject to change without notice.

© Agilent Technologies, Inc. 2010  
Printed in USA, January 19, 2010  
5990-5286EN