AD		
	 -	-

AD-E400 972

TECHNICAL REPORT ARLCD-TR-82028

EROSION RESISTANCE EVALUATION OF POTENTIAL GUN BARREL COATINGS

ARTHUR J. BRACUTI JOSEPH A. LANNON LCUIS A. BOTTEI ARRADCOM

D. BHAT SAN FERNANDO LABORATORIES PACOIMA. CA 91331

FEBRUARY 1983



て

) ()

(·)

AD A 1

US ARMY ARMAMENT RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT-COMMAND LARGE CALIBER WEAPON SYSTEMS LABORATORY DOVER, NEW JERSEY



The views, opinions, and/or findings contained in this report are those of the author(s) and should not be construed as an official Department of the Army position, policy, or decision, unless so designated by other documentation.

The citation in this report of the names of commercial firms or commercially available products or services does not constitute official endorsement by or approval of the U.S. Government.

Destroy this report when no longer needed. Do not return to the originator.

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE Descriptions REPORT NUMBER 1. SOUT ACCESSION NO. 1. RECITING FORM Rechnical Report ARLCD-TR-82028 AD-A/A&/A/A AD-A/A&/A/A D. REPORT DOCUMENTATION OF 5. TYPE OF MEPORT & PERIOD COVERED READING 5. TYPE OF MEPORT & PERIOD COVERED REPORT LA GUN RESISTANCE EVALUATION OF Final FOTENTIAL GUN BARREL COATINGS 5. TYPE OF MEPORT & PERIOD COVERED Authory 5. TYPE OF MEPORT & PERIOD COVERED AUTHORY Sama Farnando Laboratories AUTHORY 6. CONTRALING ORDANIES Name AND ADDRESS 1. REPORT DATE RERADCOM, LONIL 1. CONTROLING OFFICE AND AND RESS RERADCOM, TSD 1. AREPORT DATE TINFO DIV (DRDAR-TSS) 1. NUMBER OF PAGES JOYET, NJ 07801 1. AREPORT DATE AUTHORY SECURITY CLASS (OF MAR AND ADDRESS REPORT DATESS 1. NUMBER OF FAGES JOYET, NJ 07801 1. SECURITY CLASS (OF MAR AND ADDRESS NUMITION STATEMENT (of the Appreci SUPPLEMENTARY HOTES 1. SECURITY CLASS (OF MAR AND ADDRESS (IF different free Report) SUPPLEMENTARY HOTES 1. SECURITY CLASS (OF MAR AND ADDRESS (IF different free Re	UNCLASSIFIED SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Date Entering)	
REPORT NUMBER Is GOVT ACCESSION NO. 1: RECIPIENT ELECTALIS AND ADDRESS READCOM, LONSI. JEANS AND ENSITY OF AND ADDRESS READCOM, SO ALECTALIS AND ADDRESS READCOM, SD TOA 9 DOVER, NJ 07801 LONTROLING STATEMENT (of the Ampony DOVER, NJ 07801 LONTROLING STATEMENT (of the Ampony DUPLIS ELECTION FORMERS (INTERNATION AND E ADDRESS (I	REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE	READ INSTRUCTIONS
Prechnical Report ARLCD-TR-82028 DD-A/26 /C7 A TILE (and Bahrids) F. TYPE OF REPORT & PERMOD COVERED EROSION RESISTANCE EVALUATION OF Jan 1980 FOTENTIAL GUN BARREL COATINGS F. TYPE OF REPORT & PERMOD COVERED Authonyo S. CONTRACT ON GRANT NUMBER Authonyo E. CONTRACT ON GRANT NUMBER Authonyo E. CONTRACT ON GRANT NUMBER J. Bat, San Fernando Laboretories I. PERFORMING GRANT NUMBER IRRADCOM, LONSL Polite Statemeet Biv (DRDAR-LCA-G) Jover, NJ 07801 I. CONTROLLING OFFICE NEE AND ADDRESS IRRADCOM, TSD II. NEFORT DAYE Pebruary 1983 II. NEFORT DAYE TINFO Div (DRDAR-TSS) Junclassified Jover, NJ 07801 J. Unclassified II. DIV (DRDAR-TSS) Junclassified Jover of public release; distribution unlimited. II. DIFFIGUTION STATEMENT (of the Memory on the Memory of the Memory) A BUPPLEMENTARY NOTES r. Bhat was responsible for applying the various sample coatings to reduce gun arrel erosion. I MERT Contrast of the Memory and Memory and Memory) un barrel weat A MORDE AND TATEMENT (of the Memory and Memory) un barrel coating Junclassified The Memory)	1. REPORT NUMBER	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
Herenizel Report ARECU-TR-B2028 All-1/LAC / (// Ittle de denning Ittle de denning EROSION RESISTANCE EVALUATION OF Final Jan 1980 Jan 1981 CAUTHORKO E CONTRACT OF GRANT NUMBER February 1983 IN NUMBER OF PROTES FINEDUTION STATEMENT (of the Report) IN NUMBER OF PROTES STORTONING OF PUBLIC release; distribution unlimited. 29 CONTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the Authors and Identify by block number) In Exponsion Conting CONTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the Authors and Identify by block number) In CONTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the Authors and Identify by block number) A DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the Authors and Identify by block number) In CONTRIBUTION STATEMEN	NX 4151, 101	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
AUTHORMY POTENTIAL GUN BARREL COATING POTENTIAL GUN BARREL COATING AUTHORMY ALTHORMY	Technical Report ARLCD-TR-82028 RID-TTAY ICT	A TYPE OF PERGET & REMODICOUTERD
EROSION RESISTANCE EVALUATION OF POTENTIAL GUN BARREL COATINGS - AUTHORY, Authory J. Bracuti. Joseph A. Lannon, Louis A. Bottei, Project Engineers, ARRADCOM D. Bhat, San Fernando Laboratories - Exformation organization and a constantiation - Barload Constantiation and a constantiation - Barload Constantiatin - Barload C		DATE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED
20TENTIAL GUN BARREL COATINGS Jun 1200 - Jun 201 2 Jun 1200 - Series and Continues Series and Continues of the series and ser	EROSION RESISTANCE EVALUATION OF	Final
AUTHOR(4) Yrthur J. Bracuti. Joseph A. Lannon, Jouls A. Bottei, Project Engineers, ARRADCOM J. Bhat, San Fernando Laboratories Performing offennitation HAME AND ADDREss ARRADCOM LCWSL. Pipiled Sciences Div (DRDAR-LCA-G) Jover, NJ 07801 L CONTROLING OFFICE HAME AND ADDREss IRRADCOM, TSD TINFO Div (DRDAR-TSS) Jover, NJ 07801 L CONTROLING OFFICE HAME AND ADDREss II. REPORT DAYE February 1983 TINFO Div (DRDAR-TSS) Jover, NJ 07801 Unclassified II. REPORT DAYE February 1983 TINFO Div (DRDAR-TSS) Jover, NJ 07801 Jover, NJ 07801 J. CONTROLING OFFICE HAME AND ADDREss II. REPORT DAYE February 1983 TINFO Div (DRDAR-TSS) Jover, NJ 07801	POTENTIAL GUN BARREL COATINGS	6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER
 Authorký Arthur J. Bracuti. Joseph A. Lannon, Jouls A. Bottei, Project Engineers, ARRADCOM J. Bhat, San Fernando Laboratories - Perromineo GRAMIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS - NERKADCOM, LCWSL Pplied Sciences Div (DRDAR-LCA-G) Jover, NJ 07801 CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS - RRADCOM, TSD TINFO Div (DRDAR-TSS) Jover, NJ 07801 CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS - READOWNER OF PAGES - DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the ADDRESS() different from Controlling Office) DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the Address of the open of SCH Could Factorian and the second of the second of		
Arthur J. Bracuti Joseph A. Lannon, Louis A. Bottei, Project Engineers, ARRADCOM O. Bhat, San Fernando Laboratories FERFORMING GRANNEATION NAME AND ADDRESS FERFORMING GRANNEATION NAME AND ADDRESS RERADCOM, LCWSL. Applied Sciences Div (DRDAR-LCA-G) JOVER, NJ 07801 1. CONTROLLING CEFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS RRADCOM, TSD STINFO Div (DRDAR-TSS) Dover, NJ 07801 1. CONTROLLING CEFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS RRADCOM, TSD TINFO Div (DRDAR-TSS) Dover, NJ 07801 1. SECURITY CLASS. (of the report) Unclassified 1. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the destract entered in Block 20, If different from Report) P. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the destract entered in Block 20, If different from Report) b. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES T. Bhat was responsible for applying the various sample coatings to reduce gun atrel erosion. b. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse olds If necessary and Identify by block number) un barrel coating un barrel erosion Distrate erosion the diverse of the researce and identify by block number) b. SUPPLEMENTARY HOTES A ADSTRACT (Continue on reverse olds If necessary and Identify by block number) b. SUPPLEMENTARY HOTES A ADSTRACT (Continue on reverse olds If necessary and Identify by block number) D. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse olds If necessary and Identify by block number) D. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse olds If necessary and Identify by block number) b. SUPPLEMENTARY HOTES A ADSTRACT (Continue on reverse olds If necessary and Identify by block number) D. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse olds If necessary and Identify by block number) D. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse olds If necessary and Identify by block number) D. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse olds If necessary and Identify by block number) D. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse olds If necessary and Identify by block number) D. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse olds If necessary and Identify by blo	7. AUTHOR(a)	B. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER'S)
Jouis A. Bottei, Project Engineers, ARRADCOM D. Bhat, San Fernando Laboratories * PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS * PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS RRADCOM, LCMSL. hyplied Sciences Div (DRDAR-LCA-G) Dover, NJ 07801 1. CONTMOLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS RRADCOM, TSD TINFO Biv (DRDAR-TSS) Dover, NJ 07801 1. CONTMOLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS RRADCOM, TSD TINFO Div (DRDAR-TSS) Dover, NJ 07801 1. WONDER OF PAGES Verning ARENCY NAME & ADDRESS(!! different from Controling Office) 1. BECURITY CLASS. (of this report) TINFO Biv (DRDAR-TSS) Dover, NJ 07801 1. CONTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the Report) I. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the Report) T. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the destrect mitterd in Block 20, if different from Report) I. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES r. Bhat was responsible for applying the various sample coatings to reduce gun arrel erosion. b. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) un barrel coating un barrel were indicated poor adhesion between each re- factory metal coating and 4340 steel. Mechanical failure of the molybdenum substrate complicated the erosion da	Arthur J. Bracuti, Joseph A. Lannon,	
	Louis A. Bottei, Project Engineers, ARRADCOM	
Performing Organization Amile and Address Applied Sciences Div (DRDAR-LCA-G) TOA 9	D. Bhat, San Fernando Laboratories	
Introduction LUND: Introduction TOA 9 Dover, NJ 07801 TOA 9 I. controlling office NAME AND ADDRESS II. REFORT DATE RRADCOM, TSD February 1983 Dover, NJ 07801 II. REFORT DATE Prover, NJ 07801 II. REFORT DATE I. MONITONING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(// different from Controling Office) II. REFORT DATE I. MONITONING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(// different from Controling Office) II. REFORT DATE I. MONITONING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(// different from Controling Office) II. REFORT DATE I. MONITONING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(// different from Controling Office) III. REFORT DATE I. MONITONING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(// different from Controling Office) III. REFORT DATE I. MONITONING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(// different from Controling Office) III. REFORT DATE I. METHING TON STATEMENT (of the American Intered in Block 20, // different from Report) IIII. REFORT DATE Proved for public release; distribution unlimited. IIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIII	ADDADCOM LOUGT	10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS
TOA 9	ARRADUUM, LUWOL	
I. CONTROLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS IRADOM, TSD IRADOM, TSD STINFO Div (DRDAR-TSS) JOVER, NJ 07801 I. MUMBEROF PAGES J9 I. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) Unclassified Unclassified Unclassified Unclassified Unclassified I. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) Unclassified Unclas	Dower NI 07801	TOA 9
RRADCOM, TSD STINFO Div (DRDAR-TSS) Dover, NJ 07801 4. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(<i>II different free Controlling Office</i>) 4. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(<i>II different free Controlling Office</i>) 4. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(<i>II different free Controlling Office</i>) 4. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(<i>II different free Controlling Office</i>) 4. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(<i>II different free Controlling Office</i>) 5. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, <i>II different free Report</i>) 5. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, <i>II different free Report</i>) 5. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES 7. Bhat was responsible for applying the various sample coatings to reduce gun arrel erosion. 5. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse olds <i>II necessary and identify by block number</i>) 9. Not was responsed by <i>Necessary and identify by block number</i>) 9. Not was responsed by <i>Necessary and identify by block number</i>) 9. Not was responsed by <i>Necessary and identify by block number</i>) 9. Not was responsed by <i>Necessary and identify by block number</i>) 9. Not was responsed by <i>Necessary and identify by block number</i>) 9. Not was responsed by <i>Necessary and identify by block number</i>) 9. Not barrel coating 9. Not steel and molybdenum substrate were investigated. Erosion data ac- 9. Add Steel and molybdenum substrate were investigated. Erosion data ac- 9. Not the ARRADCOM test device indicated poor adhesion between each re- 9. Table complicated the erosion data, but if was concluded that the true true. 9. State complicated the region data, but if was concluded the the true. 9. State complicated the region data, but if was concluded the the true. 9. State complicated the region data, but if was concluded the the true. 9. State complicated the region data, but if was concluded the the true. 9. State complicated the region data, but if was concluded the the true. 9. State complicated the region data. 9. State complicate the state true. 9. State complicate the state true. 9.	11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS	
STINFO Div (DRDAR-TSS) Dover, NJ 07801 4. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(# different from Controlling Office) 4. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(# different from Controlling Office) 4. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(# different from Controlling Office) 4. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(# different from Controlling Office) 4. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(# different from Controlling Office) 5. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the electron microd in Block 20, # different from Report) 5. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the electron microd in Block 20, # different from Report) 5. SUPPLEMENTARY HOTES 7. Bhat was responsible for applying the various sample coatings to reduce gun arrel erosion. 5. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side # necessary and identify by block number) 9. Marrel coating 9. Marrel wear 1. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side # necessary and identify by block number) 1. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side # necessary and identify by block number) 1. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side # necessary and identify by block number) 1. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side # necessary and identify by block number) 1. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side # necessary and identify by block number) 1. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side # necessary and identify by block number) 1. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side # necessary and identify by block number) 1. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side # necessary and identify by block number) 1. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side # necessary and identify by block number) 1. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side # necessary and identify by block number) 1. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side # necessary and identify by block number) 1. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side # necessary and identify by block number) 1. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side # necessary and identify by block number) 1. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side # necessary and identify by block number) 1. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side # necessary and identify by block number) 1. AB	ARRADCOM. TSD	February 1983
29 29 29 29 29 29 29 29 29 20 29 20 29 20 29 20 29 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20	STINFO Div (DRDAR-TSS)	13. NUMBER OF PAGES
MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(If different from Controlling Office) Is SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) Unclassified Unclassified Unclassified Supproved for public release; distribution unlimited. OISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the obstract mitteed in Block 20, If different from Report) Unclassified SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES r. Bhat was responsible for applying the various sample coatings to reduce gun arrel erosion. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse elde if necessary and identify by block number) un barrel coating un barrel erosion un barrel erosion the reverse elde if necessary and identify by block number) ABSTRACT (Caciting and how substrate were investigated. Erosion data ac- uired with the ARRACOM test device indicated poor adhesion between each re- ractory metal coating and 4340 steel. Mechanical failure of the molybdenum ubstrate complicated the tracter of	Dover, NJ 07801	29
Unclassified Uscretification/DowndRadDing Constrained for public release; distribution unlimited.	14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(It different from Controlling Office)	15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report)
Unclassified 18. processified 18. processified		
DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the Report) Approved for public release; distribution unlimited. JUSTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the electric entered in Block 20, If different from Report) JUSTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the electric entered in Block 20, If different from Report) JUSTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the electric entered in Block 20, If different from Report) JUSTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the electric entered in Block 20, If different from Report) JUSTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the electric entered in Block 20, If different from Report) JUSTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the electric entered in Block 20, If different from Report) JUSTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the electric entered in Block 20, If different from Report) JUSTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the electric entered in Block 20, If different from Report) JUSTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the electric entered in Block 20, If different from Report) JUSTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the electric entered in Block 20, If different from Report) JUSTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the electric entered in Block 20, If different from Report) JUSTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the electric entered in Block 20, If different from Report) JUSTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the electric entered in Block 20, If different from Report) JUSTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the electric entered in Block 20, If different from Report) JUSTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the electric entered in Block 20, If different from Report) JUSTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the electric entered in Block 20, If different from Report) JUSTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the electric entered in Block 20, If different from Report) LECTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the electric entered in the electric enterees investigated. Erosion data ac- JUSTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the erosion data. Ac- JUSTRIBUTION ELECTRIC enterees electric		Unclassified
DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Approved for public release; distribution unlimited. J. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the obstract entered in Block 20, If different from Report) SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES T. Bhat was responsible for applying the various sample coatings to reduce gun arrel erosion. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) un barrel coating un barrel erosion un barrel wear ARSTRACT (Continue on reverse side If necessary and identify by block number) he erosion resistance of tungsten/carbon and tantalum/tungsten deposited on ISI 4340 steel and molybdenum substrate were investigated. Erosion data ac- uired with the ARRADCOM test device indicated poor adhesion between each re- ractory metal coating and 4340 steel. Mechanical failure of the molybdenum		SCHEDULE
<pre>approved for public release; distribution unlimited. >> DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the obstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report) >> SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES r. Bhat was responsible for applying the various sample coatings to reduce gun arrel erosion. >> KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) un barrel coating un barrel erosion un barrel erosion >> KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) He erosion resistance of tungsten/carbon and tantalum/tungsten deposited on ISI 4340 steel and molybdenum substrate were investigated. Erosion data ac- uired with the ARRADCOM test device indicated poor adhesion between each re- ractory metal coating and 4340 steel. Mechanical failure of the molybdenum ubstrate complicated the erosion data but it was concluded that the tungeten/c</pre>	A DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report)	
 SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES r. Bhat was responsible for applying the various sample coatings to reduce gun arrel erosion. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse elds if necessary and identify by block number) un barrel coating un barrel erosion un barrel wear ABSTRACT (Continue an reverse olds if necessary and identify by block number) he erosion resistance of tungsten/carbon and tantalum/tungsten deposited on ISI 4340 steel and molybdenum substrate were investigated. Erosion data acuired with the ARRADCOM test device indicated poor adhesion between each reractory metal coating and 4340 steel. Mechanical failure of the molybdenum ubstrate complicated the erosion data, but it was concluded that the tungsten/ 	17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the obstract entered in Block 20, if different fro	m Report)
ANSTRACT (Continue on reverse elde if necessary and identify by block number) ANSTRACT (Continue on reverse elde if necessary and identify by block number) ANSTRACT (Continue on reverse elde if necessary and identify by block number) ANSTRACT (Continue on reverse elde if necessary and identify by block number) ANSTRACT (Continue on reverse elde if necessary and identify by block number) ANSTRACT (Continue on reverse elde if necessary and identify by block number) he erosion resistance of tungsten/carbon and tantalum/tungsten deposited on ISI 4340 steel and molybdenum substrate were investigated. Erosion data acuired with the ARRADCOM test device indicated poor adhesion between each reractory metal coating and 4340 steel. Mechanical failure of the molybdenum ubstrate complicated the erosion data, but it was concluded that the tungsten/	18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES Dr. Bhat was responsible for applying the various of	ample contings to reduce sup
 KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) un barrel coating un barrel erosion un barrel wear ANSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) he erosion resistance of tungsten/carbon and tantalum/tungsten deposited on ISI 4340 steel and molybdenum substrate were investigated. Erosion data ac- uired with the ARRADCOM test device indicated poor adhesion between each re- ractory metal coating and 4340 steel. Mechanical failure of the molybdenum ubstrate complicated the erosion data, but it was concluded that the tungsten/ 	barrel erosion.	ampre coactings to reduce gui
un barrel coating un barrel erosion un barrel wear AABSTRACT (Continue on reverse etch H mesonery and identify by block number) he erosion resistance of tungsten/carbon and tantalum/tungsten deposited on ISI 4340 steel and molybdenum substrate were investigated. Erosion data ac- uired with the ARRADCOM test device indicated poor adhesion between each re- ractory metal coating and 4340 steel. Mechanical failure of the molybdenum ubstrate complicated the erosion data, but it was concluded that the tungsten/	19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse elde if necessary and identify by block number)	
un barrel erosion un barrel wear ADSTRACT (Continue on reverse etch N necessary and identify by block number) he erosion resistance of tungsten/carbon and tantalum/tungsten deposited on ISI 4340 steel and molybdenum substrate were investigated. Erosion data ac- uired with the ARRADCOM test device indicated poor adhesion between each re- ractory metal coating and 4340 steel. Mechanical failure of the molybdenum ubstrate complicated the erosion data, but it was concluded that the tungsten/	Gun barrel coating	
ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse olds N necessary and identify by block number) he erosion resistance of tungsten/carbon and tantalum/tungsten deposited on ISI 4340 steel and molybdenum substrate were investigated. Erosion data ac- uired with the ARRADCOM test device indicated poor adhesion between each re- ractory metal coating and 4340 steel. Mechanical failure of the molybdenum ubstrate complicated the erosion data, but it was concluded that the tungsten/	Gun barrel erosion	
ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse olds N necessary and identify by block number) he erosion resistance of tungsten/carbon and tantalum/tungsten deposited on ISI 4340 steel and molybdenum substrate were investigated. Erosion data ac- uired with the ARRADCOM test device indicated poor adhesion between each re- ractory metal coating and 4340 steel. Mechanical failure of the molybdenum ubstrate complicated the erosion data, but it was concluded that the tungsten/	Gun barrel wear	
he erosion resistance of tungsten/carbon and tantalum/tungsten deposited on ISI 4340 steel and molybdenum substrate were investigated. Erosion data ac- uired with the ARRADCOM test device indicated poor adhesion between each re- ractory metal coating and 4340 steel. Mechanical failure of the molybdenum ubstrate complicated the erosion data, but it was concluded that the tungsten/	20. A BRTEACT (Tradition on sources and Management and Identify by Mark sumbor)	
arbon coating performed better than steel at higher pressures. No apparent ad- antage was observed with the tantalum/tungsten coating at any pressure.	The erosion resistance of tungsten/carbon and tantal AISI 4340 steel and molybdenum substrate were invest quired with the ARRADCOM test device indicated poor fractory metal coating and 4340 steel. Mechanical f substrate complicated the erosion data, but it was o carbon coating performed better than steel at higher vantage was observed with the tantalum/tungsten coat	lum/tungsten deposited on tigated. Erosion data ac- adhesion between each re- failure of the molybdenum concluded that the tungsten/ r pressures. No apparent ad- ting at any pressure.
(cont)		(cont)

he

DD 1 JAN 73 1473 EDITION OF I NOV 65 IS OBSOLETE

UNCLASSIFIED SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Date Entered)

1.1.8<u>88.8</u>.8

... 🗥

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE(Men Date Entered)

20. ABSTRACT (cont)

Ŀ

Microscopic examination of the coatings showed extensive gas erosion of the surface of the tantalum/tungsten coating, but very little erosion in the tungsten/ carbon surface.

UNCLASSIFIED SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE(When Date Entered)

and a second second

. **.**

CONTENTS

Ъ.,

		Page
Introduction		1
Procedure		1
Tungsten/Carbon Coatings Tantalum/Tungsten Coating Erosion Testing		1 2 2
Results and Comparisons		. 3
Steel Sleeves (AISI 4340) Tantalum/Tungsten Coatings Molybdenum Sleeves Tantalum/Tungsten Coatings	(Steel Sleeves) (Molybdenum Sleeves)	3 4 5 6
Conclusions		6

Distribution List

L

Accession For	
NTIS GRA&I	
Justification] \ 5 ° \$
By Distuites or/	
	-
Dist	
A	

21

. *

TABLES

ŀ

E

1	Typical conditions for depositing CM500L and 90Ta-10W alloy	7
2	M30 composition and physico-chemico properties	8
3	Erosion data for CM500L coated steel sleeves	9
4	Erosion data for AISI 4340 steel	9
5	Erosion data for Ta/W coated steel sleeves	10
6	Erosion data for CM500 coated molybdenum sleeves	11
7	Erosion data for Ta/W coated molybdenum sleeves	13

FIGURES

ľ

1.1.1

1	Erosion apparatus	15
2	CM500L coating on steel (600X/3000X)	16
3	Eroded CM500L coating on steel (550X/2200X)	16
4	Fractured and eroded Ta/W coating on steel (150X)	17
5	Eroded steel substrate adjacent to Ta/W conting (700X/3500X)	17
6	CM500 coating on molybdenum substrate with radial crack	18
7	Eroded CM500 coating on molybdenum substrate (60X/350X)	18
8	Chipped CM500 coating at bore leading edge (220X/100X)	i 9

INTRODUCTION

This report documents an attempt to minimize or reduce gun barrel erosion in large caliber guns. The correction of the gun barrel erosion problem can be addressed from several directions. One approach is to formulate new propellants or modify current propellants to produce less erosive combustion products without significantly sacrificing propellant energetics; another is to modify gun barrels in some way to better resist the erosive combustion environments 'roduced by current propellants. Both approaches have been used with varyi degrees of success, including new low flame-temperature propellants and tradit hal plating of gun barrels with chrome.

Although refractory metals that are potentially superior to chromium have been available, and more are being discovered every day, limited use has been made of these materials because of the difficulties encountered in coating gun barrels. Recently, however, coating deposition technology has made such strides that use of these exotic refractory metals in gun barrels is now feasible. Specifically, Cullinan and D'Andrea¹ reported encouraging results in using tantalum coated 20-mm steel liners.

The main thrust of this program was to develop refractory coatings suitable for use in large caliber gun: . Three candidate refractory metal alloys, tungsten/ cargon alloy; (CM500) low-temperature deposited tungsten/carbon alloy; (CM500L), and 98% Ta/2% W alloy were applied to AISI 4340 steel and molybdenum substrates to test each alloy's erosion behavior under controlled, simulated gun firing conditions.

PROCEDURE

Tungsten/Carbon Coatings

Both AISI 4340 steel and molybdenum inserts were coated with tungsten/carbon alloy by means of the chemical vapor deposition (CVD) process. The steel samples were coated at low temperature (725 K) with tungsten carbon alloy (W/C), identified by the contractor as CM500L, while the molybdenum inserts were coated at higher temperatures ranging from 1165 to 1245 K with the W/C alloy identified by the contractor as CM500.

To protect the steel substrate from the corrosivity of the reactive gases at the deposition temperature when WF_6 is used as the tungstem precursor, an initial

¹ R. Cullinan and G. D'Andrea, "Erosion Studies of Tantulum Gun Barrels," 1980 JANNAF Propulsion Meeting, vol I, p 201, 1980. thin layer of relatively inert metal, in this case electroless nickel, was deposited onto the steel substrate. In addition to being inert, nickel is also compatible with both steel and tungsten. The deposition parameters, substrate temperature, chamber pressure, gas flow rate, and gas composition are presented in table 1.

Tantalum/Tungsten Coatings

Test inserts of AISI 4340 steel and molybdenum were coated with Ta/W alloy at deposition temperatures ranging from 1300-1450 K. An initial layer of titanium was deposited from the vapor phase onto the steel substrate to form an interlayer which is compatible with both iron (steel) and tantalum. Titanium waa selected rather than nickel because, in addition to the higher melting point, citanium also reacts with the carbon and the steel substrate to form a thin surface layer of titanium carbide (TiC). This stable TiC layer is an effective carbon diffusion barrier which prevents any further interaction of carbon in the steel with the tantalum coating. This eliminates the possibility of the formation of the undesired brittle TaC. After this titanization process, Ta/W alloy was coated onto the Ti-TiC layer. This was accomplished by passing chlorine over 90 Ta/10W alloy chips from a mixture of metal chloride gases, Ta Cl_5 (g), WCl_6 (g), WCl_5 (g) which was reduced onto the substrate surface by hydrogen as Ta/W Although the target composition was 90% tantalum and 10% tungsten, the alloy. achieved composition was 98% tantalum and 2% tungsten. The working parameters for this process are presented in table 1.

Erosion Testing

The erosion data were obtained with a closed bomb modified to accept a gun barrel and a cylindrical metal erosion sleeve. This variation of the closed bomb is usually referred to as the vented erosion tester and is shown in figure 1. In this investigation, the erosion sleeves consisted of AISI 4340 steel, refractory metal coated AISI 4340 steel, and refractory metal coated molybdenum. Each sleeve was fabricated to have an outer diameter of 2.70 cm, an inner diameter of 0.95 cm, and a length of 2.06 cm. The average masses of the steel and molybdenum erosion sleeves were 80 g and 103 g, respectively. A pressure transducer positioned inside the chamber (closed bomb) was connected to a Nicolet digital oscilloscope which was scaled to display pressure versus time. To control pressure, a stainless steel rupture disc was inserted between the barrel and the erosion sleeve. In addition, the barrel was filled with water and a rubber stopper inserted into the muzzle to insure proper pressure buildup.

The Bach CM500% coated steel sleeve and the CM500 coated molybdenum sleeve were cleaned, weighed, fired three times, recleaned, and reweighed. After three whots, the average weight loss was used as a measure of erosivity. For the Ta/Wcoated steel sleeves, an initial single-shot mass loss was measured for each sample. All subsequent measurements made on these samples were based on average

weight losses for three successive shots. All erosion measurements made on Ta/Wcoated molybdenum sleeves were based on single shot weight-loss measurements.

The internal ballistics were controlled by arbitrarily adjusting the propelling charge weights to 30, 40 and 50 g which yielded peak pressure in the ranges of 150, 180 and 260 MPa, respectively. Since the same propellant (M30) was used throughout this study, flame temperature was a constant while burn times and peak pressures were measured charge-mass dependent parameters. The composition and physico-chemico properties of M30 propellant are listed in table 2.

RESULTS AND COMPARISONS

Steel Sleeves (AISI 4340)

CM500L Coatings

Two steel sleeves identified as nos 398 and 400 were received from the contractor with CM500L coatings of 0.010 cm and 0.015 cm thicknesses, respectively. Cursory visual examination by the Large Caliber Weapon Systems Laboratory indicated that each coating was deposited uniformly along the bore surface with no apparent local areas of defects. However, the contractor reported² that the coating on sleeve no. 400 did not appear to be as well bonded to the bore surface as did the other coatings. The hardness of the coating on sleeve no. 398 varied from 700 kg/mm² HV₅₀₀ near the steel substrate to 2400 kg/mm² HV₅₀₀ at the i.d. free surface. This hardness gradient was caused by the incorporation of carbon into the tungsten coating during the process. This results in a carbon rich tungsten carbide and tungsten layer at the i.d. free surface which displays greater hardness.

The erosion test data for the CM500L-coated sleeves are presented in table 3. In this work, all bore surface losses are reported as volume losses rather than mass losses. This departure from the usual convention of reporting mass losses was necessary to normalize all erosion data to a common scale to make erosion comparisons among the different coatings and steel meaningful.

Erosion data, obtained in the 150 MPa range indicated that sleeve no. 398 with the 0.010 cm CM500L coating retained 89.0% of the coating after three shots and 73.7% after the ninth shot, while the sleeve no. 400 with the 0.015 cm coating retained only 0.78% of the coating after three shots and 0.00% after the six shots. On an average per shot basis, the sleeve with the 0.010 cm coating lost $0.0017 \pm .00041$ cm³ and the other sleeve lost $0.01045 \pm .01696$ cm³. Steel sleeves on the other hand, displayed an average per shot erosion value of 0.00067 $\pm .00014$ in the 150 MPa pressure range (table 4). A comparison of these data suggested that 4340 steel apparently erodes less per shot them does CM500L alloy. The larger standard deviations observed in the erosion data for CM500L

² Chemetal letter from Robert Holzl dated October 8, 1979.

coatings suggested that different phenomena may be involved in each erosion event. In contrast, the small standard deviations observed for the steel sleeves at all pressures indicated that the same phenomena (or phenomenon) occur in each erosion event.

Visual examination of each sleeve after erosion testing revealed that little coating was left on sleeve no. 400 while a substantial amount of coating remained on sleeve no. 398. As a result of poor bonding or adhesion between the CM500L alloy and the steel substrate, most of the coating was blown off sleeve no. 400 within the first three shots. Also, the erosion data acquired with the remaining shots reflected the combined erosion effects of the exposed steel substrate and the remnants of CM500L coatings.

Scanning electron microscope (SEM) photographs of the etched cross section of a CM500L coated sleeve, not previously prosion tested, are presented in figure 2. These photographs clearly illustrate the concentric coherent layers of steel, nickel, columnar tungsten, and the outer layer of tungsten/tungsten carbides. The layer containing the tungsten carbides also exhibits a myriad of worm holes which probably result from the polishing operation used in sample preparation. During polishing, particles of W_2C are pulled out of the matrix which scratch or gouge the surface of the matrix. Examination of these worm holes indicated high carbon concentrations in the worm hole edges. A more highly magnified rendition of the coating shows the fine microstructure of the tungsten carbide layer. The SEM photographs of the CM500L coating remnants in figure 3 reveal the presence of cracks and wear tracks in coating after erosion testing. The wear tracks result from the erosive action of flowing hot gases, while the cracks may be a consequence of a structure-stress relationship. The growth morphology of the stressed tungsten layer is columnar which produces a microcrack network along grain boundaries that extends from the tungsten carbide surface to the steel substrate sur-Thermal-mechanical stresses produced during erosion testing adversely face. affected this microcrack network resulting in portions of this tungsten undercoating along with its tungsten carbide overlayer to break away from the steel substrate. This phenomenon was observed by Gibson³ for chromium coatings exhibiting columnar morphology.

Tantalum/Tungsten Coatings (Steel Sleeves)

.

Steel sleeves coated with 0.10 cm and 0.019 cm of Ta/W alloy were received from the contractor. The hardness of these coatings ranged from 350 to 400 kg/mm^2 HV₅₀₀. Energy dispersive x-ray analysis of the coatings revealed that the alloy composition was 98% Ta and 2% W, rather than the target composition of 90% Ta and 10% W. Hence, the hardness of the coatings was lower than expected. No titanium could be detected at the interface between the steel and the Ta/W alloy which indicated: (1) The steel substrate was not titanized as desired, and (2)

³ I. Gibson, "Development of A Vented Chamber Erosion System for Gun Barrel Coating Assessment Studies," (in press).

the Ta/W alloy was bonded directly to the steel substrate. Visual examination of the coatings, however, indicated apparent good interlayer bonding.

The Ta/W coated steel erosion data in table 5 were obtained in the 180 MPa pressure range. Sleeve no. 107 lost less than 1% during the first shot but lost the remainder of the coating during the next three shots. The other sleeve lost about 17% of the coating during the first shot and the remainder during the next Visual examination of each sleeve revealed massive spalling octhree shots. curred during testing. In both cases, the erosion per shot level apparently exceeded that of 4340 steel. An SEM photograph presented in figure 4 clearly The erosion effects on the surfaces of the steel and the Ta/W deshows: (1)posit, (2) the columnar morphology, and (3) the attendant microcrack metwork. A more highly magnified view of the severely eroded steel substrate immediately adjacent to the same remnant Ta/W coating (fig. 5) illustrates the drastic erosion caused by gas flow eddy currents.

Molybdenum Sleeves

CM500 Coatings

The hardness of the CM500 coated samples ranged from 2100 to 2400 HV_{500} . In contrast to the CM500L coatings; however, no hardness gradient was observed in the CM500 coating. This was considered indicative of a homogeneous coating in which all the alloy components were uniformly mixed in a single layer. The homogeneity of the fine microstructure of the CM500 coating is varified in the SEM photographs presented in figure 6.

The CM500 erosion test results, presented in table 5, were complicated by the fact that the molybdenum sleeves cracked longitudinally in eight out of ten In these cases, the reported erosion values may be artifically inflated cases. by the material lost during crack formation. In one case, sleeve no. 3, the cracking was so severe that it split in half. Examination of this sample revealed that, in addition to gross longitudinal cracks, small local cracks were evident in the coating. SEM photographs of a typical local crack, presented in figure 6, show that the crack in the coating terminates at the substrate interface, and that considerable gas erosion occurs at the substrate interface. Despite this catastrophic fracture of the coating and the cracking of the sleeve itself, CM500 displayed both excellent adhesion to the molybdenum substrate and good erosion resistance (fig. 7). It should also be noted that the leading edge of the bore surface of each sleeve exhibited extensive chipping. SEM photographs of a typical chipped leading edge presented in figure 8 clearly show a fractured coating with angular protuberances.

The erosion results presented in table 6 indicate that in the 150-MPs range, CM500 erosion performance is marginally worse than 4340 steel itself, but this may be an artifact caused by sleeve cracking and chipping. In the higher pressure regime, CM500 apparently performs better than steel. Also, the level of CM500 erosion does not increase significantly with erosion.

Tantalum/Tungsten Coatings (Molybdenum Sleeves)

Single shot erosion data for Ta/W-coated molybdenum sleeves are listed in table 7. Again, these results have been negatively affected by longitudinal cracking of the molybdenum sleeves and by chipping of the coating on the leading edge of the bore surface. Only two out of six samples exceed or replicate the average per-shot erosion performance of steel at 150 MPa, but this may not reflect the true erosion characteristics of this coating. At higher pressures, only one sample matches the average per shot erosion performance of steel. Examination of the standard deviations and each single shot erosion datum suggest multi-phenomena effects may randomly occur. For those shots where the coating matches or outperforms steel, erosion is the dominant or only effect; all other shots probably include losses which result because of crack formation and edge chipping.

CONCLUSIONS

From the data obtained, the following was concluded:

1. Tantalum/tungsten coatings offer little apparent advantage over steel in the ARRADCOM test device.

2. The tungsten/carbon alloy, CM500, is a candidate coating to reduce wear in gun tubes.

Adhesion problems with steel, however, have to be solved before this coating can be tested in a gun.

and a second and a second second

Table 1. Typical conditions for depositing CM500L and 90Ta-10W alloy

e Run time	(min)	60-130	120-270*	60	30-75
ubstrate temp	(K)	725	1425	t 1300- 1450	1165- 1245
Chamter S pressure	(MPa)	1 • 354	0.178-0.445	0.036-0.053	0.926
	T1C14		* 0†	11	11
	C ₂ H ₅ OH	0.5	11	11	11
(ml/min)	CH ₃ OH	11	11	11	120
rates	WF6	75- 100	I	11	250
flow 1	c1 ₂	11	75 135	25 100	11
Gas	Ar	11	1000 1500	75 250	ί I
	N2	10	LF	11	860 1135
	H ₂		840 1040	100 400	295 350
	Substrate	4340 steel	4340 steel	Q	Ŵ
	Deposit	CHSOOL	90Ta-10W	90Ta-10W	CH 500

TiCl $_4$ turned off after 30 min and Cl $_2$ * Includes 30 min TiCl4 for initial coating of Ti on steel.
flow started through 90Ta-10W alloy chip pot.

Table 2. M30 composition and physico-chemico properties

Composition	Pressure (MPa)
Nitrocellulose (12.6% N)	28.00
Nitroglycerine	22.50
Nitroguanidine	47.7
Ethyl-centralite	1.50
Graphite	1.10
Cryolite	0.30
Ethanol (residual)	0.30
Water (residual)	0.00

Properties*

$T_{f}(K)$.	2 99 0.0
C _p J/mol-K	43.6
$I^{r}(J/g)$	1072.0
CO (mol/kg)	11.9
H ₂ (mol/kg)	5.8
H ₂ 0 (mol/kg)	10.4
N_0 (mol/kg)	11.9
Cố ₂ (mol/kg)	3.0
Toťal (mol/kg)	43.1
$M_{,}$ (g/g-mol)	22.3
HEX obs cal/g	974.0

* Calculated by Blake Internal Ballistic Code

8

Table 3. Erosion data for CM500L coated steel sleeves*

	Pressure (MPa)	Erosion (cm ³ /shot)	Total erosion (cm ³)	Coating left (%)
		Sleeve no. 398 (0.0	10 cm coating)	
	157.78	0.00223	0.00669	89.00
	156.06	0.00168	0.00504	80.72
	159.37	0.00142	0.00426	73.71
Average	156.26±3.15	0.00178±.00041		
		Sleeve no. 400 (0.0	15 cm coating)	
	153.92	0.03003	0.09009	0.78
	155.02	0.00082	0.00246	0.00
	159.85	0.00049	0.00147	0.00
Average	156.26±3.15	0.0104±.01696		

* Three successive shots fired in each test.

ų

Table 4. Erosion data for AISI 4340 steel*

Average erosion (cm ³ /shot)
0.00041±.00015
0.00067±.00014
0.00106±.00013
0.00625±.00023

* Average value based on ten shots.

internet at a second second

No. of shots	Pressure (MPa)	Erosion (cm ³ /shot)	Total erosion (cm ³)	Coating left (%)
		Sleeve no. 107 (0.010	cm coating)	
1	185.17	0.00138	0.00138	99.77
3	183.96	0.02835	0.07505	0.00
Average	184.57±.86	ი.•01487±01907		
		Sleeve no. 110 (0.019	cm coating)	
1	183.96	0.01945	0.01945	83.01
3	193.96	0.04269	0.12807	0.00
Average	183 .96±. 00	0.03107±01643		

Table 5. Erosion data for Ta/W coated steel sleeves

.

· • •

. . .

Table 6. Brosion data for CM500 coated molybdenum sleeves*

1	Pressure (MPa)	Erosion (cm ³ /shot)	Coating left (X)	Total cracks
		Sleeve no. 1 (O.	0355 cm coating	
	144.1	0.000309	99.581	0
	183+3	0.001098	98.100	0
	220.5	0.001325	96-312	0
		Sleeve no. 2 (0.0	3912 cm costing)	
	143.8	0.001567	97 .809	0
	147.9	0.00149	95.725	0
	145.0	0.00053	94 • 981	0
(avg	0.0014 9± .000378)			
		Sleeve no. 3 (0.03912 cm costing)		
	148.8	0.000964	98.740	
	148.7	0.005093	92 • 080	Split in Half
(avg	0.00303±.00292)			
		Sleeve no. 4 (0.0	3912 cm costing)	
	145.1	0.001541	98.162	
	144.0	0.002108	95.647	
	143.9	0.000459	95.079	1
(avg	0.00137±.00084)			
		Sleeve no. 5 (0.0	0521 cm coating)	
	146.3	0.002515	97.599	
	144.4	0.004351	93.422	3

(avg 0.00343±.00130)

:-

Table 6. (cont)

]	Pressure (MPa)	Erosion (cm ³ /shot)	Coating left (%)	Total cracks
		Sleeve no. 6 (0.	0376 cm costing)	
	146.3 144.4	0.004206 0.000686	94 •567 93 •680	3
(avg	0.00245±.00249)			
		Sleeve no. 7 (0.		
	144.8 179.6	0.00582 0.000325	99•024 98•479	2
		Sleeve no. 8 (O.	1829 cm coating)	
	146.3 143.7	0.000504 0.002036	97.907 92.608	
(avg	0.00142±.00087)			
	178.45	0.000428	91.506	3

* Average value after three shots.

1	Pressure (MPa)	Erosion (cm ³ /shot)	Coating left (%)	Total cracks
		Sleeve no. 9 (0.	00381 cm coating)	
	140.5 144.7	0.00000 0.00045	100.00 98.078	
	141.2	0.000367	94.874	3
(avg	0.00030±.00020)			
	184.7	0.000843	91 •28ň	
	185.2 182.1	0.000837 0.00109	87•698 83•698	
(avg	0.00117±.00051)			
	219.1	0.00191	74.838	3
	Sample no. 12 (0.01586 cm coating)			
	150.2	0.000240	99.750	
	151.0	0.000129	99.616 99.252	
(avg	0.00014±.000093)		,,,,,,	
	184.7	0.0009160	93.43	
	186.0	0.002830	92.97	
	186.4	0.002950	`91 •96	3
(avg	0.00223±.00051)		•	
		04191 cm coating)		
	144.0	0.01300	94.732	
	144.0	0.00042	94.56	
	149.7	0.000475	94 • 36	
	142.6	0.000722	93.8	
(avg	0.00305±.00552)			
	183 3	0-000928	93.43	
	186.0	0.001145	92.97	
	186.0	0.00335	91.61	

Table 7. Erosion data for Ta/W coated molybdenum sleeves*

(avg 0.00181±.00134)

3

.

.

Table 7. (cont)

1	Pressure (MPs)	Erosion (cm ³ /shot)	Coating left (%)	Total cracks
		Sample no. 15 (0.0	9459 cm coating)	
	144.7	0.000915	99.680	
	143.3	0.00134	99 • 22 0	
	143.3	0.000578	99.020	
	143.3	0.000892	98.7 10	
(avg	0.00093±.00031)			
	184.0	0.00349	97. 50	
	183.3	0.002144	96.76	0
(avg	0.00282±.00095)	•		
		Sample no. 16 (0.0)1905 cm coating)	
	148.1	0.000892	99.22	
	148.8	0.00350	96.18	
	151.6	0.00245	94.08	
(avg	0.00228±.00131)			
	188.8	0.08592	19.36	0
		Sample no. 17(0.	127 cm coating)	
	149.7	0.00669	91.54	
	143.1	0.00546	84.63	
	149.5	0.01145	70.14	4
_				

(avg 0.00787±.00316)

ļ

* Single shot erosion data.





Figure 2. CM500L coating on steel (600X/3000X)



Figure 3. Eroded CM5COL coating on steel (550X/2200X)



Figure 4. Fractured and eroded Ta/W coating on steel (150X)





17

-]

المراجب فيتحد مناها معاجر



Figure 6. CM500 coating on molybdenum substrate with radial crack



Figure 7. Eroded CM500 coating on molybdenum substrate (60X/350X)





DISTRIBUTION LIST

Commander U.S. Army Armament Research and Development Command ATTN: DRDAR-LC DRDAR-LCA DRDAR-LCA-G (10) DRDAR-TSS (5) DRDAR-GCL Dover, NJ 07801 Administrator Defense Technical Information Center ATTN: Accessions Division (12) Cameron Station Alexandria, VA 22314

Director U.S. Army Materiel Systems Analysis Activity ATTN: DRXSY-MP Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21005

Commander/Director Chemical Systems Laboratory U.S. Army Armament Research and Development Command ATTN: DRDAR-CLJ-L DRDAR-CLB-PA APG, Edgewood Area, MD 21010

Director

5

Ballistics Research Laboratory U.S. Army Armament Research and Development Command ATTN: DRDAR-TSB-S DRDAR-BL DRDAR-BLP Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21005

Chief

Benet Weapons Laboratory, LCWSL U.S. Army Armament Research and Development Command ATTN: DRDAR-LCB-TL Watervliet, NY 12189

• •

Commander U.S. Army Armament Materiel Readiness Command ATTN: DRSAR-LEP-L Rock Island, II. 61299

Director U.S. Army TRADOC Systems Analysis Activity ATTN: ATAA-SL White Sands Missile Range, NM 88002