Kinetic Transitions in Fe-Mn-C Alloys

Hatem Zurob, Armand Beche, Chris Hutchinson, Gary Purdy, Yves Brechet



Experiments

A steel with 0.94 wt% Mn and 0.57% C was decarburized at:















Blue dots show experimental data obtained by decarburizing a long sample in a temperature gradient for 32 min.



Additional Results

 Fe-0.94%Mn-0.27%C give at <u>806C</u>, gives something very close to PE.

 Fe-2%Mn-0.6%C at <u>736C</u>, gives LENP, possibly something much faster at the corners.



Reminder

- Fe-Ni-C followed the LENP model under all conditions.
- This was checked with Fe → Fe-5%Ni diffusion couple. Ferrite growth stopped at the LENP limit.
- We also tried to decarburize above the LENP limit and no ferrite was formed.



- What is the difference between Ni and Mn?
- How do we explain the PE state at high temperatures in Fe-Mn-C.
- How can we capture the transition?
- How do we account for long-lived intermediate states between LENP and PE?

Discussion

- We tried a Global Dissipation approach but found that LENP always dissipates more energy than PE. As such a transition could not be explained.
- Hillert's Approach (Phoenix) involving a diffusive flux and a diffusionless flux (due to interface motion) could also be used, but it requires four cross interface parameters for which we don't have any estimates.
- Segregation to the interface may explain the difference between Mn and Ni. It may also delay the transition from PE to LENP leading to a long-lived PE state.
- Kirkendall Effect. The difference in temperature dependence of the mobilities of Mn and Fe in the interface might explain the transition.

Additional Results

Fe-0.58Mn-0.31Si-0.61C



Fe-0.88Si-0.58C



Fe-2Cr-0.58C



Fe-0.51Mo-0.54C

