

Corrosion protection of Mg/Al alloys by thermal sprayed aluminium coatings

A. Pardo^{a,*}, P. Casajús^a, M. Mohedano^a, A.E. Coy^a, F. Viejo^a, B. Torres^b, E. Matykina^c

^aDepartamento de Ciencia de Materiales, Facultad de Químicas, Universidad Complutense, 28040, Madrid, Spain

^bDepartamento de Ciencia e Ingeniería de Materiales, ESCET, Universidad Rey Juan Carlos, 28933, Móstoles, Madrid, Spain

^cCorrosion and Protection Centre, School of Materials, The University of Manchester, P.O. Box 88, Sackville Street, Manchester, M60 1QD, United Kingdom

**Corresponding author. Tel: 34 1 3944348; Fax: 34 1 3944357*

E-mail: anpardo@quim.ucm.es

ABSTRACT

The protective features of thermal sprayed Al-coatings applied on AZ31, AZ80 and AZ91D magnesium/aluminium alloys were evaluated in 3.5 wt.% NaCl solution by electrochemical and gravimetric measurements. The changes in the morphology and corrosion behaviour of the Al-coatings induced by a cold-pressing post-treatment were also examined. The specimens were characterized by scanning electron microscopy (SEM), energy dispersive X-ray (EDX) analysis and low-angle X-ray diffraction (XRD). The as-sprayed Al-coatings revealed a high degree of porosity and poor corrosion protection, which resulted in galvanic acceleration of the corrosion of the magnesium substrates. The application of a cold-pressing post-treatment produced more compact Al-coatings with better bonding at the substrate/coating interface and higher corrosion resistance regardless of the nature of the magnesium alloy.

KEYWORDS: Magnesium; Aluminum coatings; Corrosion; Thermal spraying

1. INTRODUCTION

Magnesium alloys are promising materials in the automotive industry where their lightweight can be used to great advantage and contribute to energy savings and reduced environmental impact [1]. However, the use of magnesium alloys is limited by their low corrosion and wear resistance [2, 3]. Thus, the corrosion protection of magnesium alloys has evoked great interest during recent years. Several surface treatments such as anodising, chemical conversion, gas-phase deposition processes and electroplating can be used for tailoring the surface properties of magnesium alloys [4-6].

Among gas-phase deposition processes, thermal spraying (TS) technology offers a variety of techniques that allow the deposition of a wide range of functional coatings designed for specific environments [7-9]. For instance, TS processing is widely used in the automotive industry to produce coatings on transmission and engine parts such as synchronizing rings, shift forks and large volume of piston rings [10, 11]. Recent studies have also shown that thermal spraying has a high potential for surface modification of magnesium alloys [12-20].

Regarding Al-coatings, they can be deposited on magnesium alloys using several routes [21, 22]. For instance, Al-rich coatings can be obtained by painting and further heating at ~ 400 °C [23, 24]. Even though the coatings were not very uniform, the formation of the $Mg_{17}Al_{12}$ phase improved the hardness and corrosion resistance of the magnesium alloy. This approach is in line with the fact that aluminium produces a significant improvement of the corrosion resistance of Mg/Al systems by formation of aluminium rich oxides as well as networks of β -phase ($Mg_{17}Al_{12}$) [25, 26].

In the case of aluminium-based thermal sprayed coatings applied to magnesium alloys [12, 16, 18-20] and the assessment of their corrosion behaviour [16, 18, 19] the number of studies is relatively scarce. In general, the coatings produced by TS process are quite uniform in thickness and they do not exhibit phase transformations with respect to the original powder, which is advantageous for achievement of certain control over desirable properties, *i.e.* corrosion resistance. Although the Al-TS coatings may present interfacial reactions with the magnesium surface during the process, the composition of the coating can be controlled by heat post-treatments [19, 20]. And in the case of high levels of porosity the coatings can be consolidated by several post-treatments methods [16].

In the present study, the corrosion behaviour of Al-TS coatings deposited on three commercial magnesium/aluminium alloys – AZ31, AZ80 and AZ91D – was evaluated in 3.5 wt.% NaCl. The effect of a cold-pressing post-treatment on the morphology and corrosion performance of the coatings was also investigated.

2. EXPERIMENTAL

2.1. Test materials

Chemical compositions of the tested magnesium alloys (AZ31, AZ80 and AZ91D) are listed in Table I. Pure Mg was used as the reference material. Mg and AZ31 were fabricated in wrought condition and supplied in plates of 3 mm thickness, whereas AZ80 and AZ91D alloys were manufactured by casting using for the experiments billets

of 300 x 10 and 250 x 10 mm, respectively. All the materials were supplied by Magnesium Elektron Ltd.

2.2. Thermal sprayed aluminium coatings

Prior to thermal spraying process, the alloy surfaces were sandblasted with corundum particles (1 mm diameter) in order to enhance the adhesion of the deposited coatings.

Al-coatings were applied using aluminium powder with an average particle size of 125 μm (Castolin: 99.5% Al) and a flame spray gun (Castolin DS8000 system with a SSM40 modulus), which provides a thermal power of 28 kW. The following main processing parameters were used: spraying distance of 20 cm; neutral flame (*i.e.* balanced amounts of oxygen and acetylene to get full combustion) and a transversal gun displacement over the sample surface of 150 cm min^{-1} ; material feeding rate of $\sim 1.0 \text{ g s}^{-1}$ and average particle speed of 300 m s^{-1} . In order to reduce the level of porosity in the coatings, a cold-pressing post-treatment was carried out at a pressure of 32 MPa for 3 min at room temperature.

2.3. Microstructural characterization

For metallographic characterization of the coated specimens, cross-sections were wet ground through successive grades of SiC abrasive paper, from P120 to P2000 followed by polishing with 0.1 μm diamond paste. Two etching reagents were used: a) Nital, 5 mL HNO_3 + 95 mL ethanol, to reveal the constituents and general microstructure of Mg, AZ80 and AZ91D materials and b) Vilella reagent, 0.6 g picric acid + 10 mL ethanol + 90 mL H_2O , to reveal the grain boundaries in the AZ31 alloy. The constituents were examined by SEM using a JEOL JSM-6400 microscope equipped

with Oxford Link EDX microanalysis hardware. Low-angle XRD studies were carried out by using a Philips X'Pert diffractometer ($K_{\alpha}\text{Cu} = 1.54056 \text{ \AA}$).

2.4. Gravimetric measurements

Gravimetric measurements were performed using rectangular (Mg and AZ31) and cylindrical (AZ80 and AZ91D) specimens of working area $\sim 15 \text{ cm}^2$ immersed in 3.5 wt.% NaCl solution at room temperature (pH 5.6, 22 °C). Prior to the tests, specimens were measured and weighed. Once the test was finished for each immersion time, the samples were extracted, rinsed with isopropyl alcohol, dried in hot air, and then weighed again in order to calculate the mass gain per unit surface area. Corrosion rate was calculated from the mass gain per unit of surface area, determined from the expression $(M_i - M_f) / A$, where M_i is the initial mass, M_f the final mass and A the exposed surface area.

2.5. Electrochemical measurements

DC electrochemical measurements were performed using an AUTOLAB-PGSTAT 30 computer-controlled potentiostat and a conventional three-electrode cell, employing a graphite counter electrode and a silver-silver chloride reference electrode (SSE) with a potential of 0.197 V with respect to the standard hydrogen electrode (SHE). The solution concentration inside the reference electrode compartment was 3M KCl. The working electrode with 2 cm^2 of exposed area was the test material and the solution was naturally aerated 3.5 wt.% NaCl solution at room temperature (22 °C). Immersion times were up to 7 days. Cyclic polarization measurements were undertaken at a scan rate of 0.3 mV s^{-1} , from -100 mV to +400 mV with respect to the corrosion potential (E_{corr}).

The potential was scanned back when the polarization curve reached the anodic current density of 5 mA cm^{-2} . In order to obtain additional information, pH changes of the test solution as a function of the immersion time were recorded during the experiments using a standard pH-meter.

2.6. Characterization of corrosion products

The corroded surfaces were examined using SEM, EDX and low-angle XRD in order to determine the composition, morphology and evolution of the corrosion products formed on the surface.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1. Microstructural characterization

Figures 1a-f show the backscattered scanning electron (BSE) micrographs of the cross-sections of as-sprayed (Al-TS) and cold-pressed Al-coatings (Al-TS+CP). For all the investigated magnesium alloys, the Al-TS coatings revealed an average thickness of $600 \pm 15 \text{ }\mu\text{m}$ with a very rough surface, interconnected pores randomly distributed within the layer and poor bonding at the substrate/coating interface (Fig. 1a-c). The latter presented some roughness due to the sand blasting pre-treatment.

The cold-pressing post-treatment under 32 MPa at room temperature produced smoother surfaces and more homogeneous and compact Al-coatings with a thickness of $500 \pm 5 \text{ }\mu\text{m}$ (Fig. 1d-f, Fig. 2). This corresponded to a thickness reduction by at least 17% compared with the as-sprayed coatings. SEM examination also revealed the absence of cracks/pores at the substrate/coating interface. Thus, the applied post-

treatment produced a significant reduction of the porosity level and improved the bonding of the coating to the substrate. Unlike hot-pressing post-treatments [16] there was no evidence of deformation microstructures of the substrates or inter-diffusion or compound layers between the Al-coatings and the magnesium substrates.

3.2. Gravimetric results

Figure 3 shows the mass changes of the tested materials after immersion in 3.5 wt.% NaCl solution for several times up to 10 days. The untreated materials gradually dissolved in the test solution with mass losses following approximately linear kinetics. Commercially pure Mg was completely dissolved after 16 h of immersion in the test solution, whereas magnesium/aluminium alloys revealed lower mass losses. The AZ80 and AZ91D magnesium alloys revealed a significant higher corrosion resistance than that of Mg and AZ31 materials [25, 26].

The Al-TS coatings changed the corrosion behaviour of all investigated materials, which, in general, exhibited mass gain during the immersion test. Possibly, the interconnected pores in these coatings facilitated the penetration of chloride ions with the subsequent corrosion attack and formation of aluminium and magnesium corrosion products. Thus, the Al-TS coatings provided low corrosion protection to the magnesium substrates; for instance, pure Mg was completely dissolved after 2 days of immersion. On the other hand, the cold-pressed Al-coatings (Al-TS+CP) revealed significantly lower values of mass gain suggesting that the improved corrosion performance of the Al-TS+CP coatings was directly associated with the elimination of interconnected pores within the layers after the cold-pressing post-treatment.

The kinetic laws calculated from the experimental data in Figure 3 are shown in Table 2. In each case, they were approximated by a linear equation $y = b \cdot t$, where “ y ” coordinate represents the mass gain in mg cm^{-2} and “ t ” is the immersion time in hours. Negative values of the kinetic constant (b) were attributed to the dissolution of the magnesium matrix, whereas positive values were associated with the formation of corrosion products. Increasing amounts of aluminium in the bulk composition of the magnesium alloys reduced the corrosion rate for both untreated substrates and Al-TS coated specimens. In the case of Al-TS+CP coatings, all the substrates presented lower corrosion rates ($\sim 1.5 \times 10^{-2} \text{ mg cm}^{-2} \text{ h}^{-1}$) compared with the Al-TS coatings ($> 6.0 \times 10^{-2} \text{ mg cm}^{-2} \text{ h}^{-1}$). Besides, the corrosion rates were very similar regardless of the composition of the substrate, suggesting a lower porosity degree and hampered access of electrolyte species towards the magnesium substrate.

3.3. Electrochemical results

Figure 4 shows the anodic and cyclic polarization curves of all tested specimens after immersion in 3.5 wt.% NaCl for 1 hour. Compared with the untreated materials ($E_{\text{corr}} = -1.5 \text{ V}_{\text{SSE}}$), E_{corr} shifted towards the more noble values after the deposition of Al-TS ($E_{\text{corr}} = -1.3 \text{ V}_{\text{SSE}}$) and Al-TS+CP coatings ($E_{\text{corr}} = -1.1/-1.2 \text{ V}_{\text{SSE}}$) due to the higher nobility of aluminium than that of magnesium.

The corrosion current density, i_{corr} , of as-received alloys decreased with higher aluminium content in the composition of the alloys, from $\sim 4 \times 10^{-3} \text{ A cm}^{-2}$ for pure Mg, to $2 \times 10^{-5} \text{ A cm}^{-2}$ for magnesium alloys containing 8-9 wt.% aluminium [25, 26]. The




i_{corr} values of Al-TS coatings were similar or even higher in the case of AZ80 and AZ91D alloys. The latter suggested penetration of the electrolyte through the interconnected pores in the Al-TS coatings and galvanic acceleration of the corrosion of the magnesium substrates. In consistency with the gravimetric results, the application of a cold-pressing post-treatment greatly enhanced the performance of Al-sprayed coatings in 3.5 wt.% NaCl solution. Thus, for the Al-TS+CP coatings the i_{corr} values were around $10^{-6} \text{ A cm}^{-2}$ and a passive range of 0.5 V was observed between the E_{corr} and the pitting potential at approximately - 0.60 V. The results obtained for the Al-TS+CP coatings were similar to those reported for aluminium thermal spray coatings on other magnesium alloys. For instance, Z. Wei et al. [18] and L.-H. Chiu et al. [19] reported i_{corr} values in the same range for hot-pressed arc-spray aluminium coatings on the AZ31 alloy immersed in 3.5 wt.% NaCl solution.

Figure 5 discloses the evolution of the electrochemical behaviour of each material after 7 days of immersion in the saline solution. The high dissolution rate observed for pure magnesium before and after the deposition of the Al-TS coating limited its electrochemical study to the first stages of immersion in 3.5 wt.% NaCl. In general, for long immersion times, the polarization curves of untreated materials shifted toward greater current densities, suggesting that the formation of corrosion products did not impede the progression of the corrosion attack. On the other hand, the polarization curves of the Al-TS+CP coatings practically remained unchanged during the experiments, indicating a steady performance of these coatings.

The comparison of the polarization resistance (R_p) values, determined from the electrochemical tests, revealed values of up to $\sim 10^4 \Omega \cdot \text{cm}^2$ for the Al-TS+CP coatings after immersion in 3.5 wt.% NaCl for 1 hour, which were higher than those of untreated specimens and Al-TS coatings by one to three orders of magnitude (Table 3). In general, the R_p values of magnesium alloys with Al-coatings increased with the immersion time, especially in the case of Al-TS+CP coatings. This was possibly related to the nucleation and growth of a slightly protective layer of aluminium-rich corrosion products over the coating surface that offered additional electrochemical resistance.

3.4. pH measurements

It is known, that an oxide film mainly consisting of magnesium hydroxide or brucite forms on the surface of magnesium when is exposed to the atmosphere or aqueous solutions. This film is stable in the basic range of pH values, but in the presence of chloride anions the surface film breaks down and magnesium appears unprotected. Although corrosion mechanism of magnesium needs further investigation, it is generally reported that the following reactions take place in aqueous environments:



Thus, pH values of the test solution increase along with the cathodic reaction due to the formation of OH^- and, therefore, for a given immersion time higher pH values suggest higher corrosion rate of magnesium. According to this, pH values can be measured in

order to follow the evolution of magnesium alloys immersed in 3.5 wt.% NaCl (Figure 6). These measurements were carried out with duplicate specimens of 15 cm² immersed in 500 ml of test solution at 22 °C.

At the early stages of the corrosion process (1 hour), all un-coated magnesium alloys revealed a sudden and sharp increase of the pH (pH >10), which was attributed to the corrosion attack produced when the aggressive solution reacts with the fresh magnesium surfaces. For increasing immersion times, the pH values remained practically constant or slightly decreased due to the saturation of the solution with Mg(OH)₂ and some acidification due to increasing concentrations of atmospheric carbon dioxide in the test solution. Likewise, a rapid increase of the pH values was observed for the Al-TS and Al-TS+CP coatings, although less evident for the cold-pressed coatings. However, the pH values remained lower than those of un-coated magnesium materials, indicating that the deposited Al-coatings, especially the Al-TS+CP coatings, reduced the participation of magnesium in the corrosion mechanism of the investigated materials.

3.4. Characterization of corrosion products

The scanning electron micrograph of the cross-section of the AZ31 alloy after immersion in the aggressive solution for 10 days revealed a thick corrosion layer of irregular thickness between 300 and 500 µm, probably consisting of magnesium oxides/hydroxides (Fig. 7a) [25, 26]. On the other hand, the Al-coated specimens revealed less corrosion damage of the magnesium substrate and formation of aluminium corrosion products as a result of corrosion of the Al-coatings (Figs. 7b-c). For the Al-TS specimens, the SEM study at higher magnification revealed a non-uniform attack with a

~ 15 μm -thick aluminium-rich corrosion layer in the outer coating surface and corrosion products throughout the cavities within the coating. This indicated that the aggressive solution readily penetrates towards the bulk material facilitating the galvanic acceleration of the corrosion of the magnesium substrate (Figure 8). The Al-TS+CP coatings revealed a more homogeneous and thinner corrosion layer (~ 4 μm) compared with the Al-TS coatings, and the absence of corrosion products in the inner regions of the coating (Fig. 9). According to the electrochemical results this layer provided some corrosion protection with increasing immersion times in 3.5 wt.% NaCl.

The examination of the cross-sections of the AZ80 and AZ91D alloys with Al-TS+CP coatings after immersion in the test solution for 10 days (Figure 10) indicated that these specimens followed a similar corrosion mechanism to that observed for the AZ31 alloy. For all the Al-coatings there was no evidence of delamination attack at the coating/bulk material interface. Thus, according to the gravimetric and electrochemical results and SEM observation, the corrosion behaviour of the Al-TS+CP specimens was unaffected by the nature of the magnesium substrate, indicating that the cold-pressing post-treatment is an effective process to reduce the corrosion susceptibility of magnesium alloys with aluminium thermal spray coatings.

Figure 11 discloses the average thickness of the corrosion layer determined from SEM observation of all the specimens after immersion in 3.5 wt.% NaCl solution for 10 days. The cold-pressing post-treatment reduced the thickness of the corrosion layer, compared with the untreated materials, by 40-75 times depending on the magnesium alloy. The thickness of the corrosion layer formed in the Al-TS specimens was also inferior to that

of untreated specimens, although, in this case the corrosion products formed within the coating should be taken into consideration.

The low-angle (1°) XRD study of the corrosion layer formed on the un-coated magnesium alloys after immersion in 3.5 wt.% NaCl for 10 days revealed brucite ($\text{Mg}(\text{OH})_2$) as the main corrosion product, which revealed higher intensity peaks for Mg and AZ31 materials due to formation of a thicker corrosion layer during the severe attack that both materials disclosed (Figure 12a). On the other hand, the corrosion layer formed on the Al-TS and Al-TS+CP specimens consisted of bayerite ($\beta\text{-Al}_2\text{O}_3 \cdot 3\text{H}_2\text{O}$), with lower intensity peaks for the Al-TS specimens (Figs. 12b-c). This may be attributed to the higher surface roughness and non-uniformity of the corrosion attack that these coatings exhibited.

5. CONCLUSIONS

1. The investigated magnesium alloys revealed severe corrosion attack in 3.5 wt.% NaCl solution characterized by the nucleation and growth of an irregular and low protective corrosion layer of $\text{Mg}(\text{OH})_2$.
2. The as-sprayed aluminium coatings (Al-TS) revealed a poor corrosion performance in the test solution due to their high degree of interconnected pores facilitating the penetration of aggressive species towards the bulk material. Aluminium corrosion products were observed within the cavities of the coatings. Crevice corrosion phenomena may occur within these cavities. Additionally, galvanic acceleration of

the corrosion attack of the magnesium alloys was observed when the electrolyte reached the coating/substrate interface.

3. The application of a cold-pressing post-treatment resulted in more homogeneous coatings with a better bonding at the substrate/coating interface and a significant reduction of the porosity level. Accordingly, the corrosion performance of all investigated alloys was enhanced regardless of their composition or microstructure.

Acknowledgements. The authors wish to thank the MCYT for the financial support given to this work (Project MAT2006-13179-C02-01-02).

6. REFERENCES

1. T.J. Polmear, Light Alloys - Metallurgy of the Light Metals, 2nd Ed., Edward Arnold, London (UK), 1995.
2. W.S. Loose, in: L.M. Pidgeon, J.C. Mathes, N.E. Woldmen (Eds.), Corrosion and Protection of Magnesium, Metals Handbook, ASM International, Materials Park, Ohio (USA), 1946, 173.
3. R. Ambat, N.N. Aung, W. Zhou, J. Appl. Electrochem. **30** (2000) p. 865.
4. M. Walter, in: K.U. Kainer (Ed.), Proc. 6th Int. Conf. Magnesium Alloys and Their Applications, Wiley-VCH Verlag, Wolfsburg (Germany), 2003, 529.
5. H. Umehara, T. Okada, Y. Togawa. Report of Industrial Products Research Institute, No. 125, 1992, p. 43.
6. J.E. Gray-Munro, B. Luan, L. Huntington, Appl. Surf. Sci. **254** (2008) p. 2871.
7. Y. Gao, X. Xu, Z. Yan, G. Xin, Surf. Coat. Technol. **154** (2002) p. 189.
8. R.S.C. Paredes, S.C. Amico, A.S.C.M. d'Oliveira, Surf. Coat. Technol. **200** (2006) p. 3049.
9. W.Y. Li, C. Zhang, X. Guo, G.J. Li, H. Liao, C. Coddet, Appl. Surf. Sci. **254** (2007) p. 517.
10. G. Barbezat, Surf. Coat. Technol. **200** (2005) p. 1990.
11. G. Barbezat, Surf. Coat. Technol. **201** (2006) p. 2028.
12. M. Parco, L. Zhao, J. Zwick, K. Bobzin, E. Lugscheider, Surf. Coat. Technol. **201** (2007) p. 6290.
13. E. Lugscheider, M. Parco, K.U. Kainer, N. Hort, in: K.U. Kainer (Ed.), Proc. of the 6th Int. Conf. Magnesium Alloys and Their Applications, Wiley-VCH Verlag, Wolfsburg, Germany, 2003, p. 860.

14. Fr.-W. Bach, K. Möhwald, Z. Babiak, J. Prehm, L. Engl E. Lugscheider, M. Parco, R. Dicks, in: M. Geiger, K.-D. Bouzakis, B. Denkena, H.-K. Tönshoff, Fr.-W. Bach, U. Popp (Eds.), Proc. of the 47th International Conference THE Coatings, April 5-7, 2004, Bamberg: Meisenbach, Erlangen, Germany, 2004, p. 425.
15. Fr.-W. Bach, K. Möhwald, L. Engl, E. Lugscheider, M. Parco, K. Seemann, in: E. Lugscheider (Ed.), Proc. International Thermal Spray Conference ITSC 2005, DVS-Verlag, Dusseldorf, Basel, Germany, 2005.
16. H. Pokhmurska, B. Wielage, T. Lampke, T. Grund, M. Student, N. Chervinska, Surf. Coat. Technol. **202** (2008) p. 4515.
17. M. Parco, L. Zhao, J. Zwick, K. Bobzin, E. Lugscheider, Surf. Coat. Technol. **201** (2006) p. 3269.
18. Z. Wei, L. Liu, W. Ding, Mater. Sci. Forum **488-489** (2005) p. 685.
19. L.H. Chiu, H.A. Lin, C.C. Chen, C.F. Yang, C.H. Chang, J.C. Wu, Mater. Sci. Forum **419-422** (2003) p. 909.
20. J. Zhang, Y. Wang, R.C. Zeng, W.J. Huang, Mater. Sci. Forum **546-549** (2007) p. 529.
21. S. Ignat, P. Sallamand, D. Grevey, M. Lambertin, Appl. Surf. Sci. **225** (2004) p. 124.
22. Ch. Christoglou, N. Voudouris, G.N. Angelopoulos, M. Pant, W. Dahl, Surf. Coat. Technol. **184** (2004) p. 149.
23. I. Shigematsu, M. Nakamura, N. Saitou, K. Shimojima, J. Mater. Sci. Lett. **19** (2000) p. 473.
24. L. Zhu, G. Song, Surf. Coat. Technol. **200** (2006) p. 2834.

25. A. Pardo, M. C. Merino, A. E. Coy, R. Arrabal, F. Viejo, E. Matykina, Corros. Sci. **50** (2008) p. 823.
26. A. Pardo, M.C. Merino, A.E. Coy, F. Viejo, R. Arrabal, S. Feliú Jr., Electrochim. Acta **53** (2008) p. 7890.

FIGURES AND TABLE CAPTIONS

Table 1. Nominal composition of the materials tested.

Table 2. Kinetic laws of the materials immersed in 3.5 wt.% NaCl solution.

Table 3. Variation of R_p as a function of the immersion time in 3.5 wt.% NaCl solution.

Figure 1. Backscattered scanning electron micrographs of the cross-sections of: (a-c) Al-TS and (d-f) Al-TS+CP coatings (AZ31, AZ80 and AZ91D alloys).

Figure 2. Scanning electron micrographs of the surface morphology of Al-coatings on the AZ31 alloy: (a) Al-TS and (b) Al-TS+CP.

Figure 3. Mass changes versus time after immersion in 3.5 wt.% NaCl solution at 22 °C: (a) Mg metal and AZ31 and (b) AZ80 and AZ91D specimens.

Figure 4. Anodic and cyclic polarization curves in 3.5 wt.% NaCl solution for 1 hour: (a) Mg, (b) AZ31, (c) AZ80 and (d) AZ91D specimens.

Figure 5. Anodic and cyclic polarization curves in 3.5wt.% NaCl solution for 7 days: (a) Mg, (b) AZ31, (c) AZ80 and (d) AZ91D specimens.

Figure 6. Evolution of the pH values of the test solution for immersion times up to 7 days for all specimens tested: (a) Mg, (b) AZ31, (c) AZ80 and (d) AZ91D.

Figure 7. Backscattered scanning electron micrographs of the cross-sections of the AZ31 specimens after immersion in 3.5 wt.% NaCl for 10 days: (a) un-coated, (b) Al-TS and (c) Al-TS+CP.

Figure 8. (a) SEM detail of the cross-section of the AZ31 Al-TS specimen after immersion in 3.5 wt.% NaCl for 10 days; (b) profile line analysis at the coating surface; (c) Al and (d) O X-ray elemental maps.

Figure 9. (a) Backscattered scanning electron micrograph of the cross-section of the AZ31 Al-TS+CP specimen after immersion in 3.5 wt.% NaCl for 10 days; (b) profile line analysis at the coating surface; (c) Al and (d) O X-ray elemental maps.

Figure 10. Backscattered scanning electron micrographs of the cross-sections of the Al-TS+CP coatings after immersion in 3.5 wt.% NaCl for 10 days: (a) AZ80 and (b) AZ91D.

Figure 11. Thickness values of the corrosion layer determined for all specimens tested after immersion in 3.5 wt.% NaCl for 10 days.

Figure 12. Low-angle (1°) XRD study of all specimens immersed in 3.5 wt.% NaCl solution for 10 days: (a) un-coated, (b) Al-TS and (c) Al-TS+CP.




Figure 1





Figure 2





Figure 3





Figure 4







Figure 5




Figure 6




Figure 7






Figure 8

Al-TS (AZ31)




Figure 9

Al-TS+C.P (AZ31)




Figure 10




Figure 11






Figure 12




Figure 13







Figure 14

Material	Composición química (% en peso)									
	Al	Zn	Mn	Si	Cu	Fe	Ni	Ca	Zr	Otros
Mg (99%)	0.006	0.014	0.03	0.019	0.001	0.004	<0.001			
AZ31	3.1	0.73	0.25	0.02	<0.001	0.005	<0.001	<0.01	<0.001	<0.30
AZ91D	8.8	0.68	0.30	0.01	<0.001	0.004	<0.008			<0.30
AZ80	8.2	0.46	0.13	0.01	<0.001	0.004				<0.30

Table I

Material	Kinetic law : $y=b \cdot t$; [y (mg/cm ²), t (h)]		
Mg (99%)	$y = -1303 \times 10^{-2} \cdot t$	$0 \leq t \leq 16$	($r^2=0.99$)
Mg T.S	$y = 906 \times 10^{-2} \cdot t$	$0 \leq t \leq 16$	($r^2=0.97$)
	$y = -729 \times 10^{-2} \cdot t$	$18 \leq t \leq 50$	($r^2=0.96$)
Mg T.S+CP	$y = -1.20 \times 10^{-2} \cdot t$	$0 \leq t \leq 240$	($r^2=0.97$)
AZ31	$y = -23.10 \times 10^{-2} \cdot t$	$0 \leq t \leq 240$	($r^2=0.99$)
AZ31 T.S	$y = 24.60 \times 10^{-2} \cdot t$	$0 \leq t \leq 240$	($r^2=0.99$)
AZ31 T.S+CP	$y = 1.01 \times 10^{-2} \cdot t$	$0 \leq t \leq 240$	($r^2=0.97$)
AZ80	$y = -0.31 \times 10^{-2} \cdot t$	$0 \leq t \leq 240$	($r^2=0.98$)
AZ80 T.S	$y = 5.59 \times 10^{-2} \cdot t$	$0 \leq t \leq 240$	($r^2=0.98$)
AZ80 T.S+CP	$y = 1.22 \times 10^{-2} \cdot t$	$0 \leq t \leq 240$	($r^2=0.96$)
AZ91	$y = -0.37 \times 10^{-2} \cdot t$	$0 \leq t \leq 240$	($r^2=0.98$)
AZ91 T.S	$y = 6.97 \times 10^{-2} \cdot t$	$0 \leq t \leq 240$	($r^2=0.98$)
AZ91 T.S+CP	$y = 1.70 \times 10^{-2} \cdot t$	$0 \leq t \leq 240$	($r^2=0.96$)

Table II

Material	Rp (ohm·cm ²)			
	0.042 d	1 d	3 d	7 d
Mg	23.71	34.8	-	-
Mg T.S	216	106.2	45.85	-
Mg T.S+CP	1.63E4	2.37E4	1.08E5	1.10E5
AZ31	349.2	316	242.3	113.8
AZ31 T.S	174	710.9	294	177.7
AZ31 T.S+CP	2.74E4	6.48E4	1.19E5	1.20E5
AZ80	5293	2965	2122	296
AZ80 T.S	183.7	1043	440.2	383.3
AZ80 T.S+CP	1.40E4	5.34E4	6.02E4	9.00E4
AZ91	1305	885.9	312	160.7
AZ91 T.S	180.4	887.2	408.8	323.2
AZ91 T.S+CP	1.50E4	5.01E4	7.28E4	9.20E4

Table III