

Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory

Recent Work

Title

Wetting and strenght issues at Al/alpha-alumina interfaces

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/5w56k2sr>

Journal

Journal of the European Ceramic Society, 23(15)

Authors

Saiz, Eduardo
Tomsia, Antoni P.
Suganuma, Katsuaki

Publication Date

2003-04-15

Wetting and Strength Issues at Al/ α -Alumina Interfaces

E. Saiz¹, A. P. Tomsia¹ and K. Suganuma²

¹Materials Sciences Division, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory
University of California, Berkeley, CA, 94720 USA

²Institute of Scientific and Industrial Research, Osaka University, Japan

Corresponding address: Eduardo Saiz
Materials Sciences Division, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory,
Berkeley, CA 94720, USA
Phone: 510-486-1446, FAX: 510-486-4761
e-mail: esaiz@lbl.gov

Abstract

The wetting behavior and strength at aluminum/alumina interfaces has been an active subject of research. Al/alumina applications include ceramic-metal composites and several applications for electronic industries. In this paper the interface strength and microstructure of Al/ α -alumina was investigated. We discovered that in a solid-state joining, the strength of the joint increases with increasing joining temperature. In a liquid-state joining, the strength of the joint gradually decreases due to the formation of unbonded areas. The strength, σ_b , is expressed by the following equation as a function of unbonded area, A: $\sigma_b = 2.22 A + 143$ ($70\% \leq A \leq 100\%$). The highest strength reached 400 MPa when the interface was formed at around the melting temperature of aluminum. An aluminum layer close to the interface became a single crystal when it was bonded to a sapphire. The following crystallographic orientation relationship is established:

$$\bar{1}11)_{Al} // (001)_{\alpha-Al_2O_3}, \langle 110 \rangle_{Al} // \langle 100 \rangle_{\alpha-Al_2O_3}$$

Amorphous alumina islands were formed at the interface. In the amorphous alumina, γ -alumina nanocrystals grew from the sapphire, with the same orientation relationship to sapphire as above.

Keywords: alumina, aluminum, interface, strength, microstructure, sapphire

1. Introduction

The combination of alumina and aluminum is well known and has many applications. For instance, α -alumina has been used in the electronic industries for many years as a ceramic insulator whereas aluminum is one of the best electrodes, having good electric conductivity second only to copper. Powders and fibers of alumina are also used to reinforce aluminum alloys, one of the most common lightweight materials for components in automobile engines and other transportation systems. In many of those cases, the formation of a strong aluminum/alumina interface is required. Consequently, extensive research is being performed on the wetting of liquid aluminum on alumina and on the joining and brazing of both materials⁽¹⁻¹⁰⁾.

The aim of this work is to evaluate the basic parameters which govern the formation of aluminum/alumina interfaces. Sessile drop experiments have been performed to study the wetting

of liquid aluminum on alumina. The interfacial microstructure has been evaluated using atomic force microscopy (AFM), scanning electron microscopy (SEM) and transmission electron microscopy (TEM). The evolution of the interfacial morphology was followed in order to determine the relevant atomic transport rates. The strength of aluminum/alumina bonds fabricated at various temperatures using solid-state diffusion bonding or liquid-state brazing was measured and correlated to the interfacial microstructure.

2. Experimental Procedure

2.1. Wetting experiments

Wetting experiments were performed by melting small pieces (0.2-0.5 g) of Al (99.999%, Johnson Matthey) on sapphire and polycrystalline alumina substrates. The experiments were conducted in vacuum or Ar (gettered at 1073 K with Ti-Zr chips, $p(\text{O}_2) \sim 10^{-13}$ Pa) in a resistance furnace with a Ta heating element. Heating rates varied between 10 to 35 K/min. After the required time at temperature, the furnace was shut off leading to faster cooling rates. The contact angles of molten aluminum were measured ($\pm 2^\circ$) through a porthole in the furnace as a function of time and temperature. Experiments in gettered Ar were also performed by placing the sample in a closed alumina crucible. It is expected that under those conditions, the $p(\text{O}_2)$ inside the crucible would be close to the phase boundary value at which Al and Al_2O_3 can coexist in equilibrium, $p(\text{O}_2)^{\text{eq}}$. In these experiments, the contact angles were measured after cooling. Our experience indicates that the contact angles measured right before and after cooling are only different by few degrees.

The polycrystalline alumina substrates were prepared from pure Al_2O_3 powders (99.999%, Showa-Denko, Japan). The powders were isostatically pressed (200 MPa) and the resulting blocks were embedded in pure alumina powder and sintered in vacuum (10^{-3} Pa) at 1700°C for 2 h.

Substrates ($\sim 10 \times 10 \times 2$ mm) were cut from the sintered block using a diamond saw and polished with diamond paste (1 μm particle size). Subsequently, they were annealed in vacuum at 1600°C for 6 h in order to ensure that the grain boundaries intersect the surface at their equilibrium angle. The final average grain size is ~ 20 μm . In order to minimize contamination during annealing, the substrates were placed with the polished sides face to face and embedded in pure alumina powder. The boundary grooves that formed during heat treatment were removed by a light polishing with diamond (1 μm particle size).

After the wetting tests, the aluminum was dissolved from the substrate with HCl, and the area under the drop was analyzed by optical microscopy, SEM and AFM. The profiles of the boundary grooves at the solid/liquid and solid/vapor interfaces were measured using AFM line analysis in the constant force mode. In order to study the evolution of grooves with time, pieces of the aluminum were consecutively melted at the same place on the substrate, and the interface was analyzed after sequential heating and etching steps. Parallel studies of boundary grooving on free alumina substrates were performed at the same temperatures and atmospheres.

2.2. Joining experiments

A number of α -alumina disks of 50 mm diameter and 20 mm height were sintered by hot-pressing alumina powder (average particle size of 0.3 μm , Sumitomo Chemical Co. Ltd., AKP30) under 30 MPa pressure at 1450°C for 1 h in Ar atmosphere. From those disks, $16 \times 16 \times 18$ mm blocks were cut. The faces to be joined (16×16 mm) were ground and polished to have optical flatness. Bars ($3 \times 4 \times 35$ mm) were cut from the sintered body, and their strength was measured using the four point bending test. The average alumina strength was 551 MPa (standard deviation: 43 MPa). Sapphire was also used for bonding to aluminum to characterize the interfacial structure. The bonding face was the (001) basal plane of α -alumina.

Joining specimens were prepared by inserting two aluminum sheets (99.993%, 100 μm thick) between two alumina blocks and hot pressing in vacuum maintained at 1.5 MPa pressure. The joining temperatures varied between 550°C (solid-state diffusion bonding) to 1200°C (liquid-state brazing). The applied pressure and holding time were 10 MPa and 1h, respectively.

From the bonded blocks, 3×4×36 mm bars were cut and used for measuring the joining strength by 4-point bending at room temperature. Cross-head speed was 0.5 mm/min. The upper span and the lower span were 10 mm and 30 mm, respectively.

The interfacial microstructure was primarily characterized by TEM. TEM specimens (200 μm thick and 2.3 mm diameter disks) were cut from the joints, dimpled, and polished by Ar ion thinning. The specimens were coated with a thin carbon layer to avoid charging. For high resolution, a JEOL JEM200CX microscope was used at 200 kV, and for nano-EDS analysis a HITACHI HF2000 was used at the same voltage.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1. Wetting and Diffusion Studies

The effect of temperature on the final contact angle of molten Al on alumina substrates is illustrated in Figure 1 where results taken from the literature^{1, 11-16} are also presented for comparison. There was no significant difference in the angles recorded on sapphire or polycrystalline alumina. Below 1000°C, the drop is covered by a thick oxide layer and exhibits an irregular shape. At temperatures higher than 1000°C, the drop is shiny and the contact angle (θ) decreases as time and temperature increase, approaching a value of $\sim 70^\circ$ after 60 min at 1400°C. In experiments performed under vacuum at temperatures higher than 1100°C the contact angle of aluminum oscillates periodically. For example, at 1100°C, after reaching a value of $\sim 80^\circ$, θ decreases in ~ 20 -30 minutes to $\sim 60^\circ$ and then suddenly jumps again to the maximum value. In

these cases, after removing the drops, rings are visible on the alumina surface, one for each jump (Figure 2).

The Al/Al₂O₃ system has a fundamental difference with respect to other metal/oxide combinations: at a given temperature there is only one oxygen partial pressure at which Al and Al₂O₃ can coexist in equilibrium ($p(\text{O}_2)^{\text{eq}}$). This oxygen partial pressure ranging from $\sim 10^{-59}$ atm at 600°C to $\sim 10^{-22}$ atm at 1500°C is typically much lower than attainable in most experimental set-ups. For other metal/ceramic systems, there is a large enough range of $p(\text{O}_2)$ where both phases can coexist in equilibrium and a region can exist in which all the interfaces are stoichiometric, and consequently the interfacial energies are independent of oxygen activity. However in the Al/Al₂O₃ system, some adsorption is expected at all the interfaces involved. For example, like for other metals, adsorption of oxygen can be expected on the surface of the liquid aluminum in equilibrium with its oxide. Consequently, the surface energy of Al at $p(\text{O}_2)^{\text{eq}}$ will be somewhat lower than that of pure, clean Al.

The low value of the equilibrium $p(\text{O}_2)$ explains the stability of the oxide layer on the liquid surface at temperatures below 1000°C. At higher temperatures this oxide layer disappears. Two reasons have been proposed for this behavior: erosion through formation of volatile Al₂O species,¹⁷ cracking due to the volume changes, and thermal expansion mismatch¹⁷. When the temperatures increases above 1000°C, the Al vapors react with the oxygen such that the oxygen activity around the drop will correspond to the equilibrium value for the Al/Al₂O₃ system¹⁷⁻¹⁸. The observed oscillation of the contact angle in vacuum at high temperatures is associated with the formation of ridges at the triple line. The ridges form to achieve full three dimensional equilibrium of the surface forces at the triple junction.¹⁹⁻²⁰ After the formation of the ridge, the fast evaporation of Al decreases the contact angle below a critical value and the junction breaks away from the

ridge.²⁰ Afterwards, a new ridge forms and the cycle starts again. According to this description, the maximum value of the contact angle, after each jump, should correspond to the one described by Young's equation.¹⁹⁻²⁰

The AFM and SEM analyses of the alumina surface after dissolving the metal have shown that the Al/Al₂O₃ interfaces are strongly faceted (Figure 3). The shape of some facets suggests that the alumina basal plane is one of the low energy surfaces. The shapes of the interfacial grain boundary grooves correspond to diffusion controlled growth, albeit perturbed by the facets. This is in contrast with the stoichiometric interfaces between alumina and other FCC metals that appear to be very isotropic.²¹ The Al₂O₃ surfaces outside the Al drops seem to be less strongly faceted than those under Al, but somewhat more so than stoichiometric alumina surfaces of Al₂O₃. Mass transport is orders of magnitude faster than at the Ni, Au or Cu/Al₂O₃ interfaces at similar temperatures.²¹

The measurement of groove angles and the liquid-solid contact angle allowed the deduction of relevant interfacial energies (Table 1). The annealing at 1500°C in a closed alumina crucible produced a clean Al drop suggesting the equilibrium $p(\text{O}_2)$ was achieved. There is some degree of uncertainty in the reported γ_{lv} due to the low oxygen activities needed to maintain molten Al free of oxide.^{22,23} To account for these uncertainties, two calculations are presented in Table 1, one used 80°, and 0.7 J/m², which are upper bounds for the coexistence condition at 1500°C, and the other using 70° and 0.3 J/m², which may be on the low side of better estimates for this condition. The lower values are consistent with the expected decrease of the surface energy of the metal at the oxygen partial pressure in which it coexists with its own oxide with respect to reported values for clean aluminum, this decrease is due to oxygen adsorption.²¹ For both sets, the resulting γ_{sv} is unambiguously lower, and γ_{gb} is somewhat smaller than reported for stoichiometric interfaces in

metal alumina systems ($\gamma_{sv}=1-1.2 \text{ J/m}^2$, $\gamma_{gb}=0.8-1.1 \text{ J/m}^2$).²¹ This can be expected if there is some adsorption. For either value of θ , a higher value of γ_{lv} than that chosen for Al in equilibrium with Al_2O_3 would yield surface and grain boundary energies for alumina being higher than those for stoichiometric interfaces which would be very unlikely. Instead, application of the Gibbs adsorption isotherm would indicate that if these surfaces were oxygen deficient, i.e., having an Al excess, these energies should be lower.^{21, 22} As the solid-vapor and especially the solid-liquid interfaces are faceted, torque terms can be important and some corrections have to be applied²⁴⁻²⁵ in order to exactly calculate each interfacial energy; the values in Table 1 presume that the average energies remain approximately correct.

The grooving transport rates observed at the Al/ Al_2O_3 interfaces and free alumina surface away from the aluminum drop are much faster than any ever reported for alumina surfaces implying much faster diffusivities. It should be pointed out that most of the surface and volume diffusivities reported for alumina have been calculated after experiments performed at oxygen partial pressures far larger than the one at which aluminum and alumina can coexist in equilibrium. Although vapor transport may be suspected to control groove growth on the free alumina surface ahead of the aluminum drop at the higher temperatures, the implied $t^{1/2}$ fit was unsatisfactory.²⁶ Groove growth involves diffusion of both Al and O ions. Although each species could move independently, the dissolution and deposition must involve stoichiometric Al_2O_3 . Typically experiments performed on alumina surfaces are done at oxygen partial pressures where the groove growth is controlled by the surface diffusion of Al ions. Due the low oxygen activity in the Al/ Al_2O_3 system, the calculated interface diffusivity on the alumina surface ahead of the aluminum drop would likely represent that for O instead of Al, and is for an Al-rich interface.

At the solid/liquid interface, comparison of the $t^{1/3}$ (groove growth controlled by volume

diffusion,²⁷ $t^{1/4}$ (groove growth controlled by interfacial diffusion)²⁰ and combined fittings (that add the contributions for both paths)²¹ do not clearly favor one of the diffusion paths suggesting that both are contributing to groove growth (Table 2). The upper limit for the interfacial diffusivity ($t^{1/4}$ fitting) and the value from the combined equation are similar. The corresponding interfacial diffusivities at the metal/ceramic interface are somewhat similar than those measured in alumina surface ahead of the Al drop (taking into account the temperature difference). The fast volume diffusivities are consistent with transport through the liquid phase. In this case, the diffusion of the species (Al, O or some complexes of them) with the lower xD_V product will control grooving kinetics (x is the molar solubility and D_V the volume diffusivity). Transport in the liquid depends upon the concentration of diffusing species, it could be expected that diffusion of O or O-rich species should be limiting at very low oxygen activity at which aluminum and alumina can coexist in equilibrium. The implied solubilities of O in the liquid Al ($10^{-5} - 10^{-7}$) are reasonable.²⁸

The basal plane has clearly become relatively more stable for the interface, and seemingly also for the surface of the alumina ahead of the aluminum drop. This indicates there is a change in the Wulff plot for the sapphire-vapor surface versus those recently reported for higher oxygen activities^{29,30} and would be consistent with the idea that the surfaces oriented parallel to alternating sheets of O and Al atoms in the crystal structure may be partially reduced more readily. The (001) plane has been shown to become Al rich in UHV.³¹⁻³² Evidently, the situation is analogous for the Al/Al₂O₃ interface. The average surface and grain boundary energies are somewhat reduced with respect to those recorded for other metals at higher $p(\text{O}_2)$. For the surface, this would reflect the lower energy for surfaces nearly parallel to (001), but others may be susceptible to reduction to a lesser degree. Evidently, at least some grain boundaries are similarly susceptible to becoming Al-rich.

3.2. Interface Strength

Figure 4 shows the bending strength of the alumina joints as a function of joining temperature. Data taken from the literature is also included for comparison.³³⁻³⁴ The bonding strength is low for the joint solid-state bonded at 550 °C, but it increases as temperature rises to 650°C, and peak strength is achieved at joining temperatures between 650°C and 700°C. Above 700°C, the strength gradually decreases as the joining temperature increases. The peak bond strength is about 450 MPa, much higher than aluminum (~100 MPa) and approximately 80% of the alumina strength. In fact, some of the joints fractured in alumina away from the interfacial region.

When evaluating the strength of ceramic/metal joints, several parameters related to the difference in elastic and plastic properties of the two materials should be considered. The plastic and elastic deformation of the metal layer becomes large with increasing thickness. Inverse thickness dependence has been attributed to the influence of corner stress concentrations. Because the analytical equations for four-point and three point bending strength are derived for bars with uniform curvature, a large deviation between the measured and absolute strengths for ceramic/metal joints can occur. The final thickness of the metal layer varied with the joining temperature (Figure 5), which may influence strength. Below the melting temperature of aluminum, 660°C, the thickness of the aluminum layer was about 100 μm, but it decreased to about 10 μm after liquid-state bonding, almost remaining constant up to 1200°C.

Joints fabricated in the low temperature range, between 550°C and 600°C, exhibited interface decohesion at the aluminum/alumina interface. In contrast, the joints formed at 650°C did not show any interface decohesion but showed cracks inside the aluminum layer or in the alumina. This observation implies that the interface strength is higher than 400 MPa. Thus, those joints are different both in strength and in fracture mode, even though the thickness of the aluminum layer is

almost the same. The weak strength of the joints fabricated in the lower temperature range can be attributed to the presence of an oxide skin on aluminum. As the temperature approaches the melting point of aluminum, the oxide skin breaks, and aluminum and alumina can form a direct interface with high strength.

Above the Al melting point, the final thickness of the interlayer (~10 μm) does not depend on the joining temperature. The gradual decrease in strength with temperature above 660°C is not a result of variations in the thickness of the aluminum layer but a result of the development of unbonded regions on the joint. Figure 6 shows typical fracture surfaces after bending tests (the fracture propagated from the bottom to the top). The fracture surface of the sample bonded just above the melting temperature of aluminum, 700°C shows a crack that propagated in the aluminum layer up to the middle of the bar and then moved into the alumina body. In the aluminum fracture surface, no defects such as unbonded areas are observed. In contrast, the joints fabricated at higher temperature exhibit many large unbonded areas. Figure 7 shows the total bonded area on the fracture surface as a function of joining temperature. The ratio of bonded area to the total interface area gradually decreases from 100% at 700°C to 70% at 1200°C. Surprisingly the joints with 30% unbonded area still exhibit high strength (~90% of the maximum strength obtained at 650°C - 700°C). The relationship between strength and unbonded area, replotted in Fig. 8, is almost linear. By the least squares method, the following experimental relationship can be derived:

$$\sigma_b = 1.69 A + 116 \quad (1)$$

where σ_b is the bending strength of a joint in MPa and A is the ratio of bonded area/total interface area. It should be noted that when A is zero, the strength is 116 MPa. The equation is, therefore, valid for $A \geq 70\%$, which is the smallest bonded area measured.

The decreasing strength with increasing joining temperature can be explained by taking into account aluminum wetting and viscosity. With increasing temperature, contact angle and viscosity of the liquid Al decreases. Because the contact angle of Al on Al_2O_3 is lower than 90° , the capillary pressure drives the alumina blocks tighter when an external pressure is also applied. However, most of the melt will be squeezed out of the joint layer, leading to the formation of unbonded regions. With increasing temperature, the movement of the molten aluminum towards the free surface becomes faster as the viscosity and contact angle decrease, resulting in larger unbonded areas.

Even though unbonded regions remain at the interface, the strength of the bond is quite high, reaching almost 80% of the alumina strength. In some cases, fracture occurred inside the alumina, away from the interface, from which we can infer that the interfacial aluminum/alumina strength is very high. Thus, we can conclude that aluminum brazes are very useful for joining aluminum and alumina for structural applications, which is why aluminum alloy matrix composites have strong interfaces between matrices and various alumina reinforcements when good wetting and direct contact are achieved between both phases.

3.3. Aluminum/Alumina Interface

Aluminum and alumina form quite a strong interface. The α -alumina is the most stable oxide of aluminum and the phase diagram indicates that no other compound can be formed at the Al/ Al_2O_3 interface.³⁵ This observation was confirmed by TEM of the polycrystalline alumina joint. To better characterize the Al/ Al_2O_3 interface, aluminum/sapphire joints were fabricated at 650°C , which is the temperature at which the highest strength was obtained for the aluminum/polycrystalline alumina system.

The interface was studied by TEM. Figure 9 shows a TEM micrograph of the interface with the

diffraction patterns of sapphire and aluminum. The incident electron beam is located along the $\langle 100 \rangle$ direction of sapphire and the bonding face, which is the basal plane of sapphire, i.e., (001), is edge-on viewed. The interface is flat, without any modification by the bonding procedure. Polycrystalline in its initial state, aluminum becomes a single crystal without any boundary inside. Several points were analyzed, and all areas had the same crystallographic characteristics. From the diffraction patterns, the following orientation relationship is derived:

$$(\bar{1}11)_{Al} // (001)_{\alpha-Al_2O_3}, \langle 110 \rangle_{Al} // \langle 100 \rangle_{\alpha-Al_2O_3} \quad (2)$$

This orientation relationship has been reported for the interfaces between fcc metals and sapphire.^{36,37} At such interfaces, the six-fold symmetric close-packed atomic arrangements facing together provides the best periodicity match. However, the lattice mismatch between the (111) plane of aluminum and the (001) plane of alumina is quite large, reaching to 20.8%. As shown in the diffraction pattern in Figure 9 and following lattice images in Figures 10 and 11 both crystals slightly incline or rotate in respect each other, which should relax the large mismatch at the interface.

Several islands with non uniform structure were observed attached to the interface on the aluminum side (Fig. 9a)) while no corresponding feature in the sapphire side was found. Nano-probe EDS analysis did not show any third element in those areas; only oxygen and aluminum were detected in the islands (Fig. 9(b)), indicating that islands are aluminum oxide. In addition, they did not show any lattice fringe nor any specific diffraction spot. These islands are thus identified as amorphous aluminum oxide, which originates from the oxide skin of aluminum. A continuous amorphous alumina layer will reduce the interfacial strength³⁸, but in the samples bonded above 600°C, the amorphous material only forms isolated islands along the interface, resulting in bonds with strengths approaching that of the alumina. Conversely, the presence of a

continuous layer of amorphous alumina in the samples joined below 600 °C³⁶ results in the formation of weak interfaces.

High-resolution TEM reveals the formation of a new crystalline structure at the interface between sapphire and the amorphous oxide, shown in Figure 11. The interval of the new lattice fringes is approximately 0.20 nm, close to the lattice distance of the (002) planes of aluminum. However, the nano-beam EDS clearly shows the presence of oxygen, and the crystalline phase is always in contact with the sapphire surface. These observations suggest that the crystalline phase is aluminum oxide. Figure 12 shows the typical diffraction pattern obtained from an area involving the crystals and the sapphire substrate as well as showing the interpretation of the diffraction pattern. Table 3 summarizes the lattice distances compared with those of aluminum and α -alumina. The experimentally obtained lattice distances correspond well to those of γ -alumina rather than those of metallic aluminum. We conclude that the interfacial crystals in the amorphous islands are γ -alumina because at such low temperature range, especially below 800°C γ -alumina is formed rather than β or α -alumina.³⁸⁻⁴⁰ The fact that the γ -alumina has good orientation relationship with the sapphire substrate implies the formation of strong interfaces between the two phases. The orientation relationship between sapphire and γ -alumina can be expressed by Equation (2) replacing aluminum with γ -alumina.

4. Conclusions

In the present work, several aspects of the Al/Al₂O₃ interfaces have been evaluated: wetting, atomic transport, anisotropy, strength and microstructure. The results can be summarized as follows:

1. The contact angle of liquid aluminum on alumina is lower than 90° at temperatures higher than 1000°C and decreases with temperature to a value of 70° at 1500°C.

2. Transport rates at the Al/Al₂O₃ interface and on the free surface of alumina away from the drop are much faster than previously reported for pure alumina and other metal/alumina systems.
3. The Al/Al₂O₃ interface is highly anisotropic. The basal plane of alumina seems to be one of the stable interfacial planes.
4. In solid-state joining, the strength of the joint increases with increasing temperature. In liquid-state brazing, the strength gradually decreases because of the formation of unbonded regions.
5. The strength of the bonded, σ_b , can be expressed as a function of unbonded area, A, by the following equation: $\sigma_b = 2.69 A + 116$ (in MPa, $70\% \leq A \leq 100\%$).
6. The highest strength (400 MPa) was obtained when the interface is formed at around the melting temperature of aluminum.
7. The interfacial aluminum layer becomes a single crystal when it is joined to sapphire. The following crystallographic orientation relationship was established:

$$(\bar{1}11)_{Al} // (001)_{\alpha-Al_2O_3}, \langle 110 \rangle_{Al} // \langle 100 \rangle_{\alpha-Al_2O_3}$$

8. Amorphous aluminum oxide islands formed at the interface. In the amorphous oxide, γ -alumina nanocrystals with the same orientation relationship grew from the sapphire.

Acknowledgments

K. Suganuma work was supported by the 21COE program of The Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology. E. Saiz and A. P. Tomsia work was supported by the Director, Office of Energy Research, Office of Basic Energy Sciences, Materials Sciences Division of the U. S. Department of Energy under Contract No. DE-AC03-76SF00098.

References

1. Brennan, J. J. & Pask, J. A., Effect of nature of surfaces on wetting of sapphire by liquid aluminum. *J. Am. Ceram. Soc.*, 1968, **51**, 569-73.
2. Nicholas, M. G., Mortimer, D. A., Jones, L. M. & Crispin, R. M., Some Observations on the Wetting and Bonding of Nitride Ceramics. *J. Mater. Sci.*, 1990, **25**, 2679-2689.
3. Klomp, J. T., Bonding of Metals to Ceramics and Glasses. *Amer. Ceram. Soc. Bull.*, 1972, **51**, 683-688.
4. Iseki, T. & Nicholas, M. G., The Elevated Temperature Strengths of Alumina-Aluminium and Magnesium--Aluminium Samples. *J. Mater. Sci.*, 1979, **14**, 687-692.
5. Kohno, T., Yamada, T. & Yokoi, K., Bonding of Ceramics to Metals With Interlayers of Al--Si Clad Aluminium. *J. Japan Inst. Metals*, 1985, **49**, 876-883.
6. Suzumura, A., Onzawa, T., Arata, Y., Ohomori, A. & Sano, S., Friction Welding of Ceramics to Aluminum. 1987, *J.High Temp. Soc.*, **13**, 43.
7. Suganuma, K., New Process for Brazing Ceramics Utilizing Squeeze Casting. *J.Mater.Sci.*, 191, **26**, 6144.
8. Levi, C. G., Abbaschian C. J. & Mehrabian, R., Interface Interactions During Fabrication of Al Alloy/Al₂O₃ Fiber Composites. *Metall.Trans.A*, 1978, **9**, 697-711.
9. Munitz, A., Metzger, M. & Mehrabian, R. The Interface Phase in Al-Mg/Al₂O₃ Composites, *Metall.Trans. A*, 1979, **10**, 1491-1496.
10. Hall, I. W. & Barrailler, V. The Effect of Thermal Exposure on the Microstructure and Fiber /Matrix Interface of an Al₂O₃/Al Composite. *Metall.Trans.A*, 1986, **17**, 1075-1080.
11. Naidich, J. V., The Wettability of Solids by Liquid Metals. *Prog. Surf. Membr. Sci.*, 1981, **14**, 353-483.
12. Weirauch Jr., D. A., A reappraisal of wetting in the system Al-Al₂O₃ from 750-1000°C. In *Ceramic Microstructures '86. Role of interfaces*, eds J. A. Pask & A. G. Evans, Plenum Press, New York, 1987, pp. 329-340.
13. Champion, J. A., Keene, B. J. & Sillwood, J. M., Wetting of aluminum oxide by molten aluminum and other metals. *J. Mat. Sci.*, 1969, **4**, 39-49.
14. Kaplan W. D., Alumina-Aluminum interfaces. Non-equilibrium wetting in a binary systems.

In Interfacial Science in Ceramic Joining. Eds. A. Bellosi, T. Kosmač & A. P. Tomsia, Kluwer Academic Publishers, London, 1998, pp. 153-160.

15. Levi, G. & Kaplan, W. D., Oxygen induced interfacial phenomena during wetting of alumina by liquid aluminium. *Acta Mater.*, 2002, **50**, 75-88.

16. Woohyun Jung, Huesup Song, Sang Whan Park, Doh-Yeon Kim. Variation of contact angles with temperature and time in the Al-Al₂O₃ system. *Met. & Mat. Trans. B-Process Metallurgy & Materials Processing Science*, 1996, **27B**, 51-55.

17. Laurent, V., Chatain, D. Chatillon, C. & Eustathopoulos, N., Wettability of monocrystalline alumina by aluminum between its melting point and 1273 K. *Acta Metall.*, 1988, **36**, 1797-1803.

18. Ricci, E. & Passerone, A., Review: Surface tension and its relations with adsorption, vapourization and surface reactivity of liquid metals. *Mat. Sci. Eng.*, 1993, **A161**, 31-40.

19. Saiz, E., Tomsia, A. P. & Cannon, R. M., Ridging effects on wetting and spreading of liquids on solids. *Acta Mater.*, 1998, **46**, 2349-61.

20. Saiz, E., Tomsia, A. P. & Cannon, R. M., Triple line ridging and attachment in high-temperature wetting. *Scripta Materialia*, 2001, **44**, 159-64.

21. Saiz, E., Cannon R. M. & Tomsia, A. P., Energetics and atomic transport at liquid metal/Al₂O₃ interfaces. *Acta Mater.*, 1999, **47**, 4209-20.

22. Saiz, E., Tomsia, A. P. & Cannon, R. M., Wetting and work of adhesion in oxide/metal systems. In *Ceramic Microstructures: Control at the Atomic Level*, ed. A. P. Tomsia and A. M. Glaeser. Plenum Press, New York, 1998, pp. 65-82.

23. Keene, B. J., Review of data for the surface tension of pure metals. *Int. Mat. Rev.*, 1993, **38**, 157-192.

24. Hoffman, D. W. & Cahn, J. W., A vector thermodynamics for anisotropic surfaces. I. Fundamentals and applications to plane surface junctions, *Surf. Sci.*, 1972, **31**, 368-388.

25. Herring, C., The use of classical macroscopic concepts in surface-energy problems. In *Structure and Properties of Solid Surfaces*, 1953, eds. R. Gomer and C.S. Smith, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, pp. 5-72.

26. Mullins, W. W., Theory of thermal grooving, *J. Appl. Phys.*, 1957, **28**, 333-339.

27. Mullins, W. W., Grain boundary grooving by volume diffusion, *Trans. Met. Soc. AIME*, 1960, **218**, 354-361.

28. Wriedt, H. A., The Al-O (Aluminum-Oxygen) System. *Bull. Alloy Phase Diagrams*, 1985, **6**, 548-553.

29. Jung-Hae Choi, Doh-Yeon Kim, Hockey, B. J, Wiederhorn, S. M., Handwerker, C. A., Blendell, J. E., Carter, W. C & Roosen, A. R. Equilibrium shape of internal cavities in sapphire, *J. Amer. Ceram. Soc.*, 1997, **80**, 62-68.

30. Kitayama M & Glaeser, A. M., The energetics and kinetics of pore shape changes in alumina. *Key Eng. Mat.*, 1999, **159-160**, 193-204.

31. French, T. M & Somorjai, G. A., Composition and surface structure of the (0001) face of α -alumina by low-energy electron diffraction. *J. Phys. Chem.*, 1970, **74**, 2489-2495.
32. Gautier M., Renaud, G., Van, L. P., Villette, B., Pollak, M., Thromat, N., Jollet, F. & Duraud J-P, α Al₂O₃/(0001) surfaces: atomic and electronic structure. *J. Amer. Ceram. Soc.*, 1994, **77**, 323-334.
33. Kruzic, J. J., Interfacial and near interfacial crack growth phenomena in metal bonded alumina. Ph Thesis, University of California Berkeley, 2001.
34. Dalglish, B. J., Saiz, E., Tomsia, A. P., Cannon, R. M. & Ritchie, R. O., Interface formation and strength in ceramic-metal systems. *Scripta Met. Mat.*, 1994, **31**, 1109-1114
35. Hansen M., *Constitution of Binary Alloys*. 1958, McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc, New York.
- 36 Klomp, J. T., Ceramic and metal surfaces in ceramic-to-metal bonding. *Proceedings of the British Ceramic Society*, 1984, **34**, 249-259.
- 37 Fecht, H. J. & Gleiter, H., A Lock-In model for the atomic structure of interphase boundaries between metals and ionic crystals. *Acta Metall.*, 1985, **33**, 557-562.
38. Ikeuchi, K., Solid state bonding of aluminum alloys to dissimilar metals. *J. Japan Inst. Light Metals*, 1996, **46**, 298-306.
39. Sukanuma, K., Interfaces in β -SiC Whiskers/6061 Aluminum Composites. *J. Mater. Res.*, 1993, **8**, 2569-2576.
40. Sukanuma, K., Interfacial microstructures of potassium titanate whiskers in pure aluminum and 6061 alloy matrix. *J. Japan Inst. Metals*, 1994, **58**, 1213-1219.

Table 1. Measured contact and dihedral angles and corresponding interfacial energies. The dihedral angles have been measured from the AFM profiles and include corrections due to the finite AFM tip radius.²¹ Two calculations are presented which are lower and upper bounds for the coexistence condition at 1500°C. For both sets, the resulting γ_{sv} is lower, and γ_{sl} and of γ_{gb} are somewhat smaller than for other metal/alumina systems. For either value of θ , a higher value of γ_{lv} than those chosen would yield surface and grain boundary energies for alumina being higher than those reported for stoichiometric surfaces, that will be unlikely. Instead if the Al/Al₂O₃ surfaces were oxygen deficient, i.e., having an Al excess, these energies should be lower.¹⁵

Temperature (°C)	θ	ϕ_l	ϕ_v	γ_{lv} (J/m ²)	γ_{sl} (J/m ²)	γ_{sv} (J/m ²)	γ_{gb} (J/m ²)
1500	70°	93°	107°	0.30 ¹⁵	0.65	0.76	0.90
1500	80° ¹⁵	''	''	0.74 ²³	0.81	0.95	1.12

Table 2. Surface and volume diffusivities calculated for the Al/Al₂O₃ system. The Al₂O₃(Al) values correspond to the surface of alumina outside of the aluminum drop (experiment performed in a closed crucible). The Al/Al₂O₃ values correspond to the metal/ceramic interface. Values for the clean surface of alumina measured using the AFM technique are also presented for comparison. In the fittings, w is the groove width, $B_i = (\omega D_i \gamma_i \Omega) / kT$ and $B_v = (x D_v \gamma_i \Omega) / kT$, Ω is the molecular volume, ω is the interfacial width, x is the molar solubility in the liquid metal for the diffusing species and D_i and D_v are the interfacial and volume diffusivities, γ_i is the corresponding interfacial energy and k is the Boltzman constant.

System	Temp (°C)	Surface Diffusion		Volume Diffusion		Combined		
		$w = 4.6 \left(\frac{B_i t}{2} \right)^{1/4} + w_0$		$w = 5 \left(\frac{B_v t}{2} \right)^{1/3} + w_0$		$w = 4.6 \left(\frac{B_i t}{2} \right)^{1/4} + 5 \left(\frac{B_v t}{2} \right)^{1/3} + w_0$		
		$\omega \cdot D_i$ (m ³ ·s)	w_0 (nm)	$x \cdot D_v$ (m ² ·s)	w_0 (nm)	$\omega \cdot D_i$ (m ³ ·s)	$x \cdot D_v$ (m ² ·s)	w_0 (nm)
Al ₂ O ₃	1600	4.6·10 ⁻²¹	0					
Al ₂ O ₃ (Al)	1500	2.6·10 ⁻¹⁸	2688					
Al/Al ₂ O ₃	1100	1.1·10 ⁻¹⁹	-162	5·10 ⁻¹⁴	630	4.1·10 ⁻²⁰	6.6·10 ⁻¹⁶	0

Table 3. Lattice spacing obtained from diffraction pattern in Figure 10.

Experimental value	1.38 nm	1.88 nm
Al	431 nm (002) plane	2.024 nm (220) plane
γ -Al ₂ O ₃	1.395 nm (004) plane	1.977 nm (440) plane

Figure captions

Figure 1. Contact angles of Al drops on alumina. The results from the present work were obtained after sixty minutes at the experimental temperature. Results from other authors are also presented for comparison. Because at temperatures below 1000°C (gray area in the graph) the Al drop is usually covered by an oxide layer, the data in that range corresponds to experiments performed using a doser or other means to produce a pristine Al surface.

Figure 2. (a) The oscillation of the macroscopic contact angles for Al/Al₂O₃ in vacuum at 1100°C is due to the combined effects of rapid evaporation and successive formation and breakaway from ridges that pin the periphery. The dotted line shows the equilibrium contact angle described by Young's equation. (b) Optical micrograph of the "reaction rings" that can be observed after removing the Al drop, the rings are actually delineated by triple line ridges.

Figure 3. (a) AFM of the area of the alumina substrate that was under an Al drop melted for 15 minutes at 1500°C (b) SEM micrograph of the area under a drop melted for 30 minutes at 1100°C. Facets are clearly visible (marked with arrows on the AFM image).

Figure 4 Bending strength of alumina/aluminum/alumina joints as a function of joining temperature. Results from other authors are also presented for comparison. The strength depends on the thickness of the aluminum foil, for a given temp stronger bonds are achieved

Figure 5 Thickness of aluminum layer as a function of joining temperature.

Figure 6 Fracture surface of joints joined (A) at 1200 °C and (B) at 700 °C. Fracture proceeded from the bottom to the top.

Figure 7 Fraction of bonded area as a function of joining temperature.

Figure 8 Bending strength of each specimen vs. bonded area.

Figure 9 (A) TEM photograph of aluminum/sapphire interface joined at 650 °C with diffraction patterns. The two arrows point to the distorted region in aluminum. (B) EDX spectra from the distorted region in (A).

Figure 10 HREM of aluminum/sapphire interface showing an amorphous layer.

Figure 11. HREM of aluminum/sapphire interface showing lattice fringes in an amorphous layer.

Figure 12. (A) Diffraction pattern obtained from amorphous layer with lattice fringes near sapphire and (B) its interpretation. The arrows indicate the diffraction from the lattice in the amorphous layer.




Figure 1





Figure 2





Figure 3




Figure 4




Figure 6




Figure 6




Figure 7




Figure 8





Figure 9




Figure 10




Figure 11





Figure 12