

Is spark plasma sintering suitable for the densification of continuous carbon fibre - UHTCMCs?

Original

Is spark plasma sintering suitable for the densification of continuous carbon fibre - UHTCMCs? / Zoli, L.; Vinci, A.; Galizia, P.; Gutierrez-Gonzalez, C. F.; Rivera, S.; Sciti, D.. - In: JOURNAL OF THE EUROPEAN CERAMIC SOCIETY. - ISSN 0955-2219. - STAMPA. - 40:7(2020), pp. 2597-2603. [10.1016/j.jeurceramsoc.2019.12.004]

Availability:

This version is available at: 11583/2952109 since: 2022-01-21T14:32:50Z

Publisher:

Elsevier Ltd

Published

DOI:10.1016/j.jeurceramsoc.2019.12.004

Terms of use:

openAccess

This article is made available under terms and conditions as specified in the corresponding bibliographic description in the repository

Publisher copyright

Elsevier postprint/Author's Accepted Manuscript

© 2020. This manuscript version is made available under the CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 license
<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>. The final authenticated version is available online at:
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jeurceramsoc.2019.12.004>

(Article begins on next page)

Is spark plasma sintering suitable for the densification of continuous carbon fibre - UHTCMCs?

Luca Zoli ^a, Antonio Vinci ^a, Pietro Galizia ^a, Carlos F. Guitérrez-Gonzalez ^b, Sergio Rivera ^b, Diletta Sciti ^{a,*}

^a CNR-ISTEC, Institute of Science and Technology for Ceramics, Via Granarolo 64, I-48018 Faenza, Italy

^b Nanoker Research S.L., Polígono de Olloniego, Parcela 22A - Nave 5, 33660 Oviedo, Principado de Asturias (Spain)

*Corresponding author: D. Sciti, diletta.sciti@istec.cnr.it, phone +39 0546 699748, fax +39 0546 46381

ABSTRACT

For the first time we show that spark plasma sintering can efficiently replace hot pressing for the densification of UHTCMCs, in the present case ZrB₂/SiC composites reinforced with continuous carbon fibres. To this purpose, the same materials were first produced by hot pressing as baseline samples and then by spark plasma sintering (SPS) to compare microstructure and basic mechanical properties. A special emphasis was given to the study of interfaces, in case of both coated and uncoated carbon fibres.

SPS allowed for faster sintering but required an adjustment of the temperature to avoid fibre degradation compared to hot pressing. With similar porosity levels, we observed a slight decrease of flexural strength (300 vs 470 MPa), and an improvement of fracture toughness (15 vs 10 MPa√m) for SPSed samples. SPS was proved to be an effective method for the consolidation of continuous fibre reinforced UHTC composites.

Keywords: spark plasma sintering; ceramic matrix composite; UHTCMC; carbon fibre; hot pressing

1. Introduction

Spark plasma sintering (SPS) is a **consolidation** technique for the processing of several class of materials and configurations. [1–3] The simultaneous application of electrical current and mechanical pressure allows to overcome many of the problems encountered with poorly sinterable materials [4–8]. The advantages of SPS over hot pressing for refractory ceramic bulk compounds such as Ultra-High Temperature Ceramics (UHTCs) has been proved in several publications [9–12]. With this technique it is possible to reduce the maximum temperature, holding time and/or avoid the use of sintering agents, which results in overall refinement of the microstructure and improvement of mechanical properties [13]. Recently, fast consolidation of ZrB₂-based composites reinforced with ultra-short pitch-based carbon fibres (<0.5 mm) has been obtained by SPS, with minimal or no fibre damage provided that the sintering parameters are carefully tailored[14].

This paper investigates for the first time the SPS densification of continuous carbon fibre - UHTCMCs obtained by overlapping carbon fibre preforms impregnated with ZrB₂-SiC powder mixtures. UHTCMCs are under development in the European project C³HARME (www.c3harme.eu) and are designed to be applied in aerospace harsh environments such as thermal protection systems for hypersonic re-entry vehicles and rocket nozzles for satellite launchers [15,16]. UHTCMCs should in principle overcome the operational limits of SiC-based CMCs, due to active oxidation of SiC to SiO_(g) at temperatures above 1600 °C and at low oxygen partial pressures [17–21]. Several processing methods are currently under investigation to combine the functionality of the UHTC phase with the damage tolerance of CMCs; one approach is based on the coating of CMCs with a layer of UHTCs [22], while other methods involve the incorporation of UHTC particles in the starting liquid precursor [19,23,24]. In all these cases the UHTC phase represent a very low volumetric fraction of the final composite [25–27]

Hot pressed continuous carbon fibre-UHTCMCs are basically constituted by a UHTC matrix well integrated with the carbon preform, and have recently shown an excellent oxidation

1 resistance [18], thermal shock resistance up to 1500 °C [26] and damage tolerance [28]. Further
2 investigations have been carried out on ablation behaviour under hypersonic re-entry conditions
3
4 [29] demonstrating an excellent behaviour at temperature exceeding 2500 °C.
5

6
7 **In the present work, consolidation efficiency of C_f/ZrB₂-SiC UHTCMCs by spark plasma
8
9 sintering was investigated. On the same materials, hot pressing cycles were performed as reference.
10
11 Sintering parameters, microstructural features and mechanical properties were compared in order to
12
13 understand advantages and drawbacks of the SPS technology. This work also includes the study of
14
15 sinterability and characterization with two different types of fibres i.e.:
16
17**

- 18 - pyrolytic carbon (PyC) coated PAN-based carbon fibres,
19
20
21 - uncoated pitch-based carbon fibres.
22

23 24 25 26 **2. Experimental**

27
28 **Fabrication.** The following raw materials were used:

29
30 *Powders:* ZrB₂ Grade B, H.C. Starck, Germany, particle size range 0.5-6 µm, impurities (wt%): 0.2
31
32 C, 1.3 O, 0.19 N, 0.1 Fe, 1.4 Hf; α-SiC (Grade UF-25, H.C. Starck, Germany, D₅₀ 0.45 µm.
33
34

35 *Fibres:* PAN-derived Carbon fibres (T800HB-6000, TORAYCA, Japan), diameter 5 µm, coating:
36
37 pyrolytic carbon (PyC) 0.0811 g/m (coating thickness ~0.5-1 µm); pitch-based carbon fibres
38
39 (XN80-6K, Granoc, Japan), diameter 10 µm, uncoated.
40
41

42 A (90 vol% ZrB₂ - 10 vol% SiC) powder mixture was prepared by wet ball milling and dried. With
43
44 the mixed powders, aqueous slurries were prepared according to previous studies [25]. Composites
45
46 were fabricated impregnating unidirectional fibre bundles with the slurry and subsequently stacking
47
48 the fibre layers, either 30 x 30 mm² squares or Ø = 40 mm discs, in a 0/0° configuration. The 4
49
50 materials have the following compositions, in vol% (see details in Table 1):
51
52
53

- 54
55
56
57 45% (90 % ZrB₂-10 % SiC) + 55 vol% PyC PAN-C_f, labelled as **C_SPS** or **C_HP**,
58
59
60 55% (90 % ZrB₂-10 % SiC) + 45 vol% Pitch-C_f, labelled as **U_SPS** or **U_HP**,
61
62
63
64
65

1 where “C” refers to coated fibres, “U” to uncoated fibres, “SPS” to spark plasma sintering and “HP”
2 to hot pressing.
3

4 **Sintering.** Hot pressing cycles were carried out on 30 x 30 mm² samples on the basis of
5 previous experience [26], under vacuum (~0.2 mbar), at 1900 °C, 40 MPa, holding time of 30 min,
6 heating rate of 25 °C/min, free cooling. **The temperature behaviour was monitored by an optical
7 pyrometer focused on the external surface of the graphite die. Since the heating rate is low and the
8 sample highly thermally conductive we assume that temperature experienced by the sample is
9 consistent with the value measured by the pyrometer.** Spark plasma sintering cycles (SPS furnaces
10 HPD25, FCT Systeme GMBH, Germany) on Ø = 40 mm discs were carried out under vacuum
11 (~0.3 mbar) at 1850, 1900 °C, holding time 2-5 min, heating rate 100 °C/min, cooling rate 450
12 °C/minute. **The temperature was monitored with an optical pyrometer focused on the bottom of the
13 upper graphite punch, about 5 mm away from the sample.** The final pressure of 40 MPa was applied
14 at the beginning of the cycle and released at the beginning of the cooling stage.
15
16

17 **Characterization.** The bulk density of the sintered pellets was determined using
18 Archimedes’ method, and the relative density was defined as the ratio between the experimental and
19 the theoretical values. The theoretical density of materials was calculated with the rule of mixtures
20 on the basis of the starting composition. Residual porosity, **fibre volumetric content (FVC) and
21 mean grain size (m.g.s)** of ZrB₂ were measured by image analysis using the Image-Pro Analyzer 7.0
22 software (v.7, Media Cybernetics, USA) on SEM images of polished sections. The microstructures
23 were analysed on polished and fractured surfaces using field emission scanning electron microscopy
24 (FE-SEM, Carl Zeiss Sigma NTS GmbH Oberkochen, Germany).
25
26

27 Four-point bending tests (σ) were performed on 25 × 2.5 × 2 mm³ bars (length by width by
28 thickness, respectively). Chevron notched beams (CNBs) specimens of 25 × 2 × 2.5 mm³ (length by
29 width by thickness, respectively) were used for toughness tests (K_{Ic}). The test bars were notched
30 with a 0.1 mm-thick diamond saw; the chevron-notch tip depth and average side length were about
31 0.12 and 0.80 of the bar thickness, respectively. All tested bars were fractured using a semi-

articulated stainless steel four-point fixture with a lower span of 20 mm and an upper span of 10 mm, using a Zwick-Roell Z050 screw-driven load frame. The crosshead speed was 1 mm/min and 0.05 mm/min for σ and K_{Ic} , respectively. The Work-of-Fracture (WoF) was calculated from the CNB test as the area below the load-displacement curve divided by the double of the projected real surface.

3. Results and discussion

3.1 SPS vs HP - Microstructural features and fibre/matrix interface characteristics

Table 1 summarizes sintering conditions, densities and properties of the materials obtained.

Label	Sintering conditions				Sintering T_{onset}	Max densification rate	Density	Porosity	ZrB ₂ mean grain size	Fibre volumetric content	Flexural strength, σ	Fracture toughness, K_{Ic}
	(°C/min)	(°C)	(MPa)	(min)	(°C)	(%/min)	(g/cm ³)	(%)	(μ m)	(%)	(MPa)	(MPa \sqrt m)
C_HP	25	1900	40	30	1600	0.9	3.0	18	~2.4	55	470 \pm 50	10.0 \pm 3.0
C_SPS	100	1850	40	3	1500	6	3.0	18	~2.3	55	300 \pm 50	14.6 \pm 3.0
U_HP	25	1900	40	30	1600	0.9	3.8	10	~2.5	45	320 \pm 10	10.3 \pm 0.3
U_SPS	100	1850	40	3	1500	6	4.0	5	~2.4	45	260 \pm 20	8.7 \pm 0.4

Table 1. Sintering parameters (heating rate, max temperature, pressure, residence time), physical properties and mechanical properties of specimens sintered by HP (C_HP, U_HP) and SPS (C_SPS, U_SPS) with coated PAN-derived fibres (C) and uncoated pitch-based fibres (U).

C_HP (reference sample): The composite with coated fibres, hot pressed at 1900 °C, showed a residual porosity of 18%, Table 1. Densification was aided by formation of Si-O liquid phases that helped particle rearrangement and favoured cleaning of the ZrB₂ particle surface from surficial ZrO₂ and B₂O₃, incorporating them in the liquid, as previously reported [30]. The typical densification curve is reported in Fig. 1a. The onset for densification was around 1600 °C, with a change in the slope related to an increase of the densification rate at around 1700 °C. The maximum

densification rate, $\sim 0.9 \text{ \% min}^{-1}$, was recorded during the heating step when temperature approached 1850 °C.




Fig. 1. Densification curves obtained for a) HP cycle at 1900 °C, 30 min, b) SPS cycle at 1900 °C, 5 min. In the inset the densification rate vs. temperature during heating step is shown.

Details of the microstructure, Fig. 2, show coated fibres grouped in clusters, Fig. 2a, with unaltered coating, Fig. 2b, c and isolated fibres with a reacted layer in place of the coating, at the interface, Fig. 2e. The coating was useful to prevent a strong fibre/matrix reaction, which would have been unavoidable in the case of uncoated fibres [25]. Around the fibres, we detected the formation of small bright contrasting grains and intermediate grey particles (Fig. 2c), which were recognized as ZrC and SiC particles by EDS (Fig. 2d). Formation of ZrC at the interface with C fibres was already reported in previous works [14] and is caused by carbo-reduction of ZrO_2 present on the surface of ZrB_2 particles with carbon provided by the fibres, see reaction 1.



For isolated fibres, inclusions of ZrC and SiC particles inside the coating/fibres were detected and were due to penetration of Si-O based liquid phases inside the coating layers and subsequent reaction with the fibre, during sintering, see Fig 2e. The combination of unreacted

1 clustered coated fibres (Fig. 2b) and isolated fibres (Fig. 2e) with partially reacted interfaces led to a
2 mixture of weak and strong interfaces, as depicted in the fracture image in Fig. 2f.
3
4





Fig. 2. Microstructural details of sample C_HP, a) polished cross section showing grouped fibres, b) magnification of the grouped fibres joined by the coating, c) coating detachment due to load application, d) EDS analysis of 3 different spots marked in fig. 2c as 1,2,3, e) two fibres with reacted coating, f) fracture surface with extensive pull-out of grouped fibres and no pull-out of isolated fibres.

C_SPS: Different trials were conducted to replicate similar microstructural features as for hot pressed samples. SPS cycles were first conducted at 1900 °C for 2, 3, 5 min, and then at 1850 °C for 2, 3, 5 min. The densification curve for the cycle at 1900 °C, 5 min, is reported in Fig. 1b. Besides the displacement originating from the thermal expansion effects of the pistons, the behaviour is similar to hot pressing. The onset of densification occurred roughly at 1500 °C; at 1800 °C a sudden increase of densification rate was observed. Due to the four times higher heating rate, the maximum value of densification rate, of about 6 % min⁻¹, was achieved after the heating step when the temperature reached the peak of 1906 °C. The higher densification rate for SPS compared to HP is likely due to the higher heating rate of the former. With these sintering conditions, full density was achieved; however, SEM analysis on the fracture surfaces revealed the degradation of

1 the fibre coating, leading to the loss of the coating functionality and no fibre debonding during
2 fracture (Fig. 3). Decreasing the holding time from 5 to 2 minutes did not solve the issue of
3 fibre/matrix overreaction, therefore it was necessary to decrease the maximum sintering
4 temperature.
5
6
7 4 temperature.




8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24 5
25
26 6 **Fig. 3. Fracture surface of the damaged fibre highlighting a group of four fibre sections overreacted**
27 **with the matrix. The dark contrasting rounded phases are the fibers, the light contrasting phase is**
28 **the ZrB_2 matrix, the grey contrasting is SiC. The jagged interface containing ZrC particles is due to**
29 **the overreaction of the fibre and matrix at the fibre/matrix interface during SPS at 1900 °C.**
30
31
32 9
33
34 10
35

36 11 Cycles carried out at 1850 °C for shorter times, 2 min, were considered more suitable to
37
38 12 achieve a level of densification (residual porosity < 20 %) in the matrix similar to the hot pressing
39
40
41 13 one, with no fibre damage. A slight ZrB_2 grains refinement was observed for SPS, see Table 1.

42
43 14 Fig. 4 shows essential features of the composite sintered at 1850 °C for 2 min. Similar to
44
45 15 C_HP the fibre distribution was uneven, due to the fibre coating applied before impregnation, see
46
47
48 16 Fig. 4a. Indeed, the liquid slurry could not penetrate the bundles connected by the CVD PyC
49
50 17 coating, and neither SPS nor HP did repair this defect. Noteworthy, inside fibre clusters a partial
51
52
53 18 detachment of the coating from the fibre was frequently observed during densification (Fig. 4b).
54
55 19 This detachment was likely due to shrinkage stresses occurring during the SPS treatment. On the
56
57
58 20 contrary, isolated fibres showed a more reacted interface, and no coating detachment, see Fig. 4c,
59
60 21 similar to hot pressing. Overall, the phenomenon of coating detachment was more marked after
61
62
63
64
65

1 SPS, Fig. 4b, very likely enhanced by the faster heating and cooling rate that did not allow a
2 suitable rearrangement of particles inside the composites. On the other hand, the higher temperature
3 and longer holding time of hot pressing caused a slightly higher reaction at the interface for isolated
4 fibres, (compare Fig. 4c to 2e). In Fig. 4d a bimodal extensive fibre pull-out is visible, weak
5 interface for grouped fibres and a strong interface for isolated fibres. Details in Fig. 4e, indicate that
6 fibre sliding occurred predominantly between fibres and coating.




7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Fig. 4. Microstructural details of sample C_SPS, a) polished cross section showing grouped fibres, b) magnification of the grouped fibres showing coating detachment c) isolated fibre cross section with partially reacted coating, d) fracture surface with an extensive fibre pull-out, e) details of the interface after fibre sliding.

U_HP (reference HP sample): The microstructure obtained with uncoated pitch fibres is very different from the previous cases, Fig. 5a. This is due to several factors including the lower FVC, 45 vs 55 vol.% and a larger fibre diameter, ~10 μm. But most of all, uncoated fibres were more homogeneously infiltrated by the slurry compared to coated fibres (Fig. 5a,d). As for the matrix/fibre interface, it is clear that the absence of coating favoured a stronger adhesion with the

1 matrix (Fig. 5c), as previously reported [28], resulting in a decrease of fibre pull-out extent (Fig. 5d)
2 compared to the samples with coated fibres (Fig. 2f). At the interface, the formation of SiC (Fig. 5c)
3 and ZrC (not shown) was observed, as for the previous specimens.



37
38 **Fig. 5.** Microstructural details of sample U_HP, a) polished cross section showing
39 homogeneously distributed fibres in the matrix (dark contrasting are not infiltrated area), b) detail of
40 a fibre cross section surrounded by the matrix (residual porosity highlighted by arrows), c) detail of
41 fibre/matrix interface showing partial fibre detachment and partial matrix anchorage with residual
42 SiC phase at the interface, d) fracture surface where fibre pull-out is visible, dark contrasting are
43 fibres and white contrasting is matrix.

44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51 **U_SPS:** The composite was sintered at 1850 °C, 2 min, as for C_SPS. The final porosity
52 was ~5% (Table 1), in agreement with microstructure analysis (Fig. 6a-b). As for U_HP, fibres are
53 well distributed in the UHTC matrix and the interface was strong but quite smooth (Fig. 6c), just
54 displaying small SiC particles. The extent of fibre pull-out was lower than the reference hot pressed
55 sample, consisting with higher matrix density achieved, and occurred via intra-fibre sliding, Fig.
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

6d,e. Fig. 6e shows the external fibre graphite layer adherent to ZrB_2 matrix but detached from the rest of the fibre. The matrix **mean grain size** of U_HP and U_SPS are comparable, see Table 1.




Fig. 6. Microstructural details of sample U_SPS, a) polished cross section showing **well distributed fibres in the matrix**, b) detail of the matrix, **dark contrasting area are pores**, the **light contrasting phase is ZrB_2 matrix**, the **grey contrasting is SiC**. c) single fibre polished section; d) fracture surface with short fibre pull-out, e) detail of fibre/matrix interface where **graphite layers remained adherent to the matrix after intra-fibre sliding are visible**.

In summary, experiments and microstructural analyses confirmed that it is possible to replicate the microstructure of a UHTCMC densified by hot pressing, using the SPS technique. The temperature must be lowered by some 50 °C and the holding time is reduced **from half an hour** to few minutes. This finding holds true for small and thin samples as those here considered but it is likely that experimental parameters must be re-adjusted in case of samples with different mass and dimensions. Parallel cycles at 1900 °C confirmed that SPS was much faster than hot pressing to

1 achieve nearly full density in the matrix, but the fibre/matrix interface reactivity was too high,
2 which jeopardized the capability for damage tolerance of the composite. From the microstructural
3 features and densification curves it was concluded that similar densification mechanisms occurred
4 during the two thermal treatments, mostly based on conventional heating effects. For SPS, the Joule
5 effect had the consequence of a faster heating compared to hot pressing and this accelerated the
6 diffusion processes via liquid phase sintering. The presence of a coating allowed the use of PAN-
7 derived fibres, previously found unsuitable for this process, by preventing the reaction at the
8 interface between the fibre and the matrix. However, coated fibres were more delicate and the
9 coating was prone to detachment during the sintering treatment very likely due to the application of
10 a mechanical load. Pitch-based carbon fibres were suitable even without expensive coatings due to
11 their higher chemical stability (graphitic structure), but the lack of a coating always resulted in a
12 stronger fibre/matrix interface that limited fibre pull-out.

3.2 Mechanical behaviour

Flexural strength and fracture toughness load-displacement curves are reported in Fig. 7 and
Fig. 8 respectively, highlighting the direct comparison between SPS and HP treatment on the same
composition. For the sake of clarity, it must be mentioned that these tests were useful just for
comparison purposes; it is well known that flexural strength values are affected by interlaminar
fracture, thus it is unlikely that the values reported in Table 1 always represent the ultimate
materials strength. The same holds true for fracture toughness, in which the reported value could be
a mixture of opening mode (**mode I**) and shearing mode (**mode II**).




Fig. 7. C_SPS vs C_HP: a) Comparison of stress-displacement curves of the flexural test and b) load-displacement curves of chevron notched beams (CNB) specimens.




Fig. 8. U_SPS vs U_HP: Comparison of stress-displacement curves of the flexural test and b) load-displacement curves of chevron notched beams (CNB) specimens for samples.

C_SPS vs C_HP. The results obtained in terms of mechanical strength and toughness can be easily interpreted on the basis of the microstructural observations. Comparing samples C_SPS and C_HP, coated fibres and different techniques, Fig. 7, a lower strength was found when SPS was the sintering technique, Fig. 7a, while the toughness was improved up to a corresponding Work-of-Fracture (WoF) of 7 KJ/m², Fig. 7b. Stresses induced by a rapid densification, fast heating and cooling led to creation of new defects, such as coating detachment, lower adhesion between layers compared to HP, because powder particles inside and around impregnated bundles had less time for rearrangement. This probably resulted in a higher chance of interlaminar fracture and crack growth

1 in **mode II**. On the other hand, the rapid heat treatment limited the fibre/matrix interface reactions,
2 leading to higher fracture toughness.
3

4 **U_SPS vs U_HP**. For this group of composites, the difference recorded in mechanical
5 properties between the two techniques is much less evident and the WOF is attested to about 0.5
6 KJ/m², Fig. 8a, b. The slightly lower values of toughness found for U_SPS can be attributed to the
7 stronger fibre/matrix bond. The load-displacement curves of CNBs, Fig. 8b, showed a similar trend
8 and could be affected by a lower contribution of crack growth in **mode II**. Also the lower data
9 scattering of both mechanical tests suggests that a more homogeneous microstructure was obtained
10 with uncoated pitch-based carbon fibres.
11

12 As a general observation ultra-high modulus pitch-based carbon fibres show a lower
13 degree of reaction during sintering with oxide impurities, SiC and ZrB₂ grains compared to
14 intermediate modulus PAN-derived fibres. The reason lies in the different microstructure of the
15 carbon, which is highly crystalline with a graphitic structure for the former, and amorphous with a
16 turbostratic structure for the latter. Such difference in structure is responsible for the intra-fibre-
17 sliding in pitch-based C_f and, at the same time, the unsuitability of uncoated PAN-based C_f [25].
18 About the lower delamination and the higher microstructure homogeneity of the material reinforced
19 with uncoated pitch-based fibres, a possible explanation, could be the faster rearrangement during
20 sintering under uniaxial pressure, of isolated C_f rather than joined grouped C_f.
21

22 Flexural strength and toughness were higher in composites with coated PAN-based fibres.
23 This could be associated to both the higher FVC and the intrinsically higher strength of the PAN-
24 derived fibres which was retained even after sintering. Compared to pitch-based carbon fibres [26],
25 coated PyC/PAN-based carbon fibres allowed for an extensive fibre pull-out from the UHTC matrix
26 upon fracture. The coating was well anchored to the matrix, but the fibre/coating interface remained
27 weak and fibres were able to slide out of the coating. Moreover, the lower stiffness of the PAN-
28 derived fibres prevented premature fibre failure during sliding.
29

1 As far as the fracture toughness of hot pressed specimens is concerned, the individual
2 values of K_{Ic} did not highlight any significant difference between coated and uncoated fibres. The
3
4 apparently higher mean values, obtained with the coated C_f , should be addressed to the higher
5
6 tendency to delaminate, which on the one side attests the higher damage tolerance behaviour. On
7
8 the other side, owing the higher contribution of shearing mode, the calculated K_{Ic} values are not
9
10 reliable as absolute values.
11
12

13 4. Conclusions

14 In this paper, for the first time, the feasibility of SPS for the consolidation of continuous
15
16 fibre reinforced ZrB_2-SiC composites was demonstrated. Specimens reinforced with both coated
17
18 PAN-based fibres or pitch-derived carbon fibres were successfully sintered by SPS and it was
19
20 shown that microstructure and mechanical properties were comparable to materials produced by hot
21
22 pressing.
23
24

25 Consolidation by SPS was much faster, but required a fine tuning of the sintering
26
27 parameters to limit excessive reaction at fibre/matrix interface. Comparison of shrinkage curves and
28
29 microstructures indicated that C_f/ZrB_2-SiC sintered by HP and SPS underwent similar densification
30
31 mechanisms, e.g. liquid phase sintering, and similar chemical interactions between the involved
32
33 species. Spark plasma sintered composites reinforced with 55 vol% of coated fibres reached a
34
35 strength of 300 MPa and a fracture toughness of 15 $MPa\sqrt{m}$.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 Acknowledgements

49 This work received support by the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and
50
51 innovation programme under Grant Agreement n°685594. (C³HARME: Next Generation Ceramic
52
53 Composites for Harsh Combustion Environment and Space). Authors gratefully acknowledge A.
54
55 Schoberth (AIRBUS group) for supplying coated fibres, C. Melandri and D. Dalle Fabbriche, CNR-
56
57 ISTEK for technical support.
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

References

- [1] Z.A. Munir, U. Anselmi-Tamburini, M. Ohyanagi, The effect of electric field and pressure on the synthesis and consolidation of materials: A review of the spark plasma sintering method, *J. Mater. Sci.* 41 (2006) 763–777. doi:10.1007/s10853-006-6555-2.
- [2] R. Orrù, G. Cao, Comparison of reactive and non-reactive spark plasma sintering routes for the fabrication of monolithic and composite Ultra High Temperature Ceramics (UHTC) materials, *Materials (Basel)*. 6 (2013) 1566–1583. doi:10.3390/ma6051566.
- [3] G. Cao, C. Estournes, J. Garay, R. Orru, eds., *Spark Plasma Sintering*, 1st Ed., Elsevier, 2019. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/C2018-0-02428-7.
- [4] J. Lin, Y. Huang, H. Zhang, Y. Yang, Y. Wu, Spark plasma sintering of ZrO₂ fiber toughened ZrB₂-based ultra-high temperature ceramics, *Ceram. Int.* 41 (2015) 10336–10340. doi:10.1016/j.ceramint.2015.04.148.
- [5] H. Hu, Q. Wang, Z. Chen, C. Zhang, Y. Zhang, J. Wang, Preparation and characterization of C/SiC–ZrB₂ composites by precursor infiltration and pyrolysis process, *Ceram. Int.* 36 (2010) 1011–1016. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ceramint.2009.11.015.
- [6] C. Xu, Y. Cai, K. Flodström, Z. Li, S. Esmailzadeh, G. Zhang, Spark plasma sintering of B₄C ceramics : The effects of milling medium and TiB₂ addition, *Int. J. Refract. Met. Hard Mater.* 30 (2012) 139–144. doi:10.1016/j.ijrmhm.2011.07.016.
- [7] H. Jin, S. Meng, W. Xie, C. Xu, J. Niu, ZrB₂-CNTs Nanocomposites Fabricated by Spark Plasma Sintering, *Materials (Basel)*. 9 (2016) 967. doi:10.3390/ma9120967.
- [8] X. Zhang, L. Xu, S. Du, C. Liu, J. Han, W. Han, Spark plasma sintering and hot pressing of ZrB₂-SiC ultra-high temperature ceramics, *J. Alloys Compd.* (2008). doi:10.1016/j.jallcom.2007.11.018.
- [9] J. Gonzalez-Julian, K. Jähnert, K. Speer, L. Liu, J. Räthel, M. Knapp, H. Ehrenberg, M. Bram, O. Guillon, Effect of Internal Current Flow during the Sintering of Zirconium Diboride by Field Assisted Sintering Technology, *J. Am. Ceram. Soc.* 99 (2016) 35–42. doi:10.1111/jace.13931.
- [10] G.B. Yadhukulakrishnan, S. Karumuri, A. Rahman, R.P. Singh, A. Kaan Kalkan, S.P. Harimkar, Spark plasma sintering of graphene reinforced zirconium diboride ultra-high temperature ceramic composites, *Ceram. Int.* 39 (2013) 6637–6646. doi:10.1016/j.ceramint.2013.01.101.
- [11] E. Zapata-Solvas, D.D. Jayaseelan, H.T. Lin, P. Brown, W.E. Lee, Mechanical properties of ZrB₂- and HfB₂-based ultra-high temperature ceramics fabricated by spark plasma sintering,

- 1 J. Eur. Ceram. Soc. 33 (2013) 1373–1386. doi:10.1016/j.jeurceramsoc.2012.12.009.
- 2 [12] J. Zou, J. Liu, J. Zhao, G.J. Zhang, S. Huang, B. Qian, J. Vleugels, O. Van der Biest, J.Z.
3 Shen, A top-down approach to densify ZrB₂-SiC-BN composites with deeper homogeneity
4 and improved reliability, Chem. Eng. J. (2014). doi:10.1016/j.cej.2014.03.089.
- 5 [13] S.-Q. Guo, Densification of ZrB₂-based composites and their mechanical and physical
6 properties: A review, J. Eur. Ceram. Soc. 29 (2009) 995–1011.
7 doi:10.1016/j.jeurceramsoc.2008.11.008.
- 8 [14] L. Zoli, A. Vinci, L. Silvestroni, D. Sciti, M. Reece, S. Grasso, Rapid spark plasma sintering
9 to produce dense UHTCs reinforced with undamaged carbon fibres, Mater. Des. 130 (2017)
10 1–7. doi:10.1016/j.matdes.2017.05.029.
- 11 [15] R. Savino, L. Criscuolo, G.D. Di Martino, S. Mungiguerra, Aero-thermo-chemical
12 characterization of ultra-high-temperature ceramics for aerospace applications, J. Eur.
13 Ceram. Soc. 38 (2018) 2937–2953. doi:10.1016/j.jeurceramsoc.2017.12.043.
- 14 [16] W. Krenkel, Ceramic Matrix Composites: Fiber Reinforced Ceramics and their Applications,
15 2008. doi:10.1002/9783527622412.
- 16 [17] M.E. Westwood, J.D. Webster, R.J. Day, F.H. Hayes, R. Taylor, Review Oxidation
17 protection for carbon fibre composites, J. Mater. Sci. 31 (1996) 1389–1397.
18 doi:10.1016/0008-6223(89)90204-2.
- 19 [18] A. Vinci, L. Zoli, E. Landi, D. Sciti, Oxidation behaviour of a continuous carbon fibre
20 reinforced ZrB₂-SiC composite, Corros. Sci. 123 (2017). doi:10.1016/j.corsci.2017.04.012.
- 21 [19] S. Tang, J. Deng, S. Wang, W. Liu, K. Yang, Ablation behaviors of ultra-high temperature
22 ceramic composites, Mater. Sci. Eng. A. 465 (2007) 1–7. doi:10.1016/j.msea.2007.02.040.
- 23 [20] A. Paul, J. Binner, B. Vaidhyanathan, UHTC Composites for Hypersonic Applications, in:
24 Ultra-High Temp. Ceram. Mater. Extrem. Environ. Appl., 2014: pp. 144–166.
25 doi:10.1002/9781118700853.ch7.
- 26 [21] J.W. Zimmermann, G.E. Hilmas, W.G. Fahrenholtz, Thermal shock resistance of ZrB₂ and
27 ZrB₂-30% SiC, Mater. Chem. Phys. 112 (2008) 140–145.
28 doi:10.1016/j.matchemphys.2008.05.048.
- 29 [22] B. Xu, C. Hong, S. Zhou, J. Han, X. Zhang, High-temperature erosion resistance of ZrB₂-
30 based ceramic coating for lightweight carbon/carbon composites under simulated
31 atmospheric re-entry conditions by high frequency plasma wind tunnel test, Ceram. Int. 42
32 (2016) 9511–9518. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ceramint.2016.03.029.
- 33 [23] Q. Li, S. Dong, Z. Wang, G. Shi, Fabrication and properties of 3-D Cf/ZrB₂-ZrC-SiC
34 composites via polymer infiltration and pyrolysis, Ceram. Int. 39 (2013) 5937–5941.

1 doi:10.1016/j.ceramint.2012.11.074.

- 2 [24] S. Tang, J. Deng, S. Wang, W. Liu, Comparison of thermal and ablation behaviors of C/SiC
3 composites and C/ZrB₂-SiC composites, *Corros. Sci.* 51 (2009) 54–61.
4
5 doi:10.1016/j.corsci.2008.09.037.
6
- 7 [25] D. Sciti, A. Natali Murri, V. Medri, L. Zoli, Continuous C fibre composites with a porous
8 ZrB₂ Matrix, *Mater. Des.* 85 (2015). doi:10.1016/j.matdes.2015.06.136.
9
- 10 [26] L. Zoli, A. Vinci, P. Galizia, C. Melandri, Di. Sciti, On the thermal shock resistance and
11 mechanical properties of novel unidirectional UHTCMCs for extreme environments, *Sci.*
12
13 *Rep.* (2018). doi:10.1038/s41598-018-27328-x.
14
- 15 [27] V. Rubio, P. Ramanujam, J. Binner, Ultra-high temperature ceramic composite, *Adv. Appl.*
16
17 *Ceram.* (2018). doi:10.1080/17436753.2018.1475140.
18
- 19 [28] P. Galizia, S. Failla, L. Zoli, D. Sciti, Tough salami-inspired Cf/ZrB₂ UHTCMCs produced
20 by electrophoretic deposition, *J. Eur. Ceram. Soc.* 38 (2018) 403–409.
21
22 doi:10.1016/J.JEURCERAMSOC.2017.09.047.
23
- 24 [29] S. Mungiguerra, G.D. Di Martino, A. Cecere, R. Savino, L. Silvestroni, A. Vinci, L. Zoli, D.
25 Sciti, Arc-jet wind tunnel characterization of ultra-high-temperature ceramic matrix
26 composites, *Corros. Sci.* (2019). doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.corsci.2018.12.039.
27
- 28 [30] W.G. Fahrenholtz, G.E. Hilmas, I.G. Talmy, J.A. Zaykoski, Refractory diborides of
29 zirconium and hafnium, *J. Am. Ceram. Soc.* 90 (2007) 1347–1364. doi:10.1111/j.1551-
30
31 2916.2007.01583.x.
32
33
34
35