Stored energy and recrystallized microstructures in nickel processed by accumulative roll bonding to different strains - DTU Orbit (09/11/2017)

Stored energy and recrystallized microstructures in nickel processed by accumulative roll bonding to different strains

The stored energy and the microstructure have been investigated in polycrystalline Ni processed by accumulative roll bonding (ARB) to different von Mises strains, epsilon(vM) = 1.6-6.4. The stored energy in Ni after ARB is found to be higher than that in conventionally rolled Ni samples after similar strains, which is attributed to a finer average boundary spacing due to ARB. Annealing at 300 degrees C for 2 h after ARB results in recrystallized microstructures and textures, which are very different in the samples deformed to different strains. Whereas there is no dominant texture component in the ARB-processed samples annealed after strains <3, cube-oriented grains dominate the texture in the higher-strain samples. Nevertheless, regions near the most recently formed bonding interfaces contain a large frequency of non-cube oriented grains even in the high-strain samples. The average recrystallized grain size decreases with increasing strain before annealing, whereas the fraction of LABs formed between recrystallized grains increases. The correlation between the average recrystallized grain size, crystallographic texture and the fraction of LABs is discussed. Results obtained in this study are compared with previous findings for ARB-processed materials.

General information

State: Published
Organisations: Department of Wind Energy, Materials science and characterization
Authors: Zhang, Y. (Intern), Mishin, O. (Intern)
Pages: 323-328
Publication date: 2017
Main Research Area: Technical/natural sciences

Publication information

Journal: Materials Characterization
Volume: 129
ISSN (Print): 1044-5803
Ratings:

BFI (2017): BFI-level 1

Web of Science (2017): Indexed yes

BFI (2016): BFI-level 1

Scopus rating (2016): CiteScore 2.75 SJR 1.24 SNIP 1.54

BFI (2015): BFI-level 1

Scopus rating (2015): SJR 1.242 SNIP 1.606 CiteScore 2.61

Web of Science (2015): Indexed yes

BFI (2014): BFI-level 1

Scopus rating (2014): SJR 1.373 SNIP 2.025 CiteScore 2.47

Web of Science (2014): Indexed yes

BFI (2013): BFI-level 1

Scopus rating (2013): SJR 1.183 SNIP 1.79 CiteScore 2.31

ISI indexed (2013): ISI indexed yes

BFI (2012): BFI-level 1

Scopus rating (2012): SJR 1.227 SNIP 2.063 CiteScore 2.26

ISI indexed (2012): ISI indexed yes

Web of Science (2012): Indexed yes

BFI (2011): BFI-level 1

Scopus rating (2011): SJR 1.132 SNIP 2.21 CiteScore 2.13

ISI indexed (2011): ISI indexed yes

Web of Science (2011): Indexed yes

BFI (2010): BFI-level 1

Scopus rating (2010): SJR 1.231 SNIP 1.767

Web of Science (2010): Indexed yes

BFI (2009): BFI-level 1

Scopus rating (2009): SJR 1.002 SNIP 1.541

BFI (2008): BFI-level 1

Scopus rating (2008): SJR 0.81 SNIP 1.299

Web of Science (2008): Indexed yes

Scopus rating (2007): SJR 0.623 SNIP 1.16

Scopus rating (2006): SJR 0.625 SNIP 0.948
Scopus rating (2005): SJR 0.693 SNIP 1.218
Scopus rating (2004): SJR 0.67 SNIP 1.017
Scopus rating (2003): SJR 0.468 SNIP 0.899
Web of Science (2003): Indexed yes
Scopus rating (2002): SJR 0.457 SNIP 0.607
Web of Science (2002): Indexed yes
Scopus rating (2001): SJR 0.497 SNIP 0.922
Scopus rating (2000): SJR 0.275 SNIP 0.326
Scopus rating (1999): SJR 0.476 SNIP 0.409
Original language: English
DOIs:
10.1016/j.matchar.2017.05.024
Source: FindIt
Source-ID: 2358734558
Publication: Research - peer-review › Journal article – Annual report year: 2017