Improving Al Wettability on B₄C by Transition Metal Doping: a Combined DFT and Experiment Study

Wang Zhixuan¹, Li Qiulin², Zheng Jiyun², Liu Wei¹, Shu Guogang³, Wu Ping⁴, Xu Ben¹

¹ Tsinghua University, Beijing 100084, China; ² Tsinghua University Graduate School, Tsinghua University City Park, Shenzhen 518055, China;

³ China Nuclear Power Engineering Co., Ltd, Technology Building, Shenzhen 518055, China; ⁴ Singapore University of Technology and Design, Singapore 487372, Singapore

Abstract: B₄C/Al MMC is one of the most potential neutron-shielding materials. The poor wettability of B₄C/Al interface damages the mechanical properties. To understand the alloying (or doping) effects in improving the wettability of B₄C/Al interfaces, we investigated the Al(111)/AlB₂(0001) and Al(111)/TiB₂(0001) interfacial structures via a combined approach of experiment and DFT calculations. We find a larger work of adhesion (W_{ad}) on the Al(111)/TiB₂(0001) than the Al(111)/AlB₂(0001) interfaces. The subsequently calculated partial density of states (PDOS) of doped-diborides show fewer anti-bonding states in Al(111)/TiB₂(0001) than in Al(111)/AlB₂(0001), which contribute to a stronger bonding between Ti-3d and B-2p states and lead to a higher W_{ad} and better wetting. Furthermore, we predict improved wettability of Al/B₄C by V-doping, because of the fewer anti-bonding states in vanadium-boron molecular orbitals. The same approach developed in this study may be applied for general design of alloy elements to improve the interfacial wetting of alloy-semiconductor systems.

Key words: B₄C/Al; DFT; wettability; work of adhesion; PDOS

Al-B₄C metal matrix composites are considered to be new advanced materials for the nuclear industry, primarily because of their excellent ability to capture neutrons as well as their high stiffness, high thermal conductivity and low density [1,2]. However, the poor wettability of the metal-ceramic interfaces significantly damages the mechanical properties of stir-cast Al-B₄C MMCs [3,4]. Thus it is significant to solve the wetting problem and understand the wetting mechanism.

Zhang et al. [5] found that Al-Ti alloy and Kennedy et al. [6,7] also found that K₂TiF₆ flux doped into the liquid aluminum could increase the wettability of B₄C/Al interfaces. Rajan et al. [8,9] found that B₄C particles preheated at 250 °C for 2 h or B₄C particles coated by copper also could improve the poor wettability between B₄C particles and Al matrix. Adding Al-Ti alloy into liquid Al to enhance the

wetting is widely used in industry. But few studies have been performed to explain how Ti doping increases the wettability of the B₄C/Al interfaces.

It was demonstrated that the interface reaction products were AlB₂ and Al₃BC at 750 °C and that AlB₂ crystals were adjacent to the Al matrix in the work of Zhang et al. [5]. Furthermore, Zhang et al. [5,10,11] also proved that Ti introduced into liquid Al could produce Al₃BC and a new product TiB₂, which replaced AlB₂ crystals and remained to be adjacent to Al matrix. It is noticed that the diborides (AlB₂/TiB₂) remained in direct proximity to Al matrix whether doping Ti or not. This work raised an assumption that the wetting difference between Al/AlB₂ and Al/TiB₂ could be one of the reasons that affect the wettability of B₄C/Al interface. In order to validate this assumption, a stir casting experiment would be necessary to confirm that TiB₂

Received date: August 13, 2016

Foundation item: National Natural Science Foundation of China (51301094)

Corresponding author: Xu Ben, Ph. D., Associate Professor, School of Materials Science and Engineering, Tsinghua University, Beijing 100084, P. R. China, Tel: 0086-10-62772852, E-mail: xuben@mail.tsinghua.edu.cn

Copyright © 2017, Northwest Institute for Nonferrous Metal Research. Published by Elsevier BV. All rights reserved.

do replace AlB_2 and do remain in direct proximity to the Al matrix.

1 Experiment

The material used in this experiment was commercially pure aluminum (1060) reinforced with 31 wt% B_4C particles (average size ranging from 18~23 μm), containing 3.5 wt% Ti. The stirring action was performed in a vacuum mixer furnace (550 r/min) at 730 $^{\circ}\text{C}$. Fig.1 shows the SEM micrograph of the composite samples after a 15 min holding period. It is evident that the old AlB_2 product disappeared and was replaced by TiB_2 crystals, which continuously enclosed Al_3BC layer and were located near to the Al matrix. These agreed well with the findings of earlier reports in the work of Chen et al.^[5,12] and provided a logic premise for the assumption above. Then the difference of the wettability between Al/ AlB_2 and Al/ TiB_2 interfaces would be studied by calculation methods.

2 Calculation Methods

Recently, the first-principles methods based on density functional theory (DFT) have been successfully applied to the detailed studies of metal/ceramic interface adhesion^[13-18]. First-principles calculations can accurately provide the detailed atomic, electronic structures of the interface and quantitatively predict the work of adhesion (W_{ad}). In this work, we studied the Al/ AlB_2 and Al/ TiB_2 interface structures and discussed the wetting improvement of Ti element on the Al/ B_4C interface.

Few experimental studies have been performed to find out the match planes between Al/ AlB_2 and Al/ TiB_2 interfaces. In this work, the orientation relationships between Al, AlB_2 and TiB_2 phases were chosen as:

$$(111)_{\text{Al}} // (0001)_{\text{AlB}_2}, (111)_{\text{Al}} // (0001)_{\text{TiB}_2} \quad (1)$$

It is based on two reasons: 1) the close packed planes could theoretically become the match planes. Al phase is fcc structure, whose close packed plane is (111) plane; AlB_2 and TiB_2 are hcp structures, whose close packed planes are (0001) planes. The relatively small misfits between Al(111)/ AlB_2 (0001) and Al(111)/ TiB_2 (0001) are beneficial to match. 2) Zhang et al.^[19] found that Al(111) matched AlB_2 (0001)/ TiB_2 (0001) relatively well with an edge-to-edge matching model.

2.1 Bulk properties

For this study, first-principles calculations were performed with the Vienna Ab initio Simulation Package (VASP) using a plane-wave basis set for the expansion of the single-particle Kohn-Sham wave functions, and the electron-ion interaction was described using the projector-augmented-wave (PAW) method^[20]. The exchange-correlation energy was described by the generalized gradient approximation of Perdew and Wang (PW91)^[21]. The lattice parameter optimization calculation used a $13 \times 13 \times 13$ Gamma k -mesh for Brillouin zone integrations. The calculations of the work of adhesion (W_{ad}) of Al/ AlB_2 used a $8 \times 5 \times 1$ and a $9 \times 5 \times 1$ Gamma k -mesh for Al-terminated and B-terminated models, respectively. The calculations of the W_{ad} of Al/ TiB_2 used the $8 \times 5 \times 1$ Gamma k -mesh for Ti-/B-terminated models. All calculations employed a high plane-wave energy cutoff of 450 eV. This set of parameters assured the convergence tolerance of energy of 10^{-4} eV/atom and the Hellmann-Feynman force on atom of 10^{-3} eV/0.1 nm per atom when calculating the W_{ad} of Al/ AlB_2 and Al/ TiB_2 interface structures. A 1 nm of vacuum was sufficient for convergence tests and interface energy calculations.

The calculated lattice parameters of Al bulk are: $a=b=c=0.405$ nm, which are consistent with the experimental result, 0.404 nm and other theoretical results^[14-16]. For the AlB_2 and TiB_2 phases with a space group symmetry P6/mmm, the lattice parameters attained by bulk calculations are $a=b=0.301$ nm and $c=0.326$ nm ($c/a=1.08$), $a=b=0.303$ nm and $c=0.323$ nm ($c/a=1.07$), respectively, which agrees well with experimental and other calculation results^[22-25].

2.2 Convergence tests

The purpose of this convergence tests is to simulate the interface between the bulk-like slabs. Therefore, it is necessary to insure that all the slabs are sufficiently thick to exhibit the bulk-like interiors. In this study, we have conducted convergence tests on the Al(111), AlB_2 (0001) and TiB_2 (0001) slabs. Because of the polarity of the AlB_2 (0001) and TiB_2 (0001) surfaces, it is necessary to use the symmetric AlB_2 (0001) and TiB_2 (0001) slabs to eliminate the dipole effect.

Fig.1 SEM micrograph of the Al composite containing 3.5 wt% Ti, showing the TiB_2 layers in the B_4C /Al interface (15 min holding time at 730 $^{\circ}\text{C}$)

With the method proposed by Boettger et al.^[15,16,26], we obtained the surface energies of Al (111), AlB₂ (0001) and TiB₂ (0001) slabs, σ^N . For example, the Al (111) slabs have a surface energy of:

$$\sigma^N = (E^{\text{slab}} - ME^{\text{bulk}}) / 2A \quad (2)$$

where, E^{slab} is the total energy of a relaxed slab, E^{bulk} is the chemical potentials of bulk Al, M is the number of Al atoms in the Al(111) slabs, N is the number of layers of the relaxed slab, and A is the surface area. The surface free energies of Al (111) slabs with more than five layers converge to 0.77 J/m², which is in agreement with the experimental value, 0.82 J/m²^[27]. AlB₂ (0001) slabs with more than eleven layers converge to 0.94 J/m² (Al-terminated) and 1.51 J/m² (B-terminated), and TiB₂ (0001) slabs with more than eleven layers converge to 2.21 J/m² (Ti-terminated) and 6.05 J/m² (B-terminated)^[28]. It should be noticed that the surface free energies of the B-terminated surfaces are larger than those of the Al-terminated and Ti-terminated surfaces, which implies that the Al-terminated and Ti-terminated surfaces are more stable than the B-terminated surface. Thus, a five-layer Al(111) slab, an eleven-layer AlB₂(0001) slab and an eleven-layer TiB₂(0001) slab are thick enough to ensure a bulk-like interior interface.

2.3 Stability

Because symmetric slabs are employed in the convergence tests, the AlB₂(0001)/TiB₂(0001) slabs in the calculations are non-stoichiometric slabs. It should be necessary to account for the effects of non-stoichiometry when calculating the surface energies of the AlB₂ (0001) and TiB₂ (0001) surfaces. The surface free energy (σ) can be defined as, taking the Al(111)/AlB₂(0001) interface as an example:

$$\sigma_{\text{AlB}_2(0001)} = (E^{\text{slab}} - N_{\text{Al}} \cdot \mu_{\text{Al}}^{\text{slab}} - N_{\text{B}} \cdot \mu_{\text{B}}^{\text{slab}} + PV - TS) / 2A_{\text{surface}} \quad (3)$$

here, A_{surface} is the surface area, E^{slab} is the total energy of a fully relaxed eleven-layer AlB₂ (0001) supercell, N_{Al} and N_{B} are the numbers of the Al and B atoms in the supercell, respectively; $\mu_{\text{Al}}^{\text{slab}}$ and $\mu_{\text{B}}^{\text{slab}}$ are the chemical potentials of Al and B in the slab, respectively; P , V , T and S denote the pressure, volume, temperature and entropy of the system, respectively. The terms of PV and TS may be neglected at 0 K and typical pressures. Thus, Eq. (3) can be rewritten as:

$$\sigma_{\text{AlB}_2(0001)} = \left[E^{\text{slab}} - \left(N_{\text{Al}} - \frac{1}{2} N_{\text{B}} \right) \cdot \mu_{\text{Al}}^{\text{slab}} - \frac{1}{2} N_{\text{B}} \cdot \mu_{\text{AlB}_2}^{\text{bulk}} \right] / 2A_{\text{surface}} \quad (4)$$

Moreover, the chemical potential of the bulk AlB₂ ($\mu_{\text{AlB}_2}^{\text{bulk}}$) is related to their 0 K heat of formation ($\Delta H_f^\ominus$) and the chemical potential of Al and B in their bulks ($\mu_{\text{Al}}^{\text{bulk}}$, $\mu_{\text{B}}^{\text{bulk}}$), which is shown as^[16]:

$$\mu_{\text{AlB}_2}^{\text{bulk}} = \mu_{\text{Al}}^{\text{bulk}} + 2\mu_{\text{B}}^{\text{bulk}} + \Delta_f H_{\text{AlB}_2}^\ominus \quad (5)$$

$$\mu_{\text{AlB}_2}^{\text{bulk}} = \mu_{\text{Al}}^{\text{slab}} + 2\mu_{\text{B}}^{\text{slab}} \quad (6)$$

where, $\Delta_f H_{\text{AlB}_2}^\ominus$ is the heat of formation of AlB₂, and it can be defined as:

$$\Delta_f H_{\text{AlB}_2}^\ominus = \mu_{\text{AlB}_2}^{\text{bulk}} - (\mu_{\text{Al}}^{\text{bulk}} + 2\mu_{\text{B}}^{\text{bulk}}) \quad (7)$$

Combining Eq. (5) with Eq. (6), the following relation can be given:

$$\mu_{\text{Al}}^{\text{slab}} - \mu_{\text{Al}}^{\text{bulk}} = 2\mu_{\text{B}}^{\text{bulk}} - 2\mu_{\text{B}}^{\text{slab}} + \Delta_f H_{\text{AlB}_2}^\ominus \quad (8)$$

As is known, the chemical potentials of Al and B in the slab must be less than those atoms in their bulks. Otherwise, the compound slab would be unstable and decompose into elementary substances. Thus, the range of Al chemical potential is:

$$\Delta_f H_{\text{AlB}_2}^\ominus \leq \mu_{\text{Al}}^{\text{slab}} - \mu_{\text{Al}}^{\text{bulk}} \leq 0 \quad (9)$$

As shown in Fig.2a, which plots the surface energies of AlB₂ (0001) versus the Al chemical potential, the range of $\mu_{\text{Al}}^{\text{slab}} - \mu_{\text{Al}}^{\text{bulk}}$ is -0.13~0 eV, which is close to another calculation result of -0.11~0 eV^[29]. The Al-terminated surface energy is much lower than that for the B-terminated surface energy over the entire Al chemical potential, indicating that the outmost atomic layer of the AlB₂ particles prefers Al to B atom termination in equilibrium conditions. In Fig.2b,

Fig.2 Relationships between the surface energies and metal chemical potentials: (a) Al- and B-terminated AlB₂(0001); (b) Ti- and B-terminated TiB₂(0001) (the vertical dash dotted lines indicate the ultimate Al and Ti chemical potential values for which bulk AlB₂ and TiB₂ form)

which shows the surface energies of $\text{TiB}_2(0001)$ versus Ti chemical potential, the range of $\mu_{\text{Ti}}^{\text{slab}} - \mu_{\text{Ti}}^{\text{bulk}}$ is $-3.12 \sim 0$ eV, which agrees with the experimental value of $-3.4 \sim 0$ eV^[30] and theoretical value of -3.2 eV^[31]. The B-terminated surface is more stable than the Ti-terminated surface at low Ti chemical potential, but when the Ti chemical potential increases, the situation is reversed.

2.4 Work of adhesion and contact angles

The $\text{Al}(111)/\text{AlB}_2(0001)$ and $\text{Al}(111)/\text{TiB}_2(0001)$ models used the superlattice geometry in which eleven-layer $\text{AlB}_2/\text{TiB}_2(0001)$ slab were respectively placed between two five-layer slabs of $\text{Al}(111)$ slabs, resulting in two identical interfaces (shown in Fig.3). To compensate for the mismatch between Al and $\text{AlB}_2/\text{TiB}_2$ surfaces and to satisfy the periodic boundary conditions in the supercell calculations, the (softer) Al slabs were stretched by 4.81% to be commensurate with the AlB_2 slab, and with the TiB_2 slab were stretched by 5.59%. During the geometry optimization, all atoms were allowed to be freely relaxed in three directions.

The work of adhesion (W_{ad}) can be defined as the reversible work associated with creating the respective free surfaces from a bonded interface. First-principles methods can accurately calculate the W_{ad} by determining the difference in the total energy between the interfaces; taking the $\text{Al}(111)/\text{AlB}_2(0001)$ interface as an example:

$$W_{\text{ad}} = (E_{\text{Al}}^{\text{total}} + E_{\text{AlB}_2}^{\text{total}} - E_{\text{Al/AlB}_2}^{\text{total}}) / A_{\text{surface}} \quad (10)$$

where, $E_{\text{Al}}^{\text{total}}$, $E_{\text{AlB}_2}^{\text{total}}$ and $E_{\text{Al/AlB}_2}^{\text{total}}$ are the total energy of the relaxed Al slab, AlB_2 slab and Al/AlB_2 interface, respectively, and A_{surface} is the interface area. The calculated values of W_{ad} for the Al/AlB_2 and Al/TiB_2 interface structures are listed in Table 1.

In Table 1, it should be noted that for the Al/AlB_2 interface, the W_{ad} of the Al-terminated interface, 0.85 J/m^2 , is smaller than that for the B-terminated interface, 1.66 J/m^2 . For the Al/TiB_2 interface, the W_{ad} of the Ti-terminated is 3.06 J/m^2 , larger than that for the B-terminated interface, 2.48 J/m^2 . Although our calculation were performed at 0 K, it has been shown that the calculated results are valid for $T > 0 \text{ K}$ for the acceptable total-energy difference in solids^[15,16,21]. In conclusion, the W_{ad} of the Ti-terminated interface is the largest of all systems studied.

Moreover, W_{ad} can be used to quantitatively predict the wetting properties of an interface:

$$W_{\text{ad}} = \gamma_{\text{mv}} + \gamma_{\text{cv}} - \gamma_{\text{mc}} \quad (11)$$

where, γ_{mv} and γ_{cv} are the surface energies of metal and ceramic, respectively, and γ_{mc} is the interfacial energy between metal and ceramic. Based on Eq.(11) and the Young relationship, we can obtain the relationship between W_{ad} and the contact angle:

$$W_{\text{ad}} = \gamma_{\text{mv}} \cdot (1 + \cos \theta) \quad (12)$$

Fig.3 $\text{Al}(111)/\text{AlB}_2(0001)$ and $\text{Al}(111)/\text{TiB}_2(0001)$ slab models: (a) Al-terminated model for Al/AlB_2 slab, (b) B-terminated model for Al/AlB_2 slab, (c) Ti-terminated model for Al/TiB_2 slab, and (d) B-terminated model for Al/TiB_2 slab (yellow balls are Al, green balls are B and red balls are Ti)

Table 1 Values of adhesion work for $\text{Al}(111)/\text{AlB}_2(0001)$ and $\text{Al}(111)/\text{TiB}_2(0001)$ interfaces

Interface	Termination	$W_{\text{ad}}/\text{J m}^{-2}$
Al/AlB_2	Al	0.85
	B	1.66
Al/TiB_2	Ti	3.06
	B	2.48

With Eq.(12), we can easily understand that larger W_{ad} corresponds to a smaller contact angle, which means a better wettability. Comparing W_{ad} of $\text{Al}(111)/\text{TiB}_2(0001)$ with that for $\text{Al}(111)/\text{AlB}_2(0001)$, W_{ad} of either the Ti-terminated or B-terminated system with $\text{Al}(111)/\text{TiB}_2(0001)$ is much larger than that of the Al-terminated or B-terminated system with $\text{Al}(111)/\text{AlB}_2(0001)$, indicating that the Al wets better on the TiB_2 system than the AlB_2 system, with the same γ_{mv} . At this point, the assumption that the wetting difference between Al/AlB_2 and Al/TiB_2 interfaces could affect the wettability of $\text{B}_4\text{C/Al}$ interface could be proved. This is how Ti increases the wettability of the $\text{B}_4\text{C/Al}$ interfaces. There is no doubt that the rotation of slabs, the stacking sequences for the Al/AlB_2 and Al/TiB_2 interfaces could be other factors to affect the wettability of $\text{B}_4\text{C/Al}$ interface.

3 Discussion

3.1 PDOS of AlB_2 and Ti-AlB_2 systems

We concluded that it is the stronger bonding formed between Al-TiB_2 that may result in the larger W_{ad} and enhance the wettability. Therefore, we selected the partial density of states (PDOS) of Me-B atoms to reveal the formation mechanism of the bonds between Al, Ti and B. In the calculation, a $2 \times 2 \times 2$ AlB_2 supercell was adopted. In the doped

system, the Al atom at the spatial center of the supercell was replaced by a Ti atom.

The PDOS by atom of AlB_2 and Ti-AlB_2 are shown in Fig.4. The overlaps between the B-2s and B-2p states in AlB_2 and Ti-AlB_2 indicate the sp^2 hybridization, which form the main bonding among boron layers. For the Ti-AlB_2 system, the energy range of the PDOS is obviously narrower than that of the PDOS of AlB_2 . Moreover, the PDOS of Al shows a high peak of the 3s states and residuals 3p states around the Fermi level. In addition, the Ti-4s and Ti-3p states are mainly localized and contribute little to the bonding states. However, there are two peaks around the Fermi energy in the PDOS of Ti-B (Fig. 4b-IV). The one below the Fermi level (-2.4 eV) is a result of the hybridization of Ti-3d and B-2p states, which contributes to Ti-B covalent bonds. The other peak above the Fermi level (0.8 eV) consists of the hybridization of Ti-3d states and Al-3s states, which results in Ti-Al metallic bonds. The hybridization among Ti-3d, Al-2s and B-2p contribute to a steep pseudogap at the Fermi energy in the PDOS of Ti-AlB_2

Fig.4 Partial density of states of AlB_2 and Ti-AlB_2 systems: (a) partial Al, B density of states and total density of states of AlB_2 ; (b) partial Al, B, Ti density of states and total density of states of Ti-AlB_2 (the vertical lines indicate the Fermi level E_F)

instead of a more “flat” pseudogap for AlB_2 . The intensified anti-bonding states above the Fermi energy of AlB_2 , which indicates more anti-bonding states, result in less stable Al-B bonds, comparing with the Ti-B bonds. Accordingly, we could draw a clear conclusion as to the reason that Al wets TiB_2 better than AlB_2 . As a result of electron transfer, no extra electrons of TiB_2 enter the anti-bonding space, which stabilizes the cohesion between Ti-3d and B-2p. Thus, stronger bonds can contribute to large W_{ad} and lower contact angles to achieve a better wettability.

3.2 PDOS of Me- AlB_2 systems

As previous papers reported, Ti is widely used in industry to improve the wettability of the $\text{Al/B}_4\text{C}$ system, but it performs badly at low temperatures of approximately 700~900 °C. Therefore, it is important to find more ideal alloy elements to increase the wettability of the $\text{Al/B}_4\text{C}$ system. Taking the elements with similar chemical properties into consideration, we choose Sc, V, Y, Zr and Nb as candidates. On the other hand, commercially pure Al contains many dopants such as Mg and Cr, which may damage the wettability of the $\text{Al/B}_4\text{C}$ system. It is therefore necessary to study the wetting influence of the dopants. The PDOS curves of the supercells are shown in Fig.5 after replacing the Al atom at the spatial center of a $2 \times 2 \times 2$ AlB_2 supercell by a dopant (Sc, V, Cr, Y, Zr, Nb).

It is found that the PDOS of Sc-, Y-, Zr- and Nb- AlB_2 are almost zero and cannot contribute to the Me-B bonding nor lower the contact angles. Comparing the PDOS of residual V-, Cr- AlB_2 and AlB_2 , we find that the hybridization of B-2s and B-2p are still the dominant bonding states among boron layers and that the energy ranges of PDOS are also shorter than AlB_2 . For V- AlB_2 , there are still two peaks around the Fermi level in the PDOS of V-B. One peak below the Fermi level is a result of the hybridization of V-3d and B-2p states, which indicates covalent bonds between V and B. The other peak above the Fermi level consists of the hybridization of V-3d and Al-3s states, which shows the metallic bonds. These two peaks form a steep pseudogap at the Fermi energy. The weaker anti-bonding states of the V-B PDOS compared to the AlB_2 PDOS could stabilize the V-B bonds, which may lower the contact angles between Al phase and VB_2 phase. A peak at the Fermi level in the B-Cr PDOS is formed by the hybridization of Al-3s and Cr-3d states, indicating the formation of Al-Cr metallic bonds. Moreover, there are two peaks below the Fermi level, which consist of Al-3d, B-2p and Cr-3d states. The fact that the anti-bonding states form a peak at the Fermi level indicates more anti-bonding states compared with AlB_2 , which could weaken the bonding among Al, B and Cr, and damage the wettability of Al and CrB_2 to be even worse than Al and AlB_2 .

Fig.5 Partial density of states of Me-AlB₂ systems: (a) the Sc-doped AlB₂ system, (b) the V-doped AlB₂ system, (c) the Cr-doped AlB₂ system, (d) the Y-doped AlB₂ system, (e) the Zr-doped AlB₂ system, and (f) the Nb-doped AlB₂ system (the vertical lines indicate the Fermi level E_F)

4 Conclusions

1) The Al(111)/TiB₂(0001) interface has higher adhesion energies than the Al(111)/AlB₂(0001) interface, which means the Al(111)/TiB₂(0001) interface has a better wettability. The wetting difference between Al matrix and diborides is one of the factors to influence the wettability of B₄C/Al interfaces.

2) For AlB₂(0001), the Al-terminated surface is more stable than the B-terminated surface, but the surface stability relationship of TiB₂(0001) is dominated by the Ti chemical potential.

3) It is evident that the stronger bonding of the Al/TiB₂ over the Al/AlB₂ interface is a result of the fewer anti-bonding states with electron transfer. The more stable bonding achieves the larger W_{ad} for the Al/TiB₂ interface, which indicates a better wettability. Thus the reason why the wettability of Al-B₄C MMCs could be improved with Al-Ti alloy addition is proved.

4) The PDOS of V-doped AlB₂ shows fewer anti-bonding states than AlB₂; thus, Al-V alloys may also improve the wettability of the Al/B₄C interface and may be promising candidates for industrial applications.

References

- Kim S, Sachdev A K. In Yin W, Das S K eds. *Aluminum Alloys: Fabrication, Characterization, and Applications*[M]. Warrendale, PA: TMS, 2008: 51
- Viala J C, Bouix J, Gonzalez G et al. *Journal of Materials Science*[J], 1997, 32: 4559
- Delannay F, Froyen L and Deruyttere A. *Journal of Materials Science*[J], 1987, 22: 1
- Halverson D C, Pyzik A J et al. *Journal of the American Ceramic Society*[J], 1989, 72: 775
- Zhang Z, Fortin K, Charette A et al. *Journal of Materials Science*[J], 2011, 46: 3176
- Kennedy A R. *Journal of Materials Science*[J], 2002, 37: 317
- Kennedy A R, Brampton B. *Scripta Materialia*[J], 2001, 44: 1077
- Deepa J P, Resmi V G, Rajan T et al. *T Indian I Metals*[J], 2011, 64: 47
- Mahesh V P, Nair P S, Rajan T et al. *Journal of Composite Materials*[J], 2011, 511: 089 026
- Zhang Z, Chen X G, Charette A. *Journal of Materials Science*[J], 2009, 44: 492
- Zhang Z, Chen X G, Charette A. *Journal of Materials Science*[J], 2007, 42: 7354
- Lai J, Zhang Z, Chen X G. *Journal of Materials Science*[J], 2011, 46: 451
- Li Y, Gao Y, Xiao B, Ma S et al. *Applied Surface Science*[J], 2011, 257: 5671
- Liu L M, Wang S Q, Ye H Q. *Acta Materialia*[J], 2004, 52: 3681
- Siegel D J, Hector L G et al. *Physical Review B*[J], 2003, 67: 92105
- Siegel D J, Hector L G et al. *Surface Science*[J], 2002, 498: 321
- Zhang W, Smith J R. *Physical Review B*[J], 2000, 61: 16 883
- Shu G G, Xu Q, Wu P. *ACS Applied Materials & Interfaces*[J], 2015, 14: 7576

- 19 Zhang M, Kelly P M et al. *Acta Materialia*[J], 2005, 53: 1427
- 20 Kresse G, Joubert D. *Physical Review B*[J], 1999, 59: 1758
- 21 Perdew J P, Chevary J A et al. *Physical Review B*[J], 1992, 46: 6671
- 22 Burdett J K, Canadell E, Miller G J. *Journal of American Chemical Society*[J], 1986, 108: 6561
- 23 Lie K, Høier R, Brydson R. *Physical Review B*[J], 2000, 61: 1786
- 24 Loa I, Kunc K, Syassen K et al. *Physical Review B*[J], 2002, 66: 134 101
- 25 Tian D, Wang X. *Journal of Physics-Condensed Matter*[J], 1992, 4: 8765
- 26 Boettger J C. *Physical Review B*[J], 1994, 49: 16 798
- 27 Tyson W R, Miller W A. *Surface Science*[J], 1977, 62: 267
- 28 Han Y F, Dai Y, Shu D et al. *Journal of Physics-Condensed Matter*[J], 2006, 18: 4197
- 29 Han Y F, Dai Y B et al. *Applied Surface Science*[J], 2011, 257: 7831
- 30 Topor L, Kleppa O J. *The Journal of Chemical Thermodynamics*[J], 1985, 17: 1003
- 31 Han Y F, Dai Y B, Shu D et al. *Applied Physics Letters*[J], 2006, 89: 144 107

过渡元素改善 B₄C/Al 材料界面润湿性的机理研究

王治璇¹, 李丘林², 郑继云², 刘 伟¹, 束国刚³, 吴 平⁴, 徐 贲¹

(1. 清华大学, 北京 100084)

(2. 清华大学深圳研究生院, 广东 深圳 518055)

(3. 中国核电工程有限公司, 广东 深圳 518055)

(4. 新加坡科技设计大学, 新加坡 487372)

摘 要: B₄C/Al复合材料是目前最理想的中子吸收材料,但工业上常用的液态搅拌法制备过程中存在着界面润湿性差的问题。结合实验及第一性原理的方法,通过研究Al(111)/AlB₂(0001)和Al(111)/TiB₂(0001)界面的结构来分析工业上添加过渡元素Ti对B₄C/Al界面润湿性的改善机制。通过计算发现,Al(111)/TiB₂(0001)界面相对Al(111)/AlB₂(0001)界面具有更高的粘附功值,说明其界面结合更强。进一步对比Ti掺杂二硼化物和AlB₂的偏态密度结构,发现Ti掺杂体具有较低的反键态,表明Ti-3d和B-2p轨道电子杂化后,在B、Ti原子间形成了较强的化学键,从而促进了Al(111)/TiB₂(0001)界面处的强结合作用,提高了Al(111)/TiB₂(0001)界面粘附功,故而改善了B₄C/Al界面的润湿性。根据同样的理论依据,V掺杂体也具有较低的反键态,V和B之间的强结合效果或许能够改善B₄C/Al界面的润湿性,成为又一理想的溶体改性掺杂元素。

关键词: 碳化硼铝基复合材料; 密度泛函理论; 润湿性; 粘附功; 偏态密度

作者简介: 王治璇,女,1989年生,硕士,清华大学材料学院,北京 100084,电话: 010-62772852, E-mail: 961695557@qq.com