



Designation: **B931–14 (Reapproved 2018)<sup>ε1</sup> B931 – 23**

## Standard Test Method for Metallographically Estimating the Observed Case Depth of Ferrous Powder Metallurgy (PM) Parts<sup>1</sup>

This standard is issued under the fixed designation B931; the number immediately following the designation indicates the year of original adoption or, in the case of revision, the year of last revision. A number in parentheses indicates the year of last reapproval. A superscript epsilon ( $\epsilon$ ) indicates an editorial change since the last revision or reapproval.

---

<sup>ε1</sup> NOTE—Editorially corrected Table 1 in October 2018.

---

### 1. ~~Scope~~ Scope\*

1.1 A metallographic method is described for estimating the observed case depth of ferrous powder metallurgy (PM) parts. This method may be used for all types of hardened cases where there is a discernible difference between the microstructure of the hardened surface and that of the interior of the part.

1.2 With the exception of the values for grit size for which the U.S. standard designation is the industry standard, the values stated in SI units are to be regarded as standard.

1.3 *This standard does not purport to address all of the safety concerns, if any, associated with its use. It is the responsibility of the user of this standard to establish appropriate safety, health, and environmental practices and determine the applicability of regulatory limitations prior to use.*

1.4 *This international standard was developed in accordance with internationally recognized principles on standardization established in the Decision on Principles for the Development of International Standards, Guides and Recommendations issued by the World Trade Organization Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT) Committee.*

### 2. Referenced Documents

#### 2.1 ASTM Standards:<sup>2</sup>

[B243 Terminology of Powder Metallurgy](#)

[E177 Practice for Use of the Terms Precision and Bias in ASTM Test Methods](#)

[E407 Practice for Microetching Metals and Alloys](#)

[E456 Terminology Relating to Quality and Statistics](#)

[E691 Practice for Conducting an Interlaboratory Study to Determine the Precision of a Test Method](#)

#### 2.2 MPIF Standards:

[MPIF Standard 70 Guide to Sample Preparation of Ferrous Powder Metallurgy \(PM\) Materials for Cross-Sectional Metallographic Evaluation](#)

---

<sup>1</sup> This test method is under the jurisdiction of ASTM Committee B09 on Metal Powders and Metal Powder Products and is the direct responsibility of Subcommittee B09.05 on Structural Parts.

Current edition approved Sept. 1, 2014; Feb. 1, 2023. Published October 2018; February 2023. Originally approved in 2003. Last previous edition approved in 2014 as B931–14; B931 – 14 (2018)<sup>ε1</sup>. DOI: 10.1520/B0931-14R18E01; 10.1520/B0931-23.

<sup>2</sup> For referenced ASTM standards, visit the ASTM website, www.astm.org, or contact ASTM Customer Service at service@astm.org. For *Annual Book of ASTM Standards* volume information, refer to the standard's Document Summary page on the ASTM website.

\*A Summary of Changes section appears at the end of this standard

### 3. Terminology

3.1 *Definitions*—Definitions of powder metallurgy (PM) terms can be found in Terminology B243. Additional descriptive information is available in the Related Material section of Vol 02.05 of the under “General Information on PM” on the B09 web page. Annual Book of ASTM Standards.

3.2 The metallographically estimated observed case depth is defined as the distance from the surface of the part to the point where, at a magnification of 100×, there is a discernible difference in the ~~microstructure~~ microstructure of the material.

### 4. Summary of Test Method

4.1 The powder metallurgy part is sectioned and the surface prepared for metallographic evaluation. The metallographic specimen is etched and the distance is measured from the surface of the part to the point at which a discernible difference in the microstructure of the material is observed.

### 5. Significance and Use

5.1 The engineering function of many PM parts may require an exterior portion of the part to have a hardened layer. Where case hardening produces a distinct transition in the microstructure, metallographic estimation of the observed case depth may be used to check the depth to which the surface has been hardened.

### 6. Apparatus

6.1 Equipment for the metallographic preparation of test specimens—see ~~Appendix X1~~.MPIF Standard 70.

6.2 *Metallographic Microscope*, permitting observation and measurement at a magnification of 100×.

### 7. Reagents and Materials

7.1 Etchants such as  $\pm 2\%$  to 5 % nital, nital/picral combinations, or other suitable etchants. For more information on suitable etchants refer to Practice E407.

### 8. Test Specimens

8.1 Cut a test specimen from the PM part, perpendicular to the hardened surface at a specified location, being careful to avoid any cutting or grinding procedure that would affect the original microstructure.

8.2 Mounting of the test specimen is recommended for convenience in surface preparation and edge retention. Edge retention is important for proper measurement of the observed case depth.

### 9. Procedure

9.1 ~~Grind and polish the test specimen using methods such as those summarized~~ Guidelines for grinding and polishing specimens are provided in ~~Appendix X1~~.MPIF Standard 70.

9.2 Etch the specimen with etchants such as  $\pm 2\%$  to 5 % nital or nital/picral combinations.

9.2.1 *Observed Case Depth:*

9.2.1.1 Examine the surface region of the part at a magnification of 100×.

9.2.1.2 Measure the distance from the surface of the part to the point where there is a discernible difference in the microstructure of the material.

NOTE 1—The nature and amount of intermediate transformation products will depend on the material being heat treated, its density, and the type of surface hardening treatment being used. The sharpness of the change in the microstructure at the point of transition will therefore vary. The microstructure

expected at this transition point should be agreed between the producer and purchaser of the part. Magnifications higher than 100× may be used to check the microstructure of the part in the region of the transition zone. However, the metallographic estimate of the observed case depth shall be made at a magnification of 100×.

## 10. Report

10.1 Report the following information:

10.1.1 The type of material and case measured,

10.1.2 The type of etchant used,

10.1.3 The location of the measurement, and

10.1.4 The metallographically estimated observed case depth to the nearest ~~0.1 mm~~ 0.1 mm.

## 11. Precision and Bias

11.1 The precision of this test method is based on an intralaboratory study of ASTM B931, Standard Test Method for Metallographically Estimating the Observed Case Depth of Ferrous Powder Metallurgy (PM) Parts, conducted in 2013. A single laboratory participated in this study, testing two different induction-hardened PM parts. Every “test result” represents an individual determination. The laboratory reported 40 replicate test results for each of the materials. Except for the use of only one laboratory, Practice ~~E691~~ E691 was followed for the design and analysis of the data; the details are given in ASTM Research Report No. B09-1021.<sup>3</sup>

11.1.1 *Repeatability (r)*—~~The difference between repetitive results obtained by the same operator in a given laboratory applying the same test method with the same apparatus under constant operating conditions on identical test material within short intervals of time would, in the long run, in the normal and correct operation of the test method, exceed the following values only in one case in 20. The repeatability was determined based on 40 individual tests in a single laboratory.~~

~~11.1.1.1 Repeatability can be interpreted as maximum difference between two results, obtained under repeatability conditions, which is accepted as plausible due to random causes under normal and correct operation of the test method.~~

~~11.1.1.2 Repeatability limits are listed in Table 1.~~

11.1.2 *Reproducibility (R)*—~~The difference between two single and independent results obtained by different operators applying the same test method in different laboratories using different apparatus on identical test material would, in the long run, in the normal and correct operation of the test method, exceed the following values only in one case in 20. Reproducibility limits cannot be calculated from a single laboratory’s results. The reproducibility of this test method is being determined and will be available on or before December 2025.~~

~~11.1.2.1 Reproducibility can be interpreted as maximum difference between two results, obtained under reproducibility conditions, which is accepted as plausible due to random causes under normal and correct operation of the test method.~~

~~11.1.2.2 Reproducibility limits cannot be calculated from a single laboratory’s results. The reproducibility of this test method is being determined and will be available on or before December 2018.~~

**TABLE 1 Observed Case Depth (µm)**

	Average <sup>A</sup>	Repeatability Standard Deviation	Repeatability Limit
	$\bar{x}$	$s_r$	$r$
Sprocket A	880	39.2	110
Sprocket B	560	42.3	120

<sup>A</sup>The average of the laboratories’ calculated averages.

<sup>3</sup> Supporting data have been filed at ASTM International Headquarters and may be obtained by requesting Research Report RR:B09-1021. Contact ASTM Customer Service at service@astm.org.

11.1.3 The above terms (“repeatability limit” and “reproducibility limit”) are used as specified in Practice E177.

11.1.4 Any judgment in accordance with statement 11.1.1 would normally have an approximate 95 % probability of being correct. The precision statistics obtained in this ILS must not, however, be treated as exact mathematical quantities which are applicable to all circumstances and uses. The limited number of laboratories reporting replicate results essentially guarantees that there will be times when differences greater than predicted by the ILS results will arise, sometimes with considerably greater or smaller frequency than the 95 % probability limit would imply. Consider the repeatability limit as a general guide, and the associated probability of 95 % as only a rough indicator of what can be expected.

11.2 *Bias*—At the time of the study, there was no accepted reference material suitable for determining the bias for this test method, therefore no statement on bias is being made.

11.3 The precision statement was determined through statistical examination of 80 results, from a single laboratory, on two different PM parts described below:

PM sprocket A: induction-hardened case depth of approximately 900  $\mu\text{m}$

PM sprocket B: induction-hardened case depth of approximately 500  $\mu\text{m}$

## 12. Measurement Uncertainty

12.1 The precision of Test Method B931 shall be considered by those performing the test when reporting metallographically estimated case depth results.

## 13. Keywords

13.1 case depth; observed case depth; PM; powder metallurgy

iTeh Standards  
(<https://standards.itih.ai>)  
Document Preview  
(Nonmandatory Information)

### X1. SAMPLE PREPARATION

ASTM B931-23

<https://standards.itih.ai/catalog/standards/sist/6b8ad1e0-5813-4588-938b-e66c122d62b4/astm-b931-23>

X1.1 The methods described in this appendix are proven practices for metallographic preparation of porous PM materials. It is recognized that other procedures or materials used in preparation of a sample may be equally as good and can be used on the basis of availability and preference of individual laboratories.

#### X1.2 Method 1

X1.2.1 The porous samples should be free of oil or coolant. Remove any oil using Soxhlet extraction. Mount and vacuum impregnate samples with epoxy resin, to fill porosity and to prevent the pickup of etchants. Use a sample cup or holder to form the mount. Pour epoxy resin over the sample in the cup to a total depth of about 19 mm. Evacuate the cup to minus 88 kPa and hold at that pressure for 10 min. Then restore ambient air pressure to force the resin into most of the sample. Cure at room temperature or at 50°C.

X1.2.2 Grind on 240, 400, and 600 grit wet SiC paper, on a rotating wheel, and change the polishing direction 90° after each paper. Etch samples for 1 min in their normal etchant, for example, 2% nital, to begin to open the porosity. Rough polishing for 8 to 12 min total on 1  $\mu\text{m}$  alumina ( $\text{Al}_2\text{O}_3$ ), long napped cloth (for example Struers felt cloth), at 250 rpm, and 300 gf load, using an automated polisher opens smeared pores. This rough polishing opens and exaggerates the pores. To return the pores to their true area fraction, polish for 4 min at 125 rpm on a shorter nap cloth (for example Struers MOL cloth), with 1  $\mu\text{m}$  diamond paste. Final polishing is done for 20 to 30 s using 0.05  $\mu\text{m}$  deagglomerated alumina, and a long napped cloth (for example, Buehler

Microcloth), at 125 rpm, and 75 gf load, on an automated polisher. Polishing may also be done by hand for the times indicated. The first two polishings require moderate pressure and the final polish requires light pressure.

X1.2.3 The metallographic structure should be free of smeared porosity. Generally at 800 to 1000 $\times$ , the edge of a smeared over pore will appear as a thin gray line outlining one side of the pore, and occasionally outlining most of the pore.

### **X1.3 Method 2**

X1.3.1 The specimen should be carefully selected so that it is representative of the region of interest. After selection, the specimen may require sectioning to provide a workable specimen. Sectioning may be made employing an abrasive or diamond wheel.

X1.3.2 Heat should be avoided to prevent occurrence of possible changes in microstructure. If slow feeds are employed, a coolant may not be necessary to avoid temperature buildups. If abrasive wheels are used, then a coolant is often necessary to avoid overheating of the specimen.

X1.3.3 If a coolant is employed, it may be retained within the pores. The lubricant must be removed prior to the preparation of the specimen for examination. This may be accomplished by using a Soxhlet extractor or an ultrasonic cleaner. The extraction condenser is the most efficient and the least expensive.

X1.3.4 Generally, specimens to be evaluated for case depth are mounted to provide edge retention. There are many kinds of mounting compounds available. Most common materials include epoxies (powder or liquid), diallyl phthalate, or Bakelite. Of these, Bakelite is sometimes preferred because it is harder and therefore provides improved edge retention. Bakelite requires equipment to apply heat and pressure, whereas the epoxies do not.

X1.3.5 After mounting, the specimen is ground to provide a flat, stress-free surface. A belt grinder is generally used first with care to prevent heating of the specimen. Grit size is dependent on the preference of the metallographer, although finer grits are preferred.

X1.3.6 The specimen is then hand ground on four emery papers, generally of 240, 320, 400, and 600 grit.

X1.3.7 Etch samples for 1 min in their normal etchant, for example, 2 % nital, to begin to open the porosity.

X1.3.8 Wet polishing follows hand grinding and etching. Several polishing media are employed including diamond paste, magnesia, alumina, etc. Grit size varies between 1 and 0.3  $\mu\text{m}$  and is applied to nap-free cloths such as nylon. To remove remaining scratches and stress, a soft cloth with finer polishing compound is employed. Generally a short-napped cloth is preferred. A fine 0.5  $\mu\text{m}$  alumina is recommended. For best results, and to ensure complete freedom of pores from worked metal, repeat the polishing and etching procedure. Final polishing generally requires 3 to 5 min.

X1.3.9 Automated polishing equipment is also available. Automated polishing is accomplished by moving the specimen across a polishing cloth in an abrasive solution undergoing vibrating action. Cloths and abrasives available are numerous and are generally selected by experience of the metallographer.