Designation: G 99 – 04

Standard Test Method for Wear Testing with a Pin-on-Disk Apparatus[1]

This standard is issued under the fixed designation G 99; 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 (ϵ) indicates an editorial change since the last revision or reapproval.

1. Scope

1.1 This test method covers a laboratory procedure for determining the wear of materials during sliding using a pin-on-disk apparatus. Materials are tested in pairs under nominally non-abrasive conditions. The principal areas of experimental attention in using this type of apparatus to measure wear are described. The coefficient of friction may also be determined.

1.2 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 and health practices and determine the applicability of regulatory limitations prior to use.*

2. Referenced Documents

2.1 *ASTM Standards:*[2]

E 122 Practice for Choice of Sample Size to Estimate, With a Specified Tolerable Error, the Average for Characteristic of a Lot or Process

E 177 Practice for Use of the Terms Precision and Bias in ASTM Test Methods

E 178 Practice for Dealing with Outlying Observations

G 40 Terminology Relating to Wear and Erosion

G 117 Guide for Calculating and Reporting Measures of Precision using Data from Interlaboratory Wear or Erosion Tests

2.2 *Other Standard:*[3]

DIN-50324 Testing of Friction and Wear

3. Summary of Test Method

3.1 For the pin-on-disk wear test, two specimens are required. One, a pin with a radiused tip, is positioned perpendicular to the other, usually a flat circular disk. A ball, rigidly held, is often used as the pin specimen. The test machine causes either the disk specimen or the pin specimen to revolve about the disk center. In either case, the sliding path is a circle on the disk surface. The plane of the disk may be oriented either horizontally or vertically.

NOTE 1—Wear results may differ for different orientations.

3.1.1 The pin specimen is pressed against the disk at a specified load usually by means of an arm or lever and attached weights. Other loading methods have been used, such as hydraulic or pneumatic.

NOTE 2—Wear results may differ for different loading methods.

3.2 Wear results are reported as volume loss in cubic millimetres for the pin and the disk separately. When two different materials are tested, it is recommended that each material be tested in both the pin and disk positions.

3.3 The amount of wear is determined by measuring appropriate linear dimensions of both specimens before and after the test, or by weighing both specimens before and after the test. If linear measures of wear are used, the length change or shape change of the pin, and the depth or shape change of the disk wear track (in millimetres) are determined by any suitable metrological technique, such as electronic distance gaging or stylus profiling. Linear measures of wear are converted to wear volume (in cubic millimetres) by using appropriate geometric relations. Linear measures of wear are used frequently in practice since mass loss is often too small to measure precisely. If loss of mass is measured, the mass loss value is converted to volume loss (in cubic millimetres) using an appropriate value for the specimen density.

3.4 Wear results are usually obtained by conducting a test for a selected sliding distance and for selected values of load and speed. One set of test conditions that was used in an interlaboratory measurement series is given in Table 1 and Table 2 as a guide. Other test conditions may be selected depending on the purpose of the test.

3.5 Wear results may in some cases be reported as plots of wear volume versus sliding distance using different specimens for different distances. Such plots may display non-linear relationships between wear volume and distance over certain portions of the total sliding distance, and linear relationships over other portions. Causes for such differing relationships

[1] This test method is under the jurisdiction of ASTM Committee G02 on Wear and Erosion and is the direct responsibility of Subcommittee G02.40 on Non-Abrasive Wear.

Current edition approved Jan. 1, 2004. Published January 2004. Originally approved in 1990. Last previous edition approved in 2003 as G 99 – 03.

[2] 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.

[3] Available from Beuth Verlag GmbH, Burggrafenstrasse 6, 1000 Berlin 30, Germany.

TABLE 1 Characteristics of the Interlaboratory Wear Test Specimens

NOTE—See Note 4 in 10.3.1 for information.

	Composition (weight%)	Microstructure	Hardness (HV 10)	Roughness[A]	
				R_z(mean) (µm)	R_a(mean) (µm)
Steel ball (100 Cr6) (AISI 52 100)[B] Diameter 10 mm	1.35 to 1.65 Cr ← 0.95 to 1.10 C 0.15 to 0.35 Si 0.25 to 0.45 Mn	martensitic with minor carbides and austenite	838 ± 21	0.100	0.010
Steel disc (100 Cr6) (AISI 52 100)[C] Diameter 40 mm	← <0.030 P <0.030 S	martensitic with minor carbides and austenite	852 ± 14	0.952	0.113
Alumina ball, diameter = 10 mm[D]	← 95 % Al_2O_3 (with additives of TiO_2,	equi-granular alpha alumina with very minor secondary	1610 ± 101 (HV 0.2)	1.369	0.123
Alumina disc, diameter = 40.6 mm[D]	← MgO, and ZnO)	phases	1599 ± 144 (HV 0.2)	0.968	0.041

[A] Measured by stylus profilometry. R_z is maximum peak-to-valley roughness. R_a is arithmetic average roughness.
[B] Standard ball-bearing balls (SKF).
[C] Standard spacers for thrust bearings (INA).
[D] Manufactured by Compagnie Industrielle des Ceramiques Electroniques, France.

TABLE 2 Results of the Interlaboratory Tests[A]

NOTE 1— See Note 4 in 10.3.1.
NOTE 2—Numbers in parentheses refer to all data received in the tests. In accordance with Practice E 178E 178, outlier data values were identified in some cases and discarded, resulting in the numbers without parentheses. The differences are seen to be small.
NOTE 3—Values preceded by ± are one standard deviation.
NOTE 4—Data were provided by 28 laboratories.
NOTE 5—Calculated quantities (for example, wear volume) are given as mean values only.
NOTE 6—Values labeled "NM" were found to be smaller than the reproducible limit of measurement.
NOTE 7—A similar compilation of test data is given in DIN–50324.

Results (ball) (disk)	Specimen Pairs			
	Steel-steel	Alumina-steel	Steel-alumina	Alumina-alumina
Ball wear scar diameter (mm)	2.11 ± 0.27 (2.11 ± 0.27)	NM	2.08 ± 0.35 (2.03 ± 0.41)	0.3± 0.06 (0.3 ± 0.06)
Ball wear volume (10^{-3} mm^3)	198 (198)	...	186 (169)	0.08 (0.08)
Number of values	102 (102)	...	60 (64)	56 (59)
Disk wear scar width (mm)	NM	0.64 ± 0.12 (0.64 ± 0.12)	NM	NM
Disk wear volume (10^{-3} mm^3)	...	480 (480)	...	...
Number of values	...	60 (60)	...	...
Friction coefficient	0.60 ± 0.11	0.76 ± 0.14	0.60 ± 0.12	0.41 ± 0.08
Number of values	109	75	64	76

[A] Test conditions: F = 10 N; v = 0.1 ms $^{-1}$, T = 23°C; relative humidity range 12 to 78 %; laboratory air; sliding distance 1000 m; wear track (nominal) diameter = 32 mm; materials: steel = AISI 52 100; and alumina = α-Al_2O_3.

include initial "break-in" processes, transitions between regions of different dominant wear mechanisms, and so forth. The extent of such non-linear periods depends on the details of the test system, materials, and test conditions.

3.6 It is not recommended that continuous wear depth data obtained from position-sensing gages be used because of the complicated effects of wear debris and transfer films present in the contact gap, and interferences from thermal expansion or contraction.

4. Significance and Use

4.1 The amount of wear in any system will, in general, depend upon the number of system factors such as the applied load, machine characteristics, sliding speed, sliding distance, the environment, and the material properties. The value of any wear test method lies in predicting the relative ranking of material combinations. Since the pin-on-disk test method does not attempt to duplicate all the conditions that may be experienced in service (for example; lubrication, load, pressure, contact geometry, removal of wear debris, and presence of corrosive environment), there is no insurance that the test will predict the wear rate of a given material under conditions differing from those in the test.