**NOTICE: This standard has either been superseded and replaced by a new version or withdrawn. Contact ASTM International (www.astm.org) for the latest information.**



**Designation: G102 – 89 (Reapproved 2004)**´**<sup>1</sup>**

## **Standard Practice for Calculation of Corrosion Rates and Related Information from Electrochemical Measurements<sup>1</sup>**

This standard is issued under the fixed designation G102; 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  $(\varepsilon)$  indicates an editorial change since the last revision or reapproval.

 $\varepsilon^1$  Nore—Information updated editorially in November 2004.

#### **1. Scope**

1.1 This practice covers the providing of guidance in converting the results of electrochemical measurements to rates of uniform corrosion. Calculation methods for converting corrosion current density values to either mass loss rates or average penetration rates are given for most engineering alloys. In addition, some guidelines for converting polarization resistance values to corrosion rates are provided.

### **2. Referenced Documents**

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

2.1 ASTM Standards:<sup>2</sup> minimize calc<br>D2776 Test Methods for Corrosivity of Water in the Ab-<br>Pelectrochemica sence of Heat Transfer (Electrical Methods) $3$ 

G1 [Practice for Preparing, Cleaning, and Evaluating Corro-](http://dx.doi.org/10.1520/G0001)**4. Corrosion Current Der 4.1 Corrosion current valuating Corro- 4.1 Corrosion current valuating Corro- 4.1 Corrosion current valuating Corro- 4.1 Corr** [sion Test Specimens](http://dx.doi.org/10.1520/G0001)

G5 [Reference Test Method for Making Potentiostatic and](http://dx.doi.org/10.1520/G0005) cells and polarization Potentiodynamic Anodic Polarization Measurements [Potentiodynamic Anodic Polarization Measurements](http://dx.doi.org/10.1520/G0005)

G59 [Test Method for Conducting Potentiodynamic Polar](http://dx.doi.org/10.1520/G0059)[ization Resistance Measurements](http://dx.doi.org/10.1520/G0059)

3.1 Electrochemical corrosion rate measurements often provide results in terms of electrical current. Although the conversion of these current values into mass loss rates or penetration rates is based on Faraday's Law, the calculations can be complicated for alloys and metals with elements having multiple valence values. This practice is intended to provide guidance in calculating mass loss and penetration rates for such alloys. Some typical values of equivalent weights for a variety of metals and alloys are provided.

3.2 Electrochemical corrosion rate measurements may provide results in terms of electrical resistance. The conversion of these results to either mass loss or penetration rates requires additional electrochemical information. Some approaches for estimating this information are given.

3.3 Use of this practice will aid in producing more consistent corrosion rate data from electrochemical results. This will make results from different studies more comparable and minimize calculation errors that may occur in transforming electrochemical results to corrosion rate values.

#### **4. Corrosion Current Density**

https://standards/sist/746ebf00-3033 current by the geometric area of the electrode exposed to 4.1 Corrosion current values may be obtained from galvanic cells and polarization measurements, including Tafel extrapolations or polarization resistance measurements. (See Reference Test Method G5 and Practice G59 for examples.) The first step is to convert the measured or estimated current value to ASTM G102-89 (current density. This is accomplished by dividing the total current by the geometric area of the electrode exposed to the solution. The surface roughness is generally not taken into account when calculating the current density. It is assumed that the current distributes uniformly across the area used in this calculation. In the case of galvanic couples, the exposed area of the anodic specimen should be used. This calculation may be expressed as follows:

$$
i_{\text{cor}} = \frac{I_{\text{cor}}}{A} \tag{1}
$$

where:

 $i_{\text{cor}}$  = corrosion current density,  $\mu A/\text{cm}^2$ ,

 $I_{\rm cor}$  = total anodic current,  $\mu$ A, and

 $\overrightarrow{A}$  = exposed specimen area, cm<sup>2</sup>.

Other units may be used in this calculation. In some computerized polarization equipment, this calculation is made automatically after the specimen area is programmed into the computer. A sample calculation is given in Appendix X1.

Copyright © ASTM International, 100 Barr Harbor Drive, PO Box C700, West Conshohocken, PA 19428-2959, United States.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> This practice is under the jurisdiction of ASTM Committee [G01](http://www.astm.org/COMMIT/COMMITTEE/G01.htm) on Corrosion of Metals and is the direct responsibility of Subcommittee [G01.11](http://www.astm.org/COMMIT/SUBCOMMIT/G0111.htm) on Electrochemical Measurements in Corrosion Testing.

Current edition approved Nov 1, 2004. Published November 2004. Originally approved in 1989. Last previous edition approved in 1999 as G102 – 89 (1999). DOI: 10.1520/G0102-89R04E01.

<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.

<sup>3</sup> Withdrawn.

4.2 *Equivalent Weight*—Equivalent weight, EW, may be thought of as the mass of metal in grams that will be oxidized by the passage of one Faraday (96 489  $\pm$  2 C (amp-sec)) of electric charge.

NOTE 1-The value of EW is not dependent on the unit system chosen and so may be considered dimensionless.

For pure elements, the equivalent weight is given by:

$$
EW = \frac{W}{n} \tag{2}
$$

where:

- $W =$  the atomic weight of the element, and
- $n =$  the number of electrons required to oxidize an atom of the element in the corrosion process, that is, the valence of the element.

4.3 For alloys, the equivalent weight is more complex. It is usually assumed that the process of oxidation is uniform and does not occur selectively to any component of the alloy. If this is not true, then the calculation approach will need to be adjusted to reflect the observed mechanism. In addition, some rationale must be adopted for assigning values of *n* to the elements in the alloy because many elements exhibit more than one valence value.





# $\frac{1}{2}$  G102 – 89 (2004)<sup> $\epsilon$ 1</sup>



**TABLE 1** *Continued*

*<sup>A</sup>* Registered trademark Carpenter Technology.

*<sup>B</sup>* Registered trademark Haynes International.

a Registered trademark Carpenter Technology.<br><sup>B</sup> Registered trademark Haynes International.<br>No⊤∈ 1—Alloying elements at concentrations below 1 % by mass were not included in the calculation, for example, they were conside NOTE 2-Mid-range values were assumed for concentrations of alloying elements.

NOTE 3-Only consistent valence groupings were used.

NOTE 4—(Eq 4) was used to make these calculations.

4.4 To calculate the alloy equivalent weight, the following approach may be used. Consider a unit mass of alloy oxidized. The electron equivalent for 1 g of an alloy, *Q* is then:

$$
Q = \sum \frac{\text{nifi}}{\text{Wi}} \tag{3}
$$

where:

fi = the mass fraction of the  $i<sup>th</sup>$  element in the alloy,

 $Wi =$  the atomic weight of the i<sup>th</sup> element in the alloy, and

 $\overrightarrow{n}$  = the valence of the i<sup>th</sup> element of the alloy.

Therefore, the alloy equivalent weight, *EW*, is the reciprocal of this quantity:

$$
EW = \frac{1}{\sum_{i} \frac{\text{nifi}}{\text{Wi}}} \tag{4}
$$

Normally only elements above 1 mass percent in the alloy are included in the calculation. In cases where the actual analysis of an alloy is not available, it is conventional to use the mid-range of the composition specification for each element, unless a better basis is available. A sample calculation is given in Appendix X2 **(1)**. 4

4.5 Valence assignments for elements that exhibit multiple valences can create uncertainty. It is best if an independent technique can be used to establish the proper valence for each alloying element. Sometimes it is possible to analyze the corrosion products and use those results to establish the proper valence. Another approach is to measure or estimate the electrode potential of the corroding surface. Equilibrium diagrams showing regions of stability of various phases as a function of potential and pH may be created from thermodynamic data. These diagrams are known as Potential-pH (Pourbaix) diagrams and have been published by several authors **(2, 3)**. The appropriate diagrams for the various alloying elements can be consulted to estimate the stable valence of each element at the temperature, potential, and pH of the contacting electrolyte that existed during the test.

NOTE 2—Some of the older publications used inaccurate thermodynamic data to construct the diagrams and consequently they are in error.

<sup>4</sup> The boldface numbers in parentheses refer to the list of references at the end of this standard.