

# CLEANING LABORATORY EVALUATION SUMMARY

SCL #: 2006  
 DateRun: 03/30/2006  
 Experimenters: Jason Marshall  
 ClientType: Coatings Manufacturer  
 ProjectNumber: Project #2  
 Substrates: Steel  
 PartType: Coupon  
 Contaminants: None  
 Cleaning Methods: Immersion/Soak  
 Analytical Methods: Gravimetric, Visual

Purpose: To evaluate supplied product for compatibility with steel coupons.

Experimental Procedure: Testing was conducted following ASTM G21-72 (2004) Standard Practice for Laboratory Immersion Corrosion Testing of Metals. This practice, rather than a standardized procedure is presented as a guide so that some of the pitfalls of such testing may be avoided. Coupon corrosion testing is predominantly designed to investigate general corrosion.

Coupons with a large surface-to-mass ratio and a small ratio of edge area to total area were used. Two inch square coupons were used that had a thickness of 0.034" thick.

The temperature was held at 71 F +/- 2 F.

The volume of the test solution should be large enough to avoid any appreciable change in its corrosivity during the test, either through exhaustion of corrosive constituents or by accumulating of corrosion products that might affect further corrosion. The lab filled one 400 ml Pyrex beakers with 350 ml of the solution.

Three cold rolled steel coupons (CR 1020) were precleaned for five minutes in a 5% solution of Armakleen M Aero in an ultrasonic tank. Cleaned coupons were rinsed in tap water at 120 F for 15 seconds and dried using compressed air for 30 seconds. The coupons were then weighed to establish baseline weights. Three coupons were immersed into each solution, suspended by stainless steel hooks. Beakers were then covered with parafilm to reduce evaporation or contamination of the solutions. The soak time was set at 24 hours (1440 minutes). At the end of the soak time, coupons were removed from the beakers and observations were made prior to cleaning.

Coupons were cleaned for 15 seconds in M Aero 5% solution using immersion soaking. Coupons were not rinsed but were dried using compressed air for 15 seconds. Dry coupons were then weighed to determine the amount of weight loss if any. After reweighing, coupons were examined for the presence of pits.

### Interpretation of Results

The mass loss during the test period can be used as the principal measure of corrosion. Average corrosion rate can be calculated from the following equation:

$$\text{Corrosion Rate} = (K*W)/(A*T*D)$$

K = a constant

T = time of exposure in hours to the nearest 0.01 h

A = area in cm<sup>2</sup> to the nearest 0.01 cm<sup>2</sup>

W = mass loss in g, to the nearest 1 mg (corrected for any loss during cleaning)

D = density in g/cm<sup>3</sup>

Corrosion Rate Units Desired	Constant (K) in Corrosion Rate Equation
mils per year (mpy)	3.45 x 10 <sup>6</sup>
inches per year (ipy)	3.45 x 10 <sup>3</sup>
inches per month (ipm)	2.87 x 10 <sup>2</sup>
millimeters per year (mm/y)	8.76 x 10 <sup>4</sup>
micrometers per year (um/y)	8.76 x 10 <sup>7</sup>
picometers per second (pm/s)	2.78 x 10 <sup>6</sup>

# CLEANING LABORATORY EVALUATION SUMMARY

g per sq. meter per hour (g/m <sup>2</sup> -h)	1.00 x 10 <sup>4</sup> x D
---	----------------------------

Results:

Data used in calculation:  
 K = 8.76 x 10<sup>4</sup> in millimeters per year (mm/y)  
 T = 22 h  
 A = 50 cm<sup>2</sup>  
 w = 0.0091 g

Coupon	Initial	24 Soak	Wt Loss	Ave Change	Coupon Obs
1	31.7543	31.7428	0.0115		darkened
2	31.7261	31.7202	0.0059	0.0091	darkened
3	31.7972	31.7873	0.0099		darkened

All coupons were a dark grey color - Original coloring was light grey/silver

Product	Coupon type	Corrosion Rate
Tigmar 521	Steel Coupons	0.000725 mm/y

Summary:

<b>Substrates:</b>	Steel				
<b>Contaminants:</b>	None				
<b>Company Name:</b>	<b>Product Name:</b>	<b>Conc.:</b>	<b>Efficiency:</b>	<b>Effective:</b>	<b>Observations:</b>
United Organics Corp	Tigmar 521	100	0.00	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Conclusion:

The Tigmar 521 had more effect on the steel coupons than on the aluminum coupons. The rate of corrosion on steel was found to be 0.000725 mm/y as compared to 0.000024 mm/y on aluminum.