Experimental Investigation of the Thermal Contact Conductance of Electroplated Silver Coatings

M. A. Lambert* and L. S. Fletcher†
Texas A&M University, College Station, Texas 77843

Standard electronic modules can be made more reliable by decreasing module temperature. This may be accomplished by increasing the thermal contact conductance of the junction between the frame guide ribs and chassis card rails. Soft metallic coatings for the card rails would deform readily under pressure, thereby increasing the actual contact area and associated conductance. This investigation evaluated the conductance enhancement provided by vapor deposited, electroplated, and flame-sprayed silver coatings. Experimental measurements of thermal contact conductance were performed for anodized aluminum 6101-T6 and electroless nickel-plated copper C11000-H03 frame materials in junction with uncoated and silver-coated A356-T61 card rail material. Baseline conductance data for the anodized aluminum 6101 to uncoated aluminum A356 ranged from 25 to 91 W/m²K (4.4 to 16 Btu/h ft²0°F), and values for the nickel-plated copper to uncoated aluminum A356 ranged from 600 to 2800 W/m²K (106 to 493 Btu/h ft²0°F) for contact pressures of 172–862 Kpa (25 to 125 psi) and mean junction temperatures of 20–100°C (68–212°F). Experimental conductance data for vapor-deposited, electroplated, and flame-sprayed silver-coated aluminum A356 demonstrated thermal enhancement factors of 1.44–2.14, 1.78–15.2, and 1.00–2.30, respectively, for junctions with anodized aluminum 6101, and 0.76–2.19, 1.06–2.83, and 0.45–0.75, respectively, for junctions with nickel-plated copper. The vapor deposited and thinner flame-sprayed coatings were susceptible to galvanic corrosion. All electroplated and the thicker flame-sprayed coatings exhibited excellent corrosion resistance.

Nomenclature

\[ F = \text{flatness} \]
\[ H = \text{Vicker's microhardness} \]
\[ h = \text{thermal contact conductance} \]
\[ k = \text{thermal conductivity} \]
\[ R = \text{roughness} \]
\[ S = \text{asperity slope} \]
\[ t = \text{coating thickness} \]
\[ W = \text{waviness} \]

Subscripts

\[ a = \text{average} \]
\[ c = \text{coated, coating} \]
\[ q = \text{rms} \]
\[ s = \text{substrate} \]
\[ u = \text{uncoated} \]

I. Introduction

The performance of electronics is often diminished by excessive operating temperatures, as evidenced by increased switching times and rates of failure.\(^1\) The thermal contact resistance between the frame guide ribs and chassis card rails of standard electronic module (SEM) systems, shown in Fig. 1, which are utilized extensively in electronic systems, present a significant barrier to heat rejection. Heat transfer across pressed junctions (e.g., the guide rib/card rail junction) is restricted because the true contact area is only a small fraction of the apparent contact area, due to irregularities in surface profile, which limit contact to a relatively few small spots.\(^2\) As a result, heat is constrained to pass primarily through narrow constrictions or bridges of contact between the two surfaces. This restriction is manifested by a large change in temperature across the gap between two contacting surfaces.

The thermal contact resistance at a junction between two materials may be reduced by a number of methods. These include, increasing the apparent contact area, using smoother, flatter surfaces, increasing the contact pressure, and inserting or applying certain foils or coatings between the surfaces. Augmenting the apparent contact area may require extensive system redesign, finer surface finishes, and closer tolerances that may not be economically or technologically feasible, and excessive contact pressure that may damage or distort components. Thus, conductance enhancing interstitial materials comprise an attractive alternative. Soft, conductive foils and coatings may enhance the contact conductance by deforming readily under load, thereby conforming to the surfaces and increasing the contact area. Fletcher\(^3\) performed an extensive
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review of investigations dealing with thermal enhancement techniques for electronic components, and concluded that soft metallic interstitial materials provided the greatest thermal enhancement. He also surmised that metallic coatings are superior to metallic foils and inserts because coatings are typically more durable and not subject to wrinkling, the occurrence of which may actually increase contact resistance.

The purpose of the present investigation is that of enhancing the contact conductance of the junction between the frame guide rib and chassis card rail of SEM systems, more specifically, identifying and characterizing the most suitable metallic coating for the chassis card rails. A more detailed account of this investigation has been reported by Lambert and Fletcher. The electronic modules may be subjected to harsh environmental conditions, such as sliding contact during insertion and removal of frames, periodic contact due to thermal cycling, severe vibrational and accelerative loading (in avionics), and corrosive (marine) atmospheres. Therefore, any potential metallic coating material for aluminum card rails must be not only corrosion-resistant, when used singly, but must also be galvanically compatible with metallic frame materials with which it is in contact.

There have been a number of experimental investigations dealing with the thermal conductance of metals with metallic coatings. All but one of these investigations involved the use of vapor-deposited or ion-deposited metallic or metal/carbon coatings. Mal’kov and Dobashin performed the only contact conductance experiments with electrochemically plated surfaces (i.e., silver, nickel, and copper platings on stainless steel). Chung et al. and Sheffield et al. studied the conductance of transitional buffering interface (TBI) coatings. These coatings are composed of phase mixtures of vapor-deposited carbon and metals (e.g., copper/carbon and silver/carbon). Some of these investigations contain theoretical correlations for predicting the thermal contact conductance of metallic-coated metals. However, as previously described, these correlations are not generally applicable to the majority of published data.

Lambert and Fletcher reviewed the properties of all metallic elements with the purpose of identifying those most suitable for SEM card rails. They concluded that all but silver and gold should be excluded from consideration for reasons of high hardness, poor wear resistance, low conductivity, galvanic incompatibility with the electroless nickel-plated frame, or poor corrosion resistance. Gold, as a coating for the card rails, would be prohibitively expensive, because of the quantities of the metal required, leaving silver as the best overall choice.

The hardness and surface finish of metallic coatings, which have a significant effect on their contact conductance, are greatly dependent upon the method of application. Vapor-deposited metallic or TBI coatings are typically quite soft. Vibrational loading and repeated contact during thermal cycling or assembly and disassembly may wear away such coatings. Lambert and Fletcher demonstrated the susceptibility of vapor-deposited silver and gold coatings on aluminum substrates to galvanic corrosion, probably due to the presence of pinholes in the thin metallic coatings. Another possible drawback to the use of vapor-deposited metallic or TBI coatings for large or intricate components is the fact that these coatings must be applied in vacuo, and the path between the vapor source and the surface to be coated must be largely unobstructed. Consequently, vapor-deposited metallic or TBI coatings may not be viable conductance-enhancing coatings for SEM card rails.

The conductance enhancing capability of electroplated metallic coatings has been largely unexplored. Electroplated metallic coatings often exhibit excellent adhesion to the substrate and good corrosion and wear resistance, depending on the nature and thickness of the plating. Pinhole-free platings of sufficient thickness completely mask the substrate, thereby preventing galvanic corrosion between the plating and substrate. The method of plating lends itself to use with large, intricate components and high-volume production.

Plasma (or flame) spraying is another coating method that may produce durable, adherent coatings. Plasma spraying involves injecting metal powders (or feeding metal wire in the case of flame spraying) into a high velocity stream of combustion gases that melt the metal and propel it onto the surface to be coated.

This investigation was directed toward experimental measurement of the thermal contact conductance for anodized aluminum 6010-T6 and electroless-nickel-plated copper C1000-H03 frame materials in contact with bare aluminum A356-T61 card rail material, then experimental determination of the conductance when the aluminum A356 was coated with vapor-deposited, electroplated, and flame-sprayed silver.

II. Experimental Program

An experimental investigation of the thermal contact conductance of silver coatings for SEM card rails has been conducted. The experimental facility, materials, samples, coating techniques, corrosion-resistance testing, thermophysical property measurements, test procedure, and data and uncertainty analyses are described below.

A. Experimental Facility

The experimental apparatus consists of a frame that supports the contact conductance test specimens (hereafter called heat flux meters) in a vertical column, as shown in Fig. 2. It contains a pneumatic pressure bellows for applying the desired contact load and a load cell for measuring this load. The upper and lower fixtures (source-sink-holder assemblies) are each equipped with electrical heaters and a coolant jacket through which refrigerated ethylene glycol from a constant temperature bath may be circulated. The upper heat flux meter is inserted into the upper fixture, the lower heat flux meter is inserted into the lower fixture, and the middle heat flux meter is placed between the upper and lower heat flux meters.

Load is transferred from the lower movable plate and the base plate to the specimen column through a pair of stainless steel ball bearings, one atop the upper fixture and the other beneath the lower fixture. The ball bearings serve to maintain uniform axial loading across the test surfaces by eliminating bending moments. Flexible hoses supplying the coolant jackets nearly eliminate lateral forces and their associated bending moments.

A heat flux may be established in either the upward or downward direction by providing power to the heaters in one fixture and supplying refrigerant to the other fixture. The
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Table 1 Thermal conductivity, Vicker's microhardness, and surface metrological data for test specimens

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base material-sample/surface</th>
<th>Coating material</th>
<th>k/s, k/N·m</th>
<th>H:(a/s, H:(b/cm²</th>
<th>t, µm</th>
<th>Ra, µm</th>
<th>Rq, µm</th>
<th>W(a, W/µm</th>
<th>W(b, W/µm</th>
<th>(F, µm</th>
<th>t, µm</th>
<th>Ra, µm</th>
<th>W(a, W/µm</th>
<th>W(b, W/µm</th>
<th>(F, µm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6101-F2</td>
<td>Anodized hard coat</td>
<td>208.40±0.0292</td>
<td>85/280</td>
<td>85.1</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>26.95</td>
<td>3350</td>
<td>82.3</td>
<td>106.3</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td>74.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1100-F2</td>
<td>Anodized Electroless nickel plating</td>
<td>405.7/5.02</td>
<td>101/600</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>1744</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>33.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A356-S3-AA</td>
<td>Anodized Bare</td>
<td>152.1/None</td>
<td>128/None</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>9.10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A356-S3-NC</td>
<td>Anodized Electroplated silver</td>
<td>152.1/427</td>
<td>128/116</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>7.30</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A356-S5-NC</td>
<td>Anodized Electroplated silver</td>
<td>128/108</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>7.98</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A356-S6-NC</td>
<td>Anodized Electroplated silver</td>
<td>128/101</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>110.9</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A356-S6-NC</td>
<td>Anodized Electroplated silver</td>
<td>128/105</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>117.9</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A356-S14-AA</td>
<td>Anodized Electroplated silver</td>
<td>152.1/427</td>
<td>128/83</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>19.05</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>70.9</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>34.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A356-S14-NC</td>
<td>Anodized Electroplated silver</td>
<td>128/95</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>30.45</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>77.6</td>
<td>104.7</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>47.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A356-S19-NC</td>
<td>Anodized Electroplated silver</td>
<td>128/93</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>19.80</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>70.9</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td>78.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A356-S18-NC</td>
<td>Anodized Electroplated silver</td>
<td>128/93</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>27.35</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>53.9</td>
<td>69.3</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A356-S17-NC</td>
<td>Anodized Electroplated silver</td>
<td>128/93</td>
<td>76.2</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>24.10</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>74.0</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td>92.5</td>
<td>949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A356-S17-NC</td>
<td>Anodized Electroplated silver</td>
<td>128/93</td>
<td>76.2</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>26.50</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A356-S8-AA</td>
<td>Anodized Flame-sprayed silver</td>
<td>152.1/427</td>
<td>128/115</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>7.65</td>
<td>9.46</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>65.15</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>301.2</td>
<td>372.4</td>
<td>110.2</td>
<td>140.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A356-S8-NC</td>
<td>Anodized Flame-sprayed silver</td>
<td>128/115</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>7.59</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>56.00</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>241.3</td>
<td>298.8</td>
<td>102.8</td>
<td>128.3</td>
<td>2205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A356-S7-AA</td>
<td>Anodized Flame-sprayed silver</td>
<td>128/117</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2717</td>
<td>336.6</td>
<td>153.1</td>
<td>200.0</td>
<td>2866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A356-S7-NC</td>
<td>Anodized Flame-sprayed silver</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>6.21</td>
<td>7.74</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>2455</td>
<td>304.7</td>
<td>139.8</td>
<td>184.3</td>
<td>3547</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A356-S21-NC</td>
<td>Anodized Flame-sprayed silver</td>
<td>128/112</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>5.96</td>
<td>7.39</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>71.40</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>234.6</td>
<td>290.9</td>
<td>137.8</td>
<td>172.0</td>
<td>2811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A356-S20-NC</td>
<td>Anodized Flame-sprayed silver</td>
<td>128/113</td>
<td>76.2</td>
<td>6.74</td>
<td>8.28</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>86.85</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>265.4</td>
<td>326.0</td>
<td>177.6</td>
<td>213.7</td>
<td>3419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A356-S21-NC</td>
<td>Anodized Flame-sprayed silver</td>
<td>76.2</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.16</td>
<td>6.78</td>
<td>8.06</td>
<td>68.35</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>199.6</td>
<td>242.5</td>
<td>266.9</td>
<td>317.3</td>
<td>2691</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*AA and NC denote surfaces in contact with anodized aluminum 6101 and nickel-plated copper, respectively. The two rows of data for the anodized aluminum 6101 and copper specimens are for mutually perpendicular measurements across each of their surfaces.

\(k\) for anodic coating from Peterson and Fletcher, 21 for nickel plating from Gawrilov, 22 and \(k\) for silver from Touloukian and Ho. 20

\(H:\(c, H:\(d\) cm, H:\(e\) mm, H:\(f\) in., H:\(g\) ft, H:\(h\) µm, H:\(i\) in.\)

For the purpose of measuring thermal conductivity, a heat flux meter fabricated from each of the three base materials was used alternately as the middle heat flux meter in the test column. The upper and lower heat flux meters (aluminum 6101 and copper, respectively) were replaced by a pair of electrolytic iron heat flux meters machined to the previously described configuration. The thermal conductivity of the electrolytic iron over a wide range of temperature was measured by the National Bureau of Standards/National Institute of Standards and Technology (NBS/NIST). Thus, the conductivity of the base materials is traceable to a universally accepted standard. The experimentally determined values of thermal conductivity and Vickers microhardness (VHN) for the three base materials approximate published values for similar alloys24 22 and are listed in Table 1.

D. Coating Techniques

The aluminum 6101 heat flux meter, as well as coating thickness and hardness test coupons, were given a black anodic coating using a chilled sulfuric acid process described by Darrow. 22 “Hard coat” is the term commonly used in industry (Type III in U.S. military specifications) to describe anodic coatings synthesized by this technique. The electrolytes (i.e., no electrical current applied) nickel plating for the copper C11000-H03 heat flux meter and test coupons was deposited using methods described by Krieg 23 and a plating solution developed by Maclean and Karten. 24

The vapor-deposited silver coatings for the aluminum A356 were applied by placing the heat flux meters and hardness coupons to be coated in a vacuum chamber near an evaporation source containing silver. The evaporated metal coats the flux meter or coupon (and all other surfaces in the vacuum chamber) by condensing on the sample.

The method of electropolishing the silver onto the A356 aluminum involves two steps, a preliminary, thin, silver “strike” coating, and a subsequent thicker main plating. The strike coating is essential for good adhesion of the main plating.
The main plating electrolyte is that described by Sora and Bollhalder,\textsuperscript{27} and the strike formula is that given by Blair.\textsuperscript{28} The flame-sprayed silver coatings were applied by the high-velocity oxygen fuel (HVOF) method. This involves igniting a high-pressure fuel (H\textsubscript{2}) and oxygen mixture in a combustion chamber and directing the hot gas through a channeling nozzle. Silver wire is fed into the hot gas stream near the tip of the nozzle where it is melted and propelled by the gas jet onto the surface to be coated.

The VHN of the three base materials and all coating/base material combinations used in this investigation was measured using a Buehler microhardness tester with indentor loads ranging from 10- to 500-g force. The microhardness values for a load of 500-g force are listed in Table 1. The VHN of the electroless nickel-plated copper C11000-H03 for platings thicker than 34 \textmu m (0.0014 in.) was determined to range from 530 to 640 kg/mm\textsuperscript{2}, which is within the published range expected for such coatings (500–700 kg/mm\textsuperscript{2}).\textsuperscript{29} The microhardness of platings thinner than 34 \textmu m (0.0014 in.) decreases with increasing indentor load because the indentor penetrates the plating deeply enough for the soft copper to influence the indicated hardness. Since the indentor penetrates the plating deeply enough for the soft copper to influence the indicated hardness, the VHN of the electroless nickel plating applied to the copper specimen is estimated to be approximately 600 kg/mm\textsuperscript{2}.

The VHN of the anodized coating is generally independent of indentor load and increases slightly with coating thickness. The value of 280 kg/mm\textsuperscript{2} listed in Table 1 is the average determined for a hard coat sample approximately 85 \textmu m (0.00335 in.) thick.

All three types of silver coating/aluminum A356 combinations yielded lower VHN values than the VHN of bare aluminum (436). The electroplated silver-coated aluminum A356 was the softest of the three combinations, and the microhardness varied little with coating thickness. The microhardness of vapor-deposited silver-coated aluminum A356 decreased slightly with increasing coating thickness. The VHN of the flame-sprayed silver-coated aluminum A356 was essentially independent of coating thickness and the greatest of the three types of silver coating/aluminum combinations.

**F. Surface Measurements**

The topography of contacting surfaces has a profound effect on the thermal contact conductance of the junction. Consequently, the specimen's surfaces were characterized using a Surf analyser 5000/400 manufactured by Federal Products Corporation. Salient surface measurements are provided in Table 1.

**G. Environmental Testing**

Samples of all coating/substrate combinations used in this investigation were subjected to the standard salt spray test as per ASTM Standard B117.\textsuperscript{29} The salt spray test provides an accelerated (48-h) trial of component performance in a marine environment.

After exposure, no evidence of corrosion was found on the anodized aluminum 6101 and electroless nickel-plated copper coupons. However, the vapor-deposited silver-coated A356 coupons exhibited extensive flaking of the coating and oxidation of the substrate, indicative of poor adhesion and galvanic corrosion. Coupons with thin flame-sprayed silver coatings also corroded, probably because the thin flame-sprayed coatings, which are highly porous, did not completely cover the aluminum substrate. The electroplated silver-coated coupons displayed no indications of corrosion.

**H. Experimental Procedure**

Each separate test began with insertion of the bare or coated aluminum A356 middle heat flux meter between the anodized aluminum 6101 upper heat flux meter and the electroless nickel-plated copper lower heat flux meter. Exact alignment of the specimen was ensured by use of a specially designed alignment tool. A preload pressure of 862 kPa (125 psig), equal to the maximum-test pressure, was applied to simulate the standard practice of applying maximum-rated torque to wedge clamps, then pressure was reduced to the minimum test pressure of 172 kPa (25 psig).

All thermocouples were connected to a Hewlett Packard 3497A data acquisition system, the radiation shield was placed around the test column, and the vacuum jar was then sealed over the apparatus and evacuated. After outgassing, the appropriate coolant valve was opened, bellows pressure adjusted, and heater power selected. Contact pressure was increased from 172 to 862 kPa (25 to 125 psig) while maintaining each desired mean interface temperature, which was in turn raised from 20 to 100°C (68 to 212°F). Thus, counting the preloading as the first cycle, the 20°C test was the second cycle, the 40°C test was the third cycle, etc. Steady-state was assumed to have been obtained when none of the temperature readings of the 15 thermocouples changed by more than 0.3°C within an hour. The data acquisition system was used to collect temperature data, which was transmitted to an HP-87 computer that calculated the thermal contact conductance values.

**I. Data Analysis**

The conductance evaluation program utilized temperature and load measurements, and heat flux meter configurations and conductivities. The program calculated the heat flux through each of the three heat flux meters from Fourier's Law, using its temperature gradient, obtained from a linear regression of its five thermocouple temperature readings, and its previously calibrated temperature-dependent conductivity. The temperature discontinuities across the junctions were obtained by extrapolating the temperature profiles within the heat flux meters to the interfaces. The contact conductance of the appropriate junction, for which heat passed from either the anodized aluminum 6101 upper heat flux meter or the electroless nickel-plated copper lower heat flux meter (frame material) to the aluminum A356 middle heat flux meter (card rail material), was computed as the average heat flux of the specimens on either side of the junction divided by the temperature discontinuity across the junction.

**J. Uncertainty Analysis**

Uncertainty in the experimentally determined thermal contact conductance data arises from a number of causes, the major contributors being uncertainties in the thermal conductivity of the specimens and errors in the indicated thermocouple temperatures due to their limit of accuracy and electrical signal noise in the instrumentation. Since the level of uncertainty must be considered when evaluating the experimental results, the method of Kline and McClintock\textsuperscript{30} is used to estimate the uncertainty in the conductance data. The uncertainties in the thermal conductivities of the three base materials were calculated to be 2.88, 3.14, and 5.30% for the aluminum A356-T61, aluminum 6101-T6, and copper C11000-H03, respectively. The uncertainty in the contact conductance is estimated to be 6.07% for the anodized aluminum 6101 to bare aluminum A356, and 9.28% for the electroless nickel-plated copper to bare aluminum A356. The uncertainty in the contact conductance for junctions involving silver-coated aluminum A356 is 6.44%.

**III. Results and Discussion**

In order to assess the potential enhancement of thermal contact conductance afforded by silver coatings for the card rails, baseline data for junctions with uncoated card rail material were needed for comparison with results for junctions with silver-coated card rail material. This investigation entailed the experimental determination of the thermal contact conductance for anodized aluminum 6101-T6 and electroless nickel-plated copper C11000-H03 frame materials in contact.
with bare aluminum A356-T61 card rail material, as well as experimental measurement of the conductance for vapor-deposited, electroplated, and flame-sprayed silver-coated aluminum A356-T61. The contact conductance data for junctions involving bare and vapor-deposited silver-coated aluminum A356 were determined previously. These results are discussed here for the purpose of comparing them to the conductance data for electroplated and flame-sprayed silver coatings and to an existing predictive theory.

A. Baseline Contact Conductance Results

The thermal contact conductance data for the anodized aluminum 6101-T6 and electroless nickel-plated copper C11000-H03 in conjunction with bare aluminum A356 are presented in Fig. 3 as a function of apparent contact pressure and mean interface temperature. The thermal contact conductance for the anodized aluminum 6101 to bare aluminum A356 ranges from 25 to 92 W/m²K (4.4 to 16 Btu/h-ft²°F) over the given ranges of temperature and pressure. The relatively low magnitude of the conductance is reasonable, since the anodic coating is a very poor conductor and so acts as an insulator, and its relatively high hardness and large roughness (see Table 1) result in a very small true contact area.

Peterson and Fletcher performed one of the few other experimental investigations of the thermal conductivity and thermal contact conductance of anodized aluminum. They tested aluminum 6061-T6 with anodic coatings of several different thicknesses in contact with bare aluminum. Some of the anodic coatings they studied were comparable in thickness to the anodic coating used in the present investigation, i.e., 84.3 µm (0.00332 in.), and the conductance data for these coatings are included in Fig. 3. The magnitude and trends of the data are similar. Peterson and Fletcher performed all tests at a mean interface temperature of 25°C (77°F). They did not describe the particular anodization process for their specimens.

The thermal contact conductance of the nickel-plated copper C11000-H03 to aluminum A356 varies from 600 to 2800 W/m²K (106 to 493 Btu/h-ft²°F), which is substantially (25 to 30 times) greater than the conductance of the anodized aluminum 6101 to bare aluminum A356. Although the electroless nickel-plated copper is approximately twice as hard as the anodized aluminum 6101, it is the hardness of the softer material (bare aluminum A356 in both cases) that has a greater effect on contact conductance, as it is the first to undergo plastic flow. The conductance of the nickel-plated copper to bare aluminum A356 is much greater than the conductance of the anodized aluminum 6101 to bare aluminum A356, because the nickel plating is many times more conductive and much smoother than the anodic coating.

For both junctions, the conductance increases significantly with increasing temperature. This may be due in part to increased conductivity of the materials and softening of the aluminum A356 (the nickel plating and anodic coating do not soften from 20 to 100°C), although the moderate changes in these properties can account for only a small portion of the substantial increase in conductance with temperature. Thermally induced distortions of the nonconforming surfaces may contribute to the increase, although over the moderate temperature range employed, this effect is not expected to be very large. The major contributor to this phenomenon is very likely repeated loading. Although a preload equal to the maximum test load was employed after insertion of each aluminum A356 middle heat flux meter, plastic deformation and, hence, true contact area, may have been increased with each successive pressure excursion. Recall that testing began with increasing pressure while maintaining 20°C, followed by reducing pressure to the minimum value, raising temperature 40°C, then again increasing pressure, etc.

B. Contact Conductance for Vapor-Deposited Silver Coatings

The thermal contact conductance data for anodized aluminum 6101 and electroless nickel plated copper in contact with vapor-deposited silver-coated aluminum A356 are illustrated in Fig. 4 as a function of coating thickness, contact pressure, and mean interface temperature. Vapor-deposited
silver was applied to the aluminum A356 in thicknesses of 1, 2, and 3 µm (39, 79, and 118 µm, respectively).

Thermal contact conductance is expected to increase with increasing coating thickness (for coatings softer than the substrate) until the coating is sufficiently thick that its bulk resistance becomes significant, as stated by Kang et al. They noted that the optimum thickness of indium, lead, and tin coatings ranged from 0.5 to 2 µm. Silver is the most highly conductive metal and would have to be applied in much greater thicknesses than used in this investigation for its bulk resistance to have a measurable effect on conductance.

However, for the junction of anodized aluminum 6101 to vapor-deposited silver-coated aluminum A356, the conductance of the 2-µm vapor deposited silver coating is less than the conductance of the 1-µm coating. This is because the 2-µm silver-coated surface exhibited significant crowning or rounding, thereby reducing the size of the macroscopic contact region, whereas the 1-µm-coated heat flux meter was quite flat, allowing contact over nearly its entire surface. The 3-µm-coated surface was also rounded, though less so than the 2-µm-coated surface, which may account for the fact the conductance of the 3-µm-coated surface was only slightly greater than that of the 1-µm coating. The 3-µm coating was selected for further testing at 20 and 100°C. Note from Fig. 4 that the conductance of the anodized aluminum 6101 to 3-µm silver-coated aluminum A356 increases considerably with increasing temperature.

As shown in Fig. 4, the conductance of the nickel-plated copper to vapor-deposited silver-coated aluminum A356 junction increases monotonically with silver-coating thickness. The 1-µm-coated surface was very flat, while the 2- and 3-µm-coated surfaces showed slight rounding. The 3-µm coating was also tested at 20 and 100°C, and, again, the conductance increased significantly with silver-plating thickness. Also shown in Fig. 4 are contact conductance data for vapor-deposited silver-coated aluminum 6061-T651 in contact with bare aluminum 6061-T651 from Sheffield et al. These data were obtained at a mean interface temperature of 60°C for silver coatings of 0.3 µm (12 µin.) average thickness on specimens of widely varying roughness, 0.25-4.4 µm (10-176 µin.), as indicated by their surface descriptions in Fig. 6. The data reported by Sheffield et al. are considerably greater in magnitude than the results of the present investigation. This may be because the aluminum 6061-T651 specimens they tested were probably more highly polished than the aluminum A356 employed in this investigation, as evidenced by their bare junction results (not shown), which are considerably greater than the bare junction results for the present investigation. Their specimens also may have been flatter, resulting in larger macroscopic contact regions. The results of Sheffield et al. show an increase in conductance with increasing roughness.

C. Contact Conductance for Electroplated Silver Coatings

The thermal contact conductance data for anodized aluminum 6101 and electroless nickel-plated copper to electroplated silver-coated aluminum A356 are plotted in Fig. 5. Four thicknesses of electroplated silver were tested, 12.7, 25.4, 50.8, and 76.2 µm (0.0005, 0.001, 0.002, and 0.003 in., respectively);

Figure 5 shows that the conductance of the thinnest electroplated coating (12.7 µm) in contact with the anodized aluminum 6101 is several times greater than the conductance of the thicker electroplatings, and that conductance generally decreases with increasing plating thickness. This may be due to the fact that the plating process generated localized spots with a significantly greater plating thickness than the rest of the surface. These raised spots or bumps, which were essentially absent from the 12.7-µm plating, increased in size with increased plating thickness. Contact was mostly limited to the tops of these raised spots, which caused the conductance of the three thicker platings to be much lower than the conductance of the 12.7-µm plating. The 12.7-µm silver-plated surface was also tested at 20 and 100°C. Note that the conductance of the 12.7-µm plating in contact with the anodized aluminum 6101 increases markedly from 20 to 100°C.

The thinnest electroplated silver coating (12.7 µm) for the aluminum A356 also yielded the greatest conductance in contact with the nickel-plated copper, as seen in Fig. 5. Again, this was due to the presence of bumps on the thicker silver platings, which impeded heat flow across the junction. The conductance generally decreased with increasing coating thickness. Again, the 12.7-µm electroplated silver coating was tested at 20 and 100°C, and the conductance was found to increase considerably with increasing temperature.

D. Contact Conductance for Flame-Sprayed Silver Coatings

Thermal contact conductance data for the anodized aluminum 6101 and electroless nickel-plated copper in contact with flame-sprayed silver-coated aluminum A356 are shown in Fig. 6. Four thicknesses of flame-sprayed silver were evaluated, 12.7, 25.4, 50.8, and 76.2 µm (0.0005, 0.001, 0.002, and 0.003 in., respectively).

As illustrated in Fig. 6, the thinnest flame-sprayed silver coating (12.7 µm) for the aluminum A356 provided the greatest thermal contact conductance in junction with the anodized aluminum 6101. Hence, this coating thickness was also tested at 20 and 100°C. The conductance increases considerably with increasing temperature.

The 12.7- and 50.8-µm-thick flame-sprayed coatings for the aluminum A356 in junction with the nickel-plated copper (Fig. 6) displayed the greatest conductance values over the range of pressures tested. The 12.7-µm coating was chosen for further testing at 20 and 100°C. Again, the conductance is observed to increase markedly with increasing temperature.

E. Thermal Enhancement Provided by Silver Coatings

The contact conductance for anodized aluminum 6101 to vapor-deposited, electroplated, and flame-sprayed silver-coated aluminum A356 with respect to the conductance for anodized aluminum 6101 to uncoated aluminum A356 (i.e., ratio of coated to uncoated conductance) is plotted in Fig. 7. The
electroplated silver coatings afforded by far the greatest conductance enhancement, ranging from approximately 2.0 to 4.5 for the three thicker coatings (25.4, 50.8, and 76.2 µm), up to approximately an order of magnitude for the thinnest (12.7-µm) electroplated coating. The vapor-deposited silver coatings provided enhancement factors ranging from approximately 2.0 to 2.8. The conductance ratios for the vapor-deposited silver coatings ranged from 0.75 to 2.2. The conductance ratios for the flame-sprayed silver coatings ranged from 0.45 to 0.75. That is, the flame-sprayed silver coatings caused reduced conductance.

F. Comparison with Theoretical Predictions

The experimental thermal contact conductance results for electroless nickel-plated copper to bare and silver-coated aluminum A356 were compared to Antonetti and Yovanovich’s\textsuperscript{10} theory for predicting the contact conductance of metallic coated metals, as illustrated in Fig. 9. Antonetti and Yovanovich’s theory was developed for conforming (usually taken to mean optically flat), rough surfaces, whereas those surfaces employed in the present investigation often exhibited significant flatness deviations, since they were intended to be representative of typical commercially prepared surfaces. Flatness deviations lead to macroscopic gaps and significantly reduced conductance. Hence, the theory, since it deals only with microscopic contact resistance, should describe the upper bound to the data. Therefore, it is expected that the dimensionless conductance values for the present investigation should fall well below the prediction.

However, note from Fig. 9 that the dimensionless conductance values fall both above and below the theoretical prediction. This may be largely due to the value of thermal conductivity for the electroless nickel plating employed in calculations, 5.02 W/mK, as provided by Gawrilov.\textsuperscript{22} This
Fig. 9 Dimensionless thermal contact conductance vs relative pressure for electroless nickel-plated copper to bare and vapor-deposited, electroplated, and flame-sprayed silver-coated aluminum A356-T61.

value is more than an order of magnitude lower than the conductivity of commercially pure nickel (approximately 70 W/mK). Although the high phosphorus content of the electroless nickel plating (9.4% by weight) will certainly reduce the conductivity below the value for commercially pure nickel, the effect may not be as great as that reported by Gawrilov.22 If the conductivity for commercially pure nickel is used, the dimensionless conductance is reduced by slightly more than an order of magnitude, thus displacing all data in Fig. 9 below the prediction as would be expected.

IV. Conclusions and Recommendations

This investigation was directed toward experimentally determining the thermal contact conductance of anodized aluminum 6010 and electroless nickel-plated copper frame materials to bare as well as vapor-deposited, electroplated and flame-sprayed silver-coated aluminum A356 card rail material. The conductance data for silver-coated aluminum A356 were compared to the baseline experimental results for uncoated aluminum A356 in order to determine the level of enhancement afforded by the silver coatings.

The electroplated silver coatings for the aluminum A356 card rail material provided substantial improvement of the conductance of junctions involving both the anodized aluminum 6010 and electroless nickel-plated copper. The vapor-deposited silver coatings usually made for increased conductance, whereas the flame-sprayed silver coatings enhanced the conductance of the junction with anodized aluminum 6010 and reduced the conductance of the junction with electroless nickel-plated copper.

In addition to possessing the best thermal enhancement characteristics, at least for this investigation, electroplated silver coatings are highly adherent, wear resistant, and impervious to corrosion in a marine atmosphere, as demonstrated by the salt spray test. Electroplated silver coatings are also relatively easily applied and fairly inexpensive. Aluminum A356 with thin coatings of vapor-deposited silver, as used in this investigation, was found to be highly susceptible to galvanic corrosion in a marine atmosphere. However, thicker vapor-deposited silver coatings may prevent galvanic corrosion by completely masking the substrate. Flame-sprayed silver coatings, though quite durable, are highly porous, which may allow for galvanic corrosion if coatings are not thick enough to completely mask the surface.

The results for electroless nickel-plated copper to aluminum A356 were compared to the theory of Antonetti and Yovanovich20 for conforming, rough metallic-coated metals. Some dimensionless conductance values for the present investigation were unexpectedly greater than predicted, although this may be due to an inordinately low estimate of the thermal conductivity of the electroless nickel plating.

It is recommended that electroplated and/or vapor-deposited silver coatings be evaluated for their suitability in supplementing the anodic coatings on aluminum 6101-T6 frames and the electroless nickel platings on copper frames.
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