

LIST OF FIGURES

Fig. 2.1	Matrix based classification of Composites	8
Fig. 2.2	Classification of the processing routes to develop MMCs	9
Fig. 2.3	Steps involved in powder Metallurgy process	11
Fig. 2.4	Schematic diagram of sintering mechanism	12
Fig. 2.5	Schematic diagram showing co-deposition of a metallic matrix and reinforcing particulates via thermal spray process	14
Fig. 2.6	Schematic diagram of Spark plasma sintering of powder sample	18
Fig. 3.1	Schematic diagram of a typical spark plasma sintering machine	48
Fig. 3.2	Schematic diagram of flat tensile sample	50
Fig. 3.3	Schematic diagram of ball/pin on disc tribotester	51
Fig. 4.1	XRD patterns of pure copper and composites fabricated by Spark plasma sintering.	56
Fig. 4.2	Micrographs of (a) CA, (b) CAM, and (c) CAMB composites captured by SEM under the scattered mode. Inset images correspond to the back-scattered mode of respective composites.	57
Fig. 4.3	Scanning electron micrographs along with corresponding area elemental distribution of (a) CA, (b) CAM, and (c) CAMB composites.	58
Fig. 4.4	Variation of coefficient of friction for pure Cu and Cu-based hybrid composites at a load of 8N load and sliding speed of 0.5 m.s ⁻¹ .	59
Fig. 4.5	Variation of the average coefficient of friction for pure Cu and Cu-based hybrid composites as functions of (a) load and (b) composition.	61
Fig. 4.6	Variation of the wear rate for pure Cu and Cu-based hybrid composites as functions of (a) load and (b) composition.	62
Fig. 4.7	SEM micrographs of worn surfaces of (a) pure Cu and (b-d) Cu-based hybrid composites CA, CAM, and CAMB, respectively. Atomic and weight % of elements on the worn surfaces of CAM	63

and CAMB composites are shown based on the EDX measurements. The EN 31 steel ball was used as counterface. Load: 2 N, sliding speed: 0.5 m. s⁻¹.

Fig. 4.8	SEM micrographs of worn surfaces of (a) pure Cu and (b-d) Cu-based hybrid composites CA, CAM, and CAMB, respectively. The EN 31 steel ball was used as counter face. Load: 4 N, sliding speed: 0.5 m.s ⁻¹ .	64
Fig. 4.9	SEM micrographs of worn surfaces of (a) pure Cu and (b-d) Cu based hybrid composites CA, CAM, and CAMB, respectively. The EN 31 steel ball was used as counter face. Load: 8 N, sliding speed: 0.5 m.s ⁻¹ .	65
Fig. 4.10	XRD patterns of worn tracks developed on (a) pure Cu and (b-d) Cu-based hybrid composites CA, CAM, and CAMB, respectively under the load of 8 N.	66
Fig. 4.11	SEM micrographs of the counter surface of EN 31 steel balls used for sliding against (a) pure Cu and (b-d) Cu-based hybrid composites CA, CAM, and CAMB, respectively. Load: 8 N.	67
Fig. 4.12	SEM micrographs of wear debris collected from the (a) CA and (b) CAMB composites after the wear tests.	68
Fig. 4.13	Micrographs of worn sub-surfaces of (a) pure Cu and (b-d) Cu-based hybrid composites CA, CAM, and CAMB, respectively. (e) The magnified circular area of CAMB composite (d).	70
Fig. 4.14	Topographic images of worn surfaces of (a) pure Cu and (b-d) Cu-based hybrid composites CA, CAM, and CAMB, respectively, scanned by AFM. The EN 31 steel ball was used as counterface. Load: 8 N, sliding speed: 0.5 m.s ⁻¹ .	71
Fig. 5.1	TEM micrographs, corresponds to low and high magnification of a-b) rGO, c-d) MoS ₂ . Inset of the micrographs (b and d) corresponds to HRTEM image of respective nano particles	82
Fig. 5.2	Illustration of low and high-resolution micrographs of rGO-MoS ₂ hybrid captured by TEM. (a) The rGO lamellae are indicated by white arrows in the figure (b), whereas MoS ₂ lamellae are explicitly shown in the figure (b) with interlamellar spacing and (c) Microscopic image along with corresponding area elemental distribution of C, Mo, and S in the rGO-MoS ₂ hybrid.	83
Fig. 5.3	(a) XPS spectrum of rGO-MoS ₂ hybrid and (b) XPS spectra of C 1s, Mo 3d, and S 2p along with their deconvoluted peak components.	85

Fig. 5.4	XRD pattern of rGO-MoS ₂ hybrid.	86
Fig. 5.5	Raman band A _{1g} of MoS ₂ nanosheets in the rGO-MoS ₂ hybrid	86
Fig. 5.6	Back-scattered mode SEM micrograph of Cu-rGO-MoS ₂ (a) CGM 600, (b) CGM 650, (c) CGM 700, (d) CGM 750, prepared at sintering temperatures of 600, 650 and 700 and 750 °C, respectively.	87
Fig. 5.7	(a-b) TEM micrograph of Cu-rGO-MoS ₂ composite (c) Selected area diffraction pattern of Cu-rGO-MoS ₂ composite (d) HRTEM micrograph showing interface of copper and rGO-MoS ₂ phase.	89
Fig. 5.8	XRD patterns of CGM 600, CGM 650, CGM 700, and CGM 750 specimens. The characteristics features due to rGO, MoS ₂ , and MoC are expanded in their inset graphs.	90
Fig. 5.9	(a) Raman spectra of Cu-rGO-MoS ₂ composites prepared at sintering temperature of 600 °C, 650 °C, 700 °C, and 750 °C. The G and D bands revealed the presence of rGO in Cu-rGO-MoS ₂ composites. (b) Shift in G peak position with sintering temperature.	91
Fig. 5.10	Variation of punch displacement with sintering temperature.	92
Fig. 5.11	Variation of (a) Density and (b) Hardness with composites.	94
Fig. 5.12	Tensile stress-strain curve for specimen sintered at different temperatures.	95
Fig. 5.13	Fractographs of composites (a) CGM 600, (b) CGM 650, (c) CGM 700, (d) CGM 750 and their corresponding elemental mapping.	96
Fig. 5.14	(a) Variation of coefficient of friction with number of cycles, and (b) average coefficient of friction for PC and composites sintered at different sintering temperature.	98
Fig. 5.15	Variation of wear rate of pure copper and Cu-rGO-MoS ₂ composites.	99
Fig. 5.16	(a) Variation of coefficient of friction with number of cycles, and (b) average coefficient of friction with load.	101
Fig. 5.17	Variation of wear rate with load for pure copper and optimized specimen.	102

Fig. 5.18	The topographic images obtained from AFM of worn surfaces for (a) CGM 600, (b) CGM 650, (c) CGM 700, and (d) CGM 750 samples of Cu-rGO-MoS ₂ composites after the tribo-test, tested under the load: 4 N, sliding speed: 0.5 m.s ⁻¹ .	102
Fig. 5.19	Worn surface micrographs depicting the wear events for the specimens (a) PC, (b) CGM 600, (c) CGM 650, (d) CGM 700, and (e) CGM 750, tested under the load of 4N and 0.5 m.s ⁻¹ .	105
Fig. 5.20	SEM Micrographs of counter surface steel balls slid against (a-b) CGM 600, (c-d) CGM 650, (e-f) CGM 700, and (g-h) CGM 750 samples of Cu-rGO-MoS ₂ composites. The FESEM micrographs at higher resolutions are shown with corresponding elemental distribution overlay obtained from EDAX.	106
Fig. 5.21	Micrographs of worn scars developed on steel balls during tribo-tests against (a) CGM 600, (b) CGM 650, (c) CGM 700, and (d) CGM 750 samples of Cu-rGO-MoS ₂ composites. The SEM micrographs are shown along with corresponding area elemental distribution and overlay of all contributing elements.	107
Fig. 5.22	Scanning electron micrographs of worn tracks developed on (a) PC and (b) CGM 700 composite under the load of 10 N at sliding speed of 0.5 m/s sliding speed.	108
Fig. 5.23	Schematic illustration representing the sliding of counter face over the Cu-rGO-MoS ₂ composite. It demonstrates the expansion and contraction of graphene sheets along with the nature of forces acting during the sliding.	119
Fig. 6.1	SEM micrograph of (a) PC, (b) CG, (c) CM, (d) CGM. Inset of Figure b corresponds the low magnification image showing dark agglomerates.	123
Fig. 6.2	SEM micrographs of (a) CGM 0.5, (b) CGM 1.0, (c) CGM 1.5 and (d) CGM 2.0 composites.	123
Fig. 6.3	XRD patterns of PC, CM, CG and CGM specimens.	125
Fig. 6.4	XRD patterns of CGM 0.5, CGM 1.0, CGM 1.5 and CGM 2.0.	126
Fig. 6.5	Graphs depicting (a) Real time Coefficient of Friction curve with number of cycles and (b) Variation of average coefficient of friction with Composition.	129
Fig. 6.6	Variation of wear rate with Composition.	130

Fig. 6.7	SEM micrographs of the worn surfaces of specimens of (a) PC, (b) CG, (c) CM, (d) CGM, tested at the load of 6 N and 0.5 m. s ⁻¹ .	131
Fig. 6.8	Worn track profiles of (a) PC, (b) CM, (c) CG and (d) CGM.	132
Fig. 6.9	Elemental mapping of worn tracks corresponding to the composites (a) CG, (b) CM and (c) CGM.	133
Fig.6.10	Elemental mapping of worn surface corresponding to CM composite depicting the formation of oxide layer.	134
Fig. 6.11	Elemental mapping depicting tribo-layer formation over the worn surface of CGM composite.	134
Fig. 6.12	SEM micrographs of counter surfaces corresponds to sample: (a) PC, (b) CG, (c) CM and (d) CGM.	135
Fig. 6.13	Elemental mapping of counter face corresponding to composite CGM depicting the formation of transfer layer over the surface.	136
Fig. 6.14	SEM micrographs of subsurface region for the sample (a) PC, (b) CG, (c) CM and (d) CGM. Inset of the Fig. 6.14 (a) shows the high magnification micrograph for sample PC subsurface region.	137
Fig. 6.15	Raman spectra of two separate points taken from unworn and worn surface of composite CGM.	138
Fig. 6.16	Variation of Coefficient of friction with number of cycles against the steel ball under the load of (a) 4 N, (b) 6N, (c) 8N and (d) 10N.	146
Fig. 6.17	(a) Variation of Coefficient of friction with number of cycles against the steel ball under the load of 10 N, (b) Variation of average coefficient of friction with applied load and (c) Variation of average coefficient of friction with composition.	148
Fig. 6.18	(a) Variation of wear rate with load for composites and (b) Variation of wear rate with composition at different loads.	149
Fig. 6.19	Worn surface micrograph of composites (a) CGM 0.5, (b) CGM 1.0, (c) CGM 1.5 and (d) CGM 2.0, tested at the load of 4N and sliding speed 0.5 m.s ⁻¹ .	150
Fig. 6.20	Worn surface micrograph of composites a) CGM 0.5, b) CGM 1.0, c) CGM 1.5, and d) CGM 2.0, tested at the load of 10N and 0.5 m.s ⁻¹ sliding speed.	151

Fig. 6.21	Representative microscopic images and corresponding area elemental distribution of the worn surface of (a) CGM 0.5 and (b) CGM 2.0 nanocomposites at a load of 6N.	151
Fig. 6.22	Worn surfaces micrograph of steel balls slid against (a, b) CGM 0.5, (c, d) CGM 1.0, (e, f) CGM 1.5 and (g, h) CGM 2.0 composites shown at low and high resolutions. Load: 10 N, Sliding speed: 0.5 m/s.	154
Fig. 6.23	Scanning electron micrographs of the wear debris collected after the tribo-tests for (a) CGM 0.5, (b) CGM 1.0, (c) CGM 1.5 and (d) CGM 2.0 composites slid against the steel ball under the load of 10 N.	155
Fig. 6.24	Schematic illustration depicting the plausible wear mechanism of Cu-rGO-MoS ₂ nanocomposite, emphasizing the role of rGO-MoS ₂ nanofiller.	163