

List of Figures

- 1.1 Yield strength versus year of introduction of aluminium alloy [2] 2
- 1.2 Engineering properties required for main structural components [4]. 5
- 1.3 Primary types of aluminium alloys [8]. 8
- 1.4 Variation of resistance to SCC and strength with aging time [12]. 11
- 1.5 Variation of hardness during RRA heat treatment [12]. 12
- 1.6 Effect of particle diameter and CRSS on dislocation-precipitate interaction [1]. 14
- 1.7 Distribution of precipitates within the matrix in (a) T6, (b) RRA and (c) T7 temper respectively [17]. 15
- 1.8 Distribution of grain boundary precipitates in (a) T6, (b) RRA and (c) T7 temper respectively [17]. 16
- 1.9 Dispersoid of $Al_{12}Mg_2Cr$ in alloy 7075 [9]. 18
- 1.10 (a) Schematic of USSP chamber and (b) repeated impact creating surface layer with high strain [28]. 20
- 1.11 Schematic illustration of grain refinement via DDW and DT [37]. 22
- 1.12 Schematic illustration of grain refinement by mechanical twins and dislocations resulting from SMAT [37]. 23
- 1.13 Microstructure evolution of USSP treated AA7075 at different depths of (a) $8\ \mu m$, (b) $40\ \mu m$, (c) $60\ \mu m$ and (d) SADP corresponding to fig. c [39] 25
- 1.14 S/N curves of different SMATed samples and SMATed samples combined with annealing [58]. 28
- 1.15 Variation of fatigue life with plastic strain amplitude [61]. 30

1.16	Coffin-Manson plot of high nitrogen stainless steel for the un-shot peened and 10 min shot peened specimens [62].	31
2.1	Schematic of the retrogression and reaging heat treatment of AA7075. . .	36
2.2	The peening head (left) and the central unit (right) of the ultrasonic shot peening device.	37
2.3	Geometry of the flat tensile specimen with dimensions in mm.	40
2.4	Schematic of the cylindrical LCF specimen with dimensions in mm. . . .	41
2.5	Dimensions of the specimen used in the SSRT test with dimension in mm.	43
3.1	Optical micrographs showing microstructure of the AA7075 in RRA condition.	46
3.2	Surface topography of the AA7075 samples in (a) un-USSP condition & USSP treated respectively for different durations (b) 15 s, (c) 30 s, (d) 60 s, & (e) 300 s.	47
3.3	Cross-Sectional SEM image of the AA 7075 USSP treated for different durations: (a) 15 s, (b) 60 s and (c) 300 s	48
3.4	Bright field TEM micrographs of the AA7075: (a) PA-unUSSP, (b) HRTEM image of GP-zone, (c) corresponding IFFT pattern of framed region in Fig. b, (c) HRTEM image of η' precipitate, (e) corresponding IFFT pattern of framed region in Fig.c, HAADF-STEM image and EDS mapping of Al,Zn, Mg and Cr of (f) η -phase and (g) E-phase respectively.	50
3.5	HRTEM micrographs of η -phase and its corresponding FFT (a) spherical and (b) needle morphology in PA-unUSSP condition	51
3.6	Bright field TEM micrographs and their corresponding SAD patterns from the top surface regions of the AA7075 in different USSP treated conditions: (a) USSP 15, (c) USSP 30, (e) USSP 60, (g) USSP 180 and (i) USSP 300.	53
3.7	Bright field TEM micrographs showing microstructure evolution at different depths of the AA7075, USSP treated for 30 seconds.	55

3.8	Bright field TEM micrographs showing microstructure evolution at different depths of the AA7075, USSP treated for 300 seconds.	57
3.9	IQ maps of the AA7075 in different conditions (a) un-USSP, (b) USSP 30, (c) USSP 180 and (d) USSP 300.	58
3.10	Auto grain maps of the AA7075 in different conditions (a) un-USSP, (b) USSP 30, (c) USSP 180 and (d) USSP 300.	59
3.11	Thickness of the different types of microstructure layers.	60
3.12	Grain boundary misorientation maps of the AA7075 in different conditions (a) un-USSP, (b) USSP 30, (c) USSP 180 and (d) USSP 300.	61
3.13	Variation of grain boundary misorientation of the AA7075 in different conditions (a) un-USSP, (b) USSP 30, (c) USSP 180 and (d) USSP 300.	61
3.14	XRD patterns of the 7075 Al alloy in the un-USSP condition and USSP treated for different durations of time.	63
3.15	(a) Variation of average crystallite size and mean micro-strain and (b) Variation of dislocation density and lattice parameter with treatment time of USSP in the AA7075.	64
3.16	XRD patterns of the AA7075 in different conditions.	65
3.17	Variation of the residual stress along the depth from the surface of the AA7075, USSP treated for different durations.	67
3.18	Distribution of residual stress in the AA7075 in different conditions.	67
3.19	Variation of average surface roughness of the AA7075 with duration of USSP.	68
3.20	Variation of microhardness from the surface towards interior of the AA7075, USSP treated for different durations.	69
3.21	Variation of microhardness of the AA7075 in the different conditions.	70
3.22	Schematic illustration showing microstructural evolution process of the AA7075 treated with USSP.	73

4.1	DSC thermograms of the AA7075 in the un-USSP and USSP treated conditions obtained at heating rate of 10°C/min.	81
4.2	Variation of microhardness of the USSP treated AA7075 with the duration of annealing at different temperatures.	82
4.3	XRD profiles of the USSP treated sample and the USSP treated samples annealed at different temperatures for 30 minutes.	83
4.4	XRD profiles of the as USSP treated sample and the USSP treated samples following annealing at (a) 150°C, (b) 250°C and (c) 350°C for varying periods of time.	84
4.5	Variation of (a) Crystallite size, (b) Microstrain and (c) Dislocation density of the USSP treated AA7075 with duration of post annealing treatment at different temperatures.	85
4.6	Bright field TEM micrographs and respective SAED patterns of the USSP treated samples annealed at (a) 150°C, (b) 200°C, (c) 250°C, (d) 300°C and (e) 350°C for 30 minutes.	87
4.7	Plot of $\ln k$ vs $1000/T$ for the estimation of activation energy for grain growth of the USSP treated AA7075.	94
5.1	Cyclic Stress response curves of AA7075 in different conditions (a) un-USSP, (b) USSP 30, (c) USSP 60, (d) USSP 180 and (e) USSP 300. . . .	103
5.2	Variation of cyclic hardening factor with number of cycles for the un-USSP and the samples USSP treated for different durations, at the total strain amplitude $\Delta\epsilon_t/2$ of $\pm 0.38\%$	104
5.3	Dependence of fatigue life on total strain amplitude for the different conditions.	104
5.4	Dependence of fatigue life, number of reversals to failure ($2N_f = 1$) on the plastic strain amplitude for the un-USSP and different USSP treated conditions.	105
5.5	Variation of plastic strain energy density in un-USSP and different USSP treated conditions.	106

5.6	SEM fractographs showing morphology of fractured surfaces of the un-USSP sample, tested at the total strain amplitudes of (a) $\pm 0.60\%$, (b) $\pm 0.45\%$, (c) $\pm 0.38\%$ and the USSP 180 samples tested at the total strain amplitude of (d) $\pm 0.60\%$, (e) $\pm 0.45\%$, (f) $\pm 0.38\%$	108
5.7	Compressive residual stress in surface region of the USSP 180 specimen in the as-USSP treated condition and following LCF at different total strain amplitudes up to half of their LCF life ($N_f/2$).	110
5.8	SEM fractographs showing fracture surfaces of the specimens tested at the total strain amplitudes of $\pm 0.38\%$, $\pm 0.60\%$ respectively: (a, b) un-USSP and (c, d) USSP 180.	111
5.9	Variation of interstriation spacing at different total strain amplitudes for the un-USSP and USSP 180 specimens.	113
5.10	SEM micrograph of the USSP 300 sample tested in LCF at the total strain amplitude of $\pm 0.38\%$. (a) Surface morphology of the circumferential surface close to fracture end and (b) longitudinal section of the tested sample showing crack profile.	114
6.1	Bright field TEM micrograph of the AA7075: (a) PA-USSP condition with its corresponding SADP, (b) GP-zones and η' precipitates, (c) HRTEM of η -phase and (d) HRTEM of E-phase.	119
6.2	Bright field TEM micrograph of the AA7075: (a) PA-USSP-SR condition with its corresponding SADP, (b) GP-zones and η' precipitates, and (c) showing coarse η and E-phase precipitates.	120
6.3	Bright field TEM micrograph of the AA7075: (a) ST-USSP-PA condition with its corresponding SADP, (b) GP-zones, η' precipitates and (c) HRTEM of η' precipitates.	122
6.4	Engineering stress-strain curves of the AA7075 in different conditions. . .	123
6.5	Cyclic stress response curves of the AA7075 in different conditions (a) PA-USSP, (b) PA-USSP-SR and (c) ST-USSP-PA.	124

6.6	Dependence of fatigue life, as reversals to failure, on plastic strain amplitude.	125
6.7	Dependence of fatigue life on total strain amplitude for different conditions.	126
6.8	Variation of the number of cycles for crack initiation (N_i) and for crack propagation (N_p) for the AA7075 tested in LCF at different total strain amplitudes.	127
6.9	SEM fractographs showing overall fracture surfaces and fatigue striation in the specimens tested at the total strain amplitude of $\pm 0.45\%$: (a) PA-USSP, (b) PA-USSP-SR and (c) ST-USSP-PA.	128
6.10	HRTEM micrographs and corresponding IFFT images of dislocation distribution around precipitates in (a) PA-USSP, (b) PA-USSP-SR and (c) ST-USSP-PA.	131
7.1	Potentiodynamic polarization curves of the un-USSP and the different USSP treated samples in 3.5 wt% NaCl solution, following exposure of 30 minutes	138
7.2	EIS plots of un-USSP and different USSP treated samples in 3.5 wt.% NaCl solution recorded at their respective open circuit potentials for immersion durations of 24 h (a-c) and 360 h (d-f).	141
7.3	Equivalent electrochemical circuit of CPE model.	144
7.4	Anodic polarization curves of the un-USSP and USSP treated samples after 360 h of exposure in 3.5 wt.% NaCl solution.	145
7.5	Variation of weight gain of the 7075 Al alloy with duration of immersion in 3.5 wt.% NaCl solution for the un-USSP and different USSP treated samples.	146
7.6	Corrosion rate of aluminium alloy 7075 in different USSP conditions after 60 days of immersion in 3.5 wt.% NaCl solution.	147
7.7	X-ray diffractograms of the 7075 Al alloy after exposure in 3.5 wt.% NaCl solution for 15 days in the un-USSP and different USSP treated conditions.	148

7.8	SEM micrographs of the 7075 Al alloy after exposure in 3.5 wt.% NaCl solution for 15 days: (a) un-USSP, (b) USSP 15, and (c) USSP 300 conditions.	149
7.9	EDX results of the 7075 Al alloy following immersion in 3.5 wt.% NaCl solution for 15 days: (a) un-USSP, (b) USSP 15 and (c) USSP 300.	151
8.1	Volta potential map (a, c) and linear distribution of potential (b, d) for un-USSP and USSP 15 samples respectively.	160
8.2	Potentiodynamic polarization curves in 3.5 wt% NaCl solution, after 30 minutes of their exposure.	162
8.3	EIS plots of the un-USSP and different USSP treated samples in 3.5 wt% NaCl solution recorded at their respective open circuit potentials for immersion duration of (a-c) 24 h and (d-f) 360 h respectively.	167
8.4	Equivalent electrical circuit	169
8.5	Potentiodynamic polarization curves of the un-USSP and USSP treated specimens after 360 h of exposure in 3.5 wt.% NaCl solution	170
8.6	XPS Al2p spectrum of different samples: (a) un-USSP, (b) un-USSP+360h of exposure, (c) USSP 15 and (d) USSP 15+360h of exposure.	171
8.7	Stress-Strain curves of un-USSP and USSP specimens in Air and 3.5 wt.% NaCl solution at slow strain rate of $10^{-6} s^{-1}$	173
8.8	Time to failure of SSRT tests for the un-USSP and USSP conditions.	174
8.9	Morphology and the corresponding EDS of the AA7075 after potentiodynamic polarization in 3.5 wt% NaCl solution (a) un-USSP and (b) USSP 15.	176
8.10	Schematic showing surface morphology of (a) un-USSP and (b) USSP treated specimen.	178
8.11	Fracture surfaces of the SSRT samples in un-USSP condition tested in (a) air, (b) 3.5 wt% NaCl solution and in USSP condition tested in (c) air and (d) 3.5 wt% NaCl solution.	186

8.12 SEM micrograph of longitudinal section of SSRT tested samples in 3.5
wt.% NaCl (a) un-USSP and (b) USSP conditions. 187