

Development of Nickel Free Nitrogen Stabilized Austenitic Stainless Steel for Biomedical Applications



**THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT
FOR THE AWARD OF DEGREE**

Doctor of Philosophy

by

Chandra Shekhar Kumar

**DEPARTMENT OF METALLURGICAL ENGINEERING
INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY
(BANARAS HINDU UNIVERSITY)
VARANASI-221005, INDIA**

Roll No- 16141002

2021

CERTIFICATE

It is certified that the work contained in the thesis titled *“Development of Nickel Free Nitrogen Stabilized Austenitic Stainless Steel for Biomedical Applications”* by *“Chandra Shekhar Kumar”* has been carried out under my supervision and this work has not been submitted elsewhere for a degree.

It is further certified that the student has fulfilled all the requirements of Comprehensive Examination, Candidacy and SOTA for the award of Ph.D. Degree.

Supervisor

Dr. G. S. Mahobia

(Associate Professor)

Department of Metallurgical Engineering
Indian Institute of Technology
(Banaras Hindu University),
Varanasi-221005, INDIA

DECLARATION BY THE CANDIDATE

I, "*Chandra Shekhar Kumar*", certify that the work embodied in this thesis is my own bona fide work and carried out by me under the supervision of "*Dr. G. S. Mahobia*" from "*July 2016*" to "*October 2021*", at the "*Department of Metallurgical Engineering*", Indian Institute of Technology (BHU), Varanasi. The matter embodied in this thesis has not been submitted for the award of any other degree/diploma. I declare that I have faithfully acknowledged and given credits to the research workers wherever their works have been cited in my work in this thesis. I further declare that I have not willfully copied any other's work, paragraphs, text, data, results, *etc.*, reported in journals, books, magazines, reports dissertations, theses, *etc.*, or available at websites and have not included them in this thesis and have not cited as my own work.

Date

Place

Chandra Shekhar Kumar

CERTIFICATE FROM THE SUPERVISOR

This is to certify that the above statement made by the candidate is correct to the best of my knowledge.

Supervisor

Dr. G. S. Mahobia

(Associate Professor)

Professor and Head

Department of Metallurgical Engineering,
Indian Institute of Technology (BHU), Varanasi- 221005

COPYRIGHT TRANSFER CERTIFICATE

Title of the Thesis: “Development of nickel free nitrogen stabilized austenitic stainless steel for biomedical applications”

Name of the Student: Chandra Shekhar Kumar

COPYRIGHT TRANSFER

The undersigned hereby assigns to the Indian Institute of Technology (Banaras Hindu University), Varanasi all rights under copyright that may exist in and for the above thesis submitted for the award of the "*Ph.D. Degree*".

Date:

Place:

Chandra Shekhar Kumar

Note: However, the author may reproduce or authorize others to reproduce materials extracted verbatim from the thesis or derivative of the thesis for author's personal use provided that the source and the Institute's copyright notice are indicated.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I take this opportunity to express my sincere thanks and gratitude beyond words to my supervisor, Dr. G. S. Mahobia for his consistent help, encouragement and valuable discussions during the entire duration of my Ph.D. work. I would like to express my deepest sense of gratitude to my revered Guru Prof. Vakil Singh, under whose able guidance the present research work was conceived. I would not have been able to complete this thesis work without their blessings, invaluable efforts and constant encouragement.

Besides my supervisor, I would like to thank my RPEC members: Dr. Amit Rastogi (IMS-BHU) and Dr. Kausik Chattopadhyay, Department of Metallurgical Engineering, for their support and insightful comments. I would like to convey my sincere thanks to Prof. Sunil Mohan (Head, Department of Metallurgical Engineering, IIT (BHU), Varanasi), Prof. N. K. Mukhopadhyay and Prof. R. K. Mandal (Former Heads, Department of Metallurgical Engineering, IIT (BHU)), for providing all necessary facilities to conduct my research work. My sincere thanks to Prof. O. P. Sinha, Prof. N. C. Santhi Srinivas, Dr. Joysurya Basu and other faculty members of the department for their cooperation and inspiration.

I am highly thankful to Dr. Sanjeev Kumar Mahto (School of Biomedical Engineering) for providing facility to carry out cell culture study and related valuable discussion. I am also thankful to Dr. Suruchi Poddar and Neelima Varshney from School of Biomedical Engineering, for their help during cell culture study. I am thankful to Dr. Gaurav Singh (IMS-BHU) for helping in *in vivo* animal study. I also acknowledge Prof. Rajiv Prakash (Prof.-in-charge, CIFIC, IIT (BHU)) for extending necessary characterization facilities. I am thankful to Prof. I. Samajdar, IIT Bombay, for providing facility to carry out residual stress analysis. My sincere thanks are due to Mr. Girish Sahu (CIFIC, IIT (BHU)) for his constant help in conducting SEM studies.

I am thankful to my friends, Pramod, Asnit, Shubham, Deepak Singh, Sharvan, Amit, Biswajit, Sandip, Jaydeep, Nitesh and seniors Dr. Sanjeev Rana, Dr. Vaibhav Pandey, Dr. Rupendra Singh Rajpurohit, Dr. Manish K Kishore Singh, Dr. Vivek Pandey, Dr. Vikash Shivam, Dr. Yagnesh Shadangi and Mr. Ch. V. Rao for their needful help and making joyful and memorable moments at IIT (BHU), Varanasi.

I am also thankful to all the laboratory, library and workshop staffs specially Shri Sushil Ji, Shri Balwant Ji and Shri Mangal Patel for helping in tensile and fatigue samples preparation, Shri Lalit Kumar Singh for helping in transmission electron microscopy and Shri Kamlesh, Shri Minz for helping in various mechanical testing. I am also thankful to all office staff of the Department particularly Shri R P Yadav, Shri Rishabh Tiwari and Shri J P Patel for providing necessary help as and when desired.

Last, but not the least, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my family, my parents, for educating me, for their unconditional support and encouragement to pursue my interest. I would also like to thank my elder brother Mr. Shashi Shekhar Kumar for his constant encouragement and support.

I also wish to thank all my friends and the persons whose names have not been mentioned on this piece of paper for extending their cooperation directly or indirectly.

Chandra Shekhar Kumar

*Dedicated to
My Beloved Parents*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page No.
Table of Contents	xiii
List of Figures	xxi
List of Tables	xxix
Abbreviations	xxxii
Symbols	xxxiii
Preface	xxxv
Chapter 1 INTRODUCTION AND LITERATURE REVIEW	1-28
1.1 Introduction	1
1.2 Various Modes of Failure of Orthopedic Implants	2
1.2.1 Improper Loading of Implants	2
1.2.2 Fatigue of Implants	2
1.2.3 Corrosion and Corrosion Fatigue of Implants	3
1.3 Metallic Biomaterials	5
1.4 316L Austenitic Stainless Steel as a Biomaterial	6
1.5 Nickel Allergy: Government Policies and Directives and Need for the Development of Nickel-Free Austenitic Stainless Steel	9
1.6 Role of Alloying Elements in High Nitrogen Austenitic Stainless Steels without Nickel	9
1.6.1 Role of Carbon (C)	10
1.6.2 Role of Chromium (Cr)	10
1.6.3 Role of Molybdenum (Mo)	10

1.6.4	Role of Manganese (Mn)	11
1.6.5	Role of Nitrogen (N)	11
1.7	Development of Nickel-Free Nitrogen Stabilized Austenitic Stainless Steel for Biomedical Applications	16
1.7.1	Philosophy of Alloy Design of Nickel-Free Nitrogen Stabilized Austenitic Stainless Steel	17
1.7.2	Mechanical Behavior, Corrosion Resistance and Biocompatibility of Nickel-Free Nitrogen Stabilized Austenitic Stainless Steel	19
1.8	Surface Modification of Metallic Materials	22
1.8.1	Ultrasonic Shot Peening	23
1.8.2	Role of Surface Nanostructuring on Various Properties of Metallic Materials	25
1.9	Surface Modification and its Impact on Properties of Nitrogen Stabilized Austenitic Stainless Steel	26
1.10	Scope of the Present Investigation	27
1.11	Objectives of the Present Investigation	28
Chapter 2	MATERIALS AND EXPERIMENTAL METHODS	29-46
2.1	Introduction	29
2.2	Materials	29
2.3	Ultrasonic Shot Peening	30
2.4	Microstructural Characterization	32
2.4.1	Optical Microscopy	32
2.4.2	Scanning Electron Microscopy	32
2.4.3	Transmission Electron Microscopy	33

2.4.4	X-Ray Diffraction	33
2.5	Surface Roughness Measurement	34
2.6	Mechanical Testing	34
2.6.1	Hardness Testing	34
2.6.2	Tensile Testing	34
2.6.3	Low Cycle Fatigue Testing	34
2.6.4	High Cycle Fatigue and Corrosion Fatigue Testing	36
2.7	Corrosion Testing	38
2.8	Biocompatibility Testing	39
2.8.1	Cell Culture	39
2.8.2	Cell Proliferation	40
2.8.3	<i>In vivo</i> Animal Study of HNS	41
2.8.4	Cell Adhesion	43
2.8.5	<i>In vitro</i> Cytotoxicity	43
2.8.6	<i>In vitro</i> Hemocompatibility	44
2.8.7	Irritation and Skin Sensitization	44
2.8.8	Guinea Pig Maximization Test of Physiological Saline Extract of HNS-Mo	45
2.8.9	Acute Systematic Toxicity	46
2.8.10	Implantation of HNS-Mo	46
Chapter 3	MECHANICAL PROPERTIES, CORROSION BEHAVIOR AND BIOCOMPATIBILITY OF NICKEL- FREE AUSTENITIC STAINLESS STEEL (HNS)	47-66
3.1	Introduction	47
3.2	Microstructure Characterization of the HNS and 316L	47

3.3	Comparison of Corrosion Behavior of the HNS and 316L	49
3.4	Comparison of Mechanical Properties of the HNS and 316L	50
3.4.1	Tensile Properties and Hardness	50
3.4.2	Low Cycle Fatigue Behavior	51
3.4.3	High Cycle Fatigue Behavior in Air	54
3.5	Biocompatibility of HNS	55
3.5.1	<i>In vitro</i> Cell Culture and Proliferation	55
3.5.2	<i>In vivo</i> /Animal Study	57
3.5.2.1	Histopathology	60
3.6	Discussion	60
3.6.1	Microstructure and Corrosion Resistance	60
3.6.2	Mechanical Behavior	62
3.6.3	Biocompatibility	65
3.7	Conclusions	66
Chapter 4	MECHANICAL PROPERTIES, CORROSION BEHAVIOR AND BIOCOMPATIBILITY OF INDIGENOUSLY DEVELOPED NICKEL-FREE AUSTENITIC STAINLESS STEEL (HNS-Mo)	67-86
4.1	Introduction	67
4.2	Microstructure Characterization of HNS-Mo	68
4.3	Corrosion Behavior of HNS-Mo	69
4.4	Comparison of Mechanical Properties of the HNS-Mo, HNS and 316L	71
4.4.1	Tensile Properties and Hardness	71
4.4.2	High Cycle Fatigue Behavior of the HNS-Mo in Air	72
4.4.3	Corrosion Fatigue of HNS-Mo	73

4.5	Biocompatibility of HNS-Mo	74
4.5.1	<i>In vitro</i> Cell Adhesion and Proliferation	74
4.5.2	<i>In vitro</i> Cytotoxicity	76
4.5.3	Hematology	77
4.5.4	<i>In vivo</i> Studies	78
4.5.4.1	Irritation and Skin Sensitization	78
4.5.4.2	Acute Systematic Toxicity	78
4.5.4.3	Implantation of HNS-Mo	79
4.6	Discussion	79
4.6.1	Microstructure and Corrosion Resistance of HNS-Mo	80
4.6.2	Mechanical Behavior of HNS-Mo	83
4.6.3	Biocompatibility of HNS-Mo	84
4.7	Conclusions	85
Chapter 5	EFFECT OF ULTRASONIC SHOT PEENING ON MICROSTRUCTURE, CORROSION RESISTANCE, BIOCOMPATIBILITY AND LOW CYCLE FATIGUE BEHAVIOR OF NICKEL-FREE AUSTENITIC STAINLESS STEEL (HNS)	87-121
5.1	Introduction	87
5.2	Surface Morphology and Surface Roughness	88
5.3	Microstructure Characterization of the USPed Samples	91
5.4	Hardness and Residual Stress	96
5.5	Effect of Ultrasonic Shot Peening on Corrosion Resistance of the HNS	98
5.6	Effect of Ultrasonic Shot Peening on Cell Culture and Proliferation of the HNS	100

5.7	Effect of Ultrasonic Shot Peening on Low Cycle Fatigue Behavior of the HNS	104
5.7.1	Effect of Ultrasonic Shot Peening on Cyclic Stress Response	104
5.7.2	Effect of Ultrasonic Shot Peening on Low Cycle Fatigue Life	106
5.7.3	Variation in the Cycles for Crack Initiation and Propagation	108
5.7.4	Fracture Behavior	109
5.8	Discussion	112
5.8.1	Surface Nanostructuring by Ultrasonic Shot Peening	112
5.8.2	Effect of Ultrasonic Shot Peening on Corrosion Resistance	114
5.8.3	Effect of Ultrasonic Shot Peening on <i>in vitro</i> Cell Culture and Proliferation	116
5.8.4	Effect of Ultrasonic Shot Peening on Low Cycle Fatigue Behavior	117
5.9	Conclusions	120
Chapter 6	EFFECT OF ULTRASONIC SHOT PEENING ON CORROSION RESISTANCE, BIOCOMPATIBILITY, FATIGUE AND CORROSION FATIGUE BEHAVIOR OF THE INDIGENOUSLY DEVELOPED NICKEL-FREE AUSTENITIC STAINLESS STEEL (HNS-Mo)	123-136
6.1	Introduction	123
6.2	Effect of Ultrasonic Shot Peening on Corrosion Behavior of the HNS-Mo	124
6.3	Effect of Ultrasonic Shot Peening on Cell Culture and Proliferation of the HNS-Mo	125
6.4	Effect of Ultrasonic Shot Peening on High Cycle Fatigue and Corrosion Fatigue of the HNS-Mo	128

6.5	Discussion	130
6.5.1	Effect of Ultrasonic Shot Peening on Corrosion Behavior	130
6.5.2	Effect of Ultrasonic Shot Peening on Cell Culture and Proliferation	132
6.5.3	Effect of Ultrasonic Shot Peening on High Cycle Fatigue and Corrosion Fatigue Life	133
6.6	Conclusions	136
Chapter 7	SUMMARY AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE WORK	137- 140
7.1	Introduction	137
7.2	Summary	137
7.3	Suggestions for Future Work	140
Appendices		141-158
References		159-172
List of Publications/Patents		173

List of Figures

Figure No.	Description of Figures	Page No.
1.1	Modified Schaeffler diagram for predicting stable phase of stainless steel from Cr and Ni equivalent	18
1.2	Schematic representation of USP set-up	23
2.1	The peening head (left) and the central unit (right) of the ultrasonic shot peening device	30
2.2	MTS TM Landmark servo-hydraulic fatigue test system (Model 370.10)	35
2.3	Geometry of LCF fatigue test sample	35
2.4	Sample geometry for stress-controlled high cycle fatigue tests in (a) air and (b) simulated body fluid (corrosion fatigue)	37
2.5	Corrosion fatigue test set-up	37
2.6	Various surgical steps: (a) Step 1: Part preparation, (b) Step 2: Anterior midline incision over knee, patella retracted laterally and exposure of knee joint, (c) Step 3: Fracture created in distal femoral shaft, (d) Step 4: Fracture fixed retrogradely with HNS wire, and (e) Step 5: Wound closed in layers	42
3.1	Optical micrographs showing the microstructures of the (a) HNS and (b) 316L austenitic stainless steels	48
3.2	XRD patterns of the austenitic stainless steels: (a) HNS and (b) 316L	48
3.3	Potentiodynamic polarization curves of the HNS and 316L austenitic stainless steels	49

3.4	Comparison of engineering stress-strain curves of the HNS and 316L austenitic stainless steels	50
3.5	Cyclic stress response curves of the austenitic stainless steels: (a) HNS and (b) 316L	51
3.6	Variation of the number of reversals to failure ($2N_f$) with strain amplitude for austenitic stainless steels: (a) HNS and (b) 316L	53
3.7	Comparison of high cycle fatigue behavior of the HNS and 316L austenitic stainless steels in air, at stress ratio of 0.1	55
3.8	Panel representing the fluorescent cell culture images of the MG-63 human bone osteosarcoma cells on the various steel samples; after 1 day, 3 days and 5 days of incubation. Blue color: nuclei staining; red color: actin cytoskeleton filament staining	56
3.9	Histograms representing comparison of the MG-63 cell proliferation on the 316L and HNS austenitic stainless steels; after 1, 3 and 5 days of incubation by MTT assay. In this experiment, absorbance of control for the 5th day culture was taken as reference for all the samples. * $p \leq 0.05$ with respect to 1 day of corresponding group. # $p \leq 0.05$ with respect to 3 days of corresponding group. \$ $p \leq 0.05$ with respect to 3 days of 316L	57
3.10	(a, b) Post operation day 1 radiographs of group 1, and (c, d) 3 weeks follow up radiographs of the respective cases of group 1. Arrows indicate the fracture sites and the encircled regions show the union of fracture after 3 weeks	58
3.11	(a, b) Post operation day 1 radiographs of group 2, and (c, d) 6 weeks follow up radiographs of the respective cases of group 2. Arrows	59

	indicate the fracture sites and the encircled regions show the union of fracture after 6 weeks	
3.12	Post operation - after harvesting femur: (a, b) at 3 weeks (group 1); and (c, d) at 6 weeks (group 2). Arrows show the callus	59
4.1	(a) Optical micrograph, and (b) X-ray diffraction pattern of the HNS-Mo austenitic stainless steel	69
4.2	Microstructure of the HNS-Mo austenitic stainless steel, following 10% oxalic acid test according to ASTM A-262, practice A	69
4.3	Potentiodynamic polarization curves of the HNS-Mo, HNS and 316L austenitic stainless steels	70
4.4	Comparison of engineering stress-strain curves of the HNS-Mo, HNS and 316L austenitic stainless steels	71
4.5	(a) Comparison of high cycle fatigue behavior of the HNS-Mo, HNS and 316L austenitic stainless steels in the air, (b) Comparison of high cycle fatigue behavior of the HNS-Mo in air and SBF, at stress ratio of 0.1	72
4.6	L-929 cells adhesion on (a) HNS-Mo and (b) glass coverslip	74
4.7	Panel representing the fluorescent cell culture images of the MG-63 human bone osteosarcoma cells on the various steel samples; after 1 day, 3 days and 5 days of incubation. Blue color: nuclei staining; red color: actin cytoskeleton filament staining	75
4.8	Histograms representing comparison of the MG-63 cell proliferation on the 316L, HNS and HNS-Mo austenitic stainless steels after 1, 3 and 5 days of incubation by MTT assay. In this experiment, absorbance of control for the 5 th day culture was taken as a reference	76

for all the samples. * $p \leq 0.05$ with respect to 1 day of corresponding group. # $p \leq 0.05$ with respect to 3 days of corresponding group. \$ $p \leq 0.05$ with respect to 316L for the same day. & $p \leq 0.05$ with respect to HNS for the same day.

4.9	L-929 cells after 24 h contact with (a) HNS-Mo austenitic stainless steel, (b) negative control (UHMWPE) and (c) positive control (PVC).	77
5.1	Surface morphology of the HNS in various USPed conditions: (a) USP 2-0.5, (b) USP 2-2, (c) USP 3-0.5, and (d) USP 3-2	88
5.2	Surface morphology of the samples of HNS in different conditions of USP: (a) USP 2-0.5, (b) USP 2-1, (c) USP 2-2, (d) USP 3-0.5, (e) USP 3-1, and (d) USP 3-2	89
5.3	SEM micrographs of the longitudinal sections, normal to the USPed flat surface of the disc-shaped samples, in various USPed conditions: (a) USP 2-1, (b) USP 3-1, (c) USP 3-3, and (d) USP 3-6. The right side edge is the edge of the USPed surface	92
5.4	X-ray diffraction patterns of the HNS in the Un-USP and different USPed conditions: (a) X-ray diffractograms, and (b) magnified (111) peaks	93
5.5	Bright field TEM micrographs and their corresponding SAD patterns from the top surface regions of the HNS in different USPed conditions: (a, b) USP 2-2; (c, d) USP 3-0.5; (e, f) USP 3-3; and (g, h) USP 3-6	95

5.6	(a) Bright field TEM micrograph and (b) corresponding SAD patterns of the USP 3-6 sample at the depth of $\sim 20 \mu\text{m}$ from the USPed surface	96
5.7	Surface hardness of the HNS in different USPed conditions	96
5.8	Microhardness profiles of the HNS in different USPed conditions	97
5.9	Variation of residual stress induced in the HNS in different USPed conditions from the surface to $300 \mu\text{m}$ depth	98
5.10	Potentiodynamic polarization plots of the HNS in the Un-USP and different USPed conditions	99
5.11	Panel representing the fluorescent cell culture images of MG-63 human bone osteosarcoma cells on the various HNS samples; after 1 day, 3 days and 5 days of incubation. Blue color: nuclei staining; red color: actin cytoskeleton filament staining	101- 102
5.12	Histograms representing comparison of MG-63 cell proliferation after 1, 3 and 5 days of incubation by MTT assay for the HNS in various USPed conditions. In this experiment, absorbance of control for the 5 th day culture was taken as reference for all the samples. * $p \leq 0.05$ with respect to 1 day of corresponding group. # $p \leq 0.05$ with respect to 3 days of corresponding group. & $p \leq 0.05$ with respect to Un-USP for the same day	103
5.13	Cyclic stress response curves of the HNS in different USPed conditions at varying strain amplitudes; (a) Un-USP, (b) USP 3-3, (c) USP 3-6, (d) USP 3-10, and (e) USP 3-14	105
5.14	Variation of $ \sigma_t - \sigma_c $ with number of cycles at the different total strain amplitudes ($\Delta\epsilon_t/2$): (a) $\pm 0.40 \%$, and (b) $\pm 0.80 \%$	106

5.15	(a) Effect of USP duration on fatigue life of the USPed samples with respect to Un-USP sample at high ($\pm 0.80\%$) and low ($\pm 0.40\%$) strain amplitudes, and (b) Coffin-Manson plots showing the variation of the number of reversals to failure ($2N_f$) with plastic strain amplitude for the Un-USP and different USPed conditions	108
5.16	(a) Schematic presentation of quotient plots ($ \sigma_c/\sigma_t \times 100$), with number of cycles and determination of the number of cycles to crack initiation (N_i), (b) Variation of the number of cycles for crack initiation (N_i) and crack propagation (N_p), with % total strain amplitude ($\pm \Delta \epsilon_t/2$) for the Un-USP and different USPed conditions	109
5.17	Fracture behavior of the different samples at the total strain amplitude of $\pm 0.40\%$: (a, b) Un-USP; (c, d) USP 3-6; (e, f) USP 3-14. Boxes and circles show the crack initiation sites. Arrows indicate the direction of crack propagation	110
5.18	SEM micrographs showing surface morphology of the LCF samples on the periphery (close to fracture ends) of the different samples tested at: (A) $\Delta \epsilon_t/2 = \pm 0.40\%$: (a) Un-USP, (b) USP 3-3, and (c) USP 3-14; (B) $\Delta \epsilon_t/2 = \pm 0.80\%$: (d) Un-USP, (e) USP 3-3, and (f) USP 3-14. Arrows indicate the direction of loading	111
6.1	Potentiodynamic polarization plots of the HNS-Mo in various USPed conditions	124
6.2	Panel representing the fluorescent cell culture images of MG-63 human bone osteosarcoma cells on the HNS-Mo samples in various USPed conditions; after 1 day, 3 days and 5 days of incubation. Blue color: nuclei staining; red color: actin cytoskeleton filament staining	126- 127

- 6.3 Histograms representing comparison of MG-63 cell proliferation after 1, 3 and 5 days of incubation by MTT assay for the HNS-Mo in various USPed conditions. In this experiment, absorbance of control for the 5th day culture was taken as a reference for all the samples. * $p \leq 0.05$ with respect to 1 day of corresponding group. # $p \leq 0.05$ with respect to 3 days of corresponding group. \$ $p \leq 0.05$ with respect to Un-USP for the same day. & $p \leq 0.05$ with respect to USP 2-1 for the same day 128
- 6.4 Comparison of high cycle fatigue life of the HNS-Mo in the Un-USP and USP 3-3 conditions in (a) air, and (b) SBF 130

List of Tables

Table No.	Description of Tables	Page No.
1.1	Composition of selected components of human body fluids	3
1.2	Composition of simulated physiological fluids/solutions	4
1.3	Comparison of various mechanical properties and applications of metallic alloys	6
2.1	Chemical compositions of the three austenitic stainless steels (wt%)	30
2.2	Designations of the differently USPed samples of the nickel-free nitrogen stabilized austenitic stainless steels	31
2.3	Test matrix of low cycle fatigue tests	36
2.4	Grading criteria for reactivity of cells	44
3.1	Inclusion rating of the HNS austenitic stainless steel	48
3.2	Corrosion data of the HNS and 316L austenitic stainless steels	50
3.3	Tensile properties of the HNS and 316L austenitic stainless steels	51
3.4	LCF data of the HNS and 316L austenitic stainless steels	53
3.5	Fatigue parameters based on strain-life relationships	54
3.6	Comparison of high cycle fatigue life of the HNS and 316L austenitic stainless steels at various maximum stresses	54
3.7	Theoretical PREN and MARC values of the HNS and 316L austenitic stainless steels	61
4.1	Inclusion rating of the HNS-Mo austenitic stainless steel	69
4.2	Corrosion data of the HNS-Mo, HNS and 316L austenitic stainless steels	71

4.3	Tensile properties of the HNS-Mo, HNS and 316L austenitic stainless steels	72
4.4	Comparison of high cycle fatigue life of the HNS-Mo, HNS and 316L austenitic stainless steels at various maximum stresses	73
4.5	Grading of reactivity of cells	77
4.6	Theoretical nickel equivalent, chromium equivalent, PREN and MARC values of the HNS-Mo, HNS and 316L austenitic stainless steels	81
5.1	Surface roughness parameters of flat disc-shaped samples of the HNS in different conditions of USP	90
5.2	Surface roughness parameters over gauge section of the LCF samples in different conditions of USP	91
5.3	Crystallite size and microstrain of the USPed HNS samples, estimated by XRD analysis	94
5.4	Corrosion parameters of the HNS in different conditions	100
5.5	LCF data of the Un-USP and USPed samples of HNS	107
5.6	LCF parameters based on the strain-life relationship	108
6.1	Corrosion data of HNS-Mo in various conditions	125
6.2	Comparison of high cycle fatigue life of the HNS-Mo austenitic stainless steel for the USP 3-3 and Un-USP conditions, at various maximum stresses in air and SBF environment	129

Abbreviations

AISI	American Iron and Steel Institute
ALP	Alkaline Phosphatase
ASTM	American Society for Testing and Materials
BDT	Brittle to Ductile Transition
Co-Cr	Cobalt-Chromium
CSO	Cotton Seed Oil
DBTT	Ductile to Brittle Transition Temperature
DMG	Dimethyl-glyoxime
DMEM	Dulbecco's Modified Eagle's Medium
FBS	Fetal Bovine Serum
FCC	Face Centered Cubic
GPa	Giga Pascal
GPMT	Guinea Pig Maximization Test
HCF	High Cycle Fatigue
IARC	International Agency for Research on Cancer
IGC	Intergranular Corrosion
ISO	International Organization for Standardization
IREL	Increment Rate of Endurance Limit
LCF	Low Cycle Fatigue
MARC	Measure of Alloying for Resistance Against Corrosion
MEM	Minimum Essential Medium
MPa	Mega Pascal
MRI	Magnetic Resonance Imaging
MTT	3-[4,5-Dimethyl-thiazol-2-yl]-2,5-diphenyl tetrazolium bromide
OCP	Open Circuit Potential
PBS	Phosphate Buffer Saline
PREN	Pitting Resistance Equivalent Number
PS	Physiological Saline

RT	Room Temperature
SBF	Simulated Body Fluid
SCE	Saturated Calomel Electrode
SEM	Scanning Electron Microscope
SFE	Stacking Fault Energy
SMAT	Surface Mechanical Attrition Treatment
SMRT	Surface Mechanical Rolling Treatment
TEM	Transmission Electron Microscope
Ti	Titanium
USPed	Ultrasonic Shot Peened
USP	Ultrasonic Shot Peening
UHMWPE	Ultra-High Molecular Weight Polyethylene
UTS	Ultimate Tensile Strength
WHO	World Health Organization
XPS	X-ray Photoelectron Spectroscopy
XRD	X-ray Diffraction
YS	Yield Strength

Symbols

Hz	Hertz
°C	Degree Centigrade
mgL ⁻¹	Milligram Per Liter
gL ⁻¹	Gram Per Liter
molL ⁻¹	Moles Per Liter
μg/cm ² /week	Microgram Per Square Centimeter Per Week
mm	Millimeter
H _v	Vickers Hardness
wt%	Weight Percent
k	Kilo
μm	Micrometer
V	Volt
θ	Theta
kN	Kilo Newton
h	Hour
Sec	Second
Min	Minute
E _{corr}	Corrosion Potential
E _{bd}	Breakdown Potential
i _{cr}	Critical Current Density
i _{corr}	Corrosion Current Density
Δε _t /2	Total Strain Amplitude
Δε _e /2	Elastic Strain Amplitude
Δε _p /2	Plastic Strain Amplitude
Δσ/2	Stress Amplitude
N _f	Fatigue Life
2N _f	Number of Reversals to Failure
σ _t	Cyclic Tensile Stress

σ_c	Cyclic Compressive Stress
\leq	Less Than or Equals to
\geq	Greater Than or Equals to
$=$	Equals to
\sim	Approximately
R	Stress Ratio
N_i	Number of Cycles for Crack Initiation
N_p	Number of Cycles for Crack Propagation
mJ/m^2	Milli Joule per square meter

Preface

Metallic materials are backbone of orthopedic surgical procedures. Titanium, cobalt-chromium based alloys, stainless steel, tantalum, gold and niobium are widely used metallic biomaterials nowadays in medical applications. Implants are found to fail mainly due to fatigue, wear, corrosion, corrosion fatigue and their synergistic effect. Material debris resulting from corrosion and wear gets accumulated in the human body. The 316L austenitic stainless steel is a widely used steel for making medical devices, with many advantages such as easy processing, cost-effectiveness and favorable mechanical properties. However, appreciable amount of nickel (≥ 10 wt%) in the 316L causes allergic reactions resulting in eczema, swelling, itching, reddening, carcinogenic and teratogenic effects in human body. These harmful effects of nickel triggered a need for austenitic stainless steel without nickel. Nitrogen and manganese are austenite stabilizers. Austenitic grades of stainless steel are non-magnetic, which is one of the most crucial requirements of implant materials. Replacement of nickel by nitrogen and manganese provides a stable microstructure and facilitates better biocompatibility in respect of the conventional 316L. Nitrogen in stainless steel significantly enhances corrosion resistance, strength and work-hardening rate. Numerous studies have been carried out on development of nickel free grade of austenitic stainless steel, however, very few of them have been developed and studied in detail from the point of view of biomedical application. It was found that very high amount of nitrogen increases brittleness of the material and restricts the use of stainless steel for a wide temperature range. A very high amount of chromium in stainless steel stabilizes the ferrite phase. Mo is added in stainless steels to improve the pitting resistance, however, very high amount of Mo promotes formation of ferrite and σ -phase. Therefore, there is a need for design of a stainless steel

which is either free from nickel or has negligible amount of nickel with optimum amount of Cr, Mn, N and Mo.

The present investigation deals with systematic study of two grades of nickel free austenitic stainless steels. One is based on the Fe-Cr-Mn-N system (HNS) and the other is based on Fe-Cr-Mn-Mo-N system (HNS-Mo). Initially, HNS was studied for mechanical properties (tensile, hardness, low cycle fatigue and high cycle fatigue), corrosion behavior in simulated body fluid (SBF) environment and biocompatibility, and its behavior was compared with that of the conventionally used 316L austenitic stainless steel, containing nickel. Ultrasonic Shot Peening (USP) is a novel technique of surface modification in which grain size in the surface region of materials gets refined to nano scale and compressive residual stresses are induced in the surface region, and surface related properties of metallic materials are significantly enhanced. The objective of the present study was development of a nickel free grade of austenitic stainless steel for the replacement of 316L. The effect of USP on microstructure, corrosion, fatigue and biocompatibility behavior of 316L stainless steel was well documented. However, for the nickel free stainless steel, no study had been performed. Therefore, in the present investigation, study on the USP effect was not conducted for the 316L. Study on this aspect, was carried out only for the nickel free austenitic stainless steels HNS and HNS-Mo. In the present investigation, two different shot sizes of 2 mm and 3 mm were used for different durations of USP. HNS was characterized for the changes in microstructure, following USP, using the techniques like scanning electron microscopy, X-ray diffraction and transmission electron microscopy. It was also characterized for hardness, surface roughness and compressive residual stress.

Chapter-1 presents the brief introduction along with the literature review on requirement and development of nickel-free austenitic stainless steels. It also includes the effect of

nitrogen on various properties. This chapter presents the description of USP and its effect on various properties of metallic materials. At the end of this chapter, the objectives of the present investigation are listed.

Chapter-2 presents the chemical compositions of three types of stainless steels used for the study and the details of sample preparation for various testing. It includes the experimental procedure for various mechanical, corrosion and biocompatibility testing along with the details of USP. This chapter also presents the process of sample preparation and operational details of X-Ray Diffraction, Scanning Electron Microscopy and Transmission Electron Microscopy, used for phase analysis and microstructural characterization.

Chapter-3 presents the comparison of various properties of HNS and 316L. HNS and 316L were tested for mechanical properties, corrosion resistance and biocompatibility. The HNS and 316L stainless steels are austenitic, free from carbide precipitates at grain boundaries and have negligible ferrite content. The inclusion rating, an important requirement of the implant material, was found within the limit of ISO 5832-1. The microstructure was found free from intergranular corrosion and grain dropping according to standard ASTM A 262 practice A and E. The breakdown potentials of 316 mV_{SCE} and 196 mV_{SCE} are found for the 316L and HNS steels, respectively, from potentiodynamic polarization tests in Ringer's solution. The yield strength of the 316L and HNS was found 279 MPa and 525 MPa, respectively in air. It should be noted that yield strength of the HNS is ~ 2 times that of the 316L. Also, the low cycle fatigue life of the HNS in air was nearly 2 times that of the 316L, irrespective of the strain amplitudes. However, the breakdown potential and endurance limit of the HNS were inferior to that of the 316L. The biocompatibility of HNS was studied in vitro and in vivo. The cell culture and proliferation study exhibited similar cell response for both HNS and 316L stainless steels.

Additionally, *in vivo* animal study of HNS did not show any adverse effect and was found biocompatible.

Chapter-4 presents the characterization of a new grade of austenitic stainless steel, free from nickel, and stabilized by nitrogen and manganese, which was designed with small addition of Mo and developed with the help of M/s Mishra Dhatu Nigam Limited. This steel was characterized for microstructure, corrosion behavior, mechanical properties and biocompatibility. Its characterization showed austenite microstructure with some annealing twins, absence of grain boundary precipitates and negligible delta ferrite. The breakdown potential of the HNS-Mo was found 310 mV_{SCE}, comparable to that of the 316L (316 mV_{SCE}). Its yield strength was found 540 MPa which is higher than that of HNS and ~ 2 times that of 316L. The endurance limit (maximum stress) corresponding to 10⁷ cycles of the HNS-Mo decreased from 513 MPa in air to 475 MPa in simulated body fluid environment. HNS-Mo showed stress amplitude of ~ 213 MPa in SBF environment for 10⁷ cycles at stress ratio of 0.1, higher than that of the reported value of 200 MPa of 316L. The HNS-Mo showed better mechanical properties and exhibited cell adhesion and proliferation, similar to those of the 316L and HNS. It was further studied extensively for biocompatibility, both *in vitro* and *in vivo*, and showed acceptable *in vitro* cytotoxicity according to ISO 10993-5. The irritation and skin sensitization, acute systematic toxicity and implantation study showed acceptable biocompatibility. Overall, the performance of HNS-Mo was found better in comparison with those of HNS and 316L, and was found comparatively more suitable for biomedical applications.

Chapter-5 presents the effect of USP on microstructure, corrosion resistance, biocompatibility and low cycle fatigue of HNS. There was no deformation induced martensitic transformation of the HNS after USP. The surface grains of the HNS were refined to 15 nm, following USP for 2 minutes with 3 mm shots. Surface hardness was

increased by 42%, following USP for 2 minutes with 3 mm shots and there was a gradual decrease in hardness from surface to interior. Also, compressive residual stress was induced after USP and it increased with increase in the duration of USP. Corrosion resistance of HNS was increased, following USP for shorter duration. However, it decreased for 2 minutes of USP due to excessive surface damage. A peculiar effect of USP on LCF life of the HNS was observed. LCF life increased at lower strain amplitude but decreased at higher strain amplitude, following USP. LCF life of the HNS was increased to ~ 18 times by the USP with 3 mm shots for 18 minutes, it was mainly due to delay in crack initiation caused by nanostructured surface and associated compressive residual stress.

Chapter-6 presents the effect of USP on electrochemical corrosion in SBF, biocompatibility (cell culture and proliferation), high cycle fatigue and corrosion fatigue of HNS-Mo. A significant improvement in corrosion resistance, biocompatibility, fatigue and corrosion fatigue was observed, following USP. The breakdown potential of the HNS-Mo was increased from 310 mV_{SCE} to 370 mV_{SCE} and 395 mV_{SCE}, following USP for 30 seconds with 3 mm and 2 mm shots, respectively. Since, there was continuous increase in LCF life of the HNS at lower strain amplitude, with increase in the duration of USP, it shows higher positive effect of USP in the regime of high cycle fatigue. As, high cycle stress controlled fatigue life is more important for implant material, the effect of USP on high cycle fatigue life of the HNS-Mo was studied both in air and in SBF. High cycle fatigue life of the HNS-Mo improved significantly, following USP with 3 mm shots for 3 minutes; the endurance limit (maximum stress) increased from 513 MPa to 572 MPa in air and from 475 MPa to 572 MPa in simulated body fluid environment.

Chapter-7 presents the major conclusions drawn from the present investigation along with suggestions for future work.

