Single-step calibration method for nano indentation testing machines
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ABSTRACT
Nano indentation is an effective method for materials mechanical characterisation at grain scale. Literature underlined relevance of testing machine calibration to measurement uncertainty of the mechanical characterisation. ISO 14577-2 defines multi-step iterative methods for calibrating frame compliance and indenter area function that do not require high-resolution microscopes. Previous research demonstrated that standard’s recommendations are unsatisfactory and result in high calibration uncertainty. This work defines an improved calibration method based on a single-step procedure that achieves, as proved by experimental tests, definite advantages in terms of implementation and measurement uncertainty of both calibration and mechanical characterisation with respect to current procedures.

© 2020 CIRP. Published by Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction
Currently, to cope with the more stringent demands of customers for enhanced performances and customisation, manufacturing is facing the development of novel processes, e.g. Additive Manufacturing [1], and advanced materials, e.g. innovative composites [2] and coatings [3]. This, within the framework of Industry 4.0 and the need to cope with big data, requires flexible and fast quality inspections that relies on thorough, accurate and precise characterisation methods [4].

Amongst several product properties, the characterisation of technological surfaces is core both to control the manufacturing process, as surfaces may feature distinctive manufacturing signatures, and to engineer the product [5]. In particular, the mechanical properties of technological surfaces are interesting as they ultimately affect tribological, wear and fatigue behaviour.

Instrumented Indentation Test (IIT) is one of the most appealing mechanical characterisation techniques. It consists of a semi-destructive test, which requires limited sample preparation and can be performed on the final product. It allows to achieve a thorough multiscale mechanical characterisation, i.e. ranging from grain to bulk properties, in terms of Young’s modulus, hardness, creep and relaxation and stress-strain behaviour [6]. Nowadays, nano-indentation is exploited to optimise manufacturing processes by characterising related products. It finds application in characterising microstructures by quantitatively distinguishing different phases [7] and estimating the characteristic dimension of the microstructure [8], multi-layer materials by assessing mechanical properties decoupling the contribution of the coating and the substrates [9], estimating residual stresses [10] and characterising micro- and nano-structures, e.g. MEMS [11].

Considering the wide characterisation capabilities and its limited destructiveness, IIT seems suitable for online quality controls and rapid set-up of manufacturing process and was standardised by the ISO 14577, latest updated in 2015.

IIT consists in performing an indentation on a sample by applying a loading-holding-unloading cycle during which the applied force, \( F \), and the related displacement of the indenter in the material, \( h \), are measured. The characterisation of the material is then achieved by analysing the indentation curve (IC), i.e. the \( F(h) \) curve, see Fig. 1.

The measurement of \( h \) during the whole test allows to resolve hardness, for which IIT was originally conceived, and other mechanical properties at nano-scales, where optical resolution hampers the application of traditional methods [6,12]. The synchronous measurement of \( F \) and resulting \( h \) is usually obtained by a high-accuracy three-plate capacitive transducer [12].

Amongst the several possible characterisation output, the indentation hardness, \( H_I \), and the indentation modulus, \( E_{IT} \), i.e. an estimate of the Young modulus \( E \) of the material, are the most commonly reported and they are defined in Eq. 1 [13], where, \( v_s \) and \( v_i \) respectively are the Poisson’s modulus of the indenter and tested material, \( E_s \) is the indenter Young’s modulus, \( S \) is the contact stiffness, i.e. the sample stiffness, and \( A_p \) is the projection, on the sample surface, of contact area between the indenter and the specimen.

\[
H_I = \frac{F_{\text{max}}}{A_p (1 - v_s^2)} \quad (1.1) \\
E_{IT} = \frac{1 - v_s^2}{2 \sqrt{E_s (1 - v_s^2) / 1 - v_i^2}} \quad (1.2)
\]

\( S \) can be computed by modelling the indenter-sample system as a couple of ideal springs representing for the testing machine and the sample, respectively with a compliance \( C_I \) and 1/S [6,14]. The system total compliance, \( C_{\text{tot}} = C_I + 1/S \), is obtained as the reciprocal of the measured total stiffness, \( S_{\text{tot}} \), which is the slope of the tangent to the...
uncertainty contributions to measurement uncertainty of indentation depth \( h_0 \).

The functional form of \( A_p \) depends on the indenter geometry. In the most typical case of a modified Berkovich indenter, i.e. a tetrahedron with dihedral angle of 130.56°, it is \( A_p(h_c) = 24.5 \cdot h_c^2 \) [13]. However, due to wear and deviation from ideal geometry, e.g. tip blunting and offset, a more general form can be written as in Eq. (3) [16,17]:

\[
A_p(h_c) = \alpha_a h_c^2 + \alpha_b h_c + \alpha_0
\]  

Furthermore, \( A_p \) is related to the reduced Young’s modulus, \( E_r \), according to the following equation [13]:

\[
A_p(h_{c,max}) = \frac{\pi \alpha^2}{4E_r} = \frac{\pi}{4E_r(C_{tot} - C_f)^2}
\]

provided the industrial relevance of this characterisation technique, traceability, accuracy and precision are core to be achieved and ISO 14577-2:2015 establishes the calibration procedure for the testing machine to guarantee them and ISO 14577-1:2015 lists uncertainty contributions to final characterisation results. Barbato et al. [18] proved that \( C_f \) and the parameters of \( A_p \) are the major contributors to measurement uncertainty of \( E_r \). These are calibrated through a procedure described in the Annex D of ISO 14577-2:2015.

Five alternative methods are present. Methods no. 1, 3 and 5 calculate \( C_f \) by preliminary calibrating the parameters of \( A_p \) through the measurement of the indenter tip by a metrological AFM. Despite the smaller calibration uncertainty, they are more expensive; thus, in academic and industry practice, method no. 2 and 4 are preferred. They both consist of an iterative procedure which achieves the calibration of \( C_f \) and \( A_p \) parameters by relying only on the results of a set of indentations. Although the widespread adoption of the method no. 2 and 4, the ISO 14577-2:2015, reference literature [16,19] and good practices of testing machine manufacturers provide a wide range of calibration recipes, which, however, demonstrate the method’s unclear definition and comparison have shown to be unsatisfactory for accuracy, precision and consistency among each other [20].

To overcome the criticalities of the cheaper calibration approaches, the present paper proposes an improved calibration method based on a single-step procedure rather than on an iterative method to improve both implementation of the calibration and mechanical characterisation results. Section 2 discusses current calibration methods and proposes the novel approach. Section 3 analyses results based on experimental tests and Section 4 draws conclusions.
These non-trivial hypotheses have not been properly investigated in previous approaches [16,17,19], for this reason the standard assumes an Ordinary Least Square (OLS) to suffice for the regressions, thus neglecting predictors variability and affecting the estimate of parameters. In order to implement the ODR approach, Eqs. from 1 to 4 must be combined in the system reported in Eq. (3), which, due to the current use of OLS has never been proposed and investigated before in the scientific literature. This, with respect to the standard method, has twofold advantages. First, mathematical and statistical formality to the calibration problem is provided which avoids possible misinterpretation of the unclearly defined multi-step iterative algorithm and allows the adoption of a more appropriate statistical tool. Second, HIT is introduced in the calibration pipeline: because calibrated parameters are exploited to characterise also hardness, conceptually it is core to include it in the calibration procedure. The only trivial requirement for this approach is that calibration laboratories upstream in the traceability chain should calibrate reference materials also in terms of HIT via an independent technique, e.g. by calibrating \( H_B \) by a metrological AFM.

2.3. Uncertainty evaluation

Influencing factors for the calibration measurement uncertainty are sourced by measurements, i.e. \( f_{\text{max}}, h_{\text{max}}, S_m \) which also contain measurement noise, by calibration certificates of reference materials, i.e. \( v_i, E_i, H_i \), and by tabular values, i.e. \( \gamma_i \) and \( E_i \). The standard approach, because of OLS iterative workflow, introduces as influencing factors \( C_f \) and \( A_p \), parameters, i.e. the calibration results themselves. Thus, closed formulae for the uncertainty propagation according to GUM [22] cannot be written. As regards the single step method, influencing factors are only the measured, calibrated and tabular ones. However, nonlinear regression does not guarantee that the outputs distribute according to a normal distribution. Therefore, the simple standard deviation of regression output cannot be assumed as the standard uncertainty of the calibrated parameters. To evaluate the expanded uncertainty at a 95% confidence level, a Monte Carlo Method (MCM) with at least \( 10^5 \) iterations shall be exploited to estimate distribution of \( C_f \) and \( A_p \) parameters. Inputs are the influencing factors, with measurement and calibrated sources assumed to distribute normally and tabular sources uniformly [23].

3. Analysis of calibration methods

3.1. Experimental data

Data were collected during last CIRP international comparison on nanoindentation [24] according to literature [16,17]: fifty \((J = 5\) and \( I = 10\)) indentations on W and SiO\(_2\) calibrated reference materials at \((0.1, 0.5, 1.0, 5.0, 10.0)\) mN; the setup is chosen to optimise standard method accuracy and precision. Indentations were performed by a Hysitron TriboScope, hosted in the facilities of the Oklahoma State University and equipped with a modified Berkovich indenter \((E_i = 1140\) GPa, \(v_i = 0.07\) and \(\varepsilon = 0.75\)), see Fig. 3, was calibrated on calibrated samples, whose characteristics are summarised in Table 1. The testing equipment features a force-displacement transducer with resolution and noise floor, respectively, of \(1\) nN and \(75\) nN, on force, and

![Fig. 3. Detail and scheme of the Hysitron TriboScope indentation head.](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Calibration body</th>
<th>( E ) / GPa</th>
<th>( \nu )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SiO(_2)</td>
<td>NPL</td>
<td>73.3 ± 0.6</td>
<td>0.161 ± 0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>NPL</td>
<td>413.0 ± 2.8</td>
<td>0.281 ± 0.003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Fig. 4. ISO and single step method calibrated parameters comparison.](image)

Fig. 4. ISO and single step method calibrated parameters comparison.

Results, as mean and expanded uncertainty, see Section 2.3, in terms of \( C_f \) and \( A_p \) parameters are shown in Fig. 4. Good practices prescribe to validate the calibrated parameter by characterising calibrated reference materials, \( E_{\text{IT}}, H_{\text{IT}} \) and \( F/S^2 \) (since it is independent from \( A_p \) [25]) of W and SiO\(_2\) as these materials represent wide range of mechanical properties, are shown in Figures from 5 to 7. The single step method provides more accurate and precise results in most of the cases. With respect to the ISO method, the single step method shows higher robustness to possible outliers, which yield the high uncertainty in Fig. 5(a). In Fig. 5(a), the asymmetry of \( E_{\text{IT}} \) confidence interval when the system is calibrated according to the standard can also be seen. Improved accuracy with respect to the standard method is shown for \( H_{\text{IT}} \), which is expected because of the method definition see Figs. 5(b) and 5(b). \( F/S^2 \) results in Fig. 7 show that most accurate and precise calibration of \( C_f \) is obtained by the single step method. Similar results were preliminary obtained performing same

![Fig. 5. ISO and single step method validation on SiO\(_2\). (a) \( E_{\text{IT}} \) (b) \( H_{\text{IT}} \). Black dashed lines are calibrated references mean and uncertainty interval.](image)

![Fig. 6. ISO and single step method validation on W. (a) \( E_{\text{IT}} \) (b) \( H_{\text{IT}} \). Black dashed lines are calibrated references mean and uncertainty interval.](image)
experiments on different indentation platforms, i.e. Hysitron TI 950 (owned by Istituto Italiano di Tecnologia in Turin – Italy) and Anton Paar NHT\(^2\) (owned by Politecnico di Torino – Italy).

4. Conclusions

This work proposed a single step procedure to overcome the several shortcomings of ISO 14577-2:2015 iterative calibration method for nanoindentation testing equipment. The single step method has both conceptual and practical advantages. The former consist in providing rigorous mathematical formulation to the problem; in catering for variability of inputs by relying on an Orthogonal Distance Regression (ODR), and introducing the hardness as calibration reference. The latter have been proved, through experimental comparison, to be a greater accuracy and precision with respect to the standard approach, not only for the calibrated values but also for the validation on reference materials. Even if this approach requires calibration laboratories upstream in the traceability chain to calibrate indentation hardness by an independent technique, the related costs are negligible in comparison to the great procedural and metrological advantages. Future works will exploit the proposed single-step method to improve and simplify the calibration procedure by investigating the effect of reference materials when they are not calibrated in terms of \(H_N\). Future research will also address comparison of performances between this method and the more expensive alternatives based on AFM, and amongst different instrumented indentation machines.
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