

# Design and Validation of Conformal Anodes for a Thermal Barrier Coating on a Triple Vane

G. Nelissen,<sup>1\*</sup> B. Van den Bossche,<sup>1</sup> A. Rose<sup>1</sup> and J. Foster<sup>2</sup>  
<sup>1</sup>Elsyca N. V., Z. 1. Researchpark 310, 1731 Zellik, Belgium  
<sup>2</sup>Praxair Ltd, Weston-super-Mare, UK

Thermal barrier coatings (TBCs) are layered systems deposited on thermally highly loaded metallic components such as high pressure turbine blades or nozzle guide vanes in gas turbines. TKIBOMET® MCrAlY coatings are Praxair Surface Technologies' unique electrodeposited version of the high temperature oxidation and corrosion resistant MCrAlY coating and typically contain "metal" (nickel/cobalt) chromium-aluminum-yttrium and other active elements. Praxair's MCrAlY coatings are produced by the carefully controlled co-deposition of CrAlY powder with nickel and/or cobalt from conventional electroplating baths. This is later followed by vacuum heat treatment to produce the MCrAlY alloy coating. To date, design of the electroplating configuration is largely a combination of experiential and empirical approaches often consuming substantial labor and lead time. This paper describes how Elsyca's newly developed CAM tools were used to assess and guide the design of a conformal anode system with the objective of achieving a very uniform deposit on a triple vane configuration. The simulations are validated with experimental deposit thickness measurements on the actual parts and a very good agreement is observed for all test points on the triple vanes. From this it can be concluded that simulations are a relevant and very powerful tool to design complex plating configurations. Implementing such a digital manufacturing approach can significantly reduce labor costs in reaching an optimum tooling design, resulting in a reduction in time to market and time to revenue.

## Introduction

In industrial plating cells, the current density and layer thickness distribution over a substrate or workpiece are governed by the electrolyte characteristics, the reactor configuration and the electrical driving force. The key electrolyte characteristics (to be determined at operating temperature) are:

- Ohmic drop in the electrolyte solution (electrolyte conductivity);
- Cathodic polarization and plating efficiency;
- Anodic polarization.

The reactor configuration is defined as the assembly of:

- Position and shape of anodes, screens and current thieves;
- Workpiece shape and dimensions;
- Selective insulation of workpiece surfaces.

Most plating processes are current driven, and the electrical parameters are:

- Total injected current or current per source (if multiple sources are present);
- Distribution of the current (single source) over multiple anodes.

The modeling approach that takes into account these phenomena is commonly denoted as the "potential model." In order to produce reliable simulation results, the physico-chemical input parameters (polarization behavior, plating efficiency and electrolyte conductivity) need to be determined carefully for the electrolyte bath being used, at the proper operating temperature.

Plating cell design for optimizing the plated layer thickness distribution by trial and error will often attract huge labor costs, while the ultimate result on the layer thickness distribution might remain poor, or just within specifications, mainly due to the large quantity of adjustable process parameters (see above).

In this paper, DC current simulations are performed for a triple vane cathode with conformal anodes. A Ni-Co bath is considered, as developed by Praxair in-house. This electrolyte is part of the Tribomet® MCrAlY coating series. The final layer thickness on each spot on the blades is governed by:

---

\* Corresponding author:  
Dr. Gert Nelissen  
ELSYCA  
Z1 Researchpark 310  
B-1731 Zellik  
Belgium  
E-mail: gert.nelissen@elsyca.com

- Current density distribution and Faraday's law;
- Incorporation of CrAlY powder particles (estimated to be about 45 vol%).

In practice, the triple vane configurations are rotated in the plating tank, in order to expose each surface in the upward horizontal position to the CrAlY powder for at least a fraction of the process time (enabling the particles to settle and be incorporated into the deposit).

In order not to complicate this study, the laboratory characterization of the plating bath is performed without CrAlY particle load; hence the simulated Ni-Co layer thickness distributions do not include this particle load either. In a later stage, it will be investigated whether there is a simple correlation between local Ni-Co layer thickness values, and the experimentally observed layer thickness values with particle incorporation.

### Plating bath characteristics

Polarization measurements have been performed for the (powder free) bath sample, for an operating temperature of 44°C (111°F). The conductivity of the electrolyte is measured to be 7.25 S/m.

For the current density range of interest (approximately 0.0 to 200 A/m<sup>2</sup>), the cathodic polarization curve shows a Butler-Volmer type (exponential) behavior (Fig. 1).

The local deposit thickness can be computed based from Faraday's law:

$$d = \frac{M \Delta t \theta j}{\rho z F} \quad (1)$$

- where  $d$  = local deposit thickness (m);  
 $\theta$  = efficiency of the plating process (depending on  $j$ );  
 $z$  = Ni and Co ion charge (= 2);  
 $M$  = average atomic weight of Ni and Co (= 58.9 g/mol);  
 $\rho$  = average Ni and Co material density (= 8.9 kg/dm<sup>3</sup>);  
 $j$  = local cathodic current density (A/m<sup>2</sup>).




Figure 1—Cathodic electrode polarization curve obtained at a rotating disc electrode at 2000 rpm, after an electrolyte ohmic drop correction.

Since the physical data for Ni and Co are very similar, an average value for  $M$  and  $\rho$  will do. The plating efficiency,  $\theta$  is assumed to be very close to 100%. The total plating time  $\Delta t$  is 72,000 sec (20 hr).

The polarization behavior of the platinized titanium anodes is approximated by a linear curve (taken from Elsyca's in-house database):

$$j = 1.0E+3(V-U) - 1.5E+3, \quad (2)$$

where  $V$  is the electrode potential,  $U$  is the electrolyte potential adjacent to the electrode and  $j$  is the current density in A/m<sup>2</sup>,

### Plating configuration

The CAD model is a SolidWorks® assembly with several components as shown in Fig. 3:

- Triple vane part;
- Four Ti mesh anodes (Fig. 2);
- Anode rods and holders;
- Fixtures for the triple van part at top and bottom.

### Simulation results

The simulated current density distribution over the blades is plotted in Fig. 4, for a total impressed current of 5.65 A, and a plating time of 20 hr. It is observed that the current density over the triple vane head ranges from 5 - 12 A/m<sup>2</sup> (compared to an average value over the blades of about 40 A/m<sup>2</sup>; hence the head is indeed acting as a non-negligible current robber.

The current density distribution over the anodes is plotted in Fig. 5. The surfaces of the outer anodes that are directed in opposite sense from the blades still deliver some current. The total current that is delivered by each anode (from left to right in Fig. 5) is computed as: 1.25 A / 1.69 A / 1.69 A / 1.02 A. This implies that the outer anodes deliver significantly more current than would be expected from an ideal situation (*i.e.*, half the value of the inner ones).




Figure 2—Photograph of Ti mesh anode with holders and rod.




Figure 3—Triple vane plating configuration for simulation purposes.

The simulated layer thickness distribution is given in Figs. 6a and b. Values on the blades range from about 50 to 150  $\mu\text{m}$ , with the lowest values observed at the inner platform fillets, and the highest at the trailing edges of the blades.

## Comparison to experimental results

A comparison of simulated layer thickness values with experimental values is given in Table 1. However, the experimental values were obtained with a powder loaded bath, whereas the simulated values hold for a powder free bath. It is interesting to note that the ratio or factor between the simulated and experimental results is fairly consistent, at 2.6 on the blade surfaces and 2.35 on the fillets and neighboring spots. As already mentioned, the inclusion of the MCrAlY powder in the electrolyte will affect the resulting plating thickness for a number of reasons:

- The actual “volume” of the powder particles will physically increase the thickness of the deposited layer simply due to their inclusion;
- The movement of the workpiece in the bath will affect the rate at which the particles settle onto the surfaces and their inclusion into the deposit - a sediment of variable thickness is formed which will increase (thickness dependent) the resistance to current flow;
- The plating efficiency for the Ni-Watts type bath was assumed to be close to 100%, whereas, in reality there will be a decrease in efficiency in areas of low current density, such as in the fillets. The results indicate that an adjustment is required to the anode design to improve fillet thicknesses.




Figure 4—Simulated current density distribution over the blades (in  $\text{A}/\text{m}^2$ ).




Figure 5—Simulated current density distribution over the titanium mesh anode ( $\text{A}/\text{m}^2$ ).

**Table 1**  
**Experimental and simulated layer thickness values for different spots on the blades**

	Position A			Position E			Position K			Position O		
	Exp	Sim	Ratio									
Vane A 25%	290	118	2.46	280	113	2.48	400	138	2.90	275	85	3.24
Vane A 50%	278	114	2.44	297	111	2.68	382	135	2.83	235	82	2.87
Vane A 75%	250	106	2.36	262	107	2.45	365	126	2.90	220	79	2.78
Vane B 25%	280	116	2.41	295	104	2.84	367	139	2.64	220	86	2.56
Vane B 50%	290	115	2.52	290	103	2.82	380	134	2.84	220	81	2.72
Vane B 75%	275	108	2.55	275	100	2.75	405	128	3.16	215	79	2.72
Vane C 25%	277	117	2.36	235	103	2.28	400	150	2.67	175	93	1.88
Vane C 50%	275	118	2.33	280	105	2.67	395	146	2.70	185	89	2.08
Vane C 75%	260	110	2.36	277	101	2.74	345	136	2.54	172	86	2.00

	Aero			Fillet			Platform		
	Exp	Sim	Ratio	Exp	Sim	Ratio	Exp	Sim	Ratio
Vane A Outer Convex	165	81	2.04	125	70	1.79	167	92	1.82
Vane A Outer Concave	172	74	2.32	165	54	3.06	207	80	2.59
Vane A Inner Convex	160	77	2.08	142	69	2.06	158	86	1.84
Vane A Inner Concave	185	57	3.25	155	47	3.30	207	67	3.09
Vane B Outer Convex	250	84	2.98	225	73	3.08	295	88	3.35
Vane B Outer Concave	125	59	2.12	150	52	2.88	152	73	2.08
Vane B Inner Convex	152	67	2.27	140	54	2.59	180	63	2.86
Vane B Inner Concave	135	55	2.45	130	45	2.89	175	55	3.18
Vane C Outer Convex	205	89	2.30	160	79	2.02	190	95	2.00
Vane C Outer Concave	75	60	1.25	62	51	1.22	75	65	1.15
Vane C Inner Convex	240	90	2.67	152	61	2.49	160	61	2.62
Vane C Inner Concave	110	64	1.72	85	49	1.73	105	62	1.69




Figure 6—(a) Simulated Ni-Co layer thickness distribution over the blades ( $\mu\text{m}$ ); (b) Simulated Ni-Co layer thickness distribution on the inner (L) and outer (R) platform.

Consequently, since the content of the MCrAlY power is 45 vol%, then the thickness of the deposited layer will be larger by a factor of 1/0.45, or 2.22. This observation goes a long way towards explaining the difference in experimental and predicted thicknesses. Other, smaller effects will come into play, such as the current density effect on plating efficiency.

Since the components are rotated in the electroplating bath, it is sensible to assume that all surfaces will be presented to the settling MCrAlY powder for the same fraction of process time, and hence, in this particular process, the flow will not affect the final thickness distribution. Scattering (noise) of experimental values seems to be higher on the fillets than on the blade surfaces.

## Conclusions

The compared results from Table 1 suggest that the simulations for a powder-free bath can very well predict experimental values for a powder-loaded bath. Simple accounting for the 45% volume fraction content of the powder would suggest a factor of 2.22, however, an across the board factor of 2.5 results in a better agreement. This is probably due to the variation of nickel plating efficiency in lower current density regions. Other deviations are explained by several factors:

- Anodic polarization behavior of titanium anodes is only approximate (should be measured on laboratory scale for a sample of the titanium mesh);
- Stochastic spread (noise) on experimental values ;
- Approximate geometrical definition of sample points for comparison ;
- Anode misalignments;
- Flow influence on particle incorporation.

One recommendation would be to revisit the data and investigate if a variable factor can be determined as a function of varying current density and plating efficiency.

A simulation strategy for optimizing the electrode / triple vane configuration will involve different steps:

- Step 1:** Defining the acceptance window for the definition of new auxiliary tools (anodes, screens, current robbers, etc.) and for modifications to the existing anodes;
- Step 2:** Defining some different configurations involving auxiliary anodes and/or screens and/or current robbers with a high potential improvement on the layer thickness distribution;
- Step 3:** Performing one or more exploratory simulations for each of these configuration (using full main anodes);
- Step 4:** Optimizing the dimensions and position of the auxiliary tools for the selected configurations by consecutive simulations (using full main anodes);
- Step 5:** Fine tuning the dimensions and position of the auxiliary tools using perforated main anodes;
- Step 6:** Implementing the optimized configuration in practice and performing a wet run;
- Step 7:** Measure the layer thickness distribution over the triple vane part (destructive test);
- Step 8:** If specifications are not yet met, go back to Steps 4 and 5 for further optimizing the configuration and perform a new wet run afterwards.

## About the Authors



*Gert Nelissen graduated from the Vrije Universiteit Brussel (VUB, Belgium) (1993) with a M.Sc. degree in Electromechanical Engineering. From 1993 to 2003, he worked at the Electrotechnics Department (ETEC) of the Vrije Universiteit Brussel where he received a Ph.D. in electrical engineering (2003). His thesis title was "Simulation of Multi-ion Transport in Turbulent Flow." His main research interests include the modeling of turbulent flow and mass transfer and the simulation of complex electrochemical system including various deposition processes and anodizing. As co-founder of Elsyca, Dr. Nelissen acted as consulting and engineering manager, mainly focusing on projects including flow and mass transfer until the end of 2007. Since then, he has been responsible for research and technology development within Elsyca, comprising all externally funded and strategic research projects.*



*Bart Van den Bossche graduated from the Vrije Universiteit Brussel (VUB, Belgium) (1991) with a M.Sc. degree in Metallurgical Engineering. He received a Ph.D. in electrochemical engineering in 1998. He heads Elsyca's Engineering Department. Dr. Van den Bossche has been active in electrochemical process computer modeling for over 12 years, as reflected in a series of peer reviewed papers. In addition, he has a long track record as a consultant for electrochemical cell design and optimization in the plating, galvanofarming and electrochemical machining industry. As Elsyca co-founder, he is in charge of several Elsyca consulting projects on plating process optimization and cathodic protection system evaluation.*