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Abstract

This letter attempts to comment on two articles by Reis et al., in the aspects of creep consideration, chemical analysis, and phase transformation measurements in maraging steels.
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This short paper comments on a number of incorrect or inaccurate aspects of a paper by Reis et al. [1]. All quotes of figure, table, equation and section numbers refer to those used in the original papers.

Reis et al. considered creep behaviour of 18Ni maraging steel in microstructural unstable condition at temperature higher than the ageing temperature. This consideration is meaningful for some specific exploitation cases (for instance, emergency rating of aviation engine). Scientific value of the work [1] is attributed to information of creep-induced coarsening of Ni3(Ti,Mo) and Laves phase.
The first comment is that the creep times before fracture are too short for the studies in [1] to be considered creep in its commonly regarded sense. In Table 4 in [1], the shortest time to rupture (t_r) is 0.05 h, i.e., 3 min. How is this creep time meaningful? Normal tensile tests use about 1% strain/min, which would last much longer than 3 min before rupture.

Maraging steels have “poor” creep performance at the temperatures, 550-650 °C, used in [1], because the ultra-high strength of these steels is achieved by an ageing treatment at temperatures below such temperatures [2]. If held at a temperature higher than the ageing heat treatment temperature, whether under loading or not, the microstructure of the steel will change substantially over a short period of time, in minutes and hours. So, the “constant” A in Eq. 1 in [1] will change substantially over a short period of time, in minutes and hours. Indeed, the creep rate Eq. 1 in [1] is for diffusion creep [3, 4], and not applicable to creep during which a phase transformation takes place. The conventional creep theory, for example Eq. 1 in [1], cannot be applied to such a case. It is also stated in [1] that A depends on temperature and applied stress. This is a further mistake. Figs. 5 and 6 in [1] were plotted on the assumption that A does not depend on temperature and applied stress.

A proof of the conventional creep theory not applicable to the maraging steel at such temperatures higher than the ageing heat treatment temperatures is the finding by Reis et al. [1] that the stress exponent n and the creep activation energy Q_c both change substantially (Section 2.2 in [1]). The plotting of the diagram in Fig. 5 in [1] assumes that Q_c is constant. The plotting of the diagram in Fig. 6 [1] assumes that n is constant. Neither are turned out to be true from the results.

The second issue is concerned with phase chemistry. The Ni contents in both the matrix and Ni_3(Ti,Mo), given in Table 3 in [1], are lower than the Ni content in the steel overall, given in Table 1
in [1]. This does not satisfy the materials balance for Ni, and suggests that there is another Ni-rich phase missed in the microstructural characterisation or there are large errors in the composition analysis. On the other hand, calculations based on materials balance using the Ti, Co, and Mo contents in Tables 1 and 3 in [1] give the percentage of \( \text{Ni}_3(\text{Ti,Mo}) \) in the steel as 5\% (from materials balance of Ti), 5\% (Co) and 39\% (Mo). This means that the measurement of Mo concentrations also has large errors.

Reis et al. evaluated chemical composition of \( \text{Ni}_3(\text{Ti,Mo}) \) particles using foils. As a result, they received chemical composition from the particles and surrounded matrix. This is why Table 3 in [1] is incorrect.
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