



Designation: G 46 – 76 (Reapproved 1986)^{e1}

G-90-45

Standard Practice for EXAMINATION AND EVALUATION OF PITTING CORROSION¹

This standard is issued under the fixed designation G 46; the number immediately following the designation indicates the year of original adoption or, in the case of revision, the year of last revision. A number in parentheses indicates the year of last reapproval. A superscript epsilon (e) indicates an editorial change since the last revision or reapproval.

^{e1} NOTE—Editorial changes were made throughout in February 1986.

1. Scope

1.1 This practice is a guide to assist in the selection of procedures that can be used in the identification and examination of pits and in the evaluation of pitting corrosion to determine the extent of its effect.

1.2 *This standard may involve hazardous materials, operations, and equipment. This standard does not purport to address all of the safety problems associated with its use. It is the responsibility of whoever uses this standard to consult and establish appropriate safety and health practices and determine the applicability of regulatory limitations prior to use.*

2. Applicable Documents

2.1 ASTM Standards:

E 3 Methods of Preparation of Metallographic Specimens²

G 1 Practice for Preparing, Cleaning, and Evaluating Corrosion Test Specimens³

G 16 Practice for Applying Statistics to Analysis of Corrosion Data³

2.2 National Association of Corrosion Engineers Standard:

RP-01-73 Collection and Identification of Corrosion Products⁴

3. Definition

3.1 *pitting*—the localized corrosion of a metal surface, confined to a point or small area, that takes the form of cavities.

4. Significance and Use

4.1 It is important to be able to determine the extent of pitting, either in a service application where it is necessary to predict the remaining life

in a metal structure, or in laboratory test programs that are used to select the most pitting-resistant materials for service.

5. Identification and Examination of Pits

5.1 *Visual Inspection*—A visual examination of the corroded metal surface is usually beneficial, and this is done under ordinary light, with or without the use of a low-power magnifying glass, to determine the extent of corrosion and the apparent location of pits. It is often advisable to photograph the corroded surface at this point so that it can be compared with the clean surface after the removal of corrosion products.

5.1.1 If the metal specimen has been exposed to an unknown environment, the composition of the corrosion products may be of value in determining the cause of corrosion. Follow recommended procedures in the removal of particulate corrosion products and reserve them for future identification (see NACE Standard RP-01-73).

5.1.2 To expose the pits fully, use recommended cleaning procedures to remove the corrosion products and avoid solutions that attack the base metal excessively (see Practice G 1). It may be advisable during cleaning to probe the pits with a pointed tool to determine the extent of undercutting or subsurface corrosion (Fig. 1). However, scrubbing with a stiff bristle brush will detect the leakage field and to outline the size

¹ This practice is under the jurisdiction of ASTM Committee G-1 on Corrosion of Metals, and is the direct responsibility of Subcommittee G01.05 on Laboratory Corrosion Tests.

Current edition approved April 9, 1976. Published July 1976.

² Annual Book of ASTM Standards, Vol 03.03.

³ Annual Book of ASTM Standards, Vol 03.02.

⁴ Insert in *Materials Protection and Performance*, Vol 12, June 1973, p. 65.



often enlarge the pit openings sufficiently by removal of corrosion products, or undercut metal to make the pits easier to evaluate.

5.1.3 Examine the cleaned metal surface under ordinary light to determine the approximate size and distribution of pits. Follow this procedure by a more detailed examination through a microscope using low magnification (20×).

5.1.4 Determine the size, shape, and density of pits.

5.1.4.1 Pits may have various sizes and shapes. A visual examination of the metal surface may show a round, elongated, or irregular opening, but it seldom provides an accurate indication of corrosion beneath the surface. Thus, it is often necessary to cross section the pit to see its actual shape and to determine its true depth. Several variations in the cross-sectioned shape of pits are shown in Fig. 1.

5.1.4.2 It is a tedious job to determine pit density by counting pits through a microscope eyepiece, but the task can be made easier by the use of a plastic grid. Place the grid, containing 3 to 6-mm squares, on the metal surface. Count and record the number of pits in each square, and move across the grid in a systematic manner until all the surface has been covered. This approach minimizes eyestrain because the eyes can be taken from the field of view without fear of losing the area of interest.

5.1.5 *Metallographic Examination*—Select and cut out a representative portion of the metal surface containing the pits and prepare a metallographic specimen in accordance with the recommended procedures given in Methods E 3. Examine microscopically to determine whether there is a relation between pits and inclusions or microstructure, or whether the cavities are true pits or might have resulted from metal dropout caused by intergranular corrosion, dealloying, etc.

5.2 *Nondestructive Inspection*—A number of techniques have been developed to assist in the detection of cracks or cavities in a metal surface without destroying the material (1).⁵ These methods are less effective for locating and defining the shape of pits than some of those previously discussed, but they merit consideration because they are often used *in situ*, and thus are more applicable to field applications.

5.2.1 *Radiographic*—Radiation, such as X rays, are passed through the object. The intensity

of the emergent rays varies with the thickness of the material. Imperfections may be detected if they cause a change in the absorption of X rays. Detectors or films are used to provide an image of interior imperfections. The metal thickness that can be inspected is dependent on the available energy output. Pores or pits must be as large as 1/2% of the metal thickness to be detected. This technique has only slight application to pitting detection, but it might be a useful means to compare specimens before and after corrosion to determine whether pitting has occurred and whether it is associated with previous porosity. It may also be useful to determine the extent of subsurface and undercutting pitting (Fig. 1).

5.2.2 *Electromagnetic:*

5.2.2.1 Eddy currents can be used to detect defects or irregularities in the structure of electrically conducting materials. When a specimen is exposed to a varying magnetic field, produced by connecting an alternating current to a coil, eddy currents are induced in the specimen, and they in turn produce a magnetic field of their own. Materials with defects will produce a magnetic field that is different from that of a reference material without defects, and an appropriate detection instrument is required to determine these differences.

5.2.2.2 The induction of a magnetic field in ferromagnetic materials is another approach that is used. Discontinuities that are transverse to the direction of the magnetic field cause a leakage field to form above the surface of the part. Ferromagnetic particles are placed on the surface to and shape of the discontinuities. Rather small imperfections can be detected by this method. However, the method is limited by the required directionality of defects to the magnetic field, by the possible need for demagnetization of the material, and by the limited shape of parts that can be examined.

5.2.3 *Sonics:*

5.2.3.1 In the use of ultrasonics, pulses of sound energy are transmitted through a couplant, such as oil or water, onto the metal surface where waves are generated. The reflected echoes are converted to electrical signals that can be interpreted to show the location of flaws or pits. Both contact and immersion methods are used. The

⁵ The boldface numbers in parentheses refer to the list of references at the end of this practice.



test has good sensitivity and provides instantaneous information about the size and location of flaws. However, reference standards are required for comparison, and training is needed to interpret the results properly.

5.2.3.2 An alternative approach is to use acoustic emissions in detecting flaws in metals. Imperfections, such as pits, generate high-frequency emissions under thermal or mechanical stress. The frequency of emission and the number of occurrences per unit time determine the presence of defects.

5.2.4 *Penetrants*—Defects opening to the surface can be detected by the application of a penetrating liquid that subsequently exudes from the surface after the excess penetrant has been removed. Defects are located by spraying the surface with a developer that reacts with a dye in the penetrant, or the penetrant may contain a fluorescent material that is viewed under black light. The size of the defect is shown by the intensity of the color and the rate of bleed-out. This technique provides only an approximation of the depth and size of pits.

5.2.5 None of these nondestructive test methods provide satisfactory detailed information about pitting. They can be used to locate pits and to provide some information about the size of pits, but they generally are not able to detect small pits, and confusion may arise in attempting to differentiate between pits and other surface blemishes. Most of these methods were developed to detect cracks or flaws in metals, but with more refined development they may become more applicable to pitting measurements.

6. Extent of Pitting

6.1 *Mass Loss*—Metal mass loss is not ordinarily recommended for use as a measure of the extent of pitting unless general corrosion is slight and pitting is fairly severe. If uniform corrosion is significant, the contribution of pitting to total metal loss is small, and pitting damage cannot be determined accurately from mass loss. In any case, mass loss can only provide information about total metal loss due to pitting but nothing about depth of penetration. However, mass loss should not be neglected in every case because it may be of value; for example, mass loss along with a visual comparison of pitted surfaces may be adequate to evaluate the pitting resistance of alloys in laboratory tests.

6.2 *Pit Depth Measurement:*

6.2.1 *Metallographic*—Pit depth can be determined by sectioning vertically through a preselected pit, mounting the cross-sectioned pit metallographically, and polishing the surface. The depth of the pit is measured on the flat, polished surface by the use of a microscope with a calibrated eyepiece. The method is very accurate, but it requires good judgment in the selection of the pit and good technique in cutting through the pit. Its limitations are that it is time consuming, the deepest pit may not have been selected, and the pit may not have been sectioned at the deepest point of penetration.

6.2.2 *Machining (2, 3):*

6.2.2.1 This method requires a sample that is fairly regular in shape, and it involves the destruction of the specimen. Measure the thickness of the specimen between two areas that have not been affected by general corrosion. Select a portion of the surface on one side of the specimen that is relatively unaffected; then machine the opposite surface where the pits are located on a precision lathe, grinder, or mill until all signs of corrosion have disappeared. (Some difficulty from galling and smearing may be encountered with soft metals, and pits may be obliterated.) Measure the thickness of the specimen between the unaffected surface and subtract from the original thickness to give the maximum depth of pitting. Repeat this procedure on the unmachined surface unless the thickness has been reduced by 50% or more during the machining of the first side.

6.2.2.2 This method is equally suitable for determining the number of pits with specific depths. Count the visible pits; then machine away the surface of the metal in measured stages and count the number of visible pits remaining at each stage. Subtract the number of pits at each stage from the count at the previous stage to obtain the number of pits at each depth of cut.

6.2.3 *Micrometer or Depth Gage:*

6.2.3.1 This method is based on the use of a pointed needle attached to a micrometer or calibrated depth gage to penetrate the pit cavity. Zero the instrument on an unaffected area at the lip of the pit. Insert the needle in the pit until it reaches the base where a new measurement is taken. The distance traveled by the needle is the depth of the pit. It is best to use constant-tension instruments to minimize metal penetration at