NIST Technical Note 2096

Small Punch Testing to Estimate Mechanical Properties of Additively Manufactured Ti-6Al-4V

Enrico Lucon Jake Benzing Nik Hrabe

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.TN.2096



NIST Technical Note 2096

Small Punch Testing to Estimate Mechanical Properties of Additively Manufactured Ti-6Al-4V

Enrico Lucon Jake Benzing Nik Hrabe Applied Chemicals and Materials Division Material Measurement Laboratory

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.TN.2096

June 2020



U.S. Department of Commerce Wilbur L. Ross, Jr., Secretary

National Institute of Standards and Technology Walter Copan, NIST Director and Undersecretary of Commerce for Standards and Technology Certain commercial entities, equipment, or materials may be identified in this document in order to describe an experimental procedure or concept adequately. Such identification is not intended to imply recommendation or endorsement by the National Institute of Standards and Technology, nor is it intended to imply that the entities, materials, or equipment are necessarily the best available for the purpose.

National Institute of Standards and Technology Technical Note 2096 Natl. Inst. Stand. Technol. Tech. Note 2096, 277 pages (June 2020) CODEN: NTNOEF

> This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.TN.2096

Abstract

Small Punch (SP) testing is a methodology that uses small disk-shaped specimens, generally 8 mm in diameter and 0.5 mm thick, to estimate mechanical properties of metallic materials, such as tensile properties, fracture toughness, and ductile-to-brittle transition temperature. Empirical correlations are typically used to infer conventional mechanical properties from characteristic forces and displacements obtained from the test record. Most of the available literature relates to SP testing of steels, while relatively little information is available for other metallic materials. At NIST in Boulder, Colorado, SP tests were conducted on additively manufactured (AM) Ti-6Al-4V with different processing parameters and heat treatment conditions. The shape of force/punch displacement curves appeared different than typically reported for conventionally manufactured steels, and correlations with tensile parameters were generally weaker than those published for steel samples. We are led to conclude that the application of the SP technique, characterized by a biaxial loading mode, to materials with high anisotropy, such as current batches of AM Ti-6Al-4V, may be somewhat problematic and therefore of limited applicability. Finally, the use of actuator displacement instead of punch displacement in test analyses appeared to cause a generalized worsening of the correlations.

Key words

additive manufacturing, empirical correlations, fracture toughness, Small Punch, tensile properties, Ti-6A1-4V.

Table of Contents

1.	Int	troduction	12
2.	Ex	perimental setup for SP testing	14
3.	Ma	aterial and conditions investigated	16
4.	Te	st results	17
2	4.1.	General remarks	17
2	1.2.	Preliminary tests (standard HIP, scan length = 56 mm, supported)	19
2	1.3.	As-built, scan length = 78 mm	21
2	1.4.	As-built, scan length = 26 mm	22
2	4.5.	Non-standard (800 °C) HIP, scan length = 78 mm	23
2	4.6.	Standard (900 °C) HIP, scan length = 78 mm	24
2	4.7.	Standard (900 °C) HIP, scan length = 26 mm	25
2	4.8.	Non-standard (1050 °C) + additional (800 °C) HIP, scan length = 78 mm	26
2	1.9.	Comparison between different conditions (non-supported specimens)	27
	4.9	0.1. rough specimens	27
	4.9	0.2. Polished specimens	28
	4.9	0.3. General considerations	30
5.	Co	rrelations with tensile properties	31
4	5.1.	Yield strength correlations	31
4	5.2.	Ultimate tensile strength correlations	34
4	5.3.	Elongation correlations	36
6.	Co	orrelations with fracture toughness	39
7.	Us	e of actuator displacement in the analyses	40
8.	Di	scussion	43
9.	Co	nclusions	44
Re	fere	nces	45

List of Figures

Figure 1 - Schematic representation of the SP test method.	12
Figure 2 - Typical form of a SP force-deflection diagram for steel, showing five distinct	
regions [1]	13
Figure 3 - SP testing fixture used at NIST, shown disassembled (left) and assembled (right)).
	15
Figure 4 - SP testing fixture mounted on the test machine with the extensioneter for punch	
displacement measurement.	15
Figure 5 - Dimensions and tolerances of the SP specimens.	16

Figure 6 - Force-punch displacement curve for a SP test on AM Ti64 (as-built, scan length =
78 mm)
Figure 7 - Determination of two alternative values for the elastic-plastic transition force,
$F_{e,proj}$ and $F_{e,int}$. The green and red lines are the two linear fits, while the blue squares are
experimental force-displacement points
Figure 8 - Values of elastic-plastic transition forces and maximum forces as a function of
estimated maximum strain rate
Figure 9 - Average values and standard deviations for $F_{e,proj}$
Figure 10 - Average values and standard deviations for $F_{\rm m}$
Figure 11 - Average values and standard deviations for $F_{e,proj}$
Figure 12 - Average values and standard deviations for <i>F</i> _m
Figure 13 - Correlations between $F_{e,proj}/h_0^2$ and yield strength for rough and polished
specimens of AM Ti64
Figure 14 - Correlations between $F_{e,int}/h_0^2$ and yield strength for rough and polished
specimens of AM Ti64
Figure 15 - Correlations between $F_{0.1 \text{mm,off}}/h_0^2$ and yield strength for rough and polished
specimens of AM Ti64
Figure 16 - Correlations between $F_{\rm m}/h_0^2$ and ultimate tensile strength for rough and polished
specimens of AM Ti64
Figure 17 - Correlations between $F_{\rm m}/(h_0 u_{\rm m})$ and ultimate tensile strength for rough and
polished specimens of AM Ti6435
Figure 18 - Correlations between $F_{infl}/(h_0 u_m)$ and ultimate tensile strength for rough and
polished specimens of AM Ti64
Figure 19 - Correlations between $F_{0.65\text{mm}}/h_0^2$ and ultimate tensile strength for rough and
polished specimens of AM Ti64
Figure 20 - Correlations between $(u_f - h_0)$ and total elongation for rough and polished
specimens of AM Ti64
Figure 21 - Correlations between u_m/h_0 and uniform elongation for rough and polished
specimens of AM Ti64
Figure 22 - Correlations between $F_{\rm m}/h_0^2$ and ultimate tensile strength for rough and polished
specimens of AM Ti64
Figure 23 - Empirical correlations between J_Q and $E_{SP}/(h_0 u_f)$ for rough and polished SP
specimens of AM Ti64 40
Figure 24 – Mean characteristic force values obtained for rough specimens using
extensometer and actuator displacements, with $\pm 1\sigma$ error bands
Figure 25 – Mean characteristic displacement values obtained for rough specimens using
extensometer and actuator displacements, with $\pm 1\sigma$ error bands
Figure 26 – Mean characteristic energy values obtained for rough specimens using
extensometer and actuator displacements, with $\pm 1\sigma$ error bands
Figure 25 – Force-displacement curve for a SP test on ODS 14YWT steel [37] 44

List of Tables

Table 1 –	- Test matrix (for material condition codes, see bullet list in Section 3 above) 1	.7
Table 2 –	- Tensile properties for the different material conditions1	7

Table 3 - Test results for supported specimens with standard HIP and scan length = 56 mm
(linear elastic slopes and forces)
Table 4 - Test results for supported specimens with standard HIP and scan length = 56 mm
(displacements and energies)
Table 5 – Test results for rough as-built specimens with scan length = 78 mm (linear elastic
slopes and forces)
Table 6 – Test results for rough as-built specimens with scan length = 78 mm (displacements
and energies)
Table 7 – Test results for polished as-built specimens with scan length = 78 mm (linear
elastic slopes and forces)
Table 8 – Test results for polished as-built specimens with scan length = 78 mm
(displacements and energies)
Table 9 – Test results for rough as-built specimens with scan length = 26 mm (linear elastic
slopes and forces)
Table 10 – Test results for rough as-built specimens with scan length = 26 mm
(displacements and energies)
Table 11 – Test results for polished as-built specimens with scan length = 26 mm (linear
elastic slopes and forces)
Table 12 – Test results for polished as-built specimens with scan length = 26 mm
(displacements and energies)
Table 13 - Test results for rough specimens with non-standard HIP and scan length = 26 mm
(linear elastic slopes and forces)
Table 14 - Test results for rough specimens with non-standard HIP and scan length = 26 mm
(displacements and energies)
Table 15 - Test results for polished specimens with non-standard HIP and scan length = 26
mm (linear elastic slopes and forces)
Table 16 - Test results for polished specimens with non-standard HIP and scan length = 26
mm (displacements and energies)23
Table 17 - Test results for rough specimens with standard HIP and scan length = 78 mm
(linear elastic slopes and forces)
Table 18 - Test results for rough specimens with standard HIP and scan length = 78 mm
(displacements and energies)
Table 19 - Test results for polished specimens with standard HIP and scan length = 78 mm
(linear elastic slopes and forces)
Table 20 - Test results for polished specimens with standard HIP and scan length = 78 mm
(displacements and energies)
Table 21 - Test results for rough specimens with standard HIP and scan length = 26 mm
(linear elastic slopes and forces)
Table 22 - Test results for rough specimens with standard HIP and scan length = 26 mm
(displacements and energies)
Table 23 - Test results for polished specimens with standard HIP and scan length = 26 mm
(linear elastic slopes and forces)
Table 24 - Test results for polished specimens with standard HIP and scan length = 26 mm
(displacements and energies)
Table 25 - Test results for rough specimens with standard + additional HIP and scan length =
78 mm (linear elastic slopes and forces)

Table 26 - Test results for rough specimens with standard + additional HIP and scan length =
78 mm (displacements and energies)
Table 27 - Test results for polished specimens with standard + additional HIP and scan
length = 78 mm (linear elastic slopes and forces)
Table 28 - Test results for polished specimens with standard + additional HIP and scan
length = 78 mm (displacements and energies)
Table 29 – Average values and standard deviations for rough specimens in the different
conditions (elastic slopes and forces)
Table 30 – Average values and standard deviations for rough specimens in the different
conditions (displacements and energies)
Table 31 – Average values and standard deviations for polished specimens in the different
conditions (elastic slopes and forces)
Table 32 – Average values and standard deviations for polished specimens in the different
conditions (displacements and energies)
Table 33 - Summary of yield strength correlations obtained for rough specimens of AM
Ti64
Table 34 - Summary of yield strength correlations obtained for polished specimens of AM
Ti64
Table 35 - Summary of ultimate tensile strength correlations obtained for rough specimens
of AM Ti64
Table 36 - Summary of ultimate tensile strength correlations obtained for polished specimens
of AM Ti64
Table 37 - Summary of total elongation correlations obtained for rough specimens of AM
Ti64
Table 38 - Summary of total elongation correlations obtained for polished specimens of AM
Ti64
Table 39 - Uniform elongation correlation obtained for rough specimens of AM Ti64
Table 40 - Uniform elongation correlation obtained for polished specimens of AM Ti64 38
Table 41 - Elastic-plastic fracture toughness measured on four AM Ti64 conditions [14] 39
Table 42 - Correlation coefficients for extensioneter-based and actuator-based correlations
for rough specimens. In the last column, red arrows indicate a decrease in r going from
extensometer to actuator (two red arrows = substantial decrease), green arrows an increase,
and black horizontal arrows a minor variation

List of Annexes

- ANNEX 1 SP Test Results for Standard HIP, scan length = 56 mm, supported (rough specimens)
- ANNEX 2 SP Test Results for As built, scan length = 78 mm, non-supported (rough specimens)
- ANNEX 3 SP Test Results for As built, scan length = 78 mm, non-supported (polished specimens)
- ANNEX 4 SP Test Results for As built, scan length = 26 mm, non-supported (rough specimens)

ANNEX 4	SP Test Results for As built, scan length = 26 mm, non-supported (rough specimens)
ANNEX 5	SP Test Results for As built, scan length = 26 mm, non-supported (polished specimens)
ANNEX 6	SP Test Results for 800 °C HIP, scan length = 78 mm, non-supported (rough specimens)
ANNEX 7	SP Test Results for 800 °C HIP, scan length = 78 mm, non-supported (polished specimens)
ANNEX 8	SP Test Results for 900 °C HIP, scan length = 78 mm, non-supported (rough specimens)
ANNEX 9	SP Test Results for 900 °C HIP, scan length = 78 mm, non-supported (polished specimens)
ANNEX 10	SP Test Results for 900 °C HIP, scan length = 26 mm, non-supported (rough specimens)
ANNEX 11	SP Test Results for 900 °C HIP, scan length = 26 mm, non-supported (polished specimens)
ANNEX 12	SP Test Results for 1050 °C + 800 °C HIP, scan length = 78 mm, non-supported (rough specimens)
ANNEX 13	SP Test Results for 1050 °C + 800 °C HIP, scan length = 78 mm, non-supported (polished specimens)
ANNEX 14	Correlations obtained for AM Ti64 between yield strength and SP parameters
ANNEX 15	Correlations obtained for AM Ti64 between ultimate tensile strength and SP parameters

ANNEX 16 Correlations obtained for AM Ti64 between total/uniform elongation and SP parameters

Glossary

AM	Additive Manufacturing / Additively Manufactured
ASTM	American Society for Testing and Materials
CEN	European Committee for Standardization
EBM	Electron-Beam Melting, aka Electron-Beam Additive Manufacturing
EDM	Electro-Discharge Machining
D	In SP testing, specimen diameter (mm)
dv/dt	In SP testing, punch displacement rate (mm/s)
$E_{\rm m}$	In SP testing, total energy calculated up to $u_{\rm m}$ (J)
$E_{\rm PL}$	In SP testing, plastic energy calculated up to $u_{\rm m}$ (J)
E_{SP}	In SP testing, fracture energy calculated up to $u_{\rm f}$ (J)
\mathcal{E}_{f}	In SP testing, effective fracture strain
$\dot{\varepsilon}_{SP}^{max}$	In SP testing, estimated maximum strain rate (1/s)
<i>E</i> t	In tensile testing, total elongation (%)
\mathcal{E}_{u}	In tensile testing, uniform elongation (%)
F	Force (N)
F_{e}	In SP testing, elastic-plastic transition force (N)
$F_{ m h0/10,off}$	In SP testing, force at the intersection between the test record and a line parallel to the slope of the initial linear region with an offset of $0.1 \cdot h_0$ (N)
F_{infl}	In SP testing, force at the inflection point of the curve $(d^2F/du^2 = 0)$ (N)
$F_{\rm m}$	In SP testing, maximum force (N)
F _{0.1mm,off}	In SP testing, force at the intersection between the test record and a line parallel to the slope of the initial linear region with an offset of $0.1 \text{ mm}(N)$
$F_{0.1 \mathrm{mm}}$	In SP testing, force corresponding to a displacement value of 0.1 mm (N)
$F_{0.48mm}$	In SP testing, force corresponding to a displacement value of 0.48 mm (N)
F0.5mm	In SP testing, force corresponding to a displacement value of 0.5 mm (N)
$F_{0.645mm}$	In SP testing, force corresponding to a displacement value of 0.645 mm (N)
$F_{0.65mm}$	In SP testing, force corresponding to a displacement value of 0.65 mm (N)
$F_{0.9mm}$	In SP testing, force corresponding to a displacement value of 0.9 mm (N)
f(v)	In SP testing, bilinear function used to determine F_e [10,11].
h_0	In SP testing, initial specimen thickness (mm)
ISO	International Standardization Organization
Κ	In SP testing, curvature parameter according to [30]
KV	Charpy absorbed energy (J)
r	Pearson correlation coefficient
Ra	Surface roughness (µm)
R _m	In tensile testing, tensile strength (MPa)

R_{p02}	In tensile testing, yield strength (MPa)
Slope _{ini}	In SP testing, slope of the initial elastic region of the curve (N/mm)
SP	Small Punch
t _{calc}	Calculated value of the <i>t</i> -test statistic
t _{critical}	Critical value of the <i>t</i> -test statistic (if $t_{calc} > t_{critical}$, means are statistically different)
и	Specimen deflection (mm)
v	Punch displacement (mm)
$v_{ m f}$	In SP testing, punch displacement corresponding to a 20 $\%$ force drop with respect to maximum force (mm)
v _m	In SP testing, punch displacement at maximum force (mm)
Vlp	In SP testing, punch displacement at the occurrence of the first significant pop-in (mm).

1. Introduction

In the field of experimental techniques based on sub-size or miniaturized specimens, destructive testing of very small disk-shaped specimens allows characterizing the mechanical properties of service-exposed plant components or structures with a minimal amount of material extracted from the component [1]. Moreover, a considerable number of disk specimens can be extracted from machining leftovers or already tested conventional specimens.

The Small Punch (SP) test, also known as the Disk Bend test, was developed in the mid-1980s [2,3] through the use of tiny disks of 3 mm diameter and 0.25 mm thickness, centrally loaded by a spherical ball or hemispherical punch, and expanded into a larger lower die. The test system was a module that could be placed between the loading platens of a tensile machine and subsequently loaded in compression [3]. The outcome is a bulge in the disk rather than a shear cut, as in a similar methodology called the Shear Punch test [4]. Although disks of these dimensions are still used for SP testing, nowadays the most popular specimen geometry is a round disk with a diameter of 8 mm and a thickness of 0.5 mm, which is the geometry used in this study. The use of square specimens (10 mm \times 10 mm) has also been reported [5] but is not as common.

A schematic representation of the SP test method is shown in Fig. 1.



Figure 1 - Schematic representation of the SP test method.

The general form of a SP force/deflection test record for a steel specimen is shown in Fig. 2 [1]. Five distinct regions can be identified:

- 1. Elastic region,
- 2. Departure from linearity (elastic-plastic transition),
- 3. Local bending, transitioning to a membrane stress regime,
- 4. Membrane stress regime, and
- 5. Final failure region.

The general form of the test record suggests that yield stress may be associated with the change in slope between regions 1 and 2, while the ultimate tensile stress may be related to the maximum force, and ductility to maximum deflection. However, in the case of steels showing low ductility, the membrane stress regime and final failure region may be virtually absent or minimized.



Figure 2 - Typical form of a SP force-deflection diagram for steel, showing five distinct regions [1].

Characteristic values of force, displacement, and energy (calculated by integrating force and displacement) are identified on the test record. These values are generally fed into empirical relationships to obtain estimates of specific mechanical parameters, such as tensile properties, ductile-to-brittle transition temperature, fracture toughness, for the material under investigation. Numerous empirical correlations are available in the literature, and have been developed by comparing characteristic parameters from SP tests with tensile properties, transition temperature toughness values measured by means of conventional tests.

In most cases, correlations appear to be strongly dependent on the material (or the class of material) under investigation, and cannot be expected to be applicable to other materials or material conditions [5].

However, alternative approaches of a more analytical nature have also been proposed. Several authors have matched force-displacement curves from SP tests, up to the point of observed crack initiation, to a database of curves corresponding to a range of stress-strain constitutive behaviors. The model used in this case is a Ramberg-Osgood model with a possible modification to accommodate the discontinuous yield observed in several low-alloy steels [6]. Other analytical methods have also been proposed, involving the use of Neural Networks and Finite Element simulations [7-9]. The approach used in this report for the analysis of SP test results, however, is strictly of a correlative nature.

Even though researchers all over the world have been performing SP tests since the 1980s, an official test standard issued by an internationally recognized standardization body (ASTM or ISO) has yet to be developed.

The currently available document that most closely resembles a test standard is a European CEN¹ Workshop Agreement, CWA 15627 (*Small Punch Test Method for Metallic Materials*), issued in 2007 [10]. At the time of writing, a Draft ASTM *Test Method for Small Punch Testing of Metallic Materials* [11], modeled after CWA 15627, is being developed inside the ASTM E10.02 Sub-Committee (*Behavior and Use of Nuclear Materials*), and is in the final balloting stages.

¹ CEN: Comité Européen de Normalisation (European Committee for Standardization).

The development of SP testing at NIST in Boulder, CO, and the validation of the relevant experimental and analytical procedures was covered in a recently published NIST Internal Report [12]. In this report, we present the results of SP testing conducted with the objective of deriving estimates of mechanical properties (tensile and fracture toughness) for additively manufactured (AM) Ti-6Al-4V in various conditions. Previously published investigations focused on the measurement of Charpy impact toughness [13] and room temperature elastic-plastic fracture toughness [14] of the same material under various manufacturing conditions.

Additive Manufacturing (AM), previously referred to as 3D printing, is a process in which material is joined or solidified under computer control to create a threedimensional object, with material being fused (such as liquid molecules or powder grains being fused together), typically layer by layer. In the 1990s, 3D printing was considered only suitable to produce functional or aesthetical prototypes. Nowadays, the precision, repeatability, and material range have increased to the point that 3D printing, or AM, is considered an industrial production technology.

The objective of the NIST Additive Manufacturing Fatigue and Fracture Project is twofold:

- Develop appropriate measurement science for fatigue and fracture behavior of additively manufactured metals, to underpin a rapid qualification framework.
- Determine the effect of processing (including post-processing) and structure (e.g. internal defects, external defects, residual stress, crystallographic texture, grain size, and chemistry) on fatigue and fracture properties of additively manufactured metals.

Ti-6Al-4V (hereinafter referred to as Ti64) is the most widely used titanium alloy, featuring good machinability and excellent mechanical properties. It offers the best all-round performance for a variety of weight reduction applications in aerospace, automotive, and marine equipment. Its high strength, low weight, and outstanding corrosion resistance has led to a wide range of successful applications that demand high levels of reliable performance in surgery and medicine, aerospace, automotive, chemical plants, power generation, oil and gas extraction, sports, and other major industries.

2. Experimental setup for SP testing

The fixture developed at NIST for SP testing, following the recommendations in refs. [10,11], consists of an upper and a lower die, a rod (100 mm long, 2.5 mm diameter), and a ball (2.5 mm diameter). The combination of the rod and ball constitute the punch, which is driven through the specimen, held between the upper and lower dies. The fixture is shown in Fig. 3 in both disassembled (left) and assembled (right) form.

The fixture was mounted on a universal electro-mechanical test machine, equipped with a 5 kN capacity load cell and an extensometer². The extensometer was attached to one of the columns of the machine in order to measure the relative displacement between the machine actuator and the machine frame, in close proximity to the punch. Fig. 4 shows the fixture mounted on the test machine and the positioning of the extensometer with respect to the

 $^{^2}$ Load cell, machine actuator, and extensioneter are regularly calibrated in accordance with ASTM E4 and E83. Based on calibrations current at the time of testing, maximum errors were found to be less than 0.7 % for force values, less than 1.5 % for actuator displacements, and less than 2 % for extensioneter displacement values.

machine actuator. Unlike the extensioneter signal, actuator displacement includes the compliance of the whole test system.



Figure 3 - SP testing fixture used at NIST, shown disassembled (left) and assembled (right).



Figure 4 - SP testing fixture mounted on the test machine with the extensometer for punch displacement measurement.

All tests (except for a preliminary series described in Sec. 4.2) were performed at room temperature (21 °C \pm 2 °C) in actuator displacement control, at rates between 0.001 mm/s and 0.003 mm/s. Force, actuator displacement, and punch displacement (extensometer) data were recorded at a sampling frequency of 1 Hz. To account for the compliance of the test system on punch displacement, actuator and extensometer displacements were recorded without a specimen in place, and then subtracted from displacements measured during the tests.³

³ In a few SP tests, punch displacement is larger than actuator displacement, contrary to expectations. The reason for this is unclear, and the most likely explanation is related to the different positioning of the extensioneter from one test to the other. The use of a clip-on-gage, always located in the same spot, instead of an extensioneter should improve the consistency of the displacement signals in future tests.

3. Material and conditions investigated

The AM Ti64 parts used in this study were fabricated using an EBM powder bed fusion $Arcam^4 A1$ machine (software version 3.2.132,60 kV, 50 µm layer thickness) and standard Arcam Ti64 gas-atomized powder (70 µm average diameter).

The following conditions (AM processing parameters), for which conventional tensile and fracture toughness test results had been previously measured [14,15], were investigated:

- a. As-built condition (*i.e.*, no heat treatment).
- b. Non-standard Ti64 HIP (800 °C, 100 MPa, 2 h, Ar environment, standard heating and cooling rates⁵).
- c. Standard Ti64 HIP (900 °C, 100 MPa, 2 h, Ar environment, standard heating and cooling rates⁴).
- d. Non-standard Ti64 HIP (1050 °C, 100 MPa, 2 h, rapid cooling⁶ in Ar) with an additional HIP (800 °C, 30 MPa, 2 h, slow cooling⁴ in Ar meant for martensite tempering).
- e. Scan lengths⁷ of:

e1. 78 mm and

e2. 26 mm.

In order to assess the applicability of SP testing to AM Ti64, a preliminary series of 10 tests was performed on supported⁸ specimens, all in standard HIP condition (900 °C), corresponding to a different scan length (52 mm). An additional objective of these preliminary tests was to investigate the influence of different actuator displacement rates on the test results.

All SP disks were machined from AM Ti64 blocks by electrical discharge machining (EDM) in accordance with the drawing in Fig. 5.



Figure 5 - Dimensions and tolerances of the SP specimens.

After machining, some of the specimens were polished to the surface finish required by the ASTM Draft [10], $Ra \le 0.25 \mu m$, by means of abrasive paper with an abrasive grit size designation P400 followed by fine grinding (P1200). As a result, polished disks had a thickness ranging from 0.43 mm to 0.48 mm. The rest of the specimens (rough disks) had surface roughness in the range $Ra = 3 \mu m$ to 4 μm . This allowed us to investigate the influence of surface finish on SP test results.

⁴ Certain commercial software, equipment, instruments or materials are identified in this paper to adequately specify the experimental procedure. Such identification is not intended to imply recommendation or endorsement by the National Institute of Standards and Technology, nor is it intended to imply that the equipment or materials identified are necessarily the best available for the purpose.

⁵ 12 °C/minute. ⁶ 1600 °C/minute.

⁷ Scan length is a manufacturer-specific parameter that corresponds to the distance the electron beam travels on a single track before turning around to begin the next track. It has been shown to determine energy density and affect texture [16].

⁸ Specimens directly attached to the build plate were identified as "non-supported", while "supported" specimens (such as the ones tested in the preliminary phase) were connected to the build plate by means of standard thin wafer supports.

The overall test matrix, excluding the preliminary study, is presented in Table 1. The total number of tests performed was 55 (36 on rough specimens and 19 on polished specimens). All specimens were extracted from non-supported parts, and were tested at room temperature (21 °C \pm 2 °C).

Material	Number of tests performed							
condition	Rough disks	Polished disks						
a,e1	6	3						
a,e2	6	3						
b,e1	6	4						
c,e1	6	2						
c,e2	6	4						
d,e1	6	3						

Table 1 – Test matrix (for material condition codes, see bullet list in Section 3 above).

The main tensile properties for the different conditions investigated, obtained from conventional tensile tests [15] and used for the correlations with SP test results, are listed in Table 2.

Table 2 – Tensile properties for the different material conditions.

Material condition	R _{p02} (MPa)	R _m (MPa)	ε _u (%)	8f (%)		
a,e1	879	981	9.5	27.8		
a,e2	875	972	9.1	25.5		
b,e1	864	969	10.1	31.7		
c,e1	838	951	10.0	31.0		
c,e2	799	918	10.0	31.8		
d,e1	885	985	7.9	18.8		

4. Test results

4.1. General remarks

An example of force/punch displacement curve for condition {b,e1} is shown in Fig. 6. Depending on material condition, one or more force drops were observed before, at, and/or after maximum force.

The SP curves obtained in this study are qualitatively similar to those reported in the literature for other investigations on EBM AM Ti64 [17-20], and differ significantly from conventional SP test records for steel specimens, as in the example illustrated in Fig. 2. However, the five regions shown in Fig. 1 can still be reasonably identified, see Fig. 6, and the analysis of the test can be conducted in accordance with Refs. [10,11].



Figure 6 - Force-punch displacement curve for a SP test on AM Ti64 (as-built, scan length = 78 mm).

From the analysis of each individual force-punch displacement curve the following force values, to be used for correlation with tensile properties, were extracted:

- elastic-plastic transition force, F_{e} (Fig. 6)
- maximum force, $F_{\rm m}$ (Fig. 6)
- force at the intersection between the test record and a line parallel to the slope of the initial linear region with an offset of $0.1 \cdot h_0$, $F_{h0/10,off}$
- force at the inflection point of the curve $(d^2F/du^2 = 0)$, F_{infl} (Fig. 6)
- force at the intersection between the test record and a line parallel to the slope of the initial linear region with an offset of 0.1 mm, $F_{0.1\text{mm,off}}$
- force corresponding to a displacement value of 0.XXX mm, $F_{0.XXXmm}$ (where 0.XXX = 0.48, 0.645, or 0.65).

Note that, in accordance with Refs. [10,11], the elastic-plastic transition force, F_{e} , is obtained as the projection on the test record of the intersection between two linear fits. However, one of the yield strength correlations that have been proposed in the literature directly uses the force corresponding to the intersection of the regression lines. Therefore, in this investigation, the two values are labelled respectively $F_{e,proj}$ and $F_{e,int}$ (see Fig. 7 for an illustration of the two values).

The following punch displacement values, corresponding to forces bearing the same subscript, will also recorded: u_e , u_m (Fig. 6), $u_{h0/10,off}$, u_{infl} , $u_{0.1mm,off}$, and $u_{e1.5}$.

Finally, three energy values were also calculated for each test:

- total energy calculated up to $u_{\rm m}$, $E_{\rm m}$;
- plastic energy calculated up to $u_{\rm m}$, $E_{\rm SP}$;
- fracture energy calculated up to $u_{\rm f}, E_{\rm SP}$.

Additionally, the slope of the initial elastic part of the test record, $Slope_{ini}$, as well as forces and displacements corresponding to test end (F_f and u_f , Fig. 6), were also reported.



Figure 7 - Determination of two alternative values for the elastic-plastic transition force, $F_{e,proj}$ and $F_{e,int}$. The green and red lines are the two linear fits, while the blue squares are experimental force-displacement points.

All the analyses were performed by means of a macro-enabled spreadsheet, which has been described in [12]. This same report also provides specific details on the determination of the individual characteristic values of force, displacement, and energy.

4.2. Preliminary tests (standard HIP, scan length = 56 mm, supported)

Ten SP specimens (all rough) were tested in the preliminary series, with test speeds (actuator displacement rates) ranging between 0.0007 mm/s and 0.0084 mm/s. Note that the most commonly used test rate in the literature is 0.0015 mm/s. The applied displacement rates correspond to a range of maximum estimated strain rate $\dot{\varepsilon}_{max} = 7.35 \times 10^{-4} \text{s}^{-1}$ to 8.38 $\times 10^{-3} \text{s}^{-1}$ [10,11], *i.e.*, more than an order of magnitude.

The results obtained are presented, with average values and standard deviations (absolute and relative⁹), in Table 3 (linear elastic slopes and characteristic forces) and Table 4 (characteristic displacements and energies). Data reported in the Tables show that forces and displacements corresponding to the elastic-plastic transition exhibit the largest standard deviations.

⁹ The relative standard deviation, expressed in %, is obtained by dividing the absolute standard deviation by the average value. This is also called *coefficient of variation* (CV).

Specimen	Displacement	h ₀	$\dot{\epsilon}_{SP}^{max}$	Slope _{ini}	F _{e,proj}	F _{e,int}	F _{h0/10,off}	F _{0.1mm,off}	F _{0.1mm}	F _{0.48mm}	F _{0.5mm}	F _{0.65mm}	F _{0.9mm}	Fm	F _{infl}	F _f
id	rate (mm/s)	(mm)	(s ⁻¹)	(N/mm)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)
SP1	0.0007	0.50	7.35E-04	1550.087	444.0	450.1	717.9	929.0	158.3	682.1	706.7	873.6	1132.5	1155.0	1039.1	924.0
SP2	0.0071	0.50	7.05E-03	2219.097	321.9	337.6	532.4	714.6	226.5	785.1	814.2	977.1	1053.2	1102.8	169.1	882.2
SP3	0.0030	0.50	3.00E-03	2129.119	412.0	429.3	607.7	768.0	221.2	782.8	808.5	960.7	1057.7	1107.5	1080.9	886.0
SP4	0.0007	0.51	7.23E-04	1767.222	319.7	329.3	557.7	760.7	174.1	697.7	722.3	904.2	1096.9	1128.8	1122.8	903.0
SP5	0.0070	0.49	7.01E-03	2008.641	346.0	351.1	613.3	785.1	208.1	775.4	793.7	958.5	1087.4	1091.8	1082.4	873.5
SP6	0.0010	0.49	1.01E-03	2045.639	371.8	390.6	590.3	743.8	209.9	767.7	788.2	964.4	1150.9	1169.2	693.0	935.3
SP7	0.0010	0.50	1.01E-03	1893.577	347.1	354.2	567.8	753.2	191.7	735.9	762.0	929.8	1092.3	1103.7	446.2	882.9
SP8	0.0010	0.50	1.02E-03	1797.352	354.0	366.1	560.1	782.2	182.3	704.7	735.4	928.1	1186.9	1186.9	790.2	949.5
SP9	0.0010	0.49	1.01E-03	2175.631	391.5	410.5	575.3	730.7	221.4	792.9	816.7	1006.7	1094.7	1154.0	1066.3	923.2
SP10	0.0084	0.49	8.38E-03	2050.102	423.4	441.0	661.4	821.2	201.1	790.3	815.8	959.7	1097.1	1157.3	720.7	925.8
			Mean	1963.647	373.1	386.0	598.4	778.9	199.5	751.5	776.4	946.3	1105.0	1135.7	821.1	908.6
		60	209.755	43.003	44.485	55.350	60.700	22.532	42.540	41.842	38.161	41.093	32.983	321.027	26.387	
			SD	10.7%	11.5%	11.5%	9.2%	7.8%	11.3%	5.7%	5.4%	4.0%	3.7%	2.9%	39.1%	2.9%

Table 3 - Test results for supported specimens with standard HIP and scan length = 56 mm (linear elastic slopes and forces).

Table 4 - Test results for supported specimens with standard HIP and scan length = 56 mm (displacements and energies).

Specimen	Displacement	ho	$\dot{\epsilon}_{SP}^{max}$	u _e	Uh0/10,off	U _{0.1mm,off}	U _{e1.5}	u _m	u _{infl}	u _f	E _{SP}	Em	E _{PL}
id	rate (mm/s)	(mm)	(s ⁻¹)	(mm)	(mm)	(mm)	(mm)	(mm)	(mm)	(mm)	(L)	(L)	(L)
SP1	0.0007	0.50	7.35E-04	0.290	0.513	0.701	0.074	1.076	1.300	1.475	1.18	0.76	0.33
SP2	0.0071	0.50	7.05E-03	0.152	0.291	0.423	0.366	1.053	2.299	1.500	1.25	0.79	0.52
SP3	0.0030	0.50	3.00E-03	0.202	0.336	0.463	0.042	1.034	0.991	1.529	1.28	0.77	0.48
SP4	0.0007	0.51	7.23E-04	0.186	0.366	0.532	0.097	1.102	0.963			0.80	0.44
SP5	0.0070	0.49	7.01E-03	0.175	0.356	0.491	0.067	0.886	0.878			0.60	0.30
SP6	0.0010	0.49	1.01E-03	0.191	0.339	0.464	0.081	0.881	1.734	1.505	1.28	0.61	0.27
SP7	0.0010	0.50	1.01E-03	0.187	0.351	0.498	0.086	0.894	0.257	1.675	1.38	0.59	0.27
SP8	0.0010	0.50	1.02E-03	0.204	0.362	0.535	0.111	0.899	1.729	1.478	1.20	0.59	0.20
SP9	0.0010	0.49	1.01E-03	0.189	0.315	0.436	0.086	1.132	1.428	1.576	1.37	0.90	0.59
SP10	0.0084	0.49	8.38E-03	0.215	0.373	0.502	0.076	1.121	0.419	1.560	1.34	0.87	0.55
			Mean	0.199	0.360	0.504	0.109	1.008	1.200	1.537	1.28	0.73	0.39
			50	0.036	0.059	0.078	0.092	0.106	0.627	0.067	0.075	0.120	0.136
			SD	18.3%	16.5%	15.5%	84.8%	10.5%	52.3%	4.3%	5.9%	16.5%	34.5%

Test and analysis details for each of the tests performed on this group of specimens are provided in Annex 1.

The influence of estimated maximum strain rate on elastic-plastic transition forces $(F_{e,proj})$ and maximum forces (F_m) is illustrated in Fig. 8. For both force values, the slopes of the linear fits are statistically not different from zero based on ANOVA tests, indicating that the influence of displacement rate within the investigated range (0.0007 mm/s to 0.0084 mm/s) is negligible.



Figure 8 - Values of elastic-plastic transition forces and maximum forces as a function of estimated maximum strain rate.

4.3. As-built, scan length = 78 mm

Test results for the rough specimens is presented in Tables 5 and 6, which describe elastic slope/forces and displacements/energies, respectively. Likewise, Tables 7 and 8 describe the equivalent measurements for the polished specimens.

Table 5 – Test results for rough as-built specimens with scan length = 78 mm (linear elastic slopes and forces).

Specimen	Displacement	h ₀	$\dot{\epsilon}_{SP}^{max}$	Slope _{el}	F _{e, proj}	F _{e,int}	F _{h0/10, off}	F _{0.1mm,off}	F _{0.1mm}	F _{0.48mm}	F _{0.5mm}	F _{0.65mm}	F _{0.9mm}	Fm	F _{infl}	F _f
id	rate (mm/s)	(mm)	(s ⁻¹)	(N/mm)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)
SP1	0.0009	0.51	9.34E-04	2098.05	352.6	361.0	621.7	808.2	216.0	807.1	831.2	995.7	1057.2	1070.8	645.2	856.7
SP2	0.0010	0.50	9.27E-04	2693.16	394.4	404.7	638.2	841.7	271.0	930.2	944.1	996.4	1047.2	1065.2	1038.6	852.2
SP4	0.0010	0.48	9.64E-04	3070.90	511.2	549.7	674.5	767.8	333.2	884.0	901.6	986.5	1103.1	1109.4	709.8	887.5
SP5	0.0010	0.49	9.64E-04	2960.92	396.4	424.7	571.1	732.9	299.7	879.4	899.0	973.8	1088.7	1098.1	635.9	878.4
SP6	0.0010	0.49	9.69E-04	2769.78	507.7	526.7	703.1	851.9	288.5	919.3	951.0	1009.7	1024.5	1050.7	740.5	840.6
SP7	0.0011	0.51	1.01E-03	2772.76	438.4	470.2	653.3	822.8	288.2	915.7	927.0	1059.5	1083.8	1109.3	703.4	887.4
			Mean	2727.6	433.4	456.2	643.7	804.2	282.8	889.3	909.0	1003.6	1067.4	1083.9	745.6	867.1
			60	338.711	64.851	72.952	45.500	45.717	38.718	45.085	43.665	29.862	29.503	24.972	149.028	19.978
			50	12.4%	15.0%	16.0%	7.1%	5.7%	13.7%	5.1%	4.8%	3.0%	2.8%	2.3%	20.0%	2.3%

Table 6 – Test results for rough as-built specimens with scan length = 78 mm (displacements and energies).

Specimen	Displacement	ho	$\dot{\epsilon}_{SP}^{max}$	u _e	Uh0/10,off	U _{0.1mm,off}	U _{e1.5}	u _m	u _{infl}	u _f	E _{SP}	Em	E _{PL}
id	rate (mm/s)	(mm)	(s ⁻¹)	(mm)	(mm)	(mm)	(mm)	(mm)	(mm)	(mm)	(L)	(L)	(L)
SP1	0.0009	0.51	9.34E-04	0.172	0.346	0.487	0.074	0.938	1.568	1.297	1.02	0.67	0.39
SP2	0.0010	0.50	9.27E-04	0.150	0.287	0.413	0.070	0.866	0.902	1.345	1.11	0.65	0.44
SP4	0.0010	0.48	9.64E-04	0.179	0.271	0.351	0.317	0.900	1.639	1.405	1.19	0.69	0.49
SP5	0.0010	0.49	9.64E-04	0.143	0.243	0.348	0.085	0.864	1.656	1.373	1.16	0.64	0.44
SP6	0.0010	0.49	9.69E-04	0.190	0.304	0.408	0.525	0.977	1.608	1.479	1.26	0.77	0.57
SP7	0.0011	0.51	1.01E-03	0.170	0.286	0.398	0.063	1.019	1.592	1.425	1.22	0.83	0.60
			Mean	0.167	0.290	0.401	0.189	0.928	1.494	1.387	1.160	0.707	0.489
			60	0.018	0.035	0.051	0.192	0.062	0.292	0.064	0.086	0.074	0.083
			30	10.5%	11.9%	12.7%	101.4%	6.7%	19.5%	4.6%	7.4%	10.5%	17.0%

Table 7 – Test results for polished as-built specimens with scan length = 78 mm (linear elastic slopes and forces).

Specimen	Displacement	ho	$\dot{\epsilon}_{SP}^{max}$	Slope _{ini}	F _{e, proj}	F _{e,int}	F _{h0/10,off}	F _{0.1mm,off}	F _{0.1mm}	F _{0.48mm}	F _{0.5mm}	F _{0.65mm}	F _{0.9mm}	Fm	F _{infl}	F _f
id	rate (mm/s)	(mm)	(s ⁻¹)	(N/mm)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)
SP8	0.0014	0.45	1.44E-03	3519.91	387.3	421.6	521.6	694.8	336.9	903.1	921.2	911.2	972.6	975.4	505.2	780.3
SP9	0.0014	0.45	1.44E-03	3278.01	453.6	495.0	577.5	721.5	334.5	868.3	870.6	939.4	1006.8	1010.7	970.1	808.5
SP10	0.0014	0.45	1.43E-03	2907.81	390.0	419.9	532.1	698.4	298.2	845.6	852.7	865.9	937.9	955.3	487.2	764.3
			Mean	3235.2	410.3	445.5	543.7	704.9	323.2	872.3	891.4	906.9	972.5	980.5	654.1	784.4
			5	308.286	37.534	42.895	29.705	14.482	21.680	28.996	35.128	30.395	28.143	28.013	273.751	22.411
			30	9.5%	9.1%	9.6%	5.5%	2.1%	6.7%	3.3%	3.9%	3.4%	2.9%	2.9%	41.8%	2.9%

Table 8 – Test results for polished as-built specimens with scan length = 78 mm (displacements and energies).

Specimen	Displacement	h _o	$\dot{\epsilon}_{SP}^{max}$	u _e	Uh0/10,off	U _{0.1mm,off}	U _{e1.5}	u _m	u _{infl}	u _f	E _{SP}	Em	E _{PL}
id	rate (mm/s)	(mm)	(s ⁻¹)	(mm)	(mm)	(mm)	(mm)	(mm)	(mm)	(mm)	(L)	(L)	(L)
SP8	0.0014	0.45	1.44E-03	0.120	0.194	0.298	0.328	0.861	1.624	1.250	0.98	0.63	0.49
SP9	0.0014	0.45	1.44E-03	0.151	0.221	0.321	0.311	0.893	1.010	1.271	1.01	0.66	0.50
SP10	0.0014	0.45	1.43E-03	0.144	0.228	0.340	0.399	0.976	1.611	1.351	1.03	0.70	0.54
			Mean	0.138	0.214	0.320	0.346	0.910	1.415	1.291	1.006	0.661	0.512
			SD.	0.016	0.018	0.021	0.047	0.059	0.351	0.053	0.026	0.036	0.027
			30	11.9%	8.5%	6.7%	13.5%	6.5%	24.8%	4.1%	2.6%	5.5%	5.3%

Test and analysis details for each of the tests performed on this group of specimens are provided in Annex 2 (rough) and Annex 3 (polished).

4.4. As-built, scan length = 26 mm

Test results for the rough specimens is presented in Tables 9 and 10, which describe elastic slope/forces and displacements/energies, respectively. Likewise, Tables 11 and 12 describe the equivalent measurements for the polished specimens.

Table 9 – Test results for rough as-built specimens with scan length = 26 mm (linear elastic slopes and forces).

Specimen	Displacement	ho	$\dot{\epsilon}_{SP}^{max}$	Slope _{el}	F _{e,proj}	F _{e,int}	F _{h0/10,off}	F _{0.1mm,off}	F _{0.1mm}	F _{0.48mm}	F _{0.5mm}	F _{0.65mm}	F _{0.9mm}	Fm	F _{infl}	F _f
id	rate (mm/s)	(mm)	(s ⁻¹)	(N/mm)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)
SP1	0.0009	0.51	1.03E-03	1876.53	398.1	408.4	643.2	787.6	188.5	745.2	770.4	920.4	1005.9	1093.5	1000.8	874.8
SP2	0.0010	0.50	1.04E-03	1860.63	449.1	457.0	673.4	831.5	186.6	758.0	777.1	939.1	1002.7	1158.1	630.8	926.5
SP4	0.0010	0.50	1.04E-03	1666.44	452.2	456.5	780.4	974.2	163.0	736.5	763.6	947.0	1060.2	1071.7	349.1	857.3
SP5	0.0010	0.49	1.04E-03	2016.45	383.2	393.2	612.4	785.9	198.4	774.2	799.9	921.8	1061.4	1107.0	740.2	885.6
SP6	0.0010	0.49	1.03E-03	1745.38	401.5	408.2	675.0	872.4	174.9	738.2	762.2	922.1	1003.1	1090.5	715.8	872.4
SP7	0.0011	0.49	1.04E-03	1752.85	364.6	370.9	637.4	832.6	172.4	725.1	742.0	915.6	1055.6	1088.0	634.4	870.4
			Mean	1819.7	408.1	415.7	670.3	847.4	180.6	746.2	769.2	927.7	1031.5	1101.5	678.5	881.2
			60	124.177	35.413	34.645	58.835	70.053	12.844	17.464	19.085	12.365	30.302	29.973	210.609	23.978
			30	6.8%	8.7%	8.3%	8.8%	8.3%	7.1%	2.3%	2.5%	1.3%	2.9%	2.7%	31.0%	2.7%

Table 10 – Test results for rough as-built specimens with scan length = 26 mm (displacements and energies).

Specimen	Displacement	h _o	$\dot{\epsilon}_{SP}^{max}$	u _e	U _{h0/10,off}	U _{0.1mm,off}	u _{e1.5}	u _m	u _{infl}	u _f	E _{SP}	Em	E _{PL}
id	rate (mm/s)	(mm)	(s ⁻¹)	(mm)	(mm)	(mm)	(mm)	(mm)	(mm)	(mm)	(L)	(L)	(L)
SP1	0.0009	0.51	1.03E-03	0.218	0.393	0.520	0.100	1.142	0.774	1.585	1.28	0.84	0.52
SP2	0.0010	0.50	1.04E-03	0.246	0.412	0.547	0.084	1.150	1.799	1.463	1.21	0.88	0.51
SP4	0.0010	0.50	1.04E-03	0.274	0.519	0.685	0.105	0.987	1.765	1.395	1.09	0.68	0.33
SP5	0.0010	0.49	1.04E-03	0.195	0.355	0.490	0.083	1.152	0.452	1.481	1.20	0.88	0.57
SP6	0.0010	0.49	1.03E-03	0.234	0.437	0.601	0.079	1.058	1.752	1.558	1.25	0.75	0.41
SP7	0.0011	0.49	1.04E-03	0.212	0.414	0.576	0.093	1.101	1.794	1.524	1.21	0.79	0.45
			Mean	0.230	0.422	0.570	0.091	1.098	1.389	1.501	1.208	0.801	0.467
			50	0.028	0.055	0.069	0.010	0.066	0.610	0.069	0.066	0.079	0.088
			30	12.2%	13.0%	12.1%	11.6%	6.0%	43.9%	4.6%	5.5%	9.8%	18.7%

Table 11 – Test results for polished as-built specimens with scan length = 26 mm (linear elastic slopes and forces).

Specimen	Displacement	h _o	$\dot{\epsilon}_{SP}^{max}$	Slope _{ini}	F _{e,proj}	F _{e,int}	F _{h0/10,off}	F _{0.1mm,off}	F _{0.1mm}	F _{0.48mm}	F _{0.5mm}	F _{0.65mm}	F _{0.9mm}	F _{ept}	F _{e1.5}	Fm	F _{infl}	Ff
id	rate (mm/s)	(mm)	(s ⁻¹)	(N/mm)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)
SP8	0.0014	0.45	1.44E-03	3010.25	418.2	454.3	558.7	705.8	310.4	853.6	875.2	956.3	934.8	81.4	760.3	968.0	515.4	774.4
SP9	0.0014	0.44	1.44E-03	2889.12	428.5	466.5	552.1	694.6	295.4	818.5	818.5	897.2	926.0	702.3	732.7	956.8	487.4	765.4
SP10	0.0014	0.45	1.45E-03	3283.40	363.6	404.3	522.6	688.9	317.7	880.6	898.1	949.1	962.4	430.5	658.3	981.3	76.1	785.1
			Mean	3060.9	403.4	441.7	544.4	696.4	307.8	850.9	866.8	939.7	939.5	404.8	717.1	968.7	359.6	775.0
			5	201.966	34.849	32.945	19.237	8.628	11.394	31.135	33.928	28.546	15.826	311.251	52.720	12.301	245.929	9.841
			50	6.6%	8.6%	7.5%	3.5%	1.2%	3.7%	3.7%	3.9%	3.0%	1.7%	76.9%	7.4%	1.3%	68.4%	1.3%

Table 12 – Test results for polished as-built specimens with scan length = 26 mm (displacements and energies).

Specimen	Displacement	ho	$\dot{\epsilon}_{SP}^{max}$	u _e	Uh0/10,off	U _{0.1mm,off}	U _{e1.5}	u _m	Uinfl	u _f	Esp	Em	E _{PL}
id	rate (mm/s)	(mm)	(s ⁻¹)	(mm)	(mm)	(mm)	(mm)	(mm)	(mm)	(mm)	(L)	(L)	(L)
SP8	0.0014	0.45	1.44E-03	0.151	0.231	0.335	0.379	0.680	1.661	1.245	0.95	0.44	0.28
SP9	0.0014	0.44	1.44E-03	0.161	0.236	0.341	0.372	0.844	1.631	1.232	0.91	0.57	0.42
SP10	0.0014	0.45	1.45E-03	0.123	0.205	0.310	0.294	0.818	0.018	1.219	0.94	0.58	0.43
			Mean	0.145	0.224	0.329	0.348	0.780	1.103	1.232	0.934	0.531	0.377
			50	0.020	0.017	0.016	0.047	0.088	0.940	0.013	0.021	0.080	0.082
			30	13.6%	7.5%	5.0%	13.6%	11.3%	85.2%	1.1%	2.2%	15.1%	21.8%

Test and analysis details for each of the tests performed on this group of specimens are provided in Annex 4 (rough) and Annex 5 (polished).

4.5. Non-standard (800 °C) HIP, scan length = 78 mm

Test results for the rough specimens is presented in Tables 13 and 14, which describe elastic slope/forces and displacements/energies, respectively. Likewise, Tables 15 and 16 describe the equivalent measurements for the polished specimens.

Table 13 - Test results for rough specimens with non-standard HIP and scan length = 26 mm (linear elastic slopes and forces).

Specimen	Displacement	ho	$\dot{\epsilon}_{SP}^{max}$	Slope _{el}	F _{e,proj}	F _{e,int}	Fh0/10,off	F _{0.1mm,off}	F _{0.1mm}	F _{0.48mm}	F _{0.5mm}	F _{0.65mm}	F _{0.9mm}	Fm	F _{infl}	F _f
id	rate (mm/s)	(mm)	(s ⁻¹)	(N/mm)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)
SP1	0.0009	0.49	1.00E-03	1958.20	443.2	455.3	691.4	868.9	202.7	790.4	815.5	959.6	1032.8	1082.5	468.1	866.0
SP2	0.0010	0.50	1.01E-03	2210.27	445.7	460.3	630.4	761.0	228.5	803.0	820.2	938.4	1020.1	1068.2	628.6	854.6
SP4	0.0010	0.49	1.01E-03	1801.57	487.1	492.4	663.9	828.7	179.3	737.4	765.0	915.6	1126.4	1157.1	590.9	925.7
SP5	0.0010	0.50	1.02E-03	1639.54	428.9	438.4	677.5	817.2	164.1	692.9	714.6	879.5	1054.7	1106.8	577.5	885.4
SP6	0.0010	0.51	1.04E-03	1754.55	436.8	447.0	658.3	845.0	173.6	722.7	747.9	927.5	1056.0	1070.9	565.7	856.7
SP7	0.0011	0.49	1.02E-03	1754.55	472.8	447.0	781.3	904.7	194.5	763.6	786.6	930.1	1093.5	1131.1	960.9	904.9
			Mean	1853.1	452.4	456.7	683.8	837.6	190.5	751.7	774.9	925.1	1063.9	1102.8	632.0	882.2
			SD.	203.128	22.560	19.048	51.957	48.816	23.321	41.878	40.725	26.722	39.555	35.741	169.768	28.593
			30	11.0%	5.0%	4.2%	7.6%	5.8%	12.2%	5.6%	5.3%	2.9%	3.7%	3.2%	26.9%	3.2%

Table 14 - Test results for rough specimens	with non-standard HIP	and scan length = 26	mm
(displacements and energies).			

Specimen	Displacement	h _o	$\dot{\epsilon}_{SP}^{max}$	u _e	u _{h0/10,off}	U _{0.1mm,off}	U _{e1.5}	u _m	u _{infl}	u _f	E _{SP}	Em	E _{PL}
id	rate (mm/s)	(mm)	(s ⁻¹)	(mm)	(mm)	(mm)	(mm)	(mm)	(mm)	(mm)	(L)	(L)	(L)
SP1	0.0009	0.49	1.00E-03	0.232	0.404	0.544	-0.025	0.822	1.734	1.335	1.05	0.54	0.24
SP2	0.0010	0.50	1.01E-03	0.208	0.336	0.445	0.060	1.074	0.332	1.533	1.25	0.80	0.54
SP4	0.0010	0.49	1.01E-03	0.273	0.419	0.560	0.119	0.946	1.731	1.458	1.20	0.65	0.28
SP5	0.0010	0.50	1.02E-03	0.267	0.464	0.598	0.086	1.038	1.766	1.371	1.05	0.71	0.34
SP6	0.0010	0.51	1.04E-03	0.255	0.426	0.582	0.108	0.917	1.782	1.413	1.09	0.60	0.27
SP7	0.0011	0.49	1.02E-03	0.255	0.495	0.616	0.091	1.115	1.422	1.476	1.22	0.84	0.48
			Mean	0.248	0.424	0.558	0.073	0.985	1.461	1.431	1.144	0.690	0.358
			60	0.024	0.055	0.061	0.052	0.110	0.569	0.073	0.089	0.118	0.124
			30	9.7%	12.9%	10.9%	71.5%	11.2%	39.0%	5.1%	7.8%	17.1%	34.6%

Table 15 - Test results for polished specimens with non-standard HIP and scan length = 26 mm (linear elastic slopes and forces).

Specimen	Displacement	h _o	$\dot{\epsilon}_{SP}^{max}$	Slope _{ini}	F _{e, proj}	F _{e,int}	F _{h0/10,off}	F _{0.1mm,off}	F _{0.1mm}	F _{0.48mm}	F _{0.5mm}	F _{0.65mm}	F _{0.9mm}	Fm	F _{infl}	F _f
id	rate (mm/s)	(mm)	(s ⁻¹)	(N/mm)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)
SP7	0.0014	0.45	1.44E-03	3521.07	431.3	473.5	559.8	698.0	348.9	874.7	890.4	922.1	1005.9	1013.5	988.7	810.8
SP8	0.0014	0.44	1.44E-03	2983.80	381.2	413.1	513.8	661.1	298.0	832.4	850.4	961.4	918.9	963.9	592.8	771.1
SP9	0.0014	0.44	1.43E-03	3115.09	393.2	426.2	528.3	656.9	317.5	833.0	853.6	967.8	916.7	971.8	623.1	777.4
SP10	0.0014	0.44	1.43E-03	3258.38	348.2	381.0	484.1	630.0	314.7	854.8	874.9	917.2	989.1	996.4	686.5	797.1
			Mean	3219.6	388.5	423.4	521.5	661.5	319.8	848.7	871.9	938.1	967.3	986.4	722.8	789.1
			50	230.154	34.326	38.373	31.487	27.941	21.276	20.176	19.307	24.342	45.744	22.768	181.546	18.215
		I	50	7.1%	8.8%	9.1%	6.0%	4.2%	6.7%	2.4%	2.2%	2.6%	4.7%	2.3%	25.1%	2.3%

Table 16 - Test results for polished specimens with non-standard HIP and scan length = 26 mm (displacements and energies).

Specimen	Displacement	ho	$\dot{\epsilon}_{SP}^{max}$	u _e	Uh0/10,off	U _{0.1mm,off}	U _{e1.5}	u _m	u _{infl}	u _f	E _{SP}	Em	E _{PL}
id	rate (mm/s)	(mm)	(s ⁻¹)	(mm)	(mm)	(mm)	(mm)	(mm)	(mm)	(mm)	(L)	(L)	(L)
SP7	0.0014	0.45	1.44E-03	0.134	0.205	0.299	0.219	0.885	1.026	1.278	1.03	0.66	0.51
SP8	0.0014	0.44	1.44E-03	0.138	0.217	0.322	0.334	0.654	1.666	1.404	1.05	0.40	0.25
SP9	0.0014	0.44	1.43E-03	0.137	0.214	0.311	0.381	0.691	1.662	1.475	1.14	0.44	0.29
SP10	0.0014	0.44	1.43E-03	0.117	0.193	0.294	0.265	0.900	1.416	1.306	1.02	0.64	0.49
			Mean	0.132	0.207	0.306	0.300	0.782	1.442	1.366	1.061	0.538	0.387
			SD.	0.010	0.011	0.012	0.072	0.128	0.301	0.090	0.055	0.133	0.136
			30	7.6%	5.2%	4.1%	24.1%	16.4%	20.9%	6.6%	5.1%	24.8%	35.3%

Test and analysis details for each of the tests performed on this group of specimens are provided in Annex 6 (rough) and Annex 7 (polished).

4.6. Standard (900 °C) HIP, scan length = 78 mm

Six rough specimens and four polished specimens were tested. Results are shown in Table 17 (elastic slopes and forces) and Table 18 (displacements and energies) for rough specimens, and Table 19 (elastic slopes and forces) and Table 20 (displacements and energies) for polished specimens.

Table 17 - Test results for rough specimens with standard HIP and scan length = 78 mm (linear elastic slopes and forces).

Specimen	Displacement	ho	έ ^{max}	Slope _{el}	F _{e,proj}	F _{e,int}	F _{h0/10,off}	F _{0.1mm,off}	F _{0.1mm}	F _{0.48mm}	F _{0.5mm}	F _{0.65mm}	F _{0.9mm}	Fm	F _{infl}	F _f
id	rate (mm/s)	(mm)	(s ⁻¹)	(N/mm)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)
SP2	0.0009	0.51	1.02E-03	2099.36	401.3	417.4	583.9	720.0	207.5	762.7	784.5	918.6	1071.1	1123.6	650.9	898.9
SP3	0.0010	0.50	1.01E-03	1839.49	415.5	420.7	609.6	766.2	189.0	729.5	748.0	917.2	1037.6	1095.6	731.2	876.5
SP4	0.0010	0.55	1.00E-03	825.63	345.3	344.0	1011.2	1004.9	82.4	391.9	410.4	521.4	743.9	1022.4	5.0	817.9
SP5	0.0010	0.51	1.01E-03	1987.01	342.7	350.8	539.8	723.3	201.3	748.8	773.6	958.5	1047.8	1085.0	577.3	868.0
SP7	0.0010	0.51	1.02E-03	2057.23	447.6	457.9	662.2	792.1	211.6	791.3	810.9	946.7	1090.2	1112.3	515.1	889.9
SP8	0.0011	0.52	1.01E-03	2064.56	358.3	371.4	595.4	781.4	209.2	787.7	809.0	983.9	1042.8	1067.5	486.6	854.0
			Mean	1812.2	385.1	393.7	667.0	798.0	183.5	702.0	722.7	874.4	1005.6	1084.4	494.3	867.5
			SD.	492.099	42.872	45.216	173.226	105.646	50.196	153.698	154.800	174.744	129.710	36.274	255.897	29.019
			30	27.2%	11.1%	11.5%	26.0%	13.2%	27.4%	21.9%	21.4%	20.0%	12.9%	3.3%	51.8%	3.3%

Table 18 - Test results for rough specimens with standard HIP and scan length = 78 mm (displacements and energies).

Specimen	Displacement	ho	$\dot{\varepsilon}_{SP}^{max}$	u _e	u _{h0/10,off}	U _{0.1mm,off}	U _{e1.5}	u _m	u _{infl}	u _f	E _{SP}	Em	E _{PL}
id	rate (mm/s)	(mm)	(s ⁻¹)	(mm)	(mm)	(mm)	(mm)	(mm)	(mm)	(mm)	(L)	(L)	(L)
SP2	0.0009	0.51	1.02E-03	0.199	0.328	0.444	0.064	1.091	1.748	1.450	1.18	0.81	0.51
SP3	0.0010	0.50	1.01E-03	0.229	0.383	0.517	0.082	1.094	0.483	1.567	1.28	0.79	0.47
SP4	0.0010	0.55	1.00E-03	0.417	1.276	1.320	0.176	1.267	-0.107	1.653	1.02	0.66	0.03
SP5	0.0010	0.51	1.01E-03	0.177	0.322	0.465	0.064	0.837	1.742	1.463	1.17	0.54	0.24
SP7	0.0010	0.51	1.02E-03	0.223	0.373	0.485	0.066	0.870	0.268	1.525	1.25	0.59	0.29
SP8	0.0011	0.52	1.01E-03	0.180	0.339	0.479	0.066	0.950	1.747	1.337	1.05	0.67	0.39
			Mean	0.237	0.504	0.618	0.086	1.018	0.980	1.499	1.158	0.678	0.322
			60	0.090	0.379	0.345	0.044	0.163	0.860	0.109	0.104	0.108	0.176
			30	38.1%	75.3%	55.7%	51.4%	16.0%	87.7%	7.2%	9.0%	16.0%	54.7%

Table 19 - Test results for polished specimens with standard HIP and scan length = 78 mm (linear elastic slopes and forces).

Specimen	Displacement	ho	$\dot{\epsilon}_{SP}^{max}$	Slope _{ini}	F _{e,proj}	F _{e,int}	F _{h0/10,off}	F _{0.1mm,off}	F _{0.1mm}	F _{0.48mm}	F _{0.5mm}	F _{0.65mm}	F _{0.9mm}	Fm	F _{infl}	F _f
id	rate (mm/s)	(mm)	(s ⁻¹)	(N/mm)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)
SP9	0.0014	0.45	1.43E-03	2910.50	414.0	438.5	568.5	715.2	301.3	877.3	898.4	938.6	1015.8	1031.9	622.9	825.5
SP10	0.0014	0.46	1.44E-03	3178.87	357.8	385.1	496.9	656.5	311.3	869.2	881.3	971.0	1074.2	1081.8	573.1	865.4
			Mean	3044.7	385.9	411.8	532.7	685.9	306.3	873.2	889.8	954.8	1045.0	1056.8	598.0	845.5
			50	189.766	39.775	37.792	50.614	41.524	7.047	5.735	12.130	22.911	41.296	35.293	35.269	28.234
			30	6.2%	10.3%	9.2%	9.5%	6.1%	2.3%	0.7%	1.4%	2.4%	4.0%	3.3%	5.9%	3.3%

Table 20 - Test results for polished specimens with standard HIP and scan length = 78 mm (displacements and energies).

Specimen	Displacement	ho	$\dot{\epsilon}_{SP}^{max}$	u _e	Uh0/10,off	U _{0.1mm,off}	u _{e1.5}	u _m	u _{infl}	u _f	E _{SP}	Em	E _{PL}
id	rate (mm/s)	(mm)	(s ⁻¹)	(mm)	(mm)	(mm)	(mm)	(mm)	(mm)	(mm)	(L)	(L)	(L)
SP9	0.0014	0.45	1.43E-03	0.151	0.241	0.347	0.391	0.955	1.663	1.448	1.18	0.71	0.53
SP10	0.0014	0.46	1.44E-03	0.121	0.203	0.307	0.354	0.891	1.676	1.306	1.07	0.66	0.47
			Mean	0.136	0.222	0.327	0.373	0.923	1.669	1.377	1.126	0.685	0.502
			SD.	0.021	0.026	0.028	0.026	0.045	0.010	0.100	0.079	0.038	0.039
			30	15.4%	11.9%	8.7%	7.1%	4.9%	0.6%	7.3%	7.0%	5.6%	7.7%

Test and analysis details for each of the tests performed on this group of specimens are provided in Annex 8 (rough) and Annex 9 (polished).

4.7. Standard (900 °C) HIP, scan length = 26 mm

Test results for the rough specimens is presented in Tables 21 and 22, which describe elastic slope/forces and displacements/energies, respectively. Likewise, Tables 23 and 24 describe the equivalent measurements for the polished specimens.

Table 21 - Test results for rough specimens with standard HIP and scan length = 26 mm (linear elastic slopes and forces).

Specimen	Displacement	h _o	$\dot{\epsilon}_{SP}^{max}$	Slope _{ini}	F _{e,proj}	F _{e,int}	F _{h0/10,off}	F _{0.1mm,off}	F _{0.1mm}	F _{0.48mm}	F _{0.5mm}	F _{0.65mm}	F _{0.9mm}	Fm	F _{infl}	F _f
id	rate (mm/s)	(mm)	(s ⁻¹)	(N/mm)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)
SP1	0.0011	0.49	1.10E-03	1685.886	343.4	356.2	595.2	759.3	176.4	682.5	710.3	880.1	1035.2	1121.8	584.1	897.5
SP2	0.0012	0.49	1.17E-03	1482.609	412.2	420.5	668.2	920.9	146.5	641.9	668.0	844.5	1062.3	1085.3		868.2
SP3	0.0011	0.50	1.14E-03	1615.912	371.8	383.3	584.3	743.4	157.2	663.6	691.1	838.0	1046.7	1097.0	1083.1	877.6
SP4	0.0012	0.49	1.16E-03	1821.886	369.8	379.0	580.9	724.9	187.2	704.5	724.9	860.5	1049.7	1094.2	688.8	875.4
SP5	0.0012	0.48	1.17E-03	1641.543	381.6	390.5	573.8	715.8	162.4	662.9	679.5	828.5	1026.5	1071.5	46.1	857.2
SP6	0.0012	0.50	1.15E-03	1952.197	410.2	423.9	590.8	712.0	200.5	728.9	753.7	902.6	1027.1	1057.0	632.8	845.6
			Mean	1700.006	381.5	392.2	598.9	762.7	171.7	680.7	704.6	859.0	1041.3	1087.8	607.0	870.2
				165.170	26.249	25.916	34.762	79.509	20.112	31.655	31.632	28.027	14.132	22.394	370.515	17.915
			SD	9.7%	6.9%	6.6%	5.8%	10.4%	11.7%	4.7%	4.5%	3.3%	1.4%	2.1%	61.0%	2.1%

Table 22 - Test results for rough specimens with standard HIP and scan length = 26 mm (displacements and energies).

Specimen	Displacement	h _o	$\dot{\epsilon}_{SP}^{max}$	u _e	u _{h0/10,off}	U _{0.1mm,off}	u _{e1.5}	u _m	u _{infl}	u _f	E _{SP}	Em	E _{PL}
id	rate (mm/s)	(mm)	(s ⁻¹)	(mm)	(mm)	(mm)	(mm)	(mm)	(mm)	(mm)	(L)	(L)	(L)
SP1	0.0011	0.49	1.10E-03	0.211	0.403	0.552	0.042	1.201	0.389	1.491	1.18	0.89	0.51
SP2	0.0012	0.49	1.17E-03	0.284	0.501	0.721	0.057	0.924		1.799	1.44	0.56	0.16
SP3	0.0011	0.50	1.14E-03	0.237	0.412	0.561	0.082	1.213	1.131	1.726	1.39	0.88	0.50
SP4	0.0012	0.49	1.16E-03	0.208	0.369	0.498	0.114	1.238	2.005	1.800	1.49	0.92	0.60
SP5	0.0012	0.48	1.17E-03	0.238	0.400	0.536	0.078	1.146	0.014	1.733	1.38	0.80	0.45
SP6	0.0012	0.50	1.15E-03	0.217	0.353	0.465	0.559	0.948	1.994	1.708	1.38	0.63	0.34
			Mean	0.233	0.406	0.555	0.155	1.112	1.107	1.709	1.38	0.78	0.43
			60	0.028	0.052	0.089	0.199	0.140	0.909	0.114	0.105	0.150	0.154
			30	12.1%	12.7%	16.0%	128.1%	12.6%	82.1%	6.6%	7.6%	19.3%	36.0%

Table 23 - Test results for polished specimens with standard HIP and scan length = 26 mm (linear elastic slopes and forces).

Specimen	Displacement	ho	$\dot{\epsilon}_{SP}^{max}$	Slope _{ini}	F _{e,proj}	F _{e,int}	F _{h0/10,off}	F _{0.1mm,off}	F _{0.1mm}	F _{0.48mm}	F _{0.5mm}	F _{0.65mm}	F _{0.9mm}	Fm	F _{infl}	F _f
id	rate (mm/s)	(mm)	(s ⁻¹)	(N/mm)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)
SP7	0.0014	0.45	1.44E-03	3201.67	373.5	397.2	522.2	653.3	309.9	870.1	882.4	965.2	918.4	992.2	593.6	793.7
SP8	0.0014	0.46	1.43E-03	3288.00	372.2	402.0	515.6	660.5	324.6	882.8	902.5	1026.6	1079.7	1091.8	559.0	873.4
SP9	0.0015	0.45	1.46E-03	2989.78	373.8	406.2	531.7	690.7	300.6	882.8	915.7	961.6	969.8	995.9	509.4	796.7
SP10	0.0014	0.45	1.44E-03	2849.28	434.7	467.2	595.3	748.0	293.0	872.8	878.4	921.6	1033.5	1040.8	967.1	832.7
			Mean	2919.5	404.3	436.7	563.5	719.3	296.8	877.8	894.8	968.8	1000.3	1018.4	738.3	814.7
			60	99.345	43.068	43.075	44.949	40.531	5.429	7.055	17.491	43.314	70.800	31.765	323.589	25.412
			50	3.4%	10.7%	9.9%	8.0%	5.6%	1.8%	0.8%	2.0%	4.5%	7.1%	3.1%	43.8%	3.1%

Table 24 - Test results for polished specimens with standard HIP and scan length = 26 mm (displacements and energies).

Specimen	Displacement	ho	$\dot{\epsilon}_{SP}^{max}$	u _e	U _{h0/10,off}	U _{0.1mm,off}	U _{e1.5}	u _m	u _{infl}	u _f	E _{SP}	Em	E _{PL}
id	rate (mm/s)	(mm)	(s ⁻¹)	(mm)	(mm)	(mm)	(mm)	(mm)	(mm)	(mm)	(L)	(L)	(L)
SP7	0.0014	0.45	1.44E-03	0.124	0.209	0.305	0.269	0.618	1.667	1.369	1.05	0.38	0.23
SP8	0.0014	0.46	1.43E-03	0.122	0.203	0.302	0.357	0.832	1.487	1.273	1.06	0.62	0.43
SP9	0.0015	0.45	1.46E-03	0.136	0.223	0.333	0.380	0.558	1.648	1.323	1.04	0.32	0.16
SP10	0.0014	0.45	1.44E-03	0.164	0.254	0.364	0.457	0.899	0.707	1.356	1.09	0.65	0.46
			Mean	0.150	0.238	0.348	0.418	0.728	1.177	1.340	1.062	0.489	0.311
			60	0.020	0.022	0.022	0.054	0.242	0.665	0.023	0.034	0.232	0.215
			30	13.2%	9.2%	6.3%	13.0%	33.2%	56.5%	1.7%	3.2%	47.4%	69.1%

Test and analysis details for each of the tests performed on this group of specimens are provided in Annex 10 (rough) and Annex 11 (polished).

4.8. Non-standard (1050 °C) + additional (800 °C) HIP, scan length = 78 mm

Test results for the rough specimens is presented in Tables 25 and 26, which describe elastic slope/forces and displacements/energies, respectively. Likewise, Tables 27 and 28 describe the equivalent measurements for the polished specimens.

Table 25 - Test results for rough specimens with standard + additional HIP and scan length = 78 mm (linear elastic slopes and forces).

Specimen	Displacement	h ₀	$\dot{\epsilon}_{SP}^{max}$	Slope _{ini}	F _{e,proj}	F _{e,int}	F _{h0/10,off}	F _{0.1mm,off}	F _{0.1mm}	F _{0.48mm}	F _{0.5mm}	F _{0.65mm}	F _{0.9mm}	Fm	F _{infl}	F _f
id	rate (mm/s)	(mm)	(s ⁻¹)	(N/mm)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)
SP1	0.0010	0.47	1.04E-03	2139.702	407.3	420.1	576.8	703.8	218.3	768.0	791.8	932.3	1126.7	1192.9	702.3	954.3
SP2	0.0011	0.48	1.07E-03	2011.628	365.1	377.5	570.1	732.7	207.9	748.0	779.8	931.9	1138.0	1194.5	1189.5	955.6
SP4	0.0011	0.49	1.07E-03	1844.336	456.7	465.1	646.7	771.7	182.3	731.7	753.7	910.0	1138.2	1230.4	714.9	984.3
SP5	0.0011	0.49	1.08E-03	1930.462	475.7	485.1	644.0	765.3	196.2	748.9	772.8	928.4	1162.1	1225.3	61.4	980.2
SP6	0.0011	0.48	1.11E-03	1918.267	414.5	430.1	594.2	713.8	193.2	724.3	747.6	901.9	1106.7	1156.0	901.5	924.8
SP7	0.0011	0.47	1.04E-03	1874.916	380.2	393.6	604.0	742.3	191.4	732.4	752.2	912.0	1122.9	1196.6	678.8	957.2
			Mean	1953.218	416.6	428.6	606.0	738.3	198.2	742.2	766.3	919.4	1132.4	1199.3	708.1	959.4
			SD.	107.623	42.811	41.099	32.814	27.146	12.817	15.961	17.816	13.055	18.590	26.767	371.000	21.413
			30	5.5%	10.3%	9.6%	5.4%	3.7%	6.5%	2.2%	2.3%	1.4%	1.6%	2.2%	52.4%	2.2%

Table 26 - Test results for rough specimens with standard + additional HIP and scan length = 78 mm (displacements and energies).

Specimen	Displacement	h _o	$\dot{\epsilon}_{SP}^{max}$	u _e	U _{h0/10,off}	U _{0.1mm,off}	u _{e1.5}	u _m	u _{infl}	u _f	E _{SP}	Em	E _{PL}
id	rate (mm/s)	(mm)	(s ⁻¹)	(mm)	(mm)	(mm)	(mm)	(mm)	(mm)	(mm)	(L)	(L)	(L)
SP1	0.0010	0.47	1.04E-03	0.196	0.320	0.430	0.104	1.066	1.760	1.498	1.29	0.81	0.48
SP2	0.0011	0.48	1.07E-03	0.188	0.335	0.465	0.072	1.071	1.077	1.458	1.23	0.80	0.45
SP4	0.0011	0.49	1.07E-03	0.252	0.401	0.519	0.096	1.065	1.831	1.560	1.34	0.79	0.38
SP5	0.0011	0.49	1.08E-03	0.251	0.385	0.496	0.066	1.005	0.027	1.524	1.32	0.74	0.35
SP6	0.0011	0.48	1.11E-03	0.224	0.360	0.472	0.075	1.002	0.649	1.628	1.36	0.71	0.36
SP7	0.0011	0.47	1.04E-03	0.210	0.372	0.496	0.082	1.023	1.843	1.412	1.14	0.73	0.35
			Mean	0.220	0.362	0.480	0.083	1.039	1.198	1.513	1.28	0.76	0.39
			SD.	0.027	0.031	0.031	0.015	0.032	0.751	0.076	0.083	0.043	0.055
			30	12.4%	8.5%	6.5%	17.7%	3.1%	62.7%	5.0%	6.5%	5.7%	14.1%

Table 27 - Test results for polished specimens with standard + additional HIP and scan length = 78 mm (linear elastic slopes and forces).

Specimen	Displacement	h _o	$\dot{\epsilon}_{SP}^{max}$	Slope _{ini}	F _{e,proj}	F _{e,int}	F _{h0/10,off}	F _{0.1mm,off}	F _{0.1mm}	F _{0.48mm}	F _{0.5mm}	F _{0.65mm}	F _{0.9mm}	Fm	F _{infl}	F _f
id	rate (mm/s)	(mm)	(s ⁻¹)	(N/mm)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)
SP8	0.0014	0.43	1.43E-03	2957.72	367.2	392.6	490.5	657.8	295.8	833.8	859.5	975.0	999.1	1023.0	849.4	818.4
SP9	0.0015	0.46	1.47E-03	3214.86	418.1	453.3	576.1	713.0	321.2	908.7	920.9	1039.7	1045.0	1064.1	545.6	851.3
SP10	0.0015	0.44	1.46E-03	3294.63	403.9	436.2	549.7	691.2	325.1	904.6	926.6	1069.5	1024.2	1096.7	895.1	877.4
			Mean	3254.7	411.0	444.7	562.9	702.1	323.1	906.7	902.3	1028.1	1022.8	1080.4	720.4	864.3
			SD.	56.403	10.033	12.074	18.685	15.372	2.758	2.886	37.219	48.302	22.945	23.017	247.087	18.413
			30	1.7%	2.4%	2.7%	3.3%	2.2%	0.9%	0.3%	4.1%	4.7%	2.2%	2.1%	34.3%	2.1%

Table 28 - Test results for polished specimens with standard + additional HIP and scan length = 78 mm (displacements and energies).

Spe	cimen	Displacement	h ₀	$\dot{\epsilon}_{SP}^{max}$	u _e	Uh0/10,off	U _{0.1mm,off}	U _{e1.5}	u _m	u _{infl}	u _f	E _{SP}	Em	E _{PL}
	id	rate (mm/s)	(mm)	(s ⁻¹)	(mm)	(mm)	(mm)	(mm)	(mm)	(mm)	(mm)	(L)	(L)	(L)
	SP8	0.0014	0.43	1.43E-03	0.133	0.209	0.323	0.386	0.761	1.174	1.260	0.97	0.51	0.33
9	SP9	0.0015	0.46	1.47E-03	0.141	0.226	0.322	0.342	0.719	1.614	1.242	1.02	0.51	0.33
S	P10	0.0015	0.44	1.46E-03	0.132	0.211	0.311	0.282	0.693	0.470	1.109	0.89	0.48	0.30
				Mean	0.137	0.219	0.316	0.312	0.706	1.042	1.176	0.958	0.494	0.315
				50	0.006	0.011	0.008	0.043	0.019	0.809	0.094	0.089	0.019	0.023
				30	4.4%	4.9%	2.5%	13.8%	2.6%	77.6%	8.0%	9.3%	3.8%	7.4%

Test and analysis details for each of the tests performed on this group of specimens are provided in Annex 12 (rough) and Annex 13 (polished).

4.9. Comparison between different conditions (non-supported specimens)

4.9.1. rough specimens

Average values and standard deviations (absolute and relative) for the various characteristic parameters of the different conditions examined (excluding the preliminary tests) are compared in Table 29 (elastic slopes and forces) and Table 30 (displacements and energies).

Table 29 – Average	values	and	standard	deviations	for	rough	specimens	in	the	different
conditions (elastic slop	pes and	forc	es).							

Material	Scan	Displacement	Slope _{ini}	F _{e,proj}	F _{e,int}	F _{h0/10,off}	F _{0.1mm,off}	F _{0.1mm}	F _{0.48mm}	F _{0.5mm}	F _{0.65mm}	F _{0.9mm}	Fm	F _{infl}	F _f
condition	length (mm)	rate (mm/s)	(N/mm)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)
			2727.595	433.4	456.2	643.7	804.2	282.8	889.3	909.0	1003.6	1067.4	1083.9	745.6	867.1
	78	0.001	338.711	64.9	73.0	45.5	45.7	<i>38.7</i>	45.1	43.7	29.9	29.5	25.0	149.0	20.0
Ac Built			12.4%	15.0%	16.0%	7.1%	5.7%	13.7%	5.1%	4.8%	3.0%	2.8%	2.3%	20.0%	2.3%
AS-Duilt			1819.712	408.1	415.7	670.3	847.4	180.6	746.2	769.2	927.7	1031.5	1101.5	678.5	881.2
	26	0.001	124.177	35.4	34.6	58.8	70.1	12.8	17.5	19.1	12.4	30.3	30.0	210.6	24.0
			6.8%	8.7%	8.3%	8.8%	8.3%	7.1%	2.3%	2.5%	1.3%	2.9%	2.7%	31.0%	2.7%
шр			1853.112	452.4	456.7	683.8	837.6	190.5	751.7	774.9	925.1	1063.9	1102.8	632.0	882.2
000 °C	78	0.001	203.128	22.6	19.0	52.0	48.8	23.3	41.9	40.7	26.7	39.6	35.7	169.8	28.6
800 C			11.0%	5.0%	4.2%	7.6%	5.8%	12.2%	5.6%	5.3%	2.9%	3.7%	3.2%	26.9%	3.2%
			1812.213	385.1	393.7	667.0	798.0	183.5	702.0	722.7	874.4	1005.6	1084.4	494.3	867.5
	78	0.001	492.099	42.9	45.2	173.2	105.6	50.2	153.7	154.8	174.7	129.7	36.3	255.9	29.0
HIP			27.2%	11.1%	11.5%	26.0%	13.2%	27.4%	21.9%	21.4%	20.0%	12.9%	3.3%	51.8%	3.3%
900 °C			1700.006	381.5	392.2	598.9	762.7	171.7	680.7	704.6	859.0	1041.3	1087.8	607.0	870.2
	26	0.001	165.170	26.2	25.9	34.8	79.5	20.1	31.7	31.6	28.0	14.1	22.4	370.5	17.9
			9.7%	6.9%	6.6%	5.8%	10.4%	11.7%	4.7%	4.5%	3.3%	1.4%	2.1%	61.0%	2.1%
HIP			1953.218	416.6	428.6	606.0	738.3	198.2	742.2	766.3	919.4	1132.4	1199.3	708.1	959.4
1050 °C +	78	0.001	107.623	42.8	41.1	32.8	27.1	12.8	16.0	17.8	13.1	18.6	26.8	371.0	21.4
800 °C			5.5%	10.3%	9.6%	5.4%	3.7%	6.5%	2.2%	2.3%	1.4%	1.6%	2.2%	52.4%	2.2%

Table 30 – Average values and standard deviations for rough specimens in the different conditions (displacements and energies).

Material	Scan	Displacement	u _e	Uh0/10,off	u _{0.1mm,off}	u _{e1.5}	u _m	u _{infl}	u _f	Esp	Em	E _{PL}
condition	length (mm)	rate (mm/s)	(mm)	(mm)	(mm)	(mm)	(mm)	(mm)	(mm)	(J)	(L)	(L)
			0.167	0.290	0.401	0.189	0.928	1.494	1.387	1.16	0.71	0.49
	78	0.001	0.018	0.035	0.051	0.192	0.062	0.292	0.064	0.09	0.07	0.08
			1.8%	3.5%	5.1%	19.2%	6.7%	29.2%	4.6%	7.4%	10.5%	17.0%
AS-DUIIL			0.230	0.422	0.570	0.091	1.098	1.389	1.501	1.21	0.80	0.47
	26	0.001	0.028	0.055	0.069	0.010	0.066	0.610	0.069	0.07	0.08	0.09
			12.2%	13.0%	12.1%	11.6%	6.0%	43.9%	4.6%	5.5%	9.8%	18.7%
шр			0.248	0.424	0.558	0.073	0.985	1.461	1.431	1.14	0.69	0.36
ПIР 900 °C	78	0.001	0.024	0.055	0.061	0.052	0.110	0.569	0.073	0.09	0.12	0.12
800 C			9.7%	12.9%	10.9%	71.5%	11.2%	39.0%	5.1%	7.8%	17.1%	34.6%
			0.237	0.504	0.618	0.086	1.018	0.980	1.499	1.16	0.68	0.32
	78	0.001	0.090	0.379	0.345	0.044	0.163	0.860	0.109	0.10	0.11	0.18
HIP			38.1%	75.3%	55.7%	51.4%	16.0%	87.7%	7.2%	9.0%	16.0%	54.7%
900 °C			0.233	0.406	0.555	0.155	1.112	1.107	1.709	1.38	0.78	0.43
	26	0.001	0.028	0.052	0.089	0.199	0.140	0.909	0.114	0.10	0.15	0.15
			12.1%	12.7%	16.0%	128.1%	12.6%	82.1%	6.6%	7.6%	19.3%	36.0%
HIP			0.220	0.362	0.480	0.083	1.039	1.198	1.513	1.28	0.76	0.39
1050 °C +	78	0.001	0.027	0.031	0.031	0.015	0.032	0.751	0.076	0.08	0.04	0.06
800 °C			12.4%	8.5%	6.5%	17.7%	3.1%	62.7%	5.0%	6.5%	5.7%	14.1%

Comparisons in terms of $F_{e,proj}$ and F_m are illustrated in Fig. 9 and Fig. 10, respectively. Considering that $F_{e,proj}$ is directly proportional to the yield strength and F_m is directly proportional to the ultimate tensile strength, the condition which exhibited the best combination of tensile properties, in terms of high values and low standard deviations, corresponds to the non-standard HIP treatment (800 °C) with scan length = 78 mm. A decrease in scan length (from 78 mm to 26 mm) appears to have a minor influence on both lower yield strength and ultimate tensile strength, as can be observed for the as-built and standard HIP conditions.



Figure 9 - Average values and standard deviations for $F_{e,proj}$.



Figure 10 - Average values and standard deviations for $F_{\rm m}$.

4.9.2. Polished specimens

Average values and standard deviations (absolute and relative) for the various characteristic parameters of the different conditions examined (excluding the preliminary tests) are compared in Table 31 (elastic slopes and forces) and Table 32 (displacements and energies).

Material	Scan	Supported	Displacement	Slope	E	E. int	Eng/10 +#	Fo. 1	Form	Former	Form	Former	Farmer	E.,	Fine	E.
condition	length	(Y/N)	rate (mm/s)	(N/mm)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)
condition	lengen	(1/11)	1000 (1111) 5)	3235.245	410.3	445.5	543.7	704.9	323.2	872.3	891.4	906.9	972.5	980.5	654.1	784.4
	78	N	0.0014	308 286	37 534	42 895	29 705	14 482	21 680	28 996	35 128	30 395	28 143	28 013	273 751	22 411
				9.5%	9.1%	9.6%	5 5%	2.1%	6.7%	3 3%	3.9%	3.4%	2.9%	2.9%	41.8%	2.9%
As-Built				3060.926	403.4	441.7	544.4	696.4	307.8	850.9	866.8	939.7	939.5	968.7	359.6	775.0
	26	N	0.0014	201 966	34 849	32 945	19 237	8 628	11 394	31 135	33 928	28 546	15.826	12 301	245 929	9 841
	20		0.0011	6.6%	8.6%	7.5%	3 5%	1.2%	3 7%	3.7%	3.9%	3.0%	1 7%	1 3%	68.4%	1 3%
				2210 586	399 5	123 1	521 5	661 5	210.8	9/19 7	871 0	028 1	967.3	986.4	722.8	790 1
HIP	78	N	0.0014	220 154	24 226	28 272	21 /97	27 0/1	21 276	20 176	10 207	24 242	A5 744	22 768	181 5/6	18 215
800 °C	70	IN	0.0014	7 10/	0 00/	0.1%	51.467	1 70/	21.270	20.170	2 20/	24.342	43.744	22.700	25 10/	2 20/
				7.1/0	0.0/0	9.1/0	0.0%	4.2/0	0.776	2.4/0	2.2/0	2.0%	4.770	2.3/0	23.1/0	2.3/0
				3044.687	385.9	411.8	532.7	685.9	306.3	8/3.2	889.8	954.8	1045.0	1056.8	598.0	845.5
	78	N	0.0014	189.766	39.775	37.792	50.614	41.524	7.047	5.735	12.130	22.911	41.296	35.293	35.269	28.234
HIP				6.2%	10.3%	9.2%	9.5%	6.1%	2.3%	0.7%	1.4%	2.4%	4.0%	3.3%	5.9%	3.3%
900 °C				2919.529	404.3	436.7	563.5	719.3	296.8	877.8	894.8	968.8	1000.3	1018.4	738.3	814.7
	26	N	0.0014	99.345	43.068	43.075	44.949	40.531	5.429	7.055	17.491	43.314	70.800	31.765	323.589	25.412
				3.4%	10.7%	9.9%	8.0%	5.6%	1.8%	0.8%	2.0%	4.5%	7.1%	3.1%	43.8%	3.1%
HIP				3254.743	411.0	444.7	562.9	702.1	323.1	906.7	902.3	1028.1	1022.8	1080.4	720.4	864.3
1050 °C +	78	N	0.0015	56.403	10.033	12.074	18.685	15.372	2.758	2.886	37.219	48.302	22.945	23.017	247.087	18.413
900 °C				1.7%	2.4%	2.7%	3.3%	2.2%	0.9%	0.3%	4.1%	4.7%	2.2%	2.1%	34.3%	2.1%

Table 31 – Average values and standard deviations for polished specimens in the different conditions (elastic slopes and forces).

Table 32 – Average values and standard deviations for polished specimens in the different conditions (displacements and energies).

Material	Scan	Supported	Displacement	u _e	uh0/10,off	U _{0.1mm,off}	U _{e1.5}	u _m	u _{infl}	u _f	E _{SP}	Em	E _{PL}
condition	length	(Y/N)	rate (mm/s)	(mm)	(mm)	(mm)	(mm)	(mm)	(mm)	(mm)	(L)	(J)	(L)
				0.138	0.214	0.320	0.346	0.910	1.415	1.291	1.01	0.66	0.51
	78	N	0.0014	0.016	0.018	0.021	0.047	0.059	0.351	0.053	0.026	0.036	0.027
Ac Built				11.9%	8.5%	6.7%	13.5%	6.5%	24.8%	4.1%	2.6%	5.5%	5.3%
AS-Duilt				0.145	0.224	0.329	0.348	0.780	1.103	1.232	0.93	0.53	0.38
	26	N	0.0014	0.020	0.017	0.016	0.047	0.088	0.940	0.013	0.021	0.080	0.082
				13.6%	7.5%	5.0%	13.6%	11.3%	85.2%	1.1%	2.2%	15.1%	21.8%
				0.132	0.207	0.306	0.300	0.782	1.442	1.366	1.06	0.54	0.39
	78	N	0.0014	0.010	0.011	0.012	0.072	0.128	0.301	0.090	0.055	0.133	0.136
800 C				7.6%	5.2%	4.1%	24.1%	16.4%	20.9%	6.6%	5.1%	24.8%	35.3%
				0.136	0.222	0.327	0.373	0.923	1.669	1.377	1.13	0.69	0.50
	78	N	0.0014	0.021	0.026	0.028	0.026	0.045	0.010	0.100	0.079	0.038	0.039
HIP				15.4%	11.9%	8.7%	7.1%	4.9%	0.6%	7.3%	7.0%	5.6%	7.7%
900 °C				0.150	0.238	0.348	0.418	0.728	1.177	1.340	1.06	0.49	0.31
	26	N	0.0014	0.020	0.022	0.022	0.054	0.242	0.665	0.023	0.034	0.232	0.215
				13.2%	9.2%	6.3%	13.0%	33.2%	56.5%	1.7%	3.2%	47.4%	69.1%
HIP				0.137	0.219	0.316	0.312	0.706	1.042	1.176	0.96	0.49	0.31
1050 °C +	78	N	0.0015	0.006	0.011	0.008	0.043	0.019	0.809	0.094	0.089	0.019	0.023
900 °C				4.4%	4.9%	2.5%	13.8%	2.6%	77.6%	8.0%	9.3%	3.8%	7.4%

Comparisons for $F_{e,proj}$ and F_m are illustrated in Fig. 11 and Fig. 12, respectively. Unlike rough specimens, for polished specimen the condition which exhibited the best combination of tensile properties, in terms of high values and low standard deviations, corresponds to the non-standard multiple HIP treatment (1050 °C + 800 °C) with scan length = 78 mm.

A univocal effect of scan length cannot be detected for polished specimens, as can be observed from the as-built and standard HIP conditions.



Figure 11 - Average values and standard deviations for $F_{e,proj}$.



Figure 12 - Average values and standard deviations for $F_{\rm m}$.

4.9.3. General considerations

It must be stressed that average values in Tables 29 to 31 should not be compared directly between rough and polished specimens, as these latter had a lower thickness (0.43 mm - 0.47 mm) than the former (0.5 mm). However, standard deviations can be legitimately compared.

The SP parameter that exhibits the least variability (1.3 % - 3.3 %) is the maximum force $F_{\rm m}$, whereas elastic-plastic transition forces $F_{\rm e,proj}$ and $F_{\rm e,int}$, which are calculated from the intersection of two linear fits, yielded relative standard deviations in the range 2.4 % – 15.0 %. Interestingly, displacements at maximum force, $u_{\rm m}$, generally showed larger scatter than displacements corresponding to a 20 % force drop from the maximum, $u_{\rm f}$. In terms of calculated energies, the most consistent parameter is the fracture energy, $E_{\rm SP}$.

No obvious effect of surface finish (rough vs. polished) could be detected on the variability of SP parameters.

5. Correlations with tensile properties

Many empirical correlations between normalized SP parameters and conventional tensile properties have been proposed in the literature, almost exclusively for steels. For most of these correlations, the accuracy of the predicted strength values (yield and ultimate) was reported to be in the order of ± 25 MPa. Specifically:

- <u>Yield strength</u> has been mostly correlated with F_e/h_0^2 [21-27]. Alternative correlations for R_{p02} have been proposed with:
 - $F_{h0/10,off}$, normalized by h_0^2 [23];
 - $F_{0.1\text{mm,off}}$, normalized by h_0^2 [22,24];
 - *Slope*_{ini}, normalized by h_0 [28].
- <u>Tensile strength</u> has been mostly correlated with F_m , normalized either by h_0^2 [23,25,27] or $h_0 \cdot u_m$ [21-27,29]. Other force values that have been correlated with R_m are:
 - F_{infl} , normalized by $h_0 \cdot u_m$ [27];
 - $F_{0.48\text{mm}}$ [27], $F_{0.645\text{mm}}$ [25], and $F_{0.65\text{mm}}$ [28], all normalized by h_0^2 .
- <u>Total elongation</u> has been correlated with $u_{\rm m}$ [23,31], $u_{\rm m}/h_0$ [23,32], and $\frac{u_f h_0}{h_0}$ [33].

Almost every correlation was proposed in the generic linear form:

$$Y = \alpha_1 X + \alpha_2 \quad , \tag{1}$$

where *Y* is the tensile property of interest, *X* is the normalized SP parameter, and α_1 , α_2 are slope and intercept, respectively, of a least-squares linear regression between *X* and *Y*.

As far as energy values are concerned, in the literature they are only used to construct a transition curve by performing tests at different temperatures. The flexural point of the energy/temperature curve is then empirically correlated to the ductile-to-brittle transition temperature established from Charpy tests [34,35].

In previous work by the authors [12], correlations for three investigated steels (A533B cl. 1, 4340 low-energy, and 4340 high-energy) were derived and compared with those proposed by other authors. A similar approach was taken for this investigation.

The strength of the established correlations is hereinafter defined on the basis of the Pearson correlation coefficient, r:

- strong (r > 0.70) color: green,
- moderate $(0.70 \le r < 0.50)$ color: yellow,
- weak $(0.50 \le r < 0.30)$ color: pink, or
- absent/no correlation ($r \le 0.30$) color: red.

5.1. Yield strength correlations

A summary of the yield strength correlations obtained for rough specimens is provided in Table 33, while the same information is shown in Table 34 for polished specimens. The Tables present the values of the linear coefficients (slope and intercept), as well as the values of the correlation coefficient r. The yield properties to be correlated with SP parameters were measured in [15].

		Slope	0.1462	0.1190	0.0264	0.1853	0.0987	0.0737	0.0227
		Intercept	610.82	657.04	754.16	372.04	536.89	786.89	766.22
		r	0.6661	0.5574	0.5597	0.6946	0.5079	0.5553	0.5338
		Tensile	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP
Material	Scan length	property	parameter	parameter	parameter	parameter	parameter	parameter	parameter
condition	(mm)	0.2% YS	$F_{e,proj}/h_0^2$	$F_{e,int}/h_0^2$	F _{e,proj} /(u _e h ₀)	$F_{h0/10,off}/h_0^2$	$F_{0.1mm,off}/h_0^2$	R _{p0.2,Hähner}	Slope _{ini} /h ₀
Ac Built	78	879	1767.1	1860.5	5229.1	2614.9	3261.8	1329.3	5504.99
A3-Built	26	875	1653.8	1684.5	3596.0	2717.5	3437.7	1097.1	3664.67
HIP 800 °C	78	864	1837.0	1853.6	3694.5	2777.0	3400.1	986.2	3732.27
	78	838	1451.6	1484.6	3446.2	2474.9	2978.5	881.4	3532.78
HIP 900 C	26	799	1578.6	1565.1	3361.1	2478.7	3157.5	668.5	3456.76
HIP 1050+800 °C	78	885	1805.4	1622.8	3955.3	2629.1	3204.4	720.6	4072.12

Table 33 - Summary of yield strength correlations obtained for rough specimens of AM Ti64.

Table 34 - Summary of yield strength correlations obtained for polished specimens of AM Ti64.

		Slope	0.4042	0.2934	0.0860	0.3697	0.3204	0.3374	0.0842
		Intercept	60.79	231.42	301.34	-131.46	-239.58	322.70	268.19
		r	0.8545	0.8167	0.5143	0.6709	0.7681	0.3967	0.6079
		Tensile	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP
Material	Scan length	property	parameter	parameter	parameter	parameter	parameter	parameter	parameter
condition	(mm)	0.2% YS	$F_{e,proj}/h_0^2$	$F_{e,int}/h_0^2$	F _{e,proj} /(u _e h ₀)	$F_{h0/10,off}/h_0^2$	$F_{0.1mm,off}/h_0^2$	R _{p0.2,Hähner}	Slope _{ini} /h ₀
Ac Built	78	878.9	2026.2	2200.1	6620.8	2685.1	3481.0	1567.1	7189.43
AS-Built	26	875.5	2024.6	2216.5	6250.2	2730.4	3491.7	1558.2	6850.70
HIP 800 °C	78	863.7	1982.0	2160.3	6671.0	2661.8	3377.1	1594.6	7272.78
	78	837.8	1867.6	1992.8	6262.8	2578.0	3317.2	1548.3	6689.19
11F 900 C	26	799.3	1899.1	2043.5	6328.9	2645.1	3363.1	1573.4	6809.58
HIP 1050+800 °C	78	885.1	2016.0	2172.8	6604.2	2738.3	3499.0	1654.4	7118.34

All the correlations established for rough specimens were moderate $(0.70 \le r < 0.50)$, while for polished specimens three of the correlations were found to be strong (r > 0.70) and one weak $(0.50 \le r < 0.30)$. The three strong correlations obtained are depicted in Figs. 13 to 15, which also include data and linear fits for rough specimens.



Figure 13 - Correlations between $F_{e,proj}/h_0^2$ and yield strength for rough and polished specimens of AM Ti64.



Figure 14 - Correlations between $F_{e,int}/h_0^2$ and yield strength for rough and polished specimens of AM Ti64.



Figure 15 - Correlations between $F_{0.1\text{mm,off}}/h_0^2$ and yield strength for rough and polished specimens of AM Ti64.

All the yield strength correlations, obtained for both rough and polished specimens, are documented in Annex 14.

5.2. Ultimate tensile strength correlations

A summary of the ultimate tensile strength correlations obtained for rough specimens is provided in Table 35, while the same information is shown in Table 36 for polished specimens. The Tables present the values of the linear coefficients (slope and intercept), as well as the values of the correlation coefficient r. The ultimate tensile values to be correlated with SP parameters were measured in [15].

Table 35 - Summary of ultimate tensile strength correlations obtained for rough specimensof AM Ti64.

		Slope	0.0273	0.1074	0.0817	0.0530	0.0654
		Intercept	839.28	726.27	861.04	800.01	717.99
		r	0.4040	0.7386	0.8852	0.7036	0.7312
		Tensile	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP
Material	Scan length	property	parameter	parameter	parameter	parameter	parameter
condition	(mm)	UTS	F_m/h_0^2	F _m /(h ₀ u _m)	F _{infl} /(h ₀ u _m)	$F_{0.48mm}/h_0^2$	$F_{0.65mm}/h_0^2$
Ac Built	78	981	4401.2	2364.3	1631.7	3612.1	4071.6
As-Built	26	972	4467.9	2024.4	1232.0	3027.0	3762.7
HIP 800 °C	78	969	4476.0	2277.9	1281.6	3050.9	3753.5
	78	951	4079.7	2116.3	1001.8	2663.4	3314.6
111F 900 C	26	918	4502.7	2015.7	889.0	2816.2	3554.2
HIP 1050+800 °C	78	985	5207.7	2407.2	1416.1	3224.8	3994.1

Table 36 - Summary of ultimate tensile strength correlations obtained for polished specimens of AM Ti64.

		Slope	0.0129	-0.0167	0.0004	0.1362	0.0242
		Intercept	897.43	1010.27	961.83	374.43	847.22
		r	0.1066	-0.2458	0.0081	0.5135	0.2539
		Tensile	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP
Material	Scan length	property	parameter	parameter	parameter	parameter	parameter
condition	(mm)	UTS	F_m/h_0^2	F _m /(h _o u _m)	F _{infl} /(h ₀ u _m)	$F_{0.48mm}/h_0^2$	$F_{0.65mm}/h_0^2$
Ac Ruilt	78	980.9	4841.8	2402.0	1608.7	4307.8	4471.7
As-Built	26	971.7	4856.1	2802.6	1068.0	4263.9	4681.2
HIP 800 °C	78	969.1	5037.5	2902.2	2081.8	4334.3	4814.0
	78	950.6	5104.0	2520.4	1424.0	4219.9	4612.1
111 JOO C	26	917.8	5029.3	3240.3	2003.7	4284.6	4729.5
HIP 1050+800 °C	78	985.3	5408.8	3313.0	2393.5	4492.1	5237.1

Interestingly, the results point in a different direction with respect to what we obtained for the yield strength. Correlations are generally much stronger for rough specimens (four strong and one weak) than for polished specimens (four non-existent and one moderate).

The empirical relationships established between $R_{\rm m}$ and $F_{\rm m}/h_0^2$, $F_{\rm m}/(h_0 u_{\rm m})$, $F_{\rm infl}/(h_0 u_{\rm m})$, and $F_{0.65 {\rm mm}}/h_0^2$ are shown in Figs. 16-19 for both groups of specimens.

All the ultimate tensile strength correlations, obtained for both rough and polished specimens, are documented in Annex 15.



Figure 16 - Correlations between $F_{\rm m}/h_0^2$ and ultimate tensile strength for rough and polished specimens of AM Ti64.



Figure 17 - Correlations between $F_{\rm m}/(h_0 u_{\rm m})$ and ultimate tensile strength for rough and polished specimens of AM Ti64.



Figure 18 - Correlations between $F_{infl}/(h_0 u_m)$ and ultimate tensile strength for rough and polished specimens of AM Ti64.



Figure 19 - Correlations between $F_{0.65\text{mm}}/h_0^2$ and ultimate tensile strength for rough and polished specimens of AM Ti64.

5.3. Elongation correlations

A summary of the correlations with total elongation from tensile tests obtained for rough specimens is provided in Table 37, while the same information is shown in Table 38 for
polished specimens. The Tables present the values of the linear coefficients (slope and intercept), as well as the values of the correlation coefficient r. The total elongation values to be correlated with SP parameters were measured in [15].

Table 37 - Summary of total elongation correlations obtained for rough specimens of AMTi64.

		Slope	-0.0861	-0.0089
		Intercept	0.46	0.30
		r	-0.2681	-0.0436
		Tensile	SP	SP
Material	Scan length	property	parameter	parameter
condition	(mm)	TE	u _m /h ₀	(u _f -h ₀)/h ₀
Ac Built	78	27.8%	1.867	1.796
AS-DUIIL	26	25.5%	2.211	2.023
HIP 800 °C	78	31.7%	1.984	1.882
HIP 900 °C	78	31.0%	1.968	1.902
	26	31.8%	2.262	2.477
HIP 1050+800 °C	78	18.8%	2.165	2.152

Table 38 - Summary of total elongation correlations obtained for polished specimens of AM Ti64.

		Slope	0.0832	0.3047
		Intercept	0.13	-0.30
		r	0.3036	0.8838
		Tensile	SP	SP
Material	Scan length	property	parameter	parameter
condition	(mm)	TE	u _m /h₀	(u _f -h ₀)/h ₀
Ac Built	78	27.8%	2.023	1.868
AS-BUIIL	26	25.5%	1.749	1.759
HIP 800 °C	78	31.7%	1.767	2.088
	78	31.0%	2.029	2.029
HIP 900 C	26	31.8%	1.605	1.941
HIP 1050+800 °C	78	18.8%	1.636	1.717

For rough specimens, negative (and therefore non-physical) correlations were found between ε_{t} and both u_{m}/h_{0} and $\frac{u_{f}-h_{0}}{h_{0}}$ (Fig. 20). In the case of polished specimens, however, both correlations were positive, and the correlation with $\frac{u_{f}-h_{0}}{h_{0}}$ (Fig. 20) was quite strong.



Figure 20 - Correlations between $(u_f - h_0)$ and total elongation for rough and polished specimens of AM Ti64.

We also attempted to correlate uniform elongation, ε_u , to the normalized punch displacement at maximum force, u_m/h_0 (Tables 39-40 and Fig. 21). Once again, a non-physical negative relationship was found for rough specimens, whereas a weak (r = 0.39) positive correlation was obtained for polished specimens.

Table 39 -	Uniform	elongation	correlation	obtained	for rough	specimens	of AM Ti64.

		Slope	-0.0179
		Intercept	0.13
		r	-0.3420
		Tensile	SP
Material	Scan length	property	parameter
condition	(mm)	UE	u _m /h ₀
Ac Built	78	9.5%	1.867
AS-Built	26	9.1%	2.211
HIP 800 °C	78	10.1%	1.984
	78	10.0%	1.968
HIP 900 C	26	10.0%	2.262
HIP 1050+800 °C	78	7.9%	2.165

Table 40 - Uniform elongation correlation obtained for polished specimens of AM Ti64.

		Slope	0.0173
		Intercept	0.06
		r	0.3870
		Tensile	SP
Material	Scan length	property	parameter
condition	(mm)	UE	u _m /h ₀
Ac Built	78	9.5%	2.023
AS-Duilt	26	9.1%	1.749
HIP 800 °C	78	10.1%	1.767
	78	10.0%	2.029
11F 900 C	26	10.0%	1.605
HIP 1050+800 °C	78	7.9%	1.636



Figure 21 - Correlations between u_m/h_0 and uniform elongation for rough and polished specimens of AM Ti64.

All the total and uniform elongation correlations, obtained for both rough and polished specimens, are documented in Annex 16.



Figure 22 - Correlations between $F_{\rm m}/h_0^2$ and ultimate tensile strength for rough and polished specimens of AM Ti64.

6. Correlations with fracture toughness

In the literature, fracture toughness has been generally estimated from SP test results by means of analytical approaches involving finite element calculations [37,38]. Most of the few published empirical correlations were established between critical *J*-integral (J_{Ic} , J_Q) and effective (or biaxial) fracture strain [10,23,38,39], calculated as:

$$\varepsilon_{\rm f} = ln\left(\frac{h_0}{h_{\rm f}}\right)$$
 (2)

However, at the time of writing, $h_{\rm f}$ values were not available for the specimens tested.

The room temperature elastic-plastic fracture toughness of four of the AM Ti64 investigated conditions (as-built and non-standard 900 °C HIP, two scan lengths) was measured on fatigue precracked Charpy-type specimens in a previous investigation [14], by means of the Elastic Compliance single-specimen methodology, in terms of size-sensitive critical value of *J*-integral, J_Q (Table 41).

 Table 41 - Elastic-plastic fracture toughness measured on four AM Ti64 conditions [14].

Material condition	J_Q (kN/m ²)	
a,e1	121.14	
a,e2	93.23	
c,e1	157.67	
c,e2	151.61	

In this study, we attempted novel correlations between J_Q and the following normalized SP energy values: $\frac{E_{SP}}{h_0 u_{\rm f}}$, $\frac{E_{\rm m}}{h_0 u_{\rm m}}$, and $\frac{E_{\rm PL}}{h_0 u_{\rm m,pl}}$. In each case, SP energy was normalized by the product of the initial thickness by the corresponding displacement value. For $E_{\rm PL}$, the plastic component of $u_{\rm m}$ was calculated as:

$$u_{\rm m,pl} = u_{\rm m} - \frac{F_{\rm m}}{slope_{\rm ini}} \qquad (3)$$

For both rough and polished specimens, moderately strong correlations were found between J_Q and the normalized fracture energy $\frac{E_{SP}}{h_0 u_f}$ (r = 0.60 and 0.62, respectively, Fig. 17). The remaining correlations obtained were negative and therefore unacceptable for rough specimens, while in the case of polished specimens a weak correlation was obtained for the plastic energy, $\frac{E_{PL}}{h_0 u_{m,pl}}$ (r = 0.43), and no correlation was observed with the normalized total energy, $\frac{E_m}{h_0 u_m}$ (r = 0.18).



Figure 23 - Empirical correlations between J_Q and $E_{SP}/(h_0 u_f)$ for rough and polished SP specimens of AM Ti64.

7. Use of actuator displacement in the analyses

Two displacement signals were recorded during SP testing: the signal of the extensioneter, which corresponds to punch displacement, and the displacement of the machine actuator. Several authors have also reported the use of another displacement (specimen deflection), measured by a transducer (LVDT) positioned below the specimen being tested.

All the analyses of the tests performed on rough specimens were repeated using actuator displacement as a surrogate of punch displacement. Comparisons between average values and standard deviations for selected characteristic force, displacement, and energy values obtained using extensioneter and actuator displacements are illustrated in Fig. 24 ($F_{e,proj}$ and $F_{0.1mm,off}$), Fig. 25 (u_e , $u_{0.1mm,off}$, u_m , and u_f), and Fig. 26 (E_{SP} , E_m , and E_{PL}).



Figure 24 – Mean characteristic force values obtained for rough specimens using extensometer and actuator displacements, with $\pm 1\sigma$ error bands.



Figure 25 – Mean characteristic displacement values obtained for rough specimens using extensioneter and actuator displacements, with $\pm 1\sigma$ error bands.



Figure 26 – Mean characteristic energy values obtained for rough specimens using extensioneter and actuator displacements, with $\pm 1\sigma$ error bands.

The data shown in Figs. 24-26 show a relatively modest influence of the choice of displacement signal on the characteristic parameters obtained from SP tests, also considering the relatively large standard deviations. Two qualitative remarks can nonetheless be formulated:

- Most of the average values are within ± 10 % of each other.
- In case of force values (Fig. 24), a specific trend is not clearly visible. For displacements (Fig. 25) and energies (Fig. 26), it can be observed that actuator-based values tend to be generally higher than extensometer-based values.

The most practical information, however, is the effect of using actuator displacements to derive correlations with tensile properties, in a hypothetical situation where no external displacement transducer is available. Such an effect is illustrated in Table 42, which compares values of Pearson's correlation coefficient, r, from selected empirical correlations established by using SP extensometer-based and actuator-based parameters for rough specimens.

Note that we will not report details on specific actuator-based empirical correlations here, as the reference procedure this document uses is based on measuring punch displacement by means of an extensometer. **Table 42** - Correlation coefficients for extensiometer-based and actuator-based correlations for rough specimens. In the last column, red arrows indicate a decrease in r going from extensiometer to actuator (two red arrows = substantial decrease), green arrows an increase, and black horizontal arrows a minor variation.

-		Correlation c	Correlation coefficients, r		
Y-variable	X-variable	Extensometer	Actuator	Change	
	$F_{e, proj}/h_0^2$	0.6661	0.5619	⇒	
Yield	$F_{e,proj}/(u_eh_0)$	0.5597	0.4458	⇒	
strength	$F_{0.1mm,off}/h_0^2$	0.1262	0.4257	1	
	Slope _{el} /h ₀	0.5338	0.3972	⇒	
Ultimate	F_m/h_0^2	0.4040			
strength	F _m /(u _m h ₀)	0.7386	0.0608	⇒	
UE	u _m /h ₀	-0.3420	-0.3580	₽	
TE	u _f /h ₀	-0.2681	-0.1304	₽	
	(u _f -h ₀)/h ₀	-0.0436	0.1975	1	

As can be seen in Table 42, the use of actuator displacement generally tends to weaken the strength of the strongest correlations that were established on the basis of extensioneter displacement. Relative improvements are only observed for relationships that were already rather shaky, or even non-physical (negative values of r).

8. Discussion

Across the board, the quality of empirical correlations between tensile properties and SP parameters for AM Ti64 was found to be poorer than that reported for steels in the open literature. This is hardly surprising, considering that the Small Punch methodology was developed for application to high-quality materials in the power industry [1], and was found to be inaccurate for highly anisotropic materials, such as oxide dispersion strengthened (ODS) steels [40]. As an example, the force-displacement curve for a SP test on ODS 14YWT steel [40] shown in Figure 24, exhibits several force drops ("pop-in" type events), associated with the steel's susceptibility to secondary cracking, and has a different form than the classical SP curve for homogeneous steels (Figure 1).



Figure 27 – Force-displacement curve for a SP test on ODS 14YWT steel [40].

It should also be noted that the range of tensile properties for the AM Ti64 investigated conditions, with respect to the property average value was relatively limited, particularly in the case of R_{p02} and R_m (10.1 % and 7 %, respectively). This makes it even more difficult to obtain strong correlations, particularly in the presence of significant experimental variability.

As far as the influence of specimen surface finish is concerned, we can generally state that polished specimens correlate slightly better with AM Ti64 tensile properties than rough specimens, which supports the inclusion of the Ra < $0.25 \mu m$ requirement in both the ASTM draft [11] and the CEN Workshop Agreement CWA15627:2007 [10]. Moreover, we observe that normalized force values are systematically larger for polished specimens.

Follow-up microstructural investigations are planned to provide a more complete interpretation of the SP results obtained in the different conditions, including measurements of final specimen thickness values, $h_{\rm f}$, on the fracture surface to be correlated with fracture toughness.

9. Conclusions

The overall quality of the empirical correlations that we obtained between tensile properties and SP test parameters for six conditions of AM Ti64 is not satisfactory. Most correlations were found to be non-existent or weak at best. This is not an unexpected conclusion, since the Small Punch methodology has been shown to have limited applicability for highly anisotropic materials, such as those currently produced via Additive Manufacturing. However, it's important to note that the AM community is actively working on decreasing the anisotropy of AM materials, and therefore these correlations could be revisited once significant progress has been made in this direction.

The available literature on the application of various SP testing techniques, including fatigue and creep, to various types of Ti64 (forged, cast, and EBM) [17-20, 41] demonstrates a significant level of interest in the material testing community. Published force-displacement curves of AM specimens [17-20] are similar to those we obtained in this study. Several references also show significantly lower tensile properties for AM Ti64 with respect to forged

and cast material, as inferred from SP tests performed both at ambient and elevated temperatures [17,19,20].

In our study, the strongest correlations (correlation coefficient $r > 0.70^{10}$) for polished specimens were found between:

- Yield strength (*R*_{p02}) and normalized SP elastic-plastic transition force (*F*_e/*h*₀²), Eqs. (2) and (3).
- Yield strength (R_{p02}) and normalized SP force at $h_0/10$ offset $(F_{h0,off}/h_0^2)$ for rough specimens (Ra > 3 µm), Eq. (4).
- Yield strength (R_{p02}) and normalized SP force at 0.1 mm offset (F_{0.1mm,off}/h₀²) for polished specimens (Ra < 0.25 μm), Eq. (5).
- Total elongation (ϵ_i) and normalized SP displacement at fracture $(\frac{u_f h_0}{h_0})$ for polished specimens, Eq. (8).

Correlations between fracture toughness and normalized SP energies were also attempted, but were not particularly successful, with a highest degree of correlation around r = 0.60 obtained between J_Q and normalized fracture energy.

The influence of surface roughness on SP characteristic parameters was found to be significant on specimen yielding and fracture, in that these phenomena tend to occur earlier in the test in the case of rougher specimens. Across the board, polished specimens (Ra < 0.25 μ m, in accordance with current normative or pre-normative documents) appear to yield better correlations.

Finally, the use of actuator displacement in the place of punch displacement (measured by an extensioneter) in the analysis of SP tests did not have a particularly significant influence on characteristic parameters, but caused a generalized weakening of the empirical correlations with tensile properties.

References

- [1] Lucon, E., 2014, "Testing of Small-Sized Specimens," Comprehensive Materials Processing, C. J. Van Tyne, ed., Elsevier Ltd., Vol. 1, pp. 135-163. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-096532-1.00110-2
- [2] Harling, O. K., Lee, M., Sohn, D.-S., Kohse, G., and Lau, C. W., 1986, "The MIT Miniaturised Disc Bend Test," The Use of Small-Scale Specimens for Testing Irradiated Material, ASTM STP 888. W. R. Corwin, and G. E. Lucas, eds., ASTM, Philadelphia, PA, pp. 50–65.
- [3] Manahan, M. P., Browning, A. E., Argon, A. S., and Harling, O. K., 1986, "Miniaturised Disc Bend Test Technique Development and Application," The Use of Small-Scale Specimens for Testing Irradiated Material, ASTM STP 888. W. R. Corwin, and G. E. Lucas, eds., ASTM, Philadelphia, PA, pp. 17–49.
- [4] Hankin, G. L., Toloczko, M. B., Hamilton, M. L., Garner, F. A., and Faulkner, R. G., 1998, "Validation of the Shear Punch – Tensile Correlation Technique Using Irradiated Materials," *Journal of Nuclear Materials*, 258–263, pp. 1651–1656. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0022-3115(98)00203-7</u>

¹⁰ To put this value into context, most published correlations for steels report correlation coefficients higher than 0.90.

- [5] Bicego, V., Lucon, E., and Sampietri, C., 1998, "The 'Small Punch' Technique for Evaluating Quasi Non-Destructively the Mechanical Properties of Steels," In Fracture from Defects, ECF 12: Proceedings of the Twelfth European Conference on Fracture. M. W. Brown, E. R. de los Rios, K. J. Miller, eds., EMAS Publishing, London, Vol. 1, pp 1273–1278.
- [6] Sainte-Catherine, C., Messier. J., Poussard, C., Rosinski, S., and Foulds, J., 2002, "Small Punch Test: EPRI-CEA Finite Element Simulation Benchmark and Inverse Method for the Estimation of Elastic Plastic Behavior," in *Small Specimen Test Techniques: Fourth Volume, ASTM STP 1418, M. A. Sokolov, J. D. Landes, and G. E. Lucas, Eds., ASTM* International, West Conshohocken, PA, pp. 350-370.
- [7] Abendroth, M. and Kuna, M., 2003, "Determination of Deformation and Failure Properties of Ductile Materials by Means of the Small Punch Test and Neural Networks," *Computational Materials Science*, Vol 28, pp. 633-644. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.commatsci.2003.08.031</u>
- [8] Abendroth, M. and Kuna, M., 2004, "Determination of Ductile Material Properties by Means of the Small Punch Test and Neural Networks," *Advanced Engineering Materials*, Vol 6, No. 7, 2004, pp. 536-540. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/adem.200400405</u>
- [9] Kuna, M. and Abendroth, M., 2012, "Identification and Validation of Ductile Damage Parameters by the Small Punch Test," in Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference SSTT, Determination of Mechanical Properties of Materials by Small Punch and Other Miniature Testing Techniques, Oct 2-4. 2012, Ostrava, Czech Republic, Ocelot Publ., ISBN 978-80-260-0079-2, pp. 4-18.
- [10] CEN Workshop Agreement, CWA 15627:2007, "Small Punch Test Method for Metallic Materials," European Committee for Standardization, Brussels, Belgium.
- [11] ASTM Subcommittee E10.02, 2019, "Standard Test Method for Small Punch Testing of Metallic Materials," Work Item WK61832, Version 01/29/19.
- [12] Lucon, E., Benzing, J., and Hrabe, N., 2020, "Development and Validation of Small Punch Testing at NIST," NIST Internal Report 8303, Boulder, Colorado. <u>https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8303</u>
- [13] Lucon, E. and Hrabe, N., 2018, "Instrumented Impact Testing of Miniaturized Charpy Specimens of AM Ti-6Al-4V," *Materials Performance and Characterization*, Vol. 7, No. 1, pp. 126–138. <u>https://doi.org/10.1520/MPC20170160</u>
- [14] Lucon, E., Benzing, J., and Hrabe, N., 2019, "Room Temperature Fracture Toughness Characterization of Additively Manufactured Ti-6Al-4V," NIST Technical Note 2065, Boulder, Colorado. <u>https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.TN.2065</u>
- [15] Benzing, J., Hrabe, N., Quinn, T., White, R., and Rentz, R., 2019, "Manipulation of microstructure and tensile properties of additively manufactured Ti-6Al-4V parts," presented at the 19th International ASTM/ESIS Symposium on Fatigue and Fracture Mechanics (42nd National Symposium on Fatigue and Fracture Mechanics), May 15-17, 2019, Denver, CO, USA.
- [16] Hrabe, N., Gnäupel-Herold, T., and Quinn, T., 2017," Fatigue properties of a titanium alloy (Ti-6Al-4V) fabricated via electron beam melting (EBM): Effects of internal defects and residual stress," *International Journal of Fatigue*, Vol. 94, pp. 202–210.
- [17] Lancaster, R., Davies, G., Illsley, H., Jeffs, S., and Baxter, G., 2016, "Structural Integrity of an Electron Beam Melted Titanium," *Materials*, 9, 470. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.3390/ma9060470</u>

- [18] Lancaster, R. J., Illsey, H. W., Davies, G. R., Jeffs, S. P., and Baxter, G. J., 2016, "Modelling the small punch tensile behaviour of an aerospace alloy," *Materials Science and Technology*, 33:9, pp. 1065-1073 <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02670836.2016.1230168</u>
- [19] Hurst, R. C., Lancaster, R. J., Jeffs, S. P., and Bache, M. R., 2016, "The contribution of small punch testing towards the development of materials for aero-engine applications," *Theoretical and Applied Fracture Mechanics* 86, pp. 69-77. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tafmec.2016.07.013
- [20] Illsey, H., Lancaster, R., Hurst, R., Jeffs, S., and Baxter, G., 2017, "Mechanical Property Characterisation of Electron Beam Melted (EBM) via Small Punch Tensile Testing," *Key Engineering Materials*, Vol. 734, pp. 51–60.
- [21] Ruan, Y., Spätig, P., and Victoria, M., 2002, "Assessment of mechanical properties of the martensitic steel EUROFER97 by means of punch tests," *Journal of Nuclear Materials*, Volumes 307-311, pp. 236–239. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0022-3115(02)01194-7</u>
- [22] Matocha, K., 2012, "Determination of actual tensile and fracture characteristics of critical components of industrial plants under long term operation by SPT," Proceedings of the ASME 2012 Pressure Vessels & Piping Conference, PVP2012, Toronto, Canada, July 15-19, ASME Paper No. PVP2012-78553. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1115/PVP2012-78553</u>
- [23] García, T.E., Rodríguez, C., Belzunce, F.J., and Suárez, C., 2014, "Estimation of the mechanical properties of metallic materials by means of the small punch test," J Alloys and Compounds, 582, pp. 708-717. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jallcom.2013.08.009</u>
- [24] Matocha, K., 2015, "Small-Punch Testing for Tensile and Fracture Behavior: Experiences and Way Forward," Small Specimen Test Techniques: 6th Volume, ASTM STP 1576, M. A. Sokolov and E. Lucon, eds., West Conshohocken, PA, pp. 145–159. http://dx.doi.org/10.1520/STP157620140005
- [25] Bruchhausen, M., Holmström, S., Simonovski, I., Austin, T., Lapetite, J.-M., Ripplinger, J.-M., and de Haan, F., 2016, "Recent developments in small punch testing: Tensile properties and DBTT," *Theoretical and Applied Fracture Mechanics*, 86, pp. 2–10. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tafmec.2016.09.012</u>
- [26] Altstadt, E., Ge, H.E., Kuksenko, V., Serrano, M., Houska, M., Lasan, M., Bruchhausen, M., Lapetite, and Dai, Y., 2016, "Critical evaluation of the small punch test as a screening procedure for mechanical properties," *Journal of Nuclear Materials*, 472, pp. 186–195. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jnucmat.2015.07.029</u>
- [27] Janča, A., Siegl, J., and Haušild, P., 2016, "Small punch test evaluation methods for material characterization," *Journal of Nuclear Materials*, 481, pp. 201–213. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jnucmat.2015.07.029</u>
- [28] Chica, J.C., Díez, P.M.B., and Calzada, M.P., 2018, "Development of an improved correlation method for the yield strength of steel alloys in the small punch test," Proceedings of 5th International Small Sample Test Techniques, SSTT2018, Swansea University, UK, July 10-12, 2018, Ubiquity Proceedings. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.5334/uproc.12</u>
- [29] Kumar, K., Pooleery, A., Madhusoodanan, K., Singh, R.N., Chakravartty, J.K., Shriwastaw, R.S., Dutta, B.K., and Sinha, R.K., 2015, "Evaluation of ultimate tensile strength using Miniature Disk Bend Test," *Journal of Nuclear Materials*, 461, pp. 100– 111. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jnucmat.2015.02.029</u>
- [30] Altstadt, E., Houska, M., Simonovski, I., Bruchhausen, M., Holmström, S., and Lacalle, R., 2018, "On the estimation of ultimate tensile stress from small punch testing,"

International Journal of Mechanical Sciences, 136, pp. 85–93. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijmecsci.2017.12.016

- [31] Fleury, E. and Ha, J.S., 1998, "On the estimation of ultimate tensile stress from small punch testing," *International Journal of Pressure Vessel and Piping*, 75, pp. 699–706.
- [32] Rodriguez, C., Garcia Cabezas, J., Cardenas, E., Belzunce, F. J., and Betegon, C., 2009, "Mechanical Properties Characterization of Heat-Affected Zone Using the Small Punch Test," *Welding Research*, Vol. 88, pp. 188-s–192-s.
- [33] Yang, S., Ling, X., and Peng, D., 2018, "Elastic and plastic deformation behavior analysis in small punch test for mechanical properties evaluation," *Journal of Central South University*, 25(4), pp. 747–753. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11771-018-3779-7</u>
- [34] Contreras, M.A., Rodríguez, C., Belzunce, F. J., and Betegón, C., 2008, "Use of the small punch test to determine the ductile-to-brittle transition temperature of structural steels," *Fatigue & Fracture of Engineering Materials & Structures*, 31, pp. 727-737. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2695.2008.01259.x
- [35] Matocha, K., 2015, "Small Punch Testing for Tensile and Fracture Behavior: Experiences and Way Forward," Small Specimen Test Techniques: 6th Volume. STP 1576, Mikhail Sokolov and Enrico Lucon, Eds. ASTM International, West Conshohocken, PA, pp. 145-159. http://dx.doi.org/10.1520/STP157620140005
- [36] Foulds, J.R. and Jewett, C. W., 1991, "Miniature Specimen Test Technique for Estimating Toughness," Report GS-7526, Electric Power Research Institute, Palo Alto, CA.
- [37] Foulds, J. R., Wu, M., Srivastav, S., and Jewett, C. W., 1997, "Fracture and Tensile Properties of ASTM Cross-Comparison Exercise A533B Steel by Small Punch Testing", *Small Specimen Test Techniques*, ASTM STP 1329, W. R. Corwin, S. T. Rosinski, and E. Van Walle, eds., ASTM, Philadelphia, PA, pp 557–574.
- [38] Wang, Z.-X., Shi, H.-J., Lu J., Shi P., and Ma X.-F., 2008, "Small punch testing for assessing the fracture properties of the reactor vessel steel with different thicknesses," *Nuclear Engineering and Design*, 238, pp. 3186–3193. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.nucengdes.2008.07.013</u>
- [39] Hurst, R. C. and Matocha, K., 2015, "A Renaissance in the Use of the Small Punch Testing Technique," Transactions, SMiRT-23, Manchester, United Kingdom, August 10-14, 2015, Division II. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1115/PVP2015-45095</u>
- [40] Altstadt, E., Houska, M., and Das, A., 2018, "Effect of anisotropic microstructure of ODS steels on small punch test results," Proceedings of 5th International Small Sample Test Techniques, SSTT2018, Swansea University, UK, July 10-12, 2018, Ubiquity Proceedings. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.5334/uproc.4</u>
- [41] Lewis, D. T. S., Lancaster, R. J., Jeffs, S. P., Illsley, H. W., Davies, S. J., and Baxter, G. J., 2019, "Characterising the fatigue performance of additive materials using the small punch test," *Materials Science & Engineering A* 754, pp. 719-727. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.msea.2019.03.115</u>

ANNEX 1

SP Test Results for

900 °C HIP, scan length = 52 mm, supported ("rough" specimens)

Specimen ID: 900HIP_2_S_a_SP1 **Material:** AM Ti-64 **Test speed:** 0.000735 mm/s **Max strain rate:** 7.35E-04 s⁻¹

TEST	RESULTS	S			
Forc	e values				
F _{e,proj} =	444.0	Ν			
F _{e,int} =	450.1	Ν			
F _{h0/10,off} =	717.9	Ν			
F _{0.1mm,off} =	929.0	Ν			
F _{0.1mm} =	158.3	Ν			
F _{0.48mm} =	682.1	Ν			
F _{0.5mm} =	706.7	Ν			
F _{0.65mm} =	873.6	Ν			
F _{0.9mm} =	1132.5	Ν			
F _{ept} =	320.9	Ν			
F _{e1.5} =	113.5	Ν			
F _m =	1155.0	Ν			
F _{infl} =	1039.1	Ν			
F _f =	924.0	Ν			
Displace	Displacement values				
u _e =	0.290	mm			
u _{h0/10,off} =	0.513	mm			
u _{0.1mm,off} =	0.701	mm			
u _{e1.5} =	0.074	mm			
u _m =	1.076	mm			
u _{infl} =	1.300	mm			
u _f =	1.475	mm			
Initial linear slope					
Slope _{ini} =	1550.09	N/mm			
Ener	gy values				
E _{SP} =	1.18	J			
E _m =	0.76	J			
E _{PL} =	0.33	J			





 Specimen ID:
 900HIP_2_S_a_SP2

 Material:
 AM Ti-64

 Test speed:
 0.007052 mm/s

 Max strain rate:
 7.05E-03 s⁻¹

TEST	RESULTS	S			
Forc	e values				
F _{e,proj} =	321.9	Ν			
F _{e,int} =	337.6	Ν			
F _{h0/10,off} =	532.4	Ν			
F _{0.1mm,off} =	714.6	Ν			
F _{0.1mm} =	226.5	Ν			
F _{0.48mm} =	785.1	Ν			
F _{0.5mm} =	814.2	Ν			
F _{0.65mm} =	977.1	Ν			
F _{0.9mm} =	1053.2	Ν			
F _{ept} =	1069.2	Ν			
F _{e1.5} =	635.6	Ν			
F _m =	1102.8	Ν			
F _{infl} =	169.1	Ν			
F _f =	882.2	Ν			
Displace	Displacement values				
u _e =	0.152	mm			
u _{h0/10,off} =	0.291	mm			
u _{0.1mm,off} =	0.423	mm			
u _{e1.5} =	0.366	mm			
u _m =	1.053	mm			
u _{infl} =	2.299	mm			
u _f =	1.500	mm			
Initial linear slope					
Slope _{ini} =	2219.10	N/mm			
Ener	gy values				
E _{SP} =	1.25	l			
E _m =	0.79	J			
E _{PL} =	0.52	J			





Specimen ID: 900HIP_2_S_a_SP3 **Material:** AM Ti-64 **Test speed:** 0.002996 mm/s **Max strain rate:** 3.00E-03 s⁻¹

TEST	RESULTS	S			
Forc	e values				
F _{e,proj} =	412.0	Ν			
F _{e,int} =	429.3	N			
F _{h0/10,off} =	607.7	Ν			
F _{0.1mm,off} =	768.0	Ν			
F _{0.1mm} =	221.2	Ν			
F _{0.48mm} =	782.8	Ν			
F _{0.5mm} =	808.5	Ν			
F _{0.65mm} =	960.7	Ν			
F _{0.9mm} =	1057.7	Ν			
F _{ept} =	856.8	Ν			
F _{e1.5} =	91.6	Ν			
F _m =	1107.5	Ν			
F _{infl} =	1080.9	Ν			
F _f =	886.0	Ν			
Displace	Displacement values				
u _e =	0.202	mm			
u _{h0/10,off} =	0.336	mm			
u _{0.1mm,off} =	0.463	mm			
u _{e1.5} =	0.042	mm			
u _m =	1.034	mm			
u _{infl} =	0.991	mm			
u _f =	1.529	mm			
Initial linear slope					
Slope _{ini} =	2129.12	N/mm			
Energ	gy values				
E _{SP} =	1.28	l			
E _m =	0.77	J			
E _{PL} =	0.48	J			





Specimen ID: 900HIP_2_S_a_SP4 **Material:** AM Ti-64 **Test speed:** 0.000723 mm/s **Max strain rate:** 7.23E-04 s⁻¹

TEST	RESULT	S		
Forc	e values			
F _{e,proj} =	319.7	Ν		
F _{e,int} =	329.3	Ν		
F _{h0/10,off} =	557.7	Ν		
F _{0.1mm,off} =	760.7	Ν		
F _{0.1mm} =	174.1	Ν		
F _{0.48mm} =	697.7	Ν		
F _{0.5mm} =	722.3	Ν		
F _{0.65mm} =	904.2	Ν		
F _{0.9mm} =	1096.9	Ν		
F _{ept} =	1117.1	Ν		
F _{e1.5} =	172.4	Ν		
F _m =	1128.8	Ν		
F _{infl} =	1122.8	Ν		
F _f =	903.0	Ν		
Displace	ment valu	ies		
u _e =	0.186	mm		
u _{h0/10,off} =	0.366	mm		
u _{0.1mm,off} =	0.532	mm		
u _{e1.5} =	0.097	mm		
u _m =	1.102	mm		
u _{infl} =	0.963	mm		
u _f =		mm		
Initial linear slope				
Slope _{ini} =	1767.22	N/mm		
Energy values				
E _{SP} =	#N/A	J		
E _m =	0.80	J		
E _{PL} =	0.44	J		





 Specimen ID:
 900HIP_2_S_a_SP5

 Material:
 AM Ti-64

 Test speed:
 0.007006 mm/s

 Max strain rate:
 7.01E-03 s⁻¹

TEST	RESULT	S			
Forc	e values				
F _{e,proj} =	346.0	Ν			
F _{e,int} =	351.1	Ν			
F _{h0/10,off} =	613.3	Ν			
F _{0.1mm,off} =	785.1	Ν			
F _{0.1mm} =	208.1	Ν			
F _{0.48mm} =	775.4	Ν			
F _{0.5mm} =	793.7	Ν			
F _{0.65mm} =	958.5	Ν			
F _{0.9mm} =	1087.4	Ν			
F _{ept} =	543.1	Ν			
F _{e1.5} =	140.2	Ν			
F _m =	1091.8	Ν			
F _{infl} =	1082.4	Ν			
F _f =	873.5	Ν			
Displace	Displacement values				
u _e =	0.175	mm			
u _{h0/10,off} =	0.356	mm			
u _{0.1mm,off} =	0.491	mm			
u _{e1.5} =	0.067	mm			
u _m =	0.886	mm			
u _{infl} =	0.878	mm			
u _f =		mm			
Initial linear slope					
Slope _{ini} =	2008.64	N/mm			
Energy values					
E _{SP} =	#N/A	l			
E _m =	0.60	J			
E _{PL} =	0.30	J			





Specimen ID: 900HIP_2_S_a_SP6 **Material:** AM Ti-64 **Test speed:** 0.001014 mm/s **Max strain rate:** 1.01E-03 s⁻¹

TEST RESULTS				
Force values				
F _{e,proj} =	371.8	Ν		
F _{e,int} =	390.6	Ν		
F _{h0/10,off} =	590.3	Ν		
F _{0.1mm,off} =	743.8	Ν		
F _{0.1mm} =	209.9	Ν		
F _{0.48mm} =	767.7	Ν		
F _{0.5mm} =	788.2	Ν		
F _{0.65mm} =	964.4	Ν		
F _{0.9mm} =	1150.9	Ν		
F _{ept} =	32.5	Ν		
F _{e1.5} =	170.6	Ν		
F _m =	1169. 2	Ν		
F _{infl} =	693.0	Ν		
F _f =	935.3	Ν		
Displacement values				
u _e =	0.191	mm		
u _{h0/10,off} =	0.339	mm		
u _{0.1mm,off} =	0.464	mm		
u _{e1.5} =	0.081	mm		
u _m =	0.881	mm		
u _{infl} =	1.734	mm		
u _f =	1.505	mm		
Initial linear slope				
Slope _{ini} =	2045.64	N/mm		
Energy values				
E _{SP} =	1.28	l		
E _m =	0.61	J		
E _{PL} =	0.27	J		





Specimen ID: 900HIP_2_S_a_SP7 **Material:** AM Ti-64 **Test speed:** 0.001006 mm/s **Max strain rate:** 1.01E-03 s⁻¹

TEST RESULTS				
Force values				
F _{e,proj} =	347.1	Ν		
F _{e,int} =	354.2	Ν		
F _{h0/10,off} =	567.8	Ν		
F _{0.1mm,off} =	753.2	Ν		
F _{0.1mm} =	191.7	Ν		
F _{0.48mm} =	735.9	Ν		
F _{0.5mm} =	762.0	Ν		
F _{0.65mm} =	929.8	Ν		
F _{0.9mm} =	1092.3	Ν		
F _{ept} =	326.7	Ν		
F _{e1.5} =	164.9	Ν		
F _m =	1103.7	Ν		
F _{infl} =	446.2	Ν		
F _f =	882.9	Ν		
Displacement values				
u _e =	0.187	mm		
u _{h0/10,off} =	0.351	mm		
u _{0.1mm,off} =	0.498	mm		
u _{e1.5} =	0.086	mm		
u _m =	0.894	mm		
u _{infl} =	0.257	mm		
u _f =	1.675	mm		
Initial linear slope				
Slope _{ini} =	1893.58	N/mm		
Energy values				
E _{SP} =	1.38	J		
E _m =	0.59	J		
E _{PL} =	0.27	J		





Specimen ID: 900HIP_2_S_a_SP8 **Material:** AM Ti-64 **Test speed:** 0.001025 mm/s **Max strain rate:** 1.02E-03 s⁻¹

TEST RESULTS			
Force values			
F _{e,proj} =	354.0	Ν	
F _{e,int} =	366.1	Ν	
F _{h0/10,off} =	560.1	Ν	
F _{0.1mm,off} =	782.2	Ν	
F _{0.1mm} =	182.3	Ν	
F _{0.48mm} =	704.7	Ν	
F _{0.5mm} =	735.4	Ν	
F _{0.65mm} =	928.1	Ν	
F _{0.9mm} =	1186.9	Ν	
F _{ept} =	855.9	Ν	
F _{e1.5} =	199.5	Ν	
F _m =	1186.9	Ν	
F _{infl} =	790.2	Ν	
F _f =	949.5	Ν	
Displacement values			
u _e =	0.204	mm	
u _{h0/10,off} =	0.362	mm	
u _{0.1mm,off} =	0.535	mm	
u _{e1.5} =	0.111	mm	
u _m =	0.899	mm	
u _{infl} =	1.729	mm	
u _f =	1.478	mm	
Initial linear slope			
Slope _{ini} =	1797.35	N/mm	
Energy values			
E _{SP} =	1.20	J	
E _m =	0.59	J	
E _{PL} =	0.20	J	




Specimen ID: 900HIP_2_S_a_SP9 **Material:** AM Ti-64 **Test speed:** 0.001009 mm/s **Max strain rate:** 1.01E-03 s⁻¹

TEST RESULTS		
Forc	e values	
F _{e,proj} =	391.5	Ν
F _{e,int} =	410.5	Ν
F _{h0/10,off} =	575.3	Ν
F _{0.1mm,off} =	730.7	Ν
F _{0.1mm} =	221.4	Ν
F _{0.48mm} =	792.9	Ν
F _{0.5mm} =	816.7	Ν
F _{0.65mm} =	1006.7	Ν
F _{0.9mm} =	1094.7	Ν
F _{ept} =	1120.6	Ν
F _{e1.5} =	187.6	Ν
F _m =	1154.0	Ν
F _{infl} =	1066.3	Ν
F _f =	923.2	Ν
Displace	ment valu	ies
u _e =	0.189	mm
u _{h0/10,off} =	0.315	mm
u _{0.1mm,off} =	0.436	mm
u _{e1.5} =	0.086	mm
u _m =	1.132	mm
u _{infl} =	1.428	mm
u _f =	1.576	mm
Initial linear slope		
Slope _{ini} =	2175.63	N/mm
Ener	gy values	
E _{SP} =	1.37	J
E _m =	0.90	J
E _{PL} =	0.59	J





Specimen ID: 900HIP_2_S_a_SP10 **Material:** AM Ti-64 **Test speed:** 0.008383 mm/s **Max strain rate:** 8.38E-03 s⁻¹

TEST	TEST RESULTS	
Forc	e values	
F _{e,proj} =	423.4	Ν
F _{e,int} =	441.0	Ν
F _{h0/10,off} =	661.4	Ν
F _{0.1mm,off} =	821.2	Ν
F _{0.1mm} =	201.1	Ν
F _{0.48mm} =	790.3	Ν
F _{0.5mm} =	815.8	Ν
F _{0.65mm} =	959.7	Ν
F _{0.9mm} =	1097.1	Ν
F _{ept} =	977.1	Ν
F _{e1.5} =	164.5	Ν
F _m =	1157.3	Ν
F _{infl} =	720.7	Ν
F _f =	925.8	Ν
Displace	ment valu	es
u _e =	0.215	mm
u _{h0/10,off} =	0.373	mm
u _{0.1mm,off} =	0.502	mm
u _{e1.5} =	0.076	mm
u _m =	1.121	mm
u _{infl} =	0.419	mm
u _f =	1.560	mm
Initial linear slope		
Slope _{ini} =	2050.10	N/mm
Energ	gy values	
E _{SP} =	1.34	1
E _m =	0.87	J
E _{PL} =	0.55	J





ANNEX 2

SP Test Results for

As built, scan length = 78 mm, non-supported ("rough" specimens)

Specimen ID: AB_1_N_a_SP1 **Material:** AM Ti-64 **Test speed:** 0.000934 mm/s **Max strain rate:** 9.34E-04 s⁻¹

TEST RESULTS		
Forc	e values	
F _{e,proj} =	352.6	Ν
F _{e,int} =	361.0	Ν
F _{h0/10,off} =	621.7	Ν
F _{0.1mm,off} =	808.2	Ν
F _{0.1mm} =	216.0	Ν
F _{0.48mm} =	807.1	Ν
F _{0.5mm} =	831.2	Ν
F _{0.65mm} =	995.7	Ν
F _{0.9mm} =	1057.2	Ν
F _{ept} =	23.9	Ν
F _{e1.5} =	155.8	Ν
F _m =	1070.8	Ν
F _{infl} =	645.2	Ν
F _f =	856.7	Ν
Displace	ment valu	ies
u _e =	0.172	mm
u _{h0/10,off} =	0.346	mm
u _{0.1mm,off} =	0.487	mm
u _{e1.5} =	0.074	mm
u _m =	0.938	mm
u _{infl} =	1.568	mm
u _f =	1.297	mm
Initial linear slope		
Slope _{ini} =	2098.05	N/mm
Energy values		
E _{SP} =	1.02	J
E _m =	0.67	J
Е _{РL} =	0.39	J





Specimen ID: AB_1_N_a_SP2 **Material:** AM Ti-64 **Test speed:** 0.000927 mm/s **Max strain rate:** 9.27E-04 s⁻¹

TEST	RESULT	S
Forc	e values	
F _{e,proj} =	394.4	Ν
F _{e,int} =	404.7	Ν
F _{h0/10,off} =	638.2	Ν
F _{0.1mm,off} =	841.7	Ν
F _{0.1mm} =	271.0	Ν
F _{0.48mm} =	930.2	Ν
F _{0.5mm} =	944.1	Ν
F _{0.65mm} =	996.4	Ν
F _{0.9mm} =	1047.2	Ν
F _{ept} =	704.5	Ν
F _{e1.5} =	190.1	Ν
F _m =	1065.2	Ν
F _{infl} =	1038.6	Ν
F _f =	852.2	Ν
Displace	ment valu	es
u _e =	0.150	mm
u _{h0/10,off} =	0.287	mm
u _{0.1mm,off} =	0.413	mm
u _{e1.5} =	0.070	mm
u _m =	0.866	mm
u _{infl} =	0.902	mm
u _f =	1.345	mm
Initial linear slope		
Slope _{ini} =	2693.16	N/mm
Ener	gy values	
E _{SP} =	1.11	J
E _m =	0.65	J
E _{PL} =	0.44	J





Specimen ID: AB_1_N_a_SP4 **Material:** AM Ti-64 **Test speed:** 0.000964 mm/s **Max strain rate:** 9.64E-04 s⁻¹

TEST RESULTS			
Forc	e values		
F _{e,proj} =	511.2	Ν	
F _{e,int} =	549.7	Ν	
F _{h0/10,off} =	674.5	Ν	
F _{0.1mm,off} =	767.8	Ν	
F _{0.1mm} =	333.2	Ν	
F _{0.48mm} =	884.0	Ν	
F _{0.5mm} =	901.6	Ν	
F _{0.65mm} =	986.5	Ν	
F _{0.9mm} =	1103.1	Ν	
F _{ept} =	792.6	Ν	
F _{e1.5} =	732.4	Ν	
F _m =	1109.4	Ν	
F _{infl} =	709.8	Ν	
F _f =	887.5	Ν	
Displace	Displacement values		
u _e =	0.179	mm	
u _{h0/10,off} =	0.271	mm	
u _{0.1mm,off} =	0.351	mm	
u _{e1.5} =	0.317	mm	
u _m =	0.900	mm	
u _{infl} =	1.639	mm	
u _f =	1.405	mm	
Initial linear slope			
Slope _{ini} =	3070.90	N/mm	
Energ	gy values		
E _{SP} =	1.19	J	
E _m =	0.69	J	
E _{PL} =	0.49	J	





Specimen ID: AB_1_N_a_SP5 **Material:** AM Ti-64 **Test speed:** 0.000964 mm/s **Max strain rate:** 9.64E-04 s⁻¹

TEST	TEST RESULTS		
Forc	e values		
F _{e,proj} =	396.4	Ν	
F _{e,int} =	424.7	Ν	
F _{h0/10,off} =	571.1	Ν	
F _{0.1mm,off} =	732.9	Ν	
F _{0.1mm} =	299.7	Ν	
F _{0.48mm} =	879.4	Ν	
F _{0.5mm} =	899.0	Ν	
F _{0.65mm} =	973.8	Ν	
F _{0.9mm} =	1088.7	Ν	
F _{ept} =	887.5	Ν	
F _{e1.5} =	261.9	Ν	
F _m =	1098.1	Ν	
F _{infl} =	635.9	Ν	
F _f =	878.4	Ν	
Displace	ment valu	es	
u _e =	0.143	mm	
u _{h0/10,off} =	0.243	mm	
u _{0.1mm,off} =	0.348	mm	
u _{e1.5} =	0.085	mm	
u _m =	0.864	mm	
u _{infl} =	1.656	mm	
u _f =	1.373	mm	
Initial linear slope			
Slope _{ini} =	2960.92	N/mm	
Ener	gy values		
E _{SP} =	1.16	J	
E _m =	0.64	J	
E _{PL} =	0.44	J	





Specimen ID: AB_1_N_a_SP6 **Material:** AM Ti-64 **Test speed:** 0.000969 mm/s **Max strain rate:** 9.69E-04 s⁻¹

TEST RESULTS		
Forc	e values	
F _{e,proj} =	507.7	Ν
F _{e,int} =	526.7	Ν
F _{h0/10,off} =	703.1	Ν
F _{0.1mm,off} =	851.9	Ν
F _{0.1mm} =	288.5	Ν
F _{0.48mm} =	919.3	Ν
F _{0.5mm} =	951.0	Ν
F _{0.65mm} =	1009.7	Ν
F _{0.9mm} =	1024.5	Ν
F _{ept} =	410.0	Ν
F _{e1.5} =	983.5	Ν
F _m =	1050.7	Ν
F _{infl} =	740.5	Ν
F _f =	840.6	Ν
Displace	ment valu	ies
u _e =	0.190	mm
u _{h0/10,off} =	0.304	mm
u _{0.1mm,off} =	0.408	mm
u _{e1.5} =	0.525	mm
u _m =	0.977	mm
u _{infl} =	1.608	mm
u _f =	1.479	mm
Initial linear slope		
Slope _{ini} =	2769.78	N/mm
Energy values		
E _{SP} =	1.26	l
E _m =	0.77	J
E _{PL} =	0.57	J





Specimen ID: AB_1_N_a_SP7 **Material:** AM Ti-64 **Test speed:** 0.001011 mm/s **Max strain rate:** 1.01E-03 s⁻¹

TEST RESULTS		
Ford	e values	
F _{e,proj} =	438.4	Ν
F _{e,int} =	470.2	Ν
F _{h0/10,off} =	653.3	Ν
F _{0.1mm,off} =	822.8	Ν
F _{0.1mm} =	288.2	Ν
F _{0.48mm} =	915.7	Ν
F _{0.5mm} =	927.0	Ν
F _{0.65mm} =	1059.5	Ν
F _{0.9mm} =	1083.8	Ν
F _{ept} =	309.6	Ν
F _{e1.5} =	187.5	Ν
F _m =	1109.3	Ν
F _{infl} =	703.4	Ν
F _f =	887.4	Ν
Displace	ment valu	es
u _e =	0.170	mm
u _{h0/10,off} =	0.286	mm
u _{0.1mm,off} =	0.398	mm
u _{e1.5} =	0.063	mm
u _m =	1.019	mm
u _{infl} =	1.592	mm
u _f =	1.425	mm
Initial linear slope		
Slope _{ini} =	2772.76	N/mm
Ener	gy values	
E _{SP} =	1.22	J
E _m =	0.83	J
Е _{РL} =	0.60	J





ANNEX 3

SP Test Results for

As built, scan length = 78 mm, non-supported (polished specimens)

Specimen ID: AB_1_N_a_SP8 (polish Material: AM Ti-64 Test speed: 0.001436 mm/s Max strain rate: 1.44E-03 s⁻¹

TEST	RESULT	S
Forc	e values	
F _{e,proj} =	387.3	Ν
F _{e,int} =	421.6	Ν
F _{h0/10,off} =	521.6	Ν
F _{0.1mm,off} =	694.8	Ν
F _{0.1mm} =	336.9	Ν
F _{0.48mm} =	903.1	Ν
F _{0.5mm} =	921.2	Ν
F _{0.65mm} =	911.2	Ν
F _{0.9mm} =	972.6	Ν
F _{ept} =	783.2	Ν
F _{e1.5} =	736.8	Ν
F _m =	975.4	Ν
F _{infl} =	505.2	Ν
F _f =	780.3	Ν
Displace	ment valu	ies
u _e =	0.120	mm
u _{h0/10,off} =	0.194	mm
u _{0.1mm,off} =	0.298	mm
u _{e1.5} =	0.328	mm
u _m =	0.861	mm
u _{infl} =	1.624	mm
u _f =	1.250	mm
Initial linear slope		
Slope _{ini} =	3519.91	N/mm
Ener	gy values	
E _{SP} =	0.98	J
E _m =	0.63	J
Е _{РL} =	0.49	J





Specimen ID: AB_1_N_a_SP9 (polish Material: AM Ti-64 Test speed: 0.001437 mm/s Max strain rate: 1.44E-03 s⁻¹

TEST RESULTS		
Forc	e values	
F _{e,proj} =	453.6	Ν
F _{e,int} =	495.0	Ν
F _{h0/10,off} =	577.5	Ν
F _{0.1mm,off} =	721.5	Ν
F _{0.1mm} =	334.5	Ν
F _{0.48mm} =	868.3	Ν
F _{0.5mm} =	870.6	Ν
F _{0.65mm} =	939.4	Ν
F _{0.9mm} =	1006.8	Ν
F _{ept} =	737.8	Ν
F _{e1.5} =	711.4	Ν
F _m =	1010.7	Ν
F _{infl} =	970.1	Ν
F _f =	808.5	Ν
Displace	ment valu	les
u _e =	0.151	mm
u _{h0/10,off} =	0.221	mm
u _{0.1mm,off} =	0.321	mm
u _{e1.5} =	0.311	mm
u _m =	0.893	mm
u _{infl} =	1.010	mm
u _f =	1.271	mm
Initial linear slope		
Slope _{ini} =	3278.01	N/mm
Ener	gy values	
E _{SP} =	1.01	J
E _m =	0.66	J
Е _{РL} =	0.50	J





Specimen ID: AB_1_N_a_SP10 (polis Material: AM Ti-64 Test speed: 0.00143 mm/s Max strain rate: 1.43E-03 s⁻¹

TEST RESULTS		
Forc	e values	
F _{e,proj} =	390.0	Ν
F _{e,int} =	419.9	Ν
F _{h0/10,off} =	532.1	Ν
F _{0.1mm,off} =	698.4	Ν
F _{0.1mm} =	298.2	Ν
F _{0.48mm} =	845.6	Ν
F _{0.5mm} =	852.7	Ν
F _{0.65mm} =	865.9	Ν
F _{0.9mm} =	937.9	Ν
F _{ept} =	878.2	Ν
F _{e1.5} =	775.3	Ν
F _m =	955.3	Ν
F _{infl} =	487.2	Ν
F _f =	764.3	Ν
Displace	ment valu	ies
u _e =	0.144	mm
u _{h0/10,off} =	0.228	mm
u _{0.1mm,off} =	0.340	mm
u _{e1.5} =	0.399	mm
u _m =	0.976	mm
u _{infl} =	1.611	mm
u _f =	1.351	mm
Initial linear slope		
Slope _{ini} =	2907.81	N/mm
Ener	gy values	
E _{SP} =	1.03	J
E _m =	0.70	J
Е _{РL} =	0.54	J




ANNEX 4

SP Test Results for

As built, scan length = 26 mm, non-supported ("rough" specimens)

Specimen ID: AB_3_N_a_SP1 **Material:** AM Ti-64 **Test speed:** 0.001031 mm/s **Max strain rate:** 1.03E-03 s⁻¹

TEST RESULTS		
Forc	e values	
F _{e,proj} =	398.1	Ν
F _{e,int} =	408.4	Ν
F _{h0/10,off} =	643.2	Ν
F _{0.1mm,off} =	787.6	Ν
F _{0.1mm} =	188.5	Ν
F _{0.48mm} =	745.2	Ν
F _{0.5mm} =	770.4	Ν
F _{0.65mm} =	920.4	Ν
F _{0.9mm} =	1005.9	Ν
F _{ept} =	117.8	Ν
F _{e1.5} =	192.6	Ν
F _m =	1093.5	Ν
F _{infl} =	1000.8	Ν
F _f =	874.8	Ν
Displace	ment valu	ies
u _e =	0.218	mm
u _{h0/10,off} =	0.393	mm
u _{0.1mm,off} =	0.520	mm
u _{e1.5} =	0.100	mm
u _m =	1.142	mm
u _{infl} =	0.774	mm
u _f =	1.585	mm
Initial linear slope		
Slope _{ini} =	1876.53	N/mm
Energy values		
E _{SP} =	1.28	J
E _m =	0.84	J
Е _{РL} =	0.52	J





Specimen ID: AB_3_N_a_SP3 **Material:** AM Ti-64 **Test speed:** 0.00104 mm/s **Max strain rate:** 1.04E-03 s⁻¹

TEST RESULTS		
Forc	e values	
F _{e,proj} =	449.1	Ν
F _{e,int} =	457.0	Ν
F _{h0/10,off} =	673.4	Ν
F _{0.1mm,off} =	831.5	Ν
F _{0.1mm} =	186.6	Ν
F _{0.48mm} =	758.0	Ν
F _{0.5mm} =	777.1	Ν
F _{0.65mm} =	939.1	Ν
F _{0.9mm} =	1002.7	Ν
F _{ept} =	609.0	Ν
F _{e1.5} =	156.4	Ν
F _m =	1158.1	Ν
F _{infl} =	630.8	Ν
F _f =	926.5	Ν
Displace	ment valu	ies
u _e =	0.246	mm
u _{h0/10,off} =	0.412	mm
u _{0.1mm,off} =	0.547	mm
u _{e1.5} =	0.084	mm
u _m =	1.150	mm
u _{infl} =	1.799	mm
u _f =	1.463	mm
Initial linear slope		
Slope _{ini} =	1860.63	N/mm
Ener	gy values	
E _{SP} =	1.21	l
E _m =	0.88	J
E _{PL} =	0.51	J





Specimen ID: AB_3_N_a_SP4 **Material:** AM Ti-64 **Test speed:** 0.001042 mm/s **Max strain rate:** 1.04E-03 s⁻¹

TEST RESULTS		
Forc	e values	
F _{e,proj} =	452.2	Ν
F _{e,int} =	456.5	Ν
F _{h0/10,off} =	780.4	Ν
F _{0.1mm,off} =	974.2	Ν
F _{0.1mm} =	163.0	Ν
F _{0.48mm} =	736.5	Ν
F _{0.5mm} =	763.6	Ν
F _{0.65mm} =	947.0	Ν
F _{0.9mm} =	1060.2	Ν
F _{ept} =	942.2	Ν
F _{e1.5} =	174.1	Ν
F _m =	1071.7	Ν
F _{infl} =	349.1	Ν
F _f =	857.3	Ν
Displace	ment valu	ies
u _e =	0.274	mm
u _{h0/10,off} =	0.519	mm
u _{0.1mm,off} =	0.685	mm
u _{e1.5} =	0.105	mm
u _m =	0.987	mm
u _{infl} =	1.765	mm
u _f =	1.395	mm
Initial linear slope		
Slope _{ini} =	1666.44	N/mm
Energy values		
E _{SP} =	1.09	J
E _m =	0.68	J
E _{PL} =	0.33	J





Specimen ID: AB_3_N_a_SP5 **Material:** AM Ti-64 **Test speed:** 0.00104 mm/s **Max strain rate:** 1.04E-03 s⁻¹

TEST RESULTS		
Forc	e values	
F _{e,proj} =	383.2	Ν
F _{e,int} =	393.2	Ν
F _{h0/10,off} =	612.4	Ν
F _{0.1mm,off} =	785.9	Ν
F _{0.1mm} =	198.4	Ν
F _{0.48mm} =	774.2	Ν
F _{0.5mm} =	799.9	Ν
F _{0.65mm} =	921.8	Ν
F _{0.9mm} =	1061.4	Ν
F _{ept} =	613.7	Ν
F _{e1.5} =	163.9	Ν
F _m =	1107.0	Ν
F _{infl} =	740.2	Ν
F _f =	885.6	Ν
Displace	ment valu	ies
u _e =	0.195	mm
u _{h0/10,off} =	0.355	mm
u _{0.1mm,off} =	0.490	mm
u _{e1.5} =	0.083	mm
u _m =	1.152	mm
u _{infl} =	0.452	mm
u _f =	1.481	mm
Initial linear slope		
Slope _{ini} =	2016.45	N/mm
Energy values		
E _{SP} =	1.20	J
E _m =	0.88	J
Е _{РL} =	0.57	J





Specimen ID: AB_3_N_a_SP6 **Material:** AM Ti-64 **Test speed:** 0.001034 mm/s **Max strain rate:** 1.03E-03 s⁻¹

TEST RESULTS		
Forc	e values	
F _{e,proj} =	401.5	Ν
F _{e,int} =	408.2	Ν
F _{h0/10,off} =	675.0	Ν
F _{0.1mm,off} =	872.4	Ν
F _{0.1mm} =	174.9	Ν
F _{0.48mm} =	738.2	Ν
F _{0.5mm} =	762.2	Ν
F _{0.65mm} =	922.1	Ν
F _{0.9mm} =	1003.1	Ν
F _{ept} =	756.4	Ν
F _{e1.5} =	140.7	Ν
F _m =	1090.5	Ν
F _{infl} =	715.8	Ν
F _f =	872.4	Ν
Displace	ment valu	ies
u _e =	0.234	mm
u _{h0/10,off} =	0.437	mm
u _{0.1mm,off} =	0.601	mm
u _{e1.5} =	0.079	mm
u _m =	1.058	mm
u _{infl} =	1.752	mm
u _f =	1.558	mm
Initial linear slope		
Slope _{ini} =	1745.38	N/mm
Ener	gy values	
E _{SP} =	1.25	l
E _m =	0.75	J
Е _{РL} =	0.41	J





Specimen ID: AB_3_N_a_SP7 **Material:** AM Ti-64 **Test speed:** 0.001043 mm/s **Max strain rate:** 1.04E-03 s⁻¹

TEST RESULTS		
Forc	e values	
F _{e,proj} =	364.6	Ν
F _{e,int} =	370.9	Ν
F _{h0/10,off} =	637.4	Ν
F _{0.1mm,off} =	832.6	Ν
F _{0.1mm} =	172.4	Ν
F _{0.48mm} =	725.1	Ν
F _{0.5mm} =	742.0	Ν
F _{0.65mm} =	915.6	Ν
F _{0.9mm} =	1055.6	Ν
F _{ept} =	241.5	Ν
F _{e1.5} =	164.6	Ν
F _m =	1088.0	Ν
F _{infl} =	634.4	Ν
F _f =	870.4	Ν
Displace	ment valu	es
u _e =	0.212	mm
u _{h0/10,off} =	0.414	mm
u _{0.1mm,off} =	0.576	mm
u _{e1.5} =	0.093	mm
u _m =	1.101	mm
u _{infl} =	1.794	mm
u _f =	1.524	mm
Initial linear slope		
Slope _{ini} =	1752.85	N/mm
Ener	gy values	
E _{SP} =	1.21	J
E _m =	0.79	J
Е _{РL} =	0.45	J





ANNEX 5

SP Test Results for

As built, scan length = 26 mm, non-supported (polished specimens)

Specimen ID: AB_3_N_a_SP8 (polish Material: AM Ti-64 Test speed: 0.001444 mm/s Max strain rate: 1.44E-03 s⁻¹

TEST RESULTS		
Forc	e values	
F _{e,proj} =	418.2	Ν
F _{e,int} =	454.3	Ν
F _{h0/10,off} =	558.7	Ν
F _{0.1mm,off} =	705.8	Ν
F _{0.1mm} =	310.4	Ν
F _{0.48mm} =	853.6	Ν
F _{0.5mm} =	875.2	Ν
F _{0.65mm} =	956.3	Ν
F _{0.9mm} =	934.8	Ν
F _{ept} =	81.4	Ν
F _{e1.5} =	760.3	Ν
F _m =	968.0	Ν
F _{infl} =	515.4	Ν
F _f =	774.4	Ν
Displace	ment valu	es
u _e =	0.151	mm
u _{h0/10,off} =	0.231	mm
u _{0.1mm,off} =	0.335	mm
u _{e1.5} =	0.379	mm
u _m =	0.680	mm
u _{infl} =	1.661	mm
u _f =	1.245	mm
Initial I	inear slop	е
Slope _{ini} =	3010.25	N/mm
Ener	gy values	
E _{SP} =	0.95	J
E _m =	0.44	J
E _{PL} =	0.28	J





Specimen ID: AB_3_N_a_SP9 (polish Material: AM Ti-64 Test speed: 0.001445 mm/s Max strain rate: 1.44E-03 s⁻¹

TEST	TEST RESULTS	
Forc	e values	
F _{e,proj} =	428.5	Ν
F _{e,int} =	466.5	Ν
F _{h0/10,off} =	552.1	Ν
F _{0.1mm,off} =	694.6	Ν
F _{0.1mm} =	295.4	Ν
F _{0.48mm} =	818.5	Ν
F _{0.5mm} =	818.5	Ν
F _{0.65mm} =	897.2	Ν
F _{0.9mm} =	926.0	Ν
F _{ept} =	702.3	Ν
F _{e1.5} =	732.7	Ν
F _m =	956.8	Ν
F _{infl} =	487.4	Ν
F _f =	765.4	Ν
Displace	ment valu	es
u _e =	0.161	mm
u _{h0/10,off} =	0.236	mm
u _{0.1mm,off} =	0.341	mm
u _{e1.5} =	0.372	mm
u _m =	0.844	mm
u _{infl} =	1.631	mm
u _f =	1.232	mm
Initial linear slope		
Slope _{ini} =	2889.12	N/mm
Ener	gy values	
E _{SP} =	0.91	J
E _m =	0.57	J
Е _{РL} =	0.42	J





Specimen ID: AB_3_N_a_SP10 (polis Material: AM Ti-64 Test speed: 0.001449 mm/s Max strain rate: 1.45E-03 s⁻¹

TEST RESULTS		
Forc	e values	
F _{e,proj} =	363.6	Ν
F _{e,int} =	404.3	Ν
F _{h0/10,off} =	522.6	Ν
F _{0.1mm,off} =	688.9	Ν
F _{0.1mm} =	317.7	Ν
F _{0.48mm} =	880.6	Ν
F _{0.5mm} =	898.1	Ν
F _{0.65mm} =	949.1	Ν
F _{0.9mm} =	962.4	Ν
F _{ept} =	430.5	Ν
F _{e1.5} =	658.3	Ν
F _m =	981.3	Ν
F _{infl} =	76.1	Ν
F _f =	785.1	Ν
Displace	ment valu	es
u _e =	0.123	mm
u _{h0/10,off} =	0.205	mm
u _{0.1mm,off} =	0.310	mm
u _{e1.5} =	0.294	mm
u _m =	0.818	mm
u _{infl} =	0.018	mm
u _f =	1.219	mm
Initial linear slope		
Slope _{ini} =	3283.40	N/mm
Ener	gy values	
E _{SP} =	0.94	J
E _m =	0.58	J
Е _{РL} =	0.43	J





ANNEX 6

SP Test Results for

800 °C HIP, scan length = 78 mm, non-supported ("rough" specimens)

Specimen ID: 800HIP_1_N_a_SP1 **Material:** AM Ti-64 **Test speed:** 0.001004 mm/s **Max strain rate:** 1.00E-03 s⁻¹

TEST RESULTS		
Forc	e values	
F _{e,proj} =	443.2	Ν
F _{e,int} =	455.3	Ν
F _{h0/10,off} =	691.4	Ν
F _{0.1mm,off} =	868.9	Ν
F _{0.1mm} =	202.7	Ν
F _{0.48mm} =	790.4	Ν
F _{0.5mm} =	815.5	Ν
F _{0.65mm} =	959.6	Ν
F _{0.9mm} =	1032.8	Ν
F _{ept} =	572.9	Ν
F _{e1.5} =	10.1	Ν
F _m =	1082.5	Ν
F _{infl} =	468.1	Ν
F _f =	866.0	Ν
Displace	ment valu	es
u _e =	0.232	mm
u _{h0/10,off} =	0.404	mm
u _{0.1mm,off} =	0.544	mm
u _{e1.5} =	-0.025	mm
u _m =	0.822	mm
u _{infl} =	1.734	mm
u _f =	1.335	mm
Initial linear slope		
Slope _{ini} =	1958.20	N/mm
Ener	gy values	
E _{SP} =	1.05	l
E _m =	0.54	J
E _{PL} =	0.24	J





Specimen ID: 800HIP_1_N_a_SP2 **Material:** AM Ti-64 **Test speed:** 0.001005 mm/s **Max strain rate:** 1.01E-03 s⁻¹

TEST RESULTS		
Forc	e values	
F _{e,proj} =	445.7	Ν
F _{e,int} =	460.3	Ν
F _{h0/10,off} =	630.4	Ν
F _{0.1mm,off} =	761.0	Ν
F _{0.1mm} =	228.5	Ν
F _{0.48mm} =	803.0	Ν
F _{0.5mm} =	820.2	Ν
F _{0.65mm} =	938.4	Ν
F _{0.9mm} =	1020.1	Ν
F _{ept} =	966.0	Ν
F _{e1.5} =	136.8	Ν
F _m =	1068.2	Ν
F _{infl} =	628.6	Ν
F _f =	854.6	Ν
Displace	ment valu	ies
u _e =	0.208	mm
u _{h0/10,off} =	0.336	mm
u _{0.1mm,off} =	0.445	mm
u _{e1.5} =	0.060	mm
u _m =	1.074	mm
u _{infl} =	0.332	mm
u _f =	1.533	mm
Initial linear slope		
Slope _{ini} =	2210.27	N/mm
Ener	gy values	
E _{SP} =	1.25	J
E _m =	0.80	J
Е _{РL} =	0.54	J




Specimen ID: 800HIP_1_N_a_SP3 **Material:** AM Ti-64 **Test speed:** 0.001012 mm/s **Max strain rate:** 1.01E-03 s⁻¹

TEST	TEST RESULTS		
Forc	e values		
F _{e,proj} =	487.1	Ν	
F _{e,int} =	492.4	Ν	
F _{h0/10,off} =	663.9	Ν	
F _{0.1mm,off} =	828.7	Ν	
F _{0.1mm} =	179.3	Ν	
F _{0.48mm} =	737.4	Ν	
F _{0.5mm} =	765.0	Ν	
F _{0.65mm} =	915.6	Ν	
F _{0.9mm} =	1126.4	Ν	
F _{ept} =	708.1	Ν	
F _{e1.5} =	216.7	Ν	
F _m =	1157.1	Ν	
F _{infl} =	590.9	Ν	
F _f =	925.7	Ν	
Displace	ment valu	ies	
u _e =	0.273	mm	
u _{h0/10,off} =	0.419	mm	
u _{0.1mm,off} =	0.560	mm	
u _{e1.5} =	0.119	mm	
u _m =	0.946	mm	
u _{infl} =	1.731	mm	
u _f =	1.458	mm	
Initial linear slope			
Slope _{ini} =	1801.57	N/mm	
Ener	gy values		
E _{SP} =	1.20	J	
E _m =	0.65	J	
E _{PL} =	0.28	J	





Specimen ID: 800HIP_1_N_a_SP4 **Material:** AM Ti-64 **Test speed:** 0.001023 mm/s **Max strain rate:** 1.02E-03 s⁻¹

TEST	RESULT	S
Forc	e values	
F _{e,proj} =	428.9	Ν
F _{e,int} =	438.4	Ν
F _{h0/10,off} =	677.5	Ν
F _{0.1mm,off} =	817.2	Ν
F _{0.1mm} =	164.1	Ν
F _{0.48mm} =	692.9	Ν
F _{0.5mm} =	714.6	Ν
F _{0.65mm} =	879.5	Ν
F _{0.9mm} =	1054.7	Ν
F _{ept} =	411.3	Ν
F _{e1.5} =	142.5	Ν
F _m =	1106.8	Ν
F _{infl} =	577.5	Ν
F _f =	885.4	Ν
Displace	ment valu	ies
u _e =	0.267	mm
u _{h0/10,off} =	0.464	mm
u _{0.1mm,off} =	0.598	mm
u _{e1.5} =	0.086	mm
u _m =	1.038	mm
u _{infl} =	1.766	mm
u _f =	1.371	mm
Initial linear slope		
Slope _{ini} =	1639.54	N/mm
Ener	gy values	
E _{SP} =	1.05	J
E _m =	0.71	J
E _{PL} =	0.34	J





Specimen ID: 800HIP_1_N_a_SP5 **Material:** AM Ti-64 **Test speed:** 0.001036 mm/s **Max strain rate:** 1.04E-03 s⁻¹

TEST	RESULT	S
Forc	e values	
F _{e,proj} =	436.8	Ν
F _{e,int} =	447.0	Ν
F _{h0/10,off} =	658.3	Ν
F _{0.1mm,off} =	845.0	Ν
F _{0.1mm} =	173.6	Ν
F _{0.48mm} =	722.7	Ν
F _{0.5mm} =	747.9	Ν
F _{0.65mm} =	927.5	Ν
F _{0.9mm} =	1056.0	Ν
F _{ept} =	115.1	Ν
F _{e1.5} =	190.3	Ν
F _m =	1070.9	Ν
F _{infl} =	565.7	Ν
F _f =	856.7	Ν
Displace	ment valu	ies
u _e =	0.255	mm
u _{h0/10,off} =	0.426	mm
u _{0.1mm,off} =	0.582	mm
u _{e1.5} =	0.108	mm
u _m =	0.917	mm
u _{infl} =	1.782	mm
u _f =	1.413	mm
Initial linear slope		
Slope _{ini} =	1754.55	N/mm
Ener	gy values	
E _{SP} =	1.09	l
E _m =	0.60	J
E _{PL} =	0.27	J





Specimen ID: 800HIP_1_N_a_SP6 **Material:** AM Ti-64 **Test speed:** 0.001022 mm/s **Max strain rate:** 1.02E-03 s⁻¹

TEST	TEST RESULTS		
Forc	e values		
F _{e,proj} =	472.8	Ν	
F _{e,int} =	447.0	Ν	
F _{h0/10,off} =	781.3	Ν	
F _{0.1mm,off} =	904.7	Ν	
F _{0.1mm} =	194.5	Ν	
F _{0.48mm} =	763.6	Ν	
F _{0.5mm} =	786.6	Ν	
F _{0.65mm} =	930.1	Ν	
F _{0.9mm} =	1093.5	Ν	
F _{ept} =	1122.7	Ν	
F _{e1.5} =	180.0	Ν	
F _m =	1131.1	Ν	
F _{infl} =	960.9	Ν	
F _f =	904.9	Ν	
Displace	ment valu	ies	
u _e =	0.255	mm	
u _{h0/10,off} =	0.495	mm	
u _{0.1mm,off} =	0.616	mm	
u _{e1.5} =	0.091	mm	
u _m =	1.115	mm	
u _{infl} =	1.422	mm	
u _f =	1.476	mm	
Initial linear slope			
Slope _{ini} =	1754.55	N/mm	
Ener	gy values		
E _{SP} =	1.22	J	
E _m =	0.84	J	
E _{PL} =	0.48	J	





ANNEX 7

SP Test Results for

800 °C HIP, scan length = 78 mm, non-supported (polished specimens)

Specimen ID: 800HIP_1_N_a_SP7 (p **Material:** AM Ti-64 **Test speed:** 0.001441 mm/s **Max strain rate:** 1.44E-03 s⁻¹

TEST	RESULTS	S
Forc	e values	
F _{e,proj} =	431.3	Ν
F _{e,int} =	473.5	Ν
F _{h0/10,off} =	559.8	Ν
F _{0.1mm,off} =	698.0	Ν
F _{0.1mm} =	348.9	Ν
F _{0.48mm} =	874.7	Ν
F _{0.5mm} =	890.4	Ν
F _{0.65mm} =	922.1	Ν
F _{0.9mm} =	1005.9	Ν
F _{ept} =	652.4	Ν
F _{e1.5} =	577.2	Ν
F _m =	1013.5	Ν
F _{infl} =	988.7	Ν
F _f =	810.8	Ν
Displace	ment valu	ies
u _e =	0.134	mm
u _{h0/10,off} =	0.205	mm
u _{0.1mm,off} =	0.299	mm
u _{e1.5} =	0.219	mm
u _m =	0.885	mm
u _{infl} =	1.026	mm
u _f =	1.278	mm
Initial linear slope		
Slope _{ini} =	3521.07	N/mm
Energ	gy values	
E _{SP} =	1.03	J
E _m =	0.66	J
Е _{РL} =	0.51	J





Specimen ID: 800HIP_1_N_a_SP8 (p **Material:** AM Ti-64 **Test speed:** 0.001443 mm/s **Max strain rate:** 1.44E-03 s⁻¹

TEST RESULTS		
Forc	e values	
F _{e,proj} =	381.2	Ν
F _{e,int} =	413.1	Ν
F _{h0/10,off} =	513.8	Ν
F _{0.1mm,off} =	661.1	Ν
F _{0.1mm} =	298.0	Ν
F _{0.48mm} =	832.4	Ν
F _{0.5mm} =	850.4	Ν
F _{0.65mm} =	961.4	Ν
F _{0.9mm} =	918.9	Ν
F _{ept} =	722.6	Ν
F _{e1.5} =	673.6	Ν
F _m =	963.9	Ν
F _{infl} =	592.8	Ν
F _f =	771.1	Ν
Displace	ment valu	es
u _e =	0.138	mm
u _{h0/10,off} =	0.217	mm
u _{0.1mm,off} =	0.322	mm
u _{e1.5} =	0.334	mm
u _m =	0.654	mm
u _{infl} =	1.666	mm
u _f =	1.404	mm
Initial linear slope		
Slope _{ini} =	2983.80	N/mm
Ener	gy values	
E _{SP} =	1.05	J
E _m =	0.40	J
E _{PL} =	0.25	J





Specimen ID: 800HIP_1_N_a_SP9 (p **Material:** AM Ti-64 **Test speed:** 0.001434 mm/s **Max strain rate:** 1.43E-03 s⁻¹

TEST	RESULTS	S
Forc	e values	
F _{e,proj} =	393.2	Ν
F _{e,int} =	426.2	Ν
F _{h0/10,off} =	528.3	Ν
F _{0.1mm,off} =	656.9	Ν
F _{0.1mm} =	317.5	Ν
F _{0.48mm} =	833.0	Ν
F _{0.5mm} =	853.6	Ν
F _{0.65mm} =	967.8	Ν
F _{0.9mm} =	916.7	Ν
F _{ept} =	613.3	Ν
F _{e1.5} =	753.9	Ν
F _m =	971.8	Ν
F _{infl} =	623.1	Ν
F _f =	777.4	Ν
Displace	ment valu	ies
u _e =	0.137	mm
u _{h0/10,off} =	0.214	mm
u _{0.1mm,off} =	0.311	mm
u _{e1.5} =	0.381	mm
u _m =	0.691	mm
u _{infl} =	1.662	mm
u _f =	1.475	mm
Initial linear slope		
Slope _{ini} =	3115.09	N/mm
Ener	gy values	
E _{SP} =	1.14	J
E _m =	0.44	J
E _{PL} =	0.29	J





Specimen ID: 800HIP_1_N_a_SP10 (**Material:** AM Ti-64 **Test speed:** 0.001428 mm/s **Max strain rate:** 1.43E-03 s⁻¹

TEST	RESULTS	S
Forc	e values	
F _{e,proj} =	348.2	Ν
F _{e,int} =	381.0	Ν
F _{h0/10,off} =	484.1	Ν
F _{0.1mm,off} =	630.0	Ν
F _{0.1mm} =	314.7	Ν
F _{0.48mm} =	854.8	Ν
F _{0.5mm} =	874.9	Ν
F _{0.65mm} =	917.2	Ν
F _{0.9mm} =	989.1	Ν
F _{ept} =	558.4	Ν
F _{e1.5} =	589.4	Ν
F _m =	996.4	Ν
F _{infl} =	686.5	Ν
F _f =	797.1	Ν
Displacement values		
u _e =	0.117	mm
u _{h0/10,off} =	0.193	mm
u _{0.1mm,off} =	0.294	mm
u _{e1.5} =	0.265	mm
u _m =	0.900	mm
u _{infl} =	1.416	mm
u _f =	1.306	mm
Initial linear slope		
Slope _{ini} =	3258.38	N/mm
Ener	gy values	
E _{SP} =	1.02	J
E _m =	0.64	J
Е _{РL} =	0.49	J





ANNEX 8

SP Test Results for

900 °C HIP, scan length = 78 mm, non-supported ("rough" specimens)

Specimen ID: 900HIP_1_N_a_SP2 **Material:** AM Ti-64 **Test speed:** 0.001017 mm/s **Max strain rate:** 1.02E-03 s⁻¹

TEST	TEST RESULTS		
Forc	e values		
F _{e,proj} =	401.3	Ν	
F _{e,int} =	417.4	Ν	
F _{h0/10,off} =	583.9	Ν	
F _{0.1mm,off} =	720.0	Ν	
F _{0.1mm} =	207.5	Ν	
F _{0.48mm} =	762.7	Ν	
F _{0.5mm} =	784.5	Ν	
F _{0.65mm} =	918.6	Ν	
F _{0.9mm} =	1071.1	Ν	
F _{ept} =	1038.6	Ν	
F _{e1.5} =	139.7	Ν	
F _m =	1123.6	Ν	
F _{infl} =	650.9	Ν	
F _f =	898.9	Ν	
Displace	ment valu	es	
u _e =	0.199	mm	
u _{h0/10,off} =	0.328	mm	
u _{0.1mm,off} =	0.444	mm	
u _{e1.5} =	0.064	mm	
u _m =	1.091	mm	
u _{infl} =	1.748	mm	
u _f =	1.450	mm	
Initial linear slope			
Slope _{ini} =	2099.36	N/mm	
Ener	gy values		
E _{SP} =	1.18	l	
E _m =	0.81	J	
E _{PL} =	0.51	J	





Specimen ID: 900HIP_1_N_a_SP3 **Material:** AM Ti-64 **Test speed:** 0.001014 mm/s **Max strain rate:** 1.01E-03 s⁻¹

TEST	TEST RESULTS		
Forc	e values		
F _{e,proj} =	415.5	Ν	
F _{e,int} =	420.7	Ν	
F _{h0/10,off} =	609.6	Ν	
F _{0.1mm,off} =	766.2	Ν	
F _{0.1mm} =	189.0	Ν	
F _{0.48mm} =	729.5	Ν	
F _{0.5mm} =	748.0	Ν	
F _{0.65mm} =	917.2	Ν	
F _{0.9mm} =	1037.6	Ν	
F _{ept} =	979.7	Ν	
F _{e1.5} =	152.6	Ν	
F _m =	1095.6	Ν	
F _{infl} =	731.2	Ν	
F _f =	876.5	Ν	
Displace	ment valu	ies	
u _e =	0.229	mm	
u _{h0/10,off} =	0.383	mm	
u _{0.1mm,off} =	0.517	mm	
u _{e1.5} =	0.082	mm	
u _m =	1.094	mm	
u _{infl} =	0.483	mm	
u _f =	1.567	mm	
Initial linear slope			
Slope _{ini} =	1839.49	N/mm	
Ener	gy values		
E _{SP} =	1.28	J	
E _m =	0.79	J	
E _{PL} =	0.47	J	





Specimen ID: 900HIP_1_N_a_SP4 **Material:** AM Ti-64 **Test speed:** 0.001005 mm/s **Max strain rate:** 1.00E-03 s⁻¹

TEST	RESULT	S
Force	e values	
F _{e,proj} =	345.3	Ν
F _{e,int} =	344.0	Ν
F _{h0/10,off} =	1011.2	Ν
F _{0.1mm,off} =	1004.9	Ν
F _{0.1mm} =	82.4	Ν
F _{0.48mm} =	391.9	Ν
F _{0.5mm} =	410.4	Ν
F _{0.65mm} =	521.4	Ν
F _{0.9mm} =	743.9	Ν
F _{ept} =	193.3	Ν
F _{e1.5} =	144.1	Ν
F _m =	1022.4	Ν
F _{infl} =	5.0	Ν
F _f =	817.9	Ν
Displace	ment valı	les
u _e =	0.417	mm
u _{h0/10,off} =	1.276	mm
u _{0.1mm,off} =	1.320	mm
u _{e1.5} =	0.176	mm
u _m =	1.267	mm
u _{infl} =	-0.107	mm
u _f =	1.653	mm
Initial linear slope		
Slope _{ini} =	825.63	N/mm
Energ	gy values	
E _{SP} =	1.02	1
E _m =	0.66	J
Е _{РL} =	0.03	J





Specimen ID: 900HIP_1_N_a_SP5 **Material:** AM Ti-64 **Test speed:** 0.00101 mm/s **Max strain rate:** 1.01E-03 s⁻¹

TEST RESULTS		
Forc	e values	
F _{e,proj} =	342.7	Ν
F _{e,int} =	350.8	Ν
F _{h0/10,off} =	539.8	Ν
F _{0.1mm,off} =	723.3	Ν
F _{0.1mm} =	201.3	Ν
F _{0.48mm} =	748.8	Ν
F _{0.5mm} =	773.6	Ν
F _{0.65mm} =	958.5	Ν
F _{0.9mm} =	1047.8	Ν
F _{ept} =	97.4	Ν
F _{e1.5} =	128.8	Ν
F _m =	1085.0	Ν
F _{infl} =	577.3	Ν
F _f =	868.0	Ν
Displace	ment valu	ies
u _e =	0.177	mm
u _{h0/10,off} =	0.322	mm
u _{0.1mm,off} =	0.465	mm
u _{e1.5} =	0.064	mm
u _m =	0.837	mm
u _{infl} =	1.742	mm
u _f =	1.463	mm
Initial linear slope		
Slope _{ini} =	1987.01	N/mm
Ener	gy values	
E _{SP} =	1.17	J
E _m =	0.54	J
E _{PL} =	0.24	J




Specimen ID: 900HIP_1_N_a_SP7 **Material:** AM Ti-64 **Test speed:** 0.00102 mm/s **Max strain rate:** 1.02E-03 s⁻¹

TEST RESULTS		
Forc	e values	
F _{e,proj} =	447.6	Ν
F _{e,int} =	457.9	Ν
F _{h0/10,off} =	662.2	Ν
F _{0.1mm,off} =	792.1	Ν
F _{0.1mm} =	211.6	Ν
F _{0.48mm} =	791.3	Ν
F _{0.5mm} =	810.9	Ν
F _{0.65mm} =	946.7	Ν
F _{0.9mm} =	1090.2	Ν
F _{ept} =	1017.1	Ν
F _{e1.5} =	134.1	Ν
F _m =	1112.3	Ν
F _{infl} =	515.1	Ν
F _f =	889.9	Ν
Displace	ment valu	es
u _e =	0.223	mm
u _{h0/10,off} =	0.373	mm
u _{0.1mm,off} =	0.485	mm
u _{e1.5} =	0.066	mm
u _m =	0.870	mm
u _{infl} =	0.268	mm
u _f =	1.525	mm
Initial linear slope		
Slope _{ini} =	2057.23	N/mm
Energy values		
E _{SP} =	1.25	J
E _m =	0.59	J
E _{PL} =	0.29	J





Specimen ID: 900HIP_1_N_a_SP8 **Material:** AM Ti-64 **Test speed:** 0.001006 mm/s **Max strain rate:** 1.01E-03 s⁻¹

TEST RESULTS		
Force	e values	
F _{e,proj} =	358.3	Ν
F _{e,int} =	371.4	Ν
F _{h0/10,off} =	595.4	Ν
F _{0.1mm,off} =	781.4	Ν
F _{0.1mm} =	209.2	Ν
F _{0.48mm} =	787.7	Ν
F _{0.5mm} =	809.0	Ν
F _{0.65mm} =	983.9	Ν
F _{0.9mm} =	1042.8	Ν
F _{ept} =	1032.2	Ν
F _{e1.5} =	138.9	Ν
F _m =	1067.5	Ν
F _{infl} =	486.6	Ν
F _f =	854.0	Ν
Displacement values		
u _e =	0.180	mm
u _{h0/10,off} =	0.339	mm
u _{0.1mm,off} =	0.479	mm
u _{e1.5} =	0.066	mm
u _m =	0.950	mm
u _{infl} =	1.747	mm
u _f =	1.337	mm
Initial linear slope		
Slope _{ini} =	2064.56	N/mm
Energy values		
E _{SP} =	1.05	J
E _m =	0.67	J
Е _{РL} =	0.39	J





ANNEX 9

SP Test Results for

900 °C HIP, scan length = 78 mm, non-supported (polished specimens)

Specimen ID: 900HIP_1_N_a_SP9 (p **Material:** AM Ti-64 **Test speed:** 0.001428 mm/s **Max strain rate:** 1.43E-03 s⁻¹

TEST RESULTS		
Forc	e values	
F _{e,proj} =	414.0	Ν
F _{e,int} =	438.5	Ν
F _{h0/10,off} =	568.5	Ν
F _{0.1mm,off} =	715.2	Ν
F _{0.1mm} =	301.3	Ν
F _{0.48mm} =	877.3	Ν
F _{0.5mm} =	898.4	Ν
F _{0.65mm} =	938.6	Ν
F _{0.9mm} =	1015.8	Ν
F _{ept} =	156.7	Ν
F _{e1.5} =	764.7	Ν
F _m =	1031.9	Ν
F _{infl} =	622.9	Ν
F _f =	825.5	Ν
Displacement values		
u _e =	0.151	mm
u _{h0/10,off} =	0.241	mm
u _{0.1mm,off} =	0.347	mm
u _{e1.5} =	0.391	mm
u _m =	0.955	mm
u _{infl} =	1.663	mm
u _f =	1.448	mm
Initial linear slope		
Slope _{ini} =	2910.50	N/mm
Energy values		
E _{SP} =	1.18	l
E _m =	0.71	J
E _{PL} =	0.53	J





Specimen ID: 900HIP_1_N_a_SP10 (**Material:** AM Ti-64 **Test speed:** 0.001438 mm/s **Max strain rate:** 1.44E-03 s⁻¹

TEST RESULTS		
Forc	e values	
F _{e,proj} =	357.8	Ν
F _{e,int} =	385.1	Ν
F _{h0/10,off} =	496.9	Ν
F _{0.1mm,off} =	656.5	Ν
F _{0.1mm} =	311.3	Ν
F _{0.48mm} =	869.2	Ν
F _{0.5mm} =	881.3	Ν
F _{0.65mm} =	971.0	Ν
F _{0.9mm} =	1074.2	Ν
F _{ept} =	676.9	Ν
F _{e1.5} =	714.7	Ν
F _m =	1081.8	Ν
F _{infl} =	573.1	Ν
F _f =	865.4	Ν
Displace	ment valu	ies
u _e =	0.121	mm
u _{h0/10,off} =	0.203	mm
u _{0.1mm,off} =	0.307	mm
u _{e1.5} =	0.354	mm
u _m =	0.891	mm
u _{infl} =	1.676	mm
u _f =	1.306	mm
Initial linear slope		
Slope _{ini} =	3178.87	N/mm
Energy values		
E _{SP} =	1.07	J
E _m =	0.66	J
Е _{РL} =	0.47	J





ANNEX 10

SP Test Results for

900 °C HIP, scan length = 26 mm, non-supported ("rough" specimens)

Specimen ID: 900HIP_3_N_a_SP1 **Material:** AM Ti-64 **Test speed:** 0.001105 mm/s **Max strain rate:** 1.10E-03 s⁻¹

TEST RESULTS		
Force	e values	
F _{e,proj} =	343.4	Ν
F _{e,int} =	356.2	Ν
F _{h0/10,off} =	595.2	Ν
F _{0.1mm,off} =	759.3	Ν
F _{0.1mm} =	176.4	Ν
F _{0.48mm} =	682.5	Ν
F _{0.5mm} =	710.3	Ν
F _{0.65mm} =	880.1	Ν
F _{0.9mm} =	1035.2	Ν
F _{ept} =	1102.4	Ν
F _{e1.5} =	77.5	Ν
F _m =	1121.8	Ν
F _{infl} =	584.1	Ν
F _f =	897.5	Ν
Displacement values		
u _e =	0.211	mm
u _{h0/10,off} =	0.403	mm
u _{0.1mm,off} =	0.552	mm
u _{e1.5} =	0.042	mm
u _m =	1.201	mm
u _{infl} =	0.389	mm
u _f =	1.491	mm
Initial linear slope		
Slope _{ini} =	1685.89	N/mm
Energy values		
E _{SP} =	1.18	l
E _m =	0.89	J
Е _{РL} =	0.51	J





Specimen ID: 900HIP_3_N_a_SP2 **Material:** AM Ti-64 **Test speed:** 0.001171 mm/s **Max strain rate:** 1.17E-03 s⁻¹

TEST	TEST RESULTS		
Ford	e values		
F _{e,proj} =	412.2	Ν	
F _{e,int} =	420.5	Ν	
F _{h0/10,off} =	668.2	Ν	
F _{0.1mm,off} =	920.9	Ν	
F _{0.1mm} =	146.5	Ν	
F _{0.48mm} =	641.9	Ν	
F _{0.5mm} =	668.0	Ν	
F _{0.65mm} =	844.5	Ν	
F _{0.9mm} =	1062.3	Ν	
F _{ept} =	#DIV/0!	Ν	
F _{e1.5} =	82.3	Ν	
F _m =	1085.3	Ν	
F _{infl} =	#DIV/0!	Ν	
F _f =	868.2	Ν	
Displace	ment valu	ies	
u _e =	0.284	mm	
u _{h0/10,off} =	0.501	mm	
u _{0.1mm,off} =	0.721	mm	
u _{e1.5} =	0.057	mm	
u _m =	0.924	mm	
u _{infl} =	#DIV/0!	mm	
u _f =	1.799	mm	
Initial linear slope			
Slope _{ini} =	1482.61	N/mm	
Ener	gy values		
E _{SP} =	1.44	J	
E _m =	0.56	J	
E _{PL} =	0.16	J	





Specimen ID: 900HIP_3_N_a_SP3 **Material:** AM Ti-64 **Test speed:** 0.001142 mm/s **Max strain rate:** 1.14E-03 s⁻¹

TEST RESULTS		
Forc	e values	
F _{e,proj} =	371.8	Ν
F _{e,int} =	383.3	Ν
F _{h0/10,off} =	584.3	Ν
F _{0.1mm,off} =	743.4	Ν
F _{0.1mm} =	157.2	Ν
F _{0.48mm} =	663.6	Ν
F _{0.5mm} =	691.1	Ν
F _{0.65mm} =	838.0	Ν
F _{0.9mm} =	1046.7	Ν
F _{ept} =	392.2	Ν
F _{e1.5} =	131.6	Ν
F _m =	1097.0	Ν
F _{infl} =	1083.1	Ν
F _f =	877.6	Ν
Displacement values		
u _e =	0.237	mm
u _{h0/10,off} =	0.412	mm
u _{0.1mm,off} =	0.561	mm
u _{e1.5} =	0.082	mm
u _m =	1.213	mm
u _{infl} =	1.131	mm
u _f =	1.726	mm
Initial linear slope		
Slope _{ini} =	1615.91	N/mm
Energy values		
E _{SP} =	1.39	l
E _m =	0.88	J
E _{PL} =	0.50	J





Specimen ID: 900HIP_3_N_a_SP4 **Material:** AM Ti-64 **Test speed:** 0.001164 mm/s **Max strain rate:** 1.16E-03 s⁻¹

TEST RESULTS		
Forc	e values	
F _{e,proj} =	369.8	Ν
F _{e,int} =	379.0	Ν
F _{h0/10,off} =	580.9	Ν
F _{0.1mm,off} =	724.9	Ν
F _{0.1mm} =	187.2	Ν
F _{0.48mm} =	704.5	Ν
F _{0.5mm} =	724.9	Ν
F _{0.65mm} =	860.5	Ν
F _{0.9mm} =	1049.7	Ν
F _{ept} =	60.7	Ν
F _{e1.5} =	210.0	Ν
F _m =	1094.2	Ν
F _{infl} =	688.8	Ν
F _f =	875.4	Ν
Displace	ment valu	ies
u _e =	0.208	mm
u _{h0/10,off} =	0.369	mm
u _{0.1mm,off} =	0.498	mm
u _{e1.5} =	0.114	mm
u _m =	1.238	mm
u _{infl} =	2.005	mm
u _f =	1.800	mm
Initial linear slope		
Slope _{ini} =	1821.89	N/mm
Energy values		
E _{SP} =	1.49	J
E _m =	0.92	J
E _{PL} =	0.60	J





Specimen ID: 900HIP_3_N_a_SP5 **Material:** AM Ti-64 **Test speed:** 0.001171 mm/s **Max strain rate:** 1.17E-03 s⁻¹

TEST RESULTS			
Forc	e values		
F _{e,proj} =	381.6	Ν	
F _{e,int} =	390.5	Ν	
F _{h0/10,off} =	573.8	Ν	
F _{0.1mm,off} =	715.8	Ν	
F _{0.1mm} =	162.4	Ν	
F _{0.48mm} =	662.9	Ν	
F _{0.5mm} =	679.5	Ν	
F _{0.65mm} =	828.5	Ν	
F _{0.9mm} =	1026.5	Ν	
F _{ept} =	1027.3	Ν	
F _{e1.5} =	131.3	Ν	
F _m =	1071.5	Ν	
F _{infl} =	46.1	Ν	
F _f =	857.2	Ν	
Displace	Displacement values		
u _e =	0.238	mm	
u _{h0/10,off} =	0.400	mm	
u _{0.1mm,off} =	0.536	mm	
u _{e1.5} =	0.078	mm	
u _m =	1.146	mm	
u _{infl} =	0.014	mm	
u _f =	1.733	mm	
Initial linear slope			
Slope _{ini} =	1641.54	N/mm	
Energy values			
E _{SP} =	1.38	J	
E _m =	0.80	J	
E _{PL} =	0.45	J	





Specimen ID: 900HIP_3_N_a_SP6 **Material:** AM Ti-64 **Test speed:** 0.001153 mm/s **Max strain rate:** 1.15E-03 s⁻¹

TEST RESULTS		
Forc	e values	
F _{e,proj} =	410.2	Ν
F _{e,int} =	423.9	N
F _{h0/10,off} =	590.8	Ν
F _{0.1mm,off} =	712.0	Ν
F _{0.1mm} =	200.5	Ν
F _{0.48mm} =	728.9	Ν
F _{0.5mm} =	753.7	Ν
F _{0.65mm} =	902.6	Ν
F _{0.9mm} =	1027.1	Ν
F _{ept} =	847.9	Ν
F _{e1.5} =	807.9	Ν
F _m =	1057.0	Ν
F _{infl} =	632.8	Ν
F _f =	845.6	Ν
Displacement values		
u _e =	0.217	mm
u _{h0/10,off} =	0.353	mm
u _{0.1mm,off} =	0.465	mm
u _{e1.5} =	0.559	mm
u _m =	0.948	mm
u _{infl} =	1.994	mm
u _f =	1.708	mm
Initial linear slope		
Slope _{ini} =	1952.20	N/mm
Energy values		
E _{SP} =	1.38	J
E _m =	0.63	J
Е _{РL} =	0.34	J





ANNEX 11

SP Test Results for

900 °C HIP, scan length = 26 mm, non-supported (polished specimens)

Specimen ID: 900HIP_3_N_a_SP7 (pc **Material:** AM Ti-64 **Test speed:** 0.001441 mm/s **Max strain rate:** 1.44E-03 s⁻¹

TEST	RESULT	S
Force values		
F _{e,proj} =	373.5	N
F _{e,int} =	397.2	Ν
F _{h0/10,off} =	522.2	Ν
F _{0.1mm,off} =	653.3	Ν
F _{0.1mm} =	309.9	Ν
F _{0.48mm} =	870.1	Ν
F _{0.5mm} =	882.4	Ν
F _{0.65mm} =	965.2	Ν
F _{0.9mm} =	918.4	Ν
F _{ept} =	831.9	Ν
F _{e1.5} =	600.9	Ν
F _m =	992.2	Ν
F _{infl} =	593.6	Ν
F _f =	793.7	Ν
Displacement values		
u _e =	0.124	mm
u _{h0/10,off} =	0.209	mm
u _{0.1mm,off} =	0.305	mm
u _{e1.5} =	0.269	mm
u _m =	0.618	mm
u _{infl} =	1.667	mm
u _f =	1.369	mm
Initial linear slope		
Slope _{ini} =	3201.67	N/mm
Ener	gy values	
E _{SP} =	1.05	J
E _m =	0.38	J
E _{PL} =	0.23	J




Specimen ID: 900HIP_3_N_a_SP8 (pc **Material:** AM Ti-64 **Test speed:** 0.001426 mm/s **Max strain rate:** 1.43E-03 s⁻¹

TEST RESULTS		
Force values		
F _{e,proj} =	372.2	Ν
F _{e,int} =	402.0	Ν
F _{h0/10,off} =	515.6	Ν
F _{0.1mm,off} =	660.5	Ν
F _{0.1mm} =	324.6	Ν
F _{0.48mm} =	882.8	Ν
F _{0.5mm} =	902.5	Ν
F _{0.65mm} =	1026.6	Ν
F _{0.9mm} =	1079.7	Ν
F _{ept} =	369.2	Ν
F _{e1.5} =	735.9	Ν
F _m =	1091.8	Ν
F _{infl} =	559.0	Ν
F _f =	873.4	Ν
Displacement values		
u _e =	0.122	mm
u _{h0/10,off} =	0.203	mm
u _{0.1mm,off} =	0.302	mm
u _{e1.5} =	0.357	mm
u _m =	0.832	mm
u _{infl} =	1.487	mm
u _f =	1.273	mm
Initial linear slope		
Slope _{ini} =	3288.00	N/mm
Ener	gy values	
E _{SP} =	1.06	J
E _m =	0.62	J
E _{PL} =	0.43	J





Specimen ID: 900HIP_3_N_a_SP9 (pc **Material:** AM Ti-64 **Test speed:** 0.001459 mm/s **Max strain rate:** 1.46E-03 s⁻¹

TEST RESULTS		
Force values		
F _{e,proj} =	373.8	Ν
F _{e,int} =	406.2	Ν
F _{h0/10,off} =	531.7	Ν
F _{0.1mm,off} =	690.7	Ν
F _{0.1mm} =	300.6	Ν
F _{0.48mm} =	882.8	Ν
F _{0.5mm} =	915.7	Ν
F _{0.65mm} =	961.6	Ν
F _{0.9mm} =	969.8	Ν
F _{ept} =	721.9	Ν
F _{e1.5} =	746.2	Ν
F _m =	995.9	Ν
F _{infl} =	509.4	Ν
F _f =	796.7	Ν
Displace	ement valu	ies
u _e =	0.136	mm
u _{h0/10,off} =	0.223	mm
u _{0.1mm,off} =	0.333	mm
u _{e1.5} =	0.380	mm
u _m =	0.558	mm
u _{infl} =	1.648	mm
u _f =	1.323	mm
Initial linear slope		
Slope _{ini} =	2989.78	N/mm
Ener	gy values	
E _{SP} =	1.04	J
E _m =	0.32	J
E _{PL} =	0.16	J





Specimen ID: 900HIP_3_N_a_SP10 (**Material:** AM Ti-64 **Test speed:** 0.001444 mm/s **Max strain rate:** 1.44E-03 s⁻¹

TEST RESULTS		
Force values		
F _{e,proj} =	434.7	Ν
F _{e,int} =	467.2	Ν
F _{h0/10,off} =	595.3	Ν
F _{0.1mm,off} =	748.0	Ν
F _{0.1mm} =	293.0	Ν
F _{0.48mm} =	872.8	Ν
F _{0.5mm} =	878.4	Ν
F _{0.65mm} =	921.6	Ν
F _{0.9mm} =	1033.5	Ν
F _{ept} =	884.7	Ν
F _{e1.5} =	858.4	Ν
F _m =	1040.8	Ν
F _{infl} =	967.1	Ν
F _f =	832.7	Ν
Displace	ment valu	ies
u _e =	0.164	mm
u _{h0/10,off} =	0.254	mm
u _{0.1mm,off} =	0.364	mm
u _{e1.5} =	0.457	mm
u _m =	0.899	mm
u _{infl} =	0.707	mm
u _f =	1.356	mm
Initial linear slope		
Slope _{ini} =	2849.28	N/mm
Ener	gy values	
E _{SP} =	1.09	1
E _m =	0.65	J
E _{PL} =	0.46	J





ANNEX 12

SP Test Results for

1050 °C + 800 °C HIP, scan length = 78 mm, non-supported ("rough" specimens)

Specimen ID: SuperB_1_N_a_SP1 Material: AM Ti-64 Test speed: 0.001043 mm/s Max strain rate: 1.04E-03 s⁻¹

TEST RESULTS		
Force values		
F _{e,proj} =	407.3	Ν
F _{e,int} =	420.1	Ν
F _{h0/10,off} =	576.8	Ν
F _{0.1mm,off} =	703.8	Ν
F _{0.1mm} =	218.3	Ν
F _{0.48mm} =	768.0	N
F _{0.5mm} =	791.8	N
F _{0.65mm} =	932.3	N
F _{0.9mm} =	1126.7	Ν
F _{ept} =	1179.1	Ν
F _{e1.5} =	231.7	Ν
F _m =	1192.9	Ν
F _{infl} =	702.3	Ν
F _f =	954.3	Ν
Displace	ement valu	ies
u _e =	0.196	mm
u _{h0/10,off} =	0.320	mm
u _{0.1mm,off} =	0.430	mm
u _{e1.5} =	0.104	mm
u _m =	1.066	mm
u _{infl} =	1.760	mm
u _f =	1.498	mm
Initial linear slope		
Slope _{ini} =	2139.70	N/mm
Ener	gy values	
E _{SP} =	1.29	J
E _m =	0.81	J
E _{PL} =	0.48	J





Specimen ID: SuperB_1_N_a_SP2 Material: AM Ti-64 Test speed: 0.001067 mm/s Max strain rate: 1.07E-03 s⁻¹

TEST	TEST RESULTS	
Force values		
F _{e,proj} =	365.1	Ν
F _{e,int} =	377.5	Ν
F _{h0/10,off} =	570.1	Ν
F _{0.1mm,off} =	732.7	Ν
F _{0.1mm} =	207.9	Ν
F _{0.48mm} =	748.0	Ν
F _{0.5mm} =	779.8	Ν
F _{0.65mm} =	931.9	Ν
F _{0.9mm} =	1138.0	Ν
F _{ept} =	1127.1	Ν
F _{e1.5} =	146.1	Ν
F _m =	1194.5	Ν
F _{infl} =	1189.5	Ν
F _f =	955.6	Ν
Displace	ement valu	ies
u _e =	0.188	mm
u _{h0/10,off} =	0.335	mm
u _{0.1mm,off} =	0.465	mm
u _{e1.5} =	0.072	mm
u _m =	1.071	mm
u _{infl} =	1.077	mm
u _f =	1.458	mm
Initial linear slope		
Slope _{ini} =	2011.63	N/mm
Ener	gy values	
E _{SP} =	1.23	1
E _m =	0.80	J
E _{PL} =	0.45	J





Specimen ID: SuperB_1_N_a_SP4 Material: AM Ti-64 Test speed: 0.00107 mm/s Max strain rate: 1.07E-03 s⁻¹

TEST RESULTS		
Force values		
F _{e,proj} =	456.7	Ν
F _{e,int} =	465.1	Ν
F _{h0/10,off} =	646.7	Ν
F _{0.1mm,off} =	771.7	Ν
F _{0.1mm} =	182.3	Ν
F _{0.48mm} =	731.7	Ν
F _{0.5mm} =	753.7	Ν
F _{0.65mm} =	910.0	Ν
F _{0.9mm} =	1138.2	Ν
F _{ept} =	868.4	Ν
F _{e1.5} =	173.5	Ν
F _m =	1230.4	Ν
F _{infl} =	714.9	Ν
F _f =	984.3	Ν
Displace	ement valu	les
u _e =	0.252	mm
u _{h0/10,off} =	0.401	mm
u _{0.1mm,off} =	0.519	mm
u _{e1.5} =	0.096	mm
u _m =	1.065	mm
u _{infl} =	1.831	mm
u _f =	1.560	mm
Initial	linear slop	е
Slope _{ini} =	1844.34	N/mm
Ener	gy values	
E _{SP} =	1.34	J
E _m =	0.79	J
E _{PL} =	0.38	J





Specimen ID: SuperB_1_N_a_SP5 Material: AM Ti-64 Test speed: 0.001076 mm/s Max strain rate: 1.08E-03 s⁻¹

TEST RESULTS			
Force values			
F _{e,proj} =	475.7	Ν	
F _{e,int} =	485.1	Ν	
F _{h0/10,off} =	644.0	Ν	
F _{0.1mm,off} =	765.3	Ν	
F _{0.1mm} =	196.2	Ν	
F _{0.48mm} =	748.9	Ν	
F _{0.5mm} =	772.8	Ν	
F _{0.65mm} =	928.4	Ν	
F _{0.9mm} =	1162.1	Ν	
F _{ept} =	539.2	Ν	
F _{e1.5} =	126.7	Ν	
F _m =	1225.3	Ν	
F _{infl} =	61.4	Ν	
F _f =	980.2	Ν	
Displace	ement valu	ies	
u _e =	0.251	mm	
u _{h0/10,off} =	0.385	mm	
u _{0.1mm,off} =	0.496	mm	
u _{e1.5} =	0.066	mm	
u _m =	1.005	mm	
u _{infl} =	0.027	mm	
u _f =	1.524	mm	
Initial I	Initial linear slope		
Slope _{ini} =	1930.46	N/mm	
Ener	gy values		
E _{SP} =	1.32	J	
E _m =	0.74	J	
E _{PL} =	0.35	J	





Specimen ID: SuperB_1_N_a_SP6 Material: AM Ti-64 Test speed: 0.001113 mm/s Max strain rate: 1.11E-03 s⁻¹

TEST RESULTS			
Force values			
F _{e,proj} =	414.5	Ν	
F _{e,int} =	430.1	Ν	
F _{h0/10,off} =	594.2	Ν	
F _{0.1mm,off} =	713.8	Ν	
F _{0.1mm} =	193.2	Ν	
F _{0.48mm} =	724.3	Ν	
F _{0.5mm} =	747.6	Ν	
F _{0.65mm} =	901.9	Ν	
F _{0.9mm} =	1106.7	Ν	
F _{ept} =	431.9	Ν	
F _{e1.5} =	143.3	Ν	
F _m =	1156.0	Ν	
F _{infl} =	901.5	Ν	
F _f =	924.8	Ν	
Displacement values			
u _e =	0.224	mm	
u _{h0/10,off} =	0.360	mm	
u _{0.1mm,off} =	0.472	mm	
u _{e1.5} =	0.075	mm	
u _m =	1.002	mm	
u _{infl} =	0.649	mm	
u _f =	1.628	mm	
Initial I	Initial linear slope		
Slope _{ini} =	1918.27	N/mm	
Ener	gy values		
E _{SP} =	1.36	J	
E _m =	0.71	J	
E _{PL} =	0.36	J	





Specimen ID: SuperB_1_N_a_SP7 Material: AM Ti-64 Test speed: 0.001064 mm/s Max strain rate: 1.06E-03 s⁻¹

TEST RESULTS			
Force values			
F _{e,proj} =	380.2	Ν	
F _{e,int} =	393.6	Ν	
F _{h0/10,off} =	604.0	Ν	
F _{0.1mm,off} =	742.3	Ν	
F _{0.1mm} =	191.4	Ν	
F _{0.48mm} =	732.4	Ν	
F _{0.5mm} =	752.2	Ν	
F _{0.65mm} =	912.0	Ν	
F _{0.9mm} =	1122.9	Ν	
F _{ept} =	1096.6	Ν	
F _{e1.5} =	155.8	Ν	
F _m =	1196.6	Ν	
F _{infl} =	678.8	Ν	
F _f =	957.2	Ν	
Displace	Displacement values		
u _e =	0.210	mm	
u _{h0/10,off} =	0.372	mm	
u _{0.1mm,off} =	0.496	mm	
u _{e1.5} =	0.082	mm	
u _m =	1.023	mm	
u _{infl} =	1.843	mm	
u _f =	1.412	mm	
Initial linear slope			
Slope _{ini} =	1874.92	N/mm	
Ener	gy values		
E _{SP} =	1.14	J	
E _m =	0.73	J	
E _{PL} =	0.35	J	





ANNEX 13

SP Test Results for

1050 °C + 800 °C HIP, scan length = 78 mm, non-supported

(polished specimens)

Specimen ID: 900HIP_3_N_a_SP7 (pc **Material:** AM Ti-64 **Test speed:** 0.001441 mm/s **Max strain rate:** 1.44E-03 s⁻¹

TEST	TEST RESULTS	
Force values		
F _{e,proj} =	373.5	N
F _{e,int} =	397.2	Ν
F _{h0/10,off} =	522.2	Ν
F _{0.1mm,off} =	653.3	Ν
F _{0.1mm} =	309.9	Ν
F _{0.48mm} =	870.1	Ν
F _{0.5mm} =	882.4	Ν
F _{0.65mm} =	965.2	Ν
F _{0.9mm} =	918.4	Ν
F _{ept} =	831.9	Ν
F _{e1.5} =	600.9	Ν
F _m =	992.2	Ν
F _{infl} =	593.6	Ν
F _f =	793.7	Ν
Displace	ement valu	ies
u _e =	0.124	mm
u _{h0/10,off} =	0.209	mm
u _{0.1mm,off} =	0.305	mm
u _{e1.5} =	0.269	mm
u _m =	0.618	mm
u _{infl} =	1.667	mm
u _f =	1.369	mm
Initial linear slope		
Slope _{ini} =	3201.67	N/mm
Ener	gy values	
E _{SP} =	1.05	J
E _m =	0.38	J
E _{PL} =	0.23	J





Specimen ID: 900HIP_3_N_a_SP8 (pc **Material:** AM Ti-64 **Test speed:** 0.001426 mm/s **Max strain rate:** 1.43E-03 s⁻¹

TEST RESULTS		
Force values		
F _{e,proj} =	372.2	Ν
F _{e,int} =	402.0	Ν
F _{h0/10,off} =	515.6	Ν
F _{0.1mm,off} =	660.5	Ν
F _{0.1mm} =	324.6	Ν
F _{0.48mm} =	882.8	Ν
F _{0.5mm} =	902.5	Ν
F _{0.65mm} =	1026.6	Ν
F _{0.9mm} =	1079.7	Ν
F _{ept} =	369.2	Ν
F _{e1.5} =	735.9	Ν
F _m =	1091.8	Ν
F _{infl} =	559.0	Ν
F _f =	873.4	Ν
Displacement values		
u _e =	0.122	mm
u _{h0/10,off} =	0.203	mm
u _{0.1mm,off} =	0.302	mm
u _{e1.5} =	0.357	mm
u _m =	0.832	mm
u _{infl} =	1.487	mm
u _f =	1.273	mm
Initial linear slope		
Slope _{ini} =	3288.00	N/mm
Ener	gy values	
E _{SP} =	1.06	J
E _m =	0.62	J
E _{PL} =	0.43	J




Small Punch Test Results

Specimen ID: 900HIP_3_N_a_SP9 (pc **Material:** AM Ti-64 **Test speed:** 0.001459 mm/s **Max strain rate:** 1.46E-03 s⁻¹

TEST RESULTS			
Force values			
F _{e,proj} =	373.8	Ν	
F _{e,int} =	406.2	Ν	
F _{h0/10,off} =	531.7	Ν	
F _{0.1mm,off} =	690.7	Ν	
F _{0.1mm} =	300.6	Ν	
F _{0.48mm} =	882.8	Ν	
F _{0.5mm} =	915.7	Ν	
F _{0.65mm} =	961.6	Ν	
F _{0.9mm} =	969.8	Ν	
F _{ept} =	721.9	Ν	
F _{e1.5} =	746.2	Ν	
F _m =	995.9	Ν	
F _{infl} =	509.4	Ν	
F _f =	796.7	Ν	
Displacement values			
u _e =	0.136	mm	
u _{h0/10,off} =	0.223	mm	
u _{0.1mm,off} =	0.333	mm	
u _{e1.5} =	0.380	mm	
u _m =	0.558	mm	
u _{infl} =	1.648	mm	
u _f =	1.323	mm	
Initial linear slope			
Slope _{ini} =	2989.78	N/mm	
Energy values			
E _{SP} =	1.04	J	
E _m =	0.32	J	
E _{PL} =	0.16	J	





Small Punch Test Results

Specimen ID: 900HIP_3_N_a_SP10 (**Material:** AM Ti-64 **Test speed:** 0.001444 mm/s **Max strain rate:** 1.44E-03 s⁻¹

TEST RESULTS			
Force values			
F _{e,proj} =	434.7	Ν	
F _{e,int} =	467.2	Ν	
F _{h0/10,off} =	595.3	Ν	
F _{0.1mm,off} =	748.0	Ν	
F _{0.1mm} =	293.0	Ν	
F _{0.48mm} =	872.8	Ν	
F _{0.5mm} =	878.4	Ν	
F _{0.65mm} =	921.6	Ν	
F _{0.9mm} =	1033.5	Ν	
F _{ept} =	884.7	Ν	
F _{e1.5} =	858.4	Ν	
F _m =	1040.8	Ν	
F _{infl} =	967.1	Ν	
F _f =	832.7	Ν	
Displacement values			
u _e =	0.164	mm	
u _{h0/10,off} =	0.254	mm	
u _{0.1mm,off} =	0.364	mm	
u _{e1.5} =	0.457	mm	
u _m =	0.899	mm	
u _{infl} =	0.707	mm	
u _f =	1.356	mm	
Initial linear slope			
Slope _{ini} =	2849.28	N/mm	
Energy values			
E _{SP} =	1.09	1	
E _m =	0.65	J	
E _{PL} =	0.46	J	





ANNEX 14

Correlations obtained for AM Ti64 between yield strength and SP parameters















ANNEX 15

Correlations obtained for AM Ti64

between ultimate tensile strength and SP parameters











ANNEX 16

Correlations obtained for AM Ti64

between total/uniform elongation and SP parameters





