

# **Comparison Between Plastic Contact Hardness Models and Experiments**

**F. H. Milanez  
M. M. Yovanovich  
J. R. Culham**

**AIAA Paper No 2003-0160  
presented at 41<sup>st</sup> AIAA Aerospace Sciences Meeting  
and Exhibit, Reno, NV, January 6-9, 2003**

# COMPARISONS BETWEEN PLASTIC CONTACT HARDNESS MODELS AND EXPERIMENTS

F. H. Milanez\*  
M. M. Yovanovich†  
J. R. Culham‡

Microelectronics Heat Transfer Laboratory  
Department of Mechanical Engineering  
University of Waterloo  
Waterloo, Ontario, Canada N2L 3G1

## ABSTRACT

The objective of this paper is to test empirical correlations available in the literature to predict the surface micro-hardness of metals. The surface micro-hardness is an important input parameter for thermal contact conductance models. The usual way of obtaining information about surface micro-hardness is by Vickers micro-hardness tests at various loads, which demands considerable time. The empirical correlations that are tested here need a single bulk hardness measurement at room temperature to estimate the micro-hardness variation near the surface at any temperature level. The application of the correlations is very easy and straightforward. Thermal contact conductance experimental data available in the literature for SS 304, Ni 200 and Zr-alloys are tested here. The results show that the empirical correlations worked very well for SS 304 and Ni 200. For Zr-4, the results were not satisfactory, indicating that this alloy responded to work-hardening in a different way from the other metals tested.

## NOMENCLATURE

$c_1$  Vickers correlation coefficient;  $MPa$   
 $c_2$  Vickers correlation coefficient  
 $C_c$  dimensionless contact conductance (Eq. 1)  
 $d$  Vickers average diagonal;  $\mu m$

\* Research Assistant, milanez@mhtlab.uwaterloo.ca

† Distinguished Professor Emeritus, Fellow AIAA, mmyov@mhtlab.uwaterloo.ca

‡ Associate Professor, Director MHTL, rix@mhtlab.uwaterloo.ca

$H$  Hardness;  $MPa$   
 $H^*$  Dimensionless hardness  
 $h_c$  contact conductance;  $W/m^2 \cdot K$   
 $k$  solid thermal conductivity;  $W/m \cdot K$   
 $k_s$  harmonic mean thermal conductivity,  
 $= 2k_1k_2/(k_1 + k_2)$ ;  $W/m \cdot K$   
 $m$  effective mean absolute asperity slope,  
 $= \sqrt{m_1^2 + m_2^2}$   
 $P$  apparent contact pressure;  $MPa$   
 $RMS$  root-mean-square value  
 $T$  temperature;  $K$

### *Subscripts*

0 reference  
1, 2 surfaces 1 and 2 or solids 1 and 2  
 $a$  apparent  
 $c$  contact  
 $r$  real  
 $rm$  room  
 $v$  Vickers

### *Greek Symbols*

$\sigma$  RMS surface roughness;  $\mu m$   
 $= \sqrt{\sigma_1^2 + \sigma_2^2}$ ;  $\mu m$

## INTRODUCTION

Since actual surfaces present deviations from their idealized geometrical form, known as roughness and waviness, when two solids are put into contact, they will touch only at their highest asperities. The heat transfer across the interface between real solids is not as effective as if the solids were perfectly smooth and flat. Since the real contact area is much smaller than the apparent contact area ( $< 2\%$ ), a resistance to heat flow, known as thermal contact

resistance, appears at the interface between the contacting solids. Heat transfer across the interface between two solids has been the subject of study of various researchers over many years. Contact heat transfer has many applications in engineering, such as ball bearings, microelectronic chips and nuclear energy.

When two solids are pressed together, the contacting asperities will deform and originate small spots of solid-solid contact. In the remaining portion of the apparent contact area the bodies are separated by a very thin gap. Heat transfer between two contacting solids can take place by three different modes: conduction through the contact spots, radiation through the gap in the remaining part of the apparent area and conduction through the gas that fills the gap. These heat transfer modes are treated separately and the sum of the conductances associated with each of these heat transfer modes is called the joint conductance. In this work, only the heat transfer associated with the solid to solid contact is considered. There are several models available in the open literature to predict the gap and the radiation conductance at the interface between contacting bodies.

Since the solid-to-solid contact heat transfer is more dominant than the gap and the radiation heat transfer, the heat flow from the hotter body must constrict in the region of the contact spots and then spread as it enters the colder body. This constriction and subsequent spreading of the heat flow results in an impediment to heat flow at the interface, referred to as contact resistance. The inverse of the contact resistance per unit apparent area is generally known as contact conductance.

There are several thermal contact conductance models available in the literature. Almost all the existing thermal contact conductance models are composed of three sub-models: thermal, geometrical and mechanical deformation models. The thermal model predicts the contact conductance for a given set of contact parameters: shape, size and number of contact spots. These contact parameters are obtained from a particular asperity mechanical deformation model, which can be elastic, plastic or elastoplastic. The deformation model requires a geometric model of the surface in order to be able to predict the contact parameters.

This work is focused on the issue of the deformation of the contacting asperities, i.e., the mechanical deformation model. Only surfaces undergoing plastic deformation are considered here. The crucial parameter that controls the plastic deformation of the contacting asperities is the surface micro-

hardness. The usual way of obtaining this information is from Vickers micro-hardness tests at several indentation loads, which is a time consuming task. To avoid that, Sridhar and Yovanovich<sup>1</sup> proposed empirical correlations to estimate the surface micro-hardness from the bulk hardness, which can be assessed through a single Brinell hardness test. It is also known that the hardness of metals is a function of temperature. Since hardness measurements are commonly made at temperatures different from the temperature encountered in thermal contact problems, Nho<sup>2</sup> proposed correlations to correct the micro-hardness of metals for the actual interface temperature. The objective of this work is to test the accuracy of the correlations proposed by Sridhar and Yovanovich<sup>1</sup> and by Nho<sup>2</sup> to estimate surface micro-hardness. These correlations are used here to reduce thermal contact conductance experimental data available in the literature.

## THEORY REVIEW

Cooper, Mikic and Yovanovich<sup>3</sup> developed a theoretical thermal contact conductance model for contacting surfaces whose asperities experience plastic deformation. Various researchers in the thermal contact conductance field have employed this model during the last decades and it has been shown to be generally very accurate. Yovanovich<sup>4</sup> correlated the model in a very simple form, as follows:

$$C_c = \frac{h_c \sigma}{k_s m} = 1.25 \left( \frac{P}{H_c} \right)^{0.95} \quad (1)$$

where  $h_c$  is the thermal contact conductance,  $k_s$  is the harmonic mean of the thermal conductivities of the contacting bodies, and  $\sigma$  and  $m$  are the RMS roughness and the mean absolute slope of the combined profile of the two contacting surfaces, respectively. The apparent contact pressure is  $P$  and  $H_c$  is the plastic contact hardness. This model is valid for isotropic surfaces, i.e., surfaces that do not present any directional roughness texture.

The plastic contact hardness  $H_c$ , appearing in the expression above, is defined as the mechanical pressure that the contacting asperities can support. As the contacting surfaces are pressed against each other, the asperities of the harder surface indent the softer surface, which experiences plastic deformation. If the two materials have similar hardnesses, mutual deformation takes place. As a measure of  $H_c$ , Cooper, Mikic and Yovanovich<sup>3</sup> proposed the use of the bulk hardness of the softer of the two contacting materials. According to the authors, the bulk hardness should be obtained by indentation

hardness tests, such as the Brinell test. However, Hegazy<sup>5</sup> showed that the bulk hardness is not a good measure of the supporting contact pressure. According to the author, the use of bulk hardness makes the model of Cooper, Mikic and Yovanovich<sup>3</sup> over predict experimental data by as much as 300%, in some cases. This is because only the material very close to the surface suffers deformation under load, and the surface is generally much harder than the bulk of the material due to work hardening during the surface preparation. The bulk hardness tests employ relatively large indentation loads and therefore the indenter penetrates very deep into the surface. As a measure of  $H_c$ , Hegazy<sup>5</sup> proposed the use of the surface micro-hardness instead of the bulk hardness. He proposed a model to predict the plastic contact hardness near the surface, which gave excellent agreement between thermal contact conductance theory and experiments. He measured the Vickers micro-hardness for various indentation loads. The Vickers micro-hardness test employs indentation loads as low as  $0.1N$ , and the penetration is generally a few micrometers deep. Therefore, the hardness of the material very close to the surface is assessed. The obtained Vickers micro-hardness values ( $H_v$ ) were then correlated to the respective diagonal length of the square indentations left by the indenter ( $d_v$ ), which is proportional to the indentation depth, in the following form:

$$H_v = c_1 \left( \frac{d_v}{d_0} \right)^{c_2} \quad (2)$$

where  $d_0$  is some arbitrary reference value, which is chosen, for convenience, to be  $d_0 = 1\mu m$ . The  $c_1$  and  $c_2$  coefficients appearing in the expression above are called the micro-hardness correlation coefficients, and they give a representation of the metal hardness variation with depth.

Song and Yovanovich<sup>6</sup> proposed a model to predict the dimensionless contact pressure  $P/H_c$ , for a contacting pair with known  $\sigma$ ,  $m$ ,  $c_1$  and  $c_2$ . The authors correlated their model in the following form:

$$\frac{P}{H_c} = \left[ \frac{P}{c_1(1.62\sigma/m)^{c_2}} \right] \frac{1}{1 + 0.071c_2} \quad (3)$$

The value obtained for  $P/H_c$  from the expression above is directly used in Eq. (1) to predict the thermal contact conductance  $h_c$ .

So far, the only way of assessing the surface micro-hardness, i.e. assessing  $c_1$  and  $c_2$ , is from Vickers micro-hardness tests at various loads, which

demands considerable time. In order to overcome this problem, Sridhar and Yovanovich<sup>1</sup>, proposed empirical correlations to predict  $c_1$  and  $c_2$  as a function of the Brinell hardness, which can be obtained from a single indentation. The authors analyzed the surface micro-hardnesses of several metals and their relation to the bulk hardness. Using micro-hardness tests from Hegazy<sup>5</sup> and Nho<sup>2</sup> for SS 304, Ni 200 and Zr-alloys, as well as their own untreated and heat-treated tool steel and Ti-alloy specimens, Sridhar and Yovanovich<sup>1</sup> proposed the following empirical correlations to estimate  $c_1$  and  $c_2$  based on the material bulk hardness:

$$\frac{c_1}{3178} = \left[ 4.0 - 5.77H_B^* + 4.0(H_B^*)^2 - 0.61(H_B^*)^3 \right] \quad (4)$$

and

$$c_2 = -0.370 + 0.442 \left( \frac{H_B}{c_1} \right) \quad (5)$$

where  $H_B$  is the Brinell hardness and  $H_B^* = H_B/3178$ . These correlations are valid for metals with Brinell hardnesses between 1300 and 7600 *MPa*.

It is well known that the hardness of metals is a function of temperature: the higher the temperature, the softer the metal. Hardness measurements are generally conducted at room temperature, while the interface temperatures of actual thermal contact problems could reach much higher temperatures. Nho<sup>2</sup> conducted experiments to analyze the effect of temperature on the micro-hardness correlation coefficients  $c_1$  and  $c_2$  of Al 6061-T5, SS 304 and Ni 200. The author found that  $c_2$  is not sensitive to temperature variations between approximately 20 and 200°C. On the other hand,  $c_1$  decreased nearly exponentially with temperature. The author proposed the following correlations to estimate the  $c_1$  coefficients for SS 304, Ni 200 and Al 6061-T5 at high temperatures:

For SS 304:

$$\frac{c_1}{c_1(T_{rm})} = \exp[-1.675x10^{-3}(T - T_{rm})] \quad (6)$$

For Ni 200:

$$\frac{c_1}{c_1(T_{rm})} = \exp[-1.372x10^{-3}(T - T_{rm})] \quad (7)$$

For Al 6061-T5:

$$\frac{c_1}{c_1(T_{rm})} = \exp[-1.19x10^{-3}(T - T_{rm})] \quad (8)$$

which are valid for  $20 < T < 200^\circ C$ . In these equations,  $c_1(T_{rm})$  is the value of  $c_1$  obtained at room temperature  $T_{rm}$ .


The objective of this work is to compare the models reviewed here with thermal contact conductance experimental data from Hegazy<sup>5</sup> and Antonetti<sup>7</sup> for conforming isotropic rough surfaces. The tests were performed under vacuum environment, with samples possessing various roughness levels, and for different metals. The data sets consist of the contact between bead-blasted/lapped surfaces. The study is focused on the analysis of the accuracy of the Sridhar and Yovanovich<sup>1</sup> correlations for  $c_1$  and  $c_2$  (Eqs. 4 and 5). The accuracy of the correlations proposed by Nho<sup>2</sup> to correct  $c_1$  for the actual interface temperature is also analyzed in more detail in this paper.

### COMPARISON BETWEEN THEORY AND EXPERIMENTS

Hegazy<sup>5</sup> measured the thermal contact conductance of the interface between lapped/bead-blasted surfaces of similar metals possessing various roughness levels. The author tested SS 304, Ni 200 and Zr-alloys. The first two are common materials employed by the industry and the Zr-alloys are generally used by the nuclear energy industry. The interface temperature during the tests were approximately  $180^\circ C$ .

Figure 1 shows the comparison between theory and SS 304 experimental data. Four pairs, presenting four different values of the ratio  $\sigma/m$  are shown in this graph and are compared with the theoretical model (Eqs. 1 and 3). In this graph,  $c_1$  and  $c_2$  were obtained by the author from Vickers micro-hardness measurements at room temperature. The RMS difference for all 4 pairs is only 16%. The RMS difference of each pair can also be seen. The agreement is very good, in general, especially at higher contact pressures. The theory underpredicts experiments at light contact loads, which according to Milanez, Yovanovich and Culham<sup>8</sup>, is due to the truncation of the highest contacting asperities and is not related to the incorrect prediction of the supporting contact pressure  $H_c$ .

Since the interface temperature during the tests (approximately  $180^\circ C$ ) were higher than the temperature during the Vickers micro-hardness tests, the data shown in Fig. 1 were reduced again using the  $c_1$  coefficient corrected according to Eq. (6). The results are shown in Fig. 2. In this graph, the theory slightly overpredicts the experiments at high loads. As  $c_1$  is corrected for temperature, the data points are displaced to the right in Fig. 2 because the plastic contact pressure ( $H_c \sim c_1$ ) is smaller than in Fig. 1. However, the RMS difference is approximately the same (16%) in both cases.



**Figure 1** - SS 304 data from Hegazy<sup>5</sup> ( $c_1$  and  $c_2$  measured,  $c_1$  not corrected)

In order to verify the accuracy of the correlations from Sridhar and Yovanovich<sup>1</sup> for  $c_1$  and  $c_2$  (Eqs. 4 and 5), the same SS 304 data sets from Hegazy<sup>5</sup> were reduced again. For SS 304 a bulk hardness value of  $H_B = 1474 MPa$  was reported by Hegazy<sup>5</sup>. For this value of bulk hardness, the Sridhar and Yovanovich<sup>1</sup> correlations give  $c_1(T_{rm}) = 6753 MPa$  and  $c_2 = -0.273$ , against  $c_1(T_{rm}) = 6271 MPa$  and  $c_2 = -0.229$ , which were measured by Hegazy<sup>5</sup>. Figure 3 shows the comparison between theory and the SS 304 experimental data from Hegazy<sup>5</sup> with  $c_1$  and  $c_2$  estimated using the correlations from Sridhar and Yovanovich<sup>1</sup>. Comparing Figs. 2 and 3, one can see that the results obtained using the estimated values of  $c_1$  and  $c_2$  are similar to the results using the measured values. Therefore the Sridhar and Yovanovich<sup>1</sup> correlations were accurate in this case.

A behavior similar to the SS 304 data presented above was noticed with the Ni 200 data from Hegazy<sup>5</sup> as well. Using  $c_1$  obtained from measurements at room temperature leads the theory to predict experiments very well, with a RMS difference of 12%. Using the  $c_1$  value corrected for the actual interface temperature, the theory slightly overpredicts the experiments at high loads, exactly in the same way as shown previously for SS 304. The RMS differences are 18% using the measured values of  $c_1$  and  $c_2$  and 15% using the predicted values using the Sridhar and Yovanovich<sup>1</sup> correlations. Therefore, for the Ni 200 data set from Hegazy<sup>5</sup>, the Sridhar and

Yovanovich<sup>1</sup> correlations were accurate, similar to the SS 304 data set.

The comparisons between Zr-2.5wt%Nb and Zr-4 data and theoretical predictions for both the measured and the estimated values of  $c_1$  and  $c_2$  are presented in Figs. 4 and 5, respectively. The RMS difference of all data sets for the measured  $c_1$  and  $c_2$  values is 20%. Using the values estimated by the Sridhar and Yovanovich<sup>1</sup> correlations, the RMS difference is 50%.

This reasonably large value of RMS implies that the correlations for  $c_1$  and  $c_2$  were not suitable for these data sets. The  $c_1$  and  $c_2$  values that Hegazy<sup>5</sup> obtained from his specimens are quite different from the values Sridhar and Yovanovich<sup>1</sup> used to obtain his correlations. Table 1 presents the  $c_1$  and  $c_2$  values measured by Hegazy<sup>5</sup>, the values used by Sridhar and Yovanovich<sup>1</sup> to obtain Eqs. (4) and (5), and the values that come from Eqs. (4) and (5). As can




Figure 2 - SS 304 data from Hegazy<sup>5</sup> ( $c_1$  and  $c_2$  measured,  $c_1$  corrected)




Figure 4 - Zr-alloys data from Hegazy<sup>5</sup> ( $c_1$  and  $c_2$  measured,  $c_1$  not corrected)




Figure 3 - SS 304 data from Hegazy<sup>5</sup> ( $c_1$  and  $c_2$  from Eqs. 4 and 5,  $c_1$  corrected)




Figure 5 - Zr-alloys data from Hegazy<sup>5</sup> ( $c_1$  and  $c_2$  from Eqs. 4 and 5,  $c_1$  not corrected)

be seen in this table, for Zr-2.5wt%Nb, SS 304, and Ni 200, the values computed using the Sridhar and Yovanovich<sup>1</sup> correlations (last column) are in good agreement with the values measured by Hegazy<sup>5</sup> (second column). Also for these metals, the values employed by Sridhar and Yovanovich<sup>1</sup> (third column) to obtain Eqs (4) and (5) are the same values measured by Hegazy<sup>5</sup>. However, for Zr-4, Sridhar and Yovanovich<sup>1</sup> used very different values to obtain their correlations (third column) from the values measured by Hegazy<sup>5</sup> (second column). As a result, the values coming from the Sridhar and Yovanovich<sup>1</sup> correlations (last column) are quite different from the measured values (second column). This explains why the comparison between theory and experimental data shown in Fig. 4 is less accurate than when compared with Fig. 5.

From these observations, it can be concluded that the Zr-4 alloy behaves differently than SS 304, Ni 200 and Zr-2.5 wt%Nb with respect to micro-hardness. The last three metals present consistent micro-hardness measurements in different samples, while it is clear from the second and third columns of Table 1 that the samples measured by Hegazy<sup>5</sup> and the measurements used by Sridhar and Yovanovich<sup>1</sup> to find the correlations given by Eq. (4) and (5) are quite different. The reason for this distinct behavior is probably related to the way different metals

respond to the work-hardening during the surface preparation. However, it is still very difficult to predict how the work-hardening takes place during the surface preparation. The literature lacks works in this field.

Antonetti<sup>8</sup> also measured the contact conductance between Ni 200 specimens presenting four distinct values of  $\sigma/m$ . The data were reduced and plotted along with the isotropic contact conductance model (Eq. 1) and the results are shown in Figs. 6 to 8. Figure 6 was obtained using the measured values of  $c_1$  and  $c_2$ , with  $c_1$  not corrected for temperature. Figure 7 was also obtained using the measured values of  $c_1$  and  $c_2$ , but with  $c_1$  corrected for the actual interface temperature. Figure 8 was obtained with  $c_1$  and  $c_2$  predicted using Eqs. (4) and (5), and  $c_1$  corrected for temperature (Eq. 7). In Fig. 6 the agreement is excellent for the entire range of contact pressures, with a RMS difference of only 6%. When  $c_1$  is corrected for temperature (Fig. 7), the theory tends to slightly over predict the experimental data, with a RMS difference of 12%. The Sridhar and Yovanovich<sup>1</sup> correlations for  $c_1$  and  $c_2$  make the theory predict the data points very well (Fig. 8), with a RMS difference of 8%. Therefore, the Ni 200 data from Antonetti<sup>8</sup> presented a behaviour very similar to the Ni 200 and SS 304 data from Hegazy<sup>5</sup>.

**Table 1** - Bulk Hardness ( $H_B$  [MPa]),  $c_1$  [MPa] and  $c_2$

Material	Measured by Hegazy <sup>5</sup>	Used to obtain Eqs. (4) and (5) (Sridhar and Yovanovich <sup>1</sup> )	Computed using Eqs. (4) and (5)
<b>Zr-2.5wt%Nb</b>	$c_1 = 5884$	$c_1 = 5884$	$c_1 = 6190$
$H_B = 1727$	$c_2 = -0.267$	$c_2 = -0.267$	$c_2 = -0.237$
<b>Zr-4</b>	$c_1 = 3320$	$c_1 = 5677$	$c_1 = 6372$
$H_B = 1913$	$c_2 = -0.145$	$c_2 = -0.278$	$c_2 = -0.249$
<b>Ni 200</b>	$c_1 = 6304$	$c_1 = 6304$	$c_1 = 6309$
$H_B = 1668$	$c_2 = -0.264$	$c_2 = -0.264$	$c_2 = -0.245$
<b>SS 304</b>	$c_1 = 6271$	$c_1 = 6271$	$c_1 = 6753$
$H_B = 1472$	$c_2 = -0.229$	$c_2 = -0.229$	$c_2 = -0.273$




Figure 6 - Ni 200 data from Antonetti<sup>7</sup> ( $c_1$  and  $c_2$  measured,  $c_1$  not corrected)




Figure 7 - Ni 200 data from Antonetti<sup>7</sup> ( $c_1$  and  $c_2$  measured,  $c_1$  corrected)

## SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The objective of this work was to compare thermal contact conductance experimental data between conforming rough surfaces under vacuum against models available in the open literature. The available data include SS 304, Ni 200, Zr-4 and Zr-2.5wt%Nb pairs from Hegazy<sup>5</sup> and Antonetti<sup>7</sup>. The contact conductance models analyzed here are based on the model of Cooper et al.<sup>3</sup>, for asperities ex-

periencing plastic deformation. The surface microhardness coefficients  $c_1$  and  $c_2$  used here, which are very important input parameters to the thermal contact conductance model, were both the measured values and the values estimated using the empirical correlations proposed by Sridhar and Yovanovich<sup>1</sup>.

The correlations proposed by Nho<sup>2</sup> to correct the  $c_1$  coefficient for the actual temperature of the interface were also tested here. The correlations proposed by Nho<sup>2</sup> to correct  $c_1$  for the actual interface temperature in general make the theory slightly overpredict the experimental data. The experimental data used here appears to agree better with the predictions when the  $c_1$  values at room temperature are used instead of the corrected values.

For Ni 200 and SS 304, the  $c_1$  and  $c_2$  values computed using the Sridhar and Yovanovich<sup>1</sup> correlations gave very good results. The RMS differences for each data set vary only a few percent if one uses the estimated  $c_1$  and  $c_2$  instead of the measured values. For the Zr-alloys, the results were not very good, especially for Zr-4. It is believed that this alloy responds to work-hardening during surface preparation in a different way to the other metals tested. Further studies are needed in order to test the validity of the empirical correlations for  $c_1$  and  $c_2$  over a larger spectrum of metals.




Figure 8 - Ni 200 data from Antonetti<sup>7</sup> ( $c_1$  and  $c_2$  from Eqs. 4 and 5,  $c_1$  corrected)

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors acknowledge the continued financial support of the Natural Science and Engineering Research Council of Canada. The first author would



like to acknowledge the support of the Brazilian Federal Agency for Post-Graduate Education - CAPES.

### REFERENCES

- 1) Sridhar, M.R. and Yovanovich, M.M., "Empirical Methods to Predict Vickers Microhardness," *Wear*, Vol. 193, pp. 91-98, 1996.
- 2) Nho, K. M., "Experimental Investigation of Heat Flow Rate and Directional Effect on Contact Conductance of Anisotropic Ground/Lapped Interfaces," Ph. D. Thesis, University of Waterloo, Ontario, Canada, 1990.
- 3) Cooper, M. G., Mikic, B. B. and Yovanovich, M. M., "Thermal Contact Conductance," *Journal of Heat Mass Transfer*, Vol.12, pp. 279-300, 1969.
- 4) Yovanovich, M. M., "Thermal Contact Correlations," *Spacecraft Radiative Heat Transfer and Temperature Control*, Edited by T. E. Horton, Progress in Astronautics and Aeronautics, Vol.83, New York, 1981.
- 5) Hegazy. A. A., "Thermal Joint Conductance of Conforming Rough Surfaces: Effect of Surface Micro-hardness Variation," Ph. D. Thesis, University of Waterloo, Ontario, Canada, 1985.
- 6) Song, S. and Yovanovich, M. M., "Relative Contact Pressure: Dependence on Surface Roughness and Vickers Microhardness," *AIAA Journal of Thermophysics and Heat Transfer*, Vol.2, No. 4, pp. 633-640, 1988.
- 7) Antonetti, V. W., "On the Use of Metallic Coatings to Enhance Thermal Contact Conductance," Ph. D. Thesis, University of Waterloo, Ontario, Canada, 1983.
- 8) Milanez, F.H., Yovanovich, M.M. and Culham, J.R., "Effect of Surface Asperity Truncation on Thermal Contact Conductance", 8th Intersociety Conference on Thermal and Thermomechanical Phenomena in Electronic Systems - Itherm, San Diego, CA, May 29-June 1, 2002.