Pre-print of a published manuscript

Application of massive laser shock processing for improvement of mechanical and tribological properties

Uroš Trdan, Michal Skarba, Juan A. Porro, José L. Ocaña, Janez Grum

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.surfcoat.2018.02.084>

Published in: Surface & Coatings Technology, Volume 342, May 2018, Pages 1-11

Received: 15 November 2017

Accepted: 21 February 2018

This is a pre-print of an article published in Surface & Coatings Technology. The final authenticated version is available online at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.surfcoat.2018.02.084>

Please cite this article as: U. Trdan, M. Skarba, J.A. Porro, J.L. Ocaña, J. Grum, Application of massive laser shock processing for improvement of mechanical and tribological properties, *Surface & Coatings Technology*, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.surfcoat.2018.02.084>

Application of massive laser shock processing for improvement of mechanical and tribological properties

Uroš Trdan ^{a*}, Michal Skarba ^b, Juan A. Porro ^c, José L. Ocaña ^c, Janez Grum ^a

^a University of Ljubljana, Faculty of Mechanical Engineering, Askerceva 6, 1000 Ljubljana, Slovenia

^b Slovak University of Technology in Bratislava, Vazovova 5, SK-81243 Bratislava, Slovakia

^c UPM Laser Centre, Polytechnical University of Madrid, Ctra. Valencia, k.m. 7.3, 28031 Madrid, Spain

uros.trdan@fs.uni-lj.si, michal.skarba@stuba.sk, japorro@etsii.upm.es, jlocana@etsii.upm.es,
janez.grum@fs.uni-lj.si

*Corresponding author: Assist. Prof. Uroš Trdan, PhD.

Email: uros.trdan@fs.uni-lj.si

Tel.: +386 1 477 1432

Submitted to: *Surface and Coatings Technology*

Date: November 15 2017

Abstract

The present paper aims to investigate topographical, microstructural, mechanical and tribological behaviour of precipitation hardened Al alloy subjected to massive laser shock processing (LSP) without protective coating at 2500 pulses/cm², using three beam diameters. Wear tests under dry sliding conditions resulted in severe wear, whereas the main wear mechanisms were adhesion accompanied by abrasive wear. Nevertheless, LSP with optimal processing parameters reduce the friction coefficient and wear rate with lower degrees of adhesion and abrasion inside the wear track in comparison to the untreated sample. The enhanced tribological performance is attributed to the positive influence of LSP induced surface topography, surface compressive residual stresses (RS) and dense dislocation arrangements, as the result of high-pressure shock waves. Nonetheless, due to the narrow window of optimal parameters reduced wear resistance as a consequence of undesired thermal/softening effect due to laser ablation and melting was detected with non-optimal processing parameters.

34

35 **Keywords:** Laser shock processing; Aluminium alloy; Wear, Microhardness; Residual stress;
36 Microstructure.

37

38 **1. Introduction**

39 Despite the fact that laser processing technologies belong to a green manufacturing branch
40 and that aluminium and its alloys are the third most commonly used commercial engineering
41 materials, a constant demand towards higher efficient surfaces, lower and cleaner production
42 costs with lower waste gas emissions remains. Among the products within the 6xxx series
43 aluminium alloys, AA6082 is regarded as a high (medium-high) strength alloy, which
44 contains high numbers of intermetallic second-phase particles, ranging up to 10 μm , i.e.
45 spherical $\alpha\text{-Al}_{12}(\text{Fe}, \text{Mn})_3\text{Si}$, $\beta\text{-Al}_5\text{FeSi}$, and $\beta\text{-Mg}_2\text{Si}$ in the form of plates or cubes [1].
46 However, the predominant nano-precipitate in the peak-aged condition contributing the most
47 to the increase in material hardness and strength is the β'' phase (Mg_5Si_6) [2]. Nevertheless,
48 despite the fact that the age hardenability of Al–Mg–Si alloys is high due to excess amounts
49 of silicon and magnesium, which enhances the precipitation kinetics during heat treatment,
50 the major disadvantage is insufficient wear resistance [3].

51 According to Sánchez-Santana et al. [4] wear can be regarded (along with fatigue and
52 corrosion) as one of the three most common problems found in industry, leading to the
53 replacement of industrial parts and components, due to reduced operating efficiency,
54 increased loss of power, oil consumption, etc. Ductile materials, such as aluminium alloys
55 under dry sliding conditions, usually experience severe wear; however, it is far from clear
56 which aluminium alloy would offer the best wear resistance [5]. In fact, as Ghazali et al. [6]
57 suggested it is not clear if the wear resistance scales with the starting hardness of the alloy,
58 which would suggest that a precipitation-hardened matrix would be optimum, or whether it is
59 the work-hardening characteristics that are more important.

60 Over the previous two decades laser shock processing (LSP) has been recognized as an
61 advanced, effective, fast emerging severe plastic deformation (SPD) technology which has
62 been successfully applied to various materials to impart compressive residual stresses, various
63 high-density dislocation configurations, grain refinement, improved fatigue, corrosion and
64 wear resistance [7][8][9][10][11][12][13][14]. Authors [7][10] have confirmed
65 nanocrystalline structures with refined grains, dense dislocation walls and dislocation cells in
66 the material surface as a consequence of laser-induced shock waves propagating into material.
67 Moreover, it has been shown [11] that LSP with a sacrificial protective layer is a reliable and
68 precise surface texturing technique for the fabrication of surface microdents, which may act as
69 lubricant reservoirs to reduce friction and wear in contact applications. Kumar et al. [12] have
70 also confirmed that LSP with optimized laser fluence can improve wear resistance by as much
71 as 91 % compared to an untreated sample. On the contrary, Hatamleh et al. [14] reported only
72 marginal improvement in wear of laser shock processed stir-welded 2195 Al alloy.

73 LSP also possess important environmental benefit over conventional SP process, with
74 lower material/energy consumption during the peening process, with as much as 55% lower
75 environmental impacts [15]. Moreover, it was pointed out that LSP has close-to-zero
76 particulate emissions, hence greatly improves the indoor air quality and, thus reduces
77 occupational health risks. However, the same authors argued that with the ‘coated’ LSP
78 regime the consumption of protective opaque, i.e. aluminium foil present the dominant
79 contributor of energy and material losses across all impact categories.

80 It should be noted that, according to the availability of different laser sources providing
81 different pulse times and different laser energy over different treatment areas, two main
82 processing regimes for LSP treatments exist, which can be applied either with or without an
83 ablative/protective layer [10]. In the so-called ‘high energy + long pulse’ regime, pulsed lasers
84 with energy in excess of several tens of joules and interaction times of up to several tens of ns,
85 deliver their energy to broad surface areas (in excess of 10 mm²). In such way high thermo-

86 mechanical impulse able to originate the desired residual stress fields on a single pulse-by-
87 pulse basis is provided. This approach demands an additional protective/sacrificial overlay
88 (paint, metallic tape, etc.) at the interaction zone prior to the laser application. The absorbing
89 protective coating enhances the laser radiation absorption and, in turn, prevents thermal
90 effects caused by the relatively long time of contact between the plasma and the treated
91 material.

92 In contrast to the coated LSP regime, the so-called ‘low energy + short pulse’ regime was
93 developed in 1995 for nuclear power plants since the process requires neither surface
94 preparation under radiation environment, nor drainage of water in a reactor vessel [16] [17].
95 In this regime, pulsed lasers with interaction times in the range of several ns and with only
96 mJ-J of energy are applied to smaller surface areas in order to maintain the required threshold
97 energy for the LSP effect. In this case, large areas are covered by a controlled pulse
98 overlapping strategy. At each location of pulse incidence, the effect of pulse overlapping can
99 produce a deep (around or over 1 mm) field of compressive residual stress with very good
100 degree of uniformity and control [18]. In this case (with a comparatively short pulse
101 interaction time), the resulting mechanical and thermal waves applied to the treated material
102 are temporarily uncoupled. With the mechanical wave being applied faster, the residual
103 effects of the subsequent thermal wave are comparatively very small and limited to a narrow
104 zone close to the material’s external surface. Hence, the effect of shock waves prevails,
105 producing compressive residual stresses [19].

106 This is an important feature to be taken into account as it is possible to eliminate the
107 coating layer used in the ‘high-energy’ approach without any appreciable loss of final surface
108 quality. Moreover, a quality factor due to the stress state uniformity in the component being
109 treated can be provided. Further, protective overlay is a time-consuming affair and it must be
110 applied at the interaction zone prior to the application to prevent the surface from being
111 damaged by the high power laser irradiation. Also, the overlay becomes damaged severely

112 during the LSP process, requiring frequent replacement hence making it slow, less efficient
113 and expensive in industrial applications [20]. It should be noted that the handling system with
114 the low energy, uncoated LSP process to access the target component is simpler since there is
115 no reactive force against laser irradiation, which has confirmed this process to be very
116 practical not only in nuclear facilities but also in other harsh environments necessitating full-
117 remote operation [19]. In view of this, low energy, short pulse, laser shock processing without
118 protective coating controlled by a predefined massive pulse overlapping strategy can be
119 regarded as a very promising, cost-effective and cleaner surface treatment technology.

120 With this in mind and since there is limited reports on the possible detrimental effect of
121 non-optimal LSP process parameters on wear behaviour, the present work describes the
122 investigation of possible improvements of the surface morphology and tribological behaviour
123 of Al 6082 alloy by massive, uncoated low energy LSP with 2500 pulses/cm², using three
124 beam diameters, i.e. three laser intensities. Tribological behaviour was evaluated using a ball-
125 on-disc tribometer and the wear tracks characterized using a scanning electron microscope
126 (SEM). In addition, the influence of laser shock processing on the surface morphology was
127 characterized using a 3D confocal laser scanning microscope (CLSM) and transmission
128 electron microscope (TEM), whereas the mechanical state was evaluated by microhardness
129 and residual stress by XRD and hole-drilling measurements.

130

131 **2. Experimental design**

132 *2.1 Material and sample preparation*

133 Test samples were sectioned from a 10 mm thick rolled plate of 6082 Al alloy, using a
134 water jet process. The chemical composition (in wt. %) of the material used in this study was
135 0.87 Si, 0.72 Mg, 0.42 Mn, 0.35 Fe, 0.15 minor elements (Cu, Cr, Ni, Zn, Ti) and Al the rest.
136 The overall heat treatment procedure, T651 (homogenization, solution treatment, aging, etc.),
137 including the subsequent LSP is schematically presented in Fig. 1.

Fig. 1. Schematic presentation of the overall heat treatment and subsequent LSP treatment.

SEM/EDS line analysis (Fig. 2) confirmed the basic Al matrix with fine distribution of intermetallic phases. Results of our previous research [10] confirmed various intermetallic particles in these alloys, i.e. smaller β -Mg₂Si precipitates in the form of plates or cubes and larger α -Al₁₂(Fe,Mn)₃Si intermetallic dispersoids, which are in the length of $\sim 4\mu\text{m}$.

Fig. 2. (a) SEM/BEI microstructure of the base material; (b) EDS line analysis results marked on (a).

Prior to LSP, no additional machining of the samples was carried out. In order to ensure surface uniformity and proper laser laser-beam interactions with the sample surface all samples were thoroughly degreased with acetone and rinsed with de-ionised water, before performing laser processing.

154

155 *2.2 Laser shock processing*

156 Laser shock processing (LSP) was carried out without any ablative/protective coating in a
157 water confinement regime; whereas laser pulses were overlapped and scanned in a raster-type
158 x-y pattern to completely cover the treated area ([Fig. 1](#)). A water jet set up was employed to
159 create a thin water layer with a constant thickness (1–2 mm) and maintain a bubble-free,
160 uniform confinement layer. This enabled plasma confinement during laser–target interaction
161 as well as the replacement of laser ablated particles, ensuring a constant pure laser–matter
162 interaction.

163 A Spectra-Physics Q-switched Nd:YAG laser source with an irradiation wavelength of
164 1064 nm, producing 10 ns duration pulses (FWHM), with the maximum laser beam energy of
165 2.8 J/pulse was used for LSP. The effects of a massive laser shock treatment was investigated
166 at a pulse density of 2500 pulses/cm², with a unified overlapping distance between
167 consecutive pulses of 0.2 mm, while the laser beam was constantly perpendicular to the
168 sample surface. Three kinds of beam diameters were chosen, i.e. 1.5 mm (LSP–1.5 mm),
169 2.0 mm (LSP–2.0 mm), and 2.5 mm (LSP–2.5 mm), which modified surface layers differently
170 due to different peak power density and coverage factors, as shown in [Fig. 3](#).

171 For each parameter set of the experimental run, two samples were prepared for further
172 analysis; (i) tribological characterization, and (ii) evaluation of surface modifications. In order
173 to investigate the effects of massive LSP on surface integrity, i.e. laser-shock induced surface
174 craters, dislocation configuration, and mechanical properties and its effect on dry-contact
175 wear behaviour, no additional grinding of the treated surface was employed since it would not
176 reflect the real surface condition induced by the laser treatment.

177

Fig. 3. Surface appearance after LSP with different beam diameters; (a) LSP–1.5 mm and (b) LSP–2.5 mm.

2.3 Surface topography

Topographical analyses were performed using a confocal laser scanning microscope (CLSM) at a wavelength of 405 nm (Zeiss LSM700) to study the influence of massive LSP on the spatial characteristics of the treated surface. Determinations of surface roughness and waviness were obtained using a unified high-pass and low-pass filter with ($\lambda_c = 200 \mu\text{m}$).

2.4 Residual stresses and microhardness

Surface transverse σ_{xx} and longitudinal σ_{yy} residual stresses (RS) in regard to the LSP direction (Fig. 1) were determined by a Proto iXRD system with Cr-K α X-rays (2.291 Å) from the Al{222} diffraction peak located at the angle $2\theta = 156.31^\circ$ [21][22]. The side inclination method with 9 beta angles with 5° oscillation for each measurement point was adopt, and the $\sin^2\psi$ method with a Gaussian profile fitting was applied for the residual stress

194 analysis. The X-ray elastic constant $S_2/2$ used was $18.56 \times 10^{-6} \text{ MPa}^{-1}$. The focused X-ray
195 beam diameter was set to 2.0 mm.

196 Depth-resolved RS were measured with a Hole-Drilling measurement equipment and the
197 strain gage CEA-06-062UM-120 (Vishay Intertechnology Inc., Malvern, PA, USA) in
198 accordance with ASTM E 837-08 standard [23] and Vishay Tech Note TN-503-10 [24].
199 Diameter of the blind hole was measured using Alicona G4 3D Infinite focus measuring
200 (IFM) device, with an optical lateral and vertical resolution of 800 nm and 100 nm,
201 respectively. The final RS in depth-distribution was calculated with the integral method, using
202 H-Drill software, whereas the average standard deviation of the errors in the measured strain
203 values was $4.7 \mu\epsilon$. Both, hole-drilling technique, its operation principles and parameters of the
204 IFM device have been described in detail in ref. [18].

205 Near surface micro-hardness measurements prior to and after LSP were carried out on a
206 Vickers Hardness (HV) tester at a constant 200 g load and 20 s load time at the depth 75 μm
207 below the surface, whereas in average five separate measurements for each data point were
208 performed.

209

210 *2.5 Microstructural observations*

211 Worn surfaces of samples were identified with a Hitachi S-3000N scanning electron
212 microscope (SEM) attached to an Energy Dispersive X-ray spectroscopy (EDX).
213 Microstructures of base material (BM) and LSP-treated samples were characterized in the
214 cross-sectional direction using a Jeol 2000-FX transmission electron microscope (TEM),
215 operated at 200 kV. Detailed TEM procedure TEM was described previously in ref. [10].

216

217 *2.6 Friction and wear behaviour*

218 Tribological behaviour under dry contact conditions was studied in air at an ambient
219 temperature of 23 °C with a Microtest MT/30/NI/LIN tribometer using a ball-on-disc

configuration with a rolling ball of AISI 52100 steel (diameter 3 mm). Test parameters were chosen according to the ASTM G99-04 standard [25] as follows: sliding tangential speed 0.0785 m/s, sliding distance 1000 m and a normal load of 5 N, which corresponds to a maximum Hertzian contact pressure of 1.22 GPa (mean value 0.81 GPa).

During the experiments friction coefficient were recorded. Afterwards, additional measurements of the cross-sectional areas for the calculation of the worn volume (area multiplied by the average length of the footprint) were assessed by means of a Leica ICM1000 confocal laser scanning microscope (CLSM) with a wavelength of 635 nm. For each condition, four measurements of the cross-sectional area at different locations of the groove were taken and averaged and specific wear rate K was calculated based on the worn volume.

Moreover, to obtain a further insight about massive LSP effect on wear behaviour additional surface profile, height-difference measurements, i.e. cross-sectional correlations (maximum height & max. depth) measurements and roughness analyses [26][27][28] of the wear track. All measurements were performed using Alicona G4 3D IFM device (using the same parameters as described above), whereas determinations of surface roughness were obtained using a unified high-pass filtration ($\lambda_c = 250 \mu\text{m}$).

237

238 **3. Results and discussion**

239 *3.1 Surface topography*

240 Fig. 4 and 5 show the topographic characteristic of the BM and the LSP sample surfaces, respectively. Since all laser treated samples showed similar topography as the result of massive laser shock processing at 2500 pulses/cm², the sample LSP-1.5 mm (Fig. 5) was chosen as the representative one, whereas the topography results of all samples are given in Table 1. In order to obtain a proper insight about LSP effects on surface topography, analyses were performed only on the laser processed region.

247

248 **Fig. 4.** CLSM topographical analysis of BM sample; (a) 3D image, (b) 2D image after high-
 249 pass filtration and (c) topographical line profiles marked in (b).

250

251 Topography comparison among these two samples confirms a major influence of
 252 preliminary laser treatment, with higher waviness and roughness with the LSP sample.
 253 Moreover, the roughness profile values with the BM sample in the directions of 0° and 45°
 254 (marked on Fig. 4b) reveals very small differences as a consequence of the rolling
 255 ($R_a=2.372 \mu\text{m}$ vs. $R_a=2.827 \mu\text{m}$). However, after LSP (Fig. 5), the significant anisotropy effect
 256 in surface roughness can be seen as a collateral effect of the raster-type laser scan pattern (see
 257 Fig. 1 and 3) Here, the R_a value is higher by as much as 43 % in the longitudinal (0°) in
 258 comparison to the diagonal (45°) direction, i.e. $3.983 \mu\text{m}$ vs. $2.784 \mu\text{m}$.

259 In order to obtain further surface texture information and comparison among BM and LSP-
 260 treated samples, three 3D amplitude roughness parameters (S_c – mean height of the roughness
 261 area; S_a – arithmetical mean deviation of the roughness area and S_z – averaged peak to valley
 262 of the roughness area) and three waviness parameters (W_c – mean height of the waviness area;

263 W_a – arithmetical mean deviation of the waviness area and W_z – averaged peak to valley of the
 264 waviness area) were analysed over the complete measured area.
 265

266
 267 **Fig. 5.** CLSM analysis of LSP-1.5 mm sample. (a) 3D image, (b) 2D image after high-pass
 268 filtration and (c) topographical line profiles marked in (b).
 269

270 As can be seen from the results in [Table 1](#), the laser beam diameter has a significant effect
 271 on the final 3D topography, whereas the lowest roughness and waviness is obtained with the
 272 BM sample. With the BM sample roughness S_a , evaluated over the complete measured
 273 surface equals to 2.689 μm . After LSP, the roughness S_a increases with increasing beam
 274 diameter, i.e. 3.479 μm (LSP-1.5 mm) < 4.374 μm (LSP-2.0 mm) < 6.463 μm (LSP-
 275 2.5 mm). Therefore, the S_a parameter is lower by as much as a factor of 1.9 with the sample
 276 LSP-1.5 mm in comparison to the sample treated with the largest beam diameter (LSP-
 277 2.5 mm). A similar situation can be observed with other 3D amplitude roughness parameters.
 278 Moreover, the results confirm that the LSP process modifies the waviness parameters even
 279 more. In particular, sample LSP after laser treatment with the largest laser beam diameter

reveals a high increase of waviness, exhibiting an almost 35-times higher averaged peak to valley parameter W_z in comparison to the BM sample (68.704 μm vs. 1.986 μm) and a 10-times higher value in comparison to the LSP-1.5 mm sample ($W_z=6.646 \mu\text{m}$). Hence, the obtained results indicate that the surface topography is indeed sensitive to the laser beam diameter and overlap ratio, expressing a lower degree of asperities (smaller roughness and waviness) with the lowest overlap ratio with the smallest laser beam diameter, and vice versa.

Table 1. 3D CLSM topography (roughness and waviness) results.

Sample	S_c (μm)	S_a (μm)	S_z (μm)	W_c (μm)	W_a (μm)	W_z (μm)
BM	27.860	2.689	48.629	5.240	1.098	1.986
LSP-1.5 mm	48.369	3.479	76.577	9.047	3.011	6.646
LSP-2.0 mm	66.905	4.374	85.514	21.351	8.955	14.334
LSP-2.5 mm	85.777	6.463	94.140	77.388	21.398	68.704

During LSP, expressive surface craters were generated due to numerous laser-beam interactions with the sample surface, producing local surface ablation and plastic deformation induced by multiple laser-induced shock waves at ultra-high strain rates, which can exceed 10^7 s^{-1} [29]. Similar trend of the increased surface topography was reported previously by Yakimets et al. [30], whereas only the changes of wave parameters with unchanged roughness were confirmed. Nevertheless, it should be noted that in their investigation, an ablative protective coating was used, which caused only a mechanical effect due to shock wave propagation.

3.2 Residual stresses and microhardness

In this section residual stresses were investigated since it exist in almost all materials and arise whenever inelastic processes occur [31]. Moreover, the actual sign of residual stresses (tensile/compressive) and their location plays a crucial role on material performance in engineering applications, thus, demands the precise knowledge and control of residual stresses in various applications [32]. Although, recently intensive research efforts have been devoted

on downscaling of stress relaxation measurement techniques to a local- /micro-scale by slit milling method using a combination of SEM imaging, FIB milling, and DIC image analysis [31][32][33][34], in this study residual stresses were analysed using a combination of standardized XRD and hole drilling method.

Fig. 6a and b illustrates in-depth residual stress distribution in x (σ_{xx}) and y-direction (σ_{yy}) obtained using the hole drilling technique. Examination of the holes after the drilling (Fig. 6c) confirms good accuracy and stability of the hole drilling equipment even at larger depths, with the average blind-hole diameter of 2.05 ± 0.03 mm.

Fig. 6. (a,b) In-depth residual stresses and (c) 3D presentation of the drilled blind-hole and its cross section (*Note: blank spaces in Fig.6c represent the un-measured points*).

The results of the residual stress measurements indicate close to zero stress state with the BM sample. On the contrary, all LSP samples indicate compressive stresses with significantly

319 higher values in the advancing, y-direction (σ_{yy}). Results depict that the magnitude of
320 compressive RS correlates with the magnitude of peak power density and is in the following
321 order: LSP-1.5 mm (-292 MPa) < LSP-2.0 mm (-261 MPa) < LSP-2.5 mm (-138 MPa). As
322 can be seen from Fig. 6b a relatively steep stress gradient is observed where the compressive
323 RS within the first 350 μm increases to ~ -170 MPa. After this region, similar RS distribution
324 can be seen as with the other two LSP samples. However, with larger beam diameter, the
325 penetration depth of compressive RS is higher. Hence, the lowest ($\delta_{xx,1}=725 \mu\text{m}$) and the
326 highest ($\delta_{xx,3}>967 \mu\text{m}$) penetration depths of compression in x-direction are obtained with
327 laser beam diameters of 1.5 mm and 2.5 mm, respectively.

328 It should be noted that compressive RS of -292 MPa and -261 MPa obtained with the
329 samples treated with beam diameter of 1.5 and 2.0 mm in y-direction are very close to the
330 yield strength of the material (320 MPa), indicating that RS are probably overestimated and
331 the actual RS should be lower. Nonetheless, hole-drilling technique provides useable
332 qualitative information about in-depth residual stress distribution [35][36].

333 Another important factor to be noted from Fig. 6 is quite large differences among RS in the
334 specific direction (σ_{xx} and σ_{yy}) as the collateral effect of the raster laser scan pattern [37].
335 Nevertheless, it is worth noting that although differences among RS components in a specific
336 direction exist, both stress components are of a compressive character, which could
337 effectively enhance wear resistance.

338 In order to investigate the possible thermal/softening effect on the very top surface
339 produced during massive uncoated LSP regime, additional XRD RS measurements were
340 performed. Fig. 7 shows a comparison between top-surface RS and near-surface ($z = 75 \mu\text{m}$)
341 Vickers micro-hardness. Surprisingly, the highest compressive RS are achieved with the
342 sample LSP-2.0 mm treated with middle laser beam diameter ($\sigma_{yy} = -55 \pm 11$ MPa and $\sigma_{xx} = -$
343 22 ± 9 MPa), followed by sample LSP-1.5 mm and LSP-2.5 mm. Results depict larger
344 compressive RS in the y-direction compared to the stresses in x-direction, which is in

345 accordance with the hole-drilling RS results. Further, with sample treated with 1.5 and
 346 2.0 mm laser beam diameter compressive RS are achieved in both directions, indicating
 347 sufficient shock waves and work hardening effect, which prevailed over the thermal effect
 348 due to laser ablation and melting.

349
 350 **Fig. 7.** Comparison of surface residual stress and near-surface micro-hardness.

351
 352 However, with LSP-2.5 mm sample tensile stresses in the x-direction ($\sigma_{xx} = 15 \pm 8$ MPa)
 353 and near zero RS in the y-direction ($\sigma_{yy} = -1 \pm 7$ MPa) are obtained. Such results indicate that
 354 here the softening/thermal effect prevailed over insufficient mechanical shock wave loading
 355 due to low power density and high coverage factor as a consequence of the largest laser spot
 356 diameter. Similar results were reported by Gill et al. [20] who investigated the effects of laser
 357 shock processing with and without protective coating, where high compressive RS (-
 358 550 MPa) with a protective overlay and much smaller compressive stresses (-50 MPa)
 359 without a protective coating were confirmed. However, their results depicted tensile RS from
 360 the depth of $\sim 5 - 80$ μm below the surface which afterwards changed to a compressive state.
 361 Our results (Fig. 6 and 7) did not demonstrate this, indicating the important influence of the
 362 LSP parameters.

363 Micro-hardness of untreated material was approximately 94 HV, whereas the highest
 364 micro-hardness increase of about + 9% is obtained with the sample LSP-1.5 mm (103 ± 3 HV

365 vs. 94 ± 2 HV). The micro-hardness of other two LSP samples is 100 ± 2 HV and 98 ± 3 HV,
366 respectively. These results indicate correlation with the magnitude of compressive RS in Fig.
367 6 at the depth of 75 μm , where microhardness was measured. Although, it would be expected
368 that large compressive RS would affect the microhardness on the larger scale, our results
369 indicate only minor increase. Such results are consistent with our previous study [38] and
370 with results reported by Peyre et al. [39], who also reported little improvement in the micro-
371 hardness properties for 7075 Al alloy after laser shock processing compared to shot peened
372 material.

373

374 3.3 TEM analysis

375 Fig. 8 shows the TEM bright field images of the surface layers of untreated and LSP
376 samples. It can be distinctly observed from Fig. 8a that the dislocation density in BM sample
377 is moderately low, with two sets of nano intermetallic particles inside the matrix.

378 On the contrary, Fig. 8b-d confirms high-density dislocations introduced by laser shock
379 processing. Fig. 8b and c show dense dislocation walls, dislocation tangles and cells having
380 relatively thin walls. Here, only a few dislocation lines were observed, but dislocation pile-
381 ups are formed in the vicinity of the different particles, which seems to act as effective
382 blockers of dislocation movement. Fig. 8b indicates that severe plastic deformation induced
383 by massive LSP impacts promoted in considerable increase in dislocation density, as well as
384 in the formation of dislocation networks and dislocation cell structures, which can lead to
385 refined and eventually to ultra-fine and nano-grains [40]. Results of our previous study [10]
386 indicate that dislocation slip is the main factor of the grain refinement mechanism during LSP
387 as a result of repetitive laser-induced shock waves at the treated surface. Based on the
388 comprehensive TEM analysis and dislocation density evaluation, the grain refinement
389 mechanism has also been proposed therein.

390

Fig. 8. TEM bright field observations of various samples: (a) BM, (b-d) LSP samples treated with different laser beam diameters.

Moreover, current and previous TEM observations revealed no effect of LSP on precipitation kinetics, its distribution and size which is common with conventional shot peening process. For example, Noordhuis and De Hosson [41] report obvious very fine dispersion of silicon in aluminium of laser melted and shot peened eutectic aluminium-silicon (Al-12Si) alloy with formation of small silicon precipitates, which lead to a further hardness increase. In contrast, our results did not demonstrate this, which is in good correlation with obtained hardness results, since the nano-size β'' phase (Mg_5Si_6) precipitates contributes the most to the increasing strength of Al-Mg-Si alloys [2][42]. Hence, finer or denser distribution of β'' nano-size precipitates reflects in greater hardness and strength of such Al-alloy [10]. Fabbro et al. [43] attributed this differences (SP vs. LSP) to three interactive factors: (1) shock duration is very small, (2) compared to the SP process, no contact deformation or Hertzian

loading occurs, and (3) impact pressures are usually much lower than those from the SP process. Nevertheless, the same authors confirmed more than two times higher fatigue life after laser shock processing compared to the shot peening, in which higher surface embrittlement and surface roughening promoted more rapid crack development.

However, in the case of the LSP–2.5 mm sample (Fig. 8d) the situation is different. Here, TEM analysis shows only the presence of dislocation lines and the presence of nano-particles, of which many have planar defects as a result of thermal effect, producing tensile RS (Fig. 7). This phenomenon is most likely associated with nano-particles deposition on top of the underlying matrix during LSP treatment, where after surface ablation shock waves re-deposit these particles on the matrix [20]. However, this is consistent only with LSP–2.5 mm sample treated with the largest beam diameter and the highest overlapping ratio and is not the case with other two LSP samples.

3.4 Friction and wear

Fig. 9 shows the real time friction coefficient variation of BM and LSP samples during wear tests with a contact force of 5N and speed of 0.0785 m/s. From the global friction coefficient evolution for the pair of 6082 Al alloy–AISI 52100 stainless steel ball (Fig. 9a), it can be noted that all samples exhibited a similar trend, with a certain degree of oscillation.

By examining the diagram of the friction coefficient vs. sliding distance, it can be seen that the friction coefficient stabilizes quickly after the start (running-in-period). Afterwards, active friction is observed showing the approximately linear function of the sliding distance. At the beginning of the steady state period (~ 100m), the friction coefficient was found to be approximately 0.4 and 0.3 for the BM and LSP samples, respectively. With further sliding distance, the friction coefficient show a constant increase with a certain degree of oscillations, associated with a stick-slip phenomenon as adhesion wear takes place, due to junction formation and interlocking of asperities between mating surfaces and progressive degradation

432 of the sample surface. Wear particles which are generated begin to plough into the surface,
 433 indicating steady weight loss of the tribosystem.

434

435 **Fig. 9.** Friction coefficient as a function of sliding distance.

436

437 Nevertheless, [Fig. 9](#) shows that, in comparison to the BM, LSP produce a lowering of the
 438 global friction coefficient under dry contact conditions. After ~700 m, all samples show
 439 almost constant friction, indicating that wear particles inside the wear track are balanced by
 440 wear particles leaving the wear track. The average friction coefficient at the end of the test at
 441 1000 m sliding distance was 0.51 for the BM and in the range of 0.36 – 0.48 for LSP samples.
 442 LSP–1.5 mm sample shows similar friction to the BM sample most likely due to the lower
 443 surface roughness and waviness compared to the other two LSP sample ([Table 1](#)), which
 444 reflect in less contact points of asperities resulting in increased contact pressure and
 445 coefficient of friction.

446 [Fig. 10](#) shows an example of the typical wear pattern and an obtained 3D CLSM profile,
 447 which was employed to determine worn volumes. Visual inspection revealed no visible
 448 damage on the AISI52100 ball surface, due to its much higher hardness. Thus, the wear of the
 449 ball was neglected. In order to obtain accurate readings measurements of the wear volume
 450 were taken at four different locations along the wear track, and the average value along with
 451 the standard deviation was calculated. After determination of the worn volumes, specific wear

452 rates of the samples were calculated, and wear scars were evaluated via SEM/SEI analysis to
 453 determine whether severe or mild wear occurred.
 454

455
 456 **Fig. 10.** Typical wear scar (a) and 3D CLSM wear scar profile (b).
 457

458 Measured wear volume and calculated values of the specific wear K rate (worn volume
 459 (mm^3) divided by the product of load (N) and total sliding distance (m)) of untreated and LSP
 460 samples are given in Table 2. The specific wear rate of BM sample ($4.08 \pm 0.83 \times 10^{-4}$
 461 mm^3/Nm) is 12 % higher in comparison to the sample LSP-2.0 mm ($3.64 \pm 0.59 \times 10^{-4}$
 462 mm^3/Nm), which exhibited the lowest wear among all samples. Nonetheless, it should be
 463 noted that values of specific wear rate greater than $2 \times 10^{-4} \text{ mm}^3/\text{Nm}$ indicate that sever wear
 464 occurred with all tested samples [44][45]. As expected, the highest wear rate
 465 ($K=4.09 \pm 0.86 \times 10^{-4} \text{ mm}^3/\text{Nm}$) was achieved with LSP-2.5 mm sample.

466
 467 **Table 2.** Wear volume (W_v) and specific wear rate (K) results.

Sample	W_v (mm^3)	σ (mm^3)	K ($\text{mm}^3/\text{N m}$)	σ ($\text{mm}^3/\text{N m}$)

Untreated	2.041E-03	4.165E-4	4.083E-4	8.331E-5
LSP-1.5 mm	1.959E-03	3.199E-4	3.918E-4	6.398E-5
LSP-2.0 mm	1.820E-03	2.952E-4	3.640E-4	5.904E-5
LSP-2.5 mm	2.045E-03	4.289E-4	4.090E-4	8.578E-5

468
469 The higher specific wear rate of the sample LSP-2.5 mm treated with the largest spot
470 diameter is directly associated with the treatment itself, due to the softening effect during laser
471 shock processing. As TEM analysis confirmed local thermal effects with this sample caused
472 the lowest dislocation density inside the Al matrix (Fig. 8d) and tensile surface RS (Fig. 7),
473 which restrained the protective properties above the critical pressure during the wear test as
474 soon as the asperities induced by LSP were worn off.
475

476
477 **Fig. 11.** (a) Schematic presentation of roughness measurement and (b) determination of
478 maximum width and height of the cross sectional profiles of the wear track. (c) surface
479 profiles inside the wear track with given values obtained from the topographical analyses.

480

Topographical features of the wear scars, i.e. surface profile, cross-sectional measurements maximum height and roughness analyses were additionally studied by IFM microscopy (Fig.11). From the cross sectional profiles (Fig.11b) maximum width ($x_{\max}$) and height ($z_{\max}$) of the wear track were determined. Results from Fig 11c depict perfect correlation with the Wear volume (W_v) and specific wear rate (K) results. Moreover, it is clearly revealed that the largest $x_{\max}$ ($\sim 1804 \mu\text{m}$) and $z_{\max}$ ($\sim 277 \mu\text{m}$) of the wear track was obtained with LSP-2.5 mm sample, which exhibit almost 35% higher maximum height in comparison to the LSP-2.0 mm sample (and $z_{\max} = \sim 206 \mu\text{m}$) due to occurrence of higher degree of abrasive wear, mainly by a ploughing mechanism. This is additionally confirmed by the roughness results (Fig.11b and c), whereas LSP-2.5 mm sample achieved the highest surface roughness inside the wear track. Results depicts that the roughness R_a inside the wear track is in the following order: LSP-2.0 mm ($1.11 \mu\text{m}$) < LSP-1.5 mm ($1.26 \mu\text{m}$) < BM ($1.80 \mu\text{m}$) < LSP-2.5 mm ($2.05 \mu\text{m}$). Although, in the case of hard, tough coating (e.g. TiC/a-C nanocomposite coatings) almost linear correlation among wear rate and rate of roughness decrease exists [26], that does not hold true in the case of soft materials. It should be noted that in such tribo-systems (soft Al alloy-hard tool steel) surface asperities are worn off almost instantly during wear at such high maximum Hertzian loading ($p_{\max} = 1.22 \text{ GPa}$). Hence, compressive residual stresses and refined microstructure seemingly plays a crucial role on wear behaviour.

The above findings are additionally confirmed by SEM/SEI images of the worn surfaces in Fig. 12. It is clear from Figs. 12a and b that the governing wear mechanism with the BM sample is primarily adhesion and delamination by adhesion due to the occurrence of the stick-slip phenomenon resulting in progressive degradation of the surface. SEM analysis of the worn surfaces at higher magnification (Fig. 12b and d) also confirm abrasive wear with many scratches or grooves parallel to each other in the sliding direction in the worn track on both the treated and untreated samples. However, visual inspection in Fig. 12b shows extensive surface damage accompanied by deeper abrasion groove marks on the BM sample, as a result

507 of the agglomeration and compaction of the third-body wear debris generated during the test
508 [45] [46].
509

510
511 **Fig. 12.** SEM/SEI images of wear scars; (a-b) Untreated and (c-d) LSP sample treated with
512 2.0 mm laser beam diameter.
513

514 In contrast, after LSP, a smoother surface is obtained, with shallower abrasive marks, with
515 a lower degree of plastic deformation due to high compressive residual stresses induced by
516 the shock waves. Furthermore, the surface condition inside and near the wear track in Fig. 12c
517 shows that the asperities formed during LSP were all removed during the test. Our results are
518 consistent with those reported by Kumar et al. [12], which once again confirm the
519 predominant effect of compressive residual stresses and high density of dislocations induced

520 by the LSP process as soon as the surface asperities due to intense local plastic deformation
 521 are worn off.

522
 523 **Fig. 13.** Schematic presentation of surface topography effect on tribological behaviour under
 524 dry contact condition.

525
 526 The above results confirm that the LSP induced surface asperities (peaks and valleys) and
 527 compressive RS beneficially affects the tribological behaviour under dry contact conditions.
 528 The schematic presentation in Fig. 13 shows that LSP treatment enables several positive
 529 effects on the tribological behaviour:

- 530 (i) increasing the number of contact points of asperities and thus decreasing the
- 531 contact pressure resulting in the reduction of the friction coefficient (Fig. 9);
- 532 (ii) increasing the number of interfacial bonds/junctions created during sliding, which
- 533 would need higher force to break compared to the machined surface;

- 534 (iii) neutralizing the degradation process by collecting the wear debris in the valleys of
535 LSP-induced craters, which is consistent with [Fig. 12](#);
- 536 (iv) lowering the frictional energy as the asperities are worn off due to high near-
537 surface compressive residual stresses and high density of dislocations, which is
538 consistent with results in [Figs. 7-9](#).

539

540 Furthermore, a modified, thicker, and more stable passive oxide film layer generated
541 during LSP treatment could also have contributed to the lowering of friction coefficient and
542 wear. In our previous work [\[13\]](#), XPS analysis confirmed that plasma ablation and shock
543 waves propagation during LSP treatment transforms Al_2O_3 into a more stable oxide form,
544 with higher binding energy, contributing to 7-times higher polarisation resistance R_p and a
545 lower value of double layer capacitance (C_{dl}) than BM sample. Moreover, the deformation
546 response of the asperities peaks in contact before the worn-out also plays a crucial role.
547 Although hardness has a high influence on the surface deformation mode, it seems that
548 surface compressive residual stresses contribute the most. Since the stress originating from
549 sliding is opposed to RS induced by LSP the frictional energy needed for sliding at the
550 beginning of the running-in-period is lower, which is consistent with diagrams in [Fig. 9](#). Our
551 results indicate that surface compressive residual stress plays a crucial role and prevails over
552 surface hardness, indicating higher elastic response of the asperities of the LSP surface.

553 In addition, under lubricated contact, the positive influence of LSP is even more considerable
554 because surface valleys act as lubricant reservoirs, which help to lubricate contact areas.
555 Hence, it contributes to the generation of hydrodynamic pressure and accordingly separation
556 of materials in contact [\[47\]](#).

557

558 **5. Conclusions**

559 Dry sliding wear characteristics of BM and LSP samples treated with 2500 pulses/cm²,
560 have been investigated. Based on the research conducted, for this specific parameter window
561 used on 6082 Al alloy, the following conclusion can be given:

- 562 - Massive LSP can result in surface and in-depth compressive residual stresses with
563 associated high density dislocation structures, accompanied by low, almost negligible
564 increase of surface micro-hardness.
- 565 - To minimize surface topography, a smaller laser beam diameter producing a lower
566 overlapping ratio is preferred.
- 567 - Massive low energy, LSP was found to be effective in lowering wear rate and friction
568 coefficient by up to 29 %. However, LSP parameters play a crucial role on the
569 tribological properties, which can be even worse than with the BM if the parameters
570 are not optimal and the thermal effect prevails.
- 571 - Predominate effect in reducing wear rate are compressive surface RS and high-density
572 dislocation configurations.
- 573 - Maximal surface compressive RS were not achieved with the smallest laser beam
574 diameter, i.e. highest power density. Results indicate optimal condition with LSP
575 sample treated with the middle (2.0 mm) laser beam diameter. Here, the highest
576 surface compressive RS, smallest friction coefficient, specific wear rate and wear
577 volume with lowest roughness inside the wear track were achieved, despite lower
578 microhardness compared to the LSP-1.5 mm sample treated with (highest power
579 density).
- 580 - The prevailing wear mechanism consists of adhesion, accompanied with abrasion on
581 both the untreated and LSP-treated samples. However, the latter showed superior
582 morphology, with a lower degree of adhesion and abrasion inside the wear track.

583

584 **Acknowledgments**

585 This work was performed with a financial support from the state budget by the Slovenian
586 Research Agency, Programme No. P2-0270. Part of this work presents the result of the
587 project implementation: CE for development and application of advanced diagnostic methods
588 in processing of metallic and non-metallic materials - APRODIMET, ITMS: 26220120048,
589 supported by the Research & Development Operational Programme funded by the ERDF.
590 The authors also acknowledge Prof. Jose Luis Ocaña Moreno and Centro Láser UPM
591 (Universidad Politécnica de Madrid, Spain) for laser shock processing and wear
592 measurements.

593

594 **References**

- 595 [1] Y. Birol, The effect of processing and Mn content on the T5 and T6 properties of
596 AA6082 profiles, *J. Mater. Process. Technol.* 173 (2006) 84–91.
- 597 [2] M. Cabibbo, S. Spigarelli, E. Evangelista, A TEM investigation on the effect of
598 semisolid forming on precipitation processes in an Al–Mg–Si alloy, *Mater. Charact.*
599 49 (2003), 193–202.
- 600 [3] C.S. Ramesh, A. Ahamed, Friction and wear behaviour of cast Al 6063 based in situ
601 metal matrix composites, *Wear* 271 (2011), 1928– 1939.
- 602 [4] U. Sánchez-Santana, C. Rubio-González, G. Gomez-Rosas, J.L. Ocaña, C.
603 Molpeceres, J. Porro, M. Morales, Wear and friction of 6061-T6 aluminum alloy
604 treated by laser shock processing. *Wear* 260 (2006) 847–854.
- 605 [5] C. Perrin, W.M. Rainforth, Work hardening behaviour at the worn surface of Al-Cu
606 and Al-Si alloys. *Wear* 204 (1997) 171-179.
- 607 [6] M.J. Ghazali, W.M. Rainforth, H. Jones, The wear of wrought aluminium alloys under
608 dry sliding conditions, *Tribol. Int.* 40 (2007) 160–169.
- 609 [7] S. Lou, Y. Li, L. Zhou, X. Nie, G. He, Y. Li, W. He, Surface nanocrystallization of
610 metallic alloys with different stacking fault energy induced by laser shock processing,
611 *Mater. Des.* (2016) 104, 320-326.
- 612 [8] P. Peyre, L. Berthe, V. Vignal, I. Popa, T. Baudin, Analysis of laser shock waves and
613 resulting surface deformations in an Al–Cu–Li aluminum alloy, 2012 *J. Phys. D: Appl.*
614 *Phys.* (2012) 45 335304.

- 615 [9] D. Karthik, S. Arul Xavier Stango, U.Vijayalakshmi, S.Swaroop, Electrochemical
616 behavior of laser shock peened Inconel 625 superalloy, *Surf. Coat. Technol.* 311
617 (2017), 46–54.
- 618 [10] U. Trdan, M. Skarba, J. Grum, Laser shock peening effect on the dislocation
619 transitions and grain refinement of Al–Mg–Si alloy, *Mater. Charact.* 97 (2014) 57–68.
- 620 [11] Y.B. Guo, R. Caslaru, Fabrication and characterization of micro dent arrays produced
621 by laser shock peening on titanium Ti-6Al-4V surfaces, *J. Mater. Process. Technol.*
622 211 (2011) 729-736.
- 623 [12] D. Kumar, S.N. Akhtar, A.K. Patel, J. Ramkumar, K. Balani, Tribological
624 performance of laser peened Ti–6Al–4V, *Wear* 322-323 (2015) 203–217.
- 625 [13] U. Trdan, J. Grum, Evaluation of corrosion resistance of AA6082-T651 aluminium
626 alloy after laser shock peening by means of cyclic polarisation and EIS methods,
627 *Corros. Sci.* 59 (2012) 324–333.
- 628 [14] O. Hatamleh, J. Smith, D. Cohen, R. Bradley, Surface roughness and friction
629 coefficient in peened friction stir welded 2195 aluminum alloy, *Appl. Surf. Sci.* 255
630 (2009) 7414–7426.
- 631 [15] F. Zhao, W.Z. Bernstein, G. Naik, G.J. Cheng, Environmental assessment of laser
632 assisted manufacturing: case studies on laser shock peening and laser assisted turning,
633 *Journal of Cleaner Production* 18 (2010) 1311-1319.
- 634 [16] N. Mukai, N. Aoki, M. Obata, A. Ito, Y. Sano, C. Konagai, Proceedings of the 3rd
635 JSME/ASME International Conference on Nuclear Engineering (Paper No. S404-3),
636 Kyoto, *Japan*, 1995, 1489-1494.
- 637 [17] Y. Sano, K. Masaki, T. Gushi, T. Sano, Improvement in fatigue performance of
638 friction stir welded A6061-T6 aluminum alloy by laser peening without coating.
639 *Mater. Design* 36 (2012) 809–814.
- 640 [18] U. Trdan, J.A. Porro, J.L. Ocaña, J. Grum, Laser shock peening without absorbent
641 coating (LSPwC) effect on 3D surface topography and mechanical properties of 6082-
642 T651 Al alloy. *Surf. Coat. Technol.* 208 (2012) 109–16.
- 643 [19] Y. Sano, N. Mukai, M. Obata, M. Yoda, T. Kubo, I. Chida, T. Uehara, H. Kato, S.
644 Shima, Laser peening without protective coating as a surface enhancement
645 technology. Proceedings of 15th International Conference on Nuclear Engineering
646 (paper no.: ICONE15-10812), Nagoya, Japan, 2007 p.p. 1-8.

- 647 [20] A.S. Gill, A. Telang, V.K. Vasudevan, Characteristis of surface layer formed on
648 Inconel 718 by laser shock peening with and without a protective coating. *J. Mater.*
649 *Process. Technol.* 225 (2015) 463– 472.
- 650 [21] A. Lodini, M.E. Fitzpatrick, editors. *Analysis of residual stress by diffraction using*
651 *neutron and synchrotron radiation*. London: Taylor & Francis; 2003.
- 652 [22] T. Sano, T. Eimura, R. Kashiwabara, T. Matsuda, Y. Isshiki, A. Hirose, Femtosecond
653 laser peening of 2024 aluminum alloy without a sacrificial overlay under atmospheric
654 conditions, *J. Laser Appl.* 29, 012005 (2017); doi: 10.2351/1.4967013
- 655 [23] ASTM E 837-08, 2008. *Standard Test Method for Determining Residual Stresses by*
656 *the Hole-Drilling Strain-Gage Method*. ASTM Int., USA.
- 657 [24] Vishay Tech Note TN-503, 2010. *Measurement of Residual Stresses by the Hole-*
658 *Drilling Strain Gage Method*. Vishay Precision Group, Micro Measurements Int.,
659 USA.
- 660 [25] ASTM G 99-04, 2004. *Standard Test Method for Wear Testing with a Pin on Disk*
661 *Apparatus*. ASTM Int., USA.
- 662 [26] K.P. Shaha, Y.T. Pei, D. Martinez-Martinez, J.Th.M. De Hosson, Influence of
663 hardness and roughness on the tribological performance of TiC/a-C nanocomposite
664 coatings, *Surface & Coatings Technology* 205 (2010) 2624–2632.
- 665 [27] A. Cavaleiro, J.T.M. De Hosson, *Nanostructured Coatings*, Springer, New York, 2006.
- 666 [28] K.P. Shaha, Y.T. Pei, D. Martinez-Martinez, J.Th.M. De Hosson, Influence of Surface
667 Roughness on the Transfer Film Formation and Frictional Behavior of TiC/a-C
668 Nanocomposite Coatings, *Tribol. Lett.* (2010).
- 669 [29] J.Z. Lu, K.Y. Luo, Y.K. Zhang, G.F. Sun, Y.Y. Gu, J.Z. Zhou, X.D. Ren, X.C. Zhang,
670 L.F. Zhang, K.M. Chen, C.Y. Cui, Y.F. Jiang, A.X. Feng, L. Zhang, Grain refinement
671 of LY2 aluminum alloy induced by ultra-high plastic strain during multiple laser
672 shock processing impacts, *Acta. Mater.* 58 (2010) 3984–3994.
- 673 [30] I. Yakimets, C. Richard, G. Béranger, P. Peyre, Laser peening processing effect on
674 mechanical and tribological properties of rolling steel 100Cr6. *Wear* 256 (2004) 311–
675 320.
- 676 [31] C. Mansilla, D. Martínez-Martínez., V. Ocelík, J.Th.M. De Hosson, On the
677 determination of local residual stress gradients by the slit milling method, *J. Mater.*
678 *Sci.* 50 (2015) 3646–3655.

- 679 [32] C. Mansilla, V. Ocelík, J.Th.M. De Hosson, Local residual stress measurements on
680 nitride layers, *Materials Science&EngineeringA*636 (2015) 476–483.
- 681 [33] C. Mansilla, V. Ocelík, J.Th.M. De Hosson, A New Methodology to Analyze
682 Instabilities in SEM Imaging, *Microsc. Microanal.* 20 (2014) 1625–1637.
- 683 [34] I. Basu, V. Ocelík, J.Th.M. De Hosson, Measurement of spatial stress gradients near
684 grain boundaries, *Scripta Materialia* 136 (2017) 11–14.
- 685 [35] N. Kashaev, V. Ventzke, M. Horstmann, S. Chupakhin, S. Riekehr, R. Falck, E.
686 Maawad, P. Staron, N. Schell, N. Huber, Effects of laser shock peening on the
687 microstructure and fatigue crack propagation behaviour of thin AA2024 specimens,
688 *Int. J. Fatigue* 98 (2017) 223–233
- 689 [36] S. Chupakhin, N. Kashaev, N. Huber, Effect of elasto-plastic material behaviour on
690 determination of residual stress profiles using the hole drilling method, *J.Strain Anal.*
691 *Eng. Des.* 51/8 (2016), 572–581.
- 692 [37] C. Correa, D. Peral, J.A. Porro, M. Díaz, L. Ruiz de Lara, A. García-Beltrán, et al.,
693 Random-type scanning patterns in laser shock peening without absorbing coating in
694 2024-T351 Al alloy: a solution to reduce residual stress anisotropy, *Opt. Laser*
695 *Technol.* 73 (2015) 179–187.
- 696 [38] Z. Bergant, U. Trdan, J. Grum, Effects of laser shock processing on high cycle fatigue
697 crack growth rate and fracture toughness of aluminium alloy 6082-T651, *International*
698 *Journal of Fatigue* 87 (2016) 444–455
- 699 [39] P. Peyre, R. Fabbro, P. Merrien, H.P. Lieurade, Laser shock processing of aluminium
700 alloys. Application to high cycle fatigue behaviour, *Mater. Sci. Eng. A* 210 (1996)
701 102–113.
- 702 [40] S. Huang, J.Z. Zhou, J. Sheng, K.Y. Luo, J.Z. Lu, Z.C. Xu, X.K. Meng, L. Dai, L.D.
703 Zuo, H.Y. Ruan, H.S. Chen,. Effects of laser peening with different coverage areas on
704 fatigue crack growth properties of 6061-T6 aluminum alloy, *Int. J. Fatigue* 47 (2013)
705 292-299.
- 706 [41] J. Noordhuis, J.Th.M. De Hosson, Surface modification by means of laser melting
707 combined with shot peening: A novel approach, *Acta Mater.* 40/12 (1992) 3317–3324.
- 708 [42] G.A. Edwards, K. Stiller, G.L. Dunlop, M.J. Couper, The precipitation sequence in
709 Al–Mg–Si alloys, *Acta Mater.* 46 (1998) 3893–3904.

- 710 [43] R. Fabbro, P. Peyre, L. Berthe, X. Scherpereel, Physics and applications of laser shock
711 processing. *Laser. Appl.* 10 (1998) 265–79.
- 712 [44] K. Hiratsuka, K. Muramoto, K. Role of wear particles in severe–mild wear transition.
713 *Wear* 259 (2005) 467–476.
- 714 [45] J. Zhang, A.T. Alpas, Transition between mild and severe wear in aluminium alloys,
715 *Acta. Mater.* 45 (1997) 513–528.
- 716 [46] D.K. Dwivedi, Adhesive wear behaviour of cast aluminium–silicon alloys: Overview.
717 *Mater. Design* 31 (2010) 2517–2531.
- 718 [47] O. Higounenc, Correlation of shot peening parameters to surface characteristic, in:
719 ICSP-9, Paris, France, 2005, pp28–35.

720

721

722 **Tables**

723

724 **Table 1.** 3D CLSM topography (roughness and waviness) results.

Sample	S_c (μm)	S_a (μm)	S_z (μm)	W_c (μm)	W_a (μm)	W_z (μm)
BM	27.860	2.689	48.629	5.240	1.098	1.986
LSP-2.5 mm	48.369	3.479	76.577	9.047	3.011	6.646
LSP-2.0 mm	66.905	4.374	85.514	21.351	8.955	14.334
LSP-2.5 mm	85.777	6.463	94.140	77.388	21.398	68.704

725

726

727 **Table 2.** Wear volume (W_v) and specific wear rate (K) results.

Sample	W_v (mm ³)	σ (mm ³)	K (mm ³ /N m)	σ (mm ³ /N m)
Untreated	2.041E-03	4.165E-4	4.083E-4	8.331E-5
LSP-1.5 mm	1.959E-03	3.199E-4	3.918E-4	6.398E-5
LSP-2.0 mm	1.820E-03	2.952E-4	3.640E-4	5.904E-5
LSP-2.5 mm	2.045E-03	4.289E-4	4.090E-4	8.578E-5

728

729 **Figure captions**

730 **Fig. 1.** Schematic presentation of the overall heat treatment and subsequent LSP treatment.

731 **Fig. 2.** (a) SEM/BEI microstructure of the base material; (b) EDS line analysis results marked
732 on (a).

733 **Fig. 3.** Surface appearance after LSP with different beam diameters; (a) LSP–1.5 mm and (b)
734 LSP–2.5 mm.

735 **Fig. 4.** CLSM topographical analysis of BM sample; (a) 3D image, (b) 2D image after high-
736 pass filtration and (c) topographical line profiles marked in (b).

737 **Fig. 5.** CLSM analysis of LSP–1.5 mm sample. (a) 3D image, (b) 2D image after high-pass
738 filtration and (c) topographical line profiles marked in (b).

739 **Fig. 6.** (a,b) In-depth residual stresses and (c) 3D presentation of the drilled blind-hole and its
740 cross section (*Note:* blank spaces in Fig.6c represent the un-measured points).

741 **Fig. 7.** Comparison of surface residual stress and near-surface micro-hardness.

742 **Fig. 8.** TEM bright field observations of various samples: (a) BM, (b-d) LSP samples treated
743 with different laser beam diameters.

744 **Fig. 9.** Friction coefficient as a function of sliding distance.

745 **Fig. 10.** Typical wear scar (a) and 3D CLSM wear scar profile (b).

746 **Fig. 11.** (a) Schematic presentation of roughness measurement, (b) determination of
747 maximum width and height of the cross sectional profiles of the wear track and (c) surface
748 profiles inside the wear track with given values obtained from the topographical analyses.

749 **Fig. 12.** SEM/SEI images of wear scars; (a-b) Untreated and (c-d) LSP sample treated with
750 2.0 mm laser beam diameter.

751 **Fig. 13.** Schematic presentation of surface topography effect on tribological behaviour under
752 dry contact condition.