

e.d

Center for Advanced Materials

# CAM

Submitted to Journal of Materials Science

## Pore Size Distribution, Grain Growth, and the Sintering Stress

L.C. De Jonghe, M.-Y. Chu, and M.K.-F. Lin

September 1988


LAWRENCE  
BERKELEY LABORATORY

NOV 30 1988

LIBRARY AND  
DOCUMENTS SECTION

**TWO-WEEK LOAN COPY**

*This is a Library Circulating Copy  
which may be borrowed for two weeks.*



**Materials and Chemical Sciences Division**  
**Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory • University of California**  
ONE CYCLOTRON ROAD, BERKELEY, CA 94720 • (415) 486-4755

LBL-25915  
e.d

## **DISCLAIMER**

This document was prepared as an account of work sponsored by the United States Government. While this document is believed to contain correct information, neither the United States Government nor any agency thereof, nor the Regents of the University of California, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by its trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise, does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or any agency thereof, or the Regents of the University of California. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof or the Regents of the University of California.

**Pore Size Distribution, Grain Growth, and  
the Sintering Stress**

L.C. De Jonghe, M.-Y. Chu, and M.K.-F. Lin

Department of Materials Science and Mineral Engineering  
University of California  
and  
Center for Advanced Materials  
Materials and Chemical Sciences Division  
Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory  
1 Cyclotron Road  
Berkeley, California 94720

September 1988

# PORE SIZE DISTRIBUTION, GRAIN GROWTH, AND THE SINTERING STRESS.

Lutgard C. De Jonghe, May-Ying Chu, and Mark K.-F. Lin  
Department of Materials Science and Mineral Engineering  
and  
Center for Advanced Materials, Lawrence Berkeley Lab  
University of California, Berkeley  
Berkeley, CA 94720

## Abstract

The effects of a pore size distribution and of the pore coordination number on the sintering stress is examined using a simple model. The sintering stress is found to be proportional to the mean of the pore sizes weighted according to the Voronoi cell pertaining to each pore, rather than to the simple pore size average. Large heteropores are shown to have little effect on the sintering stress. Decreases in pore coordination number of such pores, resulting from grain growth, are found to affect the sintering stress little, but can significantly increase the stress intensification factor. The near-constancy of the sintering stress, observed experimentally for many powders over a wide range of sintered densities, does not directly follow from the simple model. It is argued that this constancy results from pore shrinkage, due to densification, which is compensated by pore growth due to coarsening.

## Introduction

Practical powder compacts contain imperfections that affect their microstructural development and their sintering behavior very significantly. These imperfections are well known but very difficult to avoid completely: inhomogeneous particle and pore distributions, either in the green powder compact or developing as a result of abnormal grain growth and pore break away, are the source of much of the undesirable features in sintered bodies.

In considering the densification process of heterogeneous powder compacts, the presence of inhomogeneities must be taken into account and considered together with grain growth or coarsening

to reach an understanding of the sintering process. An important parameter in characterizing densification is the sintering stress<sup>1\*</sup>,  $\Sigma/\phi$ , ( also called the sintering force<sup>2</sup>, the sintering potential<sup>3</sup>, or the sintering pressure<sup>4</sup>) and how it is affected by coarsening or grain growth and by the presence of a pore size distribution. The present paper attempts to elucidate these processes by examining simple models of pore distributions and relating these to experimental determinations of the sintering stress.

Several investigators have considered the evolution and the role of microstructure, and its effects on sintering of powder compacts. Perhaps the first ones to emphasize this aspect of densification were Rhines and his coworkers<sup>1,5</sup>, who focussed on the structural evolution of the pore network, when most other researchers were attempting to correlate diffusion data from traditional tracer diffusion experiments with those extracted from sintering of powder compacts. These comparison most often used highly abstracted representations, such as the two-sphere model, in the data analysis<sup>6,7</sup>. Gregg and Rhines<sup>8</sup> departed from this direction and attempted to measure the sintering stress (or sintering force) from zero-strain rate conditions observed during tensile loading of sintering copper compacts. Generally, for these copper sphere compacts, the sintering stress increased with increasing density. These authors successfully correlated the measured sintering stress with the quantitative stereological data obtained on their specimens. More recently, De Jonghe et al<sup>9</sup>, and Raj<sup>4</sup> et al used a different, and perhaps somewhat simpler, experimental technique to determine the sintering stress. The simultaneous measurement of creep and densification led to the

---

\*  $\Sigma$  = mean stress on the grain boundaries or in the skeleton of solids  
 $\phi$  = (overall cross sectional area)/(load bearing area)

interesting observation on all ceramic powder systems studied so far that, at constant applied stress, the ratio of the densification rate over the creep rate is constant *from the onset of densification*, over a wide range of sintered densities. This finding, indicating that the sintering stress is constant, is in contrast to the earlier observations of Gregg and Rhines who found the sintering stress for copper sphere compacts to increase monotonically for most of the same density range. In this paper some possible reasons are offered that may explain this difference in evolution of the measured sintering stresses.

Effects of particle size distributions on densification rates were analyzed by Coble<sup>10</sup>, who treated this problem by taking into account the effects of the strain rate mismatch associated with the different local unconstrained sintering rates of particle pairs. Here, a related procedure is followed to solve for the densification strain rate of stress-coupled pore assemblies. Formal consideration of the importance of the backstresses generated by differential densification that result from heterogeneous regions of inclusions in powder compacts were presented by Hsueh et al<sup>3</sup>, by Raj et al<sup>4,11</sup>, and by Scherer<sup>12</sup>. These treatments considered explicitly the interaction of the mismatch backstresses with the sintering stress. An experimentally based analysis by De Jonghe et al<sup>1</sup> and a study by Scherer<sup>13</sup> showed that these backstresses were simply viscous, and that viscoelastic stresses do not accumulate in a sintering body. Therefore, the time-dependent viscoelastic problem need not be solved, and quasi-steady state conditions can be assumed when formulating the instantaneous self-stress in densification of heterogeneous powder compacts.

The relationship between the sintering stress, which is the

equivalent externally applied stress, and the effective mean stress on the grain boundaries follows from a geometrical analysis. In general, this analysis would be complex. Beeré<sup>14,15</sup> considered this relationship for uniform pore networks equilibrated at some fixed densities, and defined the stress intensification factor,  $\phi$ , as providing the relationship. Vieira and Brook<sup>16</sup> fitted these calculations to an exponential expression, which was later verified experimentally by Rahaman et al<sup>17</sup> in a set of creep-sintering experiments. The presence of large heteropores in a fine-pore matrix will both affect  $\phi$  as well as the sintering stress. The model used here considered the effects of large heteropores on the sintering stress and on the stress intensification factor,  $\phi$ .

Practically, the importance of non-uniformity in powder compacts in obstructing the production of high quality sintered products has been well documented. For example, Rhodes<sup>18</sup> studied the effects of agglomeration on sintering, and made the important observation that the full potential of fine powders can only be realized when agglomerates are eliminated. The full significance of this observation was later made evident by the use of near-monosized powders by Pober et al<sup>19</sup>. In another example, Dynys and Halloran<sup>20</sup> demonstrated that the densification rate of a green compact decreases with increasing agglomerate content. For some ZnO powder compacts containing dispersions of SiC particles, De Jonghe and Rahaman<sup>21</sup> demonstrated a significant reduction in the sintering rates compared to single phase compacts, as the volume fraction of inclusions increased. The severity of this reduction in sintering rates of particulate composites increased with decreasing dispersed particle size, an effect not predicted by a viscous or viscoelastic analysis, which could be attributed in part to the increased tendency of the dispersed phase to

cluster as its particle size decreases. One form of cluster formation was addressed by Lange<sup>22</sup> who considered the possible development of undeformable percolation skeletons by the dispersed phase. Lange and Davis<sup>23</sup> also reported on the sintering of agglomerated powder compacts and discussed the possible role of the pore coordination number, concluding that grain growth may have to precede densification if this number is too high. The effects of the pore coordination number and the presence of isolated large pores is also considered here and related to the sintering stress.

### I. Model

To examine the behavior of a pore distribution, a 1-dimensional model, as shown in Fig 1, is adopted. A string of  $N$  pores is contained in a length  $l$  of grain boundary between two solids. The  $i^{\text{th}}$  pore has a radius  $r_i$  and is separated from the  $i^{\text{th}+1}$  pore by the grain boundary segment of length  $x_i$ . The overall stress intensification factor  $\phi$  for this system is simply

$$\phi = l / \sum_{i=1}^N x_i \quad \text{Eqn 1}$$

while the stress intensification factor of the  $i^{\text{th}}$  unconstrained segment is

$$\phi_i = G_i / x_i \quad \text{Eqn 2}^+$$

---

<sup>+</sup>It is noted here that  $\phi \neq \sum_{i=1}^N G_i / \sum_{i=1}^N x_i$  which does not equal  $\sum_{i=1}^N (G_i / x_i)$

The effective sintering stress on  $x_i$ , that is the mean stress exerted on the free segment  $x_i$ , is

$$\Sigma_i = \gamma \phi_i (1/r_i + 1/r_{i+1})/2 \quad \text{Eqn 3}^*$$

The constrained displacement rate of the  $i^{\text{th}}$  segment is then

$$\dot{s}_i = K(\Sigma_i + \sigma_i/\gamma)/x_i^2 \quad \text{Eqn 4}$$

where  $K$  is a kinetic constant and where  $\sigma_i$  are the compatibility stresses that are needed to have the displacement rate equal for each segment to the overall displacement rate  $\dot{s}$ . Since the  $\sigma_i$  are self-stresses they must obey

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \sigma_i x_i = 0 \quad \text{Eqn 5}$$

Multiplying both sides in Eqn 4 with  $x_i$  and summing then gives

$$\dot{s} = K\gamma \left[ \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N \Sigma_i x_i}{\sum_{i=1}^N x_i^3} \right] \quad \text{Eqn 6}$$

$\Sigma_i x_i$  is also the force exerted on the unconstrained  $i^{\text{th}}$  segment,

---

\*The effects of the grain boundaries, introducing a grain size dependent term in Eqn 1 and 2, as discussed by Cannon<sup>3</sup> and by De Jonghe and Rahaman<sup>1</sup>, is ignored here. It could, in principle, be accommodated by choosing an effective  $r_i$  that is slightly different from the physical one.

so that with Eqn 5 the total force, F, exerted on the boundary of length l is

$$F = \sum_{i=1}^N F_i = \sum_{i=1}^N \Sigma_i x_i \quad \text{Eqn 7}$$

Also, by definition one has

$$\sum_{i=1}^N F_i / l = \Sigma / \phi \quad \text{Eqn 8}$$

From Eqns 1-3, 6, and 7 it follows that

$$\Sigma = \gamma \left[ \sum_{i=1}^N \left( \frac{G_i + G_{i+1}}{2} \right) \left( \frac{1}{r_i} \right) \right] / \sum_{i=1}^N x_i \quad \text{Eqn 9}$$

if it is assumed that the first and the last term of the summation have little effect on the total sum. This becomes a good approximation for N sufficiently large. With < > denoting the arithmetical average, Eqn 9 may be written as:

$$\Sigma = \gamma \langle G_i / r_i \rangle / \langle x_i \rangle \quad \text{Eqn 10}$$

Eqn 10 establishes the relationship between the details of the microstructure of the model and the macroscopic value of the effective sintering stress,  $\Sigma$ . If  $G_i$  and  $x_i$  are statistically uncorrelated then one has

$$\langle G_i / r_i \rangle = \langle G_i \rangle \langle 1 / r_i \rangle \quad \text{Eqn 11}$$

so that, from Eqn 10, it would follow that

$$\Sigma = \gamma \langle G_i/x_i \rangle \langle 1/r_i \rangle = \langle \phi_i \rangle \langle 1/r_i \rangle \quad \text{Eqn 12}$$

Then, with  $\langle \phi_i \rangle = \phi$ , one would obtain the usual expression for the driving force of sintering as the mean curvature of the pores. Eqn 11 indicates, however, that this result is only valid if the pore spacing and the pore radii are statistically strictly independent. This is very unlikely to be satisfied in any powder compact. For example, a large heteropore is separated from its smaller neighbors by approximately the particle size, as is evident in the partly sintered microstructure shown in Fig 2a. Eqn 9 may also be written as follows, if end effects are again ignored in the summation:

$$\Sigma = \gamma \sum_{i=1}^N \{ (G_i + G_{i+1})/2 \} (1/r_{i+1}) / N \langle x_i \rangle \quad \text{Eqn 13}$$

The term  $(G_i + G_{i+1})/2$  has the same meaning as the Voronoi cell pertaining to the  $i^{\text{th}}+1$  pore. In general then, the value of the sintering stress will *not* correspond to the mean curvature of the pores as derived, for example from a stereological analysis; rather, the curvature of the pores will need to be weighted according to the size of their associated Voronoi cell. This makes the derivation of a valid sintering stress from quantitative microscopy far more difficult, except in those cases where the validity of Eqn 11 can be clearly established.

The quantitative extension of the argument to an irregular,

continuous three-dimensional pore networks is not straightforward, since Voronoi cells cannot be constructed readily. It should, however, be expected that the macroscopic sintering stress will again depend on pore curvature weighted by a measure of local pore separation.

## II Effects of isolated large pores

Isolated large pores are often present in green or partly sintered powder compacts. As an example, a partly sintered, heterogeneous powder compact of MgO is shown in Figs 2a and 2b. The effects of the presence of a limited number of large pores in a fine-pore matrix on the sintering stress and on the stress intensification factor can, in part, be assessed by considering a modified version of Fig 1. In the original pore distribution, Fig 3a, containing  $N$  pores, a large pore of radius  $r_L$  is inserted to replace a small one where  $r_L \gg r$ , Fig 3b. This changes  $l$  to  $(l+2r_L)$  and, replaces one term with  $(G_L+G_{L+1})/2r_L$  in the summation, Eqn 9. In this procedure the  $x_i$  are unchanged. If relatively few large pores are substituted, then isolated, large heteropores would hardly affect the magnitude of the sintering stress. Significant decreases in the sintering stress might result if the large pore would, at the same time, have large nearest neighbor spacings, but this would be an uncommon situation. As an example, the microstructure shown in Fig 2a indeed shows no such correlation between the spacing to the pores neighboring the large pores and the large pore radius.

The value of the stress intensification factor,  $\phi$ , would, however, be affected in proportion to the increase in grain boundary porosity. If the stress intensification factor before

introduction of the large pore is  $\phi_1$  and after the introduction of the large pore is  $\phi_2$ , then Eqn 1 immediately shows that

$$\phi_2 = [(1+2r_L)/l]\phi_1 \quad \text{Eqn 14}$$

The effect of the heteroporosity is thus mainly on the stress intensification factor, and changes in the heteroporosity should affect the creep rates and the densification rates in a similar fashion, leaving the ratio of the densification rate over the constant-stress creep rate unaffected.

During the densification of some heterogeneous MgO powder compacts, containing the bimodal pore distribution shown in Fig 2a, it was observed that the constant-stress creep rate remained proportional to the densification rate while the microstructure evolved from its initial bimodal structure Fig 2a to a more uniform one Fig 2b: the accompanying variations in the creep rates were considerable, but paralleled the variation in the densification rates<sup>24</sup>. The discussion here supports the conclusion that the anomalous change in the densification rate observed during the sintering of these MgO compacts shown in Figs 2a and 2b, should not be attributed to changes in the sintering stress,  $\Sigma/\phi$ , but rather to changes in the geometrical factor  $\phi$ , the stress intensification factor.

The stress intensification factor calculated by Beeré<sup>14,15</sup> for three-dimensional powder compacts follows a relation of the form

$$\phi = \exp(aP) \quad \text{Eqn 15}$$

where  $a$  would be a factor only dependent on the dihedral angle, and  $P$  is the fractional porosity. When the pore coordination number is high, however, as for a large pore in a fine grained matrix, then this correlation between the dihedral angle and  $a$  cannot be maintained. The two types of pores structures are shown in Figs 4a and 4b. The exponential dependence of the stress intensification factor pertains to relatively well equilibrated microstructures in which pores or pore channels are surrounded by 3 or 4 grains. With increasing pore coordination number, one could visualize that the pore geometry would correspond more and more to a random spherical one, for which  $\phi \approx 1/\text{porosity}$ . Then, when grain growth occurs, with a consequent transformation of the heteropore shape from a spherical one to one that is described well by the Beeré geometry, the maximum change  $\Delta\Phi_{\max}$  in  $\phi$  resulting from grain growth can be estimated to be

$$\Delta\Phi_{\max} = P_L \exp(aP_L) \quad \text{Eqn 16}$$

This factor increases with increasing heteroporosity,  $P_L$ , and decreasing dihedral angle (high value of  $a$ ).

If, as in the earlier work by De Jonghe et al<sup>1,24</sup>, the large pores are initially considered to be inactive but later become active as a result of grain growth then two branches of  $\phi$  might be observed, as sketched in Fig 5. For the branch a, corresponding to the bimodal pore structure, one would have

$$\phi_a = (1/(1-P_L) \exp[a(P-P_L)/(1-P_L)]) \quad \text{Eqn 17}^*$$

---

\* This expression differs slightly from the one given in Ref 1, where the correction for the porosity of the fine-pore matrix was not included.

while for the later stage microstructure one has

$$\phi_b = \exp(aP)$$

Eqn 18

The data together with the corresponding microstructures reported earlier<sup>17</sup>, generally conform to the assertion that the effects of the changes in the pore coordination number of large pores within a fine-pore matrix is chiefly on the stress intensification factor.

### III Evolution of $\Sigma/\phi$ with sintered density

Numerous creep/sintering experiments<sup>25</sup> now are indicating that the creep rate over the densification rate remains relatively constant from the onset of densification to well into the final stages of sintering. The change in this ratio is usually not greater than a factor of 1.5. The relative constancy of the ratio of the densification rate to the constant-stress creep rate is a strong indication that the sintering stress,  $\Sigma/\phi$ , is also relatively constant in the same sintered density range. This change is considerably less than what would be expected on the basis of the present model, as well as on the basis of other models<sup>15</sup> in which the sintering stress would vary significantly as densification proceeds. A near-constant sintering stress requires that the mean curvature of the pore surfaces remains constant, while the present model requires that the mean curvature increases with increasing densification. Clearly, the present model, while useful in relating the sintering stress to pore distributions and to pore coordination, does not contain those physical aspects that can predict the experimental observation of the near-

constancy of  $\Sigma/\phi$  over a wide sintered density range.

The relative constancy of the sintering stress is likely to be attributable to the coarsening that occurs simultaneously with densification. Indeed, when the experimentally determined sintering stress of  $\text{CdO}$ <sup>17</sup> is considered at constant grain size then, as expected from the model, a higher density compact has a higher sintering stress, as shown in Fig 6. Near-constancy of the sintering stress during densification could then prevail if the increase in the sintering stress due to densification-induced pore shrinkage is approximately compensated by the decrease in the sintering stress due to pore growth caused by coarsening. It would follow for systems in which coarsening is suppressed, e. g. by special choice of initial geometry or use of additives, that the sintering stress would have to increase with density. The results of Gregg and Rhines<sup>8</sup> on large, monosized copper spheres likely fall within this category, accounting for the difference in behavior that the micron or submicron, non-monosized powder compacts have displayed. Further, in the conventional powder compact, a multitude of densification states are present simultaneously. The shift from open porosity to closed porosity, for example, does not take place suddenly, but develops gradually throughout the densifying compact<sup>26</sup>. This would also tend to average changes in the sintering stress, especially in the early sintering stages.

### Conclusions

Examination of the densification rate of simple, stress-coupled pore assemblies indicate that the sintering stress is determined by the mean of the pore sizes weighted according to their Voronoi

cell size. In correlating the sintering stress with quantitative microscopy of polished sections, it is thus necessary to incorporate this additional microstructural information.

Inclusion of relatively few, large heteropores is shown to affect the sintering stress very little. Instead, such pores increase the stress intensification factor.

The main effect of grain growth on the large heteropores is that they transform from a roughly spherical to a more lenticular shape, with a concomitant increase in the stress intensification factor. As a result, while anomalies in the sintering rate may be observed, the sintering rate will remain proportional to the constant-stress creep rate, as borne out by recent results on the densification of MgO compacts.

The constancy of the sintering stress from the onset of densification throughout a wide range of sintered densities, is argued to result mainly from a dynamic balance between pore radius decrease due to densification and pore growth due to coarsening.

---

**Acknowledgement:** This work was supported by the Division of Materials Sciences, Office of Basic Energy Sciences, U.S. Department of Energy, under Contract No. DE-AC03-76SF00098.

## REFERENCES

1. L. C. De Jonghe and M. N. Rahaman, *Acta metall.* 36 (1988) 223.
2. F. N. Rhines and R. T. DeHoff in "Sintering and Heterogeneous Catalysis", *Materials Science Research* Vol. 16, edited by G. C. Kuczynski, A. E. Miller and G. A. Sargent (Plenum Press, New York, 1984) p.49.
3. C. H. Hsueh, A. G. Evans, R. M. Cannon and R. J. Brook, *Acta metall.* 34 (1986) 927.
4. R. Raj and R. K. Bordia, *Acta metall.* 32 (1984) 1003.
5. R. T. DeHoff, R. A. Rummel, H. P. LaBuff, and F. N. Rhines in "Modern Developments In Powder Metallurgy", Vol.1 (Plenum Press, New York 1966) p.310.
6. G. C. Kuczynski, *Met. Trans. AIME.* 185 (1949) 169.
7. P. Wellner and Exner, *Physics of Sintering.* 5 (1973) 25.
8. R. A. Gregg and F. N. Rhines, *Metall. Trans.* 4 (1973) 1365.
9. L. C. De Jonghe and M. N. Rahaman, *Rev. Sci. Instrum.* 55 (1984) 2007.
10. R. L. Coble, *J. Am. Ceram. Soc.* 56 (1973) 461.
11. R. K. Bordia and R. Raj, *J. Am. Ceram. Soc.* 69 (1986) C-55.
12. G. W. Scherer, *J. Am. Ceram. Soc.* 70 (1987) 719.

13. G. W. Scherer, *Acta metall.* In press.
14. W. Beeré, *Acta metall.* 23 (1975) 131.
15. W. Beeré, *Acta metall.* 23 (1975) 139.
16. J. M. Vieira and R. J. Brook, *J. Am. Ceram. Soc.* 67 (1984) 245.
17. M. N. Rahaman, L. C. De Jonghe and R. J. Brook, *J. Am. Ceram. Soc.* 69 (1986) 53.
18. W. Rhode, *J. Am. Ceram. Soc.* 64 (1981) 19.
19. R. L. Pober, E. A. Barringer, M. V. Parish, N. Levoy, and H. K. Bowen in "Emergent Process Methods For High-Technology Ceramics", *Materials Sciences Research Vol. 17*, edited R. F. Davis, H. Palmour III and R. L. Porter (Plenum Press, New York 1984) p.193.
20. F. W. Dynys and J. W. Halloran, *J. Am. Ceram. Soc.* 67 (1984) 596.
21. L. C. De Jonghe, M. N. Rahaman and C. H. Hsueh, *Acta metall.* 34 (1986) 1467.
22. F. F. Lange, *J. Mater. Res.* 2 (1987) 59.
23. F. F. Lange and B. I. Davis, *Advances in Ceramics.* 12 (1984) 699.
24. M. Lin, M. N. Rahaman and L. C. De Jonghe, *J. Am. Ceram. Soc.* 70 (1987) 360.

25. L. C. De Jonghe and V. Srikanth, *J. Am. Ceram. Soc.* 71 (1988)  
C-356.

26. S. C. Coleman and W. B. Beeré, *Phil. Mag.* 31 (1975) 1403.

## FIGURES

Figure 1. One-dimensional model of a string of  $N$  pores contained in a length  $l$  between two solids.

Figure 2a. Microstructure of partly sintered MgO compact, bimodal pore structure (polished surface).

2b. Microstructure of MgO compact upon further sintering, more uniform pore structure (polished surface).

Figure 3a. Original pore distribution:  $N$  pores on length  $l$ .

3b. Heteropore distribution : large pore with radius,  $r_L$  replaces a small pore,  $N$  pores on length  $l+2r_L$ .

Figure 4a. Large spherical pore with high coordination number.

4b. Lens shaped pore with low coordination number.

Figure 5. Two branches of  $\phi$  corresponding to the bimodal pore structure, calculated according to Eqns 17 and 18, with  $a=4$  and  $P_L=0.3$ .  $\phi_a$  corresponds to the initial value of  $\phi$  (Eqn 17) while  $\phi_b$  corresponds to the value of  $\phi$  after most of the heteroporosity has transformed to conform to  $\phi_b$  (Eqn 18).

Figure 6. Densification rate over constant-stress creep rate for  $\text{CdO}^{17}$ , at a constant grain size of  $3 \mu\text{m}$ , versus the sintered density.




Fig. 1




Fig. 2




Fig. 3





Fig. 4




Fig. 5




Fig. 6

LAWRENCE BERKELEY LABORATORY  
TECHNICAL INFORMATION DEPARTMENT  
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA  
BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA 94720