Tureau of Standards

Certificate of Analyses

STANDARD SAMPLE No. 30

CHROME-VANADIUM STEEL

CASTING FURNISHED BY BETHLEHEM STEEL CO., SOUTH BETHLEHEM, PA.

		:												1		1		
	CARBON.		SILICON.		PHOSPHORUS.				SULPHUR.			MANGANESE.						
ANALYST.	DIRECT COMBUS- TION,	SOLUTION AND COM- BUSTION.	DROWN METHOD,	OTHER METHODS.	ALKALI- MOLYBDATE.	MOLYBDATE REDUCTION.	WEIGHING PHOS PHO-MOLYBDATE.	AS Mg ₂ P ₂ O ₇ AFTER ACKTATE SEPARATION.	OXIDATION.	EVOLUTION (CdS-Iodine).	OTHER METHODS.	FORD (Weighing as Mn ₂ P ₂ O ₁).	OTHER METHODS.	CHROMIUM.	VANADIUM.	NICKEL.	COPPER.	MOLYBDENUM.
1	. 377	.376		.111				. 042	. 029		. 0271		. 530	1. 34	. 204	.104	.055	
2	. 376			. 126				.0362	. 029		. 0281		\$.550 \$.560	$1.34 \\ 1.35$	}. 207	.091	. 074	.008
3	. 373			.110				. 034	. 028				. 557	${1.37} \{1.34$. 204	.100	. 070	
4	. 385			. 122	. 045			. 044	. 027	. 027		 -	. 5563	1. 338	. 2163	\[\cdot \] 150 \\ \cdot \] 120	}. 068	
5	. 366	. 3 66	.115	.112				.041	. 030		. 0324	 	. 565	1.33	. 218	. 120	.064	
6	. 350		.122		.037					.030		. 555		1. 37	.185			
7		.374		. 104			. 048			. 029			. 540	1.35	. 220			
8		.370		.110			. 047		. 029			.576		1. 35	. 206	. 110	. 082	
9	.360			.112	. 046					. 030			.600	1.38	. 215	.120	.080	
10	.376	. 384		$\{.121 \\ .117$	}. 045					.028			. 586	1.37	$\{.224 \\ .217$	}. 140	.080	
11	. 385		. 107	· 		. 046				. 0285			. 578	1.35	.194	<u></u>		
Av	. 372*	.374	.115	.114	. 043	.046	. 047	.039	. 029	. 029	. 029	. 565	. 562	1.35	. 21	. 117	. 07	.008
GEN. Av	. 373		.114		. 043			. 029			. 563		1.35	. 21	.117	. 07	. 008	

*In view of the results of certain chemists, especially those of the Midvale Steel Co., supported by tests made at the Bureau of Standards, it seems not improbable that even the highest results reported for carbon in this steel are slightly below the truth. The matter is under investigation.

INDEX TO ANALYSTS

- J. R. Cain, Bureau of Standards.
 L. F. Witmer, Bureau of Standards.
 Wm. H. Keen, Washington Steel and Ordnance Co., Washington, D. C.

- 4. H. L. Frevert, Midvale Steel Co., Philadelphia, Pa. 5. E. A. Loos, Carpenter Steel Co., Reading, Pa. 6. J. Lloyd Uhler, Union Steel Casting Co., Philadelphia, Pa.

- J. L. Harvey, Carnegie Steel Co., Homestead, Pa.
 W. D. Brown, Carnegie Steel Co., Duquesne, Pa.
 C. M. Johnson, The Crucible Steel Co. of America, Park Works, Pittsburgh, Pa.
 George M. Berry, Halcomb Steel Co., Syracuse, N. Y.
 H. J. Force and C. Schoen, Delaware, Lackawanna & Western R. R., Scranton, Pa.

S. W. STRATTON,

Director.

Washington, D. C.

 $^{^1}$ Evolution— $\rm H_2O_2$ —BaSO4. 2 Fe and Cr removed by electrolysis before precipitating. 3 Mean by three methods.

<sup>Meineke's method.
Absorption in zinc chloride solution.</sup>

The methods used for determining special and certain other constituents are indicated below, in so far as they are not shown by the table. In most cases the values given in the table are the means of two or more determinations. This is particularly true of those made at the Bureau of Standards. The numbers designating analysts correspond to those in the "Index to Analysts."

1. CHROMIUM

1. Cain's method (Bur. Stand. Tech. Paper No. 6; J. Ind. Eng. Chem., 4, 17, 1912). Solution in HCl without oxidation, precipitation by BaCO₂, fusion with Na₂CO₃ and KNO₃, etc., precipitation as PbCrO₄ and final titration with FeSO₄ or FeSO₄ and K₂Cr₂O₇. 2. Like 1 for the value 1.34, using, however, H₂SO₄ instead of HCl and MgO instead of BaCO₃; for 1.35 the ether and NaOH separations, finishing as in Cain's method. 3. McKenna's method for the value 1.34; gravimetrically after ether and NaOH separations for 1.37. 4. Cain's method as by 1, 1.33; new volumetric method not yet published, 1.33; Barba's method, 1.34. 5. Cain's method as by 1. 6. Method not reported. 7. McKenna's method. 8. Fusion with Na₂O₂ and titration after separation from vanadium (see Blair, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 30, 1229). 9 and 10. See Johnson, "Analysis of Special Steels, etc.," 1909, pp. 8, 9, 10, 32, 33. 11. Barba's method.

2. VANADIUM

1. Cain's method (Bur. Stand. Bull., Vol. 8, Reprint No. 161; J. Ind. Eng. Chem., 3, 476, 1911). Solution in H₂SO₄ or HCl without oxidation, precipitation with CdCO₅, removal of excess cadmium by H₂S, of iron and chromium by electrolysis with Hg cathode in H₂SO₄ solution, and titration with KMnO₄. 2. Precipitate formed by MgO without oxidation of iron dissolved in HNO₅, poured into NaOH to remove sesquioxides, vanadium precipitated by HgNO₅ and finally titrated by KMnO₄ in sulphate solution. 3. Sodium hydroxide separation after ether extraction of iron, precipitation of vanadium with HgNO₅. 4. Campagne's method, correcting for chromium, 0.203; special Midvale electrolytic method, 0.221; Cain's method as in 1, 0.223. 5. Cain's method. 6. Method published in pamphlet of American Vanadium Co. 7. Method not reported., 8. Campagne's method. 9. See Johnson, "Analysis of Special Steels, etc.," 1909, pp. 8, 9, 10, 32, 33. 10. Johnson's method as by 9 for the value 0.217; ether and NaOH separations, precipitation by HgNO₃, fusion with Na₂CO₃, reduction with SO₂ and titration with KMnO₄ for 0.224. 11. See Blair, "Chemical Analysis of Iron," 7th ed., p. 209.

3. MANGANESE

1. Cain's method (J. Ind. Eng. Chem., 3, 630, 1911). Precipitation of chromium by CdCO₃ from the sulphuric acid solution of the steel and treatment of the filtrate by the bismuthate method. 2. Like 1 for the value 0.55, using, however, MgO instead of CdCO₃; for 0.56, ether separation of iron, followed by ZnO precipitation and determination of manganese in the filtrate by the bismuthate method. 3. Ford-Williams precipitation, followed by bismuthate determination. 4. Bismuthate method for the value 0.556; modified bismuthate for 0.561; Cain's method (see 1 above) for 0.551. 5. Cain's method. 7. Ford precipitation, followed by persulphate color determination. 9. See Johnson, "Analysis of Special Steels, etc.," 1909, pp. 180–182. 10. Like 9. 11. Persulphate oxidation and titration against As₂O₃.

4. COPPER, NICKEL, MOLYBDENUM

Determined by Bureau of Standards analysts as described in Bur. Stand. Circular No. 14. To give in sufficient detail the methods used by other analysts would require more space than the importance of the determinations seems to warrant.