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Abstract: Fluorides, bromides, and iodides, despite being less common than chlorides, are present in various environments of industrial relevance. Stainless steels suffer pitting corrosion in solutions of all halides except fluorides, which can be understood considering that fluoride is the anion of a weak acid. The aggressiveness of the rest of the halides for pitting corrosion is on the order \( \text{Cl}^- > \text{Br}^- > \text{I}^- \) for stainless steels with Mo content below 3 wt.%. Mo is not as effective in inhibiting \( \text{Br}^- \) pitting corrosion as it is for inhibiting \( \text{Cl}^- \) pitting corrosion. Most of those observations were rationalized based on the effect of anions on pit growth kinetics. Sensitized austenitic stainless steel suffers stress corrosion cracking (SCC) in solutions of all halides, albeit chlorides seem to be the most aggressive. Fluoride SCC is relevant for SCC under insulation of stainless steels, and standards and regulations developed to mitigate this problem consider this ion as aggressive as chloride. For the solubilized stainless steels, aggressiveness toward SCC is in the order \( \text{Cl}^- > \text{Br}^- \). The SCC of solubilized stainless steels was not observed in solutions of \( \text{F}^- \) and \( \text{I}^- \), and the possible reasons for this fact are discussed.
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1 Introduction

Chlorides are present in a wide variety of industrial environments (Kolotyrkin, 1963; Brown, 1977), including fossil and nuclear power plants, food, paper, pulp, and chemical industry and petroleum refineries. Therefore, pitting, crevice corrosion, and stress corrosion cracking (SCC) of stainless steels were extensively studied in chloride solutions (Brown, 1977; Cragnolino et al., 1981; Cragnolino & Macdonald, 1982; Haruyama, 1982; Sedriks, 1996; Frankel, 1998; Szklarska-Smialowska, 2005). Given those considerations, this review will be focused on SCC and pitting corrosion of stainless steels in solutions of halides other than chlorides, in particular, at a temperature below 100°C.

The SCC of stainless steel was observed in solutions of all halide ions. The SCC in \( \text{F}^- \) and \( \text{I}^- \) solutions was only reported for alloys in the sensitized condition (Table 1). Sensitization occurs by exposure of stainless steels to elevated temperatures during welding, heat treatment, or service conditions, causing chromium carbide precipitation at grain boundaries and depletion in chromium close to grain boundaries, thus, favoring intergranular (IG) attack and intergranular stress corrosion cracking (IGSCC). A remarkable observation is that IGSCC was observed in laboratory tests even when \( \text{F}^- \) concentration in the solutions was as low as 1 ppm (Ward et al., 1969; Theus & Cels, 1974). Pitting corrosion of stainless steels, on the other hand, occurs in solutions of all halides except \( \text{F}^- \) (Table 1). Moreover, \( \text{F}^- \) can act as an inhibitor of pitting and crevice corrosion in chloride solutions (Yamazaki, 1994, 1996), and this was explained based on the fact that it is the anion of a weak acid.

2 Abundance of halogens in nature

Fluorine (F), chlorine (Cl), bromine (Br), iodine (I), and astatine (At) are the elements of the halogen family that occur naturally on Earth. Astatine is the rarest of the naturally occurring elements (Greenwood & Earnshaw, 1997), and it is radioactive with a half-life of 8.1 h for its most stable isotope (Lide, 2005). Therefore, At is not
further discussed in this review. The rest of the elements in the halogen family achieve a stable configuration by forming diatomic molecules: $F_2$ and $Cl_2$ are gases, $Br_2$ is a liquid, and $I_2$ is solid at ambient temperature and pressure. However, due to their reactivity, halogens occur in nature as halides (X$^{-}$), and iodine also occurs as iodate ($IO_3^-$) (Greenwood & Earnshaw, 1997). The abundance of elements in crustal rocks decreases with an increase in the atomic mass of the halogen element (Greenwood & Earnshaw, 1997). While fluoride is more abundant than chloride in crustal rocks, fluoride is mainly present in minerals that are scarcely soluble in water, like fluorite or fluorspar (CaF$_2$), cryolite (Na$_3$AlF$_6$), and fluorapatite (CaF$_2$·3Ca$_3$(PO$_4$)$_2$), whereas chloride is mainly present in water-soluble rock salt (NaCl) (Chambers & Holliday, 1975; Greenwood & Earnshaw, 1997). Chloride is the dominant anion in ocean water, where its concentration is 1.9 wt.% (Greenwood & Earnshaw, 1997), about 15,000 times higher than $F^-$ (Warner, 1971) and 290 times higher than $Br^-$ (Stine, 1929). Iodine is less abundant than lighter halogens both in the earth’s crust and in ocean water. Iodine is a micronutrient necessary for various organisms (Ito, 1988). In seawater, it can be present as $I^-$ and $IO_3^-$, with total inorganic iodine in ocean water at around 0.05 ppm (Ito, 1988). The concentration of halide ions in seawater is summarized in Table 1. Chloride dominates in aerosols in the atmosphere, and they can contact metals by direct deposition or after dissolution in rainwater. The main sources of chlorides in aerosols are the ocean, road deicing salts, or the products of the combustion of fossil fuels and residues (Willison et al., 1989).

### 3 Stability of halides in water

The stable oxidation number of fluorine and chlorine throughout the range of stability of water is $-1$ (Pourbaix, 1966). In dilute solutions of hydrofluoric acid (HF), $F^-$ dominate at pH $>3.17$ (Mccoubrey, 1955), which is the $pK_a$ of HF (Table 1). Below this pH, HF dominates (Pourbaix, 1966). In more concentrated solutions (greater than 3.8 g F/l), the bifluoride ion, HF$_2^-$, predominates in the pH region close to $pK_a$ (Pourbaix, 1966). Hydrochloric acid, HCl, is a strong acid; hence, it is completely dissociated in water, and the stable form of chlorine in water solutions is as $Cl^-$. Bromine is stable as $Br^-$ in almost the entire range of water stability, except for very low pH and oxidizing conditions, where it can react according to (Pourbaix, 1966):

$$2Br^-(ac) \rightarrow Br_2(l) + 2e^- \quad E_0 = 1.082 \, V_{SHE}$$

Iodine has the lowest standard reduction potential of the halogen group ($E_0 = 0.62 \, V_{SHE}$), and aqueous I$^-$ solutions are thermodynamically unstable in the presence of dissolved oxygen, reacting to give $IO_3^-$ (Pourbaix, 1966):

$$I^-(ac) + 3H_2O \rightarrow IO_3^-(ac) + 6H^+(ac) + 6e^- \quad E_0 = 1.085 \, V_{SHE}$$

$IO_3^-$ is the thermodynamically stable form of iodine in seawater, but $I^-$ is produced by biologically mediated reduction of $IO_3^-$ or under reducing conditions (Ito, 1988). In acid media, the intermediate formation of $I_2$ or $I^3-$ (trio-iodide) occurs according to (Pourbaix, 1966):

$$3I^-(ac) \rightarrow I_2(ac) + 2e^- \quad E_0 = 0.536 \, V_{SHE}$$

### Table 1: Selected properties of the halides and overview of observed modes of corrosion of stainless steel in halide solutions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Halide ion, X$^-$</th>
<th>$F^-$</th>
<th>$Cl^-$</th>
<th>$Br^-$</th>
<th>$I^-$</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Radius of X$^-$ (nm)</td>
<td>0.133</td>
<td>0.181</td>
<td>0.196</td>
<td>0.219</td>
<td>Chambers &amp; Holliday, 1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta G^\circ_{no}^{\text{red}}$ (kJ/mol)</td>
<td>$-472$</td>
<td>$-351$</td>
<td>$-326$</td>
<td>$-294$</td>
<td>Macdonald &amp; Lei, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$pK_a$ of HX</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Mccoubrey, 1955; Greenwood &amp; Earnshaw, 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concentration in seawater (ppm)</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>$19 \times 10^3$</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0.05 (present as $I^-$ and $IO_3^-$)</td>
<td>Stine, 1929; Warner, 1971; Ito, 1988; Greenwood &amp; Earnshaw, 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitting of stainless steel in X$^-$ solutions</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Tzaneva et al., 2006; Macdonald &amp; Lei 2016; Pahlavan et al., 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCC of stainless steel in X$^-$ solutions</td>
<td>Only in sensitized condition</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Only in sensitized condition</td>
<td>Rhodes, 1969; Ward et al., 1969; Theus &amp; Cels, 1974; Griess et al., 1985, Takekoto et al., 1985; Trabanelli et al., 1988; Zucchi et al., 1988; Itzhak &amp; Elias, 1994; Itzhak et al., 1996; Whorlow &amp; Hutto, 1997; Downs et al., 2007; Sridhar et al., 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Presence of halides in industrial environments

4.1 Fluorides

In industrial applications of stainless steels, some relevant sources of F⁻ are thermal insulation (Takemoto et al., 1985; Whorlow et al., 1997) and electrode coatings and fluxes used during welding operation (Ward et al., 1969; Takemoto et al., 1985). Fluorinated hydrocarbons used in lubricants and gaskets can liberate F⁻ at the temperature of operation of pressurized or boiling water reactors (Brown, 1977). Fluorides are present in pickling solutions of stainless steels. Pickling is a surface process that removes metallic contamination, besides welding and heat treatment scales. This process is typically performed by immersion in nitric and hydrofluoric acid solutions, but it is explicitly not recommended for sensitized stainless steels by ASTM A380 (ASTM A380-17, 2017), due to possible intergranular attack and SCC even under ambient conditions (Berry et al., 1973). Fluoridation is the addition of F⁻ to a public water supply to prevent tooth decay, and it is targeted to maintain a concentration of about 1 ppm in water (Greenwood & Earnshaw, 1997). Cryolite is used in the electrolysis of alumina for metallic aluminum production (Greenwood & Earnshaw, 1997). Fluorine has a key role in the nuclear fuel cycle (Crouse, 2015), where it is used to produce gaseous UF₆ from which fissionable isotopes can be separated by different technologies.

4.2 Bromides

Industrial applications of bromine compounds used to be dominated by 1,2-dibromoethane or ethylene dibromide, a compound added to gasoline as a lead scavenger, until environmental legislation limited the use of lead-based anti-knock additives (Greenwood & Earnshaw, 1997; Thomas et al., 1997). Ethylene dibromide and methyl bromide have applications as pesticides as well (Greenwood & Earnshaw, 1997). Other major applications of bromine compounds are as flame retardants, in plastics, fibers, rugs, and carpets. Silver bromide, AgBr, is an active compound in photographic films. Some catalysts for chemical industries contain bromides, and this caused pitting of a type 316L stainless steel component handling organic acids (Ohtsu & Miyazawa, 2012). Bromides are present in high-density brine completion fluids, applied to deep oil and gas wells to balance the high pressure of the well and maintain the borehole stability (Liu et al., 2014). Those fluids typically contain bromides or chlorides of Ca, Zn, and Na (Sridhar et al., 2017). Calcium bromide is used for controlling mercury emissions of coal-fired power plants (Ladwig & Blythe, 2017). The salt decomposes in the furnace to yield bromine or hydrogen bromide, and they react with elemental mercury. Oxidized mercury compounds are then more easily captured in downstream wet scrubbers for flue gas desulfurization. However, bromides can cause localized corrosion problems of materials used for wet scrubbers (Ozturk & Grubb, 2012).

Concentrated LiBr brines have applications in absorption refrigeration systems (Itzhak & Elias, 1994; Srikrin et al., 2001). The main advantage of those systems is that a compressor is not used. Water is used as the refrigerant, and when it evaporates at low pressure, heat is absorbed from the environment. This water vapor is absorbed by concentrated LiBr brines. The brine, now diluted, is heated in a generator. The brine becomes concentrated, and evaporated water from it is condensed in a heat exchanger. The condensed water and concentrated brine are now ready to start a new cycle. Stainless steels are frequently used in metallic parts of those systems, which motivated corrosion studies in concentrated (above 50%) LiBr brines at temperature in the range from 80°C to 160°C (Griess et al., 1985; Guiñon et al., 1994; Itzhak & Elias, 1994; Itzhak et al., 1996).

4.3 Iodides

Iodine solutions are commonly used in redox titrations. Iodine is scarcely soluble in water, but solubility increases in iodide solutions by the following complexation reaction (Harris, 2007):

\[ 2I_1(ac) \rightarrow 3I_1(ac) + 2e^- \quad E_0 = 0.789 \, V_{SHE} \]  

I⁻⁻ solutions can be used to titrate solutions of reducing agents, using starch as an indicator. Oxidizing solutions are treated with I⁻ to produce an excess of I₃⁻, which is then titrated with thiosulfate (Harris, 2007).

\[ I_1(ac) + 2S_2O_3^{2-} (ac) \rightarrow 3I^-(ac) + S_4O_6^{2-} (ac) \]  

Triiodide solutions have applications as antiseptic for cuts and wounds (Chambers & Hollday 1975). Stainless
5 Pitting corrosion in halides other than chloride solutions

Pitting corrosion of stainless steels involves breakdown of the passive film, metastable pitting, and stable growth of pits (Frankel et al., 2017). Breakdown of the passive film was explained by halide adsorption and thinning of the passive film, halide penetration, and the film-breaking mechanism, as reviewed in-depthly elsewhere (Frankel, 1998; Szklarska-Smialowska, 2005; Soltis, 2015). Halide ions affect properties of the passive film, for example, XPS studies show that the thickness of the passive film of iron in buffer solution decreases as the concentration of \( \text{Cl}^-, \text{Br}^-, \text{and I}^- \) increases (Khalil et al., 1985), and \( \text{Cl}^- \) is the most aggressive for a given concentration. The point defect model was also applied to analyze passivity breakdown in solutions of the different halide ions (Macdonald & Lei, 2016). The model successfully predicts that the ability of halide ions to cause passivity breakdown is in the order \( \text{F}^- < \text{Cl}^- < \text{Br}^- < \text{I}^- \). According to this model, passivity breakdown first requires absorption of the halide ion into the passive film. In short, halide ions absorb by occupying surface oxygen anion vacancies, and this process requires expansion of the oxygen vacancy to accommodate the halide ion with a larger diameter, dehydration of the halide ion, and insertion of the halide ion into the expanded oxygen vacancy. By considering the Gibbs free energy required for each of those processes, a minimum in breakdown potential was predicted for \( \text{Cl}^- \) solutions. The exceptionally high stability of hydrated \( \text{F}^- \) ions is elucidated in Table 1 by the Gibbs free energy values of halide anion hydration, \( \Delta G_{\text{hyd}}^0 \) (Macdonald & Lei, 2016). The high energy required for \( \text{F}^- \) dehydration results in the absence of passivity breakdown in \( \text{F}^- \) solutions.

Despite those effects of halide ions on properties and breakdown of the passive film, it is known that breakdown events of the passive film can occur at a very high rate, as evidenced during metastable pitting at potentials below the stable pitting potential, \( E_{\text{pit}} \) (Frankel et al., 2017). Those frequent events of passive film breakdown and metastable growth are not a problem for structural integrity if repassivation of the passive film is rapid (Frankel et al., 2017). Furthermore, stainless steels for industrial applications usually have appreciable fractions of inclusions or second phase particles, which provide favorable sites for pit initiation and possibly sulfur-containing aggressive species to the local environment (Frankel, 1998). Therefore, the main attention is often targeted to understanding the conditions required for stable growth, or in other words, those that make a metastable pit grow stably (Frankel, 1998; Newman, 2001; Li et al., 2018). Like many other variables that affect pitting corrosion resistance (Newman, 2001), the aggressiveness of the different halide ions can be understood in terms of their effect on stable pit growth rather than on pit nucleation.

The aggressiveness of the different halide anions can be ranked by comparison of pitting potential \( (E_{\text{pit}}) \), the repassivation potential \( (E_{\text{rep}}) \) or the critical pitting temperature (CPT) at a given molar concentration of the anion, or by evaluating the minimum amount required for stable pit growth (Szklarska-Smialowska, 2005).

5.1 Fluoride solutions

Hydrofluoric acid is a weak acid, with a pKₐ of 3.17 (Mccoumbrey, 1955) (Table 1). The rest of the acids are strong, meaning that they completely dissociate in water. The localized acidification theory of pitting corrosion (Galvele, 1976) predicts that the anions of weak acids act as inhibitors. In accord with those considerations, pitting corrosion of stainless steels was not observed in fluoride solutions at room temperature (Streicher, 1956; Koch, 1993). Studied materials where this was verified include quenched and tempered martensitic 403 stainless steel (Pahlavan et al., 2016), supermartensitic 13 Cr stainless steel (Macdonald & Lei, 2016), sensitized 304 stainless steel (Zucchi et al., 1988),...
17 wt.% Cr, 12 wt.% Mn and 0.61 wt.% N stainless steel, and 18 wt.% Cr with 9 wt.% Ni stainless steels (Tzaneva et al., 2006). The absence of pitting was confirmed by either observation of specimens after the test or absence of hysteresis in the return potential scanning curve.

While type 304 sensitized stainless steel suffer intergranular attack and SCC in the presence of F\textsuperscript{−} ions (Ward et al., 1969; Theus & Cels, 1974), breakdown of the passive layer was not observed in the absence of stress at room temperature (Trabantelli et al., 1988; Zucchi et al., 1988). The Cr content near the grain boundary of sensitized stainless steel is controlled by the bulk chemical composition of the stainless steel, time, and temperature in the carbide precipitation region, and grain size. For type 304 stainless steel, scanning transmission electron microscope (STEM) studies coupled with X-ray energy-dispersive spectroscopy (EDS) revealed that the Cr content near the grain boundary can decrease to 13 wt.% or less (Rao, 1979; Ford & Silverman, 1980; Thoralvås & Salwén, 1984). Despite this depletion in Cr at the grain boundary, as the potential was increased in the anodic direction, polarization curves of sensitized type 304 stainless steel in F\textsuperscript{−} solutions at room temperature exhibited a passive behavior, followed by a current increase in the potential range corresponding to oxygen evolution (Zucchi et al., 1988). No hysteresis was observed on the potential scan in the noble direction, confirming that localized corrosion did not occur even at the most positive potentials (Zucchi et al., 1988). In accord with those studies, anodic polarization in F\textsuperscript{−} solutions did not cause breakdown of the passive layer in martensitic stainless steels (Pahlavan et al., 2016), where the bulk Cr content was close to the Cr content near the grain boundary of sensitized 304 stainless steel.

Despite stable pitting is not observed in fluoride solutions, Macdonald and Lei (2016) reported metastable pitting for a 13 Cr martensitic stainless steel in 0.1 M NaF solution. The rate of metastable pitting events and the average current density increased in the order F\textsuperscript{−} < I\textsuperscript{−} < Br\textsuperscript{−} < Cl\textsuperscript{−}. The average current density of metastable pits in F\textsuperscript{−} solutions was one order of magnitude lower than in Cl\textsuperscript{−} solutions (Macdonald & Lei, 2016). The low frequency of those events and their low current might explain why other authors working in similar systems reported the absence of metastable pitting in F\textsuperscript{−} solutions (Pahlavan et al., 2016).

5.2 Fluorides as inhibitors of Cl\textsuperscript{−} pitting and crevice corrosion

It was shown that F\textsuperscript{−} increases the pitting initiation (Yamazaki, 1994) and crevice corrosion initiation and repassivation (Yamazaki, 1996, 1997) potential of type 304 stainless steel in Cl\textsuperscript{−} solutions. This increase in the pitting potential when F\textsuperscript{−} is added to Cl\textsuperscript{−} solutions was also reported by Pahlavan et al. (2016) for type 403 martensitic stainless steel. Interestingly, when F\textsuperscript{−} was added to Cl\textsuperscript{−} solutions, the rate of nucleation of metastable pits increased (Pahlavan et al., 2016). Therefore, F\textsuperscript{−} appear to inhibit the stable growth of pits, and this was explained on the basis of Galvele’s localized acidification theory (Galvele, 1976). The high pK\textsubscript{a} of HF results in F\textsuperscript{−} bonding to H\textsuperscript{+} at pit bottoms, therefore, inhibiting pit growth (Pahlavan et al., 2016).

5.3 Pitting corrosion in halides and strength of the hydrohalide acid

Stable pitting of stainless steels was observed in solutions of the rest of the halides. The strength of the acid increases from HCl to HI (Table 1) (Chambers & Holliday, 1975), but because they are all strong and completely dissociated in water, this difference in strength can only be observed in solvents more acidic than water, for example, acetic acid. In aqueous solution, this difference in strength is irrelevant because they are all leveled out to H\textsubscript{3}O\textsuperscript{+} (Chambers & Holliday, 1975), and in fact, the aggressiveness of the different anions for pitting corrosion of stainless steels and passive iron in aqueous solutions generally increases from I\textsuperscript{−} < Br\textsuperscript{−} < Cl\textsuperscript{−} (Tousek, 1975; Janik-Czachor, 1979; Szklarska-Smialowska, 2005; Tzaneva et al., 2006; Pahlavan et al., 2016). A notable exception to this rule is observed in Mo alloyed stainless steels, where it was found that Br\textsuperscript{−} ions are more aggressive than Cl\textsuperscript{−} (Guo & Ives, 1990; Kaneko & Isaacs, 2002) above a certain content of Mo, as discussed in a subsequent section.

5.4 Effect of halide ion concentration on the pitting potential

Pitting potentials (E\textsubscript{pit}) decrease with an increase in the concentration of the aggressive ion, [X\textsuperscript{−}], according to (Galvele, 1976; Szklarska-Smialowska, 2005):

\[ E_{\text{pit}} = a - B \log[X^{-}] \quad (7) \]

where a and B are constants. The B value is controlled by the charge of the aggressive anion and complexation reactions between metal cations and anions inside the pit (Nguyen et al., 2019). Without complexation, a B value of 59 mV is predicted for all halide ions at room
temperature (Galvele, 1976; Nguyen et al., 2019). For pure iron in borate buffer solutions containing Cl−, Br−, or I−, Janik-Czachor (1979) reported a B value of 100 mV, irrespective of the nature of the halide ion. For pure iron, this is an unusually high value, considering other studies (Galvele, 1976; Nguyen et al., 2019) in Cl− solutions, where it was reported to be close to 59 mV. On the other hand, for stainless steels that suffer pitting at room temperature, the reported B values in Cl− solutions are close to 90 mV (Galvele, 1976; Laycock & Newman, 1997; Nguyen et al., 2019). The B value increases with the stability constant of the metal-chloride complex, and stainless steels contain chromium, which forms complexes more stable than iron (Nguyen et al., 2019). Measurements in martensitic stainless steels (Pahlavan et al., 2016) revealed that the B value for Cl−, Br−, and I− was 130, 80, and 76 mV, respectively. For type 316 austenitic stainless steel, a slope of 91 mV was reported for Cl− solutions and of 75 mV in Br− solutions (Pahlavan et al., 2019a). In other words, an equal increase in halide ion concentration will cause a higher decrease in pitting potential for Cl− than for the rest of the halides.

5.5 Adsorption of the halides and pitting corrosion

The halide ion radius and the strength of the adsorbed halide-metal bond increase with atomic mass (Table 1) (de Castro & Wilde, 1979; Szklarska-Smialowska, 2005) so that larger iodide ion adsorption is thermodynamically more favored than fluoride adsorption. Therefore, the anions that adsorb more strongly to the metal are less aggressive for pitting (Szklarska-Smialowska, 2005). A plausible explanation for this fact could be that adsorption of halide ions to the bare metal surface exposed to an acid solution can inhibit active dissolution of the metal, under certain conditions. Cl−, Br−, and I− additions to a H2SO4 solution result in lower rates of active metal dissolution, as it is observed for mild steel (Jesionek & Szklarska-Smialowska, 1983), pure nickel (Abd El Rehim et al., 1986), and 18 Cr-8 Ni stainless steel (Asawa, 1971). An inhibiting effect on carbon steel corrosion is also observed when KF is added to 0.01 M H2SO4 solutions (Sekine et al., 1994), but this is probably related to a buffering effect of F− ions.

The strength of adsorption of halides to active metal, the surface coverage of halides and the inhibition efficiency increase with increasing halide ion size (Jesionek & Szklarska-Smialowska, 1983; Abd El Rehim et al., 1986). However, this inhibiting effect of halides on active dissolution of metals in acid solutions is observed below a concentration that is specific for each halide ion and material (Asawa, 1971; Jesionek & Szklarska-Smialowska, 1983; Abd El Rehim et al., 1986) and around 10−2 M (Abd El Rehim et al., 1986). For Ni in sulfuric acid solutions (Abd El Rehim et al., 1986), when halide ions are present at a concentration above 10−4 M, they accelerate anodic dissolution and shift the active to passive transition to higher potential, and the aggressiveness increases in the order I−< Br−< Cl−. A similar effect is observed in 18 Cr-8 Ni stainless steels in 4 N H2SO4 (Asawa, 1971), for concentrations of halide ions up to 1 M. At the bottom of a pit under sustained growth, the concentration of halide ions can be much higher, on the order of 8 M or more (Mankowski & Szklarska-Smialowska, 1975). The effect of halide ion on metal dissolution at those concentrations was studied with the artificial pit electrode, as will be discussed below.

Pitting corrosion studies with wire electrodes showed an “anomalous” higher aggressiveness of Br− vs. Cl− (Carroll & Lynskey, 1994), under a wide range of experimental variables. The pitting potential was lower in Br− than in Cl− solutions for types 316, 304L, and 302 stainless steel wires, measured in solutions of pH ranging from 3 to 9 and halide concentration ranging from 0.1 M to 1 M. This anomalous effect was associated to a refining effect of the wire-drawing process on inclusions like sulfides (Pistorius & Burstein, 1992), which act as favorable sites for pit initiation of stainless steels in Cl− solutions (Szklarska-Smialowska, 2005). On the other hand, pitting potentials in bromide solutions were similar whether they were measured with wire electrodes or electrodes cut from bars, suggesting that pitting initiation in Br− solutions relies more on the adsorption of Br− ions than on interaction with inclusions. According to the authors (Carroll & Lynskey, 1994), Br− has a greater tendency to adsorb on the metal surface than Cl−, and this has a greater effect on pit initiation when there is a low population of sulfides. Measurements of pitting potential of 316L stainless steels electrodes cut from bars, with a regular population of sulfides, showed the higher aggressiveness of Cl− vs. Br− usually observed for low Mo stainless steels.

5.6 Pit growth in Cl− vs. Br− solutions

Pit growth can be studied independently of pit initiation with the “lead-in-pencil” or artificial pit electrode technique (Laycock & Newman, 1997; Kaneko & Isaacs, 2000; Ernst & Newman, 2008). A survey of the literature published up to date reveals that this technique was used to study pit growth kinetics in Br− vs. Cl− solutions (Kaneko & Isaacs, 2000; Pahlavan et al., 2019a,b), but no studies were reported in I− solutions. In this technique, a wire of
the metal or alloy to be studied is embedded in epoxy, and after dissolving back the metal at an anodic potential, a one-dimensional artificial pit is eventually formed after the conglomeration of smaller pits (Laycock & Newman, 1997). The electrochemical potential is then scanned in the active direction, while the current is measured. Figure 1 shows the polarization curves of artificial pit electrodes obtained in Br⁻ vs. Cl⁻ solutions, for an 18 wt.% Cr-12 wt.% Ni austenitic stainless steel (Kaneko & Isaacs, 2000). Similar results were obtained by Pahlavan et al. (2019a) for a type 316 austenitic stainless steel. A region where current is independent of potential is observed in Figure 1. In this region, a salt film is precipitated on the metal surface, and the current density of the unidimensional pit is diffusion limited \( (i_{\text{lim}}) \) (Laycock & Newman, 1997):

\[
i_{\text{lim}} = \frac{n F D C_{\text{sat}}}{x}
\]

where \( n \) is the average charge of metal ions, \( F \) is Faraday's constant, \( D \) is the effective or average diffusion coefficient of metal cations, \( C_{\text{sat}} \) is the molar concentration of metal ions in the saturated halide salt solution, and \( x \) is the depth of the unidimensional pit. Notice that Eq. (8) is based on Fick’ s first law of diffusion and, therefore, is strictly valid during steady state. Because of metal dissolution, \( x \) increases with time. However, relative changes of \( x \) during the characteristic time of diffusion, \( x^2/D \), are small enough for the approximation to be valid (Laycock & Newman, 1997). As a consequence, despite \( x \) increases as potential is scanned in the active direction, \( i_{\text{lim}} \) is independent of potential for scan rates in the range of 1 mV/s to 10 mV/s, typically used in this experiment (Laycock & Newman 1997; Li et al. 2019).

It is expected that the most prominent element in the alloy will precipitate first (Bocher et al., 2010). For stainless steel, ferrous halide should dominate in the salt film. However, how chromium, nickel, and the rest of the alloying and impurity elements affect the precipitation of iron halides is not known in depth. Kaneko and Isaacs (2000) argue that the concentration of saturated FeBr₂ should be similar to saturated FeCl₂ and around 5 M. In that case, the reason for the higher diffusion-limited current density reported in the literature (Kaneko & Isaacs, 2000; Pahlavan et al., 2019a) and schematized in Figure 1 resides in a higher diffusion coefficient of metallic cations in Br⁻ vs. Cl⁻ solutions, which is roughly estimated to be within a factor of 1.5. As potential is decreased, eventually, the salt film is dissolved, which is indicated by a small hump in the \( i \) vs. \( E \) curve (Ernst & Newman, 2008) (Figure 1). Current then decreases sharply with potential, due to ohmic drop and activation control.

The transition potential, \( E_T \), is the minimum applied potential required for salt film precipitation at the pit bottom. From Figure 1, this potential can be estimated as the potential, where \( E = i_{\text{lim}} \), on the left of the hump associated with salt film dissolution (Laycock & Newman, 1997; Ernst & Newman, 2008). The actual potential at the pit bottom might be lower due to an ohmic drop in potential, and it can be estimated by different procedures detailed in the literature (Gaudet et al., 1986; Laycock & Newman 1997; Li et al., 2019). An increase in \( E_T \) measured with pencil electrodes correlated with an increase in \( E_{\text{pit}} \) measured on flat electrodes, as the Br⁻/Cl⁻ concentration ratio increased in solutions with a total halide concentration of 0.2 M (Pahlavan et al. 2019b). Kaneko and Isaacs (2000) reported similar results for 1 M Br⁻ and 1 M Cl⁻ solutions. According to Laycock and Newman (1997), stable pitting requires the precipitation of a salt film at the pit bottom, thus, explaining the correlation between \( E_T \) and \( E_{\text{pit}} \). While a solution saturated in metallic cations is the most aggressive solution attainable at the pit bottom at a given temperature, recent studies confirm that stable pitting can be sustained in less concentrated solutions (Srinivasan & Kelly, 2017; Li et al., 2019). For example, according to Srinivasan and Kelly (2017), stable pitting of a 316L stainless steel at room temperature requires a concentration around 50% of the saturated solution at the pit bottom (Srinivasan & Kelly, 2017), otherwise the pit repassivates.

**Figure 1:** Anodic polarization curves of 18 wt.% Cr–12 wt.% Ni stainless steel, obtained for a 0.44-mm deep artificial pit electrode in 1 M LiCl and 1 M LiBr bulk solutions. The electrochemical potential was scanned at a rate of 5 mV/s in the active direction. \( E_T \) is the transition potential, where anodic dissolution shifts from diffusion control to activation/ohmic control. Adapted from Corrosion Science, 42(1), Kaneko and Isaacs, Pitting of stainless steel in bromide, chloride and bromide/chloride solutions, 67–78, Copyright (2000), with permission from Elsevier.
A deeper understanding of how measurements with the artificial pit electrode can explain $E_{\text{pit}}$ differences in Br$^-$ vs. Cl$^-$ solutions can be achieved with a suitable model for pit growth (Li et al., 2018; Pahlavan et al., 2019b). During pitting corrosion, metallic cations are produced by anodic dissolution at the pit bottom and diffuse out of the pit down a concentration gradient. Mathematically, a stable growth of pits requires that (Li et al., 2018)

$$i_{\text{diff, max}} \geq i_{\text{diff, crit}}$$

where $i_{\text{diff, max}}$ is the maximum anodic dissolution current at the pit bottom for a given temperature, pit solution concentration, and potential, and $i_{\text{diff, crit}}$ is the critical current density for diffusion of metallic cations out of the pit. In other words, the rate of production of metallic ions at the pit bottom must compensate its loss by diffusion out of the pit, otherwise, dilution and repassivation occur. The expression for $i_{\text{diff, crit}}$ for unidimensional pits is similar to Eq. (8), but $C_{\text{crit}}$ is a fraction of $C_{\text{sat}}$ (Li et al., 2018):

$$i_{\text{diff, crit}} = \frac{nFDC_{\text{crit}}}{x}$$

From artificial pit experiments and a diffusion model (Gaudet et al., 1986), Kaneko and Isaacs (2000) argue that to prevent pit repassivation, a higher concentration of metallic ions is required in Br$^-$ vs. Cl$^-$ solutions, i.e. $C_{\text{crit}}$ in Br$^-$ will be higher than $C_{\text{crit}}$ in Cl$^-$ in Eq. (10). As previously discussed, the diffusion coefficient of metallic cations is higher in Br$^-$ vs. Cl$^-$ solutions, according to experiments conducted by Kaneko and Isaacs (2000). Therefore, from Eqs. (9) and (10) and for a given pit depth $x$, pit stability in Br$^-$ solutions requires a higher dissolution current $i_{\text{diff, max}}$ at the pit bottom. Finally, considering the curves presented in Figure 1, it is inferred that for a given current density, a higher potential is required to attain it in Br$^-$ vs. Cl$^-$ solutions. Notice that this analysis was made considering unidimensional pits, but it can be extended because similar expressions hold for hemispherical pits (Li et al., 2018). All those contributions explain the higher $E_{\text{pit}}$ observed in Br$^-$ vs. Cl$^-$ solutions (Kaneko & Isaacs, 2000; Pahlavan et al., 2019a,b), confirming that the higher aggressiveness of Br$^-$ vs. Cl$^-$ ions can be explained on the basis of pit growth kinetics.

5.7 The Mo effect in Br$^-$ vs. Cl$^-$ solutions

Ferritic (Kaneko & Isaacs, 2002) and austenitic (Guo & Ives, 1990; Kaneko & Isaacs, 2002) stainless steels alloyed with Mo can be more susceptible to pitting in Br$^-$ vs. Cl$^-$ solutions. A higher pitting potential was measured in Br$^-$ vs. Cl$^-$ solutions when Mo content was low (Guo & Ives, 1990; Kaneko & Isaacs, 2002; Pahlavan et al., 2019a); however, Mo additions had a stronger inhibiting effect on the pitting potential in Cl$^-$ than in Br$^-$ solutions (Horvath & Uhlig, 1968). Hence, above a certain Mo content that depended on stainless steel microstructure (Kaneko & Isaacs, 2002), Br$^-$ became more aggressive than Cl$^-$, causing stable pitting at lower potentials. Those results were in good correlation with anodic polarization curves measured with the artificial pit electrode (Kaneko & Isaacs, 2002). In Cl$^-$ solutions, studies with the artificial pit electrode reveal that Mo increases pitting resistance by shifting the bare metal anodic dissolution curve to higher potentials (Laycock & Newman, 1997). This displacement of the anodic curve for a given increment of Mo is lower in Br$^-$ solutions vs. Cl$^-$ solutions (Kaneko & Isaacs, 2002). This lower effect of Mo in preventing Br$^-$ pitting was attributed to the formation of soluble molybdenum complexes (Newman, 2001), a lower production of inhibiting polymolybdate species in bromide solutions (Domínguez-Aguilar & Newman, 2006), or to the fact that when Br$^-$ displaces the anodic dissolution curve to a higher potential, as schematized in Figure 1, Mo dissolves more easily, and it is less effective as an inhibitor (Ernst & Newman, 2008).

For commercial steels, $E_{\text{pit}}$ in Cl$^-$ is lower than $E_{\text{pit}}$ in Br$^-$ for type 304 stainless steel (Ernst & Newman, 2008), type 301 stainless steel (0.19% Mo as impurity) (Guo & Ives, 1990), type 316 stainless steel (2.5% Mo) (Guo & Ives, 1990; Ernst & Newman, 2008; Pahlavan et al., 2019a), and type UNS S31260 (3% Mo) duplex stainless steel (Yamamoto & Hosoya, 1995). The reverse behavior is observed for type 904L (UNS N08904) with 4.5 wt.% Mo (Guo & Ives, 1990; Abd El Meguid, 1997) and for 6% Mo superaustenitic stainless steel (UNS S31254) (Guo & Ives, 1990). Some of those results are summarized in Figure 2 for measurements of $E_{\text{pit}}$ near room temperature.

5.8 PRE$_n$ and localized corrosion resistance in Br$^-$ solutions

With the exception of Mo, how effective the different alloying elements are for preventing localized corrosion in Br$^-$ and I$^-$ solutions was not as deeply and systematically studied as in Cl$^-$ solutions. For Cl$^-$ solutions, the beneficial effect of Cr, Mo, W, and N on pitting and crevice corrosion resistance of stainless steels is often summarized with the
PREₙ (pitting resistance equivalent with nitrogen) number (ISO 2010):

\[ \text{PRE}_{\text{N}} = \text{wt.\% Cr} + 3.3(\text{wt.\% Mo} + 0.5 \text{ wt.\% W}) + 16 \text{ wt.\% N} \]

In the literature, there are similar versions of this equation that do not consider the beneficial effect of W or with different factors for N (Malik et al., 1994, 1995; Sedriks, 1996; Szklarska-Smialowska, 2005). \( E_{\text{pit}} \) in seawater (Malik et al., 1994, 1995) and CPT in ferric chloride solutions (Sedriks, 1996) both increase with an increase in \( \text{PRE}_{\text{N}} \). Similar correlations exist for crevice corrosion critical parameters (Sedriks, 1996). CPT increases with \( \text{PRE}_{\text{N}} \) in 35,500 ppm Br⁻ solutions, but the slope in the CPT vs. \( \text{PRE}_{\text{N}} \) graph was lower in Br⁻ than in Cl⁻ solutions (Ozturk & Grubb, 2012). Considering this finding, a threshold or engineering rules valid in chloride solutions, like \( \text{PRE}_{\text{N}} > 40 \) for resistance to localized corrosion in seawater at room temperature (Norsok, 2014; Francis & Hebdon, 2015), will not be valid for bromide solutions of similar concentrations. The critical pitting temperature of austenitic UNS N08904 (\( \text{PRE}_{\text{N}} = 34.9 \)) and UNS S31254 (\( \text{PRE}_{\text{N}} = 43.5 \)) stainless steel is near room temperature in Br⁻ solutions (Guo & Ives, 1990; Abd El Meguid, 1997), i.e. more than 30°C lower than values measured in Cl⁻ solutions (Guo & Ives, 1990). Given those results, the use of high \( \text{PRE}_{\text{N}} \) (and in particular, high Mo) stainless steels for mitigation of pitting corrosion is less effective in Br⁻ than in Cl⁻ solutions.

6 Stress corrosion cracking in halides solutions

Austenitic stainless steels suffer SCC in the presence of Cl⁻ ions (Scully, 1968; Hänninen, 1979; Cragnolino & Macdonald, 1982; Sedriks, 1996; Streicher, 2011), both in the fully solubilized and sensitized microstructures. The crack path in Cl⁻ solutions can be either transgranular (TG) or intergranular (IG), as reviewed by Cragnolino and Macdonald (1982). Similar to the situation for pitting corrosion, the SCC in halides other than Cl⁻ solutions received comparatively less attention. Some cases of SCC were reported for austenitic (Griess et al., 1985; Itzhak & Elias, 1994; Itzhak et al., 1996) and martensitic (Downs et al., 2007) stainless steels in the presence of bromides or other bromine species (Lee et al., 1983; Nordin, 1983). Similar to Cl⁻ solutions, sensitization is not required for SCC occurrence in Br⁻ solutions. Finally, a number of researchers conclude that I⁻ act as an inhibitor of Cl⁻ SCC of austenitic stainless steels (Overman, 1966; Uhlig & Cook, 1969; O’Dell & Brown, 1978; O’Dell et al., 1980; Pinkus et al., 1981; Itzhak & Eliezer, 1983).

While pitting corrosion was not observed in F⁻ solutions, sensitized stainless steels suffer IGSCC in this environment (Ward et al., 1969; Theus & Cels, 1974; Takemoto et al., 1985; Trabanelli et al., 1988; Zucchi et al., 1988; Shibata et al., 1993a,b; Whorlow et al., 1997), a problem that was researched mainly because the presence of F⁻ is common in thermal insulation materials (Whorlow & Hutto, 1997) and in fluxes used in welding processes (Ward et al., 1969; Takemoto et al., 1985). In contrast to Cl⁻ solutions, no instances of F⁻-induced SCC were reported up to date in fully solubilized microstructures, as will be discussed in depth below.

6.1 SCC testing techniques and apparent “thresholds” for SCC

A short discussion of different tests used to quantify the aggressiveness of the different halide anions toward the SCC of stainless steel is presented. It has first to be noticed that sensitized type 304 suffers IGSCC in slow strain rate tests (SSRT) even in oxygen-containing “pure water” at a temperature above 50°C (Ford & Povich, 1979; Ford & Silverman, 1980; Cragnolino & Macdonald, 1982; Congleton...
By “pure water,” it is meant a solution with less than 5 ppb Cl− (Congleton & Sui, 1992) or conductivity <0.3 μS/cm (Ford & Silverman, 1980). It was proposed that strain can expose bare metal to the environment, and if the potential is in a range where repassivation of grain boundaries is slower than the matrix, crack propagation can proceed even in the absence of aggressive ions (Ford & Povich, 1979; Ford & Silverman, 1980; Cragnolino & Macdonald, 1982). The presence of halide ions increases the SCC susceptibility, for example, the minimum oxygen concentration and the minimum potential for SCC occurrence in SSRT decrease with an increase in Cl− concentration (Congleton & Sui, 1992).

Halide ions are typically required for cracking in constant deflection tests, like those depicted in Figure 3. Dana and Delong (1956) and Dana (1957) proposed in the 1950s the SCC test shown in Figure 3, left. The test mimics the leaching of chlorides in the insulation followed by concentration by evaporation at the stainless steel surface, simulating the environment in contact with a stainless steel pipe under thermal insulation. This test was standardized in 1971 in the ASTM C692 standard, and it is one of the alternatives listed in the current version of this standard (ASTM C692-13, 2018). This test, however, is limited to “wicking-type” thermal insulation. Those materials wet completely when partially immersed in water. In this test, chlorides and other ions leach in the deionized (DI) water and concentrate on the surface of a U-bend stainless steel specimen. Temperature is controlled by the Joule effect with a transformer, connected either to a resistance heater taped to the specimen, as originally proposed by Dana (1957) or directly to the specimen, as later standardized by ASTM C692 standard (Figure 3, left). The 304 stainless steel is sensitized by heating for 3 h at 649°C. This temperature is close to the nose of the time-temperature-sensitization curve of type 304 stainless steel (Sedriks, 1996). The specimen is then bent into a U shape and stressed to 30 ksi (207 MPa) with a bolt and nut, and placed in the testing apparatus depicted in Figure 3, left. An insulation specimen passes the test if there are no cracks in the stainless steel surface after a 28-day period. In an alternative method (Hutto et al., 1985; Whitaker et al., 1990), temperature is controlled with a steam-heated pipe, and the DI water is dripped over the insulating material with a peristaltic pump (Figure 3, right). This alternative method was incorporated to ASTM C692 in the 1990 edition, and it has the advantage that it is applicable to both wicking and non-wicking thermal insulators (Hutto et al., 1985), while also reproducing more closely the type of wetting of an insulator most likely to be encountered in “real life” service. Prior to using either of the tests depicted in Figure 3 for qualification of insulating materials, the standard (ASTM C692-13, 2018) requires that the test method and sensitized stainless steel must be tested with pure water (less than 0.1 ppm Cl−) and with a 1500-ppm Cl− solution. Four coupons must crack in the Cl− solution, and none of the four coupons should crack in pure water. Notice that similar solution conditions than those of the “blank” test might produce cracking of a sensitized stainless steel tested in a SSRT. In other words, the observed or apparent threshold conditions for cracking are dependent on the test method used.

“Thresholds” for SCC, i.e. a threshold aggressive anion concentration, potential, temperature, and stress intensity factor, are supposedly critical parameters above which SCC is possible and below which immunity is granted. Threshold values are usually defined considering material performance in short-term laboratory tests, performed under aggressive conditions (Andresen, 2019). Immunity is associated with successful performance in an accelerated condition.
laboratory test, which often implies the absence of crack initiation after a certain time. For constant load and constant deflection tests, exposure time is often set to 30 days (Sridhar et al., 2017). After finishing the test, specimens are analyzed; however, there could be ambiguity in the minimum dimensions that a flaw or defect must have to be considered an initiated crack. In addition, it could be argued that cracks could have initiated if the exposure time was longer than the selected test duration.

It was proposed that rather than attempting to define thresholds for SCC, dependencies of crack growth rate with SCC variables should be characterized (Andresen, 2013, 2019). The SCC crack growth rate has a complex dependence on many variables, i.e. temperature, species in solution and their concentration, pH, stress, electrochemical potential, material microstructure, and strength (Staehle & Gorman, 2003). Careful experiments of in situ crack-growth rate measurements of stainless steels and nickel-based alloys in regions of supposed “immunity” to SCC in high-temperature water revealed in many instances crack propagation at a low growth rate (Andresen, 2019). It was proposed that a similar situation might be valid in other material-environment systems. If crack growth rate dependency with SCC variables and the actual defect size (or resolution of nondestructive testing methods) are known (Andresen & Ford, 1988), the residual life of the component or the optimum inspection interval can be assessed.

Much of the research conducted on the effect of F⁻, I⁻, and Br⁻ on SCC was based on accelerated tests, where the effect of one of those variables is explored while keeping the others constant. The identified region of “immunity” or crack growth at a low rate will not guarantee crack propagation at a low rate if one or more of the rest of the SCC variables or loading conditions are changed. Ideally, the dependency of crack growth rate with each of the variables that control SCC should be studied, but the equipment required is more sophisticated, and tests are more expensive.

6.2 SCC in sulfuric acid + halide ion solutions

Most cases of SCC occur when the bulk surface of the stainless steel is in the passive state. However, it has been shown (Acello & Greene, 1962; Asawa, 1971, 1987) that dilute additions of Cl⁻, Br⁻, and I⁻ to a H₂SO₄ solution cause the SCC of the solution annealed type 304 stainless steel. This occurs in a specific range of halide ion concentration and at a potential close to the corrosion potential, where the alloy is actively dissolving. Outside this potential range, the alloy failed by uniform attack or water-line corrosion (Asawa, 1987). Cl⁻, Br⁻, and I⁻ acted as dissolution inhibitors when their concentrations were below 10⁻¹, 2×10⁻³, and 3×10⁻⁴ M, respectively; beyond these concentrations, they promoted uniform corrosion (Asawa, 1987). SCC was observed in a potential and halide ion concentration where the uniform dissolution rate was lower than 1 nm/s, regardless of the nature of the halide ion (Asawa, 1987).

6.3 Effect of halides other than Cl⁻ on SCC in high-temperature water

A few studies addressed the effect of halides other than Cl⁻ on high temperature (around 300°C) water, an environment relevant for cooling water of nuclear power plants. The SCC in high-temperature water of types 304 and 316 stainless steel in the presence of Br⁻ ions (Kumada, 1996) is characterized by a transgranular crack path, and the reported threshold amounts of Br⁻ and dissolved oxygen required for cracking in accelerated tests at 250°C were 50 ppm and 0.1 ppm, respectively. Fluorides at a concentration level of 1–10 ppm favored intergranular cracking in constant load tests of thermally sensitized type 304 and type 316 stainless steel in high-temperature water with 10 ppm O₂ (Berry et al., 1973). Finally, it was reported (Chung et al., 1996) that fluorides favor IGSCC of irradiated type 304 stainless steel, where Cr depletion at the grain boundary was caused by irradiation.

6.4 Critical potential for SCC in halide solutions

The rest of this review will mainly address SCC of stainless steels in halide solutions at lower temperatures and at bulk pH values where a passive film is stable, but might rupture locally giving localized corrosion phenomena like pitting or crevice corrosion. Under such conditions, Cl⁻ SCC initiates from localized attack in pits and crevices (Newman, 2001). It was proposed that a lower bound for the critical potential for Cl⁻ SCC of stainless steels and other corrosion-resistant alloys is the repassivation potential for localized corrosion, Erp (Tsujikawa et al., 1994; Cagnolino et al., 1996; Sridhar et al., 2017). Erp might correspond to the pitting or crevice repassivation potential, depending on the type of localized corrosion process that is occurring. Electrochemical techniques for measuring Erp are described in the literature (Sridhar et al., 2017). Below this potential, any initiated crack or flaw in the passive film would be arrested by repassivation of the film.
(Cragnolino et al., 1994). This condition of $E_{\text{corr}} > E_{\text{ip}}$ for SCC crack propagation is necessary, but not a sufficient condition. Notice that an excessively high potential would cause crack blunting by pitting or crevice corrosion (Tsujikawa et al., 1994; Newman, 2001). Crack velocity has to be larger than the rate of localized corrosion, and because an increase in temperature causes a higher increase in crack velocity due to a larger activation energy (Che-Sheng Chen et al., 1997; Newman, 2001), this results in a critical temperature for SCC (Che-Sheng Chen et al., 1997). Finally, plastic strain rate is required at the crack tip, for a local disruption of the passive film (Andresen & Ford, 1988; Sridhar et al., 2017; Andresen, 2019).

Extensive testing by Tsujikawa et al. (1994), using spot-welded specimens of various austenitic stainless steels exposed to Cl− solutions confirmed that initiation of cracks required a potential greater than $E_{\text{ip}}$. In those tests, a small sheet of stainless steel was spot-welded on top of a larger coupon, generating both a crevice and weld nuggets with residual stresses around them. The SSRT of Fe-Ni-Cr-Mo alloys 316L and 825 in Cl− solutions confirmed nuggets with residual stresses around them. The SSRT of Fe-Ni-Cr-Mo alloys 316L and 825 in Cl− solutions confirmed that at potentials below $E_{\text{ip}}$, specimens failed in a ductile fashion (Cragnolino et al., 1996; Pan et al., 2000). For the same system, using pre-cracked wedge-loaded fracture mechanics specimens, crack growth was only detected when the potential was above $E_{\text{p}}$ (Pan et al., 2000), and no cracks were observed below $E_{\text{p}}$ in constant deflection tests (Cragnolino et al., 1996). Recently, in situ measurement of crack growth rate on pre-cracked specimens confirmed (Gui et al., 2014; Sridhar et al., 2017) a decrease in crack growth rate of almost two orders of magnitude as the potential decreased below $E_{\text{ip}}$ for a 13-Cr supermartensitic stainless steel in a 0.3 M NaCl solution at 85°C.

Summarizing, depending on the test method used, it is inferred that for stainless steels in Cl− solutions at a potential below $E_{\text{ip}}$, SCC initiation or crack growth rate is extremely difficult or decreases abruptly, respectively. This dependence of SCC with potential, assuming a similar cracking mechanism in solutions of the other halides, is useful for interpreting SCC results reported for the rest of the halides. For stainless steels with no or little content of Mo, the $E_{\text{ip}}$ (Tzaneva et al., 2006) in halide solutions increases in the same order as $E_{\text{p}}$, i.e., Cl− < Br− < I−. In this regard, chlorides are often reported (Scully, 1968; Davis, 1994; Whorlow et al., 1997) as the most effective of the halide ions to promote SCC of stainless steels. Likewise, considering the absence of stable localized corrosion of stainless steels in F− solutions (Tzaneva et al., 2006; Macdonald & Lei, 2016; Pahlavan et al., 2016), SCC should not be expected in F− solutions. As previously mentioned, fluoride SCC is exclusively observed in sensitized microstructures (Zucchi et al., 1988), probably because the chromium-depleted region near the grain boundary repassivates slower than the matrix in the presence of F− ions.

### 6.5 IGSCC in F− solutions

Sensitized stainless steels suffer IGSCC in the presence of F− ions (Ward et al., 1969; Theus & Cels, 1974; Takemoto et al., 1985; Trabaneli et al., 1988; Zucchi et al., 1988; Shibata et al., 1993a,b), even in dilute $5 \times 10^{-5}$ m (1 ppm) F− solutions at room temperature, as determined by the SSRT (Trabaneli et al., 1988; Zucchi et al., 1988). IGSCC was also reported in constant load tests in $10^{-4}$ m (2 ppm) F− solutions at room temperature (Trabaneli et al., 1988). By comparison of results available in the literature (Takemoto et al., 1985; Trabaneli et al., 1988; Zucchi et al., 1988), it is observed that IGSCC occurrence requires more aggressive conditions (higher T or higher F− concentration) in constant load or constant deflection tests than in SSRT.

#### 6.5.1 Effect of potential on F− IGSCC

The breakdown of the passive layer was not observed in conventional polarization curves of sensitized stainless steel in F− solutions (Zucchi et al., 1988), as previously discussed. In contrast, a breakdown potential ($E_b$) associated to intergranular cracking was observed when stressed specimens were anodically polarized in F− solutions (Theus & Cels, 1974) at 65°C. According to the authors (Theus & Cels, 1974), IGSCC occurred when $E_{\text{corr}} > E_b$. $E_b$ decreased with pH and with F− concentration in the range of 1–1000 ppm. $E_{\text{corr}}$ decreased with pH, but it was fairly independent of F− concentration. Therefore, a decrease in pH or an increase in F− concentration increased cracking susceptibility. Notice the difference of this cracking condition with $E_{\text{corr}} > E_{\text{ip}}$ for the SCC of stainless steel (Tsujikawa et al., 1994; Cragnolino et al., 1996; Sridhar et al., 2017). The $E_b$ determined by Theus and Cels (1974) is a potentiodynamically determined potential for initiation, and it might vary with experimental parameters like crack incubation time and potential scanning rate. While specimens exhibited cracks when the potential was above $E_{\text{ip}}$, some specimens exhibited cracking when polarized below $E_{\text{ip}}$. A more conservative potential to prevent cracking might be the repassivation potential, $E_{\text{rep}}$, measured during a backward scan in the active direction after controlled localized corrosion propagation (Szkłarska-Smiałowska, 2005; Sridhar et al., 2017). Theus and Cels (1974) did not conduct cyclic potentiodynamic tests for $E_{\text{ip}}$ determination, but the
existence of an arrest potential for intergranular attack in F− solutions is hypothesized. The existence of a crack arrest or critical potential in F− solutions can be inferred from tests conducted by Zucchi et al. (1988). The authors performed an SSRT of sensitized stainless steel wires and then after crack initiation; the deformation was kept constant. Crack propagation could be detected by monitoring the load as a function of time: crack propagation caused a decrease in load, and the load remained constant when the crack was arrested (Zucchi et al., 1988). It was verified that crack propagated and arrested as the potential was switched within or outside the crack propagation potential range, respectively. For example, for a 200-ppm F− solution at 25°C, crack propagation occurred within −0.4 and +0.4 V_sce. The upper potential limit might correspond to crack blunting, but this was not discussed in depth by the authors. Finally, the minimum crack propagation rate that can be resolved with this technique was not reported in the paper.

6.5.2 Effect of sensitization on F− IGSCC

In contrast to Cl− SCC, a solution annealing heat treatment completely prevents F− IGSCC (Ward et al., 1969; Theus & Cels, 1974). Transgranular branching and pitting attack commonly observed in tests of Cl− SCC of sensitized type 304 SS are not observed in F− solutions (Ward et al., 1969). Those results suggest that F− attack is restricted to the intergranular region. Theus and Cels (1974) argue that the dependence of IGSCC with parameters of the sensitizing thermal cycle is difficult to assess. This issue could be solved with a systematic study of the dependence of F− IGSCC with the degree of sensitization (DOS). The thermal cycle affects DOS, which can be defined as the extent of Cr depletion near the grain boundary (Parvathavarthini & Mudali, 2014). DOS can be quantified by coverage (fraction of total grain boundary depleted in Cr), depth (minimum concentration of Cr), and width (distance from grain boundary with a depleted Cr content) (Parvathavarthini & Mudali, 2014). DOS can be estimated with electrochemical techniques, as recently reviewed by Parvathavarthini and Mudali (2014).

6.5.3 Effect of temperature and F− concentration on F− IGSCC

Similar to the case for Cl− SCC (Speidel, 1981), an increase in temperature from 25°C to 80°C increases the kinetics of the attack, according to Zucchi et al. (1988) and Ward et al. (1969). Measurements of time to failure at constant load and the ductility loss in the SSRT suggest that the aggressiveness of F− increases with its concentration in the solutions, from 10⁻⁴ to 10⁻² M (0.2–200 ppm F−) (Trabanelli et al., 1988; Zucchi et al. 1988). This is in accord with the decrease in breakdown potential in anodic polarization curves of stressed specimens reported by Theus and Cels (1974), from 5×10⁻² to 5×10⁻¹ M (1–1000 ppm F−). Some authors claim that a maximum susceptibility to IGSCC occurs at an intermediate F− concentration. Using SSRT, Shibata et al. (1993b) showed that the region of maximum susceptibility is around 450 ppm F− (0.02 M). Likewise, Ward et al. (1969) reported that solutions with a concentration around 1 M F− (20,000 ppm F−) do not cause IGSCC. Adding Cl− ions to a the F− solution did not change the kinetics or mode of attack; hence, a synergism between those ions was discarded (Ward et al., 1969). Whorlow et al. (1997) drew similar conclusions, after adding F− ions to a Cl− solution. This solution had a Cl− concentration just below the threshold amount required for SCC in constant deflection tests, as will be discussed in detail in the next section.

6.5.4 SCC of stainless steels under thermal insulation

SCC in F− and F− + Cl− solutions were mainly studied (Take-moto et al., 1985; Whorlow et al., 1997; Whorlow and Hutto, 1997) because those ions are common impurities found in materials for thermal insulation. This failure mechanism is also known as ESCC, where the “E” means that the water and halides involved in the cracking mechanism are external to the pipe, tank, or vessel. Pipes conveying high-temperature fluids are commonly wrapped with thermal insulation to minimize heat losses and to protect nearby personnel. Water from rain, nearby processes, or arising from steam condensation can wet the thermal insulation (Dana, 1957; Ahluwalia, 2006). Alternatively, vapor from the atmosphere can condensate on a surface that is temporarily below the dew point (Ahluwalia, 2006). Water lixiviates impurities in the thermal insulation, and upon contact with the hot stainless steel surface, those impurities are concentrated by evaporation of the solvent (Dana, 1957; Ahluwalia, 2006). If aggressive species, namely, F− + Cl−, are originally present in the thermal insulation material, this leaching and concentration process can create optimum environmental conditions for the SCC of the stainless steel. Most failures occur in equipment with the stainless steel surface at a temperature between 50°C and 175°C (Ahluwalia, 2006; NACE, 2017). Below this temperature, the concentration by evaporation is not significant, and the kinetics of SCC is low, and above 175°C, liquid water presence on the stainless steel surface is less frequent. More
conservatively (McIntyre, 1985), the upper temperature is listed as 260°C, the temperature below which some chloride salts retain their hydration water. However, even in equipment operating above the maximum temperature, it is necessary to consider possible SCC occurrence during start-up and shutdown (McIntyre, 1985).

The SCC of stainless steel under insulation, like any other SCC problem, requires tensile stresses on susceptible materials exposed to a given environment. Most stainless steel products contain sufficient residual stresses to cause SCC in an aggressive environment even without applied stresses (NACE, 2017). This situation worsens if welding or cold work is involved in the fabrication process. Decreasing stress can be impractical, and changing the material is economically infeasible, especially in operating plants. Therefore, most strategies for prevention of ESCC focus on the environment. Standard specifications, like ASTM C795 (ASTM C795-08, 2018), provide limits for the maximum concentration of Cl⁻ and F⁻ in thermal insulation in contact with stainless steel. Thermal insulation has to be qualified in a preproduction standard test (ASTM C692-13, 2018), Figure 3, where it is tested to determine if the amount of leachable Cl⁻, F⁻, and inhibitors in the thermal insulator can cause SCC in a sensitized type 304 stainless steel stressed specimen at high temperature. Once the chemical composition and production process of the insulator is thus qualified, standard test method ASTM C871 (ASTM C871-13, 2018) is used to measure the chemical composition, specifically the concentration of chlorides, fluorides, sodium, and silicates of subsequent production lots. The maximum acceptable concentrations of Cl⁻ and F⁻ in the insulator are indicated in standard ASTM C795 (ASTM C795-08, 2018), as a function of the concentration of inhibiting species (sodium and silicates). Regulatory guide US NRC 1.36 (US Nuclear Regulatory Commission 2015), applicable to thermal insulation to be used in nuclear power plants, contains similar guidelines as those of ASTM C795. The historical evolution of those standards is briefly discussed below, and it is of interest because it shows changes in perception on the aggressiveness of F⁻.

6.5.5 Historical evolution of standards related to SCC of stainless steels under thermal insulation

Karnes in the 1960s determined that SCC can be inhibited if a certain amount of sodium and silicates are present in the thermal insulation material (Whitaker et al., 1990), and the results were reported in a Cl⁻ vs. Na⁺ + silicates graph, known as the acceptability curve (Figure 4). In this graph, an arbitrary line separates the compositions of the insulator that cause the SCC in the stainless steel from those that do not. The line was traced considering that if no more than one out of four specimens failed, the test was considered a “pass” (Whitaker et al., 1990). While Karnes originally published the acceptability curve with Cl⁻ in the ordinate, the United States Atomic Energy Commission (USAEC) published the Regulatory Guide (RG) 1.36 in 1973 (US Atomic Energy Commission, 1973), where the ordinate was changed to Cl⁻ + F⁻. Accordingly, the maximum Cl⁻ + F⁻ content in the insulator was limited to 600 ppm. According to Whitaker et al. (1990), F⁻ was added to this regulatory guide because of the “chemical similarity and normally greater chemical aggressiveness of the fluoride,” rather than based on experimentally measured effects of F⁻ on SCC. The United States military standard MIL-I-24244 (MIL-I-24244A 1974) issued in 1974 did not contain the F⁻ requirement, but this was added in a subsequent revision, to be consistent with RG 1.36 (Whitaker et al., 1990). Furthermore, the minimum sodium + silicate content was fixed at 50 ppm. ASTM C795, first published in 1977, did not contain the fluoride requirement in the acceptability curve (Figure 4), until the 2008 version, where it was added to “be consistent with other standards” (ASTM C795-08, 2018).

The F⁻ + Cl⁻ vs. Cl⁻ controversy in the ordinate of the Karnes acceptability graph was studied in depth by Whorlow and Hutto (1997), in a report prepared for the US Nuclear Regulatory Commission and later published by ASTM (Whorlow et al., 1997). The experimental setup was similar to the one depicted in Figure 3 (right), but instead
of dripping DI water to leach ions from the insulator block, different solutions were dripped directly over the type 304 sensitized stainless steel surface, at a fixed flow rate for 28 days. The authors (Whorlow & Hutto, 1997) provided a chart to convert the concentration of ions in the solution (in mg/l) to the equivalent concentration in the insulator (in mg/kg), considering that in a real qualification test, the same flow rate would drip over the insulator but with DI water. In the absence of inhibiting species like sodium and silicates, the authors concluded that F\(^-\) ions cause SCC when they are in a concentration above 20 mg/kg (20 ppm) in the insulator. This is equivalent (Whorlow & Hutto, 1997) to 0.8 ppm of F\(^-\) in solution, which is further concentrated at the stainless steel surface by water evaporation. Therefore, this susceptibility to SCC of type 304 sensitized stainless steel in F\(^-\) solutions is in accord to the results reported elsewhere (Ward et al., 1969; Theus & Cels, 1974; Zucchi et al., 1988) with different experimental setups.

In comparison to Cl\(^-\) ions, SCC in F\(^-\) can be inhibited with considerably lower amounts of sodium and silicates, as summarized in Figure 5 (Whorlow & Hutto, 1997). Furthermore, when F\(^-\) ions were added to a solution of Cl\(^-\), sodium, and silicate originally below the Karnes acceptability curve, SCC was not observed, despite the total Cl\(^-\) + F\(^-\) content of the solution was in the cracking region of the acceptability graph (Figure 6). A single exception was the test run at 1000 ppm sodium + silicate and 100 ppm Cl\(^-\) + 35 ppm F\(^-\), marked with an arrow in Figure 6. Based on those results, the authors (Whorlow & Hutto, 1997) discarded a synergistic effect between Cl\(^-\) and F\(^-\), in accord with research previously published by Ward et al. (1969).

In other words, the amount of silicate and sodium required to inhibit Cl\(^-\) SCC seems to be sufficient to inhibit the effect of further additions of F\(^-\) (Whorlow & Hutto, 1997). Despite those results, when the US Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) revised RG 1.36 in 2015 (US Nuclear Regulatory Commission, 2015), both Cl\(^-\) and F\(^-\) were considered as equally aggressive species and placed in the ordinate of Karnes acceptability graph. By this time, ASTM had already included F\(^-\) in the ordinate of Karnes graph, in the 2008 version of ASTM C795 (ASTM C795-08, 2018). The International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) published in 2011 the report “Stress corrosion cracking in light water reactors: good practices and lessons learned” (International Atomic Energy Agency, 2011), where the Karnes figure with Cl\(^-\) + F\(^-\) in the ordinates was reproduced. In summary, current standards and regulatory guides on ESCC of austenitic stainless steels consider F\(^-\) as aggressive as Cl\(^-\), despite contrary conclusions drawn in laboratory tests.

### 6.5.6 Some limitations of standards related to SCC of stainless steels under thermal insulation

Whorlow and coworkers (Whorlow & Hutto, 1997; Whorlow et al., 1997) reported that the inhibitor effectiveness was dependent on the type of silicate; the order of increasing effectiveness was sodium disilicate (Na\(_2\)Si\(_2\)O\(_5\)), sodium
metasilicate ($\text{Na}_2\text{SiO}_3$) and sodium orthosilicate ($\text{Na}_4\text{SiO}_4$).
In other words, summarizing criticism on the acceptability curve of thermal insulation material (Figure 4), neither
the aggressive ions plotted in ordinate or the inhibiting ions in the abscissa seem to be equally effective in promoting or preventing ESCC, respectively. Whorlow and coworkers reported the SCC of sensitized stainless steels in environments with chloride and sodium + silicate concentrations below the Karnes line, in other words, in the zone of acceptable analysis (Whorlow & Hutto 1997; Whorlow et al., 1997). The occurrence of SCC failures below the Karnes curve is not surprising because this curve was traced following the criterion that if none or one out of four SCC specimens failed for a given thermal insulation composition, the point was considered a pass (McIntyre, 1985; Whitaker et al., 1990). Current recommendations of ASTM C 795 require that the preproduction SCC test (ASTM C692-13, 2018) is passed if none of the specimens exhibit cracks. Lots produced with this validated production method and using similar ingredients are acceptable if their chemical composition falls inside the acceptable region (Figure 4) or if their chemical composition was validated with a pass in a preproduction SCC test. US REG 1.36 (US Nuclear Regulatory Commission, 2015) is more conservative because it not only requires that the chemical composition of the insulator falls in the acceptable region (Figure 4) but also that the chemical analysis of the Cl$^- + $F$^-$ content of the lot does not exceed 150% of the average values measured during preproduction qualification tests and that the sodium and silicate content is not below 50% of the average amount of those inhibitors measured during successful preproduction qualification tests.

Takemoto et al. (1985) questioned the 600 ppm high chloride limit in the acceptability graph (Figure 4). Using constant deflection tests with an initial stress above that required by ASTM C692 (ASTM C692-13, 2018), they proposed a threshold of 2000 ppm for a sensitized type 304 stainless steel and 3000 ppm for a solution annealed stainless steel, exposed to 95°C solutions. The difference in apparent Cl$^-$ threshold concentration values could be explained considering its strong dependence with the rest of the testing variables.

In contrast to other studies (Ward et al., 1969; Whorlow & Hutto, 1997), Takemoto et al. (1985) suggest a synergistic effect of F$^-$ and Cl$^-$, indicating that the 600 ppm high Cl$^-$ limit can be much lower in the presence of F$^-$, decreasing to 200 ppm when the F$^-$ concentration is 100 ppm. The authors state that F$^-$ aggressiveness is maximum at 50°C, which is in conflict with results later published by Zucchi et al. (1988), where aggressiveness of F$^-$ was higher at 80°C. Figure 7 summarizes the effect of F$^-$ and Cl$^-$ on the SCC of sensitized stainless steels at 50°C, according to Takemoto et al. (1985). The line that separates the SCC vs. No SCC zone was constructed based on laboratory tests in NaF and NaCl solutions without added silicates.

A major limitation of ASTM standards for ESCC management is that they only measure the capacity of inhibitors in the insulating material to guard against SCC failures caused by aggressive species in the insulating material. As reviewed by McIntyre (1985), Takemoto et al. (1985), and Hutto et al. (1985), and NACE International Standard SP0198-2017 (NACE, 2017), other potential sources of Cl$^-$ of industrial relevance are the atmosphere, especially near coastal or industrial areas, or rainwater, processed, or potable water that might accidentally contact the thermal insulation. Insulation materials might have an excess of inhibitors to mitigate the effect of externally introduced aggressive ions. The ability of the insulation material to inhibit the effect of aggressive ions from outside sources can be tested using any of the experimental setups in Figure 3, if a Cl$^-$ solution is used instead of DI water. In the “accelerated Dana test” a 1500-ppm (mg/l) Cl$^-$ solution is used (Hutto et al., 1985; Whitaker et al., 1990), and an additional benefit is that the testing time is reduced from 28 to 6 days. However, it has not yet been included as an alternative procedure in ASTM C692. While inhibitors in the thermal insulator can offset the effect of externally introduced aggressive ions, it has to be noticed that if the equipment is severely wetted, the inhibitor might be leached and transported away from the surfaces needing inhibition (NACE, 2017).

If water reaches the stainless steel surface through cracks in the thermal insulator without soaking through

![Figure 7: Summary of the effect of fluorides and chlorides on SCC at 50°C, for a solution without silicates and a type 304 sensitized stainless steel under constant deflection. Adapted from Takemoto et al. (1985). © NACE International, 1985.](image)
the insulation (McIntyre, 1985), the amount of leachable aggressive and inhibiting species in the insulator is not so relevant, and cracking can be controlled by the Cl\textsuperscript{−} or F\textsuperscript{−} concentration in the water. Guidelines for preventing water ingress to the thermal insulation are listed in the NACE International Standard SP0198-2017 (NACE, 2017). This standard addresses corrosion under insulation (CUI) under both stainless and carbon steels. Despite differences in their corrosion mechanisms, preventing water contact to the external surface of equipment is a common corrosion control strategy. An additional ESCC control strategy is the use of coatings or aluminum foil wrapping (Richardson & Fitzsimmons, 1985; NACE, 2017). The aluminum foil provides an additional barrier that prevents water and ions to be in contact with the stainless steel surface (Richardson & Fitzsimmons, 1985). More important, aluminum provides cathodic protection and decreases the corrosion potential of the stainless steel surface (Richardson & Fitzsimmons, 1985), which is effective for preventing Cl\textsuperscript{−} and F\textsuperscript{−} SCC (Smialowski & Rychcik, 1967; Rhodes, 1969; Uhlig & Cook, 1969; Theus & Cels, 1974).

Finally, it is noticed that the methodology of ESCC management with ASTM standards was developed based on results obtained with accelerated tests with smooth stainless steel coupons. However, if flaws or cracks are detected on a stainless steel component, it cannot be assured that they will not propagate during further use, even if new thermal insulation is installed, and its composition lays within the acceptability zone of Figure 4. Under such a scenario, knowledge of dependence of SCC growth rate with stress and environmental and material variables would be of much greater use for assessing the remaining life of the component (Andresen & Ford, 1988).

### 6.6 Br\textsuperscript{−} stress corrosion cracking

Pitting and crevice corrosion of stainless steels is observed in Br\textsuperscript{−} solutions, even in the fully solubilized condition. Therefore, considering a similar mechanism for SCC in Br\textsuperscript{−} vs. Cl\textsuperscript{−}, one of the necessary (Tsujikawa et al., 1994; Che-Sheng Chen et al., 1997; Newman, 2001; Sridhar et al., 2017) conditions for SCC would be fulfilled if $E_{\text{corr}} > E_{\text{th}}$. Br\textsuperscript{−} SCC was reported in environments of industrial interest, like completion fluids for the oil and gas industry (Downs et al., 2007; Sridhar et al., 2017) and brines for absorption refrigeration systems (Griess et al., 1985; Itzhak & Elias, 1994; Itzhak et al., 1996). With regard to laboratory tests, Rhodes (1969) reported SCC in 304 stainless steel exposed to 59% MgBr\textsubscript{2} solutions at 150\textdegree C, but cracking was not observed when the solution was more dilute than 36%.

As a comparison, the SCC of 304 stainless steels occurs readily in accelerated laboratory tests in 20% MgCl\textsubscript{2} at 105\textdegree C (Brauns & Ternes, 1968), and more generally, at a temperature above 100\textdegree C, just a few ppm of Cl\textsuperscript{−} can cause SCC (Haruyama 1982) in industrial equipment. Therefore, albeit probably not as aggressive as Cl\textsuperscript{−}, the evidence reported suggests that concentrated, hot Br\textsuperscript{−} brines can cause SCC of stainless steels even in the fully solubilized condition.

Mo increases resistance to both localized corrosion and SCC of stainless steels in Cl\textsuperscript{−} solutions (Speidel, 1981; Sedriks, 1996; Prosek et al., 2009). This higher resistance is reflected in material selection guidelines; for example, to prevent Cl\textsuperscript{−} SCC in marine atmospheric environments, Norsok standard M-001 (Norsok 2014) sets the maximum operating temperature of type 6 Mo stainless steel in 120\textdegree C, higher than the 60\textdegree C set for a type 316 stainless steel (2.5 wt.% Mo). As illustrated in Figure 2, for alloys with a high concentration of Mo like stainless steel type 904L, Br\textsuperscript{−} can be more aggressive toward pitting than Cl\textsuperscript{−}. This higher aggressiveness of Br\textsuperscript{−} is also evidenced by a large decrease in CPT and CCT (Guo & Ives, 1990; Abd El Meguid, 1997; Ozturk & Grubb, 2012). An unsolved question is whether the higher aggressiveness of Br\textsuperscript{−} vs. Cl\textsuperscript{−} toward pitting and crevice corrosion in high Mo stainless steels implies also a higher SCC susceptibility in Br\textsuperscript{−} vs. Cl\textsuperscript{−} solutions.

#### 6.6.1 SCC in Br\textsuperscript{−} containing completion fluids for oil and gas wells

Completion fluids used in high pressure, high-temperature oil, and gas wells might contain large concentrations of Br\textsuperscript{−}. When contaminated with O\textsubscript{2} or acid gases like CO\textsubscript{2} and H\textsubscript{2}S, those brines can cause SCC in corrosion-resistant alloys like martensitic stainless steels (13 Cr-1Mo, 13 Cr-2Mo) (Downs et al., 2007). SCC was reported in laboratory studies of 13 Cr-2Mo stainless steel exposed to CO\textsubscript{2} and H\textsubscript{2}S solutions at both 160\textdegree C and 40\textdegree C in concentrated Br\textsuperscript{−} solutions. Formate brines are often used in replacement of bromide brines to mitigate this problem (Downs et al., 2007; Sridhar et al., 2017).

#### 6.6.2 SCC in Br\textsuperscript{−} brines for absorption refrigeration systems

LiBr commercial brines for use in absorption refrigeration systems can contain lithium chromates and lithium hydroxide (Griess et al., 1985; Iguan Muñoz et al., 2003), added as corrosion inhibitors. These systems operate
under deaerated conditions, and besides the problem of integrity of materials, the release of hydrogen by the cathodic reaction at the corrosion potential produces non-condensable gases that decrease efficiency (Chandler, 1999). Desired corrosion rates in LiBr brines are below 1 mpy (25 μm/year). Various stainless steels and carbon steels in presence of chromates or other inhibitors fulfill this constraint (Chandler, 1999). The presence of chromates and deaerated conditions contribute to lower the corrosion potential (Igual Muñoz et al., 2003) and mitigate pitting corrosion. However, the high operating temperature (~150°C) might favor SCC.

With regard to SCC of stainless steels in LiBr brines, in a preliminary report, Griess et al. (1985) studied the SCC of austenitic type 304 stainless steels in 68% LiBr solutions at 160°C, conditions similar to those encountered in absorption refrigeration systems. The presence of oxygen was required for cracking of U-bend specimens, and none out of 20 specimens cracked under deaerated conditions (Griess et al., 1985). On the other hand, the SCC of types 304 and 316 stainless steels was reported by Itzhak et al. in 55% LiBr brines at 120°C and 160°C in deaerated conditions, both with the constant load (Itzhak & Elias, 1994) and slow strain rate technique (Itzhak et al., 1996). Specimens were studied in the “as-received” state (Itzhak & Elias, 1994; Itzhak et al., 1996), which included a 15% cold work estimated by comparison to fully annealed specimens of the same heat. The SCC crack path was generally transgranular, but depending on loading mode and temperature, mixed IG and TG cracks were observed for type 316 stainless steel. Itzhak et al. studied SCC in brines with pH varying from 6 to 11.6, and time to failure generally increased with increasing pH. The content of chlorides present as potential impurities in LiBr brines was not measured, and two different grades of LiBr salts were used by the authors, i.e. “analytical” (Itzhak & Elias, 1994) and “commercial” (Itzhak et al., 1996) grade.

Considering the concentration of LiBr solutions used in studies of evaluation of stainless steel for absorption refrigeration systems, it could be argued that trace amounts of chlorides in the salt could explain the SCC process. For example, Griess et al. (1985) reported that 37 ppm of chlorides were present in the brine as impurities from the LiBr salt, enough to cause chloride SCC at 160°C even in absence of Br− (Sedriks, 1996). Despite this, the authors argue that Cl− was not responsible for cracking because the Cl− SCC inhibitors like chromate did not inhibit cracking in the concentrated LiBr salt (Griess et al., 1985). However, the role of chromate as a Cl− SCC inhibitor is disputed (O’Dell & Brown, 1978) because despite stabilizing the passive film, it can raise the electrochemical potential. Stronger evidence to support the observation that cracking was actually due to Br− is that according to U-bend constant deflection SCC tests conducted by Rhodes (1969), intentional additions of Cl− to 36% MgBr2 solutions did not induce cracking in type 304 stainless steel specimen, but SCC was observed in 59% MgBr2 solutions at 150°C.

### 6.6.3 Br− SCC under thermal insulation

The effect of Br− on SCC of stainless steel under thermal insulation was not as deeply studied as the effect of F− and Cl−, probably because they are not as widely found in insulation as the lighter halides (Whorlow et al., 1997). The SCC of sensitized type 304 stainless steels in Br− solutions was reported with an experimental setup similar to that shown in Figure 3 (right) (Whorlow et al., 1997). The presence of SCC cracks and pits was reported in sensitized type 304 stainless steel U-bend coupons heated to 100°C and exposed to 1500 ppm Br− solutions (added as KBr), which was directly dripped over the stainless steel coupon. Under this experimental setup, the solution was concentrated by water evaporation at the hot stainless steel surface, so it is difficult to compare those experiments with those conducted in LiBr brines. The Br− SCC of sensitized stainless steel could be inhibited with sodium orthosilicate, with a concentration of inhibitor that was much lower than required to inhibit Cl− SCC (Whorlow & Hutto, 1997). Br− ions were never included in ordinates of the acceptability curve of thermal insulation material (Figure 4). However, some analytical techniques (ASTM C871-18, 2018) to determine the Cl− concentration in thermal insulation cannot discriminate between Cl−, Br−, and I−, thus providing a false higher concentration of Cl−. The concentration of inhibitor required in the thermal insulator would be increased accordingly, and considering that Cl− is the most effective of those halides to cause ESCC in sensitized stainless steel, the possible effect of Br− and I− would be inhibited as well (Whorlow & Hutto, 1997).

### 6.6.4 SCC and localized corrosion in bromine compounds in desalination plants

The presence of Br− ions in seawater can lead to corrosion issues in stainless steels used for multi-stage flash (MSF) desalination plants (Oldfield & Todd, 1981). Despite Cl− being more concentrated in seawater than Br−, Table 1, two different mechanisms (Oldfield & Todd, 1981; Lee et al., 1983) were proposed for the enrichment of bromine species in the vapor phase. Chlorine (Cl−) is usually added...
to feed-water as a biocide, and it can oxidize Br⁻ to Br₂, a reaction that is favored when pH is lower than 6 (Oldfield & Todd, 1981). Alternatively, bromamines can evolve from chlorinated seawater, if ammonia is present in seawater (Lee et al., 1983). Bromine and bromamines are then removed from the MSF plant together with non-condensable gases. Bromamines can decompose to hydrobromic acid and free bromine (Lee et al., 1983). Bromine is more oxidizing than oxygen (Lee et al., 1983), thus it raises the corrosion potential and favors pitting, crevice corrosion, and SCC. The SCC of type 316L stainless steel due to the presence of bromine species was reported in air ejector condenser systems (Black & Morris, 1981; Nordin, 1983) and venting pipes of MSF plants (Lee et al., 1983). Pitting and uniform corrosion of 316L were also reported in Br₇ solutions (Hodgkiess et al., 1985), and it was related to bromine reduction reaction, Eq. (1) that yields bromides.

To prevent this type of failure, it was proposed to use higher alloyed stainless steel like 904L (Black & Morris, 1981; Nordin, 1983) or strict control of pH, chlorination level, and ammonia content in feedwater (Oldfield & Todd, 1981; Lee et al., 1983).

### 6.7 SCC in the presence of iodides and iodine

The SCC of zirconium alloys used for nuclear power reactor fuel cladding in iodine, a byproduct of the uranium fission reaction, is a well-documented problem (Cox, 1972; Wood, 1972; Sidky, 1998). While zirconium alloys are widely used as cladding in water-cooled reactors operating at temperatures close to 300°C, studies (Lobb & Jones, 1976; Lobb & Nicholson 1976; Lobb, 1978; Kiselevskii et al., 1993) conducted at 650°C and 750°C report that iodine vapor decreases creep resistance of austenitic stainless steels, a problem relevant for fuel cladding integrity of fast and advanced cooled reactors. Likewise, I⁻ and I² can be generated in aqueous homogeneous reactors, where uranium salts are dissolved in an aqueous solution that serves as moderator and coolant (Lillard, 2010). As reviewed by Lillard (2010), pitting and SCC of stainless steel in iodine solutions can affect the integrity of the off-gas extraction system of those reactors, required to remove the gases produced by radioysis.

\[ E_{p,i} > E_{p,b} \]

of stainless steels in I⁻ solutions are larger than in Br⁻ or Cl⁻ solutions (Rhodes, 1969; Tzanueva et al., 2006; Macdonald & Lei, 2016). Therefore, the \( E_{Corr} > E_{p} \) (Tsujikawa et al., 1994; Che-Sheng Chen et al., 1997; Sridhar et al., 2017) criterion predicts SCC resistance in a wider range of potential in I⁻ vs. the rest of the halide solutions. Furthermore, under open-circuit conditions, the requirement that \( E_{Corr} > E_{p} \) (Tsujikawa et al., 1994; Che-Sheng Chen et al., 1997; Sridhar et al., 2017) is usually fulfilled by the presence of oxygen in the solution. However, iodide solutions are unstable in the presence of oxygen, reacting with it to give iodates or iodine (Eqs. (2) and (11)) (Pinkus et al., 1981; Itzhak & Eliezer, 1983):

\[ 2I^- + \frac{1}{2}O_2 + 2H^+ \rightarrow I_2 + H_2O \]  

Given those considerations, in the case of I⁻ solutions, the reactants required for halide stress cracking might not be present simultaneously under common open-circuit conditions.

Nevertheless, SCC was observed in sensitized type 304 stainless steel. Whorlow and Hutto (1997), using an experimental setup similar to the one in Figure 3 (right), reported SCC in I⁻ solutions, added as KI. However, cracks were much shorter than those observed in chlorides, and cracking could be inhibited with silicates. In a previous attempt, SCC was not observed in iodide solutions (Whitaker et al., 1990), but this was explained based on a possible low carbon content of the stainless steel used. Current recommendations of ASTM C692 (ASTM C692-13, 2018) for evaluation of thermal insulation require a solution annealed type 304 stainless steel with carbon content in the range of 0.05–0.06%, which is then sensitized for 3 h at 649°C.

### 6.8 Inhibition of Cl⁻ SCC by I⁻ and I₂

Some researchers propose that iodide and iodine can act as inhibitors of SCC in Cl⁻ and Br⁻ solutions. Slow strain rate test (SSRT) studies (Huang et al., 1993) of solution annealed Ti-stabilized 321 stainless steel (UNS S32100) concluded that I⁻ and I₂ inhibit SCC of stainless steels in 0.5 m NaCl + 0.5 m HCl solutions at 55°C, with I⁻ being more effective than I₂. The fracture surface in the presence of 5 mmol/l KI was ductile with the presence of dimples. Similarly (Uhlig & Cook, 1969), additions of NaI to the boiling MgCl₂ SCC test solution increased the time to failure of solution annealed and cold-worked specimens of 304 stainless steel under constant load conditions, and no cracks were observed after 200 h of testing when more than 3.7% of NaI were added to the MgCl₂ solution. According to Itzhak et al. (Pinkus et al., 1981; Itzhak & Eliezer 1983), I⁻ acts as a cathodic inhibitor of chloride SCC, reacting with oxygen and protons according to Eq. (11). Evidence for the occurrence of this reaction was that the solution turned to yellow-brown color.
The corrosion potential in boiling 38% MgCl₂ + 15% NaI was 200 mV lower than the corrosion potential in boiling 38% MgCl₂ (Pinkus et al., 1981). A decrease in corrosion potential should contribute to inhibition of chloride SCC in boiling MgCl₂ solutions (Smialowski & Rychcik, 1967; Rhodes, 1969; Uhlig & Cook, 1969). Additions of 1% KI to a 55% LiBr brine of pH = 4 also inhibited Br⁻ SCC of type 316 stainless steel (Itzhak et al., 1996). Finally, some constant deflection tests performed on type 304 stainless steel with a setup similar to that shown in Figure 3 (right) (Whorlow et al., 1997) suggest that I⁻ is an ineffective inhibitor of Br⁻ and F⁻ SCC when the stainless steel is sensitized.

7 Summary and conclusions

Pitting and SCC of stainless steels is possible in halides other than chlorides. Several examples where this problem manifested in the industry were presented. Chloride is not only the halide most commonly encountered in environments of industrial relevance but also in most conditions the most aggressive. There is general agreement that the localized corrosion initiation (E_pit) and repassivation potential (E_cr) of stainless steels increase in the following order, Cl⁻ < Br⁻ < I⁻. The intensity of SCC in halide solutions decreases in the same order, which can be understood considering that a necessary condition for SCC is that E_pit > E_cr. A notable exception is that pitting in Br⁻ solutions can be more aggressive than in Cl⁻ solutions, for alloys with a high content of molybdenum. However, it is yet unsolved if high molybdenum stainless steels are more susceptible to SCC in Br⁻ than in Cl⁻ solutions. Detailed knowledge of the effect of alloying elements on Br⁻ localized corrosion and SCC would allow more rationality in the selection of stainless steels for bromide service.

For solubilized stainless steels, SCC was not observed in F⁻ and I⁻ solutions. For F⁻ solutions, this could be related to the pitting and localized corrosion immunity in those solutions. However, a sensitizing heat treatment decreases chromium content at the grain boundary, favoring localized rupture, and intergranular SCC is possible in the presence of stress. Passivity breakdown of stainless steels in iodide solutions would require excessively high potentials, and furthermore, iodides are unstable in the presence of dissolved oxygen, reacting with it to yield iodates and iodine. Hence, several researchers propose that iodides act as inhibitors for SCC of stainless steels in bromides and chlorides.
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