

JOURNAL OF APPLIED ELECTROCHEMISTRY (JACH)

Dear Author(s),

Please find attached the PDF proof of your paper which is to be published in *Journal of Applied Electrochemistry*, a Consent-to-Publish form, and an Offprint Order form. You will not receive a paper proof nor the original manuscript.

NOTE: No article can be further processed without a signed Consent-to-Publish form in the possession of the publisher. Please sign and return this form with your corrected proofs.

This PDF file has been produced automatically; therefore certain details of the page layout may still need to be amended before printing. However, the final product will conform to our usual high standards for page layout and image resolution.

Corrections should be kept to a minimum. Please use the proofs solely for checking the typesetting and editing, as well as the completeness and correctness of the text, tables and figures. Changes to the content of the article as accepted for publication will not be considered at this stage.

These proofs will be read and corrected only by you. Kluwer Academic Publishers will not proofread the paper after it has been returned, and will not assume responsibility for any errors that you have failed to correct in the proofs.

If your article contains colour illustrations and you would like to receive proofs of these illustrations, please contact us at the e-mail address provided below.

Your response, with or without corrections, should reach us within 72 hours of receipt of this material. We ask that you do not make any corrections to the electronic file (PDF), rather, corrections and any other comments should be submitted to KAP in one of the following ways:

Minor corrections (± 10) should be sent as an attachment to an e-mail to: proofscorrection@wkap.nl
Always quote the four-letter journal code and number and the PIPS No. (from your proof) in the subject field of your e-mail!

Extensive corrections must be clearly marked on a printout of the PDF file and should be sent by courier to:

Kluwer Academic Publishers
Manufacturing Department
Van Godewijckstraat 30
P.O. Box 990
3300 AZ Dordrecht
The Netherlands

The uncorrected proofs of your article will be posted under "Forthcoming Articles" on the journal webpage at www.kluweronline.com for a limited period.

Your offprints are not usually available until three weeks after publication of the journal issue, when they are sent out by surface mail. Consequently, it may take 2 to 3 months for offprints to reach authors outside Europe.

OFFPRINT ORDER

123259 / 5146963

Dr M. Vazquez
Universidad Nacional De Mar Del
Plata, INTEMA, Facultad De
Ingenieria
Juan B. Justo 4302
7608 Mar Del Plata
Argentina

RE: **The performance of a migrating...**
by: **MORRIS/VICO/VAZQUEZ**

To be published in:
Journal of Applied Electrochemistry

Dear **Dr Vazquez**

This is to let you know that the above publication has gone into production and will appear in due course. Offprints of your article may be ordered by filling in and returning this form.

I would like to receive

50 offprints free of charge

..... additional offprints without cover (minimum of 50 offprints)

Orders for offprints are only accepted if received with payment or if accompanied by an official purchase order from your institution, failing of which no offprints can be produced. Postage and handling cost are absorbed by the publishers. Payment can be made by credit card, bankdraft personal cheque or international money order. Payment is accepted in any hard currency. Prices of additional offprints and delivery terms are mentioned on the enclosed price list. Make cheques payable to KLUWER ACADEMIC PUBLISHERS – DORDRECHT

I enclose payment to the amount of

Please charge my credit card account

Card no.: Expiry date:

Access Eurocard America Express Bank Americard

Visa Diners club Master Charge

I enclose official purchase order no.

VAT identification number

Date Signature

PLEASE CHECK YOUR ADDRESS AND CORRECT IF NECESSARY



ELECTRONIC REPRINT ORDER FORM

After publication of your journal article, electronic (PDF) reprints may be purchased by arrangement with Kluwer Academic Publishers and Aries Systems Corporation.

The PDF file you will receive will be protected with a copyright system called DocuRights®. Purchasing 50 reprints will enable you to redistribute the PDF file to up to 50 computers. You may distribute your allotted number of PDFs as you wish; for example, you may send it out via e-mail or post it to your website. You will be able to print five (5) copies of your article from each one of the PDF reprints.

Please type or print carefully. Fill out each item completely.

1. Your name: _____
Your e-mail address: _____
Your phone number: _____
Your fax number: _____
2. Journal title (vol, iss, pp): _____
3. Article title: _____
4. Article author(s): _____
5. How many PDF reprints do you want? _____
6. Please refer to the pricing chart below to calculate the cost of your order.

Number of PDF reprints	Cost (in U.S. dollars)
50	\$200
100	\$275
150	\$325
200	\$350

NOTE: Prices shown apply only to orders submitted by individual article authors or editors. Commercial orders must be directed to the Publisher.

All orders must be prepaid. Payments must be made in one of the following forms:

- a check drawn on a U.S. bank
- an international money order
- Visa, MasterCard, or American Express (no other credit cards can be accepted)

Send this form with payment to:

Aries Systems Corporation
200 Sutton Street
North Andover, Massachusetts 01845
Attn.: Electronic Reprints

PAYMENT (type or print carefully):

Amount of check enclosed: _____ (payable to Aries Systems Corporation)

VISA _____

MasterCard _____

American Express _____

Expiration date: _____ Signature: _____

Your PDF reprint file will be sent to the above e-mail address. If you have any questions about your order, or if you need technical support, please contact: support@docurights.com

For subscriptions and to see all of our other products and services, visit the Kluwer website at :
<http://www.kluweronline.com>

CONSENT TO PUBLISH & TRANSFER OF COPYRIGHT

For the mutual benefit and protection of Authors and Publishers it is necessary that Authors provide formal written CONSENT TO PUBLISH and TRANSFER OF COPYRIGHT before publication of the Work.

The signed CONSENT ensures that the Publisher has the Author's permission to publish the relevant Work.

The signed TRANSFER entitles the Publisher on behalf of the Author to protect the Work against unauthorised use and to authorise dissemination of the Work by means of offprints, legitimate photocopies, microform editions, reprints, translations, and secondary information sources such as abstracting and indexing services including data bases

The Publisher hereby requests the Author to complete and return this form promptly to Kluwer Academic Publishers, Manufacturing Department, P.O. Box 990, 3300 AZ Dordrecht, The Netherlands.

Title of Contribution:

The performance of a migrating...

Author(s):

MORRIS/VICO/VAZQUEZ

Name of Journal:

Journal of Applied Electrochemistry

1. The Author hereby assigns to the Publisher the copyright to the Contribution named above whereby the Publisher shall have the exclusive right to publish the said Contribution and translations of it wholly or in part throughout the World during the full term of copyright including renewals and extensions thereafter. These rights include without limitation mechanical, electronic and visual reproduction; electronic storage and retrieval; and all other forms of electronic publication or any other types of publication including all subsidiary rights.
2. The Author retains the right to republish the Contribution in any printed collection consisting solely of the Author's own Works without charge and subject only to notifying the Publisher of the intent to do so and to ensuring that the publication by the Publisher is properly credited and that the relevant copyright notice is repeated verbatim.
3. In the event of receiving any other request to reprint or translate all or part of the Contribution the Publisher shall endeavour to obtain the approval of the Author prior to giving any such permission.
4. The Author guarantees that the Contribution is original, has not been published previously, is not under consideration for publication elsewhere, and that any necessary permission to quote from another source has been obtained. (A copy of such permission should be sent with this form.)
5. The Author declares that any person named as co-author of the Contribution is aware of the fact and has agreed to being so named.

Date

Name

Signature*

* To be signed by the Author, also on behalf of any co-authors, or by the Employer, where appropriate.

For Publisher's use only
Journal Issue

Pages

Ms. Ref. No.
Year

JACH271/02

PIPS No. **5146963**

TERMS OF DELIVERY

1. A minimum of 50 offprints may be ordered. Prices corresponding to the number of pages and quantities ordered are given below.
2. Author for correspondence will receive this offprint order form. This author is therefore also responsible for any orders the co-authors wish to make. All orders for a particular paper should appear together on only one form.
3. Offprints are printed at the same time the book or journal is printed. Thus, no alterations from the exact form in which the article appears in a book or journal are possible. Any orders for offprints that are received after the book or journal is printed should be submitted to the Production Secretariat at the address below.
4. Offprints will be forwarded within a short time after the appearance of the published paper.
5. No additional offprints can be printed or sent unless this order form is filled in, signed, returned with appropriate payment or official purchase order and received before the book or journal goes to press.
6. Any correspondence in connection with offprints must state the name of the periodical, title and offprint order number and name(s) of the author(s). In case of camera-ready publications please inform us as soon as possible, preferably by fax, about the number of offprints you wish to order.
All communications should be sent to Kluwer Academic Publishers, Manufacturing Department, P.O. Box 990, 3300 AZ Dordrecht / Van Godewijckstraat 30, 3311 GX Dordrecht, The Netherlands.
ABN-AMRO Bank, Dordrecht 50.80.13.917, Postal Cheque Account Number 4447384.

Prices of additional offprints are in EUR

Number of copies	Number of pages					
	1-4	5-8	9-12	13-16	17-20	+4
50	108	177	248	318	388	71
100	153	238	323	407	492	85
150	200	300	400	500	599	100
200	246	361	476	591	706	115
250	292	422	551	681	810	130
300	339	483	628	772	917	145
350	385	544	703	863	1022	159
400	431	606	780	955	1129	175
450	478	667	857	1046	1235	189
500	524	728	932	1136	1340	204
+50	+50	+62	+72	+92	+103	+15

Payment will be accepted in any convertible currency. Please check the rate of exchange with your bank.

If ordering from within The Netherlands please add 6% VAT to the price quoted above.

As of January 1st 1993 customers within the EEC must consider the following rules:

- **If you are in possession of a VAT identification number, please fill the VAT number in on the order form. You will not be charged VAT.**
- **If you do *not* have a VAT number, then please add the low VAT rate - applicable to your country - to the prices quoted above.**

PROOF CORRECTION MARKS TO BE USED BY AUTHORS

MARGINAL MARK	MEANING	CORRESPONDING MARK IN TEXT
<i>d</i>	Delete (take out)	/ or ⊥ Cross through
<i>d</i>	Delete and close-up	∩ / ⊕ Above and below matter to be taken out
<i>stat.</i>	Leave as printed (when matter has been crossed out by mistake) Under matter to remain
<i>Capit.</i>	Change to capital letters	≡ Under letters or words altered
<i>l.c.</i>	Change to lower case letters	⊖ Encircle letters altered
<i>bold.</i>	Change to bold type	~ Under matter altered
<i>bold ital.</i>	Change to bold italic type	≡ Under matter altered
<i>ital.</i>	Change to italics	— Under matter altered
<i>rom.</i>	Change to roman type	⊖ Encircle matter altered
X	Replace by similar but undamaged character or remove extraneous marks	⊖ Encircle letter to be altered
γ	Insert (or substitute) superior figure or sign	λ or /
λ	Insert (or substitute) inferior figure or sign	λ or /
⊖	Insert (or substitute) hyphen	λ or /
EN ⊥	Insert (or substitute) dash	λ or /
⊖	Insert (or substitute) solidus	λ or /
...	Insert (or substitute) ellipsis	λ or /
⊖	Close-up—delete space	⊖ Linking words or letters

#	Insert space	or ∟	Between items
<i>equal #</i>	Make spacing equal		Between items
↑	Reduce space	or ↑	Between items
⊖	Insert space between lines or paragraphs		
←	Reduce space between lines or paragraphs		
⊖	Transpose	⊖	Between letters or words, numbered when necessary
⊖	Transpose lines	⊖	
<i>centre</i>	Place in centre of line	⊖ ⊖	Around matter to be centred
⊖	move to the left	⊖	
⊖	move to the right	⊖	
<i>(NP)</i>	Begin a new paragraph	⊖	Before first word of new paragraph
<i>sum on</i>	No fresh paragraph here	⊖	Between paragraphs
λ	(Caret mark.) Insert matter indicated in margin	λ	
γ γ γ γ	Insert single/double quotes	λ λ	

Remarks

To indicate a substitution, simply cross out the letters or words to be replaced, and write the correct letters or words in the margin. It is not necessary, nor even desirable, to use the marks for *delete* and *insert* when making a substitution. If there is more than one substitution in a line, place them in the correct order in the margin, and indicate the end of each correction with an oblique stroke / . Alternatively, continental location marks may be used, but these are to be placed in front of the corrections, not behind as in the case of the oblique stroke.

The typesetter treats *all* letters and words in the margin as insertions or substitutions, so — to avoid misunderstanding — any comments *not* intended to form part of the text should be encircled.

All alterations should be marked clearly so that there is no risk of misunderstanding; long additions or amendments should be typed on separate slips and attached. *Only really essential alterations should be made at proof stage.*

In addition to reading the proofs, please look through your edited manuscript to see if there are any queries from the copy editor, and if so, answer the queries on the proofs.



The performance of a migrating corrosion inhibitor suitable for reinforced concrete

W. MORRIS, A. VICO and M. VÁZQUEZ*

División Corrosión, INTEMA, Facultad de Ingeniería, Universidad Nacional de Mar del Plata, J.B. Justo 4302 B7608FDQ Mar del Plata, Argentina

(*author for correspondence, fax: +54 223 4810046, e-mail: mvazquez@fi.mdp.edu.ar)

Received 19 November 2002; accepted in revised form 24 July 2003

Key words: chloride, corrosion, durability, inhibitors, reinforced concrete

Abstract

The protection provided by a migrating corrosion inhibitor (MCI) based on an alkylaminoalcohol was tested on concrete specimens containing reinforcing steel bar (rebar) segments. Two inhibitor dosages were investigated, together with two water/cement ratios and various chloride contents. The inhibition efficiency was followed over a period of 1000 days measuring electrical and electrochemical parameters such as the corrosion potential, the corrosion current density, the electrical resistance and performing electrochemical impedance spectra. The inhibitor was able to reduce the corrosion rate only when the initial chloride content was below 0.16 wt.% (percent weight relative to cement content). The efficiency increased as the water/cement ratio increased. There was no beneficial effect when the initial chloride content was greater than 0.43 wt.%. The efficiency of the product increased when the amount of inhibitor being applied doubled.

1. Introduction

Among the many procedures that can be used to mitigate the corrosion of reinforcing steel in concrete, protective coatings and sealers, cathodic protection, concrete realkalization and corrosion inhibitors are the most commonly employed.

Over the last years the use of organic inhibitors has increased. Nowadays, this family of products is an alternative to the more commonly employed calcium nitrite-based inhibitors. Organic inhibitors offer protection by adsorbing and forming a protective film on the passive steel surface. The organic molecule usually contains a polar group that adsorbs on the metal and a non-polar, hydrophobic chain oriented perpendicular to this surface. On one hand these chains act by repelling aggressive contaminants dissolved in the pore solution and on the other, forming a tight film (barrier) on the metallic surface. On the basis of XPS measurements, Welle et al. [1] proposed a chemical model for the interaction between steel surfaces and formulations based on dilute solutions of a typical inhibiting agent (*N,N'*-dimethylaminoethanol). The organic molecule is apparently strongly bonded to the steel surface and displaces ionic species from the metal/solution interface hence protecting the surface film from ionic attack.

Corrosion inhibitors in reinforced concrete can be added to the mixing water during the concrete preparation or be applied to the external surface of hardened concrete. In this last case, the inhibiting compound

should diffuse through the concrete cover and reach the steel bar in a sufficiently high concentration to protect steel against corrosion. Those products acting under this principle are referred as migrating corrosion inhibitors (MCI).

The product under investigation is a commercial MCI based on an alkylaminoalcohol designed to protect steel against corrosive attack in reinforced concrete. It will be referred to as 'inhibitor' from here on.

Corrosion inhibitors designed to protect steel in concrete are frequently tested in synthetic pore solutions and in mortars. Studies carried out using concrete samples are scarce. Moreover, the results recently reported for inhibitors tested in the two simulated environments (pore solution and mortars) are somewhat contradictory [2–4]. Elsener et al. [2] studied the performance of an alkylamin-based inhibitor in mortars and in alkaline solutions. In mortars, there is no apparent pitting inhibition or corrosion rate decrease but the initiation of the corrosion process appears to be delayed. The beneficial effect decreases on carbonated mortars. In a recent publication by the same authors [3], the discrepancy between the fast diffusion of the MCI in mortar and the lack of corrosion inhibition was rationalised by the fact that only the diffusion of the volatile phase was measured. Migration of the non-volatile component (carbonic acids) through the solid was not proved and assumed to be slow. Thus, the inefficiency detected in mortars, as compared to solutions, should be related to the inability of the non-



volatile components to reach the metal. In turn, Hope and co-workers [4] assumed that the difference in the inhibitors efficiency tested in concrete or in synthetic pore solutions resulted from the dependence of the inhibition mechanism on chemical reactions within the cement phase.

In this context, the performance of the products in actual concrete structures can be difficult to estimate. So, in an attempt to better represent real service conditions observed on structures constructed on the seacoast of Argentina, the present investigation addresses the performance of a migrating inhibitor evaluating the commercial product under investigation in samples of steel embedded in concrete. Two inhibitor dosages were investigated, together with two water/cement ratios and various chloride contents.

2. Experimental

The complete description of the experimental set up can be found elsewhere [5]. Samples consisted of concrete specimens containing four steel reinforcement bar segments (rebars), as can be seen in Figure 1. The specimens had a cylindrical shape with a diameter of 15 cm and height of 20 cm. Rebars had a diameter of 1 cm and an exposed area of 40 cm². They were placed in such a way that a concrete cover of 1.5 cm was achieved. Two of the four rebar segments in each specimen were coated and the performance of the coatings was analysed in a previous publication [6].

Four different concrete mixes were selected for this study. There were two types of concrete, a *standard quality* one prepared with a water/cement ratio (w/c) of 0.60 and a cement content of 300 kg m⁻³, and a *good quality* concrete prepared with w/c = 0.40 and a cement

content of 400 kg m⁻³ were tested. Three different chloride contents were chosen in order to evaluate the influence of admixed chlorides on the inhibitor efficiency. This aspect was of great interest taking into account that in many coastal cities of Argentina concrete structures were built using sea sand as a fine aggregate. A concrete sample with no admixed chlorides was also prepared to be used as reference.

The compositions of the different concrete mixes are presented in Table 1. The initial chloride concentration in the concrete mixes ($[Cl^-]_0$) was determined following the ASTM C1152 standard. Chloride concentration profiles resulting from exposure to the marine environment can be found in a previous publication [7].

A total of 24 specimens were prepared, six specimens per each concrete mix (A, B, C and D, see Table 1). They were demolded 24 h after casting and were kept in a laboratory environment (20 °C, 65% RH) for the following 6 days. Seven days after demolding, two different amounts of inhibitor were applied averaging 480 ± 10 and 830 ± 10 g m⁻² (later on referred to as 400 and 800 g m⁻², respectively). The lower dose is the one recommended by the manufacturer. The six specimens prepared with each concrete mix were treated as follows: two were impregnated with 400 g m⁻² of inhibitor (labelled MI4, where M represents the mix composition, A, B, C or D), two with 800 g m⁻² (labelled MI8, where M represents the mix composition, A, B, C or D) and another two specimens were left as blanks with no inhibitor being applied. The product was applied on the external surface of hardened concrete following the manufacturer recommendations. The presence of the corrosion inhibitor at the rebar surface in a sufficient concentration was confirmed by analyses based on a colorimetric method proposed by the inhibitor's manufacturer.




Fig. 1. Schematic representation of the cylindrical concrete test sample used in the study.

Table 1. Mix design composition

Mix design identification	A	B	C	D
Cement content/kg m ⁻³	300	400	300	300
Water/l	180	160	180	180
Fine Aggregate (FA)				
River sand/kg	–	–	851	858
Sea sand/kg	858	789	–	–
River rock MAS = 10 mm/kg	1003	1042	1003	1003
Sodium chloride/kg	–	–	7.4	–
Superplasticizer/%	1.0	2.5	–	–
Water/cement ratio	0.60	0.40	0.60	0.60
Fine aggregate/total aggregate	0.46	0.43	0.46	0.46
% Cl ⁻ /wt. cement	0.78	0.43	1.60	0.16
Slump test/cm	3.0	3.0	6.5	8.0

The samples were kept for 90 days in an indoors environment. The specimens were then exposed to a so-called ‘seashore’ environment, located at approximately 100 m from the coastal line. Samples were directly exposed to rainfall, sea spray and wind. The environmental conditions in the city of Mar del Plata, Argentina (lat. S:37.56, long. W:57.35), are characterized by temperatures ranging from 14 to 27 °C during the summer and 3–13 °C during winter with an average monthly rainfall of 90 mm.

The corrosion progress was monitored over 1000 days following the variations of the main electrochemical parameters: the corrosion potential E_{corr} , the electrical resistance R , and the polarization resistance, R_p . This last parameter was used to estimate the rebar corrosion rate, CR.

The corrosion potential was measured using a high impedance voltmeter (HP E2378A) against a standard Cu/CuSO₄ saturated reference electrode (CSE). The electrical resistance (R_s) was measured between the two uncoated rebar segments using a Nilsson 400 soil resistivity meter. This instrument uses a square wave of 97 Hz, preventing polarization of the electrodes. The electrical resistivity of concrete (ρ) was calculated as $\rho = kR_s$, where $k = 7.5$ [8]. Polarization resistance (R_p) was evaluated as $\Delta V/\Delta i$, from potential sweeps up to ± 0.01 V from E_{corr} at a scan rate of 10^{-4} V s⁻¹. Experiments were performed using a CMS100 from Gamry Instruments Inc. potentiostat. A rebar segment was used as counter electrode and a CSE employed as reference electrode. The results were corrected to compensate the IR drop error.

Electrochemical impedance spectroscopy (EIS) tests were performed on all specimens treated with the inhibitor after approximately 800 days of exposure to the marine environment. The experimental set up was the same one used for the polarization resistance measurements. The a.c. signal had an amplitude of ± 0.01 V and the frequency was varied between 100 kHz and 0.1 mHz. Experiments were performed using a EIS900 unit from Gamry Instruments Inc. The analysis was performed with equivalent circuits using the Gamry software. Figure 2 shows the components involved on the equivalent circuit [9, 10]. Investigations performed in




Fig. 2. Equivalent circuit proposed for modeling the electrochemical impedance response observed in the rebar segments embedded in concrete.

this field have suggested that a layer of precipitated Ca(OH)₂ covers the rebar surface providing an extra protection of steel from corrosion [11]. This film introduces a capacitance to the system that is identified as C_f in parallel with resistor R_f . C_h and R_h refer to the capacitor and resistor associated to concrete. Figure 3 shows the Nyquist diagram that could be expected from an EIS test performed on a concrete specimens.




Fig. 3. Representation of a typical Nyquist diagram obtained for steel in concrete.

3. Results and discussion

Figure 4a and b present the variation of the rebar corrosion potential in time for the specimens (blank and treated with 400 g m^{-2} of inhibitor). Each value corresponds to the average of data read from four different rebars in two different concrete samples of the same composition. Dashed lines represent the threshold values commonly accepted to differentiate between active and passive rebar corrosion. E_{corr} values more positive than -0.2 V vs CSE are generally representative of passive steel. E_{corr} values more negative than -0.35 V vs CSE are usually considered typical of rebars undergoing active corrosion [12]. The blank and the treated specimens showed no significant difference between the rebar corrosion potential trends obtained on each of the three mixes containing admixed chlorides (A, B and C). The difference in the rebar corrosion potential trend of mix D ($w/c = 0.6$ and no admixed chlorides) became evident after approximately 400 days of exposure. After this period of time, the E_{corr} values of the blank specimens start shifting negatively, probably due to the increase in chloride concentration at the rebar surface coming from the environment [7]. On the other hand, the rebar corrosion potential values of the equivalent treated specimens increase with time, reaching values characteristic of passive steel. Therefore, even when blank (D) and treated (DI4) specimens present similar chloride concentrations at the rebar surface, the pres-

ence of the inhibitor in mix DI4 seems to maintain the passive state of steel. The application of a higher amount of inhibitor showed no significant difference in the corrosion potential values.

Figure 5a and b present the variation in the resistivity for the blank and the specimens treated with 400 g m^{-2} of inhibitor respectively. After approximately 1000 days exposure to the seashore condition the treated specimens (DI4, $w/c = 0.6$, no admixed chlorides) give ρ values that are almost twice the corresponding values measured on the blank specimens. Preliminary investigations based on EIS indicate that both the increase in the electrical resistivity of the concrete and the presence of a protective layer on the rebar surface are responsible for the good performance of the inhibitor, when applied on concrete with no admixed chlorides (see below). A correspondence between ρ and Cl^- content in each mix was observed only on the treated specimens AI, CI and DI ($w/c = 0.6$). The resistivity increased as the chloride concentration in these mixes decreased.

Figure 6 presents a comparison of the resistivity (ρ) of concrete measured on the blank and treated specimens (400 and 800 g m^{-2}) corresponding to 180 and 360 days of exposure. The application of 400 g m^{-2} of inhibitor has little effect, both in time for the same concrete mix, and also when comparing blank and treated specimens. However, it is clear that the electrical resistivity of concrete increased (almost doubled) with time in all the samples treated with 800 g m^{-2} .




Fig. 4. Variation of the rebar corrosion potential (E_{corr}) in time. The vertical line at 90 days indicates the time of exposure to the marine environment. (a) Blank specimens (○) A, (■) B, (◇) C, (▲) D; (b) specimens treated with 400 g m^{-2} of inhibitor (○) AI4, (■) BI4, (◇) CI4, (▲) DI4.




Fig. 5. Variation of concrete resistivity (ρ) with time. The vertical line at 90 days indicates the time of exposure to the marine environment. (a) Blank specimens (○) A, (■) B, (◇) C, (▲) D; (b) specimens treated with 400 g m^{-2} of inhibitor (○) AI4, (■) BI4, (◇) CI4, (▲) DI4.




Fig. 6. Values of electrical resistivity of concrete measured on blank and treated with the inhibitor (400 and 800 g m^{-2} after 180 and 360 days of exposure to the marine environment).

Figure 7a and b present the rebar corrosion rate (CR) trends for the blank and specimens treated with 400 g m^{-2} of inhibitor exposed to marine environment. No significant difference was observed between the CR values measured on blank and treated specimens prepared with admixed chlorides (compare A, B and C to AI4, BI4 and CI4). As expected, the rebar corrosion rate of both blank and treated specimens increased as the initial chloride content in these mixes increased. In samples with no admixed chlorides and $w/c = 0.6$, the treated specimens (DI4) gave CR values that were almost one order of magnitude lower than those measured on the blank specimens (D). Even accepting

some dispersion in the measured CR values, the decrease is significant. Only in the case of the DI4 specimens was it found that the measured CR fell clearly below $1 \mu\text{m year}^{-1}$, corresponding to rebars in the passive state.

Figure 8 compares the CR values measured on the blank and the treated specimens (400 and 800 g m^{-2}) corresponding to approximately 180 and 360 days of exposure to the marine environment. As presented above, the application of 400 g m^{-2} of inhibitor reduced the rebar corrosion rate only on specimens DI4. This effect was also observed on mixes CI8 ($w/c = 0.6$, FA = river sand with 1.5% admixed chlorides) and in a less extent on mix AI8 ($w/c = 0.6$, FA = sea sand) when the dosage of the product was doubled. Finally, the application of the corrosion inhibitor had no favorable effect on mix B ($w/c = 0.4$, FA = sea sand).

The results show that in the lower dose the inhibitor was only effective when applied on concrete with no admixed chlorides (initial $[\text{Cl}^-] = 0.16\%$), having no beneficial effects in those mixes prepared with initial chloride contents higher than 0.43% by weight of cement. However, it should be taken into account that the chloride content at the rebar surface in samples D can increase up to 1% after 1000 days of exposure to the marine environment [7]. In concrete mixes prepared with high w/c ratios, the performance of the inhibitor improved as the amount of the product is increased by a factor of two.




Fig. 7. Evolution of the rebar corrosion rate (CR) in time. (a) The blank specimens; (b) specimens treated with 400 g m^{-2} of inhibitor. All the specimens were exposed to the seashore environment at day 90.

Figures 9–11 present the Nyquist diagrams obtained for EIS tests on the rebar segments of the D, DI4 and DI8 specimens after 850 days of exposure. The plot




Fig. 8. Rebar corrosion rate (CR) values measured on the blank and treated with the inhibitor (400 and 800 g m^{-2}) after approximately 180 and 360 days of exposure to the marine environment.




Fig. 9. Nyquist diagram corresponding to the rebar segment of specimen D (blank) after 850 days of exposure to the marine environment. Frequency range: 100 kHz to 0.01 Hz.

scales were adjusted in order to view the region of the curves where the time constant associated with any film or layer present on the rebar surface may be identified. Each plot presents the experimental and modelled data points. The values of R_s (concrete resistance), R_f (film resistance) and R_p (polarization resistance) were determined from these plots. These values are presented in Table 2 for the blank, treated with 400 g m^{-2} and with 800 g m^{-2} inhibitor specimens (D, DI4 and DI8, respectively).

Specimens DI4 and DI8 gave R_s values twice as high as that measured on the blank specimen. As R_s is proportional to the resistivity of concrete, the application of the inhibitor seems to increase the value of ρ , in good agreement with the results presented in Figure 6 for long exposure times.

One of the most important observations is that the film resistance R_f increases as the amount of inhibitor applied on the concrete surface increases. This behavior indicates that, in mix design D, the inhibitor improves




Fig. 10. Nyquist diagram corresponding to the rebar segment of specimen DI (400 g m^{-2} inhibitor) after 850 days of exposure to the marine environment. Frequency range: 100 kHz to 0.01 Hz.




Fig. 11. Nyquist diagram obtained corresponding to the rebar segment of specimen DI (800 g m^{-2} inhibitor) after 850 days of exposure to the marine environment. Frequency range: 100 kHz to 0.01 Hz.

Table 2. Values of R_s (concrete resistance), R_f (film resistance) and R_p (polarization resistance) obtained from the EIS measurements performed after 850 days of exposure to the marine environment (see Figures 10–12)

Specimen	R_s / Ω	R_f / Ω	R_p / Ω
D	1245	40	14 000
DI4	3670	150	35 000
DI8	3650	200	50 000

the formation of a protective film on the rebar surface. Finally, the highest values of R_p , and therefore the lowest rebar corrosion rate, are observed on specimens treated with 800 g m^{-2} inhibitor followed by specimens treated with 400 g m^{-2} (see Table 2). This observation agrees with the results shown above where the lowest rebar corrosion rates were observed on the specimens treated with 800 g m^{-2} followed by those treated with 400 g m^{-2} and finally the blank specimens (see Figure 8).

4. Conclusions

The efficiency of the corrosion inhibitor depends on the initial chloride concentration in the concrete ($[\text{Cl}^-]_0$). The product helps to decrease the rebar corrosion rate in concrete that presents values of $[\text{Cl}^-]_0$ lower than 0.43% (by weight) with respect to the cement content.

The performance of the corrosion inhibitor depends on the quality of concrete, being more effective on concrete mixes prepared with high water to cement ratios. As the penetration of the product takes place within the gaseous phase of the concrete pores, the higher the porosity, the easier the product penetrates the concrete cover.

The efficiency of the product increases with the application of higher doses. The application of 400 g m^{-2} showed positive effects (reduction of rebar corrosion rate) only in concrete mix D which was prepared with river sand, no admixed chlorides and $w/c = 0.6$. On the other hand, the application of 800 g m^{-2} showed positive effects on all the concrete mixes examined with the exception of mix B, prepared with $w/c = 0.4$.

On the basis of EIS results, the rebar corrosion rate reduction observed on the specimens treated with inhibitor could be attributed to the consolidation of the protective passive film that naturally appears on the steel surface in contact with concrete having high alkalinity and no chlorides.

References

1. J.D. Welle, K. Liao, M. Kaiser, U. Grunze, ■. Mader and N. Blank, *Appl. Surf. Sci.* **119** (1997) 185.
2. B. Elsener, M. Buchler, F. Stalder and H. Bohni, *Corrosion* **55** (1999) 1155.
3. B. Elsener, M. Buchler, F. Stalder and H. Bohni, *Corrosion* **56** (2000) 727.
4. L. Mammoliti, C.M. Hansson and B.B. Hope, *Cement Concrete Res.* **29** (1999) 1583.
5. W. Morris and M. Vázquez, *Cement Concrete Res.* **32** (2002) 259.
6. W. Morris, M. Vázquez and S. Rosso, *J. Mater. Sci.* **35** (2000) 1885.
7. W. Morris, A. Vico, M. Vázquez and S.R. de Sanchez, *Corros. Sci.* **44** (2002) 81–99.
8. W. Morris, A. Sagues and E. Moreno, *Cement Concrete Res.* **26** (1996) 1779.
9. L. Lemoine, F. Wenger and J. Galland, in N.S. Backer, V. Chaker and D. Witinj (Eds), 'Corrosion Rates of Steel in Concrete', ASTM STP 1065, (ASTM, Philadelphia, 1990), p. 118.
10. D.G. John and P.C. Searson, and J.L. Dawson, *Br. Corros. J.* **16** (1981) 102.
11. C.L. Page, *Nature* **258** (1975) 5335.
12. ASTM C 876, 'Standard Test Method for Half-Cell Potential for Uncoated Reinforcing Steel in Concrete' (American Society of Testing and Materials, Philadelphia, 1987).