

Optimization of EDM parameters for Maximum Removal Rate(MRR) on D3 Die Steel Using Factorial Design

Dr. Jinesh Kumar Jain* Deepak Saini**

*Associate Professor, DME, Govt. Engg. College, Ajmer

**Research Scholar, DME, Govt. Engg. College, Ajmer

Abstract:

The electrical discharge machining (EDM), is one of the processing based on non-traditional manufacturing procedures, is gaining increased popularity, since it does not require cutting tools and allows machining involving hard, brittle, thin and complex geometry. Electrical discharge machining (EDM) is one of the earliest non-traditional machining processes. EDM process is based on thermoelectric energy between the work piece and an electrode. Material removal rate (MRR) is an important performance measure in EDM process. Since long, EDM researchers have explored a number of ways to improve and optimize the MRR including some unique experimental concepts that depart from the traditional EDM sparking phenomenon. The quality of the machined work piece is greatly influenced by the cutting conditions. In order to produce parts with the desired surface finish using EDM, EDM parameters should be selected properly.

Keywords: EDM, parameters, MRR, dielectric, powder, variations.

1. INTRODUCTION:

In the manufacturing industries, various machining processes are adopted for removing the material from the work piece to obtain finished product. Due to demands for alloy materials having high hardness, toughness and impact in aerospace and automotive industries, electrical discharge machining (WEDM) technology has grown tremendously. The EDM provides the best alternative or sometimes the only alternative for machining conductive, exotic, high strength and temperature resistive materials, conductive engineering ceramics with the scope of generating intricate shapes and profiles with high dimensional accuracy and good surface finish.

Electric discharge machining (EDM) is a non-traditional machining where material removal takes place by electro thermal process. In which heat is produced by electric spark & then melting and vaporization of tiny particles of work- specimen occurs due to thermal energy. EDM is possible only to electrically conductive material. It is mainly used for hard and high strength material with simple as well as complex geometry with high precision, accuracy & finish in small batches or job shop basis.

2. WORKING PRINCIPLE OF EDM

EDM is electro- thermal machining in which material is removed by erosion with rapid recurring type spark produced between tools & works which results in melting & vaporization of small particles of specimen. In this process a gap of about 0.025 mm is kept between work-piece & tool using servo mechanism. Both tool & work-

specimen are submersed in dielectric fluid which is generally EDM oil / kerosene /deionised water.

Tool is made of anode & work-piece is made of cathode & proper gap is maintained. When the voltage across the gap becomes high enough, it discharges spark through the gap. Spark is produced in the pulse duration $T_{on}=2-2000$ micro second range and during the off time and which results in acceleration of the positive ions and electrons producing a conductive discharge channel. A sudden drop of electric resistance increases current density and creates powerful magnetic field due to increase in ionization. As the spark occurs, sufficient pressure is developed between tool & work, result in high pressure and temperature that removes metal by melting and erosion. This cycle goes on working time and then electrode is raised up for lift time T for good flushing. The parameters which have to be controlled are gap voltage (v), peak current (I_p), pulse duration (T_{ON}).




Figure 1: Working principle of EDM




Figure 2: Schematic view of discharge gap

Important parameters of EDM

1) Spark On-time (Pulse time or Ton): The duration of time (μs) the current is allowed to flow per cycle. Material removal is directly proportional to the amount of energy applied during this on-time. This energy is really controlled by the peak current and the length of the on-time.

2) Spark Off-time (Pause time or T off): The duration of time (μs) between the sparks (that is to say, on-time). This time allows the molten material to solidify and to be wash out of the arc gap. This parameter is to affect the speed and the stability of the cut. Thus, if the off-time is too short, it will cause sparks to be unstable.

3) Arc Gap (or gap): The Arc gap is distance between the electrode and work piece during the process of EDM. It may be called as spark gap. Spark gap can be maintained by servo system

4) Discharge Current (Current Ip): Current is measured in amp Allowed to per cycle. Discharge current is directly proportional to the Material removal rate.

5) Duty Cycle (τ): It is a percentage of the on-time relative to the total cycle time. This parameter is calculated by dividing the on-time by the total cycle time (on-time pulse off-time).

$$\tau = (\text{Pulse on time} / \text{Pulse off time} + \text{Pulse on time}).$$

6) Voltage (V): It is a potential that can be measure by volt it is also effect to the material removal rate and allowed to per cycle.

7) Over Cut: It is a clearance per side between the

3. DESIGN FACTORS & THEIR RANGE

Table 3.1: Input parameters and their range

S.N.	Input parameters	unit	Range
1	Pulse on-time(T_{on})	Micro second	6-200 μs
2	Pulse off-time(T_{off})	Micro second	12-100 μs

3.1 Experimental Procedure

- Initially, we had the work-piece AISI-D3 die steel of size 160*50*15mm³.
- Then, the piece was grinded from top & bottom to get finish surface of the work-piece so that we could perform electric discharge machining in proper way.
- The purpose was to drill the hole of diameter 12mm and up to 8mm depth.
- That was performed using Cu electrode of 12mm diameter and kerosene was taken as a dielectric fluid to drill the hole on to the work-piece by EDM process.
- For this, tool was hold in the tool holder and work-piece was supported on table.
- Then, feed was given to the electrode to drill the hole of required size on to the work-piece.
- Total 20 runs were performed at different level of factors according to design matrix made by Design Expert software.
- For each of the treatment, time to drill the hole was noted and then MRR (material removal rate) was calculated using the formula required.

3.2 EVALUATION OF MRR:

- MRR = (volume of the material removed / time taken in minute) mm³/min
- MRR = (Area of hole * depth of hole) / time taken
- In our case
- Hole diameter =12mm, depth = 8mm
- So, volume = $(\pi/4) * d^2 * l = (\pi/4) * 12^2 * 8 \text{ mm}^3$

3.3 DESIGN MATRIX

Table 3.2: Design matrix for material removal rate (MRR)

Std	C:Pulse on (Microsecond)	D:Pulse off (Microsecond)	MRR (mm ³ /sec)
1	6	12	47.25
2	6	12	45.16
3	6	12	55.39
4	6	12	51.62
5	200	12	68.27
6	200	12	63.72
7	200	12	72.24
8	200	12	67.83
9	6	100	37.51
10	6	100	33.36
11	6	100	43.96
12	6	100	39.98
13	200	100	53.45
14	200	100	49.12
15	200	100	57.22
16	200	100	52.87
17	103	56	50.23
18	103	56	50.87
19	103	56	50.67
20	103	56	49.32

4. ANOVA FOR METAL REMOVAL RATE PREDICTION MODEL

4.1 Diagnosis of assumptions of ANOVA




Fig. 4.1 Normal probability plot of residuals

To check the assumption of normal distribution, the normal probability plot of the residuals is shown in fig.4.1. The figure displays that the residuals generally fall

on a straight line implying that the errors are distributed normally

The fig.4.2 represents residuals versus the predicted response plot for surface roughness. The figure shows that there is no obvious pattern and it shows unusual structure. This implies that there is no reason to suspect any violation of the independence or constant variance assumption.




Fig. 4.2 Plot of residuals v/s predicted response




Fig. 4.3 Plot of predicted v/s actual response

A graph of the actual response values versus the predicted response values is shown in fig.4.3 The figure reveals that all the data points split evenly by the 45 degree line.

4.2 ANOVA analysis and development of metal removal rate prediction model

The ANOVA test for response surface model for metal removal rate is summarized in Table 4.2. This analysis was carried out for a significance level of $\alpha = 0.05$, i.e. for a confidence level of 95%.

Table 4.2 Resulting ANOVA table for metal removal rate

Source	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F-Value	p-value Prob > F
Model	1754.03	3	584.68	400.45	0.0001
C-Pulse on (Microseconds)	1064.23	1	1064.23	731.38	0.0001
D-Pulse off (Microseconds)	676.13	1	676.13	464.67	0.0001
CD	13.67	1	13.67	9.40	0.0090
Residual	18.92	16	1.46		
Lack of Fit	17.49	13	1.75	3.68	0.1553
Pure Error	1.42	3	0.47		
Core Total	1772.95	19			
Std. Dev.	1.206			R-Squared	0.9904
Mean	46.860			Adj R-Squared	0.9859
C.V. %	2.320			Pred R-Squared	0.9839
PRESS	31.553			Adeq Precision	54.1941

Table shows that the value of “Prob. > F” for model is 0.0001 which is less than 0.05, that indicates the model is significant. In the same manner, the value of “Prob. > F” for main effect of Pulse on, Pulse off and two-level interaction of current and Pulse on, Pulse off and Pulse off are less than 0.05 so these terms are significant model terms.

The value of “Prob. > F” for lack-of-fit is 0.1553 which is greater than 0.05 and it indicates the insignificant lack of fit.

The R² value is equal to 0.99 or close to 1, which is desirable. The adjusted R² value is equal to 0.986. The result shows that the adjusted R² value is very close to the ordinary R² value. Adequate precision value is equal to 54.1941.

The regression model for metal removal rate in terms of coded factors is shown as follows:

$$(MRR) = 8.16 * C - 6.5 * D - 0.92 * C * D \quad (4.3)$$

While, the following equation is the empirical model in terms of actual factors

$$(MRR) = 0.108 * Pulse\ on - 0.125 * Pulse\ off - 0.00021 * Pulse\ on * Pulse\ off$$

(4.4)

5. CONTRIBUTION OF EDM PARAMETERS ON METALREMOVAL RATE

The fig.5.1 shows the half normal plot, the extreme right side factor has the highest effect on the response, however as the dots corresponding to the particular

factor comes nearer and nearer to the line, it shows these value affects the least.




Fig.5.1: A half normal plot shows the effectiveness of the factors

The value at the right extreme has the strongest effect on the metal removal rate and keeps on decreasing as it comes nearer and nearer to the line. It can also be understood in the fig 5.2, which shows the of effectiveness rank wise. The graph is between t-value and rank of factors.




Fig.5.2: Graph between t-value and rank

The t-value here denotes the effectiveness of the factor. As it can be seen from the figure, that the most effective factor is C, followed by D, combination of C & D.

6. EFFECT OF EDM PARAMETERS ON METAL REMOVAL RATE

6.1 Effect of pulse on time on metal removal rate

Influence of pulse on time on metal removal rate at constant pulse off time (56 microseconds) is shown in fig. 6.1 It is clear from the plot that as the pulse on time increases from 6 microseconds to 200 microseconds, the value of metal removal rate also increases. The metal removal rate is most affected by the amount of discharge energy which increases with increase in pulse on-time. Furthermore, greater discharge energy will produce a larger crater, causing a high metal removal rate.




Fig. 6.1 Plot between pulse on and surface roughness at voltage (37.50 Volts), current (15.5 A) and pulse off time (56 microseconds)

6.2 Effect of pulse off time on metal removal rate




Fig.6.2 Plot between pulse on and metal removal rate at voltage (37.50 Volts), current (15.5 A) and pulse on time (103 microseconds)

Influence of pulse off time on metal removal rate at constant voltage (37.50 Volts), constant current (15.5 A) and constant pulse on time (103 microseconds) is shown in fig.6.2. The amount of discharge energy decreases with increase in pulse off-time. Further as the discharge energy decrease, the metal removal rate also decreases.

6.3 Interaction effect of pulse off and pulse on time on metal removal rate

The interaction between pulse off time and pulse on time on the MRR at constant voltage 37.5 V and constant current 15.5 A is shown in fig 6.3.




Fig.6.3 Interaction plot between pulse off time and pulse on time on the MRR

The black line shows the graph between pulse on and MRR at constant pulse off time 12 microseconds while

red line shows the graph between pulse on and MRR at constant pulse off time 100 microseconds. From the interaction plot it is clear that as the pulse on time increases the MRR also increases at both pulse off time. It is also visible that for every value of pulse on time, the MRR is higher at low value of pulse off time as compare to high value of pulse off time.

7. OPTIMIZATION OF EDM PARAMETERS FOR MAXIMUM METAL REMOVAL RATE

In the present study, the aim is to obtain the optimal values of EDM parameters in order to minimize the value of weight loss of AISI D2 steel pins. The constraints used during the optimization process are summarized in Table 3.1. The optimal solutions are reported in Table 3.2.

Table 7.1 Constraints for optimization of EDM parameters

Condition	Units	Goal	Lower limit	Upper limit
C:Pulse on	Microseconds	Is in range	6	200
D:Pulse off	Microseconds	Is in range	12	100
MRR	mm ³ /sec	Maximize	33.36	72.24

Table 7.2 Optimization results for MRR

Solution No.	C:Pulse on (Microseconds)	D:Pulse off (Microseconds)	MRR (mm ³ /sec)	Desirability	Remarks
1	200	12	71.51	1	Selected

8. CONCLUSION

The important conclusions drawn from the present work are summarized as follows:

- 1.) The two relationships between MRR and EDM parameters have been developed. The predicted results are in good agreement with the measured ones. These relationships are applicable within the ranges of tested parameters.
- 2.) All the two independent parameters (Pulse on time and Pulse off time) seem to be the influential EDM parameters.
- 3.) The MRR prediction model developed clearly shows that the pulse on seems to be the most significant factor.
- 4.) MRR increases as increase in pulse on time, increase but decreases as increase in pulse off time.
- 5.) The maximum MRR has been observed to be 71.51 mm³/sec, pulse on time = 200 microseconds and pulse off time = 12 microseconds.

In this study mathematical modeling and optimization has been attempted only for two response variable. The work can be extended to consider more response variables. Also more parameters such as temperature, shape of electrode, type of fluids can be introduced to have a better insight into the process.

REFERENCES

1. Hang –Ming Chow, Biing-Hwa Yan, Fuang-Yuan Huang, Jung-Cherng Hung: Study Of Added Powder In Kerosene For The Micro-Slit Machining Using EDM On Titanium Alloy; Journal of Material Processing Technology 101(2000) 95-103.
2. Ozlem salman, M. Cengiz Kayacan: Evolatory Programming Method For Modeling The EDM Parameters For Roughness; Journal of material processing technology 200(2008) 347-355.
3. H.K.Kansal, Sehijpal Singh, Pradeep Kumar: Effect Of Silicon Powder Mixed EDM On Machining Rate Of AISI D2 Die Steel; Journal of manufacturing process vol.9/NO.1 2007.
4. Hang Ming Chow, Lieh-Dai Yang, Chien-Tien Lin, Yuan-Feng Chen: The Use Of Sic Powder In Water As Dielectric For Micro-Slit EDM Machining; Journal of material processing technology 195(2008) 160-170.
5. W.S.Jhao, Q.G.Meng, Z.L.Wang: The Application Of Research On Powder Mixed EDM In Rough Machining; Journal of material processing technology 129 (2002) 30-33.
6. Y.S.Wong, L.C.Lim, Iqbal Rahman, W.M.Tee: Near Mirror Finish Phenomenon In EDM Using Powder Mixed Dielectric Fluid; Journal of material processing technology 79(1998) 30-40.

7. Sameh S.Habib: Study Of Parameters In Electrical Discharge Machining Through RSM Approach; Applied mathematical modeling 33(2009) 4397-4407.
8. S.Assarzadeh, M.Ghoreisni: Stastical Modeling And Optimization Of Process Parameters In EDM Of Cobalt Bonded Tungsten Carbide Composite (WC/6%Co); Procedia CIRP 6(2013) 463-468.
9. Singaram Laxman, Mahesh Kumar; Optimization Of Process Parameters Using Response Surface Methodology For EN31 Tool Steel Machining; International Journal of Engineering science and Innovative Technology (IJESIT) volume 2, Issue 5, September (2013).
10. Md.Ashikur Rehman Khan, M.M.Rahman, Kadirgama, M.A.Maleque and M. Ishak; Prediction Of Surface Roughness Of Ti-6Al-4V In EDM; Journal of Mechanical Engineering and Sciences (JMES) e-ISSN: 2331-8380; Volume1, P.P. 16-24 (Dec.2011).
11. K.D. Chattopadhyay, S.Verma, P.S. Satsangi and P.C.Sharma; "Development Of Empirical Model For Different Process Parameters During Rotary Electric Discharge Machining Of Copper-Steel (EN-8)System"; Journal of Material Processing Technology 209 (2009) 1454-1465.
12. Hsien-Ching Chen, Jen Chang Lin, Yung Kuang Yang & Chih Hung Tsai; "Optimization Of Wire Electric Discharge Machining For Pure Tungsten Using A Neural Network Integrated Simulation Annealing Approach"; Expert systems with applications 37(2010) 7147-7153.
13. Ojlem salman and M. Cengiz Kayacan; "Evolutionary Programming Method For Modelling The EDM Parameters For Roughness"; Journal of Material Processing Technology 200 (2008) 347-355.
14. Kannachai kanlayasiri and Prajak Jattacul; "Simultaneous Optimization Of Dimensional Accuracy And Surface Roughness For Finishing Cut Of Wire-Edmed K460 Tool Steel"; Precision Engineering 37 (2013) 556-561.
15. Sourabh K. Saha and S.K. Choudhary; "Experimental Investigation And Empirical Modelling Of The Dry Electric Discharge Machining Process"; International journal of Machine Tools & Manufacture 49 (2009) 297-308