# Experimental Investigations into Powder-Mixed Electrical Discharge Machining (PMEDM) of HCHCr D2 Die Steel 

R. Shinde ${ }^{1}$, N. Patil ${ }^{\mathbf{}^{*}}$, D.Raut ${ }^{3}$, R. Pawade ${ }^{4}$, P. Brahmankar ${ }^{5}$<br>${ }^{1}$ Assistant Professor, Deogiri Institute of Engineering \& Management Studies, Aurangabad, India<br>${ }^{2}$ Professor,Marathwada Institute of Technology, Aurangabad, India<br>${ }^{3}$ Professor,Veermata Jijabai Technological Institute, Mumbai (M.S.), India<br>${ }^{4}$ Associate Professor, ${ }^{5}$ Professor, Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Technological University, Lonere, India \{nilesh.patil@mit.asia\}


#### Abstract

The purpose of this paper is to present an experimental work attempting to model and optimize the influencing process parameters involved in powder-mixed electrical discharge machining (PMEDM). Looking at available literature it is observed that a lot of work can be done in the field of electric discharge machining related to surface integrity. In this work Aluminum, Silicon and Silicon Carbide fine abrasive powders with particle concentration of $2 \mathrm{gm} / 1$ and size of $44 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ were added into the SEO25 (spark erosion oil) dielectric liquid of electrical discharge machine. The experiments were carried out on experimental set up developed in laboratory. HCHCr D2 die steel and copper was used as work piece and tool electrode materials, respectively. Response surface methodology (RSM), employing a face-centered central composite design for three design variables such as peak current (Ip), pulse on-time (Ton), and powder material was used to assess the process performance. Suitable mathematical models for the response outputs were obtained.
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## 1 Introduction

Amongst the non-traditional machining processes, electrical discharge machining (EDM) finding increased applications in tool and dies making industry because of its ability to produce geometrically complex shapes and capability to machine extremely harder, electrically conductive materials. Still, the disadvantages like high time consuming machining process and poor surface finish limits its use in the industry. Researchers have been trying to explore the different ways to improve the EDM process since long time and Powder Mixed Electrical Discharge Machining (PMEDM) is one of such attempt to enhance process capabilities to overcome the disadvantages.

PMEDM has a different machining mechanism from the conventional EDM [1]. The electric field is created by applying voltage between two electrodes. The desired powder is suspended into dielectric fluid. The spark gap is filled up with these additive particles resulting increased gap distance between tool and the workpiece from 2550 to $50-150 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ [2-4]. Energized powder particles in the spark gap are accelerated by the electric field and act like conductors forming chains which bridge the gap between the tool electrode and the workpiece leading to an early explosion helps enhancing the ignition process causing faster erosion from the work piece surface [3].

### 1.1Background

It has been reported by many researchers in recent studies that addition of powder particles such as $\mathrm{Al}, \mathrm{Si}, \mathrm{C}$, $\mathrm{SiC}, \mathrm{Al}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}, \mathrm{Ni}, \mathrm{Ti}, \mathrm{Cr}$ and Cu powders (size smaller than $100 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ ) significantly affects the performance of EDM process [5]. Tzeng and Chen used aluminium, chromium, copper, and silicon carbide powders for machining SKD-11 and found that the best surface finish was obtained with smallest particles size i.e, $(70-80 \mu \mathrm{~m})$ [6]. Kung and Chaing reported that MRR increases, while TWR decreases with increase in powder concentration. Both MRR and TWR apparently increase with increase in pulse on time and discharge current.
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The experiments were performed using Al powder suspended in mineral oil as dielectric with $94 \mathrm{WC}-6 \mathrm{Co}$ work material and copper as tool electrode [7]. Amandeep Singh presented a review on recent advancement in EDM.
He concluded that additive powder in electrolyte can lead to increase in MRR and decreased TWR [8]. Based on the literature the most promising results were found with $\mathrm{Al}, \mathrm{Si}$ and SiC . Hence these powders were used in EDM for experimental purpose.

## 2 Experimentation

The experiments were performed on ZNC, Electronica EDM machine. Dielectric used was SEO25. A separate experimental set up was designed. For a set of experiment, different powders i.e. $\mathrm{Al}, \mathrm{Si}$ and SiC in ration of $2 \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{l}$ were mixed in a dielectric. The work piece material used in this study is HCHCr D2 die steel (Comparable standards: AISI D2).

Table 1 Process Parameters and their Levels

| Sr. <br> No. | Machining Parameters | Symbol | SI | Levels |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
|  |  |  | Unit | -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 |  |
| 01 | Peak Current | Ip | A | 1 | 6 | 11 | 16 | 21 |  |
| 02 | Pulse on Time | Ton | $\mu \mathrm{s}$ | 100 | 200 | 300 | 400 | 500 |  |
| 03 | Powder | Powder | - | Al | Al | Si | SiC | SiC |  |

In this work, total 20 experiments were conducted at the stipulated conditions. The experimental plans were designed on the basis of the central composite design (CCD) technique of RSM. Table 2 shows the responses observed by performing the experiments and depending upon responses observed effect of specific input parameter on the response parameter was studied.

## 3 Results and Discussion

For the analysis of the results ANOVA is employed to identify significant parameters. In addition, response surface model have been developed and presented for material removal rate, tool wear rate and surface roughness. The adequacies of the model are given in Table 3. The Model F-value, R-Squared and Adj RSquared value implies that model is significant. This model can be used to navigate the design space.

Table 2 Experimental Observations

| Experiment <br> No. | Ip (A) | Ton $(\mu \mathrm{s})$ | Powder | MRR <br> $\left(\mathrm{mm}^{3} / \mathrm{min}.\right)$ | TWR <br> $\left(\mathrm{mm}^{3} / \mathrm{min}.\right)$ | SR <br> $\mathrm{Ra}(\mu \mathrm{m})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | 06 | 200 | Al | 0.959 | 0.128 | 3.19 |
| 2 | 16 | 200 | Al | 1.226 | 0.093 | 3.88 |
| 3 | 06 | 400 | Al | 2.102 | 0.27 | 3.17 |
| 4 | 16 | 400 | Al | 2.803 | 0.319 | 4.23 |
| 5 | 06 | 200 | SiC | 0.942 | 0.094 | 3.08 |
| 6 | 16 | 200 | SiC | 1.143 | 0.084 | 4.16 |
| 7 | 06 | 400 | SiC | 1.839 | 0.171 | 2.79 |
| 8 | 16 | 400 | SiC | 2.26 | 0.193 | 4.09 |
| 9 | 01 | 300 | Si | 0.387 | 0.056 | 3.25 |
| 10 | 21 | 300 | Si | 1.132 | 0.0861 | 5.05 |
| 11 | 11 | 100 | Si | 1.032 | 0.067 | 3.5 |
| 12 | 11 | 500 | Si | 3.09 | 0.329 | 3.16 |
| 13 | 11 | 300 | Al | 2.871 | 0.409 | 3.30 |
| 14 | 11 | 300 | SiC | 2.453 | 0.265 | 3.22 |


| 15 | 11 | 300 | Si | 2.616 | 0.325 | 2.74 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 16 | 11 | 300 | Si | 2.453 | 0.258 | 2.81 |
| 17 | 11 | 300 | Si | 2.803 | 0.361 | 2.67 |
| 18 | 11 | 300 | Si | 2.505 | 0.276 | 2.78 |
| 19 | 11 | 300 | Si | 2.45 | 0.267 | 2.90 |
| 20 | 11 | 300 | Si | 2.616 | 0.312 | 2.77 |

Table 3 Adequacy of the models

| Response <br> Parameters | F Value | R-Squared | Adj R-Squared |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| MRR | 94.7701 | 0.988412 | 0.977982 |
| TWR | 22.4464 | 0.952834 | 0.910385 |
| SR | 114.518 | 0.990391 | 0.981742 |

### 3.1 The Influence of Process Parameters on Performance Measures

In this section the effect of controlling parameters such as peak current (Ip), Pulse on time (Ton), and powder properties on material removal rate, tool wear rate and surface roughness are presented on the basis of twenty sucessful runs carried out for the specific combination of the input parametes and their levels.


Fig. 1. Surface Plot for MRR

From the figure 1, it can be seen that at lowest range of peak current $1 \mathrm{~A}, \mathrm{MRR}$ found to be low, increasing gradually up to mid range of 11 A , and decreased slowly with further increase in peak current. Whereas in case of pulse on time the lowest MRR is observed at lowest values of $100 \mu \mathrm{~s}$ increased consistently up to $500 \mu \mathrm{~s}$, hence, maximum MRR is obtained at high peak current of 11 A and highest pulse on time $500 \mu \mathrm{~s}$. The effect of powder type and peak current on MRR is shown in Figure 1(B) At range of peak current 11A-16A, MRR found to be best and decreased with increase in peak current, to be found lowest at decreased value of 1 A , Whereas Al found to be producing highest MRR of $2.871 \mathrm{~mm}^{3} / \mathrm{min}$. at peak current of 11 A and Si with the value of 1 A gives the lowest results. Now figure $1(\mathrm{C})$ reveals the estimated response surface of interaction between powder and pulse on time for MRR. It increases with increase in pulse on time applicable to all three powders. It also shows that pulse on time and powder combination have significant effect on MRR specially in case of Al producing maximum MRR at highest pulse on time value $500 \mu$ s and minimum MRR at pulse on time value of $100 \mu \mathrm{~s}$.

Figure 2 shows the estimated response surface for TWR in relation to peak current and pulse on time. At lowest range of peak current 1 A , found to be lowest increased gradually up to mid range of 11 A , and decreased slowly with further increase in peak current. Whereas, in case of pulse on time the lowest TWR is observed at lowest values of $100 \mu \mathrm{~s}$ increased consistently till highest value of $500 \mu \mathrm{~s}$. Hence, maximum TWR can be obtained at high peak current of 11 A and highest pulse on time $500 \mu \mathrm{~s}$.


Fig. 2. Surface plot for TWR


Fig. 3. Surface plot for surface roughness
Figure 3 shows that increasing peak current increases the surface roughness as increase in peak current increases the discharge energy and the impulsive force there by removing more molten material. This generates deep and larger discharge craters which increases the roughness of the surface. Higher roughness found at high peak current of 21 A combining with highest and lowest values of pulse on time $100 \mu \mathrm{~s}$ and $500 \mu \mathrm{~s}$. With low peak current the best surface finish is obtainable at the mid range level of peak current 6 A to 11 A and pulse on time $200 \mu \mathrm{~s}-300 \mu \mathrm{~s}$. Al produces high surface roughness followed by Sic and the Si. The effect of powder type and peak current is shown in Figure 3(B). The highest roughness found at high peak current of 21 A . with low peak current the best surface finish is obtainable at the mid range level of peak current 6 A to 11 A and Al produce high surface roughness followed by Sic. Si produce the best surface finish than other two powders. In Figure 3(C) the estimated response surface of interaction between powder and pulse on time for Surface Roughness is shown. It can be seen that SR increases with higher and lower range of pulse on time in case of Al powder. Whereas in case of $\mathrm{Si}, \mathrm{SR}$ found to be high at lowest values of pulse on decreases gradually up to certain point and again start increasing with increase in pulse on time. SiC gives the best surface finish as pulse on time increases.

## 4 Conclusions

- The significant improvement had been observed due to addition of powder. Material removal rate is higher with Al as an additive in comparison to that of Si and Sic . While comparing all three powders ( $\mathrm{Al}, \mathrm{Si}, \mathrm{SiC}$ ), the better result were found with the Si powder.
- Surface roughness was mainly affected by the current and pulse on time. At higher value of current causes the more surface roughness.
- Of all the machining parameters investigated, current was found to be the most significant factor. Higher current produced higher MRR, TWR and SR.
- The significant results of confirmation experiments have confirmed the validity of the used Response surface methodology for optimizing the machining parameters.
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