Henryk HOLKA[1]
Maciej MATUSZEWSKI[1]
Janusz MUSIAL[1]
Michal STYP-REKOWSKI[1]

TRIBOLOGICAL ASPECTS
OF SOME MATERIALS ABRASIVE-WATER JET CUTTING

This article presents results of comparative studies into the roughness (very significant tribological factor) of surfaces cut using the AWJM method. Cutting was performed on samples made of quenched and tampered alloy steel (1.2080), plastic (polyamide PA6) and mineral material (syenite). Variable parameters in the cutting process included: jet pressure and feed. As a result of measurements involving selected roughness parameters (Ra, Rz and Rq), it was discovered that the majority of variable factors had a significant effect on the cut surface roughness. It was also demonstrated that the contact method measurements cannot be performed with regard to plastics because the results are characterised by a very great scatter of results values, making them unreliable.

1. INTRODUCTION

Cutting operation is commonly used in modern manufacturing processes. Cutting can be performed on a wide range of materials: from technical (metals, plastics) through mineral materials and derivative materials (rocks, ceramics) to biological materials (wood, straw, organic tissue). Cutting is applied at various stages of the production process and so the requirements concerning characteristics of cut surfaces are varied: different requirements will apply to cutting not followed by further operations or treatment and yet different to cutting followed by further treatment.

The investigations presented in the paper involve a cutting method which uses a concentrated jet of water and abrasive material (AWJM) – the method that is developing rapidly due to its advantages [1],[2], but still defined as non-conventional treatment [3],[4].

The main aim of the investigations was to verify to what extent parameters of cutting using the AWJM method affect the geometrical structure of cut surfaces made of structural material having very different characteristics: steel, plastic and mineral material. Surface roughness is a significant tribological feature, therefore selected roughness parameters are taken as the measure for cutting results assessment.

---

[1] Faculty of Mechanical Engineering, University of Technology and Life Sciences in Bydgoszcz

2. OBJECT AND RANGE OF INVESTIGATIONS

Experiments concern to cutting samples with a rectangular cross-section (b x h) 30 x 10mm, made of three different materials:

- very popular tool steel, numbered 1.2080 and with symbol acc. to European Standard X210Cr12 (traditional mark NC11), quenched and tampered to 43 HRC,
- polyamide plastic, marked PA-6,
- syenite.

Used in investigations materials have strength feature quite differ. The main reason of such choice was need to determine the some roughness parameters obtained by abrasive-water jet cutting with defined parameters.

Cutting operations were realized using abrasive-water contour machine, made of PR China marked DWJFB 1313.

As independent variables in presented investigations following quantities were accepted:

- pressure of working fluid: p = 200, 250 MPa,
- feed rate: f = 64, 80 and 96 mm/min.

According to references, eg. [5],[6], that's are the factors which essential influences cutting surfaces features.

Fluid jet consists mixture of water and Garnet abrasive, mesh 80 and nozzle diameter was 1.016 mm. During machining the cutting head was 2 mm from upper surface of cutting materials.

Results of cutting process were evaluated on the base of measurements of below mentioned three chosen roughness parameters:

- Ra – arithmetic mean of profile deviation from the mean,
- Rz – total height of profile,
- Rq – quadratic mean of profile deviation from the mean.

Roughness were measured in three places: 0,25, 0,50 i 0,75 of b dimension (widthness) on measuring length (4 mm) situated on the middle of samples thickness h. As final result average value of 3 measurements was accepted. Measurements were made by means of profilograph Hommelwerke T 2000.

Presented research have initial character, verifying methodic possibilities, so three elements set of roughness parameters, measured by means of mentioned device one accepted as adequate.

3. RESULTS OF EXPERIMENTAL INVESTIGATIONS

Cutting surface roughness measurement findings are taken down in below tables. The values of roughness parameters provided in Table 1 refer to the cutting of steel samples quenched and tempered up to 43 HRC. Based on the analysis of these results it was appeared that the tested cutting parameters had an effect on the obtained roughness. It was found that roughness is also higher for greater values of parameters, e.g. Ra parameter increased by 0.61 micrometer, i.e. by almost 30 % (from 2.16 to 2.77μm), where there was

a change in the feed rate *f* from 64 to 96 mm/min, i.e. for an increase by 50%.

Roughness changes are also caused by changes in the jet pressure. At the feed rate $f = 64$mm/min, an increase in the pressure *p* from 200 to 250 (25%) resulted in an increase in *Ra* parameter but only by ca. 12%. At different feed rates, an increase in roughness, expressed in a change of *Ra* parameter, is even lower (ca. 6%).

Table 1. Results of some roughness parameters measurements of surface cutting by means of AWJM for steel sample

Pressure *p*,MPa ⟍ Feed rate, *f*, mm/min	64	80	96
Ra, μm			
200	2,16	2,68	2,77
250	2,42	2,85	2,95
Rz, μm			
200	11,20	11,80	13,17
250	13,29	14,42	15,99
Rq, μm			
200	2,74	3,26	3,37
250	3,13	3,59	3,75

Changes found in the geometrical structure of the surface being cut are described by regression equations which have the following form in the analysed case:

a) for jet pressure $p = 200$ MPa:

$$Ra = -0{,}215 f^2 + 1{,}165 f + 1{,}21$$

$$Rz = 0{,}385 f^2 - 0{,}555 f + 11{,}37$$

$$Rq = -0{,}205 f^2 + 1{,}135 f + 1{,}81$$

b) for jet pressure $p = 250$ MPa:

$$Ra = -0{,}165 f^2 + 0{,}925 f + 1{,}66$$

$$Rz = 0{,}220 f^2 - 0{,}470 f + 12{,}60$$

$$Rq = -0{,}150 f^2 + 0{,}910 f + 2{,}37$$

Statistical calculations demonstrate that the above equations reflect very well observed changes, which is confirmed by the values of correlation coefficients approximating to 1.0.

Roughness parameters of the polyamide samples surfaces on which the cutting operation was performed are characterised by a very high scatter of values. This is confirmed by calculated standard deviation values, e.g. maximum standard deviation for *Ra* parameter was S = 3.06 (where the average value of this parameter is $Ra = 2{,}87\mu$m). Scatter of values for other roughness parameters measured was also great.

Such characteristics of changes, in particular non-repeatability of measurement results is most probably caused by the roughness parameters measurement method applied. Due to the low hardness of the sample material, the hard and thin gauging point – stylus – does not slide on the tops of ridges but machines (scratches) them instead. A similar phenomenon is described in literature [7] and effects of measurements are presented in Fig. 1. Therefore, rules and limitations of contact method applicability in roughness measurements should be defined.


Fig. 1. Surface view after roughness measuring using contact methods; visible narrow stylus ploughing lines [7]

Due to the inability to perform roughness measurement using other methods (non-contact), these results are excluded from further analysis.

The third structural material used in the study was syenite – mineral material (rock) used e.g. in construction of very precise process and measurement machines (Tables, bodies). The results presented in Table 2 indicate that the surface roughness obtained as a result of abrasive-water jet cutting is similar for all analysed values of process parameters.

Table 2. Results of some roughness parameters measurements of surface cutting by means of AWJM for syenite samples

Feed rate, f [mm/min] / Pressure, p[MPa]	64	80	96
Ra [µm]			
200	3,93	3,85	3,78
250	3,87	3,74	3,70
Rz [µm]			
200	18,58	18,18	17,98
250	17,44	17,16	17,01
Rq [µm]			
200	4,92	4,82	4,74
250	4,85	4,69	4,64

Change in feed from 64 to 96mm/min, i.e. by 50 % results in a change of the average value of *Ra* parameter from 3.93 to 3.78µm, i.e. its decrease but only ca. 4%. Similar situation occurs where jet pressure is changed: an increase in the value of this process parameter from 200 to 250MPa (25%) results in *Ra* parameter value being decreased from 3.93 to 3.87µm, i.e. only 1.5%. Similar relations occur for other roughness parameters analysed.

Observed relations for this structural material were described by mathematical models. Their form is as follows:

a) for jet pressure $p = 200$MPa:
$$Ra = 0{,}045 f^2 - 0{,}265 f + 4{,}09$$
$$Rz = 0{,}100 f^2 - 0{,}700 f + 19{,}18$$
$$Rq = 0{,}055 f^2 - 0{,}325 f + 5{,}12$$

b) for jet pressure $p = 250$MPa:
$$Ra = 0{,}005 f^2 - 0{,}095 f + 4{,}02$$
$$Rz = 0{,}065 f^2 - 0{,}475 f + 17{,}85$$
$$Rq = 0{,}010 f^2 - 0{,}130 f + 5{,}04$$

It will be easier to compare the results obtained for analysed structural materials by referring to diagrams – graphic representation of developed mathematical models. In Fig. 2 one show exemplary diagrams, referring in this case to *Ra* parameter.

The diagrams indicate that in both analysed cases pressure has a minor effect on the obtained roughness measured with *Ra* parameter but recorded gradient is greater for the cutting of steel. Diagrams for other parameters are very similar in quality.

a)   b)

Fig. 2. Graphs of function $Ra = f(f)$ for the samples made of: a) steel, b) syenite

Comparison of the results obtained for two structural materials very different from each other (Fig. 3) shows that there are certain characteristic differences. An increase in steel treatment parameters (feed and pressure) resulted in an increase of roughness in cut surfaces, whereas in the case of mineral material a reverse tendency was observed: greater values of process parameters resulted in smaller surface roughness. Such situation may

result from the water and abrasive jet containing mineral grains and so, in the case of syenite, mineral machines mineral making the hardness of the tool and the hardness of the machined object similar. As far as the cutting of steel is concerned, the difference in hardness is greater and therefore the relations between analysed factors are similar to those in traditional machining. It is assumed that the hardness of the tool should be larger than that of the machined element by at least 30HRC.

Diagrams in Fig. 3 indicate that the roughness of the cut surfaces, machined with the same parameters, is much greater for syenite than for steel. Furthermore, it can be seen that the values of all measured parameters of machined surfaces where the parameters are the same are greater for mineral material than for steel.

a)   b)

Fig. 3. Histograms showing changes in roughness parameters: *Ra*, *Rz* and *Rq* of the steel and syenite samples surfaces being cut recorded at the jet pressure of a) $p = 200$MPa, b) $p = 250$MPa

The roughness parameters of cut surfaces make this treatment to be defined as a roughing one, so it can be assumed that this method of cutting can be useful with regard to elements of which machined surfaces will be subject to further treatment. However, the AWJM method is not recommended for surfaces which are not machined after cutting – AWJM should not be used as the finishing treatment.

Comparison between the average parameter (*Ra*) and maximum parameter (*Rz*) indicates that the quotient of these values is larger for steel surfaces (ca. 5.5) than for syenite (ca. 4.7). This comparison between the two parameters allows the profile shape to be estimated (and indirectly that of surface as well). Furthermore, the comparison shows that it is more developed for steel than for syenite, which can be explained by the difference between the hardness of the cutting tool and the workpiece.

Better comparison of the surface condition for both machined materials would require measurements of a wider range of roughness parameters.

4. SUMMARY

Based on the experiments and the analysis of the selected roughness parameters measurements results obtained from such experiments, conclusions of practical nature can be formulated. The most significant of which are as follows:

- abrasive water jet method can be used for the cutting of structural materials with various chemical compositions and structure – with satisfactory efficiency,
- roughness level of the cut surface using the AWJM method defines this method as roughing,
- the contact method cannot be used for measurements of values describing geometrical structure of cut surfaces in the case of plastics because its results do not allow comparative analyses to be performed due to the very great of values of results scatter.

As one said above, the experiments presented in this article have initial character, so on the base of obtained results one can conclude that the established aim of research was accomplished.

REFERENCES

[1] OCZOŚ K. E., 2003, Efficiency of innovative technologies on an example of selected methods of jet-erosion machining,. Mechanik, 76/8-9, 463-468, (in Polish).
[2] KOSMOL J., WALA T., HASSAN A.I., 2001, Preliminary attempt to FEM modeling of AWJM of polymeric composites. Materiały II Międzynarodowej Konferencji „Obróbka wysokociśnieniowym strumieniem wody – WJM 2001", Kraków, 39-48, (in Polish).
[3] RUSZAJ A., 1999, Unconventional methods of production of units of machine and tools, Instytut Obróbki Skrawaniem. Kraków, (in Polish).
[4] STYP-REKOWSKI M., 2003, Hybrid and untraditional processing as suplement of file of techniques producrtion of concentrated carriers of energy, w: STYP-REKOWSKI M. (red.). 2003, Chosen questions of processings the concentrated bundle of energy, Wydawnictwo Bydgoskiego Towarzystwa Naukowego, 213-216, (in Polish).
[5] MAZURKIEWICZ A., 2008, Factors influencing on quality of steel surface after abrasive-water jet cutting,. Inżynieria materiałowa, 5, 1-4, (in Polish).
[6] PEREC A., 1999, Cutting construction al materials by abrassive water jet of low pressure, Materiały Konferencji „Mechanika'99. Nauka i praktyka", Wydawnictwo Politechniki Gdańskiej, Gdańsk, 135-136, (in Polish).
[7] POSMYK A., CHMIELNIK I. P., 2010, Influence of method of measuring roughness of composite material on opinion of surface, Kompozyty, 10/3, 229-234, (in Polish).