



Cairo University

PREDICTION OF DUCTILE FRACTURE STRAINS IN UPSETTING PROCESSES

By
Mostafa Khaled Megahed Ali Hassan

A Thesis Submitted to the
Faculty of Engineering at Cairo University
in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
in
Mechanical Design and Production Engineering

FACULTY OF ENGINEERING, CAIRO UNIVERSITY
GIZA, EGYPT
2020

PREDICTION OF DUCTILE FRACTURE STRAINS IN UPSETTING PROCESSES

By
Mostafa Khaled Megahed Ali Hassan

A Thesis Submitted to the
Faculty of Engineering at Cairo University
in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
in
Mechanical Design and Production Engineering

Under the Supervision of

Ass. Prof. Dr. Chahinaz Saleh

Ass. Prof. Dr. Mostafa Shazly

.....
Department of Mechanical Design
and Production Engineering
Faculty of Engineering, Cairo
University

.....
Mechanical Engineering Department
Faculty of Engineering,
The British University in Egypt

FACULTY OF ENGINEERING, CAIRO UNIVERSITY
GIZA, EGYPT
2020

PREDICTION OF DUCTILE FRACTURE STRAINS IN UPSETTING PROCESSES

By
Mostafa Khaled Megahed Ali Hassan

A Thesis Submitted to the
Faculty of Engineering at Cairo University
in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
in
Mechanical Design and Production Engineering

Approved by the
Examining Committee

Ass. Prof. Dr. Chahinaz A. R. Saleh,

Thesis Main Advisor

Ass. Prof. Dr. Mostafa Shazly

Advisor

Prof. Dr. Abdelrahman Ragab,

Internal Examiner

Prof. Dr. Mahmoud Mohamed M. Nemat-Alla, External Examiner
- Dean of the Faculty of Engineering, Kafr El-Sheikh University.

FACULTY OF ENGINEERING, CAIRO UNIVERSITY
GIZA, EGYPT
2020

Engineer's Name: Mostafa Khaled Megahed Ali Hassan
Date of Birth: 14/2/1992
Nationality: Egyptian
E-mail: moustafakhaled14@gmail.com
Phone: +201115151580
Address: 41/14 St/El-shatr el-asher/New Maadi/Cairo
Registration Date: 1/10/2013
Awarding Date: .../.../2020
Degree: Master of Science
Department: Mechanical Design and Production Engineering



Supervisors:

Ass. Prof. Chahinaz Abdel Rahman Saleh
Ass. Prof. Mostafa Shazly
(Faculty of Engineering, The British University in Egypt)

Examiners:

Prof. Dr. Mahmoud Mohamed M. Nemat-Alla (External examiner)
(Dean of the Faculty of Engineering, Kafr El-Sheikh University)
Prof. Dr. Abdelrahman Ragab (Internal Examiner)
Ass. Prof. Chahinaz A. R. Saleh (Thesis main Advisor)
Ass. Prof. Mostafa Shazly (Advisor)

Title of Thesis:

PREDICTION OF DUCTILE FRACTURE STRAINS IN UPSETTING PROCESSES

Key Words:

Ductile fracture; porous metal plasticity; finite element analysis, forming limit diagram at fracture, upsetting process.

Summary:

Forgeability and workability are measures of the plastic deformation limit that workpieces can undergo under bulk-forming processes. Upsetting tests for different axisymmetric specimens are usually used to construct the forming limit diagram at fracture (FLDF). The objective of the present work is to predict the FLDF for upsetting processes using coupled and Uncoupled DF approaches and relating the friction conditions and specimen dimensions to the critical height reduction of blocks. Numerical simulations are performed to determine the stress and strain distribution at the locations of crack formation. Two FE models are adopted after validating the results against published data; one considers voided materials while the other does not. It has been found that the coupled DF approach is in principle capable of predicting analytically the failure in upsetting processes. For uncoupled DF approach, an average value of the critical parameter (Cavg) in the out-of-plane shear and hydrostatic integrals has to be assigned from experiments to predict a semi empirically bilinear forming limit diagram at fracture FLDF. The fitting expression developed from the parametric study gives results close to the results obtained numerically with an error less than 9.69 %.

Disclaimer

I hereby declare that this thesis is my own original work and that no part of it has been submitted for a degree qualification at any other university or institute.

I further declare that I have appropriately acknowledged all sources used and have cited them in the references section.

Name: Mostafa Khaled Megahed Ali Hassan

Date: .../.../2020

Signature:

Dedication

I dedicate this work to all interested and knowledge eager folks.

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank all the people who contributed in some way to the work described in this thesis. First, I thank my academic advisor, Dr. Chahinaz for her time, effort and patience.

I would like to thank my family who supported me through these years. I would like to thank my wife Fatma for her constant love, my mom for her prayers and my father for his support.

Table of Contents

DISCLAIMER	I
DEDICATION	II
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	III
TABLE OF CONTENTS	IV
LIST OF TABLES.....	VI
LIST OF FIGURES.....	VII
NOMENCLATURE	X
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	XII
ABSTRACT	XIII
CHAPTER 1 : INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER 2 : LITERATURE REVIEW	3
2.1. FAILURE MECHANISMS IN DUCTILE FRACTURE.....	3
2.1.1. Failure Mechanisms Prevailing at Positive Stress Triaxiality	3
2.1.2. Failure Mechanisms Prevailing at Negative Stress Triaxiality	8
2.2. DUCTILE FRACTURE MODELS.....	10
2.2.1. Models of Coupled Ductile Fracture Approach	10
2.2.2. Uncoupled Ductile Fracture models.....	14
2.3. PREDICTION OF FORMING LIMIT DIAGRAM AT FRACTURE FLDF IN BULK-FORMING.....	15
2.3.1. Experimental forming limit	16
2.3.2. Analytical and numerical determination of forming Diagram at Fracture FLDF.....	18
2.3.2.1. Coupled approach	18
2.3.2.2. Uncoupled approach	18
2.4. SCOPE OF WORK.....	20
2.5. THESIS STRUCTURE	21
CHAPTER 3 : THEORETICAL BACKGROUND	23
3.1. REVIEW OF CONSTITUTIVE RELATIONS USED FOR COUPLED DUCTILE FRACTURE ANALYSIS	23
3.2. REVIEW OF EQUATIONS FOR UNCOUPLED DUCTILE FRACTURE ANALYSIS	28
CHAPTER 4 : FEA OF UPSETTING PROCESSES: CHARACTERISTICS AND VALIDATION	31

4.1.	INTRODUCTION	31
4.2.	DYNAMIC EXPLICIT ANALYSIS IN ABAQUS.....	31
4.3.	SPECIMENS' GEOMETRIES	32
4.4.	THE AXISYMMETRIC FINITE ELEMENT MODEL	33
4.4.1.	Axisymmetric model validation	36
4.4.2.	Comparison with Dadras [94](semi-empirical) model.....	41
4.5.	THREE-DIMENSIONAL FINITE ELEMENT MODEL	43
4.5.1.	Validation of the rectangular block model	45
4.6.	MECHANICS OF DEFORMATION OF BILLETS UNDER THE UPSETTING PROCESS.....	49
4.6.1.	Effect of friction conditions, specimen configuration and type of material	49
4.6.2.	Stress triaxiality range in the upsetting process and its effect on the crack shape	55
CHAPTER 5 : PREDICTION OF FORMING LIMIT DIAGRAM AT FRACTURE FLDF		59
5.1.	DETERMINATION OF FORMING LIMIT DIAGRAMS AT FRACTURE (FLDF) USING A COUPLED APPROACH.....	59
5.1.1.	Effect of various parameters on FLDF	61
5.1.2.	Comparisons with experiments	64
5.2.	DETERMINATION OF FORMING LIMIT DIAGRAM AT FRACTURE (FLDF) USING UNCOUPLED APPROACH	70
5.2.1.	Computations procedure.....	70
5.2.2.	Bilinear forming limit curves of selected steels	70
5.3.	PARAMETRIC EQUATION OF RECTANGULAR BILLETS FOR FAILURE PREDICTION.....	74
CHAPTER 6 : CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS		77
REFERENCES		79

List of Tables

Table 2.1: Review of coalescence criteria from literature (with modification) [23].....	13
Table 2.2: Uncoupled models with two constants or more [5].....	15
Table 4.1: Geometry utilized in validation of FEA and designation of the equator. (All dimensions are in mm).	32
Table 4.2: Data of published upsetting models used in the axisymmetric validation	37
Table 4.3: Stress triaxiality range and failure strain for different upsetting configurations made of different materials with shown crack orientation.	56
Table 5.1: Material parameters and experimental plane strains values at failure for different specimen configurations.	64
Table 5.2: Values of C_{avg} of both materials regarding the failure mechanism.	73
Table 5.3: FE models used in the analysis (all dimensions in mm)	74
Table 5.4: Trials used in deducing a parametric expressions.	76

List of Figures

Figure 1.1: Ductile fracture: a) cylindrical upsetting [6], b) Extrusion[7]	1
Figure 1.2: Upsetting of cylinder specimen with (H/D) =1 at different height reduction [8].	2
Figure 2.1: Void nucleation by Matrix-particle decohesion (a) or particle cracking (b) [24].	4
Figure 2.2: Void nucleation in shear bands initiated at ferrite cementite interface in pearlitic steel [25].	4
Figure 2.3: Voids growth with rotation and shape change at shearing incipient of a copper alloy [3], [36].	6
Figure 2.4: Internal necking in the middle region of the necked section of an as-rolled copper tensile specimen [29].	6
Figure 2.5: Void linkage by void sheeting in AISI 4340 steel at a plastic strain equal to 0.25 [28].	7
Figure 2.6: Coalescence by necking and simple touching of voids in low alloy steel [37].	7
Figure 2.7: Void coalescence under high positive stress-triaxiality (a) and under low positive stress-triaxiality (b) [13].	8
Figure 2.8: Fracture surface photographs of A12024-T351 under upsetting of cylindrical specimens [5].	9
Figure 2.9: cross-section in the fracture surface through the matrix material [5].	9
Figure 2.10: Different fracture strains of cold-drawn 1045 steel at the equatorial surface in different cylindrical upsetting processes [88]	16
Figure 2.11: Schematic bilinear fracture locus in bulk-forming (line1 represents mode III and line 2 represents mode I) [91].	17
Figure 2.12: Bao's forming limit in the average stress triaxiality and equivalent strain at fracture space compared to experimental points [5].	19
Figure 2.13: Silva's forming limit covering stress triaxiality from -0.2 to 0.6 (c stands for cylindrical specimens, t for tapered and f for flanged), Mode I (opening) and Mode III (shearing) [95].	20
Figure 3.1: Fracture modes in upsetting (a) shearing mode, (b) opening mode.....	29
Figure 4.1: Quarter cylindrical portion used in FEA.....	33
Figure 4.2: Details of the axisymmetric model	34
Figure 4.3: Variation of internal energy (IE) and Kinetic energy (KE) through the forming process using, step time=0.01s.	35
Figure 4.4: Variation of the equivalent plastic strain at the equatorial surface for different mesh sizes.	35
Figure 4.5: Mesh size grading from bigger to smaller.	36
Figure 4.6: Strain path at the equator of the outer surface during loading as predicted by present model and Landre's model[82].	37
Figure 4.7: Comparison of the strain path for a point at the equatorial as predicted by the present model and the experimental results of [83].	38
Figure 4.8: Variation of stress components σ_θ and σ_z with the effective strain for cylindrical upsetting tests at coefficient of friction equal to 0.1. (a) H/D = 1 [C2]. (b) H/D = 1.5 [C3]. (see Table 4.2).	39
Figure 4.9: Variation of the diametral change ΔD with the axial displacement U as predicted by the FE model and the experiment of Radić [104].	40

Figure 4.10: Variation of the ratio between hydrostatic stress and equivalent matrix stress with respect to axial strain for the current FE model and Dadras model [94].	41
Figure 4.11: Variation of the ratio between Axial stress and equivalent matrix stress with respect to Axial strain for the current FE model and Dadras model [94].	42
Figure 4.12: Variation of the ratio between tangential stress and equivalent matrix stress with respect to axial strain for the current FE model and Dadras model [94].	42
Figure 4.13: Eighth of the specimen used in FEA.	44
Figure 4.14: Specimen description with its symmetry planes.	44
Figure 4.15: Flow stress-strain relation for commercially-pure aluminum used in FE model [105].	45
Figure 4.16: Deformed symmetry planes at 40 % HR as shown in x-z plane (a) and in x-y plane (b).	46
Figure 4.17: Comparison between the experimentally detected deformed billet profile and the FE results of Pillinger et al. [105] and the present model at 40 % reduction. ...	47
Figure 4.18: Comparison between the experimental and predicted forging load for Initial heights (H_0) of 5.25 mm and 7.65 mm at frictionless condition.	48
Figure 4.19: Variation of normalized plane stresses σ_θ, σ_Z through upsetting process for cylindrical specimen made of AISI 1040 for different contact conditions. ($H/D = 1.125$).	50
Figure 4.20: Variation of normalized axial stress σ_Z for two different material AISI 1040 and AL2024-T351 ($H/D=1.125$ and $m=0.2$).	50
Figure 4.21: Strain path of two different material AISI 1040 [82] and AL2024-T351 [5] at 1.125 aspect ratio with different friction conditions.	51
Figure 4.22: Variation of the normalized plane stresses σ_θ, σ_Z through upsetting of AISI 1040 cylindrical specimen with different aspect ratios at $m=0.3$	51
Figure 4.23: Strain path of AISI 1040 [82] for different aspect ratios at $m=0.3$.	52
Figure 4.24: Variation of the normalized plane stresses σ_θ, σ_Z through upsetting of AISI 1040[82] axisymmetric specimens with different configurations.	52
Figure 4.25: Strain path of AISI 1040 [82] for different axisymmetric configuration...	53
Figure 4.26: Vertical strain distribution and deformed shape for tapered and flanged compression specimens at H.R. 61.3 % and with $\mu = 0.15$	54
Figure 4.27: Two failure modes shown for AA2030-T4 flanged upsetted specimen, (mode I) “opening” conventional DF mode and (mode III) “shearing” [95].	57
Figure 5.1: Coalescence point determination for a cylindrical specimen (C1) of AISI 1040 steel with and without shear effect, at $CV_0 = 0.01$ and $\lambda_{1i} = \lambda_{2i} = 0.2$	60
Figure 5.2: Forming limit curves for AISI 1040 of different initial void volume fraction CV_0 ($n = 0.226$, $\lambda_{1i} = 1$) according to McClintock condition [2], [3], [11].	61
Figure 5.3: Forming limit curves for different strain-hardening exponents n ($CV_0 = 0.02$, $\lambda_{1i} = 1$) according to McClintock condition [2], [3], [11].	62
Figure 5.4: Forming limit curves for different Initial void shapes λ_{1i} ($CV_0 = 0.02$, $n = 0.226$) according to McClintock condition [2], [3], [11].	63
Figure 5.5: Comparison between the predicted limit curves FLDF using different criteria with experimental failure points for AISI 1040 steel. Shear Effect are not considered in void shape evolution.	65
Figure 5.6: Comparison between the predicted limit curves FLDF and the experimental failure points for AISI 1040 steel. The effect of shear on void shape evolution are considered.	66
Figure 5.7: Comparison of predicted limit curves FLDF with experimental failure points for AISI 1045 steel. The predicted bounding limit curves corresponds to initial void volume fraction range without adding the shear effect.	67

Figure 5.8: Comparison of predicted limit curves FLDF with experimental failure points for AISI 1045 steel with applying the shear condition.....	68
Figure 5.9: Comparison of predicted limit curves FLDF at $\lambda_1 i = 0.2$ according to Ragab [10] criteria with $CV_0 = 0.0001$ and McClintock [2], [3], [11] with $CV_0 = 0.02$ with experimental failure points of AISI 1040 steel.....	69
Figure 5.10: Critical values for the damage parameter C estimated according to two failure modes for the different specimen configurations, (a) AISI 1040 and (b) AISI 1045.	71
Figure 5.11: Bilinear fracture limit for AISI 1040 and AISI 1045 steels compared to the theoretical limit of Kuhn et al. [88].	72
Figure 5.12: Bilinear fracture limit for AISI 1045 compared with experimental failure points of Kuhn et al. [88].....	73
Figure 5.12: Billet dimensions used in the analysis.	75

Nomenclature

C_{v_o}, C_v	Initial and current Void volume fraction
q_1, q_2, q_3	Tvergaard adjusting parameters
C	Critical damaged parameter of uncoupled integrals
$\bar{\epsilon}$	Equivalent strain
$\bar{\epsilon}_e$	Effective strain for the matrix
$\bar{\epsilon}_e$	Equivalent elastic strain
$\bar{\epsilon}_p$	Equivalent plastic strain
$\bar{\epsilon}_f$	Equivalent strain at failure
ϵ_v^p	Volumetric plastic strain
$\epsilon_{1,2,3}$	Principal strains from maximum to minimum
$\epsilon_\theta, \epsilon_z$	Tangential and axial strain
σ_{ij}	Stress terms in the stress tensor
σ_m	Hydro static stress
$\bar{\sigma}$	Macroscopic von-Mises flow stress
$\bar{\sigma}_M$	Equivalent stress for the matrix
$\sigma_{1,2,3}$	Principal stresses from maximum to minimum
σ_θ, σ_z	Tangential and axial stress
C^e	Elasticity matrix
λ	Plastic multiplier
λ_{1i}, λ_1	Initial and current void aspect ratio
λ_{2i}, λ_2	Initial and current unit cell aspect ratio
$\frac{b_1}{b_2}$	Ligament size ratio
n	Strain hardening exponent
D	Shear damage
g_θ	Lode angle dependence function
θ_l	Lode angle
τ_{13}	Out of plane shear stress
μ	Coefficient of friction
E	Modulus of elasticity

ν	Poisson's ratio
H/D	Height to diameter ratio