

STUDY OF THE ROUGHNESS AS FUNCTION OF MACHINING PARAMETERS



<https://doi.org/10.22533/at.ed.4871124151029>

Fecha de aceptación: 03/07/2025

Jean Robert Pereira Rodrigues

Lourival Matos de Sousa Filho

Paulo Roberto Campos Flexa Ribeiro Filho

Ivanildo Silva Abreu

Wellinton de Assunção

José Roberto Pereira Rodrigues

Welberth Santos Ferreira

Fernando Lima de Oliveira

Keyll Carlos Ribeiro Martins

Moisés dos Santos Rocha

(Vc) and feed rate (f). The Doehlert's matrix was defined with five levels for feed rate and three levels for cutting speed, according to coded variables. From these experiments the correlation between input and output variables was determined. The best model is in agreement with the analysis of variance and Fischer's test. Graphs were obtained for both response and contour surfaces. In addition, the optimal point for the best model was determined by the Lagrange criterion, which corresponds to a feed rate (f) of 0.0880 mm rev⁻¹ and the cutting speed (Vc) of 155 mm min⁻¹, resulting in a minimum roughness average value (Ra) equals to 0.8916 μm .

KEYWORDS: Doehlert's experimental planning; roughness; external cylindrical turning.

ABSTRACT: Experimental evaluations based on statistical and scientific criteria play fundamental role in identification of optimal performance parameters in manufacturing engineering. Based on this premise, the Doehlert's experimental planning method was applied to external cylindrical turning process of ABNT 1045 steel, with the purpose of determining the roughness correlation as a function of the cutting speed

INTRODUCTION

The quality of machined products is directly linked to the roughness. Depending on the implementation of certain components and characteristics of assembly will be needed to apply subsequent finishing processes such as grinding and polishing (Ratnam, 2016). In

the process of turning the roughness is directly influenced by the characteristics of the machine, machining tools parameters, tool wear, cutting speed and feeds, among others. Slamani, Gauthier, and Chatelain (2016) examined the surface roughness as function of the cutting speed in turning operations and concluded that there is a trend to increase the roughness with respect to tool wear, being therefore considered surface roughness as quantitative parameter for tool's evaluation.

In general, the experimental determination of the various correlational parameters for machine/material is fundamental for optimal performance in manufacture engineering. For such reason, the idea of experimental design is established, which is a set of tests with scientific and statistical criteria in order to determine the influence of several variables on a given system or process results (Montgomery, 2009). The main difference between the various types of plans -such as factorial design, central composite design, Taguchi and Doehlert- are their planning matrices. For this study, as an alternative rather useful and attractive to the second order, was used the Doehlert's planning.

The Doehlert matrix was presented by David H. Doehlert in 1970, where the matrix points correspond to the vertices of a regular simplex. In general, the total number of experimental points in the planning equals to k^2+k+pc where k is the number of factors and pc is the number of experiments at the midpoint. An important property of the planning is related to the number of levels that each variable possesses, which allows to evaluate the variables considered more important, that is, exhibit more pronounced effects at most number of points on studied region (Hammami, Ouejhani, Bellakhal, & Dachraoui, 2009). Doehlert's Design describes a circular area for two variables and its matrix consists of a central point and six additional points forming a regular simplex. The Doehlert matrices are pre-established and their constructions require smaller number of experiments when compared to other plans (Benini, L. & Rossi, 2019; Ennaciri, Baçaoui, Sergent, & Yaacoubi, 2014).

The objective of this work is to identify through Doehlert's planning matrix the correlation of roughness average (Ra) as function of cutting speed (Vc) and feed rate (f) in turning process of ABNT 1045 steel.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

Firstly, all experiments were performed according to Doehlert' matrix shown in Table 1 and obtained the corresponding roughness (Ra) in which the numbers in parentheses indicate the coded levels. After that, were proposed models with and without interaction between cutting speed and feed rate (input variables). Quadratic models also were proposed as shown in Equation 1 to 3 and then were used the least squares method to obtain the models (response functions). The analyses to determine the best model were performed through coefficient adjustment, variance analysis and F-test, generating the most

representative model (Montgomery, 2009). Finally, defined the best model, was carried out the optimal point using the Lagrange criterion, i.e., to determine cutting speed and feed rate that generate the smallest roughness.

For external cylindrical turning was used Nardini ND325 lathe (Figure 1), with main motor consisting of 8-5Hp (6/3.7 kW) of power. The selected machining tool was a MD Tool P20 class. Surface roughness measurements were carried out with a portable rugosimeter Digimess with 0.08 mm cutoff length and 0.001 μm Roughness Average resolution. The ABNT 1045 steel sample pieces were obtained from cylindrical rods with diameter of 97 and 500 mm length, divided into 16 samples.

$$y = b_0 + b_1x_1 + b_2x_2 \quad (1)$$

$$y = b_0 + b_1x_1 + b_2x_2 + b_3x_1x_2 \quad (2)$$

$$y = b_0 + b_1x_1 + b_2x_2 + b_3x_1^2 + b_4x_2^2 \quad (3)$$

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 2 shows the models that were proposed at variables codified respectively, with estimated parameters and the adjustment coefficients determination (r_{adj}^2).

The analysis of variance (ANOVA) is shown in Table 3, in which *finv* mean the inverse function of Fischer's distribution, F-test, calculated for a confidence interval of 0.95, $p-1$ degrees of freedom to regression (MQR) and $n-p$ degrees of freedom to error (MQE), in which p is number of the parameter of model and n is total number of observations.

According the Table 2 the best model was model_3, in which in this model the adjustment determination coefficient (r_{adj}^2) was the highest, 0.9898, this result is also corroborated with F-test test, shown in Table 3. All models were statistically validated, once the relation MQR/MQE were higher than *finv* to all models, in accordance with the statistic of F-test. However, the model_3 showed the highest MQR/MQE ration among the models, which means this model has the lowest residual, being identified as the best model. Its natural variables are given by Equation 4. The response surface and its contour's plot are shown in Figure 2 and 3, respectively.

Experiments	Input Variables		Output Variable	
	x_1 (feed rate f) mm rev ⁻¹	x_2 (cutting speed) m min. ⁻¹	$y R_a (\mu\text{m})$	
1	0.151 (0)	243.8 (0)	1.622667	1.572333
2	0.199 (1)	243.8 (0)	3.021	2.752333
3	0.176 (0.5)	304.73 (0.866)	2.363	2.338333
4	0.091 (-1)	243.8 (0)	0.796	1.120667
5	0.125 (-0.5)	192 (-0.866)	1.228333	1.115667
6	0.176 (0.5)	192 (-0.866)	2.074667	2.005667
7	0.125 (-0.5)	304.73 (0.866)	1.333667	1.230333

Table 1. Doehlert' Matrix.

Models	r_{adj}^2	
$y = 1.7329 + 0.9656x_1 + 0.1214x_2$	0.9461	Model_1
$y = 1.7329 + 0.9656x_1 + 0.1214x_2 + 0.1158x_1x_2$	0.9350	Model_2
$y = 1.5867 + 0.9656x_1 + 0.1214x_2 + 0.3358x_1^2 + 0.0542x_2^2$	0.9898	Model_3

Table 2. Models proposal.

	SQ	nGL	MQ	MQR/MQE	finv
Regression	2.8415	2	1.4207	53.66	6.94
Model_1 error	0.1059	4	0.0265		
Total	2.9474	6			
Regression	2.9474	3	0.9505	29.75	9.27
Model_2 error	0.0958	3	0.0319		
Total	2.9683	6			
Regression	2.9373	4	0.7343	145.96	19.25
Model_3 error	0.0101	2	0.0050		
Total	2.9474	6			

Table 3. ANOVA Table.

$$Ra = 2.3347 - 27.3234 * f - 0.0031 * V_c + 155.1702 * f^2 + 0.00001V_c^2 \quad (4)$$



Figure 1. External cylindrical turning process.

$$\text{SR Model}_3 yb = b_0 + b_1 \cdot N_1 + b_2 \cdot N_2 + b_3 \cdot N_1 \cdot N_1 + b_4 \cdot N_2 \cdot N_2$$





Figure 2. Response surface from the best model (Model_3).



that for described conditions, these parameters will produce the smallest mean roughness of 0.8916 μm .

REFERENCES

- Benini, L. & Rossi, M. A. C. (2019). Doehlert Experimental Design in the Roughness Evaluation as a Function of Milling Machining input Parameters of The ABNT 1020 Steel, The Journal of Engineering and Exact Sciences – JCEC, Vol. 05 N. 04. doi: 10.18540/jcecvl5iss4pp0338-0350.
- Ennaciri, K., Baçaoui, A., Sergent, M., & Yaacoubi, A. (2014). Application of fractional factorial and Doehlert designs for optimizing the preparation of activated carbons from Argan shells. *Chemometrics and Intelligent Laboratory Systems*, 139, 45-57. doi: 10.1016/j.chemolab.2014.09.006
- Hammami, S., Ouejhani, A., Bellakhal, N., & Dachraoui, M. (2009). Application of Doehlert matrix to determine the optimal conditions of electrochemical treatment of tannery effluents. *Journal of Hazardous Materials*, 163(1), 251-258. doi: 10.1016/j.jhazmat.2008.06.124
- Montgomery, D. C. (2009). *Design and analysis of experiments* (7th ed.). New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Ratnam, M. M. (2016). Factors affecting surface roughness in finish turning. *Reference Module in Materials Science and Materials Engineering, from Comprehensive Materials Finishing*, 1(1), 1-25. doi: 10.1016/B978-0-12-803581-8.09147-5
- Slamani, M., Gauthier, S., & Chatelain, J. F. (2016). Comparison of surface roughness quality obtained by high speed CNC trimming and high speed robotic trimming for CFRP laminate. *Robotics and Computer-Integrated Manufacturing*, 42, 63-72. doi: 10.1016/j.rcim.2016.05.004