

# GLOBAL JOURNAL OF ENGINEERING SCIENCE AND RESEARCHES EXPERIMENTAL INVESTIGATION AND PROCESS PARAMETERS OF CO2 LASER CUTTING ON C45- MEDIUM CARBON STEEL NSukhanthaSai Koti<sup>1</sup> & V VMuraliKrishnam Raju<sup>2</sup>

Sagi Rama KrishnamRaju Engineering College, Bhimavaram, A.P, 534204, INDIA

#### ABSTRACT

Although metal cutting operations traditionally employ mechanical or manual processes, laser cutting can be a viable, effective, and cost-efficient option for metal fabrication. This project defines mathematical models of value changes for surface roughness (Ra,  $\mu$ m) and Kerf width (Kw, mm) during the experimentation of laser cutting on C45 medium carbon steel using oxygen as an assist gas. The width of laser kerf and quality of the cut edges are affected by process parameters are, laser power (P), cutting speed (V), Assist gas pressure(p). The experiment was designed and carried out the basic stand of the L27 orthogonal array and subsequently, the predictive model has been developed using multiple regression analysis, Analysis of variance (ANOVA) is then carried out to find the relative influence of process parameters on Ra and Kw. After comparing the simulated data with experimental data, the regression model shows the predicting Ra and Kw with more than 92% and 94% of accuracy for the given range of input parameters. It was observed that the Laser power had more effect on rather than cutting speed and gas pressure.

Keywords: Laser cutting, surface roughness, kerf width, ANOVA, regression.

# I. INTRODUCTION

Among various advanced machining processes, laser cutting is one of the most widely used thermal-based processes applied for processing a wide variety of materials. In laser cutting the material is melted or evaporated by focusing the laser beam on the workpiece surface. It is a high energy-density process that works quickly on complex shapes, is applicable to any type of material, generates no mechanical stress on the workpiece, reduces waste, provides ecologically clean technology, and has the ability to do work in the micro range [1].

However,  $Co_2$  Laser cutting system on surface characteristics of the cut section in the cutting stainless steel (SS) sheet (ASTM 304). In this study, cutting parameters laser power, cutting speed and gas pressure are analyzed and optimized with consideration of workpiece surface roughness and top kerf width. It was observed that the laser power had more effect on rather than cutting speed and gas pressure [2, 3]

Laser beam cutting may be applied for the miniaturization and ultra-precision cutting and/or finishing by appropriate control of different process parameters multi-objective optimization the kerf deviation, kerf width and kerf taper in the laser cutting of Inconel-718, The comparison of optimization results to experimental results shows an improvement of 88%, 10.63% and 42.15% in kerf deviation, kerf width and kerf taper, respectively [3, 4]

The nontraditional machining process is a substantially more effective way to machine this alloy. Laser cutting is an advanced thermal machining process that can be used as an alternative to mechanical cutting process.mathematical models of value changes for surface roughness (Ra,  $\mu$ m) and heat affected zone width (HAZ, mm) during high-alloyed steel 1.4828 laser cutting using oxygen as an assist gas. For the definition of appropriate mathematical models, multiple linear regression analysis is used, to obtain smaller values of the Ra parameter, one should strive as much possible towards higher cutting speed desired parameters.[5]

Therefore, in the current study C45- medium carbon steel is extensively investigated with a focus on modelling of  $Co_2$  Laser cutting machine parameters like Laser power (P), Cutting speed (V), Gas pressure (p) as input parameters

163





# ISSN 2348 - 8034 Impact Factor- 5.070

while Surface Roughness (Ra) and Kerf width (kw) are observed as output responses. ANOVA and regression analysis is performed for all output responses and optimal inputs are identified for each desired response parameter.

# II. EXPERIMENTAL SETUP

The experiments were conducted on CNC laser cuttingMachine AMADA Quattro FANUC AF1000E. The process to analyze the effects of the predominant process parameters, i.e., Laser power, cutting speed, gas pressure during Laser cutting operation on the required machining characteristics i.e., surface roughness, kerf top with improved quality of products. The laser cutting experimental setup is shown in Figure 4.13. Experiments were conducted usinglaser cutting Machine for C-45 medium carbon steel as a specimen material. The specifications of laser cutting Machine used in the present study are given in Tables 4.



Figure.1 Laser cutting machine setup

| MODEL                         | SPECIFICATIONS                   |
|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|
|                               |                                  |
| Model                         | AMADA (Quattro) Japan.           |
| Laser continuous rated output | 1000 W                           |
| Maximum cutting size          | 1,250mm * 1,250mm (X and Y axis) |
| Z-axis traveling              | 100mm (Zaxis)                    |
| Cutting feed rate             | 2000mm/min (X and Y axis)        |
| Accuracy                      | ±0.01 mm                         |
| Max. cutting sheet Thickness  | 6 mm                             |
|                               |                                  |

| Table.2 Chemical | composition of | of the c-45 | carbon steel |
|------------------|----------------|-------------|--------------|
|------------------|----------------|-------------|--------------|

| С %       | Si % | Mn %      | Р%    | S %  | Cr % | Ni % |
|-----------|------|-----------|-------|------|------|------|
| 0.42-0.50 | 0.40 | 0.50-0.80 | 0.045 | 0.45 | 0.40 | 0.40 |

164





# ISSN 2348 - 8034 Impact Factor- 5.070

|        | Table.3Machining variables and th           | eir levels used in | the experiment | ation   |         |
|--------|---|--------------------|----------------|---------|---------|
| Symbol | Cutting Parameters                          | Unit               | Level 1        | Level 2 | Level 3 |
|        | 8   |                    |                |         |         |
|        |   |                    |                |         |         |
| LP     | Laser power                                 | [W]                | 600            | 800     | 1000    |
| CS     | cutting speed V (mm/min)                    | [mm/min]           | 1400           | 1700    | 2000    |
| CD     | $\Omega_{2}^{2}$ aggist gas pressures (Par) | [Dor]              | 0.2            | 0.4     | 0.5     |
| Or     | O2 assist gas pressures(bar)                |                    | 0.5            | 0.4     | 0.5     |
|        |   |                    |                |         |         |
|        |   |                    |                |         |         |

Table.3Machining variables and their levels used in the experimentation

# III. MEASUREMENT OF RESPONSE PARAMETERS

The three response parameters measured after machining of laser cutting are surface roughness and kerf width.

#### **3.1Surface Roughness**

The surface roughness was measured by using a portable surface roughness tester (MitutoyoSurftest SJ-210). An average of three measurements was used as a response value in each machinedslot.

#### 3.2 Kerf width

Kerf is defined as the width of material that is removed by a cutting process. It was originally used to describe how much material was removed by the tool. In the present study, the kerf width of each specimen is measured by using Profile projector.

# IV. MODELING AND VALIDATION

In this present study laser cutting of experiment is carried out and ANOVA and multiple regression modeling are done to predicted the Ra and Kw in context of input parameters. Figure 3 and figure 4 shows the main effect plots for Ra and Kw using Minitab 17 software.





ISSN 2348 - 8034 Impact Factor- 5.070



Fig.2 main effects plots for surface roughness Ra

|        |    | Tabl    | e.4 Results of A | ANOVA for Ra |       |       |               |
|--------|----|---------|------------------|--------------|-------|-------|---------------|
| SOURCE | DF | SEQSS   | ADJ SS           | ADJ MS       | F     | Р     | %Contribution |
|        |    |         |                  |              |       |       |               |
| LP     | 2  | 0.97496 | 0.97496          | 0.487478     | 55.12 | 0.000 | 73.77         |
| CS     | r  | 0 16206 | 0 16206          | 0.091244     | 0.20  | 0.001 | 12 22         |
| 63     | 2  | 0.10290 | 0.10290          | 0.061344     | 9.20  | 0.001 | 12.33         |
| GP     | 2  | 0.00696 | 0.00696          | 0.003478     | 0.39  | 0.680 | 0.52          |
|        |    |         |                  |              |       |       |               |
| ERROR  | 20 | 0.17687 | 0.17687          | 0.008843     |       |       | 13.38         |
|        |    |         |                  |              |       |       |               |
| TOTAL  | 26 | 1.32147 |                  |              |       |       |               |

**ANOVA** of surface roughness

The result of Ra generated through Minitab is shown in table 2. laser power is the most prominent factor affecting the Ka with a Percentage of contribution is 73.77 % followed by cutting speed with a % of contribution is 12.33 % and Gas pressure has negligible influence on Ra % contribution is 0.52 % as illustrated in the table.





ISSN 2348 - 8034 Impact Factor- 5.070



Figure.3 Main Effect plot for Kw

## ANOVA of kerf width

| Table.5 results of ANOVA for Kw |    |           |           |          |       |       |               |
|---------------------------------|----|-----------|-----------|----------|-------|-------|---------------|
| SOURCE                          | DF | Seq SS    | adj SS    | Adj MS   | F     | Р     | %Contribution |
|                                 |    |           |           |          |       |       |               |
| LP                              | 2  | 0.009807  | 0.009807  | 0.004904 | 32.61 | 0.000 | 38.00         |
|                                 |    |           |           |          |       |       |               |
| CS                              | 2  | 0.009385  | 0.009385  | 0.004693 | 31.21 | 0.000 | 36.36         |
| CD                              | •  | 0.000.007 | 0.000.007 | 0.001004 | 12.00 | 0.000 | 10.07         |
| GP                              | 2  | 0.003607  | 0.003607  | 0.001804 | 12.00 | 0.000 | 13.97         |
| FPPOP                           | 20 | 0.003007  | 0.003007  | 0.000150 |       |       | 11.65         |
| LINKOK                          | 20 | 0.005007  | 0.005007  | 0.000150 |       |       | 11.05         |
| TOTAL                           | 26 | 0.025807  |           |          |       |       |               |
| 1011L                           | 20 | 0.020007  |           |          |       |       |               |

The result of Kw generated through Minitab 17 is shown in table 3. the effect of laser power is the most prominent factor affecting the Kw with a Percentage of contribution is 38.00 %, followed by cutting speed with a % of contribution is 36.36 % and Gas pressure has negligible influence on Kw % of contribution is 13.97 % as illustrated in the table.

# V. DEVELOPED MULTIPLE REGRESSION MODELS

The mathematical model has been prepared for Ra and Kw using Multiple Regression Analysis to predict the Ra and Kw. Therefore regression tool software MINITAB 17 has been used to find the value of regression coefficients, The developedMultiple Regressionmathematical models for surface roughnessand kerf width are shown in equation (1), and (1), respectively and the R-Sq values for regression model is 92.72% and 94.22%

167





#### ISSN 2348 - 8034 Impact Factor- 5.070

 $\begin{array}{l} Ra = 1.42 + 0.00350 \ LP - 2.31 \ CS + 3.76 \ GP - 0.000001 \ lp2 + 0.444 \ cs2 - 2.67 \ gp2 \\ + 0.000153 \ lp \ cs - 0.00383 \ lp \ gp + 0.917 \ cs \ gp \end{array} (1)$ 

Kw = 0.409 - 0.000288 LP - 0.248 CS + 1.031 GP + 0.000000 lp2 + 0.0309 cs2 - 1.389 gp2 + 0.000153 lp cs + 0.000250 lp gp - 0.1389 cs gp

# VI. COMPARISON OF RESULTS

Table 3 shows the results of experimental Ra and kw and predicted Ra and kw using second regression model and figure 5 and 6 shows the comparison of results

| Exp. trial | Natural Factors       |                              | Experimen                | Experimental Results |         | predicted results |         |
|------------|-----------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|---------|-------------------|---------|
|            | Laser<br>Power<br>[W] | Cutting<br>Speed<br>[mm/min] | Gas<br>Pressure<br>[bar] | Ra [µm]              | Kw [mm] | Ra [µm]           | Kw [mm] |
| 1          | 600                   | 1400                         | 0.3                      | 1.62                 | 0.28    | 1.5               | 0.24    |
| 2          | 600                   | 1400                         | 0.4                      | 1.65                 | 0.26    | 1.59              | 0.25    |
| 3          | 600                   | 1400                         | 0.5                      | 1.86                 | 0.24    | 1.63              | 0.22    |
| 4          | 600                   | 1700                         | 0.3                      | 1.53                 | 0.23    | 1.33              | 0.21    |
| 5          | 600                   | 1700                         | 0.4                      | 1.63                 | 0.22    | 1.45              | 0.21    |
| 6          | 600                   | 1700                         | 0.5                      | 1.57                 | 0.23    | 1.51              | 0.18    |
| 7          | 600                   | 2000                         | 0.3                      | 1.36                 | 0.17    | 1.24              | 0.19    |
| 8          | 600                   | 2000                         | 0.4                      | 1.31                 | 0.14    | 1.39              | 0.18    |
| 9          | 600                   | 2000                         | 0.5                      | 1.62                 | 0.16    | 1.48              | 0.15    |
| 10         | 800                   | 1400                         | 0.3                      | 1.98                 | 0.29    | 1.74              | 0.24    |
| 11         | 800                   | 1400                         | 0.4                      | 2.04                 | 0.3     | 1.75              | 0.25    |
| 12         | 800                   | 1400                         | 0.5                      | 1.81                 | 0.26    | 1.71              | 0.23    |
| 13         | 800                   | 1700                         | 0.3                      | 1.74                 | 0.28    | 1.58              | 0.22    |
| 14         | 800                   | 1700                         | 0.4                      | 1.86                 | 0.24    | 1.61              | 0.23    |
| 15         | 800                   | 1700                         | 0.5                      | 1.61                 | 0.22    | 1.6               | 0.2     |
| 16         | 800                   | 2000                         | 0.3                      | 1.74                 | 0.18    | 1.49              | 0.21    |
| 17         | 800                   | 2000                         | 0.4                      | 1.76                 | 0.22    | 1.56              | 0.21    |
| 18         | 800                   | 2000                         | 0.5                      | 1.92                 | 0.24    | 1.57              | 0.18    |
| 19         | 1000                  | 1400                         | 0.3                      | 2.15                 | 0.28    | 1.89              | 0.24    |
| 20         | 1000                  | 1400                         | 0.4                      | 2.23                 | 0.26    | 1.82              | 0.26    |
| 21         | 1000                  | 1400                         | 0.5                      | 1.81                 | 0.29    | 1.7               | 0.24    |
| 22         | 1000                  | 1700                         | 0.3                      | 2.13                 | 0.27    | 1.74              | 0.23    |
| 23         | 1000                  | 1700                         | 0.4                      | 2.08                 | 0.29    | 1.7               | 0.24    |
| 24         | 1000                  | 1700                         | 0.5                      | 1.91                 | 0.25    | 1.61              | 0.22    |
| 25         | 1000                  | 2000                         | 0.3                      | 2.04                 | 0.24    | 1.67              | 0.23    |
| 26         | 1000                  | 2000                         | 0.4                      | 1.92                 | 0.25    | 1.66              | 0.23    |
| 27         | 1000                  | 2000                         | 0.5                      | 1.94                 | 0.26    | 1.59              | 0.2     |
|            |                       |                              |                          | 168                  |         |                   |         |

Table 6 Experimental and predicted results of Ra and Kw





# ISSN 2348 - 8034 Impact Factor- 5.070



Figure.4 Comparison of Ra results



Figure.5 Comparison of Kw results





### ISSN 2348 - 8034 Impact Factor- 5.070



Figure.6 Signal to Noise ratio plot for Ra and Kw

| PARAMETER | <b>OPTIMUM CONDITION</b> |
|-----------|--------------------------|
|           | LASER POWER- 600         |
| RA        | CUTTING SPEED-2.0        |
|           | GASS PRESSURE- 0.3       |
|           | LASER POWER- 600         |
| KW        | CUTTING SPEED-2.0        |
|           | GASS PRESSURE- 0.5       |

*c* **n** c

#### VII. CONCLUSION

The complete analysis of influence process parameters the machining was performed with laser cutting on medium carbon steel. The cutting parameters selected during experiments were laser power, cutting speed and gas pressure, while the response parameters taken is surface roughness and kerf width. Multiple regression model using MINITAB 17 has been developed from experimental data to predict the Ra and Kw.

#### VIII. SURFACE ROUGHNESS

- From the ANOVA table, it is found that laser power laser power is the most influential factor followed by • cutting speed and gas pressure.
- Based on the experimental results, through Regression, it is found surface roughness increase in the laser power and cutting speed.
- From the main effect slots, it is found that the minimum surface roughness is obtained at Laser power 600watts, cutting speed 2000 mm/min and gas pressure 0.3 bar.
- Regression analysis was successfully applied to prediction accuracy of surface roughness is 92.72%.

#### IX. **KERF WIDTH**

- From the ANOVA table, it is found that laser power laser power is the most influential factor followed by cutting speed and gas pressure.
- Based on the experimental results, through Regression, it is found surface roughness increase in the laser power and cutting speed.



(C)Global Journal Of Engineering Science And Researches



### ISSN 2348 - 8034 Impact Factor- 5.070

- From the main effect slots, it is found that the minimum kerf width is obtained at Laser power 600 watts, cutting speed 2000 mm/min and gas pressure 0.5 bar.
- Regression analysis was successfully applied to kerf width with the prediction accuracy is 94.22%.

### X. ACKNOWLEDGMENT

First and foremost, I wish to express my sincere appreciation to my research Guide, Sri V.V MuraliKrishnamRaju<sub>M.E</sub>constantly guiding and encouraging me throughout this study. We highly thank full to Sri C Rama Bhadri Rajusir, for extending their help in using MINITAB 17. My sincere thanks to M.B Engineering industries Hyderabad (TS), India to provide the facility for conduction of experiment.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] Biswas, R., et al., Artificial Neural Network Modelling of Nd: YAG Laser Microdrilling on Titanium Nitride-Alumina Composite, Proceedings of the Institution of Mechanical Engineers, Part B: Journal of Engineering Manufacture, 224 (2010), 3, pp. 473-482
- [2] Drupal J. Kotadiyaa, Jaydeep M. Kapoparab, Anjal R. Patel, Chirag G. Dalwadib, D. H. Pandya, Parametric analysis of process parameters for Laser cutting process on SS-304, Materials Today: Proceedings 5 (2018) 5384–5390, 2214-7853© 2017 Elsevier Ltd.
- [3] D. J. Kotadiya\*, D. H. Pandya, Parametric analysis of laser machining with response surface method on SS-304, Procedia Technology 23 (2016) 376 382, 2212-0173 © 2016 The Authors. Published by Elsevier Ltd.
- [4] P. Kumar Shrivastava, A. Kumar Pandey, Parametric Optimization of Multiple Quality Characteristics in Laser Cutting of Inconel-718 by using Hybrid Approach of Multiple Regression Analysis and Genetic Algorithm, Infrared Physics & Technology (2018), doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.infrared.2018.04.013
- [5] P. Kumar Shrivastava, A. Kumar Pandey, Geometrical quality evaluation in laser cutting of Inconel-718 sheet by using Taguchi based regression analysis and particle swarm optimization, Infrared Physics & Technology (2018), doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.infrared.2018.01.028
- [6] AhmetCekic\*, DerzijaBegic-Hajdarevic, Definition of Mathematical Models of High-Alloyed Steel 1.4828 in CO2 Laser Cutting, Procedia Engineering 100 (2015) 435–444, 1877-7058 © 2015 The Authors.Published by Elsevier Ltd.
- [7] Milo J. MADI\* and Miroslav R. RADOVANOVI, analysis of the heat affected zone in co2 laser cutting of stainless steel, thermal science, the Year 2012, Vol. 16, Suppl. 2, pp. S363-S373, DOI: 10.2298/TSCI120424175M
- [8] AhmetCekic\*, DerzijaBegic-Hajdarevic, Malik Kulenovic, Alma Omerspahic, CO2 Laser Cutting of Alloy Steels using N2 Assist Gas, Procedia Engineering 69 (2014) 310–315, 1877-7058 © 2014 The Authors. Published by Elsevier Ltd.
- [9] Krzysztof Jarosz, PiotrLöschnera, PiotrNiesłonya,\*, Effect of cutting speed on surface quality and heataffected zone in laser cutting of 316L stainless steel, Procedia Engineering 149 (2016) 155 – 162, 1877-7058 © 2016 The Authors. Published by Elsevier Ltd.
- [10]D. Petković, V. Nikolić, M. Milovančević, L. Lazov, Estimation of the most influential factors on the laser cutting process heat affected zone (HAZ) by adaptive neuro-fuzzy technique, Infrared Physics & Technology (2016), doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.infrared.2016.05.005
- [11]Yan-Liang Zhang, Jun-hui Lei \*, Prediction of Laser Cutting Roughness in Intelligent Manufacturing Mode Based on ANFIS, Procedia Engineering 174 (2017) 82–89, 1877-7058 © 2017 The Authors. Published by Elsevier Ltd.
- [12]milošmadić\*, Miroslavradovanović, an artificial intelligence approach for the prediction of surface roughness in co2 laser cutting, Journal of Engineering Science and Technology Vol. 7, No. 6 (2012) 679 – 689.
- [13]Imed Miraouil, a Mohamed Boujelbene2,3, Emin Bayraktar3, Analysis of Roughness and Heat Affected Zone of Steel Plates Obtained by Laser Cutting, Advanced Materials Research Vol 974 (2014) pp 169-173, doi:10.4028/www.scientific.net/AMR.974.169.





## ISSN 2348 - 8034 Impact Factor- 5.070

- [14]V.Senthilkumar and G. Jayaprakash, Experimental Investigation and Parametric Analysis of CO2 Laser cutting of Stainless Steel, Middle-East Journal of Scientific Research 25 (4): 804-811, 2017 ISSN 1990-9233.
- [15] V.Senthilkumar1, M. Bharath2, K.Dhanapal3, M.Dhinesh Kumaran4, R.Gobinath5, Analysis and Optimization of Laser Machining Parameters, (An ISO 3297: 2007 Certified Organization) Vol. 5, Special Issue 8, May 2016.
- [16]V. Senthilkumar1\*, G. Jayaprakash2, M. Thilak1, Parametric analysis of laser cutting of mild steel, Print ISSN: 0974-2115, Journal of Chemical and Pharmaceutical Sciences.

