Heat generation model for taper cylindrical pin profile in FSW
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1. Introduction

Friction stir welding (FSW) [1–5] was invented at The Welding Institute (TWI) of UK in 1991 as a solid-state joining technique, and it was initially applied to aluminum (Al) alloys. Researchers all over the world now recognize the benefits of using solid-state welding process as potential measure for difficult-to-weld materials and for additive manufacturing. For example, friction stir processing (FSP) and friction welding, friction surfacing processes are under active consideration for additive manufacturing [6]. The science and technology is directed toward advanced equipment development, tool design and tool material development, welding process parameter optimization, understanding and predicting microstructural and mechanical property evolution during joining. By adapting the concepts of FSW, FSP have been developed for the fabrication of metal matrix composites (MMC) [7], surface modification [8]. During this process, the material undergoes intense plastic deformation at elevated temperature resulting in significant grain refinement. Tool geometry/design plays an important role in FSW/P process because it performs main functions such as (a) localized heating, (b) material flow and (c) stirring action. A number of researchers used different tool geometries/designs in order to improve the mechanical properties [9].

In the present work, an analytical model for heat generation for taper cylindrical (TC) pin profile in FSW was
Nomenclature

- $Q_1$: heat generation from shoulder surface
- $Q_2$: heat generation from probe surface
- $Q_3$: heat generation from tip surface
- $\mu$: friction coefficient
- $\omega$: tool angular rotation speed (rad/s)
- $\alpha$: tool pin taper angle ($^\circ$)
- $\nu$: tool speed of $\omega$ (m/s)
- $\sigma$: contact pressure (Pa)
- $r_{\text{Contact}}$: contact shear stress (Pa)
- $R_{PT}$: tool probe radius (mm) (taper)
- $R_{PS}$: tool probe radius (mm) (straight)
- $R_{\text{Shoulder}}$: tool shoulder radius (mm)
- $Q_{\text{Total}}$: total heat generation (W)
- $H_{\text{Probe}}$: tool probe height (mm)

Developed. Nowadays, the analytical models developed are only for straight cylindrical pin (SC) pin profile. The need of developing analytical model is that for TC pin profile better mechanical properties were obtained than SC pin profile [10–14]. The proposed analytical expression is a modification of previous analytical models developed by Khandkar et al. [15] and Schmidt et al. [16]. Khandkar et al. [15] introduced a torque based heat input model for SC pin profile, where the torque/power known from experiments is used in the expression for the heat source. Furthermore, Schmidt et al. [16] developed an analytical model for heat generation for SC having concave shoulder in FSW based on different assumptions in terms of contact condition between the rotating tool surface and the weld piece. Biswas and Mandal [14] reported that tools having a concave shoulder led to lesser temperature rise. At the same time, conical tool pins exhibited somewhat lesser peak temperature compared to that of a SC pin profile. Gadakh and Kumar [17] have made an attempt to develop an analytical model for heat generation for TC pin profile but they have modeled it incorrectly.

From the experimental aspect various researchers reported better mechanical properties for TC pin profile. Suresha et al. [10] reveals that the conical tools show better joint efficiency compared to the square (SQ) tools. Hattingh et al. [11] found that taper pin angle is beneficial in producing the plastic flow conditions that are conducive to high strength welds. Buffa et al. [12] observed that increase in temperature is greater when the pin angle is small than that when pin angle is large. It is also important here to note that fine grain-sized product is always desired, so it is better to lower the working temperature where the grain growth during cooling from the working temperature is negligible called finishing temperature which is just above the minimum recrystallization temperature. In hot working processes grain size is favored by a low finishing temperature [18]. Mishra and Ma [9] reported that FSW/FSP parameters, tool geometry, composition of workpiece, temperature of the workpiece, vertical pressure, and active cooling exert significant influence on the size of the recrystallized grains in the FSW/FSP materials. As the pin taper angle increases, the contact area between the welding pin and workpiece increases which increases frictional heat, deformation energy and heat affected zone (HAZ). A SC pin profile is helpful for obtaining a smaller grain size, but the nugget area obtained by SC pin profile is smaller than that by TC pin profile. A bigger pin angle has a significant increase in nugget area, namely the core of the welding where the grain size is in the order of 2–5 $\mu m$, which eventually leads to enhanced nugget integrity. Lammlein et al. [13] stated that conical tool reduces the process forces drastically. The $90^\circ$ tool welds retained a reasonable percentage of parent material strength (50–60%). The $90^\circ$ tool was shown to work better than the $60^\circ$, $80^\circ$, or $120^\circ$ tools. Small cone inclusive angles require higher spindle speeds and create more flash while large angles produce larger processed and HAZs.

Another motivation for development of the model is that Fujii et al. [19] reported that in case of 6061-T6, whose deformation resistance is relatively low, the tool shape does not significantly affect the microstructures and mechanical properties of the joints. They have reported that under almost all FSW conditions, defect-free FSW joints were obtained. Accordingly, the tensile strength is not affected by the tool shape. But from macrostructure, tunnel defects were seen for triangular (TRI) pin profile at 1500 rpm, 1000 mm/min. While Elangovan et al. [20] revealed that microstructure of FSP region produced by SQ pin profile at 1200 rpm contained fine equiaxed grains which is for superior tensile properties of the joints. Also, microhardness survey shows that greater hardness for the TC pin profile than the SC pin profile. Furthermore, from the macroscopic point of view, tunnel defects were seen for SC pin profile at 1400 and 1600 rpm; for TRI pin profile at 1600 rpm. The above two references appear to be conflicting with each other.

Kumar and Raju [21] have studied the influence of different tool pin profiles (TC, taper cylindrical with threaded (TCH), TRI, SQ, pentagon (PEN) and hexagon (HEX)) on microstructure and mechanical properties of FSWed copper and reported that joints made using SQ tool pin profile resulted in better mechanical properties compared to other tool pin profiles. Ramanjaneyulu et al. [22,23] studied the influence of different tool pin profiles such as TC, taper (TRI, SQ, PEN and HEX) on heat generation and microstructure of AA2014 aluminium alloy. They have reported that the rate of heat generation as well as peak temperatures are relatively higher in the case of non-circular pin profiles, increasing with the number of flats (i.e., SQ to HEX). From the reported literature, it is well understood that the pin geometry plays a vital role for material flow, temperature history, grain size and mechanical properties in FSW process. From these aspect, there is ardent need of a model for TC pin profile by which one can find the peak temperature at the weld zone so that severe softening in the HAZ because of reversion (dissolution) of Mg-Si precipitates during weld thermal cycle can be minimised or avoided in case of Al–Mg–Si alloys [24] by controlling weld process parameters.

Modeling offers great prospects in the future for reducing experimental effort in development of welding parameters, tool design, machine design, clamping systems and many other areas, and with the large effort currently being made in modeling it is reasonable to expect a significant return on this investment [25]. The numerical method can solve complicated functions that are difficult to be solved by the analytical
method. However, a numerical solution is discrete. On the other hand, the analytical method can solve relatively easy functions. Its solution is given by a formula that shows clearly the relationship between independent and dependent variables [26].

In this paper, combined approach of both methods was considered. In the first part an approximate analytical equation for heat generation was developed for TC pin profile and in the second part the effect of the taper pin on the temperature history was shown. The main objective was to estimate the heat generated due to plastic deformation and friction between the workpiece and tool surfaces. In order to verify the proposed model, this generated heat energy and the associated maximum temperature were compared to the results available in the literature.

2. Analytical estimation of heat generation

Fig. 1 shows three different regions where Q1 is the heat generated under the tool shoulder, Q2 at the tool pin side and Q3 at the tool pin tip, hence the total heat generation, \( Q_{\text{total}} = Q_1 + Q_2 + Q_3 \).

The following underlying assumptions were made for the analytical modeling.

- The analytical estimation based on a general assumption of uniform contact shear stress \( \tau_{\text{contact}} \) was considered.
- The sliding condition the shearing take place at the contact interface.
- Other mechanism of heat generation such as deformation was not considered.
- Due to friction interface conditions the frictional shear stress \( \tau_{\text{friction}} \) was considered. The shear stress estimated for a sliding condition was \( \tau_{\text{contact}} = \tau_{\text{friction}} = \mu P = \mu PF \).

A simple tool design with flat shoulder surface, TC probe side surface and flat probe tip surface is assumed which is the modified version of the analytical model given by Schmidt et al. [16]. The TC pin surface is characterized by the taper angle \( \alpha \). The general equation for heat generation:

\[
dQ = \omega \cdot r \cdot dF = \omega \cdot r \cdot \tau_{\text{contact}} \cdot dA
\]  

(1)

The contact surface between tool and workpiece given by position and orientation relative to rotation axis is shown in Fig. 2.

2.1. Heat generation from the shoulder surface

In order to calculate the heat generation in the shoulder surface rotating around the tool center axis, an infinitesimal segment on that surface is considered. The infinitesimal segment area \( dA = r \cdot d\theta \cdot dr \) is exposed to a uniform contact shear stress \( \tau_{\text{contact}} \). This segment contributes with an infinitesimal force of \( dF = \tau_{\text{contact}} \cdot dA \) and torque of \( dM = r \cdot dF \). The heat generation from this segment is

\[
dQ = \omega \cdot r \cdot dF = \omega \cdot r^2 \cdot \tau_{\text{contact}} \cdot d\theta \cdot dr
\]  

(2)

where \( r \) is the distance from the considered area to the center of rotation, \( \omega \) is the angular velocity, and \( r \cdot d\theta \) and \( dr \) are the segment dimensions. Integration of Eq. (2) over the shoulder area from \( R_{PT} \) to \( R_{\text{shoulder}} \) gives the shoulder heat generation, \( Q_1 \).

\[
Q_1 = \int_0^{2\pi} \int_{R_{PT}}^{R_{\text{shoulder}}} \omega \cdot r^2 \cdot \tau_{\text{contact}} \cdot d\theta \cdot dr
\]  

(3)

\[
Q_1 = \frac{2}{3} \pi \rho \tau_{\text{contact}} (R_{\text{shoulder}}^3 - R_{PT}^3)
\]

2.2. Heat generation from the taper probe surface

The probe consists of a taper cylindrical surface with a bottom radius of \( R_{PS} \), top radius \( R_{PT} \) and probe height \( H_{\text{probe}} \). The heat generated from the probe is given by Eq. (4) over the probe side area.

\[
Q_2 = \int_0^{2\pi} \int_0^1 \omega \cdot r^2 \cdot \tau_{\text{contact}} \cdot d\theta \cdot dz
\]

\[
Q_2 = 2 \cdot \pi \cdot \omega \cdot \tau_{\text{contact}} \cdot \left( \frac{R_{PS} + R_{PT}}{2} \right)^2
\]  

(4)

\[
Q_2 = \frac{\pi \cdot \omega \cdot \tau_{\text{contact}}}{2} \cdot \frac{H_{\text{probe}}}{\cos \omega} \cdot (R_{PS} + R_{PT})^2
\]
Table 1 - Material characteristics and tool geometry of the Al alloys [29].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alloy</th>
<th>Thickness, t (mm)</th>
<th>(R_{\text{shoulder}}) (mm)</th>
<th>(R_{\text{PS}}) (mm)</th>
<th>(H_{\text{probe}}) (mm)</th>
<th>(T_s) (°C)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AA6061-T6</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA6061-T651</td>
<td>8.13</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA6082-T6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA7050-T7451</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA7050-T7451</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>488</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3. Heat generation from the pin tip surface

Integration of Eq. (2) over the pin tip surface, assuming a flat pin tip gives pin tip heat generation, \(Q_3\),

\[
Q_3 = \int_0^{2\pi} \int_0^{R_{\text{PS}}} \omega \cdot r^2 \cdot \tau_{\text{contact}} \cdot d\theta \cdot dr
\]

From Eqs. (3)–(5), \(Q_{\text{Total}}\) can be calculated as:

\[
Q_{\text{Total}} = Q_1 + Q_2 + Q_3
\]

\[
Q_{\text{Total}} = \frac{2}{3} \pi \omega \tau_{\text{contact}} \left( R_{\text{shoulder}}^3 - R_{\text{PT}}^3 \right) + \frac{\pi \omega \tau_{\text{contact}}}{2} \left( R_{\text{PS}} + R_{\text{PT}} \right)^2 + \frac{3}{4} H_{\text{probe}} \cos \alpha \left( R_{\text{PT}} - H_{\text{probe}} \cdot \tan \alpha \right)^2
\]

But,

\[
R_{\text{PS}} = R_{\text{PT}} - H_{\text{probe}} \cdot \tan \alpha
\]

Hence, \(Q_{\text{Total}}\) becomes,

\[
Q_{\text{Total}} = \frac{2}{3} \pi \omega \tau_{\text{contact}} \left( R_{\text{shoulder}}^3 - R_{\text{PT}}^3 \right) + \frac{3}{4} H_{\text{probe}} \cos \alpha \left( R_{\text{PT}} - H_{\text{probe}} \cdot \tan \alpha \right)^2
\]

The energy per unit length of the weld can be calculated dividing Eq. (7) by the transverse speed:

\[
Q_{\text{Energy/length}} = \frac{2}{3} \frac{\omega \cdot F \cdot \mu}{v \cdot R_{\text{shoulder}}^2} \left( R_{\text{shoulder}}^3 - R_{\text{PT}}^3 + \frac{3}{4} H_{\text{probe}} \cos \alpha \left( R_{\text{PT}} - H_{\text{probe}} \cdot \tan \alpha \right)^2 \right)
\]

\[
(2 \cdot R_{\text{PT}} - H_{\text{probe}} \cdot \tan \alpha)^2 + (R_{\text{PT}} - H_{\text{probe}} \cdot \tan \alpha)^3
\]

In the case of a SC pin profile, the heat generation expression simplifies to \((R_{\text{PT}} = R_{\text{PS}})\)

\[
Q_{\text{Total}} = \frac{2}{3} \pi \omega \tau_{\text{contact}} \left( R_{\text{shoulder}}^3 + 3 \cdot H_{\text{probe}} \cdot R_{\text{PS}}^2 \right)
\]

This correlates with the results found by Khandkar et al. [15] or Schmidt et al. [16]. The same expression without the last term has been suggested by Frigaard et al. [27,28].

The energy per unit length of the weld can be calculated dividing Eq. (8) by transverse speed.

\[
\frac{Q_{\text{Energy/length}}}{} = \frac{2}{3} \frac{\omega \cdot F \cdot \mu}{v \cdot R_{\text{shoulder}}^2} \left( R_{\text{shoulder}}^3 - R_{\text{PT}}^3 + \frac{3}{4} H_{\text{probe}} \cos \alpha \left( R_{\text{PT}} - H_{\text{probe}} \cdot \tan \alpha \right)^2 \right)
\]

The shear stress estimates for a sliding condition \(\tau_{\text{friction}} = \mu P = \mu F\) and pressure equals to the force divided by the projected area.

\[
Q_{\text{Energy/length}} = \frac{2}{3} \frac{\omega \cdot F \cdot \mu}{v \cdot R_{\text{shoulder}}^2} \left( R_{\text{shoulder}}^3 - R_{\text{PT}}^3 + \frac{3}{4} H_{\text{probe}} \cos \alpha \left( 2 \cdot R_{\text{PT}} - H_{\text{probe}} \cdot \tan \alpha \right)^2 + (R_{\text{PT}} - H_{\text{probe}} \cdot \tan \alpha)^3 \right)
\]

The effective energy per weld length \((Q_{\text{Eff}})\) is defined as the energy per weld length multiplied by the transfer efficiency \((\beta, \text{ratio of the pin length} H_{\text{probe}} \text{ to the work piece thickness} t)\) and given by:

\[
Q_{\text{Eff}} = \frac{h}{t} \cdot Q_{\text{Energy/length}} = \beta \cdot Q_{\text{Energy/length}}
\]

For validation of the proposed model, the empirical relationship developed by Hamilton et al. [29] between the temperature ratio and the effective energy level was considered. The empirical formula is given by

\[
\frac{Q_{\text{Eff}}}{Q_{\text{Eff}}} = 1.56 \times 10^{-4} \cdot Q_{\text{Eff}} + 0.54
\]

The coefficient of friction \((\mu)\) varies with temperature. But in the present model for demonstration purpose it was considered as 0.5. Table 1 shows the material characteristics and tool geometry of the different Al alloys [29]. Table 2 shows welding process parameters \(Q_{\text{Energy/length}}\) and \(T_{\text{max}} (°C)\) of the different Al alloys along with the results of this study considering zero taper angle \(\alpha\). Fig. 3 shows the variation of the peak temperature for the proposed model, Hamilton et al. [29] model, and Emami and Domiaty [30] results.

![Fig. 3 - Variation of the peak temperature for the proposed model, Hamilton et al. [29] model and Emami and Domiaty [30] results.](image)
Table 2 – Welding process parameters of the Al alloys and calculated peak temperature [30].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alloy</th>
<th>(\text{rev min}^{-1} (\omega))</th>
<th>(v (\text{mm min}^{-1}))</th>
<th>(F (\text{kN}))</th>
<th>(Q_{\text{energy/length}} (\text{J mm}^{-1}))(^{(b)})</th>
<th>(Q_{\text{energy/length}} (\text{J mm}^{-1}))(^{(c)})</th>
<th>(T_{\text{max}} (\text{C}))(^{(b)})</th>
<th>(T_{\text{max}} (\text{C}))(^{(c)})</th>
<th>(T_{\text{max}} (\text{C}))(^{(b)})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AA6061-T6</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1639</td>
<td>1756</td>
<td>1652</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA6061-T651</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1896</td>
<td>2049</td>
<td>2049</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA6082-T6</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA7050-T651</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1273</td>
<td>1373</td>
<td>1291</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA7050-T7451</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>2214</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA7050-T7451</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2464</td>
<td>2559</td>
<td>3199</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA7050-T7451</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2868</td>
<td>2897</td>
<td>3621</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA7050-T7451</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3053</td>
<td>3053</td>
<td>3816</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA7050-T7451</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2410</td>
<td>2410</td>
<td>2678</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Effect of taper angle on thermal history

In Fig. 4(a–c) under given set of conditions peak temperature goes on reducing. From Fig. 4(a) it is seen that for 59° taper angle temperature is 286 °C, beyond that range becomes zero. For Fig. 4(b), 34° taper angle, temperature is 400 °C and for Fig. 4(c) 26° taper angle, it is 278 °C.

A similar trend is seen as suggested by Lammlein et al. [13]. They mentioned that 90° (here 45°) tool welds retained a reasonable percentage of parent material strength (50–60%) than the 60° (here 30°), 80° (here 40°), or 120° (here 60°) tools. Furthermore, Woo et al. [31] reported that in case of Al–Mg–Si alloys precipitation phase begins at 215 °C and at 550 °C temperature there is complete dissolution of (\(\beta'\)) [32]. Considering the solvus temperature of the (\(\beta'\)) below 353 °C, the temperature inside the material during FSP can be high enough to dissolve the initial strengthening precipitates (\(\beta'\)), resulting in the microstructural softening for the precipitation-hardenable 6061-T6 Al alloys. Softening in the nugget zone and thermomechanically affected zone (TMAZ) is mainly related to the complete dissolution of needle-shape precipitates (\(\beta'\)), while the softening in the HAZ is due to the partial dissolution of (\(\beta'\)) and the growth of the rod-shape precipitates (\(\beta'\)).

It is interesting to note that as taper pin angle increases (under constant shoulder to pin diameter ratio), the contact area of the probe with workpiece increases resulting in increase in friction and heat generation. Schmidt et al. [16] reported that maximum heat generated is due to tool shoulder (86%) than probe (11%) for SC pin profile which is approximately 81. This indicates that for SC pin profile due to small contact area of the probe with the workpiece, less heat is generated at the probe side. In short, the contact area of the probe with the workpiece in the case of SC pin profile is less as compared to the TC pin profile. So, the net heat flow is from probe toward the shoulder. However, the heat generated by the pin (%) is much lower [16]. As a consequence, the net result of temperature is always less than SC pin profile.

Fig. 4 – Effect of taper angle on peak temperature (a) AA6061-T6, (b) AA6061-T651 and (c) AA6082-T6.
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**4. Conclusions**

In this study, an analytical model for heat generation for FSW of Al alloy using taper cylindrical pin profile was developed. A combined of both analytical as well as numerical approach was considered. There is good agreement between the generated heat energy and the associated maximum temperature by the proposed model and results available in the literature. With the proposed analytical approach one can directly see the peak temperature for respective taper probe angle under given process conditions which will be helpful for predicting the mechanical properties for that Al alloy and hence elimination of post weld testing cost and time. The developed model described in this study with modification in Eqs. (11) and (12) can be used to predict the peak temperature for different alloys and materials.
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