Effect of fiber-matrix volume fraction and fiber orientation on the design of composite suspension system
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Abstract. The suspension is one of the most essential parts of the vehicle whose main purpose is to absorb the energy transmitted by the bump to the vehicle. It also helps to maintain the surface contact of wheels with the road for better stability, ride and comfort. Carbon-epoxy composites are being extensively used in the automobile industry due to its high strength and specific stiffness. The main objective of this work is to identify the suitability of unidirectional carbon fiber for the design of composite suspension system by considering the effect of fiber-matrix volume fractions and fiber orientation. Double-wish bone type suspension system was considered for analysis. The control arms in the suspension system which are generally made up of Low Carbon Steel were replaced by Unidirectional carbon fiber. The strength of the composite material depends on the amount of fiber and matrix content which are indicated by fiber-matrix volume fractions. Fiber orientation also plays an important role in the design of composite materials since the direction of maximum strength depends on it. Various fiber-matrix volume fractions are considered and the material properties in each case are found by conducting tensile and compression testing on UTM. Thus from the experimental data the volume fractions with better mechanical properties are chosen. The suspension model was modelled in UG-NX and finite element analysis (FEA) was performed using ANSYS 18.1. The mechanical properties found experimentally were considered for analysis. For various fiber orientations, analysis was carried out and the optimum orientation is found.
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1. Introduction

Composite structures are being extensively used in automobile industry, especially for the components which are critically stressed such as suspension arms, chassis, gear box, aerodynamic devices and brake disks [1]. Carbon-epoxy fibers are generally preferred for highly stressed components over other composite materials due to its superior material properties such as high specific strength, specific stiffness and almost limitless formability.
Unlike the isotropic materials, the composite layers have in general three planes of material symmetry. The mechanical properties such as tensile, flexural, compression and impact strength depends on the fiber orientation, fiber-resin ratio and number of laminates [3]. In this paper the investigation is carried on the effect of fiber-matrix volume fraction and fiber orientation on the design of composite suspension system. The suspension system selected in this paper is double-wish bone suspension which is widely used in the commercial vehicles.

2. Material selection

2.1 Fiber material
The fiber material selected in this paper is Uni-directional carbon fiber which is a transversely isotropic material i.e. the material have one property in the X-direction and another property in Y-direction and Z-direction. The carbon fibers are generally composed of carbon atoms having diameter of about 6-10 micrometer. Generally, carbon fibers are derived from polyacrylonitrile (PAN) and from petroleum, also known as coal pitch. But PAN based carbon fibers are commonly used.

2.2 Epoxy resin
Epoxy resin refers to a type of reactive pre-polymer and polymer containing epoxide groups. It is cured by curing agent called “hardener”. Most common hardener used for epoxy resins are amines, phenols, acid anhydrides, thiols and alcohol. The properties of the epoxy resin is tabulated in the below.

| S.No | Parameters                     | Value  |
|------|--------------------------------|--------|
| 1    | Density in g/cm³ 3             | 1.2    |
| 2    | Young’s modulus in Mpa         | 3780   |
| 3    | Poisson’s ratio                | 0.35   |
| 4    | Shear modulus in Mpa           | 1400   |
| 5    | Tensile strength in Mpa        | 54.6   |
| 6    | Compressive strength in Mpa    | 108    |
| 7    | Shear strength in Mpa          | 29     |

3. Specimen preparation for testing on UTM
The standard specimens with various fiber-matrix volume fractions for tensile and compressive testing are prepared by using the ASTM D3039 and ASTM D695 respectively.
Wet hand layup technique was used for preparing the test specimen. The various fiber-matrix volume fractions were maintained by taking appropriate amount of epoxy, hardener and fiber on weight basis. Table 2 shows the amount of fiber, matrix and hardener used for longitudinal tensile test specimen. Similar calculation was also carried out for transverse tensile test specimen and compression test specimen.

Table 2. Amount of fiber and matrix used to prepare test specimen

| Fiber-matrix volume fraction | Volume of fiber (cm$^3$) | Volume of matrix (cm$^3$) | Mass of fiber (g) | Mass of epoxy (g) | Mass of hardener (g) |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|------------------|------------------|---------------------|
| 40-60                       | 1.5                      | 2.25                      | 2.625            | 2.87             | 0.6318              |
| 50-50                       | 1.875                    | 1.875                     | 3.281            | 3.398            | 0.5265              |
| 60-40                       | 2.25                     | 1.5                       | 3.94             | 3.94             | 0.4212              |
| 70-30                       | 2.625                    | 1.125                     | 4.59             | 4.59             | 0.3159              |
| 80-20                       | 3                        | 0.75                      | 5.25             | 5.25             | 0.306               |

4. Experimental set up

The universal testing machine having load capacity of 400 KN is used for testing the specimen in tension and compression. The strain rate is kept constant and the load is applied until the specimen is failed. The test data was obtained from the digital logger connected to the UTM through a computer. The output of the test is load Vs displacement graph. The tensile strength was calculated from the obtained graph and is tabulated in table 3.
Figure 8. Experimental setup

Figure 9. Tensile testing

Figure 10. Compression testing

Figure 11. Load v/s displacement graph for longitudinal specimen

Figure 12. Stress v/s strain graph for longitudinal specimen.
Figure 13. Load v/s displacement graph for transverse specimen

Figure 14. Stress v/s strain graph for transverse specimen

Table 3. Strength obtained in longitudinal and transverse direction from tensile testing

| Fiber-Matrix Volume fraction | Longitudinal strength (Mpa) | Transverse strength (Mpa) |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|
| 40-60                       | 658.182                     | 28.130                    |
| 50-50                       | 764.180                     | 27.192                    |
| 60-40                       | 974.611                     | 22.510                    |
| 70-30                       | 1178.73                     | 19.680                    |
| 80-20                       | 364.265                     | 2.191                     |

Compression strength for all the specimen was nearly same and its value for 70-30 fiber-matrix volume fraction was 489.289 Mpa in longitudinal direction and 103.579 Mpa in transverse direction.

5. Predictive models
Predictive models are the mathematical models that give the properties of the composite theoretically. From the literature it is observed that these models are reliable [13]. Generally these are used to obtain the young’s modulus (E), shear modulus (G) and Poisson’s ratio (v) because large numbers of
experiments are required to find all these material constants. Thus the above material properties were calculated using formulae given below and tabulated in Table 4.

5.1 Properties in longitudinal direction

i. \( E_c = V_f E_f + V_m E_m \)

ii. \( v_c = v_f V_f + v_m V_m \)

iii. \( \frac{G_m}{G_m} = \frac{1 + n V_f}{1 - n V_f} \)

Where,

\[
\begin{align*}
n & = \frac{(G_f / G_m) - 1}{(G_f / G_m) + 1}
\end{align*}
\]

5.2 Properties in transverse direction

i. \( E_c = \frac{(E_f E_m)}{(1-V_f)E_f + V_f E_m} \)

ii. \( v_c = v_f V_f + v_m V_m \)

iii. \( \frac{G_m}{G_m} = \frac{1 + n V_f}{1 - n V_f} \)

Where,

\[
\begin{align*}
n & = \frac{(G_f / G_m) - 1}{(G_f / G_m) + 1}
\end{align*}
\]

Table 4. Material constants obtained from predictive model

| Fiber-matrix volume fraction | \( E_x \) (Mpa) | \( E_y \) (Mpa) | \( E_z \) (Mpa) | \( \mu_x \) | \( \mu_y \) | \( \mu_z \) | \( G_{xy} \) (Mpa) | \( G_{xz} \) (Mpa) | \( G_{zx} \) (Mpa) |
|-----------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| 40-60                       | 70668          | 5560           | 5560           | 0.284     | 0.376     | 0.284     | 2650          | 2169          | 2650          |
| 50-50                       | 87390          | 6303           | 6303           | 0.295     | 0.385     | 0.295     | 3093          | 2328          | 3093          |
| 60-40                       | 104112         | 7274           | 7274           | 0.306     | 0.392     | 0.306     | 3815          | 2514          | 3815          |
| 70-30                       | 120000         | 8600           | 8600           | 0.317     | 0.406     | 0.317     | 4690          | 2731          | 4690          |
| 80-20                       | 137000         | 10514          | 10514          | 0.328     | 0.406     | 0.328     | 5918          | 2989          | 5918          |

6. Failure criteria

In isotropic materials the failure prediction is based on maximum principle stress, maximum principle strain, columb-mohr etc. But these criteria are not used for unidirectional lamina because the planes which are possibly weak may or may not be aligned with the direction of principal stress. Thus several alternate failure criteria like Puck, Tsai-Wu, Tsai-Hill criteria are developed for predicting the failure of composite lamina.

Inverse Reverse Factor (IRF) is the parameter used in composite failure. The failure load can be defined as the load value divided by IRF. Thus when IRF>1 the composite fails and if IRF<1 it is safe. But to avoid unnecessary bulky structure IRF must be maintained between 0.9 and 1.

7. Calculation of member's thickness

The thickness of control arm was selected by using the flow chart as shown in figure. In process-1 initial thickness of composite control arm was chosen based on the steel control arm with some increase in arm thickness. Then, IRF of the model was obtained based on failure envelope of PUCK and Tsai-Hill criterion. If the obtained IRF>1, then the thickness is needed to be increased. On the other hand if IRF<0.9, the thickness of the arm is above required thickness. Thus in this case reduce the thickness.

In process-2, the structure shall be tested against the vertical deflection criteria. If the resultant deflection greater than allowable deflection then the thickness have to be increased. After completing process-2, in order to make sure that IRF is still between 0.9 and 1 process-1 shall be repeated.
Figure 15. Algorithm used for selection of thickness for composite control arm

8. Design of Suspension system

The suspension is one of the most crucial part of the vehicle. The main purpose of suspension is to absorb the energy transmitted by the bump to the vehicle. It also helps to maintain the surface contact of wheels with the road for better stability, ride and comfort.

Figure 16. Double wish bone suspension

In this paper we have selected a double-wish suspension. The control arms which are generally made up of low carbon steels are replaced by unidirectional carbon fiber and the effect of Fiber-matrix volume fraction and Fiber orientation is observed.

The suspension model is designed in UGNX 11.0. Since the control arms are to be made from composite, the arms must be designed using the surface entity and remaining parts such as knuckle and bolts can be designed using the solid entity. The model is then exported to Ansys 18.1.
The control arm was fabricated using the unidirectional carbon fiber according to the dimensions. 1:2 scale-down prototype model of the complete suspension assembly was 3d printed using fusion deposition modelling.

9. Analysis
The analysis of the composite suspension was carried out in ANSYS 18.1 using ANSYS (ACP) module. The properties obtained from the testing of the composite specimen are taken as input to the ANSYS software. The suspension arms which are modelled using the surface entity are layered up in ANSYS ACP Pre module and various fiber orientations are provided in it.

The load of 1750 N was applied on each arm. Since the suspension system mainly failed due to loads generated during bumpy obstacles. Generally 4 G load is taken on the vehicle during the bump.

Total load on vehicle = 4G = 4*350*10 = 14000 N

Load on each arm = 14000/8 = 1750 N

Analysis was carried on by considering various fiber orientations for the unidirectional carbon fiber. Deformation, IRF and Von-misses stresses were obtained and tabulated below.
Figure 21. Failure by using PUCK failure criteria

Figure 22. Type of failure occurred

Figure 23. Failure by Tsai-Hill failure criteria

Figure 24. Type of failure occurred

The analysis was also carried out by using the low carbon steel (LCS) material.

Figure 25. Deformation in LCS suspension

Figure 26. Von-mises stress in LCS suspension

| Angle (degrees) | Deflection (mm) | IRF (Puck failure criteria) | IRF (Tsai hill failure criteria) | Von-mises stress (N/mm²) |
|----------------|----------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 0,0,0,0        | 2.4646         | 0.96648                     | 0.96609                          | 537.99                   |
| 10,10,10,10    | 4.8917         | 1.02796                     | 1.0104                           | 542.47                   |
| 20,20,20,20    | 6.2843         | 1.2964                      | 1.2892                           | 550.28                   |
| 30,30,30,30    | 7.0968         | 1.897                       | 1.8904                           | 469.71                   |
| 40,40,40,40    | 10.405         | 2.9463                      | 2.9404                           | 555.98                   |
| 50,50,50,50    | 12.185         | 3.4082                      | 3.4047                           | 554.46                   |
| 60,60,60,60    | 13.724         | 3.6374                      | 3.635                            | 552.12                   |
| 70,70,70,70    | 15.066         | 3.7225                      | 3.7226                           | 549.92                   |
| 80,80,80,80    | 16.191         | 3.6942                      | 3.6911                           | 548.16                   |
| 90,90,90,90    | 16.725         | 3.6659                      | 3.6608                           | 547.28                   |
10. Results and Conclusion

In the testing of composite specimen on UTM with different volume fractions, as the fiber content increased from 40% to 70%, the strength of the composite also increased, since the fiber strength is higher than the matrix material. But on further increase in fiber content i.e. from 70% to 80% there was decrease in the strength. This is due to insufficient amount of matrix needed to wet the fibers, thus leading to debonding and premature failure of the composite material due to shear stress developed between the lamina. Thus 70-30 fiber-matrix volume fraction has optimum strength equal to 1178.730 MPa. Thus material properties of 70-30 fiber-matrix volume fraction are considered for the design of suspension control arm.

Among all the fiber orientation considered, (0,0,0,0) showed minimum deformation of 2.4646 mm and minimum IRF of 0.96648 with both of them being in the allowable limits. From Puck and Tsai-Hill failure criterion critical area in the composite control arms are at joint and the mode of failure is "pmA" which indicates that the failure is due to matrix tension failure. The term “th” indicates failure of composite at critical points where the distortion energy exceeded the allowable value. Thus by combining both the failure criterion all the critical points and there modes of failure is obtained.

About 53.28% weight reduction was observed for the control arms when unidirectional carbon fiber was used instead of low carbon steel.
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