Experimental and optimised data set for hot extrusion of B₄C/Al 6061 composite using Taguchi coupled GRA technique
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A B S T R A C T

Modern aluminium composites reinforced with variety of hard particles become more usage in Industrial environment. But manufacturing of composites with homogenously distributed reinforcement becomes the challenge. To overcome this challenge, most of the Aluminium composite are undergone a secondary extrusion process. The data presented here are related to hot extrusion of round geometry to hexagonal section Al/B₄C composite. Availability of data is extended to expose the optimal parameters of the process over the extrusion load and tensile strength of the extrudate. Ram speed, geometry of die profile, billet temperature and friction within the die and billet interface have been considered as chief process parameters which influence the extrusion load and strength of the product. Totally, nine experiments were conducted as per Taguchi’s L9 orthogonal array to reach optimal parameters. Most influencing parameters with ranking significance have been arrived through ANOVA, MRPI and grey grade. Optimal parameters were compared with confirmation experiments and predicted one to justify the investigation.
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### Value of the data

- The data finds a pivotal role to demonstrate the optimum process conditions of hot extrusion not only for extruding Al/B₄C composite but also for all materials.
- The data are found useful to fellow researchers and industrialist to know the intense effect of three chief extrusion process parameters over the extrusion load.
- The data can be useful to compare further optimisation of processes through any of the conventional or unconventional way of optimisation technique for the hot extrusion process.
- The data presented here are much more beneficial for the design and development of extrusion dies.

### 1. Data description

The data presented in this article are both raw and analysed in natures which are related to hot extrusion process of Aluminium 6061 alloy reinforced with boron carbide particles as shown in Fig. 1. Table 1 shows the specification details of Scanning Electron Microscope employed for the experiment. The chemical composition of Aluminium 6061 and Boron carbide are tabulated.

| **Table 1** |
|------------------|------------------|
| Instrument       | JSM6360          |
| Signal           | SEI              |
| WD               | 27               |
| Magnification    | 100              |
| Accel Volt       | 23               |
| Spot size        | 35               |
in Table 2 and Table 4, respectively. Mechanical properties of Aluminium 6061 and Boron carbide are shown in Table 3 and Table 5, respectively. Experimental condition followed for each trial has been given in Table 6. Selection of process parameters and their levels with corresponding values are given in Table 7. Observed values of responses (extrusion load and tensile strength) through nine experiments under the principle of Taguchi’s L9 orthogonal array have been tabulated as a raw data in Table 8. Table 9 depicts the manipulated S/N ratios and normalised S/N ratios. Computed grey coefficients and grade has given in Table 10. The ranking effect of each parameter over the response can be known from Multi Response Performance Index which has tabulated in Table 11. The percentage of contribution over the impact of response of each parameter has been given as ANOVA Table 12. Table 13 interprets the comparison of grey grade between random and optimal parameters. Fig. 2 depicts the stir casting set up and the casted specimen is shown in Fig. 3. The schematic view of three different profiles used for experiment
Fig. 3. Al–B₄C composite.

Fig. 4. Three different die profile.

is shown in Fig. 4. Fig. 5(a), (b) and (c) represents the experimental setup, fabricated cosine profiled die and extrudate respectively. The geometrical profile of cosine curve is shown in Fig. 6. Pictorial view of computed grey graph is presented in Fig. 7 and the percentage of influence of each parameter is shown in Fig. 8. Raw data are provided in supplementary file.

2. Experimental design, materials, and methods

2.1. Materials

Boron carbide particles with particle size of 35μm observed through Scanning Electron Microscope whose specification is shown in Table 1, were used to reinforce the proposed composite. Microscopic view of the particles is shown in Fig. 1. Aluminium 6061 alloy was utilised as matrix material.

2.2. Methods

Stir casting set up as shown in Fig. 2 was employed to fabricate the composite. Initially Aluminium alloy 6061 whose chemical composition and mechanical properties has been given in Tables 2 and 3 respectively was melted at 750 °C in a crucible, made out of graphite. Then, B₄C particles whose chemical composition and mechanical properties has been given in Tables 4 and 5 respectively were preheated up to 500 °C and mixed with molten bath. In order to achieve a homogenous mixture of composite, stirring process with nearly 400rpm was maintained for about 45 minutes. The mixture was poured in to the cylindrical mould having with dimensions of 12mm diameter and 25mm long. Fig. 3 shows the casted composite. Experimental extrusion
Fig. 5. a) Experimental resource. b) Extrusion die. c) Extrudate.

Fig. 6. Cosine profile.
Fig. 7. Grey grade chart.

Fig. 8. Percentage of influence of each parameter.

Table 4
Chemical compositions of boron carbide.

|          | B  | C  | Si  | Fe  | B₂O₃ |
|----------|----|----|-----|-----|------|
| Bal      | 0.1| 0.17| 0.2 | 0.1 |      |

Table 5
Properties of Boron carbide.

| Property                  | Density | Elastic modulus | Yield strength | Thermal conductivity | Melting point | Hardness (Vickers) |
|---------------------------|---------|-----------------|----------------|----------------------|---------------|--------------------|
| Density                   | 2.5 g/cm³ | 460 GPa         | 569 MPa        | 42 W/mK              | 2763 °C       | 38 GPa             |

was carried out by following the conditions given in Table 6, with the help of UTM shown in Fig. 5(a). Three extrusion dies with different die profile namely, fillet radius, conical and cosine curve, illustrated in Fig. 4 were manufactured through Die sink and wire cut EDM and one of the die manufactured with cosine profile is shown in Fig. 5(b) and typical cosine curve has been shown in Fig. 6. Initially, the casted specimen was heated to a given temperature within muffle furnace. The hot round billet was loaded in the die and then the punch was used to press the
Table 6  
Experimental conditions.

| Parameter            | Specification                                      |
|----------------------|----------------------------------------------------|
| Press tool           | 600 KN UTM (Digital) UTE-60                        |
| Resolution           | – 0.1mm                                            |
| Clearance between    | 600 mm                                             |
| columns              |                                                   |
| Minimum test speed   | – 0.1 mm/min                                       |
| Ram stroke            | 250 mm                                             |
| Accuracy              | ± 0.5%                                             |
| Material             | 15% vol. B4C/Al 6061 composite                    |
| Die                  | Conical, Fillet radius, Cosine profiled die geometry |
| Punch                | 10 mm dia × 50 mm length EN 28 rod                  |
| Lubrication          | Graphite powder                                    |
| Billet dimensions    | 10 mm dia × 25 mm length                           |
| Heating source       | Muffle furnace                                     |

Table 7  
Process parameters and their levels.

| Symbol | Process parameter       | Unit       | Level 1 | Level 2 | Level 3 |
|--------|-------------------------|------------|---------|---------|---------|
| A      | Ram speed               | mm/min     | 4       | 8       | 12      |
| B      | Billet temperature      | °C         | 200     | 300     | 400     |
| C      | Die profile geometry    | Fillet radius | Conical | Cosine |
| D      | Friction factor         | 0.2        | 0.6     | 0.8     |

billet by following a referred level of ram speed. During this deformation, one of the responses, extrusion load was recorded. The experimental trial was carried out by following three levels of temperatures and three levels of ram speed by utilising three different dies.

2.3. Experimental design

2.3.1. Selection of process variable and their levels

Extrusion is one of the important metal forming operation, which is highly influenced by geometry of the die profile, initial billet temperature, friction condition between the die and billet interface and also ram speed. These four parameters were considered to be more significant and their levels were also decided to cover low, medium and higher region of magnitudes so as to accomplish optimal parameter set.

Whenever frictional factor is a matter of concern during the experiments, die surface was fully lubricated by applying a graphite powder as higher level, partially lubricated as medium and zero lubrication or dry extrusion as low level.

2.3.2. Design of experiment

Taguchi’s method of experimental design can be found very much useful in solving the complex engineering problems with lean data. Implementation of orthogonal array paves the way to decrease the number of experiments drastically. Each column in OA represents important parameters which influence the responses. The degree of freedom and number of trials were decided by the number of parameters and their levels. The order of parameter level for each trial has mentioned in Table 8.

Whenever, the extrusion process is considered, load needed to extrude the billet becomes a significant response because it decides the press capacity [1–3]. Moreover the importance of secondary extrusion process for the processing of composite lies with homogenous distribution of reinforcement in order to enhance the strength of the composite, hence tensile strength of the composite being another objective [4]. It is most important to know the degree of influence of the extrusion parameters over these objectives with optimised way. However, inclusion of two responses changes the problem into multivariable approach. As per the Taguchi’s robust design
Table 8
Experimental layout using L9 orthogonal arrays.

| Experiment no. | Extrusion process parameters | Extrusion load (tons) | Tensile strength Mpa |
|----------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|
|                | Ram speed (A) | Billet temperature (B) | Die profile geometry (C) | Friction condition (D) | Level | Value (mm/min) | Level | Value (°C) | Level | Shape | Level | Value |
| 1              | 1             | 4                      | 1                     | Conical              | 1     | 0.2            | 18.5  |             | 428   |       |       |       |
| 2              | 1             | 4                      | 2                     | Fillet radius        | 2     | 0.6            | 19.1  |             | 381   |       |       |       |
| 3              | 1             | 4                      | 3                     | Cosine               | 3     | 0.8            | 20.1  |             | 353   |       |       |       |
| 4              | 2             | 8                      | 1                     | Fillet radius        | 3     | 0.8            | 21.7  |             | 315   |       |       |       |
| 5              | 2             | 8                      | 3                     | Cosine               | 1     | 0.2            | 20.5  |             | 344   |       |       |       |
| 6              | 2             | 8                      | 1                     | Conical              | 2     | 0.6            | 17.1  |             | 394   |       |       |       |
| 7              | 3             | 12                     | 1                     | Cosine               | 2     | 0.6            | 20.3  |             | 348   |       |       |       |
| 8              | 3             | 12                     | 2                     | Fillet radius        | 3     | 0.8            | 19.5  |             | 346   |       |       |       |
| 9              | 3             | 12                     | 3                     | Conical              | 1     | 0.2            | 19.8  |             | 361   |       |       |       |

Table 9
S/N ratio and normalised S/N ratio.

| Trial no | S/N ratio | Normalised S/N ratio | Normalised S/N ratio |
|----------|-----------|----------------------|----------------------|
|          | Extrusion load | Tensile strength | Extrusion load | Tensile strength |
| 1        | −25.34    | 52.62               | 0.328               | 0.000             |
| 2        | −25.62    | 51.62               | 0.463               | 0.374             |
| 3        | −26.06    | 50.95               | 0.676               | 0.625             |
| 4        | −26.73    | 49.95               | 1.000               | 1.000             |
| 5        | −26.23    | 50.73               | 0.758               | 0.707             |
| 6        | −24.66    | 51.91               | 0.000               | 0.266             |
| 7        | −26.15    | 50.83               | 0.719               | 0.670             |
| 8        | −25.80    | 51.34               | 0.550               | 0.479             |
| 9        | −25.93    | 51.15               | 0.613               | 0.550             |

Table 10
Grey relational coefficients and grey relational grade.

| Trial no | Normalised S/N ratio | Quality loss | Grey relational coefficient | Grey grade |
|----------|---------------------|--------------|-----------------------------|------------|
|          | Extrusion load | Tensile strength | ΔExtrusion load | ΔTensile strength | GExtrusion load | GTensile strength |
| 1        | 0.328               | 0.000         | 0.672                       | 1.000      | 0.598           | 0.500          | 0.549 |
| 2        | 0.463               | 0.374         | 0.537                       | 0.626      | 0.650           | 0.615          | 0.632 |
| 3        | 0.676               | 0.625         | 0.324                       | 0.375      | 0.755           | 0.727          | 0.741 |
| 4        | 1.000               | 1.000         | 0.000                       | 0.000      | 1.000           | 1.000          | 1.000 |
| 5        | 0.758               | 0.707         | 0.242                       | 0.293      | 0.800           | 0.773          | 0.786 |
| 6        | 0.000               | 0.266         | 1.000                       | 0.734      | 0.500           | 0.576          | 0.538 |
| 7        | 0.719               | 0.670         | 0.281                       | 0.330      | 0.780           | 0.752          | 0.766 |
| 8        | 0.550               | 0.479         | 0.450                       | 0.521      | 0.512           | 0.657          | 0.584 |
| 9        | 0.613               | 0.550         | 0.387                       | 0.450      | 0.712           | 0.689          | 0.700 |

Table 11
Mean MRPI and the ranking of factors effect.

| Factors | Ram speed (A) | Billet temperature (B) | Die profile geometry (C) | Friction factor (D) |
|---------|---------------|------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|
| Level 1 | 0.64          | 0.605                  | 0.557                    | 0.678*              |
| Level 2 | 0.60          | 0.659                  | 0.61                     | 0.645               |
| Level 3 | 0.68*         | 0.66*                  | 0.764*                   | 0.608               |
| Max–min | 0.04          | 0.055                  | 0.207                    | 0.07                |
| Rank    | 4             | 3                      | 1                        | 2                   |
of experimental approach, there shall be nine experiments conducted based on L9 OA [5]. For each experimental trial, the extrudate shown in Fig. 5(C) was made into observation of extrusion load and tensile strength using UTM.

### 2.3.3. Grey relational analysis

GRA can be applicable to evaluate the problem with more than one objective. The multi-response optimisation can be changed in to single objective problem. The data observed through experiments were analysed and normalised between zero to one so as to generate the grey relational coefficients. Initially the response data recorded in experiment trials were transformed into S/N ratio. The effect of response in terms of larger or smaller was arrived. For the present case, one of the objective extrusion load to be as lower as possible and another objective tensile strength should be as higher as possible are preferred. S/N ratio were calculated as per smaller the better type and larger the better type approaches as follows,

For smaller the better type \( \frac{S}{N} \text{ ratio} = -10 \log \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} y_{ij}^2 \right) \) \hspace{1cm} (1)

For larger the better type \( \frac{S}{N} \text{ ratio} = - \log \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{1}{y_{ij}} \right) \) \hspace{1cm} (2)

The purpose of normalisation is to express the analysed data in to single decimal ranging from 0 to 1. The following relation was employed to execute the normalisation under smaller the better type approach.

\( Z_{ij} \) = normalised value for the \( i \) th experiment/trial for the \( j \) th response

\[ Z_{ij} = \frac{\max (Y_{ij}, i = 1, 2, \ldots, n) - Y_{ij}}{\max (Y_{ij}, i = 1, 2, \ldots, n) - \min (Y_{ij}, i = 1, 2, \ldots, n)} \] \hspace{1cm} (3)

From the normalised S/N ratio, the grey relational coefficient can be manipulated by using the following relation,

\[ GC_{ij} = \frac{\Delta_{\min} + \lambda \Delta_{\max}}{\Delta_{ij} + \lambda \Delta_{\max}} \begin{cases} \quad \text{i = 1, 2, \ldots, n - experiments} \; \\ \; \text{j = 1, 2, \ldots, m - responses} \end{cases} \] \hspace{1cm} (4)

| Table 12 | ANOVA table. |
|----------|---------------|
| Source of variation | DOF | Sum of squares | Mean squares | F value | % Contribution | Rank |
| Ram speed (A) | 2 | 0.0041 | 0.002 | 0.2 | 3 | 4 |
| Billet temperature (B) | 2 | 0.024 | 0.012 | 1.2 | 18 | 3 |
| Die profile (C) | 2 | 0.066 | 0.033 | 3.3 | 50 | 1 |
| Friction factor (D) | 2 | 0.038 | 0.019 | 1.9 | 29 | 2 |
| Error | 8 | 0.083 | | | | |
| Total | 16 | | | 6.6 | 100 | |

| Table 13 | Comparative table of the grey grade for the random and optimal process parameters. |
|----------|------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Response Value | Optimal process parameters |
| | Predicted \( A_3 B_2 C_1 D_1 \) | Confirmation experiment \( A_3 B_2 C_1 D_1 \) |
| Extrusion load (tons) | 17.87 | |
| Tensile strength (MPa) | 413 | |
| Grey relational grade | 0.716 | 0.689 |
\(\Delta = \text{Absolute difference between } Y_{ij} \text{ and } Y_{ij} \text{ which is a deviation from the target value and can be treated as quality loss}

Y_{ij} = \text{Ideal normalised value of the } j \text{th response}

Y_{ij} = \text{the } i \text{th normalised value of the } j \text{th response}

\Delta_{\text{min}} = \text{Minimum value of } \Delta

\Delta_{\text{max}} = \text{Maximum value of } \Delta

\lambda = \text{Distinguishing coefficient defined in the range } 0 \leq \lambda \leq 1

The Grey Relational Grade (\(G_i\)) can be determined with the help of following relation,

\[
G_i = \frac{1}{m} \sum \frac{G_i}{\Delta_i}
\]  

(5)

The manipulated Grey Relational grade now can be equated with Multi Response Performance Index (MRPI), so as to convert the multi objective problem into single objective. The optimal parameters required to extrude the composite with minimum extrusion load and maximum tensile strength can be earned through MRPI data.

It is quite clear from the MRPI analysis that, the effect of die profile geometry is more significant than the rest of other three parameters followed by the effect of friction. The higher values of MRPI are taken into consideration for arriving the optimal parameters. It is quite clear from the grey grade graph presented in Fig. 7 which confirms the optimal level of parameters for the extrusion process as \(A_3B_3C_3D_1\).

The main intention of constructing ANOVA table is to evaluate the quantum of significance of each parameter over the responses. The rank and percentage of contribution of each parameter can be known through ANOVA. From Fig. 8, it is very much clear that the die profile has got the most influencing characteristic over the responses by achieving highest contribution of 50% followed by friction factor as second and billet temperature as third influencing parameters. It is evident that ram speed becomes the least significant parameter in the study. The physical reason behind this influence has observed that, the nature of profile with uniform curvature of cosine profile ensures the homogeneity in plastic deformation and material flow by preventing the chances of agglomeration of B_3C particles near the die entrance [6]. Development of more frictional effect within die and billet region makes the peripheral layer of the work material to deform much slower than the central zone. This imbalanced strain behaviour during plastic deformation obviously requires more extrusion load, which in turn shows the importance of friction factor over the extrusion process. At higher temperatures, the molecular bonding between adjacent molecules becomes diffused, which in turn causes quick deformation by absorbing minimum extrusion load than at low temperature.

3. Verification of optimal parameter through confirmation experiment

Confirmation experiment was carried out by following the optimised process parameters \(A_3B_3C_3D_1\). The experiment was conducted with a ram speed of 12 mm/min, with cosine profiled die, applied with full lubrication and with a billet temperature of 400 °C. The observed values of extrusion force and tensile strength are as 17.87 tons and 413 MPa respectively.

The predicted grey relation \(\alpha_{\text{predicted}}\) of the bio degradable nano cutting fluid can be expressed as

\[
\alpha_{\text{predicted}} = \alpha_m + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left( \alpha_o - \alpha_m \right)
\]

Where \(\alpha_{\text{predicted}}\) is the grey relation grade for the predicted parameters, \(\alpha_m\) is the mean average of the grey relational grades, \(\alpha_o\) is the average grey relational grade of the optimal level of the fluid parameters (\(A_3B_3C_3D_1\)) and ‘\(n\)’ is the number of significant factors considered from the response table. The computed predicted grey relational grade was 0.689.

Comparison table confirms that, the difference between predicted and confirmation experiment is within the allowable value confident interval. Hence this type of statistical investigation
through minimum number experiment can be very much useful in solving complex problem in extrusion Industries to arrive for the optimal process parameters over the quality and product cost.
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