On numerical simulation of powder compaction processes: powder transfer modelling and characterisation
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A numerical model for the powder transfer stage in powder metallurgy cold compaction processes, and the corresponding material characterisation procedure, are proposed. They have been designed on the basis of the following requirements: robust and consistent computational mechanics ingredients, reliability of the obtained results for practical processes in powder metallurgy and industrial viability in the sense that characterisation of any mixture doesn’t require either much effort or much time of the enduser. The starting point is a previously developed numerical model for powder compaction, formulated in terms of the large plastic deformation theory, which requires calibration of four parameters controlling the evolution of the yield surface. This calibration, which had been successfully carried out in the past in a range of moderate to high densities, is now extended to very low densities in order to make numerical simulations able to deal with compaction processes involving relevant powder transfer stages. To circumvent the difficulties inherent to direct measurements of very low powder densities, a simple apparatus, which allows studying the powder motion in the chamber, has been designed to provide an indirect way of calibration. On this basis, a set of calibration experiments is proposed.

The proposed methodology appears to be simple and industrially viable. Although in the work it is applied to the specific constitutive model used by the authors, it also appears available for other families of constitutive models for powder compaction. As a relevant result, this would allow the same constitutive model to be used, via only the appropriated material characterisation, for simulation of densification in powder transfer stages as well as in pure compaction stages.

INTRODUCTION

During the last two decades, a number of numerical models to predict the mechanical behaviour of the powder during compaction processes1–10 have been proposed. Their mechanical (constitutive) ingredients are, in general, particularisations of the family of porous and frictional elasto–plastic material models, including one or more yield surfaces, with either associative or non-associative flow rules, and several (density dependent) parameters that control the size and shape of the yield surface.

As for the numerical strategy, the finite element method has been successfully applied to powder forming simulation11–13 but essentially restricted to the pressing and ejection phases. In these cases a full die cavity, with the required amount of properly distributed powder of uniform density, is taken as the initial geometry for the simulation of the subsequent compaction process. However, this assumption is not valid for the actual manufacturing process of a great variety of industrial parts that exhibit different levels on the upper face. Although during the filling stage the feeder moves over the die cavity producing a flat powder surface, then, and prior to the compaction phase, a powder transfer stage, achieved through repositioning of the tooling elements, takes place. In this stage, powder particles experience substantial motions, which can result in relevant densifications in certain zones that cannot be neglected for the rest of the simulation.

Friction among the powder grains, tooling kinematics and, occasionally, the applied forces are the main factors that can distort density distributions during powder transfer stages. In many cases, partially empty powder regions can appear that result in very low density zones after compaction, which, in turn, are responsible for mechanical defects in the final part. Removal or minimisation of these zones requires, among other actions, a proper definition of the tooling kinematics. Therefore, the powder transfer stage should be considered in any comprehensive numerical simulation tool aiming at helping the designer of the compaction process.

However, this transfer stage has been little analysed. The reasons are diverse: on one hand the difficulty to obtain reliable experimental results and, on the other, the important difficulties found when trying to simulate large motions of the powder with the numerical tools developed so far. From the experimental and numerical point of view, very relevant results in powder transfer can be found in Refs. 14 and 15. There, the use of the discrete element method (DEM) is proposed as an alternative to circumvent the intrinsic limitations of the classical finite element method when the phenomena involve large displacements and strains.

On the contrary, the present work focuses on a generalisation of the powder compaction model, initially described in Refs. 9–11, which is extended to include the powder transfer stage from a continuum point of view. Based on: some experimental results reported in the literature so
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Calibration of the compaction model is carried out as follows: the two parameters defining the ellipse are calibrated through monitoring of the compaction of a very flat cylindrical part (thus minimising wall friction effects), whereas the two parameters of the Drucker–Prager failure envelope are calibrated by means of fracture tests (i.e. compression test and Brazilian disc test\(^{17}\) appropriated to the brittle character of green compacted parts). Friction coefficients are calibrated on thin cylindrical specimens with a large aspect ratio, such that the effects of friction on powder densification are maximised. However, those tests cannot be performed for the region of low densities (ranging from the apparent density to the tap density, 3–4.0 g cm\(^{-3}\), for iron powder) and the correct determination of powder behaviour for that region is an open problem so far. In the remainder of this work, with the aim of improving the calibration at that range and keeping in mind the industrial application of the results, a new family of experiments at the low density region is proposed.

### CONSTITUTIVE MODEL

The model is formulated in terms of the large plastic deformations and it is based on the results presented in Refs. 9–11 where a numerical model for the compaction stage was presented. There, one centred elliptic surface depending on two parameters was proposed. The extension presented here consists, essentially, of the reformulation of the yield surface, the plastic flow and its numerical implementation. The yield surface is extended to a multiple surface case adding up to the ellipse a new surface of the Drucker–Prager type (see Fig. 1). Then, the ellipse is devised to capture the material hardening during compaction, whereas the role of the Drucker–Prager surface is to control the material mechanical failure at high densities and to account for friction effects between grains at low densities.

The adopted kinematics is based on the multiplicative decomposition of the deformation gradient tensor \(F\) that is decomposed into its elastic and plastic counterparts,\(^{18}\) \(F = \dot{E} F^0\) and, consequently, the strain tensor admits an additive decomposition into the elastic and plastic strains \(\varepsilon = \varepsilon^e + \varepsilon^p\). The plastic (irrecoverable) strain \(\varepsilon^p\) is then interpreted as the loss of voids between grains during the compaction, and the elastic component \(\varepsilon^e\) comes from the (recoverable upon unloading) particle elastic deformation.

The elastic response is described in terms of an elastic energy deformation defined by means of a quadratic function of the elastic strains. From that, the Kirchhoff stress tensor can be written in a Hooke lawlike way in terms of the elastic strains

\[
\sigma = 2\mu \varepsilon^p + 3 \lambda \varepsilon^e
\]

where \(\mu\) and \(\lambda\) are the classical Lamé constants.

The strength evolution of the material is controlled by means of the two following surfaces

\[
\Phi_1(\mu, \rho) = \frac{1}{\mu} \varepsilon^p + \frac{2}{\mu} [r(\varepsilon^p)]^2 - [s(\rho)]^2 \leq 0
\]

and

\[
\Phi_2(\mu, \rho) = \frac{1}{\mu} \varepsilon^p - \frac{2}{\mu} [r(\varepsilon^p)]^2 - \frac{1}{\mu} \varepsilon^e \leq 0
\]

where \(\mu = \frac{1}{2} \mu^2\) is the norm of the deviatoric part of \(\dot{\varepsilon}\), \(\rho = \frac{1}{2} \mu^2\) is the mean stress and \(\rho\) stands for the powder density. Functions \(\Phi_1(\mu, \rho) = 0\) and \(\Phi_2(\mu, \rho) = 0\) define, respectively, an ellipse and a straight line in the \(p-q\) plane (see Fig. 1). Parameters \(s(\rho)\) and \(t\) determine the size and shape of the ellipse in terms of the radii \(r_1\) and \(r_2\) as

\[
s(\rho) = r_1(\rho) \quad t(\rho) = t(\rho)
\]

Parameters \(b_1(\rho)\) and \(b_2(\rho)\) correspond, respectively, to the friction angle and cohesion of the Drucker–Prager failure envelope. Notice the dependence on the density \(\rho\) of parameters \(a_1, a_2, b_1, b_2\), and, therefore, of the shape and size of both surfaces in Fig. 1.

### EXTERNAL FRICTION

Another relevant aspect of the compaction model is the friction between powder and tools (external friction). Several options are available for this modelling aspect, i.e. dry or static friction models (Coulomb type friction) defined by

\[
t = \mu_0(\rho) t_{TN}
\]

where \(t_f\) and \(t_{TN}\) stand for the tangential and normal forces, respectively, and \(\mu_0(\rho)\) is the (density dependent) friction coefficient, and also dynamic friction models (Norton–Hoff type) given by

\[
t = \mu_0(\rho, v) t_{TN}
\]

where the friction coefficient \(\mu_0(\rho, v)\) depends on both the density and the relative powder/tool tangential velocity \(v\). Both families were implemented and extensively checked. It was observed that the dynamic friction model exhibits a more robust behaviour for numerical simulations and, therefore, it was chosen as the default friction model. Further details about this topic can be found in Refs. 10 and 11.

### MATERIAL CHARACTERISATION

The constitutive model described above involves several material properties that have to be evaluated for every powder mixture to be considered in the simulations.\(^{15}\) The procedure to determine the evolution of the material properties necessary for the model, and supplied to the material database of the simulation code shall be termed ‘characterisation of the material’. One should impose on that procedure the following requirements: simplicity, in the sense that characterisation of any mixture does not require much effort or much time to the enduser accuracy of the results (in appropriate balance with the first requirement) and consistency with the selected mathematical model.
Some of the material properties involved in the model above, have an immediate physical significance, and they can be extracted from standard laboratory tests, i.e. the elastic properties of the compact and in equation (1). Also parameters \( b_1 \) and \( b_2 \), relative to the Drucker–Prager failure surface in equation (2\( b_2 \)), can be obtained via well established fracture tests, such as compression and Brazilian disc tests, on green compacted parts. 20

Nevertheless, there are other properties such as parameters \( s_1(\rho) \), \( s_2(\rho) \) in equations (2\( a \)) and (3), and the friction coefficient \( \mu_d(\rho,v) \) in equation (5) whose evolution in terms of the density \( \rho \) and the velocity \( v \) cannot be determined by resorting to standard procedures. In Figs. 2–8, a procedure for that part of the material characterisation is sketched. A set of two specimens A (flat) and B, C (open and slender) is compacted via a uniaxial single effect procedure, in an experimental press (developed by AMES S.A.), which is equipped with monitoring and data capturing systems. Two load cells capture the evolution, along the compaction process, of the vertical upper and lower pressures on the specimen and, by resorting to a simple system of pins placed at fixed heights in the die, one or two (depending on the experiment) lateral pressures. In addition, the evolution of the height of the specimen is also registered. The corresponding digitalised histories are captured and
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**2 Specimens for material characterisation.** Specimen A (slenderness height/radius \( \approx 1 \)) and specimens B, C (slenderness height/thickness \( \approx 17–30 \))

**3 Slightly slender specimen**

**4 Evolution of parameters \( s_1 \) and \( s_2 \) in terms of density**

Some of the material properties involved in the model above, have an immediate physical significance, and they can be extracted from standard laboratory tests, i.e. the elastic properties of the compact \( \mu \) and \( \lambda \) in equation (1). Also parameters \( b_1 \) and \( b_2 \), relative to the Drucker–Prager failure surface in equation (2\( b_2 \)), can be obtained via well established fracture tests, such as compression and Brazilian disc tests, on green compacted parts. 20

Nevertheless, there are other properties such as parameters \( s_1(\rho) \), \( s_2(\rho) \) in equations (2\( a \)) and (3), and the friction coefficient \( \mu_d(\rho,v) \) in equation (5) whose evolution in terms of the density \( \rho \) and the velocity \( v \) cannot be determined by resorting to standard procedures. In Figs. 2–8, a procedure for that part of the material characterisation is sketched. A set of two specimens A (flat) and B, C (open and slender) is compacted via a uniaxial single effect procedure, in an experimental press (developed by AMES S.A.), which is equipped with monitoring and data capturing systems. Two load cells capture the evolution, along the compaction process, of the vertical upper and lower pressures on the specimen and, by resorting to a simple system of pins placed at fixed heights in the die, one or two (depending on the experiment) lateral pressures. In addition, the evolution of the height of the specimen is also registered. The corresponding digitalised histories are captured and

**5 Evolution of \( \beta(v) \) and \( \kappa(\rho) \)**

**6 Uniaxial compaction of slightly slender part: specimen A**
recorded in experimental data files. All the specimens were produced using the same Distaloy AE 0.6% C 0.6% wax powder blend.

Results for specimen A, slightly slender (Fig. 3), are used to extract the compaction properties $s_1$ and $s_2$ assuming the following hypotheses.

H1. The stress and the strain fields are homogeneous and independent of the friction effects (due to the small aspect ratio of the specimen).

H2. The radial component of the plastic strain, $e^{p}_{rr}$, is zero (emerging from the hypothesis that the elastic strains are negligible, $e^{e}=0$, and that, for this particular geometry, the total radial strain $e_{rr}$ is zero, so that $e^{p}_{rr}=e^{p}_{rr}-e^{e}_{rr}=0$).

Under the assumptions above, the evolution equation of the plastic flow, restricted to the radial direction, can be solved for $s_1(P_{ax},P_{rad})$ in terms of the axial pressure $P_{ax}$ and the radial pressure $P_{rad}$ in Fig. 3. In a second step, by substitution into the yield function equation (2a), the evolution of $s_1(P_{ax},P_{rad})$ can be readily obtained. The specimen density $\rho$ is indirectly measured from the specimen height along the test and the mass $M$, as indicated in Fig. 3. Then, for a given powder mixture to be characterised, $P_{ax}$ and $P_{rad}$ can be computed. Finally, substitution of these data into those expressions provides the desired evolutions in terms of the density

$$s_1(\rho)=s_1(P_{ax},P_{rad}(\rho))$$

$$s_2(\rho)=s_2(P_{ax},P_{rad}(\rho))$$

Typical curves $s_1-\rho$ and $s_2-\rho$ for iron powder obtained by means of that methodology, are shown in Fig. 4.

Once the material properties $s_1$ and $s_2$ have been determined from specimen A, results obtained from testing the greatly slender specimen B, C (see Fig. 2) are used to extract the friction coefficient $\mu_\phi(\rho,v)$. Geometrical features of specimens B and C are the same but the corresponding tests differ on the compaction velocity. Specimen B is compacted at the speed $\delta=0.8$ mm s$^{-1}$ (low compaction speed) and specimen C is compacted at $\delta=0.8$ mm s$^{-1}$ (high compaction speed). For these experiments, the following assumptions are made about the friction coefficient $\mu_\phi(\rho,v)$.

H3. The friction coefficient can be split up into two terms

$$\mu_\phi(\rho,v)=\beta(\rho)\kappa(\rho)$$

which uncouple velocity and density dependences in terms of the factors $\beta(\rho)$ and $\kappa(\rho)$, respectively.

H4. The normal force $t_N$, at the powder/die contact cylindrical surface, varies linearly in height.

H5. The relative velocity powder/die at the contact cylindrical surface has a parabolic variation in height from $v=0$ at the bottom of the specimen to $v=\delta$ at the top.

Under those hypothesis, and imposing vertical equilibrium of forces, preliminary analytical solutions for $\beta(\rho)$ and $\kappa(\rho)$ can be obtained. The corresponding curves $\beta-\nu$ and $\kappa-\rho$ are then corrected by comparison of numerical and experimental results in a trial and error procedure to achieve a satisfactory agreement. In Fig. 5, typical values of those curves, for an iron powder, are presented.

The values for parameters $s_1(\rho)$, $s_2(\rho)$ and, $\mu_\phi(\rho,v)$ obtained by means of those procedures are supposed to hold for the considered powder mixture under any loading conditions in the tested range of densities, thus characterising the material. In Figs. 6-8, a comparison between numerical and experimental results for specimens A, B and C, with the material characterised by the curves in Figs. 4 and 5, is presented. There a satisfactory agreement of the numerical results with the experimental measurements can be observed.

The characterisation curves obtained through the direct calibration procedure presented so far, can only be determined at the range of medium high densities as the testing machine provides physically meaningful values (typically 0.6–1.0 in terms of the relative density). For the low densities range (typically 0.3–0.6 in terms of the relative density) they could be determined, as a first approximation, by simple extrapolation. This seems to be enough for capturing densification at pure compaction stages. However, preliminary numerical experiments showed that this was not enough as a significant amount of powder transfer takes place. Then, it turns out that, in the low density range, those material parameters should be determined via a different procedure, by resorting to indirect measuring of densification effects on some experimentally measurable physical property, i.e. the transfer ability of the powder. This motivated the experiment presented in the next section.

### Powder transfer experiment

As stated above, a new set of experiments, to study the material behaviour during the powder transfer stage is required. According to this aim, AMES S.A. designed and built a simple piece of equipment to visualise and measure the powder transfer behaviour. Figure 9 displays a frontal view of this apparatus, where die, core and lower punch can be recognised. The apparatus is equipped with a feed handle that allows the user to move the lower punch to the required positions. In order to observe the internal process the front face of the apparatus is covered with a transparent material.

In Fig. 10 a typical initial chamber is presented, where the highlighted L shaped cavity is filled up with powder through the hole in the upper part of the die. The experiment consists of transferring powder, by means of
In the absence of any type of friction (powder/powder or powder/tooling frictions), one should expect the powder to be transferred to the upper cavity without densification. However, internal and external friction mechanisms lead to local densification and only part of the powder volume lost by the lower L shaped cavity is transferred to the upper one. Thus, the amount of transferred powder is an indicator of the transfer capability of the mixture and provides an indirect way of calibration for a model aiming at reproducing that effect.

In addition, the apparatus allows a certain control, via the values of \( h_a \) and \( h_b \) in Fig. 10, of the internal and external friction that is mobilised during the experiment and, therefore, of the resulting amount of powder transfer. Experiments in Figs. 11 and 12 confirm that assertion: in experiment A the punch is initially placed such that \( h_a = h_b = 20 \text{ mm} \) \((h_a/h_b = 1)\). Then, it is moved up to a final position such that \( h_a = 0 \) as shown in Fig. 11. There it can be checked that 95% of the initial volume of the lower powder column has been transferred to the final upper column \((b-a=19 \text{ mm})\) and, consequently, little powder densification occurs. This sates that, for this configuration, the mobilised internal and external friction mechanisms are quite small. In experiment B it is set that \( h_a = 25 \text{ mm} \) and \( h_b = 40 \text{ mm} \) \((h_a/h_b = 0.6)\). The final position of the powder is presented in Fig. 12 where it can be seen that just a column of \( b-a=20 \text{ mm} \) 80% of the initial lower column volume) has been transferred. This corresponds to a case of powder transfer involving rather more densification.

### Calibration of powder transfer

For the constitutive model above, powder densification is closely related to the orientation of the normal to the elliptical yield surface, \( \Phi_1 \) in equation (2a), in the stress space (see Fig. 1), which in turn defines the plastic strain flow \( \dot{\varepsilon} \) for that associative plasticity model (see Fig. 13). The higher the hydrostatic component of \( \dot{\varepsilon} \) (horizontal component figure) the more compressible is the powder, and the opposite holds for the deviatoric (vertical) component of \( \dot{\varepsilon} \). It then follows

**9 Specific apparatus to study powder transfer**

**10 Frontal view of initial chamber:** \( r_e = 51 \text{ mm}, \ r_i = 18 \text{ mm}, \ r_c = 6 \text{ mm} \)

**11 Experiment A: final deformation of powder after transfer stage. Lower punch displacement is 20 mm: a is 20 mm; b is 39 mm; c is 35 mm**

**12 Experiment B: final position of powder after transfer stage. Lower punch displacement is 25 mm: a is 40 mm; b is 60 mm; c is 54 mm**
that, for a given path in the stress space during the compaction process (Fig. 13a), the flatter the yield surface then the smaller is the resulting compaction (Fig. 13b) and more powder transfer takes place. This is a crucial concept to be exploited for characterisation of the powder transfer: flat elliptical surfaces, characterised by small values of the shape factor $s_2$ in equation (3), translate into more powder transfer capacity.

Parameter $s_2$ can be then understood as the one that controls the amount of powder transfer and the level of densification during transport of powder and allows focusing that part of powder characterisation on determining the $s_2-\rho$ curve for the low range of densities. In combination with the powder transfer experiments described above, trial and error procedures using the results provided by

13  

14 Typical $s_2-\rho$ curve for complete range of densities

15 Typical $s_1-\rho$ curve for complete range of densities

16 Numerical simulation of powder transfer experiments A and B. Initial geometries and finite element meshes
numerical simulations for different guesses of that curve, allows the values of $s_2$ to be adjusted for that low range of densities. In Fig. 14, a typical resulting $s_2-\rho$ curve for the full range of densities, complementing the one obtained for medium high densities in Fig. 2, is presented. Finally, the curve $s_1-\rho$ for medium high densities in Fig. 15 is extrapolated to the low densities range, thus completing the characterisation procedure.

**REPRESENTATIVE NUMERICAL SIMULATIONS**

For numerical modelling purposes, POWCOM, an implicit finite element code for simulation of powder compaction processes, equipped with large strain kinematics, contact friction algorithms and remeshing strategies, and GID, a customisable graphical pre/post processor, developed at the International Center for Numerical Methods in Engineering (CIMNE) have been used.

To illustrate the proposed methodology, the powder transfer experiments of Fig. 11 and 12 are simulated. Due to the axisymmetric features of the experimental equipment, only 2D simulations are required. The considered finite element meshes and initial position of the tools, for both experiments, are shown in Figs. 17 and 18. They consist of 1422 and 2993 linear triangular elements, respectively, to represent the powder material and the tools. The powder behaviour is simulated by means of the
constitutive model described above, whereas the material parameters are adjusted according to the characterisation procedure also presented above. Other values are: apparent density, 3.3-4 g cm$^{-3}$; Young’s modulus, 300 MPa, and 0-3 for the Poisson ratio. With no loss of generality, rigid tools are supposed. The considered time interval of the process is 3 s divided into 300 time steps.

In Figs. 17 and 18 simulation results corresponding to experiments A, in Fig. 11, and B, in Fig. 12, respectively, are presented. Comparisons in terms of the transferred powder column height and shape (values $b$ and $c$ in the figures) agree, as should be expected since material characterisation was made on that basis. More interestingly, it can be observed as the simulation provides values of non-negligible densifications and non-uniform final density distributions that could affect the simulation of a subsequent compaction process.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

Material characterisation of powder mixtures at low density ranges is still an open question. Direct measurements of mechanical properties and densification at those low densities place important experimental difficulties that cannot be easily overcome. On the other hand, numerical modelling of powder transfer in powder compaction processes requires proper characterisation of the powder densification at low densities.

Throughout the preceding sections, a methodology for calibration of powder transfer in compaction processes has been presented. Based on a simple apparatus, simple experiments provide measurable results in terms of powder transfer, which can be used for indirect material characterisation of powder mixtures at low density ranges for specific constitutive models. This complements classical material characterisation procedures for medium high density ranges. Examples of application to a particular constitutive model have been provided.

The proposed methodology appears to be simple and industrially viable. As it is applied to the specific constitutive model used by the authors, it allows direct determination of the specific parameter that defines the aspect ratio of the elliptical cup surface which, in turn, is responsible for the amount of densification in powder transfer processes. It seems that this methodology could also be applied to other families of constitutive models for powder compaction. As a relevant result, this would allow the same constitutive model to be used, via only the appropriated material characterisation, for simulation of densification in powder transfer stages as well as in pure compaction stages.
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