The Bendability of Ultra High strength Steels
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Abstract. Automotive manufacturers have been reducing the weight of their vehicles to meet increasingly stringent environmental legislation that reflects public demand. A strategy is to use higher strength materials for parts with reduced cross-sections. However, such materials are less formable than traditional grades. The frequent result is increased processing and piece costs. 3D roll forming is a novel and flexible process: it is estimated that a quarter of the structure of a vehicle can be made with a single set of tooling. Unlike stamping, this process requires material with low work hardening rates. In this paper, we present results of ultra high strength steels that have low elongation in a tension but display high formability in bending through the suppression of the necking response.

1. Introduction

The UK manufactures over 1.6 m vehicles per annum, which is predicted to rise 9% annually. The sector accounts for 7.3% of manufacturing output and 5.2% of manufacturing employment [1]. Automotive manufacturers, however, are facing increasing demands to minimise the environmental impact of their products through lightweighting while improving safety standards. For example, the UK government passed the Climate Change Act (2008) to reduce its emissions by 80% from 1990 levels by 2050. The contradictory environmental and safety demands have led to increasing use of high strength materials such as ultra-high strength steel (UHSS) that have a high strength to weight ratio. These materials have ultimate tensile strengths above 1000MPa but low elongations, making them difficult to form with the conventional cold stamping process.

One way to adopt low formability materials is to use alternative processing routes such as roll-forming[2]. Roll forming increases formability by deforming material through incremental, localised bending [3]. Sheet material flows through a series of rollers rigidly mounted on stands that bend the sheet as it flows through the rollers. The number of stands depends on the complexity of the geometry and can range from 4 to 35. Roll forming is cheap to operate, involves high material utilisation and is environmentally friendly but is limited to processing parts with a single cross-section along its length. Even though the geometry of this cross-section can be more complex than what can be achieved by stamping, forming a fixed cross-section along the length of a part limits its appeal for processing automotive parts, which frequently requires a varying cross-section along its length.

The limitation of the method is being addressed by the recent development of the flexible roll forming process [4]. With this method, the individual rolls are mounted on actuators that can change the
position and orientation of the rollers as a sheet flows through. With correct control, parts with continually varying cross-sections along its length can be produced. Flexible roll forming, therefore, opens up the possibility of roll forming automotive components with high strength materials such as UHSS.

Recent work on roll forming has looked into the effect of residual stresses on the springback on the final part. For example, Mendiguren et. al [5] and Weiss et. al [6] tried to relate bending behaviour of dual phase steels and aluminium respectively to their springback. Hosseini et. al [2] developed a strain gauge-based technique to measure residual stresses of the order of yield stress in UHSS. In this work, the behaviour of a UHSS dual phase grade is investigated by comparing its bendability to its stretch performance and by characterising its through-thickness strain distribution during a bending test. The results show that the material can sustain significantly higher strain in bending compared to stretching.

2. Method
The chemical composition of the dual phase UHSS is given in Table 1.

| Element | C  | Mn | Si  | Nb  |
|---------|----|----|-----|-----|
| Composition % | 0.15 | 0.15 | 0.05 | 0.013 |

Table 1 Chemical composition of the dual phase grade

Stretch formability of the material was characterised with tensile tests and by measuring its forming limit curve (FLC). Tensile tests were carried out according to ISO 6892-1:2009 and FLC tests were carried out according to ISO 12004-2:2008. Tensile tests were conducted along, 45° and 90° to the grain direction. The tests were carried out on an Instron 250kN test machine, strains were measured with an optical/non-contact extensometer and loads were measured with a 100kN loadcell. FLC tests were carried on an Interlaken ServoPress 225 test machine. Strains were measured with a GOM digital image correlation (DIC) device mounted above the machine. Three repeats were carried out of each test.

Bending formability was characterised with plane strain bending tests that were carried out on a purpose built bending rig mounted on an Instron 5800 frame. To assess formability, a DIC device was used to capture strains along the thickness of the sheet (Fig.1).

![Fig.1 Photo of the bending rig mounted on an Instron 5800 frame](image)

3. Results
The results of the tensile tests are in Table 2 and the results for the FLC tests are in Fig.2.

| 0.2% proof stress Mpa | 0° to grain | 45° to grain | 90° to grain |
|-----------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Ultimate tensile strength (UTS) Mpa | 1046.7±0.5 | 1070.7±7 | 1080.6±12 |
| r-value | 0.38±0.02 | 0.49±0.03 | 0.46±0.03 |
| n-value | 0.14±0 | 0.14±0.01 | 0.14±0 |
| Yield ratio = proof/UTS | 0.67±0.02 | 0.67±0.02 | 0.68±0 |

Table 2 Summary of data for the dual phase steel used in this study
The results illustrate a material with a high strength to weight ratio (Table 1) but low formability, particularly in the plane strain region (Fig.2). Away from the plane strain path (Fig.2), formability increases so that in the biaxial region, failure takes place at around 0.25 strain. Its low formability is anticipated by a low work hardening rate of 0.14 (or high yield ratio of 0.67) in all directions with respect to its grain.

In plane strain bending, the material in the outer ligament of the bend was able to support greater strain than in the stretch mode experienced in the tensile and FLC tests (Fig.3). Compared to the plane strain deformation failure strain that was measured to be about 0.1-0.11 (Fig.2), the strain the bending sample supported was 0.16-0.17 (Fig.3). Unlike FLC samples, which necked and failed, analysis of the bending samples using scanning electron microscopy (SEM) did not reveal significant damage (Fig.4). With the current design of the bending apparatus, bending of the sample was limited to about 80°. As a result, it was not possible to explore the limits of bending formability of the material.
4. Conclusions

Tensile tests and plane strain bending tests were carried out on a dual phase UHSS. The results showed that the material was able to support higher major strains in bending than in stretch. The full field major strain field showed that the high strain levels were found, as expected, in the outer ligament of the sample. However, despite the higher strains in bending, little evidence of damage was found in the microstructure of the material, suggesting that it is able to sustain even higher strains.
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