

CRANFIELD UNIVERSITY

Markus M.W. Knüfermann

MACHINING SURFACES OF OPTICAL QUALITY
BY HARD TURNING

School of Industrial and Manufacturing Science

PhD Thesis

CRANFIELD UNIVERSITY

School of Industrial and Manufacturing Science

PhD Thesis

Academic Year 2003/2004

Markus M.W. Knüfermann

MACHINING SURFACES OF OPTICAL QUALITY
BY HARD TURNING

Supervisors: Prof. John Corbett
Prof. Paul Shore
Prof. David J. Stephenson

November 2003

This thesis is submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

©Cranfield University 2003. All rights reserved.
No part of this publication may be reproduced without the written permission of the copyright owner

ABSTRACT

The main aim of this work was the machining by hard turning of surfaces with optical surface quality. A numerical target had been set as a surface roughness $R_a = 10\text{nm}$.

It has been shown that achieving roughnesses of that magnitude by hard turning is possible. Individual work pieces exhibited the desired surface properties for short lengths at a time, but it proved to be very difficult to achieve these surfaces consistently and over longer cuts. The factors influencing the surface roughness were identified as tool defects and machine vibration in addition to the standard cutting parameters and choice of cutting tool.

A model of surface generation in hard turning has been developed and good correlation between simulated and experimentally determined surface roughnesses was achieved. By introducing a material partition equation which determines the proportional contribution of material removal mechanisms in the undeformed chip a comprehensive method for assessing the contributing factors in material removal was developed. While it has been shown that surfaces in hard turning are almost exclusively generated by chip removal and plastic deformation the developed model is versatile enough to include elastic deformation of the work piece.

With the help of the model of surface generation in hard turning it has been possible to attribute magnitudes of the influencing factors with respect to the cutting parameters such as feed rate and tool corner radius, and the main disturbances – tool defects and machine vibration. From this conclusions were drawn on the requirements for machine tools and cutting tools, which will need to be realised to make ultra-precision hard turning of surfaces of optical quality a feasible manufacturing process.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost I would like to thank my employer, Cranfield Precision, for giving me the opportunity to carry out the research work and for their sponsorship.

I also would like to express my gratitude to my supervisors Prof. John Corbett, Prof. Paul Shore and Prof. David Stephenson for their support and encouragement. I profited greatly from their advice, their ideas and knowledge.

I wish to thank my colleagues at Cranfield Precision and the members of staff of Cranfield University, who supported me in one way or another during the work on this dissertation. Two of my colleagues deserve a particular mention: Roger Nunn for getting me started on hard turning and his help in setting-up the DeltaTurn40, also Mike Pierse for designing the DeltaTurn40 ultra-precision lathe in the first place and for his continuous interest in the progress of this research.

This work was in part supported by the European Commission through the Framework 5 project ULTRAFLEX.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	Introduction	1
2	Literature review	2
2.1	The hard turning process.....	2
2.1.1	The principle of hard turning	2
2.1.2	Surface roughness.....	4
2.1.3	Surface generation.....	6
2.1.4	Surface integrity	10
2.1.5	Cutting tools.....	13
2.1.6	Modelling of the hard turning process.....	18
2.2	“Ultra-precision” turning machines.....	20
2.3	Competing processes	23
3	Scope of Work.....	26
4	Equipment & Procedures.....	27
4.1	The DeltaTurn40 ultra-precision lathe.....	27
4.2	Sample work pieces.....	29
4.3	Metrology.....	34
5	Results & Discussion.....	39
5.1	Surface roughness generation under influence of a minimum undeformed chip thickness.....	39
5.1.1	Comparison of actual and simulated profiles.....	51
5.2	Simulation of surface roughness generation at low feed rates with imperfect cutting tools	53
5.2.1	Simulation of single-defect cutting edges.....	54
5.2.2	Simulation of regular multi-defect cutting edges.....	59
5.3	Cutting tests with standard cutting tools.....	61
5.3.1	Surface roughness from short assessment lengths	62
5.3.2	Cutting edge quality.....	63
5.3.3	Surface roughness from long assessment lengths - Influence of asynchronous error motion.....	66
5.4	Refined simulation of surface roughness generation.....	70
5.4.1	Tool ‘fingerprints’ in the assessment of tools with wiper geometry	76

5.5	Tool wear at low feed rates.....	79
5.5.1	Flank wear	79
5.5.2	Notch wear.....	80
5.5.3	Effect of tool wear on surface roughness	84
5.5.4	Conclusions on the material partition equation	87
6	Conclusions and Outlook	91
Appendix A	Important features on cutting tools	94
Appendix B	Simulation Source Code.....	95
References	100

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1: Principle of Hard Turning	2
Figure 2: Chip formation in hard turning	3
Figure 3: Surface Roughness.....	5
Figure 4: Dimensions and shape of the undeformed chip.....	6
Figure 5: Surface roughness generation in turning.....	7
Figure 6: Determination of the stagnation point according to L'Vov	8
Figure 7: Approximate surface hardness values (HV0.02) depending on process conditions given by Bongardt [18]	11
Figure 8: Typical Residual Stress Profile in hard turning.....	12
Figure 9: Tool wear in section parallel to the Tool Back Plane	17
Figure 10: Tool wear in section parallel to the Tool Reference Plane P_r	18
Figure 11: Development of machining accuracy after Taniguchi in comparison to current turning machines	20
Figure 12: The DeltaTurn40 ultra-precision lathe	28
Figure 13: Schematics of the DeltaTurn40	29
Figure 14: CVT component, ultra-precision machined surfaces indicated in red.....	30
Figure 15: Hard Turning development component	32
Figure 16: Hardness profile of sample work pieces	33
Figure 17: Etched sample surface (visual light and false colour image)	34
Figure 18: Primary tool profiles	36
Figure 19: Sample work piece for recording the tool profile prior to low- feed machining.....	38
Figure 20: Comparison of Brammerz's equation and Equation 11	41
Figure 21: Flow Diagram of Surface Generation Software	42
Figure 22: Proportional contribution to material removal in Brammerz's theory.....	45
Figure 23: Comparison of Brammerz's and simulated roughnesses.....	46
Figure 24: Simulated development of surface roughness at low feed rates	48
Figure 25: Simulated surface profiles using Brammerz at low feeds.....	50
Figure 26: Comparison of simulated and actual surface roughness (R_a)	51

Figure 27: Comparison of simulated and actual surface profiles ($r_\varepsilon=0.4\text{mm}$, $r_n=10\mu\text{m}$)	52
Figure 28: Profile of an unused CBN cutting tool ($r_\varepsilon=0.4\text{mm}$, BNX25)	54
Figure 29: Tool profiles with single defects	55
Figure 30: Roughness prediction (R_t) from cutting tools with single defects	58
Figure 31: Surface roughness simulated with sinusoidal defects (r_ε 0.4mm , defect height $0.47\mu\text{m}$, defect width $19.8\mu\text{m}$)	60
Figure 32: Surface roughness simulated with sinusoidal defects (r_ε 0.4mm , defect height $0.25\mu\text{m}$, defect width $3.97\mu\text{m}$)	60
Figure 33: Underlying trend in dependency between feed and surface roughness (R_t)	61
Figure 34: Roughness R_t vs. Feed (averaged from three cutting tests) ..	62
Figure 35: Scanning electron micrograph of severe coating failure	64
Figure 36: Measurement of the Cutting Edge Radius	65
Figure 37: Difference in surface roughness due to change in assessment length (machined with CBN100).....	67
Figure 38: Vibration contribution to surface roughness.....	67
Figure 39: Peak-to-Peak vibration levels.....	68
Figure 40: Asynchronous Error Motion at $f=1\mu\text{m}$ measured off surface roughness.....	69
Figure 41: Flow diagram of surface roughness simulation including synchronous error	70
Figure 42: Effect of different vibration levels on surface roughness R_a (Tool Defect Height: $0.33\mu\text{m}$, Defect Width: $10.1\mu\text{m}$)	71
Figure 43: Comparison between measured and simulated surface roughnesses (R_a , R_t)	72
Figure 44: Machine/Cutting tool fingerprints (grey areas) and experimental results (red dots)	74
Figure 45: Causes and their relative effects on surface roughness (new tools, $r_\varepsilon 0.4$)	75
Figure 46: Wiper tool geometry used in cutting trials.....	77
Figure 47: Fingerprints for round nose ($r_\varepsilon 0.4$) and wiper tool ($r_\varepsilon 0.8$, 0.5° wiper)	78
Figure 48: Wear marks on tools after $t_c=20\text{min}$	79
Figure 49: Wear mark width development with cutting time	80
Figure 50: Comparison of new and worn cutting tools after a cutting time $t_c=20\text{min}$	81

Figure 51: Simulation of Notch Wear Propagation at $f=40\mu\text{m}$ 82

Figure 52: Measured Notch Wear Propagation at $f=40\mu\text{m}$ 82

Figure 53: ‘Notch’ wear at $f=2\mu\text{m}$ 83

Figure 54: Notch depth development for different feed rates 84

Figure 55: Development of Surface Roughness (R_a) with cutting time.. 85

Figure 56: Development of asynchronous vibration with cutting time .. 86

Figure 57: Causes and their relative effects on surface roughness (worn tools)..... 87

Figure 58: Relative material partition in hard turning 89

Figure 59: Proportions of plastic deformation on work piece surface ($r_\epsilon=0.4\text{mm}$, $r_n=10\mu\text{m}$)..... 90

Figure 60: Proportions of plastic deformation with different cutting edge radii ($r_\epsilon=0.4\text{mm}$)..... 90

Figure 61: Cutting edges and surfaces on the cutting part of a turning tool 94

Figure 62: Cutting tool features in the tool reference plane P_r 94

Figure 63: Cutting tool features in the tool back plane..... 94

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: CBN grades used for turning of hard steel.....	14
Table 2: Selected finishing processes used after hard turning	25
Table 3: Material Composition of the CVT work piece (51CrV4).....	31
Table 4: Typical sample preparation for metallurgical analysis.	33
Table 5: Surface roughness measurement parameters (Talysurf)	34
Table 6: Surface roughness measurement parameters (Wyko RST).....	35
Table 7: Defect dimensions used in the simulation.....	54
Table 8: Cutting Edge Roughness Parameters.....	64
Table 9: Cutting Edge Radii measurements (supplied by Seco Tools UK)	65

NOTATION

Capital Letters

A_α	Flank
$A_{\alpha 1}$	Major first flank
$A_{\alpha 1}'$	Minor first flank
$A_{\alpha 2}$	Major second flank
$A_{\alpha 2}'$	Minor second flank
A_γ	Face
$A_{\gamma 1}$	Major first face
$A_{\gamma 2}$	Major second face
$F_{\gamma n}$	Force normal to the chip
$F_{\chi n}$	Force normal to the major cutting edge
$F_{\gamma t}$ $F_{\chi t}'$	Force tangential to the chip
F_c	Cutting Force
HRC	Hardness Rockwell 'C'
HV	Hardness Vickers
L	Evaluation Length or Sampling Length
M	Reference line
P_r	Tool reference plane
R_a	Surface finish parameter (Roughness Average)
R_t	Surface finish parameter (Peak-to-Valley height)
S	Major cutting edge
S'	Minor cutting edge
S_m	Mean width of the profile elements
V_B	Wear mark width

Lower case letters

a_p	Depth of cut
f	Feed
h	Undeformed chip thickness
h_{min}	Minimum undeformed chip thickness
p_{cut}	Proportion of chip removal
$p_{elastic}$	Proportion of elastic deformation
$p_{plastic}$	Proportion of plastic deformation
r_n	Rounded cutting edge radius
r_ε	Tool corner radius
t	Time
t_c	Cutting time
v_c	Cutting speed
y_i	Profile point
y_{max}	Highest profile point
y_{min}	Lowest profile point
c_i	Calculation constants

Greek letters and symbols

Δh_{el}	Elastically deformed proportion of undeformed chip thickness
Δh_{pl}	Plastically deformed proportion of undeformed chip thickness
κ_{re}	Tool cutting edge angle
$\Phi(x)$	Heaviside Step Function
Θ	Stagnation point angle
σ	Standard deviation

Abbreviations

CBN	Cubic Boron Nitride
CGI	Compacted Graphite Iron
CVT	Continuously Variable Transmission
DSP	Digital Signal Processing
PCBN	Polycrystalline Cubic Boron Nitride