

## List Of Figures

<u>Fig. No.</u>	<u>Title of Figures</u>	<u>Page No.</u>
Fig. 2.1	Schematic sketch showing conventional hand spinning of a hollow metallic conical part.	(8)
Fig. 2.2	Schematic sketch showing conventional power spinning of a hollow metallic cone.	(9)
Fig. 2.3 (a)	Flow forming of a hollow conical part schematically shown.	(11)
Fig. 2.3 (b)	Scheme for flow forming the hollow pointed cone.	(12)
Fig. 2.4	Three basic categories of parts produced by flow forming process.	(14)
Fig. 2.5	'Sine Law' as applied in flow forming of cone.	(16)
Fig. 2.6	Method for second stage flow forming.	(17)
Fig. 2.7	Flow forming of a conical part with varying wall thickness.	(19)
Fig. 2.8	Relationship for combined cupping (by spinning) & cylindrical flow forming.	(21)
Fig. 2.9	Volumetric relationship in flow forming of cylindrical shapes.	(22)
Fig. 2.10	Technique of forward flow forming of tube.	(24)
Fig. 2.11	Reverse flow forming technique for tubular parts.	(25)
Fig. 2.12	Flow forming of curvilinear (spherical) shape of varying wall thickness from flat blank of uniform thickness.	(26)
Fig. 2.13	Flow forming of curvilinear (parabolic) shape of constant wall thickness from a contoured blank.	(27)
Fig. 2.14	Some typical components produced by flow forming process.	(33)
Fig. 2.15	Schematic sketch of a two-roller flow forming machine.	(35)
Fig. 2.16	A single roller flow forming machine.	(36)
Fig. 2.17	A three roller flow forming machine.	(36)

Fig. 2.18	A horizontal two rollers CNC flow forming machine and its control panel.	(37)
Fig. 2.19	Schematic sketch showing deformation of metal in flow forming of hollow conical part.	(44)
Fig. 2.20	The idealised flow forming process.	(44)
Fig. 2.21	Straining of an element in cone spin forging (a) Tangential Section, (b) Axial Section, (c) Radial Section.	(49)
Fig. 2.22	Comparison of the approximate upper-bound estimates with experimental values of the dimensionless tangential component force 70/30 brass.	(51)
Fig. 3.1	Schematic illustration of tensile fracture modes as functions of temperature and strain rate.	(57)
Fig. 3.2	Stages in the dimpled-rupture mode of ductile fracture.	(57)
Fig. 3.3	Iteration cycles of experimentation.	(65)
Fig. 3.4	Arrangement of experimental points indicating trial numbers in the $2^3$ factorial design of experiment.	(65)
Fig. 3.5 (a)	Scheme of experimental set-up for flow formability test.	(68)
Fig. 3.5 (b)	Pictorial view of actual experimental set-up for flow formability test.	(69)
Fig. 3.5 (c)	Fractured elliptical part at the end of the flow formability test.	(70)
Fig. 3.5 (d)	Samples of the elliptical components of Al, Cu, DD steel sheetmetals after undergoing flow formability test.	(70)
Fig. 3.6	Forming roller configuration and geometry used in experiment on flow formability.	(71)
Fig. 3.7	Individual effect of metal thickness on flow formability.	(85)
Fig. 3.8	Individual influence of mandrel rotational speed on flow formability.	(86)
Fig. 3.9	Individual effect of roller feed on flow formability.	(87)

Fig. 3.10	Arrangement of the experimental points indicating trial numbers in the design of experiment for flow formability evaluation.	(89)
Fig. 3.11	Response surface for formability ( $R_f$ ) of aluminium sheetmetal.	(102 - 103)
Fig. 3.12	Response surface for flow formability ( $R_f$ ) of copper sheetmetal.	(104 - 105)
Fig. 3.13	Response surface for flow formability ( $R_f$ ) of DD steel sheetmetal.	(106 - 107)
Fig. 3.14	Comparison of response surface between linear and non-linear model for flow formability of aluminium sheetmetal.	(121)
Fig. 3.15	Comparison of response surface between linear and non-linear model for flow formability of copper sheetmetal.	(122)
Fig. 3.16	Comparison of response surface between linear and non-linear model for flow formability of DD steel sheetmetal.	(123)
Fig. 3.17	Relationship between flow formability and work-material properties.	(125)
Fig. 3.18	Variation in magnitude of coefficients of fitted flow formability model with change in material toughness.	(126)
Fig. 4.1	A typical flow formed conical liner for shaped charge warhead.	(132)
Fig. 4.2	Deviation and variation in wall thickness of flow formed cones made from aluminium sheetmetals at $N = 600$ rpm & $f = 50$ mm/min.	(135)
Fig. 4.3	Schematic sketch showing experimental set-up for flow forming of a hollow cone.	(138)
Fig. 4.4	Actual pictorial view of experimental set-up for assessing dimensional accuracy and surface finish of flow formed cones.	(139)
Fig. 4.5 (a)	Mandrel ( $2\alpha = 60^\circ$ ), sheetmetal blanks and flow formed cones of different materials used in the experiment.	(140)
Fig. 4.5 (b)	Photograph showing the actual flow formed cones of different angles and materials made during the experiment.	(140)
Fig. 4.6	Important features of the three mandrels used in the experiment.	(142)

Fig. 4.7	Forming roller configuration and geometry used in experiment on accuracy and surface finish of flow formed cones.	(143)
Fig. 4.8	Measurement of included cone angle by 3-coordinate measuring machine (CMM) of Karl Zeiss make.	(145)
Fig. 4.9	Improved set-up for manual measurement of wall thickness of flow formed cones.	(146)
Fig. 4.10	Measurement of surface finish on the external surface of flow formed cones by 'Handy Surf'-E30A roughness tester.	(146)
Fig. 4.11	Layout of $3^3$ factorial design of experiment showing trial numbers and treatment combinations.	(149)
Fig. 4.12	Response surface contour for dimensional accuracy (% upper deviation, upper deviation of cone wall thickness), of aluminium flow formed cones.	(194 - 195)
Fig. 4.13	Response surface contour for dimensional accuracy (% upper deviation, upper deviation of cone wall thickness), of copper flow formed cones.	(196 - 197)
Fig. 4.14	Response surface contour for surface roughness (Ra) of aluminium flow formed cones.	(198 - 199)
Fig. 4.15	Response surface contour for surface roughness (Ra) of copper flow formed cones.	(200 - 201)
Fig. 5.1	Plot of best accuracy (unconstrained) versus $X_1$ (or R or $2\alpha$ ) at optimum values of $X_2 = 1$ and $X_3 = -1$ for aluminium flow formed cones.	(216)
Fig. 5.2	Plot of best accuracy (unconstrained) versus $X_1$ (or R or $2\alpha$ ) at optimum values of $X_2 = 1$ and $X_3 = -1$ for copper flow formed cones.	(218)
Fig. 5.3	Plot of best surface finish (unconstrained) versus $X_1$ (or R or $2\alpha$ ) at optimum values of $X_2 = 1$ and $X_3 = -1$ for aluminium flow formed cones.	(221)
Fig. 5.4	Plot of best surface finish (unconstrained) versus $X_1$ (or R or $2\alpha$ ) at optimum values of $X_2 = 1$ and $X_3 = -1$ for copper flow formed cones.	(224)
Fig. 5.5	3D representation of best accuracy ( $y_{aa}$ ) <sub>min</sub> versus $X_2$ and $X_3$ at $X_1 = .05$ for aluminium flow formed cones.	(228)

- Fig. 5.6 3D representation of best accuracy  $(y_{ca})_{\min}$  versus  $X_2$  and  $X_3$  at  $X_1 = -0.5$  for copper flow formed cones. (228)
- Fig. 5.7 3D representation at best surface finish  $(y_{as})_{\min}$  versus  $X_2$  and  $X_3$  at  $X_1 = -0.75$  for aluminium flow formed cones. (229)
- Fig. 5.8 3D representation of best surface finish  $(y_{cs})_{\min}$  versus  $X_2$  and  $X_3$  at  $X_1 = -0.75$  for copper flow formed cones. (229)
- Fig. 5.9 Graphical representation of constrained optimal accuracy  $(y_{aa})_{\min}$  and corresponding surface finish  $(y_{as})$  versus  $X_1$  (at optimum values of  $X_1 = 1$  and  $X_1 = -1$ ) subjected to  $y_{as} < 1.7\mu\text{m}$  for aluminium flow formed cones. (234)
- Fig. 5.10 Graphical representation of constrained optimal accuracy  $(y_{ca})_{\min}$  and corresponding surface finish  $(y_{cs})$  versus  $X_1$  (at optimum values of  $X_1 = 1$  and  $X_1 = -1$ ) subjected to  $y_{cs} < 1.7\mu\text{m}$  for copper flow formed cones. (235)
- Fig. 5.11 3-Dimensional plot of constrained optimal accuracy  $(y_{aa})$  versus  $X_2$  and  $X_3$  at specified  $X_1 = 0$  subject to  $y_{as} < 1.7\mu\text{m}$  for aluminium flow formed cones. (239)
- Fig. 5.12 3-Dimensional plot of constrained optimal accuracy  $(y_{ca})$  versus  $X_2$  and  $X_3$  at specified  $X_1 = 0$  subject to  $y_{cs} < 1.7\mu\text{m}$  for copper flow formed cones. (239)
- Fig. 5.13 3-Dimensional plot of constrained optimal accuracy  $(y_{as})$  versus  $X_2$  and  $X_3$  at specified  $X_1 = -1$  subject to  $y_{cs} < 1.7\mu\text{m}$  for aluminium flow formed cones. (240)
- Fig. 5.14 3-Dimensional plot of constrained optimal accuracy  $(y_{aa})$  versus  $X_2$  and  $X_3$  at specified  $X_1 = -1$  subject to  $y_{cs} < 1.7\mu\text{m}$  for copper flow formed cones. (240)

## *List Of Tables*

<u>Table No.</u>	<u>Title of Table</u>	<u>Page No.</u>
Table 2.1	Technical specification of flow forming machine (Kieserling Germany make)	(34)
Table 2.2	Technical specification of flow forming machine (L & F, USA make)	(34)
Table 2.3	Technical specifications for Lico range of flow forming machines	(38)
Table 2.4	Classification of major metal forming processes	(39-41)
Table 3.1	Levels of factors used in the factorial experiment	(67)
Table 3.2	Technical Specification of flow forming machine used in the experiment	(73)
Table 3.3	Specification of work materials	(73)
Table 3.4	Response (flow formability measure, $R_f$ % of factorial experiment on sheetmetal	(73)
Table 3.5	Treatment symbols and corresponding combinations of levels of factors	(74)
Table 3.6	Yates' method for computing factorial effects	(75)
Table 3.7	Yates' method of computing factorial effects total for aluminium, copper, deep drawn grade steel sheetmetal	(76)
Table 3.8(a)	Analysis of variance for aluminium sheetmetal	(80)
Table 3.8(b)	Analysis of variance for copper sheetmetal	(81)
Table 3.8©	Analysis of variance for DD steel sheetmetal	(82)
Table 3.9	Outer ANOVA for all the three material combined	(84)
Table 3.10	Levels of variables and their coding	(90)

Table 3.11(a)	Process variables and flow formability results for three different sheetmetals	(93)
Table 3.11(b)	Coded variables and flow formability results for three different sheetmetals	(94)
Table 3.12	Values of estimated coefficients for the fitted model of flow formability	(95)
Table 3.13	Observed and estimated values of responses	(97-98)
Table 3.14(a)	Analysis of variance for the fitted model	(99)
Table 3.14(b)	ANOVA of fitted flow formability model for different sheetmetals	(101)
Table 3.15	Estimation of coefficients for non-linear fitted flow formability model	(111)
Table 3.16	Observed and estimated values of flow formability responses	(113-115)
Table 3.17(a)	Format/method for ANOVA of the fitted non-linear model	(116)
Table 3.17(b)	ANOVA for fitted non-linear flow formability model	(118)
Table 3.18	Calculated values of "t" for regression coefficients	(120)
Table 4.1	Wall thickness data of flow formed as measured in preliminary trials	(134)
Table 4.2	Material properties of work materials used in the experiment on dimensional accuracy and surface finish of flow formed cones	(134)
Table 4.3	Different ways of representing 27 treatment combinations in 3 <sup>3</sup> factorial design of experiment	(148)
Table 4.4	Levels of factors used in the experiment	(150)
Table 4.5	Observed response values with two replicates (the y's) in terms of % upper deviation of the cone wall thickness from the set sine thickness (t) for aluminium flow formed cones	(151)
Table 4.6	Twice replicate observed response values (the y's) in terms of % upper deviation of cone wall thickness ( $\delta t$ ) <sub>u</sub> from the set sine thickness (t) for flow formed copper cones	(151)

Table 4.7	Observed replicated values (the y's) in terms of mean surface roughness (Ra) in micrometers on external surface of flow formed aluminium cones	(152)
Table 4.8	Observed replicated values (the y's) in terms of mean surface roughness (Ra) in micrometers on external surface of flow formed copper cones	(152)
Table 4.9	Extension of Yates; method for calculation of the effects and their sum of squares from $3^3$ factorial experiment to assess % upper deviation of cone wall thickness $[(\delta t)_u]$ for aluminium flow formed cones [ref. data of table 4.5]	(154)
Table 4.10	Extension of Yates; method for calculation of the effects and their sum of squares from $3^3$ factorial experiment to assess % upper deviation of cone wall thickness $[(\delta t)_u]$ for Copper flow formed cones [ref. data of table 4.6]	(155)
Table 4.11	Extension of Yates; method for calculation of the effects and their sum of squares from $3^3$ factorial experiment to assess % average surface roughness [Ra in $\mu\text{m}$ ] on external surface of Aluminium flow formed cones [ref. data of table 4.7]	(156)
Table 4.12	Extension of Yates; method for calculation of the effects and their sum of squares from $3^3$ factorial experiment to assess % average surface roughness [Ra in $\mu\text{m}$ ] on external surface of copper flow formed cones [ref. data of table 4.8]	(157)
Table 4.13	Analysis of variance for $3^3$ factorial experiment to assess the factor affecting % upper deviation of cone wall thickness for aluminium flow formed cones [ref. table 4.9]	(162)
Table 4.14	Analysis of variance for $3^3$ factorial experiment to assess the factor affecting % upper deviation of cone wall thickness for copper flow formed cones [ref. table 4.10]	(163)
Table 4.15	Analysis of variance for $3^3$ factorial experiment to assess the factors affecting average surface roughness of aluminium flow formed cones [ref. table 4.11]	(164)
Table 4.16	Analysis of variance for $3^3$ factorial experiment to assess the factors affecting average surface roughness of copper flow formed cones [ref. table 4.12]	(165)
Table 4.17	Coded factor level for $3^3$ factorial experiment	(170)

Table 4.18	Factor levels and response obtained from $3^3$ factorial experiment to evaluate dimensional accuracy of aluminium flow formed cones (ref. table 4.5)	(172)
Table 4.19	Factor levels and response obtained from $3^3$ factorial experiment to evaluate dimensional accuracy of copper flow formed cones (ref. table 4.6)	(173)
Table 4.20	Factor levels and response obtained from $3^3$ factorial experiment to evaluate surface roughness of aluminium flow formed cones (ref. table 4.7)	(174)
Table 4.21	Factor levels and response obtained from $3^3$ factorial experiment to evaluate surface roughness of copper flow formed cones (ref. table 4.8)	(175)
Table 4.22	Coded levels of independent variables according to equation(4.4) and the responses obtained from accuracy experiment on aluminium flow formed cones (ref. table 4.18)	(176)
Table 4.23	Coded levels of independent variables according to equation(4.4) and the responses obtained from accuracy experiment on copper flow formed cones (ref. table 4.19)	(177)
Table 4.24	Coded levels of independent variables according to equation(4.4) and the responses obtained from surface finish y experiment on aluminium flow formed cones (ref. table 4.20)	(178)
Table 4.25	Coded levels of independent variables according to equation(4.4) and the responses obtained from surface finish y experiment on copper flow formed cones (ref. table 4.21)	(179)
Table 4.26	Calculation for estimates of the coefficients and regression analysis for equation (4.4) [ref. data of table 4.22]	(182)
Table 4.27	Estimate of the coefficients and regression analysis for equation(4.4) [ref. data of table 4.23]	((183)
Table 4.28	Calculation for estimates of the coefficients and regression analysis for equation (4.4) [ref. data of table 4.24]	(184)
Table 4.29	Calculation for estimates of the coefficients and regression analysis for equation (4.4) [ref. data of table 4.25]	(185)
Table 4.30	Estimated coefficient with standard errors (deviations) for fitted equations predicting dimensional accuracy and surface finish of flow formed cones	(190)