



**U*ni*MAP**

**OPTIMIZATION OF MACHINING PROCESSES BY  
USING CRITERIA OF MAXIMUM PRODUCTIVITY  
AND MINIMUM COST**

by

**AEAD M. AHMED**

(0940510393)

A thesis submitted in fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy (Manufacturing Engineering)

School of Manufacturing Engineering

**UNIVERSITI MALAYSIA PERLIS**

2013



## ACKNOWLEDGMENT

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم

Uncountable thanks go to my parents for their love and blessings. They always provide me the strength to live and progress in this life. I would also like to thank them for their continuous support, patience, encouragement and extra care. I am forever grateful to them and my brothers and sisters for their continued moral support. It was impossible to stay this far from them and do this work without their confidence in me. The deepest thanks from my heart go to my precious wife and my children who really change my life for the best during my study. I would also like to express my gratitude and thanks to Professor Dr. Ryspek Usumabatov for his patience during my Ph.D. journey. My most sincere thanks go to my co-supervisor, Professor Dr. Zuraidah M. Zain, for her guidance and encouragement during my research. Prof Zuraidah, thank you very much for the time you spent with me to help me transform my thesis in this form. Honestly, without your help and suggestions, this thesis will not be as good as it is in this current form. I would like also to show my respect and thanks to my co-supervisor, Dr. Muhamad Saifuldin Abdul Manan, for his suggestions to improve my thesis. Without his help, I would not have been able to achieve what I have achieved. I am also thankful all the technicians in the laboratories. I enjoyed the moments I shared with them. They have helped enormously. I wish them all the best in their life. Last but not least, I am thankful to all my friends for the moments I shared with them. I pray to Allah for them to achieve nothing but success in this life and the next.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|   | <b>Page</b> |
|---|-------------|
| DECLARATION OF THESIS .....                   | i           |
| ACKNOWLEDGMENT .....                          | ii          |
| TABLE OF CONTENTS .....                       | iii         |
| LIST OF TABLES .....                          | viii        |
| LIST OF FIGURES .....                         | ix          |
| LIST OF SYMBOLS.....                          | xi          |
| LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS .....                   | xiv         |
| ABSTRAK .....                                 | xv          |
| ABSTRACT .....                                | xvi         |
| CHAPTER 1:INTRODUCTION .....                  | 1           |
| 1.1 Background .....                          | 1           |
| 1.2 Economics of Machining Optimization ..... | 4           |
| 1.3 Machining Parameters.....                 | 6           |
| 1.4 Problem Statement .....                   | 7           |
| 1.5 Contribution .....                        | 8           |
| 1.6 Research Objectives .....                 | 8           |
| 1.7 Scope of Work.....                        | 9           |
| 1.8 Thesis Overview.....                      | 11          |
| CHAPTER 2:LITERATURE REVIEW .....             | 13          |
| 2.1 Introduction .....                        | 13          |
| 2.2 Turning Operation.....                    | 15          |
| 2.2.1 External Operations .....               | 16          |

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| 2.2.2 Internal Operations .....                             | 17        |
| 2.3 Cutting Tool Materials .....                            | 17        |
| 2.3.1 High Speed Steel, Carbon Steel Tool .....             | 18        |
| 2.3.2 Ceramics .....  | 19        |
| 2.3.3 Cermet .....  | 20        |
| 2.4 Tool Life.....  | 21        |
| 2.5 Tool Wear.....  | 23        |
| 2.6 Tool Wear Sensors .....                                 | 27        |
| 2.7 Type of Tool Damage .....                               | 28        |
| 2.7.1 Causes of Tool Damage .....                           | 29        |
| 2.7.1.1 Mechanical Damage.....                              | 29        |
| 2.7.1.2 Thermal Damage Plastic Deformation.....             | 30        |
| 2.7.1.3 Thermal Damage Diffusion .....                      | 31        |
| 2.7.1.4 Thermal Damage and Chemical Reaction .....          | 31        |
| 2.7.1.5 Adhesion .....                                      | 32        |
| 2.8 Optimization Machining Modes, Cost and Time Models..... | 32        |
| 2.9 Summary .....   | 49        |
| <b>CHAPTER 3:RESEARCH METHODOLOGY.....</b>                  | <b>51</b> |
| 3.1 Introduction .....                                      | 51        |
| 3.2 Experimental Procedure .....                            | 54        |
| 3.2.1 Experimental Procedure for Measuring Tool Life .....  | 56        |
| 3.2.2 Experiment Procedure for Hardness Test.....           | 58        |

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| 3.3 Chemical Properties of High Speed Steel .....  | 59  |
| 3.4 Analytical Approach of Maximum Productivity for Single Cutting Tool Process<br>.....                           | 61  |
| 3.5 Analytical Approach of the Maximum Productivity for Multi Tool Process .....                                   | 68  |
| 3.5.1 Change of Machining Time with Changes in Machining Modes .....   | 70  |
| 3.5.2 Change of Auxiliary Time with Changes in Machining Modes .....   | 72  |
| 3.5.3 Change of Time Losses Due to Reliability of Cutters with Changes in<br>Machining Modes .....                 | 72  |
| 3.5.4 Change of Time Losses Due to Reliability of Machine Tool Units with<br>Change in Machining Modes .....       | 75  |
| 3.5.5 Productivity of Machine Tool with Changes in Machining Modes .....   | 76  |
| 3.6 Cost Analytical Approach for Single Cutting Tool Process .....   | 76  |
| 3.7 Cost of Change of Machining Time with Changes in Machining Modes for Multi<br>Cutter Process .....             | 81  |
| 3.8 Analytical Approach for Productivity of Machine Tools Depending on Change of<br>Processing Modes .....         | 83  |
| 3.8.1 Recommended Solution for Changing Machining Modes .....  | 84  |
| 3.9 Analytical Approach of Optimization of the Multi Tool Machining Process with<br>Simultaneous Action .....      | 97  |
| 3.9.1 Change in Machining Time Relative to Change in Machining Mode .....  | 101 |
| 3.9.2 Change in Time Losses Due to Reliability of Machine Tool Units Relative<br>to Change in Machining Mode ..... | 105 |

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| 3.9.3 Productivity of Machine Tool Relative to Changes in Multi Tool Machining<br>Mode for Single Tools Cutting Process ..... | 106 |
| CHAPTER 4:RESULTS AND DISSCUSION .....  | 108 |
| 4.1 Introduction .....  | 108 |
| 4.2 Productivity of Machine Tools Depending on Change of Processing Modes ...   | 108 |
| 4.2.1 Work Example.....   | 109 |
| 4.3 Optimization of Multi Tool Machining Process with Simultaneous Action .....   | 112 |
| 4.3.1 Working Example for a Multi Tool Simultaneous Machining Process .....   | 113 |
| 4.3.2 Results and Discussion.....   | 117 |
| 4.4 Optimization Processing Mode of Machine Tools by Using Maximum<br>Productivity and Minimum Cost.....                      | 118 |
| 4.4.1 Productivity of Machine Tool with Simultaneous Machining Process .....  | 120 |
| 4.4.2 Validation of Mathematical Model of Productivity for HSS Single Tool .  | 131 |
| 4.4.3 Productivity of the Machine Tool with Changes in the Multi Tool Process<br>.....  | 140 |
| 4.4.4 Validation of Mathematical Model for Productivity of Multi Tools Process<br>.....                                       | 141 |
| 4.4.5 Cost of Changes in Machining Modes for Cutting-Tools Process.....   | 149 |
| 4.5 Summary .....   | 154 |
| CHAPTER 5:CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....   | 156 |
| 5.1 Introduction.....   | 156 |
| 5.2 Summary .....   | 156 |

|                           |     |
|---------------------------|-----|
| 5.3 Conclusion .....      | 157 |
| 5.4 Recommendations ..... | 159 |
| REFERENCES .....          | 161 |
| LIST OF PUBLICATIONS..... | 179 |
| APPENDIX A .....          | 182 |
| APPENDIX B.....           | 190 |

© This item is protected by original copyright



## LIST OF TABLES

|   | <b>Page</b> |
|---|-------------|
| Table 2.1: Wear Allowance of Tool Material.....   | 25          |
| Table 3.1: Comparison between AI Technique and Methodology Used in this Research<br>..... | 53          |
| Table 3.2: Chemical Composition of Work-Piece Material (AISI 1021).....                   | 56          |
| Table 3.3: Rockwell Hardness (HRC) for HSS Cutting Tool Sample.....                       | 59          |
| Table 3.4: Rockwell Hardness for Work Piece Material (AISI 1021).....                     | 59          |
| Table 3.5: Chemical Composition of HSS Tool Material (SKH9).....                          | 60          |
| Table 4.1: Machining Parameters .....   | 114         |
| Table 4.2: Tool Normative Parameters.....   | 114         |
| Table 4.3: Machining Parameters Used in the Analysis.....                                 | 121         |
| Table 4.4: Polynomial Regression for Single Tool Cutting Process .....                    | 135         |
| Table 4.5: Quadratic Polynomial Interpolation Data for Single Tool Cutting Process        | 135         |
| Table 4.6: Polynomial Regression Data for Multi Tools Cutting Process.....                | 142         |
| Table 4.7: Quadratic Polynomial Interpolation for Multi Tools Cutting Process .....       | 143         |

## LIST OF FIGURES

|  | <b>Page</b> |
|--|-------------|
| Figure 2.1: Turning Process .....  | 16          |
| Figure 2.2: Tools Wears Pattern in Turning .....   | 24          |
| Figure 2.3: Tools Wear in Turning Process .....  | 26          |
| Figure 2.4: Classification of Mechanical Damage.....   | 30          |
| Figure 3.1: Overview of Methodology .....  | 52          |
| Figure 4.1: Productivity of an Automatic Machine Tool versus a Cutting Speed Increase<br>at X Time ..... | 110         |
| Figure 4.2: Part Surfaces Machined by Three Tools Simultaneously .....                                   | 113         |
| Figure 4.3: Productivity of Multi Tooling Process versus Coefficient of Change in<br>Cutting Speed ..... | 115         |
| Figure 4.4: Reduction of Tool Life versus Cutting Speed .....  | 119         |
| Figure 4.5: Part Surfaces Machined by Single Tool Cutter .....   | 120         |
| Figure 4.6: Productivity versus Feed Rate Using HSS Tool .....   | 122         |
| Figure 4.7: High Speed Steel Tool Life versus Cutting Speed .....  | 124         |
| Figure 4.8: Cemented Carbide Tool Life versus Cutting Speed.....   | 124         |
| Figure 4.9: Machining Time versus Cutting Speed .....  | 125         |
| Figure 4.10: Productivity of Single Cutting Process versus Cutting Speed for HSS Tool<br>.....           | 127         |
| Figure 4.11: Productivity of Single Cutting versus Cutting Speed for Carbide Tool...                     | 127         |
| Figure 4.12: Productivity of Single Cutting versus Cutting Speed for Ceramics Tool                       | 128         |
| Figure 4.13: Costs versus Cutting Speed .....  | 129         |
| Figure 4.14: Cost of Single-Cutting Process versus Cutting Speed for HSS Tool.....                       | 130         |
| Figure 4.15: Cost of Single-Cutting Process versus Cutting Speed for Carbide Tool..                      | 130         |

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| Figure 4.16: Cost of Single-Cutting versus Cutting Speed for Ceramics Tool .....               | 131 |
| Figure 4.17: Productivity of Single Cutting Process versus Cutting Speed for HSS Tool<br>..... | 140 |
| Figure 4.18: Productivity of Multi- Tools Process versus Cutting Speed .....                   | 149 |
| Figure 4.19: Productivity and Cost of Single-Tool versus Cutting Speed.....                    | 150 |
| Figure 4.20: Cost of Multi Tool versus Cutting Speed.....                                      | 151 |
| Figure 4.21: Productivity and Cost of Multi Tool versus Cutting Speed .....                    | 153 |

© This item is protected by original copyright

## LIST OF SYMBOLS

| Term                     | Description   | Units    |
|--------------------------|---|----------|
| $\sum_{j=1}^p t_{ej}$    | Time Losses Referred to One Part Due to Reliability of Machine Tool Units Containing Mechanical Electrical, Hydraulic, etc. Treatment | min/part |
| $\sum_{i=1}^k t_{ci}$    | Losses Referred to One Part Due to Reliability of Cutting Tools That Changed After Limit Time of Wearing or Occasional Braking        | min/part |
| $\sum_{j=1}^s t_{org.j}$ | Time Losses Due to Managerial and Organizational Problems of $S$  | min/part |
| $\sum_{i=1}^d t_{t.i}$   | Time Losses Referring to One Product Due to Technical Problems of a Machine   | min/part |
| $\sum_{i=1}^r t_{ci}$    | Time Losses Referred to One Part Due to Reliability of $r$ Tools  | min/part |
| $\sum_{i=1}^r t_{ci}^*$  | Time Losses Due to Reliability of $r$ Tools at New Cutting Speeds   | min/part |
| $\sum_{j=1}^p t_{uj}$    | Time Losses Referring to One Part Due to the Reliability of $P$ Machine Units   | min/part |
| $a$                      | Safety Distance   | mm       |
| $B$                      | Ratio of the Failure Rates of Mechanisms of Auxiliary Motions to Machine Motions  |          |
| $B_g$                    | Burden Rate of Tool Grinder   | MYR/min  |
| $B_m$                    | Overhead Charge of the Machine  | MYR/min  |
| $C$                      | Taylor's Coefficient of the Cutter Work   |          |
| $C_l$                    | Cost of Loading, Unloading  | MYR/part |
| $C_m$                    | Machining Cost  | MYR/part |
| $C_p$                    | Total Machining Cost Per Part   | MYR/part |
| $C_s$                    | Cost of Setting Up for Machining, material and  | MYR/part |

|           |   |           |
|-----------|---|-----------|
|           | nonproductive cost  |           |
| $C_t$     | Cost of Tool-Related Expenses Per One Piece                                 | MYR/part  |
| $d$       | Depth of Cut  | mm        |
| $D$       | Diameter of the Part to be Machined   | mm        |
| $f$       | Feed Rate   | mm/rev    |
| $k$       | Coefficient of Change in the Machining Mode                                 |           |
| $L_g$     | Labor Cost of Tool Grinder Operator   | MYR/min   |
| $L_m$     | Labor Cost of Production Operator Per Hour                                  | MYR/min   |
| $l_p$     | The Length of the Part Being Machined                                       | mm        |
| $M$       | Average Time of Cutter Replacement  | min       |
| $m^*$     | Mean Time Between Failures Under the Condition of Change in Processing Mode | min       |
| $Mr$      | Ratio of the Failure Rates of the Machine Tool Machining Motion Mechanism   |           |
| $N$       | Index of the Type of Cutter Material  |           |
| $n_m$     | Number of the Revolutions of the Spindle                                    |           |
| $N_p$     | Number of Part Machined Per Tool Grind                                      |           |
| $Q$       | Productivity Rate of Automatic Machine Tools                                | parts/min |
| $T$       | Tool Life or Cycle Time   | min       |
| $t_a$     | Auxiliary Time  | min/part  |
| $t_c$     | Time Losses Referred to One Product Due to Failures of the Cutter           | min/part  |
| $T_c$     | Time Required to Change Tool  | min       |
| $t_{c,p}$ | Time of Cutting Process   |           |
| $t_e$     | Time Losses Referred to One Product Due to the Reliability                  | min/part  |
| $T_g$     | Time Required to Grind the Tool   | min       |
| $t_i$     | Time Losses Due to Repair   | min/part  |
| $T_l$     | Time Involved In Loading and Unloading the Part                             | min/part  |

|                |  |          |
|----------------|--|----------|
| $t_m$          | Machining Time   | min/part |
| $t_{m.l}$      | Longest Machining Time of the Multi-Cutting Process  | min/part |
| $t_{mo}$       | Total Machining Time   | min/part |
| $V$            | Cutting Speed  | m/min    |
| $W$            | Power Factor of Hyperbolic Function  |          |
| $z$            | Number of Products Machined Per Observation Time   |          |
| $z^*$          | Number of Products Produced Per Work Time of a Machine Tool Under the Condition of Change in Processing Mode |          |
| $\theta$       | Observation Time   | min      |
| $\theta_i$     | Idle Time  | min      |
| $\theta_{org}$ | Idle Time Due to Managerial and Organizational Problems  | min      |
| $\theta_t$     | Idle Time Due to Technical Failures of the Machine   | min      |
| $\theta_u$     | Time Losses Due to $P$ Mechanisms  | min      |
| $\theta_w$     | Machine Work Time  | min      |

© This item is protected by original copyright

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

| <b>Term</b> | <b>Description</b>                    | <b>Units</b>         |
|-------------|---------------------------------------|----------------------|
| <i>AI</i>   | Artificial Intelligence               |                      |
| <i>AISI</i> | American Iron and Steel Institute     |                      |
| <i>ANN</i>  | Artificial Neural Networks            |                      |
| <i>CBN</i>  | Cubic Boron Nitride                   |                      |
| <i>CVD</i>  | Chemical Vapor Deposition             |                      |
| <i>GA</i>   | Genetic Algorithm                     |                      |
| <i>GP</i>   | Geometric Programming                 |                      |
| <i>HRC</i>  | Rockwell Hardness                     |                      |
| <i>KT</i>   | Crater Wear                           | mm                   |
| <i>LGP</i>  | Linear Goal Programming Technique     |                      |
| <i>MRR</i>  | Material Removal Rate                 | mm <sup>3</sup> /min |
| <i>NLGP</i> | Non-Linear Goal Programming Technique |                      |
| <i>PVD</i>  | Physical Vapor Deposition             |                      |
| <i>VB</i>   | Flank Wear                            | mm                   |

## Pengoptimuman Proses Pemesinan Melalui Nilai Tara Kadar Pengeluaran Maksimum Dan Kos Minimum

### ABSTRAK

Dalam bidang pembuatan, proses pemesinan dengan menggunakan norma-norma produktiviti maksimum dan kos yang minimum adalah diikat. Dalam banyak kes, peningkatan mod pemesinan membawa kepada peningkatan dalam produktiviti dan kos pemesinan turut meningkat. Tesis ini merumuskan satu set model matematik yang membolehkan penetapan produktiviti maksimum dan parameter kos yang minimum pada peralatan mesin. Tiga pendekatan matematik baru telah dibangunkan untuk mencapai matlamat ini. Dalam pendekatan pertama, produktiviti maksimum diberi sebagai fungsi yang semakin meningkat pada kelajuan pemotongan ( $x$ ) masa adalah 0.93. Pendekatan kedua memberi tumpuan kepada mengoptimumkan proses pemesinan pelbagai alat dengan tindakan serentak. Di sini, produktiviti maksimum pada faktor ( $k$ ) ialah 1.28 untuk mengubah kelajuan pemotongan telah diperolehi. Manakala dalam pendekatan ketiga, produktiviti maksimum dan kos yang minimum untuk alat pelbagai tunggal dan dibentangkan. Persamaan berguna dalam model untuk meramalkan mod pemprosesan yang akan memberi produktiviti maksimum dan kos yang minimum. Dengan menaip ungkapan matematik maju di MATLAB, produktiviti alat mesin dikira. Kerja-kerja ini telah dilakukan di bawah keadaan kering. Keputusan menunjukkan kelajuan pemotongan yang optimum ( $V_{opt}$ ) pada produktiviti maksimum bagi alat memotong tunggal untuk keluli kelajuan tinggi dan karbida sebagai teori. Manakala dengan menaip diameter bahan kerja adalah 25mm, kedalaman pemotongan 2mm dan makanan kadar 0.21mm/rev, yang dicapai uji kaji, kelajuan pemotongan yang sesuai untuk HSS bahan-bahan yang diuji ialah 50 m/min. manakala kelajuan pemotongan yang optimum memotong proses pemesinan alat daripada bahan-bahan yang berbeza sebagai teori produktiviti maksimum bagi tersusun karbida adalah 95 m/min. manakala bagi alat memotong pelbagai bahan-bahan yang sama produktiviti maksimum teori diperolehi pada 80 m/min. manakala kelajuan pemotongan yang optimum untuk memotong alat proses pemesinan pelbagai bahan-bahan yang sama sebagai percubaan untuk produktiviti maksimum pada 75 m/min. Walau bagaimanapun, peningkatan rejim pemesinan membawa kepada peningkatan dalam kedua-dua kos pemesinan dan produktiviti. Dalam pendekatan kos yang minimum, yang merupakan kelajuan pemotongan yang betul bahan-bahan yang diuji adalah 46 m/min. Nilai julat mudah kelajuan multi-cutting untuk kedua-dua produktiviti dan kos yang diperolehi dalam kerja-kerja ini adalah 40 hingga 90m/min. Dan pelbagai yang baik memotong kelajuan 40 hingga 60 m/min untuk mendapatkan kos yang minimum. Rangkaian sesuai kelajuan model matematik pemotong untuk produktiviti alat tunggal dan multi-memotong untuk kekerasan pertengahan kerja sekeping bahan adalah 35 hingga 69 m/min, 50 hingga 90m/min, masing-masing Walaupun kedua-dua set data teori dan eksperimen menunjukkan kelakuan yang sama, terdapat sedikit penyelewengan dalam diterima bagi dua nilai set data.



## **Optimization of machining processes by using criteria of maximum productivity and minimum cost**

### **ABSTRACT**

In manufacturing, the machining process by using norms of the maximum productivity and minimum cost is knotted. In many cases, the increase of machining modes leads to an increase in productivity, and the machining cost also increases. The present thesis formulates a set of mathematical models that enable the setting of maximum productivity and minimum cost parameters on machine tools. Three new mathematical approaches have been developed to achieve this objective. In the first approach, maximum productivity is given as a function of the increase of cutting speed at (x) time equal 0.93. The second approach focuses on optimizing multi tool machining process with simultaneous actions. Here, the maximum productivity at (k) factor, which is 1.28 of changing the cutting speed, has been derived. Whereas in the third approach, maximum productivity and minimum cost for single and multi tools are presented. The equations are useful in modeling and predicting the processing mode that will give maximum productivity and minimum cost. By keying in the developed mathematical expressions in MATLAB, the productivity of the machine tool is calculated. This work has been carried out under dry conditions. The results give the optimum cutting speed ( $V_{opt}$ ) at maximum productivity for a single cutting tool for high speed steel and carbide as a theoretical. Whereas by keying a diameter of work piece is 25mm, depth of cut 2mm and feed rate 0.21mm/rev, which are achieved experimentally, the proper cutting speed for HSS of the tested materials is 50 m/min. whereas the optimum cutting speeds of cutting tool machining process of the different materials as a theoretical of maximum productivity for cemented carbide is 95 m/min. whilst for the multi cutting tool of the same materials the maximum theoretical productivity is obtained at 80 m/min. whereas the optimum cutting speeds for the multi cutting tool machining process of the same materials as an experimental for maximum productivity at 75 m/min. However, increasing the machining regimes leads to an increase in both of machining cost and productivity. In the minimum cost approach, which is a proper cutting speed of the tested materials is 46 m/min. The convenient range values of multi-cutting speed for both productivity and cost obtained in this work is 40 to 90m/min, and a favorable range of cutting speed is 40 to 60 m/min to get the minimum cost. The appropriate range of cutting speed of the mathematical model for the productivity for single and multi - cutting tool for intermediate hardness of work piece material is 35 to 69 m/min, 50 to 90m/min, respectively. Although both theoretical and experimental data sets show similar behavior, there are slight deviations within acceptable range for the two data set values.

# CHAPTER 1

## INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 Background

Machined metals and alloys are classified to be soft or hard, wrought or cast, brittle or ductile, with a low or high melting point. Most of the components in the engineering world are produced by a machining process regardless of the size or shape. In order to produce any component type, different machining operations such as turning, milling, drilling and boring, are to be used. There are different parameters to be considered during the machining process for a tool; among them is the cutting speed, which could be reached to a high value of 3500 m/min in Alumina, or very low as in some carbon alloys, which can be a few centimeters per minute. The cutting time may be extended to several hours or can be interrupted in fractions of a second, depending on the cutter type (Malkin, 1989).

Metal cutting machining processes comprise many unsolved problems that should be resolved in order to obtain reliable data with respect to the economics of manufacturing some analytical models that are well-described were able to predict the tool life through changes in the machining, there are also well-known mathematical equations that calculate the minimum machining cost depending on the changes in the machining regimes, thereby optimizing the machining process. However, known equations of metal cutting processes, tool life and minimum machining cost, which is one of the main indices of machining economics, Groover, (2006); De-Garmo et al. (2002); Beddoes et al. (1999); Bralla, (2007) and Flores et al. (2007). Researchers do not consider the very important aspects of machine tool output that are influenced by

the change in machining regimes. However, indices of the productivity rate of machine tools and machining costs logically depend on the failures of cutters, Freiheit & Hu, (2002); Jones et al. (2004) and Isakov, (2004)

Metal cutting processes are industrial processes in which the metal parts are shaped by removing unwanted materials. According to Weller (1984) the wide range of cutting speed gives manufacturers a many materials can be choose for their machining process. In these operations, metal is removed as a plastically deformed chip, and a fairly unified physical analysis can be carried out by using orthogonal and oblique cutting models.

Wilson (1971) and Chryssolouris (1991) proposed that abrasive wear occurs on grinding and honing processes. To add, abrasive wear also occurs in nontraditional machining processes such as electro discharge, ultrasonic, electrochemical and laser machining. In abrasive processes, small chips are removed from the metal. The chips then stick to the cutting tool. In nontraditional processes, the metal is removed on a much smaller scale by thermal, electrical, and chemical processes compared to the amount removed in traditional machining processes.

Chang (1988) proposed that metal-cutting process can also be applied to nonmetallic work materials such as polymer, wood, and ceramics. Because there is a difference in the thermo mechanical properties between the cutting tool and the nonmetallic work-piece materials, the process is also considered as a machining process.

The turning operation is one of the most common operations employed in experimental work on metal cutting. The work-piece materials are held in the chuck of the lathe machine, and it will be rotated at a fixed speed that is set by the operator. The hardness of the cutting tool should be high compared to the work-piece. The cutting tool

passes at a constant feed rate along the axis of the bar that is being machined. Out of this process, the cutting tool starts to cut a layer of metal away to form a cylinder or a surface with a complex profile. The cutting speed ( $V$ ) is the rate at which the uncut surface of the work-piece passes the cutting edge of the cutting tool within the observation time, and it is usually expressed in meter per minute ( $m/min$ ). The feed rate ( $f$ ) is the distance that the cutting tool is moved in an axial direction at each revolution of the work-piece that is machined, and it is usually expressed in millimeters per revolution ( $mm/rev$ ). The depth of cut ( $d$ ) is the thickness of the metal that has been removed from the work-piece material, and it is measured in a radial direction of the product. It is usually expressed in millimeter ( $mm$ ). The parameters discussed are combined to give the 'metal removal rate' ( $MRR$ ) which is usually given as ( $MRR = V * f * d$ ). The MRR is used to measure the efficiency of the cutting operation (Boothroyd & Knight, 1989).

The cutting speed and feed rate are effectively the most important parameters that can be controlled by the operator to achieve optimum cutting conditions. The depth of cut is usually chosen according to the initial size of the work-piece material and the required size of the final product. The cutting speed is usually within the range of 3 m/min and 200 m/min. For new high speed machining processes that use Alumina alloys cutters, the speed may reach up to 3500 m/min. However, the rotational speed of the chucks spindle of the lathe machine is usually constant during a single operation, and it is expressed as revolution per minute (rpm). The cutting speed along the pass keeps changing due to the variation in the work-piece diameter. At the nose of the tool, the speed is often a bit lower than at the outer surface of the bar, therefore, the cutting speed is considered constant along the tool edge in the turning process.

The feed rate varies between 0.0125 mm /rev and 2.5 mm /rev, depending on the hardness of work-piece material. The depth of cut takes from values close to zero up to 25 mm. It is possible to remove metal from the work-piece material at a rate of more than 1600 cm<sup>3</sup> /min but this value is uncommon. The recommended range of the metal removal rate, which is 80 to 160 cm<sup>3</sup> /min, would normally be considered as rapid (Tounsi & Elbestawi, 2003).

The cutting edge is at the intersection of the rake face and the clearance face or flank of the tool. The tool is designed and held in such a position that the clearance angle is variable but is often in the order of 6 -10°. The rake face is inclined at an angle to the axis of the work-piece, and this angle can be adjusted to achieve optimum cutting performance for particular tool materials, work materials and cutting conditions. The rake angle is measured from a line parallel to the axis of rotation of the work-piece.

A positive rake angle is one where the rake face dips below the line. Early metal-cutting tools had large positive rake angles, and this caused the cutting edge to be easily damaged. Cutting tools are more robust if they have smaller rake angles, including zero and negative rake angle values. Rake angles can reach up to 15°, but it is better to have a negative rake angle value of 5° or 6°, with the angle between the rake and clearance face to be 90°. The tool terminates in an end clearance face, which is also inclined at such an angle as to avoid rubbing against the freshly cut surface. The nose of the tool is at the intersection of all three faces and may be sharp, but more frequently there is a nose radius between the two clearance faces (Benedict, 1987).

## **1.2 Economics of Machining Optimization**

Childs et al. (2000) proposed that the ultimate objective of manufacturing engineering is to produce objects at the most economical cost. To do this, the machining

process should be optimized to get the minimum possible cost. All aspects of the machine tool technology, manufacturing systems management, and material technology, which influence the process, must be considered. According to Childs et al. (2000) the purpose is not to develop detailed recommendations for best practice, but to show how these three factors interact to create an improvement. Isakov (2004) listed the various costs associated with the machining process, namely:

- Manpower cost,  $C_l$ , - measured in currency per unit time, generally by the number of hours that the operator is employed. Handling cost is also included here. Handling cost arises because of the time spent in the loading and unloading of tools and work-piece materials, in which time the machine tool is kept idle. Operators may also be required to attend to other jobs, of which the machine is kept idle, too.
- Machine tool operating (overhead) cost  $C_m$  - which includes machine depreciation and other costs associated with the running of the machine tool such as amount of power consumed, maintenance overhead and consumables such as lubricants. This may also include the other overhead costs, such as buildings, land and administrative overheads.

Combining the above costs in the overall overhead cost  $C_o$

$$C_o = C_m + C_l \quad (1.1)$$

In addition, there is also the tool cost, which is the price of the tool used for the given operation.

Kronenberg (1966) presented three optimization criteria that can be considered, and they are the minimization of machine cost, the maximization of production rate, and the maximizing of profit. The three criteria, profit required more information in terms of

various costs which may not always be available to the processes' planning department. Hence the other two criteria, namely machine cost and production rate, are more practical in terms of actual planning and implementation.

The costs stated earlier can be demonstrated with a simple turning operation. When the production rate is to be maximized, the cutting speed goes up, resulting in a decrease of the tool life. The reverse is also true. This happens because the earlier optimization does not take into account any constraints on the variables; hence the variables go to the extreme. It is necessary to get more useful values for optimization to be carried out using various constraints on the variables. Some of the possible constraints include maximum cutting power available at the machine tool spindle, maximum force permissible, the surface finish and diametric tolerance to be achieved on the machined surface, limits on cutting speed, feed rate, depth of cut imposed by the machine tool and cutting tool, maximum permissible cutting temperature, maximum permissible chatter, maximum permissible work-piece static and dynamic instability, tool life, and tool fracture.

### 1.3 Machining Parameters

Cutting speed ( $V$ ) is the largest parameter of the relative to cutting tool or work-piece. In turning, the work-piece rotates, and the speed of the rotation is very important. In contrast, in drilling and milling, it is the cutting tool that rotates, and likewise, this speed is very important. In turning,  $V$  is given by the surface speed of the work-piece, namely,

$$V = \frac{\pi * D * N}{1000} \quad (1.2)$$

where  $V$  (m/min) is the rate at which the uncut surface of the work material passes the cutting edge of the tool. This speed is dependent on the rpm ( $N_s$ ) and the diameter of the rotating work-piece  $D$  (mm). The depth of cut ( $d$ ) is the distance the cutting tool penetrates into the work-piece. In turning machining process, for example,  $d$  is given by  $(D1-D2)/2$ . The feed rate, ( $f$ ), is the movement of the tool per revolution. In turning, it is the distance the tool travels in one revolution of the work-piece and is given in units of mm/rev or in/rev.

Efficient machining requires the removal of material to be as fast as possible while producing the required tolerances of the dimensions and surfaces. The metal removal rate in turning is the product of three cutting parameters, namely,  $MRR$  ( $\text{cm}^3/\text{min}$ ) = depth of cut \*cutting speed\* feed rate, Childs et al. (2000).

$$MRR = v * f * d \quad (1.3)$$

#### 1.4 Problem Statement

It is a well-known fact that manufacturing processes should be set to achieve the highest productivity at the lowest possible cost. However, in reality, productivity and cost are usually inversely proportionate to one another. In order to get the highest productivity, the cost of production goes up, too. In order to get higher productivity of a machining process, the cutting speed, the feed rate, and the depth of cut are usually increased. However, increasing these three parameters invariably lead to a decrease in the tool life. A worn-out tool will affect the quality of the end product. Hence, the tool must be replaced often. When the replacement cutting tool is carried out, the machining work must stop, thereby decreasing the productivity of the process. At the same time, tool replacement does not come in cheap. Tools cost money, resulting in an increase in the cost of manufacturing. A machining regime is characterized by the following