

Modeling of Powder Forming Process using an Exponential-Cap Powder Model in Marc

Per Nordlund, Shiva Padmanaban, Parag Dixit MSC Software

Considerations in Powder Modeling

- Powder is a compressible material and the yielding is dependent on hydrostatic stress.
- At low mean stress failure is by shear localization.
- At higher mean stress strain hardening behavior is observed, hence a moving failure surface is required.



Sandia Geomodel

Highlights:

- Geomodel has one continuous yield surface.
- Cap feature accounts for the presence of pores in a material and allows for plastic volume changes even in pure hydrostatic loading .
- Allows cracks and voids to interact phenomenologically in a way which reproduces observed data better.
- Flexibility to reduce the model to other more classical models

$$f(I_1, J_2, J_3; \kappa) = \Gamma^2(\overline{\theta})J_2 - f_f^2(I_1)f_c^2(I_1, \kappa)$$





 κ governs the evolution of the Cap surface

MSC

SOFTWARE

Lode Angle Function

1. Gudehus:
$$\Gamma(\overline{\theta}) = \frac{1}{2} \Big[1 + \sin 3\overline{\theta} + \frac{1}{\psi} (1 - \sin 3\overline{\theta}) \Big]$$

2. Willam-Warnke: $\Gamma(\overline{\theta}) = \frac{4(1 - \psi^2)\cos^2 \alpha^* + (2\psi - 1)^2}{2(1 - \psi^2)\cos \alpha^* + (2\psi - 1)\sqrt{4(1 - \psi^2)\cos^2 \alpha^* + 5\psi^2 - 4\psi}}$
where $\alpha^* = \frac{\pi}{6} + \overline{\theta}$
3. Mohr-Coulomb: $\Gamma(\overline{\theta}) = \frac{2\sqrt{3}}{3 - \sin\phi} \Big(\cos\overline{\theta} - \frac{\sin\phi\sin\overline{\theta}}{\sqrt{3}}\Big)$









[6] A.F. Fossum et. al. (2004)



Isotropic and Kinematic Hardening Mechanisms



[4] A.F. Fossum et. al. (2004)





Sandia Geomodel

Limitations:

- Based on the infinitesimal strain theory, i.e., on the additive decomposition of the strain into elastic and plastic parts.
- Elastic model is hypoelastic rather than hyperelastic.
- Is initially isotropic, kinematic hardening is the only mechanism for deformation induced anisotropy.
- Geomodel is limited to relatively small distortional (shear) strains, though large volume changes are permitted.





SOFTWARE

BRIATING REALLT

MSC

Comparison with Other Models



[8] I.C. Sinka et.al.(2007)



Obtaining Shear Failure Parameters

Step1:

Conduct load-to-failure triaxial compression tests on the material and record all peak stress states. Each individual experiment has precisely one stress state at which the second stress variant achieves a peak value. Characterizing the shear failure surface requires numerous such experiments.

Step2:

For every available load-to-failure experiment, find the stress state at which is larger than any of the other stress states in that experiment. Construct a table of data ($I_1^{peak}, \sqrt{J_2}$) where I_1^{peak} is the value of I_1 at the stress state at which J_2 is at its peak value.

Step3:

Fit the data to the exponential shear failure function using the curve fitting option provided in Mentat

$$f_s(I_1) = A_1 - A_3 e^{A_2 I_1} - A_4 I_1$$





Step1:

Obtain hydrostatic pressure vs total volumetric strain data by conducting experiments run to the point of total pore collapse.

Step2:

Use the elastic unloading curve to determine a shift distance that must be applied at any pressure to remove the elastic part of the strain. This will give you a plot of pressure vs. plastic volumetric strain.



Step3:

Use curve fitting program provided in Mentat to fit the above data to the following curve

$$\varepsilon_{v}^{p} = W \left[e^{D_{1}(X-X_{0})-D_{2}(X-X_{0})^{2}} - 1 \right]$$



Backward Extrusion with Powder material







Backward Extrusion with Powder material







