

# ANALYSIS OF THERMO-MECHANICAL COUPLING IN QUENCHING PROCESS

## Eduardo Prieto Silva

Instituto Militar de Engenharia  
Department of Mechanical and Materials Engineering  
22.290.270 – Rio de Janeiro – RJ – Brazil  
E-Mail: eduardo.prieto@csn.com.br

## Pedro Manuel Calas Lopes Pacheco

CEFET/RJ  
Department of Mechanical Engineering  
20.271.110 – Rio de Janeiro – RJ – Brazil  
E-Mail: calas@cefet-rj.br

## Marcelo Amorim Savi

Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro  
COPPE – Department of Mechanical Engineering  
21.945.970 – Rio de Janeiro – RJ – Brazil, Caixa Postal 68.503  
E-Mail: savi@ufrj.br

**Abstract.** *The present contribution considers modeling and simulation of the quenching process, presenting an anisothermal model formulated within the framework of continuum mechanics and the thermodynamics of irreversible processes. The energy equation thermo-mechanical coupling terms due to internal and thermal couplings are exploited. In order to analyze the importance of these terms, three different models are considered. The first one is an uncoupled model in the sense that these terms are neglected, corresponding to the rigid body energy equation. In second model, these couplings are represented through the incorporation of a source term in the energy equation associated with the latent heat released during the austenite-martensite phase transformation. Finally, the third model considers all thermo-mechanical coupling terms of the proposed model. Progressive induction hardening of a cylindrical body is considered as an application of the proposed general formulation. Numerical simulations present some situations where it is important to consider the thermo-mechanical coupling terms due to internal and thermal couplings.*

**Keywords.** *Quenching, Phase transformation, Thermo-mechanical Coupling, Modeling.*

## 1. Introduction

Quenching is a commonly used heat treatment process employed to control the mechanical properties of steels. In brief, quenching consists of raising the temperature of the steel above a certain critical temperature, called austenitizing temperature, holding it at that temperature for a fixed time, and then rapidly cooling it in a suitable medium to room temperature. The resulting microstructures formed from quenching (ferrite, pearlite, bainite and martensite) depend on cooling rate and on steel characteristics, which are normally expressed by the Continuous Cooling Transformation (CCT) diagram. If the steel is cooled sufficient rapidly following austenitizing, the formation of ferrite, pearlite and bainite is avoided, and martensite is produced. The volumetric expansion associated with the formation of martensite combined with large temperature gradients and non-uniform cooling promotes high residual stresses in quenched steels. The prediction of such stresses is a rather difficult task.

Quenching represents one of last stages in the fabrication of mechanical components. This process may induce distortion or even cracking, and hence it is important to predict residual stresses caused by this process. Many works are devoted to this aim (Denis, 1996; Denis *et al.*, 1992, 1999; Fernandes *et al.*, 1985, 1986; Woodard, *et al.*, 1999; Sjöström, 1985, 1994; Sen *et al.*, 2000), however, the proposed models are not generic and are usually applicable to simple geometries.

Phenomenological aspects of quenching involve couplings among different physical processes and, therefore, its description is unusually complex. Basically, three couplings are essential: thermal phenomena, phase transformation and mechanical aspects. Pacheco *et al.* (2001) propose a constitutive model to describe the thermo-mechanical behavior related to the quenching process. This anisothermal model is formulated within the framework of continuum mechanics and the thermodynamics of irreversible processes. One of the advantages of this formulation is the possibility to identify couplings, estimating the effect of each one on the process. The cited reference considers a numerical procedure based on the operator split technique associated with an iterative numerical scheme in order to deal with nonlinearities in the formulation. With this assumption, the coupled governing equations are solved from four uncoupled problems. The proposed general formulation is applied to the progressive induction hardening of steel cylinders. In the cited reference, numerical results are carried out neglecting energy equation thermo-mechanical coupling terms associated with internal and thermal couplings.

The present contribution revisits this constitutive model exploiting the thermo-mechanical coupling in the energy equation considering austenite-martensite phase transformation process. This is an important task on the description of quenching process and is not completely reported in literature. Sjöström (1985), for example, says that thermo-mechanical coupling terms in the energy equation are essential in the modeling of quenching process. Habraken &

Bourdouxhe (1992) and Woodard *et al.* (1999) present a finite element analysis considering energy equation couplings as a latent heat, showing that it is an essential effect to be considered in the modeling of quenching. Levitas (1997, 1998, 2000) and Idesman *et al.* (1997, 2000) made important contributions to the study of thermo-mechanical aspects of phase transformation in elastoplastic materials.

In this article, numerical simulations establish a comparison among three different models: Uncoupled, which does not include energy equation coupling terms; Latent heat, with a source term in the energy equation associated with the latent heat released during the martensitic phase transformation; and Coupled, that considers all coupling terms in the proposed model.

## 2. Constitutive Model

The thermodynamic state of a solid is completely defined by the knowledge of the state variables. Constitutive equations may be formulated within the framework of continuum mechanics and the thermodynamics of irreversible processes, by considering thermodynamic forces, defined from the Helmholtz free energy,  $\psi$ , and thermodynamic fluxes, defined from the pseudo-potential of dissipation,  $\phi$  (Pacheco *et al.*, 2001).

The quenching model proposed here allows one to identify different coupling phenomena, estimating the effect of each one in the process. With this aim, a Helmholtz free energy is proposed as a function of observable variables, total deformation,  $\varepsilon_{ij}$ , and temperature,  $T$ ; also, internal variables are considered: plastic deformation,  $\varepsilon_{ij}^p$ , volumetric fraction of martensitic phase,  $\beta$ , and another set of variables associated with the phase transformation, hardening and other effects as damage. Here, this set considers a variable related to kinematic hardening,  $\alpha_{ij}$ . Therefore, the following free energy is considered, presented in indicial notation where summation convention is evoked (Eringen, 1967):

$$\rho \psi(\varepsilon_{ij}, \varepsilon_{ij}^p, \alpha_{ij}, \beta, T) = W(\varepsilon_{ij}, \varepsilon_{ij}^p, \alpha_{ij}, \beta, T) = W_e(\varepsilon_{ij} - \varepsilon_{ij}^p, \beta, T) + W_\alpha(\alpha_{ij}) + W_\beta(\beta) - W_T(T) \quad (1)$$

where  $\rho$  is the material density. The elastic deformation is defined as follows:

$$\varepsilon_{ij}^e = \varepsilon_{ij} - \varepsilon_{ij}^p - \alpha_T(T - T_0)\delta_{ij} - \gamma\beta\delta_{ij} - (3/2)\kappa\sigma_{ij}^d\beta(2 - \beta) \quad (2)$$

In the right hand side of this expression, the first term is the total strain while the second is related to plastic strain. The third term,  $\alpha_T(T - T_0)\delta_{ij}$ , is associated with thermal expansion. The parameter  $\alpha_T$  is the coefficient of linear thermal expansion,  $T_0$  is a reference temperature and  $\delta_{ij}$  is the Kronecker delta. The fourth term,  $\gamma\beta\delta_{ij}$ , is related to volumetric expansion associated with phase transformation from austenite to martensite. Therefore, when part of a material experiences phase transformation, there is an increment of volumetric deformation, proportional to  $\gamma$ , a material property related to the total expansion associated with martensitic transformation. Finally, the last term,  $(3/2)\kappa\sigma_{ij}^d\beta(2 - \beta)$ , is denoted as transformation plasticity deformation, being the result of several physical mechanisms (Denis, 1985; Sjöström, 1985; Cherkaoui, 2002). This behavior is related to localized plastic deformation promoted by the martensitic transformation. In this term, the deviatoric stress component is defined by  $\sigma_{ij}^d = \sigma_{ij} - \delta_{ij}(\sigma_{kk}/3)$ , with  $\sigma_{ij}$  being the stress tensor component. Moreover,  $\kappa$  is a material parameter. It should be emphasized that this deformation may be related to stress states that are inside the yield surface.

With these assumptions, energy functions may be expressed by,

$$W_\alpha(\alpha_{ij}) = \frac{1}{2} H_{ijkl} \alpha_{ij} \alpha_{kl} \quad (3)$$

$$W_T(T) = \rho \int_{T_0}^T C_1 \log(\xi) d\xi + \frac{\rho}{2} C_2 T^2 \quad (4)$$

$$W_\beta(\beta) = I_\beta(\beta) \quad (5)$$

$$W_e(\varepsilon_{ij} - \varepsilon_{ij}^p, \beta, T) = \Phi_{ijpq} E_{pqkl} \left[ \frac{1}{2} (\varepsilon_{ij} - \varepsilon_{ij}^p) (\varepsilon_{kl} - \varepsilon_{kl}^p) - (\alpha_T(T - T_0) + \gamma\beta) (\varepsilon_{ij} - \varepsilon_{ij}^p) \delta_{kl} \right] + \frac{\Phi_{ijpq} E_{pqkk} \left[ \frac{1}{2} \kappa\beta(2 - \beta) \right] \Phi_{aaef} E_{efrs} \left[ \frac{1}{2} (\varepsilon_{ij} - \varepsilon_{ij}^p) (\varepsilon_{rs} - \varepsilon_{rs}^p) - (\alpha_T(T - T_0) + \gamma\beta) (\varepsilon_{ij} - \varepsilon_{ij}^p) \delta_{rs} \right]}{\left( 1 - \Phi_{bbcd} E_{cdgg} \left[ \frac{1}{2} \kappa\beta(2 - \beta) \right] \right)} \quad (6)$$

The components  $E_{ijkl}$  and  $H_{ijkl}$  are associated with elastic and hardening tensors, respectively;  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  are positive constants. Auxiliary tensors are also defined in order to simplify this expression:

$$C_{ijpq} = \delta_{pi}\delta_{qj} + \frac{3}{2}E_{ijpq}\kappa\beta(2-\beta) \quad \Phi_{ijpq} = C_{ijpq}^{-1} \quad (7)$$

Tensor component  $\Phi_{ijpq}$  is associated with the inverse of  $C_{ijpq}$  and  $I_\beta(\beta)$  is the indicator function related to the convex set  $C_\beta = \{\beta \mid 0 \leq \beta \leq 1\}$  (Rockafellar, 1970).

The austenite-martensite phase transformation is described with the aid of the following condition:

$$\varsigma_{A \rightarrow M}(\dot{T}, T) = \Gamma(-\dot{T} - rM_s) \Gamma(M_s - T) \Gamma(T - M_f) \quad (8)$$

where  $rM_s$  is the critical cooling rate for the martensite formation, defined from the *CCT* diagram;  $\dot{T}$  is the cooling rate. Also,  $\Gamma(x)$  is the Heaviside function (Wang *et al.*, 1997).

Therefore, the kinetics of martensitic phase transformation may be expressed by

$$\beta = \beta(T, \dot{T}) = \varsigma_{A \rightarrow M} \beta^m \quad (9)$$

where  $\beta^m$  is defined from the equation proposed by Koistinen and Marburger (1959):

$$\beta^m = 1 - \exp[-k(M_s - T)] \quad (10)$$

where,  $k$  is a material constant.  $M_s$  is the temperature where martensite starts to form in the stress-free state and  $M_f$  is the temperature where martensite finishes its formation in the stress-free state.

Thermodynamics forces ( $\sigma_{ij}$ ,  $P_{ij}$ ,  $X_{ij}$ ,  $B^\beta$ ,  $s$ ), associated with state variables ( $\varepsilon_{ij}$ ,  $\varepsilon_{ij}^p$ ,  $\alpha_{ij}$ ,  $\beta$ ,  $T$ ), are defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_{ij} = \frac{\partial W}{\partial \varepsilon_{ij}} = & \Phi_{ijpq} E_{pqkl} [\varepsilon_{kl} - \varepsilon_{kl}^p - (\alpha_T(T - T_0) + \gamma\beta)\delta_{kl}] + \\ & + \Phi_{ijpq} E_{pqkk} \left[ \frac{1}{2} \kappa\beta(2-\beta) \right] \left\{ \frac{\Phi_{aaef} E_{efrs} [\varepsilon_{rs} - \varepsilon_{rs}^p - (\alpha_T(T - T_0) + \gamma\beta)\delta_{rs}]}{1 - \Phi_{bbcd} E_{cdgg} \left[ \frac{1}{2} \kappa\beta(2-\beta) \right]} \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

$$P_{ij} = -\frac{\partial W}{\partial \varepsilon_{ij}^p} = \sigma_{ij} \quad (12)$$

$$X_{ij} = \frac{\partial W}{\partial \alpha_{ij}} = H_{ijkl} \alpha_{kl} \quad (13)$$

$$s = -\frac{1}{\rho} \frac{\partial W}{\partial T} \quad (14)$$

$$B^\beta = -\frac{\partial W}{\partial \beta} = -\left( \frac{\partial W_e}{\partial \beta} + Z \right) = E_{pqkl} (\varepsilon_{ij} - \varepsilon_{ij}^p) \left\{ A_{ijpqkl} + \frac{E_{efrs} \delta_{kl}}{\Xi} \left[ B_{ijpqefrs} + M_{ijpqefrs} + \frac{N_{ijpqefrs}}{\Xi} \right] \right\} - Z \quad (15)$$

where:

$$\Xi = 1 - \Phi_{zzhn} E_{hxxx} \left[ \frac{1}{2} \kappa\beta(2-\beta) \right] \quad (16)$$

Again, auxiliary tensors are defined in order to simplify the expressions presented before:

$$A_{ijpqkl} = \frac{\partial \Phi_{ijpq}}{\partial \beta} \left\{ (\alpha_T(T - T_0) + \gamma\beta)\delta_{kl} - \frac{1}{2}(\varepsilon_{kl} - \varepsilon_{kl}^p) \right\} + \Phi_{ijpq} \gamma \delta_{kl} \quad (17)$$

$$B_{ijpqefrs} = \left[ \frac{1}{2} \kappa\beta(2-\beta) \right] \left\{ \frac{\partial \Phi_{ijpq}}{\partial \beta} \Phi_{aaef} + \Phi_{ijpq} \frac{\partial \Phi_{aaef}}{\partial \beta} \right\} \left\{ (\alpha_T(T - T_0) + \gamma\beta)\delta_{rs} - \frac{1}{2}(\varepsilon_{rs} - \varepsilon_{rs}^p) \right\} \quad (18)$$

$$M_{ijpqefrs} = \Phi_{ijpq} \Phi_{aaef} \left\{ \kappa(1-\beta) \left( (\alpha_T(T-T_0) + \gamma\beta)\delta_{rs} - \frac{1}{2}(\varepsilon_{rs} - \varepsilon_{rs}^p) \right) + \gamma \left[ \frac{1}{2} \kappa\beta(2-\beta) \right] \delta_{rs} \right\} \quad (19)$$

$$N_{ijpqefrs} = \Phi_{ijpq} \left[ \frac{1}{2} \kappa\beta(2-\beta) \right] \Phi_{aaef} \left\{ E_{cdgg} \left( \frac{\partial \Phi_{bbcd}}{\partial \beta} \left[ \frac{1}{2} \kappa\beta(2-\beta) \right] + \Phi_{bbcd} \kappa(1-\beta) \right) \right\} \quad (20)$$

$$\left\{ (\alpha_T(T-T_0) + \gamma\beta)\delta_{rs} - \frac{1}{2}(\varepsilon_{rs} - \varepsilon_{rs}^p) \right\}$$

$Z \in \partial_\beta I_\beta(\beta)$  is the sub-differential of the indicator function  $I_\beta$  (Rockafellar, 1970).

In order to describe dissipation processes, it is necessary to introduce a potential of dissipation  $\phi(\dot{\varepsilon}_{ij}^p, \dot{\alpha}_{ij}, \dot{\beta}, q_i)$ , which can be split into two parts:  $\phi(\dot{\varepsilon}_{ij}^p, \dot{\alpha}_{ij}, \dot{\beta}, q_i) = \phi_I(\dot{\varepsilon}_{ij}^p, \dot{\alpha}_{ij}, \dot{\beta}) + \phi_T(q_i)$ . Also, this potential can be written through its dual  $\phi^*(P_{ij}, X_{ij}, B^\beta, g_i) = \phi_I^*(P_{ij}, X_{ij}, B^\beta) + \phi_T^*(g_i)$ :

$$\phi_I^* = I_f^*(P_{ij}, X_{ij}) + \varsigma_{A \rightarrow M} \dot{\beta}^m B^\beta \quad \phi_T^* = \frac{T}{2} \Lambda g_i g_i \quad (21)$$

where  $g_i = (1/T) \partial T / \partial x_i$  and  $\Lambda$  is the coefficient of thermal conductivity which is function of temperature;  $I_f^*(P_{ij}, X_{ij})$  is the indicator function associated with elastic domain, related to the *von Mises* criterion (Lemaitre & Chaboche, 1990),

$$f(P_{ij}, X_{ij}) = \left[ \frac{3}{2} (P_{ij}^d - X_{ij}^d)(P_{ij}^d - X_{ij}^d) \right]^{1/2} - \sigma_Y \leq 0 \quad (22)$$

$\sigma_Y$  is the material yield stress,  $X_{ij}^d = X_{ij} - \delta_{ij} (X_{kk}/3)$  and  $P_{ij}^d = \sigma_{ij}^d$ . A set of evolution laws obtained from  $\phi^*$  characterizes dissipative processes,

$$\dot{\varepsilon}_{ij}^p \in \partial_{P_{ij}} I_f^*(P_{ij}, X_{ij}) = \lambda \text{sign}(\sigma_{ij} - H_{ijkl} \alpha_{kl}) \quad (23)$$

$$\dot{\alpha}_{ij} \in -\partial_{X_{ij}} I_f^*(\sigma_{ij}, X_{ij}) = \dot{\varepsilon}_{ij}^p \quad (24)$$

$$\dot{\beta} = \frac{\partial \phi^*}{\partial B^\beta} = \varsigma_{A \rightarrow M} \dot{\beta}^m \quad (25)$$

$$q_i = -\frac{\partial \phi^*}{\partial g_i} = -\Lambda T g_i = -\Lambda \frac{\partial T}{\partial x_i} \quad (26)$$

where  $\text{sign}(x) = x / |x|$ ;  $q_i$  is the heat flux vector and  $\lambda$  is the plastic multiplier from the classical theory of plasticity (Lemaitre & Chaboche, 1990).

Assuming a specific heat as  $c = -(T/\rho) \partial^2 W / \partial T^2$  and the set of constitutive equations (12-16, 24-27), the energy equation can be written as:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \left( \Lambda \frac{\partial T}{\partial x_i} \right) - \rho c \dot{T} = -a_I - a_T \quad (27)$$

where,

$$a_I = \sigma_{ij} \dot{\varepsilon}_{ij}^p - X_{ij} \dot{\alpha}_{ij} + B^\beta \dot{\beta} \quad a_T = T \left( \frac{\partial \sigma_{ij}}{\partial T} (\dot{\varepsilon}_{ij} - \dot{\varepsilon}_{ij}^p) + \frac{\partial X_{ij}}{\partial T} \dot{\alpha}_{ij} - \frac{\partial B^\beta}{\partial T} \dot{\beta} \right) \quad (28)$$

The term  $a_I$  is denoted as internal coupling and is always positive. It has a role in (Eq. 27) similar to a heat source in the classical energy equation (heat equation) for rigid bodies. The term  $a_T$  denotes the thermal coupling and can be either positive or negative.

With these assumptions, the set of constitutive equations formed by (11-15, 23-26) verify the inequality established by the second law of thermodynamics which can be expanded in a local form as:

$$d_1 = \sigma_{ij} \dot{\epsilon}_{ij}^p - X_{ij} \dot{\alpha}_{ij} + B^\beta \dot{\beta} \geq 0 \quad d_2 = -(q_i g_i) \geq 0 \quad (29)$$

The term  $d_1$  represents mechanical dissipation while  $d_2$  is thermal dissipation.

It should be pointed out that the coupling term  $Z\dot{\beta}$  from the term  $B^\beta \dot{\beta}$  (Eq. 29a), always vanishes. Notice that if  $T > M_s$  and  $T < M_f$ , then  $\dot{\beta} = 0$ , vanishing the term. On the other hand, if  $M_s \geq T \geq M_f$ ,  $\dot{\beta} \neq 0$ . However, from the definition of the indicator function,  $I_\beta = 0$ , and therefore, the coupling term must be zero again. For the same reasons,  $\frac{\partial Z}{\partial T} \dot{\beta}$  always vanishes (Eq. 28).

In metal forming, the thermo-mechanical coupling is usually taken into account by an empirical constant called the heat conversion factor,  $\chi$ , which represents the part of the plastic power transformed into heat (Pacheco, 1994):

$$\chi = \frac{a_I + a_T}{\sigma_{ij} \dot{\epsilon}_{ij}^p} \quad (30)$$

Some authors consider the latent heat effect related to phase transformation (Denis *et al.*, 1987; Denis *et al.*, 1999; Woodard *et al.*, 1999; Sjöström, 1994). The internal heat source due to the latent heat released during phase transformation may be described by:

$$\dot{Q} = \Delta H_m \dot{\beta} \quad (31)$$

where  $\Delta H_m$  is the latent heat released during the austenite-martensite transformation. The latent heat released is associated with enthalpy change (Woodard *et al.*, 1999).

### 3. Cylindrical Bodies

This contribution considers cylindrical bodies as an application of the proposed general formulation. Other references present different analyses of this problem (Pacheco *et al.*, 1997; Camarão *et al.*, 2000). With this assumption, heat transfer analysis may be reduced to a one-dimensional problem. Also, plane stress or plane strain state can be assumed. Under these assumptions, only radial,  $r$ , circumferential,  $\theta$ , and longitudinal,  $z$ , components need to be considered and a one-dimensional model is formulated. In brief, it is important to notice that tensor quantities may be replaced by scalar or vector quantities. As examples, one could mention:  $E_{ijkl}$  replaced by  $E$ ;  $H_{ijkl}$  replaced by  $H$ ;  $\sigma_{ij}$  replaced by  $\sigma_i$  ( $\sigma_r, \sigma_\theta, \sigma_z$ ). A detailed description of these simplifications could be found in Pacheco *et al.* (2001).

The numerical procedure here proposed is based on the operator split technique (Ortiz *et al.*, 1983; Pacheco, 1994) associated with an iterative numerical scheme in order to deal with nonlinearities in the formulation. With this assumption, coupled governing equations are solved from four uncoupled problems: thermal, phase transformation, thermo-elastic and elastoplastic.

*Thermal Problem* - Comprises a radial conduction problem with surface convection. Material properties depend on temperature, and therefore, the problem is governed by nonlinear parabolic equations. An implicit finite difference predictor-corrector procedure is used for numerical solution (Ames, 1992; Pacheco, 1994).

*Phase Transformation Problem* - Volumetric fraction of martensitic phase is determined in this problem. Evolution equations are integrated from a simple implicit Euler method (Ames, 1992; Nakamura, 1993).

*Thermo-elastic Problem* - Stress and displacement fields are evaluated from temperature distribution. Numerical solution is obtained employing a shooting method procedure (Ames, 1992; Nakamura, 1993).

*Elastoplastic Problem* - Stress and strain fields are determined considering the plastic strain evolution in the process. Numerical solution is based on the classical return mapping algorithm (Simo & Mische, 1992; Simo & Hughes, 1998).

### 4. Numerical Simulations

As an application of the general proposed model, numerical investigations associated with the quenching of long steel cylindrical bar are carried out simulating a progressive induction (PI) hardening, which is a heat treatment process carried out by moving a workpiece at a constant speed through a coil and a cooling ring. Applying an alternating current to the coil, a magnetic field is generated inducing eddy currents that heat the workpiece. When heated, a thin surface layer of austenite is formed. Afterward, a cooling fluid is sprayed on the surface by the cooling ring promoting the quenching of the layer, which is transformed into martensite, pearlite, bainite and proeutectoid ferrite/cementite

depending on, among other things, the cooling rate. A hard surface layer with high compressive residual stresses, combined with a tough core with tensile residual stresses, is often obtained.

This article considers progressive induction hardening simulations in a cylindrical bar with radius  $R$  and a thickness of induced layer,  $e_{PI}$ . In order to consider the restriction associated with adjacent regions of the heated region, which are at lower temperatures, a plane strain state is adopted. Experimental results for progressive induction hardening in cylindrical bodies, discussed in Pacheco *et al.* (2001) are used as reference for the comparison with the numerical results here obtained.

Material parameters of SAE 4140H cylinder are presented in Table 1 and the latent heat released, associated with enthalpy change for austenite-martensite transformation, is  $\Delta H_m = 640 \times 10^6 \text{ J/m}^3$ . Other parameters depend on temperature and are interpolated from experimental data as follows (Melander, 1985; Hildenwall, 1979; Camarão, 1998; Pacheco *et al.*, 2001; Silva, 2002):

Table 1 – Material parameters (SAE 4140H).

$k = 1.100 \times 10^{-2} \text{ K}^{-1}$	$\kappa = 5.200 \times 10^{-11} \text{ Pa}^{-1}$	$M_s = 748 \text{ K}$
$\gamma = 1.110 \times 10^{-2}$	$\rho = 7.800 \times 10^3 \text{ kg/m}^3$	$M_f = 573 \text{ K}$

$$E = E_A(1-\beta) + E_M\beta \quad \begin{cases} E_A = 1.985 \times 10^{11} - 4.462 \times 10^7 T - 9.909 \times 10^4 T^2 - 2.059 T^3 \\ E_M = 2.145 \times 10^{11} - 3.097 \times 10^7 T - 9.208 \times 10^4 T^2 - 2.797 T^3 \end{cases} \quad (32)$$

$$H = \begin{cases} 2.092 \times 10^6 + 3.833 \times 10^5 T - 3.459 \times 10^2 T^2, & \text{if } T \leq 723 \text{ K} \\ 2.259 \times 10^9 - 2.988 \times 10^6 T, & \text{if } 723 \text{ K} < T \leq 748 \text{ K} \\ 5.064 \times 10^7 - 3.492 \times 10^4 T, & \text{if } T > 748 \text{ K} \end{cases} \quad (33)$$

$$\sigma_Y = \begin{cases} 7.520 \times 10^8 + 2.370 \times 10^5 T - 5.995 \times 10^2 T^2, & \text{if } T \leq 723 \text{ K} \\ 1.598 \times 10^{10} - 2.126 \times 10^7 T, & \text{if } 723 \text{ K} < T \leq 748 \text{ K} \\ 1.595 \times 10^8 - 1.094 \times 10^5 T, & \text{if } T > 748 \text{ K} \end{cases} \quad (34)$$

$$\alpha_T = \begin{cases} 1.115 \times 10^{-5} + 1.918 \times 10^{-8} T - 8.798 \times 10^{-11} T^2 + 2.043 \times 10^{-13} T^3, & \text{if } T \leq 748 \text{ K} \\ 2.230 \times 10^{-5}, & \text{if } T > 748 \text{ K} \end{cases} \quad (35)$$

$$c = 2.159 \times 10^2 + 0.548 T \quad (36)$$

$$A = 5.223 + 1.318 \times 10^{-2} T \quad (37)$$

$$h_{fluid} = \begin{cases} 6.960 \times 10^2, & \text{if } T \leq 404 \text{ K} \\ 2.182 \times 10^4 - 1.030 \times 10^2 T + 1.256 \times 10^{-1} T^2, & \text{if } 404 \text{ K} < T \leq 504 \text{ K} \\ -2.593 \times 10^4 + 5.500 \times 10^2 T, & \text{if } 504 \text{ K} < T \leq 554 \text{ K} \\ -9.437 \times 10^4 + 4.715 \times 10^2 T - 7.286 \times 10^{-1} T^2 + 3.607 \times 10^{-4} T^3, & \text{if } 554 \text{ K} < T \leq 804 \text{ K} \\ 1.210 \times 10^3, & \text{if } T > 804 \text{ K} \end{cases} \quad (38)$$

$$h_{air} = \begin{cases} 2.916 + 6.104 \times 10^{-2} T - 1.213 \times 10^{-4} T^2, & \text{if } T \leq 533 \text{ K} \\ 6.832 + 1.837 \times 10^{-2} T - 1.681 \times 10^{-5} T^2 + 6.764 \times 10^{-9} T^3, & \text{if } 533 \text{ K} < T \leq 1200 \text{ K} \\ 3.907 \times 10^1 - 2.619 \times 10^{-2} T, & \text{if } 1200 \text{ K} < T \leq 1311 \text{ K} \\ -2.305 \times 10^1 + 3.366 \times 10^{-2} T, & \text{if } T > 1311 \text{ K} \end{cases} \quad (39)$$

where  $h$  is the heat convection coefficient.

At first, consider PI hardening simulations in a cylindrical bar with radius  $R = 22.5 \text{ mm}$ . A 3.5 mm thickness layer is heated to 1120 K (850°C) for 5 s and then sprayed by a liquid medium at 294 K (21°C) for 10 s. Afterwards, air-cooling is assumed until a time instant of 60 s is reached. A convergence analysis is developed and a spatial discretization of 81 points with a variable time step ( $5.6 \times 10^{-6} \text{ s}$  for  $t < 5 \text{ s}$ ,  $5.6 \times 10^{-4} \text{ s}$  for  $5 \text{ s} \leq t < 15 \text{ s}$  and  $5.0 \times 10^{-2} \text{ s}$  for  $t \geq 15 \text{ s}$ ) is adopted.

Martensitic volumetric fraction distribution through the radius is now considered for the final time instant. Different approaches to evaluate thermo-mechanical coupling terms are concerned in order to establish a comparison among results. *Latent heat* approach presents more drastically discrepancies than the proposed *coupled* model, when compared to results of *uncoupled* model (Figure 1).




Figure 1 – Effect of coupling terms in the distribution of volumetric fractions of martensite through the radius.

The forthcoming analysis presents residual stress components distribution for the final time instant. Results confirm the previous analysis for the volumetric fraction of martensite, showing that the consideration of the energy equation thermo-mechanical coupling terms (*coupled* model) in the analysis produce intermediate results between *uncoupled* analysis and the *latent heat* approach. Figure (2) presents residual stress components distributions through the radius.




Figure 2 – Effect of coupling terms on the distribution of residual stress component. (a)  $\sigma_r$ ; (b)  $\sigma_\theta$ ; (c)  $\sigma_z$ .

Temperature distribution is now focused. Figure (3) presents the temperature time history for different positions in the cylinder. The energy equation thermo-mechanical coupling terms introduce a delay in the temperature evolution. In spite of the small amount, the delay can influence considerable diffusive phase transformations, for example, as pointed by Woodard *et al.* (1999).




Figure 3 – Effect of coupling terms on the temperature distribution. (a) center,  $r = 0$ ; (b)  $r = R/2$ ; (c) surface,  $r = R$ .

Effects of energy equation thermo-mechanical coupling terms may become more pronounced for other geometry or quenching conditions. As examples, one could mention the thickness of the induced layer and the diameter of the cylinder. Woodard *et al.* (1999) exploit this second situation. The forthcoming analysis is concerned with situations that elucidate this behavior. At first, consider the previous example, related to a cylindrical bar with  $R = 22.5$  mm. Figure (4) shows values of circumferential and longitudinal residual stress components at the surface of the cylinder for different thickness of induced layer. Notice that the effect of energy equation thermo-mechanical coupling terms is more pronounced for the smaller thickness value of induced layer. Assuming the *uncoupled* model as a reference, the *coupled* model presents a difference of about 70 MPa (10%) and 60 MPa (62%) for circumferential and longitudinal stresses, respectively. The *latent heat* approach present higher differences: 90 MPa for both circumferential and longitudinal stresses, meaning differences of 13% and 90%, respectively. Figure (5) shows that the effect of thermo-

mechanical coupling terms related to the *coupled* and *latent heat* models become more important in martensitic volumetric fractions determination for intermediary values of the thickness of induced layer (5 mm).




Figure 4 – Effect of coupling terms for different thickness of induced layer on stress components at the surface of a cylinder with  $R = 22.5$  mm. (a)  $\sigma_\theta$ ; (b)  $\sigma_z$ .




Figure 5 – Effect of coupling terms for different thickness of induced layer on the volumetric fractions of martensite in a cylinder with  $R = 22.5$  mm. (a) 1 mm; (b) 5 mm; (c) 15 mm.




Figure 6 – Effect of coupling terms for different thickness of induced layer on stress components at the surface of a cylinder with  $R = 100.0$  mm. (a)  $\sigma_\theta$ ; (b)  $\sigma_z$ .

At this point, a cylinder of radius  $R = 100$  mm is considered. Under this situation, the effects of thermo-mechanical coupling terms are even more pronounced, confirming the conclusion of Woodard *et al.* (1999). Figure (6) shows values for circumferential and longitudinal residual stress components at the surface of the cylinder for different thickness of induced layer. Considering the smaller thickness value of induced layer ( $e_{pl} = 1$  mm) and assuming the *uncoupled* model as a reference, differences of about 70% and 250% are observed for circumferential stress considering the *coupled* and *latent heat* models, respectively. On the other hand, using the same analysis for longitudinal stress, it is observed differences of about 20% and 50% considering the *coupled* and *latent heat* models, respectively. For  $e_{pl}$  values in the range of 15 to 18 mm, discrepancies among the *coupled* model with respect to the others is about 200 MPa for circumferential and 140 MPa for longitudinal stresses. For  $e_{pl}$  values greater than 22 mm, the three models present similar values of residual stresses. Figure (7) presents the distribution of martensitic volumetric fractions predicted by each model. Once again, for martensitic phase distribution, energy equation thermo-mechanical coupling terms become more important for a range of intermediary values of the thickness of induced layer (2.5 to 5 mm). For  $e_{pl}$  values greater than 12.5 mm, both *coupled* and *latent heat* models present similar martensitic phase distribution.




Figure 7 – Effect of coupling terms for different thickness of induced layer on the volumetric fractions of martensite in a cylinder with  $R = 100.0$  mm. (a) 1 mm; (b) 2.5 mm; (c) 12.5 mm.

## 5. Conclusions

The present contribution considers modeling and simulation of the quenching process, presenting an anisothermal model formulated within the framework of continuum mechanics and the thermodynamics of irreversible processes. Progressive induction hardening of a cylindrical body is considered as an application of the proposed general formulation. Thermo-mechanical coupling is exploited in order to evaluate the effect of internal and thermal coupling terms in the energy equation. Three different models are considered with this aim: *Uncoupled*, which does not include energy equation coupling terms; *Latent heat*, with a source term in the energy equation associated with the latent heat released during the martensitic phase transformation; and *Coupled*, that considers all coupling terms in the proposed model. Numerical simulations show that the energy equation thermo-mechanical coupling terms influence the determination of residual stress and the austenite-martensite phase transformation. These effects tend to become more pronounced in the analysis when greater diameters are considered. The variation of the thickness of induced layers related to progressive induced hardening is also an important parameter that influences the coupling terms. It should be pointed out that more drastically discrepancies may be expected in the analysis of quenching process considering other phases. Regarding temperature distribution, for example, even in situations where values are not considerably affected by the thermo-mechanical coupling terms, small temperature variations may cause different predictions for diffusive phase transformations because the time delay of the response. Besides, for the possibility of the formation of other phases (ferrite, pearlite and bainite) the proposed model predicts the incorporation of other coupling terms associated with these phases. Therefore, the authors agree that a complete comprehension of thermo-mechanical coupling terms must be obtained from the analysis of a model that contemplates diffusive and non-diffusive phase transformations.

## 6. Acknowledgements

The authors would like to acknowledge the support of the Brazilian Agencies CNPq and CAPES.

## 7. References

- Ames, W.F., 1992, “*Numerical Methods for Partial Differential Equations*”, 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition, Academic Press.
- Camarão, A.F., 1998, “*A Model to Predict Residual Stresses in the Progressive Induced Quenching of Steel Cylinders*”, PhD thesis, Department of Metallurgical and Materials Engineering, Universidade de São Paulo (in Portuguese).
- Camarão, A.F., da Silva, P.S.C.P. & Pacheco, P.M.C.L., 2000, “Finite Element Modeling of Thermal and Residual Stresses Induced by Steel Quenching”, In *Seminário de Fratura, Desgaste e Fadiga de Componentes Automotivísticos*, Brazilian Society of Automotive Engineering, Rio de Janeiro (in Portuguese).
- Cherkaoui, M., 2002, “Transformation Induced Plasticity: Mechanisms and Modeling”, *Journal of Engineering Materials and Technology*, v.124, pp.55-61.
- Denis, S., Farias, D. & Simon, A., 1992, “Mathematical Model Coupling Phase Transformation and Temperature Evolutions in Steels”, *ISIJ International*, v.32, No. 3, pp.316-326.
- Denis S., 1996, “Considering Stress-Phase Transformation Interaction in the Calculation of Heat Treatment Residual Stresses”, *Journal de Physique IV*, v.6, January, pp.159-174.
- Denis, S., Archambault, S., Aubry, C., Mey, A., Louin, J.C. & Simon, A., 1999, “Modelling of Phase Transformation Kinetics in Steels and Coupling with Heat Treatment Residual Stress Predictions”, *Journal de Physique IV*, v.9, September, pp.323-332.
- Eringen, A.C., 1967, “*Mechanics of Continua*”, John Wiley, New York.
- Fernandes, M. B., Denis, S. & Simon, A., 1985, “Mathematical Model Coupling Phase Transformation and Temperature Evolution during Quenching of Steels”, *Materials Science and Technology*, v.1, October, pp.838-844.
- Fernandes, M. B., Denis, S. & Simon, A., 1986, “Prévision de l'évolution Thermique et Structurale des Aciers au Cours de leur refroidissement Continu”, *Mémoires et Etudes Scientifiques Revue de Métallurgie*, pp.355-366.
- Habraken, A.M. & Bourdouxhe, M., 1992, “Coupled Thermo-mechanical-metallurgical Analysis During the Cooling Process of Steel Pieces”, *European Journal of Mechanics A-Solids*, v.11(3), pp.381-402.

- Hildenwall, B., 1979, “*Prediction of the Residual Stresses Created During Quenching*”, Ph.D. thesis, Linköping University.
- Idesman, A.V., Levitas, V.I. & Stein, E., 1997, “Simulation of Martensitic Phase Transition Progress with Continuous and Discontinuous Displacements at the Interface”, *Computational and Materials Science*, v.9(1-2), pp.64-75.
- Idesman, A.V., Levitas, V.I. & Stein, E., 2000, “Structural Changes in Elastoplastic Materials: A Unified Finite-Element Approach to Phase Transformation, Twinning and Fracture”, *International Journal of Plasticity*, v.18 (7-8), pp.893-949.
- Koistinen, D.P. and Marburger, R.E., 1959, “A General Equation Prescribing the Extent of the Austenite-Martensite Transformation In Pure Iron-Carbon Alloys and Plain Carbon Steels”, *Acta Metallurgica*, v.7, pp.59-60.
- Lemaitre, J. & Chaboche, J.L., 1990, “*Mechanics of Solid Materials*”, Cambridge Press.
- Levitas, V.I., 1997, “Phase Transitions in Elastoplastic Materials: Continuum Thermomechanical Theory and Examples of Control. Part I e II.”, *Journal of Mechanics and Physics Solids*, v.45(6), pp.923-947 and v.45(7), pp.1203-1222.
- Levitas, V.I., 1998, “Thermomechanical Theory of Martensitic Phase Transformations in Inelastic Materials”, *International Journal of Solids and Structures*, v.35(9-10), pp.889-940.
- Levitas, V.I., 2000, “Structural Changes Without Stable Intermediate State in Inelastic Material. Part I and II”, *International Journal of Plasticity*, v.18 (7-8), pp.805-849 and pp.851-892.
- Melander, M., 1985, “*A Computational and Experimental Investigation of Induction and Laser Hardening*”, Ph.D. thesis, Department of Mechanical Engineering, Linköping University.
- Nakamura, S., 1993, “*Applied Numerical Methods in C*”, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey.
- Ortiz, M., Pinsky, P.M. & Taylor, R.L., 1983, Operator Split Methods for the Numerical Solution of the Elastoplastic Dynamic Problem, *Computer Methods of Applied Mechanics and Engineering*, v. 39, pp.137-157.
- Pacheco, P.M.C.L., 1994, “*Analysis of the Thermomechanical Coupling in Elastoviscoplastic Materials*”, Ph.D. thesis, Department of Mechanical Engineering, Pontificia Universidade Católica do Rio de Janeiro (in Portuguese).
- Pacheco, P.M.C.L., Oliveira, S.A., Camarão, A.F. & Savi, M.A., 1997, “A model to predict residual stresses introduced by the quenching process in steels”, In Proceedings of the XIV Brazilian Congress of Mechanical Engineering - ABCM (in Portuguese).
- Pacheco, P.M.C.L., Camarão, A.F. & Savi, M.A., 2001, “Analysis of Residual Stresses Generated by Progressive Induction Hardening of Steel Cylinders”, *Journal of Strain Analysis for Engineering Design*, v.36, n.5, pp.507-516.
- Rockafellar, R. T., 1970, “*Convex Analysis*”, Princeton Press.
- Sen, S., Aksakal, B. & Ozel, A., 2000, “Transient and Residual Thermal Stresses in Quenched Cylindrical Bodies”, *International Journal of Mechanical Sciences*, 42, pp.2013-2029.
- Silva, E.P., 2002, “Modeling and Simulation of Quenching Process in Steels using Finite Element”, M.Sc. thesis, Department of Mechanical and Materials Engineering, Instituto Militar de Engenharia, IME-RJ, October (in Portuguese).
- Simo, J.C. & Hughes, T.J.R., 1998, “*Computational Inelasticity*”, Springer.
- Simo, J.C. & Miehe, C., 1992, “Associative Coupled Thermoplasticity at Finite Strains: Formulation, Numerical Analysis and Implementation”, *Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering*, v.98, pp.41-104.
- Sjöström, S., 1985, “Interactions and Constitutive Models for Calculating Quench Stresses in Steel”, *Material Science and Technology*, v.1, pp.823-829.
- Sjöström, S., 1994, “Physical, Mathematical and Numerical Modelling for Calculation of Residual Stresses: Fundamentals and Applications”, In Proceedings of the *Fourth International Conference on Residual Stresses*, June 8-10, Baltimore, USA.
- Wang, H.G., Guan, Y.H., Chen, T.L. & Zhang, J.T., 1997, “A Study of Thermal Stresses during Laser Quenching”, *Journal of Materials Processing Technology*, 63, pp.550-553.
- Woodard, P.R., Chandrasekar, S. & Yang, H. T. Y., 1999, “Analysis of Temperature and Microstructure in the Quenching of Steel Cylinders”, *Metallurgical and Materials Transactions B*, v. 30B, August, pp.815-822.