VTT Technical Research Centre of Finland Ltd

## **VTT ProperTune**<sup>™</sup>

Enabling Integrated Computational Materials Engineering for Businesses

www.vttresearch.com/propertune

### Contents





- Brief introduction to core concepts of "VTT properTune"
- Typical uses & how projects make use of "VTT properTune" in R&D&I
- 2 industry use cases:
  - Design of a new wear resistant steel (in collaboration with ArcelorMittal)
  - Optimization of damage tolerant composites & microstructures (in collaboration with Caterpillar)





### **EXAMPLE:** Applying VTT properTune to Modeling of Wear Damage and Cumulative Wear





### VTT properTune as a tool for "Integrated Computational Materials Engineering"







#### Thin films and coatings

TiN, DLC, MoS2, TS, laser, welded coatings



#### **Metals**

Wear resistant steels, very high strength steels, steels for machinery, welds, dissimilar metal joints, copper, cast irons, additive manufacturing





#### **Composite/Hard materials**

Cemented carbides, cermets, PM materials and composites, rock materials



#### **Soft materials**

Nanocomposites, polymer composites, elastomers, biomaterials





#### www.vttresearch.com/propertune

# From material microstructure to full scale components and systems

- Tools to create the microstructure:
  - SEM, FIB, EBSD, μ-CT, TEM, APT
- Tools to characterize the properties:
  - Nanoindentation, AFM and SPM for mechanical property mapping
- Tools to validate the models:
  - Laboratory or component/ system level testing











www.vttresearch.com/propertune



Use case 1: Design of a new wear resistant steel (in collaboration with ArcelorMittal)



### **Microstructural modeling: model generation**



Martensitic steel microstructure



Prior austenite grains reconstructed



Hierarchies, such as block boundaries (green) and packet boundaries (red) 12/07/2019



**Computational microstructure** 

Merger of advanced characterization and modeling means provides quite a realistic description of steel at the microstructural level

### **Microstructural modeling: model generation**



either statistical or directly imaging based model

### Scratch test models, FM450 fully martensitic grade



+2.250e+00+2.000e+00+1.750e+00+1.500e+00+1.250e+00+1.250e+01+5.000e-01+2.500e-01+0.000e+00



# FM450 microstructure design with single asperity contact: load carrying capacity







# Testing of new steel grade(s) by TUBS in full scale wear test arrangement



**Arcelor**Mittal

Technische Universität







The tine ran typically for some 100-200 km in a "tillage simulator", roughly 8 m diameter track where the soil/abrasive characteristics can be controlled and adjusted.



#### Testing of new steel grade(s) by TUBS in Technisch Universität Braunschwe full scale wear test arrangement **Arcelor**Mittal **Relative Mass Loss** Wear Rate 0,6 25,0 Difference Х X approx. 2-2.5 0,5 20,0 fold in wear current grades rate Wear Rate [g/km] رو من 0 ۴ Mass loss [g] 15,0 0,32 $\times$ 10,0 0,31 0.30 new grades 5,0 0,17<sup>×</sup> 0,17 0,16 T 0,13 0,0 0,1 100 125 25 50 75 0 0 Distance [km] С F G \_ AT450 FM450 RA900 В The "properTune" Material ••••• G •• B fully Fully Retained martensitic **Autotempered** martensitic austenite grades, B, C, AT450 **FM450 RA900** F, G



Use case 2: Optimization of wear resistant composites & microstructures (in collaboration with Caterpillar)



### Models & different analysis cases

**Diamond tip +** 

- Model types, two microstructural regions of interest:
  - Coating contact surface microstructural model
  - Coating-to-substrate interface microstructural model



E.g. carbide and boride containing composite microstructure with martensitic matrix

microstructure Coating contact surface microstructural model layout

Coating contact surface microstructure:

substrate

coating



coating

Coating-substrate interface microstructure:



- Wear load cases:
  - Compression, indentation, scratch test
  - Erosion wear (small abrasives)
  - Impact wear (larger abrasives)
  - Steel ball impact (validation)



### Validation and performance tests



- Steel ball and WC-Co ball impact tests with different impact energies (3 sets of 6 different energies from 0.5 to 2.2J) performed – Experimental results are used to validate the models
- Ball velocity recorded with high speed camera just before impact
- Craters analysed with 3D-profilometer and more detailed analysis performed with SEM or FIB-SEM





### Verification case via impact wear like loading



Steel ball impact test for simple validation of the model, model maximum remaining displacement for experimental impact velocity and angle 58  $\mu$ m, which is well in line with the experimental results (considering scatter of both experiments + models, and the fact that in current work still utilizing 2D modeling). Experimental results between 43 to 53  $\mu$ m

12/07/2019



### Modeling results, dynamic impact analyses



Impact of a small abrasive and microstructure ("local" hard granite)

Impact of the small abrasive on the surface at 15 m/s, equivalent stress contours



### **X-Ray Tomography of Granite sample**



# Summary of results for sliding abrasion and erosive & abrasive conditions

S. Misee (Ag; 75%) 1 000+00 2 225+00 2 500+00 2 500+000+00 2 500+000+00 2 500+000+000+000+000+000+000+000+000+000	Equivalent stress contours	PEEO (A03775%) 1 0539-030 1 0539-030 1 0539-030 1 0539-030 1 0539-030		structure all abrasives ~ erosion. ity 15 m/s, angle 50°
S. Max In Pane Principal (Atg: 75%) - 2.000e-02 - 1.000e-02 - 1.000e-02 - 1.000e-02 - 1.000e-02 - 3.058e-00 - 3.058e-01 - 3.05				
- 9398-02 - 9398-02 - 9398-02			1 <sup>st</sup> principal stress contours	Equivalent plastic strain contours



# Modeling abrasive wear loading in 2- and 3-body contactsModeling abrasive wear loading arising from



Wear resistance and the "collapse" of a rock column and a velocity of approx. 50 m/s at a nominal angle of 50 degrees.



### Modeling abrasive wear loading in 2- and 3body contacts

Modeling abrasive wear loading arising from 2- and 3-body abrasion.



Wear resistant plate moving laterally with a velocity of 10 m/s.

# Summary: Comparison of impact resistance of two different microstructures







**OUTCOME:** Impact resistance retained, resistance to abrasion (G65) improved by 40%.

#### References

