Machining performance enhancement of EN-31 die steel using MWCNT mixed rotary EDM
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The present study investigates the influence of adding multi-wall carbon nanotube (MWCNT) into the dielectric fluid of electric discharge machining (EDM) in terms of material removal rate (MRR), surface roughness (SR) and surface topology of EN-31 die steel using Cu electrode. A customized rotary electrode set-up has been developed to compare the performance improvement of powder mixed rotary electrical discharge machining (PMREDM) as compared to powder mixed electrical discharge machining (PMEDM) and conventional EDM. The present study attempts to investigate the optimization of process parameters of MWCNT mixed rotary EDM of EN-31 die steel using response surface methodology (RSM) and genetic algorithm (GA) in terms of MRR and SR. The optimization results show that MWCNT mixed rotary EDM shows highest value of MRR (9.72 mm³/min) and lowest value of SR (Rₐ = 2.03 µm), which are approximately 46.17% higher and 45.43% lower than conventional EDM values respectively. Further, various combinations of optimal values of MRR and SR and their corresponding input parameters setting have been shown in pareto table created by multi-objective optimization GA technique available in MATLAB. Finally, field emission scanning electron microscope (FESEM) analysis of MWCNT mixed rotary EDM and EDM surfaces is carried out which reveals that MWCNT mixed rotary EDM shows better surface topography as compared to EDM process.
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1 Introduction

In present age of technological development, EDM has become one of the most popular unconventional machining process. Due to contactless thermal erosion by EDM, it is widely used to machine variety of hard to cut conductive materials irrespective of their hardness. In the last few decades, EDM has gained more attention and has been widely used in various fields like the mould and die making industry, automobile industry, aviation industry and in surgical equipment. In EDM process material is removed from workpiece due to the series of repetitive sparks developed between workpiece and tool electrode immersed in dielectric fluid. These series of repeated spark occur when a voltage of 80 - 320 V is applied between the electrodes at suitable electrode gap for sparking. This thermal energy generates a plasma channel between the electrodes with a temperature range of 8000 – 12000 °C, which ultimately erodes the material by melting and vaporization from the vaporizing zone of the workpiece. Low machining efficiency and surface integrity are the prime concerns for the proper industrialization of the EDM process. Due to the unpredictable nature of the EDM process, researchers not only tried to improve the process performance by controlling various input parameters but also applied various modifications by using different tool electrodes and different EDM pulse generator. A step further, various process alterations like workpiece ultrasonic vibration assisted EDM, dielectric ultrasonic vibration assisted EDM, tool ultrasonic vibration assisted EDM, workpiece rotary EDM, EDM with rotary tool and near dry EDM are also investigated and succeed to some extent to overcome the EDM challenges. But one of the process which get highest success towards EDM challenges, is powder mixed electric discharge machining (PMEDM). Jeswani was the first who reported 60% improvement in MRR and 15% reduction in TWR by using Gr (4g/l concentration) PMEDMing of mild steel. Fong and Chen unfolded the powder characteristics and reported that the smallest particle size generates lower surface roughness and highest recast layer thickness.
Kansal et al.\textsuperscript{14} reported optimum setting of MRR, SR and TWR for Gr PMEDM of HCHCr die steel. Cogun et al.\textsuperscript{15} reported that Gr PMEDMing of SAE 1040 steel shows remarkably higher MRR, lower SR, higher TWR and higher MH as compare to H\textsubscript{2}BO\textsubscript{3} PMEDM due to better thermal conductivity of Gr powder. Peças and Henriques\textsuperscript{16} reported lowest values of surface roughness, crater width, crater depth and recast layer thickness by using Si PMEDM. Bhattacharya et al.\textsuperscript{17} revealed that Gr powder produces highest MH while Cu powder shows the smallest grain size on machined surface during the PMEDMing of various die steels. Mai et al.\textsuperscript{18} reported 66% lower machining time and improved SR (0.09\(\mu\)m) by using CNT mixed EDM as compared to conventional EDM. Izman et al.\textsuperscript{19} achieved higher MRR, lower SR and reduced recast layer thickness (RLT) as compare to conventional EDM by using MWCNT mixed EDM. Hu et al.\textsuperscript{20} reported better surface finish, higher micro hardness and improved corrosion and wear resistance surface on SiCp/Al composite using Al PMEDM. Sari et al.\textsuperscript{21} reported 154\% higher MRR, 24\% lower tool wear rate (TWR), 34\% lower SR and 37\% reduced RLT with MWCNT mixed EDM as compared to conventional EDM. H Kumar\textsuperscript{22} achieved significant improvement in MRR and SF by using CNT mixed EDM as compared to conventional EDM. Hariprasad et al.\textsuperscript{23} obtained 69\% higher MRR and 35\% reduced SR with Ti nano powder mixed EDM (NPMEDM) as compared to conventional EDM. Kumar et al.\textsuperscript{24} reported improved MRR and lower SR with low cost Al\textsubscript{2}O\textsubscript{3} NPMEDM as compared to conventional EDM. Wang and Yan\textsuperscript{25} reported that higher MRR can be achieved in case of electric discharge blind hole drilling of Al\textsubscript{2}O\textsubscript{3}/6061Al composite using eccentric hole tool with the only concern of TWR. Guu and Hocheng\textsuperscript{9} reported approximately twice time improvement in MRR and 50 \% reduction in SR with workpiece rotation at 5000 rpm. Mohan et al.\textsuperscript{26} reported that tool rotation plays a significant role to improve MRR and reduce SR in case of electric discharge machining of Al-SiC composite. Kuppan et al.\textsuperscript{27} reported significant impact of tool rotation on enhancement MRR and Surface finish in deep hole drilling of Inconel 718. Govindan and Joshi\textsuperscript{28} reported that tool rotation is one of the significant factor to enhance MRR in dry electric discharge drilling. Puthumana and Joshi\textsuperscript{29} reported remarkable enhancement in MRR and decrement in TWR in dry EDM by using rotary slotted tool. Teimouri and Baseri\textsuperscript{30,31} reported remarkable improvement in MRR and surface finish in case of magnetic field assisted rotary EDM due to better flushing of debris except high TWR and overcut were the only concern. All the above discussed research works prove that tool rotation has a significant impact on EDM machining process. Vishwakarma et al.\textsuperscript{32} achieved approximately 2.5 times higher MRR with rotary EDM as compared to PMEDM of Al-SiC metal matrix composite. Baseri and Sadeghian\textsuperscript{33} reported improved MRR, lower TWR and higher SF with TiO\textsubscript{2} NPMEDM using rotary tool as compared to conventional EDM. Based on the available literature survey, it was found that very little work has been reported on nano powder mixed rotary EDM (NPMREDM) and therefore present work investigate the machining performance of MWCNT mixed rotary EDM. Present study investigate the optimum setting of MRR and SR using GA available in MATLAB. Further multi-objective optimization (MOO) using GA, available in MATLAB is used for multiple response optimization.

2 Materials and Methods

2.1 Experimentation

The present investigation has been carried out on die sinking EDM (Make: J K MACHINES, Model: ZNC 25). An external rotary tool head has been developed by using DC motor, rotating chuck, timer belt drive and arduino chip to provide a range of rotational speed to the tool as shown in Fig.1. To

![Fig. 1 — Schematic diagram of PMEDM set-up.](image-url)
optimize the cost of the experiment powder use must be minimized. Therefore, a small tank made of acrylic material of size 30 X 22 X 13 cm³ is used for experimental purpose which is filled by MWCNT mixed dielectric. A submersible pump attached with nozzles is also used to ensure proper flushing of the debris from the sparking zone. EN-31 die steel having chemical composition \( C = 0.9 – 1.2\% \), \( Si = 0.1 – 0.35\% \), \( Mn = 0.3 – 0.75\% \), \( Cr = 1 – 1.6\% \), \( S \) and \( P \) each 0.025% (max.) and balance is ferrous) is used as a workpiece. The dimension of the workpiece were selected as 25 mm length, 25 mm width and 20 mm thickness for the present investigation. EN-31 die steel because of its high compressive strength, high hardness, and high abrasive resistance is widely used in bearings, spinning, punch and die industries. Cu rod with diameter 10 mm is used as a tool electrode and MWCNT (Length: 1-10 μm; OD: 5-20 nm; ID: 2-6 nm) mixed in EDM oil is used as a dielectric for the experimentation purpose. The present experimental study is carried out to achieve the optimum value of MRR and SR for MWCNT powder mixed rotary EDM using RSM and GA. Further, multi-objective optimization (MOO) available in MATLAB 2017a is used to achieve the common setting of input parameters for different optimum response values of MRR and SR. Further, the optimum values of MRR and SR for MWCNT mixed rotary EDM process is then compared with MWCNT mixed EDM, rotary EDM and conventional EDM, respectively. For this purpose, four independent input variables namely peak current \( (I_p) \), pulse on time \( (T_{on}) \), pulse off time \( (T_{off}) \) and powder concentration \( (P_c) \) are selected, based on Ishikawa cause effect diagram as shown in Fig.2. The range of input parameters was selected based on pilot test (varying one variable and keeping other constant) and are given in Table 1. Further, the result of pilot test showcased in Fig.3, which demonstrate the effect of individual parameter on MRR and SR.

Optimization of MRR and SR was the prime objective during the present investigation. Therefore, measurement of MRR were done by measuring the difference between the weight of workpiece before and after the machining. Further this difference in weight of workpiece before and after machining is converted into volumetric loss as:

\[
MRR(\text{mm}^3/\text{min}) = \frac{W_b - W_a}{\rho \times t} \times 1000 \quad \ldots (1)
\]

Where,
\( W_b \) = weight of workpiece before machining in gm.
\( W_a \) = weight of workpiece after machining in gm.
\( \rho \) = density of workpiece material (g/cm³)
\( t \) = machining time (min)

| Table 1 — Selected range of input parameters for optimization purpose. |
|-------------------|------------------------|------------------------|
| Factor Symbol    | Parameter Symbol       | Levels                |
|                  |                        | Low (-1)              |
|                  |                        | Medium (0)            |
|                  |                        | High (+1)             |
| \( I_p \)        | Peak current (Ampere)  | 3                     |
| \( T_{on} \)     | Pulse on time (μs)     | 100                   |
| \( T_{off} \)    | Pulse off time (μs)    | 40                    |
| \( P_c \)        | Powder concentration (g/l) | 1          |
| \( T_r \)        | Tool rotation (rpm)    | 1200                  |
| Polarity         |                        | Negative             |

Fig.2 — The Ishikawa cause-effect diagram for PMEDM process.
In present investigation surface roughness is measured in term of $R_a$, which is arithmetic mean of peak and valleys of the surface irregularities measured microscopically. To measure the $R_a$ value after each experiment MITUTOYO surface tester (model: SJ 310) is used throughout the experimentation.

### 2.2 Response Surface Modeling

RSM is a well-known designing as well as optimization technique for multi interacting process parameters. This technique is not only used to investigate the effect of individual input parameters but also used to examine the effect of interaction of input parameters. In RSM performance parameters and input parameters are connected as:

$$y = f(x_1, x_2, x_3, ..., x_p) \quad \cdots (2)$$

where $x_1, x_2, x_3$ are the input process parameters and $y$ is the output performance parameter. Generally
a quadratic model of input parameters is used for the modeling of fitness function which is as follows:

\[ y = c_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{p} c_{ii} x_i^2 \sum_{j} c_{ij} x_i x_j \]  

... (3)

where, \( c_0 \) represent constant and all other \( c \)'s are the coefficient.

2.3 Genetic Algorithm

Genetic algorithm (GA) is a unique technique to provide solution for both constrained and unconstrained optimization problems by generating a random initial population comprising of set of input parameters. The fitness function, which is generally used to transform the objective function value into a measure of relative fitness\(^{35} \) thus:

\[ F(x) = g(f(x)) \]  

... (4)

where, \( f \) is the objective function, \( g \) transform the value of objective function to a positive number and \( F \) shows the resulting relative fitness. The individual fitness, \( F(x_i) \), of each individual is calculated as the individual’s raw performance \( f(x_i) \), relative to the whole population i.e.

\[ F(x_i) = \frac{f(x_i)}{\sum_{i}^{N_{\text{ind}}} f(x_i)} \]  

... (5)

where, \( N_{\text{ind}} \) is the size of population and \( x_i \) is the phenotypic value of individual \( i \).

The values of important GA parameters for entire process are chosen as follows: population size = 50, cross over fraction = 0.8, mutation rate = 0.01 and number of generations = 100.

A quadratic model for MRR and SR was developed by using RSM (Box-Behnken technique) available in Design Expert 6 Software. Total 30 numbers of experiments were performed thrice to achieve the average value of MRR and SR against each experiment as shown in Table 2. Further these results of MRR and SR and are used to generate quadratic model of MRR and SR generated by Design Expert 6 software as shown in Eq. (6) and Eq. (7).

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
Run No. & Process Parameters & MRR (mm\(^3\)/min) & Average & SR (\(\mu\)m) & Average \\
\hline
 & \( \text{l}_{\text{p}} \) (A) & \( T_{\text{on}} \) (\(\mu\)s) & \( T_{\text{off}} \) (\(\mu\)s) & \( P_{\text{i}} \) (g/l) & 1 & 2 & 3 & Average & 1 & 2 & 3 & Average \\
\hline
3 & 7 & 100 & 70 & 2 & 8.56 & 8.59 & 8.68 & 8.61 & 7.32 & 7.33 & 7.25 & 7.3 \\
4 & 5 & 150 & 70 & 2 & 6.67 & 6.65 & 6.75 & 6.69 & 4.91 & 4.89 & 4.84 & 4.88 \\
5 & 5 & 150 & 70 & 2 & 6.79 & 6.82 & 6.73 & 6.78 & 4.83 & 4.88 & 4.84 & 4.85 \\
6 & 5 & 150 & 40 & 1 & 5.34 & 5.42 & 5.35 & 5.37 & 5.88 & 5.83 & 5.87 & 5.86 \\
7 & 5 & 150 & 100 & 3 & 5.91 & 5.85 & 5.82 & 5.86 & 6.61 & 6.63 & 6.71 & 6.65 \\
8 & 5 & 150 & 100 & 1 & 5.17 & 5.12 & 5.13 & 5.14 & 5.89 & 5.87 & 5.79 & 5.85 \\
9 & 5 & 150 & 70 & 2 & 4.26 & 4.35 & 4.32 & 4.31 & 2.08 & 2.13 & 2.06 & 2.09 \\
10 & 5 & 200 & 70 & 2 & 4.67 & 4.63 & 4.56 & 4.62 & 2.61 & 2.68 & 2.66 & 2.65 \\
12 & 3 & 150 & 70 & 1 & 3.97 & 3.96 & 3.89 & 3.94 & 2.82 & 2.89 & 2.87 & 2.86 \\
13 & 5 & 150 & 70 & 2 & 6.76 & 6.84 & 6.77 & 6.79 & 4.93 & 4.89 & 4.82 & 4.88 \\
14 & 7 & 150 & 70 & 1 & 8.19 & 8.24 & 8.11 & 8.18 & 8.61 & 8.54 & 8.53 & 8.56 \\
15 & 7 & 200 & 40 & 2 & 6.85 & 6.78 & 6.83 & 6.82 & 5.07 & 5.12 & 5.08 & 5.09 \\
16 & 3 & 150 & 70 & 3 & 4.68 & 4.72 & 4.73 & 4.71 & 3.78 & 3.72 & 3.69 & 3.73 \\
17 & 5 & 200 & 100 & 2 & 6.56 & 6.51 & 6.55 & 6.54 & 5.11 & 5.08 & 4.99 & 5.06 \\
18 & 5 & 150 & 70 & 2 & 6.71 & 6.64 & 6.69 & 6.68 & 4.81 & 4.84 & 4.75 & 4.80 \\
20 & 5 & 100 & 100 & 2 & 6.26 & 6.31 & 6.27 & 6.28 & 4.65 & 4.67 & 4.72 & 4.68 \\
21 & 5 & 200 & 70 & 3 & 5.76 & 5.83 & 5.84 & 5.81 & 6.96 & 6.94 & 6.84 & 6.92 \\
22 & 5 & 200 & 70 & 1 & 5.07 & 5.04 & 4.95 & 5.02 & 6.11 & 6.16 & 6.12 & 6.13 \\
24 & 5 & 150 & 70 & 2 & 6.75 & 6.82 & 6.77 & 6.78 & 4.93 & 4.9 & 4.84 & 4.89 \\
25 & 5 & 100 & 70 & 3 & 5.61 & 5.69 & 5.59 & 5.63 & 6.47 & 6.52 & 6.48 & 6.49 \\
26 & 3 & 150 & 40 & 2 & 5.23 & 5.19 & 5.09 & 5.17 & 2.29 & 2.36 & 2.28 & 2.31 \\
27 & 3 & 150 & 100 & 2 & 4.63 & 4.59 & 4.52 & 4.58 & 2.33 & 2.31 & 2.23 & 2.29 \\
29 & 5 & 100 & 70 & 1 & 5.09 & 5.16 & 5.11 & 5.12 & 5.42 & 5.51 & 5.45 & 5.46 \\
30 & 5 & 150 & 70 & 2 & 6.75 & 6.82 & 6.77 & 6.78 & 4.85 & 4.94 & 4.88 & 4.89 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Table 2 — Design of experimental matrix and corresponding response value against each setting.}
\end{table}
MRR = 2.46256 - 0.36646*I_p + 0.04180*T_on + 1.26852*T_0ff + 3.76167*P_c + 0.11448*I_p^2 – 1.47333*E_0ff – 8.14815*E_0ff^2 – 0.92208*P_c^2 + 9.00000*P_c*T_on + 2.08333*E_0ff^2 – 0.11448*I_p*T_0ff + 0.220000*P_c*P_c – 2.83333*E_0ff^3 + 1.40000*E_0ff*P_c – 1.66667*E_0ff^3

The acceptability of the model is required for the analysis of data and for this purpose goodness of fit of the model is required, which includes the checking of model significant test, coefficient test, model coefficient test and lack of fitness test. ANOVA is carried out to check the overall acceptability of MRR and SR models. These response models are further used to optimize for individual response and multiple response by using GA in MATLAB R2017a.

2.4 Analysis of MRR Model

Quadratic model for MRR is further investigated by using ANOVA at 95% confidence level to check the Acceptability of the model. The ANOVA result for MRR is shown in Table 3. MRR model shows an excellent relationship between input parameters and response (MRR) since the value of R^2 and adjusted R^2 are 99.61% and 99.19% which provides best justification for co-relation input parameters and response. Signal to noise ratio is associated with adequate precision and if this term has a value more than 4, the model is fit for optimization. The associated p-value for the MRR model is significantly less than 5% (< 0.05) which indicated that the model is statically significant [36]. Further, it can be observed from the ANOVA model that lack of fit is non-significant which also support the acceptance of the model. The term A (I_p), B (T_m), C (T_0ff), D (P_c), A^2, B^2, D^2 and AD appear as significant variables while the remaining variables and their interactions are non-significant. Further, Fig. 4(a)

![Normal Plot of Residuals](image)

Fig. 4 — (a) Normal probability plots of residuals for MRR, (b) Actual versus predicted response for MRR and (c) Perturbation graph for MRR.
shows normal plots of residuals for MRR and it is clear from the figure that most of the plots are lying on or along the straight line which is a clear cut indication of uniform scattering of errors. Figure 4(b) shows the excellent closeness between actual values and predicted values of MRR, which indicate that regression model is well suited for the actual values of MRR. Finally, Fig. 4(c) shows the perturbation plot for MRR which shows the effect of each individual parameter on MRR while keeping other parameters constant.

2.5 Optimization of MRR Using GA

The mathematical model for MRR is used as an input function for GA without any constraint. MATLAB response for predicted optimum value of MRR appear as 9.50 mm³/min, which is shown in Fig. 5(a) and corresponding input parameters setting are shown in Fig. 5(b). It can be observed from Fig. 5 (a) that in initial population of the generation, the best and average value of MRR varies significantly. But as the iterations proceed, the best and average value difference become non-significant. Further, it becomes very difficult to reduce the different between best and average value of MRR as the iterations proceed.

2.6 Analysis of Surface Roughness Model

ANOVA analysis for SR model is shown in Table 4, which shows that proposed model exhibit excellent correlation between input parameters and response (SR). The value of R² and adjusted R² are 99.24% and 98.54% respectively, which shows excellent correlation between input parameters and output response (SR). Adequate Precision which is linked with signal to noise ratio shows value 47.777, which is more than 4 and makes the model quite fit for optimization. The associated p - value for the SR model is significantly less than 5% (< 0.05) which shows that model is accepted as a statically significant model36. Further Fig. 6(a) shows the normal plots of residuals for SR. It is clear from the figure that most of the plots lie on or along the straight line which is a clear cut indication of uniform scattering of errors. Figure 6(b) shows the excellent closeness between actual values and predicted values of SR, which indicate that regression model is well suited for the actual values of SR. Finally, Fig. 6(c) shows the perturbation plot for SR which shows the effect of each individual parameter on SR while keeping other parameters constant.

![Fig.5 — MATLAB response for (a) MRR fitness curve and (b) Optimum MRR input setting.](image-url)
2.7 Optimization of SR Using GA
The mathematical model for the minimization of SR is used as an input function for GA to optimize it. MATLAB generated fitness curve Fig. 7(a) shows predicted minimum value of SR (Ra = 1.96 µm) and Fig. 7(b) shows the corresponding input parameters setting. Similar to the MRR fitness curve, SR fitness curve is also converging and best and average values of SR are approximately coinciding as the iterations move forward.

2.8 Multi-objective Optimization with Genetic Algorithm
In multi-objective optimization with GA, a mathematical model for MRR and SR are used to develop a common objective function. MATLAB response for MOO appears as Pareto table (Table 5) and Pareto front (Fig. 8). Pareto table shows different input values and corresponding optimal values of MRR and SR and Pareto front shows the graphical representation of these optimum values of MRR and SR. It is clear from the Pareto front and Pareto table that if higher MRR is required than SR will also be high and if low SR is required than MRR will also be low. Therefore a compromised value of MRR and SR can be selected by using corresponding input parameters setting.

3 Results and Discussion
3.1 Analysis of MRR
The predicted and experimental value of MRR for MWCNT mixed rotary EDM are 9.50 mm³/min and

![Fig. 6 — (a) Normal probability plots of residuals for SR, (b) Actual versus predicted response for SR and (c) Perturbation graph for SR.](image1)

![Fig. 7 — MATLAB response for (a) SR fitness curve and (b) Optimum SR input setting.](image2)
9.72 mm³/min respectively at optimum input parameters setting. Result shows that experimental value of MRR at optimal setting are very close to predicted value of MRR and showing 2.31 % error between them. Experiments were also carried out for conventional EDM, conventional rotary EDM and PMEDM to find the optimum MRR for respective processes. MRR results for conventional EDM, REDM, PMEDM and RPMEDM at corresponding optimum setting is shown in Table 6 and also shown in Fig 9 (a). All these results indicates that REDM shows approximately 22.86% higher MRR than conventional EDM while PMEDM shows approximately 37.14% and 11.63% higher MRR than conventional EDM, respectively and REDM and finally PMREDM shows approximately 46.17%, 18.9% and 6.58% higher MRR than conventional EDM, REDM and PMEDM respectively. Highest value of MRR for PMREDM occurs due to presence of MWCNT in dielectric which not only increases the discharge gap between two electrodes but also increases the discharge transitivity and tool rotation provides extra support towards the enhancement of MRR due to better flushing. Further, rotary EDM shows better MRR than conventional EDM because rotary action of the tool provide extra support to the debris to exit and minimizes the chances of re-attaching these debris from machining area. Highest value of MRR for MWCNT mixed rotary EDM occurs at highest Ip, medium Ton, low Toff and medium Pc. Since high Ip produces high pulse energy and

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SNo</th>
<th>MRR (mm³/min)</th>
<th>SR (µm)</th>
<th>Ip (A)</th>
<th>Ton (µs)</th>
<th>Toff (µs)</th>
<th>Pc (g/l)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-5.31</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>116.05</td>
<td>61.59</td>
<td>1.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-9.08</td>
<td>7.41</td>
<td>6.91</td>
<td>123.88</td>
<td>65.66</td>
<td>2.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-8.93</td>
<td>7.23</td>
<td>6.72</td>
<td>136.50</td>
<td>71.63</td>
<td>2.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>-7.68</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>5.82</td>
<td>137.47</td>
<td>67.55</td>
<td>2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>-4.67</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>107.00</td>
<td>57.54</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-7.24</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>132.51</td>
<td>67.70</td>
<td>2.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>-4.90</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>120.43</td>
<td>67.92</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>-5.06</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>117.67</td>
<td>61.53</td>
<td>1.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>-9.43</td>
<td>7.68</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>146.15</td>
<td>77.02</td>
<td>2.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>-7.37</td>
<td>5.62</td>
<td>5.62</td>
<td>131.78</td>
<td>67.37</td>
<td>2.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>-5.61</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>121.49</td>
<td>68.76</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>-5.79</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>126.81</td>
<td>64.95</td>
<td>1.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>-6.41</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>141.99</td>
<td>63.62</td>
<td>2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>-7.04</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>142.74</td>
<td>75.49</td>
<td>2.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>-8.14</td>
<td>6.46</td>
<td>6.24</td>
<td>127.62</td>
<td>68.21</td>
<td>2.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>-6.23</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>133.58</td>
<td>68.61</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>-6.80</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>131.15</td>
<td>68.60</td>
<td>2.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>-8.49</td>
<td>6.82</td>
<td>6.41</td>
<td>138.43</td>
<td>76.43</td>
<td>2.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>-5.91</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>128.89</td>
<td>68.55</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>-9.40</td>
<td>7.67</td>
<td>6.98</td>
<td>146.15</td>
<td>77.03</td>
<td>2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>-5.22</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>125.50</td>
<td>62.11</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>-7.48</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>137.16</td>
<td>69.82</td>
<td>2.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig.8 — MATLAB generated Pareto front graph for MRR and SR.

Fig. 9 — (a) MRR and (b) SR comparison of EDM, rotary EDM and powder mixed rotary EDM (PMREDM) at corresponding optimum setting.
Table 6 — MRR and SR results for PMREDM, PMEDM, REDM and EDM processes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Response Setting</th>
<th>Response value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>PMREDM</td>
<td>MRR (I_p = 7A, T_on = 168µs, T_off = 66µs, P_c = 2.24g/l) &amp; N = 1200RPM</td>
<td>9.72(mm²/min)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SR (I_p = 3A, T_on = 100µs, T_off = 66µs, P_c = 1.8g/l) &amp; N = 1200RPM</td>
<td>2.03(µm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>PMEDM</td>
<td>MRR (I_p = 7A, T_on = 168µs, T_off = 66µs, P_c = 2.24g/l) &amp; N = 0RPM</td>
<td>9.12(mm²/min)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SR (I_p = 3, T_on = 100, T_off = 65, P_c = 1.8) &amp; N = 0</td>
<td>2.21(µm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>REDM</td>
<td>MRR (I_p = 7A, T_on = 168µs, T_off = 66µs) &amp; N = 1200RPM</td>
<td>8.17(mm²/min)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SR (I_p = 3A, T_on = 100µs, T_off = 65µs) &amp; N = 1200RPM</td>
<td>2.46(µm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>EDM</td>
<td>MRR (I_p = 7A, T_on = 168µs, T_off = 66µs)</td>
<td>6.65(mm²/min)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SR ((I_p = 3A, T_on = 100µs, T_off = 65µs)</td>
<td>3.72(µm)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

therefore deeper size craters are produced, which finally leads to higher MRR. Further as the T_on increases, MRR increases but as it goes beyond a certain value it produces more debris and less time for them to exit from machining area which ultimately leads to resolidification of debris onto machined area and reducing the MRR. Increasing T_off directly reduces the MRR. Finally, highest MRR achieved at approximately middle level of P_c because as the P_c increases, more chain formation and multiple sparks occurs at different places but increasing P_c beyond a certain level decreases MRR due to high discharge turbulence.

3.2 Analysis of Surface Roughness

The predicted and experimental value of SR for MWCNT mixed rotary EDM are 1.96 µm and 2.03 µm respectively at optimum input parameters setting. Validation result shows that predicted and experimental value of SR are very close to each other with an accepted error of 3.57%. Experiments were also carried out for conventional EDM, conventional rotary EDM and PMREDM to find the optimum value of SR for respective processes. SR result for conventional EDM, REDM, PMEDM and PMREDM at corresponding optimum setting is shown in Table 6 and also shown in Fig. 9 (b). All these results indicates that REDM shows approximately 33.87% lower SR than conventional EDM while PMEDM shows approximately 40.59% and 10.16% lower SR than conventional EDM and REDM, respectively and finally PMREDM shows approximately 45.43%, 17.48% and 8.15% lower SR than conventional EDM, REDM and PMEDM, respectively. Lowest value of SR is achieved at low I_p, low T_on and medium level of P_c while T_off appears as a non-significant factor. Low I_p produces low pulse energy resulting in small and shallow craters on the workpiece which ultimately leads to better surface quality. Increasing T_on produces more machined particles and more chances to adhere on the workpiece therefore increasing the SR. Further increasing P_c beyond the optimum value increases SR since high P_c increases discharge turbulence and produces uneven machined surface.

3.3 Surface Topography

Surface topography plays an important role for the components which are very costly and working under high stress conditions and the safety of whole system mostly depends on these components. EDM is one of the most important unconventional machining process used to develop many such crucial parts in mold and die making industries, automobile and aviation industries. Therefore along with surface quality of the machined part, topography of the surface was also examined for MWCNT mixed rotary EDMed surfaces and (c, d) EDM surfaces.

Fig. 10 — (a, b) FESEM images of MWCNT mixed rotary EDMed surfaces and (c, d) EDM surfaces.
micro cracks appears on the MWCNT mixed rotary EDM (Fig. 10b) while EDM machined surface shows bigger micro crack along with micro holes which are clearly visible in Fig. 10d. MWCNT mixed rotary EDM shows superior surface topographical properties because of MWCNT powder mixed in the dielectric medium. Adding MWCNT powder not only increases the number of spark in the machining zone but also reduces the energy associated with each spark. Therefore less amount of thermal energy is transferred in the machining area. Further, the high thermal conductivity of MWCNT particles mixed in EDM dielectric enhances the heat transfer capability of plasma channel developed and therefore reducing the heat flow rate towards the workpiece. Therefore reducing the thermal stresses and solidifying shrinkages. Further, increased spark gap and rotary action of tool electrode which provide better flushing condition and ultimately providing a major reason for better surface quality than conventional EDM.

4 Conclusions

Performance enhancement of EN-31 die steel using MWCNT mixed rotary EDM results in the following conclusion:

(i) MWCNT mixed rotary EDM shows maximum value of MRR (9.72 mm³/min) at I_p = 7A, T_on = 168 µs, T_off = 66 µs and P_C = 2.24 g/l, which is very close to the predicted value of MRR (9.50 mm³/min). Further, RPMEDM shows approximately 46.17 %, 18.90 % and 6.58 % higher than EDM, REDM and PMEDM respectively.

(ii) MWCNT mixed rotary EDM shows lowest value of SR (2.03 µm) at I_p = 3A, T_on = 100 µs, T_off = 65 µs and P_C = 1.8 g/l, which very close to predicted SR value (1.96 µm). Further, PMREDM shows approximately 45.43 %, 17.48 % and 8.15 % lower SR than conventional EDM, REDM and PMEDM respectively.

(iii) With the help of MOO result shown in Pareto Table 5, input parameter can be selected against required optimum value of MRR and SR.

(iv) FESEM analysis of MWCNT mixed rotary EDM shows superior surface topography as compared to conventional EDM.
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