

# Analyze and Optimize the Welding Parameters of the Process by Pulsed Tubular Wire (FCAW - Flux Cored Arc Welding) Based on the Geometry of the Weld Beads Resulting from each Test

João Roberto Sartori Moreno<sup>1,\*</sup>, Jéssika Batista Guimarães<sup>1</sup>, Elisângela Aparecida da Silva Lizzi<sup>1</sup> and Celso Alves Correa<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department Materials and Mechanical Engineering, Federal Technological University of Paraná, Cornélio Procopio, Brazil

**Abstract:** This study aimed to analyze and optimize deposition welding parameters using a pulsed tubular wire process (FCAW - Flux Cored Arc Welding), where the influence variables adopted were the average current, the pulsation frequency, the welding speed and the contact-tip-workpiece distance, with each variable being tested at three different levels. The geometric characteristics evaluated, that is, the response variables, are width, reinforcement, penetration, reinforcement area, penetration area and dilution. The geometric characteristics evaluated, that is, the response variables, are the width, the reinforcement, the penetration, the reinforcement area, the penetration area, the contact-tip-workpiece distance and the dilution. In order to achieve the proposed objective, statistical techniques were used as analysis tools, and, in the first phase, the robust design method (Taguchi) was used to establish which combinations of parameters would be performed in each test, providing us with an L9 matrix. In a second phase, analysis of variance tables (ANOVA) were constructed to select the most significant parameters.

**Keywords:** Robust design method, Regression models, Set of responses, Penetration area, Contact-tip-workpiece distance.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Currently, coatings of materials with high quality and properties of hardness and resistance to wear, as is the case of martensitic steel, have been widely accepted both in the original manufacturing process of components subject to intense demands in relation to these properties, as in the process of recovery sudden or scheduled maintenance of these components damaged.

For example, in the case of hydraulic turbines, cavitation erosion is a constant and harmful phenomenon, being responsible for large losses and damages in the electricity sector. However, the replacement of an already installed hydraulic unit would be unfeasible from a technical and economic point of view, with the costs of repairs being significant, and the biggest consequence is the stop of the hydraulic unit for several days, to recover the surfaces eroded by cavitation [1].

In coating welding the main objective is to obtain a bead with the lowest possible dilution, obtaining in the bead morphology a small penetration, the largest width and possible reinforcement, for a better process yield.

Thus, in the welding segment, the FCAW (Flux Cored Arc Welding) process has been increasingly used. This process is evidenced in the industrial environment because it has a large production capacity, mainly ensured by the high current density, which guarantees a high melting rate, high work factor and automation of the process [2].

The geometry of the weld bead obtained by coating welding process is a major factor that distinguishes this method from other conventional ones. With the profile obtained, it is possible to cover large areas with fewer passes, thus contributing to saving material and time. Therefore, it is noted that one of the biggest challenges of this method is to adjust the process parameters so that the deposited material can acquire the desired geometry [3].

The used to regression models, analysis of variance and other statistics methods of their data, based on an experimental design by Taguchi method, making it possible to identify which parameters would significantly influence their responses [4, 5].

Another common approach is based on response surface models (RSM - Response Surface Methodology), which is a tool that allows to evaluate how the responses are affected when the input variables are adjusted outside the region of interest, to know which input variables when combined they affect the response and also know which values of these

\*Address correspondence to this author at the Department Materials and Mechanical Engineering, Federal Technological University of Paraná, Cornélio Procopio, Brazil;  
E-mail: joaosartori@utfpr.edu.br

variables will have the desired response (maximized or minimized) and which the response surface is closer to this optimum [6, 7].

Since in the welding with tubular wire (FCAW-Flux Cored Arc Welding) with pulsed current, coalescence between metals occurs through an electric arc established between the part to be welded and a continuously fed electrode, variables already well known as width, reinforcement, penetration, reinforcement area, penetration area, contact-tip-workpiece distance (CTWD) and dilution, are specific data fundamental to the efficiency and quality of hardfacing [8].

However, jointly controlling all these parameters, technically depends on the skill of the welder, the machine, but factorial experiments, regression models and statistical hypothesis testing, where a fraction of the total number of combinations of the input variables is performed, can identify and justify the efficiency reasons of the response variables by Oliveira [9], *et al.*, 2015.

## 2. EXPERIMENTAL METHODS

The samples used for the survey of the technical results were of a substrate in steel SAE 1020 and deposit of the coating in martensitic steel EC410NiMo, where the coatings were performed using the bench shown in Figure 1. The specimens used in the tests were SAE 1020 steel flat bars with 185.00 mm in length, 63.50 mm in width and 12.70 mm in thickness.

During the preparation and testing of deposits beads they were strictly followed important procedures for the best deposition possible with prior preheating of the sheet waiting at 200°C and subsequently decrease for 150°C temperature to eventually apply the following passes.

It is important to highlight that in Figure 1 we have: 1: Welding source; 2: wire feeder; 3: Torch cooling system; 4: Data acquisition system; 5: Torch; 6: Torch displacement system; 7: Protective gases.


It was defined that for this work a coating welding was carried out, deposition in a single weld cord, following the parameters described in Table 1.

**Table 1: Parameters and Levels Maintained Constant during the Welding**

Parameters	Level
Electrode polarity	CCEP
Shielding gas	Argon + 2% Oxigen
Gas flow	15 L/min.
Torch angle	90°
Welding position	Plana
Interpass temperature	150°C
Wire feed speed	8,5 m/min.
Numbers of cords	01
Peak Current (Ip)	350 A
Peak Time (tp)	10 ms



**Figure 1:** Welding workbench identifying the main equipment used to carry out the experiments.



**Figure 2:** Representation of the sectioning performed on all weld beads and geometry of the coating weld bead section.

The transfer of metal during the welding process when using the pulsed electric arc was achieved by combining the efficiency of the work source with two current levels, where at the high level of current intensity, there is a high current applied in a given time interval, when the drop is detached; and at the lowest level of current with a certain time, there is the formation of the drop, so that it is highlighted at the upper level of current [10].

The specimen for measures of responses such as width, penetration, area of penetration, reinforcement and reinforcement area were extracted from the beads and properly prepared macro graphically as shown in Figure 2, which also indicates the respective delimitations of these measures.

**2.1. Experimental Planning**

In planning the experiments, care was taken that the input variables were purposely modified at different levels so that it is possible to analyze what happens in the response variables. The importance of carrying out a design of the experiments is mainly to obtain satisfactory results and at the same time savings [11].

For this work, we adopted a common matrix model, where it presents 4 variables and 3 levels, as shown in

Table 2, that from then on, the test tests were performed.

Therefore, when stipulating 4 variables and 3 levels, being average current (170; 200 and 230 A), pulsation frequency (18.18; 20.00 and 22.22 Hz), welding speed (300; 350 and 400 mm/min.) and contact-tip-workpiece distance (30; 35 and 40 mm), we will have a matrix with the best combination of these parameters in order to maximize the process, in this case an L9 matrix (3<sup>4</sup>).

In addition, the method provides other main tools: the P diagram; the ideal function; the quadratic loss function; the signal to noise ratio; and orthogonal vectors, also adopted in the analysis of the results.

Table 3 shows the parameter combinations provided by the program and applied during the tests.

It is necessary to use randomization to perform the tests, thus minimizing errors in the functioning of any instrument, measurement errors, error in the instrumentation system and equipment accuracy. Therefore, the tests carried out for pulsed current followed the following sequence: 2, 5, 4, 8, 7, 3, 9, 6, 1. Thus, each test was performed with two repetitions to obtain a satisfactory number of results, and thus enable statistical analysis in L18 matrix.

**Table 2: Influence Variables and their Levels**

Variables/Levels	-1	0	1
Average Welding Current (A)	170	200	230
Pulsation Frequency (Hz)	18.88	20.00	22.22
Welding Speed (mm/min)	300	350	400
Contact-Tip-Workpiece Distance(mm)	30	35	40

**Table 3: Values of Tests with Pulsed Current**

Experiment	Average Current (A)	Pulsation Frequency (Hz)	Welding speed (mm/min)	Contact-tip-workpiece distance (mm)
1	170	18.18	300	30
2	200	20.00	300	35
3	230	22.22	300	40
4	230	20.00	350	30
5	170	22.22	350	35
6	200	18.18	350	40
7	200	22.22	400	30
8	230	18.18	400	35
9	170	20.00	400	40

So, after obtained of the collected data was performed statistical analysis using regressions linear multiple models, with first order regression equations, so results exhibition in tables of ANOVA and graphs of effects that interfere in the response variables. In this evaluation and validation of models, when opting for first-order linear regression model methods, it is necessary to check the assumptions about the residuals of the adjusted model ( $\epsilon_i$ ), to verify their adequacy or lead to a review of the proposed models.

Thus, the assumptions of the residues imply homoscedasticity, absence of autocorrelation and that the residues follow a normal probability distribution with zero mean and constant variance. All assumptions were checked using graphs (QQ plot, graph of dispersion of the residuals versus predicted and graph of autocorrelation of the residuals) and hypothesis tests.

In all statistical analyzes, a fixed significance level of 5% and computational support from the MINITAB software were used.

## 2.2. Statistical Analysis

Every procedure for statistical analysis of the collected data was performed with the support of the MINITAB software. First order regression equations were generated, with tables by the ANOVA software, with graphs of effects and how the influence variables influenced the response variables.

In this work we opted for the graphical analysis of residues, where a normal probability graph was generated, commonly called Normal Q-Q Plot, that is, one that verifies the assumption that the residues are

normally distributed. On the other hand, the other diagnostic graphs are presented:

- Graph of the residuals versus the predicted values: verifies the homoscedasticity of the model, that is, constant  $\sigma^2$ ;
- Graph of the residues versus the order of observation or order of data collection: assesses the hypothesis of data independence, that is, if there is no self-correlation between the residues.

## 2.3. Hypothesis Testing

A statistical hypothesis [12] is an affirmation where the decision-making procedure is called a hypothesis test that must follow the steps:

1. Parameters of interest: from the context of the problem, identify the parameter of interest;
2. Null hypothesis,  $H_0$ : establish the null hypothesis;
3. Alternative hypothesis,  $H_1$ : specify an appropriate alternative hypothesis,  $H_1$ ;
4. Test statistic: determine an appropriate test statistic;
5. Decision rule under  $H_0$  if: criteria for rejection or non-rejection of the null hypothesis ( $H_0$ );
6. Calculations: calculate any required sample quantities, substitute them in the equation for the test statistic and calculate this value.
7. Conclusions: decide whether or not  $H_0$  should be rejected and report this in the context of the problem.

### 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

The response variables, that is, the results we sought at the end of the tests, for this study were width, reinforcement, penetration, reinforcement area, penetration area and dilution. The values determined for width, reinforcement, penetration, reinforcement area and penetration area measured using the AUTOCAD software.

As we can see in Table 2 shows a complete survey of data measured at and which will be statistically tabulated. Figure 3 shows the profiles of the geometry of the beads obtained in the experiments.

However in the Table 4 presents the results obtained in each experiment for the cord morphology with pulsed current and its respective repetition, where we observed that for lower currents, in this case for 170 A, the reinforcement was very high and, consequently, a small width, when compared to larger currents, such as 200 and 230 A.

Therefore, according to the variables and levels adopted in this work, to meet the conditions of a coating weld, that is, to decrease passes for the coating of the area of interest, the best results are achieved in practice with the use of higher current values, such as 200 and 230 A.

A first highlight is the increase in the width of the cord as the average current and the contact-tip-workpiece distance increase. We obtained a minimum width of 7.920 mm for the current of 170 A, and a maximum of 11.510 mm for the current of 230 A.

This result is in accordance with the bibliography [13, 14] in the area, because the higher the concentration of heat at the tip of the electrode, the greater the heating, causing a greater amount of material to be deposited in the melt pool.

In the reinforcement, we note a maximum value of 4.750 mm with a current of 170 A, and a minimum value of 3.140 mm for conditions worked with a current of 230 A.

On the other hand, we noticed an inverse behavior in width, after all, as the current increases, the reinforcement decreases, considering that there is a reduction in the reinforcement as the welding speed and contact-tip-workpiece distance increase.

As for the reinforcement area, we found higher values with the reduction of the welding speed, where in the surveys we obtained a maximum reinforcement area of 33.140 mm<sup>2</sup> with a welding speed of 300 mm/min and a minimum value of 20.540 mm<sup>2</sup> with a welding speed 400 mm/min.










Current (A)	Welding Speed (mm/min.)		
	300	350	400
170	 Freq.: 18,18Hz CTWD: 30mm	 Freq.: 22,22Hz CTWD: 33mm	 Freq.: 20,00Hz CTWD: 36mm
200	 Freq.: 20,00Hz CTWD: 33mm	 Freq.: 18,18Hz CTWD: 36mm	 Freq.: 22,22Hz CTWD: 30mm
230	 Freq.: 22,22Hz CTWD: 36mm	 Freq.: 20,00Hz CTWD: 30mm	 Freq.: 18,18Hz CTWD: 33mm

Figure 3: Geometry of the weld beads obtained in the welding tests.

Table 4: Results of Weld Bead Morphology with Pulsed Current

Tests	Welding Parameters				Results					
	AC	PF	WS	CTWD	W	R	P	PA	RA	D
1	170	18.18	300	30	9.240	4.750	1.970	8.220	33.140	19.874
2	170	18.18	300	30	8.140	4.350	2.050	8.770	27.960	23.877
3	200	20.00	300	33	10.690	4.110	2.340	12.480	32.600	27.684
4	200	20.00	300	33	11.040	4.090	2.690	13.970	29.870	31.866
5	230	22.22	300	36	11.460	3.420	2.230	12.190	30.330	28.669
6	230	22.22	300	36	11.510	3.590	2.150	11.370	30.950	26.867
7	230	20.00	350	30	10.060	3.560	2.540	11.420	26.920	29.786
8	230	20.00	350	30	10.130	3.610	2.550	11.560	26.600	30.294
9	170	22.22	350	33	8.130	4.110	1.880	8.500	23.990	26.162
10	170	22.22	350	33	7.920	4.200	1.860	7.750	25.180	23.535
11	200	18.18	350	36	10.480	3.710	2.820	13.930	28.230	33.041
12	200	18.18	350	36	9.860	3.650	2.500	11.500	26.060	30.618
13	200	22.22	400	30	9.810	3.320	2.070	9.750	23.170	29.617
14	200	22.22	400	30	9.630	3.270	2.480	11.950	22.010	35.188
15	230	18.18	400	33	9.750	3.520	2.080	10.660	23.290	31.399
16	230	18.18	400	33	10.040	3.140	2.130	10.720	22.230	32.534
17	170	20.00	400	36	8.980	3.400	1.980	9.750	20.540	32.189
18	170	20.00	400	36	9.120	3.250	1.590	8.050	20.880	27.826

\*AC: Average Current (A); PF: Pulsation Frequency (Hz); WS: Welding Speed (mm/min); CTWD: contact-tip-workpiece distance (mm); W: Width (mm); R: Reinforcement (mm); P: Penetration (mm); PA: Penetration Area (mm<sup>2</sup>); RA: Reinforcement Area (mm<sup>2</sup>); D: Dilution (%).

In penetration, we find a minimum value of 1.590 mm at a current of 170 A and a maximum value of 2.820 mm at a current of 200 A. There is an increase in penetration as the current increases. The same is true for the penetration area, where it obtained a minimum value of 7.750 mm<sup>2</sup> in the current of 170 A, and a maximum of 13.970 mm<sup>2</sup> in the current of 200 A.

### 3.1. Results of Signals Obtained

Since the tests were performed with pulsed current, the signals of current and voltage were collected simultaneously for each experiment performed. Figure 4 shows the signal obtained from one of the tests with the results of current and voltage RMS (Root Mean Square) for an interval of 10 seconds, the period




Figure 4: Simultaneous current and voltage signal obtained in one of the tests.



being between 20 and 30 seconds. RMS current and voltage, means that we are referring to the effective current and voltage, that is, when an equipment is turned on, not all the stipulated current and voltage are absorbed, therefore, we call it effective current and voltage, the one that is actually absorbed.

Figure 4 we verify the pulses that happen both in the current and in the voltage simultaneously. However, we observed that for a time interval of 10 seconds, these signals end up not being clearly visualized. Therefore, for a better understanding of the results, the signals were sectioned at an interval of 0.5 seconds, in the period between 12 and 12.5 seconds, which is represented in Figure 5 for a test where an average current of 230 A was used, pulse frequency of 20.00 Hz, welding speed of 350 mm/min. and nozzle contact distance of 30 mm.

### 3.2. Results of the Regression Models

A regression model was generated for each response variable to analyze the results, as well as,

generated an interaction graph to understand the maximization of the influence variables in relation to the welding process. From the multiple linear regression models, we obtained ANOVA [15] tables that allowed, from the "p" value, to verify which input variables (average current, pulsation frequency, welding speed and contact-tip-workpiece distance) influence significantly in the process variables directly (width, reinforcement, penetration, reinforcement area, penetration and dilution area).

This decision-making in relation to the "p" value was based on the hypothesis test concepts, that is, it can be considered that the input variable has a statistically significant influence on the response variable, when the "p" value has lower values at the level of significance (0.05 or 5%), rejecting  $H_0$ .

In Table 5 we have the "p" values obtained, highlighting those in which there was rejection of  $H_0$ , as regression equations were generated for each response variable, as highlighted below.




Figure 5: Current and voltage signals for a test with an average current of 230 A.

Table 5: Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) Obtained through Regression Analysis for Response Variables ("p" value)

Factor	W	R	P	PA	RA	D
$x_1$ : Average Current (A)	0.000	0.000	0.040	0.009	0.103	0.023
$x_2$ : Pulsation Frequency (Hz)	0.706	0.094	0.391	0.647	0.308	0.854
$x_3$ : Welding Speed (mm/min)	0.043	0.000	0.306	0.288	0.000	0.011
$x_4$ : CTWD (mm)	0.058	0.014	0.712	0.371	0.578	0.315

For the statistical generation of each response variable, the following equations for mathematical modeling were carefully formulated.

Width (mm):  $1.49 + 0.03172 x_1 + 0.0335 x_2 - 0.00792 x_3 + 0.1222 x_4$ ;

Reinforcement (mm):  $10.748 - 0.00894 x_1 - 0.0484 x_2 - 0.00735 x_3 - 0.0511 x_4$ ;

Penetration (mm):  $2.67 + 0.00653 x_1 - 0.0378 x_2 - 0.00183 x_3 - 0.0108 x_4$ ;

Area of penetration (mm<sup>2</sup>):  $2.34 + 0.0469 x_1 - 0.107 x_2 - 0.01020 x_3 + 0.142 x_4$ ;

Reinforcement area (mm<sup>2</sup>):  $59.20 + 0.0240 x_1 - 0.215 x_2 - 0.08788 x_3 - 0.078 x_4$ ;

Dilution (%):  $-11.1 + 0.0725 x_1 - 0.078 x_2 + 0.0499 x_3 + 0.294 x_4$

We note very precisely that the effects graphs generated for each response, where its interpretation is simplified, but is associated with the values found in the ANOVA tables, and that mathematically the regression equations and extracted observations came from Table 2. A first aspect to be verified is that every time that in the effects graph we see a great variation between the lines, this means that that input variable is having a significant influence on the studied response variable in question, since we also observed that the data of "p" values were obtained for this same input variable.

In the analysis of the effect of the variables, we noticed that there was great variation in the lines, and that there is also a significant "p" value, that is, lower than the level of significance (0.05) rejecting H<sub>0</sub>. Therefore, when the lines have a small variation, there is also a "p" value higher than the level of significance,




Figure 6: Effect of welding variables/parameters on (a) Width and (b) Reinforcement.



thus concluding that that particular input variable is not having a significant influence on the response [16].

A second aspect for the interpretation of these graphic effects, is the association with the regression equations, because when the regression coefficient that multiplies the input variable has a positive sign, we interpret that this response variable is being positively affected by the input variable, that is, as the levels of the input variable increase, we will have one increase in the results of the response variable, thus maximizing the values at the highest level which is the same when the regression coefficient obtains a negative sign. Therefore, we will have that the response variable is being negatively affected by the input variable, that is, as the levels of the input variable increase, there will be a reduction in the results of the response variable, thus, maximizing the response at the lowest level adopted.

All of these analyzes are recorded in Figures 6(a), (b); Figures 7(a), (b) and Figures 8(a), (b) for all important variables in the work.

Figure 6(a) shows that the data average was 9.78 mm (dotted line), where the behavior of the weld cords showed an increase in width with an increase in the average current and the distance between the contact-tip-workpiece-distance. However, with the increase in speed, the opposite happens, that is, the width decreases, because the electric arc remains a shorter time during welding in the melting pool.

The pulsation frequency, on the other hand, obtained a small difference in its lines, since  $H_0$  was not rejected for this variable ( $P = 0.706$ ). The variables that most affected the width were the average current ( $P = 0.000$ ), the welding speed ( $P = 0.043$ ) and to a




Figure 7: Effect of welding variables/parameters on (a) Penetration and (b) Penetration Area.

lesser extent, but very close to the contact-tip-workpiece distance ( $P = 0.058$ ), as shown in Table 5.

In the reinforcement according to Figure 6(b) the average of the results was of 3.73 mm (dotted line), verifying a decrease of the reinforcement according to the increase of the levels of each parameter. The parameters with the greatest effect on the variables were the average current ( $P = 0.000$ ), the welding speed ( $P = 0.000$ ) and contact-tip-workpiece-distance ( $P = 0.014$ ). The pulsation frequency, on the other hand, did not reject  $H_0$ , obtaining a  $P = 0.094$ .

In the penetration shown in Figure 7(a), the average of the data was 2.22 mm (dotted line). In this response variable, we have a greater intensity of influence from the variation of the average current ( $P = 0.040$ ), as  $H_0$  was rejected.

However, for the area of penetration shown in Figure 7(b), the average of the results was 10.70 mm<sup>2</sup> (dotted line). As can be seen, the parameter with the greatest effect was the average current ( $P = 0.009$ ), as it was the straight line with the greatest difference in slope, as well as in penetration, rejecting  $H_0$ .

In the reinforcement area, Figure 8(a), we obtain an average of the data of 26.33 mm<sup>2</sup>. The parameter with the greatest intensity of effects was the welding speed ( $P = 0.000$ ), rejecting  $H_0$ , where there was a decrease in the reinforcement area with its increase, as well as in the reinforcement.

In the dilution, Figure 8(b), the average of the results was 28.95% (dotted line). By the graphic behavior, we verified the factors of greatest influence the average current ( $P = 0.023$ ) and the welding speed




Figure 8: Effect of welding variables/parameters on (a) reinforcement area and (b) dilution.

( $P = 0.011$ ). The contact-tip-workpiece distance obtained a P value equal to **0.315**, not rejecting  $H_0$ .

From the graphical analysis it appears that all the results obtained, from the collected data and the statistical analyzes, are summarized in the simple observation of these figures, where very similar results were obtained by other researchers by Kurtulmus [17], 2015. Emphasizing that, all analyzes to verify the assumptions imposed in the literature [18] for the residuals of the regression equations were also performed and satisfied, which indicates that this regression model is adequate to predict values and analyze the influence on responses [19].

Figure 9 represents the normal probability graphs of the residues for Width, Reinforcement, Penetration, Penetration Area, Reinforcement Area and Dilution.

In these graphs of Figure 9, their axes are constructed by contrasting the theoretical quantiles of a normal probability distribution with the observed quantiles of the residues obtained by the model. Which means that if the points approach a 45° straight line (perfect linear pattern), it makes it possible to infer that they approach a standard normal distribution.

Therefore, it appears that the registered residues approach the diagonal, without any significant deviation, that is, the normal empirical distribution is verified, as the points approach the line.

Still, to show confidence in the use of the equations to predict the results, analyzes were performed calculating the percentage of correctness of these mathematical models [20]. For this, a calculation of MAPE (Mean Absolute Percentage Error) was applied to the results measured and predicted by the model.

Figure 10 shows that this present study is above the cutoff point recommended in the scientific literature, since we obtain an average AAPE of around 6% in the generated models, that is, a good accuracy and extrapolation of the experimental results. Thus, we verified that from all these statistical analyzes of the welding tests carried out, by the statistical regression models [21], by analyzes of variance, by the MAPE calculations and other equations employed were satisfactory according to the parameters established for their validation, and allow be used with some confidence to predict the results of a welding process [22].





Figure 9: Normal Probability Graph of the residuals of the response variables.



**Figure 10:** Results plotted from the Percentage Absolute  $H_{it}$  and MAPE for each response variable.

#### 4. CONCLUSIONS

On determining and optimizing the best conditions using regression models for coating welding through the process of welding with pulsed current tubular wire, it is possible to conclude that the influence variables and their interactions were decisive for the control of the welding process, allowing to find responses with significant effects to improve performance;

Among the adopted methodology of a project of analysis of the experiments with use of robust design, specifically method TAGUCHI, it provided important and effective data, as well as the analysis of applied statistics that provided the statistical study of the answers, even with a small amount of experiments;

Based on the results of the regression models and visualized by the analysis of variance tables, it appears that among the stipulated parameters, the average current (A) affected almost all responses, with the exception of the reinforcement area. The welding speed (mm/min) just did not interfere with the penetration and the penetration area. The contact-tip-workpiece distance (mm) significantly influences the reinforcement and the pulsation frequency (Hz) did not affect any of the responses;

According to the tests carried out, the largest width (11.51 mm) was obtained at an average current of 230 A, welding speed of 300 mm/min, a pulse frequency of 22.22 Hz and a nozzle contact distance of 36 mm. The

statistical regression model produced was effective in studying the responses obtained, demonstrating reliability in the results found, and adequate for predicting and extrapolating the findings according to MAPE values. The effects graphs generated by the regression model were consistent with the results obtained in the tests, after all the influence variables affected positively or negatively according to each response variable, in the same way as observed in the experiments, which may lead to an effective use of these findings. in bench experiments in the welding area.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] Kumar D and Bhingole PP. "CFD Based Analysis of Combined Effect of Cavitation and Silt Erosion on Kaplan Turbine", *Materials Today: Proceedings*, 2015; 2(4-5): 2314-2322. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.matpr.2015.07.276>
- [2] Shi Y, Zheng Z, Huang J. "Sensitivity model for prediction of bead geometry in underwater wet flux cored arc welding", *Trans. Nonferrous Met. Soc. of China*, 2013; 23: 1977-1984. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1003-6326\(13\)62686-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1003-6326(13)62686-2)
- [3] Prabhu R, Alwarsamy T. "Study and investigations on process parameters for bead geometry during cladding by pulsed MIG welding process" 2014, *International Review of Mechanical Engineering*, 8(4): 722-729.
- [4] Ghazali FA, Manurung YHP, Mohamed Mohamed A, Alias SK, Abdullah S. "Effect of process parameters on the mechanical properties and failure behavior of spot welded low carbon steel", *Journal of Mechanical Engineering and Sciences (JMES)*, 2015; 8: 1489-1497. <https://doi.org/10.15282/jmes.8.2015.23.0145>
- [5] Prasad KS, Rao CS, Rao DN. "Study on factors effecting weld pool geometry of pulsed current micro plasma arc welded AISI 304L austenitic stainless steel sheets using

- statistical approach", *Journal of Minerals and Materials Characterization and Engineering*, 2012; 11(8): 790-799.  
<https://doi.org/10.4236/jmmce.2012.118068>
- [6] Achebo J, Salisu S. "Reduction of undercuts in fillet welded joints using Taguchi Optimization Method", *Journal of Minerals and Materials Characterization and Engineering*, 2015; 10:171-179.  
<https://doi.org/10.4236/jmmce.2015.33020>
- [7] Kumar CL, Vanaja T, Murti KGK, Prasad VSH. "Optimization of MIG welding process parameters for improving welding strength of steel", *International Journal of Engineering Trends and Technology (IJETT)*, 2017; 50(1): 25-33.  
<https://doi.org/10.14445/22315381/IJETT-V50P205>
- [8] Moreno JRS, Pinto HC and Ávila JA. "Characterization of welding parameters and microstructure in a coating made with a tubular electrode of SAE EC410NiMo on a SAE 1020 steel substrate by FCAW process", 2019, Conference: 21st International Conference Materials, Methods & Technologies, Burgas - Bulgaria.
- [9] Oliveira ALM, Costa JD, DE Sousa MB, Alves JJN, Campos ARN, Santana RAC, et al., "Studies on electrodeposition and characterization of the Ni-W-Fe alloys coatings", *J. Alloys Compd.*, 2015; 619: 697-703.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jallcom.2014.09.087>
- [10] Montgomery DC. "Design and analysis of experiments" 10th edition John Wiley ISBN: 978-1-119-49244-3; 2019.
- [11] Sivaraman K, Kulkarni DV, DE A. "Pulsed current gas metal arc welding of P91 steels using metal cored wires" *Journal of Materials Processing Technology*, 2016; 229: 826-833.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmatprotec.2015.11.007>
- [12] Streib FE and Dehmer M. "Understanding Statistical Hypothesis Testing: The Logic of Statistical Inference"; *Mach. Learn. Knowl. Extr.* 1: 945-961; 2019.  
<https://doi.org/10.3390/make1030054>
- [13] Moreno JRS, Pinto HC, Correa CA, Mastelari N, Marin LG, Silva E, Ávila JA. "Cladding welding of CA6M with pulsed FCAW and results analysis through the L9 TAGUCHI and ANOVA", *International Journal of Advanced Engineering Research and Science (IJAERS)*, 2018; 5(5): 150-157.  
<https://doi.org/10.22161/ijaers.5.5.20>
- [14] Kumar V. "Optimization of Weld Bead Width in Tungsten Inert Gas Welding of Austenitic Stainless Steel Alloy", *American Journal Mechanical Engineering*, 2014; 2(2): 50-53.  
<https://doi.org/10.12691/ajme-2-2-4>
- [15] Qasim A, Nisar S, Shah A, Khalid MS and Sheikh MA. "Optimization of process parameters for machining of AISI-1045 steel using Taguchi design and ANOVA" *Simulation Modelling Practice and Theory*, 2015; 59: 36-51.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.simpat.2015.08.004>
- [16] Abbas AT, Hamza K, Aly MF and Al-Bahkali EA. "Multiobjective optimization of turning cutting parameters for J-steel material," *Advances in Materials Science and Engineering*, 2016, Article ID 6429160, 8 pages.  
<https://doi.org/10.1155/2016/6429160>
- [17] Kurtulmus M, Yukler AI, Bilici MK and Catalgol Z. "Effects of welding current and arc voltage on FCAW weld bead geometry", *International Journal of Research in Engineering and Technology*, 2015; 4(9): 23-28. available @ <http://www.ijret.org>  
<https://doi.org/10.15623/ijret.2015.0409004>
- [18] Sindhu D and Ruban M. "The Study on Effect of Process Parameters on Weld Deposits in Pulsed Gas Metal Arc Welding", *International Journal of Innovative Research in Science, Engineering and Technology -IJIRSET*, 2016; 5(4): 6247-6256
- [19] Joseph GB, Chaitanya PS, Kumar RV, Mageshwaran G and Jeevahan J. "Effect of Cladding Process Parameters for Mild Steel Surface Treatment" *International Journal of Vehicle Structures & Systems*, 2019; 11(4): 372-375.  
<https://doi.org/10.4273/ijvss.11.4.06>
- [20] Paiva EJ, Rodrigues LO, Costa SC, Paiva AP, Balestrassi PP. "FCAW Welding Process Optimization Using the Multivariate Mean Square Error" *Soldagem & Inspeção*, 2010; 15(1): 031-040.  
<https://doi.org/10.1590/S0104-92242010000100005>
- [21] Sreeraj P, Kannan T, Subhasis M. "Prediction and optimization of stainless steel cladding deposited by GMAW process using response surface methodology, ANN and PSO", *International Journal of Engineering and Science*, 2013; 3(5): 30-41;  
<http://www.researchinventy.com/papers/v3i5/D03503041.pdf>
- [22] Velazquez K, Estrada G and Gonzalez A. "Statistical Analysis for Quality Welding Process: An Aerospace Industry Case Study" *Journal of Applied Sciences*, 2014; 14: 2285-2291.  
<https://doi.org/10.3923/jas.2014.2285.2291>

Received on 26-02-2022

Accepted on 20-05-2022

Published on 19-07-2022

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31875/2410-4701.2022.09.02>© 2022 Moreno *et al.*; Zeal Press.

This is an open access article licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>) which permits unrestricted use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the work is properly cited.