



AUSTRALIA
University of Southern Queensland
Faculty of Health, Engineering and Sciences

**Wear and Frictional Performance of Metals under
Dry/Waste Cooking Oil Lubricant Conditions**

For the award of

Doctor of Philosophy

A dissertation submitted by

Jasem Alotaibi
Master in Engineering

2014

Abstract

The development of recycled, renewable and sustainable products to replace fossil products is a vital concern from industrial, environmental and academic viewpoints. Lubricants are one of the synthetic products widely used in numerous fields of the manufacturing and industrial sectors. Furthermore in 2005, more than 38 million metric tons of oils were used in the lubrication techniques of various industrial applications in the United States (US). In other words, the need for alternative friendly lubricants needs to increase by about 36 billion gallons to meet expected demands in 2022. This need motivates the current investigation of the potential use of waste cooking oil as a lubricant for tribological applications. A review of the available literature reviewed no work related to this topic. However, many works have been conducted on vegetable oils and their potential as lubricant. The current study establishes the basis for the research in the area of waste cooking oil as a lubricant; focusing on the oil and its blend characteristics and applications in journal bearings.

At the first stage of this study, comprehensive experiments were conducted on the wear and the frictional behaviour of brass, aluminium and mild steel metals sliding against a stainless steel counterface under dry contact condition for comparison purposes with the lubricant results. Furthermore, predicting the tribological performance of materials is a very complex task and many attempts to model the wear and frictional behaviour of materials have failed. In this study, the artificial neural networks approach is used as a tool to predict wear, roughness, interface temperature and the frictional behaviour of metals under different operating parameters.

For the wear experiments under dry contact conditions, the wear and frictional performance of brass, aluminium and mild steel metals was investigated at different operating parameters: sliding distances (0 – 10.8 km) and applied loads (0 – 50 N) against a stainless steel counterface at a sliding velocity of 2.8 m/s. Experiments were performed using a block-on-ring (BOR) machine. To categorise the wear mechanism and damage features on the worn surfaces and the collected debris, scanning electron microscopy was used. A thermal imager was used to measure the interface temperature between the contacted bodies.

The results of the dry tests revealed that the operating parameters significantly influence the wear and frictional behaviour of all the metals. Brass metal exhibited better wear and frictional behaviour compared to the other metals tested. This is mainly due to the presence of 4% of Pb which helped reduce the aggressiveness of the material removal. Three different wear mechanisms were observed: two-body abrasion (brass), three-body abrasion (mild steel) and adhesive (aluminium). Friction coefficient trends were almost steady for brass and mild steel, however, aluminium/stainless steel exhibited slight fluctuations due to the modifications of the worn surface due to the sliding.

A biolubricant extracted from waste cooking oil (WCO) was developed in this study. Different blends of lubricant were prepared: fully synthetic 100%SO, 75%SO+25%WCO, 50%SO+50%WCO 25%SO+75%WCO and 100%WCO. The prepared waste cooking oil was blended with 5% (wt) of EVA copolymer and 2%

(wt) of EC and synthetic oils. Viscosity, pour point and flash points of the blends were examined and compared with industrial lubricants, (10W-50, 15W-40, 5W-40, and 5W-30).

The possibility of using WCO with its blend as a lubricant was tested using two techniques. First, a new tribology machine was designed and fabricated locally to study the wear and frictional performance of brass, aluminium and mild steel under lubricant conditions considering different sliding distances (up to 10.8 km), applied loads (10 N – 40 N) and sliding speed of 2.8 m/s at different lubricant temperatures (22°C, 40°C, 80°C). For consistent comparison purposes with the dry data, 113 kPa applied pressure was used as the dry contact condition was conducted mainly on 50N applied load which is equivalent to 113 kPa.

This study found promising potential for the use of WCO as a lubricant from a viscosity viewpoint. The viscosity of the waste cooking oil was significantly enhanced with the addition of 5% (wt) of EVA copolymer and 2% (wt) of EC. Blending the waste cooking oil with the fully synthetic oil also showed good improvement in performance. Based on the viscosity data, it is found that the pure waste cooking oil is very comparable with W5-30 oil which is recommended for gasoline and diesel engines. Increasing the applied load reduced the specific wear rate due to the presence of the lubricant which assisted to absorb the heat in the interface and clear (polish) the rubbed surfaces. The lubricant temperature was the key in determining the wear behaviour of the materials. Increasing the temperature reduced the viscosity, leading to less lifting during the experiments (i.e. a high specific wear rate). Conversely, the lubricant temperature showed no remarkable influence on the frictional behaviour. This is mainly due to the chemical adsorption of the fatty acids on the worn surfaces which acted as coated layer. From the journal bearing testing results, the waste cooking oil and its blends exhibited a similar trend in oil pressure values to the ones obtained for the fully synthetic oil, thus demonstrating the potential of waste cooking oil and its blends for journal bearing applications.

The complexity of predicting the wear and frictional performance of the materials motivates the tribologist to adopt an artificial neural network (ANN) approach, as it can be used to make such predictions with caution. In developing an ANN for this study, training function, performance and adopting functions were found to be the keys to predicting wear, roughness and interface temperature. The large input data of the friction coefficient (12009 x 3 x 3) made the prediction of friction coefficient difficult and led to poor ANN performance. Using individual inputs for each parameter and training the ANN in several steps improved the performance. About 95.5% prediction performance was recorded, particularly for the wear, roughness and interface temperature.

List of Publications

- Alotaibi, J, Yousif, B & Yusaf, T 2014, 'Wear behaviour and mechanism of different metals sliding against stainless steel counterface', *Proceedings of the Institution of Mechanical Engineers, Part J: Journal of Engineering Tribology*, p. 1350650114527072.
- Alotaibi, J, Yousif, B & Yusaf, T (in press), 'Brass, aluminium, and mild steel sliding against stainless steel under dry conditions', *International Journal of Precision Technology, Inderscience*.
- Alotaibi, J, Yousif, B & Yusaf, T (under review), 'Review on biolubricants and the potential of waste cooking oil', *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Review*.
- Alotaibi, J, Yousif, B & Yusaf, T (forthcoming), 'The potential of using waste cooking oil as lubricant', paper to be presented at Wear of Materials (WOM), Toronto, Canada, 12–16 April 2015.
- Alotaibi, J, Yousif, B & Yusaf, T (in progress), 'Designing a new lubrication tribology machine and the possibility of using waste cooking oil as lubricant, paper to be submitted to *Tribology Letter*.

Certification of Thesis

I certify that the ideas, designs and experimental work, results, analyses and conclusions set out in this thesis are entirely my own effort, except where otherwise indicated and acknowledged.

I further certify that the work is original and has not been previously submitted for assessment in any other course or institution, except where specifically stated.

Jasem Alotaibi
0061039057

Signature of Candidate

Date

Endorsement

Signature of Principal Supervisor

Signature of Associate
Supervisor

Date

Date

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my most sincere appreciation to my PhD project supervisors Dr B. F. Yousif and Dr. Talal Yusaf for their support, encouragement, valuable input and guidance at every stage of this thesis. I would also like to extend my gratitude towards the entire departmental and technical staff for their assistance and support in using the facilities and materials for conducting the experimental work for this thesis.

In addition, I wish to express my deepest appreciation to my family members for their constant support throughout this study, especially my mother and my son Ghanim. I would also like to thank my friends for their encouragement.

For the English editing services, I would like to thank Elite editing company (academic English editing) and Ms. Sandra Cochrane from the library of University of Southern Queensland.

Finally, I wish to extend my sincere gratitude to the University of Southern Queensland for their financial support during this study.

Contents

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|
| Abstract | ii |
| List of Publications | iv |
| Certification of Thesis | v |
| Acknowledgements | vi |
| Contents | vii |
| List of Tables | xvi |
| List of Figures | x |
| List of Abbreviations | xvii |
| Chapter 1: Introduction | 1 |
| 1.1 Introduction | 1 |
| 1.2 Research Question..... | 2 |
| 1.3 Objectives of the Project | 2 |
| 1.4 Significance and Contributions | 2 |
| 1.5 Organisation of the Thesis | 3 |
| Chapter 2: Literature Review | 5 |
| 2.1 Introduction | 5 |
| 2.2 Lubricants and Biolubricants | 5 |
| 2.2.1 Biolubricants in the Recent Era..... | 6 |
| 2.2.2 Characteristics of Biolubricant Oils | 9 |
| 2.3.1 Edible and Inedible Oils..... | 11 |
| 2.3 Waste Cooking Oil..... | 12 |
| 2.4 Tribological Test Rig | 13 |
| 2.4.1 Operating Parameters Effects..... | 14 |
| 2.4.2 Effect of Lubricant Temperature on the Wear and Frictional Behaviour of Metals..... | 14 |
| 2.4.3 Influence of additives on characteristics of lubricants | 15 |
| 2.4.4 Dry Adhesive Wear Behaviour of Common Metals | 16 |
| 2.5 Artificial Neural Networks..... | 17 |
| 2.6 Summary of the Literature | 18 |
| Chapter 3: Methodology and Newly Designed Machine | 19 |
| 3.1 Introduction | 19 |
| 3.2 Preparation of Materials | 19 |
| 3.2.1 Waste Cooking Oil Preparations | 19 |
| 3.2.2 Metals Selection | 21 |
| 3.3 Hybrid Tribological Machine..... | 21 |
| 3.3.1 The Block-on-ring Concept..... | 21 |
| 3.3.2 Integration of Lubricant Temperature in the New Machine | 22 |
| 3.3.3 Verification of the New Hybrid Tribological Machine..... | 28 |
| 3.4 Experimental Procedure | 29 |
| 3.4.1 Dry Adhesive Wear Testing..... | 29 |
| 3.4.2 Adhesive Wear Testing Under Lubricant Condition | 31 |
| 3.5 Properties of Waste Cooking Oil | 33 |
| 3.5.1 Pour Point and Flash Points | 33 |
| 3.5.2 Viscosity of the Waste Cooking Oil and its Blends..... | 34 |
| Chapter 4: Wear Behaviour and Mechanism of Different Metals Sliding Against Stainless Steel Counterface | 41 |
| 4.1 Introduction | 41 |
| 4.2 Background | 41 |
| 4.3 Dry Wear Behaviour of Selected Metals | 42 |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|
| 4.3.1 Specific Wear Rate against Sliding Distance | 42 |
| 4.3.2 Dry Frictional Behaviour of Selected Metals..... | 46 |
| 4.3.3 Worn Surface Observation on Selected Metals Subjected to Dry Sliding | 49 |
| 4.4 Chapter Summary..... | 60 |
| Chapter 5: The Potential Use of Waste Cooking Oil as a Lubricant | 61 |
| 5.1 Introduction | 61 |
| 5.2 Influence of Waste Cooking Oil on the Tribological Performance of the Metals | 61 |
| 5.2.1 Wear Behaviour of Metals Under Waste Cooking Oil Lubricant Conditions | 61 |
| 5.2.2 Frictional Performance of Metals Wear under Waste Cooking Oil Lubricant Conditions..... | 65 |
| 5.2.3 Observations of Worn Surface Tested Under Waste Cooking Oil..... | 67 |
| 5.3 Wear and Frictional Behaviour of Metals Using Different Blends of Lubricant | 72 |
| 5.3.1 Wear Behaviour of Selected Metals using Different Blends of Lubricant | 72 |
| 5.3.2 Frictional Wear Behaviour | 77 |
| 5.3.3 Surface Observations..... | 80 |
| 5.4 Influence of the Lubricant Temperature on the Wear and Friction Behaviour of the Metals | 85 |
| 5.4.1 Wear Behaviour..... | 85 |
| 5.4.2 Frictional Behaviour..... | 87 |
| 5.4.3 Surface Observation | 89 |
| 5.5 Chapter Summary..... | 97 |
| Chapter 6: The Performance of Waste Cooking Oil in Journal Bearings..... | 99 |
| 6.1 Introduction | 99 |
| 6.2 Working Mechanism of Journal Bearings..... | 99 |
| 6.3 Lubricant Preparation and Experimental Procedure | 101 |
| 6.3.1 Lubricant Selection and Preparation for Journal Bearing Tests..... | 101 |
| 6.3.2 Journal Bearing Setup | 101 |
| 6.3.3 Experimental Procedure | 104 |
| 6.4 Results and Discussion..... | 105 |
| 6.4.1 Pressure Distribution | 106 |
| 6.4.2 Lubricant Temperature in Journal Bearing | 108 |
| 6.4.3 Friction Coefficient | 110 |
| 6.5 Chapter Summary..... | 111 |
| Chapter 7: Prediction of Dry Wear Performance Using Artificial Neural Networks | 112 |
| 7.1 Introduction | 112 |
| 7.2 Development of the ANN Model | 112 |
| 7.2.1 Selection of the Model | 112 |
| 7.2.2 Experimental Data and ANN Development Method | 114 |
| 7.2.3 Selection of the ANN Parameters | 115 |
| 7.2.4 Training the ANN Model | 116 |
| 7.2.5 Scope of Prediction | 119 |
| 7.3 Optimisation of the ANN Model..... | 119 |
| 7.3.1 ANN for Wear, Temperature And Roughness Prediction..... | 119 |
| 7.3.2 Optimum ANN Model for Friction Coefficient | 125 |

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|
| 7.4 Prediction of Specific Wear Rate | 132 |
| 7.5 Chapter Summary | 137 |
| Chapter 8: Conclusions and Recommendations | 138 |
| 8.1 Conclusions | 138 |
| 8.2 Recommendations | 140 |
| References | 141 |
| Appendix A: Detailed Drawings of the Components of the Hybrid Tribology Machine | 160 |
| Appendix B: Details of the ANN models | 174 |
| B.1 The Performance of Different Training Functions | 174 |
| B.2 Optimum Performance Function | 185 |

List of Figures

| | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Figure 1.1: Layout of the thesis..... | 4 |
| Figure 2.1: Data extracted from an international database (www.sciencedirect.com) showing the number of publications in the area of biolubricants. | 6 |
| Figure 3.1: Waste cooking oil extraction, preparation and blending | 20 |
| Figure 3.2: Block-on-ring technique | 22 |
| Figure 3.3: Three-dimensional view of the hybrid tribology machine | 23 |
| Figure 3.4: The custom-made load cell sensing frictional force | 24 |
| Figure 3.5: Leakage and sealing sections in the lubricant container..... | 25 |
| Figure 3.6: Assessment stage of the hybrid tribology machine before operation | 26 |
| Figure 3.7: Photos of the hybrid tribological machine integrated with the computer | 27 |
| Figure 3.8: Specific wear rate of the selected materials at 113.7 kPa applied stress using the new hybrid and laboratory machines at 2.8m/s sliding distance | 28 |
| Figure 3.9: Tribological machine with block-on-ring configuration (Yousif (2013a)) | 29 |
| Figure 3.10: Roughness profiles of sections on the polished samples before testing* <i>the scale of the figures are different since they are auto-generated by Mahr roughness machine.</i> | 30 |
| Figure 3.11: Extraction of the debris from the lubricant..... | 33 |
| Figure 3.12: Viscosity vs. temperature of different blends of waste cooking and synthetic oils..... | 35 |
| Figure 3.13: Viscosity of the blends at 40°C and 80°C..... | 36 |
| Figure 3.14: Waste cooking oil viscosity with industrial lubricant..... | 38 |
| Figure 3.15: Viscosity index of waste cooking oil and its blend with W 5-30 | 39 |
| Figure 4.1: Specific wear rate vs. sliding distance of brass, aluminium and mild steel materials under dry contact conditions..... | 43 |
| Figure 4.2: Specific wear rate vs. sliding distance of brass, aluminium and mild steel materials under dry contact conditions..... | 44 |
| Figure 4.3: Weight loss vs. sliding distance of brass, aluminium and mild steel materials under dry contact conditions..... | 45 |
| Figure 4.4: Summary of specific wear rate at steady state of brass, aluminium and mild steel materials under dry contact conditions at different applied loads after 10.8 km sliding distance | 45 |
| Figure 4.5: Friction coefficient vs. sliding distance of brass, aluminium and mild steel materials under dry contact conditions..... | 46 |
| Figure 4.6: Summary of friction coefficient at steady state of brass, aluminium and mild steel materials under dry contact conditions at different applied loads after 10.8 km sliding distance | 47 |
| Figure 4.7: Heat distribution in the rubbing area of the metals with the counterface after 2.5 km sliding distance under 30 N applied load * <i>The arrow points out the main measurement spot.</i> | 49 |
| Figure 4.8: Samples of the roughness profile of the specimens after the tests showing the maximum reading at different applied loads after 10.8 km sliding distance.. | 50 |
| Figure 4.9: Average worn surface roughness after the test at different applied loads after 10.8 km sliding distance | 51 |
| Figure 4.10: Micrographs of the steel surface after the sliding showing different wear mechanisms | 53 |
| Figure 4.11: Micrographs of the aluminium surface after the sliding showing adhesive, abrasive and ploughing wear mechanisms | 54 |

| | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Figure 4.12: Micrographs of the brass surface after the sliding showing purely adhesive associate with small area of abrasive wear mechanisms..... | 55 |
| Figure 4.13 Micrographs of the collected debris after stainless steel sliding against mild steel, aluminium and brass under the applied load of 50 N for 10.8 km sliding distance..... | 56 |
| Figure 4.14: Schematic drawing showing different wear mechanisms exhibited when stainless steel rubbed against a) brass, b) aluminium and c) mild steel..... | 57 |
| Figure 5.1: Specific wear rate of the metals against sliding distance under different applied loads using waste cooking oil as a lubricant at 22°C | 63 |
| Figure 5.2: Specific wear rate of the metals against applied load using waste cooking oil as a lubricant at 22°C after 10.8 km sliding distance..... | 64 |
| Figure 5.3: Friction coefficients of the metals against sliding distance using waste cooking oil as a lubricant at 22°C under the applied load of 30 N..... | 66 |
| Figure 5.4: Mean friction coefficients of the metals against applied load using waste cooking oil as a lubricant at 22°C | 66 |
| Figure 5.5: Counterface temperature against applied load using waste cooking oil as a lubricant at starting temperature of 22°C | 67 |
| Figure 5.6: Sample of the roughness of the worn surfaces under the condition of waste cooking oil as a lubricant at a temperature of 22°C | 68 |
| Figure 5.7: Ra of the worn surfaces at different applied loads under the condition of waste cooking oil as a lubricant at a temperature of 22°C at the applied load of 30N..... | 69 |
| Figure 5.8: Micrographs of a) brass surface before tests b-e) the worn surface of the brass after testing at different applied loads under the condition of waste cooking oil as a lubricant at a temperature of 22°C showing: abrasive wear mechanism marked as “A”; plastic deformation marked as “ <i>Pl</i> ” and polishing process marked as “ <i>P</i> ” | 70 |
| Figure 5.9: Micrographs of a) aluminium surface before tests and b-d) the worn surface of the aluminium after testing at different applied loads under the condition of waste cooking oil as a lubricant at a temperature of 22°C. 22°C showing: abrasive wear mechanism marked as “A” and polishing process marked as “ <i>P</i> ” | 71 |
| Figure 5.10: Micrographs of a) mild steel surface before tests, and b-d) the worn surface of the mild steel after testing under the applied load of 30 N under the condition of waste cooking oil as a lubricant at a temperature of 22°C showing: abrasive wear mechanism marked as “A”; plastic deformation marked as “ <i>Pl</i> ” and polishing process marked as “ <i>P</i> ”..... | 72 |
| Figure 5.11: Specific wear rate vs. sliding distance of different materials tested under 40 N applied load using different blends of lubricant..... | 74 |
| Figure 5.12: Specific wear rate of different materials tested under 40 N applied load using different blends of lubricant after 10.8 km sliding distance * <i>the left Y-Axis is the scale for the aluminium specific wear rate.</i> | 75 |
| Figure 5.13: Correlation between the specific wear rate and the lubricant viscosity for all the materials after 10.8 km sliding distance..... | 76 |
| Figure 5.14: Schematic drawing showing the differences in contact mechanisms.... | 77 |
| Figure 5.15 Friction coefficient vs. sliding distance of different materials tested at 40 N applied load using different blends of lubricant..... | 79 |
| Figure 5.16: Ra of the worn surfaces at different blends at 40 N applied load after 10.8 km..... | 80 |

| | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Figure 5.17: Micrographs of worn surface of aluminium after testing using different lubricants at 40 N applied load after 10.8 km sliding distance showing: abrasive wear mechanism marked as “A”; plastic deformation marked as “Pl” and polishing process marked as “P” | 82 |
| Figure 5.18: Micrographs of worn surface of brass after testing using different lubricants at 40 N applied load after 10.8 km sliding distance showing: abrasive wear mechanism marked as “A”; plastic deformation marked as “Pl” and polishing process marked as “P” | 83 |
| Figure 5.19: Micrographs of worn surface of mild steel after testing using different lubricants at 40 N applied load after 10.8 km sliding distance showing: abrasive wear mechanism marked as “A”; and polishing process marked as “P” | 84 |
| Figure 5.20: Specific wear rate of different materials after 10.8 km sliding distance using different lubricants under different environmental temperatures | 86 |
| Figure 5.21: Increment percentage in the specific wear rate of different materials after 10.8 km sliding distance using different lubricants under different environmental temperatures compared to the room temperature condition..... | 87 |
| Figure 5.22: Friction coefficient vs. sliding distance of different materials tested under 40 N applied load using lubricant (50% WCO + 50% SO) under different temperatures | 88 |
| Figure 5.23: Mean values of friction coefficients for all the materials tested under different lubricants and different environmental temperatures | 89 |
| Figure 5.24: Sample of the roughness of the worn surfaces under the condition of 50% waste cooking oil and 50% synthetic oil as a lubricant at elevated temperature of 40°C | 90 |
| Figure 5.25: Sample of the roughness of the worn surfaces under the condition of 50% waste cooking oil and 50% synthetic oil as a lubricant at elevated temperature of 80°C | 91 |
| Figure 5.26: Average roughness of the worn surface of the tested metals under different lubricants and environmental temperature. | 92 |
| Figure 5.27: Micrographs of brass using lubricant (50 % WCO + 50% S) under different environmental temperatures under the applied load of 40 N after 10.8 km sliding distance showing: abrasive wear mechanism marked as “A”; and adhesive wear marked as “Ad” | 93 |
| Figure 5.28: Micrographs of aluminium using lubricant (50 % WCO + 50% S) under different environmental temperatures under the applied load of 40 N after 10.8 km sliding distance showing: abrasive wear mechanism “marked as “A”; adhesive wear marked as “Ad”, and ploughing marked as “Pl” | 93 |
| Figure 5.29: Micrographs of mild steel using lubricant (50% WCO + 50% S) under different environmental temperatures under the applied load of 40 N after 10.8 km sliding distance showing: abrasive wear mechanism “marked as “A”; and pitting marked as “Pt” | 94 |
| Figure 5.30: Photo showing a sample of the oil when the mild steel was tested using lubricant (50 % WCO + 50% S) at 40 N after 10.8 km sliding distance with environmental temperature of 80°C | 95 |
| Figure 5.31: Micrographs of mild steel debris after testing using lubricant (50% WCO + 50% S) at 40 N after 10.8 km sliding distance with an environmental temperature of 80°C | 96 |

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Figure 5.32: Micrographs of aluminium debris after testing using lubricant (50 % WCO + 50% S) at 40 N after 10.8 km sliding distance with environmental temperature of 80°C | 97 |
| Figure 6.1: Pressure distribution in journal bearing..... | 100 |
| Figure 6.2: Journal bearing setup | 102 |
| Figure 6.3 Mechanism of the load applied to the journal bearing in the rig | 103 |
| Figure 6.4: Sommerfeld Number of the blends at the operating parameters of 600 rpm and 10 kN load..... | 105 |
| Figure 6.5: Pressure distribution around the journal bearing showing the position of the minimum film thickness * <i>all the values of the pressure are in MPa and the vertical arrow represents the load.</i> | 107 |
| Figure 6.6: Pressure distribution in journal bearing for different blends..... | 108 |
| Figure 6.7: Lubricant temperature (°C) distribution in journal bearing for different blends | 109 |
| Figure 6.8: Temperature vs. angle of the blends..... | 110 |
| Figure 6.9: Friction coefficient in journal bearings for different blends..... | 111 |
| Figure 7.1: ANN configuration for the prediction of A) friction coefficient, and B) specific wear rate (Ws), surface roughness, interface temperature..... | 113 |
| Figure 7.2: The method used in the current work for developing the ANN | 115 |
| Figure 7.3: Initial ANN Model developed considering two hidden layers of TRAINBFG training function | 116 |
| Figure 7.4: Training process for TrainBFG function | 117 |
| Figure 7.5: Train output for TrainBFG function..... | 118 |
| Figure 7.6: The performance of the ANN model training function to predict the specific wear rate, interface temperature and roughness for different sliding distances, materials and applied loads | 121 |
| Figure 7.7: The performance of the feed-forward back propagation network using TRAINRP as training function and a) LEARNGD or b) LEARNGDM as adaption learning function..... | 122 |
| Figure 7.8: The performance of the feed-forward back propagation network using TRAINRP as training function, LEARNGD as adaption learning function with different performance functions..... | 123 |
| Figure 7.9: The performance of the feed-forward back propagation network using TRAINRP as training function, LEARNGD as adaption learning function and MSEREG as performance function with different numbers of neurons | 124 |
| Figure 7.10: The performance of the optimum model to predict the specific wear rate, interface temperature and the roughness under different applied loads and sliding distances | 125 |
| Figure 7.11: Required training time for ANN to predict the friction coefficient..... | 126 |
| Figure 7.12: Regression of ANN results in predicting the friction coefficient with different numbers of data | 127 |
| Figure 7.13: Performance of the ANN to predict the friction coefficient using different training functions and numbers of data | 128 |
| Figure 7.14 Performance of the ANN to predict the friction coefficient using different applied loads..... | 129 |
| Figure 7.15: Performance of the ANN to predict the friction coefficient using BR training function for different performance functions and different numbers of input data..... | 129 |

| | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Figure 7.16: Performance of the ANN to predict the friction coefficient using BR training function and MSE performance function with different numbers of neurons and input data..... | 130 |
| Figure 7.17: Performance of the optimum ANN mode for the friction coefficient prediction..... | 131 |
| Figure 7.18: Real experimental data for friction coefficient of aluminium at 30 N applied load in comparing to the predicted data | 131 |
| Figure 7.19: Real experimental data and predicted data for brass materials at different operating parameters | 133 |
| Figure 7.20: Real experimental data and predicted data for aluminium materials at different operating parameters | 135 |
| Figure 7.21: Real experimental data and predicted data for mild steel materials at different operating parameters | 136 |
| Figure A.1: Overview of the hybrid tribology machine showing the main dimensions. | 160 |
| Figure A.2: Two-dimensional views of the lever for the hybrid tribology machine with the ISO. | 161 |
| Figure A.3: Two-dimensional views of the lever holder for the hybrid tribology machine with the ISO..... | 162 |
| Figure A.4: Two-dimensional views of the sample holder for the hybrid tribology machine with the ISO..... | 163 |
| Figure A.5: The main shaft connecting the counterface and the motor through the coupling..... | 164 |
| Figure A.6: Two-dimensional views of the counterface for the hybrid tribology machine with the ISO..... | 165 |
| Figure A.7: Two-dimensional views of the lubricant container for the hybrid tribology machine with the ISO. | 166 |
| Figure A.8: Two-dimensional views of the machine cover for the hybrid tribology machine with the ISO..... | 167 |
| Figure A.9: The seal cup for the hole in which the main shaft enters the lubricant container..... | 168 |
| Figure A.10: The balancing weight that is attached to the main lever of the machine. | 169 |
| Figure A.11: The main frame of the machine showing the base with the generated slots to attach the components..... | 170 |
| Figure A.12: The designed weights for the new machine..... | 171 |
| Figure A.13: The weight holder for the new machine. | 172 |
| Figure A.14: The pivot for the new machine. | 173 |
| Figure B.1: Performance of Trainbfg..... | 174 |
| Figure B.2: Performance of Trainbr..... | 175 |
| Figure B.3: Performance of Traincgb..... | 176 |
| Figure B.4: Performance of Traincgf..... | 177 |
| Figure B.5: Performance of Traincgp..... | 178 |
| Figure B.6: Performance of Traingd..... | 179 |
| Figure B.7: Performance of Traingda..... | 180 |
| Figure B.8: Performance of Traingdm..... | 181 |
| Figure B.9: Performance of Trainoss..... | 182 |
| Figure B.10: Performance of Trainrp..... | 183 |
| Figure B.12: Performance of MES..... | 185 |
| Figure B.13: Performance of MSEREG..... | 186 |

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Figure B.14: Performance of SSE..... | 187 |
| Figure B.15: Performance of ANN model with 2 Neurons in the hidden layer..... | 188 |
| Figure B.16: Performance of ANN model with 4 Neurons in the hidden layer..... | 189 |
| Figure B.17: Performance of ANN model with 6 Neurons in the hidden layer..... | 190 |
| Figure B.18: Performance of ANN model with 8 Neurons in the hidden layer..... | 191 |
| Figure B.19: Performance of ANN model with 10 Neurons in the hidden layer..... | 192 |
| Figure B.20: Performance of ANN model with 12 Neurons in the hidden layer..... | 193 |
| Figure B.21: Performance of ANN model with 14 Neurons in the hidden layer..... | 194 |
| Figure B.22: Performance of ANN model with 16 Neurons in the hidden layer..... | 195 |
| Figure B.23: Performance of ANN model with 18 Neurons in the hidden layer..... | 196 |
| Figure B.24: Performance of ANN model with 20 Neurons in the hidden layer..... | 197 |

List of Tables

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Table 2.1: Different Types of Vegetable Oil and their Applications | 7 |
| Table 2.2: Summary of Recent Studies on Vegetable Oils as Lubricants..... | 8 |
| Table 2.3: Main Physical Properties of Vegetable Oils (Quinchia et al. 2012). | 10 |
| Table 2.4: Recent Applications of Waste Cooking Oil..... | 13 |
| Table 3.1: Fatty Acid Composition of the Collected Waste Cooking Oil..... | 20 |
| Table 3.2: Properties of Mild Steel, Aluminium and Brass | 21 |
| Table 3.3: Operating Parameters for Adhesive Wear Testing under Lubricant Conditions | 32 |
| Table 3.4: Some of the fully synthetic oil specifications | 33 |
| Table 3.5: Pour Point and Flash Point of the Blends | 34 |
| Table 3.6: ISO Viscosity Grade Requirements ('Mixed-fiber diets and cholesterol metabolism in middle-aged men' 1991; Rudnick 2006; Rudnick 2010)..... | 37 |
| Table 3.7: Comparison to Previous Works and Standards..... | 40 |
| Table 4.1: Recent Works on the Dry Wear Performance of Aluminium, Mild Steel and Brass | 58 |
| Table 6.1: Details of the Journal Bearing Rig (Ahmad, Kasolang & Dwyer-Joyce 2013; Ahmad, Kasolang & Dwyer-Joyce 2014; Ahmed et al. 2013; Kasolang et al. 2012)..... | 104 |
| Table 7.1: Sample of the Input and Output Data for Brass at 50 N Applied Load and Different Sliding Distances | 114 |
| Table 7.2: Terms of the Training Function | 120 |

List of Abbreviations

| | |
|-------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|
| ASTM D97-02 | Standard Test Method for Pour Point of Petroleum Products |
| BOR | block-on-ring |
| DITA | Di-Isotridecyl Adipate |
| DSC | differential scanning calorimetry |
| DSRW | dry sand rubber wheel |
| EC | ethyl cellulose |
| EVA | ethylene-vinyl acetate |
| FE | finite element |
| POD | pin-on-disc |
| PUFA | polyunsaturated fatty acid |
| SEM | scanning electron microscope |
| SO | synthetic oil |
| TAG | triacylglycerol |
| US | United States |
| USQ | University of Southern Queensland |
| WCO | waste cooking oil |
| WSRW | wet sand rubber wheel |