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During a manufacturing process, the ultrasonic shot peening (USP) technique can be used as the final surface treatment. The aim of this operation is to introduce surface compressive residual stresses in order to prevent crack propagation advancement. Although the numerical simulation method is able to predict the level of residual stresses in a peened part, the 3D modelling of the real USP process, in which many successive and shifted impacts take place, is very delicate to perform and costly in terms of computing time and memory space required. In this paper, a two step method based at first on the calculation of the averaged plastic strain tensor in a half-space by using a semi-analytical method and in a second time on the transfer of this plastic strain field to a finite element model is proposed in order to simulate the effects of the USP process in thin structures. The accuracy and advantages of the semi-analytical method are validated by a benchmark with several finite element codes. Experiments, similar to the Almen test, are performed on thin plates of Inconel 600. Numerical results in terms of distortions and residual stresses are compared with the experimental data.

1. Introduction

The manufacturing process of a mechanical part is made by a succession of operations that usually involve severe mechanical and/or thermal loadings. In consequence, an element taken at the beginning of its service life usually exhibits residual stresses that can have a significant impact on its fatigue life. Surface or volume treatments are often applied at the end of the process to generate compressive residual stresses and reduce the harmful effects of the forming operations.

As an example, Inconel 600 (IN600), a nickel-based alloy, is widely used in construction of nuclear reactors due to its excellent mechanical properties at high temperature and corrosion resistance. The presence of nickel enhances the resistance against corrosion. However, when a component is placed in a corrosive environment such as the primary circuit of a nuclear reactor, it becomes sensitive to the phenomenon of stress-corrosion cracking. Therefore it must be ensured that the level of residual stresses after the manufacturing process is lower than the triggering threshold of stress-corrosion cracking. In order to reduce such risks, a final surface treatment can be applied on the part. The objective is to introduce compressive residual stresses to prevent occurrence of cracking.

Among the mechanical surface treatments, several have been studied over the years such as the classical shot peening, or more recently the ultrasonic shot peening (USP), laser peening or water jet peening. The USP process which is often applied in a local zone can be seen as a complementary technology to classical shot peening. Its main benefit compared to conventional shot peening is the low roughness of the surface due to a better quality of the shots and lower impact speeds. The USP has also the advantage that balls are contained and can be recovered after treatment. This allows in situ treatment of the surfaces when USP is used as a repairing technique.

Beyond the generation of residual stresses, peening processes can also be used to deform material, in which case it is called peen forming, see for example, Gariépy et al. (2011). For this second group of applications the prediction of the distortions generated by the process becomes critical. Applications of shot peening cover also the joining of material of dissimilar mechanical properties, see Harada et al. (2006).
Due to their various applications, peening processes are nowa-
days the subject of many studies. The simulation of these processes
started more than a decade ago with the simulation of one single
impact. Meguid et al. (1999) studied the effect of various properties,
including shot radius, velocity and material hardening properties
and analysed their influence on the depth of the compressive resid-
ual stress layer. They also noted the few interests at this time to the
modelling of the peening processes. Rouhoud et al. (2005) have
investigated the effect of temperature on the residual stress field
due to one single impact, showing that it has a negligible effect
for low velocity and relatively large shots. This effect was deeply
studied in the work of Rouhoud et al. (2009) who showed that
it reduces the level of residual stresses but only as a second order
effect. It should be noted that the range of temperature was below
200 °C, which has a limited effect on the strain-stress curve for the
material investigated (35NiCrMo16).

However, the results obtained for one impact cannot be consid-
ered significant of the multiple impact process, as was shown
for example by Kang et al. (2010). They noted the importance of mod-
elling an appropriate coverage with a sufficient number of impacts
to better apprehend the residual stress field. Frijia et al. (2006) used
symmetries in the both surface directions to multiply the number of
simulated impacts but the reference cell used in their simulations
sees only one impact. They showed that the results obtained with
this model show large differences with the experiments, showing
the importance to account for multiple impacts.

Most recent studies thus concentrate on the prediction of resi-
dual stresses, and distortions with models involving multiple
impacts. The prediction of distortions is important to determine the
influence of the process and apply it to peen forming. Levers and
Prior (1998) started more than 10 years ago, predicting the distor-
tions generated by the process on wing panels. For the validation
of numerical models, the distortions are usually represented by the
maximum deflection of thin peened plates that is called the Almen
intensity or arc height. Guagliano (2001) proposed analytical for-
mulae to link the Almen intensity to the level of residual stresses
based on a finite element model involving 5 impacts. More recently,
Miao et al. (2010) studied experimentally the number of peening
passes necessary to reach a saturation and provided empirical rela-
tions to link it to the arc height. A recent study by Gariépy et al.
(2011) even predicts the Almen distortion of specimen before the
bolts maintaining it during the peening operation are removed.

Performing realistic simulations of multiple impacts is limited
by three major difficulties. First the large number of impacts to be
modelled leads to unaffordable computing time. For this reason,
Wang et al. (1998) proposed empirical models to predict the resid-
ual stresses. Majzoobi et al. (2005) found that the simulation of
25 impacts allows to obtain a uniform stress state but noted that
this value can vary with the peening and material parameters. They
also indicated that the optimum stress state can occur before the
saturation point. As for many other authors, they used various sym-
metries in their multiple impacts model to reduce the computation
time. Miao et al. (2009) proposed a review of these various sym-
metries and reference cell shapes used in the literature for multiple
impact models. Klemenz et al. (2009) used similar symmetries to
model 121 impacts and averaged the results over a representative
area covered by several impacts, and finally confronted the numer-
ical results to experiments. Those models suppose a deterministic
distribution of the impacts that necessarily differs from the reality
of the process. Nevertheless, an averaging of the simulation results
over a sufficiently representative area leads to fair predictions of
residual stresses. The influence of the impact distribution and espe-
cially the sequence of the impacts and the number of impact cycles
was studied recently by Kim et al. (2012).

Several authors propose stochastic models of the impact distri-
bution to account for the complexity of the process. For example,
Bagheri et al. (2010) simulated a very large number of impacts,
up to 134, randomly distributed on a reference area and compared
the results to residual stresses measured by X-ray diffraction to pre-
dict surface nanocrystallization. Mylonas and Labeas (2011) also
use a stochastic model of the shot distribution and consequently
model a few tens of shots, randomly distributed on the impact
surface with a realistic velocity distribution.

A third method proposed to account for multiple impacts is
to determine the eigenstrain generated by one or a few number
of impacts and to multiply them to determine the effect of large
number of impacts. Achinta and Nowell (2011) determined the
eigenstrain generated by one pulse of laser shock peening, equiv-
alent to one impact in conventional shot peening, and sum this
result to represent the effect of the whole process. The resolution
of the equilibrium of the impacted body containing these eigen-
strains allows obtaining the final residual stresses. Song et al. (2012)
recently obtained satisfactory prediction of residual stresses by
using a similar method. They used the plastic strain obtained at the
centre of one single indentation to represent the effect of multiple
impacts.

The second major difficulty is the determination of a realistic
loading as input to the impact simulation. In the case of laser peen-
ing or hammering (Hacini et al., 2008), the position and intensity
of the impacts or shocks is deterministic, but the physics of the
impacts remains the same. In most peening model, the loading is
represented by two parameters: the impact velocity, usually taken
constant for all impacts and the coverage rate, which is the ratio
of the impacted surface over the initial surface. Majzoobi et al. (2005)
showed that the impact velocity has a significant influence on the
results for multiple impacts. A correct determination of the impact
velocity is thus necessary. Miao et al. (2009) performed simulations
of several dozens of randomly distributed impacts at various
velocities and averaged them over a representative cell to model a
realistic distribution of the impacts and their velocities. The predic-
tion of these velocities lies on a model of the process itself. Gariépy
et al. (2011) proposed a modelling of the air nozzle of a shot peen-
device to predict the impact velocity. For the case of USP, models
of the peening chamber, accounting for the multiple impacts of
the shots, are used. They rely on the definition of the coefficient
of restitution that allows to predict the rebound velocity of a shot
impacting a surface or another shot. Analytical formulae, as those
proposed by Jackson et al. (2010) allow to predict these coefficients
of restitution. Recent work by Chaise et al. (2011) extended these
formulae to materials with isotropic hardening to improve the pre-
diction of the rebound velocities and therefore subsequent impact
velocities within the ultrasonic chamber.

The last difficulty is the determination of the material properties
of the impacted surface. Indeed at the impact velocities commonly
involved in shot peening, viscous effects can occur. Klemenz et al.
(2009) used for example an elasto-visco-plastic law with combined
isotropic and kinematic hardening to predict the residual stresses.
In the case of very large strain rates, as in laser peening for example,
the determination of realistic parameters for the viscous part of
the behaviour can become a challenge. Amarchinta et al. (2010)
proposed an inverse method to determine the material behaviour
at high strain rates. Seifried et al. (2010) showed that viscous effects
can be neglected for certain materials while they are critical for
others. In the present study a simple isotropic hardening law was
used since it was found sufficient for the applications presented
here.

In this paper, a three-dimensional approach to determine the
residual stresses and distortions in a thin structure after a peening
treatment is proposed. A combination of a semi-analytical method
(SAM) and the finite element method (FEM) is used. The advan-
tage of the SAM is that it allows a considerable saving of computing
time compared to the FEM, however it relies on the assumption of
half-space for the bodies in contact, which is not true for thin structures. A methodology is proposed here to account for thin structures, i.e. when the plastically deformed layer is of thickness significant compared to the structure thickness. The method is applied to the USP treatment of thin plates but can easily be extended to other peening processes and impacted structures.

First, an experimental study of the USP process on thin plates made of IN600 is presented. In a second step, the numerical multiple impacts model is proposed. The SAM is used to determine the plastic strain field generated by the USP process that is averaged over a local representative area of the half-space. Then, this inelastic strain field is transferred into a FE model (using the commercial package Systus/Sysweld, SYSWELD, 2008) to predict the residual stress field that is averaged to the process (shots velocities and peening coverage rate). The materials' yield strengths allow the large difference between the materials' yield strengths allows to consider the shots as purely elastic.

The treated surfaces are initially painted in order to determine the coverage rate. Experimentally, the coverage rate is defined as the percentage of the surface that has been impacted at least once. A 100% coverage is defined when the whole surface has been impacted. The coverage is then equal to 200% when the exposure time is doubled.

2.3. Residual stresses, initial state and measurements

All specimens are machined by wire electrical discharge machining and both faces have been grinded. Then, the specimens have been submitted to a stress relieving heat treatment (SRHT, 3 h at 600 °C) to reduce as much as possible the stresses caused by machining. The SHRT temperature and maintaining time have been chosen not to modify the microstructure and therefore the mechanical properties. However X-ray diffraction measurements before and after SHRT, prior the USP, showed that the level of residual stresses was not significantly affected by the SHRT. A residual stress level of the order of 100 MPa is still observed in the specimens.

For determination of residual stresses in IN600, the diffraction peaks at 114.13° in the plane 3,3,1 are recorded using Cu Kα radiation, with a position sensitive detector (PSD). The parameters are the following: 40 kV and 30 mA. For measurement of the depth of the specimen, a small thickness is released using electro-polishing on a 10 mm × 10 mm surface. A measurement error of ±50 MPa was estimated and is applied on all residual stress values.

2.2. Materials and shot peening parameters

In this paper, the USP experiments are carried out on thin plates made of IN600 (initial yield strength σ0 = 215 MPa, Young’s modulus E = 195.2 GPa, Poisson’s ratio ν = 0.3, density ρ = 8250 kg/m³). The bearing steel AISI S1100 (σ0 = 1618 MPa, E = 213 GPa, ν = 0.29, ρ = 7834 kg/m³) was chosen for the shots with a diameter of 4 mm. The large difference between the materials’ yield strengths allows to consider the shots as purely elastic.

The treated surfaces are initially painted in order to determine the coverage rate. Experimentally, the coverage rate is defined as the percentage of the surface that has been impacted at least once. A 100% coverage is defined when the whole surface has been impacted. The coverage is then equal to 200% when the exposure time is doubled.

2.1. Experimental device and principle

The USP device used in these experiments is illustrated in Fig. 1(a). A sinusoidal electric field is delivered by a generator. By using a piezo-transmitter, this electric energy is transformed into an ultrasonic vibration and then amplified by a booster. This energy is thereafter transferred into kinetic energy stored by the balls when they are projected by the sonotrode. The balls are confined in a chamber on top of which the specimen is fixed. Similar to the “Almen test”, the specimen is fixed by four bolts as illustrated in Fig. 1(b). During the process, the successive impacts will generate a compressive residual stress field at the surface and in the close sublayer of the treated plate (Fig. 1(c)). A tensile residual stress field of lower amplitude balances the compressive effect at higher depth to ensure the equilibrium. At the end of the process, a small curvature of the plate can be observed. After the removal of the bolts, the residual stress field is redistributed due to the change of boundary conditions. The convexity of the surface is thus increased in the direction of the peened surface. The maximum deflection is used industrially to characterize the peening process.

Several parameters can influence the results of the experiments. They are mainly related to the shots (material and diameter) and to the process (shots velocities and peening coverage rate). The corresponding parameters used in our experiments are presented thereafter.

2.4. Impact velocity

The last important input parameter is the shot velocity. Since the movements of the balls in the chamber are random, the collisions between them or with the side walls of the chamber can change the direction and the velocity of the balls. It is assumed here that all the impacts will occur at the same velocity and an average velocity is considered. This average velocity is taken to be the maximum initial velocity of the sonotrode. Considering that the sinusoidal harmonic signal delivered by the generator is:

\[ x(t) = A \sin(\omega t) \]  

where \( A \) is the amplitude and \( \omega \) represents the pulsation. It yields:

\[ \frac{dx}{dt} = A \omega \cos(\omega t) \]

According to Eq. (2), the maximum initial velocity is:

\[ V_{\text{initial}} = 2\pi f \]

where \( f \) represents the frequency of vibration of the sonotrode.

The initial theoretical shot velocity calculated with our experimental parameters is equal to 4 m/s and corresponds to the average capabilities of the USP device used for the experiments. This value is considered as the average velocity of the impacts during the process and will be used as an input in the simulations. The real impact velocity in USP is difficult to estimate due to the complex kinematics of the shots in the peening chamber. A value of 4 m/s is in the range of velocities estimated by other authors, as Todaka et al. (2004) that indicated that the shot velocity in USP is lower than 20 m/s. Piště et al. (2005) have established a model of the USP process and obtained a shot mean speed of the order of 3 m/s.

Due to the large number of impacts between shots and with the chamber’s walls during a USP process, the impacts are largely multidirectional. The estimation of the impact velocity is then complicated. Only 10 shots were used in the experiments to reduce the number of impacts between shots. The impacts between the
shots during the experiments can then be considered mainly normal to the impacted surface and the previous approximation used to estimate the impact velocity. Obviously, in the case of a real USP process, the kinematics of the shots would become more complicated and a specific model would be required to determine the impact velocity distribution, as indicated in the introduction. Such a model would allow to obtain both the average impact velocities and the velocity distribution.

3. Numerical model

The main problem of multiple impact simulations is the computation time they require. For this purpose, it is proposed here to use a semi-analytical method (SAM) to model the impacts that has the advantage to be about one order of magnitude faster than classical finite element method.

3.1. The semi-analytical method

When analytical solutions cannot be found for complex problems, it is possible to divide these problems in a sum of basic solutions for which analytical solutions are known. Such analytical solutions are derived from the boundary elements technique. Based on this method, a semi-analytical code for the study of elastic-plastic contact problems has been developed. The initial development of the problem was made by Jacq et al. (2002) and subsequent development on the plasticity can be found in Nélias et al. (2006). The method was then extended to solve impact problems (see Chaise et al., 2011). Note that, at the impact velocities encountered during USP process, it could be assumed that inertial effects can be neglected since the impact velocity, here equal to 4 m/s, is far lower than the speed of elastic waves in metals (3000 m/s in aluminium, 5200 m/s in steel). Under these conditions, Johnson (1985) showed that the impact problem can be treated as quasi-static. The impact velocity observed in conventional shot peening being seldom higher than 150 m/s, a quasi-static model can be used to model the shot peening process. This is confirmed by the work of Rouhaud et al. (2005) who showed that a quasi-static model can be used, in their case for impacts at 75 m/s. In addition the bodies in contact can be considered as half-space since the contact dimensions are small compared to the dimensions of the bodies.

Stick-slip should occur within the contact area for frictional normal impact (see Gallego et al., 2010), as well as gross slip for oblique contact. These effects will not be considered here. In what will follow the impact will be assumed frictionless and normal to the surface. Note that for frictionless contact, it is also equivalent to an oblique impact but with the projection of the velocity vector on the normal to the surface taken as the impact velocity.

The general algorithm of the semi-analytical impact model is presented in Fig. 2. The initial state is first defined by the shot velocity, shot radius and mechanical properties of the shot and the body. At each time step, the rigid body displacement is determined from the current shot velocity. Then the displacement is used as input to a classical elastic normal contact solver. The pressure field resulting from this solver is used to calculate the so-called elastic stresses using the elementary analytical solutions derived by Love (1952). Initial plastic strains are used to calculate the residual stresses (based on the solutions developed by Chiu, 1978). The total stress is calculated as the sum of the two former stresses and used as input to a classical return-mapping algorithm to calculate the increment of plastic strain in the body.

From this increment, new residual stresses are computed along with the increment of surface residual displacement. The surface definition is so updated and the contact problem recomputed. This loop is reproduced until convergence of both the contact and plastic problems are obtained. The convergence of the contact problem

Fig. 1. Experimental device: (a) overall view; (b) fixation system of the specimen by bolts; and (c) typical residual stress profile due to USP treatment.
is checked by the convergence of the increment of surface displacement while the value of the yield function at each point of the body is used to validate the convergence of the plastic problem. When the convergence is reached, the final contact force is used to update the velocity of the ball and the next rigid body displacement can be calculated. For more details on SAM as developed to solve inelastic contact problems or contact problem with heterogeneous materials the reader may refer to Boucly et al. (2007), Fulleringer and Nélias (2010), Leroux and Nélias (2011) or Chaise and Nélias (2011). The reader may also refer to the recent work of Wang, Keer and co-authors from Northwestern University (Chen et al., 2009; Chen and Wang, 2008; Zhou et al., 2009), Bosman and Schipper at the University of Twente (Bosman and Schipper, 2011), and Wang et al. from Tsinghua Univ. (Wang et al., 2010).

At the end of the rebound, the final residual stress and plastic strain tensors resulting from the impact are obtained.

### 3.2. Benchmark validation

A benchmark was realized between the following finite element codes: Abaqus, Code_Aster, Systus/Sysweld and the SAM. The aim here is to validate the results obtained from an impact simulation by the SAM and to compare the respective performances of the codes. The test case presented here corresponds to a more general shot peening case and input data is then different than the one of the USP case. Nevertheless, the amount of plastic strain obtained in both cases is similar in order to validate the chosen framework.

#### 3.2.1. Input data

A single impact of an elastic ball (Young’s modulus $E = 207$ GPa, Poisson’s ratio $\nu = 0.3$) on an elastic-plastic flat body ($E = 111$ GPa, $\nu = 0.29$) is considered. The impacted body hardening law is isotropic, governed by a Ramberg–Osgood law described as follows:

$$\sigma = \sigma_0 + k\varepsilon_p^n$$  \hspace{1cm} (4)

with $\sigma_0 = 478$ MPa, $k = 3270.6$ MPa and $n = 0.441$.

The ball diameter is 0.6 mm and the impact velocity is taken equal to 40 m/s. Those conditions correspond to the case of classical shot peening of a TiAl6V material body with AISI52100 shots. The initial velocity is perpendicular to the impacted surface and the contact is considered frictionless.

#### 3.2.2. Calculation conditions

In all models, the contact area was discretized with elements of dimensions 8.5 mm $\times$ 8.5 mm $\times$ 4.25 mm. Out of this area, the mesh is defined differently for each model, each one running on a different software. Linear brick elements with reduced integration were adopted in the FE codes. For the SAM, cuboidal elements of constant size are defined. Each element has a single calculation point (equivalent to a Gauss point in FEM) located at its centre. The Abaqus and Code_Aster models present one plane of symmetry, while Systus/Sysweld presents one quarter of the problem only. The FE models are presented in Fig. 3. For the SAM, no symmetry is considered and the full 3D problem is modelled. Furthermore, the element size in the SAM has to be constant to perform the computation and a fine mesh is so adopted over all the discretized area.

Table 1 presents the number of nodes, type of elements and CPU frequency used for each code. The approximate computation time for each calculation is also given. The differences in computation time between the FE codes are mainly related to the number of symmetries considered. More importantly, the SAM, despite a larger number of elements, resents a computation time about one order of magnitude lower than the FEM.

#### 3.2.3. Benchmark results

The normal surface residual displacement, describing the dent after impact, obtained for each code is plotted in Fig. 4. This displacement $u^m$ and the radial coordinate $x$ are normalized by the radius of contact $a^c$. The plastic strain components along the depth taken at the centre of the impact are plotted in Fig. 5. The results obtained with the different codes show a good agreement both at the surface and along depth. It can be noticed that the $zz$ component is the most sensitive and the one for which the largest differences are observed between codes. The SAM can then be considered accurate to predict plastic strains even at relatively high strain amplitudes (here about 10%).
Fig. 3. Finite element model mesh definition and zoom around the contact area for the Abaqus model (a), Code_Aster model (b) and Systus/Sysweld model (c).

Table 1
Numerical parameters for the single impact benchmark between the semi-analytical method, Abaqus, code_ASTER and Systus/Sysweld.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Finite element codes</th>
<th>Semi-analytical method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abaqus</td>
<td>Linear hexahedra with reduced integration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code_Aster</td>
<td>Cuboids with a central calculation point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systus</td>
<td>Cuboids with a central calculation point</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element size in contact area</th>
<th>( \Delta x = \Delta y = 8.5 \mu m )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( a^t / \Delta x \approx 10 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \Delta z = \Delta x / 2 ) (in depth direction)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element type</th>
<th>Nodes</th>
<th>CPU time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nodes</td>
<td>139,693</td>
<td>(~20 \text{ h})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes</td>
<td>101,121</td>
<td>(~15 \text{ h})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes</td>
<td>139,557</td>
<td>(~10 \text{ h})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes</td>
<td>168,070</td>
<td>(~1.7 \text{ h})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Number of cuboids in the largest (final) computation zone.

The SAM presents a significantly reduced computation time despite a higher number of elements. This increase in the number of elements is due to the constant size of the SAM elements, required for the FFT calculation. The fine mesh size in the contact area has to be the same over the whole computation domain even in the zones with lower strain and stress gradients. The Systus/Sysweld results were computed in reduced CPU time compared to the other FE codes, it should be noticed that only a quarter of the domain was modelled while Abaqus and Code_Aster models describe one half of the problem. The SAM models the full 3D domain, without symmetry simplifications. Note that what is costly in terms of computing time with SAM is the number of elements in the plastic zone. Despite this drawback, the computation with the SAM is significantly faster (see Table 1). Meanwhile, the FE codes present differences in the computation time despite a similar number of nodes. The construction of the model and the FE software being different for each model, it led to significant differences on the computation time. Furthermore, a mesh sensitivity analysis was performed on the SAM. A mesh size twice coarser than the one used in this benchmark provides similar results.

Fig. 4. Benchmark results: residual surface displacement \( u_z^r/a^t \) as a function of the radial coordinate \( x \), normalized by the area of contact radius \( a^t \).

Fig. 5. Benchmark results: accumulated plastic strain at the centre of the impact as a function of the depth \( z \).
3.3. Multiple impacts model

3.3.1. Model hypotheses

Multiple impact models can be sorted in two categories: deterministic and stochastic ones, see Section 1. The model proposed here is based on a deterministic approach. The impacts' velocities and distribution are set a priori.

Each impact is simulated using the SAM. Based on the studied range of velocity, the model is quasi-static. The current model considers only impacts normal to the surface to simplify the estimation of the impact velocity. As long as the number of shots is small and frictional effects can be neglected, this hypothesis seems reasonable.

The influence of constant impact velocity is discussed in Section 3.3.5. The impact distribution is described by the coverage rate. The definition of the coverage rate estimated experimentally does not match the definition of the simulated one. It is assumed that experimental and numerical results with similar values of coverage are equivalent. Furthermore, a random sequence of impacts, typically obtained in experiments is supposed to produce results equivalent to those resulting from a defined impact sequence as long as the coverages are equal and after averaging the results over a representative area as defined in Section 3.3.3. This hypothesis is very strong but allows to compare in the most simple way experimental and numerical results.

3.3.2. Impact distribution and coverage rate

It is assumed that after a uniform shot peening treatment on a surface, the residual stress and strain state have specific characteristics. The strain state is supposed uniform in planes parallel to the surface and isotropic. Consequently the plastic strain varies only along the depth of the specimen (z coordinate) and is independent of the position at the surface (x and y coordinates). This is assumed valid far enough from the boundaries of the art, based on Saint-Venant’s principle. Consequently, instead of the whole treated surface a local area is considered to calculate the residual strain and stress field in order to minimize the number of impacts to simulate.

In this study, the impacts are supposed to occur at the three corners of an equilateral triangle the side length of which is noted d (see Fig. 6). Taking the triangle formed by the centre of three impacts, a reference area $A_r$ is defined. The coverage rate $c$ can be calculated as the ratio between the surface covered by the impacts over the reference area as follows:

$$c = \frac{2\pi \left(\frac{a^*}{d}\right)^2}{\sqrt{3}}$$

where $a^*$ is the radius of the maximum area of contact for a single elastic plastic impact. Note that this value is only slightly altered by the presence of former impacts and is so representative for all impacts occurring during the process. The value $a^*$ is used for the coverage definition since it defines the surface on which a pressure has actually been applied which corresponds experimentally to the surface where painting would have been removed.

A significant difference appears here between the definitions of the experimental and numerical coverages. The experimental value considers that each point of the surface has been impacted at least once when the coverage equal 100%. Meanwhile, the numerical value will assume a 100% coverage while some points of the surface have not been impacted but some others have been impacted at least twice. This difference has no critical influence on the results presented here.

3.3.3. Averaging process

For each depth $z$, the plastic strain tensor components are averaged over the reference area as indicated in Eq. (6). This average is representative of the homogeneous strain values generated by the USP process described in the former section. This hypothesis is supported by the area-averaged approach firstly developed by Menig et al. (2001) and recently applied on a square pattern by Kim et al. (2010) which indicated that the area-averaged solution is very close to the XRD solution.

$$\overline{\varepsilon_{ij}}(z) = \frac{1}{N_r} \sum_{(x,y) \in A_r} \varepsilon_{ij}^p(x, y, z)$$  \hspace{1cm} (6)

where $N_r$ is the number of elements in the reference area $A_r$.

A triangular repartition of the impacts was chosen to minimize the number of simulations. It allows with only three impacts to obtain a fair representation of the full shot peened state but it does present only one plane of symmetry. Different distributions, like a square one, would present two symmetries and so a diagonal averaged plastic strain tensor. It is indeed expected that for an isotropic fully shot peened state, the results taken at any point of the surface would be constant, independent of the coordinate system and without off-diagonal terms. The averaged plastic strain tensor is thus modified as follows which is equivalent to average the results over four simulations with different orientations of the triangle obtained by a rotation of $\pi/2$, $\pi$ and $3\pi/2$:

$$\overline{\varepsilon_{ij}} = \frac{1}{2} \begin{bmatrix} \overline{\varepsilon_{xx}} + \overline{\varepsilon_{yy}} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \overline{\varepsilon_{xx}} + \overline{\varepsilon_{yy}} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \overline{\varepsilon_{zz}} \end{bmatrix}$$  \hspace{1cm} (7)

The results, depending only on the depth $z$, are consistent with the hypothesis made on the residual strain field in a fully shot peened body. Simulations performed on a square distribution of the impacts showed that the pattern of impacts has a little influence on the results that are thus mainly governed by the coverage rate.

3.3.4. Representative number of impacts

In the literature, the number of impacts required to obtain stabilized results appears to be a critical parameter. The residual stresses are highly influenced by the impacts surrounding the reference area. On the contrary, the plastic strains are influenced by only a small number of impacts around the reference area, leading to eigenstrain methods as applied by Achinta and Nowell (2011) to laser shock peening. The influence of impact beyond the three reference ones is studied here.

The case of a perfectly plastic body with a 150% coverage rate subjected to 6 impacts distributed as indicated in Fig. 6 is studied (Table 2). This case can be considered as a limit case. As no
hardening is involved the evolution of plastic strain from one impact to the other is the highest. In the case of a 150% coverage rate, the contact radius $a^*$ is approximately equal to 2/3 of the distance between impacts. With very large overlapping of the impacts, the influence of each impact on the previous impact’s plastic strain is the highest.

For this case (Fig. 7), only a slight increase of the averaged accumulated plastic strain is observed between the 3rd and 6th impacts. Three impacts are then considered as a very reasonable, and significantly lower compared to the former models (Majzoobi et al., 2005), number of impacts required to accurately describe the averaged plastic strain profile. This limit value is valid for the current model only, i.e. for impacts regularly spaced out on a triangular grid and occurring at constant velocity. For stochastic models typically, as the one proposed by Bagherifard et al. (2010) subsequent impacts might occur in the reference area and increase the plastic strain level but the coverage rate value would also increase.

3.3.5. Influence of the impact velocity distribution

The influence of a variation of the impact velocity around an average value is studied here. Three simulations of three impacts are made for two cases. The first simulation considers three impacts at a constant reference velocity $v_{\text{ref}}$, corresponding to a reference kinetic energy $E_{\text{kin ref}}$. For the second simulation, the first impact velocity is lower than the reference velocity and such that the kinetic energy of the first impact is 20% lower than $E_{\text{kin ref}}$. The second impact velocity is equal to $v_{\text{ref}}$ and the last impact velocity is higher than $v_{\text{ref}}$ with a kinetic energy 20% higher than $E_{\text{kin ref}}$. The third simulation considers the same impact velocities but this time the impact velocity decreases for each impact. For each simulation the total kinetic energy brought to the body through the three impacts is constant and equal to $3E_{\text{kin ref}}$. The remaining impact parameters are indicated in Table 3 and the results post-processed as usual are presented in Fig. 8.

Results for these three sets of simulations are almost the same. A similar set of simulations is performed with a larger kinetic energy variation (up to 50%) between each impact, results are also plotted in Fig. 8.

For this larger variation case, the maximum (averaged value) accumulated plastic strain is lower but the profile of residual stress remains almost constant. A rebalancing of the residual stresses is observed at deep depth in this case.

From these simulations it can be concluded that a variation of the impact velocity around an average constant value has a negligible effect on the results as soon as the total kinetic energy brought to the system is constant. The use of a constant velocity for the simulations is thus validated.

3.4. From plastic strains in a semi-infinite body to residual stresses in a thin structure

The half-space hypothesis considered in the SAM being unsuitable to predict the residual state within thin structures treated by USP, a technique to transfer the plastic strain field into a thin structure is proposed here.

The averaged plastic strain tensor previously defined is only dependent on the depth and is considered representative of the final state of the plate (see Section 3.3.2). This profile is transferred to a finite element model of the plate, or any other structure, the tensors values being constant in each plane parallel to the surface. These averaged strains are used as initial plastic or inelastic strain tensors values being constant in each plane parallel to the surface.

The FE analysis is done with Systus/Sysweld. In most commercial FE packages it is not possible to import an inelastic strain tensor as initial state, whereas equivalent thermal strains can be used to represent the original state as presented by Fullinger and Nielas (2010). The mesh is set up by 8-node linear bricks. No external load is applied to the plate. The material parameters of the plate in
Table 2
Simulation parameter for the study of the effect of more than three impacts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of impacts</th>
<th>Impact velocity [m/s]</th>
<th>Yield limit $\sigma_y$ [MPa]</th>
<th>Tangent modulus $E_t/E$</th>
<th>Coverage rate $c$ [%]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3
Simulation parameters for the study of the effect of a variation of impact velocity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of impacts</th>
<th>Impact velocity [m/s]</th>
<th>Yield limit $\sigma_y$ [MPa]</th>
<th>Tangent modulus $E_t/E$</th>
<th>Coverage rate $c$ [%]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$[20 \pm 20% E_{km}]$</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$[20 \pm 50% E_{km}]$</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

the FE model are equal to those of the SAM. The boundaries of the plate are kept free, thus representing the state when the bolts are removed. The residual stress state in the plate after the peening process is obtained by solving the static equilibrium of the plate (see Fig. 9) which accommodates the plastic (or inelastic) strains. These residual stresses are observed at the central point of the structure far from the boundaries where it is assumed that side effects will influence the results.

4. Results and discussion

Experimental data are compared with numerical results. For each simulation three impacts are performed. The shots velocity is assumed constant and equal to the maximum velocity of the sonotrode (4 m/s). The AISI52100 properties are considered for the shots that are assumed to behave elastically. The IN600 hardening behaviour is described by a Ramberg–Osgood hardening law deduced from monotonic tensile tests with $K = 1450$ MPa and $n = 0.8$. Simulation results are averaged following the multiple impact method. The radial averaged residual stress obtained in the half-space (i.e. by SAM prior to the transfer of inelastic strains to the thin structure) will be also indicated in Fig. 10(a)–(c) presented hereafter.

The averaged plastic strain is then exported in a FE model to determine the residual stresses in the finite structure (see Fig. 10(a)–(c)) and the deflection of the samples (Fig. 11). The residual stresses in Fig. 10(a)–(c) are plotted along the depth of the plate at its centre. Fig. 11 shows the deformed profiles of the thin plate in the plane $y = 0$.

The residual stresses at the centre of the plate are measured in the longitudinal ($\sigma_{xx}$) and transverse ($\sigma_{yy}$) directions. In addition, the residual arc height of the specimen is measured by a 3D coordinate-measuring machine in the longitudinal direction of the plate and along its centre.

The residual stress profiles are quite similar for all coverages, both from experiments and simulations. Measured and simulated stresses are plotted in Figs. 10(a)–(c). For all processed specimens the stresses are compressive both at the surface and in the top sub-layer. Moreover, it can be seen that the transverse stresses ($\sigma_{yy}$) are higher than the longitudinal ones ($\sigma_{xx}$). This can be explained by the clamping conditions of the specimen. Indeed, the specimen can sustain higher deformation in the longitudinal direction than the transverse one. Note that the gap between $\sigma_{xx}$ and $\sigma_{yy}$ is the same for the simulations and the measurements.

A significant difference can be observed between measured and calculated residual stresses in the top surface layer (up to 100 μm). This difference might be caused by the machining process, indeed.

![Fig. 9. Averaging and transfer to finite structure procedure. Averaging of results over the semi-infinite body reference area, exportation as initial inelastic strains in a finite element model of a finite size structure and computation of residual stresses by solving the equilibrium.](image)
EDM typically leaves strong tensile residual stresses (potentially up to a few hundreds MPa) in the subsurface layer up to 100–200 μm, see for example, Ekmekci et al. (2006). The samples were considered initially free of plastic strain while the stress relieving treatment was not efficient enough to reduce the initial hardening due to surface machining.

The measurement points at depth ranging from 0.4 to 0.5 mm (i.e. one fourth of the plate thickness) diverge somewhat from the numerical results in Fig. 10(b) (coverage rate of 150%) and Fig. 10(c) (coverage rate of 200%). As indicated in the XRD measurement conditions, this is probably due to the loss of rigidity of the plate that was not corrected.

An excellent fit is obtained between simulation and experimental results for the deflection of the plate (see Fig. 11). The maximum measured value is nicely reproduced by the model. Results tend to diverge at the border of the plate were the actual boundary conditions logically differ from those used in the simulations. For this case, no saturation of the deflection is observed for the three values of coverage rate.

5. Conclusion

A multiple impacts model to predict the result of an USP treatment on a thin structure was proposed. This model is based on a semi-analytical method which has the advantage of saving considerable computing time compared to the classical finite element method, without sacrificing the quality of results. An averaging and transfer process to a FE model allows considering any kind of structures, despite the semi-infinite body hypothesis of the SAM. The averaging of the results allows simulating only three impacts to simulate a full shot peening process and to bridge the results with the actual experimental measures that are also averaged over a given, yet not necessarily representative, volume. Predicting the results of a full peening process with fine mesh description becomes
affordable within a few hours on a standard desktop with a relatively fine mesh.

The model was successfully applied to thin structures. The comparison between the numerical and experimental results shows a good agreement for the distortions and correct trends for the residual stresses. Several parameters remain to be controlled for an accurate simulation of the process. In particular, the impact velocity, that has a direct influence on the level of plastic strains, was here roughly estimated. A finer description of this velocity would be necessary for a full analysis of the process and will be of concern in future works. Nevertheless it was shown that the determination of an average impact velocity is sufficient to obtain realistic results on global structures.
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