

**SIZING ACCURACY OF LACK OF SIDE WALL FUSION ON
SINGLE V-BUTT JOINT WELDS USING ULTRASONIC BACK TIP
DIFFRACTION TECHNIQUE**

NURHAYATI NADHIRAH BINTI MUHAMAD

**Final Year Project Report Submitted in
Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements for the
Degree of Bachelor of Science (Hons.) Physics
in the Faculty of Applied Sciences
Universiti Teknologi MARA**

JULY 2017

ABSTRACT

SIZING ACCURACY OF LACK OF SIDE WALL FUSION ON SINGLE V-BUTT JOINT WELDS USING ULTRASONIC BACK TIP DIFFRACTION TECHNIQUE

This purpose of study is to compare the performance of conventional Ultrasonic Testing (UT) with Back Tip Diffraction technique on Phased Array Ultrasonic Testing (PAUT) in determining the size of Lack of Sidewall Fusion (LOSWF) defect on single V-butt joint welds. The instrument used for both methods is OmniScan MX2, equipped with 5L64 probe and rexolite angle wedge. The frequency and beam angle is set at 5MHz and 45°, 60° and 70°. Three welded carbon steel for this study are PL 14971, PL 14962 and PL 14960, each has designated LOSWF defect varied in height and length. The sizing technique applied is 6dB drop technique. The dimension obtained then compared with a reference data and the relative difference between the two acquired. For PL 14971, the relative error for conventional UT and PAUT with Back Tip Diffraction inspection in obtaining LOSWF length is 0% and 6.67% while 373% and 20.4% for its height. For PL 14962 and PL 14960, the length relative difference for is 7.14% and 10.7% using conventional UT and 10.7% and 32.1% using PAUT. Their height relative difference using conventional method is 21.4% and 80.6%. The diffracted signal from PL 14962 and PL 14960 were too faint to acquire their height. Therefore, this study proved that conventional UT method is suitable to obtain LOSWF length and height for specimen that has any thickness. PAUT with Back Tip Diffraction technique, however, is not suitable to determine defect height for specimen that is 8mm or thinner than that.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | Page |
|--|-------------|
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENT | iii |
| TABLE OF CONTENTS | iv |
| LIST OF TABLE | vi |
| LIST OF FIGURES | vii |
| LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS | ix |
| ABSTRACT | x |
| ABSTRAK | xi |
| | |
| CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION | |
| 1.1 Background of Study | 1 |
| 1.2 Problem Statement | 5 |
| 1.3 Objectives of Study | 5 |
| | |
| CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW | |
| 2.1 Introduction | 6 |
| 2.1.1 Conventional Ultrasonic Testing | 9 |
| 2.1.2 Phased Array Ultrasonic Testing (PAUT) | 10 |
| 2.1.2.1 Back Tip Diffraction Technique | 11 |
| 2.2 Material for Inspection | 12 |
| 2.2.1 Lack of Sidewall Fusion (LOSWF) | 13 |
| 2.3 Advantages and Limitations of UT | 13 |
| | |
| CHAPTER 3 METHODOLOGY | |
| 3.1 Sample/Apparatus/Instruments and Experimental Set Up | 15 |
| 3.1.1 Welded Metal Plate | 16 |
| 3.1.2 OmniScan MX2 | 22 |
| 3.2 Conventional UT Inspection | 25 |
| 3.2.1 Calibration of Apparatus for Conventional UT | 26 |
| 3.2.2 LOSWF Detection using Conventional UT | 28 |
| 3.2.3 LOSWF Sizing using Conventional UT | 29 |
| 3.3 PAUT Inspection | 31 |
| 3.3.1 Calibration of Apparatus for PAUT | 32 |
| 3.3.2 LOSWF Detection using PAUT | 33 |
| 3.3.2.1 LOSWF Detection using PAUT and Back Tip Diffraction Technique | 34 |
| 3.3.3 LOSWF Sizing using PAUT | 35 |
| 3.4 Expected Result | 36 |
| 3.4.1 Conventional UT | 36 |
| 3.4.2 PAUT | 37 |

| | |
|---|----|
| CHAPTER 4 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION | |
| 4.1 Inspection Data | 38 |
| 4.1.1 Conventional UT Inspection Data | 38 |
| 4.1.2 PAUT with Back Tip Inspection Data | 39 |
| 4.2 Data Analysis | 45 |
| 4.2.1 False Analysis | 45 |
| 4.2.2 Identification and Sizing of LOSWF | 47 |
| 4.2.3 Variation in Sizing of LOSWF | 48 |
| | |
| CHAPTER 5 CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS | 50 |
| | |
| CITED REFERENCES | 52 |
| CURRICULUM VITAE | 54 |

LIST OF TABLES

| Table | Caption | Page |
|--------------|--|-------------|
| 3.1 | Specification details of metal plate PL 14971 | 17 |
| 3.2 | Specification details of metal plate PL 14962 | 19 |
| 3.3 | Specification details of metal plate PL 14960 | 20 |
| 3.4 | Parameters for conventional UT | 26 |
| 4.1 | Length and height of LOSWF obtained using conventional UT method | 39 |
| 4.2 | Color range according to reflected wave amplitude | 40 |
| 4.3 | Length and height of LOSWF obtained using back tip diffraction technique on PAUT method | 44 |