EFFECT OF LASER ENERGY ON WELD STRENGTH FOR NEODYMIUM YTTRIUM ALUMINUM GARNET (ND:YAG) AT $\lambda =$ 1.06 µm

Khairi Khazman Zulkiflee, Nurul Sabihah Zakaria*

School of Distance Education, Universiti Sains Malaysia (USM), 11800 USM, Pulau Pinang, Malaysia

*Corresponding author: nurulsabihah@usm.my

Abstract

The effect of different laser welding energies on neodymium yttrium aluminium garnet was studied and discussed. Results for weld strength at 0.9 Joules, 1.0 Joules and 1.1 Joules laser energy had been investigated for the butt joint of titanium plate with 0.01-inch thickness using pull test method. The results showed that the laser energy had effect on weld strength of the welded samples. The average of weld strength results show increasing with the increasing on laser energy from 0.9 Joules, 1.0 Joules and 1.1 Joules which is 29.968 N, 32.444 N and 34.605 N respectively. Differences of laser energy influence the weld strength as higher weld strength was observed at higher laser energy. The highest weld strength observed is 36.785 N at 1.1 Joules. These results show the laser energy gives higher weld strength for titanium plate.

Keywords: Laser energy, weld strength, neodymium yttrium aluminium garnet.

Article History:- Received: 12 November 2020; Accepted: 24 May 2021; Published: 31 October 2021 © by Universiti Teknologi MARA, Cawangan Negeri Sembilan, 2021, e-ISSN: 2289-6368

Introduction

Laser is a beam of concentrated light energy generated at a specific wavelength. Lasers deliver energy in the form of electromagnetic radiation beams. Laser energy is a variable input and deemed as critical parameter to weld performance as the laser energy might influence the weld strength of the manufacturing product. The differences of laser energy will result in difference of weld strength. Ideally, higher laser energy will provide higher weld strength as the higher energy may penetrate deeper into both welded components for fusion (Fahlström, 2019). Laser energy produced during laser welding process will create a heat to melt the welded parts together. The laser welding processes are intended to create either an electrical joint, structural joint or temporary joint between components. However, excessive laser energy might reduce the weld strength which impact the fusion of the welded joint material whereas over penetration and defect formed. This study focused to determine the effect of weld strength for different laser energy using Neodymium Yttrium Aluminum Garnet (Nd:YAG) laser at 1.06 micrometres (µm) wavelength while maintaining the same welding parameter and parts used. Several parameters can influence the weld strength such as welding distance, material, pulse shape, frequency/rate, pulse duration and beam size (Marya et al., 2005; Radaj, 1996; Li et al., 2011; Casalino et al., 2010; Shamini, 2017; Torabi & Kohalan, 2018; Kumar et al., 2019). Aforementioned parameters were kept constant in this study. This study is important in order to obtain a good product quality and longer the welded joint lifespan which having a high weld strength without defect.

It should be noted that the radiation for Nd:YAG laser energy with wavelength of 1.06 μ m is amongst the purest spectral forms. The laser rod used in Nd:YAG laser welders is a synthetic crystal of Yttrium Aluminum Garnet (YAG). The YAG material is the host material which is containing a small fraction of neodymium called the active element. The YAG crystal is physically hard, stable, optically isotropic and has good thermal conductivity. These characteristics allows the laser operating at high average power levels produces by the lasing material called Neodymium (Nd³⁺). The laser rod dimensions are around 15 millimetres (mm) and a length of 200 mm, selected based on the power to ensure the crystal

quality and thermal management of the rod. The thermal heating occurred at high energetic levels to generate a lasing action (Chandra Singh et al., 2012).

Laser welding widely used as an industrial tool in joining method because of its advantages such as low thermal distortion of the work piece due to low heat input, narrow heat affected zone, deep and narrow welds can be produced with high metallurgical quality, high welding speeds, flexible process which suited to automation and operate in conjunction with robots (Kundu et al., 2019; Williams, 1997; Cao et al., 2003; Schubert et al., 2001; Romoli & Rashed, 2015). According to Bachmann et al. (2016), welding depth penetration was related to the high laser power. Chua et al., (2019) had studied in laser welding aluminium alloy shown depth penetration increase with increasing of laser energy. In addition, Hekmatjou et al. (2018) studied also prove that the weld penetration for 5456 aluminium alloy increase with increase of laser power increase using Nd:YAG laser welding. Oyyaravelu et al. (2016) had investigated laser welding using Nd:YAG laser on high strength low alloy (HSLA) SA516 grade 70 boiler steel and concluded that the weld depth penetration increase with increase of laser power due to increase of heat input. In Yan & Shi, (2019) investigation on Al/Cu joints shear strength resulted to be increase and then decreases with the increase of the laser power which the maximum is about 99.8 MPa with the 2.45 kW laser power. Bahrami et al. (2019) had investigated on 17-4 PH stainless steel shown that the tensile strength and weld penetration increase respective to the increasing of laser energy. Zheng et al. (2008) had studied the influence of laser welding parameters on Nickel Titanium (NiTi) alloy wires and concluded the weld quality was found related to laser power where high energy resulted in good mechanical properties such as higher fracture strength. Kumar et al. (2018) had concluded that the size of heat affected zone and width of the weld increase affected by laser energy increase for Monel 400 alloy sheet whereas, the maximum tensile strength was obtained at energy of 10J. Samad et al. (2019) had studied on the aluminium alloy EN AW 6082 using a varies of laser power and welding speed shown the depth penetration and the width of heat affected zone is increase with the increase of laser power. Gnanasekaran et al. (2021) had investigated the effect of Nd: YAG laser power on AISI 301 austenitic stainless steel joints which resulted deeper penetration and higher tensile strength at higher laser power.

The weld strength is influence by the laser energy absorption of a material during welding process. As two component parts are brought together, a beam of laser light is generated by the laser welder at a specific wavelength. When a laser beam strikes, the absorptive material absorbed and converted into heat, which begins melting the absorptive part at the component joining location. The component then cool and solidify, which creates a strong joint.

Pull testing were performed using Chatillon pull tester. Pull testing was commonly used to determine the physical strength of the material. In this study pull testing were performed using a motorised pull tester at speed of 1 inch per minutes. The pull tester measured the peak force to separate the test samples apart. Generally, higher laser energy can produce higher weld strength which completely melt the parts. However, low or excessive laser energy also can produce lower weld strength (Li et al., 2011; Fahlström, 2019). According to Fahlström (2019) and Hatim et al. (2012), lower tensile strength observed in laser welding which does not weld the whole depth due to lack of penetration. According to Hatim et al. (2012), Chen et al. (2019) and Li et al. (2011), if the laser power kept increased, the tensile strength decreased as the peak tensile strength is corresponded to the complete penetration without any obvious defect. An excessive laser power can cause defect which led to decreased in tensile strength. As the outcome for higher laser energy, the welded component is expected to provide higher pull strength during pull test.

Methods

Three runs had been conducted in the experiment based on different laser energy of Neodymium Yttrium Aluminum Garnet (Nd:YAG) at 1.06 μ m wavelength which are 0.9 Joules, 1.0 Joules and 1.1 Joules. Thirty (30) samples were used for each run. Rofin SWMP 6002 Nd:YAG laser welding machine and titanium plate was used in this study using butt joints. Butt joint is where two pieces of material are placed side by side and the weld is made at the interface between two materials. Firstly, the reference

voltage for desired energy output and the welding parameters was adjusting per experiment run plan. Parameter was fix at frequency: 0 Hz, pulse duration: 2.5 milisecond (ms) and collimator: 6. Parameter setting was verified at the beginning of each run and set at 0.9 Joules, 1.0 Joules and 1.1 Joules laser energy respectively prior testing for each run. Each sample was prepared and labelled according to the number sequence (sample 1 to sample 30) for each run prior laser welding. Each sample was placed into the welding chamber and the laser spot alignment was aligned at the joint position for the welding operation. During welding operation, argon was injected at 8 liters per minute (l/min) through a nozzle, creating an inert protective atmosphere. Each welded joint was subjected for the 100% visual inspection to determine a good sample was produced. Defect samples will be eliminated from the experiment to avoid inconsistent results. After visual inspection, each good sample had been pulled tested. The pull testing was performed by Chatillon TCD225 pull tester.

Result and Discussion

Results for Run 1, Run 2 and Run 3 are shown in supporting information section. Laser energy against pull strength shown higher pull strength observed for higher laser energy per Figure 1. Higher pull strength is observed at 1.1 Joules compare to 0.9 and 1.0 Joules. Based on the test results, all samples from Run 1, Run 2 and Run 3 passed visual inspection. Pull testing is performed to determine the maximum force attained for each sample. A destructive test is performed whereby the test sample is pulled to a specified force until the test sample separated. Overall, the results show the lowest pull strength is 28.134 N in Run 1 and highest pull strength is 36.785 N in Run 3.



Figure 1. Laser energy against pull strength shown higher pull strength observed for higher laser energy

The average of pull strength for the samples showing an increasing trend respectively to increasing of laser energy which are 29.968 N for Run 1, 32.444 N for Run 2 and 34.605 N for Run 3 as shown in Figure 2. Meanwhile, standard deviation is showing the consistency around 1 N. All the results are summarized in Table 1. Based on the results, the minimum, maximum and average value of pull strength for 0.9 Joules, 1.0 Joules and 1.1 Joules increase with increasing of the laser energy. In this study, the pull strength increasing resulted by the increasing of laser energy due to higher laser energy was penetrated deeper into the welded material which maximizes the weld depth compare to lower laser energy. The increasing of weld depth penetration influences the increasing area of molten welded area.

So, the weld strength increase as larger force is required to break the welded samples. Therefore, these results showing a higher weld strength can help to improve a welded joint lifespan which larger force is required to break the welded joints apart.



Figure 2. Laser energy against average pull strength

Table 1. Pull strength

| Process Output | Number of run | Number of sample | Mean (N) | Standard Deviation (N) | Min (N) | Max (N) |
|-------------------|------------------|------------------|-------------|---------------------------|------------|------------|
| Pull | Run 1 | 30 | 29.968 | 1.082 | 28.134 | 32.270 |
| Strength | Run 2 | 30 | 32.444 | 1.095 | 30.602 | 34.339 |
| | Run 3 | 30 | 34.605 | 1.106 | 31.870 | 36.785 |

Conclusion

The effect of weld strength based on laser energy of Neodymium Yttrium Aluminium Garnet (Nd:YAG) at 1.06 µm wavelength had led to the conclusion where all pull strength data showed an increasing trend. Besides that, by comparing the pull test data, the average pull strength was increase with a percentage 1.23 % from 0.9 Joules to 1.0 Joules and 0.92 % from 1.0 Joules to 1.1 Joules. Laser energy increase, then weld strength will increase was experimentally proven. The higher weld strength was influence by higher energy which penetrate deeper into both welded components for fusion. This may beneficial to titanium-based product such as in aircraft, fastener and medical devices.

References

Bachmann, M., Gumenyuk, A., & Rethmeier, M. (2016). Welding with High-power Lasers: Trends and Developments. Physics Procedia, 83, 15-25.

Bahrami Balajaddeh, M., & Naffakh-Moosavy, H. (2019). Pulsed Nd:YAG laser welding of 17-4 pH stainless steel: Microstructure, mechanical properties, and weldability investigation. *Optics & Laser Technology, 119*, 105651.

Cao, X., Wallace, W., Poon, C., & Immarigeon, J.P. (2003). Research and Progress in Laser Welding of Wrought Aluminum Alloys. I. Laser Welding Processes. *Materials and Manufacturing Processes*, 18(1), 1-22.

Casalino, G., Dal Maso, U., Angelastro, A., & Campanelli, S. L. (2010). Hybrid Laser Welding: A Review. In DAAAM International Scientific Book 2010. DAAAM International Vienna: pp. 413-430.

Chandra Singh, S., Zeng, H., Guo, C., & Cai, W. (2012). Lasers: Fundamentals, Types, and Operations. In Nanomaterials: Processing and Characterization with Lasers, First Edition. Wiley-VCH Verlag GmbH & Co. KGaA: pp. 1-34.

Chen, Y., Yang, Z., Shi, C., Xin, Z., & Zeng, Z. (2019). Laser-CMT hybrid welding-brazing of Al/steel butt joint: Weld formation, intermetallic compounds, and mechanical properties. *Materials*, *12(22)*, 3651.

Chua, S., Chen, H., & Bi, G. (2019). Influence of pulse energy density in micro laser weld of crack sensitive Al alloy sheets. *Journal of Manufacturing Processes*, *38*, 1-8.

Fahlström, Karl. (2019). Laser welding of ultra-high strength steel and a cast magnesium alloy for light-weight design, Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Engineering Science, Research Environment Production Technology West, University West.

Gnanasekaran, S., Senthil Kumar, S., Venugopal, N., Upadhyaya, M., Manjunath, T., Chelladurai, S., & Padmanaban, G. (2021). Effect of laser power on microstructure and tensile properties of pulsed Nd:YAG laser beam welded AISI 301 austenitic stainless steel joints. *Materials Today: Proceedings, 37*, 934-939.

Hatim, N., Jameel, N., & Mohammed, A. (2012). The Effect of Laser Welding on the Tensile Strength and Radiographic Analysis of Co-Cr Repaired Joints. *Al-Rafidain Dental Journal*, *12(1)*, 1–13.

Hekmatjou, H., & Naffakh-Moosavy, H. (2018). Hot cracking in pulsed Nd:YAG laser welding of AA5456. Optics & Laser Technology, 103, 22-32.

Kumar, S. G., Saravanan, S., Vetriselvan, R., & Raghukandan, K. (2018). Numerical and experimental studies on the effect of varied pulse energy in Nd:YAG laser welding of Monel 400 sheets. *Infrared Physics & Technology*, *93*, 184-191.

Kumar, S. G., Raghukandan, K., Saravanan, S., & Sivagurumanikandan, N. (2019). Optimization of parameters to attain higher tensile strength in pulsed Nd: YAG laser welded Hastelloy C-276–Monel 400 sheets. *Infrared Physics & Technology*, *100*, 1-10.

Kundu, J., Ray, T., Kundu, A., & Shome, M. (2019). Effect of the laser power on the mechanical performance of the laser spot welds in dual phase steels. *Journal of Materials Processing Technology*, 267, 114–123.

Li, M., Li, Z., Zhao, Y., Li, H., Wang, Y., & Huang, J. (2011). Influence of Welding Parameters on Weld Formation and Microstructure of Dual-Laser Beams Welded T-Joint of Aluminum Alloy. *Advances in Materials Science and Engineering*, 1687-8434.

Marya, M., Wang, K., Hector, J.L.G., & Gayden, X. (2005). Tensile-shear forces and fracture modes in single and multiple weld specimens in Dual-Phase Steels. *Journal Manufacturing Science Engineering*, 128, 287–298.

Oyyaravelu, R., Kuppan, P. & Arivazhagan, N., (2016). Metallurgical and mechanical properties of laser welded high strength low alloy steel. *Journal of Advanced Research*, 7(3), 463-472.

Radaj, D. (1996). Theory of forces and stresses in spot welded overlap joints. *Archive of Applied Mechanics*, 67, 22–34.

Romoli, L., & Rashed, C. A. A. (2015). The influence of laser welding configuration on the properties of dissimilar stainless steel welds. *International Journal of Advanced Manufacturing Technology*, 81(1–4), 563–576.

Samad, Z., Nor, N., & Fauzi, E. (2019). Thermo-Mechanical Simulation of Temperature Distribution and Prediction of Heat-Affected Zone Size in MIG Welding Process on Aluminium Alloy EN AW 6082-T6. *IOP Conference Series: Materials Science and Engineering*, *530*, 012016.

Schubert, E., Klassen, M., Zerner, I., Walz, C., & Sepold, G. (2001). Light-weight structures produced by laser

beam joining for future applications in automobile and aerospace industry. Journal of Materials Processing Technology, 115(1), 2-8.

Shamini, P. Janasekaran (2017). Welding of T-Joint Configuration Between Dissimilar Metals Using Low Powered Fiber Laser. Ph.D. dissertation, Faculty of Engineering, University of Malaya.

Torabi, A., & Kolahan, F. (2018). Optimizing pulsed Nd:YAG laser beam welding process parameters to attain maximum ultimate tensile strength for thin AISI316L sheet using response surface methodology and simulated annealing algorithm. *Optics & Laser Technology, 103*, 300-310.

Williams, C. (1997). CO₂ laser processing - an overview. *Aircraft Engineering and Aerospace Technology*, 69(1), 43–52.

Yan, S., & Shi, Y. (2019). Influence of laser power on microstructure and mechanical property of laser-welded Al/Cu dissimilar lap joints. *Journal of Manufacturing Processes*, 45, 312-321.

Zheng, Y. F., Li, L., Li, W. S., Song, Y. G. (2008). The influence of laser welding parameters on the microstructure and mechanical property of the as-jointed NiTi alloy wires. *Material Letters*, 62(15), 2325-2328.

Supporting Information

| Run 1 | | | | |
|--------|--------------------------------|-------------------|--|--|
| Sample | Visual Inspection: (Pass/Fail) | Pull Strength (N) | | |
| 1 | Pass | 28.934 | | |
| 2 | Pass | 31.425 | | |
| 3 | Pass | 28.400 | | |
| 4 | Pass | 29.868 | | |
| 5 | Pass | 29.913 | | |
| 6 | Pass | 32.270 | | |
| 7 | Pass | 30.513 | | |
| 8 | Pass | 29.512 | | |
| 9 | Pass | 29.335 | | |
| 10 | Pass | 29.557 | | |
| 11 | Pass | 29.646 | | |
| 12 | Pass | 31.514 | | |
| 13 | Pass | 29.891 | | |
| 14 | Pass | 28.356 | | |
| 15 | Pass | 30.113 | | |
| 16 | Pass | 31.158 | | |
| 17 | Pass | 30.202 | | |
| 18 | Pass | 29.335 | | |
| 19 | Pass | 28.779 | | |
| 20 | Pass | 30.580 | | |
| 21 | Pass | 31.692 | | |
| 22 | Pass | 29.601 | | |
| 23 | Pass | 29.802 | | |
| 24 | Pass | 29.112 | | |
| 25 | Pass | 31.581 | | |
| 26 | Pass | 28.134 | | |
| 27 | Pass | 30.046 | | |
| 28 | Pass | 29.068 | | |
| 29 | Pass | 31.403 | | |
| 30 | Pass | 29.312 | | |
| | Average | 29.968 | | |

Test results for Run 1 at 0.9 Joules la

| Test results for Run 2 at 1.0 Joules laser energy | | | | |
|---|--------------------------------|-------------------|--|--|
| Run 2 | | | | |
| Sample | Visual Inspection: (Pass/Fail) | Pull Strength (N) | | |
| 1 | Pass | 33.493 | | |
| 2 | Pass | 33.605 | | |
| 3 | Pass | 31.047 | | |
| 4 | Pass | 32.248 | | |
| 5 | Pass | 33.227 | | |
| 6 | Pass | 33.716 | | |
| 7 | Pass | 34.072 | | |
| 8 | Pass | 32.115 | | |
| 9 | Pass | 33.093 | | |
| 10 | Pass | 33.493 | | |
| 11 | Pass | 31.358 | | |
| 12 | Pass | 30.624 | | |
| 13 | Pass | 32.604 | | |
| 14 | Pass | 31.825 | | |
| 15 | Pass | 32.760 | | |
| 16 | Pass | 31.092 | | |
| 17 | Pass | 32.804 | | |
| 18 | Pass | 32.515 | | |
| 19 | Pass | 32.715 | | |
| 20 | Pass | 30.602 | | |
| 21 | Pass | 33.427 | | |
| 22 | Pass | 30.980 | | |
| 23 | Pass | 32.737 | | |
| 24 | Pass | 31.047 | | |
| 25 | Pass | 32.270 | | |
| 26 | Pass | 34.339 | | |
| 27 | Pass | 34.116 | | |
| 28 | Pass | 32.404 | | |
| 29 | Pass | 31.336 | | |
| 30 | Pass | 31.648 | | |
| | Average | 32.444 | | |

Journal of Academia Vol. 9, Issue 2 (2021) 145 - 153

| Test results for Run 3 at 1.1 Joules laser energy | | | | |
|---|--------------------------------|-------------------|--|--|
| Run 3 | | | | |
| Sample | Visual Inspection: (Pass/Fail) | Pull Strength (N) | | |
| 1 | Pass | 34.494 | | |
| 2 | Pass | 36.785 | | |
| 3 | Pass | 33.427 | | |
| 4 | Pass | 33.560 | | |
| 5 | Pass | 33.960 | | |
| 6 | Pass | 34.361 | | |
| 7 | Pass | 35.339 | | |
| 8 | Pass | 34.472 | | |
| 9 | Pass | 33.738 | | |
| 10 | Pass | 35.406 | | |
| 11 | Pass | 33.049 | | |
| 12 | Pass | 35.028 | | |
| 13 | Pass | 34.161 | | |
| 14 | Pass | 34.939 | | |
| 15 | Pass | 34.628 | | |
| 16 | Pass | 35.940 | | |
| 17 | Pass | 33.360 | | |
| 18 | Pass | 35.940 | | |
| 19 | Pass | 35.295 | | |
| 20 | Pass | 31.870 | | |
| 21 | Pass | 34.961 | | |
| 22 | Pass | 35.428 | | |
| 23 | Pass | 35.918 | | |
| 24 | Pass | 35.339 | | |
| 25 | Pass | 33.582 | | |
| 26 | Pass | 33.916 | | |
| 27 | Pass | 35.806 | | |
| 28 | Pass | 32.960 | | |
| 29 | Pass | 34.917 | | |
| 30 | Pass | 35.584 | | |
| | Average | 34.605 | | |

| Journa | l of Academia | Vol. 9, | Issue 2 | (2021) |) 145 – | 153 |
|--------|---------------|---------|---------|--------|---------|-----|
|--------|---------------|---------|---------|--------|---------|-----|