Modeling of jetflow drilling with consideration of the chaotic erosion histories of particles
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Abstract

A general model is presented for the simulation of a drilling process by abrasive waterjet. The conventional constitutive equation for the erosion rate of a single particle penetrating into a solid target is extended and applied to millions of particle strikes, taking into consideration their erosion histories. The theoretical advancement of this model reflects the inherent damping effect that occurs as the depth of drilling increases. Particles involved in erosion are divided into categories according to their kinematic features, and their penetration performances are evaluated individually. A particle-laden jetflow with chaotic behavior, which was constructed previously by the authors, is employed to coordinate the positions of particles and describe their velocities and flow rates, including laminar and turbulent flow with the average scale. The high accuracy of the theoretical results is verified by independent experiments of drilling glass, titanium and other materials. © 1997 Elsevier Science S.A.
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1. Introduction

It is difficult to drill deep and small holes in hard-to-machine materials like titanium and brittle ceramics. A recent development in abrasive waterjet (AWJ) technology provides a new alternative machining tool to carry out such an operation on the shop floor [1]. Similar to other AWJ machining processes, in AWJ drilling, millions of high-speed particles (40–400 m s⁻¹) strike the target every few seconds and remove material little by little. For a ductile material, a particle can cut much like a traditional machining tool [2–4], while for a brittle material it penetrates into the target through fragmentation [5,6]. Craters and ditches produced by the impact of particles are visible with a microscope as displayed in Figs. 1 and 2. Possibly owing to the complexity of impact processes, to date the authors are unaware of any
model for the three-dimensional drilling process which can evaluate the erosive contribution of every individual particle.

The modeling of AWJ drilling can serve at least two practical purposes. First, the off-line simulation prior to the online operation can help engineers choose optimal parameters that will yield low cost and high quality. Second, if on-line control is required, an accurate robust model is necessary in association with the sensor and controllers to form a closed-loop control system.

In general, three steps are needed for the development of an accurate model: (1) kinematic analysis of abrasive particles in multiphase jetflow, (2) establishment of the constitutive law for the particle-target interaction, and (3) evaluation of drilling performance conducted by millions of particles. Extensive investigations have been implemented by the authors for simulation of particle motion on the cross-section of particle-laden flow [7-9], therefore the attention here is turned to the derivation of constitutive equations and the computation of the geometrical configuration of a hole. The theoretical analysis is verified by independent experiments of drilling glass, titanium and other materials.

2. Constitutive equation

The relation between the average depth of penetration caused by the impact of a single particle and other machining parameters is defined as the constitutive equation of particle-target interaction during erosion. Great efforts have been made in the past decades to build this type of relation to evaluate accurately the erosion rate for machining purposes.

Extensive theoretical and experimental investigations show that the average depth of penetration \( h_0 \) on the dry surface of a ductile material can be expressed by

\[
h_0 = \lambda_1 V^{A_2}
\]

where \( V \) is the velocity of the particle, \( \lambda_1 > 0 \) and \( A_2 > 0 \) are constants relevant to material properties, impact angle, and contact geometry of the particle and target [2-6,10-14].

Eq. (1) is based on metal cutting dynamics and the Hertz impact contact theory [2,10-12] which lead to the relation between the average removal volume \( Q_0 \) and the velocity \( V \) of a particle

\[
Q_0 = E_1 V^{E_2}
\]

where \( E_1 \) and \( E_2 \) are constants. The conversion of Eq. (2) to Eq. (1) is basically a geometric process rather than a physical process. Today the constitutive Eq. (1) is widely accepted by the researchers in this area as a classical relation. However, it is very important to point out that Eq. (1) is confined by several limitations. For example, Eq. (1) no longer holds when a film exists between two contact bodies. In addition, it is independent from erosion histories of other particles. As a matter of fact, the latest studies [14,15] show that the impact force will be reduced if a moving object encounters a soft film before penetrating into a target. For the one-phase liquid film, the relation between the impact force \( P_1 \) and the thickness \( H \) of the film is given by

\[
P_1 \rightarrow \frac{1}{H^2}
\]

derived from a fluid mechanics approach [15]. When the film consists of the mixture of solid and liquid, the relation is of the form

\[
P_1 \rightarrow \frac{1}{H^\alpha}
\]

where \( \alpha \) is a physical constant. Eq. (4) is deduced from the Hertz impact contact theory for two inhomogeneous bodies [14].

The thickness of the film between a particle and the target is likely to increase with the increase of depth of drilling. Therefore, the impact force varies simultaneously with the change. This suggests that the classical relation Eq. (1) needs modifying before being applied to calculate the erosion rate of a particle in AWJ drilling. In doing so, two basic assumptions are introduced as follows.

- The form of Eq. (1) is invariable under any erosion conditions provided that \( \lambda_1 \) and \( A_2 \) are functions of the drilling depth.
- Eq. (1) is also suitable for brittle materials if the material fragmentation caused by impact takes place only within the immediate area.

In deriving the relation between the depth of penetration and relevant parameters, one critical concern is that its mathematical statement must be concise in addition to accuracy, so as to reduce computation time. As shown in Fig. 3, the surface of a target material to be drilled is divided into a finite element network. During the erosion, each element acts as a memory-cell to record the histories of those particles which pass through it and hit the target surface. As shown in Fig. 3, when the \( j \)th particle trapped by the \( i \)th cell at instant \( t_i \) strikes the surface, based on the above assumptions, the constitutive equation for the average penetration depth is generalized to

\[
\delta h_j = \lambda_1 (h_{j-1}) \left[ V_{i} (r_{i}, \theta_{i}) \right]^{A_2 (h_{j-1})}
\]

Fig. 3. The surface network and its memory cells covering the drilling region.
Here \( h_{j-1} \) is the depth of penetration by \( j - 1 \) particles prior to the \( j \)-th particle in the \( i \)-th cell. \( V_j = v_j / v_{\text{max}} \) (0 ≤ \( V_j ≤ 1 \)) is the dimensionless outgoing velocity of the \( j \)-th particle right after it exits from the nozzle. \( v_j \) is its real velocity and \( v_{\text{max}} \) is the maximum velocity of particles in the jet flow. Without loss of generality, the radius produced by ongoing flow is taken as the unit radius while the cross-sectional thickness of the ring-shaped outgoing flow is denoted by \( \delta \). The final theoretical radius of a hole is \( 1 + \delta \).

It is very important to point out that, like the constitutive equations in continuum mechanics [16], \( \lambda_1(h_{j-1}) \) and \( \lambda_2(h_{j-1}) \) in Eq. (5) are not arbitrary functions of \( h_{j-1} \) but are constrained strictly by various physical principles. To find appropriate explicit forms of \( \lambda_1(h_{j-1}) \) and \( \lambda_2(h_{j-1}) \), a comprehensive analysis on these constraints is necessary.

Differentiating \( \delta h_j \) of Eq. (5) with respect to \( h_{j-1} \), leads to

\[
\frac{d(\delta h_j)}{dh_{j-1}} = V_j \left( \frac{d\lambda_1}{dh_{j-1}} + \lambda_1 \ln V_j \frac{d\lambda_2}{dh_{j-1}} \right) \tag{6}
\]

Since \( \delta h_j \) decreases when \( h_{j-1} \) increases and the damping effects are not negligible, \( d(\delta h_j)/dh_{j-1} \leq 0 \) holds during erosion. Then Eq. (6) produces

\[
\frac{d\lambda_1}{dh_{j-1}} + \lambda_1 \ln V_j \frac{d\lambda_2}{dh_{j-1}} \leq 0 \quad (V_j \neq 0) \tag{7}
\]

and furthermore

\[
\frac{d\lambda_1}{dh_{j-1}} \leq \lambda_1 \left| \ln V_j \right| \frac{d\lambda_2}{dh_{j-1}} \tag{8}
\]

owing to \( \ln V_j \leq 0 \). Eq. (8) is a constraint on the relation among \( \lambda_1 \), \( \lambda_2 \) and \( V_j \); further examination is necessary to find a more specific constraint on \( \lambda_1 \).

At the center of the jet, the dimensionless velocity \( V_j \) reaches its maximum value \( V_j = 1 \), and hence \( \ln V_j \) reads its minimum \( \ln V_j = 0 \). Additionally, \( \lambda_1 \ln V_j \lambda_1 / dh_{j-1} \) and \( \lambda_2 / dh_{j-1} \) are both independent of \( V_j \), therefore, the inequality

\[
\frac{d\lambda_1}{dh_{j-1}} \leq 0 \tag{9}
\]

must hold as a general constraint on the function \( \lambda_1(h_{j-1}) \) of constitutive Eq. (5). Another constraint on \( \lambda_1(h_{j-1}) \) is that it is bounded at any circumstance including \( h_{j-1} = 0 \).

For ductile materials, the constraint \( \lambda_2(h_{j-1}) = 2-2.3 \) appears to be true, in most cases, according to many investigations [2,3,6,10-13]. A constraint on the function \( \lambda_2(h_{j-1}) \) for brittle materials can be derived from the energy conservation principle. Without loss of generality, the area of the new surface generated by the impact of the \( j \)-th particle is written as \( S_i(\delta h_{j-1}) \) where \( S_i \) is the geometric transforming coefficient. For example, one can find \( S_i = 2 \pi r \) if the crater is assumed to have a hemispherical shape. The surface energy consumed by the formation of the new surface is

\[
E_i = \gamma_0 S_i(\delta h_{j-1})^2 = \gamma_0 S_i \delta h_{j-1}^2 \leq \frac{1}{2} m_p V_j^2 \tag{10}
\]

where \( m_p \) is the mass of the particle. The physical meaning of Eq. (10) is that the surface energy consumed by brittle fragmentation is less than the total kinetic energy of the particle. Based on the energy conservation principle, from another form of Eq. (10)

\[
\lambda_2 V_j^{2(\alpha_2 - 1)} < \frac{m_p}{2S_i \gamma_0} \tag{11}
\]

one can confirm that the constraint

\[
\lambda_2(h_{j-1}) \geq 1 \tag{12}
\]

must hold. Otherwise when \( V_j \to 0 \) the condition

\[
V_j^{2(\alpha_2 - 1)} \to \infty \tag{13}
\]

leads to a conclusion against a fundamental law if \( \lambda_2(h_{j-1}) < 1 \).

Based on Eqs. (3) and (4) and inequality Eq. (9), the forms of \( \lambda_1 \) and \( \lambda_2 \) are chosen as

\[
\lambda_1 = \frac{l_1}{h_{j-1}^{l_1 + 1} + l_2} \quad \lambda_2 = l_3 h_{j-1} + 2 \quad (l_1 \geq 1, l_2 > 0, \delta_j > -1) \tag{14}
\]

where \( l_i (i = 1-4) \) are constants. The constant \( l_2 \) is introduced for ensuring that \( \lambda_i \) is bounded when \( h_{j-1} = 0 \). Here \( l_1 \geq 1 \) is required because the first-order differentiation of \( \lambda_1 \)

\[
\frac{d\lambda_1}{dh_{j-1}} = - \frac{l_1 h_{j-1}^{l_1 - 1}}{(h_{j-1} + l_2)^2} \tag{15}
\]

must be bounded when \( h_{j-1} \to 0 \).

The final form of the constitutive equation is

\[\delta h_j = \frac{l_3}{h_{j-1}^{l_3 + 1} + l_2} \left[ V_j(r, \theta_j) \right]^{\delta h_{j-1} + 2} \tag{16}\]

It will be seen that the unknown constants \( l_i (i = 1-4) \) will be reduced from four to one. In Eq. (14), the physical meaning of \( l_1/l_2 \) can be clarified by setting \( j = 1 \) at the center of a hole, namely, \( h_1 = 1 \) owing to \( h_0 = 0 \) and \( V_j = 1 \). \( l_1 \) is a parameter to reflect damping effects, and \( l_2 \) is a parameter that controls the shape of a hole and it is independent of the maximum depth of penetration.

Intuitively, the deeper a hole is, the thicker the film between two contact bodies should be. Therefore, in comparison with Eqs. (3) and (4), the following expressions are chosen for \( l_i (i = 1-4) \)

\[l_i = 2, l_3 = l_2 = l^i, l_4 = 0.2/l \tag{17}\]

where \( l > 0 \) is a constant. As a result, Eq. (16) is rewritten in the dimensionless form

\[\delta \tilde{h}_j = \frac{1}{h_{j-1}^{1 + 1} + 1} \left[ V_j(r, \theta_j) \right]^{0.2 \delta h_{j-1} + 2} \tag{18}\]

with

\[\tilde{h}_{j-1} = h_{j-1}/l, \quad \delta h_j = \delta h_j/l \tag{19}\]
According to the result in [2], the expression of average constant incoming velocity \( V_j^* \) with damping effects works out to be \( V_j^* = V_j / (a + bh_j - 1) \) where \( a \) and \( b \) are constants. The information contained in Eq. (18) reflects a similarity from this parameter if \( V_j^* / (\mu_j^2 - 1)^{1/2} + 1 \) is defined as the incoming velocity.

One remarkable feature of Eq. (18) is that it only has one unknown parameter \( l \), which can be determined by combining theoretical modeling with the test of drilling a hole in the material to be machined.

3. Category of particles

Before evaluating the depth of penetration corresponding to a memory cell defined in Fig. 3, it is imperative to know the number of particles which pass through a memory cell and effectively contact the target material. In doing so, the criterion for trapping particles in the \( j \)th cell is introduced in the forms

\[
|r_j - r_i| \leq \frac{\Delta r}{2}, \quad |\theta_j - \theta_i| \leq \frac{\Delta \theta}{2}
\]

where \((r_j, \theta_j)\) are the coordinates of a particle at a given instant, \( \Delta r \) is the radial increment of the cell network and \( \Delta \theta \) is the angular increment. Note that Eq. (20) can be a necessary and sufficient condition for effective erosion only if a particle hits the target. Otherwise it is only a necessary condition because some particles rebounding from the previous impact may pass over the area covered by the \( i \)th cell but not strike it.

All the particles recorded by a cell are defined as a point set \( \Omega \). In terms of the roles of particles in erosion, \( \Omega \) is divided into two subsets, \( \Omega_1 \) and \( \Omega_2 \). The particles striking the surface directly are categorized into \( \Omega_1 \), and the particles rebounding from the previous impact belong to group \( \Omega_2 \). Obviously,

\[
\Omega_1 \cap \Omega_2 = \emptyset, \quad \Omega_1 \cup \Omega_2 = \Omega
\]

hold under the classification. For the sake of accurate calculations, further divisions of \( \Omega_1 \) and \( \Omega_2 \) are necessary.

As shown in Fig. 4, \( \Omega_1 \) is divided into many subsets and they yield the relations

\[
\omega_1 \cup \omega_2 \cup \ldots \cup \omega_k = \emptyset, \quad \omega_1 \cup \omega_2 \cup \ldots \cup \omega_k = \Omega
\]

One criterion for the division of Eq. (22) is that particles in a subset are sufficient to cover the area of the cell and to remove a layer of the target material. In addition, particles in the subset \( \omega_{k-1} \) (\( 1 < k < K \)) enter into the cell earlier than particles in \( \omega_k \). The classification is essential in applying constitutive Eq. (16) or Eq. (18) to the evaluation of penetration rates of particles.

Usually a particle of \( \Omega_2 \) carries much less energy than a particle in \( \Omega_1 \) does, or in other words, the particles of \( \Omega_1 \) remove material much more efficiently than particles of \( \Omega_2 \). In comparison with their performance in deep cutting, the particles of \( \Omega_2 \) play a less important role in drilling a hole. The rationale for this reasoning is that there is no way for a particle of \( \Omega_2 \) to escape other than the ring-like channel of backflow neighboring on the lateral surface of a hole. As a result, a particle of \( \Omega_2 \) can hardly generate an effective secondary impact because of the resistance of incoming flow.

In particular, when a cell is located on the boundary, its particles, denoted by \( \Omega_0 \), are transported by backflow. The criterion Eq. (20) becomes

\[
|r_j - (1 + \delta_i)| \leq \frac{\Delta r}{2}, \quad |\theta_j - \theta_i| \leq \frac{\Delta \theta}{2}
\]

In this case, \( \Omega_1 \) does not exist. However, only these particles contacting the lateral surface of a hole can erode the target, and the majority of them in backflow exits from the annular channel without contacting the target.

4. Source of particles

If there is no theoretical particle source of the jetflow with specific coordinates and velocity profiles, it is impossible to model a drilling process by use of the above theoretical results. Theoretically speaking, a useful particle source is a point set that possesses the following essential conditions.

- The order of appearance of particles on the cross-section of the jetflow is randomly disordered or chaotic with respect to either the location or time.
- After the number of particles passing through the cross-section exceeds a certain value, the particle distribution should approach the axisymmetrical status. In other words, the three-phase jetflow appears to be geometrically axisymmetrical.
- The particles should be endowed with any desired velocity profile and flow rate so that they are adaptable to variable machining conditions.

A novel approach has been developed by the authors to construct such particle sources [7-9]. The patterns of a par-
particle distribution and its velocity profile are shown in Fig. 5. The variable \( V_{sp} \) for a desired point set with the oscillation characteristic is the dimensionless velocity profile calculated by particle distribution, and \( V_z = (1 - r)^{1/7} \) with smooth curvature is its theoretical value given as the known condition. \( R_{fp} \) and \( R_r \) are flow rate ratios with respect to \( V_{sp} \) and \( V_z \) respectively.

Based on the simulation results [7-9], positions of particles are known despite their disordered property over the erosion region and hence a cell can trap the particles passing through it based on the criterion Eq. (20). When the number of particles that the cell receives reaches the designated value, constitutive Eq. (18) can be used to evaluate, step by step, the erosion rate.

Two typical physical parameters of a particle source are its velocity profile and flow rate ratio. In modeling a drilling process, two types of velocity profile and flow rate ratio are used to describe the kinematic manners of particles [17-19]. One comes from laminar flow with

\[
V_j = 1 - r_j, \quad R_f = r_j^2(2 - r_j) \tag{24}
\]

where \( R_f \) stands physically for the flow rate ratio; the other results from the seventh root law for turbulent flow

\[
V_j = (1 - r_j)^{1/7}, \quad R_f = 1 - (1 - r_j)^{6/7}(1 + \frac{2}{7}r_j) \tag{25}
\]

The physical meaning of \( R_f \) is the intensity of the number of particles passing through a specific region during a time interval.

### 5. Modeling and experiment

The central task of modeling is to determine the erosion rates of particles in every cell. In the present work, the particles of \( \Omega_2 \) are not evaluated theoretically because it is very difficult to estimate their exact number and velocity distribution, but their effects are counted by experimental constants \( l_i \) \((i = 1-4)\). In addition, particles in \( \Omega_3 \) in backflow are assumed to enlarge only proportionally the diameter of a hole generated by particles of \( \Omega_2 \), and hence they are independent of the shape and depth of a hole. Consequently, only the particles of \( \Omega_2 \) are taken into account owing to their high energy status.

Substitution of the first equation in Eq. (24) and Eq. (25) into Eq. (18) respectively leads to two equations

\[
\delta h_j = \frac{1}{h_{j-1}^2 + 1} (1 - r_j^2)^{0.2h_{j-1} + 2} \tag{26}
\]

for laminar jetflow and

\[
\delta h_j = \frac{1}{h_{j-1}^2 + 1} (1 - r_j)^{1/7}(0.2h_{j-1} + 2) \tag{27}
\]

for turbulent jetflow, where \( h_{j-1} = h_{j-1} (\omega_i) \) \((i = 2,...,K)\) is the function of the point set \( \omega_i \) with respect to a specific cell.

An example is given here to illustrate how to model the drilling process by means of the above theoretical results. Suppose that a cell receives 100 strikes during an entire erosion process. The particles are equally divided into four portions, that is, \( \omega_1 = \omega_2 = \omega_3 = \omega_4 = 25 \). After substitution of radii \( r_j \) of the first 25 particles into Eq. (26) or Eq. (27) of \( h_0 = 0 \) \((j = 1)\) to calculate the depth of penetration produced by every particle, one obtains the average depth of drilling by dividing the sum of the penetrations of the 25 particles by 25. The result is taken as the depth \( h_1 \) of Eq. (26) or Eq. (27). During computation of the average depth generated by the second 25 particles, \( h_1 \) is used to compute the average removal of the second layer. Repeating this procedure, one gains the final depth \( h_l \) of penetration by 100 particles in the cell by adding them together as

\[
\delta h_{j} = \sum_{k=1}^{4} \delta h_{j} = \sum_{k=1}^{4} \frac{1}{h_{j-1}^2 + 1} [V_k(r_j)]^{0.2h_{j-1} + 2} (h_0 = 0) \tag{28}
\]

Note that the constant \( l \) is contained in Eq. (28). After the penetration of all the cells is found, the shape of the hole is the accumulation of all the depths covering the drilling area.

From Eqs. (18) and (19), one may think that the equation \( \delta h = l \) for the central depth of a hole \((r_j = 0)\) can be used to
determine the value of \( l \) in association with an experimental result. However, it is found that theoretical results can be improved if it is ascertained by a maximum depth of drilling. In addition, it is difficult to estimate the initial depth \( h_i \) of drilling.

An extended application of the model is to serve the closed loop control of a drilling operation [10,20], which requires that the model has the capability to respond rapidly. Additionally, the minimal computation can also lead to high efficiency and convenience for the shop floor. For practical purposes the analogous method described below is developed.

The cell analyzed here is located at the center of a hole with the maximum depth of penetration. Corresponding to \( \{ \omega_1, \omega_2, ..., \omega_j \} = \Omega_1 \), a group of depths is determined and listed as \( \{ h_1, h_2, ..., h_j \} \) for the cell. After the experiment gives the maximum or final depth \( h_{\text{max}} \) and the time \( t_{\text{max}} \), the constant \( l \) can be determined by

\[
\bar{h}_j = h_j = h_{\text{max}} - l = h_{\text{max}} / h_j
\]

and therefore

\[
(h_1, h_2, ..., h_{j-1}) = l(\bar{h}_1, \bar{h}_2, ..., \bar{h}_{j-1})
\]

A nominated abrasive flow rate \( \bar{m} \) is introduced to calculate the instant of penetrating a depth, given by

\[
\bar{m} = n(\Omega_1) / t_{\text{max}}
\]

where \( n(\Omega_1) \) is the total number of particles in \( \Omega_1 \). Consequently, a group of instants is determined by

\[
(t_1, t_2, ..., t_{j-1}) = [n_1(\omega_1), n_2(\omega_1 + \omega_2), ..., n_{j-1}(\omega_1 + \omega_2 + ... + \omega_{j-1})] / \bar{m}
\]

where \( n_k \) \((1 \leq k \leq j-1)\) is the sum of particles in the \( k \) subsets. As a result, one can verify and further predict the depth of drilling in terms of the one-to-one correspondence \( \{(t_1, h_1), (t_2, h_2), ..., (t_{j-1}, h_{j-1})\} \).

The most important feature of this approach is that the general relation between the depth of penetration and the time can be found without specific constraints on machining parameters, such as the abrasive flow rate and material properties. All other potential influences are included in the constant \( l \).

The effectiveness of this model has been justified by many ‘blind tests’. That is, after carrying out independent drilling experiments, someone else tells the authors a pair of data \( (h_{\text{max}}, t_{\text{max}}) = (h_{\text{max}}, t_{\text{max}}) \). With the aid of the model, the authors can quickly give the rest of the results: \( (h_1, t_1), (h_2, t_2), ..., (h_{j-1}, t_{j-1}) \). It should be noted that no other parameters are required, such as water pressure, materials of target and abrasive, abrasive flow rate and so on.

Two patterns are given in Fig. 6 to show the geometrical configurations of holes resulting from the simulation. To simplify numerical treatments, the axisymmetrical property of flow is employed to reduce the number of memory cells. For the simulation of drilling glass and titanium, 20 cells are designed over the erosion region and the particles within each cell are divided into 10 groups. The number of cells and the group number of particles in each cell are chosen such that the craters produced by particles can cover the area of a cell and a moderate increase or decrease in the two numbers does not have any significant influence on the theoretical erosion rate. If one wishes to scrutinize the surface characteristics caused by the chaotic behavior, size and shape of particles, more cells are needed and their sizes must be smaller. The axisymmetrical property of jetflow cannot be utilized at the local zone in this circumstance.

The experimental verification of the geometry of a hole is given for glass in Fig. 7. Because of the existence of a groove on the surface of the glass specimen with the dimensions \( 200 \times 200 \times 75 \text{ mm} \), the shape of the hole is distorted in the middle part in Fig. 7(a). This distortion is not seen in Fig. 7(b) after changing the viewing angle. The five holes are drilled by low speed flow which is possibly laminar flow since the waterjet pressure assigned in the experiments is as low as 50 MPa. Thus its theoretical counterpart is the pattern displayed in Fig. 6(a). For titanium, the shape of a hole is not directly visible but it appears to have similarity with the holes shown in Fig. 6(b). It can be seen that the shape of a hole depends mainly on the velocity profile of jetflow. As assumed before, backflow may proportionally enlarge the
Tables 1 and 2 exhibit the excellent consistency between the theoretical and experimental data of the maximum depth of drilling for two types of materials, where \( h_e \) and \( h_t \) represent experimental and theoretical results respectively.

### 6. Conclusion and discussion

Armed with the knowledge that the erosion of a material is produced by millions of particles with high speed, the model first focuses on the construction of a reasonable constitutive equation between the depth of erosion and other machining parameters. In attempting to find such a fundamental relation, the mathematical structure of a classical formula is assumed to be invariable but its parameters are generalized to be functions of the drilling depth. Subjected to the basic physical constraints, an explicit form of the constitutive equation is presented whose structure is confined within the rational range.

Emphasis is given not only to an individual particle, but also to many particles in a given small region. The importance of this attention lies in the fact that the macro visible shape of a hole is the erosive result of millions of particles with different kinetic behaviors. In other words, when a constitutive equation is established for a single particle, the estimation of macro erosion is not completed unless contributions of all particles are counted. Generally speaking, particles are divided into three types. One is transported directly by ongoing jetflow, one is transported by outgoing flow and the third is those particles rebounding from their previous strikes. The three types of particles are treated differently in the model.

All the efforts could be in vain if a particle source is not available which represents the particle laden flow exiting from the nozzle. A desired source of particles is constructed in the previous research work and it can be endowed with any velocity profile, flow rate and shape. When coordinates and velocities of particles are known, memory cells of the surface network over the erosion region can trap particles passing through them and their penetration abilities can be evaluated. The final result is the accumulation of contributions made by particles in all cells.

To have an efficient approach to the simulation, the analogous method is introduced to reduce computation time and storage space. From the comparison between theory and experiment, it is confirmed that the model has very good accuracy and is applicable to the shop floor. Nevertheless, if surface characterization is required, the influence of particle size and chaotic distribution should be considered in the model; naturally this will make the mathematical computations more complex.
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