

„Understanding Multi-Arc Plasma Spraying“

Von der Fakultät für Maschinenwesen der
Rheinisch-Westfälischen Technischen Hochschule Aachen
zur Erlangung des akademischen Grades eines Doktors der Ingenieurwissenschaften
genehmigte Dissertation

vorgelegt von

Mehmet Öte

Berichter: Univ.-Prof. Dr.-Ing. Kirsten Bobzin
Univ.-Prof. Dr.-Ing. Jochen Schein

Tag der mündlichen Prüfung: 01. Juni 2016

Schriftenreihe Oberflächentechnik

Band 44

Mehmet Öte

Understanding Multi-Arc Plasma Spraying

Shaker Verlag
Aachen 2016

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available in the Internet at <http://dnb.d-nb.de>.

Zugl.: D 82 (Diss. RWTH Aachen University, 2016)

Copyright Shaker Verlag 2016

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the publishers.

Printed in Germany.

ISBN 978-3-8440-4598-7

ISSN 1864-0796

Shaker Verlag GmbH • P.O. BOX 101818 • D-52018 Aachen

Phone: 0049/2407/9596-0 • Telefax: 0049/2407/9596-9

Internet: www.shaker.de • e-mail: info@shaker.de

Acknowledgement

Apart from my efforts, the success of this study depended on the encouragement and guiding of many others. I take this opportunity to express my gratitude to the people who have been instrumental in the successful completion of this study.

Firstly, I would like to express my sincere gratitude to Prof. Dr.-Ing. Kirsten Bobzin for enabling me to work on this subject and related research, for her patience, motivation, and supervision. Her guidance has enabled the successful completion of this work. Moreover, I would like to thank to the rest of my thesis committee: Prof. Dr.-Ing. Jochen Schein and Prof. Dr.-Ing. Uwe Reisgen for evaluating my study.

I am very grateful to the fellow colleagues at Surface Engineering Institute (IOT) for their advice and support during my research activities. Many thanks to Dr.-Ing. Li Dong Zhao, and Frederik Thomas Linke for providing interesting technical discussions and introducing me to the other aspects of thermal spray technology. My sincere thanks also go to Dr.-Ing. Nazlim Bagcivan for his belief in me and his helpfulness. In addition, I would like to thank other former and current colleagues from IOT for providing a sense of community and camaraderie, there are too many of you to mention but I would especially like to thank Stephanie Wiesner, Serhan Bastürk, Xifang Liao, Dr.-Ing. Thomas Warda, Dr.-Ing. Ivica Petkovic, Dr.-Ing. Thomas Schläfer, Dr.-Ing. Nils Kopp, Dr.-Ing. Baycan Yildirim, Martin Andreas Knoch, Tim Königstein, Ilkin Alkhasli and Mostafa Arghavani.

For their technical support regarding the execution of the experiments conducted in this study, I would like to thank Metin Yüceer and Ulrich Schmitz. I am grateful to all the administrative staff for practical support throughout my thesis, including Anke Lück, Jutta Ziemes and Anne Feck. Furthermore, I would like to thank our IT administrators for maintaining the computer platforms on which the numerical analyses in this study have been conducted. My sincere thanks go to Uwe Werner at this point.

Furthermore, I thank to colleagues from Institute of Plasma Technology and Mathematics, University of the Federal Armed Forces, Munich, Germany (EIT-1) for the excellent collaboration. In particular, I am grateful to Dr. Zimmermann enlightening me about the advanced diagnostic methods such as emission spectroscopic computer tomography and laser

Doppler anemometry. Without the contribution of him and his institution regarding the supervision and execution of the experiments, this study could not be completed successfully.

I gratefully acknowledge the financial support of the German Research Foundation (DFG) within the projects “Homogenization of Coating Properties in Atmospheric Plasma Spraying” (BO 1979/32-2) and “Precision Melt Engineering” (SFB 1120, Subproject A10).

On a more personal note I am eternally grateful to my father Ömer Öte, my mom Nurhayat Öte and my sister Seyda Öte for never letting me doubt myself and for being there when I needed them. I must also mention that my three years old daughter Nura Öte helped me a lot all the time forcing me to take a break and to go away with her to play yard when I needed. Finally I would like to thank my long suffering other half Semiha Öte. Words cannot express my gratitude for everything you have done. Thank you for accompanying and supporting me on this. This thesis is a testament to your faith in me. I hope I have made you all proud.

Abstract

Multi-arc plasma spraying systems promise several advantages in comparison to the conventional single-arc systems. However, some of the underlying fundamentals of the multi-arc plasma spraying are still poorly understood. Intensive numerical research which has been conducted to identify the fundamentals of conventional single-arc plasma spraying has not been applied to multi-arc plasma spraying process yet. A comprehensive numerical research to understand the behavior of the plasma columns in the plasma torch as well as that of powder particles in the plasma jet in multi-arc plasma spraying were the subjects of this thesis.

In this study, the focus was set to the influence of relevant numerical aspects and model assumptions on the numerical results. The models which are necessary to analyze the plasma and particle behavior in multi-arc spraying systems have been subjected to intensive verification with respect to the underlying model assumptions and numerical aspects. Subsequently, the prediction powers of the models have been evaluated by comparing the results of the developed models with the results of advanced diagnostic systems. General characteristics of plasma columns within and outside of the spraying system as well as particle behaviors in the plasma jet have been analyzed using developed numerical models. Furthermore, the possible application areas of the developed models have been introduced exemplarily.

Good accuracy of the models regarding the predicted plasma jet characteristics and particle temperatures and velocities is evident. Due to the stable behavior of the plasma columns, modeling of multi-arc spraying systems promises accurate description of the process and a high predicting power allowing a successful deployment of the developed models with the purpose of designing and optimization of process and injection parameters.

Abstract (deutsch)

Das Mehr-Kathoden-Plasmaspritzen verspricht mehrere Vorteile im Vergleich zum herkömmlichen Ein-Kathode-Plasmaspritzen. Allerdings sind die Grundlagen dieses Prozesses noch wenig erforscht. Intensive numerische Untersuchungen, die zu einem besseren Verständnis der Grundlagen des konventionellen Ein-Kathode-Plasmaspritzens geführt haben, beziehen sich noch nicht auf das Multi-Elektroden-Plasmaspritzen. Daher war die Entwicklung der numerischen Modelle, die die physikalischen Vorgänge im Plasmagenerator sowie das Verhalten der Pulverpartikel im Mehr-Kathoden-Plasmaspritzen beschreiben, Gegenstand der Arbeiten in dieser Dissertation.

In dieser Studie wurde der Fokus auf den Einfluss der relevanten numerischen Aspekte und Modellannahmen auf die numerischen Ergebnisse gelegt. Die Modelle, die notwendig sind, um das Plasma- und das Partikelverhalten im Mehr-Kathoden-Plasmaspritzen zu analysieren, wurden in Bezug auf die zugrunde liegenden Modellannahmen und numerischen Aspekte einer intensiven Verifikation unterzogen. Anschließend wurde die Vorhersagefähigkeit der Modelle auf Basis eines umfangreichen Vergleichs zwischen den Ergebnissen der entwickelten Modelle und der experimentellen Diagnosesysteme bewertet. Die Eigenschaften der Plasmasäulen innerhalb und außerhalb des Plasmagenerators sowie das Partikelverhalten im Plasmastrahl wurden mittels entwickelter Modelle analysiert. Darüber hinaus wurden die möglichen Anwendungsbereiche der entwickelten Modelle exemplarisch vorgestellt.

Die hohe Genauigkeit der numerischen Modelle in Bezug auf die berechneten Plasmastrahleigenschaften, Partikeltemperaturen und -geschwindigkeiten ist evident. Aufgrund des stabilen Verhaltens der Plasmasäulen, verspricht die Modellierung vom Mehr-Kathoden-Plasmaspritzen eine genaue Beschreibung des Prozesses und eine hohe Vorhersagefähigkeit. Folglich ist ein erfolgreicher Einsatz der entwickelten Modelle mit dem Ziel der Entwicklung und Optimierung von Prozess- und Injektionsparametern zu erwarten.

Table of Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	Modeling Multi-Arc Spraying Systems	3
2.1	State of Art for Plasma Modeling in Multi-Arc Spraying Systems	5
2.2	Mathematical Model of Spraying System	6
2.3	Properties of Plasma Gas	9
2.4	Boundary Conditions of Spraying System	11
2.4.1	Gas Inlets	11
2.4.2	Nozzle Outlet	12
2.4.3	Neutrodes, Ceramic Rings and Housing	12
2.4.4	Electrodes	12
2.5	Turbulence in Spraying System	16
2.6	Radiation in Spraying System	18
2.7	Summary	21
3	Modeling the Plasma Jet in Multi-Arc Plasma Spraying	23
3.1	State of Art for Plasma Jet Modeling	24
3.2	Mathematical Model and Boundary Conditions of Plasma Jet	26
3.3	Turbulence in Plasma Jet	27
3.4	Diffusion/Demixing in Plasma Jet	34
3.5	Summary	39
4	Plasma-Particle Interaction in Multi-Arc Spraying Systems	40
4.1	State of Art for Modeling the Particle-Plasma Interaction	41
4.2	Mathematical Model, Material Properties and Boundary Conditions	46
4.2.1	Momentum Transfer	49
4.2.2	Heat Transfer	55
4.2.3	Mass Transfer	59
4.3	Summary	60
5	Validation	62
5.1	Experimental Methods	62

5.1.1	Plasma Temperatures	63
5.1.2	Particle Velocities	65
5.1.3	Particle Temperatures	67
5.2	Validation of Plasma Generator and Plasma Jet Models	69
5.3	Validation of Plasma-Particle Interaction Model	86
5.4	Summary	98
6	Results and Discussion	100
6.1	Characteristics of Plasma jet	100
6.2	Particle In-flight Characteristics	103
6.3	Summary	107
7	Test Cases	108
7.1	Determination of Process Parameters	108
7.2	Optimization of Injection	111
7.3	Summary	115
8	Conclusion	116
	References	118

List of Figures

Figure 1:	Schematic representation of a three-cathode/one-anode spraying torch	4
Figure 2:	Interior geometry of the TriplexPro™-210 torch from Oerlikon Metco GmbH (Hattersheim, Germany) [Bob16]	7
Figure 3:	General characteristics of plasma columns in a multi-arc plasma spraying system for different process parameters [Bob16]	9
Figure 4:	Influence of the definition of gas properties on the calculated velocity profiles at the torch outlet [Bob16]	11
Figure 5:	Calculated temperature profiles at torch outlet with different electrical conductivities assigned to the elements close to the anode surface [Bob16]	14
Figure 6:	Influence of the magnetic fields induced in the cathode domain on to the calculated temperature profiles at the torch outlet [Bob16]	16
Figure 7:	Net radiative flux of pure Ar with respect to temperature [Bob16]	19
Figure 8:	Calculated temperature profiles at the torch outlet using radiation models with different path lengths [Bob16]	20
Figure 9:	Boundary conditions for plasma jet simulations	26
Figure 10:	Temperature profiles calculated using four different RANS turbulence models. Volumetric gas flow rate: 180 SLPM, electric current: 200 A	29
Figure 11:	Temperature profiles calculated using different two-equation RANS turbulence models. Volumetric gas flow rate: 50 SLPM, electric current: 500 A	30
Figure 12:	Temperature profiles calculated using different two-equation RANS turbulence models. Volumetric gas flow rate: 70 SLPM, electric current: 500 A	30
Figure 13:	Temperature profile after Pope's modification	31
Figure 14:	Iso-surfaces for different temperatures calculated with LES	33
Figure 15:	Comparison of the temperatures calculated using SST turbulence model and LES	34

Figure 16: Comparison of the results with and without the use of diffusion model	38
Figure 17: Comparison of the diffusion mass fluxes of Ar with respect to two different process parameters.	39
Figure 18: Boundary conditions of the particle-plasma interaction model	46
Figure 19: Comparison of calculated plasma gas temperatures and particle velocities in simulations which employ one-way and two-way coupling.	49
Figure 20: Particle temperatures and velocities calculated in axial direction; comparison of the approaches of White and Vardelle et al.	53
Figure 21: Influence of the virtual mass force on the particle velocities.	54
Figure 22: Particle temperatures calculated in axial direction; comparison of Ranz-Marshall and Hughmark correlations.	56
Figure 23: Calculated particle temperatures and mass fractions of their liquid phases	58
Figure 24: Schematic representation of emission spectroscopic computer tomography [Lan06, Zim13]	64
Figure 25: Schematic representation of laser Doppler velocimetry	66
Figure 26: Specific radiation of an imaginary material for different temperatures	68
Figure 27: Temperature profile at cross sectional plane 20 mm downstream to the nozzle outlet for parameter sets 1-4. Top: simulation results, Bottom: measurement results. Process gas: Ar, Nozzle diameter: 9 mm	74
Figure 28: Temperature profile at cross sectional plane 20 mm downstream to the nozzle outlet for parameter sets 2, 5 and 7. Left: simulation results, right: measurement results. Process gas: Ar, Nozzle diameter: 9 mm	75
Figure 29: Comparison of the simulated and computed 3D-profiles	76
Figure 30: Comparison of the computed and measured iso-surfaces	77
Figure 31: The change in the length and the form of the plasma jet with respect to process parameters	79
Figure 32: Comparison between computed tomography and CCD-images	80

List of Figures

Figure 33: Process gas at temperatures more than 6000 K with at least 10 % mass fraction of air	82
Figure 34: Net radiative flux of argon plasma jet. Top: for different path lengths, Bottom: Shift due to normalization	84
Figure 35: Comparison of the simulated and measured rate of change in the plasma length and form	85
Figure 36: Measurement grids and their distance to the plasma generator	86
Figure 37: Comparison of measured and defined volumetric particle size distributions	88
Figure 38: Injection pipes incorporated to the calculation domain	89
Figure 39: Change in the particle velocities with respect to axial distance and process parameters. Comparison of the calculated and measured values for parameter sets 1 to 4.	90
Figure 40: Change in the particle velocities with respect to axial distance and process parameters. Comparison of the calculated and measured values for parameter sets 5 to 8.	92
Figure 41: Max. particle velocities detected with LDA and DPV-2000	93
Figure 42: Number of detected particles using measurement system DPV-2000	94
Figure 43: Particle temperatures with respect to axial distance	95
Figure 44: Course of particles as they interact with plasma jet	97
Figure 45: The change in the gas temperature und velocity at nozzle outlet against the change in the process parameters	100
Figure 46: Main arrangements which the profiles prefer to follow at the nozzle outlet	102
Figure 47: Mass averaged particle temperatures and velocities with respect to process parameters.	104
Figure 48: Distribution of dynamic viscosity of process gas over the injection plane; trajectories of particles with different diameters	106
Figure 49: Microstructures of the deposited Al_2O_3 coatings	109
Figure 50: Correlation between the melting degree and coating thicknesses	110
Figure 51: Change in the melting degree of the particles with respect to injector head length	112

Figure 52: Change in the melting degree of the particles with respect to different volumetric gas flow rates of injection gas	113
Figure 53: Change in the particle velocities with respect to altered injection conditions	114

List of Tables

Table 1:	Material data used in the plasma-particle interaction simulations	47
Table 2:	Investigated parameter sets together with the resulting values of the dependent parameters. Process gas: Ar, Nozzle diameter: 9 mm	70
Table 3:	Simulation results of the dependent parameters. Process gas: Argon, Nozzle diameter: 9 mm	71
Table 4:	Measured and calculated maximum temperatures at a cross-sectional plane 20 mm distance to the nozzle outlet. Process gas: Ar, Nozzle diameter: 9 mm	72
Table 5:	Relationship between the axial distance of measurement plane and the distance between single measurement points	87

List of Abbreviations

EIT-1	Institute of Plasma Technology and Mathematics, University of the Federal Armed Forces, Munich, Germany
CCD	Charged-coupled device
CFD	Computational Fluid Dynamics
CT	Computed tomography
DC	Direct current
DNS	Direct numerical simulation
LANL	Los Alamos National Laboratory
LCE	Local chemical equilibrium
LDA	Laser Doppler anemometry
LES	Large eddy simulation
LTE	Local thermodynamic equilibrium
MHD	Magneto hydrodynamics
NASA	National Aeronautics and Space Administration
NLTE	Non-LTE
RANS	Reynolds-averaged Navier-Stokes
RF	Radio frequency
RMS	Root mean square
RNG	Renormalization Group Theory
SLPM	Standard liter per minute
SST	Shear Stress Transport

List of Symbols

A_i	Interfacial area
A_p	Cross sectional area of particle
Bi	Biot number
c	Courant number
C_D	Drag coefficient
c_{opt}	Optical magnification
C_{p_g}	Specific heat capacity of plasma gas
C_{vm}	Virtual mass coefficient
d	Distance
D_{AB}^E	Combined diffusion coefficient due to gradients in the electric field
D_{AB}^P	Combined diffusion coefficient due to gradients in the total pressure
D_{AB}^T	Combined diffusion coefficient due to temperature gradients
D_{AB}^X	Combined diffusion coefficient due to mole fraction gradients
d_{fc}	Diameter of flexible cord
d_i	Injector diameter
d_n	Nozzle outlet diameter
d_p	Particle diameter
E	Electric field
f	Frequency
F_D	Drag Force
F_{vm}	Virtual mass force
h	Heat transfer coefficient

I	Electric current
J_A	Diffusion mass flux of gas A
k	Turbulent kinetic energy
L	Path length
L_b	Latent heat of boiling
L_f	Latent heat of fusion
l_i	Length of injector head
Ma	Mach number
$M()$	Measured intensity
m_A	Mass of the heavy ions in gas A
m_B	Mass of the heavy ions in gas B
m_g	Mass of the plasma gas
\dot{m}_{ig}	Mass flow rate of injection gas
$\dot{m}_{l \rightarrow g}$	Rate of evaporation
m_p	Particle mass
\dot{m}_p	Mass flow rate of injected particles
$\dot{m}_{s \rightarrow l}$	Melting rate
n	Number density
Nu_p	Particle Nusselt number
p	Pressure
P	Spatial position
P_{el}	Electric Power
P_{loss}	Cooling loss

List of Symbols

P_{net}	Net power
Pr_g	Gas Prandtl number
p_{tot}	Total pressure
Q_c	Convective heat transfer
Re_p	Particle Reynolds number
S	Electric Conductivity
s	Slip velocity
T	Temperature
t	Time
T_{Arb}	Arbitrary temperature
$T_{\text{b,p}}$	Boiling point of the feedstock material
T_g	Plasma gas temperature
$T_{\text{m,p}}$	Melting point of the feedstock material
T_{max}^c	Calculated max. temperature
T_{max}^m	Measured max. temperature
T_p	Particle temperature
v	Velocity
V	Electric potential
v_g	Velocity of plasma gas
v_p	Particle velocity
x_B	Mole fraction of gas B
Y_A	Mass fraction of gas A
Δ	Deviation

Δx	Distance between two laser strips
Δ_λ	Wavelength range
ε	emissivity
ε	turbulent dissipation
$\varepsilon()$	emission intensity
θ	angle between two incident laser beams
κ	Thermal conductivity
κ_g	Thermal conductivity of plasma gas
κ_p	Thermal conductivity of particle
λ	Wave length
μ	Mean value
μ_g	Dynamic viscosity of plasma gas
ρ_g	Density of plasma gas
σ	Standard deviation
φ	Volumetric flow rate
$\varphi()$	Plasma gas property, i.e. density, viscosity, conductivity etc.
$\bar{\varphi}$	Plasma gas property averaged across the boundary layer
ω	Specific dissipation