Optimization of wire EDM process parameters on Al6061/Al2O3 composite and its surface integrity studies
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Abstract. Metal matrix composites (MMC) are finding application in many fields such as aerospace and automobile industries. This is due to their advantages such as light weight and low cost. Among all the available non-traditional machining processes, wire electric discharge machining (WEDM) is found to be a suitable method for producing complex or intricate shapes in composite materials. In this study, an aluminum metal matrix composite (AMMC) with 6% and 8% weight (wt) fraction of Al2O3 is prepared through the stir casting process. The fabricated AMMC specimen is machined using WEDM, considering various process parameters such as wt% of reinforcement, gap voltage (Vg), peak current (Ip), wire tension (WT) and dielectric pressure (Pd). Output responses such as the machining rate (MR) and surface roughness (Ra) of the slots are analyzed by conducting L9 mixed orthogonal array (OA) experiments. The experiments are analyzed using techniques for order preference by similarity to ideal solution (TOPSIS) and analysis of variance (ANOVA). Based on the analyses, the optimum combination of process parameters for better MR and Ra is as follows: wt% = 6 gm, Vg = 53 V, Ip = 8 A, WT = 11 g, Pd = 13 bar. The optimum level of process parameters for MR and Ra are 1.5 mm/min and 3.648 µm, respectively. Based on ANOVA, the peak current is found to have a significant influence on MR and Ra. Moreover, based on a scanning electron microscope (SEM) image, the presence of micro-ridges, reinforcement, micro-craters, micro-cracks, recast layers and oxide formation are all analyzed on the surface being machined.
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1. Introduction

MMC materials have been gaining importance in the most recent decade due to their advantages such as the high strength to weight ratio, good wear and corrosion resistance. These materials are finding application in various fields such as the automobile, aerospace and many other industries producing spare parts [1–4]. AMMC are fabricated through various process methods such as stir casting, powder metallurgy, pressure infiltration, spray deposition and squeeze casting. Among these, stir casting technology is a simple and inexpensive one and is suitable for mass production of composite materials [5]. For understanding the machinability of AMMC through WEDM, researchers worldwide have conducted experiments and studied the effect of process parameters. Suresh Kumar et al. [6] have done the WEDM experiments to optimize the process parameters such as peak current, pulse on time, wire feed rate and wt% of boron carbide on output responses like kerf width and Ra. The aluminum (6351) alloy reinforced with 5wt% SiC and with various weight content of B4C is fabricated through the stir casting process. It is concluded that the pulse on time is the most significant factor that affects the kerf width. Patil et al. [7] have investigated the effect of the type of wire electrode material on the A359/SiCp composite. In this investigation, brass wire and CuZn50 coated copper wire are used and 10% to 30% of volume fraction of SiC reinforcement is used for the preparation of AMMC. Based on the results, the cutting rate is found to be greater in the case of coated wire as compared to the plain brass wire while kerf width is found to be smaller for coated wire. Sathish Kumar et al. [8] have investigated the effect of WEDM on Al6063 reinforced with various percentages of SiC by considering various control parameters such as pulse on time, pulse off time, gap voltage and wire feed on metal removal rate (MRR) and Ra. L9 OA is used to carry out the experiments and it is observed that the increase in the volume % of SiC resulted in decreased MRR and increased Ra. Dey et al. [9] have studied the effect of machining parameters like pulse on time, pulse off time and wire speed on various wt% of fly ash reinforced with AMMC. The experimental result reveals that pulse on time and percentage of reinforcement are the most significant factors that affect all the three responses, namely cutting speed, kerf width and Ra. Lal et al. [10] have conducted the experiments with an Al7075/Al2O3/SiC hybrid composite through WEDM to determine the effect of process parameters, namely pulse on time, pulse off time, wire drum speed and pulse current. The experiments are carried out with L27 OA on hybrid MMC and the composite is prepared by means of the inert gas-assisted electromagnetic stir casting process. Taguchi-based grey relational analysis (GRA) is used to optimize multiple performance characteristics of hybrid MMC for Ra and kerf width. It is found that pulse on time is the major contributing factor while machining the hybrid composite. It is evident from the above literature survey that researchers have conducted machinability studies on AMMCs through WEDM, and data related to optimization of the process parameters on MR, Ra and surface topography is sparse. In the present research, AMMCs are fabricated by using an Al6061 alloy reinforced with various wt% of Al2O3 such as 6% and 8% through the stir
casting process and cutting into suitable size for machining in WEDM. Furthermore, various WEDM parameters and levels are identified through the preliminary machining process and experiments on L18-mixed OA are conducted to study the output responses. Optimization of process parameters is essential for commercialization of the WEDM process, hence multi-objective optimization techniques such as TOPSIS are used. Additionally, the most significant process parameter that affects the machining is identified using ANOVA.

2. Experimental setup

The composite materials used in the present study consist of Al6061 as the matrix material alloy, reinforced with various wt % of Al2O3 (6 and 8) prepared through the stir casting technique. Table 1 provides the details of chemical composition of the Al6061 alloy.

Table 1
Percentage of chemical composition of Al6061

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Al</th>
<th>Cr</th>
<th>Cu</th>
<th>Fe</th>
<th>Mg</th>
<th>Mn</th>
<th>Si</th>
<th>Ti</th>
<th>Zn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The prepared AMMC specimens are subjected to machining through WEDM. The dimensions of the workpiece considered for the machining are 100x100x10 mm. A brass wire is used as the tool electrode material. The experiments are conducted by considering the input parameters such as gap voltage (Vg), peak current (IP) wire tension (WT) and dielectric pressure (Pd). Details of the experimental setup of WEDM are presented in Table 2.

The performance measure MR is evaluated based on the time taken for the completion of a rectangular slot for each parameter combination. Surface roughness is observed using a surface roughness meter. The levels of process parameters considered are given in Table 3. These levels are identified based on preliminary experiments.

Table 3
Parameters and levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>Notations</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Wt % of reinforcement</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Gap voltage</td>
<td>Vg</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Peak current</td>
<td>IP</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Wire tension</td>
<td>WT</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Dielectric pressure</td>
<td>Pd</td>
<td>Bar</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The L18-mixed OA is determined based on the number of parameters and levels. In this experiment, 5 parameters are included with 1 parameter at 2 levels and the remaining 3 parameters at 3 levels; hence L18-mixed OA is constructed and presented in Table 4. Figure 1 shows the photograph of the machined WEDM work piece.
3. Results and discussion

The TOPSIS method proves useful for determining the best alternative from among the different alternatives available. The step-by-step procedure for the TOPSIS method is presented in [11–13].

1. Construct the decision matrix consisting of m alternatives and n criteria,

\[
\text{Decision Matrix} = \begin{bmatrix}
    x_{11} & x_{12} & \cdots & x_{1n} \\
    x_{21} & x_{22} & \cdots & x_{2n} \\
    \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
    x_{m1} & x_{m2} & \cdots & x_{mn}
\end{bmatrix}. \tag{1}
\]

2. Calculate the normalized decision matrix, where the normalized value \( n_{ij} \) is calculated as follows:

\[
n_{ij} = \frac{x_{ij}}{\sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^{m} x_{ij}^2}}. \tag{2}
\]

\( j = 1, 2, 3, \ldots, m, i = 1, 2, 3, \ldots n. \)

3. Calculate the weighted normalized decision matrix, which could be determined as:

\[
P_{ij} = W_i n_{ij} \tag{3}
\]

\( j = 1, 2, 3, \ldots, m, i = 1, 2, 3, \ldots n. \)

4. Obtain positive-ideal and negative-ideal solutions from the following expressions:

\[
V^+ = (p_1^+, p_2^+, \ldots, p_n^+) \text{ for max values} \tag{4}
\]

\[
V^- = (p_1^-, p_2^-, \ldots, p_n^-) \text{ for min values}. \tag{5}
\]

5. Obtain separation measures by using the following expression:

\[
d_j^+ = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{n} (p_{ij} - p_i^+)^2} \tag{6}
\]

\[
d_j^- = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{n} (p_{ij} - p_i^-)^2} \tag{7}
\]

\( j = 1, 2, \ldots, m. \)

6. Calculate the relative closeness coefficient by using the following equation:

\[
CC_i = \frac{d_i^-}{d_i^+ + d_i^-}. \tag{8}
\]

7. The CC values are arranged in the descending order for finding the most and the least preferred values.

The best alternative is determined from 18 alternatives and based on the attributes, the decision matrix is evaluated. The normalized decision matrix is formed by using the above TOPSIS procedures. From the normalized decision matrix, the weighted normalized decision matrix is calculated by considering the

---

### Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exp. No.</th>
<th>Wt% of reinforcement</th>
<th>( V_0 ) (v)</th>
<th>IP (A)</th>
<th>WT (g)</th>
<th>( P_d ) (Bar)</th>
<th>MR mm/min</th>
<th>Surface roughness (R_a) ( \mu m )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>3.118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>3.689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>3.680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>3.292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>3.470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>3.475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>3.305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>3.432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>3.320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>3.128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>3.629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>3.586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.270</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
equal weightage for both the attributes. The positive-ideal and negative-ideal solutions as found from the weighted normalized decision matrix are 0.1712, 0.1063, 0.0799 and 0.1259, respectively. Separation measures of each alternative are determined using equations (6) and (7). Further, the relative closeness of a particular alternative was determined by using equation (8). The highest closeness coefficient is ranked as number 1 and from these values, it is evident that alternative 3 is the best choice for higher MR and surface quality. Based on the closeness coefficient calculated, the 12th experiment is identified to be the second best parameter combination and the 15th experiment is the third best alternative for the output responses. The optimum combination of WEDM process parameters for MR and $R_a$ is $W_t\% = 6\text{gm}$, $V_g = 53$, $I_p = 8$, $WT = 11$ and $P_d = 13$ bar. The MR and $R_a$ for the optimum combination parameter levels are found to be 1.5 mm/min and 3.648 $\mu$m.

### 4. Result of ANOVA

The preference values obtained from the TOPSIS method are statistically analyzed by ANOVA to investigate the effects of process parameters on the output response. The most significant parameter that affects the performance characteristics is analyzed using the F-test [14]. Based on results of ANOVA in Table 6, the estimated F-values show that the peak current is the most significant factor that influences MR and surface roughness with the contribution of 47.23%. The next influencing factor that affects the machining process is gap voltage, whose contribution stands at 23.26%. The peak current plays a vital role for generation of the high energy spark required for melting and evaporation of workpiece material. Hence it is clear that proper control of electrical parameters yields the best result in the WEDM of AMMC.

#### 4.1. Effect of process parameters on MR and surface roughness

Figure 2 shows the mean effect plot for MR and $R_a$. It is evident that the lower level of weight percentage reinforcement shows higher MR and surface quality. Output performance increases with the decrease in the wt % of reinforcement. At

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expt No.</th>
<th>Normalized data</th>
<th>Weighted normalized data</th>
<th>Separation measures</th>
<th>Closeness coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MR</td>
<td>$R_a$</td>
<td>MR</td>
<td>$R_a$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2282</td>
<td>0.2386</td>
<td>0.1141</td>
<td>0.1193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2282</td>
<td>0.2519</td>
<td>0.1141</td>
<td>0.1259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.3423</td>
<td>0.2487</td>
<td>0.1712</td>
<td>0.1243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.1826</td>
<td>0.2125</td>
<td>0.0913</td>
<td>0.1063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.2739</td>
<td>0.2515</td>
<td>0.1369</td>
<td>0.1257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.2739</td>
<td>0.2509</td>
<td>0.1369</td>
<td>0.1254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.2282</td>
<td>0.2244</td>
<td>0.1141</td>
<td>0.1122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.1826</td>
<td>0.2244</td>
<td>0.0913</td>
<td>0.1122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.2282</td>
<td>0.2469</td>
<td>0.1141</td>
<td>0.1235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.1826</td>
<td>0.2365</td>
<td>0.0913</td>
<td>0.1183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.2739</td>
<td>0.2369</td>
<td>0.1369</td>
<td>0.1184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.2967</td>
<td>0.2253</td>
<td>0.1483</td>
<td>0.1126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.2739</td>
<td>0.2312</td>
<td>0.1369</td>
<td>0.1066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.1826</td>
<td>0.2430</td>
<td>0.0913</td>
<td>0.1170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.2739</td>
<td>0.2474</td>
<td>0.0799</td>
<td>0.1237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.1826</td>
<td>0.2445</td>
<td>0.0913</td>
<td>0.1222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.2282</td>
<td>0.2226</td>
<td>0.1141</td>
<td>0.1113</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Machining parameter</th>
<th>DOF</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>% of contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wt % of Reinforcement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.03544</td>
<td>0.03544</td>
<td>1.9018</td>
<td>3.8406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$V_g$</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.21472</td>
<td>0.10736</td>
<td>5.7612</td>
<td>23.2685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.43584</td>
<td>0.21792</td>
<td>11.6944</td>
<td>47.2314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WT</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.02839</td>
<td>0.01420</td>
<td>0.7617</td>
<td>3.0766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P_d$</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.02204</td>
<td>0.01102</td>
<td>0.2031</td>
<td>2.3889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.18630</td>
<td>0.01864</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>20.1941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.92270</td>
<td>0.40460</td>
<td>20.3222</td>
<td>100.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
lower wt% of reinforcement, the distribution of reinforcement in AMMC is sporadically placed all over the matrix, and hence the melting and evaporation of AMMC is faster than the one that occurs in the Al alloy. With the increase in the wt% of reinforcement, the presence of reinforcement reduces the conductivity of AMMC. This effect reduces the efficiency of spark generation and results in improper MR. Moreover, the presence of a non-conductivity zone leads to partial melting and evaporation of material, leading to recasting and delamination of layers. MR and surface quality are higher at lower gap voltage and increase further if gap voltage affects the output performance. The peak current shows significant influence on the response. Hence optimum selection of the electrical parameter level contributes to higher MR and surface quality. Output performance increases and decreases with wire tension. The reinforcement particle in the Al matrix during machining would exist in two states, partially melted and completely melted. The increase in wire tension contributes to the removal of completely melted material. The melting and evaporation of material depend prominently on the current and voltage, hence wire tension is considered to be a less significant factor. It is evident from Fig. 2 that the increase in dielectric pressure reduces the output performance, as it disturbs plasma generation in the machining zone.

4.2. Surface topography of the machined surface. Figure 3 shows the image of a machined slot, and the WEDMed surface is examined for its characteristics such as the micro-ridges, presence of reinforcement, micro-craters, micro-cracks, recast layers and oxide layers. The SEM images are taken at three different regions of the machined slot, namely the top region, middle region and bottom region for the optimum parameter combination.

Figure 4 depicts the surface topography of the top region of the rectangular slot for parameter combination of 6% wt of reinforcement, 53 V of gap voltage, peak current 4 A, dielectric pressure of 11 bar and wire tension of 9 g. The SEM images clearly show the generation of micro-ridges and formation of recast layers in AMMC. The pattern of forming micro-ridges is uniform towards one direction, as presented in Fig. 4. It is due to the fact that the generation of spark in a particular direction along with the plasma pressure creates the specified flow pattern of molten metal. Moreover, the cutting direction of the wire contributes to the generation of a similar type of micro-ridges, as shown in Fig. 5. The $R_a$ value at this region is found to be at 3.5 µm and the uniform distribution of re-casted layers results in more peaks while valleys result in more $R_a$ value.
sure of 13 bar and wire tension of 11 g. The machining speed is found to be 1.5 mm/min, and also from the SEM images more micro-craters are observed, shown in Fig. 11. This can be attributed to the bulk removing of reinforcement. The reinforcement bonding in the aluminum matrix gets loosened due to heating and the bulk removal of reinforcement contributes
to more micro-craters and higher machining speed. Moreover, the sizes of the micro-craters are in the range of 80 to 120 µm. The optimum combination for better machining rate and surface roughness is found to be 6% weight of reinforcement, 53 V of gap voltage, peak current of 8 A, dielectric pressure of 13 bar and wire tension of 11 g. The machining speed is found to be 1.5 mm/min, and also from the SEM images more micro-crac- ters are observed, shown in Fig. 11. This can be attributed to the bulk removing of reinforcement. The reinforcement bonding in the aluminum matrix gets loosened due to heating and the bulk removal of reinforcement contributes to more micro-craters and higher machining speed. Moreover, the sizes of the micro-cra - ters are in the range of 80 to 120 µm.

In AMMC, the presence of micro-cracks is noticed mainly in the region of agglomeration of reinforcement. It is evident from Fig. 12 that the micro-cracks are initiated at the particle-matrix interfaces [15]. The SEM images clearly depict the presence of cracks near the alumina-reinforced region. The SEM micrographs presented are taken from the middle region of the slot machined for optimum combinations of process parameters. Researchers have reported that the major reason for micro-crack initiation is debonding at the reinforcement-matrix interface [16]. The length of the crack on the WEDMed surface is found to be in the range of 100–300 µm. Recast layers are nothing but the deposition of partially molten metal on the machining zone, which is not completely evaporated during sparking. The presence of recast layers on the WEDMed surface is predominately noticed in the SEM micrograph shown in Fig. 13. The generation of recast layers depends mainly on the spark energy; hence proper control of electrical parameters lowers the recast layer in the WEDM process. The gas bubbles are noticed in certain regions where reinforcement is predominantly present, as shown in Fig. 14. This is due to the fact that during the addition of alumina particles into AMMC air enters the materials along with the reinforcement. This entrapped air is released during the WEDM process and it creates the micro-void on the surfaces. Hence proper control of weight percentage and size of reinforce- ment have a significant effect on the generation of micro-voids.

Fig. 12. Machined surface with micro cracks

Fig. 13. Machined surface with recast layers
Figures 15a and 15b show the EDAX (energy dispersive X-ray) image of 6% Al₂O₃ AMMC for both the conditions, i.e. before and after machining. It is evident from Table 7 and Table 8 that there is a significant change in the percentage of oxide. The presence of oxide before machining is found to be 20.36% before machining and then it increases to 22.77% after machining. Moreover, on comparing Fig. 16a and Fig. 16b, the presence of oxide after machining for 8% is found to be 39.82%, which shows an increase of approximately 17% in oxide formation.

Table 7
Output of EDAX analysis – before machining (6% Al₂O₃)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EL</th>
<th>AN</th>
<th>Series</th>
<th>Unn. C (wt.%)</th>
<th>Norm. C (wt.%)</th>
<th>Atom. C (at%)</th>
<th>Error (1 Sigma (wt. %))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Al</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>K-Series</td>
<td>52.43</td>
<td>74.03</td>
<td>66.05</td>
<td>2.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>K-Series</td>
<td>14.42</td>
<td>20.36</td>
<td>30.63</td>
<td>2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>K-Series</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cu</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>K-Series</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Si</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>K-Series</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mg</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>K-Series</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mn</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>K-Series</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cr</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>K-Series</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70.82</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8
Output of EDAX analysis – after machining (6% Al₂O₃)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EL</th>
<th>AN</th>
<th>Series</th>
<th>Unn. C (wt.%)</th>
<th>Norm. C (wt.%)</th>
<th>Atom. C (at%)</th>
<th>Error (1 Sigma (wt. %))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AL</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>K-Series</td>
<td>43.60</td>
<td>69.18</td>
<td>61.89</td>
<td>2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>K-Series</td>
<td>14.35</td>
<td>22.77</td>
<td>34.35</td>
<td>2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zn</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>K-Series</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>K-Series</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Si</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>K-Series</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>63.03</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AMMCs with 6% and 8% weight fraction of Al₂O₃ are prepared through the stir casting process. They are machined using various process parameters such as wt% of reinforcement, gap voltage (Vg), peak current (IP) wire tension (WT) and dielectric pressure (Pd). Based on the TOPSIS analysis, the optimum combination for better MR and Ra is wt% = 6 gm, Vg = 53, Ip = 8, WT = 11 and Pd = 13 bar. ANOVA shows that the peak current has a significant influence on MR and Ra. The percentage of contribution of peak current is found to be 47.23. The next influencing factor that affects the machining process is gap voltage, whose contribution is 23.26%. The wire tension is considered a less significant factor.

The EDAX images for 6% and 8% of Al₂O₃ AMMC before and after machining show a significant increase in oxide formation. SEM micrographs confirm the presence of micro-ridges, reinforcement, micro-craters, micro-cracks and the recast layers on machined surface for an optimum experimental condition. The size of the micro-craters on the machined surface is in the range of 80 to 120 µm and the length of the crack is found to be in the range of 100–300 µm.

### 5. Conclusions

AMMCs with 6% and 8% weight fraction of Al₂O₃ are prepared through the stir casting process. They are machined using various process parameters such as wt% of reinforcement, gap voltage (Vg), peak current (IP) wire tension (WT) and dielectric pressure (Pd). Based on the TOPSIS analysis, the optimum combination for better MR and Ra is wt% = 6 gm, Vg = 53, Ip = 8, WT = 11 and Pd = 13 bar. ANOVA shows that the peak current has a significant influence on MR and Ra. The percentage of contribution of peak current is found to be 47.23. The next influencing factor that affects the machining process is gap voltage, whose contribution is 23.26%. The wire tension is considered a less significant factor.

The EDAX images for 6% and 8% of Al₂O₃ AMMC before and after machining show a significant increase in oxide formation. SEM micrographs confirm the presence of micro-ridges, reinforcement, micro-craters, micro-cracks and the recast layers on machined surface for an optimum experimental condition. The size of the micro-craters on the machined surface is in the range of 80 to 120 µm and the length of the crack is found to be in the range of 100–300 µm.
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