

**CHARACTERIZATION OF WELD DEFECTS IN
SINGLE V-BUTT WELDED MILD STEEL
PLATES USING ULTRASONIC A-SCAN
TECHNIQUE**



 University of Moratuwa, Sri Lanka.
Dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
MASTER OF PHILOSOPHY
IN
MATERIALS SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING

T.M.R. TENNAKOON

B.SC (PHYSICS SPECIAL), M.SC (NUCLEAR SCIENCE.)

DEPARTMENT OF MATERIALS SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING

UNIVERSITY OF MORATUWA

SRI LANKA

March 2010

DECLARATION

I hereby declare that this dissertation is my own work and that, to the best of my knowledge and behalf, it contains no material previously published or written by another person nor material which, to substantial extent, has been accepted for the award of any other academic qualification of a university or other institute of higher learning except where an acknowledgement is made in the text.

Authors name; **T.M.R. Tennakoon**

Date; 01.03.2010

Signature ; -----

This is to certify that this dissertation is based on the work carried-out by Mr.T.M.R.Tennakoon under my supervision. This dissertation has been prepared according to the format stipulated and is of acceptable standard.

Certified by; **Dr.R.G.N.De.S.Munasinghe (Supervisor)**

Department of Materials Science and Engineering

Faculty of Engineering

University of Moratuwa.

Sri Lanka.

Signature -----

Date-----

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I gratefully acknowledge Dr. R. G. N. De. S. Munasinghe, Senior Lecturer and my Supervisor for his enthusiastic guidance and encouragement in my research. My special thanks are due to his superior knowledge about the subject. His contribution to this thesis is many-folded, thus inseparable and mainly responsible for its successful conclusion.

I wish to express my deepest gratitude to Dr. S. U. Adikari, Head of Materials Science and Engineering Department for his inspired guidance and suggestions, proposals and advice in successfully completing this research.

I am deeply grateful to Prof. M. P. Dias, Prof. R. Hewamanna, Prof. B. M. A. O. Perera, Dr W. Abeyewickreme - former Chairmen of the Atomic Energy Authority for their guidance, support, and advice with superior knowledge and allowing me to use equipments and receive other benefits via Atomic Energy Authority (AEA).

I thank all the staff members of the AEA and Materials Science and Engineering Department who greatly supported me by providing all necessary facilities such as equipment, computers, stationeries etc. through out my whole research.

I should appreciate specially my colleagues of the AEA for their good support and encouragement provided to me to complete the research successfully.

My deepest gratitude to my wife and two sons for their support, understanding and encouragement that they have provided to complete this degree successfully.

T.M.R. Tennakoon.

Abstract

In Ultrasonic A-Scan technique the depth and the size of the defects in a material can be determined by the position and amplitude of the reflected echo on the CRT screen. However the main difficulty in ultrasonic testing is that the precise recognition of the defect type.

In conventional ultrasonic A-scan methods recognition of the defect type (porosity, slag, crack etc.) is ascertained by a series of movement of the probe as rotational, orbital, lateral and transverse to observe the echo pattern. Here the human eye perceives many facts simultaneously by moving a transducer in infinite increments in 3D to seek out additional information-the mind sorts and processes the accumulated real-time facts and combines them with empirical data from experience and case history before making final decision on the defect. These ultrasonic echo patterns are quite complex since those may contain many signals other than defect echoes, same defect may display different echo patterns, different defects may display similar echo patterns and the amplitude and shape of the signal may change due to slight movement of the testing probe.

Therefore the interpretation of defects using this technique is very complicated and totally depends on the experience of the operator who carries out the testing. Hence only well-experienced NDT personnel can identify defect type using this method. This is one of the main drawbacks related to Ultrasonic A-scan technique.

The objective of this research is to study the relationship between type of defect and echo amplitude in single-V butt welded steel plates and to propose a new concept to identify defect type with the help of a self developed software which will be cheap, portable and simple to understand by the operator.

To achieve this objective initially a mathematical relationship between echo amplitude and defect type was developed for common weld defects in single-V butt welded steel plates (slag, porosity, crack etc.) using newly derived mathematical equations for above defects.

Since the amplitude of the echo signal affects by the defect size this parameter alone can not be used to identify the type of defect. As such the possibilities of using few other features such as width of defect echo, position of defect and change of probe angle also were considered.

Experimental results show that any individual defect in single-V butt welded mild steel plates produces echo signals with unique pulse width and range of amplitude levels. In addition the results show that lack of penetration can be identified using a second probe angle in addition to single probe angle as use in conventional methods. Lack of side-wall fusion can be identified by using position of probe with respect to weld center line.

These individual characters of defects, which are inherent to those defects, were used to predict the type of unknown defects using a self developed software programme named “ULTRASL1”.

The significance of this work is that the introduction of a specialized procedure with a software programme to identify type of defect, so that Non-Destructive Testing personnel with any level of experience can share the expertise of the best operators in the industry. Hence it will support to reduce one of the main problems concerning ultrasonic testing i.e. the difficulties in recognition of defect type.

The work was limited for defects like slag(volumetric), isolated pore, porosity, lack of inter-run fusion, lack of side-wall fusion, crack and lack of penetration in single-V butt welded mild steel plates.

List of Tables

	PAGE
Table 1: Modelling of natural flaws in single-V butt welded plates	39
Table 2: Type of defects created artificially	74
Table 3: Echo amplitudes for different couplant thicknesses.	75
Table 4: Roughness of surfaces of test samples	77
Table 5: Variation of echo amplitude with defect depth and Probe angle for equipment USK7B and USK 7	78
Table 6: Average amplitudes for different depths and probe angles	79
Table 7: Echo amplitudes from defects containing air and Welding slag	80
Table 8: Flaw echo amplitude with and without welding slag	81
Table 9: Echo amplitude for different diameters-Test 1	82
Table 10: Echo amplitude for different diameters-Test 2	83
Table 11: Echo amplitude for different diameters-Normal beam probe	84
Table 12: Echo height with respect to each probe angle-artificial blocks	85
Table 13: Echo height with respect to each probe angle –natural defects	86
Table 14: Set of data obtained from defects in fabricated welded specimens	89
Table 15: Set of data obtained from defects in welded specimens in-situ	91
Table 16: Comparison of test results-Laboratory testing	97
Table 17: Comparison of test results- Measurements taken in-situ	98
Table 18: Set of data obtained from defects in fabricated welded Specimens using Digital Ultrasonic Flaw Detector.	103
Table 19: Comparison of data obtained using Digital Flaw Detector and Analogue Flaw Detector	104
Table 20: A summary of the results of the entire experiment	111

List of Figures

	PAGE
Figure 1: Ultrasonic A-scan presentation	03
Figure 2: Echo patterns of various defects	07
Figure 3: Classification of defects based on the pulse echo technique	09
Figure 4: Flow chart to determine the type of defect as per JIS Z 3060	10
Figure5: Graphical correlation between defect type,echo amplitude and angle of probe	13
Figure6: Sound pressure from an ultrasonic probe	17
Figure7: Reflection of ultrasound from a spherical reflector	20
Figure8: Variation of defect echo amplitude with beam path distance	24
Figure9: Reflection and transmission at air-steel interface	26
Figure10: Transmission of sound waves in to steel through a couplant	29
Figure11: Reflection of ultrasound at steel – air interface	28
Figure12: Reflection of ultrasound at steel – slag interface	29
Figure13: An enlarged profile of surface finishes	30
Figure14: Measurement of Roughness average	31
Figure15: Effects of surface roughness on echo amplitude	31
Figure16: Reflection of ultrasound at a defect surface	34
Figure17: Portion of sound pressure received by the probe	35
Figure18: Different probe positions to obtain maximum echo	35
Figure19: Comparison of amplitude values of common defects	40
Figure20: Width of an echo signal from a defect	41
Figure21: Echo signal from back wall or flat circular reflector	42
Figure22: Echo signal from isolated porosity	43
Figure23: Echo signal from a slag	44
Figure24: Position of the probe with respect to the weld center line	45
Figure25: Reflection, refraction and mode conversion	48
Figure26: Sound pressure of reflected waves vs. angle of incidence	48
Figure27: Reflected and transmitted sound pressure at an interface	49
Figure28: Reflection of shear waves at a right angled corner by a 70° probe.	49
Figure29: Reflection of shear waves at a right-angled corner by 45 ⁰ and 60 ⁰ angle probes.	50
Figure30: Comparison of percentages of echo amplitude from probe angles 45 ⁰ , 60 ⁰ and 70 ⁰	51
Figure31: Schematic Diagram of an Ultrasonic Flaw Detector	53
Figure32: Cross section of typical contact transducer	54
Figure33: Cross section of an angle beam probe	56
Figure34: Possible defects in single-V butt welded plates	61
Figure35: Defects considered in the research work	61
Figure36: Plate to plate butt joint and pipe to pipe butt joint	62

Figure37:	Measurement of echo amplitude vs. thickness of couplant	64
Figure38:	Measurements of echo amplitudes with respect to 20% DAC	65
Figure.39	Variation of echo amplitude with defect area	67
Figure40:	Mild steel stepped test block	68
Figure41:	15 mm thick single-V butt steel plate	68
Figure42:	Echo amplitudes for probe angles 46° , 61° and 73°	62
Figure43:	Variation of echo amplitude with couplant thickness- 45°	76
Figure44:	Variation of echo amplitude with couplant thickness- 60°	77
Figure45:	Variation of echo amplitude with couplant thickness- 70°	78
Figure46:	Graph of depth of hole vs. echo amplitude	79
Figure47:	Echo amplitudes from defects containing air and slag	80
Figure48:	Correlation graph of amplitude with and without welding slag.	81
Figure49:	Graph of echo amplitude verses diameter-Test 1	82
Figure50:	Graph of echo amplitude verses diameter-Test 2	83
Figure51:	Graph of echo amplitude verses diameter- Normal beam probe	84
Figure52:	Correlation graph between experimental and theoretical values of stand-off distances	87
Figure53:	Radiographic Testing Technique	93
Figure54:	A radiograph of the fabricated test specimen-T1	94
Figure55:	Experimental set up of an ultrasonic test	100
Figure56:	Measurement of defect parameters	100
Figure57:	Echo Pattern of a Slag Inclusion	101
Figure58:	Echo Pattern of a Crack	101
Figure59:	Echo Pattern of a Lack of Penetration	102
Figure60:	Echo Pattern of an Isolated Pore	102
Figure61:	Echo Pattern of a Lack of Fusion	103
Figure62:	Correlation graph between data obtained using Digital Flaw Detector and Analogue Flaw Detector	104
Figure63:	Comparison of theoretical and experimental echo heights	109
Figure64:	Identification of lack of fusion in double-V butt plates	120
Figure65:	Identification of lack of penetration in double-V butt plates	121
Figure66:	Reflection of shear waves at the inside surface of a curved specimen	122
Figure67:	Skip distances multiplying factor ' f_p ' for curved surfaces	123
Figure68:	Beam path multiplying factor ' f_s ' for curved surfaces	123

Abbreviations

NDT -Non Destructive Testing

UT -Ultrasonic Testing

RT -Radiographic Testing

MT -Magnetic Particle Testing

PT -Liquid Penetrant Testing

ET -Eddy Current Testing

CRT -Cathode Ray Tube



University of Moratuwa, Sri Lanka.
Electronic Theses & Dissertations
www.lib.mrt.ac.lk

LIST OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
Declaration	ii
Acknowledgement	iii
Abstract	iv
List of Tables	vi
List of Figures	vii
Abbreviations	ix
1.0 Introduction	
1.1 Background	
1.1.1 Non-Destructive testing of materials	1
1.1.2 Ultrasonic testing of materials	2
1.1.3 Advantages and limitations of UT	3
1.2 Objectives of the research	5
1.3 Methodology	5
2.0 Literature Review	
2.1 Conventional method of defect identification	6
2.2 Recent development of defect identification methods	8
2.3 Recognition of defect type using echo height	12
3.0 Theoretical Basis	
3.1 Sound pressure at a finite distance from a probe	14
3.2 Sound pressure received by the probe from a reflector	18
3.3 Factors which influence the received sound pressure	25
3.3.1 Effect of couplant type and thickness on received sound pressure	26
3.3.2 Effect of impurities within the defect on received sound pressure	28
3.3.3 Effect of roughness of the test surface on received sound pressure	30
3.3.4 Effect of probe parameters on received sound Pressure	32
3.3.4.1 Probe angle	32
3.3.4.2 Frequency of wave	32
3.3.4.3 Size of probe	32
3.3.5 Effect of defect orientation on received sound pressure	34
3.3.6 Effect of roughness of defect surface on received sound pressure	36
3.3.7 Affect of depth of defect on received sound Pressure	37
3.3.8 Affect of defect area on received sound Pressure	37

	PAGE	
3.4	Acoustic energy equations of spherical, cylindrical and flat circular reflectors	38
3.5	Comparison of echo amplitudes from defects in single-V butt welded plates	39
3.6	Relationship of defect type to width of echo signal	40
3.6.1	Back wall or flat circular reflector	42
3.6.2	Crack and lack of sidewall fusion	42
3.6.3	Isolated pore and porosity	43
3.6.4	Slag	43
3.7	Relationship of defect type to its position	44
3.7.1	Identification of lack of sidewall fusion	44
3.7.2	Identification of defects in weld root	47
3.8	Usage of different probe angles to identify defect type	47
4.0	Equipment and Accessories used	
4.1	Ultrasonic Flaw Detector	52
4.2	Ultrasonic Probe	53
4.2.1	Contact Transducers	55
4.2.2	Dual Element Transducers	55
4.2.3	Angle Beam Transducers	55
5.0	Research Methodology	
5.1	Fabrication of test specimens	57
5.2	Effect of couplant thickness on defect echo amplitude	63
5.3	Effect of test surface roughness on defect echo amplitude	64
5.4	Effect of depth of defect on echo amplitude	65
5.5	Effect of impurities within the defect on echo amplitude	66
5.6	Effect of defect area on echo amplitude	66
5.7	Identification of lack of penetration by change of probe angle.	67
5.8	Identification of lack of sidewall fusion	70
5.9	Development of a relationship between defect type, echo amplitude, echo width, defect position and probe angle	70
5.9.1	Experimental Procedure	71
5.9.2	Development of a Computer Programme	73
6.0	Results	
6.1	Fabrication of test specimens	74
6.2	Effect of couplant thickness on defect echo amplitude	75
6.3	Effect of test surface roughness on defect echo amplitude	77
6.4	Effect of depth of defect on echo amplitude	78
6.5	Effect of impurities within the defect on echo amplitude	79
6.6	Effect of defect area on echo amplitude	82

	PAGE	
6.7	Identification of lack of penetration by change of probe angle.	85
6.8	Identification of lack of sidewall fusion	87
6.9	Development of a relationship between defect type, echo amplitude, echo width, defect position and Probe angle	88
6.9.1	Set of data obtained from identified defects in fabricated welded specimens	88
6.9.2	Set of data obtained from defects in-situ	90
6.10	Verification of test results	
6.10.1	Verification of results by RT	92
6.10.2	Verification of results by conventional methods	94
6.10.3	Comparison of test results	96
6.10.4	Set of data obtained using Digital Ultrasonic Flaw Detector	99
7.0	Discussion	
7.1	Fabrication of test specimens	106
7.2	Effect of couplant thickness on defect echo amplitude	106
7.3	Effect of test surface roughness on defect echo amplitude	107
7.4	Effect of depth of defect on echo amplitude	108
7.5	Effect of impurities within the defect on echo amplitude	108
7.6	Effect of defect area on echo amplitude	108
7.7	Identification of lack of penetration by change of probe angle.	109
7.8	Identification of lack of sidewall fusion	110
7.9	Development of a relationship between defect type, echo amplitude, echo width, defect position and probe angle	117
8.0	Conclusions	110
9.0	Constrains	119
10.0	Future work	121
11.0	References	125
12.0	Annexure 1 (Computer programme)	130
12.1	Input and output data module	
12.2	Flow chart of the computer programme	
12.3	Software of the computer programme	