Global Jour. of Engg. & Tech. Volume. 1, Number 3 (2008) 329-335

APPLICATION OF NEURO - FUZZY TO COMPONENT ELEMENTS OF A GRINDING WHEEL

A.O. ODIOR

Department of Production Engineering, University of Benin, Nigeria,

and F. A. OYAWALE

Department of Industrial and Production Engineering, University of Dadan, Nigeria.

Abstract : The grinding wheel is made of very small, sharp and hard silicon carbide abrasive particles or grits held together by strong porous bond. These silicon carbide abrasive particles are hard crystalline materials which are held together by the strong, porous bond and these abrasive materials which are of extreme hardness are used to shape other materials by a grinding or abrading action. The paper presents, an analysis of the various component elements of a typical grinding wheel using neuro Tuzzy technique. Among these component elements we have, the size of the grains and its spacing, volumetric proportion of grains, volumetric proportion of bonding material and volumetric proportion of pores. However, the work is new as it appears to be the first application of neuro - fuzzy to component elements of a grinding wheel.

Introduction

A grinding wheel is an expendable wheel that carries an abrasive compound on its periphery. They are made of small, sharp and very hard natural or synthetic abrasive minerals, bonded together in a matrix to form a wheel. Grinding wheels are available in a wide variety of sizes, ranging from less than 0.63 centimeter to several meters in diameter. They are also available in numerous shapes like flat disks, cylinders, cups, cones, and wheels with a profile cut into the periphery (Malkin and Ritter, 1989). The grinding wheel is made of very small, sharp and hard silicon carbide abrasive particles or grits held together by strong porous bond and during grinding, a small tiny chip is cut by each of these active grains that comes in contact with the work piece as the grinding wheel whirls past it (Odior, 2002). Those grains at the surface of the wheel that actually perform the cutting operation are called the active grains. As a result of the irregular shapes of the grains, there is considerable interference between each active grain and the new work surface and each active grain actually acts as a single point cutting tool. (Li, et. al., 2005, Theodore, 2002).

Keywords : Silicon Carbide Abrasive, Grinding Wheel, Porous Bond, Neuro - Fuzzy.

Grinding is one of the most versatile methods of removing material from machine parts by the cutting action of the countless hard and sharp abrasive particles of a revolving grinding wheel to provide precise geometry. Grinding or abrasive machining therefore, refers to processes for removing material in the forn of small chips by the mechanical action of irregularly shaped abrasive grains that are held in place by a bonding material on a moving wheel or abrasive belt. (Diniz et al, 2000). A wheel consisting of relatively tough abrasive grains strongly bonded together will only exhibit self sharpening characteristic to a small degree and will quickly develop a glazed appearance during grinding. This glazed appearance is caused by the relatively large worn areas that develop on the active grains and these worn areas result in excessive friction and the overheating of the work piece. It is therefore necessary to dress the grinding wheel at frequent intervals by passing a diamond-tipped dressing tool across the wheel surface while the wheel rotates.(Radford, et al. 1978).

A grinding wheel is therefore a complex cutting tool since it is characterized by a number of design parameters and variables which include: the size of the grains and its spacing, volumetric proportion of grains, volumetric proportion of bonding material and volumetric proportion of pores. As a result of the complexity in analyzing the component elements of grinding wheel, a neuro fuzzy approach was adopted for our analysis. A neuro - fuzzy model combines the fuzzy - logic and neural network principles to generate model that will result in the evaluation of specified desired output. While fuzzy logic performs an inference mechanism under cognitive uncertainty (Zadeh, 1988), computational neural networks offer exciting advantages, such as learning, adaptation, fault-tolerance, parallelism and generalization (Wasserman, 1989). To enable a system to deal with cognitive uncertainties in a manner more like humans, we incorporate the concept of fuzzy logic into neural networks to evaluate the performance characteristics of a grinding wheel and the resulting hybrid system is called fuzzy neural, neural fuzzy, neurofuzzy or fuzzy-neuro network.

The Structural Composition of a Grinding Wheel

A grinding wheel consists of abrasive grains (A, G), the bonding material (B, M), and the pore (P).

A grinding wheel consists of abrasive grains (A, G), the bonding material (B, M), and the pore (P₂). Therefore the structure of a grinding wheel is the relationship of the abrasive grain to the bonding material and the relationship of these two elements to the spaces or voids that separate them. A grinding wheel consists of abrasive grains (A, G), the bonding material (B, M_{i}) . and the pore (P_).

A grinding wheel is made with the proportions of three major components (Malkin and Ritter, 1989) as follows :

 $G_w = P_g + P_b + P_p = 1.0$ Where $P_g = volumetric proportion of grains;$

 $P_{\rm b}$ = volumetric proportion of bonding material;

and P_n = volumetric proportion of pores.

So, $G_w^p = P_g + P_b + P_p$, and $P_g + P_b + P_p = 1.0$. A neural network is now used for a typical grinding wheel as follows,

 $P_i W_i > 0$ or $\sum P_i W_i \le 0$

where W = weight, i = g, b, p and N = 1 to 3. The model gives the following two different types of outputs: (1) output #1 = 1 if W P + W P + W P > 0 (2) output #2 = 0 if W P + W P + W P + W P = 0 Therefore; for W P + W P + W P = 0, output = 0 And for if W P + W P + W P = 0, output = 0. The network adapts as follows: Change the weight have a second s

Change the weight by an amount proportional to the difference between the desired output and the actual output. This leads to the following equation;

$$\Delta W_i = \eta^* (D - Y).P_i;$$

where n is the learning rate,

D is the desired output

and Y is the actual output.

Since only two components; the grain and the bond are the major constituents of a grinding wheel, the neuro fuzzy model reduces to :

$$\left\{ W_{g}P_{g} + W_{b}P_{b} + W_{p} \right\}_{<0}^{>0}$$

The neural network is given in Figure-1, while the output from the model becomes:

(1) output #1 = 1 if $W_{g}^{P} + W_{b}^{P} + W_{p} > 0$ (2) output #2 = 0 if $W_{g}^{g} P_{g}^{g} + W_{b}^{P} P_{b} + W_{p}^{p} \le 0$.



Fig.-1 : The Neural Network for the Grinding Wheel Components.

The components of the neural network model with the desired outputs are now presented in Table-1

	INPUTS			
Grain (Pg)	Bond Material (Pb)	DESIRED OUTPUT		
0	0	0		
0	1	1		
1	0	1	j.	
	1	1		

Table-1 : The Inputs and the Desired Output from the Neuro - fuzzy Model.

Neuro-Fuzzy Analysis for Abrasive Grains (A, G,) Production

The abrasive grains were produced using varying percentages of silica sand (S_iS_a) , petroleum coke (P_cC_a) , saw dust (S_aD_v) and common salt (C_sS_a) . These components were properly mixed for the production. We now develop neuro - fuzzy model for the production of silicon carbide abrasive grains as follows :

 $A_{ib}O_{j} = S_{i}S_{a} + P_{e}C_{o} + S_{a}D_{u} + C_{o}S_{a}.$

Building the Models from Numerical Values.

For fuzzy modeling, all numerical values are replaced with linguistic values that are then used to analyze the model. For example, wheel grade is replaced by the linguistic values; "soft", "medium" or "hard". Therefore, the fuzzy models are built based on the following aspects:

(1) A very smooth surface finish needs a grinding wheel with finer grit size.

(2) A smooth surface finish needs a grinding wheel with fine grit size.

(3)A rough surface finish needs a grinding wheel with coarse grit size. These parameters are now denoted as follows.

 $Y = A_{L}G_{L} = Abrasive Grains,$

 $X_{i} = S_{i}S_{i} = Silicon Sand,$

 $X'_2 = P'_2C'_0 = Petroleum Coke,$

 $X_3 = S_2 D_2 = Saw Dust,$

 $X_4^{a} = C_0^{a}S_a^{b} = Common Salt.$

So we have; $Y = X_1 + X_2 + X_3 + X_4$. The neuro - fuzzy model is given as

 $Y_d = SX_i W_i$

were $Y_d =$ desired output,

 $X_i = variable constituents,$

W = attach weights.

The structure of neuro fuzzy model is presented in Figure 2 while the simplified form of the model is presented in Figure-3.



Fig. 2 : The Structure of Neuro Fuzzy Model.

The above structure is now modified to get the simplified structure of the neuro fuzzy model as presented below.



Fig.-3 : The Simplified Structure of Neuro Fuzzy Model.

The input and output parameters for the neuro - fuzzy model with their identified variables are now presented in Table-2 below.

Table-2 : Identified Variables for Neuro - Fuzzy Model Input and Output Parameters

Variable Name	Description	Fuzzy Variables.
A, G	Abrasive Grains	Coarse, Medium, Fine, Very Fine,
S.S.	Silicon Sand	Coarse, Medium, Fine, Very Fine,
P C	Petroleum Coke	Coarse, Medium, Fine, Very Fine.
S D	Saw Dust,	Coarse, Medium, Fine, Very Fine.
C _u S ₂	Common Salt.	Coarse, Medium, Fine, Very Fine.

332

In the production of the abrasive grains or grits, it was observed that the fuzzy variables fine and very fine gave the same result as that of the fuzzy variable fine. Therefore, the neuro-fuzzy model with their identified variables are now reduced to the form presented in Table-3.

Table-3 : Normalized Identified Variables for Neuro - Fuzzy Model Input and Output Parameters

Variable Name	Description	Fuzzy Variables.
A _b G	Abrasive Grains	Coarse, Medium, Fine.
S.S.	Silicon Sand	Coarse, Medium, Fine.
P.C.	Petroleum Coke	Coarse, Medium, Fine.
S D	Saw Dust,	Coarse, Medium, Fine.
C _s	Common Salt.	Coarse, Medium, Fine.

Therefore, the fuzzy model relates the desired output Y_d to the output Y. Considering the output parameters from the neuro fuzzy model, we have;

(1) $(Y_d - Y) = Negative (N) = Optimistic (O_n),$

(2) $(Y_d - Y) = Zero (Z) = Normal (N),$

(3) $(Y_d - Y) = Positive (P) = Pessimistic (P_e).$

These parameters are to be processed to arrive at the specified desired output by using the following base rules :

- (1) IF($Y_d Y$) = N AND ($Y_d Y$) = N continues, THEN output = Optimistic (O_p).
- (2) IF $(\mathring{Y}_d Y) = Z$ AND $(\mathring{Y}_d Y) = Z$ continues, THEN output = Normal (N). (3) IF $(\mathring{Y}_d Y) = P$ AND $(\mathring{Y}_d Y) = P$ continues, THEN output Pessimistic (P_a)

For the effective production of silicon carbide grains, three major important parameters are considered. These are (1) silica sand (S_iS_a) , petroleum coke (P_eC_o) and temperature (T_e) . Denoting silica sand by S, petroleum coke by P and temperature by T, we now represent these input parameters by a neuro fuzzy model structure with a network as follows :





were S_i, P_e, T_e are input parameters, O_p, M_i, P_e are output parameters, Y_d is the desired output and $(Y_d - \Sigma S P T)$ is the linguistic variable.

Neuro Fuzzy Output Parameters.

The output parameters are;

(1) High grade grinding wheel (Optimistic, O₂),

(2) Normal grade grinding wheel (Most Likely, M.),

(3) Poor grade grinding wheel (Pessimistic, P.).

The Linguistic Variables;

(1) $(Y_d - \Sigma S_p P_e T_e) = Negative (N) = HGGW = Optimistic (O_p)$

- (2) $(Y_d \Sigma S_i P_e T_e) = Zero (Z) = NGGW = Most Likely (M_i)$
- (3) $(Y_d \Sigma S_P T_s) = Positive (P) = PGGW = Pessimistic (P_s).$

The neuro fuzzy model is now represented with a simplified fuzzy network.



The components of fuzzy logic control model for the production of abrasive grains with membership functions are presented in Table-4.

Table-4	:	Relationship	Between	Fuzzy	Output	and	Membership	Function.
---------	---	--------------	---------	-------	--------	-----	------------	-----------

Level	Interpretation	Fuzzy Output	Linguistic Variables.
1	Optimistic	Negative	$(Y_{d} - \Sigma S_{i}P_{c}T_{c})$
2	Most Likely	Zero	$(Y_d - \Sigma S_i P_r T_c)$
3	Pessimistic	Positive	$(Y_{d} - \Sigma S P_{e}T)$

The degree of relationship between fuzzy output and membership function ranges from 0 to 1.0 (Yu and Skibniewski).

The Grinding Wheel System Operating Rules.

INPUT No 1 : ["Input", Negative (O_), Positive (P_), Zero (N)].

INPUT No. 2 :{GN- Getting Negative (O_p), GP- Getting Positive (Pe), GZ Getting Zero (N)}. The system response with its output becomes:

Output $O_p = Optimistic$, $P_e = Nil$, and N = Nil.

The degree of relationship between fuzzy output and membership function ranges from 0 to 1.0. The graphical illustration of Table-4 is presented in Figure-6.





APPLICATION OF NEURO-FUZZY TO COMPONENT ELEMENTS OF A GRINDING WHEEL 335

The interpretation of the graph shows that :

i. When the quality of the desired grinding wheel is lower than the quality of the grinding wheel obtained the model prompts negative (optimistic output).

ii. When the quality of the desired grinding wheel is the same as the quality of the grinding wheel obtained model prompts zero (Most Likely output),

iii. When the quality of the desired grinding wheel is higher than the quality of the grinding wheel obtained the model prompts positive (pessimistic output).

Conclusion.

A grinding wheel is one of the most versatile cutting tools used for removing material from machine parts by abrasion. It is an expendable wheel that carries an abrasive compound on its periphery. Grinding wheels are made of small, sharp and very hard natural or synthetic abrasive particles bonded together by a suitable bonding material. Neuro fuzzy models were used to analyze the contribution of each of the component elements of a typical grinding wheel made of silicon carbide abrasive material. The prominent constituents of a silicon carbide grinding wheel include; silica sand, petroleum coke, saw dust and sodium chloride. Silicon carbide and petroleum coke are the most important constituents. It was discovered that the size of the grains and its spacing, volumetric proportion of grains, volumetric proportion of bonding material and volumetric proportion of pores influence greatly the performance characteristics of a grinding wheel.

REFERENCES

- Diniz, A. E.; Marcondes, F. C. and Coppini, N. L., (2000) : Technology of the Machining of Materials. 2nd. Edition, Artiliber Publisher Limited, Campinas, Brazil.
- Malkin, S. and Ritter, P.E., (1989): Grinding Technology: Theory and Applications of Machining with Abrasives.. Ellis Horwood Limited Publishers, Chichester, Halsted Prtess: a division of John Wiley & Sons
- Odior, A.O., (2002) : Development of a Grinding Wheel from Locally Available Materials. The Journal of Nigerian Institution of Production Engineers, Vol. 7, No. 2, 62 68.
- Radford J.D. and Richardson, D.B., (1978) : Production Technology. Second Edition. Edward Arnold, London.
- Theodore, L.Z. (2002) : "A Theoretical Investigation on the Mechanically Induced Residual Stresses due to Surface Grinding. International Journal of Machine Tools and Manufacture, Vol. 12, No.8, pp 34- 45.

Wasserman, P.D., (1989) : Neural Computing, Van nostrand Reinhold, New York.

Yu, W. and Skibniewski, M. J. (1999) : A neuro-fuzzy computational approach to constructability knowledge acquisition for construction technology evaluation, Automation in Construction, 8, 539-552.

Zadeh, L. A., (1988) : Fuzzy logic, IEEE Computer. April, 83-92.