

AD-A233 643


AD

TECHNICAL REPORT ARCCB-TR-91001

**EFFECTS OF FORGING REDUCTION
ON 120-MM M256 TUBE MATERIAL**

CHARLES CALDERONE

JOHN SENICK



JANUARY 1991



**US ARMY ARMAMENT RESEARCH,
DEVELOPMENT AND ENGINEERING CENTER
CLOSE COMBAT ARMAMENTS CENTER
BENÉT LABORATORIES
WATERVLIET, N.Y. 12189-4050**



APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE; DISTRIBUTION UNLIMITED

DISCLAIMER

The findings in this report are not to be construed as an official Department of the Army position unless so designated by other authorized documents.

The use of trade name(s) and/or manufacturer(s) does not constitute an official indorsement or approval.

DESTRUCTION NOTICE

For classified documents, follow the procedures in DoD 5200.22-M, Industrial Security Manual, Section II-19 or DoD 5200.1-R, Information Security Program Regulation, Chapter IX.

For unclassified, limited documents, destroy by any method that will prevent disclosure of contents or reconstruction of the document.

For unclassified, unlimited documents, destroy when the report is no longer needed. Do not return it to the originator.

20. ABSTRACT (CONT'D)

results indicate that forging reduction has little or no effect on the mechanical properties of 120-mm gun tube material. However, the data indicate that the uniformity of properties over the range of forging reductions is due to the superior quality of the material. Electroslag remelted material used to produce 120-mm preforms appears to be capable of maintaining uniform mechanical properties over the range of reductions investigated. It is anticipated that steels produced without a secondary melting process will not maintain uniformity of properties over the same range of forging reductions. This same effort will be repeated on a material which does not experience a secondary melting process.

Accession For	
NTIS GRA&I	☒
DTIC TAB	☐
Unannounced	☐
Justification	
By	
Distribution/	
Availability Codes	
Dist	Avail and/or Special
A-1	



UNCLASSIFIED

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
INTRODUCTION	1
PROCEDURE	1
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	2
Mechanical	2
Metallurgical	2
SUMMARY/CONCLUSION	3

TABLES

I. FORGING REDUCTIONS	5
II. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PREFORM LOCATION, FORGING REDUCTIONS, AND CROSS-SECTIONAL AREA	6
III. EXPERIMENTAL FORGING DATA	7
IV. GRAIN SIZE COMPARISON	8

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

1. Material processing	9
2. Layout for cutting test discs and test specimens	10
3. Yield strength versus location in tube	11
4. Tensile strength versus location in tube	12
5. Percent reduction in area versus location in tube	13
6. Percent elongation versus location in tube	14
7. Charpy impact versus location in tube	15
8. Photomicrograph depicting tempered martensitic microstructure found in all samples	16
9. High magnification photomicrograph of tempered martensite	16

10.	Photomicrographs of macroetched structure found in mechanical property samples	
	(a) Disc #2	17
	(b) Disc #9	17
11.	Typical oxide-type inclusions found in all samples	18
12.	Higher magnification photomicrograph of "worst" stringer-type inclusion found in the subject material	18

INTRODUCTION

Variations in mechanical properties of heat treated gun tubes have historically been a concern in the production of reliable and acceptable gun tubes. Reasons for these variations include melting and forging practice, chemistry, heat treatment procedure, testing procedure, etc. Specifically, in this investigation the amount of forging reduction was examined to determine if it causes a spread in mechanical properties from the breech to the muzzle end of gun tubes. The objective was to show that the difference in forging reduction between the breech and muzzle ends accounts for the difference in mechanical properties from one end to the other.

PROCEDURE

An experimental forging was designed to cover a range of forging reductions as large as possible for this investigation. The starting material selected was a 120-mm M256 preform with excess test material which could be utilized for the experiment. The steel was produced by electroslag remelting (ESR) methods and press forged in an open die operation to its initial preform dimensions. The preform end to be rotary forged first was machined to a tapered section allowing for a range of forging reductions as it was forged into the muzzle end of a 120-mm M256 tube (Figure 1). The extra material in the preform was forged into extra muzzle length in the resulting forging. The forging reduction range selected was from 1:1 to 5:1, which was the practical limit of our rotary forging equipment. This forging reduction range on the GFM-55 rotary forge, combined with the open die press forging reduction from the starting ingot, gives a total forging reduction range from 3.36:1 to 16.90:1 as shown in Table I. Forging reduction is defined as the ratio of the cross-sectional area of the

starting material to the cross-sectional area of the resulting forging. In the experiment, the cross-sectional area of the tapered section of the preform was computed at incremental locations along the length of the taper. Then the location of the material in the muzzle section of the resulting 120-mm forging was computed at these incremental locations (Table II). After forging, the tube was heat treated in a Selas heat treat system. This is a horizontal, continuous heat treat system used to thermally process all rotary forged production gun tubes. Standard heat treat parameters for the 120-mm M256 gun tube were used to heat treat this tube. Forging reduction ranges were sampled by cutting nine test discs at the locations specified in Table II and then machining them into test specimens as shown in Figure 2. Four tensile and four Charpy test specimens were evaluated from each test disc.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Mechanical

The test specimens from the nine muzzle test discs as well as a standard breech end test disc were tested, and the results are given in Table III. The range shown for each of the mechanical properties indicates no significant variation in property levels along the entire length of the tube (see Figures 3 through 7). The results also show no upward or downward trend when comparing the mechanical properties obtained within the nine muzzle discs or from breech to muzzle ends.

Metallurgical

As-tested mechanical property samples from discs #2, #5, #7, and #9 were metallographically prepared and metallurgically examined to determine what effect forging had on the material's microstructural features. The samples were examined for general microstructure, nonmetallic inclusion content/morphology,

macrostructure, and grain size. The samples selected spanned the full range of forging reductions. None of the corresponding mechanical properties of these samples displayed significant variations from disc to disc. This observation was further supported by the general lack of microstructural variations in the samples evaluated. All samples exhibited a fine-grained, tempered martensitic microstructure indicating successful heat treatment as seen in Figures 8 and 9. The "macrostructural" characterization showed a reasonably uniform structure (Figures 10a and 10b), suggesting very little chemical heterogeneity in this material.

The inclusions found in all samples were predominantly of an oxide type and were relatively small in size and distribution (see Figure 11). The "worst case" stringer-type inclusion found in any of the samples is identified by the arrow in Figure 11. This inclusion, magnified in Figure 12, was identified as a silicate. The lone microstructural variation found in these samples appeared in the grain size determinations. Table IV shows the average ASTM grain size for each disc.

The general trend of this data reveals that as forging reduction increases, grain size increases. (NOTE: As grain size increases, grain size number decreases.) This agrees well with the metallurgical theory that if all other variables for a material are comparable, the regions which experience the most mechanical working prior to heat treatment nucleate grains faster during heat treatment, and consequently, these grains can grow to a larger size.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

All mechanical property values reported in this experiment showed good uniformity across the entire forging reduction range. The metallurgical analyses corroborated the mechanical property results. Metallographic samples obtained

from each disc were prepared and examined and all displayed a uniform tempered martensitic microstructure. The material's macrostructural features were also uniform and showed no significant chemical inhomogeneity. Nonmetallic inclusion content/morphology was also uniform from disc to disc. The ASTM grain size was the lone material feature showing any variation. As stated previously, the grain size increased predictably as the forging reduction (or amount of mechanical working) increased. The varied grain sizes, however, did not appear to significantly affect the mechanical properties from disc to disc.

It should be noted that the material used in this experiment was a premium quality steel produced by consumable remelting methods. The general lack of sizeable nonmetallic inclusions in this material, especially malleable types (i.e., sulfides), and the relative absence of chemical segregation minimizes the probability that ductility-related mechanical properties (percent reduction in area (% RA) and percent elongation (% EL)) will be affected by varying forging reduction. This also tends to make this type of experiment more appropriate for showing forging reduction effects on strength and toughness. Because these properties were also uniform, it can be concluded that typical 120-mm M256 forging shows no significant mechanical property variations resulting from forging reduction variation over the range in this study.

Mechanical properties, especially ductility, tend to display less uniformity as the material displays increased structural and chemical inhomogeneity. Because the manufacturing method for the 155-mm and 105-mm preforms/forgings does not include a secondary melting process (i.e., ESR or vacuum arc remelting (VAR)), these materials inherently possess more material variation than the 120-mm material and would most likely show the effects of this variation in mechanical or physical property responses.

TABLE I. FORGING REDUCTIONS

(Cross-Sectional Areas Taken From Figure 1)

Ingot to Forging

$$706.9 \text{ in.}^2 / 210.6 \text{ in.}^2 = 3.36:1$$

Preform to Tube Forging

(Tapered Section of the Preform to Muzzle Diameter)

$$\text{Minimum } 31.5 \text{ in.}^2 / 31.5 \text{ in.}^2 = 1:1$$

$$\text{Maximum } 158.6 \text{ in.}^2 / 31.5 \text{ in.}^2 = 5.03:1$$

Total Forging Reduction

$$\text{Minimum } 3.36 \times 1 = 3.36:1$$

$$\text{Maximum } 3.36 \times 5.03 = 16.90:1$$

TABLE II. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PREFORM LOCATION,
FORGING REDUCTIONS, AND CROSS-SECTIONAL AREA

(120-mm Tube Forging Muzzle End Cross-Sectional Area = 31.5 in.²)

Forging Reduction	Location (in.)	Preform Area (in. ²)	Diameter (in.)	Resulting Location in Tube* (in.)
1:1	0-6	31.5	7.95	0-6
1.5:1	8.5	47.3	9.12	9.11
2:1	10.7	63.0	10.16	12.96
2.5:1	12.7	78.8	11.10	17.45
3:1	14.6	94.5	11.97	22.53
3.5:1	16.3	110.3	12.78	28.14
4:1	17.9	126.0	13.55	34.26
4.5:1	19.5	141.8	14.27	40.79
5:1	20.9	157.5	14.95	47.64

*Measured from the muzzle end.

TABLE III. EXPERIMENTAL FORGING DATA

Test Disc	12 O'Clock				3 O'Clock	6 O'Clock				9 O'Clock
	Y.S.	T.S.	%RA	%EL	Charpy	Y.S.	T.S.	%RA	%EL	Charpy
1	157	167	57	16	59	155	166	57	16	57
2	A1)153	164	54	14	B1)62	C1)158	167	55	15	D1)60
	A2)155	165	56	15	B2)57	C2)155	165	53	14	D2)57
3	A1)153	163	57	17	B1)58	C1)157	167	50	14	D1)57
	A2)152	163	54	14	B2)59	C2)156	166	54	14	D2)53
4	A1)155	165	55	15	B1)56	C1)155	165	53	14	D1)56
	A2)153	164	54	14	B2)52	C2)155	166	53	14	D2)54
5	A1)153	164	56	16	B1)52	C1)155	165	57	17	D1)56
	A2)153	164	56	16	B2)53	C2)155	166	52	14	D2)52
6	A1)155	165	57	16	B1)57	C1)156	166	54	14	D1)55
	A2)155	165	54	14	B2)56	C2)157	168	56	16	D2)50
7	A1)157	166	57	16	B1)54	C1)155	165	55	15	D1)56
	A2)155	166	56	16	B2)50	C2)155	165	57	16	D2)52
8	A1)155	165	57	16	B1)52	C1)157	167	54	14	D1)57
	A2)155	166	57	16	B2)51	C2)157	168	53	14	D2)49
9	A1)155	165	60	17	B1)58	C1)157	168	55	15	D1)58
	A2)155	165	57	16	B2)53	C2)155	167	59	16	D2)56
Br End	158	169	56	15	56	158	168	53	14	54

Y.S. - Yield Strength

T.S. - Tensile Strength

A1,A2,B1,B2,C1,C2,D1,D2 - See Figure 2

TABLE IV. GRAIN SIZE COMPARISON

Disc #	Forging Reduction	Average ASTM Grain Size	Average Grain Area x 10 ⁻⁷ in. ²
2	1.5:1	8.9	3.3
5	3:1	8.4	4.7
7	4:1	8.4	4.7
9	5:1	7.7	7.6




Figure 1. Material processing.




Figure 2. Layout for cutting test discs and test specimens.

YIELD STRENGTH




Figure 3. Yield strength versus location in tube.

TENSILE STRENGTH




Figure 4. Tensile strength versus location in tube.

% REDUCTION IN AREA




FIGURE 5

Figure 5. Percent reduction in area versus location in tube.

% ELONGATION




FIGURE 6

Figure 6. Percent elongation versus location in tube.

CHARPY IMPACT




FIGURE 7

Figure 7. Charpy impact versus location in tube.






Figure 8. Photomicrograph depicting tempered martensitic microstructure found in all samples (400X, 2 percent nital).



Figure 9. High magnification photomicrograph of tempered martensite (1000X, 2 percent nital).



(a) Disc #2



(b) Disc #9

Figure 10. Photomicrographs of macroetched structure found in mechanical property samples (50X, 1 percent picric).




Figure 11. Typical oxide-type inclusions (dark spheres) found in all samples. The arrow points to a silicate-type stringer inclusion (100X).




Figure 12. Higher magnification photomicrograph of "worst" stringer-type inclusion found in the subject material (400X).

TECHNICAL REPORT INTERNAL DISTRIBUTION LIST

	<u>NO. OF COPIES</u>
CHIEF, DEVELOPMENT ENGINEERING DIVISION	
ATTN: SMCAR-CCB-D	1
-DA	1
-DC	1
-DI	1
-DP	1
-DR	1
-DS (SYSTEMS)	1
CHIEF, ENGINEERING SUPPORT DIVISION	
ATTN: SMCAR-CCB-S	1
-SE	1
CHIEF, RESEARCH DIVISION	
ATTN: SMCAR-CCB-R	2
-RA	1
-RE	1
-RM	1
-RP	1
-RT	1
TECHNICAL LIBRARY	5
ATTN: SMCAR-CCB-TL	
TECHNICAL PUBLICATIONS & EDITING SECTION	3
ATTN: SMCAR-CCB-TL	
DIRECTOR, OPERATIONS DIRECTORATE	1
ATTN: SMCWV-OD	
DIRECTOR, PROCUREMENT DIRECTORATE	1
ATTN: SMCWV-PP	
DIRECTOR, PRODUCT ASSURANCE DIRECTORATE	1
ATTN: SMCWV-QA	

NOTE: PLEASE NOTIFY DIRECTOR, BENET LABORATORIES, ATTN: SMCAR-CCB-TL, OF ANY ADDRESS CHANGES.

TECHNICAL REPORT EXTERNAL DISTRIBUTION LIST

	<u>NO. OF COPIES</u>		<u>NO. OF COPIES</u>
ASST SEC OF THE ARMY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ATTN: DEPT FOR SCI AND TECH THE PENTAGON WASHINGTON, D.C. 20310-0103	1	COMMANDER ROCK ISLAND ARSENAL ATTN: SMCRI-ENM ROCK ISLAND, IL 61299-5000	1
ADMINISTRATOR DEFENSE TECHNICAL INFO CENTER ATTN: DTIC-FDAC CAMERON STATION ALEXANDRIA, VA 22304-6145	12	DIRECTOR US ARMY INDUSTRIAL BASE ENGR ACTV ATTN: AMXIB-P ROCK ISLAND, IL 61299-7260	1
COMMANDER US ARMY ARDEC ATTN: SMCAR-AEE	1	COMMANDER US ARMY TANK-AUTMV R&D COMMAND ATTN: AMSTA-DDL (TECH LIB) WARREN, MI 48397-5000	1
SMCAR-AES, BLDG. 321	1	COMMANDER US MILITARY ACADEMY ATTN: DEPARTMENT OF MECHANICS WEST POINT, NY 10996-1792	1
SMCAR-AET-O, BLDG. 351N	1		
SMCAR-CC	1		
SMCAR-CCP-A	1		
SMCAR-FSA	1		
SMCAR-FSM-E	1	US ARMY MISSILE COMMAND REDSTONE SCIENTIFIC INFO CTR ATTN: DOCUMENTS SECT, BLDG. 4484 REDSTONE ARSENAL, AL 35898-5241	2
SMCAR-FSS-D, BLDG. 94	1		
SMCAR-IMI-I (STINFO) BLDG. 59	2		
PICATINNY ARSENAL, NJ 07806-5000			
DIRECTOR US ARMY BALLISTIC RESEARCH LABORATORY ATTN: SLCBR-DD-T, BLDG. 305 ABERDEEN PROVING GROUND, MD 21005-5066	1	COMMANDER US ARMY FGN SCIENCE AND TECH CTR ATTN: DRXST-SD 220 7TH STREET, N.E. CHARLOTTESVILLE, VA 22901	1
DIRECTOR US ARMY MATERIEL SYSTEMS ANALYSIS ACTV ATTN: AMXSY-MP ABERDEEN PROVING GROUND, MD 21005-5071	1	COMMANDER US ARMY LABCOM MATERIALS TECHNOLOGY LAB ATTN: SLCMT-IML (TECH LIB) WATERTOWN, MA 02172-0001	2
COMMANDER HQ, AMCCOM ATTN: AMSMC-IMP-L ROCK ISLAND, IL 61299-6000	1		

NOTE: PLEASE NOTIFY COMMANDER, ARMAMENT RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, AND ENGINEERING CENTER, US ARMY AMCCOM, ATTN: BENET LABORATORIES, SMCAR-CCB-TL, WATERVLIET, NY 12189-4050, OF ANY ADDRESS CHANGES.

TECHNICAL REPORT EXTERNAL DISTRIBUTION LIST (CONT'D)

	<u>NO. OF COPIES</u>		<u>NO. OF COPIES</u>
COMMANDER US ARMY LABCOM, ISA ATTN: SLCIS-IM-TL 2800 POWDER MILL ROAD ADELPHI, MD 20783-1145	1	COMMANDER AIR FORCE ARMAMENT LABORATORY ATTN: AFATL/MN EGLIN AFB, FL 32542-5434	1
COMMANDER US ARMY RESEARCH OFFICE ATTN: CHIEF, IPO P.O. BOX 12211 RESEARCH TRIANGLE PARK, NC 27709-2211	1	COMMANDER AIR FORCE ARMAMENT LABORATORY ATTN: AFATL/MNF EGLIN AFB, FL 32542-5434	1
DIRECTOR US NAVAL RESEARCH LAB ATTN: MATERIALS SCI & TECH DIVISION CODE 26-27 (DOC LIB) WASHINGTON, D.C. 20375	1 1	METALS AND CERAMICS INFO CTR BATTELLE COLUMBUS DIVISION 505 KING AVENUE COLUMBUS, OH 43201-2693	1
DIRECTOR US ARMY BALLISTIC RESEARCH LABORATORY ATTN: SLCBR-IB-M (DR. BRUCE BURNS) ABERDEEN PROVING GROUND, MD 21005-5066	1		

NOTE: PLEASE NOTIFY COMMANDER, ARMAMENT RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, AND ENGINEERING CENTER, US ARMY AMCCOM, ATTN: BENET LABORATORIES, SMCAR-CCB-TL, WATERVLIET, NY 12189-4050, OF ANY ADDRESS CHANGES.