

## LIST OF TABLES

| <b>Table No.</b>   | <b>Page No.</b> |
|--|-----------------|
| Table 1.1 Comparison between Conventional Extruder and Continuous Extruder [Agrawal et al. (2002)]                                       | 3               |
| Table 3.1: Material data for Pure Aluminum Rod for Continuous Extrusion simulations  | 40              |
| Table 3.2: Chemical composition of Pure Aluminum Rod for Continuous Extrusion simulations  | 40              |
| Table 3.3 Details of mesh elements for 8 mm diameter feedstock   | 42              |
| Table 3.4: The results of simulation for 8 mm diameter Aluminum feedstock.   | 47              |
| Table 3.5: Simulation parameters for 9.5 mm feedstock  | 50              |
| Table 3.6: Details of mesh elements for 9.5mm diameter feedstock   | 50              |
| Table 3.7: Simulation results in tabular form representing effect of feedstock temperature in Continuous Extrusion of Aluminum feedstock | 60              |
| Table 3.8 Simulation results in tabular form for 9.5 mm Aluminum feedstock   | 66              |
| Table 3.9: Data for the numerical simulation of 12.5 mm Copper feedstock   | 66              |
| Table 3.10: Mesh elements details for 12.5 mm diameter of Copper feedstock   | 67              |
| Table 3.11: Results in tabular form for Simulation of 12.5 mm Copper feedstock   | 72              |
| Table 3.12: Power consumption from initial entry to abutment chamber   | 103             |
| Table 3.13: Power consumption inside the abutment die chamber  | 104             |
| Table 3.14: Power consumption from initial entry to abutment chamber   | 105             |
| Table 3.15: Power consumption inside the abutment die chamber  | 105             |
| Table 3.16: Power consumption from initial entry to abutment chamber   | 106             |
| Table 3.17: Power consumption inside the abutment die chamber  | 106             |
| Table 3.18: Power consumption from initial entry to abutment chamber   | 107             |
| Table 3.19: Power consumption inside the abutment die chamber  | 108             |
| Table 3.20: Power consumption from initial entry to abutment chamber   | 109             |
| Table 3.21: Power consumption inside the abutment die chamber  | 109             |
| Table 3.22: Power consumption from initial entry to abutment chamber   | 110             |
| Table 3.23: Power consumption inside the abutment die chamber  | 111             |
| Table 3.24: Power consumption from initial entry to abutment chamber   | 112             |

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| Table 3.25: Power consumption inside the abutment die chamber  | 112 |
| Table 3.26: Comparison of Analytical and Simulation Power required for extrusion of Aluminum feedstock                         | 113 |
| Table 4.1: Chronological Development of Continuous Extrusion Setup at IIT (BHU)  | 116 |
| Table 5.1: Specification of Commercial Setup (Setup 1)   | 144 |
| Table 5.2: Specification of Design Developed and fabricated Setup (Setup 2)  | 144 |
| Table 5.3: Composition of the feedstock used   | 147 |
| Table 5.4: Results of experiments for Aluminum alloy   | 148 |
| Table 5.5: Validation for Aluminum alloy   | 149 |
| Table 5.6: Chemical Composition of the Copper feedstock used for extrusion experiments   | 150 |
| Table 5.7: Results of experiments for Copper feedstock   | 151 |
| Table 5.8: Validation of results for Copper feedstock  | 151 |
| Table 5.9: Tensile test result of Aluminum samples   | 167 |
| Table 5.10: Chemical composition of Pure Copper feedstock before and after extrusion   | 167 |
| Table 5.11: Tensile test result of Copper samples  | 168 |
| Table 5.12: Hardness test result of Aluminum alloy samples   | 171 |
| Table 5.13: Hardness test result of Copper samples   | 172 |
| Table 6.1: Experimental parameter and levels   | 190 |
| Table 6.2: Experimental plan and result for Ultimate Tensile Strength based on Central Composite second order rotatable design | 191 |
| Table 6.3: Test for significance of UTS  | 192 |
| Table 6.4: Test result of ANOVA for UTS  | 192 |
| Table 6.5: Test for significance of Hardness   | 196 |
| Table 6.6: Experimental plan and result for Hardness based on Central Composite second order rotatable design                  | 197 |
| Table 6.7: Test result of ANOVA for Hardness   | 198 |
| Table 6.8: Experimental plan and result for Yield Strength based on Central Composite second order rotatable design            | 202 |
| Table 6.9: Test for significance of Yield Strength   | 203 |
| Table 6.10: Test result of ANOVA for Yield Strength  | 203 |

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| Table 6.11: Test for significance of % Elongation   | 207 |
| Table 6.12: Experimental plan and result % Elongation based on central composite second order rotatable design                  | 208 |
| Table 6.13: Test result of ANOVA for % Elongation   | 209 |
| Table 6.14: Experimental parameter and levels   | 214 |
| Table 6.15: Experimental plan and result for Ultimate Tensile Strength based on Central Composite second order rotatable design | 215 |
| Table 6.16: Test for significance of UTS  | 216 |
| Table 6.17: Test result of ANOVA for UTS  | 216 |
| Table 6.18: Experimental plan and result for Hardness based on Central Composite second order rotatable design                  | 220 |
| Table 6.19: Test for significance of Hardness   | 221 |
| Table 6.20: Test result of ANOVA for Hardness   | 222 |
| Table 6.21: Experimental plan and result for Yield Strength based on Central Composite second order rotatable design            | 225 |
| Table 6.22: Test for significance of Yield Strength   | 226 |
| Table 6.23: Test result of ANOVA for Yield Strength   | 227 |
| Table 6.24: Test for significance of % Elongation   | 229 |
| Table 6.25: Test result of ANOVA for % Elongation   | 230 |
| Table 6.26: Experimental plan and result for % Elongation based on central composite second order rotatable design              | 231 |
| Table 6.27: Experimental parameter and levels   | 235 |
| Table 6.28: Development of experimental plan design matrix based on CCD   | 237 |
| Table 6.29: Experimental plan and result based on CCD   | 238 |
| Table 6.30: Test of significance for Extrusion Load   | 240 |
| Table 6.31: Test of ANOVA for Extrusion Load  | 241 |
| Table 6.32: Test of significance for Torque required  | 245 |
| Table 6.33: Test of ANOVA for Torque required   | 246 |
| Table 6.34: Test of significance for Effective stress   | 250 |
| Table 6.35: Test of ANOVA for Effective stress  | 251 |
| Table 6.36: Test of significance for Damage value   | 255 |

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| Table 6.37: Test of ANOVA for Damage value                       | 256 |
| Table 6.38: Test of significance for Product Temperature         | 260 |
| Table 6.39: Test of ANOVA for Product Temperature                | 261 |
| Table 6.40: Results of comparison of $R^2$ value for RSM and ANN | 270 |
| Table 6.41: RSM results for Aluminum and Copper feedstock        | 272 |
| Table 7.1: RSM results for Aluminum and Copper feedstock         | 276 |