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Abstract:

The multi-ribbed framework for the F-102A airplane speed brake door is an AZ91 magnesium alloy casting about 2-1/2 feet wide by 4-1/2 feet long. This complex casting, which essentially is a lattice of thin-walled ribs, is heat treated and aged prior to end use. Since excessive porosity was encountered with a large number of castings, correlations of the casting strengths with the results of dye-penetrant and radiographic inspection were required. As a result of comparisons of tensile strength data with dye-penetrant and radiographic inspections, the following conclusions were drawn: (1) dye-penetrant inspection is inadequate for determining acceptable limits of casting porosity; and (2) x-ray ratings correlated very well with tensile test results. Radiographic inspection thus was considered the more reliable inspection method.
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INTRODUCTION:

Part No. 8-73673 is a multi-ribbed framework for the speed brake door of the F-102A. The casting is roughly 2 1/2 ft. wide and 4 1/2 ft. long; it is cast from AZ91 magnesium alloy and subsequently heat treated and aged. Although the complexity of the problems associated with the fabrication of these castings can be readily appreciated, many of the parts received at Convair were found to possess an inordinate amount of porosity. This report describes the evaluation tests which were made on three (3) of the castings.

OBJECT:

To determine the efficiency of dye-penetrant and radiographic inspection as methods of rating casting quality.

CONCLUSIONS:

The tensile tests of specimens cut from the castings led to the following conclusions:

1. Dye-penetrant inspection cannot be considered an adequate method of determining the acceptable limits of casting porosity.
2. As anticipated, X-ray ratings correlated very well with tensile test results. Radiographic testing is much more trustworthy than dye-penetrant examination as a non-destructive test of such porous materials.

PROCEDURE:

Three castings, identified by X-ray No., were included in this investigation. After dye-penetrant examination, rough specimen outlines were scribed on the metal in areas which exhibited varying amounts of dye "bleed-out". The parts were then cleaned and marked for sampling as shown in Figures 1, through 3. In all, twenty-nine specimens were removed from the three castings; No. 18 proved to be too small for test purposes and was discarded.

The coupons were machined to standard 0.5-inch gauge width, but the original surfaces were not disturbed along the flat sides of the samples. In the instances where adjoining ribs entered the gauge section, the ribs were simply cut off outside the fillets.

The samples were then inspected and rated by the Process Control Department. The dye-penetrant method requires approval or rejection by an experienced inspector. Photographs of all of the coupons are shown in Figures 4 through 10; the pictures were taken shortly after the dye-penetrant examination and with the developer coating still intact.
PROCEDURE: (Continued)

The grading system employed in the X-ray ratings is based upon a series of filmed standards prescribed by ASTM Standard E98-53T. According to this comparison type of evaluation, Grade 1 would be free of defects, Grade 2 acceptable, Grade 3 acceptable but questionable, and Grade 4 would be rejectable. (This type of procedure enjoys wide-spread usage).

No X-rays were taken of coupons removed from the static-test casting - specimens 18 through 29.

Tensile testing was accomplished by the Physical Test Section using the 12,000 lb. Tinius Olsen Machine.

From the broken tensiles, small sections were then cut from the fracture areas and grouped in plastic mounts for polishing - two or three samples per mount. In each case the prepared surface represented an internal portion of the sample, perpendicular to the fracture, and extending 1/4" to 3/8" from the fracture.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION:

The tensile properties and inspection ratings of the coupons are shown in Table I. The "Correlation" column was based upon an overall appraisal of ratings vs. actual properties for each specimen.

The dye-penetrant technique proved to be useful for rejecting material, but the method could not be used in a positive sense - too many spongy samples were apparently acceptable.

Radiographic inspection was much more reliable as a means of estimating acceptable limits of micro-shrinkage. Since X-rays can detect internal voids which are not connected to the surface, the advantage of this method in applications of this type is readily understood and accepted. It is unfortunate that the X-ray examination did not include the group of specimens from the static-test casting.

A study of the photomicrographs disclosed many regions of localized porosity and/or mechanical tears. Each photograph represents only a small portion of a particular sample and often tends to exaggerate the extent of the defects. The economical practice of placing more than one sample in a single plastic mount led to considerable difficulty in producing an even polish on the relatively soft magnesium samples. Consequently, only one photomicrograph is included in the report for each of the described conditions (Figures 11 through 17).

NOTE: This report was prepared from data recorded in Laboratory Record Book No. 910.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specimen No.</th>
<th>Mechanical Properties</th>
<th>Die Filler Zone</th>
<th>Acceptance</th>
<th>Reject.</th>
<th>Radiographic Rating</th>
<th>Metallographic Rating</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>13,500</td>
<td>12,800</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>12,800</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>12,800</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>12,800</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>12,800</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>12,800</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>12,800</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>12,800</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>12,800</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>12,800</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>12,800</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>12,800</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>12,800</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table I. Mechanical Properties & Inspection Ratings of Tensile Samples from AZ91-HTA Castings.

- For testing technique – grip not inside axis of central
- Grades 2 & 3: "Acceptable" – Grade 4: "Rejectable"
- Fracture occurred outside of grip range section

Note: Specimens arranged in order of increasing ultimate strength, psi.
FIGURE 1. PART NO. 8-73673, X-RAY NO. H7315-2 (COUPONS 1-11)
FIGURE 3. STATIC-TEST CASTING, X-RAY NO. H7316-3 (COUPONS 18-29)
FIGURE 4. COUPONS 1, 3, 4, & 5. (SHOWING DYE INDICATIONS)
FIGURE 5. COUPONS 7-11 (SHOWING DYE INDICATIONS)
FIGURE 6. COUPONS 2, 6, 12, & 13 (SHOWING DYE INDICATIONS)
FIGURE 7. COUPONS 14-17 (SHOWING DYE INDICATIONS)
FIGURE 7. COUPONS 14-17 (SHOWING DYE INDICATIONS)
FIGURE 8. COUPONS 19, 22, 23, & 24 (SHOWING DYE INDICATIONS)
FIGURE 9. COUPONS 22, 21, 25, & 26 (SHOWING DYE INDICATIONS)
FIGURE 10. COU-OONS 27-29 (SHOWING DYE INDICATIONS)
FIGURE 11. "SEVERE" SHRINKAGE POROSITY (SPEC. NO. 13)
MAG: 100X UNETCHED

FIGURE "MODERATE TO SEVERE" CONDITION (SPEC. NO. 7)
MAG: 100X UNETCHED
FIGURE 13. "MODERATE" CONDITION (SPEC. NO. 28)
MAG: 100X UNETCHED

FIGURE 14. "SLIGHT" CONDITION (SPEC. NO. 14)
MAG: 100X UNETCHED
FIGURE 15. "SEVERE-LOCALIZED" CONDITION (SPEC.NO. 24)

MAG: 100X UNETCHED

FIGURE 16. "MODERATE-LOCALIZED" CONDITION (SPEC.NO. 9)

MAG: 100X UNETCHED
FIGURE 17. "TORN" CONDITION (SPEC. NO. 10)

MAG: 100X UNETCHED