

List Of Figures

Figure No	Title	Page No
1.1	Flow diagram illustrating the research work	4
2.1	Schematic diagram of tensile test specimen a) before testing b) After testing. ΔL is the total extension of the specimen during the tensile test.	13
2.2	Engineering stress=strain curve showing a) different stresses, b) 0.2% proof stress	15
2.3	True stress - true strain curve (flow curve).	15
2.4	The stress-elongation curve. The elastic elongation is exaggerated for clarity.	16
2.5	The Charpy impact test sample and impact toughness versus test temperature curve.	18
2.6	Schematic view of arc welding process.	21
2.7	Schematic view of manual metal arc welding (MMAW).	22
2.8	Different types of joint preparations.	23
2.9	Schematic view of the various zones in a single pass weld metal.	28
2.10	a) Schematic diagram showing different constituents of the primary microstructure in the columnar austenite grains of a steel weld, b) scanning electron micrograph of the primary microstructure of a steel weld. α -allotrimorphic ferrite α_w - Widmanstätten ferrite and α_a -acicular ferrite.	29
2.11	Various regions in a multilayer welding.	30
2.12	Microstructural variations in heat affected zone The banded structure is a characteristic feature of segregated steels which have been rolled	31
2.13	Schematic CCT diagram for steel weld metal, summarizing the possible effect of microstructure and alloying on the transformation products for a given weld cooling time.	32
2.14	Temperature dependence of the yield strength of iron (gettered with titanium) at a plastic strain of 0.002. The strain rate is $2.5 \times 10^{-4} \text{ s}^{-1}$.	33
2.15	Contributions to the solid solution strengthening of ferrite.	36

2.16	The effect of some substitutional solutes (3 at.%) on the yield strength of iron. The strain rate is $2.5 \times 10^{-4} \text{ s}^{-1}$.	37
2.17	Carbide sequence in water quenched $2\frac{1}{4}\text{Cr-1Mo}$ steel, where 'M' represents metallic elements. The weld microstructure consists of allotriomorphic ferrite (α), Widmanstätten ferrite (α_w) and acicular ferrite (α_a). Nitrogen is assumed to be in solid solution	38
2.18	and any Strain ageing effects in the as-welded microstructure are assumed to be negligible. The solid solution strengthening (σ_{ss}) is expressed as the sum of the contributions from each solute: A schematic diagram of a three-layer feed-forward network. The model's complexity is controlled by the number of neurons in the second layer, known as hidden units.	41
2.19	Under-and over-fitting. A set of noisy data points (hollow boxes) has been fitted by (a) linear regression and (b) an overly complex function. In the first case the fit clearly does not represent the data, and in the second case the fit over lies the training data perfectly but generalizes poorly to new points (crosses).	45
2.20	Comparison of error on training and testing sets as a function of network complexity, illustrating the problem of over complex models as in Figure 3.2.	48
2.21	Schematic illustration of the uncertainty in defining a fitting function in regions where data are sparse (B) or noisy (A). The thinner lines represent error bounds due to uncertainties in determining the weights. Note that, outside the range of data, the extrapolation is increasingly uncertain (C). Areas of high uncertainty will provide the most informative new experiments.	49
2.22	A schematic representation of a simple neural network with the elements	50
2.23	Shows the functions in Neural Networks.	51
2.24	Activation function in Neural Network	53
2.25	The process of the genetic algorithm	54
2.26	Principle of the Uniform crossover	60
2.27	Database distribution used for yield strength model. "p.p.m ." corresponds to parts per million by weight.	64
3.1	(a to f) Yield Strength (YS) model features.	71
3.2		76

3.3	The perceived significance value of best seven yield strength models in a committee for each of the input variables.	76
3.4	(a to c) 2 Training data, validation data and test data of the Best GRNN model for Yield Strength.	80
3.5	Database distribution used for Ultimate Tensile Strength model. “p.p.m .’ corresponds to parts per million by weight.	89
3.6	(a,b,c,d,e,f) 5.2 : Ultimate Tensile Strength (UTS) model features.	93
3.7	The perceived significance σ_w value of best eight Ultimate Tensile Strength models for each of the inputs.	94
3.8	Training data, validation data and test data of the Best GRNN model for Ultimate Tensile Strength.	98
3.9	Database distribution used for Elongation model. “p.p.m .’ corresponds to parts per million by weight.	107
3.10	(a,b,c,d,e,f) Elongation (EL) model features.	112
3.11	The perceived significance σ_w value of best two Elongation models for each of the inputs.	113
3.12	Training data, validation data and test data of the Best GRNN model for Elongation	117
3.13	Database distribution used for Charpy Toughness model. “p.p.m .’ corresponds to parts per million by weight.	126
3.14	(a,b,c,d,e,f) : Charpy Toughness (CT) model features.	130
3.15	The perceived significance σ_w value of best eight Charpy Toughness models for each of the inputs.	131
3.16	(a to c) Training data, validation data and test data of the Best GRNN model for Charpy Toughness.	135
4.1	(a to q) Response graphs (a to q) of Input variables and Yield Strength of Ferritic Steel Welds using committee model of Bayesian Neural Network	143
4.2	(a to q) Response graphs of Input variables and Yield Strength of Ferritic Steel Welds (GRNN)	153
4.3.1	Predicted variations in Yield Strength (MPa) as a function of the Carbon and Manganese concentrations	156

4.3.2	Predicted variations in Yield Strength (MPa) as a function of the Carbon and Nickel concentrations	157
4.3.3	Predicted variations in Yield Strength (MPa) as a function of the Carbon and Chromium concentrations	158
4.3.4	Predicted variations in Yield Strength (MPa) as a function of the Carbon and Molybdenum concentrations	159
4.3.5	Predicted variations in Yield Strength (MPa) as a function of the Carbon and Vanadium concentrations	160
4.3.6	Predicted variations in Yield Strength (MPa) as a function of the Carbon and Silicon concentrations	161
4.3.7	Predicted variations in Yield Strength (MPa) as a function of the Carbon and Boron concentrations	162
4.3.8	Predicted variations in Yield Strength (MPa) as a function of the Carbon and Titanium concentrations	163
4.3.9	Predicted variations in Yield Strength (MPa) as a function of the Carbon and Niobium concentrations	164
4.3.10	Predicted variations in Yield Strength (MPa) as a function of the Carbon concentration and Heat input	165
4.3.11	Predicted variations in Yield Strength (MPa) as a function of the Carbon concentration and Interpass temperature	166
4.3.12	Predicted variations in Yield Strength (MPa) as a function of the Carbon concentration and Post-weld heat treatment time	167
4.3.13	Predicted variations in Yield Strength (MPa) as a function of the Nickel and Chromium concentrations	168
4.3.14	Predicted variations in Yield Strength (MPa) as a function of the Molybdenum and Vanadium concentrations	169
4.3.15	Predicted variations in Yield Strength (MPa) as a function of the Boron and Niobium concentrations	170
4.3.16	Predicted variations in Yield Strength (MPa) as a function of the Heat input and Interpass temperature	171
4.3.17	Predicted variations in Yield Strength (MPa) as a function of the Post-weld heat	172

	treatment temperature and Post-weld heat treatment time	
4.3.18	Predicted variations in Yield Strength (MPa) as a function of the Carbon and Post-weld heat treatment temperature	173
4.4	Response graphs (a to r) of Input variables and Ultimate Tensile Strength of Ferritic Steel Welds using committee model of Bayesian Neural Network	191
4.5	(a to r) Response graphs of Input variables Ultimate Tensile Strength of Ferritic Steel Welds	201
4.6.1	Predicted variations in Ultimate Tensile Strength (MPa) as a function of the Carbon and Silicon concentrations	204
4.6.2	Predicted variations in Ultimate Tensile Strength (MPa) as a function of the Carbon and Manganese concentrations	205
4.6.3	Predicted variations in Ultimate Tensile Strength (MPa) as a function of the Carbon and Nickel concentrations	206
4.6.4	Predicted variations in Ultimate Tensile Strength (MPa) as a function of the Carbon and Chromium concentrations	207
4.6.5	Predicted variations in Ultimate Tensile Strength (MPa) as a function of the Carbon and Molybdenum concentrations	208
4.6.6	Predicted variations in Ultimate Tensile Strength (MPa) as a function of the Carbon and Vanadium concentrations	209
4.6.7	Predicted variations in Ultimate Tensile Strength (MPa) as a function of the Carbon and Titanium concentrations	210
4.6.8	Predicted variations in Ultimate Tensile Strength (MPa) as a function of the Carbon and Boron concentrations	211
4.6.9	Predicted variations in Ultimate Tensile Strength (MPa) as a function of the Carbon and Niobium concentrations	212
4.6.10	Predicted variations in Ultimate Tensile Strength (MPa) as a function of the Carbon concentration and Heat input	213
4.6.11	Predicted variations in Ultimate Tensile Strength (MPa) as a function of the Carbon concentration and Interpass temperature	214
4.6.12	Predicted variations in Ultimate Tensile Strength (MPa) as a function of the Carbon concentration and Post-weld heat treatment temperature	215

4.6.13	Predicted variations in Ultimate Tensile Strength (MPa) as a function of the Carbon concentration and Post-weld heat treatment time	216
4.6.14	Predicted variations in Ultimate Tensile Strength (MPa) as a function of the Nickel and Chromium concentrations	217
4.6.15	Predicted variations in Ultimate Tensile Strength (MPa) as a function of the Molybdenum and Vanadium concentrations	218
4.6.16	Predicted variations in Ultimate Tensile Strength (MPa) as a function of the Oxygen and Titanium concentrations	219
4.6.17	Predicted variations in Ultimate Tensile Strength (MPa) as a function of the Boron and Niobium concentrations	220
4.6.18	Predicted variations in Ultimate Tensile Strength (MPa) as a function of the Heat input and Interpass temperature	221
4.6.19	Predicted variations in Ultimate Tensile Strength (MPa) as a function of the Post-weld heat treatment temperature and Post-weld heat treatment temperature time.	222
4.7	(a to r) Response graphs of Input variables and Elongation of Ferritic Steel Welds using committee model of Bayesian Neural Network	240
4.8	(a to r) Response graphs (a to r) of Input variables Elongation of Ferritic Steel Welds	251
4.9.1	Predicted variations in Elongation (%) as a function of the Carbon and Manganese concentrations	255
4.9.2	Predicted variations in Elongation (%) as a function of the Carbon and Silicon concentrations	256
4.9.3	Predicted variations in Elongation (%) as a function of the Silicon and Manganese concentrations	257
4.9.4	Predicted variations in Elongation (%) as a function of the Nickel and Chromium concentrations	258
4.9.5	Predicted variations in Elongation (%) as a function of the Molybdenum and Vanadium concentrations	259
4.9.6	Predicted variations in Elongation (%) as a function of the Copper and Oxygen concentrations	260
4.9.7	Predicted variations in Elongation (%) as a function of the Oxygen and Titanium	261

	concentrations	
4.9.8	Predicted variations in Elongation (%) as a function of the Boron and Oxygen concentrations	262
4.9.9	Predicted variations in Elongation (%) as a function of the Niobium concentration and Heat input	263
4.9.10	Predicted variations in Elongation (%) as a function of the Heat input and Interpass temperature	264
4.9.11	Predicted variations in Elongation (%) as a function of the Post-weld Heat treatment temperature and Post-weld Heat treatment time	265
4.9.12	Predicted variations in Elongation (%) as a function of the Nickel concentration and Heat input	266
4.9.13	Predicted variations in Elongation (%) as a function of the Chromium concentration and Heat input	267
4.10	(a to t) Response graphs (a to t) of Input variables and Charpy Toughness of Ferritic Steel Welds using committee model of Bayesian Neural Network	283
4.11	(a to t) Response graphs of Input variables and Charpy Toughness of Ferritic Steel Welds (GRNN)	294
4.12.1	Contour plot showing the variation in Predicted Charpy Toughness as a function of the Carbon and Manganese concentrations.	298
4.12.2	Predicted variations in Charpy Toughness (J) as a function of the Manganese and Nickel concentrations	299
4.12.3	Predicted variations in Charpy Toughness (J) as a function of the Manganese concentration and Interpass temperature	300
4.12.4	Predicted variations in Charpy Toughness (J) as a function of the Nickel concentration and Interpass temperature	301
4.12.5	Predicted variations in Charpy Toughness (J) as a function of the Chromium concentration and Interpass temperature	302
4.12.6	Predicted variations in Charpy Toughness (J) as a function of the Heat Input(kJ mm-1) and Interpass temperature	303
4.12.7	Predicted variations in Charpy Toughness (J) as a function of the Carbon and Silicon concentrations	304

4.12.8	Predicted variations in Charpy Toughness (J) as a function of the Nickel and Chromium concentrations	305
4.12.9	Predicted variations in Charpy Toughness (J) as a function of the Molybdenum and Vanadium concentrations	306
4.12.10	Predicted variations in Charpy Toughness (J) as a function of the Copper and Oxygen concentrations	307
4.12.11	Predicted variations in Charpy Toughness (J) as a function of the Oxygen and Titanium concentrations	308
4.12.12	Predicted variations in Charpy Toughness (J) as a function of the Nitrogen and Boron concentrations	309
4.12.13	Predicted variations in Charpy Toughness (J) as a function of the Niobium concentration and Heat input(kJ mm ⁻¹)	310
4.12.14	Predicted variations in Charpy Toughness (J) as a function of the Post-weld Heat treatment temperature and Post-weld Heat treatment time	311
4.12.15	Predicted variations in Charpy Toughness (J) as a function of the Interpass temperature and Testing temperature for Charpy Toughness	312
4.12.16	Predicted variations in Charpy Toughness (J) as a function of the Nickel and Testing temperature for Charpy Toughness	313
4.12.17	3D Contour Plot of Charpy Toughness, Nickel Manganese and Testing Temperature for Charpy toughness > 213K (-60C) (GRNN)	320
4.12.18	3D Contour Plot of Charpy Toughness, Nickel Manganese and Testing Temperature for Charpy toughness > 233K (-40C) (GRNN)	321
4.13.1	Ternary Categorical Graph of Chromium, Manganese, Nickel, Heat Input and Charpy Toughness shows 25 J line with Heat input ≤ 2.1 (wt% Mn range from 0 to 2.31, wt% Ni range from 0 to 10.8, wt% Cr range from 0 to 11.8)	323
4.13.2	Ternary Categorical Graph of Chromium, Manganese, Nickel, Heat Input and Charpy Toughness shows 25 J to 275 J lines with Heat input in range 3.6 to 5.11 (wt% Mn range from 0 to 2.31, wt% Ni range from 0 to 10.8, wt% Cr range from 0 to 11.8)	325
4.13.3	Ternary Categorical Graph of Chromium, Manganese, Nickel, Heat Input and Charpy Toughness shows 25 J to 300 J lines with Heat input > 5.1 1 (wt% Mn	326

range from 0 to 2.31, wt% Ni range from 0 to 10.8, wt% Cr range from 0 to 11.8)

Ternary Categorized Graph of Chromium, Manganese, Nickel, Heat Input and

4.13.4 Charpy Toughness(Enlarged view of Figure.10 near the Chromium.) (wt% Mn 327

range from 0 to 2.31, wt% Ni range from 0 to 10.8, wt% Cr range from 0 to 11.8)