NRC Publications Archive Archives des publications du CNRC

Non-destructive detection of lack of penetration defects in friction stir welds

Mandache, C.; Levesque, D.; Dubourg, L.; Gougeon, P.

This publication could be one of several versions: author's original, accepted manuscript or the publisher's version. / La version de cette publication peut être l'une des suivantes : la version prépublication de l'auteur, la version acceptée du manuscrit ou la version de l'éditeur.

For the publisher's version, please access the DOI link below. / Pour consulter la version de l'éditeur, utilisez le lien DOI ci-dessous.

Publisher's version / Version de l'éditeur:

<https://doi.org/10.1179/1362171812Y.0000000007>

Science and Technology of Welding & Joining, 17, 4, pp. 295-303, 2012-05-01

NRC Publications Record / Notice d'Archives des publications de CNRC:

<https://nrc-publications.canada.ca/eng/view/object/?id=ab7b86e4-e147-40b7-9d5c-aafb42b248da>

<https://publications-cnrc.canada.ca/fra/voir/objet/?id=ab7b86e4-e147-40b7-9d5c-aafb42b248da>

Access and use of this website and the material on it are subject to the Terms and Conditions set forth at

<https://nrc-publications.canada.ca/eng/copyright>

READ THESE TERMS AND CONDITIONS CAREFULLY BEFORE USING THIS WEBSITE.

L'accès à ce site Web et l'utilisation de son contenu sont assujettis aux conditions présentées dans le site

<https://publications-cnrc.canada.ca/fra/droits>

LISEZ CES CONDITIONS ATTENTIVEMENT AVANT D'UTILISER CE SITE WEB.

Questions? Contact the NRC Publications Archive team at

PublicationsArchive-ArchivesPublications@nrc-cnrc.gc.ca. If you wish to email the authors directly, please see the first page of the publication for their contact information.

Vous avez des questions? Nous pouvons vous aider. Pour communiquer directement avec un auteur, consultez la première page de la revue dans laquelle son article a été publié afin de trouver ses coordonnées. Si vous n'arrivez pas à les repérer, communiquez avec nous à PublicationsArchive-ArchivesPublications@nrc-cnrc.gc.ca.

Non-destructive detection of lack of penetration defects in friction stir welds

Catalin Mandache^{1,*}, Daniel Levesque², Laurent Dubourg^{1,#}, Patrick Gougeon²

National Research Council Canada

¹Institute for Aerospace Research, 1200 Montreal Rd, Ottawa, Ontario, K1A 0R6, Canada

²Industrial Materials Institute, 75 de Mortagne Blvd, Boucherville, Quebec, J4B 6Y4, Canada

[#]currently with Institut Maupertuis, Contour Antoine de St-Exupéry, Campus de Ker Lann, 35170 Bruz, France

*corresponding author: catalin.mandache@nrc-cnrc.gc.ca, phone: 1-613-991-2132, fax: 1-613-952-7136

This study focuses on the comparative investigation of different non-destructive inspection techniques for detection of lack of penetration discontinuities in butt-joint friction stir welds. A variable size lack of penetration has been purposely introduced by progressively changing the tool pin length. While inspecting the weld from the discontinuity side provides results of higher sensitivity, service inspection of friction stir welded components requires evaluation from the welding tool side, opposite to the defect-containing one. Non-destructive techniques amenable for inspection from either the tool side or the far side of the weld are analyzed and inspection results are presented for comparison. Subsequently, bending tests and metallographic examinations were employed to confirm the size of the lack of penetration defects and correlate these results with the non-destructive inspection capabilities.

1. Introduction

Friction Stir (FS) welding uses a tool to generate heat by friction and stir the parent materials; in this process the heat does not melt, but only plasticizes the materials [1]. FS welding is gaining acceptance in the manufacturing of components and structures for transport industries: aerospace, automotive, naval, and railway [1]. Lower costs, repeatable and fast manufacture, increased strength, good surface finish, environmentally friendly (no fumes) are specifics that contribute to the attractiveness of FS welding to the aerospace industry. Aluminum alloys in the 2xxx and 7xxx series are selected in aerospace applications for their high strength and low weight, and FS welding has the potential to replace most of the fastened structures made from these alloys. Unlike fusion welding, FS welding results in components of strength close or similar to the parent materials. On the other hand, since the metal does not melt and no filler material is added, the types of defects found in FS welds are different from the ones in fusion welding. This aspect raises new challenges for the non-destructive inspection (NDI) technicians who will need to adapt their inspection procedures and the interpretation of the data from other types of conventional weld inspections. Moreover, reliable non-destructive evaluation plays an important role in the acceptance and expansion of this joining technology in the industry.

The FS welding process parameters are greatly affecting the quality of the weld; therefore, the tool design, the welding tool forces, as well as torque, angle, and position of pin axis, the tool's linear and rotational speeds need to be carefully selected [2,3]. They influence a series of interconnected properties, such as the weld microstructure, hardness, tensile strength, residual stresses, and electric conductivity [1-4]. The welding pin exerts in-plane (horizontal) and downward (vertical) forces. Controlling the downward force is important in establishing the weld penetration depth. However, through an inadequate

choice of welding parameters, tool wear and part deformation during welding could inadvertently create lack of penetration discontinuities in FS welds.

In this work, various non-destructive evaluation techniques are employed to establish the effect of the pin length and their capabilities to detect the existence of lack of penetration discontinuities. In fusion welding, this type of flaw is due to inadequate joint penetration at the root of the weld. Although it represents a common type of defect in many different welding processes, it has a higher prevalence in FS welding, due to improper welding tool down force, or tool wear-out. The results of the non-destructive inspections are then correlated with destructive examinations, such as metallographic observations of the cross-section of the weld, the defect size and orientation. Bending tests are also performed in order to confirm the criticality of certain size lack of penetration defects.

2. Specimen and inspection techniques

The force exercised on the welding tool facilitates a good pin penetration, but not allowing the pin to be in contact with the backing surface, since this could damage the tool and welding setup. In general, the pin-to-back distance is always larger than zero, but this could induce lack of penetration defects, as schematically shown in Figure 1. These types of flaws are very common in butt-joints.

Figure 1: Schematic representation of a butt-weld including descriptive terminology used in this paper.

The present study uses five non-destructive inspection techniques: (1) phased array ultrasonic waves, (2) laser generated ultrasonic waves with synthetic aperture focusing technique (SAFT) processing, (3) conventional eddy current, (4) pulsed eddy current, and (5) liquid penetrant testing. They are all used to detect a lack of penetration defect of varying size introduced in an Al 2024 butt-weld using a controllable pin penetration. All these techniques have their own advantages and disadvantages; the focus of this work is not to quantitatively compare them, but to analyze their capabilities in terms of sensitivity to the defect geometry characteristics. It is important to note that the liquid penetrant and conventional eddy current techniques are applied from the defect side of the specimen, while the other techniques are applied from the opposite side (the welding tool side) of the butt-weld, requiring more input energy to go through the sample thickness in order to reach and investigate the discontinuity-containing side.

The butt-weld analyzed in this study was produced with an MTS FSW I-STIR equipment. The total welding distance, from pin entry to pin exit was 345 mm. Coupons (400 mm x 200 mm) of AA2024-T3 were machined from 2.56-mm thick plate material and butt welds were produced with a welding tool made of H13 steel. The rolling direction of the plates was placed parallel to the welding path. The tool consisted of a cylindrical threaded retractable pin having a diameter of 6.3 mm and a smooth concave shoulder with a diameter of 19.0 mm. Plates of same dimensions were placed on a steel backing anvil and

clamped along the two long edges. The welding parameters consisted of a rotational speed of 1000 RPM, a traveling speed of 10 mm/s, a tilt angle of 2° and a fixed shoulder penetration depth of 0.2 mm (use of vertical position control mode). The tool (*i.e.* pin and shoulder) penetration increases linearly from 1.2 mm at the weld beginning to 2.5 mm at the weld end, as schematically illustrated in Figure 2.a. This introduces a variable weld depth and, consequently, a decreasing depth lack of penetration discontinuity. A picture of the butt-weld specimen after machining is shown in Figure 2.b. Finally, the tool side of the specimen is mechanically machined (0.2 mm taken off) to remove any surface asperities resulting from the welding that could influence the NDI results. Figure 2.c schematically shows the pin and shoulder penetration into the plate. The tool depth is assumed to vary linearly from the beginning to the end of the weld. While the pin depth varies, the shoulder penetration is constant, being equal to 0.2 mm. However, this is removed through machining to create a better surface finish and not negatively influence the inspection results. It is important to note that the weld depth is larger than the tool penetration, according to previous observations [5]. This aspect will be further discussed in the “Destructive testing” section of this paper.

Based on the discussion above, the tool penetration in the investigated specimen, after machining, can be described by the following linear equation, where x is the position along the weld and $x=0$ represents the weld start.:

$$\text{tool_penetration(mm)} = (1.3 / 345) \cdot x + 1.0 \quad (1)$$

Naturally, after machining, the maximum value of the defect height (as defined in Figure 1) for the lack of penetration, at any location along the weld, is the coupon thickness, *i.e.* 2.36 mm, minus the tool penetration. However, in practice, the vertical dimension is much less than this theoretical estimation, as it will be discussed in the “Destructive testing” section.

3. Non-destructive inspection

Using the butt-joint friction stir welded coupon described in the previous section, the results obtained with five different non-destructive inspection techniques are presented below. Liquid penetrant and conventional eddy current techniques inspected the weld from the far side, the side that contains the lack of penetration defect, while the three other techniques (pulsed eddy current, phased array ultrasonic waves testing and laser generated ultrasonic waves with SAFT) were inspecting the weld from the welding tool side, *i.e.* opposite side with respect to the lack of penetration defect. In what follows, only summary descriptions of the underlying principles of the non-destructive testing techniques and data processing algorithms are given. Detailed information regarding the NDI techniques could be found in the references provided.

3.1. Ultrasonic testing

Ultrasonic waves propagating in a specimen under test provide great information about its non-visible structure based on the transmitted and/or reflected signals. Ultrasonic waves are commonly used in the inspection of welds; however, for the present case there are some added complexities associated to the small thickness of the specimen, leading to difficulties in focusing the ultrasonic beam on the area of interest.

a

b

c

Figure 2: (a) Schematic drawing and dimensions of the butt-weld, (b) picture of the specimen from the tool side, after removal of the weld asperities (0.2 mm of thickness), (c) schematic (not to scale) of tool penetration depth before and after surface machining of the weld. All dimensions are given in mm.

3.1.1. Phased array ultrasonic waves

Phased array ultrasonic waves testing has gained NDI acceptance in the last few years and it is now customarily employed in weld inspection applications. Its advantages over conventional ultrasonic inspections come from the use of multiple wave generating elements and ability to focus and steer the ultrasonic beam without movement of the probe, while the images are formed by constructive interference [6, 7]. On the test piece under study, the phased array ultrasonic testing was performed at discrete locations, at intervals of 19 mm along the weld in order to capture information regarding the lack of penetration discontinuity. The inspections were performed from the tool side (opposite to the discontinuity side) using a linear array of 16 elements, creating waves of 10 MHz frequency, adapted with a shear wave wedge able to generate waves at 60 degrees incidence in steel. The wedge and array assembly were able to generate a beam spread between 45 and 70 degrees in the specimen under test. The probe was positioned away from the weld location, and oriented in such a way that the emerging ultrasonic beam is perpendicular to the weld length axis. Selected results are shown in Figure 3 as sectorial scan presentations. The lack of penetration indications are seen between the vertical cursors, corresponding to a range of sound path length from 5.94 to 6.83 mm from the probe, as theoretically predetermined based on the wave propagation principles. The color intensity is proportional to the reflected signal amplitude, and, consequently, to the lack of penetration size. Based on the discrete inspections presented, the phased array ultrasonic waves technique could detect reflections from the discontinuity up to positions of more than 160 mm, but less than 179 mm from the start of the weld. Although indications between the cursors at 217 mm and 235 mm could be seen in the following results, these do not exceed the background noise level of the signal; therefore, they could not be reliably attributed to the presence of discontinuities in the weld.

Figure 3: Phased array ultrasonic sectorial scans at various locations along the butt-weld (distances from the beginning of the weld).

3.1.2. Synthetic aperture focusing technique

The SAFT algorithm uses Fourier time-domain information and allows synchronization of the ultrasonic signals scattered back in different directions from each point in the weld region [5]. For these scans, the spatial sampling step was selected to be 0.1 mm for both x and y directions. The technique used laser generated ultrasonic waves with a spot size of about 50 μm , from a 35 ps duration Nd:YAG laser in its 3rd harmonic. The detection used a long pulse Nd:YAG laser and demodulation was performed with a photorefractive interferometer; frequencies of up to 220 MHz were successfully used in this inspection. The images shown in Figure 4 represent the SAFT-processed laser ultrasonic inspections corresponding to six different pin locations along the weld. The scans are individual areas of 10 mm x 10 mm, and surface machining of the part are visible as lines from the bottom left corner to the top right corner. Clear indications of lack of penetration are visible in the scans closer to the weld start. Towards the middle of the weld, as in the scan after 164 mm, an interrupted lack of penetration indication could be seen; however, for a coordinate along the length of the weld of more than 245 mm no lack of penetration is observed and the weld is considered free of these types of discontinuities. According to equation (1), at a

coordinate equal to 245 mm, the tool penetration depth is 1.92 mm in the 2.36 mm total thickness specimen.

Figure 4: Laser generated ultrasonic waves testing with SAFT processing at different locations along the weld; coordinates indicate distance from the beginning of the weld.

3.2. Eddy current testing

The eddy current non-destructive testing method consists of electromagnetically inducing a current flow in an electrically conductive test piece by passing a time-varying current through a coil. The eddy currents are creating a response magnetic field to the excitation one that depends on the material properties, geometry, and encountered discontinuities. The method has various variants, depending on the excitation waveform, the type of sensing, and data representation; the communalities among them are that they cannot penetrate large distances in the material, maximum a few millimeters, and that they are applicable only to electrically conductive parts. In this paper, the two most known eddy current techniques are used: conventional and pulsed ones.

3.2.1. Conventional eddy current

In conventional eddy current testing, a sinusoidal waveform is used for excitation, while the response signals are represented on an impedance plane diagram, as changes in the resistive and reactive components of the impedance of the coil. This technique lacks the capability of probing deeper than few millimeters in the material, therefore it is being considered a surface or near-surface inspection. In this experiment a 400 kHz sinusoidal waveform was used for the excitation of an absolute coil, *i.e.* used for both driving and sensing the eddy current in the FS weld. The probe, model ECNDT PA 0050, was connected to a commercial Zetec MIZ 27 instrument that was interfaced with a computer. The scans were performed from the far-side of the weld, the one that contained the lack of penetration. The probe was

sampling the weld surface at every 0.1 mm. In Figure 5, the results of this inspection are shown in two sections, identified as the coordinate along the weld (0 mm for the beginning of the weld and 345 mm for its end). The color changes are due to changes in the coil impedance induced by the test piece. It should be noted that the data presented in Figure 5 is lift-off compensated at the acquisition time. The lift-off represents the changes in coupling between the probe and specimen due to minute variations in the distance between the two along the inspection. Moreover, the raw data is post-processed, normalized, in order to clearly display the lack of penetration discontinuity. The lack of penetration is seen as an almost horizontal line up to about 165 mm from the start of the weld. In the section after the end of the weld (after 345 mm coordinate) the two plates are in contact, but not welded. The eddy current response corresponding to this is similar to the one of a large crack.

Figure 5: Conventional eddy current inspection results presented in two sections along the weld.

Although the lack of penetration is the thin line of the upper picture of Figure 5, towards the end of the weld a low intensity, wider area is believed to be related to the changes in the electrical conductivity due to the manufacturing influences, as more material is plasticized by the welding pin. As was the case with SAFT, some tool marks, probably from post-weld machining are visible running at about 50° angle across the weld.

3.2.2. Pulsed eddy current

The pulsed eddy current uses a square waveform to drive the excitation coil instead of a sinusoidal wave excitation, as for the conventional eddy current testing. In general, this technique is capable of probing the material deeper than the conventional eddy currents [4, 8]. Another significant difference is that the signals are recorded in the time domain and not on an impedance plane diagram, as was the case of the former technique. In this inspection, a probe containing two coils, one for excitation and one for recording, placed side-by-side and aligned with the weld length, were used for scanning. The scanning resolution was set to 0.2 mm on each direction. Again, the recorded signals were post-processed, applying lift-off compensation, background subtraction, and image filtering algorithms, as described elsewhere [4]. The results obtained along with this technique are shown in Figure 6. In this representation of the inspection the defect boundaries are more visible, rather than the defect itself. The continuous scan (broken down in two sections in Figure 6) indicates detection of the lack of penetration discontinuity up to coordinates equal to 160 mm from the weld start; although, some unreliable indications after that position, as seen from Figure 6. This might be due to a widening of the defect or heat-affected conductivity changes.

Figure 6: Pulsed eddy current inspection results; coordinates indicate distance from the beginning of the weld.

3.3. *Liquid penetrant testing*

The liquid penetrant inspection method uses capillarity principles to detect tight defects open to the specimen's surface. A fluorescent liquid is applied evenly to the far-side surface of the weld and time was allowed for this to penetrate open discontinuities [9]. While the surface liquid is wiped or rinsed away, a quantity remains entrapped in the discontinuity, then it is drawn out by using a developer, followed by visual analysis under ultra-violet light. Indications of discontinuities, their location and size, could be determined based on the fluorescent dye visible on the surface. A photograph of the FS butt-welded specimen under ultra-violet light is shown below, in Figure 7. It is important to note that there are clear indications before the weld start and after the weld end, where the two plates are in contact, but not welded. The lack of penetration defect is more evident between 0 and 110 mm coordinates on the weld, a fact also observed with the conventional eddy current inspection, as seen in Figure 5. However, less intense indications could still be observed until about 190 mm from the weld start.

Figure 7: Liquid penetrant inspection results from the far-side of the specimen, photograph under ultra-violet light. Coordinates along the weld are given in millimeters.

4. Destructive testing

Metallographic examinations performed at thirteen locations along the length of the weld revealed the presence of lack of penetration defects until about 150 mm from the weld start. However, besides lack of penetration, another type of defect is present, consisting of a thin layer of oxide, customarily called “kissing bond” [1]. Kissing bonds are known to be present at the intimate contact of two adjacent surfaces, but without actual metallurgical bond and lack of cohesion forces. These types of defects propagate from the tip of the lack of penetration and along the weld nugget boundary. Another observation of the metallographic analysis is that the lack of penetration defect is not perpendicular to the surface of the coupon, but it has an oblique orientation, making an angle with the surface normal (vertical) starting at about 20° and it increases as the tool depth progresses, reaching a value of 59° at 150 mm from the weld start. This orientation of the defects is expected, due to the stirring of the plasticized metal and to the geometry of the pin. Figure 8 shows one of the metallographic images at a distance of 95 mm from the weld start. The magnified photograph tries to identify the two types of discontinuities: lack of penetration and kissing bond. It is important to note that this defect makes an angle of 57° with the vertical, and while the total defect length is 0.701 mm, its height is only of 0.364 mm. This aspect was emphasized earlier in Figure 1. Moreover, the kissing bond is found to deviate even more from the vertical axis as the weld progressed. It was found through metallography that the kissing bond angle with the vertical increases from 68° at 176 mm from the weld start to 80° at 257 mm coordinate (the last location where the defect is observed before the end of the weld).

Figure 9 shows the maximum un-weld thickness of the coupon, as the total thickness of the coupon minus the tool depth, but also the vertical size of the defects (*i.e.* defect height) – here including the lack of penetration, oxide film (kissing bond) and the total defect (lack of penetration and kissing bond). As it could be seen from the plot, the actual weld depth is larger than the tool penetration depth by a varying range, from 0.35 mm to 0.64 mm. The tool penetration depth varies linearly from 1.0 to 2.3 mm, as shown in Figure 2.a (plus the surface machining of 0.2 mm of the thickness). Moreover, while the lack of penetration defect is present to up to 150 mm from the weld start, the kissing bond was observable until about 260 mm from the weld start.

Bending tests were performed on 12 equidistant specimens along the weld, according to [10]. Figure 10 shows the results of the bending tests at the same discrete locations at which the ultrasonic inspections were presented. The overall observation is that the bending causes the specimen to break when the lack of penetration defect is present, and it only creates cracks when just kissing bonds were identified through metallographic analysis.

Figure 8: Metallographic examinations at 95 mm from the weld start, where both lack of penetration and oxide film/kissing bond defects are present. The magnified section is presented twice for better visibility (on the right with the lack of penetration defect identified by a red color, and the kissing bond by blue color.)

Figure 9: Vertical size of the discontinuities along the weld length (LOP- lack of penetration, KB- kissing bond).

Figure 10: Bending tests specimens and results. The coordinates indicate distance from the weld start to the centre of the specimen. Each specimen had a width of 18.8 mm.

5. Summary and Discussions

According to the destructive testing and metallographic examinations, the lack of penetration is confirmed up to 149 mm from the weld start while at 176 mm the lack of penetration is no longer observed, while kissing bonds are present up to a coordinate of 257 mm. Conventional eddy current and liquid penetrant techniques investigated the FS weld from the discontinuity side, and they are discussed here first.

The liquid penetrant inspection technique clearly indicates the presence of a surface opened discontinuity up to 110 mm from the weld start. Reduced intensity continuous fluorescent indications are found up to 140 mm, after which the results are spotted until 190 mm (as seen in Figure 7). It is important to note that this is a qualitative technique and it only depends on whether the defect is open to surface or not. Given the “no-width” characteristic of a kissing bond defect, the liquid penetrant technique is not expected to give any indication of this type of discontinuity. Correspondingly, lack of penetration is not found to exist with liquid penetration inspection at 176 mm, where the destructive testing confirms the inexistence of lack of penetration, and beyond. However, the discontinuous indications might correspond to local spots where lack of penetration exists in conjunction with kissing bonds.

Since in eddy current inspections, both conventional and pulsed, the induced current flow is parallel to the surface of the specimen, disruptions in their path are due to the portion of the defect perpendicular to the surface of the weld. As it was observed from the destructive testing, the defect has a slanted orientation, reaching angles down to 60° with the vertical for the lack of penetration defect, and as large as 10° for the kissing bond-types of discontinuities. Conventional eddy current gives out indications of the lack of penetration defect until about 165 mm (as from Figure 5). Kissing bonds are not identifiable with this type of inspection due to both contact of the defect faces and defect orientation with respect to the eddy current flow.

Phased array ultrasonic waves, pulsed eddy current, as well as laser ultrasonics with SAFT analysis were investigating the defect from the tool side, meaning that the input energy had to be transmitted through the welded material before interacting with the defect. Phased array ultrasonics and pulsed eddy current gave results similar to the ones obtained with inspections from the discontinuity side of the specimen, *i.e.* liquid penetrant and conventional eddy current. The phased array ultrasonic wave technique successfully identifies the lack of penetration defect, up to 160 mm from the weld start, as seen in Figure 3. However, the kissing bonds are not detected by this technique due to the defect orientation, since the setup was optimized in order to detect defects that are perpendicular to the weld. The SAFT processing of laser generated ultrasonic waves of high frequencies is the only technique that detects both lack of penetration and kissing bond types of defects, but without differentiating between the two.

6. Conclusions

This study investigated the capabilities of five different non-destructive testing techniques to inspect for lack of penetration discontinuities in butt-joint friction stir welds. A specimen with a varying lack of penetration, introduced by adapting the welding tool penetration was specially manufactured for this purpose. Two of the five inspection techniques, conventional eddy current and liquid penetrant, investigated the weld from the lack of penetration side. The other three techniques, phased array ultrasonic waves, laser generated ultrasonic waves with SAFT processing, and pulsed eddy current inspected the specimen from the welding tool side, which is opposite to the defect-containing side. Although the first two techniques have certain advantages and provided more reliable results since they investigate the defect-containing side of the specimen, the other three techniques are more realistic from a practical point of view, where in most of the cases, the weld surface from the tool side will be the one exposed for inspection. All the inspection techniques revealed the presence of the lack of penetration discontinuity up to at least 150 mm from the weld start, corresponding to a defect height of 0.2 mm (total defect length of 0.357 mm, as confirmed through destructive examinations). The liquid penetrant technique showed the presence of the defect until up to 190 mm from the weld start. The SAFT processing of the laser generated ultrasonic waves detected both lack of penetration and kissing bond types of defects up to about 245 mm from the weld start. Bending tests demonstrated that when lack of penetration defects are present the coupons break, while when kissing bonds exist by themselves, without accompanied by lack of penetration, the bending specimens do not break, but show only surface cracking. Interestingly, for the bending coupon presenting a kissing bond of 0.33 mm length (only 0.056 mm vertical height), the specimen does not show any sign of damage after performing the bending test.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank Michael Brothers from Institute for Aerospace Research, as well as to Mario Patry, Martin Lord, and François Nadeau from Industrial Materials Institute of National Research Council of Canada for their contributions to this project.

References:

1. P.L. Threadgill, A.J. Leonard, H.R. Shercliff, P.J. Withers, Friction stir welding of aluminum alloys, International Materials Reviews, Published by Maney for the Institute of Materials, Minerals and Mining and the ASM International, Vol. 54, No. 2, pp. 49-93, 2009;
2. L. Dubourg, F.-O. Gagnon, F. Nadeau, L. St-Georges, M. Jahazi, Process window optimization for FSW of thin and thick sheet Al alloys using statistical methods, Proceedings of the 6th International Symposium on Friction Stir Welding, Saint-Sauveur, Quebec, Canada, 10-13 October, 2006;
3. L. Dubourg, A. Merati, M. Gallant, M. Jahazi, Manufacturing of aircraft panels by friction stir lap welding of 7075-T6 stringers on 2024-T3 skin: process optimization and mechanical properties, Proceedings of the 7th International Symposium on Friction Stir Welding, Awaji Island, Japan, 20-22 May, 2008;
4. C. Mandache, L. Dubourg, A. Merati, M. Jahazi, Pulsed eddy current testing of friction stir welds, Materials Evaluation, Vol. 66, No. 4, pp. 382-386, 2008;
5. D. Lévesque, L. Dubourg, C. Mandache, S.E. Kruger, M. Lord, A. Merati, M. Jahazi and J.-P. Monchalin, Synthetic aperture technique for the ultrasonic evaluation of friction stir welds, Review of Quantitative Nondestructive Evaluation, ed. D.O. Thompson and D.E. Chimenti, Vol. 27, pp. 263-270, 2008;
6. Introduction to Phased Array Ultrasonic Technology Applications, Published by Olympus NDT, 48 Woerd Ave, Waltham, MA 02453, USA, 2004;
7. B.W. Drinkwater, P.D. Wilcox, Ultrasonic arrays for non-destructive evaluation: a review, NDT & E International, Vol. 39, 2006, 525-541;
8. R.A. Smith, The potential for friction stir weld inspection using transient eddy currents, Insight, Vol. 47, No. 3, 2005, 133-143;
9. ASTM International E1210-10, Standard practice for fluorescent liquid penetrant testing using hydrophilic post-emulsification process;
10. ISO 5173:2009 – Destructive tests on welds in metallic materials – Bend tests.