Simulation of bi-material nano-second laser ablation
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Introduction

Among the new cleaning processes, laser ablation technique generates a great interest since 1990 and has led to industrial patents [1, 2, 3]. Number of studies have been done on this topic in United States, France, China, Japan and United Kindom. This process is based on ejection of contaminated matter consequently to energy absorption coming from laser pulses. After ablating, the mater can be collected by vacuum and insulated to avoid environment contamination. As this is a non-contact method, the treatment can be provided safely regarding contamination and as only oxide is ablated, the contaminated material amount to be treated remains quite weak. Moreover, this technique is particularly suitable for metallic treatment due to its ability to the laser beam to interact only with the contaminated oxide. In these conditions, the laser ablation leads to high cleaning rate [4, 6]. Nevertheless, the process has to be optimized to reduce the residual contamination level. Indeed, literature indicates several parameters limiting the treatment efficiency. One of the negative effects is the diffusion of contaminant in the bulk due to the laser heating [6] and the entrapment of contaminant in surface defects [5, 7, 8]. Both of them need an increase of the laser decontamination knowledge mainly treated experimentally at this time.

In addition to an experimental study, authors propose in this paper a numerical analysis of the process. The supposed ablation phenomena are phase explosion, mechanical fracturing and vaporization. To reduce the scale of the numerical problem, a single pulse is studied but results will be extrapolated to real treatment conditions. The physical model and numerical assumptions will be firstly explained. After result validation, an analysis of ablation mechanisms will be proposed.

Theory / Experimental Set-up

In order to be sufficiently predictive for understanding ablation phenomenon, the present model has to consider heat transfers in both phases, fluid flow and mass transfers. Moreover, as the material is evaporating, a recoil pressure is applied at the liquid-gas boundary and the liquid boundary motion has to be considered numerically (Figure 1).

All these phenomena will be described in the next subsections.

Governing Equations / Numerical Model / Simulation / Methods / Use of Simulation Apps

Geometrical assumption:

As the laser beam is circular and the workpiece quite large regarding the beam size $R_0$, it is possible to consider the problem in cylindrical coordinates system (Figure 2). Moreover, for this understanding stage, the study is focused on a single laser impact.

Heat transfers:

$$
\rho_m c_p \frac{\partial T}{\partial t} + \rho_m c_p \vec{v} \cdot \nabla T = \nabla \cdot (\lambda_m \nabla T) + S_{m}(r, z, t)
$$
Where \( \rho_m, c_p m \) and \( \lambda_m \) are the material dependent thermal properties. \( T \) is the computed temperature and \( S_m(r, z, t) \) the laser bulk power absorption set only in the oxide layer. The exponent \( \alpha \) indicates that the fusion latent heat is included in an equivalent [9] specific heat:

\[
\varepsilon_p^{ed} = \varepsilon_p m + \frac{L_m}{\sqrt{\pi \Delta T^2}} \exp\left(-\frac{(T - T_m)^2}{\Delta T^2}\right)
\]

As the oxide is not perfectly opaque, a certain amount of power is distributed in the oxide bulk. This absorption is assumed to follow a Beer-Lambert law:

\[
S_m(r, z, t) = \varphi_{laser}(r, t) \exp^{-A_{Fe3O4}(2-z_0)} A_{Fe3O4}
\]

With \( A_{Fe3O4} \) the oxide volume absorption, \( z_0 \) the \( z \) coordinate of A and B points (Figure 2). \( \varphi_{laser} \) is the spatial and temporal distribution of the laser beam.

\[
\varphi_{laser}(t) = D(t) \frac{\alpha P_m}{2 f \frac{\pi}{\tau R_0^2}} \exp\left(-\frac{r^2}{2R_0^2}\right)
\]

\( D(t) \) is the time distribution of the laser impulsion shown in Figure 3 and coming from experimental measurements. \( P_m \) is the mean value of laser power, \( R_0 \) the standard deviation of this Gaussian expression (with \( \frac{1}{2} \) factor), \( f \) the frequency and \( \tau \) the pulse time duration.

- [BF], [FC] and [CD] Thermal insulation
  \[
  - \lambda_m \nabla T, \vec{n} = 0
  \]

Where, \( h_{cv} \) is a convection coefficient, \( \varepsilon \) is the material emissivity, \( \sigma_b \) the Stefan-Boltzmann constant, \( m \) is the evaporation rate coming from Hertz-Langmuir equation [13] and \( L_{vap} \) the latent heat of vaporization.

\[
\dot{m} = \dot{p}_{sat}(T) \sqrt{\frac{M}{2\pi R T}} (1 - \beta_v)
\]

With \( \dot{p}_{sat} \) the saturation pressure (Clausius-Clapeyron equation [13]):

\[
\dot{p}_{sat} = \dot{p}_0 \exp\left(\frac{M_{L_v}}{R} \frac{1}{T} \frac{1}{\gamma}\right)
\]

\( T_v \) is the boiling point, \( M \) the molar mass and \( p_0 \) the ambient pressure.

**Fluid flow:**

The fluid flow problem is computed through the resolution of two equations: Momentum conservation and mass conservation.

\[
\rho_m \left[ \frac{\partial \vec{v}}{\partial t} + (\vec{v} \cdot \nabla)\vec{v} \right] = \nabla \left( \mu_m (\nabla \vec{v} + (\nabla \vec{v})^T) \right) + \vec{f}_v
\]

\[
\nabla \cdot \vec{v} = 0
\]

Where the dynamic viscosity \( \mu_m \) is assumed to be the same in both materials. It should be noted that the mass conservation is written here for a not compressible material and Boussinesq approximations are not made here due to the very fast time dynamics avoiding convective eddies.

**Boundary conditions:**

- [AE] and [ED] Axial symmetry
  \[
  \vec{v}, \vec{n} = 0
  \]

- [AB] surface tension and recoil pressure
  \[
  \sigma, \vec{n} = \gamma(T) \kappa + p_{rec}
  \]

- [BF], [FC] and [CD] no slip
  \[
  \vec{v} = 0
  \]

With \( \gamma \) the liquid material surface tension, \( \kappa \) the local curvature of the interface and \( p_{rec} \) the recoil pressure coming from the saturation pressure and considering the retro-diffusion coefficient \( \beta \) [12].
\[ p_{rec} = p_0 + p_{sat} \frac{(1 + \beta_r)}{2} \]

To complete the description, the initial conditions in velocity is zero and the pressure is set to the atmospheric one. The laser evaporation thermal and mechanical phenomena are described in more detail in literature [10, 11, 13].

**Chemical species transport:**
As the aim is to compute the oxide residual content, the proportion of each element (steel and oxide) has to be computed. The model used here is the component conservation thanks to the Fick law:

\[ \frac{\partial C}{\partial t} + \vec{v} \cdot \nabla C = \vec{V} \cdot (D_{iff}(T) \nabla C) \]

For the whole boundaries, no material flux is considered. The diffusion coefficient \( D_{iff}(T) \) is assumed to be temperature dependent through an Arrhenius law in the solid phase and related to the Stokes-Einstein approximation in the liquid [14]:

\[
D_{iff}(T) = \begin{cases} 
D_0 e^{\frac{Q}{k_B T}} & (T < T_{m_{Fe2O4}}) \\
\frac{k_B T}{6\pi a_{Eu} \mu} & (T > T_{m_{Fe2O4}})
\end{cases}
\]

Where \( D_0 \) is the pre-exponential factor, \( Q \) is the activation energy, \( k_B \) is the Boltzmann constant and \( a_{Eu} \) is the atomic size of Europium element.

It should be noted that the diffusive properties of oxide in steel with the temperature are not very accurate. Nevertheless, as the dynamic is very fast the fluid transport is supposed to be more sensitive.

**Liquid deformation and material ablation:**
In this model the liquid - gas interface has to move due to the recoil pressure compensated by surface tension and due to the material withdrawal by vaporization. The former phenomena are computed form pressure equilibrium coming from fluid flow calculation ([AB] boundary condition in Fluid flow paragraph), thus naturally conservative in mass. The later one is coming from the mass ablated rate calculation \( \dot{m} \). As this mass leaves the studied system, it has to be uncorrelated to the mass conservation.

**Boundary conditions:**
- [AE], [ED], [BF] and [FC] no motion in the \( r \) direction and free displacement in the \( z \) direction
- [DC] free along \( r \) and locked along \( z \)
- [AB] normal velocity \( v_b = \vec{v} \cdot \bar{n} - \vec{v}_l \cdot \bar{n} \)

With \( \vec{v} \cdot \bar{n} \) the conservative part coming from the fluid flow calculation and \( \vec{v}_l \cdot \bar{n} \) the normal "ablation velocity" (\( \vec{v}_l \cdot \bar{n} = \dot{m}/\rho_m \))

The resulting motion of the mesh in the domains is computed in order to optimize the mesh quality through an arbitrary hyper-elastic model.

**Model and process parameters:**
The parameters used in previous models are summarized in tables 1 and 2.

**Table 1: Model Properties**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Properties</th>
<th>304L</th>
<th>Fe304</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \lambda ) [W/m/K]</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \rho ) [kg/m(^3)]</td>
<td>8020</td>
<td>5180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( c_p ) [J/kg/K]</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( D_0 ) [m(^2)/s]</td>
<td>( 5 \times 10^{-6} )</td>
<td>( 4.5 \times 10^{-7} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \alpha ) [%]</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( A ) [cm(^{-1})]</td>
<td>( 36 \times 10^4 )</td>
<td>( 32 \times 10^4 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( T_m ) [K]</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>1863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( T_v ) [K]</td>
<td>3173</td>
<td>2896</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: Common and process properties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Properties</th>
<th>304L and Fe$_3$O$_4$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\eta$ [Pa.s]</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\gamma$ [N/m]</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\frac{\partial y}{\partial t}$ [N/m/K]</td>
<td>$1.2 \times 10^{-4}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\beta_t$</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R_0$ [m]</td>
<td>$32.5 \times 10^{-5}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P_m$ [W]</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T_\infty$ [K]</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$h_{cv}$ [W/m$^2$/K]</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mesh properties and time step:
This problem has the particularity to be multi-scales in space and in time. In other words, the oxide layer is 130 nm thick and the whole simulated piece is 30 $\mu$m thick (figure 2) and the pulse duration is 150 ns (figure 3) whereas the process period is 50 $\mu$s. Thus, the time and space discretizations have to be chosen carefully.

Firstly, in order to consider correctly the whole laser pulse, a time step of 5 ns is set during the pulse and 10 ns during the cooling. Secondly, the oxide layer is spatially meshed with triangular 10 nm elements.

After a mesh convergence analysis, this configuration seems to allow correct computation of laser absorption and oxide concentration calculation.

In the rest of the element sizes growth with a factor of 1.1 (Figure 4).

In order to reduce the Degrees Of Freedom to be solved, a linear interpolation is set in elements for all physics. The numerical problem is thus composed by more of 2500000 DOF, solved with 2x8@2.4GHz CPU in approximately 4 hours.

Results and discussion

Before presenting results, the aim of this numerical analysis has to be recalled. This model is made to predict the ablated material amount and to understand ablation phenomena. The first part of the results is the model validation regarding similar experiment. In a second step, the ablation phenomena will be analyzed in the current process parameter range.

Model validation

Firstly, the thermal field can be validated through oxide ablation amount and melted zone comparisons with experiments. The figure 5 is an extrapolate 3D view showing oxide concentration decrease with the time during one spot laser processing. It can be observed that the ablated zone remains constant after 500 ns, i.e. few
hundred nanoseconds after the laser pulse. Two mechanisms are responsible to the oxide amount decrease in the center part, the material removing due to evaporation and the lateral fluid motion involved by recoil pressure.

The isolevel lines indicate the fusion and vaporization temperatures. The larger one can be compared to the experimental melted zone (figure 6).

In order to validate the thermal field, numerical key temperatures (melting and vaporization) are compared to experimental picture in figure 6. A particular caution has been taken to scales equality between experiment and simulation results. The experimental picture shows three different areas, the ablated zone (lighter zone is the metal), oxide melted zone where the initial roughness seems to be modified and the solid oxide zone. The comparison indicates that the ablated zone corresponds to material part which is higher than the boiling point and the melted

Figure 5: Dynamics of oxide removal.
oxide limit is also consistent with calculated melted zone.

In addition to this upper view analysis, the melted thickness was measured on transmission electronic microscopy pictures. The experimental thickness is estimated to 0.7 µm whereas the numerical model predicts 1.2 µm. This discrepancy can be explained by the uncertainties on material properties at high temperature. Indeed, in the model, thermal properties are different for oxide and metal, but not temperature dependent. Moreover, as the phase change is very fast, it is quite difficult to detect the transition zone accurately on TEM pictures. The experimental information is probably slightly underestimated.

The computed minimal oxide residual concentration is close to 28 %. As the measured initial content of contaminant was 1 % in the oxide, we can estimate its residual concentration as 0.28 % numerically. This content has also been measured experimentally to 0.2 % (by GDMS).

**Oxide layer removal analysis:**

In this part, the previous model will be used to explain phenomena occurring during oxide layer ablation. The most probable reasons of oxide withdrawal are:

— phase explosion,
— mechanical fracturing,
— vaporization.

The first one appears when the metal start to evaporated before oxide with both oxide and metal in liquid phase. The second one is similar to glass cutting, i.e. the solid oxide is broken due to its thermal expansion. The last one, is the classical evaporation process, which means that the oxide leaves the sample as vapor.

To validate or invalidate one of the previous ablation origins, the temperature evolution seems to be crucial information. The time evolution of point A and E temperatures are plotted in figure 7. The different material melting and boiling points are added to the plot. The intersections of lines and temperature curves indicate when each phase start to melt and evaporate.

This figure indicates that the oxide melts and evaporates before metal. Moreover, the metal start to melt nearly when the oxide starts to evaporate. When the metal start to evaporate, the calculated evaporation rate of oxide is more than 20 times higher than metal. This fact indicates that the phase explosion is the weakest likely assumption.

In addition to this analysis, the high evaporation rate indicates the vaporization is a sensitive phenomenon in this context. For instance and for this case, with an evaporation radius equal to the laser beam radius (32 µm) during approximately 100 ns the ablated mass during $1.44 \times 10^6$ pulses (experimental conditions) is computed to 5.1 mg. The experimentally measured vaporized mass is estimated to 3.3 mg. The gap between these two values is mainly due to the context and assumptions. Indeed, numerically, the ablated mass of one pulse is multiplied by the number of experimental spot while the experimental data concerns overlapped spots (80 %). Thus, the two evaporation cases are not perfectly similar, in the numerical case, only oxide is ablated, whereas in

![Figure 6: Experiment and numerical melted and evaporated zones](image-url)

As the thermal and species fields are quite well estimated numerically, the model is supposed to be sufficiently predictive to allow understanding of the oxide layer withdrawal.
the experiment, a part of previously ablated area is reheated. As the oxide absorbs more energy than metal, the evaporation considered numerically is higher.

Figure 7: Temperature and evaporation rate evolution with time on points A and E (Figure 1).

Conclusions

As a conclusion, an ablation model has been done considering thermal, fluid flows and species effects. As the experimental context is quite extreme, the experimental validation is difficult. Nevertheless, the few information compared between the model and experiment results allow to be quite confident with the simulation. It provides a lot of information to analyze and leads to propose interpretation of the most likely mechanism occurring in our ablation case.
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