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1. introduction
Numerical simulation has been playing a significant role in manufacturing recently. The general Thermo-elastic-plastic (T-E-P) FEM software is now widely used in mechanical process as during welding. However, the research in comparing with in detail results using different T-E-P FEM software is rare. It is necessary to learn all the differences of calculation results by different software for industrial applications.

In this paper, three kinds of software (ANSYS, ABAQUS and JWRIAN) are employed in T-E-P FEM analysis for bead-on-plate welding, and temperature field and stress field are discussed in detail through a series of calculations. By comparing experimental results which are published, the differences among results which are obtained by different T-E-P FEM software are established.

2. Model for Analysis
Bead-on-plate welding is taken as the research model herein. The length, the width and the thickness of the plate is 400mm, 400mm and 10mm respectively. The material is low-carbon steel. The FE model has 2720 solid elements and 3690 nodes. The smallest size of element is 10mm×2.5mm×2.5mm.

The thermal properties and mechanical properties are dependent on temperature, which reference to paper [1]. DC3D8 and SOLID 70 are used for temperature calculation for Abaqus and Ansys, and to simulate the stress field, C3D8I and SOLID 45 are chosen for Abaqus and Ansys respectively. In order to simplify calculation, the moving welding arc is simplified as a cuboid interior moving heat source.

3. Calculated Results
Comparison of temperature
Figure 1 shows the distribution of temperature at center cross-section on the surface of plate when welding time is 21 sec, and total heat input parameter (Q/h²) is 4.06 (J/mm³), welding speed is 10mm/Sec.

From Fig.1, it is clearly seen that temperature results obtained from three kinds of software are consistent, the peak temperature has difference a bit.

Comparison of plastic strain
Figure 2 displays the plastic strain in Y-direction by Abaqus, Ansys and Jwrian at center cross-section in middle of the plate.

Figure 3 is the curve of the temperature history and plastic strain history at center that coordinate is (200, 0, 5).

It is found that plastic strain from Abaqus and Ansys are good in agreement, yet that from Jwrian is a little smaller than the others.
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Comparison of residual stress

The comparison of residual stresses in welding direction (X) on surface at center cross-section is shown in Fig. 4.

According to Fig. 4, it is found that results from Abaqus resemble those from Ansys, but the distribution area of residual stress obtained from Jwrian is narrower than Abaqus and Ansys.

Fig. 3 Temperature and plastic strain histories

Fig. 4 Distribution of residual stresses at center cross-section

Comparison of deformation

The curve of relation between transverse shrinkage and heat input parameter $Q/h^2$ is Fig. 5. As seen from Fig. 5, the results calculated by the T-E-P FEM software agree with the experimental data [3], and also that from Jwrian is a little smaller than that.

Fig. 5 Relationship between transverse shrinkage and heat input parameter

Figure 6 shows relation between angular distortion and heat input parameter. Seen as Fig. 6, if the heat input parameter $Q/h^2$ is small, the angular distortion obtained from calculator by the T-E-P FEM software are agreement in experimented data. With the increase of heat input parameter $Q/h^2$, the difference between the numerical results and experimental data increases. Reason may be that metal melting has not been considered in T-E-P FEM analysis. In the case of Jwrian, better results can be obtained in high heat input area compared with the other software.

Fig. 6 Relationship between angular distortion and heat input parameter

Comparison of computed time

The computed time of temperature field and stress field are show in Table 1. From this table, it can be seen that Abaqus takes the shortest time among the three kinds of software in the same condition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1 comparison of computed time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperature filed (min)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress field (min)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Conclusions

The conclusions of this study are summarized as follows:

(1) The temperature results obtained from three kinds of software are consistent; the peak temperature has a small difference.

(2) The calculated results of residual stress accord closely each other, but distribution area of Jwrian is narrower than Abaqus and Ansys.

(3) The calculated transverse shrinkages agree with the experimental data, yet that from Jwrian is a little small than experimental data.

(4) If heat input is small, the calculated angular distortion is agreement with experiment data, with the increasing of heat input, the difference increases.

(5) Abaqus takes the shortest time among the three kinds of software in the same condition.
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