Engineering Materials: A Data-Driven Approach to EV Chassis Selection

Systematic analysis of mechanical, physical, and chemical properties to optimize material selection for electric vehicle chassis applications. This comprehensive study leverages advanced analytics to evaluate 1,552 material specifications across 44 heat treatment variants, applying multi-criteria decision frameworks to identify optimal solutions for structural integrity, weight efficiency, and environmental durability.

Project by: Aravindh G | aravindhkrishnan09@gmail.com

Program: DIYguru Data Science & Engineering Analytics Batch 2025 | May 6th, 2025

Project Roadmap: Systematic Material Analysis

01

Dataset Architecture

Dual-dataset structure: detailed property profiles (Dataset 1) and simplified suitability markers (Dataset 2)

02

Single-Dataset Engineering

Six foundational tasks exploring mechanical properties, design ratios, and environmental compatibility

03

Cross-Dataset Integration

Six advanced tasks merging datasets for discrepancy auditing, outlier detection, and multi-criteria ranking

04

Material Optimization

Final selection framework balancing strength, ductility, weight, and corrosion resistance for EV chassis

Understanding the Data: Two Complementary Datasets

Dataset 1: Detailed Properties

1,552 materials with comprehensive specifications

- **Mechanical:** Su, Sy, A5, E, G (strength, elasticity, ductility)
- **Hardness:** Bhn, HV (surface resistance metrics)
- **Physical:** ρ (density), μ (friction coefficient)
- **Environmental:** pH compatibility indicators
- **Metadata:** Standards, heat treatments, descriptions

Dataset 2: Simplified Suitability

1,548 materials with binary classification

- Core mechanical properties (Su, Sy, E, G)
- Physical properties (μ, ρ)
- **Critical addition:** Use Flag (True/False) indicating engineering suitability
- Enables validation and cross-verification
- Supports binary classification modeling

Data Quality Foundation: Initial Exploration Results

1552

Total materials analyzed

Spanning 1,225 unique material types

44

Heat treatment variants

From annealing to tempering at various temperatures

750

Missing heat treatment entries

Filled with 'Unknown' mode value

9

Properties with outliers

Su, Sy, A5, Bhn, G, µ, ρ, pH, HV flagged for review

Key data quality actions: Missing values imputed using mode strategy, outliers capped using IQR method to preserve realistic engineering ranges, and duplicates removed to ensure analytical integrity. All string columns standardized by trimming whitespace.

Cleaning Impact: Ultimate Tensile Strength (Su)

Mean (MPa)	572.75	559.05
Std Dev	326.83	285.05
Maximum	2220	1252.5
Minimum	69	69

Interpretation

Mean decreased 2.4% — extreme outliers artificially inflated average strength

Std dev reduced 12.8% — more consistent, reliable dataset for engineering decisions

Max capped at 1252.5 MPa — unrealistic 2220 MPa value removed using IQR upper bound

Outlier handling transformed an unreliable dataset into a practical engineering reference, eliminating exotic or erroneous values that could mislead material selection for EV chassis applications.

Yield Strength & Ductility: Cleaned Statistics

Yield Strength (Sy)

Before: Mean 387 MPa, Max 2048 MPa

After: Mean 364 MPa, Max 867.5 MPa

Maximum value capped 57.6% — removed super-alloy outliers not representative of standard automotive steels

Elongation at Break (A5)

Before: Mean 19.3%, Max 70%

After: Mean 17.5%, Max 37%

Extreme ductility values (likely polymers or errors) removed — realistic metal behavior restored for crash analysis

Data quality note: Source data contained non-integer Sy anomalies (e.g., "280 max", "25 max") requiring type conversion and validation before statistical processing. Cleaning reduced standard deviation across all metrics, improving dataset reliability for multi-criteria optimization.

Material-Treatment Efficiency: Top Performers

1	2	3
Highest Overall Efficiency	**Best Ductility**	**Optimal Hardness**
Steel SAE 51410 – Tempered at 400°F	**DIN X6CrNiTi1810 – Unknown treatment**	**Yellow brass C26800 – Unknown treatment**
Composite efficiency score: **85,530**	A5 efficiency: **37.0%**	Bhn/HV efficiency: **223.5**
Combines Su, Sy, E, G for maximum structural performance	Ideal for energy-absorbing crumple zones requiring high elongation	Superior wear resistance for contact surfaces and bushings

When analyzing materials individually by type, **Steel SAE 51431** achieved the highest efficiency (57,011), while heat treatment analysis revealed **Full-hard** processing as most effective (55,892.67). However, combined Material × Treatment analysis provides more actionable insights for application-specific selection.

Design Ratio Analysis: Three Critical Metrics

1

Strength-to-Hardness

Su / Bhn

Balances tensile strength against wear resistance — critical for machinability and forming operations

Top: Steel SAE 1141 (5.77)

2

Strength-Ductility Index

Su × A5

Measures energy absorption capacity — vital for crash structures requiring controlled deformation

Top: Steel SAE 30201 (29,341)

3

Strength-to-Weight

Su / ρ

Optimizes structural efficiency per unit mass — directly impacts vehicle range and handling

Top: Steel 20ChGNR GOST (0.161)

Engineering Application Mapping

Chassis & Suspension

Requirement: High machinability + strength

Optimal materials:

- Steel SAE 1141
- DIN 55Cr3
- DIN 37Cr4

Strength-to-Hardness ratio of 5.77 enables efficient forming while maintaining structural integrity

Crumple Zones

Requirement: Maximum energy absorption

Optimal materials:

- Steel SAE 30201
- Steel SAE 30301
- Steel SAE 30202

Strength-Ductility indices above 26,000 ensure controlled deformation before failure

Lightweight Structures

Requirement: Minimize weight without sacrificing strength

Optimal materials:

- Steel 20ChGNR GOST
- Steel 40ChFA GOST
- Steel 30ChGT GOST

Strength-to-Weight ratios above 0.160 directly extend EV range

Hardness Analysis: Critical Data Limitation

217

Brinell Hardness (Bhn)

All materials show identical value after cleaning

230

Vickers Hardness (HV)

Uniform across entire dataset post-processing

13

HV-Bhn Divergence

Consistent 13-unit difference suggests surface-hardened materials

> **Analytical constraint:** Zero variation in hardness metrics prevents correlation analysis and comparative evaluation. This suggests the dataset contains placeholder values, over-normalized data, or represents a single material class. The 13-unit divergence (HV > Bhn) indicates surface hardening — beneficial for wear-resistant applications like gears and pistons.

Implication: Hardness cannot be used as a differentiating factor in material selection. Design decisions must rely on strength, ductility, and density metrics where variation exists.

Elasticity Relationships: E, G, and μ

Strong Linear Correlation: E vs G

Elastic Modulus (E) and Shear Modulus (G) exhibit proportional relationship, confirming **isotropic material behavior** across the dataset.

Theoretical relationship: $E = 2G(1 + \mu)$

Linear distribution validates dataset consistency — materials behave predictably under tension and shear, critical for finite element analysis of chassis loading scenarios.

Weak Correlation: E vs μ

Poisson's ratio (μ) shows minimal variation with Elastic Modulus, suggesting μ is independent of stiffness in this material set.

Design Implications

- **Isotropic confirmation:** Simplifies FEA modeling — uniform stiffness in all directions
- **Predictable behavior:** E/G ratio enables accurate shear load calculations
- **Poisson independence:** Lateral strain behavior decoupled from axial stiffness

Application: Suspension components requiring torsional resistance (drive shafts, control arms) can be optimized using G values, while tensile loads (chassis rails) prioritize E.

Environmental Compatibility: pH Profile

100% Basic pH Classification

All materials in cleaned dataset exhibit alkaline characteristics (pH > 7), optimizing corrosion resistance in basic environments

Marine Applications

Ideal for seawater exposure where salt and algae shift pH alkaline — suitable for coastal EV operations and ship components

Chemical Processing

Prevents corrosion in alkaline solutions — applicable for battery coolant systems and cleaning solution contact surfaces

Biocompatibility Potential

Body fluids operate at pH ~7.4 (slightly basic) — materials suitable for medical device integration or biometric sensors

Surface treatment recommendation: While inherent basic pH provides corrosion resistance, additional coatings (anodizing, galvanization) can extend durability in extreme alkaline environments or provide multi-environment versatility.

Cross-Dataset Integration: Merging Strategy

1

Dataset Preparation

D2: Removed 4 duplicate materials (NF variants), handled outliers in Su, Sy, G, μ, ρ, stripped whitespace from all string columns

2

Identifier Creation

Generated 'Material_Alias' by concatenating Std + Material + Heat treatment. Replaced 'Unknown' with blanks for D2 matching compatibility

3

ID Mapping

Created synthetic IDs in D2 by mapping from D1 using Material_Alias as key — ensures unique identification across datasets

4

Inner Join Merge

Final merge on Material_Alias + ID: D1 (1,552) + D2 (1,548) → Merged (1,548 records)

Merge success rate: 99.7% (1,548/1,552) — only 4 materials from D1 lacked D2 equivalents, likely due to duplicate removal. High overlap validates dataset compatibility and enables robust cross-verification analysis.

Discrepancy Audit: Dataset Consistency Validation

94.4%

Property Agreement Rate

1,461 of 1,548 materials show identical Su, Sy, E, G values across datasets

5.6%

Minor Discrepancies

87 materials exhibit small differences, likely from rounding or unit conversion

Statistical Comparison

Mean, standard deviation, max, and min values show **negligible change** between D1 and D2 after outlier handling:

- Su: Mean difference < 1%
- Sy: Mean difference < 1%
- E: Values identical (normalized)
- G: Values identical (normalized)

Validation Outcome

High data integrity confirmed. Both datasets derived from consistent source with minimal processing variation.

The 94.4% agreement rate validates D2's Use Flag as reliable ground truth for suitability classification modeling.

Use Flag Patterns: Suitability Criteria Discovery

Su (MPa)	568.6	457.7	-19.5%	Lower strength preferred
Sy (MPa)	370.0	303.5	-18.0%	Lower yield acceptable
A5 (%)	17.14	20.60	+20.2%	Higher ductility required
E (MPa)	160,551	205,422	+28.0%	Higher stiffness valued
G (MPa)	64,021	79,578	+24.3%	Shear resistance critical

> **Key insight:** "Use = True" materials prioritize **ductility and elastic resistance** over raw tensile strength. This suggests suitability criteria favor materials that can absorb energy and maintain dimensional stability under cyclic loads — ideal for EV chassis subjected to vibration and impact.

Multi-Criteria Material Ranking Framework

Scoring Methodology

Normalization: Min-max scaling (0-1 range) for Su, A5, ρ; Z-score for outlier-sensitive properties

Weighting scheme:

- 35% — Ultimate Strength (Su)
- 25% — Ductility (A5)
- 15% — Inverse Density (1/ρ)
- 15% — pH neutrality score
- -10% — Poisson's ratio penalty (abs(μ - 0.3))

Formula:
Score = 0.35×Su_norm + 0.25×A5_norm + 0.15×(1-ρ_norm) + 0.15×pH_score - 0.10×μ_penalty

Top 5 Materials by Composite Score

1. **Steel SAE 30201 (annealed)** — Score: -27.046
2. **Steel SAE 30301 (annealed)** — Score: -27.056
3. **Steel 12Ch25N16G7AR GOST 5949-75** — Score: -27.058
4. **Steel SAE 51431 (tempered 400°F)** — Score: -27.061
5. **Steel SAE 51416 (tempered 400°F)** — Score: -27.061

Note: Negative scores result from penalty term; rankings remain valid (lower = better after normalization).

Application guidance: SAE 30201/30301 excel in ductility-critical zones (crumple structures), while SAE 514xx series offers superior hardness for suspension mounting points requiring wear resistance.

Outlier Material Detection: Three Failure Modes

High Strength, Low Ductility

Materials exhibiting Su > 1000 MPa but A5 < 5% — brittle behavior under impact loads. **Risk:** Catastrophic failure without warning deformation in crash scenarios. **Example use:** Limited to non-structural fasteners or static mounts.

Extreme Resistivity Anomalies

Materials exceeding 95th percentile in electrical resistance — atypical for metallic chassis materials. **Implication:** Potential grounding issues or electromagnetic shielding problems. Requires verification if aluminum alloys or composites are present.

Hardness Scale Inconsistency

No materials showed HV vs Bhn divergence beyond threshold after cleaning. **Result:** Dataset exhibits uniform surface treatment characteristics — validates consistent processing but limits hardness-based differentiation.

Material Descriptor Analysis: Keyword Insights

Hardening: 77 Materials

Average properties:

- Su: 812.84 MPa
- Sy: 582.62 MPa
- A5: 12.39%
- ρ: 7860 kg/m^3

High strength, moderate ductility — ideal for structural members requiring wear resistance

Corrosion-Resistant: 8 Materials

Average properties:

- Su: 775.00 MPa
- Sy: 473.81 MPa
- A5: 24.00%
- ρ: 7873.75 kg/m^3

Superior ductility (24% vs 12%) — optimal for exposed body panels and undercarriage

Ductile keyword: Zero matches in dataset — suggests descriptor field lacks standardized terminology. Materials with A5 > 20% exist but aren't explicitly labeled "ductile." **Recommendation:** Implement semantic search or property-based filtering rather than text matching for material discovery.

Final Recommendation: EV Chassis Material Selection

Primary Structural Rails

Material: Steel SAE 51410 (Tempered 400°F)

Justification: Highest composite efficiency (85,530), optimal strength-to-weight ratio (0.160), superior hardness for mounting point durability

Properties: Su: 1252 MPa, Sy: 867 MPa, E: 206 GPa

Crumple Zones & Bumper Reinforcements

Material: Steel SAE 30201 (Annealed)

Justification: Maximum strength-ductility index (29,341), A5: 37% enables controlled energy absorption, top multi-criteria score

Properties: Su: 793 MPa, Sy: 304 MPa, elongation optimized for crash performance

Suspension Components

Material: Steel SAE 1141

Justification: Best strength-to-hardness ratio (5.77) ensures machinability + fatigue resistance, Bhn: 217 provides wear resistance for articulating joints

Properties: Balanced Su/Sy for cyclic loading, optimized for forging operations

Corrosion-Exposed Panels

Material: DIN X6CrNiTi1810 or Corrosion-Resistant subset (8 materials)

Justification: A5: 24% (vs 12% hardened steels), alkaline pH compatibility, stainless chemistry for underbody/coastal environments

Properties: Lower strength acceptable for non-structural panels, ductility prevents stress corrosion cracking

Conclusion: Data-Driven Material Optimization

Dataset Integrity

Rigorous cleaning achieved 94.4% cross-dataset agreement, outlier handling reduced variance 12-28%, enabling reliable analysis

Multi-Criteria Framework

Weighted scoring (35% strength, 25% ductility, 15% weight, 15% pH, -10% μ penalty) identified optimal materials for four chassis zones

Application Mapping

Use Flag analysis revealed ductility + elastic modulus prioritized over raw strength — confirms energy absorption focus for EV safety

Engineering Impact

Recommended material suite balances crashworthiness (SAE 30201), structural efficiency (SAE 51410), machinability (SAE 1141), and corrosion resistance (X6CrNiTi1810) for comprehensive EV chassis performance

Future work: Integrate cost analysis, validate recommendations through finite element crash simulations, expand dataset to include aluminum alloys and composites for further weight reduction opportunities.