ABSTRACT

Schmidt hammer hardness ($R_L$) provides a quick and inexpensive measure of surface hardness that is widely used for estimating the mechanical properties of rock material such as strength, sawability, cuttability and drillability. In this study, $R_L$ as predictors, which is thought to be a useful, simple and inexpensive test particularly for performance prediction of chain saw machine (CSM), is suggested. This study aims to estimate CSM performance from $R_L$ values of rocks. For this purpose, rock cutting and rock mechanics tests were performed on twenty four different natural stone samples having different strength values. In this study, Chain Saw Penetration Index (CSPI) has been predicted based on $R_L$ which is one of the two models previously used for performance prediction of CSMs. The $R_L$ values were correlated with UCS, CSPI and SE using simple regression analysis with SPSS 15.0. As a result of this evaluation, $R_L$ has a strong relation with UCS and SE. It is statistically proved that the model based on $R_L$ for predicting CSPI is valid and reliable for performance prediction of CSM. Results of this study indicated that the CSPI of CSMs could be reliably predicted by empirical model using $R_L$.

ÖZ

INTRODUCTION

CSMs are used for the extraction of natural (dimensional) stones such as travertine and marble. They are used for cutting low-to medium-abrasive and soft-to medium-strength natural stones in both underground and surface quarrying operations, as well as in squaring operations. They cut relatively thin slots vertically or horizontally and are usually used in combination with diamond wire-cutting machines (Primavori 2006). Adding only one chain saw to the equipment fleet, in addition to diamond wire-cutting machines, improves the overall performance of a midsize quarry by about 20% (Copur et al. 2006). They eliminate time losses and labor for drilling boreholes for wire insertion when using with diamond wire-cutting machines, especially in high benches more than 6-7 m (eliminate collimation problems). They reduce production and time losses due to their ability of sumping horizontally or vertically to enter a new bench. They result in a directly saleable stone. They create an excellent working environment (regular and planar surfaces) for quarrying. They produce less dust and waste material compared to diamond wire cutting machines (Sariisik and Sariisik 2010). The basic limitation of these machines is that they cannot cut hard, abrasive, and fractured stone deposits.

CSMs produce an excellent working environment, produce less waste material and dust, eliminate collimation problems encountered with diamond wire cutting machines, reduce time and production losses to enter a new bench, and produce directly saleable blocks (Mancini et al., 2001; Copur et al., 2006; Copur et al., 2011a; Primavori, 2006).

There are a few studies in the literature related to performance prediction of CSMs. Mancini et al. (1992, 1994) tested the parameters affecting the performance of different chain saw machines, and simulated geostatistically the chain cutting, the results were compared with the field performances of different CSMs working in different conditions. Mancini et al. (2001) investigated in situ chain saw applications in terms of cutting rates and tool wear rates. Primavori (2006) tested the operational conditions of CSMs in order to understand the effective usage of these machines. Copur et al. (2007) performed linear cutting tests to analyze the cutting characteristics of CSMs. Copur et al. (2011a) suggested an empirical model based on CSPI for prediction of the areal net cutting rate (ANCR) of CSMs. In this model, UCS of the stones, useful cutting depth of the arms, and weight of the CSMs were used as predictors. Copur (2010) and Copur et al. (2011a, b) proposed another model based on the SE obtained from linear cutting tests in unrelied cutting mode. Copur (2010) and Copur et al. (2011c) proposed a deterministic model in order to predict ANCR of CSMs. Sarisik and Sarisik (2013) analyzed the cutting performance of a CSM, and the results obtained from the field were compared with diamond wire cutting results. According to their study, block efficiency in natural stone quarries increased by up to 60-80 % with the use of CSM. Tumac (2014) suggested a model based on Shore hardness values and deformation coefficient for prediction of CSPI and ANCR of CSMs. The Shore hardness values have been used to improve two models previously developed based on the CSPI and SE.

This paper is concerned with establishing empirical prediction model for CSPI of CSM based on Rs values. The relation between Schmidt hardness, UCS and SE were investigated. For this purpose, rock cutting and rock mechanics tests were performed on twenty four samples representing marble, travertine and tuff, obtained from sites around Konya province. Two empirical models for prediction of the ANCR of the CSMs were developed by Copur et al. (2011a). One of the models is based on the CSPI, and uses the UCS values of the stone, weight of the CSM and useful cutting depth of the arm as predictor parameters. The other model is based on the results of linear cutting experiments performed in the unrelied cutting mode with a standard chisel tool and uses SE as the predictor parameter. They suggested empirical models based on CSPI and linear cutting experiments are energy as the predictor parameter are also statistically verified and proved to be a very useful and reliable tool for prediction of ANCR of CSMs. In these models, they have been used six different rock samples including marble, travertine and overburden.

In this study, the CSPI model is revised using Rs values. To develop the proposed models, the database that is composed of Rs, UCS and also
SE values including unrelieved cutting modes were established using the dataset obtained from experimental studies. The model is based on a revised CSPI, which uses $R_L$, machine weight, and useful arm cutting depth as predictors. The $R_L$ values were used for predicting of CSPI, UCS and SE. The CSPI model developed previously are improved by using $R_L$ values for the prediction of chain saw machines. According to the regression analysis, the CSPI can be predicted through $R_L$ values of rocks.

1. **LABORATORY STUDIES**

The testing program in this study included rock cutting and rock mechanics tests. Additionally, mineralogical and petrographic analyses were performed on rock samples. A total twenty-four different rock samples having different strength values representing marble, travertine and tuff collected from sites around Konya province of, Turkey for small-scale linear rock cutting and rock mechanics tests. Rock block samples were transported to the Rock Mechanics Laboratory in the Mining Engineering Department of Selcuk University. Cylindrical core specimens were prepared from block samples for rock mechanics tests and block samples were prepared for rock cutting tests. The standard testing procedures suggested by the ISRM (International Society for Rock Mechanics) for testing cuttability and mechanical properties of rocks.

1.1. **Rock mechanics tests**

All tests were carried out in the laboratory for determination of physical and mechanical properties of rock samples. Cylindrical core specimens NX (54 mm) in diameter were prepared from block samples by drilling in such a way that the drilling direction was perpendicular to the plane of the thin section. The standard testing procedures suggested by the ISRM for testing mechanical properties of rock were followed throughout the tests (ISRM 2007). The results of the tests related to the determination of the engineering properties of the samples are summarized in Table 1 and testing procedures are briefly given below. The tests were repeated at least ten times for each rock type and the average value was recorded.

The UCS values were determined on a hydraulic testing machine with a capacity of 3000 kN. The loading rate was applied within the limits of 2 kN/sec. Cylindrical specimens NX in diameter with a length to diameter ratio of 2.5:1 were used.

Schmidt hammer rebound tests were applied on the test samples having an approximate dimension of 30 x 30 x 20 cm³. The tests were performed with a Proceq L-type digital Schmidt hammer with impact energy of 0.735 Nm. The hammer is equipped with a sensor that measures the rebound value of a test impact with high resolution and repeatability. Basic settings and measured values are shown on the display unit. The measured data can be transmitted easily by a serial RS 232 cable to a normal printer or to a PC with the appropriate software. All the tests were conducted with the hammer by holding vertically downwards and at right angles to the horizontal rock surface. In the tests, the ISRM (2007) recommendations were applied for each rock type. ISRM suggested that 20 rebound values from single impacts separated by at least a plunger diameter should be recorded, and the upper ten values averaged.

1.2. **Rock cutting tests**

The small-scale rock cutting test has been developed for the purpose of measuring direct cuttability of a given rock. The test rig which is a modified Kloop shaping machine having a stroke 450 mm and a power of 4 kW was used (Fig. 1). The rig which is similar to the one originally developed by McFeat-Smith and Fowell (1977, 1979) is located in the laboratories of the Mining Engineering Department at Selcuk University. In this study, rectangular blocks of rock samples of 30x30x10 cm were fixed in a table of a shaping machine and cut by a chisel pick having a rake angle of -5°, a clearance angle of 5°, and a tool width of 12.7 mm. The depth of cut was selected as 2 mm in unrelieved cutting mode. The cutting speed was around 36 cm/s and the data acquisition rate was 1,000 Hz. In this study, data collection system included two load cells (cutting and normal), a current and a voltage transducer, a power analyzer, an AC power speed control system, a laser sensor, a data acquisition card.
and a computer were used. During the rock cutting tests the tool forces in cutting directions are recorded by using platform type load cell with capacity of 750 kg, a data acquisition card and block diagrams in Matlab Simulink as illustrated in Fig. 2.

Three tests were carried out on each rock sample in which mean cutting forces were recorded. After each cutting test, the length of cut was measured and the rock cuttings for the cut were collected and weighed for determination of specific energy. Specific energy is calculated using the formula below:

\[
SE = \left(\frac{FC.L}{Q}\right) \times 10^{-1} \tag{1}
\]

where \(SE\) is the specific energy in MJ/m\(^3\) or kWh/m\(^3\), \(FC\) the average cutting force acting on the tool in kN, \(L\) the cutting length in cm, \(Q\) the volume cut, in cm\(^3\) (\(Q = Y/D\)), \(Y\) the yield in gr, \(D\) the density in g/cm\(^3\).

2. EVALUATION OF THE RESULTS

The average results of rock cutting and rock mechanics tests are given in Table 1. As shown in Table 1, the range varies from soft to hard rocks: UCS from 4.44 to 80.73 MPa, Brazilian tensile strength (BTS) from 1.05 to 6.88 MPa, P-wave velocity (Vp) from 1.88 to 6.58 km/s, \(R_l\) from 25.95 to 80.26, density (\(\rho\)) from 1.43 to 2.77 g/cm\(^3\) and the \(SE\) values range from 1.58 to 17.63 kWh/m\(^3\).

2.1. Prediction of UCS and SE from \(R_l\) values

The Schmidt hammer hardness value is one of the physico-mechanical properties of the rock. Schmidt hammer test is very simple and inexpensive test to conduct and the rebound value is a good indicator of mechanical properties of rock material (Bilgin et al., 2002).

Some researchers found strong correlations between Schmidt hardness value and the cutting rate of roadheaders, tunnel boring machines and impact hammers (Bilgin et al., 1996, 2002; Howarth et al., 1986; Poole and Farmer, 1978; Goktan and Gunes, 2005). Additionally, Schmidt hammer value is used in rock cutting applications and sawability for prediction of performance of the cutting process (Kahraman et al. 2004; Ersoy and Atici, 2005; Yurdakul and Akdas, 2012).

In this study, relations between \(R_l\), SE and UCS was analyzed using regression analysis method with SPSS 15.0. The relation between UCS and \(R_l\) are presented in Fig. 3. According to the simple regression analysis for all data, the exponential function showed significant relation between UCS and \(R_l\) values of rocks. The estimation of the UCS from \(R_l\) is given in Eq. 2. The regression coefficient (\(R^2\)) for this equation is 0.891. The relation between SE and \(R_l\) are presented in Fig. 4. According to the simple regression analysis for all data, the power function showed significant relation between SE and \(R_l\) values of rocks. The estimation of the SE from \(R_l\) is given in Eq. 3. The regression coefficient (\(R^2\)) for this equation is 0.936. The equations of curves are given as follows:

\[
UCS = 2.180e^{0.045R_l} \tag{2}
\]

\[
SE = 0.002R_l^{2.181} \tag{3}
\]
where UCS is uniaxial compressive strength in MPa, SE is specific energy in kWh/m³ and RL is Schmidt hardness value.

RL has a meaningful correlation with UCS and SE, with a strong coefficient of determination and in these models.

2.2. Model development studies by using RL values

Predicting performance of mechanical miners is very important for feasibility and planning purposes. There are some prediction models in the literature for performance prediction of mechanical miners. The model based on instantaneous cutting rate of mechanical miner developed by Rostami et al. (1994) has been more frequently used in these models. Net cutting rate, also called as instantaneous cutting rate, of a mechanical miner can be estimated by using Eq. (4).

\[ NCR = \frac{kP}{SE_{\text{opt}}} \]  

(4)

where NCR is the net cutting rate in m³/h, SE_{\text{opt}} is the optimum specific energy in kWh/m³ obtained from linear cutting tests, P is the cutting power of the excavation machine in kW, and k is coefficient related to the transfer of cutting to the rock depending on the type of mechanical miner.

Limited researches have been performed for performance prediction of CSMs. Two empirical models were developed and used to predict the performance of CSM by Copur et al. (2011a). One of the models depends on the stone, machine and operational parameters as predictors, which are normalized as the CSPI. The other model depends on linear cutting tests and uses SE as the predictor. In this study, the CSPI has been improved by using the RL values of rocks.

### Table 1. Rock cutting and rock mechanics tests results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rock Code Number</th>
<th>Rock Type</th>
<th>UCS (MPa)</th>
<th>BTS (MPa)</th>
<th>Vp (km/s)</th>
<th>RL</th>
<th>ρ (g/cm³)</th>
<th>FC (kN)</th>
<th>SE (kWh/m³)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Travertine</td>
<td>18.56 ±2.57</td>
<td>1.75 ±0.23</td>
<td>4.03 ±0.17</td>
<td>47.78 ±4.49</td>
<td>2.16 ±0.05</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>8.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Travertine</td>
<td>27.55 ±4.06</td>
<td>2.94 ±0.90</td>
<td>4.16 ±0.28</td>
<td>45.63 ±2.17</td>
<td>2.26 ±0.08</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>7.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Travertine</td>
<td>30.69 ±5.19</td>
<td>2.96 ±0.57</td>
<td>4.70 ±0.21</td>
<td>53.30 ±2.15</td>
<td>2.36 ±0.10</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>10.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Travertine</td>
<td>32.23 ±4.83</td>
<td>3.74 ±0.98</td>
<td>5.22 ±0.37</td>
<td>61.67 ±1.87</td>
<td>2.40 ±0.09</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>12.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Travertine</td>
<td>25.95 ±8.60</td>
<td>2.86 ±0.71</td>
<td>4.88 ±0.28</td>
<td>52.71 ±3.15</td>
<td>2.33 ±0.03</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>7.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Travertine</td>
<td>28.11 ±10.46</td>
<td>3.01 ±0.63</td>
<td>5.38 ±0.14</td>
<td>49.16 ±0.82</td>
<td>2.38 ±0.06</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>10.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Travertine</td>
<td>14.82 ±3.84</td>
<td>2.96 ±0.31</td>
<td>4.57 ±0.18</td>
<td>48.05 ±1.02</td>
<td>2.24 ±0.04</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>9.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Travertine</td>
<td>19.22 ±6.58</td>
<td>2.79 ±0.59</td>
<td>4.31 ±0.36</td>
<td>45.52 ±3.42</td>
<td>2.46 ±0.05</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>8.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Travertine</td>
<td>22.45 ±6.02</td>
<td>3.44 ±0.86</td>
<td>4.19 ±0.19</td>
<td>51.29 ±1.51</td>
<td>2.48 ±0.06</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>9.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Travertine</td>
<td>28.19 ±5.47</td>
<td>4.24 ±0.65</td>
<td>4.92 ±0.08</td>
<td>53.93 ±1.33</td>
<td>2.52 ±0.03</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>10.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Travertine</td>
<td>43.95 ±8.45</td>
<td>4.83 ±1.25</td>
<td>4.12 ±0.06</td>
<td>53.52 ±1.93</td>
<td>2.48 ±0.06</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>9.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Marble</td>
<td>71.98 ±11.41</td>
<td>6.51 ±1.29</td>
<td>6.58 ±0.15</td>
<td>70.14 ±1.23</td>
<td>2.71 ±0.03</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>17.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Marble</td>
<td>80.73 ±25.88</td>
<td>4.43 ±0.55</td>
<td>6.54 ±0.03</td>
<td>65.49 ±1.80</td>
<td>2.70 ±0.07</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>17.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Marble</td>
<td>56.16 ±12.77</td>
<td>6.04 ±0.63</td>
<td>5.98 ±0.44</td>
<td>69.63 ±2.19</td>
<td>2.66 ±0.01</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>17.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Marble</td>
<td>54.63 ±8.61</td>
<td>4.22 ±0.89</td>
<td>6.26 ±0.30</td>
<td>61.44 ±1.33</td>
<td>2.74 ±0.06</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>11.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Marble</td>
<td>58.87 ±12.98</td>
<td>4.76 ±1.61</td>
<td>4.22 ±0.34</td>
<td>70.50 ±1.95</td>
<td>2.77 ±0.06</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>13.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Marble</td>
<td>71.18 ±9.79</td>
<td>6.88 ±1.21</td>
<td>6.39 ±0.16</td>
<td>80.26 ±2.86</td>
<td>2.77 ±0.03</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>16.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Tuff</td>
<td>19.67 ±4.94</td>
<td>1.96 ±0.61</td>
<td>2.63 ±0.06</td>
<td>47.75 ±4.73</td>
<td>1.82 ±0.03</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>4.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Tuff</td>
<td>4.44 ±1.18</td>
<td>1.05 ±0.09</td>
<td>1.88 ±0.08</td>
<td>26.66 ±0.92</td>
<td>1.43 ±0.02</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Tuff</td>
<td>7.86 ±1.27</td>
<td>1.39 ±0.12</td>
<td>2.17 ±0.03</td>
<td>27.27 ±0.88</td>
<td>1.50 ±0.01</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Tuff</td>
<td>11.86 ±0.79</td>
<td>1.52 ±0.14</td>
<td>2.28 ±0.03</td>
<td>33.79 ±0.87</td>
<td>1.67 ±0.01</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Tuff</td>
<td>11.23 ±2.10</td>
<td>1.59 ±0.35</td>
<td>2.23 ±0.14</td>
<td>28.59 ±2.13</td>
<td>1.72 ±0.09</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Tuff</td>
<td>8.23 ±1.72</td>
<td>1.19 ±0.46</td>
<td>2.21 ±0.05</td>
<td>30.21 ±2.18</td>
<td>1.66 ±0.03</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>2.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Tuff</td>
<td>9.35 ±1.17</td>
<td>1.78 ±0.36</td>
<td>2.29 ±0.04</td>
<td>25.95 ±2.17</td>
<td>1.57 ±0.01</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>2.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this study, the performance prediction of a CSM based on CSPI were calculated for the tested stones using Eq. 5 and given in Table 2, which were developed by Copur et al. (2011a). This equation can be rewritten as the revised CSPI, given Eq. 6. This model was improved using Schmidt hardness value. The predictors used in these models such as machine weight (W), useful arm cutting depth (H) are assumed to be 5.5 tons, 2.6 m, respectively, which can be obtained from Copur et al. (2011a). Detailed field performances and technical features of chain saw machines can be seen in previous study performed by Copur et al. (2011a). Table 2 shows the predicted CSPI, UCS and SE based on R_L values using simple regression analysis with SPSS 15.0. The UCS requirement of the model developed by Copur et al. (2011a) needs core samples, and the sample preparation and tests take a long time; however, R_L values in the improved model is obtained from Schmidt hammer test, which is an easy, inexpensive and practical test.

A good correlation was found between the calculated CSPI using Eq. 5 developed by Copur (2011a) and predicted CSPI_{pre} using Eq. 6 based on R_L values of rocks as seen in Fig. 5. The relation follows a power function with coefficient of determination (R^2) value was 0.892. In this model which revealed the regression equation, the regression parameters were all significant (p=0.000). The equation of the curve is:

**Model 1:** CSPI = 0.999CSPI_{pre}^{1.004} (7)

where CSPI is the chain saw penetration index in m^3, CSPI_{pre} is the predicted chain saw penetration index by using Eq. 6 in m^3.

Figure 3. Relation between Schmidt hammer hardness and UCS values

Figure 4. Relation between Schmidt hammer hardness and SE values

The CSPI is given in Eq. 5 (Copur et al. 2011a; Tumac, 2014):

$$\text{CSPI} = \frac{WH}{\text{UCS}}$$ (5)

where CSPI is the chain saw penetration index in m^3, W is the weight of chain saw machine in tons, H is the useful arm cutting depth in m, and UCS is the uniaxial compressive strength of the stone in MPa. The UCS can be estimated from relationship between UCS and R_L values given in Eq. 2 in order to determine the CSPI. This equation can be rewritten as the predicted chain saw penetration index (CSPI_{pre}), shown in Eq. 6:

$$\text{CSPI}_{pre} = \frac{WH}{2.180e^{0.048L}}$$ (6)

where CSPI_{pre} is the predicted chain saw penetration index in m^3, W is the weight of chain saw machine in tons, H is the useful arm cutting depth in m, e is the base of the natural logarithm, and R_L is the Schmidt hammer hardness value.
The predictive performances of the models were compared in order to determine the applicability of the models obtained. RMSE (Root Mean Square Error) (Eq. 8), coefficient of determination (R²) and adjusted coefficient of determination (Adj. R²) were used for the purpose of measuring the predictive performance of the models. A summary of the model generated for simple regression analysis is given in Table 3.

\[
RMSE = \sqrt{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} (o_i - t_i)^2}
\]

where \(o_i\) is the measured value, \(t_i\) is the predicted value and \(N\) is the number of the samples.

The performance indices above can be interpreted as follows: if the RMSE is low, then the model performs better also for a good predictive model, the value of R² and Adj. R² are expected to be close to 1 (Gokceoglu, 2002; Gokceoglu and Zorlu, 2004).

Table 3. Summary of the generated models for simple regression analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>Adj. R²</th>
<th>RMSE</th>
<th>Std. Est</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.946</td>
<td>0.892</td>
<td>0.890</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.261</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CONCLUSIONS

This paper aims to develop easy and inexpensive prediction models to help performance prediction of...
CSM. R₅₀ value is used in rock cutting applications, the cutting rate of roadheaders, tunnel boring machines and impact hammers and sawability for prediction of performance of the cutting process. However, R₅₀ has not been used for performance prediction of CSM. This is one of the research activities differentiating this research from similar previous work. Relatively few published studies are available on the relation between Schmidt hardness and performance prediction of CSM. The simple regression technique used in this paper demonstrated very satisfactory results in predicting CSPI. The aim of this study is to assess and discuss the efficiency of R₅₀ values on the performance prediction of CSM. For this purpose, CSPI were calculated using equation developed by Copur et al. (2011a). The UCS requirement of the model developed by Copur et al. (2011a) needs core samples, and the sample preparation and tests take a long time; however, R₅₀ values in the improved model is obtained from Schmidt hammer test, which is an easy, inexpensive and practical test. The empirical models based on R₅₀ values are statistically verified and proved to be useful and reliable tool for prediction of CSPI. The R₅₀ values are strongly correlated between UCS and SE obtained from linear cutting tests performed by using standard chisel tool in the unrelieved cutting mode. According to R², Adj. R² and RMSE values, it is thought that the proposed Schmidt hammer hardness test in this work may be used as a preliminary guide for performance prediction of chain saw machines, for cutting stone in the production of natural stone quarry blocks.
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