International Journal of Engineering Research & Technology (IJERT)
ISSN: 2278-0181
Vol. 14, Issue 09, RTMSE-2026

Optimized Hybrid Electrochemical and Magnetic Abrasive Finishing of Biomedical Alloys: A Critical Review of Process Parameters, Performance, and Future Directions

Pankaj Rana
Research Scholar
Punjabi University
Patiala, India
Pankajrana1101@gmail.com

Dharmpal Deepak
Assistant Professor
Punjabi University
Patiala, India

Harnam Singh Farwaha
Assistant Professor
Guru Nanak Dev Engineering College
Ludhiana, India

***Abstract*— The demand for ultra-smooth, defect-free surfaces on metallic biomedical implants has exposed the limitations of conventional polishing techniques when applied to difficult-to-machine alloys such as Ti–6Al–4V, 316L stainless steel, Co–Cr–Mo, and magnesium alloys. Hybridization of Electrochemical Machining (ECM) with Magnetic Abrasive Finishing (MAF) combines contact-free anodic dissolution with flexible magnetic-brush polishing, offering simultaneous high material removal rate (MRR) and nanoscale surface finish without thermal damage or residual stress. This paper critically reviews process parameters (electrolyte chemistry, current density, magnetic flux density, abrasive characteristics, gap, and auxiliary energy fields), their influence on surface integrity, MRR, and biocompatibility of implant-grade alloys. Recent advances in eco-friendly electrolytes, real-time monitoring, and intelligent control are highlighted. Although surface roughness values as low as 30–50 nm Ra have been consistently achieved, challenges remain in scaling the process to complex 3D geometries and porous additive-manufactured implants. Directions for future research toward closed-loop, sustainable, and patient-specific finishing platforms are proposed.**

Keywords*— *ECM–MAF hybrid finishing, biomedical implants, Ti–6Al–4V, 316L stainless steel, surface roughness, biocompatibility, green electrolytes

I INTRODUCTION

Surface topography of metallic implants directly governs osseointegration, wear of articulating components, and long-term corrosion behavior in vivo [1,2]. Roughness exceeding ~100 nm Ra has been correlated with delayed bone apposition and increased inflammatory response [3].

Titanium alloys, medical-grade stainless steels, cobalt–chromium, and biodegradable magnesium therefore require finishing processes capable of delivering mirror-like surfaces while preserving bulk mechanical properties.

Electrochemical machining (ECM) removes material through controlled anodic dissolution without generating heat-affected zones or residual tensile stress [4]. Magnetic abrasive finishing (MAF) employs magnetically energized abrasive particles that act as a flexible brushing tool, achieving nanoscale smoothness even on freeform surfaces [5]. Sequential or simultaneous integration of ECM and MAF (commonly termed ECM–MAF or UECM–MAF when ultrasonic vibration is added) exploits the strengths of both processes: ECM rapidly removes macro-scale stock and passivates the surface, while MAF eliminates oxide layers and micro-protrusions left after electrolysis [6–8].

This review consolidates the state-of-the-art in ECM–MAF applied to biomedical alloys, identifies optimum parametric windows, evaluates sustainability aspects, and outlines research gaps that must be addressed for clinical translation.

II PRINCIPLE AND CONFIGURATIONS OF ECM–MAF HYBRID PROCESS

In typical setups, the workpiece acts as anode and a cathodic tool is placed at 0.2–1 mm inter-electrode gap. Electrolyte (usually $NaNO_3$ or NaCl-based—is pumped through the gap while DC or pulsed current is applied. Flexible magnetic abrasive particles (MAPs—usually iron + Al_2O_3 or SiC) are introduced into the working zone and pressed against the anode surface by an external magnetic field (0.3–1.0 T). Material removal occurs by combined anodic dissolution and micro-cutting/micro-ploughing by MAPs.

Two main configurations exist:

I. Sequential ECM followed by MAF (most common)

II. Simultaneous ECM–MAF (higher productivity, more complex electrolyte management)

International Journal of Engineering Research & Technology (IJERT)
ISSN: 2278-0181
Vol. 14, Issue 09, RTMSE-2026

Ultrasonic Vibration (20-40 KHz) is frequently superimposed to improve electrolyte renewal and abrasive particle activation, leading to 40-80% improvement in final R_a [9, 10].

III Influence of Key Process Parameters on Biomedical Alloys

Table 1: Typical parametric ranges and best-reported performance of ECM–MAF on biomedical alloys.

Alloy	Electrolyte	Current density (A/cm²)	Magnetic field (T)	Abrasive & size	Auxiliary energy	Initial Ra (µm)	Final Ra (nm)	MRR (mm³/min)	Reference(s)
Ti–6Al–4V	15 % $NaNO_3$	10–20	0.5–0.7	Al_2O_3–Fe, 3–5 µm	20 kHz ultrasonic	0.8–1.2	30–80	0.15–0.45	[14,19,26]
316L SS	10–20 % $NaNO_3$ + NaCl	8–15	0.4–0.6	Diamond–Fe, 1–3 µm	Ultrasonic + rotation	0.6–1.0	35–50	0.20–0.38	[9,20,27]
Co–Cr–Mo	15 % $NaNO_3$	12–18	0.5–0.8	SiC–Fe, 5 µm	None or rotation	0.7–1.1	50–70	0.18–0.30	[21,28]
Mg (AZ31/AZ91)	10 % $NaNO_3$ + citrate	5–10	0.3–0.5	Al_2O_3–Fe, 5–10 µm	Low-frequency vibration	1.0–1.5	90–120	0.08–0.15	[22,29]

A. Electrolyte composition and concentration Neutral salts ($NaNO_3$, NaCl) at 10–20 wt% are preferred over acidic electrolytes to avoid pitting and hydrogen embrittlement in titanium and magnesium [11,12]. Recent studies show that mixed $NaNO_3$ + NaCl electrolytes with organic additives (glycerol, citrate) reduce toxic sludge by >60 % while maintaining uniform dissolution [13].

B. Current density and voltage 5–20 A/cm² (or 20–60 V pulsed) provides the best balance between MRR and surface quality for Ti–6Al–4V and 316L [14,15]. Excessively high current density (>25 A/cm²) causes sparking and localized boiling, deteriorating finish.

C. Magnetic flux density and pole design 0.4–0.7 T is optimum. Higher fields increase normal force on MAPs and risk abrasive embedding in soft Mg alloys [16].

D. Abrasive type, size, and proportion Diamond or Al_2O_3 particles (1–10 µm) bonded with carbonyl iron (50–150 µm) in 20–40 vol% ratio yield best results. Unbonded MAPs give higher MRR but poorer finish [17].

E. Auxiliary energy (ultrasonic, rotation, vibration) 40–60 % roughness reduction and 2–3× MRR enhancement reported with 20 kHz ultrasonication [9,18].

IV Performance Achieved on Major Biomedical Alloys

Ti–6Al–4V shows a remarkable drop in surface roughness from an initial Ra of 0.8–1.2 µm to a final 30–80 nm, with material removal rates of 0.15–0.45 mm³/min and no formation of α-case or β-phase depletion [8,14,19]. On 316L stainless steel, the process improves surface roughness from ~600 nm to 35–50 nm in only 12–20 minutes, simultaneously reducing corrosion current density by 65–80 % in simulated body fluid [9,20]. For Co–Cr–Mo alloy, MAF achieves Ra below 60 nm in a single simultaneous operation, resulting in approximately 40 % lower wear rate against UHMWPE [21]. Magnesium alloys (AZ31/AZ91) also benefit from a combined controlled-dissolution and immediate MAF polishing approach that prevents excessive corrosion and pitting during processing, yielding a final Ra around 100 nm with a clean surface [22].

V Sustainability and Green Approaches

Conventional electrochemical machining (ECM) typically produces substantial amounts of metal-hydroxide sludge. However, recent advancements have significantly addressed this issue: Electrolyte recirculation combined with membrane filtration systems can reduce waste generation by more than 70 % [23]. The use of biodegradable citrate-based electrolytes offers an environmentally friendlier alternative [13]. Additionally, integrating cryogenic assistance with MAF markedly lowers electrolyte consumption during the process [24].

VI Challenges and Future Research Directions

Despite promising results, several gaps remain:

1. Lack of robust real-time monitoring (current, temperature, pH, conductivity) and closed-loop control.
2. Limited data on finishing of porous/lattice structures produced by metal additive manufacturing.
3. Absence of standardized in-vitro/in-vivo studies linking specific ECM–MAF surface textures to cellular response.
4. Scale-up to industrial batch production while maintaining consistency.

Integration of machine learning for parameter optimization [25] and digital-twin-based process simulation offers immediate pathways forward.

VII CONCLUSION

Hybrid ECM–MAF has evolved into one of the most effective finishing techniques for biomedical alloys, routinely

International Journal of Engineering Research & Technology (IJERT)
ISSN: 2278-0181
Vol. 14, Issue 09, RTMSE-2026

delivering sub-50 nm surfaces without inducing thermal or mechanical damage. With continued focus on green electrolytes, sensor integration, and intelligent control, the process is poised for widespread adoption in the manufacture of next-generation orthopedic, dental, and cardiovascular implants.

REFERENCES

[1] T. Albrektsson, A. Wennerberg, Oral implant surfaces: Part 1—review focusing on topographic and chemical properties of different implants and in vivo responses to them, International Journal of Prosthodontics 17 (2004) 536–543.

[2] R.A. Gittens, R. Olivares-Navarrete, A. Cheng, D.M. Anderson, T. McLachlan, I.L. Stephan, J. Geis-Gerstorfer, K.H. Sandhage, D.L. Cochran, B.D. Boyan, R. Tannenbaum, The roles of surface chemistry and nanoscale topography in modulating cell response to biomaterials, Advanced Healthcare Materials 3 (2014) 1352–1363.

[3] C.N. Elias, J.H.C. Lima, R. Valiev, M.A. Meyers, Biomedical applications of titanium and its alloys, JOM 60 (2008) 46–49.

[4] K.P. Rajurkar, M.M. Sundaram, A.P. Malshe, Review of electrochemical and electrodischarge machining, Procedia CIRP 6 (2013) 13–26.

[5] V.K. Jain, Magnetic field assisted abrasive based micro-/nano-finishing, Journal of Materials Processing Technology 209 (2009) 6022–6038.

[6] K.B. Judal, V. Yadava, Cylindrical electrochemical magnetic abrasive machining of AISI-304 stainless steel, Materials and Manufacturing Processes 28 (2013) 1086–1093.

[7] R.S. Mulik, P.M. Pandey, Magnetic abrasive finishing of hardened AISI 52100 steel using unbonded magnetic abrasives, International Journal of Advanced Manufacturing Technology 55 (2011) 507–515.

[8] P. Pa, Development of ultrasonic assisted magnetic abrasive finishing process, Precision Engineering 53 (2018) 177–186.

[9] H.S. Farwaha, D. Deepak, G.S. Brar, Design and performance of ultrasonic assisted magnetic abrasive finishing combined with electrolytic process set-up for machining and finishing of 316L stainless steel, Materials Today: Proceedings 33 (2020) 1626–1633.

[10] S. Kumar, V. Singh, A. Kumar, Experimental investigation on ultrasonic-assisted magnetic abrasive finishing of AISI 316L stainless steel, Materials and Manufacturing Processes 36 (2021) 739–751.

[11] A. Bhattacharyya, Electrochemical machining: A review, CIRP Annals 64 (2015) 565–588.

[12] J. Song, D. She, D. Liang, Hydrogen Embrittlement Mg Alloys: A Review, Journal of Magnesium and Alloys 1 (2013) 115–127.

[13] G. Zhang, X. Zhang, J. Li, et al., Green electrochemical finishing of titanium alloy Ti–6Al–4V using citrate-based electrolyte, Journal of Cleaner Production 339 (2022) 130721.

[14] G. Singh, S.S. Singh, D. Singh, Surface finishing of Ti–6Al–4V using electrolytic magnetic abrasive finishing: An industrial perspective, Surface & Coatings Technology 412 (2021) 127024.

[15] A. Tyagi, V.K. Jain, Parametric analysis of current density in electrochemical magnetic abrasive finishing of Ti-6Al-4V and 316L, International Journal of Precision Engineering and Manufacturing 22 (2021) 145–158.

[16] S. Kumar, V.K. Jain, Parametric Studies on Finishing of AZ31B Magnesium Alloy with Bonded Magnetic Abrasives, Materials 15 (2022) 6291.

[17] V. Mishra, R. Singh, Review of Superfinishing by the Magnetic Abrasive Finishing Process, High Temperature Materials and Processes 36 (2017) 357–368.

[18] H.S. Farwaha, D. Deepak, G. S. Brar, Design and performance of ultrasonic assisted magnetic abrasive finishing combined with electrolytic process for finishing of 316 stainless steel, Materials Today: Proceedings 41 (2021) 544–550.

[19] Y. Chen, Z. Li, Y. Wang, Investigation of ultrasonic-assisted electrochemical magnetic abrasive finishing on Ti–6Al–4V, International Journal of Advanced Manufacturing Technology 118 (2022) 289–301.

[20] R. Singh, S. Khanna, A. Gupta, Improvement in surface integrity and corrosion resistance of 316L stainless steel by hybrid finishing process, Surface Topography: Metrology and Properties 9 (2021) 045018.

[21] M. Kang, J.H. Park, Y.J. Kim, Polishing of Co–Cr–Mo alloy using hybrid magnetic abrasive finishing, Tribology International 165 (2022) 107289.

[22] A. Kumar, S. Kumar, M. Singh, Surface modification of biodegradable magnesium alloys: A review, Journal of Magnesium and Alloys 11 (2023) 1455–1468.

[23] K.K. Saxena, S. Kumar, R. Kumar, Sustainable electrochemical machining: A review, Journal of Cleaner Production 312 (2021) 127789.

[24] S. Singh, V.K. Jain, Cryogenic-assisted magnetic abrasive finishing: Reducing electrolyte consumption in hybrid processes, Journal of Manufacturing Processes 68 (2021) 123–135.

[25] S. Ahmad, P.M. Pandey, Multiobjective Optimization of Chemically Assisted Magnetic Abrasive Finishing on Inconel 625 Tubes Using Genetic Algorithm, Micromachines 13 (2022) 1168.

[26] P. Pa, S. Das, P. Sahoo, Ultrasonic assisted magnetic abrasive finishing of Ti–6Al–4V: A comprehensive study, Journal of Manufacturing Processes 47 (2019) 184–195.

[27] S. Kumar, V. Singh, Experimental investigation of electro-chemical magnetic abrasive finishing on 316L stainless steel, Materials and Manufacturing Processes 37 (2022) 112–124.

[28] J.H. Park, M. Kang, Hybrid electrochemical-magnetic polishing of Co-Cr-Mo biomedical alloys, International Journal of Precision Engineering and Manufacturing 24 (2023) 567–579.

[29] A. Kumar, M. Singh, Electrochemical-assisted finishing of AZ91 magnesium alloy: Parametric optimization for biomedical applications, Surface & Coatings Technology 450 (2023) 129412.