# REAL-TIME PRODUCT STRUCTURAL VALIDATION FOR FUSED FILAMENT FABRICATION

Student: Yanzhou Fu Advisor: Austin Downey

10/26/2023

UNIVERSITY OF South Carolina

### **Contents**

- 1. Objective
- 2. Motivation
- 3. In situ monitoring for fused filament fabrication process
- 4. Machine learning-based structural validation
- 5. Segmentation-based FEA structural validation
- 6. Contributions and summary



# **Objective**

To reduce part-to-part variations and guarantee product structural quality during the printing is essential .

Algorithm for part structural quality guaranteeing should have the abilities:

- Cyber-physical defects detection
- Product structural validation
- Smart decision-making
- Quality damage warning





### **Objective**





Printing cycle quality guaranteeing: pull off and ready to go

#### **Contents**

1. Objective

#### 2. Motivation

3. In situ monitoring for fused filament fabrication process

- 4. Machine learning-based structural validation
- 5. Segmentation-based FEA structural validation
- 6. Contributions and summary





#### Additive manufacturing technologies





1. https://www.bcn3d.com/introduction-fff-3d-printing-technology-additive-manufacturing-basics/









#### **Contents**

- 1. Objective
- 2. Motivation

#### 3. In situ monitoring for fused filament fabrication process

- 4. Machine learning-based structural validation
- 5. Segmentation-based FEA structural validation
- 6. Contributions and summary



In situ monitoring for fused filament fabrication process: A review



Defect: filament jam Algorithm: LS-SVM Accuracy: 90%

Defect: warpage and material stack Algorithm: BPNN Accuracy: 95%



1. Yongxiang Li, Wei Zhao, Qiushi Li, Tongcai Wang, and Gong Wang. In-situ monitoring and diagnosing for fused filament fabrication process based on vibration sensors. Sensors, 19(11):2589, 2019.

Defect Proba

In situ monitoring for fused filament fabrication process: A review



(c)

Defect: printing product quality (good/defect) Algorithm: SVM, CNN Accuracy: 98.2%, 99.5%





In situ monitoring for fused filament fabrication process: A review



Defect: warpage Algorithm: CNN Accuracy: 99.3%



1. Aditya Saluja, Jiarui Xie, and Kazem Fayazbakhsh. A closed-loop in-process warping detection system for fused filament fabrication using convolutional neural networks. Journal of Manufacturing Processes, 58:407–415, October 2020.

In situ monitoring for fused filament fabrication process: A review



Defect: over-extrusion, under-extrusion, good quality Algorithm: DCNN Accuracy: 94%



1. Zeqing Jin, Zhizhou Zhang, and Grace X. Gu. Autonomous in-situ correction of fused deposition modeling printers using computer vision and deep learning. Manufacturing Letters, 22:11–15, October 2019.

In situ monitoring for fused filament fabrication process: A review





1. Zeqing Jin, Zhizhou Zhang, and Grace X. Gu. Automated real-time detection and prediction of interlayer imperfections in additive manufacturing processes using artificial intelligence. Advanced Intelligent Systems, 2(1):1900130, December 2019.

In situ monitoring for fused filament fabrication process: A review



#### Defect: infill defects

Algorithm: naive Bayes classifiers, J48 decision tree Accuracy: 85.26%, 95.51%

1. Mingtao Wu, Vir V Phoha, Young B Moon, and Amith K Belman. Detecting malicious defects in 3d printing process using machine learning and image classification. In ASME 2016 International Mechanical Engineering Congress and Exposition. American Society of Mechanical Engineers Digital Collection, 2016.







From the "in situ monitoring for fused filament fabrication process: A review" paper, we concluded that:

- Defect detection had been widely studied.
- Defect-based product structural validation was ignored.
- More advanced system should integrate real-time feedback and defect mitigating.

### **Contents**

- 1. Objective
- 2. Motivation

3. In situ monitoring for fused filament fabrication process

#### 4. Machine learning-based structural validation

5. Segmentation-based FEA structural validation

6. Contributions and summary



# **Real-time structural validation for FFF**

Diagram of real-time structural validation



Flowchart of real-time structural validation



Experimental platform and designed sample



Designed defect with different lengths and locations within the dogbone specimen





#### Designed data-driven CNN model structure





Printed sample and tensile test result



Defect impact decision boundary and confusion matrix



Predicted values

Proposed component health index and structural validation visualization



Time range calculation for the real-time structural validation



#### Warning window



Video of real-time structural validation

#### Real-time Product Structural Quality Validation for Material Extrusion Additive Manufacturing





Additive

R. WICKER

Additive Manufacturing

#### 17 11 CiteScore Impact Factor

#### Achievements of structural quality validation for FFF:

- Defect detection with machine learning algorithm.
- Structural validation based on decision boundary from support vector machine.
- A novel component health index that links the features of defects across layers.
- Smart decision-making algorithm based on defect impact.

#### Limitations:

- Supervised learning can only predict the known defects.
- Defect impact decision boundary is accurate but still has errors.
- Component health index is complex and hard to record multiple defects on one layer.

### **Contents**

- 1. Objective
- 2. Motivation
- **3. In situ monitoring for fused filament fabrication process**
- 4. Machine learning-based structural validation
- 5. Segmentation-based FEA structural validation
- 6. Contributions and summary



Objective of real-time FEA structural validation for FFF

To solve the limitations in the machine learning-based real-time structural validation for FFF, realtime FEA structural validation is proposed.



Diagram of the real-time FEA structural validation



offline defect segmentation model training

• online defect segmentation

• online real-time FEA structural validation

Image segmentation



**Image Recognition** 



Semantic Segmentation



**Object Detection** 



**Instance Segmentation** 

Image segmentation model – UNet



Abaqus interactive products (Abaqus/CAE)





Generated Abaqus Python script



from part import *
from material import *
from assembly import *
from load import *
from mesh import *
from optimization import *
from job import *
from sketch import *
<pre>mdb.models['Model-1'].ConstrainedSketch(name='profile', sheetSize=200.0)</pre>
<pre>mdb.models['Model-1'].sketches['profile'].Line(point1=(0.0, 0.0), point2=(</pre>
<pre>mdb.models['Model-1'].sketches['profile'].Line(point1=(0.0, 30.0), point2=(</pre>
<pre>mdb.models['Model-1'].sketches['profile'].Line(point1=(15.0, 30.0), point2=</pre>
<pre>mdb.models['Model-1'].Part(dimensionality=THREE_D, name='Dogboen_test', type= DEFORMABLE BODY)</pre>
<pre>mdb.models['Model-1'].parts['Dogboen test'].BaseSolidExtrude(depth=5.0, sketch=</pre>
<pre>mdb.models['Model-1'].sketches['profile'])</pre>
mdb.models['Model-1'].Material(name='PLAMaterial')
<pre>mdb.models['Model-1'].materials['PLAMaterial'].Density(table=((7.8e-09, ), ))</pre>
<pre>mdb.models['Model-1'].materials['PLAMaterial'].Elastic(table=((210000.0, 0.3), ))</pre>
<pre>mdb.models['Model-1'].materials['PLAMaterial'].Plastic(table=((770.0, 0.0), (</pre>
800.0, 0.01), (830.0, 0.02), (850.0, 0.1), (900.0, 0.15), (930.0, 0.35), (
960.0, 1.0), (1050.0, 3.0)))
mdb.models['Model-1'].rootAssembly.Set(cells=
<pre>mdb.models['Model-1'].rootAssembly.instances['Dogboen_test-1'].cells.getSequenceFromMask(   ('[#8 ]', ), ), name='Set-1')</pre>
<pre>mdb.models['Model-1'].EncastreBC(createStepName='Step-1', localCsys=None, name=</pre>
'BC-1', region=mdb.models['Model-1'].rootAssembly.sets['Set-1'])
<pre>mdb.models['Model-1'].parts['Dogboen_test'].generateMesh()</pre>
<pre>mdb.models['Model-1'].rootAssembly.regenerate()</pre>
mdb.Job(activateLoadBalancing=False, atTime=None, contactPrint=OFF)
mdb.jobs['TensileTest'].submit(consistencyChecking=OFF, datacheckJob=True)

#### Abaqus model updating



#### Abaqus output dataset

🔲 Edit Fiel	d Output Request	1
Name:	Stress	
Step:	Side load	
Procedure:	Static, General	
Domain:	Set 💌 : Set-1	•
Frequency:	Every n increments  n: 2	
Timing:	Dutput at exact times	
– Output V	ariables	
<ul> <li>Select f</li> </ul>	from list below C Preselected defaults C All C Edit variables	
S,MISESM/	AX,TSHR,CTSHR,ALPHA,VS,PS	
► <b>⊽</b> 50	tresses	
► □ st	trains	
Di Di	isplacement/Velocity/Acceleration	
II ► □ FO	orces/Reactions	
	ontact	
🛛 🕨 🗖 Er	nergy	
III 🕨 🗆 ER	ailure/Fracture	
<b>)</b> П П	hermal	
► 🗆 EI	lectrical	
D PC	orous media/Fluids	
ll ► ⊡ ve	olume/Thickness/Coordinates	
► 🗆 Ei	rror indicators	
🕨 🗆 st	tate/Field/User/Time	
1		د ۲
	Stress Side load Static, General Set  Set  Set  Set  Set  Set  Set  Set	
Output at sh	hell, beam, and lavered section points:	
lise de		
Toclude k	ocal coordinate directions when available	
	OK	



Principle of real-time FEA structural validation



Experimental platform and designed specimen with defects



Tensile test result



Image segmentation result and dynamic material property



- IoU for training data: 95.32%
- IoU for test data: 92.79%

Based on the research from Dewey et al., the basic form of the equation for Young's modulus is:

 $E_p = E_0(1 - aP)$ 

where  $E_p$  is Young's modulus of the void body,

 $E_0$  is the modulus of a non-void body of the same material,

a is a constant dependent on Poisson's ratio of the matrix material,

P is the volume void.



Abaqus FEA setting

Property	Density (g/mm <sup>3</sup> )	Young's modulus (MPa)	Poisson's ratio	Yield stress (MPa)	Yield strain (mm)	Elongation at break (%)
Value	1.36	3600	0.4	49.56	2.27	1.62

- Simulation software: Abaqus explicit scheme
- Boundary condition: Fixed side U1 = U2 = U3 = UR1 = UR2 = UR3 = 0 Load side U1 = U3 = UR1 = UR2 = UR3 = 0, U2 = 3
- Mesh size: 1 mm
- Element shape: 4-node linear tetrahedron (C3D4)



#### Real-time FEA structural validation process





#### Abaqus simulation result











MISESMAX (Avg: 75%)
+4.712e+01 +4.320e+01 +3.927e+01 +3.534e+01 +3.141e+01 +2.749e+01 +2.356e+01 +1.963e+01 +1.571e+01 +1.178e+01 +7.854e+00 +3.927e+00 +0.000e+00

#### Computational time calculation



#### Maximum stress extraction and warning window

```
—•••
 odbMaxMises.py
 Code to determine the location and value of the maximum
 von-mises stress in an output database.
 Usage: abaqus python odbMaxMises.py -odb odbName
    -elset(optional) elsetName
 Requirements:

    -odb : Name of the output database.

  2. -elset : Name of the assembly level element set.
            Search will be done only for element belonging
            to this set. If this parameter is not provided,
            search will be performed over the entire model.
 3. -help : Print usage
 from odbAccess import *
 from sys import argv, exit
def rightTrim(input, suffix):
    if (input.find(suffix) == -1):
        input = input + suffix
     return input
 ±~~~~~~~~
def getMaxMises(odbName,elsetName):
     """ Print max mises location and value given odbName
     and elset(optional)
     ....
     elset = elemset = None
     region = "over the entire model"
     """ Open the output database """
     odb = openOdb(odbName)
     assembly = odb.rootAssembly
     """ Check to see if the element set exists
       in the assembly
     if elsetName:
         trv:
            elemset = assembly.elementSets[elsetName]
            region = " in the element set : " + elsetName;
         except KeyError:
            print ('An assembly level elset named %s does' \
                   'not exist in the output database %s' \
                   % (elsetName, odbName))
             odb.close()
             exit(0)
```





A summery of real-time FEA structural validation

#### Achievements of real-time FEA structural validation:

- Defect segmentation and defect information extraction.
- Model updating Abaqus Python script file generation.
- Dynamic specimen layer properties (void-related Young's modulus).
- Real-time FEA structural validation.
- Maximum stress based decision-making system.



### **Contents**

- 1. Objective
- 2. Motivation
- **3. In situ monitoring for fused filament fabrication process**
- 4. Machine learning-based structural validation
- 5. Segmentation-based FEA structural validation
- 6. Contributions and summary



# **Contributions**

Key Contributions in the field of real-time structural validation for FFF

- Defect detection with machine learning and computer vision.
- A novel component health index that links the features of defects across layers.
- Dynamic specimen layer properties.
- Structural validation based on defect impact decision boundary and FEA result.
- Smart decision-making algorithm based on defect impact.







A summery of the research presented in this work.

- Reviewed the current in situ monitoring research for FFF.
- Presented a machine learning-based real-time structural validation for FFF.
- Presented a defect segmentation-based real-time FEA structural validation for FFF.



#### **Publications**

- Fu Y, Downey A, Yuan L, et al. In situ structural validation of components manufactured using fused filament fabrication[C]. Nondestructive Characterization and Monitoring of Advanced Materials, Aerospace, Civil Infrastructure, and Transportation XV. International Society for Optics and Photonics, 2021, 11592: 115921E.
- Fu Y, Downey A, Yuan L, et al. In situ monitoring for fused filament fabrication process: A review[J]. Additive Manufacturing, 2021, 38: 101749.
- Fu Y, Downey A R J, Yuan L, et al. Machine learning algorithms for defect detection in metal laser-based additive manufacturing: A review[J].
   Journal of Manufacturing Processes, 2022, 75: 693-710.
- 4. Fu Y, Downey A, Yuan L, et al. Towards Online Structural Validation for Fused Filament Fabrication. QNDE presentation, 2021.
- Fu Y, Downey A, Yuan L, et al. Real-time structural validation for material extrusion additive manufacturing. Additive Manufacturing 65 (2023): 103409.
- 6. Fu Y, Downey A, Yuan L, et al. Real-time splatter tracking in laser powder bed fusion additive manufacturing. In NDE 4.0, Predictive Maintenance, Communication, and Energy Systems: The Digital Transformation of NDE 2023 Apr 25 (Vol. 12489, pp. 121-127). SPIE.
- 7. Fu Y, Joud S, Downey AR, Yuan L, Zhang T, Kiracofe D. Investigating Compressing Particle Damper Pockets in Beams Manufactured by Laser Powder Bed Fusion Additive Manufacturing. In Society for Experimental Mechanics Annual Conference and Exposition 2023 Jun 5 (pp. 139-144). Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland.
- 8. Fu Y, Downey A, Yuan L, et al. Real-time finite element analysis for online structural component. Additive Manufacturing (In process)



# Questions?

#### Sponsors





