



### Extrusion Deposition Additive Manufacturing (EDAM) of carbon fiber reinforced composite parts and tools for particle detector mechanics

Purdue University – Composites Manufacturing & Simulation Center

Sushrut Karmarkar, Eduardo Barocio, Justin Hicks Jack Gulley, Jack Wheeler, Lucas Richardson, Benjamin Denos, Andreas Jung

June 10, 2022









### What structures are we involved with?

HL-LHC CMS Upgrade

#### Large Support Structures –

- 1. Boundary Tracker Support Tube (BTST)
- 2. Inner Tracker Support Tube (ITST)
- 3. Inner Tracker Service Cylinder Small Structures –
- 1. Detector dees multilayer support structure
- 2. Flat plate stock for Silicon Modules backing / cooling plates







#### Overview

- Introduction to EDAM
- Material selection and testing for EDAM
  - Radiation testing for degradation
  - Characterization methods and results
  - Material characterization for printing and process performance simulations
- Additive3D printing and process performance simulations
- Case studies
  - Bonding and machining tools for CMS
  - Pre-preg layup tools
  - ITST Inner Track Rails





#### What is Extrusion Deposition Additive Manufacturing



Feed Stock - Polyphenylene sulfide (PPS)





**PURDUE** UNIVERSITY

#### **Extrusion Deposition Additive Manufacturing**



- Composite Additive Manufacturing Research Instrument (CAMRI) at Purdue
- Fixed single screw extruder configuration
- Numeric controlled print bed
- Printing highly filled thermoplastics
- Characterization/validation tool
- 20 x 20 x 10 inch print volume (0.5 x 0.5 x 0.25 meter)





Feed Stock - Polyphenylene sulfide (PPS)



#### Thermwood LSAM Research Laboratory at Purdue

- 5 x 10 x 4 feet (1.5m x 3m x 1.2m) print volume
- Print rates up to 200 pounds (90 kg) per hour
- The system has been modified to enable print temperatures of 450°C
- 5 axis LSAT CNC milling machine



#### . . .

LSAM ADDITIVE PRINTER (10'X5')



### Need for simulations and 3D printing for CMS project

1. Large tooling and trimming fixtures needed for assembly, trimming and composite layup







Conventional tooling-

- Heavy
- Lead to higher material loss in CNC machining
- Need to use rectangular blocks to make complex shapes as needed by the CMS project
- Better precision than 3D printed tooling for high temperature cure layup tools





#### Need for simulations and 3D printing for CMS project

EDAM prototype tooling – Inner Tracker Service Cylinder



EDAM prototype tooling – Inner Tracker Support Tube

#### Conventional tooling-

- Lighter to handle
- Minimal material loss in CNC machining
- complex shaped can be directly printed as needed by the CMS project
- Lower precision than conventional tooling for layup tools – but still within the required tolerance on service cylinder / ITST (?)

IDEAL FOR ASSEMBLY AND CNC TRIMMING FIXTURES

Finished tool surface coated with mold release

Layup and vacuum bagging

THE R. LOW





### Need for simulations and 3D printing for CMS project

2. Material cost and machining time (Tooling comparison provided for Inner Tracker tool )

		Conventional Tooling	PPS + CF material for high temperature CF pre-preg cure (EDAM)	ABS + CF material for tooling and assembly at room temp (EDAM)
1.	Cost per unit weight	\$ 8.5/lb (\$18.7/kg) - sold as blocks of size (1000x500x100mm)	\$ 28/lb (\$61.7/kg)	\$ 15/lb (\$33/kg)
2.	Cost of material needed for the ITST tool	<pre>\$ 2550 (tooling block + adhesive + surface treatment)</pre>	\$ 2800	\$ 1500
3.	Time needed for final tool	~ 50 working hours	~ 60 working hours (15 simulation + 15 design iterations + 30 EDAM and CNC)	~ 30 working hours
4.	Total weight	~ 184 lbs (83.5 kg)	~ 100 lbs (45 kg)	~ 100 lbs (45 kg)



36

#### Need for simulations and 3D printing for CMS project

- 3. Precisions / tolerances needed for CMS parts we need to understand how the shape change happens
  - Aspect ratios and shapes ITST track long and thin parts lead to high process induced warpage – hence we need to predict it and compensate for this shape





Figure 2.10 Beams printed with neat ABS and 13% by volume of carbon fiber reinforced ABS to demonstrate the role of fiber reinforced composites in the EDAM process [2].





Radiation Resistance

#### Effect of radiation on –

- Thermal Conductivity
- Elastic modulus
- Poisson's ratio
- Coefficient of thermal expansion (CTE)

#### **Material Characterization**



#### Heat Transfer

- Thermal Conductivity
- Specific Heat
- Emissivity
- Performance at subzero temperatures



#### Thermo-mechanics

- Crystallization / Melting
- Coefficients of Thermal
  Expansion

Cost

Bonding



#### Viscoelasticity

Prony Series model



#### **Error in Material Property Value**





#### CTE results – ThermaTech PPS – no significant degradation as f(rad-dose)







## Thermal conductivity – ThermaTech PPS – no significant degradation as f(rad-dose)



Thermal conductivity results from Ryan



- <u>https://indico.cern.ch/event/1065348/</u>
- <u>https://www.physics.purdue.edu/cmsfpix/The</u> <u>rmalMeasurements/</u>

This material has thermal conductivity at 4 W/mK in stacking direction and about 13W/mK in print direction, so really useful in Dees where thermal pathway needed between coolant tube to portcards / sensor assembly





#### Preliminary DMA results for storage modulus









# Additive3D printing and process performance simulations







### **CAMRI – Process Monitoring**



#### Video 10X





### LSAM Printing Process







#### ADDITIVE3D Workflow







#### ADDITIVE3D Workflow



![](_page_19_Picture_0.jpeg)

### **EDAM System Characterization**

![](_page_19_Figure_3.jpeg)

![](_page_20_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_20_Picture_2.jpeg)

#### **Material Characterization**

![](_page_20_Figure_4.jpeg)

![](_page_21_Picture_0.jpeg)

### **Process and Performance Simulation**

![](_page_21_Figure_3.jpeg)

![](_page_22_Picture_0.jpeg)

### **Process and Performance Simulation**

![](_page_22_Figure_3.jpeg)

![](_page_23_Picture_0.jpeg)

### **Case Studies**

- 1. Inner Tracker Service Cylinder Stiffener Bonding Jig
- 2. Inner Tracker Service Cylinder Layup Tool
- 3. ITST Center Section Trimming/Machining Tool
- 4. ITST Rails/Tracks
- 5. CMS Inner Track forward pixel Dees perimeter seal

![](_page_23_Picture_8.jpeg)

![](_page_24_Picture_0.jpeg)

#### Composites Manufacturing & Simulation Center \*\*

### #1 - Inner Tracker Service Cylinder Stiffener Bonding Jig

![](_page_24_Picture_3.jpeg)

![](_page_25_Picture_0.jpeg)

### **Process Simulation**

![](_page_25_Figure_3.jpeg)

![](_page_26_Picture_0.jpeg)

### **Process Simulation Results**

![](_page_26_Figure_3.jpeg)

![](_page_27_Picture_0.jpeg)

### **Process Simulation Results**

![](_page_27_Figure_3.jpeg)

#### 10x Deformation & 80x Printing Speed

![](_page_28_Picture_0.jpeg)

### **Process Simulation Results**

Deformation -  $U_x - (mm)$ Stress -  $\sigma_{11}$  (MPa) S, S11 U, U1 (Avg: 75%) 21.6 15.0 1.1 0.9 12.5 0.6 0.4 7.5 5.0 2.5 0.0 -2.5 -5.0 -7.5 -10.0 -12.5 -15.0 -25.4 0.2 0.0 -0.2 -0.4 -0.6 -0.7 -0.9 -1.1

#### 10x Deformation & 80x Printing Speed

![](_page_29_Picture_2.jpeg)

### #2 - Inner Tracker Service Cylinder Layup Tool

![](_page_29_Picture_4.jpeg)

![](_page_29_Picture_5.jpeg)

Nodal Deformation for the Part Performance Analysis in Autoclave

![](_page_29_Picture_7.jpeg)

Compensated Tool Surface Generated for Machining the Printed Tool

![](_page_29_Picture_9.jpeg)

![](_page_29_Picture_10.jpeg)

![](_page_29_Picture_11.jpeg)

Finished tool surface coated with mold release

![](_page_29_Picture_13.jpeg)

Layup and vacuum bagging

### Current Iteration on Service Cylinder Tool – in progress (Fall 2022)

![](_page_30_Picture_2.jpeg)

- We have tried to achieve the precision for the service cylinder layup tool using EDAM in the past but failed.
- This time with the better development of the Additive3D simulation code we are going to try to make a 16inch (400 mm) TFPX only prototype for TBPX – TFPX flange mounting as well as Dees mounting practice
- Proof of concept for the EDAM tooling application

![](_page_31_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_31_Picture_2.jpeg)

# Preliminary Simulation Results – Service Cylinder – in progress (Fall 2022)

TIME	X-POS	Y-POS	Z-POS	EXTRUSION STATUS	PRINT COND
sec	mm	mm	mm	ON/OFF	
0	164.28	156.84	0	0	3
0.2	173.45	156.05	0	0	3
0.401	180.79	149.58	0	0	3
0.601	198.13	125.82	0	1	3
0.801	221	101.52	0	1	3
1.002	246.77	80.33	0	1	3
1.202	275.01	62.59	0	1	3
1.402	305.27	48.58	0	1	3
1.603	337.06	38.52	0	1	3
1.803	369.86	32.57	0	1	3
2.003	403.16	30.83	0	1	3
2.204	436.41	33.32	0	1	3

![](_page_32_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_32_Picture_2.jpeg)

#### Heat Transfer Analysis

![](_page_32_Figure_4.jpeg)

#### Nodal Temperature in Kelvin

![](_page_32_Figure_6.jpeg)

#### Degree of Crystallization

![](_page_33_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_33_Picture_2.jpeg)

#### **Deformation Analysis**

![](_page_33_Figure_4.jpeg)

![](_page_34_Picture_0.jpeg)

### #3 - ITST Center Section Trimming/Machining Tool

![](_page_34_Picture_3.jpeg)

![](_page_35_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_35_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_36_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_36_Picture_1.jpeg)

### #4 - ITST Rails/Tracks

![](_page_36_Figure_3.jpeg)

![](_page_37_Picture_0.jpeg)

### ITST Center Section Rails / Tracks – small prototypes

![](_page_37_Picture_3.jpeg)

![](_page_38_Picture_0.jpeg)

### ITST Rails/Tracks – Coming up early Fall 2022!

![](_page_38_Figure_3.jpeg)

![](_page_39_Picture_0.jpeg)

### #5 - EDAM for small thermally conductive parts in the Inner Tracker – TFPX scope – Fall 2022

![](_page_39_Picture_4.jpeg)

graphite laminate

- Requirement along with stiffness, high thermal conductivity
- Waiting on thermal analysis to see if this lower thermal conductivity is acceptable

	EDAM PPS + graphite	EX1515-K13D2U	
	Low cost	Super Expensive	
	High tooling / CNC time needed	High material wastage	
	Lower in-plane thermal conductivity	Higher in-plane thermal conductivity	
	Higher thickness thermal conductivity	Lower thickness thermal conductivity	
	Survives radiation – 1.2 GRad		
Higher time needed per part		Quicker mass production	

![](_page_40_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_40_Picture_2.jpeg)

#### Conclusions

- EDAM is currently being used for machining & trimming fixtures and assembly & bonding jigs, we are exploring the use to layup tooling to reduce overall tooling cost and time and make manufacturing of the tool easy
- For applications to large precision parts like ITST track it is easier to 3D print a stock block and machine the tracks than buy stock material
- EDAM is the future for tooling and assembly applications for composite manufacturing !!

![](_page_41_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_41_Picture_1.jpeg)

### Thank you

 Thank you to Eduardo Barocio and Additive Manufacturing Group at CMSC for providing help with slides.

For those looking at the pdf version of this talk – the videos can be seen at this link - <u>FTDM\_2022\_EDAMandCMS\_SRK</u>

![](_page_41_Picture_5.jpeg)

![](_page_42_Picture_0.jpeg)

### Back Up Slides

- Material Characterization for EDAM process simulation and material card development
- Case study Stringer Geometry for oven cure EDAM tool

![](_page_42_Picture_5.jpeg)

![](_page_43_Picture_0.jpeg)

### **Thermal Conductivity**

Laser Flash Method

![](_page_43_Figure_4.jpeg)

![](_page_43_Figure_5.jpeg)

![](_page_44_Picture_0.jpeg)

### **Specific Heat Capacity**

#### **Differential Scanning Calorimetry**

![](_page_44_Picture_4.jpeg)

![](_page_44_Figure_5.jpeg)

![](_page_45_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_45_Picture_2.jpeg)

### **Emissivity Characterization**

Black body emission test

![](_page_45_Picture_5.jpeg)

![](_page_45_Figure_6.jpeg)

Isothermal blackbody cavity -  $\epsilon = 0.92$ 

![](_page_46_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_46_Picture_1.jpeg)

### **Crystallization Kinetic Modeling**

![](_page_46_Picture_3.jpeg)

![](_page_46_Picture_4.jpeg)

![](_page_46_Figure_5.jpeg)

![](_page_47_Picture_0.jpeg)

### **Experimental Measurements**

#### **Differential Scanning Calorimetry**

![](_page_47_Figure_4.jpeg)

![](_page_48_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_48_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_48_Figure_2.jpeg)

### **Crystallization Model Generation**

![](_page_48_Figure_4.jpeg)

![](_page_49_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_49_Picture_2.jpeg)

### **Polymer Melting**

![](_page_49_Figure_4.jpeg)

#### Non-isothermal DSC

 $X_m(T,p) = \{1 + (d-1)\exp[-k_{mb}(T-T_c)]\}^{\frac{1}{1-d}}$ 

![](_page_50_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_50_Picture_2.jpeg)

### Melting and Crystallization Models

![](_page_50_Figure_4.jpeg)

![](_page_51_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_51_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_51_Picture_2.jpeg)

### **Characterization of Welding Times**

· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
CODE	Dwell	<b>Build Platform</b>	G1 (J/m^2)		Dh
CODE	Time (s)	Temperature (°C)	MEAN	STD	Db
DCB - 5	5	215	455.58	71.49	0.91
DCB - 10	10	215	450.16	49.45	0.90
DCB - 20	20	215	433.89	40.85	0.86
DCB - 40	40	215	392.77	33.43	0.78
DCB - 201	10	120	58.74	17.73	0.12
DCB - 202	10	140	211.36	60.70	0.42
DCB - 203	10	250	502.47	45.20	1.00
	CODE DCB - 5 DCB - 10 DCB - 20 DCB - 201 DCB - 201 DCB - 202 DCB - 203	Dwell Time (s)        DCB - 5        DCB - 10        DCB - 20        DCB - 40        DCB - 201        DCB - 202        DCB - 201        DCB - 202        DCB - 203        DCB - 203	Dwell Time (s)      Build Platform Temperature (°C)        DCB - 5      5        DCB - 10      10        DCB - 20      20        DCB - 40      40        DCB - 201      10        DCB - 201      10        DCB - 201      10        DCB - 201      10        DCB - 202      10        DCB - 203      10	Dwell Time (s)      Build Platform Temperature (°C)      G1 (. MEAN        DCB - 5      5      215      455.58        DCB - 10      10      215      450.16        DCB - 20      20      215      433.89        DCB - 40      40      215      392.77        DCB - 201      10      120      58.74        DCB - 202      10      140      211.36        DCB - 203      10      250      502.47	Dwell Time (s)      Build Platform Temperature (°C)      G1 (J/m^2)        DCB - 5      5      215      MEAN      STD        DCB - 10      10      215      455.58      71.49        DCB - 20      20      215      433.89      40.85        DCB - 40      40      215      392.77      33.43        DCB - 201      10      120      58.74      17.73        DCB - 202      10      140      211.36      60.70        DCB - 203      10      250      502.47      45.20

![](_page_51_Picture_5.jpeg)

**Temperature History Obtained from Printing** Simulation

![](_page_51_Figure_7.jpeg)

![](_page_52_Picture_0.jpeg)

### **CTE** Characterization

![](_page_52_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_53_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_53_Picture_2.jpeg)

### Thermoviscoelasticity

![](_page_53_Figure_4.jpeg)

![](_page_54_Picture_2.jpeg)

### Case Study - Stringer Tool Geometry

![](_page_54_Picture_4.jpeg)

Three parts made.

- One machined to Nominal Tool Surface (Printed with Celstran© PPS)
- Two Machined to Compensated Tool Geometry (Printed with Celstran© PPS and Techmer © PPS respectively)

Woven fabric prepreg used to make parts at 250 °F oven cure.

Surface scanned with FARO ScanArm©

![](_page_55_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_55_Picture_2.jpeg)

### **Stringer Tool Geometry**

![](_page_55_Figure_4.jpeg)

Nominal Tool Shape

![](_page_55_Figure_6.jpeg)

Compensated Tool Shape printed with Celstran© PPS-CF50-01

![](_page_55_Picture_8.jpeg)

Compensated Tool Shape printed with Techmer Electrafil© XT1 3DP

PPS

Maximum Distance: +0.343/	- Maximum Distance:	Maximum Distance:	
0.441 mm	+0.232/-0.483 mm	+0.537/-0.852 mm	
Avg. Dist.: 0.010 mm	Avg. Dist.: 0.002 mm	Avg. Dist.: 0.004 mm	
Std. Dev.: 0.127 mm	Std. Dev.: 0.083 mm	Std. Dev.: 0.167 mm	