#### MEASURING THERMOMECHANICAL RESPONSE OF LARGE-FORMAT PRINTED POLYMER COMPOSITE STRUCTURES VIA DIGITAL IMAGE CORRELATION

<u>Tyler M. Corum</u><sup>1</sup>, Johnna C. O'Connell<sup>1</sup>, James C. Brackett<sup>1</sup>, Ahmed Arabi Hassen<sup>2</sup>, Chad E. Duty<sup>1,2</sup>

 Mechanical, Aerospace, and Biomedical Engineering - University of Tennessee Knoxville, TN
 Manufacturing Science Division - Oak Ridge National Laboratory Oak Ridge, TN









# **Overview Moving Forward**

- Background
- Materials for Study
- TMA Testing
- DIC Oven Testing
- Predictive Modeling
- Conclusions



DIC Oven at the University of Tennessee



#### Large-Format Additive Manufacturing

- Large-Format AM (LFAM) is advantageous for tooling applications<sup>1</sup>
- Big Area Additive Manufacturing (BAAM) and other LFAM type systems can create large complex parts using Fiber Reinforced Polymer (FRP) feedstock
- The use of FRP feedstock lowers material costs, increases part stiffness, & lowers coefficient of thermal expansion (CTE)<sup>2</sup>
- LFAM tools may still experience warpage at autoclave conditions





1. Duty et al., 2015, DOI: 10.2172/1209207 2. Love et al., 2014, DOI:10.1557/jmr.2014.212



#### What leads to this warpage?





## **Structural Hierarchy of LFAM**

Macrostructure

Behavior of structure as a whole

#### Mesostructure

Interaction of layers/beads

#### *Microstructure*

Arrangement of fiber & porosity within bead







### Non-homogeneous Microstructure

- Varying fiber orientation results in a nonhomogeneous microstructure
- Fiber orientation & void distribution varies across bead
- Properties are dependent on location within the bead



**CF-ABS** bead printed via LFAM



#### **Fiber Orientation**



Fiber Reinforced Polymer Composites = MATRIX + FIBER

- During the extrusion, fibers are aligned by nozzle shear in the print direction<sup>1</sup>
- This results in highly aligned bead edge with a randomly oriented center by comparison<sup>2</sup>
- Anisotropic fibers resist expansion more (over 10x) in the longitudinal than transverse direction
- Properties are **dependent on fiber orientation**







#### **Traditional CTE Measurement**

- Thermomechanical Analysis (TMA) traditionally used for CTE measurements
- Highly accurate test
- TMA measures a small specimen (max 10 mm x 10 mm x 10 mm)<sup>1</sup>
- Assumes isotropy, homogeneity
- Struggles to accurately measure LFAM printed FRP



# Due to complex microstructure of LFAM, we need a better way to measure these parts... Digital Image Correlation





## Objectives

- Observe dependence of CTE on direction & location using TMA
- Measure global response using DIC & compare results to (local) TMA values
- Develop predictive model that incorporates degree of fiber orientation & validate using the DIC Oven







# **Materials for Study**

- 20% wt. carbon fiber reinforced acrylonitrile butadiene styrene (CF-ABS) feedstock
- Printed using Big Area Additive Manufacturing<sup>1</sup> (BAAM)
- Bead geometry: 15 mm x 6 mm
- Printed 0-0 and 0-90 layer orientation



*"Serpentine" Toolpath taken by the printer* 



0-0 Layer Orientation



0-90 Layer Orientation





#### TMA Approach

- Multiple samples across single LFAM bead (rather than single test)
- Cut locations chosen to capture different degrees of fiber orientation
- Left bead interface (LBI), left center (LC), center (CB), right center (RC), and right bead interface (RBI)





## TMA Approach

- Cuts made using a Buehler IsoMet diamond saw
- Individual layer cut from cube
- TMA samples cut from layer slice
- Final dimensions: 5 mm x 5 mm x 5 mm
- Dried in furnace overnight at 80 °C before testing
- Samples heated to 90 °C at 5 °C/min



#### Sampling process from BAAM Cube



#### **TMA Results**





- Similar TMA results to other CF-ABS studies<sup>1,2</sup>
- Overall trend,  $CTE_x < CTE_y < CTE_z$
- Non-symmetric about bead center → serpentine toolpath
- Relatively consistent CTE<sub>x</sub> across bead
- Inverse response for CTE<sub>y</sub> & CTE<sub>z</sub> values across bead
  - Rotating fiber orientation tensor





#### **DIC Oven**



15



# **DIC Oven Approach**

- Machined to flat, parallel faces
- Dried in furnace overnight at 80 °C before testing
- Lightly sprayed with high temperature white spray paint
- Speckled using Correlated Solutions speckle kit (0.007" stamp) with black ink



Speckled DIC samples





### **DIC Oven Approach**



- Set sample position, brightness
- Room temperature imaging
- Allow the sample to reach steady state temperature of 90 °C
- Steady state imaging
- Upload images to Vic-2D for stain values
- Enter data in equation below to find CTE



 $\varepsilon$  = strain T = temperature SS = steady state temperature RT = room temperature





#### **DIC Oven Results**

x-direction y-direction z-direction





- Overall trend,  $CTE_x < CTE_y < CTE_z$
- Clear influence of layer orientation
  on CTE values
  - Difference in  $CTE_x$  and  $CTE_y$  from 246% (0-0)  $\rightarrow$  10% (0-90)
- DIC Oven able to capture
  mesostructural properties





## TMA vs. DIC Oven Results



#### 



- Plot of 0-0 cube with TMA & DIC Oven data
- Similar CTE<sub>x</sub> values
- Mesostructure effects influenced CTE<sub>v</sub> values
  - The DIC Oven captured effects of surrounding beads
- TMA CTE<sub>z</sub> values were lower than the DIC Oven
  - The DIC Oven captured expansion of multiple layers
- The DIC Oven captured **mesostructural** properties as **influenced** by **microstructure**





# **Modeling Approach**

- Finite Element Analysis (FEA) model
  developed using Abaqus
- Single bead created
  - Regions correspond to TMA
  - CTE inputs from TMA
  - Remaining inputs from other LFAM studies w/ CF-ABS<sup>1,2</sup>
- Single bead used to create layers
- Layers used to create structure
- Both 0-0 & 0-90 models developed



#### **Development of Abaqus Model**





# Predicted CTE vs. DIC Oven



#### 🖬 DICx 🔲 DICy 🔲 DICz 🖾 FEAx 🖾 FEAy 🔲 FEAz



- Trend of  $CTE_x < CTE_y < CTE_z$  for 0-0 & 0-90
- The 0-0 model predicted values 13-15% higher than DIC Oven
  - Site-specific sampling is a viable input
- FEA showed similar change in  $CTE_x \& CTE_y$ values for the 0-90 model as the DIC Oven
- Predictions showed sampling & model technique as valid method for LFAM



### Conclusions

- Difficult to accurately measure thermomechanical response of LFAM structures
- Printed FRP = Nonhomogeneous structure
- TMA testing showed variation of CTE across bead
- Data from the DIC Oven compared well to TMA
- The DIC Oven demonstrated ability to capture mesostrucural properties of LFAM material
- FEA showed site-specific sampling & localized inputs can accurately predict CTE values



DIC Oven at the University of Tennessee



## **Submitted to Journal**

"Measuring Thermomechanical Response of Largeformat Printed Polymer Composite Structures Via Digital Image Correlation"

- Submitted July 2024 to Additive Manufacturing
- Anticipated release in Fall 2024
- Co-Authors:
  - Tyler Corum (*first author*)
  - Johnna O'Connell
  - James Bracket
  - Ahmed Arabi Hassen
  - Chad Duty





### Acknowledgements

Special thanks to the Southeastern Advanced Machine Tools Network (SEAMTN) at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville for funding this research.

This work was partially supported by the National Science Foundation under Grant No. 2055529.

This research was sponsored by the U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Advanced Manufacturing Office, under contract DE-AC05-00OR22725 with UT-Battelle, LLC.





Southeastern Advanced Machine Tools Network









# Thank you for your time

Any Questions?



Additive Manufacturing

<u>Contact</u>: tcorum2@vols.utk.edu







Southeastern Advanced Machine Tools Network





#### **REFERENCE SLIDES**





### TMA Approach

- Measured using a TA Instruments Q400 TMA
- Sample was heated from room temperature to 90 °C at 5 °C/min
- Four temperature cycles with natural cooling between for each test
- Linear region of curve measured to determine CTE
- Data from curves 2-4 averaged to represent average CTE for each region
- Two tests per sample to ensure consistency



 $CTE = AVG(CTE_2, CTE_3, CTE_4)$ 



## Strain Map, XY Plane





Created using Vic-2D

- Homogenous spread of relatively low strain in the x-dir
- Notice red & blue bands of strain in the y-dir
  - Red is high strain at bead edges
  - Blue is lower strain at the more randomly oriented bead center



direction



influencing strain

### Strain Map, XZ Plane





- Created using Vic-2D
- Homogenous spread of low strain in x-dir
- Bands again in the y-dir
  - High strain from aligned fibers at layer interfaces (red)
  - Fibers provide much less resistance in transverse direction
  - Lower strain from random orientation (orange-yellow)





# **Modeling Approach**

- Thermally loaded by a temperature change of 70 °C (20 °C → 90 °C )
- 15900 total 3D stress elements
- Linear, hexahedral elements
- Thermally-coupled trilinear displacement 8-node element (C3D8T element type)



Mesh Applied to model



