



Resource-Driven Product Family Design in Additive Manufacturing

NINGRONG LEI, XILING YAO, SEUNG KI MOON, GUIJUN BI

*School of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering, Nanyang Technological University, HW1-01-05 2A
Nanyang Link
637372, Singapore*

Singapore Institute of Manufacturing Technology, 71 Nanyang Drive
638075, Singapore

Introduction

- ▶ **Product family**
 - ▶ A group of related products (variants) derived from a set of common elements (platform) [1]
- ▶ **Additive manufacturing (AM)**
 - ▶ Manufacture products with complex geometry, ideal for customized product design [2]
- ▶ **Resource-driven product family design in AM**
 - ▶ Resource (material, manufacturing time, cost) as a key design consideration in product family design in AM


[1] T. Simpson, Z. Siddique, and J. Jiao, "Platform-Based Product Family Development," in *Product Platform and Product Family Design*, T. Simpson, Z. Siddique, and J. Jiao, Eds., ed: Springer US, 2006, pp. 1-15.

[2] R. Ponche, J. Hascoet, O. Kerbrat, and P. Mognol, "A new global approach to design for additive manufacturing," *Virtual and Physical Prototyping*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 93-105, 2012.



Methodology

► Overview of the proposed design framework





Methodology

- ▶ **Topology Optimization (TO)**
 - ▶ TO algorithms distribute finite elements of material within a predefined space [3]
 - ▶ Solid Isotropic Material with Penalization (SIMP) approach [4]:
 - ▶ Power law of material properties
 - ▶ Objective: minimize structure compliance under loading
 - ▶ Constraint: total amount of material (volume fraction)

[3] M. P. Bendsøe and O. Sigmund, Topology optimization: theory, methods and applications / M. P. Bendsøe, O. Sigmund., ser. Engineering online library. Berlin; New York : Springer, 2003., 2003.

[4] M. Bendsøe, "Optimal shape design as a material distribution problem," Structural optimization, vol. 1, no. 4, pp. 193–202, 1989.





Methodology

- ▶ Design for additive manufacturing (DFAM) rules and limitations
 - ▶ Process/machine-dependent
 - ▶ Minimum wall thickness, minimum hole diameter, maximum build envelope, etc.
 - ▶ Modify each variant design based on these rules and limitations



Methodology

- ▶ **Cost analysis**
 - ▶ Manufacturing time and cost are measures of resource consumption of each variant in the product family
 - ▶ Manufacturing time

$$t = t_{setup} + t_{preheat} + \sum_{i=1}^n t_i$$

Where:

t_{setup} = Machine setup time

$t_{preheat}$ = Preheat time

t_i = Time to build the i-th layer

n = Total number of layers of one part



Methodology

- ▶ **Cost analysis**
 - ▶ Total manufacturing cost of each variant in the product family

$$C = C_{material}M + C_{operation}t + C_{manpower} + C_{overhead}$$

Where:

$C_{material}$ = Unit cost of material usage per gram

M = Total mass of the material usage

$C_{operation}$ = Machine operation cost per hour

t = Total time to build a part


$C_{manpower}$ = Manpower cost in preparing the build as well as post-processing

$C_{overhead}$ = Other overhead cost




Case study

- ▶ Cantilever beam: fixed at one end, load = 10N at the free end
- ▶ Design requirements: low compliance upon loading, light-weight
- ▶ Platform
 - ▶ A solid rectangular cantilever beam
 - ▶ Length = 200mm, height = 20mm, thickness = 10mm





Case study

- ▶ Variant generation – Topology optimization (SIMP)
 - ▶ 10 variants, with different overall material consumption (measured in volume fraction): 10%, 20%, ... 100%



Case study

- ▶ FEA, using Calculix
 - ▶ Simulate the maximum displacement at the free end
 - ▶ A tradeoff is found between material consumption and structural strength




Case study

- ▶ **Design for AM rules and limitations**
 - ▶ Fused Deposition Modeling (FDM) process
 - ▶ Minimum allowable wall thick = 0.8mm → Beam NO. 1 (10% material) is not manufacturable
- ▶ **Additive manufactured samples:**
 - ▶ Beam NO.2 to NO. 10 were built by FDM
 - ▶ Material: Polylactic acid (PLA) thermoplastics


Layer thickness (mm)	Fill density (%)	Print speed (mm/s)	Track width (mm)	Nozzle temperature (°C)	Platform temperature (°C)
0.1	100	80	0.4	210	55




Case study




(a)



(b)



(c)



(d)



(e)



(f)



(g)



(h)



(i)

Nine beams of the family: (a) Sample NO. 2; (b) Sample NO. 3; (c) Sample NO. 4; (d) Sample NO. 5; (e) Sample NO. 6; (f) Sample NO. 7; (g) Sample NO. 8; (h) Sample NO. 9; (i) Sample NO. 10

Case study

- ▶ Manufacturing time and cost of each variant in the product family

$$t = t_{setup} + t_{preheat} + \sum_{i=1}^n t_i$$


$$C = C_{material}M + C_{operation}t + C_{manpower} + C_{overhead}$$

Sample NO.	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Material consumption	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%
Manufacturing time (min)	59	74	86	99	111	121	128	124	123
Cost (\$)	25.7	32.3	37.7	43.5	49.2	53.8	57.5	56.5	56.4



Case study

- ▶ Manufacturing time and cost of each variant in the product family





Closing remark

- ▶ A resource-driven product family design framework in additive manufacturing
- ▶ Parts with complex geometry and material distribution can be manufactured by AM, which provides more freedom to product family design
- ▶ Tradeoff is found between product performance and resource consumption
- ▶ Resource consumption (material usage, manufacturing time, and cost) can be a consideration for selecting production plan





Future work

- ▶ Costing models for other AM processes
- ▶ More complex products, perhaps with assemblies





THANK YOU

