Function Integration Impact on Failure Rates in Additive Manufactured Parts

Przemyslaw Czapski¹, Bartlomiej Swiatek¹ ¹*HBM Prenscia, Warsaw, Poland*

This paper investigates impacts of merging components and reduction of sub-assemblies on failure rate while keeping functionality by exploiting additive manufacturing (AM) capabilities. The analysis is performed by considering a base structure for part composition providing set of functions, and then comparing this with a list of alternatives that consist of merged components realized through AM. The comparative analysis focuses on failure rates and failure counts with optimum maintenance strategies applied. The analysis assumes respective failure mode elimination and failure rate reduction due to geometry improvement and additive manufactured material strength capabilities.

Twelve parts group build base structure providing set of functions. Some of the functions are required for assembling purposes only and with that will create an opportunity for component merging. Table 1.a present part dependencies indicating direction how failure modes are transferred. Table 1.b presents explored merging scenarios realized through AM



		Output										Output																
		Part_01	Part_02	Part_03	Part_04	Part_05	Part_06	Part_07	Part_08	Part_09	Part_10	Part_11	Part_12				Part_01	Part_05	Part_08	Part_06	Part_10	Part_12	Part_09	Part_11	Part_03	Part_04	Part_07	Part_02
Input	Part_01	Х	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			Part_01	Х	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Part_02	0	Х	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0			Part_05	1	Х	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
	Part_03	0	0	Х	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			Part_08	1	0	Х	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Part_04	0	1	1	х	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			Part_06	0	0	1	X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Part_05	1	0	0	1	Х	1	0	1	0	0	0	0			Part_10	0	0	1	0	Х	1	0	1	0	1	0	0
	Part_06	0	0	0	0	0	х	0	1	0	0	0	0		out	Part_12	0	0	0	0	0	Х	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Part_07	0	1	0	1	0	0	х	0	0	0	0	0		lu	Part_09	0	0	0	0	0	1	Х	0	1	0	0	0
	Part_08	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	Х	0	0	0	0			Part_11	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	Х	0	0	0	0
	Part_09	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	Х	0	0	1			Part_03	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Х	1	0	0
	Part_10	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	х	1	1			Part_04	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	Х	0	1
	Part_11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	Х	0			Part_07	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	х	1
	Part_12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	X	b)		Part_02	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	LХ

For the purpose of the reliability analysis failure modes affecting component functions were simplified down to two failure rate contributors. First as an Exponential distribution with a constant failure rate and second, increasing failure rate, described by Weibull distribution.

In performed analysis merged components realized through AM have improved failure rates due to geometry improvement (modeled as Effectiveness Factor for constant failure rate reduction) and additive manufactured material strength capabilities (modeled as Effectiveness Factor for Eta parameter in Weibull distribution). Additionally, due to function reduction of sub-assemblies respective failure modes were eliminated.

Figure 1.a and Figure 1.b present partial Reliability results for base structure and one of the merger alternatives. Proposed analysis method allows recognize how reliability targets for additive manufactured parts can be reached by optimizing function merger. Part maintainability and predictive maintenance activities are also discussed from the perspective of applicability to optimize maintenance strategies.

Name	Reliability (Analytical)	Name	Reliability (Analytical)
🖃 🛅 Ass01	0.0077	🖃 🛅 Ass01	0.7214
🔄 🚆 Part01	0.7144	🖨 🚍 Part01_3D1	0.9164
- Function 1	0.7144	E- 💽 Function 1	0.9904
- • Failure 1	0.8939	E- 💽 Failure 1	0.9904
-E C01	0.9648	- 🖹 C01	0.9968
- E W01	0.9266	- 🖹 W01	0.9936
🖃 💽 Failure 5	0.8523	Function 5	0.9823
-E C05	0.9700	Failure 5	0.9823
LE W05	0.8786	- <u></u> C05	0.9948
- • Failure 8	0.9376	- <u>=</u> w05	0.9874
-E C08	0.9696	Function 6	0.9645
-E W08	0.9671	Failure 6	0.9645
🖃 🖹 Part02	0.5978	- <u>=</u> C06	0.9911
- Function 2	0.5978	- <u>=</u> W06	0.9732
- • Failure 2	0.8739	Function 8	0.9766
- 🖹 C02	0.9631	Failure 8	0.9904
- E W02	0.9074	- <u>E</u> C08	0.9929
- • Failure 4	0.8818	_ <u>⊒</u> ₩08	0.9975
-E C04	0.9550	- O Failure 10	0.9860
LE W04	0.9234	- <u>=</u> C10	0.9945
- • Failure 7	0.7758	_ <u>⊇</u> ₩10	0.9915
- E C07	0.9689	🖶 🚆 Part02_3D1	0.9342
- E W07	0.8007	Function 9	0.9843
🖃 🖹 Part03	0.6826	E- 💽 Failure 9	0.9843
- 🕨 Function 3	0.6826	— 📃 C09	0.9990
- 💽 Failure 3	0.8959	- <u>=</u> W09	0.9853
-E C03	0.9680	Function 10	0.9860
LE W03	0.9255	E- 💽 Failure 10	0.9860
- • Failure 4	0.8818	- <u></u> C10	0.9945
-E C04	0.9550	- E W10	0.9915
LE W04	0.9234	Function 11	0.9770
E- Eailure 9	0.8641	Failure 11	0.9770
- E C09	0.9666	- 🖹 C11	0.9895
) La W09	0.8940	b) w11	0.9873

Figure 1. Example of reliability results (partial) for a) base structure b) one of the alternatives that consist of merged components realized through AM

a

Keywords: Additive manufacturing; Reliability; Failure Rate; Parametric analysis; Components merger