

1, 2, 3

FDM

1, 2, 3, 49008, ; e-mail: info@yuzhnoye.com
2/10, 61046, ; e-mail: admi@ipmach.kharkov.ua
37, 03056,

FDM

FDM

45°

45°

3D FORTUS 900 MC Stratasys.

: ULTEM 9085 PLA.

PLA, ULTEM 9085.

PLA, ULTEM 9085.

: FDM

3D

Additive manufacturing is very promising for aerospace engineering and aircraft construction. Using these technologies, light structures with preset strength properties can be made. For lack of tables of the mechanical properties of materials made by additive technologies, any calculation must be accompanied by the experimental determination of their mechanical properties.

This paper presents an experimental approach to the determination of the mechanical characteristics of parts printed by FDM technologies. Parts manufactured from polymers by FDM technologies are shown to be orthotropic. Therefore, their elastic properties are described by nine constants: three Young's moduli, three shear moduli, and three Poisson ratios. A cube is printed for the experimental determination of these constants. Six specimens are cut out from the cube. Three specimens are cut parallel to the cube edges, and the other three are cut at an angle of 45° to them. Each such specimen is manufactured in five pieces. This makes it possible to average the tensile stress-strain diagrams obtained for all the components of the stress tensor. The mechanical properties of the material are determined from these diagrams. The three Young's moduli and the three Poisson ratios are determined from the three specimen types parallel to the cube edges. The three shear moduli are determined from the specimens cut at an angle of 45° to the cube edges. To determine these constants, tensile stress-strain diagrams are obtained experimentally.

A technology is presented for manufacturing specimens on a Stratasys FORTUS 900 MC 3D printer. The mechanical properties of two polymer materials (ULTEM 9085 and PLA) are determined and compared. PLA has higher Young's moduli and shear moduli and lower Poisson ratios than ULTEM 9085.

Keywords: FDM technology, orthotropic polymer material, mechanical properties, 3D printer.

[1, 2].

« » . . . »

© . . . , . . . , . . . , 2021

. - 2021. - 1.

ULTEM  
 United Launch Alliance  
 ULTEM 9085

[3]

FDM

3D  
 FDM

[4-7].

[8, 9].

[10]

ULTEM

Ultem 9085 –

[11].

Ultem 9085

[12].

[13]

3D

FDM.

FDM

.1

Ultem 9085.  
 90°.

[9].


(1; 2; 3)

$$E_{11}, G_{12}, E_{22}, G_{23}, E_{33}, G_{13} \quad (1)$$

$$E_{11}, E_{22}, E_{33} - ; G_{12}, G_{23}, G_{13} - ;$$

$E_{12}, E_{23}, E_{13} -$   
 [1-8, 12],

FDM



. 1 -

FDM

( . 2).

[14 – 19].

Ultem 9085

3D (1).

FORTUS 900 MC

Stratasys.

1.

3D

2.

Ultem 9085

2

Ultem 9085

[20–22].

3.

3D-


Stratasys F900

240

180 °C.

« »

4. 16 Ultem 9085. -
5. 0,254 . 0,254 .
- F900 3D- Stratasys
6. 3D ,
7. ,
8. Ultem 9085 380 °C.
- 180 °C 120
9. 70 °C .
- 70 °C .



. 2 -

3D

3D .

[14, 23].  
150,0×12,7×4,0 .

. 3.

[14, 15].



.3 -

Tira Test 2300,

10

1 % . 4

[14-18].



.4 -

.2,

.3.

( .2)

ANSYS

2.

Utem.

Utem

30

(

).



.5, )  
.5, )

12( 12),

.5, b) –

23( 23).

Stratasys ULTEM 9085 Utem 1. 2150



.5 –

ULTEM 9085

$11,$	$22,$	$33,$	$G_{12},$	$G_{13},$	$G_{23},$	$32$	$13$	$12$
$2,25 \cdot 10^9$	$2,96 \cdot 10^9$	$2,41 \cdot 10^9$	$6,67 \cdot 10^8$	$8,29 \cdot 10^8$	$8,89 \cdot 10^8$	0,32	0,33	0,31

. 1, ULTEM 9085

ULTEM,

[24].



3.

PLA.

(PLA).

ULTEM.

. 6.



. 6 -

PLA

. 2.

2 –

PLA

$I_1$	$22$	$33$	$G_{12}$	$G_{13}$	$G_{23}$	$23$	$31$	$21$
$3,58 \cdot 10^9$	$3,00 \cdot 10^9$	$3,81 \cdot 10^9$	$1,07 \cdot 10^9$	$1,40 \cdot 10^9$	$1,41 \cdot 10^9$	0,224	0,22	0,25

ULTEM PLA.

PLA

ULTEM 9085.

PLA

ULTEM 9085.

FDM.

9085

ULTEM 9085.

PLA

PLA ULTEM

PLA

ULTEM

9085.

( 2020.02/128).

1. *Matthews N.* Additive metal technologies for aerospace sustainment. Aircraft Sustainment and Repair. R. Jones, A. A. Baker, Neil Matthews, V. K. Champagne (Eds.). Elsevier, 2018. P. 845–862. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-100540-8.00015-7>
2. *Boparai K. S., Singh R.* Advances in Fused Deposition Modeling. Reference Collection in Materials Science and Materials Engineering. Elsevier, 2017. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-803581-8.04166-7>
3. *Byberg K. I., Gebisa A. W., Lemu H. G.* Mechanical properties of ULTEM 9085 material processed by fused deposition modeling. Polymer Testing. 2018. Vol. 72. P. 335–347. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polymertesting.2018.10.040>
4. *Ahn S.-H., Montero M., Odell D., Roundy S., Wright P. K.* Anisotropic material properties of fused deposition modeling ABS. Rapid Prototyping journal. 2002. Vol. 8, No. 4. P. 248–257. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13552540210441166>
5. *Domingo-Espin M., Puigoriol-Forcada J. M., Garcia-Granada A.-A., Llum J., Borros S., Reyes G.* Mechanical property characterization and simulation of fused deposition modeling Polycarbonate parts. Materials & Design. 2015. Vol. 83. P. 670–677. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.matdes.2015.06.074>
6. *Bellini A., Guceri S.* Mechanical characterization of parts fabricated using fused deposition modelling. Rapid Prototyping Journal. 2003. Vol. 9, No. 4. P. 252–264. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13552540310489631>
7. *Casavola C., Cazzato A., Moramarco V., Pappalettere C.* Orthotropic mechanical properties of fused deposition modelling parts described by classical laminate theory. Materials and Design. 2016. Vol. 90. P. 453–458. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.matdes.2015.11.009>
8. *Chen Y., Li T., Jia Z., Scarpa F., Yao C.-W., Wang L.* 3D printed hierarchical honeycombs with shape integrity under large compressive deformations. Materials and Design. 2018. Vol. 137. P. 226–234. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.matdes.2017.10.028>
9. *Parsons E. M.* Lightweight cellular metal composites with zero and tunable thermal expansion enabled by ultrasonic additive manufacturing: Modeling, manufacturing, and testing. Composite Structures. 2019. Vol. 223. Article 110656. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compstruct.2019.02.031>
10. *Gerisa A. W., Lenu H. G.* Influence of 3D printing process parameters on tensile properties of ULTEM 9085. Procedia Manufacturing. 2019. Vol. 30. P. 331–338. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.promfg.2019.02.047>
11. *Motaparti K. P., Taylor G., Leu M. C., Chandrashekhara K., Castle J., Matlack M.* Effects of build parameters on compression properties for ULTEM 9085 parts by fused deposition modeling. Solid Freeform Fabrication. Proceedings of the 26th Annual International Solid Freeform Fabrication Symposium – An Additive Manufacturing Conference. 2016. P. 964–977.
12. *Popescu D., Zapciu A., Amza C., Baciuc F., Marinescu R.* FDM process parameters influence over the mechanical properties of polymer specimens: A review. Polymer Testing. 2018. Vol. 69. P. 157–166. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polymertesting.2018.05.020>



13. Zaldivar R. J., Witkin D. B., McLouth T., Patel D. N., Schmitt K., Nokes J. P. Influence of Processing and Orientation Print Effects on the Mechanical and Thermal Behavior of 3D-Printed ULTEM® 9085 Material. Additive manufacturing. 2017. Vol. 13. P. 71–80. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.addma.2016.11.007>
14. Chamis C. C., Sinclair J. H. Ten-deg off – axis test for shear properties in fiber composites. Experimental Mechanics. 1977. No. 17. P. 339–346. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02326320>
15. ASTM D 3039. Standard Test Method for Tensile Properties of Polymer Matrix Composite. ASTM International. 2017. 13 p.
16. Pagano N. J., Halpin J. C. Influence of end constraint in the testing of anisotropic bodies. Journal of Composite Materials. 1968. Vol. 2, No. 1. P. 18–31. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002199836800200102>
17. Pierron F., Vautrin A. The 10° off-axis tensile test: a critical approach. Composites Science and Technology. 1996. Vol. 56. P. 483–488. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0266-3538\(96\)00004-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0266-3538(96)00004-8)
18. Pindera M. J., Herakovich C. T. Shear characterization of unidirectional composites with the off-axis test. Experimental mechanics. 1986. Vol. 26. P. 103–112. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02319962>
19. ASTM D3518. Standard Test Method for In-Plane Shear Response of Polymer Matrix Composite Materials by Tensile Test of a  $\pm 45^\circ$  Laminate. ASTM International. 2018. 7 p.
20. ASTM D638-14. Standard Test Method for Tensile Properties of Plastics. ASTM International. 2014. 17 p.
21. ASTM D695-15. Standard Test Method for Compressive Properties of Rigid Plastics. ASTM International. 2015. 8 p.
22. ASTM D790-17. Flexural properties of unreinforced and reinforced plastics and electrical insulating materials. ASTM International. 2017. 38 p.
23. Carlsson L. A., Kardomateas G. A. Characterization of the Mechanical Properties of Face Sheet and Core Materials. Book: Structural and Failure Mechanics of Sandwich Composites, Solid Mechanics and its Applications. Springer, 2011. P. 19–37, [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4020-3225-7\\_2](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4020-3225-7_2)
24. Avramov K. Bifurcations of parametric oscillations of beams with three equilibria. Acta Mechanica, 2003, Vol. 164. P. 115–138. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00707-003-0022-9>

16.03.2021,  
07.04.2021