



ALMA MATER STUDIORUM
UNIVERSITÀ DI BOLOGNA

ARCHIVIO ISTITUZIONALE
DELLA RICERCA

Alma Mater Studiorum Università di Bologna Archivio istituzionale della ricerca

Modelling of the Multi Jet Fusion Capillarity Effect on Close Facing Edges

This is the final peer-reviewed author's accepted manuscript (postprint) of the following publication:

Published Version:

Mattia Mele, Giampaolo Campana, Gian Luca Monti (2023). Modelling of the Multi Jet Fusion Capillarity Effect on Close Facing Edges. RAPID PROTOTYPING JOURNAL, 29(5), 971-979 [10.1108/RPJ-05-2022-0161].

Availability:

This version is available at: <https://hdl.handle.net/11585/909649> since: 2024-09-05

Published:

DOI: <http://doi.org/10.1108/RPJ-05-2022-0161>

Terms of use:

Some rights reserved. The terms and conditions for the reuse of this version of the manuscript are specified in the publishing policy. For all terms of use and more information see the publisher's website.

This item was downloaded from IRIS Università di Bologna (<https://cris.unibo.it/>).
When citing, please refer to the published version.

(Article begins on next page)

Modelling of the Multi Jet Fusion Capillarity Effect on Close Facing Edges

Abstract

Purpose The objective of this research is to develop a physical model able to predict the shape of the capillarity effect in Multi Jet Fusion when two facing edges mutually affect each other. The work also aims at testing the consistency of such a model with experimental observations.

Design/methodology/approach

An analytical model of the phenomenon is developed considering the surface tension of the polymer melt adhering to the unfused powder. The general equilibrium equations are solved by imposing the boundary conditions corresponding to the case of two close facing edges, in which the shapes of the menisci are mutually influenced.

The analytical model is validated through an experimental activity. Specifically, a set of parallelepipeds with variable width was manufactured using an HP Multi Jet Fusion 4200. The morphologies of capillarities were captured via 3D scanning and compared with those predicted by the model.

Findings **The results of this study** demonstrate that the average error to the experimental capillarity profile is lower than that obtained by existing methods. Particularly, considerable improvements are achieved as far as the maximum capillarity height is concerned. The manufactured specimens exhibit a change in slope near the edges, which is arguably attributable to coating powder and other effects not included in the analytical model.

Originality/value The model presented in this study differs in hypotheses from previous methods in literature by assuming a null derivative of the capillarity shape in the central point of the meniscus. This allows for a more

accurate prediction of the defect morphology in the case of close facing edges.

Keywords: Additive Manufacturing, Multi Jet Fusion, Capillarity, Accuracy

1. Introduction


1.1. Motivation of the study

The central role of Additive Manufacturing (AM) in the future industry is nowadays well-established (Dilberoglu et al., 2017; Mehrpouya et al., 2019; Haleem and Javaid, 2019). AM technologies open a wide range of new opportunities thanks to their full digitalisation and the overcoming of several geometrical constraints of traditional manufacturing processes (Ngo et al., 2018; Ali et al., 2019). These aspects allow the development of groundbreaking business models (Savolainen and Collan, 2020). One of the most fascinating opportunities is mass customisation, i.e. the design and fabrication on a large scale of parts that are adapted to the needs of the individual customers (Deradjat and Minshall, 2017; Shukla et al., 2018).

One of the main limits to the economic sustainability of mass customisation is the generally low production rate of these technologies (Thomas and Gilbert, 2015; Gutowski et al., 2017). In fact, the high building time and the cost of the equipment have a major impact on the product cost (Costabile et al., 2016). Fig. 1 maps the production rate versus the resolution of different polymer-based AM processes (CIMdata Inc, 2018).

Fig. 1 shows that Multi Jet Fusion allows for achieving an impressive building rate. This feature, together with the mechanical properties of parts, makes the MJF extremely appealing for industrial applications of AM (O'Connor et al., 2018; Craft et al., 2018).

MJF is a powder-bed AM process patented by HP Inc. ® for transforming polymeric materials. Even though new materials have been recently introduced by HP, most of the applications are based on the use of PolyAmide (PA), sometimes reinforced with glass beads (O' Connor and Dowling, 2019).



23
24
25
26
27
28
29


Figure 1: Comparison of Additive Manufacturing Technologies—Build Rate Compared to Resolution (Courtesy of Fraunhofer IAPT) (CIMdata Inc, 2018)

30
31
32
33
34
35

As in the High-Speed Sintering (HSS) process, a Fusing Agent (FA) is deposited through printheads on the powder bed (Thomas et al., 2006). The layer is then irradiated using an InfraRed Lamp (IRL), which melts the material wetted by Radiation Absorbing Material (RAM) (Ellis et al., 2014).

36
37
38
39
40
41

Unlike in HSS, a Detailing Agent (DA) is deposited at the borders of RAM. The DA prevents the undesired sintering of adjacent powder and the infiltration of molten material (Emamjomeh, AliPrasad et al., 2015). Fig. 2 shows a schematic representation of the process.



49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60


Figure 2: Scheme of the Multi Jet Fusion Process (adapted by HP Development Company L.P. (2014)). a) Material recoating, b) Thermal control, c) Application of the fusing agent, d) Application of the detailing energy, e) Fusion and f) Fused Layer.

35 Parts produced by MJF are characterised by almost isotropic mechanical
 36 behaviour and water tightness (Morales-Planas et al., 2018).

37 Despite the many benefits of this technology, MJF is characterised by some
 38 specific process-induced defects (HP Development Company L.P., 2017a). One
 39 of the most peculiar is the so-called capillarity effect, which is at the centre of
 40 this investigation.

41 1.2. Capillarity effect

42 As described in the previous section, two different agents are deposited on
 43 the layer, namely the FA and the DA. In order to prevent infiltration of molten
 44 polymer, the DA contains a surfactant, whose role is to limit the liquid material
 45 (Emamjomeh, AliPrasad et al., 2015). This surfactant increases the surface
 46 tension at the interface between the solid and the molten polymer, resulting in
 47 a local rise of the liquid meniscus (Rosen, 2012; De Gennes et al., 2013). Fig. 3
 48 shows a detail of this phenomenon.



44 Figure 3: Scheme of the fusion process. a) InfraRed Lamp (IRL) melting powder by
 45 Fusing Agent (FA). b) Fused material raising on powder soaked by Detailing Agent (DA).

49 After the solidification process is completed, the marker of the capillarity
 50 effect is still visible at the edges of the up-facing planes. Fig. 4 shows an
 51 example of this effect on a manufactured part.

52 A physical model of the capillarity is given by Mele et al. (2019). This model




Figure 4: Picture of the capillarity effect on the manufactured part

assumes that this defect becomes null at an infinite distance to the edge, i.e. that the surface is sufficiently large to let the defect vanish away from borders. Such a condition is not met in the case of small parts with a small distance between facing edges. Therefore, in these cases, the model proposed by Mele et al. (2019) is not applicable.

A different solution of the physical model intended for application to cylindrical shapes was proposed by Mele et al. (2021). This model does not pose limitations in terms of dimensions but assumes that the surface where the capillarity effect arises is axisymmetric.

Therefore, these models do not allow for the prediction of the capillarity shape in the case of small surfaces with facing edges. To fill this gap, the present article derives a new equation to fit this case starting from a physical model of the process. A benchmark part is then designed and manufactured to observe the actual shape of the defect. The profile of the capillarity effect is acquired through 3D scanning and compared to the analytical results to validate the model.

2. Analytical model

For the scope of this study, it is assumed that the molten polymer in contact with the unmelted powder infiltrated by DA behaves like a liquid facing a vertical solid wall. Such an assumption is common to previous literature on the

73 capillarity effect in MJF (Mele et al., 2019, 2021).

74 The interfacial tension γ between the solid and the liquid is a characteristic
75 value given a certain combination of materials (De Gennes et al., 2013). Also,
76 the interface is characterised by the contact angle θ_e between the two phases.

77 This study investigates the case of two vertical walls facing each other. As a
78 hypothesis, the two edges are assumed to be parallel and their normal direction
79 is referred to as x . The analysed system is represented in Fig. 5, in which
80 b indicates the half distance between the edges along the x -axis and θ_e is the
81 contact angle between the liquid and solid phases. As can be seen, the coordinate
82 system is located in the central point of the meniscus. Fig. 5 highlights also an
83 element of infinitesimal length dx (coloured in red). Fig. 6 shows a detail of
84 this element.




Figure 5: Model of the meniscus between two facing edges and infinitesimal element of length dx (red coloured).

85 Fig. 6 shows that the infinitesimal element is subject to the hydrostatic force
86 $F_{h,s}$, directed along the negative z direction. The module of this force can be
87 calculated as in Eq. 1:

$$F_{h,s} = \rho \times g \times z \times dx \quad (1)$$

88 where ρ is the density of the liquid, g is the acceleration of gravity, z is the
89 local height of the meniscus and dx is the infinitesimal length along the x -axis.




Figure 6: Detail of an infinitesimal element dx

As shown in Fig. 6, the element is also subject to the force F_{st} due to the interfacial tension γ mentioned above.

This force is tangent to the meniscus. The inclinations of F_{st} at the right and left side of the infinitesimal element are indicated as α and $\alpha + d\alpha$, respectively. Assuming a unitary depth of the infinitesimal element, the modulus of F_{st} is equal to the surface tension γ .

Under these assumptions, Eq. 2 expresses the condition of vertical equilibrium on the infinitesimal element:

$$\Delta\rho \times g \times z \times dx = \gamma \times \sin(\alpha + d\alpha) - \gamma \times \sin(\alpha) \cong \gamma \times \cos(\alpha) \times d\alpha \quad (2)$$

It is worth noticing that the density ρ in Eq. 1 has been replaced with the term $\Delta\rho$, which represents the difference in density between the powder and the molten polymer. The aim is to consider the powder coating effect on the meniscus.

According to the representation in Fig. 6, the tangent of the angle α is given in Eq. 3:

$$\tan(\alpha) = \frac{dz}{dx} \quad (3)$$

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 where dx and dz are the infinitesimal increments along the x and z -axes,
9 respectively.

10 Under these assumptions, the condition of equilibrium leads to Eq. 4 (Mele
11 et al., 2019):
12
13

$$z(x) = \frac{\gamma}{\Delta\rho \times g} \times \frac{d^2z}{dx^2} = k^{-2} \frac{d^2z}{dx^2} \quad (4)$$

14
15
16
17 Where k^{-1} is the characteristic length of the capillary, defined as in Eq. 5)
18 (De Gennes et al., 2013):
19

$$k^{-1} = \sqrt{\frac{\gamma}{\Delta\rho \times g}} \quad (5)$$

20
21
22
23 To solve the differential equation in Eq. 4, it is necessary to introduce the
24 boundary conditions of the problem. As stated above, the contact angle θ_e
25 between the solid and the liquid is a characteristic of the pair of materials. This
26 condition is expressed in Eq. 6:
27
28

$$\frac{dz}{dx}_{x=b} = \cot(\theta_e) \quad (6)$$

29
30
31
32 The second hypothesis is that the shape of the meniscus is symmetric, i.e.
33 the direction of the defect has no influence on the capillarity effect. Under this
34 assumption, the slope of the meniscus is null on the centre point of the two
35 walls, as expressed in Eq. 7:
36
37

$$\frac{dz}{dx}_{x=0} = 0 \quad (7)$$

38
39
40
41 Solving Eq. 4 with the boundary conditions in Eq. 6 and Eq. 7 leads to
42 the result in Eq. 8, which describes the profile of the surface between the two
43 edges.
44
45

$$z(x, b) = \frac{e^{k(b-x)}(1 + e^{2kx})k^{-1}\cot(\theta_e)}{e^{2kb} - 1} \quad (8)$$

46
47
48
49 The model in Eq. 8 will be referenced in the following as Close Edges
50 Capillarity Model (CECM). This model can also be used to calculate the value
51 of the meniscus rise in the central point, i.e. at $x=0$, as shown in Eq. 9:
52
53

$$z(0, b) = \frac{2e^{kb}}{e^{2kb} - 1} k^{-1} \cot(\theta_e) \quad (9)$$

124 It can be observed that the value in Eq. 9 asymptotically tends to 0 when
 125 b approaches infinity, i.e. $\lim_{b \rightarrow \infty} z(0, b) = 0$. Even though this value is never
 126 reached, the height of the central point becomes negligible above a certain width
 127 b which depends on the values of θ_e and k^{-1} . This criterion can be applied to
 128 determine the distance at which the edges can be considered close. A practical
 129 example is given in the next section when defining the dimensions of specimens.

130 To calculate the maximum rise of the liquid, Eq. 8 is computed at $x=b$, as
 131 shown in Eq. 10:

$$z(b, b) = \frac{e^{2kb} + 1}{e^{2kb} - 1} k^{-1} \cot(\theta_e) \quad (10)$$

132 To calculate the maximum height of the capillarity z_{max} , the difference be-
 133 tween the maximum and minimum rise of the liquid, i.e. between Eq. 10 and
 134 Eq. 9, must be calculated. This leads to the result in Eq. 11:

$$z_{max}(b) = z(b, b) - z(0, b) = k^{-1} \cot(\theta_e) \tanh\left(\frac{kb}{2}\right) \quad (11)$$

135 The expression in Eq. 11 tends to 0 when b approaches 0, i.e. $\lim_{b \rightarrow 0} z_{max}(b) =$
 136 0. In fact, when reducing the distance to edges, the effect of the force F_{st} due to
 137 interfacial tension is dominant also in the central region, whose difference with
 138 edges vanishes. In these conditions, the meniscus tends to have a flat shape. It
 139 is worth mentioning that both Eq. 9 and 10 tend to infinity when b approaches
 140 0 since the interfacial tension becomes dominant on gravity and the liquid moves
 141 upward under the effect of capillarity. In the MJF process, the rise is limited
 142 by the height of the deposited powder layer, as shown in Fig. 3.

143 Observing Eq. 11, it is also possible to notice that, as b approaches infinity,
 144 the maximum height tends to the finite value in Eq. 12:

$$\lim_{b \rightarrow \infty} z_{max}(b) = k^{-1} \cot(\theta_e). \quad (12)$$

Eq. 8 can be reformulated by moving the origin of the x-axis on the left edge of the capillarity by substituting x with $x - b$. Operating this substitution and calculating the limit as b approaches infinity leads to the result shown in Eq. 13, which is the theoretical upper limit to the capillarity height.

$$\lim_{b \rightarrow \infty} \frac{e^{k(2b-x)}(1 + e^{2k(x-b)})k^{-1} \cot(\theta_e)}{e^{2kb} - 1} = e^{-kx} k^{-1} \cot(\theta_e) \quad (13)$$

The right side of Eq. 13 is the model of capillarity obtained by Mele et al. (2019), which will be referenced as *Free Edge Capillarity Model (FECM)* in the following. This is consistent with the physics of the problem, since increasing b the mutual influence of the two edges vanishes and the FECM can be applied.

3. Experimental activity

3.1. Design and manufacturing of specimens

The benchmark in Fig. 7 has been designed to inspect the capillarity effect between facing edges. The coordinate system in Fig. 7 shows the orientation of the part within the build chamber. As can be observed, the benchmark comprises five planar top surfaces where the capillarity effect is observed. It is worth underlining that the five repetitions of each test condition are carried out on the same benchmark. This allows for minimising the effect of process conditions, e.g. part cooling, which can alter the final result (Mele et al., 2020b). On the other hand, this approach may suffer from limitations whether an external factor affects the quality of the entire manufactured part. This risk is accepted as this study focuses on a local effect, namely capillarity, which is unlikely to be systematically altered in all the regions of the part by external factors. Further applications of the method will be necessary to test its consistency in different processing conditions.

The thickness of the part is limited to prevent sinking, which may alter the observation (HP Development Company L.P., 2017b). Observing Fig. 7 it is possible to notice that the only variable dimension is the width of the upper planes, namely the faces where the capillarity effect is measured.




Figure 7: Benchmark used to observe the capillarity effect (dimensions in mm)

172 All the specimens were produced through an HP MJF 4200 using PA12
 173 powder, the properties of which are summarised in Tab. 1.

Table 1: Properties of the PA12 powder used for testing

Property	Value	Reference
Particle size (μm)	60	(Morales-Planas et al., 2018)
Powder Bulk density ($\frac{\text{g}}{\text{cm}^3}$)	0.425	(Morales-Planas et al., 2018)
Onset melting temperature ($^{\circ}\text{C}$)	180.5	(Sillani et al., 2019)
First melting fusion enthalpy (J g^{-1})	110.3	(Sillani et al., 2019)
Cristallinity (%)	52.7	(Sillani et al., 2019)
Crystallization temperature ($^{\circ}\text{C}$)	148.6	(Sillani et al., 2019)
Crystallization enthalpy (J g^{-1})	47.9	(Sillani et al., 2019)
Moleculare weigth (M_N) ($\frac{\text{g}}{\text{mol}}$)	80,852	(Sillani et al., 2019)
Moleculare weigth (M_W) ($\frac{\text{g}}{\text{mol}}$)	41,020	(Sillani et al., 2019)
Polydispersity (-)	1.97	(Sillani et al., 2019)

174 The irradiance of the machine was set to -3.5% after the fine-tuning proce-
 175 dure. The fast printing mode was used for the process (HP Development Com-
 176 pany L.P., 2014). The room where the production took place was maintained
 177 at $25 \pm 5^{\circ}\text{C}$ temperature and humidity $40 \pm 5\%$. The main process parameters

178 are summarised in Tab. 2 (Mele et al., 2019).

Table 2: Parameters of the MJF process (Mele et al., 2019)

Property	Value
Layer build time (s)	7.6
Fusing agent ($\frac{mm^3}{mm^3(part)}$)	58×10^{-3}
Detailing agent ($\frac{mm^3}{mm^3(part)}$)	62×10^{-3}

179 The benchmarks were positioned in the bottom central region of the build
 180 volume. The build job included 45 parts with a total volume of 28,052.57 mm³.
 181 The total build height and nesting density were equal to 112.13 mm and 6.23%,
 182 respectively.

183 As shown in Fig. 7, the profile is oriented along the **x**-axis. the average
 184 values observed on the west and east edges by Mele et al. (2019) are used to
 185 calculate the profile in Eq. 8. These values are summarised in Tab. 3

Table 3: Parameters used for calculation of Eq. 8 (Mele et al., 2019)

Property	Value
k^{-1} (mm)	1.545
θ_e (°)	78.3
γ ($\frac{mN}{m}$)	15.91
$\Delta\rho$ ($\frac{kg}{m^3}$)	675

186 Entering values of Tab. 3 in Eq. 9, it can be verified that the value of $z(0,b)$
 187 decreases below 0.01 mm when b exceeds 5.36 mm. This is thus considered
 188 an upper limit to define close edges in the investigated case. Accordingly, four
 189 different specimens were designed varying the values of b from 2 to 5 mm with
 190 a step of 1 mm.

191 After unpacking, the parts were manually brushed to prevent accidental
 192 modifications of the capillary effect during air blasting.

193 *3.2. Measurement of the capillarity effect*

194 In order to observe the shape of the top surfaces, all the specimens were
 195 digitalised by means of a FARO ScanArm non-contact structured blue light 3D
 196 scanner. The software Geomagic[®] Control X[™] by 3D System[©] was used to
 197 manage the acquired scans. Particularly, the clouds of points captured through
 198 the scanner were aligned to the digital models of benchmarks using the best-fit
 199 option provided by the software. The distance between the model and the point
 200 cloud was measured along parallel lines directed as the **x**-axis, as shown in Fig.
 201 8.




Figure 8: Scheme of comparison points on upper surfaces

202 A distance of 7 mm is kept between these lines and the sides of the specimen,
 203 so as to avoid the influence of border edges. Six parallel lines with step 2 mm
 204 along the **y**-axis are analysed for each surface, resulting in 30 measuring lines
 205 per specimen.

206 For each line, the distance along **the z-axis** between the point cloud and the
 207 CAD model is measured in fixed positions (represented as blue dots in Fig. 8)

208 by using the comparison point tool of Geomagic[®] Control X[™]. The comparison
 209 points are located at $\Delta r = 0.1\text{mm}$ one from each other starting from the edge,
 210 as shown in Fig. 8. The total number of comparison points along a scanning
 211 line (N_p) can be thus calculated as in Eq. 14:

$$N_p = \left(\frac{2b}{\Delta r} + 1\right) \quad (14)$$

212 Tab. 4 summarises the measures and comparison points of each specimen.

Table 4: Widths and comparison points of the different specimens

Specimen	b (mm)	N_p	Total comparison points
1	5	101	606
2	4	81	486
3	3	61	366
4	2	41	246

213 As can be seen in Tab. 4, a minimum of 246 sample points is tested on the
 214 smallest benchmark, i.e. when $b=2$ mm.

215 The distances between the scan and the CAD model at comparison points
 216 were exported by Geomagic[®] Control X[™] as plain text files. These files were
 217 then imported to Microsoft[®] Excel[™] to perform the data analysis detailed in
 218 the following.

219 As described by Attene et al. (2003), the contactless measuring system causes
 220 chamfering of sharp edges. For this reason, the very last point of each measuring
 221 line is excluded from the analysis.

222 For each upper plane j , the average height $\bar{z}_j(x)$ at the generic coordinate x
 223 is calculated as the average value measured on the six measuring lines.

224 The measured profile $\bar{z}(x)$ on the specimen is then obtained as the average
 225 of $\bar{z}_j(x)$ on the five planes, i.e. as in Eq. 15:

$$\bar{z}(x) = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^5 \bar{z}_j(x)}{5} = \frac{1}{5} \sum_{j=1}^5 \left(\frac{1}{6} \sum_{i=1}^6 \bar{z}_{i,j}(x)\right) \quad (15)$$

226 where $\bar{z}_{i,j}(x)$ is the height measured at position x along the i -th of the six
 227 measuring lines on the j -th top plane. Using the same notation, the standard
 228 deviation of measurements at the position x is calculated as in Eq. 16:

$$\sigma_z(x) = \sqrt{\frac{1}{4} \sum_{j=1}^5 (\bar{z}(x) - \bar{z}_j(x))^2} \quad (16)$$

229 The average value of standard deviation on the profile of semi-width b ($\bar{\sigma}(b)$)
 230 can be calculated as in Eq. 17. $\bar{\sigma}(b)$ provides an estimation of the consistency
 231 of the capillarity profile among the measuring lines. This information is used
 232 to verify whether the number of repetitions, i.e. 30 lines per each of the four
 233 values of b , is sufficient to reliably represent the defect.

$$\bar{\sigma}(b) = \frac{1}{N_p} \sum_{k=0}^{N_p-1} \sigma_z(k \times \Delta r) \quad (17)$$

234 3.3. Error between prediction and calculation

235 The error of the prediction is calculated as the absolute value of the difference
 236 between $z(x)$ (Eq. 8) and $\bar{z}(x)$ (Eq. 15).

237 The overall per cent average error of the prediction $\bar{E}(b)$ is calculated in Eq.
 238 18, while the corresponding standard deviation σ_E is given in Eq. 19. These
 239 values will be used in the next section to describe the accuracy of the model.

$$\bar{E}(b) = \frac{1}{N_p} \sum_{k=0}^{N_p-1} \frac{\bar{z}(k \times \Delta r) - z(k \times \Delta r)}{\bar{z}(k \times \Delta r)} \quad (18)$$

$$\sigma_E = \sqrt{\frac{1}{N_p - 1} \sum_{k=0}^{N_p-1} \left(\bar{E} - \frac{\bar{z}(k \times \Delta r) - z(k \times \Delta r)}{\bar{z}(k \times \Delta r)} \right)^2} \quad (19)$$

240 3.4. Results and discussion

241 Tab. 5 shows the average values of standard deviation $\bar{\sigma}(b)(mm)$ on the
 242 profiles. It is possible to notice that these values are below 20 μm on each
 243 specimen. This finding demonstrates that the shape of the capillarity effect is
 244 consistent among the 30 measurement lines of each specimen. This suggests

245 that the number of repetitions, i.e. 5 planes per part and 6 measuring lines
 246 on each plane, is sufficient to achieve a reliable representation of the defect.
 247 Therefore, it is possible to use the average profile $\bar{z}(x)$ as a reliable estimation
 248 of the planar top surfaces for a given semi-width b .

Table 5: Average values of standard deviation

Specimen	b (mm)	$\bar{\sigma}$ (mm)
1	5	0.005
2	4	0.013
3	3	0.016
4	2	0.017

249 Tab. 6 summarises the per cent average error between the predicted and
 250 measured profile (\bar{E}) and the corresponding standard deviation (σ_E). The av-
 251 erage percent error of the FECM is also reported for comparison.

Table 6: Error between calculated and measured profile of the capillarity effect

Specimen	b (mm)	$\bar{E} \pm \sigma_E$ (CECM) (%)	$\bar{E} \pm \sigma_E$ (FECM) (%)
1	5	-15.3 ± 27.7	29.3 ± 36.7
2	4	-23.7 ± 22.4	47.1 ± 128.3
3	3	-31.6 ± 25	35.2 ± 67.8
4	2	-30.0 ± 40.9	66.1 ± 82.7

252 Results in Tab. 6 show that the CECM leads to negative values of \bar{E} , i.e.
 253 the model averagely underestimates the measured shapes. On the contrary, a
 254 positive error is obtained by FECM. The absolute value of \bar{E} is always lower in
 255 the case of CECM. This finding demonstrates that the model proposed in this
 256 study allows for a more accurate estimation of the capillarity shape if compared
 257 with existing methods.

258 The underestimation of the profile provided by CECM may be critical in
 259 case this model is integrated with redesign strategies aiming at removing the

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

260 capillarity effect, such as that proposed by Mele et al. (2020a). Also, in this case,
261 several design iterations should be performed updating the distance b between
262 edges.

263 High values of standard deviation σ_E are found in all the observations. The
264 reason for this is that the distance between the prediction and the measurement
265 is unevenly distributed along the x -axis. This can also be seen in Figs. 9 - 12,
266 which show the comparison between the calculated and measured profiles of the
267 capillarity effect, namely $z(x)$ and $\bar{z}(x)$, respectively.




Figure 9: Comparison between $z(x)$ and $\bar{z}(x)$ for specimen 1 ($b= 5$ mm)




Figure 10: Comparison between $z(x)$ and $\bar{z}(x)$ for specimen 2 ($b= 4$ mm)

268 The overlap of the curves shows that the measured profiles present an in-




Figure 11: Comparison between $z(x)$ and $\bar{z}(x)$ for specimen 3 ($b= 3$ mm)




Figure 12: Comparison between $z(x)$ and $\bar{z}(x)$ for specimen 4 ($b= 2$ mm)

269 flexion that is not calculated by Eq. 8. This difference is arguably attributable
 270 to other influential factors which are not considered by the model, such as the
 271 covering powder and the coating detailing agent. The present model does not
 272 allow for directly including these factors since, as discussed in Section 2, it starts
 273 from the assumption that the polymer melt behaves like a liquid facing a solid
 274 wall. Future research will be dedicated to understanding if this gap between
 275 analytical and experimental results can be filled through empirical factors or
 276 changing the hypotheses of the physical model.

277 It is worth mentioning that the average error presented in Tab. 6 is subject

278 to variations due to the accuracy of the measuring system. In fact, in the central
 279 region of the profile the values of $\bar{z}(x)$ are in the same order of magnitude as the
 280 accuracy of the measuring system. Further analysis is thus performed comparing
 281 the maximum measured height of the capillarity (\bar{z}_{max}) with that calculated by
 282 the model (z_{max}). Fig. 13 shows this comparison for both CECM and FECM.
 283 The per cent errors ($\bar{E}_{z_{max}}$) of the two models are summarised in Tab. 7.




Figure 13: Maximum capillarity height as a function of the part width

Table 7: Error between the calculated and measured profile of the capillarity effect

Specimen	b (mm)	\bar{z}_{max} (μm)	$\bar{E}_{z_{max}, (CECM)}$ (%)	$\bar{E}_{z_{max}, (FECM)}$ (%)
1	5	142	7.5	14.2
2	4	235	7.2	15.3
3	3	257	2.1	16.8
4	2	269	28.1	63.2

284 Results in Fig. 13 and Tab. 7 show that the maximum height of the cap-
 285 illarity increases while b increases, plateauing below the maximum theoretical
 286 value $k^{-1}\cot(\theta_e)$ (which is equal to 0.32 mm). These experimental observations
 287 are consistent with the physical model of the phenomenon discussed in Section
 288 2.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

289 The error values in Tab. 7 demonstrate that the CECM allows for a sub-
290 stantially better estimation of \bar{z}_{max} if compared with FECM, especially for low
291 values of b . The graphical representation in Fig. 13 shows that the predictions
292 of FECM and CECM tend to converge while increasing b . This result is ex-
293 pected since, as discussed in Section 2, CECM approaches FECM as the mutual
294 influence of facing edges decreases.

295 4. Conclusions

296 The CECM presented in this study allows for a more accurate estimation
297 of the capillarity shape on close facing edges by MJF if compared with exist-
298 ing models. Particularly, findings demonstrate a considerable reduction of the
299 average per cent error between the calculated and measured capillarity profile.
300 Unlike in the case of FECM, the CECM leads to negative errors, i.e. an average
301 underestimation of the real shape is obtained.

302 The advantages of CECM over FECM are evident also as far as the maxi-
303 mum height of the capillarity is concerned. Particularly, the estimation obtained
304 through the newly proposed model is highly more realistic for the smallest mea-
305 sured observed. While increasing the distance between edges, results of FECM
306 and CECM approach each other.

307 The comparison between calculated and experimental curves shows an inflex-
308 ion of the actual capillarity shape, which is not predicted by CECM. This effect
309 is arguably attributable to influential factors not represented by the **physical**
310 model and deserves further research to be unveiled.

311 Acknowledgements

312 The authors would like to thank the MIUR (Italian Ministry of University
313 and Research) for funding support and Juno Design S.r.l. for laboratory facili-
314 ties.

315 **References**


- 316 Ali, M.H., Batai, S., Sarbassov, D., 2019. 3D printing: a critical review of
317 current development and future prospects. *Rapid Prototyping Journal* 25,
318 1108–1126. doi:10.1108/RPJ-11-2018-0293.
- 319 Attene, M., Falcidieno, B., Rossignac, J., Spagnuolo, M., 2003. Edge-sharpener:
320 recovering sharp features in triangulations of non-adaptively re-meshed sur-
321 faces. *Proceedings of the 2003 Eurographics/ACM SIGGRAPH symposium*
322 *on Geometry processing*, 62–69URL: [http://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?](http://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=882378)
323 [id=882378](http://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=882378).
- 324 CIMdata Inc, 2018. *Industrialization of Additive Manufacturing Accessible To-*
325 *day*. Technical Report July.
- 326 Costabile, G., Fera, M., Fruggiero, F., Lambiase, A., Pham, D., 2016. Cost
327 models of additive manufacturing: A literature review. *International Journal*
328 *of Industrial Engineering Computations* 8, 263–282. doi:10.5267/j.ijiec.
329 2016.9.001.
- 330 Craft, G., Nussbaum, J., Crane, N., Harmon, J.P., 2018. Impact of extended sin-
331 tering times on mechanical properties in PA-12 parts produced by powderbed
332 fusion processes. *Additive Manufacturing* 22, 800–806. URL: [https://doi.](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.addma.2018.06.028)
333 [org/10.1016/j.addma.2018.06.028](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.addma.2018.06.028), doi:10.1016/j.addma.2018.06.028.
- 334 De Gennes, P.G., Brochard-Wyart, F., Quéré, D., 2013. *Capillarity and wet-*
335 *ting phenomena: drops, bubbles, pearls, waves*. Springer Science & Business
336 Media.
- 337 Deradjat, D., Minshall, T., 2017. Implementation of rapid manufacturing for
338 mass customisation. *Journal of Manufacturing Technology Management* 28,
339 95–121. doi:10.1108/JMTM-01-2016-0007.
- 340 Dilberoglu, U.M., Gharehpapagh, B., Yaman, U., Dolen, M., 2017. The Role of
341 Additive Manufacturing in the Era of Industry 4.0. *Procedia Manufacturing*

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 342 11, 545–554. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.promfg.2017.07.148>,
9 343 doi:10.1016/j.promfg.2017.07.148.
- 10
11 344 Ellis, A., Noble, C.J., Hopkinson, N., 2014. High Speed Sintering: Assessing
12 345 the influence of print density on microstructure and mechanical properties of
13 346 nylon parts. *Additive Manufacturing* 1, 48–51. URL: [http://dx.doi.org/](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.addma.2014.07.003)
14 347 [10.1016/j.addma.2014.07.003](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.addma.2014.07.003), doi:10.1016/j.addma.2014.07.003.
- 15
16
17 348 Emamjomeh, AliPrasad, K.A., Novick, M.A., Fung, E.M., 2015. Detailing agent
19 349 for three-dimensional (3d) printing.
- 20
21 350 Gutowski, T., Jiang, S., Cooper, D., Corman, G., Hausmann, M., Manson, J.A.,
22 351 Schudeleit, T., Wegener, K., Sabelle, M., Ramos-Grez, J., Sekulic, D.P., 2017.
23 352 Note on the Rate and Energy Efficiency Limits for Additive Manufacturing.
24 353 *Journal of Industrial Ecology* 21, S69–S79. doi:10.1111/jiec.12664.
- 25
26
27 354 Haleem, A., Javaid, M., 2019. Additive Manufacturing Applications in Indus-
28 355 try 4.0: A Review. *Journal of Industrial Integration and Management* 04,
29 356 1930001. doi:10.1142/s2424862219300011.
- 30
31
32 357 HP Development Company L.P., 2014. HP Multi Jet Fusion technology. Tech-
33 358 nical White Paper , 8.
- 34
35
36 359 HP Development Company L.P., 2017a. Multi Jet Fusion printing tips and
37 360 tricks. Technical White Paper .
- 38
39
40 361 HP Development Company L.P., 2017b. Multi Jet Fusion printing tips and
41 362 tricks. Technical White Paper .
- 42
43
44 363 Mehrpouya, M., Dehghanghadikolaei, A., Fotovvati, B., Vosooghnia, A.,
45 364 Emamian, S.S., Gisario, A., 2019. The Potential of Additive Manufactur-
46 365 ing in the Smart Factory Industrial 4.0: A Review. *Applied Science* , 34.
- 47
48
49 366 Mele, M., Campana, G., Monti, G.L., 2019. Modelling of the capil-
50 367 larity effect in Multi Jet Fusion technology. *Additive Manufacturing*


- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 368 30, 100879. URL: [https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/](https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S2214860419305664)
9 369 S2214860419305664, doi:10.1016/j.addma.2019.100879.
- 10
11 370 Mele, M., Campana, G., Monti, G.L., 2020a. A finned-riser design to avoid the
12 371 capillarity effect in multi-jet fusion technology. *Rapid Prototyping Journal*
13 372 doi:10.1108/RPJ-01-2020-0020.
- 14
15
16 373 Mele, M., Campana, G., Monti, G.L., 2021. Modelling of the capillarity effect for
17 374 cylindrical shapes in Multi Jet Fusion technology. *Progress in Additive Manu-*
18 375 *facturing* URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40964-021-00200-7>, doi:10.
19 376 1007/s40964-021-00200-7.
- 20
21
22
23 377 Mele, M., Campana, G., Pisaneschi, G., Monti, G.L., 2020b. Investigation
24 378 into effects of cooling rate on properties of polyamide 12 parts in the multi
25 379 jet fusion process. *Rapid Prototyping Journal* 26, 1789–1795. doi:10.1108/
26 380 RPJ-04-2020-0080.
- 27
28
29
30 381 Morales-Planas, S., Minguella-Canela, J., Lluma-Fuentes, J., Travieso-
31 382 Rodriguez, J.A., García-Granada, A.A., 2018. Multi Jet Fusion PA12 man-
32 383 ufacturing parameters for watertightness, strength and tolerances. *Materials*
33 384 11, 1–11. doi:10.3390/ma11081472.
- 34
35
36 385 Ngo, T.D., Kashani, A., Imbalzano, G., Nguyen, K.T., Hui, D., 2018. Addi-
37 386 tive manufacturing (3D printing): A review of materials, methods, applica-
38 387 tions and challenges. *Composites Part B: Engineering* 143, 172–196. URL:
39 388 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compositesb.2018.02.012>, doi:10.1016/j.
40 389 compositesb.2018.02.012.
- 41
42
43
44 390 O' Connor, H.J., Dowling, D.P., 2019. Comparison between the properties
45 391 of polyamide 12 and glass bead filled polyamide 12 using the multi jet fu-
46 392 sion printing process. *Additive Manufacturing* 31, 100961. URL: <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S2214860419300958>, doi:10.
47 393 1016/j.addma.2019.100961.
48 394
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 395 O'Connor, H.J., Dickson, A.N., Dowling, D.P., 2018. Evaluation of the me-
9 396 chanical performance of polymer parts fabricated using a production scale
10 397 multi jet fusion printing process. *Additive Manufacturing* 22, 381–387.
11 398 doi:10.1016/j.addma.2018.05.035.
- 12
13
14 399 Rosen, M., 2012. Surfactants and interfacial phenomena. volume 40. doi:10.
15 400 1016/0166-6622(89)80030-7.
- 16
17
18 401 Savolainen, J., Collan, M., 2020. How Additive Manufacturing Technology
19 402 Changes Business Models? – Review of Literature. *Additive Manufac-*
20 403 *ing* 32, 101070. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.addma.2020.101070>,
21 404 doi:10.1016/j.addma.2020.101070.
- 22
23
24 405 Shukla, M., Todorov, I., Kapletiac, D., 2018. Application of Additive Manu-
25 406 facturing for Mass Customization: Understanding the Interaction of Critical
26 407 Barriers. *Production Planning & Control* 29, 814–825.
- 27
28
29 408 Sillani, F., Kleijnen, R.G., Vetterli, M., Schmid, M., Wegener, K., 2019. Se-
30 409 lective laser sintering and multi jet fusion: Process-induced modification of
31 410 the raw materials and analyses of parts performance. *Additive Manufac-*
32 411 *turing* 27, 32–41. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.addma.2019.02.004>,
33 412 doi:10.1016/j.addma.2019.02.004.
- 34
35
36
37 413 Thomas, D.S., Gilbert, S.W., 2015. Costs and cost effectiveness of additive
38 414 manufacturing: A literature review and discussion. *Additive Manufacturing:*
39 415 *Costs, Cost Effectiveness and Industry Economics* , 1–96.
- 40
41
42
43 416 Thomas, H.R., Hopkinson, N., Erasenthiran, P., 2006. High Speed Sin-
44 417 tering – Continuing Research into a New Rapid Manufacturing Process.
45 418 *Proceedings of the 17th Solid Freeform Fabrication Symposium (SFF)* ,
46 419 682–691 URL: <http://sffsymposium.engr.utexas.edu/2006TOC%0Ahttp://sffsymposium.engr.utexas.edu/Manuscripts/2006/2006-59-Thomas.pdf>.
47 420
48 421 pdf.
- 49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




71x56mm (150 x 150 DPI)




73x54mm (150 x 150 DPI)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




73x49mm (150 x 150 DPI)




121x52mm (150 x 150 DPI)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




82x27mm (150 x 150 DPI)




121x53mm (150 x 150 DPI)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




121x52mm (150 x 150 DPI)




121x52mm (150 x 150 DPI)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




121x53mm (150 x 150 DPI)



121x23mm (150 x 150 DPI)


1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




121x52mm (150 x 150 DPI)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60



160x137mm (96 x 96 DPI)



121x53mm (150 x 150 DPI)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60