**Hot End and Extruder Volumetric Flow**

**Analysis**

Theory and Design Analysis for High Speed Large Format 3D Printing

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Alan Ng  University of Washington  alan5@u.washington.edu | Rajas Agashe  University of Washington  rajas@cs.washington.edu |

Hot End and Extruder Volumetric Flow Analysis

Theory and Design Analysis for High Speed Large Format 3D Printing

Alan Ng

Rajas Agashe

Winter 2015

M E 498 Advanced Additive Manufacturing

Instructor: Mark Ganter

Washington Open Object Fabricators

University of Washington

Abstract

In order to maximize the volumetric flow rate of material extrusion, a series of experiments were performed to test many of the variables that effect this rate. The parameters chosen for the tests were based on our hypothesis formed through preliminary research.

[COMPLETE AFTER]

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank the Washington Open Object Fabricators (WOOF 3D) club for their valuable contributions, use of space, and allowed use of research materials. Additionally we would like to thank Mark Ganter, Steve Weidner, and Jeff Bergeson for their direct input that greatly assisted our research.

Table of Contents

Abstract

Acknowledgements

Terminology

Introduction

Purpose of study (why study performed, specific purpose, etc.)

Research questions

Delimitations (set boundaries)

Theory

Research

Component breakdown

Filament size

Filament material

Nozzle orifice

Melt zone length

Drive system

Hypothesis/Guess

Experiment

Set-up (products, printer, hot end, room, conditions)

Procedure (priming, calibrating, extruding, filament loading)

Testing Results

Test 1

Test 2

…

Test N

Analysis

Die Swell

Motor/Driver Limitations

Hot End

Conclusion

References

Appendix

Calculations (SA:V ratio, filament length)

Data

Table of Contents

**Type chapter title (level 1)1**

Type chapter title (level 2)2

Type chapter title (level 3)3

**Type chapter title (level 1)4**

Type chapter title (level 2)5

Type chapter title (level 3)6

Terminology

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Hot End | Active component of the printer that melts filament and extrudes the melted plastic onto the bed and part. |
| Heat Sink | Heat exchanger that actively dissipates heat from the hot end into the surrounding environment |
| Heat Break | Connection between heat sink and heater block that marks the transition from the hot to cold regions of a hot end. |
| Heater Block | Thermally conductive component that holds the heating element and temperature reading device. |
| Nozzle | Tip of the hot end with a small hole (0.40 mm is a common size) at which molten plastic is extruded. |
| Heater  Cartridge | A common heating element based on electrical resistance. Tube shaped. Used in testing. |
| Thermistor | Most commonly found temperature sensor. Resistor with significantly varying resistance values based on temperature. Monitor heat production to allow printer to keep constant temperature. |
| Extruder | Active component of printer that pulls filament from spool and feeds it into the hot end to be melted and extruded. Powered by stepper motor. |
| Idler | Part of an extruder that ensures filament is pushed against hobbed bolt. Usually tensioned using a spring. |
| Hobbed Bolt | Teethed bolt that grips filament. |
| Material  Extrusion | Most common form of additive manufacturing among 3D printer hobbyists and enthusiasts. Also known as fused deposition modeling (FDM) or fused filament fabrication (FFF). |
| Pronterface | G-Code sender application with graphical interface. Software used in testing to control printer and run basic functions. |
| Priming | Process of flushing old material out of the hot end to ensure continuous filament line. Done by extruding a small amount of plastic. |
| Die Swell | Phenomenon where extrudate is greater in size than the die size. |
| G-Code | This is the code that controls Advanced Additive Manufacturing machinery as well as CNC mills and specifies the direction to move in, how fast to move and can be used to change the settings on these machines. |
| Threading | At higher volumetric flow rates, as it becomes more challenging to extrude the filament the hob bolt begins to dig into the filament creating grooves. The term “threading” refers to when even the extruded filament displays theses grooves (appearing similar to the threads on a machine screw). This obviously occurs as since the extruded filament wasn’t heated to the appropriate temperature due to its quicker passage through the hot end because of the high extrusion speed. This can be minimized through increasing the extruder temperature. |
| Blobbing | This refers to a severe differential (more than a 25% difference) in extruded filament’s cross sectional diameter. For example, if 50mm of filament was being extruded and one cross section has a diameter of .6mm and another had a diameter of 1.2mm that would be labeled as “blobbing.” |
| Printer Calibration | A necessary step before every trial where we test that correct length is being extruded (more detail in prep section) |
| Pulled Through Filament  Failure Mode | This refers to how many millimeters of filament are pulled by the motor and the hob bolt.  This refers to one or more of the following.   * Loud motor grinding noise, with little extruded filament. For example if the specified length was 50mm(and printer is properly calibrated which it was before every trial) and only 10mm went through then that would be failure. * Blobbing is characterized as a failure mode. * Severe threading. * Not enough filament pulled through as measured in the calibrated settings. For example, if we had calibrated the printer to pull 50mm of filament and this was successfully happening at lower speeds then the a failure would be 10mm less than the calibration or lower was pulled through so if only 10mm was pulled through (which occurred for some of the trials) then it would have been a failure mode. |

Introduction

Purpose of Study

Many 3D printers today are capable of high speed linear motion. However, maximum acceleration is vastly different from maximum acceptable printing speed. The root of this apparent problem lies within the hot end and extruder assembly. Current configurations are simply not able to feed, melt, and extrude material quick enough to match the speed and acceleration of mechanical movement. This limiting factor is described as the volumetric flow rate of material extrusion, the key to greatly reducing print time.

The purpose of this study is to identify limiting variables and experimentally test for attributes that ensure maximum overall volumetric flow rate of material extrusion.

Research Questions

* What is the main limiting factor preventing greater flow rate of material?
* Is it one dominating factor or a combination of variables that make up this limit?
* What attributes of a hot end and extruder are ideal for reducing print time?

Delimitations

Experiments performed are purely material extrusion. This is only one of the major components involved with the goal of reducing print times. Keep in mind the printer must still be able to mechanically move at high acceleration. Information presented also does not address the adhesive or warping properties of the extruded material during an actual print.

Theory

Research

A large majority of preliminary research was performed online. The proposed theoretical optimizations are based on conclusions found through this research, consulting others, and previous experiences. Sources of research include online articles, blog posts, manufacturer documentation, engineering drawings, and forum discussions.

Component Breakdown

Filament Diameter

Within the hot end and extruder sub-assembly there are two major determinants of material extrusion: the rate at which filament can be fed into the hot end and the rate at which the hot end is capable of melting filament and extruding that material.

Large format speed printing yearns for high volumetric flow rate. It may make intuitive sense to use larger filament for these prints. 3 mm diameter filament will indeed deliver more volume per length given the same extruder setup. However, feed rate is something that can be variably changed based on motor specifications, while melting rate is much more constrained. This means that the volumetric flow is primarily bound by the melting rate of plastic within the hot end. The extent of this boundary is not clearly defined and may even be beyond the limitations of the motor.

The greater the contact surface area with the hot end per unit volume of filament (SA:V ratio), the greater the ability to transfer heat per volume. More and quicker heat transfer from the hot end melt-zone to the filament is essential to achieving a rapid melting rate. This basic thermodynamic design principle is also seen in computer heat sinks. They are composed of many very thin aluminum plates, because it optimizes the contact surface area with the surrounding cooling medium. This property can be applied both for cooling and heating objects.

The importance lies in the ratio between surface area and volume. The following chart compares the statistics of both filament sizes given the same volume of material:

**Filament Comparison for a Given Volume**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Filament Diameter | 1.75 mm | 3 mm |
| Sample Volume (V) | 1000 mm3 | 1000 mm3 |
| Filament Length Required (L) | 415.752 mm | 141.471 mm |
| Surface Area of Given Length (SA) | 2285.716 mm2 | 1333.333 mm2 |
| SA:V Ratio | 2.286 | 1.333 |

Surface area calculated is based only on the outer portion of the cylindrical filament that will be in contact with the walls inside the hot end.

The tradeoff becomes 1.71 times more SA:V and therefore quicker melting, for a minimum 2.94 times faster feed rate. If optimizing for volumetric flow rate, 1.75 mm has a decisive advantage given its ability to melt significantly faster. The problem is the extruder motor will need to run at least 3 times quicker.

If truly optimizing for absolute maximum print speed, a motor capable of high rotational speed as well as enough torque for constant extrusion and retraction and a proper cooling setup is needed to print with 1.75 mm.

Nozzle Orifice

An obvious solution to increasing the outgoing volumetric flow rate is to increase the orifice of the nozzle, allowing greater amounts of material to be extruded. This also leads to thicker maximum layer heights, but more importantly wider layer tracks. Wider tracks means greater layer adhesion as well as the ability to retain more heat and can help reduce layer warping through uneven layer temperatures. Larger nozzles orifices will lead to lower resolution. The tradeoff between resolution and speed is subjective.

Melt-Zone Length

When talking about hot ends thermally, there are 3 major regions across the hot end: melt, transition, and cold zones.

The melt-zone is the hottest part of the hot end and consists of the heater block with the heater cartridge attached and the nozzle. As the name implies, this is where the filament melts and is pushed out the orifice. This region is absolutely vital to the print and can be modified to suit the goal of greater volumetric flow.

The length of the melt-zone controls the amount of molten plastic within the hot end at any given time. It also increases the residency time of filament within the melt-zone, ensuring that the heat transfer from the heater block and nozzle to filament has enough time to melt it fully.

Drive System

Newton’s second law states that the acceleration of an object is inversely proportional to its mass. Reducing the mass on any moving part will reduce its inertia, thus reducing its resistance to change in velocity.

Depending on the gantry system, in order to increase acceleration of the hot end carriage mass must be removed from the unit.

One solution is to implement a Bowden drive system. The remotely mounted extruder and respective motor will greatly reduce the moving mass on the hot end, considering that a NEMA 17 stepper motor is 300-400 g.

Filament Material and Quality

Volumetric Flow Rate

Initially the first couple failure mode tests were performed by increasing the filament pulled rate in mm/s. However, after finalizing the various variables that were to be tested such as nozzle diameter, filament diameter etc. it was decided that such a procedure would yield puzzling data. For example, 3mm filament could failing at a lower rate than 1.75mm filament would lead to incorrect conclusions since this method of incrementing simply takes into account length and not volume. Thus, it was decided to measure by volumetric flow rate per trial in increments of 200 millimeters cubed per second. Here is the equation to find the volumetric flow rate from a filament of a certain diameter, where the speed of extrusion is multiplied by the cross sectional area of the filament.

Hypothesis

In the beginning, several predictions were made regarding performance of 1.75mm versus 3.00mm filament, ABS versus PLA material, and the V6 hot end versus the E3D Volcano. The 1.75mm filament was predicted to have a higher failure volumetric flow rate compared to the 3.00 filament since a smaller diameter means higher surface area to volume ratio making it easier to melt(as shown in the table above). This would allow it to be extruded at higher volumetric flow rates because while its being pulled fast it resides in the hot end for shorter amounts of time thus superior melting capabilities would allow it reach melting temperature even at higher rates. ABS was hypothesized to be extruded at a higher volumetric flow rate then PLA since it has higher thermal conductivity. Lastly, the Volcano was believed to allow for better extrusion since it is longer which allows the filament to reside in the hot end for a longer period of time thus it will heat up quicker and more uniform, earning higher volumetric flow rates.

Experiment

Set-Up

During experiments, it is important that the testing variable is the only variable. When there are more than one external factors, it is difficult to say with certainty X is caused by Y when in fact it could have been Z.

All testing was performed using a MakerFarm Prusa i3v 8”. The microcontroller, cables, power supply, software, and computer were also the same in every test. Hot end and extruder set-up were the only factors change. Experiments were all conducted in MEB G045 (WOOF 3D room).

The hot end products used were all created by E3D. Specifically the products used were E3D’s v6 All Metal Hot End and Volcano with their respective hardware. The choice of a single manufacturer is one of the most important decisions in testing, as it ensures that the machining quality is the same and eliminates the variable of different hot end quality and performance.

Procedure

1. Prepare the printer with the necessary hot end, filament, extruder, temperature etc.
2. Extrude 50mm of filament at the specified speed in mm/s specified in the table.
3. Diligently monitor the hob bolt for stripped filament or skipping of the motor. Note grinding or whining sounds from the motor.
4. Keep turning the filament spool so sufficient slack is maintained to prevent the filament from snapping.
5. Depending on the trial measure the diameter/length of the extruded filament, or measure the length of the extruded filament.
6. If moderate die swell/blobbing occurs or extruded length/pulled length is a little less than at the control volumetric flow rate of 200, then give the trial a rating of 2. If the conditions are the exact same as the volumetric flow rate of 200 then give a 1. Lastly, if the extruded filament exhibits severe blobbing or pulled filament is much less than 50 mm(around 50% error from the control) then give trial an X which represents failure.
7. Repeat steps 2-6 five times then move onto the next volumetric flow rate.

Testing Results

Table 1

Data

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Flow Rate (mm3/min)** | **Speed**  **(mm2/min)** | **Trial 1** | **Trial 2** | **Trial 3** | **Trial 4** | **Trial 5** | **Avg.**  **Value** | **Deviation**  **Avg. Value** |
| **200** | 83.15 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |
| **400** | 166.30 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |
| **600** | 249.45 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |
| **800** | 332.60 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |
| **1000** | 415.75 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |
| **1200** | 498.90 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |
| **1400** | 582.05 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |
| **1600** | 665.20 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |
| **1800** | 748.35 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |  |
| **2000** | 831.50 | X | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2.2 |  |
| **2200** | 914.65 | X | X | X | X | X | 3.4 |  |
| **2400** | 997.80 |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |
| **2600** | 1080.96 |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |
| **2800** | 1164.11 |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |
| **3000** | 1247.26 |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |

Specifications

* Octave 1.75mm Black ABS Filament @ 240 C
* E3D Volcano 1.75mm
* Spring Tension: (~58.70 mm for 3mm) (~58.90 mm for 1.75mm)

Findings

* Clicking noise 600 flow, bad extruder design/assembly maybe?
* Filament damaged by humidity, contains a lot of water, evident by blobs which are actually bubbles, makes hard to judge failure mode.
* 850 mm/min skips steps.
* No stripping at all, even in failure mode.

Table 2

Data

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Flow Rate (mm3/min)** | **Speed**  **(mm2/min)** | **Trial 1** | **Trial 2** | **Trial 3** | **Trial 4** | **Trial 5** | **Avg.**  **Value** | **Deviation**  **Avg. Value** |
| **200** | 83.15 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |
| **400** | 166.30 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |
| **600** | 249.45 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |
| **800** | 332.60 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |
| **1000** | 415.75 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |
| **1200** | 498.90 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |
| **1400** | 582.05 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |
| **1600** | 665.20 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |
| **1800** | 748.35 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1.4 |  |
| **2000** | 831.50 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |
| **2200** | 914.65 | X | X | X | X | X | 3 |  |
| **2400** | 997.80 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **2600** | 1080.96 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **2800** | 1164.11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **3000** | 1247.26 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Specifications

* 1.75 mm ABS Octave Yellow branded (poor history as oxygen has been trapping) @ 240
* E3D Volcano 1.2mm Orifice
* Spring Tension: (~58.70 mm for 3mm) (~58.90 mm for 1.75mm)

Findings

* Clicking noise on motor starts on the first trial.
* At 750 mm/s minor blobbing begins to occur as well as minor threading (intermittent occurrence). Blobbing occurs around every 30mm even if the extruded length is increased.
* The 831 mm/s doesn’t cause any blobbing but loud motor grinding noise heard and stepping visible thus really extruding at a smaller volumetric flow rate.
* At 914 high grinding noise heard, and wheels barely turn and no filament extruded thus motor failure had occurred due to lack of motor torque at high speeds.
* Important observation is that no need for number 3 on the rating scheme because extrusion quality goes from minor blobbing and threading to sudden failure.
* Failure for ABS(this trial) occurs at the same volumetric flow rate as for PLA, thus although this material has higher thermal conductivity than PLA, its not enough to heat up to 240 fast enough to offset the higher motor speeds. Or it can still melt but the motor doesn’t have enough torque at higher speeds to push the filament through. However, since threading was visible the limitation for this trial probably is the filament not being able to get hot enough rather than the motor lacking torque.

Table 3

Data

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Flow Rate (mm3/min)** | **Speed**  **(mm2/min)** | **Trial 1** | **Trial 2** | **Trial 3** | **Trial 4** | **Trial 5** | **Avg.**  **Value** | **Deviation**  **Avg. Value** |
| **200** | 83.15 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |
| **400** | 166.30 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |
| **600** | 249.45 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |
| **800** | 332.60 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |
| **1000** | 415.75 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |
| **1200** | 498.90 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |
| **1400** | 582.05 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |
| **1600** | 665.20 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |  |
| **1800** | 748.35 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |  |
| **2000** | 831.50 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |
| **2200** | 914.65 | X | X | X | X | X | X |  |
| **2400** | 997.80 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **2600** | 1080.96 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **2800** | 1164.11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **3000** | 1247.26 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Specifications

* 1.75mm Unknown Red PLA @ 190
* E3D Volcano 1.2mm Orifice
* Spring Tension: (~58.70 mm for 3mm) (~58.90 mm for 1.75mm)

Findings

* Initially was buckling around 665 flow rate so it was attributed to a smaller length in tubing that wasn’t covering all the filament, so tubing was increased in length to circumvent this problem.
* However, the buckling still persists and now it is attributed to the smaller nozzle size’s inability to push through as much filament as that is the only variable between this trial and the other trial with red PLA that worked up till 831.
* Now after making the changes previous findings no longer relevant.
* For 665.2 speed, roughly after 76 mm the extruded filament starts to fail as it has blobs, deformed shape, with some threading, and motor grinding noise is heard with a couple skipped steps.
* For 748 same 76mm failure length as above.
* At 831 severe motor grinding noise but extrusion is flawless indicating the skipping steps mimicking a trial at a lower speed.
* Failure at 914, high grinding noise and very little filament extruded. Motor failure as with the smaller tip there is higher pressure required to push the filament through and the motor doesn’t contain the power to push it.

Table 4

Data

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Flow Rate (mm3/min)** | **Speed**  **(mm2/min)** | **Trial 1** | **Trial 2** | **Trial 3** | **Trial 4** | **Trial 5** | **Avg.**  **Value** | **Deviation**  **Avg. Value** |
| **200** | 83.15 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |
| **400** | 166.30 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |
| **600** | 249.45 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |
| **800** | 332.60 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |
| **1000** | 415.75 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |
| **1200** | 498.90 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |
| **1400** | 582.05 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |
| **1600** | 665.20 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1.4 |  |
| **1800** | 748.35 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |  |
| **2000** | 831.50 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |
| **2200** | 914.65 | X | X | X | X | X | 3 |  |
| **2400** | 997.80 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **2600** | 1080.96 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **2800** | 1164.11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **3000** | 1247.26 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Specifications

* 1.75mm Unknown Red PLA @ 190 instead of 3.0mm
* 1.2mm E3D Volcano nozzle
* Spring Tension: (~58.70 mm for 3mm) (~58.90 mm for 1.75mm)

Findings

* Spring Tension: (~58.70 mm for 3mm) (~58.90 mm for 1.75mm)
* At 665.2 Minor Threading begins to occur near the end of extrusion around a 10mm patch.
* At 748 the maximum threading occurs because this is the maximum speed at which the motor can push the filament through. Threading occurs near last 25mm and continues if extrusion length increased.
* At 831 clean trial occurs because the motor has gone past its actual limit so it extrudes as if it is extruding at a lower speed. This is proven by the grinding noise of the motor and the twitching suggesting that it is skipping steps.
* Failure mode occurs at 914.65, and severe motor grinding noise is heard, and motor gears move very slowly suggesting that failure is in lack of motor power to push the filament through.

Table 5

Data

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Speed (mm/min)** | **Trial 1** | **Trial 2** | **Trial 3** | **Trial 4** | **Trial 5** | **Trial 6** | **Trial 7** | **Trial 8** | **Deviation**  **Measurement** |
| **50** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **75** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **100** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **125** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **150** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **175** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 65.187 |
| **200** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 21.517 |
| **225** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 18.277 |
| **250** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **275** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **300** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **325** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **350** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **375** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **400** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Specifications

* 3.00 mm Octave Yellow ABS @ 240
* 1.2mm E3D Volcano nozzle
* Spring Tension: (~58.70 mm for 3mm) (~58.90 mm for 1.75mm)

Findings

* Deviations in form of blob
* 175: First sign of blobs, 1 blob in all 8 trials
* 200: Around 3 blobs
* 225: Blobs affect power accumulation

Table 6

Data

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Speed (mm/min)** | **Trial 1** | **Trial 2** | **Trial 3** | **Trial 4** | **Trial 5** | **Trial 6** | **Trial 7** | **Trial 8** | **Deviation**  **Measurement** |
| **50** | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |
| **75** | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| **100** | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| **125** | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| **150** | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| **175** | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| **200** | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| **225** | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | Minor |
| **250** | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 |  |  |  | Minor Blb Begins |
| **275** | 3 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **300** | 3 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **325** | 3 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2.41mm, 1.37mm |
| **350** | 3 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.65mm,.99mm |
| **375** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **400** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Specifications

* 3.00 mm Unknown Red PLA @ 190
* 1.2mm E3D Volcano nozzle
* Spring Tension: (~58.70 mm for 3mm) (~58.90 mm for 1.75mm)

Findings

* Findings initially minor blobbing occurred at 250, but after replacing the stepper controller with a heat sink the blobbing occurs a few times beginning at 225, so the maximum speed for consistent extrusion occurs 200.
* Failure is that extrusions starts thin and then gets thicker
* 1 = extrusion feed rate and extrusion is fine, 2 = very minor blobbing, 3 = major difference in thickness of extrusions roughly 25% deviation

Table 7

Data

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Temp |  | 2200 V-flowrate |
| 240 |  | 9.28mm |
| 250 |  | 16.34mm |
| 260 |  | 18.49mm |
| 270 |  | 20.5mm |

Rate of pulled filament/increase in temperature is .374mm/C

Specifications

* Yellow Octave ABS 1.75mm
* 1.2mm orifice, E3D volcano
* Spring Tension: (~58.70 mm for 3mm) (~58.90 mm for 1.75mm)

Findings

* After noticing that at the failure rates less than the specified filament was pulled, we decided to measure the pulled filament at the failure flow rate as the temperature was increased.
* We noticed that as the temperature increased the motor grinding noise became noticeably less audible.
* The pulled filament length increased by about 10mm from 240 all the way to 270. The explanation for the lack of filament being pulled has a two-fold explanation. First, the motor is reaching its maximum speed so the torque is decreasing thus it can no longer exert the force to drive the filament and begins stepping and no filament comes out. The second explanation is that the since the filament is moving so fast through it’s not actually heating to its necessary 240 degrees. Thus, since it is partially stiff it cannot be extruded easily and hence the increasing temperature allows for it to be extruded more easily and the trend shows this as the pulled filament length increases as the temperature increases.
* An important observation is that the pulled filament by increase in temperature rate for ABS is 3 times the size of that for PLA. The reason for this probably occurs to higher thermal conductivity. Although ABS has a higher thermal conductivity thus its atoms are closer together and can transfer heat quicker, it also has higher melting point due to this increased density. Thus, after it has melted the higher thermal conductivity plays a bigger role because while both have the same failure flow rate, ABS with increases in temperature is better able to alleviate this.

Table 8

Data

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | |  |  |  |
|  |  |
| Temp | 2200 |
| 190 | 14.39 |  |  |  |  |
| 200 | 16.92 |  |  |  |  |
| 210 | 16.90 |  |  |  |  |
| 220 | 23.11 |  |  |  |  |
| 230 | 22.00 |  |  |  |  |
| 240 | 22.35 |  |  |  |  |
| 250 | 24.11 |  |  |  |  |
| 260 | 26.52 |  |  |  |  |
| 270 | 29.43 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |

Rate of pulled filament/increase in temperature is .188mm/C

**Summary:**

* After noticing that at the failure rates less than the specified filament was pulled, we decided to measure the pulled filament at the failure flow rate as the temperature was increased.

Specifications

* Unknown Red PLA 1.75mm
* 1.2mm orifice, E3D volcano
* Spring Tension: (~58.70 mm for 3mm) (~58.90 mm for 1.75mm)

Findings

* We noticed that as the temperature increased the motor grinding noise became noticeably less audible.
* The pulled filament length increased by about 15mm from 190 all the way to 270. The explanation for the lack of filament being pulled has a two-fold explanation. First, the motor is reaching its maximum speed so the torque is decreasing thus it can no longer exert the force to drive the filament and begins stepping and no filament comes out. The second explanation is that the since the filament is moving so fast through it’s not actually heating to its necessary 240 degrees. Thus, since it is partially stiff it cannot be extruded easily and hence the increasing temperature allows for it to be extruded more easily and the trend shows this as the pulled filament length increases as the temperature increases.
* An interesting observation is that for this trial, over a temperature differential of 80 degrees Celsius, the extruded length increased by 15mm while for the ABS over a temperature differential of 30 degrees the extruded length increased by 10mm. Clearly the extruded length increased to the temperature increase ratio is far higher for the ABS filament possibly occurring because ABS has a higher thermal conductivity allowing it melt more for each temperature increase(**need to review this analysis because not sure if correct**).

Table 9

Data

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Temp | Extruded Length | Cross Section Diameter |
| 190 | 76 | .98 |
| 200 | 90 | .80 |
| 210 | 96 | .75 |
| 220 | 99 | .67 |
| 230 | 108 | .64 |
| 240 | 116 | .62 |
| 250 | 124 | .61 |
| 260 | 158 | .60 |

Specifications

* 1.75 Unknown red PLA filament @ 190
* 1.2mm V6 nozzle with 0.6mm orifice
* Spring Tension: (~58.70 mm for 3mm) (~58.90 mm for 1.75mm)

Findings

* Extruded length increases for higher temperatures since the increased temperature is more conducive towards the filament melting so it can escape the hot end quicker.
* In the trial at 190 degrees Celsius die swell occurs because the diameter is .98mm which is greater than the nozzle orifice of 0.6mm, however as the temperature increases the die swell reduces as the diameter at 260 degrees is equal to the diameter of the nozzle itself.
* However, it is important to note that at the end of a certain length of the extruded filament(as seen in the picture below) die swell begins to reoccur as the diameter of the extruded filament becomes noticeably thicker. This occurs since the filament was sitting in the hot end before hand it is sufficiently melted, however, but once the motor starts the filament near the end doesn’t spend as much time in the hot end as did the filament in the beginning thus it doesn’t get hot enough and failure as well as die swell occur.
* Thus important to not that increasing the temperature did not prevent failure, just alleviated the extent of the failure as occurrence of die swell in the beginning is avoided completely at high temperatures as .6 was the cross section diameter for 260, and its occurrence later is delayed as the extruded length(before major die swell) grows steadily for each temperature.
* During this trial, exact hot end temperature limits were ambiguous thus to be safe temperature was only increased till 260 degrees Celsius even though the limit was 300 due hot end sensitivity.

Table 10

Data

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Temp | Extruded Length mm | Cross Sect Diameter mm |
| 240 | 63 | .74 |
| 250 | 71 | .68 |
| 260 | 74 | .65 |
| 270 | 97 | .64 |

Temperature vs. Extruded quality in terms of thickness and length


Specifications

* 1.75mm ABS Yellow Octave Filament
* 1.2mm V6 nozzle with 0.6mm orifice

Findings

* Extruded length increases for higher temperatures and another important observation is that the area with the severe blobbing remains fairly constant in length throughout the different trials(Look for an explanation for this). Overall blobbing occurs at the end of each trial suggesting that even 270 degrees isn’t high enough so hot end needs a higher temperature to so even if the filament is there for a shorter time it will heat up to 240.
* The initial diameter for the extruded filament for the trials decreases as the temperature increases, and it gets closer and closer to the actual orifice diameter size, this occurs because at the lower temperatures it hasn’t melted completely due to the fast speeds at which at it is travelling through the orifice so its diameter is closer to the diameter of the pulled filament which was 1.75mm, however at higher temperatures it melts properly thus it reaches the orifice diameter.
* Spring Tension: (~58.70 mm for 3mm) (~58.90 mm for 1.75mm)

Photos



…

Cover the results from pure motor failure

Basically going to cover results from the threading and how that leads then moving to high temperature trials

An important observation was made in Table 2 (the trial with 1.75mm ABS orifice 1.2mm) as well as Table 3(the trial with 1.75 mm PLA with the orifice of 0.6mm). The failure mode for Table two occurred at the volumetric flow rate of 2200 where loud motor grinding noises where heard, the extruded filament came out significantly slower than the previous rate, and there was threading on the extruded filament. For table 3 the failure mode was threading as well as severe blobbing. Initially this was thought as a failure of the motor however after further analysis it was deduced that if the filament was appropriately melting there shouldn’t be any threading at all because extruded filament has homogenous texture. Thus a new set of tests was incorporated in which it was decided that the filament would be extruded at the failure rate while increasing the temperature in 10 minutes as if the filament is extruded really fast it doesn’t spend sufficient time in the hot end so isn’t actually heated to the necessary 190 or 240 degrees and might actually be extruded at around 150 or 220 and thus doesn’t have the homogenous consistency.

-I want to write a quick g-code calibration script in free time, you enter the value its supposed to extrude and then how much it did, its current step setting, and then it generates the correct amount Gcode for you and inputs it into the command. Will look into the source on github and make a in program mod, if not can write a separate script

Rough Testing Results Outline:

1st set of trials was essentially pla vs abs, and 1.75mm and 3.00mm

abs vs pla no affirmative sets of data,

1.75 vs 3.00 mm roughly the same (could do a more precise set of tests)

(basically have a possible explanation for pla vs abs, for 1.75mm vs 3.00mm)

blame the motor for this issue

2nd

Temperature vs the maximum failure rate

Success as filament pulled through

3rd

Better more efficient motor setup and how that actually ends up affecting the maximum volumetric flow rate

Due this same trial for this motor possibly with a higher temperature

Analysis

Die Swell

Die swell is a phenomenon evident in 3D printing and other forms of polymer extrusion in which the extruded material is greater in diameter than the die. The polymer stream is compressed upon entrance into the barrel of the hot end nozzle and the polymer “swells” back to its original shape after exiting.

The extent of swelling is expressed as B, the die-swell ratio of extrudate diameter to die diameter.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | (A) |

Stepper Motor and Driver Limitations

Extruder Design

In the hobbyist and enthusiast world, printed extruder parts are extremely common. Without the quality control and high standards found in the hot end market, there is more room for problems to occur.

An example of

Appendix

Appendix A - Calculations

Calibrating Extruder Steps

It is essential the extruder steps per millimeter is properly calibrated before testing. The NEMA 17 stepper motor used is capable of 200 steps per revolution. This translates to a 1.8° rotation of the shaft per step. The value E, in steps per millimeter, defines for the printer the number of steps required to feed length L in millimeters of filament. The procedure to proper calibration consists of instructing the printer to extrude a set length of material and measuring the actual length fed. The following equation is used:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | (1) |

Where Enew is the new steps per millimeter value to input to the printer to properly calibrate the extruder, Lset is the set length of filament to be extruded, Lmeasured is the actual length of filament pulled, and Ecurrent is the current extruder value.

Calibration for these experiments all follow the same procedure. From a known point, 150 mm of filament is marked. Using Pronterface, a printer G-CODE sender, the printer is instructed to extrude 100 mm of filament at a set slow speed known to work without failure. After extruding the length from the mark to the known point is measured. If properly calibrated, this value Lmeasured should be exactly 50 mm. Otherwise:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | (2) |

For example, after instructed to extrude 100 mm the actual measured length of filament fed is 125 mm. This gives the **extruder multiplier** that is multiplied with the current extruder value, to give the new steps per millimeter as seen in Equation (1).

This process is repeated until a single value of steps per millimeter passes two trials of measurement at 100 mm of filament fed with a tolerance of ±1.00 mm.

Filament Diameter

Appendix B – Printrun Software

Automating Calibration with Macros

Inputting G-Code for every calibration and manually inputting the extruded filament length as well as extrusion speed became exceedingly tedious after many tests thus it was decided to fork the Pronterface repository and then add some custom buttons and fields to automate the calibration process and write scripts to run the various tests.

However, after reading through the source code and documentation it was realized that Pronterface includes the capability to include custom macros, but the reason why this is truly powerful is it allows the user to integrate python with the gCode macro making it easier to execute program logic. Because of this source wasn’t modified instead several python scripts were written to automate calibration and testing.

First, three simple buttons were added to Pronterface labeled “800 steps,” “700 steps,” and “600 steps,” and each of these sets the extruder steps value to the number on the button. Then the material would be extruded and the pulled amount would be measured and then the macro “calibrate\_extruder” would be called by passing in the arguments for the “[set extruded length] [actual extruded length] [steps number]” and then this would automatically generate the g-Code using the calibration formula for a very accurate printer steps calibration. This code as well as some of the other macros are attached below.

Appendix C – Die Swell