





NSERC

eCRSNG

MECHANICAL PROPERTIES OF NEWLY DEVELOPED ABRADABLE MATERIALS FOR ADDITIVE MANUFACTURING

lee Lee Hia, Postdoctoral Fellow

2 Laboratory of **m**ultiscale **m**echanics Laboratoire de mécanique multi-échelles

herche en

Laboratoire d'analyse vibratoire et acoustique

et composites







30th July – 4th August, 2023



BACKGROUND

400

LM²

ICAO environmental objectives for 2050 1- Reduce CO₂ emissions by 75% 2- Reduce noise level by 65%

-

1 3 1 1

50 11

INTRODUCTION





Thermoset composite

Abradable composite materials

Reduce clearance Limit aerodynamic loses Blade tip sealing Preferential coating wear Decrease fuel consumption

2. safran-group.com, 2016

3. Legrand et al., 2012

4. http://www.afiklmem.com







ADDITIVE MANUFACTURING OF ABRADABLE MICROSCAFFOLD





6-axis robot with a half engine fan case

Non-planar DIW of abradable microscaffold network using multinozzle printhead on a FFF of a curved HTRP sandwich panel



ABRADABLE MATERIAL FORMULATIONS





[5] D Brzeski, IL Hia, JF Chauvette, etc., Additive Manufacturing, 47, 2021, 102245.

5/12 **SAFRAN**



MECHANICAL TEST I: SHORE D







Shore D durometer

- Increasing of GM loading decreases in Shore D hardness
- Higher GM loading leads to higher porosity, thus reducing hardness



MECHANICAL TEST II: ADHESION TEST

10.00

9.00

8.00

7.00

6.00

5.00

4.00

3.00

2.00

1.00

0.00

Pull Out Strength [Mpa]







Pull off adhesion test on abradable coating

[6] <u>https://www.defelsko.com/resources/test-methods-for-coating-adhesionhttps://www.defelsko.com/resources/test-methods-for-coating-adhesion</u>



- The pull out strength increases with GM loading
- Without GM, the adhesion of the abradable coating is poor on the aluminium substrate
- Benchmark with highest GM loading (~23wt%) has poor adhesion on the substrate



MECHANICAL TEST III: ABRADABILITY TEST





(a) Schematic of abradability test rig with three titanium blades attach on rotating disk. Images taken from the (b) camera and (c) thermal camera during the abradability test.



MECHANICAL TEST III: ABRADABILITY TEST





- Overall, the abradability of 3 new abradable materials are comparable with Benchmark
- There is no material adhesion on the TA6V blades, smooth cutting tracks observed thus the abradables are being removed easily
- Dust formation and pores clogging might affect acoustic properties

Top view of (a-c) 3D printed abradables micro-scaffolds and (d-f) coatings showing the tracks after being abraded by TA6V blades. Dust traces generated are found in the pores of microscaffolds.



MECHANICAL TEST III: ABRADABILITY TEST



• The higher penetration depth of abradable coating compared to microscaffold could be due to the higher temperature recorded which also soften the materials, thus more materials being abraded

• The highest penetration depth found in 10GM8FS microscaffold could be due to the high porosity and fragility of abradable materials, thus the internal structures could be easily compacted during the blade scratching rather than being removed

 Overall, the DIW microscaffold made of 0GM12FS and 5GM10FS were having great abradability which is very similar to the Benchmark



SUMMARY



 New DIW abradable materials have been developed and they are successfully printed into microscaffold network

- Their mechanical properties (i.e. Shore D, adhesion and abradability tests) were evaluated as compared to the commercial abradable product
- Impact of fume silica on the hardness is insignificant compared to glass microspheres.
 Increasing of glass microsphere increase the Shore D hardness of abradable materials
- Higher GM loadings lead to higher pull out strength and also the adhesion on the aluminium substrate
- Two abradable materials (0GM12FS and 5GM10FS) showed better abradability as compared to 10GM8FS material



Thank You Team Objective 4!





