

The 23rd International Conference on Composites Materials, July 30th-August 4th, 2023, Belfast, Northern Ireland

Cure Monitoring of Composites Using Encapsulated Cantilever Microfiber Bragg Grating

H. Q. Zhang, Q. Wu, X. R. Su, J. Guo, Y. X. Zhang, W. L. Lan, and K. Xiong

¹ State Key Laboratory of Mechanics and Control for Aerospace Structures, Nanjing University of Aeronautics and Astronautics, Nanjing University of Aeronautics and Astronautics, Nanjing, China

* Corresponding: <u>hanqi zhang@nuaa.edu.cn</u> wu.qi@nuaa.edu.cn

砺志奋进 追梦蓝天





Experimental setup









1.1 Composite structures

Composite structures in aviation industry



Composites has been widely used in many industries owing to its advantageous properties.





1.2 Degree of cure (DOC)



DOC is influenced by parameters like heating rates and temperature, and affect the mechanical properties of composites.



1.3 Cure monitoring techniques

Differential Scanning Calorimetry (DSC)



Dielectric analysis (DEA)



Cure monitoring techniques, such as DSC and DEA, face challenges such as limited sample size and the need for bulk sensors.



Embedding PZT in composites presents challenges due to its large size; FBG has distortion in the spectrum and lacks the desired ultrasonic sensing performance.





3 Experimental setup







Sensor



2.1 Encapsulated cantilever FBG (EC-FBG)

Schematic of EC-FBG

Ultrasonic sensing performance



EC-FBG exhibits superior ultrasonic sensing performance compared to FBG and PZT.



Sensor



2.2 Microfiber Bragg grating (MFBG)

Schematic of MFBG

Ultrasonic sensing performance





Sensor



2.3 Cantilevered MFBG (CMFBG)

Schematic of CMFBG

Ultrasonic sensing performance



Ultrasonic signals received by CMFBG has a 227% increase in amplitude compared to FBG.





3 Experimental setup







FBG sensors, macro fiber composite (MFC) and thermocouple (TC) are arranged on the prepreg. Acousto-ultrasonic system is established, including the excitation and FBG sensing system.



3.2 Thermoforming process





- Pressure: The pressure was 0.1 MPa before 60 min, and then increased to 0.35 MPa.
- Temperature: The temperature was increased to 80 °C in 60 min, and maintained for 30 min. Subsequently, the temperature increased to 120 °C within approximately 40 min and maintained for 120 min.
- Vacuum: -0.08~-0.078 MPa.





3 Experimental setup







Results



4.1 Temperature



The wavelength shift of the FBG sensor closely tracked the cure temperature during the thermoforming process, the average difference is 1.7 °C.





4.2 Ultrasonic signal



0.2 **16**

Time(ms)



4.3 Amplitude of ultrasonic signal

Results



The amplitude of the ultrasonic signal fluctuates during the thermoforming process. The effect of the reflectivity of spectrum is eliminated.





4.4 Normalized amplitude



Normalized amplitude was calculated using the amplitude of signals received by FBG sensor 1 and 2, showing an upward trend as crosslinking reaction progresses.





3 Experimental setup









- 1. The ultrasonic sensing performance of CMFBG is investigated.
- 2. The ultrasonic sensing characteristics of CMFBG can be adjusted by controlling the geometric parameters.
- 3. Temperature and ultrasonic signals during the thermoforming process can be detected by FBG sensor.
- 4. DOC can be monitored by analyzing the normalized amplitude of ultrasonic signals.



In-situ monitoring of the temperature and DOC of CFRP can be achieved by integrating the FBG sensor based acousto-ultrasonic method, which has the potential to enhance control and optimization of the thermoforming process.

Acknowledgement & Reference



Acknowledgement

This work was supported in part the National Key R&D Program of China (2021YFF0501800), in part by National Natural Science Foundation of China (11972016, 12111530106), in part by the Research Fund of State Key Laboratory of Mechanics and Control for Aerospace Structures (MCMS-I-0521G04).

Reference

- 1. Liu X. South China University of Technology, 2012.
- 2. Zhang S, Xia M, Zhong B. Acta Aeronautica et Astronautica Sinica, 2016, 37(1):30-44.
- 3. Ma Z, Gao L, Xu J. Aeronautical Manufacturing Technology. 2021, 64(11):24–30.
- 4. Ruiz E, Trochu F. Composites Part A: Applied Science and Manufacturing, 2005, 36:806-829.
- 5. Hardis R, Jessop J, Peters F. Composites Part A: Applied Science and Manufacturing, 2013, 49:100-108.
- 6. Campana C, Leger R, Sonnier R, et al. Composites Part A: Applied Science and Manufacturing, 2018, 107:171-179.
- 7. Benedetti A, Fernandes P, Granja J, et al. Composites Part B: Engineering, 2016, 89:219-229.
- 8. Hudson T. North Carolina State University, 2017.
- 9. Yu Y, Liu X, Cui X, et al. Composites Science and Technology, 2023, 240:110079.
- 10. https://www.compositesworld.com/
- 11. Hudson T, Auwaijan N, Yuan F. Journal of Composite Materials, 2019, 53(7):969–979.
- 12. Zhang H, Wu Q, Chen C. IEEE Sensors Journal, 22(16):15991-15998.
- 13. Zhang H, Zhu H, Wu Q. Journal Of Lightwave Technology, 41(1): 355-361.



THANK YOU FOR LISTENING

负重奋进 志在超越