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Dimensional Accuracy Analysis of Samples Printed in Delta and Cartesian Kinematic Three Dimensional Printers

Highlights

❖ Delta and cartesian 3D printers
❖ Calibration blocks designed to make measurements in different ways
❖ Statistical T test verification of measurement results

Graphical Abstract
The accuracy of the 4 calibration pieces printed on each printer was measured and statistically tabulated below.

Aim
In this study, the performances of machines installed in the delta and cartesian kinematic structures, which are mostly used in the kinematic systems of three-dimensional printers, were analyzed.

Design & Methodology
In this context, in two different machines with these two construction structures, the same boundary conditions and 4 pieces of calibration parts especially in manufacturing features were printed. 23 different elements that constituted the calibration part were measured, tabulated, statistically analyzed, and the acceptable measuremental tolerance ranges of the elements were determined and the accuracy values of the machines were compared.

Originality
The dimensional linearity of the products printed in 3D printers with two different structures was tried to be compared.

Findings
As a result of this study, according to T test results, 15 of the 23 measurements on the Cartesian system based three-dimensional printers were obtained as acceptable in terms of tolerance range as well as 9 of the 23 different measurements were obtained as acceptable on Delta system

Conclusion
Consequently, operation accuracy of the Cartesian system based three-dimensional printers were higher than the Delta system under the same working conditions and manufacturing parameters.
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ABSTRACT

The motion mechanisms of manufacturing and robotic systems are developed in different structures, mainly in cartesian and delta structures having series or parallel movement abilities according to the capacity and construction structure of the system. Different systems are used according to the criteria such as bearing load capacity, sensitivity or cost of the system. In this study, the performances of machines installed in the delta and cartesian kinematic structures, which are mostly used in the kinematic systems of three - dimensional printers, were analyzed. In this context, in two different machines with these two construction structures, the same boundary conditions and 4 pieces of calibration parts especially in manufacturing features were printed. 23 different elements that constituted the calibration part were measured, tabulated, statistically analyzed, and the acceptable measuremental tolerance ranges of the elements were determined and the accuracy values of the machines were compared. As a result of this study, according to the T test results, 15 of the 23 measurements on the Cartesian system based three-dimensional printers were obtained as acceptable in terms of tolerance range as well as 9 of the 23 different measurements were obtained as acceptable on Delta system. Consequently, operation accuracy of the Cartesian system based three-dimensional printers were higher than the Delta system under the same working conditions and manufacturing parameters.
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**INTRODUCTION**

Different kinematic structures, mainly cartesian, series and parallel, are used in robotic system constructions. Cartesian systems are the robotic structures that move along the basic axes of X, Y, Z, and serial kinematic systems are the structures with articulated structures that are similar to the human arm. Parallel kinematic systems take place in this group in the delta kinematic systems; the end effector is defined as a closed kinematic chain mechanism that is connected to the base with several independent kinematic chains. Cartesian and delta systems are the most frequently used structures in three-
dimensional printer constructions. Cartesian systems are widely used for their benefits such as ease of production and maintenance, high reproducibility characteristics, mathematical modeling, computability, and ease of control. Compared to serial and cartesian mechanisms, the use of parallel mechanisms is preferred due to its advantages such as high rigidity, high sensitivity, accuracy, load carrying capacity, and high speed. Besides these advantages, both cartesian and delta systems have disadvantages, as well. Within the scope of this study, the measuremental accuracies of 3d printers developed via these two systems after printing were examined. The related studies within the historical development of three-dimensional printer technologies are examined below.

In the development process of 3d printers have been named with many terms like virtual prototyping, rapid prototyping and additive manufacturing in throughout their history. These technologies are included in almost all the business and education life under recent conditions. Rapid modeling of all types of products, whether oriented to artistic, engineering or manufacturing, has become much faster, cost-effective and easy to model and also producible through these machines. The first patent regarding these systems belongs to Charles Hull in 1986 [1]. The recommended system is based on the principle that the parts are directly manufactured from the CAD (Computer Aided Design) model on a plane with the principle of layer and fused deposition. Thus, the production and product development processes have shortened [2]. Through the developed method, shortening of both the design and manufacturing processes, layered production that has started as the rapid prototyping (RP) system has converted 3-dimensional printing technologies into a rapidly developing commercial product [3-8]. The rapid development of these technologies has directed the manufacturers to develop hobby machines and improve the processes. In this context, one of the most rapidly developing and most widely used modeling technologies is the fused deposition method (FDM). The main advantages of this method for industrial technologies are that the materials with various characteristics can be used (PLA, ABS, HIPS, PET etc.), it is easy to change the material, maintenance and consumable costs are low, it allows production with a tolerance up to averagely ±0.1 mm, toxic substances and harmful gases do not form during the production, it allows the production of complex parts, and it is operated at low temperature ranges [9]. Annual sales of rapid prototyping systems using the FDM technique have increased approximately by 13.9% worldwide [10]. The technological development of three-dimensional printers, widespread internet access, and cheap computer use have made it a new open design tool that can accelerate self-managing sustainable development [11]. FDM is the most widely used 3D printer technique in the world [12]. There are some studies in the literature regarding the measurement and calculations of dimensional accuracy and surface roughness of the parts manufactured in three-dimensional printer machines using the FDM technique. Sudin M.N. et al., [13] investigated the dimensional accuracy of the machine by producing parts with 400 MC machines operated by using the FDM method. As a result of the study, they found that the machine and the elements printed in circular geometric shapes such as cylinder, sphere and holes were less sensitive. Bakar et al., [14] examined the limits of the Prodigy Plus three-dimensional printer operating via FDM method and performed the measurements and calculations of dimensional accuracy and surface quality of the parts produced on this lathe. In his study, Dyrbus [15] examined the dimensional accuracy characteristics of the machine. He had shown in his study that 0.1 mm and 0.4°dimensional accuracy can be obtained in the parts produced by the FDM method. Dixit et al., [16] examined the effect of process parameters by comparing the open source and low-cost three-dimensional printers. Galantuucci et al. [17] used the experimental method design to improve the dimensional accuracy in rectangular test samples minimizing the length, width and height changes for both the industrial three-dimensional printer system and the open source code systems. Habeeb et al., [18] examined the tensile strength and porosity of three-dimensional printer machine operated by open source FDM method and asserted that they are comparative to the mid-class commercial products. Also, other studies improving the dimensional sensitivity and surface roughness of open source three-dimensional printers [19-23] are also reported. In the study by Kaygısız, performance analyses of CNC milling machine that was designed and produced for educational purposes were done and in this context, the test samples were processed on the lathe, the measurements of the elements were done, the statistical analysis of the measurements were done, and the accuracy of the lathe was tried to be calculated [24].

2. MATERIAL AND METHOD

In the present study, the performances of machines installed in the delta and cartesian kinematic structures, which are mostly used in the kinematic systems of three-dimensional printers, and their measurement accuracies after printing were analyzed. In this context, 4 calibration parts with the same limit conditions and production characteristics were printed by using the Anycubic Kossel delta type FDM three-dimensional printer in Figure 1 and the cartesian-structure FDM three-dimensional printer that was designed and produced by us in Figure 2. Twenty-three different elements forming the calibration part were measured, tabulated, and statistically analyzed and the acceptance range criteria of the elements according to the T test were determined, and the accuracy values of the machines were tried to be compared. Table 1 and 2 shows the properties of both machines.
Design of the calibration part to be measured was made using Solidworks program. Figure 3 shows the elements of the designed model and Table 3 shows the relevant sizes. Square, cylindrical, and open-ended rectangles were preferred in the design. In this way, it was aimed to reveal the accuracy ratios of indentation, clearance and elevation printing of three-dimensional printers having two different systems.

### Table 3. Design measurement values of the model used in printing

| Square | Measure (mm) | Circle | Measure (mm) | Channel | Measure (mm) |
|--------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|--------------|
| K1     | 15x15        | D1     | Ø15          | L1      | 15           |
| K2     | 15x15        | D2     | Ø5           | L2      | 7.5          |
| K3     | 10x10        | D3     | Ø10          | L3      | 10           |
| K4     | 10x10        | D4     | Ø10          | L4      | 12.5         |
| K5     | 7.5x7.5      | D5     | Ø6.5         | L5      | 10           |
| K6     | 7.5x7.5      | D6     | Ø6.5         |         |              |
2.2. Printing of the Measurement Models

The calibration part designed in the Solidworks program was saved as STL and transferred to the Cura program, relevant production codes were formed by entering the below-mentioned printing properties, and the printing process was done. Four calibration parts were printed with each of the same limit conditions and production properties as FDM three-dimensional printers belonging to the two systems. Figures 4, 5, 6 and 7 show Cura and Repedier program images and printing criteria.

![Cura Program Cartesian System Coding Display](image1)

**Figure 4.** Cura Program Cartesian System Coding Display.

![Repedier Program Cartesian System Coding Display](image2)

**Figure 5.** Repedier Program Cartesian System Coding Display.

![Cura Program Delta System Coding Display](image3)

**Figure 6.** Cura Program Delta System Coding Display.

![Repedier Program Delta System Coding Display](image4)

**Figure 7.** Repedier Program Delta System Coding Display.

| Property                | Explanation |
|-------------------------|-------------|
| Layer Height            | 0.15 mm     |
| Crust Thickness         | 0.8 mm      |
| Lower - Upper Layer     | 0.6 mm      |
| Thickness               |             |
| Duty rate               | 40%         |
| Printing speed          | 50 mm/s     |
| Printing temperature    | 210°C       |
| Plate temperature       | 40°C        |
| Filament Diameter       | 1.75 mm     |
| Flow rate               | %100        |
| Material used           | PLA         |

Table 4. Printing Process Limit Conditions

2.3. Dimensional Measurement of the Models Printed

In this study, four from each of samples with square hole-square elevation, cylinder hole-cylinder elevation and open-ended rectangular hole designs having 23 different measurements in the Cartesian system three-dimensional printer and Delta system three-dimensional printer were printed. In order to understand the difference between two different three-dimensional printers, the original measurement was taken from the CAD program and square cube-square holes were measured from the axes of x and y, and open-ended rectangular holes were measured from the x-axis by using a digital caliper with 0.01 mm precision. Cylindrical elevations were measured by using an external diameter micrometer with 0.01 mm precision and the holes were measured by using an internal diameter micrometer with 0.01 mm precision. The samples printed in both three-dimensional printers are measured and the values were formed as specified in Table 5 and Table 6. The mean, deviation, variance, and standard deviation values of the values measured for each machine were calculated in their own table groups. T-test was applied in order to compare the compatibility of this calculation to the values desired between two machines.
and its results are presented in Table 7. In the table, the lower limit and upper limit were specified according to the original measurement value as a result of the values measured in both machines and their efficiencies were interpreted according to different printing types due to the specified limit values.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

As a result of the t-test, it was observed according to the value ranges specified in Table 7 that Cartesian system three-dimensional printer was not within the acceptance range values in the directions specified in K1 (INTERNAL) x and y axes, K3 (INTERNAL) y axis and K5(INTERNAL) x and y axes in square hole printings and it was within the acceptance range in the measurement of K3(INTERNAL) x axis. In square elevation printings, square elevations were not within the

specified acceptance range in K2(EXTERNAL) x and y axes, K4(EXTERNAL) x and y axes, K6(EXTERNAL) x and y axes. In cylinder hole printings, D3(INTERNAL) measurement was within the specified acceptance range and D1(INTERNAL) and D5 (INTERNAL) cylindrical holes were not within the specified acceptance range. Regarding the cylindrical elevation printings, D2(EXTERNAL), D4(EXTERNAL) and D6(EXTERNAL) measurements were within the specified acceptance range. In open-ended rectangular hole printing measurements, L1, L2, L3 and L4 were within the specified acceptance range but L5 was not within the specified acceptance range. As a result of the measurement evaluations applied in the delta system three-dimensional printer samples, it was concluded that it worked more accurately in cylindrical elevation printings and open-ended rectangular printings.

As a result of this study, according to T test results, 15 of the 23 measurements on the Cartesian system based three-dimensional printers were obtained as acceptable in terms of tolerance range as well as 9 of the 23 different measurements were obtained as acceptable on Delta system. Consequently, operation accuracy of the Cartesian system based three-dimensional printers were higher than the Delta system under the same working conditions and manufacturing parameters. According to the results of the measurement evaluation, it can be asserted that the operation accuracy of Cartesian system three-dimensional printer was higher than Delta system three-dimensional printer.
Table 5. Dimensional accuracy of the part properties at different sizes in Cartesian System 3D printer.

| CARTESIAN SYSTEM 3D | Part Feature | Nominal Value | N1  | N2  | N3  | N4  | average | deviation | variance | Std. Deviation | Remarks       |
|---------------------|--------------|---------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|---------|-----------|----------|---------------|---------------|
| SQUARE              | K1(INSIDE)   | 15x15mm       |    |     |     |     | 14.84  | 14.93     | 14.91    | 14.81         | 14.8725       | 0.1275        | 0.0054        | 0.0736        | Exceed Tolerance |
|                     |              |               |    |     |     |     | 14.83  | 14.90     | 14.90    | 14.83         | 14.8650       | 0.1350        | 0.0061        | 0.0779        | Exceed Tolerance |
|                     | K2(INSIDE)   | 10x10mm       | 9.86| 9.93| 8.86| 9.84| 9.8725 | 0.1275    | 0.0054  | 0.0736        | Within Tolerance |
|                     |              |               |    |     |     |     | 9.87   | 9.97      | 9.84     | 9.88          | 9.8900        | 0.1100        | 0.0400        | 0.0635        | Within Tolerance |
|                     | K3(INSIDE)   | 7.5x7.5mm     | 7.32| 7.34| 7.33| 7.33| 7.3325 | 0.1765    | 0.0094  | 0.0967        | Exceed Tolerance |
|                     |              |               |    |     |     |     | 7.31   | 7.32      | 7.38     | 7.32          | 7.3325        | 0.1765        | 0.0094        | 0.0967        | Exceed Tolerance |
|                     | K4(INSIDE)   | 7.5x7.5mm     | 7.50| 7.51| 7.53| 7.45| 7.4975 | 0.0025    | 0.0000  | 0.0014        | Within Tolerance |
|                     |              |               |    |     |     |     | 7.47   | 7.52      | 7.52     | 7.56          | 7.5175        | 0.0017        | 0.0001        | 0.0101        | Within Tolerance |
|                     | D1(INSIDE)   | Ø15           | 14.8 | 14.73| 14.81| 14.72| 14.7650 | 0.2350    | 0.0184  | 0.1357        | Within Tolerance |
|                     | D2(INSIDE)   | Ø10           | 14.85| 14.88| 14.98| 14.86| 14.8925 | 0.1075    | 0.0039  | 0.0621        | Within Tolerance |
|                     | D3(INSIDE)   | Ø6.5          | 9.8  | 9.81 | 9.85 | 9.81 | 9.8175  | 0.1825    | 0.0111  | 0.1054        | Exceed Tolerance |
|                     | D4(INSIDE)   | Ø5            | 9.95 | 9.91 | 9.94 | 9.72 | 9.8800  | 0.1200    | 0.0048  | 0.0693        | Within Tolerance |
|                     | D5(INSIDE)   | Ø6            | 6.23 | 6.38 | 6.48 | 6.31 | 6.3500  | 0.1500    | 0.0075  | 0.0866        | Exceed Tolerance |
|                     | D6(INSIDE)   |               | 6.43 | 6.44 | 6.35 | 6.38 | 6.4000  | 0.1000    | 0.0033  | 0.0577        | Within Tolerance |
| OPEN END            | L1           | 15            | 14.74| 14.9 | 14.89| 14.84| 14.8425 | 0.1575    | 0.0083  | 0.0909        | Within Tolerance |
|                     | L2           | 7.5           | 7.3  | 7.34 | 7.45 | 7.25 | 7.3350  | 0.1650    | 0.0091  | 0.0953        | Within Tolerance |
|                     | L3           | 10            | 9.91 | 9.89 | 9.92 | 9.83 | 9.8875  | 0.1125    | 0.0042  | 0.0650        | Exceed Tolerance |
|                     | L4           | 12.5          | 12.36| 12.42| 12.34| 12.29| 12.3525 | 0.1475    | 0.0073  | 0.0852        | Within Tolerance |
|                     | L5           | 10            | 9.9  | 9.92 | 9.84 | 9.31 | 9.7425  | 0.2575    | 0.0221  | 0.1487        | Within Tolerance |
### Table 6. Dimensional accuracy of the part properties at different sizes in Delta System 3D printer.

| Part Feature | Nominal Value | N1 | N2 | N3 | N4 | average | deviation | variance | Std. Deviation | Remarks       |
|--------------|---------------|----|----|----|----|---------|-----------|----------|----------------|---------------|
| SQUARE       |               |    |    |    |    |         |           |          |                |               |
| K1(INSIDE)   | 15x15mm       | 14.93 | 14.90 | 14.95 | 14.87 | 14.9125 | 0.0875 | 0.0026 | 0.0505 | Exceed Tolerance |
| K1y          |               | 14.88 | 14.88 | 14.85 | 14.86 | 14.8675 | 0.1325 | 0.0059 | 0.0765 |                |
| K2x          | 15.35 | 15.31 | 15.34 | 15.31 | 15.3275 | -0.3275 | 0.0358 | 0.1891 |            | Exceed Tolerance |
| K2y          | 15.32 | 15.27 | 15.33 | 15.33 | 15.3125 | -0.3125 | 0.0326 | 0.1804 |            |                |
| K3(INSIDE)   | 10x10mm       | 9.94 | 9.96 | 10.02 | 9.98 | 9.9750 | 0.0250 | 0.0002 | 0.0144 | Within Tolerance |
| K3y          | 9.88 | 9.86 | 9.95 | 9.88 | 9.8925 | 0.1075 | 0.0039 | 0.0621 |            |                |
| K4(OUTSIDE)  | 10x10mm       | 10.24 | 10.25 | 10.25 | 10.23 | 10.2425 | -0.2425 | 0.0196 | 0.1400 | Exceed Tolerance |
| K4y          | 10.26 | 10.24 | 10.26 | 10.30 | 10.2650 | -0.2650 | 0.0234 | 0.1530 |            |                |
| K5(INSIDE)   | 7.5x7.5mm     | 7.40 | 7.41 | 7.37 | 7.36 | 7.3850 | 0.1150 | 0.0044 | 0.0664 |            | Exceed Tolerance |
| K5y          | 7.32 | 7.29 | 7.30 | 7.29 | 7.3000 | 0.2000 | 0.0133 | 0.1155 |            |                |
| K6(OUTSIDE)  | 7.5x7.5mm     | 7.73 | 7.72 | 7.77 | 7.80 | 7.7550 | -0.2550 | 0.0217 | 0.1472 | Exceed Tolerance |
| K6y          | 7.74 | 7.70 | 7.75 | 7.74 | 7.7325 | -0.2325 | 0.0180 | 0.1342 |            |                |
| CYLINDRICAL  |               |    |    |    |    |         |           |          |                |               |
| D1(INSIDE)   | Ø15           | 14.9 | 14.87 | 14.88 | 14.78 | 14.8575 | 0.1425 | 0.0068 | 0.0823 |            | Exceed Tolerance |
| D2(OUTSIDE)  | Ø15           | 15.05 | 15.06 | 15.03 | 15.05 | 15.0475 | -0.0475 | 0.0008 | 0.0274 |            |                |
| D3(INSIDE)   | Ø10           | 9.94 | 9.96 | 9.9  | 9.87 | 9.9200 | 0.0800 | 0.0021 | 0.0462 |            | Within Tolerance |
| D4(OUTSIDE)  | Ø10           | 9.95 | 10.05 | 10.06 | 10.01 | 10.0175 | -0.0175 | 0.0001 | 0.0101 |            |                |
| D5(INSIDE)   | Ø6.5          | 6.4  | 6.35 | 6.37 | 6.35 | 6.3675 | 0.1325 | 0.0059 | 0.0765 |            | Exceed Tolerance |
| D6(OUTSIDE)  | Ø6.5          | 6.57 | 6.54 | 6.55 | 6.52 | 6.5450 | -0.0450 | 0.0007 | 0.0260 |            | Within Tolerance |
| OPEN END RECTANGULAR | |   | | | | | | | | |
| L1           | 15            | 14.94 | 14.91 | 14.9 | 14.9 | 14.9125 | 0.0875 | 0.0026 | 0.0505 |            | Within Tolerance |
| L2           | 7.5           | 7.47 | 7.46 | 7.4 | 7.45 | 7.4450 | 0.0550 | 0.0010 | 0.0318 |            | Within Tolerance |
| L3           | 10            | 9.93 | 9.96 | 9.93 | 9.94 | 9.9400 | 0.0600 | 0.0012 | 0.0346 |            | Within Tolerance |
| L4           | 12.5          | 12.42 | 12.48 | 12.48 | 12.53 | 12.4775 | 0.0225 | 0.0002 | 0.0130 |            | Within Tolerance |
| L5           | 10            | 9.9 | 9.93 | 9.98 | 9.94 | 9.9375 | 0.0625 | 0.0013 | 0.0361 |            | Exceed Tolerance |
Table 7. Dimensional accuracy of properties of the printed parts in Cartesian system and Delta System 3D printers

| General t test | Lower limit | Upper limit |
|----------------|-------------|-------------|
| Sx1_x2 | t-test     |             |             |
| 0.051546 | 0.776013 | 14.94288 | 15.05712 |
| 0.063053 | 0.039649 | 14.99691 | 15.00309 |
| 0.110082 | 2.588978 | 9.825782 | 10.17422 |
| 0.107125 | 2.217043 | 14.9044  | 15.0962  |
| 0.043309 | 2.366698 | 9.947838 | 10.05216 |
| 0.051269 | 0.048763 | 9.996903 | 10.0031  |
| 0.080988 | 3.17949  | 9.972465 | 10.02754 |
| 0.0891  | 2.581356 | 9.947838 | 10.05216 |
| 0.067726 | 0.775183 | 7.425035 | 7.574965 |
| 0.086959 | 0.373741 | 7.463857 | 7.536143 |
| 0.085004 | 3.029266 | 7.495628 | 7.504372 |
| 0.077719 | 2.766368 | 7.47205  | 7.52795  |
| 0.09161 | 1.009717 | 14.863   | 15.137   |
| 0.039176 | 3.956551 | 14.75444 | 15.24556 |
| 0.066421 | 1.543177 | 9.837401 | 10.1626  |
| 0.040423 | 3.40152  | 9.764336 | 10.23566 |
| 0.066714 | 0.262316 | 6.477283 | 6.522717 |
| 0.036553 | 3.968689 | 6.270973 | 6.729027 |
| 0.060058 | 1.165543 | 14.89401 | 15.10599 |
| 0.057975 | 1.897367 | 7.319252 | 7.680748 |
| 0.0425  | 1.235294 | 9.919765 | 10.08023 |
| 0.049735 | 2.5133   | 12.28597 | 12.71403 |
| 0.088325 | 2.207744 | 9.67178  | 10.32822 |

4. CONCLUSION
In this study, two different types of three-dimensional printers were used. Measurements and evaluation results operation accuracy of the Cartesian system based 3d printer is obtained higher than the Delta system based 3d printer under the same working conditions and same manufacturing parameters. Therefore, it may be recommended to use Cartesian system when printing especially square type structures.
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