Testing the similarity conditions in the CT measurement of additively manufactured lattice structures
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Abstract
X-ray computed tomography (CT) enables the non-destructive measurement of hidden internal features that are inaccessible by tactile or optical coordinate measuring systems. This makes CT the technology of choice for inspecting complex components made by additive manufacturing (AM), lattice structures being a prime example. Uncertainty assessment in CT dimensional measurements is limited to the substitution method, which prescribes strict similarity conditions between the test object and a separate, calibrated reference object. The notoriously rough surfaces and form deviations in AM components present a challenge in terms of ensuring similarity with respect to the idealized reference object, particularly as these deviations pertain to changes in X-ray penetration lengths during CT measurement. Currently, though, there is no literature on how to quantify ‘similarity’ and to what extent these conditions can be stressed while ensuring that uncertainty in the CT measurement of AM parts can be correctly determined. In this study, we investigate the effect that varying degrees of dissimilarity in object shape and size have on the image quality of their tomographic reconstruction in the context of establishing a quantitative measure of similarity.
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1. Introduction

Lattice structures produced using additive manufacturing (AM) can provide improved stiffness/weight, energy absorption, heat transfer, and bio-integration of conventionally designed components [1–3]. X-ray computed tomography (XCT) is widely used to non-destructively characterize lattice structures, e.g., for mechanical testing [4–7]. However, XCT measurements can be influenced by various uncertainty contributors, including the material and geometric characteristics of the object to be measured. Uncertainty in the XCT measurement of lattices has been studied to a limited extent [8, 9]. In general, the assessment of uncertainty in CT is limited to the substitution method, which is described in the VDI/VDE 2630-2.1 guideline [10]. This approach relies on the presence of a separate, calibrated reference object that meets strict similarity conditions in terms of material, shape, and size with respect to the test object. The similarity conditions are specified to ensure that bias, repeatability, and other uncertainty components determined from the measurement of the reference object are equally applicable to the measurement of the test object. In other words, the response of the CT system to any differences between reference and test objects should be approximately linear [11].

The notoriously rough surfaces of AM components present a challenge in terms of ensuring similarity, particularly in terms of shape and size, between as-built test objects and the corresponding reference objects, which are typically manufactured with smooth surfaces to enable low uncertainty calibration of the relevant measurement systems. These geometric dissimilarities can result in significant differences in X-ray penetration length during the CT measurement of small, complex parts such as lattice structures.

The non-linear relationship between penetration length and polychromatic X-ray absorption, i.e., the term in the exponent of the Beer-Lambert equation, and the monochromaticity assumed in conventional tomographic reconstruction algorithms result in so-called beam hardening artifacts. Differences in penetration lengths between reference and test object will result in different manifestations of beam hardening artifacts in the reconstructed volumes, which can compromise the similarity conditions prescribed in VDI/VDE 2630-2.1 guidelines. However, there is currently no literature on how to quantify ‘similarity’ and to what extent these conditions can be stressed while ensuring that uncertainty in the CT measurement of AM parts can be correctly determined. In this study, we investigate the effect that varying degrees of dissimilarity in object shape and size have on the image quality of their tomographic reconstruction in the context of establishing a quantitative measure of similarity.

To simulate the effect of AM-induced form errors, several test lattice objects are designed with varying strut diameters. Polychromatic cone beam CT acquisitions of the test objects are simulated, and each dataset is subsequently reconstructed using conventional Feldkamp-Davis-Kress (FDK) filtered back projection. The similarity between the various reconstructed test objects is determined using a slightly modified...
2. Methodology

A lattice-like structure with struts of 0.5 mm nominal diameter (Figure 1a) was additively manufactured with the struts oriented horizontally with respect to the build direction. This AM component was then scanned using XCT and processed in VGStudio MAX 3.4 (Figure 1b) [13]. Cylinders were then least-squares fit to each strut and the cylindricity error was evaluated. Figure 1c displays the cylindrical form error of one strut. Across the nine cylinders of the structure, form errors of approximately ±0.15 mm were observed. The magnitude of these form errors was used to guide the experiment conducted in this work.

### 2.1. XCT Simulation

Monochromatic and polychromatic XCT acquisitions were simulated using aRTist software [14]. Five cylinder arrays similar to the lattice-like structure in Figure 1 were simulated, each array comprising different cylinder diameters (0.3 mm, 0.4 mm, 0.5 mm, 0.6 mm, 0.7 mm). The acquisition geometry (a), the polychromatic X-ray spectrum (b), an example projection (c), and a sample slice of the reconstructed volume (d) can be seen in Figure 2. The simulation parameters are shown in Table 1. The polychromatic X-ray spectrum was generated using source parameters from an actual industrial X-ray source at the Georgia Institute of Technology, while the energy in the monochromatic simulations was given by the weighted mean of the polychromatic spectrum, similar to the average energy in [15]. Noise and unsharpness (geometric or detector) were not included in the simulated acquisitions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Target material W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Target angle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Window material Be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Window thickness 0.2 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acceleration voltage 130 kV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physical filter 0.5 mm Cu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Energy (mono)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detector</td>
<td>Pixel size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of pixels (WxH) 500 x 350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Source to detector distance 803.359 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object Positioning</td>
<td>Source to rotation axis distance 60.506 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data acquisition</td>
<td>Number of projections 900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reconstruction algorithm FDK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bit depth (reconstruction) 32bit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.2. XCT Data analysis

The reconstructed volumes were imported into MATLAB and processed using a modified implementation of the technique to determine the CDF described in ASTM E1695 [12]. For each volume, background correction was first performed by subtracting from all voxel-wise gray values in the volume the average voxel value in the background, defined as the region from the blue box to the lateral edges of the volume defined in Figure 3a. A global threshold value was calculated utilizing the ISO50 method for the entire volume and was used to determine the boundary between the material and background for the volume. The central slice along the rotational axis of the volume was then isolated for analysis in this study.

Regions of interest were created around each cylinder in the central slice (shown as red squares in Figure 3) to enable cylinder-wise analyses. The CDF was calculated for each region using the tiling method described in ASTM E1695. It is recommended that the tile size (D”) is increased until "...the size..."
of the tiles becomes too large to obtain a statistically significant number of tiles. It is recommended that the minimum number of tiles is about 25° [12]. While this recommendation is reasonable for the XCT measurement of the relatively larger cylindrical phantom prescribed in ASTM E1695, it is generally difficult to satisfy when measuring the small struts of lattice structures. Hence, in this work, the minimum number of tiles for a given \( D^* \) is set to 4. The results of the reconstructions were assumed to be axisymmetric with respect to the lateral axes of the volumes, and therefore only the results of the center cylinder (I in Figure 3), a side cylinder (II in Figure 3), and a corner cylinder (III in Figure 3) were evaluated. Monochromatic and polychromatic acquisitions of the AM component surface model shown in Figure 1b were also simulated. The CDFs of these simulations were determined using the previously described method.

3. Results

Ideal cylinder arrays

The center cylinder of the array is subject to stronger cupping artifacts than the other cylinders. Figure 4 displays the CDF curves of the center cylinder for both monochromatic and polychromatic simulations in the 0.3 mm, 0.5 mm, and 0.7 mm diameter cylinder arrays. All monochromatic scans appear to show an approximately linear decrease in the CDF value with increasing \( D^* \). This indicates that only statistical noise is observed in the monochromatic scans, as pure statistical noise should follow a slope of -1 on the log-log plot [12]. This observation was made in the monochromatic simulations of all cylinder diameters. In the polychromatic simulations, the CDF of the 0.3 mm diameter cylinder closely follows its monochromatic CDF but deviates at larger values of \( D^* \). As \( D^* \) increases, the number of tiles used in the CDF calculation continues to drop until the predefined minimum of 4. With a low sample size, a higher variance in the CDF values is expected. However, the polychromatic CDFs of the 0.5 mm and 0.7 mm diameter cylinders depart from their monochromatic CDFs at low values of \( D^* \), indicating an increased variation in reconstructed gray values within the cross section of the cylinder, i.e., more pronounced cupping artifacts. This departure increases with increasing cylinder diameter.

Figure 4. CDF curves for the center cylinder of both monochromatic and polychromatic simulations in 0.3 mm, 0.5 mm, 0.7 mm diameter arrays

To further examine this behavior, the CDF acquired from the monochromatic simulations (CDF\(_M\)) was subtracted from the CDF acquired from the polychromatic simulations (CDF\(_P\)) for all arrays. Figure 5 displays these results for the center cylinder at all diameters; as the diameter of the cylinder array increases, CDF\(_P\) increasingly deviates from CDF\(_M\). This trend is expected as there are stronger cupping artifacts in larger cylinders.

Figure 5. Difference between CDF\(_P\) and CDF\(_M\) in the center cylinder for all diameters

Figures 6 and 7 show the difference between CDF\(_P\) and CDF\(_M\) for the side and corner cylinders, respectively, of each array. A reduction in magnitude between the side and corner cylinders, and the center cylinder is apparent. This behavior is expected, as the side and corner cylinders are subject to reduced cupping artifacts. The average difference in CDF value is observed to be lower in the corner cylinders for the 0.3 mm, 0.4 mm, and 0.5 mm compared to the side cylinders. Interestingly, this trend is not observed in the 0.6 mm and 0.7 mm diameter arrays.

Figure 6. Difference between CDF\(_P\) and CDF\(_M\) in the side cylinder for all diameters

Figure 7. Difference between CDF\(_P\) and CDF\(_M\) in the corner cylinder for all diameters

AM cylinder array

Figure 8 displays the difference between CDF\(_P\) and CDF\(_M\) for three cylinders (center, side, and corner) in the AM component. Differences in the plot trends between the ideal cylinder arrays.
and the AM component are immediately noted. A much higher
difference between the CDF_{p} and CDF_{m} is observed at D^* = 1 for
all three cylinders, indicating a much higher standard deviation of
voxel-wise gray values in the polychromatic simulation. Upon
closer visual examination of the reconstructed slice, windmill
artifacts (due to aliasing in the reconstruction of sharp edges) were noted.

![Figure 8. CDF curves for AM component](image1)

Nevertheless, the trend observed in Figures 5, 6, and 7, in
which the difference between the polychromatic and
monochromatic simulations increases as the cylinder in question
becomes more central in the array for 0.5 mm diameter, is also
observed here. The internal gray values, normalized here with
respect to the highest and lowest gray values in the region of
interest, on the different cylinder locations are investigated.
While the gray values of the monochromatic simulations are
relatively uniform across the cross section of the cylinder, with
minor fluctuations due to statistical variation, the gray values in
the polychromatic simulation are not uniform. Figure 9 displays
the normalized gray values for the center, side, and corner
cylinders in the 0.7 mm diameter array. Significant variations in
the gray values across the cross-sectional area of the cylinder
is observed as a function of cylinder position. This variation
could explain why the CDF results between the side and corner
cylinders in the 0.6 mm and 0.7 mm diameter arrays did not
appear to follow the same trend as in the other diameters. While
the CDF appears to detect some differences between the
cylinders, it is not able to capture changes in the gray value
distribution across the cross-sectional area of the cylinder. It is
not entirely clear at what point the presented results are
definitively dis-similar. Furthermore, it is not immediately
apparent that the results from the various arrays are similar.
Thus, this raises a question regarding similarity analysis: in the
comparison of two sets of results, should the null hypothesis be
similarity or dis-similarity?

It should be noted that the authors also attempted to
evaluate the spatial resolution of each dataset using the
methodology described in ASTM E1695. However, the described
methodology could not be applied to the AM component, as
form errors would invalidate the creation of the edge response
function.

![Figure 9. 3D surface plots of the relative internal intensity of various cylinders in the 0.7 mm diameter array: (a) Center cylinder (b) Side
cylinder (c) Corner cylinder](image2)

4. Conclusion

There is currently no quantitative basis with which we can
assert sufficient similarity to warrant the use of the substitution
method for a test object deviating, e.g., in terms of X-ray
penetration length, from the reference object. In this study, we
investigate the use of the CDF, an image quality metric
prescribed in ASTM E1695, to expose differences in the
manifestation of cupping artifacts due to differences in X-ray
penetration lengths. These results indicate that changes in form
error can potentially lead to significant variations in CDF within
a lattice structure. Furthermore, these results show that
variations in the CDF can also occur between individual struts of a
lattice based on their position. Future work will investigate
new approaches to determine spatial resolution that are robust
to non-ideal geometries, and will evaluate the efficacy of other
metrics as measures of similarity. This and future studies should
stimulate discussions and further work on determining a cut-off
for similarity based on these metrics.
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