Our current approach to DIC uncertainty quantification

B. Blaysat¹, F. Sur², <u>M. Grédiac¹</u>

¹Université Clermont Auvergne, France

²Université de Lorraine, France

Quantities considered for this quantification:

1- **displacement resolution** or **random error**: any multiple of the std of the noise impairing the displacement maps

- = what emerges from the noise floor
- mainly due to sensor noise propagation in [1][2][3]

2- bias or systematic error:

- bias 1: interpolation bias when mapping the current image in the reference coordinate system

- bias 2: due to the matching function
- bias 3: due to the interpolation of the displacement in L-DIC

3- link between displacement resolution and bias 2/3 through the **spatial resolution**:

= « period of a sine displacement beyond which the bias affecting the displacement returned by DIC is greater than a certain value » [4]

4- metrological efficiency indicator for a given value of bias 2/3 =product between the displacement resolution and bias 2/3 [3]

Speckles deformed artificially are needed:

 →2017: overkill/binning, but potential errors induced while generating the deformed speckle images

- 2017→: using a Boolean model from stochastic geometry to avoid any interpolation scheme (codes/images available online soon) [5]

[1] B. Blaysat, M. Grédiac, F. Sur, Int. Jour. Num. Meth. Eng., 2016

[2] B. Blaysat, M. Grédiac, F. Sur, Exp. Mech., 2016

[3] M. Grédiac, B. Blaysat, F. Sur, Exp. Mech., 2017, in revision

[4] L. Wittevrongel, P. Lava, S. V. Lomov, D. Debruyne, Exp. Mech., 2015

[5] F. Sur, B. Blaysat, M. Grédiac, 2017, under review

Dynamic measurements of strain in soft tissues using optical method

Paolo Ferraiuoli, PhD student Mathematical Modelling in Medicine (MMM) group Department of Infection, Immunity & Cardiovascular Disease Faculty of Medicine, Dentistry and Health



Institute for *in silico* Medicine







Uncertainty quantification during my experiments

Zero-strain test through a **rigid body motion** (**RBM**) of the object (Haddadi et al., 2008)

Any non-zero component is an error source



Key challenges associated with DIC measurements in soft tissues

- Imaging and speckle pattern application issues:
 - **reflection** caused by the curved surface
 - **blurring** of the speckles during the deformations
 - surface moist
- Error in the 3D reconstruction and mapping of the displacements between the two images (stereo-angle)





Optimisation of the DIC parameters (subset and step size)





February 2017 Author: Dr Caroline Graham





Design level measurement:

- The importance of modelling and physical tests will only increase with new design innovation and a competing economic drive to consider 'off the shelf' parts
- The requirement for both design level measurement and microscale uniform material characterisation
- This is not suitably addressed by any 'British Standard' or common measurement technique





Measurement Requirement:

- Design level measurements and microscale material characterisation tests
- Measurement method must be sensitive enough to determine thermal expansion in each material; X and Y direction, sub micrometre expansion, thermal expansion calibration
- not suitably addressed by any Standard or common measurement technique



Typical microelectronic QFN Assembly:

- Layered 'composite' component soldered to GRP Printed Circuit Board
- Highly dissimilar materials (Ceramic or Silicon, epoxy, alloy, grp)
- Highly directional PCB properties
- Non-symmetrical about design mid height
- FEA indicates high strain variance within discrete small material volumes

Dr C Graham 2017

THANK YOU FOR YOUR ATTENTION

=

111

de,

11

11





Structural Test Laboratory

System

- GOM 5M system for strain mapping & point tracking
- Measurement volumes up to 280x200mm

Calibration

- Check 'calibration deviation' and 'scale deviation'

Measurement

- 3 snapshots maximum deviation
- Indication of error for a given parameter during test

Limitations

- Pre-test 'noise check' typical deviation ~200µ8
- System is 'experimental'
- No consideration of systematic errors

<u>Challenges</u>

- Gaining confidence in data obtained
- Complex geometry of components
- Variation in pattern and post processing parameters
- Create internal process





DIC Uncertainty

- How can the speckling process be controlled?
- To what extent does spray paint selection affect the results?
- How can paint adhesion be guaranteed/verified?
- Is there a particular scale at which DIC is more appropriate?
- What are the implications of speckle size?
- How do lens distortions manifest within the DIC results?
- How sensitive is 2D DIC to camera position?
- What results are most suitable for comparison between DIC and FE?
- At what point can DIC be assumed unsuitable when testing ductile materials?
- How can an accuracy be determined for DIC results?
- How can an appropriate facet size be quickly selected?



7 Steps to Measurement Uncertainty



Erwin Hack, Empa, Dübendorf, Switzerland

- 1. Definition of measurand
 - Importance is often underestimated
- 2. Specification of target uncertainty
- 3. Modelling the measurement chain
 - Modularization (e.g. calibration, object, experimental set-up)
 - Analytical or numerical modelling (e.g. Monte Carlo)
- 4. Identification of input and influence parameters
- 5. Quantification of the standard uncertainties
 - Type A and B (according to GUM ¹)
- 6. Calculation of the combined uncertainty
 - Using the model defined before
- 7. Re-loop or Report
 - Comparison to target specification

¹ GUM: Guide to the Expression of Uncertainty in Measurement, JCGM 100:2008 Supplement 1 to the GUM — Propagation of distributions using a Monte Carlo method, JCGM 101:2008 Supplement 2 to the GUM — Extension to any number of output quantities JCGM 102:2011



Quantification of uncertainties in DIC M.Palanca – M.L. Ruspi – L. Cristofolini

DIC-measured strain for known (imposed) scenarios:

0 displacement 0 strain







Known strain





ALMA MATER STUDIORUM - UNIVERSITÀ DI BOLOGNA



Quantification of uncertainties in DIC M.Palanca – M.L. Ruspi – L. Cristofolini

Metrics:

0 displacement 0 strain Known translation/rotationKnown translation/rotation0 strainKnown strain

- Strain accuracy:
 ➤ Average ≠ 0
- Strain precision (standard deviation)
 Standard deviation around nominal value
- Comparison with beam theory
- Comparison with strain gauges

Results with optimal HW & SW settings:

- Accuracy = 10 microstrain
- Precision = 110 microstrain





Ready for application to human spine M.Palanca – M.L. Ruspi – L. Cristofolini

Aims: Strain measurements on vertebrae and intervertebral discs MAX PRINCIPAL STRAIN

microstrain

200 000-152 500-105 000-52 500-**-10 000-**

MIN PRINCIPAL STRAIN



microstrain

10 000--52 500-105 000-152 500-**-200 000-**



Comparison of **painting** lining methods for **historic house** environments

Vladimir Vilde





Natural pattern & Coloured surfaces





Uncontrolled Built heritage





Pro vs consumer RGB and access









Managing Uncertainty

Histogram of std on grey scale level over 5 static images Sensitivity of results to subset and overlap choice





DIC Measurements of the Human Heart during Cardiopulmonary Bypass Surgery

Mikko Hokka and Sven Curtze

Tampere University of Technology, **Department of Materials Science**







Measurement setup



- 2x 5MPIX Elite cameras
- ~1.5 m distance
- Adjustments not possible
- Post calibration

Data Processing



- 2D or 3D DIC calculations using Davis 8.x
- Sum of Differentials



Output



- Various parameters to describe functioning of the Right Ventricle
- Changes can be detected
- Patient monitoring

Uncertainty Quantification



lights up hearts

Uncertainties in the raw data





- Poor contrast patterns, glare problems and other experimental issues
- Qualitative estimation of errors based on stereo reconstruction error (3D) and correlation values (2D)

Uncertainties in the final results



- ...We are working on it...
- Currently only statistical methods, scatter plots, mean values, and standard deviations are being evaluated.
- Need new ideas!

To Identify 1st Coating Crack



Fangming Zhao

• Steel/Primer coating/DIC painting



T. Wu, P.E. Irving, D. Ayre, G. Dell'Anno, P. Jackson, F. Zhao Engineering Fracture Mechanics 159 (2016) 1-15

AkzoNobel

To Measure Strain to 1st Coating

• Local strain at 1st coating crack (DIC images)



- Unclear points
 - Global strain (0.68%, extensometer) vs local strain (1.21%, DIC)
 - Effects of DIC painting



Project

- NDT of composite materials
- Not currently using DIC
- Primarily used pulsed thermography
 - Camera flash to generate heat pulse to heat specimen
 - IR camera used to measure and record thermal decay
 - Decay of defective and non defective areas not equal

Southampton

Experimental Setup



Uncertainty Quantification in Digital Image Correlation

How GOM train DIC uncertainty quantification

Amy Johnson | 22.02.2017



Qom

Noise checks on a stationary object

mml

0.002

0.002

0.001

0.001

0.000

0.000

-0.000

-0.001

-0.001

-0.002

0.002

<u>Method</u>

- Set the system up ready for measurement
- Position part to be measured
- Capture a series of 10+ images statically
- Check component for displacement

This Checks

- Optical set-up Lens focus, camera angle, depth of field etc
- Calibration
- Lighting
- Pattern quality

How GOM train DIC uncertainty quantification | Amy Johnson



