

A comparison of the tolerance analysis methods in the open-loop assembly

Kosec, P.^a, Škec, S.^{a,b,*}, Miler, D.^a

^aUniversity of Zagreb, Faculty of Mechanical Engineering and Naval Architecture, Zagreb, Croatia

^bTechnical University of Denmark, Kongens Lyngby, Denmark

ABSTRACT

Dimensional and geometric tolerances affect both the cost and the functionality of a given product. Finding the acceptable trade-off between the two is among the common engineering tasks. Thus, many tolerance analysis methods are developed to help engineers and assist in the decision-making process. In this article, the authors have assessed four tolerance analysis methods by applying them to the open-loop assembly. The results obtained by the tolerance chart (worst-case) method, Monte-Carlo simulation, vector-loop analysis, and the Unified Jacobian-torsor model were analysed and compared. Additionally, the overview and application guidelines are included for each of the methods, aiming to help both researchers and practitioners. The results have confirmed that there are significant variations in the outputs across the observed methods, implying the need for informed method selection.

© 2020 CPE, University of Maribor. All rights reserved.

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Assembly;
Open-loop assembly;
Tolerance analysis;
Computer aided tolerancing;
Tolerance chart analysis;
Unified Jacobian-torsor model;
Monte Carlo method;
Vector-loop analysis

*Corresponding author:

stanko.skec@fsb.hr
(Škec, S.)

Article history:

Received 6 September 2019

Revised 11 March 2020

Accepted 17 March 2020

References

- [1] Polini, W. (2011). Geometric tolerance analysis, In: Colosimo, B., Senin, N. (eds.), *Geometric tolerances: Impact on product design, quality inspection and statistical process monitoring*, Vol. 2, Springer, London, United Kingdom, 39-68, doi: [10.1007/978-1-84996-311-4_2](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-84996-311-4_2).
- [2] International organisation for standardisation (2011). ISO 8015-2011 – Geometrical product specifications (GPS) – Fundamentals – Concepts, principles and rules, ISO, Geneva, Switzerland.
- [3] Sigurdarson, N., Eifler, T., Ebro, M. (2018). The applicability of CAT tools in industry – Boundaries and challenges in tolerance engineering practice observed in a medical device company, *Procedia CIRP*, Vol. 75, 261-266, doi: [10.1016/j.procir.2018.04.066](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procir.2018.04.066).
- [4] Corrado, A., Polini, W. (2017). Manufacturing signature in jacobian and torsor models for tolerance analysis of rigid parts, *Robotics and Computer-Integrated Manufacturing*, Vol. 46, 15-24, doi: [10.1016/j.rcim.2016.11.004](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rcim.2016.11.004).
- [5] Ramnath, S., Haghghi, P., Chitale, A., Davidson, J.K., Shah, J.J. (2018). Comparative study of tolerance analysis methods applied to a complex assembly, *Procedia CIRP*, Vol. 75, 208-213, doi: [10.1016/j.procir.2018.04.073](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procir.2018.04.073).
- [6] Chen, H., Jin, S., Li, Z., Lai, X. (2014). A comprehensive study of three dimensional tolerance analysis methods, *Computer-Aided Design*, Vol. 53, 1-13, doi: [10.1016/j.cad.2014.02.014](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cad.2014.02.014).
- [7] Morse, E.P., Shakarji, C.M., Srinivasan, V. (2018). A brief analysis of recent ISO tolerancing standards and their potential impact on digitalization of manufacturing, *Procedia CIRP*, Vol. 75, 11-18, doi: [10.1016/j.procir.2018.04.080](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procir.2018.04.080).
- [8] American Society of Mechanical Engineers (2004). ASME Y14.5 – Mathematical definition of dimensioning and tolerancing principles, ASME, New York, USA, 1-15.
- [9] Shen, Z., Ameta, G., Shah, J.J., Davidson, J.K. (2005). A comparative study of tolerance analysis methods, *Journal of Computing and Information Science in Engineering*, Vol. 5, No. 3, 247-256, doi: [10.1115/1.1979509](https://doi.org/10.1115/1.1979509).

- [10] Marziale, M., Polini, W. (2011). A review of two models for tolerance analysis of an assembly: Jacobian and torsor, *International Journal of Computing Integrated Manufacturing*, Vol. 24, No. 1, 74-86, doi: [10.1080/0951192X.2010.531286](https://doi.org/10.1080/0951192X.2010.531286).
- [11] Chase, K.W., Magleby, S.P., Gao, J. (2004). Tolerance analysis of 2-D and 3-D mechanical assemblies with small kinematic adjustment, *Advanced Tolerancing Techniques*, Vol. 218, 1869-1873.
- [12] Ghie, W. (2009). Statistical analysis tolerance using jacobian torsor model based on uncertainty propagation method, *The International Journal of Multiphysics*, Vol. 3, No. 1, 11-30, doi: [10.1260/175095409787924472](https://doi.org/10.1260/175095409787924472).
- [13] Ghie, W., Laperrière, L., Desrochers, A. (2010). Statistical tolerance analysis using the unified Jacobian-Torsor model, *International Journal of Production Research*, Vol. 48, No. 15, 4609-4630, doi: [10.1080/00207540902824982](https://doi.org/10.1080/00207540902824982).
- [14] Wang, Y. (2008). Closed-loop analysis in semantic tolerance modeling, *Journal of Mechanical Design*, Vol. 130, No. 6, Article No. 061701, doi: [10.1115/1.2900715](https://doi.org/10.1115/1.2900715).
- [15] Schleich, B., Wartzack, S. (2016). A quantitative comparison of tolerance analysis approaches for rigid mechanical assemblies, *Procedia CIRP*, Vol. 43, 172-177, doi: [10.1016/j.procir.2016.02.013](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procir.2016.02.013).
- [16] Magadum, R., Allurkar, B.S. (2015). A comparative study of fasteners tolerance analysis methods, *International Journal of Scientific & Engineering Research*, Vol. 6, No. 6, 700-705.
- [17] Fischer, B.R. (2015). *Mechanical Tolerance Stackup and Analysis*, CRC Press, Boca Raton, USA.
- [18] Yan, H., Wu, X., Yang, J. (2015). Application of Monte Carlo method in tolerance analysis, *Procedia CIRP*, Vol. 27, 281-285, doi: [10.1016/j.procir.2015.04.079](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procir.2015.04.079).
- [19] Schenkelberg, F. (2016). *Statistical tolerance analysis – Basic introduction*, FMS Reliability Publishing, Los Gatos, USA.
- [20] Chase, K.W., Gao, J., Magleby, S.P. (1995). General 2-D tolerance analysis of mechanical assemblies with small kinematic adjustments, *Journal of Design and Manufacturing Automation*, Vol. 5, 263-274.
- [21] Desrochers, A., Ghie, W., Laperrière, L. (2003). Application of unified jacobian-torsor model for tolerance analysis, *Journal of Computing and Information Science in Engineering*, Vol. 3, No. 1, 2-14, doi: [10.1115/1.1573235](https://doi.org/10.1115/1.1573235).
- [22] Ghie, W. (2012). Tolerance analysis using Jacobian-Torsor model: Statistical and deterministic applications, In: Cakaj, S. (ed.), *Modelling simulation and optimization – Tolerance and optimal control*, InTech, Rijeka, Croatia, 147-160, doi: [10.5772/9043](https://doi.org/10.5772/9043).
- [23] Desrochers, A., Delbart, O. (1998). Determination of part position uncertainty within mechanical assembly using screw parameters, In: ElMaraghy H.A. (ed.), *Geometric design tolerancing: Theories, standards and applications*, Springer, Boston, USA, 185-196, doi: [10.1007/978-1-4615-5797-5_14](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4615-5797-5_14).
- [24] Peng, H., Lu, W. (2017). Three-dimensional assembly tolerance analysis based on the Jacobian-Torsor statistical model, In: *Proceedings of 3rd International Conference on Mechatronics and Mechanical Engineering (ICMME 2016)*, Les Ulis, France, doi: [10.1051/mateconf/20179507007](https://doi.org/10.1051/mateconf/20179507007).
- [25] Siva Kumar, M., Kannan, S.M., Jayabalan, V. (2009). A new algorithm for optimum tolerance allocation of complex assemblies with alternative processes selection, *The International Journal of Advanced Manufacturing Technology*, Vol. 40, No. 7-8, 819-836, doi: [10.1007/s00170-008-1389-5](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00170-008-1389-5).
- [26] Ramesh Kumar, L., Padmanaban, K.P., Balamurugan, C. (2016). Optimal tolerance allocation in a complex assembly using evolutionary algorithms, *International Journal of Simulation Modelling*, Vol. 15, No. 1, 121-132, doi: [10.2507/IJSIMM15\(1\)10.331](https://doi.org/10.2507/IJSIMM15(1)10.331).

Primerjava metod tolerančne analize v sestavu z odprto zanko

Kosec, P.^a, Škec, S.^{a,b,*}, Miler, D.^a

^aUniversity of Zagreb, Faculty of Mechanical Engineering and Naval Architecture, Zagreb, Croatia

^bTechnical University of Denmark, Kongens Lyngby, Denmark

POVZETEK

Dimenzijske in geometrijske tolerance vplivajo tako na stroške kot na funkcionalnost določenega izdelka. Iskanje sprejemljivega kompromisa med obema je ena izmed pogostih inženirskih nalog. Razvitih je veliko metod analize tolerance, ki pomagajo inženirjem pri odločanju. V tem članku so avtorji ocenili štiri metode analize tolerance, tako da so jih uporabili na sestavu z odprto zanko. Analizirani in primerjani so bili rezultati, pridobljeni z metodo tolerančnega diagrama (najslabši primer), Monte-Carlo simulacijo, vektorsko zračno analizo in poenotenim Jakobi-torzorskim modelom. Poleg tega so za vsako od metod vključeni pregled in smernice za uporabo, katerih namen je pomagati raziskovalcem in izvajalcem. Rezultati so potrdili, da obstajajo znatne razlike v učinkih opazovanih metod, kar kaže na potrebo po informirani izbiri metode.

© 2020 CPE, University of Maribor. All rights reserved.

PODATKI O ČLANKU

Ključne besede:

Sestav;
Sestav z odprto zanko;
Analiza tolerance;
Računalniško podprte tolerance;
Analiza diagrama toleranc;
Enotni Jakobi-torzorski model;
Metoda Monte Carlo;
Analiza vektorske zanke

**Kontaktna oseba:*

stanko.skec@fsb.hr
(Škec, S.)

Zgodovina članka:

Prejet 6. septembra 2019
Popravljen 11. marca 2020
Sprejet 17. marca 2020
