

DEVELOPMENT AND DEMONSTRATION OF A MULTIPLE MATERIAL
STEREOLITHOGRAPHY SYSTEM

OSWALDO ALONSO LOZOYA

Department of Mechanical and Industrial Engineering

APPROVED:

Ryan B. Wicker, Ph.D., Chair

Malcolm N. Cooke, Ph.D.

Carl W. Dirk, Ph.D.

Pablo Arenaz, Ph.D.
Dean of the Graduate School

PREVIEW

DEVELOPMENT AND DEMONSTRATION OF A MULTIPLE MATERIAL
STEREOLITHOGRAPHY SYSTEM

by

OSWALDO ALONSO LOZOYA, B.S.M.E.

THESIS

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of

The University of Texas at El Paso

in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements

for the Degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Department of Mechanical and Industrial Engineering

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT EL PASO

May 2006

UMI Number: 1435303

PREVIEW

UMI[®]

UMI Microform 1435303

Copyright 2006 by ProQuest Information and Learning Company.
All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against
unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

ProQuest Information and Learning Company
300 North Zeeb Road
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my advisor and mentor, Dr. Ryan B. Wicker, who guided me through this journey and encouraged me to thrive in the achievement of unprecedented goals and visions of my studies. His continuous guidance and the opportunity of becoming his research assistant throughout my graduate studies made all this work possible. I would like to extend my regards to the other committee members, Dr. Malcolm N. Cooke and Dr. Carl W. Dirk, for their patience and support during the writing of this thesis.

My deepest gratitude goes to my family and loved ones, for supporting and believing in me at all times. The faith and love they deposit in me continually is the driving force of my ambitions, and their care and concern for my personal advance at all levels is the strength that keeps me motivated in times of despair and doubt. For all these and many more reasons, this thesis is dedicated to my mother, Verónica Angélica Iñiguez; my father, Luis Raul Lozoya; and my brothers Juan Raul and Luis Gerardo. Thank you for wishing me the best always. Thank you for waiting for my safe return home always. Thank you for being an intrinsic part of me.

This work could have not been completed without the support of Liz Pardo, Carlos Herrera, Rudy Aguilar and the entire faculty and staff members that shared my experiences at the UTEP Mechanical Engineering Department throughout this stage of my life. To Francisco Medina, Karina Arcaute, Hector Sandoval, Luis Ochoa, Yinko Grajeda, Asim Inamdar and everyone directly involved in the activities of the W.M. Keck BBMEL goes my deepest appreciation.

To all the people I met in the extent of my studies here at UTEP, in Ciudad Juárez, El Paso and other places, who gave me the gift of their unconditional friendship and belief in the hardest times and in the lightest. To those who taught me so much when they thought I was the one

teaching, and to those who unconditionally instructed me while they were learning from me. To those who are waiting for me. And to those who remember me fondly for the slightest moments we were able to share a piece of our lives. To every one of them, I extend my heartfelt gratitude.

This support and other research support for the fulfillment of this thesis were provided through the Texas Advanced Research (Advanced Technology / Technology Development and Transfer) Program under Grant #003661-0020-2003. Other research support was also provided through Grant #11804 from the W.M. Keck Foundation; research Contract #28643 from Sandia National Laboratories in the Laboratory Directed Research and Development (LDRD) program, and through the endowed Mr. and Mrs. MacIntosh Murchison Chair I in Engineering.

This thesis was submitted to the Supervising Committee on November 22nd, 2005.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The research described in this thesis addresses the development of a working multiple material stereolithography (MMSL) system by means of a functional retrofit of components into an existing stereolithography (SL) machine as a demonstration of MMSL manufacturing feasibility. A patent filed by Wicker, Medina, and Elkins (2004a) covering the MMSL concept, was used as the primary design reference for the implementation of the retrofit to the existing SL machine. The developed retrofitted MMSL system is installed in the process chamber of a SLA™ 250/50 by the removal of some of the components of the original system (e.g. Zephyr™ blade). Original system laser and optical equipment (laser beam spot size of 0.004-in – 0.008-in from a DPSS laser source) along with the vertical stage (0.0001-in resolution) and computer controls were used in the retrofit.

Using the concept of a rotary multiple vat assembly with diverse resins, multiple material parts were built for testing. The build envelope of the system is 3-in x 3-in x 1-in, using a layer thickness of 0.008-in and resin overfill strategy in order to maintain a constant surface level. The construction of parts follows a stratified strategy, where single material sections in a multiple material part are completed on the platform sequentially, in order to minimize build time and limit the number of intermediate resin washing cycles (used to rinse resin out of parts prior to their submersion in a different resin). Because of the process followed, a sweeping blade cannot be used to control resin surface uniformity. Dip coating and increased wait time between layer construction, inspired in early SL system models, were the techniques used instead for layer surface wetting.

The retrofitted MMSL system proves the feasibility of MMSL manufacturing; however, its vertical accuracy requires improvement. During MMSL stratified build, upper plane offset of part surfaces in different material sections, designed to be coincident in the CAD file and in the order of 20 mils (two- to three-layer thicknesses), becomes present; this is affected by surface wetting of each material (i.e. resin moulding) and retrofit assembly dimensional stack-up deviations. This situation can be improved to the order of 3-4 mils (less than one-layer thickness) by performing measurements of resin level height above Mylar® platform surface, originally proposed by Hector Sandoval for platform home location, and calculating differences between multiple vats at a known vertical stage location, using a hexagonal wet film comb coating thickness gage (Elcometer®), as shown by stratified build single material SL manufacturing measurements also presented in this thesis. The accuracy of the system in the planar region remains within the capability of the original SL system, as expected, with resolution within the range of 0.004-in – 0.008-in, as it is the case for the laser beam spot size.

Multiple material shear and normal specimens were used in order to demonstrate the feasibility of MMSL manufacturing and as samples for multiple bonding strength characterization through tensile testing, using three different resins from DSM Somos®: WaterShed™ 11120, ProtoTherm™ 12120 and NanoForm™ 15120. No conclusive result to define the failure limits of shear bonding strength were found, as specimen failure outside of the bonding contact plane occurred, leaving the definition of ultimate shear bonding strength undefined. Nonetheless, since they define an upper shear stress value prior to sample fracture that follows a linear response in the stress-strain curves before any cold-drawing behavior is observable (i.e. polymer yield region), shear stress values recorded at specimen failure were used to determine reference engineering design yield parameters. The reference shear strength values

(95% CI) obtained through testing are the following: 2080 ± 178 psi (3.18 ± 0.58 % elongation) for WaterShed™-NanoForm™; 2673 ± 294 psi (5.33 ± 0.62 % elongation) for WaterShed™-ProtoTherm™; and 1934 ± 465 psi (1.92 ± 0.53 % elongation) for ProtoTherm™-NanoForm™.

Normal bonding strength testing results describe a behavior similar to mechanical testing response of semi-crystalline polymeric structures. In addition, multiple material specimens illustrate different stress-strain responses in the cold drawing and strain hardening regions of the response for each multiple material bonding interface. In ductile-to-brittle multiple material bonding (WaterShed™-ProtoTherm™ and WaterShed™-NanoForm™ multiple material specimens), a mean ultimate normal strength with smaller distribution spread can be determined, in comparison with dispersed data distribution of elongation at break of the specimens; the opposite occurs in the tested brittle-to-brittle multiple material specimens (ProtoTherm™-NanoForm™). The mean yield stress (95% CI) of ductile-to-brittle multiple material specimens is always higher than the brittle-to-brittle multiple material bonding case: 835 ± 295 psi for ProtoTherm™-NanoForm™; 1423 ± 228 psi for WaterShed™-NanoForm™; and 1019 ± 203 psi for WaterShed™-ProtoTherm™. This may suggest the influence of WaterShed™ (ductile resin, 11 – 20 % elongation at break material specification from DSM Somos®) in helping the bonding interface sustain higher loads in ductile-to-brittle interfaces by plastically deforming, as shown by the quasi-cleavage fracture mode SEM image for a WaterShed™-ProtoTherm™ normal sample interface separation surface after testing.

In order to understand shear bonding strength behavior on these SL materials, single material samples optimized for shear fracture using linear elastic FEA were built (gage width 0.125-in, gage thickness 0.240-in, step-notch extension 0.100-in across half the specimen's thickness, shear plane overlap 0.040-in), both in the MMSL retrofit and a standard single material SL

system, with WaterShed™ and an additional resin, DSM Somos® 9120, with a 3:1 ratio between gage region normal cross section (i.e. step-notch section) and shear (i.e. overlap) plane area. Shear fracture was not observed for any sample built with any of these two SL materials; instead, normal fracture modes are found outside of the shear plane, as observed in the samples and described by numerous SEM images portraying cleavage brittle fracture modes in the fracture surfaces of specimens built in various orientations, build runs and stratified builds in both single or multiple vats. In addition, testing results yield different nominal shear stress values along with comparable specimen extension at sample fracture for different sample build orientations, with lower shear stress values for samples built vertically in contrast with any other orthogonal orientations (sample built on edge or built on flat specimen surfaces), which may suggest an effect on the manner the shear plane is built during SL manufacturing on shear bonding strength; for example, in the case of individual build runs of WaterShed™ samples in a single orientation, the testing results for nominal shear stress are the following (95% CI): 6033 ± 114 psi for samples built on edge; 6386 ± 153 psi for samples built on flat; and 4194 ± 242 psi for samples built vertically. On the other hand, for Aluminum Alloy 6061-T6 samples using the same linear elastic FEA optimized geometry (machined from stock by Carlos Herrera, Mechanical and Industrial Engineering Department technical staff associate and machinist), shear fracture is present in all cases, with ultimate shear strength values that match the published properties of this material (30,000 psi) and characteristic shear dimple (microvoid coalescence or MVC) fracture modes on the fracture surface.

Although the total integration of some of the described subsystems of the patent is left for future research, the operation of the manual MMSL system presented here is the first known

demonstration of this technology. Successful demonstration of the system provides a useful tool for future MMSL research.

PREVIEW

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	x
LIST OF TABLES	xvii
LIST OF EQUATIONS	xx
LIST OF FIGURES	xxii
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 RESEARCH MOTIVATION	1
1.2 PROJECT OBJECTIVES	3
1.2.1 Multiple Material Stereolithography (MMSL) Patent	3
1.2.1.1 Field of Opportunity	3
1.2.1.2 Summary of Approach to MMSL System Design	4
1.2.2 Multiple Material Interface Bonding	7
1.3 BACKGROUND	8
1.4 LABORATORY INVOLVED: W.M. KECK BBMEL	9
1.5 THESIS OUTLINE	11
CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW	12
2.1 INTRODUCTION	12
2.1.1 The SL Process	13
2.1.2 Latest Advancements in SL Field	16
2.1.3 SL Contribution to other Fields of Study	23

2.1.3.1	Introduction.....	23
2.1.3.2	Electronics.....	24
2.1.3.3	SL Materials Research for End-Use Component Applications	27
2.1.3.4	Architectural Modeling.....	29
2.1.3.5	Medical Surgery Planning and Modeling	30
2.1.3.6	Disease Characterization and Preventive Medicine.....	34
2.1.3.7	Anthropology and Related Sciences	35
2.1.3.8	Tissue Engineering Research and Materials	38
2.1.3.9	Robotics and Automatic Systems Control.....	40
2.1.3.10	Other Fields of Influence	43
2.2	SL MATERIALS	43
2.2.1	Photopolymerization Principles.....	44
2.2.2	Photosensitivity Parameters.....	46
2.2.2.1	General concepts.....	46
2.2.2.2	Laser Drawing Theoretical Approach.....	48
2.2.3	SL Resins Used.....	51
2.2.3.1	WaterShed™ 11120 Resin.....	52
2.2.3.2	ProtoTherm™ 12120 Resin	52
2.2.3.3	NanoForm™ 15120 Resin	53
2.3	ASTM D 638-01 TESTING STANDARD.....	53
2.4	POLYMER MECHANICAL TESTING RESPONSE	54
2.4.1	Crystallinity.....	54
2.4.2	Polymer load-elongation curves	55

CHAPTER 3	EXPERIMENTAL SETUP AND RETROFIT DESIGN	59
3.1	PREVIOUS SL SYSTEMS OPERATION.....	59
3.1.1	Laser.....	63
3.1.1.1	Laser Equipment.....	64
3.1.1.2	Laser scanning: vectors.....	65
3.1.2	Optical System.....	66
3.1.3	Process Chamber.....	67
3.1.4	Control Panel	69
3.1.5	Control Computer	69
3.1.6	Recoater System.....	69
3.1.7	SLA™ 250 Operation Specifications	72
3.2	RETROFIT DESIGN.....	72
3.2.1	Retrofit Description	73
3.2.1.1	Platform Assembly.....	73
3.2.1.2	Multiple Vat Assembly.....	75
3.2.1.3	Laser Equipment.....	76
3.2.1.4	Intermediate Resin Cleansing of Parts Under Construction	76
3.2.2	Parts and Assembly Description.....	77
3.2.2.1	Multiple Vat Assembly.....	78
3.2.2.2	Platform Assembly.....	91
3.2.3	Retrofit Vertical Motion Characteristics.....	98
CHAPTER 4	MMSL SYSTEM OPERATION	100
4.1	PROBLEMS ADDRESSED ON SETUP.....	100

4.1.1	Laser Operation.....	100
4.1.2	Resin Behavior.....	102
4.1.3	Laser Drawing Calculations.....	106
4.1.3.1	Laser Scan Velocity Change.....	107
4.1.3.2	Cure Depth Increment.....	108
4.1.3.3	Laser Scan Line Width Interference	112
4.1.4	Limited Workspace.....	113
4.1.5	SL Build File Management Process.....	119
4.1.5.1	STL File Preparation.....	120
4.1.5.2	Build File Execution	124
CHAPTER 5	MMSL SYSTEM DEMONSTRATION	128
5.1	MULTIPLE MATERIAL SPECIMENS MANUFACTURING.....	136
5.1.1	Sample Geometry and Build Process.....	136
5.1.1.1	Shear Test Samples.....	137
5.1.1.2	Normal Test Samples.....	146
5.1.2	Final Manufactured Specimens.....	152
5.1.2.1	Multiple Material Shear Testing Specimens.....	154
5.1.2.2	Multiple Material Normal Testing Specimens.....	161
5.1.3	Build Time Estimation.....	168
5.1.3.1	Surface Wetting Time Estimation.....	168
5.1.3.2	Test Sample Cross-Section Drawing Time Estimation	169
CHAPTER 6	RESULTS OF STUDY.....	176
6.1	MULTIPLE MATERIAL INTERFACE TESTING	176

6.2	RESULTS OF TESTING	177
6.2.1	WaterShed™-NanoForm™ Specimens	177
6.2.1.1	Shear Tensile Strength Testing	178
6.2.1.2	Normal Tensile Strength Testing	180
6.2.2	WaterShed™-ProtoTherm™ Specimens	182
6.2.2.1	Shear Tensile Strength Testing	182
6.2.2.2	Normal Tensile Strength Testing	185
6.2.3	ProtoTherm™-NanoForm™ Specimens	187
6.2.3.1	Shear Tensile Strength Testing	187
6.2.3.2	Normal Tensile Strength Testing	189
6.2.4	Analysis of results	191
6.2.4.1	Shear Tensile Strength Analysis	192
6.2.4.2	Normal Tensile Strength Analysis	196
CHAPTER 7	SYSTEM MATERIALS ASSESSMENT	204
7.1	MMSL RETROFIT ACCURACY	204
7.1.1	Vertical Stage Performance	205
7.1.2	Single Material Specimen Construction for Accuracy Research	208
7.1.2.1	Four-sample individual Mylar® platforms configuration	208
7.1.2.2	Single run sample build	210
7.1.2.3	Stratified Build	212
7.2	SPECIMEN GEOMETRY OPTIMIZATION	224
7.2.1	Stress concentration FEA localization	224
7.2.2	Localized stress magnitude FEA optimization	227

7.3	OPTIMIZED SAMPLE GEOMETRY TESTING: SINGLE MATERIAL	232
7.3.1	Sample build orientation	234
7.3.2	DSM Somos® 9120 sample testing.....	237
7.3.2.1	Series testing	237
7.3.2.2	Step-Notch Model vs. Superposed model comparative testing	242
7.3.3	WaterShed™ (DSM Somos® 11120) sample testing.....	247
7.3.3.1	Step-Notch model testing.....	247
7.3.3.2	Aluminum 6061-T6 vs. WaterShed™ comparative testing.....	253
CHAPTER 8	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	263
8.1	SUMMARY OF DESIGN	263
8.2	SUMMARY OF OPERATION	264
8.3	SUMMARY OF RESULTS	264
8.4	RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH.....	267
REFERENCES	270
APPENDIX A	MMSL System Assemblies: Drawings.....	282
APPENDIX B	FEA Simulation: Multiple Vat Assembly.....	302
APPENDIX C	FEA Simulation: Platform Assembly	306
APPENDIX D	Equipment Specifications	311
APPENDIX E	ASTM D638-01 Testing Standard.....	314
APPENDIX F	SL Resins Material Specifications	318
APPENDIX G	Shear Sample Normal Stress Calculations.....	320
APPENDIX H	Fracture Surface Images	323
APPENDIX I	Statistics: Confidence Intervals.....	331

CURRICULUM VITAE.....	332
-----------------------	-----

PREVIEW

LIST OF TABLES

Table 4.1. Modified exposure level parameters for resin polymerization subject to 10 mL/min overfill flow.	104
Table 4.2. Laser scan velocity calculation comparison for different resins based on the critical exposure limit value used.....	108
Table 4.3. Cure depth calculation comparison for different resins based on the critical exposure limit value used.	110
Table 4.4. Laser cured line width comparison for different resins based on the critical exposure limit value used.	113
Table 5.1. Shear stress multiple material interface specimens set fabrication protocol report sheet.	145
Table 5.2. Normal stress multiple material interface specimens set fabrication protocol report sheet.	151
Table 5.3. Measurements of width and length of multiple material shear test samples contact plane (WaterShed™-ProtoTherm™).	154
Table 5.4. Measurements of width and length of multiple material shear test samples contact plane (WaterShed™-NanoForm™).	155
Table 5.5. Measurements of width and length of multiple material shear test samples contact plane (ProtoTherm™-NanoForm™).	155
Table 5.6. Comparative measurements of thickness and width of multiple material shear test samples halves (WaterShed™-ProtoTherm™).....	155

Table 5.7. Comparative measurements of thickness and width of multiple material shear test samples halves (WaterShed™-NanoForm™).....	156
Table 5.8. Comparative measurements of thickness and width of multiple material shear test samples halves (ProtoTherm™-NanoForm™).....	156
Table 5.9. Measurements of width and length of multiple material normal test samples cross-sectional dimensions (WaterShed™-ProtoTherm™).	162
Table 5.10. Measurements of width and length of multiple material normal test samples cross-sectional dimensions (WaterShed™-NanoForm™).	162
Table 5.11. Measurements of width and length of multiple material normal test samples cross-sectional dimensions (ProtoTherm™-NanoForm™).....	163
Table 5.12. Normal test single sample cross-section dimensional characteristics.	171
Table 5.13. Calculated total build times for normal test samples build files of different resins.	172
Table 5.14. Calculated build times for multiple material normal test samples.....	172
Table 5.15. Shear test single sample cross-section dimensional characteristics.....	173
Table 5.16. Calculated total build times for shear test samples build files of different resins. .	175
Table 5.17. Calculated build times for multiple material shear test samples.	175
Table 6.1. Failure mode descriptions for multiple material shear test specimens.	192
Table 6.2. Mechanical testing results at fracture of multiple material shear specimens for each multiple material interface combination.	195
Table 6.3. Mechanical testing results at yield limit of multiple material normal specimens for each multiple material interface combination.....	200

Table 6.4. Mechanical testing results at cold-drawing limit of multiple material normal specimens for each multiple material interface combination.....	201
Table 6.5. Mechanical testing results at ultimate limit of multiple material normal specimens for each multiple material interface combination.....	202
Table 7.1. DSM Somos® 9120 Series testing measurements for shear stress at sample fracture.	241
Table 7.2. DSM Somos® 9120 comparative testing measurements for shear stress at sample fracture with superposed and step-notch models.	246
Table 7.3. WaterShed™ comparative testing measurements for shear stress at sample fracture with different ordered manufacturing strategies.....	252
Table 7.4. WaterShed™ comparative build orientation testing measurements for shear stress at sample fracture between single and multiple orientation build runs.	261
Table 7.5. WaterShed™ comparative build orientation testing measurements for linear slope in the 0.010-in to 0.015-in sample extension range between single and multiple orientation build runs.	262

LIST OF EQUATIONS

Equation 2.1. Cure depth function for photosensitive SL resins.	48
Equation 2.2. Maximum laser exposure power function (Gaussian distribution).	49
Equation 2.3. Laser scan velocity function.	49
Equation 2.4. Maximum cured line width on resin surface (Gaussian distribution).	50
Equation 2.5. Simplified maximum cured line width function for SL calculation.	50
Equation 2.6. Resin surface area polymerization rate function.	50
Equation 4.1. Relationship between laser scan velocity and critical exposure limit ratios (specified vs. user-input values for exposure limit).	107
Equation 4.2. Solution of maximum incident laser energy from the cure depth function.	108
Equation 4.3. Actual achieved cure depth function resulting from the change of the critical exposure limit parameters in the operation of the SL.	109
Equation 4.4. Laser cured line width ratio resulting from the change of the critical exposure limit between specified and user-input value.	112
Equation 5.1. Surface wetting time function.	168
Equation 5.2. Laser drawing tracing distance for a defined layer cross sectional area.	169
Equation 5.3. Layer cross section drawing time.	170
Equation 5.4. Cross sectional area function for normal test samples build file.	170
Equation 5.5. Perimeter function for normal test samples build file.	171
Equation 5.6. Laser drawing time for a layer cross-section from normal test samples build file.	171
Equation 5.7. Total build time function for normal test samples build file.	172

Equation 5.8. Cross sectional area (Type 1) function for shear test samples build file.....	173
Equation 5.9. Cross sectional area (Type 2) function for shear test samples build file.....	173
Equation 5.10. Perimeter (Type 1) function for shear test samples build file.	173
Equation 5.11. Perimeter (Type 2) function for shear test samples build file.	173
Equation 5.12. Laser drawing time for a layer cross-section from normal test samples build file (Type 1).....	174
Equation 5.13. Laser drawing time for a layer cross-section from normal test samples build file (Type 2).....	174
Equation 5.14. Total build time function for shear test samples build file.....	174

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.1. MMSL system as conceived in patent application by Wicker <i>et al.</i> (2004a).....	6
Figure 1.2. MMSL sytem operation (patent application filed by Wicker <i>et al.</i> , 2004a).....	8
Figure 2.1. SL process illustration (adopted directly from Dufaud <i>et al.</i> , 2002).....	15
Figure 2.2. SLA™ 250/50 prototype (from 3D Systems®) built by following specified insert placement guidelines (adopted directly from Kataria & Rosen, 2001).....	17
Figure 2.3. SL manufactured micro-pipe with helical separation wall; microscopic view (a) and SEM picture of cross-section (b) (adopted directly from Lee & Cho, 2003).	20
Figure 2.4. SEM image of micro gear movable structure built with Super-IH process (adopted directly from Maruo <i>et al.</i> , 2002).....	22
Figure 2.5. Menger sponge structures constructed by SL technology for stages (a) 0, (b) 1, (c) 2, and (d) 3 (adopted directly from Takeda <i>et al.</i> , 2004).	25
Figure 2.6. Transducer created with PZT suspension composite resin (adopted directly from Dufaud, Marchal & Corbel, 2002).	28
Figure 2.7. Modern track and field sports facility architectural model assembled from SL fabricated parts (adopted directly from Giannatsis <i>et al.</i> , 2002).....	30
Figure 2.8. Pre-surgical rehearsal on canine limb deformities correction (adopted directly from Harrysson <i>et al.</i> , 2003).	33
Figure 2.9. Human cancellous bone samples created by SL technology (adopted directly from Bibb & Sisias, 2002).	34
Figure 2.10. Tyrolean Iceman finding site at rock depression in 1991 (adopted directly from Recheis <i>et al.</i> , 1999).	36