



**Michigan
Technological
University**

Michigan Technological University
Digital Commons @ Michigan Tech

Department of Materials Science and
Engineering Publications

Department of Materials Science and
Engineering

7-17-2013

Life-Cycle Economic Analysis of Distributed Manufacturing with Open-Source 3-D Printers

Ben T. Wittbrodt
Michigan Technological University

A. G. Glover
Michigan Technological University

J. Laureto
Michigan Technological University

G. C. Anzalone
Michigan Technological University

D. Oppliger
Michigan Technological University

See next page for additional authors

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.mtu.edu/materials_fp

Recommended Citation

B.T. Wittbrodt, A.G. Glover, J. Laureto, G.C. Anzalone, D. Oppliger, J.L. Irwin, J.M. Pearce (2013), Life-cycle economic analysis of distributed manufacturing with open-source 3-D printers, *Mechatronics*, 23(6), 713-726. http://digitalcommons.mtu.edu/materials_fp/48

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.mtu.edu/materials_fp

Authors

Ben T. Wittbrodt, A. G. Glover, J. Laureto, G. C. Anzalone, D. Oppliger, J. L. Irwin, and Joshua M. Pearce

Life-Cycle Economic Analysis of Distributed Manufacturing with Open-Source 3-D Printers

B.T. Wittbrodt^a, A.G. Glover^a, J. Laureto^a, G.C. Anzalone^b, D. Oppliger^c, J. L. Irwin^d, J.M. Pearce^{a,e,*}

a. Department of Materials Science & Engineering, Michigan Technological University, Houghton, MI, USA

b. Civil and Environmental Engineering, Michigan Technological University, Houghton, MI, USA

c. Engineering Fundamentals, Michigan Technological University, Houghton, MI, USA

d. Mechanical Engineering Technology, Michigan Technological University, Houghton, MI, USA

e. Department of Electrical & Computer Engineering, Michigan Technological University, Houghton, MI, USA

* Corresponding author: 601 M&M Building, 1400 Townsend Drive, Houghton, MI 49931-1295
906-487-1466, pearce@mtu.edu

Abstract

The recent development of open-source 3-D printers makes scaling of distributed additive-based manufacturing of high-value objects technically feasible. These self-replicating rapid prototypers (RepRaps) can manufacture approximately half of their own parts from sequential fused deposition of polymer feedstocks. RepRaps have been proposed and demonstrated to be useful for conventional prototyping and engineering, customizing scientific equipment, and appropriate technology-related manufacturing for sustainable development. However, in order for this technology to proliferate like 2-D electronic printers have, it must be economically viable for a typical household. This study reports on the life-cycle economic analysis (LCEA) of RepRap technology for an average U.S. household. A new low-cost RepRap is described and the costs of materials and time to construct it are quantified. The economic costs of a selection of twenty open-source printable designs (representing less than 0.04% of those available), are typical of products that a household might purchase, are quantified for print time, energy, and filament consumption and compared to low and high Internet market prices for similar products without shipping costs. The results show that even making the extremely conservative assumption that the household would only use the printer to make the selected twenty products a year the avoided purchase cost savings would range from about \$300 to \$2000/year. Assuming the 25 hours of necessary printing for the selected products is evenly distributed throughout the year these savings provide a simple payback time for the RepRap in 4 months to 2 years and provide an ROI between >200% and >40%. As both upgrades and the components that are most likely to wear out in the RepRap can be printed and thus the lifetime of the distributing manufacturing can be substantially increased the unavoidable conclusion from this study is that the RepRap is an economically attractive investment for the average U.S. household already. It appears clear that as RepRaps improve in reliability, continue to decline in cost and both the number and assumed utility of open-source designs continues growing exponentially, open-source 3-D printers will become a mass-market mechatronic device.

Keywords: 3-D printing; distributed manufacturing; open-source hardware; RepRap; additive-layer manufacturing; rapid prototyping

1. Introduction

The technological development of additive manufacturing and 3-D printing has been substantial, fueling rapid growth in commercial rapid prototyping as it has proven useful for both design and small-batch production [1-8]. There has been speculation by the *Economist* that these technical advances could result in a 'third industrial revolution' governed by mass-customization and digital manufacturing following traditional business paradigms [9]. However, the recent development of open-source 3-D printers makes the scaling of mass-distributed additive manufacturing of high-value objects technically feasible at the individual or household level [10-18]. These 3-D printers are self-replicating rapid prototypers (RepRaps), which manufacture approximately half of their own mechanical components (57% self replicating potential, excluding fasteners, bolts and nuts) from sequential fused deposition of a range of polymers and use common hardware [11,19,20]. The RepRap is a mechatronic device consisting of a combination of printed mechanical components, stepper motors for 3-D motion and extrusion, and a hot-end for melting and depositing sequential layers of polymers; all of which is controlled by an open-source micro-controller such as the Arduino [21,22]. The extruder intakes a filament of the working material (polyactic acid (PLA), acrylonitrile butadiene styrene (ABS), and high-density polyethylene (HDPE) among other materials [23,24]), melts it using resistive heating, and extrudes it through a nozzle. RepRaps have been proposed and demonstrated to be useful for standard prototyping and engineering [19], education [25], customizing scientific equipment [26], chemical reactionware [27], electronic sensors [28], wire embedding [29], tissue engineering [30] and appropriate technology-related product manufacturing for sustainable development [14]. Despite this wide array of applications, RepRaps are relatively simple mechatronic devices. Historically, mechatronics has been relatively isolated as specialist discipline, but now the advent of the RepRap with its inherent open-source nature offers the potential for widespread proliferation of mechatronics education and participation. However, in order for this technology to become as ubiquitous as are common 2-D electronic printers, the RepRap must be economically viable for the standard household.

This study reports on the life-cycle economic analysis (LCEA) of RepRap technology for an average U.S. household. A new low-cost RepRap is described and the costs of materials and time to construct it are quantified. The costs for a selection of open-source printable designs that a typical family might purchase are quantified for print time, energy, and filament consumption and compared to low and high market prices for similar products. The results of this life-cycle economic analysis, the developmental

trends including environmental impact, and comparison with commercial 3-D printers are discussed and conclusions are drawn about the future of distributed manufacturing.

2. Material and Methods

A new variant of the Prusa Mendel RepRap shown in Figure 1 was used to print the physical parts for an LCEA analysis. The RepRap bill of materials (BOM) and printed parts list are shown in Appendix A and B, respectively. The capital cost (C_{RepRap}) of the RepRap was calculated by summing the individual costs of the BOM and the necessary printed components. The printers have an approximately cubic build envelope with sides 18 cm in length with a print rate of 60mm/s (although the printers are capable of 120mm/s). The RepRap used here had a 0.5mm diameter nozzle, 0.1mm positioning accuracy and used 0.2 or 0.25 mm layer thickness, depending on the detail necessary for the print.

The growth rate of open-source designs was determined by recording the date and posted item number on Thingiverse. Twenty open-source designs were selected from over 100,000 items in the Thingiverse repository [31], which met the following criteria: 1) printable in PLA with existing RepRap technology, 2) have a commercially available direct substitute, and 3) are likely to be purchased or owned by an average American household.

3. Calculations

The high and low commercial costs for each product were found using a Google Shopping search in February 2013 from conventional brick and mortar retailers, excluding shipping costs. It should be noted that shipping for low-value products often dominated total cost, but was nevertheless ignored to ensure conservative estimates of return. Operating costs for the RepRap-produced products (O_p) were calculated using energy and filament consumption as measured and described below, applying the U.S. average electric rate of \$0.1174/kW-hr [32] and the average cost of PLA [33] as follows:

$$O_p = EC_e + 1000m_f C_f \quad [\text{US\$}/\text{part}] \quad (1)$$

where E is energy use in kW-hr, C_e is the average U.S. electric rate in US\$, m_f is the filament mass consumed in grams (m_f also includes any support material that needed to be printed for a specific part), and C_f is the cost of the filament in US\$/kg. The total cost of a RepRap produced product is:

$$P_{\text{RepRap}} = \sum O_p + \sum A \quad [\text{US\$}/\text{product}] \quad (2)$$

where A represents the cost of individual non-printed components in \$US.

Prints were made with PLA using with a bed temperature of 65°C and extruder temperature of 190°C.

Both the layer height and infill percentages are shown in Table 1 as they varied for the item being printed (e.g. products such as the garlic press that require increased mechanical strength were printed with 100% fill, while lightly-loaded products like the spoon holder were printed with 10% fill). Energy use was measured during extrusion with a multimeter (± 0.005 kW-hr) for each part during printing. Energy required for pre-heating the stage was measured 10 times and averaged. Filament use is estimated by the open-source slicing software, Cura [34] and then verified by massing (± 0.05 g) on a digital scale. The avoided costs (C_a) for a product is the difference between the cost to print with the RepRap, which includes a factor for failed prints (determined from Appendix B by measuring the bad prints on a new RepRap with a user performing initial prints for parts for another RepRap). The percent change is given by:

$$\frac{(P_{\text{RepRap}} - P_c)}{P_{\text{RepRap}}} \times 100\% = \frac{C_a}{P_{\text{RepRap}}} \times 100\% \quad (3)$$

[percent]

for the low ($P_{c\text{-low}}$) and high ($P_{c\text{-high}}$) retail costs respectively. The simple payback time (t_{pb}) of the RepRap is given by:

$$t_{\text{pb}} = \frac{C_{\text{RepRap}}}{\sum C_a} = \frac{C_{\text{RepRap}}}{\sum (P_{\text{RepRap}} - P_c)} \quad (4)$$

[years]

where C_{RepRap} is the cost of the RepRap and the sum is taken over a collection of products avoided for purchasing by 3-D printing. The approximate return on investment (R) for a RepRap in percent following [35] can be given by:

$$t_{\text{pb}} = (1 - e^{-RT})/R \quad (5)$$

[years]

where T is the lifetime of the RepRap in years and assumed to be at least 3 years. The durability of the machine has yet to be proven in longer-term real-world testing, however it is clear that a large portion of the machine can be printed, and therefore replaced when parts wear out. In the same way, the RepRap can be upgraded.

4. Results and Discussion

4.1 Growth of Open-source Designs

The growth rate of open-source designs is shown in Figure 2 as a function of time. It should be noted that this is the total number of designs and a high estimate for those listed on Thingiverse as this includes designs that were deleted by users or by Makerbot Industries, the host of the site, for any form of content restrictions (e.g. weapons, pornography, etc.). Thingiverse, however, is not the only repository of open-source designs as they are also stored on Google Sketchup 3-D Warehouse, 123D Content, 3Dvia, Shapeways 3-D parts database, Appropedia, Github and the GrabCAD library. Thus the data in Figure 2 should be indicative of the growth rate not the total number of open-source designs. As can be seen from Figure 2 the growth

has been rapid and can be fit with an exponential growth function. As of June 6, 2013 there were over 101,150.

4.2 Open-source 3-D Printing Fabrication Times and Energy Use

Of these 100,000 designs the 20 designs were chosen (or less than 0.02% of those available only on one repository) for analysis and are listed along with their Thingiverse thing number in Table 1. The designs can be downloaded from [www.thingiverse.com/thing:\[thing number\]](http://www.thingiverse.com/thing:[thing number]). In addition Table 1 quantifies both the Cura sliced theoretical PLA filament length, mass, and estimated print time along with the experimentally verified mass, energy consumed in kW-hrs and print times.

For both the simulation and the experimental results energy use per mass and energy use per time values are shown and graphed in Figures 3 and 4 respectively. As can be seen in Figures 3 and 4 there is a linear correlation with energy use and both mass printed and time to print with an R^2 of 0.85 and 0.9, respectfully. Cura overestimated the mass due to a difference in measured density (1269 kg/m^3) with Curas default setting of (1300 kg/m^3). In addition, the diameter of the filament used in Cura was 2.98 mm while the measured diameter was about 2.8mm. This difference existed because the Cura slicing diameter was used as a printing quality variable and altered to obtain high-quality prints and complete surface uniformity. As can be seen in Table 1 the actual printing time was about 12% longer than Cura estimated, due to retraction time and non-extrusion movement time of the printer. This was to ensure high-quality prints, but could be reduced for a highly-tuned printer. The total print time for the 20 products was just under 25 hours and used about 500g of filament. Energy use was minimal at 0.1 kW-hr per hour of printing and 0.01 kW-hr for the bed and extruder to be heated. The average deposition rate was 0.3 g/min and ranged from 0.2 to 0.4 g/min. This factor of two range existed because of the need for support, varying infill percentage, and geometric complexity of the print model.

4.3 Distributed Production Costs with Open-source 3-D Printing

The cost of HS RepRap, C_{RepRap} , is about US\$575 when purchasing parts in single printer quantities and the printed parts (shown in detail in Appendix A). This cost is low comparable with other in-home office equipment products, although it demands investment of approximately 24 hours for one person with modest technical competence to assemble once the BOM has been procured (see Appendix B). Commercial versions of fully-assembled open-source 3-D printers are available ranging from US\$2,199 from Trinity Labs [36], US\$1,725 from Aleph Objects [37], US\$1,400 from Type A Machines [38], and

Printbot LC for US\$799 [39]. Many other open-source 3-D printers are now on the market [40]. It should also be noted there are less sophisticated RepRap-like commercial products like the Printbot Jr for US\$399 with a significantly smaller build volume (4 inch³) [39]. These less expensive small 3-D printers can be used as 'RepStraps' to help manufacture the printed parts for a full scale RepRap. The RepRap parts can be printed in approximately 21 hours, but a print failure rate of 20% could lead to longer print times as detailed in Appendix B. These values from Appendix B will be used as the inputs in the LCEA below.

An economic evaluation is shown in Table 2 for all twenty products, including printing costs, high and low retail costs, and the percent change in the high and low cases. As can be seen in Table 2, there are substantial cost savings for distributed manufacturing over purchasing from online retailers. The total cost for printing the 20 selected products was about \$20 including energy and feedstock costs. On average the products cost less than one dollar a piece to print. In comparison, online retail costs ranged from of \$300 to \$1,900; averaging between \$15 and about \$100 per product. The average change yields savings over 2,500% when considering the low retail price and over 10,000% with the high retail choices. The largest savings (e.g. over 10,000%) were seen with individually customized products, such as the orthotic, while the smallest savings were observed with simple mass-produced items like shower curtain rings. However, even in the case of the shower curtain rings, where there was no option for a high-cost alternative, the savings remained at over 100% for distributed manufacturing. It should be pointed out here that for most products the higher-cost retail estimate is a more appropriate comparison for the RepRap printed product as those tend to have customized or intricate designs. There is also some evidence of a 'maker premium' where consumers assign a higher value to products that as they took part in fabricating [41]. The actual perceived value varies widely, however, as it is dependent on the individual consumer.

4.3.1 Electrical Energy Costs

As RepRaps have been shown to be more efficient than conventional manufacturing of polymer products [42], the energy consumption for the selected products was expected to be small as demonstrated in Table 1. As seen in Table 2, the total electrical cost for printing all twenty products was only 31 U.S. cents; it is inconsequential on a per-print basis. This holds true even in areas where energy prices are well above average (e.g. in the upper peninsula of Michigan, where electricity is roughly double the U.S. average). It can be assumed any energy price escalation observed over the life cycle of the RepRap would favor distributed manufacturing because of the reduced embodied energy of transportation.

This would not be the case with off-grid applications or in rural areas of developing countries. Energy in these contexts can be the largest component of the operating cost and research on reducing specific energy of parts produced is still needed. As the machine is completely DC powered at low voltage (12-24V) it is a good candidate for powering with solar photovoltaic technology. While the machines used in this study require a host PC to operate, other low cost, open-source solutions exist for making them stand-alone. The introduction of the Raspberry Pi [43] and a new generation of ARM microcontrollers [44,45] makes completely stand-alone web-enabled printers possible requiring less energy to operate while simultaneously expanding their feature set. This may expand the market interest beyond the U.S. into the developed world [14].

4.3.2 Polymer Filament Costs

Filament made up the bulk of operating costs at \$17.80 for the 20 products. It should be pointed out here that relatively common costs for filament were used (\$35/kg). Currently there is filament on the market for \$20-175/kg. There have been several efforts to create open-source RecycleBots [24, 46], which are plastic extrusion systems for fabricating RepRap feedstock. RecycleBots allow RepRap users to recycle bad prints and convert waste plastic into filament. There are versions for both the DIY enthusiasts (e.g. Lyman [47]) as well as the successful Filabot KickStarter project [48], which foreshadows eventual open market competition following the example of the RepRap itself, versions of which are sold by dozens of companies on the Internet. This RecycleBot technology essentially eliminates the plastic cost associated with failed prints and has the potential to significantly reduce filament cost by allowing for the substitution of waste containers (e.g. milk jugs or shampoo bottles) as feedstock. As this technology matures and begins to be deployed more widely there will be downward pressure on filament prices [24]. Both of these trends will be ignored in the analysis below in order to provide a conservative economic return on investment for distributed manufacturing.

4.4 Print Quality and Time Investment

The two primary concerns about the viability of wide-scale use of low-cost 3-D printing are 1) print quality and thus the suitability for market applications and 2) the ease of use, which encompasses time investment in learning the software and hardware associated with a RepRap.

The RepRap print quality can be seen for the spoon rest in Figure 5. This kitchen item was printed in PLA with 0.2mm step height, which is the current standard, although many open-source 3-D printers can already print

with 0.1mm step heights. The steps are visible and thus some printed products may not be perceived of as high-enough quality for some consumers. This perception is highly dependent on specific consumer preferences. Obviously for many parts and products that are not visible and meet the mechanical requirements of the application this is not an issue. For products where a specific aesthetic quality must be met there are several options of post processing 3-D prints. 3-D printed objects can be sanded and polished and painted to meet many consumer preferences. In addition, post-print chemical treatments have been developed. ABS prints can be smoothed with acetone (nail polish remover) either by direct brush application or via a vapor treatment. PLA, however, is the primary printing material of choice. PLA can be smoothed with a dip treatment in dichloromethane (CH_2Cl_2 , DCM). The results of such a treatment are shown in Figure 6, where the handle of the razor holder was dipped into DCM for 45 seconds and rinsed with water. It is clear from Figure 6, that the DCM smooths the surface and creates a coat to seal it as seen on the right against the unprocessed print on the left. Future work is needed to investigate the acceptability of 3-D printed products for the average consumer, particularly in light of the cost savings discussed in the next section.

The second common concern is the ease of use, which involves the barrier to adoption created by the need for users to invest their time to learn CAD and the operation of a RepRap. First, it should be pointed out that all of the products printed for this study were pre-designed and available on Thingiverse for free and thus involved no CAD skills to print. In addition, on-line applications are now available that enable users to customize designs without knowing CAD. Thus, there is no real investment necessary. However, it is anticipated, as will be discussed in section 4.6.4, that 3-D printer users will want to make that investment to create products for themselves that have not been designed by others. Similarly for the commercialized open-source 3-D printers the learning curve for printer maintenance and use is relatively shallow and actually less complicated than setting up a networked office color laser printer. The time investment in building a 3-D printer from parts, trouble shooting it, and working to develop it is substantial and will not be of interest to all consumers. However, for many individuals the RepRap can provide an access point into the innovative area of mechatronics. This can be viewed as a benefit rather than a cost as it is clear that having a greater percentage of the population knowledgeable about CAD and mechatronics and sharing their designs and experiences would benefit the mechatronics community as a whole by providing more knowledgeable students and employees. The cost in the time to make the 3-D prints themselves is small as users can do other activities (e.g. read, watch tv, exercise, etc.) while products are manufactured.

4.5 Avoided Costs, Payback Times, and ROI of Distributed Manufacturing

As can be seen in Table 2 the total avoided costs for the low and high retail estimates are about \$290 and \$1,920 (including a 20% failed print rate) and inputting these values into equation 3 gives simple payback times of less than 2 years to about 4 months. These payback times are based on the extremely conservative premise that only 20 items are printed per year and that printing is evenly distributed throughout the year despite the fact it could be accomplished in little over 1 day. Again using equation 3 the simple payback times assuming only 20 products printed per year for even the most expensive commercial open-source 3-D printers are less than 1 year or 6 years for the low and high retail prices, respectively. The payback times for the RepRap can then be inserted into equation 5, to provide ROIs, but demand an estimated lifetime. This is less straight forward than with most capital manufacturing equipment as the components that are most likely to wear out in the RepRap are easily replaced by the self-replicating nature of the 3-D printer. In addition, the RepRap design continues to improve and evolve usually through the refinement of printed parts – so it is similar to an upgradeable computer in that lifetime can be extended. Although, this self-upgrade-ability and maintenance could indicate an infinite lifetime, if three year and five year lifetimes are chosen as illustrations, the ROI for the RepRap shown in Figure 1 compared to low retail costs is over 20% and 40% respectively. For the high retail costs the RepRap ROI >200%. These RepRap ROIs are clearly extremely conservative as they assume that the users do not print out more than 20 products (as listed in Table 2) per year. As these products can be printed in under less than 25 hours, any owner could print them in less than a week even if printing was restricted to after working hours. The products analyzed here represent less than 0.02% of an exponentially expanding catalog, so it is safe to assume the typical household would print far more than 20 fabricated products per year. These RepRap ROIs compare extremely favorably to after tax income from other investments (e.g. savings accounts ~0%, ~2% certificate of deposit, or ~4% on the stock market, adjusted for inflation) [35]. RepRaps and distributed manufacturing thus offers a much better investment opportunity than standard manufacturing practices as the inflation adjusted before tax internal rate of return for companies is about 10%, after corporate income taxes 7%, and after investors pay capital gains taxes, about 4% [49]. The RepRap can be regarded as an extremely conservative investment opportunity that has significantly higher returns than most investment opportunities with similar risks. This investment is limited, however, to only the relatively modest cost of a single RepRap for a U.S. household.

4.6 Implications of Results

The potential implications of these results are i) expected rapid growth of distributed manufacturing using open-source 3-D printing, ii) large-scale adoption and shifts to life-cycle thinking in consumption, iii) growth of localized cottage industries, and iv) a revitalization of hands-on engineering based education.

4.6.1 Rapid Growth

It is clear from these results that the economic benefit and the open-source nature of the RepRap project is driving rapid growth. This is verified by the rapid growth of open-source 3-D designs shown in Figure 2, which can be assumed to be due to more 3-D printer users making designs for themselves and sharing them following the open-source paradigm. This trend is likely to continue as the majority of the Thingiverse community up until this time has been using OpenSCAD [50]. OpenSCAD is an open-source, script-based computer aided design application, which allows users to describe the geometric specifications of the required object by using three primitive shapes (cylinder, sphere and cube) and complex polygons using polygon, polyline and the 2D-3D extrusion commands. OpenSCAD allows for parametric designs; the ability to alter a design by changing parameters of the describing geometry. This allows changes to be made to the design easily and quickly by simply adjusting the value of user-defined variables. Although extremely powerful, CAD scripting in OpenSCAD is clearly beyond the technical comfort level of the average U.S. consumer and as of this writing the vast majority of the designs on Thingiverse are from hackers/makers with considerably higher-comfort levels with technology than average consumers. Thingiverse, however, has recently introduced a Customizer App that acts as a front end for OpenSCAD code to enable inexperienced users to customize designs interactively (e.g. with the use of sliders on parametric variables). This development makes customizing open-source CAD designs accessible to the average consumer. This significantly expands the number of participating designers. There is already some evidence of this effect seen in Figure 2, in the sudden rise in the number of designs putting the total back on the exponential growth curve. It should be noted that the newly instituted default customizer saves any customization as a new design and thus the method of design counting used in this article will lose some utility in the future. As this App opens up design to more people, the number of open-source designers is assumed to increase along with those who begin using 3-D printers. This will provide even more designs of steadily increasing complexity and value, as users make designs relevant to their lives expands. This will create a positive feedback loop, increasing the value of owning a 3-D printer

beyond the threshold of the purchase price. For many consumers the existing catalog of open-source designs already has crossed this threshold as the market for 3-D printers is expanding rapidly [51].

For many consumers the ROI of a RepRap will steadily increase as more designs are made as indicated by the results. Similar to the situation in scientific labs, which can justify the cost of a RepRap by customizing and printing a single piece of scientific equipment [26,52], for some U.S. households with high-value custom needs the printer pays for itself within a day of printing. For example, although custom orthotics can be purchased on the Internet for about \$100, those provided by a professional are normally \$500-\$800 and presumably of higher quality and value to the consumer. These high costs are normally prohibitive for those wishing more than one pair of orthotics, but with the design for thing: 46922, which uses the Thingiverse customizer, it is possible to print as many as you like for less than 1% of the cost. In addition, open-source [53,54] or free [55-57] image processing and 3-D scanning tools make possible replication of a professionally customized orthotic by direct creation of a 3-D mesh that is then suitable for printing as many as desired. This enables consumers to print \$500-800 quality orthotics for ~\$2 as long as they have one existing pair. Such opportunities for consumers would also be expected to increase the growth rate.

4.6.2 Mainstream Adoption and Shifts in Consumption

If distributed manufacturing with open-source 3-D printing becomes common, there will be a steadily increasing number of products printed by consumers that would otherwise have been retail purchases. This will create a slow shift to hyper-localized manufacturing, at least for some classes of product. However, it may also create a fundamental and more subtle shift in the nature of consumption in the overall economy.

For some time now the trend in consumer goods has been towards lower cost, often disposable over the more expensive durable consumer goods [58]. Consider the case of shaving. Most American men who shave buy disposable razors or disposable razor cartridges that fit into reusable handles because the initial cost is much lower than more robust product options (e.g. a safety razor, for example, costs US\$20-80 online). This initial startup cost prevents consumers from using the more economical (over the life cycle) choice. Now that there is an open-source safety razor design available for free download (thing:43568), which costs about 36 U.S. cents to print, the barrier to entry has been eliminated for everyone with a 3-D printer. A 10 pack of double edge safety-razor blades cost about US\$5 (28 cents per blade) on Amazon. If it is assumed that an average user consumes one double blade every two weeks the blade costs for open-source safety razor shaving is about US\$7/year. To put this in

perspective, the cost of shaving using drugstore blades or cartridges is between US\$100 and US\$300/year [59,60]. Assuming the average man shaves for about 65 years, using the printed razor and only replacing the metal blades would result in a net savings of between US\$6,500 and US\$19,000 over a lifetime. Similar opportunities exist for a large number of currently disposable products, whose designs may not have yet been put in the public domain, but can be expected in the near future. By shifting to distributed manufacturing in this way, consumer spending could be reduced significantly.

4.6.3 Open-Source Cottage Industry

It is not clear that every consumer will need or want a 3-D printer when there is the option to print custom products at competitive or lower prices. Already several Internet-based 3-D print shops [61-63] produce items as-ordered and can print a number of different materials including metal, ceramic and plastic. 3-D print shops could also be more localized similar to local bakeries. The open-source RepRap printer is well suited for cottage industry, potentially filling local niche markets [41].

A completely new inventory paradigm is introduced to micro-scale manufacturers who utilize this technology: the carrying cost for maintaining high value inventory is eliminated. As demonstrated by this analysis, the technology places one-off items that historically carry high prices well within reach of the average citizen. Micro-scale manufacturers need only inventory low-value, low-cost printer feedstock, reducing both direct and operating costs. Instead of insuring and protecting expensive inventory, micro-manufacturers produce on a per-order basis and can offer a variety of products heretofore unheard of.

4.6.4 Education

The widespread use of distributed manufacturing with RepRaps may also have a positive educational benefit and is in line with current pedagogical trends [64]. The educational value of building and then using a RepRap type 3-D printer can be considerable, encompassing, for example, CAD/CAM, mechanical engineering, electronics, and materials science. Most obviously widespread use of RepRaps will be an enormous benefit for pre-training students in mechatronics. Students can work to develop their fundamental mechatronics skills while servicing their RepRaps. In addition, students can create their own designs, print them and share them as open-source models on Thingiverse. The open-source 3-D printer compliments the Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS)[65], which are currently in the final revision phase and scheduled to be completed in early summer 2013. These new standards are slated for adoption in many states throughout the U.S. and have a primary focus on process rather than content and contain significant emphasis on science and engineering

practices. The open-source 3-D printers can provide an opportunity to engage in these practices with a “hands on” and “minds on” approach. For example, the NGSS calls for students to learn about three phases of solving problems in the realm of Engineering Design, all of which can be accomplished *physically* with a RepRap: 1) defining the problem, 2) designing solutions and 3) optimizing design solutions. In addition, schools can simply reduce costs by fabricating learning aids in house such as chemistry models, physics bench equipment, or mechanical devices for class-room demonstrations. Already a printable collection of open-source optics components has been created, which can save schools money by printing in house [66]. More complex creations such as open-source colorimeters, automated filter wheels, and other analysis equipment have been designed and are available as open source hardware [52]. By working in teams to create these things, students will play an unprecedented role in their own education as well the education of others.

4.7 Limitations and Future Work

This study had several limitations including a limited number of products analyzed; 20. Although this study did not take into account detailed financial variables such as i) energy cost escalation rates, ii) inflation, iii) discount factors, iv) loan rates/capital costs, or v) opportunity costs, the nature of the investment analyzed and the method of U.S. consumer decision making enables the use of the simple payback and simple ROI. For many individuals the effort needed to make their own products may not be worth the time involved even if only a fraction of print time is active user time. Although this study quantified the time it was not used in the LCEA as there is extreme variability due to individual perception of opportunity costs across the U.S. population. In addition, rarely do individuals make this calculation with 2-D printing as it is actually more effort and time consuming to employ commercial printers to print a document.

In this study only a single printing material (PLA) was used. The cost of using other printing materials such as ABS and waste/recycled plastic can also be investigated in future work. There are already a number of RepRap compatible designs that vastly expand the materials catalog of print media, including versions of paste extruders [67], which can be used with many viscous materials [68], a spoolhead extruder to print metal wire onto plastic, which in the future can be used to print circuit boards [29], and a granule extruder including a method to create the granules [69,70]. The classic RepRap design is also attractive for repurposing for uses beyond additive manufacturing. Lightweight CNC milling of printed circuit boards (PCB) using a RepRap fitted with a light duty cutter has been demonstrated [71] and others have fit RepRaps with pens and solid state lasers for PCB making. A full LCEA is needed for each of these material possibilities and

B.T. Wittbrodt, A.G. Glover, J. Laureto, G.C. Anzalone, D. Oppliger, J.L. Irwin, J.M. Pearce (2013), Life-cycle economic analysis of distributed manufacturing with open-source 3-D printers, *Mechatronics*, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.mechatronics.2013.06.002>

alternative designs as one of them may further expand the economic utility of open-source 3-D printing for the consumer.

5. Conclusions

The results of this LCEA study of the open-source RepRap 3-D printer show that even making extremely conservative assumptions, the average U.S. household would save hundreds to thousands of dollars per year in avoided purchases by printing commercial products in their own homes. Only about one day of printing is necessary to fabricate the group of twenty open-source printable designs selected for this study, which represent less than 0.02% of those currently available on a single design repository. If it is assumed this printing is evenly distributed throughout the year these savings provide a simple payback time for the RepRap of 4 months to 2 years and provide an ROI between >20% and >200% when compared to high and low retail costs, respectively. The results show that the RepRap is already an economically attractive investment for the average U.S. household. It appears clear that as RepRaps improve in reliability, continue to drop in cost and the number and assumed utility of open-source designs continue growing exponentially, open-source 3-D printers will become a mass-market mechatronic device.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to acknowledge helpful discussions with members of the open-source hardware community and support from the McArthur Research Internship and Michigan Tech School of Technology.

References

[1] M. Glesner, A. Kirschbaum, F.-M. Renner, B. Voss, State-of-the-art in rapid prototyping for mechatronic systems. *Mechatronics* 12 (2002) 987–998.

[2] E. Toyserkani, A. Khajepour, A mechatronics approach to laser powder deposition process. *Mechatronics* 16, (2006) 631–641.

[3] A. Gebhardt, *Rapid Prototyping*. Hanser-Gardner, 2003. (3rd German Edition: Hanser, 2007).

[4] A. Gebhardt, F. Schmidt, J. Hotter, W. Sokalla, P. Sokalla, Additive Manufacturing by selective laser melting the realizer desktop machine and its application for the dental industry. *Physics Procedia* 5, Part B, (2010) 543–549.

[5] N. Crane, J. Tuckerman, G. N. Nielson, Self-assembly in additive manufacturing: opportunities and obstacles,

Rapid Prototyping Journal 17, 3(2011) 211–217.

[6] V. Petrovic, J. V. H. Gonzalez, O. J. Ferrando, J. D. Gordillo, J. R. B. Puchades, L. P. Grinan, Additive layered manufacturing: sectors of industrial application shown through case studies, *Int. J. of Production Research* 49,4(2011)1061–1079.

[7] S. Upcraft, R. Fletcher, *The Rapid Prototyping Technologies*, *Assembly Automation* 23 (2012) 318-330.

[8] H. Lipson, M. Kurman, *Fabricated: The New World of 3D Printing*. Wiley, Indianapolis, In. 2013.

[9] *The Economist*, A third industrial revolution: Special report: Manufacturing and innovation, *The Economist* (2012).

[10] N. Gershenfeld, *Fab: The Coming Revolution on Your Desktop – from Personal Computers to Personal Fabrication*, Basic Books, New York, 2005.

[11] R. Jones, P. Haufe, E. Sells, RepRap - the Replicating Rapid Prototyper, *Robotica* 29, 1(2011) 177–191.

[12] Corney, J. The next and last industrial revolution?, *Assembly Automation* 25, 4(2005) 257.

[13] E. Malone, H. Lipson, *Fab@Home: The Personal Desktop Fabricator Kit*, *Rapid Prototyping Journal* 13, 4(2007) 245–255.

[14] J. Pearce, C. Blair, K. J. Laciak, R. Andrews, A. Nosrat, 3-D Printing of Open Source Appropriate Technologies for Self-Directed Sustainable Development, *Journal of Sustainable Development* 3, 4,(2010) 17–29.

[15] S. Bradshaw, A. Bowyer, P. Haufe, The intellectual property implications of low-cost 3D printing, *SCRIPTed* 7, 1(2010) 1–27.

[16] D. Holland, G. O'Donnell, G. Bennett, Open Design and the Reprap Project, presented at the 27th International Manufacturing Conference (2010).

[17] M. Weinberg, IT WILL BE AWESOME IF THEY DON'T SCREW IT UP (2010). . [Online]. Available: <http://nlc1.nlc.state.ne.us/epubs/creativecommons/3DPrintingPaperPublicKnowledge.pdf> [Accessed: 25-Feb-2013].

[18] J. Cano, The Cambrian explosion of popular 3D printing, *International Journal of Artificial Intelligence and Interactive Multimedia* 1, 4(2011) 30–32.

B.T. Wittbrodt, A.G. Glover, J. Laureto, G.C. Anzalone, D. Oppliger, J.L. Irwin, J.M. Pearce (2013), Life-cycle economic analysis of distributed manufacturing with open-source 3-D printers, *Mechatronics*, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.mechatronics.2013.06.002>

- [19] E. Sells, S. Bailard, Z. Smith, A. Bowyer, Reprap: the replicating rapid prototype: maximizing customizability by breeding the means of production, in F. T. Piller, M. M. Tseng (Eds.), *Handbook of Research in Mass Customization and Personalization: Strategies and concepts*. Vol. 1. World Scientific, 2010, pp. 568-580.
- [20] R. Arnott, The Reprap project - open source meets 3D printing, *Computer and Information Science Seminar Series* (2008).
- [21] Arduino. [Online]. Available: <http://www.arduino.cc/>. [Accessed: 25-Feb-2013].
- [22] J. Kentzer, B. Koch, M. Thiim, R. W. Jones, E. Villumsen, An Open Source Hardware-based Mechatronics Project: The Replicating Rapid 3-D Printer, presented at the 4th International Conference on Mechatronics (2011) 1–8.
- [23] J. Gonzalez-Gomez, A. Valero-Gomez, A. Prieto-Moreno, M. Abderrahim, A new open source 3D-Printable mobile robotic platform for education, in: *Advances in Autonomous Mini Robots*, University of Bielefeld, Germany, 2012, pp. 49–62.
- [24] C. Baechler, M. DeVuono, J. M. Pearce, Distributed recycling of waste polymer into reprap feedstock, *Rapid Prototyping Journal*, 19, 2(2013) 118-125.
- [25] N. Grujovic, M. Radovic, V. Kanjevac, J. Borota, G. Grujovic, D. Divac, 3D printing technology in education environment, presented at the 34th International Conference on Production Engineering (2011).
- [26] J. M. Pearce, Building Research Equipment with Free, Open-Source Hardware, *Science* 337, 6100 (2012) 1303–1304.
- [27] M. Symes, P. J. Kitson, J. Yan, C. J. Richmond, G. J. T. Cooper, Integrated 3D-printed reactionware for chemical synthesis and analysis, *Nature Chemistry* 4, 5(2012) 349–54.
- [28] S. J. Leigh, R. J. Bradley, C. P. Purcell, D. R. Billson, A Simple, Low-Cost Conductive Composite Material for 3D Printing of Electronic Sensors, *PLoS ONE* 7, 1(2012).
- [29] J. Bayless, M. Chen, and B. Dai, Wire Embedding 3D Printer, Engineering Physics Department, University of British Columbia (2010).
- [30] V. L. Tsang, S.N. Bhatia, Three-dimensional tissue fabrication. *Adv. Drug Delivery Reviews* 56 (2004) 1635–1647.
- [31] Thingiverse - Digital Designs for Physical Objects, Thingiverse. [Online]. Available: <http://www.thingiverse.com/>. [Accessed: 9-Jun-2013].
- [32] U.S Energy Information Administration, Table 5.6.A Average Retail Price of Electricity to Ultimate Customers by End Use Sector, EIA-Electricity Data. [Online]. Available: http://www.eia.gov/electricity/monthly/epm_table_grapher.cfm?t=epmt_5_06_a. [Accessed: 25-Feb-2013].
- [33] Printing Material Suppliers, RepRapWiki. [Online]. Available: http://reprap.org/wiki/Printing_Material_Suppliers. [Accessed: 25-Feb-2013].
- [34] Cura. [Online]. Available: <http://daid.github.com/Cura/>. [Accessed: 25-Feb-2013].
- [35] J. M. Pearce, D. Dekenberger, H. Zielonka, Accelerating Applied Sustainability by Utilizing Return on Investment for Energy Conservation Measures, *Int. J. of Energy, Env. and Economics* 17, 1(2009) 61–80.
- [36] TrinityLab, Aluminatus TrinityOne 3d Printer, TrinityLab. [Online]. Available: <http://trinitylabs.com/products/aluminatus-trinityone-3d-printer>. [Accessed: 25-Feb-2013].
- [37] LulzBot, AO-101 3D Printer, LulzBot. [Online]. Available: <http://www.lulzbot.com/?q=products/ao-101-3d-printer>. [Accessed: 25-Feb-2013].
- [38] Type A Machines, Series 1 3D Printers, Type A Machines. [Online]. Available: <http://www.typeamachines.com/cart>. [Accessed: 6-Jun-2013].
- [39] Printrbot, Printrbot Kits [Online]. Available: <http://printrbot.com/product-category/printrbot-kits/> [Accessed: 25-Feb-2013].
- [40] 3Ders, Price Compare – 3d Printers [Online]. Available: <http://www.3ders.org/pricecompare/3dprinters/> [Accessed: 25-Feb-2013].
- [41] C. Anderson, *Makers: The New Industrial Revolution*. Crown Business. New York, 2012.
- [42] M.A. Kreiger, J.M. Pearce, Environmental Impacts of Distributed Manufacturing from 3-D Printing of Polymer Components and Products, *MRS Online Proceedings* (2013) 1492, mrsf12-1492-g01-02.

B.T. Wittbrodt, A.G. Glover, J. Laureto, G.C. Anzalone, D. Oppliger, J.L. Irwin, J.M. Pearce (2013), Life-cycle economic analysis of distributed manufacturing with open-source 3-D printers, *Mechatronics*, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.mechatronics.2013.06.002>

[43] Raspberry Pi. [Online]. Available: <http://www.raspberrypi.org/>. [Accessed: 25-Feb-2013].

[44] BeagleBoard-bone, BeagleBoard. [Online]. Available: <http://beagleboard.org/bone>. [Accessed: 25-Feb-2013].

[45] Arduino, ArduinoBoardDue. [Online]. Available: <http://arduino.cc/en/Main/ArduinoBoardDue>. [Accessed: 25-Feb-2013].

[46] M. Kreiger, G. C. Anzalone, M. L. Mulder, A. Glover, J. M Pearce. Distributed Recycling of Post-Consumer Plastic Waste in Rural Areas. MRS Online Proceedings Library, 1492, mrsf12-1492-g04-06 (2013).

[47] H. Lyman, Lyman Filament Extruder. [Online]. Available: <http://www.thingiverse.com/thing:30642> [Accessed: 25-Feb-2013].

[48] T. McNaney, Filabot: Plastic Filament Maker. [Online]. Available: <http://www.kickstarter.com/projects/rocknail/filabot-plastic-filament-maker> [Accessed: 25-Feb-2013].

[49] R. Newell, W. Pizer. Discounting the benefits of climate change mitigation: How much do uncertain rates increase valuation? Economic Technical Series, Pew center on Global Climate Change: Arlington VA. 2001.

[50] OpenSCAD, OpenSCAD - The Programmers Solid 3D CAD Modeller, [Online]. Available: <http://www.openscad.org/>. [Accessed: 25-Feb-2013]

[51] Make. The Ultimate Guide to 3D Printing. O' Reilly, Sebastopol, CA, 2013.

[52] G.C. Anzalone, A.G. Glover, J.M. Pearce, Open-Source Colorimeter. *Sensors* 13(4) (2013) 5338-5346.

[53] ReconstructMe, Reconstruct your world with ReconstructMe. [Online]. Available: <http://reconstructme.net/>. [Accessed: 25-Feb-2013].

[54] MakerScanner - Open Source 3D Scanning. [Online]. Available: <http://www.makerscanner.com/>. [Accessed: 25-Feb-2013].

[55] Autodesk 123D - 123D Catch turn photos into 3D models.[Online]. Available: <http://www.123dapp.com/catch>. [Accessed: 25-Feb-2013].

[56] DAVID 3D Scanner. [Online]. Available: <http://www.david-laserscanner.com/>. [Accessed: 25-Feb-2013].

[57] About My3DScanner. [Online]. Available: <http://my3dscanner.com/>. [Accessed: 25-Feb-2013].

[58] L. Claudio, Waste Cature: Environment Impact of the Clothing Industry, *Environ. Health Perspect.* 115, 9(2007) 449–454.

[59] Antonio, Save \$300 – Learn to Shave Like a Man, Real Men Real Style. [Online]. Available: <http://www.realmenrealstyle.com/learn-to-shave-like-man/>. [Accessed: 25-Feb-2013].

[60] S. Cendrowski, How long does a razor really last? Gillette comes clean, *Fortune*, 2012.

[61] T. Redlich, J. P. Wulfsberg, and F. L. Bruhns, Virtual Factory for Customized Open Production, presented at the 15th International Product Development Management Conference, Tagungsband (2008).

[62] Shapeways, Shapeways - Make & Share Your Products with 3D Printing. [Online]. Available: <http://www.shapeways.com/>. [Accessed: 25-Feb-2013].

[63] Ponoko, 3D printing, laser cutting – design, make & build your own products with Ponoko. [Online]. Available: <https://www.ponoko.com/>. [Accessed: 25-Feb-2013].

[64] J. Gumbrecht. The high-tech return of high school shop class. *Schools of Thought Blog*, CNN. [Online]. Available: http://schoolsofthought.blogs.cnn.com/2013/02/28/the-high-tech-return-of-high-school-shop-class/?hpt=hp_bn1 [Accessed: 28-Feb-2013].

[65] Next Generation Science Standards. [Online]. Available: <http://www.nextgenscience.org/>. [Accessed: 25-Feb-2013].

[66] C. Zhang, N. C. Anzalone, R. P. Faria, J.M. Pearce, Open-Source 3D-Printable Optics Equipment, *PLoS One* 8(3) (2013) e59840.

[67] Caulk extruder, Thingiverse. [Online]. Available: <http://www.thingiverse.com/thing:39954>. [Accessed: 25-Feb-2013].

[68] A. Mann, Feeding the Final Frontier: 3-D Printers Could Make Astronaut Meals, *Wired Science* (2013). [Online]. Available: <http://www.wired.com/wiredscience/2013/02/3-d-food-printer-space/>. [Accessed: 25-Feb-2013].

[69] G. B. Braanker, J. E. . Duwel, J. J. Flohil, G. E.

B.T. Wittbrodt, A.G. Glover, J. Laureto, G.C. Anzalone, D. Oppliger, J.L. Irwin, J.M. Pearce (2013), Life-cycle economic analysis of distributed manufacturing with open-source 3-D printers, *Mechatronics*, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.mechatronics.2013.06.002>

Tokaya, Developing a plastics recycling add-on for the RepRap 3D printer, Delft University of Technology, Prototyping Lab.

[70] A. Tan, T. Nixon, Rapid prototype manufacturing system, School of Mechanical Engineering, The University of Adelaide, Australia, 2007.

[71] Milling and Drilling Head, RepRapWiki. [Online]. Available: http://reprap.org/wiki/Milling_and_Drilling_Head. [Accessed: 25-Feb-2013].

Figures




Figure 1. A new variant of the Prusa Mendell RepRap and open-source 3-D printer capable of fabricating about half of its own parts. In the picture all the translucent blue parts were printed on an identical mechatronic machine.




Figure 2. The approximate number of open-source designs on Thingiverse, which can be printed on an open-source 3-D printer, as a function of date.




Figure 3. Electrical energy consumption in kilowatt-hours as a function of mass in grams of filament deposited including support material.




Figure 4. Electrical energy consumption in kilowatt-hours as a function of printing time in minutes.

B.T. Wittbrodt, A.G. Glover, J. Laureto, G.C. Anzalone, D. Oppliger, J.L. Irwin, J.M. Pearce (2013), Life-cycle economic analysis of distributed manufacturing with open-source 3-D printers, *Mechatronics*, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.mechatronics.2013.06.002>



Figure 5. Example of RepRap print quality - close-up photograph of the spoon rest.

B.T. Wittbrodt, A.G. Glover, J. Laureto, G.C. Anzalone, D. Oppliger, J.L. Irwin, J.M. Pearce (2013), Life-cycle economic analysis of distributed manufacturing with open-source 3-D printers, *Mechatronics*, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.mechatronics.2013.06.002>




Figure 6. The results of post-print processing using dip smoothing of PLA with dichloromethane (right) compared to unprocessed print showing 0.2 mm step heights (left).

Table 1. Selected open-source designs that are printable on a RepRap with both Cura slicing simulations and experimentally measured values of energy, mass and print time.

Product	Thing:	Cura Slicing Simulation Estimates						Experimentally Measured Values					
		Meters	Mass (g)	Infill	Layer height (mm)	Nozzle diameter (mm)	Estimated Print Time	Actual Print Time	Time (min.)	kWh	Mass (g)	kWh/g	kWh/hr
iPhone 5 dock	33338	5.87	53.2	0.5	0.25	0.5	1:35:00	2:04:30	124.50	0.28	46.2	0.0061	0.1349
iPhone 4 dock	6931	2.65	24.02	0.3	0.25	0.5	0:45:15	0:56:26	56.43	0.1	19.5	0.0051	0.1063
iPhone 5 case	43279	1.05	9.51	1	0.2	0.5	0:23:00	0:33:27	33.45	0.04	7.5	0.0053	0.0717
Jewelry Organizer	45003	2.8	25.39	0.1	0.25	0.5	0:48:00	0:58:30	58.50	0.08	19.63	0.0041	0.0821
Garlic Press	38854	6.24	56.54	1	0.25	0.5	1:38:00	2:09:47	129.78	0.26	45.01	0.0058	0.1202
Caliper	48413	0.92	8.38	0.25	0.2	0.5	0:17:00	0:22:22	22.37	0.05	6.37	0.0078	0.1341
Wall Plate	47956	2.16	19.59	0.2	0.2	0.5	0:41:00	0:46:15	46.25	0.07	15.7	0.0045	0.0908
Shower Curtain Ring x12	42667	4.72	42.68	0.1	0.25	0.5	1:28:00	1:44:36	104.60	0.24	33.6	0.0071	0.1377
Shower Head	40903	10.01	90.72	0.5	0.25	0.5	2:16:00	2:48:04	168.07	0.27	71.32	0.0038	0.0964
Key Hanger (3 hooks)	44482	2.41	21.85	0.1	0.25	0.5	0:47:00	0:54:21	54.35	0.08	17.03	0.0047	0.0883
iPad Stand	46887	2.11	17.99	0.1	0.2	0.5	0:53:00	0:51:20	51.33	0.1	11.24	0.0089	0.1169
Orthotic	47208	5.48	49.01	1	0.25	0.5	1:35:00	1:29:58	89.97	0.13	39.08	0.0033	0.0867
Safety Razor	43568	1.79	15.22	0.1	0.25	0.5	0:52:00	0:44:37	44.62	0.09	9.9	0.0091	0.1210
Pickup	38220	5.31	45.28	0.3	0.25	0.5	1:39:00	1:59:21	119.35	0.19	39.31	0.0048	0.0955
Train Track Toy	47528	1.75	14.94	0.1	0.25	0.5	0:44:00	0:27:22	27.37	0.06	11.27	0.0053	0.1315
Nano Watchband (5 links)	44761	1.37	12.47	0.1	0.2	0.5	0:20:00	0:32:49	32.82	0.05	9.15	0.0055	0.0914
iPhone Tripod	47944	1.82	16.47	0.1	0.25	0.5	0:36:00	0:44:44	44.73	0.08	12.88	0.0062	0.1073
Paper Towel Holder	44068	9.47	85.84	0.25	0.25	0.5	2:48:00	3:24:05	204.08	0.31	63.44	0.0049	0.0911
Pierogi mold	17545	2.63	23.86	0.15	0.25	0.5	0:39:00	0:50:00	50.00	0.07	18.9	0.0037	0.0840
Spoon holder	22000	1.6	14.5	0.1	0.25	0.5	0:30:00	0:35:24	35.40	0.06	11.6	0.0052	0.1017
Totals		72.16	647.46				21:14:15	24:57:58	1497.96	2.61	508.63		
Averages												0.0056	0.1045

Table 2. Components and total economic costs for selected open-source designs that are printable on a RepRap compared to high and low retail costs.

Product	Thing:	Mass (g)	kWh	Cost of Plastic	Cost of Electricity	Total RepRap Cost	Total Retail Cost Low	Total Retail Cost High	Percent Change Low	Percent Change High
iPhone 5 dock	33338	46.2	0.28	\$1.62	\$0.03	\$1.65	3.56	\$29.99	-116	-1,718
iPhone 4 dock	6931	19.5	0.1	\$0.68	\$0.01	\$0.69	\$16.99	\$39.99	-2,347	-5,660
iPhone 5 case (custom)	43279	7.5	0.04	\$0.26	\$0.00	\$0.27	\$20.00	\$56.00	-7,385	-20,858
Jewelry Organizer	45003	19.63	0.08	\$0.69	\$0.01	\$0.70	\$9.00	\$104.48	-1,192	-14,902
Garlic Press	38854	45.01	0.26	\$1.58	\$0.03	\$1.61	\$5.22	\$10.25	-225	-538
Caliper	48413	6.37	0.05	\$0.22	\$0.01	\$0.23	\$6.08	\$7.88	-2,557	-3,344
Wall Plate	47956	15.7	0.07	\$0.55	\$0.01	\$0.56	\$2.30	\$22.07	-312	-3,857
Shower Curtain Ring x12	42667	33.6	0.24	\$1.18	\$0.03	\$1.20	\$2.99	2.99	-148	-148
Shower Head	40903	71.32	0.27	\$2.50	\$0.03	\$2.53	\$7.87	\$437.22	-211	-17,196
Key Hanger (3 hooks)	44482	17.03	0.08	\$0.60	\$0.01	\$0.61	\$6.98	\$49.10	-1,053	-8,010
iPad Stand	46887	11.24	0.1	\$0.39	\$0.01	\$0.41	\$16.99	\$49.00	-4,094	-11,995
Orthotic	47208	39.08	0.13	\$1.37	\$0.02	\$1.38	\$99.00	\$800.00	-7,058	-57,743
Safety Razor	43568	9.9	0.09	\$0.35	\$0.01	\$0.36	\$17.00	\$78.00	-4,661	-21,745
Pickup	38220	39.31	0.19	\$1.38	\$0.02	\$1.40	\$9.99	\$22.99	-615	-1,544
Train Track Toy	47528	11.27	0.06	\$0.39	\$0.01	\$0.40	\$39.48	\$58.98	-9,733	-14,590
Nano Watchband (5 links)	44761	9.15	0.05	\$0.32	\$0.01	\$0.33	\$16.98	\$79.95	-5,107	-24,416
iPhone Tripod	47944	12.88	0.08	\$0.45	\$0.01	\$0.46	\$8.50	\$29.95	-1,747	-6,408
Paper Towel Holder	44068	63.44	0.31	\$2.22	\$0.04	\$2.26	\$11.20	\$25.00	-396	-1,008
Pierogi mold	17545	18.9	0.07	\$0.66	\$0.01	\$0.67	\$6.95	\$24.99	-938	-3,631
Spoon holder	22000	11.6	0.06	\$0.41	\$0.01	\$0.41	\$4.95	\$15.00	-1,098	-3,532

B.T. Wittbrodt, A.G. Glover, J. Laureto, G.C. Anzalone, D. Oppliger, J.L. Irwin, J.M. Pearce (2013), Life-cycle economic analysis of distributed manufacturing with open-source 3-D printers, *Mechatronics*, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.mechatronics.2013.06.002>

Appendices

Please see article for appendices: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.mechatronics.2013.06.002>

An updated build instructions and BOM can be found here:

http://www.appropedia.org/MOST_RepRap_parallel_build_overview

Appendix A. Printer Bill of Materials (BOM)

Appendix B. RepRap Part Printing Times