

Is it the same as other manufacturer's high frequency or AE type measurements?

This is a common initial question when we go into a company who have had either demonstrations or previous experience of such equipment which is different from the more familiar vibration techniques. We can categorically state that our technology is both unique and distinct from all such other instruments on the market and because of this we have never sought to associate the capabilities of our approach with that of any other such instrument.

When you see the MHC in use the first thing that will strike you as being different is the way that you just switch the MHC on and the Distress measurement gives an instant assessment of condition without the need to input machine specific information such as shaft speed and bearing details in order for it to do its analysis properly. This means that the MHC is more direct, far less prone to being misapplied (eg where you're not sure of the speed or the internal construction) and more appropriate for applying to complex machinery (such as gearboxes) where there are many bearings and gears in close proximity.

Another very important aspect from a practical viewpoint is that measurements with some technologies are well documented to be critically dependent upon the positioning and orientation of the sensor with respect to the plane of the bearing and the loaded zone. For such methods sensitivity to faults and consistency of measurements can only be achieved if great care is taken. By contrast our unique implementation of the AE method makes measurements very insensitive to the precise position and orientation of the AE sensor.

But you don't have to take our word for it why not compare one of our MHC products with any other CM instrument on the market and see for yourself which is the easiest, quickest and most effective for you.