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"The State-of-the-art in PHM as Applied to Aerospace Applications"

Aerospace applications present one of the most suitable candidates for reaping the benefits of mature PHM technologies. In the past several years number of PHM publications have grown significantly yet, there are very few successful industrial applications are reported. This paper first attempts a critical review of approaches presented in papers published in the last decade and then analyzes needs, challenges, and opportunities as the research field marches ahead.
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