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ABSTRACT

The laser powder bed fusion (LPBF) process is strongly influenced by the characteristics of the powder layer, including its thickness and thermal transport properties. This paper investigates in-situ characterization of the powder layer using thermographic inspection. A thermal camera monitors the temperature history of the powder surface immediately after a layer of new powder is deposited by the recoating system. During this process, thermal energy diffuses from the underlying solid part, eventually raising the temperature of the above powder layer. Guided by 1D modeling of this heat-up process, experiments show how the parameterized thermal history can be correlated with powder layer thickness and its thermal conductivity. A neural network, based on the parameterized thermal history, further improves the correlation after training. It is used to predict the part distortion for an unsupported structure. This method detects serious part distortion several layers before the part breaks through the powder layer and interacts with the recoater. This approach can be automated to prevent catastrophic recoater crashes or abrasion of soft wipers and has the potential to monitor local properties of the powder layer in-situ.

1. Introduction

The process dynamics of laser powder bed fusion (LPBF) have received considerable study. In particular, both experimental and computational studies have shown how the process parameters, e.g. laser power and scan speed, affect the local properties of the part, e.g. porosity. In-situ diagnostics have also focused on monitoring the melt pool and several research groups have shown significant correlations between radiative signatures and the local part quality. While it has not received as much attention, the properties of the powder layer, particularly the thickness, also has a significant influence on the local melt pool and overall properties of the part. In general, a thicker powder layer increases the production rate but can lead to porosity due to lack of fusion [1]. Also, if the powder layer becomes too thin, it becomes discontinuous with vacancies that can negatively affect the final part [2–4]. The powder layer thickness has been shown to affect the melt pool size [5], grain size [6], density [7], microhardness [6,7], surface roughness [8], strength, and elasticity [9,10] of the produced part.

The nominal powder layer thickness can be specified for each layer by controlling the elevator step size in between layers. However, unlike other process parameters (e.g. laser power, scan-speed, beam path), there is less control authority for powder layer thickness, both overall and locally. At a global level, consolidation of the powder on the first few layers, leads to a substantial increase in powder thickness over the nominal build layer thickness [11,12]. Locally, the powder thickness is affected by thermal distortion of the part as the separation between the part and the wiper changes. The thinner powder bed layers also have been shown to increase the thermally induced residual stresses [13–15]. This is particularly a concern for overhanging structures, where the unsupported edge bends away from the build plate and reduces the powder layer thickness. The reduction in powder layer thickness feedbacks to higher local temperatures, producing more part distortion and resulting in further reductions in powder layer thickness in subsequent layers. This cycle can progress rapidly and lead to interference between the part and the recoater, equivalent to a negative powder layer
thickness. In the case of soft wipers, this interaction leads to abrasion of the wiper surface which can affect all the parts in line with the damage region (increasing the local powder layer thickness). For a rigid wiper, the interference leads to a collision, which stops the motion of the recoater or damages it. Recoater crashes are a widespread failure and impedes the automation of additive manufacturing processes such as LPBF [16].

Monitoring the surface with high-resolution optical imaging can capture regions of the build not fully covered by powder after the recoating step [17,18]. While this can capture a part that has broken through the powder layer, it does not resolve local variations in powder thickness, which would provide advanced warning of part distortion, and could potentially be used in feedback control. Several techniques have been developed to measure the part height after laser consolidation and this can be used to infer the powder layer thickness. For example, Williams et al. [19] used a fixed laser displacement to measure the local height of the powder layer and consolidated material. DePond et al. [20] presented a technique using optical coherence tomography (OCT) to generate a high-resolution point-by-point map of the part height. Several groups have studied fringe projection techniques to measure part height [21–23]. These techniques require pausing the process to measure the height which adds time to the print.

This paper investigates a thermography based technique to estimate the powder bed thickness. Infrared thermography uses the diffusion of heat through a material to evaluate the material properties [24] including the thermal diffusivity and optical absorption coefficient [25], as well as discontinuities such as sub-surface cracks or defects and coating thicknesses [26]. The surface temperature is observed using a thermal camera and the heat source forcing the thermal diffusion can be active or passive [27,28]. The information about the thermal transport is often dynamic and a wide range of techniques to evaluate process transient thermal histories have been developed, particularly for active thermography where there is temporal control of the heat source [29–32].

In this paper, the printed part serves as the heat source, which retains heat from the deposition process. This heating can be supplemented by a heated build plate but is not required. When the recoating process spreads relatively cool powder over the previously deposited region, heat diffuses through powder to its top surface. The temperature history of the top surface is observed with a thermal camera. The transient thermal response is a function of the layer thickness as well as the thermal properties of the powder layer. For a powder with constant thermal properties, the transient response can be parameterized and these signatures correlated with layer thickness.

Thermal cameras are present in many LPBF machines, particularly research installations, and are used to monitor thermal features during additive manufacturing [33]. Short-wavelength infrared (SWIR) and long-wavelength infrared (LWIR) cameras combined with visible camera have been used to measure melt-pool dimensions [34], cooling rate [35], thermal distortion [36], surface temperature [37,38], and thermal history [39]. This is largely motivated by defect detection. A number of data-driven approaches aid in relating signatures to thermal features to defects or properties [40]. In particular, machine learning algorithms have been used to process imaging data to efficiently assess the part quality and detect build defects [41,42]. This data-based method to train a detection algorithm for potential errors is widely used due to its robust performance for an extensive range of operating conditions. Among advanced machine-learning methods, feed-forward neural networks (FNN) have successfully performed regression tasks in many applications [43,44]. This paper shows how a FNN improves on a simple physics based regression by allowing more feature data to be included in the correlation.

The paper is organized as follows. The experimental setup, including the configuration of the thermal camera, and representative thermal histories are first presented. A 1D thermal model is developed and used to suggest a parameterization for the thermal history. The rise time is extracted from this parameterization. The measured rise time is correlated with experimental powder bed thicknesses for a calibration specimen. This data is compared to the 1D model to provide an estimate for the thermal conductivity. Next, all the parameterized data is used with FNN to improve the ability to predict powder layer thickness. This is validated by monitoring the powder layer thickness for a printed part with an overhang. This experiment also shows the potential to predict the interaction with the wiper 10 layers before it occurs. The thermographic inspection technique is shown to have significant potential for monitoring the powder bed thickness and can be expanded to detect variations in the powder properties. This has the potential to limit recoater/part collisions which are a common failure in LPBF. Monitoring the powder layer health is critical to ensuring part quality. The technique requires a relatively low cost thermal camera, but by using the powder spreading process, the inspection technique does not add delays or otherwise modify the LPBF process. These advantages may make the approach attractive for industrial adoption.

2. Experimental setup

Fig. 1 illustrates the experimental setup with a long-wavelength infrared (LWIR) camera (FLIR A655sc) integrated with a commercial LPBF machine (Renishaw AM250). A ZnSe window on the chamber allows the LWIR camera to observe the build plate from 15° off-normal. The LWIR camera has 640 × 480 pixels which corresponds to a spatial resolution of 325 μm in this configuration. The spectral range of this LWIR camera is 7.5–14.0 μm. The noise-equivalent temperature difference (NETD) is 30 mK and frame rate is 200 Hz. The camera reports the temperature of the scene assuming an emissivity of 0.95 (gray body approximation) and is not corrected for transmission through the window. Because the emissivity of the powder and the printed solid material as well as the wiper differ, the measured temperatures are lower than the true temperatures. However, the relevant information for the procedure presented in this paper is in the time domain. This allows the measured temperatures to be normalized for calculations and removes requirements for emissivity and non-uniformity calibrations, significantly simplifying the instrumentation.

Fig. 2 shows the temperature history of a single pixel for a 67.6 s duration layer during a typical build using 304 L stainless steel powder in a Renishaw AM250. The powder used in this paper had diameters ranging between 15 and 40 μm with a mean diameter 25 μm. At the start of the process, powder is dispensed from the hopper at the back of the chamber. The wiper spreads the powder over the build area, traveling from the back of the chamber to the front of the chamber. The time index is shifted so that the wiper passes over the pixel in Fig. 2 at t = 0. As the wiper completes its travel, it pushes any excess powder into a catchment
new powder layer heating process with insets highlighting the changes of the layer height.

At the conclusion of the laser patterning, the build plate is lowered by interaction but is saturated when the pixel is heated directly by the laser. Fig. 2.

Fig. 2. Temperature history of a single pixel, for (a) one complete layer and (b) new powder layer heating process with insets highlighting the changes of emissivity of the pixel.

at the front of the chamber. The laser is then scanned over the pattern for the layer to fuse the powder to the part. The camera captures this interaction but is saturated when the pixel is heated directly by the laser. At the conclusion of the laser patterning, the build plate is lowered by the layer height, $\delta$, and the wiper returns to the back of the chamber, passing back over the pixel at $t = 63.5 \text{ s}$. The emissivity of the pixel changes depending on the states of the material and presence of the wiper. These changes are indicated by the color of the trace.

Fig. 2(b) shows a close-up of the interaction with the wiper during the powder-spraying step. Initially the pixel corresponds to the printed part which has a lower emissivity. This has cooled from the interaction with the laser, although there still retains some residual heat as well as any heating from the build plate (maintained at $80^\circ \text{C}$ for the builds). The wiper pushes powder in front of it. Some of this powder enters the powder-spreading step. Initially the pixel corresponds to the printed part of the printed solid part. Radiation exchange at the free surface of the powder is neglected, but a convection boundary condition is applied. The printed solid part is modeled as semi-infinite. The temperature of the semi-infinite end side is constant temperature at $T_s = 80^\circ \text{C}$. This problem is governed by the heat transfer equation,

$$\frac{dT}{dz} = \frac{k}{\rho c} \frac{\partial^2 T}{\partial z^2}$$

with boundary conditions,

$$k \frac{\partial T}{\partial z} \bigg|_{z=0} = h[T(z=0,t) - T_\infty]$$

and initial condition

$$T(z,t=0) = \begin{cases} T_p & 0 < z < \delta \\ T_s & \delta < z \end{cases}$$

where $T$ is the temperature and is a function of time, $t$, and distance from the surface of the powder, $z$. The thermal properties in Eq. (2) depend on the material and can be either powder or printed solid (denoted by the subscript, $i$, which is $p$ for powder and $s$ for printed solid). $k$, $\rho$ and $c$ are the effective thermal conductivity, density and specific heat of the materials. $h$ is the convection heat transfer coefficient. $T_\infty$ is the ambient temperature while $T_s$ and $T_p$ are the initial temperatures of the printed powder and solid, respectively.

which removes the effects of the temperature of the underlying part as well as the dependence on the camera’s calibration.

3. 1D heat transfer model and finite differential elements solution

3.1. 1D heat transfer model

Insight into the temperature history can be achieved from modeling the thermal diffusion through the powder from the underlying part. While the powder layer is made of discrete particles, evaluating it as a continuous effective medium significantly simplifies the analysis. Also, the thickness of the powder is much less than the lateral extent of most parts, so it is reasonable to model the problem as 1D problem in the $z$-direction. Lastly, the temperature range for the system during the recoating step does not vary significantly enough to consider thermally dependent properties. Fig. 3(a) illustrates this model. A powder layer of thickness, $\delta$, is in contact with the printed solid part. Radiation exchange at the free surface of the powder is neglected, but a convection boundary condition is applied. The printed solid part is modeled as semi-infinite. The temperature of the semi-infinite end side is constant temperature at $T_s = 80^\circ \text{C}$. This problem is governed by the heat transfer equation,

$$\frac{dT}{dz} = \frac{k}{\rho c} \frac{\partial^2 T}{\partial z^2}$$

with boundary conditions,

$$k \frac{\partial T}{\partial z} \bigg|_{z=0} = h[T(z=0,t) - T_\infty]$$

and initial condition

$$T(z,t=0) = \begin{cases} T_p & 0 < z < \delta \\ T_s & \delta < z \end{cases}$$

where $T$ is the temperature and is a function of time, $t$, and distance from the surface of the powder, $z$. The thermal properties in Eq. (2) depend on the material and can be either powder or printed solid (denoted by the subscript, $i$, which is $p$ for powder and $s$ for printed solid). $k$, $\rho$ and $c$ are the effective thermal conductivity, density and specific heat of the materials. $h$ is the convection heat transfer coefficient. $T_\infty$ is the ambient temperature while $T_s$ and $T_p$ are the initial temperatures of the printed powder and solid, respectively.

which removes the effects of the temperature of the underlying part as well as the dependence on the camera’s calibration.
solid and powder, respectively.

The temperature distribution is solved using a finite difference method using material properties shown in Table 1. The powder’s effective thermal conductivity is fit from experiments as described in Section 4.2. The calculated temperature distribution is shown as a function of depth 𝑧 in Fig. 3(b) for 𝑇𝑠 = 80°C, 𝑇𝑝 = 60°C, 𝑇𝑤 = 60°C, and ℎ = 15 W/m²K. The thermal camera only has access to the surface temperature of the powder. The model predicts that the powder surface temperature approaches the steady state within almost 1 s.

### 3.2. Thermal feature: rise time

It is helpful to have a parameterized expression to fit to the surface temperature history. The following equation captures the surface temperature rise predicted by the finite difference solution to Eqs. (2)-(5).

\[ T(z = 0, t) = A_1 - A_2e^{-\beta_1(t-\tau)} - A_3e^{-\beta_2(t-\tau)} \quad \text{for } t > \tau. \]  

(6)

where \( A_1 \) is the powder free surface’s steady-state temperature and \( A_1, A_2, A_3 \) is the powder free surface’s initial temperature, \( T_p \). Replacing \( t \) with \( t - \tau \) allows the time history to be shifted so the initial condition occurs at \( \tau \) (when the wiper introduces fresh powder to the printed solid surface). The coefficients \( \beta_1 \) and \( \beta_2 \) depend on the powder layer thickness and thermal diffusivity of the materials. For a sufficiently thick powder layer on a high thermal diffusivity material \((\alpha = k_p/\rho_c)\) material, it can be shown that \( \beta_1 \propto 1/\sqrt{\alpha} \). While this serves as a starting point, it breaks down for thinner powder layers and this paper fits the coefficients numerically for both simulation and experiments. After normalization using Eq. (1), the initial temperature of powder free surface \( T(z = 0, t = \tau_i) \) is zero, so that \( A_1, A_2, A_3 = 0 \) and Eq. (6) can be simplified as

\[ T'(z = 0, t) = A_1 - A_2e^{-\beta_1(t-\tau)} - (A_1 - A_2)e^{-\beta_2(t-\tau)} \quad \text{for } t > \tau. \]  

(7)

The coefficients \( A_1, A_2, \beta_1, \beta_2 \) and \( \tau_i \) can be fit to the free surface temperature. Fig. 4(a) shows the ability of Eq. (7) to capture the free surface temperature predicted by the finite difference model for different powder layer thicknesses. The mean squared error for the powder thicknesses in Fig. 4(a) is less than 5.3 × 10^{-6}.

A characteristic rise time, \( \tau \), defined as the time from \( \tau_i \) for the surface temperature to reach 90% of steady state, can be obtained from Eq. (7).

\[ A_2e^{-\beta_1\tau} + (A_1 - A_2)e^{-\beta_2\tau} = 0.1A_1 \]  

(8)

The rise time serves as a thermal feature which can be related to the powder layer thickness or the thermal properties. Fig. 4(b) shows the dependence of the rise time on the powder layer thickness from finite difference model calculated results. This relationship is captured by a power law dependence

\[ \delta = 296.8\delta_0^{0.548}. \]  

(9)

Assuming the constant properties in Table 1, this function can be used to predict the powder thickness \( \delta \) from rise-time \( \tau \), which can be fit to simulated or experimental data. The uncertainty in the predicted powder layer thickness depends on the first derivative of Eq. (9). An estimate for the uncertainty in the powder layer thickness, \( \Delta \delta \) is given by

\[ \Delta \delta = \frac{\delta}{\partial \delta} \Delta \tau \]  

(10)

### 4. Experimental validation

#### 4.1. Calibration to experimental powder thickness

The parametric expressions in Eqs. (7) and (8) can also be applied to experimentally gathered data, and the experimentally fit coefficients can then be used to predict the powder thickness. This approach requires collection of temperature histories for various known powder thicknesses. Fig. 5(a) and b shows a simple gage specimen printed with the Renishaw AM250. It consists of 5 mm wide strips, 35 mm long, at different elevations \( h \) from a printed datum plane. After the specimen was printed, the unfused powder is removed from above the gage specimen. The specimen is not removed from the build platform. After the powder is removed the chamber is resealed again, the argon atmosphere restored, and the build plate heated to 80°C, before commanding the system to add a new layer of powder. The wiper then spreads powder over the build plate including the specimen. This gives a powder layer thickness that varies spatially with the height of the individual strips of the gage specimen. The powder layer thickness is \( \delta = h_0 - h \), where \( h_0 \) is the height above the datum of the build plane. In this experiment \( h_0 = 360 \mu m \) so that the highest specimen has \( \delta = 40 \mu m \) of powder above it. The heights of the gage specimen and corresponding powder thicknesses are listed in Table 2. The 8 different heights in the table are repeated three times along the width of the specimen. The thermal histories for each pixel above the specimen are recorded during the recoating process. After this, the build plate is removed from chamber.

---

**Table 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Properties</th>
<th>304 L Solid</th>
<th>304 L Powder</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Density, ρ [kg/m³]</td>
<td>8030</td>
<td>4818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific heat capacity, c [J/kg K]</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thermal conductivity, k [W/m K]</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>0.269</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and cleaned. The top surface of the specimen is then laser scanned (LMI Gocater 2320) to measure precisely and map the height of each strip above the datum plane. Fig. 5 (b) shows the measured height of each specimen and Fig. 5 (c) shows a spatial map of the corresponding powder thickness registered to the camera pixels. This shows minimal local variances from the nominal powder thickness.

Fig. 6 (a) shows examples of the temperature histories for pixels with different nominal powder thicknesses. Eq. (7) is fit to the temperature history pixel-by-pixel. The five fitted coefficients are plotted in Fig. 5(e)-(i). As mentioned in Section 3.2, \( A_1 \) corresponds to the normalized steady state temperature and should have a nominal value of unity. Fig. 5(c) shows that the fitted values of \( A_1 \) range between 0.97 and 1.03. The time shift \( t_i \) is related to when the wiper passes over the pixel. The coefficient \( \beta_1 \) is inversely proportionate to the thickness of the powder layer as should be expected. Fig. 5(f) shows that \( t_i \) scales linearly with \( y \) for thinner powder layers. This agrees with the constant velocity \( v=140 \text{ mm/s} \) of the wiper in the \( y \)-direction. For thicker powder layers, there is a delay between when the powder is deposited and when a temperature rise can be observed on the free surface because of the time it takes for thermal energy to diffuse through the powder layer.

The coefficient of determination, \( R^2 \), for these fits is shown in Fig. 5(j). The figure shows that Eq. (7) captures the local temperature histories well and the minimum \( R^2 \) over the entire gage specimen is 0.98 with an average for all the data of \( R^2 = 0.997 \). The five fitted coefficients can be combined using Eq. (8) to calculate the rise time for each pixel. This is plotted in Fig. 5(d). The correspondence between powder layer thickness and rise time is clearly visible in Fig. 5(c) and (d). Fig. 6(b) also shows the powder layer thickness as a function of rise time. A power law fit to this data gives the relationship

\[
\delta = 296.9 \tau^{0.5074}
\]

which has \( R^2 = 0.869 \).

While the parameterization from the 1D model captures the response well for the interior of the strips as illustrated in Fig. 6(a), Fig. 6(b) shows significant scatter in the rise time and the measured powder thickness. Much of this occurs at the boundary between strips. In these regions, the assumptions of the 1D model are not satisfied and the thermal disturbance spreads laterally (cylindrically away from the edge defined by the adjacent strips). Experimentally, this lateral spread is on the order of two pixels (0.65 mm for this setup) and is convoluted with resolution of the camera.
4.2. Powder thermal conductivity

The temperature history also depends on the thermal properties of the powder layer. Fig. 7(a) shows the predicted relationship between the rise time and powder layer thickness for different effective thermal conductivities of the powder, \( k_p \), calculated using the 1D heat transfer model in Section 3. As expected, the rise time scales inversely to the thermal conductivity. Fig. 7(a) also shows the experimental data from Fig. 6(b) again and suggests that the effective thermal conductivity can be fit to the experimental data. Fig. 7(b) shows the coefficient of determination \( R^2 \) for fitting experimental data with the 1D diffusion model results obtained using different effective thermal conductivities. A third order polynomial is used to fit the data and has the maximum

\[ \text{Serial Number} = \text{Effective Thermal Conductivity} \]

where the coefficient of determination \( R^2 \) for power law fitted rise time/powder layer thickness relationship is presented by the following equations

\[ \text{input layer: } a_i^{[l]} = \sigma^{[l]} \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n_l} w_{ij}^{[l]} x_i + b_i^{[l]} \right) \]

\[ \text{hidden layer: } a_j^{[l-1]} = \sigma^{[l-1]} \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n_l} w_{ij}^{[l]} a_i^{[l-1]} + b_i^{[l-1]} \right) \]

\[ \text{output layer: } y_j = \sigma^0 \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n_l} w_{ij}^{[l]} a_i^{[l]} + b_i^{[l]} \right) \]

where \( x_i \) is input features and \( y_j \) is the desired output target. \( w_{ij}^{[l]} \) is the weight from neuron \( i \) of the \( k \)-1 layer to neuron \( j \) of the \( k \) layer. \( I \) and \( n_k \) denote the number of layers and number of neurons for the \( k \) layer, respectively. \( b_i^{[k]} \) and \( \sigma^0 \) are the bias and activation function for the \( k \) layer.

In this study, there are 42,510 total data points that are split based on a ratio of 70–15–15 into the training, validation, and testing dataset for the FNN, respectively. The training dataset is used to adjust the weights and biases of the FNN, the validation dataset is used to adjust the hyperparameters (number neurons) of the FNN, and the testing dataset is used to evaluate the performance of the FNN to an unseen dataset. It is important to note that data splitting is conducted before any further data processing steps such as normalization and scaling to prevent data leakage. Using the regression learner MATLAB toolbox, several different FNN architectures are tested against each other with their own specifications. A model with a single hidden layer with 100 hidden neurons and ReLu as the activation function displayed the best performance with an R-squared value of 0.962.

Fig. 8 compares the prediction results from the rise time only correlation and the five parameters based FNN. The FNN performs significantly better for thinner powder layers. The overall coefficient of determination \( R^2 \) improves to 0.962 for the FNN as opposed to 0.859 using the rise time correlation. Fig. 8(c) shows histograms of the true powder thicknesses when the predicted powder layer thickness is \( \delta_p = 200 \pm 5 \mu m \). Fitting a normal distribution to the results from both models gives a 95% confidence interval estimate of the true powder layer thickness of \( \delta = 194.2 \pm 60.6 \mu m \) for the rise time correlation which is improved to \( \delta = 201.5 \pm 32.2 \mu m \) for the FNN model.

6. In-situ thermographic monitoring for recoater interaction

Thermal distortion occurs commonly in LPBF. This can occur for unsupported parts when there is inadequate conduction to the build plate leading to excessive heating. The distortion lowers the powder thickness on next layer which exacerbates the overheating as less material is melted. When the distortion of the part causes it to break through the powder layer, it can interact with the recoater. The interaction of the recoater with the part can abrade a soft wiper while a rigid wiper can crash into the part and damage the machine, part, or both. In the case of a flexible wiper, the abraded area allows an increase in the powder layer thickness for every part in-line with the abraded area. The contact with the wiper is potentially catastrophic for both types of wipers. Detecting thermal distortion prior to a part breaking through the powder layer allows the local process parameters to be adjusted in order
to limit distortion or to have the part suppressed to save the build. The distorted part leads to a change in the local powder layer thickness which can be detected using the thermographic powder layer monitoring technique.

Artifacts with an overhang are printed to demonstrate a change in powder layer thickness caused by thermal stress as reported in our previous work [42]. The dimensions of the overhang artifact are shown in Fig. 9(a). The dimensions of the overhang artifact are shown in Fig. 9(a). Fig. 9(b) shows a photograph of the specimen and a block printed with the Renishaw AM250 system using a flexible (silicone) wiper. The block is added behind the specimen to capture any subsequent changes in the powder bed thickness due to the abraded wiper. These artifacts are printed using nominal process parameters developed for stainless steel 304 L. Specifically, a laser power of 200 W, beam size of 75 µm, scan speed of 800 mm/s and setup nominal powder thickness δN = 50 µm. For simplicity, the laser was only rastered in the x-direction. The parts in Fig. 9(b) were stopped after 219 layers and show significant distortion in the unsupported overhanging region.

The height of the powder layer is monitored using the thermal camera, the temperature history for each point fitted using the 5-parameters in Fig. 5, and the FNN used to predict the powder layer thickness. Fig. 10(a) shows the predicted powder thickness averaged along the leading edge of the overhang artifact (red line). For reference, the predicted powder thickness averaged over a line at the center of each layer (blue line) is also plotted. The constant raster direction leads to a slightly higher part (lower thickness) at the edge almost immediately. This is stable by layer 40. The powder layer thickness on the unsupported edge starts decreasing more and more at layer 180 due to thermal distortion. Over the entire print, the reference thickness in the center of the part is stable.

To verify these predictions, specimens were stopped at intermediate heights during the build. Photographs of the specimens stopped at layers 50, 140, and 215 are shown in Fig. 10(a). At the conclusion of the build, these parts were laser scanned (after removing powder but without removing the parts from the build plate). The nominal height is calculated by multiplying the number of layers with the nominal powder layer thickness. The actual powder layer thickness is this nominal height minus the laser scanner measured height. This thickness is plotted for both the unsupported edge and center of the part in Fig. 10(a) as points, by averaging the data measured over each line (red dash line or blue dash line) for the various layers. This validation was repeated for three
different parts (stopped at the same layer) and the error bars show the
standard deviations. The figure shows that the predicted layer height
from the thermal inspection method agrees well with the measured
height. In particular, the thermal distortion predicted that the part broke
trough the powder layer at layer 212 while the measurements show a
break-through between layers 200 and 205.

Fig. 10(b) shows the thermal inspection predicted height for the
block behind the overhang artifact. The predicted powder layer height is
plotted for the same x-position as the traces in Fig. 10(a) (immediately
behind the leading edge of the artifact and at its center). The powder
layer stabilizes by layer 40. At layer 215, the local powder layer thick-
ness behind the unsupported edge starts to increase dramatically. This is
due to the abrasion of the wiper and leads to the local deposition of more
powder. While not visible in the photograph of the part in Fig. 9(b), if
this continued, it could negatively affect the local part properties.

Fig. 10(c) shows photographs of five identical parts, stopped at layer
219, and the wiper. The damage to the wiper is visible (scratched metal
and abraded silicon). The decrease in the powder layer thickness
indicating an imminent crash could be detected by layer 190 from the
thermal inspection estimate. This is at least 10 layers before the collision
and would allow the part to be suppressed to prevent damage to the
wiper as well as any other parts in the build.

It is interesting to observe that the measured as well as predicted
powder layer thicknesses are so much larger than the nominal powder
layer thickness, about 200 and 50 µm, respectively. This is consistent
with Mahmoodkhani et al. [11] who showed a nominal powder thick-
ness of 20 µm resulted in a measured powder layer thickness of more
than 100 µm as well as Wischeropp et al. [12] who showed nominal
powder layer thicknesses of 30 and 50 µm corresponded to actual
thicknesses of 165 and 225 µm. This phenomenon is the result of
shrinkage of powder consolidation over multiple layers [11] in addition
to significant losses of the powder from spatter and denudation [12].

In addition to suppressing a bad part before it breaks through, detecting
thermal distortion early could be used to adjust the process
parameters to match the reduced powder layer thickness. This includes
lowering the laser power or increasing the scan speed. There is also the
possibility to adjust the scan path to minimize overheating. Because the
distortion is detected early, there is time to react by making more
gradual changes. Other more drastic approaches are possible, including
laser ablation of the distorted region or physically deforming it down.

7. Conclusion

This paper demonstrates the potential of using in-situ thermographic
inspection to evaluate the powder layer thickness and estimate local
powder layer thermal properties. An experimental study, conducted
using realistic process parameters in a commercial LPBF machine, agrees
well with a 1D thermal diffusion model for the powder layer. This uses a
stationary LWIR thermal camera in a staring configuration. A parametric
fit of the temperature history is used to generate a correlation to the
powder layer thickness. A simplified rise time model provides insight
into the factor of the powder layer thickness. A simplified rise time model provides insight
and was used to estimate thermal conductivity, but it was outperformed
by a FNN machine learning method for data obtained from a calibration
specimen. This was tested for a simple artifact with an overhanging
unsupported edge. Without underlying supported structure, the ability
of the overhang to dissipate heat is significantly reduced, causing heat to
build up at the edge. Overheating causes thermal distortion, which re-
duces the thickness of the next powder layer. The overheating is exas-
perrated as there is less powder for the laser to melt and the distortion
rapidly increases to the point where it breaks through the powder layer
and produces the abrasion of the wiper. The FNN model was
applied to monitor thermal distortion and could ultimately predict a
wiper collision at least 10 layers before it occurred.

The thermal inspection method appears to have several advantages
relative to existing methods for monitoring the powder layer in-situ. In
particular, because the inspection occurs during the recoating step, it
does not add additional processing time for the inspection. Comparing
with optical coherence tomography and fringe projection methods, this
method’s additional equipment costs are minimal. The thermographic
inspection technique was able to resolve the powder layer thickness to
± 32.2 µm (within the mean particle diameter).

Future work will include the development of automatic part suppress-
ion algorithms as well as providing feedback to try to minimize
thermal distortion. In addition, the ability to certify additional aspects of
the powder bed health will also be expanded. For example, variances in
the powder size distribution can be detected by identifying changes in
the local thermal properties of the bed. While quantitative measure-
ments require training, the thermographic inspection technique can
reveal local deviations from the standard thermal history in the bed. This
approach extends to other aspects of the LPBF process including the gas
flow over the powder bed. This study also suggests that other techniques from thermographic based non-destructive testing, including active thermography, may add significant insight to the LBPF process.
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