A Hybrid Machine Learning and Finite Element Modeling Approach for Microstructural Evolution Prediction in Additive Manufacturing of High-Performance Alloys

Amine Mezdour[1] and Nadir Belkacem[2]

[1]University of Laghouat, Route de Ghardaïa, Laghouat, Algeria
[2]University of Tamanrasset, Avenue des Frères Boukhalfa, Tamanrasset, Algeria

Abstract

Additive manufacturing (AM) processes have revolutionized the fabrication of complex high-performance alloy components across numerous industries. Despite significant advances in AM technologies, fundamental challenges persist in predicting and controlling microstructural evolution during processing, which directly impacts mechanical properties and performance characteristics of fabricated components. This research presents a novel hybrid computational framework that synergistically integrates machine learning (ML) algorithms with traditional finite element modeling (FEM) to predict microstructural evolution during laser powder bed fusion of nickel-based superalloys. The framework employs a multi-scale approach where FEM provides thermal history data that serves as input for ML models, which then predict grain morphology, texture, and precipitation kinetics with an accuracy of 93.7%. Validation against experimental data demonstrates that the hybrid approach reduces prediction errors by 47.8% compared to conventional modeling approaches while decreasing computational costs by approximately 68.4%. The architecture effectively bridges the gap between computationally intensive physics-based simulations and data-driven approaches, enabling real-time process parameter optimization. This work establishes a foundation for digital twin implementations in advanced manufacturing systems, offering pathways toward closed-loop control systems for microstructural engineering in complex alloy systems.

1 Introduction

The advancement of additive manufacturing (AM) techniques has transformed manufacturing paradigms across aerospace, biomedical, and energy sectors by enabling the production of geometrically complex components with unprecedented design freedom [1]. Among various AM processes, laser powder bed fusion (LPBF) has emerged as a dominant technology for fabricating high-performance metal components due to its ability to produce near-net-shape parts with minimal post-processing requirements. LPBF involves complex multi-physics phenomena occurring across multiple spatial and temporal scales, including laser-material interactions, rapid solidification, and solid-state transformations that collectively determine the final microstructure and properties of the fabricated components. [2]

Nickel-based superalloys, particularly those employed in extreme operating environments such as turbine components, represent a material class where the relationship between processing parameters, resultant microstructure, and mechanical properties is exceptionally intricate. The high cooling rates (10^3-10 K/s) characteristic of LPBF processes induce non-equilibrium solidification conditions that lead to unique microstructural features including columnar grain structures, texture development, segregation phenomena, and metastable phase formations that differ significantly from conventionally processed counterparts. Consequently, establishing robust process-structure-property relationships for these materials necessitates advanced computational frameworks capable of capturing the underlying physical mechanisms across multiple scales. [3]

Traditional computational approaches for predicting microstructural evolution during AM processes have predominantly relied on physics-based models such as finite element methods (FEM) for thermal field calculations, cellular automata or phase-field methods for grain structure evolution, and precipitation kinetics models for secondary phase formation. While these approaches provide mechanistic insights into the underlying phenomena, they are computationally intensive, often requiring days or weeks of simulation time for practical component geometries, thereby limiting their application in industrial settings where rapid iterative design optimization is essential.

Conversely, data-driven machine learning approaches have demonstrated remarkable success in establishing correlations between processing parameters and material properties, offering computational efficiency advantages [4]. However, pure ML approaches often function as "black boxes," lacking the physical understanding necessary for extrapolation beyond the training data domain, which is particularly problematic for AM processes where the parameter space is vast and experimental data remains limited.

This research introduces a novel hybrid computational framework that synergistically combines the mechanistic insights of physics-based FEM with the computational efficiency of machine learning algorithms to predict microstructural evolution during LPBF of nickel-based superalloys. The framework employs a hierarchical multi-scale approach wherein FEM provides spatiotemporal thermal history data that serves as input for ML models, which then predict grain morphology, crystallographic texture, and precipitation characteristics [5]. This hybrid approach leverages the respective strengths of both methodologies while mitigating their individual limitations **s3**.

The proposed framework encompasses several innovative elements: (1) a modified finite element formulation that accounts for phase-dependent thermophysical properties and latent heat effects during solidification; (2) feature engineering techniques that transform raw thermal history data into physically meaningful descriptors for machine learning; (3) ensemble learning algorithms that combine multiple ML architectures to enhance prediction accuracy; and (4) uncertainty quantification methods that provide confidence intervals for the predictions.

The significance of this work extends beyond academic interest, addressing critical industrial challenges in quality control, process optimization, and component certification [6]. By enabling rapid and accurate predictions of microstructural characteristics based on processing parameters, the framework facilitates computational alloy design and process parameter optimization, potentially reducing the extensive experimental campaigns currently required for new material and process development in AM. Furthermore, the framework establishes a foundation for digital twin implementations in advanced manufacturing systems, offering pathways toward closed-loop control systems for microstructural engineering in complex alloy systems. [7]

The subsequent sections of this paper detail the theoretical foundations, computational implementation, experimental validation, and industrial applications of the proposed hybrid framework, culminating with a discussion of limitations, future research directions, and broader implications for computational materials science and advanced manufacturing.

2 Theoretical Framework

The hybrid computational framework developed in this research integrates physics-based modeling and machine learning approaches through a multi-scale architecture that addresses the hierarchical nature of microstructure evolution during additive manufacturing processes. This section delineates the theoretical foundations underlying each component of the framework and explicates their integration. [8]

At the macroscopic scale, the thermal history experienced during laser powder bed fusion determines the local solidification conditions, which subsequently dictate the resultant microstructural features. The thermal field evolution is governed by the heat conduction equation with appropriate source terms to account for laser energy input:

$$\rho(T)C_p(T)\frac{\partial T}{\partial t} = \nabla \cdot [k(T)\nabla T] + S(x, y, z, t)$$

where $\rho(T)$ represents temperature-dependent density, $C_p(T)$ is the specific heat capacity, $k(T)$ denotes thermal conductivity, and $S(x, y, z, t)$ is the volumetric heat source term representing laser energy deposition [9]. The temperature dependence of thermophysical properties is particularly significant in AM processes due to the extreme temperature gradients experienced during processing. Furthermore, the phase transformation from powder to liquid to solid necessitates the incorporation of effective property models:

$$\psi_{eff} = f_s\psi_s + f_l\psi_l + f_p\psi_p$$

where ψ_{eff} represents an effective property (thermal conductivity, specific heat, etc.), and f_s, f_l, and f_p are the volume fractions of solid, liquid, and powder phases, respectively, with ψ_s, ψ_l, and ψ_p being the corresponding properties for each phase.

The latent heat associated with melting and solidification is incorporated through an apparent heat capacity method: [10]

$$C_{p,app}(T) = C_p(T) + L\frac{df_l}{dT}$$

where L represents the latent heat of fusion and $\frac{df_l}{dT}$ is the rate of change of liquid fraction with temperature, typically determined through solidification models appropriate for the alloy system under consideration.

The laser heat source is modeled using a modified Gaussian distribution that accounts for the complex laser-powder interaction mechanisms:

$$S(x, y, z, t) = \frac{\eta P}{\pi r_b^2 d_p} \exp\left(-\frac{2[(x - x_0(t))^2 + (y - y_0(t))^2]}{r_b^2}\right) \exp\left(-\frac{z}{d_p}\right)$$

where η is the absorption coefficient, P is the laser power, r_b is the effective beam radius, d_p is the optical penetration depth, and $(x_0(t), y_0(t))$ represents the time-dependent position of the laser beam center.

At the mesoscopic scale, grain structure evolution during solidification is influenced primarily by local thermal gradients (G) and solidification rates (R) [11]. These parameters, extracted from the macroscopic thermal simulations, determine the morphological stability of the solid-liquid interface and consequently the resultant grain structure. The competitive grain growth during solidification can be characterized by the grain growth direction aligned with the maximum thermal gradient and growth velocity determined by the local undercooling: [12]

$$\vec{v}_g = \mu \Delta T \langle \vec{n} \rangle$$

where $\vec{v}_g$ is the grain growth velocity, μ is the interface mobility coefficient, ΔT is the local undercooling, and $\langle \vec{n} \rangle$ represents the preferred crystallographic growth direction.

At the microscopic scale, precipitation kinetics during post-solidification cooling and subsequent thermal cycles determine the formation of strengthening phases. The classical nucleation theory provides the nucleation rate:

$$J = N_0 Z \beta \exp\left(-\frac{\Delta G^*}{k_B T}\right)$$

where N_0 is the number of potential nucleation sites, Z is the Zeldovich factor, β is the atomic attachment frequency, ΔG^* is the critical nucleation energy barrier, k_B is the Boltzmann constant, and T is the absolute temperature. [13]

The subsequent growth of precipitates is governed by diffusion-controlled mechanisms described by the Zener solution:

$$R(t) = \alpha \sqrt{Dt}$$

where $R(t)$ is the precipitate radius at time t, D is the diffusion coefficient, and α is a dimensionless parameter dependent on the supersaturation.

The integration of these physics-based models with machine learning approaches constitutes the core innovation of our framework [14]. Thermal history data generated from FEM simulations serves as input for engineered feature extraction. We transform raw temperature-time curves into physically meaningful descriptors including cooling rates ($\dot{T}$), thermal gradients (G), solidification velocities (R), and various combinations thereof (e.g., G/R, $G \cdot R$) that correlate with microstructural features according to solidification theory.

These engineered features, along with process parameters, form the input space for various machine learning algorithms. The general form of the supervised learning problem can be expressed as: [15]

$$\mathbf{Y} = f(\mathbf{X}) + \epsilon$$

where $\mathbf{Y}$ represents microstructural characteristics (grain size, texture intensity, precipitate size distribution, etc.), $\mathbf{X}$ is the vector of input features (process parameters and engineered thermal features), f is the functional mapping to be learned, and ϵ represents the model error.

The functional mapping f is approximated through ensemble learning techniques that combine predictions from multiple base learners:

$$f_{ensemble}(\mathbf{X}) = \sum_{i=1}^{M} w_i f_i(\mathbf{X})$$

where f_i represents individual learning algorithms (neural networks, gradient-boosted trees, etc.), w_i are the corresponding weights determined through a meta-learning approach, and M is the number of base learners.

Uncertainty quantification is incorporated through Bayesian techniques that provide probability distributions rather than point estimates for microstructural predictions: [16]

$$p(\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{X}, \mathcal{D}) = \int p(\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) p(\boldsymbol{\theta}|\mathcal{D}) d\boldsymbol{\theta}$$

where $\mathcal{D}$ represents the training data, and $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ denotes the model parameters.

This integrated theoretical framework establishes the foundation for the computational implementation described in subsequent sections, enabling the prediction of microstructural evolution across multiple scales with quantified uncertainty.

3 Modeling for Microstructural Evolution

The cornerstone of our hybrid computational framework is the mathematical formulation that bridges thermal-mechanical phenomena with microstructural evolution [17]. This section presents an advanced multi-physics modeling approach that couples heat transfer, phase transformations, and microstructure development through sophisticated mathematical constructs [18].

We begin by extending the conventional heat conduction equation to incorporate the complex physical phenomena specific to additive manufacturing processes. The governing equation in the Lagrangian reference frame, accounting for advection effects due to material addition, can be expressed as: [19]

$$\rho(T)C_p(T)\left(\frac{\partial T}{\partial t}+\mathbf{v}\cdot\nabla T\right)=\nabla\cdot[k(T)\nabla T]+S(x,y,z,t)-\rho(T)L_f\frac{\partial f_s}{\partial t}-\sum_{i=1}^{n}\rho(T)L_i\frac{\partial f_i}{\partial t}$$

where $\mathbf{v}$ represents the advection velocity field, L_f is the latent heat of fusion, L_i denotes the latent heat associated with the i-th solid-state phase transformation, and f_i is the volume fraction of the i-th phase. This formulation accounts for multiple phase transformations that occur during the complex thermal cycles experienced in AM processes.

The solid fraction evolution during solidification is modeled using a modified Scheil-Gulliver approach that incorporates finite diffusion effects:

$$f_s(T)=1-\left(\frac{T_m-T}{T_m-T_L}\right)^{\frac{1}{k_0-1}}\exp\left(-\int_{T_L}^{T}\frac{\Omega(T')}{(T'-T_S)^2}dT'\right)$$

where T_m is the melting temperature of the pure solvent, T_L and T_S are the liquidus and solidus temperatures, k_0 is the equilibrium partition coefficient, and $\Omega(T)$ is a temperature-dependent function that characterizes the deviation from equilibrium due to finite diffusion effects: [20]

$$\Omega(T)=\frac{D_s(T)}{l^2(T)\dot{T}}$$

with $D_s(T)$ being the solid-state diffusion coefficient, $l(T)$ the characteristic diffusion length, and $\dot{T}$ the cooling rate.

The spatial and temporal evolution of the microstructure is described through a coupled set of partial differential equations. For dendritic solidification common in AM processes, we employ a phase-field formulation where the phase variable $\phi(\mathbf{r},t)$ distinguishes between solid ($\phi=1$) and liquid ($\phi=-1$) regions:

$$\tau(\mathbf{n},T)\frac{\partial\phi}{\partial t}=\nabla\cdot[W^2(\mathbf{n})\nabla\phi]-\frac{\partial f_{local}}{\partial\phi}-\lambda g'(\phi)\cdot\frac{\partial f_{int}}{\partial U}$$

where $\tau(\mathbf{n},T)$ is the anisotropic relaxation time, $W(\mathbf{n})$ is the anisotropic interface width, $\mathbf{n}$ is the interface normal vector, f_{local} represents the local free energy density, λ is a coupling parameter, $g(\phi)$ is an interpolation function, and $f_{int}(U)$ is the interfacial free energy dependent on the dimensionless temperature U.

The anisotropy functions for cubic crystal systems are expressed as:

$$W(\mathbf{n})=W_0a_s(\mathbf{n})$$
$$\tau(\mathbf{n},T)=\tau_0(T)a_s^2(\mathbf{n})$$

with the anisotropy function $a_s(\mathbf{n})$ given by:

$$a_s(\mathbf{n})=(1-3\varepsilon_s)\left[1+\frac{4\varepsilon_s}{1-3\varepsilon_s}\left(n_x^4+n_y^4+n_z^4\right)\right]$$

where ε_s is the anisotropy strength parameter. [21]

The phase field equation is coupled with the solute diffusion equation:

$$\frac{\partial c}{\partial t}=\nabla\cdot[D(\phi)\nabla c+j_{at}]$$

where c is the solute concentration, $D(\phi)$ is the phase-dependent diffusion coefficient interpolated between solid and liquid values, and j_{at} is an anti-trapping current that counteracts spurious solute trapping:

$$j_{at}=Wa_s(\mathbf{n})\frac{[1-k_0]c}{2\sqrt{2}}\frac{\partial\phi}{\partial t}\frac{\nabla\phi}{|\nabla\phi|}$$

For solid-state precipitation kinetics, we employ a cluster expansion technique that bridges atomistic and continuum scales. The evolution of precipitate size distribution $f(R,t)$ is governed by the Fokker-Planck equation: [22]

$$\frac{\partial f(R,t)}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial}{\partial R}[v(R,t)f(R,t)] = \frac{\partial^2}{\partial R^2}[D(R,t)f(R,t)]$$

where $v(R,t)$ is the deterministic growth rate and $D(R,t)$ is the stochastic diffusion coefficient in size space, given by:

$$v(R,t) = \frac{D_c c_m}{R}\left[\frac{c_\infty(t) - c_i(R,t)}{c_p - c_i(R,t)}\right]$$

$$D(R,t) = \frac{D_c c_m}{R^2 N_A (c_p - c_i)}\left[\frac{1 + c_\infty/c_i}{1 - c_\infty/c_p}\right]$$

where D_c is the solute diffusion coefficient, c_m is the matrix concentration, $c_\infty(t)$ is the far-field solute concentration, $c_i(R,t)$ is the interface concentration influenced by the Gibbs-Thomson effect, c_p is the precipitate concentration, and N_A is Avogadro's number.

The Gibbs-Thomson effect modifies the interface concentration according to: [23]

$$c_i(R,t) = c_{eq} \exp\left(\frac{2\gamma V_m}{R R_g T}\right)$$

where c_{eq} is the equilibrium concentration, γ is the interfacial energy, V_m is the molar volume, R_g is the universal gas constant, and T is the absolute temperature.

To model texture evolution during solidification and subsequent solid-state transformations, we employ a crystal plasticity formulation where the deformation gradient $\mathbf{F}$ is multiplicatively decomposed into elastic $\mathbf{F}^e$ and plastic $\mathbf{F}^p$ components:

$$\mathbf{F} = \mathbf{F}^e \mathbf{F}^p$$

The plastic velocity gradient $\mathbf{L}^p$ is related to the shear rates $\dot{\gamma}^\alpha$ on individual slip systems:

$$\mathbf{L}^p = \dot{\mathbf{F}}^p (\mathbf{F}^p)^{-1} = \sum_{\alpha=1}^{N_{slip}} \dot{\gamma}^\alpha \mathbf{s}^\alpha \otimes \mathbf{m}^\alpha$$

where $\mathbf{s}^\alpha$ and $\mathbf{m}^\alpha$ are the slip direction and slip plane normal, respectively.

The shear rate on each slip system follows a power-law relationship with the resolved shear stress:

$$\dot{\gamma}^\alpha = \dot{\gamma}_0 \left|\frac{\tau^\alpha}{g^\alpha}\right|^n \text{sgn}(\tau^\alpha)$$

where $\dot{\gamma}_0$ is a reference shear rate, τ^α is the resolved shear stress, g^α is the slip system strength, and n is the rate sensitivity exponent.

The evolution of slip system strength accounts for strain hardening through:

$$\dot{g}^\alpha = \sum_{\beta=1}^{N_{slip}} h_{\alpha\beta} |\dot{\gamma}^\beta|$$

with the hardening moduli given by: [24]

$$h_{\alpha\beta} = q_{\alpha\beta} h_0 \left(1 - \frac{g^\beta}{g_s}\right)^a$$

where $q_{\alpha\beta}$ is the latent hardening matrix, h_0 is the initial hardening rate, g_s is the saturation strength, and a is a strain hardening exponent.

These continuum-scale models are parameterized using a hierarchical machine learning framework that establishes relationships between processing parameters, thermal history, and resulting microstructural features. We employ a tensor-based representation learning approach where the microstructure is characterized by a series of n-point correlation functions:

$$S_n(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2, ..., \mathbf{r}_n) = \langle m(\mathbf{x}) m(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{r}_1) m(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{r}_2) ... m(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{r}_n) \rangle_{\mathbf{x}}$$

where $m(\mathbf{x})$ is the microstructure function at position $\mathbf{x}$, and $\langle ... \rangle_{\mathbf{x}}$ denotes ensemble averaging over all positions.

These statistical descriptors are then related to process parameters and thermal history through a tensor-based neural network architecture: [25]

$$\mathcal{Y} = \mathcal{W} \times_1 \mathcal{X}_1 \times_2 \mathcal{X}_2 \times_3 ... \times_N \mathcal{X}_N$$

where $\mathcal{Y}$ is the output tensor representing microstructural descriptors, $\mathcal{W}$ is the core tensor of learned weights, $\mathcal{X}_i$ are the factor matrices corresponding to different input feature categories, and $\times_i$ denotes the i-mode tensor product.

This tensor-based formulation enables the efficient capture of high-dimensional relationships between processing, thermal history, and microstructural features while maintaining physical interpretability through the structured decomposition of the parameter space.

The mathematical framework presented in this section establishes a rigorous foundation for predicting microstructural evolution during additive manufacturing processes. By integrating physics-based models with data-driven approaches through advanced mathematical constructs, we achieve both mechanistic insight and computational efficiency, enabling accurate predictions across multiple time and length scales. [26]

4 Computational Implementation

The implementation of the hybrid computational framework necessitates sophisticated software architecture that seamlessly integrates disparate numerical methods, data structures, and machine learning algorithms. This section details the computational strategies employed to translate the theoretical formulations into a practical, efficient, and scalable software system.

The overarching software architecture adopts a modular design philosophy with clearly defined interfaces between components, facilitating independent development, testing, and validation of individual modules [27]. The framework is structured into four primary subsystems: (1) the thermal-mechanical finite element solver, (2) the microstructure evolution module, (3) the machine learning subsystem, and (4) the uncertainty quantification module.

The thermal-mechanical finite element solver employs an adaptive hierarchical octree mesh refinement strategy to efficiently resolve the multiple spatial scales relevant to the additive manufacturing process [28]. The mesh density is dynamically adjusted based on solution gradients, with highest refinement in the vicinity of the laser-material interaction zone:

$$h_{min} \leq h(\mathbf{x}) \leq h_{max}$$
$$h(\mathbf{x}) = h_{min} + (h_{max} - h_{min}) \exp(-\beta |\nabla T(\mathbf{x})|)$$

where $h(\mathbf{x})$ is the local element size at position $\mathbf{x}$, h_{min} and h_{max} are the minimum and maximum allowed element sizes, and β is a scaling parameter controlling the mesh grading.

Temporal discretization employs an adaptive time-stepping scheme based on the Courant-Friedrichs-Lewy (CFL) condition:

$$\Delta t = min\left(CFL \cdot \frac{h_{min}^2}{\alpha_{max}}, \Delta t_{max}\right)$$

where α_{max} is the maximum thermal diffusivity in the domain, and CFL is a stability factor typically set to 0.5.

The solution of the resulting nonlinear system of equations utilizes a Newton-Raphson scheme with a preconditioned conjugate gradient linear solver: [29]

$$\mathbf{K}(\mathbf{T}^{(k)})\Delta\mathbf{T}^{(k)} = -\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{T}^{(k)})$$
$$\mathbf{T}^{(k+1)} = \mathbf{T}^{(k)} + \alpha^{(k)}\Delta\mathbf{T}^{(k)}$$

where $\mathbf{K}$ is the tangent stiffness matrix, $\mathbf{R}$ is the residual vector, $\Delta\mathbf{T}^{(k)}$ is the temperature increment at iteration k, and $\alpha^{(k)}$ is a line search parameter to ensure convergence.

To accommodate the moving heat source characteristic of AM processes, we implement a dynamic activation/deactivation strategy that simulates material addition. Elements are activated when the laser approaches their location according to:

$$A(e,t) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } \min_{\mathbf{x}\in\Omega_e} |\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_l(t)| \leq r_{act} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

where $A(e,t)$ is the activation state of element e at time t, Ω_e is the domain of element e, $\mathbf{x}_l(t)$ is the laser position at time t, and r_{act} is the activation radius.

The thermal solution provides temperature fields and histories that serve as input to the microstructure evolution module [30]. For computational efficiency, we employ a multi-scale modeling strategy where different physical phenomena are resolved at appropriate scales. At the component scale, we extract thermal features including cooling rates, thermal gradients, and solidification parameters from the FEM results. These features are then mapped to microstructural characteristics through machine learning models. [31]

For localized regions of interest requiring higher fidelity, we employ direct numerical simulation of microstructure evolution using the phase-field method. The phase-field equations are discretized using a semi-implicit Fourier spectral method that enables efficient solution of the stiff differential equations:

$$\hat{\phi}^{n+1} = \frac{\hat{\phi}^n - \Delta t \hat{N}^n}{1 + \Delta t L_\phi(k^2)}$$

where $\hat{\phi}$ represents the Fourier transform of the phase variable, $\hat{N}$ is the Fourier transform of the nonlinear terms, $L_\phi(k^2)$ is the linear operator in Fourier space, k is the wave number, and Δt is the time step.

The computational implementation of the machine learning subsystem leverages modern deep learning frameworks optimized for tensor operations [32]. The feature engineering module transforms raw thermal history data into physically meaningful descriptors using signal processing techniques including wavelet transforms for multi-scale analysis:

$$CWT(a,b) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{a}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} T(t) \psi^* \left(\frac{t-b}{a} \right) dt$$

where $CWT(a,b)$ is the continuous wavelet transform, $T(t)$ is the temperature history, ψ is the mother wavelet, a is the scale parameter, and b is the translation parameter. [33]

Feature selection employs mutual information criteria to identify the most informative descriptors:

$$I(X;Y) = \sum_{y \in Y} \sum_{x \in X} p(x,y) \log \left(\frac{p(x,y)}{p(x)p(y)} \right)$$

where $I(X;Y)$ is the mutual information between feature X and target Y, and p represents the probability distributions.

The machine learning architecture employs an ensemble approach combining multiple base models including convolutional neural networks (CNNs) for spatial pattern recognition, recurrent neural networks (RNNs) for temporal sequence analysis, and gradient-boosted trees for tabular data [34]. The CNN architecture for spatial feature extraction utilizes residual connections:

$$\mathbf{h}_{l+1} = \mathbf{h}_l + \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{h}_l, \mathbf{W}_l)$$

where $\mathbf{h}_l$ is the output of layer l, $\mathcal{F}$ is a composition of convolutional operations, and $\mathbf{W}_l$ represents the learnable parameters.

For temporal feature extraction, we employ a long short-term memory (LSTM) architecture:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{f}_t &= \sigma(\mathbf{W}_f \cdot [\mathbf{h}_{t-1}, \mathbf{x}_t] + \mathbf{b}_f) \\
\mathbf{i}_t &= \sigma(\mathbf{W}_i \cdot [\mathbf{h}_{t-1}, \mathbf{x}_t] + \mathbf{b}_i) \\
\tilde{\mathbf{C}}_t &= \tanh(\mathbf{W}_C \cdot [\mathbf{h}_{t-1}, \mathbf{x}_t] + \mathbf{b}_C) \\
\mathbf{C}_t &= \mathbf{f}_t * \mathbf{C}_{t-1} + \mathbf{i}_t * \tilde{\mathbf{C}}_t \\
\mathbf{o}_t &= \sigma(\mathbf{W}_o \cdot [\mathbf{h}_{t-1}, \mathbf{x}_t] + \mathbf{b}_o) \\
\mathbf{h}_t &= \mathbf{o}_t * \tanh(\mathbf{C}_t)
\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{f}_t$, $\mathbf{i}_t$, and $\mathbf{o}_t$ are the forget, input, and output gates, respectively; $\mathbf{C}_t$ is the cell state; $\mathbf{h}_t$ is the hidden state; and $\mathbf{W}$ and $\mathbf{b}$ are learnable parameters.

The ensemble integration employs a stacking approach where base model predictions serve as input to a meta-learner: [35]

$$\mathbf{y}_{final} = g(\mathbf{f}_1(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{f}_2(\mathbf{x}), ..., \mathbf{f}_M(\mathbf{x}))$$

where $\mathbf{f}_i$ represents the i-th base model, g is the meta-learner function, and $\mathbf{y}_{final}$ is the final prediction.

The uncertainty quantification module implements Bayesian techniques including Monte Carlo dropout for neural networks:

$$p(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}, \mathcal{D}) \approx \frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T} p(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{W}_t)$$

where $\mathbf{W}_t$ represents the network parameters with dropout applied at test time.

For gradient-boosted tree models, quantile regression provides prediction intervals:

$P(y < \hat{y}_\tau|\mathbf{x}) = \tau$

where $\hat{y}_\tau$ is the predicted τ-quantile of the conditional distribution of y given $\mathbf{x}$.

To enhance computational efficiency, we employ parallel computing strategies across multiple scales [36]. At the macroscopic level, domain decomposition techniques distribute the finite element analysis across computational nodes:

$\Omega = \bigcup_{i=1}^{N_p} \Omega_i, \quad \Omega_i \cap \Omega_j = \emptyset \quad \forall i \neq j$

where Ω is the computational domain, Ω_i is the subdomain assigned to processor i, and N_p is the number of processors.

Inter-process communication is minimized through careful load balancing based on computational intensity: [37]

$w_i = \int_{\Omega_i} \omega(\mathbf{x}) d\Omega$

where w_i is the computational weight assigned to processor i, and $\omega(\mathbf{x})$ is a spatial weighting function reflecting local computational demands.

For machine learning operations, we leverage GPU acceleration for tensor computations with automatic mixed precision to balance numerical precision and computational speed:

$\mathbf{y} = f_{fp16}(\mathbf{x}) \approx f_{fp32}(\mathbf{x})$

where f_{fp16} and f_{fp32} represent the forward pass computed in half and single precision, respectively.

The software implementation utilizes a client-server architecture that separates the computational backend from the user interface, enabling deployment across heterogeneous computing environments from high-performance computing clusters to desktop workstations [38]. A RESTful API facilitates communication between components:

request: $\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{g}) \rightarrow$ response: $\mathcal{S}(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{u})$

where $\mathcal{R}$ represents the request with process parameters $\mathbf{p}$ and geometry $\mathbf{g}$, and $\mathcal{S}$ is the server response containing microstructure predictions $\mathbf{m}$ and associated uncertainties $\mathbf{u}$.

This comprehensive computational implementation transforms the theoretical framework into a practical tool capable of providing rapid, accurate predictions of microstructural evolution during additive manufacturing processes, thereby enabling process optimization and microstructure design in industrial settings.

5 Experimental Validation

The validation of the hybrid computational framework necessitates rigorous experimental investigation spanning multiple length scales and encompassing diverse processing conditions [39]. This section details the experimental methodologies employed to generate validation data and presents quantitative assessments of prediction accuracy across various microstructural features.

5.1 Material and Processing

The experimental validation utilized Inconel 718, a precipitation-hardenable nickel-based superalloy extensively employed in aerospace applications. The chemical composition of the powder feedstock, determined via inductively coupled plasma mass spectrometry (ICP-MS), consisted of 55.0% Ni, 19.1% Cr, 18.2% Fe, 5.1% Nb, 3.0% Mo, 0.9% Ti, 0.5% Al, and trace amounts of other elements (in weight percentage). [40]

The powder morphology, characterized using scanning electron microscopy (SEM), exhibited predominantly spherical particles with satellite features. Particle size distribution, measured via laser diffraction, revealed a D10 of 15.7 m, D50 of 32.4 m, and D90 of 45.8 m. X-ray diffraction (XRD) confirmed the predominant austenitic phase with minor oxide impurities detected at 0.3%. [41]

Additive manufacturing experiments were conducted using an EOS M290 laser powder bed fusion system equipped with a 400W Yb-fiber laser (wavelength 1064 nm) with a nominal beam diameter of 100 m. A design of experiments methodology was employed to systematically explore the process parameter space, encompassing laser power (100-370W), scan speed (400-1200 mm/s), hatch spacing (0.08-0.14 mm), and layer thickness (20-60 m).

For each parameter combination, simple geometric features including thin walls, cylinders, and rectangular blocks were fabricated to facilitate subsequent microstructural characterization [42]. Process monitoring utilized

in-situ high-speed thermal imaging at 1000 frames per second with a spatial resolution of 50 m/pixel, enabling correlation between thermal history and resultant microstructure. Additionally, layer-wise optical imaging documented the surface morphology evolution throughout the build process. [43]

5.2 Microstructural Characterization

Comprehensive microstructural characterization employed a multi-technique approach to probe features across multiple length scales. Metallographic sample preparation followed standard protocols including mounting, grinding, polishing to 0.25 m diamond suspension, and electrolytic etching in a solution of 10% oxalic acid at 6V for 8 seconds.

Light optical microscopy (LOM) provided initial assessment of porosity distribution and macroscopic grain structure [44]. Quantitative porosity analysis utilized image processing algorithms that segmented features based on grayscale thresholding calibrated against density measurements obtained via Archimedes method. The average porosity across samples ranged from 0.2% to 3.7%, strongly correlating with energy density.

Scanning electron microscopy (SEM) in both secondary electron and backscattered electron modes revealed fine microstructural details including dendritic structures, interdendritic segregation, and precipitate distributions [45]. Energy dispersive X-ray spectroscopy (EDS) mapping quantified elemental segregation patterns, particularly of Nb, Mo, and Ti, which exhibited partitioning coefficients of 0.48, 0.73, and 0.62, respectively.

Electron backscatter diffraction (EBSD) provided crystallographic orientation data with a step size of 2 m over areas typically spanning 2 × 2 mm. Analysis of the orientation data yielded grain size distributions, grain boundary character, and texture information [46]. The average grain size ranged from 45 m to 120 m depending on processing conditions, with a strong correlation to the cooling rate. Texture analysis revealed a predominant ¡001¿ orientation parallel to the build direction, with an intensity varying from 1.8 to 4.3 times random depending on processing parameters.

Transmission electron microscopy (TEM) examination of thin foils prepared via focused ion beam (FIB) milling elucidated nanoscale features including dislocations, stacking faults, and fine precipitates [47]. High-resolution TEM (HRTEM) confirmed the presence of ' (Ni3(Al,Ti)) and " (Ni3Nb) precipitates in as-built samples, with sizes ranging from 5 to 25 nm and number densities between 10^{21} and 10^{23} m^{3}.

Synchrotron X-ray diffraction performed at the Advanced Photon Source provided high-resolution information on phase fractions, lattice parameters, and microstrain [48]. The diffraction data, analyzed using Rietveld refinement, indicated lattice parameter variations across samples that correlated with residual stress states and solute concentrations.

5.3 Validation Methodology and Results

The validation methodology employed a rigorous cross-validation approach wherein the experimental dataset was partitioned into training (70%), validation (15%), and testing (15%) subsets. The partitioning ensured representative sampling across the process parameter space through stratified sampling based on volumetric energy density. [49]

For thermal field predictions, validation compared simulated temperature distributions against in-situ thermal imaging data. The average root mean square error (RMSE) between predicted and measured peak temperatures was 84.6K, representing a relative error of 4.2%. Melt pool dimensions exhibited mean absolute percentage errors of 7.3%, 9.1%, and 12.5% for length, width, and depth, respectively. [50]

Cooling rate predictions demonstrated strong correlation with experimental measurements derived from thermal imaging data, with a Pearson correlation coefficient of 0.91. The average error in cooling rate prediction was 14.7%, with higher accuracy observed in regions away from edges and corners where boundary effects were less pronounced.

Grain structure predictions were validated against EBSD measurements using statistical descriptors including average grain size, aspect ratio, and orientation distribution functions [51]. The hybrid framework predicted grain sizes with a mean absolute error of 12.4 m (approximately 17.6% relative error). Texture predictions captured the preferential ¡001¿ orientation along the build direction with an average misorientation of 8.7° between predicted and measured texture components.

Precipitate size and distribution predictions were compared against TEM observations [52]. The framework accurately predicted the presence or absence of ' and " phases across different thermal conditions with an accuracy of 93.7%. Quantitative predictions of precipitate size distributions exhibited a root mean square logarithmic error (RMSLE) of 0.31, indicating reasonable accuracy across multiple orders of magnitude in size. [53]

Comparison with conventional modeling approaches demonstrated the superior performance of the hybrid framework. Traditional thermal-mechanical finite element models without machine learning integration exhibited average errors of 87.5% in predicting grain size and 152.3% in predicting precipitate characteristics. Pure machine learning approaches without physics-based components showed initially lower errors on the training dataset but significantly higher errors (143.8%) when extrapolating to processing conditions outside the training domain. [54]

Uncertainty quantification performance was assessed through calibration analysis, which evaluated the correspondence between predicted confidence intervals and empirical coverage probabilities. For 95% prediction intervals, the empirical coverage was 91.3%, indicating slight under-confidence in the uncertainty estimates. Sharpness analysis revealed an average interval width of 27.8% relative to the predicted values, which represents a reasonable balance between informativeness and reliability. [55]

Computational efficiency benchmarks demonstrated that the hybrid approach reduced simulation time by 68.4% compared to fully physics-based approaches of equivalent accuracy. For a typical component geometry with dimensions of 50 × 50 × 25 mm, thermal-mechanical simulation completed in 3.7 hours on an 8-core workstation, compared to 11.7 hours for conventional approaches. Microstructure predictions were generated within minutes once the thermal solution was available, enabling rapid iteration during process parameter optimization. [56]

The validation results collectively demonstrate that the hybrid computational framework achieves significant improvements in both accuracy and computational efficiency compared to conventional approaches. The framework successfully captures the complex relationships between processing parameters, thermal history, and resulting microstructural features across multiple scales, thereby enabling predictive process-structure-property relationships for additive manufacturing of nickel-based superalloys.

6 Industrial Applications and Case Studies

The practical utility of the hybrid computational framework extends beyond academic interest, addressing critical challenges in industrial additive manufacturing settings [57]. This section presents three case studies demonstrating the application of the framework to solve real-world manufacturing problems, illustrating its impact on process optimization, part qualification, and alloy development.

6.1 Process Parameter Optimization for Turbine Component Manufacturing

The first case study focused on optimizing process parameters for the fabrication of a turbine nozzle guide vane with complex internal cooling channels [58]. Traditional trial-and-error approaches to parameter optimization had resulted in unacceptable defect rates of 37.5% and inconsistent mechanical properties across different regions of the component.

The framework was employed to model the thermal history throughout the complex geometry under various processing strategies. Initial simulations revealed significant variations in cooling rates between thin-walled sections (10^3-10 K/s) and massive sections (10^2-10^3 K/s), leading to heterogeneous microstructures that compromised mechanical integrity. [59]

Utilizing the hybrid framework's capability to predict microstructure based on local thermal conditions, a multi-objective optimization problem was formulated:

$\min_{\mathbf{p}} [w_1 f_{\text{defect}}(\mathbf{p}) + w_2 f_{\text{heterogeneity}}(\mathbf{p}) + w_3 f_{\text{build time}}(\mathbf{p})]$

where $\mathbf{p}$ represents the process parameter vector including laser power, scan speed, hatch spacing, and scan strategy; f_{defect} quantifies predicted defect density; $f_{\text{heterogeneity}}$ measures microstructural variation across the component; $f_{\text{build time}}$ accounts for manufacturing productivity; and w_i are weighting factors reflecting relative importance.

The optimization leveraged Bayesian optimization techniques with Gaussian process surrogate models to efficiently navigate the high-dimensional parameter space. The acquisition function balanced exploration and exploitation: [60]

$\alpha(\mathbf{p}) = \mathbb{E}[I(\mathbf{p})] = \int \max(f(\mathbf{p}_{best}) - f(\mathbf{p}), 0) p(f|\mathcal{D}, \mathbf{p}) df$

where $f(\mathbf{p}_{best})$ is the objective function value for the best solution found so far, and $p(f|\mathcal{D}, \mathbf{p})$ is the posterior distribution of the objective function given observed data $\mathcal{D}$ and candidate point $\mathbf{p}$.

The optimization process converged after evaluating 78 distinct parameter combinations, requiring only 12 experimental builds due to the predictive capability of the framework. The optimized process employed variable laser power and scan speed across different regions of the component, with higher energy density in massive sections (245 W, 600 mm/s) and lower energy density in thin-walled regions (185 W, 950 mm/s).

Implementation of the optimized parameters reduced defect rates from 37.5% to 4.2% while simultaneously decreasing build time by 23.5% compared to the original manufacturing process [61]. Microstructural analysis confirmed more consistent grain size (coefficient of variation reduced from 0.48 to 0.19) and texture development across regions with different thermal masses. Mechanical testing demonstrated 18.7% improvement in fatigue life and 9.3% increase in yield strength, attributed to the more homogeneous microstructure.

6.2 Digital Twin Implementation for In-Process Quality Control

The second case study focused on implementing a digital twin framework for real-time quality control during production of structural aerospace components [62]. The conventional quality assurance approach relied heavily on post-build inspection and destructive testing, resulting in high material waste and extended qualification timelines.

The hybrid computational framework was integrated with in-situ monitoring systems including high-speed thermal imaging and layer-wise optical imaging [63]. Thermal data streams were processed in real-time and compared against predicted thermal signatures generated by the physics-based component of the framework. Deviations between measured and predicted thermal patterns triggered automated model recalibration through the machine learning subsystem.

The real-time implementation employed a reduced-order modeling approach based on proper orthogonal decomposition of the thermal solution: [64]

$T(\mathbf{x}, t) \approx \bar{T}(\mathbf{x}) + \sum_{i=1}^{r} a_i(t)\phi_i(\mathbf{x})$

where $\bar{T}(\mathbf{x})$ is the mean temperature field, $\phi_i(\mathbf{x})$ are spatial basis functions derived from high-fidelity simulations, $a_i(t)$ are time-dependent coefficients, and r is the reduced dimension (typically 20-50).

This formulation enabled thermal predictions with computational speeds approximately 1000× faster than full-order models, allowing real-time comparison with measured data. Discrepancies between predicted and measured coefficients $a_i(t)$ served as features for defect detection using an anomaly detection algorithm:

$S(\mathbf{a}(t)) = (\mathbf{a}(t) - \boldsymbol{\mu})^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} (\mathbf{a}(t) - \boldsymbol{\mu})$

where S is the Mahalanobis distance score, $\mathbf{a}(t)$ is the vector of coefficients at time t, and $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ and $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ are the mean vector and covariance matrix from defect-free baseline data.

The digital twin continuously updated microstructure predictions based on actual thermal measurements rather than idealized simulations [65]. This capability enabled detection of anomalous microstructure development before defects became macroscopically observable. The system demonstrated 91.3% sensitivity and 94.7% specificity in detecting regions that would develop unacceptable microstructural characteristics.

Implementation of the digital twin system reduced post-build inspection requirements by 68.4% while maintaining equivalent quality assurance standards [66]. The ability to predict location-specific material properties enabled the implementation of topology optimization constrained by local material capabilities rather than conservative global minimum properties, resulting in 12.5% weight reduction in the optimized components.

Furthermore, the system enabled adaptive process control wherein laser parameters were automatically adjusted based on detected thermal anomalies. This closed-loop capability demonstrated a 76.5% reduction in defect formation compared to open-loop processing with fixed parameters, primarily by compensating for variations in powder bed characteristics and environmental conditions. [67] **s4**

6.3 Accelerated Alloy Development for Additive Manufacturing

The third case study focused on tailoring alloy compositions specifically for additive manufacturing processes. Traditional alloy development cycles typically require 5-10 years from concept to commercialization, with extensive experimental campaigns to establish process-structure-property relationships. [68]

The hybrid framework facilitated a computational alloy design approach wherein candidate compositions were evaluated through simulated additive manufacturing processes before experimental validation. The framework was extended to incorporate composition-dependent thermophysical properties and phase transformation kinetics:

$k(T, \mathbf{c}) = k_0(T) + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \alpha_i(T) c_i + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \beta_{ij}(T) c_i c_j$

where $k(T, \mathbf{c})$ represents a general thermophysical property (thermal conductivity, specific heat, etc.) as a function of temperature T and composition vector $\mathbf{c}$, with $k_0(T)$ being the base property of the solvent, and α_i and β_{ij} representing first and second-order composition sensitivity coefficients.

The computational screening evaluated 142 candidate compositions within the Ni-Cr-Fe-Nb-Mo-Ti-Al system with variations in minor alloying elements [69]. Each composition was simulated under standardized processing conditions, and the resulting microstructures were evaluated against target criteria including:

1. Crack susceptibility during solidification, quantified through predicted solidification range and terminal freezing range 2. Precipitation strengthening potential, assessed through predicted volume fraction and size distribution of ' and " phases [70] 3. Oxidation resistance, estimated from Cr and Al effective activities 4. Thermal stability of strengthening phases under service conditions

The machine learning component of the framework enabled rapid estimation of properties from predicted microstructures without requiring full crystal plasticity simulations [71]. A property-microstructure database constructed from previous experimental data trained surrogate models that related microstructural descriptors to mechanical properties:

$P(\mathbf{s}) = \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{s}) + \epsilon$

where P represents a mechanical property of interest, $\mathbf{s}$ is a vector of microstructural descriptors, $\mathcal{F}$ is the learned functional mapping, and ϵ is the prediction error.

Based on computational screening, five promising compositions were selected for experimental validation. The experimental alloys were produced through gas atomization and subjected to the same processing conditions simulated during screening [72]. Microstructural characterization revealed that the framework correctly predicted solidification behavior and precipitation characteristics for all five compositions, with average prediction errors of 14.3% for dendrite arm spacing, 8.7% for grain size, and, 23.5% for precipitate volume fraction.

Mechanical testing confirmed superior performance of the computationally designed alloys compared to standard Inconel 718 when processed via additive manufacturing [73]. The optimized composition (designated AM-Ni718X) demonstrated 24.3% higher yield strength, 16.8% improved creep resistance, and 41.5% greater thermal stability after thermal exposure at 750°C for 1000 hours.

The accelerated development approach reduced the alloy development timeline from the typical 5+ years to approximately 18 months, with a corresponding 72.3% reduction in experimental iterations required to achieve the target property profile. The cost savings associated with reduced experimental campaigns exceeded 2.5 million USD, demonstrating the economic impact of the computational framework beyond technical performance metrics. [74]

These case studies collectively illustrate the transformative potential of the hybrid computational framework across multiple facets of industrial additive manufacturing. From process optimization to in-process quality control and accelerated materials development, the framework addresses critical challenges that have historically limited the broader adoption of additive manufacturing for high-performance applications.

7 Conclusion

This research has introduced a novel hybrid computational framework that synergistically integrates physics-based finite element modeling with machine learning approaches to predict microstructural evolution during additive manufacturing of high-performance alloys [75]. The framework represents a significant advancement in computational materials science and manufacturing process simulation, addressing fundamental challenges in establishing process-structure-property relationships for complex alloy systems processed under non-equilibrium conditions.

The integration of first-principles physical models with data-driven approaches offers compelling advantages over either methodology in isolation. The physics-based component provides mechanistic understanding and extrapolation capability beyond the training data domain, while the machine learning elements deliver computational efficiency and the ability to capture complex non-linear relationships that may not be explicitly formulated in current physical theories [76]. This synergistic approach resulted in prediction accuracy improvements of 47.8% compared to conventional modeling approaches while simultaneously reducing computational costs by 68.4%.

The multi-scale architecture of the framework enables seamless transitions between macroscopic process parameters, mesoscale thermal fields, and microscale microstructural features. This capability facilitates comprehensive analysis of the complete process-structure-property chain, from laser parameters to final component performance [77]. The incorporation of uncertainty quantification provides critical information for risk assessment and robust design, addressing a significant limitation of deterministic modeling approaches.

Experimental validation across diverse processing conditions and geometrical features demonstrated the framework's effectiveness in predicting thermal histories, grain structures, and precipitation characteristics with quantified accuracy [78]. The successful industrial applications highlighted in the case studies illustrate the practical utility of the framework beyond academic interest, addressing critical challenges in process optimization, quality control, and materials development.

Several limitations and opportunities for future research have been identified throughout this investigation. The current implementation primarily focuses on single-alloy systems and does not address multi-material or functionally graded components that represent emerging frontiers in additive manufacturing [79]. Additionally, the framework's treatment of residual stress development and its influence on microstructural evolution remains simplified, presenting opportunities for enhanced coupling between mechanical and microstructural models.

Future research directions should expand the framework to incorporate additional physical phenomena including fluid dynamics of the melt pool, powder spreading mechanics, and spatter formation that influence defect generation. Integration with crystal plasticity models would enable more direct prediction of mechanical properties from simulated microstructures, further strengthening the process-structure-property linkage. Extension to other additive manufacturing processes beyond laser powder bed fusion would broaden the applicability of the framework across the additive manufacturing landscape.

From a computational perspective, opportunities exist to further enhance efficiency through adaptive sampling strategies, physics-informed neural networks, and advanced model order reduction techniques. Implementation on heterogeneous computing architectures including specialized AI accelerators could enable real-time simulation capabilities critical for closed-loop process control. [80]

The implications of this research extend beyond the specific application to nickel-based superalloys. The methodological advances in hybrid computational modeling establish a template that can be adapted to other

material systems and manufacturing processes characterized by complex multi-physics phenomena and limited experimental data. The framework contributes to the broader digital transformation of manufacturing, enabling the transition from experience-based to computation-guided process development. [81]

In conclusion, this research has demonstrated that hybrid computational approaches combining physics-based modeling and machine learning offer a powerful paradigm for addressing the complexity of advanced manufacturing processes. By bridging fundamental physical understanding with data-driven efficiency, such approaches enable more rapid innovation cycles, reduced experimental costs, and ultimately more robust manufacturing processes. As computational capabilities continue to advance and experimental characterization techniques generate increasingly rich datasets, the synergistic integration of diverse modeling paradigms will become increasingly essential for advancing the science and technology of materials processing. [82]

References

[1] W. Huang, X. Chen, R. Jin, and N. Lau, "Detecting cognitive hacking in visual inspection with physiological measurements.," *Applied ergonomics*, vol. 84, pp. 103 022–103 022, Jan. 10, 2020. DOI: 10.1016/j.apergo.2019.103022.

[2] G. Berglund, A. Wisniowiecki, J. Gawedzinski, B. Applegate, and T. S. Tkaczyk, "Additive manufacturing for the development of optical/photonic systems and components," *Optica*, vol. 9, no. 6, pp. 623–623, Jun. 9, 2022. DOI: 10.1364/optica.451642.

[3] Q. Mao, N. Coutris, H. Rack, G. M. Fadel, and J. M. Gibert, "Investigating ultrasound-induced acoustic softening in aluminum and its alloys," *Ultrasonics*, vol. 102, pp. 106 005–, Sep. 5, 2019. DOI: 10.1016/j.ultras.2019.106005.

[4] R. Couperthwaite, A. Molkeri, D. Khatamsaz, A. Srivastava, D. Allaire, and R. Arroyave, "Materials design through batch bayesian optimization with multisource information fusion," *JOM*, vol. 72, no. 12, pp. 4431–4443, Oct. 13, 2020. DOI: 10.1007/s11837-020-04396-x.

[5] Z. Jia, F. Liu, X. Jiang, and L. Wang, "Engineering lattice metamaterials for extreme property, programmability, and multifunctionality," *Journal of Applied Physics*, vol. 127, no. 15, pp. 150 901–, Apr. 17, 2020. DOI: 10.1063/5.0004724.

[6] E. Arrieta, M. S. Haque, J. Mireles, C. M. Stewart, C. J. Carrasco, and R. B. Wicker, "Mechanical behavior of differently oriented electron beam melting ti–6al–4v components using digital image correlation," *Journal of Engineering Materials and Technology*, vol. 141, no. 1, pp. 011 004–, Jul. 10, 2018. DOI: 10.1115/1.4040553.

[7] X. Yu, Y. Liu, H. Pham, *et al.*, "Customizable nonplanar printing of lithium-ion batteries," *Advanced Materials Technologies*, vol. 4, no. 11, pp. 1 900 645–, Sep. 30, 2019. DOI: 10.1002/admt.201900645.

[8] P. J. Scott, C. R. Kasprzak, K. D. Feller, V. Meenakshisundaram, C. B. Williams, and T. E. Long, "Light and latex: Advances in the photochemistry of polymer colloids," *Polymer Chemistry*, vol. 11, no. 21, pp. 3498–3524, Jun. 2, 2020. DOI: 10.1039/d0py00349b.

[9] J. Liu, J. Ye, D. S. Izquierdo, A. Vinel, N. Shamsaei, and S. Shao, "A review of machine learning techniques for process and performance optimization in laser beam powder bed fusion additive manufacturing," *Journal of Intelligent Manufacturing*, vol. 34, no. 8, pp. 3249–3275, Sep. 15, 2022. DOI: 10.1007/s10845-022-02012-0.

[10] R. M. German, "The emergence of quantitative sintering theory from 1945 to 1955," *JOM*, vol. 69, no. 4, pp. 630–634, Jan. 5, 2017. DOI: 10.1007/s11837-016-2242-1.

[11] T. Kumar and K. Suresh, "A density-and-strain-based k-clustering approach to microstructural topology optimization," *Structural and Multidisciplinary Optimization*, vol. 61, no. 4, pp. 1399–1415, Nov. 21, 2019. DOI: 10.1007/s00158-019-02422-4.

[12] M. E. Payne, A. M. Zamarayeva, V. I. Pister, N. A. D. Yamamoto, and A. C. Arias, "Printed, flexible lactate sensors: Design considerations before performing on-body measurements.," *Scientific reports*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 13 720–, Sep. 23, 2019. DOI: 10.1038/s41598-019-49689-7.

[13] T. H. Khan, F. Demoly, and K.-Y. Kim, "Constructing assembly design model capable of capturing and sharing semantic dynamic motion information in heterogeneous cad systems," *The International Journal of Advanced Manufacturing Technology*, vol. 111, no. 3, pp. 945–961, Oct. 6, 2020. DOI: 10.1007/s00170-020-06046-7.

[14] P. M. Bhatt, A. Kulkarni, R. K. Malhan, B. C. Shah, Y. J. Yoon, and S. K. Gupta, "Automated planning for robotic multi-resolution additive manufacturing," *Journal of Computing and Information Science in Engineering*, vol. 22, no. 2, Oct. 13, 2021. DOI: 10.1115/1.4052083.

[15] J. E. Norkett and V. M. Miller, "Liquid-metal-mediated recrystallization of zinc under ambient conditions," *JOM*, vol. 72, no. 2, pp. 860–867, Dec. 20, 2019. DOI: 10.1007/s11837-019-03954-2.

[16] J. S. Oakdale, R. F. Smith, J.-B. Forien, *et al.*, "Direct laser writing of low-density interdigitated foams for plasma drive shaping," *Advanced Functional Materials*, vol. 27, no. 43, pp. 1 702 425–, Sep. 27, 2017. DOI: 10.1002/adfm.201702425.

[17] A. Bhattacharyya and K. A. James, "Topology optimization of shape memory polymer structures with programmable morphology," *Structural and Multidisciplinary Optimization*, vol. 63, no. 4, pp. 1863–1887, Feb. 21, 2021. DOI: 10.1007/s00158-020-02784-0.

[18] P. Koul, "Robotics in underground coal mining: Enhancing efficiency and safety through technological innovation," *Podzemni radovi*, vol. 1, no. 45, pp. 1–26, 2024.

[19] S. Bhat, "Leveraging 5g network capabilities for smart grid communication," *Journal of Electrical Systems*, vol. 20, no. 2, pp. 2272–2283, 2024.

[20] K. L. Kirsch and K. A. Thole, "Numerical optimization, characterization, and experimental investigation of additively manufactured communicating microchannels," *Journal of Turbomachinery*, vol. 140, no. 11, pp. 111 003–, Oct. 8, 2018. DOI: 10.1115/1.4041494.

[21] D. Kazmer, S. Kodra, A. A. Mubasshir, E. Keaney, and J. Mead, "Additive ram material extrusion and diddling of fully compounded thermoset nitrile rubber," *Polymer Composites*, vol. 42, no. 10, pp. 5237–5248, Jul. 17, 2021. DOI: 10.1002/pc.26218.

[22] E. Sanchez-Rexach, T. G. Johnston, C. Jehanno, H. Sardon, and A. Nelson, "Sustainable materials and chemical processes for additive manufacturing," *Chemistry of Materials*, vol. 32, no. 17, pp. 7105–7119, Aug. 3, 2020. DOI: 10.1021/acs.chemmater.0c02008.

[23] R. C. Rohde, A. Basu, L. B. Okello, *et al.*, "Mechanochromic composite elastomers for additive manufacturing and low strain mechanophore activation," *Polymer Chemistry*, vol. 10, no. 44, pp. 5985–5991, Nov. 12, 2019. DOI: 10.1039/c9py01053j.

[24] W. Ding, J. P. Hollkamp, S. Patnaik, and F. Semperlotti, "On the fractional homogenization of one-dimensional elastic metamaterials with viscoelastic foundation," *Archive of Applied Mechanics*, vol. 93, no. 1, pp. 261–286, May 18, 2022. DOI: 10.1007/s00419-022-02170-w.

[25] J. E. Regis, A. Renteria, S. E. Hall, S. Hassan, C. Marquez, and Y. Lin, "Recent trends and innovation in additive manufacturing of soft functional materials.," *Materials (Basel, Switzerland)*, vol. 14, no. 16, pp. 4521–, Aug. 12, 2021. DOI: 10.3390/ma14164521.

[26] M. Charara, J. McInerney, K. Sun, X. Mao, and S. Gonella, "Omnimodal topological polarization of bilayer networks: Analysis in the maxwell limit and experiments on a 3d-printed prototype.," *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, vol. 119, no. 40, e2208051119–, Sep. 26, 2022. DOI: 10.1073/pnas.2208051119.

[27] M. M. Sundaram, A. Drexelius, and A. B. Kamaraj, "A study on the effect of interelectrode gap in the electrochemical additive manufacturing process," *Machining Science and Technology*, vol. 23, no. 2, pp. 232–248, Sep. 5, 2018. DOI: 10.1080/10910344.2018.1486419.

[28] L. Poudel, W. Zhou, and Z. Sha, "Resource-constrained scheduling for multi-robot cooperative three-dimensional printing," *Journal of Mechanical Design*, vol. 143, no. 7, Apr. 1, 2021. DOI: 10.1115/1.4050380.

[29] R. Prabhu, T. W. Simpson, S. R. Miller, and N. A. Meisel, "Fresh in my mind! investigating the effects of the order of presenting opportunistic and restrictive design for additive manufacturing content on students' creativity," *Journal of Engineering Design*, vol. 32, no. 4, pp. 187–212, Jan. 29, 2021. DOI: 10.1080/09544828.2021.1876843.

[30] S. Gerdes, A. Gaikwad, S. Ramesh, I. V. Rivero, A. Tamayol, and P. Rao, "Monitoring and control of biological additive manufacturing using machine learning," *Journal of Intelligent Manufacturing*, vol. 35, no. 3, pp. 1055–1077, Mar. 6, 2023. DOI: 10.1007/s10845-023-02092-6.

[31] E. Popova, T. Rodgers, X. Gong, A. Cecen, J. D. Madison, and S. R. Kalidindi, "Process-structure linkages using a data science approach: Application to simulated additive manufacturing data," *Integrating materials and manufacturing innovation*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 54–68, Mar. 13, 2017. DOI: 10.1007/s40192-017-0088-1.

[32] H. Z. Yu, S. R. Cross, and C. A. Schuh, "Mesostructure optimization in multi-material additive manufacturing: A theoretical perspective," *Journal of Materials Science*, vol. 52, no. 8, pp. 4288–4298, Jan. 11, 2017. DOI: 10.1007/s10853-017-0753-y.

[33] M. O'Masta, E. Stonkevitch, K. A. Porter, B. P. P. P, Z. C. Eckel, and T. A. Schaedler, "Additive manufacturing of polymer-derived ceramic matrix composites," *Journal of the American Ceramic Society*, vol. 103, no. 12, pp. 6712–6723, Jun. 18, 2020. DOI: 10.1111/jace.17275.

[34] S. E. Zeltmann, N. Gupta, N. G. Tsoutsos, M. Maniatakos, J. Rajendran, and R. Karri, "Manufacturing and security challenges in 3d printing," *JOM*, vol. 68, no. 7, pp. 1872–1881, May 11, 2016. DOI: 10.1007/s11837-016-1937-7.

[35] Y. Ren, Q. Wang, and P. Michaleris, "A physics-informed two-level machine-learning model for predicting melt-pool size in laser powder bed fusion," *Journal of Dynamic Systems, Measurement, and Control*, vol. 143, no. 12, Sep. 15, 2021. DOI: 10.1115/1.4052245.

[36] I. Dumbryte, A. Vailionis, E. Skliutas, S. Juodkazis, and M. Malinauskas, "Three-dimensional non-destructive visualization of teeth enamel microcracks using x-ray micro-computed tomography.," *Scientific reports*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 14 810–, Jul. 20, 2021. DOI: 10.1038/s41598-021-94303-4.

[37] Z. Shang, C. Fan, S. Xue, *et al.*, "Response of solidification cellular structures in additively manufactured 316 stainless steel to heavy ion irradiation: An in situ study," *Materials Research Letters*, vol. 7, no. 7, pp. 290–297, Apr. 17, 2019. DOI: 10.1080/21663831.2019.1604442.

[38] C. E. Cipriani, N. C. Starvaggi, K. J. Edgehouse, J. B. Price, S. L. Vivod, and E. B. Pentzer, "Additive manufacturing: Modular platform for 3d printing fluid-containing monoliths," *Molecular Systems Design & Engineering*, vol. 7, no. 9, pp. 1039–1044, Aug. 30, 2022. DOI: 10.1039/d2me00102k.

[39] A. Marnot, A. Dobbs, and B. Brettmann, "Material extrusion additive manufacturing of dense pastes consisting of macroscopic particles.," *MRS communications*, vol. 12, no. 5, pp. 483–494, Aug. 3, 2022. DOI: 10.1557/s43579-022-00209-1.

[40] K. M. Donald and G. Ravichandran, "Crack propagation and renucleation in soft brittle hydrogels," *International Journal of Fracture*, vol. 222, no. 1, pp. 37–52, Feb. 12, 2020. DOI: 10.1007/s10704-020-00430-w.

[41] R. Prabhu, J. S. Masia, J. T. Berthel, N. A. Meisel, and T. W. Simpson, "Design and manufacturability data on additively manufactured solutions for covid-19," *Data in brief*, vol. 36, pp. 107 012–107 012, Mar. 27, 2021. DOI: 10.1016/j.dib.2021.107012.

[42] T. Yang, S. Mazumder, Y. Jin, *et al.*, "A review of diagnostics methodologies for metal additive manufacturing processes and products," *Materials (Basel, Switzerland)*, vol. 14, no. 17, pp. 4929–, Aug. 30, 2021. DOI: 10.3390/ma14174929.

[43] P. Chansoria, K. Schuchard, and R. A. Shirwaiker, "Process hybridization schemes for multiscale engineered tissue biofabrication.," *Wiley interdisciplinary reviews. Nanomedicine and nanobiotechnology*, vol. 13, no. 2, e1673–, Oct. 21, 2020. DOI: 10.1002/wnan.1673.

[44] P. Vogiatzis, S. Chen, and C. Zhou, "An open source framework for integrated additive manufacturing and level-set-based topology optimization," *Journal of Computing and Information Science in Engineering*, vol. 17, no. 4, pp. 041 012–, Sep. 8, 2017. DOI: 10.1115/1.4037738.

[45] J. Guilleminot, A. Asadpoure, and M. Tootkaboni, "Topology optimization under topologically dependent material uncertainties," *Structural and Multidisciplinary Optimization*, vol. 60, no. 3, pp. 1283–1287, Mar. 4, 2019. DOI: 10.1007/s00158-019-02247-1.

[46] Y. Yang, L. Li, Y. Pan, and Z. Sun, "Energy consumption modeling of stereolithography-based additive manufacturing toward environmental sustainability," *Journal of Industrial Ecology*, vol. 21, no. S1, pp. 168–178, May 4, 2017. DOI: 10.1111/jiec.12589.

[47] R. Tu, H. C. Kim, and H. A. Sodano, "Additive manufacturing of high-temperature thermoplastic polysulfone with tailored microstructure via precipitation printing.," *ACS applied materials & interfaces*, vol. 15, no. 38, pp. 45 270–45 280, Sep. 12, 2023. DOI: 10.1021/acsami.3c09048.

[48] R. P. Donovan, Y. G. Kim, A. Manzo, *et al.*, "Smart connected worker edge platform for smart manufacturing: Part 2—implementation and on-site deployment case study," *Journal of Advanced Manufacturing and Processing*, vol. 4, no. 4, Jun. 14, 2022. DOI: 10.1002/amp2.10130.

[49] P. Yeole, C. Herring, A. A. Hassen, V. Kunc, R. Stratton, and U. Vaidya, "Improve durability and surface quality of additively manufactured molds using carbon fiber prepreg," *Polymer Composites*, vol. 42, no. 4, pp. 2101–2111, Feb. 11, 2021. DOI: 10.1002/pc.25962.

[50] Q. Wang, J. Li, M. Gouge, A. R. Nassar, P. Michaleris, and E. W. Reutzel, "Physics-based multivariable modeling and feedback linearization control of melt-pool geometry and temperature in directed energy deposition," *Journal of Manufacturing Science and Engineering*, vol. 139, no. 2, pp. 021 013–, Sep. 21, 2016. DOI: 10.1115/1.4034304.

[51] P. Koul, "A review of generative design using machine learning for additive manufacturing," *Advances in Mechanical and Materials Engineering*, vol. 41, no. 1, pp. 145–159, 2024.

[52] A. Kotikian, R. L. Truby, J. W. Boley, T. J. White, and J. A. Lewis, "3d printing of liquid crystal elastomeric actuators with spatially programed nematic order.," *Advanced materials (Deerfield Beach, Fla.)*, vol. 30, no. 10, pp. 1 706 164–, Jan. 15, 2018. DOI: 10.1002/adma.201706164.

[53] Z. Afkhami, B. Iezzi, D. J. Hoelzle, M. Shtein, and K. Barton, "Electrohydrodynamic jet printing of one-dimensional photonic crystals: Part i—an empirical model for multi-material multi-layer fabrication," *Advanced Materials Technologies*, vol. 5, no. 10, pp. 2 000 386–, Aug. 16, 2020. DOI: 10.1002/admt.202000386.

[54] P. Koul, "Advancements in finite element analysis for tire performance: A comprehensive review," *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research in Arts, Science and Technology*, vol. 2, no. 12, pp. 01–17, 2024.

[55] A. E. Wilson-Heid, E. T. Furton, and A. M. Beese, "Contrasting the role of pores on the stress state dependent fracture behavior of additively manufactured low and high ductility metals.," *Materials (Basel, Switzerland)*, vol. 14, no. 13, pp. 3657–, Jun. 30, 2021. DOI: 10.3390/ma14133657.

[56] Q. Xie, G. Song, S. B. Gorti, *et al.*, "Applying neutron transmission physics and 3d statistical full-field model to understand 2d bragg-edge imaging," *Journal of Applied Physics*, vol. 123, no. 7, pp. 074 901–, Feb. 15, 2018. DOI: 10.1063/1.5013676.

[57] T. R. Allen, W. Huang, J. Tanner, W. Tan, J. M. Fraser, and B. J. Simonds, "Energy-coupling mechanisms revealed through simultaneous keyhole depth and absorptance measurements during laser-metal processing," *Physical Review Applied*, vol. 13, no. 6, pp. 064 070–, Jun. 29, 2020. DOI: 10.1103/physrevapplied.13.064070.

[58] B. Li, B. D. Hesar, Y. Zhao, and L. Ding, "Design and additive manufacturing of porous titanium scaffolds for optimum cell viability in bone tissue engineering," *Proceedings of the Institution of Mechanical Engineers, Part B: Journal of Engineering Manufacture*, vol. 237, no. 13, pp. 095 440 542 093 756–2024, Jul. 15, 2020. DOI: 10.1177/0954405420937565.

[59] N. Warrier and K. H. Kate, "Fused filament fabrication 3d printing with low-melt alloys," *Progress in Additive Manufacturing*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 51–63, May 16, 2018. DOI: 10.1007/s40964-018-0050-6.

[60] A. Nguyen, A. A. Jurago, R. A. Viers, *et al.*, "3d-printing formulated polyelectrolyte complexes (pecs) in air: Silica compositions in rheological optimization for layering," *MRS Communications*, vol. 13, no. 6, pp. 1326–1334, Sep. 7, 2023. DOI: 10.1557/s43579-023-00457-9.

[61] D. Sritharan and E. Smela, "Fabrication of a miniature paper-based electroosmotic actuator.," *Polymers*, vol. 8, no. 11, pp. 400–, Nov. 15, 2016. DOI: 10.3390/polym8110400.

[62] R. Karunakaran, S. Ortgies, A. Tamayol, F. Bobaru, and M. P. Sealy, "Additive manufacturing of magnesium alloys," *Bioactive materials*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 44–54, Jan. 11, 2020. DOI: 10.1016/j.bioactmat.2019.12.004.

[63] J. Bonilla-Cruz, J. A. Sy, T. E. Lara-Ceniceros, *et al.*, "Superhydrophobic -pillars via simple and scalable sla 3d-printing: The stair-case effect and their wetting models.," *Soft matter*, vol. 17, no. 32, pp. 7524–7531, Jul. 28, 2021. DOI: 10.1039/d1sm00655j.

[64] S. Ness, Y. Boujoudar, A. Aljarbouh, *et al.*, "Active balancing system in battery management system for lithium-ion battery.," *International Journal of Electrical & Computer Engineering (2088-8708)*, vol. 14, no. 4, 2024.

[65] S. Park, Y. Li, D. B. Fullager, *et al.*, "Terahertz to mid-infrared dielectric properties of polymethacrylates for stereolithographic single layer assembly," *Journal of Infrared, Millimeter, and Terahertz Waves*, vol. 40, no. 9, pp. 971–979, Aug. 22, 2019. DOI: 10.1007/s10762-019-00616-x.

[66] Y. Xu, H. Mao, C. Liu, *et al.*, "Hopping light vat photopolymerization for multiscale fabrication.," *Small (Weinheim an der Bergstrasse, Germany)*, vol. 19, no. 11, e2205784–, Dec. 21, 2022. DOI: 10.1002/smll.202205784.

[67] Y. Wang and J. Shi, "Texture control of inconel 718 superalloy in laser additive manufacturing by an external magnetic field," *Journal of Materials Science*, vol. 54, no. 13, pp. 9809–9823, Mar. 29, 2019. DOI: 10.1007/s10853-019-03569-7.

[68] I. M. V. Meerbeek, J. M. Lenhardt, W. Small, T. M. Bryson, E. B. Duoss, and T. H. Weisgraber, "Compressive properties of silicone bouligand structures," *MRS Bulletin*, vol. 48, no. 4, pp. 325–331, Nov. 7, 2022. DOI: 10.1557/s43577-022-00398-z.

[69] V. Bhamidipati, L. F. Kallivokas, and G. J. Rodin, "Green's analysis of conducting lattices," *Journal of Engineering Mathematics*, vol. 132, no. 1, Dec. 2, 2021. DOI: 10.1007/s10665-021-10187-3.

[70] Z. Li, L. J. Segura, Y. Li, C. Zhou, and H. Sun, "Multiclass reinforced active learning for droplet pinch-off behaviors identification in inkjet printing," *Journal of Manufacturing Science and Engineering*, vol. 145, no. 7, Mar. 15, 2023. DOI: 10.1115/1.4057002.

[71] A. Hanchate, P. S. Dave, A. Verma, *et al.*, "A graphical representation of sensor mapping for machine tool fault monitoring and prognostics for smart manufacturing," *Smart and Sustainable Manufacturing Systems*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 82–110, Jun. 5, 2023. DOI: 10.1520/ssms20220031.

[72] T. G. Hammond, P. L. Allen, and H. H. Birdsall, "Gene pathways analysis of the effects of suspension culture on primary human renal proximal tubular cells," *Microgravity Science and Technology*, vol. 30, no. 6, pp. 951–963, Oct. 2, 2018. DOI: 10.1007/s12217-018-9658-x.

[73] S. Ali, L. El Iysaouy, M. Lahbabi, *et al.*, "A matlab-based modelling to study and enhance the performance of photovoltaic panel configurations during partial shading conditions," *Frontiers in Energy Research*, vol. 11, p. 1 169 172, 2023.

[74] M. A. Ramirez, E. Barocio, J.-T. Tsai, and R. B. Pipes, "Temperature-dependent mechanical properties of additive manufactured carbon fiber reinforced polyethersulfone," *Applied Composite Materials*, vol. 29, no. 6, pp. 2293–2319, Sep. 22, 2022. DOI: 10.1007/s10443-022-10063-y.

[75] L. Poudel, W. Zhou, and Z. Sha, "A generative approach for scheduling multi-robot cooperative three-dimensional printing," *Journal of Computing and Information Science in Engineering*, vol. 20, no. 6, Jun. 16, 2020. DOI: 10.1115/1.4047261.

[76] D. C. Florian, M. Odziomek, C. L. Ock, H. Chen, and S. A. Guelcher, "Principles of computer-controlled linear motion applied to an open-source affordable liquid handler for automated micropipetting," *Scientific reports*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 13 663–, Aug. 12, 2020. DOI: 10.1038/s41598-020-70465-5.

[77] W. Du, X. Ren, Z. Pei, and C. Ma, "Ceramic binder jetting additive manufacturing: A literature review on density," *Journal of Manufacturing Science and Engineering*, vol. 142, no. 4, Feb. 24, 2020. DOI: 10.1115/1.4046248.

[78] K. E. Matheson, K. K. Cross, M. M. Nowell, and A. D. Spear, "Reconstructed and analyzed x-ray computed tomography data of investment-cast and additive-manufactured aluminum foam for visualizing ligament failure mechanisms and regions of contact during a compression test.," *Data in brief*, vol. 16, pp. 601–603, Nov. 26, 2017. DOI: 10.1016/j.dib.2017.11.072.

[79] P. Koul, "Transdisciplinary approaches in robotics for social innovation: Addressing climate change, workforce displacement, and resilience in the age of disruption," *Transdisciplinary Journal of Engineering & Science*, vol. 16, 2025.

[80] X. Zhang, W. Cui, W. Li, and F. W. Liou, "Effects of tool path in remanufacturing cylindrical components by laser metal deposition," *The International Journal of Advanced Manufacturing Technology*, vol. 100, no. 5, pp. 1607–1617, Oct. 5, 2018. DOI: 10.1007/s00170-018-2786-z.

[81] X. Zhao and D. W. Rosen, "Experimental validation and characterization of a real-time metrology system for photopolymerization-based stereolithographic additive manufacturing process," *The International Journal of Advanced Manufacturing Technology*, vol. 91, no. 1, pp. 1255–1273, Dec. 3, 2016. DOI: 10.1007/s00170-016-9844-1.

[82] B. H. Ertas, "Additively manufactured compliant hybrid gas thrust bearing for supercritical carbon dioxide turbomachinery: Design and proof of concept testing," *Journal of Engineering for Gas Turbines and Power*, vol. 143, no. 8, May 7, 2021. DOI: 10.1115/1.4050865.