In-Situ Thermographic Inspection for Laser Powder Bed Fusion
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Abstract

Laser powder bed fusion is strongly influenced by the quality of the powder layer including the powder properties as well as the layer thickness. In particular, thermal stresses can produce sufficient part deformation to the point that a part interferes with the wiper. This paper investigates the use of long-wave infrared thermography to monitor the surface temperature of the build. When cold powder is spread by the wiper, heat diffuses from the underlying part through the powder. The surface temperature history is a strong function of the thermal transport properties of the powder as well as the thickness. This correlation is explored and measured experimentally. It is then used to estimate the powder layer thickness above overhanging parts. This approach is shown to capture the part distortion and predicts wiper state prior to catastrophic interaction with the part.
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1. Introduction

Laser powder bed fusion (LPBF), as one of the most common additive manufacturing technologies, is a process that melts a metal powder by a high-power laser beam layer by layer to generate 3D metal parts [1-3]. The powder layer properties affect the product performance significantly. For example, the microhardness decreases, and the grain size increases for 1Cr18Ni9Ti stainless steel powder when the layer thickness increases in the range of 60 – 100 µm [4]. However, for the CL50WS powder, powder layer thickness in the range of 30 - 40 µm has no significant influence on microhardness [5-6]. Other mechanical properties of the fabricated parts may also be sensitive to powder properties. For the parts produced from Ti-6Al-4V powder, rapid increase in porosity and surface roughness may result from the use of thick powder layer above 40 µm [7].

In-situ measurement of powder layer thickness has attracted many researchers’ attention in recent years. Richard et al. developed a laser displacement in-situ non-destructive method to measure the top powder layer thickness [8]. There are other optical in-situ methods to measure the top powder surface profile. For example, the high-speed spectral domain optical coherence tomography (SD-OCT) was used to measure the layer roughness [9]. The digital fringe projection technique was implemented to measure the surface topography of powder layer [10]. Although these optical approaches can measure the powder layer thickness, none of them can provide the powder thermal conductivity information based on their in-situ measurement data.

Thermal cameras and imaging approaches have been used to monitor thermal features during LPBF manufacturing [11]. Short-wavelength infrared (SWIR) cameras, which are more sensitive at high temperature, have been used to monitor the melt-pool dynamics and stability [12], cooling rate [13], and combined with visible cameras to monitor defects [14]. In contrast, relatively inexpensive, uncooled long-wavelength infrared (LWIR) cameras, which are more sensitive at lower temperature, have been used to observe the plume formed by material evaporation and heating of the surrounding gas [15], obtain the surface temperature and cooling time [16], and predict the temperature distribution [17]. Furthermore, image data has been combined with machine learning algorithms to provide an efficient means to assess part quality, validate specific internal geometries, and detect build defects [18,19]. However, no previous researchers have used LWIR cameras to measure in-situ the powder layer thickness and thermal conductivity. The study described in the present paper fills this significant gap.

In this study, a LWIR camera is used to monitor the temperature of the powder bed during the LPBF process. By analyzing the thermography data, the temperature profile is calculated from the thermal history, and the temperature rise time is mapped to the powder layer thickness based on 1D thermal modeling. The obtained powder
layer thickness has been verified experimentally. Finally, an application of the in-situ thermographic monitoring for recoater jam prediction is demonstrated.

2. Experimental setup

Renishaw AM250, which is an additive manufacturing machine that fabricates metal parts by using the LPBF process, was used to manufacture 304L stainless steel samples. An FLIR A655sc LWIR camera was installed in a Renishaw AM250 machine at the Missouri University of Science and Technology. Figure 1a shows the experimental setup. The ZnSe window locates in front of the LWIR camera was used to seal the build chamber. Figure 1b shows an example of the camera field of view.

![Experimental setup diagram](image)

Fig. 1. (a) LWIR image of blackbody during cooling and (b) reference visible image of experimental setup.

Since the 304L stainless steel powder bed and LPBF printed solid part have different emissivity, the radiance recorded by the infrared camera needs to be calibrated for both the powder bed and the solid part. Our calibration experiment is shown in Fig. 2. A LPBF 304L stainless steel bin with a cavity in it is manufactured to the equivalent of a blackbody. 304L powder was placed partially on the bin’s top surface, and the bin surface remained observable from the infrared camera. This blackbody was heated by the AM250 laser with 200W for seconds at a time as shown in Fig. 2a schematic. This design configuration permitted the simultaneous temperature calibration for the blackbody, 304L stainless steel powder, and 304L solid bin. The LWIR image shown in Fig. 2a denotes the temperature distribution during cooling, and a visible image of the experimental setup is shown in Fig. 2b. The $T_{\text{apparent}}$ is the temperature measured by the thermal camera single pixel. The actual temperature $T_{\text{actual}}$ of the blackbody was recorded by thermocouples located at the top and bottom of the calibration cube. The average of the two thermocouple values is plotted as the actual temperature in the heating and cooling curve shown in Fig. 3(a). The corresponding $T_{\text{apparent}}$ temperatures for the various material states were measured with the LWIR camera. These results are included in Fig. 3(b).

In the cooling process, the various material states have the same temperature. However, the different emissivity of these various states make the apparent temperatures recorded by the camera different as shown in Fig. 3(b). The cooling portions of the curves in Fig. 3(b) were used to develop the calibrations from the apparent temperature to the actual temperature. These results are included as Fig. 4 and show that the actual temperature scales linearly with the apparent temperature for all the blackbody, the 304L powder, and the 304L solid. The different calibration equations obtained are:

$$
T_{\text{blackbody}} = T \times 5.83 \times 101.67 \\
T_{\text{solid}} = T \times 14.84 \times 310.28 \\
T_{\text{powder}} = T \times 7.64 \times 144.38
$$

These calibration equations will be used to determine the actual temperatures from the measured apparent temperature.
Fig. 2. (a) LWIR image of blackbody during cooling and (b) reference visible image of experimental setup.

Fig. 3. Blackbody heating and cooling curves with (a) actual temperature from thermocouple measurements and (b) apparent temperature from various locations in LWIR data.

Fig. 4. LWIR temperature calibrations for blackbody material, 304L stainless steel powder, and 304L stainless steel solid.
3. LWIR camera data processing

3.1 Thermal history

The specimens of 304L stainless steel were manufactured by the Renishaw AM250 and recorded by layer-to-layer LWIR imaging. The laser in Renishaw AM250 scans the powder parts with a point-to-point exposure strategy. This scanning process steps discretely with the parameters of point distance, exposure time, and hatch spacing. The laser scanning has a fixed orientation perpendicular to wiper moving direction and there was no rotation of the scanning direction from layer to layer. The wiper is located in front of the build plane during the laser scanning fabrication. After the laser finishes the scanning of one layer, the wiper returns to the powder delivery hopper at the back side of the build plane. Then the wiper obtains the fresh powder from the powder delivery hopper, and it goes forward to spread a fresh layer of powder. This process is shown in Fig. 5. The experiment parameter sets are laser power 200W, exposure time 50 µs, point distance 60 µm, hatch spacing 85 µm, and powder thickness 50 µm. The build plate is heated to 80°C during the LPBF process. The entire build chamber is filled with Argon gas to avoid oxidation.

![Fig. 5. Schematic of powder spreading process](image)

The thermal histories of laser printing with the calibration equations in Eq. (1) are shown in Fig. 6a. When the build plate’s top surface is covered by powder, the thermal history needs to be calibrated using the powder emissivity. Similarly, when the powder is melt and then solidified, the solid emissivity should be used. Fig. 6b shows this calibration results. In Fig. 6a, the left-valley minimum temperature indicates the wiper temperature when the wiper is spreading the powder. When the wiper obtains the fresh powder from the powder delivery hopper, it moves to the front to spread a fresh layer of powder with 50 µm height. The newly spread powder is heated by the printed layer underneath. The temperature rise curve after the left valley represents this temperature heat-up process. After this spread, the wiper stays at the front of build plate during the laser printing. The temperature at the peak represents the laser heating the powder bed and melting the powder. After the laser printing, the wiper goes back to the powder delivery hopper. The right-valley minimum temperature in the thermal history indicates the wiper temperature when the powder is covered by the wiper during its traveling back. There is a slight temperature rise when wiper return. This is because when wiper return, it respread tiny powder on the top of printed solid area.

![Fig. 6. (a) Temperature history obtained by using different calibration equations, (b) calibrated temperature history.](image)
The powder temperature heat-up process is valuable because it relates to the powder properties: the temperature of a thinner powder layer rises faster than the temperature of a thicker powder layer.

3.2 1D heat transfer model

In order to understand the effect of powder properties, a one-dimensional heat transfer model is established. A schematic of the 1D heat transfer model is shown in Fig. 7a. There are two finite slabs with thickness $\delta$ and $s$ representing the powder and printed solid parts. The powder slab is assumed in perfect contact with the printed solid slab. The $x$-coordinates $x_p$ and $x_s$ for the powder and solid slabs are conveniently chosen as shown in the figure. The equation describing unsteady 1D heat conduction and the initial and boundary conditions for the powder slab in $x_p$-coordinate are given by

$$\frac{\partial T_i}{\partial t} = \frac{k_p}{C_p \rho_p} \frac{\partial^2 T_i}{\partial x_p^2} \tag{2}$$

$$T_i(\delta, t) = T_i(t) \tag{3}$$

$$k_p \frac{\partial T_i}{\partial x_p} \bigg|_{x_p=0} = h \left[ T_i(0, t) - T_\infty \right] \tag{4}$$

$$T_i(x_p, 0) = T_{p_i} \tag{5}$$

where $T_i$ is the temperature distribution of powder, $t$ is time, $x_p$ is the distance normal to the build plane, $k_p$ is the thermal conductivity of powder, $C_p$ is the specific heat capacity of powder, $\rho_p$ is the density of powder, $\delta$ is the thickness of powder layer, $T_i$ is the interface temperature, $T_\infty$ is the ambient temperature, $h$ is the convective heat transfer coefficient of gas, $T_{p_i}$ is the initial temperature of powder. The radiation loss occurred at the powder top surface is assumed negligible.

The finite difference method is used to solve the above equations for the temperature distribution for a given powder thickness. The obtained temperature distributions for several powder thicknesses are shown in Fig. 7b and 7c, where the material properties used are given in Table 1. The $T_\infty$ is 30°C as the temperature of the Argon gas. $T_s$ is 80°C as the build plate heating temperature. $T_{p_i}$ is 30°C as same as $T_\infty$, $h$ is 15 W/m$^2$K, $s$ is 3mm.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Properties</th>
<th>304L Solid</th>
<th>304L Powder</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Density $\rho$ [kg/m$^3$]</td>
<td>8030</td>
<td>4818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific heat capacity $c$ [J/kg$\cdot$K]</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thermal conductivity $k$ [W/m$\cdot$K]</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 Material properties of 304L solid and powder

Figure 7b shows the temperature history of the powder top surface for different powder thicknesses. The temperature of a thicker powder layer rises more slowly than the temperature of a thinner powder layer. Fig. 7c shows the temperature distribution along the depth direction. It shows that the powder surface temperature reaches almost $T_i$ in 1s.
4. Correlation of thermal features with powder properties

4.1 Rise time

The heat-up curves in Fig. 7b are examined carefully in order to express them in mathematical equations. It is observed that a linear combination of a constant and two exponential functions with different coefficients can be used to fit the temperature rise very well. The expression of this fitting function is

\[ T = \begin{cases} A_1 - A_2 e^{-\alpha_1 t} - A_3 e^{-\alpha_2 t} & t > t_i \\ A_1 - A_2 & t < t_i \end{cases} \]  

(6)

This is a piecewise function. \(A_1\) is the powder’s steady-state temperature. \(A_1 - A_2 - A_3\) is the powder’s initial temperature. \(\alpha_1\) can be very large to represent the initial rapid heat-up process and \(\alpha_2\) is smaller to represent the speed of approaching the steady-state temperature. \(t_i\) is the time that the powder starts to heat up. By using this function, the temperature rise curves in Fig. 7b can be fitted very well as shown in Fig. 8a. The purpose of constructing this fitting function is to obtain the temperature rise time. The temperature rise time is defined here as the time period from the initial time to the time when temperature reaches 90% of the steady-state temperature. The rise time can be obtained by solving the equation:

\[ A_1 e^{-\alpha_1 t} + A_2 e^{-\alpha_2 t} = 0.1(A_2 + A_1) \]  

(7)

The correlation between 1D model thermal history with fitting result and powder thickness with respect to rise time calculated from 1D model is shown in Fig. 8a and Fig. 8b.
The rise time of different powder thickness calculated by the 1D model is shown in Fig. 8b with respect to the powder thickness. It is clear that the relationship between powder thickness and temperature rise time is monotonic, and it can be represented by the following exponential function:

$$\delta = 231.2 \times 10^{-0.5045 \times \text{rise} \delta t}$$  \hspace{1cm} (8)

By using this exponential function, the powder layer thickness can be calculated from its temperature rise time.

### 4.2 Powder properties

Equation 8 shows the relationship between powder thickness and temperature rise time calculated by using 1D heat transfer model. This relationship needs to be validated experimentally. The specimens with different heights were fabricated by the AM250 machine for the validation experiment. As shown in Fig. 10, there are 4 identical specimens, each having 8 strips with different heights. Fig. 9a shows the profile of 8 different heights and Table 2 lists the strip heights and the corresponding powder thickness for every strip. After this experiment, the build plate was taken out of the build chamber and its precise dimensions was measured by laser scanning. The powder layer thickness above every strip can be calculated as the total powder thickness subtracts the specimen’s height. The 2D map of powder layer thickness is shown in Fig. 9c.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>n</th>
<th>h [mm]</th>
<th>(\delta) [(\mu m)]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 The height of each of the eight different strips and corresponding powder thickness

To measure the temperature rise, when the manufacture of these 4 specimens was done and before moved it out, the build plate was kept in the Renishaw AM250 build chamber’s original position. Then the 4 specimens’ top surfaces were cleaned. After cleaning specimens’ surface powder and keeping the build plate temperature at 80°C, a new fresh layer was spread by the wiper to cover all the 4 specimens’ top surfaces. Since the fresh powder has a lower temperature \(T_p\) and the specimens have different heights, the specimen strips with higher heights have thinner fresh powder to heat up. The fresh powder was heated up at different speeds at various locations. The infrared camera recorded the process of temperature rise for all the height strips. Then Eq. 6 was used to fit all the temperature history and Eq. 7 was used to calculate the rise time. The final 2D map of the rise time is shown in Fig. 10a.

Figure 11a shows the temperature rise curves at four different positions on a specimen’s top surface. The fitting curves obtained by Eq. 6 match very well with the temperatures measured by the LWIR camera. The data of mean powder thicknesses vs. temperature rise time for each of the 8 strips in the four specimens from Fig. 9c and 10a are plotted in Fig. 11b. The error bars indicate the standard deviation. The power function obtained to fit these mean values by regression is

$$\delta = 218.6 \times 10^{0.58 \times \text{rise} \delta t}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (9)

Note that the values of coefficients in this function from experiment are close to the values of coefficients obtained previously 1D model for Eq. 8. The difference is caused by the rise time calculation. The 2D map of powder thickness can be calculated from Eq. 9 and is shown in Fig. 10b.

In order to compare the powder thickness predicted by Eq. 9 with measured powder thickness, data of Fig. 9c and Fig. 10b are plotted together as show in Fig. 11. The \(R^2\) for this prediction results is 0.7641.

303
Fig. 9. (a) Surface profile of one specimen with 8 different strips, (b) Images of four specimens, each divided into eight strips with different heights (c) 2D map of the powder thickness.

Fig. 10. (a) 2D map of the temperature rise time for different regions of the specimens and (b) 2D map of the powder thickness calculated by Eq. 9.

Fig. 11. (a) Comparison between measured temperatures with fitting results and (b) powder thickness with respect to temperature rise time from experimental data.
Fig. 12. Comparison between measured powder thickness with respect to powder thickness predicted by rise time

5. Application of the in-situ thermographic monitoring for recoater jam prediction

The thermographic inspection of powder thickness is applied for recoater jam prediction and prevention in the LPBF process. Because of the residual stresses occurred in the parts during LPBF manufacturing, overhanging parts always curl up. The deformation grows faster on the overhanging part’s contour than its interior. The part curl-up after deformation over a threshold can hit the wiper and cause serious consequences. Hence, prediction and prevention of the recoater jam in real-time LPBF manufacture is necessary. A recoater jam prediction system has been established based on calculating the powder layer thickness at different locations of the powder bed. When the curl-up deformation grows, the powder layer at the curl-up location becomes thinner and thinner and eventually will damage the wiper and cause the recoater jam. The powder layer thickness can be used to represent the amount of curl-up. To demonstrate this application, overhanging semi-arches are manufactured, and the corresponding powder thicknesses are calculated. The nominal layer thickness is 50 µm. Figure 13a shows the calculated powder thickness at the right edge of each of two semi-arches shown from the first layer to the occurrence of recoater jam. The curve has four different regions. In the initial region shown by the light blue area, the powder thickness increases. In the green region from layer 50 to layer 170, the powder thickness keeps essentially constant. In the yellow region, the powder thickness drops (decreases quickly) from layer 170 to layer 215. In the pink (last) region, the recoater jam occurred and powder thickness fluctuates wildly. Fig. 13b shows the final states of five semi-arches and the ablated wiper in the experiment. The silicone part of the wiper is ablated by the semi-arch deformations, and the metal parts of wiper behind silicone are scratched too.

Fig. 13. (a) Real-time calculated powder thickness and (b) final semi-arch samples and the ablated wiper.

6. Conclusion
This paper presents using a LWIR camera to perform in-situ powder layer thickness during metal additive manufacturing processes. A 1D powder layer heat transfer model was developed and solved using the finite difference method, from which the calculation of rise time profile from temperature distribution in the powder was made. The method of mapping temperature rise time to powder layer thickness was illustrated. The 1D model of temperature rise time vs. powder thickness agrees well with validation experimental result. The application of this thermographic inspection method for overhang curl-up detection and recoater jam prevention was demonstrated.
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