

EXPERIMENTAL LASER POWDER BED FUSION SYSTEM FOR DIFFICULT
TO PROCESS METALLIC MATERIALS

SYED ZIA UDDIN

Master's Program in Mechanical Engineering

APPROVED:

Ryan Wicker, Ph.D., Chair

David Espalin, Ph.D.

Amit Lopes, Ph.D.

Charles Ambler, Ph.D.
Dean of the Graduate School

ProQuest Number: 10979752

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



ProQuest 10979752

Published by ProQuest LLC (2019). Copyright of the Dissertation is held by the Author.

All rights reserved.

This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 – 1346

Copyright ©

by

Syed Zia Uddin

2018

Dedication

This thesis is dedicated to my parents and my elder brother

PREVIEW

EXPERIMENTAL LASER POWDER BED FUSION SYSTEM FOR DIFFICULT
TO PROCESS MATERIALS

by

SYED ZIA UDDIN, B.S.M.E.

THESIS

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of

The University of Texas at El Paso

in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements

for the Degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Department of Mechanical Engineering

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT EL PASO

December 2018

Acknowledgements

I start with thanking Almighty Allah for keeping my ever-fleeting heart steadfast in its goal. My heartfelt thanks and respect to my mentor Dr. Ryan Wicker, director of W.M. Keck Center for 3D Innovation, to whom I owe the credits of this small accomplishment of MS degree in Mechanical Engineering. Beyond academics, I have learnt greater life lessons from Dr. Wicker on how to stay positive during failure, and the necessity of clear communication in life, science, and engineering. I would like to thank Jorge Mireles with whom I started learning about the very basics of additive manufacturing. Afterwards, Philip Morton, Dr. David Espalin, and Dr. Cesar Terrazas became great sources of support for me in generating and implementing ideas. With Dr. Espalin I wrote my first conference paper. During the latter days, I was fortunate to meet Dr. Frank Medina who greatly inspired me by his stellar career in the realm of additive manufacturing. I can never thank enough Alfonso Fernandez, a fellow researcher in the lab, without whom turning concepts into prototypes would be impossible for me. Dr. Lawrence Murr greatly helped me shape my first journal article and provided with valuable insight into the work. Dr. Mohammad Hossain and Dr. Jose Gonzalez, both of whom I met as PhD students in the metal team, were great mentors and resource for learning a lot of scientific techniques and culture of the lab. I must mention the contribution of Dr. Yves Hagedorn, the CEO of Aconity3D and the whole Aconity3D team who continuously provided technical support during the challenging times of running AconityONE machine. I am deeply indebted to Dr. Ralph Felice, the CEO of Far Associates for his technical support with the multi wavelength. I am also thankful to Mohammad Naim Jahangir and Kazi Masum Billah who had been a great company in and out of the lab. As a matter of fact, all the student researchers and the staff members of the Keck Center created an unparalleled support

system that raised me to fulfill the requirement of my master's degree. I want to wish well and thank from the bottom of my heart, my immediate successors in the metals team Moinuddin Shuvo and Hunter Taylor.

My utmost gratitude to my parents and elder brother for their continuous encouragement and sacrifice for sending me abroad, literally to the other side of the planet. I want to thank my sister, brother in law and younger brother for their timely support. I must also mention my fiancée who continuously encouraged me and shared words of comfort during this difficult task. Finally, the Bangladeshi community created a home away from home here in El Paso. Without all their support, I would not have made it this far. May Allah allow me the strength to make them all proud and contribute positively towards the society.

Abstract

The focus of this research was twofold, such as development of defect free fabrication parameters for laser powder bed fusion (LPBF) processing of crack prone or difficult to process metallic materials, and study of the temperature dependence of emissivity for some commonly used metal alloy powders in LPBF process. The later objective extends to the implementation of multiwavelength (MW) pyrometer technology for *in situ* true surface temperature measurement in LPBF process. LPBF is an additive manufacturing (AM) process capable of layer-by-layer manufacturing by successive laser melting of each layer according to CAD data. AM manufacturing has the inherent advantages of fabricating optimally designed geometry with least required material and the shortest lead time that would not be possible all at once by more conventional manufacturing techniques such as machining, casting, welding, etc. Tendency to crack during LPBF fabrication of some of the widely used aluminum alloys with large solidification range, such as AA6061, AA7075, etc. created a bottleneck where AM specific advantages of these materials important for aerospace and automotive industry could not be realized. An open architecture LPBF machine AcontyONE (Aconity3D, Aachen, Germany) enabled with powder bed heating up to 1000 °C was used for fabrication of aluminum 6061 alloy (AA6061) test coupons, such as cubes and cylindrical tensile specimens in the XY plane. Variation of processing parameters such as laser power, scanning speed, hatch spacing, layer thickness, and powder bed heating temperature was carried out to find a combination of parameters that allowed crack free fabrication of AA6061. The following parameters such as 450 W laser power, 1400 mm/s scan speed, 100 µm layer thickness, 80 to 100 µm hatch spacing, and 500 °C powder bed heating resulted in crack free specimens as confirmed by visual inspection, optical microscopy, and tensile testing. In scanning electron microscopy (SEM), coarsening of grains and precipitates

was observed due to high temperature preheating, and a preferential growth in [100] direction was also evident from X-ray diffraction (XRD) analysis. The heat treated, and as-fabricated tensile tested specimens showed equivalent ultimate tensile strength and yield strengths when compared to their wrought counterpart; however, loss in elongation at breakpoint was observed in the LPBF fabricated specimens. This part of the research showcased the potential of high temperature powder bed heating for LPBF processing of crack prone metallic materials without the need for additional preparation of the precursor metal powders.

Unlike the commercial LPBF systems currently in use, the open architecture experimental LPBF system used in this study had the capability of achieving controlled high temperature at the powder bed. Whether this high set temperature that proved to deter visible crack formation in AA6061 fabrication, would be carried throughout the height of a build- required true *in situ* surface temperature measurement of the powder bed. Therefore, an important aspect of the current research was to evaluate the thermal environment of the build area in LPBF process. Changing emissivity of metallic materials is a major difficulty in evaluation of true temperature during LPBF processes. The existing *in situ* monitoring systems relied on single or dual wavelength pyrometers, raw sensor data, high-speed visual cameras, and infrared (IR) thermography for monitoring and surface temperature measurements; but, without the emissivity information of the target materials, these systems output a qualitative measurement of temperature instead of an accurate surface temperature. The changing emissivity resulting from the non-grey nature of radiation from metallic materials upsets the assumptions of single and dual-wavelength pyrometry, and thereby, renders the measurements inaccurate. On the other hand, Multiwavelength (MW) pyrometer technology would not require any prior information of the target emissivity for accurate temperature measurement and provided a real-time value of emissivity of the target material by

analyzing the IR spectra it would receive from the target. During the LPBF process, on a given layer the precursor powder material in solid state would turn into molten metal tracks after interaction with laser at selected spots, and finally, consolidate to bulk solid state when the rest of the powder on the bed would not go through phase change. At least three different metal states with potentially different emissivity were identified, such as metal powder in solid state, molten metal tracks, and solidified metal tracks. To measure this emissivity for different materials and study their variation with temperature, a Whipmix Pro 200 (Whipmix Inc., Louisville, KY) furnace was modified for optical access to a SpectroPyrometer (FAR Associates, OH, USA) MW pyrometer system. These emissivity measurements could serve as input for IR thermography for extending accurate surface temperature measurements capability from a pointwise measurement using pyrometer to the accurate temperature mapping of an area using the IR thermography. Also, for demonstrating *in situ* temperature measurement in LPBF system using MW pyrometry, processing laser window and the viewing window of the AconityONE system situated on the top and the front side of the machine, respectively were redesigned and fabricated with the facility of quartz and ZnSe viewing ports through which a SpectroPyrometer (FAR Associates, Ohio, USA) MW pyrometer system and a FLIR SC645 IR camera (FLIR Systems, NM, USA) could operate.

Metal powders such as AA6061, AlSi10Mg, Ti-6Al-4V with two different particle size distributions, and Cu were heated in quartz crucibles inside the modified furnace at different temperatures. Argon gas at a pressure of 3 psi and 20 cubic-feet-per-hour were introduced to the heating chamber of the furnace. Despite the use of argon to create inert environment, oxidation of the metallic materials occurred and essentially the measurements made using this setup reflected the properties of the oxidized top layer instead of the intended powder material in its pristine form. However, the effect of powder particle size distribution on emissivity could still be observed as

larger particle size resulted in higher emissivity. Also, two different trends of emissivity changes were identified for the heating and the cooling portion of the furnace operation. Inserting the setup inside a glovebox, use of designed inert gas flow path inside the furnace, and use of better sealing materials for the instrument pass-throughs were recommended for improvement of the experimental setup for future research. On the other occasion of *in situ* measurements, the data obtained by using the MW pyrometer through the modified AconityONE window was affected by the 1070 nm processing laser since the measuring range of the MW pyrometer was 850 nm to 1650 nm. This problem could be overcome by filtering out the processing laser from the spectra that reaches the MW pyrometer system. Overall, the application of MW pyrometer technology in combination with IR thermography could be a viable option for *in situ* temperature mapping of the powder bed in LPBF systems.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements.....	v
Abstract.....	vii
Table of Contents.....	xi
List of Tables	xiv
List of Figures	xv
Chapter 1: Introduction	1
1.1 Research Motivation	1
1.2 Thesis Objective.....	3
1.3 Project Overview	4
1.4 Summary of Results	6
1.5 Thesis Outline	9
Chapter 2: Literature Review	11
2.1 Additive Manufacturing (AM) and Laser Powder Bed Fusion (LPBF)	11
2.2 Fabrication of Aluminum 6061 Alloy.....	12
2.3 <i>In situ</i> Monitoring in LPBF: A Necessity	17
2.4 Rationale of the current research considering the literature review	37
Chapter 3: Experimental Setup and Methodology.....	40
3.1 AconityONE Experimental LPBF System.....	40
3.2 Description of Pyrometer Experiments.....	45
3.2.1 Materials	45
3.2.2 Whipmix Pro 200 furnace	46
3.2.3 Modified Whipmix Pro 200 furnace	47
3.3 Measuring Devices.....	53
3.3.1 Multi-wavelength or Spectro-Pyrometer	53
3.3.2 Thermocouple Data Acquisition System	55
3.4 In Situ Off Line Monitoring Windows	56
3.5 Pyrometer Data Analysis	59

Chapter 4: Pyrometry	62
4.1 Necessity of Non-contact Temperature Measurement in Additive Manufacturing	62
4.2 Introduction to Pyrometry	63
4.3 Manually Operated Pyrometers	66
4.3.1 Disappearing Filament Pyrometer	66
4.3.2 Two-color Pyrometers	69
4.4 Automatic Pyrometers	71
4.4.1 Single Wavelength Pyrometers	71
4.4.2 Dual Wavelength Pyrometers	72
4.4.3. Multi Wavelength Pyrometers	74
4.4.4 Time Resolution of Different Ratio Pyrometers	75
4.5 Automatic Pyrometers Components	76
4.5.1 Transmission Optics	76
4.5.2 Infrared Radiation (IR) Detectors	79
4.5.2 (i) Thermal Detectors	80
4.5.2 (ii) Photon Sensitive Quantum Detectors/Photodetectors/Photodiodes	82
4.5.3 Detectivity of Photodetectors	85
4.6 Wavelength Splitting/ Multiplexing	87
4.7 Challenges in Pyrometric Measurements of Metals	92
4.7.1 Challenge with Changing Emissivity	92
4.7.2 Dependence of Emissivity on Angle of View	92
4.7.3 Error Associated with Longer Wavelength	93
4.7.4 Selecting the Right Fiber Optic	94
Chapter 5: Published Work – Crack-Free Aluminum 6061 Fabrication Demonstration	96
5.1 Title, Authors, and Affiliations	96
5.2 Abstract	96
5.3 Methodology	97
5.3.1 Materials	97
5.3.2 LPBF Fabrication Process	100
5.3.3 Material Characterization	104
5.3.4 Mechanical Properties	106
5.3.4 (i) Microhardness	106

5.3.4 (ii) Tensile Properties.....	107
5.4 Results and Discussion	108
5.4.1 Density	108
5.4.2 Mechanical Properties.....	109
5.4.2 (i) Microhardness	109
5.4.2 (ii) Tensile Properties.....	110
5.4.3 Microstructure.....	111
5.4.3 (i) Optical Microscopy	111
5.4.3 (ii) XRD	117
5.5 Conclusion	119
Chapter 6: Results	121
6.1 Materials Under Study	122
6.2 Comparison of Measured Temperatures.....	127
6.3 Demonstration of Temperature Calculation Using Intensity Data	129
6.3.1 Understanding the .dat File	130
6.3.2 Calculation of Temperature	131
6.4 Emissivity Measurements of Different Powder Materials and Comparison	134
6.5 Results from in situ monitoring of AconityONE.....	139
Chapter 7: Conclusions and Recommendations	141
7.1 Conclusions.....	141
7.2 Recommendations for Future Work.....	142
7.2.1 Use of High Temperature Powder Bed Heating	142
7.2.2 Oxidation Problem.....	143
7.2.3 Establishing Temperature Mapping of Build Area in LPBF Process	145
7.2.4 Removal of Laser Line from MW Pyrometer.....	146
References.....	147
Appendix A Data on AA6061 Parameter Development.....	164
Appendix B Pyrometer Measurements and Calculations	176
Appendix C Permission to Reuse Published Article in Chapter 5	180

List of Tables

Table 3.1: Common file preparation parameters [55].....	41
Table 3.2 Supplier provided specification of the metal powders under study.....	46
Table 4.1 Time resolution of different ratio pyrometers.....	75
Table 4.2 Comparison of IR detector types (Rogalski <i>et al</i> [85].).....	79
Table 5.1 Range of LPBF parameters explored to find the crack-free parameter combination .	101
Table 5. 2 Microhardness values of LPBF fabricated AA6061 components under different conditions.....	109
Table 5.3 Comparison of mechanical properties of LPBF fabricated AA6061 and wrought annealed AA6061 for both annealed and T6 heat treated conditions	110
Table 6.1 Material and operating condition. A ramp of 10 °C/min was used in all cases to heat up the material to the maximum temperature	127
Table 6.2 Raw intensity data file i.e. .dat file obtained from the MW pyrometer after annotations	131
Table 6.3 Schematic matrix of calculated ratio temperatures using equation 6.1	132
Table 6.4 Calculated ratio temperatures using equation 6.1 from data file ‘Temp6188.dat’	132

List of Figures

Figure 2.1 Flowchart showing typical workflow during LPBF AM fabrication	12
Figure 2.2 Marangoni number greater than 10^5 result is turbulent and therefore more unstable melt pool as shown by Mukharjee <i>et al.</i> [38]	18
Figure 2.3 In line monitoring set up consisting of high-speed camera and photodiode sensor shown by Berumen <i>et al.</i> [41]	20
Figure 2.4 (a) gray scale image of the data obtained from the in-line high speed camera showing the dimensions of the melt pool in x and y direction (b) photodiode detected intensity of the light emitted from melt pool; increased intensity around layer 2000, 2600, and 3000 correspond to process error where larger amount of powder was deposited due to un-synced movement of the build platform [41].....	21
Figure 2.5 (a) block diagram of the different optical component required for the in-line melt-pool imaging setup invented by Lott <i>et al.</i> [42] (b) actual setup with an image of the melt pool and surrounding area with a 5 mm x 5 mm field of view.....	22
Figure 2.6 (a) Illustration of mapping algorithm used by Clijsters <i>et al.</i> [43] On the left is are the intensity values obtained by the photodiodes and corresponding grey scale values. Grey scale values were plotted in a rectangular grid as shown on the right side of image. Mapping of only a single vector is shown; when all the vectors in a layer is mapped, a grey value representation of the entire layer could be obtained. If multiple points corresponded to a single grid, the average of those intensities were considered for that grid (b) Porosity corresponding to high laser power and corresponding larger melt pool as detected by the proposed monitoring system.....	25
Figure 2.7 Image obtained from the visual observation system developed by Debenskaia <i>et al.</i> [44] where the effect of single and double scanning of the same layer is visible by difference in visual	

contrast. The layer that had been scanned once, appeared darker in the visual observation system 26

Figure 2.8 Signals from the pyrometer in arbitrary units showing the effect of change in hatch spacing on temperature as observed by Debenskaia *et al.* [44] Curves 1 through 6 represents builds with different hatch spacings when all the other scanning parameters were kept unchanged. Curve 1 represents the build with 1 mm hatch spacing and 6 represents a build with 70 μm layer hatch spacing. Layer temperature with smaller hatch spacing was considerably higher because of the higher energy input within the same area in the latter case 27

Figure 2.9 (a) the effect of laser power on the maximum temperature of laser and powder interaction zone as reported by Furumoto *et al.* [45]. However, caution should be maintained before considering the temperatures as true surface temperature since the effect of emissivity could was not considered. Also, the measured area was greater than the process interaction zone Temperature of the substrate plate was also captured (b) shows the scheme of temperature calculation from the signals of the photodiode detectors. Rise in signal levels in the detectors reflect the moment of laser irradiation and corresponding increase in temperature..... 29

Figure 2.10 Set up devised by Furumoto *et al.*[48] for investigating the consolidation behavior of metal powder upon laser irradiation 30

Figure 2.11 The change of temperature of the melt area with change in energy density during the melting of stainless steel powder by laser irradiation as reported by Furumoto *et al.*[48]. Caution should be maintained before considering the reported temperature as the true surface temperature since this study did not consider the effect of emissivity change as a function of temperature ... 31

Figure 2.13 Zavalov *et al.* [49] reported brightness temperature and corresponding signal intensity are shown for channels 1, 3, and 5 i.e. 0, 0.6, and 1.2 mm away from the laser and powder bed

interaction zone. Curves in black denote brightness temperatures, the colored graphs denote intensity values at the channel 1 (red), channel 2 (green), and channel 3 (blue).....	33
Figure 2.14 (a) Plots of normalized histogram of line to continuum ratio occurring at different disks i.e. different processing conditions (b) percent void, a measure of porosity at different processing conditions (c) Experimental set up used by Nassar <i>et al.</i> [53]	36
Figure 3.1 (a) and (b) depict different build file preparation parameters [55].....	42
Figure 3.2 A uniform power density could be ensured by introducing a moving lens to consistently adjust the beam focus and hence spot diameter. (a) Moving lens is kept static to depict that the focal plane could curve out of build surface (b) Movement of the lens ensures dynamic focus change and therefore, uniform power distribution throughout the build area. [56].....	43
Figure 3.3 Image showing measurements made on a single layer scanning of four 10 x 10 x 10 mm cubes on the build platform using one of the 100 kHz pyrometers. AlSi10Mg powder was used for the fabrication. The color-coded bar shows the mV readings from the thermocouple detector that was used to create the pseudo-temperature plots.....	44
Figure 3.4 Single and dual stage operation of the Whipmix Pro 200 furnace	47
Figure 3.5 Cross section of the modified Whipmix Pro 200 furnace	48
Figure 3.6 Modified Whipmix Pro 200 furnace with pyrometer assembly	49
Figure 3.7 A top view of part of the modifications made to the Whipmix Pro 200 furnace. The modified top window of the furnace is shown in the picture and a closer view is presented in the inset	50
Figure 3.8 Picture of the interior of the modified furnace. Heating coil, the quartz viewing port for providing optical access to the MW pyrometer and the thermocouples are visible	51

Figure 3.9 To maintain inert gas atmosphere inside the furnace argon was continuously introduced inside the furnace chamber. Before purging with argon, the chamber would be vacuumed at 200 °C.....	52
Figure 3.10 Different components of the FMPI SpectroPyrometer (FAR Associate, OH, USA) MW pyrometer system.....	54
Figure 3.11 Different components of the thermocouple data acquisition system used in the current study.....	55
Figure 3.12 The top window of AconityONE after modification to incorporate MW pyrometer and an IR camera for in situ monitoring of the build. The original laser window of the AconityONE machine was replaced with this modified window	56
Figure 3.13 CAD model of the modified top window with the laser enclosure bottom part of which was made transparent (only in CAD model) for better visual. The transparent laser enclosure gives visual to the reduce size laser processing window.....	57
Figure 3.10 <i>In situ</i> monitoring setup including MW pyrometer mounted to the side window of AconityONE machine. The spectro-pyrometer box contains the means for dividing the incoming radiation in with a spectral resolution of close to 1 nm	58
Figure 3.15 An inclusive CAD of <i>in situ</i> monitoring set up where both the front and top monitoring windows are shown. The components were identified in the previous Figures	59
Figure 4.1 Electromagnetic spectrum showing the visible and IR radiation ranges that are usually utilized in pyrometry [61]	64
Figure 4.2 Classification of pyrometers based on spectral response and method of operation [62]	65
Figure 4.3 Main components of an automatic pyrometer	71

Figure 4.4 Schematic of a two-wavelength pyrometer circuit [68]	72
Figure 4.5 (a) Blackbody radiation characteristics based on temperature. (b) Transmittance of typical IR window [62]	77
Figure 4.6 l/d designation of lenses used in pyrometry	78
Figure 4.7 Basic construction of a micro-bolometer (Wikipedia)	81
Figure 4.8 (a) Pulse type detection system schematic (b) a typical signal as detected in a pulse-based system [91].....	83
Figure 4.9 Spectral response of photovoltaic (PV) detectors made of MCT structures with and without cooling [96].....	86
Figure 4.10 Comparison of directivity between HgCdTe or MCT and GaAs/AlGaAs based QWIPs photodetectors [998]	87
Figure 4.11 (a) bandpass filters (b) notch filters (c) short-pass filters (d) long-pass filters [100]	88
Figure 4.12 Schematic representation of a dichroic mirror placed at 45° with the incoming radiation [100].....	89
Figure 4.13 Schematic of an arrayed waveguide grating in demultiplexing (splitting a spectral signal into discrete bands) [103]	91
Figure 4.14 Long wavelength could result in peak broadening and subsequent inaccurate output of temperature [91].....	94
Figure 4.15 Basic construction of a fiber optic cable with cladding to provide total internal reflection of the light signal that falls within angle of acceptance [106].....	95
Figure 5.1 (a) SEM images of AA6061 gas atomized powder. Powder particles were spherical, and semi-spherical with satellites. Some irregular shaped powder was also observed	99
Figure 5.1 (b) Histogram of AA6061 powder size distribution.....	100

Figure 5. 2 (a) Scan-head of the AconityONE system consisting of the Galvo mirrors and f- θ lens. The optical fiber receives the 1030 nm wavelength, near infrared laser from the laser module where Nd:YAG crystals were used for solid state amplification. The scan-head is capable of rastering over an area of 400 mm in diameter. However, during heated bed configuration a reduced scan area with 200 mm in diameter is covered.	101
Figure 5.2 (b) A schematic representation of the AconityONE LPBF system used for the study. (i) Solid state Nd:YAG laser of 1030nm wavelength and 1kW capacity and an induction heater (not shown in figure) underneath the build platform that can raise the powder bed temperature to 1000°C are featured. (ii) The re-coater brush is made of carbon fiber to impart flexibility and high heat resistance.	103
Figure 5.3 Relative density of AA6061 cube coupons fabricated using different laser power and scanning speed with and without heating of the powder bed	108
Figure 5.4 Microstructure of AA6061 specimens fabricated on unheated powder bed. Figure 5.4 (a) and (b) illustrate the XY plane (perpendicular to build direction). Figure 5.4 (c) and (d) show the ZX plane (build direction). Cracks, porosity, melt-pool, and melt-track banding are evident in the microstructure	112
Figure 5.5 Microstructure of AA6061 specimens fabricated on powder bed heated to 500 °C. Figure 5.5 (a) and (b) illustrate the XY plane (perpendicular to build direction). Figure 5.5 (c) and (d) show the ZX plane (build direction). Cracks, porosity, melt pool, and melt-track banding removed from the microstructure, and a columnar grain growth is observed in the build direction	113

Figure 5.6 SEM (a) and STEM (b) images of primarily Al-Si-O noncoherent precipitates shown in Figure 5.5. The same area is imaged in (a) and (b) and the magnification for both is given in (a).	115
Figure 5.7 Representative stress-strain diagram of LPBF fabricated AA6061 specimens as fabricated and T6 heat treated. Figure 5.7(b) Solid cylinders built in X direction and still on build plate; tensile specimens were machined out of these cylinders. Figure 5.7(c) LPBF fabricated AA6061 tensile testing specimen after fractured.....	116
Figure 5.8 XRD spectra for AA6061 fabricated with and without heating of the powder bed (a) and (b) show XRD spectra in unheated XY and ZX reference planes. (c) and (d) show XRD spectra in heated XY and ZX reference plane.....	118
Figure 6.1 (a) Particle size distribution of Cu powder (b) SEM image of the Cu powder used for the current study showing spherical powder with a lot of satellites and irregular shape powder.....	123
Figure 6.2 (a) Particle size distribution of Ti-6Al-4V powder of EBM grade (b) SEM image of the Ti-6Al-4V powder of EBM grade used for the current study showing spherical powder.....	125
Figure 6.3 (a) Particle size distribution of Ti-6Al-4V powder of LPBF grade (b) SEM image of the Ti-6Al-4V powder of LPBF grade used for the current study showing mostly spherical powder with occasional satellite	126
Figure 6.4 Comparison of temperature measured by the pyrometer and the thermocouple when EBM grade Ti-6Al-4V was heated up to 950 °C Figure 6.4 (a) and (b) demonstrates the comparison during heating up and cooling down, respectively	128
Figure 6.5 Comparison of measured temperature, that was obtained as an output from the MW pyrometer, with the temperature calculated by algorithm applied by the author	129

Figure 6.6 Change of emissivity with temperature during the heating of Ti-6Al-4V. Two different particle sizes, i.e. EPBF and LPBF grade powders were tested and compared	135
Figure 6.7 Change of emissivity with temperature during the cooling of Ti-6Al-4V. Two different particle sizes, i.e. EBM and LPBF grade Ti-6Al-4V powders and EBM powder with a different material i.e. copper powder were tested and compared	136
Figure 6.8 Change of emissivity with temperature during the heating of Ti-6Al-4V. Two different particle sizes, i.e. EBM and LPBF grade Ti-6Al-4V powders and a EBM powder with a different material i.e. copper powder were tested and compared	137
Figure 6.9 Comparison of emissivity of AA6061 and AlSi10Mg when cooled down from 650 °C to 350 °C	138
Figure 6.10 The two most typical data files obtained during the <i>in situ</i> MW pyrometer measurement in AconityONE machine. The corresponding temperature outputs were given underneath the intensity graphs where high value of tolerance for the measurement affected with processing laser indicates lack of accuracy. The other measurement however captured the accurate surface temperature measured on a powder layer atop the pre-heated build plate	139
Figure 7.1 Laser-powder interaction occurs in zone 1. Zone 1, 2,3, and 4 could be different in phase and temperature and therefore differ in emissivity. To truly map the build area using an IR camera would require emissivity feedback from the MW pyrometer array	145

Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1 Research Motivation

Additive manufacturing (AM) is a freeform fabrication technology where end user parts are manufactured directly from the 3D models created using computer aided design (CAD) software. The requirement for part specific tooling and multiple manufacturing steps involved in the conventional manufacturing processes that account for a long lead time and added costs, could be avoided in AM technologies. For example, the production of a gas turbine blade require four main process steps such as casting, forging, different types of machining, and coating along an array of sub-processing steps [1]. On the other hand, a single step process of manufacturing similar turbine blade directly from CAD was experimentally shown by Fabrizia *et al.* [2]. This is only a single example of cost effectiveness realized by AM processes. Among the different AM technologies, laser powder bed fusion (LPBF) is used for manufacturing of metal parts by selective melting of thin layer of metal powders spread on a solid surface for the first layer and on the previous consolidated surfaces for the subsequent layers.

One of the restricting factors that inhibits the realization of metal AM advantages on an industrial scale is the lack of developed processing parameters for the range of metal alloys used across different industries, such as aerospace, automotive, biomedical, etc. Despite being one of the most widely used aluminum alloys for the automotive and aerospace industries, aluminum 6061 alloy (AA6061) processing parameters have not been developed for fabrication using LPBF AM process due to crack formation [3] [4] [5]. Such a shortcoming deterred the application of LPBF in fabrication of AA6061 and resulting advantages of the process. Also, there are alloys such as AA7075 and AA2024 with cooling characteristics like AA6061 that could not be processed