ORIGINAL ARTICLE

Autonomous Decision-Making in Additive Manufacturing via Integration of Machine Learning with Digital Twin Architectures

Diego Montalvo[1] and Luis Quishpe[2]

[1]Technical University of Manabí, Avenida Universitaria, Portoviejo
[2]University of Loja, Department of Software Engineering, Calle Lourdes y Mercadillo, Loja

ABSTRACT

Additive manufacturing has emerged as a revolutionary paradigm in modern industrial production systems, enabling unprecedented geometric complexity and functional integration. This research investigates the symbiotic integration of machine learning algorithms with digital twin architectures to facilitate autonomous decision-making in metal-based additive manufacturing processes. We propose a novel framework that synthesizes real-time sensor data acquisition, multi-physics simulation, and reinforcement learning to optimize process parameters dynamically during fabrication. The methodology employs tensor-based representation learning coupled with graph neural networks to capture the complex spatial-temporal correlations inherent in melt pool dynamics. Empirical validation on Ti-6Al-4V and Inconel 718 specimens demonstrates that our approach reduces geometric deviations by 37.4% and porosity defects by 42.8% compared to conventional feedback control systems. Furthermore, the computational overhead of the proposed system adds only 1.3% to total fabrication time while enhancing mechanical properties by approximately 18.5% across multiple metrics. This research establishes a foundational architecture for self-regulating additive manufacturing systems capable of autonomous adaptation to material and process variability without human intervention.

1 | Introduction

The paradigm of additive manufacturing (AM) has fundamentally transformed industrial production capabilities, permitting unprecedented geometric complexity and functional integration within monolithic structures. However, the full potential of AM technologies remains constrained by process reliability limitations, particularly in high-performance applications where material integrity and dimensional accuracy are paramount. Traditional process control methodologies relying on predetermined parameter sets have proven inadequate to address the inherent stochasticity of metal-based AM processes, where thermal gradients, phase transformations, and residual stress evolution create a complex, interdependent web of physical phenomena.

Recent advances in computational intelligence, particularly in the domains of machine learning (ML) and digital twin (DT) technologies, have created new opportunities for autonomous manufacturing systems capable of self-optimization and adaptive control. Digital twins—high-fidelity virtual replicas of physical systems that evolve synchronously with their physical counterparts—offer a framework for integrating multi-physics simulations with real-time sensor data [1]. When augmented with machine learning capabilities, these cyber-physical systems can potentially implement predictive control strategies that anticipate and mitigate defect formation mechanisms before they manifest in the physical domain.

The integration of ML and DT technologies represents a convergence of computational paradigms that has been explored in various industrial contexts, yet its application to metal-based additive manufacturing presents unique challenges. The extreme thermal gradients, rapid solidification kinetics, and complex microstructural evolution characteristic of processes such as Laser Powder Bed Fusion (LPBF) and Directed Energy Deposition (DED) require specialized approaches to data representation, model architecture, and computational implementation.

This research addresses the fundamental question: Can autonomous decision-making systems integrating ML with DT architectures achieve superior process outcomes compared to conventional control methodologies in metal-based additive manufacturing? We hypothesize that by establishing bidirectional information flow between real-time sensor measurements and physics-informed predictive models, enhanced by machine learning algorithms that recognize complex patterns in process dynamics, a step-change improvement in build quality and repeatability can be achieved. [2]

Our work makes several contributions to the field. First, we propose a novel framework for autonomous decision-making in AM that synthesizes sensor fusion, multi-physics simulation, and reinforcement learning to dynamically optimize process parameters during fabrication. Second, we develop a tensor-based representation learning approach coupled with graph neural networks to efficiently capture the spatial-temporal correlations inherent in melt pool dynamics. Third, we introduce a computational architecture that minimizes latency in the decision-making loop, enabling real-time intervention during the build process [3]. Finally, we validate our approach through extensive experimentation on two commercially significant alloy systems: Ti-6Al-4V and Inconel 718.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 provides a theoretical background on the fundamental physics of metal-based AM processes and the computational foundations of digital twins and machine learning as applied to manufacturing systems. Section 3 details our proposed autonomous decision-making framework, including the mathematical formulations underpinning each component [4]. Section 4 presents the experimental methodology employed to validate the framework. Section 5 explores the advanced mathematical modeling used to characterize the multi-physics aspects of the process. Section 6 reports the experimental results and analyzes the performance improvements achieved. Section 7 discusses the implications of our findings for industrial applications and identifies limitations of the current approach [5]. Finally, Section 8 concludes the paper and outlines directions for future research.

2 | Theoretical Foundations

The autonomous decision-making framework for additive manufacturing presented in this paper builds upon established theoretical foundations across multiple domains. This section elucidates the key principles and computational paradigms that underpin our approach.

Metal-based additive manufacturing processes operate within complex thermophysical regimes characterized by extreme temperature gradients, rapid solidification, and intricate microstructural evolution. The fidelity of the final component depends on precise control of the energy input, which directly influences melt pool dynamics and, consequently, the formation of defects such as porosity, lack of fusion, and residual stress-induced distortion [6] [7]. The governing physics can be described by coupled partial differential equations representing conservation of mass, momentum, and energy, supplemented by constitutive relations for material behavior under extreme conditions [8].

The thermal history during fabrication is particularly critical, as it governs phase transformations and resultant microstructure. The temperature field T(x,y,z,t) evolves according to the heat conduction equation, modified to account for phase change:

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

where $\rho(T)$ represents temperature-dependent density, $c_p(T)$ is the specific heat capacity, $k(T)$ denotes thermal conductivity, and $Q(x,y,z,t)$ represents the volumetric heat source term [9]. The heat source term encapsulates the energy input from the laser or electron beam and can be modeled using various approaches, including Gaussian distributions, ray-tracing algorithms, or more sophisticated representations that account for multiple reflections and absorption phenomena.

Digital twin technology provides a computational framework for integrating physics-based models with sensor data to create a synchronized virtual representation of the physical process. In the context of additive manufacturing, a digital twin continuously assimilates sensor measurements to update boundary conditions, material properties, and state variables within the physics-based models, thereby maintaining fidelity between the virtual and physical domains. This bidirectional information flow enables predictive capabilities that extend beyond mere monitoring, allowing for anticipatory control actions that prevent defect formation rather than merely detecting defects post-factum. [10]

The mathematical foundation of digital twins in AM can be formalized as a state-space representation where the state vector x(t) evolves according to:

$$\frac{dx(t)}{dt} = f(x(t), u(t), \theta(t), t)$$

where $u(t)$ represents control inputs (e.g., laser power, scan speed), $\theta(t)$ denotes time-varying parameters (e.g., material properties that may evolve due to temperature or microstructural changes), and $f(\cdot)$ is the nonlinear function encapsulating the process physics. The observable measurements $y(t)$ are related to the state vector by:

$$y(t) = h(x(t), t) + \varepsilon(t)$$ [11]

where $h(\cdot)$ is the measurement function and $\varepsilon(t)$ represents measurement noise. The digital twin continuously updates its state estimation based on incoming sensor data, typically employing variants of Kalman filtering, particle filtering, or more advanced data assimilation techniques.

Machine learning augments the digital twin framework by enabling the discovery of complex patterns in process data that may not be explicitly captured by first-principles physics models. Deep learning architectures, particularly those designed for spatio-temporal data such as convolutional neural networks (CNNs) and recurrent neural networks (RNNs), have demonstrated remarkable capability in extracting hierarchical features from raw sensor data in manufacturing contexts. [12]

$$J(\pi) = \mathbb{E}_{\tau\sim p_\pi(\tau)}\left[\sum_{t=0}^{T}\gamma^t r(s_t, a_t)\right]$$

where τ represents a trajectory of states and actions, $p_\pi(\tau)$ is the probability distribution over trajectories induced by policy π, $\gamma \in [0,1]$ is a discount factor, and $r(s_t, a_t)$ is the immediate reward received after taking action a_t in state s_t.

In the context of AM process control, the state space encompasses the current system status as represented by sensor measurements and digital twin predictions, while actions correspond to adjustments to process parameters such as laser power, scan speed, or hatch spacing.

The integration of physics-based modeling, digital twin technology, and machine learning creates a comprehensive framework for autonomous decision-making in additive manufacturing. Physics-based models provide the fundamental understanding of process dynamics and constrain the solution space to physically realistic scenarios. Digital twins enable real-time synchronization between the virtual and physical domains, facilitating predictive capabilities. Machine learning algorithms extract complex patterns from data and optimize control strategies through reinforcement learning [13]. This synergistic combination offers the potential for unprecedented control over the AM process, with autonomous adaptation to process variations and material heterogeneities.

3 | Autonomous Decision-Making Framework

Our proposed autonomous decision-making framework for additive manufacturing integrates three primary computational components: a sensor fusion module, a physics-informed digital twin, and a reinforcement learning agent. These components operate in a closed-loop architecture that enables continuous monitoring, prediction, and adaptation throughout the build process.

The sensor fusion module consolidates data from multiple in-situ monitoring systems, including high-speed thermal cameras, photodiodes, acoustic emissions sensors, and layer-wise optical imaging [14]. Raw sensor data undergoes preprocessing to address issues such as noise reduction, missing data imputation, and spatial-temporal alignment. Feature extraction techniques then identify relevant process signatures that serve as inputs to both the digital twin and the reinforcement learning agent.

We implement a novel multi-modal attention mechanism to dynamically weight the importance of different sensor inputs based on their relevance to current process conditions:

$$\alpha_i(t) = \frac{\exp\left(W_a^T \tanh\left(W_b s_i(t) + W_c z(t-1)\right)\right)}{\sum_{j=1}^{N} \exp\left(W_a^T \tanh\left(W_b s_j(t) + W_c z(t-1)\right)\right)}$$

where $\alpha_i(t)$ represents the attention weight assigned to sensor modality i at time t, $s_i(t)$ denotes the feature vector from sensor i, $z(t-1)$ is the previous system state estimate, and W_a, W_b, W_c are learnable parameter matrices [15]. The weighted sensor features are then aggregated to form a comprehensive process state representation:

$$z(t) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \alpha_i(t) \cdot g(s_i(t))$$

where g(·) represents a nonlinear transformation implemented as a neural network that projects different sensor modalities into a common latent space.

The physics-informed digital twin comprises a hierarchy of computational models spanning multiple length and time scales. At the macroscale, finite element methods solve the coupled thermal-mechanical equations to predict temperature distributions, residual stresses, and deformations [16]. At the mesoscale, phase field models simulate melt pool dynamics and solidification phenomena. At the microscale, crystal plasticity simulations predict microstructural evolution and resultant mechanical properties.

To maintain computational efficiency while preserving physical fidelity, we employ a reduced-order modeling approach based on proper orthogonal decomposition (POD). The temperature field T(x,y,z,t) is approximated as: [17]

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

where $\bar{T}(x, y, z)$ represents the mean temperature field, $\phi_i(x, y, z)$ are spatial basis functions derived from POD, and $a_i(t)$ are time-dependent coefficients. This approach reduces the dimensionality of the thermal problem from millions of degrees of freedom to typically less than 100 modal coefficients, enabling real-time computation.

The digital twin continuously assimilates sensor data to update its state estimates and boundary conditions. We implement an ensemble Kalman filter (EnKF) for this purpose, which provides a computationally efficient approach to nonlinear state estimation:

$$X_a = X_f + K(Y - HX_f)[18]$$

where X_a is the analysis (updated) ensemble, X_f is the forecast ensemble derived from the physics-based models, Y represents perturbed observations, H is the observation operator mapping state variables to observable quantities, and K is the Kalman gain matrix computed from ensemble statistics.

The reinforcement learning agent operates within this integrated framework to optimize process parameters dynamically. We formulate the control problem as a Markov Decision Process (MDP) with a state space encompassing both measured and predicted process variables, an action space consisting of adjustable process parameters, and a reward function that quantifies build quality. The reward function incorporates multiple objectives including geometric accuracy, porosity minimization, and mechanical property optimization:

$$\begin{aligned} r(s_t, a_t) = {} & w_1\, r_{\text{geom}}(s_t, a_t) + w_2\, r_{\text{poros}}(s_t, a_t) \\ & + w_3\, r_{\text{mech}}(s_t, a_t) - w_4\, c(a_t) \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where w_i are weighting factors determined through a Pareto optimization approach, $r_{\text{geom}}, r_{\text{poros}}, r_{\text{mech}}$ represent rewards related to geometric accuracy, porosity, and mechanical properties respectively, and $c(a_t)$ is a cost function penalizing excessive parameter adjustments that may introduce instabilities.

We implement a Twin Delayed Deep Deterministic Policy Gradient (TD3) algorithm, an actor-critic reinforcement learning approach well-suited for continuous control problems with high-dimensional state and action spaces [19]. The actor network parametrizes the policy $\pi_\phi(a|s)$, mapping states to deterministic actions:

$$a = \pi_\phi(s) + \varepsilon$$

where ε represents exploration noise modeled as an Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process. The critic networks Q_{θ_1} and Q_{θ_2} estimate the action-value function, with parameters updated to minimize the loss:

$$L(\theta_i) = \mathbb{E}_{(s,a,r,s')\sim D}\left[(Q_{\theta_i}(s,a) - y)^2\right]$$

where D represents the replay buffer containing experience tuples (s, a, r, s'), and y is the target value defined as: [20]

$$y = r + \gamma \min_{i=1,2} Q_{\theta'_i}(s', \pi_{\phi'}(s') + \text{clip}(\varepsilon', -c, c))$$

with θ'_i and ϕ' denoting the parameters of target networks updated via Polyak averaging, and $\text{clip}(\varepsilon', -c, c)$ representing clipped noise added to target actions for policy smoothing.
The integration of these components creates a closed-loop system capable of autonomous decision-making during the additive manufacturing process. Sensor data flows into both the digital twin and the reinforcement learning agent, the digital twin provides predictions that augment the state representation, and the reinforcement learning agent determines optimal parameter adjustments that are executed on the physical system. This continuous feedback loop enables adaptation to process variations and disturbances, ultimately leading to improved build quality and repeatability.

4 | Experimental Methodology

To validate the efficacy of our autonomous decision-making framework, we conducted a comprehensive experimental campaign utilizing industrial-grade additive manufacturing equipment and advanced characterization techniques [21]. This section details the experimental setup, materials, process parameters, and evaluation methodologies employed in our investigation.
The experimental platform consisted of a modified EOS M290 Laser Powder Bed Fusion (LPBF) system equipped with an array of in-situ monitoring sensors. The baseline system specifications included a 400W Yb-fiber laser operating at 1070nm wavelength with a nominal spot size of 100m. We augmented this system with a high-speed thermal camera (FLIR A8303sc) operating at 1000Hz with spatial resolution of 1280×720 pixels, a photodiode-based melt pool monitoring system with 100kHz sampling rate, and a layer-wise optical imaging system with 2.3m/pixel resolution [22]. Additionally, we integrated acoustic emission sensors (Physical Acoustics R15) operating at 150kHz sampling rate to detect ultrasonic waves generated during the build process.
Two commercial alloy systems were selected for experimentation: Ti-6Al-4V (Grade 5) and Inconel 718. These alloys represent materials commonly employed in aerospace and medical applications where component integrity is paramount. Powder characteristics were thoroughly characterized; the Ti-6Al-4V powder exhibited a particle size distribution of 15-45m with apparent density of 2.56g/cm^3 and flow rate of 14.3s/50g measured per ASTM B213 [23]. The Inconel 718 powder showed a particle size distribution of 15-53m with apparent density of 4.42g/cm^3 and flow rate of 15.7s/50g.
The test geometry consisted of canonical features designed to challenge the additive manufacturing process, including thin walls (0.5-2mm thickness), overhanging structures (30°, 45°, and 60° angles), internal cooling channels (1-5mm diameter), and variable thickness regions. This geometry incorporated features from standardized test artifacts while adding complexities relevant to high-performance applications. Each experimental build included six identical geometries per build plate to assess process repeatability.
We established a comprehensive design of experiments (DOE) incorporating both control methodology and material type as experimental factors [24]. The control methodologies evaluated included: (1) standard parameters with no in-process adjustments (baseline), (2) conventional feedback control using melt pool monitoring data, and (3) our proposed autonomous decision-making framework. For each material, we conducted three replicate builds per control methodology, resulting in a total of 18 experimental builds.
The process parameter space investigated encompassed laser power (100–350 W), scan speed (600–1400 mm/s), hatch spacing (0.08–0.14 mm), and layer thickness (30–60 μm). For the baseline condition, parameters were selected based on manufacturer recommendations and preliminary optimization studies [25]. For the conventional feedback control, parameters were adjusted based on melt pool size measurements following industry-standard protocols. For our autonomous system, the reinforcement learning agent was permitted to adjust parameters within constrained ranges to ensure operational safety: laser power adjustments were limited to ±15% of nominal values per layer, scan speed adjustments to ±20%, and hatch spacing adjustments to ±10%.

Build quality was assessed through multiple complementary characterization techniques. Geometric accuracy was evaluated using a Zeiss COMET L3D structured light scanner with 10 μm measurement uncertainty, comparing as-built geometries to the original CAD model [26]. Porosity was quantified via X-ray computed tomography (CT) using a North Star Imaging X5000 system with 5 μm voxel resolution, analyzing both bulk porosity percentage and pore size distribution. Microstructural analysis was performed using electron backscatter diffraction (EBSD) on a FEI Quanta 600 scanning electron microscope to characterize grain size, orientation, and texture. Mechanical properties were assessed through tensile testing per ASTM E8 on specimens extracted from each build, measuring ultimate tensile strength, yield strength, elongation, and elastic modulus. Additionally, residual stress distributions were measured using neutron diffraction at the NIST Center for Neutron Research. [27]

The performance of our autonomous decision-making framework was evaluated against both the baseline and conventional feedback control approaches across multiple metrics including dimensional accuracy, porosity percentage, mechanical properties, build time, and computational overhead. Statistical significance was assessed using analysis of variance (ANOVA) with post-hoc Tukey tests at 95% confidence level. Process stability was evaluated through statistical process control methodologies, analyzing the variance in quality metrics both within and between builds.

To quantify the learning efficiency of the reinforcement learning agent, we monitored the convergence of the policy during training, measuring the number of iterations required to achieve stable performance and the final reward attained [28]. The computational efficiency of the digital twin was assessed through benchmarking studies measuring simulation time per layer and prediction accuracy compared to high-fidelity models.

This experimental methodology provides a rigorous framework for evaluating the efficacy of our autonomous decision-making approach in enhancing additive manufacturing process outcomes. The combination of advanced in-situ monitoring, comprehensive characterization techniques, and statistical analysis enables a thorough assessment of performance improvements across multiple quality dimensions.

5 | Multi-Physics Phenomena

This section presents the advanced mathematical modeling framework developed to characterize the complex multi-physics phenomena inherent in metal-based additive manufacturing processes [29]. Our approach synthesizes high-dimensional tensor representations, differential geometry, and stochastic partial differential equations to create a unified computational framework capable of capturing the intricate interplay between thermal, mechanical, and microstructural domains.

The cornerstone of our modeling approach is a tensor-based representation of the process state. We define a fifth-order process tensor $\mathcal{P} \in \mathbb{R}^{I_1 \times I_2 \times I_3 \times I_4 \times I_5}$, where the dimensions correspond to spatial coordinates (I_1, I_2, I_3), time (I_4), and process variables (I_5) including temperature, phase fraction, stress components, and microstructural descriptors. This high-dimensional representation enables the capture of complex spatial-temporal correlations across multiple physical domains.

To address the computational challenges associated with such high-dimensional tensors, we employ a tensor decomposition approach based on the Canonical Polyadic (CP) decomposition:

$$\mathcal{P} \approx \sum_{r=1}^{R} \lambda_r \, a_r^{(1)} \circ a_r^{(2)} \circ a_r^{(3)} \circ a_r^{(4)} \circ a_r^{(5)}$$

where R is the tensor rank, λ_r are scalar weights, $a_r^{(n)}$ are unit-norm vectors, and $\circ$ represents the outer product. This decomposition facilitates dimensionality reduction while preserving the essential multi-way interactions between physical variables across space and time. [30]

The evolution of the process tensor is governed by a system of coupled stochastic partial differential equations (SPDEs) that incorporate both deterministic physics and stochastic elements representing process uncertainties. The general form of these equations can be expressed as:

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{P}}{\partial t} = \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{P}) + \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{P}) + \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{P}, \xi(x,t))$$

where $\mathcal{L}$ represents linear differential operators, $\mathcal{N}$ encompasses nonlinear terms, and $\mathcal{S}$ captures stochastic contributions with $\xi(x,t)$ representing space-time white noise processes.

For the thermal domain, we extend the standard heat conduction equation to account for phase transformations and latent heat effects:

$$\rho(T)c_p(T)\frac{\partial T}{\partial t} = \nabla\cdot[k(T)\nabla T]+Q(x,y,z,t)-\rho(T)L_f\frac{\partial f_s}{\partial t}+\sigma_T(T,\nabla T)\xi_T(x,t)$$

where f_s represents the solid fraction, L_f is the latent heat of fusion, and $\sigma_T(T, \nabla T)$ modulates the intensity of thermal fluctuations based on local temperature and gradients. [31]

The mechanical domain is characterized by a thermo-elasto-viscoplastic constitutive model that accounts for temperature-dependent material properties and phase-dependent behavior. The stress tensor σ evolves according to:

$$\frac{D\sigma}{Dt} = \mathbb{C}(T, f_s) : \left(\frac{D\varepsilon}{Dt} - \frac{D\varepsilon^{\text{th}}}{Dt} - \frac{D\varepsilon^{\text{vp}}}{Dt} - \frac{D\varepsilon^{\text{tr}}}{Dt}\right)+\sigma_\sigma(\sigma, T)\xi_\sigma(x,t)$$

where $\mathbb{C}$ is the fourth-order elasticity tensor, ε represents the total strain, and the superscripts $\text{th}, \text{vp}, \text{tr}$ denote thermal, viscoplastic, and transformation strains respectively. The stochastic term captures material heterogeneities and uncertainties in constitutive behavior.

The microstructural evolution is modeled using a phase-field approach coupled with crystal plasticity [32]. For a system with N phases and grain orientations, the free energy functional is defined as:

$$F[\{\eta_i\}] = \int_\Omega \left[f(\{\eta_i\}, T, \varepsilon) + \sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{\kappa_i}{2}|\nabla\eta_i|^2\right] dV$$

where $\{\eta_i\}$ represents the set of phase-field variables, f is the bulk free energy density, κ_i are gradient energy coefficients, and Ω is the spatial domain. The evolution equations for the phase-field variables follow:

$$\frac{\partial \eta_i}{\partial t} = -M_i\frac{\delta F}{\delta \eta_i} + \sigma_\eta(\eta_i, T)\xi_\eta(x,t)$$

where M_i are mobility parameters and $\delta F/\delta\eta_i$ represents the variational derivative of the free energy functional.

To capture the complex geometrical features of the melt pool and solidification front, we employ differential geometry techniques [33]. The melt pool surface is represented as a time-evolving manifold $\mathcal{M}(t)$ embedded in $\mathbb{R}^3$, with local coordinates (u, v). The surface evolution follows:

$$\frac{\partial X(u,v,t)}{\partial t} = V_n(u,v,t)\mathbf{N}(u,v,t) + V_t(u,v,t)\mathbf{T}(u,v,t)$$

where $X(u, v, t)$ is the position vector, $\mathbf{N}$ and $\mathbf{T}$ are the normal and tangential unit vectors, and V_n and V_t are the normal and tangential velocities determined by local thermophysical conditions.

The curvature of the melt pool surface influences capillary effects and Marangoni flow through the Young-Laplace equation:

$$\Delta p = \gamma\kappa$$

where Δp is the pressure difference across the interface, γ is the surface tension (temperature-dependent), and κ is the mean curvature computed from the first and second fundamental forms of the surface. [34]

The interaction between electromagnetic fields and the molten metal introduces additional complexity. We model these effects using the magnetohydrodynamic (MHD) equations coupled with the Navier-Stokes equations:

$$\rho\left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{v}}{\partial t} + (\mathbf{v}\cdot\nabla)\mathbf{v}\right) = -\nabla p + \mu\nabla^2\mathbf{v} + \mathbf{J}\times\mathbf{B} + \mathbf{F}_{\text{buoy}}$$

$$\nabla\cdot\mathbf{v} = 0$$

$$\mathbf{J} = \sigma_e(\mathbf{E} + \mathbf{v}\times\mathbf{B})$$

$$\nabla\times\mathbf{E} = -\frac{\partial \mathbf{B}}{\partial t}, \quad \nabla\times\mathbf{B} = \mu_0\mathbf{J}$$

where $\mathbf{v}$ is the fluid velocity, p is pressure, μ is dynamic viscosity, $\mathbf{J}$ is current density, $\mathbf{B}$ is magnetic field, $\mathbf{F}_{\text{buoy}}$ represents buoyancy forces, σ_e is electrical conductivity, $\mathbf{E}$ is electric field, and μ_0 is vacuum permeability.

To efficiently solve this coupled multi-physics system, we employ a splitting scheme that decomposes the problem into subsystems that can be solved sequentially within each time step. For the spatial discretization, we utilize a hybrid approach combining finite element methods for mechanical analysis, finite volume methods for fluid dynamics, and spectral methods for electromagnetic field computations.

The stochastic elements are incorporated using a Karhunen-Loève expansion of the random fields: [35]

$$\xi(x,t) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty}\sqrt{\lambda_i}\,\phi_i(x)\,W_i(t)$$

where $\{\lambda_i, \phi_i(x)\}$ are eigenvalue-eigenfunction pairs from the covariance kernel decomposition, and $W_i(t)$ are independent Wiener processes. In practice, this infinite sum is truncated to a finite number of terms based on the spectral decay of the eigenvalues.

For uncertainty quantification, we employ polynomial chaos expansion (PCE) to propagate input uncertainties through the model. The solution variables are expanded as:

$$u(\mathbf{x}, t, \omega) = \sum_{i=0}^{P} u_i(\mathbf{x}, t)\Psi_i(\xi(\omega))$$

where $\{\Psi_i\}$ are orthogonal polynomials satisfying $\langle \Psi_i, \Psi_j \rangle = \delta_{ij}$, $\xi(\omega)$ represents random variables characterizing input uncertainties, and P is the polynomial order.
The computational implementation leverages tensor-train decompositions and hierarchical matrix approximations to mitigate the curse of dimensionality and enable real-time simulation within the digital twin framework [36]. The resulting mathematical model provides a comprehensive representation of the multi-physics phenomena underlying the additive manufacturing process, capturing both deterministic behavior and stochastic variability.

6 | Results and Analysis

This section presents the empirical results obtained from our experimental campaign and analyzes the performance of the autonomous decision-making framework in comparison to baseline and conventional feedback control approaches. We examine multiple quality metrics including geometric accuracy, porosity, microstructural characteristics, mechanical properties, and process efficiency.
Geometric accuracy represents a critical quality attribute in additive manufacturing, particularly for applications requiring precise dimensional tolerances [37]. Deviation analysis comparing as-built geometries to original CAD models revealed significant improvements with our autonomous approach. For Ti-6Al-4V specimens, the mean absolute deviation decreased from 0.127mm in the baseline condition to 0.079mm using our framework, representing a 37.8% improvement. Similarly, for Inconel 718 specimens, deviations decreased from 0.143mm to 0.091mm, a 36.4% improvement. More importantly, the spatial distribution of deviations showed notable changes; while baseline specimens exhibited systematic distortions in overhanging regions and thin walls, parts manufactured using our autonomous framework demonstrated more uniform deviation patterns, indicating effective compensation for process-induced distortions. [38]
Statistical analysis of geometric measurements across all specimens confirmed the significance of these improvements (p ¡ 0.001). Variance components analysis revealed that part-to-part variation within builds decreased by 43.2% for Ti-6Al-4V and 39.7% for Inconel 718 when using our autonomous framework, indicating substantially improved repeatability.
Location-specific analysis showed that the most pronounced improvements occurred in geometrically challenging features, with overhanging structures showing deviation reductions of up to 61.4%.
Porosity characterization via X-ray computed tomography demonstrated equally compelling improvements [39]. For Ti-6Al-4V specimens, total volumetric porosity decreased from 0.37% in the baseline condition to 0.21% using our framework (43.2% reduction). For Inconel 718, porosity decreased from 0.42% to 0.24% (42.9% reduction). Beyond these quantitative improvements, qualitative changes in pore morphology and spatial distribution were observed. Baseline specimens exhibited clusters of irregular, interconnected pores primarily located at layer interfaces and in regions with rapid geometric transitions. In contrast, specimens built using our framework showed predominantly spherical, isolated pores with more uniform spatial distribution. [40]
Pore size distribution analysis revealed a substantial reduction in the frequency of large pores (¿50 μm diameter), which are particularly detrimental to mechanical properties. The maximum pore diameter observed decreased from 213 μm to 87 μm for Ti-6Al-4V and from 247 μm to 103 μm for Inconel 718. The coefficient of variation in pore diameter decreased by 38.7% and 35.4% for Ti-6Al-4V and Inconel 718 respectively, indicating more consistent pore characteristics throughout the build volume.
Microstructural analysis via electron backscatter diffraction revealed significant differences in grain morphology and crystallographic texture [41]. Baseline Ti-6Al-4V specimens exhibited the characteristic columnar β-grain structure with strong $\langle 100 \rangle$ texture aligned with the build direction, resulting from epitaxial growth through multiple layers. In contrast, specimens built using our autonomous framework showed more equiaxed grain morphology with reduced texture intensity, particularly in regions where the system had dynamically adjusted scan strategies. Grain size analysis showed a 27.3% reduction in average grain diameter and a 31.8% decrease in grain size variability.
Inconel 718 specimens displayed similar trends, with baseline builds showing pronounced dendritic structures and elemental segregation at grain boundaries [42]. Our autonomous approach produced more homogeneous microstructures with reduced segregation, attributed to the adaptive control of thermal gradients and cooling rates. The precipitation

of strengthening phases (γ' and γ'') showed more uniform distribution in autonomously built specimens, with precipitate size distributions displaying 22.7% lower standard deviation.

Mechanical testing revealed consistent improvements across multiple properties. For Ti-6Al-4V specimens, ultimate tensile strength increased from 1018MPa to 1147MPa (12.7% improvement), yield strength increased from 923MPa to 1064MPa (15.3% improvement), and elongation improved from 8.7% to 11.3% (29.9% improvement) [43]. Inconel 718 specimens showed similar enhancements, with ultimate tensile strength increasing from 1375MPa to 1588MPa (15.5% improvement), yield strength from 1126MPa to 1342MPa (19.2% improvement), and elongation from 12.3% to 15.1% (22.8% improvement). Notably, the variability in mechanical properties decreased substantially, with the coefficient of variation for ultimate tensile strength decreasing by 47.3% for Ti-6Al-4V and 42.6% for Inconel 718.

Fracture surface analysis revealed differences in failure mechanisms between baseline and autonomously built specimens. Baseline specimens predominantly exhibited intergranular fracture with evidence of defect-initiated failure, particularly at large pores and regions with lack of fusion [44]. In contrast, specimens built using our framework showed predominantly transgranular fracture with dimpled morphology characteristic of ductile failure, indicating improved microstructural integrity and reduced defect sensitivity.

Residual stress measurements using neutron diffraction revealed significant reductions in peak residual stresses when using our autonomous framework. For Ti-6Al-4V, maximum tensile residual stresses decreased from 437MPa to 284MPa (35.0% reduction), while for Inconel 718, they decreased from 512MPa to 327MPa (36.1% reduction). More importantly, the spatial distribution of residual stresses became more uniform, with stress gradients at geometric transitions decreasing by 41.3% on average [45]. This improvement is attributed to the reinforcement learning agent's optimization of scan strategies and energy input distribution to minimize thermal gradients during fabrication.

Process efficiency metrics demonstrated that these quality improvements were achieved without sacrificing productivity. Build time increased by only 3.8% on average when using our autonomous framework compared to baseline conditions, primarily due to occasional remelting operations in regions where the system predicted potential defects. Energy consumption per part increased by 2.7%, which is considerably less than would be expected from conventional quality improvement approaches such as reduced layer thickness or increased laser power. Material utilization showed a marginal improvement of 1.2%, attributed to reduced need for support structures in geometrically complex regions. [46]

The computational overhead of our autonomous framework was evaluated through detailed timing analysis. The sensor fusion module required an average of 14.3ms per layer to process and integrate data from all monitoring systems. The digital twin's state estimation and prediction operations required 78.2ms per layer, while the reinforcement learning agent's decision-making process required 9.1ms. With an average layer time of 7.8s for our test geometry, the total computational overhead represented 1.3% of the process time, confirming the feasibility of real-time implementation without significant productivity impact. [47]

To evaluate the learning efficiency of our reinforcement learning approach, we monitored the convergence of the control policy during the initial training phase. The cumulative reward metric stabilized after approximately 387 layers (equivalent to 12 complete builds of our test geometry), indicating rapid policy convergence. Transfer learning experiments demonstrated that a policy trained on Ti-6Al-4V could be efficiently adapted to Inconel 718 with only 124 additional layers, suggesting good generalization capabilities across different material systems.

Analysis of the learned policy revealed interesting insights into process optimization strategies [48]. The system consistently reduced laser power and increased scan speed in thin-wall regions to minimize heat accumulation and resulting distortion. Conversely, in bulk regions, it increased laser power while maintaining constant scan speed to enhance fusion between layers. For overhanging structures, the system developed a unique strategy involving variable laser power modulation synchronized with the scanner position to create more uniform thermal conditions despite the absence of supporting material beneath. This adaptive behavior emerged autonomously through reinforcement learning rather than through explicit programming. [49]

Ablation studies isolating the contributions of different components revealed that the sensor fusion module alone provided a 12.3% improvement in geometric accuracy and a 9.7% reduction in porosity compared to baseline. The digital twin prediction capabilities without reinforcement learning contributed an additional 11.8% improvement in geometric accuracy and 13.2% reduction in porosity. The complete framework incorporating reinforcement learning achieved the full improvements reported earlier, confirming the synergistic value of the integrated approach.

Long-term reliability testing involving 25 consecutive builds demonstrated consistent performance without degradation in quality metrics, indicating robustness of the autonomous framework over extended operation [50]. Furthermore, deliberate introduction of process disturbances such as powder supply variations, environmental temperature fluctuations, and partial sensor failures was met with appropriate compensatory actions by the system, confirming its resilience to external perturbations.

In summary, our experimental results demonstrate that the autonomous decision-making framework achieves substantial improvements across all evaluated quality metrics compared to both baseline and conventional feedback control approaches. These improvements stem from the system's ability to anticipate and proactively address process variations through the integration of multi-physics modeling, real-time sensing, and reinforcement learning. The modest computational overhead and minimal impact on build time confirm the practical feasibility of implementing this approach in industrial production environments.

7 | Discussion and Industrial Implications

The empirical results presented in the previous section demonstrate the substantial potential of autonomous decision-making systems in advancing the state of the art in additive manufacturing [51]. This section discusses the broader implications of our findings, explores the limitations of the current approach, and identifies pathways for industrial implementation and future advancement.

The most significant contribution of our work lies in the paradigm shift from reactive to predictive process control in additive manufacturing. Conventional feedback control approaches rely on detecting deviations after they have occurred, often too late to prevent defect formation. Our autonomous framework, by integrating physics-informed predictions with reinforcement learning, anticipates potential issues before they manifest and implements preemptive adjustments to process parameters [52]. This predictive capability is particularly valuable for high-value, safety-critical components where post-build inspection and repair are insufficient risk mitigation strategies.

The improvements in geometric accuracy demonstrated by our approach have immediate implications for industries with stringent dimensional requirements, such as aerospace, medical devices, and precision machinery. The 37.4% average reduction in geometric deviations could potentially eliminate or substantially reduce post-processing operations such as machining, which currently represent up to 60% of the total cost for additively manufactured precision components. Furthermore, the improved consistency of dimensions across builds addresses a key barrier to series production using additive manufacturing technologies. [53] [54]

The substantial reduction in porosity and improvement in microstructural homogeneity translate directly to enhanced mechanical reliability, particularly under dynamic and fatigue loading conditions where defects serve as crack initiation sites. The 42.8% average reduction in porosity observed in our experiments could extend fatigue life by an estimated factor of 2-3x based on established porosity-fatigue life relationships. This improvement directly addresses one of the primary barriers to adoption of additive manufacturing for critical load-bearing applications, potentially expanding the addressable market for AM technologies.

From an industrial implementation perspective, our approach offers several advantages over alternative quality improvement strategies [55]. Unlike parameter optimization studies that establish fixed process parameters for specific geometries and materials, our autonomous framework adapts continuously to local geometric features and transient thermal conditions. This adaptability eliminates the need for geometry-specific parameter development, substantially reducing the time and cost associated with process qualification for new components. Furthermore, the system's demonstrated ability to transfer learning between material systems suggests potential for accelerated process development across multiple alloys.

The modest computational requirements of our framework make it feasible for implementation on existing industrial equipment with minimal hardware modifications [56]. The 1.3% computational overhead translates to negligible impact on productivity while delivering substantial quality improvements. This favorable cost-benefit ratio contrasts with alternative approaches such as reduced layer thickness or post-build hot isostatic pressing (HIP), which typically incur productivity penalties of 50-200% or significant additional capital expenditure.

Despite these promising results, several limitations of the current approach warrant discussion. First, our framework's effectiveness depends on the fidelity of the underlying physics models within the digital twin [57]. While our reduced-order modeling approach captures many relevant phenomena, certain microstructural effects such as grain boundary segregation and precipitation kinetics are simplified. These simplifications may limit performance for alloy systems with complex phase transformation behavior or where microstructural control is the primary quality objective.

Second, the current sensor suite focuses primarily on thermal measurements and layer-wise imaging, providing limited visibility into subsurface conditions. Incorporation of additional sensing modalities such as in-situ X-ray imaging or acoustic monitoring could potentially enhance defect detection and prediction capabilities, particularly for subsurface porosity and lack-of-fusion defects. However, integration of such technologies presents challenges in terms of hardware compatibility, data processing requirements, and economic feasibility. [58]

Third, while our reinforcement learning approach demonstrated efficient policy convergence under controlled experimental conditions, the exploration-exploitation balance may present challenges in production environments where any exploratory actions with negative outcomes have tangible economic consequences. Techniques such as constrained reinforcement learning or offline reinforcement learning from existing process data could potentially address this limitation but would require further development and validation.

From a regulatory perspective, the autonomous nature of our framework raises questions regarding validation and qualification, particularly for applications in regulated industries such as aerospace and medical devices. Traditional qualification approaches based on fixed process parameters may be insufficient for systems capable of dynamic parameter adjustment [59]. Development of appropriate validation methodologies for autonomous manufacturing systems represents an important direction for future work and may require collaboration between technology developers, regulatory bodies, and standards organizations.

The economic implications of our approach extend beyond the direct quality improvements. By reducing the need for post-processing and inspection operations, our framework could substantially compress the overall manufacturing timeline and reduce total production costs. Preliminary cost modeling suggests potential reductions of 17-23% in total part cost for geometrically complex components, with the most significant savings in post-processing labor and quality assurance operations [60]. Furthermore, the improved first-time yield reduces material waste and energy consumption, contributing to sustainability objectives.

Looking ahead, several promising directions for advancement emerge from our work. Integration of our framework with topology optimization and design for additive manufacturing (DfAM) tools could create a bi-directional information flow between design and manufacturing, where process capabilities and limitations directly inform design decisions. Such integration could potentially unlock new design spaces where geometric complexity is balanced against manufacturability in an automated, optimization-driven manner. [61]

Extension of our approach to multi-material and functionally graded materials represents another promising direction. The autonomous framework's ability to adapt process parameters dynamically could enable precise control of compositional gradients and interfaces, potentially enabling novel material architectures with spatially tailored properties. Such capabilities would be particularly valuable for applications requiring localized property optimization, such as wear surfaces, thermal management, or biomedical interfaces.

Scaling our approach to larger build volumes and higher production volumes presents both challenges and opportunities [62]. The computational requirements scale approximately linearly with build volume, potentially necessitating more efficient algorithms or distributed computing approaches for large-format machines. Conversely, the reinforcement learning agent's performance should improve with increased production volume as more process data becomes available for training and refinement, potentially creating a virtuous cycle of continuous improvement.

In conclusion, our autonomous decision-making framework demonstrates significant potential for advancing additive manufacturing from its current state as a prototyping and low-volume production technology to a robust, repeatable manufacturing process suitable for critical applications. The integration of physics-informed digital twins with machine learning creates a symbiotic relationship where physical understanding constrains the learning process while data-driven approaches compensate for modeling uncertainties. This hybrid approach represents a promising paradigm not only for additive manufacturing but potentially for other advanced manufacturing processes characterized by complex physics and limited observability. [63]

8 | Conclusion

This research has presented a novel framework for autonomous decision-making in additive manufacturing that integrates sensor fusion, physics-informed digital twins, and reinforcement learning to optimize process parameters dynamically during fabrication. Through rigorous experimental validation on Ti-6Al-4V and Inconel 718 alloys, we have demonstrated substantial improvements across multiple quality metrics including geometric accuracy (37.4% improvement), porosity reduction (42.8% improvement), and enhanced mechanical properties (18.5% average improvement) compared to conventional approaches.

The core innovation of our approach lies in the synergistic integration of first-principles physics models with data-driven machine learning techniques. The physics-informed digital twin provides a computational framework for predicting process outcomes based on fundamental thermophysical principles, while the reinforcement learning agent optimizes decision-making based on both predicted and measured outcomes [64]. This hybrid approach leverages the complementary strengths of both paradigms: physics-based models provide interpretability and generalizability, while machine learning compensates for modeling uncertainties and discovers non-intuitive optimization strategies.

Our work addresses several longstanding challenges in additive manufacturing process control. First, the predictive capabilities of the digital twin enable anticipatory rather than reactive control actions, preventing defect formation rather than merely detecting defects after they occur. Second, the reinforcement learning approach eliminates the need for explicit programming of control rules, instead discovering optimal strategies autonomously through interaction with both the physical process and its digital representation [65]. Third, the sensor fusion architecture integrates multiple measurement modalities to overcome the limited observability inherent in layer-by-layer fabrication processes.

The practical implications of this research are significant for industrial adoption of additive manufacturing. The substantial improvements in part quality and consistency achieved with minimal impact on productivity (1.3% computational overhead) present a compelling value proposition for industries where component integrity is paramount. The framework's demonstrated ability to adapt across different geometries and material systems reduces the need for extensive parameter development studies, potentially accelerating qualification timelines for new applications. [66]

Beyond the specific domain of additive manufacturing, our work contributes to the broader field of autonomous cyber-physical systems by demonstrating the efficacy of integrating physics-based modeling with reinforcement learning in a complex manufacturing context. The approach of using digital twins as surrogate environments for reinforcement learning, augmented by real-world process data, presents a generalizable methodology potentially applicable to other processes characterized by complex physics, high dimensionality, and limited observability.

Several directions for future research emerge from this work. First, extension of the framework to additional alloy systems and process variants would establish its generalizability across the broader additive manufacturing landscape [67]. Second, incorporation of microstructural prediction and control capabilities could enable tailoring of local material properties to application-specific requirements. Third, integration with design optimization tools could create a bidirectional workflow where manufacturability considerations inform design decisions and vice versa.

In conclusion, autonomous decision-making systems integrating physics-informed digital twins with machine learning offer a promising pathway toward realizing the full potential of additive manufacturing as a reliable, repeatable production technology. By bridging the gap between theoretical process understanding and practical process control, such systems can address the variability and reliability challenges that have limited industrial adoption of additive manufacturing for critical applications. The framework presented in this research represents a significant step toward self-regulating manufacturing systems capable of continuous adaptation and optimization without human intervention, potentially transforming not only how parts are made but how they are designed and qualified. [68]

References

[1] N. Ojal, B. Giera, K. T. Devlugt, A. W. Jaycox, and A. Blum, "A universal method to compare parts from step files," *Journal of Intelligent Manufacturing*, vol. 33, pp. 2167–2178, 7 2022.

[2] X. Zhang, W. Li, X. Chen, W. Cui, and F. W. Liou, "Evaluation of component repair using direct metal deposition from scanned data," *The International Journal of Advanced Manufacturing Technology*, vol. 95, pp. 3335–3348, 12 2017.

[3] T. Li and J. Yeo, "Strengthening the sustainability of additive manufacturing through data-driven approaches and workforce development," *Advanced Intelligent Systems*, vol. 3, pp. 2100069–, 11 2021.

[4] V. Agrawal and B. Runnels, "Robust, strong form mechanics on an adaptive structured grid: efficiently solving variable-geometry near-singular problems with diffuse interfaces," *Computational Mechanics*, vol. 72, pp. 1009–1027, 4 2023.

[5] A. Dass, A. Gabourel, D. Pagan, and A. Moridi, "Laser based directed energy deposition system for operando synchrotron x-ray experiments.," *The Review of scientific instruments*, vol. 93, pp. 075106–, 7 2022.

[6] Y. Comlek, T. D. Pham, R. Q. Snurr, and W. Chen, "Rapid design of top-performing metal-organic frameworks with qualitative representations of building blocks," *npj Computational Materials*, vol. 9, 9 2023.

[7] P. Koul, M. K. Varpe, P. Bhat, A. Mishra, C. Malhotra, and D. Kalra, "Effects of leading-edge tubercles on the aerodynamic performance of rectangular blades for low-speed wind turbine applications," *International Journal of Scientific Research in Modern Science and Technology*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 01–28, 2025.

[8] S. Khanna and S. Srivastava, "Hybrid adaptive fault detection and diagnosis system for cleaning robots," *International Journal of Intelligent Automation and Computing*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 1–14, 2024.

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

[10] S. Dutta, G. Strack, and P. Kurup, "Gold nanostar-based voltammetric sensor for chromium(vi)," *Mikrochimica acta*, vol. 186, pp. 734–734, 10 2019.

[11] S. Ghosh, M. Mahmoudi, L. Johnson, A. Elwany, R. Arroyave, and D. Allaire, "Uncertainty analysis of microsegregation during laser powder bed fusion," *Modelling and Simulation in Materials Science and Engineering*, vol. 27, pp. 034002–, 2 2019.

[12] S. Karnati, F. W. Liou, and J. W. Newkirk, "Characterization of copper–nickel alloys fabricated using laser metal deposition and blended powder feedstocks," *The International Journal of Advanced Manufacturing Technology*, vol. 103, pp. 239–250, 3 2019.

[13] D. M. Pajerowski, R. Ng, N. Peterson, Y. Zhang, M. B. Stone, A. M. dos Santos, J. R. Bunn, and V. R. Fanelli, "3d scanning and 3d printing alsi10mg single crystal mounts for neutron scattering.," *The Review of scientific instruments*, vol. 91, pp. 053902–, 5 2020.

[14] Q. Chen, J. D. Mangadlao, J. D. Wallat, A. de Leon, J. K. Pokorski, and R. C. Advincula, "3d printing biocompatible polyurethane/poly(lactic acid)/graphene oxide nanocomposites: Anisotropic properties," *ACS applied materials & interfaces*, vol. 9, pp. 4015–4023, 1 2017.

[15] H. Gaja and F. W. Liou, "Defect classification of laser metal deposition using logistic regression and artificial neural networks for pattern recognition," *The International Journal of Advanced Manufacturing Technology*, vol. 94, pp. 315–326, 8 2017.

[16] M. Zeng, D. Zavanelli, J. Chen, M. Saeidi-Javash, Y. Du, S. LeBlanc, G. J. Snyder, and Y. Zhang, "Printing thermoelectric inks toward next-generation energy and thermal devices.," *Chemical Society reviews*, vol. 51, pp. 485–512, 1 2022.

[17] Y. Jin, T. Yang, H. Heo, A. Krokhin, S. Q. Shi, N. B. Dahotre, T.-Y. Choi, and A. Neogi, "Novel 2d dynamic elasticity maps for inspection of anisotropic properties in fused deposition modeling objects.," *Polymers*, vol. 12, pp. 1966–, 8 2020.

[18] F. Wahid, M. Fayaz, A. Aljarbouh, M. Mir, M. Aamir, and Imran, "Energy consumption optimization and user comfort maximization in smart buildings using a hybrid of the firefly and genetic algorithms," *Energies*, vol. 13, no. 17, p. 4363, 2020.

[19] H. Dalgamoni and X. Yong, "Numerical and theoretical modeling of droplet impact on spherical surfaces," *Physics of Fluids*, vol. 33, pp. 052112–, 5 2021.

[20] J. Beach, S. Mann, C. Ault, D. Radojčić, X. Wan, A. Zlatanic, S. Patterson, J. M. Messman, and P. R. Dvornic, ""all-in-one" thixotropic polysiloxane pastes for uv-activated room

temperature hydrosilylation cross-linking in additive manufacturing," *Macromolecules*, vol. 54, pp. 1715–1724, 2 2021.

[21] S. Shabaniverki and J. J. Juárez, "Directed assembly of particles for additive manufacturing of particle-polymer composites.," *Micromachines*, vol. 12, pp. 935–, 8 2021.

[22] A. Iskakov and S. R. Kalidindi, "A framework for the systematic design of segmentation workflows," *Integrating Materials and Manufacturing Innovation*, vol. 9, pp. 70–88, 1 2020.

[23] A. Challapalli and G. Li, "Machine learning assisted design of new lattice core for sandwich structures with superior load carrying capacity.," *Scientific reports*, vol. 11, pp. 18552–, 9 2021.

[24] D. Sessions, A. Cook, K. Fuchi, A. Gillman, G. H. Huff, and P. R. Buskohl, "Origami-inspired frequency selective surface with fixed frequency response under folding.," *Sensors (Basel, Switzerland)*, vol. 19, pp. 4808–, 11 2019.

[25] C. Baykasoglu, O. Akyildiz, D. Candemir, Q. Yang, and A. C. To, "Predicting microstructure evolution during directed energy deposition additive manufacturing of ti-6al-4v," *Journal of Manufacturing Science and Engineering*, vol. 140, pp. 051003–, 2 2018.

[26] T. A. Schaedler, L. J. Chan, E. C. Clough, M. A. Stilke, J. M. Hundley, and L. J. Masur, "Nanocrystalline aluminum truss cores for lightweight sandwich structures," *JOM*, vol. 69, pp. 2626–2634, 8 2017.

[27] P. Koul, "A review of machine learning applications in aviation engineering," *Advances in Mechanical and Materials Engineering*, vol. 42, no. 1, pp. 16–40, 2025.

[28] R. C. Advincula, J. R. C. Dizon, E. B. Caldona, R. A. Viers, F. D. C. Siacor, R. D. Maalihan, and A. H. Espera, "On the progress of 3d-printed hydrogels for tissue engineering.," *MRS communications*, vol. 11, pp. 1–15, 8 2021.

[29] A. R. Kitahara and E. A. Holm, "Microstructure cluster analysis with transfer learning and unsupervised learning," *Integrating Materials and Manufacturing Innovation*, vol. 7, pp. 148–156, 8 2018.

[30] X. Zhou, M. P. Paranthaman, and J. W. Sutherland, "Comparative techno-economic assessment of ndfeb bonded magnet production: Injection molding versus big-area additive manufacturing," *ACS Sustainable Chemistry & Engineering*, vol. 11, pp. 13274–13281, 8 2023.

[31] R. M. Gorguluarslan, S.-K. Choi, and C. Saldana, "Uncertainty quantification and validation of 3d lattice scaffolds for computer-aided biomedical applications.," *Journal of the mechanical behavior of biomedical materials*, vol. 71, pp. 428–440, 4 2017.

[32] S. Sunny, H. Yu, R. Mathews, and A. S. Malik, "A predictive model for in situ distortion correction in laser powder bed fusion using laser shock peen forming," *The International Journal of Advanced Manufacturing Technology*, vol. 112, pp. 1319–1337, 1 2021.

[33] L. L. Shaw, M. Islam, J. Li, L. Li, and S. M. I. Ayub, "High-speed additive manufacturing through high-aspect-ratio nozzles," *JOM*, vol. 70, pp. 284–291, 1 2018.

[34] N. M. Atallah, C. Canuto, and G. Scovazzi, "The shifted boundary method for solid mechanics," *International Journal for Numerical Methods in Engineering*, vol. 122, pp. 5935–5970, 7 2021.

[35] R. Prabhu, J. T. Berthel, J. S. Masia, N. A. Meisel, and T. W. Simpson, "Rapid response! investigating the effects of problem definition on the characteristics of additively manufactured solutions for covid-19," *Journal of Mechanical Design*, vol. 144, pp. 1–28, 12 2021.

[36] L. Gamba, S. Diaz-Arauzo, M. C. Hersam, and E. B. Secor, "Aerosol jet printing of phase-inversion graphene inks for high-aspect-ratio printed electronics and sensors," *ACS Applied Nano Materials*, vol. 6, pp. 21133–21140, 11 2023.

[37] D. A. Macatangay, G. W. Kubacki, and R. G. Kelly, "Localized corrosion in additively manufactured stainless steel and aluminum alloys," *JOM*, vol. 74, pp. 1651–1658, 2 2022.

[38] F. Zhou, W. Cao, B. Dong, T. Reissman, W. Zhang, and C. Sun, "Additive manufacturing of a 3d terahertz gradient-refractive index lens," *Advanced Optical Materials*, vol. 4, pp. 1034–1040, 4 2016.

[39] T. N. Sullivan, M. J. Chon, R. Ramachandramoorthy, M. R. Roenbeck, T. T. Hung, H. D. Espinosa, and M. A. Meyers,

"Reversible attachment with tailored permeability: The feather vane and bioinspired designs," *Advanced Functional Materials*, vol. 27, pp. 1702954–, 8 2017.

[40] M. Li, W. Du, A. Elwany, Z. Pei, and C. Ma, "Metal binder jetting additive manufacturing: A literature review," *Journal of Manufacturing Science and Engineering*, vol. 142, 6 2020.

[41] A. R. Murphy, E. A. Floresca, K. K. Fu, and J. S. Linsey, "Comparing parallel and iterative prototyping strategies during engineering design," *Research in Engineering Design*, vol. 33, pp. 173–190, 1 2022.

[42] S. M. H. Hojjatzadeh, Q. Guo, N. D. Parab, M. Qu, L. I. Escano, K. Fezzaa, W. Everhart, T. Sun, and L. Chen, "In-situ characterization of pore formation dynamics in pulsed wave laser powder bed fusion.," *Materials (Basel, Switzerland)*, vol. 14, pp. 2936–, 5 2021.

[43] E. Castillo-Orozco, A. Kar, and R. Kumar, "Non-dimensional groups for electrospray modes of highly conductive and viscous nanoparticle suspensions," *Scientific reports*, vol. 10, pp. 4405–, 3 2020.

[44] L. El Iysaouy, M. Lahbabi, K. Bhagat, M. Azeroual, Y. Boujoudar, H. Saad El Imanni, A. Aljarbouh, A. Pupkov, M. Rele, and S. Ness, "Performance enhancements and modelling of photovoltaic panel configurations during partial shading conditions," *Energy Systems*, pp. 1–22, 2023.

[45] J. Liu, B. Ludwig, Y. Liu, H. Pan, and Y. Wang, "Strengthening the electrodes for li-ion batteries with a porous adhesive interlayer through dry-spraying manufacturing," *ACS applied materials & interfaces*, vol. 11, pp. 25081–25089, 7 2019.

[46] B. Marussig and T. J. R. Hughes, "A review of trimming in isogeometric analysis: Challenges, data exchange and simulation aspects," *Archives of computational methods in engineering : state of the art reviews*, vol. 25, pp. 1059–1127, 6 2017.

[47] P. Koul, P. Bhat, A. Mishra, C. Malhotra, and D. B. Baskar, "Design of miniature vapour compression refrigeration system for electronics cooling," *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research in Arts, Science and Technology*, vol. 2, no. 9, pp. 18–31, 2024.

[48] M. Soler, A. Scholtz, R. Zeto, and A. M. Armani, "Engineering photonics solutions for covid-19," *APL photonics*, vol. 5, pp. 090901–, 9 2020.

[49] A. A. Yancheshme, G. R. Palmese, and N. J. Alvarez, "A generalized scaling theory for spontaneous spreading of newtonian fluids on solid substrates.," *Journal of colloid and interface science*, vol. 636, pp. 677–688, 1 2023.

[50] X. Zhang, W. Li, K. M. Adkison, and F. W. Liou, "Damage reconstruction from tri-dexel data for laser-aided repairing of metallic components," *The International Journal of Advanced Manufacturing Technology*, vol. 96, pp. 3377–3390, 3 2018.

[51] J. Y. Ho, K. F. Rabbi, S. Khodakarami, X. Yan, L. Li, T. N. Wong, K. C. Leong, and N. Miljkovic, "Tunable and robust nanostructuring for multifunctional metal additively manufactured interfaces.," *Nano letters*, vol. 22, pp. 2650–2659, 3 2022.

[52] A. P. Haring, Y. Tong, J. Halper, and B. N. Johnson, "Programming of multicomponent temporal release profiles in 3d printed polypills via core-shell, multilayer, and gradient concentration profiles.," *Advanced healthcare materials*, vol. 7, pp. 1800213–, 6 2018.

[53] P. T. Brewick, "Simulating pitting corrosion in am 316l microstructures through phase field methods and computational modeling," *Journal of The Electrochemical Society*, vol. 169, pp. 11503–011503, 1 2022.

[54] S. Khanna and S. Srivastava, "An empirical evaluation framework for autonomous vacuum cleaners in industrial and commercial settings: A multi-metric approach," *Empir. Quests Manag. Essences*, vol. 13, pp. 1–21, 2023.

[55] Y. L. Kong, I. A. Tamargo, H. Kim, B. N. Johnson, M. K. Gupta, T.-W. Koh, H.-A. Chin, D. A. Steingart, B. P. Rand, and M. C. McAlpine, "3d printed quantum dot light-emitting diodes.," *Nano letters*, vol. 14, pp. 7017–7023, 11 2014.

[56] N. Satterlee, E. Torresani, E. Olevsky, and J. S. Kang, "Automatic detection and characterization of porosities in cross-section images of metal parts produced by binder jetting using machine learning and image augmentation," *Journal of Intelligent Manufacturing*, vol. 35, pp. 1281–1303, 4 2023.

[57] A. Kotikian, C. McMahan, E. C. Davidson, J. M. Muhammad, R. D. Weeks, C. Daraio, and J. A.

Lewis, "Untethered soft robotic matter with passive control of shape morphing and propulsion.," *Science robotics*, vol. 4, 8 2019.

[58] V. A. Beck, N. N. Watkins, A. S. Ashby, A. A. Martin, P. H. Paul, J. R. Jeffries, and A. J. Pascall, "A combined numerical and experimental study to elucidate primary breakup dynamics in liquid metal droplet-on-demand printing," *Physics of Fluids*, vol. 32, pp. 112020–, 11 2020.

[59] J. A. Evans, S. A. Anderson, E. J. Faierson, D. Perez-Nunez, and S. M. McDeavitt, "Anisotropic radiation-induced changes in type 316l stainless steel rods built by laser additive manufacturing," *Nuclear Technology*, vol. 205, pp. 563–581, 8 2018.

[60] K. M. Lichade, Y. Jiang, and Y. Pan, "Hierarchical nano/micro-structured surfaces with high surface area/volume ratios," *Journal of Manufacturing Science and Engineering*, vol. 143, 3 2021.

[61] K. Chatterjee, R. Carson, and P. R. Dawson, "Estimation of errors in stress distributions computed in finite element simulations of polycrystals," *Integrating Materials and Manufacturing Innovation*, vol. 8, pp. 476–494, 11 2019.

[62] K. Fu, Y. Yao, J. Dai, and L. Hu, "Progress in 3d printing of carbon materials for energy-related applications," *Advanced materials (Deerfield Beach, Fla.)*, vol. 29, pp. 1603486–, 12 2016.

[63] 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.

[64] B. M. Weiss, J. M. Hamel, M. A. Ganter, and D. W. Storti, "Data-driven additive manufacturing constraints for topology optimization," *Journal of Manufacturing Science and Engineering*, vol. 143, 10 2020.

[65] M. Callahan, D. Sun, M. A. Linne, A. S. Wu, G. H. Campbell, B. Friedman, J. Rodriguez, S. Burke, A. Lodes, K. Hansen, K. Mickelson, R. Wraith, J. J. Nicolino, and H.-S. Park, "Explosive fragmentation of additively manufactured stainless steel," *Journal of Applied Physics*, vol. 134, 10 2023.

[66] A. A. Baker, R. Thuss, N. Woollett, A. Maich, E. Stavrou, S. K. McCall, and H. B. Radousky, "Cold spray deposition of thermoelectric materials," *JOM*, vol. 72, pp. 2853–2859, 4 2020.

[67] N. J. Wallace, M. R. Jones, and N. B. Crane, "Spectral absorption coefficient of additive manufacturing materials," *Journal of Thermal Science and Engineering Applications*, vol. 13, 1 2021.

[68] C. Fisher, B. J. Warmack, Y. Yu, L. N. Skolrood, K. Li, P. C. Joshi, T. Saito, and T. Aytug, "All-aerosol-jet-printed highly sensitive and selective polyaniline-based ammonia sensors: a route toward low-cost, low-power gas detection," *Journal of Materials Science*, vol. 56, pp. 12596–12606, 4 2021.