

Advancing Additive Manufacturing through Deep Learning: A Comprehensive Review of Current Progress and Future Challenges

Amirul Islam Saimon^a, Emmanuel Yangué^b, Xiaowei Yue^c,
Zhenyu (James) Kong^a, and Chenang Liu^{b*} (email: chenang.liu@okstate.edu)

^aGrado Department of Industrial & Systems Engineering, Virginia Tech, USA
^bSchool of Industrial Engineering & Management, Oklahoma State University, USA
^cDepartment of Industrial Engineering, Tsinghua University, China

Abstract

Additive manufacturing (AM) has already proved itself to be the potential alternative to widely-used subtractive manufacturing due to its extraordinary capacity of manufacturing highly customized products with minimum material wastage. Nevertheless, it is still not being considered as the primary choice for the industry due to some of its major inherent challenges, including complex and dynamic process interactions, which are sometimes difficult to fully understand even with traditional machine learning because of the involvement of high-dimensional data such as images, point clouds, and voxels. However, the recent emergence of deep learning (DL) is showing great promise in overcoming many of these challenges as DL can automatically capture complex relationships from high-dimensional data without hand-crafted feature extraction. Therefore, the volume of research in the intersection of AM and DL is exponentially growing each year which makes it difficult for the researchers to keep track of the trend and future potential directions. Furthermore, to the best of our knowledge, there is no comprehensive review paper in this research track summarizing the recent studies. Therefore, this paper reviews the recent studies that apply DL for making the AM process better with a high-level summary of their contributions and limitations. Finally, it summarizes the current challenges and recommends some of the promising opportunities in this domain for further investigation with a special focus on generalizing DL models for wide-range of geometry types, managing uncertainties both in AM data and DL models, overcoming limited and noisy AM data issues by incorporating generative models, and unveiling the potential of interpretable DL for AM.

Keywords: Additive manufacturing (AM); Data Analytics; Deep learning (DL); Design for additive manufacturing (DfAM); Monitoring and control.

1 Introduction

The popularity of additive manufacturing (AM) over conventional subtractive manufacturing has been increasing due to the rising demand for customized products. This popularity can be easily realized from the rapidly expanding trend of the AM market size, from USD 20,670 million in 2023 to USD 98,310 million in 2032, as highlighted in Research (2023). AM not only provides an excellent alternative to conventional manufacturing but also reduces material wastage during the process (Gibson et al. (2021)). Furthermore, it has the capability of printing parts having internal cavities in the design as well as parts having multiple components that are already assembled (Després et al. (2020)). Despite these appealing features and potentials for industrial adoption, industries continue to encounter challenges in adopting AM as the primary manufacturing process for mass production, fundamentally due to inconsistency in part quality and properties as well as process inefficiencies (Li et al. (2020), Li et al. (2021a), Pandiyan et al. (2022a)). Therefore, researchers are continuously analyzing AM process from different perspectives and proposing methods to overcome these challenges.

Traditionally, AM is being analyzed using pure physical experiments and modeled using pure physics-based models. For instance, researchers conduct experiments to characterize material properties and employ Finite Element Analysis to model thermal distribution during printing. Analyses based on *pure physical experiments* can be time-consuming and expensive depending on the requirements of the experiments. On the other hand, *pure physics-based models* typically use equations based on fundamental physical principles to predict the behavior of the AM process. Pure physics-based models also have some limitations including (*i*) computational expense due to solving equations for each metal powder bed point, (*ii*) sensitivity to model assumptions, and (*iii*) limitations in capturing intricate interactions among different process parameters. Therefore, data-driven machine learning (ML) has emerged as a promising alternative to the conventional approaches in the domain of AM.

There are many review papers in literature that summarized the articles implementing data-driven ML for varied scenarios of the AM process. Relevant review papers are listed in Table 1. Data-driven ML or general ML techniques can be considered into two categories - traditional ML, and deep ML or deep learning (DL). Traditional ML can po-

tentially uncover latent patterns from historical AM data by manually extracting local and global features. However, as the complexity and scope of AM continue to expand, DL has become more effective in dealing with AM challenges than traditional ML. This is due to the ability of DL to (i) handle vast amounts of complex data, (ii) automatically capture complex and nonlinear relationships without manual feature extraction, and (iii) instantaneous prediction. However, most of the review papers listed in Table 1 mainly focused on the general ML applications in AM. In this paper, *general ML* term is used to indicate both the traditional and deep ML techniques. Naturally, as a part of the greater domain of ML, DL applications in AM was also discussed in those review papers but with little or negligible attention. Though Qi et al. (2019) attempted to review the studies that use neural network (NN) based ML techniques in AM applications, but they ended up focusing mostly on the shallow, not deeper, NN architecture. Therefore, this paper is mainly interested in the exploration of only DL techniques, not traditional ML, for the improvement of AM process.

Table 1: List of review articles in the intersection of AM and ML

ML techniques	AM process	Review articles
	General AM	Razvi et al. (2019); Meng et al. (2020); Jin et al. (2020); Wang et al. (2020); Goh et al. (2021); Liu et al. (2022a); Qin et al. (2022); Chinchanikar and Shaikh (2022); Sarkon et al. (2022); Zhang et al. (2022); Xames et al. (2022); Kumar et al. (2023); Jiang (2023)
General ML	L-PBF	Sing et al. (2021); Mahmoud et al. (2021); Fu et al. (2022); Liu et al. (2022c)
	WAAM	Hamrani et al. (2023)
	AJP	Guo et al. (2023)
	General AM	Qi et al. (2019)
NN-based	WAAM	He et al. (2023); Mattera et al. (2023)
CNN-based	General AM	Valizadeh and Wolff (2022)

To the best of our knowledge, Valizadeh and Wolff (2022) is the only paper that reviewed the application of DL in the domain of AM. However, it did not generalize the reviewing process by considering the applications of all the relevant DL techniques. It mainly considered the applications of Convolutional Neural Networks (CNN) in AM. Furthermore, it reviewed the articles up to the year 2020 with a few from the year 2021, more specifically only 5 articles from 2021. However, researchers and practitioners are continuously conducting research in the intersection of DL and AM, and publishing quality findings. Therefore, a detailed and robust review paper is a timely demand to keep track of the progress and be up-to-date with the state-of-the-art trends in the domain. To fill all these research gaps,

Table 2: List of keywords being used in the preliminary search to find the relevant articles

Set of keywords	Keywords
Set 1	Additive manufacturing; 3D printing; AM; Laser powder bed fusion; L-PBF; Directed energy deposition; DED; Wire arc additive manufacturing; WAAM; Fused filament fabrication; FFF; Selective laser sintering; SLS; Selective laser melting; SLM; Robotic additive manufacturing; Direct-ink-Writing; DIW; Aerosol jet printing; AJP; Metal additive manufacturing.
Set 2	Deep learning; DL; Convolutional neural networks; CNN; Deep Neural Networks; DNN; Recurrent Neural Networks; RNN; Deep Reinforcement Learning; DRL; Deep transfer learning; Long Short-Term Memory; LSTM; Transformers.

this paper reviews the studies that used various DL techniques across diverse AM processes. We plan not to be limited to a particular DL techniques (i.e., CNN) or any particular AM processes (i.e., L-PBF), but rather all the relevant studies in the intersection. The articles listed in this paper are gathered and collected from different well-known search engines including Google Scholar and Scopus. The keyword sets, obviously not restricted to, those listed in Table 2 can be used as a reference to understand the search procedure and the representative papers.

The high-level contributions of this paper can be summarized as follows:

1. This is the first paper, to the best of our knowledge, that comprehensively reviews most of the existing literature that apply DL to diverse aspects of AM life-cycle including design, process modeling and optimization, as well as *in-situ* monitoring and control.
2. Compared to the existing review papers (Table 1), this paper specifically focuses only on the research applying DL in AM. All other papers review research applying general ML (both traditional ML and DL) in AM where DL applications are reviewed with partial attention.
3. Upon realization of the importance of input data in DL implementation, this paper offers a detailed overview of different data types that frequently arise in the AM processes.
4. In addition to the state-of-the-art literature review, this paper also offers recommendations and guidelines for further research in this direction. Therefore, it would be a great source for the new researchers, interested in the intersection of AM and DL, to capture existing progress within a short time and focus on the potential gaps.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 identifies some of the common research problems in the AM (Subsection 2.1), the capacity of DL to address those research problems (Subsection 2.2), and a comprehensive classification of data frequently arising in AM (Subsection 2.3). Section 3 systematically reviews the implementations of DL in AM by clustering articles in different subsections - design for AM (Subsection 3.1), data-driven thermal profile and process-structure-property relationship modeling (Subsection 3.2), and process monitoring and control (Subsection 3.3). Section 4 lists the challenges and potential research scopes in the intersection of DL and AM based on the literature in Section 3, and finally, Section 5 completes the paper with relevant concluding remarks.

2 Background

2.1 *Research problems in the AM process*

The popularity of DL in AM applications can be highly attributed to some well-defined and established research problems of the AM process including the necessity of understanding the *complex process-structure-property (PSP) relationship*, the requirements of analyzing *high-dimensional* data within a short time for *in-situ* process control, and the challenge of dealing with *limited* or *noisy* data.

Proper understanding of the PSP relationship helps in selecting appropriate materials, process parameters, and performance indicators for AM process, which subsequently leads to the printed parts of desired expectation. However, this interaction is too complex to capture using simple functions due to the dynamic nature of the process. Data-driven DL technique can be a great tool in this scenario considering the ability of approximating complex relationships without manual feature extraction.

AM processes are continuously generating complex data including image, point clouds, etc. Therefore, extracting complex spatial and temporal information from these high-dimensional data are becoming challenging. However, DL has dedicated techniques that are showing great performance in extracting spatial and temporal information from such complex data. Details on AM data types are separately described in Section 2.3 considering the importance of input data for DL implementation.

The challenge of limited or noisy data is still common in some aspects of AM where

data collection is expensive or collected data are very noisy. In this type of scenario, it is possible to use a pre-trained DL model and leverage transfer learning to overcome the issue of scarce labeled data, or augment more samples from the available data distribution.

The research focusing on *in-situ* monitoring and control in AM is rapidly growing due to its capability of printing defect-free parts with consistent quality. However, it is challenging to instantaneously analyze the large volume of data collected through in-process monitoring techniques using traditional statistical methods for controlling the process in real-time. On the other hand, DL can effectively analyze potential patterns and extract relevant information from the available data within a very short time which helps in implementing *in-situ* control in AM.

2.2 Leveraging DL for advanced understanding of AM

This section demonstrates how DL addresses AM research problems from Section 2.1 through highlighting some of the motivating capacity of common DL techniques. The very basic DL technique is the deep neural network (DNN) which can *capture the complex relationships* among AM process parameters and different performance indicators of the printed parts. Convolutional neural networks (CNN) can effectively extract spatial features from grid-like data, such as 2D melt pool thermal image or 3D voxelized data. Recurrent Neural Networks (RNN) and Gated Recurrent Unit (GRU) Networks are capable of modeling temporal dependencies in time series sensor data for process monitoring and control (e.g., predicting temperature variations) or predictive maintenance (e.g., predicting the potential clogging time of the printer nozzle based on temperature and pressure sensor data) of AM.

Generative models like Variational Autoencoder (VAE) and Generative Adversarial Networks (GAN) can be used to augment additional samples from the same underlying distribution of the available data to overcome the *issue of limited data* (Li et al. (2021b)). Generative models can also be utilized in the design phase of AM to generate novel designs (Després et al. (2020)) or assess the manufacturability of the existing designs (Guo et al. (2021)). Again, DL models pre-trained on larger datasets and fine-tuned for limited data might also potentially resolve the limited data issue. This is known as transfer learning (TL). An increasing attention to TL for AM applications is noticeable in the literature.

Considering the increasing popularity, a high-level summary of the articles using deep TL for AM is listed in Table 3 which will be further discussed in relevant sections.

Table 3: Articles that used transfer learning in AM applications

Pretrained Networks (authors)	Articles using transfer learning for AM applications
ResNet (He et al. (2016))	Xia et al. (2022); He et al. (2016); Pandiyan et al. (2022b); Kim et al. (2023b); Xie et al. (2022)
VGGNet (Simonyan and Zisserman (2014))	Westphal and Seitz (2021); Li et al. (2021a); Xia et al. (2022); Kim et al. (2022); Pandiyan et al. (2022b); Kim et al. (2023b)
Xception (Chollet (2017))	Westphal and Seitz (2021); Fischer et al. (2022)
EfficientNet (Tan and Le (2019))	Xia et al. (2022); Tan and Le (2019)
GoogLeNet (Szegedy et al. (2015))	Xia et al. (2022); Kim et al. (2022)
ErfNet (Romera et al. (2017))	Wang et al. (2021)
MobileNet (Howard et al. (2017))	Xie et al. (2022);
AlexNet (Krizhevsky et al. (2012))	Scime and Beuth (2018); Imani et al. (2019)
YOLO (Redmon et al. (2016))	Zhu et al. (2023)

Ensuring the *real-time analysis and understanding capacity* of the AM data is the key to real-time process control. DL methods having networks like Autoencoder (AE), Variational Autoencoder (VAE) or their variants can compress high-dimensional AM data to a lower dimensional space, instantaneously capture the latent representations discarding redundant information, and classify newly printed parts as successful or defective - thus helps in real-time anomaly detection (Shi et al. (2022a)). Low-dimensional latent representation also helps in process optimization by selecting the optimal parameters. In addition, deep reinforcement learning (DRL) can help in understanding the complex behaviors of the AM process and making sequential decisions in dynamic AM environments.

2.3 Data in additive manufacturing

The successful implementation of DL for AM is highly dependent on the quality and availability of the AM data as naturally DL models are data-hungry. AM data are generated from diverse sources in varied forms. AM data can be classified in different ways from various perspectives. One possible approach is the classification based on data dimensions as shown in Figure 1 - 1D, 2D, and 3D data.




Figure 1: A summary of AM data

2.3.1 One-dimensional (1D) data

1D AM data can be of acoustic emissions (AE), temperature, pressure, humidity, etc, where AE signals are more common in literature. These data can be classified into two categories keeping AE data in one and the rest of the 1D data in another category. *Time series AE* data, detected by sensors such as microphone or transducer, are sequentially recorded sound pressure levels at different times of AM process (Ye et al. (2018b), Mohammadi et al. (2021), Pandiyan et al. (2022b), Surovi and Soh (2023) and Chen et al. (2023)). *Time series sensor* data covers all other time series AM data other than AE signal. For example: Mozaffar et al. (2021) and Li et al. (2023b) measured temperature, Mozaffar et al. (2018) and Mozaffar et al. (2021) measured distance, Li et al. (2023b) measured vibration at different time steps of the AM process.

2.3.2 Two-dimensional (2D) data

2D data is the largest category as it is one of the structured ways of representing AM data. After a thorough screening of the literature, the following types of 2D data seem frequent in DL for AM research. (i) *Pixelized 2D section sliced from 3D CAD geometries* is the 2D representation of a specific cross-section taken from a 3D Computer-Aided Design (CAD) geometry. It involves visualizing a specific plane within the 3D object and, then, projecting its features onto a 2D grid (Mozaffar et al. (2020)). (ii) *2D lattice structure image* is the representation of a regularly spaced arrangement of points in a 2D grid that usually indicates a repeating structure or pattern (Després et al. (2020)). (iii) *Powder bed images* are

one of the most frequently used 2D input types that are captured before, during, and after the printing process. They have important process information that DL techniques can extract, and subsequently, the extracted information is utilized for process improvement (Scime et al. (2020), Westphal and Seitz (2021), Ansari et al. (2022), and Fischer et al. (2022)). (iv) *Melt pool thermal images* capture the temperature distribution within the melt pool during the printing process. Temperature history has direct relations with many important aspects of AM process which help to get the causal relationship between process and porosity (Tian et al. (2020)), melt pool segmentation (Liu et al. (2021b)), distortion prediction (Francis and Bian (2019)), porosity prediction (Ho et al. (2021) and Gao et al. (2023)), weld reinforcement prediction (Lu et al. (2021)), layer width control (Wang et al. (2021)), and thermal signature prediction (Guo et al. (2022)). (v) *Melt pool microstructure images* are captured using optical microscopy or scanning electron microscopy (SEM). Most of the articles used melt pool microstructure images for the advanced understanding of process-structure-property relationships (Herriott and Spear (2020), Peng et al. (2022), Fang et al. (2022), Tu et al. (2022), and Wang et al. (2023a)). (vi) *Electron Backscatter Diffraction (EBSD) image* has the micro-scale level information of crystallographic properties (structure and orientation) of materials (Han et al. (2020)). (vii) *Video data or high-frequency images* are the sequences of images or frames captured during the AM process. The straightforward way of collecting video is to record the entire process first, and then, gather specific frames offline as 2D images from the recorded video (Liu et al. (2019a), Baumgartl et al. (2020), and Pandiyan et al. (2022a)).

2.3.3 *Three-dimensional (3D) data*

Various kinds of 3D representations are common in literature to represent the structure of 3D designs or AM parts, such as point cloud, mesh, and volumetric pixel or voxel (Figure 2). A *3D point cloud* is a set of raw points in a 3D coordinate system. The biggest advantage of using raw point cloud as input to the DL model is that there is no issue of losing 3D shape information. On the other hand, point cloud data are unstructured and unordered, so DL models should be able to deal with these. Modern DL models, such as PointNet (Qi et al. (2017a)), PointNet++ (Qi et al. (2017b)), and MVGCN (Wang et al. (2023c)) are capable of directly using point cloud data for analyzing 3D shapes in AM.

Due to the challenges of dealing with raw point cloud in DL, most of the studies (e.g., Zhu et al. (2020), Ye et al. (2021), Guo et al. (2021), Standfield et al. (2022), etc.) converted the raw point cloud into a grid-like structured data (e.g., *voxels*) before feeding into the DL model. It is important to mention that, voxelization is not memory and time-efficient as well as somewhat prone to information loss (Cao et al. (2020)). Finally, a *3D mesh* is the polygonal representation of 3D data. It is a collection of vertices, edges, and faces that define the surface and shape of a 3D AM part. Huang et al. (2020) utilized 3D mesh data as input to the DL model for finding the shape correspondence between the geometric shapes of customized AM products.




Figure 2: 3D representation of a sample part: (a) original, (b) voxel, (c) point cloud, and (d) mesh

3 Deep learning techniques in additive manufacturing applications

3.1 Design for AM (DfAM)

The design phase is one of the most significant phases of the entire product lifecycle considering the impact on the overall product cost of more than 70% according to Almasri et al. (2023). This impact increases in the case of AM as it has more design freedom due to the ability of AM processes to manufacture complex parts of almost (theoretically) any shape (Jiang et al. (2022)). Therefore, design for additive manufacturing (DfAM) attempts to improve the quality and performance of the AM printed product by designing and optimizing the product in a cost-effective and time-efficient manner (Gibson et al. (2021)). Jiang et al. (2022) proposed a framework for DfAM which is integrated with machine learning.

Motivated by the framework proposed by Jiang et al. (2022), a customized representation of DL-enabled DfAM is shown in Figure 3.




Figure 3: Schematic representation of deep learning-enabled design for AM

3.1.1 Part design and design optimization

Topology optimization (TO) identifies the best material distribution within a pre-defined design domain where FE equations need to be solved in each iteration (Ibhadode et al. (2023)). Therefore, DL techniques are being investigated to bypass this computationally expensive FE simulation in different settings - identifying hidden patterns of multiple TO iterations (Hertlein et al. (2021)), computing computationally expensive and intractable indexes (Iyer et al. (2021)), and integrating both mechanical and geometrical constraints in the formulation of TO (Hertlein et al. (2021), Almasri et al. (2022) and Almasri et al. (2023)). Among these, Hertlein et al. (2021) claimed to be the first article implementing DL that outperforms traditional TO effectively and efficiently in AM applications even with limited test cases.

Hertlein et al. (2021) used conditional generative adversarial network (cGAN) to capture the latent patterns in multiple similar TO runs which helps in predicting near-optimal designs without running from scratch each time. They included both mechanical and AM constraints in TO for the first time so that the designed shapes do not face any difficulties during manufacturing (Almasri et al. (2022) and Almasri et al. (2023)). Motivated by the work of Hertlein et al. (2021), Almasri et al. (2022) proposed DL-AM-TO model where they integrated both mechanical and manufacturing constraints. Though both of

Hertlein et al. (2021) and Almasri et al. (2022) used GAN-based generative methods, their architectures were different. Later, Almasri et al. (2023) further improved the DL-AM-TO architecture by converting it from a regression-type problem to a classification-type problem which resulted in better performance. Furthermore, Iyer et al. (2021) incorporated the producibility constraint in the standard TO to deal with the issue of cracking resulted from the steeper thermal gradient portion. They introduced the crack issue through the maximum shear strain index (MSSI) that can be estimated in different locations of the part using an attention-aware deep CNN model. The model proved effective on a gas turbine component which ensured an optimal and crack-free design for printing.

Table 4: Articles applying DL techniques for part design and design optimization

Applications	AM Processes	Articles	DL Techniques	Input Data	Evaluation Metrics
Topology optimization	General AM	Hertlein et al. (2021)	cGAN	Image	MSE
		Almasri et al. (2022)	cGAN	Image	Relative error
	L-PBF	Iyer et al. (2021)	3D CNN	Voxel	Relative error and Accuracy
Novel micro-lattice design	General AM	Després et al. (2020)	GCN	2D lattice	AUC
Manufacturability assessment	SLS	Guo et al. (2021)	GAN	Voxel	Accuracy, AUC-ROC, and F1-score
	L-PBF	Zhang et al. (2021)	CNN	Voxel	Accuracy and IoU
		Zhang and Zhao (2022)	Sparse CNN	Voxel	Accuracy and IoU

Novel micro-lattice design is gradually becoming important due to the attractive properties of the micro-lattices including a high strength-to-weight ratio and excellent energy absorption capabilities, to name a few. AM can effectively print lattice structures. However, it still requires a substantial research for the analysis and design (Rashed et al. (2016), Ha et al. (2023)). Therefore, Després et al. (2020) proposed a deep auto-encoder model for creating novel lattice structures where they used 2D lattice structures as the input.

Manufacturability assessment (also known as printability assessment) can address the potential challenges in printing the complex geometric parts (e.g., metal cellular structures) early in the design phase. Guo et al. (2021) proposed a semi-supervised deep autoencoder GAN (AE-GAN) to assess the manufacturability of cellular structures in a direct metal laser sintering process. Zhang et al. (2021) proposed another manufacturability assessment model where they combined CNNs for design considerations and NNs for process aspects. They only considered the low-resolution cases as their pre-processing step involved

computationally expensive voxelization. To potentially resolve the issue of computation, Zhang and Zhao (2022) proposed to use the concept of sparsity in the design which helped the model to be more generalized as well as capacitated high-resolution voxelization. A summary of this entire section is also provided in Table 4.

3.1.2 *Geometric shape deviation: prediction and compensation*

Increased design customization introduces more variation which makes the geometric shape deviation prediction a challenging task. To the best of our knowledge, Shen et al. (2019b) used DL for the first time to model the AM deviation. Their model used a convolutional autoencoder architecture with specially designed cross-entropy as a loss function. They demonstrated the model only in low resolution ($32 \times 32 \times 32$) and a linear deformation setting. Later, Zhao et al. (2019) verified the method proposed by Shen et al. (2019b) in high resolution ($64 \times 64 \times 64$) and nonlinear setting. Shen et al. (2019a) further improved the accuracy of the model proposed by Shen et al. (2019b) with slight modification in the architecture. They suggested to use PredNet as an encoder and CompNet as a decoder based on U-Net architecture in place of 3D CNN-based traditional autoencoder. Zhao et al. (2022) further improved the results of the deviation prediction model previously proposed by Shen et al. (2019b) and improved by Zhao et al. (2019). Both Shen et al. (2019b) and Zhao et al. (2019) considered the 3D object as voxel grid and proposed voxel-based framework, whereas Zhao et al. (2022) considered the point-wise deviation. To be more specific, it proposed a point-wise error prediction framework based on PointNet++ architecture (Qi et al. (2017b)).

Standfield et al. (2022) resolved many of the issues discussed above faced by Shen et al. (2019b), Zhao et al. (2019), and Shen et al. (2019a) by following an alternative approach - broke the 3D sample into smaller samples, performed individual predictions, and aggregated the results. They validated their proposed new approach on real AM dataset which claimed to offer the highest resolution than any other existing research. Similar to Standfield et al. (2022), Wang et al. (2023b) used a real AM dataset to predict the z-directional geometric deviations using the point clouds of the printed part and nominal part. Their model was an encoder-decoder type LSTM network with an attention mechanism that maintains the spatial and temporal dependencies.

Some studies addressed the shape deviation prediction problem from distinct perspectives. Francis and Bian (2019) assumed that the deviation at a point is the result of thermal gradients of its surrounding area. Therefore, they used the thermal images of the neighbouring points as input to the CNN-based deviation prediction model. Again, Huang et al. (2020) considered the deviation prediction as a shape correspondence problem and proposed a CNN-based DL framework which proved to be effective in learning and, subsequently, predicting the shape correspondence of deformed shapes.

3.1.3 *Tool path design and optimization*

Tool path can be viewed as the sequence of movements of the printing head or nozzle during printing. The selection of tool path has multifaceted impacts on the overall performance of the AM process (Steuben et al. (2016), Akram et al. (2018), and Bhardwaj and Shukla (2018)). Therefore, designing the optimal tool path is of great importance in AM.

Kim and Zohdi (2022) used deep CNN model to predict the optimal tool path for the SLS process where they considered the thermal gradient of laser paths as the optimization cost function. Almost similar to Kim and Zohdi (2022), Ren et al. (2021) used heat accumulation as the criteria for selecting the optimal laser path. Their model integrated deep RNN in FE simulation to predict the probable temperature fields of the next deposition layer for various tool path strategies. Different from Kim and Zohdi (2022) and Ren et al. (2021), Mozaffar et al. (2020) proposed a novel tool path design framework for metal AM depending on the model-free deep reinforcement learning (DRL) where an RL agent was asked to design a tool path for a given 2D section sliced from a 3D object. The demonstration results showed that, though DRL struggled to optimize the tool path in sparse reward structures, it could be effectively used to design optimal tool path in dense reward systems.

3.2 ***Data-driven AM modeling with DL for advanced AM insights***

Data-driven AM modeling eases the optimization and control of AM process. It leverages data from AM to build robust DL models. A schematic illustration of data-driven AM modeling is shown in figure 4. This section discusses data-driven AM modeling into two subsections - thermal profile modeling, and process, structure, and property modeling.




Figure 4: Schematic depiction of data-driven AM

3.2.1 *Thermal profile modeling*

Thermal profile modeling is the process of predicting and controlling the temperature distribution and variations during the AM process. Articles conducting thermal profile modeling can be separated into two clusters - pure Data-driven Deep Learning (DDDL) and Physics-Informed Deep Learning (PIDL), based on the incorporation of process physics information in the DL model.

Pure data-driven DL (DDDL) models involve using DL models solely on the patterns and relationships present in the datasets in modeling thermal profiles. For instance, Hemmasian et al. (2023) proposed a CNN-based DL model to predict thermal fields and improve parts quality. The proposed model can take process parameters and time steps as inputs and emulate the 3D thermal geometry of a melt pool in just a few seconds as compared to computational fluid dynamics (CFD) or finite element (FE). Similarly, Nalajam and Varadarajan (2021) used a CNN-LSTM model to capture both spatial and temporal features for thermal forecasting in WAAM. The fundamental limitation of this category of modeling approach is the requirement of large volume of input data in training the DL models.

Physics-informed DL (PIDL) models involve the incorporation of process physics information in the DL models to address the limitations of DDDL temperature prediction techniques. PIDL models incorporate physical equations and domain knowledge into DL model to increase the accuracy of the prediction, and enhance the transparency and interpretability of the models (Tian et al. (2020)). For instance, Zhu et al. (2021) proposed an

Table 5: Articles applying DL for AM thermal profile modeling

DL Frameworks	AM Processes	Articles	DL Techniques	Input Data	Evaluation Metrics
DDDL	WAAM	Nalajam and Varadarajan (2021)	CNN-LSTM	Layer-wise temperature	RMSE, MAE and MAPE
	SLS	Sofi and Ravani (2023)	CNN	Process parameters	MSE
PIDL	SLM	Ghungrad et al. (2022)	DNN	Layer-wise temperature	MSE and r^2
	Metal AM	Zhu et al. (2021)	FCNN	Thermal data	MSE
	LMD	Ren et al. (2020)	RNN-DNN	Thermal field	nMSE and accuracy
		Guo et al. (2022)	cGAN	Melt pool thermal image	Sampling efficiency
	GMAW	Zhou et al. (2021)	RNN-DNN	Thermal field data	Accuracy
	L-PBF	Ghungrad et al. (2023)	DNN	Layer-wise temperature	MAPE and r^2
		Hemmasian et al. (2023)	CNN	Process parameters	RMSE and IoU
		Zhao et al. (2023)	DNN	Process parameters and melt pool dimensions	Accuracy
	DED	Mozaffar et al. (2018)	RNN	Time series	MSE
		Mozaffar et al. (2021)	R-GNN	Time series	MSE and RMSE
Pham et al. (2022)		FFNN	High-fidelity data	Accuracy	

integration of physical laws (e.g., mass, momentum, and energy conservation) with DNN to enhance the learning process of a metal AM process. The efficacy of the PIDL has also been demonstrated in predicting porosity via thermal images (Tian et al. (2020)). Ghungrad et al. (2022) conducted a comparative study to demonstrate the effectiveness of their PIDL model against a pure DDDL LSTM model in the SLM process for thermal prediction. The PIDL model showed superior performance in terms of time and accuracy, even with limited data. Ghungrad et al. (2023) further improved the performance of PIDL by proposing an architecture-driven PIDL (APIDL) to predict thermal history in the L-PBF process for a limited dataset. Table 5 provides a high-level summary of thermal profile modeling using DL techniques.

3.2.2 Process, structure, and property modeling

Process-structure-property modeling in AM explores how the process parameters affect material microstructure and properties (Wang et al. (2023a)). DL-based PSP modeling has been utilized by several studies for properties prediction in AM. For instance, Croom et al. (2022) used a modified U-Net with FE to predict stress in defective porous parts in the L-PBF process. Fang et al. (2022) used 1D CNN to develop a PSP relationship in DED to predict the mechanical properties. Zhang et al. (2018) proposed an LSTM-based prediction tool to quantify the nonlinear relationship between the printing process and tensile strength

for the AM manufactured part quality. Similarly, Zhang et al. (2019b) utilized an LSTM network to improve tensile strength prediction for the FDM process. Herriott and Spear (2020) performed a comparative study to determine the capability of various traditional ML and CNN models for the prediction of microstructure properties in the MAM process. Other notable studies that used DL for PSP modeling in general AM applications are Lu et al. (2021), Tu et al. (2022), Maurizi et al. (2022), Peng et al. (2022), Koç et al. (2022), Qin et al. (2023), and Wang et al. (2023a), to mention a few.

3.3 DL-driven process monitoring and control

Process monitoring and control is a way to identify and rectify irregularities in the printing process. Current studies are using DL techniques for this purpose in different capacity. This section is divided into four subsections: image-based monitoring, sensor signal-based monitoring, point cloud-based monitoring, and process control.

Table 6: Articles applying DL for porosity prediction-based monitoring

Monitoring mode	AM Processes	Articles	DL Techniques	Input Data	Evaluation Metrics
Multi-sensor	LBAM	Tian et al. (2021)	CNN and RNN	3D Pyrometer and IR images	Precision, recall, and accuracy
		Zamiela et al. (2023)	CNN and LSTM	3D thermal and ultrasonic images	F1, accuracy
Image	General AM	Senanayaka et al. (2023)	CNN	3D melt pool images	Precision and confusion matrix
	LMD	Tian et al. (2020)	CNN	3D melt pool images	Precision, recall, accuracy, MAE and RMSE
	L-PBF	Zhang et al. (2019a)	CNN	Melt pool images	RMSE and accuracy
		Mao et al. (2023)	CNN and ConvLSTM	Thermal signatures 2D images	F1, precision, recall, ROCAUC
		Ogoke et al. (2022)	DC-GAN	3D CT scan images	nearest neighbor distances, pore volumes and anisotropies
	SLM	Ho et al. (2021)	Res-RCNN	Thermal images	Accuracy and F score
		Song et al. (2023)	GAN and VAE	Microstructure images	Error
FFF	Sieglkas (2022)	GAN	Microtomography images	Similarity	
AE	L-PBF	Johnson et al. (2022)	CNN	FE data	Accuracy and confusion matrix
	SLM	Park et al. (2021)	DNN	Process parameters	Accuracy

An example of process monitoring in AM is porosity monitoring. Voids or porosity present in printed products can cause a great threat to the quality of the final product. Utilizing DL can help in achieving a more accurate porosity prediction model. For instance,

Tian et al. (2021) proposed a novel approach by fusing two established DL techniques through transfer learning. The PyroNet (VGG16 (Simonyan and Zisserman (2014))) and IRNet (Donahue et al. (2015))), respectively correlate pyrometer images and infrared (IR) images to porosity. Similarly, Zamiela et al. (2023), Ho et al. (2021), and Mao et al. (2023) all used thermal images for porosity prediction because thermal history can capture the relationship between the AM processes and porosity. Table 6 lists the articles focusing only on porosity prediction-based monitoring and Figure 5 presents an overall summary of this section with four subsections.




Figure 5: A high-level summary of process monitoring and control literature

3.3.1 *Image-based monitoring*

Image-based monitoring is one of the most used process monitoring approaches in AM due to the capacity of DL models such as CNN to extract spatial features from grid-like data and availability of high-resolution cameras. The studies applying DL models to image-based monitoring can be summarized into DL-based image processing and deficiencies monitoring for quality assessment.

DL-based image processing consists of using DL techniques to manipulate, transform, or extract features from the input images in order to enhance the AM process monitoring performance. Input data quality plays a role in ensuring a high-performance monitoring process. Some of the techniques used include image augmentation, segmentation, transfer learning, and feature extraction. For instance, Kim et al. (2023b) addressed the issue of laser synchronization for data collection within the melt pool by using a stacked CNN denoising autoencoder (SCDAE) to transform the melt pool images and then fed them into five pre-trained CNN models (VGG16&19, ResNet50&101, DenseNet101) with self-supervised learning (SSL). Transfer learning cannot always be appropriate due to the high process parameters in AM, therefore others like Tan et al. (2020) and Xie et al. (2022) turned to feature extraction techniques. Tan et al. (2020) extracted spatter signatures from images using a combination of a CNN model for block selection and TNN for threshold approximation to segment the image. Xie et al. (2022) focused on developing a data labeling framework to extract true labels from 2D images which could be trained on general deep learning models. Data generation is another important aspect of image processing in AM monitoring. Ramlatchan and Li (2022) proposed to use a GAN and cGAN with a train on synthetic test on real (TSTR) technique between the two generative models to generate data with many features for real-world applications.

Deficiencies monitoring for quality assessment is the process of assessing and detecting imperfections such as defects, anomalies, deformation, faults, or cracks within the AM process to ensure the quality of the printed product. In anomaly detection studies, DL models are used to classify between abnormal and normal conditions with high accuracy (Lee et al. (2022), Kwon et al. (2020)). For example, Tan et al. (2023) processed their image inputs using a conditional GAN to generate minority sample images for a fault group. Due to the process drift in FDM, a shift was created in the source and target domains. Therefore, the domain adversarial neural network (DANN) is used to process features from a variety of domains and, finally, identify faulty parameters leading to drifted values. CNN-based models, in Figure 6, are the most used models for image-based deficiencies monitoring for quality assessment.

For instance, Wang and Cheung (2022) proposed a CNN-based defect detection model,




Figure 6: Articles applying the CNN-based model for image-based deficiencies monitoring for quality assessment per AM process

CenterNet-CL, that identified defects with their location, count, density map, size, and heat map. On the other hand, building high-efficiency network architecture applicable to AM is a difficult task. For this reason, many papers in literature such as Scime and Beuth (2018), Kim et al. (2023a), Xia et al. (2022), Scime et al. (2020), and Zhu et al. (2023) utilized transfer learning from effective networks to address AM defect detection issues. For instance, Westphal and Seitz (2021) used the pre-trained weights of VGG16 (Simonyan and Zisserman (2014)) and Xception (Chollet (2017)). It is worth mentioning that quality monitoring of AM still faces a challenge in transferring models across materials which limits the widespread generalization of DL tools. Banadaki et al. (2020), Fischer et al. (2022), Mi et al. (2023), Li et al. (2021a), Pandiyan et al. (2022a), and Li et al. (2020), all proposed DL models for quality monitoring where they focused on image-based inputs. For instance, Pandiyan et al. (2022a) proposed contrastive CNN model for quality monitoring using layer-wise inputs in DED using sequential frames from recorded video.

Other DL techniques can also be used for defect detection in AM. For instance, Mehta and Shao (2022) used a federated DL-based technique for defect detection. Their approach used the popular U-net semantic segmentation network for pixel-wise defect detection. Ye et al. (2018a) used a deep belief network (DBN), a generative model, for defect detection in the SLM process using spatter and plume signature. Two-photon lithography (TPL)

process monitoring has been challenging over the years due to the requirements of parameter tuning. To solve such an issue Lee et al. (2020) proposed a process monitoring and control utilizing TPL videos of different parts to classify cured processes from uncured, damaged, and illuminated ones. The proposed method used an optimized sequential CNN-LSTM mean sub-sequence for *in-situ* part quality detection. Such spatial-temporal monitoring models (e.g. convLSTM) have been utilized for other studies for anomaly detection (Ko et al. (2022)). Several studies are also leveraging deep learning-based autoencoder (e.g. CAE) for direct deficiencies monitoring in AM (Tan and Le (2019), Zhao et al. (2019)). Larsen and Hooper (2022), on the other hand, used their CAE for dimension reduction before feeding the inputs into an RNN to improve anomaly detection by monitoring the dynamics signature.

3.3.2 *Sensor signal-based monitoring*

Sensors are widely used in AM process monitoring. From the literature reviewed, this section is divided by acoustic emission based, spectral emission based, and multi-sensor based.

Acoustic emissions (AE) is an effective non-destructive testing (NDT) that can monitor and capture various types of defects. Moreover, it is a viable approach to capture time-related defects while being a solution for printing processes where certain types of monitoring are not possible. Many researchers have utilized acoustic emission (AE) inputs for their detection analysis. For instance, Mohammadi et al. (2021) developed an AE-based defect detection (cracks, porosity, and minimum defect) model with their quality (low, medium, high) for the L-PBF process. To eliminate the need for model-specific training, the authors followed a multiple-step approach by first matching the signal with the defect using a deep learning network. Similarly, Ye et al. (2018b) also developed an AE-based defect detection model, but for the selective laser melting (SLM) process. The DL model, a DBN, was tested across five states (balling, slight balling, normal, slight overheating, overheating) with performance better than models such as SVM and multilayer perceptron (MLP). Chen et al. (2023) proposed a porosity and crack detection model using a CNN-based model. The proposed model, mel-frequency cepstral coefficients-based CNN (MFCC-CNN) was made of several layers (three convolutional, one flattened, one fully con-

nected, one SoftMax). It demonstrated its effectiveness by having the highest AUC-ROC and accuracy in terms of prediction, and a porous class classification accuracy above 90%.

Both Hespeler et al. (2022) and Chen et al. (2022) proposed AE-based monitoring for the DED process. Hespeler et al. (2022) used a CNN-based model to establish quality assessment monitoring for the DED process. Their model, which performed very well on high-quality samples, dropped significantly in accuracy while being retrained on both high- and low-quality samples. It implies that though deep learning models are powerful, AM researchers have to be careful of the high risk of overfitting and the generalization of their model, with never-seen samples. On the other hand, Chen et al. (2022) used transfer learning from two established deep learning models (R-CED) (Park and Lee (2016)) and (F-DNN) (Liu et al. (2014)) to bypass the issues faced by Hespeler et al. (2022). F-DNN and R-CED were mostly used in the past for speech enhancement and denoising and, therefore were a great fit for this study. All those combinations helped AE monitoring to achieve a better performance.

Spectral emissions are another way to use signal-based monitoring in AM. Pandiyan et al. (2022b) and Ren et al. (2022) developed quality assessment monitoring for AM via spectral-based data. To address the issue faced by Hespeler et al. (2022), Pandiyan et al. (2022b) also used deep transfer learning like Chen et al. (2022) from VGG-16 (Simonyan and Zisserman (2014)) and ResNet (He et al. (2016)). Ren et al. (2022) performed their quality assessment using an LSTM autoencoder and K-means clustering to reconstruct the signals matching the original inputs. The LSTM autoencoder has been used in various applications as an unsupervised feature extraction and reconstruction tool for temporal data such as spectrum inputs. Williams et al. (2018) used spatial resolved acoustic spectroscopy signals (SRAS) within the L-PBF process to develop defect monitoring and detection in L-PBF using a CNN-based model. The model was called densely connected convolutional block architecture for multimodal image regression (DCB-MIR) in metal-based AM. DCB-MIR consists of 6 blocks of a fully connected convolutional network. Using the cosine similarity as an evaluation metric, the model demonstrated some improvement in defect detection.

Multi-sensor signal-based monitoring is necessary for AM processes such as M-LPBF which require the involvement of several movable sources and therefore require the use of

advanced algorithms to effectively exploit such complexity. To do so, Surana et al. (2023) presented a novel approach for Lack of fusion (LoF) flaw detection in M-LPBF metal AM using the integration of multi-spectral sensors and lasers. The authors used the sensors to generate XCT time series data converted into rasterized images fed to a convolutional autoencoder. Moreover, Voigt and Moeckel (2022) did a benchmark study to establish the effectiveness of certain deep-learning models as benchmarks for M-LPBF via multi-sensors for defect detection. Using CNNs to model spatial relationships and RNN to detect patterns such as pores over time, the authors determined the significance of multiple-layer classification with time series characteristics for AM.

Pandiyani et al. (2022c) did L-PBF monitoring over scanning methods such as X-rays since alteration could be quickly fixed by stopping the process. The authors proposed to use the strong capability of the CNN-LSTM to train signals from AE, infrared, back reflection, and visible sensors. This approach providing heterogeneous sensing could capture zones lacking fusion, keyhole, and conduction modes. Li et al. (2023a) developed an imbalanced data generation to improve the performance of quality monitoring in L-PBF. To do so, the authors captured layer-wise images, photodiode signals, and AE signals, to create imbalanced data fusion. GAN was used to generate data to balance the minority classes. This approach was validated by the multi-sensors outperforming a single sensor data.

3.3.3 *Point cloud-based monitoring*

Point clouds are 3D point representations of an object with the capability to capture lower geometric variations created by certain process shifts in AM (Ye et al. (2020), Yangue et al. (2023)). Lyu et al. (2021) proposed a process monitoring for surface anomaly detection in L-PBF using point clouds and an autoencoder. The collected 3D point clouds, through a FFF printed object, were transformed into 2D images fed into a hybrid convolutional autoencoder (HCAE) for anomaly detection. Similarly, Yangue et al. (2023) used 3D point clouds from a layer-wise printed object in FFF for surface morphology prediction. The proposed model consisted of using a CNN encoder to extract important spatial features from the layer-wise point clouds and transforming them into a latent code fed into the LSTM for prediction. The predicted code was then reconstructed to its original size using the CNN decoder. Such integrated DL models could achieve higher performance in AM

process monitoring compared to basic DL or ML models.

Point cloud-based monitoring also provides solutions to certain limitations faced with image-based monitoring. For instance, many image-based monitoring models tend to decline in accuracy and precision caused by potential data loss and sensibility to certain elements such as resolution, noise, and depth of defects. To address such issues, Wang et al. (2023c) proposed to utilize the strong capability of 3D point clouds to provide more precision in defect detection. A multi-view graph CNN (MVGCN) was utilized as a supervised defect classification tool. Though raw point clouds potentially can provide exact process information, the collection of real point cloud data is still little bit time consuming which is a barrier in real-time AM monitoring. Therefore, Liu et al. (2022b) proposed a CNN-based technique to model the correlation between 2D images and 3D point cloud data, which offered an efficient solution to the time limitation issue.

3.3.4 *AM process control*

Ensuring consistent quality in the final parts in AM is always challenging due to the dynamic and complex nature of the process. Therefore, many researchers have leveraged advancements in DL to develop high-performance models for controlling the AM parts' quality through process control.

CNN-based models have been utilized in several process control applications for detection and correction via image input data analysis (Wang et al. (2021)). Brion and Pattinson (2022) used 3D metadata and a real-time video to produce labeled images fed to a RegNet DL model (Radosavovic et al. (2020)), enabling the prediction of material flow rate alteration in the FFF process. The model can therefore correct errors in due time. Certain studies have advanced monitoring tools for detection but not for correction. To address this issue, Brion et al. (2022) proposed a warp detection and correction model for the FFF process using transfer learning from the CNN-based model, YOLO. The authors claimed that a lot of studies were only performing warp monitoring without actually performing correction and prevention.

Integrated deep learning models have also been used to address certain complex issues of process monitoring and control. Akhavan et al. (2023) developed a closed-loop system for quality assessment and control of AM using a hybrid convolutional auto-encoder decoder

(HCAE) model. The HCAE model was used to determine the statistical characterization of the top surface roughness of the printed AM products. The authors also proposed a modified confusion matrix based on a newly developed HCAE metric that could adequately classify multioutput models. This new accuracy metric should address the limitations of the multi-label confusion matrix proposed by Heydarian et al. (2022). Inyang-Udoh et al. (2022) developed a control framework to predict the height evolution of parts using a ConvRNN model with physical structures inspired from by their previous process control work (Inyang-Udoh and Mishra (2021)) and (Inyang-Udoh et al. (2020)). This conv-RNN model could further improve the performance of predictive geometry control in AM.

Reinforcement learnings have also been used for process control of AM (Dharmawan et al. (2020), Piovarci et al. (2022), and Chung et al. (2022)). In many reinforcement learning techniques, agents are set to learn from a particular environment/system, and the actions will be taken based on the reward that the agents received from their performance. Ogoke and Farimani (2021) used a deep reinforcement learning (DRL) approach to control thermal features in the L-PBF process. The authors proposed a policy-based model where the agent learns the policy or parameters that eventually control the environment. The DRL learned from the model by changing the velocity and power control over two different trajectories (horizontal and triangular).

4 Challenges and future directions

4.1 *Generalizing the AM-oriented DL model to better handle the complex AM part geometry*

Most of the studies in current literature focus on the simple geometric shapes (e.g., cubic, cylindrical, etc.) as a proof of concept to demonstrate the efficacy of their proposed DL methods. Therefore, DL techniques need to be further generalized to better handle complex and highly customized AM products where generalization means improving the ability and versatility of the models for a wider range of geometric shapes. Improving model transferability and sharing knowledge among models could be some potential research directions to attempt for geometry-invariant DL model for AM applications.

1. Improve transferability: Transfer learning (TL) enhances transferability by allowing a model to train on a wide range of simple geometric shapes, and then, fine-tune for more complex and customized products (Tang et al. (2022)). (i) Most of the existing TL applications for AM ignore the *relevance between the source and the target domain* as they use qualitative measures to find the similarity between the domains. Therefore, a promising research direction might be to build a generalized framework that will help in finding the quantitative similarity among different AM domains. (ii) *Inclusion of domain-specific AM process knowledge into the transferable information* might also help in improving the transferability of the model, since traditional TL for AM mostly focus on the transfer of information as a form of data, model parameters and weights. (iii) Developing *novel domain adaptation method* might also be considered to transition from simple geometric shapes to complex one. Involving non-black-box methods such as statistical modeling (Liu et al. (2019b)) and domain-aware approaches (Bappy et al. (2022)) would also be beneficial.
2. Knowledge sharing among DL models: The capability of DL models in handling complex AM geometries can be improved by encouraging knowledge sharing (within and across domain) among DL models using techniques like ensemble learning, federated learning, and incremental learning. *An ensemble model* having multiple DL models with different specialization is an effective way of knowledge sharing among models in order to improve understanding of unseen geometries. If each model can be designed to focus on specific features of parts' geometry (e.g., internal structure, layered structure, fillets and chamfers, overhangs and undercuts, surface textures, etc.), then, the combination of their predictions will be more generalized to the complex customized shapes. *Federated learning (FL)* allows the model to learn from different data sources and, as a consequence, be robust to highly customized geometries. Mehta and Shao (2022) followed a FL approach for pixel-wise defect detection in AM for only single class defect; their work might be considered as a starting point for an extension to multiple defect types. *Incremental transfer learning* with new data might be explored to gradually improve the model by incorporating time-dependent geometric shapes and varied complexities from the new unseen data and at the same time sharing knowledge from already trained model. Recently, Shi et al. (2023a) proposed a gen-

eralized knowledge-sharing framework to improve the performance of DL models in a decentralized manufacturing systems which could be further explored in AM.

4.2 **Data landscape: availability and quality**

DL models usually require a large amount of data. However, data generated from AM are not always readily available due to the issues of availability, and quality.

1. Data availability: (i) *Imbalanced data*: In general, producing abnormal or defective parts is not as frequent as the production of normal or defect-free parts in real AM process which results in the class imbalance problem. Augmenting data from the minority class is a common technique to tackle the problem of class imbalance. Recently, Chung et al. (2023) proposed a DL-based three-player GAN to solve the issue of class imbalance in AM which shows better performance than most of the existing methods. (ii) *Incomplete data*: Due to the technical difficulties or sensor failures, it is possible that some of the sensor readings are missing in a specific crucial time interval during AM process monitoring which might affect the decisions of process optimization. In these scenarios, DL-based data imputation methods, such as autoencoders, generative models, etc. (e.g., Li et al. (2023c)), could be explored to find patterns from the existing sensor measurements and intelligently fill the missing measurement. Again, to address the incomplete data issue, Williams et al. (2019) initialized the effort of utilizing readily-available online design repositories (i.e., GrabCAD, Thingiverse, etc.) which could be a good starting point for further exploration
2. Data quality: (i) *Noisy data*: Noise can arise in AM data from several sources - environmental factors, sensor inaccuracies, etc. The DL model should be checked for robustness to noisy data. The test performance on the synthetically generated noisy datasets might be an indicator of model robustness. Regularization techniques could also be explored to make the model more robust. The robust model remains less sensitive to minor variations arising from the sensor-related difficulties in the AM data. (ii) *Low accuracy data*: If sensors are not well-calibrated then it is possible to find less accurate data which are anomalies or outliers. Outliers might lead to inaccurate prediction of the DL model. To exclude outliers from the dataset, novel

DL-based outlier detection tools are required. DL-based anomaly detection models should be integrated with the AM process in such a way that it can detect anomalies in real-time and help take appropriate feedback actions. (iii) *Data security*: AM data, both process and design, might be confidential or partially confidential to share across the manufacturing industries (Shi et al. (2021), Shi et al. (2023b), Fullington et al. (2023)). On the other hand, DL models are data-hungry since more training data helps the model be more confident in the unseen data. Therefore, deep federated learning can be an effective solution to use data from many sources or clients without sharing mutual information among themselves to ensure data security and at the same time utilize the collaborative understanding to train the model. Additionally, Mehta and Shao (2022) suggested exploring various data protection approaches including blockchain technology, differential privacy, secure multiparty computation, and homomorphic encryption to enhance the security of AM client data. (iv) *Data heterogeneity*: AM processes involve multiple sources of data including temperature sensors and camera images. Sometimes it is required to integrate them for comprehensive analysis. Specific DL architectures such as multi-modal architectures can jointly analyze these different types of data. Generalized DL-based multi-modal data fusion methods can be tailored for specific data sources of the AM process, such as integrating *in-situ* and *ex-situ* images for porosity detection in metal AM (Zamiela et al. (2023)). However, these types of works still suffer from adjusting complex geometries and sensor placement-related issues, which might be a direction of future research.

4.3 Uncertainty management in DL for AM applications

Uncertainty is everywhere and being a practical process AM is more prone to uncertainty. AM process-oriented uncertainty can be involved in DL models in different formats including input data uncertainty and model uncertainty. If input data uncertainty cannot be quantified before feeding into the DL model, it will propagate and might mislead model outputs and interpretations. Therefore, effective uncertainty quantification (UQ) in the input data and propagation through DL models specific to AM applications might be explored. A general UQ flowchart tailored for AM is shown in figure 7 which is proposed by Mahadevan et al. (2022). Mahadevan et al. (2022) also reviewed the literature on UQ




Figure 7: Uncertainty quantification flowchart in AM process (Mahadevan et al. (2022))

for the improvement of the AM process, however, it is a generalized review of UQ for AM where DL is not the primary focus. In contrast, Abdar et al. (2021) provided a very good survey of existing methods to handle uncertainty in DL models, but it does not focus on the AM process. Recent studies such as (Abdar et al. (2021) and Mahadevan et al. (2022)) provided strong support to the UQ for DL research in AM applications.

4.4 **Balancing model complexity and interpretability**

Finding appropriate balance between model complexity and interpretability is one of the challenges in the implementation of DL for AM. This section highlights some of the potential *issues related to highly complex DL models, and techniques to reduce model complexity.* Finally, it focuses on the potential of *leveraging interpretable DL in AM.*

Highly complex DL models are naturally related to some of the inherent challenges of overfitting, requirements of large amounts of data and computational resources. However, as discussed earlier, accurate and noise-free data is still both expensive and time-consuming in AM. Furthermore, complex models with larger datasets require high-computational resources. All of these challenges need to keep in mind during the implementation of DL for AM applications. *Data dimension reduction* and *model hyper-parameter tuning* techniques can be utilized to reduce the complexity of the DL models. Dimension reduction

techniques could simplify the raw data and thereby help the model to capture informative features (Liu et al. (2021a), Shi et al. (2022b)). Regarding hyper-parameter tuning, it is worth mentioning that most of the existing DL implementations for AM follow random or trial-and-error basis search. It would be a good research direction to explore advanced optimization-based hyper-parameter tuning methods tailored to AM.

It is still difficult to clearly interpret the prediction results of the DL models due to the over-parameterized complex black-box nature. Moreover, no studies have been noticed in the literature on the interpretability of DL models for specifically AM applications. Therefore, interpretable DL can be a potential research direction in the field of AM. It can contribute by making DL models' decisions easily interpretable for the AM community, identifying critical features responsible for defective parts, enhancing trust in the capacity of DL models, and eventually helping in the widespread adoption of DL in AM industries. A recent survey paper (Li et al. (2022)) is focused on interpretable DL in general.

5 Conclusion

This paper provides a comprehensive review of the studies focusing on the implementation of DL, not traditional ML, for improving the performance of AM showing the most recent trend in this intersection. The review starts with the identification of the frequent research problems in the AM domain, and then, refers to the capacity of DL to address those research problems with special comparison to traditional ML. Understanding the importance of data in DL implementation, a detailed classification of AM data is also provided which is rare in the current literature. After that, a comparative review of the articles applying DL in different aspects of the AM life cycle is provided which includes design for AM, both pure data-driven and physics-informed AM process modeling, and AM process monitoring and control. The findings and future guidelines are also listed generously.

This work also identifies that leveraging DL to advance AM still needs significant attention because of (i) the rapid individual growth of DL and AM domain, (ii) the availability of an enormous amount of AM data as a result of the development of sensor data acquisition and fusion techniques, and (iii) the development of the computational resources.

References

- Abdar, M., Pourpanah, F., Hussain, S., Rezazadegan, D., Liu, L., Ghavamzadeh, M., Fieguth, P., Cao, X., Khosravi, A., Acharya, U. R., et al. (2021). A review of uncertainty quantification in deep learning: Techniques, applications and challenges. *Information fusion*, 76:243–297.
- Akhavan, J., Lyu, J., and Manoochchri, S. (2023). A deep learning solution for real-time quality assessment and control in additive manufacturing using point cloud data. *Journal of Intelligent Manufacturing*, pages 1–18.
- Akram, J., Chalavadi, P., Pal, D., and Stucker, B. (2018). Understanding grain evolution in additive manufacturing through modeling. *Additive Manufacturing*, 21:255–268.
- Almasri, W., Danglade, F., Bettebghor, D., Adjed, F., and Ababsa, F. (2022). Deep learning for additive manufacturing-driven topology optimization. *Procedia CIRP*, 109:49–54.
- Almasri, W., Danglade, F., Bettebghor, D., Adjed, F., and Ababsa, F. (2023). A data-driven topology optimization approach to handle geometrical manufacturing constraints in the earlier steps of the design phase. *Procedia CIRP*, 119:377–383.
- Ansari, M. A., Crampton, A., Garrard, R., Cai, B., and Attallah, M. (2022). A convolutional neural network (cnn) classification to identify the presence of pores in powder bed fusion images. *The International Journal of Advanced Manufacturing Technology*, 120(7-8):5133–5150.
- Banadaki, Y., Razaviarab, N., Fekrmandi, H., and Sharifi, S. (2020). Toward enabling a reliable quality monitoring system for additive manufacturing process using deep convolutional neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.08749*.
- Bappy, M. M., Liu, C., Bian, L., and Tian, W. (2022). Morphological dynamics-based anomaly detection towards in situ layer-wise certification for directed energy deposition processes. *Journal of Manufacturing Science and Engineering*, 144(11):111007.
- Baumgartl, H., Tomas, J., Buettner, R., and Merkel, M. (2020). A deep learning-based model for defect detection in laser-powder bed fusion using in-situ thermographic monitoring. *Progress in Additive Manufacturing*, 5(3):277–285.
- Bhardwaj, T. and Shukla, M. (2018). Effect of laser scanning strategies on texture, physical and mechanical properties of laser sintered maraging steel. *Materials Science and Engineering: A*, 734:102–109.
- Brion, D. A. and Pattinson, S. W. (2022). Quantitative and real-time control of 3d printing material flow through deep learning. *Advanced Intelligent Systems*, 4(11):2200153.
- Brion, D. A., Shen, M., and Pattinson, S. W. (2022). Automated recognition and correction of warp deformation in extrusion additive manufacturing. *Additive Manufacturing*, 56:102838.
- Cao, W., Robinson, T., Hua, Y., Boussuge, F., Colligan, A. R., and Pan, W. (2020). Graph representation of 3d cad models for machining feature recognition with deep learning. In

- International Design Engineering Technical Conferences and Computers and Information in Engineering Conference*, volume 84003, page V11AT11A003. American Society of Mechanical Engineers.
- Chen, L., Yao, X., and Moon, S. K. (2022). In-situ acoustic monitoring of direct energy deposition process with deep learning-assisted signal denoising. *Materials Today: Proceedings*, 70:136–142.
- Chen, L., Yao, X., Tan, C., He, W., Su, J., Weng, F., Chew, Y., Ng, N. P. H., and Moon, S. K. (2023). In-situ crack and keyhole pore detection in laser directed energy deposition through acoustic signal and deep learning. *Additive Manufacturing*, 69:103547.
- Chinchanikar, S. and Shaikh, A. A. (2022). A review on machine learning, big data analytics, and design for additive manufacturing for aerospace applications. *Journal of Materials Engineering and Performance*, 31(8):6112–6130.
- Chollet, F. (2017). Xception: Deep learning with depthwise separable convolutions. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 1251–1258.
- Chung, J., Shen, B., and Kong, Z. J. (2023). Anomaly detection in additive manufacturing processes using supervised classification with imbalanced sensor data based on generative adversarial network. *Journal of Intelligent Manufacturing*, pages 1–20.
- Chung, J., Shen, B., Law, A. C. C., and Kong, Z. J. (2022). Reinforcement learning-based defect mitigation for quality assurance of additive manufacturing. *Journal of Manufacturing Systems*, 65:822–835.
- Croom, B. P., Berkson, M., Mueller, R. K., Presley, M., and Storck, S. (2022). Deep learning prediction of stress fields in additively manufactured metals with intricate defect networks. *Mechanics of Materials*, 165:104191.
- Després, N., Cyr, E., Setoodeh, P., and Mohammadi, M. (2020). Deep learning and design for additive manufacturing: a framework for microlattice architecture. *Jom*, 72:2408–2418.
- Dharmawan, A. G., Xiong, Y., Foong, S., and Soh, G. S. (2020). A model-based reinforcement learning and correction framework for process control of robotic wire arc additive manufacturing. In *2020 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, pages 4030–4036. IEEE.
- Donahue, J., Anne Hendricks, L., Guadarrama, S., Rohrbach, M., Venugopalan, S., Saenko, K., and Darrell, T. (2015). Long-term recurrent convolutional networks for visual recognition and description. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 2625–2634.
- Fang, L., Cheng, L., Glerum, J. A., Bennett, J., Cao, J., and Wagner, G. J. (2022). Data-driven analysis of process, structure, and properties of additively manufactured inconel 718 thin walls. *npj Computational Materials*, 8(1):126.

- Fischer, F. G., Zimmermann, M. G., Praetzs, N., and Knaak, C. (2022). Monitoring of the powder bed quality in metal additive manufacturing using deep transfer learning. *Materials & Design*, 222:111029.
- Francis, J. and Bian, L. (2019). Deep learning for distortion prediction in laser-based additive manufacturing using big data. *Manufacturing Letters*, 20:10–14.
- Fu, Y., Downey, A. R., Yuan, L., Zhang, T., Pratt, A., and Balogun, Y. (2022). Machine learning algorithms for defect detection in metal laser-based additive manufacturing: A review. *Journal of Manufacturing Processes*, 75:693–710.
- Fullington, D., Bian, L., and Tian, W. (2023). Design de-identification of thermal history for collaborative process-defect modeling of directed energy deposition processes. *Journal of Manufacturing Science and Engineering*, 145(5):051004.
- Gao, Y., Wang, X., Son, J., Yue, X., and Wu, J. (2023). Hierarchical modeling of microstructural images for porosity prediction in metal additive manufacturing via two-point correlation function. *IISE Transactions*, 55(9):957–969.
- Ghungrad, S., Faegh, M., Gould, B., Wolff, S. J., and Haghghi, A. (2023). Architecture-driven physics-informed deep learning for temperature prediction in laser powder bed fusion additive manufacturing with limited data. *Journal of Manufacturing Science and Engineering*, 145(8):081007.
- Ghungrad, S., Gould, B., Wolff, S., and Haghghi, A. (2022). Physics-informed artificial intelligence for temperature prediction in metal additive manufacturing: A comparative study. In *International Manufacturing Science and Engineering Conference*, volume 85802, page V001T01A008. American Society of Mechanical Engineers.
- Gibson, I., Rosen, D., Stucker, B., Khorasani, M., Rosen, D., Stucker, B., and Khorasani, M. (2021). *Additive manufacturing technologies*, volume 17. Springer.
- Goh, G. D., Sing, S. L., and Yeong, W. Y. (2021). A review on machine learning in 3d printing: applications, potential, and challenges. *Artificial Intelligence Review*, 54(1):63–94.
- Guo, S., Guo, W., Bian, L., and Guo, Y. (2022). A deep-learning-based surrogate model for thermal signature prediction in laser metal deposition. *IEEE Transactions on Automation Science and Engineering*.
- Guo, S., Ko, H., and Wang, A. (2023). Applications and prospects of machine learning for aerosol jet printing: A review. *IISE Transactions*, (just-accepted):1–31.
- Guo, Y., Lu, W. F., and Fuh, J. Y. H. (2021). Semi-supervised deep learning based framework for assessing manufacturability of cellular structures in direct metal laser sintering process. *Journal of Intelligent Manufacturing*, 32:347–359.
- Ha, C. S., Yao, D., Xu, Z., Liu, C., Liu, H., Elkins, D., Kile, M., Deshpande, V., Kong, Z., Bauchy, M., et al. (2023). Rapid inverse design of metamaterials based on prescribed mechanical behavior through machine learning. *Nature Communications*, 14(1):5765.

- Hamrani, A., Agarwal, A., Allouhi, A., and McDaniel, D. (2023). Applying machine learning to wire arc additive manufacturing: a systematic data-driven literature review. *Journal of Intelligent Manufacturing*, pages 1–33.
- Han, Y., Griffiths, R. J., Hang, Z. Y., and Zhu, Y. (2020). Quantitative microstructure analysis for solid-state metal additive manufacturing via deep learning. *Journal of Materials Research*, 35(15):1936–1948.
- He, F., Yuan, L., Mu, H., Ros, M., Ding, D., Pan, Z., and Li, H. (2023). Research and application of artificial intelligence techniques for wire arc additive manufacturing: a state-of-the-art review. *Robotics and Computer-Integrated Manufacturing*, 82:102525.
- He, K., Zhang, X., Ren, S., and Sun, J. (2016). Deep residual learning for image recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 770–778.
- Hemmasian, A., Ogoke, F., Akbari, P., Malen, J., Beuth, J., and Farimani, A. B. (2023). Surrogate modeling of melt pool temperature field using deep learning. *Additive Manufacturing Letters*, 5:100123.
- Herriott, C. and Spear, A. D. (2020). Predicting microstructure-dependent mechanical properties in additively manufactured metals with machine-and deep-learning methods. *Computational Materials Science*, 175:109599.
- Hertlein, N., Buskohl, P. R., Gillman, A., Vemaganti, K., and Anand, S. (2021). Generative adversarial network for early-stage design flexibility in topology optimization for additive manufacturing. *Journal of Manufacturing Systems*, 59:675–685.
- Hespeler, S., Dehghan-Niri, E., Juhasz, M., Luo, K., and Halliday, H. S. (2022). Deep learning for in-situ layer quality monitoring during laser-based directed energy deposition (lb-ded) additive manufacturing process. *Applied Sciences*, 12(18):8974.
- Heydarian, M., Doyle, T. E., and Samavi, R. (2022). Mlcm: Multi-label confusion matrix. *IEEE Access*, 10:19083–19095.
- Ho, S., Zhang, W., Young, W., Buchholz, M., Al Jufout, S., Dajani, K., Bian, L., and Mozumdar, M. (2021). Dlam: Deep learning based real-time porosity prediction for additive manufacturing using thermal images of the melt pool. *IEEE Access*, 9:115100–115114.
- Howard, A. G., Zhu, M., Chen, B., Kalenichenko, D., Wang, W., Weyand, T., Andreetto, M., and Adam, H. (2017). Mobilenets: Efficient convolutional neural networks for mobile vision applications. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1704.04861*.
- Huang, J., Sun, H., Kwok, T.-H., Zhou, C., and Xu, W. (2020). Geometric deep learning for shape correspondence in mass customization by three-dimensional printing. *Journal of Manufacturing Science and Engineering*, 142(6):061003.
- Ibhadode, O., Zhang, Z., Sixt, J., Nsiempba, K. M., Orakwe, J., Martinez-Marchese, A., Ero, O., Shahabadi, S. I., Bonakdar, A., and Toyserkani, E. (2023). Topology optimization for metal additive manufacturing: current trends, challenges, and future outlook. *Virtual and Physical Prototyping*, 18(1):e2181192.

- Imani, F., Chen, R., Diewald, E., Reutzel, E., and Yang, H. (2019). Deep learning of variant geometry in layerwise imaging profiles for additive manufacturing quality control. *Journal of Manufacturing Science and Engineering*, 141(11):111001.
- Inyang-Udoh, U., Chen, A., and Mishra, S. (2022). A learn-and-control strategy for jet-based additive manufacturing. *IEEE/ASME Transactions on Mechatronics*, 27(4):1946–1954.
- Inyang-Udoh, U., Guo, Y., Peters, J., Oomen, T., and Mishra, S. (2020). Layer-to-layer predictive control of inkjet 3-d printing. *IEEE/ASME Transactions on Mechatronics*, 25(4):1783–1793.
- Inyang-Udoh, U. and Mishra, S. (2021). A physics-guided neural network dynamical model for droplet-based additive manufacturing. *IEEE Transactions on Control Systems Technology*, 30(5):1863–1875.
- Iyer, N. S., Mirzendehtel, A. M., Raghavan, S., Jiao, Y., Ulu, E., Behandish, M., Nelaturi, S., and Robinson, D. M. (2021). Pato: producibility-aware topology optimization using deep learning for metal additive manufacturing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.04552*.
- Jiang, J. (2023). A survey of machine learning in additive manufacturing technologies. *International Journal of Computer Integrated Manufacturing*, pages 1–23.
- Jiang, J., Xiong, Y., Zhang, Z., and Rosen, D. W. (2022). Machine learning integrated design for additive manufacturing. *Journal of Intelligent Manufacturing*, 33(4):1073–1086.
- Jin, Z., Zhang, Z., Demir, K., and Gu, G. X. (2020). Machine learning for advanced additive manufacturing. *Matter*, 3(5):1541–1556.
- Johnson, K. L., Maestas, D., Emery, J. M., Grigoriu, M. D., Smith, M. D., and Martinez, C. (2022). Failure classification of porous additively manufactured parts using deep learning. *Computational Materials Science*, 204:111098.
- Kim, D. and Zohdi, T. (2022). Tool path optimization of selective laser sintering processes using deep learning. *Computational Mechanics*, 69(1):383–401.
- Kim, E.-S., Lee, D.-H., Seo, G.-J., Kim, D.-B., and Shin, S.-J. (2023a). Development of a cnn-based real-time monitoring algorithm for additively manufactured molybdenum. *Sensors and Actuators A: Physical*, 352:114205.
- Kim, H., Lee, H., and Ahn, S.-H. (2022). Systematic deep transfer learning method based on a small image dataset for spaghetti-shape defect monitoring of fused deposition modeling. *Journal of Manufacturing Systems*, 65:439–451.
- Kim, J., Yang, Z., Ko, H., Cho, H., and Lu, Y. (2023b). Deep learning-based data registration of melt-pool-monitoring images for laser powder bed fusion additive manufacturing. *Journal of Manufacturing Systems*, 68:117–129.
- Ko, H., Kim, J., Lu, Y., Shin, D., Yang, Z., and Oh, Y. (2022). Spatial-temporal modeling using deep learning for real-time monitoring of additive manufacturing. In *International*

- Design Engineering Technical Conferences and Computers and Information in Engineering Conference*, volume 86212, page V002T02A019. American Society of Mechanical Engineers.
- Koç, E., Zeybek, S., Kısasöz, B. Ö., Çalışkan, C. İ., and Bulduk, M. E. (2022). Estimation of surface roughness in selective laser sintering using computational models. *The International Journal of Advanced Manufacturing Technology*, pages 1–13.
- Krizhevsky, A., Sutskever, I., and Hinton, G. E. (2012). Imagenet classification with deep convolutional neural networks. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 25.
- Kumar, S., Gopi, T., Harikeerthana, N., Gupta, M. K., Gaur, V., Krolczyk, G. M., and Wu, C. (2023). Machine learning techniques in additive manufacturing: a state of the art review on design, processes and production control. *Journal of Intelligent Manufacturing*, 34(1):21–55.
- Kwon, O., Kim, H. G., Ham, M. J., Kim, W., Kim, G.-H., Cho, J.-H., Kim, N. I., and Kim, K. (2020). A deep neural network for classification of melt-pool images in metal additive manufacturing. *Journal of Intelligent Manufacturing*, 31:375–386.
- Larsen, S. and Hooper, P. A. (2022). Deep semi-supervised learning of dynamics for anomaly detection in laser powder bed fusion. *Journal of Intelligent Manufacturing*, 33(2):457–471.
- Lee, H., Heogh, W., Yang, J., Yoon, J., Park, J., Ji, S., and Lee, H. (2022). Deep learning for in-situ powder stream fault detection in directed energy deposition process. *Journal of Manufacturing Systems*, 62:575–587.
- Lee, X. Y., Saha, S. K., Sarkar, S., and Giera, B. (2020). Automated detection of part quality during two-photon lithography via deep learning. *Additive Manufacturing*, 36:101444.
- Li, J., Cao, L., Liu, H., Zhou, Q., Zhang, X., and Li, M. (2023a). Imbalanced data generation and fusion for in-situ monitoring of laser powder bed fusion. *Mechanical Systems and Signal Processing*, 199:110508.
- Li, J., Zhou, Q., Huang, X., Li, M., and Cao, L. (2021a). In situ quality inspection with layer-wise visual images based on deep transfer learning during selective laser melting. *Journal of Intelligent Manufacturing*, pages 1–15.
- Li, X., Jia, X., Yang, Q., and Lee, J. (2020). Quality analysis in metal additive manufacturing with deep learning. *Journal of Intelligent Manufacturing*, 31:2003–2017.
- Li, X., Xiong, H., Li, X., Wu, X., Zhang, X., Liu, J., Bian, J., and Dou, D. (2022). Interpretable deep learning: Interpretation, interpretability, trustworthiness, and beyond. *Knowledge and Information Systems*, 64(12):3197–3234.
- Li, X., Zhang, M., Zhou, M., Wang, J., Zhu, W., Wu, C., and Zhang, X. (2023b). Qualify assessment for extrusion-based additive manufacturing with 3d scan and machine learning. *Journal of Manufacturing Processes*, 90:274–285.

- Li, Y., Shi, Z., and Liu, C. (2023c). Transformer-enabled generative adversarial imputation network with selective generation (sgt-gain) for missing region imputation. *IISE Transactions*, pages 1–13.
- Li, Y., Shi, Z., Liu, C., Tian, W., Kong, Z., and Williams, C. B. (2021b). Augmented time regularized generative adversarial network (atr-gan) for data augmentation in online process anomaly detection. *IEEE Transactions on Automation Science and Engineering*, 19(4):3338–3355.
- Liu, C., Kong, Z., Babu, S., Joslin, C., and Ferguson, J. (2021a). An integrated manifold learning approach for high-dimensional data feature extractions and its applications to online process monitoring of additive manufacturing. *IISE Transactions*, 53(11):1215–1230.
- Liu, C., Law, A. C. C., Roberson, D., and Kong, Z. J. (2019a). Image analysis-based closed loop quality control for additive manufacturing with fused filament fabrication. *Journal of Manufacturing Systems*, 51:75–86.
- Liu, C., Tian, W., and Kan, C. (2022a). When ai meets additive manufacturing: Challenges and emerging opportunities for human-centered products development. *Journal of Manufacturing Systems*, 64:648–656.
- Liu, C., Wang, R. R., Ho, I., Kong, Z. J., Williams, C., Babu, S., and Joslin, C. (2022b). Toward online layer-wise surface morphology measurement in additive manufacturing using a deep learning-based approach. *Journal of Intelligent Manufacturing*, pages 1–17.
- Liu, D., Smaragdis, P., and Kim, M. (2014). Experiments on deep learning for speech denoising. In *Fifteenth Annual Conference of the International Speech Communication Association*.
- Liu, J., Liu, C., Bai, Y., Rao, P., Williams, C. B., and Kong, Z. (2019b). Layer-wise spatial modeling of porosity in additive manufacturing. *IISE Transactions*, 51(2):109–123.
- Liu, J., Ye, J., Silva Izquierdo, D., Vinel, A., Shamsaei, N., and Shao, S. (2022c). A review of machine learning techniques for process and performance optimization in laser beam powder bed fusion additive manufacturing. *Journal of Intelligent Manufacturing*, pages 1–27.
- Liu, W., Wang, Z., Tian, L., Lauria, S., and Liu, X. (2021b). Melt pool segmentation for additive manufacturing: A generative adversarial network approach. *Computers & Electrical Engineering*, 92:107183.
- Lu, J., He, H., Shi, Y., Bai, L., Zhao, Z., and Han, J. (2021). Quantitative prediction for weld reinforcement in arc welding additive manufacturing based on molten pool image and deep residual network. *Additive Manufacturing*, 41:101980.
- Lyu, J., Akhavan Taheri Boroujeni, J., and Manoochchri, S. (2021). In-situ laser-based process monitoring and in-plane surface anomaly identification for additive manufacturing using point cloud and machine learning. In *International Design Engineering Technical Conferences and Computers and Information in Engineering Conference*, volume 85376, page V002T02A030. American Society of Mechanical Engineers.

- Mahadevan, S., Nath, P., and Hu, Z. (2022). Uncertainty quantification for additive manufacturing process improvement: Recent advances. *ASCE-ASME Journal of Risk and Uncertainty in Engineering Systems, Part B: Mechanical Engineering*, 8(1):010801.
- Mahmoud, D., Magolon, M., Boer, J., Elbestawi, M., and Mohammadi, M. G. (2021). Applications of machine learning in process monitoring and controls of l-pbf additive manufacturing: a review. *Applied Sciences*, 11(24):11910.
- Mao, Y., Lin, H., Yu, C. X., Frye, R., Beckett, D., Anderson, K., Jacquemetton, L., Carter, F., Gao, Z., Liao, W.-k., et al. (2023). A deep learning framework for layer-wise porosity prediction in metal powder bed fusion using thermal signatures. *Journal of Intelligent Manufacturing*, 34(1):315–329.
- Mattera, G., Nele, L., and Paoella, D. (2023). Monitoring and control the wire arc additive manufacturing process using artificial intelligence techniques: A review. *Journal of Intelligent Manufacturing*, pages 1–31.
- Maurizi, M., Gao, C., and Berto, F. (2022). Predicting stress, strain and deformation fields in materials and structures with graph neural networks. *Scientific Reports*, 12(1):21834.
- Mehta, M. and Shao, C. (2022). Federated learning-based semantic segmentation for pixel-wise defect detection in additive manufacturing. *Journal of Manufacturing Systems*, 64:197–210.
- Meng, L., McWilliams, B., Jarosinski, W., Park, H.-Y., Jung, Y.-G., Lee, J., and Zhang, J. (2020). Machine learning in additive manufacturing: a review. *Jom*, 72:2363–2377.
- Mi, J., Zhang, Y., Li, H., Shen, S., Yang, Y., Song, C., Zhou, X., Duan, Y., Lu, J., and Mai, H. (2023). In-situ monitoring laser based directed energy deposition process with deep convolutional neural network. *Journal of Intelligent Manufacturing*, pages 683–693.
- Mohammadi, M. G., Mahmoud, D., and Elbestawi, M. (2021). On the application of machine learning for defect detection in l-pbf additive manufacturing. *Optics & Laser Technology*, 143:107338.
- Mozaffar, M., Ebrahimi, A., and Cao, J. (2020). Toolpath design for additive manufacturing using deep reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.14365*.
- Mozaffar, M., Liao, S., Lin, H., Ehmann, K., and Cao, J. (2021). Geometry-agnostic data-driven thermal modeling of additive manufacturing processes using graph neural networks. *Additive Manufacturing*, 48:102449.
- Mozaffar, M., Paul, A., Al-Bahrani, R., Wolff, S., Choudhary, A., Agrawal, A., Ehmann, K., and Cao, J. (2018). Data-driven prediction of the high-dimensional thermal history in directed energy deposition processes via recurrent neural networks. *Manufacturing letters*, 18:35–39.
- Nalajam, P. K. and Varadarajan, R. (2021). A hybrid deep learning model for layer-wise melt pool temperature forecasting in wire-arc additive manufacturing process. *IEEE Access*, 9:100652–100664.

- Ogoke, F. and Farimani, A. B. (2021). Thermal control of laser powder bed fusion using deep reinforcement learning. *Additive Manufacturing*, 46:102033.
- Ogoke, O. F., Johnson, K., Glinsky, M., Laursen, C., Kramer, S., and Farimani, A. B. (2022). Deep-learned generators of porosity distributions produced during metal additive manufacturing. *Additive Manufacturing*, 60:103250.
- Pandiyan, V., Cui, D., Le-Quang, T., Deshpande, P., Wasmer, K., and Shevchik, S. (2022a). In situ quality monitoring in direct energy deposition process using co-axial process zone imaging and deep contrastive learning. *Journal of Manufacturing Processes*, 81:1064–1075.
- Pandiyan, V., Drissi-Daoudi, R., Shevchik, S., Masinelli, G., Le-Quang, T., Logé, R., and Wasmer, K. (2022b). Deep transfer learning of additive manufacturing mechanisms across materials in metal-based laser powder bed fusion process. *Journal of Materials Processing Technology*, 303:117531.
- Pandiyan, V., Masinelli, G., Claire, N., Le-Quang, T., Hamidi-Nasab, M., de Formanoir, C., Esmailzadeh, R., Goel, S., Marone, F., Logé, R., et al. (2022c). Deep learning-based monitoring of laser powder bed fusion process on variable time-scales using heterogeneous sensing and operando x-ray radiography guidance. *Additive Manufacturing*, 58:103007.
- Park, S.-H., Choi, S., and Jhang, K.-Y. (2021). Porosity evaluation of additively manufactured components using deep learning-based ultrasonic nondestructive testing. *International Journal of Precision Engineering and Manufacturing-Green Technology*, pages 1–13.
- Park, S. R. and Lee, J. (2016). A fully convolutional neural network for speech enhancement. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1609.07132*.
- Peng, H., Liu, A., Huang, J., Cao, L., Liu, J., and Lu, L. (2022). Ph-net: Parallelepiped microstructure homogenization via 3d convolutional neural networks. *Additive Manufacturing*, 60:103237.
- Pham, T. Q. D., Hoang, T. V., Van Tran, X., Pham, Q. T., Fetni, S., Duchêne, L., Tran, H. S., and Habraken, A.-M. (2022). Fast and accurate prediction of temperature evolutions in additive manufacturing process using deep learning. *Journal of Intelligent Manufacturing*, pages 1–19.
- Piovarci, M., Foshey, M., Xu, J., Erps, T., Babaei, V., Didyk, P., Rusinkiewicz, S., Matusik, W., and Bickel, B. (2022). Closed-loop control of direct ink writing via reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.11819*.
- Qi, C. R., Su, H., Mo, K., and Guibas, L. J. (2017a). Pointnet: Deep learning on point sets for 3d classification and segmentation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 652–660.
- Qi, C. R., Yi, L., Su, H., and Guibas, L. J. (2017b). Pointnet++: Deep hierarchical feature learning on point sets in a metric space. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30.

- Qi, X., Chen, G., Li, Y., Cheng, X., and Li, C. (2019). Applying neural-network-based machine learning to additive manufacturing: current applications, challenges, and future perspectives. *Engineering*, 5(4):721–729.
- Qin, J., Hu, F., Liu, Y., Witherell, P., Wang, C. C., Rosen, D. W., Simpson, T. W., Lu, Y., and Tang, Q. (2022). Research and application of machine learning for additive manufacturing. *Additive Manufacturing*, 52:102691.
- Qin, Y., DeWitt, S., Radhakrishnan, B., and Biros, G. (2023). Grainnn: A neighbor-aware long short-term memory network for predicting microstructure evolution during polycrystalline grain formation. *Computational Materials Science*, 218:111927.
- Radosavovic, I., Kosaraju, R. P., Girshick, R., He, K., and Dollár, P. (2020). Designing network design spaces. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 10428–10436.
- Ramlatchan, A. and Li, Y. (2022). Image synthesis using conditional gans for selective laser melting additive manufacturing. In *2022 International Joint Conference on Neural Networks (IJCNN)*, pages 1–8. IEEE.
- Rashed, M., Ashraf, M., Mines, R., and Hazell, P. J. (2016). Metallic microlattice materials: A current state of the art on manufacturing, mechanical properties and applications. *Materials & Design*, 95:518–533.
- Razvi, S. S., Feng, S., Narayanan, A., Lee, Y.-T. T., and Witherell, P. (2019). A review of machine learning applications in additive manufacturing. In *International design engineering technical conferences and computers and information in engineering conference*, volume 59179, page V001T02A040. American Society of Mechanical Engineers.
- Redmon, J., Divvala, S., Girshick, R., and Farhadi, A. (2016). You only look once: Unified, real-time object detection. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 779–788.
- Ren, K., Chew, Y., Liu, N., Zhang, Y., Fuh, J., and Bi, G. (2021). Integrated numerical modelling and deep learning for multi-layer cube deposition planning in laser aided additive manufacturing. *Virtual and Physical Prototyping*, 16(3):318–332.
- Ren, K., Chew, Y., Zhang, Y., Fuh, J., and Bi, G. (2020). Thermal field prediction for laser scanning paths in laser aided additive manufacturing by physics-based machine learning. *Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering*, 362:112734.
- Ren, W., Wen, G., Zhang, Z., and Mazumder, J. (2022). Quality monitoring in additive manufacturing using emission spectroscopy and unsupervised deep learning. *Materials and Manufacturing Processes*, 37(11):1339–1346.
- Research, P. (2023). 3d printing market size is expanding to usd 98,310 million by 2032. Available at : <https://finance.yahoo.com/news/3d-printing-market-size-expanding-144000417.html> (accessed on October 9, 2023).

- Romera, E., Alvarez, J. M., Bergasa, L. M., and Arroyo, R. (2017). Erfnet: Efficient residual factorized convnet for real-time semantic segmentation. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, 19(1):263–272.
- Sarkon, G. K., Safaei, B., Kenevisi, M. S., Arman, S., and Zeeshan, Q. (2022). State-of-the-art review of machine learning applications in additive manufacturing; from design to manufacturing and property control. *Archives of Computational Methods in Engineering*, 29(7):5663–5721.
- Scime, L. and Beuth, J. (2018). A multi-scale convolutional neural network for autonomous anomaly detection and classification in a laser powder bed fusion additive manufacturing process. *Additive Manufacturing*, 24:273–286.
- Scime, L., Siddel, D., Baird, S., and Paquit, V. (2020). Layer-wise anomaly detection and classification for powder bed additive manufacturing processes: A machine-agnostic algorithm for real-time pixel-wise semantic segmentation. *Additive Manufacturing*, 36:101453.
- Senanayaka, A., Tian, W., Falls, T., and Bian, L. (2023). Understanding the effects of process conditions on thermal–defect relationship: A transfer machine learning approach. *Journal of Manufacturing Science and Engineering*, 145(7):071010.
- Shen, Z., Shang, X., Li, Y., Bao, Y., Zhang, X., Dong, X., Wan, L., Xiong, G., and Wang, F.-Y. (2019a). Prednet and compnet: Prediction and high-precision compensation of in-plane shape deformation for additive manufacturing. In *2019 IEEE 15th International Conference on Automation Science and Engineering (CASE)*, pages 462–467. IEEE.
- Shen, Z., Shang, X., Zhao, M., Dong, X., Xiong, G., and Wang, F.-Y. (2019b). A learning-based framework for error compensation in 3d printing. *IEEE transactions on cybernetics*, 49(11):4042–4050.
- Shi, Z., Kan, C., Tian, W., and Liu, C. (2021). A blockchain-based g-code protection approach for cyber-physical security in additive manufacturing. *Journal of Computing and Information Science in Engineering*, 21(4):041007.
- Shi, Z., Li, Y., and Liu, C. (2023a). Knowledge distillation-based information sharing for online process monitoring in decentralized manufacturing system. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.12004*.
- Shi, Z., Mamun, A. A., Kan, C., Tian, W., and Liu, C. (2022a). An lstm-autoencoder based online side channel monitoring approach for cyber-physical attack detection in additive manufacturing. *Journal of Intelligent Manufacturing*, pages 1–17.
- Shi, Z., Mandal, S., Harimkar, S., and Liu, C. (2022b). Hybrid data-driven feature extraction-enabled surface modeling for metal additive manufacturing. *The International Journal of Advanced Manufacturing Technology*, 121(7-8):4643–4662.
- Shi, Z., Oskolkov, B., Tian, W., Kan, C., and Liu, C. (2023b). Sensor data protection through integration of blockchain and camouflaged encryption in cyber-physical manufacturing systems. *Journal of Computing and Information Science in Engineering*, pages 1–25.

- Siegkas, P. (2022). Generating 3d porous structures using machine learning and additive manufacturing. *Materials & Design*, 220:110858.
- Simonyan, K. and Zisserman, A. (2014). Very deep convolutional networks for large-scale image recognition. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1409.1556*.
- Sing, S. L., Kuo, C., Shih, C., Ho, C., and Chua, C. K. (2021). Perspectives of using machine learning in laser powder bed fusion for metal additive manufacturing. *Virtual and Physical Prototyping*, 16(3):372–386.
- Sofi, A. R. and Ravani, B. (2023). Sub-second prediction of the heatmap of powder-beds in additive manufacturing using deep encoder–decoder convolutional neural networks. *Journal of Computing and Information Science in Engineering*, 23(2):021008.
- Song, Z., Wang, X., Gao, Y., Son, J., and Wu, J. (2023). A hybrid deep generative network for pore morphology prediction in metal additive manufacturing. *Journal of Manufacturing Science and Engineering*, 145(7):071005.
- Standfield, B., Gračanin, D., Wang, R., and Kong, Z. (2022). High-resolution shape deformation prediction in additive manufacturing using 3d cnn. In *2022 Winter Simulation Conference (WSC)*, pages 641–652. IEEE.
- Steuben, J. C., Iliopoulos, A. P., and Michopoulos, J. G. (2016). Implicit slicing for functionally tailored additive manufacturing. *Computer-Aided Design*, 77:107–119.
- Surana, A., Lynch, M. E., Nassar, A. R., Ojard, G. C., Fisher, B. A., Corbin, D., and Overdorff, R. (2023). Flaw detection in multi-laser powder bed fusion using in situ coaxial multi-spectral sensing and deep learning. *Journal of Manufacturing Science and Engineering*, 145(5):051005.
- Surovi, N. A. and Soh, G. S. (2023). Acoustic feature based geometric defect identification in wire arc additive manufacturing. *Virtual and Physical Prototyping*, 18(1):e2210553.
- Szegedy, C., Liu, W., Jia, Y., Sermanet, P., Reed, S., Anguelov, D., Erhan, D., Vanhoucke, V., and Rabinovich, A. (2015). Going deeper with convolutions. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 1–9.
- Tan, L., Huang, T., Liu, J., Li, Q., and Wu, X. (2023). Deep adversarial learning system for fault diagnosis in fused deposition modeling with imbalanced data. *Computers & Industrial Engineering*, 176:108887.
- Tan, M. and Le, Q. (2019). Efficientnet: Rethinking model scaling for convolutional neural networks. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 6105–6114. PMLR.
- Tan, Z., Fang, Q., Li, H., Liu, S., Zhu, W., and Yang, D. (2020). Neural network based image segmentation for spatter extraction during laser-based powder bed fusion processing. *Optics & Laser Technology*, 130:106347.
- Tang, Y., Dehaghani, M. R., and Wang, G. G. (2022). Review of transfer learning in modeling additive manufacturing processes. *Additive Manufacturing*, page 103357.

- Tian, Q., Guo, S., Guo, Y., et al. (2020). A physics-driven deep learning model for process-porosity causal relationship and porosity prediction with interpretability in laser metal deposition. *CIRP Annals*, 69(1):205–208.
- Tian, Q., Guo, S., Melder, E., Bian, L., and Guo, W. G. (2021). Deep learning-based data fusion method for in situ porosity detection in laser-based additive manufacturing. *Journal of Manufacturing Science and Engineering*, 143(4):041011.
- Tu, Y., Liu, Z., Carneiro, L., Ryan, C. M., Parnell, A. C., Leen, S. B., and Harrison, N. M. (2022). Towards an instant structure-property prediction quality control tool for additive manufactured steel using a crystal plasticity trained deep learning surrogate. *Materials & Design*, 213:110345.
- Valizadeh, M. and Wolff, S. J. (2022). Convolutional neural network applications in additive manufacturing: A review. *Advances in Industrial and Manufacturing Engineering*, page 100072.
- Voigt, J. and Moeckel, M. (2022). Benchmarking a multi-layer approach and neural network architectures for defect detection in pbf-lb/m. *Materials Today Communications*, 33:104878.
- Wang, C., Chandra, S., Huang, S., Tor, S. B., and Tan, X. (2023a). Unraveling process-microstructure-property correlations in powder-bed fusion additive manufacturing through information-rich surface features with deep learning. *Journal of Materials Processing Technology*, 311:117804.
- Wang, C., Tan, X., Tor, S. B., and Lim, C. (2020). Machine learning in additive manufacturing: State-of-the-art and perspectives. *Additive Manufacturing*, 36:101538.
- Wang, H., Shraida, H. A. A., and Yu, J. (2023b). Predictive modeling of out-of-plane deviation for the quality improvement of additive manufacturing. In *Materials Science Forum*, volume 1086, pages 79–83. Trans Tech Publ.
- Wang, R. and Cheung, C. F. (2022). Centernet-based defect detection for additive manufacturing. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 188:116000.
- Wang, Y., Lu, J., Zhao, Z., Deng, W., Han, J., Bai, L., Yang, X., and Yao, J. (2021). Active disturbance rejection control of layer width in wire arc additive manufacturing based on deep learning. *Journal of Manufacturing Processes*, 67:364–375.
- Wang, Y., Sun, W., Jin, J., Kong, Z., and Yue, X. (2023c). Mvgen: Multi-view graph convolutional neural network for surface defect identification using three-dimensional point cloud. *Journal of Manufacturing Science and Engineering*, 145(3):031004.
- Westphal, E. and Seitz, H. (2021). A machine learning method for defect detection and visualization in selective laser sintering based on convolutional neural networks. *Additive Manufacturing*, 41:101965.
- Williams, G., Meisel, N. A., Simpson, T. W., and McComb, C. (2019). Design repository effectiveness for 3d convolutional neural networks: Application to additive manufacturing. *Journal of Mechanical Design*, 141(11).

- Williams, J., Dryburgh, P., Clare, A., Rao, P., and Samal, A. (2018). Defect detection and monitoring in metal additive manufactured parts through deep learning of spatially resolved acoustic spectroscopy signals. *Smart and Sustainable Manufacturing Systems*, 2(1).
- Xames, M. D., Torsha, F. K., and Sarwar, F. (2022). A systematic literature review on recent trends of machine learning applications in additive manufacturing. *Journal of Intelligent Manufacturing*, pages 1–27.
- Xia, C., Pan, Z., Li, Y., Chen, J., and Li, H. (2022). Vision-based melt pool monitoring for wire-arc additive manufacturing using deep learning method. *The International Journal of Advanced Manufacturing Technology*, 120(1-2):551–562.
- Xie, J., Jiang, T., and Chen, X. (2022). An image segmentation framework for in-situ monitoring in laser powder bed fusion additive manufacturing. *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, 55(37):800–806.
- Yangué, E., Ye, Z., Kan, C., and Liu, C. (2023). Integrated deep learning-based online layer-wise surface prediction of additive manufacturing. *Manufacturing Letters*, 35:760–769.
- Ye, D., Fuh, J. Y. H., Zhang, Y., Hong, G. S., and Zhu, K. (2018a). In situ monitoring of selective laser melting using plume and spatter signatures by deep belief networks. *ISA transactions*, 81:96–104.
- Ye, D., Hong, G. S., Zhang, Y., Zhu, K., and Fuh, J. Y. H. (2018b). Defect detection in selective laser melting technology by acoustic signals with deep belief networks. *The International Journal of Advanced Manufacturing Technology*, 96:2791–2801.
- Ye, Z., Liu, C., Tian, W., and Kan, C. (2020). A deep learning approach for the identification of small process shifts in additive manufacturing using 3d point clouds. *Procedia Manufacturing*, 48:770–775.
- Ye, Z., Liu, C., Tian, W., and Kan, C. (2021). In-situ point cloud fusion for layer-wise monitoring of additive manufacturing. *Journal of Manufacturing Systems*, 61:210–222.
- Zamiela, C., Jiang, Z., Stokes, R., Tian, Z., Netchaev, A., Dickerson, C., Tian, W., and Bian, L. (2023). Deep multi-modal u-net fusion methodology of thermal and ultrasonic images for porosity detection in additive manufacturing. *Journal of Manufacturing Science and Engineering*, 145(6):061009.
- Zhang, B., Liu, S., and Shin, Y. C. (2019a). In-process monitoring of porosity during laser additive manufacturing process. *Additive Manufacturing*, 28:497–505.
- Zhang, J., Wang, P., and Gao, R. X. (2018). Modeling of layer-wise additive manufacturing for part quality prediction. *Procedia Manufacturing*, 16:155–162.
- Zhang, J., Wang, P., and Gao, R. X. (2019b). Deep learning-based tensile strength prediction in fused deposition modeling. *Computers in industry*, 107:11–21.

- Zhang, Y., Safdar, M., Xie, J., Li, J., Sage, M., and Zhao, Y. F. (2022). A systematic review on data of additive manufacturing for machine learning applications: the data quality, type, preprocessing, and management. *Journal of Intelligent Manufacturing*, pages 1–36.
- Zhang, Y., Yang, S., Dong, G., and Zhao, Y. F. (2021). Predictive manufacturability assessment system for laser powder bed fusion based on a hybrid machine learning model. *Additive Manufacturing*, 41:101946.
- Zhang, Y. and Zhao, Y. F. (2022). Hybrid sparse convolutional neural networks for predicting manufacturability of visual defects of laser powder bed fusion processes. *Journal of Manufacturing Systems*, 62:835–845.
- Zhao, M., Wei, H., Mao, Y., Zhang, C., Liu, T., and Liao, W. (2023). Predictions of additive manufacturing process parameters and molten pool dimensions with a physics-informed deep learning model. *Engineering*, 23:181–195.
- Zhao, M., Xiong, G., Shang, X., Liu, C., Shen, Z., and Wu, H. (2019). Nonlinear deformation prediction and compensation for 3d printing based on cae neural networks. In *2019 IEEE 15th International Conference on Automation Science and Engineering (CASE)*, pages 667–672. IEEE.
- Zhao, M., Xiong, G., Wang, W., Fang, Q., Shen, Z., Wan, L., and Zhu, F. (2022). A point-based neural network for real-scenario deformation prediction in additive manufacturing. In *2022 IEEE 18th International Conference on Automation Science and Engineering (CASE)*, pages 1656–1661. IEEE.
- Zhou, Z., Shen, H., Liu, B., Du, W., and Jin, J. (2021). Thermal field prediction for welding paths in multi-layer gas metal arc welding-based additive manufacturing: A machine learning approach. *Journal of Manufacturing Processes*, 64:960–971.
- Zhu, Q., Liu, Z., and Yan, J. (2021). Machine learning for metal additive manufacturing: predicting temperature and melt pool fluid dynamics using physics-informed neural networks. *Computational Mechanics*, 67:619–635.
- Zhu, X., Jiang, F., Guo, C., Xu, D., Wang, Z., and Jiang, G. (2023). Surface morphology inspection for directed energy deposition using small dataset with transfer learning. *Journal of Manufacturing Processes*, 93:101–115.
- Zhu, Z., Ferreira, K., Anwer, N., Mathieu, L., Guo, K., and Qiao, L. (2020). Convolutional neural network for geometric deviation prediction in additive manufacturing. *Procedia Cirp*, 91:534–539.