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Abstract

Laser powder bed fusion (LPBF) is a revolutionary manufacturing technology that fabricates parts with unparalleled complexity, layer-by-layer. However, there are limited choices of commercial powders for LPBF, constrained partly by the laser absorbance, an area that is not well investigated. Carbon additives are commonly used to promote near infra-red (NIR) absorbance of the powders but their efficiency is limited. Here, we combine *operando* synchrotron X-ray imaging with chemical characterisation techniques to elucidate the role of additives on NIR absorption, melt track and defect evolution mechanisms during LPBF. We employ a reduced graphene oxide (rGO) additive to enable LPBF of low NIR absorbance powder, SiO2, under systematic build conditions. This work successfully manufactured glass tracks with a high relative density (99.6%) and overhang features (> 5 mm long) without pre/post heat treatment. Compared to conventional carbon additives, the rGO increases the powder’s NIR absorbance by *ca.* 3 times and decreases the warpage and porosity in LPBF glass tracks. Our approach will dramatically widen the palette of materials for laser processing and enable existing LPBF machines to process low absorbance powder, such as SiO2, using a NIR beam.

# Introduction

Additive manufacturing (AM) shifts the paradigm in materials design and processing, impacting on many different sectors [1], including aerospace [2], biomedical, and tissue engineering [3,4]. It enables the rapid development of products with complex and customisable features made out of various classes of materials, including metals/alloys [5], polymers [6], ceramics [7], glass [8], biomaterials [9], and multi-materials [10]. From the myriad of AM processes developed, laser powder bed fusion (LPBF) is emerging as one of the most promising technologies that employs a laser beam to induce localised melting of powder particles, following a slice by slice digital design. One of the many advantages of LPBF is the fabrication of parts in a single step without subsequent lengthy de-binding or sintering post processing.

Most commercial LPBF systems are designed to process metallic powders with a near infra-red (NIR) laser beam at wavelengths, *λ*, of 1030 - 1070 nm [11], with a fewsystems equipped with a CO2 (*λ* = 10.6 μm) laser for processing polymers [12] and glass [13–15]. NIR diode lasers are more cost-effective and compact, therefore there is a drive to develop a single LPBF system that can process all classes of materials; however, this has not been realised. One of the main challenges in achieving this is the large variations of laser absorbance ( in powder feedstocks [11], *e.g.* metals/alloys ( = 0.53 – 0.81) [16], polymers (= 0.07 – 0.52) [17], glass ( ≤ 0.03) [15,18], and ceramics, such as alumina (= 0.01 - 0.3 [19]) and zirconia (≤ 0.15) [20]in the NIR region whereas polymers and glasses absorb at least 40% better at the far-IR spectrum [21,22]. The is considered as a key factor that controls the melt pool and defect dynamics in LPBF [23]. It is governed by the powder chemistry [23], powder packing density [24], and the processing temperature which depends on the input laser parameters, *e.g.* scan speed, and laser power [16,25], *etc.* Powders with low (*i.e.* high transmissivity or/and high reflectivity), *e.g.* fused silica, usually exhibit weak laser-matter interaction meaning reduced productivity which limits their usage and hampers the adoption of LPBF for new product applications.

There are two alternatives to widen the palette of materials for LPBF technology. Indirect selective laser sintering [26] is used to form a green preform by melting an inorganic material with a low-temperature organic binder, *e.g.* polymer [27]. The binder is subsequently removed by post heat treatments whilst consolidating the part [26]. The part often suffers from volume shrinkage and results in defect formation, compromising its dimensional accuracy and performance. The second method is to employ additives to increase of the powder feedstock, inducing a photothermal effect to promote the melting or sintering of the inorganic materials.

Materials exhibiting a photothermal effect are used in many applications including welding [28], photothermal therapy, drug delivery, ultra-sound molecular imaging, etc. [29]. These materials include TiB2 [30,31], transition metal oxides (TMOs), *e.g.* ITO, TiO2, Fe2O3, *etc.* [32,33], and carbon-based materials, *e.g.*, carbon black [34], carbon nanotubes (CNT) [35], graphene [36], reduced graphene oxide [37], and nanocomposites of rGO with additions of mesoporous silicon, amorphous carbon, CuS, [38] or TMOs [39] but their photothermal conversion efficiency is not optimal in the NIR region, *e.g.* 1030 - 1070 nm. The use of the photothermal effect in additive manufacturing has been very limited. To date, only carbon powder has been used as a NIR enhancer for LPBF of silica [40]. This application remains less explored, possibly due to the low photothermal conversion efficiency and lack of understanding regarding the interactions with the laser beam during LPBF. Increasing the absorbance of the powder feedstock would enable a significant expansion in AM materials selection and enable single step processing with a LPBF system.

Besides the challenges of selective laser absorbance, one of the major issues hampering the progress of AM technology is our lack of fundamental knowledge of the process. Although recent work is providing much needed insight on the evolution of metallic powder beds during their interaction with the laser beam [18,23,25,33,41–43] using *in situ* and *operando* X-ray imaging and diffraction, we know much less when it comes to LPBF of ceramics or glasses [18] because of their fundamental differences in powder properties, *e.g.* optical, chemical, and thermophysical properties.

Silica glass is a ubiquitous material and has extensive uses across many sectors as it is inexpensive and vastly abundant on earth and other planets [44]. Custom shaped silica glass is usually cast in moulds, made by subtractive manufacturing, or by glass blowing techniques, *etc.* [15]; however, these methods cannot achieve rapid and economic design iterations, restricting further uses of fused silica. With the advantages of LPBF, several groups exploit this technology to make custom-built optical components, microfluidic ships[8], chemical/environmental sensing applications [45,46]. LPBF can tackle this manufacturing challenge, though little research has been done on LPBF of fused silica with a NIR laser beam. Prior attempts were made to additive manufacture fused silica using a CO2 laser, including the filament-fed directed energy deposition and LPBF wherein the print resolution in both AM technologies was typically in the hundreds of micrometres owing to the large feedstock size [21] and large beam diameter [40], respectively. Additionally, the LPBF parts usually have low-density because they contain various types of imperfections, including porosity [40] and cracks [47]. Other AM approaches, *e.g.* stereolithography (SLA) [8] and direct ink writing [48], have successfully produced transparent and amorphous fused silica parts, however, both require lengthy post processes, including drying, debinding, and sintering, that limit final part size.

In this work, we employ two different carbon additives: nano-carbon (nano-C) and reduced graphene oxides (rGO) to enhance the laser absorbance of the fused silica powder bed. We process these powder mixtures using a custom-built *In Situ* and *Operando* Process Replicator (ISOPR) machine [43] while performing *in situ* and *operando* synchrotron X-ray imaging to investigate the role played by these carbon additives and elucidate key mechanisms involved during LPBF of glass. Here, we successfully demonstrate a one-step process of fused silica using LPBF with a NIR beam, achieving high density AM glass parts prior to further heat treatment.

# Results and discussion

## Materials synthesis and processing

In this study, we compare the performance of two carbon-based NIR absorbers: (1) nano-carbon (nano-C) and (2) reduced graphene oxide (rGO), investigating how they enhance the processability of low laser absorbance materials, *e.g.* SiO2 (*A* < 0.05), for LPBF. We produced two powder mixtures of SiO2 + 0.2 wt.% nano-C and SiO2 + 0.2 wt.% rGO via the processing methods depicted in **Materials** and **Methods** and **Figure 1a.** After that, they were processed using the ISOPR (**Figure 1b**). We produced single-layer tracks and larger cubic samples of 5 x 5 x 5 mm3 (**Figure 1c**). Preliminary characterisation data for the larger samplesis available in the **Supplementary Information**

****

**Figure 1:** Laser powder bed fusion (LPBF) of fused silica, SiO2, powder mixtures using a near-infrared laser beam. **a**, Schematic of the powder production process where powder mixtures undergo mechanical mixing, drying, and sieving, resulting in SiO2 + nano carbon and SiO2 + reduced graphene oxide (after heat treatment) - insets show the typical powder morphology; **b**, glass mixtures are then processed by an *In Situ* and *Operando* Process Replicator (ISOPR) to produce large-scale sample coupons and **c**. glass structures of Imperial College London crossover with University College London (ICL x UCL)

## *In situ* observations during laser powder bed fusion

To understand how the selected NIR absorbers perform during LPBF, we conducted a systematic set of single-layer track experiments whilst monitoring the sintering, melting, and vitrification behaviour during LPBF of SiO2 + nano-C and SiO2 + rGO using high-speed X-ray imaging (**Figure 2a**). From these experiments, we selected two sets of time-series radiographs taken during LPBF of SiO2 + nano-C (**Figure 2b-c**) and SiO2 + rGO (**Figure 2d-e**) at a scan speed, *v* = 25 and 50 mm s-1 to elucidate aspects of the LPBF process, see details in **Supplementary videos 1 – 4**.

**Figure 2b** shows that an intense laser beam (*ca.* 107 W cm-2) penetrates through the powder bed containing SiO2 + nano-C. A vast majority of the NIR beam is absorbed by the nano-C additive and other photons are either transmitted through or scattered by the SiO2 particles. Upon photon absorption, the NIR beam energy is converted into heat by the photothermal effect which conducts to the rest of the powder bed and promotes sintering or melting of particles. This whole series of phenomena can be described by the radiation conduction mechanism [18].

During the first 100 ms of the LPBF process, **Supplementary video 1** shows that the ejection of powder particles, *i.e.* powder spatter, mainly occurs at the laser-matter interaction zone whilst forming a cavity (or a denudation zone) in the powder bed. The denudation zone is much larger than those observed during LPBF of metal powders [18,33,41], or for 13-93 bioactive glass [18], see **Supplementary Figure 1.** This can be linked to the slow acceleration of the laser scanning mirrors, resulting in a long laser-matter interaction time (*ca.* 5 ms). Consequently, the laser beam penetrates through the powder bed and vaporises the metallic substrate (3 mm below powder bed surface), forming a fast-moving plume. Furthermore, there are several factors that may also contribute to the spatter formation mechanism. Firstly, the chemical constituents of the SiO2 powder mixture have low temperature volatile TMOs, *e.g.* ZnO [49] and Cr2O3 [50] (**Supplementary Table 1**)**,** high contents of carbon and oxygen species, and residual moisture. During processing, the low-temperature volatiles can easily vaporise, releasing a small amount of vapour. Secondly, the carbon species can react with SiO2 at 1600°C in an inert atmosphere, *i.e.* the carbothermal reduction, liberating CO, CO2, and SiO gases [51], and this process usually takes over several hours rather than over ms. Though the ISOPR’s chamber operates at a positive pressure of 10kPa, this may lower the vapour pressure and softening temperature of SiO2, accelerating the carbothermal reduction process. Thirdly, the decomposition of oxygen-functional groups in the SiO2 + nano-C or rGO powder mixtures into H2O, CO, and CO2, at elevated temperature (150 – 195°C) [52], see X-ray Photoelectric Spectroscopy (XPS) and Thermogravimetric analysis (TGA) results. Fourthly, the residual oxygen in the inert gas may also attribute to the reaction between carbon and oxygen at elevated temperature. Consequently, the combination of gas liberation with low temperature volatiles, *i.e.* plume generation, induces powder spatter during LPBF.

Once the scanning mirror reaches its maximum speed, only a small amount of powder spatter is observed, confirming our prior hypothesis regarding the initial ejecta event is based on vaporisation of the metallic substrate. Though we observe a different kind of spatter where a large cluster of sintered powder with a large drag coefficient, expels upwards, and lands near the laser-matter interaction zone.

As the LPBF progresses, the glass track appears in the radiograph at 160 ms (as shown by the dark grey features in **Figure 2b**). The glass features are slowly merging and growing into a glass track by the viscous flow mechanism [18,22]. Powder sintering occasionally occurs on top of the powder bed (highlighted by the purple dotted circle) because the laser beam remelts the powder spatter, forming a hump on the glass track surface (see 60-70 ms and 120-180 ms in **Supplementary video 1**). The hump formation increases surface roughness and may reduce mechanical properties.

The evolution mechanisms of the fused silica glass tracks are distinctively different from those revealed during LPBF of metal powders [18,33,41]. We reveal that the bubble formation inside the melt track during LPBF is strongly linked to the plume generation mechanisms described earlier. These bubbles can grow at the expense of others via coalescence and subsequently expand and collapse. Some of them are trapped inside the glass track because of the high viscosity of SiO2 which is *ca.* 1.6 – 2.7 Pa.s [53] at its softening temperature range of 1500 - 1670°C. These trapped bubbles may shrink to a smaller size, becoming voids as the glass track vitrifies. Compared to LPBF of metal powders, a typical viscosity of the liquid metals is in the order of 10-3 Pa.S [54], *ca.* 3 orders magnitude lower than that of SiO2. The liquid metal can migrate bubbles within the melt pool and towards the melt surface via Marangoni convection [33,41]. This allows bubbles to escape either via the keyhole/vapour depression or from the melt surface [41]. Our results confirm that a high viscosity melt dampens the Marangoni convection and promotes pore formation during LPBF of SiO2, similar to that observed during LPBF of 13-93 bioactive glass [18]. We can summarise that the evolution mechanism of glass track undergoes a recurring sequence of events: (1) formation of a cavity, followed by (2) plume generation, (3) spatter formation, (4) melt track formation (with possible powder sintering), (5) bubble formation and collapse, and (6) bubble shrinkage as the glass track cools, see radiographs at 238 and 286 ms.

Under this processing condition, only a porous and irregular glass track is formed as a result of excessive heat input to the LPBF process. To confirm that, we lower the heat input by increasing *v* from 25 to 50 mm s-1 (**Figure 2c** and **Supplementary video 2**) which reduces the size of the cavity and the track depth. From **Figure 2c,** the glass track appears much denser than that in **Figure 2b** as it absorbs more of the incoming X-rays and hence appears darker in the radiographs. However, increasing *v* in LPBF causes frequent powder spatter and sintered ejecta at the laser-matter interaction zone (100 ms), and hence more powder particles land on top of the powder bed. These experiments prove that the nano-C additive increases the NIR absorbance of powder feedstock; however, the glass tracks (SiO2 + nano-C) produced under the conditions studied exhibit an irregular track shape and a large amount of porosity, suggesting that it is not an ideal NIR absorber for the LPBF process.

In the SiO2 + rGO study, (**Figure 2d and Supplementary video 3**) we reveal similar phenomena as those described in **Figure 2b** and **c,** in terms of the track formation process. However, there are several unique observations with LPBF of SiO2 + rGO, suggesting that rGO performs significantly better than the nano-C additive. The SiO2 + rGO glass tracks exhibit a continuous line shape, suggesting that the rGO providesa better laser absorption for the SiO2 glass mixture compared to that with nano-C additive, *i.e.* further enhanced the laser absorbance of SiO2.During LPBF of SiO2 + rGO, significantly less spatter is produced. Moreover, the additive manufactured glass tracks have less porosity and warpage than those produced with SiO2 + nano-C (see frames at 286 ms in **Figure 2d-e,** respectively).

Neither rGO nor nano-C is thermally stable, both additives may emit CO, CO2, and SiO gas during LPBF even under an argon protective environment [51]. We hypothesise that nano-C is more reactive than rGO at elevated temperature owing to its highly reactive surface and disordered structure [55]. The TGA results (**Supplementary Figure 2**) show that the SiO2 + nano-C powder mixture lost *ca.* 7 times more weight than that of the SiO2 + rGO powder mixture at elevated temperature (up to 1600ºC). This suggests that there are less volatile substances at low temperature and indicates that LPBF of SiO2 + nano-C additive can liberate more gas bubbles than SiO2 + rGO.

Under the LPBF conditions, the pressure of the silica melt is expected to be ca. 1 atm. Even though the melting temperature of the fused silica is high, the pressure in the melt track is 6 order magnitudes lower than the required pressure for CO2 to dissolve into the silica melt [56], and hence it exolves as a gas molecule. The migration of gas pores is slow within the viscous glass, trapping inside the SiO2 track. Moreover, the laser melting process may also trap some of the argon gas from the environment into the glass track. Morever, the side effect of the bubble collapse can also lead to spatter formation (see 96 – 104 ms in **Supplementary video 3**), reducing the amount of powder available for LPBF and resulting in a low-density region in the glass track, see the light grey colour in the middle of the SiO2 + nano-Ctracks.

Comparing these observations with prior studies under overhang conditions (only with powder support) [18,33,41], all metallic tracks tend to extend towards the bottom of the powder bed rather than those observed here. Here, we demonstrate, for the first time, the possibility of producing a 5 mm long track of SiO2 + rGO under overhang conditions which is unprecedented as existing LPBF machines require support structures to fabricate overhang features unless the powder bed is preheated at high temperature [57,58].

Using the ISOPR we can explore the process parameter space with immediate feedback. Increasing *v* further reduces the internal porosity, warpage, and melt depth of the AM track (**Figure 2e and Supplementary video 4**). Our results demonstrate that rGO offers many benefits when processing SiO2, including increasing NIR absorption, provision of homogenous heating across the powder bed, and enhancing the thermal conductivity of the powder bed while decreasing the warpage and porosity. **Figure 2d** and **e** show streak-like melt features near the bottom of the glass tracks of SiO2 + rGO, see green arrows at 286 ms. These features are possibly formed when the scattered and attenuated laser beam starts to interact with the rGO, melting the fused silica matrix by the photothermal and radiation conduction mechanisms. These streak-like melt features stop growing once the attenuated beam energy is fully absorbed by the rGO.



**Figure 2:** LPBF of glass monitored using *in situ* and *operando* high-speed X-ray imaging. (a) Schematic of the ISOPR and high-speed imaging setup at beamline I13-2, Diamond Light Source, UK. Time-series radiographs (see **Supplementary videos 1 – 4** forfull video) captured during LPBF of (b-c) SiO2 + nano-C and (d-e) SiO2 + rGO powders. Powders are fused by a focused laser beam (nominal power 200 W; scan speed, *v*, of 25 or 50 mm s-1). The light grey, mid-grey, and dark grey pixels represent the background, powder bed, and melt track, respectively. The red dotted arrows indicate the scan direction of the laser beam. Blue arrows indicate the flow direction of argon gas. Magenta and green highlights show the sintered powder and powder spatter, respectively. Scale bar = 1 mm.

We further investigate the effects of *v* on the melting or vitrification process by performing systematic trail runs whilst imaging these processes with X-rays. We segmented the radiographs and assembled a time-integrated image (using methods depicted in [33]) to aid the visualisation of the LPBF process over time. We combine these images to form a mechanism map as shown in **Supplementary Figure 3.** For the case of SiO2 + nano-C, we can see that a significant amount of powder spatter is shown under the conditions studied, the glass track becomes more discontinuous with increasing *v* andno glass tracks are formed at *v* > 40 mm s-1*,* see selected SEM images in **Supplementary Figure 4a-c**. For the case of SiO2 + rGO, we successfully built continuous tracks across *v* of 25 – 90 mm s-1*,* see selected SEM images in **Supplementary Figure 4d-f** and X-ray computed tomography (XCT) images of the glass tracks in **Figure 3**.

We employed XCT to assess the relative density of the built tracks over a wide range of processing parameters (see **Figure 3**). In general, the relative density of the glass tracks increases linearly with *v* (or linear energy density, *LED* = *P/v*). At fast *v* (or the lower input *LED*), this reduces vaporisation of low temperature volatiles within the powder mixtures (*a.k.a.* the reboil effect [59]) and minimises possible reaction between the additive and SiO2.

For the SiO2 + nano-C, the relative density increases from ca. 79.8 % to 98.5% with increasing v; however, the track length of SiO2 + nano-C is shorter than that produced with SiO2 + rGO. This is because the nano-C exhibits a low laser absorbance, the powder mixture absorbs insufficient energy to melt completely and there is little time for trapped pores to escape from the melt pool, forming defects in the glass track as it cools. For the SiO2 + rGO, the relative density also increases from 97.8% to 99.6 % with increasing *v*. However, our results show that AM of SiO2 + rGO has a better control of porosity over a wide range of *LED.* Here, we confirm that both nano-C and rGO additives can enhance the NIR absorbance of SiO2 and enable the melting and vitrification of SiO2 using a NIR laser system.



**Figure 3**: **Relative density (%) plot of glass tracks produced by LPBF.** The green and magenta colours indicate the results from SiO2 + nano-C and SiO2 + rGO, respectively. The linear energy density is calculated by dividing laser power and scan speeds. The three-dimensional rendered image volumes are generated from X-ray computed tomography scans and they are overlaid with their corresponding pore volume. Scale bar = 1 mm.

## Mechanistic insights into the laser absorption mechanism

The SEM images (**Supplementary Figure 5**) examine the morphology of five different powder feedstocks: (1) spherical SiO2 powder particles (**Supplementary Figure 5a**); (2) large secondary powder formed by a cluster of primary nano-C particles (**Supplementary Figure 5b**); and (3) the flake-like graphene oxide (GO) **Supplementary Figure 5c**). (4) The SiO2 + nano-C powder mixture (**Supplementary Figure 5d**), exhibits smaller clusters of nano-C particles, some of which further break down into finer nano-particles during mechanical mixing, and subsequently adhered to the SiO2 powder surface. For the SiO2 + rGO powder mixture, the size of the GO flakes (**Supplementary Figure 5c**) is expected to reduce after mechanical mixing and heat treatment, forming rGO particles (**Supplementary Figure 5e**)**.** Their powder size distributions are available in **Supplementary Figure 6** and **Materials and Methods**.

The X-ray Diffraction (XRD) patterns of the as-supplied SiO2 and two other powder mixtures (**Supplementary Figure 7**) exhibit a combination of a broad (amorphous SiO2) diffraction peak and some weak crystalline (quartz) diffraction peaks. The absence of nano-C and rGO peaks in the XRD pattern is owing to their small mass fraction (< 5 wt.%) in the powder mixture which is below the detection limit of the XRD system.

The diffuse reflectance or measurements (**Figure 4a**) are closely linked to the laser absorbance of the powder feedstocks [18]. The measurements in the wavelength ( range of 1030 - 1070 nm are of utmost interest, matching most commercial LPBF systems, see the red region of interest (ROI). Under normal operation, these systems are used primarily for processing some metallic systems due to their relatively high laser absorbance of = 0.53 – 0.81 [16], while other materials are difficult to process, including polymers (= 0.07 – 0.52) [17], glass (= < 0.03) [15,18], and ceramics (= 0.15) [20]. As expected, the of SiO2 as-supplied powder shows a negligible IR absorbance [60] in the ROI, confirming that neither the amorphous or quartz phases have active laser absorption mechanisms at ranging from 900 to 1400 nm. The of powder mixtures of SiO2 + nano-C is *ca.* 0.3, similar performance to that reported in prior work [40]. Moreover, the SiO2 + rGO mixture has a of *ca.* 0.9 and hence a 20-fold better in NIR absorption than that of SiO2 (<0.05) within the ROI.

We determine the optical bandgaps () of nano-C and rGO using the tangent of Tauc plots, their is estimated as 0.656 eV (**Figure 4b**) and 0.553 eV (**Figure 4c**), respectively. Our results match well with the previously reported results in which the of amorphous carbon varies from 0.45 to 2.12 eV [61] depending on the hydrogen content whereas the rGO has a variable from0.02 to 2 eV depending on the degree of reduction [62]. The incoming laser energy of 1.1 – 1.2 eV (at 1030 – 1070 nm) is greater than of nano-C and rGO, sufficient to enable the transit of electrons from the valence to the conduction band, *i.e.* transition, and then inducing a photothermal effect, this is followed by the radiation conduction and melting of SiO2 [18]. The low of rGO means that less photon energy is required for inducing the photothermal effect than that required by nano-C , however, this only partially explains why the laser absorbance of rGO is better than that of nano-C .

The ATR-FTIR spectra (**Figure 4d**) show typical IR absorption responses from the SiO2 powder feedstock (see peak assignment information in **Supplementary Table 2** and the full spectrum in **Supplementary Figure 8**). For the SiO2 + rGO powder, **Figure 4d** shows C–C stretching vibrations (1080 cm-1) [63], C–O stretching vibrations (1046 – 1087 cm-1) [64], and the C-O-C stretching vibration from the basal planes of the epoxy groups (1220 cm-1) [65]. Both powder mixtures exhibit weak and broad absorption peaks (1500 – 2000 cm-1) arising from the C=C bond vibrations. These additional IR absorption peaks in the SiO2 + nano-C and SiO2 + rGO powder mixtures indicate that the presence of carbon bonds play a crucial role in the NIR absorption mechanism (**Figure 4b**).

Therefore, we probe further the chemical structure of both additives and compare them with the SiO2 powders using Raman spectroscopy, see **Figure 4c** and **Supplementary Table 3** forindividual peak information. The low spectral response of borosilicate glass makes it an excellent substrate material for the Raman spectroscopy. The SiO2 Raman spectrum only shows the presence of the amorphous SiO2 phase [66,67] and differs from the XRD results (**Supplementary Figure 7**) because the beam-powder interactive volume is significantly smaller in Raman spectroscopy than in XRD, and hence the XRD results are more statistically relevant. The SiO2 + nano-C Raman spectrum displays the D (defect) band (1348 cm-1) and the G (graphite) band (1585 cm-1) whereasthe SiO2 + rGO Raman spectrum exhibits strong peak signals in the D band (1350 cm-1), the G band (1594 cm-1), and weak signals of D + G band [68] or S3 band a second-order peak derived from the D + G band [69] (2951.7 cm-1). Neither of the powder mixtures shows the SiO2 Raman peaks due to the small laser beam size, confirming that the excitation laser beam mainly interacts with the nano-C and rGO additives. The D band indicates the disorders of the chemical structure, its signal strength depends on the presence of defects and relates to the stretching of the *sp2* orbital in the material structure whereas the G band arises from the Raman active response for the combination of *sp2* hybridised orbital (basal plane) and *sp3* orbital (*e.g.* the functional group near the edge) of the additives. The prominent feature of the D + G band in the SiO2 + rGO powder mixture [70] is owing to the chemical and edge/point defects induced by the reduction process of GO. We also quantify the amount of disorder, the degree of oxidation, or the average size of the *sp2* ring clusters of the carbon structure, , using an intensity ratio of D and G bands [71–73], *i.e.*  [29], and [74] where is the Raman excitation energy (eV) and of the laser beam is 514.5 nm. The ratio of SiO2 + nano-C and SiO2 + rGO is calculated as 0.85 and 0.94 (similar to the value calculated from prior work [75]), and hence the is estimated to be 19.3 nmand17.5 nm, respectively. Comparing these results with a high purity graphene domain of rGO with an of 8.96 nm [76], we can confirm that both additives are highly disordered.

By probing the surfaces of both additives using XPS, the O/C ratio of both carbon additives is estimated to be 0.28 (nano-C) and 0.09 (rGO), respectively (see details in (**Supplementary Figure 9** and **Supplementary Table 4**). It is well documented that the smaller the O/C ratio, the smaller the , further supporting our findings from **Figure 4a-c**. [62]

Our results also confirm that the carbon species are responsible for the enhanced NIR absorption mechanisms but further information is needed to explain the performance difference between two additives.By **c**omparing the C 1s spectra (**Figure 4f–g**), both powders exhibit C=C (~283.7eV), C-C/C-H (~284.7 eV), O-C=O (~288.5 eV), C-O (~286.1 eV) species, the peak assignment matches well with the O1s and Si 2p spectra (**Supplementary Figure 10a–d**) and ATR-FTIR results (**Figure 4d**). However, the deconvoluted C 1s spectrum SiO2 + rGO powder mixture shows a satellite peak at 289.9 eV due to the interactions arise from the aromatic rings in the rGO backbone which corroborates with the evidence shown in **Figure 4c–d.** Wequantify individual peak positions and calculate the atomic concentration (*at.*%) of different carbon species in the SiO2 + nano-C and SiO2 + rGO powder mixtures, see details in **Materials and Methods** and **Table 1.** We use the differentiated X-ray induced C KLL spectra (**Figure 4h**) to estimate the *d* parameter of nano-C (*drGO*) and rGO, (*drGO* ), which are 10 eV and 28 eV, indicating that the rGO is *sp2*-like material and nano-C is *sp3-*likematerial, respectively (see details in **Supplementary information**) [77]. The *d* parameter values also support our calculated valuesbecausethe*sp3* in nano-C causes a distortion to the honeycomb graphene lattice, and thus the of nano-C is higher than that of rGO [78]. **Figure 4g** and **Table 1** show that the C=C species in rGO is *ca.* 4 times higher than that in nano-C (**Figure 4f**) whereas the C=O and O-C=O in rGO are significantly lower than that of the nano-C due to the restoration of the *sp2* graphitic domains. The transition (**Figure 4g**) from the C=C and aromatic rings in addition to the conjugation between planes of rGO flakes seem to play a crucial role in the NIR absorption mechanism. It is well documented that the *sp2* domains of rGO exhibit non-linear optical properties [76], including Saturation Absorption (SA) in *sp2* carbon clusters and Two-Photon Absorption (TPA) and excited-state absorption (ESA) in small localised *sp2* carbon and *sp3* carbon matrix, respectively [78]. The delocalised electrons (or surface plasmons [79]) in the valence band from the *sp2*carbon configuration and *sp2*carbon cluster reduces the , and hence the ofrGO is lower than that of nano-C (**Figure 4b-c**). Given that the nano-C has fewer delocalised electrons (**Figure 4f**) compared to those of the rGO, there are fewer electrons taking part in the photothermal conversion mechanism, resulting in a porous glass structure (**Figure 2b-c**). In contrast, the rGO consists of a high number of delocalised electrons from the aromatic rings (**Figure 4g**), this promotes the melting and vitrification of SiO2 during LPBF, resulting in highly dense tracks (≥ 97.8%) under the conditions studied (**Figure 2d-e**).

Table 1: XPS quantification analysis of the C1s scan in SiO2 + nano-C and SiO2 + rGO powder mixtures.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Powder type | Bonds | Peak position (eV) | Atomic concentration (*at.* %) |
| SiO2 + nano-C | C=C  C-C/C-H  C-O  O-C=O | 283.3  284.7  286.1  288.5 | 17.5  58.4  13.8  10.3 |
| SiO2 + rGO | C=C  C-C/C-H  C-O  O-C=O  π – π\* | 283.7  284.7  286.1  288.4  289.9 | 67.6  20.0  0.8  6.0  5.6 |



**Figure 4:** Powder characterisation of SiO2, SiO2 + nano-C and SiO2 + rGO: **a**, Diffuse reflectance measurement in Kubelka-Munk unit or . The red region indicates the wavelength of the laser beam (1030 – 1070 nm), Tauc plots of **b**, SiO2 + nano-C and **c**,SiO2 + rGO where the red arrows indicate the signal variations when changing light source; **d**, a zoom-in ATR-FTIR spectrum (the full version is available in **Supplementary figure 8**). **e**, Raman spectra of SiO2 + rGO (magenta), SiO2 + nano-C (green), SiO2 (black), and borosilicate substrate (blue), high-resolution XPS spectra of C 1s, f, SiO2 + nano-C and g, SiO2 + rGO, and h, the differentiated C KLL curve calculated from the XPS survey scans of the SiO2 + nano-C and SiO2 + rGO powder examples. The *d* parameter measures the energy separation between maxima and minima in the differentiated C KLL spectrum and is denoted as *drGO* and *d*C. Peak assignment details are recorded in **Supplementary information**.

# Conclusions

In summary, we demonstrate the application of nano carbon (nano-C) and reduced graphene oxides (rGO) as NIR absorbers for laser powder bed fusion (LPBF). Our results provide mechanistic insights into the laser absorption, evolution mechanisms of glass track, and defects, *e.g.* spatter and bubbles, during LPBF of SiO2 with two types of carbon additives. In this study, the rGO exhibits a larger amount of C=C bonds with small *sp2*graphitic domains and the conjugations between rGO additives combined with a low O/C ratio, resulting in a smaller optical bandgap (0.553 eV) than nano-C (0.656 eV) for the photothermal effect and radiation conduction mechanism to take place. Our XCT analysis demonstrates that nano-C additives can enable the production of tracks with a relative density of > 80%, while tracks made by rGO achieve a relative density of 99.7 %. We show that rGO performs much better than nano-C as an NIR absorber with 3 times increase in NIR absorption, and it also reduces porosity and warpage in the LPBF tracks. Here, we demonstrate that the rGO offers a huge potential to improve the processability of low NIR absorbance materials and can be applied to other types of feedstock materials, *e.g.* wire, rods, sheets, *etc.*, opening new possibilities for laser processing, beyond additive manufacturing. Our work takes us a step closer towards enabling the processing of different classes of materials using a single NIR laser system.

# Materials and Methods

## Materials synthesis

As-supplied SiO2 powder (SS1206, Industrial Powder, USA) was selected due to its low NIR absorbance and two carbon additives were selected as a NIR enhancer to improve the processability of feedstock materials: (1) graphene oxide (GO) flake was prepared from natural graphite powder (Sigma Aldrich - Merck KGaA, Germany) using a custom-built reactor and a modified Marcano *et al.* [80] procedure described elsewhere [75], and (2) nano carbon (denoted as nano-C) (Sigma Aldrich - Merck KGaA, Germany). Both GO and nano-C powders were combined with SiO2 powder by vigorous mechanical mixing in methyl ethyl ketone (MEK) solvent (Acros Organics – ThermoFisherScientific, USA) using alumina milling media and TURBULA mixer for 10 hours. We collected the powder after the MEK was evaporated. After that, the SiO2 + nano-C powder was sieved through a 100 µm mesh whereas the SiO2 + GO powder was heat-treated at 950 °C in a tube furnace under H2/Ar atmosphere for 1.5 hours and then sieved to produce a SiO2 powder covered with reduced graphene oxide (rGO). The resultant chemical composition of SiO2 + 0.2 wt.% nano-C and SiO2 + 0.2 wt.% rGO, see schematic in **Figure 1a**.

## Powder characterisation

The powder morphology was characterised using high-resolution field emission gun scanning electron microscopy (LEO Gemini 1525 - FEG-SEM). Particle size analysis was performed using a Mastersizer 2000 laser diffraction particle size analyser (Malvern Panalytical Ltd., UK). The powder size distributions of SiO2, as supplied C, and GO flakes are shown in (**Supplementary Figure 5**) in which their median particle size is 18 μm, 70 nm, and 30 μm [75], respectively. The elemental composition of these powders was characterised by X-ray fluorescence (XRF) spectroscopy using a Panalytical Epsilon 3XL Benchtop XRF machine (Malvern Panalytical Ltd., UK) and data analysis was performed using Omnian software (Malvern Panalytical Ltd., UK). The crystal structure was examined by X-ray Diffraction (XRD) using a Panalytical X′Pert Pro MPD series automated spectrometer (Malvern Panalytical Ltd., UK, UK) with a radiation (λ =1.541Å) at 40 kV and 40 mA, a 2θ scanning range (degrees) from 10° to 100° with a step size of 0.03°, and a count rate of 50 s per step. The phase identification of the XRD patterns and Rietveld refinement analysis were performed in Profex [81].

To understand the laser absorption behaviour, we measured the diffuse reflectance () and the Kubelka-Munk measurement, of SiO2, SiO2 + nano-C, and SiO2 + rGO powders using a UV-VIS-NIR spectrophotometer using a single bounce diamond crystal and an integrating sphere attachment (UV-2600 and IRS-2600 plus, Shimadzu Corporation, Japan), see details in ref [18]. has been used to correlate the diffuse reflectance (), *i.e.* the IR absorbance of glass powders [18,82].

Raman spectroscopywas performed on dry powder samples of SiO2, SiO2 + nano-C, and SiO2 + rGO mounted on a borosilicate glass substrate using a Renishaw InVia Raman spectroscope (Renishaw plc, Wotton-under-Edge, UK). All samples were excited by an argon ion laser (= 514.5 nm) via a 50x microscope objective (NA = 0.4, spot size = *ca.* 5 μm). The laser power used was optimised at 50% (*ca.* 1.4 mW) to avoid saturating the charged-coupled device. All spectra were collected with an exposure time of 30 s and 2 accumulations. We processed these spectra using the Renishaw WiRE 3.2 software and performed peak analysis using python (v.3.7) with NumPy [83], PeakUtils, Matplotlib, and SciPy libraries [84].

Attenuated total reflectance-Fourier transform infrared spectroscopy (ATR-FTIR) was used to identify functional groups of the powder mixtures. All spectra were collected at room temperature (25ºC) in the wavenumber range of 600 – 4000 cm−1 with a resolution of 2 cm-1 and an average of 16 scans using a Nicolet iS10 FT-IR Spectrometer (Thermo Fisher Scientific, USA).

The chemical states of SiO2 + nano-C and SiO2 + rGO were examined by X-ray photoelectron spectroscopy (XPS) (Nexsa Surface Analysis System, Thermo Fisher Scientific Inc., USA). Both powder mixtures were characterised using a micro-focused monochromatic Al X-ray source (72 W) over an area of *ca.* 400 x 200 μm2. The XPS survey was conducted at pass energy of 200 eV with a step size of 0.1 eV and dwell time at 10 ms. High-resolution scans were conducted at pass energy of 40 eV with a step size of 0.1 eV and a dwell time of 50 ms. Charge neutralisation was applied to the sample using a combination of low energy electrons and Ar+ ions at an argon partial pressure of 10−8 Torr in the x–y scan mode, ion acceleration of 3 kV, and ion beam current density of 1 μA mm−2. Binding energies were referenced to Si 2p at ~103.2 eV, with peak fitting undertaken using CasaXPS version 2.3.15 (Casa Software Ltd, UK).

To study the gas release during LPBF, the SiO2 + nano-C and SiO2 + rGO powder mixture were loaded onto platinum pans under argon conditions and analysed by the Thermal Analysis instrument STA 449F1 (NETZSCH-Gerätebau GmbH, Germany) in a flowing argon atmosphere at a flow rate of 40 - 50 ml min-1. The weight of the samples was recorded following a heating profile: the furnace temperature was ramped to 1600°C at a heating rate of 20°C min-1 and then dwell for 15 mins. Lastly, the temperature was slowly ramped back to 20°C.

## Real-time observation during laser powder bed fusion additive manufacturing

To reveal the performance of rGO and nano-C on SiO2 during LPBF, we used a custom-built *In Situ and Operando* Process Replicator (ISOPR) to produce melt tracks whilst imaging how they were being built with synchrotron X-rays (**Figure 1b**). The ISOPR has a miniature powder bed with a dimension of 46 mm (length) x 1.2 mm (wide) x 3 mm (depth) which is made out of two glassy carbon plates and a metal substrate (see details in the blue dotted rectangle).[33] Although the ISOPR is equipped with an automated gravity feed hopper, powder particles were manually loaded onto the powder bed due to poor powder flowability. For each experiment, the environmental chamber was first evacuated to 10-3 mbar for 10 s and backfilled with argon gas at a constant flow rate of 4 l min-1 to prevent oxidation. The ISOPR is equipped with a 200 W 1030 - 1070 nm TEM00 mode continuous wave laser with a spot size of 50 µm (4σx,y), see details in ref [18,33,41]. The laser beam is controlled by the BeamConstruct software (HALaser Systems, Germany). It was set to scan a 5 mm line at the powder bed with a laser power (*P*) of 200 W and a range of scan speeds (*v)* from 10 to 90 mm s-1.

To visualise the LPBF process, we used a pink beam imaging mode in the beamline I13-2 (Diamond Light Source, UK). The incoming X-ray beam from the undulator source was filtered by a 2.1 mm Al, a 1.34 mm graphite, and a Rhodium mirror, resulting in an energy range of 15 - 30 keV (at an ID gap of 5 mm). After the X-ray beam interacted with the powder bed, the attenuated X-ray converted into radiographs via a 300 µm LuAg: Ce scintillator crystal coupled with a high-speed imaging camera (FASTCAM SAZ 2100K, Photron Ltd., USA) and a 4x objective lens. Each radiograph was recorded at 5 kHz (and 0.2 ms) with a field of view of 5.1 x 5.1 mm and a 5 µm pixel size.

The laser melting and image acquisition processes were synchronised using a digital signal level converter and position capture unit - Zebra (Quantum detector Ltd., UK). The camera was operated in a ring buffer mode that continuously recorded images into the on-board memory of the camera whilst waiting for an external trigger. Once the camera received the trigger signal, it saved *ca.* 3000 radiographs onto a local drive. The camera automatically performed a dark-field correction before image acquisition (Photron FASTCAM Viewer software,Photron Ltd., USA), therefore we only required to perform flat-field corrections by dividing the captured radiographs by an average of 100 flat-filed images. All images were denoised, segmented, and rendered as videos using a similar method depicted in ref. [18,33,41].

## Post-build characterisation using X-ray computed tomography

After the *in situ* radiography experiments, all built tracks were examined by a laboratory X-ray computed tomography (XCT) system (Nikon XTH 225 *X-ray microfocus* system, Nikon, Japan), using 50 kV and 130 µA with an exposure time of 500 ms. Each scan acquired a total of 3176 projections All XCT scans were reconstructed into a 3D image volume with a voxel size of 2.7 x 2.7 x 2.7 µm3 using built-in beam hardening correction and filtered back projection algorithms in CT Pro3D (Nikon, Japan), see ref [18]. The reconstructed image volumes were post-processed and quantified by Avizo 7.0 (Thermo Fisher Scientific, USA). We first applied a 3D median filter with a kernel size of 3 x 3 x 3 for 2 iterations for noise reduction. After that, the glass structure was segmented from the filtered image using the Otsu threshold [85], resulting in a threshold image volume. Next, the volume of the glass structure () was calculated by applying connect component analysis [86] to the threshold image. We applied a Boolean negation operator to the threshold images and obtain the image volume only containing pores. Similar to the quantification, the total volume of pores () was quantified using connected component analysis, only accounting for objects with at least 5 voxels. A detailed analysis procedure is depicted in ref [87] and the relative density is calculated by .
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