

---

---

**Additive manufacturing of metals —  
Non-destructive testing and evaluation  
— Defect detection in parts**

*Fabrication additive de métaux — Essais et évaluation non destructifs  
— Détection de défauts dans les pièces*

iTeh STANDARD PREVIEW  
(standards.iteh.ai)

ISO/ASTM TR 52905:2023

<https://standards.iteh.ai/catalog/standards/sist/12b7de41-101c-47e1-acd3-83fd82ac1220/iso-astm-tr-52905-2023>



Reference number  
ISO/ASTM TR 52905:2023(E)

© ISO/ASTM International 2023

iTeh STANDARD PREVIEW  
(standards.iteh.ai)

ISO/ASTM TR 52905:2023

<https://standards.iteh.ai/catalog/standards/sist/12b7de41-101c-47e1-acd3-83fd82ac1220/iso-astm-tr-52905-2023>



**COPYRIGHT PROTECTED DOCUMENT**

© ISO/ASTM International 2023

All rights reserved. Unless otherwise specified, or required in the context of its implementation, no part of this publication may be reproduced or utilized otherwise in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, or posting on the internet or an intranet, without prior written permission. Permission can be requested from either ISO at the address below or ISO's member body in the country of the requester. In the United States, such requests should be sent to ASTM International.

ISO copyright office  
CP 401 • Ch. de Blandonnet 8  
CH-1214 Vernier, Geneva  
Phone: +41 22 749 01 11

Email: [copyright@iso.org](mailto:copyright@iso.org)  
Website: [www.iso.org](http://www.iso.org)

Published in Switzerland

ASTM International  
100 Barr Harbor Drive, PO Box C700  
West Conshohocken, PA 19428-2959, USA  
Phone: +610 832 9634  
Fax: +610 832 9635  
Email: [khooper@astm.org](mailto:khooper@astm.org)  
Website: [www.astm.org](http://www.astm.org)

# Contents

	Page
<b>Foreword</b> .....	<b>v</b>
<b>Introduction</b> .....	<b>vi</b>
<b>1 Scope</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>2 Normative references</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>3 Terms and definitions</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>4 NDT potential for authentication and/or identification</b> .....	<b>2</b>
<b>5 List of abbreviated terms</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>6 Typical flaws/defects in AM</b> .....	<b>4</b>
6.1 Flaw origins/causes.....	4
6.2 Flaw/defects classification.....	4
6.3 Defect classification strategies for AM.....	12
<b>7 NDT standards review</b> .....	<b>13</b>
7.1 Post-process NDT standards.....	13
7.1.1 ISO review.....	13
7.2 In-process NDT review.....	15
<b>8 Standard selection structure for AM</b> .....	<b>18</b>
<b>9 NDT techniques potential for AM only defects</b> .....	<b>19</b>
<b>10 AM artefacts</b> .....	<b>28</b>
10.1 Design.....	28
10.1.1 Star artefact.....	28
10.1.2 À la carte artefact.....	34
10.2 Manufacturing.....	36
10.2.1 Star artefact.....	36
10.2.2 À la carte artefact.....	37
<b>11 NDT method trials and validation using star artefact</b> .....	<b>38</b>
11.1 Experimental trials.....	38
11.1.1 X-ray Computed Tomography – XCT (MTC & GE & EWI).....	39
11.1.2 Neutron Imaging — NI and Synchrotron radiation — SX (HZB & ESRF).....	43
11.1.3 Thermography Testing — TT (University of Bath).....	50
11.1.4 Resonant Ultrasound Spectroscopy methods — RUS.....	59
11.1.5 Ultrasonic testing — UT and Phase Array UT — PAUT (EWI and NIST and LNE).....	75
11.1.6 Residual stress — RS (ILL).....	80
<b>12 Defect built validation star artefact (Cut-off MTC)</b> .....	<b>85</b>
12.1 Summary of procedure by XCT.....	85
12.1.1 Apparatus.....	86
12.1.2 Significance of data/interpretation of results.....	87
12.2 Summary of procedure by metallography.....	90
12.2.1 Apparatus.....	91
12.2.2 Significance of data/Interpretation of results.....	91
12.3 Comments/observations.....	93
<b>13 NDT trials for à la carte artefact</b> .....	<b>94</b>
13.1 Summary of procedure.....	94
13.2 Apparatus.....	94
13.3 Significance of data/interpretation of results.....	94
13.4 Comments/observations.....	97
<b>14 Summary of the trials findings by material</b> .....	<b>97</b>
<b>15 Main conclusions</b> .....	<b>101</b>

<b>Annex A (informative) Causes and effects of defects in wire DED and PBF process</b> .....	<b>104</b>
<b>Annex B (informative) Review of existing NDT standards for welding or casting for application of post build AM flaws</b> .....	<b>106</b>
<b>Annex C (informative) Star artefacts using during the trials</b> .....	<b>111</b>
<b>Annex D (informative) Summary of star artefact manufacturing and NDT technologies for trials</b> .....	<b>115</b>
<b>Annex E (informative) XCT parameters and XCT set up used for inspection and validation</b> .....	<b>118</b>
<b>Annex F (informative) Parameters and set up for Neutron Image (NI) and Synchrotron (Sx) inspection</b> .....	<b>135</b>
<b>Annex G (informative) Set up for PT and SHT inspection</b> .....	<b>141</b>
<b>Annex H (informative) Ultrasonic test</b> .....	<b>144</b>
<b>Annex I (informative) Residual stress characterisation of Ti6Al4V by Neutron diffraction</b> .....	<b>155</b>
<b>Bibliography</b> .....	<b>157</b>

iTeh STANDARD PREVIEW  
(standards.iteh.ai)

[ISO/ASTM TR 52905:2023](https://standards.iteh.ai/catalog/standards/sist/12b7de41-101c-47e1-acd3-83fd82ac1220/iso-astm-tr-52905-2023)

<https://standards.iteh.ai/catalog/standards/sist/12b7de41-101c-47e1-acd3-83fd82ac1220/iso-astm-tr-52905-2023>

## Foreword

ISO (the International Organization for Standardization) is a worldwide federation of national standards bodies (ISO member bodies). The work of preparing International Standards is normally carried out through ISO technical committees. Each member body interested in a subject for which a technical committee has been established has the right to be represented on that committee. International organizations, governmental and non-governmental, in liaison with ISO, also take part in the work. ISO collaborates closely with the International Electrotechnical Commission (IEC) on all matters of electrotechnical standardization.

The procedures used to develop this document and those intended for its further maintenance are described in the ISO/IEC Directives, Part 1. In particular, the different approval criteria needed for the different types of ISO documents should be noted. This document was drafted in accordance with the editorial rules of the ISO/IEC Directives, Part 2 (see [www.iso.org/directives](http://www.iso.org/directives)).

Attention is drawn to the possibility that some of the elements of this document may be the subject of patent rights. ISO shall not be held responsible for identifying any or all such patent rights. Details of any patent rights identified during the development of the document will be in the Introduction and/or on the ISO list of patent declarations received (see [www.iso.org/patents](http://www.iso.org/patents)).

Any trade name used in this document is information given for the convenience of users and does not constitute an endorsement.

For an explanation of the voluntary nature of standards, the meaning of ISO specific terms and expressions related to conformity assessment, as well as information about ISO's adherence to the World Trade Organization (WTO) principles in the Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT), see [www.iso.org/iso/foreword.html](http://www.iso.org/iso/foreword.html).

The committee responsible for this document is ISO/TC 261, *Additive manufacturing*, in cooperation with ASTM Committee F42, *Additive manufacturing technologies*, on the basis of a partnership agreement between ISO and ASTM International with the aim to create a common set of ISO/ASTM standards on additive manufacturing, in collaboration with the European Committee for Standardization (CEN) Technical Committee CEN/TC 438, *Additive manufacturing*, in accordance with the Agreement on technical cooperation between ISO and CEN (Vienna Agreement).

Any feedback or questions on this document should be directed to the user's national standards body. A complete listing of these bodies can be found at [www.iso.org/members.html](http://www.iso.org/members.html).

## Introduction

In response to the urgent need for standards for Additive Manufacturing (AM), this document initially indicates Non-Destructive Testing (NDT) methods with potential to detect defects and determine residual strain distribution that are generated in AM processes. A number of these methods were verified. The strategy adopted was to review existing NDT standards for matured manufacturing processes which are similar to AM, namely casting and welding. This potentially reduces the number of standards required to comprehensively cover the defects in AM. For identified AM unique defects, this document proposes a two-level NDT approach: a star artefact as an Initial Quality Indicator (IQI) and *à la carte* artefact where an example shows the specific steps to follow for the very specific unique AM part to be built, paving the way for a structured and comprehensive framework.

Most metal inspection methods in NDT use ultrasound or X-rays, but these techniques cannot always cope with the complicated shapes typically produced by AM. In most circumstances X-ray computed tomography (CT) is a more suitable method, but it also has limitations and room for improvement or adaptation to AM, on top of being a costly method both in time and money.

This document includes post-process non-destructive testing of additive manufacturing (AM) of metallic parts with a comprehensive approach. It covers several sectors and a similar framework can be applied to other materials (e.g. ceramics, polymers, etc.). In-process NDT and metrology standards are referenced as they are being developed. This document presents current standards capability to detect which of the Additive Manufacturing (AM) flaw types and which flaws require new standards, using a standard selection tool. NDT methods with the highest potential will be tested.

iTeh STANDARD PREVIEW  
(standards.iteh.ai)

[ISO/ASTM TR 52905:2023](https://standards.iteh.ai/catalog/standards/sist/12b7de41-101c-47e1-acd3-83fd82ac1220/iso-astm-tr-52905-2023)

<https://standards.iteh.ai/catalog/standards/sist/12b7de41-101c-47e1-acd3-83fd82ac1220/iso-astm-tr-52905-2023>

# Additive manufacturing of metals — Non-destructive testing and evaluation — Defect detection in parts

## 1 Scope

This document categorises additive manufacturing (AM) defects in DED and PBF laser and electron beam category of processes, provides a review of relevant current NDT standards, details NDT methods that are specific to AM and complex 3D geometries and outlines existing non-destructive testing techniques that are applicable to some AM types of defects.

This document is aimed at users and producers of AM processes and it applies, in particular, to the following:

- safety critical AM applications;
- assured confidence in AM;
- reverse engineered products manufactured by AM;
- test bodies wishing to compare requested and actual geometries.

## 2 Normative references

The following documents are referred to in the text in such a way that some or all of their content constitutes requirements of this document. For dated references, only the edition cited applies. For undated references, the latest edition of the referenced document (including any amendments) applies.

ISO 11484, *Steel products — Employer's qualification system for non-destructive testing (NDT) personnel*

ISO/ASTM 52900, *Additive manufacturing — General principles — Fundamentals and vocabulary*

ASTM E1316, *Terminology for Nondestructive Testing*

EN 1330-2, *Non-destructive testing — Terminology — Part 2: Terms common to the non-destructive testing methods*

## 3 Terms and definitions

For the purposes of this document, the terms and definitions given in ISO/ASTM 52900, ASTM E1316, EN 1330-2, ISO 11484, and the following apply.

ISO and IEC maintain terminological databases for use in standardization at the following addresses:

- ISO Online browsing platform: available at <https://www.iso.org/obp>
- IEC Electropedia: available at <https://www.electropedia.org/>

### 3.1

#### **flaw type**

identifiable features that defines a specific flaw

Note 1 to entry: defect term, this word is used when a flaw that does not meet specified acceptance criteria and is rejectable.

Note 2 to entry: Flaw term, an imperfection or discontinuity that is not necessarily rejectable

**3.2**  
**lack of fusion**  
**LOF**

type of process-induced porosity, in which the powder or wire feedstock is not fully melted or fused onto the previously deposited substrate

Note 1 to entry: In PBF, this type of flaw can be an empty cavity, or contain unmelted or partially fused powder, referred to as unconsolidated powder.

Note 2 to entry: LOF typically occurs in the bulk, making its detection difficult.

Note 3 to entry: Like voids, LOF can occur on the build layer plane (layer/horizontal LOF) or across multiple build layers (cross layer/vertical LOF).

**3.3**  
**unconsolidated powder**

unmelted powder that due to process failure was not melted and became trapped internally

**3.4**  
**layer shift**

<E beam> when it is disturbed by a magnetic field a layer or a number of layers are shifted away from the other build layers

Note 1 to entry: see stop/start for PBF laser/E beam.

**3.5**  
**trapped powder**

unmelted powder that is not intended for the part but is trapped within internal part cavities

**3.6**  
**porosity**

presence of small voids in a part making it less than fully dense

Note 1 to entry: Porosity may be quantified as a ratio, expressed as a percentage of the volume of voids to the total volume of the part.

[SOURCE: ISO/ASTM 52900:2019, 3.11.8]

## **4 NDT potential for authentication and/or identification**

Some of the NDT methods in this technical report have the additional potential to extract authentication and/or identification apparatus or design embedded in the design of the AM part. Such a potential clearly depends on the material(s), geometry and process selected to fabricate the part, however the design information and AM data file can embed in its geometry or texture ad-hoc devices that potentially could be extracted by NDT techniques. ISO/TC 292 specifies and maintains a number of standards supporting such devices within the ISO referential, and are fully applicable to AM digital information. The specific requirements of design techniques, materials, processes, NDT modalities and applications, however, still require careful evaluation, selection and classification.



## 5 List of abbreviated terms

AM	additive manufacturing
BAE	British Aerospace and Engineering Systems
EB-PBF	electron beam powder bed fusion
ESFR	European Synchrotron Research Facility
EWI	Edison Welding Institute
FMC	full matrix capture
GE-PD	general electric powder division
HZB	Helmholtz Zentrum Berlin
ILL	Institute Laue-Langevin
IR	infrared
IRT	infrared thermography
J & J	Johnson & Johnson
LNE	laboratoire national de métrologie et d'essais
PBF-LB	laser powder bed fusion
DED-LB	laser directed energy deposition
MTC	The Manufacturing Technology Centre
ND	neutron diffraction
NDE	non-destructive evaluation
NDT	non-destructive testing
NI	neutron Imaging
NIST	National Institute of Standards and Technology
NLA	non-linear acoustic testing
NLR	non-linear resonance testing
PAUT	phase array ultrasound testing
PCRT	process compensated resonance testing
PT	pulse thermography
RAM	resonance acoustic method
ROI	Region of interest
SX	X-ray synchrotron
SHT	step heating thermography

TFM	total focusing method
TMS	the modal shop
UoB	university of bath
XCT	X-ray computed tomography

## 6 Typical flaws/defects in AM

### 6.1 Flaw origins/causes

The causes of defects across different types of AM processes can be quite different, but the defects that they generate can be remarkably similar. Detecting the defects also does not depend on the cause, and in general only the size and geometry (and potentially morphology) of the defect matters for detection.

The causes and effects of a number of AM flaws have been reported in the European project AMAZE<sup>[21]</sup>. [Table A.1](#) and [Table A.2](#) give explanations of the mechanisms by which these flaws are generated and those mechanisms are linked to the process parameters selected and the resulting processing conditions, see ISO 11484. Understanding the conditions under which flaws are generated and simplifying the terminology used to describe these flaws will aid the drive for quality improvement required for widespread implementation of the technology.

The flowchart displayed in [Figure 1](#) gives an idea of the complexity of flaw generation within the PBF process. As can be seen, the generation of one flaw type can result in an anomalous processing condition, which in turn generates a second flaw. For example, the presence of a thick layer or low laser (or electron beam) power can lead to under-melting, which in turn can lead to unconsolidated powder. Coupled with the tendency of the power source to decrease the surface energy of unconsolidated powder under the action of surface tension, ensuing ball formation may arise due to shrinkage and worsened wetting, leading to pitting, an uneven build surface, or an increase in surface roughness; see EN 1330-2.

Therefore, even when there are multiple causes, a single flaw type or conditions can be generated (excessive surface roughness) causing failure by a single failure mode (surface cracking leading to reduced fatigue properties). Alternatively, it is also conceivable that a single flaw type or condition can cause failure by several different failure modes.

### 6.2 Flaw/defects classification

Post-built AM flaws have been identified based on a report from the FP7 European AMAZE project. Potential flaws in directed energy deposition (DED) and powder bed fusion (PBF) are listed in [Table 1](#) and [Table 2](#) respectively. A brief description for each flaw type is also given in the tables.

Due to the similarity in manufacturing, defects from welding and casting bear some resemblance to defects from AM processes such as PBF and DED. Defects in post-built PBF and DED parts are identified and listed in EN 1330-2, ASTM E1316 and References <sup>[22]</sup>. As noted in [Table 1](#) and [Table 2](#), both technologies have common defects such as porosity, inclusions, undercuts, geometry, LOF, and a rough surface texture. However, the mechanisms for PBF and DED defect generation are very different, and more importantly, the relative abundance of each defect type will be very different due to the melting and solidification mechanisms involved (and the significantly higher thermal gradients present in DED). DED involves imparting a momentum into the melt pool rather than melting the powder that is already present. The important difference between the two methods is that of timescales.




Figure 1 — Causes, mode of failures and defect formation in PBF AM (see ISO/ASTM 52900)

In PBF, there is a balance of timescales between melting and re-solidification. If the melt rate is too low, then the melt pool can become unstable and break into multiple pools. If the melt rate is too high, powder partially melts in front of the melt pool, which can cause defects or heat affected zones. In DED, this balance is not relevant, but the powder (or wire) that is fed into the melt pool can melt sufficiently quickly. The issue of adding cold material (with a given momentum) to a melt pool is not well understood, but has a large effect on the Marangoni convection direction and thermal gradients present. It is likely that the melt pool depth will be much shallower (which may reduce powder surrounding the melt pool) and that the thermal gradients less severe (which cause a flatter melt pool), though this depends on the wetting between substrate (which has no surrounding powder) and the melt pool. This difference in the melt pool dynamics impacts its shape.

This has two important consequences, grain growth and bubble dynamics. Internal defects are attributable to cracking, pores, or lack of material. Cracking has many causes, but is generally related to the grain boundary (apart from solidification cracking). Note that the issue of “spattering” that is

believed to be prominent in DED (or indeed welding) is still a significant issue in PBF. For L-PBF the issue is that of ablation at the surface of the melt pool caused by the large thermal gradients. For EB-PBF the problem occurs from two mechanisms; ablation and charging of the powder.

**Table 1 — Typical flaws in directed energy deposition**







Flaw type	Description
<p>Poor surface finish</p>	<p>The surface roughness on the part does not meet the target specification for the part. Measurement of the surface roughness is considered out-of-scope for NDT however, visual examination can be included.</p> 
<p>Porosity</p>	<p>Typically spherical in shape and contains gas. Porosities can grow in a line to form a chain or elongated porosity.</p> 
<p>Incomplete fusion</p>	<p>Fusion between the entire base metal surfaces and between adjoining welds are not complete. This occurs when new material has been used and the build parameters have not been optimised. Typically, this flaw is eliminated as the process improved when all parameters have been optimised.</p> 
<p>Undercuts at the toe of the welds between adjoining weld beads</p>	<p>A groove melted into the base metal adjacent to the weld toe or weld face and left unfilled by weld metal.</p>

Table 1 (continued)

Flaw type	Description
Non-uniform weld bead and fusion characteristic	 <p>These indicate errors in the process which can risk integrity of the build. Internal flaws caused by this can be void, porosity, or incomplete fusion.</p>
Hole or void	<p>Typically occurs internally in the built part as shown in the micrograph below. It is difficult to detect by physical examination of the part.</p> 
Non-metallic inclusions	<p>Inclusions can come from the powder or the wire feedstock. Some inclusions are intentionally added to the powder to improve the process (e.g. for oxidation) but they could also be caused by contaminants in the process.</p>
Cracking	<p>Cracking can develop from internal holes or voids which then grows to the external surface.</p> 
Lack of geometrical accuracy/steps in the part	<p>Variation of the part dimension from the CAD model will not be currently part of the review. Nevertheless, steps and gross variation which can be detected by visual examination are included.</p>

**Table 2 — Typical flaws in powder bed fusion**





Flaw type	Description
Unconsolidated powder	<p>Unconsolidated powder leading to porosity or voids. The morphology is different to gas generated pores, but the geometry and size are not dissimilar. The image below is an example taken from RASCAL project.</p> 
Trapped powder	<p>Unmelted powder that is not intended for the part is trapped within part cavities.</p> 
Layer defect (Horizontal lack of fusion)	<p>Void or porosity with or without unconsolidated powder that grows on the build layer plane in a connected or semi-connected manner. The image below is a vertical slice of an X-ray computed tomography scan.</p>

Table 2 (continued)

Flaw type	Description
	
<p>Cross layer (Vertical lack of fusion)</p>	<p>Void or porosity with or without unconsolidated powder that grows along the build axis in a connected or semi-connected manner. The images below show vertical and horizontal slices from an X-ray computed tomography scan.</p> <p>Vertical slice view.</p>  <p>Top slice view.</p>