

3D Printing-Based Approaches for Customized Engineering Components

Dr. Jussi Korhonen

Associate Professor, University of Turku, Finland

Abstract

Three-dimensional (3D) printing has emerged as an important advanced manufacturing technology for producing customized engineering components with complex geometries, reduced material consumption, and shorter development cycles. Unlike conventional manufacturing methods that generally depend on subtractive processes, specialized tooling, and standardized production configurations, additive manufacturing enables components to be fabricated directly from digital models through successive material deposition or consolidation. This capability has expanded opportunities for customized products in mechanical, aerospace, automotive, biomedical, energy, and industrial engineering applications. The present study examines 3D printing-based approaches for customized engineering components by analyzing major additive manufacturing processes, material considerations, design strategies, process optimization techniques, and application-oriented performance requirements. The study adopts a structured analytical methodology based on secondary technical literature and comparative evaluation of established additive manufacturing approaches.

Particular attention is given to fused filament fabrication, selective laser sintering, stereolithography, selective laser melting, and related technologies because of their relevance to customized component development. The analysis indicates that 3D printing provides significant advantages in geometric freedom, rapid prototyping, low-volume production, mass customization, and design integration. However, manufacturing accuracy, surface quality, anisotropic mechanical behavior, material limitations, process repeatability, and post-processing requirements remain important challenges. Effective customization therefore requires an integrated approach involving digital design optimization, material selection, process parameter control, quality inspection, and application-specific validation. The study further identifies emerging research directions involving artificial intelligence-assisted process optimization, multi-material printing, hybrid manufacturing, functional integration, digital twins, and sustainable additive manufacturing. The findings demonstrate that 3D printing can serve as a strategic engineering production approach when its technological capabilities are aligned with component requirements, production constraints, and performance objectives.

Keywords: 3D Printing, Additive Manufacturing, Customized Components, Engineering Design, Rapid Prototyping, Material Optimization, Digital Manufacturing, Process Optimization

1. Introduction

The increasing demand for customized engineering products has encouraged manufacturers and researchers to explore production technologies capable of generating complex components without extensive tooling requirements. Traditional manufacturing systems are highly effective for standardized,

high-volume production but may become less economical when components require individualized geometries, small production batches, or frequent design modifications. Three-dimensional printing, commonly referred to as additive manufacturing, addresses several of these limitations by constructing components directly from digital models through layer-by-layer fabrication. This approach provides engineers with greater freedom to develop geometries that may be difficult or expensive to manufacture through conventional processes.

3D printing has progressed from a rapid prototyping technology into a broader manufacturing platform capable of supporting functional component production. Modern additive manufacturing systems employ polymers, metals, ceramics, composites, and other specialized materials according to application requirements. Technologies such as fused filament fabrication, stereolithography, selective laser sintering, and metal powder-bed fusion provide different combinations of dimensional accuracy, mechanical performance, production speed, and surface quality. The selection of an appropriate printing process is therefore strongly dependent on component geometry, material characteristics, functional requirements, and economic considerations.

Customization represents one of the most significant advantages of additive manufacturing. Digital production allows component dimensions and geometries to be modified without requiring substantial changes to physical tooling. Engineers can consequently develop products tailored to individual applications, operating environments, and performance requirements. Lightweight lattice structures, conformal cooling channels, topology-optimized components, customized fixtures, and application-specific mechanical parts illustrate how additive manufacturing can support design personalization. The integration of computer-aided design, simulation, scanning, and digital manufacturing further strengthens this capability.

Despite these advantages, customized 3D-printed components continue to experience technical limitations. Dimensional deviations, surface roughness, porosity, residual stresses, thermal distortion, weak interlayer bonding, and process variability can affect final component performance. Material behavior may also differ according to printing orientation and processing conditions, creating anisotropic properties that must be considered during engineering design. Consequently, successful customization cannot depend solely on geometric freedom; it requires systematic control of the complete digital-to-physical manufacturing process.

The development of intelligent additive manufacturing is creating additional opportunities for customized engineering production. Artificial intelligence, machine learning, digital twins, in-process monitoring, automated inspection, and advanced simulation can improve process reliability and component quality. At the same time, hybrid manufacturing approaches that combine additive and subtractive processes can address limitations associated with surface finish and dimensional precision. This study therefore evaluates 3D printing-based approaches for customized engineering components, emphasizing technological capabilities, material and design considerations, process optimization, applications, challenges, future research opportunities, and limitations.

2. Objectives

The primary objective of this study is to examine the technological approaches used for producing customized engineering components through 3D printing. The study focuses on understanding how additive manufacturing processes, materials, digital design techniques, and process optimization strategies contribute to component customization, manufacturing efficiency, and functional performance.

2.1 Evaluate Additive Manufacturing Technologies

The first objective is to evaluate major 3D printing technologies used for customized engineering components. Different processes provide distinct advantages in terms of material compatibility, dimensional accuracy, manufacturing speed, geometric freedom, and mechanical performance. Understanding these differences is essential for selecting an appropriate manufacturing approach according to component requirements.

The study also considers how process-specific characteristics influence customized production. Polymer-based processes may be suitable for prototypes and lightweight components, whereas metal additive manufacturing can support demanding structural applications. Process selection therefore requires simultaneous consideration of geometry, material, accuracy, performance, and production requirements.

2.2 Examine Design and Process Optimization

The second objective is to examine design and process optimization strategies that improve the performance and reliability of customized 3D-printed components. Digital design tools can enable topology optimization, lattice structures, integrated geometries, and weight reduction while maintaining functional requirements.

The study further evaluates the importance of printing parameters, build orientation, layer thickness, thermal conditions, support structures, and post-processing. Optimizing these variables can reduce manufacturing defects and improve dimensional accuracy, mechanical properties, and surface quality.

3. Literature Review

3.1 Development of 3D Printing in Engineering Manufacturing

Additive manufacturing has evolved significantly since its initial application in rapid prototyping. Early systems primarily focused on producing visual models and prototypes, whereas modern systems increasingly support functional component production. Gibson et al. identified additive manufacturing as a broad family of technologies capable of converting digital design information into physical objects through successive material addition. This principle has enabled manufacturing systems to move toward greater design flexibility and digital integration.

The engineering significance of additive manufacturing is closely associated with its ability to fabricate geometries that are difficult to produce through conventional manufacturing. Complex internal channels, lattice structures, topology-optimized components, and integrated assemblies can often be produced with fewer manufacturing constraints. This has particularly benefited aerospace and automotive engineering, where weight reduction and functional integration are important design objectives.

3.2 Technologies and Materials for Customized Components

Several additive manufacturing technologies are relevant to customized engineering production. Fused filament fabrication is widely used because of its relatively low equipment cost and broad polymer availability. Stereolithography provides high-resolution polymer components and is particularly valuable where dimensional detail is important. Selective laser sintering can manufacture polymeric components

without extensive support structures, while metal powder-bed fusion technologies provide opportunities for producing high-performance metallic components.

Material selection directly influences the quality and functional performance of printed components. Thermoplastics such as ABS, PLA, nylon, and advanced engineering polymers provide different combinations of strength, stiffness, thermal resistance, and durability. Metals such as titanium, aluminum, stainless steel, and nickel-based alloys are used for more demanding applications. Material properties are also influenced by processing parameters and printing direction, making material-process compatibility an important consideration.

3.3 Design Optimization and Customization

Computer-aided engineering has become closely integrated with additive manufacturing. Engineers can develop customized components by combining CAD modeling, topology optimization, finite element analysis, and additive manufacturing simulation. Topology optimization can remove unnecessary material while retaining structural performance, whereas lattice structures can provide lightweight configurations with controlled stiffness and energy absorption.

Customization also enables functional integration. Multiple mechanical features can potentially be incorporated into a single printed component, reducing assembly requirements. Customized tooling, ergonomic components, fixtures, heat exchangers, and specialized machine parts can therefore be developed according to specific operational needs. This capability changes the relationship between product design and manufacturing by allowing geometry to be adapted to production without major tooling modifications.

3.4 Quality and Performance of Printed Components

Component quality remains a central concern in additive manufacturing. Layer-by-layer fabrication may generate surface irregularities, dimensional variation, porosity, residual stress, and defects associated with thermal cycling. The influence of printing orientation can also result in direction-dependent mechanical properties. These issues become particularly important when customized components are intended for safety-critical or load-bearing applications.

Researchers have therefore emphasized process monitoring, non-destructive inspection, optimized parameter selection, and post-processing. Heat treatment, machining, surface finishing, hot isostatic pressing, and other techniques can improve the final properties of printed components. Quality assurance must consequently cover the complete manufacturing chain rather than focusing exclusively on the printing stage.

4. Methodology

4.1 Research Design

This study uses a structured qualitative and analytical research design to examine 3D printing-based approaches for customized engineering components. The research is based on secondary technical literature, including academic publications, engineering studies, additive manufacturing research, and established manufacturing frameworks. The selected literature was examined to identify recurring technological characteristics, customization strategies, material considerations, quality factors, and application requirements associated with additive manufacturing.

The analytical approach compares different 3D printing technologies according to their suitability for customized engineering applications. Factors considered include geometric capability, material compatibility, dimensional accuracy, surface quality, mechanical performance, production flexibility, and post-processing requirements. The study synthesizes these factors to identify technology-selection patterns and major limitations affecting customized component manufacturing.

4.2 Technology and Material Evaluation

The study evaluates commonly applied additive manufacturing technologies, including fused filament fabrication, stereolithography, selective laser sintering, and metal powder-bed fusion. Each technology is considered according to its operating principle, compatible materials, geometric capability, and suitability for engineering component production. The evaluation provides a comparative basis for understanding how process characteristics affect customization opportunities.

Material evaluation considers polymers, metals, ceramics, and composite materials from an engineering perspective. Particular attention is given to strength, thermal resistance, dimensional stability, durability, manufacturability, and application suitability. The relationship between material properties and printing conditions is also considered because processing parameters can substantially influence the performance of final components.

4.3 Analytical Evaluation Criteria

The collected information was evaluated using the following criteria:

- Geometric complexity and customization capability
- Dimensional accuracy and repeatability
- Mechanical and thermal performance
- Material compatibility
- Manufacturing speed and scalability
- Surface quality and post-processing requirements
- Process monitoring and quality assurance
- Material utilization and sustainability
- Economic feasibility
- Suitability for low-volume and application-specific production

These criteria provide a structured basis for comparing additive manufacturing approaches and identifying their engineering applications.

4.4 Data Synthesis

The final stage involved synthesizing the findings into thematic categories related to technology selection, design optimization, material performance, quality control, customization, and industrial implementation. Comparative patterns were identified across the reviewed approaches rather than relying on a single manufacturing technology.

The synthesis also considered emerging developments in intelligent additive manufacturing. Artificial intelligence, digital twins, automated inspection, and hybrid production were examined as potential mechanisms for improving process control and component quality. The resulting framework supports a broader understanding of how 3D printing can contribute to customized engineering manufacturing.

5. Analysis

5.1 Comparative Performance of 3D Printing Technologies

The effectiveness of 3D printing for customized engineering components depends strongly on the selected manufacturing process. Different technologies provide different balances between accuracy, material flexibility, productivity, cost, and mechanical performance.

Table 1: Comparative Characteristics of Major 3D Printing Technologies

Technology	Typical Materials	Customization Capability	Accuracy	Major Engineering Application
Fused Filament Fabrication	Thermoplastics	High	Moderate	Prototypes, fixtures, functional polymer parts
Stereolithography	Photopolymers	High	High	Precision prototypes, customized models
Selective Laser Sintering	Polymer powders	Very High	High	Complex components, low-volume production
Metal Powder-Bed Fusion	Metals and alloys	Very High	High	Aerospace, automotive, industrial components
Binder Jetting	Metals, ceramics, polymers	High	Moderate–High	Batch production and complex geometries

Interpretation: Table 1 demonstrates that no single technology is optimal for every customized engineering requirement. Fused filament fabrication provides accessibility and economical production, whereas stereolithography is advantageous where fine detail is required. Selective laser sintering offers strong geometric flexibility because support structures can often be minimized.

Metal powder-bed fusion provides substantial opportunities for high-performance engineering components but generally involves higher equipment and processing costs. Therefore, customization requires technology selection based on the specific balance between geometry, material, precision, performance, and cost.

5.2 Factors Influencing Component Quality

The quality of a customized 3D-printed component is influenced by several interconnected variables. Printing orientation determines the direction of layer formation and can affect mechanical anisotropy. Layer thickness influences both surface quality and production time, while temperature and energy input affect material bonding and structural integrity. Support configuration can also influence dimensional accuracy and post-processing requirements.

Table 2: Key Factors Affecting Customized 3D-Printed Component Performance

Factor	Primary Effect	Engineering Significance
Layer Thickness	Surface quality and build time	Determines resolution and productivity
Build Orientation	Mechanical anisotropy	Influences strength and dimensional stability
Printing Temperature	Material bonding	Affects structural integrity
Energy Density	Melting and consolidation	Influences porosity and defects
Infill/Lattice Structure	Weight and stiffness	Enables functional customization
Support Structures	Geometric stability	Affects post-processing
Post-Processing	Surface and material properties	Improves final performance
Inspection	Defect identification	Supports quality assurance

Interpretation: Table 2 indicates that component performance depends on the interaction of design and process variables rather than on printing technology alone. Optimizing build orientation, layer thickness, thermal conditions, and energy input can reduce defects and improve component reliability.

At the design level, lattice and infill structures allow engineers to control the relationship between weight and stiffness. Post-processing and inspection further contribute to final component quality. Consequently, customized additive manufacturing should be managed as an integrated design–manufacturing–inspection system.

5.3 Engineering Applications of Customized 3D Printing

Customized 3D printing is increasingly relevant to aerospace, automotive, robotics, industrial machinery, energy systems, and specialized tooling. Aerospace components can benefit from lightweight structures and topology optimization, while automotive applications can employ additive manufacturing for prototypes, customized fixtures, ducts, and selected functional components.

In industrial engineering, customized tooling and production aids can be manufactured according to specific machine configurations. This can reduce lead times associated with conventional tooling. In robotics, 3D printing enables lightweight end-effectors, housings, brackets, and application-specific mechanical structures. The ability to modify digital designs quickly is particularly valuable where engineering systems require frequent customization.

6. Discussion

6.1 Design Freedom and Manufacturing Flexibility

The principal engineering advantage of 3D printing is its ability to translate complex digital geometries into physical components without requiring conventional molds or extensive dedicated tooling. This capability enables engineers to incorporate internal channels, lattice structures, topology-optimized

configurations, and integrated mechanical features. As a result, design decisions can increasingly focus on functional requirements rather than limitations imposed by conventional manufacturing processes.

Customization also improves flexibility in low-volume production. A manufacturer can modify a digital model and produce a revised component without completely redesigning the production infrastructure. This characteristic is valuable for specialized machinery, replacement components, research equipment, and application-specific engineering systems. Digital inventories can further reduce the need to physically store large quantities of specialized components.

6.2 Material and Process Considerations

Material selection is a major determinant of additive manufacturing performance. Polymer-based printing provides economical customization for many applications, but high-temperature, high-load, and safety-critical environments may require advanced polymers, metals, or composites. The compatibility between material and printing process must therefore be established before production.

Process conditions are equally important because identical materials can exhibit different properties under different manufacturing parameters. Thermal history, layer bonding, cooling behavior, and build orientation can influence mechanical strength and dimensional stability. Engineers should therefore integrate material characterization with process optimization rather than treating material selection as an independent design decision.

6.3 Integration with Digital Engineering

The increasing integration of additive manufacturing with digital engineering tools is transforming customized production. CAD systems provide the basic geometry, while simulation and optimization tools can predict structural performance and identify opportunities for material reduction. Digital twins can further connect virtual models with physical manufacturing processes and operational data.

Artificial intelligence may strengthen this integration by identifying relationships between printing parameters and component quality. Machine-learning models can potentially predict defects, optimize process settings, and support automated quality inspection. Such technologies can contribute to more consistent customized production, particularly when manufacturing systems operate with changing geometries and application-specific requirements.

7. Challenges

7.1 Dimensional Accuracy and Surface Quality

Dimensional accuracy remains a significant challenge in additive manufacturing because thermal contraction, material deposition behavior, layer formation, and machine calibration can produce deviations from the digital model. Surface roughness is also common in many printing processes, particularly where curved or inclined surfaces are constructed through discrete layers. These limitations can reduce the suitability of printed components for applications requiring tight tolerances.

Post-processing can improve surface quality and dimensional accuracy, but additional processing increases manufacturing time and cost. Machining, polishing, heat treatment, and other finishing methods may also introduce additional production steps. Effective process planning must therefore balance printing capability with the requirements of final component geometry and performance.

7.2 Material and Mechanical Limitations

Printed materials may demonstrate anisotropic mechanical properties because layer interfaces can behave differently from material within individual layers. Porosity, incomplete bonding, residual stress, and thermal effects may further influence strength and fatigue performance. These challenges are particularly important for components subjected to cyclic loading or demanding environmental conditions.

The limited availability of validated material databases also creates difficulties in engineering design. Designers require reliable mechanical, thermal, and fatigue data to ensure that customized components meet application requirements. Greater standardization of material characterization and process qualification is therefore necessary for broader industrial adoption.

7.3 Cost, Scalability, and Quality Assurance

Although additive manufacturing can reduce tooling requirements, equipment, material, maintenance, and post-processing costs may remain high for advanced systems. Metal additive manufacturing is particularly sensitive to equipment and material expenses. Production speed can also become a limitation when large numbers of components are required.

Quality assurance presents another challenge because conventional inspection methods may not always be sufficient for complex internal structures. In-process monitoring, computed tomography, laser scanning, and other advanced inspection techniques can provide greater insight into component integrity but may increase production complexity. Developing efficient and automated quality assurance systems remains an important engineering requirement.

8. Future Research

8.1 Artificial Intelligence-Assisted Additive Manufacturing

Future research should investigate artificial intelligence and machine learning approaches for real-time optimization of 3D printing processes. Intelligent systems could analyze temperature, energy input, deposition patterns, vibration, and imaging information to identify abnormal process conditions. Predictive models may subsequently adjust manufacturing parameters to reduce defects and improve consistency.

Research should also explore adaptive control systems capable of responding to changing component geometries and material behavior. Such approaches could reduce dependence on fixed process parameters and improve the reliability of customized manufacturing. Integration of AI with process monitoring could eventually support autonomous additive manufacturing systems.

8.2 Multi-Material and Functional Printing

Multi-material additive manufacturing represents another important research direction. Future systems may enable components containing materials with different mechanical, thermal, electrical, or chemical properties within a single manufacturing process. Such capability could allow engineers to produce components with integrated structural and functional characteristics.

Research is also needed to improve material compatibility and bonding between different materials. Reliable multi-material interfaces, predictable degradation behavior, and long-term performance must be established before widespread industrial deployment. Successful development could significantly expand the functional scope of customized engineering components.

8.3 Hybrid and Sustainable Manufacturing

Future research should further investigate hybrid systems combining additive and subtractive manufacturing. Additive processes can generate complex near-net-shape geometries, while machining can provide accurate final surfaces and tight tolerances. Integrating both approaches could provide a practical balance between geometric freedom and precision.

Sustainability should also become a central research consideration. Studies should evaluate energy consumption, material recycling, production waste, component lifetime, and end-of-life strategies. Sustainable additive manufacturing models should consider the complete life cycle of customized components rather than focusing only on material efficiency during printing.

9. Limitations

This study is primarily based on secondary technical literature and analytical comparison rather than experimental testing of individual 3D printing systems. Consequently, the findings do not represent the performance of one specific printer, material, or manufacturing environment. Differences in equipment configuration, environmental conditions, material formulations, and process parameters may produce outcomes that vary from the generalized findings presented in this study.

Another limitation concerns the rapidly evolving nature of additive manufacturing technologies. New materials, printing systems, monitoring techniques, and optimization algorithms continue to emerge. Therefore, some technological developments may progress beyond the scope of the reviewed literature. Future experimental studies should validate the identified relationships through controlled manufacturing trials, standardized mechanical testing, lifecycle assessment, and application-specific performance evaluation.

10. Conclusion

Three-dimensional printing has become an important technology for customized engineering component development because it provides substantial flexibility in geometry, material utilization, production configuration, and digital design integration. Unlike conventional manufacturing approaches that often require dedicated tooling and standardized production arrangements, additive manufacturing enables components to be produced directly from modifiable digital models. This capability supports rapid design iteration, low-volume manufacturing, lightweight structures, complex geometries, and application-specific component development. The analysis demonstrates that technology selection must be aligned with material requirements, dimensional accuracy, mechanical performance, production volume, and economic constraints.

The performance of customized 3D-printed components depends on the coordinated management of design and manufacturing parameters. Build orientation, layer thickness, printing temperature, energy input, support structures, material characteristics, and post-processing can substantially influence component quality. While polymer-based technologies provide accessible and economical customization, advanced metal and composite additive manufacturing systems offer greater opportunities for demanding engineering applications. However, anisotropic mechanical behavior, dimensional variation, surface roughness, residual stress, porosity, material limitations, and quality assurance remain significant barriers to widespread adoption.

Future development is likely to involve greater integration of artificial intelligence, digital twins, automated inspection, multi-material printing, hybrid manufacturing, and sustainable production

methods. These technologies can improve process adaptability, quality control, functional integration, and resource efficiency. Nevertheless, successful industrial implementation requires reliable standards, validated material databases, process qualification, and application-specific testing. Overall, 3D printing should not be viewed merely as an alternative production technique but as a digital engineering approach capable of connecting customized design, intelligent manufacturing, and advanced component performance. Its long-term value will depend on the ability of engineering organizations to integrate additive manufacturing into broader design, production, quality, and sustainability strategies.

References

1. Fianko, S. K., Dzogbewu, T. C., Agbamava, E., & de Beer, D. J. (2025). Mass customisation strategies in additive manufacturing: A systematic review and implementation framework. *Processes*, 13(6), 1855. <https://doi.org/10.3390/pr13061855>
2. Yang, J., Liu, H., Cai, G., & Jin, H. (2025). Additive manufacturing and influencing factors of lattice structures: A review. *Materials*, 18(7), 1397. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ma18071397>
3. Dalpadulo, E., Guazzini, L., & Leali, F. (2025). Towards design automation of topology optimized parts: Assessment of shape and parametric optimization-based methods. *The International Journal of Advanced Manufacturing Technology*, 141, 1329–1345. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00170-025-16725-y>
4. Favi, C., Murgese, L., Villazzi, N., Gallozzi, S., Mandolini, M., & Marconi, M. (2025). Integrating life cycle engineering into design for additive manufacturing: A review. *Journal of Manufacturing Systems*, 82, 599–631. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmsy.2025.07.010>
5. Goh, G. D., Wong, K. K., Tan, N., Seet, H. L., & Nai, M. L. S. (2024). Large-format additive manufacturing of polymers: A review of fabrication processes, materials, and design. *Virtual and Physical Prototyping*, 19(1), e2336160. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17452759.2024.2336160>
6. Liu, S., Li, Q., Hu, J., Chen, W., Zhang, Y., Luo, Y., & Wang, Q. (2024). A survey of topology optimization methods considering manufacturable structural feature constraints for additive manufacturing structures. *Additive Manufacturing Frontiers*, 3(2), 200143. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amf.2024.200143>
7. Alli, Y. A., Anuar, H., Manshor, M. R., Okafor, C. E., Kamarulzaman, A. F., Akçakale, N., Mohd Nazeri, F. N., Bodaghi, M., Suhr, J., & Mohd Nasir, N. A. (2024). Optimization of 4D/3D printing via machine learning: A systematic review. *Hybrid Advances*, 6, 100242. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hybadv.2024.100242>
8. Khalid, M. Y., Arif, Z. U., Tariq, A., Hossain, M., Umer, R., & Bodaghi, M. (2024). 3D printing of active mechanical metamaterials: A critical review. *Materials & Design*, 246, 113305. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.matdes.2024.113305>
9. Gobena, S. T., & Woldeyohannes, A. D. (2024). Comparative review on the application of smart material in additive manufacturing: 3D and 4D printing. *Discover Applied Sciences*, 6, 353. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42452-024-05999-8>
10. Elhadad, A. A., Rosa-Sainz, A., Cañete-Yaque, R., Peralta, E., Begines Ruiz, B., Balbuena, M., Alcudia Cruz, A., & Torres Hernández, Y. (2023). Applications and multidisciplinary perspective on 3D printing techniques: Recent developments and future trends. *Materials Science and Engineering: R: Reports*, 156, 100760. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mser.2023.100760>

11. Ciccone, F., Bacciaglia, A., & Ceruti, A. (2023). Optimization with artificial intelligence in additive manufacturing: A systematic review. *Journal of the Brazilian Society of Mechanical Sciences and Engineering*, 45, 303. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40430-023-04200-2>
12. Kharat, V. J., Singh, P., Sharath Raju, G., Kumar Yadav, D., Satyanarayana Gupta, M., Arun, V., Hussein Majeed, A., & Singh, N. (2023). Additive manufacturing (3D printing): A review of materials, methods, applications and challenges. *Materials Today: Proceedings*, 104, 1871–1880. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.matpr.2023.11.033>
13. Nandhakumar, R., & Venkatesan, K. (2023). A process parameters review on selective laser melting-based additive manufacturing of single and multi-material: Microstructure, physical properties, tribological, and surface roughness. *Materials Today Communications*, 35, 105538. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mtcomm.2023.105538>
14. Lacroix, R., Timonina-Farkas, A., & Seifert, R. W. (2023). Utilizing additive manufacturing and mass customization under capacity constraints. *Journal of Intelligent Manufacturing*, 34, 281–301. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10845-022-02007-x>
15. Fuchs, D., Bartz, R., Kuschmitz, S., & Vietor, T. (2022). Necessary advances in computer-aided design to leverage on additive manufacturing design freedom. *The International Journal on Interactive Design and Manufacturing*, 16, 1633–1651. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12008-022-00888-z>
16. Feldhausen, T., Heinrich, L., Saleeby, K., Burl, A., Post, B., MacDonald, E., Saldana, C., & Love, L. (2022). Review of computer-aided manufacturing (CAM) strategies for hybrid directed energy deposition. *Additive Manufacturing*, 56, 102900. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.addma.2022.102900>
17. Pal, A. K., Mohanty, A. K., & Misra, M. (2021). Additive manufacturing technology of polymeric materials for customized products: Recent developments and future prospective. *RSC Advances*, 11, 36398–36438. <https://doi.org/10.1039/D1RA04060J>
18. García-Domínguez, A., Claver, J., & Sebastián, M. A. (2020). Optimization methodology for additive manufacturing of customized parts by fused deposition modeling (FDM): Application to a shoe heel. *Polymers*, 12(9), 2119. <https://doi.org/10.3390/polym12092119>
19. Vaneker, T., Bernard, A., Moroni, G., Gibson, I., & Zhang, Y. (2020). Design for additive manufacturing: Framework and methodology. *CIRP Annals*, 69(2), 578–599. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cirp.2020.05.006>
20. Zolfagharian, A., Lakhi, M., Ranjbar, S., & Bodaghi, M. (2021). Custom shoe sole design and modeling toward 3D printing. *International Journal of Bioprinting*, 7(4), 396. <https://doi.org/10.18063/ijb.v7i4.396>