

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

EVALUATION OF DIRECT LIGHT PROCESSING FOR THE FABRICATION OF BIOACTIVE CERAMIC SCAFFOLDS: EFFECT OF PORE/STRUT SIZE ON MANUFACTURABILITY AND MECHANICAL PERFORMANCE

Claudia Paredes¹, Francisco J. Martínez-Vázquez^{1,*}, Hamada Elsayed^{2,3}, Paolo Colombo^{2,4}, Antonia Pajares¹ and Pedro Miranda¹

¹ Department of Mechanical, Energy and Materials Engineering, University of Extremadura, Avda. de Elvas s/n., 06006 Badajoz, Spain

² Department of Industrial Engineering, University of Padova, Italy

³ Ceramics Department, National Research Centre, 12622 Dokki, Cairo, Egypt

⁴ Department of Materials Science and Engineering, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA 16802, USA

* Corresponding author: Francisco J. Martínez-Vázquez E-Mail: fjmartinezv@unex.es; Tel: +34-924-289-300; Fax: +34-924-289-601.

1
2
3
4 **Abstract**
5

6 Bioactive ceramic scaffolds for bone regeneration consisting of a three-dimensional mesh
7 of interpenetrating struts with square section were fabricated via Digital Light Processing
8 (DLP). The ability of the technique to manufacture 3D porous structures from β -tricalcium
9 phosphate (β -TCP) powders with different dimensions of struts and pores was evaluated,
10 identifying the possibilities and limitations of the manufacturing process. Small pore sizes
11 were found to seriously complicate the elimination of excess slurry from the scaffold's
12 innermost pores. The effect of the strut/pore size on the mechanical performance of the
13 scaffolds under compressive stresses was also evaluated, but no significant influence was
14 found. Under compressive stresses, the structures resulted weaker when tested
15 perpendicularly to the printing plane due to interlayer shear failure. Interlayer superficial
16 grooves are proposed as potential failure-controlling defects, which could also explain the
17 lack of a Weibull size effect on the mechanical strength of the fabricated DLP scaffolds.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 **Keywords:** Scaffolds; Ceramic; Mechanical properties; Digital Light Processing
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1. Introduction

As the world population continues its progressive ageing, the need of restorative surgeries to reestablish the normal functionality of damaged bone tissue has increased [1–3]. Due to existing limitations of currently available techniques for the substitutive repair of large bone lesions with artificial implants, the development of biodegradable bone scaffolds capable of inducing bone regeneration is presently a recurring research subject. Among these studies, the use of different Additive Manufacturing (AM) techniques to fabricate these bioactive porous substrates has received increasing attention due to their extraordinary versatility and the geometrical control they provide both at the microstructural and macroscopic levels [4–6].

Biodegradable scaffolds must facilitate the interaction with the surrounding tissue, ensuring the migration of bone cells to their interior, in order to actively induce bone regeneration before their complete degradation [4]. This requires the use of materials with adequate mechanical performance and osteoconductive properties. Bioactive ceramics (such as calcium phosphates or calcium sulfate and bioactive 45S5 and 13-93 glasses, etc.) are often an ideal choice, due to their capacity to interact with the surrounding tissue and their similarities in composition to the inorganic phase of bone [1,4,7]. Among the calcium phosphates, β -tricalcium phosphate (β -TCP) is a preferred choice since it can actively induce bone ingrowth and has a most adequate degradation rate [4,8].

The downside of all these bioceramic materials is their low mechanical performance in terms of brittleness and strength [9]. The latter is especially compromised when fabricating scaffolds with high porosity levels [10]. Digital Light Processing (DLP), among other AM techniques, enables the fabrication of complex structures with very high resolutions and

1
2
3
4 shorter printing times [11,12]. This not only allows the scaffolds fabricated by DLP to
5
6 perfectly fit the patient's lesion, but also provides a singular level of control on the size and
7
8 distribution of their interconnected pores leading to higher load bearing capacities, as
9
10 demonstrated in scaffolds fabricated by different AM techniques [6,13–15].
11
12
13

14 DLP as its sister AM technique, stereolithography (SLA), is based on the crosslinking of a
15
16 photosensitive liquid resin selectively induced by a source of light with the appropriate
17
18 wavelength in the UV or visible range [12,16]. While SLA uses a UV-laser to cure the resin
19
20 point-by-point, DLP systems use a UV-visible light projector to cure a whole layer of the
21
22 part by sequentially projecting onto the resin the images of the different cross sections that
23
24 make up the structure [12,16]. Printed parts stay attached to the printing base, which can
25
26 move vertically towards and away from the resin vat, to let fresh resin flow beneath the part
27
28 after each layer is printed. Typical layer thickness ranges from 20 to 100 microns,
29
30 depending on the required minimum feature size and macroscopic architecture of the part.
31
32
33

34 Acrylic resins are commonly used due to their capacity to rapidly polymerize at room
35
36 temperature [17]. These resins are generally composed of **multifunctional monomers with**
37
38 **typically (meth)acrylate or epoxy groups**, a photoinitiator and a light absorber, whose
39
40 relation with the UV emission spectrum of the equipment must be optimized [17]. The
41
42 photo-absorber helps controlling the penetration depth **and the scattering** of the light, which
43
44 in turn determine the manufacturing resolution **in the printing direction (Z-direction) and**
45
46 **in-plane (XY-directions), respectively**.
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54 The fabrication of ceramic structures by this technique is possible by adding a ceramic filler
55
56 to the resin, thus creating a slurry whose organic component is susceptible to
57
58 polymerization when the light irradiates the suspension, trapping the ceramic particles in
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 place after the exposure [12,16]. The suspension viscosity must remain as low as
5 possible—a maximum value of 3 Pa·s is typically quoted, although higher values are
6 possible depending on the DLP printer configuration—to ensure its free flow during the
7 printing process [12,18], which limits the solid loading in the slurry. The low solid content
8 can potentially lead to cracking problems either when eliminating the organics present in
9 the printed part or during subsequent sintering, where it can also reduce densification, and,
10 thus, limits the mechanical performance of the final part. The refractive index of the
11 ceramic phase plays likewise a crucial role in the printing process since the inorganic
12 particles can interfere with the irradiation of the polymer by producing light scattering,
13 which decreases the resolution in the XY plane and the penetration depth of the radiation in
14 the Z direction. Therefore, optimal printing results are obtained when the refractive index
15 of the resin and the ceramic powder are similar [12,18,19]. In addition to affecting the
16 printing process, the concentration of the ceramic also determines the volume change
17 occurring in the structures when they are subjected to a subsequent high temperature
18 sintering treatment, which is necessary to impart the desired properties to the final parts.
19 Since the shrinkage will be lower the higher the powder concentration is, it is necessary to
20 reach a balance between the two conflicting requirements [12].

21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46 Despite the difficulties, the fabrication of bone implants by DLP using ceramic fillers in
47 photocurable resins is being pursued by many authors due to the great potential of this
48 manufacturing technique. Both bioinert ceramics, such as alumina and zirconia, [16,20], as
49 well as bioactive compositions such as hydroxyapatite or calcium phosphates [16,21–23]
50 and especially bioactive glasses [24–26] have been successfully fabricated by these vat
51 photopolymerization techniques (SLA/DLP). However, to date, there are no studies in the
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 literature dedicated to systematically evaluating the effects of pore and strut size on the
5
6 manufacturability and mechanical performance of bioactive ceramics scaffolds fabricated
7
8 by DLP
9

10
11 Thus, the objective of this study was the investigation of the effect of feature (pore and
12
13 strut) size on the fabrication and properties of β -tricalcium phosphate (β -TCP) scaffolds for
14
15 bone regeneration produced by DLP. In particular, the limitations on feature size imposed
16
17 by the printing process when using a ceramic/resin suspension were evaluated, and the
18
19 effect of pore and strut size on the mechanical properties of scaffolds with the same pre-
20
21 designed macroporosity was analyzed.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 **2. Materials and methods**

31 *2.1. Scaffold fabrication by DLP*


32
33 Commercial powders of β -TCP (Whitlockite OD, Plasma Biotol Limited) with an average
34
35 particle size of 2.36 μm , a density of 3.07 g/cm^3 and a refractive index of 1.63 [27], were
36
37 suspended in a commercial acrylic resin (FTD Standard Blend 3D Printing resin, Fun To
38
39 Do, Alkmaar, The Netherland). The acrylic resin employed had a density of 1.13 g/cm^3 and
40
41 a refractive index of 1.5 [28], was unpigmented, but included suitable photo-initiators,
42
43 curing very quickly when exposed to UV-visible light, which speeds up the printing
44
45 process. However, this fact also entails certain limitations, since there is just a small
46
47 window to prevent overexposure, where cure depths do not match the desired layer
48
49 thickness. Therefore, a pigment was added to the mixture to act as a photo-absorber with
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 the aim of providing a better control over the curing process as highlighted in previous
5
6 studies [24,25].
7
8

9
10 To obtain a homogeneous suspension with suitable viscosity for printing, a centrifugal
11
12 planetary mixer (THINKY ARE-250) was used after adding each element to the mixture, in
13
14 intervals of 5 min at 2000 rpm. After the final composition was reached, further mixing was
15
16 carried out via magnetic stirring, for at least 12 h, on a hot plate heated to 50 °C. This
17
18 increased the stability and homogeneity of the mixture, yielding a lower final viscosity that
19
20 allowed increasing the solid loading. The slurry composition was optimized for the
21
22 fabrication of a scaffold with pore size (s_p) and strut size (s_s) (i.e. $s_p = s_s = 400 \mu\text{m}$), varying
23
24 the ceramic powder content in the resin from 40 to 60 wt.% and printing with different
25
26 exposure times and layer thickness values. As a result, the optimum powder concentration
27
28 **in terms of accuracy and reproducibility during printing** was established to be 50 wt.%, to
29
30 which 0.75 wt.% of pigment (Poinsettia, Squires Kitchen) was added to obtain the desired
31
32 control over the morphology of the struts edges. For that slurry, the optimal printing
33
34 parameters were an exposure time of 0.3 s for a layer thickness of 25 μm .
35
36
37
38
39
40

41
42 Digital models of porous scaffolds with cubical shape and around $6 \times 6 \times 6 \text{ mm}^3$ external
43
44 dimensions were produced using a CAD software (Creo Parametric 6.0, PTC Corporation).
45
46 The internal architecture had also a cubic symmetry with square-section struts in three
47
48 orthogonal directions intersecting at common points like a Cartesian 3D grid. Total porosity
49
50 was kept constant ($\sim 44 \%$ of the total volume) but the pore and strut size were varied:
51
52 $s_p = s_s = 300, 350, 400, 500, 600$ and $700 \mu\text{m}$ (Figure 1). These model feature sizes will be
53
54 used to identify each type of scaffolds throughout the manuscript. Specimens were printed
55
56 using the 3DLPrinter-HD 2.0 (Robofactory, Venice, Italy) that uses UV-visible radiation
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 with a wavelength in the range of 400-500 nm and an intensity of 10 mW/cm² [29] to
5
6 illuminate the bottom of a transparent vat and the printing platform suspended from the top
7
8 (bottom-up technology). Layer thickness (25 μm) was selected to match the curing depth,
9
10 and the models were appropriately sliced along the Z direction using the printer's software.
11
12 A combination of isopropanol, sonication and compressed air was the cleaning method
13
14 employed to eliminate residues of uncured slurry from the part after the printing process.
15
16 After cleaning, a post-curing treatment in an UV-light oven (365 nm, Robot Factory,
17
18 Mirano (VE), Italy) for 15 min was carried out to guarantee the integrity of the parts.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50



51 Figure 1. CAD-models used in this work for the fabrication of the different scaffolds by
52 DLP. Labels indicate their feature (pore and strut) size, which will be used to name each
53 type of structure throughout the manuscript.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 Fully cured samples were then heat-treated in a conventional Lenton chamber furnace
5
6 (Parsons Lane, Hope, UK). A two-stage treatment (debinding and sintering) was employed:
7
8 first, an initial heating ramp of 0.3°C/min was used to reach 500°C, a temperature that was
9
10 hold for 5 h to fully decompose the acrylic resin. Then, sintering of the ceramic samples
11
12 was performed at 1200°C for 2 h, with a heating ramp of 3°C/min.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 *2.2. Microstructural characterization*

21
22
23 Dimensional variations of the printed specimens with respect to the CAD file, due to light
24
25 scattering from TCP particles, as well as the shrinkage due to debinding and subsequent
26
27 sintering at 1200°C, were evaluated using a stereomicroscope (STEMI 2000-C, Zeiss,
28
29 USA) and a scanning electron microscope (S-3600 N, Hitachi, Japan). **A minimum of 15**
30
31 **measurements were done for each dimension at randomly chosen locations of the external**
32
33 **surfaces of the specimens.**
34
35
36
37

38
39 Apparent density values were estimated from weight and external dimensions
40
41 measurements using a digital balance and caliper, respectively. Considering that the pre-
42
43 designed macroporosity was around 44 vol.%, microporosity within the struts could be
44
45 estimated from these density measurements. Nonetheless, mercury porosimetry (Pascal
46
47 440, Thermo Scientific, Inc) was also performed at a maximum pressure of 330 MPa to
48
49 evaluate this parameter.
50
51
52

53 *2.3. Mechanical testing*

54
55
56 The compressive strength (σ_c) of the sintered specimens was determined from the
57
58 maximum load registered during uniaxial compression tests. The tests were performed on a
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 universal testing machine (Shimadzu Autograph AG-IS) on a minimum of 5 specimens per
5
6 type of sample. Loading was applied either perpendicular (\perp), or in the case of samples
7
8 with $s_s = s_p = 500 \mu\text{m}$, also parallel (\parallel) to the building plane at a constant crosshead speed
9
10 of 0.6 mm/min.
11
12
13

14 *2.4.Simulation by Finite Element Method (FEM)*

15 Abaqus/CAE software (2019 version, SimuliaTM) was used to perform simulations under a
16
17 compressive load in model scaffolds with an architecture analogous to that of the
18
19 specimens studied in this work. Geometrical models were developed from the CAD files
20
21 used for printing (see figure 1), but the strut intersections were rounded to better simulate
22
23 the actual scaffolds obtained after printing (Figure 2). Different curvature radii were used in
24
25 order to analyze the effect of such parameter on the resulting stress field. Tetrahedral
26
27 quadratic elements were used to mesh the whole structure with a maximum element size of
28
29 $100 \mu\text{m}$. A representative cell in the center of the structure was meshed with finer elements
30
31 ($10 \mu\text{m}$) in order to improve the precision of the results. An isotropic elastic behavior was
32
33 assumed for the TCP, and the elastic modulus was set to 36 GPa as in previous studies [30],
34
35 although the developed stress field is independent of this parameter for a structure made of
36
37 a single material, since only the strains change with the modulus. The Poisson coefficient
38
39 was set to 0.22. The boundary conditions were set by defining a downward displacement of
40
41 $100 \mu\text{m}$ on the upper surface of the scaffold in the direction perpendicular to that surface,
42
43 and a null rotation and displacement at the opposite, bottom surface.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

3. Results and discussion

Using the optimized composition of the slurry, layer thickness and exposure time indicated in the experimental section, scaffolds with different pore and strut sizes were printed to evaluate the effect of these parameters on their microstructural and mechanical performance. Figure 2 shows a representative SEM micrograph of an unsintered scaffold (after cleaning and UV curing) with 500 μm features size. In this image it is possible to visualize the individual layers stacking along the printing direction, due to the so called “stair stepping” effect typical of DLP and other AM techniques. Also, one can observe that the pores are completely open, the struts are well defined and no apparent delamination between layers exists. The main hurdle encountered in the fabrication process was the elimination of uncured slurry trapped inside the inner pores of the scaffolds, an issue that became harder to solve as the pore size decreased. As a consequence, scaffolds evaluated were limited to a minimum model pore size of 300 μm . This limitation found during the cleaning process could become very significant specially for the fabrication of large scaffolds or porous structures requiring high resolution and/or smaller pore sizes.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65




Figure 2. Printed scaffold with features size of 500 μm after cleaning and post-printing UV curing.

The dimensions of the unsintered samples (after cleaning and curing post-printing treatments) were very close (within measurement errors) to the dimensions in the CAD models, as that was the main criteria used in the optimization of the exposure conditions. As expected, however, the scaffolds shrunk significantly after sintering, as highlighted in the SEM micrographs reported in Figure 3, showing lateral views of a scaffold with 400 μm feature size before (Fig. 3a-c) and after heat-treatment (Fig. 3d-f). The microporosity that is apparent in the unsintered specimens is produced by superficial dissolution of the resin during the cleaning process and would not be found in the struts' interior. From these images, it is again possible to note that bonding between layers is apparently good, both

1
2
3
4 before and after the heat treatment, with no evidence of the interphases apart from the
5
6 roughness at the external surface (Figs. 3b and 3e), which allows for the identification of
7
8 individual layers.
9

10
11 Measurements of pore and strut size, s_p and s_s respectively, after the heat treatment are
12
13 reported in Table 1. The average linear shrinkage for all samples was almost isotropic and
14
15 computed to be 30 ± 1 %, as evaluated from their external dimensions before and after
16
17 sintering. This large shrinkage may become an issue for the fabrication of complex
18
19 structures, especially when dimensional accuracy is a requirement and the architecture of
20
21 the component is not homogeneous in each direction in space, for example when trying to
22
23 match the scaffold external shape to a specific patient's lesion. Small dimensional
24
25 differences were found between the printing plane (XY) and the layer stacking direction
26
27 (Z), with struts slightly thicker—and pores, hence, smaller—in the **stacking direction**.
28
29 These differences, while statistically significant, were small (< 5 %) and **typically** below
30
31 the selected layer thickness of $25 \mu\text{m}$, in any case comparable in most cases to the
32
33 experimental errors in the measurements. Therefore, they were neglected in subsequent
34
35 analyses by averaging dimensional data in all directions.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65




Figure 3. SEM micrographs of the surface of representative scaffolds with 400 μm model feature dimensions before (a-c) and after (d-f) heat treatment.

The aforementioned notable shrinkage after sintering was accompanied by a significant reduction of microporosity (cf. Figs. 3c and 3f). Apparent density, as shown in Figure 4, was very similar for the different scaffolds. However, statistically different values were measured in the case of structures with smaller feature dimensions (in the designed models): 300 and 350 μm. Specifically, in those cases the scaffolds were apparently slightly denser, by ~ 10 % and 6 %, respectively, than the average value for the rest of the cases; such average density was $1.44 \pm 0.06 \text{ g/cm}^3$, which corresponded to an apparent porosity of approximately $53 \pm 2\%$. Since, as mentioned in previous section, the designed macropores represent around 44 vol.% volumetric porosity, the rest would correspond to the microporosity within the struts. As a result, it was estimated that struts contained ~10 vol.% of pores in the case of 400, 500, 600 and 700 feature-size scaffolds, while in the 300 and 350 ones it would be ~4 to 6 vol.%, respectively.





Figure 4. Apparent density and total porosity for the fabricated scaffolds after sintering, with indicated model feature dimensions. Data represent mean values with standard deviations as error.

The result provided by mercury intrusion porosimetry for the microporosity of the struts was 26 vol.%, which corresponds to a 14.6 vol.% of volumetric porosity in the scaffold, which roughly agrees with the estimations (within the large uncertainties in all these estimations) made for the scaffolds with larger pores. Also, the comparison between both estimates seems to indicate that closed porosity, if any, is not very abundant since otherwise the mercury porosimetry estimation should lie well below the previously calculated value since only the open porosity is accessible to the mercury. In any case, both estimates suggest that despite the relatively large shrinkage occurring during the heat treatment, the low green density of the fabricated scaffolds still yielded a very significant level of strut


1
2
3
4 microporosity after sintering, and although this can be beneficial in terms of biological
5 performance of the scaffolds, it certainly limits their mechanical strength. The typical pore
6 distribution is shown in Figure 5a, corresponding to a scaffold with 500 μm characteristic
7 size, with most of the pores in the submicrometric range. These dimensions are in line with
8 the SEM observations of the microstructure (Fig.3f). The secondary maximum at larger,
9 micrometric pore sizes is attributed to surface roughness arising from layer stacking and
10 small superficial fissures that may occur during debinding.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20



21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44 Figure 5. Representative (a) volumetric pore size distribution in a sintered scaffold with 500
45 μm characteristic size.
46
47

48
49 Since microporosity within the struts does not seem to depend significantly on the scaffolds
50 feature sizes, the reason for the observed difference in density (Fig. 4) in scaffolds with
51 smaller feature sizes should be explained by a lack of success in eliminating the excess of
52 slurry from the inner macroporosity. This was confirmed by SEM observations of some
53 scaffolds' midsections, as the one shown in Figure 6 for a scaffold with 300 μm
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65


1
2
3
4 characteristic size. The additional ceramic material resulting from the sintering of the slurry
5 trapped in the innermost pores of the scaffold, which was not removed by the post-printing
6 cleaning procedure, is evident in this image. It should be noted that this ceramic residue
7 coming from the incomplete removal of the slurry was observed only in the scaffolds with
8 the smallest pore sizes (i.e. 300 and 350 μm).
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19



46 Figure 6. SEM micrograph of the transversal midsection of a scaffold with 300 μm feature
47 size. The ceramic material resulting from the densification of the slurry occupying its inner
48 pores can be observed.
49
50
51
52


53
54
55
56 Regarding the mechanical characterization of the scaffolds, firstly the most deleterious load
57 configuration was identified by performing uniaxial compression tests on scaffolds with
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 500 μm feature size along two orthogonal directions: perpendicular (\perp) and parallel (\parallel) to
5
6 the building/printing plane (XY). Representative examples of stress-strain curves for the
7
8 the building/printing plane (XY). Representative examples of stress-strain curves for the
9
10 two loading configurations and the mean compressive strength (σ_c) values obtained are
11
12 shown in Figure 7. When the load was applied in the perpendicular direction, multiple local
13
14 cracking events can be observed in the stress-strain curve even before approaching the
15
16 ultimate stress (Fig. 7a). However, when the load was applied in the parallel direction
17
18 failure occurred more abruptly with little sign of any previous damage to the structure.
19
20 Besides, the measured compressive strength (Fig. 7b) for the parallel configuration
21
22 (22 ± 4 MPa) almost doubled the value for the perpendicular configuration (12 ± 3 MPa).
23
24 In both cases, the strength of the fabricated scaffolds remained above or well within the
25
26 range of cancellous bone strength values.
27
28
29
30
31
32



33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48 Figure 7. (a) Representative stress-strain curves and (b) mean uniaxial compressive strength
49
50 (with standard deviation as error bar) for scaffolds with 500 μm feature size tested parallel
51
52 and perpendicular to the printing plane as indicated. The shaded band in (b) represents
53
54 typical values of human cancellous bone [31], for comparison.
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 Understanding why the scaffolds are weaker when tested in the perpendicular orientation is
5 not straightforward. One might try to attribute it to the dimensional differences observed in
6 the evaluation of the scaffold microstructure (see Table 1). However, while the struts sizes
7 evaluated in the printing XY plane were smaller than in the Z direction—which should
8 decrease the cross-sectional area that supports the load and make the structure weaker when
9 tested in the perpendicular direction—the differences would only account for a ~10%
10 increase in strength in the samples tested in the parallel orientation, far below the observed
11 83 % difference. On the other hand, when the stress fields developed during the
12 compressive test were analyzed by FEM, it was found that the maximum tensile stresses
13 concentrated along the edges created by the intersections of the struts perpendicular to the
14 loading axis (Figure 8a).




52 Figure 8. FEM simulation results for scaffolds under compressive loading: (a) Maximum
53 principal stress (normalized by applied stress: $\sigma_{max} / \sigma_{ap}$) contour plot and (b) maximum
54 tensile stress value in the structure (normalized by applied stress: $\sigma_{MAX} / \sigma_{ap}$) calculated as a
55

1
2
3
4 function of the radius of curvature at the strut intersections (normalized by strut size: r_c / s_s)
5
6 in the FEM model.
7
8
9

10
11
12
13 Consequently, as indicated in Figure 8b, the value of the maximum stress in the structure,
14
15 σ_{max} , is highly dependent on the radius of curvature selected for such corner, r_c , which acts
16
17 as a stress concentrator. Measurements of such curvature radii in the micrographs for the
18
19 500 μm scaffolds yielded an average value of $25 \pm 6 \mu\text{m}$ for the samples tested in the
20
21 parallel direction—in very good agreement with the layer height selected for printing.
22
23 However, a much larger $74 \pm 12 \mu\text{m}$ was measured for samples tested in the perpendicular
24
25 direction. The reason for that increase in the radius of curvature within the printing plane
26
27 could be attributed to the light scattered during printing from the exposed regions
28
29 corresponding to the two intersecting struts, which is enough to cause polymerization of the
30
31 resin at such corners. Consequently, the larger curvature of the edges within the printing
32
33 plane should reduce the stress concentration and, thus, increase the compressive strength of
34
35 the scaffolds (by $\sim 50\%$) when tested perpendicularly to that plane, not diminish it.
36
37 Moreover, this curvature would also increase the effective area supporting the load when
38
39 testing in the orthogonal direction, effectively countering the reduction in the area
40
41 associated to smaller struts.
42
43
44
45
46
47


48
49
50 Therefore, the explanation for the observed results must be found not in differences in the
51
52 stress fields developed under each loading configuration, but on the flaw population leading
53
54 to failure (i.e. the material intrinsic strength) in each case. The intrinsic strength of a
55
56 polycrystalline material such as β -TCP is typically an isotropic magnitude. However, when
57
58 the material is built layer by layer, as in 3D printing technologies such as DLP, a new
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 defect population may be generated at the interfaces between layers (and printing lines, in
5 the case of other additive manufacturing techniques such as Direct Ink Writing), which can
6
7 lead to a significant anisotropy in the material intrinsic strength [32,33] and toughness [34].
8
9 These fracture controlling defects cannot be, however, exclusively the interlayer surface
10 grooves that are apparent in Fig. 3, since propagation of cracks in mode I (preferred in
11 brittle materials) from those surface flaws would be more favorable when testing in the
12 parallel orientation. Layered structures are typically found to be weaker when tested
13 perpendicular to the stacked layers in compression because the presence of defects across
14 the whole interlayer favors shear-driven delamination [32]. Unlike tensile stresses, which
15 are localized exclusively at the surface of the struts (Fig. 9a), shear stresses remain high
16 throughout the struts' sections (Fig. 9b), facilitating crack initiation and propagation.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32



33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47 Figure 9. FEM simulation results for scaffolds under compressive loading: (a) Maximum
48 principal stress, σ_{max} , and (b) von Mises stress, σ_{Mises} , contour plots. Stress values have been
49
50 normalized by the applied stress, σ_{ap} .
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 These defects are not evident in cross-sectional SEM micrographs (Fig. 10), where
5 individual layers can be discerned only at the surface of the struts, even in polished sections
6 (Fig. 10d). Nonetheless, their presence might explain also why the struts dimensions were
7 slightly larger in the Z direction (Table 1). Moreover, the existence of interlayer defects in
8 parts manufactured by vat photopolymerization techniques (DLP) have also been recently
9 reported [35].
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21



36 Figure 10. Cross-sectional SEM micrographs of a scaffold fractured perpendicularly to the
37 printing plane (a-c) before and (d) after polishing. Layer grooves are evident at the surface
38 of the struts, but no interlayers defects can be found towards the strut's interior.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 According to this hypothesis, the reduction in strength when compressing perpendicularly
48 to the printing plane would be due to the generation of local interlayer shear cracks that
49 facilitate the progressive failure of the structure. The occurrence of these local cracks was
50 apparent already in the serrated stress-strain curves of specimen tested in the perpendicular
51 orientation (Fig. 7a), but is more clearly appreciated in the *postmortem* SEM micrographs
52 shown in Fig. 11. In this fractured specimen, the longitudinal cracking of the struts along
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 the intersections that was predicted by the FEM stress contours (Fig. 8a) are observed
5
6 perpendicular to the image. But, more importantly, it is evident that there is also extensive
7
8 fracture on the vertical struts (those perpendicular to the image in Fig.11a). Those struts are
9
10 fractured diagonally, as corresponding to a shear driven mechanism, with multiple evidence
11
12 of steps in the fracture surface (Fig. 11b) as expected from a laminated material with weak
13
14 interlayers. Indeed, micrographs taken in the transversal direction (Fig. 11c) show cracks
15
16 forming an hourglass shape typically found in this type of shear driven failure of laminated
17
18 ceramic materials [32]. Such failures can occur locally at much lower stresses than required
19
20 for longitudinal cracks propagation, and they reduce the overall structure resistance by
21
22 diminishing the effective area of the scaffold sustaining the applied load. This does not
23
24 occur when testing parallel to the printing plane where all the stacked layers support the
25
26 load until a longitudinal crack can propagate through one of the interlayers at the struts'
27
28 intersections. Of course, once that happens failure is catastrophic (Fig. 7a), but the stress
29
30 required for this crack to initiate propagation throughout the structure is higher than for
31
32 failure in the perpendicular orientation.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65




Figure 11. SEM micrographs of a fractured scaffold after a uniaxial compression test in the direction perpendicular to the printing plane: (a) Top view showing crack propagation both orthogonal to the printing plane but also diagonally through the vertical struts, with (b) evidence of steps produced by interlayer cracking and (c) hourglass shaped cracks in the transversal orientation, typical of shear driven failure.

Although, to the best of our knowledge, this anisotropy in the compressive strength had not been previously reported in the literature for ceramics materials fabricated by DLP, the magnitude of the weakening due to interlayer defects seems to be quite significant for the materials developed in this study. Indeed, it more than compensates the effect of the curvature at the struts intersections that would have tended to make the scaffolds stronger when compressed in the perpendicular direction. Instead, the structure resulted to be ~55 % weaker under that load configuration. These results indicate that ceramic components fabricated by DLP, regardless of their geometry, will be weaker when compressed perpendicularly to the printing plane due to interlayer shear failure. Minimizing the interlayer defects responsible for this failure should be a major focus of any future research aimed at further enhancing the mechanical performance of these components. Improving

1
2
3
4 densification through the optimization of the solid content in the resins' slurries and the
5
6 debinding process for resin elimination in each formulation should be beneficial in this
7
8 regard. Indeed, existing studies in ceramics materials such as alumina and zirconia, which
9
10 can be fully densified, fabricated by vat photopolymerization techniques report a much
11
12 more reduced anisotropy in their (bending) strength, and how this anisotropy diminishes
13
14 with densification and surface polishing [35,36]. Moreover, improving the stabilization of
15
16 the ceramic particles in the acrylic polymer, to avoid potential sedimentation during
17
18 printing, which would lead to a polymer-rich top region in each layer generating interlayer
19
20 porosity and delamination after debinding and sintering, should also be pursued. The effect
21
22 of other printing parameters such as exposure time and layer thickness should be also
23
24 analysed in detail in future work
25
26
27
28
29
30

31
32 Scaffolds for all remaining feature sizes were tested perpendicular to the printing plane
33
34 since this was the most deleterious configuration. Representative stress-strain curves and
35
36 resulting mean compressive strength values are shown in **Figure 12a**. All scaffolds
37
38 exhibited a brittle behavior and after the maximum stress was reached, the curve dropped
39
40 progressively down to zero, as expected. However, scaffolds with the two smallest feature
41
42 sizes were able to sustain the load for a much longer period after the peak stress thanks to
43
44 the denser core formed by the slurry trapped within the innermost pores. Nonetheless, as
45
46 shown in **Fig. 12b**, the compressive strength does not significantly ($p > 0.5$) change with
47
48 the feature size of the scaffolds and all values lay close to the upper limit of the cancellous
49
50 bone range [31], at an average value of 12 ± 3 MPa. These results suggest that varying the
51
52 dimensions of pores and bars, at least within the range of values analyzed here, does not
53
54 have any significant influence in the final resistance of the parts.
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65




Figure 12. (a) Representative load-displacement curves and (b) mean compressive strength as a function of scaffold's feature size (with standard deviations as error bars), as evaluated in uniaxial compression tests with the load applied perpendicularly to the printing plane. The shaded band represents typical values of human cancellous bone [31], for comparison.

This is somewhat unexpected since the strength of individual struts should typically decrease with increasing size according to Weibull's theory of fracture on brittle materials [37]. This size effect has been also previously reported in scaffolds by Sabree *et al.* [38]. but it is certainly not reproduced in the present work. The most likely explanation would be that fracture in DLP scaffolds is controlled by a population of large defects introduced by the fabrication process itself which does not vary with the scaffolds feature size. Surface grooves associated to layer stacking (see Figs. 3b and 3e) are certainly to be considered representative of such critical defects, in agreement with the proposed fracture mechanism through interlayer shear failure. Defects associated to the cleaning process could also be responsible for both this lack of size effect and the large scattering in the mechanical results. Indeed, the difficulty and, thus, the duration of the cleaning process increases as the pore size diminishes; moreover, a longer exposure to the solvent and air flows used during

1
2
3
4 cleaning could produce larger defects in the struts, which would mask the Weibull size
5
6 effect. However, no strong evidence was found neither in the SEM micrographs nor in the
7
8 porosimetry data available to convincingly support this latter explanation. Nonetheless,
9
10 clarifying this matter completely would require further research to corroborate the findings
11
12 in other systems and using larger datasets. Using ceramic scaffolds with a higher toughness
13
14 or improved green density may lead to lower scattering in the strength data which could
15
16 simplify the analysis of the size effect, which for the size range explored here might well be
17
18 within the data scattering in this work. In any case, the results of this study suggest that the
19
20 DLP technique allows for the fabrication of cellular components with fully open and
21
22 interconnected porosity, when printing with a design pore size larger than $\sim 400\ \mu\text{m}$, and a
23
24 known strength which would depend only on the amount of volumetric porosity and not on
25
26 the chosen pore size.
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 **4. Conclusions**

40
41 Ceramic suspensions for Direct Light Processing, obtained by adding 50 wt.% of β -TCP
42
43 powder as filler to an acrylic resin were successfully employed to fabricate bioactive
44
45 scaffolds composed of interpenetrating square-section struts with dimensions varying from
46
47 300 to 700 μm but with comparable volumetric microporosity. Elimination of uncured resin
48
49 trapped within the pores became a significant limitation of this technique in the fabrication
50
51 of scaffolds with small pore sizes: traces of uncured resin remained trapped in the inner
52
53 pores—even in pores as large as 350 μm —a problem that is expected to worsen with
54
55 increasing the size of the printed component. The low volumetric solid content ($\sim 25\ \text{vol.}\%$)
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 of the suspensions is also of some concern. Scaffolds fabricated here underwent a large
5
6 (30 %) linear shrinkage after heat treatment, which may become an issue for the fabrication
7
8 of complex structures, especially when dimensional accuracy is a requirement. Low green
9
10 density can also limit mechanical performance, especially in materials that are difficult to
11
12 densify. In the case of the micrometric TCP powder used here ~25 vol.% microporosity
13
14 remained within the struts after sintering. And although this can be beneficial in terms of
15
16 cell attachment and proliferation, it certainly limits the mechanical performance of the
17
18 structure. Besides, the results of the mechanical tests performed point towards the presence
19
20 of interlayer defects inducing shear failure in the structures under compression
21
22 perpendicular to the printing plane, which thus becomes the most deleterious loading
23
24 configuration for these scaffolds. Nevertheless, the compressive strength of the fabricated
25
26 scaffolds was comparable to that of cancellous bone [31], even when tested perpendicular
27
28 to the printing plane. Unexpectedly, the scaffold strength was found to be independent of
29
30 the strut and pore sizes, or at least the effect was undetectable within the data scattering.
31
32 This lack of effect could be attributed to defects of fixed size and location controlling
33
34 failure; these defects can be identified in the surface steps which are typical of this layer-
35
36 by-layer additive manufacturing technique (DLP). Future research should focus on
37
38 increasing solid content in the resins in order to minimize shrinkage and enhance
39
40 mechanical performance of the scaffolds and, of course, their biological performance
41
42 should also be assessed.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56

57 **5. Acknowledgements**

58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 This work was supported by the Spanish Ministerio de Ciencia, Innovación y
5
6 Universidades, co-funded by the European Regional Development Funds [grants RTI2018-
7
8 095566-B-I00 (MCIU/AEI/FEDER, UE) and MAT2015-64670-R (MINECO/FEDER,
9
10 UE)].
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 **6. References**

- 22
23 [1] M. Bohner, Resorbable biomaterials as bone graft substitutes An ageing population
24 and the democratization of high-risk sports have, *Mater. Today*. 13 (2010) 24–30.
25
26 doi:10.1016/S1369-7021(10)70014-6.
27
28
29
30
31 [2] H.R. Piehler, The Future of Medicine, *MRS Bull.* 25 (2000) 67–70.
32
33 doi:https://10.1038/scientificamerican0413-48.
34
35
36
37 [3] R. Langer, J.P. Vacanti, N. Series, N. May, *Tissue Engineering*, 260 (2008) 920–
38
39 926. doi:https://10.1126/science.8493529.
40
41
42 [4] S. Bose, S. Vahabzadeh, A. Bandyopadhyay, Bone tissue engineering using 3D
43
44 printing, *Mater. Today*. 16 (2013) 496–504.
45
46 doi:https://10.1016/j.mattod.2013.11.017.
47
48
49
50 [5] N. Travitzky, A. Bonet, B. Dermeik, T. Fey, I. Filbert-Demut, L. Schlier, T.
51
52 Schlordt, P. Greil, Additive manufacturing of ceramic-based materials, in: *Adv. Eng.*
53
54 *Mater.*, 2014: pp. 729–754. doi:10.1002/adem.201400097.
55
56
57
58 [6] P. Miranda, A. Pajares, E. Saiz, A.P. Tomsia, F. Guiberteau, Mechanical properties
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 of calcium phosphate scaffolds fabricated by robocasting, *J. Biomed. Mater. Res.*
5
6 Part A. (2007). doi:<https://10.1002/jbm.a.31587>.
7
8

- 9
10 [7] A.J. Salinas, M. Vallet-Regí, *Bioactive ceramics : from bone grafts to tissue*, RSC
11
12 *Adv.* (2013) 3, 11116. doi:<https://10.1039/c3ra00166k>.
13
14
15 [8] G. Daculsi, O. Laboux, O. Malard, P. Weiss, *Current state of the art of biphasic*
16
17 *calcium phosphate bioceramics*, *J. Mater. Sci. Mater. Med.* 14 (2003) 195–200.
18
19 doi:10.1023/A:1022842404495.
20
21
22 [9] I. D Thompson, L. L Hench, *Mechanical Properties of Bioactive Glasses*, *Glass-*
23
24 *Ceramics and Composites*, 1998. doi:<https://10.1243/0954411981533908>.
25
26
27 [10] V. Karageorgiou, D. Kaplan, *Porosity of 3D biomaterial scaffolds and osteogenesis*,
28
29 *Biomaterials.* 26 (2005) 5474–5491. doi:<https://10.1016/j.biomaterials.2005.02.002>.
30
31
32 [11] S. A Skoog, P.L. Goering, J. Narayan, U.S. Food, J. Narayan, *Stereolithography in*
33
34 *tissue engineering*, 2013. doi:10.1007/s10856-013-5107-y.
35
36
37 [12] Z. Chen, Z. Li, J. Li, C. Liu, C. Lao, Y. Fu, C. Liu, Y. Li, P. Wang, Y. He, *3D*
38
39 *printing of ceramics : A review*, *J. Eur. Ceram. Soc.* 39 (2019) 661–687.
40
41
42 doi:10.1016/j.jeurceramsoc.2018.11.013.
43
44
45 [13] S. Eqtesadi, A. Motealleh, P. Miranda, A. Pajares, A. Lemos, J.M.F. Ferreira,
46
47 *Robocasting of 45S5 bioactive glass scaffolds for bone tissue engineering*, *J. Eur.*
48
49 *Ceram. Soc.* 34 (2014) 107–118. doi:10.1016/j.jeurceramsoc.2013.08.003.
50
51
52 [14] F.J. Martínez-Vázquez, F.H. Perera, P. Miranda, A. Pajares, F. Guiberteau,
53
54
55 *Improving the compressive strength of bioceramic robocast scaffolds by polymer*
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 infiltration, *Acta Biomater.* 6 (2010) 4361–4368. doi:10.1016/j.actbio.2010.05.024.
5
6

- 7 [15] Y. Zeng, Y. Yan, H. Yan, C. Liu, *Biomaterials* 3D printing of hydroxyapatite
8 scaffolds with good mechanical and biocompatible properties by digital light
9 processing, *J. Mater. Sci.* 53 (2018) 6291–6301. doi:10.1007/s10853-018-1992-2.
10
11
12
13
14
15 [16] R. Felzmann, S. Gruber, G. Mitteramskogler, P. Tesavibul, A.R. Boccaccini, R.
16 Liska, J. Stampfl, *Lithography-based additive manufacturing of cellular ceramic*
17 *structures*, in: *Adv. Eng. Mater.*, 2012: pp. 1052–1058.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26 [17] V.S.D. Voet, T. Strating, G.H.M. Schnelting, P. Dijkstra, M. Tietema, J. Xu, A.J.J.
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
- Woorntman, K. Loos, J. Jager, R. Folkersma, *Biobased Acrylate Photocurable Resin Formulation for Stereolithography 3D Printing*, *ACS Omega.* 3 (2018) 1403–1408. doi:10.1021/acsomega.7b01648.
- [18] M.L. Griffith, J.W. Halloran, *Freeform Fabrication of Ceramics via Stereolithography*, *J. Am. Ceram. Soc.* 79 (1996) 2601–608.
- [19] A. Badev, Y. Abouliatim, T. Chartier, L. Lecamp, P. Lebaudy, C. Chaput, C. Delage, *Photopolymerization kinetics of a polyether acrylate in the presence of ceramic fillers used in stereolithography*, *J. Photochem. Photobiol. A Chem.* 222 (2011) 117–122. doi:10.1016/j.jphotochem.2011.05.010.
- [20] R. He, W. Liu, Z. Wu, D. An, M. Huang, H. Wu, Q. Jiang, X. Ji, S. Wu, Z. Xie, *Fabrication of complex-shaped zirconia ceramic parts via a DLP- stereolithography-based 3D printing method*, *Ceram. Int.* 44 (2018) 3412–3416. doi:10.1016/j.ceramint.2017.11.135.

- 1
2
3
4 [21] Y. Lee, J. Lee, W. Maeng, Y. Koh, H. Kim, Journal of the European Ceramic
5 Society Photocurable ceramic slurry using solid camphor as novel diluent for
6
7 conventional digital light processing (DLP) process, J. Eur. Ceram. Soc. 39 (2019)
8
9 4358–4365. doi:10.1016/j.jeurceramsoc.2019.05.069.
10
11
12
13
14 [22] F. Scalera, C.E. Corcione, F. Montagna, A. Sannino, A. Maffezzoli, Development
15 and characterization of UV curable epoxy / hydroxyapatite suspensions for
16
17 stereolithography applied to bone tissue engineering, Ceram. Int. 40 (2014) 15455–
18
19 15462. doi:10.1016/j.ceramint.2014.06.117.
20
21
22
23
24 [23] V.I. Putlyayev, P. V. Evdokimov, T. V. Safronova, E.S. Klimashina, N.K. Orlov,
25 Fabrication of osteoconductive $\text{Ca}_{3-x}\text{M}_2\text{x}(\text{PO}_4)_2$ (M = Na, K) calcium phosphate
26
27 bioceramics by stereolithographic 3D printing, Inorg. Mater. 53 (2017) 529–535.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35 [24] J. Schmidt, H. Elsayed, E. Bernardo, P. Colombo, Digital light processing of
36
37 wollastonite-diopside glass-ceramic complex structures, J. Eur. Ceram. Soc. 38
38
39 (2018) 4580–4584. doi:10.1016/j.jeurceramsoc.2018.06.004.
40
41
42
43 [25] H. Elsayed, J. Schmidt, Bioactive glass-ceramic scaffolds by additive manufacturing
44
45 and sinter-crystallization of fine glass powders, (2018) 6–10.
46
47
48
49
50
51
52 [26] R. Gmeiner, G. Mitteramskogler, J. Stampfl, A.R. Boccaccini, Stereolithographic
53
54 ceramic manufacturing of high strength bioactive glass, Int. J. Appl. Ceram.
55
56 Technol. 12 (2015) 38–45. doi:10.1111/ijac.12325.
57
58
59 [27] P.J. Scully, A. Baum, D. Liu, W. Perrie, Refractive Index Structures in Polymers
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4 Refractive Index Structures in Polymers, 2012. doi:10.1007/978-3-642-23366-1.
5
6
7
8 [28] p. 4-49 Lide, D.R. (ed). CRC Handbook of Chemistry and Physics. 72nd ed. Boca
9 Raton, FL: CRC Press, 1991-1992., No Title, (n.d.).
10
11
12 [29] O. Santoliquido, P. Colombo, A. Ortona, Additive Manufacturing of ceramic
13 components by Digital Light Processing: A comparison between the “bottom-up”
14 and the “top-down” approaches, J. Eur. Ceram. Soc. 39 (2019) 2140–2148.
15 doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeurceramsoc.2019.01.044.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22 [30] F.J. Martínez-Vázquez, F.H. Perera, P. Miranda, A. Pajares, F. Guiberteau,
23 Improving the compressive strength of bioceramic robocast scaffolds by polymer
24 infiltration, Acta Biomater. 6 (2010) 4361–4368.
25 doi:https://10.1016/j.actbio.2010.05.024.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32 [31] L.L. Hench, Biomaterials, Artificial Organs and Tissue Engineering, in: L.L. Hench,
33 J.R.B.T.-B. Jones (Eds.), Woodhead Publ. Ser. Biomater., 2005: pp. 79–89.
34 doi:https://doi.org/10.1533/9781845690861.2.79.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41 [32] P. Feng, X. Meng, J. Chen, L. Ye, Mechanical properties of structures 3D printed
42 with cementitious powders, Constr. Build. Mater. 93 (2015) 486–497.
43 doi:10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2015.05.132.
44
45
46
47
48
49 [33] E. Feilden, E. García-tu, F. Giuliani, E. Saiz, L. Vandeperre, Journal of the European
50 Ceramic Society Robocasting of structural ceramic parts with hydrogel inks, 36
51 (2016) 2525–2533. doi:10.1016/j.jeurceramsoc.2016.03.001.
52
53
54
55
56
57 [34] T.G.T. Nindhia, J. Schlacher, T. Lube, Fracture Toughness (K IC) of Lithography
58 Based Manufactured Alumina Ceramic, IOP Conf. Ser. Mater. Sci. Eng. 348 (2018).
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

doi:10.1088/1757-899X/348/1/012022.


- [35] J. Schlacher, T. Lube, W. Harrer, G. Mitteramskogler, M. Schwentenwein, R. Danzer, Strength of additive manufactured alumina, *J. Eur. Ceram. Soc.* (2020) 1–9. doi:10.1016/j.jeurceramsoc.2020.03.073.
- [36] M. Saâdaoui, F. Khaldoun, J. Adrien, H. Reveron, J. Chevalier, X-ray tomography of additive-manufactured zirconia : Processing defects – Strength relations, *J. Eur. Ceram. Soc.* 40 (2020) 3200–3207. doi:10.1016/j.jeurceramsoc.2019.04.010.
- [37] W.J. Weibull, A statistical distribution function of wide applicability, *J. Appl. Mech.* (1951) 293–299.
- [38] I. Sabree, J.E. Gough, B. Derby, Mechanical properties of porous ceramic scaffolds : Influence of internal dimensions, 41 (2015) 8425–8432. doi:10.1016/j.ceramint.2015.03.044.

Table 1. Scaffolds' feature (pore and strut) dimensions evaluated after sintering.


Model size (µm)	Strut size (µm)		Pore size (µm)		Average feature size (µm)
	XY directions	Z direction	XY directions	Z direction	
300	201 ± 12	207 ± 3	214 ± 6	200 ± 5	205 ± 10
350	238 ± 25	262 ± 6	252 ± 13	255 ± 9	251 ± 17
400	274 ± 3	276 ± 5	275 ± 10	271 ± 9	274 ± 8
500	344 ± 19	363 ± 12	386 ± 14	367 ± 16	365 ± 22
600	422 ± 20	446 ± 7	451 ± 10	432 ± 12	438 ± 17
700	467 ± 14	532 ± 14	540 ± 20	500 ± 9	507 ± 33

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65


Figure 1
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)




300 μm




350 μm




400 μm



500 μm



600 μm



700 μm

Figure 2
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)




Figure 3
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)




Figure 4

[Click here to download high resolution image](#)




Figure 6
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)




Figure 5
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)





Figure 7
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)





Figure 8
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)





Figure 9
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)





Figure 10
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)




Figure 11
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)






Figure 12
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)



1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Figure 1. CAD-models used in this work for the fabrication of the different scaffolds by DLP. Labels indicate their feature (pore and strut) size, which will be used to name each type of structure throughout the manuscript.

Figure 2. Printed scaffold with features size of 500 μm after cleaning and post-printing UV curing.

Figure 3. SEM micrographs of the surface of representative scaffolds with 400 μm model feature dimensions before (a-c) and after (d-f) heat treatment.

Figure 4. Apparent density and total porosity for the fabricated scaffolds after sintering, with indicated model feature dimensions. Data represent mean values with standard deviations as error.

Figure 5. Representative (a) volumetric pore size distribution in a sintered scaffold with 500 μm characteristic size.

Figure 6. SEM micrograph of the transversal midsection of a scaffold with 300 μm feature size. The ceramic material resulting from the densification of the slurry occupying its inner pores can be observed.

Figure 7. (a) Representative stress-strain curves and (b) mean uniaxial compressive strength (with standard deviation as error bar) for scaffolds with 500 μm feature size tested parallel and perpendicular to the printing plane as indicated. The shaded band in (b) represents typical values of human cancellous bone [30], for comparison.

Figure 8. FEM simulation results for scaffolds under compressive loading: (a) Maximum principal stress (normalized by applied stress: $\sigma_{max} / \sigma_{ap}$) contour plot and (b) maximum tensile stress value in the structure (normalized by applied stress: $\sigma_{MAX} / \sigma_{ap}$)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

calculated as a function of the radius of curvature at the strut intersections (normalized by strut size: r_c / s_s) in the FEM model.

Figure 9. FEM simulation results for scaffolds under compressive loading: (a) Maximum principal stress, σ_{max} , and (b) von Mises stress, σ_{Mises} , contour plots. Stress values have been normalized by the applied stress, σ_{ap} .

Figure 10. Cross-sectional SEM micrographs of a scaffold fractured perpendicularly to the printing plane (a-c) before and (d) after polishing. Layer grooves are evident at the surface of the struts, but no interlayer defects can be found towards the strut's interior.

Figure 11. SEM micrographs of a fractured scaffold after a uniaxial compression test in the direction perpendicular to the printing plane: (a) Top view showing crack propagation both orthogonal to the printing plane but also diagonally through the vertical struts, with (b) evidence of steps produced by interlayer cracking and (c) hourglass shaped cracks in the transversal orientation, typical of shear driven failure.

Figure 12. (a) Representative load-displacement curves and (b) mean compressive strength as a function of scaffold's feature size (with standard deviations as error bars), as evaluated in uniaxial compression tests with the load applied perpendicularly to the printing plane. The shaded band represents typical values of human cancellous bone [31], for comparison.

Declaration of interests

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

The authors declare the following financial interests/personal relationships which may be considered as potential competing interests: