

Programming Anisotropy in 4D-Printed Liquid-Crystal Elastomers

Director Alignment, Vat-Photopolymerisation Routes, Actuation Fidelity and Drift

Juan Segurola

3Dresyns by Resyner Technologies S.L.

© 2026 Juan Segurola. All Rights Reserved.

ER-199 · Engineering Review · Version 0.2 · 14 September 2026

Correspondence: info@3Dresyns.com · www.3Dresyns.com

Statement of Significance

The useful output of a printed liquid-crystal elastomer is not a shape change alone. It is a reproducible relationship between a prescribed director field, the orientation actually retained after printing and locking, and the transformation measured over a declared stimulus history. ER-199 treats anisotropy as a manufactured state variable. It separates geometric resolution from alignment resolution, distinguishes in-process from post-print programming, and requires local orientation evidence, transformation-error measurements and cyclic drift to be reported together. This qualification approach supports public scientific assessment without exposing commercially actionable resin formulations or compensation rules.

Abstract

Four-dimensional printing of liquid-crystal elastomers combines geometry, anisotropic molecular order and stimulus-dependent mechanics. A successful demonstration can nevertheless conceal several different failures: the printed geometry may be accurate while the director field is wrong; a director field may be present but spatially blurred; a first thermal transformation may resemble the target while later cycles drift; or a programmed shape may result from structural compliance rather than the intended local anisotropy. Primary studies show that orientation may be encoded through extrusion flow, surface shear, electric or magnetic fields, or post-print mechanical deformation followed by a second locking reaction [1–5]. These routes do not create equivalent material states and cannot be qualified by one universal processing parameter. ER-199 proposes a route-neutral engineering framework based on a declared target director field, independent measurement of local orientation, registration between orientation and printed coordinates, state-matched actuation tests, full-field transformation error, repeatability and drift. The framework distinguishes voxel or geometric resolution from alignment-domain resolution and separates material-level anisotropy from device-level soft-robotics performance. It deliberately withholds component identities, concentrations, exposure schedules, field strengths, alignment-time rules and compensation algorithms. The result is a bounded method for deciding whether programmed anisotropy has been manufactured and retained, rather than inferred from an attractive motion.

Keywords: liquid-crystal elastomer; 4D printing; director alignment; anisotropy; vat photopolymerisation; digital light processing; actuation fidelity; repeatability; drift

1. Scope and controlling identity

ER-199 owns alignment programming, print-route constraints, local anisotropy, transformation fidelity, repeatability and drift in printed LCEs. Its engineering question is: how is mesogen or director orientation encoded, retained and verified through printing so that programmed transformation is reproducible rather than merely demonstrated?

The neighbouring boundaries are binding. ER-024 retains device-level soft-robotics actuation, compliance, fatigue and multimaterial constraints. ER-048 retains qualification limits for biomedical translation of 4D photopolymers. ER-063 retains dynamic-bond exchange. ER-199 does not rank commercial formulations, prescribe a production recipe or claim biological suitability. It addresses the material-and-process evidence connecting a target director field to a measured transformation.

2. The manufactured object has more than geometry

A conventional printed-part description may specify a three-dimensional boundary and a material designation. For an LCE, that description is incomplete. The relevant manufactured state also includes a spatial director field, an orientation magnitude or distribution, the phase and network state in which that orientation is locked, and the stimulus history under which it will be read.

The target should therefore be expressed as at least four linked objects:

1. the nominal printed geometry;
2. the prescribed director field or alignment-domain map;
3. the locking and reference state in which the director field is retained; and
4. the target transformation under a declared stimulus path and mechanical boundary condition.

Conformity of one object cannot establish conformity of the others. Dimensional agreement before activation does not prove director alignment. Visible actuation does not prove that the intended local field was produced. Agreement at one temperature does not establish the transformation path or cyclic stability.

3. Alignment routes are not interchangeable

Printed LCEs can acquire orientation before, during or after geometric fabrication. The route determines which variables are coupled and which evidence is needed.

In extrusion printing, coupled shear and extensional flows can orient the director along or within the deposited filament. Telles and co-workers linked ink rheology, nozzle geometry and process conditions to local orientation using modelling and in-operando X-ray measurements [1]. Their results show why a toolpath is not itself an orientation measurement: director order can vary within a filament and with the flow field even when the visible path is unchanged.

In surface-shear programming, deposited material can first be returned to a polydomain state, locally sheared according to a generated path, and then locked. Zhai and co-workers connected local alignment conditions to curvature programming and compared transformed surfaces with target geometries [2]. This separates material deposition from alignment encoding, but it also introduces registration, layer sequencing and time-to-lock questions.

Electric-field alignment during multi-photon printing can orient liquid-crystalline material in situ at small scales. Münchinger and co-workers demonstrated complex director distributions and also observed cycle-dependent deterioration in demanding structures [3]. The evidence is relevant to alignment verification and drift even though the fabrication scale and optical process are not identical to layerwise DLP.

Magnetically assisted DLP can combine photomasking with a controlled field orientation. Bischoff and co-workers reported spatially distinct alignment domains within and across printed layers and quantified boundary and anchoring limitations [4]. The effective alignment resolution was not simply the projector pixel size; interactions at cured boundaries and surfaces contributed another length scale.

Post-print mechanical programming takes a different route. Jiang and co-workers first printed a structure by vat photopolymerisation, then imposed deformation and used a second reaction to lock the associated orientation [5]. Here the CAD geometry, applied programming deformation and final director distribution are related but not identical descriptions. The method demonstrated reversible transformation and short cyclic testing, but its evidence does not justify universal transfer to other networks or programming histories.

These examples establish a taxonomy, not a recipe. Flow, surface, field and mechanical programming should be reported as distinct routes because each produces different gradients, boundary effects and uncertainty.

4. Define the target director field before inspection

The target director field should be fixed before the measured orientation map is examined. It may be piecewise uniform, continuously varying or defined implicitly through a target deformation and an inverse model. In every case the representation should state:

- the coordinate system and registration to the printed geometry;
- whether the director is treated as head-tail symmetric;
- the spatial sampling or domain size;
- the intended orientation magnitude or order, where relevant;
- treatment of interfaces, discontinuities and unassigned regions; and
- the reference thermal and mechanical state.

A colour map without these definitions is illustrative rather than metrological. Likewise, a CAD toolpath cannot be substituted for the target director field unless a validated transformation from path and process state to orientation has been demonstrated for the applicable material and equipment state.

5. Geometric resolution and alignment resolution

Geometric resolution asks whether the solid boundary or feature was produced. Alignment resolution asks whether adjacent regions with different prescribed orientations remain distinguishable in the cured material. The two limits can differ substantially.

For field-assisted DLP, optical voxel size, cure spread, field uniformity, alignment kinetics, surface anchoring and the influence of previously cured layers can all affect the smallest reliable alignment domain [4]. For extrusion, radial gradients generated inside a nozzle can remain inside a geometrically uniform filament [1]. For surface programming, contact footprint, path spacing, local shear history and registration across layers limit the encoded field [2].

Qualification should therefore use paired artefacts or measurements:

1. a geometric feature test that measures the printed boundary; and
2. an alignment-domain test that measures orientation magnitude and angular error across intended transitions.

Reporting projector pixels, nominal layer thickness or nozzle diameter alone does not establish either achieved limit.

6. Orientation must be measured independently of motion

The director field should be measured using a technique sensitive to orientation rather than inferred solely from the actuated shape. Depending on scale and material, appropriate evidence may include polarized optical microscopy, polarized infrared spectroscopy, wide- or small-angle X-ray scattering, birefringence mapping or another validated orientation-sensitive method [1,4,5].

No single method is universally sufficient. A method should be qualified for spatial resolution, sampling depth, angular sensitivity, phase state and specimen geometry. Surface-sensitive evidence cannot automatically represent the volume. A line scan cannot establish a two- or three-dimensional field without a justified sampling design.

The reported result should distinguish at least:

- angular error relative to the local target;
- orientational order or dispersion;
- spatial transition width between domains;
- within-region variation; and
- unmeasured or low-confidence regions.

Where the measurement collapses through thickness, the limitation should be explicit. Apparent in-plane agreement may conceal a depth-dependent director field.

7. Locking and retention are separate from initial alignment

Alignment exists in a processing window before it becomes a retained material state. The route may lock orientation by photopolymerisation, a second chemical reaction or another network-forming step. Qualification must distinguish:

1. alignment achieved before locking;
2. alignment retained immediately after locking;
3. alignment retained after washing, post-processing and conditioning; and
4. alignment retained after stimulus cycling.

Loss between these states can arise from relaxation, anchoring, shrinkage, incomplete locking or further reaction. The cause should not be assigned without evidence. A single final orientation map establishes the retained state but cannot identify which preceding step generated any deviation.

The two-stage VPP study provides an example in which deformation-induced alignment and a later reaction were used to fix a programmed configuration [5]. That architecture demonstrates the need to verify both reaction separation and retained alignment. ER-199 does not reproduce its composition or processing conditions.

8. Transformation fidelity is a field comparison

The transformed object should be compared with a predeclared target over the region of interest, not judged from a selected photograph. Suitable outputs may include displacement fields, surface deviation, curvature error, angular error, strain fields or a task-specific geometric metric. Zhai and co-workers used digitised target geometry and structural comparisons to evaluate surface morphing [2], illustrating the value of measuring the whole transformed surface rather than only an endpoint displacement.

At minimum, the comparison should identify:

- the stimulus input and its spatial uniformity;
- heating and cooling direction, rate and dwell where relevant;
- constraints, fixtures and applied loads;
- initial reference state;
- full-field or spatially representative deformation;
- uncertainty and replicate structure; and
- regions excluded from analysis.

Actuation amplitude and transformation fidelity are different quantities. A large motion may have poor spatial agreement with the target, while a smaller motion may be highly repeatable and geometrically faithful.

9. Separate programming error from actuation error

When a transformation misses its target, the error can enter at several stages:

1. inverse design or target-field construction;
2. registration of the field to the printed geometry;
3. physical alignment;
4. locking and post-processing;
5. constitutive response under stimulus; or
6. measurement of the transformed state.

A defensible study retains intermediate evidence so these stages are not collapsed. An orientation map before actuation helps separate alignment manufacture from constitutive modelling. Geometry measured before and after post-processing separates print error from programming distortion. Repeated transformation measurements separate stable bias from drift.

Model agreement should be tested on withheld geometries or director fields when predictive performance is claimed. Fitting a model to the same specimen used to demonstrate agreement establishes description, not independent prediction.

10. Repeatability and drift

Repeatability concerns variation under nominally unchanged conditions. Drift concerns systematic change with cycle count, time, storage, thermal history or accumulated strain. Both are required before describing a programmed transformation as stable.

The cycle protocol should preserve the full stimulus path and define the measurement point within each cycle. First-cycle behaviour should not be silently mixed with later stabilised response. Telles and co-workers explicitly used a later heating cycle after erasing thermal history for their comparison [1]. Jiang and co-workers reported consistent strain evolution over eleven cycles for one selected formulation and condition [5]. Münchinger and co-workers observed diminishing motion and eventual loss of discontinuous buckling over five demanding thermal cycles in one microstructure [3]. Together these results show that neither short stability nor deterioration is universal.

A minimum drift record should include:

- cycle-resolved amplitude and transformation error;
- zero-state or residual-shape shift;
- transition-temperature or onset shift where relevant;
- failure, delamination or visible damage;
- orientation evidence before and after cycling when feasible; and
- a declared stopping rule.

Claims must match duration. Eleven cycles can demonstrate short-run repeatability under the tested conditions; they do not establish service life.

11. Lot, build and position effects

The director field may vary between resin preparations, builds and positions within a build. A qualification design should treat these as separate variance components rather than collecting all specimens as interchangeable replicates.

For vat processes, position-dependent field strength, optical exposure, temperature, surface anchoring and prior-layer history may create spatial effects [4]. For extrusion routes, ink relaxation, temperature, pressure history and nozzle condition can alter the flow-to-alignment relationship [1]. Post-print mechanical programming adds fixture and deformation-field variation [5].

The public report need not reveal proprietary control settings, but it should state the number of independent material preparations, builds, positions and specimens. Without this hierarchy, narrow within-specimen repeatability can be mistaken for process reproducibility.

12. A route-neutral qualification matrix

The following evidence classes allow different alignment routes to be compared without forcing them into one process recipe:

Evidence class	Required question
Target definition	Was the director field and transformed geometry declared before inspection?
Route identity	Was alignment encoded by flow, surface interaction, external field, mechanical programming or another stated mechanism?
Registration	Is the orientation map registered to the printed coordinates and layer history?
Orientation	Was local direction and order measured independently of actuation?
Spatial fidelity	Are domain boundaries, gradients and unresolved regions reported?
Locking	Is retention through cure and post-processing demonstrated?
Transformation	Is the stimulated shape compared quantitatively with its target?
Repeatability	Are independent specimens and builds distinguished from repeated measurements?
Drift	Are cycle-resolved bias and degradation reported over a bounded interval?
Claim boundary	Are device performance, biomedical use and chemistry-specific conclusions kept outside ER-199?

A route may be scientifically promising while some cells remain unverified. The proper result is a bounded claim, not forced completeness.

13. Protecting proprietary know-how

A public engineering review can disclose the variables and evidence classes required for qualification without disclosing how a commercial resin or printer is tuned.

The public layer may state the alignment route, measurement method, spatial and cyclic test design, achieved uncertainty, domain fidelity and transformation performance. It may also state that formulation, exposure, field or compensation variables were controlled within a qualified window.

The following may remain proprietary: component identities and ratios, photoinitiator and absorber selection, exposure schedules, field strengths, alignment times, rheological targets, cure-depth compensation, post-processing sequences and inverse-design correction rules. If those details are withheld, the claims must be limited to the tested system. Independent reproducibility or broad transfer cannot be claimed without sufficient disclosure.

Know-how protection does not permit evidential substitution. A confidential orientation measurement may be summarised through a traceable aggregate result, but visible motion alone cannot replace it.

14. Minimum evidence set

A defensible claim of programmed anisotropy in a printed LCE should include:

1. a predeclared geometry, director field and transformed target;
2. the alignment route and locking sequence;
3. registration between print coordinates and orientation coordinates;
4. an orientation-sensitive measurement with stated spatial and angular limits;
5. separate geometric and alignment-resolution results;
6. evidence of retention after printing and post-processing;
7. state-matched full-field transformation comparison;
8. replicate structure across specimens, builds and relevant positions;
9. cycle-resolved repeatability and drift over a declared interval; and
10. explicit boundaries on transfer, lifetime and application claims.

An omission does not make the experiment valueless. It narrows what has been demonstrated.

15. Conclusions

Programmed anisotropy in a 4D-printed LCE is a controlled chain from target director field to retained orientation and from retained orientation to transformation. Geometry, alignment, locking, actuation and drift are distinct propositions. None should be inferred solely from another.

Primary studies demonstrate several viable routes, including flow, surface shear, electric and magnetic fields, and post-print mechanical programming [1–5]. Their different strengths and limitations support a route-neutral qualification architecture rather than a universal manufacturing prescription.

The core engineering record should combine local orientation, spatial registration, transformation fidelity, repeatability and drift. This evidence can be reported while commercially actionable formulations and compensation rules remain protected. The resulting claim is narrower than a general declaration of 4D-printing success, but more useful: it states whether the intended anisotropic material state was manufactured, retained and read reproducibly.

Related Engineering Review boundaries

The controlling ownership statement and all neighbouring boundaries are stated once in §1 and govern the whole review.

References

1. Telles R, Kotikian A, Freychet G, et al. Spatially programmed alignment and actuation in printed liquid crystal elastomers. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*. 2025;122(3):e2414960122. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2414960122>
2. Zhai Y, Tolley MT, Ng TN. Digital Programming of Liquid Crystal Elastomers to Achieve High-Fidelity Surface Morphing. *Applied Materials Today*. 2022;27:101501. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apmt.2022.101501>
3. Münchinger A, Hahn V, Beutel D, et al. Multi-Photon 4D Printing of Complex Liquid Crystalline Microstructures by In Situ Alignment Using Electric Fields. *Advanced Materials Technologies*. 2022;7:2100944. <https://doi.org/10.1002/admt.202100944>
4. Bischoff A, Jamshididana S, Miller Z, et al. Spatially Tailorable Liquid Crystalline Elastomer Alignment During Digital Light Process 3D Printing. *Advanced Functional Materials*. 2026;36:e22676. <https://doi.org/10.1002/adfm.202522676>
5. Jiang H, Chung C, Gracego AX, et al. 4D printing through vat photopolymerization of two-stage UV-curable liquid crystal elastomers. *Nature Communications*. 2026;17:1671. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-026-68370-y>

Competing interests

The author is Founder, CEO and CTO of 3Dresyns by Resyner Technologies S.L. The review intentionally withholds commercially actionable formulation and processing details. No comparative product recommendation is made.

Data availability

No new experimental dataset was generated. Source-access states and claim limits are recorded in the accompanying source ledger.

Copyright

© 2026 Juan Seguro. All Rights Reserved. No part of this work may be reproduced, distributed or transmitted without the prior written permission of the copyright holder, except where permitted by applicable law.