

Release-Layer and Demoulding-Surface Engineering for Photocurable Processes: Interfacial Energy, Wear, Fouling and Transfer Fidelity

A coupled interface, optics, transport and lifecycle qualification framework for photocurable release surfaces

Juan Seguro

3Dresyns by Resyner Technologies S.L.

© 2026 Juan Seguro. All Rights Reserved.

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

ER-226 · Engineering Review · Version 0.2 · 19 September 2026

Abstract

A release film, coated vat window or demoulding surface in a photocurable process is a functional interface whose behaviour cannot be reduced to low surface energy. Separation force also depends on cured area and geometry, resin viscosity, degree of conversion, fluid drainage, lift trajectory, support compliance and deformation. Where the window controls light transmission or oxygen delivery, the release construction also alters cure and dimensional fidelity. With use, wear, scratching, swelling, clouding, fouling and additive depletion can change these coupled functions before catastrophic failure occurs.

This review defines a qualification architecture for release surfaces used in vat photopolymerisation, photocurable replication and adjacent demoulding processes. It requires identity, thickness, support, compliance, texture, optics and oxygen transport to be specified; separates adhesion, suction or hydrodynamic pressure, deformation and cure-shrinkage contributions; pairs separation force with part fidelity and residue inspection; and follows functional drift over counted cycles. Replacement is based on application-specific drift from a validated baseline rather than a universal cycle count. The evidence does not establish a commercial film, coating recipe, force limit, lift setting, dead-zone dimension, service interval or life prediction.

Keywords: release film; vat photopolymerisation; demoulding; separation force; oxygen window; optical transmission; wear; fouling; transfer fidelity

1. Significance and scope

The release surface is often treated as passive consumable hardware. In practice it is part of the optical path, fluid boundary, mechanical load path and chemical interface. A film may lower adhesion yet deform enough to change peel progression. A coating may reduce separation force while attenuating or redistributing light. An oxygen-permeable window may suppress interfacial cure but introduce transport and chemistry dependencies. Repeated contact can transfer resin, release agent or wear debris and can change fidelity before a visible tear appears.

ER-226 addresses qualification of release layers and demoulding surfaces for photocurable processes. Its central decision is whether surface identity, construction, interfacial chemistry, optics or oxygen transport, resin and cure, geometry and motion, cycle history and part fidelity jointly support continued use.

1.1 Corpus boundary

ER-003 retains nanoimprint material–process coupling, stamp mechanics, resist behaviour and demoulding energetics. ER-030 retains oxygen inhibition and free-surface or interfacial cure as cure phenomena in vat photopolymerisation. ER-040 retains general wear, tribology and surface-damage methods. ER-053 retains generic wetting and adhesion to substrates or build platforms. ER-226 is restricted to the release surface as a consumable functional interface, including its construction, coupled separation physics, optical or oxygen function, wear and fouling, residue transfer, fidelity drift and replacement criteria. It does not replace nanoimprint, cure-inhibition, tribology or generic-adhesion ownership.

2. Define the release construction

A release-surface record should identify polymer, coating or composite chemistry; manufacturer or controlled formulation; lot; thickness; support and bonding; modulus or compliance where relevant; texture and exposed face; optical transmission and haze at the process wavelength; oxygen permeability or transport function where relevant; conditioning; installation tension; and prior cycle history. “FEP”, “PDMS” or “coated window” is not a complete state description.

Li and co-workers described a composite PDMS/PET construction combining a low-adhesion surface, porous support and pressure equalisation [2]. Lee and co-workers examined a durable soft mould construction for repeated replication of a high-adhesion photocurable resin [5]. These studies show that chemistry and mechanical construction act together. Their materials and numerical results are specific to the tested assemblies and do not define a universal release layer.

3. Separate interfacial adhesion from hydrodynamic and mechanical loads

Measured separation force can contain contributions from interfacial adhesion, negative or differential pressure, viscous drainage, elastic deformation of the film or machine, cured-part bending and acceleration. The balance changes with cured area, feature layout, gap, viscosity, lift speed and acceleration. A lower peak force does not by itself identify which contribution changed.

Gritsenko and co-workers modelled the effect of time-dependent platform motion and acceleration on separation force for constrained-surface stereolithography [7]. Yang and Wu evaluated a spring-assisted mechanism whose compliance and trajectory affected force and dimensional performance [8]. Li and co-workers coupled low-adhesion chemistry with a compliant, pressure-equalising film construction [2]. Together, these sources support decomposing material, hydrodynamic and machine effects. They do not establish universal lift settings or force limits.

4. Preserve geometry, motion and resin context

Every force comparison should retain the projected cured area, perimeter, feature distribution, window size and support, initial gap, resin viscosity and temperature, conversion state, lift direction, displacement, velocity and acceleration, and the compliance of the part, platform and release assembly. Flat coupons can reveal controlled differences but may not represent distributed production geometries.

Gritsenko and co-workers distinguished flat and patterned boundary cases within a declared model [7]. Yang and Wu showed that machine compliance and motion strategy can alter both separation response and printed quality [8]. Therefore a material comparison should hold geometry and motion constant, while a motion study should hold the release construction and resin state constant. Pooling both changes prevents causal interpretation.

5. Couple oxygen transport to interfacial cure

An oxygen-permeable release window can maintain a liquid interface by inhibiting radical cure near the boundary. This is not simply a low-adhesion coating. Oxygen delivery depends on material permeability, thickness, concentration gradient, resin consumption and process timing. The inhibited region also depends on photochemistry, exposure and resin formulation.

Tumbleston and co-workers described continuous liquid interface production using an oxygen-permeable window and a persistent uncured region [1]. That publisher-abstract evidence supports the existence of a coupled oxygen-window process architecture, but not a universal dead-zone dimension, speed or operating condition. ER-030 retains oxygen inhibition as a cure phenomenon; ER-226 uses that phenomenon only to qualify the functional role of the release window. Qualification should measure or bound oxygen transport and cure response in the declared window–resin–exposure system.

6. Treat optical function independently from adhesion

A release surface in the exposure path can absorb, scatter, refract or spatially redistribute light. Thickness, roughness, clouding, fillers and coatings may alter dose even when separation force improves. Conversely, a highly transmitting surface may have unsuitable adhesion or wear. Optical and release functions therefore require separate acceptance gates.

Muniyandi and co-workers investigated a dual-functional coating intended to control interfacial adhesion and photon-regulated curing, with separation-force, Z-fidelity and repeated-cycle observations [3]. This evidence was inspected at publisher-abstract depth together with publisher supporting data. It supports independent measurement of adhesion-related and optical effects, not transfer of the reported superamphiphobic or quantum-dot–PDMS construction as a recipe.

Report spectral transmission and haze at relevant thickness and incidence, not only a broadband nominal value. Verify cure depth, lateral fidelity or another process-relevant cure endpoint after installing the release surface. A force reduction without optical verification cannot support a dimensional-fidelity claim.

7. Include cure shrinkage in demoulding interpretation

Photocure changes the contacting material while it is constrained against the release surface. Polymerisation shrinkage and modulus development can create normal and shear stresses, increase conformity to texture or change the stored energy available for separation. Surface energy and cure behaviour can therefore affect demoulding independently.

Kim and co-workers varied surface-energy-related chemistry and photocure shrinkage in a UV-imprint resist and observed their effects on mould-release force [4]. That result was inspected at publisher-abstract depth and belongs to ER-003's nanoimprint, resist-behaviour and demoulding-energetics domain. It is used here only to retain cure shrinkage as a separate variable; it does not establish a vat-film formulation, optimum or numerical limit.

8. Distinguish peeling, deformation and true release

Flexible films can separate through a moving peel front rather than uniform opening. This can reduce peak force while increasing local strain, cycle time or dimensional disturbance. Film tension, support porosity, clamping and thickness determine the deformation field. A compliant machine element can similarly reshape the force trace without changing interfacial chemistry.

Li and co-workers attributed part of the performance of a PDMS/PET construction to flexible peeling and pressure balance [2]. Yang and Wu evaluated spring-assisted compliance in a DLP mechanism [8]. Because reference [2] was inspected at abstract depth, only the stated construction–force relationship is used. Qualification should record the full force–displacement or force–time trace where possible and inspect the part and surface after release.

9. Treat the release surface as a drifting consumable

Repeated exposure to resin, radicals, light, cleaning agents and mechanical strain can change the release surface. Candidate mechanisms include abrasion, scratching, fatigue, swelling, extraction, additive depletion, coating delamination, resin fouling and optical clouding. Some changes are reversible by cleaning; others permanently change chemistry, texture, compliance or transmission.

Lee and co-workers inspected defect behaviour over repeated photocured-resin replications using a durable soft mould [5]. Yang and co-workers designed release-agent-retaining moulds and examined multi-cycle demoulding and residue behaviour [6]. Muniyandi and co-workers reported repeated-cycle stability for a dual-functional release coating [3]. These studies support counted-cycle monitoring, but their cycle counts and constructions are not transferable service intervals.

10. Inspect both sides for transfer and residue

Successful separation does not prove that the interface remained clean. Resin can remain on the release surface, and release material or mobile additive can transfer to the part. Thin residue may alter subsequent coating, bonding, optical or biological performance without obvious dimensional damage.

Lee and co-workers combined repeated replication with mould or replica defect inspection [5]. Yang and co-workers examined release-agent-retaining moulds and transfer-related behaviour across multiple moulded materials [6]. Qualification should inspect both the release surface and the produced face, using microscopy, mass change, spectroscopy or another method appropriate to the suspected residue. Transfer acceptance must be tied to the next operation on the part.

11. Track fidelity together with separation force

Low separation force is not the final product requirement. Dimensional error can arise from film deflection, part deformation, light attenuation, scattering, incomplete cure or damage during peeling. Relevant fidelity measures may include thickness, Z accuracy, lateral dimensions, edge quality, surface texture, feature survival and defect rate.

Muniyandi and co-workers paired separation response with Z-fidelity in a photon-regulating coating study [3]. Yang and Wu coupled a mechanical release aid with printed-performance measures [8]. Lee and co-workers inspected replication defects over reuse [5]. These sources support a dual endpoint: release mechanics and transfer fidelity must both remain acceptable.

12. Establish baseline and replacement by functional drift

A new release surface should be baselined after installation and conditioning using the actual resin, exposure, geometry and motion. Subsequent checks can compare force-trace features, optical transmission or haze, oxygen-dependent cure response, surface chemistry or topography, swelling or thickness, residue and part fidelity. Replacement is triggered when an application-specific acceptance criterion is exceeded, not when a universal cycle number is reached.

Cycle count remains essential metadata, but it is not a life model by itself. Exposure dose, geometry distribution, resin chemistry, cleaning method, idle storage and accidental contact can produce different damage per cycle. Where monitoring uses a witness geometry, its relationship to production parts should be demonstrated.

13. Build a non-compensatory qualification matrix

Gate	Required evidence	Unsupported shortcut prevented
Construction	Chemistry, exposed face, thickness, support, compliance and texture	Treating a polymer name as the complete release surface
Coupled process	Resin, conversion, geometry, area, viscosity, motion and force trace	Assigning every load change to surface energy
Optical or oxygen function	Spectral transmission or oxygen-dependent cure response	Assuming low force preserves cure and fidelity
Lifecycle	Counted cycles, cleaning, wear, swelling, fouling, clouding and residue	Declaring durability from initial release
Output fidelity	Part dimensions, surface, defects and transfer contamination	Accepting a release surface from force alone

The gates are independent. Low force cannot compensate for optical drift, and good initial fidelity cannot waive wear, fouling or transfer inspection.

14. Minimum reporting set

Report release-surface chemistry and product or controlled formulation; lot and exposed face; thickness, support, adhesion to support, texture and compliance; installation, tension and conditioning; spectral transmission and haze; oxygen permeability or functional oxygen-response method where relevant; resin identity, viscosity and temperature; exposure spectrum, irradiance, time, atmosphere and conversion endpoint; cured area, perimeter, geometry and feature distribution; gap and lift displacement, velocity and acceleration; force sensor, sampling and trace treatment; machine and film compliance; cycle count and idle history; cleaning and handling; wear, swelling, scratching, clouding and fouling observations; residue on both faces; part dimensions, surface and defects; replicates, uncertainty and application-specific acceptance criteria.

Every numerical result must retain release construction, resin, exposure and conversion, geometry, motion, support, cycle count and fidelity endpoint. No force, lift setting, optical value or replacement interval is transferable when those qualifiers change.

15. Knowledge boundary

The evidence establishes that release depends on chemistry, film construction, hydrodynamics and compliance rather than surface energy alone [2,4,7,8]; that oxygen-permeable windows couple separation architecture to cure inhibition [1]; that optical regulation and adhesion control require independent verification [3]; that release surfaces can drift over counted cycles through damage, residue or depletion [3,5,6]; that transfer contamination is distinct from successful separation [5,6]; and that machine motion can confound release-material comparisons [7,8]. These propositions are bounded against nanoimprint material–process coupling, resist behaviour and demoulding energetics retained by ER-003; oxygen inhibition and free-surface or interfacial cure retained by ER-030; general wear and tribology retained by ER-040; and generic substrate or build-platform adhesion retained by ER-053.

16. Limitations

The eight primary sources span continuous liquid interface production, a PDMS/PET release film, a dual-functional photon-regulating coating, UV-imprint resist release, durable soft moulds, release-agent-retaining printed moulds, constrained-surface stereolithography modelling and a spring-assisted DLP mechanism. Four sources, references 1–4, were inspected only at publisher-abstract depth; publisher supporting data were additionally inspected for reference 3. Their use is limited to propositions explicit at that depth. Four sources, references 5–8, were inspected at full-text or repository-full depth. The corpus has no common round-robin release surface, resin, geometry, motion profile, optical method or cycle protocol. It does not establish a commercial film or coating recipe, universal separation-force limit, lift setting, dead-zone dimension, service cycle, replacement threshold, acceleration factor or life prediction.

17. Conclusions

A release layer or demoulding surface in a photocurable process is a coupled chemical, optical, transport and mechanical interface. Its identity includes construction, thickness, support, compliance, texture and exposed face. Separation force must be interpreted with resin, conversion, geometry, hydrodynamics, motion and deformation rather than assigned to surface energy alone. Optical transmission and oxygen delivery require separate verification because they affect cure and fidelity. Wear, swelling, fouling, clouding, additive depletion and residue transfer should be followed over counted cycles on both the release surface and the part. Replacement is therefore an application-specific decision based on measured functional drift, not a universal cycle count or force threshold.

References

- 1 Tumbleston JR, Shirvanyants D, Ermoshkin N, Januszewicz R, Johnson AR, Kelly D, Chen K, Pinschmidt R, Rolland JP, Ermoshkin A, Samulski ET, DeSimone JM. Continuous liquid interface production of 3D objects. *Science*. 2015;347:1349–1352. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aaa2397>
- 2 Li Y, Deng Y, Chen Q, Kuzhandaivel D, Chen W, Wu L, Wang J. Flexible non-adhesive PDMS/PET release film for reducing separation force in bottom-up vat photopolymerization 3D-printing. *Applied Surface Science*. 2026;737:166876. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apsusc.2026.166876>
- 3 Muniyandi V, Mansoor F, Chen W, Li Y, Weng Z, Thirunavukkarasu N, Wu L. Decoupling Adhesion and Photon-Regulated Curing via Superamphiphobic and Quantum Dot-PDMS Dual Functional Coatings in Vat Photopolymerization. *ACS Applied Polymer Materials*. 2026;8:11084–11103. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acsapm.6c00950>
- 4 Kim BG, Jeong EJ, Kwon KH, Yoo YE, Choi DS, Kim J. Controlling mold releasing propensity—the role of surface energy and a multiple chain transfer agent. *ACS Applied Materials & Interfaces*. 2012;4:3465–3470. <https://doi.org/10.1021/am3005303>
- 5 Lee J, Lee SH, Kwak MK. Durable Soft Mold for Imprinting of High-Adhesive Resin. *Coatings*. 2021;11:137. <https://doi.org/10.3390/coatings11020137>
- 6 Yang X, Wu T, Liu D, Wu J, Wang Y, Lu Y, Ji Z, Jia X, Jiang P, Wang X. 3D printing of release-agent retaining molds. *Additive Manufacturing*. 2023;71:103580. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.addma.2023.103580>
- 7 Gritsenko D, Paoli R, Xu J. The Effect of Acceleration on the Separation Force in Constrained-Surface Stereolithography. *Applied Sciences*. 2022;12:442. <https://doi.org/10.3390/app12010442>
- 8 Yang CJ, Wu SS. Comprehensive performance of a low-cost spring-assisted mechanism for digital light processing. *International Journal of Advanced Manufacturing Technology*. 2023;125:4099–4118. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00170-023-10977-2>

Copyright · © 2026 Juan Seguro. All Rights Reserved.