

Two-Photon and Multiphoton Fabrication of Photopolymer Metasurfaces: Subwavelength Feature Control, Dispersion and Device Efficiency

Linking nanoscale geometry, material dispersion and optical efficiency in polymer metasurface fabrication

Juan Segurola

3Dresyns by Resyner Technologies S.L.

© 2026 Juan Segurola. All Rights Reserved.

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

ER-332 · Engineering Review · Version 0.4 · 28 September 2026

Abstract

Photopolymer metasurfaces require manufacturing control at a scale where unit-cell geometry, material dispersion and collective optical response are inseparable. This review examines two-photon and multiphoton fabrication as a route to three-dimensional or high-aspect-ratio metasurface architectures, with emphasis on subwavelength feature fidelity, resonator-to-resonator variability, refractive-index state and efficiency. General two-photon process physics provides necessary context, but metasurface qualification additionally requires device-specific evidence linking fabricated meta-atom dimensions to phase, amplitude or polarisation response. The review distinguishes local feature resolution from array-level registration and from optical efficiency, because a process can resolve isolated structures while failing through accumulated dimensional bias or disorder. A practical qualification route is proposed using dimensional distributions, dispersion-aware electromagnetic comparison, efficiency and wavefront measurements, and stability tests that preserve the distinction between fabrication error and material-state drift.

Keywords: two-photon lithography; metasurface; subwavelength fabrication; dispersion; nanopillar; efficiency; phase control; optical metrology

1. Significance and scope

A metasurface is not qualified by demonstrating that subwavelength features are printable. Its function emerges from an ensemble of elements whose dimensions and spacing encode an optical transfer function. Small systematic biases can shift resonance or phase across the complete aperture, while random element-to-element variation redistributes energy into unwanted orders or scatter. The manufacturing question is therefore whether the printed population of meta-atoms realises the designed phase, amplitude or polarisation response over wavelength and aperture.

1.1 Corpus boundary

ER-332 owns fabrication and qualification of subwavelength metasurfaces whose optical function arises from meta-atom response. ER-331 owns refractive micro-optics, ER-338 periodic photonic crystals, ER-339 resolved surface-relief diffractive elements, and ER-425 terahertz components. These boundaries are mutual: ER-332 is limited to metasurface feature control, dispersion and device efficiency.

2. The unit cell is the measurand

Metasurface behaviour emerges from an array of subwavelength scatterers. The relevant manufacturing variables are therefore not only global dimensions but unit-cell width, height, sidewall taper, spacing and registration. Small systematic biases can change phase delay and resonance conditions [1,2,4] [6].

3. Material dispersion couples to geometry

Polymer refractive index and absorption determine the phase range obtainable from a given feature height. Conversion and post-cure can change this state. Geometry and optical constants must be characterised together before assigning a measured efficiency loss to fabrication error [1-3].

4. Thresholding and proximity effects

Multiphoton fabrication is nonlinear but not immune to proximity effects. Voxel overlap, scan strategy, radical diffusion, shrinkage and development can merge gaps or narrow pillars. Dense-array calibration structures should therefore accompany isolated-feature tests [1,2,4].

5. Device-level qualification

Efficiency, polarisation response, bandwidth, wavefront and stray orders should be measured against the fabricated geometry. Reporting only SEM images or a single focal spot does not establish metasurface fidelity.

6. Qualification architecture

A metasurface qualification architecture should measure the distribution of critical meta-atom dimensions, array placement error, local defects and finished refractive state before interpreting optical efficiency. Representative SEM images are insufficient because the optical response is aperture-wide. Sampling plans should therefore capture field position and repeated structures, then feed measured dimensions into an electromagnetic model or a calibrated surrogate so that expected phase or resonance shifts can be compared with measured device behaviour.

7. Minimum evidence for transfer

Transfer requires evidence at three levels: fabrication capability, realised population statistics and optical function. The process description should identify writing modality, voxel or exposure strategy, development/post-cure and any dimensional compensation. The finished device record should include critical dimension distributions, pitch/registration, material dispersion and the wavelength-dependent functional metric relevant to the design, such as diffraction efficiency, polarisation conversion or wavefront shaping [5].

7.1 Evidence hierarchy and transfer

The strongest transfer test is a closed prediction: measured dimensional bias and refractive state are used to predict a spectral or phase shift, and the observed shift is compared with that prediction. Agreement supports transfer of a physical model; disagreement indicates an unmeasured state variable, coupling effect or metrology limitation. A single peak-efficiency value cannot reveal which class of error dominates.

7.2 Research priorities

Research priorities include large-area dimensional metrology for dense meta-atom arrays, uncertainty propagation from fabrication tolerances to system efficiency, and ageing studies for polymer refractive index and nanoscale geometry. Multiphoton processes also need throughput studies that report whether scaling strategies preserve unit-cell uniformity rather than only total build time.

Table 1. Minimum qualification matrix for multiphoton-fabricated photopolymer metasurfaces.

Metasurface state	Minimum measurement	Qualification purpose
Unit cell	width, height, pitch, sidewall angle	maps fabrication bias
Material	n and k versus wavelength	defines phase and absorption budget
Array	registration and missing/merged elements	tests collective fidelity
Optical	efficiency and wavefront	tests intended phase function
Robustness	conditioning and repeat build	tests reproducibility

8. Interpretation matrix

Metasurface failure modes are strongly coupled: reduced efficiency can arise from systematic size bias, random disorder, surface roughness, wrong refractive index, polarisation mismatch or spectral detuning. The interpretation matrix therefore pairs each optical symptom with a geometry- or material-sensitive control rather than assigning cause from efficiency alone.

Table 2. Diagnostic interpretation matrix for metasurface efficiency and dispersion.

Device symptom	Plausible origin	Discriminating control
Low efficiency, correct average size	dispersion/roughness or local variance	measure n,k and unit-cell distribution
Spectral shift	systematic geometry or index shift	SEM/AFM plus spectroscopy
Polarisation sensitivity exceeds model	anisotropic features or alignment	orientation-resolved microscopy and polarimetry
Strong stray orders	phase quantisation or placement error	Fourier-plane measurement and geometry map

9. Limitations and evidence gaps

Metasurface literature spans visible, infrared and terahertz regimes with different feature-size ratios and material-loss mechanisms. The evidence base is also divided between planar nanofabrication and three-dimensional direct laser writing. Numerical efficiencies and

tolerance bands should therefore be treated as design-specific. This review does not infer universal dimensional thresholds from a single wavelength or architecture.

10. Conclusions

For photopolymer metasurfaces, resolution is a necessary but insufficient manufacturing metric. Qualification must connect the realised distribution of meta-atom geometry and refractive state to wavelength-dependent phase or amplitude control and finally to device efficiency. That chain distinguishes printable structure from reproducible optical function and provides a rational basis for process transfer, compensation and requalification.

References

1. Wang H, Zhang W, Ladika D, Yu H, Gailevičius D, Wang H, Pan C-F, Nair PNS, Ke Y, Mori T, Chan JYE, Ruan Q, Farsari M, Malinauskas M, Juodkazis S, Gu M, Yang JKW. Two-Photon Polymerization Lithography for Optics and Photonics: Fundamentals, Materials, Technologies, and Applications. *Advanced Functional Materials*. 2023;33(39):2214211. doi:10.1002/adfm.202214211.
2. O'Halloran S, Pandit A, Heise A, Kellett A. Two-Photon Polymerization: Fundamentals, Materials, and Chemical Modification Strategies. *Advanced Science*. 2023;10(7):e2204072. doi:10.1002/advs.202204072.
3. Chekkaramkodi D, Jacob L, Shebeeb CM, Umer R, Butt H. Review of vat photopolymerization 3D printing of photonic devices. *Additive Manufacturing*. 2024;86:104189. doi:10.1016/j.addma.2024.104189.
4. Zhou X, Hou Y, Lin J. A review on the processing accuracy of two-photon polymerization. *AIP Advances*. 2015;5(3):030701. doi:10.1063/1.4916886.
5. Eisa MH, Zia A, Hassan Z, Saeed S. Ultrafast Laser Two-Photon Lithography for Metasurface Engineering: Advances in Fabrication and Photonic Applications. *Laser & Photonics Reviews*. 2026;20(11):e02914. doi:10.1002/lpor.202502914.
6. Wang X, Fan X, Liu Y, Xu K, Zhou Y, Zhang Z, Chen F, Yu X, Deng L, Gao H, Xiong W. 3D Nanolithography via Holographic Multi-Focus Metalens. *Laser & Photonics Reviews*. 2024;18(11):2400181. doi:10.1002/lpor.202400181.

Competing interests

The author is Founder, CEO and CTO of 3Dresyns by Resyner Technologies S.L. No comparative product recommendation is made.

Data availability

No new experimental dataset was generated for this review.