

Build Layout, Part Nesting and Production Scheduling in Vat Photopolymerisation: Exposure Uniformity, Risk and Throughput

Treating the build plate as a constrained production field rather than empty geometric space

Juan Segurola

3Dresyns by Resyner Technologies S.L.

© 2026 Juan Segurola. All Rights Reserved.

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

ER-345 · Engineering Review · Version 0.5 · 28 September 2026

Abstract

A build plate is not spatially neutral. Large projected areas can synchronise peel forces and resin displacement. Printer utilisation can increase while total production throughput falls if washing, drying, support removal or post-curing become the bottleneck. Parts with different heights, support burdens or acceptance routes share one process history but may require different downstream treatment. Minimum spacing, forbidden zones, exposure-field maps, maximum projected area, resin-volume reserve and post-processing capacity can be treated as hard constraints. Qualification therefore depends on preserving the measured state, configuration and exception history needed to distinguish these mechanisms in production rather than relying on nominal recipe identity alone.

Keywords: build layout; part nesting; scheduling; vat photopolymerisation; exposure uniformity; throughput; production risk

1. Significance and scope

A build plate is not spatially neutral. The engineering question is how build layout, spatial exposure variation, nesting and production scheduling jointly affect risk and throughput, and which of those effects require explicit qualification rather than heuristic placement. The review focuses on evidence that supports repeatable manufacturing decisions and excludes proprietary recipes, supplier-specific settings and undocumented operator heuristics.

1.1 Corpus boundary

ER-345 owns build-level layout, nesting and scheduling decisions for vat photopolymerisation production. It does not own support-structure design, machine capability estimation or general production-planning software architecture. ER-346 owns algorithmic support generation and verification, while ER-344 owns machine capability; ER-345 owns layout, nesting and production scheduling.

2. Layout couples geometry to process field

A build plate is not spatially neutral. Irradiance uniformity, separation forces, resin replenishment, edge effects and thermal history can vary with position. Nesting algorithms that minimise unused area can therefore increase process risk if they ignore field-dependent quality [1,2].

3. Density and orientation change collective loading

Large projected areas can synchronise peel forces and resin displacement. Staggering orientations or distributing cross-sectional area across layers can reduce simultaneous loading even when total part count is unchanged. Layout qualification should consider the time-resolved projected area, not only packing density.

4. Throughput is constrained by post-processing too

Printer utilisation can increase while total production throughput falls if washing, drying, support removal or post-curing become the bottleneck. Scheduling should therefore include downstream resource capacity and transfer timing, particularly for materials whose green state evolves before final cure [1,3].

5. Mixed-part builds complicate release

Parts with different heights, support burdens or acceptance routes share one process history but may require different downstream treatment. Mixed builds should be permitted only when common process conditions and traceability can be maintained without obscuring lot identity or inspection status [1,3].

6. Risk-aware nesting needs explicit constraints

Minimum spacing, forbidden zones, exposure-field maps, maximum projected area, resin-volume reserve and post-processing capacity can be treated as hard constraints. Throughput optimisation should occur inside that validated feasible region rather than trading quality margins against parts per build invisibly [1-3].

7. Qualification architecture

A layout policy should define allowable field zones, spacing rules, orientation constraints, mixed-build rules and escalation for exceptional jobs. The evidence base should include mapped reference builds and production history sufficient to show that the rules control the dominant field effects [1,2].

8. Evidence hierarchy and transfer

Simulation or packing efficiency is weak evidence unless linked to measured process behaviour. Strong transfer evidence shows that accepted layouts reproduce quality across repeated builds and that excursions outside the layout envelope produce the predicted risk signal [1,2]. Fleet-level transfer also benefits from round-robin study design and monitoring principles that separate observed process variation from study artefact [4,5].

Table 1. Qualification matrix for build layout, part nesting and production scheduling in vat photopolymerisation.

Planning variable	Quality mechanism	Constraint/evidence
Plate position	Exposure and mechanics	Qualified field map
Part spacing	Optical/mechanical interaction	Minimum spacing rule
Projected area	Peel/load transient	Layerwise area limit
Mixed part families	Traceability and post-process mismatch	Compatibility rule
Downstream capacity	Queue and state drift	Scheduling capacity model

9. Interpretation matrix

For build layout and production scheduling, yield or throughput changes may arise from spatial irradiance, part crowding, drainage/support interactions or queue and transfer delays. Diagnosis should combine build-position maps, layout records and cycle-time data rather than attributing the outcome to nesting density alone.

Table 2. Diagnostic interpretation matrix for build layout and production scheduling.

Planning outcome	Hidden risk	Required check
Maximum packing	Crowded high-load layers	Projected-area profile
Shortest print queue	Wash/post-cure bottleneck	End-to-end capacity
Mixed-height build	Unequal exposure/post-process burden	Family compatibility
Edge utilisation	Field non-uniformity	Reference-map acceptance

10. Limitations and evidence gaps

Public studies do not yet provide a universal quantitative model linking part nesting, projected area, exposure-field non-uniformity, resin replenishment and downstream capacity to total production risk. Scheduling optima are equipment- and product-mix dependent, and the constraints identified here require local validation. The review therefore defines the variables that must be bounded, not a single preferred nesting density or scheduling rule.

11. Conclusions

Build layout and scheduling should be treated as coupled production-control decisions rather than independent software conveniences. Spatial exposure constraints, part interactions, resin availability and downstream capacity can all change risk and throughput. A qualified scheduling strategy therefore makes those constraints explicit and demonstrates them on the intended production mix.

References

1. ISO/ASTM 52920:2023. Additive manufacturing - Qualification principles - Requirements for industrial additive manufacturing processes and production sites. ISO, Geneva, 2023.
2. Jiang J, Xu X, Stringer J. Support Structures for Additive Manufacturing: A Review. *Journal of Manufacturing and Materials Processing*. 2018;2(4):64. doi:10.3390/jmmp2040064.
3. Chaudhary MA, Kashif W, Ullah Z. A comprehensive review of support structure minimization in additive manufacturing: design, orientation, optimization, and process strategies. *International Journal of Advanced Manufacturing Technology*. 2026;145:4467-4504. doi:10.1007/s00170-026-18633-1.
4. ISO/ASTM TR 52917:2022. Additive manufacturing - Round robin testing - General guidelines. ASTM International / ISO, 2022. doi:10.1520/ISO/ASTMTR52917-EB.
5. Pazoki D, Dowling D, Ghadimi P. A systematic literature review of control and monitoring systems applied in metal additive manufacturing processes. *International Journal of Advanced Manufacturing Technology*. 2026;143:1223-1252. doi:10.1007/s00170-026-17511-0.

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.