

Cleanliness Zones and Contamination Control in Photopolymer Manufacturing: Air, Surfaces, Tools and Material Segregation

Risk-based contamination control from raw material handling to clean post-processing

Juan Segurola

3Dresyns by Resyner Technologies S.L.

© 2026 Juan Segurola. All Rights Reserved.

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

ER-348 · Engineering Review · Version 0.5 · 28 September 2026

Abstract

A photopolymer facility may need strict particle control for micro-optics, medical devices or microfluidics while general engineering parts may tolerate a less restrictive environment. Particles and volatile contamination can arrive through air, but tools, gloves, containers, transfer carts, printer vats and wash fixtures often dominate practical cross-contamination. Pigmented resins, conductive fillers, silicones, release agents and aggressive cleaners can create low-level carryover that is difficult to diagnose later. Airborne particle counts do not measure uncured resin residue or chemical films on benches and tools. A cleaning procedure is not qualified by its written existence. 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: cleanliness; contamination control; photopolymer manufacturing; air cleanliness; surface cleanliness; segregation; tools

1. Significance and scope

A photopolymer facility may need strict particle control for micro-optics, medical devices or microfluidics while general engineering parts may tolerate a less restrictive environment. The engineering question is how cleanliness zones, air, surfaces, tools and material segregation should be controlled so that contamination risk remains matched to product sensitivity rather than to a generic cleanroom label. 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-348 owns contamination-control architecture for photopolymer manufacturing environments. It does not prescribe a universal cleanroom class and does not replace product-specific bioburden, sterility or chemical-purity requirements. ER-347 owns automated washing, drying and post-curing transfer control; ER-349 owns electronic batch-record architecture. ER-348 is limited to cleanliness zoning, material segregation and contamination-control evidence at manufacturing interfaces.

2. Cleanliness should be risk based

A photopolymer facility may need strict particle control for micro-optics, medical devices or microfluidics while general engineering parts may tolerate a less restrictive environment. Classification should therefore follow product and process sensitivity, not prestige. ISO 14644 provides particle-classification and monitoring frameworks but does not by itself define the needed class for a photopolymer process [1,2].

3. Air is only one contamination route

Particles and volatile contamination can arrive through air, but tools, gloves, containers, transfer carts, printer vats and wash fixtures often dominate practical cross-contamination. A control plan should map contact surfaces and material-flow interfaces rather than equating cleanliness with HVAC performance [1-3].

4. Material segregation prevents invisible mixing

Material segregation is required when incompatible or visually indistinguishable materials share tools, containers or transfer paths. ISO/ASTM 52920 and ISA-88 support controlled material identity, process segregation and traceable execution, but they do not quantify chemistry-specific carryover. ER-348 therefore treats dedicated tools or validated cleaning as risk controls and requires any claim about a particular contaminant to be supported by material-specific evidence [3,4].

5. Surface monitoring must match the hazard

Airborne particle counts do not measure uncured resin residue or chemical films on benches and tools. Surface checks should target the expected contaminant using visual, gravimetric, wipe, fluorescence or chemical methods where justified. The measurement has to answer a defined contamination question [1-3].

6. Cleaning verification needs acceptance logic

A cleaning procedure is not qualified by its written existence. Worst-case soil, hard-to-clean geometry, contact time and cleaning agent condition should be challenged. Re-cleaning after a failed check should remain traceable so that recurring weak points are not hidden [3,4].

7. Qualification architecture

Zones should be defined by allowed materials, operations, gowning/tool rules, cleaning frequency and transfer interfaces. Monitoring combines environmental data with surface/tool evidence and deviation trending. The objective is stable contamination risk, not the largest possible monitoring dataset [1-4].

8. Evidence hierarchy and transfer

A cleanroom certificate is weak evidence for product cleanliness unless the process interfaces are also controlled. Strong transfer evidence demonstrates that air, surfaces, tools and segregation controls jointly keep the relevant contaminant below the product-specific decision limit [1-4].

Table 1. Qualification matrix for cleanliness zones and contamination control in photopolymer manufacturing.

Contamination route	Typical source	Primary control
Air	Dust/aerosol	Classified or controlled environment
Surface	Resin residue, cleaners	Validated cleaning
Tool	Cross-material carryover	Dedicated/verified-clean tools
Container	Misidentification or residue	Closed labelled transfer
Personnel	Gloves/clothing/contact	Gowning and handling rules

9. Interpretation matrix

For contamination control, an excursion can arise from airborne ingress, surface or tool carryover, failed material segregation or the sampling method itself. Source tracing should combine zone history, surface/tool controls, material movement and blank or control samples before a contamination route is assigned.

Table 2. Diagnostic interpretation matrix for cleanliness and contamination control.

Monitoring result	Interpretation risk	Follow-up
Air counts acceptable	Surface contamination still possible	Surface/tool checks
Repeated local residue	Cleaning design weakness	Root-cause and method change
Cross-colour carryover	Segregation failure	Trace movement/tools
Trend shift after maintenance	Construction/maintenance source	Heightened monitoring

10. Limitations and evidence gaps

Airborne particle classifications describe only one contamination pathway and do not by themselves establish acceptable chemical carryover, surface residue, tool contamination or bioburden for a given product. Published evidence is insufficient to define universal zoning or cleaning limits for photopolymer manufacturing. Contamination controls must therefore be risk based and supported by material- and product-specific verification where chemistry-specific carryover matters.

11. Conclusions

Cleanliness control in photopolymer manufacturing should be built around contamination pathways that can affect the product, not around a cleanroom label alone. Air, surfaces, tools and material segregation require different evidence. The appropriate zoning and verification strategy follows from the consequence of contamination and the ability of the monitoring method to detect it.

References

1. ISO 14644-1:2015. Cleanrooms and associated controlled environments - Part 1: Classification of air cleanliness by particle concentration. ISO, Geneva, 2015.
2. ISO 14644-2:2015. Cleanrooms and associated controlled environments - Part 2: Monitoring to provide evidence of cleanroom performance related to air cleanliness by particle concentration. ISO, Geneva, 2015.
3. ISO/ASTM 52920:2023. Additive manufacturing - Qualification principles - Requirements for industrial additive manufacturing processes and production sites. ISO, Geneva, 2023.
4. ISA-88.00.01-2010. Batch Control - Part 1: Models and Terminology. International Society of Automation, 2010.

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.