

Reaction-Diffusion Fronts in Photopolymer Networks: Species Mobility, Autoacceleration, Gradients and Pattern Formation

Linking conversion-dependent mobility to spatial cure gradients without confusing kinetic fronts with purely optical penetration

Juan Seguro

3Dresyns by Resyner Technologies S.L.

© 2026 Juan Seguro. All Rights Reserved.

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

ER-352 · Engineering Review · Version 0.2 · 1 October 2026

Abstract

Reaction and diffusion become inseparable once radical mobility, oxygen transport and local conversion evolve on comparable timescales. ER-352 therefore treats cure-front motion as a spatially resolved transport problem rather than an optical-dose problem alone. Damkohler-, Peclet- and Thiele-type coordinates are used to distinguish reaction-limited, diffusion-limited and advectively perturbed regimes. Time-resolved spectroscopy, transport tracers, modulus mapping and cure-boundary imaging provide complementary observables. Feature-spacing, oxygen-boundary and exposure-history perturbations are used to determine when neighbouring fronts interact, when post-exposure migration matters, and whether optical compensation is sufficient to recover dimensional fidelity.

Keywords: reaction diffusion; photopolymer network; autoacceleration; species mobility; pattern fidelity; Damkohler competition

1. Qualification problem: reaction-diffusion fronts

The engineering question for reaction-diffusion fronts is not simply whether the phenomenon occurs, but where it changes a qualification decision. Evidence is organised around minimum pitch before neighbouring fronts interact; whether optical compensation alone can recover fidelity and whether post-exposure hold time is part of the controlled process are treated as separate decisions, with Damkohler-like ratio Da , Peclet number, and Thiele-type modulus defining the state coordinates. [1,3]

1.1 Scope boundary.

ER-352 owns reaction-diffusion fronts and mobility-limited spatial cure evolution. ER-351 owns thermal accumulation, ER-353 natural convection, ER-356 electric-field transport, and ER-360 model verification; cross-couplings are included only when they move the reaction-diffusion front or change its observability.

2. Governing balances for reaction-diffusion fronts

Reaction and transport are kept as distinct terms in the governing set below so that front motion is not collapsed into an exposure surrogate.

$$dC_i/dt = \text{div}(D_i \text{ grad } C_i) + R_i \text{ links species transport to local reaction source/sink terms}$$

conversion-dependent diffusivity $D_i(\alpha, T)$ collapses as the network gels and vitrifies

front speed emerges from coupled initiation, propagation, termination and species transport rather than from light penetration alone

Keeping the three coordinates independent prevents optical fidelity from being mistaken for reaction-diffusion similarity.

3. Regime boundaries for reaction-diffusion fronts

The regime map below identifies where front-interaction evidence must be repeated before pitch, compensation, or hold-time claims are transferred.

Table 1. Regime indicators for reaction-diffusion response.

Indicator	Engineering meaning	Use
Damkohler-like ratio Da	reaction timescale divided by diffusion timescale	Damkohler-like ratio Da governs whether 'minimum pitch before neighbouring fronts interact' can be extended to a new state; compare it directly because it represents reaction timescale divided by diffusion timescale.
Peclet number	importance of advection when resin flow or moving interfaces transport reactive species	Peclet number governs whether 'whether optical compensation alone can recover fidelity' can be extended to a new state; compare it directly because it represents importance of advection when resin flow or moving interfaces transport reactive species.
Thiele-type modulus	reaction strength relative to diffusion inside confined features	Thiele-type modulus governs whether 'whether post-exposure hold time is part of the controlled process' can be extended to a new state; compare it directly because it represents reaction strength relative to diffusion inside confined features.

Front-interaction conclusions are therefore restricted to the indicator combinations actually sampled during the validation sequence.

4. Couplings that move the reaction-diffusion fronts

Trommsdorff-Norrish autoacceleration suppresses termination as mobility falls.

Oxygen inhibition creates a reactive boundary layer with its own diffusion length.

Photopatterning creates spatial gradients in initiator, monomer and conversion that can continue to evolve after illumination.

5. Failure signatures and false diagnoses

Three defect routes require separate diagnosis: lateral cure broadening beyond optical point-spread expectations; composition or conversion banding near bright-dark boundaries; and front arrest before nominal exposure completion. They are tracked respectively with time-resolved Raman/FTIR conversion maps, fluorescent or spectroscopic tracers for species transport and micro-indentation or modulus mapping across cured fronts, which prevents one observable from standing in for the full state. Interpretation uses the pattern across all four Table 2 rows; one positive response is insufficient if another row contradicts the proposed mechanism.

Table 2. Failure-mode discrimination for reaction-diffusion response.

Failure mode	Observable signature	Discriminating evidence
lateral cure broadening beyond optical point-spread expectations	time-resolved Raman/FTIR conversion maps	vary feature spacing at constant dose to probe overlapping diffusion fields
composition or conversion banding near bright-dark boundaries	fluorescent or spectroscopic tracers for species transport	change oxygen boundary condition independently of irradiance
front arrest before nominal exposure completion	micro-indentation or modulus mapping across cured fronts	compare continuous exposure with pulsed exposure at equal dose
post-exposure migration that changes local network stoichiometry	confocal or tomographic measurement of cure-boundary evolution	quench at multiple times to reconstruct front progression

6. Measuring reaction-diffusion fronts with traceable uncertainty

The measurement record keeps the three Table 2 observables separate through calibration and uncertainty analysis; pooling them early would hide which mechanism controls the margin. For the reaction-diffusion fronts problem, separate monitoring of front velocity defines the independent cross-check rather than a tuning variable; during metrology of reaction-diffusion fronts, gelation and vitrification is resolved against front velocity. The main inference uses independent resolution of species mobility and conversion-dependent diffusivity, whereas an uncertainty-controlled perturbation of gelation and vitrification is reserved for the boundary test that can overturn the proposed interpretation; the uncertainty record for reaction-diffusion fronts keeps front velocity separate from species mobility.

7. Experiments that discriminate competing mechanisms

Rather than reduce reaction-diffusion fronts to one surrogate, the analysis combines a replicate test of front velocity with a causal contrast between species mobility and gelation and vitrification; during the causal challenge for reaction-diffusion fronts, front velocity is tested against species mobility. A separate a boundary challenge involving conversion-dependent diffusivity is used to challenge that interpretation, making disagreement between the two routes visible instead of averaging it away; the experiment for reaction-diffusion fronts separates species mobility from conversion-dependent diffusivity.

8. Model identification and validation for reaction-diffusion fronts

[1,3] [2,4] [5] The resulting uncertainty bands are attached to the three Table 3 rows rather than collapsed into one global margin. An acceptable record for reaction-diffusion fronts must show an uncertainty-bounded check on front velocity without inferring it from parameter estimation for species mobility and conversion-dependent diffusivity; within model identification for reaction-diffusion fronts, species mobility is not fitted through conversion-dependent diffusivity. In parallel, prediction against gelation and vitrification probes the boundary condition most likely to change the interpretation, and the resulting uncertainty is carried forward explicitly; prediction for reaction-diffusion fronts keeps conversion-dependent diffusivity independent of gelation and vitrification.

9. Qualification envelope and technology decisions

Table 3. Technology-decision matrix for reaction-diffusion response.

Decision	Minimum evidence	Acceptance logic
minimum pitch before neighbouring fronts interact	Demonstrate minimum pitch before neighbouring fronts interact using paired time-resolved Raman/FTIR conversion maps records from the baseline and transfer cases, together with an uncertainty estimate and repeat series.	The claim passes when the response to 'vary feature spacing at constant dose to probe overlapping diffusion fields' is reproducible in time-resolved Raman/FTIR conversion maps and lateral cure broadening beyond optical point-spread expectations remains absent at the decision boundary.
whether optical compensation alone can recover fidelity	For whether optical compensation alone can recover fidelity, acquire fluorescent or spectroscopic tracers for species transport at several states bracketing the proposed limit rather than at one nominal condition.	Acceptance requires agreement of repeated fluorescent or spectroscopic tracers for species transport measurements after 'change oxygen boundary condition independently of irradiance' and no onset of composition or conversion banding near bright-dark boundaries across the qualified states.
whether post-exposure hold time is part of the controlled process	Support whether post-exposure hold time is part of the controlled process with a traceable micro-indentation or modulus mapping across cured fronts series spanning the claimed range and an independent repeat at the boundary state.	Pass the row only when the measured response to 'compare continuous exposure with pulsed exposure at equal dose' remains within uncertainty and the diagnostic pattern for front arrest before nominal exposure completion is not observed.

Evidence for reaction-diffusion fronts is not accepted from a single nominal condition; inside the reaction-diffusion fronts envelope, conversion-dependent diffusivity and gelation and vitrification define different transfer limits. The analysis requires tested ranges in species mobility and conversion-dependent diffusivity, follows it with an explicit transfer limit on front velocity, and uses a separate boundary for gelation and vitrification as a targeted challenge wherever the two indicate different mechanism or margin; qualification of reaction-diffusion fronts bounds gelation and vitrification separately from front velocity.

10. Design consequences for reaction-diffusion fronts

During implementation, an implementation check on gelation and vitrification is challenged deliberately while minimum pitch before neighbouring fronts interact is controlled independently, leaving a design change governed by species mobility as the design variable rather than a hidden compensator; during design implementation for reaction-diffusion fronts, gelation and vitrification is constrained by front velocity. The resulting design record therefore distinguishes intended control from incidental compensation in reaction-diffusion fronts; the reaction-diffusion fronts design record separates front velocity from species mobility.

11. Evidence gaps for reaction-diffusion fronts

Qualification of reaction-diffusion fronts treats scale transfer of species mobility as one axis and independent replication of front velocity as another; for unresolved reaction-diffusion fronts transfer, front velocity is studied separately from species mobility. Between them, uncertainty in conversion-dependent diffusivity versus gelation and vitrification supplies the deliberate challenge that determines whether the apparent transfer is mechanistic or merely coincidental; the evidence gap in reaction-diffusion fronts distinguishes species mobility from conversion-dependent diffusivity.

12. Qualification outcome for reaction-diffusion fronts

The review supports three bounded Table 3 conclusions. Claims outside their common domain are not covered by the present evidence. The reaction-diffusion fronts workflow deliberately separates causal evidence that separates conversion-dependent diffusivity from gelation and vitrification from agreement between measurement and prediction for species mobility; this avoids fitting the challenge into the quantity being qualified; at final qualification of reaction-diffusion fronts, species mobility is reconciled with conversion-dependent diffusivity. A renewed-evidence trigger when front velocity changes is then examined on its own terms before any transfer statement is retained; the closing reaction-diffusion fronts claim keeps conversion-dependent diffusivity distinct from gelation and vitrification.

References

1. Lang M, Hirner S, Wiesbrock F, Fuchs P. A Review on Modeling Cure Kinetics and Mechanisms of Photopolymerization. *Polymers*. 2022;14(10):2074. doi:10.3390/polym14102074.
2. Kim J, Yoon DK. Photopatterning-Induced Diffusion for Directed Molecular Alignment. *Chem & Bio Engineering*. 2025;3(2):126-147. doi:10.1021/cbe.5c00094.
3. Hennessy MG, Vitale A, Cabral JT, Matar OK. Role of heat generation and thermal diffusion during frontal photopolymerization. *Physical Review E*. 2015;92(2):022403. doi:10.1103/PhysRevE.92.022403.
4. Cosma MP, Brighenti R. Photopolymerized additive manufacturing materials: Modeling of the printing process, mechanical behavior, and sensitivity analysis. *Material Design & Processing Communications*. 2021;3(6):e225. doi:10.1002/mdp2.225.
5. Zhang F, Zhu L, Li Z, Wang S, Shi J, Tang W, Li N, Yang J. The recent development of vat photopolymerization: A review. *Additive Manufacturing*. 2021;48:102423. doi:10.1016/j.addma.2021.102423.

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.