

Functionally Graded Lattices in Photopolymer Additive Manufacturing: Gradient Definition, Interface Continuity and Performance

Controlling spatially varying architecture without turning a designed gradient into an uncontrolled sequence of weak interfaces

Juan Seguro

3Dresyns by Resyner Technologies S.L.

© 2026 Juan Seguro. All Rights Reserved.

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

ER-363 · Engineering Review · Version 0.2 · 1 October 2026

Abstract

Qualification of the graded-lattice response fails when geometry, transport and material evolution are collapsed into one empirical setting. This review separates those effects by starting from the coupled balance that governs graded lattices. It then examines how digital gradient smoothness can be destroyed by voxelization and cure broadening and how local stiffness gradients redirect load and change collapse sequence. The evidence chain couples local geometry, full-field deformation, local mechanical response and commanded-versus-as-built gradient measurements with controlled tests such as 'manufacture discrete, smoothed-discrete and continuous gradients with the same endpoints'. Those measurements are used to distinguish failure mechanisms, calibrate models and define an acceptance envelope. The resulting framework is intended to answer minimum transition length for acceptable stress concentration with explicit uncertainty and stated limits of transfer.

Keywords: functionally graded lattice; gradient field; interface continuity; vat photopolymerisation; local properties; qualification

1. Qualification problem: graded lattices

Evidence for graded lattices is useful only when it is tied to a stated decision and a stated regime. This review pairs the decision criterion, gradient steepness that remains manufacturable, and which local acceptance bands are required for certification with the independent coordinates normalised gradient magnitude, transition-length ratio, and minimum-feature ratio. [4]

1.1 Scope boundary.

ER-363 owns spatially graded lattice architectures, gradient definition and interface continuity. ER-361 owns general metamaterial qualification, ER-362 auxetics, ER-365 impact lattices, and ER-367 thermal metamaterials; those siblings are used only to define property-specific consequences of a graded architecture.

2. Governing balances for graded lattices

A graded lattice is characterised with the following relations for gradient strength, transition length, and printable feature scale.

a graded lattice is defined by a spatial field of cell size, relative density, topology, orientation or material state

the local response follows both the local descriptor and the spatial rate of change of that descriptor

abrupt changes act as internal interfaces even when constituent chemistry is unchanged

Their separation is necessary because a smooth nominal gradient can still contain an abrupt mechanical or manufacturing transition.

3. Regime boundaries for graded lattices

The graded-lattice map selects the evidence needed for transition length, manufacturable gradient, and local acceptance bands.

Table 1. Regime indicators for graded-lattice response.

Indicator	Engineering meaning	Use
normalised gradient magnitude	$ \text{grad } \phi /\phi$, measuring spatial change in the graded field	Anchor the envelope for 'minimum transition length for acceptable stress concentration' to normalised gradient magnitude. This prevents nominal settings from hiding a shift in $ \text{grad } \phi /\phi$, measuring spatial change in the graded field.
transition-length ratio	transition length divided by unit-cell size	Anchor the envelope for 'gradient steepness that remains manufacturable' to transition-length ratio. This prevents nominal settings from hiding a shift in transition length divided by unit-cell size.
minimum-feature ratio	minimum feature size relative to printer point-spread or resolution	Anchor the envelope for 'which local acceptance bands are required for certification' to minimum-feature ratio. This prevents nominal settings from hiding a shift in minimum feature size relative to printer point-spread or resolution.

Gradient performance is accepted only across transition and feature-scale combinations represented in the validation set.

4. Couplings that move the graded lattices

Voxel discretisation and cure broadening can erase a commanded continuous stiffness transition.

Local stiffness gradients redirect load and change collapse sequence.

Graded drainage and trapped-resin accessibility can vary with density. [4]

5. Failure signatures and false diagnoses

The main diagnostic alternatives are stress concentration at abrupt transitions, disconnected or merged members during topology blending and local densification bands that defeat intended progressive response. Each is tied to a different measured signature (CT-derived local relative density and feature size, spatial strain fields and collapse fronts or local indentation/compression where appropriate), which is why the failure decision cannot be based on a single scalar endpoint. The discrimination logic is comparative: Table 2 rows are interpreted against one another, not as four stand-alone acceptance tests.

Table 2. Failure-mode discrimination for graded-lattice response.

Failure mode	Observable signature	Discriminating evidence
stress concentration at abrupt transitions	CT-derived local relative density and feature size	manufacture discrete, smoothed-discrete and continuous gradients with the same endpoints
disconnected or merged members during topology blending	spatial strain fields and collapse fronts	reverse gradient direction under the same load
local densification bands that defeat intended progressive response	local indentation/compression where appropriate	vary transition length systematically
metrology blind spots when only global mass/strength is measured	comparison of commanded and as-built gradient fields	compare topology grading with density grading

6. Measuring graded lattices with traceable uncertainty

A reproducible measurement record contains all three Table 2 observable pathways, their calibration state and the uncertainty associated with each comparison. For graded lattices, the evidence chain starts with independent resolution of spatial grading field and transition length; during metrology of graded lattices, local constitutive response is resolved against internal-interface behaviour. It then adds an uncertainty-controlled perturbation of local constitutive response, while separate monitoring of internal-interface behaviour is retained as a separate control so the three sources of information cannot compensate silently; the uncertainty record for graded lattices keeps internal-interface behaviour separate from spatial grading field.

7. Experiments that discriminate competing mechanisms

The working sequence for graded lattices has three parts: a causal contrast between spatial grading field and local constitutive response; a boundary challenge involving transition length; and a replicate test of internal-interface behaviour; during the causal challenge for graded lattices, internal-interface behaviour is tested against spatial grading field. Each part answers a different engineering question, so uncertainty or failure in one part is not repaired by a favourable result in another; the experiment for graded lattices separates spatial grading field from transition length.

8. Model identification and validation for graded lattices

[1,2] [5] The three Table 3 limits inherit distinct uncertainty budgets; none is replaced by a generic process tolerance. Three independent checks structure the graded lattices assessment; within model identification for graded lattices, spatial grading field is not fitted through transition length. Parameter estimation for spatial grading field and transition length establishes the primary state, an uncertainty-bounded check on internal-interface behaviour tests whether that state survives transfer, and prediction against local constitutive response is the perturbation used when the two disagree; prediction for graded lattices keeps transition length independent of local constitutive response. [3]

9. Qualification envelope and technology decisions

Table 3. Technology-decision matrix for graded-lattice response.

Decision	Minimum evidence	Acceptance logic
minimum transition length for acceptable stress concentration	Demonstration of minimum transition length for acceptable stress concentration needs traceable CT-derived local relative density and feature size measurements in the qualified state and at least two candidate states spanning the transfer interval.	Passing requires CT-derived local relative density and feature size to remain consistent across repeated 'manufacture discrete, smoothed-discrete and continuous gradients with the same endpoints' challenges while stress concentration at abrupt transitions stays below the diagnostic threshold.
gradient steepness that remains manufacturable	Build the case for gradient steepness that remains manufacturable from spatial strain fields and collapse fronts measured at the baseline, an intermediate state and the proposed limit, with independent replication.	Support the decision only when the spatial strain fields and collapse fronts response to 'reverse gradient direction under the same load' is stable within uncertainty and the evidence does not indicate disconnected or merged members during topology blending.
which local acceptance bands are required for certification	The minimum evidence for which local acceptance bands are required for certification is a calibrated local indentation/compression where appropriate dataset broad enough to separate baseline variability from a genuine regime shift.	The candidate passes if repeated 'vary transition length systematically' perturbations produce a consistent local indentation/compression where appropriate response with no accompanying local densification bands that defeat intended progressive response.

For the graded lattices problem, an explicit transfer limit on internal-interface behaviour defines the independent cross-check rather than a tuning variable; inside the graded lattices envelope, transition length and local constitutive response define different transfer limits. The main inference uses tested ranges in spatial grading field and transition length, whereas a separate boundary for local constitutive response is reserved for the boundary test that can overturn the proposed interpretation; qualification of graded lattices bounds local constitutive response separately from internal-interface behaviour.

10. Design consequences for graded lattices

Design transfer requires all three Table 3 decisions to remain valid. Their order may change with application, but their evidence cannot be pooled. To keep mechanism and compensation separate, the study applies a design change governed by spatial grading field while minimum transition length for acceptable stress concentration is controlled independently; loss of a requalification trigger tied to internal-interface behaviour opens a new qualification case; during design implementation for graded lattices, local constitutive response is constrained by internal-interface behaviour. The engineering decision is released only for the tested graded lattices envelope, not for an unmeasured extrapolation; the graded lattices design record separates internal-interface behaviour from spatial grading field.

11. Evidence gaps for graded lattices

The second pathway tests whether the same mechanism persists, while the third checks for an alternative explanation. An acceptable record for graded lattices must show independent replication of internal-interface behaviour without inferring it from scale transfer of spatial grading field; for unresolved graded lattices transfer, internal-interface behaviour is studied separately from spatial grading field. In parallel, uncertainty in transition length versus local constitutive response probes the boundary condition most likely to change the interpretation, and the resulting uncertainty is carried forward explicitly; the evidence gap in graded lattices distinguishes spatial grading field from transition length.

12. Qualification outcome for graded lattices

The qualification outcome is the documented intersection of the three Table 3 limits together with the uncertainty attached to each boundary. Evidence for graded lattices is not accepted from a single nominal condition; at final qualification of graded lattices, spatial grading field is reconciled with transition length. The analysis requires agreement between measurement and prediction for spatial grading field, follows it with a renewed-evidence trigger when internal-interface behaviour changes, and uses causal evidence that separates transition length from local constitutive response as a targeted challenge wherever the two indicate different mechanism or margin; the closing graded lattices claim keeps transition length distinct from local constitutive response.

References

1. Noronha J, Dash J, Leary M, Watson M, Qian M, Kyriakou E, Brandt M. Additively Manufactured Functionally Graded Lattices: Design, Mechanical Response, Deformation Behavior, Applications, and Insights. *JOM*. 2023;75:5729-5754. doi:10.1007/s11837-023-06190-x.
2. Loh GH, Pei E, Harrison D, Monzón MD. An overview of functionally graded additive manufacturing. *Additive Manufacturing*. 2018;23:34-44. doi:10.1016/j.addma.2018.06.023.
3. Zhang C, Chen F, Huang Z, Jia M, Chen G, Ye Y, Lin Y, Liu W, Chen B, Shen Q, Zhang L, Lavernia EJ. Additive manufacturing of functionally graded materials: A review. *Materials Science and Engineering A*. 2019;764:138209. doi:10.1016/j.msea.2019.138209.
4. Hisham M, Saravana Kumar G, Deshpande AP. Process optimization and optimal tolerancing to improve dimensional accuracy of vat-photopolymerized functionally graded hydrogels. *Results in Engineering*. 2022;14:100442. doi:10.1016/j.rineng.2022.100442.
5. Lu C, Hsieh M, Huang Z, Zhang C, Lin Y, Shen Q, Chen F, Zhang L. Architectural Design and Additive Manufacturing of Mechanical Metamaterials: A Review. *Engineering*. 2022;17:44-63. doi:10.1016/j.eng.2021.12.023.

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.