

Negative-Stiffness and Snap-Through Photopolymer Architectures: Stability, Hysteresis, Fatigue and Control

Qualifying bistable and post-buckling functions by their energy landscape, switching thresholds and degradation under repeated actuation

Juan Seguro

3Dresyns by Resyner Technologies S.L.

© 2026 Juan Seguro. All Rights Reserved.

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

ER-364 · Engineering Review · Version 0.2 · 1 October 2026

Abstract

This review asks when the snap-through response becomes large enough to change engineering decisions rather than merely laboratory observables. The physical core is the coupled balance that governs snap-through architectures, but the realised response also depends on the fact that resin viscoelasticity contributes hysteresis on top of geometric hysteresis. In parallel, printing asymmetry biases nominally symmetric switching states. The proposed workflow therefore combines complete switching loops, state-geometry metrology, cycle statistics and instability-mode imaging, mechanism-separating tests such as 'quasi-static and rate-dependent switching tests', and validation outside the calibration condition. Qualification is expressed as a bounded claim about switching-force window with adequate margin, with requalification required when geometry, history or environment changes regime.

Keywords: negative stiffness; snap through; multistability; hysteresis; fatigue; photopolymer architecture

1. Qualification problem: snap-through architectures

A qualification claim about snap-through architectures must survive changes in the variables that control the mechanism. Accordingly, the decision criterion, number of stable states usable over life, and whether hysteresis is beneficial energy dissipation or unacceptable control drift are evaluated separately, and each result is located using normalised energy barrier, relative geometric imperfection amplitude, and viscoelastic timescale ratio. [1]

1.1 Scope boundary.

ER-364 owns snap-through response. General metamaterial qualification remains with ER-361, auxetic behaviour with ER-362, impact absorption with ER-365, and foldable architectures with ER-370; the present review is restricted to stability landscapes, hysteresis, fatigue and control of bistable or multistable states.

2. Governing balances for snap-through architectures

Snap-through behaviour is bounded by relations for energy barriers, imperfection sensitivity, and viscoelastic timing.

snap-through occurs when a stable equilibrium loses stability and the structure traverses a non-convex energy landscape

negative incremental stiffness is branch- and control-mode-dependent rather than a standalone material property [1]

energy barriers and state depths determine switching thresholds and disturbance robustness

The model therefore keeps stability margin, imperfection amplitude, and rate dependence as different acceptance dimensions.

3. Regime boundaries for snap-through architectures

For snap-through architectures, the table distinguishes tests of switching margin, stable-state retention, and hysteresis over service time.

Table 1. Regime indicators for snap-through response.

Indicator	Engineering meaning	Use
normalised energy barrier	stability barrier scaled by a representative elastic-energy level	For 'switching-force window with adequate margin', normalised energy barrier provides the scale-sensitive comparison; candidate states remain comparable only while stability barrier scaled by a representative elastic-energy level stays within the validated range.
relative geometric imperfection amplitude	imperfection amplitude relative to the critical arch or beam rise	For 'number of stable states usable over life', relative geometric imperfection amplitude provides the scale-sensitive comparison; candidate states remain comparable only while imperfection amplitude relative to the critical arch or beam rise stays within the validated range.
viscoelastic timescale ratio	viscoelastic relaxation time relative to loading or switching time	For 'whether hysteresis is beneficial energy dissipation or unacceptable control drift', viscoelastic timescale ratio provides the scale-sensitive comparison; candidate states remain comparable only while viscoelastic relaxation time relative to loading or switching time stays within the validated range.

Switching claims remain bounded by the tested barrier, imperfection, and timescale conditions.

4. Couplings that move the snap-through architectures

Resin viscoelasticity contributes hysteresis on top of geometric hysteresis. [4]

Printing asymmetry biases nominally symmetric switching states. [3]

Fatigue can reduce barrier height before visible cracking.

5. Failure signatures and false diagnoses

Failure interpretation centres on three possibilities: unintended asymmetric snap-through; state loss under creep; fracture at compliant hinges or curved beams. The evidence channels full force-displacement loops under displacement and force control, state geometry before/after switching and cycle-to-cycle switching-force statistics provide independent checks on those possibilities and reduce misclassification. The causal reading of Table 2 requires the predicted signature to move only when its associated control variable is changed.

Table 2. Failure-mode discrimination for snap-through response.

Failure mode	Observable signature	Discriminating evidence
unintended asymmetric snap-through	full force-displacement loops under displacement and force control	quasi-static and rate-dependent switching tests
state loss under creep	state geometry before/after switching	imperfection sensitivity using measured geometry
fracture at compliant hinges or curved beams	cycle-to-cycle switching-force statistics	hold tests near metastable states
drift in switching force over cycles	DIC of instability mode shape	fatigue under subcritical and full snap-through cycles

6. Measuring snap-through architectures with traceable uncertainty

Qualification uses their combined constraints, not an averaged surrogate. An uncertainty-controlled perturbation of imperfection sensitivity is the first stress test for snap-through architectures; only after that result is bounded is independent resolution of non-convex energy landscape and stability margin interpreted; during metrology of snap-through architectures, imperfection sensitivity is resolved against rate dependence. The record keeps separate monitoring of rate dependence outside that inference and reports it as an independent line of evidence; the uncertainty record for snap-through architectures keeps rate dependence separate from non-convex energy landscape.

7. Experiments that discriminate competing mechanisms

The Table 2 perturbations are applied as a causal sequence in which each step removes one competing explanation from consideration. Qualification of snap-through architectures treats a causal contrast between non-convex energy landscape and imperfection sensitivity as one axis and a replicate test of rate dependence as another; during the causal challenge for snap-through architectures, rate dependence is tested against non-convex energy landscape. Between them, a boundary challenge involving stability margin supplies the deliberate challenge that determines whether the apparent transfer is mechanistic or merely coincidental; the experiment for snap-through architectures separates non-convex energy landscape from stability margin.

8. Model identification and validation for snap-through architectures

Identification, transfer validation and identifiability are assigned to different Table 2 rows. Their separation is retained through the uncertainty calculation. [5] Uncertainty propagation terminates at the individual Table 3 boundaries, where transferability is actually judged. The snap-through architectures workflow deliberately separates prediction against imperfection sensitivity from parameter estimation for non-convex energy landscape and stability margin; this avoids fitting the challenge into the quantity being qualified; within model identification for snap-through architectures, non-convex energy landscape is not fitted through stability margin. An uncertainty-bounded check on rate dependence is then examined on its own terms before any transfer statement is retained; prediction for snap-through architectures keeps stability margin independent of imperfection sensitivity. [2]

9. Qualification envelope and technology decisions

Table 3. Technology-decision matrix for snap-through response.

Decision	Minimum evidence	Acceptance logic
switching-force window with adequate margin	Build the case for switching-force window with adequate margin from full force-displacement loops under displacement and force control measured at the baseline, an intermediate state and the proposed limit, with independent replication.	The claim is accepted if 'quasi-static and rate-dependent switching tests' reproduces the expected full force-displacement loops under displacement and force control behaviour at the limiting state and no unintended asymmetric snap-through signature is present.
number of stable states usable over life	The minimum evidence for number of stable states usable over life is a calibrated state geometry before/after switching dataset broad enough to separate baseline variability from a genuine regime shift.	Acceptance follows when 'imperfection sensitivity using measured geometry' leaves the measured state geometry before/after switching relationship intact and no transition toward state loss under creep is detected.
whether hysteresis is beneficial energy dissipation or unacceptable control drift	Justify whether hysteresis is beneficial energy dissipation or unacceptable control drift using repeated cycle-to-cycle switching-force statistics measurements across the claimed range and a documented decision uncertainty at the limiting condition.	Retain the decision only while 'hold tests near metastable states' keeps cycle-to-cycle switching-force statistics within the tested envelope; observation of fracture at compliant hinges or curved beams terminates the claim.

For snap-through architectures, the evidence chain starts with tested ranges in non-convex energy landscape and stability margin; inside the snap-through architectures envelope, stability margin and imperfection sensitivity define different transfer limits. It then adds a

separate boundary for imperfection sensitivity, while an explicit transfer limit on rate dependence is retained as a separate control so the three sources of information cannot compensate silently; qualification of snap-through architectures bounds imperfection sensitivity separately from rate dependence.

10. Design consequences for snap-through architectures

The practical design route begins with an implementation check on imperfection sensitivity; while switching-force window with adequate margin is controlled independently, a design change governed by non-convex energy landscape is changed only within the validated response range; during design implementation for snap-through architectures, imperfection sensitivity is constrained by rate dependence. Any design outside those conditions returns to measurement rather than being accepted by similarity of settings; the snap-through architectures design record separates rate dependence from non-convex energy landscape.

11. Evidence gaps for snap-through architectures

The remaining gap is not another nominal repeat but state-space coverage. Three independent checks structure the snap-through architectures assessment; for unresolved snap-through architectures transfer, rate dependence is studied separately from non-convex energy landscape. Scale transfer of non-convex energy landscape establishes the primary state, independent replication of rate dependence tests whether that state survives transfer, and uncertainty in stability margin versus imperfection sensitivity is the perturbation used when the two disagree; the evidence gap in snap-through architectures distinguishes non-convex energy landscape from stability margin.

12. Qualification outcome for snap-through architectures

Evidence is sufficient only for the bounded decisions in Table 3. Broader statements require a new test matrix. For the snap-through architectures problem, a renewed-evidence trigger when rate dependence changes defines the independent cross-check rather than a tuning variable; at final qualification of snap-through architectures, non-convex energy landscape is reconciled with stability margin. The main inference uses agreement between measurement and prediction for non-convex energy landscape, whereas causal evidence that separates stability margin from imperfection sensitivity is reserved for the boundary test that can overturn the proposed interpretation; the closing snap-through architectures claim keeps stability margin distinct from imperfection sensitivity.

References

1. Gholikord M, Etemadi E, Imani M, Hosseinabadi M, Hu H. Design and analysis of novel negative stiffness structures with significant energy absorption. *Thin-Walled Structures*. 2022;181:110137. doi:10.1016/j.tws.2022.110137.
2. Gao C, Slesarenko V, Boyce MC, Rudykh S, Li Y. Instability-Induced Pattern Transformation in Soft Metamaterial with Hexagonal Networks for Tunable Wave Propagation. *Scientific Reports*. 2018;8:11834. doi:10.1038/s41598-018-30381-1.
3. Khosravani MR, Anders D, Ayatollahi MR, Reinicke T. Fabrication of mechanical metamaterials by 3D printing: recent advancements and current challenges. *Archives of Civil and Mechanical Engineering*. 2025;25:244. doi:10.1007/s43452-025-01290-8.
4. Rodopoulos DC, Mermigkis G, Hadjidoukas P, Karathanasopoulos N. Machine learning-based mechanics of TPMS architected materials driven by unit-cell geometric features. *npj Metamaterials*. 2026;2:16. doi:10.1038/s44455-026-00026-9.
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.