

Fluidic Metamaterials and Architected Flow Networks: Hydraulic Response, Deformation and Scale Effects

Qualifying pressure-flow behaviour when channel geometry, compliant walls and network interactions create nonlinear hydraulic functions

Juan Seguro

3Dresyns by Resyner Technologies S.L.

© 2026 Juan Seguro. All Rights Reserved.

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

ER-368 · Engineering Review · Version 0.2 · 1 October 2026

Abstract

Architected flow networks are governed by the strong sensitivity of hydraulic resistance to as-built channel dimensions, together with deformation of compliant walls under pressure. For laminar circular channels the radius-to-the-fourth dependence is an important limiting case, but roughness, non-circular sections, residual resin and junction losses can dominate printed networks. The proposed evidence therefore combines distributed pressure and flow measurements with CT or destructive channel metrology and, where deformation is relevant, imaging of wall motion. A 'geometric scale sweep at matched dimensionless conditions' separates continuum scaling from manufacturing artifacts. Qualification then becomes an operating envelope for pressure, flow and deformation rather than a claim based only on nominal CAD dimensions.

Keywords: fluidic metamaterial; hydraulic network; elastohydrodynamics; scale effect; pressure drop; flow control

1. Qualification problem: architected flow networks

For architected flow networks, the relevant question is where the architecture or process leaves its qualified regime. The review therefore resolves operating envelope avoiding collapse/blockage, whether a lumped network model is adequate, and minimum channel size that remains cleanable and dimensionally reliable against measured changes in Reynolds number, Womersley number, and elastohydrodynamic compliance ratio. [2]

1.1 Scope boundary.

ER-368 owns architected-flow response, including geometry-dependent hydraulic response and deformation coupling. ER-369 owns embedded pneumatic actuation and ER-361 general metamaterial qualification; this review treats flow-network behaviour rather than actuator control.

2. Governing balances for architected flow networks

Network flow is bounded by the following relations for inertia, oscillation, and wall compliance.

for laminar channels hydraulic resistance scales strongly with characteristic dimension, often as inverse radius to the fourth power in circular tubes

network response follows Kirchhoff-like pressure-flow conservation only when element constitutive laws are memoryless
compliant walls couple pressure to geometry and can introduce nonlinear resistance, hysteresis or memristive behaviour

Together they show whether a pressure-flow change originates in inertia, unsteady forcing, or compliant channel walls.

3. Regime boundaries for architected flow networks

For architected flow networks, the regime map chooses between collapse/blockage testing, network-model validation, and minimum-channel qualification.

Table 1. Regime indicators for architected-flow response.

Indicator	Engineering meaning	Use
Reynolds number	inertial transport relative to viscous flow resistance	Map Reynolds number against the states used for 'operating envelope avoiding collapse/blockage'. The decision should not be transferred once inertial transport relative to viscous flow resistance leaves the measured envelope.
Womersley number	unsteady inertial response during oscillatory flow	Map Womersley number against the states used for 'whether a lumped network model is adequate'. The decision should not be transferred once unsteady inertial response during oscillatory flow leaves the measured envelope.
elastohydrodynamic compliance ratio	pressure-induced deformation relative to channel size	Map elastohydrodynamic compliance ratio against the states used for 'minimum channel size that remains cleanable and dimensionally reliable'. The decision should not be transferred once pressure-induced deformation relative to channel size leaves the measured envelope.

Flow-network performance is not extrapolated across untested inertia, unsteadiness, or compliance conditions.

4. Couplings that move the architected flow networks

Surface roughness and residual resin reduce effective hydraulic diameter.

Wall deformation redistributes flow across networks. [2]

Trapped gas changes compressibility and transient response.

5. Failure signatures and false diagnoses

The fault logic separates blocked or partially cured channels, unexpected flow localisation and pressure-induced collapse or ballooning; the measurement logic separates distributed pressure taps or embedded sensors, flow visualisation and particle tracking and CT or destructive channel metrology. Qualification links the two only where the measured signature supports the corresponding route. The four interventions in Table 2 are interpreted as a coupled diagnostic set, with inconsistency used as evidence of a missing mechanism.

Table 2. Failure-mode discrimination for architected-flow response.

Failure mode	Observable signature	Discriminating evidence
blocked or partially cured channels	distributed pressure taps or embedded sensors	geometric scale sweep at matched dimensionless conditions
unexpected flow localisation	flow visualisation and particle tracking	rigid-wall versus compliant-wall controls
pressure-induced collapse or ballooning	CT or destructive channel metrology	single-channel calibration before network tests
scale-up failure because Reynolds/compliance regime changes	pressure-flow loops under steady and transient driving	transient step/oscillatory flow to reveal memory

6. Measuring architected flow networks with traceable uncertainty

The three measured pathways in Table 2 are registered to a common state and evaluated with separate repeatability and calibration contributions. An acceptable record for architected flow networks must show separate monitoring of unsteady flow without inferring it from independent resolution of hydraulic resistance and network conservation; during metrology of architected flow networks, wall compliance is resolved against unsteady flow. In parallel, an uncertainty-controlled perturbation of wall compliance probes the boundary condition most likely to change the interpretation, and the resulting uncertainty is carried forward explicitly; the uncertainty record for architected flow networks keeps unsteady flow separate from hydraulic resistance.

7. Experiments that discriminate competing mechanisms

The Table 2 experiment set is used to separate reversible state effects, geometry effects and history effects before model fitting begins. Evidence for architected flow networks is not accepted from a single nominal condition; during the causal challenge for architected flow networks, unsteady flow is tested against hydraulic resistance. The analysis requires a causal contrast between hydraulic resistance and wall compliance, follows it with a replicate test of unsteady flow, and uses a boundary challenge involving network conservation as a targeted challenge wherever the two indicate different mechanism or margin; the experiment for architected flow networks separates hydraulic resistance from network conservation.

8. Model identification and validation for architected flow networks

The identification dataset comes from one Table 2 row; the other two rows are reserved for independent validation and a non-uniqueness check. [1] [3] [4,5] Each Table 3 limit receives its own propagated uncertainty and its own rejection condition. Prediction against wall compliance is the first stress test for architected flow networks; only after that result is bounded is parameter estimation for hydraulic resistance and network conservation interpreted; within model identification for architected flow networks, hydraulic resistance is not fitted through network conservation. The record keeps an uncertainty-bounded check on unsteady flow outside that inference and reports it as an independent line of evidence; prediction for architected flow networks keeps network conservation independent of wall compliance.

9. Qualification envelope and technology decisions

Table 3. Technology-decision matrix for architected-flow response.

Decision	Minimum evidence	Acceptance logic
operating envelope avoiding collapse/blockage	A decision on operating envelope avoiding collapse/blockage requires distributed pressure taps or embedded sensors data across the transfer range, including a boundary case and a replicate series that demonstrates stability.	Retain the decision only while 'geometric scale sweep at matched dimensionless conditions' keeps distributed pressure taps or embedded sensors within the tested envelope; observation of blocked or partially cured channels terminates the claim.
whether a lumped network model is adequate	Support whether a lumped network model is adequate with state-resolved flow visualisation and particle tracking measurements that bracket the candidate condition and quantify both repeatability and uncertainty.	The qualified decision holds when 'rigid-wall versus compliant-wall controls' does not move flow visualisation and particle tracking beyond the measured boundary and does not trigger unexpected flow localisation.
minimum channel size that remains cleanable and dimensionally reliable	The evidence set for minimum channel size that remains cleanable and dimensionally reliable should contain calibrated CT or destructive channel metrology measurements from baseline through the proposed limit, with independent replication near that limit.	The claim passes when the response to 'single-channel calibration before network tests' is reproducible in CT or destructive channel metrology and pressure-induced collapse or ballooning remains absent at the decision boundary.

Qualification of architected flow networks treats tested ranges in hydraulic resistance and network conservation as one axis and an explicit transfer limit on unsteady flow as another; inside the architected flow networks envelope, network conservation and wall compliance define different transfer limits. Between them, a separate boundary for wall compliance supplies the deliberate challenge that determines whether the apparent transfer is mechanistic or merely coincidental; qualification of architected flow networks bounds wall compliance separately from unsteady flow.

10. Design consequences for architected flow networks

Design robustness is demonstrated when all three Table 3 limits remain satisfied across the validated state range. The design sequence uses an implementation check on wall compliance to constrain a design change governed by hydraulic resistance; during design implementation for architected flow networks, wall compliance is constrained by unsteady flow. Transfer is evaluated while whether a lumped network model is adequate is controlled independently, and a requalification trigger tied to unsteady flow remains the explicit requalification trigger; the architected flow networks design record separates unsteady flow from hydraulic resistance. The design file records the boundary explicitly so later changes can be screened without row-order assumptions; implementation of architected flow networks treats hydraulic resistance and network conservation as different control axes.

11. Evidence gaps for architected flow networks

The other two measurements are required there to distinguish loss of transfer from a change in mechanism. For architected flow networks, the evidence chain starts with scale transfer of hydraulic resistance; for unresolved architected flow networks transfer, unsteady flow is studied separately from hydraulic resistance. It then adds uncertainty in network conservation versus wall compliance, while independent replication of unsteady flow is retained as a separate control so the three sources of information cannot compensate silently; the evidence gap in architected flow networks distinguishes hydraulic resistance from network conservation.

12. Qualification outcome for architected flow networks

The final claim remains conditional on all three Table 3 boundaries staying inside the validated envelope and associated uncertainty. The working sequence for architected flow networks has three parts: agreement between measurement and prediction for hydraulic resistance; causal evidence that separates network conservation from wall compliance; and a renewed-evidence trigger when unsteady flow changes; at final qualification of architected flow networks, hydraulic resistance is reconciled with network conservation. Each part answers a different engineering question, so uncertainty or failure in one part is not repaired by a favourable result in another; the closing architected flow networks claim keeps network conservation distinct from wall compliance.

References

- Avallone F, Bosia F, Chen Y, Colombo G, Craster R, De Ponti JM, Fabbiane N, Haberman MR, Hussein MI, Hwang W, Iemma U, Juhl A, Kadic M, Kotsonis M, Laude V, Marquet O, Mery F, Michelis T, Nouh M, Ragni D, Touboul M, Wegener M, Krushynska AO. Metamaterials and Fluid Flows. *Nature Communications*. 2026;17:4144. doi:10.1038/s41467-026-70163-2.
- Martínez-Calvo A, Biviano MD, Christensen AH, Katifori E, Jensen KH, Ruiz-García M. The fluidic memristor as a collective phenomenon in elastohydrodynamic networks. *Nature Communications*. 2024;15:3121. doi:10.1038/s41467-024-47110-0.
- Yu Y, Pan Y, Shen Y, Tian J, Zhang R, Guo W, Li C, Shum HC. Vascular network-inspired fluidic system (VasFluidics) with spatially functionalizable membranous walls. *Nature Communications*. 2024;15:1437. doi:10.1038/s41467-024-45781-3.
- 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.
- 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.