

Resorbable Fixation Devices Made from Photocurable Materials: Why the Existing Resorbable-Fixation Clinical Evidence Does Not Transfer, and the Minimum Qualification Evidence Required

Translational medical manufacturing

Juan Seguro

3Dresyns by Resyner Technologies S.L.

© 2026 Juan Seguro. All Rights Reserved.

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

ER-466 · Engineering Review · Version 0.1 · 12 October 2026

Abstract

Resorbable fixation systems have a clinical evidence base, but the evidence available to this review does not document a resorbable fixation device made from a photocurable material. This review uses the existing resorbable-fixation literature only to identify the clinical problem space and then makes the transfer boundary explicit. It defines the minimum evidence needed to connect a photocurable manufacturing route to strength retention, degradation and healing without importing conclusions from conventionally manufactured polylactide- or polyglycolide-based fixation systems. A claim matrix and a temporal assessment separate photocuring, fixation, functional retention and resorption, while preserving early failures in the evidence record.

Keywords: resorbable fixation devices · photocurable materials · clinical evidence transfer · strength retention · degradation · healing

1. Scope and central boundary

ER-466 does not claim that photocurable resorbable fixation devices are clinically established. The held source documents resorbable fixation systems in pediatric facial fractures [1]; no source in the evidence base shows that the fixation devices in that clinical evidence were photocured. The article therefore treats non-transfer as the principal result.

2. What the clinical anchor can support

The systematic-review record establishes that resorbable fixation has been evaluated clinically as a class [1]. It can support identification of clinically relevant endpoints such as safety and outcome reporting. It cannot establish photocurable chemistry, vat-photopolymerisation process equivalence, cure state, photoproduct profile or device-specific mechanical retention.

3. Why manufacturing-route transfer fails

Two device classes can share an intended function while differing in polymer chemistry, molecular architecture, manufacturing history, residual species, geometry and degradation path. Without a source that connects photocuring to the resorbable fixation device itself, the route-specific evidence chain is open. Clinical success of conventionally manufactured resorbable hardware therefore cannot be used as direct evidence for a photocurable analogue.

4. Strength retention

A fixation device must retain adequate mechanical function while healing progresses. For a photocurable device, strength retention would have to be measured on the delivered cure state and over the relevant degradation interval. No universal retention curve is inferred here.

5. Degradation

Degradation qualification must identify the polymer network, mass-loss or molecular-change endpoint, environment, geometry and time. Photocurable systems may introduce network structures or residual species that are not represented by conventionally processed resorbable fixation materials. The controlled clinical anchor does not close that comparison.

6. Healing match

“Healing match” is not a single material property. It is a temporal relationship between loss of device support and the recovery of biological load-bearing capacity. A credible claim therefore requires both a device-state trajectory and an application-specific healing endpoint. The present source set contains neither for a photocurable device.

7. Minimum evidence required

At minimum, the chain should include: a primary source documenting a photocured resorbable fixation device; material and cure-state identity; initial mechanical properties; time-resolved strength retention; degradation characterisation; geometry-specific testing; biocompatibility evidence appropriate to the degradation products and residual species; and an application-relevant link to healing or functional support. At least one primary photocurable fixation study with strength-retention or degradation data is needed to support a photocurable fixation claim.

8. Minimum reporting set

Report chemistry and material identity, photopolymer route, exposure and post-cure state, device geometry, sterilisation where relevant, initial and time-resolved mechanical tests, degradation conditions, analytical endpoints, biological endpoint and the exact clinical evidence to which any comparison is made.

9. Direct photocurable fixation is not proof of resorption

Schwarzenberg and colleagues compared light-curable fixation with metal plates in an ex vivo ovine phalanx model [2]. The construct was formed in situ around metal screws; it was not a vat-printed resorbable screw. The introduction reports lack of biosorbability over twelve months in earlier cited work, which was not independently examined here. The comparison varied with loading mode and fracture configuration, so one stiffness advantage cannot establish overall superiority. Numerical bending results are not reproduced because the abstract contains inconsistent unit labels. This primary object supplies photocurable fixation evidence while leaving resorption unestablished and demonstrates why the conjunction requires evidence for the same device.

10. Four claims that require different evidence

The proposed assessment separates four claims: the material is photocurable; the manufactured object is a fixation device; the device retains a required function over an interval; and its material is resorbed under relevant biological conditions. Evidence for any one does not establish the others. A photocured scaffold may address a regeneration question without being a fixation device. A light-cured fixation

construct may address mechanical stabilisation without demonstrating resorption. A resorbable device made by another route does not identify the residual species or network state of a photocured analogue.

This separation can be implemented as a claim matrix. Each row would name the exact device and material, with columns for fabrication, initial function, time-resolved retention, material fate and biological outcome. Empty cells would be retained. The matrix avoids constructing an apparently complete evidence chain by taking fabrication from one material, resorption from another and clinical performance from a third.

The same discipline applies within a study. If initial mechanical testing uses one geometry and degradation testing uses a thin coupon, the coupon may characterise that exposure configuration but does not directly establish the evolving function of the complete fixation construct. A bridge would need to explain and test which aspects of geometry and exposure matter to the intended inference.

11. A temporal test of the healing-match argument

A proposed temporal analysis would put device function and the biological support requirement on the same declared timeline while retaining them as separate evidence streams. It would identify the earliest time at which the device no longer meets its predefined functional criterion and the evidence supporting the evolution of the required function. Merely observing mass loss during a period associated with healing would not establish a satisfactory match.

For illustration, suppose one construct retains 80% of its initial test capacity at time t while another retains 50%. That observation does not identify the safer construct without the initial capacities, variability, relevant loading mode and acceptance basis. Percentage retention can conceal an initially weak device. A proposed report would therefore include absolute and relative results, failure mode and uncertainty, together with the specimen and conditioning history.

A credible follow-up programme would also report specimens lost before scheduled measurement and the reason they could not be tested. Excluding early failures from later averages would select surviving specimens and could create an appearance of stable retention. These principles give the transfer boundary an experimental meaning while leaving clinical sufficiency and resorption unclaimed until they are demonstrated for the same device system.

11A. Critical appraisal of the directly relevant fixation experiment

The experiment of Schwarzenberg et al. [2] is the most direct fabrication-route comparison in this evidence set because a light-curable material was actually used to form a fixation construct. It is nevertheless a comparison of ex vivo osteosynthesis constructs in an ovine phalanx model, rather than a study of a resorbable vat-printed fixation implant. The experimental unit, anatomical substrate, screw contribution, construct topology and loading conditions must therefore remain explicit when interpreting its results.

The authors compared bending and torsion outcomes under different fracture gap and fixation conditions. Their abstract reports greater torsional stiffness for some light-cured configurations, while metal constructs sustained equivalent or higher torque and higher maximum bending moments in the reported comparisons [2]. The direction of an apparent performance advantage consequently depends on whether the endpoint is initial stiffness or load at failure, and on the precise fracture configuration. It would be incorrect to compress these outcomes into an unqualified claim that a light-cured construct is mechanically superior.

The authors themselves identify monotonic rather than cyclic loading, uncertainty in physiological loading and the absence of between-surgeon reproducibility measurements as limitations [2]. None of their results directly supplies a long-term strength-retention curve, a biodegradation trajectory or a clinical success probability for a photocurable resorbable implant. The credible contribution is proof that a particular light-curable fixation construct can be tested against established comparators under controlled mechanical conditions.

11B. Translating fixation performance into an engineering qualification programme

The first proposed qualification step is to define the intended anatomical site, fixation duration, design loads, allowable displacement and consequences of failure before choosing a photopolymer. These are design inputs, not values transferable from another indication. For each test group, report fracture gap, bone surrogate or specimen characteristics, implant geometry, fastener specification, fabrication and cure state, sterilisation history and the loading fixture. Without these identifiers, mechanically similar numerical results may represent different structural questions.

At time zero, bending and torsion tests should distinguish elastic stiffness, ultimate capacity, permanent set and failure mode. A high stiffness can reduce relative fragment motion yet coexist with a low failure threshold; conversely, strength alone does not define stability under repeated loading. Cyclic loading, where justified by the use case, should report cycles, amplitude, waveform, environment, runout criteria and damage progression. These are proposed evidence requirements, not claims of completed studies.

For a resorbable candidate, repeat relevant mechanical tests at prespecified degradation intervals using both unaged controls and specimens conditioned under explicitly documented conditions. Record mass change, dimensional change, solution conditions and analytical measures that distinguish network alteration from soluble-fraction loss. Evaluate the actual device geometry rather than treating coupons as a sufficient proxy. The temporal comparison should be between the lower bound of retained construct capacity and the specified functional demand, with uncertainty reported for both.

The proposed biological assessment requires chemical characterisation of residual species and degradation products, together with biological endpoints appropriate to intended contact, exposure and use. No conclusion about safety follows from the word photopolymerisable, from a single cytotoxicity screening result or from biocompatibility reported for another polymer family. Sterilisation compatibility, if required, is part of the delivered-state definition and cannot be treated as a downstream administrative check.

11C. Evidence transfer matrix and review limitations

An evidence-transfer matrix should distinguish at least four independently testable columns: photocuring demonstrated on the named device; fixation mechanics demonstrated on a representative construct; resorption documented analytically over time; and biological or clinical outcome documented for the same material-device configuration. Schwarzenberg et al. [2] contribute principally to the fixation-mechanics column. The resorbable-fixation clinical review [1] informs the clinical context of another class of devices. Combining them does not fill the missing intersection.

12. Evidence transfer from fixation coupons to resorbable devices

The clinically relevant variable for a resorbable fixation device is not maximum initial strength alone but the time course of load-bearing capacity relative to tissue healing. A polymer may show acceptable dry coupon properties while behaving differently after hydration, sterilisation, cyclic loading or hydrolytic change. An adequate review therefore separates static failure strength, stiffness, fatigue resistance and strength retention under specified environmental histories.

Resorption should not be inferred from polymer classification or an isolated mass-loss measurement. Changes in molecular weight, dimensional stability, crack initiation, release chemistry and local tissue response may follow different time scales. The test pathway must explicitly connect degradation chemistry to mechanical integrity and biological exposure. Published observations on conventional resorbable fixation cannot be treated as direct validation for a new photocured network with a different process history.

Device-level comparisons must preserve geometry, insertion method, bone or synthetic support, load mode and failure definition. A fixation construct can fail at an interface even if the bulk specimen performs well. An engineering acceptance framework should therefore use prespecified failure modes, an appropriately constrained comparison and an uncertainty account that follows both manufacturing variation and degradation time.

Critical synthesis: transfer limits from polymer coupons to fixation constructs

Bone fixation devices work as assemblies with bone, not as isolated tensile bars. Relevant failure modes include screw-head fracture, thread stripping, plate-hole stress concentration, relaxation under preload, loss of bending rigidity, and migration before tissue consolidation. Reviews should distinguish evidence from resorbable fixation devices produced conventionally from the much narrower record for directly printed photocurable constructs.

A useful mechanical testing matrix follows the entire functional lifetime: initial insertion or seating, cyclic physiological loading, immersion ageing at relevant conditions and end-of-support performance. Geometry, print orientation, surface finish and sterilisation history should be recorded because these may alter both crack-initiation sites and degradation. Suggested specimen and device-level tests are qualification proposals, not a claim of measured clinical success.

The most important evidence gap is temporal alignment between loss of mechanical support and biological healing. Material disappearance, acceptable resorption kinetics and successful fixation are separate endpoints. A review should classify findings by species, anatomical site, loading configuration and follow-up time, and should not infer human fracture-healing performance from strength retention in saline.

13. Limitations

This review is a focused engineering assessment, not a systematic review or quantitative meta-analysis. The existing clinical source [1] was not available in full text in the inherited evidence record; its findings cannot be reanalysed here. Quantitative estimates cannot responsibly be pooled across unrelated technologies. A future comprehensive review should specify a reproducible search strategy, inclusion criteria, extraction of device and material identity, risk-of-bias assessment and predefined handling of heterogeneity before making comparative efficacy claims.

The clinical anchor [1] remains limited to its bibliographic record; its complete text was not retrieved. The added primary photocurable fixation study [2] was examined through selected publisher methods and results and does not establish resorption. The clinical anchor is used only to identify that evidence class. No clinical effect estimate is inferred from it, and no numerical bending result is imported from the primary case.

14. Conclusions

The existing resorbable-fixation clinical evidence does not transfer automatically to a photocurable device. A defensible photocurable claim requires a new evidence chain that joins manufacturing route, cure state, mechanical retention, degradation and healing for the same device class.

Competing interests

The author is Founder, CEO and CTO of 3Dresyns by Resyner Technologies S.L. The company develops and supplies photoresins and related process materials. No proprietary formulation, manufacturing sequence, process window or comparative product recommendation is disclosed.

Data availability

No new experimental dataset was generated.

References

1. Kaur K, Quadri SA, Saini RS, Vaddamanu SK, Alarcón-Sánchez MA, Flores-Fraile J, Heboyen A. Clinical and safety outcome profiles of resorbable fixation systems in pediatric facial fractures: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Cranio-Maxillofacial Surgery*. 2026;54(9):104597. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcms.2026.104597>
2. Schwarzenberg P, Colding-Rasmussen T, Hutchinson DJ, Mischler D, Horstmann P, Petersen MM, Jacobsen S, Pastor T, Malkoch M, Wong C, Varga P. Biomechanical performance of a novel light-curable bone fixation technique. *Scientific Reports*. 2023;13:9339. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-023-35706-3>

Copyright

© 2026 Juan Seguro. All Rights Reserved.