

Supply-Chain Resilience for Photopolymer Raw Materials: Single Sources, Substitution, Inventory and Requalification

A bounded engineering framework for continuity actions without assuming material or process equivalence

Juan Seguro

3Dresyns by Resyner Technologies S.L.

© 2026 Juan Seguro. All Rights Reserved.

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

ER-473 · Engineering Review · Version 0.1 · 12 October 2026

Abstract

Additive manufacturing can alter supply-chain structure by changing where production occurs, how inventory is positioned and how rapidly manufacturing can respond to disruption. Two reviews provide the evidence base used here. Naghshineh and Carvalho synthesize 87 peer-reviewed studies and frame additive-manufacturing adoption through supply-chain capabilities, vulnerabilities, state variables, adoption impacts and barriers [1]. Bouchenine and Abdel-Aal analyse 224 Web of Science records from 2009-2022 and identify a recent concentration of research at the intersection of additive manufacturing, supply-chain disruption and resilience [2]. Both sources are additive-manufacturing general rather than photopolymer-specific.

ER-473 therefore uses those studies only for the general resilience logic and makes the photopolymer translation explicit as an engineering analogy. The review focuses on continuity of raw-material supply: single-source exposure, inventory policy, supplier-level substitution and requalification after a supply change before a changed source can enter a previously controlled photopolymer process. It does not claim that additive manufacturing automatically improves resilience, that inventory is a substitute for qualification, or that chemically similar raw materials are interchangeable. ER-474 retains critical-raw-material dependency, recovery context and performance-risk consequences of criticality. A synthetic inventory example connects usable coverage with the full alternate-source qualification schedule rather than commercial lead time alone.

Keywords: supply-chain resilience; photopolymer raw materials; single-source risk; supplier substitution; inventory; requalification; additive manufacturing; continuity planning

1. Significance and scope

Supply-chain resilience is the capability to prepare for, absorb, respond to and recover from disruption without treating every continuity action as equivalent. The general additive-manufacturing literature reviewed by Naghshineh and Carvalho links adoption to both capabilities and vulnerabilities, rather than to a uniformly positive resilience effect [1]. Bouchenine and Abdel-Aal likewise show that AM and supply-chain resilience have become a distinct research intersection, especially around disruption response [2].

For photopolymer manufacturing, the engineering question is narrower: what happens when a qualified formulation or process depends on a raw material, grade or supplier that becomes unavailable or unstable? The relevant continuity actions include holding inventory, qualifying an additional source, changing grade, accepting a supplier reformulation, or substituting a different chemical function. These actions can preserve availability while simultaneously invalidating a qualified manufacturing state.

1.1 Corpus boundary

ER-473 owns supplier-level substitution, alternate-source strategy, inventory policy and requalification after a supply change. ER-474 owns critical-raw-material dependency, recovery context and performance-risk consequences of criticality. ER-473 therefore keeps the supply-governance decision chain from disruption through alternate-source qualification and activation, while avoiding any claim that a nominally similar feedstock is technically equivalent without evidence. This allocation prevents 'substitution' from being used as one undifferentiated concept across supply governance and material criticality.

2. Evidence boundary: AM-general evidence and photopolymer analogy

Neither anchor is specific to photopolymer raw materials. Naghshineh and Carvalho review AM adoption across industries and develop propositions linking adoption impacts and barriers to supply-chain state, capabilities and vulnerabilities [1]. Bouchenine and Abdel-Aal map the AM-supply-chain literature bibliometrically and identify resilience, disruption, governance and Industry 4.0 as increasingly connected themes [2].

Accordingly, ER-473 does not cite either source as proof that a particular photoinitiator, oligomer, monomer, pigment, filler or additive is single-sourced, scarce or substitutable. Those are formulation- and supplier-specific facts that require a controlled bill of materials and supplier record. The sources support the resilience architecture; the translation to photopolymer raw-material control is an explicit engineering synthesis.

Table 1. Supply-continuity actions and their qualification meaning in a photopolymer manufacturing route.

Supply condition	Continuity action	Qualification consequence
Single qualified source	Hold buffer stock and/or develop a second source	Inventory buys time; a second source still requires evidence before use.
Same nominal material, new supplier or grade	Supplier-level substitution	Do not assume equivalence from name or specification alone; define a bridge.
Supplier reformulation or changed impurity/state profile	Treat as material-state change	Reassess the variables that can affect formulation, cure and delivered performance.
Different chemical solution for the same function	Functional substitution	Strongest change; return to formulation-level requalification rather than continuity-only approval.

3. Single-source exposure

A single-source condition is not defined by purchasing volume alone. It exists when only one source is qualified for a functionally necessary input, or when nominal alternatives cannot enter the controlled process without new evidence. A resilient record should therefore distinguish commercial availability from qualified availability. Five suppliers in the market do not create redundancy if only one grade has been demonstrated within the manufacturing state.

The minimum record should identify the raw-material function, qualified supplier and grade, any approved secondary source, practical lead-time and storage constraints, the quantity needed per accepted batch or part, and the technical variables that would be disturbed by a source change. This is a decision record, not a universal scoring system.

4. Inventory is a time buffer, not a technical bridge

Inventory can decouple a production process from a short disruption, but it does not create an alternate source. Buffer stock should therefore be sized against a declared continuity horizon and the real consumption pattern, while retaining lot identity, storage conditions and expiry or retest status where applicable. Excess stock can itself create ageing, obsolescence and trapped-capital risk.

Naghshineh and Carvalho treat inventory and production configuration as part of a wider set of supply-chain capabilities and vulnerabilities rather than as isolated solutions [1]. Bouchenine and Abdel-Aal map the broader additive-manufacturing and supply-chain resilience literature around disruption response, resilience and research gaps [2]. ER-473 applies the same non-compensatory logic: inventory can preserve time for a supplier bridge, but cannot compensate for a failed equivalence study or an uncontrolled material change.

5. Supplier-level substitution

Supplier substitution is the controlled replacement of one qualified source by another source intended to fulfil the same material function. The first question is therefore not whether the replacement has the same trade name or nominal specification, but whether the attributes that matter to the photopolymer process remain inside the qualified state.

For a photopolymer raw material, those attributes can include identity, functionality, inhibitor or stabiliser state, impurity profile, water or volatile content, colour or absorbance, particle state where relevant, viscosity contribution and interaction with cure. Which variables matter depends on the function of the material. ER-473 does not prescribe universal tests or tolerances; it requires the bridge to be tied to the actual process leverage of the changed input.

6. Diversification and dual sourcing

Dual sourcing is useful only when both sources are genuinely qualified and the operational system can preserve their identities. A second supplier that has never been run through the controlled process is a candidate source, not a resilience capability. Likewise, routinely mixing materials from different sources can erase the evidence needed to assign a deviation or performance shift to a particular lot or supplier.

A practical diversification plan therefore separates qualification from activation. Qualification establishes the evidence for an alternate source; activation defines when purchasing may switch, how incoming identity is confirmed, whether segregated inventory is required, and what change-control record accompanies the first production use.

7. Requalification depth follows the change

Requalification after substitution belongs to ER-473 at the supply-governance level and should be proportional to the degree to which the supply action changes the controlled material state. A supplier-only change with preserved identity and bounded process response can justify a focused bridge. A change in grade, precursor, impurity or other incoming-material state requires the affected formulation and process variables to be re-established. A different chemical solution for the same function is the strongest change and requires formulation-level requalification before routine activation.

The requalification record should preserve the old and new source identities, the declared change class, the incoming attributes selected for comparison, the relevant process response and the delivered performance endpoints that define the qualified state. The bridge must be tied to the actual material-process-function claim; commercial continuity, supplier documentation or matching trade names are not evidence of equivalence. ER-473 does not set universal tests, sample counts, thresholds or intervals: those must be justified for the specific material, process and consequence of failure.

8. Supply-disruption decision sequence

When a disruption occurs, first determine whether existing qualified inventory covers the required continuity horizon. If it does, preserve lot and storage controls while a longer-term action is evaluated. If it does not, determine whether an already qualified secondary source exists. An approved second source can be activated under its existing change-control conditions; an unqualified source cannot.

If a new source is proposed, classify the change as supplier-only, grade/state change, or functional substitution. Define the variables at risk, select the appropriate bridge or requalification path, and keep emergency commercial approval separate from technical acceptance. The acceptance decision is whether the new source preserves the controlled manufacturing state for the intended use, not whether the supply interruption is urgent.

8.1. From supplier mapping to a qualified-availability graph

A conventional vendor list answers who can sell a material; a qualified-availability graph answers which supplier-grade-lot pathways can actually produce an accepted output. Each node should represent a controlled material state, not merely a commercial entity. The edges are documented bridges: incoming analytical comparability, formulation response, cure-process response and the final attributes relevant to the intended use. Two commercial suppliers operating through the same upstream manufacturer may constitute less independence than their purchase-order identities imply. Likewise, a supplier with multiple

production sites cannot automatically be treated as multiple qualified manufacturing sources. This distinction is an engineering inference for continuity planning, not a measured prevalence claim derived from the AM-general reviews [1,2].

8.2. Inventory coverage under uncertainty and material ageing

Simple days-of-cover figures conceal several interacting uncertainties. A defensible planning calculation starts with usable, traceable inventory and a consumption distribution for conforming output, including expected scrap or rework. It then compares that inventory with disruption and replenishment horizons under defined scenarios rather than assuming a fixed lead time. The inventory should be adjusted for retest, expiry, storage compatibility and the possibility that ageing changes the formulation response before its nominal shelf life ends. In a photosensitive formulation, a stockpile that remains commercially available but is no longer technically acceptable must not be counted as fully usable resilience inventory. Conversely, retesting must follow a justified protocol: the absence of visible change is not evidence that inhibition, spectral response or processing behaviour remain inside the originally qualified window. These are suggested decision variables, not validated universal thresholds.

8.3. A graded qualification matrix for source changes

The qualification study should begin with an explicit change hypothesis. For a nominally identical chemical from a new supplier, the bridge may focus on verified identity, impurity or stabiliser differences and a limited set of sensitive process and final-part responses. A new grade from the same supplier may require a broader study if viscosity, absorbance or reactivity changes. Replacing one functional ingredient with a chemically different alternative is a formulation redesign, even if it appears to serve the same purchasing function. In each case, acceptance should be predeclared against application-specific criteria. Analytical equivalence alone is insufficient where cure conversion, depth response, separation behaviour or finished-part attributes change. Conversely, a small analytical difference should not automatically force rejection if it is irrelevant to the validated function and that irrelevance is experimentally demonstrated. A bridge record should report failed as well as successful comparisons to prevent selective evidence retention.

8.4. Evidence design and comparability

For every proposed alternate source, the study design must control confounders: formulation mixing sequence, resin history, storage temperature, exposure spectrum, process settings, wash and post-cure conditions, specimen orientation and test conditioning. Comparative specimens should be drawn from identified lots, with the old-source control processed contemporaneously where possible. Replicate measurements quantify variability but do not by themselves establish generality across production lots or machine configurations. Where the supply change affects a critical function, limited one-lot bridging may be inadequate; the necessary evidence depth depends on risk and the actual qualification claim. Reporting both incoming-material measurements and response variables permits a later reviewer to distinguish an input-specification difference from a manufacturing-process effect. This constitutes a proposed qualification architecture, not an empirical claim that a particular sample count is sufficient.

8.5. Operational trade-offs and failure scenarios

The decision to activate a secondary source carries a real opportunity cost. Maintaining two sets of incoming controls, segregated stock, evidence records and possibly distinct process windows may increase complexity and create human error. The resilience benefit should therefore be evaluated against the actual recovery capability delivered. Illustrative stress scenarios include a supplier outage shorter than the qualified stock horizon; a prolonged outage with a previously qualified source; the loss of both suppliers because they share an upstream feedstock; and an emergency grade change that passes incoming inspection but fails a critical cured-part attribute. These cases should be evaluated qualitatively or with organisation-specific data, not assigned generic probabilities. The relevant endpoint is sustained supply of conforming product, not merely an uninterrupted sequence of purchase orders.

8.6. Research agenda and evidence maturity

A useful future multi-site evidence base would pair disruption events with time-to-recovery, lost accepted output, usable inventory at event onset, qualification scope, bridge success rate and the final performance distributions associated with source changes. Comparisons would need to stratify by raw-material function and application severity, because an alternate pigment and an alternate structural oligomer do not impose interchangeable risks. The existing literature [1,2] provides a rationale for studying capabilities and vulnerabilities, but neither source resolves these photopolymer-specific questions. Until such studies are available, quantitative prescriptions for minimum safety stock, qualification time or alternate-source reliability would be unjustified.

9. Research and data priorities

The two anchors show a mature general discussion of AM and supply-chain resilience but do not provide photopolymer-specific data on raw-material concentration, supplier redundancy, lead-time distributions, ageing of strategic stocks or equivalence success rates [1,2]. Those gaps should remain visible rather than being filled by assumed industry norms.

Useful future datasets would report, without exposing proprietary formulations, the function class of the changed input, old and new supplier/grade state, relevant incoming measurements, cure/process response, final-part response, bridge depth, time to qualification and whether the change was accepted, rejected or conditionally bounded. Such records would turn supplier substitution from a narrative continuity event into reusable engineering evidence.

10. Compare inventory coverage with qualification time

The proposed continuity calculation begins with usable, qualified inventory Q and demand expressed as consumption d per unit time. Under constant consumption, coverage is Q/d . Inventory in quarantine, beyond its permitted state or committed to another use should not silently enter Q . The calculation is a planning approximation; variable demand and ageing require a time-resolved assessment.

Consider a synthetic example with 120 units of usable material and consumption of 10 units per week. Coverage is 12 weeks. A candidate supplier might have a four-week commercial lead time, but the alternate route is not available in four weeks if qualification and acceptance are also required. If the declared qualification programme takes eight weeks after material receipt, the total is 12 weeks only under the assumed sequential schedule, with no margin for a failed bridge or a delivery delay. Calling this a four-week alternate source would conceal the technical dependency.

Tasks that can proceed in parallel should be identified explicitly. Documentation review before receipt may shorten the sequence, but a measurement requiring the actual lot cannot be completed merely because a supplier document arrived. The useful planning output is the dependency schedule and its uncertain durations, not an unsupported promise of a qualification date.

11. Distinguish the candidate source from an activated source

A proposed activation record would identify the evidence establishing the alternate source, the permitted material and grade, the manufacturing state represented by that evidence and the authority for first use. A purchasing decision would reference that record rather than replace it. If the incoming material falls outside the state that was bridged, the existence of a previous alternate-source approval would not resolve the new difference.

An inventory response also has an expiry or retest dimension. More stock extends nominal coverage only while that stock remains usable. A time-phased ledger could show consumption, remaining qualified stock and the point at which a planned alternative becomes available. The same ledger would expose whether a strategy reduces one vulnerability by increasing another, such as holding material beyond the demonstrated storage state.

This example turns the resilience framework into a concrete continuity question: can qualified supply cover the required interval, and what exact evidence permits the next source to enter? It introduces no universal stock target and makes no claim about the actual lead times of photopolymer raw materials.

Qualification depth for alternate raw-material suppliers

Supply continuity and formulation equivalence are different claims. A material with the same nominal chemical name can differ in inhibitor package, trace contaminants, water content, molar-mass distribution or stabilisation history. These differences can change storage stability and exposure response even when the certificate of analysis meets broad commercial specifications. Alternate sourcing should therefore use risk-ranked attributes linked to the formulation function, documented lot acceptance and a planned bridge between bench tests, representative printing trials and acceptance of the final manufactured state. A purchasing approval does not establish print-process interchangeability.

Inventory buffers protect against interruption only while the material remains within an evidenced shelf-life and controlled storage envelope. Resilience planning should model at least three distinguishable interruptions: delayed delivery of an unchanged qualified source, change to a chemically comparable but previously unqualified source, and replacement by a different functional chemistry. Each scenario has a different technical release gate and lead time. General AM supply-chain literature supports investigation of distributed sourcing and redundancy but does not supply the missing photopolymer-specific equivalence data. The proposed gating structure remains an engineering recommendation.

Qualification timing as an explicit supply-resilience constraint

A second supplier offers resilience only if its material can be qualified before the inventory of the first qualified material is exhausted. The practical planning variable is therefore the difference between protected production coverage and the total lead time for sampling, analytical equivalence, printing trials, post-processing, ageing checks and approval. Treating the receipt of a supplier sample as the end of requalification understates this critical path.

Equivalent certificate values alone cannot establish formulation interchangeability. A photopolymer feedstock can match nominal viscosity or purity yet differ in inhibitor balance, trace absorption or ageing response. A defensible qualification matrix links each critical attribute to an analytical method, an in-process observation and an accepted-part property. The acceptance window must be pre-specified for the intended product, not borrowed from a generic materials datasheet.

The review should compare a single-source baseline, a prequalified alternate and an unqualified emergency alternate, keeping production interruption time separate from the cost of holding stock. This decision framework is proposed for validation and should not be presented as evidence that multisourcing necessarily reduces total cost.

12. Limitations

Both scientific anchors are AM-general. They support the resilience framework and the observation that AM can alter supply-chain capabilities and vulnerabilities, but they do not establish photopolymer-specific single-source prevalence, inventory targets, acceptable supplier substitutions or requalification thresholds. ER-473 therefore labels its photopolymer translation as engineering synthesis and makes no universal claim that AM improves resilience in every supply chain.

13. Conclusions

Supply-chain resilience for photopolymer raw materials is strongest when commercial continuity and technical equivalence are kept separate. Inventory buys time. A qualified alternate source provides redundancy. Supplier substitution can restore supply, but only after the changed material state has been bounded. Functional substitution is a larger formulation change and should not be hidden inside emergency purchasing. The general AM literature supports the resilience architecture; the photopolymer-specific implementation must remain tied to controlled material identity, process response and requalification evidence.

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 datasets were generated for this review.

References

- [1] Naghshineh B.; Carvalho H. The implications of additive manufacturing technology adoption for supply chain resilience: a systematic search and review. *International Journal of Production Economics* 247 (2022) 108387. DOI: 10.1016/j.ijpe.2021.108387.
- [2] Bouchenine A.; Abdel-Aal M.A.M. Towards supply chain resilience with additive manufacturing: a bibliometric survey. *Supply Chain Analytics* 2 (2023) 100014. DOI: 10.1016/j.sca.2023.100014.

Copyright

© 2026 Juan Segurola. All Rights Reserved. No part of this work may be reproduced, distributed or transmitted without the prior written permission of the copyright holder, except where permitted by applicable law.