

Intellectual-Property Terrain for Photopolymer Manufacturing: What Additive-Manufacturing Patent and Trade-Secret Evidence Supports, and What Freedom-to-Operate Assessment Would Require

Industrial economics and deployment

Juan Seguro

3Dresyns by Resyner Technologies S.L.

© 2026 Juan Seguro. All Rights Reserved.

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

ER-478 · Engineering Review · Version 0.1 · 12 October 2026

Abstract

Additive-manufacturing intellectual-property literature provides useful context on patents, trade secrets and protection strategies, but it does not constitute a freedom-to-operate assessment for photopolymer manufacturing [1,2]. Source [1] is a metal-3D-printing legal and policy analysis. Source [2] addresses additive manufacturing and intellectual-property protection more generally. This review uses those sources only to define the terrain that an FTO exercise would have to interrogate. No patent, claim, jurisdiction or implementation has been searched, cleared or assigned a risk rating in this review, and no freedom-to-operate conclusion is provided. A hypothetical claim-to-feature map makes document identity, legal status, technical interpretation and unresolved product facts separately auditable.

Keywords: intellectual property · photopolymer manufacturing · additive manufacturing · patents · trade secrets · freedom to operate

1. Scope and legal boundary

ER-478 is an engineering review of the intellectual-property terrain around additive manufacturing as it may inform photopolymer manufacturing. It is not legal advice. It does not perform patent clearance, claim construction, jurisdictional legal analysis or a freedom-to-operate opinion.

2. Evidence base

Source [1] analyses patent law, trade secrets and additive manufacturing in a metal-3D-printing context [1]. Its direct subject is not photopolymer manufacturing. Source [2] discusses additive manufacturing and intellectual-property protection at a broader level [2]. Together they support a bounded description of the IP terrain, not a photopolymer-specific clearance result.

3. Patents and trade secrets are different evidence objects

A patent record and a trade-secret strategy answer different questions. Patent analysis concerns publicly disclosed claims and their legal scope; trade-secret analysis concerns information intentionally kept confidential under applicable controls. The two categories can coexist in a manufacturing programme and should not be collapsed into one generic notion of ownership.

4. Why a literature review is not an FTO assessment

Freedom to operate is implementation- and jurisdiction-dependent. A literature review can identify categories that matter, but it cannot establish clearance without a defined product or process, a relevant date, jurisdictions, claim sets and a legal assessment of how those claims relate to the implementation. None of that work is performed here.

5. What an FTO assessment would require

A later FTO exercise would need a controlled technical description of the intended implementation, a declared jurisdictional and temporal scope, a search strategy appropriate to that scope, identification of relevant patent families and claims, and legal analysis of those claims against the implementation. It would also need to distinguish expired, lapsed, pending and in-force rights where relevant. These are requirements for a separate assessment, not results of this review.

6. Photopolymer-specific boundary

The photopolymer term in this article identifies the target manufacturing domain. The controlled evidence is AM-general or metal-focused. No photopolymer-specific patent landscape is claimed, and no claim is made that the reviewed sources exhaust the relevant rights for photopolymer formulations, machines, exposure methods, post-processing or applications.

7. Design space and engineering records

Engineering teams can still use an IP-aware record structure without treating it as clearance. Technical alternatives, interfaces, process steps and design choices can be documented so that a later legal review has a stable technical object to assess. Such records are decision inputs, not legal conclusions.

8. A claim-to-feature map rather than a keyword map

The proposed analytical object is a dated record linking a technical feature to an identified legal document and jurisdiction. A keyword search can locate candidate documents, but similarity of titles or abstracts does not establish whether a product falls within a claim. The map should therefore preserve the exact document, its relevant claim text, the technical interpretation being considered and the evidence describing the product feature. This review proposes the record structure; it does not determine infringement or freedom to operate.

A hypothetical claim can illustrate the distinction without referring to a real patent. Suppose a claim requires features A, B and C together. Finding A in a product description does not establish the complete conjunction. Conversely, an analyst should not assume C is absent merely because a marketing brochure does not discuss it. The appropriate record is which features are evidenced, which interpretations are disputed and which facts remain unknown.

The same technical feature may be described differently in related documents. A family relationship can help organise retrieval but does not establish that every jurisdiction contains identical claims or has the same procedural status. The analysis needs the particular document and date relevant to the question.

9. Keep legal status and technical interpretation separately auditable

An expanded assessment would distinguish identity, status, interpretation and conclusion. Identity includes publication and family information. Status refers to the authoritative record and its date. Interpretation links claim language with technical facts. A legal conclusion requires the appropriate jurisdictional assessment and should not be generated automatically from the first three fields.

A configuration change can also change the question. A material substitution, a different process step or a different supply arrangement may require the feature map to be revisited even when the product name is unchanged. The version of the product description should therefore travel with the analysis. A previous search report would remain evidence of what was examined at that time, not a permanent clearance for future configurations.

The useful engineering contribution is a reproducible package for specialist review: identified documents, verified status records, controlled technical descriptions and explicit unresolved interpretations. It should include the search scope and exclusions so that silence is not mistaken for absence of relevant rights. This develops the review's method without converting a general IP landscape into a product-specific legal opinion.

10. Engineering records that support, but do not replace, legal analysis

A freedom-to-operate review begins with a precisely defined act in a jurisdiction and a specified date: making, using, importing or selling a product or process may raise different questions. The engineering bill of features should distinguish resin composition, photoinitiator package, exposure sequence, printer control, post-processing and final use. This enables a patent professional to compare each technically material feature with active claim language, rather than inferring clearance from broad technology labels.

Patent-publication searches, legal-status searches and claim interpretation are separate activities. A patent application is not automatically an enforceable patent; expiry, lapse, national coverage, prosecution amendments and claim construction require verification from authoritative registers and professional analysis. A research paper describing a technique does not prove that practicing it is unencumbered. Conversely, the mere presence of a photopolymer-related patent family does not prove infringement.

Trade secrets require a different operational treatment: source of know-how, confidentiality duties, employee access, contractor transfers and independent development records can be relevant even when patent searches show no obvious obstacle. A defensible technical record therefore preserves dated design decisions, experimental provenance, access rights and approved third-party licenses. Such recordkeeping improves auditability but cannot substitute for legal clearance.

This Engineering Review offers an engineering input map and evaluation questions only. It neither identifies a specific valid blocking claim nor offers a legal opinion on any named 3Dresyns formulation, competitor process or national market. Those conclusions would require claim charts, register extracts and competent jurisdiction-specific legal review.

Rights clearance is a multi-layer question

A design may be created independently yet fall within a third party's patent claims; conversely a publicly described process may be free of a particular patent but still rely on confidential know-how supplied under contract. Copyright, registered designs, patents, trade secrets and contractual restrictions should therefore be inventoried separately. Freedom-to-operate analysis is jurisdiction-, claim-, date- and activity-specific. A bibliographic patent count does not demonstrate freedom to practise a manufacturing method. This review can set out what information to preserve for professional legal review, but should not itself certify non-infringement.

Trade-secret controls in distributed photopolymer production

Formulation ratios, cure parameters, calibration procedures, supplier identities and application-specific qualification data may all be candidates for confidential protection if the legal conditions are satisfied. The World Intellectual Property Organization [3] explains that trade-secret status requires commercial value arising from secrecy, restricted availability and reasonable confidentiality measures. In manufacturing transfer these conditions make practical controls relevant: recipient-by-recipient access rights, clearly scoped technical packages, confidentiality obligations, revocation arrangements and records of approved changes. Treating every file as secret regardless of its public availability or handling controls is not a defensible classification.

Patent evidence and engineering evidence answer different questions

Patent publications can reveal proposed device configurations and process strategies, but their claims and examples are not equivalent to independently replicated performance data. A patent may disclose a broad concept without demonstrating robust production yield, reproducibility or regulatory suitability for a specific application. Engineering reviews should therefore avoid using patent examples as primary verification of material performance. Where research papers, patents and supplier material are cited together, each should be labelled by evidential function. Patent landscapes may help define a targeted search; they do not resolve claim scope or validity without jurisdiction-specific legal evaluation.

Traceable decision workflow

For a proposed industrial deployment, identify the planned product, manufacturing steps and markets; log relevant technical disclosures and agreements; map search results to those activities; and record questions requiring qualified patent counsel. A second, separate technical ledger should cover material performance, equipment settings, test reports and supplier qualifications. Keeping the two ledgers separate prevents engineering approval from being mistaken for intellectual-property clearance. Change events such as a new resin chemistry or altered end use can reopen either review independently.

Patent landscape, trade secrets and freedom to operate are separate assessments

A patent-landscape search describes published rights and technical themes, subject to database coverage, classification choices and publication delay. It does not answer the legal question of whether a specified manufacturing activity infringes enforceable claims in the countries where it will occur. A freedom-to-operate analysis requires claim-level interpretation, territorial and temporal status checks, review of assignments or licences where material, and a description of the actual material, process or product to be practised. Patent-expiration dates should not be inferred from publication dates alone.

Trade-secret management requires demonstrable controls over information with commercial value because it is secret, rather than a claim that every undisclosed process parameter automatically qualifies. Access permissions, confidentiality terms, traceable disclosure and staff responsibilities matter independently of patents. The existence of an additive-manufacturing patent does not prove coverage of a particular photopolymer workflow, and a general guidance document does not constitute a formal legal opinion. This review offers engineering-facing issue separation only; it is not a jurisdiction-specific infringement or validity assessment.

An auditable distinction between clearance and protection

A patent landscape describes disclosed claims and technical developments; it does not itself determine freedom to operate. Clearance must be assessed against operative claim scope, territory, legal status, time and the exact intended commercial acts. Even a technically different formulation may require separate consideration of equipment, software, manufacturing process, downstream product and the applicable licence chain.

Trade-secret protection poses a different evidence problem. Recipes, parameter windows, source-code access and process know-how require documented access controls and contractual treatment, but a confidentiality register does not confer exclusivity against independent development. A technical-transfer dossier should classify what may be disclosed to operators, what must be restricted, and what documentation is needed to prove compliance with contractual obligations.

The engineering review can define traceable clearance questions and the boundaries of disclosure; it must not imply that a technical publication provides legal advice or a jurisdiction-specific infringement opinion. Patent and rights conclusions require qualified legal assessment against current records.

11. No clearance performed

No patent, patent family, claim, jurisdiction or freedom-to-operate position has been searched, cleared or rated in this review. The article therefore provides no safe-harbour, non-infringement conclusion or legal opinion.

12. Conclusions

The available sources support a bounded description of patent and trade-secret issues in additive manufacturing [1,2]. They do not support a completed photopolymer freedom-to-operate map. For photopolymer manufacturing, FTO remains a separate, implementation-specific legal assessment requiring defined technical, jurisdictional and claim-level inputs. No clearance is performed here.

References

1. Rimmer M. Metal 3D printing: Patent law, trade secrets, and additive manufacturing. *Frontiers in Research Metrics and Analytics*. 2022;7:958761. <https://doi.org/10.3389/frma.2022.958761>.
2. Kurfess T, Cass WJ. Rethinking Additive Manufacturing and Intellectual Property Protection. *Research-Technology Management*. 2014;57(5):35-42. <https://doi.org/10.5437/08956308X5705256>.
3. World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO). Trade Secrets. Official guidance. <https://www.wipo.int/en/web/trade-secrets> (accessed 13 October 2026).

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.

Copyright

© 2026 Juan Seguro. All Rights Reserved.