

Worker Exposure in Photopolymer Manufacturing: Task-Based Emissions and Monitoring, with Community, Waste and Justice as Open Evidence Gaps

Lifecycle assurance and responsible innovation

Juan Seguro

3Dresyns by Resyner Technologies S.L.

© 2026 Juan Seguro. All Rights Reserved.

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

ER-488 · Engineering Review · Version 0.1 · 12 October 2026

Abstract

Worker exposure during photopolymer additive manufacturing has direct evidence in the controlled source set, whereas community effects, waste-stream impacts and environmental-justice questions do not. One source examines particles and gases across vat-photopolymerisation tasks, and a second addresses organic-compound and particle emissions from photopolymer-resin AM and outgassing of manufactured resin products [1,2]. This review therefore centres on task-based worker exposure and monitoring. Community, waste and justice are retained only as named evidence gaps. No distributional claim, waste-stream claim or environmental-justice conclusion is made. A synthetic time-weighted calculation and a proposed control comparison distinguish source, area, personal and task-specific observations.

Keywords: worker exposure · photopolymer manufacturing · task-based emissions · monitoring · community impacts · waste · justice

1. Scope and ownership

ER-488 reviews worker-exposure evidence directly relevant to photopolymer manufacturing and identifies where the evidence stops. The article does not make claims about community exposure, waste distribution or environmental justice.

2. Direct worker-exposure evidence

Source [1] is directly concerned with particle and gas exposure across vat-photopolymerisation AM processes [1]. Source [2] concerns organic-compound and particle emissions from AM with photopolymer resins and chemical outgassing of manufactured resin products [2]. Together they support a worker-centred exposure discussion while leaving wider societal questions unresolved.

3. Task-based structure

Exposure should be organised by task because printing, material handling, part removal, cleaning, post-processing and other workflow stages can create different emission opportunities. Source [1] is particularly relevant to a task-based view [1]. The engineering requirement is to associate each measurement with the task and process state during which it was collected.

4. Monitoring architecture

A monitoring record should identify the task, location, sampling interval, measurement or analytical method, material/process state and the quantity being observed. Measurements taken at different tasks or locations should not be pooled without declaring that difference. This article does not introduce quantitative study values from source [2], which is available here only at publisher-abstract depth.

5. Worker exposure is not community exposure

A workplace measurement does not by itself establish exposure beyond the workplace boundary. Community exposure would require its own source-pathway-receptor evidence, location definition and monitoring design. No such claim is made from the two controlled sources.

6. Waste remains an open evidence gap

The sources in this review address emissions/exposure, not the distribution, treatment or downstream impacts of waste streams. Waste is therefore named as an open evidence gap and is not described as though a waste-impact study had been supplied.

7. Justice remains an open evidence gap

Environmental or distributional justice requires evidence about how burdens and protections are distributed across groups or locations. The controlled evidence does not provide that layer. Justice is therefore named only as a missing evidence domain.

8. Minimum worker-exposure record

At minimum, report the photopolymer process, material class, task, location, engineering controls in use, sampling or measurement method, time basis, process state and whether the measurement concerns vapour, gas, particle or another defined quantity. This minimum record is intended to preserve comparability and prevent a task-specific measurement from becoming a generic process label.

9. Product outgassing as a separate state

Source [2] includes chemical outgassing of manufactured resin products within its stated scope [2]. That is a different state from emissions during active processing. Measurements on the manufactured article should therefore be identified separately from measurements taken while resin is being handled or cured.

10. Align sampling with the exposure question

A proposed task-based assessment first distinguishes a source emission, an area concentration, a personal measurement and a biological dose. These quantities describe different points in an exposure pathway. A measurement near a printer can identify a local condition without establishing what an individual experienced across the working period. The study should therefore state the quantity measured, the sampling position, the duration and the task conditions.

Time aggregation can conceal task differences. For an illustrative concentration history, an eight-hour period containing one hour at 8 arbitrary concentration units and seven hours at 1 unit has a time-weighted average of 1.875 units. This arithmetic example supplies no exposure limit and describes no real substance. It shows that the period average does not reproduce the one-hour condition. Which measure is relevant depends on the hazard and the decision being assessed.

Results below a method's reporting limit should retain that limit and its treatment in the analysis. Replacing every such result with zero would introduce an assumption about unmeasured concentrations. Background measurements and blank controls should also remain identifiable rather than being silently subtracted without a rule.

11. Evaluate a control under comparable task conditions

A proposed control comparison would preserve material, task duration, work rate, equipment state, ventilation and sampling method as far as the question requires. If several conditions change together, the result describes the combined change unless the design can distinguish their effects. A lower measurement in a later session does not by itself identify the responsible control.

The assessment should also retain exposure routes separately. An inhalation-focused sample does not quantify skin contact, and a record of protective equipment does not directly measure its effectiveness in the task. The study would select observations appropriate to the route being evaluated and document the actual conditions of use.

A useful report would present task-specific findings with uncertainty and state which periods or activities were not represented. It would then connect the evidence to a defined control question rather than claim that an entire installation is safe from one successful measurement. This design strengthens occupational assessment while avoiding unsupported quantitative transfer between materials, machines or workplaces.

Supplementary critical engineering analysis: Exposure pathway resolution: Emissions measurements should distinguish liquid handling, printing, part removal, solvent washing, post-curing and waste consolidation. Total volatile-organic-compound readings alone cannot establish the identity or toxicological relevance of individual species, and a fixed-position monitor may miss short task-related exposure peaks. A defensible monitoring strategy combines task logs, time-resolved measurements, substance-specific sampling where warranted and documented ventilation conditions. Dermal exposure requires independent assessment because air monitoring cannot serve as its surrogate.

Community and waste boundary: Factory measurements cannot be used as a direct proxy for community exposure or waste-stream impacts. Potential pathways must first be identified through inventories of emitted substances and wastes, capture and treatment systems and the routes by which off-site exposure could occur. Where these records are absent, the responsible conclusion is an evidence gap. This review does not establish an environmental injustice outcome from occupational exposure observations alone.

Critical evidence synthesis: Task-resolved exposure evidence and limits of environmental extrapolation: A detector response near a printer is not equivalent to a measured worker dose or identified substance concentration. Sampling design should distinguish background levels, short peaks during resin handling, emissions during printing, and exposures during washing, cleaning and waste handling. Identity-specific analysis is required where a toxicological inference depends on a particular compound. Measurement uncertainty should include blank correction, sampling duration, flow calibration and the possibility that enclosure or ventilation changes the spatial pattern of emissions.

Worker exposure, community exposure and waste impacts constitute different evidentiary questions. An indoor task measurement cannot be directly converted into an off-site exposure estimate without a transport and release model supported by environmental measurements. Similarly, waste categorisation requires knowledge of actual chemical composition and treatment route, not merely whether a product is labelled cured. Where direct environmental observations are absent, these remain open evidence gaps rather than established harms or established absence of harm.

Task-resolved exposure assessment and uncertainty: A defensible occupational exposure study should delimit the operation under observation: dispensing, open-vat printing, support removal, solvent cleaning, ultraviolet post-curing, spill handling and waste transfer have distinct emission opportunities. Time-weighted averages alone can conceal short high-exposure events; task logging, ventilation conditions and sampling duration should accompany every reported concentration.

Analytical specificity matters. Total volatile-organic-compound sensor signals cannot identify individual sensitizing constituents, and an absence of detected airborne analytes does not establish the absence of dermal contact or surface contamination. Air, surface, glove breakthrough and biomonitoring endpoints cannot be used interchangeably. Limits of detection and blank corrections must be reported alongside positive readings.

A photopolymer-specific monitoring framework should compare uncured resin, contaminated solvent, residue and fully processed article as different material states. Environmental release assessment additionally needs a transport pathway, emission quantity and receptor; worker sampling cannot be extrapolated to community exposure without those data. Proposed monitoring controls are engineering recommendations, not proof of safe exposure or regulatory compliance.

For comparative intervention studies, pair measurements before and after a specified control change, holding material, machine, task and production volume stable where possible. Report inter-day variability and sample size. Capture near-misses and cleaning events because unusually short episodes can be missed by scheduled sampling.

12. Limitations

The evidence directly supports worker-focused emissions and monitoring questions. It does not support community, waste or justice claims, and source [2] is used only at publisher-abstract depth in this controlled set.

From sensor response to attributable exposure: Real-time sensors can reveal temporal patterns but generally do not identify every chemical species. A rise in broad volatile-organic-compound signal during pouring, cleaning or post-curing should be followed by a method capable of identifying and quantifying relevant compounds when exposure comparisons are claimed. Particle number, mass and size distribution are also different measurements, and a single metric may miss a change in aerosol composition. Background operations and room ventilation must be recorded alongside task observations.

An intervention study should compare equivalent tasks with and without a specified control while holding material quantity, working method and ventilation context as constant as practicable. Repeated sessions help distinguish operational variation from control effectiveness. Personal sampling may be more relevant to worker exposure than a fixed room monitor, while environmental or community effects require a different sampling design. Occupational measurements cannot be extrapolated to disposal, community burden or environmental justice outcomes without additional evidence.

13. Conclusions

Photopolymer manufacturing has a directly evidenced worker-exposure layer that can be organised by task and monitoring context [1,2]. The evidence supplied here does not extend to community impacts, waste distribution or justice. Those three domains remain open evidence gaps and should stay visibly separate from worker-exposure conclusions.

References

1. Bowers LN, Stefaniak AB, Knepp AK, LeBouf RF, Martin SB Jr, Ranpara AC, Burns DA, Virji MA. Potential for Exposure to Particles and Gases throughout Vat Photopolymerization Additive Manufacturing Processes. *Buildings*. 2022;12(8):1222. <https://doi.org/10.3390/buildings12081222>.
2. Vaisanen A, Alonen L, Ylonen S, Hyttinen M. Organic compound and particle emissions of additive manufacturing with photopolymer resins and chemical outgassing of manufactured resin products. *Journal of Toxicology and Environmental Health, Part A*. 2022;85(5):198-216. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15287394.2021.1998814>.

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 Segurola. All Rights Reserved.