

Convergence of Photopolymer Manufacturing with Textiles and Wearables: Integration, Comfort, Washing and Reliability

Strategic convergence and foresight

Juan Seguro

3Dresyns by Resyner Technologies S.L.

© 2026 Juan Seguro. All Rights Reserved.

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

ER-497 · Engineering Review · Version 0.1 · 12 October 2026

Abstract

The convergence of additive manufacturing with textiles and wearables moves the qualification problem from a printed object to a coupled soft substrate-printed feature system. Integration must survive flexing, laundering, abrasion and body contact while preserving textile drape and comfort. Reviews of 3D and 4D textiles include several additive-manufacturing routes, including material-jetting photopolymers, so this article explicitly labels process-mixed evidence and avoids treating non-photopolymer durability data as photopolymer proof. The review focuses on interface architecture, comfort, washing and reliability and distinguishes this convergence from biomanufacturing, semiconductor and construction convergence topics owned by ER-494, ER-495 and ER-496. A proposed assembly-level laundering study separates retained function, interface condition and wearability and retains specimens lost before final measurement.

Keywords: photopolymer manufacturing · textiles · wearables · integration · comfort · washing · reliability

1. Scope and convergence boundary

ER-497 owns the integration of photopolymer-manufactured features with textile and wearable substrates when the engineering question is the coupled system. It does not own biological manufacturing, semiconductor cleanroom integration or construction-scale additive manufacturing.

2. The interface is the product

A printed feature on textile experiences a compliant, porous and mobile substrate rather than a rigid build plate. Adhesion, penetration into the textile architecture, local stiffening and stress concentration govern whether the integrated system behaves as one article or as two weakly coupled layers.

3. Comfort as a measurable engineering outcome

Wearable comfort can depend on bending stiffness, local pressure, roughness, mass, thermal resistance, moisture transport and skin contact. A functional printed element can therefore pass electrical or mechanical tests while making the garment unusable. Comfort should be measured in the final integrated geometry, not inferred from resin properties alone.

4. Washing and environmental exposure

The textile literature treats laundering and washability as durability concerns for smart and functional textiles [1,2]. However, washing evidence often arises from non-photopolymer fabrication routes. Where such evidence is used here, it is process-mixed and supports only the need for repeated washing qualification, not a transferable photopolymer survival value. Photopolymer-textile systems require their own detergent, temperature, cycle and mechanical-action conditions.

5. Reliability under coupled deformation

Textiles stretch, bend, crease and recover. The printed feature may respond differently, creating interfacial peel, cracking or conductor interruption. Reliability testing should combine repeated deformation with functional measurement because a visually intact feature can lose electrical, optical or sensing performance before macroscopic failure.

6. Integration architectures

Integration can involve printing directly onto fabric, embedding textile within a printed region, printing free-standing structures that are subsequently attached, or using printed connectors and encapsulants. These architectures have different load paths and wash exposure. Qualification should identify the actual architecture rather than using '3D printed textile' as a single category.

7. Material and process specificity

Manaia et al. review 3D and 4D textile technologies across FDM, SLS, DIW and material-jetting photopolymers [1]. Dejene et al. similarly survey multiple routes at review level [2]. Their process-mixed nature means they support convergence mechanisms and test categories but not universal photopolymer thresholds.

8. Minimum qualification set

Report textile fibre and construction; surface preparation; photopolymer identity; printing route; interface architecture; printed thickness and geometry; initial adhesion or retention; bending and stretch protocol; washing protocol; comfort-relevant measurements; functional performance before and after conditioning; and failure mode.

9. Boundary with neighbouring convergence reviews

ER-494 owns convergence with biomanufacturing, ER-495 with semiconductor fabrication and ER-496 with construction. ER-497 does not generalise a universal convergence framework; it is specific to soft, wearable textile systems and their repeated mechanical and laundering environment.

10. Treat laundering as a sequence applied to an architecture

The proposed qualification record identifies the complete wearable architecture: textile, printed or coated photopolymer, interface, any functional element and the state in which each is evaluated. A material coupon can inform one part of the question but cannot automatically represent the joined assembly. Washing should be recorded as a defined sequence with the relevant detergent, mechanical action, temperature, drying and observation intervals, rather than as an unqualified number of washes.

A useful study would keep functional and wearability endpoints separate. An electrical response, optical response or other device function can remain measurable while an interface changes or the article becomes unsuitable for its intended wearing conditions. Conversely, an article can retain its appearance while its required function deteriorates. The selected measurements should follow the actual use claim.

The proposed report would retain specimens withdrawn before the final cycle and explain why they were withdrawn. Reporting only the surviving specimens could conceal early loss of adhesion, damage or functional failure.

11. A comparison that identifies the failing interface

A proposed experiment could examine the textile, the photopolymer-containing region and their interface before and after a declared exposure sequence. It would distinguish a change in the material from detachment or damage at the interface. Where the observation cannot locate the failure, the result should remain unresolved rather than be attributed to the polymer formulation by default.

For illustration, suppose a hypothetical device retains 95% of a selected signal after ten cycles but shows partial detachment. The retained signal alone would not support the claim that the complete wearable retained its intended state. The number is illustrative, not a performance criterion. Its purpose is to show why the conclusion must include the architectural endpoint relevant to continued use.

To compare studies, the review would group results by material route, architecture and exposure protocol before considering numerical retention. An outcome from a non-photopolymer system may motivate a test but cannot provide a survival value for a different interface. A direct study should also identify whether a change in finishing or protective layers, rather than the photopolymer itself, explains the observed result. This gives the repeated-wash evidence gap a concrete experimental structure.

Critical synthesis: Wearable interface reliability and claim boundaries

A cured pattern on fabric is neither a free-standing photopolymer coupon nor a textile with unchanged mechanical behaviour. The relevant experimental unit includes fibre chemistry, weave or knit architecture, surface preparation, printed-feature geometry and the bonding zone. Bending or stretching may relocate strain into adjacent fibres and cause damage outside the printed area. A comparison therefore needs uncoated textile controls, printed controls and application-matched cyclic deformation, as well as records of preconditioning.

A washing claim must specify wash chemistry, temperature, cycle number, drying and acceptance endpoint. Retained visual appearance does not demonstrate retained electrical, barrier or biological function. Skin-contact applications add potential extraction, perspiration, abrasion and exposure questions that cannot be resolved from laundering performance alone. Evidence from rigid polymer coupons should be treated as mechanistic context, not as proof of comfort, safe long-term wear or commercial wash durability.

Evidence appraisal and qualification framework

Qualification matrix: printed feature, substrate and service history

A meaningful comparison across photopolymer-textile studies begins with a material-state matrix rather than a single adhesion score. Each row should identify fibre type, textile construction, finishing treatment, polymer chemistry, exposure wavelength and dose, post-cure, washing method, and the exact finished article measured. The outcome column should distinguish initial geometry, retention after repeated use, appearance, loss of mechanical compliance and the performance of any functional feature. This matrix prevents a favourable coupon result from being used as evidence for an integrated wearable whose fabric and service history differ. It also makes omissions visible: a study that reports successful deposition but no post-laundering endpoint supports process feasibility, not use-life reliability. There is no justified common performance threshold across dissimilar fabrics and uses; requirements need to be declared against the intended function and test conditions.

Failure modes and discriminating experiments

A detached feature after laundering may reflect polymer fracture, adhesive failure at the textile-polymer interface, substrate tearing, fibre pull-out or prior chemical damage. Classifying all of these as weak adhesion conceals the mechanism needed to redesign the interface. A proposed test sequence would pair before-and-after microscopy with measured changes in bending stiffness, retained functionality and a documented cyclic deformation or washing challenge. The tested textile should be compared with an untreated or unprinted control subject to the same conditioning. Where pretreatment is changed, polymer formulation and cure state should be held constant; where cure is changed, substrate architecture must remain comparable. This is an experimental programme proposed by the review, not an empirical result reported by the two existing cited reviews. The scientific gap is the absence, within this manuscript's present sources, of sufficient application-matched comparative datasets to quantify joint reliability.

Evidence synthesis and applicability envelope

The literature should be classified by outcome level: feasibility of direct deposition, evidence of integrated function, laboratory durability, and human-use performance. Evidence in a lower category does not automatically substantiate the next. For example, resistance to bending on a strip does not establish wearer comfort, and surface appearance after a few cleaning cycles does not establish function after prolonged service. Any future systematic comparison should predefine the fabric and polymer families, the wash and abrasion protocols, failure definitions, sampling and uncertainty treatment, and whether the work measured intact samples only or also reported failed specimens. Such an applicability envelope is more useful to engineering qualification than an averaged figure assembled from incompatible protocols.

Textile interface qualification under coupled deformation and ageing

A functional photopolymer feature attached to a textile is a composite system whose performance depends on more than the cured material's bulk modulus. Yarn architecture, surface finishing, wetting, cure penetration and mechanical constraint influence adhesion and local strain. A bond that survives an initial peel test may fail after repeated folding, abrasion or washing because the substrate redistributes load differently from a rigid coupon.

Representative tests should separate tensile stretch along warp and weft, bending, cyclic fatigue, abrasion and laundering where applicable. Measurements should capture both functional response and failure location. Apparent durability after a small number of cycles cannot establish lifetime without an exposure profile and evidence that the selected test accelerates the relevant mechanism rather than creating an unrelated one.

Application requirements may include breathability, hand feel, skin contact, wash chemistry or electrical continuity. These cannot be inferred from print accuracy. A qualification matrix should state which properties were measured on the actual fabric assembly and which remain hypotheses based on standalone resin samples. This distinction prevents printed demonstration pieces from being described as qualified wearable systems.

Supplementary critical review: evidentiary and qualification boundaries

Interface mechanics and use-cycle qualification

The photopolymer-textile interface introduces a reliability problem that cannot be reduced to initial bond strength. Yarn mobility, fabric drape, local bending and repeated extension redistribute stress around printed features. A methodologically useful programme would record substrate architecture, pretreatment, print orientation, penetration or interlocking depth, and the state of the polymer after cure and cleaning. Static adhesion measured immediately after fabrication should be distinguished from damage accumulation under abrasion, bending and laundering. Observed cracking, delamination and loss of function require a documented classification with locations and test conditions. Different textile structures and finishing treatments prevent the transfer of a single adhesion value to arbitrary wearable systems; evaluation must be tied to the actual integrated structure.

Functional and human-use evidence should be kept separate

Mechanical survival does not establish wearable acceptability. Comfort-related outcomes can involve stiffness, local pressure, moisture transport, thermal response and skin contact, while functional outcomes depend on the intended sensing or protective feature. These variables may compete: increasing the amount of printed polymer could improve retention yet worsen drape or breathability. A credible literature comparison must therefore identify whether studies used flat coupons, garment-scale specimens or human-use conditions, and whether washing was simulated or conducted under a documented protocol. The general textile-printing reviews motivate these questions but do not create a universal service-life threshold. The proposed reporting set should preserve separate before-wash, after-wash and in-use measures and avoid a blanket claim of durability from a small number of cycles.

12. Limitations

The evidence base is review-dominated and process-mixed. Durability, washing and comfort results from fused-filament, sintered or direct-ink-written textile systems cannot be treated as direct photopolymer evidence. They identify test needs and failure mechanisms only.

13. Conclusions

Photopolymer-textile convergence should be qualified at the interface and system level. Integration quality, comfort, washing resistance and functional reliability are coupled. The decisive evidence is repeated performance of the final wearable architecture under realistic deformation and laundering, not successful initial printing.

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. Manaia JP, Cerejo F, Duarte J. Revolutionising textile manufacturing: a comprehensive review on 3D and 4D printing technologies. *Fashion and Textiles*. 2023;10:20. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40691-023-00339-7>
2. Dejene BK, Seidu RK, Abteu MA. Recent advances in 3D printed smart and multifunctional textile materials: Processing, properties, and their applications. *Reactive and Functional Polymers*. 2026;224:106755. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.reactfunctpolym.2026.106755>

Copyright

© 2026 Juan Seguro. All Rights Reserved.