Fast Mask Image Projection-Based Micro-Stereolithography Process for Complex Geometry
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In micro-stereolithography (µSL), high-speed fabrication is a critical challenge due to the long delay time for refreshing resin and retaining printed microfeatures. Thus, the mask-image-projection-based micro-stereolithography (MIP-µSL) using the constrained surface technique is investigated in this paper for quickly recoating liquid resin. It was reported in the literature that severe damages frequently happen in the part separation process in the constrained-surface-based MIP-µSL system. To conquer this problem, a single-layer movement separation approach was adopted, and the minimum delay time for refreshing resin was experimentally characterized. The experimental results verify that, compared with the existing MIP-µSL processes, the MIP-µSL process with single-layer movement separation method developed in this paper can build microstructures with complex geometry, with a faster build speed. [DOI: 10.1115/1.4035388]

1 Introduction

The MIP-µSL technology is an additive manufacturing (AM) approach for fabricating microstructures with three-dimensional (3D) complex geometry, especially with high aspect ratios [1–5]. Compared with other micro-manufacturing technologies such as lithography galvanoforming abforming (LIGA) and micromachining [6,7], MIP-µSL technology has the merits of simpler processing, faster fabrication speed, lower machine cost, and better capability of fabricating complex geometry. Various applications of MIP-µSL have been investigated, including the fabrication of microfluidic devices, scaffolds of biocompatible polymers for tissue reconstruction, microrobots, etc. [8–11]. To fabricate a micropart using MIP-µSL, first, a 3D computer-aided design (CAD) model is sliced to generate a set of two-dimensional (2D) layers. Each sliced layer is saved as a digital mask image, which is then projected usually by a digital micromirror device (DMD) to cure a thin layer of liquid resin [10–15]. The smallest feature reported by the MIP-µSL process is 0.6 µm [11]. Most MIP-µSL systems use a top–down projection approach. Related MIP-µSL systems based on the top–down projection approach are illustrated in Fig. 1(a). A good property of the top–down projection approach is that top surface of the cured layers is free, making it always feasible to recoat a new layer of liquid resin on top of the cured layer. However, when the needed new layer of liquid resin becomes thin, the recoating process becomes more challenging and sometimes even impossible, because of the liquid viscosity and surface tension. A resin recoating process based on a sweeper is usually required to flatten the top surface. For low-viscosity resins, a deep-dip recoating approach with a long waiting time can also be used to replace the surface sweeping process.

In comparison, a schematic diagram of the MIP-µSL systems based on bottom–up projection is shown in Fig. 1(b). Although the bottom–up projection-based MIP-µSL systems have now been widely used to fabricate macroscale structures, a relatively less literature [10] was reported to fabricate microstructures using such a constrained-surface-based approach. As a cured layer is constrained by the tank surface, it is found that the separation of the cured part is a critical issue, especially when it has microfeatures. The fabricated microstructure can be broken easily during the layer separation process. Hence, the adoption of such bottom–up projection approach in microstructure fabrication is greatly limited due to the layer separation.

In this paper, we discuss how to achieve fast build speed in the MIP-µSL process based on the bottom–up projection method. We tried to minimize the resin refreshing time by utilizing the bottom–up projection configuration and a single-layer movement separation approach. A testbed was developed and experiments were performed for various geometries to validate the developed MIP-µSL approaches.

2 A Fast MIP-µSL Process Design

2.1 Fast MIP-µSL Process Based on Bottom-Up Projection. It is found that a large separation force may occur and bubbles will be generated during the separation process, especially when a small layer thickness and a fast separating speed are used. Therefore, a 2-mm thick flexible layer of polydimethylsiloxane (PDMS, Sylgard 184 from Dow Corning, Midland, MI) is coated on the bottom surface of the liquid vat to assist the separation [16,17]. After projecting a mask image through the bottom surface of the liquid vat for a certain time and curing a layer of resin, the platform is moved up with a proper velocity along the Z
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Fig. 1 Schematic of MIP-µSL systems based on the top–down projection method (a) and the bottom–up projection method (b)
direction by a certain distance. Enough waiting time is necessary to ensure the complete filling of liquid resin in the gap with no bubbles existing. Since for a given setup with a preselected liquid resin, process parameters such as layer thickness, light intensity, and resin curing time can be determined for the MIP-μSL process; a significant portion of the MIP-μSL fabrication time that can be adjusted through process control is the resin recoating time. Therefore, to achieve a fast building process, the process parameters that determine resin recoating are critical, which are investigated in the paper including the moving-up distance and the delay time for complete filling of liquid resin. They are further minimized through experimental study for a fast MIP-μSL process.

2.2 Experimental Study of Parameters Settings. In bottom–up projection-based MIP-μSL process, fresh liquid may not be able to fill the gap completely in time, and bubbles may be generated in the liquid-filling process if the separation speed is too high. A long waiting time and a big moving distance would guarantee a complete filling of liquid resin in the gap; however, the building time will be longer. Hence, it is desired to identify the shortest waiting time and smallest moving distance in order to achieve a fast fabrication speed. To identify the minimum waiting time needed to guarantee a complete filling of liquid resin, a prototype has been developed, as discussed in Sec. 3, and the experiments have been performed based on it.

Cubes with various sizes are built by using different waiting times and moving distances for a commercial resin (SI500 from EnvisionTec) with a viscosity of 200 cP. For example, Fig. 2 shows a cube model of 6.96 × 6.96 × 2 mm³. If the built parts have holes or deep shadows under a microscope, the waiting time is considered insufficient. Accordingly, a longer waiting time will be used to rebuild the parts. A critical waiting time for void-free curing is identified for different gap sizes.

Figure 3 plots the relation between the critical waiting time, the cube size, and the Z movement distance. In all the tests, the same Z movement speed (0.05 mm/s) was used to lift the platform up. It can be observed that:

1. The minimum waiting time increases with the dimensional size for the same gap height, and bigger gap height results in a smaller minimum waiting time.
2. When the cross section size of the cured layer is smaller than 6 mm, and the gap size is bigger than 10 μm, no waiting time is needed to get the gap completely filled by the tested liquid resin. However, when the solid cross section size of the cured layer is bigger than 6 mm, a minimum waiting time $t_w$ is required in order to achieve nonvoid and bubble-free liquid resin filling. For the given setup, $t_w$ can be determined by using the following fitted experimental model:

$$
\begin{align*}
& t_w = \begin{cases} 
0 & x \leq 6.01 \text{ mm} \\
2.99h^2 - 14.07h + 16.46 & 6.01 \text{ mm} < x \leq 6.45 \text{ mm} \\
2.64h^2 - 14.56h + 20.96 & 6.45 \text{ mm} < x \leq 6.99 \text{ mm}
\end{cases} \\
& \text{where } h \text{ is the gap height } (\times 10^{-5} \text{ m}), \text{ and } x \text{ is the solid cross section size of the layer.}
\end{align*}
$$

2.3 Build Time of a Layer With the Single-Layer Movement Approach. According to the calibration tests for the preselected liquid resin, a single-layer separation and resin recoating process is developed by setting one-layer-thickness gap height and the minimum waiting time based on Eq. (1). Figure 4 presents...
the build time of a layer using the proposed single-layer movement approach. It is the sum of all the following items: 

\[ T_{\text{layer}} = T_{\text{curing}} + T_{\text{recoating}} = (T_{\text{projection}} + T_{\text{wait_projection}}) + (T_z + T_{\text{wait_filling}}). \]

\( T_{\text{curing}} \) represents the time needed for curing resin completely, which is comprised of two portions, \( T_{\text{projection}} \) and \( T_{\text{wait_projection}} \). \( T_{\text{curing}} \) is dependent on the light source, such as light intensity and wavelength, and the photo-sensitivities of the resin. The rest of the build time is used for separating the cured layer from the constrained surface and recoating a new layer of liquid resin for the next-layer curing. So we call it \( T_{\text{recoating}} \), which is comprised of \( T_z \) and \( T_{\text{wait_filling}} \). As discussed before, the bottleneck for achieving a fast building speed is the resin recoating process [8,9,11,17,18].

With the goal of developing a method for achieving a fast build speed for a given MIP-\( \mu \)-SL setup and used photocurable material, we focus on minimizing the resin recoating time, i.e., \( T_{\text{recoating}} \). In this study, the following methods are used:

1. We utilized a bottom–up projection configuration, which is widely adopted in macroscale stereolithography systems but not in micro-stereolithography systems.
2. The platform is moved up by only a layer thickness to separate the newly cured layer and to allow resin fill in the gap, instead of using the conventional method of moving up a certain distance and then moving down to form a layer gap.
3. An additional waiting time after the platform movement is added to complete the resin recoating process.

According to the experimental calibration in Sec. 2.2, the needed waiting time is 0 s, for printing a feature with solid cross section size \( x \) in the range of \((0 \text{ mm}, 6 \text{ mm})\), when a liquid resin with a viscosity, that is, not larger than 200 cP, a layer thickness of 20 \( \mu \text{m} \), a velocity of 0.05 mm/s, and an acceleration of 0.005 mm/s\(^2\) are used. For the fabrication of layers with solid cross section whose sizes are bigger than 6 mm, the optimum setting for \( T_{\text{wait_filling}} \) is determined by the experimental model of flow-filling time (refer to Eq. (1) in Sec. 2.2). Compared with the traditional MIP-\( \mu \)-SL processes that usually require more than 15 s to recoat a new layer of liquid resin, this is a great reduction of build time, enabling a much faster building speed for microstructure fabrication.
3 Experimental Setup

As shown in Fig. 5, in order to verify the proposed micro-manufacturing approach, a hardware setup and a software have been built. A DMD-based projection device was developed by modifying a commercial projector from Acer. In particular, optical system settings, such as the projection image focus, light contrast, and light intensity, have been adjusted or modified to project a well-focused image on the liquid resin curing plane. A blue filter and a black mask are used to filter the light. A clear glass Petri dish coated with PDMS on the bottom is used as the resin tank. The envelope size is $9.32 \text{ mm} \times 6.99 \text{ mm} \times 50 \text{ mm}$ ($X \times Y \times Z$). The projection image resolution of the prototype system is $9 \mu\text{m}$.

Note that by selecting different optics, e.g., light sources and lenses, larger or smaller build envelope size with different levels of resolution can be achieved in the MIP-$\mu$SL process. In addition, a process control software has been developed using Visual C++.$$ T_{\text{wait\_filling}} \text{ is determined by Eq. (1) in Sec. 2.2. If the calculated }$
Table 1 Performance of our newly developed MIP-µSL system

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Gear</th>
<th>Fan</th>
<th>Hearing-aid</th>
<th>Pipe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Figure #</td>
<td>Fig. 7</td>
<td>Fig. 8</td>
<td>Fig. 9</td>
<td>Fig. 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size (s) (mm)</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>5.867</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure type</td>
<td>Solid</td>
<td>Curveur</td>
<td>Shell</td>
<td>Shell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thickness (µm)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(T_{\text{projection}}) (s)</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(T_{\text{wait_projection}}) (sec)</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(T_w) (s)</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>3.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(T_{\text{wait_filling}}) (s)</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height z (mm)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.539</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>13.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Layer #</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(T_l) (s) in our system</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>4.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(T_l) (s) in a commercial system</td>
<td>18.05</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18.05</td>
<td>18.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(T_{\text{total building}}) (min) in our system</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>17.97</td>
<td>21.75</td>
<td>46.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(T_{\text{total building}}) (min) in a commercial system</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>93.26</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(T_{\text{projection}}\) is the projection time of one layer except the layers for base.

4.2 Build Speed Discussion. In the top-down projection-based MIP-µSL processes, it usually takes more than 20 s to recoat a thin layer of liquid resin for building next layers. However, with the discussed single-layer movement approach, the resin recoating time is less than 3.5 s for a 20 µm layer, which is much shorter than other MIP-µSL processes. Hence, a CAD model with microscale features can be fabricated in minutes instead of hours using the developed approach. Such a fabrication speed is much faster than the previously reported µSL work [19–23]. Table 1 shows the build time of our MIP-µSL system in fabricating some test parts, and how they compare with the building time of a commercial MIP-µSL system from EnvisionTEC (Dearborn, MI), Note that the same resin and resin curing time are used in the MIP-µSL system; and (3) synchronizing the projection and resin recoating process to further speed up the building process.
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