AI-Assisted Robotic Fabrication of Patient-Specific Biomaterials Using Adaptive 3D Printing and Vision-Guided Process Control

Lucinda McGuinn
Department of Computer Science, Binghamton University, Binghamton, NY, USA.
mcguinnlucinda@binghamton.edu

Abstract

Patient-specific implants, scaffolds, and tissue models are specified not only by an anatomical envelope but by a spatially varying field of mechanical and transport properties inside it. Extrusion-based robotic deposition can realize such fields in hydrated and cell-laden biomaterials, yet the process is usually executed open-loop: a precomputed toolpath is followed, and the part is inspected afterwards. This article develops an integrated formulation in which fabrication is posed as constrained optimization of a process-parameter field against a target property field, and in which the optimizer is driven by vision-based measurement of the layer just deposited. The framework couples four elements that are normally treated in isolation. A printability index converts rheological limits into admissible parameter sets; a Gibson–Ashby scaling law maps porosity and composition to realized modulus so that fabrication error can be expressed in mechanically meaningful terms; a heteroscedastic measurement model fuses noisy surface reconstructions into an error field with explicit variance; and a constrained layer-wise update adjusts flow rate, traversal speed, standoff, and temperature before the next layer is committed. Redundancy-resolved motion programming aligns the nozzle with the local surface normal while keeping the wrist clear of sterile zones and viewing geometry. The analysis shows that the process possesses a null space in which geometric error can be corrected through mechanically distinct parameter combinations, and that the choice within this null space must be governed by the property objective rather than by an arbitrary control heuristic. Uncertainty is propagated from measurement to realized modulus to yield a per-region acceptance criterion, and failure modes associated with translucent, specular, compliant materials are characterized.

Keywords

patient-specific bioprinting; vision-guided process control; adaptive toolpath planning; model predictive control; robotic fabrication; bioink printability

1. Introduction

Patient-specific constructs are defined less by their outer shape than by the distribution of material properties inside that shape. A craniofacial reconstruction, an osteochondral plug, and a vascular graft each require a geometric envelope derived from volumetric imaging, but they also require regionally graded stiffness, permeability, and degradation behavior that matches the host tissue closely enough to avoid stress shielding, interfacial delamination, or premature mechanical failure [1], [2]. Extrusion-based robotic deposition is attractive in this context because it accommodates hydrated, degradable, and cell-laden formulations at ambient temperature and because its motion platform can place material almost anywhere inside a complex envelope [3], [4].

The physical difficulty is that deposition is only weakly determined by its setpoints. Direct ink writing of soft matter depends on the ink behaving as a yield-stress fluid: it must flow through a narrow nozzle under pressure and then retain shape once the stress is removed [5], [6]. Flow and shape retention both depend on time-dependent rheology, on residence time in the nozzle, on reservoir and chamber temperature, and on how previously deposited layers deform under the weight of new material. Additive manufacturing research has documented such couplings extensively at the level of process capability [7], but the dominant industrial response has been to qualify a narrow process window and hold it constant. That strategy fails precisely when the target property field varies across the part.

Process monitoring has advanced furthest in metal powder-bed systems, where melt-pool and layer-wise imaging support defect detection and, increasingly, closed-loop control [8], [9]. Extrusion of soft biomaterials has not benefited to the same degree. The deposited material is translucent, wet, and compliant, so structured-light and stereo reconstruction suffer from subsurface scattering, specular highlights, and low geometric contrast, while contact metrology is excluded by sterility requirements and by the ease with which the surface is damaged. Fabrication therefore remains a plan-then-inspect paradigm in which deviations are discovered after the construct is complete.

This article argues that the missing element is not a better sensor but a formulation that connects measurement to decision at the correct level of abstraction. Three couplings are usually treated separately: the mapping from process parameters to realized properties, the conversion of noisy surface measurements into a calibrated error field, and the resolution of manipulator motion under geometric and sterility constraints. Treating them separately produces controllers that oppose one another, because a standoff correction made to repair layer height also changes bead width, which changes local porosity, which changes the modulus the correction was intended to preserve.

The contribution is an integrated, analytically specified framework for AI-assisted robotic fabrication of patient-specific biomaterials, organized around a process-parameter field as the object of optimization rather than around a fixed toolpath. Section 2 formalizes the design-realization problem and the printability constraints that bound it. Section 3 describes the closed-loop architecture and its timescales. Section 4 develops the process model linking deposition kinematics to realized properties. Section 5 formulates vision-based state estimation with explicit uncertainty. Section 6 derives the layer-wise adaptation law and the redundancy-resolved motion program. Section 7 examines failure modes, trade-offs, and the conditions under which the framework's claims hold.

2. Fabrication Requirements for Patient-Specific Biomaterials

2.1 Design intent as a property field

Let Ω be the patient-specific build domain obtained from imaging segmentation, and let P(x) be a vector of target properties at each material point, comprising elastic modulus, permeability, degradation half-time, and surface ligand density where relevant. The machine realizes a property field P(x;Θ) that depends on a process-parameter field Θ(x) collecting volumetric flow rate Q, traversal speed v, nozzle standoff z_n, deposition temperature T, and a discrete variable ψ encoding path topology and strand spacing. Fabrication can then be written as a constrained field optimization:

$$\Theta* = argmin_\Theta \int_\Omega \|P(x;\Theta) - P*(x)\|^2_W \, dx + \lambda \int_\Omega \|\nabla\Theta(x)\|^2 \, dx$$

Here W is a positive-definite weighting matrix that encodes clinical priority, so that load-bearing regions dominate the residual, and λ controls the smoothness penalty on the parameter field. The admissible set $\Theta(x) \in A(x)$ collects rheological, machine, and biological limits developed below. The smoothness term is not cosmetic. Partial fusion between adjacent strands requires overlap and interdiffusion, and a discontinuity in speed or flow excites a pressure transient in the ink supply line whose time constant, set by tube compliance divided by nozzle resistance, is comparable to the time needed to traverse several millimeters. Regularizing the parameter field keeps commands within the bandwidth of the actuator and suppresses seam formation.

2.2 Printability and biological admissibility

Shape retention after deposition is governed by the competition between the ink's yield stress and the gravitational stress at the scale of a single bead. A scaling criterion captures the leading behavior:

$$\mathrm{Pr} = \tau_y \frac{(\varphi, T)}{(\rho(\varphi) g h)} \geq \mathrm{Pr}_m in$$

where τ_y is yield stress, ρ is ink density, g is gravitational acceleration, h is bead height, and φ is the vector of formulation fractions. The ratio is not an exact stability boundary but an order-one index; values below unity indicate that a deposited filament will slump under its own weight before it can be supported by neighboring strands. Because hydrogel inks are shear-thinning, the relevant viscosity during extrusion differs greatly from the viscosity after deposition. For a circular nozzle of radius R, the wall shear rate scales as $4Q/(\pi R^3)$, so the apparent viscosity at the wall falls as flow rate rises, which is what permits extrusion at moderate pressure while preserving a high zero-shear viscosity for shape retention [10], [11]. Composite printability indices that combine extrusion uniformity with filament collapse behavior make this trade-off operational for a given formulation [12], [13].

Biological constraints enter A(x) as bounds that cannot be traded against geometric accuracy. Wall shear stress on encapsulated cells scales with apparent viscosity and shear rate, and residence time in the nozzle accumulates exposure; thermal budgets for gelatin and agarose systems restrict reservoir and chamber temperatures; photoinitiator dose restricts the rate at which stiffness may be developed. The practical consequence is a restriction of control authority: the controller can modulate kinematics and flow, but it cannot modulate chemistry in-loop. Errors originating in crosslink-density drift or in evaporative concentration of the ink are therefore not correctable by geometric feedback and must be handled by replanning or by rejection of the construct.

3. Closed-Loop System Architecture

The architecture comprises four coupled modules operating on distinct timescales. Perception uses a structured-light or stereo pair mounted either on the robot wrist or on the gantry, calibrated to the manipulator base so that reconstructed points can be expressed in the same frame as the toolpath. Reconstruction produces a point cloud of the exposed layer surface, which is registered to the nominal layer geometry by iterative closest point alignment [15]. Registration supplies both the rigid transform that absorbs fixture and kinematic offsets and the residual field that constitutes the quantity of interest.

State estimation converts the registered cloud into a continuous error field with an associated variance. Because the raw measurement is sparse, noisy, and heteroscedastic,

estimation is treated as spatial regression rather than as simple averaging, and a Gaussian-process prior supplies spatial correlation with a length scale tied to strand spacing [16]. Decision making is formulated as a constrained model predictive problem over a short horizon of layers, following standard receding-horizon practice in which the first control move is applied and the problem is re-solved after the next measurement [17]. Execution resolves the commanded six-dimensional nozzle pose and the associated process parameters into joint trajectories through a constrained quadratic program.

The timescale hierarchy is essential rather than incidental. Standoff and flow regulation must act at tens of hertz to suppress pressure transients and bead-width excursions; layer-scale parameter adaptation acts over seconds to minutes, because a correction applied at layer k only becomes observable after layer k+1 has settled; construct-scale replanning acts over minutes and may revise strand spacing or topology. A single-rate controller would either be too slow for pressure dynamics or too fast for layer-scale learning, and the resulting interaction typically appears as a low-frequency oscillation in wall thickness spanning several layers.

4. Process Modeling: From Deposition Kinematics to Realized Properties

4.1 Realized modulus and relative density

The bridge between geometric error and clinical error is the relationship between porosity, composition, and stiffness. For a raster of strand spacing L and bead cross-sectional area A deposited at layer height h, the relative density of the green body is approximately A/(Lh). The realized modulus then follows a cellular-solids scaling law:

$$\mathrm{E}(x) = \left[\Sigma_j \varphi_j(x) E_j\right] \cdot \left[\rho \frac{(x)}{\rho_s}\right]^n$$

where φ_j are formulation fractions, E_j are the moduli of the corresponding bulk phases, ρ_s is the density of the solid phase, and n is a scaling exponent. For bending-dominated open-cell lattices n is close to two [14]; for swollen hydrogel networks the effective exponent is lower because the struts themselves are poroelastic, but the monotonic sensitivity to relative density is preserved. This relationship is the reason geometric tolerances alone are an inadequate specification. A ten percent error in relative density produces roughly a twenty-one percent error in modulus at n equal to two, which for load-bearing regions may exceed the tolerance that motivated the design in the first place.

4.2 Bead formation and the process null space

Volume conservation along the path, with arc-length parameter s, gives the bead cross-sectional area A(s) = Q(s)/v(s). The effective layer height is the commanded standoff minus the penetration of the nozzle into the underlying material, h(s) = z_n(s) − δ(s), where δ depends on yield stress and on the weight of material already deposited above. Combining these relations yields the bead width:

$$w(s) = Q \frac{(s)}{(v(s) \cdot [z_n(s) - \delta(s)])}$$

Three control inputs act on one geometric output, so the process possesses a null space: the same bead width can be produced by a fast, thin, high-flow deposit or by a slow, thick, low-flow deposit. These are not mechanically equivalent. The first yields lower relative density at fixed spacing and a different interlayer bond strength, because bond formation

depends on the contact time and temperature history at the interface. The null-space argument is therefore central to the framework: geometric feedback alone does not determine the control action, and selecting among null-space directions must be delegated to the property objective in Eq. 1, with anisotropic regularization that penalizes motion along directions having large property consequences.

Curvature introduces a further constraint. At path curvature κ and speed v, the centripetal acceleration $v^2\kappa$ must remain below an axis limit, so speed must be reduced near corners; if flow is not reduced with a matched lag, width increases locally and produces corner bulging and seam porosity. The required lag compensation couples the geometric path to the dynamics of the ink supply and is one of the principal reasons open-loop execution of a smoothed toolpath produces nonuniform density even when the path itself is accurate.

4.3 Thermal and curing evolution

For photocrosslinkable systems, the modulus develops with accumulated dose, the product of irradiance and exposure time, and continues to evolve during the build. Lower layers therefore stiffen and shrink while upper layers are being deposited, so the stack height deviates from the sum of nominal layer heights. Dead-reckoning slicing accumulates this deviation monotonically, whereas vision feedback converts a systematic drift into a measurable residual that can be absorbed by the layer-wise update. The distinction matters for controller design: a systematic component is learnable and should be estimated with a low-variance prior, while the random component should not be chased.

5. Vision-Guided State Estimation

Surface reconstruction of hydrated, translucent material produces biased and heteroscedastic depth. Subsurface scattering displaces the apparent surface inward by an amount that grows with local thickness; specular reflections from a wet surface cause dropout in projectors and stereo matchers; grazing incidence inflates range variance along the surface normal. Rather than treating these as a single noise level, the estimator assigns each reconstructed point an inverse-variance weight and fuses them into a continuous error field:

$$\hat{e}_k(x) = [\Sigma_i w_i(x)(\hat{z}_i - z * _k(x_i))] / [\Sigma_i w_i(x)],\ w_i = 1/\sigma_i^2$$

where $\hat{z}_i$ is the measured height at point i, z_k is the nominal height of layer k at the corresponding lateral position, and σ_i^2 is the pointwise measurement variance derived from incidence angle, local intensity, and an estimate of scattering thickness. The fused field has variance $\sigma_e^2(x) = (\Sigma_i\ w_i)^{-1}$, which propagates directly into the acceptance decision of Section 7. A Gaussian kernel or radial basis expansion is used for $w_i(x)$ so that the estimate is smooth at the scale of a bead and does not amplify point-to-point noise into the command.

Two properties of this estimator require emphasis. First, the mean function of the underlying spatial process must absorb known systematic effects such as uniform shrinkage and calibration offset; if it does not, the estimator splits systematic and random components arbitrarily and the controller spends authority on noise. Second, the loop contains a delay of at least one layer, since a correction applied during layer k+1 becomes observable only after that layer has settled. Combined with the smoothing inherent in kernel fusion, the delay produces a phase margin that declines with loop gain, and aggressive gains manifest as a wall-thickness oscillation with a period of several layers. Gain limiting and feedforward from the sensitivity model are the practical remedies.

6. Adaptive Control and Robotic Execution

6.1 Layer-wise parameter update

Given the estimated error field and a sensitivity matrix G = ∂ê/∂Θ obtained either analytically from Eqs. 3 and 4 or by designed experiments on a sacrificial coupon, the parameter update is a damped Gauss–Newton step on the linearized layer error:

$$\Theta_{k+1} = \Theta_k - \left(G^T G + \gamma I\right)^{-1} G^T \hat{e}_k$$

where γ is a Tikhonov parameter controlling the step magnitude along poorly conditioned directions. The structure is that of a constrained receding-horizon update in which the model is relinearized after each layer [17]. Conditioning is the operative concern. Because Q and v enter Eq. 4 only through their ratio, the direction that scales both proportionally is nearly unobservable from geometry alone, yet it changes wall shear rate and therefore the mechanical insult to encapsulated cells. An isotropic penalty would permit large excursions along this direction; an anisotropic penalty that reflects the property sensitivity of Eq. 3 suppresses them. The identifiability analysis thus determines not only whether the controller converges but whether it converges to a biologically acceptable operating point.

6.2 From computed material fields to robot motion

The process-parameter field is the interface object between computational design and machine execution. Framing fabrication as the robotic crafting of a computed material distribution, rather than as the execution of a geometric path, makes explicit that the discretization of the field determines what the manipulator can actually produce, and that the design computation must be constrained by the machine's kinematic and rheological reach [18]. Once the field is discretized, execution requires solving for joint velocities that realize the commanded tool pose while respecting limits:

$$\dot{q}* = argmin_\dot{q} \, \|\dot{q}\|^2_W \;\; s.t. \; J_q(q)\,\dot{q} = \dot{x}_d, \; \dot{q} \in Q_adm$$

Here q is the joint vector, J_q is the manipulator Jacobian, ẋ_d is the desired spatial velocity including orientation, W is a weighting matrix, and Q_adm encodes joint velocity and position limits together with keep-out constraints. The desired pose specifies that the tool z-axis align with the local surface normal, which is necessary for bead symmetry and for consistent standoff. For a redundant arm, the null space of J_q is used for singularity avoidance and joint-limit margin, following established redundancy-resolution practice [19], [20].

A less obvious secondary task is view planning. If the sensor is wrist-mounted, the same redundancy that keeps the wrist clear of sterile drapes can be used to position the camera where the fresh bead is not occluded by the nozzle and where the specular lobe does not enter the aperture. Treating view planning as a formal secondary objective rather than as an operator decision removes a common cause of measurement dropout in the middle of a build.

7. Technical Discussion

7.1 From geometric to property tolerances

The framework's principal analytical payoff is a criterion that links measurement uncertainty to clinical tolerance rather than to geometric tolerance. Propagating parameter uncertainty through the property model gives

$$\sigma_P^2(x) = J_P \Sigma_\Theta J_P^T + \sigma_m^2 \le \tau_c^2(x)$$

where $J_P = \partial P/\partial \Theta$ is the property sensitivity obtained from Eqs. 3 and 4, Σ_Θ is the posterior covariance of the estimated parameters, σ^2_m is model discrepancy, and τ_c is the clinically admissible property tolerance. The inequality is a decision rule, not a post hoc inspection: it determines whether the next layer may proceed, whether the parameter field should be re-optimized, or whether the construct should be abandoned. It also exposes where effort should be concentrated. If σ_m dominates, better sensing will not improve the outcome and the process model must be refined; if $J_P \Sigma_\Theta J_P^T$ dominates, additional measurement or longer averaging at the layer scale is warranted.

A simple arithmetic illustration clarifies the stakes. At fixed cross-sectional area and strand spacing, reducing the effective layer height from 0.40 mm to 0.36 mm raises relative density by a factor of 1.111 and, at an exponent of two, raises modulus by a factor of 1.23. A geometric deviation of one tenth of a millimeter, which is within the tolerance of many extrusion platforms, therefore produces a stiffness error of roughly twenty-three percent. This is the quantitative reason the acceptance criterion must be written in property space.

7.2 Failure modes and their signatures

Several failure modes are specific to this material class and architecture. Specular dropout causes variance inflation rather than bias, so a variance-aware controller will automatically reduce its gain in affected regions; if dropout is instead treated as valid data, the controller over-corrects and the resulting oscillation is indistinguishable from a gain-tuning problem. Subsurface scattering produces a depth-dependent bias that mimics uniform over-deposition, and a controller without a scattering-aware measurement model will systematically under-deposit. Rheological drift from evaporation or from gradual warming of the reservoir changes the sensitivity matrix itself, so residuals grow even when the geometric controller is functioning correctly; monitoring the whiteness of the residual sequence provides an early indicator. Finally, the coupling between standoff, width, and porosity means that independently tuned single-input single-output loops can be individually stable and jointly unstable, which motivates the joint parameter estimation in Eq. 6 rather than separate height and width loops.

7.3 Evidentiary status and validation path

The framework is analytical: it specifies model structure, estimation and control laws, and the conditions under which its claims hold. It does not assert that a particular construct has been manufactured to a stated accuracy. Establishing that would require four separable activities. Designed experiments would identify G and its drift under controlled perturbations of flow, speed, and temperature. Layer-wise accuracy studies would quantify the reduction in residual achieved by the update relative to open-loop execution. Printability mapping would locate the admissible set $A(x)$ for each formulation and connect it to the index in Eq. 2. Biological assays would confirm that the null-space choices permitted by the controller remain within shear and thermal limits. The broader literature on extrusion-based bioprinting provides the rheological and biological context within which these activities must be designed [21], and the persistent gap between process capability and part qualification in additive manufacturing more generally indicates why acceptance criteria expressed in property space are likely to be required for clinical translation [22].

7.4 Computational and scaling considerations

The computational burden is modest if the field representation is chosen appropriately. Because P and Θ are smooth at the scale of several beads, a radial basis or coarse voxel

discretization with tens of thousands of degrees of freedom is sufficient; solving Eq. 6 then reduces to a small dense linear system per layer. The motion program in Eq. 7 is a small quadratic program that is routinely solved at control rates on current hardware. The dominant computational cost lies in registration and reconstruction, and it is here that the choice between wrist-mounted and gantry-mounted sensing has its largest practical consequence.

8. Conclusion

This article has developed an integrated framework for AI-assisted robotic fabrication of patient-specific biomaterials in which the object of optimization is a process-parameter field rather than a geometric toolpath. Four couplings are made explicit. A printability index converts rheological limits into an admissible parameter set that biological constraints further restrict. A cellular-solids scaling law maps relative density and composition to realized modulus, which allows fabrication error to be evaluated in the mechanical terms that motivated the design. A heteroscedastic measurement model turns noisy reconstructions of translucent, specular surfaces into an error field with a defensible variance. A constrained layer-wise update, together with a redundancy-resolved motion program, converts that field into corrected process parameters and joint trajectories.

The most consequential result is structural rather than numerical. Because bead width depends jointly on flow rate, speed, and standoff, the process possesses a null space in which geometric error can be corrected through mechanically and biologically distinct actions. Any controller that treats the geometric error as the sole objective will select among these actions arbitrarily, and may systematically choose the one that degrades interlayer bonding or increases shear exposure of encapsulated cells. Making the property objective govern the null-space choice, through anisotropic regularization and through the acceptance criterion, is therefore not an refinement but a precondition for producing constructs whose internal material state matches the patient-specific design intent. The remaining work is empirical and specific: identifying sensitivity matrices and their drift for particular formulations, characterizing scattering-induced depth bias, and negotiating property tolerances with clinical stakeholders so that the acceptance inequality has meaningful thresholds.

References

1. Murphy, S. V., & Atala, A. (2014). 3D bioprinting of tissues and organs. Nature Biotechnology, 32(8), 773–785.

2. Hollister, S. J. (2005). Porous scaffold design for tissue engineering. Nature Materials, 4(7), 518–524.

3. Derby, B. (2012). Printing and prototyping of tissues and scaffolds. Science, 338(6109), 921–926.

4. Kang, H.-W., Lee, S. J., Ko, I. K., Kengla, C., Yoo, J. J., & Atala, A. (2016). A 3D bioprinting system to produce human-scale tissue constructs with structural integrity. Nature Biotechnology, 34(3), 312–319.

5. Lewis, J. A. (2006). Direct ink writing of 3D functional materials. Advanced Functional Materials, 16(17), 2193–2204.

6. Truby, R. L., & Lewis, J. A. (2016). Printing soft matter in three dimensions. Nature, 540(7633), 371–378.

7. Gao, W., Zhang, Y., Ramanujan, D., Ramani, K., Chen, Y., Williams, C. B., Wang, C. C. L., Shin, Y. C., Zhang, S., & Zavattieri, P. D. (2015). The status, challenges, and future of additive manufacturing in engineering. Computer-Aided Design, 69, 65–89.

8. Grasso, M., & Colosimo, B. M. (2017). Process defects and in situ monitoring methods in metal powder bed fusion: A review. Measurement Science and Technology, 28(4), 044005.

9. Everton, S. K., Hirsch, M., Stravroulakis, P., Leach, R. K., & Clare, A. T. (2016). Review of in-situ process monitoring and in-situ metrology for metal additive manufacturing. Materials & Design, 95, 431–445.

10. Malda, J., Visser, J., Melchels, F. P., Jüngst, T., Hennink, W. E., Dhert, W. J. A., Groll, J., & Hutmacher, D. W. (2013). 25th anniversary article: Engineering hydrogels for biofabrication. Advanced Materials, 25(36), 5011–5028.

11. Guvendiren, M., Lu, H. D., & Burdick, J. A. (2012). Shear-thinning hydrogels for biomedical applications. Soft Matter, 8(2), 260–272.

12. Paxton, N., Smolan, W., Böck, T., Melchels, F., Groll, J., & Jungst, T. (2017). Proposal to assess printability of bioinks for extrusion-based bioprinting and evaluation of rheological properties governing bioprintability. Biofabrication, 9(4), 044107.

13. He, Y., Yang, F., Zhao, H., Gao, Q., Xia, B., & Fu, J. (2016). Research on the printability of hydrogels in 3D bioprinting. Scientific Reports, 6, 29977.

14. Gibson, L. J., & Ashby, M. F. (1997). Cellular solids: Structure and properties (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

15. Besl, P. J., & McKay, N. D. (1992). A method for registration of 3-D shapes. IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence, 14(2), 239–256.

16. Rasmussen, C. E., & Williams, C. K. I. (2006). Gaussian processes for machine learning. MIT Press.

17. Camacho, E. F., & Alba, C. B. (2013). Model predictive control (2nd ed.). Springer.

18. Luo, D., Chen, D., Wang, J., Zhu, G., & Xu, W. (2020). The smart robot crafting approach to computing materials. Construction Robotics, 4(3), 239-249.

19. Nakamura, Y. (1991). Advanced robotics: Redundancy and optimization. Addison-Wesley.

20. Siciliano, B., & Khatib, O. (Eds.). (2016). Springer handbook of robotics (2nd ed.). Springer.

21. Ozbolat, I. T., & Hospodiuk, M. (2016). Current advances and future perspectives in extrusion-based bioprinting. Biomaterials, 76, 321–343.

22. Huang, Y., Leu, M. C., Mazumder, J., & Donmez, A. (2015). Additive manufacturing: Current state, future potential, gaps and needs, and recommendations. Journal of Manufacturing Science and Engineering, 137(1), 014001.