

4D Printing on Textiles: developing a file to fabrication framework for self-forming, composite wearables

Asterios Agkathidis, Guzden Varinlioglu
asterios.agkathidis@liverpool.ac.uk, guzdenv@gmail.com¹

Keywords: 4D printing, wearable structures, 3D printing on textiles, simulation, parametric design

Abstract

This research is investigating the development of self-forming wearable composite structures by 3D printing semi-elastic embossed patterns out of semi-elastic Thermoplastic Polyurethane 95 filament on pre-stretched textiles and releasing the stress after the printing has been completed. In particular, we will present and compare two methods of 'file to fabrication' techniques for generating self-forming textile shell structures: one based on printed patterns related to their stress line simulation and a second based on modified geometrical patterns in relation to their curvature analysis. Furthermore, we will investigate the buckling degree of the composites in relation to their fabric thickness and elasticity. Our findings will emphasize the advantages and challenges of each method as well as present a comparative table chart highlighting the relationship between material properties, pattern geometry and the formal vocabulary of the composite shells.

Introduction

At the beginning of the 20th century, debates and developments which have significantly changed the character of geometry gained momentum. By 1921, Albert Einstein would question the relationship between geometry and experience, logical-formal language and real-life experience, and added physics as a complementary thinking tool to understand the universe, which he called practical geometry (Einstein, 1921). The notion of geometry, which is meant to measure the earth and initially connect it with real-world experience, turned away from reality into a logical and formal thought system, and in the early 20th century, the relationship between geometry and experience became more questionable. Against the tendency to reduce geometry to logical and formal axioms, Richard Buckminster also proposed to reconsider orthogonal and cartesian geometry in relation to action, operation and movement (Massey, 2006). He questioned geometry with different conceptions introducing the notion of folding as 'a way of thinking', 'folding as a form of action and operation', 'folding by action'. Beyond the concept of geometry being reduced to static and rigid axioms, Fuller placed movement at the centre, conceptualising it as self-provoking and self-initiating.

Frei Otto continued this approach with his research on doubly curved fabric structures during the 1970s and 1990s. Otto's modelling and shape analysis techniques were driven by physical models, distrustful of computational methods. Nevertheless, by the early 1990s, an innovative range of structures had been produced and the successes and potential led Otto et al (1995) to declare:

'Our times demand lighter, more energy-saving, more mobile and more adaptable, in short, more natural buildings, without disregarding the demand for safety and security'.

¹ Associate Prof. Dr. Department of Architecture, Izmir University of Economics, Visiting Scholar Department of Architecture, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Later, collaborations grew with others such as Brown and Rice (2001) at Arup. Rice, in contrast, was deeply committed to the computational methods that he was applying to material innovation stress analysis and form-finding. Those developments have continued and we now see membranes and textiles being used successfully in building construction in the form of roofs, facades, pneumatic structures and tents. But now, the rapid development of emerging technologies such as 3D printing and additive manufacturing, plus developments in material science, are enabling designers to consider further innovative solution synergies expanding its applicability to a wide facette of complexity and materiality such as plastics, concrete and metals. While 3D printing has been experiencing rapid development in the past two decades, the notion of four-dimensional printing has only appeared relatively recently. The term describes the process through which a 3D printed object transforms its shape and structure over the influence of environmental parameters (e.g. temperature, humidity, light) or material properties (e.g. digital shape memory or stress relaxation), whereby the fourth dimension of the printing process becomes time.

In continuation to our previous work on '3D printing of elastic fibre patterns on pre-stretched textiles' (Agkathidis, Berdos, Brown, 2019) and 'Architectural hybrid material composites, computationally enabled techniques to control form generation' (Berdos, Agkathidis, Brown, 2020), this paper will investigate the possibilities arising in shape, material properties and geometry of objects produced, by 3D printing of semi-elastic Thermoplastic Polyurethane 95 (TPU 95) onto pre-stretched elastic fabric (e.g. lycra-spandex). In particular, we will apply two different form prediction / form-finding methods as described by Agkathidis et al (2019) and Berdos et al (2020) and test their effectiveness in predicting the desired shape and their suitability and limitations for producing particular geometries. Furthermore, we will assess and verify the two methods by using three different 3D printers (an Ultimaker-3 and the low-cost JG Aurora A5, Zaxe) allowing both to print directly on different fabrics, such as Polyamide Nylon and Elastane, Modal and Elastane composites, easily consumable wearables in the textile industry.

Consequently, we will investigate the following research questions:

- Which of the two proposed methods assessed here are more effective in controlling and predicting the form and performance of hybrid panels composed of semi-flexible, pattern fibres printed onto flat elastic, pre-stretched textiles?
- How do the material properties of the individual components - the textiles and the fibres - contribute to the properties of the composite material?
- How does the fibre pattern geometry influence the form of the composite hybrid panel?
- How does the elasticity and thickness of the textile and the filament affect the degree of buckling of the final geometry?
- How does the method of assembly affect the buckling degree of the textile and its performance?

To answer the above questions, we will conduct a set of physical experiments using the two different form prediction methods on the three different printers and on different textile materials by developing a set of composite wearable prototypes. We will then analyse and compare the findings to finally draw conclusions.

Background and Literature

We will start by looking into the related work of other researchers in order to inform our research of the latest developments in the field. In their research, Joshi et al (2020) are presenting various active materials, 4D printing techniques and shape memories, however, their approach is mostly emphasizing the field of structural engineering as they are less interested in design. Cheng et al (2021) and Cheng et al (2020), are describing the development of an additive manufacturing method combined with fused granular fabrication capable of producing 4D printed meta-structures, out of biocomposite material, which can change their geometry from flat to curved in relation to the environmental humidity. However, their work is using a completely different material pallet, than the ones examined in this paper.

Furthermore, Meyer, Dopke and Ehrmann (2019) are investigating the adhesion of 3D printed polylactic acid (also known as PLA) on textile fabrics while Redondo et al (2020) are researching the adhesion of 3D printed PLA samples on fabric by using the Fused Deposition Modeling technique. Even though both works are providing valuable insights into the material properties and behaviour of PLA printed on fabric, they are neither examining the formal behaviour of the 3D printed objects nor their capability to change in time.

Another broad review on 'Additive Manufacturing and Textiles' by Sitotaw et al (2020) is casting light on various 3D printing techniques related to textiles, however, it is mostly focusing on understanding material and technique properties rather than introducing novel materials and methods. Ehrmann and Ehrmann (2020), are presenting their research on the 'Shape-Memory Properties of 3D Printed PLA Structures' which similarly to Giglio et al (2021) is focusing on 3D printed PLA fabrics rather than on composites of PLA structures printed on textiles.

The prototypes produced in the workshop by Erioli and Naldoni (2017) explore the possibilities in form generation by 3D printing semi-elastic PLA patterns on pre-stretched textiles. However, their investigation remains at an empirical level, which is rather artistic than scientific, without incorporating simulation methods and form-prediction mechanisms. A similar technique was previously presented by Guberan and Clopath (2016), in their 'Active Shoes' project, where a 3D printed geometry on a pre-stretched textile surface allowed the creation of a controlled and predictable shoe. However, there is no evidence of simulation or form-prediction tools being used either.

In their article 'Printing-on-Fabric Meta-Material for Self-Shaping Architectural Models', Jourdan et al (2021) are describing a novel method of 3D printing PLA bars on pre-stretched textiles, including a star-based pattern system as well as a novel technique to simulate and predict the final shape of the models. However, there are not revealing the software and the tools used which are certainly different to the ones applied in our research. Their work offers a useful opportunity to compare the different methods in relation to their effectiveness.

In addition, Koch, Schmelzeisen and Gries (2021), are presenting an overview of recent techniques for the generation of 4D textiles made by additive manufacturing on pre-stressed textiles offering a valid database for categorising, evaluating and assessing the techniques and methods of our research.

In their 'FabriClick' article Goudswaard et al (2020) are presenting a method for interweaving push buttons into fabrics by using 3D printing and digital embroidery. Even though they are achieving similar effects as described in our research, they don't seem to be using form prediction techniques such as stress line simulation and curvature analysis in their design process. A similar approach is

described by Kycia (2019), in her research on 3D printing on pre-stressed fabrics in order to create textile composites and explore their potential applications as building envelopes. She has explored PLA, as well as polyolefin filaments on smaller as well as scale prototypes. She is exploring rather simple, hyperbolic paraboloid geometries, without presenting any computational, form predicting methods. Finally, the research described by Aldinger et al. (2018) in the 'Tailoring Self-Formation' paper has common ground with our work. However, finite element analysis appears to be their main tool of form prediction. In their material studies, carbon fibre rods have been knitted into the fabric, and help to better control the self-formation geometry but they are not 3D printing filament on the textiles in order to produce the composite shapes.

Overall, it becomes evident that 4D printing on textiles is an upcoming research field, however, no other research teams are working with the same materials and methods presented in this paper, which increases the authenticity of our research.

Materials and Methods

As previously described, we will apply and test two different form-prediction methods for developing pattern geometries which we will then 3D print on pre-stressed textiles. By releasing the newly composed prototypes, the objects should self-form into the desired wearable shape. Both methods have been developed using parametric tools (Rhinceros and Grasshopper). In particular, Method 01 is based on utilising the Mean curvature analysis of the digital design model and adjusting geometric patterns on it by using an algorithm incorporating the Panelling Tools plug-in for Grasshopper (figure 01). The modified pattern is then being flattened, embossed and printed onto the pre-stressed textile.




Figure 01: Diamond pattern adjusted according to Mean curvature map of a curved surface (Method 01)

Method 02 is based on an algorithm incorporating the Karamba structural simulation plug-in for Grasshopper (Agkathidis et al, 2019), capable of conducting stress line simulations on the desired, digital design model (figure 02). The stress lines are then rationalised and converted into a pattern which is then flattened, embossed and printed onto the pre-stressed textile.




Figure 02: Stress line simulation pattern produced on a curved surface (Method 02)

We will test both methods by conducting four experiments, where we will design and fabricate three types of wearable objects, bracelet/coffee cup holders, hats and facemasks/extensions. The first set of experiments (01,02,03,04) will measure the displacement between digital and physical models, thus we can verify the effectiveness of each method, as well as identify the parameters which may influence the form prediction/generation. We will utilise an Ultimaker-3 3D printer, semi-elastic Thermoplastic Polyurethane 95 (TPU 95) filament and a Lycra Spandex 240 gms textile with a 40%-20% stretch in the X and Y directions. In addition, the second set of experiments (05, 06, 07, 08) will examine the buckling capacity of the composite objects in relation to the use of different textile types such as Polyamide-Nylon and Modal with different percentages of Elastane and thicknesses as well as to the embossed filament pattern (TPU95) by applying Method 02. We will also test the effectiveness of two low budget printers Zaxe and JG Aurora A5 printers, semi-elastic, which will be utilised for the second set of experiments, as well as the assembly method on the textile (either directly printed on the fabric or being laminated to it afterwards).

Verification through design experiments

Experiment 01

Experiment 01 will examine the design of a cylindrical bracelet/coffee cup holder with a single curvature geometry which was developed using Method 01. A hexagonal and a diamond-shaped pattern is applied to the bracelet model and adjusted to its Mean curvature analysis map as illustrated in figure 03. The pattern density and scale are increased in the flattest areas (blue) and decreased in the areas with the highest curvature (red).




Figure 03: Experiment 01, pattern adjustment on Mean curvature map (Method 01)

This experiment consists out of six variants, where pattern parameters such as rod thickness, pattern shape as well as the existence (or not) of a boundary rod are being tested and compared to the original, digital 3D model (figure 04). Variant v1.1 was designed using a hexagonal pattern with a rod thickness of 2.5mm without a boundary frame and did not bend to the desired shape. Variant v1.2 has a rod thickness of 2mm and a diamond-shaped pattern while variant v1.3 is using exactly the same pattern as v1.2 but its rod thickness is 2 mm. While v1.3 over-performed by curving more than expected, v1.2 did not curve enough. Variants v1.4, v1.5 and v1.6 are all alterations of the diamond pattern with a boundary, differing only in their rod thickness (2, 2.5, 1.8 mm) with v1.6 proving to be the closest to the preferred shape.




Figure 04: Experiment 01, and the variants v1.1, v1.2, v1.3, v1.4, v1.5 and v1.6.

Experiment 02

Experiment 02 will examine the design of a cylindrical bracelet/coffee cup holder with a single curvature geometry which was developed using Method 02. By applying the stress line simulation on the digital model, the stress line simulation pattern is generated as described in figure 05.




Figure 05: Experiment 02, pattern generation via stress line simulation (Method 02)

After being flattened, the stress lines were rationalised and transformed into a pattern that was embossed and 3D printed on the pre-stress fabric. We have tested two variants. Variant v2.1 has a lower density stress-line pattern with a rod thickness of 1.5 mm. Variant v2.2 has a higher density

stress line pattern with a rod thickness of 1.5 mm. Both variations have an outer frame with a 1.5 mm thickness (figure 06).



Figure 06: Experiment 02, variants v2.1 and v2.2

Experiment 3

Experiment 03 will examine the design of a facemask with a double curvature geometry which was developed using Method 01. We have produced four variants as displayed in figure 07. Variant v3.1 is formed of a 3:3 diamond-shaped pattern with a rod thickness of 2 mm, variant v3.2 of a 4:4 diamond-shaped pattern with a rod thickness of 1 mm, variants v3.3 and v3.4 of a 5:5 and 6:6 diamond-shaped pattern accordingly, both having with a rod thickness of 1 mm. None of the variants has adopted a boundary frame.




Figure 07: Experiment 03, variants v3.1, v3.2, v3.3, v3.4

Experiment 4

Experiment 04 will examine the design of a facemask with a double curvature geometry which was developed using Method 02. We have produced four variants as displayed in figure 08. Variant v4.1 applied a 40% stretch and has a rod thickness of 1 mm, variant v4.2 a 35% stretch with a rod thickness of 1.5 mm, variants v4.3 and v4.4 of a 30% and 25% stretch accordingly, both having a rod thickness of 2 mm. While variants v4.1, v4.3 and v4.4 have adopted a boundary frame, variant v4.2 has no boundary frame.



Figure 08: Experiment 04, variants v4.1, v4.2, v4.3, v4.4

Experiment 5

Experiment 05 will examine the design of a cylindrical bracelet/coffee cup holder with a single curvature geometry using Method 02 and will be printed on two different textiles with different stretching percentages. Variant v5.1 applied a 40% stretch of a silky matt transparent textile of 15 denier thickness (%83 Polyamide, %17 Elastane), while v5.2 applied a %30 stretch of the matt opaque textile of 40 denier thickness (%86 Polyamide, % 14 Elastane) while v5.3 applied a %20 stretch of the same textile. All patterns have the same rod height (2mm) but different rod thicknesses, v5.1 has a rod thickness of 1 mm, variant v5.2 with a rod thickness of 2 mm, variant v5.3 with a rod thickness of 3 mm (figure 08). The 3D prints of all variants v5.1, v5.2 and v5.3 have been printed using a JC 3D printer directly on pre-stretched textiles.



Figure 09: Experiment 05, variants v5.1, v5.2, v5.3

Experiment 6

Experiment 06 will examine the design of a face mask with a double curvature of a complete geometry (with boundaries) which was developed using Method 02 and will be printed on two different textiles using a variety of pattern geometries. All three variants (figure 09) were produced by the same printing method and the stretching factor applied was the same. We used similar textiles with a slight difference in thickness and the same rod thickness/height (1 mm of rod thickness and height). Variant v6.1 has utilised a sheer and shiny %80 Polyamide and %20 Elastane fabric with a thickness of 5 deniers. Variants v6.2 and v6.3 have utilised an opaque mat of slightly thicker, %83 Polyamide, %17 Elastane textile with a thickness of 40 deniers. All three variants have

closed, curvilinear shapes (circle, free form, and ellipse) with different 3D printed patterns. The distribution and density of the stress lines -equal in x and y dimensions- vary.



Figure 10: Experiment 06, variants v6.1, v6.2, v6.3

Experiment 7

Experiment 07 will examine a doubly curved face mask (with borders boundaries) which was developed using Method 02 and will be printed on two different textile thicknesses using different assembly methods. We have used 2 types of textiles with 20 deniers thicknesses (%82 Polyamide, %18 Elastane) and 40 deniers thicknesses (%86 Polyamide, % 14 Elastane) with differences in the embossed pattern thicknesses but with the same rod height. The textile of both v7.1 and 7.3 has a thickness of 20 deniers. Both v7.2 and v7.4 are applied on an opaque mat of slightly thicker textile (40 denier textile). In both v7.1 and v7.2 variants, the patterns were printed directly on the fabric. Variants v7.2 and v7.4 were laminated on the fabric by using mitral Cyanoacrylate Adhesive glue. The distribution and density of the stress lines vary, as well as their rod thickness and height.



Figure 11: Experiment 07, variants v7.1, v7.2, v7., v7.4 (v7.1 and v7.2 used the same assembly method, while v7.1 and 7.3 used the same textile)

Experiment 8

Experiment 08 will examine a double curvature face mask that was developed using Method 02 and will be printed on three different textiles with similar stretching percentages. Variant v8.1 was applied on a matt opaque tights fabric of 40 deniers thickness (%92 Polyamide, %8 Elastane), while v8.2 was applied on a textile of 80 deniers thickness (%91 Polyamide, % 9 Elastane) and v8.3 on a modal textile (%92 modal, %8 Elastane), all utilising patterns with the same rod height and thickness (figure 10). The 3D prints of all variants 8.1, v8.2 and v8.3 have been printed using a Zaxe printer bed and the printed patterns were laminated on the pre-stretched fabric.



Figure 11: Experiment 08, variants v8.1, v8.2, v8.3

Findings

Our findings regarding the performance of the different methods are presented in tables 01 and 02, a comparative displacement chart between variants and the digital 3D models used to design them. It becomes evident that variants v1.6, v2.2, v3.4 and v4.4 are the most successful cases of each experiment. Both of the tested methods proved to be performing to an acceptable level. Despite no prototype has the exact measurements to the digital model it has derived from, it appears that Method 02, linked to the stress line simulation delivered the smallest discrepancies in the double curvature experiment (experiment 4), with variant v4.4 differing only -7% in the X direction and -1% in the Y direction while showing no difference in the Z direction (table 02). The findings are very similar in the single curvature experiment (experiment 02), with variant v2.2 differing only -3% in the X and +2% in the Z directions while showing no difference in the Y direction (table 02).

Variations	Stretch	Material thickness (mm)	X dimension (mm)	Y dimension (mm)	Z dimension (mm)	X/Y/Z displacement (mm)
V1 DM	-	NA	30	85	40	-
V1.1	40%	2.5	102	80	57	+72/-05/+17
V1.2	40%	2.0	51	79	59	+21/-06/+19
V1.3	40%	2.5	95	75	60	+65/-10/+20
V1.4	40%	2.0	35	75	50	+05/-10/+10
V1.5	40%	2.5	37	76	56	+07/-11/+16
V1.6	40%	1.8	33	74	44	+03/-09/+04
V2 DM	-	NA	58	61	57	-
V2.1	40%	1.5	124	61	60	+66/00/+03
V2.2	40%	1.5	55	61	58	-03/00/+01
V3 DM	-	NA	170	95	106	-

V3.1	40%	2.0	152	94	15	-18/-01/-91
V3.2	40%	1.0	152	85	20	-18/-11/-86
V3.3	40%	1.0	152	94	5	-18/-01/-101
V3.4	40%	1.0	152	95	10	-18/00/-96
V4 DM	-	NA	134	150	43	-
V4.1	40%	1.0	82	120	38	-52/-30/-5
V4.2	35%	1.5	61	139	41	-73/-11/-2
V4.3	30%	1.5	101	148	43	-33/-02/0
V4.4	25%	2.0	124	148	43	-10/-02/-0

Table 01: variation size displacement chart in mm

Variations	X/Y/Z displacement in %
V1.1	+240 / -6 / +40
V1.2	+66 / -6 / +47
V1.3	+216 / -12 / +50
V1.4	+16 / -12 / +25
V1.5	+23 / -13 / +40
V1.6	+10 / -09 / +10
V2.1	+113 / 0 / +5
V2.2	-3 / 0 / +2
V3.1	-10 / -1 / -85
V3.2	-10 / -11 / -100
V3.3	-10 / -1 / -95
V3.4	-10 / 0 / -90
V4.1	-38 / -20 / -12
V4.2	-54 / -7 / -5
V4.3	-24 / -1 / 0
V4.4	-7 / -1 / 0

Table 02: variation size displacement chart in %

Our findings regarding the second set of experiments (5,6,7,8) and the buckling performance of different textile type related composites are demonstrated in table 03. It becomes evident that thinner textiles with a high percentage of elastane provide a higher degree of buckling (e.g. variants v5.1 and v7.1 with a thicknesses of 15 and 20 deniers accordingly). Furthermore, it appears that rod height and thickness have a significant impact on the buckling degree. Overall, it is observed that the right combination of textile thickness and composition, as well as the distribution of stress line pattern and rod dimensions, play an essential role in reproducing the desired form and have to be chosen accordingly (e.g. v6.2). Finally, it becomes evident that printing on pre-stretched textiles directly helps the variants to deliver a higher degree of buckling as laminated variants such as v8.1 and v8.2 deliver a smaller degree of buckling.

	Initial form	Curvature	Dimensions x/y	Buckling in the z-direction	Printer	Rod thickness/height	Textile Thickness	Textile description	Fabric type	Method of assembly
v.5.1	trimmed rectangle with curved borders	single curvature	20 cm x 8 cm	7 cm	JG	1 m x 2 mm	15 deniers	Silky matt opaque tights, flat seams and 3D technology for a perfect fit	%83 Polyamide %17 Elastane	Printed on textile
v.5.2	trimmed rectangle with curved borders	single curvature	20 cm x 8 cm	8 cm	JG	2 mm x 2 mm	40 deniers	Silky matt opaque tights, flat seams and 3D technology for a perfect fit	%86 Polyamide %14 Elastane	Printed on textile
v.5.3	trimmed rectangle with curved borders	single curvature	10 cm x 23 cm	10 cm	JG	3 mm x 2 mm	40 deniers	Silky matt opaque tights, flat seams and 3D technology for a perfect fit	%86 Polyamide %14 Elastane	Printed on textile
v6.1	Full circle	double curvature	15 cm diameter	3.5 cm	JG	1 mm x 1 mm	5 deniers	Ultra-sheer and shiny look flat seams tights	%80 Polyamide %20 Elastane	Printed on textile
v6.2	free form	double curvature	25 cm x 15 cm	2 cm	JG	1 mm x 1mm	15 deniers	Silky matt opaque tights, flat seams and 3D technology for a perfect fit	%83 Polyamide %17 Elastane	Printed on textile
v6.3	deformed ellipse with full borders	double curvature	16 cm diameter	5.5 cm	JG	1 mm x 1 mm	15 deniers	Silky matt opaque tights, flat seams and 3D technology for a perfect fit	%83 Polyamide %17 Elastane	Printed on textile
v7.1	Free form	double curvature	14 cm x 14 cm	10 cm	JG	2 mm x 1 mm	20 deniers	sheer silky matt tights, flat seams	% 82 Polyamide % 18 Elastane	Printed on textile
V72	Full circle	Double curvature	15 cm x 15 cm	3.5cm	JG	1.5 mm x 1.4 mm	40 deniers	Silky matt opaque tights, flat seams and 3D technology for a perfect fit	%86 Polyamide %14 Elastane	Printed on textile
v7.3	Hexagon	double curvature	17 cm x 17 cm	11 cm	Zaxe	1.5 mm x 1.5 mm	20 deniers	sheer silky matt tights, flat seams	% 82 Polyamide % 18 Elastane	Laminated on textile
v.7.4	Heart shape	double curvature	16.5 cm x 7.5 cm	8cm	Zaxe	1.5 mm x 1.5 mm	40 deniers	Silky matt opaque tights, flat seams and 3D technology for a perfect fit	%86 Polyamide %14 Elastane	Laminated on textile
v.8.1	Ellipse	double curvature	17cm diameter	2.8cm	Zaxe	2 mm x 2 mm	40 deniers	Matt opaque tights	%92 Polyamide %8 Elastane	Laminated on textile
v8.2	Full circle	double curvature	17cm diameter	6.5 cm	Zaxe	2 mm x 2 mm	80 deniers	matt opaque tights with 3D technology, water-resistant	%91 Polyamide %9 Elastane	Laminated on textile
v8.3	Ellipse	double curvature	17 cm x 9 cm	3.3 cm	Zaxe	1 mm x 2 mm	Modal yarn	Transferring humidity very well	%92 Modal % 8 Elastane	Laminated on textile

Table 03: textile buckling degree chart

Conclusions

Our conclusions will focus on answering our research questions. Which of the two proposed methods assessed here are more effective in controlling and predicting the form and performance of hybrid panels composed of semi-flexible, pattern fibres printed onto flat elastic, pre-stretched textiles? Even though both methods appear effective to a certain degree, Method 02 based on patterns generated by stress line simulation is more efficient, in particular, when the object is double curved. This becomes evident in tables 01 and 02, where the most accurately reproduced objects are variants v2.2 and v4.4, both doubly curved. Method 1, based on the curvature analysis and penalisation, proved successful in reproducing single curved objects, e.g. variant v1.6. However, it failed to deliver enough buckling in the z-direction in experiment 2.

How do the material properties of the individual components (the textiles and the fibres) contribute to the properties of the composite material? It appears that the relationship between textile type, rod thickness, stretching degree, pattern density and assembly method is very complex and particular, but also essential for reproducing the desired objects (tables, 01,02,03). We could identify the following relationships: less dense patterns, operate best when directly printed on the textiles, on thinner and more elastic fabrics, while a bigger rod thickness and width is required in order to reproduce the object effectively.

On the other hand, denser patterns, require thinner rod thickness and can deliver successful objects when printed on thinner, more elastic textiles. Overall, the elasticity and thickness of the textile are essential for both methods applied. The higher the elasticity degree of the textile, the more buckling is achievable (table 03). The same applies to the textile thickness, where fabrics with a thickness of 5-20 deniers, perform much better than thicker fabrics (40 deniers and above).

Furthermore, all three 3D printers (the Ultimaker 2 and the low budget printers JG and Zaxe) performed well and were able to 3D print on the textiles safely. Printing directly on the textile proved to be much more effective than laminating the pattern with glue, as the glued composites delivered less buckling in the z-direction (e.g. v8.1, v8.2 and v8.3, in table 03).

The size of all produced objects is no bigger than 25 cm, as we were limited to this size by the available 3D printers. Our future plans include experimentation with larger-scale 3D printed objects, in order to verify our findings on a larger, architectural scale.

Acknowledgements

We would like to express our acknowledgements to Darshan Chiba, Ffion Morris and Elliott Ward for executing experiment 1, Pattanan Inharwararak, Jinbi Jiang and Zili Qiu for executing experiment 2. Joseph Eyres, Viktor Lepetilo and Maxine Tai for executing experiment 3, Allena Anna Alphy, Diya Manoj Kulkarni and Poojapriyam Ravi from the Liverpool School of Architecture for executing experiment 4. Furthermore, our acknowledgements go to Furkan Sinan Üğütmen, Nezihe Gökçe Kökcan, Hilal Kaleli, Bilge Belenli, İrem Uysal, Yağmur Kaynar, Gözde Damla Turhan, Ece Küreli who acted as assistants for experiments 5,6,7 and 8 as well as Hugh Clarke, Filiz Keyder Özkan, Onur Dinmez, Çağlar Şendikici, Ayşe Bozkurt Karal from the Izmir University of Economics who executed experiments 5,6,7 and 8.

Bibliography

- Agkathidis, A., Berdos, Y., Brown, A. Active membranes: 3D printing of elastic fibre patterns on pre-stretched textiles. *International Journal of Architectural Computing*. 2019;17(1):74-87. doi:10.1177/1478077118800890
- Aldinger, A., A. Margariti, A. Koerner, S. Suzuki, and J. Knippers. 2018. Tailoring Self-Formation: Fabrication and Simulation of Membrane-Actuated Stiffness Gradient Composites. In *Creativity in Structural Design*. Boston https://www.researchgate.net/publication/326552014_Tailoring_Self-Formation_fabrication_and_simulation_of_membrane-actuated_stiffness_gradient_composites
- Berdos, Y., Agkathidis, A., Brown, A. (2020) Architectural hybrid material composites: computationally enabled techniques to control form generation, *Architectural Science Review*, 63:2, 154-164, DOI: 10.1080/00038628.2019.1666357
- Brown, A and Rice, P. *The engineer's contribution to contemporary architecture: Peter Rice*. London: Thomas Telford, 2001

Cheng, T., Wood, D., Kiesewetter, L., Oezdemir, E., Antorveza, K., and Menges, A. Programming material compliance and actuation: hybrid additive fabrication of biocomposite structures for large-scale self-shaping. *Bioinspiration & Biomimetics*, 2021. <http://iopscience.iop.org/article/10.1088/1748-3190/ac10af>

Cheng T., Wood D., Wang X., Yuan P.F., Menges A. (2020) Programming Material Intelligence: An Additive Fabrication Strategy for Self-shaping Biohybrid Components. In: Vouloutsi V., Mura A., Tauber F., Speck T., Prescott T.J., Verschure P.F.M.J. (eds) *Biomimetic and Biohybrid Systems. Living Machines 2020. Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, vol 12413. Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-64313-3_5

Giglio, A., Paoletti, I. & Conti, G.M. Three-Dimensional (3D) Textiles in Architecture and Fashion Design: a Brief Overview of the Opportunities and Limits in Current Practice. *Appl Compos Mater* (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10443-021-09932-9>

Goudswaard, M., Abraham, A., Goveia da Rocha, B., Andersen, K., Liang, R. 2020. FabriClick: Interweaving Pushbuttons into Fabrics Using 3D Printing and Digital Embroidery. *Proceedings of the 2020 ACM Designing Interactive Systems Conference*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 379–393. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3357236.3395569>

Guberan, C. and C. Clopath (2016). Active shoes. <https://selfassemblylab.mit.edu/active-shoes>. MIT Self-Assembly Lab.

Einstein, A. 1921. *Geometry and Experience*. Retrieved from https://www.relativitycalculator.com/pdfs/einstein_geometry_and_experience_1921.pdf

Ehrmann, G.; Ehrmann, A. Shape-Memory Properties of 3D Printed PLA Structures, in *Proceedings of the First International Conference on “Green” Polymer Materials 2020*, 5–25 November 2020, MDPI: Basel, Switzerland, <https://doi:10.3390/CGPM2020-07198>

Erioli, A. and L. Naldoni (2017). informed flexible matter workshop. <http://www.co-de-it.com/WordPress/informed-flexible-matter.html>

Jourdan, D., Skouras, M., Vouga, E., Bousseau, A. (2021, April). Printing-on-Fabric Meta-Material for Self-Shaping Architectural Models. In *Advances in Architectural Geometry*, April 2021, Paris, France. pp.1-19. (hal-02925036)

Joshi, S., Rawat, K., Karunakaran C, Rajamohan, V., Mathew, A.T., Koziol, K., Thakur, V.K, Balan A.S.S, 4D printing of materials for the future: Opportunities and challenges, *Applied Materials Today*, Volume 18, 2020, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apmt.2019.100490>

Massey J. 2006. Buckminster Fuller’s cybernetic pastoral: The United States Pavilion at Expo 67. *The Journal of Architecture*, 11:4, 463-483, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13602360601037883>

Meyer P, Döpke C, Ehrmann A. Improving adhesion of three-dimensional printed objects on textile fabrics by polymer coating. *Journal of Engineered Fibers and Fabrics*. January 2019. doi:10.1177/1558925019895257

Koch, H.C.; Schmelzeisen, D.; Gries, T. 4D Textiles Made by Additive Manufacturing on Pre-Stressed Textiles—An Overview. *Actuators* 2021, 10, 31. <https://doi.org/10.3390/act10020031>

Kycia, A. (2019). Hybrid textile structures as means of material-informed design strategy. In M. Ballestrem, I. Borrego, D. Fioretti, R. Pasel, and J. Weidinger (Eds.), *CA2RE Berlin Proceedings: Conference for Artistic and Architectural (Doctoral) Research*, Berlin, pp. 34–35. Universitätsverlag der TU Berlin.

Otto F, Rasch B and Schanz S. *Finding form: towards an architecture of the minimal*. Berlin: Edition Axel Menges, 1995.

Redondo, F. L., Giaroli, M. C., Villar, M. A., de, A. G. O., Ciolino, A. E., Ninago, M. D., Direct 3D Printing of Poly (lactic acid) on Cotton Fibers: Characterization of Materials and Study of Adhesion Properties of the Resulting Composites. *Macromol. Symp.* 2020, 394, 1900190. <https://doi.org/10.1002/masy.201900190>

Sitotaw, D.B.; Ahrendt, D.; Kyosev, Y.; Kabish, A.K. Additive Manufacturing and Textiles—State-of-the-Art. *Appl. Sci.* 2020, 10, 5033. <https://doi.org/10.3390/app10155033>