Tuning nanomechanical properties of microstructures made by 3D direct laser writing

*Mehdi Belqat^{1,2}, Xingyu Wu^{1,2}, Laura Piedad Chia Gomez^{1,2}, Jean-Pierre Malval^{1,2}, Sébastien
Dominici^{1,2}, Benjamin Leuschel^{1,2} Arnaud Spangenberg^{1,2}, Karine Mougin^{1,2}*

¹Université de Haute-Alsace, CNRS, IS2M UMR 7361, F-68100 Mulhouse, France

²Université de Strasbourg, France

Corresponding Authors: karine.mougin@uha.fr, arnaud.spangenberg@uha.fr

KEYWORDS: Two photon polymerization, Micro-additive manufacturing, Atomic Force Microscopy,
Young's modulus, 3D direct laser writing

24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

ABSTRACT

3D Direct laser writing (3D DLW) based on two photon polymerization represents a powerful technique for the additive manufacturing of 3D micro- and nano-structures, which have a number of promising applications in areas including biology and cell cultures up to soft robotic. New applications often entail the contact and movement of nanoscale areas, therefore understanding of the mechanical properties involved in such systems is necessary for creating reliable micro and nanoscale applications. Notably, knowledge about nanomechanics of 3D printed structures and its dependence on its geometry and contact size remains essential. This study focuses on the investigation of the Young's modulus of 3D printed microstructures by Atomic Force Microscopy. Using the PeakForce QNM AFM mode, it was possible to determine the influence of the laser power and the monomer and their mixture on the micromechanical properties, in particular the Young's modulus. The fabricated structures are 2D structures, consisting of successive lines forming a square. Three different resins have been used based on poly(ethyleneglycol)diacrylate (PEGDA), trimethylolpropane triacrylate (TMPTA) and pentaerythritol triacrylate (PETA). The results obtained show that the increase in laser power increases the Young's modulus of these raw materials, since it induces a stronger crosslinking density. Mixtures of resins have also been formulated inducing a Young's modulus structure increase when increasing the amount of PETA. By combining these two approaches, tuning of the nanomechanical properties of the final microstructures on an unprecedented range covering 3 orders of magnitude, from MPa up to GPa have been successfully achieved. This major result paves the way to in-depth reflection on future works in nanorobotics or biomedical devices, where complex mechanical behavior are highly desired.

1. Introduction

Characterization of mechanical properties of structures and materials are of primary importance for their use in a broad range of applications. The first known scientific research on the mechanics of building elements dates back only to the end of the 16th century with the famous work of Galileo on the tension and bending of beams. But, science has evolved and last century has brought new characterization techniques that have been developed to face it. In parallel, new generation of materials and complex composites have also been created and built at different scales. Among the various fabrication techniques available to shape the material, 3D direct laser writing (3D DLW) based on two photon polymerization represents a powerful technique for the fabrication of 3D micro- and nano-structures [1-3]. This technique allows to perfectly replicate miniaturized 3D objects, process that could not be achieved with traditional microfabrication technologies such as self-assembly technique [4], electron beam lithography [5] and nanoimprint lithography [6]. In addition, physico-chemical and mechanical properties of these microstructures can be easily tuned by varying different technical parameters such as nature of resins, laser power and writing speed [7-9]. However, the characterization of such micro-objects remains difficult, while the control of the mechanical properties of these microstructures is essential for their future applications. Indeed, the measurement of the Young's modulus of micro-objects is crucial to achieve the microstructures with a high fidelity. For instance, in bioengineering, tuning rigidity of a scaffold or a prosthesis allows to enhance the biocompatibility of the objects in its new environment [10]. In addition, the detection of a mechanical defect on a microstructure can avoid a real damage in its bulk or on its surface.

Nevertheless, measuring mechanical properties of micro-objects via conventional methods is impossible due to the size of these objects. In order to circumvent these limitations, several characterization techniques have been proposed and developed to study the mechanical properties of micro and nanostructures. Treacy *et al.* [11] have estimated the Young's modulus of isolated carbon nanotubes by measuring, in transmission electron microscopy, the amplitude of their intrinsic thermal vibration. This original method, although highly powerful, can only be used for specific and conductive micromaterials

79 such as carbon nanotubes. The three-point bending test is commonly used to test the bending strength of
80 materials. Inspired from this principle, Lemma *et al.* [12] have proposed a bending characterization
81 method of the mechanical properties of microstructures produced by two-photon stereolithography.
82 They have combined static and dynamic mechanical analysis on pillar-like structures and picometer-
83 sensitive laser Doppler vibrometry of drum-like structures to viably and nondestructively estimate
84 Young's modulus, Poisson's ratio, and density of 3D printed micromaterials. This innovative and non-
85 destructive method can however only be used for microstructures having a specific shape. Shin *et al.*
86 [13] have proposed another method to induce microbending in microstructures and to determine their
87 Young's modulus. For this, microcantilever bars were manufactured and at the end of these structures, a
88 microsphere was fabricated in order to induce bending using optical tweezers. The sphere was then
89 trapped by an optical beam and was able to move over several microns depending on the strength of the
90 optical trap. Young's modulus of the microcantilever could be indirectly estimated from the deviation of
91 the bar during the optical stress. Other destructive techniques such as *in situ* mechanical test in scanning
92 electronic microscope could have been used to estimate mechanical properties. Geer *et al.* [14] have
93 measured deformation of fractal-like architectures by micro-compression test and developed a
94 computational model that was able to capture local stress distributions within the nanolattices under this
95 solicitation. As a result, they could explain some of the underlying deformation mechanisms and
96 validate the measured effective stiffness of the metamaterial such as for 3D microprinted Eiffel Tower.
97 Finally, micro and nanoindentation remains one of the most commonly used tools independently of its
98 destructive character. The principal goal of a nanoindentation test is to extract elastic modulus and
99 hardness of a specimen material from experimental readings of the indenter load versus the depth of
100 penetration. Lee *et al.* [15] have used the microindentation technique to determine the Young's modulus
101 and compressive strength of different architectures (square, pillars and metamaterials) at the
102 micrometric scale. In a different way, Oakdale *et al.* [16] sought to assess the influence of density as
103 well as the influence of UV post-polymerization on Young's modulus by conducting compression tests
104 on Woodpiles using a nanoindenter. Young's moduli were extracted from the slope of the load curves.
105 Bauer *et al.* [17] did similar compressive and destructive tests at microscale on pyrolyzed resins to

determine the influence of the size of carbon nanolattices as well as the influence of an alumina coating on the Young's modulus of the 3D-printed microstructures. Lastly, Barner-Kowollik *et al.* [18] have used nanodynamical mechanical analysis (NanoDMA) to investigate the bulk viscoelastic properties (hardness, complex elastic modulus, and loss factor) of the microstructures over the course of irradiation of polymer at the nanoscale. This technique is a quite new and powerful technology to characterize the bulky mechanical properties of microstructures produced by 3D DLW. In a complementary approach, Atomic Force Microscopy in PeakForce QNM mode, which also represents an impressive and non-destructive test, allows determining mechanical properties of microstructure surface. Gou *et al.* [19] have investigated the mechanical properties of hydrogels produced by two-photon stereolithography using atomic force microscopy. In the Quantitative Nanomechanical Property Mapping (QNM) mode, they were able to determine the influence of the manufacturing laser power on the Young's modulus on their different 3D printed samples. All these different examples have shown that new generation of technics have been developed to allow determining the intrinsic mechanical properties of 3D printed microstructures depending on their geometry, nature and size. Thus, the knowledge of fundamental nanomechanics mechanism of these micromaterials remains essential. Even though the stakes are so high regarding the targeting applications, the influence of the fabrication parameters on mechanical properties are not systematically investigated when designing new advanced materials.

In this study, we have proposed to investigate three different photosensitive resins, PEGDA (Poly(ethyleneglycol)diacrylate), Trimethylolpropane Triacrylate (TMPTA) and PETA (Pentaerythritol triacrylate) to create microstructures of varying stiffness by 3D DLW. The apparent Young moduli of these materials have been determined by AFM in PeakForce QNM. Two parameters such as the increase of the laser power and the type of resins mixture have allowed to tune the nanomechanical properties of the final microstructures on a large range, from MPa up to GPa. These results pave the way to in-depth reflection on future works in nanorobotics or cell biology, where complex mechanical behavior are highly desired.

2. Materials and Methods

2.1. Materials

133 Pentaerythritol triacrylate (PETA) ($\rho = 1,18 \text{ g/ml}$; $M = 298,29 \text{ g/mol}$) and Poly(ethylene Glycol)
 134 diacrylate PEGDA ($\rho = 1,12 \text{ g/ml}$; $M = 700 \text{ g/mol}$) were purchased from Sigma-Aldrich. Diphenyl
 135 (2,4,6- trimethylbenzoyl)- phosphine oxide (TPO-L) was purchased from BASF ($M = 336,371 \text{ g/mol}$).
 136 Trimethylolpropane Triacrylate (TMPTA) was kindly provided by Sartomer ($\rho = 1,1 \text{ g/ml}$; $M = 296,32$
 137 g/mol). The chemical formula of all the products are depicted in Figure 1.

138

139 **Figure 1.** Chemical formula : a) PETA; b) PEGDA ; c) TMPTA ; d) TPO-L.

140 2.2. Characterization

141 2.2.1. Microfabrication by 3D DLW

142 A detailed description of the 3D microfabrication set-up has been previously described elsewhere. [8,
 143 20] However for the sake of clarity, it has to be mentionned that the generation of microstructures has
 144 been done via the computer-aided design (CAD) module of Simpoly allowing the control of specific
 145 parameters such as the percentage of overlap Δ_v between each voxel or the distance Δ_l between two lines
 146 forming the microstructure (Figure 2a). The two photon excitation was performed at 800 nm by
 147 focusing the femtosecond laser beam with an objective lens (x40, NA: 0.65) into a drop of resist (Figure
 148 2b). This substrate was previously functionalized with 3-(triethoxysilyl) propyl methacrylate to enhance
 149 the adhesion of the structures onto the substrate. The 3D microstructure is finally obtained by washing
 150 away the unreacted monomer using ethanol (Figure 2c).

Figure 2. 3D DLW fabrication steps of a microstructure. a) CAD modelization and writing strategy for square microstructure, b) Photofabrication based on two photon polymerization, c) SEM image of typical microstructure obtained after microprinting.

2.2.2. Atomic Force Microscopy

The investigation of the morphology, adhesives and mechanical properties of all the 3D microstructures have been performed by Atomic Force Microscope (AFM). A Bruker Multimode 8 AFM in Peakforce Quantitative Nanomechanics (PeakForce QNM) mode has been used to study the physico-chemical and mechanical nanoscale features of the 3D microstructures. Particularly, PeakForce QNM mode is a recent advanced mode developed by Bruker to investigate quantitative nanomechanical mapping properties with the simultaneous measurement of the sample's adhesion between tip and sample surface, Young's modulus (according to either Derjaguin-Muler-Toporov (DMT) or Sneddon model), deformation and energy dissipation along with the surface topography [21]. The imaging scan size was (5 μm x 5 μm). The physico-chemical parameters average such as roughness (RMS), adhesion and spell out this abbreviation (DMT) Module were determined using the Gwydion software. QNM etched silicon probes were provided by Bruker. They were RTESPA-150 presenting a nominal spring constant $k \sim 6$ N/m and RTESPA-300 presenting a nominal spring constant $k \sim 40$ N/m. All used tips were calibrated according to Bruker's user guide [21] and norm ISO13095:2014. The test operation steps of relative method in PeakForce QNM were described as followed: firstly, a Sapphire-15M (supplied by Bruker) was used for calibration of deflection sensitivity of cantilever. Then, the stiffness k of the cantilever was calibrated according to thermal noise method. Secondly, the k and R values were adjusted to make the acquired

modulus consistent with the standard values obtained with calibration samples (supplied by Bruker).
 Thirdly, the sample was carried out. The results were analysed by both Nanoscope analysis 2.0 software
 provide by Bruker and Gwyddion. The root mean square (RMS) roughness, adhesion and DMT
 modulus parameters were measured for at least three representative AFM images from different areas of
 3D microstructures, and at least three different samples for each film were studied and analysed as
 previously described in S.Oras *et al.* [22]. The Derjaguin-Muler-Toporov (DMT) model can be viewed
 as a modified Hertzian model, which takes into account the adhesive forces between the tip and the
 surface. According to this approach, the reduced Young's modulus, E_r , is given by [23].

$$E_r = \frac{3(F_{tip} - F_{adh})}{4\sqrt{Rd^3}} \quad (1)$$

In Eq. (1), F_{tip} is the force on the AFM tip, F_{adh} is the adhesive force between the AFM tip and sample,
 R is the AFM tip radius, and d is the deformation depth. The reduced Young's modulus is related to the
 sample Young's modulus (E_s) and is calculated by Eq. (2) [15].

$$\frac{1}{E_r} = \frac{(1-\nu_s^2)}{E_s} + \frac{(1-\nu_I^2)}{E_I} \quad (2)$$

where E_I is the indenter Young's modulus, ν_I is the Poisson's ratio of the indenter and ν_s is Poisson's
 ratio of the sample.

2.2.3. Fourier-Transform Infrared (FTIR) microspectroscopy

The investigation of the degree of conversion (DC) has been performed by FTIR microspectroscopy
 using a Thermo Scientific Nicolet iN10 MX equipped with a germanium tip for the ATR mode.
 Typically, the analyzed zone was 5 micrometers at the center of squared polymeric structures of 20
 micrometers length. The absorbance spectra were measured from 4000 cm^{-1} to 675 cm^{-1} wavenumber
 with a resolution of 8 cm^{-1} and 64 scans per spectrum. This method relies on measuring the degree of
 conversion (DC) of the structured polymers in comparison with the resin mixture and is determined by
 Equation (3) [24]:

196

197

$$DC = \left[1 - \frac{A_{C=C}/A_{C=O}}{A'_{C=C}/A'_{C=O}} \right] \times 100 \quad (4)$$

198

199

where $A_{C=C}$, $A_{C=O}$, $A'_{C=C}$ and $A'_{C=O}$ are the integrated area of absorption bands related to the C=C and C=O moieties in the polymerized and the nonpolymerized resin, respectively.

200

Results and discussion

201

202

203

204

205

206

207

208

209

210

211

The size and the structure of the samples have been first optimized before investigating the influence of the different parameters such as the laser power and nature of the resin on the nanomechanical properties of the 3D microstructures. Indeed, it was first necessary to determine the overlap between two consecutive voxels and two adjacent lines on the surface in order to minimize the roughness of the sample, which might also induce an impact on the modulus and adhesion measurements. Besides, the 3D architecture itself and the way photopolymerization is carried out may impact the mechanical responses of the microstructure [25], therefore we have limited our study to squared microstructures made of a single layer. The 3D DLW manufacturing of a sample starts by focusing a beam under a microscope resulting on the point-by-point photopolymerization of a resin. This point, corresponding to a voxel, takes the form of an ellipsoid and represents the building block of the fabricated structure. The overlap (Δ_v) characterizes the distance between the voxels, illustrated in Figure 2a.

Figure 3. a-d) AFM topography images of PETA 25x25 μm² square samples (PeakForce QNM mode) varying as function of overlap parameter. e) Graph depicting the evolution of roughness (RMS)-(black point) and adhesive forces (red triangle) as function of layer distance (Δ_l).

For a given line, this overlap parameter between two successive voxels was set at 60% in the CAD software, allowing a low roughness in the writing direction of the sample as depicted in Figure 3d. The overlap (Δ_l) characterizes the distance between two adjacent lines (Figure 2a). As expected, the lower the overlap is, the higher the roughness is (Figure 3). However, in case of high overlap (i.e. low distance between two adjacent lines), the difference between the threshold energy and the damage energy, defining the possible manufacturing window, is greatly reduced. For sake of clarity, the threshold energy represents the minimum energy required by the system to initiate a photopolymerization phenomenon, and the damage energy corresponds to the energy leading to the sample degradation. Besides, reducing the overlap (Δ_l) can significantly increase the manufacturing time. For instance, 25x25 μm² square microstructures used for mechanical investigations are fabricated in 12 min or 3 min respectively for Δ_l = 100 nm or for Δ_l = 400 nm. In order to optimize the fabrication

parameters, different overlap values between two adjacent lines, have been tested and the roughness of the average roughness type (Root Mean Square-RMS) and the forces of adhesion were measured by AFM as observed in Figure 3. The graph in Figure 3e shows that roughness increases with the distance value between two adjacent lines, as theoretically expected. Adhesion force also slowly increases with this parameter, however the overall variation of the value remains weak. The latter can be explained by the fact that, when the overlap is low, lines are separated and acts as single units instead of being stick and/or polymerized with the adjacent ones. As a result, it increases roughness of the overall surface, and it also leads to heterogeneity in chemical properties as illustrated by the evolution of error bars for adhesive forces. Finally, for $\Delta_l = 300$ nm, the roughness has been also characterized in function of the average laser power and the nature of the resists used (Figures S1 to S5, and Tables S3 to S6). While for a given monomer, no trends of the RMS have been noticed in function of the laser power, one can observed a slightly higher RMS values for TMPTA (50 nm) and PETA (41 nm) compare to PEGDA (27 nm). Additionally, SEM images provided in supporting information confirm the low impact of aforementioned parameters on the surface morphology of the 2D microstructures (Figures S6, S7 and S8). Consequently, a distance of 300 nm between lines has been fixed in the mechanical studies described hereafter.

Then, three different resins (PEGDA, TMPTA, PETA) have been photopolymerized using previous conditions to assess the evolution of the square sample topography as well as their mechanical properties (variation of their Young's modulus). Their corresponding approach-retract curves have been also presented in Figure 4.

Figure 4. AFM topographic images in PeakForce QNM mode and their corresponding approach-retract curves: a1-2) PEGDA; b1-2) TMPTA; c1-2) PETA.

The approach-retract curves in Figure 4 a2, b2, c2 are formed by the superposition of a blue curve which corresponds to the approach curve and of a red curve corresponding to the withdrawal curve of the tip from the surface. The difference between these two curves corresponds to the energy dissipated by the tip during contact. This Hysteresis is higher for a soft material (Figure 4-a2), and smaller for a rigid material as observed in Figure 4-c2. The Young's modulus corresponding to the three different resins with distinctive processable parameters are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1. Young's Modulus obtained for the three different monomers PEDA, TMPTA and PETA photopolymerized (manufactured with an x40 objective N.A. 0,65) for a laser power of 9.9 mW, an exposure time of 10 ms and an overlap $\Delta_l = 300$ nm, characterized by AFM in PF QNM mode.

Monomers	DMT Young's Modulus (MPa)	Cantilever's spring constant (N/m)	Tip radius (nm)
PEGDA	6,9 +/- 0,1	6	80
TMPTA	1669 +/- 56	40	100
PETA	1956 +/- 13	40	100

These results are in good agreement with literature, in particular for PEGDA [19] and PETA [12]. TMPTA and PETA have similar Young's modulus value, this can be explained by the fact that TMPTA has a similar chemical structure to PETA, as a result both resins moduli are expected to be of the same order of magnitude. In 3D DLW process, two-photon polymerization (2PP) occurs in a very limited time and space scales compare to conventional photopolymerization. Thus, additionally to oxygen inhibition, dark polymerization or functionality of monomers, many other complex phenomenon such as optical aberration or local heating have to be taken into consideration in the formation of the polymer network [26]. However, as described by E. Andrzejewska [27], the process of network formation for free radical photopolymerization is strongly linked to the kinetics of photopolymerization. The functionality, defined here as the number of polymerizable groups per molecule, play a crucial role both on the kinetics and on the formation of higher cross-link density. Indeed, higher functionality involves higher concentration of functional groups which in turn leads to a faster formation of denser network. Therefore, one can expect higher cross-link density, and consequently higher Young's modulus in PETA and TMPTA compare to PEGDA as observed in Figure 4. Once the system was calibrated, it was possible to assess the influence of the laser power as well as that of the monomer mixture on the resin Young's modulus.

3.1 Influence of the laser power

288 The PETA, TMPTA and PEGDA samples were generated under the same conditions with an overlap Δ_l
 289 = 300nm. The results obtained are presented in Figure 5.

291
 292 **Figure 5.** Evolution of Young's modulus as function of laser power for a) PETA (black circles) and
 293 TMPTA (red triangles), b) PEGDA (green circles).

294
 295 From a general point of view, an increase in Young's modulus is observed as a function of writing laser
 296 power independantly of the nature of the monomer. For PETA, Young's modulus varies from 1.85 GPa
 297 for a power of 6.73 mW up to 2.27 GPa for a power of 13.5 mW (Figure 5a). Such behavior is expected
 298 since the size of an individual voxel and the corresponding mechanical properties of the material are
 299 directly related to the energy of the laser pulse and the duration of exposure. Lu *et al.* [24] demonstrated
 300 a direct link between the laser power and the degree of conversion and therefore, by extension, the
 301 crosslinking density. Previous analyzes have shown that crosslink density is directly related to modulus
 302 of elasticity and ultimate tensile strength of crosslinked acrylic materials [28]. By comparison, Lemma
 303 *et al.* [12] observed an increase in Young's modulus of 1.5 GPa for a power of 8.5 mW at 2 GPa at 16
 304 mW, measured by micro-bending on an IP-L 780 resin (mainly composed of PETA monomer). The
 305 order of magnitude remains the same, however the values obtained by the latter are lower, which can be
 306 explained by different experimental conditions (numerical aperture of the microscope objective, overlap
 307 between each voxel, nature and concentration of photoinitiator, etc...).

For TMPTA, the results obtained are presented in Figure 5a. A similar behavior as PETA has been observed, with an increase in Young's modulus as a function of laser power. Indeed, Young's modulus varies from 1.67 GPa for a laser power of 9.9 mW to 2.3 GPa for a power of 13.5 mW. However, in comparison with PETA, it seems that the increase is more significant (increase of 38 % compared to 23 % for PETA). Chemically, both monomers have the same number of acrylic functions however, PETA is more viscous (500-1000 cP) than TMPTA (80-135 cP) due to the possibility of forming hydrogen bonds via the hydroxy group (-OH). While it is known that initial viscosity of acrylate based resist can drastically enhanced the reactivity of a given resists [29], further investigation will be necessary to state on the role of viscosity on mechanical properties. More broadly, the viscosity has been scarcely investigated in the frame of a two-photon polymerization as recently reported by Zandrini and coworkers [30].

Finally, the evolution of mechanical properties of the PEGDA is displayed in Figure 5b. An increase in the Young's modulus is observed as a function of the laser power, the Young's modulus varied from 6.9 MPa for a power of 9.9 mW to 9.5 MPa for a power of 13.5 mW, constituting an increase of 38 %. The lower modulus values can be explained by the presence of only two acrylate functions for PEGDA instead of three for PETA or TMPTA. Thus, a looser crosslinking network can be generally observed for mono- or difunctional monomers. Finally, unlike other studies where PEGDA is used as a hydrogel, it should be noted that in our formulation, no solvent has been used, which explains values of the order of MPa. In addition, in presence of water, photopolymerized materials can exhibit Young's moduli of the order of a few hundred kPa.

To conclude, the results obtained confirm the link between the final Young's modulus of the material and the manufacturing laser power, but also the influence of viscosity and the chemical nature of monomer on the mechanical properties of the material.

3.2 Influence of the monomer Mixture

In order to be able to modulate the mechanical properties of the microstructures over a wider range, several mixtures of PETA and PEGDA have been prepared to assess the chemical influence on their Young's modulus. The results obtained are summarized in the graph in Figure 6a.

Figure 6. Evolution of a) Young's modulus and of b) degree of conversion as function of PETA concentration in PEGDA for a laser power of 13.5 mW, an exposure time of 10 ms and an overlap $\Delta_l = 300\text{nm}$. The Young's moduli obtained for 0 and 10 % of PETA in PEGDA have been highlighted in inset (Green markers).

An increase in Young's modulus is observed as a function of the PETA concentration. Indeed, the addition of 10% wt PETA induces an increase of the modulus from 9.4 MPa up to 57 MPa. At 20% PETA, the modulus reaches 150 MPa. For equal mixture, the Young's modulus increases to nearly 500 MPa and to 1.15 GPa, when the amount of PETA is equal to 75%. On the other hand, Figure 6b depicts the evolution of the degree of conversion (DC) with the increase in PETA concentration in the final mixture. The DC of polymerized microstructures have been determined using ATR-FTIR microspectroscopy as proposed early by Cicha and coworkers [31]. Representative FTIR spectra for different mixtures before and after polymerization are given in the supporting information (Figure S11). Briefly, a value of 55% of conversion is determined in case of 100% of PETA. This result is in good agreement with the work of Jiang *et al.* where a degree of conversion of 42% is determined by using Raman microspectroscopy for a commercial resin, namely IP-L 780 which is mainly composed of

PETA [24]. Besides, a value higher than 80% of conversion is observed for a microstructure made of 100% of PEGDA. Due to lack of sensitivity in our experimental set-up, we can not say with certainty the absolute value, however the fact that this value is higher than the one reported for PETA is consistent with the fact that monomer of higher functionality leads to lower conversion [27]. Finally, contrary to what it has been noticed for mixture of monomers by Jiang *et al.* [32], when the concentration of PETA increase from 0 to 100 wt% in the mixture, the degree of conversion is progressively decreasing as expected. The latter highlights the impact of the monomer structure and concentration on the final degree of conversion.

These overall results show that by tuning the mixture of two monomers, it has been possible to modulate by 3 orders of magnitude (10 MPa, 100 MPa and 1000 MPa), the mechanical properties of 3D microstructures produced by 3D DLW, opening up new perspectives for the fabrication of devices with complex behavior. In addition to those varied technical parameters, the writing speed remains also another key parameter that strongly impacts the Young's modulus of 3D microstructures, and which has also to be taken under consideration when designing new microdevices.

3. Conclusion

This research work deals with the need to finely control the mechanical properties of 3D micro-objects produced by 3D DLW. Hence, evolution of the young's modulus of photopolymerized square microstructures has been investigated by AFM in PeakForce QNM mode, which represents an essential technique for the physico-chemical analysis of the surfaces of micrometric objects. Three main monomers commonly used in 3D DLW have been tested. Results have shown that it was possible to measure the apparent Young's moduli ranging from MPa to GPa at microscale. This parameter has allowed to first assess the impact of photonic manufacturing parameters on the final mechanical properties of the material at microscale. Particularly, it appears that the increase in laser power induces an increase in mechanical properties. Second, the influence of the monomer on the mechanical properties has also been highlighted. It follows that the nature and structure of the monomer have a direct influence on the Young's modulus. Third, it was possible to modulate over a wide range (3 orders

of magnitude) the mechanical properties by acting on a mixture of monomers. This latter approach opens up new perspectives in fields where complex deformations of the manufactured object are desired (nanorobotics, nanosurgery) or where 3D spatial encoding of chemical and mechanical clues are highly desired (cell biology, organ on chip, tissue engineering). Up to now, the variation of mechanical properties remains moderate with regard to the challenges in terms of complexity required to develop adaptive structures or multi-functional structures for the above mentioned applications such as nanorobotics or cell biology. Thus, new routes should be kept in being explored.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors thanks the Agence Nationale de la recherche (Project ANR 2PhotonInsight: ANR-16-CE08-0020) and Institut Carnot MICA for financial support. This work was also partially supported by an Institutional Research Grant (MIPPI4D) from the Région Grand Est.

REFERENCES

- [1] S. Maruo, O. Nakamura, S. Kawata, Three-dimensional microfabrication with two-photon-absorbed photopolymerization. *Opt. Lett.* **1997**, 2 (22), 132–134.
- [2] C. N LaFratta, J. T Fourkas, T. Baldacchini,; R. A. Farrer, Multiphoton Fabrication. *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.* **2007**, 46, 6238–6258.
- [3] C. Barner-Kowollik, M. Bastmeyer, E. Blasco, G. Delaittre, P. Müller, B. Richter, M. Wegener, 3D Laser Micro- and Nanoprinting: Challenges for Chemistry. *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.* **2017**, 56 (50), 15828–15845.
- [4] G.M. Whitesides, J.P. Mathias, C.T. Seto. Molecular Self-Assembly and Nanochemistry: A Chemical Strategy for the Synthesis of Nanostructures. *Science (80-.).* **1991**, 254, 1312–1319.
- [5] I. Haller, M. Hatzakis, R. Srinivasan. High-resolution Positive Resists for Electron-beam Exposure. *IBM J. Res. Dev.* **1968**, 12 (3), 251–256.

411 [6] S.-W. Lee, K.-S. Lee, J. Ahn, et al. Highly Sensitive Biosensing Using Arrays of Plasmonic Au
412 Nanodisks Realized by Nanoimprint Lithography. *ACS Nano* **2011**, 5 (2), 897–904.

413 [7] M. Hippler, E. Blasco, J. Qu, M. Tanaka, C. Barner-Kowollik, M. Wegener, M. Bastmeyer.
414 Controlling the shape of 3D microstructures by temperature and light. *Nature Communications* **2019**, 10,
415 232.

416 [8] L.P. Chia Gomez, A. Spangenberg, X.-A. Ton, Y. Fuchs, F. Bokeloh, J.-P. Malval, B. Tse Sum Bui,
417 D. Thuau, C. Ayela, K. Haupt, O. Soppera, Rapid prototyping of chemical microsensors based on
418 molecularly imprinted polymers synthesized by two-photon stereolithography. *Adv. Mater.* **2016**, 28 (28),
419 5931-5937.

420 [9] S.-Y. Yu, G. Schrodj, K. Mougin, J. Dentzer, J.-P. Malval, H.-W. Zan, O. Soppera, A. Spangenberg,
421 A. Direct Laser Writing of Crystallized TiO₂ and TiO₂ /Carbon Microstructures with Tunable Conductive
422 Properties. *Adv. Mater.* **2018**, 30, 1805093.

423 [10] R. O’Rorke, T. Steele, H. Taylor. Bioinspired fibrillar adhesives: A review of analytical models and
424 experimental evidence for adhesion enhancement by surface patterns. *J. Adhes. Sci. Technol.* **2015**, 30.

425 [11] M.M.J. Treacy, T.W. Ebbesen, J.M. Gibson. Exceptionally high Young’s modulus observed for
426 individual carbon nanotubes. *Nature*. **1996**, 381 (6584), 678–680.

427 [12] E.D. Lemma, F. Rizzi, T. Dattoma, et al. Mechanical Properties Tunability of Three-Dimensional
428 Polymeric Structures in Two-Photon Lithography. *IEEE Trans. Nanotechnol.* **2017**, 16 (1), 23–31.

429 [13] C.-S. Shin, T.-J. Li, C.-L. Lin. Alleviating Distortion and Improving the Young’s Modulus in Two-
430 Photon Polymerization Fabrications. *Micromachines*. **2018**, 9 (12), 615.

431 [14] L.R. Meza, A.J. Zelhofer, N. Clarke, et al. Resilient 3D hierarchical architected metamaterials. *Proc.*
432 *Natl. Acad. Sci.* **2015**, 112 (37), 11502–11507.

433 [15] J.H. Lee, J.P. Singer, E.L. Thomas. Micro-/nanostructured mechanical metamaterials. *Adv. Mater.*
434 **2012**, 24 (36), 4782–4810.

435 [16] J.S. Oakdale, J. Ye, W.L. Smith, J. Biener. Post-print UV curing method for improving the
436 mechanical properties of prototypes derived from two-photon lithography. *Opt. Express*. **2016**, 24 (24),
437 27077.

438 [17] J. Bauer, A. Schroer, R. Schwaiger, O. Kraft. Approaching theoretical strength in glassy carbon
 439 nanolattices. *Nat. Mater.* **2016**, 15 (4), 438–443.

440 [18] M. Gernhardt, E. Blasco, M. Hippler, et al. Tailoring the Mechanical Properties of 3D
 441 Microstructures Using Visible Light Post-Manufacturing. *Adv. Mater.* **2019**, 31 (30), 1901269.

442 [19] X. Gou, M. Zheng, Y. Zhao, et al. Mechanical property of PEG hydrogel and the 3D red blood cell
 443 microstructures fabricated by two-photon polymerization. *Appl. Surf. Sci.* **2017**, 416, 273–280.

444 [20] M. Jin, J. Xie, a J-P. Malval, A. Spangenberg, O. Soppera, D-L. Versace, T. Leclerc, H. Pan, D. Wan,
 445 H. Pu, P. Baldeck, O. Poizat, S. Knopf. Two-photon lithography in visible and NIR ranges using
 446 multibranch-based sensitizers for efficient acid generation. *J. Mater. Chem. C* **2014**, 2, 7201.

447 [21] Bruker PeakForce tapping brochure [https://www.bruker.com/content/bruker/int/en/products-and-](https://www.bruker.com/content/bruker/int/en/products-and-solutions/microscopes/materials-afm/afm-modes/peakforce-tapping.html)
 448 [solutions/microscopes/materials-afm/afm-modes/peakforce-tapping.html](https://www.bruker.com/content/bruker/int/en/products-and-solutions/microscopes/materials-afm/afm-modes/peakforce-tapping.html)

449 [22] S.Oras, S.Vlassov, M. Berholts, R. Lohmus, K. Mougín, Tuning adhesion forces between
 450 functionalized gold colloidal nanoparticles and silicon AFM tips: role of Ligands and capillary forces
 451 *Beilstein J. Nanotechnol.* **2018**, 9, 660–670.

452 [23] B.. Derjaguin, V.. Muller, Y.. Toporov. Effect of contact deformations on the adhesion of particles.
 453 *J. Colloid Interface Sci.* **1975**, 53 (2), 314–326.

454 [24] L.J. Jiang, Y.S. Zhou, W. Xiong, et al. Two-photon polymerization: investigation of chemical and
 455 mechanical properties of resins using Raman microspectroscopy. *Opt. Lett.* **2014**, 39 (10), 3034–3037.

456 [25] S. Juodkazis, V. Mizeikis, K. Khuen Seet, H. Misawaa, U. G. K. Wegst, Mechanical properties and
 457 tuning of three-dimensional polymeric photonic crystals. *Appl. Phys. Lett.* **2007**, 91, 241904.

458 [26] E. Skliutas, M. Lebedevaite, E. Kabouraki, T. Baldacchini, J. Ostrauskaite, M. Vamvakaki, M.
 459 Farsari, S. Juodkazis, M. Malinauskas. Polymerization mechanisms initiated by spatio-temporally
 460 confined light. *Nanophotonics* **2021**; 10(4): 1211–1242

461 [27] E. Andrzejewska. Photopolymerization kinetics of multifunctional monomers. *Progress in Polymer*
 462 *Science*, **2001**, 26, 605-665.

- 463 [28] T. Baldacchini, M. Zimmerley, C.-H. Kuo, E.O. Potma, R. Zadoyan. Characterization of
464 microstructures fabricated by two-photon polymerization using coherent anti-stokes Raman scattering
465 microscopy. *J. Phys. Chem. B* **2009**, 113 (38), 12663–12668.
- 466 [29] A. Marcinkowska, E. Andrzejewska. Viscosity Effects in the Photopolymerization of Two-
467 Monomer Systems. *Journal of Applied Polymer Science*, **2010**, 116, 280–287.
- 468 [30] T. Zandrini, N. Liaros, L.J. Jiang, Y.F. Lu, J.T. Fourkas, R. Osellame, T. Baldacchini. Effect of the
469 resin viscosity on the writing properties of two-photon polymerization. *Optical Materials Express*, **2019**,
470 9 (6), 2601-2616.
- 471 [31] K. Cicha, Z. Li, K. Stadlmann, A. Ovsianikov, R. Markut-Kohl, R. Liska, J. Stampfl. Evaluation of
472 3D structures fabricated with two-photon-photopolymerization by using FTIR spectroscopy. *Journal of*
473 *Applied Physics*, **2011**, 110, 064911
- 474 [32] L. Jiang, W. Xiong, Y. Zhou, Y. Liu, X. Huang, D. Li, T. Baldacchini, L. Jiang, Y. Lu.
475 Performance comparison of acrylic and thiolacrylic resins in two-photon polymerization. *Optics*
476 *Express*, **2016**, 24 (12), 13687-13701.

For Graphical Abstract Only

Tuning nanomechanical properties of microstructures made by 3D direct laser writing

*Mehdi Belqat^{1,2}, Xingyu Wu^{1,2}, Laura Piedad Chia Gomez^{1,2}, Jean-Pierre Malval^{1,2}, Sébastien
Dominici^{1,2}, Benjamin Leuschel^{1,2}, Arnaud Spangenberg^{1,2}, Karine Mougin^{1,2}*

¹Université de Haute-Alsace, CNRS, IS2M UMR 7361, F-68100 Mulhouse, France

²Université de Strasbourg, France

Corresponding Authors: karine.mougin@uha.fr, arnaud.spangenberg@uha.fr

Supporting Information

537 **Table of contents**

538 **1. Definition or calculation of studied parameters**

539 **Table S1** : Studied parameters and their typical used values

540 **Table S2** : Average laser powers and the respective peak irradiance

541 **2. Roughness analysis**

542 **Table S3** : RMS roughness and Young's modulus of PETA in function of average laser power.

543 **Figure S1** : Topography image (left) and Young's modulus image (right) of PETA fabricated at an
544 average laser power of $P = 6.73$ mW. RMS = 36.36 nm and $E = 1.84$ GPa.

545 **Table S4** : RMS roughness and Young's modulus of TMPTA in function of average laser power.

546 **Figure S2** : Topography image (left) and Young's modulus image (right) of TMPTA fabricated at an
547 average laser power of $P = 9.93$ mW. RMS = 51.65 nm and $E = 1.67$ GPa.

548 **Table S5** : RMS roughness and Young's modulus of PEGDA in function of average laser power.

549 **Figure S3** : Topography image (left) and Young's modulus image (right) of PEGDA fabricated at an
550 average laser power of $P = 9.93$ mW. RMS = 27.1 nm and $E = 6.92$ MPa.

551 **Table S6**: RMS roughness and Young's modulus of different mixtures of PETA and PEGDA

552 **Figure S4**: Topography image (left) and Young's modulus image (right) of 10%PETA-90%PEGDA
553 fabricated at an average laser power of $P = 13.5$ mW. RMS = 26.48 nm and $E = 57.6$ MPa.

554 **Figure S5** : Topography image (left) and Young's modulus image (right) of 20%PETA-80%PEGDA
555 fabricated at an average laser power of $P = 13.5$ mW. RMS = 36.89 nm and $E = 151.4$ MPa.

556 **Figure S6** : Topography image (left) and Young's modulus image (right) of 50%PETA-50%PEGDA
557 fabricated at an average laser power of $P = 13.5$ mW. RMS = 36.94 nm and $E = 468$ MPa.

558 **Figure S7**: Topography image (left) and Young's modulus image (right) of 75%PETA-25%PEGDA
559 fabricated at an average laser power of $P = 13.5$ mW. RMS = 45.34 nm and $E = 1153$ MPa

560 **3. Morphology characterizations**

561 **Figure S8** : SEM images of 2D PETA structures made by 3D DLW at A) 6.73 mW, B) 11.36 mW, C)
562 13.5 mW

563 **Figure S9** : SEM images of 2D PEGDA structures made by 3D DLW at A) 9.92 mW, B) 10.92, C) 13.5
564 mW.

565 **Figure S10** : SEM images of 2D structures made by 3D DLW from mixture of PETA and PEGDA: A)
566 10%PETA-90%PEGDA, B) 20%PETA-80%PEGDA, C) 50%PETA-50%PEGDA, D) 75%PETA-
567 25%PEGDA.

568 **4. Determination of degree of conversion by FTIR microspectroscopy**

569 **Figure S11** : FTIR spectra of resins with different weight percentages of PETA and PEGDA (blue
570 lines) and the corresponding two-photon polymerized squares (red lines, laser power 13.5 mW was used
571 for all squares).

572

573 **1. Definition or calculation of studied parameters**

574 **Table S1** : Studied parameters and their typical used values

Parameter	Value
Wavelength λ ¹	800 nm
Repetition rate f ¹	80 MHz
Pulse duration τ ¹	140 fs
Numerical aperture NA ¹	0.65
Lateral dimension d_l ¹	1.5 μm
Exposure time t_{exp} ¹	10 ms
Slicing Δ ¹	300 nm
Pulse Energy E	84.1 pJ – 168.8 pJ
Average laser power P_a	6.73 – 13.5 mW
Peak irradiance I ²	0.009 – 0.019 TW/cm ²

575 ¹N.B.: all these parameters are kept constant for the current study. Only the average laser power is tuned.

576 ²N.B.: the peak irradiance I is sometimes referred to as “intensity”.

577 Lateral dimension, pulse energy and peak irradiance are calculated according to equations (1), (2) and (3)
578 respectively. Lateral dimension of the voxel is calculated thanks to the equation:

579
$$d_l = \frac{1.22 \times \lambda}{NA} \quad (1)$$

580 where λ is the excitation wavelength, NA the numerical aperture of the objective. Pulse energy E is then
581 calculated using equation (2) :

582
$$E = \frac{P_a}{f} \quad (2)$$

583 where P_a is the average power in W and f the repetition rate in Hz. Peak irradiance is finally obtained
584 thanks to the following equation :

585
$$I = \frac{2E}{\pi \cdot d_l^2 \cdot \tau \cdot \sqrt{\pi}} \quad (3)$$

586 where τ is the pulse duration.

587 **Table S2** : Average laser powers and the respective peak irradiance

Average laser power (mW)	Peak irradiance (TW/cm ²)
6.73	9.59 x 10 ⁻³
9.92	14.1 x 10 ⁻³
11.36	16.1 x 10 ⁻³
12.03	17.1 x 10 ⁻³
12.8	18.2 x 10 ⁻³
13.5	19.2 x 10 ⁻³

588 **2. Roughness analysis:** The root mean square (RMS) roughness was used to measure the surface
 589 roughness of the several samples fabricated during this study. The RMS roughness and Young's modulus
 590 obtained for each monomers at different average laser powers are presented in Tables S3, S4 and S5
 591 corresponding to PETA, TMPTA and PEGDA respectively. Besides, topography and Young's modulus
 592 images obtained by AFM are presented for the 3 monomers at the energy threshold (Figure S1 to S3), as
 593 well as for two mixtures (20 and 50% PETA, Figure S4 and S5).

594
 595
 596 **Table S3 :** RMS roughness and Young's modulus of PETA in function of average laser power.

Average laser power (mW)	RMS roughness (nm)	Young's Modulus (GPa)	Stdev (GPa)
6.73	39.36	1.843	0.08
9.92	44.31	1.93	0.07
11.36	34.94	2.062	0.08
12.08	39.26	2.15	0.06
13.5	48.61	2.274	0.16

597
 598
 599
 600

601
 602 **Figure S1 :** Topography image (left) and Young's modulus image (right) of PETA fabricated at an
 603 average laser power of $P = 6.73$ mW. $RMS = 36.36$ nm and $E = 1.84$ GPa.

604
 605
 606
 607

608 **Table S4 :** RMS roughness and Young’s modulus of TMPTA in function of average laser power.

Average laser power (mW)	RMS roughness (nm)	Young’s Modulus (GPa)	Stdev (GPa)
9.92	51.65	1.67	0.06
11.36	50.83	1.77	0.07
12.08	50.9	2.08	0.05
13.5	47.7	2.3	0.11

609

610

611 **Figure S2 :** Topography image (left) and Young’s modulus image (right) of TMPTA fabricated at an
612 average laser power of $P = 9.93$ mW. RMS = 51.65 nm and $E = 1.67$ GPa.

613

614 **Table S5 :** RMS roughness and Young’s modulus of PEGDA in function of average laser power.

Average laser power (mW)	RMS roughness (nm)	Young’s Modulus (MPa)	Stdev (MPa)
9.92	27.1	6.92	0.07
11.36	20	8.21	0.08
12.03	30.9	8.89	0.2
12.8	28	9.14	0.2
13.5	26.9	9.47	0.38

615

Figure S3 : Topography image (left) and Young's modulus image (right) of PEGDA fabricated at an average laser power of $P = 9.93$ mW. RMS = 27.1 nm and E = 6.92 MPa.

Table S6: RMS roughness and Young's modulus of different mixtures of PETA and PEGDA.

Mixture	RMS roughness (nm)	Young's Modulus (MPa)	Stdev (MPa)
10%PETA – 90% PEGDA	26.48	57.6	4.3
20%PETA – 80% PEGDA	36.89	151.4	9
50%PETA – 50% PEGDA	36.94	468	16.7
75%PETA – 25% PEGDA	45.34	1153	93.9

Figure S4: Topography image (left) and Young's modulus image (right) of 10%PETA-90%PEGDA fabricated at an average laser power of $P = 13.5$ mW. RMS = 26.48 nm and E = 57.6 MPa.

Figure S5 : Topography image (left) and Young's modulus image (right) of 20%PETA-80%PEGDA fabricated at an average laser power of $P = 13.5$ mW. RMS = 36.89 nm and $E = 151.4$ MPa.

Figure S6 : Topography image (left) and Young's modulus image (right) of 50%PETA-50%PEGDA fabricated at an average laser power of $P = 13.5$ mW. RMS = 36.94 nm and $E = 468$ MPa.

Figure S7: Topography image (left) and Young's modulus image (right) of 75%PETA-25%PEGDA fabricated at an average laser power of $P = 13.5$ mW. RMS = 45.34 nm and $E = 1039$ MPa.

635 **3. Morphology characterization by scanning electron microscopy (SEM):**

636 **Figure S8 :** SEM images of 2D PETA structures made by 3D DLW at A) 6.73 mW, B) 11.36 mW, C)
637 13.5 mW.

638 **Figure S9 :** SEM images of 2D PEGDA structures made by 3D DLW at A) 9.92 mW, B) 10.92, C) 13.5
639 mW.

641 **Figure S10 :** SEM images of 2D structures made by 3D DLW from mixture of PETA and PEGDA: A)
642 10%PETA-90%PEGDA, B) 20%PETA-80%PEGDA, C) 50%PETA-50%PEGDA, D) 75%PETA-
643 25%PEGDA.

644 **4. Determination of the degree of conversion (DC) by ATR FTIR microspectroscopy :**

645 Micro-FTIR (Fourier-Transform Infrared spectroscopy) tests were performed with a Thermo Scientific
646 Nicolet iN10 MX on polymers squares of 20 micrometers length using a germanium tip ATR. The
647 analyzed zone was 5 micrometers at the center of the squares. The absorbance spectra were measured
648 from 4000 cm^{-1} to 675 cm^{-1} wavenumber with a resolution of 8 cm^{-1} and 64 scans per spectrum. This
649 method relies on measuring the degree of conversion (DC) of the structured polymers in comparison
650 with the resin mixture. The determination of the DC allow to quantify the amount of consumed carbon-
651

carbon double bonds (C=C) during the photopolymerization. It is determined using the following equation from [1]:

$$DC = \left[1 - \frac{A_{C=C}/A_{C=O}}{A'_{C=C}/A'_{C=O}} \right] \times 100 \quad (4)$$

with $A_{C=C}$, $A_{C=O}$, $A'_{C=C}$ and $A'_{C=O}$ the integrated area of absorption bands related to the C=C and C=O moieties in the polymerized and the nonpolymerized resin, respectively.

Figure S11 : FTIR spectra of resins with different weight percentages of PETA and PEGDA (blue lines) and the corresponding two-photon polymerized squares (red lines, laser power 13.5 mW was used for all squares).

References:

[1] L.J. Jiang, Y.S. Zhou, W. Xiong, et al. Two-photon polymerization: investigation of chemical and mechanical properties of resins using Raman microspectroscopy. *Opt. Lett.* **2014**, 39 (10), 3034–3037