

**A peer-reviewed version of this preprint was published in PeerJ on 1 December 2016.**

[View the peer-reviewed version](https://peerj.com/articles/2661) (peerj.com/articles/2661), which is the preferred citable publication unless you specifically need to cite this preprint.

Neches RY, Flynn KJ, Zaman L, Tung E, Pudlo N. 2016. On the intrinsic sterility of 3D printing. PeerJ 4:e2661 <https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.2661>

# On the intrinsic sterility of 3D printing

**Russell Y Neches** <sup>Corresp., 1</sup>, **Kaitlin J. Flynn** <sup>2</sup>, **Luis Zaman** <sup>3,4</sup>, **Emily Tung** <sup>5</sup>, **Nicholas Pudlo** <sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Genome Center, UC Davis, Davis, USA

<sup>2</sup> Department of Microbiology and Immunology, University of Michigan Medical School, Ann Arbor, Michigan, United States

<sup>3</sup> BEACON Center, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI, USA

<sup>4</sup> Department of Biology, University of Washington, Seattle, WA, USA

<sup>5</sup> Pivot Blo, San Francisco, CA, USA

Corresponding Author: Russell Y Neches

Email address: ryneches@ucdavis.edu

3D printers that build objects using extruded thermoplastic are quickly becoming commonplace tools in laboratories. We demonstrate that with appropriate handling, these devices are capable of producing sterile components from a non-sterile feedstock of thermoplastic without any treatment after fabrication. The fabrication process itself results in sterilization of the material. The resulting 3D printed components are suitable for a wide variety of applications, including experiments with bacteria and cell culture.

# 1 On the intrinsic sterility of 3D printing

2 Russell Y. Neches<sup>1</sup>, Kaitlin J. Flynn<sup>2</sup>, Luis Zaman<sup>3,4</sup>, Emily Tung<sup>5</sup>, and  
3 Nicholas Pudlo<sup>2</sup>

4 <sup>1</sup>U.C. Davis Genome Center

5 <sup>2</sup>University of Michigan

6 <sup>3</sup>Michigan State University

7 <sup>4</sup>University of Washington

8 <sup>5</sup>Pivot Bio

## 9 ABSTRACT

10 3D printers that build objects using extruded thermoplastic are quickly becoming commonplace tools in laboratories. We demonstrate that with appropriate handling, these devices are capable of producing sterile components from a non-sterile feedstock of thermoplastic without any treatment after fabrication. The fabrication process itself results in sterilization of the material. The resulting 3D printed components are suitable for a wide variety of applications, including experiments with bacteria and cell culture.

11 Keywords:

## 12 INTRODUCTION

13 Mass-produced, disposable products are ubiquitous in research laboratories. Roughly three billion  
14 microcentrifuge tubes are manufactured each year. [11] The ubiquity of these products has helped  
15 to standardize molecular methods by reducing variability from experiment to experiment and from  
16 laboratory to laboratory. However, the proliferation of these products has come at the cost of in-house  
17 expertise in fabrication. Without these skills, researchers are increasingly dependent on vendors to  
18 anticipate and provide for their needs. If an experiment calls for a component that is unusual or unique,  
19 researchers are forced to improvise or to redesign the experiment using more readily available components.  
20 These restrictions are not necessarily detrimental; standardized materials are crucial for reproducibility.  
21 Nevertheless, there are experiments in which the need for a custom component cannot be avoided.

22 Many researchers have turned to 3D printing, a process by which three-dimensional objects are  
23 built up additively, to fill these needs. In some respects, the technology is more limited than traditional  
24 fabrication techniques used for laboratory equipment, such as metalworking or glassblowing; it is mostly  
25 limited to materials that can be melted and extruded at relatively low temperatures (150C-300C), such as  
26 thermoplastics. At the time of this writing, there are few inexpensive machines capable of combining more  
27 than one material. In other respects, 3D printing is more powerful than traditional fabrication techniques;  
28 additive manufacturing permits the creation of geometries that are impossible by other means, such as  
29 captured free moving parts. However, the principal advantage of additive manufacturing is the ability  
30 to move directly from a digital design to a finished part. It is not necessary to have a wide variety of  
31 specialized shop tools or the personnel and skills needed to operate and maintain them.

32 One of the most important properties of basic labware in the biological sciences is sterility, and one of  
33 the most frequent questions laboratory biologists ask when they first learn of 3D printing is, “Can I auto-  
34 clave these things?” Unfortunately, most thermoplastics that are widely used in biomedical applications,  
35 particularly polylactic acid (PLA) and polyglycolic acid (PGA), will not survive a standard autoclave cycle  
36 [26]. Sterilization with  $\gamma$ -radiation is effective, but causes drastic changes to the biochemical properties  
37 of the material.<sup>1</sup> [10] Here we detail our work demonstrating that the 3D printing process itself appears to  
38 be sufficient for ensuring sterility.

39 We note that the fused deposition modeling (FDM) 3D printing process, in which a thermoplastic  
40 filament is heated to melting and forced through a narrow tube under high pressure, resembles a sort of

<sup>1</sup>For a detailed review of these studies, we recommend the review by Athanasiou and Niederauer. [1]

41 extreme pasteurization. Figure 1 compares the FDM 3D printing to several sterilization processes (note  
 42 that thermal contact time is in log scale). The 3D printing process holds the material at a higher temperature  
 43 for longer duration than both Ultra-High Temperature (UTH) pasteurization, which is used to produce  
 44 shelf-stable milk (138 °C for two seconds) and high-temperature, short-time (HTST) pasteurization used  
 45 for dairy, juice and other beverages and liquid ingredients (71.5 °C to 74 °C for 15 to 30 seconds). The  
 46 only legal pasteurization method that exceeds the thermal contact time typical of FDM 3D printing is  
 47 mentioned in Title 21, Sec. 1240.61 of the Code of Federal Regulations, which permits milk to be treated  
 48 at 63 °C for 30 minutes. This is a convenient sanitation regime for milk in non-commercial settings  
 49 (indicated in Figure 1 as “stovetop” pasteurization). 3D printing is also both hotter and longer duration  
 50 than thermization, a process used to extend the shelf life of raw milk that cannot be immediately used,  
 51 such as at cheese making facilities.

52 For most materials and toolpaths, FDM 3D printing is also hotter than typical autoclave cycles for both  
 53 gravity displacement steam sterilization and prevacuum steam sterilization. “Flash” steam sterilization  
 54 using a gravity displacement sterilizer must reach 132 °C for 3 minutes. The Centers for Disease Control  
 55 guidelines for gravity displacement steam sterilization require that the cycle reaches 121 °C for 30  
 56 minutes, or 4 minutes at 132 °C using prevacuum steam sterilization. 3D printing thermoplastics using  
 57 FDM typically requires temperatures between 190 °C and 240 °C, depending on the material and the print  
 58 parameters. Because the fabrication process calls for different extrusion rates over the course of a print,  
 59 the thermoplastic generally dwells in the melt region of the nozzle for between ten seconds and several  
 60 minutes.

61 To calculate the thermal contact time for an FDM 3D printer, we use the formula


$$T(f) = \frac{m\pi \left(\frac{d_f}{2}\right)^2}{d_n h f} \quad (1)$$

62 where  $f$  is the feed rate in millimeters per second,  $h$  is the layer height,  $d_f$  is the filament diameter,  $d_n$  is  
 63 the nozzle diameter,  $m$  is the length of the melt zone. Because the length of the melt zone can be difficult  
 64 to measure directly, but it may be inferred by using the area within the nozzle that has to be cleaned  
 65 of melted plastic after a jam. For a feed rate of 50 mm/s, the thermal contact time in our 3D printer is  
 66 about 16 seconds at 220 °C, although the print plan for a given part usually involves non-printing travel  
 67 commands and regions where printing is carried out at a slower feed rate, resulting in longer thermal  
 68 contact times.

69 Besides contact time and temperature, many sterilization protocols stipulate that high pressure must  
 70 also be achieved. Depending on the protocol, pressures may range from about 40 to 220 kPa (6 to 31 PSI).  
 71 The pressure inside the melt zone of a 3D printer nozzle is more difficult to calculate, as it depends on the  
 72 fluid dynamics within the nozzle. Many common thermoplastics, such as PLA, are non-Newtonian fluids  
 73 when melted, which further complicates the question. With those caveats in mind, we offer some rough  
 74 estimates of the pressure within the nozzle.

75 At one extreme, the maximum possible pressure would occur when the force from the viscous fluid  
 76 exiting the nozzle equals the maximum holding force of the stepper motor driving the extruder. For our  
 77 printer, this is about 50 to 60 Newtons distributed over the area of the nozzle, which has a diameter of  
 78 0.4mm. In principle, this would translate to a pressure of about 400,000 kPa (57,000 PSI) at the aperture,  
 79 about two thousand times the pressure of an autoclave cycle. In practice, the holding force of the motor is  
 80 distributed over a larger area by the hydrodynamics of the melted plastic. If the force were distributed  
 81 over the whole inner surface of the nozzle (about one square centimeter), that would result in a pressure  
 82 of about 600 kPa (87 PSI), or about triple the highest autoclave pressure. Normally, printers operate at  
 83 some fraction of maximum flow rate, and of course melting thermoplastic is not a simple fluid, and so  
 84 the pressure is not distributed evenly. In our experiments, it is likely that the pressure was often below  
 85 autoclave pressures.

86 Nevertheless, the glass transition for materials like PLA occurs very abruptly, with only a few degrees  
 87 separating the solid and liquid phase. Lowering the print temperature by a small amount can lead massive  
 88 increases in pressure. With some experimentation, it should be relatively easy to operate a 3D printer  
 89 with nozzle pressures well in excess of autoclave pressures. For example, the control firmware could be  
 90 modified to make small adjustments to the temperature to match the flow rate, or the user could specify the  
 91 temperature and flow rates in the print planning software to maintain a minimum pressure in the nozzle.



**Figure 1.** Temperatures and durations for various methods of sterilization compared to fused deposition modeling (FDM) 3D printing. The extrusion process most closely resembles pasteurization, in which non-sterile liquid is forced through a narrow, heated tube. High- temperature, short-time (HTST) pasteurization is used for milk, fruit juices and other beverages and ingredients. Ultra-high temperature (UTH) processing is used to produce products such as shelf-stable milk that do not require refrigeration. Stove- top pasteurization (30 minutes at 63 °C) is indicated as “stovetop” pasteurization. Thermization, a process used to extend the shelf life of raw milk that cannot be immediately used, such as at cheese making facilities. Typical autoclave cycles using prevacuum, and gravity displacement are indicated as “prevacuum” and “gravity,” respectively. A typical “flash” sterilization cycle for a gravity displacement sterilizer is also indicated. Pasteurization processes are indicated in black, autoclave processes in red, and thermization in orange.

92 Here we report our findings for a battery of culturing experiments conducted with 3D printed parts  
 93 manufactured with consumer 3D printers. Several variations of sterile technique were tested; we printed  
 94 parts onto surfaces treated with ethanol, onto flame-treated aluminum foil, and under UV light. Finally,  
 95 we printed onto non-sterile carpenter’s tape, and then handled the parts with flamed forceps. To our  
 96 surprise, all of these methods seem to be at least somewhat effective at producing sterile parts. We found  
 97 that the resulting parts appear to be sterile under a wide variety of culture conditions known to enrich for  
 98 a broad spectrum of microorganisms.

99 This work was carried out in three laboratories across the United States, with experiments coordinated  
 100 and results shared openly using Twitter. Much of this correspondence is directly referenced by this  
 101 manuscript so that readers may follow how the research actually unfolded. The two 3D printers used  
 102 are installed at the UC Davis Genome Center and the BEACON Center at Michigan State University,  
 103 and most of the culturing work was done at the University of Michigan Medical School. After the initial  
 104 experiments at UC Davis (Figure 2), researchers at Michigan State University independently developed



**Figure 2.** Growth after 96 hours at 37C in a shaking incubator. The leftmost beaker contains LB media inoculated with PLA plastic extruded from the printer nozzle at 220C. The center beaker contains LB media inoculated with a segment of unextruded PLA plastic filament from the same spool. The rightmost beaker contains uninoculated LB.

105 variations on those techniques. When the initial results were reproduced, a battery of test parts were  
106 prepared using several variations on the technique and mailed to the University of Michigan for culturing.  
107 The work was conducted in this way in order to reduce the “in our hands” effect, so that we could be  
108 reasonably confident that others could successfully achieve the same results.

## 109 RESULTS

110 In all of experiments described, the material used for 3D printing was non-sterile polylactide, or poly-  
111 lactic-acid (PLA) filament sourced from suppliers that primarily serve the hobbyist market. This material  
112 was selected for a number of reasons. PLA is very easy to work with in 3D printing, with good layer-  
113 to-layer adhesion and very little shrinking or warping. It is also biodegradable, which is attractive for  
114 environmental reasons. PLA and related polymers are also known to be non-toxic, bio-compatible, and  
115 are widely used in medical applications, notably soluble medical sutures. When noted, UV treatment  
116 was carried out by placing the 3D printer inside a laminar flow hood equipped with a 15 watt germicidal  
117 florescent bulb (Philips, model G15T8). The bulb remained activated during the printing process, and  
118 completed prints were collected in a sterile dish exposed to the UV while other test parts were printed. As  
119 a result, the UV doses were variable but substantial.

### 120 Enrichment experiments

121 To assess the potential for contamination after printing, 10mm diameter hollow cylinders (Figure 5)  
122 were printed under a variety of conditions and incubated in several types of liquid media at different  
123 temperatures and under aerobic, microaerophilic and anaerobic conditions. Initially, cylinders from  
124 UC Davis and MSU were grown in lysogeny broth (LB) for 96 hours. No growth was observed in the  
125 experimental tubes or in the negative control, but high turbidity was observed in the positive control.  
126 Throughout this study, positive controls were prepared by dropping cylinders onto the laboratory floor  
127 followed by retrieval using ungloved hands from underneath the refrigerator or a similarly inconvenient  
128 location.

129 After these initial experiments indicated no growth on the 3D printed parts, several more cylinders  
130 were printed. At UC Davis, test parts were printed onto flame-treated aluminum foil and transferred into  
131 conical tubes using flamed forceps. One group of cylinders was printed while the printer was situated on  
132 an open lab bench, a second group was printed in a laminar flow hood, and a third group was printed in a  
133 laminar flow hood under a UV lamp. In the process, an ample supply of positive controls were created  
134 inadvertently. At Michigan State, test parts were printed onto an ethanol-treated build platform.


135 Further growth assays were conducted with each group of cylinders in LB, nutrient-rich ACES-  
136 buffered yeast extract (AYE) [5] and Terrific Broth in aerobic conditions at 37C and 30C, revealing no  
137 growth from UV treated parts up to seven days post-inoculation (Table 1). Growth was observed with one  
138 non-UV treated part at 96 hours, which was determined to be contaminated with flora typical of human  
139 skin via selective plating and light microscopy. This was likely due to a handling mistake after printing.  
140 See section 3.7 for methods of identification.

141 To test for the presence of anaerobic organisms, parts printed with and without UV were incubated in  
142 anaerobic conditions at 37C using two growth media, AYE and a custom chopped meat broth (CM Broth).  
143 [12] After seven days, no growth was observed in any tube except the positive control. After 14 days, a  
144 tube containing a sample that had been printed without UV became turbid. The positive control and cells  
145 incubated from the non-UV treated part were analyzed via 16S rRNA sequencing and found to contain  
146 bacteria associated with human skin (Data Supplement 1).

147 The germinants sodium taurocholate and glycine, known to germinate *Clostridium difficile* and some  
148 *Bacillus* spores, respectively, [32, 28] were added to Brain Heart Infusion (BHI) medium and incubated  
149 anaerobically with 3D printed parts for 28 days at 37C. Microscopy and plating revealed no germination  
150 of these types of spores at weekly examinations.

### 151 Cell culture experiments

152 Sterile cell culture is a requirement for a variety of biological research applications. The biocompatibility  
153 of PLA and PLA-copolymers has been studied *in vitro* since at least 1975 [27] and *in vivo* since at least  
154 1966. [15] These materials have been used for sutures and surgical implants in humans since at least  
155 1974. [13] More recently, there has been a shift towards using 3D printed scaffolds in combination with  
156 cell culture for tissue engineering. [3] If the 3D printing process is sufficient to create sterile scaffolds,



**Figure 3.** Macrophages derived from mouse bone-marrow after incubation with 3D printed parts that had been treated with UV (a), without UV treatment (b), and treated with UV after handling and before incubation (c) and a control set of cells grown without 3D parts (d). Photos representative of three replicates in two independent experiments. Cell size, morphology and confluency were determined to be consistent across all experimental groups.

157 researchers could create useful scaffolds without damaging them with heat, steam, radiation or chemical  
 158 sterilization programs.

159 We performed a simple assay to ascertain if 3D printed parts are sterile under cell culture conditions.  
 160 3D printed parts that had been printed either with or without UV treatment were cultured with bone  
 161 marrow-derived mouse macrophages for six days. Contamination was assessed by plating on LB and  
 162 charcoal yeast extract thymidine (CYET) agar plates and examination under light microscopy. No  
 163 evidence of contamination was found either in cells alone (Figure 3d) or cells cultured with parts either  
 164 printed with (Figure 3a) or without UV (Figure 3b) as judged by growth on agar plates and microscopy.  
 165 Cell morphology and growth rate appeared to resemble the control cells grown in the absence of a 3D  
 166 printed part and no visible contaminants were observed. Additionally, cells grown in the presence of 3D  
 167 printed parts were competent for infection by *Legionella pneumophila* (data not shown). Cells appeared  
 168 to grow normally immediately adjacent to the part, though the opacity of the 3D printed part prevented  
 169 inspection for growth directly on the printed surface. Thus, 3D printed parts do not appear to contaminate  
 170 or affect the growth of bone marrow-derived macrophages under these conditions.


### 171 **Motility assay**

172 To demonstrate the utility of directly 3D printing sterile labware, we designed a simple four-well plate  
 173 that could be used to assay bacterial motility. [17] Each well is 70mm long and 10.3mm wide, and holds  
 174 approximately 2.5mL of liquid media. The four-well plates were removed from the build platform by  
 175 gloved hand, and were kept sterile in an empty 100mm Petri dish. We filled each well with 2mL of  
 176 0.2% w/v LB agar and allowed them to solidify for approximately 20 minutes. Then, we spotted 2µl of  
 177 a bacterial culture that had incubated for twelve hours into three lanes, and left the fourth as a control  
 178 for contamination. In this experiment, we used three bacterial strains, JW1183, BW25113, and REL606.  
 179 The first two are from the Keio Collection of single-gene knockouts, and REL606 is an *E. coli* B strain  
 180 that was used to initiate the *E. coli* Long-term Experimental Evolution Project [16]; JW1183 is a *ycgR*  
 181 deletion, and BW25113 is the ancestral strain of the Keio Collection. [2] The choice of the *ycgR* knockout  
 182 was suggested by Chris Watters as a potential bacterial “superswimmer.” [31] Indeed, using this 3D  
 183 printed plate, we were able to identify a strong swimming phenotype of the *ycgR* mutant (Figure ??).  
 184 Contamination was not observed in the control wells from several plates printed on painter’s tape, abraded  
 185 foil, or abraded and flamed foil that was used to wrap the part after printing and stored overnight before  
 186 use. These results demonstrate that direct 3D printing of sterile parts is a viable and useful approach for  
 187 applications that may require a non-standard part.

## 188 **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

### 189 **Preliminary experiment**

190 A sterile glass beaker containing roughly 20mL of LB media was placed under the nozzle of a fused  
 191 deposition modeling (FDM) 3D printer. The nozzle was heated to 220C, and the extruder drive motor was  
 192 driven forward until about 20mm of polylactide (PLA) filament had been melted and expelled through  
 193 the nozzle and into the beaker. A tangle of molten and cooled PLA detached from the nozzle and fell



**Figure 4.** A custom device for a motility assay fabricated using 3D printing. The device was found to be sterile without autoclaving if contamination during post-fabrication handling is avoided.

194 into the beaker. The mouth of the beaker was then covered with sterile aluminum foil. An unopened  
 195 sterile beaker of LB was prepared as the negative control. A positive control was prepared with a length  
 196 of un-melted PLA filament from the spool. The three beakers were placed into a shaking incubator at  
 197 37C for 96 hours. The experiment, the progress and the result were announced in real-time on Twitter to  
 198 generate feedback and suggestions from the community, which sparked collaboration described in this  
 199 paper [19, 22, 23, 20, 21]. No growth was observed in the negative control or the beaker inoculated with  
 200 extruded material, and robust growth was observed in the positive control. Experimental setup and results  
 201 were posted on Twitter as they occurred.

### 202 3D printing

203 The preliminary experiment seemed to indicate a potentially useful killing effect from the nozzle’s heat  
 204 and pressure, and so a slightly more realistic assay was conducted. A simple model was created using the  
 205 OpenSCAD [14] modeling language consisting of a cylinder of radius 4mm and height 10mm.

```
206 cylinder ( r=4, h=10 );
```

207 The model was exported in Standard Tessellation Language (STL) format [4]. The manifold was then  
 208 converted into G-code commands [30] using Cura (version 13.12-test on Linux), using a wall width of  
 209 0.4mm (equal to the nozzle diameter), cooling fans inactive, no infill, a top and bottom layer height of  
 210 zero, and a spiralized outer wall (“Joris mode,” after Joris van Tubergen) to produce a small, open tube.  
 211 The G-code was stored on a SD card and printed on an Ultimaker kit-based FDM 3D printer (standard,  
 212 current firmware builds distributed by Ultimaker were used). A small patch of aluminum foil was lightly  
 213 abraded with fine-grit sandpaper to improve surface adhesion properties, and flamed over a Bunsen burner  
 214 until signs of melting appeared. The foil patch was then affixed to the build platform, so that the build area  
 215 indicated in the G-code toolpath would be entirely within the untouched center of the patch. The G-code  
 216 toolpath was also examined to insure that the nozzle would contact no surface except the build area on  
 217 the foil. Printing was then initiated with a feed rate of 50 mm/sec at 220C. Once printing was complete,  
 218 finished parts were immediately removed from the build area using flamed forceps and transferred to  
 219 culture tubes or conical tubes for storage and shipping.

### 220 Independent reproduction of growth experiment on printed component

221 The experiment described in section 3.2 was replicated at Michigan State University on a kit-built  
 222 Ultimaker 3D printer modified with an E3D all-metal hot-end with a 0.4mm nozzle. A cylinder was  
 223 designed using OpenSCAD with a radius of 4mm and a height of 12mm. The model was exported in  
 224 STL format and sliced with Cura SteamEngine 13.12. The cylinder was printed with a wall thickness  
 225 of 0.4mm, a feed-rate of 10mm/second (the effective speed with the minimum layer cooling time set  
 226 to 5 seconds), and a nozzle temperature of 225C. The print surface was prepared with 3M Scotch Blue  
 227 painters tape, and was lightly wiped with ethanol before printing began.

228 Two printed cylinders were transferred to sterile glass tubes filled with 4mL of LB media with flamed  
 229 tweezers. A fragment of unused filament was used as a positive control, and an uninoculated tube was  
 230 used as a negative control. Tubes were transferred to a shaking incubator set at 30C. No growth was  
 231 observed after 24 hours in any of the tubes with printed parts, while the unused filament contaminated the  
 232 media. After two days, another cylinder was printed and incubated in LB broth. Again, after 24 hours no  
 233 growth was observed. None of the tubes with printed parts showed signs of growth after 96 hours.

**Table 1.** Summary of experiments conducted

Experiment	Material	Part	Media	$\Delta t$	$^{\circ}C$	Oxy.	Fab.	Cult.	Repl.	Result
Preliminary [19, 22, 23]	Orange PLA	blob	LB	96h	37	+	UCD	UCD	1	-
First trial [20, 21]	Orange PLA	tube	LB	96h	37	+	UCD	UCD	6	-
Small vessel [24]	Orange PLA	vessel	LB	96h	37	+	UCD	UCD	1	-
Terrific Broth [6, 7]	Orange PLA	tube	TB	96h	37	+	UCD	UM	2	-
AYE Broth [7]	Blue PLA	tube	AYE	96h	37	+	MSU	UM	1	+ (error?)
First MSU trial [35, 34]	Blue PLA	tube	LB	96h	30	+	MSU	MSU	3	-
Filament trial [37]	Blue PLA	filament	LB	96h	30	+	MSU	MSU	4	-
AYE Broth 2 [8]	Orange PLA	tube	AYE	48h	37	+	UCD	UM	2	-
Cell culture	Orange PLA	tube	RPMI-1640	6d	37	+	UCD	MSU	1	-
Swimmer plate [33]	Blue PLA	track plate	Soft LB agar	n/a	37	+	MSU	MSU	1	n/a
Meat Broth, Anaerobic [9]	Orange & Blue PLA	tube	Meat broth	2w	37	-	UCD & MSU	UM	2	+ growth in non-UV at 2w
Swimmer plate, redesign [36]	Blue PLA	3-track round plate	soft LB agar	48h	37	+	MSU	MSU	1	+ (handling error)
Printed on blue tape cleaned with etoh.[18]	Orange PLA	tube	RCM	7d	37	-	UCD	UCD, Mills Lab	2	-

### 234 **Terrific Broth Experiments**


235 Printed cylinders from UCD and MSU were dropped into glass culture tubes with 3mL of AYE or TB  
 236 broth in independent experiments and transferred to a roller in a 37C warm room. After 96 hours, one of  
 237 the “no UV” tubes in AYE broth became turbid with a mixed population of bacterial growth as examined  
 238 by microscopy and plating on CYET agar (Figure 9). Repeated experiments did not yield growth for these  
 239 parts, and so the contaminaiton was likely due to a handling error. No growth was observed for any parts  
 240 grown in TB.

### 241 **Meat Broth Experiments**


242 Test parts were incubated for two weeks under anaerobic conditions at 37C in chopped meat broth  
 243 (CM Broth) [12] A non-UV treated test part fabricated at UC Davis exhibited evidence of growth. The  
 244 contaminated media was plated on BHI+blood media and allowed to grow overnight (see Figure 9), and  
 245 16S rRNA sequencing was performed on resulting colonies (see Section 3.7).

### 246 **Cell culture**


247 Sterility of 3D printed parts was assessed by incubating each part with bone marrow-derived macrophages  
 248 from femurs of C57BL/6 mice (Jackson Laboratories) cultured in RPMI-1640 containing 10% heat-  
 249 inactivated fetal bovine serum (FBS) (Gibco) [29]. Microscopy was performed by culturing macrophages  
 250 in plastic dishes with 3D parts for 6 days after the initial isolation from bone marrow in L-cell conditioned  
 251 media and examining under light microscope. The University Committee on Use and Care of Animals  
 252 approved all experiments conducted in this study (principal investigator Michele Swanson; protocol  
 253 reference number PRO00005100).



(a) Model in OpenSCAD



(b) Toolpath in Cura



(c) Printing on foil

**Figure 5.** A very simple model of a cylinder was created in OpenSCAD and exported in STL format. (a) The G-code toolpath visualization of test part in Cura. The slicing engine was set to a 0.4mm wall width (equal to the diameter of the nozzle), cooling fans inactive, no infill, a top and bottom layer height of zero, and a spiralized “Joris Mode” outer wall. (b) Test parts were then 3D printed on abraided and flamed aluminum foil at 220C with a feed rate of 50 mm/sec.



**Figure 6.** After 48 hours, only the positive control (left) was contaminated. Printed cylinders in LB did not appear to contaminate the media.



**Figure 7.** 3D printed parts from UC Davis with and without UV treatment were suspended in sterile Terrific Broth supplemented with potassium salts. After 24h at 37C, no growth was observed for parts treated with UV. On the right, tubes from the above experiment at 48h. 96 hours after inoculation, no biotic growth was observed.

254 **Identification of contaminating organisms**

255 Contaminated media (see Section 3.5) was streaked onto BHI agar plates (Figure 9) supplemented with  
 256 10% defibrinated horse blood (Quad Five, Catalog No. 210; Ryegate, MT USA) for colony isolation.  
 257 Bacterial colonies with unique morphologies were picked into chopped meat broth and genomic DNA was  
 258 extracted from a 1mL cell pellet using Phenol:Chloroform and ethanol precipitation after bead beating.  
 259 Nearly full length 16S rDNA was amplified using primers 8F and 1492R (Eden et al 1991) and run on a  
 260 1% agarose gel to confirm amplification and size. PCR products were purified using the Qiagen MinElute



**Figure 8.** After two weeks in anaerobic chamber at 37C in “meat broth,” a non-UV treated part from UC Davis exhibited evidence of growth. All other parts were limp, aside from the positive control. Contaminated media was plated on BHI+blood agar overnight (see Figure 9), and 16S rRNA sequencing was performed on resulting colonies.

261 PCR purification kit (Catalog No. 28006), quantified and bidirectional sequenced at the University of  
 262 Michigan DNA Sequencing Core. Sequencing reads were analyzed using the DNASTAR Lasergene  
 263 software suite (DNASTAR, Inc., Madison, WI USA). Results were used to search the nr database [25] to  
 264 using NCBI’s BLAST online search tool determine the closest relatives. A total of three unique bacterial  
 265 colonies were analyzed; two from a positive control and one from a non-UV treated 3D printed part. All  
 266 three were 99% similar to their closest database hit, and found to be common skin associated microflora.  
 267 The positive control yielded sequences related to *Staphylococcus epidermidis* and *Propionibacterium*  
 268 *acnes*. Similarly, the non-UV treated 3D printed part was also a *Propionibacterium acnes* indicating that  
 269 the bacteria present were likely introduced to the 3D parts post printing.

### 270 **Bacterial strains, culture conditions and reagents**

271 For AYE growth experiments, 3D parts were cultured on a rolling spinner at 37C in N-(2-acetamido)-  
 272 2- aminoethanesulfonic acid (ACES; Sigma)-buffered yeast extract (AYE) broth supplemented with  
 273 100µg/mL thymidine (Sigma).[5]

274 Terrific Broth (TB) experiments were conducted on a rolling spinner at 37C in media containing yeast  
 275 extract, tryptone and glycerol supplemented with 0.17 M KH<sub>2</sub>PO<sub>4</sub>, 0.72 M K<sub>2</sub>HPO<sub>4</sub>.

276 Chopped Meat Broth and BHI-Blood agar experiments were performed in a Coy anaerobic chamber  
 277 (Grass Lake, MI) at 37C. [12]

278 Anaerobic experiments were performed in anaerobic chambers from Coy Laboratories (Grass Lake,  
 279 MI) in Brain-Heart Infusion broth supplemented with yeast extract (5g/L). 0.1% cysteine and 0.1%  
 280 taurocholate were added as germinants.

### 281 **3D printed parts from UC Davis**

282 The following materials were prepared in Jonathan Eisen’s laboratory at the UC Davis Genome Center  
 283 and shipped to Michele Swanson’s laboratory at the University of Michigan. All printed parts were printed  
 284 using Printbl Orange 3mm PLA filament at 220C with a feed rate of 50 mm/sec, using the same G-code



**Figure 9.** 10 $\mu$ l of each AYE tube (positive control, PLA plastic and negative control) was struck out on Charcoal Yeast Extract solid media and incubated at 37C to grow for 24 hours. Growth revealed that the PLA test part (top, white) appeared to contain a different bacterial species than the positive control tube (bottom, yellow). The negative control was plated on the right (no growth). Under light microscope, both bacterial growths appear coccoid, with the yellow colonies forming clumps more often. Experiment was repeated with parts from UC Davis and Michigan State, plus controls. Contamination was not observed.

285 files described in section 3.2, and placed into sixteen 50mL conical tubes using flamed forceps. The  
 286 contents of the conical tubes was as follows :

- 287 • Test objects, printed under biosafety hood (10x)
- 288 • Test objects, printed under biosafety hood with UV (10x)
- 289 • Test objects, printed under biosafety hood with UV, then dropped onto no-sterile surface during  
 290 handling (2x)
- 291 • Test object, printed under biosafety hood with UV (1x)
- 292 • Test object, printed under biosafety hood without UV, dropped during handling (1x)
- 293 • Empty, unopened conical tube
- 294 • Test object, printed under biosafety hood without UV (1x)
- 295 • Test object, printed under biosafety hood without UV (1x)
- 296 • Test object, printed under biosafety hood with UV (1x)
- 297 • Test object, printed under biosafety hood with UV (1x)
- 298 • Test object, printed under biosafety hood with UV, handled with ungloved hands (1x)
- 299 • Test objects, printed on open bench and left on lab bench overnight (2x)
- 300 • Unused Printbl Orange 3mm PLA filament (3x)
- 301 • Unused Laywoo-D3 cherrywood 3mm printable wood filament (3x)
- 302 • Unused Protoparadigm White 3mm PLA filament (3x)
- 303 • Unused Printbl Crystal Blue 3mm PLA filament (3x)

### 304 **3D printed parts from Michigan State University**

305 Several printed parts were prepared at Michigan State University and sent to the Michele Swanson lab at  
 306 the University of Michigan. Cylinders were printed using the same G-code and parameters described in  
 307 section 3.2. All printed parts from Michigan State University were printed using Ultimaker translucent  
 308 blue PLA. Each part was removed from the printbed using flamed forceps and transferred to a sterile  
 309 15mL plastic tube. The contents of the tubes was as follows :

- 310 • Test objects, printed on blue painters tape wiped down with ethanol (3x)
- 311 • Test objects, printed on abraded foil wiped with ethanol and flamed (3x)
- 312 • Unused Ultimaker translucent blue PLA filament (3x)

### 313 **3D printing systems and materials**

314 The 3D printing systems and materials used in this study are relatively inexpensive and available to the  
 315 public. While it is likely that nearly any 3D printer that uses thermoplastic extrusion will perform similarly

316 for these purposes, the exact devices and materials used in this study are available from the following  
317 suppliers :

- 318 • Ultimaker Original with v3 hot-end (UC Davis).  
319 <https://www.ultimaker.com/pages/our-printers/ultimaker-original>
- 320 • Ultimaker Original modified with a E3D hot-end (Michigan State University).  
321 <http://e3d-online.com/>
- 322 • PLA (Poly-Lactic-Acid) filament, Blue-Translucent, 0.75 kg. 2.85mm diameter.  
323 <https://www.ultimaker.com/products/pla-blue-translucent>
- 324 • PLA filament, Orange, 1.0 kg 3mm diameter (2.85 actual).  
325 <http://shop.printbl.com/products/3mm-pla-filament-1kg-spool>

## 326 **DISCUSSION**

327 This work was inspired by the observation that, while most 3D printed products cannot be autoclaved, the  
328 extrusion temperatures typically used in 3D printing are significantly higher than temperatures used in  
329 most autoclave cycles. This led us to wonder if 3D printing is an intrinsically sterile process.

330 Sterility is a difficult property to judge due to the impossibility of proving a negative. In the experiments  
331 we have presented here, we endeavored to create advantageous conditions for growth for a reasonably  
332 wide range of organisms, and particularly organisms likely to be problematic for experiments in clinical  
333 microbiology, cell culture and molecular biology. We used the “richest” rich media available to us, and  
334 attempted to induce germination of spores under aerobic and anaerobic conditions. Of course, this is not  
335 exhaustive, and the culturing conditions used would not detect the presence of (for example) *Sulfolobus*  
336 or *Methanococcus maripaludis*. We did not perform culture-independent sampling, which would be of  
337 obvious interest. However, as a practical matter, we find that the printing process does indeed produce  
338 functionally sterile parts which should be suitable a wide variety of experiments.


339 While 3D printing is likely not the ideal method for producing all labware under all circumstances,  
340 there are nevertheless a wide variety of applications and settings in which the ability to produce small  
341 batches of sterile parts would be extremely useful. The ability to manufacture sterile parts on premises  
342 during extended fieldwork in remote locations can reduce logistical risks. Schools can print materials  
343 for student laboratory projects. Researchers in developing countries can reduce their reliance on costly  
344 imported disposable labware. Otherwise well-equipped laboratories can more cheaply obtain fully custom  
345 sterile components.

346 Our experiments indicated that there are several reasonable approaches to sterile technique, though  
347 we did not attempt to establish which among them is optimal. We anticipated much higher rates of  
348 contamination than were actually observed. In more than twenty incubations, we found only two  
349 contaminated parts. Based on plating, light microscopy and 16S rRNA sequence obtained from the culture  
350 and on the fact that other parts prepared in the same way failed to produce growth, it is likely that the part  
351 was contaminated after printing. These experiments are not intended to establish a quantitative measure  
352 of the rate of contamination characteristic of the process, but rather to demonstrate that sterile parts can  
353 be produced by direct 3D printing of non-sterile thermoplastic feedstock.

## 354 **Future work**

355 While fused deposition modeling printers are by far the most common, widely available and inexpensive  
356 printers at present, there are several other 3D printing technologies. For example, there are a number of  
357 technologies based on materials that undergo photopolymerization. We happened to have two machines  
358 available to us that use photopolymerization, an Objet Eden 260, which uses an inkjet-like print head  
359 and a UV lamp, and a Formlabs Form 1, which uses stereolithography. We performed a variation of  
360 our preliminary experiment using cylinders printed using these machines, and found they were also able  
361 to produce sterile parts (Fig. 10).

362 The mechanism of sterilization in for these technologies is likely to be very different from FDM  
363 devices. It is possible that cells are destroyed by radiation; the Objet machine repeatedly exposes the  
364 build surface to intense UV radiation, and the Form 1 uses a 120mW, 405nm (violet) laser. However, the  
365 more likely killing mechanism is chemical, as the cross-linking chemistry of many photopolymerization  
366 systems is driven by high concentrations of free radicals. Unfortunately, the chemical composition of  
367 the input material and the precise nature of the reactions is proprietary. Formlabs was kind enough to



**Figure 10.** A group of cylinders were printed on an Objet Eden 260. 24 cylinders were transferred directly from the printing plate to culture tubes by scraping them from the build plate with the open tube. Two cylinders were removed with an ungloved hand to act as positive controls. Tubes were incubated for 96 hours at 37C in LB media, revealing one contaminated tube.

368 point us to the catalog of their supplier of raw materials, but we were not able to deduce the chemistry of  
 369 their system from this information alone. It is our hope that researchers more familiar with these polymer  
 370 systems will take up this question, and perhaps design materials for these printers that can be certified for  
 371 manufacturing sterile parts.

## 372 REFERENCES

- 373 [1] Athanasiou, K. A. and Niederauer, G. G. (1996). Sterilization, toxicity, biocompatibility and clinical  
 374 applications of polylactic acid/ polyglycolic acid copolymers. *Biomaterials*, 17(2):93–102.
- 375 [2] Baba, T., Ara, T., Hasegawa, M., Takai, Y., Okumura, Y., Baba, M., Datsenko, K. A., Tomita, M.,  
 376 Wanner, B. L., and Mori, H. (2006). Construction of escherichia coli k-12 in-frame, single-gene  
 377 knockout mutants: the keio collection. *Molecular systems biology*, 2(1).
- 378 [3] Bose, S., Vahabzadeh, S., and Bandyopadhyay, A. (2013). Bone tissue engineering using 3D printing.  
 379 *Materials Today*, 16(12):496–504.
- 380 [4] Burns, M. (1993). *Automated fabrication : improving productivity in manufacturing*. PTR Prentice  
 381 Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.
- 382 [5] Feeley, J. C., Gibson, R. J., Gorman, G. W., Langford, N. C., Rasheed, J. K., Mackel, D. C., and Baine,  
 383 W. B. (1979). Charcoal-yeast extract agar: primary isolation medium for *Legionella pneumophila*.  
 384 *Journal of clinical microbiology*, 10(4):437–441.
- 385 [6] Flynn, K. (2014a). 24h in terrific broth, 72 in aye, no growth from any parts! nothing under scope  
 386 either @ryneches @luiszaman <http://t.co/ypxbytwejl>.
- 387 [7] Flynn, K. (2014b). first growth in 3d parts: 96h in aye. bugs in steril part diff than +ctrl. will repeat  
 388 @luiszaman @ryneches <http://t.co/andjevrig>.
- 389 [8] Flynn, K. (2014c). Set up a quick pilot last night of @luiszaman’s “foil” 3d plastic. no growth in aye  
 390 so far! @ryneches <http://t.co/3rihlmony>.
- 391 [9] Flynn, K. (2014d). #tweepsci update! after 1 wk in “meat broth” anaerobically, growth in “no uv”  
 392 parts of @ryneches @luiszaman <http://t.co/67uomxxayu>.
- 393 [10] Gilding, D. K. and Reed, A. M. (1979). Biodegradable polymers for use in  
 394 surgery—polyglycolic/poly(actic acid) homo- and copolymers: 1. *Polymer*, 20(12):1459–1464.
- 395 [11] Hashemi, R. (2006). The “Eppy”. *The Scientist*.
- 396 [12] Hehemann, J.-H. H., Kelly, A. G., Pudlo, N. A., Martens, E. C., and Boraston, A. B. (2012). Bacteria  
 397 of the human gut microbiome catabolize red seaweed glycans with carbohydrate-active enzyme updates  
 398 from extrinsic microbes. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of*  
 399 *America*, 109(48):19786–19791.
- 400 [13] Horton, C. E., Adamson, J. E., Mladick, R. A., and Carraway, J. H. (1974). Vicryl synthetic absorbable  
 401 sutures. *The American surgeon*, 40(12):729–731.
- 402 [14] Kintel, M. and Wolf, C. (2000–2004). OpenSCAD : The programmer’s solid 3D CAD modeller.  
 403 <http://www.openscad.org/>.
- 404 [15] Kulkarni, R. K., Pani, K. C., Neuman, C., and Leonard, F. (1966). Polylactic acid for surgical  
 405 implants. *Archives of surgery (Chicago, Ill. : 1960)*, 93(5):839–843.
- 406 [16] Lenski, R. E., Rose, M. R., Simpson, S. C., and Tadler, S. C. (1991). Long-term experimental evolu-  
 407 tion in escherichia coli. i. adaptation and divergence during 2,000 generations. *American Naturalist*,  
 408 pages 1315–1341.

- 409 [17] Lewis, Z. (2014a). Bacteria “race tracks” for swimming/swarming bacteria, thingiverse thing  
410 #399245.
- 411 [18] Lewis, Z. (2014b). @ryneches after 1 week in anoxic rcm, no growth in 3d print material (foil and  
412 etoh) tubes. growth in + control. <http://t.co/otoposwmwx>.
- 413 [19] Neches, R. (2014a). Conjecture : 3d prints are sterile. let’s find out. <http://t.co/l3nrwwatrx>.
- 414 [20] Neches, R. (2014b). Does the 3d printing process produce sterile parts without autoclaving? let’s  
415 find out. <http://t.co/eh3wgkz5lm>.
- 416 [21] Neches, R. (2014c). @luiszaman @runforsushi 6 replicates after 96 hours, no growth! had to kill  
417 positive control because it was scary. <http://t.co/qqbezkm3j>.
- 418 [22] Neches, R. (2014d). No growth in culture inoculated with 3d printer extruded plastic, pos. & neg.  
419 controls worked. so far, so good! <http://t.co/eupogz15ms>.
- 420 [23] Neches, R. (2014e). Still no growth in media inoculated with plastic extruded from the 3d printer.  
421 w00t! <http://t.co/mkcxjg3xr8>.
- 422 [24] Neches, R. (2014f). Tried inoculating some overnights from a 3d printed mini-flask. @luiszaman  
423 @runforsushi <http://t.co/u4rnecpcqg>.
- 424 [25] Pruitt, K. D., Tatusova, T., and Maglott, D. R. (2005). NCBI Reference Sequence (RefSeq): a  
425 curated non-redundant sequence database of genomes, transcripts and proteins. *Nucleic acids research*,  
426 33(Database issue):D501–D504.
- 427 [26] Rozema, F. R., Bos, R. R., Boering, G., van Asten, J. A., Nijenhuis, A. J., and Pennings, A. J. (1991).  
428 The effects of different steam-sterilization programs on material properties of poly(L-lactide). *Journal*  
429 *of applied biomaterials : an official journal of the Society for Biomaterials*, 2(1):23–28.
- 430 [27] Schwöpe, A. D., Wise, D. L., and Howes, J. F. (1975). Development of polylactic/glycolic acid  
431 delivery systems for use in treatment of narcotic addiction. *National Institute on Drug Abuse research*  
432 *monograph series*, (4):13–18.
- 433 [28] Sorg, J. A. and Sonenshein, A. L. (2008). Bile salts and glycine as cogerminants for *Clostridium*  
434 *difficile* spores. *Journal of bacteriology*, 190(7):2505–2512.
- 435 [29] Swanson, M. S. and Isberg, R. R. (1996). Identification of *Legionella pneumophila* mutants that have  
436 aberrant intracellular fates. *Infection and immunity*, 64(7):2585–2594.
- 437 [30] Thomas R. Kramer and Frederick M. Proctor and Elena R. Messina (2000). The NIST RS274NGC  
438 Interpreter - Version 3.
- 439 [31] Waters, C. (2014). @luiszaman @ryneches @runforsushi just further evi-  
440 dence that that #cdigmp is the most important regulatory molecule in bacteria!  
441 <https://twitter.com/waterslabmsu/status/436493654018899968>.
- 442 [32] Wilson, K. H., Kennedy, M. J., and Fekety, F. R. (1982). Use of sodium taurocholate to enhance  
443 spore recovery on a medium selective for *Clostridium difficile*. *Journal of clinical microbiology*,  
444 15(3):443–446.
- 445 [33] Zaman, L. (2014a). 3d printed “tracks” filled with soft agar. if sterile, will put super-swimmers in  
446 @ryneches @runforsushi @relenski <http://t.co/7juf2dpnlw>.
- 447 [34] Zaman, L. (2014b). 48hr going strong with no growth @ryneches @runforsushi @relenski  
448 <http://t.co/ghrvqncub>.
- 449 [35] Zaman, L. (2014c). Good news @ryneches @runforsushi @relenski, no growth in lb at 30c. even  
450 from my \*cough cough\* test in a fume hood! <http://t.co/npdlvgvk4r>.
- 451 [36] Zaman, L. (2014d). Next version of bacteria race tracks! made to fit into a petri dish @ryneches  
452 @runforsushi #3dprinting <http://t.co/rcsdngkz0t>.
- 453 [37] Zaman, L. (2014e). Surface sterilized pla that was “snapped” to expose fresh filament not growing in  
454 lb @ryneches @runforsushi <http://t.co/8ni4qt543y>.