Study on attenuation of 3D printing commercial filaments on standard X-ray beams for dosimetry and tissue equivalence
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A B S T R A C T

3D printing techniques and materials have become widely available in the last couple of decades and remains an important topic of research as the equipments and supplements gets chipper. This study aims to evaluate the attenuation behaviour of several commercially available 3D printing filaments (ABS and PLA-based filaments and other polymers blends) over standard X-ray beams ranging from $-30$ keV to $-50$ keV and comparing the experimental results with theoretical data of Cortical Bone, Soft Tissue and PMMA. It was used the transmission method to obtain experimental attenuation coefficients to all materials. HVL for the materials were also calculated. Results show that PLA-based printing filaments mixed with metals (Al, BRASS and Cu) has higher attenuation than pure PLA. Comparing the experimental data with theoretical cross section of Soft Tissue, Cortical Bone and PMMA, it was possible to observe that with the increase of beam energy, ABS-based and other blends’ attenuation behaviour agree with PMMA/Soft tissue. None of the studied materials showed agreement of attenuation with Cortical Bone. Some variations of PLA (SILK, Black and Bone) and some of the other blends of PETG and TPU showed good agreement with Soft Tissue/PMMA since about 30 keV and it can be concluded that these filaments can be used as substitute of PMMA for mimetizing soft tissue in 3D printed phantoms.

1. Introduction

3D printing is revolutionizing all the areas of knowledge, and with radiation dosimetry and quality assurance is no different. The first 3D printing technologies were created in the 80’s (Hull, 1984; Crump, 1992) and initially were mainly used in industry. In the last 10 years, health and physics dawned the use to build a variety of phantoms, especially simulators of the human body, as a result of the great evolution occurred in machinery, materials and cost of the 3D printing technology. Several 3D printers are commercially available and these equipments nowadays are worldwide spread and the costs for the acquisition and maintenance of this equipment are becoming smaller. Especially equipment based on Fusion Filament Fabrication (FFF), investigations on feasibility of 3D printing phantoms for medical and dosimetric applications are increasing (Santos et al., 2019; Kadoya et al., 2019) since the technique allows the possibility of mixing and varying between filaments and print configurations. The available literature on FFF technology (Robinson et al., 2016; Kamomae et al., 2017; Craft and Howell, 2017; O’Dell et al., 2017; Villani et al., 2020), applied to phantom prototyping mostly explore two of most common polymers in 3D printing: acrylonitrile butadiene styrene (ABS) and Polylactic Acid (PLA), although there are a significant number of different materials and blends commercially available that can be used to mimic human soft tissue not already tested. Our recent studies identified the Hounsfield number behaviour in Computed Tomography (CT) imaging of commercial 3D printing filaments (Savi et al., 2020).

This paper aims to report the attenuation behaviour of several commercially available 3D printing filaments to be applied on development of 3D printed tissue equivalent phantoms with low cost. The attenuation was evaluated for standard X-ray beams from 29.7 keV to 46.5 keV of mean energy and experimental results are compared with NIST Database and ICRU 44 (Hubbell and Seltzer, 2004; White et al., 1989) theoretical data of radiation cross section for Cortical Bone, Soft Tissue and PMMA. The first two materials were chosen based on their prevalence in the human body and their importance on the development of a tissue equivalent phantom. PMMA was included as it is standard reference phantom material for soft tissue equivalence (White et al., 1989).
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2. Material and methods

2.1. 3D printing materials and printing set-up

This study evaluates several 3D printing materials commercially available. Plates of each material were printed with dimensions of 40 × 40 mm\(^2\) and varied thickness of 1, 2 and 5 mm (Fig. 1) in 100% rectilinear (+45°/-45°) infill in a Flashforge Creator Pro 3D and a GTMax3D Core H4 3D printers (Fig. 2) available at Radiation Protection Research Group of the Instituto Federal de Santa Catarina (IFSC). The details of the 3D printing filaments and printing protocols used can be found in Table 1.

2.2. Radiation beams

The IEC 61267 (1994) standard X-ray beams established at the Instrument Calibration Laboratory of Nuclear and Energy Research Institute (IPEN) were used to study the attenuation behaviour of the 3D printing filaments to photons, with energy range of diagnostic applications. The RQR standard beams were generated using the X-ray system Pantak/Seifert ISOVOLT 160. Specifications of the radiation beams can be found in Table 2.

2.3. Radiation detector

In order to obtain the values of transmitted radiation beams for the experimental measurements, a calibrated commercial radiation detection system RaySafe was used, with X2 R/F solid-state sensor connected.

2.4. Irradiation set-up and data analysis

The transmission method was used aiming to determine experi-
mentally the attenuation coefficients ($\mu$) of the materials. A simple exponential attenuation should be expected as a result of the strike of the beam in a detector after passing through absorbers of variable thickness. The interactions remove photons from the beam either by absorption or by scattering away from the detector and can be characterized by a fixed probability of occurrence per unit path length in the absorber. The sum of them is the probability per unit path length that the photon is removed (Knoll, 2010; Tsoulfanidis, 2010)

$$\mu = \tau + \sigma + \kappa$$

where $\tau$ is the absorption by photoelectric effect, $\sigma$ Compton scattering and $\kappa$ pair production.

The measurements were carried out with the 3D printed plates as beam absorbers, and they were positioned in front of the beam exit with thickness increasing from zero to 10 mm (details in Fig. 3). The values obtained in this procedure were analyzed using Origin® software. For each beam quality, an exponential fit was performed in order to obtain $\mu$ of the materials to each X-ray beam quality according to Eq. (2) (Knoll, 2010; Tsoulfanidis, 2010)

$$I = I_0 e^{-\mu t}$$

where $I_0$ is the initial beam intensity, and $I$ is the beam intensity when some material of thickness $t$ is placed between radiation source and detector. The use of the linear attenuation coefficient is limited by the fact that it varies with the density of the absorber, even though the absorber material is the same. The total mass attenuation coefficient ($\mu_m$) is independent on the density of the absorber and is defined as Eq. 3

$$\mu_m = \frac{\mu}{\rho}$$

where $\rho$ is the density of the absorber.

The transmission method considers the incident photons being monoenergetic (Knoll, 2010; Tsoulfanidis, 2010). Measurements in this study were performed using polyenergetic X-ray filtered beams, and this methodology is a great approximation to be used for theoretical data comparison (Villani et al., 2020). Once the linear attenuation
coefficients are calculated, the experimental values of the total mass attenuation and half-value layer (HVL) for the 3D printed phantoms can be calculated using Eq. (3) and Eq. (4) respectively

\[
\text{HVL} = \frac{\ln(2)}{\mu}
\]  

(4)

The experimental results of total mass attenuation were compared with theoretical data for Cortical Bone, Soft Tissue – human components of most interest when building a phantom – and PMMA, standard material for mimicking soft tissue in a majority of dosimetry applications (White et al., 1989). NIST database and ICRU report 44 were used to obtain the composition of the mixtures (Table 3) and XCOM (NIST, 2020) to obtain the theoretical photon cross section, and results plotted alongside experimental data for comparison.

3. Results

3.1. Radiation transmission measurements

Using Eq. (2) to the data points from the radiation transmission of the printed materials to the standard X-ray beams, it is obtained the experimental results on linear attenuation coefficients ($\mu$). Fig. 4A to D shows these results to the beam qualities measured, and respective values of $\mu$ presented in Table 4. One can observe that the values of linear attenuation are dependent on beam quality, expected as beams energy increase the attenuation decreases.

3.2. Half-value layer (HVL)

Using the attenuation coefficients ($\mu$) of Table 4 and Eq. (3), the experimental values of HVL were calculated to the printing material to all X-ray beams studied. These results are presented in Table 5. As expected, the HVL values of the printing materials also increase as the mean photon energy of the beams increase.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Density (g.cm$^{-3}$)</th>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>Fraction by weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cortical Bone</td>
<td>1.920</td>
<td>H 1</td>
<td>0.034000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C 6</td>
<td>0.155000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N 7</td>
<td>0.042000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O 8</td>
<td>0.435000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Na 11</td>
<td>0.001000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mg 12</td>
<td>0.002000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P 15</td>
<td>0.103000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S 16</td>
<td>0.003000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ca 20</td>
<td>0.225000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft Tissue</td>
<td>1.060</td>
<td>H 1</td>
<td>0.102000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C 6</td>
<td>0.143000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N 7</td>
<td>0.034000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O 8</td>
<td>0.708000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Na 11</td>
<td>0.002000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P 15</td>
<td>0.003000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S 16</td>
<td>0.003000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cl 17</td>
<td>0.002000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>K 19</td>
<td>0.003000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMMA</td>
<td>1.190</td>
<td>H 1</td>
<td>0.080541</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C 6</td>
<td>0.599846</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O 8</td>
<td>0.319613</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 Material constants and composition assumed for compounds and mixtures (Hubbell and Seltzer, 2004; White et al., 1989).
Experimental HVL calculated for the 3D printing materials.

### Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ABS-based</th>
<th>Beam Quality</th>
<th>ABS µ (cm⁻¹)</th>
<th>Adjust R²</th>
<th>Red ABS µ (cm⁻¹)</th>
<th>Adjust R²</th>
<th>ABS + µ (cm⁻¹)</th>
<th>Adjust R²</th>
<th>WOOD µ (cm⁻¹)</th>
<th>Adjust R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RQR3</td>
<td>0.285 ± 0.059</td>
<td>0.9997</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.305 ± 0.036</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.982</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.320 ± 0.021</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQR5</td>
<td>0.247 ± 0.061</td>
<td>0.9999</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.262 ± 0.026</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.988</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.279 ± 0.011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQR8</td>
<td>0.218 ± 0.065</td>
<td>0.9999</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.235 ± 0.016</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.992</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.250 ± 0.034</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQR10</td>
<td>0.193 ± 0.037</td>
<td>0.9999</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.201 ± 0.012</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.9999</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.230 ± 0.033</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ABS-based</th>
<th>Beam Quality</th>
<th>HIPS µ (cm⁻¹)</th>
<th>Adjust R²</th>
<th>PETG µ (cm⁻¹)</th>
<th>Adjust R²</th>
<th>TPE µ (cm⁻¹)</th>
<th>Adjust R²</th>
<th>TPU µ (cm⁻¹)</th>
<th>Adjust R²</th>
<th>PVA µ (cm⁻¹)</th>
<th>Adjust R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RQR3</td>
<td>0.289 ± 0.013</td>
<td>0.9995</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.449 ± 0.045</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.250 ± 0.039</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.987</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQR5</td>
<td>0.253 ± 0.012</td>
<td>0.9995</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.375 ± 0.031</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.221 ± 0.031</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.989</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQR8</td>
<td>0.218 ± 0.032</td>
<td>0.9992</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.327 ± 0.031</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.9978</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.213 ± 0.032</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.992</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQR10</td>
<td>0.197 ± 0.031</td>
<td>0.9992</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.271 ± 0.019</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.179 ± 0.019</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.988</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3. Total mass attenuation (μ_m)

Derived from linear attenuation coefficients and measured densities, the total mass attenuation of the printing materials was obtained and compared with theoretical data of Cortical Bone, Soft Tissue and PMMA. Fig. 5 show the theoretical and experimental results plotted along each other. Analysing the results, it is possible to observe that the agreement between PMMA and Soft Tissue behaviour for the printing materials improves with the increase of X-ray beam energy. The PLA-based materials mixed with metals, such as PLA + Al, PLA + BRASS and PLA + Cu has higher attenuation properties among all 3D printing materials evaluated, but without satisfactory attenuation agreement with Cortical Bone.

4. Discussions

Nowadays it is crucial for the areas of dosimetry and medical physics to incorporate technologies into clinical routine aiming to improve quality assurance to treatments and equipment calibration. The evaluation of attenuation behaviour of 3D printing materials opens a wide
range of possibilities for construction of tissue equivalent and, since the technology already are widely available, low cost 3D printed phantoms with complex geometries.

The X-ray qualities used varied from 29.7 keV, where photoelectric effect prevails, to 45.6 keV, slightly higher energy beams where there is some increase in Compton scattering. Thus, it is possible to observe that differences on $\mu$ for each material relates on beam energy and the transmission method used to our measurements sum Photoelectric and Compton interactions. Analysing the results one can observe that all the ABS-based materials presented statistically equivalent linear attenuation (within 1σ) for the RQR 3, RQR5 and RQR8 beam qualities. PLA-based filaments with “heavy” metals (Cu, Al and BRASS) presented higher attenuation properties throughout all the energy range studied, resulting in thinner HLV thicknesses as showed in Table 5.

PLA filaments without heavy additives (SILK, Black and Bone) and other blend filaments (PETG and TPU) show narrow equivalence (statistically equivalent within 1σ) with Soft Tissue and PMMA theoretical data, especially for RQR 8 and RQR10 qualities. The radiation beams used in this study are likely to harden by increasing the thickness of the absorbers during measurements, since the X-rays produced on Pantak/Seifert ISOVOLT 160 are not monoenergetic, nevertheless, considering the experimental uncertainties, our findings using this set-up are consistent with the theoretical data.

The attenuation properties of the materials used for FFF 3D printing may change according with the used printing configurations, e.g. by varying the infill percentages of the printed phantoms (Villani et al., 2020). This change affects the Computed Tomography (CT) imaging of the materials as well, as documented by Andrade et al. (2019), Savi et al. (2020). Therefore, even PLA-based filaments with metals could mimic some variations soft tissue if applying these changes in printing configuration but none of the 3D printing materials in this study presented equivalence in attenuation with Cortical Bone. These findings show that in order to be able to develop tissue-equivalent simulators using 3D printing technology by FFF, there is a gap on research and development of compatible printing filaments to this end.

5. Conclusions

This paper reports the attenuation behaviour of commercial 3D printing commercial filaments over standard X-ray beams. Experimental results show that variations of PLA (SILK, Black and Bone) and polymer blends as PETG and TPU show narrow equivalence (statistically equivalent within 1σ) with Soft Tissue/PMMA from about 30 keV and it can be concluded that all these filaments can be used as substitute of PMMA for mimetizing soft tissue in 3D printed phantoms. ABS-based filaments studied can as well be used to these applications but the energy range of radiation must be concerned. New commercial 3D printing filaments have yet be developed as suitable substitute for Cortical Bone attenuation characteristics.
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