



Development of a 3D printable maxillofacial silicone. Part II: Optimization of moderator and thixotropic agent

Jindal, S. K., Sherriff, M., Waters, M. G., Smay, J. E., & Coward, T. J. (2017). Development of a 3D printable maxillofacial silicone. Part II: Optimization of moderator and thixotropic agent. *Journal of Prosthetic Dentistry*, 119(2), 299. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.prosdent.2017.04.028>

[Link to publication record in Ulster University Research Portal](#)

Published in:

Journal of Prosthetic Dentistry

Publication Status:

Published (in print/issue): 20/06/2017

DOI:

[10.1016/j.prosdent.2017.04.028](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.prosdent.2017.04.028)

Document Version

Author Accepted version

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via Ulster University's Research Portal is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

The Research Portal is Ulster University's institutional repository that provides access to Ulster's research outputs. Every effort has been made to ensure that content in the Research Portal does not infringe any person's rights, or applicable UK laws. If you discover content in the Research Portal that you believe breaches copyright or violates any law, please contact pure-support@ulster.ac.uk.



King's Research Portal

DOI:

[10.1016/j.prosdent.2017.04.028](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.prosdent.2017.04.028)

Document Version

Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication record in King's Research Portal](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Jindal, S. K., Sherriff, M., Waters, M. G., Smay, J. E., & Coward, T. J. (2017). Development of a 3D printable maxillofacial silicone. Part II: Optimization of moderator and thixotropic agent. *Journal of Prosthetic Dentistry*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.prosdent.2017.04.028>

Citing this paper

Please note that where the full-text provided on King's Research Portal is the Author Accepted Manuscript or Post-Print version this may differ from the final Published version. If citing, it is advised that you check and use the publisher's definitive version for pagination, volume/issue, and date of publication details. And where the final published version is provided on the Research Portal, if citing you are again advised to check the publisher's website for any subsequent corrections.

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the Research Portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognize and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the Research Portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the Research Portal

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact librarypure@kcl.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

JPD-16-932

Development of a 3D printable maxillofacial silicone. Part II: Optimization of moderator and thixotropic agent

ABSTRACT

Statement of problem. Conventionally, maxillofacial prostheses are fabricated by hand carving the missing anatomic defect in wax and creating a mold into which pigmented silicone elastomer is placed. Digital technologies such as computer numerical control (CNC) milling and 3-dimensional (3D) printing have been used to prepare molds, directly or indirectly, into which a biocompatible pigmented silicone elastomer can be placed.

Purpose. The purpose of this in vitro study was to develop a silicone elastomer that could be 3D printed directly without a mold to create facial or body prostheses by varying its composition.

Material and methods. The room temperature vulcanizing (RTV) silicone composition was divided into 2 components which were mixed 1:1 to initiate polymerization in the printer before printing began. Different types of moderators and thixotropic agents were used, and the base composition was varied to obtain 11 formulations. The specimens were printed and polymerized from these formulations and tested for tear, tensile strength, and hardness. Ten readings of the specimens were recorded for tear and tensile strength and 6 for hardness. The results were analyzed using ANOVA ($\alpha=.05$). Visual assessment of uncured printed specimens was undertaken for 5 formulations to assess any differences in their ability to hold their shape after printing.

Results. The tear and tensile strength of the 11 formulations with varying moderators, thixotropic agents, and base compositions were statistically similar to each other ($P>.05$). Five

formulations of 11 were chosen for the visual assessment as they had sufficient thixotropic agent to avoid slumping while printing. The specimens showed varied slumping behavior until they polymerized. The filler content was increased in the selected formulation, and the tear and tensile strength of the formulation was increased to 6.138 kNm^{-1} and 3.836 MPa ; this was comparable with the commercial silicones currently used for the fabrication of facial prostheses.

Conclusions. The optimum combination of mechanical properties implies the use of one of the formulations as a suitable material for the 3D printing of facial prostheses.

CLINICAL IMPLICATIONS

Direct 3D printing of biocompatible silicone prostheses will make the process of manufacturing more reproducible, consistent, and reliable. This will also reduce healthcare costs in terms of chair time and the number of appointments and permit replacement prostheses to be produced rapidly.

INTRODUCTION

Facial prostheses can restore a patient's quality of life by disguising facial disfigurements caused by disease, trauma, or congenital deformity. Facial prosthetic fabrication is a labor intensive process relying on the artistic skill of maxillofacial technicians and their subjective judgements about color, fit, and texture. Digital manufacturing technologies, including 3-dimensional (3D) printing, are used by some craniofacial centers to make prostheses and remove some variability from the process.^{1,2} In these circumstances, either the prostheses are printed using hard materials that are used to make a 2-part mold, or the mold is printed directly. Subsequently, pigmented silicone is hand packed into the mold to fabricate the definitive prosthesis.³

Commonly available 3D printing technologies using thermoplastic materials have achieved good resolution and some, using ink jet printing, have achieved good color fidelity. However, techniques are currently lacking for the high-quality, color-matched printing of 2-component silicones with elastomeric properties suitable for facial prostheses. To overcome one of the challenges of the digital production of facial prostheses, it was first necessary to develop a new material that could be printed, that was suitable for prostheses, and that exhibited controllable mechanical properties.

The chosen 3D printing method for this research was similar to the fused deposition modelling scheme, but without the heated nozzle and print bed.⁴ A silicone elastomer is extruded through a room-temperature deposition nozzle onto an unheated substrate in a controlled, layer-by-layer pattern. For successful printing, the silicone must flow at a controlled rate through the deposition head with modest pressure, retain the extruded shape without significant slumping, polymerize at a controlled rate, and have mechanical properties comparable with those of existing clinical silicones. Room-temperature vulcanizing (RTV) silicone systems using an unmasked platinum catalyst that polymerizes silicone without the application of heat are preferred. Although, 1-component RTV silicones can be 3D printed, 2-component RTV silicones are preferable because of their biocompatibility and are therefore more suitable for prostheses in contact with the patient's tissues.⁵

Investigations into the initial development of a biocompatible silicone elastomer suitable for facial prostheses have been described.⁶ The formulation of base A (70% long, 20% medium, and 10% short polydimethylsiloxane [PDMS) chains] with 2.5% catalyst and 5% cross-linker was chosen from the 20 formulations investigated with varying amounts of long-, medium-, and short-chained PDMS and 5 concentrations of cross-linker. In this study, the silicone formulation

was divided into 2 parts before printing through a customized 3D printer. The heat-activated catalyst used in the previous work was replaced by an RTV catalyst to develop a printable 2-component RTV silicone. The purpose of this study was to determine whether a 2-component silicone elastomer could be developed to print facial or body prostheses by optimizing the mechanical properties and composition.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

The 2 components (Part A and Part B) of the silicone were mixed in equal quantities 1:1 during the printing process to form/print the polymerized silicone (Table 1). Part A incorporated 5% catalyst while part B included 10% cross-linker. The base A from the previous study was used, which was formed of 70% long, 20% medium, and 10% short PDMS chains, each with 20% w/w surface treated silica filler.⁵ Base E was developed with 80% long, 15% medium, and 5% short PDMS chains, each with 20% w/w surface treated silica filler to further increase the amount of long chain PDMS.

Moderator was added to inhibit the polymerization rate while a thixotropic agent was used to increase the viscosity of the silicone. Moderators: 0.5 g moderator 1 (Cyclotetra siloxane inhibitor; Silanes and Silicones Ltd) and 0.15 g moderator 2 (PT 188 moderator; Wacker Chemie AG) were used to make up 100 g for the various formulations. The addition of a thixotropic agent increased the viscosity of silicone by changing the spatial distribution, increasing interparticle attractions and increasing the entanglement density of the chains.^{7,8} The thixotropic agents, thixotropic agent 1 (silanol terminated fluid; Silanes and Silicones Ltd) and thixotropic agent 2 (Chain extender additive; Technovent Ltd) were used with various concentrations for different formulations. However, the concentration of moderator and thixotropic agent were the

same in both parts of the silicone. The RTV catalyst was platinum divinyltetramethyldisiloxane complex (Gelest Inc).

The silicone was printed using a customized 3D printer developed for printing 2-component RTV silicones (Fig. 1).⁹ The silicone components were housed in separate syringes and held affixed to the z-axis of the printer in controllable syringe pumps. Hence, the 2 components were pumped at a controlled volumetric flow rate and directed to a mixing device just before extrusion/deposition. The active mixer had a mixed volume of approximately 90 nL. Although this volume is small, it is sufficient to permit the active flow and simultaneous mixing of 2-component silicone for printing. The deposition nozzle was a 2-mm-long stainless steel capillary tube with an inside diameter of 0.5 mm. The linear print speed was 10 mm s^{-1} as the printer traced the predefined patterns in the x-y-z space. This machine has a precision of $0.01 \mu\text{m}$ in the x-y plane and a precision of 0.1 to $1 \mu\text{m}$ in the z plane.

The print patterns consisted of multiple layers of silicone deposition lines printed in parallel in the x-y plane to produce the geometry desired within a layer. After printing a layer in the x-y plane, the z height was increased to build the next layer onto it and hence complete the 3D geometry. The parallel lines within a layer and the z spacing were adjusted such that the deposited filaments overlapped sufficiently to avoid entrapment of air that could reduce the strength of the specimens. Two contours were drawn initially and filled with a series of strokes of silicone, called raster infill.⁴ The raster infill pattern for the subsequent layers was designed at alternating angles of 45 or 135 degrees. Ten air-free specimens were prepared for the tensile and tear testing of various formulations and were printed into standardized molds to assure identical specimen dimensions. Hardness specimens were printed without the use of molds.

The 2 components of silicone (part A and part B) were individually loaded into 10-mL Luer syringes, speed-mixed (Speedmixer DAC 150FVZ-K; Synergy Devices Ltd) to remove entrapped air and transferred to 5-mL syringes of the customized 3D printer. The formulations with thixotropic agent were speed-mixed at 2700 rpm for 7 minutes, while the formulations without thixotropic agent were speed-mixed at 2700 rpm for 5 minutes.

For the tensile test, 10 dumbbell-shaped specimens were printed for each formulation and tested according to ISO 37.¹⁰⁻¹³ The thickness of the dumbbell-shaped specimens -were 2 mm. Ten trouser-shaped tear test specimens were printed for each formula (100×15×2 mm) and tested according to the ISO 34.^{10-12,14} A cut in the test specimen was made at the center of the width of the test piece (40 mm long). Tensile and tear specimens were tested at a strain rate of 100 mm min⁻¹ with a universal testing machine (Model 5569A; Instron). Three hardness test specimens (40×25×8 mm) were printed with each specimen measured twice using a Shore A durometer (HBA 100-0; Sauter). The hardness test used in this study was based on the measurements of indentation of a rigid ball into the test specimen under specified conditions and conducted according to ISO 868.¹⁵ Commercially available silicone specimens (M511; Technovent Ltd) were molded and used as the acceptable standard in the study.

Material rheology was characterized by testing on a rheometer (AR2000; TA Instruments) with a 40-mm-diameter, steel plate peltier. Flow experiments were conducted by using a logarithmic sweep of shear rates (0.1–10 001 s⁻¹). All experiments were performed in ambient conditions with a gap height of 1000 µm and preliminary soak time of 60 seconds. Part A and Part B of formulations were tested separately, and the effect of shear rate on viscosity was studied.

A visual assessment was made to indicate the ability of a formulation to hold its shape with increasing height. The tubes were printed with an internal diameter of 6 mm and an external diameter of 10 mm with 30 layers. This shape was selected to print a high object with a low volume of silicone because the material holders had a capacity of only 5-mL.

Filler content affected the tear strength and tensile strength of the resulting polymer, and so the content was increased to enhance these properties. The base A was composed of long, medium, and short PDMS chains with 20% filler. Additional filler was added to the base to make up to 30% w/w. This base was then used to prepare silicone Part A and B for printing.

Data for mechanical tests were analyzed using software (Stata v14.1; Stata Corp LP) ($\alpha=.05$). The normality of residuals, an assumption for a valid analysis of variance (ANOVA), was tested graphically using normal probability plots in conjunction with the procedure described by Cox.¹⁶ The Šidák method was used to adjust for multiple comparisons between different formulations.¹⁶

RESULTS

The 2-component RTV silicone specimens were printed with various formulations of moderator and thixotropic agent, and the mechanical properties observed are listed in Table 2. The hardness test was undertaken with formulations III, VI, VII, X, and XI, which could be printed without molds or any support material and had a minimum of 3 g moderator 1 or 0.5 g moderator 2 per 100 g of formulation (Table 2).

The rheology was tested for both parts of formulations I, III, V, VII, IX, and X. Figure 2 shows the Part A and Part B of formulation I and III, which only differ in the content of thixotropic agent. Formulation III had 3 g of thixotropic agent 1 while formulation I did not, and

its viscosity was lower than formulation III at all shear rates. With increasing shear rates, the silicone was showing shear thinning effect and viscosity was decreasing. The shear rate of the printing with an 0.5-mm tip at 10 mm s^{-1} was 40 s^{-1} .

The tubes printed with formulations III, VI, VII, X, and XI are shown in Figure 3. The tubes printed well and slumped over time while polymerizing. Visually formulation III provided the optimum result as the tube maintained its shape. This formula was therefore selected over others for the next experiment of increased filler concentration.

The filler content of the formulation was increased to 30%, and the results of the mechanical tests are shown in Table 2 for formulations XII and XIII. They show a significant increase in tear and tensile strength and are comparable with the commercial silicone M511 (Technovent Ltd).⁵ The tubes printed with formulation XIII (with thixotropic agent 1) retained their shape while the tubes of formulation XII did not. The results of the ANOVA showed a significant difference between the formulations for tear and tensile strength (Table 3). The Šidák analysis showed that formulations sharing letters in groups were not significantly different at the 5% level (Table 4).

DISCUSSION

The research demonstrated that 3D printing of 2-component silicone elastomers with appropriate mechanical properties could be used to fabricate facial or body prostheses. The process of 3D printing involves printing layers of the material one on top of the other to create a complete object. Therefore, while the silicone is being printed, the layers must retain their extruded shape without significant slumping to support the layers being built above. Additionally, the polymerization rate must be controllable, and the mechanical properties must be comparable

with existing clinical silicones. The RTV silicone for printing had to be divided into 2 parts as the catalyst needed to be kept separate from the cross-linker to avoid initiation of the polymerizing reaction. The 2 parts were created such that equal volumes were needed for polymerization. Part A was made up of 95% base and 5% catalyst, while Part B consisted of 90% base and 10% cross-linker. Equal amounts of moderator and thixotropic agent were added into parts A and B of different formulations.

The RTV catalyst was rapid acting, and polymerization occurred during the mixing of the 2 components in less than a minute. Hence, the silicone was polymerizing in the mixing chamber and thus extrusion of the silicone was prevented. Consequently, a moderator which inhibited and slowed the hydroxylation cross-linking reaction at the vinyl end groups of PDMS chains was added to both parts to inhibit the polymerizing rate. As a result, the working time was increased to 30 minutes.

The layers of the printed silicone did not maintain their shape, and the subsequent layers to be printed did not have a stable base. This behavior hindered printing as the layers above did not have a stable base to print on. This resulted in uneven printing and entrapment of air. The problem was resolved by adding a thixotropic agent to both parts of the silicone elastomer. Varying amounts of thixotropic agent were added to silicone to increase its viscosity, and their effect on printed specimens was observed. The addition of a thixotropic agent made the silicone slightly translucent yet suitable for printing, as the silicone specimens could hold their shape thereafter. The thixotropic agent was responsible for increasing the viscosity of silicone by changing the spatial distribution, increasing interparticle attractions, and increasing the entanglement density of the chains.^{7,8}

In the previous paper, it was shown that base A with 2.5% catalyst and 5% cross-linker had a tensile and tear strength of 3.524 MPa and 8.484 kNm⁻¹ which decreased to 1.634 MPa and 3.076 kNm⁻¹ respectively with addition of moderator (Formulation I in Table 2).⁶ It further decreased to 1.26 MPa and 1.587 kNm⁻¹ with the addition of 3% thixotropic agent (Formulation III). Thus, the addition of moderator and thixotropic agent decreased the tear and tensile strength of silicone.

The tear strength of the formulations I-VII was lower than that of the commercial silicone M511 (8.002 kN m⁻¹). The formulations I, III, IV, and VI were also polymerized under pressure by hand packing and polymerizing. Since the polymerization reaction does not require air, the specimens polymerized. In comparison with the hand packed specimens with the printed specimens, these specimens showed higher tear and tensile strength than specimens polymerized without pressure. This explains the decreased strength of printed formulations.

Moderator 1 at 0.25% was used for printing with the working time of 15 minutes, but the printing was disturbed and often led to blocked print head channels. Therefore 0.5% moderator 1 was chosen with a working time of 30 minutes. This working time was suitable for printing. Moderator 2 was concentrated, and 0.15 g was sufficient to achieve a working time of 30 minutes. Different concentrations of thixotropic agent were added to find the most suitable for printing. The specimens with 1.5 g thixotropic agent 1 did not retain their shape, and so 3 g of thixotropic agent 1 was tested. These specimens retained their shape, and further additions of the thixotropic agent were not required.

The addition of moderator 1 and/or thixotropic agent 1 to the formulation decreased the tear and tensile strength of silicone. To enhance the tear strength, a different moderator and a thixotropic agent; moderator 2 and thixotropic agent 2 were added which had a similar

mechanism of action but differing carrying agents and concentrations of active ingredients. Thixotropic agent 2 showed statistically insignificant variation on tear strength. Both thixotropic agents act by forming temporary hydrogen bonds with silanol groups on the surface of filler particles and both the moderators act by slightly slowing the hydrosilylation process during cross-linking. It would seem that moderator 1 is too aggressive in its moderation of the reaction and in effect is permanently inhibiting cross-linking causing a reduction in tear strength. The reason for the differences seen when using the thixotropic agents is less clear. It is possible thixotropic agent 1 is also inhibiting the reaction or the effect on the filler is not being completely neutralized during polymerization thus reducing the strengthening effect of the filler.

Base A showed maximum tear strength (2.737 kN m^{-1}) with moderator 2 and thixotropic agent 2, but to further increase the strength, the number of long chain PDMS was increased in the formulation. Hence, the percentage of long chain PDMS within the formula was increased from 70% to 80%. It also had 15% of medium length and 5% of short chain PDMS. This was named Base E. With base E, 2.5% catalyst, 5% cross-linker, moderator 1, and thixotropic agent 2 were added.

The difference in tear and tensile strength between the highest and lowest values of formulations was less than 1.2 kNm^{-1} and 0.5 MPa respectively. This was practically insignificant, and the use of any particular formulation was not justified. A hardness test was undertaken to investigate possible differences between formulations. The combinations with at least 3 g thixotropic agent 1 and 0.5 g thixotropic agent 2 were printable while others were not because they could not retain their shape until the silicone had completely polymerized. Therefore, the hardness test was undertaken only for 5 formulations that could be used for further printing. The results of hardness testing showed variation between 19.7 and 21.5 Shore A for the

formulations with the thixotropic agent. These differences were not statistically different. Hence further experimentation was required to determine whether any differences existed between the formulations.

Rheology tests were performed to observe any difference between the formulations. Part A for each formulation was more viscous than Part B because Part B had 10% cross-linker which was a liquid, leading to decreased viscosity of part B. Formulation I (no thixotropic agent) was shown to have nearly Newtonian behavior at low shear rate (approximately, $\dot{\gamma} < 50 \text{ s}^{-1}$) followed by shear-thinning behavior up to the maximum tested shear rate. In contrast, formulation III (containing thixotropic agent) displayed shear thinning behavior across the entire shear rate range tested. The rheology of Part A and Part B had to be tested separately as the mixed formulation would polymerize in the rheometer. While flow through the deposition head was achieved by all formulations, shape retention of the printed part was used to distinguish the printability of the various formulations.

The tubes were printed with the 5 formulations, and the results showed that the tube of formulation III best reproduced the designed part. The retention of good shape agrees well with the observed rheology in that high viscosity in the low shear rate regimen favors less flow after printing. This formulation was thus selected for further work.

The filler loading was increased in the chosen formulation of base A with 0.5 g moderator 1 and 3 g thixotropic agent 1 from 20% to 30%. Speed-mixing was insufficient to mix the filler particles into the base; therefore, a planetary mixer was used. The mixing was adequate but air bubbles were observed trapped within the silicone. Speed-mixing was performed thereafter to remove the trapped air. The mixture had to be mixed for 5 minutes to obtain a homogenous mix of filler. If continuous mixing for 5 minutes was applied, the lids of mixing

pots were damaged inside the speedmixer and were very hot, making it necessary to open them every minute to release the generated hot air. Generally, heat generated by speed-mixing would accelerate the catalyzing reaction in RTV silicone. Since the 2 parts of silicone were kept in different pots, the silicone did not polymerize with the heat generated. The increased filler content made the formulation very viscous, but the tubes were still not printable without the thixotropic agent (Formulation XII). The tear and tensile strengths of formulation XII and XIII increased and were comparable with those of currently used commercial silicone elastomers.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the results of this in vitro testing, the following conclusions were drawn:

1. The novel 2-component RTV silicone is printable and the hardness, tear, and tensile strength were within an acceptable range for use as facial prostheses.
2. Addition of moderator and/or thixotropic agent decreased the tear and tensile strength of silicone, whereas increased filler content increased the tear and tensile strength.

REFERENCES

1. Williams RJ, Bibb R, Eggbeer D, Collis J. Use of CAD/CAM technology to fabricate a removable partial denture framework. *J Prosthet Dent* 2006;96:96-9.
2. Wolfaardt J, Sugar A, Wilkes G. Advanced technology and the future of facial prosthetics in head and neck reconstruction. *Int J Oral Maxillofac Surg* 2003;32:121-3.
3. Sykes LM, Parrott AM, Owen CP, Snaddon DR. Applications of rapid prototyping technology in maxillofacial prosthetics. *Int J Prosthodont* 2004;17:454-9.
4. Lužanin O, Movrin D, Plančak M. Effect of layer thickness, deposition angle, and infill on maximum flexural force in FDM-built specimens. *J Technol Plast* 2014;39:49-58.
5. Ratner BD, Hoffman AS, Schoen FJ, Lemons JE. *Biomaterials science*. 3rd ed. Canada: Academic Press; 2013. p.82-91.
6. Jindal SK, Sherriff M, Waters MG, Coward TJ. Development of a 3D printable maxillofacial silicone: Part I. Optimization of polydimethylsiloxane chains and cross-linker concentration. *J Prosthet Dent* 2016;116:617-22.
7. Barnes HA. Thixotropy—a review. *J Nonnewton Fluid Mech* 1997;70:1-33.
8. Mewis J, Wagner NJ. Thixotropy. *Adv Colloid Interface Sci* 2009;147–148:214-27.
9. Coward T, Jindal S, Waters M, Smay J. 3D printing of facial prostheses. WO2015107333A1 , 2015.
10. Aziz T, Waters M, Jagger R. Development of a new poly(dimethylsiloxane) maxillofacial prosthetic material. *J Biomed Mater Res B Appl Biomater* 2003;65:252-61.
11. Bellamy K, Limbert G, Waters MG, Middleton J. An elastomeric material for facial prostheses: synthesis, experimental and numerical testing aspects. *Biomater* 2003;24:5061-6.

12. Aziz T, Waters M, Jagger R. Analysis of the properties of silicone rubber maxillofacial prosthetic materials. *J Dent* 2003;31:67-74.
13. International Organization for Standardization. ISO 37:2011. Rubber, vulcanized or thermoplastic—determination of tensile stress-strain properties. Available at: <http://www.iso.org/iso/prods-services/ISOstore/store.html>. Accessed November 28, 2016.
14. International Organization for Standardization. ISO 34-1:2015. Rubber, vulcanized or thermoplastic—determination of tear strength. Part 1: trouser, angle, and crescent test pieces. Available at: <http://www.iso.org/iso/prods-services/ISOstore/store.html>. Accessed November 28, 2016.
15. International Organization for Standardization. ISO 868:2003. Plastics and ebonite—determination of indentation hardness by means of a durometer (shore hardness). Available at: <http://www.iso.org/iso/prods-services/ISOstore/store.html>. Accessed November 28, 2016.
16. Cox N. Graphics (and numerics) for univariate distributions. In: United Kingdom Stata Users' Group Meeting (no. 6); September 2012. Available at: <http://www.stata.com/meeting/uk12/abstracts/>. Accessed November 28, 2016.

TABLES

Table 1. Composition of two components of RTV silicone

| Part A | Part B |
|-------------------|-------------------|
| 95 g Base | 90 g Base |
| 5 g RTV catalyst | 10 g Cross-linker |
| Moderator | Moderator |
| Thixotropic Agent | Thixotropic Agent |

Table 2. Tear and tensile strength of printed formulations.

| Formulation No | Base | Moderator | Thixotropic agent | Tear strength \pmSD (kN m⁻¹) | Tensile strength \pmSD (MPa) | Hardness \pmSD (Shore A) |
|-----------------------|-------------|------------------|----------------------------|---|--|--|
| I | Base A | Moderator 1 | 0 | 3.076 \pm 0.75 | 1.634 \pm 0.2 | |
| II | Base A | Moderator 1 | 1.5 g Thixotropic agent 1 | 1.804 \pm 0.34 | 1.217 \pm 0.15 | |
| III | Base A | Moderator 1 | 3 g Thixotropic agent 1 | 1.587 \pm 0.11 | 1.26 \pm 0.2 | 20.2 \pm 0.41 |
| IV | Base A | Moderator 2 | 0 | 2.464 \pm 0.61 | 1.694 \pm 0.3 | |
| V | Base A | Moderator 2 | 0.25 g Thixotropic agent 2 | 2.737 \pm 0.6 | 1.6 \pm 0.13 | |
| VI | Base A | Moderator 2 | 0.5 g Thixotropic agent 2 | 2.344 \pm 0.4 | 1.573 \pm 0.11 | 19.7 \pm 0.52 |

| | | | | | | |
|-------------|------|-------------|----------------------------|-------------|------------|-----------|
| VII | Base | Moderator 2 | 0.75 g | 2.501 ±0.39 | 1.702 | 20.2 |
| | A | | Thixotropic agent 2 | | ±0.18 | ±0.41 |
| VIII | Base | Moderator 2 | 0 | 2.811 ±0.7 | 1.62 ±0.2 | |
| | E | | | | | |
| IX | Base | Moderator 1 | 0 | 2.712 ±0.76 | 1.54 ±0.17 | |
| | E | | | | | |
| X | Base | Moderator 1 | 0.5 g | 2.277 ±0.3 | 1.571 | 21.5 |
| | E | | Thixotropic agent 2 | | ±0.05 | ±0.55 |
| XI | Base | Moderator 1 | 0.75 g | 2.198 ±0.44 | 1.592 | 21.2 |
| | E | | Thixotropic agent 2 | | ±0.23 | ±0.75 |
| XII | Base | Moderator 1 | 0 | 7.057 ±0.98 | 4.297 | |
| | A-30 | | | | ±0.22 | |
| XIII | Base | Moderator 1 | 3 g Thixotropic agent 1 | 6.138 ±1.28 | 3.836 ±0.3 | 22.2 ±0.9 |
| | A-30 | | | | | |
| M511 | | | | 8.002 ±0.56 | 3.804 | 18.7 |
| | | | | | ±0.36 | ±0.47 |

Mean values (SD) g of Thixotropic agent show amount in 100 g of each formulation

Table 3. Table showing results of ANOVA for 13 formulations.

| | | Sum of | df | Mean | F | P |
|-----------------|---------------------|----------------|-----------|---------------|----------|----------|
| | | Squares | | Square | | |
| Tear | Between | 320.17 | 12 | 26.68 | 58.13 | .001 |
| Strength | Formulations | | | | | |
| | Within | 53.71 | 117 | 0.46 | | |
| | samples | | | | | |
| | Total | 373.87 | 129 | 2.89 | | |
| Tensile | Between | 111.11 | 12 | 9.26 | 227.95 | .001 |
| strength | Formulations | | | | | |
| | Within | 4.75 | 117 | 0.04 | | |
| | samples | | | | | |
| | Total | 115.86 | 129 | 0.89 | | |

Table 4. Šidák analysis of differences between formulations.

| Formulation no | Tear Strength | | Tensile Strength | |
|---------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|
| | Mean values | Šidák Groups | Mean values | Šidák Groups |
| I | 1.587 | C | 1.26 | BC |
| II | 1.805 | AC | 1.217 | C |
| III | 3.076 | B | 1.634 | A |
| IV | 2.465 | ABC | 1.601 | A |
| V | 2.737 | AB | 1.573 | A |
| VI | 2.344 | ABC | 1.702 | AB |
| VII | 2.502 | ABC | 1.62 | A |
| VIII | 2.811 | AB | 1.54 | A |
| IX | 2.713 | AB | 1.57 | AB |
| X | 2.277 | ABC | 1.571 | AB |
| XI | 2.199 | ABC | 1.592 | A |
| XII | 7.057 | D | 4.297 | |
| XIII | 6.138 | D | 3.836 | |

FIGURES

Figure 1. Customized 3D Printer for printing 2-component RTV silicone.




Figure 2. Change in viscosity with increasing shear rate.




Figure 3. Tubes printed with formulation III, VI, VII, X, and XI.

