Application Progress and Review of 3D Printing Technology in Plant Reproductive Ecology (Postprint)

Authors: Wang Liping[1],[2], Wang Linlin[2], He Zhaorong[1], Yang Yongping[2], Duan Yuanwen[2]

Date: 2018-06-22T00:00:00+00:00

Abstract

3D printing (3D Printing) is a technology that constructs objects through layer-by-layer deposition based on digital models, using adhesive materials such as powdered metals or plastics. Owing to its flexibility and precision, this technology has already played a significant role in manufacturing sectors such as defense and aerospace. Given its unique advantages, this technology also holds considerable promise in plant reproductive ecology research, although it is currently in the exploratory stage. This article provides an overview of 3D printing technology and research on the evolution of floral traits in plant reproductive ecology, summarizes the latest advances of 3D printing in this field, and discusses potential future directions.

Full Text

Preamble

Application of 3D Printing Technology in Plant Reproductive Ecology: Progress and Perspectives

WANG Li-Ping[1],[2], WANG Lin-Lin[2], HE Zhao-Rong[1], YANG Yong-Ping[2], DUAN Yuan-Wen[2]*

[1]School of Life Sciences, Yunnan University, Kunming 650500, Yunnan, China
[2]Kunming Institute of Botany, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Kunming 650201, Yunnan, China

Abstract

Three-dimensional (3D) printing is a manufacturing technology that constructs objects layer by layer using powdery metal, plastic, or other adhesive materials based on digital models. Due to its flexibility and precision, 3D printing has played a significant role in manufacturing industries such as military and aerospace. Given these unique advantages, 3D printing also holds great promise for research in plant reproductive ecology, though applications remain in the exploratory stage. This paper provides an overview of 3D printing technology and research on floral trait evolution in plant reproductive ecology, summarizes recent advances in applying 3D printing to this field, and discusses potential future directions.

Keywords: three-dimensional printing technology, plant reproductive ecology, floral trait evolution, visual signals, olfactory signals

1. Overview of 3D Printing Technology

3D printing, also known as additive manufacturing (AM), represents a type of rapid prototyping manufacturing (RPM) technology. In 2009, the American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) established the 3D Printing Technology Committee (F42 Committee) and formally defined 3D printing as a technology that, in contrast to traditional material processing methods, builds three-dimensional physical models directly from 3D CAD data by adding material layer by layer (Peltola et al, 2008; Rengier et al, 2010; Gebler et al, 2014). This manufacturing innovation has led many to consider 3D printing a crucial production tool for the "third industrial revolution."

As 3D printing technology has matured, its applications have expanded from traditional mold manufacturing to design, architecture, medicine, and plant reproductive ecology (Campos et al, 2015; Policha et al, 2016). Current applications in plant reproductive ecology remain in the initial stages, primarily focusing on floral trait evolution. 3D-printed flowers offer two key advantages: they eliminate confounding environmental factors that are difficult to control in natural settings, and they allow researchers to select materials based on experimental objectives while achieving high fidelity to meet personalized research designs. This paper focuses on recent advances and future trends in applying 3D printing to plant reproductive ecology, aiming to provide a new perspective for the field.

The origins of 3D printing technology can be traced back to the early 1980s (Kruth, 1991; Huang et al, 2013). In 1984, Charles Hull developed stereolithography based on digital data for 3D object printing, and invented the world' s first commercial 3D printer in 1986. However, the commercialization and marketization of 3D printing progressed relatively slowly. Entering the 21st century, rapid technological advances have spurred dramatic developments in 3D printing technology, cost, and applications. In terms of printing precision, current mainstream printers can achieve resolutions of 600 dpi at layer thicknesses of 0.01 mm, with advanced products reaching vertical printing speeds exceeding one inch per hour and enabling 24-bit color printing. The range of printable materials is extensive, encompassing common substances like stone and metal, as well as polymer materials and food ingredients. Approximately 14 categories of materials are currently available, allowing for over one hundred combinations. Regarding cost, 3D printer prices have dropped substantially, with Printbot' s entry-level Printrbot Play priced at only $399, while MakerBot' s high-end Replicator 2X sells for $2,499. To address the limitation of most 3D printers producing only monochrome models, Japanese company Mimaki' s full-color 3D printer 3DUJ-553 UV LED can generate ten million colors, though its price may exceed $200,000. In application domains, 3D printing was initially used for model production in mechanical and architectural industries, but has since advanced to manufacturing components for automobiles and aircraft, as well as tissue structures like blood vessels and muscles (Chia & Wu, 2015).

In recent years, scientists have used software to design printing targets and controlled physical conditions such as extrusion, laser, or high temperature to print structures for scientific research using materials with different properties. Botanists have attempted to apply this technology to study floral trait evolution in plant reproductive ecology by printing various floral structures to replace natural plant parts in experiments (Campos et al, 2015; Policha et al, 2016).

2. Floral Trait Evolution in Plant Reproductive Ecology

Floral trait evolution represents one of the most distinctive characteristics of angiosperm evolution. Pollinator-mediated selection is widely recognized as playing a crucial role in the evolution of floral traits. Darwin famously used flower structure and function to elaborate upon and support his theory of natural selection. To this day, research on floral trait evolution remains a prominent field in evolutionary biology (Armbruster, 2001; Martin, 2004; Sun et al, 2014; Kuriya et al, 2015). This section elaborates on floral trait evolution from three perspectives: visual signals, olfactory signals, and rewards.

2.1 Visual Signals

Visual signals serve as important features for attracting insects and can be divided into two main aspects: individual flower construction (such as symmetry and color) and inflorescence architecture (such as floral arrangement patterns).

Floral symmetry represents a key characteristic of angiosperm flower construction, primarily categorized as radial or bilateral symmetry. Fossil evidence indicates that approximately fifty million years after the emergence of angiosperms, flowers began evolving from primitive radial symmetry to bilateral symmetry, coinciding with the diversification period of specialized pollinating insects (Crane et al, 1995; Doyle & Endress, 2000; Endress & Doyle, 2009). Research has shown that compared to radially symmetric flowers, bilaterally symmetric flowers enhance interactions with specialized pollinators, thereby increasing pollen placement accuracy and ensuring reproductive success (Gong & Huang, 2009).

Floral color constitutes a prominent visual signal for attracting pollinators, indicating locations for feeding and pollination. For example, Sobral et al (2015) found color variation among 12 Gentiana lutea populations on the Iberian Peninsula, demonstrating that population-level color changes relate to differences in local pollinator communities and represent adaptations to local environments. Because pollinators exhibit varying preferences for floral colors, this drives the evolution of coloration. Floral color variation has been documented in at least 78 plant families (Ruxton & Schaefer, 2006).

Flowers arrange on inflorescences according to specific patterns, forming particular spatial structures. Pollinator innate preferences may significantly influence the evolution of inflorescence architecture in angiosperms. To exclude potential confounding factors under natural conditions and investigate how floral arrangement affects pollinator behavior, Jordan and Harder (2006) used artificial flowers to simulate racemose, umbellate, and paniculate inflorescences, finding that bumblebees visited different numbers of flowers across inflorescence types —fewest on racemose and most on paniculate inflorescences. This differential visitation profoundly impacts pollen receipt, pollen export, and self-pollination probability at the whole-plant level. Liao and Harder (2014) similarly used artificial flowers to simulate the effects of single large versus multiple small inflorescences on bumblebees, noting that while bees tended to move upward within individual inflorescences, they showed downward movement between inflorescences. These findings are crucial for understanding why racemose plants might adopt multiple small inflorescences versus few large ones to adapt to different pollinators.

2.2 Olfactory Signals

Floral scent represents another important signal for attracting insect pollinators, helping them locate floral resources such as nectar and pollen within flower structures. Different pollinator groups encounter distinct scent compositions. For example, Lantana camara L. in Verbenaceae, typically butterfly-pollinated, emits scents dominated by benzaldehyde and phenylethanol (Andersson et al, 2002). Clarkia breweri in Onagraceae, moth-pollinated, produces scents primarily composed of monoterpenes and linalool (Dudareva et al, 1996). Additionally, some plants mimic mold or neighboring plant odors to attract pollinators without providing rewards. For instance, the orchid Cypripedium fargesii emits a scent resembling decaying leaves (primarily composed of isoamyl alcohol and n-hexanol) to deceive flat-footed flies into pollination (Ren et al, 2011). Thus, plants can produce different chemical compounds based on pollinator olfactory preferences, volatilizing specific scents to attract pollinators and ensure reproductive success.

2.3 Rewards

Rewards (primarily nectar) constitute indispensable factors for attracting pollinators. Nectar mainly contains sugars and amino acids, along with small amounts of low-concentration phenolics, alkaloids, and other secondary metabolites. Generally, alkaloids are avoided by bees and can reduce pollination efficiency, though this depends on dosage and ecological context. Singaravelan et al found that low concentrations of cocaine and nicotine increased plant attractiveness to pollinators as a means to enhance visitation rates (Singaravelan et al, 2005; Thomson et al, 2015). Some plants produce nectar containing anthocyanins that impart color. Leucosceptrum canum Smith, a self-compatible woody plant in Lamiaceae, isolates a purple anthocyanin from its colored nectar. This species uses nectar color and dynamic changes to attract bird pollinators, effectively improving pollination efficiency during nectar feeding (Zhang et al, 2012).

3. Application Progress and Review of 3D Printing Technology in Plant Reproductive Ecology

Traditional pollination ecology research relies primarily on field observation and experiments, but field experiments are heavily influenced by external environmental factors (such as rain washing pollen from stigmas, strong winds, and low temperatures affecting pollinator behavior), which greatly impacts research progress and data accuracy.

Early plant reproductive ecology studies attempted to observe the effects of flower size and symmetry on pollinators by removing or excising petals from natural flowers (Totland, 2004; Potts, 2015). However, petal removal or excision presents two problems: first, damaged plants may release certain chemical substances or exhibit subtle visual changes that affect pollinator selection; second, artificial cutting creates edges that differ from natural petal margins, potentially influencing pollinator judgment. Moreover, because pollinator selection in nature is controlled by numerous factors, isolating the effect of a single floral trait is challenging. Artificial flowers can therefore investigate traits related to pollinator foraging behavior, including symmetry, size, color, and scent. 3D-printed flowers offer controllable shapes and high fidelity, enabling free combination of different floral displays and structures. Combined with artificial control of color and scent, they satisfy research needs for floral evolution and provide superior controllability compared to previously used paper or resin glass artificial flowers.

3D-printed flowers allow experimental control of both visual and olfactory signals. For visual signals, 3D printing can employ colored raw materials, avoiding pigment odors that might interfere with pollinators and facilitating single-signal regulation. This approach also enables investigation of how different petal patterns (such as spots and stripes) affect pollinators. Research indicates that conspicuous spots can create contrast with backgrounds within certain ranges, thereby guiding pollinators toward reproductive organs (Johnson & Dafni, 1998; van Kleunen et al, 2007; de Jager et al, 2017).

For olfactory signals, odorless raw materials can be used to print flower structures. Gas chromatography-mass spectrometry (GC-MS) can analyze natural floral scent composition, then different scent components or combinations can be added to 3D-printed flowers. Pollinator responses and visitation preferences can ultimately identify key scent components that attract pollinators. Applying 3D printing to plant reproductive ecology offers two primary benefits: first, it enables more accurate indoor simulation experiments to explore pollinator preferences for different floral traits (color, scent, shape, etc.). For example, Campos et al (2015) used 3D printing to control corolla curvature (trumpet-shaped versus flat-disk) and nectary aperture size, creating artificial flowers with different shapes to test foraging preferences. They found that hawkmoths (Manduca sexta) preferred flowers with greater corolla curvature, while nectary aperture size showed no significant effect on foraging behavior, demonstrating that corolla curvature is an important factor affecting hawkmoth foraging. This study provides an excellent precedent for investigating pollinator-floral trait relationships using 3D-printed flowers. Second, 3D printing can complement field experiments for analyzing complex floral signals. For instance, in studying orchid mimicry, Policha et al (2016) used odorless medical-grade silicone to print realistic floral structures—including sepals and mushroom-shaped labella—of the orchid Dracula lafleurii. They designed four flower types by combining real and printed organs: real flowers, flowers with real labella and printed sepals, flowers with real sepals and printed labella, and completely printed flowers. Results revealed that Dracula lafleurii attracts pollinators through combined visual and olfactory mimicry of mushrooms: visually, the labellum and showy sepals play primary roles, while olfactorily, the labellum emits mushroom-like scents. Applying 3D printing to field experiments not only reduces external interference but also provides new approaches for future field studies.

In practice, 3D-printed flowers can be used with commercial honeybees and bumblebees to detect pollinator visitation preferences for floral traits (structure, color, scent, display) under strictly controlled conditions. This can precisely reveal whether visitation differences stem from innate preferences or learned behavior, enabling species-level analysis of selection pressures on floral traits. At the community level, the controllability and convenience of 3D printing allow simulation of natural community composition and manipulation of patch size, composition, and inter-patch distances according to experimental objectives (Yang et al, 2011). This facilitates investigation of plant-pollinator and plant-plant interactions, studying pollinator selection on floral traits at the community level and providing more robust evidence for floral trait evolution. Since 3D-printed flowers cannot directly measure plant fitness, mathematical modeling can be employed to simulate pollen fate. For example, Jordan and Harder (2006) constructed the mathematical model Di = PR (1-)^(i-1) to study how bumblebee visitation behavior on different artificial inflorescence structures affects pollen export. In this model, D represents the amount of pollen deposited on the ith flower visited after a pollinator visits one flower, P is the pollen quantity in the donor flower, R is the proportion of pollen removed during visitation, and is the proportion of pollen deposited on stigmas during visitation. Such methods are applicable not only for revealing relationships between inflorescence structure and pollinator behavior but also for investigating pollen export and deposition among coexisting plants within communities. From the male fitness perspective, this can address community assembly, interspecific relationships, and floral trait evolution, greatly advancing plant reproductive ecology from field observation to indoor validation.

Applications of 3D printing in plant reproductive ecology have only just begun. While prospects are broad, several limitations remain. First, applying 3D printing to floral scent experiments may prove challenging for plants with overly complex scent compositions. Second, since raw materials are generally plastic-based and non-biodegradable, researchers should prioritize recycling and proper disposal in field environments, or preferably use biodegradable and compostable materials such as WillowFlex (Behm et al, 2018) to avoid environmental pollution. While international research using 3D printing in plant reproductive ecology has gradually deepened, domestic studies remain relatively scarce. Integrating 3D printing technology will enable more profound and accurate research in plant reproductive ecology, making new contributions to the field.

References

ANDERSSON S, NILSSON LA, GROTH I, et al, 2002. Floral scents in butterfly-pollinated plants: possible convergence in chemical composition[J]. Bot J Linn Soc, 140(2): 129-153.

ARMBRUSTER WS, 2001. Evolution of floral form: electrostatic forces, pollination, and adaptive compromise[J]. New Phytol, 152(2): 181-183.

BEHM J, WAITE BR, HSIEH ST, et al, 2018. Benefits and limitations of three-dimensional printing technology for ecological research[J]. bioRxiv, 283895.

CAMPOS EO, BRADSHAW HD, DANIEL TL, 2015. Shape matters: corolla curvature improves nectar discovery in the hawkmoth Manduca sexta[J]. Funct Ecol, 29(4): 462-468.

CHIA HN, WU BM, 2015. Recent advances in 3D printing of biomaterials[J]. J Biol Eng, 9(1): 4.

CRANE PR, FRIIS EM, PEDERSEN KR, 1995. The origin and early diversification of angiosperms[J]. Nature, 374(6517): 27-33.

DE JAGER ML, WILLIS-JONES E, CRITCHLEY S, et al, 2017. The impact of floral spot and ring markings on pollinator foraging dynamics[J]. Evol Ecol, 31(2): 193-204.

DOYLE JA, ENDRESS PK, 2000. Morphological phylogenetic analysis of basal angiosperms: comparison and combination with molecular data[J]. Int J Plant Sci, 161(S6): S121-S153.

DUDAREVA N, CSEKE L, BLANC VM, et al, 1996. Evolution of floral scent in Clarkia: novel patterns of S-linalool synthase gene expression in the C. breweri flower[J]. Plant Cell, 8(7): 1137-1148.

ENDRESS PK, DOYLE JA, 2009. Reconstructing the ancestral angiosperm flower and its initial specializations[J]. Amer J Bot, 96(1): 22-66.

GEBLER M, UITERKAMP AJMS, VISSER C, 2014. A global sustainability perspective on 3D printing technologies[J]. Energ Policy, 74: 158-167.

GONG YB, HUANG SQ, 2009. Floral symmetry: pollinator-mediated stabilizing selection on flower size in bilateral species[J]. Proc Roy Soc B-Biol Sci, 276(1675), 4013-4020.

HUANG SH, LIU P, MOKASDAR A, et al, 2013. Additive manufacturing and its societal impact: a literature review[J]. Int J Adv Manuf Technol, 67: 1191-1203.

JOHNSON SD, DAFNI A, 1998. Response of bee-flies to the shape and pattern of model flowers: implications for floral evolution in a Mediterranean herb[J]. Funct Ecol, 12(2): 289-297.

JORDAN CY, HARDER LD, 2006. Manipulation of bee behavior by inflorescence architecture and its consequences for plant mating[J]. Amer Naturalist, 167(4): 496-509.

KRUTH JP, 1991. Material incress manufacturing by rapid prototyping techniques[J]. CIRP Ann-Manuf Technol, 40(2): 603-614.

KURIYA S, HATTORI M, NAGANO Y, et al, 2015. Altitudinal flower size variation correlates with local pollinator size in a bumblebee-pollinated herb, Prunella vulgaris L. (Lamiaceae)[J]. J Evolution Biol, 28(10): 1849-1858.

LIAO WJ, HARDER LD, 2014. Consequences of multiple inflorescences and clonality for pollinator behavior and plant mating[J]. Amer Naturalist, 184(5): 580-592.

MARTIN NH, 2004. Flower size preferences of the honeybee (Apis mellifera) foraging on Mimulus guttatus (Scrophulariaceae)[J]. Evol Ecol Res, 6(5): 777-782.

MUCHHALA N, BROWN Z, ARMBRUSTER WS, et al, 2010. Competition drives specialization in pollination systems through costs to male fitness[J]. Amer Naturalist, 176: 732-743.

PELTOLA SM, MELCHELS FPW, GRIJPMA DW, et al, 2008. A review of rapid prototyping techniques for tissue engineering purposes[J], Ann Med, 40(4): 268-280.

POLICHA T, DAVIS A, BARNADAS M, et al., 2016. Disentangling visual and olfactory signals in mushroom-mimicking Dracula orchids using realistic three-dimensional printed flowers[J]. New Phytol, 210(3): 1058-1067.

POTTS JG, 2015. Effects of Floral Symmetry on Pollination in Bidens aristosa[J]. Southwest Naturalist, 60(4): 294-301.

REN ZX, LI DZ, BERNHARDT P, et al, 2011. Flowers of Cypripedium fargesii (Orchidaceae) fool flat-footed flies (Platypezidae) by faking fungus-infected foliage[J]. Proc Nat Acad Sci USA, 108(18): 7478-7480.

RENGIER F, MEHNDIRATTA A, VON TENGG-KOBLIGK H, et al, 2010. 3D printing based on imaging data: review of medical applications[J]. Int J CARS, 5(4): 335-441.

RUXTON GD, SCHAEFER HM, 2016. Floral colour change as a potential signal to pollinators[J]. Curr Opin Plant Biol, 32: 96-100.

SARGENT RD, 2004. Floral symmetry affects speciation rates in angiosperms[J]. Proc Roy Soc B-Biol Sci, 271(1539): 603-608.

SINGARAVELAN N, NEE' MAN G, INBAR M, et al, 2005. Feeding responses of free-flying honeybees to secondary compounds mimicking floral nectars[J]. J Chem Ecol, 31(12): 2791-2804.

SOBRAL M, VEIGA T, DOMÍNGUEZ P, et al, 2015. Selective pressures explain differences in flower color among Gentiana lutea populations[J]. Plos One, 10(7): e0132522.

SUN M, GROSS K, SCHIESTL FP, 2014. Floral adaptation to local pollinator guilds in a terrestrial orchid[J]. Ann Bot, 113(2): 289-300.

THOMSON JD, DRAGULEASA MA, TAN MG, 2015. Flowers with caffeinated nectar receive more pollination[J]. Arthropod-Plant Inte, 9(1): 1-7.

TOTLAND Ø, 2004. No evidence for a role of pollinator discrimination in causing selection on flower size through female reproduction[J]. Oikos, 106(3): 558-564.

VAN KLEUNEN M, NÄNNI I, DONALDSON JS, et al, 2007. The role of beetle marks and flower colour on visitation by monkey beetles (Hopliini) in the greater cape floral region, South Africa[J]. Ann Bot, 100(7): 1387-1394.

YANG S, FERRARI MJ, SHEA K, 2011. Pollinator behavior mediates negative interactions between two congeneric invasive plant species[J]. Am Nat, 177: 110-118.

ZHANG FP, CAI XH, WANG H, et al, 2012. Dark purple nectar as a foraging signal in a bird-pollinated Himalayan plant[J]. New Phytol, 193(1): 188-195.

Note: Figure translations are in progress. See original paper for figures.

Source: ChinaXiv —Machine translation. Verify with original.