Journal of
Open Source Developments

ISSN: 2395-6704
Volume 12, Issue 1, 2025
January–April
DOI (Journal): 10.37591/JoOSD

https://journals.stmjournals.com/joosd

Review JoOSD

Manufacturing Processes and 3D Printing of Health Diagnostic Tools: Economic Analysis of Open Source Frameworks

Bhupinder Singh[1,*], Ashima Jain[2]

Abstract

Health diagnosis tools, for example, the incorporation of 3D printing into their manufacturing, drastically changed medical technology, providing cheap, customizable, fast tools in the field. This transformation has been accelerated by open-source frameworks that decrease dependence upon proprietary manufacturing and increase accessibility to diagnostic tools. Economic benefits of open-source 3D printing include reduced production costs, less dependence on global supply chains, and better equity of access to health care globally. Traditional manufacturing has high initial costs, which are avoided in additive manufacturing, as it removes excess wipe of material and reduces the production cycle. Distributed manufacturing networks lead localized production, making it possible for diagnostic tools to be deployed in resource-limited settings as soon as they are produced. These applications include low-cost glucose monitors, prosthetics, and custom lab-on-a-chip devices and speak to the economic viability of this approach. With wider access to open-source collaboration, healthcare will become more affordable and accessible to all, and further innovations in medical diagnostics will ensue.

Keywords: 3D printing, additive manufacturing, open-source healthcare, diagnostic tools, economic sustainability

INTRODUCTION

3D printing technology is recently developed manufacturing capability for health diagnosis tools, making the use of it revolutionary for health innovation due to its low production costs, higher availability, and possibility of customization when compared to conventional production [1]. The open-source revolution leading to this transformation has enabled new decentralized and localized methods of manufacturing to emerge, minimizing reliance on costly proprietary solutions. Traditional manufacturing processes used for the production of medical diagnostic tools are often complicated, requiring lengthy supply chains, significant upfront capital costs, and time-consuming regulatory approval, making them expensive and less accessible, particularly for resource-limited settings [2–4]. Altering the economic, logistical, and sociopolitical landscape surrounding, diagnostics has been significantly assisted by the modularity afforded by 3D printing, especially through open-source infrastructures, where rapid prototyping and on-demand product workflows were made possible, transforming diagnostics capabilities for biosensors, microfluidics, and personalized prosthetics [5].

***Author For Correspondence**
Bhupinder Singh
E-mail: bhupindersinghlaw19@gmail.com

[1]Professor, Sharda School of Law, Sharda University, Greater Noida, Uttar Pradesh, India
[2]Assistant Professor, Sharda School of Law, Manipal University Jaipur, Rajasthan, India

Received Date: February 22, 2025
Accepted Date: February 25, 2025
Published Date: March 07, 2025

Citation: Bhupinder Singh, Ashima Jain. Manufacturing Processes and 3D Printing of Health Diagnostic Tools: Economic Analysis of Open Source Frameworks. Journal of Open Source Developments. 2025; 12(1): 43–46p.

MEDICAL DIAGNOSTICS AND MANUFACTURING PROCESSES

Currently, medical diagnostics are produced using traditional manufacturing processes that often require many complex steps consisting of design, material sourcing, molding, assembly, and distribution steps. These stages are labor-intensive, equipment-heavy, and cash-rich [6]. Moreover, strict regulatory requirements increase the development time for such clinical trials and hence, the high costs incurred by both the manufacturers and end users [7]. 3D printing, or additive manufacturing, however, makes production easier by building up three-dimensional structures from digital blueprints in layers [8]. This not only saves time for the developers but also prevents wastage of material. With the announcement that 3D printing will be integrated into healthcare, its economic benefits are profound. It contributes to a healthier economy by enabling cost-efficient production of goods to meet demand, fostering innovation, and democratizing access to life-saving diagnostic tools [9].

The reduction of high costs in traditional manufacturing is a major advantage of 3D printing for health diagnosis tools manufacture. Traditional manufacturing methods like injection molding and CNC machining need costly tooling, molds, and workforce. Such costs can be especially prohibitive for small-scale or low-income healthcare providers. With common, inexpensive materials such as biodegradable plastics, resins, and specialized polymers widely available, open-source 3D printing reduces much of these overhead costs. Additive manufacturing also allows for the development of complex geometries and intricate designs that may not be feasible with traditional configurations, adding additional functionality and efficiency to diagnostic technologies [10].

ECONOMIC ASPECTS OF 3D PRINTING

Another major economic aspect of open-source 3D printing technology is the idea of personal health diagnosis tools to be tailored to individual patients. Traditional mass-production methods depend on standardized designs which may not always cater to the patients' individual anatomical or physiological needs. Digital design platforms and open-source repositories can help healthcare providers and researchers customize and implement diagnostic tools according to personalized healthcare requirements. Such customizability minimizes any need for costly adjustments after surgery while also improving patient care overall by decreasing the amount of time required for diagnosis and comfort monitoring [11].

Even more so, the potential of open-source 3D printing to solve global healthcare supply chain issues bolsters the economic viability of the process. In traditional manufacturing and distribution systems, many intermediaries contribute to inflated costs and prolonged delivery of crucial diagnostic tools to remote or underprivileged regions. 3D printing overcomes these hurdles because it is a decentralized manufacturing technology; diagnostic tools can be made locally using printable electronic blueprints that can be downloaded. This method minimizes shipping costs and allows the local manufacture of products in response to immediate medical demand. Furthermore, open-source platforms encourage collaboration among global researchers, engineers, and medical professionals, allowing for the rapid advancement of new diagnostic solutions all while keeping costs low [12].

Microfluidic devices hold great promise for use in health diagnostics, and even they are being produced recently by open-source 3D printing. These compact, portable devices are employed in point-of-care diagnostic technology used to test for a range of diseases, including malaria, tuberculosis and COVID-19. Microfluidic devices have, however traditionally been fabricated using expensive lithography techniques which require specialized facilities and expertise with their use. That said, recent developments in 3D printing have allowed the production of high-resolution and low-cost microfluidic devices to be generated from off-the-shelf desktop 3D printers. This advancement has significant economic implications, enabling the deployment of low-cost diagnostic tools even in challenging contexts, thus enhancing healthcare accessibility and ultimately disease control [13].

OPEN SOURCE AND 3 D PRINTING IN MEDICAL DEVICES

Open-source 3D printing, too, has enabled the designing of biosensors and wearable health monitoring devices. These tools are essential for real-time health monitoring, early disease identification, and personalized medicine. Similar to traditional biosensors, which require complicated production processes and costly materials for synthesis, 3D fabricated devices can drastically reduce the resources necessary to create customized biosensors for specific applications. For instance, researchers have used 3D printing to produce electrochemical biosensors for glucose, cholesterol, and infectious disease detection. Open Source platforms enable developers to share and iterate on design for the sensors; this can help improve the diagnosis accuracy and reduce costs over time [14].

In addition to reduced costs and increased accessibility, open-source 3D printing advances sustainability in healthcare manufacturing. Traditional medical device manufacturing is wasteful as it relies on subtractive manufacturing methods whereby excess material is removed for components to reach their final shape. In contrast, in 3D printing, objects are created using additive manufacturing, which deposits only the precise amount of material needed and as a result, there is far less wasted material. Another reason is that many 3D printing materials including biodegradable polymers and recycled plastics are well aligned with sustainable manufacturing practices where environmental impact is minimized without compromising economic efficiency [15].

While open-source 3D printing has numerous advantages, wide adoption in health diagnostics still is limited due to economic and regulatory barriers. A major concern is quality assurance and standardization. Because open-source platforms permit anyone to modify digital designs without restriction, there is a potential variance in the accuracy and reliability of printed diagnostic tools. One such critical factor is the need for standardization of the manufacturing processes for 3D printed medical devices; researchers and regulators are currently developing accreditation and certification protocols, which will ensure safety and efficacy of 3D printed medical devices. Adhering to these standards will improve trust among health care providers and enable wider adoption of 3D-printed diagnostic tools [16].

A second friction is the open-source 3D printing IP landscape. Open-source frameworks encourage collaboration and innovation but also create risk for patent infringement and proprietary rights. This keeps the economic analysis of this technology in line with open access principles while still needing to incentivizing rate for innovation. This lets essential diagnostic tools be made freely available (e.g. under open source licenses), while more advanced features or full versions are commercialized to support the research and development effort. Also, the upfront cost of 3D printing infrastructure and know-how can be a barrier for some healthcare facilities, especially in developing parts of the world. Though the long-term cost savings are significant, the initial investment required to purchase high-quality 3D printers, materials and software can be prohibitive. One such effort is aimed at overcoming this barrier, through initiatives that seek to offer funding, training, and technical support to providers in poorly-resourced settings. This will be possible only through a collaboration of the non-profit and government organizations, as well as academic institutions, to make sure 3D printing technology is not just distributed based on economic ability, but is made available to all.

CONCLUSION AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

The future of open-source 3D printing with respect to health diagnostics is bright. The potential of 3D-printed diagnostic tools will be augmented by ever more sophisticated printing technology (multi-material printing, nanoprinting, etc.). AI and machine learning will technically improve 3D printing by propelling automated design optimization and predictive maintenance of 3D printing workflows. Moreover, the growth of distributed manufacturing networks and localized production facilities will further enhance healthcare preparedness, making better equipped to handle global health crises and supply chain disruptions. Thus, the manufacturing processes and economic analyses of open-source 3D printing in health diagnostics are being emphasized for its transformational capability into the health industry. 3D printing responds to many of the limitations traditional manufacturing methods face by providing affordable, customizable, and sustainable alternatives. Though obstacles like quality control issues, intellectual property considerations, and upfront investment costs still persist, research continues and partnerships are springing up around the globe to support the widespread adoption of this technology. With open-source innovation driving the future of medicine, 3D printing will ultimately make diagnostic tools more accessible and affordable, leading to better health outcomes worldwide.

REFERENCES

1. Belton J, Taylor MJ, Moonaz S, Fazzio LR, Elgelid S, Erb M, Lee M, Meyers T, Sausys A. Yoga and Science in Pain Care: Treating the Person in Pain. UK: Singing Dragon; 2019 Aug 21.
2. Erb M, Schmid AA, editors. Integrative rehabilitation practice: The foundations of whole-person care for health professionals. UK: Singing Dragon; 2021 May 21.
3. Matthews KA, Weiss SM. New research frontiers in behavioral medicine: Proceedings of the national conference. Washington, DC: National Institutes of Health; 1994.
4. Lowenberg JS. Caring and responsibility: The crossroads between holistic practice and traditional medicine. Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press; 2016 Nov 11.
5. Lim EJ, Hyun EJ. The impacts of pilates and yoga on health-promoting behaviors and subjective health status. Int J Environ Res Public Health. 2021 Apr 6; 18(7): 3802.
6. Suraj S, Singh A. Study of sense of coherence health promoting behavior in north Indian students. Indian J Med Res. 2011 Nov 1; 134(5): 645–52.
7. Raj S, Senjam SS, Singh A. Assessment of health-promoting behavior and lifestyle of adolescents of a north Indian city. Int J Prev Med. 2013 Oct; 4(10): 1189–1193.
8. Ross A, Bevans M, Brooks AT, Gibbons S, Wallen GR. Nurses and health-promoting behaviors: Knowledge may not translate into self-care. AORN J. 2017 Mar 1; 105(3): 267–75.
9. Malik E, Sheoran P, Siddiqui A. Health-promoting behaviors and menopausal symptoms: an interventional study in rural India. J Mid-life Health. 2018 Oct 1; 9(4): 200–6.
10. Taneja DK. Yoga and health. Indian J Community Med. 2014 Apr 1; 39(2): 68–72.
11. Wieland LS, Cramer H, Lauche R, Verstappen A, Parker EA, Pilkington K. Evidence on yoga for health: A bibliometric analysis of systematic reviews. Complement Ther Med. 2021 Aug 1; 60: 102746.
12. Cramer H, Quinker D, Pilkington K, Mason H, Adams J, Dobos G. Associations of yoga practice, health status, and health behavior among yoga practitioners in Germany—Results of a national cross-sectional survey. Complement Ther Med. 2019 Feb 1; 42: 19–26.
13. Oken BS, Zajdel D, Kishiyama S, Flegal K, Dehen C, Haas M, Kraemer DF, Lawrence J, Leyva J. Randomized, controlled, six-month trial of yoga in healthy seniors: effects on cognition and quality of life. Altern Ther Health Med. 2006; 12(1): 40–47.
14. Yi LJ, Tian X, Jin YF, Luo MJ, Jiménez-Herrera MF. Effects of yoga on health-related quality, physical health and psychological health in women with breast cancer receiving chemotherapy: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Ann Palliat Med. 2021 Feb; 10(2): 1961–1975.
15. Ross A, Friedmann E, Bevans M, Thomas S. National survey of yoga practitioners: mental and physical health benefits. Complement Ther Med. 2013 Aug 1; 21(4): 313–23.
16. Yang J, Cheng Y, Gong X, Yi S, Li CW, Jiang L, et al. An integrative review on the applications of 3D printing in the field of in vitro diagnostics. Chin Chem Lett. 2022;33(5):2231–42. doi: 10.1016/j.cclet.2021.08.105.

