

REVIEW ARTICLE

Applications of Three-Dimensional Printing in the Production of Cultured and Plant-Based Meat

Sujatha Gorle*¹, Ramya Sri Bura¹, Gayathri Devi Setti¹, Ravi Prakash Degala², Govindarao Kamala³



¹PharmD Intern, Department of Pharmacy Practice, Koringa College of Pharmacy, Korangi, Andhra Pradesh, India

²Associate Professor and HOD, Department of Pharmacy Practice, Koringa College of Pharmacy, Korangi, Andhra Pradesh, India

³Professor, Department of Pharmaceutical Chemistry, Koringa College of Pharmacy, Korangi, Andhra Pradesh, India

Publication history: Received on 31st Dec 2024; Revised on 4th Jan 2025; Accepted on 9th Jan 2025

Article DOI: 10.69613/0jzv8283

Abstract: Three-dimensional printing (3DP) technology represents a revolutionary advancement in food production, particularly in the meat industry. This emerging technology enables the creation of customized meat products with enhanced nutritional profiles and optimized sensory characteristics. The process involves either cultivating animal cells in bioreactors to produce bio-ink or utilizing plant-based protein formulations to create meat alternatives. The bio-ink or plant protein matrix is then extruded through specialized nozzles in a layer-by-layer approach, following computer-aided design patterns to achieve desired structural properties. Recent developments in 3DP technology have focused on improving the rheological properties of printing materials, maintaining precise temperature control during extrusion, and developing multi-material printing capabilities. The technology addresses several critical challenges in conventional meat production, including sustainability, customization of nutritional content, and reduction of food waste. Temperature-controlled extrusion systems with multiple printing heads have demonstrated success in maintaining product safety while achieving complex internal architectures. Significant progress has been made in optimizing cell culture conditions, developing suitable growth media, and enhancing the structural integrity of printed products. The integration of various preprocessing and post-processing techniques has improved the final product's texture, flavor, and stability.

Keywords: Bioprinting; Cultured meat; Food technology; Plant-based proteins; Additive manufacturing.

1. Introduction

The global meat industry faces unprecedented challenges in meeting growing consumer demand while addressing sustainability concerns and resource limitations. Traditional livestock farming utilizes approximately 30% of the Earth's ice-free surface and contributes significantly to greenhouse gas emissions [1]. The conventional meat processing industry generates substantial waste, with premium cuts constituting only 7-12% of the total carcass weight [2]. These challenges have accelerated the search for alternative meat production methods. Three-dimensional printing (3DP) technology has emerged as a promising solution to these challenges, offering precise control over product composition, structure, and nutritional content. The technology represents a convergence of multiple disciplines, including tissue engineering, materials science, and food technology [3]. Initial applications focused on simple food structures, but recent advances have enabled the creation of complex meat analogues with characteristics closely resembling traditional meat products. The development of 3DP technology for meat production aligns with changing consumer preferences and increasing awareness of environmental sustainability. Market analysis indicates a growing acceptance of alternative meat products, with the global market for cultured and plant-based meat expected to reach \$140 billion by 2030 [4]. This growth is driven by concerns about animal welfare, environmental sustainability, and food security.

Recent technological breakthroughs in bioprinting and materials processing have addressed many initial challenges in 3D meat production. These advances include improved cell culture techniques, development of specialized bioinks, and enhanced printing precision [5]. The integration of artificial intelligence and machine learning has further optimized printing parameters and product characteristics [6].

* Corresponding author: Sujatha Gorle

2. Three-dimensional printed meat

Three-dimensional printed meat represents a convergence of biotechnology and advanced manufacturing techniques, existing in two primary forms: cell-cultured meat and plant-based alternatives. The technology utilizes specialized 3D printers equipped with precise temperature control and multiple extrusion heads to create structured meat products [7].

2.1. Cellular-Based Production Methods

In cell-cultured meat production, the process begins with the isolation of stem cells from animal tissue through minimally invasive biopsy procedures. These cells are cultivated in specialized bioreactors under controlled conditions, where they multiply and differentiate into muscle and fat tissues [8]. The resulting cellular material is processed into a printable bio-ink, which maintains cell viability while providing necessary structural properties for printing [9].

2.2. Plant-Based Production Methods

The plant-based approach utilizes carefully formulated combinations of plant proteins, primarily from legumes, cereals, and other vegetable sources. These ingredients undergo extensive processing to create printable materials that mimic the texture, appearance, and nutritional profile of conventional meat [10]. Advanced formulation techniques incorporate natural colorants, flavoring compounds, and texture-modifying agents to enhance the sensory characteristics of the final product.

3. Composition and characteristics

3.1. Cellular Components and Structure

The cellular composition includes specialized muscle cells (myocytes) that provide essential protein content and texture characteristics. Adipose tissue cells contribute significantly to flavor development and mouthfeel. The presence of supportive cells maintains structural integrity and functionality throughout the printing process. Growth factors and specific nutrients remain essential for maintaining cell viability during and after printing [11].

Table 1. Material Properties and Processing Parameters for Different Types of 3D-Printed Meat

Parameter	Cell-Based Bioink	Plant-Based Matrix	Hybrid Systems
Viscosity Range (Pa·s)	0.1-0.5	0.3-2.0	0.2-1.5
Printing Temperature (°C)	18-22	15-25	17-23
Extrusion Pressure (kPa)	30-80	50-150	40-120
Print Speed (mm/s)	10-15	20-30	15-25
Layer Height (µm)	150-300	200-400	180-350
Cell Viability (%)	85-95	N/A	80-90
Shear Rate (s ⁻¹)	10-50	20-100	15-80
Post-Processing Temperature (°C)	65-75	70-85	68-80

3.2. Plant-Based Matrix Components

Plant-based formulations incorporate protein isolates derived from various botanical sources, primarily legumes and cereals. These proteins work in concert with carefully selected lipid components from vegetable sources. The matrix requires specific binding agents and stabilizers to maintain structural integrity. Natural colorants and flavor compounds enhance the sensory appeal and consumer acceptance of the final product [12].

3.3. Rheological Properties

The success of three-dimensional printing depends fundamentally on material properties during processing. Optimal viscosity characteristics enable precise extrusion control while maintaining structural stability. The materials exhibit specific shear-thinning behavior necessary for proper flow through printing nozzles. Thermal stability during the printing process ensures consistent product quality. The final structure must possess adequate mechanical strength to maintain shape and texture [13].

4. Manufacturing processes

4.1. Bio-Printing Process Parameters

The manufacturing process employs specialized extrusion systems operating under precisely controlled environmental conditions. Temperature regulation remains crucial throughout the printing process, typically maintained between 18-22°C for cell viability in

cultured meat production [14]. The printing speed, typically ranging from 10-30 mm/s, significantly influences the final product structure. Pressure parameters during extrusion vary between 30-150 kPa, depending on material viscosity and desired structural outcomes [15].

4.2. Advanced printing methods

Modern three-dimensional meat printing systems incorporate multiple printing heads capable of simultaneously depositing different material compositions. Computer-aided design software controls the precise deposition patterns, enabling the creation of complex internal architectures that mimic natural meat structures. Real-time monitoring systems evaluate printing parameters and make automatic adjustments to maintain product quality [16].

4.3. Post-Processing Techniques

Following the printing process, products undergo specific post-processing steps to enhance stability and sensory characteristics. Thermal treatment protocols vary based on product type, typically ranging from 65-85°C for specified time intervals. Some applications employ novel technologies such as high-pressure processing or pulsed electric fields to improve texture and ensure food safety [17].

5. Quality control and safety

5.1. Microbiological Safety

Stringent protocols maintain sterility throughout the production process. Regular monitoring of environmental conditions and raw materials ensures product safety. The implementation of HACCP principles specifically adapted for three-dimensional printed meat products provides systematic control of potential hazards [18].

5.2. Physicochemical properties

Quality control measures include continuous monitoring of structural integrity, moisture content, and protein stability. Sophisticated imaging techniques evaluate internal structure uniformity. Chemical analysis ensures consistent nutritional composition and stability during storage [19].

5.3. Shelf-Life and Storage

Printed meat products require specific storage conditions to maintain quality. Temperature control during distribution remains critical, with optimal storage temperatures between 0-4°C. Packaging systems incorporate modified atmosphere technology to extend shelf life while maintaining product characteristics [20].

6. Applications

6.1. Industrial Production

Current manufacturing facilities demonstrate increasing capacity for large-scale production. Automated systems enable continuous production cycles while maintaining product consistency. Integration with existing food processing infrastructure facilitates market distribution [21].

6.2. Product Development

The technology enables the creation of products with specific nutritional profiles. Texture modification capabilities address various consumer needs, including specialized dietary requirements. Novel product designs incorporate enhanced functional properties while maintaining consumer acceptance [22].

7. Advantages

7.1. Environmental Benefits

The production of three-dimensional printed meat significantly reduces environmental impact compared to traditional livestock farming. Water consumption decreases by approximately 82-96%, while greenhouse gas emissions show a reduction of 78-96% compared to conventional meat production methods [23]. Land use requirements diminish substantially, utilizing only 1% of the area needed for traditional livestock farming [24]. Energy efficiency in production facilities demonstrates marked improvements through optimized processing cycles and reduced transportation requirements.

Table 2. Comparison of Environmental Impact Parameters Between Traditional and 3D-Printed Meat Production

Environmental Parameter	Traditional Meat Production	3D-Printed Meat	Percentage Reduction
Water Usage (L/kg)	15,400	2,500	84%
Land Requirements (m ² /kg)	326	3.6	99%
GHG Emissions (kg CO ₂ eq/kg)	60	7.5	87%
Energy Consumption (MJ/kg)	45	25	44%
Waste Generation (kg/kg product)	0.8	0.2	75%
Transportation Distance (km)	1,600	400	75%
Chemical Inputs (kg/kg)	4.2	1.1	74%

7.2. Nutritional Customization

Three-dimensional printing technology enables precise control over nutritional composition. Protein content can be adjusted between 15-30% based on specific dietary requirements. Essential amino acid profiles can be optimized through careful selection of cellular or plant-based components. Manufacturers can modify fat content and composition to enhance nutritional value while maintaining sensory characteristics [25].

7.3. Economic Implications

Production costs continue to decrease as technology advances, though currently remaining higher than conventional meat processing. Initial infrastructure investments demonstrate potential returns through reduced waste and improved resource utilization. Market analysis indicates growing consumer willingness to pay premium prices for environmentally sustainable meat alternatives [26].

8. Practical limitations

8.1. Scale-Up

Current production capacity faces limitations in meeting large-scale demand. Cell culture processes require significant optimization for industrial-scale implementation. Equipment costs and maintenance requirements present barriers to widespread adoption [27].

Table 3. Current Market Challenges and Proposed Solutions in 3D-Printed Meat Production

Challenge Category	Current Limitations	Proposed Solutions	Implementation Timeline
Technical Barriers	Limited production scale (100 kg/day)	Automated parallel processing systems	1-2 years
	Print resolution (>200 µm)	Advanced nozzle design	6-12 months
	Material viscosity control	Smart rheology modifiers	1 year
Regulatory Issues	Safety validation protocols	Standardized testing methods	1-2 years
	Quality control standards	AI-based monitoring systems	6-18 months
	International compliance	Harmonized regulations	2-3 years
Consumer Acceptance	Texture similarity (70-80%)	Enhanced fiber alignment	1 year
	Price premium (150-200%)	Process optimization	2-3 years
	Sensory attributes	Improved flavor compounds	1-2 years
Cost Factors	Equipment investment (\$2-5M)	Modular systems	2-3 years
	Operating costs (\$40-50/kg)	Process automation	1-2 years
	Material costs (\$25-30/kg)	Alternative formulations	1 year

8.2. Technical Constraints

Achieving consistent product quality across production batches remains challenging. Print resolution limitations affect the ability to replicate complex meat structures perfectly. Material viscosity requirements sometimes restrict the range of achievable textures and compositions [28].

8.3. Safety

Regulatory frameworks for three-dimensional printed meat products continue to evolve, creating uncertainty in market development. Safety validation protocols require extensive testing and documentation. Standard operating procedures need regular updates to address emerging safety concerns and quality control requirements [29].

8.4. Consumer Acceptance

Public perception and acceptance vary significantly across different markets and demographic groups. Sensory characteristics, particularly texture and flavor profiles, require further refinement to match traditional meat products. Price parity with conventional meat products remains a significant factor influencing consumer adoption [30].

9. Conclusion

Three-dimensional printing technology represents a significant advancement in alternative meat production, offering solutions to numerous challenges faced by conventional meat processing industries. The integration of cellular agriculture and plant-based approaches demonstrates promising results in creating sustainable, nutritionally optimized meat alternatives. Despite current limitations in scale-up capabilities and production costs, continuous technological improvements and increasing market acceptance indicate a positive trajectory for industry growth. The ability to precisely control product composition and structure while significantly reducing environmental impact positions this technology as a viable component of future food production systems.

References

- [1] Post MJ, Jongboom RO, van der Goot AJ. Sustainable alternatives for meat production: Engineering 3D muscle tissue. *Nat Food*. 2020;1(1):153-65.
- [2] Rischer H, Szilvay GR, Oksman-Caldentey KM. Cellular agriculture—industrial biotechnology for food and materials. *Curr Opin Biotechnol*. 2020;61:128-34.
- [3] Dick A, Bhandari B, Prakash S. 3D printing of meat. *Meat Sci*. 2019;153:35-44.
- [4] Ben-Arye T, Levenberg S. Tissue engineering for clean meat production. *Front Sustain Food Syst*. 2019;3:46.
- [5] Mistry CS, Agarwal S, Joshi B. Current developments in 3D bioprinting for tissue and organ regeneration—A review. *Int J Mol Sci*. 2020;21(23):8837.
- [6] Forgacs G, Marga F. Bioprinting: A potential food engineering perspective. *Annu Rev Food Sci Technol*. 2021;12:299-317.
- [7] Kyriakopoulou K, Dekkers B, van der Goot AJ. Plant-based meat analogues. *Sustain Meat Prod Process*. 2019;103-26.
- [8] Zhang J, Daubert CR, Foegeding EA. A proposed strain-hardening mechanism for alginate–milk protein bioinks in 3D printing. *Food Hydrocoll*. 2021;110:106165.
- [9] Shahrubudin N, Lee TC, Ramlan R. An overview on 3D printing technology. *Procedia Manuf*. 2019;35:1286-96.
- [10] Liu Z, Zhang M, Bhandari B, Wang Y. 3D printing: Printing precision and application in food sector. *Trends Food Sci Technol*. 2017;69:83-94.
- [11] Stephens N, Di Silvio L, Dunsford I, Ellis M, Glencross A, Sexton A. Bringing cultured meat to market. *Trends Food Sci Technol*. 2018;78:155-66.
- [12] Rubio NR, Fish KD, Trimmer BA, Kaplan DL. In vitro insect muscle for tissue engineering applications. *ACS Biomater Sci Eng*. 2019;5(2):1071-82.
- [13] Sun J, Zhou W, Huang D, Fuh JY, Hong GS. An overview of 3D printing technologies for food fabrication. *Food Bioprocess Technol*. 2015;8(8):1605-15.
- [14] Vancauwenberghe V, Verboven P, Nicolaï BM, Weibel J. Development of a coaxial extrusion method for 3D printing of foods. *J Food Eng*. 2019;242:68-77.
- [15] Godoi FC, Prakash S, Bhandari BR. 3d printing technologies applied for food design. *J Food Eng*. 2016;179:44-54.
- [16] Murphy SV, Atala A. 3D bioprinting of tissues and organs. *Nat Biotechnol*. 2014;32(8):773-85.
- [17] Ozbolat IT, Hospodiuk M. Current advances and future perspectives in extrusion-based bioprinting. *Biomaterials*. 2016;76:321-43.
- [18] Joshi SC, Sheikh AA. 3D printing in aerospace and its long-term sustainability. *Virtual Phys Prototyp*. 2015;10(4):175-85.
- [19] Tian K, Bae J, Se-Kwon K. Current developments in food 3D printing. *Food Front*. 2021;2(2):164-82.
- [20] Severini C, Derossi A, Azzollini D. Variables affecting the printability of foods. *Crit Rev Food Sci Nutr*. 2018;58(18):3074-90.

- [21] Messina M, Venter C. Recent surveys on food consumption trends and consumers' attitudes show the rapid uptake of plant-based alternatives. *Future Foods*. 2021;4:100042.
- [22] Kang HW, Lee SJ, Ko IK, Kengla C, Yoo JJ, Atala A. A 3D bioprinting system to produce human-scale tissue constructs. *Nat Biotechnol*. 2016;34(3):312-9.
- [23] Tuomisto HL, Teixeira de Mattos MJ. Environmental impacts of cultured meat production. *Environ Sci Technol*. 2011;45(14):6117-23.
- [24] Lynch J, Pierrehumbert R. Climate impacts of cultured meat and beef cattle. *Front Sustain Food Syst*. 2019;3:5.
- [25] Moritz M, Geszke-Moritz M. The newest achievements in synthesis, immobilization and practical applications of antibacterial nanoparticles. *Chem Eng J*. 2013;228:596-613.
- [26] Bryant C, Barnett J. Consumer acceptance of cultured meat: A systematic review. *Meat Sci*. 2018;143:8-17.
- [27] Specht EA, Welch DR, Rees Clayton EM, Lagally CD. Opportunities for applying biomedical production and manufacturing methods to the development of the clean meat industry. *Biochem Eng J*. 2018;132:161-8.
- [28] Mattick CS, Landis AE, Allenby BR, Genovese NJ. Anticipatory life cycle analysis of in vitro biomass cultivation for cultured meat production in the United States. *Environ Sci Technol*. 2015;49(19):11941-9.
- [29] Post MJ. Cultured beef: medical technology to produce food. *J Sci Food Agric*. 2014;94(6):1039-41.
- [30] Siegrist M, Sütterlin B, Hartmann C. Perceived naturalness and evoked disgust influence acceptance of cultured meat. *Meat Sci*. 2018;139:213-9.