EURASIAN EXPERIMENT JOURNAL OF PUBLIC HEALTH (EEJPH)
ISSN: 2992-4081 ©EEJPH Publications
Volume 7 Issue 2 2025

Applications and Advances in 3D Scaffolds for Tissue Regeneration

Mwende Muthoni D.

Faculty of Medicine Kampala International University Uganda

ABSTRACT
Three-dimensional (3D) scaffolds are transformative tools in tissue engineering and regenerative medicine, offering structural support and biomimetic environments to foster cellular growth and tissue repair. This review examines the design, fabrication methods, and applications of 3D scaffolds, emphasizing their role in mimicking extracellular matrix properties for various tissues. Advanced fabrication technologies, such as bioprinting, allow precise control of scaffold architecture, enabling tailored solutions for bone, cartilage, nerve, and vascular regeneration. Despite significant progress, challenges such as material limitations, regulatory hurdles, and cost constraints remain. Future advancements integrating nanotechnology, bioactive materials, and artificial intelligence are discussed as pathways to enhance scaffold efficacy and facilitate clinical adoption.
Keywords: 3D scaffolds, Tissue regeneration, Tissue engineering, Extracellular matrix, Bioprinting, Biomaterials.

INTRODUCTION

Tissue regeneration is the biological process of replacing or re-establishing damaged cells, tissues, or organs. It is a highly complex and specific process that requires the formation of new tissues. The process of tissue regeneration can be initiated by tissue injury or for the routine replacement of cells in organs. Traditionally, the treatment of damaged tissues or organs is carried out by transplantation. However, the shortage of donors necessitates alternative approaches to develop biological substitutes. This has led to the introduction and evolution of tissue engineering. It involves the utilization of cells and scaffold materials to encourage the development of tissues that can then be used to restore or enhance organ function. Scaffolds play a fundamental role in key processes and respond to microenvironmental conditions [1, 2]. Scaffolds provide necessary support for cell adherence, as they form a suitable 3D environment that encourages the growth and differentiation of cells, as well as the proliferation of these differentiated cells according to tissue type. Scaffold architecture has the potential to significantly impact clinical outcomes, and a search for the ideal arrangement of a scaffold that best imitates the nanoscale components of the natural extracellular matrix has been ongoing for some time. As a result, significant effort has been made to innovate the design and functionalization of scaffolds to develop superior tissue through advancements in tissue constructs such as bioprinting technology. This review emphasizes the innovation and updates in the design and applications of three-dimensional (3D) scaffolds used in tissue repair. As scaffolds used for this purpose should resemble the extracellular matrix both morphologically and compositionally, a critical segment of the extracellular matrix is also discussed. Additionally, regulatory aspects are also considered and debated [3, 2].

Types of 3D Scaffolds and Their Properties

The three-dimensional (3D) scaffolds that can play critical roles for cells and hence, tissue restoration or regeneration can be classified into different types. According to the source of scaffolds, they can be listed as natural scaffolds, such as collagen and gelatin, or synthetic scaffolds, including polylactic acid or polycaprolactone. Furthermore, there are other category types, hybrids or composites, which include polymers and natural products. Each type of 3D scaffold can have some advantages over the others, which include beneficial surface characteristics, adjustable mechanical strength, or inherent biodegradable properties. It is noteworthy that certain properties, such as suitable porosity, surface characteristics, and mechanical strength, contribute to cell attachment, proliferation, and differentiation on 3D scaffolds [4, 5]. The composition of the 3D scaffolds can be determined based on the target tissue, which includes collagen, gelatin, or cellulose-based scaffolds for tissue reconstruction or repair. In addition, it has also been shown that the investigational results depend on the biomaterials used, which include polycaprolactone, collagen, or polylactic acid for bone regeneration. It is worth noting that the architectures of the 3D scaffolds are important in mimicking the native tissue environment. Cylindrical structures with circular pores have been designed to mimic the native cylindrical tubular tissue, such as nerve conduits, to encourage cellular attachment, penetration, and proliferation. In general, there remains a requirement to improve the efficiency and reduce the cost of 3D scaffolds used for in vitro testing before application in vivo experiments. There is a wide range of 3D scaffold types that have been utilized to mimic the extracellular matrix in tissue to promote the regeneration and correction of tissue defects [6, 7].

Methods and Technologies for Fabricating 3D Scaffolds

The method of fabricating 3D scaffolds is of key importance when assessing the viable approaches of each tissue engineering application. Several different technologies have been described to fabricate 3D scaffolds; each method has its features that could fulfill and meet the application requirements. Knowledge of the various fabrication methods was proposed to provide functional 3D scaffolds depending on the tissue requirement [8, 9]. For more than a decade, the most common and traditional methods to fabricate 3D scaffolds are electrospinning, solvent casting, and freeze-drying. These processes seem to be suitable for the encapsulation of a large number of cells into the scaffolds, as well as the extracellular matrix secreted by the cells that are accumulated on the substrate surface. Despite the potential of these three structural forms of 3D scaffolds, each method has several limitations, including the necessity of using organic solvents to prepare the polymers or to remove the type of precursors, the limited potential of generating complex constructs, and the impact on controlling stated parameters such as porosity and pore sizes, which degrade their performance. Advanced techniques that can be used to fabricate 3D structures include 3D printing and bioprinting. These two techniques are among the most important innovations in the manufacturing of a 3D printer, as they enable the deposition of bioactive porosity and mechanical properties in the targeted layers and locations, with beneficial potential for building personalized biomaterials [9, 8]. Given the prominence of the physical and chemical properties of the 3D scaffolds to control cell behavior, specialized attention should be directed to the technology of the fabrication process to maintain the integration and functional macro-scale characteristics from the micro to nanometer scale. We proposed and presented the image generation of the development pathway of scaffold fabrication strategies used in 2018 and/or are under development, describing the principles of the different techniques along with the potential advantages and limitations of the production of 3D scaffolds for tissue engineering purposes. Thus, it is possible to use each of the methods to explore the specific ins and outs to avoid their future in addition to a successful and repeated process on a large scale. Furthermore, the review discussed the effect of various fabrication parameters on both the native scaffold geometry and the inherent functionalities, illustrating their impact on cell matchmaking or clinical applications. Integration of modern features such as bioactive factors at the nanoscale level and the potential to reap opportunities to date is also discussed, as is the integration of multiple cell types during the manufacturing process and its impact on functional tissue integration and therapeutic outcomes. Furthermore, the future implications of these technologies to develop personalized regenerative medicine solutions are discussed along with the implications of future work to prepare for further advances and discover other approaches in scaffold fabrication and tissue development [10, 11]. To date, various technologies have been developed for applications in regenerative treatment in targeted tissue and interdisciplinary research, but challenges remain to exploit the success. This review provides a summary of novel approaches, including the integration of cells and bioactive agents in addition to advanced 3D scaffolds, with a focus on the state of the art in fabrication techniques. Rather than providing a comprehensive review of these technologies and their applications, this discussion focuses on the impact of the methods used to fabricate the individual technologies in terms of the capability to generate designed functional structures with controlled structural forms [12, 13].

Applications of 3D Scaffolds in Tissue Regeneration

Tissue scaffolds are routinely tested and developed for in vivo biologic applications. This review explores the potential clinical scenarios to which scaffolds might be applied. The major uses for scaffolds are laboratory and clinical tissue engineering protocols for bone, cartilage, nerve, and blood vessel regeneration. Scaffolds have seen an increase in use as physical support to healing tissues like skin that might not need regeneration. Furthermore, cellular healing and plasticity in combination with local factors have provided alternative tissues based on endogenous stem cell activity. For instance, scaffolds have been used to treat soft tissue defects by stimulating local tissue healing, which has a basis in studies where proliferating fibroblasts and keratinocytes are desired [14, 15]. Although initially derived as a non-degradable tissue engineering tool, one of the first major uses of scaffolds was to develop into a tissue regeneration material for cartilage repair. The use of 3D scaffolds in cells also conceptualized the importance of vascular tissue repair of small vessels, which are often needed for bypass grafts and access shunts in hemodialysis, a clinical scenario without a suitable tissue repair option. Skin autotransplants are often used to close skin excisions larger than 5–10 cm^2 and also include a part of the dermis—the regenerative layer of supporting tissue inserted as the skin graft. Professional wound dressing companies have been experimenting with 3D dehydrated porcine dermis as dermal scaffolds. Over 100,000 wounds have been successfully treated commercially with this product. Laboratory statistics are always much larger, such as millions of dollars' worth of regenerating tissues [16, 17].

Challenges and Future Directions in the Field of 3D Scaffolds for Tissue Regeneration

At all stages of scaffold design and implementation, there is a range of practical, legal, and ethical challenges involved in translating 3D scaffold technologies into clinical applications. Limitations of materials used in manufacturing 3D scaffolds, as well as scaffold fabrication, can be the underlying causes of the failure of the scaffold's usefulness. Such failure of the scaffold can pertinently affect the microenvironment within the implanted construct. The scaffold alone cannot be regenerative; it must control the interaction with local host tissues. Although there are few commercial products available in the market that have been approved for clinical use for tissue repair or regeneration, the development and adoption of tissue engineering and cell therapy-based products have been limited by both regulatory and ethical hurdles. The regulatory agencies concerned with these classes of therapy have been urging for a blend of medical devices and biological products; therefore, the creation of biocompatible formulations requires much attention to validation and testing [18, 19].

Future Directions

Taken further, a break in today's conventional biological, metallic, and carbon-based materials, such as polymeric materials, is also an emerging demand for consideration to break the current circuitry and enhance its potential, such as biohybrid solutions and composites like metals and polymers. Finally, scaffold properties and their applications will attract much more attention, such as nanotechnology on the way to the future, nanotechnology, nanomaterials, and regenerative engineering. Because the polymer nanofiber mats are similar in diameter to natural ECM components, submicron fibrous networks highly mimic natural ECM, thus providing an excellent porous environment for tissue cells to reside and maintain not only cell adhesion, attachment, and further spreading, but also proliferation and extracellular matrix development. Artificial intelligence and machine learning dedicated to 3D scaffold materials and tissue engineering can be used to propose regenerative solutions and build automated smart data labeling for quicker decision-making in the regenerative industry. The accelerated approval of new technologies in implantable medical devices requires medical device manufacturers to provide valid data that supports clinical utility. The importance of the interdisciplinary scaffold-working group between medical devices and tissue engineering scientists will become more prevalent in the future. Because of the hierarchical organizational complexity and 3D presentation of human body tissue structures, it is currently not feasible to create a synthetic scaffold that could directly replace damaged tissues and organs. Articular cartilage and spinal cord networks are embedded within proteoglycans in an organized manner and so on. Several recent developments are reshaping the field [20, 21].

CONCLUSION

3D scaffolds represent a cornerstone of modern tissue engineering, bridging the gap between biological systems and synthetic materials to promote tissue repair and regeneration. While advances in scaffold design and fabrication methods have unlocked significant potential, challenges in scalability, material performance, and regulatory approval persist. Emerging technologies, such as nanomaterials and artificial intelligence, hold promise for overcoming these limitations and optimizing scaffold-based solutions for personalized regenerative medicine. By fostering interdisciplinary collaboration and embracing innovation, the field is poised to transform healthcare through enhanced treatment options for complex tissue defects.

REFERENCES

1. Zhu G, Zhang T, Chen M, Yao K, Huang X, Zhang B, Li Y, Liu J, Wang Y, Zhao Z. Bone physiological microenvironment and healing mechanism: Basis for future bone-tissue engineering scaffolds. Bioactive materials. 2021 Nov 1;6(11):4110-40. sciencedirect.com
2. Collins MN, Ren G, Young K, Pina S, Reis RL, Oliveira JM. Scaffold fabrication technologies and structure/function properties in bone tissue engineering. Advanced functional materials. 2021 May;31(21):2010609. wiley.com
3. Wu R, Li Y, Shen M, Yang X, Zhang L, Ke X, Yang G, Gao C, Gou Z, Xu S. Bone tissue regeneration: the role of finely tuned pore architecture of bioactive scaffolds before clinical translation. Bioactive materials. 2021 May 1;6(5):1242-54. sciencedirect.com
4. Donnaloja F, Jacchetti E, Soncini M, Raimondi MT. Natural and synthetic polymers for bone scaffolds optimization. Polymers. 2020 Apr 14;12(4):905.
5. Shimojo AA, Rodrigues IC, Perez AG, Souto EM, Gabriel LP, Webster T. Scaffolds for tissue engineering: A state-of-the-art review concerning types, properties, materials, processing, and characterization. Racing for the surface: Antimicrobial and Interface tissue engineering. 2020:647-76. [HTML]
6. Garot C, Bettega G, Picart C. Additive manufacturing of material scaffolds for bone regeneration: toward application in the clinics. Advanced functional materials. 2021 Jan;31(5):2006967.
7. Dissanayaka WL, Zhang C. Scaffold-based and scaffold-free strategies in dental pulp regeneration. Journal of endodontics. 2020 Sep 1;46(9):S81-9.
8. Suamte L, Tirkey A, Barman J, Babu PJ. Various manufacturing methods and ideal properties of scaffolds for tissue engineering applications. Smart Materials in Manufacturing. 2023 Jan 1;1:100011.
9. Koyyada A, Orsu P. Recent advancements and associated challenges of scaffold fabrication techniques in tissue engineering applications. Regenerative Engineering and Translational Medicine. 2021 Jun;7:147-59. [HTML]
10. Kim HS, Kumbar SG, Nukavarapu SP. Biomaterial-directed cell behavior for tissue engineering. Current Opinion in biomedical engineering. 2021 Mar 1;17:100260. nih.gov
11. Rivero RE, Capella V, Liaudat AC, Bosch P, Barbero CA, Rodríguez N, Rivarola CR. Mechanical physicochemical behavior and of a 3D hydrogel scaffold during cell growth and proliferation. RSC advances. 2020;10(10):5827-37. rsc.org
12. Khalilov R. A COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW OF ADVANCED NANO-BIOMATERIALS IN REGENERATIVE MEDICINE AND DRUG DELIVERY. Advances in Biology & Earth Sciences. 2023 Jan 1;8(1).
13. Tang G, Liu Z, Liu Y, Yu J, Wang X, Tan Z, Ye X. Recent trends in the development of bone regenerative biomaterials. Frontiers in Cell and Developmental biology. 2021 May 7;9:665813. frontiersin.org
14. Casarin M, Fortunato TM, Imran S, Todesco M, Sandrin D, Borile G, Toniolo I, Marchesan M, Gerosa G, Bagno A, Romanato F. Porcine Small Intestinal Submucosa (SIS) as a Suitable scaffold for the creation of a tissue-engineered urinary conduit: Decellularization, biomechanical and biocompatibility characterization using new approaches. International journal of molecular sciences. 2022 Mar 4;23(5):2826. mdpi.com
15. Power RN, Cavanagh BL, Dixon JE, Curtin CM, O'Brien FJ. Development of a gene-activated scaffold incorporating multifunctional cell-penetrating peptides for pSDF-1α delivery for enhanced angiogenesis in tissue engineering applications. International Journal of Molecular Sciences. 2022 Jan 27;23(3):1460. mdpi.com
16. Jiang S, Guo W, Tian G, Luo X, Peng L, Liu S, Sui X, Guo Q, Li X. Clinical application status of articular cartilage regeneration techniques: tissue-engineered cartilage brings new hope. Stem Cells International. 2020;2020(1):5690252. wiley.com

17. Wasyłeczko M, Sikorska W, Chwojnowski A. Review of synthetic and hybrid scaffolds in cartilage tissue engineering. Membranes. 2020 Nov 17;10(11):348.
18. Laubach M, Suresh S, Herath B, Wille ML, Delbrück H, Alabdulrahman H, Hutmacher DW, Hildebrand F. Clinical translation of a patient-specific scaffold-guided bone regeneration concept in four cases with large long bone defects. Journal of Orthopaedic Translation. 2022 May 1;34:73-84. sciencedirect.com
19. Feier AM, Portan D, Manu DR, Kostopoulos V, Kotrotsos A, Strnad G, Dobreanu M, Salcudean A, Bataga T. Primary MSCs for personalized medicine: ethical challenges, isolation and biocompatibility evaluation of 3D electrospun and printed scaffolds. Biomedicines. 2022 Jun 30;10(7):1563. mdpi.com
20. Chi J, Wang M, Chen J, Hu L, Chen Z, Backman LJ, Zhang W. Topographic orientation of scaffolds for tissue regeneration: recent advances in biomaterial design and applications. Biomimetics. 2022 Sep 12;7(3):131. mdpi.com
21. Marsudi MA, Ariski RT, Wibowo A, Cooper G, Barlian A, Rachmantyo R, Bartolo PJ. Conductive polymeric-based electroactive scaffolds for tissue engineering applications: Current progress and challenges from biomaterials and manufacturing perspectives. International Journal of Molecular Sciences. 2021 Oct 26;22(21):11543. mdpi.com

CITE AS: Mwende Muthoni D. (2024). Applications and Advances in 3D Scaffolds for Tissue Regeneration. EURASIAN EXPERIMENT JOURNAL OF PUBLIC HEALTH, 7(2):27-31.