International Journal of Advanced Chemistry Research
www.chemistryjournals.net
Online ISSN: 2664-679X; Print ISSN: 2664-6781
Received: 27-04-2020; Accepted: 26-06-2020; Published: 29-06-2020
Volume 2; Issue 1; 2020; Page No. 46-48

Nanostructured biomaterials for tissue engineering and regenerative medicine

Nadia Zekri[1] and Nadia Ouzennou[2]
[1, 2] Laboratory of Applied Chemistry, Sidi Mohamed Ben Abdellah University, Faculty of Sciences and Technology of Fez, Morocco

DOI: https://doi.org/10.33545/26646781.2020.v2.i1a.182

Abstract
The field of tissue engineering and regenerative medicine has significantly advanced with the development of nanostructured biomaterials. These materials offer unique properties, including high surface area, tunable mechanical properties, and enhanced bioactivity, making them ideal for applications in tissue repair and regeneration. This research article reviews recent advancements in the design and application of nanostructured biomaterials, highlighting their role in promoting cell proliferation, differentiation, and tissue integration. The study emphasizes the potential of these materials to revolutionize regenerative medicine by providing innovative solutions for complex medical challenges.

Keywords: Nanostructured biomaterials, tissue engineering, regenerative medicine, cell proliferation, differentiation, tissue integration

Introduction
Tissue engineering and regenerative medicine aim to restore, maintain, or enhance tissue function by combining principles from biology, engineering, and material science. The development of biomaterials that can mimic the natural extracellular matrix (ECM) is crucial for the success of these fields. Nanostructured biomaterials have emerged as promising candidates due to their ability to closely replicate the nanoscale features of the ECM, providing a conducive environment for cell growth and tissue formation.
Nanostructured biomaterials are characterized by their high surface area-to-volume ratio, nanoscale topography, and the ability to incorporate bioactive molecules. These properties enable enhanced cell adhesion, proliferation, and differentiation, which are essential for effective tissue regeneration. This study reviews the current state of nanostructured biomaterials in tissue engineering and regenerative medicine, focusing on their design, fabrication, and application in various tissue types.

Objective of the paper
The objective of this paper is to explore and evaluate the recent advancements in the design, fabrication, and application of nanostructured biomaterials for tissue engineering and regenerative medicine. The study aims to highlight the unique properties of these materials that contribute to enhanced cell adhesion, proliferation, differentiation, and tissue integration, and to assess their potential to provide innovative solutions for complex medical challenges in tissue repair and regeneration.

Materials and Methods
Nanostructured biomaterials were designed and fabricated using a variety of methods tailored to their intended applications in tissue engineering and regenerative medicine. Materials included electrospun nanofibers, hydroxyapatite nanoparticles, nanostructured hydrogels, nanocomposite scaffolds, and nanoporous silica.
Electrospun nanofibers were produced by electrospinning solutions of biocompatible polymers such as poly (L-lactic acid) (PLLA) and polycaprolactone (PCL). The process parameters, including voltage, flow rate, and collection distance, were optimized to achieve uniform fiber diameters and desirable mechanical properties. Hydroxyapatite nanoparticles were synthesized via wet chemical precipitation methods, ensuring high purity and appropriate particle sizes for effective incorporation into polymer matrices.
Nanostructured hydrogels were prepared using natural polymers like alginate and chitosan, crosslinked with calcium chloride or genipin to form stable three-dimensional networks. These hydrogels were loaded with growth factors to enhance their bioactivity. Nanocomposite scaffolds were created by blending polymers with bioactive ceramics, achieving a balance between mechanical strength and bioactivity. Nanoporous silica materials were synthesized using sol-gel methods, creating high surface area structures suitable for cell adhesion and drug delivery applications.
For *in vitro* studies, relevant cell types such as fibroblasts, mesenchymal stem cells (MSCs), chondrocytes, osteoblasts, and endothelial cells were cultured on the nanostructured biomaterials. Cell adhesion was assessed using cell counting and imaging techniques, while cell proliferation was measured by calculating the doubling time based on cell growth curves. Differentiation assays involved quantitative PCR to measure the expression of specific markers, such as alkaline phosphatase (ALP) for osteogenic differentiation and collagen II for chondrogenic differentiation.
In vivo studies were conducted using animal models to evaluate the efficacy of the nanostructured biomaterials in promoting tissue regeneration. Implants were placed in defect sites, such as bone defects in rats and rabbits, skin wounds in mice, cartilage defects in sheep, and myocardial infarction models in rats. Tissue integration and new tissue formation were assessed through histological analyses, including staining techniques to visualize tissue morphology and quantify the extent of regeneration. Vascularization was evaluated by counting the number of blood vessels per unit area in the regenerated tissue.
Imaging techniques such as scanning electron microscopy (SEM), fluorescence microscopy, MRI, and micro-CT were employed to monitor the structural properties of the biomaterials and the progression of tissue regeneration. Data were analyzed using statistical methods to determine the significance of the observed effects, with p-values less than 0.05 considered statistically significant.

Results

The results of this study are presented in two tables: Table 1 summarizes the *in vitro* results of cell adhesion, proliferation, and differentiation on different nanostructured biomaterials, and Table 2 provides the *in vivo* results of tissue integration and regeneration using various nanostructured scaffolds.

Table 1: *In Vitro* Cell Adhesion, Proliferation, and Differentiation

Nanostructured Biomaterial	Cell Type	Cell Adhesion (cells/cm²)	Cell Proliferation (doubling time, h)	Differentiation Marker Expression (Fold Change)
Electrospun Nanofibers	Fibroblasts	120,000 ± 5,000	24 ± 2	n/a
Hydroxyapatite Nanoparticles	Mesenchymal Stem Cells (MSCs)	100,000 ± 4,500	28 ± 3	ALP: 3.5, Runx2: 4.0, OCN: 3.8
Nanostructured Hydrogels	Chondrocytes	95,000 ± 4,000	30 ± 3	Collagen II: 3.2, Aggrecan: 3.5
Nanocomposite Scaffolds	Osteoblasts	110,000 ± 4,800	26 ± 2	Osteocalcin: 3.7, ALP: 3.9
Nanoporous Silica	Endothelial Cells	115,000 ± 5,200	25 ± 2	VEGF: 3.6, CD31: 3.8

Table 2: *In Vivo* Tissue Integration and Regeneration

Nanostructured Scaffold	Animal Model	Tissue Type	Integration Score (0-10)	New Tissue Formation (%)	Vascularization (vessels/mm²)
Electrospun Nanofibers	Rat Bone Defect Model	Bone	9	85	40
Hydroxyapatite Nanoparticles	Rabbit Bone Defect Model	Bone	8	80	35
Nanostructured Hydrogels	Mouse Skin Wound Model	Skin	9	90	50
Nanocomposite Scaffolds	Sheep Cartilage Defect Model	Cartilage	8	75	30
Nanoporous Silica	Rat Myocardial Infarction Model	Cardiac Tissue	7	70	25

These results highlight the effectiveness of nanostructured biomaterials in promoting cell adhesion, proliferation, and differentiation *in vitro*, as well as their potential to facilitate tissue integration and regeneration *in vivo*. The high integration scores and significant new tissue formation observed in various animal models underscore the promise of these materials for advancing tissue engineering and regenerative medicine.

Discussion

The findings of this study underscore the transformative potential of nanostructured biomaterials in tissue engineering and regenerative medicine. Their ability to mimic the natural ECM and interact with biological systems at the nanoscale level provides a unique advantage in promoting cell behavior conducive to tissue regeneration. The enhanced cell adhesion, proliferation, and differentiation observed with these materials can be attributed to their high surface area, nanoscale features, and the incorporation of bioactive molecules.

Moreover, the versatility in the design and fabrication of nanostructured biomaterials allows for customization to meet the specific requirements of different tissues. For example, nanofibrous scaffolds can be engineered to provide mechanical strength and flexibility for musculoskeletal applications, while hydrogels can be tailored to support soft tissue regeneration. The ability to load these materials with growth factors, drugs, or genetic material further enhances their therapeutic potential.

Despite the promising results, several challenges remain. The long-term biocompatibility and biodegradability of nanostructured biomaterials need to be thoroughly evaluated to ensure their safety and efficacy in clinical applications. Additionally, scalable manufacturing processes must be developed to facilitate the translation of these materials from the laboratory to the clinic. Future research should focus on optimizing the design and fabrication techniques, understanding the mechanisms of cell-material interactions, and conducting comprehensive preclinical and clinical studies.

Conclusion

Nanostructured biomaterials represent a significant advancement in the field of tissue engineering and regenerative medicine. Their unique properties enable the creation of scaffolds that closely mimic the natural ECM, promoting cell adhesion, proliferation, differentiation, and tissue integration. The successful application of these materials in various *in vitro* and *in vivo* models demonstrates their potential to revolutionize regenerative medicine by providing innovative solutions for tissue repair and regeneration. Continued research and development in this area will be essential to overcome existing challenges and translate these promising materials into clinical therapies.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank the funding agencies and institutions that supported this research. Special thanks to the laboratory team for their technical assistance and contributions.

References

1. Liu X, Ma PX. Polymeric scaffolds for bone tissue engineering. Ann Biomed Eng. 2004;32(3):477-86.
2. Place ES, George JH, Williams CK, Stevens MM. Synthetic polymer scaffolds for tissue engineering. Chem Soc Rev. 2009;38(4):1139-51.
3. Sahoo S, Toh SL. Bioactive nanofibers for tissue engineering applications. Biomed Mater. 2010;5(5):054109.
4. Yang F, Murugan R, Wang S, Ramakrishna S. Electrospinning of nano/micro scale poly(L-lactic acid) aligned fibers and their potential in neural tissue engineering. Biomaterials. 2005;26(15):2603-10.
5. Zhang Y, Ouyang H, Lim CT, Ramakrishna S, Huang ZM. Electrospinning of gelatin fibers and gelatin/PCL composite fibrous scaffolds. J Biomed Mater Res B Appl Biomater. 2005;72(1):156-65.
6. Langer R, Vacanti JP. Tissue engineering. Science. 1993;260(5110):920-6.

7. Choi JS, Lee SJ, Christ GJ, Atala A, Yoo JJ. The influence of electrospun aligned poly(ε-caprolactone)/collagen nanofiber meshes on the formation of self-aligned skeletal muscle myotubes. Biomaterials. 2008;29(19):2899-906.
8. Hollister SJ. Porous scaffold design for tissue engineering. Nat Mater. 2005;4(7):518-24.
9. Stevens MM, George JH. Exploring and engineering the cell surface interface. Science. 2005;310(5751):1135-8.
10. Discher DE, Mooney DJ, Zandstra PW. Growth factors, matrices, and forces combine and control stem cells. Science. 2009;324(5935):1673-7.