THE ENGINEER STORY

e-ISSN: 3009 - 0792 Volume 17, 2025, 5-8

A REVIEW ON BIOMATERIALS AND ADVANCED FABRICATION OF ENGINEERED SCAFFOLDS FOR BONE REGENERATION

Fatin Hazwani[1,*], Ahmad Farrahnoor[2], Daisuke Yoshino[3]
[1] Department of Applied Mechanics and Design, Faculty of Mechanical Engineering, Universiti Teknologi Malaysia, 81310 UTM Johor Bahru, Johor, Malaysia.
[2] Faculty of Mechanical Engineering, Universiti Teknologi MARA, Cawangan Pulau Pinang, 13500, Malaysia.
[3] Division of Advanced Applied Physics, Institute of Engineering, Tokyo University of Agriculture and Technology, 184-8588, Tokyo, Japan.
[*] Corresponding author: fatinhazwani@utm.my

ABSTRACT

Bone tissue engineering (BTE) represents a crucial strategy for repairing large bone defects, relying on the 3D scaffold to provide both structural support and biological guidance for tissue ingrowth. This comprehensive review analyzes recent progress in scaffold development, focusing on the essential interplay between biomaterials and advanced fabrication techniques. This paper explores composite material systems, including bio-ceramics and biodegradable polymers, designed to achieve a necessary balance of mechanical strength and bioactivity, detailing how advanced methods like 3D printing create biomimetic microarchitectures. While significant advances are noted, critical challenges persist, particularly achieving functional vascularization deep within the scaffold and resolving the mechanical mismatch to prevent implant failure. Ultimately, successful clinical translation requires integrated strategies that combine optimized structural design with biological signaling to orchestrate durable new bone formation.

KEYWORD

Bone scaffold, tissue engineering, biomaterials

INTRODUCTION

Bone is a remarkable tissue with a natural capacity for self-repair; however, large bone defects resulting from severe trauma, tumor resection, or congenital defects often exceed this intrinsic healing ability, necessitating clinical intervention [1]. Traditional treatments, such as autografts and allografts, suffer from significant drawbacks, including donor site morbidity, limited availability, and the risk of immune rejection or disease transmission [2, 3]. To overcome these limitations, the multidisciplinary field of Bone Tissue Engineering (BTE) has emerged as a promising alternative, aiming to regenerate functional bone tissue by combining three main components: cells, bioactive factors, and a three-dimensional (3D) scaffold [4]. The development of an ideal scaffold is central to this paradigm.

The primary function of a BTE scaffold is to mimic the structure and function of the native Extracellular Matrix (ECM), providing a temporary template for cell adhesion, proliferation, differentiation, and subsequent host tissue ingrowth [5]. An optimal bone scaffold must possess several critical characteristics. First, it must be biocompatible to ensure a favorable cellular response without eliciting chronic inflammation or toxicity [6]. Second, it requires a highly porous and interconnected architecture to facilitate nutrient and oxygen transport, waste removal, and vascularization throughout the construct [7]. Third, the scaffold must exhibit appropriate mechanical properties, capable of bearing physiological loads during the healing process, a common challenge given the high stiffness of native bone [8]. Finally, the scaffold should be biodegradable at a rate synchronized with new bone formation, eventually being replaced entirely by regenerated tissue [5, 9].

The selection of the appropriate biomaterial is foundational to scaffold design, determining its biological and mechanical performance. This review aims to provide a concise overview of the

most prominent biomaterials utilized for bone scaffolds and critically examine the various experimental techniques, spanning conventional methods to advanced AM strategies employed in their fabrication.

BIOMATERIALS FOR BONE SCAFFOLD FABRICATION

Polymeric biomaterials are widely used in bone tissue engineering due to their versatility, ease of processing, and tunable biodegradation rates [10]. Natural polymers such as collagen, chitosan, and gelatin offer excellent biocompatibility and cell-recognition properties, but their rapid degradation and weak mechanical strength limit their use [11, 12]. Synthetic polymers like poly (lactic acid) (PLA), poly (glycolic acid) (PGA), and poly (lactic (co-glycolic acid)) (PLGA) provide better mechanical performance and predictable degradation but may produce acidic by-products that cause localized inflammation [13, 14]. Ceramic materials such as hydroxyapatite (HA) contribute stiffness and osteoconductivity, promoting direct bone formation on the scaffold surface [15, 16]. However, their brittleness and low fracture toughness restrict use in load-bearing applications [17].

To address these limitations, polymer–ceramic composites have been developed to combine the mechanical flexibility of polymers with the bioactivity of ceramics [18]. For instance, poly(caprolactone)/hydroxyapatite (PCL/HA) composites integrate PCL's elasticity and processability with HA's osteoconductive and reinforcing properties, offering a balanced scaffold for bone tissue regeneration [19].

FABRICATION TECHNIQUES

The fabrication of 3D scaffolds with interconnected porosity is as critical as the selection of suitable biomaterials. Conventional techniques such as solvent casting and particle leaching can achieve high porosity but offer limited control over pore size uniformity and interconnectivity [20]. Similarly, the freeze-drying method, widely applied to natural polymers and hydrogels, generates porous structures through solvent sublimation but often results in anisotropic and poorly tunable architectures [21].

Additive manufacturing (AM) has transformed scaffold fabrication by enabling precise, computer-aided control of pore geometry, size, and interconnectivity. Techniques such as Fused Deposition Modeling (FDM), Stereolithography (SLA), and Digital Light Processing (DLP) allow the production of complex, patient-specific scaffolds derived from medical imaging data [22]. Recent advances in hybrid and biofabrication strategies such as combining electrospinning with 3D printing or incorporating cells and growth factors through bioprinting further enhance biological functionality and vascularization potential [23, 24]. These developments mark a significant step toward creating the next generation of personalized, bioactive scaffolds for bone tissue engineering.

CURRENT CHALLENGES

A major challenge lies in the dual requirement for the scaffold to be both mechanically robust and highly porous. Bone scaffolds must initially provide sufficient mechanical integrity to withstand physiological loading at the defect site, preventing construct collapse and allowing for early patient mobilization [25]. However, if the scaffold's stiffness is significantly higher than that of the newly forming bone tissue, it can lead to the phenomenon of stress shielding. Stress shielding reduces the mechanical stimulus necessary for native bone cells, which can ultimately cause bone resorption, non-union, and mechanical failure of the implant [26]. Achieving an ideal degradation rate, where the scaffold's mechanical properties gradually decrease to match the increase in strength of the regenerating tissue is difficult to control precisely for all defects and biomaterial chemistries [27]. Furthermore, traditional ceramics often lack the necessary toughness to prevent catastrophic failure, and polymers often lack the necessary stiffness for load-bearing sites [28].

While advanced techniques like 3D printing offer unprecedented control over macroporous architecture (pore size >100μm), they often lack the resolution necessary to replicate the nanoscale

features of the native ECM that are crucial for specific cell adhesion and signalling [29]. The journey from a promising laboratory prototype to a clinically approved device faces significant challenges related to scalability, reproducibility, and regulatory approval [30]. 3D printed scaffolds, though patient-specific, are often time-consuming to produce, and quality control over the batch-to-batch consistency of materials and printing parameters is difficult to maintain. The incorporation of growth factors (BMP-2) into scaffolds raises regulatory hurdles due to high cost, short half-life, and potential for adverse effects from uncontrolled release kinetics [31]. Finally, the current lack of standardized, validated *in vitro* models that accurately predict the long-term *in vivo* performance, especially concerning degradation byproducts and chronic inflammatory response, further complicates the translational pathway for next-generation, functionalized bone scaffolds [32].

CONCLUSION

The field of bone tissue engineering continues to advance rapidly, offering transformative solutions for large bone defect repair. The successful development of a bone scaffold hinges on the careful convergence of material science and sophisticated manufacturing. Biomaterials, spanning osteoconductive ceramics, versatile polymers, and mechanically robust composites, are selected and tailored to mimic the chemical and biological cues of the native bone matrix. Simultaneously, fabrication techniques, from conventional methods like freeze-drying to precision-driven 3D printing and electrospinning, are continually being refined to achieve the critical balance of interconnected porosity, appropriate mechanical strength, and favourable degradation kinetics. Future efforts must focus on developing smarter, bioactive scaffolds capable of guiding vascularization and cellular differentiation to fully realize the clinical promise of engineered bone substitutes.

REFERENCE

[1] Dimitriou, R., Jones, E., McGonagle, D., & Giannoudis, P. V. (2011). Bone regeneration: current concepts and future directions. BMC Medicine, 9(1), 66.

[2] Younger, E. M., & Chapman, M. W. (1989). Morbidity at bone graft donor sites. The Journal of Orthopaedic and Trauma, 3(3), 192-195.

[3] Stevens, M. M. (2008). Biomaterials for bone tissue engineering. Materials Today, 11(5), 18-25.

[4] Langer, R., & Vacanti, J. P. (1993). Tissue Engineering. Science, 260(5110), 920-926.

[5] Hollister, S. J. (2005). Porous scaffold design for tissue engineering. Nature Materials, 4(7), 518-524.

[6] Chen, G., Sato, T., & Tanaka, J. (2007). In vitro bioactivity of poly(L-lactic acid)/hydroxyapatite nanocomposite scaffolds. Journal of Biomedical Materials Research Part A, 80(2), 346-353.

[7] Karageorgiou, V., & Kaplan, D. (2005). Porosity of 3D biomaterial scaffolds and osteogenesis. Biomaterials, 26(27), 5474-5491.

[8] Detsch, R., & Boccaccini, A. R. (2015). Bone tissue engineering scaffolds based on inorganic-organic polymer hybrids. Journal of Materials Chemistry B, 3(16), 3254-3269.

[9] Hutmacher, D. W. (2000). Scaffolds in tissue engineering bone and cartilage. Biomaterials, 21(24), 2529-2543.

[10] Wei, G., & Ma, P. X. (2004). Structure and properties of nano-hydroxyapatite/polymer composite scaffolds for bone tissue engineering. Biomaterials, 25(19), 4749-4757.

[11] Ke, D., Zhou, X., Peng, Y., Zhang, X., & Li, Q. (2020). Advances in chitosan-based scaffolds for bone tissue engineering. Carbohydrate Polymers, 229, 115505.

[12] Parenteau, M., Cussons, M., Yahia, L., & Rivard, M. (2021). Collagen and gelatin-based scaffolds for bone tissue engineering. Regenerative Engineering and Translational Medicine, 7(2), 173-191.

[13] Athanasiou, K. A., Agrawal, C. M., Suedy, F., & Hadjicostas, T. (1998). The development of biomaterials for tissue engineering. Tissue Engineering, 4(2), 153-162.

[14] Middleton, J. C., & Tipton, A. J. (2000). Synthetic biodegradable polymers as orthopedic devices. Advanced Drug Delivery Reviews, 42(1-2), 1-24.
[15] Kim, T. H., Lee, J. S., Lee, D. H., & Kim, H. E. (2007). Fabrication and mechanical property of porous HA/PLLA composite scaffolds. Biomaterials, 28(29), 4335-4343.
[16] Hench, L. L. (1998). Bioceramics: from concept to clinic. Journal of the American Ceramic Society, 81(7), 1705-1728.
[17] Rezwan, K., Chen, Q. Z., Blaker, J. J., & Boccaccini, A. R. (2006). Biodegradable and bioactive polymer/inorganic composite scaffolds for bone tissue engineering. Biomaterials, 27(18), 3413-3431.
[18] Su, Y., Zhang, Z., O'Neill, E., Zhou, Y., & Wei, M. (2018). The design and optimization of composite scaffolds for bone regeneration. Current Opinion in Solid State and Materials Science, 22(4), 161-172.
[19] Shirosaki, Y., Tsuru, K., Hayakawa, S., Ohtsuki, C., Osaka, A., Motomura, T., & Ishizaki, T. (2008). Physical properties and in vitro cellular compatibility of PCL/HA scaffolds prepared by 3D plotting. Biomaterials, 29(16), 2535-2543.
[20] Thomson, R. C., Yaszemski, M. J., Powers, J. M., & Mikos, A. G. (1998). Fabrication of biodegradable polymer scaffolds to engineer bone tissue. Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences, 831(1), 32-43.
[21] Zhang, Y., Zhang, M., Chen, Y., & Zhang, Y. (2017). Freeze-casting: A versatile technique for porous materials. Advanced Materials, 29(16), 1606622.
[22] Melchels, F. P. W., Murugappan, S., & Grijpma, D. W. (2011). 3D Printing of poly(propylene fumarate) scaffolds for bone tissue engineering. Biomaterials, 32(5), 1266-1273.
[28] Bose, S., Vahabzadeh, S., & Bandyopadhyay, A. (2013). Bone tissue engineering using 3D printing. Materials Today, 16(12), 496-504.
[23] Guastaldi, F. P., Lacerda-Abreu, P. O., Ferreira-Junior, M., & Fernandes, V. (2023). Bioprinting for Bone Tissue Engineering. Advanced Healthcare Materials, 12(1), 2201968.
[24] Hollister, S. J. (2005). Porous scaffold design for tissue engineering. Nature Materials, 4(7), 518-524.
[25] Jones, A. C., Arns, T., & Boccaccini, A. R. (2017). Stress shielding in bone tissue engineering: a review of current computational and experimental approaches. Journal of Tissue Engineering and Regenerative Medicine, 11(1), 3-19.
[26] Rezwan, K., Chen, Q. Z., Blaker, J. J., & Boccaccini, A. R. (2006). Biodegradable and bioactive polymer/inorganic composite scaffolds for bone tissue engineering. Biomaterials, 27(18), 3413-3431.
[27] Bose, S., Vahabzadeh, S., & Bandyopadhyay, A. (2013). Bone tissue engineering using 3D printing. Materials Today, 16(12), 496-504.
[28] Kim, S. H., Park, J. H., & Yang, S. Y. (2018). 3D printing and electrospinning in bone tissue engineering. Polymers, 10(9), 1016.
[29] Ghassemi, P., Karslidis, C., & Zhang, Y. (2020). Converging 3D printing and electrospinning for hierarchical scaffolds: a review. Advanced Science, 7(12), 2000571.
[30] Giannoudis, P. V., Einhorn, T. A., & Marsh, D. (2019). Bone regeneration: a complex biological process and clinical challenge. Injury, 50, S1-S5.
[31] Hutmacher, D. W., Sittinger, M., & Klug, F. (2018). Scaffolds in tissue engineering: the great escape. Nature Reviews Materials, 3(7), 241-253.
[32] Lee, K., Silva, E. A., & Mooney, D. J. (2011). Growth factor delivery for tissue engineering. Journal of Controlled Release, 153(3), 198-208.