Vol. 12, No. 2, December 2025, ISSN: 2049-4963

www.ijbmsp.org

Additive Manufacturing in tissue engineering: Advances in bioinks, scaffold design, and regenerative therapies

Sobia Mehreen[1], Noorulain Riaz[2], Sania Ikram[1], Adeen Rehman[1], Muhammad Amir Khan[3]

[1]Department of Biological Sciences, National University of Medical Sciences, Islamabad, Punjab, Pakistan.

[2]Department of Pharmacy, Kohat University of Science and Technology, Kohat, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan.

[3]Department of Foreign Medical Education, Fergana Medical Institute of public, 2A Yangi Turon Street, Fergana, 150100, Uzbekistan

Email: amirwazir568@gmail.com

Abstract - Additive manufacturing (AM), commonly referred to as 3D printing, has emerged as a transformative technology in tissue engineering, enabling the fabrication of complex, patient-specific scaffolds with precise control over architecture, porosity, and material composition. This review highlights recent advances in bioinks, scaffold design, and regenerative therapies, emphasizing their critical role in promoting cellular proliferation, differentiation, and tissue maturation. Natural, synthetic, and hybrid bioinks are discussed, focusing on their printability, biocompatibility, and incorporation of bioactive cues. Scaffold design strategies, including structural optimization, biomimetic architectures, and functionalization with growth factors or nanoparticles, are examined for their capacity to enhance mechanical performance and tissue integration. Applications in bone, cartilage, skin, cardiovascular, and neural regeneration are reviewed, demonstrating the potential of AM to address complex tissue defects. Current challenges, such as limited vascularization, cell viability, mechanical constraints, and regulatory hurdles, are also analyzed. Finally, future perspectives emphasize the integration of smart materials, 4D bioprinting, and AI-assisted design to achieve patient-specific, multifunctional, and clinically translatable tissue constructs. Collectively, this review provides a comprehensive overview of AM's role in advancing regenerative medicine and highlights emerging trends toward personalized and effective tissue therapies.

Keywords - Additive Manufacturing, tissue engineering, bioinks, scaffold design, regenerative medicine

1. Introduction

Tissue engineering has emerged as a transformative field aimed at restoring, maintaining, or improving tissue function by combining cells, biomaterials, and bioactive molecules [1].However, the fabrication of physiologically relevant three-dimensional (3D) tissue constructs that replicate the complexity of native tissues remains a major challenge. Conventional scaffold fabrication techniques such as solvent casting, particulate leaching, gas foaming, and electrospinning often lack the precision, reproducibility, and structural control necessary to mimic the native extracellular matrix (ECM) [2]. In this context, additive manufacturing (AM), commonly known as 3D printing, has revolutionized the landscape of biomedical engineering by enabling the creation of customized, patient-specific, and highly controlled architectures with microscale precision [3].

Additive manufacturing operates on a layer-by-layer deposition principle, allowing the precise spatial arrangement of biomaterials and living cells in three dimension [4]. This bottom-up approach offers several advantages over traditional methods, including the ability to control porosity, mechanical properties, and material composition in a programmable manner [5]. The integration of AM with bioprinting technologies has further advanced tissue engineering by facilitating the direct incorporation of living cells, growth factors, and bioactive agents into printable bioinks, thereby allowing the fabrication of biologically functional tissues and organ-like constructs [6]. Recent advancements in bioinks, scaffold design, and printing techniques have significantly improved the fidelity and biological performance of printed constructs [7]. Meanwhile, innovations in scaffold design and computational modeling have enabled the development of biomimetic architectures that closely resemble the mechanical and biochemical cues of native tissues [8]. These advances collectively open new possibilities for regenerative therapies, including bone and cartilage repair, wound healing, neural regeneration, and the development of vascularized tissues [9]. This review aims to provide a comprehensive overview of recent advancements in additive manufacturing for tissue engineering, with a particular focus on the evolution of bioinks, scaffold design

strategies, and their application in regenerative medicine. Furthermore, current challenges, limitations, and future perspectives are discussed to highlight the potential of this rapidly evolving technology in shaping the next generation of patient-specific regenerative therapies.

2. Fundamentals of Additive Manufacturing in Biomedicine

Additive manufacturing (AM), commonly referred to as 3D printing, is a layer-by-layer fabrication technique that has transformed biomedical engineering by enabling the construction of complex and patient-specific structures [10]. Unlike conventional subtractive methods, which involve cutting or molding, AM builds objects directly from digital blueprints, allowing unmatched control over geometry, porosity, and composition [11]. The technique operates by depositing successive layers of biomaterials in a predesigned pattern until a three-dimensional construct is formed. This digital-driven precision offers exceptional design flexibility and reproducibility while minimizing material waste [12, 13]. The growing use of AM in biomedicine is primarily driven by its capacity to fabricate scaffolds, implants, and drug delivery systems with customized architecture, making it an indispensable tool in tissue engineering and regenerative medicine [14]. Furthermore, the integration of computer-aided design (CAD) and imaging data such as MRI or CT scans has enabled patient-specific medical solutions that align precisely with individual anatomical structures [15, 16].

Several AM technologies have been adapted for biomedical applications, each employing different fabrication mechanisms to suit specific materials and purposes. Stereolithography (SLA), one of the earliest and most precise AM techniques [17], utilizes photopolymerization to solidify resin under controlled light exposure, achieving high resolution ideal for microtissue constructs [18]. Fused Deposition Modeling (FDM) is widely used due to its simplicity and affordability, extruding thermoplastic polymers such as PLA or PCL to create robust scaffolds for bone and cartilage repair [19].Selective Laser Sintering (SLS) and Electron Beam Melting (EBM), on the other hand, are powder-based methods suitable for producing metallic and ceramic implants with excellent mechanical strength [20]. More recently, inkjet and extrusion-based bioprinting techniques have gained prominence as they allow the direct deposition of bioinks laden with living cells and biomolecules, paving the way for functional tissue and organ fabrication [21]. Each of these AM methods offers unique advantages depending on the targeted biomedical application, required resolution, and material compatibility.

The digital workflow is central to the success of additive manufacturing in the biomedical field. It typically begins with data acquisition using imaging modalities such as CT or MRI, followed by 3D reconstruction through CAD software to create precise anatomical models [22, 23]. These digital designs are sliced into thin layers to guide the printer's movements and determine structural resolution. Print parameters such as nozzle diameter, extrusion pressure, laser intensity, and layer thickness are carefully optimized to achieve desired porosity, surface topography, and mechanical stability [13, 24]. Computational tools like finite element analysis (FEA) assist in simulating the mechanical performance and nutrient diffusion of the printed structures before fabrication [25]. Moreover, the integration of artificial intelligence (AI) and machine learning (ML) into AM processes has enhanced design optimization, predictive modeling, and error correction during printing [26]. This digital-to-physical synergy has made it possible to fabricate reproducible, complex, and functional tissue constructs tailored for specific clinical applications [27].

Material selection plays a pivotal role in determining the biological and mechanical properties of AM-fabricated structures [28]. Biomaterials used in AM are broadly classified into natural, synthetic, and composite materials. Natural polymers such as collagen, gelatin, alginate, chitosan, and hyaluronic acid provide excellent biocompatibility and mimic the native extracellular matrix (ECM), although their weak mechanical properties often limit their structural use [29]. Synthetic polymers, including PLA, PLGA, PEG, and PCL, offer tunable degradation rates and mechanical strength, making them ideal for load-bearing scaffolds [30]. Ceramics, such as hydroxyapatite and tricalcium phosphate, are commonly used for bone tissue regeneration due to their osteoconductive nature [31], while metallic biomaterials like titanium and its alloys are favored for orthopedic and dental implants [32]. The emergence of composite and hybrid biomaterials combines the biological activity of natural polymers with the robustness of synthetics, enabling multifunctional scaffolds capable of promoting cell attachment, proliferation, and differentiation [33]. Recent advancements in material science have led to the development of smart and stimuli-responsive materials that can adapt to physiological environments by responding to pH, temperature, or magnetic fields [34]. These innovations, coupled with advancements in multi-material and 4D printing, have significantly expanded the biomedical potential of additive manufacturing. 4D printing, for example, introduces a temporal dimension by allowing printed constructions to undergo shape transformation or functional activation over time [35]. Moreover, improvements in bioink formulation, including cell-laden hydrogels and nanocomposite blends, have brought AM closer to clinical translation by enabling the fabrication of living tissues with native-like properties [36]. Despite challenges related to vascularization, cell viability, and regulatory approval, the integration of digital design, advanced biomaterials, and bioprinting technologies continues to drive AM as a cornerstone of next-generation tissue engineering and regenerative medicine [37].

3. Bioinks for Tissue Engineering

Bioinks are the cornerstone of bioprinting and play a pivotal role in the fabrication of functional tissue constructs. They serve as carriers for living cells, biomolecules, and growth factors while providing a structural framework that mimics the natural extracellular matrix (ECM) [38]. The formulation of an ideal bioink requires a careful balance between printability, biocompatibility, mechanical integrity,

and bio functionality [39, 40]. A bioink must maintain its rheological stability during extrusion, support high cell viability under shear stress, and form a stable, porous architecture after printing [41]. Typically, bioinks are composed of hydrogel matrices, either natural, synthetic, or hybrid polymers, that allow diffusion of oxygen and nutrients while maintaining a moist microenvironment for cell survival [42]. The development of bioinks has evolved from simple polymeric gels to complex formulations that incorporate nanomaterials, bioactive molecules, and even living cells, transforming additive manufacturing into a truly biological fabrication process capable of replicating native tissue organization [43].

Natural polymer-based bioinks have gained considerable attention due to their excellent biocompatibility and structural resemblance to the native ECM [44, 45] Materials such as alginate, gelatin, collagen, chitosan, and hyaluronic acid have been extensively used in tissue engineering applications [46]. Alginate, known for its rapid ionic crosslinking ability, provides structural support but lacks cell adhesion sites, often necessitating modification or blending with other polymers [47]. Gelatin and its Methacrylated derivative (GelMA) offer superior biological recognition and tunable mechanical properties, making them ideal for soft tissue bioprinting [48]. Similarly, chitosan and hyaluronic acid enhance cell proliferation and wound healing but require chemical modifications to achieve consistent printability [49, 50]. Despite these advantages, the poor mechanical robustness and variability of natural polymers limit their standalone use, prompting the emergence of hybrid bioinks that combine natural bioactivity with synthetic reinforcement [51]. In contrast, synthetic bioinks including polyethylene glycol (PEG), polycaprolactone (PCL), and poly(lactic-co-glycolic acid) (PLGA)—offer controlled physicochemical properties, high reproducibility, and tunable degradation rates suitable for long-term tissue regeneration [52]. PEG-based systems can be functionalized with peptides or cell-adhesive motifs, while thermoplastic polymers like PCL provide structural scaffolding in combination with softer hydrogels [53]. Synthetic materials also enable fine-tuning of mechanical properties to match those of native tissues such as bone or cartilage [54]. However, their inert nature often requires surface modification or co-printing with natural biomaterials to improve bioactivity and cell response. The most recent developments involve composite and nanocomposite bioinks, which incorporate nanoparticles such as graphene oxide, hydroxyapatite, or silica to enhance printability, conductivity, or osteogenic potential [55]. These formulations demonstrate how bioinks can be engineered not only to support structural fidelity but also to deliver biological signals that drive tissue-specific regeneration [56].

Recent research has focused on developing smart and stimuli-responsive bioinks capable of dynamic interactions with their environment [57]. These innovative materials can respond to external cues such as temperature, pH, light, or magnetic fields, allowing spatiotemporal control of mechanical and biological functions [58]. For instance, thermoresponsive hydrogels like Pluronic F127 and PNIPAAm enable reversible sol–gel transitions, facilitating on-demand printing and structural tuning [59]. Moreover, cell-laden bioinks now incorporate growth factors, gene vectors, and extracellular vesicles to enhance angiogenesis and tissue integration [60]. Despite remarkable progress, challenges such as limited vascularization, cell survival during printing, and regulatory standardization continue to hinder clinical translation [61] Nonetheless, continuous advances in biomaterial chemistry, crosslinking strategies, and digital bioprinting technologies are steadily overcoming these limitations [62]. The future of tissue engineering lies in customized, multifunctional bioinks that integrate mechanical precision, biological complexity, and environmental responsiveness to create viable, functional tissues suitable for regenerative medicine[63].

4. Scaffold Design and Fabrication

4.1. Structural and Mechanical Considerations

The design and fabrication of scaffolds are central to tissue engineering because they provide the three-dimensional framework that supports cell attachment, proliferation, and tissue regeneration [64]. An ideal scaffold must possess the appropriate mechanical strength, porosity, and degradation profile to mimic the native extracellular matrix (ECM) and accommodate the physiological forces of the target tissue [65]. The pore size, interconnectivity, and surface roughness influence not only mechanical integrity but also cellular infiltration, nutrient diffusion, and vascularization[66]. For instance, bone scaffolds typically require pore sizes above 300 μm for osteogenesis, whereas skin or cartilage constructs benefit from smaller, more uniform pores [67]. Additive manufacturing enables precise control over these parameters by adjusting printing resolution, infill pattern, and material composition. Moreover, the mechanical properties of scaffolds can be customized by modifying polymer blends, incorporating reinforcing fillers, or adjusting crosslinking density. Such structural tunability is critical to ensure that the scaffold provides temporary mechanical support while gradually degrading as new tissue forms [68].

4.2. Biomimetic Scaffold Architectures

Recent advancements in 3D printing have enabled the creation of biomimetic scaffold architectures that replicate the complex hierarchical structure of native tissues [69]. These designs often integrate gradients in stiffness, porosity, or biochemical cues to reproduce the heterogeneous nature of biological systems. For example, osteochondral scaffolds incorporate a dual-layer structure that transitions from a hard, mineralized base for bone regeneration to a soft, collagen-rich top for cartilage repair [70]. The use of multi-material and multi-nozzle printing systems allows spatial deposition of different polymers, ceramics, or bioinks to achieve these functional gradients [71]. Computational design tools and finite element modeling (FEM) further assist in predicting mechanical behavior and optimizing the architecture for load-bearing applications [72]. Advances in

4D printing where scaffolds change shape or property over time in response to stimuli are also contributing to the development of adaptive, self-assembling tissue constructs [73]. These biomimetic architectures enhance cellular responses, promote tissue integration, and bring engineered constructs closer to replicating natural organ complexity [74].

4.3. Functionalization Strategies

To improve the biological performance of scaffolds, surface and bulk functionalization strategies are widely employed [75]. Surface modification techniques such as plasma treatment, chemical grafting, and peptide conjugation introduce bioactive groups that enhance cell adhesion and proliferation [76]. Incorporating growth factors like bone morphogenetic proteins (BMPs), vascular endothelial growth factor (VEGF), or epidermal growth factor (EGF) into the scaffold matrix allows controlled release that directs tissue-specific differentiation and healing [77]. Furthermore, nanostructured coatings or the incorporation of nanoparticles—such as silver for antibacterial activity or hydroxyapatite for osteoconductive enhance both functionality and biocompatibility [78, 79]. The integration of stimuli-responsive components enables smart scaffolds capable of modulating their behavior under physiological triggers, such as pH or temperature changes [80]. Additionally, functionalization with extracellular matrix-derived peptides (e.g., RGD, YIGSR) enhances cell–matrix interactions and accelerates tissue maturation [81].These strategies transform inert scaffolds into bioactive platforms that actively participate in cellular signaling and tissue regeneration.

5. Regenerative Therapies and Applications

5.1. Tissue Regeneration and Wound Healing

Regenerative therapies aim to restore the structure and function of damaged tissues by combining scaffolds, bioactive molecules, and living cells to recreate the native healing environment [82, 83]. In wound healing, engineered scaffolds not only act as physical barriers against infection but also as biological templates that guide fibroblast migration, collagen deposition, and neovascularization [84]. Incorporation of anti-inflammatory agents, growth factors, or stem cells further accelerate tissue granulation and epithelialization [85, 86]. Materials such as collagen, chitosan, and hyaluronic acid are widely utilized for skin regeneration because of their inherent biocompatibility and ability to maintain a moist wound environment [87, 88]. Moreover, the use of nitric oxide-releasing or antimicrobial nanoparticle-loaded scaffolds provides dual benefits of bacterial inhibition and enhanced tissue repair. These advanced therapeutic systems demonstrate significant potential to reduce healing time, minimize scar formation, and improve functional recovery in chronic and infected wounds [89].

5.2. Bone and Cartilage Regeneration

Bone and cartilage defects present major clinical challenges due to their limited self-healing capacity and complex microarchitecture [90]. Regenerative approaches utilize bioceramic-, polymer-, or composite-based scaffolds seeded with osteogenic or chondrogenic cells to promote mineralization and matrix deposition [50, 91]. Hydroxyapatite, tricalcium phosphate, and bioactive glass are commonly incorporated to provide mechanical strength and osteoconductive, while natural polymers such as gelatin or alginate enhance biocompatibility [92].Growth factors including BMP-2 and TGF-β are frequently embedded to stimulate cellular differentiation and matrix synthesis [93]. In cartilage repair, scaffolds with gradient porosity or dual-phase designs enable simultaneous bone and cartilage regeneration at the osteochondral interface[94]. Moreover, 3D bioprinting of patient-specific constructs using autologous stem cells has shown promising outcomes in reconstructive and orthopedic applications [95]. These developments indicate that scaffold-assisted bone and cartilage regeneration can offer a viable alternative to grafts or prosthetic implants in clinical settings.

5.3. Cardiovascular and Neural Applications

In cardiovascular tissue engineering, regenerative scaffolds aim to restore vascular integrity and cardiac function following ischemic injury [96]. Biodegradable polymers such as polycaprolactone (PCL) and polylactic-co-glycolic acid (PLGA) have been used to fabricate vascular grafts, heart patches, and stents with improved biocompatibility and endothelialization capacity [97, 98]. The integration of angiogenic factors such as VEGF or nitric oxide donors enhances neovascularization and perfusion in ischemic tissues [99]. Similarly, in neural regeneration, conductive scaffolds incorporating graphene, carbon nanotubes, or MXenes facilitate electrical signal transmission and promote axonal growth [100]. The inclusion of neurotrophic factors and aligned fiber topography further supports neuronal differentiation and functional recovery [45, 101]. These biomaterial-based interventions demonstrate how scaffold-assisted regenerative therapies can bridge structural and functional gaps in complex tissues such as the heart and nervous system, where conventional treatments remain inadequate [102, 103].

5.4. Emerging Clinical and Translational Perspectives

Although regenerative scaffolds and nano therapeutic systems have demonstrated promising preclinical outcomes, their clinical translation remains challenging due to issues of scalability, immune compatibility, and regulatory approval[104]. Standardization of scaffold fabrication, sterilization, and storage is essential to ensure reproducibility and patient safety [105]. The advent of personalized medicine and 3D bioprinting offers opportunities for patient-specific constructions that match defect geometry and biological requirements [106]. Moreover, integrating stem cell therapy, gene delivery, and bio responsive drug systems can further enhance therapeutic precision. Ongoing clinical trials in chronic wounds, bone defects, and cardiovascular disorders are validating the long-term safety and efficacy of these engineered systems.

As interdisciplinary innovations continue to evolve, the combination of advanced materials, intelligent design, and biological insights holds the potential to revolutionize regenerative medicine, ultimately achieving functional tissue restoration and improved quality of life for patients [107].

6. Challenges and Limitations

Despite significant advancements in additive manufacturing and tissue engineering, several challenges limit the widespread clinical translation of these technologies. One major issue is the biological and material constraints inherent to scaffold fabrication [108]. Many natural polymers, while highly biocompatible, lack sufficient mechanical strength and structural stability for load-bearing applications, whereas synthetic polymers often exhibit limited bioactivity and cell-interactive properties [109]. Achieving a balance between mechanical robustness and biological functionality remains difficult. Additionally, maintaining cell viability and functionality during and after the printing process is challenging, especially in thick or highly complex constructs where nutrient and oxygen diffusion is restricted [110]. Vascularization within engineered tissues remains a critical barrier, as insufficient blood supply can lead to hypoxia, necrosis, and impaired tissue maturation [111]. Moreover, the degradation kinetics of biomaterials must be carefully tuned to match tissue regeneration rates, as premature degradation can compromise structural support while delayed degradation may hinder integration.

Technical, regulatory, and translational challenges further hinder clinical adoption [112]. Reproducibility and scalability of additive manufacturing processes are limited by printer resolution, material inconsistencies, and variations in bioink preparation. Sterilization and storage of cell-laden constructs present additional hurdles, particularly for off-the-shelf therapies. Regulatory frameworks for complex, personalized, and biologically active constructions are still evolving, requiring rigorous safety and efficacy testing [113] Ethical concerns also arise when using stem cells or patient-derived tissues [114]. Finally, cost-effectiveness remains a significant limitation for widespread clinical implementation [115]. Overcoming these challenges requires continued interdisciplinary innovation in biomaterials, printing technologies, computational modeling, and clinical validation, alongside standardized protocols and regulatory guidance [116]. Addressing these limitations is essential to translating the promise of additive manufacturing from experimental studies to practical, patient-specific regenerative therapies.

7. Conclusion and Future Perspectives

Additive manufacturing has revolutionized tissue engineering by providing unprecedented control over scaffold architecture, material composition, and cellular organization. The ability to fabricate patient-specific constructs with precise micro- and macro-scale features has significantly improved the design of scaffolds, bioinks, and functionalized materials for regenerative therapies. Emerging technologies such as 4D bioprinting, multi-material printing, and AI-assisted design optimization are poised to further enhance scaffold functionality, enabling dynamic, stimuli-responsive constructs that can adapt to the physiological environment. Integration of smart bioinks and nanocomposite materials allows precise control over mechanical, chemical, and biological cues, promoting cell proliferation, differentiation, and tissue maturation. These advancements hold great promise for addressing complex tissue defects that are difficult to treat with conventional therapies.

Looking forward, the successful clinical translation of additive manufacturing in tissue engineering will rely on overcoming remaining biological, technical, and regulatory challenges. Strategies to enhance vascularization, nutrient diffusion, and long-term cell viability are essential for fabricating thick or highly metabolic tissues. Standardization of printing protocols, bioink formulations, and scaffold functionalization will improve reproducibility and ensure safety for clinical applications. Moreover, combining AM with stem cell therapy, gene delivery, and controlled release systems may enable personalized regenerative treatments tailored to individual patients. Continued collaboration among material scientists, engineers, and clinicians will be critical for developing constructs that not only replicate tissue architecture but also restore functional and physiological performance in vivo.

In conclusion, additive manufacturing has transformed the landscape of tissue engineering by providing versatile tools to design and fabricate biologically functional scaffolds. While challenges remain, ongoing innovations in bioinks, scaffold design, and bioprinting technologies are steadily bridging the gap between laboratory research and clinical applications. The future of regenerative medicine lies in intelligent, patient-specific, and multifunctional constructs that integrate structural precision with biological activity. With continued interdisciplinary efforts and technological refinement, additive manufacturing is poised to become a cornerstone of next-generation tissue regeneration, enabling the development of therapies that restore damaged tissues, improve patient outcomes, and advance the field of personalized medicine.

Acknowledgment

The author would like to acknowledge the National University of Medical Sciences, (NUMS), Punjab, Pakistan for its valuable support and contribution to the research.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare no conflicts of interest related to this work.

References

[1] D. Veeman *et al.*, "Additive manufacturing of biopolymers for tissue engineering and regenerative medicine: an overview, potential applications, advancements, and trends," *International Journal of Polymer Science,* vol. 2021, no. 1, p. 4907027, 2021.

[2] F. Azari and R. Jazaei, "Advancements and Challenges in Soft Tissue Engineering: A Comprehensive Review of Additive Manufacturing Technologies," in *ASME 2024 International Mechanical Engineering Congress and Exposition*, 2024, vol.

Volume 4: Biomedical and Biotechnology Engineering, V004T06A049, doi: 10.1115/imece2024-145980. [Online]. Available: https://doi.org/10.1115/IMECE2024-145980

[3] S. Boopathi and P. Kumar, "Advanced bioprinting processes using additive manufacturing technologies: Revolutionizing tissue engineering. 3D Printing Technologies: Digital Manufacturing," *Artificial Intelligence, Industry,* vol. 4, p. 95, 2024.

[4] M. J. Mirzaali, V. Moosabeiki, S. M. Rajaai, J. Zhou, and A. A. Zadpoor, "Additive manufacturing of biomaterials—design principles and their implementation," *Materials,* vol. 15, no. 15, p. 5457, 2022.

[5] L. Zhou *et al.*, "Additive manufacturing: a comprehensive review," *Sensors,* vol. 24, no. 9, p. 2668, 2024.

[6] J. Cho *et al.*, "Transformative Mechanical and Piezoelectric Properties in Organic–Inorganic Hybrid Materials for Biomedical Applications," *ACS Nano,* vol. 19, no. 41, pp. 36035-36081, 2025/10/21 2025, doi: 10.1021/acsnano.5c07220.

[7] S. Zoghi, "Advancements in tissue engineering: A review of bioprinting techniques, scaffolds, and bioinks," *Biomedical Engineering and Computational Biology,* vol. 15, p. 11795972241288099, 2024.

[8] S. R. Shah, C. D. Modi, S. Singh, D. D. Mori, M. M. Soniwala, and B. G. Prajapati, "Recent advances in additive manufacturing of polycaprolactone-based scaffolds for tissue engineering applications: a comprehensive review," *Regenerative Engineering and Translational Medicine,* vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 112-131, 2025.

[9] X. Zhao *et al.*, "Beyond hype: unveiling the Real challenges in clinical translation of 3D printed bone scaffolds and the fresh prospects of bioprinted organoids," *Journal of Nanobiotechnology,* vol. 22, no. 1, p. 500, 2024/08/21 2024, doi: 10.1186/s12951-024-02759-z.

[10] C.-F. Bănică, A. Sover, and D.-C. Anghel, "Printing the future layer by layer: a comprehensive exploration of additive manufacturing in the era of industry 4.0," *Applied Sciences,* vol. 14, no. 21, p. 9919, 2024.

[11] H. K. Surmen, F. Ortes, and Y. Z. Arslan, "Fundamentals of 3D printing and its applications in biomedical engineering," in *3D Printing in Biomedical Engineering*: Springer, 2020, pp. 23-41.

[12] H. Yi, X. Guo, F. Chang, J. An, and C. Chua, "Ink-jetting-based conformal additive manufacturing: advantages, opportunities, and challenges," *International Journal of Extreme Manufacturing,* 2025.

[13] A. Waleed *et al.*, "Nanotechnology and biomedical devices used as a novel tool in biosensing and bioimaging of disease," *Journal of Women Medical and Dental College,* vol. 1, no. 4, 2023.

[14] B. Sun, Q. Ma, X. Wang, J. Liu, and M. Rejab, "Additive manufacturing in medical applications: a brief review," in *IOP conference series: materials science and engineering*, 2021, vol. 1078, no. 1: IOP Publishing, p. 012007.

[15] M. Maintz *et al.*, "Patient-specific implants made of 3D printed bioresorbable polymers at the point-of-care: material, technology, and scope of surgical application," *3D Printing in Medicine,* vol. 10, no. 1, p. 13, 2024/04/19 2024, doi: 10.1186/s41205-024-00207-0.

[16] M. Aftab *et al.*, "Biomedical Applications of Carbon Dots: Advances in Antimicrobial Therapy and Targeted Delivery Systems," *Biomedical Materials & Devices,* pp. 1-22, 2025.

[17] S. Deshmane, P. Kendre, H. Mahajan, and S. Jain, "Stereolithography 3D printing technology in pharmaceuticals: a review," *Drug Development and Industrial Pharmacy,* vol. 47, no. 9, pp. 1362-1372, 2021.

[18] A. K. Kushwaha *et al.*, "Fundamentals of stereolithography: techniques, properties, and applications," in *Tribology of additively manufactured materials*: Elsevier, 2022, pp. 87-106.

[19] M. Montez *et al.*, "Fused deposition modeling (FDM): processes, material properties, and applications," in *Tribology of Additively Manufactured Materials*: Elsevier, 2022, pp. 137-163.

[20] P. Upadhyay, S. Agarwal, R. Chauhan, and S. Upadhyay, "Fundamental Concepts of Additive Manufacturing in the Biomedical Field," in *Handbook of 3D Printing in Biomedical Applications*: CRC Press, pp. 1-20.

[21] R. R. Jose, M. J. Rodriguez, T. A. Dixon, F. Omenetto, and D. L. Kaplan, "Evolution of bioinks and additive manufacturing technologies for 3D bioprinting," *ACS biomaterials science & engineering,* vol. 2, no. 10, pp. 1662-1678, 2016.

[22] C. Zhang, R. Pinquié, A. Polette, G. Carasi, H. De Charnace, and J.-P. Pernot, "Automatic 3D CAD models reconstruction from 2D orthographic drawings," *Computers & Graphics,* vol. 114, pp. 179-189, 2023.

[23] M. Ullah *et al.*, "Clindamycin-loaded polyhydroxyalkanoate nanoparticles for the treatment of methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus-infected wounds," *Pharmaceutics,* vol. 16, no. 10, p. 1315, 2024.

[24] A. C. C. Law *et al.*, "Process parameter optimization for reproducible fabrication of layer porosity quality of 3D-printed tissue scaffold," *Journal of Intelligent Manufacturing,* vol. 35, no. 4, pp. 1825-1844, 2024.

[25] Z. Yang, *Finite element analysis for biomedical engineering applications*. CRC Press, 2019.

[26] F. Ciccone, A. Bacciaglia, and A. Ceruti, "Optimization with artificial intelligence in additive manufacturing: a systematic review," *Journal of the Brazilian Society of Mechanical Sciences and Engineering,* vol. 45, no. 6, p. 303, 2023.

[27] W. Clarke, *The smart revolution: how AI and 3D printing are transforming industry*. eBookIt. com, 2024.

[28] P. Pesode and S. Barve, "Additive manufacturing of metallic biomaterials and its biocompatibility," *Materials Today: Proceedings,* 2022.

[29] L. Zhao, Y. Zhou, J. Zhang, H. Liang, X. Chen, and H. Tan, "Natural polymer-based hydrogels: From polymer to biomedical applications," *Pharmaceutics,* vol. 15, no. 10, p. 2514, 2023.

[30] A. V. Manzhirov, "Fundamentals of mechanical design and analysis for am fabricated parts," *Procedia Manufacturing,* vol. 7, pp. 59-65, 2017.

[31] S. K. Kucko, S. M. Raeman, and T. J. Keenan, "Current advances in hydroxyapatite-and β-tricalcium phosphate-based composites for biomedical applications: a review," *Biomedical Materials & Devices,* vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 49-65, 2023.

[32] F. D. Al-Shalawi *et al.*, "Biomaterials as implants in the orthopedic field for regenerative medicine: metal versus synthetic polymers," *Polymers,* vol. 15, no. 12, p. 2601, 2023.

[33] S. Kumari *et al.*, "Design strategies for composite matrix and multifunctional polymeric scaffolds with enhanced bioactivity for bone tissue engineering," *Frontiers in Chemistry,* vol. 10, p. 1051678, 2022.

[34] H. Wei, J. Cui, K. Lin, J. Xie, and X. Wang, "Recent advances in smart stimuli-responsive biomaterials for bone therapeutics and regeneration," *Bone research,* vol. 10, no. 1, p. 17, 2022.

[35] M. Han, Y. Yang, and L. Li, "Energy consumption modeling of 4D printing thermal-responsive polymers with integrated compositional design for material," *Additive Manufacturing,* vol. 34, p. 101223, 2020.

[36] C. Chandarana, D. Sane, S. Mishra, A. chaubey, U. Gohil, and B. Prajapati, "Recent Advances in Bioink Research for Biomedical Applications," *Biomedical Materials & Devices,* pp. 1-32, 2025.

[37] Z. Akhtar, "Exploring biomedical engineering (BME): Advances within accelerated computing and regenerative medicine for a computational and medical science perspective exploration analysis," *J. Emerg. Med. OA,* vol. 2, pp. 1-23, 2024.

[38] C.-Y. Zhang *et al.*, "Three-dimensional bioprinting of decellularized extracellular matrix-based bioinks for tissue engineering," *Molecules,* vol. 27, no. 11, p. 3442, 2022.

[39] J. Nulty, R. Schipani, R. Burdis, and D. J. Kelly, "Bioinks and their applications in tissue engineering," in *Polymer-Based Additive Manufacturing: Biomedical Applications*: Springer, 2019, pp. 187-218.

[40] M. Aftab *et al.*, "Recent Trends and Future Directions in 3D Printing of Biocompatible Polymers," *Journal of Manufacturing and Materials Processing,* vol. 9, no. 4, p. 129, 2025.

[41] M. A. Habib and B. Khoda, "Rheological analysis of bio-ink for 3D bio-printing processes," *Journal of manufacturing processes,* vol. 76, pp. 708-718, 2022.

[42] A. Ullah, M. Ullah, and S. I. Lim, "Recent advancements in nanotechnology based drug delivery for the management of cardiovascular disease," *Current problems in cardiology,* vol. 49, no. 4, p. 102396, 2024.

[43] K. S. Iyer *et al.*, "Microgel-based bioink for extrusion-based 3D bioprinting and its applications in tissue engineering," *Bioactive Materials,* vol. 48, pp. 273-293, 2025.

[44] C. Benwood *et al.*, "Natural biomaterials and their use as bioinks for printing tissues," *Bioengineering,* vol. 8, no. 2, p. 27, 2021.

[45] M. A. Khan *et al.*, "3D printing technology and its revolutionary role in stent implementation in cardiovascular disease," *Current Problems in Cardiology,* vol. 49, no. 6, p. 102568, 2024.

[46] D. R. Sahoo and T. Biswal, "Alginate and its application to tissue engineering," *SN Applied Sciences,* vol. 3, no. 1, p. 30, 2021.
[47] A. Hurtado, A. A. Aljabali, V. Mishra, M. M. Tambuwala, and Á. Serrano-Aroca, "Alginate: Enhancement strategies for advanced applications," *International Journal of Molecular Sciences,* vol. 23, no. 9, p. 4486, 2022.
[48] S. Asim, T. A. Tabish, U. Liaqat, I. T. Ozbolat, and M. Rizwan, "Advances in gelatin bioinks to optimize bioprinted cell functions," *Advanced healthcare materials,* vol. 12, no. 17, p. 2203148, 2023.
[49] Y.-W. Ding, Z.-Y. Wang, Z.-W. Ren, X.-W. Zhang, and D.-X. Wei, "Advances in modified hyaluronic acid-based hydrogels for skin wound healing," *Biomaterials Science,* vol. 10, no. 13, pp. 3393-3409, 2022.
[50] S. U. Khan *et al.*, "Nanotherapeutic approaches for transdermal drug delivery systems and their biomedical applications," *European Polymer Journal,* vol. 207, p. 112819, 2024.
[51] J. Kerwald, A. G. De Mitri, J. A. de Moura Delezuk, G. J. de Castilho, and M. M. Beppu, "Natural Polymers and Their Processing: Bottlenecks to Overcome Their Limitations in Medical Applications," *Biomedical Materials & Devices,* vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 213-233, 2023.
[52] R. Khoeini *et al.*, "Natural and synthetic bioinks for 3D bioprinting," *Advanced NanoBiomed Research,* vol. 1, no. 8, p. 2000097, 2021.
[53] Z. Xiao, S. Zhao, X. Zhang, G. Wei, and Z. Su, "Recent advances in peptide engineering of PEG hydrogels: Strategies, functional regulation, and biomedical applications," *Macromolecular Materials and Engineering,* vol. 307, no. 11, p. 2200385, 2022.
[54] E. Abelardo, "Synthetic material bioinks," in *3D Bioprinting for Reconstructive Surgery*: Elsevier, 2018, pp. 137-144.
[55] K. Loukelis, Z. A. Helal, A. G. Mikos, and M. Chatzinikolaidou, "Nanocomposite bioprinting for tissue engineering applications," *Gels,* vol. 9, no. 2, p. 103, 2023.
[56] H. Ravanbakhsh, G. Bao, Z. Luo, L. G. Mongeau, and Y. S. Zhang, "Composite inks for extrusion printing of biological and biomedical constructs," *ACS Biomaterials Science & Engineering,* vol. 7, no. 9, pp. 4009-4026, 2020.
[57] M. Rahimnejad *et al.*, "Stimuli-responsive biomaterials: smart avenue toward 4D bioprinting," *Critical reviews in biotechnology,* vol. 44, no. 5, pp. 860-891, 2024.
[58] A. Teixeira do Nascimento *et al.*, "Stimuli-Responsive Materials for Biomedical Applications," *Advanced Materials,* vol. 37, no. 36, p. e07559, 2025.
[59] S. Chatterjee and P. C.-l. Hui, "Review of applications and future prospects of stimuli-responsive hydrogel based on thermo-responsive biopolymers in drug delivery systems," *Polymers,* vol. 13, no. 13, p. 2086, 2021.
[60] S. M. Hull, L. G. Brunel, and S. C. Heilshorn, "3D bioprinting of cell-laden hydrogels for improved biological functionality," *Advanced Materials,* vol. 34, no. 2, p. 2103691, 2022.
[61] S. Vijayavenkataraman, "3D bioprinting: challenges in commercialization and clinical translation," *Journal of 3D printing in medicine,* vol. 7, no. 2, p. 3DP8, 2023.
[62] A. Bhandari, R. N. Ghosh, P. Namboothiri, and M. Peter, "A review of stimuli-responsive materials in 4D bioprinting for biomedical applications," *Materials Advances,* 2025.
[63] M. Aftab, S. Mehreen, M. Ullah, S. Ikram, and M. Naeem, "Recent Advancements in Inorganic Based Nanomaterials for Wound Healing; Challenges and Future Opportunities," *Journal of Cluster Science,* vol. 36, no. 6, pp. 1-33, 2025.
[64] D. W. Hutmacher, B. Tandon, and P. D. Dalton, "Scaffold design and fabrication," in *Tissue engineering*: Elsevier, 2023, pp. 355-385.
[65] L. Suamte, A. Tirkey, J. Barman, and P. J. Babu, "Various manufacturing methods and ideal properties of scaffolds for tissue engineering applications," *Smart Materials in Manufacturing,* vol. 1, p. 100011, 2023.
[66] F. Mukasheva, L. Adilova, A. Dyussenbinov, B. Yernaimanova, M. Abilev, and D. Akilbekova, "Optimizing scaffold pore size for tissue engineering: Insights across various tissue types," *Frontiers in bioengineering and biotechnology,* vol. 12, p. 1444986, 2024.
[67] M. Mirkhalaf, Y. Men, R. Wang, Y. No, and H. Zreiqat, "Personalized 3D printed bone scaffolds: A review," *Acta Biomaterialia,* vol. 156, pp. 110-124, 2023.
[68] A. Johnston and A. Callanan, "Recent methods for modifying mechanical properties of tissue-engineered scaffolds for clinical applications," *Biomimetics,* vol. 8, no. 2, p. 205, 2023.
[69] F. Carotenuto *et al.*, "From soft to hard biomimetic materials: Tuning micro/nano-architecture of scaffolds for tissue regeneration," *Micromachines,* vol. 13, no. 5, p. 780, 2022.
[70] C. Bertsch *et al.*, "Biomimetic bilayered scaffolds for tissue engineering: from current design strategies to medical applications," *Advanced healthcare materials,* vol. 12, no. 17, p. 2203115, 2023.
[71] M. Al Ali, "Development Of Advanced Multi-Nozzle Multi-Material 3d Printing," 2024.
[72] D. Athinarayanarao *et al.*, "Computational design for 4D printing of topology optimized multi-material active composites," *npj Computational Materials,* vol. 9, no. 1, p. 1, 2023.
[73] M. Ramezani and Z. Mohd Ripin, "4D printing in biomedical engineering: advancements, challenges, and future directions," *Journal of functional biomaterials,* vol. 14, no. 7, p. 347, 2023.
[74] P. Nitti, A. Narayanan, R. Pellegrino, S. Villani, M. Madaghiele, and C. Demitri, "Cell-tissue interaction: the biomimetic approach to design tissue engineered biomaterials," *Bioengineering,* vol. 10, no. 10, p. 1122, 2023.
[75] Y. S. Kim and Y. S. Shin, "Surface Functionalization of 3D-Printed Bio-Inspired Scaffolds for Biomedical Applications: A Review," *Biomimetics,* vol. 9, no. 11, p. 703, 2024.
[76] X. Hu, T. Wang, F. Li, and X. Mao, "Surface modifications of biomaterials in different applied fields," *RSC advances,* vol. 13, no. 30, pp. 20495-20511, 2023.
[77] É. R. Oliveira *et al.*, "Advances in growth factor delivery for bone tissue engineering," *International journal of molecular sciences,* vol. 22, no. 2, p. 903, 2021.
[78] S. Hadi and O. Omar, "Antibacterial effect and biocompatibility of silver nanoparticle-coated bone allograft substitutes," *Cellular and Molecular Biology,* vol. 70, no. 3, pp. 67-77, 2024.
[79] K. ur Rehman, S. U. Khan, U. Zaman, S. Saeed, M. Rafique, and M. Ullah, "The Antibacterial Assessment of Biofabricated Magnesium Oxide Nanoparticles (MgO NPs) using Conocarpus erectus Leaf Extract: Antibacterial Assessment of Biofabricated Magnesium Oxide Nanoparticles (MgO NPs) using Conocarpus erectus Leaf Extract," *Journal of Women Medical and Dental College,* vol. 1, no. 2, 2022.
[80] K. M. Percival, V. Paul, and G. A. Husseini, "Recent advancements in bone tissue engineering: integrating smart scaffold technologies and bio-responsive systems for enhanced regeneration," *International Journal of Molecular Sciences,* vol. 25, no. 11, p. 6012, 2024.
[81] S. Azadi *et al.*, "Bioinspired synthetic peptide-based biomaterials regenerate bone through biomimicking of extracellular matrix," *Journal of Tissue Engineering,* vol. 15, p. 20417314241303818, 2024.
[82] M. A. Fardjahromi, H. Nazari, S. A. Tafti, A. Razmjou, S. Mukhopadhyay, and M. E. Warkiani, "Metal-organic framework-based nanomaterials for bone tissue engineering and wound healing," *Materials Today Chemistry,* vol. 23, p. 100670, 2022.
[83] N. Hasan *et al.*, "Recent advancements of nitric oxide-releasing hydrogels for wound dressing applications," *Journal of Pharmaceutical Investigation,* vol. 53, no. 6, pp. 781-801, 2023.
[84] Y. Guo, J. Huang, Y. Fang, H. Huang, and J. Wu, "1D, 2D, and 3D scaffolds promoting angiogenesis for enhanced wound healing," *Chemical Engineering Journal,* vol. 437, p. 134690, 2022.
[85] Y. Sharma, S. Ghatak, C. K. Sen, and S. Mohanty, "Emerging technologies in regenerative medicine: The future of wound care and therapy," *Journal of Molecular Medicine,* vol. 102, no. 12, pp. 1425-1450, 2024.
[86] A. Abbas *et al.*, "A comprehensive review: epidemiological strategies, catheterization and biomarkers used as a bioweapon in diagnosis and management of cardio vascular diseases," *Current Problems in Cardiology,* vol. 48, no. 7, p. 101661, 2023.
[87] W. Peng *et al.*, "Recent progress of collagen, chitosan, alginate and other hydrogels in skin repair and wound dressing applications," *International Journal of Biological Macromolecules,* vol. 208, pp. 400-408, 2022.
[88] M. Ullah *et al.*, "Shaping the future of cardiovascular disease by 3D printing applications in stent technology and its clinical outcomes," *Current Problems in Cardiology,* vol. 49, no. 1, p. 102039, 2024.
[89] N. Fani *et al.*, "Current advances in wound healing and regenerative medicine," *Current stem cell research & therapy,* vol. 19, no. 3, pp. 277-291, 2024.
[90] W. Li *et al.*, "Self-healing hydrogels for bone defect repair," *RSC advances,* vol. 13, no. 25, pp. 16773-16788, 2023.

[91] B. M. Brochu *et al.*, "Advances in bioceramics for bone regeneration: A narrative review," *Biomimetics,* vol. 9, no. 11, p. 690, 2024.
[92] I. Ielo, G. Calabrese, G. De Luca, and S. Conoci, "Recent advances in hydroxyapatite-based biocomposites for bone tissue regeneration in orthopedics," *International journal of molecular sciences,* vol. 23, no. 17, p. 9721, 2022.
[93] M. Wu, S. Wu, W. Chen, and Y.-P. Li, "The roles and regulatory mechanisms of TGF-β and BMP signaling in bone and cartilage development, homeostasis and disease," *Cell research,* vol. 34, no. 2, pp. 101-123, 2024.
[94] J. Liang *et al.*, "Biomaterial-based scaffolds in promotion of cartilage regeneration: recent advances and emerging applications," *Journal of Orthopaedic Translation,* vol. 41, pp. 54-62, 2023.
[95] S. J. Lee, W. Jeong, and A. Atala, "3D Bioprinting for Engineered Tissue Constructs and Patient-Specific Models: Current Progress and Prospects in Clinical Applications," *Advanced Materials,* vol. 36, no. 49, p. 2408032, 2024.
[96] J. A. Roacho-Pérez *et al.*, "Artificial scaffolds in cardiac tissue engineering," *Life,* vol. 12, no. 8, p. 1117, 2022.
[97] L. Abdulsalam *et al.*, "Advanced Biocompatible and Biodegradable Polymers: A Review of Functionalization, Smart Systems, and Sustainable Applications," *Polymers,* vol. 17, no. 21, p. 2901, 2025.
[98] M. Safdar *et al.*, "Genomic insights into heart health: Exploring the genetic basis of cardiovascular disease," *Current Problems in Cardiology,* vol. 49, no. 1, p. 102182, 2024.
[99] X. Chen *et al.*, "Therapeutic angiogenesis and tissue revascularization in ischemic vascular disease," *Journal of Biological Engineering,* vol. 17, no. 1, p. 13, 2023.
[100] A. Halim, K.-Y. Qu, X.-F. Zhang, and N.-P. Huang, "Recent advances in the application of two-dimensional nanomaterials for neural tissue engineering and regeneration," *ACS Biomaterials Science & Engineering,* vol. 7, no. 8, pp. 3503-3529, 2021.
[101] S. U. Khan *et al.*, "Single-cell RNA sequencing (scRNA-seq): advances and challenges for cardiovascular diseases (CVDs)," *Current problems in cardiology,* vol. 49, no. 2, p. 102202, 2024.
[102] N. Ashammakhi *et al.*, "Highlights on advancing frontiers in tissue engineering," *Tissue Engineering Part B: Reviews,* vol. 28, no. 3, pp. 633-664, 2022.
[103] S. H. M. Ullah *et al.*, "Confidence and Accuracy in identification of adverse drug reaction (ADR) reported by inpatients," *International Journal of Basic Medical Sciences and Pharmacy (IJBMSP),* vol. 10, no. 1, 2023.
[104] C. Zheng, M. Li, and J. Ding, "Challenges and opportunities of nanomedicines in clinical translation," *Bio Integration,* vol. 2, no. 2, p. 57, 2021.
[105] J. C. Schuh and K. A. Funk, "Compilation of international standards and regulatory guidance documents for evaluation of biomaterials, medical devices, and 3-D printed and regenerative medicine products," *Toxicologic pathology,* vol. 47, no. 3, pp. 344-357, 2019.
[106] S. Liu and P. Jin, "Advances and Challenges in 3D Bioprinted Cancer Models: Opportunities for Personalized Medicine and Tissue Engineering," *Polymers,* vol. 17, no. 7, p. 948, 2025.
[107] M. Thangadurai, S. S. Srinivasan, M. P. Sekar, S. Sethuraman, and D. Sundaramurthi, "Emerging perspectives on 3D printed bioreactors for clinical translation of engineered and bioprinted tissue constructs," *Journal of Materials Chemistry B,* vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 350-381, 2024.
[108] F. N. Alaribe, S. L. Manoto, and S. C. Motaung, "Scaffolds from biomaterials: advantages and limitations in bone and tissue engineering," *Biologia,* vol. 71, no. 4, pp. 353-366, 2016.
[109] H.-Y. Cheung, K.-T. Lau, T.-P. Lu, and D. Hui, "A critical review on polymer-based bio-engineered materials for scaffold development," *Composites Part B: Engineering,* vol. 38, no. 3, pp. 291-300, 2007.
[110] R. J. McMurtrey, "Analytic models of oxygen and nutrient diffusion, metabolism dynamics, and architecture optimization in three-dimensional tissue constructs with applications and insights in cerebral organoids," *Tissue Engineering Part C: Methods,* vol. 22, no. 3, pp. 221-249, 2016.
[111] E. C. Novosel, C. Kleinhans, and P. J. Kluger, "Vascularization is the key challenge in tissue engineering," *Advanced drug delivery reviews,* vol. 63, no. 4-5, pp. 300-311, 2011.
[112] C. P. Austin, "Opportunities and challenges in translational science," *Clinical and Translational Science,* vol. 14, no. 5, pp. 1629-1647, 2021.
[113] M. W. Ullah *et al.*, "From Bioinks to Functional Tissues and Organs: Advances, Challenges, and the Promise of 3D Bioprinting," *Macromolecular Materials and Engineering,* p. e00251, 2025.
[114] V. Volarevic *et al.*, "Ethical and safety issues of stem cell-based therapy," *International journal of medical sciences,* vol. 15, no. 1, p. 36, 2018.
[115] E. Krebs and B. Nosyk, "Cost-effectiveness analysis in implementation science: a research agenda and call for wider application," *Current HIV/AIDS Reports,* vol. 18, no. 3, pp. 176-185, 2021.
[116] P. Mohite, A. Puri, A. D. Gholap, Y. Chaudhari, P. V. Nagime, and S. Singh, "Regulatory Aspects, Future Prospects, and Challenges Associated with Biomaterials-Based Additive Manufacturing for Tissue Engineering," *Biomaterial-based Additive Manufacturing in Tissue Engineering and Regeneration,* pp. 531-551, 2025.