IOSR Journal of Dental and Medical Sciences (IOSR-JDMS)
e-ISSN: 2279-0853, p-ISSN: 2279-0861.Volume 23, Issue 7 Ser. 9 (July. 2024), PP 54-58
www.iosrjournals.org

Cutting-Edge Innovations In Bioprinting For Oral And Maxillofacial Surgery: Anticipated Perspectives

Richa Wadhawan[1], Priyanka Singh [2], Meghna Verma [3], Pankaj Singla[4], Prachi Sharma [5] ,Japheth Yeputho[6], Hussain Amir Sayeed [7]

Professor, Oral Medicine, Diagnosis & Radiology, PDM Dental College & Research Institute, Bahadurgarh, Haryana
Dental Surgeon, Institute Of Dental Education & Advance Studies, Gwalior, Madhya Pradesh
Post Graduate, Oral And Maxillofacial Surgery, Shree Bankey Bihari Dental College & Research Centre, Ghaziabad, Uttar Pradesh
Post Graduate, Oral And Maxillofacial Surgery, Shree Bankey Bihari Dental College & Research Centre, Ghaziabad, Uttar Pradesh
Post Graduate, Oral And Maxillofacial Surgery, Shree Bankey Bihari Dental College & Research Centre, Ghaziabad, Uttar Pradesh
Dental Surgeon, Health And Family Welfare Government Of Nagaland, District Hospital Dimapur, Dimapur, Nagaland
Dental Surgeon, Institute Of Dental Education & Advance Studies, Gwalior, Madhya Pradesh

Abstract:
Recent advancements in bioprinting technology hold significant potential to transform oral and maxillofacial surgery, offering groundbreaking capabilities in tissue regeneration and personalized treatment strategies. This review explores the current status and anticipated future developments in bioprinting for applications in oral and maxillofacial procedures. It examines various types of bioinks, encompassing natural biomaterials, synthetic biomaterials, and composite formulations, highlighting their ability to create complex tissue structures with precise anatomical fidelity. Key advantages such as customizable scaffold design, patient-specific tailoring, and the versatility to print multiple materials are underscored, alongside the ability to control cell behavior and facilitate successful in vivo implantation. The review also addresses technological challenges in bioprinting, including the imperative for enhanced vascularization and replication of tissue complexity, emphasizing ongoing research efforts aimed at achieving functional organ constructs. Ultimately, it emphasizes bioprinting's pivotal role in advancing personalized medicine and enhancing treatment outcomes for patients undergoing oral and maxillofacial surgery.

Keywords:*3D Bioprinting,Oral soft tissue, Tissue engineering, Bioprinter, Tissue engineering, Bioink, Biomaterials*

Date of Submission: 13-07-2024 Date of Acceptance: 23-07-2024

I. Introduction:

3D bioprinting, as defined by Murphy and Atala, involves the precise layer-by-layer positioning of biological materials, biochemicals, and living cells to create 3D structures with spatial control over the placement of functional components like extracellular matrix, cells, and pre-organized microvessels.[1] The bioprinting process involves three distinct stages. In the pre-processing stage, CAD tools are used to design the mesh and precisely control both the layer-by-layer deposition, which determines the microarchitecture, and the overall shape of the model, known as macroarchitecture.[2] In the processing stage, the bioink, consisting of biological materials and living cells, is utilized to print the model using an appropriate bioprinter with controlled parameters. After printing, the model advances to the post-processing stage where it is transferred to an incubator.[3] Here, it matures under specific conditions, exposed to external growth factors, and supplied daily with culture medium essential for supporting cell viability and promoting tissue development. Bioink refers to a composite of either differentiated cells or stem cells combined with fluidic biomaterials, mimicking the extracellular matrix. Upon precise deposition, it undergoes polymerization or cross-linking to form a scaffold. Initially limited to single-component deposition, advancements now enable accurate multicomponent bioink deposition, crucial for replicating complex human tissue architectures.[4]During this phase, it is exposed to external growth factors and receives a daily culture medium essential for maintaining cell viability and promoting tissue development.[5]Bioprinting technology can create anatomically accurate models for educational purposes and surgical training. This allows oral surgeons and students to practice surgical techniques in a realistic environment before performing procedures on patients.[6]Bioprinted tissue models can simulate oral diseases and conditions, providing a platform for studying disease mechanisms, testing new drugs, and evaluating treatment strategies. This contributes to advancing personalized medicine approaches in oral healthcare. It enables the incorporation of bioactive molecules, growth factors, and drugs into scaffold structures.[7] This controlled delivery system can enhance therapeutic efficacy and facilitate targeted treatment approaches in oral surgery, such as in treating infections or promoting tissue regeneration. Bioprinting facilitates the fabrication of scaffolds that mimic the native tissue environment, promoting regeneration of damaged or diseased tissues such as bone, cartilage, and gingival tissues. This is essential for enhancing healing outcomes in procedures like bone grafting and periodontal regeneration.[8]Bioprinting allows for the creation of patient-specific implants and prosthetics tailored to individual anatomical requirements. This capability is particularly useful in maxillofacial reconstruction, where precise fitting and functionality are critical. By pre-fabricating complex structures and tissues using bioprinting, surgeons can potentially reduce surgical time and improve surgical outcomes. This is particularly beneficial in procedures involving complex reconstructions or challenging anatomical sites.[9]Additionally, bioprinting contributes to developing high-quality prostheses for patients with scars, asymmetry, or malformations.Bioprinting plays a crucial role in designing advanced simulation models for medical education. Using imaging techniques like Computed Tomography and Magnetic Resonance Imaging, anatomical scans are converted into 3D prototypes using Computer Aided Design software. These virtual models guide the 3D bioprinting process, where biomaterials are layered to achieve the desired shape.Research underscores the impact of 3D bioprinting in maxillofacial surgery, showcasing enhanced patient outcomes in various clinical areas, including dental implants and mandible reconstruction.[10] The technology is beneficial for trauma surgery, orthognathic surgery, facial prosthetics, TemporoMandibular Joint procedures, and complex facial reconstruction, offering precision, reduced surgical time, and improved outcomes. However, challenges such as high costs and lengthy production times persist.This innovative approach in craniofacial surgeries utilizes biomaterials compatible with bone and cartilage cells, enabling precise defect reconstruction and holding potential to revolutionize craniofacial therapy.This cutting-edge technology enables the creation of precise anatomical structures, enhances surgical precision, and offers tailored solutions for complex cases. From dental implantations to facial reconstructions, the advancements in 3D bioprinting hold the promise of improved patient outcomes and reduced surgical complications.[11]

II. Discussion:

Bioprinting allows for the creation of patient-specific implants and prosthetics tailored to individual anatomical requirements. This capability is particularly useful in maxillofacial reconstruction, where precise fitting and functionality are critical. It facilitates the fabrication of scaffolds that mimic the native tissue environment, promoting regeneration of damaged or diseased tissues such as bone, cartilage, and gingival tissues. This is essential for enhancing healing outcomes in procedures like bone grafting and periodontal regeneration.[12] It enables the incorporation of bioactive molecules, growth factors, and drugs into scaffold structures. This controlled delivery system can enhance therapeutic efficacy and facilitate targeted treatment approaches in oral surgery, such as treating infections or promoting tissue regeneration.[13]Bioprinted tissue models can simulate oral diseases and conditions, providing a platform for studying disease mechanisms, testing new drugs, and evaluating treatment strategies.[14]This contributes to advancing personalized medicine approaches in oral healthcare. Bioprinting technology can create anatomically accurate models for educational purposes and surgical training. This allows oral surgeons and students to practice surgical techniques in a realistic environment before performing procedures on patients. By pre-fabricating complex structures and tissues using bioprinting, surgeons can potentially reduce surgical time and improve surgical outcomes.[15]This is particularly beneficial in procedures involving complex reconstructions or challenging anatomical sites. Natural polymers like alginate, collagen, gelatin, and hyaluronic acid, alongside synthetic polymers such as polyethylene glycol (PEG), polycaprolactone (PCL), and poly(lactic-co-glycolic acid) (PLGA), are commonly used in bioinks.[16] Natural polymers play a crucial role in tissue engineering and advanced bioprinting due to their tailored advantages for diverse biomedical applications.[17]Collagen, predominantly type I, is highly favored for its integral role in musculoskeletal tissues and facilitation of superior microenvironments essential for cellular growth, adhesion, and function within the extracellular matrix.[18]Fibrin, crucial in blood clotting and wound healing, serves as an effective scaffold material for vascular grafts, despite being costly, offering biodegradability, promoting cell growth, angiogenesis, and tissue regeneration.[19] Silk fibers from Bombyx mori exhibit excellent biocompatibility, mechanical stability, and low bacterial adherence, although their optimal use may require mixing with other polymers and rheological adjustments in bioink formulations.[20]Chitosan, derived from shellfish, boasts biocompatibility, antibacterial properties, and biodegradability, yet faces challenges such as weak mechanical integrity and rapid degradation under certain conditions.[21]Alginate, a natural polysaccharide, offers biocompatibility, affordability, versatile crosslinking options, compatibility with various printing methods, and ease of forming complex structures.[22]Gelatin, a natural protein, is non-cytotoxic, water-soluble, promotes cell adhesion, and exhibits biocompatible, biodegradable properties with low immunogenicity.[23]Hyaluronic acid, a high molecular weight polysaccharide integral to the extracellular matrix, is distinguished by its biodegradability, bioresorbability, excellent biocompatibility, non-adhesive, non-thrombogenic, and non-immunogenic properties, making it ideal for diverse biomedical applications.[24]Synthetic polymers like Polycaprolactone (PCL) are polyester-based materials with advantages of relatively low melting point, high stability, and long-term degradation, but they cannot encapsulate cells. Polyethylene glycol (PEG) is widely used in tissue engineering due to its hydrophilic nature; biocompatibility, non-immunogenicity, and protein rejection properties.[25]Stereolithography technique uses a laser to polymerize photocurable resin layer by layer. Initially developed for rapid prototyping due to its high resolution, stereolithography was limited in biofabrication due to the lack of biocompatible resins. However, advancements have improved biocompatibility and biodegradation of resins, making it a promising technology for future bioprinting. Examples include photosolidification. [26]Extrusion-based bioprinting, known as direct writing, employs pneumatic, piston-driven, or screw-driven methods to extrude bioink continuously onto a substrate. It accommodates various biomaterials and enables dense cell structures but is slower and suited primarily for viscous bioinks, highlighting its user-friendly nature alongside its drawbacks.[27]This method involves dispensing viscous bioink containing biomaterials, biomolecules, and cells through a nozzle. The bioink is extruded as a continuous strand or individual dots that solidify layer by layer. Cell viability in the printed tissue can be high, around 90%, despite forces and higher temperatures. However, material viscosity and potential for leaks can affect resolution and mechanical stiffness. Examples include fused deposition modeling (FDM).[28]Laser-based bioprinting, pioneered by Bohandy et al., utilizes a laser beam to deposit cells onto a receiving substrate, offering high resolution but at a higher cost and potential for cell damage. It offers high resolution and is compatible with a wide range of biomaterial viscosities. However, laser-assisted bioprinting may have lower cell viability compared to other techniques, despite being able to print mammalian cells without affecting their function. Examples include laser-guided direct writing.[29]Bioprinters employ various technologies, with inkjet-based bioprinting being prominent for its non-contact method, encompassing technologies like continuous-inkjet bioprinting, electro-hydrodynamic jet bioprinting, and drop-on-demand inkjet bioprinting.[30]Drop-on-demand inkjet bioprinters utilize several technologies: piezoelectric bioprinters generate droplets via acoustic waves from a piezoelectric actuator, thermal bioprinters use heat for ejecting picoliter droplets from a fluid chamber and nozzle setup, and electrostatic bioprinters produce droplets through voltage pulses between a pressure plate and an electrode. Inkjet printing uses microdroplets of cells to create 3D high-resolution models. It allows for the combination of multiple cell types and printing of complex structures3D bioprinting is an innovative technology that precisely positions cells to create heterogeneous tissues, showing potential for in vivo implantation pending clinical approval. It's extensively used in drug testing and creating high-throughput assays such as liver tissue models.[31]In cancer research, 3D bioprinting aids in developing in vitro cancer models and personalized medicines using hydrogels and therapeutic implants. Challenges include difficulties in vascularization and replicating complex native tissues essential for functional organs. Bioinks, composite materials of cells and biomaterials mimicking the extracellular matrix, are crucial in bioprinting. Advances now enable accurate multicomponent bioink deposition, essential for replicating complex human tissue architectures.[32]Types of bioinks include natural biomaterial-based, synthetic biomaterial-based, and cell aggregate-based varieties, along with commercially available options like Dermamatrix and Novogel. Composite bioinks integrate bioactive molecules such as magnetic iron oxide particles or blood plasma, facilitating the creation of tissues with anatomical precision. Technological advancements have reduced 3D printer costs, fostering rapid progress in medical disciplines. The process begins with creating a 3D model using computer-aided design software, enhancing efficiency and customization in medical applications. Integrating living cells into 3D printing processes is advancing tissue fabrication, supporting personalized treatments in regenerative medicine, surgical planning, and pharmaceuticals. In dental care, 3D bioprinting has emerged as a promising strategy for regenerating dental alveolar tissues, addressing challenges such as decay, tooth loss, and periodontal disease.[33] This technique allows precise cell and matrix placement, benefiting from speed, accuracy, and automation. Utilizing data from Computed Tomography or Magnetic Resonance Imaging scans, 3D bioprinting creates personalized constructs for patients, facilitating the regeneration of complex dental tissues. Future advancements in 3D bioprinting aim to optimize bioprinted microstructures and printable materials to accurately replicate native tissue architectures. Challenges remain in ensuring the safety, growth potential, and practicalities of bioprinted structures for clinical use, requiring standardization and regulatory approval.[34]

III. Future Prospects:

The future prospects of 3D bioprinting are indeed promising and encompass several innovative applications. Firstly, the capability to print specific functional tissues in vitro facilitates testing for drug tolerance and accurately assessing drug efficacy using pathological models.[35]This ability can revolutionize pharmaceutical research and personalized medicine by providing more precise and dependable testing platforms. Secondly, bioprinting functional models with defects aids in teaching surgical and prosthetic management, allowing for effective simulation of real-life scenarios. This application enhances medical education and training, potentially improving surgical outcomes through enhanced preparation and practice. Thirdly, the potential for reconstructive surgery using bioprinted autologous organs derived from small biopsies holds the promise of reducing donor site morbidity compared to traditional grafting methods. This advancement could significantly benefit patients requiring complex reconstructive procedures. Lastly, the prospect of printing autologous organs eliminates the need for waiting for donors, potentially revolutionizing organ transplantation by addressing donor shortages and reducing the risk of rejection. Currently, bioprinting methods utilize various bioinks and bioprinters tailored for specific applications. However, existing technologies face limitations such as inadequate vascularity, printing speed, resolution, and compatibility of biomaterials with physiological environments.[36] Bioinks, crucial for the bioprinting process; require improvement in mechanical, rheological, and biological properties to meet the stringent requirements of tissue engineering. Materials like hydrogels, such as alginate and gelatin, are commonly used but need enhancement in their properties. Ongoing research in 3D bioprinting aims to overcome these challenges through advancements in multimaterial bioinks, improved bioprinting methods, and better understanding of bioink behaviors using computational models. Standardization of bioinks and bioprinting processes, alongside the development of new strategies, are critical for advancing the field. With these efforts, engineered tissues and organs may soon become viable options for human recipients, promising significant advancements in healthcare and biotechnology.[3]

IV. Conclusion:

Cutting-edge innovations in bioprinting for oral and maxillofacial surgery are poised to revolutionize treatment paradigms, offering unprecedented customization and precision in reconstructive procedures. Emerging technologies promise enhanced patient outcomes through tailored tissue constructs that mimic natural anatomy and function. By leveraging advanced bioprinting techniques such as drop-on-demand inkjet, laser-based bioprinting (LIFT), and extrusion-based direct writing, researchers anticipate significant strides in complex tissue regeneration and transplantation. These developments herald a future where bioprinted implants and tissues not only restore form and function but also integrate seamlessly with surrounding tissues, promoting faster recovery and improved quality of life for patients undergoing oral and maxillofacial surgeries.

Financial support and sponsorship Nil

Conflicts of interest There are no conflicts of interest

References

[1] Tissue Engineering In Oral And Maxillofacial Surgery, Riitta Seppänen-Kaijansinkko
[2] Mironov V. The Second International Workshop On Bioprinting, Biopatterning And Bioassembly. Expert Opinbiolther. 2005; 5(8):1111–5.
[3] Vacanti Ca. The History Of Tissue Engineering. J Cell Mol Med. 2006; 10:569–76.
[4] Ingber De. Mechanical Control Of Tissue Growth: Function Follows Form. Pnas. 2005; 102(33):11571–2.
[5] Dowler C. Automatic Model Building Cuts Design Time, Costs. Plast Eng.1989; 45:43–5.
[6] Fisher Jp, Dean D, Mikos Ag, Et Al. Photo Crosslinking Characteristics And Mechanical Properties Of Diethyl Fumarate/Poly (Propylene Fumarate) Biomaterials. Biomaterials. 2002; 23:4333–43.
[7] MelchelsFp, Feijen J, GrijpmaDw, Et Al. A Poly (D, L-Lactide) Resin For The Preparation Of Tissue Engineering Scaffolds By Stereolithography. Biomaterials.2009; 30:3801–9.
[8] Chan V, Zorlutuna P, Jeong Jh, Et Al. Three Dimensional Photopatterning Of Hydrogels Using Stereolithography For Long-Term Cell Encapsulation. Lab Chip. 2010; 10:206–70.
[9] Jakab K, Norotte C, Damon B, Et Al. Tissue Engineering BySelfassembly Of Cells Printed Into Topologically Defined Structures. Tissue Eng A. 2008; 14:413–21.
[10] Murphy Sv, Atala A. 3d Bioprinting Of Tissues And Organs. Nat Biotechnol. 2014; 32(8):773–85.
[11] Truby Rl, Lewis Ja. Printing Soft Matter In Three Dimensions. Nature. 2016; 540(7633):371–8.
[12] Griffith Lg, Swartz Ma. Capturing Complex 3d Tissue Physiology In Vitro. Nat Rev Mol Cell Biol. 2006; 7(3):211–24.
[13] Achilli Tm, Meyer J, Morgan Jr. Advances In The Formation, Use And Understanding Of Multi-Cellular Spheroids. Expert Opin Biol Ther. 2012; 12(10):1347–60.
[14] Abbott A. Cell Culture: Biology’s New Dimension. Nature. 2003; 424(6951):870–2.
[15] Kim W, Kim G. Collagen/Bioceramic-Based Composite Bioink To Fabricate A Porous 3d Hascs-Laden Structure For Bone Tissue Regeneration. Biofabrication. 2019; 12(1):015007.
[16] Raja N, Yun H-S. A Simultaneous 3d Printing Process For The Fabrication Of Bioceramic And Cell-Laden Hydrogel Core/Shell Scaffolds With Potential Application In Bone Tissue Regeneration. J Mater Chem B. 2016; 4(27):4707–16.
[17] Somasekharan Lt, Et Al. Formulation And Characterization Of Alginate Dialdehyde, Gelatin, And Platelet-Rich Plasma-Based Bioink For Bioprinting Applications. Bioengineering. 2020;7 (3):108.
[18] Wang Xf, Et Al. Osteogenic Differentiation Of Three-Dimensional Bioprinted Constructs Consisting Of Human Adipose-Derived Stem Cells In Vitro And In Vivo. Plos One. 2016; 11(6):E0157214.
[19] Xie Z, Et Al. 3d Bioprinting In Tissue Engineering For Medical Applications: The Classic And The Hybrid. Polymers. 2020;12(8):1717.
[20] 20.Photocrosslinkable Hyaluronan-Gelatin Hydrogels For Two-Step Bioprinting. Tissue Eng Part A. 2010; 16(8):2675–85.
[21] Dababneh Ab, Ozbolat It. Bioprinting Technology: A Current State-Of-The-Art Review. J Manuf Sci Eng. 2014;136(6):0610161–611.

[22] Soltan N, Et Al. Printability And Cell Viability In Bioprinting Alginate Dialdehyde-Gelatin Scaffolds. Acs Biomater Sci Eng. 2019; 5(6):2976–87.

[23] Willson K, Et Al. Extrusion-Based Bioprinting: Current Standards And Relevancy For Human-Sized Tissue Fabrication. In: 3d Bioprinting. Cham: Springer; 2020. P. 65–92.

[24] Liu B, Et Al. 3d-Bioprinted Functional And Biomimetic Hydrogel Scaffolds Incorporated With Nanosilicates To Promote Bone Healing In Rat Calvarial Defect Model. Mater Sci Eng C. 2020;112:110905.

[25] Sadat-Shojai M, Khorasani M-T, Jamshidi A. 3-Dimensional Cell-Laden Nano-Hydroxyapatite/Protein Hydrogels For Bone Regeneration Applications. Mater Sci Eng C. 2015;49:835–43.

[26] Kosik-Kozioł A, Et Al. 3d Bioprinted Hydrogel Model Incorporating Β-Tricalcium Phosphate For Calcified Cartilage Tissue Engineering. Biofabrication. 2019; 11(3):035016.

[27] Chen Dx. Extrusion Bioprinting Of Scaffolds: An Introduction. In: Extrusion Bioprinting Of Scaffolds For Tissue Engineering Applications. Cham: Springer; 2019. P. 1–13.

[28] Gao G, Et Al. Bioactive Nanoparticles Stimulate Bone Tissue Formation InBioprinted Three-Dimensional Scaffold And Human Mesenchymal Stem Cells. Biotechnol J. 2014;9(10):1304–11.

[29] Ye Q, Et Al. Three Dimensional Printed Bioglass/Gelatin/Alginate Composite Scaffolds With Promoted Mechanical Strength, Biomineralization, Cell Responses And Osteogenesis. J Mater Sci Mater Med. 2020; 31(9):77.

[30] Wu Z, Et Al. In Vitro And In Vivo Biocompatibility Evaluation Of A 3d BioprintedGelatin-Sodium Alginate/Rat Schwann-Cell Scaffold. Mater Sci Eng C Mater Biol Appl. 2020;109:110530.

[31] Campbell Pg, Weiss Le. Tissue Engineering With The Aid Of Inkjet Printers. Expert Opin Biol Ther. 2007; 7(8):1123–7.

[32] Chaudhuri O, Et Al. Hydrogels WithTunable Stress Relaxation Regulate Stem Cell Fate And Activity. Nat Mater. 2016; 15(3):326–34.

[33] Tabriz Ag, Et Al. Three-Dimensional Bioprinting Of Complex Cell Laden Alginate Hydrogel Structures. Biofabrication. 2015; 7(4):045012.

[34] Mancha Sánchez E, Et Al. Hydrogels For Bioprinting: A Systematic Review Of Hydrogels Synthesis, Bioprinting Parameters, And Bioprinted Structures Behavior. Front BioengBiotechnol. 2020; 8:776.

[35] Leite Áj, Et Al. BioplottingOf A Bioactive Alginate Dialdehyde-Gelatin Composite Hydrogel Containing Bioactive Glass Nanoparticles. Biofabrication. 2016; 8(3):035005.

[36] Zehnder T, BoccacciniAr, Detsch R. BiofabricationOf A Co-Culture System In An Osteoid-Like Hydrogel Matrix. Biofabrication. 2017; 9(2):025016

[37] Grigore A, Et Al. BehaviorOf Encapsulated Mg-63 Cells In Rgd And Gelatine-Modified Alginate Hydrogels. Tissue Eng Part A. 2014; 20(15-16):2140–50.