University of Naples Federico II

Ph.D. Program in

Biomorphological and Surgical Sciences

XXXIV Cycle

Program Coordinator: Prof. Alberto Cuocolo

Ph.D. Thesis

Design of Additive Manufactured Scaffolds with Tailored Morphology and Properties for Bone Tissue Regeneration

Tutor
Prof. Giovanni Improta
Prof. Teresa Russo
Prof. Massimo Martorelli

Ph.D. Student
Dr. Pierpaolo Fucile

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1 - Tissue Engineering and additively manufactured scaffolds for tissue regeneration: state of the art 1

1.1 Introduction 1

1.2 Conventional Scaffolds fabrication techniques 5

1.3 Biofabrication: the introduction of Additive Manufacturing technologies 10

1.4 Reverse Engineering (RE) 18

1.5 Design for Additive Manufacturing (DfAM) 20

1.6 Generative Design 23

1.7 AM towards Biomedical Applications 25

1.8 Bone Tissue Engineering 30

REFERENCES 32

CHAPTER 2 - Reverse Engineering and Additive Manufacturing towards the design of 3D advanced scaffolds for hard tissue regeneration 48

2.1 Introduction 48

2.2 Materials and Methods 51

2.3 Results and Discussion 54

2.4 Conclusions 62

REFERENCES 64

CHAPTER 3 - Integrated Design Strategy for Additively Manufactured Surface-Modified Scaffolds in Tissue Engineering 71

3.1 Introduction 71

3.2 Materials and Methods 72

3.3 Results and Discussion 73

3.4 Conclusions 76

REFERENCES 77

CHAPTER 4 - Design Strategies Toward the Development Of 3D Hybrid Additive Manufactured Scaffolds For Enhanced Tissue Regeneration 81

4.1 Introduction 81

4.2 Materials and Methods 82

4.3 Results and Discussion 84

4.4 Conclusions 91

REFERENCES 93

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.1: Basic principles of Tissue Engineering 3

Figure 1.2: Scaffolds for Tissue Engineering 4

Figure 1.3: Solvent Casting process [20] 6

Figure 1.4: Gas Foaming Process [20]. 7

Figure 1.5: Phase Separation Process [20]. 8

Figure 1.6: Electrospinning Process [20]. 9

Figure 1.7: Freeze-Drying Process [20]. 9

Figure 1.8: Biofabrication for TE as the result of different disciplines interaction [10]. 10

Figure 1.9: Fused Deposition Modelling (FDM) representative scheme. 16

Figure 1.10: 3D Bioplotting representative scheme [18] 17

Figure 1.11: Topology Optimization of a mechanical part 20

Figure 1.12: Examples of lattice structures cells unit. 22

Figure 1.13: Generative Design of a mechanical part. 23

Figure 1.14: Design and fabrication process of custom-made scaffolds for TE [5]. 26

Figure 1.15: Main scaffolds parameters [119] 29

Figure 2.1: Typical results from compression tests. Stress-strain curves for 3D PCL scaffolds with specific lay-down pattern and geometric features, tested up to a strain of 0.4 mm/mm. 54

Figure 2.2: Results obtained from nanoindentation tests on PCL fibres. Hardness as a function of the applied load. Data are reported as mean value and error bar represents the standard deviation. 55

Figure 2.3: Interaction plot for RW (μm). 59

Figure 2.4: Interaction plot for maximum stress (MPa). 60

Figure 2.5: Interaction plot for the compressive modulus (MPa) 60

Figure 2.6: Percentage of Alamar Blue reduction as a function of time for PCL and PCL/HA nanocomposite scaffolds. Data are reported as mean value and error bar represents the standard deviation. 61

Figure 2.7: Values of shape factor obtained from CLSM images of hMSCs on PCL and PCL/HA nanocomposite scaffolds. Data are reported as mean value and error bar represents the standard deviation. 61

Figure 2.8: Customized nanocomposite scaffolds for mandibular defect regeneration (i.e., symphysis and ramus). 62

Figure 3.1: Typical results from in vitro biological tests: percentage of Alamar Blue reduction evaluated for the cell-laden scaffolds. Data are reported as mean value and error bar represents the standard deviation. 75

Figure 4.1: Design of the single scaffold layer (A) and the final assembly (B). 83

Figure 4.2: SEM images of the 1% Gn scaffolds (a, b, and c) and PCL/Gn 1% hybrid scaffolds (d, e, and f) before cross-linking. 85

Figure 4.3: SEM images of the 1% Gn scaffolds (a, b, and c) and PCL/Gn 1% hybrid scaffolds (d, e, and f) after cross-linking. 86

Figure 4.4: SEM images of the 3% Gn scaffolds (a, b, and c) and PCL/Gn 3% hybrid scaffolds (d, e, and f) before cross-linking. 86

Figure 4.5: SEM images of the 3% Gn scaffolds (a, b, and c) and PCL/Gn 3% hybrid scaffolds (d, e, and f) after cross-linking. 87

Figure 4.6: SEM images of the 5% Gn scaffolds (a, b, and c) and PCL/Gn 5% hybrid scaffolds (d, e, and f) before cross-linking. 87

Figure 4.7: SEM images of the 5% Gn scaffolds (a, b, and c) and PCL/Gn 5% hybrid scaffolds (d, e, and f) after cross-linking. 88

Figure 4.8: Results of compression tests on the hybrid PCL/Gn scaffolds. Plain PCL scaffolds were used as control. 89

Figure 4.9: Typical results obtained from water uptake tests on gelatin samples. 89

Figure 4.10: Typical results obtained from degradation tests on gelatin samples. 90

Figure 4.11: Results obtained from Alamar Blue Assay: (a) Alamar Blue reduction ratio observed on hybrid and plain PCL scaffolds; (b) Alamar Blue reduction ratio observed on plain gelatin scaffolds. 91

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.1: Most popular AM techniques [18]..... 12

Table 2.1: Manufacturing parameters: deposition velocity (DV), screw rotation velocity (SRV), slice thickness (ST), and process temperature (PT)..... 55

Table 2.2: porosity, RW, maximum stress, and compressive modulus of 3D PCL/HA scaffolds achieved for different PT values (DV = 10 mm/s, SRV = 30 rpm and ST = 400 μm). The data are reported as mean value ± standard deviation. 56

Table 2.3: porosity, RW, maximum stress, and compressive modulus of 3D PCL/HA scaffolds achieved for different DV values (PT = 120 °C, SRV = 30 rpm and ST = 400 μm). The data are reported as mean value ± standard deviation. 56

Table 2.4: porosity, RW, maximum stress, and compressive modulus of 3D PCL/HA scaffolds achieved for different SRV values (PT = 120 °C, DV = 10 mm/s and ST = 400 μm). The data are reported as mean value ± standard deviation. 57

Table 2.5: porosity, RW, maximum stress, and compressive modulus of 3D PCL/HA scaffolds achieved for different ST values (PT = 120 °C, DV = 10 mm/s and SRV = 30 rpm). The data are reported as mean value ± standard deviation. 58

Table 2.6: Optimised set of parameters for the fabrication of PCL/HA (90/10 w/w) scaffolds through a bioextruder system. 59

Table 3.1: Typical results from compression tests performed on neat and surface-modified 3D scaffolds (fibre diameter of 400 μm, strand distance of 600 μm, layer thickness of 300 μm): modulus (E) and maximum stress (σ_{max}). The results are reported as mean value ± standard deviation..... 74

Table 4.1: Bioprinting parameters: slice thickness (ST), strand distance (SD), deposition velocity (DV), printing temperature (PT), and operative pressure (P)..... 82