Eureka Open Access Journals
Open Access | Peer Reviewed | International Journals | Multidisciplinary Areas

Eureka Journal of Health Sciences & Medical Innovation (EJHSMI)

ISSN 2760-4942 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 5, May 2026

https://eurekaoa.com/index.php/5

CHALLENGES AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS OF BIOACTIVE SCAFFOLDS IN CRANIOFACIAL RECONSTRUCTION

Ass. Mamanazarov Akbar Nizom o'g'li
Toshkent Davlat Tibbiyot Universiteti,
yuz-jag' jarroxligi va umumiy stomatologiya fakulteti assistanti
akbarnizomivich@gmail.com

Abstract

Craniofacial reconstruction presents substantial regenerative challenges owing to the intricate interactions between osteogenesis, angiogenesis, and immune modulation within a highly specialized anatomical framework. Bioactive scaffolds have emerged as essential tools for addressing these challenges by offering osteoconductive matrices that support cellular infiltration and vascular integration. Recent advancements in B-TCP/PLLA composite scaffolds have shown improved biodegradation kinetics and mechanical stability; however, translational barriers remain, including insufficient neovascularization, inflammatory dysregulation, and biomechanical mismatches. This review synthesizes current scaffold technologies, focusing on mechanistic insights into scaffold-host interactions and the regenerative microenvironment. Key limitations, such as the timing of scaffold degradation cascades, immune polarization, and vascular insufficiency, are critically evaluated. The review further outlines future directions involving smart biomaterials with stimuli-responsive properties, AI-assisted scaffold optimization, and personalized regenerative medicine approaches that incorporate 3D/4D bioprinting technologies. These innovations have the potential to overcome existing translational bottlenecks by enabling adaptive, patient-specific regenerative

Eureka Open Access Journals
Open Access | Peer Reviewed | International Journals | Multidisciplinary Areas
Eureka Journal of Health Sciences & Medical Innovation (EJHSMI)
ISSN 2760-4942 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 5, May 2026

https://eurekaoa.com/index.php/5

systems. This narrative review aims to provide a comprehensive, mechanistically informed framework to guide the next generation of bioactive scaffold design and clinical implementation in craniofacial reconstruction.

Introduction

Craniofacial reconstruction presents a significant clinical and scientific challenge owing to the complex anatomical structures and functional requirements involved. Defects resulting from trauma, tumor excision, or congenital anomalies impose profound esthetic and functional impairments, complicating the restorative interventions. The regenerative environment of the craniofacial skeleton integrates osteogenesis, angiogenesis, and immune modulation within a mechanically dynamic and spatially confined milieu. Conventional grafting approaches are limited by donor site morbidity, autologous tissue scarcity, and inconsistent integration outcomes, necessitating advanced regenerative strategies. The biological complexity underpinning craniofacial regeneration involves tightly regulated cellular differentiation, extracellular matrix (ECM) synthesis, and vascular network formation. Scaffold-mediated regenerative approaches aim to emulate these processes by providing osteoconductive frameworks that facilitate stem cell recruitment and differentiation. However, current reconstruction modalities are hindered by inadequate vascularization, causing hypoxia and dysregulated inflammatory responses that impair scaffold integration and biomechanical mismatches, leading to premature scaffold failure. These translational challenges highlight the need for bioactive scaffolds engineered to dynamically modulate the regenerative microenvironment.

The development of bioactive scaffolds, particularly composite systems such as biphasic tricalcium phosphate/poly L-lactic acid (B-TCP/PLLA), marks a paradigm shift toward biomimetic and biodegradable constructs with tunable degradation profiles and mechanical properties. These composite scaffolds enhance cellular attachment and promote osteoimmunological homeostasis,

Eureka Open Access Journals
Open Access | Peer Reviewed | International Journals | Multidisciplinary Areas
Eureka Journal of Health Sciences & Medical Innovation (EJHSMI)
ISSN 2760-4942 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 5, May 2026

https://eurekaoa.com/index.php/5

which is critical for successful regeneration. Despite these advances, unresolved issues persist, including the precise control of scaffold-host immune interactions, synchronization of degradation kinetics with tissue ingrowth, and establishment of robust vascular networks within defect sites.

This review integrates mechanistic insights and translational perspectives that are specific to craniofacial reconstruction. This review delineates the current landscape of bioactive scaffold technologies, identifies critical scientific gaps, and articulates the necessity for advanced scaffold systems capable of personalized and adaptive regenerative responses. [1], [2], [3] Through this synthesis, we established a mechanistically informed framework to guide future scaffold design and clinical translation, underscoring the urgency of overcoming biological and biomechanical constraints to achieve predictable, long-term craniofacial regeneration.[4], [5], [6], [7]

Main Body

4.1 Evolution of Bioactive Scaffolds

The progression of bioactive scaffold development has evolved from inert, mechanically supportive matrices to biologically intelligent systems that actively modulate the regenerative microenvironment of the host tissue. Early bioinert materials provided structural support but lacked osteoconductivity, limiting cellular infiltration and integration into the bone.[8], [9], [10], [11], [12] Biomimetic engineering has introduced osteoconductive and biodegradable scaffolds that emulate native ECM components, enhancing cellular adhesion and proliferation. Biodegradable scaffolds enable gradual resorption, facilitating tissue replacement and minimizing chronic foreign-body reactions. This evolution embraces the concept of a regenerative microenvironment, wherein scaffold architecture and biochemical cues orchestrate cellular behavior, immune modulation, and vascularization. Current trends emphasize multifunctional scaffolds that integrate biochemical signaling and mechanical adaptability to

Eureka Open Access Journals
Open Access | Peer Reviewed | International Journals | Multidisciplinary Areas
Eureka Journal of Health Sciences & Medical Innovation (EJHSMI)
ISSN 2760-4942 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 5, May 2026

https://eurekaoa.com/index.php/5

address the complexity of craniofacial bone regeneration.[13], [14], [15], [16], [17]

4.2 B-TCP/PLLA Scaffold Architecture

B-TCP/PLLA composites combine the osteoconductivity of calcium phosphate ceramics with the flexibility and controlled degradability of polymers. The ceramic phase supports osteoblast differentiation and ECM mineralization, whereas the polymeric component confers mechanical stability and modulates degradation kinetics. Scaffold porosity critically influences nutrient diffusion, cellular infiltration, and neovascularization, necessitating a precise architectural design to balance mechanical strength with biological permeability.[18], [19], [20], [21] Synchronizing degradation kinetics with host tissue regeneration is essential to prevent premature scaffold collapse and prolonged foreign body presence. The polymer-ceramic interface modulates scaffold-host integration by influencing cellular adhesion and immune responses. Optimizing these structure-function relationships is pivotal for advancing scaffold efficacy in craniofacial applications.[22], [23], [24], [25], [26]

4.3 Osteogenesis & Bone Regeneration Mechanisms

Scaffold-mediated osteogenesis involves the recruitment and differentiation of mesenchymal stem cells (MSCs) into osteoblasts, deposition of the extracellular matrix (ECM), and mineralization. Key signaling pathways, including bone morphogenetic protein (BMP), Wnt, and Notch, regulate these processes and are modulated by biochemical and mechanical cues from the scaffold. Effective scaffolds promote ECM organization conducive to mineral nucleation and establish chemotactic gradients that facilitate stem cell homing. Interactions between scaffold degradation products and cellular metabolism further influence osteogenic signaling pathways. Elucidating these mechanisms enables the design

Eureka Open Access Journals
Open Access | Peer Reviewed | International Journals | Multidisciplinary Areas
Eureka Journal of Health Sciences & Medical Innovation (EJHSMI)
ISSN 2760-4942 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 5, May 2026

https://eurekaoa.com/index.php/5

of scaffolds that actively direct regenerative pathways, rather than passively supporting tissue growth.[27], [28], [29], [30], [31]

4.4 Angiogenesis & Vascularization

Neovascularization is a critical bottleneck in scaffold integration for craniofacial regeneration. Oxygen diffusion limits cellular viability beyond approximately 200 µm from capillaries, necessitating rapid vascular infiltration. Vascular endothelial growth factor (VEGF)-mediated angiogenic signaling drives endothelial cell migration and capillary formation; however, scaffold architecture and biochemical composition profoundly affect vascular integration. Temporal mismatches between scaffold degradation and vessel ingrowth generate hypoxic gradients, leading to metabolic insufficiency and impaired osteogenesis. Addressing vascular insufficiency requires scaffolds engineered to release proangiogenic factors and possess interconnected porosity that facilitates endothelial migration and nutrient transport.[32], [33], [34], [35], [36]

4.5 Osteoimmunology & Immunomodulation

Immune responses critically influence scaffold integration and regeneration. Macrophage polarization toward the M2 phenotype supports tissue remodeling and angiogenesis, whereas M1 polarization promotes inflammation and fibrosis. Scaffold properties, including surface chemistry and degradation byproducts, modulate inflammatory signaling and cytokine expression profiles. Immunomodulatory scaffolds harness these interactions to create a regenerative microenvironment conducive to osteogenesis and vascularization. Understanding immune-mediated regeneration enables the design of scaffolds that actively steer host responses, mitigate chronic inflammation, and enhance long-term functionality.[37], [38], [39], [40]

Eureka Open Access Journals
Open Access | Peer Reviewed | International Journals | Multidisciplinary Areas
Eureka Journal of Health Sciences & Medical Innovation (EJHSMI)
ISSN 2760-4942 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 5, May 2026

https://eurekaoa.com/index.php/5

4.6 Biomechanics & Degradation Kinetics

Mechanical stability under physiological loading is essential for scaffold performance but must be balanced with degradation timing to avoid premature collapse or the persistent presence of foreign bodies. The stress distribution within scaffolds influences the cellular mechanotransduction pathways critical for osteogenesis. Degradation cascades produce byproducts that may alter the local pH and tissue compatibility, affecting the host response. Mechanical mismatches between scaffolds and native bone can induce stress shielding, impairing regeneration. Therefore, optimizing the load-bearing capacity and controlled biodegradation remains a pivotal challenge in scaffold engineering for craniofacial defects.[41], [42], [43], [44]

4.7 3D/4D Printing & Personalized Regenerative Systems

Advances in 3D bioprinting have enabled the fabrication of patient-specific scaffolds with precise architectural and compositional control. The integration of 4D bioprinting introduces dynamic shape-memory biomaterials capable of adapting to physiological stimuli post-implantation. Computer-aided design and manufacturing (CAD/CAM) systems facilitate the creation of multifunctional regenerative constructs tailored to individual defect geometries and biological requirements of the patient. These technologies promise enhanced scaffold-host integration through personalized regenerative systems that accommodate clinical heterogeneity and complex craniofacial anatomy.[45], [46], [47], [48]

4.8 Clinical Translation & Surgical Implementation

The translational maturity of bioactive scaffolds is limited by regulatory complexities, manufacturing reproducibility, and surgical practicality. Current scaffold technologies are predominantly in the preclinical or pilot clinical stages, with limited multicenter validation. Surgical fixation strategies must ensure scaffold stability while minimizing the risk of infection and promoting soft tissue

Eureka Open Access Journals
Open Access | Peer Reviewed | International Journals | Multidisciplinary Areas
Eureka Journal of Health Sciences & Medical Innovation (EJHSMI)
ISSN 2760-4942 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 5, May 2026

https://eurekaoa.com/index.php/5

integration. Clinical heterogeneity and inconsistent protocols further impede the standardization. Overcoming these barriers requires integrative approaches encompassing regulatory harmonization, scalable manufacturing, and surgeon-friendly implantation techniques to facilitate their routine clinical adoption.[49], [50], [51], [52], [53]

4.9 AI-Assisted Future Regenerative Ecosystems

The incorporation of artificial intelligence (AI) into scaffold engineering has introduced predictive modeling and optimization capabilities. Machine learning algorithms analyze multifactorial data, including scaffold composition, degradation kinetics, and biological responses, to facilitate intelligent scaffold design. Digital regenerative platforms enable virtual testing and personalized scaffold customization, thereby accelerating bench-to-bedside translation. AI-assisted regenerative ecosystems promise dynamic and adaptive biomaterials capable of responding to patient-specific regenerative cues, thereby enhancing clinical outcomes in craniofacial reconstruction.[54], [55], [56], [57], [58]

Challenges / Limitations

5.1 Biological Limitations

Insufficient vascularization remains a primary biological barrier that restricts oxygen and nutrient delivery, which is essential for cellular viability within scaffolds. Limited nutrient diffusion impairs cellular infiltration and delays osteogenesis, compounded by inflammatory dysregulation, which can provoke immune-mediated scaffold failure. Persistent inflammation elevates the risk of fibrosis, creating physical and biochemical barriers to regeneration. Delayed osteogenic signaling due to hypoxia and immune imbalance undermines scaffold-host integration, necessitating advanced immunomodulatory strategies to restore regenerative homeostasis.[59], [60], [61]

Eureka Open Access Journals
Open Access | Peer Reviewed | International Journals | Multidisciplinary Areas
Eureka Journal of Health Sciences & Medical Innovation (EJHSMI)
ISSN 2760-4942 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 5, May 2026

https://eurekaoa.com/index.php/5

5.2 Biomechanical & Structural Challenges

Mechanical mismatches between scaffold materials and native bone generate stress concentrations, leading to premature scaffold collapse or stress shielding, which inhibits bone remodeling. An insufficient load-bearing capacity compromises the structural stability during critical healing phases. Degradation instability, characterized by asynchronous resorption rates, disrupts the stress distribution and scaffold integrity. Structural inconsistencies within the scaffold architecture further impair mechanical performance, underscoring the need for precise control over the biomechanical properties aligned with host tissue dynamics.[62], [63], [64]

5.3 Material-Specific Limitations

Ceramic components, such as B-TCP, exhibit inherent brittleness, limiting their load-bearing applications. Acidic degradation byproducts from polymer components can induce local pH shifts, provoking inflammatory responses that are detrimental to regeneration. Porosity-performance trade-offs arise when increased porosity enhances cellular infiltration but compromises the mechanical strength. Scaffold-host incompatibility, due to surface chemistry or degradation inconsistency, further impairs biological integration. Balancing bioactivity and mechanical demands remains a critical challenge in material performance.[65], [66], [67], [68], [69]

5.4 Clinical Translation Barriers

Defect heterogeneity and patient variability complicate scaffold standardization and the development of clinical protocols. The risk of infection remains a significant complication, exacerbated by challenges in soft tissue integration and surgical complexity. Inconsistent clinical protocols and limited long-term evidence hinder their widespread adoption. These translational barriers

Eureka Open Access Journals
Open Access | Peer Reviewed | International Journals | Multidisciplinary Areas
Eureka Journal of Health Sciences & Medical Innovation (EJHSMI)
ISSN 2760-4942 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 5, May 2026

https://eurekaoa.com/index.php/5

emphasize the necessity for personalized regenerative strategies and rigorous clinical validation to ensure their safety and efficacy.[53], [70], [71], [72]

5.5 Regulatory & Manufacturing Limitations

The regulatory approval processes for composite bioactive scaffolds are complex and require extensive characterization and validation. Manufacturing reproducibility and sterilization challenges hinder scalability. Quality control difficulties and cost-effectiveness concerns further constrain the real-world implementation of these models. Addressing these limitations requires streamlined regulatory frameworks and advanced manufacturing technologies capable of producing consistent, safe, and economically viable scaffolds.[25], [73], [74], [75]

5.6 Evidence-Quality & Methodological Limitations

Methodological heterogeneity across preclinical and clinical studies undermines comparability and evidence synthesis. Translational gaps between animal models and human applications limit their predictive validity. Inconsistent outcome measures and small sample sizes reduce the statistical power. The lack of standardized protocols and insufficient high-quality long-term trials impede definitive conclusions regarding scaffold efficacy. Enhancing evidence maturity requires coordinated efforts toward rigorous and standardized research methodologies.[70], [76], [77]

Future Perspectives

6.1 Next-Generation Smart Biomaterials

Emerging smart biomaterials incorporate stimuli-responsive elements, enabling the controlled release of bioactive factors and adaptive mechanical properties. These multifunctional scaffolds dynamically interact with the regenerative microenvironment, modulating cellular behavior and immune responses in real-

Eureka Open Access Journals
Open Access | Peer Reviewed | International Journals | Multidisciplinary Areas
Eureka Journal of Health Sciences & Medical Innovation (EJHSMI)
ISSN 2760-4942 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 5, May 2026

https://eurekaoa.com/index.php/5

time. The integration of biologically intelligent materials promises enhanced scaffold-host communication, optimizing osteogenesis and vascularization while mitigating inflammation.

6.2 AI-Assisted Scaffold Engineering

AI-driven scaffold optimization leverages machine learning to predict regenerative outcomes based on the scaffold design parameters and biological inputs. Computational biomaterial modeling facilitates the rapid iteration of scaffold architectures tailored to patient-specific needs. Digital regenerative platforms integrate multi-omics data to enhance predictive accuracy and enable personalized scaffold fabrication. These technologies accelerate translational progress by reducing the need for empirical trial-and-error approaches.

6.3 Personalized Regenerative Medicine

Patient-specific scaffolds designed using precision regenerative medicine incorporate genomic and phenotypic data to tailor biomaterial selection and regenerative protocols. Personalized implants accommodate clinical heterogeneity and optimize host response. The integration of individualized regenerative strategies enhances therapeutic efficacy and reduces adverse outcomes, representing a critical evolution in craniofacial reconstruction.

6.4 3D/4D Bioprinting & Advanced Fabrication

Advancements in 3D bioprinting have enabled the fabrication of complex, patient-specific scaffold geometries with precise control over porosity and composition. 4D bioprinting introduces dynamic shape-memory biomaterials that can adapt to physiological stimuli after implantation. These biofabrication technologies facilitate the creation of multifunctional regenerative systems that respond to evolving tissue environments, enhancing integration and functional restoration.

Eureka Open Access Journals
Open Access | Peer Reviewed | International Journals | Multidisciplinary Areas
Eureka Journal of Health Sciences & Medical Innovation (EJHSMI)
ISSN 2760-4942 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 5, May 2026

https://eurekaoa.com/index.php/5

6.5 Immunomodulatory & Microenvironment-Responsive Systems

Future scaffolds will incorporate osteoimmunology-driven design principles to actively modulate macrophage polarization and inflammatory signaling. Engineering regenerative microenvironments that promote immune-regenerative crosstalk enhances scaffold integration and tissue remodeling processes. Such systems dynamically respond to the host immune status, reducing the risk of fibrosis and improving vascularization.

6.6 Translational & Clinical Future Directions

Advancing multicenter clinical trials with standardized protocols will provide robust long-term validation of the bioactive scaffolds. Regulatory harmonization and scalable manufacturing processes are essential for facilitating clinical adoption. The integration of scaffold technologies into surgical workflows must prioritize practicality and patient-specific adaptation. Continued collaboration among biomaterial scientists, clinicians, and regulatory bodies will accelerate bench-to-bedside translation, ultimately improving craniofacial regenerative medicine outcomes.

Conclusion

Craniofacial regeneration is a multifactorial biological and translational challenge that requires sophisticated bioactive scaffold systems. The progression from inert matrices to multifunctional B-TCP/PLLA composites reflects advancements toward biomimetic and biodegradable constructs capable of orchestrating osteogenesis, angiogenesis, and osteoimmunological balance. Mechanistic insights have revealed that scaffold-host interactions, vascular insufficiency, and biomechanical mismatches critically limit clinical success. Translational barriers, including regulatory complexity and manufacturing scalability, further affect clinical readiness.

Eureka Open Access Journals
Open Access | Peer Reviewed | International Journals | Multidisciplinary Areas
OPEN ACCESS JOURNALS

Eureka Journal of Health Sciences & Medical Innovation (EJHSMI)

ISSN 2760-4942 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 5, May 2026

https://eurekaoa.com/index.php/5

Future directions emphasize smart biomaterials with stimuli-responsive capabilities, AI-assisted scaffold design, and personalized regenerative medicine that integrates advanced 3D/4D bioprinting technologies. Immunomodulatory scaffolds engineered to modulate the regenerative microenvironment hold promise for overcoming inflammatory dysregulation and enhancing vascular integration. The realization of these innovations necessitates rigorous long-term clinical validation and harmonized translational frameworks.

This review synthesizes the current knowledge and delineates a future-oriented roadmap, underscoring the necessity of interdisciplinary approaches to overcome enduring challenges. The integration of mechanistic understanding with translational intelligence positions bioactive scaffolds at the forefront of craniofacial regenerative medicine, fostering optimism for clinically effective personalized reconstructive solutions.

References

[1] S. Hollister et al., “Engineering craniofacial scaffolds,” Orthod Craniofacial Res, vol. 8, no. 3, pp. 162–173, July 2005, doi: 10.1111/j.1601-6343.2005.00329.x.

[2] M. Yazdanian et al., “Synthetic materials in craniofacial regenerative medicine: A comprehensive overview,” Front. Bioeng. Biotechnol., vol. 10, no. 11, Nov. 2022, doi: 10.3389/fbioe.2022.987195.

[3] J. D. Kretlow, S. Young, L. Klouda, M. Wong, and A. G. Mikos, “Injectable biomaterials for regenerating complex craniofacial tissues.,” Advanced Materials, vol. 21, no. 32–33, pp. 3368–3393, Aug. 2009, doi: 10.1002/adma.200802009.

[4] S. H. Zaky and R. Cancedda, “Engineering Craniofacial Structures: Facing the Challenge,” J Dent Res, vol. 88, no. 12, pp. 1077–1091, Nov. 2009, doi: 10.1177/0022034509349926.

[5] M. A. Kienstra and L. J. Marentette, “New developments in craniofacial reconstruction,” Current Opinion in Otolaryngology & Head and Neck

Eureka Open Access Journals
Open Access | Peer Reviewed | International Journals | Multidisciplinary Areas
OPEN ACCESS JOURNALS

Eureka Journal of Health Sciences & Medical Innovation (EJHSMI)

ISSN 2760-4942 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 5, May 2026

https://eurekaoa.com/index.php/5

Surgery, vol. 10, no. 4, pp. 282–285, Aug. 2002, doi: 10.1097/00020840-200208000-00007.

[6] A. Emara and R. Shah, “Recent update on craniofacial tissue engineering,” J Tissue Eng, vol. 12, no. 4, p. 204173142110037, Jan. 2021, doi: 10.1177/20417314211003735.

[7] B. Ward, S. Brown, and P. Krebsbach, “Bioengineering strategies for regeneration of craniofacial bone: a review of emerging technologies.,” Oral Diseases, vol. 16, no. 8, pp. 709–716, May 2010, doi: 10.1111/j.1601-0825.2010.01682.x.

[8] Q. Chen et al., “Biofunctionalization of Stem Cell Scaffold for Osteogenesis and Bone Regeneration,” Biomolecules, vol. 15, no. 12, p. 1700, Dec. 2025, doi: 10.3390/biom15121700.

[9] D. W. Hutmacher, J. T. Schantz, C. X. F. Lam, K. C. Tan, and T. C. Lim, “State of the art and future directions of scaffold-based bone engineering from a biomaterials perspective,” J Tissue Eng Regen Med, vol. 1, no. 4, pp. 245–260, Jan. 2007, doi: 10.1002/term.24.

[10] 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.,” IJMS, vol. 25, no. 11, p. 6012, May 2024, doi: 10.3390/ijms25116012.

[11] S. Jiang, M. Wang, and J. He, “A review of biomimetic scaffolds for bone regeneration: Toward a cell-free strategy.,” Bioengineering & Transla Med, vol. 6, no. 2, p. e10206, Dec. 2020, doi: 10.1002/btm2.10206.

[12] V. Kesireddy and F. K. Kasper, “Approaches for building bioactive elements into synthetic scaffolds for bone tissue engineering.,” J. Mater. Chem. B, vol. 4, no. 42, pp. 6773–6786, Jan. 2016, doi: 10.1039/c6tb00783j.

[13] N. Muzzio, S. Moya, and G. Romero, “Multifunctional Scaffolds and Synergistic Strategies in Tissue Engineering and Regenerative Medicine.,”

Eureka Open Access Journals
Open Access | Peer Reviewed | International Journals | Multidisciplinary Areas
OPEN ACCESS JOURNALS

Eureka Journal of Health Sciences & Medical Innovation (EJHSMI)

ISSN 2760-4942 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 5, May 2026

https://eurekaoa.com/index.php/5

Pharmaceutics, vol. 13, no. 6, p. 792, May 2021, doi: 10.3390/pharmaceutics13060792.

[14] M. M. Ali, "A primer on fabricating bioactive regenerative scaffolds – from materials and surface properties to microenvironment," Ad Med Pharma Den RE, vol. 5, no. 1, p. 100, Apr. 2025, doi: 10.21622/ampdr.2025.05.1.1282.

[15] A. Salerno, G. Cesarelli, P. Pedram, and P. A. Netti, "Modular Strategies to Build Cell-Free and Cell-Laden Scaffolds towards Bioengineered Tissues and Organs.," JCM, vol. 8, no. 11, p. 1816, Nov. 2019, doi: 10.3390/jcm8111816.

[16] C. Chen, "A physicochemical approach to design bioactive scaffolds for tissue engineering," University Of Maastricht, 2018. doi: 10.26481/dis.20170406hc.

[17] A. Farazin and S. F. Darghiasi, "Advanced polymeric scaffolds for bone tissue regeneration," Explor BioMat-X, vol. 2, June 2025, doi: 10.37349/ebmx.2025.101340.

[18] S. Yamaji and S. Kobayashi, "10505 リン酸三カルシウム/ポリL乳酸複合材料のin vitro分解特性評価(OS2-2【バイオエンジニアリング(2)】)," The Proceedings of Conference of Kanto Branch, vol. 2013.19, no. 0, pp. 71–72, Jan. 2013, doi: 10.1299/jsmekanto.2013.19.71.

[19] T. Arahira, M. Maruta, S. Matsuya, and M. Todo, "2H22 操作性・骨伝導性に優れるβ-TCP/PLLA scaffoldの作製と評価," The Proceedings of the Bioengineering Conference Annual Meeting of BED/JSME, vol. 2016.28, no. 0, p. _2H22-4_, Jan. 2016, doi: 10.1299/jsmebio.2016.28._2h22-1_.

[20] K. E. G. Dienel, B. Van Bochove, and J. V. Seppälä, "Additive Manufacturing of Bioactive Poly(trimethylene carbonate)/β-Tricalcium Phosphate Composites for Bone Regeneration.," Biomacromolecules, vol. 21, no. 2, pp. 366–375, Nov. 2019, doi: 10.1021/acs.biomac.9b01272.

[21] X. Ding, A. Li, F. Yang, K. Sun, and X. Sun, "β-tricalcium phosphate and octacalcium phosphate composite bioceramic material for bone tissue

Eureka Open Access Journals
Open Access | Peer Reviewed | International Journals | Multidisciplinary Areas
Eureka Journal of Health Sciences & Medical Innovation (EJHSMI)
ISSN 2760-4942 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 5, May 2026

https://eurekaoa.com/index.php/5

engineering.," J Biomater Appl, vol. 34, no. 9, pp. 1294–1299, Feb. 2020, doi: 10.1177/0885328220903989.
[22] E. A. Todd et al., "Functional Scaffolds for Bone Tissue Regeneration: A Comprehensive Review of Materials, Methods, and Future Directions.," JFB, vol. 15, no. 10, p. 280, Sept. 2024, doi: 10.3390/jfb15100280.
[23] M. I. Echeverria Molina, K. G. Malollari, and K. Komvopoulos, "Design Challenges in Polymeric Scaffolds for Tissue Engineering," Front. Bioeng. Biotechnol., vol. 9, p. 617141, June 2021, doi: 10.3389/fbioe.2021.617141.
[24] A. Varpe, S. Shinde, B. Champaty, A. Dash, U. Kumar, and S. Khade, "Recent Advances on Scaffolds: A Comprehensive Review of Materials, Fabrication Techniques, and Applications," Nano LIFE, vol. 14, no. 02, Feb. 2024, doi: 10.1142/s1793984424300024.
[25] M. Krishani, W. Y. Shin, H. Suhaimi, and N. S. Sambudi, "Development of Scaffolds from Bio-Based Natural Materials for Tissue Regeneration Applications: A Review," Gels, vol. 9, no. 2, p. 100, Jan. 2023, doi: 10.3390/gels9020100.
[26] T. Tateishi, G. Chen, and T. Ushida, "Biodegradable porous scaffolds for tissue engineering," Journal of Artificial Organs, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 77–83, June 2002, doi: 10.1007/s100470200014.
[27] V. Kolliopoulos, M. J. Dewey, M. Polanek, H. Xu, and B. A. C. Harley, "Amnion and chorion matrix maintain hMSC osteogenic response and enhance immunomodulatory and angiogenic potential in a mineralized collagen scaffold.," Front. Bioeng. Biotechnol., vol. 10, p. 1034701, Nov. 2022, doi: 10.3389/fbioe.2022.1034701.
[28] M. Deng et al., "IGFBP3 deposited in the human umbilical cord mesenchymal stem cell-secreted extracellular matrix promotes bone formation.," Journal Cellular Physiology, vol. 233, no. 8, pp. 5792–5804, Mar. 2018, doi: 10.1002/jcp.26342.

Eureka Open Access Journals
Open Access | Peer Reviewed | International Journals | Multidisciplinary Areas

Eureka Journal of Health Sciences & Medical Innovation (EJHSMI)

ISSN 2760-4942 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 5, May 2026

https://eurekaoa.com/index.php/5

[29] F. Soheilmoghaddam, H. Hezaveh, M. Rumble, and J. J. Cooper-White, "Driving Osteocytogenesis from Mesenchymal Stem Cells in Osteon-like Biomimetic Nanofibrous Scaffolds.," ACS Appl. Mater. Interfaces, vol. 16, no. 31, pp. 40411–40427, July 2024, doi: 10.1021/acsami.3c14785.

[30] V. M. C. Quent, C. Theodoropoulos, D. W. Hutmacher, and J. C. Reichert, "Differential osteogenicity of multiple donor-derived human mesenchymal stem cells and osteoblasts in monolayer, scaffold-based 3D culture and in vivo.," Biomedical Engineering / Biomedizinische Technik, vol. 61, no. 3, pp. 253–266, Mar. 2015, doi: 10.1515/bmt-2014-0159.

[31] K. Holkar, V. Kale, and G. Ingavle, "Cell-Instructive Mineralized Microenvironment Regulates Osteogenesis: A Growing SYMBIOSIS of Cell Biology and Biomaterials Engineering in Bone Tissue Regeneration.," ACS Biomater. Sci. Eng., vol. 9, no. 8, pp. 4867–4877, June 2023, doi: 10.1021/acsbiomaterials.3c00058.

[32] Y. He et al., "Innovations and optimal design in scaffold materials: The key to vascularization in bone tissue engineering.," Biomedical materials (Bristol, England), May 2026, doi: 10.1088/1748-605x/ae6a57.

[33] E. Ellermann, N. Meyer, R. E. Cameron, and S. M. Best, "In vitro angiogenesis in response to biomaterial properties for bone tissue engineering: a review of the state of the art," Regenerative Biomaterials, vol. 10, p. rbad027, Jan. 2023, doi: 10.1093/rb/rbad027.

[34] A. Banfi, "THE INTERPLAY OF ANGIOGENESIS AND OSTEOGENESIS FOR BONE REGENERATION," Bone Joint J, vol. 106-B, no. SUPP_2, p. 140, Jan. 2024, doi: 10.1302/1358-992x.2024.2.140.

[35] J. Nambiar, S. Jana, and S. K. Nandi, "Strategies for Enhancing Vascularization of Biomaterial-Based Scaffold in Bone Regeneration.," The Chemical Record, vol. 22, no. 6, p. e202200008, Mar. 2022, doi: 10.1002/tcr.202200008.

Eureka Open Access Journals
Open Access | Peer Reviewed | International Journals | Multidisciplinary Areas
Eureka Journal of Health Sciences & Medical Innovation (EJHSMI)
ISSN 2760-4942 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 5, May 2026

https://eurekaoa.com/index.php/5

[36] F. Diomede et al., "Functional Relationship between Osteogenesis and Angiogenesis in Tissue Regeneration.," IJMS, vol. 21, no. 9, p. 3242, May 2020, doi: 10.3390/ijms21093242.
[37] V. Kolliopoulos et al., "Reciprocal macrophage-MSC crosstalk drives immunomodulatory and regenerative phenotypes in a mineralized collagen scaffold.," bioRxiv : the preprint server for biology, Mar. 2026, doi: 10.64898/2026.03.10.710803.
[38] T. Yang, Z. Fang, J. Zhang, and S. Zheng, "Physical cues in biomaterials modulate macrophage polarization for bone regeneration: a review," Front. Bioeng. Biotechnol., vol. 13, no. 1, p. 1640560, July 2025, doi: 10.3389/fbioe.2025.1640560.
[39] Y. Zhang et al., "Enhanced Bone Regeneration via Dual Immune-Modulatory Scaffold: Integrating Lipopolysaccharide/Gelatin Methacrylate and Proanthocyanidins/Polylactic Acid to Enhance Macrophage Recruitment and M2 Phenotype Polarization.," Adv Healthcare Materials, vol. 15, no. 9, p. e04300, Dec. 2025, doi: 10.1002/adhm.202504300.
[40] P. K. Chocholata, J. Dvorakova, V. Babuska, and M. Cedikova, "Biomaterial Strategies of Macrophage Behaviour in Bone Regeneration," Regen. Eng. Transl. Med., July 2025, doi: 10.1007/s40883-025-00443-8.
[41] W. J. Hendrikson et al., "Influence of Additive Manufactured Scaffold Architecture on the Distribution of Surface Strains and Fluid Flow Shear Stresses and Expected Osteochondral Cell Differentiation," Front. Bioeng. Biotechnol., vol. 5, p. 6, Feb. 2017, doi: 10.3389/fbioe.2017.00006.
[42] T. Sun, Q. Li, H. Cheng, W. Zhang, N. Han, and Y. Kou, "Bone Tissue Engineering Scaffolds for Bone Aging: Drug Delivery and Microenvironment Regulation.," Tissue Engineering Part B: Reviews, p. 19373341251379774, Sept. 2025, doi: 10.1177/19373341251379774.
[43] C. Sandino, "In Silico Studies of the Mechanical Stimuli within Bone Tissue and Bone-Tissue-Engineered-Scaffolds," in Proceedings of the World Congress

Eureka Open Access Journals
Open Access | Peer Reviewed | International Journals | Multidisciplinary Areas
Eureka Journal of Health Sciences & Medical Innovation (EJHSMI)
ISSN 2760-4942 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 5, May 2026

https://eurekaoa.com/index.php/5

on Recent Advances in Nanotechnology, Avestia, Apr. 2017. doi: 10.11159/nddte17.1.

[44] S.-Y. Long, Y.-J. Fu, Z.-M. Zhang, R. Tang, P. Yu, and W. Yang, "Architecture mechanics mediated osteogenic progression in bone regeneration of artificial scaffolds," Sci. Adv., vol. 11, no. 29, p. eadv8804, July 2025, doi: 10.1126/sciadv.adv8804.

[45] M. Rama, A. S. Suresh, A. E. John, L. Vijaylal, and U. Vijayalakshmi, "Revolutionizing tissue engineering: integrating 3D bioprinting and additive manufacturing for precision scaffold design and biomimetic tissue regeneration," Materials Technology, vol. 40, no. 1, July 2025, doi: 10.1080/10667857.2025.2530639.

[46] S. Loai, B. Kingston, M. Tao, H. Cheng, D. Philpott, and Z. Wang, "Clinical Perspectives on 3D Bioprinting Paradigms for Regenerative Medicine," Regen Med Front., vol. 1, no. 1, Jan. 2019, doi: 10.20900/rmf20190004.

[47] W. L. Ng, C. Vyas, B. Huang, W. Y. Yeong, and P. Bartolo, "Advanced bioprinting strategies for fabrication of biomimetic tissues and organs," Int. J. Extrem. Manuf., vol. 7, no. 6, p. 062006, Aug. 2025, doi: 10.1088/2631-7990/adeee0.

[48] G. Qu, J. Huang, G. Gu, Z. Li, X. Wu, and J. Ren, "Smart implants: 4D-printed shape-morphing scaffolds for medical implantation.," IJB, vol. 9, no. 5, p. 764, May 2023, doi: 10.18063/ijb.764.

[49] M. Aftab, S. Ikram, M. Ullah, A. Wahab, and M. Naeem, "Three-Dimensional (3D) Printing Scaffold-Based Drug Delivery for Tissue Regeneration," JMMP, vol. 10, no. 1, p. 9, Dec. 2025, doi: 10.3390/jmmp10010009.

[50] C. Chaudhary and T. Garg, "Scaffolds: A Novel Carrier and Potential Wound Healer.," Crit Rev Ther Drug Carrier Syst, vol. 32, no. 4, pp. 277–321, Jan. 2015, doi: 10.1615/critrevtherdrugcarriersyst.2015011246.

Eureka Open Access Journals
Open Access | Peer Reviewed | International Journals | Multidisciplinary Areas
OPEN ACCESS JOURNALS

Eureka Journal of Health Sciences & Medical Innovation (EJHSMI)

ISSN 2760-4942 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 5, May 2026

https://eurekaoa.com/index.php/5

[51] S. Cosson, E. A. Otte, H. Hezaveh, and J. J. Cooper-White, "Concise review: tailoring bioengineered scaffolds for stem cell applications in tissue engineering and regenerative medicine.," Stem Cells Translational Medicine, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 156–164, Jan. 2015, doi: 10.5966/sctm.2014-0203.

[52] V. I. Nikolskiy, K. I. Sergatskiy, D. P. Sheremet, and A. V. Shabrov, "Scaffold technologies in regenerative medicine: history of the issue, current state and prospects of application," Khir. Z. im. N.I. Pirogova, no. 11, p. 36, Jan. 2022, doi: 10.17116/hirurgia202211136.

[53] R. Goswami et al., "Recent Advances in Tissue Engineering Scaffolds and Commercial Applications," YMER, vol. 21, no. 06, pp. 865–882, June 2022, doi: 10.37896/ymer21.06/86.

[54] R. Malviya, S. Rajput, and M. Vaidya, "Integrating AI With Tissue Engineering," pp. 25–58, Jan. 2024, doi: 10.1002/9781394230914.ch2.

[55] M. Gharibshahian, M. Torkashvand, M. Bavisi, N. Aldaghi, and A. Alizadeh, "Recent advances in artificial intelligent strategies for tissue engineering and regenerative medicine.," Skin Research and Technology, vol. 30, no. 9, p. e70016, Aug. 2024, doi: 10.1111/srt.70016.

[56] N. Shaik and A. Shaik, "ADVANCING AI-DRIVEN TISSUE ENGINEERING CONSTRUCTS THROUGH FUTURE DIRECTIONS IN REAL-TIME ADAPTATION, MULTI-MODAL INTEGRATION, AND PERSONALIZED SCAFFOLD DESIGN.," ShodhKosh J. Vis. Per. Arts, vol. 4, no. 1, June 2023, doi: 10.29121/shodhkosh.v4.i1.2023.4124.

[57] O. A.D, A. A.A, and A. O.O, "Artificial Intelligence Driven Optimisation of Scaffold Design and Production in Tissue Engineering: A Critical Review," J. Eng. Res. Rep., vol. 27, no. 12, pp. 302–326, Dec. 2025, doi: 10.9734/jerr/2025/v27i121744.

[58] O. Panahi and S. Farrokh, "Can AI Heal Us? The Promise of AI-Driven Tissue Engineering," Int J Nurs Health Care, vol. 1, no. 1, Mar. 2025, doi: 10.52106/3069-0641.1002.

Eureka Open Access Journals
Open Access | Peer Reviewed | International Journals | Multidisciplinary Areas
OPEN ACCESS JOURNALS

Eureka Journal of Health Sciences & Medical Innovation (EJHSMI)

ISSN 2760-4942 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 5, May 2026

https://eurekaoa.com/index.php/5

[59] Y. Chen et al., “Autonomous living materials and bone-inspired scaffolds motivated by human osteogenic microenvironment mechanisms,” Materials & Design, vol. 244, p. 113145, July 2024, doi: 10.1016/j.matdes.2024.113145.
[60] C. H. Contag and C. V. Maduka, “Fueling bone regeneration by rewriting immune metabolism,” Open Access Government, vol. 48, no. 1, pp. 129–130, Oct. 2025, doi: 10.56367/oag-048-11881.
[61] J. M. Sadowska and M.-P. Ginebra, “Inflammation and biomaterials: role of the immune response in bone regeneration by inorganic scaffolds.,” J. Mater. Chem. B, vol. 8, no. 41, pp. 9404–9427, Jan. 2020, doi: 10.1039/d0tb01379j.
[62] Y. Zhang and H. Gong, “Influencing Factors on the Properties of Bone Scaffolds and Their Manufacturing Techniques,” Sheng wu yi xue gong cheng xue za zhi = Journal of biomedical engineering = Shengwu yixue gongchengxue zazhi, vol. 32, no. 2, pp. 480–4, Apr. 2015.
[63] P. Prochor, A. Gryko, J. Filipiak, and E. Sajewicz, “The Influence of the Bone Scaffold Biodegradation Process on Bone Remodeling in Critical Size Bone Defects: A Finite Element Analysis.,” Journal of biomedical materials research. Part B, Applied biomaterials, vol. 114, no. 5, May 2026, doi: 10.1002/jbm.b.70090.
[64] B. M. Holzapfel, M. Rudert, and D. W. Hutmacher, “Scaffold-based Bone Tissue Engineering,” Orthopäde, vol. 46, no. 8, pp. 701–710, July 2017, doi: 10.1007/s00132-017-3444-0.
[65] Q. Lu, F. Zeng, J. Diao, Y. Kuang, N. Zhao, and Y. Wang, “Microstructure-tailored β-tricalcium phosphate scaffolds utilize degradation-guided osteoclast suppression to accelerate bone regeneration.,” Journal of materials chemistry. B, vol. 13, no. 47, pp. 15282–15296, Dec. 2025, doi: 10.1039/d5tb01393c.
[66] S. Panseri et al., “Bone-like ceramic scaffolds designed with bioinspired porosity induce a different stem cell response,” J Mater Sci: Mater Med, vol. 32, no. 1, p. 3, Jan. 2021, doi: 10.1007/s10856-020-06486-3.

Eureka Open Access Journals
Open Access | Peer Reviewed | International Journals | Multidisciplinary Areas
Eureka Journal of Health Sciences & Medical Innovation (EJHSMI)
ISSN 2760-4942 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 5, May 2026

https://eurekaoa.com/index.php/5

[67] T. Furusawa et al., "Enhancement of mechanical strength and in vivo cytocompatibility of porous β-tricalcium phosphate ceramics by gelatin coating," Int J Implant Dent, vol. 2, no. 1, p. 4, Feb. 2016, doi: 10.1186/s40729-016-0037-3.

[68] S. Y. Cheng, M. Mariatti, and Z. A. A. Hamid, "Gel casting of β-TCP scaffolds: Effects of foaming time and polymer coating," J. Phys.: Conf. Ser., vol. 1082, no. 1, p. 012079, Aug. 2018, doi: 10.1088/1742-6596/1082/1/012079.

[69] J. Vivanco, S. García-Rodríguez, E. L. Smith, and H.-L. Ploeg, "Material and Mechanical Properties of Tricalcium Phosphate-Based (TCP) Scaffolds," American Society Of Mechanical Engineers, June 2009, pp. 879–880. doi: 10.1115/sbc2009-204934.

[70] O. J. Badero, S. Bakare, C. F. Okirie, and M. Al-Awadh, "Comparative Effectiveness of Natural Versus Synthetic Biodegradable Scaffolds in Soft Tissue Reconstruction: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis.," Cureus, vol. 18, no. 4, Apr. 2026, doi: 10.7759/cureus.107399.

[71] M. Mansouri Moghaddam, M. S. Aghajanzadeh, and R. Imani, "Engineering therapeutic scaffolds: integrating drug delivery with tissue regeneration.," J. Mater. Chem. B, vol. 13, no. 35, pp. 10780–10835, Jan. 2025, doi: 10.1039/d5tb01338k.

[72] M. J. Webber, O. F. Khan, S. A. Sydlik, B. C. Tang, and R. Langer, "A perspective on the clinical translation of scaffolds for tissue engineering.," Ann Biomed Eng, vol. 43, no. 3, pp. 641–656, Sept. 2014, doi: 10.1007/s10439-014-1104-7.

[73] N. Sultana, A. Cole, and F. Strachan, "Biocomposite Scaffolds for Tissue Engineering: Materials, Fabrication Techniques and Future Directions," Materials, vol. 17, no. 22, p. 5577, Nov. 2024, doi: 10.3390/ma17225577.

[74] N. Sultana, A. E. Cole, and F. Strachan, "Review: Biocomposite Scaffolds for Tissue Engineering: Materials, Fabrication Techniques and Future Directions," Oct. 28, 2024, Mdpi Ag. doi: 10.20944/preprints202410.2096.v1.

Eureka Open Access Journals
Open Access | Peer Reviewed | International Journals | Multidisciplinary Areas

Eureka Journal of Health Sciences & Medical Innovation (EJHSMI)

ISSN 2760-4942 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 5, May 2026

https://eurekaoa.com/index.php/5

[75] S. Joshi, G. Pendyala, P. Shah, V. Mopagar, N. Padmawar, and M. Padubidri, "Scaffolds—The Ground for Regeneration: A Narrative Review," J Int Soc Prevent Communit Dent, vol. 10, no. 6, p. 692, Jan. 2020, doi: 10.4103/jispcd.jispcd_198_20.

[76] J. Janzekovic, "Analysis, Quantification and Clinical Translation of Scaffold-Based Tissue Engineering Techniques for Soft Tissue Reconstruction," Queensland University Of Technology, 2025. doi: 10.5204/thesis.eprints.261731.

[77] I. Ribitsch et al., "Large Animal Models in Regenerative Medicine and Tissue Engineering: To Do or Not to Do," Front. Bioeng. Biotechnol., vol. 8, no. Suppl 3, p. 972, Aug. 2020, doi: 10.3389/fbioe.2020.00972.