IAA Journal of Biological Sciences 13(1):1-8, 2025 www.iaajournals.org
©IAAJOURNALS ISSN:2636-7254
https://doi.org/10.59298/IAAJB/2025/13118 IAAJB131

3D Bioprinting: Revolutionizing Tissue Engineering

Tom Robert

Department of Clinical Medicine and Dentistry, Kampala International University Uganda
Email: robert.tom@studwc.kiu.ac.ug

ABSTRACT

3D bioprinting stands at the intersection of biology, engineering, and material science, enabling the precise fabrication of tissue constructs that mimic the architecture and function of native human tissues. This paper examines the evolution, techniques, materials, and multifaceted applications of 3D bioprinting in tissue engineering and regenerative medicine. From its foundational principles rooted in additive manufacturing to the development of smart bioinks and complex vascularized constructs, 3D bioprinting offers novel pathways for addressing the shortage of donor organs, personalized medicine, pharmacological testing, and even the development of food alternatives. Despite its promise, the technology faces significant challenges such as limited cell viability, bioink optimization, and unresolved regulatory frameworks. The future of bioprinting depends on interdisciplinary collaboration, innovation in biomaterials, and proactive regulatory engagement to translate laboratory successes into clinical and commercial reality.

Keywords: 3D Bioprinting, Tissue Engineering, Regenerative Medicine, Bioink, Scaffold, Smart Biomaterials, Organ Fabrication.

INTRODUCTION

Tissue Engineering, Regenerative Medicine, Pharmacology Testing, and Food Alternatives are the major applications of the 3D bioprinting technology. A 3D bioprinted tissue includes the fabrication of relevant cells and biomaterials, their structuring into a target bio-construct of similar architectural complexity to the target tissue, and the maturation of the bioprinted bio-construct to the attained tissue functionality. The gradual process of bioprinting a tissue bioconstruct proceeds through three steps: its design, fabrication, and maturation. Bioprinting starts with obtaining the anatomical structure of the target tissue by a proper imaging technique. A specialized software is then used to translate the image into a CAD drawing of cross-sectional layers. The CAD drawing is converted into a format compatible with the bioprinting device. The bioprinting device constructs the tissue using a specific printing method by employing a combination of printing materials such as scaffold, bioink, and other additive factors. The bioprinting technology is used in developmental and tissue engineering applications. In 3D printing, all printing materials are non-biological materials. The challenge remains the compatibility of shedding material for a designed printing device to replace a bioink and use it for tissue engineering applications. This certainly requires a lot of research. However, a great deal is still unknown, and much research is rapidly evolving around it, and other processes are being tested [1, 2].

Historical Background of Tissue Engineering

The increasing prevalence of organ failure is a huge burden for public health, while a shortage of available grafts intensifies this problem, so the urgency of developing replacement tissues and organs is increasingly evident. Tissue engineering, targeting to use biomaterials and cells to restore, maintain, and enhance the function of tissues and organs, has drawn great interest because of its great potential in creating artificial organs. In the 1980s, the concept of tissue engineering was first introduced, and many efforts have been made in this field since then. So far, artificial tissues such as cartilage, bone, skin, vessel, adipose tissue, muscle, and tendon have been created in a laboratory, proving the feasibility of engineering tissues. A fundamental dichotomy exists in the strategic approaches used in tissue engineering, that is, 'top-down' and 'bottom-up'. The top-down strategy involves the seeding of cells onto

biomaterial scaffolds, supplemented with growth factors to regulate cell behavior and stimulate extracellular matrix (ECM) production. However, very low cell density and uneven distribution of cells resulting from the direct seeding of cells make the expansion of anemone cells very difficult. The 'bottom-up' strategy centers on the systematic fabrication and assembly of the basic building blocks constituting tissues and organs. Cell-laden building blocks ensure the even distribution of cells, thus increasing cellular viability and promoting the formation of artificial tissues. Moreover, separately built building blocks can not only be assembled into complex structures but also be hollow, which allows for the design of a microvascular network without adding obstacles for cell growth. The bottom-up strategy is advantageous because of even cell distribution, microstructure replication, and microvascular network design. Various techniques have been utilized to construct tissues and organs from the 'bottom-up', including microfluidics, micromolding, self-assembly, three-dimensional (3D) bioprinting, and electrospinning [3, 4].

Fundamentals of 3D Printing Technology

The bioprinting process begins with imaging the target tissue using techniques like CT, MRI, and ultrasonography. The resulting images are converted into CAD drawings, preparing for printing. A bioprinting device is then loaded with bioink/scaffolds and solvents to create tissues through various methods such as inkjet, micro-extrusion, and laser-assisted bioprinting. Different combinations of media can be employed, including pure bioink and hydrogels. The outcome is influenced by the bioprinting method, ink compatibility, media used, culture conditions, and the specific tissue printed. The rapid advancements in 3D bioprinting technology have transformed tissue engineering, regenerative medicine, food production, and pharmaceuticals. For regenerative medicine, innovations in 3D printers, bioink, and scaffold materials enable the creation of human tissue-engineered organs for transplantation. In food research, 3D bioprinting demonstrates advantages over traditional methods, facilitating the design of high-quality, appealing food products. Within pharmaceuticals, gelatin polymers are used for 3D bioprinting polyclonal antibodies and spheroid cell capsules for biopharmaceuticals. 3D bioprinting is a subset of 3D printing technology, which is based on layer-by-layer automated deposition of materials to create solid structures from CAD files. This technology evolved from 2D printing methods, where materials like papers and plastics are printed using a nozzle on a substrate to produce graphics. In 3D printing, each layer is cured using various techniques, allowing for solid component fabrication. This progression was made possible by the emergence of affordable hardware and software for 3D printers. The first technique, stereolithography, is now widely known through STL file formats, with further developments enhancing material deposition and making the printing processes more versatile [5, 6].

Biological Materials for Bioprinting

Among the hundreds of bioinks recently developed and bioinks for each specific tissue type, there is also a growing interest in developing smart bioinks that could provide new opportunities for precision bioengineering by enabling spatiotemporal control. Smart bioinks can reinforce their printability once printed into structures by self-repairing and setting. This capability makes it possible to overcome the limitation of the 3D bioprinting of weak bioinks and thus expands the library of bioinks that can be used. Smart bioinks can also provide a range of cues for tissue engineering applications by either stably or reversibly dynamically changing their properties. Develop smart bioinks that combine biocompatibility, printability, and on-demand properties switching capabilities. Because of their high viscosity and gelling instantaneously at room temperature, alginate acids have been typically used as reinforcing additives in smart bioinks. An optimized 3D printing method, based on direct ink writing, was developed, and bioinks with different gelation modes, switching times, and mechanisms were fabricated. Smart bioinks capable of reversible hydrogen bond formation and breaking were developed based on gelatin and poly (ethylene glycol) diacrylate. Because of having different upper critical solution temperatures, these bioinks firstly exhibited a shape memory effect and then were melted at higher temperatures. The elastocaloric cooling resulting from the mechanical deformation of these smart bioinks was demonstrated. These smart bioinks provide spatiotemporal tunability for a range of bioengineering applications such as dynamically tuning growth factor delivery, liquid-to-gel transitions in inks, and biomaterials [7, 8].

Designing Bioprinted Tissues

3D printing technologies have revolutionized several fields such as personalized manufacturing, tooling, molding, prototyping, and casting. This technology has also shown promise for applications in tissue engineering and regenerative medicine. A bioprinter is a 3D printer utilizing bio-inks to create biomimetic tissues pre-vascularized and composed of living cells. Most 3D bioprinting techniques employ

layer-by-layer additive assembly of pre-fabricated shapes or structures as building blocks. This bioassembly method utilizes a variety of building blocks such as spheroids, pellets, sheets, and fibers. Due to the higher complexity and fullness of bioprinted structures, it generally requires a large time and effort for bioassembly-hybrid tissue construction. The patient's specific pre-fabrication method is another approach extensively studied for this purpose. This method sacrifices the integration between millimeter-sized heterogeneous tissues, generally obtained by multi-design and multi-channel, to improve the speed and accuracy of reconstruction. Despite its powerful capability, bioprinting is still facing several technical challenges for clinical translation. First, tissues printed with most bioprinting processes contain micrometric unprinted gaps due to the volumetric nature of light or ink-jetted bioprinting systems. These gaps lead to low resolutions when printing tissue constructs with small or intricate networks, as the threshold is generally dictated by the diameter of the light or bio-ink nozzle. These gaps not only extend the time required for post-processing but also hinder the integration between vascular and parenchymal tissues by introducing a cavity that cannot be printed. Second, volume and inhomogeneity misalignment volume expansion affect the bioprintability of bio-inks during the extrusion dispense step. This may lead to inhomogeneous off-printed bio-inks with poorly dispersed cells, and affect cell vitality and proliferation. Third, bioprinting requires more complex customization of feedstock formulation. Bio-inks should contain no cells under in vivo native conditions, and only allow printed aggregates to generate vascularized tissues post-bioprinting. This restricts bio-inks to simple types and types generally used for other bioprinting techniques [9, 10].

Bioprinting Techniques \and Methods

Bioprinting is a complex, multiscale process involving the deposition of various bioinks onto substrates using traditional 3D printing, controlled methods, or encapsulation techniques. Open platforms for custom bioprinting methods have been reported, along with hybrid approaches for precise tissue biofabrication. High-resolution printing of cells with bioinks poses challenges and opportunities for tissue engineering and regenerative medicine. A soft robotic platform demonstrates the ability to bioprint hydrogels with high throughput and cell viability. Current challenges in commercial bioprinters include bioink selection and printer design, impacting performance metrics. Numerous bioprinter manufacturers and suppliers have been identified, and developments in robotics within biomaterials and biomanufacturing are explored. New technical advancements highlight biostructure construction methods for advanced biomanufacturing. A soft assembly bioprinting method positions cell-laden gelatin microgels to create 3D aggregates, proving the potential for multifunctional microgel assemblies. Additionally, a bioinspired dual-vascularized 3D hydrogel system integrates microgels and alginate to create biocompatible constructs that mature into functional tissues. Continued development of bioinks and printers enhances printing performance and expands bioprinting applications, aiding in a better understanding of various biological challenges [11, 12].

Cell Viability and Functionality

The bioprinting of tissues and organs is a revolutionary aspect of tissue engineering. Recent advances in bioprinting mechanisms and bioink characteristics encourage this endeavour. However, inherent limitations on cell viability and functionality still hinder bioprinting applicability in regenerative medicine. Despite significant efforts to identify and overcome these limiting factors, a complete understanding of and solutions to these bioprinting challenges are still lacking. 3D bioprinting technologies offer a diverse set of techniques to fabricate tissue engineering constructs with the desired shape and architecture. Currently, there are several commercially available bioprinter brands with a wide variety of mechanisms. Each printer has its own set of pros and cons, and selection should be based on the application and desired outcomes. Existing bioprinter mechanisms can be classified into the following five categories: extrusion-based bioprinters, inkjet-based bioprinters, laser-assisted bioprinters, microvalve-based bioprinters, and other methods. Among these technologies, extrusion-based bioprinters, specifically pneumatic-based bioprinters, are the most widely used, benefiting from their ease of use and affordability. Extrusion-based bioprinters utilize a pressure-driven nozzle mechanism to extrude bioink at a controlled flow rate. In combination with motional control on the X, Y, and Z axes, robust and reproducible scaffolds can be fabricated. Materials such as polylactic acid, polycaprolactone, and alginate have been used to develop stand-alone constructs. More importantly, this method is now being applied to engineer tissue constructs. Recent studies demonstrated the 3D bioprinting of osteogenic, chondrogenic, and vascularised tissue constructs. In contrast to extrusion-based bioprinters, inkjet-based bioprinters do not require bioink to be rheologically tuned, allowing the printing of very low viscosity bioinks such as GF-

releasing gelatin. Combined with diverse laser techniques, this technology allows the incorporation of cells into existing scaffolds or hybrid scaffolds [13, 14].

Applications of 3D Bioprinting

3D bioprinting has shown strong potential in clinical applications within regenerative medicine and tissue engineering. Injection-based techniques in 3D bioprinting have been applied successfully to fabricate a variety of anatomically relevant tissue structures. Various 3D bioprinters, with different printing mechanisms, nozzle geometries, operabilities, and nozzle-moving technologies, have been utilized to fabricate large-size biodegradable scaffolds with tunable spool shapes, micro architectures, and complex internal pore structures in the field of bone tissue engineering. Bioprinting-based cochlear scaffolds have been used with high accuracy and multi-material fabrication capabilities, which pave the new avenues to recreate the complex shapes of biological structures in their native states, and subsequent replantation for cochlear restoration. Tissue-specific bioprinting conditions, as well as the shape- and size-tunable bioprinting, have been developed to fabricate clinically relevant cornea and retinal constructs for the treatment of corneal and retinal degenerative disorders, respectively. 3D bioprinted biobandages have shown strong potential in the repair of a variety of skin defects, abdominal aortic aneurysms, and substantial segmental bone losses. In addition, bio-printing methods, bioprinted bioinks, and bioprinted 3D structures with requisite biofunctions have been developed for cardiac, vascular, and neural applications. Furthermore, bioprinting approaches have been applied successfully to the on-demand preservation of organs and cells, as well as the in situ bioprinting of different biological structures [15, 16].

Challenges in 3D Bioprinting

Bioprinting aims to design and manufacture human-scale functional tissue constructs that can replace complex 3D structures of cellular and acellular biomaterials. This allows for the creation of tissue analogs that replicate the heterogeneity of natural tissues in cellular composition, integrity, mechanical properties, and biofunctionality. Progress has been made in developing tissue analogs resembling their native counterparts in composition and structure, but challenges remain in integrating the complexity and heterogeneity of organs. Bioinks must be biocompatible, and their immunogenicity and toxicity require further examination before human trials. Many bioink materials come from non-human sources, raising concerns about immunogenicity and potential infection. The production of degradable biomaterials is gaining attention for creating scaffolds that resorb as new tissue develops. Risks of toxicity from by-products released into the bloodstream need to be investigated, especially as the bioprinting process may exert shear forces affecting cell behavior. Hydrogel bioinks often require post-printing crosslinking, which can be cytotoxic and cause DNA damage. Regulatory challenges exist due to the inclusion of biological material, with global governing bodies struggling to provide clear guidance on bioprinting technology. The classification and regulation of regenerative and tissue-engineered products fall under advanced therapy medicinal products, reflecting the complexities of governing these innovative medical solutions [17, 18].

Future Directions In 3D Bioprinting

The prospects of bioprinting for creating large, perfusable human organs have gained attention, leading to the rise of startup bioventure companies in the USA, UK, and Israel. These companies utilize innovative technologies to replicate aspects of the human heart, backed by significant media interest and funding. However, the excitement may overshadow critical research phases and could disrupt existing economic and regulatory frameworks. Despite 3D bioprinting being a forefront technology in tissue engineering, challenges remain for clinical application, primarily due to the absence of regulatory guidelines for tissue products. The complexity of tissue bioengineering means that producing viable 3D bioprinted tissue analogs could take years, emphasizing the need for engineers to engage with regulators and advocacy groups to effectively utilize bioprinting for surgical and regenerative purposes. Successful bioprinting enterprises must also attract and maintain skilled personnel to remain competitive. Thus, early assessment of translational possibilities and collaboration with commercial and regulatory partners need to be integral to engineers' academic paths. A proactive approach towards regulatory engagement with entities like the FDA or EMA from the beginning of preclinical development is vital, especially in global collaborations, to avoid significant delays [19, 20].

Case Studies In 3D Bioprinting

Case studies in bioprinting, organized based on bioprinting technology and 3D architecture. First, the bioink and process characteristics considered in selecting appropriate case studies are discussed. This paper addresses case studies from different bioprinting technologies that are utilized to deposit various

bioinks to create a specific architectural morphology. Afterward, the general bioink and process characteristics used in each bioprinting technology are detailed. To select the case studies presented, bioprinting technologies were first categorized into six categories, according to both the technical and bioink characteristics. After identifying the representative cases from each bioprinting technology, their application and architecture are summarized in a table, along with a brief description of how they were fabricated. To segregate the case studies based on bioprinting technology, the main nozzle technology utilized for material deposition was categorized into six: inkjet, extrusion, laser, SLS, DLP, and ultra-high-speed bioprinting. For each bioprinting technology, they reviewed three cases that bioprinted biological inks to create complex 3D architectures. To maintain similarity in the bioink, only case studies using at least mammalian cells in hydrogel-based bioinks were selected. On the other hand, the bioinks utilized in bioprinted constructs and their application status are not limited. Nonetheless, there is still much possible improvement or investigation to be realized, as these cases have just begun to tackle specific aspects toward full-thickness tissue engineering applications and personalized medicine. Inkjet bioprinting consists of a print head that generates droplets by forcing bioink or using thermal energy to create vapor pressure to compress and eject the ink. The droplets are transported by inertial and viscosity forces to a collector, where they form a 2D pattern. Upon evaporation of the solvent, the bioink concentrates to create a solid 2.5D structure. Inkjet bioprinting can fabricate a range of structures, is cost-effective, and can generate small bioink droplets (essential for dense cell distribution). Nonetheless, it also has various drawbacks. First, bioink viscosity should not exceed 30 mPas, as high viscosity inhibits droplet formation. Generally, bioinks composed exclusively of natural hydrogels do not allow for inkjet printing due to low viscosity [21, 22].

Economic Impact of 3D Bioprinting

Tissue and organ transplantation is an effective remedy for end-stage damage caused by congenital or acquired diseases. However, people waiting for transplantation for a long time are still limited by the shortage of donor organs. 3D Bioprinting (3DBP), a sophisticated technique for layer-upon-layer assembly in fabricating biomimetic tissue/organ constructs, is one of the most promising candidates to fabricate functional and vascularized tissue/organ constructs for transplantation. Many commercial printers have been designed for 3DBP, which can bioprint various bioinks with complex structures in a time-saving and user-friendly manner, even by non-experts. With growing interest in bioprinting in the past decade, it is critical for users to understand the availability, working principles, applications, and advantages/disadvantages of the different hybrid commercial bioprinters. Methods for the selection of printer and bioink options are highly desirable and may promote the fast adoption of bioprinting in cell biology labs and clinics. This article aims to serve as a guide for selecting appropriate bioprinters and bioinks for specific applications. As one of the largest indirect tissue/organ transplantation markets, the biomanufacturing market in the US has a tremendous economic impact. By combining advanced rapid prototyping (RP) technologies with biological and biomimetic materials, 3D bio-printing has become a versatile strategy for fabricating biological constructs of predetermined architecture for tissue and organ engineering applications. Surprisingly, the future of 3D BPs appears to be much brighter than traditional 3D printing techniques due to the increasing demand for engineered tissues and organs for in vitro drug testing and cell culture, as well as allotransplantation. North America dominates the 3D bio-printing market in terms of market size and the need for bio-printed constructs for pharmaceutical product development, followed by Europe. However, Asia Pacific is expected to dominate the market during the forecast period due to increasing investments from biotech, biomedical, and pharmaceutical companies. The increasing number of acquisitions by prominent companies to gain market share in 3D bio-printing technology and its high revenue generation potential are drawing significant interest from stealth-mode start-ups and Biotechnology incubators [23, 24].

Ethical Considerations in Bioprinting

3D bioprinting and bioethics cover a variety of issues related to ethical questions and dilemmas in bioprinting's burgeoning market sector and technological development. Ethical and legal debates about employing 3D bioprinters for personal implants and synthetic tissues span a variety of topics, from the distribution of medical and financial benefits to public trust and ownership issues. Auxiliary ethical questions asking how bioprinters should be configured and who should be allowed access to them also merit special consideration. The biosafety of bioprinted products is another pressing issue that poses particular regulatory challenges. The present review seeks to qualify and clarify the most pressing bioethical issues in 3D bioprinting. 3D bioprinting technology is on its way to revolutionising biomedicine, tissue engineering, regenerative medicine and drug testing. The ability to produce

biocompatible cellular transplants of greater complexity and functional relevance represents a remarkable step in biotechnology. Actively interacting and functioning cellular constructs are being fabricated through actively tuned printing processes and biopolymers. However, this new biotechnology can be applied for good and bad, and its duality is painstakingly similar to that of conventional cloning. Thus, a comprehensive bioethical analysis is necessary to start a discussion of the bioethical implications of 3D bioprinting technology. 3D bioprinting is a new biotechnological platform allowing the mass fabrication of living biocompatible materials such as bionic implants and biocompatible tissues. Integration of digital modelling and bioprinting is expected to accelerate the onset of personal regenerative medicine. However, 3D bioprinting is both a promising and dangerous technology whose development poses a variety of ethical and legal questions. These unresolved issues range from biomedical and financial benefits to public trust and ownership matters. 3D bioprinting is also a new and powerful technology; therefore, naive bioethical analysis would omit a range of possible bad applications [25, 26].

Collaboration In Bioprinting Research

Collaboration between bioprinting companies, universities, hospitals, and biomedical research institutes will be pivotal for future successes. New approaches and methodologies are continuing to emerge in bioprinting, addressing challenges while promising enormous opportunities in diverse fields of biomedical research, tissue engineering, drug discovery, and regenerative medicine. Innovations in bioprinting need to progress in tandem with advances in materials design, so improvements to existing biomaterials and the development of new biomaterials should become a crucial focus. This will facilitate the expansion of bioprinting technology and applications in tissue and organ bioengineering, computational modeling, and drug evaluation applications. Manufacturing biomimetic tissue and organ construct in physiologically applicable conditions will be one of the most important advances necessary for bioprinting to have a broader impact. Achieving such a goal will need innovative, sophisticated, and integrated approaches that engineering, medical, and biological experts from multiple disciplines can address together. Bringing bioprinting advances to clinical applications will require interdisciplinary movement of technologies that have been successfully developed in research labs to the entire pharmaceutical and medical device industries. This will demand an understanding of the scientific principles underpinning bioprinting, technically effective implementations, and acceptance by regulatory agencies. Manufacturers will potentially need bioprinting systems engineered with a higher level of automation and built-in quality control tools capable of continuously monitoring the performance of the bioprinting process and the biological quality of the printed constructs [27, 28].

CONCLUSION

3D bioprinting represents a transformative advancement in tissue engineering, with the potential to redefine therapeutic strategies for organ failure, drug development, and personalized medicine. Through innovative printing techniques, bioactive materials, and biofunctional designs, bioprinting has demonstrated success in replicating complex tissue structures, from bone and cartilage to cardiac and neural constructs. However, clinical translation is hindered by technical constraints, biocompatibility issues, and a lack of regulatory clarity. Addressing these challenges requires continued interdisciplinary research, material innovation, and early engagement with regulatory bodies. As the technology matures, 3D bioprinting is poised not only to supplement current medical practices but to lead a paradigm shift toward fully personalized, engineered medical solutions.

REFERENCES

1. Saini G, Segaran N, Mayer JL, Saini A, Albadawi H, Oklu R. Applications of 3D bioprinting in tissue engineering and regenerative medicine. Journal of clinical medicine. 2021 Oct 26;10(21):4966. mdpi.com
2. Zhang LG, Leong K, Fisher JP, editors. 3D bioprinting and nanotechnology in tissue engineering and regenerative medicine. academic press; 2022 Feb 18.
3. Kumar R, Pattanayak I, Dash PA, Mohanty S. Bioceramics: a review on design concepts toward tailor-made (multi)-functional materials for tissue engineering applications. Journal of Materials Science. 2023 Feb;58(8):3460-84.
4. Rajendran AK, Sankar D, Amirthalingam S, Kim HD, Rangasamy J, Hwang NS. Trends in mechanobiology guided tissue engineering and tools to study cell-substrate interactions: a brief review. Biomaterials Research. 2023 Jun 1;27(1):55. springer.com
5. Noroozi R, Arif ZU, Taghvaei H, Khalid MY, Sahbafar H, Hadi A, Sadeghianmaryan A, Chen X. 3D and 4D bioprinting technologies: a game changer for the biomedical sector?. Annals of Biomedical Engineering. 2023 Aug;51(8):1683-712. [HTML]

6. Lodhi SK, Gill AY, Hussain I. 3D printing techniques: Transforming manufacturing with precision and sustainability. International Journal of Multidisciplinary Sciences and Arts. 2024;3(3):129-38. semanticscholar.org
7. Yang H, Fang H, Wang C, Wang Y, Qi C, Zhang Y, Zhou Q, Huang M, Wang M, Wu M. 3D printing of customized functional devices for smart biomedical systems. SmartMat. 2024 Oct;5(5):e1244. wiley.com
8. Omidian H, Mfoafo K. Three-dimensional printing strategies for enhanced hydrogel applications. Gels. 2024 Mar 25;10(4):220.
9. Ganpisetti R, Lalatsa A. Cellulose bio–ink on 3D printing applications. Journal of Young Pharmacists. 2021;13(1):1.
10. Decante G, Costa JB, Silva-Correia J, Collins MN, Reis RL, Oliveira JM. Engineering bioinks for 3D bioprinting. Biofabrication. 2021 Apr 8;13(3):032001. ul.ie
11. Wei Q, An Y, Zhao X, Li M, Zhang J. Three-dimensional bioprinting of tissue-engineered skin: Biomaterials, fabrication techniques, challenging difficulties, and future directions: A review. International Journal of Biological Macromolecules. 2024 Apr 18:131281. [HTML]
12. Ma X, Xu M, Cui X, Yin J, Wu Q. Hybrid 3D Bioprinting of Sustainable Biomaterials for Advanced Multiscale Tissue Engineering. Small. 2025 Mar 27:2408947.
13. Yazdanpanah Z, Johnston JD, Cooper DM, Chen X. 3D bioprinted scaffolds for bone tissue engineering: State-of-the-art and emerging technologies. Frontiers in bioengineering and biotechnology. 2022 Apr 11;10:824156. frontiersin.org
14. Zaszczyńska A, Moczulska-Heljak M, Gradys A, Sajkiewicz P. Advances in 3D printing for tissue engineering. Materials. 2021 Jun 8;14(12):3149. mdpi.com
15. Lam EH, Yu F, Zhu S, Wang Z. 3D bioprinting for next-generation personalized medicine. International journal of molecular sciences. 2023 Mar 28;24(7):6357. mdpi.com
16. Kantaros A. 3D printing in regenerative medicine: Technologies and resources utilized. International Journal of Molecular Sciences. 2022 Nov 23;23(23):14621.
17. Liu S, Cheng L, Liu Y, Zhang H, Song Y, Park JH, Dashnyam K, Lee JH, Khalak FA, Riester O, Shi Z. 3D Bioprinting tissue analogs: Current development and translational implications. Journal of Tissue Engineering. 2023 Jul;14:20417314231187113.
18. Jovic TH, Combellack EJ, Jessop ZM, Whitaker IS. 3D Bioprinting and the Future of Surgery. Frontiers in surgery. 2020 Nov 27;7:609836.
19. Farhat W, Chatelain F, Marret A, Faivre L, Arakelian L, Cattan P, Fuchs A. Trends in 3D bioprinting for esophageal tissue repair and reconstruction. Biomaterials. 2021 Jan 1;267:120465. sciencedirect.com
20. Salahshour P, Abdolmaleki S, Monemizadeh S, Gholizadeh S, Khaksar S. Nanobiomaterials/bioinks based scaffolds in 3D bioprinting for tissue engineering and artificial human organs. Advances in Biology & Earth Sciences. 2024 Jan 2;9. jomardpublishing.com
21. Pedroza-González SC, Rodriguez-Salvador M, Pérez-Benítez BE, Alvarez MM, Trujillo-de Santiago G. Bioinks for 3D bioprinting: A scientometric analysis of two decades of progress. International journal of bioprinting. 2021 Apr 20;7(2):333. nih.gov
22. Santoni S, Gugliandolo SG, Sponchioni M, Moscatelli D, Colosimo BM. 3D bioprinting: current status and trends—a guide to the literature and industrial practice. Bio-Design and Manufacturing. 2022 Jan;5(1):14-42. springer.com
23. Chae S, Ha DH, Lee H. 3D bioprinting strategy for engineering vascularized tissue models. International Journal of Bioprinting. 2023 Mar 9;9(5):748.
24. Zhu J, Wang Y, Zhong L, Pan F, Wang J. Advances in tissue engineering of vasculature through three-dimensional bioprinting. Developmental Dynamics. 2021 Dec;250(12):1717-38. wiley.com
25. Pathak K, Saikia R, Das A, Das D, Islam MA, Pramanik P, Parasar A, Borthakur PP, Sarmah P, Saikia M, Borthakur B. 3D printing in biomedicine: Advancing personalized care through additive manufacturing. Exploration of Medicine. 2023 Dec 29;4(6):1135-67. explorationpub.com
26. Kumar A, Gori Y, Singh S, Dwivedi G. 3D bioprinting techniques for tissue engineering applications. Tissue Engineering and Regenerative Medicine: Advances and Applications. 2025 May 28:49. [HTML]
27. Sekar MP, Budharaju H, Zennifer A, Sethuraman S, Vermeulen N, Sundaramurthi D, Kalaskar DM. Current standards and ethical landscape of engineered tissues—3D bioprinting perspective. Journal of tissue engineering. 2021 Jul;12:20417314211027677. sagepub.com

28. Finny AS. 3D bioprinting in bioremediation: a comprehensive review of principles, applications, and future directions. PeerJ. 2024 Feb 8;12:e16897.

CITE AS: Tom Robert (2025). 3D Bioprinting: Revolutionizing Tissue Engineering. IAA Journal of Biological Sciences 13(1):1-8. https://doi.org/10.59298/IAAJB/2025/13118