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Abstract

Osteochondral tissue damage is a serious concern, with even small levels of cartilage damage increasing an individual’s risk of suffering from joint discomfort or pain, with some instances even leading to osteoarthritis. Cartilage damage is often seen as a result of traumatic injury from sports or work. Currently, one of the most common treatments for osteoarthritis is joint replacement; however, this is not an optimal treatment because the replacements and procedure itself are highly invasive and the joint replacement has a limited lifespan. Therefore, especially with younger and more active patients, an earlier intervention is needed to repair the initial cartilage damage and its underlying subchondral bone. 3D printing is an exciting scaffold development method for tissue regeneration, especially within personalised medicine. However, many 3D printing techniques rely on creating a lattice structure, which often demonstrates poor cell bridging between filaments due to its large pore size, reducing regenerative capacity as cells are unable to efficiently remodel the scaffold. To tackle this issue a novel biphasic silk reinforced 3D printed scaffold was developed. This biphasic scaffold consisted of a 3D printed poly(ethylene glycol)-terephthalate-poly(butylene-terephthalate) (PEGT/PBT) lattice, infilled with a cast and freeze dried porous silk scaffold (derived from Bombyx mori silk fibroin), which continued on to a seamless silk top layer. Compression testing showed that scaffolds had a compressive modulus, ultimate compressive strength and fatigue resistance that would allow for their theoretical survival during implantation and joint articulation without stress-shielding mechanosensitive cells. Fluorescent microscopy showed biphasic scaffolds could support human bone marrow stromal cell (hBMSC) attachment and spreading after 24 hours of seeding. Scaffolds were able to successfully support cell growth for three weeks under chondrogenic conditions, and six weeks under osteogenic conditions. Histological analysis also demonstrated scaffolds allowed for osteogenic or chondrogenic differentiation of seeded hBMSCs. Histological analysis revealed, however, that scaffolds failed to create osteochondral like tissue in vitro within osteochondral culture conditions. By combining two different and unique materials, this biphasic scaffold possesses the mechanical and structural advantages of PEGT/PBT with the biocompatibility and cell supporting characteristics of silk, with none of the individual materials’ disadvantages. However, future experimentation is needed to improve the osteochondral conductivity of the biphasic scaffold.
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Chapter 1 Literature review

This section presents the relevant literature to the thesis. Firstly, the review focuses on natural articular cartilage, its role within the human body, and how cartilage damage occurs. Following this, a review of current surgical techniques and their pitfalls is undertaken, followed by a more in-depth examination into how tissue engineering is currently tackling the issue of cartilage damage and how what we know now can shape treatments of the future.
1.1 Anatomy, physiology and pathology of articular cartilage

1.1.1 The current issues with articular cartilage degeneration

Cartilage tissue damage is a serious concern, with even small levels of damage increasing an individual’s risk of suffering from osteoarthritis (Madry, Luyten and Facchini, 2012). It has been estimated that over eight million people in the UK suffer from osteoarthritis, costing the economy 36 million lost workdays (£3.2 billion). Currently, one of the most common treatments for osteoarthritis is joint replacement; however, this is not an optimal treatment because the replacements and procedure itself are highly invasive and the joint replacement only has a limited lifespan (Jacobs et al., 2006; Hunziker et al., 2014; Gademan et al., 2016). Therefore, especially with younger and more active patients, an earlier intervention is needed to attempt to regenerate the articular cartilage tissue in the initial stages of damage (osteochondral defect), preventing its future degradation into the considerably more debilitating condition of osteoarthritis.

There are several current early interventions in clinical use to treat osteochondral tissue damage but these all have serious drawbacks, with many of them failing to completely regenerate cartilage or its underlying subchondral bone (Li et al., 2017; Martín et al., 2019). Due to the current treatments being unable to demonstrate adequate and complete regeneration of cartilage and its underlying subchondral bone, there is a need for the development of an effective, new early intervention.
1.1.2 Molecular and zonal components of articular cartilage related to structural function

Articular cartilage is an extremely specialised variant of cartilage which lines the end of bones in synovial or diarthrodial joints (Madry, Luyten and Facchini, 2012; Chang, K and Martin, 2020). Articular cartilage presents a unique structure, it is a multi-phasic composite material that is also aneural, avascular and devoid of lymphatics (Loeser, 2010). The primary function of articular cartilage is to provide a smooth, lubricated surface with a low coefficient of friction to allow for effortless articulation of the joint (Responde, Natoli and Athanasiou, 2007; Gomoll and Minas, 2014). Articular cartilage also functions to distribute load within a joint to the underlying subchondral bone. Due to its unique structure and function, once articular cartilage is damaged it has an extremely poor intrinsic healing capacity, and therefore, articular cartilage damage becomes a fundamental cause of musculoskeletal disorders in clinical orthopaedics (Jiang and Tuan, 2015).

1.1.2.1 Anatomical zones of articular cartilage

The thickness of human articular cartilage varies between 2 to 4 mm and is split into four distinct zones (Figure 1), each zone possesses a unique structure and ECM composition which is ideally suited to its role (Sophia Fox, Bedi and Rodeo, 2009). This ECM is deposited and maintained by a sparse population of cells referred to as chondrocytes.

The superficial zone: this is the thinnest of all four zones and forms the articulating surface of the cartilage (Bhosale and Richardson, 2008; Sophia Fox, Bedi and Rodeo, 2009; Becerra et al., 2010). The collagen fibrils are orientated parallel to the articulating surface and mainly consist of Type II and IX Collagen. This orientation allows the surface layer to resist the shear and tensile forces experienced during articulation. This zone also contains a relatively high number...
of chondrocytes which have a flat morphology. This zone has a low proteoglycan content (Huber, Trattnig and Lintner, 2000).

The transitional zone: the superficial zone is immediately followed by the transitional zone. This zone functionally bridges the gap between the superficial zone and the deep zone and is the initial zone that resists compression during loading (Zheng Ming, Kirk Thomas and Wu Jian, 2008; Chen et al., 2013). Here, collagen fibrils are thicker and arranged obliquely, and this layer contains proteoglycans. The transitional zone has very few chondrocytes sparsely spread throughout.

The deep zone: this contributes the most to articular cartilage’s ability to resist compressive loading (Williams, Klisch and Sah, 2008). The collagen fibrils are even thicker in this zone and arranged perpendicular to the articulating surface. This zone also contains the highest concentration of proteoglycans. Its perpendicularly arranged collagen fibrils also extend into the lower calcified zone, helping to anchor the articular cartilage to the subchondral bone and calcified zone. Chondrocytes in this zone are of columnar morphology and appear to line up with the collagen fibrils.

The calcified zone of articular cartilage forms the transition zone from cartilage to the underlying subchondral bone. This zone allows for the transition in mechanical properties between cartilage and bone as well as playing a key role of anchoring the cartilage into the subchondral bone (Mansfield and Peter Winlove, 2012). The calcified zone is separated from the other zones of articular cartilage by the tidemark. The tidemark acts as a barrier, preventing the migration of cells and signalling molecules between the subchondral bone and articular cartilage (Madry, van Dijk and Mueller-Gerbl, 2010). It also prevents vascular invasion of the cartilage from the subchondral bone.
Figure 1 Diagram demonstrating the structural layers that make up articular cartilage. Chondrocyte morphology and location is represented in (a), and collagen structure and direction are represented in (b). Reprinted from B Buckwalter, J. A., Mow, V. C. and Ratcliffe, A. (1994) ‘Restoration of Injured or Degenerated Articular Cartilage’, J Am Acad Orthop Surg, 2(4), pp. 192-201. With permission of the American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons.

1.1.2.2 Molecular components of articular cartilage

The principal components of articular cartilage ECM are water, collagen, proteoglycans, and a number of noncollagenous proteins (Sophia Fox, Bedi and Rodeo, 2009). The ECM of articular cartilage is extremely stable in nature, and it has been suggested that collagen within the ECM of articular cartilage has a half-life of several decades and proteoglycans several years (Madry, Luyten and Facchini, 2012). Despite this, under certain conditions, this once extremely stable ECM can quickly be degraded.

Water is by far the most abundant component of articular cartilage, contributing up to 80% of wet weight (Maroudas et al., 1991). The distribution of water throughout articular cartilage is not even, there is a higher proportion of water seen closer to the articulating surface. Approximately 30% of the water found within articular cartilage is closely associated with collagen fibrils, and in conjunction with other proteins it is able to form a gel-like structure (Buckwalter, Mow and Ratcliffe, 1994). The majority of the remaining water is located within pores of the ECM. Under loading conditions, the water found within articular
cartilage appears to be able to move, which allows for the distribution of the compressive load (Torzilli et al., 1983; Becerra et al., 2010). Under loading it has also been seen that water is released from the articulating surface, potentially acting as a joint lubricant. This has the added role of helping to circulate nutrients from the synovial fluid to the cartilage ECM as a joint loads and unloads.

Synovial fluid is derived from the blood plasma, as well as protein molecules produced by the cells surrounding the joint, such as the synovium, and is mostly made up of hyaluronan (Bennike et al., 2014). The principal role of synovial fluid is to reduce friction of articular cartilage of synovial joints during movement (Tamer, 2014). As well as this, synovial fluid acts as a nutrient source, where through passive diffusion nutrients can be provided to the surrounding articular cartilage.

Collagen is the most abundant structural molecule found within articular cartilage, and of this, 90% to 95% is Type II collagen (Sophia Fox, Bedi and Rodeo, 2009). The Type II collagen forms a microfibrillar framework which is intertwined with proteoglycan aggregates. The Type II collagen functions to give articular cartilage its resistance to tensile forces and shear forces. Table 1 illustrates the roles of all the variants of collagen found within articular cartilage.
Table 1 Types of collagens within articular cartilage, their morphological location and function
(Wu, Woods and Eyre, 1992; Pfaff et al., 1993; Luckman, Rees and Kwan, 2003; Xu et al., 2008; Alcaide-Ruggiero et al., 2021)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collagen type</th>
<th>Morphological location</th>
<th>Function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Principal component of the microfibrillar framework</td>
<td>Tensile and shear resistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>Pericellular matrix</td>
<td>Mediates cell–matrix interactions and intermolecular interactions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX</td>
<td>Cross-linked to surface of the microfibrillar framework</td>
<td>Reinforcement of Type II collagen by crosslinked of the microfibrillar framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Closely related to the hypertrophy cells in calcified cartilage layer</td>
<td>Maintenance of cartilage stiffness, metabolic regulation of chondrocytes, facilitation of calcification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI</td>
<td>Within, or on, the microfibrillar framework</td>
<td>Regulation of cartilage formation by functioning as a nucleation site for the microfibrillar framework</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proteoglycans are heavily glycosolated protein monomers (Yanagishita, 1993; Roughley and Lee, 1994; Knudson and Knudson, 2001). The structure of proteoglycans consists of a central core protein with one or more linear glycosaminoglycan chains attached through a covalent bond. These chains can often consist of more than 100 monosaccharide chains. These monosaccharide chains extend out of the monosaccharide core, remaining separated due to repulsion of the negative charges on their sulphate and carboxylate groups. These negatively charged side chains also help proteoglycans to undertake their main function of maintaining the electrolyte and fluid balance within articular cartilage (Buckwalter and Mankin, 1998). These negatively charged components result in repulsion of other negatively charged molecules and the attraction of positively charged molecules, thus the concentration of inorganic ions is increased within the matrix. This high concentration of ions functions to increases the osmolarity, creating a Donnan effect (Günther et al., 1997). This attraction of water to the proteoglycans is what gives articular cartilage its compressive strength and its ability to resist extreme compressive loads.
Aggrecan is the most abundant proteoglycan variant found within articular cartilage (Roughley and Lee, 1994; Roughley and Mort, 2014; Ruiz Martínez et al., 2020). It consists of its core protein surrounded by more than 100 chondroitin sulphate and keratin sulphate chains. Aggrecan does not exist in isolation and rather forms a proteoglycan aggregate within the ECM. This proteoglycan aggregate consists of a central HA molecule attached to multiple noncovalently bonded aggrecans and these bonds are then stabilised by a link protein (Figure 2).

![Diagram demonstrating the structure of a proteoglycan aggregate.](image)

Figure 2 Diagram demonstrating the structure of a proteoglycan aggregate. Proteoglycan aggregate consisting of a central hyaluronic acid backbone connected to noncovalently bonded aggrecan molecules, which are stabilised by a link protein. Modified from Ruiz Martínez, M. A., Peralta Galisteo, S., Castán, H. and Morales Hernández, M. E. (2020) 'Role of proteoglycans on skin ageing: a review', International Journal of Cosmetic Science, 42(6), pp. 529-535. With permission from International Journal of Cosmetic Science.
The resident cell type of articular cartilage is the chondrocyte. Chondrocytes are a highly specialised cell type that are uniquely equipped for development, maintenance, and repair of ECM (Archer and Francis-West, 2003). Due to the avascular nature of articular cartilage, all the nutrient and metabolite exchange occurs at the surface of the articular cartilage coming from the synovial fluid. Due to this, chondrocyte metabolism is geared towards anaerobic respiration via glycolysis with the chondrocyte possessing relatively few mitochondria. The percentage of available oxygen varies between 10% at the superficial zone to <1% in the deep zone (Akkiraju and Nohe, 2015). Even with this lack of abundant oxygen chondrocytes still appear to be relatively synthetically active.

Each chondrocyte produces its own microenvironment in its immediate vicinity and is solely responsible for the turnover of the ECM within this microenvironment (Figure 3) (Sophia Fox, Bedi and Rodeo, 2009; Mobasher et al., 2014). Due to the extremely dense nature of the ECM that is produced in articular cartilage, it has been suggested that the chondrocytes become trapped within the microenvironment and are unable to migrate throughout the ECM. However, other studies have put the case forward that chondrocytes may be able to migrate through the ECM through the use of proteolytic enzymes (Morales, 2007).
1.3.3 Cartilage damage

1.3.3.1 Causes of cartilage damage

Upon analysis of the literature, the joints that have been shown to most frequently suffer from cartilage-based damage are those most associated with weight-bearing such as the knee and ankle (Rubin, 1998; Bohndorf, 1996; Sanders and Crim, 2001), with elbow and shoulder injuries being more frequent in throwing athletes and gymnasts. Injuries to small joints such as in the hands are extremely rare. There are also a number of inflammatory disorders such as rheumatoid arthritis that can lead to cartilage damage (Rannou et al., 2006).

The exact cause of articular cartilage damage is still poorly understood with many cases being idiopathic in nature; however traumatic injury to the cartilage appears...
to be one of the known causes, especially in young active patients. The traumatic injury often consists of an impacting, avulsing, or shearing force that is rapidly applied to the articular cartilage, causing damage (Pape et al., 2010). It has also been proposed that some of the idiopathic cases may actually be due to repeated relatively low intensity traumas to the cartilage leading to its degradation. This is somewhat supported by the suggestion that 55 to 60% of patients showing cartilage damage are involved in some kind of sporting athletic activity (Krishnan and Grodzinsky, 2018). Other causes such as point loading have been suggested, this could be potentially due to loss of ligamentous support due to trauma or rupture of said ligaments, leading to point loading of the articular cartilage (Gartsman and Taverna, 1997; Fleming et al., 2005). Obesity has also been suggested as another cause of joint overloading (King, March and Anandacoomarasamy, 2013).

1.1.3.2 Mechanisms of cartilage damage and subsequent degradation

In its simplest form, damage to articular cartilage can be classified as either partial-thickness, known as chondral defects/lesions, or full-thickness, known as osteochondral defects/lesions. The way in which these defects are formed varies depending on the causative factors. Acute traumatic injuries often lead to the formation of OCD, this is due to the high amount of energy involved in the injury pushing both the articular cartilage and subchondral bone past its mechanical failing point (Buckwalter et al., 2003). In OCD, the cartilage and underlying subchondral bone are damaged via impacting, leading to fracturing of both and the potential dislocation of loose bodies consisting of osteochondral tissue (Pape et al., 2010). Following this kind of acute traumatic injury, the fracturing of the subchondral bone and marrow allows for a limited healing response which is induced as blood from the marrow is able to form a fibrin clot within the defect; this also brings chondroprogenitor cells (Altman et al., 1992; Shapiro, Koide and
Glimcher, 1993; Jackson et al., 2001) which, in turn, begin to fill the defect with new tissue. However, this new tissue is non-enduring, rarely lasting longer than a few months (Jackson et al., 2001; Dell’acco and Vincent, 2010). If any tissue lasts longer than this it is functionally incompetent and is a poor replacement for the native uninjured tissue (Metsäranta et al., 1996; McMahon, O'Brien and Prendergast, 2008; Anderson et al., 2011).

In the absence of an obvious traumatic event, the cause of articular cartilage damage is more poorly understood. In some cases, there is a potential that the cause of articular cartilage degradation and defects is due to a source of misloading of the cartilage, leading to it being loaded beyond normal physiological levels (Jeffrey, Thomson and Aspden, 1997; Loening et al., 2000). This kind of cartilage damage appears to be unable to be caused by normal physiological loading, rather, repetitive loading that is greater than physiologically normal (Chu, 2001). As previously mentioned, this misloading can come from a variety of sources such as loss of ligamentous support and obesity. The way in which this misloading induces cartilage degradation is poorly understood but seems to lead to increased matrix degradation and damage to chondrocytes (Thompson et al., 1991).

This ECM loss appears to initially affect proteoglycans, leading to an increase in the degradation as well as a loss of their ability to properly aggregate (Grenier, Bhargava and Torzilli, 2014). As long as the increased degradation of proteoglycans is at a low enough level that chondrocytes are able to up regulate synthesis to maintain homeostasis, joint degradation is arrested (Krishnan and Grodzinsky, 2018). However, once the depletion of proteoglycans and extracellular matrix components is such that the chondrocytes are unable to regenerate at a sufficiently fast rate, cartilage degradation continues to increase inexorably with time. It is still unclear at what point this transfer is seen and where the tipping point that causes irreversible cartilage damage lies. When this point is reached the cartilage appears to dramatically lose stiffness, and greater
loads are transferred to other molecules such as collagen which are unable to mechanically support the tissue; this leads to their degradation as well as fibrillar disorganization (Hayes, Brower and John, 2001). The loss of the ECM support causes large loads to pass directly onto the chondrocytes leading to their death and apoptosis, ensuring an inability for cartilage regeneration. As well as chondrocyte destruction, greater forces are transferred to the subchondral bone, therefore reducing its compliance, which in turn increases loading on the articular cartilage, further leading to even more damage (Tetteh, Bajaj and Ghodadra, 2012). Once homeostasis is lost within the articular cartilage, chondrocytes appear to be unable to proliferate and migrate to the degradation site to regenerate new cartilage, which allows the defects to continue to increase in size to OCD. In addition, the defects appear to expand in width over time as well as in depth, potentially due to the higher stress seen at the edge of the defect leading to edge loading and cartilage destruction (Gratz et al., 2009). It has also been shown that individuals suffering with chondral defects and OCD have a significantly increased risk of suffering from osteoarthritis later on in life, further demonstrating the potential progressive degrading nature of cartilage damage (Messner and Maletius, 1996).

### 1.1.3.3 Characterisation and grading of cartilage defects

There are a number of grading systems that aim to characterise the level of damage seen in articular cartilage, probably the best known of which was developed by Outerbridge (Outerbridge, 1961). In the Outerbridge classification system, cartilage defects are classified as Grade 0 (normal cartilage), Grade I (softening or swelling), Grade II (partial thickness defect), Grade III (full thickness defect) and Grade IV (osteochondral defect) (Deng, Chang and Wu, 2019). The Outerbridge system is easy to understand and use, but can often lack specificity in description of the defect and some studies have shown that the system has poor repeatability and reproducibility among orthopaedic surgeons. The overall
interobserver reliability ranges from somewhat moderate ($\kappa = 0.52$) to extremely weak ($\kappa = 0.28$), where absolute agreement is $\kappa = 1.00$ (Cameron, Briggs and Steadman, 2003; Amenabar et al., 2015). In addition to this, the Outerbridge system is dramatically held back by the difficulties of using it in conjunction with MRI imaging. Due to the limitations of the Outerbridge system, the International Cartilage Repair Society (ICRS) grading system is seeing a rise in prevalence. This system allows for arthroscopic or MRI grading. The ICRS grading system uses four grades, with some containing subcategories (Figure 4) (Brittberg and Winalski, 2003; Hoemann et al., 2011). Normal cartilage demonstrating no defects or abnormalities is graded as 0. If the cartilage demonstrates surface softening or fibrillation this is characterised as a 1a with a 1b classification being given if small fissures or lacerations are seen. Defects which show obvious loss in the overlying cartilage but are no deeper than 50% of the cartilage’s thickness are then classified as a Type 2 defect. In general, Type 3 defects are those that extend >50% of the cartilage thickness, and Type 3 is further split into three subtypes. Type 3a are defects that extend through more than 50% of the cartilage’s depth but do not enter the calcified zone of cartilage. Type 3b are extended through the calcified zone but do not interrupt subchondral bone. Type 3c shows light defects in the subchondral bone. Type 4 defects extend the entire articular cartilage surface and also demonstrate severe damage and loss to the underlying subchondral bone.
Figure 4  ICRS Cartilage Injury Evaluation
Visual demonstration of the appearance of each grading of cartilage damage. Reprinted from the ICRS Cartilage Injury Evaluation Package [www.cartilage.org], with permission from the International Cartilage Repair Society.
1.1.3.4 Long term impact of cartilaginous defects to the patient

Acute traumatic injury to articular cartilage can rapidly show symptoms that present as pain in the joint when it is loaded, along with potential corresponding swelling (Gorbachova et al., 2018). The joint may also have a dull aching sensation and patients may experience unlocking or clicking in the affected joint. On the other hand, damage arising from repetitive small trauma often presents asymptomatically due to the aneural nature of cartilage (Krishnan and Grodzinsky, 2018; Tuerlings et al., 2022). However, due to the low regenerative capacity of cartilage to heal as described above, the cartilage damage will progress over time to a full OCD, and the resulting symptoms are extremely similar to the symptoms seen during acute trauma. This kind of cartilage damage appears in some cases to progress to post-traumatic osteoarthritis, although it is unclear within the literature what the exact risk factors are. This subtype of osteoarthritis has been approximated to arise in around 50% of patients with a traumatic joint injury as described previously (Anderson et al., 2011; Jang, Lee and Ju, 2021) (Figure 5). Post-traumatic osteoarthritis has been estimated to account for 12% of all osteoarthritis cases, but this estimate is hard to verify due to the large lag time that can potentially be present between the trauma and the formation of osteoarthritis (Brown et al., 2006). It is important to note that once OCDs progress to osteoarthritis, the only widespread clinically available treatment is pain management or joint replacement (Hunziker et al., 2014). Therefore, it is essential to intervene early at the OCD stage before disease progression occurs. It is also important to note that further treatments discussed within this literature review focus on treating OCD and not osteoarthritis.
1.2 The current treatment strategies for cartilaginous lesions

There is currently no ideal drug-based or biological-based therapy for treating OCD, the only treatment options currently available are surgically based (Schindler, 2011; Hunziker et al., 2014; Chimutengwende-Gordon, Donaldson and Bentley, 2020). However, the main current surgical interventions for OCD still do not provide satisfactory outcomes, each having serious flaws as discussed below. Furthermore to this, these surgical interventions are only appropriate for the treatment of OCD, and when the disease progresses to osteoarthritis the only appropriate surgical intervention is joint replacement (Hunziker et al., 2014).
1.2.1 Microfracture or micro-drilling

This treatment modality relies on induction of an endogenous healing response, which is done through drilling of the subchondral bone at the area of the defect (Figure 6). This is undertaken through the use of a high-speed drill with a diameter of 1 to 2 mm with holes spread 3 to 5 mm apart (Steadman et al., 1997; Camp, Stuart and Krych, 2013; Trofa et al., 2022). This induces a healing response by causing surgically induced bleeding and subsequent clot formation as well as opening up the OCD to the vascular and perivascular spaces under the subchondral bone, the bony tissue itself, adipose tissue and the synovium. By opening up the subchondral defect to the underlying bone, growth factors as well as bone marrow derived stem cells are able to enter the defect to encourage endogenous healing responses. This microfracture treatment relies on a patient’s own cells to encourage endogenous healing response, and thus is often more effective for younger patients who have a greater cellular activity and therefore are more likely to have a more active healing response (Asik et al., 2008).

However, on review of clinical investigations it is clear that the cartilage formed is often fibrous rather than hyaline cartilage. This fibrous cartilage is able for a short time to reduce symptoms and restore some joint modality, but often will break down over time and will no longer be functional. Furthermore, due to the treatment relying on the individual’s own endogenous healing response, it has high levels of variability and does not provide a consistent healing response between patients (Furukawa et al., 1980; Jackson et al., 2001; Chen et al., 2009).
1.2.2 Osteochondral autografts (also known as mosaicplasty)

This treatment involves taking small cylindrical osteochondral plugs (4 to 10 mm in diameter, 15 to 20 mm in depth) (Figure 7) from less weight-bearing areas of the joint or another joint from the same individual (Hangody et al., 2008; Patil and Tapasvi, 2015). These plugs are then transplanted into the OCD in a mosaic pattern to fill the defect. This technique has seen some promising outcomes in cartilage regeneration. However, upon review of the treatment, a serious problem still remains concerning donor site morbidity that can cause further damage to an already diseased joint (Hangody et al., 2001; Koh et al., 2004; Baumbach et al., 2008).

1.2.3 Osteochondral allografts

This treatment involves transplantation of cadaveric tissue into a damaged lesion. Rather than inducing a healing response, allograft transplantation aims to directly replace the lost or damaged cartilage (Hunziker et al., 2014; Trofa et al., 2022) and thus conveys the benefits of no donor site morbidity and the ability to fill relatively large size defects. However, it has been suggested that the use of cadaveric tissue poses the risk of immune rejection, though a number of studies have found little immunological reaction to the use of cadaveric tissue with no need for the use of immunosuppressants (Phipatanakul et al., 2004). One downfall of this treatment is that there is a dramatic shortage of fresh donor material, as well as the ever-looming risk of disease transmission (Chahal et al., 2013). The risk of disease transmission was particularly highlighted when individuals receiving an ACL reconstruction from allograft tissue suffered sepsis of the knee (Kainer et al., 2004).
1.2.4 Autologous chondrocyte implantation

This treatment involves the harvesting of an individual’s own chondrocytes through arthroscopic biopsy of a less weight-bearing area of the joint (Brittberg et al., 1994). These chondrocytes are then enzymatically extracted from the cartilaginous tissue and then expanded in culture, allowing for the generation of >10 million cells from the hundred thousand obtained from the biopsy. These chondrocytes are then reimplanted into the OCD under a periosteal flap (Figure 8). Although the biopsy site is small, it has been shown that there can be morbidity and a heightened risk of the formation of arthritis in the biopsy area (Bhosale and Richardson, 2008; Jones et al., 2008). Moreover, due to requirement of the two surgical procedures and tissue culture, this treatment is extremely expensive and long-term patient planning is required. Although the ACI-technique is highly popular, however, its ability to outperform other simpler and cheaper interventions such as microfracture has yet to be established. Knutsen et al., 2007 showed after five years post intervention, no significant difference was seen between ACI and microfracture in clinical outcomes and radiographic results. It was suggested by Hunziker et al., 2014 that the reason for the lack of significant difference between these interventions is that, both treatments’ mechanisms of healing are basically the same. When the ACI technique is performed the walls and floor of the defect are debrided and “neatened”, this then induces local bleeding and a spontaneous repair response from the bone-marrow spaces as seen with in microfracture.

In more recent years, the ACI approach has been improved to create the new technique of matrix-associated autologous chondrocyte implantation (MACI). Within MACI, autologous chondrocytes are implanted within a matrix which then functions as a scaffold to help tissue regeneration. The use of a matrix removes the requirement for the periosteal flap as the chondrocytes are no longer suspended within fluid (Jones et al., 2008). However, although this approach has shown excellent promise, a lack of sufficient data still exists to confidently prove
its superiority over other interventions (Hunziker et al., 2014; Colombini et al., 2023).
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Figure 8 ACI treatment of the patella

1.3 Tissue engineering approaches

Due to the lack of a satisfactory surgical intervention, there is a chronic need for a more effective intervention that does not contain the serious drawbacks of the current treatment methods. A new intervention must produce cartilage which is physiologically identical to natural cartilage as well as enduring. A tissue engineering approach may be required. As an emerging field of research, tissue engineering aims to develop functional tissue replacements by the combination of experimental biological and engineering approaches and represents a particularly
attractive approach for the treatment of musculoskeletal diseases (Armiento et al., 2018).

### 1.3.1 Cell sources for cell-based therapies for cartilage regeneration

Utilisation of an individual’s own cells seems to play a key role in many tissue engineering approaches for cartilage regeneration (Tuan, Boland and Tuli, 2003). One of the most commonly used cell types for cartilage regeneration is the primary chondrocyte, with a proven clinical track record of relative success (Pelttari et al., 2006). However, primary chondrocytes have a number of disadvantages, given the fact that donor site morbidity is seen from the harvesting process, potentially damaging further an already diseased joint (Benz et al., 2002). Primary chondrocytes also have a very limited lifespan in culture, with the risk of de-differentiation being ever present; this makes them difficult to expand to usable levels. Expansion in vitro also often sees a conversion from their spherical morphology to a flattened, fibroblast-like phenotype. Therefore, the utilisation of stem cells may be a better approach. Stem cells possess a wide availability within different adult tissues, including but not limited to bone marrow (BM-MSC) and adipose tissue (AT-MSC). Adult stem cells also show a large capacity and tolerance to in vitro expansion (Zuk et al., 2001; Lee et al., 2004; Acharya et al., 2012; Chen et al., 2012; Lee et al., 2023). To utilise MSCs within cartilage regeneration, MSCs are required to differentiate to chondrocytes. The chondrogenic differentiation process relies on a multitude of factors, including a variety of growth factors and other parameters such as cell density, cell adhesion and three-dimensional environments. To induce chondrogenesis, high-density cultures in the presence of a multitude of specific growth factors and supplements are required (Cassiede et al., 1996; Johnstone et al., 1998; Barry et al., 2001; Sekiya, Colter and Prockop, 2001; Tuan, Boland and Tuli, 2003). However, the utilisation of MSCs to create chondrocytes does not come without disadvantages.
(Sekiya et al., 2002; Winter et al., 2003; Pelttari et al., 2006). It has been shown that MSC derived chondrocytes present the risk of phenotypic instability with premature hypertrophy compared to primary chondrocytes, with the up regulation of Type X collagen and matrix metalloproteinase 13 (MMP-13), as well as undesirable calcification of cultures.

With the push towards using stem cells to generate chondrocytes for cartilage regeneration, the issue remains of maintaining and ensuring these chondrocytes are directed towards the defect and remain in place after implantation (Hunziker et al., 2014). It has been shown within ACI that use of a direct cell suspension during injection into the defect demonstrates extremely low cell retention (Nixon et al., 2011).

Other methods have been developed to help improve cell retention by using a periosteal flap, but they still exhibit donor site morbidity (Kajitani et al., 2004; Barié et al., 2020). Therefore, if these differentiated chondrocytes are to be used for cartilage regeneration, a strategy to encapsulate and maintain these chondrocytes in the site of the defect is required. This could take the form of a 3D scaffold expanding on the work seen within MACI.

### 1.3.2 Growth factors involved and used for osteochondral regeneration

Utilisation of growth factors and signalling molecules as part of a combined tissue engineering approach plays a key role in osteochondral tissue engineering as these signalling molecules can induce cellular differentiation, as well as direct tissue specific extracellular matrix deposition (Seo et al., 2014). There are a variety of methods of deploying these growth factors to direct and assist osteochondral regeneration, varying from their presence within cell culture media to their incorporation into biological scaffolds. A large and varied number of
growth factors/cytokines are in current use for cartilage tissue regeneration including TGF-β1, insulin-like growth factor-1 (IGF-1) and fibroblast growth factor-2 (FGF-2) (Mano and Reis, 2007; Santo et al., 2012; Niu et al., 2023). There is also a correspondingly wide variety of factors/cytokines for bone regeneration including BMPs, IGF-1/2 and FGFs (Salgado, Coutinho and Reis, 2004).

Traditional chondrogenic media consists of TGF-β, Insulin-Transferrin-Selenium (ITS), Dexamethasone and Ascorbic acid (vitamin C). Of these growth factors, TGF-β1, 2, and 3 are probably the most ubiquitously utilised and most well-known growth factors within cartilage regeneration (Solchaga, Penick and Welter, 2011). These growth factors have been demonstrated to induce expression of Sox-9 (a key transcription factor in chondrogenic differentiation and maintenance) as well as induce cartilaginous ECM production in MSCs (Oh et al., 2014). ITS is a supplement used in chondrogenic culture systems to support the formation of cartilage (Solchaga, Penick and Welter, 2011). ITS in general is associated with improving cell survival and maintenance of metabolic activities in differentiated chondrocytes (Kisiday et al., 2005; Enochson, Brittberg and Lindahl, 2012). Insulin is the main active component of ITS and promotes extracellular matrix production in chondrocytes via direct or indirect activation of the IGF-1 receptor (Mueller et al., 2013; Kellner et al., 2001). Dexamethasone promotes chondrogenesis by directly regulating the expression of cartilage ECM genes as well as synergistically enhancing TGF-β mediated upregulation of their expression (Derfoul et al., 2006; Tangtrongsup and Kisiday, 2015). Ascorbic acid is required as a cofactor for enzymes that hydroxylate proline and lysine in pro-collagen, allowing collagen to form its proper helical structure, leading to up regulation in collagen deposition (Temu et al., 2010; Asnaghi et al., 2018; Theruvath et al., 2021).

In addition to traditional chondrogenic media, other factors have been utilised for cartilage regeneration. IGF-1 is another signalling molecule extensively used within cartilage regeneration, with it being a major anabolic factor seen within cartilage (Schmidt, Chen and Lynch, 2006; Re’em et al., 2012; Wen et al., 2021).
Anabolic effects induced by IGF-1 originate from its ability to induce an increased synthesis of proteoglycans and collagens while simultaneously inhibiting the transcription of degradative enzymes such as MMPs (Hui, Rowan and Cawston, 2001; Davies et al., 2008; Tahimic, Wang and Bikle, 2013). IGF-1 also been shown to synergistically interact with other signalling molecules such as TGF-β to induce further cartilage regeneration (Longobardi et al., 2006; Davies et al., 2008).

Traditional osteogenic media consists of Dexamethasone and Ascorbic acid (vitamin C). Dexamethasone has been shown to activate the Wnt/β-catenin and BMP signalling pathway, leading to the activation of RUNX2, which induces osteogenesis (Hamidouche et al., 2008; Shafaei and Kalarestaghi, 2020). RUNX2 is a critical factor in differentiation and maturation of osteoblasts and therefore plays a fundamental role in bone formation and growth (Kawane et al., 2018; Xin, Zhao and Wang, 2022). Whereas ascorbic acid plays the same role as in traditional chondrogenic media, leading to up regulation of collagen deposition (Jaiswal et al., 1997; Robey, 2011; Langenbach and Handschel, 2013). In addition to traditional osteogenic media, other factors have been utilised for subchondral bone regeneration, the potential utilisation of BMP-2 has been extensively investigated for its potential to increase scaffold’s osteogenic capacity. BMP-2 functions to improve the scaffold’s osteogenic capacity by inducing osteoblast differentiation, as well as stimulating ECM deposition and mineralisation (Li et al., 2006). In particular, BMP leads to the increase in expression of Type I collagen, osteopontin, osteocalcin, bone sialoprotein, and alkaline phosphatase (ALP) (Geiger, Li and Friess, 2003; Plantz and Hsu, 2020).
1.4 Scaffolds for an osteochondral tissue engineering approach

Another element which is being extensively explored as an engineering approach for cartilage regeneration is the utilisation of scaffolds. Using a scaffold-based approach for cartilage regeneration conveys a number of benefits, firstly that the scaffold is able to replace the lost bulk morphology of both cartilage and underlying subchondral bone (Frenkel and Di Cesare, 2004). As well as this, it provides a three-dimensional environment which can encourage cell proliferation and reintegration of the scaffold with native cartilage (Ge et al., 2012; Fahmy et al., 2017).

It is important that any scaffold is able to regenerate both the cartilage and underlying subchondral bone, and failure to do this is the downfall of many cartilage regenerating tissue engineering techniques (Hunziker et al., 2014). Without this underlying subchondral bone, any overlying cartilage regeneration technique has an extreme risk of subsidence and therefore failure. It is important to create resilient subchondral bone that is able to resist and distribute articular cartilage loading.

The designing of scaffolds for osteochondral regeneration presents a unique difficulty in the fact that the design requires a scaffold to conform to the different tissue types of bone and cartilage (Frenkel and Di Cesare, 2004). The absolute minimum function of a tissue engineering scaffold is to provide a 3D environment which encourages the embedding of native cells to degrade the scaffold and replace the scaffold with new synthesised natural tissue.

The new tissue will hopefully replace the old scaffold, taking on the scaffold’s original shape and dimensions. The design criteria for a scaffold include that it must first and foremost be biocompatible, in that the scaffold itself should not have any adverse inflammatory or immune response due to degradation products
(Babensee et al., 1998). A large number of factors exist that affect scaffold biocompatibility, ranging from the chemical make-up of the scaffold, its structure and morphological features, the way the scaffold has been processed and the sterilisation techniques used (Lu et al., 2001). Residual chemicals such as solvents used in the creation of the scaffold can also lead to bioincompatibility if residue is left within the scaffold.

In addition, the scaffold must have enough porosity to allow ingrowth of host cells (and/or preloading with appropriate cell types) but also have adequate mechanical stability to allow for its survival during handling and implantation, as well as loading during normal joint articulation (Risbud and Sittinger, 2002; Frenkel and Di Cesare, 2004). However, a caveat is that the scaffold cannot have so great mechanical properties, in particular stiffness, to cause shielding of the mechanosensitive cartilage-forming cells during loading which would lead to its failure to integrate (Huey, Hu and Athanasiou, 2012).

1.4.1 Cell material interactions

A major downfall of what look like excellent tissue engineering scaffolds, in terms of physical and mechanical properties, is the scaffold’s ability to interact with cells. It is well established that cells act differently in a 3D environment compared to a 2D monolayer (Baker and Chen, 2012) (Figure 9). Cells cultured in a two-dimensional environment grow in a flat monolayer and can spread freely in the X and Y planes, with an absolute restriction to the Z plane. This leads to cells cultured under these conditions to have a forced apical–basal polarity. These culture conditions may be relevant to some cell types, like epithelial cells, but for many others this presents a physiological irrelevant environment. A more physiologically relevant environment is one consisting of a three-dimensional structure, often mimicking ECM, where embedded cells form a stellate morphology, only forming regions of polarization during cell locomotion (Mseka,
Bamburg and Cramer, 2007). This variation in cell morphology between 2D and 3D has been shown to directly impact cell characteristics, dramatically improving the tissue regenerative capacity of cells (Weaver et al., 2002; McBeath et al., 2004; Meyers, Craig and Odde, 2006). Therefore, when designing a three-dimensional scaffold for tissue regeneration, several nuanced factors need to be taken into account which may not be seen by culturing cells in 2D. First and foremost, the scaffold material must be non-toxic both to cells in contact with the scaffold and cells that may be in contact with degradation products of the scaffold. After this, cells must be able to adhere, colonise, proliferate and differentiate on the scaffold surface, eventually over time converting the scaffold itself into native tissue.

Figure 9 The differences between 3D culture and 2D monolayer culture on cell behaviour
For cells to be able to adhere to the scaffold’s surface, cell adhesions must be able to be formed between the cell and the scaffold’s surface; these cell adhesions consist of large transmembrane multi-protein complexes (Sun, Guo and Fässler, 2016; Jansen, Atherton and Ballestrem, 2017; Revach, Grosheva and Geiger, 2020). These complexes function to form a mechanical coupling between the cell’s internal cytoskeleton in the extracellular microenvironment and allow for cell locomotion along a scaffold’s surface, as well as allowing for cells to penetrate through the scaffold’s material structure (Pelham and Wang, 1997) (Figure 10). Thus, it is important for a scaffold’s surface to contain motifs that allow for the binding of a family of adhesion proteins known as integrins, allowing for cell attachment and locomotion upon the scaffold surface (Revach, Grosheva and Geiger, 2020).
1.4.2 Surface topography

Scaffold surface topography can play a key role in guiding and influencing cell fate determination. Surface topography can affect cell behaviour through numerous pathways, impacting cell adhesion, alignment, morphology, proliferation, and cell differentiation (Hatano et al., 1999; Muzzarelli et al., 2016). A key component of surface topography is surface roughness, with rougher surfaces showing an increased surface area compared to smooth surfaces. It has been demonstrated that rougher scaffold surfaces show increased protein adsorption, as well as increased cell surface interactions leading to increased level of cell adhesion and increased degradation rate (Pérez et al., 2013; Perez and Mestres, 2016; Zhang et al., 2018a; Majhy, Priyadarshini and Sen, 2021). Furthermore, rougher surfaces
have been shown to increase the potential for osteogenic differentiation and bone-like extracellular matrix deposition. Hatano et al., 1999 showed that primary rat osteoblasts demonstrated significantly elevated osteocalcin expression and ALP activity on the rough surface (0.81 μm) in comparison with the smooth one. It still remains to be elucidated whether surface roughness is able to impact chondrogenesis. The few studies that have investigated this have found that surface stiffness had a far greater impact than roughness on a scaffold's ability to support chondrogenesis (Wu et al., 2016; Zhang, Yu and Zhao, 2016).

1.5 Requirements of a scaffold to be used in tissue regeneration

1.5.1 General requirements of a scaffold to be used in regeneration

The general requirements of a scaffold to be used in regeneration include firstly biocompatibility, meaning it should be non-toxic and should not elicit an immune response or cause adverse reactions when in contact with living tissues or cells (O'Brien, 2011). It should also possess an interconnected porosity that allows for the ingrowth and infiltration of cells, as well as the free movement of nutrients and oxygen (Li et al., 2023). The scaffold must also possess adequate mechanical properties that allow it to survive manipulation, as well as post-implantation loading. It is important for the scaffold to possess biodegradability, allowing for the gradual degradation of the scaffold over time and its replacement with newly regenerated tissue (Rezwan et al., 2006). Scaffold sterility is also an essential characteristic, ensuring the scaffold is free from microbial contamination (Dai et al., 2016). Finally, the scaffold must be scalable and cost-effective, enabling its mass production to meet clinical demand.
1.5.2 Requirements of scaffolds used for cartilage regeneration

The requirements of the scaffold for cartilage regeneration are the same as those seen within the general requirements. However, there are also additional factors to consider when creating cartilage scaffolds (Hutmacher, 2000). The scaffold must be able to help direct chondrogenesis and promote new cartilage formation. In addition to this, the scaffold must not support the formation of blood vessels, neurons, and lymphatics (Wasyleczko, Sikorska and Chwojnowski, 2020). The scaffold should preferably have a pore diameter in the range of 90-120 μm and surface stiffness in the range of 10-50 kPa (Kuboki, Jin and Takita, 2001; Kong et al., 2005; Engler et al., 2006; Rowlands, George and Cooper-White, 2008; Kim et al., 2010; Shih et al., 2011; Witkowska-Zimny et al., 2013; Yang et al., 2017b; Datko Williams et al., 2018; Sun et al., 2018; Yang et al., 2020; Gavazzo et al., 2021).

1.5.3 Requirements of a scaffold to be used for bone regeneration

The scaffold requirements for bone regeneration align with the general requirements, but there are additional factors to consider specifically for bone scaffolds. The scaffold needs to actively guide osteogenic differentiation and facilitate the formation of new bone tissue. It should also support mineralization of the newly formed ECM (Filippi et al., 2020). Furthermore, the scaffold should allow for vascular invasion to facilitate neovascularization and support the development of a blood supply (Hutmacher, 2000). Ideally, the scaffold should have a pore diameter around 300 μm, a surface stiffness ranging from 40-100 kPa, and possess a rough surface topography (Kong et al., 2005; Engler et al., 2006; Rowlands, George and Cooper-White, 2008; Shih et al., 2011; Witkowska-Zimny et al., 2013; Pérez et al., 2013; Yang et al., 2017b; Datko Williams et al., 2018; Sun et al., 2018; Zhang et al., 2018a; Yang et al., 2020; Gavazzo et al., 2021).
1.6 Types of Biomaterials for osteochondral tissues engineering

Typically, four types of biomaterials are used in scaffolds for osteochondral regeneration: ceramics, metals, synthetic polymers and natural polymers, each with unique advantages and disadvantages (O'Brien, 2011).

1.6.1 Natural polymers

Natural biomaterials can be derived from plants or animal sources (Bernhard and Vunjak-Novakovic, 2016), with numerous options in current use and research. Some examples of natural biomaterials are agarose, alginate, chitosan, collagen, fibrin, and silk. Due to the natural biomaterials’ sources, they have the notable advantage of having innate cell adhesion and proliferation behaviours providing a physiologically natural environment for cells (Panseri et al., 2012). In addition, natural materials are biodegradable and biocompatible, often mimicking natural ECM. However, natural biomaterials often show notable disadvantages such as immunogenicity, batch variation, the risk of animal disease transmission, they are often mechanically weak if not properly modified, and pose the risk of being rapidly degraded (Lee and Shin, 2007; Nocera et al., 2018).

1.6.1.1 Silk fibroin from the Bombyx mori

Silk is a natural protein-based material that is produced by a variety of members of the Class Arachnida and Order Lepidoptera (Craig, 1997; Altman et al., 2003; Choi et al., 2018). These organisms use silk in the creation of a structural framework such as in web or cocoon formation. Due to silk’s pre-existing extensive use within the textile industry, it was estimated that in 2002, there were approximately 400,000 tons of dry silkworm cocoons available worldwide per
annum. Silk is already used within a variety of biomedical applications (Zhang, 2002). The reason for its extensive use is that silk fulfils many of the requirements for successful biomaterials as previously discussed; it possesses biodegradability, biocompatibility, a minimal inflammatory response post implantation, as well as long-term compatibility, and allows for cell adhesion to its surface (Thurber, Omenetto and Kaplan, 2015; Teramoto, Shirakawa and Tamada, 2020; Rnjak-Kovacina et al., 2015a; Rnjak-Kovacina et al., 2015b).

The silk created by the domesticated silkworm *Bombyx mori* consists of two main components: silk fibroin and sericins (Zhou et al., 2000). Silk fibroin fibres have a diameter of approximately 10–25 μm and consist of two proteins, a heavy chain approximately 390 kDa in size and a light chain approximately 26 kDa in size (Tanaka, Mori and Mizuno, 1993; Tanaka et al., 1999). These proteins exist in a one-to-one ratio linked by a single disulphide bond between the Cys-c20 of the heavy chain and Cys-172 of the light chain (Inoue et al., 2000) (Figure 11). A 25 kDa glycoprotein, named P25, is also non-covalently linked to the silk fibroin (Tanaka, Inoue and Mizuno, 1999). This protein structure is coated with family proteins refer to as sericins which are hydrophilic in nature and are 20–310 kDa in size (Zhou et al., 2000; Cao and Wang, 2009).

![Chemical structure of silk fibroin from Bombyx mori](image)

**Figure 11 Chemical structure of silk fibroin from Bombyx mori**

Blue represents the amino acid glycine, green represents the amino acid serine, and Red represents the amino acid arginine. Image was compiled in chemDraw 22.0.
Silk fibroins require purification to create the aqueous silk fibroin solution that serves as a base material for silk fibroin tissue engineering. This involves removal of sericin which accounts for 25-30% of the silk cocoon’s mass (Zhang, 2002). This process is typically undertaken by boiling silk cocoons in an alkaline solution of sodium carbonate, which removes the undesirable glue-like sericin protein. This is followed by solubilisation in aqueous lithium bromide solvent and purification via dialysis. This process renders an aqueous solution of relatively pure silk fibroin.

The reasoning for the removal of sericin is that numerous studies have demonstrated that this small protein is able to induce immunological response when implanted inside the body (Aramwit et al., 2009; Teuschl, van Griensven and Redl, 2013; Li et al., 2015b; Zhang et al., 2021; Ode Boni et al., 2022). In some applications such as wound care this immunological response may have beneficial effects, as the immunological reaction causes cells to be drawn to the site of the wound, helping to encourage healing and lowering the likelihood of infection (MacLeod and Mansbridge, 2015). However, in applications such as osteochondral scaffolds, this immunological response is non-desirable as it increases the likelihood of scaffold failure and the probability of fibrocartilage formation rather than hyaline (Jia et al., 2021; Li et al., 2022).

To convert the silk fibroin solution into a usable biological scaffold for use within tissue engineering, the silk fibroin solution can be subjected to freezing which leads to the formation of ice crystals within the solution (Wray et al., 2012; Saha et al., 2013; Gu et al., 2022). Following this, via sublimation within a freeze-drier, the ice crystals are removed, leaving a porous scaffold behind. This process utilises no harmful solvents as it fundamentally relies on the properties of water alone. This process also has advantages over the utilisation of porogens such as sodium chloride in the fact that it provides greater control over scaffold crystallinity as well as degradation properties (Hu et al., 2011).
1.6.2 Synthetic polymers

Synthetic biomaterials are derived within the laboratory from monomers which are polymerised creating such materials as poly(lactic acid) (PLA), poly(glycolic acid) (PGA), Poly(ethylene glycol) (PEG) and their co-polymers Polylactic-co-glycolic acid (PLGA), poly(propylene fumarate) (PPF), poly(dioxanone) (PDO) and poly(e-caprolactone) (PCL) (Mano and Reis, 2007; Trofa et al., 2022). Synthetic materials present a notable advantage over natural biomaterials due to their synthetic nature: their mechanical properties and rate of degradation can be easily modified, meaning that the mechanical properties of the material can be better aligned with that of natural cartilage and the degradation rate matched with the rate of new cartilage production (Capito and Spector, 2003). They also have the benefit of easy reproducibility with smaller batch variation (Oh et al., 2003; Sheikh et al., 2016). However, unlike natural materials, synthetic materials often lack cell adhesion motifs and are often hydrophobic preventing cell attachment and proliferation on their surface (Sarasam, Krishnaswamy and Madihally, 2006). Furthermore, these scaffolds face degradation in vivo via a hydrolysis reaction, and although this does not directly produce by-products that are immunoactive, it has the potential to reduce local pH, possibly stimulating an immunological response (Getgood et al., 2009).

1.6.2.1 PEGT/PBT Thermoplastic

PEGT/PBT is a series of segmented block copolymers (often sold under the tradename Polyactive™); the properties of this thermoplastic, as with all block copolymers, are a result of its constituent segments blending both their mechanical and physical properties (Fakirov and Gogeva, 1990b; Fakirov and Gogeva, 1990a) (Figure 12). The relatively soft and hydrophilic nature of the PEGT segments contribute elastomeric properties as well as hydrophilicity, whereas the hard hydrophobic PBT segments contribute rigidity and improved mechanical
strength. By varying the weight ratios of the two segments (PEGT and PBT) and the segments’ molecular weights, an entire family of polymers can easily be obtained with wide ranging physicochemical, biological and mechanical properties (Papadaki et al., 2001). This gives rise to the possibility of utilising different blends of PEGT/PBT depending on the scaffold’s requirements. Various studies have been undertaken to demonstrate the biocompatibility, as well as the biodegradability of this polymer blend (van Dorp et al., 1999; Ring et al., 2007; Lamme et al., 2008). It has been used within a large number of applications such as cartilage, bone, and skin regeneration and within clinical trials for the creation of artificial tympanic membrane (Grote, 1990), as well as bioactive coatings on load-bearing dental and hip implants (Meijer et al., 1995; Sakkers et al., 2000).

Figure 12 Chemical structure of PEGT/PBT segmented block copolymers
Image was compiled in chemDraw 22.0.

1.6.3 Ceramics and glasses

Ceramics, such as hydroxyapatite and other calcium phosphate-based ceramics, as well as bioactive glasses such as Bioglass®, have been widely explored within bone regeneration; thus, potentially making them suitable for subchondral bone regeneration (Rezwan et al., 2006; Jones, Lee and Hench, 2006; Trofa et al., 2022). Bioglasses and ceramic scaffolds have been shown to encourage and enhance biomineralization of the scaffold, allowing for the formation of a bone-like apatite layer on the scaffold surface. This layer encourages osteointegration with the host tissue. This scaffold type has also been shown to be osteoconductive and osteoinductive (Xynos et al., 2000; Mastrogiacomo et al., 2005). Ceramics and
bioglasses can also have their degradation rates modified by changing their porosity, allowing them to be tailored so that their degradation kinetics are the most appropriate to the tissue. The notable disadvantage of ceramics and bioglass is that although they demonstrate excellent stiffness, they are extremely brittle and show very little ability to plastically deform and therefore are unable to absorb large amounts of energy during high stress loading (Nooeaid et al., 2012). Furthermore, increases in porosity to adjust degradation rate can further impair the mechanical properties.

1.6.4 Metallic scaffolds

Metallic materials have been extensively used within orthopaedic implants, with the main materials used being titanium, titanium alloys, stainless steels, and cobalt-chromium alloy (Barui et al., 2017; Zhang et al., 2019). Their relative success in bone implants makes them potentially useful as a replacement for lost subchondral bone. The main benefits of using metallic scaffolds are their excellent mechanical properties and fatigue resistance, however they have the notable disadvantage of being bio-inert, and due to their lack of degradation functionality they act to replace bone rather than encourage its healing (Guo et al., 2013). It is also possible for the production and accumulation of wear particles over time as well as scaffold corrosion (Bal et al., 2010).

1.6.5 Scaffold surface chemistry modification

Scaffolds can also undergo surface modification to improve cell adhesion; this can be the adhesion of water or biological molecules like those naturally found within body fluid, or the active addition of molecules such as Arg–Gly–Asp (RGD), which is derived from fibronectin (Hersel, Dahmen and Kessler, 2003; Tallawi et al., 2015) (Figure 13). Surface modification can also improve cell proliferation through the addition of growth factors, such as bFGF (Huang et al., 2021). Other growth
factors can also be used for surface modification. For example, the addition of factors that can affect cell differentiation, such as TGF-β (Saha et al., 2013; Yang et al., 2017a). In addition, in situ genetic modification of cell populations can be undertaken via the adherence of plasmids or viral vectors (Wilkinson et al., 2021).

![Figure 13](image_url) How surface modification, water and other biomolecules can affect cell adhesion and tissue regeneration

### 1.6.6 A combined approach

Typically speaking, naturally derived polymers like silk have superior biological features but inferior mechanical properties when compared to their synthetic polymer counterparts (Cengiz et al., 2017; Cengiz et al., 2019). Synthetic polymers present improved mechanical properties and greatly increase the reproducibility and controllable degradation rate. Therefore, by combining a natural, biologically friendly environment with the resilience and reproducibility of a synthetic polymer, both materials should theoretically be able to act synergistically to reduce the other’s drawbacks.

### 1.6.7 Smart materials and instructive surfaces

Smart materials are materials that can respond to environmental changes or external triggers in a controlled and predictable manner. These materials can
change a variety of properties such as stiffness, conductivity, and shape (Pérez et al., 2013; Khan and Tanaka, 2018). Materials can also be induced to release bioactive factors or function as a drug delivery system (Ruskowitz and Deforest, 2018). All of these potential changes can be induced as a response to specific stimuli like temperature, pH, light, magnetic, or electrical signals (Zhao et al., 2011; Khan and Tanaka, 2018). Examples of smart materials include shape memory polymers, hydrogels with reversible swelling behaviours, and electroactive materials (Wong, Langer and Ingber, 1994; Miyata, Asami and Uragami, 1999; Cicotte et al., 2017; Buffington et al., 2019). Instructive biomaterials are designed to actively guide and influence cellular behaviour during tissue regeneration (Lutolf and Hubbell, 2005). These materials are able to provide biological cues to cells and the surrounding tissue through a variety of instructions, leading to the promotion of tissue growth or the initiation of healing processes. Instructive biomaterials function by having innate active molecules within their structure or containing growth factors or signaling molecules (Li et al., 2006; Longobardi et al., 2006; Abdul Halim, Hussein and Kandar, 2021). The presence of these factors can affect cell behavior. The material's mechanical properties and topography can also provide inductive and instructive characteristics to the biomaterial (Ji and Guvendiren, 2019; Majhy, Priyadarshini and Sen, 2021; Gavazzo et al., 2021). The potential of Smart Instructive Biomaterials was highlighted by Zhao et al., 2011, who was able to show the ability of the biomaterial Poly(2-acrylamido-2-methyl-propane sulfonic acid-co-N-butylmethacrylate) to release a number of drugs from the scaffold when the scaffold was induced with a magnetic field. Furthermore, Re'em et al. 2012 was able to demonstrate that an instructive surface consisting of affinity-bound TGF-beta to RGD-modified alginate scaffolds was able to direct hBMSCs down the chondrogenic lineage. On the other hand, Bernardo et al. 2022 was able to utilize a hydroxyapatite-based scaffold to increase osteogenesis of mouse BMSCs seeded on their scaffolds.
Unlike Smart Instructive Biomaterials, inert materials are chemically stable and exhibit minimal reactivity with their environment (Barone, Raquez and Dubois, 2011). Inert materials do not actively respond to external stimuli or changes in their environment. They maintain their properties and behaviour without significant alterations or adaptations.

1.7 Scaffold physical morphology

A scaffold’s biological and mechanical properties are not only determined by material selection, but also their structure.

1.7.1 Hydrogels

Hydrogels (highly hydrated polymer networks) are typical scaffold structures and have been widely investigated for cartilage tissue engineering (Izadifar, Chen and Kulyk, 2012; Benmassaoud et al., 2020). Utilising hydrogels has been shown to have a number of benefits, such as uniform cell distribution with the ability to encapsulate cells, in-situ gelation that allows conformation to the defect morphology, and the ability to mimic cartilage ECM due to high water content. However, several disadvantages have also been cited with utilisation of hydrogels, reducing their potential use within cartilage regeneration. The main issue with hydrogels is that their mechanical properties often make them difficult to handle and prone to failure in vitro, as well as having poor fatigue resistance (Mintz and Cooper, 2014; Formica et al., 2016; Sun et al., 2016; Sánchez-Téllez, Téllez-Jurado and Rodríguez-Lorenzo, 2017). There is the potential for toxicity due to the cross-linking agents used, as well as potential unstable gelation and degradation kinetics (Yun, Lee and Kim, 2013; Sandker et al., 2013; Mansour et al., 2014; Fukui et al., 2014; Lin et al., 2014; Formica et al., 2016). There is also a potential difficulty for migration and incorporation of native cells due to the hydrogel’s structure.
1.7.2 Porous/sponge scaffolds

Solid scaffolds can be formed into foam or sponge like structures that mimic native ECM architecture, allowing cells to interact effectively with their environment (Wang et al., 2011; Li and Sun, 2022). The porous nature of these scaffolds also gives the physical surface onto which the cells can lay their own ECM (Ma and Zhang, 2001). Due to their architecture, they are potentially more suitable for use within cartilage regeneration than hydrogels, as they have more desirable mechanical properties and a greater fatigue resistance whilst maintaining comparable biocompatibility and cellular behaviour.

1.7.3 Electrospun scaffolds

Electrospinning is a viable technique for generating ultrathin fibres via electrical forces (Xue et al., 2019). Due to the fibrous nature of electrospun scaffolds, they are able to resist both tensile and compressive forces (Niemczyk-Soczynska et al., 2021). This scaffold type also shows a high volume to surface area ratio, allowing excellent cell ingrowth potential. However, electrospun scaffolds show the notable disadvantage of limited control of pore structure with pore diameter being fundamentally controlled by fibre diameter; smaller diameter fibres lead to smaller pores and vice versa (Dahlin, Kasper and Mikos, 2011).

1.7.4 3D printing

Additive manufacturing through 3D printing has emerged as an extremely versatile manufacturing process in the field of osteochondral engineering due to its ability to be a cost-effective way to produce complex structures with extremely precise control over bulk geometry (Zhang et al., 2019; Chen et al., 2023a). Advancements in 3D printing, such as within stereolithography, fused deposition modelling, and laser sintering, along with the development of new inks and
filaments, show the fundamental way in which 3D scaffold design for engineering tissue has been accelerated forwards (Do et al., 2015; Castro, O'Brien and Zhang, 2015). 3D printing allows for convenient, fast, and individualized scaffold creation and shortens the production period. Achieving balance in the printing process between the scaffold’s load-bearing ability and its success at cellular viability is imperative; new, up-and-coming hybridisation between synthetic polymers and natural materials may help to find this balance. This novel combination of materials may be able to combine both the desirable mechanical properties and repeatability of synthetic materials and the bioactivity and biodegradability of natural materials. However, especially within lattice printed scaffolds, there appears to be an issue with cellular migration across the large pores with cells being unable to bridge the gaps between filaments, leading to retardation of cellular migration (Hu and Athanasiou, 2006; Ji and Guvendiren, 2019; Buenzli et al., 2020).

1.8 Multiphasic scaffolds

So far, the discussed scaffolds have been monophasic in nature, but as previously mentioned osteochondral defects span two clearly distinct tissue groups of cartilage and bone. Growing two unique tissue types on a single scaffold appears to be an extremely difficult task (Niederauer et al., 2000; Martin et al., 2007; O'Shea and Miao, 2008). A better strategy may be the employment of a bilayered scaffold with distinct regions which represent the cartilage and bone phases. To achieve these tissue specific biological environments, each region would have varied structural, mechanical and biomechanical properties, allowing each region to more closely mimic the tissue it is aiming to regenerate, hopefully leading to improved outcomes. Throughout the literature there appear to be three different approaches to achieving this bilayered strategy.
1.8.1 Scaffold free cartilage implanted on a bone scaffold

This approach to creating a bilayered scaffold does not utilise two distinct scaffolds and instead relies on chondrocytes which have been expanded in vivo to create cartilaginous tissue to be seeded onto a bone scaffold (O'Shea and Miao, 2008). One of the advantages of this approach is that it eliminates the need for an additional scaffold to support the cartilage construct, which can reduce the risk of implant rejection, inflammation, and other complications. This strategy has been used with varying levels of success. Some early studies demonstrated poor regenerative capacity of cartilaginous tissue in vitro (Niederauer et al., 2000).

1.8.2 Assembled bilayered scaffold

This method of bilayered scaffold creation involves two distinct individual scaffolds that have been independently shown to have the regenerational abilities of their corresponding tissue type, i.e. one scaffold for cartilage regeneration and one scaffold for bone regeneration. These two scaffolds are then combined post-synthesis either before or during surgical implantation (Gao et al., 2001; Schaefer et al., 2002; O'Shea and Miao, 2008; Fu et al., 2022). It is widely cited in the literature that scaffolds that rely on two separate combined scaffolds have issues related to poor mechanical stability between the layers, potentially leading to mechanical failure, as well as poor biological integration post in vivo implantation between these layers (Mano and Reis, 2007; O'Shea and Miao, 2008). However, a number of studies have reported contradictory information to this assertion demonstrating no detrimental impact between layers when using connecting measures, fibrin glue, sutures, and even press fitting. Rather than the above, the failing of this strategy appears to be a failure of the scaffold to regenerate articular cartilage, rather than a failure of scaffold connectivity (Gao et al., 2001; Schaefer et al., 2002).
1.8.3 Integrated biphasic scaffold

This variant of biphasic scaffolds utilises a single scaffold which is completely integrated but has distinct regions that contain different and unique properties best suited to their corresponding tissue. This allows for the complete structural integration between the cartilage phase and the bone phase requiring no additional attachment (O'Shea and Miao, 2008; Mukundan, Nirmal and Nair, 2022).

1.9 Summary

The clinical need for osteochondral defect repair arises from the desire to restore the structure and function of the affected joint. Left untreated, osteochondral defects can worsen over time, leading to a much more debilitating condition of osteoarthritis. Therefore, there is a clinical need for an effective early intervention which is able to regenerate osteochondral tissue, preventing further degeneration into osteoarthritis. There is a clear potential for an integrated multiphasic scaffold which mimics osteochondral structure and supports the regeneration of both the cartilage phase and the subchondral bone phase. However, the current available scaffold systems do not meet such unique requirements. For example: hydrogels fail due to their weak mechanical properties and fatigue resistance; 3D scaffolds fail to represent both cartilage and its underlying subchondral bone, leading to failure of regeneration; and multiphasic scaffolds fail to achieve the correct blend of regenerating both the underlying bone and overlying cartilage, leading to the failure of one of the components and thus the scaffold as a whole. Over the last few years, 3D printing has been rapidly applied in the field of tissue engineering, and this has allowed for a new influx of potential biological scaffolds for tissue regeneration; this is because 3D printing has excellent control over bulk morphology and mechanical properties of the structure. However, 3D printed scaffolds alone have some issues- due to their lattice structure these scaffolds often struggle with cell migration between filaments. Therefore, a silk infilled
scaffold may be able to blend the 3D printed scaffold’s mechanical properties and the silk’s excellent biocompatibility and cell adhesion behaviour. Therefore, the combination of 3D printed scaffolds with silk infill could be an excellent unique way to tackle cartilage regeneration.
1.10 Aims and objectives

The aim of this project was to regenerate osteochondral tissue in vitro utilising novel biphasic 3D printed silk reinforced scaffolds.

Objectives

- Characterisation of the chemical, physical, and mechanical properties of the biphasic 3D printed silk reinforced scaffolds.

- Osteochondral tissue engineering in vitro using human bone marrow stromal cells and biphasic 3D printed silk reinforced scaffolds.

1.10.1 Requirements for an osteochondral scaffold

Osteochondral scaffolds present a unique challenge in the fact there is a requirement to generate two different and very distinct tissue types in the form of cartilage and bone, as well as having many of the standard properties found for other scaffold-based tissue regeneration strategies (Table 2). Therefore, there is a requirement for an osteochondral scaffold to have two distinct regions within one scaffold focusing on cartilage and bone regeneration.

Table 2 Parameters to consider when designing an osteochondral scaffold.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mechanical and physical properties</th>
<th>Biological properties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resistance to compression</td>
<td>Biocompatibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resistance to fatigue</td>
<td>Supports cell adhesion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate porosity</td>
<td>Support of cell proliferation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of manufacturing</td>
<td>Support of cell differentiation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Degradability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Defect filling ability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sterility</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 2 Materials and methods

This chapter covers all the materials and methods utilised to create this thesis. It is split into two distinct sections; 2.1 which deals with the chemical, physical, and mechanical properties of the scaffolds and 2.2 which deals with cell culture and adding cells to the scaffolds. These sections relate directly to the two distinct results chapters that follow.
2.1 Scaffold preparation

The 3D printed scaffolds were designed and manufactured in collaboration with the University of Otago, New Zealand, after extensive discussions regarding optimal fabrication techniques with Prof Woodfield, Dr Lim and Dr Yang. Poly(ethylene glycol)-terephthalate-poly(butylene terephthalate) block copolymers (Polyactive 300PEGT55PBT45, PolyVation, The Netherlands) with a PEG molecular weight (MW) of 300 g mol\(^{-1}\) and a PEGT/PBT weight percent (wt\%) ratio of 55:45 were used for printing the 3D PEGT:PBT scaffold (15×15×2 mm\(^3\)) with a 0.75 mm pore size at a printing temperature of 180°C. To increase pore size, 3D printed scaffold filaments were printed in a double stack. After extensive discussions regarding optimal fabrication techniques with Dr Yang and with collaborators Dr Joukhdar and Dr Rnjak-Kovacina at The University of New South Wales, Australia, silk fibroin was extracted from *Bombyx mori* cocoons. To do this, initially, silk cocoons were degummed (to remove sericins) by placing cocoons into a boiling sodium carbonate solution (0.02 M) (Sigma-Aldrich, 497-19-8) for 30 minutes. The pure silk fibroin was then solubilized in a lithium bromide solution (9.3 M) (Sigma-Aldrich, 7550-35-8) at 60°C for 4 hours at a 20% wt/v of silk to lithium bromide. Lithium bromide was then removed from the solution via dialysis using D-Tube Dialyzers (3500 MWCO, Millipore) in deionized water for 3 days. To determine silk solution concentration, a known volume (1 ml) was dried and the mass of the remaining solids was taken. This protocol resulted in a 6–8% wt/v silk solution. Silk solutions were stored at 4°C. A 5% silk solution was then cast into 3D printed lattices or alone into 12 well plates (1.5 ml of silk solution into each well). To improve pore filling by the silk solution over the 3D printed scaffolds, scaffolds were placed in a desiccator for 5 minutes. Following this, samples were frozen overnight at -20°C followed by lyophilisation in a freeze-dryer. Dried constructs were then removed from the plate and placed in aluminium foil and autoclaved at 121°C for 20 minutes to sterilise the constructs and induce beta-sheet formation. The silk component of biphasic scaffolds was attached to the 3D printed component via interlocking of the silk component within the 3D printed
component after freeze-drying. Nonreinforced scaffolds were also created the same way but without the 3D printed lattice. Just before use, scaffolds were cut to 5mm x 5mm constructs and rehydrated overnight by rocking in PBS at room temperature. This was followed by placing them within a desiccator under negative pressure for five minutes whilst being submerged within PBS (unless stated otherwise).

2.2 Characterisation of the chemical, physical, and mechanical properties of biphasic 3D printed silk reinforced scaffolds

2.2.1 Light visualisation

To confirm bulk scaffold morphology, as well as successful creation of scaffolds, a stereomicroscope (Leica M205 C) connected with a Google Pixel 3A camera was utilised to visually inspect the scaffolds and photograph their cross-sectional structure (n=3).

2.2.2 Scanning electron microscope (SEM)

A scanning electron microscope produces images of a sample by scanning the surface of the sample with electrons that are accelerated and focused though a series of lenses. By detecting the backscattered and secondary electrons, SEM images can be created.

The morphology of the 3D printed silk reinforced scaffolds was investigated through the utilisation of a scanning electron microscope (SEM) (Hitachi S3400N variable pressure SEM) at various magnifications with an electron acceleration
voltage of 10.0-20.0 Kv. Prior to imaging, samples were splutter coated with gold (to prevent sample charging).

SEM images of complete scaffolds (n=4) were taken at a magnification of 40x. Each photo was made up of six photos taken across the scaffold surface and combined in Adobe lightroom (3.2.1).

Pore size was determined for the 3D printed control scaffolds, silk control scaffolds, and the biphasic scaffolds (both the cartilage and the bone phase) by taking SEM images at 100x magnification at three zones in three separate scaffolds (n=3). Average pore diameter was calculated by manually measuring the diameter of a minimum of 40 pores per image in 3 scaffolds using Image J software (version 1.41).

2.2.3 Energy Dispersive X-Ray Analysis (EDX)

The accelerated electrons from the SEM can be utilised with energy-dispersive X-ray (EDX, also referred to as EDS). Once atoms in the sample are exposed to the electron beam within the SEM, unique x-rays are released that correspond to the atom’s atomic number. This allows for elemental detection within samples. This can be conducted over a large or narrow area and allows the determination of relative atomic abundance within a sample as quantitative elemental distribution.

Energy dispersive x-ray analysis was performed with a dual Bruker XFlash detector attached to a Hitachi S3400N variable pressure SEM. Analysis was undertaken with Quantax analysis software. Accelerating voltage was set to 10 kV for all EDX measurements. Quantifications were undertaken at 3 distinct locations within 4 scaffolds for each scaffold (3D printed control scaffolds, silk control scaffolds, and the biphasic scaffolds (both the cartilage and the bone phase)) and the average was taken. Quantax analysis software utilises a peak-to-background ZAF
evaluation (P/B-ZAF) algorithm to quantify presence of various elements found within the sample. Bremsstrahlung background was automatically calculated. A Bayes deconvolution was used for line overlap separation and quantitative elemental distribution was determined.

### 2.2.4 Fourier Transform Infrared Spectroscopy analysis

Fourier Transform Infrared (FTIR) spectroscopy is a common technique used to understand the molecular bonding within a sample by utilising the infrared absorption spectrum of samples. This is conducted by subjecting the sample to infrared radiation, which causes a corresponding change in the dipole moments of some molecular bonds, leading them to move from the ground to an excited state. This change causes a vibrational energy gap which can be interpreted, leading to the formation of corresponding peaks to different molecular bonds and structures on an infrared absorption spectrum.

A Vertex 70 FTIR spectrophotometer was used to analyse molecular vibration of the scaffolds. The FTIR spectrophotometer was used in attenuated total reflection mode (ATR). A KBr beam splitter and a mid-infrared light source was utilised. Each sample of the silk control scaffolds (n=4) and biphasic scaffolds (both bone phase (n=4) and cartilage phase (n=4)) were scanned 150 times in the 500 – 3500 cm\(^{-1}\) range at a spectral resolution of 4 cm\(^{-1}\).

To determine the silk component of the scaffold protein’s secondary structure, spectroscopic devolution was undertaken in Origin (Version 12) in the Amide I region (1600–1800 cm\(^{-1}\)) of the FTIR spectrum. Devolution peaks in the range of 1,648–1,657 cm\(^{-1}\) were associated with α-Helixes, peaks in the range of 1,623–1,641 cm\(^{-1}\) and 1,674–1,695 cm\(^{-1}\) were associated with β-Sheets and peaks in the range of 1,642–1,657 cm\(^{-1}\) were associated with random coils (Jackson and Mantsch, 1995). The comparative area under each peak gave the relative
percentage makeup of the protein’s secondary structure within the scaffolds.
Peak devolution and area determination was undertaken in Origin (Version 12).

2.2.5 Swelling capacity testing

The swelling capacity of the scaffolds was assessed using PBS (Corning 21-040-CV). Silk control scaffolds (n=4), 3D printed control scaffolds (n=4), and biphasic scaffolds (n=4) were pre-weighed, followed by rehydration in PBS at 37°C; every one hour, scaffolds were removed and excess liquid was removed using filter paper and weight was recorded. The scaffolds were then returned to PBS. Percentage increase in mass was calculated by comparing the scaffolds’ dry and hydrated mass. After 18 hours, scaffolds were placed within a desiccator whilst submerged in PBS and left under negative pressure for five minutes before being weighed and compared to mass before negative pressure rehydration.

\[
\text{Swelling \%} = \frac{(W_w - W_d)}{W_d} \times 100
\]

Where Ww and Wd are wet and dry weights of the samples, respectively.

2.2.6 In vitro scaffold degradation testing

The scaffolds were subjected to an accelerated in vitro degradation model in the presence of protease XIV (Li, Ogiso and Minoura, 2003; Rnjak-Kovacina et al., 2015b; Baptista et al., 2020). In vitro degradation is useful to elucidate the potential degradation rate of different scaffolds based on their properties.

The initial mass of the dry scaffolds was recorded (3D printed (n=4), silk control scaffolds (n=4), and biphasic scaffolds (n=4)). The scaffolds were then placed in pre-weighed 1.5 mL Eppendorf tubes. 1 mL of 2 U/mL protease XIV solution in PBS (Sigma-Aldrich P5147-1G) was added to each tube and incubated at 37°C. The protease XIV was removed every 2 days. Scaffolds were then washed with deionized water and dried overnight at 60°C. Dry mass was recorded and
remaining mass percentage was calculated, and then fresh protease XIV solution was added.

\[
\Delta Wd (%) = \frac{(W_o - W_{d1})}{W_{d1}} \times 100
\]

Where Wo refers the initial sample weight and Wd1 the sample weight at after incubation in protease XIV.

### 2.2.7 Porosity testing

Scaffold porosity was calculated as per the Archimedes method (Ho and Hutmacher, 2006). This technique for deriving porosity is based on a principle of Archimedes: “A body wholly or partly immersed in a fluid is buoyed up by a force equal to the weight of the fluid displaced” (de Terris et al., 2019). Using this principle, porosity can be determined via knowing the wet mass of the scaffold, the dry mass of the scaffold, and the submerged mass of the scaffold.

Silk control scaffolds (n=4), biphasic scaffolds (n=4) and 3D printed scaffolds (n=4) were pre-weighed, followed by rehydration in ethanol under negative pressure for five minutes. The scaffolds were then removed, and excess liquid was removed using filter paper and weight was recorded. The scaffolds were then re-submerged in ethanol and the submerged weight was measured. Scaffold porosity was then calculated.

\[
\text{Porosity} = \frac{M_{\text{Wet}} - M_{\text{Dry}}}{M_{\text{Wet}} - M_{\text{Sub}}} \times 100
\]

Where \(M_{\text{Dry}}\) is the dry weight of scaffolds, \(M_{\text{Wet}}\) is the weight of the scaffold after hydration in ethanol, and \(M_{\text{Sub}}\) is the weight of the scaffolds submerged in ethanol.
2.2.8 Mechanical characterisation

2.2.8.1 Uniaxial compression testing

Uniaxial compression testing is a methodology for confirming the short-term strength of a material under a consistent compressive load rate until its failure point (Figure 14). By plotting the stress-strain information, the material’s ultimate compressive strength and compressive modulus can be determined.

Load to failure uniaxial compression testing was undertaken in wet unconfined conditions to determine the structural integrity of the biphasic scaffolds (n=4), 3D printed control scaffolds (n=4), and the silk control scaffolds (n=6). Prior to mechanical testing, all scaffolds were rehydrated in PBS for 24 hours and negatively pressure rehydrated to confirm full rehydration. Uniaxial compression testing was utilised to confirm ultimate compressive strength and Young’s modulus. Biphasic scaffolds and 3D printed control scaffolds were tested with a 500 N load cell at a strain rate of 0.1 mm min\(^{-1}\) (Instron 3365). The silk control scaffolds were tested on 1000 G load cell at a strain rate of 0.1 mm min\(^{-1}\) (Bose ElectroForce® 3200 Series III Test Instrument). Load displacement data obtained from mechanical testing rigs was converted into stress and strain utilising the equations:

\[
\sigma = \frac{A}{F}
\]

Where \(\sigma\) is the stress, \(A\) is the area of the material and \(F\) is the applied force.

\[
\varepsilon = \frac{\Delta L}{L}
\]

Where \(\varepsilon\) is the material strain, \(\Delta L\) is the change in material length and \(L\) is the original length.

From this, ultimate compressive strength was obtained. This was measured as the highest stress seen within the scaffold before failure. Strain at failure was taken as
the strain of the scaffold when the scaffold failed. The compressive modulus was determined as the gradient of the elastic region of the scaffold.

![Stress-strain curve](Image)

**Figure 14** A generalised stress strain curve for materials under compression

### 2.2.8.2 Fatigue testing

Fatigue testing was utilised to determine the long-term resistance to mechanical loading. Silk control scaffolds (n=4), 3D printed scaffolds (n=4) and biphasic scaffolds (n=3) were subjected to a load of 8 N at 100,000 cycles with a 1 Hz sinusoidal wave pattern on a Bose ElectroForce® 3200 Series III Test Instrument with a 1000 g load cell. The maximum induced strain, as well as the complete hysteresis loop data was recorded every 100 cycles, and the height of the scaffolds after testing was determined and the percent reduction in height was calculated. The absorbed energy for the hysteresis loop data was determined as per the area within the hysteresis curve calculated on Origin Pro (version 10).
2.3 Osteochondral tissue engineering \textit{in vitro} using human bone marrow stromal cells and biphasic 3D printed silk reinforced scaffolds

2.3.1 Cell culture

2.3.1.1 hBMSC isolation

hBMSCs were isolated from human femoral heads extracted as part of routine hip arthroplasty surgery with ethical approval obtained from the NREC Yorkshire and Humberside National Research Ethics Committee (numbers 18/YH/0166) (Table 3. Isolating hBMSCs from the marrow consisted of agitation of the femoral head in HBSS (Sigma Aldrich H9394). This HBSS was replaced with fresh solution until the solution ran clear. The solution containing the extracted hBMSCs was then centrifuged at 1100 RPM for 5 minutes. Pellets were then resuspended in basal media, filtered with a 70µm cell strainer (Corning 352350) and then counted in the presence of an equal volume of 0.1% acetic acid (Sigma Aldrich A6283). Cells were then seeded to a density of 250,000 cells per square centimetre. Cells were then left for seven days to allow for cell adhesion, after which non-adhered cells were washed away with two PBS washes. The adhered cells were then cultivated in basal media, consisting of $\alpha$-MEM (Corning 15-012-CV), containing 10% (v/v) FBS (Sigma-Aldrich, F75240), P/S (100 units/ml, 100 μg/ml)(Sigma Aldrich P0781) and 1 ng/ml recombinant human basic fibroblastic growth factor (bFGF) (Peprotech 100-18B). The medium was changed every 3-4 days. Cells were passaged when approaching 80% confluence. Cells of up to passage 3 were used for experiments. All of the isolated hBMSCs were confirmed for their trilineage differentiation capacity as shown in Appendix 1.
### 2.3.1.2 Culturing of cells

All experimental work involving or requiring aseptic technique was undertaken within a class II laminar flow hood. All experiments that used cells were incubated at 37°C with 5% CO₂ and 100% humidity within a tissue culture incubator.

### 2.3.1.3 Passaging cells

Passaging of cells was undertaken via aspiration of culture media followed by washing with PBS twice, followed by incubation with trypsin (Sigma-Aldrich, T4049) at 37°C for 5 to 10 minutes. The culture dish was agitated to ensure complete cell detachment. Cell suspension was neutralised by utilisation of equal parts of basal media followed by centrifugation at 1200 RPM for five minutes to allow for cells to pellet. Cells were then counted and seeded at the appropriate density based on experimental requirements.

### 2.3.1.4 Cell counting

To determine cell number, 45 µl of cell suspension was taken and added to 5 µl trypan blue solution (Sigma-Aldrich, T8154). 10µl of this solution was added to a haemocytometer and counted under a light microscope. The total number of viable cells were counted within four quadrants and the average determined. This was then utilised to determine the total number of cells by multiplying the
average determined from the haemocytometer, the trypan blue dilution factor, the cell suspension volume and by multiplying by 10,000.

Cell concentration = average cell count x trypan blue dilution factor x total volume of cell suspension x 10,000.

### 2.3.1.5 Cell freezing and cryopreservation

For long-term storage, cells were frozen at $1 \times 10^6$ cells/ml in cryoprotectant freezing medium which consisted of 40% FBS (v/v) (Sigma-Aldrich, F75240), 50% cell culture media (v/v) and 10% dimethyl sulfoxide (DMSO) (v/v) (Sigma Aldrich, D2650). 1 ml of cell suspension was added to each cryovial and frozen down in a Mr. Frosty™ freezing container (Thermo Scientific, S100-0001) in a -80°C freezer overnight followed by placing in liquid nitrogen storage.

### 2.3.1.6 *In vitro* expansion of hBMSCs

All hBMSCs were expanded in basal expansion medium consisting of a-MEM (Corning 15-012-CV), containing 10% (v/v) FBS (Sigma-Aldrich, F75240), P/S (100 units/ml, 100 μg/ml) (Sigma Aldrich P0781) and 1 ng/ml recombinant human basic fibroblastic growth factor (bFGF) (Peprotech 100-18B). bFGF was included in cell culture media to accelerate BMSC proliferation for expansion purposes, to allow experiments to be conducted in a timely manner. It has been previously demonstrated that the presence of bFGF has no negative impacts on the differentiation or capacity of BMSCs (Hori *et al.*, 2004; Wang *et al.*, 2018). The medium was changed every 3-4 days. All cells were passaged at approaching 80% confluence until passage 3 where they were experimentally used.
2.3.1.7 Live cell fluorescent labelling

CellTrackerTM Green CFMDA (5-chloromethylfluorescein diacetate) dye (ThermoFisher Scientific, C7025) was used to label live cells. CMFDA is a molecule that can freely pass through cell membranes. This is converted into a cell impermeable product which presents fluorescence. Cells were stained by mixing 10 µl of DMSO (Sigma Aldrich, D2650) into 50 µg CFMDA which was diluted further in 15 ml serum-free basal medium to create a 7 µM solution of CFMDA. This solution was then added to either cells or scaffolds containing cells and incubated for 45 minutes. This was followed by two washes in PBS and imaging was undertaken on a fluorescence Leica DMI6000 B inverted microscope or a confocal laser scanning microscope (CLSM, Leica-TCS-SP8).

A second cell viability tracker (CellTrackerTM red CMTPX dye) was utilised when simultaneous cell labelling was required allowing for the identification of unique cell populations within the same scaffold (as seen in section 4.1.8). This can help to assess cell penetration and migration from one phase to the other within the scaffold. CellTrackerTM red CMTPX dye (ThermoFisher Scientific, C34552) was also used to label live cells. CMTPX is a molecule that can freely pass through cell membranes. This is converted into a cell impermeable product which presents fluorescence. Cells were stained by mixing 10 µl of DMSO to 50 µg CMTPX which was diluted further in 6 ml serum-free basal medium to create a 12 µM solution of CMTPX. This solution was then added to the cells and incubated for 45 minutes. This was followed by two washes in PBS and imaging was undertaken on a confocal laser scanning microscope (CLSM, Leica-TCS-SP8).

2.3.1.8 Static seeding of hBMSCs on scaffolds

Cells were statically seeded onto scaffolds. This was undertaken by submerging scaffolds in a 1.5mL cell suspension containing the required number of cells per scaffold for 12 hours in a standard cell incubator before being moved to a 24 well
plate or 24 well low attachment plate. All seeding of scaffolds was undertaken statically unless stated otherwise.

2.3.1.9 Dynamic seeding of hBMSCs on scaffolds

To achieve dynamic seeding of cells onto scaffolds an in-house dynamic seeding device was used (Figure 15). Briefly, a 1.5 mL cell suspension was placed in a 1.5 mL sterile Eppendorf with a hole drilled into the lid. The rehydrated scaffolds were pre-treated with basal media containing 10% FBS. Scaffolds were then placed into the Eppendorfs (one scaffold per Eppendorf) with a hole drilled in the top. The Eppendorf was then covered with a layer of Opsite (Smith & Nephew, Cat. No: 4630) adherent, which is a polyurethane film that is gas permeable but liquid impermeable and normally used within wound care. This film cover enables gas exchange whilst keeping the contents of the tube sterile. These Eppendorfs were then placed into the in-house dynamic seeder (rotation rate of 10 RPM). The dynamic seeder was kept in a standard incubator for the duration of seeding (48 hours).
2.3.1.10 Osteogenic induction culture

To induce osteogenic differentiation, basal media was supplemented with 50 µM L-ascorbate 2-phosphate sesquimagnesium salt hydrate (Sigma-Aldrich, A8960), 100 nM dexamethasone (Sigma-Aldrich, D4902). The medium was changed every 2-3 days.

2.3.1.11 Chondrogenic induction culture

To induce chondrogenic differentiation, α-MEM (Corning 15-012-CV) was supplemented with 1% P/S (10,000 units/mL penicillin, 10 mg/mL streptomycin) (Sigma Aldrich P0781), 10% FBS, 1% ITS (Gibco, 41400-045), 50 µg/ml ascorbate 2-phosphate (Sigma-Aldrich, A8960), 0.1 µM dexamethasone (Sigma-Aldrich, D4902), and 10 ng/ml TGFβ1 (Peprotech 100-21). The medium was changed every 2-3 days.

Figure 15 In-house constructed dynamic seeder
Black arrow indicates the part of the dynamic seeder which rotates providing drive to the dynamic seeder, causing it to rotate at approximately 10 RPM. An example empty Eppendorf is also loaded to indicate sample location during the dynamic seeding.
2.3.2 Sterility testing

For sterility testing, thioglycollate medium containing resazurin was made up utilising the manufacturer’s instructions. In brief, 29.75 g thioglycollate medium powder (Millipore, 90404) was dissolved in 1 L of distilled water. This was then heated to 90°C to dissolve the powder, and solutions were visualised to check for a colour change from blue to purple. Following this, the media was decanted into glass bottles before autoclaving at 121°C for 15 minutes. The media was then allowed to cool to room temperature before scaffolds were placed into the media under aseptic conditions (n=4). Positive controls were created via opening tubes to the air and leaving on the bench side at room temperature for 10 minutes. The broth was then visually inspected for turbidity and photographed on a Google Pixel 3a camera at days 0, 3, 7, 14.

2.3.3 Contact cytotoxicity assay

Contact cytotoxicity was carried out as per ISO10993-5:2009(E) part 5: Tests for in vitro cytotoxicity. Scaffolds were placed within six well plates (n=4) and secured to the bottom via steri-strips (Medisave, R1540C). Scaffolds were washed twice in PBS, followed by the adding of basal media containing 5x10^4 cells per well. Plates were then cultured at 37°C in 5% (v/v) CO₂ in an incubator for 96 hours. Following 96 hours of culture, the scaffolds were washed twice in PBS, followed by fixation in neutral buffered formalin for 15 minutes. Cells were then stained using Giemsa solution (Sigma-Aldrich GS500) for five minutes. Plates were then air dried and examined and imaged on a Leica DM16000 B inverted microscope for cell morphology, confluency, attachment, and detachment. Wells were also graded as per Table 4.
Table 4 Reactivity grades for contact cytotoxicity testing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Reactivity</th>
<th>Description of reactivity zone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No detectable zone around or under specimen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Slight</td>
<td>Some malformed or degenerated cells under specimen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mild</td>
<td>Zone limited to area under specimen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Zone extending specimen size up to 1.0 cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Severe</td>
<td>Zone extending farther than 1.0 cm beyond specimen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3.4 Indirect cytotoxicity assay

To determine any potential for indirect cytotoxicity, ISO standard: ISO10993-5:2009(E) and ISO standard: ISO10993-12:2007 were followed. Briefly, scaffolds (n=3) were placed into 6 well plates containing 5 ml of α-MEM culture media (Corning 15-012-CV), containing 10% (v/v) FBS (Sigma-Aldrich, F75240), P/S (100 units/ml, 100 μg/ml) (Sigma Aldrich P0781) and incubated at 37°C in 5% (v/v) CO₂ for 72 hours, 1 week, 2 weeks, 3 weeks, 4 weeks, and 8 weeks. At each time point, media was collected and frozen at -80°C in cryovials until required.

Following the collection of all six aliquots, hBMSCs were seeded into 96-well plates, with a cell density of 10,000 cells/well. Cytotoxicity testing and proliferation testing was carried out with 1000 cells/well. The 96 well plates were then incubated at 37°C in 5% CO₂ for 24 h in basal media, before exchanging for 100 μL of the thawed collected media containing scaffold eluates. Cytotoxicity testing was then undertaken for 48 hours (n=4 per group), and cell proliferation testing six days (n=4 per group). The negative and positive controls consisted of α-MEM media with 10% DMSO (Sigma Aldrich, D2650) and α-MEM media, respectively.
Following this, XTT assays were undertaken as per manufactures instructions (Sigma-Aldrich 11465015001). In brief, media was replaced within the wells with XTT assay solution and incubated for 4 h at 37 °C in 5% CO₂. Following this, 100 µL was aliquoted into new 96 well plates and read on a Thermo Scientific Varioskan Flash plate reader at 450 nm and 650 nm (reference wavelengths). The values at 650 nm were deducted from 450 nm to obtain the final optical density (OD). The test well ODs were normalised to the positive control ODs to measure cell viability for cell proliferation testing.

2.3.5 Scaffold FBS surface modification

All scaffolds were preincubated at 4°C overnight in basal media and, depending on the experiment undertaken, with either 0% FBS, 10% FBS or 20% FBS.

2.3.6 Cell migration

Phalloidin is a bicyclic peptide derived from the Amanita phalloides mushroom and can selectively label F-actin, whilst Alexa Fluor 488 provides a fluorescent chromophore for imaging. F-actin is a key component of the cellular cytoskeleton and plays a fundamental role in cellular migration and cell shape. DAPI blue-fluorescent DNA stain demonstrates a 20-fold increase in fluorescence upon binding to dsDNA and is utilised as a nucleus counter stain.

Cell adhesion was investigated with Alexa Fluor® 488 phalloidin to look at F-actin positioning. Staining was undertaken on scaffolds that were seeded with 50,000 hBMSCs for 2 days (n=4 per group). After 2 days, scaffolds were washed with PBS three times before being fixed in 10% NBF for 15 mins then permeabilised with 0.1% Triton-X for 20 mins. Following this, scaffolds were stained with Alexa Fluor® 488 phalloidin stain (ThermoFisher Scientific, A12379), at a 1 in 10 dilution for 2 hours at room temperature and with DAPI (Sigma Aldrich, D9542) at a
concentration of 1 μg/ml dilution for 20 minutes. Samples were then visualised under a confocal microscope.

2.3.7 AlamarBlue™ assay for analysis of cell metabolic activity

AlamarBlue is a product containing a molecule called resazurin, which is a cell permeable non-toxic weakly fluorescent dye. AlamarBlue can be utilised to quantitatively assess cell metabolic activity and can function as an analogue of cell growth and proliferation. Resazurin undergoes a colorimetric change as part of an oxidation-reduction reaction within living cells forming a reduced product called resorufin, which is pink and highly fluorescent; the intensity of the fluorescence is directly proportional to the number of living cells and metabolic activity.

To measure the change in cell metabolic activity over time, scaffolds were seeded statically as previously described with 100,000 hBMSCs per scaffold. Scaffolds were split into three groups- biphasic scaffolds (cartilage phase), biphasic scaffolds (bone phase), and silk control scaffolds (n=4 per group). After seeding, the scaffolds were placed in low adhesion culture dishes and cultured for 1, 4, 8, 12, and 16 days. At each time point, scaffolds were removed and placed in 48 well plates containing a 10% alamarBlue (BIO-RAD BUF012A) media solution. These were then incubated for three hours before the alamarBlue solution was read on a Thermo Scientific Varioskan Flash plate fluorescent plate reader at an excitation wavelength of 560 nm, and an emissions wavelength of 590 nm. Scaffolds were then washed in PBS before being returned to the original plates with fresh media where they continued to be cultured until the next time point.
2.3.8 LDH assay for analysis of cell death percentage/rate

LDH is a cytosolic enzyme found within a variety of mammalian cells, including hBMSCs. Damage to the plasma membrane of cells leads to the release of LDH from the cytosol into the surrounding cell culture medium. Thus, by measuring the relative amounts of LDH in the surrounding medium, an analogue of cell cytotoxicity can be obtained. Quantification of the LDH is undertaken by a coupled enzymatic reaction where the LDH catalyses the conversion of lactate to pyruvate via NAD+ reduction to NADH. NADH is then further used to reduce a tetrazolium salt to a red formazan product, from which absorbance can then be measured. The amount of formed red formazan product is directly proportional to LDH levels found within the cell culture medium.

To measure the change in cell LDH release activity over time, scaffolds were seeded statically as previously described with 100,000 hBMSCs per scaffold. Scaffolds were split into three groups- biphasic scaffolds (cartilage phase), biphasic scaffolds (bone phase), and silk control scaffolds (n=4 per group). After seeding, the scaffolds were placed in low adhesion culture dishes and cultured for 2, 4, 8, 12, and 16 days. An LDH release toxicity assay was conducted utilising a CytoTox 96® Non-Radioactive Cytotoxicity Assay kit (Promega G1780) and experimentation was undertaken as per manufacturer’s instructions. In brief, 50 µL of cell media was transferred from the culture dish containing scaffolds to a 96 well plate. Following this, 50 µL of CytoTox 96® reagent was then added to the aliquots and incubated whilst protected from light for 30 minutes at room temperature. Following this, 50 µL solution was then added and plates were read for absorbance at 490 nm.
2.3.9 Seeding and culturing of hBMSCs on scaffolds under chondrogenic conditions

Scaffolds were rehydrated as previously described, and then seeded with 500,000 cells on the cartilage phase or top of the silk scaffolds. These were then cultured for three weeks in chondrogenic media before being utilised for experimentation.

2.3.10 Seeding and culturing of hBMSCs on scaffolds under osteogenic conditions

Scaffolds were rehydrated as previously described, and then seeded with 500,000 cells on the bone phase or underside of the silk scaffolds. These were then cultured for six weeks in osteogenic media before being utilised for experimentation.

2.3.11 Seeding and culturing of hBMSCs on scaffolds under osteochondral conditions

Scaffolds were rehydrated as previously described, and then seeded with 500,000 cells on the bone phase or underside of the silk scaffolds. These were then cultured for six weeks in osteogenic media, followed by seeding of the cartilage phase of biphasic scaffolds or the top of silk scaffolds with either pre-cultured hBMSCs (hBMSCs that were placed in chondrogenic media for two weeks prior to seeding) or non-pre-cultured hBMSCs. The seeding density was 500,000 cells per scaffold. These were then cultured for an additional three weeks in chondrogenic media.
2.3.12 Histology

2.3.12.1 Paraffin embedding and sectioning

All samples, prior to embedding, were fixed overnight in 10% NBF prior to tissue processing with a VIP Tissue Processor (Sakura). During processing, samples passed through four graded alcohol changes followed by xylene and paraffin wax. Following processing, samples were placed in a paraffin wax cassette. Samples were then sectioned at a thickness of 6μm and mounted on Superfrost™ Plus Microscope Slides (Fisherbrand) via floating on a 40°C water bath. Slides were then dried in a 37°C incubator. Prior to histological analysis, samples were dewaxed in a 100% xylene solution followed by rehydration to water through graded alcohol.

2.3.12.2 Haematoxylin and eosin (H&E) staining

Haematoxylin is a positively charged molecule which, when used in histological staining is able to bond with DNA and RNA to form a red stain and is utilised to identify cell nuclei. This stain is then ‘blued’ in slightly basic water. Eosin is a molecule which is able to electrostatically bind the positive amino acid residues staining them pink and is used to identify cytoplasm.

Slides were initially rehydrated through graded alcohol were then stained in Harris’s Haematoxylin for three minutes, followed by washing under running tap water until the water ran clear. Samples were then placed in Scott’s tap water for one minute. Slides were then counter stained in eosin for three minutes, followed by washing under running tap water until the water ran clear. Samples were then dehydrated in graded EtOH, followed by three 100% xylene washes for five minutes. Samples were then mounted in DPX (distyrene, plasticizer and xylene, Agar Scientific, R1340) and observed under an Olympus BX50 microscope.
2.3.12.3 Picrosirius red/Alcian blue staining

Alcian blue is a copper-containing stain. The stain consists of a copper-containing pthalocyanine ring linked to four isothiouronium groups. The dye molecules are able to bind to carboxyl and sulphur groups staining them a bright blue and are commonly used to stain polysaccharides such as glycosaminoglycans in cartilages and other body structures. Picrosirius red is a strong, linear anionic dye, consisting of six sulfonate groups that are able to associate along cationic collagen fibres, staining them red.

Slides were initially rehydrated through graded alcohol and were then stained with Alcian blue solution for 10 minutes (1% w/v in 3% acetic acid, TCS Biosciences, HS116-500). The slides were then washed under running water for one minute, followed by incubation in 1% phosphomolybdic acid (Polysciences, Inc, 24901A) for 20 minutes. The slides were then washed under running tap water for one minute and counter stained with picrosirius red (Polysciences, Inc, 24901B) for 60 minutes, followed by another wash under running tap water until the water ran clear. Samples were then dehydrated in graded EtOH, followed by three 100% xylene washes for five minutes. Samples were then mounted in DPX (distyrene, plasticizer and xylene, Agar Scientific, R1340) and observed under an Olympus BX50 microscope.

2.3.12.4 Safranin-O staining for proteoglycans

Safranin-O is a positively charged basic cationic dye that binds to the negatively charged sulfate and carboxyl groups of the GAG chains in proteoglycans with a high affinity, forming a reddish pink complex (Wall and Board, 2014).

Slides were initially rehydrated through graded alcohol and were then stained with a 0.02% Fast Green solution for 1 minute. Following this, slides were dipped in 0.1% acetic acid solution for 30 seconds, and then in 1% safranin-O solution for
30 minutes. Samples were then dehydrated in graded EtOH, followed by three 100% xylene washes for five minutes. Samples were then mounted in DPX (distyrene, plasticizer and xylene, Agar Scientific, R1340) and observed under an Olympus BX50 microscope.

### 2.3.12.5 Von Kossa staining for mineral nodule formation

Von Kossa staining was utilised to detect calcium deposits. This stain functions via the transfer of calcium salts to silver salts. This functions by the substitution of phosphate bound calcium ions with silver ions, followed by exposure to bright light which leads to a photochemical degradation of the silver, causing it to become visible.

Slides were initially rehydrated through graded alcohol and were then stained with Von Kossa stain with a Staining Kit (Atom Scientific, RRSK39-100) as per the manufacturer’s instructions. In brief, slides were incubated in 10% (w/v) aqueous silver nitrate solution at room temperature under a 50 W lamp for 45 minutes. This was followed by three washes in dH2O before incubation with 5% sodium thiosulfate for 5 minutes. Samples were then counterstained with Giemsa solution for five minutes. Samples were then dehydrated in graded EtOH, followed by three washes with 100% xylene. Samples were then mounted in DPX (distyrene, plasticizer and xylene, Agar Scientific, R1340) and observed under an Olympus BX50 microscope.

### 2.3.12.6 Immunohistochemistry

Immunohistochemistry (IHC) is a technique used in to detect specific proteins or antigens in tissues with extremely high specificity. It involves the use of antibodies that bind specifically to the target antigen and are then visualized by a detection system.
Immunohistochemical analysis was undertaken in order to qualitatively evaluate and localize the Type I and Type II collagen within the scaffolds. Slides were initially rehydrated through graded alcohol, followed by a 20-minute incubation at room temperature in proteinase K (Agilent, S302030-2). After this, samples were incubated at room temperature for 20 minutes in Dual Endogeneous Enzyme Block (Agilent, S200389-2) and then 30 minutes in a 2% milk solution (Panreac Applichem, A0830). Primary antibody (Table 5) was then added and incubated at 4° overnight. After the overnight incubation, slides were incubated in the presence of secondary antibody (DAKO Anti-mouse HRP (Agilent, K400311-2). Samples were then developed by utilising Liquid DAB (3,3'-Diaminobenzidine) (Agilent K346811-2) for 10 minutes. Samples were then dehydrated in graded EtOH, followed by three washes with 100% xylene. Samples were then mounted in DPX (distyrene, plasticizer and xylene, Agar Scientific, R1340) and observed under an Olympus BX50 microscope.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Antibody target</th>
<th>Manufacturer</th>
<th>Catalogue number</th>
<th>Antibody concentration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collagen Type I</td>
<td>Abcam</td>
<td>ab6308</td>
<td>1/150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collagen Type II</td>
<td>Merck</td>
<td>CP18</td>
<td>1/500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.4 Statistical analysis

Statistical analysis was run using SPSS (26). Data were tested for normality using a Shapiro-Wilk test and QQ plots, all data were found to be normally distributed. A two-tailed T-Test and ANOVA with Bonferroni post-hoc tests were performed.
Chapter 3 Characterisation of the chemical, physical, and mechanical properties of biphasic 3D printed silk reinforced scaffolds

This chapter is the first results chapter and is designed to cover the chemical, physical and mechanical properties of the created biphasic scaffolds in comparison to silk control scaffolds and 3D printed control scaffolds.
3.1 Results

A novel biphasic scaffold, consisting of a 3D printed lattice infilled with silk was successfully fabricated in collaboration with the University of Otago, New Zealand and the University of New South Wales, Australia. Scaffold design arose as part of an in-depth discussion process, combining expertise from the three institutions of the University of Leeds, University of Otago and the University of New South Wales. This successful fabrication was identified by initial visual examination (Figure 16) and through further investigation with SEM microscopy (Figure 17).

![Image](image_url)

**Figure 16** Representative Stereomicroscope image representing the structural similarities and differences between created scaffold types
Silk scaffolds are represented on the left of the image, 3D printed scaffolds are represented in the centre of the image, and biphasic scaffolds are represented on the right-hand side of the image (n=4). Images obtained with a stereomicroscope (Leica M205 C) with a connected Google Pixel 3A camera.
3.1.1 Scaffold morphology and porosity

To understand scaffold morphology, SEM analysis was undertaken on the biphasic scaffolds, which showed two distinct regions. The cartilage phase showed a thin sheet-like network of lamellae with interconnected porosity (Figure 18A), which seamlessly continued into the bone phase with no obvious change in silk morphology, with it successfully casting around the 3D printed lattice. The silk component of the biphasic scaffold showed no obvious morphological differences to the silk control scaffolds (Figure 18C). The 3D printed component of the bone phase of the biphasic scaffold showed no obvious difference to that seen within the 3D printed control scaffolds (Figure 18D), with there being no visible impacts of silk infilling and freeze-drying on the 3D printed component of the bone phase.

By utilising the SEM images, pore size distribution could be valued to better understand the scaffolds’ potential to accept cell infiltration as well as the potential for osteochondral differentiation of seeded cells. Both biphasic scaffolds and silk control scaffolds showed a wide distribution of pore sizes ranging from 15 µm to 370 µm (Figure 18A-C). No significant difference (p>0.05) was seen in mean pore size of the cartilage phase (117 ± 15 µm), bone phase (124 ± 24 µm), and silk control scaffolds (103 ± 13 µm). All scaffolds showed significantly smaller pore sizes than the 3D printed scaffolds (768 ± 28 µm) (Figure 18 D,H) (p<0.05).
Figure 17 Representative Compiled SEM images demonstrating complete structure and morphology of scaffolds

(A) Silk scaffolds (B) biphasic scaffolds (C) 3D printed scaffolds. Images were obtained with a Hitachi S3400N variable pressure SEM at a magnification of 40x. Each photo was made up of six photos taken across the scaffold surface and combined in Adobe lightroom (3.2.1).
Figure 18  Scaffold pore size distribution
Representative SEM images of scaffolds showing pore morphology at 50 times magnification, A-D. Cartilage phase of biphasic scaffolds (A), bone phase of biphasic scaffolds (B), silk scaffolds (C), 3D printed scaffolds (D). Pore size distribution obtained from the three technical repeats over three scaffolds measuring a minimum of 40 pores per image. E-H. Cartilage phase of biphasic scaffolds (E), bone phase of biphasic scaffolds (F), silk scaffolds (G), 3D printed scaffolds (H). There was no statistically significant difference between the average pore size in silk scaffolds, the cartilage phase of biphasic scaffolds and the bone phase of biphasic scaffolds (p>0.05). However, 3D printed scaffolds did show significantly larger average pore size than all other scaffold types (p<0.05).
3.1.2 Elemental distribution within the scaffolds

EDX analysis was undertaken to better understand the elemental distribution within the scaffolds, as well as the presence or absence of any elemental contamination introduced during fabrication. This investigation indicated that the only elements found within the 3D printed scaffolds, biphasic scaffolds, and silk control scaffolds were carbon, oxygen and nitrogen, as well as gold (Figure 19 A-D). The presence of gold was associated with the sputter coating process required to visualise biological materials within the SEM due to its electrical conductivity. No other unexpected elements were seen. This indicates that no elemental contaminants were introduced into the scaffold during fabrication, such as lithium, bromide or calcium which are used during the silk purification process. Further investigation into the normalised weight distribution of carbon, nitrogen and oxygen (Figure 20) between scaffolds showed that the silk control scaffolds have a distribution of 45.67 ± 1.40% carbon, 21.67 ± 0.31% nitrogen and 32.65 ± 1.26% oxygen; this was non-significantly different (p>0.05) to the cartilage phase of the biphasic scaffolds, which have the distribution of 45.15 ± 1.39% carbon, nitrogen 20.35 ± 0.83% and 34.50 ± 0.95% oxygen. These two scaffolds were compared to the bone phase of the biphasic scaffolds, which showed a significant increase (p<0.05) in carbon 51.06 ± 1.89%, a significant decrease (p<0.05) in nitrogen 15.24 ± 1.13%, and no significant change (p>0.05) in oxygen content 33.69 ± 0.77%. On the other hand, the 3D printed scaffolds showed significantly higher (p<0.001) carbon levels 65.51 ± 0.31%, as well as significantly lower (p<0.001) nitrogen 1.49 ± 0.10%, with no significantly different (p>0.05) oxygen levels 33.00 ± 0.21%.

Elemental distribution of nitrogen, oxygen and carbon were at the expected levels based on the molecular ratios in their molecular structure, with the silk scaffolds and the cartilage phase of the biphasic scaffolds showing the highest nitrogen content due to their protein-based nature. The bone phase of the biphasic scaffold showed the second highest nitrogen content, with the nitrogen content
being reduced compared to the cartilage phase and silk scaffolds due to its mix of protein and synthetic polymer. The 3D printed scaffolds showed negligible levels of nitrogen due to their synthetic polymer nature.

Figure 19 EDX analysis for elemental distribution within scaffolds
(A) silk control, (B) cartilage phase of the biphasic scaffolds, (C) bone phase of the biphasic scaffolds, (D) 3D printed scaffolds. (Purple) carbon, (pink) nitrogen, (green) oxygen, (blue) gold.
Figure 20 Relative elemental distribution found within the scaffold types as determined by EDX
Black - carbon, light grey-nitrogen and dark grey-oxygen. Elemental distribution was determined in 3 distinct locations within 4 scaffolds for each scaffold. The distribution of all elements in silk scaffolds and the cartilage phase of biphasic scaffolds are non-significantly different (p>0.05). These two scaffolds were compared to the bone phase of the biphasic scaffolds, which showed a significant increase (p<0.05) in carbon, a significant decrease (p<0.05) in nitrogen, and no significant change (p>0.05) in oxygen content. On the other hand, the 3D printed scaffolds showed significantly higher (p<0.001) carbon levels as well as significantly lower (p<0.001) nitrogen levels, with non-significantly different (p>0.05) oxygen levels. Data represent mean ± SD.

3.1.3 Scaffold protein crystallinity

The secondary structure of the protein component of the scaffolds (beta sheets, random coils and alpha helixes) (Figure 21) plays a fundamental role in the protein’s degradability and mechanical properties. To investigate protein crystallinity, FTIR was undertaken. This showed that the beta sheet content of the silk scaffolds was 48.2 ± 3.6%, the cartilage phase of the biphasic scaffolds was 50.1 ± 0.9%, and the bone phase of the biphasic scaffolds was 51.0 ± 3.5%. The beta sheet content at both zones of the biphasic scaffolds and silk control
scaffolds showed no significant difference compared to each other (p>0.05), inferring that casting process of the silk over the 3D printed components had no impact on the silk protein’s ability to form beta sheets. Further to this, there was also no significant difference (p>0.05) in the proportion of random coils in the cartilage phase, which showed a percentage of 39.2 ± 1.0%, the bone phase which showed a percentage of 37.8 ± 6.7%, and the silk control scaffold which showed a percentage of 39.0 ± 4.8%. There was also no significant difference (p>0.05) in alpha helix proportion between the cartilage phase (10.6 ± 0.5%), the bone phase (11.2 ± 5.5%), and silk scaffolds (12.8 ± 2.1%). Raw FTIR data is shown in appendix 1 (Figure 61).

Figure 21 The relative distribution of the protein’s secondary structure
Protein secondary structure- beta sheets, random coils and alpha helixes- found within the scaffolds as determined by FTIR. Black- silk control scaffold, green- the cartilage phase of the biphasic scaffolds, blue- the bone phase of the biphasic scaffolds (n=4 per scaffold). No statistically significant difference was seen between any scaffold and its protein secondary structure (P>0.05). Data represent mean ± SD.
3.1.4 Scaffold porosity

Scaffold porosity was evaluated using the Archimedes method (Figure 22). Scaffold porosity plays a key role in determining the available surface area for cell growth and colonisation, and cell–biomaterial interactions. Scaffold porosity is also an indicator for the scaffold’s permeability for oxygen, nutrients and waste exchange. Both the silk control scaffolds and cartilage phase of the biphasic scaffolds showed porosities greater than 70%, whereas the 3D printed scaffolds and the bone phase of the biphasic scaffolds showed porosities lower than 70%. Silk control scaffolds and the cartilage phase of the biphasic scaffolds showed the two highest porosities, with 90.03 ± 1.8% and 90.93 ± 2.7% respectively, which were non-significantly different (p>0.05); whereas, the 3D printed scaffolds and the bone phase of the biphasic scaffolds showed significantly lower (p<0.01) porosities of 56.99 ± 0.4% and 61.01 ± 1.63 respectively. There was no significant difference (p>0.05) between the porosity of the 3D printed scaffolds and the bone phase of the biphasic scaffolds.
Figure 22 Scaffold porosity
Percentage porosity of scaffolds as determined by the Archimedes method. Black- silk control scaffold, green- the cartilage phase of the biphasic scaffold, blue- the bone phase of the biphasic scaffolds, pink- 3D printed scaffolds (n=4 per group). Silk scaffolds and the cartilage phase of the biphasic scaffolds showed the 2 highest porosities which were non-significantly different (p>0.05); whereas 3D printed scaffolds and the bone phase of the biphasic scaffolds showed significantly lower (p<0.01) porosity. There was no significant difference (p>0.05) between the porosity of the 3D printed scaffolds and the bone phase of the biphasic scaffolds. Data represent mean ± SD.

3.1.5 Scaffold swelling potential

The behaviour of scaffolds in the presence of fluid and their ability to rehydrate from a dried state was investigated. Scaffold swelling ability is an important index to understand as it is directly related to pore size, interconnectivity and scaffold volume. Furthermore, it is essential to understand whether scaffolds are able to fully hydrate from a dried state, that is the complete removal of gas from all interconnected pores and its replacement with fluid, as any remaining gas can lead to the retardation of cell migration. Both the biphasic scaffolds and the silk control scaffolds saw an initial rapid increase in mass after one hour of incubation in PBS at 37°C, with the biphasic scaffolds seeing an increase of 172 ± 19%, the silk
control scaffolds seeing an increase of $1075 \pm 103\%$, and the 3D printed scaffolds seeing very little increase of $12 \pm 4.7\%$ (Figure 23). All percentage of mass changes after the first hour were significantly different ($p<0.0001$). Following the initial increase within the first hour, all three scaffolds saw no significantly different further changes in mass in the subsequent 18 hours ($p>0.05$). All changes in mass were significantly different between groups all time points ($p<0.001$). The significantly greater increase in mass within the silk control scaffolds compared to the biphasic scaffolds was assigned to the non-swelling properties of the 3D printed component of the biphasic scaffold, which also contributed to a noticeably greater starting mass.

![Figure 23 Scaffold swelling](image)

_Swelling potential of scaffolds over an 18-hour time period. Black- silk, purple- biphasic scaffold, pink- 3D printed scaffold (n=4 per group). All percentage of mass changes after the first hour were significantly different ($p<0.0001$). Following the initial increase within the first hour, all three scaffolds saw no significantly different further changes in mass in the subsequent 18 hours ($p>0.05$). All changes in mass were significantly different between groups all time points ($p<0.001$). Data represent mean ± SD._
To confirm whether the scaffolds were fully rehydrated after 18 hours of PBS incubation, a negative pressure step was added to extract any present air bubbles. By placing the scaffolds within a desiccator whilst they were submerged in PBS, it was hoped that the low-pressure environment within the desiccator would draw out any air bubbles trapped within the scaffold and replace them with the PBS in which the scaffolds were placed. To compare scaffold rehydration after 18 hours with rehydration after 18 hours plus desiccation, scaffolds were incubated in PBS at 37°C for 18 hours and weighed. Scaffolds were further desiccated, and their masses were re-weighed. Both the silk control scaffolds, and the biphasic scaffolds saw significant increases in mass, whereas the 3D printed scaffolds saw no increase in mass (Figure 24). Silk control scaffolds increased from the 18-hour level of 1241 ± 61% to the post desiccation level of 1611 ± 106% (p<0.01), and the biphasic scaffolds increased from an 18-hour level of 240 ± 47% to a post desiccation level of 299 ± 62% (p<0.01). However, the 3D printed scaffolds saw no change between the 18-hour level of 11 ± 1.4 and the post desiccation level of 11 ± 2.6 (p>0.05). This indicates that passive diffusion of fluid into the biphasic and silk scaffolds was not satisfactory to fully rehydrate the scaffolds, and desiccation is required for complete scaffold rehydration. This was further visually confirmed by the scaffolds transitioning from floating when placed within liquid to sinking.
Is italicised

Figure 24 negative pressure rehydration for scaffold rehydration
Comparison of scaffold rehydration after 18 hours of rehydration in PBS with rocking (black) or 18 hours of rehydration plus negative pressure rehydration within a desiccator for five minutes submerged in PBS (grey) (n=4 per group). Silk scaffolds and biphasic scaffolds showed a significant increase in percentage mass increase (p<0.01), whereas the 3D printed scaffolds saw no significant change (p>0.05). Data represent mean ± SD.

3.1.6 Scaffold degradability

It’s important to understand the rate and ability of the scaffold to undergo degradation over time. Ideally, the scaffold will initially provide mechanical and biological support to guide and assist the regeneration of native tissue, followed by complete degradation and reabsorption of the scaffold and replacement with native tissue (Bachtiar et al., 2016). To understand the degradation potential of biphasic scaffolds and silk control scaffolds, the scaffolds were subjected to an accelerated in vitro degradation model in the presence of protease XIV. In vitro degradation is useful to elucidate the potential degradation rate of different scaffolds based on their properties. Initially, silk scaffolds, biphasic scaffolds and 3D printed scaffolds showed similar degradation rates, with after two days there being no significant difference (p>0.05) in mass decrease, with the biphasic scaffolds having 98.8 ± 1.1% of original mass remaining, silk scaffolds having 94.5 ± 4.2% remaining and 3D printed scaffolds having 99.3 ± 1.1% remaining (Figure
However, in all the following days, the silk scaffolds had a more significant decrease in mass than the biphasic scaffolds and 3D printed scaffolds. After 20 days, all scaffolds showed a significant difference in mass. The biphasic scaffolds had 85.4 ± 2.6% of original mass compared to the silk scaffolds’ 5.3 ± 4.6% and the 3D printed scaffolds’ 98.8 ± 0.6%. Visual inspection of the biphasic scaffolds after eight days showed very little degradation to the 3D printed component compared to the silk, inferring protease XIV had mostly broken down the silk component of the biphasic scaffold, rather than the 3D printed component.

**Figure 25 In vitro degradation of scaffolds**

*In vitro* degradation of scaffolds submerged in protease solution over 20 days. Black circle- silk control scaffolds, purple square-biphasic scaffolds, pink triangle- 3D printed scaffold (n=4 per group). Initially, silk scaffolds, biphasic scaffolds and 3D printed scaffolds showed similar degradation rates, with after two days there being no significant difference (p>0.05) in mass decrease. However, in all the following days, the silk scaffolds had a more significant decrease in mass than the biphasic scaffolds and 3D printed scaffolds. After 20 days, all scaffolds showed a significant difference in mass. Dotted line represents the point below which the scaffold mass loss due to silk degradation. Line positioning is determined by mass of 3D printed scaffolds. Data represent mean ± SD.
3.1.7 Characterisation of scaffold mechanical properties

3.1.7.1 Uniaxial compression test

One of the main forces that osteochondral scaffolds will endure post implantation and during manipulation is compression. Therefore, it is essential to understand how the scaffolds interact and behave under compression (Francis et al., 2018). To investigate this, initially, basic uniaxial compression testing was undertaken to understand the mechanical properties of both silk scaffolds alone (n=6), the biphasic scaffolds (n=4) and the 3D printed scaffolds (n=4). A typical compressive stress-strain curve is shown in Figure 26. As shown by the stress-strain curve, the 3D printed lattice appears to provide rigidity and a greater load resistance. The compressive modulus was significantly greater (p<0.001) in the bone phase of the biphasic scaffold group (12.56 ± 1.94 MPa) compared to the silk scaffolds (0.113 ± 0.028 MPa) (Figure 27). However, there was no significant difference (P>0.05) between the silk scaffold and the cartilage phase of the biphasic scaffold (0.152 ± 0.010 MPa). There was also no significant difference (P>0.05) between the bone phase of the biphasic scaffold and the 3D printed scaffold (14.60 ± 0.53 MPa).

The incorporation of the silk layer appears to have no detrimental effects to the biphasic scaffold’s ultimate compressive strength, demonstrated by there being no significant difference (P>0.05) between the 3D printed scaffold’s ultimate compressive strength of 1.88 ± 0.087 MPa and the biphasic scaffold’s ultimate compressive strength of 1.56 ± 0.337 MPa (Figure 28). The presence of the silk top layer on the biphasic scaffold was also able to significantly increase the strain at failure from the 3D printed scaffold’s 25.7 ± 4.5 % to the biphasic scaffold’s 42.1 ± 7.3 % (p<0.001). The biphasic scaffold retrieved at the end of compression testing consisted of a flattened silk scaffold which remained well-integrated to the 3D printed scaffold. There was no sign of delamination between phases. The
presence of silk appeared to increase the resilience of the scaffold dramatically, extending the toe region as seen in Figure 26.

![Stress-strain curves for scaffolds under uniaxial compression testing](image)

**Figure 26** Representative stress-strain curves for the scaffolds under uniaxial compression testing. Black- silk control scaffolds, purple- biphasic scaffolds, pink- 3D printed scaffolds.
Figure 27 Scaffold compressive modulus
Scaffold compressive modulus under uniaxial compression testing as determined via stress-strain curves. Black- silk control scaffolds (n=6), green- cartilage phase of the biphasic scaffolds (n=4), blue- bone phase of the biphasic scaffolds (n=4), pink- 3D printed scaffolds (n=4). Silk scaffolds and the cartilage phase of the biphasic scaffolds showed the 2 lowest compressive modulus which were non-significantly different (p>0.05); whereas 3D printed scaffolds and the bone phase of the biphasic scaffolds showed significantly higher (p<0.001) compressive modulus. There was no significant difference (p>0.05) between the compressive modulus of the 3D printed scaffolds and the bone phase of the biphasic scaffolds. Data represent mean ± SD.
3.1.7.2 Fatigue behaviour

Rather than implanted scaffolds experiencing overload forces, it is much more likely that they will experience low intensity repeated fatigue loading during normal articulation. To understand the scaffold’s behaviour in relation to long-term repeated loading, fatigue testing was undertaken over 100,000 cycles. During fatigue testing, both the silk control scaffolds and biphasic scaffolds saw a dramatic increase in resultant strain after the first 100 cycles, followed by a plateau with very little further change (Figure 29). This contrasts with the 3D printed scaffolds, which saw a slight decrease in resultant strain. Silk control
scaffolds showed a significant increase (p<0.05) from resultant strain at cycle one (83.08 ± 1.92%) to cycle 100 (85.13 ± 1.60%), and the biphasic scaffolds also showed a significant increase (p<0.05) between the resultant strain at cycle 1 (-35.88 ± 0.69%) to cycle 100 (36.55 ± 0.64%). This is in comparison to the non-significant change (p>0.05) between the resultant strain at cycle 1 (5.81 ± 0.58%) to cycle 100 (5.99 ± 0.60%) seen in the 3D printed scaffolds. However, the decrease seen within the silk control scaffolds of 2.05 ± 0.34% was significantly greater (p<0.05) than the decrease seen within the biphasic scaffolds (0.67 ± 0.11%). This indicates that the majority of lasting fatigue damage happens in the initial first 100 cycles and very little further damage is seen following this, with biphasic scaffolds having a greater fatigue resistance than silk control scaffolds, but still not as high a fatigue resistance as the 3D printed scaffolds.
Figure 29 Resultant strain from fatigue testing of scaffolds
Fatigue testing showing resultant strain every 100 cycles after applied force of 8N over 100,000 cycles. A – silk, B – biphasic, C – 3D printed (n=4 per group). Silk control scaffolds showed a significant increase (p<0.05) from resultant strain at cycle one to cycle 100. Biphasic scaffolds also showed a significant increase (p<0.05) between the resultant strain at cycle 1 to cycle 100 after cycle 100 no further significant (p>0.05) changes were seen for both scaffolds. This is in comparison to the non-significant change (p>0.05) between the resultant strain at cycle 1 to cycle 100 seen in the 3D printed scaffolds. The decrease seen within the silk control scaffolds at cycle 100 was significantly greater (p<0.05) than the decrease seen within the biphasic scaffolds.
Following 100,000 cycles, samples were evaluated for change in overall height as a measure of permanent damage to the scaffolds (Figure 30). All Scaffolds showed significantly different heights after fatigue testing ($p<0.001$). Silk control scaffolds showed a reduction of $33.9 \pm 1.5\%$, whereas the biphasic scaffolds only saw a reduction of $18.5 \pm 2.5\%$, and the 3D printed scaffold alone saw a reduction of $2.4 \pm 0.5\%$.

![Figure 30 Scaffold height reduction due to fatigue testing](image)

*Figure 30 Scaffold height reduction due to fatigue testing*

Percentage remaining of height of scaffolds after 100,000 cycles of fatigue testing at a load of 8N. Black- silk control scaffolds, purple- biphasic scaffolds, pink- 3D printed scaffolds. All Scaffolds showed significantly different heights after fatigue testing ($p<0.001$). Data represent mean ± SD.
3.1.7.3 Hysteresis behaviour

All scaffold types showed significantly different (p<0.01) absorbed energy at each cycle count between each other (Figure 31 and Figure 32). Both biphasic and silk scaffolds showed significant decreases (p<0.05) in absorbed energy over increasing cycle count until the 10,000th cycle, after which no further significant decreases (p>0.05) were seen. Silk scaffolds went from an absorbed energy of 0.936 ± 0.148 mJ at cycle 1 to an absorbed energy of 0.396 ± 0.016 mJ at cycle 1000, and biphasic scaffolds went from an absorbed energy of 0.393 ± 0.096 mJ at cycle 1 to an absorbed energy of 0.125 ± 0.0216 mJ at cycle 1000. 3D printed scaffolds showed no significant (p>0.05) change between any cycle count with the cycle 1 absorbed energy being 0.027 ± 0.003 mJ, cycle 1000 absorbed energy being 0.0198 ± 0.002 mJ, cycle 10,000 absorbed energy being 0.0179 ± 0.001 mJ and cycle 100,000 absorbed energy being 0.0165 ± 0.0005 mJ.
Figure 31. Representative Scaffold hysteresis loops under fatigue testing
Scaffold hysteresis loops showing scaffold behaviour during loading and unloading at cycle one (black), 1000 (orange) 10,000 (blue) and 100,000 (pink). A-silk control scaffolds, B-biphasic scaffolds, C- 3D printed scaffolds.
Figure 32 Scaffolds absorbed energy during fatigue testing

Absorbed energy during hysteresis loading as determined by the area within the hysteresis loop over one cycle, 1000 cycles, 10,000 cycles and 100,000 cycles. Black- silk control scaffolds, purple- biphasic scaffolds, pink- 3D printed scaffolds (n=4 per group). All scaffold types showed significantly different (p<0.01) absorbed energy at each cycle count between each other. Both biphasic and silk scaffolds showed significant decreases (p<0.05) in absorbed energy over increasing cycle count until the 10,000th cycle, after which no further significant decreases (p>0.05) were seen. 3D printed scaffolds showed no significant (p>0.05) change between any cycle count. Data represent mean ± SD.
3.2 Discussion

Due to the extremely hierarchal and complex architecture of osteochondral tissue, grafts which represent both cartilage and bone phase may be required for proper and satisfactory osteochondral regeneration (Lopa and Madry, 2014). However, the existence of two unique tissue types means that osteochondral regeneration is particularly challenging. This thesis chapter tackled this challenge by using two pre-existing biomaterials and deploying them in a unique way; this was done via the creation of a bone phase consisting of a 3D printed Poly(ethylene glycol)-terephthalate-poly(butylene terephtalate) scaffold in which silk was utilised as an infill material which was continuously blended to a silk only cartilage phase. The use of silk within both phases allows for seamless integration between the cartilage phase and the bone phase, improving regenerative capacity due to interphase integration between the two tissue types. The choice to take a nonconventional manufacturing approach in the form of additive manufacturing via 3D printing conveys a number of benefits (Yan et al., 2015; Sosio et al., 2015; Du et al., 2017), such as easy upscaling for mass production, greater control over bulk morphology, and the potential for future use in personalised medicine.

3.2.1 Scaffold pore size and porosity

Scaffold porosity and pore size is integral to the scaffold’s function, as these two factors would dramatically affect cell adhesion, proliferation, and differentiation, as well as affecting transport of nutrients and waste products. The avascular nature of cartilage means that nutrient and waste exchange occurs between cartilage tissue and synovial fluid, either via passive diffusion or during joint articulation (Sophia Fox, Bedi and Rodeo, 2009; Liu, Shah and Luo, 2021). Porosity and pore size also play a fundamental role in angiogenesis and revascularisation in vivo (Karageorgiou and Kaplan, 2005; Wang and Yeung, 2017). When designing a scaffold with an optimal pore size for osteochondral tissue regeneration, a
difficulty is often seen in that both subchondral bone and cartilage scaffolds have differing optimal pore sizes (Lin et al., 2019). Studies have previously demonstrated that for optimal cartilage regeneration a pore size of approximately 90 µm to 120 µm is desirable as this helps to direct and encourage chondrogenesis (Kuboki, Jin and Takita, 2001; Kim et al., 2010). It has been previously shown that optimal scaffold pore size for subchondral bone regeneration is a larger size than that seen for chondrogenesis (approximately 300 µm), as this pore size seems to favour direct osteogenesis whilst also allowing for vascularisation, providing a relatively high oxygenation within the scaffold. Smaller pores still allow for osteogenic differentiation, however, via osteochondral ossification (Tsuruga et al., 1997; Kuboki, Jin and Takita, 2001; Götz et al., 2004; Karageorgiou and Kaplan, 2005). Osteochondral ossification is a process of bone formation in which cartilage tissue is converted into bone by extracellular matrix remodelling and mineralisation. The difficulty in this variability in optimal pore sizes is that the requirements of the manufacturing process of the seamless silk scaffold require a single pore range which has to be consistent between both the cartilage and bone phase. This is because, during fabrication, the temperature in which the silk is initially frozen for lyophilisation controls this parameter. The created pore size of the biphasic scaffold within this study is affected by the initial freezing temperature prior to lyophilisation. It has been previously shown that the lower the freezing temperature, the smaller the pore size created (Luo et al., 2015). This is because lower freezing temperatures show an increased cooling rate, and thus an increase in the pore nucleation driving force- the resulting structures contain a higher number of smaller pores.

The average pore size seen within the cartilage phase (117 ± 15 µm) and the bone phase (124 ± 24 µm) of this biphasic scaffold sit within the optimal range for chondrogenesis, inferring that the scaffold has excellent chondrogenic potential whilst still allowing for osteogenesis. However, this has the potential disadvantage of not being the optimal size for vascularisation of the scaffold in vivo, with the pores being approximately 200 um smaller than the optimal size, although this
may not be a major concern due to the degradability of the silk component of the biphasic scaffold.

Within this study, the cartilage phase of the biphasic scaffold showed a comparable porosity to the silk control scaffolds, with a porosity of $90.93 \pm 2.7\%$. The literature indicates that a porosity of greater than 70% is suitable for tissue regeneration (Karageorgiou and Kaplan, 2005; Cheng et al., 2018; Lutzweiler, Ndreu Halili and Engin Vrana, 2020; Abbasi et al., 2020), as a porosity of this amount theoretically allows for cell infiltration into the scaffold surface, as well as adequate permeability for oxygen, nutrients and waste exchange. However, the bone phase of the biphasic scaffolds showed a less than 70% porosity of $61.01 \pm 1.63\%$; this is comparable to the 3D printed scaffolds. The reasoning for the reduced porosity was assigned to the non-porous nature of the 3D printed component of the bone phase. Although the porosity of the bone phase is less than the indicated 70%, this fails to take into account the nuances of the scaffold design, as the silk component of the bone phase is most likely to have a comparable porosity to a silk control scaffold. Thus, although the bone phase of the biphasic scaffold as a whole has less than 70% porosity, the regional variability of the scaffold should mean that there should still be adequate cell infiltration as well as nutrition, oxygen, and waste exchange via the silk component of the bone phase.

Some tissue engineering approaches using osteochondral scaffolds select to create a tidemark mimicking feature between the cartilage and bone phase (Niu et al., 2023). An artificial tidemark included within multiphasic scaffolds often consists of a thin region with no or negligible porosity and is designed to separate the bone and cartilage phase within the scaffold. The introduction of an impermeable membrane to split these two tissue types, helping to both better mimic native tissue and prevent bony invasion and blood vessel invasion of the cartilage, therefore hopefully improving regenerative outcomes (Yildirim et al., 2023). Although some studies have shown success with incorporating tidemarks into
their scaffold design, it has also been shown that the incorporation of a tidemark can create a region within the scaffold which is mechanically weak and is at risk of causing stress localisation during loading, leading to a point of failure (Dormer, Berkland and Detamore, 2010; Cross et al., 2016). Furthermore, it has also been demonstrated that although the tidemark is effective at splitting the multiphasic scaffold and preventing bony invasion to the cartilage phase, it can also lead to the creation of two distinct zones rather than a blended tissue going from cartilage to bone, leading to another potential point of failure (Chen et al., 2023c). Therefore, within the biphasic scaffolds utilised in this project, it was selected at the design phase not to include a tidemark as it was believed that the risk of creating a stress point with poor phase integration within the scaffold, was far greater than the benefits of including a tidemark.

3.2.2 Mechanical properties

Mechanical properties of the scaffold are fundamental to its regenerative capacity; its mechanical properties need to be great enough to resist articulation and manipulation during implantation, but not so great that they do not represent native tissue. The selection to blend two material types for the bone phase enables the scaffold to possess improved characteristics for osteochondral tissue regeneration, as each material can compensate and complement the limitations seen within the other material. Silk scaffolds have previously been shown to have extremely good biocompatibility, outperforming other scaffold materials such as collagen and polylactic acid when comparing the in vivo foreign body response of these materials (Foschi et al., 2001; Altman et al., 2003; Zhang et al., 2014).

However, they have also been shown to have weak mechanical properties, making them difficult and undesirable in load-bearing applications. Therefore, as this study has demonstrated, the utilisation of a synthetic 3D printed lattice infilled with silk means the scaffold’s mechanical properties are able to be
improved. The addition of the 3D printed lattice increases the scaffold’s long-term survival and regenerative capacity. The ultimate compressive strength of the bone phase within the biphasic scaffold (1.465 MPa) sits just below that of native cancellous bone (2–12 MPa), this ultimate compressive strength appears to be high enough to allow the scaffold to survive implantation as well as joint loading (Li et al., 2015a). The seamlessly integrated silk layer further enables the scaffold to represent native tissue, as together with the bone phase the biphasic scaffold was able to show stratified mechanical properties which more closely represent native osteochondral tissue. Native osteochondral tissue has been shown to have a gradient of compressive moduli, ranging from a relatively low 0.079 MPa in the superficial layer of articular cartilage to a 5.7 GPa in the subchondral bone, which is mimicked by the biphasic scaffold (Castro, Hacking and Zhang, 2012). Although the biphasic scaffold’s mechanical properties sit slightly below that of native tissue, they are still high enough to theoretically survive implantation. The scaffolds also show a low enough compressive modulus to prevent stress shielding of highly mechanosensitive cells such as chondrocytes and osteoblasts (Guilak, Butler and Goldstein, 2001; Hu and Athanasiou, 2006; Huey, Hu and Athanasiou, 2012; Salinas, Hu and Athanasiou, 2018).

Rather than implanted scaffolds experiencing overloading forces, it is much more likely that they will experience low intensity repeated fatigue loading during normal articulation (Vikingsson et al., 2015). Fatigue loading of an osteochondral scaffold refers to the application of cyclic mechanical stresses to the scaffold to simulate the repetitive loading that occurs in vivo. By determining the fatigue hysteresis loop of osteochondral scaffolds, information on the energy absorption characteristics of the scaffold material under cyclic loading was obtained. Energy absorption is an important factor to consider in the design of osteochondral scaffolds, as it directly affects the ability of the scaffold to withstand repetitive mechanical stresses and promote tissue regeneration. The hysteresis loop represents the energy lost during each cycle of loading and unloading, as the scaffold material undergoes deformation and recovers its original shape.
(Abramowitch and Easley, 2016). The area enclosed by the hysteresis loop represents the total energy absorbed by the scaffold material over one complete cycle. A larger loop area indicates that more energy is being absorbed by the material, which can be beneficial in applications where high impact loads are expected (Teruna, Majid and Budiono, 2015; Allen et al., 2020). However, excessive energy absorption can also lead to material failure or fatigue damage over time (Klemenc et al., 2019). This is shown by the plastic deformation of the scaffold, leading to a permanent reduction in its height. Therefore, it is important to optimize the energy absorption characteristics of the scaffold material to ensure a balance between load-bearing capacity and durability.

It has previously been shown that cartilage is loaded at approximately 1Hz during normal walking, and the cartilage has a strain no greater than 6% (Eckstein et al., 2005; Vikingsson et al., 2015; Eckstein et al., 2000). As demonstrated, all three scaffolds are able to survive repeated loading far in excess of the strain seen within normal articular cartilage of 6% with no major failure being seen on any of the scaffolds. 3D printed control scaffolds showed the greatest propensity to resist fatigue loading showing very little change in the scaffold’s height (2.4 ± 0.5%), with silk control scaffolds showing the least propensity to resist fatigue loading with the greatest reduction (33.9 ± 1.5%). Biphasic scaffolds showed a blend of fatigue behaviour of the two scaffolds (18.5 ± 2.5%). However, 3D printed scaffolds also showed no energy absorption capabilities, showing complete elastic behaviour during loading and unloading. This was compared to biphasic scaffolds and silk control scaffolds, which showed an ability to absorb energy during their repeated loading and unloading cycles, inferring that the scaffolds showed some viscoelastic properties. At cycle one, silk scaffolds showed the greatest capacity to absorb energy. However, after 1000 cycles, silk scaffolds showed a reduction in energy absorption of 0.54 mJ. This is compared to the energy absorption reduction within biphasic scaffolds of 0.268 mJ. This indicates once again that the silk control scaffolds have a lower fatigue resistance than the biphasic scaffolds. The goal of fatigue testing within this study was to provide a worst-case scenario
for loading of a scaffold post implantation. However, in vivo, it is unlikely the scaffold will experience consistent loading and unloading within a fatigue environment without rest periods. Allen et al., 2020 demonstrated that, when working with the foam inners for running shoes, foam had a propensity to recover some of its energy absorbing characteristics over time if given adequate rest periods. Thus, it can be inferred that the foam-like materials used within this project may see a return of their energy absorbing characteristics if given adequate rest periods.

This data demonstrates that theoretically, the biphasic scaffolds within this study can survive low intensity repeated loading post implantation. The biphasic scaffolds’ hysteresis properties also indicate that post implantation the scaffold will be able to distribute loads exerted on the vulnerable cartilage phase into underlying subchondral bone by absorbing and redistributing energy within the scaffold structure (Malekipour et al., 2013; Lawless et al., 2017; Mountcastle et al., 2019; Gao et al., 2019; Weizel et al., 2020).

3.2.3 Swelling and degradation

Two fundamental properties of a porous sponge-like biomaterial are the scaffold swelling capacity and degradability. The ability of sponge-like scaffolds to swell and retain a certain amount of water/liquid within their structure is essential for their regenerative capacity and potential cellular interactions (Madihally and Matthew, 1999; Eckstein et al., 2000; Vikingsson et al., 2015; Offeddu et al., 2016). A scaffold’s failure to rehydrate from the dried form can fundamentally reduce its effectiveness in regards to tissue engineering and its ability to regenerate natural tissue. Failure of rehydration can lead to collapse of scaffold pores, leading to a reduction in porosity (Costa et al., 2017), which will affect cell penetration and reduce nutrient and waste exchange through the scaffold’s interconnected pore network. Furthermore, a lack of an aqueous environment can
lead to a reduction in cell adhesion to the scaffold surface. The swelling capacity of the scaffolds investigated in this study differed based on the material composition, with the biphasic scaffolds showing a lower capacity than the silk control scaffolds. This difference in swelling capacity was assigned to the 3D printed components of the biphasic scaffolds limiting swelling capacity in the presence of liquid, as well as its large contribution to the scaffolds’ initial mass. It was also found that passive diffusion of the liquid into the scaffold was unable to fully rehydrate scaffolds from the dried state and a negative pressure rehydration step is required to completely rehydrate scaffolds. This was done by first placing scaffolds into liquid before lowering the relative atmospheric pressure surrounding the scaffold; the air bubbles enclosed within the scaffold’s pores were removed, and the pores were then filled with the liquid in which the scaffold was submerged. This leads to complete scaffold rehydration and removal of any air remaining in the scaffold’s pores (as long as they are connected to the surface). The negative pressure rehydration step utilised within this study demonstrates an easy and effective way to induce scaffold rehydration within a relatively short timeframe and should enable an increased potential cell infiltration as well as an increased regenerative capacity.

It is fundamental to understand the scaffold’s degradability as it is essential to synchronise scaffold degradation with tissue formation (Bitar and Zakhem, 2014). The scaffold as a temporary matrix is removed and replaced with new tissue over time. To understand the degradation of the silk component of the scaffolds over time, an accelerated selective degradation model was used. This consisted of using protease XIV which is a cocktail of proteolytic enzymes with bacterial origin. Despite its bacterial origin, this technique well mimics the degradation environment found within synovial joints, and is an extremely useful analytical tool and has been extensively used on silk scaffolds previously (Li, Ogiso and Minoura, 2003; Rnjak-Kovacina et al., 2015b; Baptista et al., 2020). Within this study, the biphasic scaffold showed dramatically less degradation compared to the silk control scaffolds. The silk control scaffolds showed similar degradation
profiles to other studies that investigated silk only scaffolds (Rnjak-Kovacina et al., 2015b). The 3D printed component of the biphasic scaffolds showed a greater resistance to degradation than the silk infill material, as confirmed by visual inspection, showing complete degradation of the infilling silk material within the biphasic scaffold after 20 days. There appeared to be no protective effect of the 3D printed scaffold to the infilling silk material. The infilling silk material showed a similar degradation rate to silk control scaffolds. The advantage of selective degradation of the silk component over the 3D printed component is that when implanted in vivo, the scaffold will be able to degrade to allow for the introduction of native tissue whilst still maintaining its mechanical stability; this will support regeneration and prevent damage to the newly formed tissue while in an immature state, with the 3D printed components degrading later due to its greater stability associated with synthetic structure (Montaudo, Puglisi and Samperi, 1993; Capito and Spector, 2003). A limitation of utilising a proteolytic model for degradation is that it hasn’t been a good method to study the degradation of the 3D synthetic thermoplastic phases simultaneously with that of the silk. Due to the synthetic nature of the thermoplastic 3D printed scaffold, degradation will occur most likely via hydrolysis rather than proteolytic degradation (Deschamps et al., 2004).

### 3.2.4 Summary

Biphasic scaffolds were successfully created by casting silk fibroin from *Bombyx mori* over a 3D printed PEGT/PBT lattice. This biphasic scaffold showed adequate and equivalent porosity to silk control scaffolds to allow for cell infiltration. EDX data indicated no elemental contaminants remained from the scaffold creation process. The biphasic scaffold showed adequate and equivalent beta sheet formation to the silk control scaffolds. Biphasic scaffolds showed a reduction in swelling capacity compared to silk control scaffolds, however, with a swelling capacity still theoretically great enough to allow for appropriate nutrient
exchange. Both silk control scaffolds and biphasic scaffolds required a negative pressure rehydration step for appropriate rehydration. Biphasic scaffolds showed improved in vitro degradation characteristics theoretically allowing for timely degradation in vivo. Biphasic scaffolds showed improved mechanical properties compared to silk control scaffolds, as well as improved fatigue resistance.
Chapter 4 Osteochondral tissue engineering *in vitro* using human bone marrow stromal cells and biphasic 3D printed silk reinforced scaffolds

This chapter is designed to cover cell interactions with the created biphasic scaffolds under various conditions and compare these back to the silk control scaffolds.
4.1 Results

4.1.1 Scaffold sterility

To evaluate whether the autoclave step to encourage β-sheet formation in the silk scaffolds could also effectively sterilize scaffolds, sterility testing was undertaken. Thioglycollate medium is a growth medium with an oxygen gradient which allows for testing for the presence of aerobic and anaerobic bacteria. Sterility testing (Figure 33) showed that at no time point (0d, 3d, 7d, 14d) were there any infections of any scaffold, represented by no turbidity within the media, demonstrating their sterility against aerobic or anaerobic bacterial growth. This was compared to positive controls which showed extensive bacterial growth and corresponding turbidity.
Sterility testing was undertaken in thioglycolate media. Pink zone represents oxidised aerobic zone, and straw-coloured zone represents low oxygen anaerobic zone (n=4 per group). Positive controls were created via opening tubes to the air and leaving on the bench side at room temperature for 10 minutes. At day zero, no infection is seen in any group. By day 3, large amount of turbidity can be seen in the positive control with no infection being seen in any other group. This continues all the way to day 14 where still only the positive control shows an infection.
4.1.2 Scaffold cytotoxicity

4.1.2.1 Contact cytotoxicity

To understand the potential of the scaffolds to support cell growth, proliferation and migration, initially, the scaffolds were confirmed to have no contact cytotoxicity before further detailed analysis was undertaken. A contact cytotoxicity assay was undertaken as per ISO 10993-5:2009. All scaffold types showed no signs of contact cytotoxicity after microscopic analysis, with no cytotoxic zone being seen as per Figure 34 A,B, with cells growing up to and in contact with both scaffolds; the scaffolds were graded as grade 0 as per the ISO standard. Both scaffolds showed “no detectable zone around or under specimen”. Cells in all groups showed normal cell morphology, with good membrane integrity, with no cell detachment or lysis.
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**Figure 34 Scaffold contact cytotoxicity**
Investigation of contact cytotoxicity, as per ISO10993-5:2009(E) of hBMSCs cultured in the presence of silk control (A) and biphasic scaffolds (B) (n=4 per group) for 96 hours, stained with Giemsa solution, and imaged on a Leica DM16000 B inverted microscope.
4.1.2.2 Indirect cytotoxicity

Although the scaffolds showed no signs of contact cytotoxicity, it was still important to understand after long-term submersion in fluid whether any toxic degradation products are released over time. This will dramatically impact the success of the scaffold during long-term in vitro culture, as well as post implantation in vivo. To evaluate any potential cytotoxic chemical products produced during scaffold degradation in vitro, indirect cytotoxicity assays were undertaken as per ISO 10993-5:2009. 10,000 hBMSCs were seeded within a 96 well plate and were incubated for 48 h in conditioned media that had been preincubated undisturbed in the presence of silk control scaffolds or biphasic scaffolds for 72 hours, 1 week, 2 weeks, 3 weeks, 4 weeks or 8 weeks. Following this the cytotoxic reaction of the cell monolayer to the scaffold aliquots was evaluated cell viability was measured as seen in Figure 35. A slight decrease in cell viability over the 48h was seen with the increasing age of the conditioned media (72 hours, 1 week, 2 weeks, 3 weeks, 4 weeks or 8 weeks). However, this was non-significantly different from the unconditioned media (p>0.05). There was also no significant difference between either group or age of scaffold incubated media. All conditioned media and unincubated controls showed significantly greater viability than the negative control (media containing 10% DMSO).

To understand whether the scaffold degradation products had a long term effect on cell growth, a 96 well plate was seeded with a 1000 hBMSCs per well and incubated in the presence of media aliquots that had been preincubated undisturbed in the presence of silk control scaffolds or biphasic scaffolds for 72 hours, 1 week, 2 weeks, 3 weeks, 4 weeks or 8 weeks. Cell monolayers within 96 well plates were incubated in the presence of this conditioned media for six days. Wells were visually confirmed to have not reached confluence. No significant difference (p>0.05) in cell growth was seen between the conditioned media at all ages after six days of culture (Figure 36). All test samples showed no significant
difference (p<0.05) in cell growth compared to positive control groups (unincubated media)

**Figure 35 Indirect cytotoxicity**
Indirect cytotoxicity of silk control and biphasic scaffolds as determined by XTT assays was undertaken. hBMSCs at 10,000 cells/well were subjected to 48 hours incubation in media that had been preincubated with scaffolds for 72 hours, 1 week, 2 weeks, 3 weeks, 4 weeks or 8 weeks (n=4 per group). Positive controls consisted of plain media and negative controls consisted of media containing 40% DMSO. All samples showed significantly greater absorbance than negative controls (p<0.05), and no significant difference between any other group (p>0.05). Data represent mean ± SD.
Indirect cell proliferation testing of silk control and biphasic scaffolds determined by XTT assays was undertaken. hBMSCs (1000 per well) were subjected to 6 days incubation in media that had been preincubated with scaffolds for 72 hours, 1 week, 2 weeks, 3 weeks, 4 weeks or 8 weeks (n=4 per group). Positive controls consisted of plain media and negative controls consisted of media containing 40% DMSO. All samples showed significantly greater absorbance than negative controls (p<0.05), and no significant difference between any other group (p>0.05). Data represent mean ± SD.

**4.1.3 Scaffold seeding optimisation**

To optimise seeding density, initially, scaffolds were seeded with a range of seeding densities (100000, 250000, 500000, 1000000 cell per scaffold). These were then stained with cell tracker green and visualised under a fluorescent microscope. This data was then utilised to select the optimal seeding density. Each future experiment is based on the density of cells seen in the individual experiments requirements. For experiments 4.1.6 and 4.1.7, 100000 cells were selected to be utilized, as this density was believed to allow for the visualization of cells on the scaffold surface without forming a dense monolayer for experiment 4.1.6, and allowing for available scaffold surface area for cell proliferation to be investigated in experiment 4.1.7. For experiments 4.1.9, 4.1.10 and 4.1.11, 500000 cells were selected to be utilized. This density was believed to be high
enough to promote rapid scaffold colonization and allow for cellular differentiation into osteogenic and chondrogenic lineages, without being excessively high to deplete the limited stock of cells. Experiments 4.1.4, 4.1.5 and 4.1.8 also utilized 500,000 cells to maintain consistent seeding density with the differentiation experiments (4.1.9, 4.1.10 and 4.1.11).

4.1.4 The effect of surface modification on the attachment and growth of hBMSCs on biphasic scaffolds

Cell adhesion behaviour on the scaffolds was investigated to confirm that they could allow for cell adhesion and support cell growth. To help increase the potential of cell adhesion, all scaffolds (silk control and biphasic) were preincubated at 4°C overnight in basal media in the presence or absence of 20% FBS. After 24 hours of static seeding, fluorescence microscopy images showed that the hBMSCs pre-labelled with CellTracker™ Green can attach and adhere onto all the scaffold groups (Figure 37). There were no obvious differences between the 20% FBS pre-treatment groups (Figure 37 A,B) compared with that of the same scaffold without FBS pre-treatment (Figure 37 C,D). Any potential differences seen in cell adhesion between silk control scaffolds and biphasic scaffolds was assigned to the limitation of utilising a fluorescent microscope with porous materials due to its single focal plane. All groups showing excellent cell adhesion to the surface of the scaffolds and cells possessing normal morphology, with cell processes being visible. It was decided for all future experiments that scaffolds would be preincubated at 4°C overnight with 10% FBS. This level was selected to help remove variability from when the preincubation media was exchanged to the culture media, as 10% FBS is the level found within the culture media.
Cell adhesion behaviour of hBMSCs labelled with CellTracker™ Green CMFDA Dye after 24 hours between silk control scaffolds and biphasic scaffolds in the presence or absence of an overnight (4°C) incubation period with 20% FBS. (A) Silk control scaffolds incubated in 0% FBS, (B), biphasic scaffolds incubated in 0% FBS, (C) Silk control scaffolds incubated in 20% FBS, (D), biphasic scaffolds incubated in 20% FBS (n=4 per group).

4.1.5 Dynamic versus static seeding

It was important to identify the correct scaffold seeding technique, as the method selected can dramatically affect scaffold regenerative capacity as well as the cells’ ability to migrate and distribute throughout the scaffold. To evaluate different approaches to cell seeding, dynamic and static seeding were compared (Figure 38). Prior to seeding in the two condition types, hBMSCs were pre-labelled with CellTracker™ Green. It was shown in both the static and dynamic seeding
conditions that the biphasic scaffolds and the silk control scaffolds could support
cell attachment to the scaffolds with no differences in cell attachment behaviour
being noted. The static seeding group demonstrated a relatively dense
homogeneous layer of cells on the scaffold surface, with no cell attachment being
seen on any of the scaffold’s other faces (side and bottom) (Figure 38 A-D). This
was compared to the dynamic seeding group where an even distribution of cell
attachment was seen across all six of its faces; however, this was at a lower
density than the single face seen within the static seeding group (Figure 38 E-H).
This highlighted the potential utilisation of static seeding to direct cell types across
different areas of the scaffold, i.e., chondrogenic cells to the cartilage phase and
osteogenic cells to the bone phase. Therefore, static seeding was the chosen
seeding type for all future experimentation.
Figure 38. A comparison of cell distribution after dynamic or static seeding
A comparison of cell adhesion behaviour of hBMSCs labelled with CellTracker™ Green CMFDA after 24 hours of static and dynamic seeding. Images were taken on the top and bottom of the same scaffold on the two scaffold types—silk control and biphasic. (A) upper face of Silk control scaffolds statically seeded, (B) upper face of biphasic scaffolds statically seeded, (C) lower face of Silk control scaffolds statically seeded, (D) lower face of biphasic scaffolds statically seeded, (E) upper face of Silk control scaffolds, dynamic seeded, (F) upper face of biphasic scaffolds dynamic seeded, (G) lower face of Silk control scaffolds dynamic seeded, (H) lower face of biphasic scaffolds dynamic seeded (n=4 per group).
4.1.6 Cell migration and morphological shape

To better understand cell morphology as well as the ability for cells to adhere to pore surfaces, visualisation of cell adhesion was undertaken. Cells were labelled with phalloidin to identify actin fibres (green fluorescence) and with a nuclear stain DAPI (blue fluorescence). Typical images of each scaffold are shown in Figure 39. hBMSCs were shown to be growing robustly on all three scaffold types (silk control Figure 39 A, biphasic (cartilage phase) Figure 39 B and biphasic (bone phase) Figure 39 C) with good stretching and a spread and elongated morphology suggesting excellent cell adhesion. Cells were also shown to be able to effectively conform to the inner surface of scaffold pores. No clumping or balling of cells was seen. There were no obvious differences in cell adhesion morphology between scaffold types (silk control scaffolds, biphasic scaffolds (bone phase and cartilage phase). Absorption of the DAPI to the silk component of the scaffolds was seen and was represented by a strong blue fluorescence which was not present in the absence of the dye.
Figure 39 Cell cytoskeleton scaffold interaction
Confocal microscopy of hBMSCs on different scaffolds after 2 days (50,000 cells per scaffold). (A) Silk control scaffolds, (B) cartilage phase, (C) Bone phase of biphasic scaffolds (D) unseeded and unstained control silk scaffold (n=4 per group). Blue colouring (DAPI) represents cell nuclei and silk scaffolds. Green colouring (Alexa FluorTM 488 phallolidin) represents actin within the cell cytoskeleton.
4.1.7 Cell metabolic activity and cell death rate

It is important to understand the cells’ interaction with the scaffold and how it affects cell metabolic activity- it is important that over time cells are able to maintain or increase their metabolic activity. The interactions between relative cell metabolic activity and scaffold type were investigated by an Alamar blue assay, by seeding of 100,000 hBMSCs onto silk control scaffolds, the cartilage phase of the biphasic scaffolds and the bone phase of the biphasic scaffolds (Figure 40). All scaffold types showed an increase in cell metabolic activity over 16 days. On day one, silk control scaffolds showed a relative fluorescence of 196.1 ± 42.5, the cartilage phase of the biphasic scaffolds showed a relative fluorescence of 172.1 ± 25.2, and the bone phase of the biphasic scaffolds showed a relative fluorescence of 112.4 ± 24.1. All scaffolds showed a significant increase (p<0.001) over the 16 days from the day one results, with the silk control scaffold showing 555.2 ± 55.0, the cartilage phase of the biphasic scaffold showing 488.2 ± 72.4, and the bone phase of the biphasic scaffold showing 488.6 ± 62.4. At no time point did any scaffold show significantly different (p>0.05) metabolic activity compared with any of the other scaffold types.

To evaluate relative cellular toxicity, an LDH assay was undertaken, consisting of seeding 100,000 hBMSCs onto the silk control scaffolds, the cartilage phase of the biphasic scaffolds and the bone phase of the biphasic scaffolds, and then measuring released LDH in the cell culture media. LDH levels decreased over the first eight days before plateauing and seeing no further decreases (Figure 41). LDH levels on day 2 in the silk control scaffolds showed a relative absorbance of 0.390 ± 0.047, the cartilage phase of the biphasic scaffolds showed 0.393 ± 0.062, and the bone phase of the biphasic scaffolds showed 0.335 ± 0.049. All scaffolds showed a significant decrease (p<0.05) in LDH activity after 8 days, with silk scaffolds showing a relative activity of 0.095 ± 0.052, the cartilage phase of the biphasic scaffolds showing a relative activity of 0.031 ± 0.078, and the bone phase of the biphasic scaffolds showing a relative activity of 0.039 ± 0.093. After eight
days, no significant further ($p>0.05$) changes in LDH activity were seen. At no time point did any scaffold show significantly different ($p>0.05$) LDH activity compared with any of the other scaffold types. The decreasing LDH activity was assigned to reduced cell apoptosis over time as cells settled and began to proliferate onto the seeded scaffolds. It was further confirmed that the reducing LDH activity was not due to complete cell death, as the Alamar blue assay showed increasing metabolic activity over the same time period. Data for both Alamar blue and LDH activity is displayed as a relative absorption data.
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**Figure 40** Cell metabolic activity on scaffolds as determined by alamarBlue

Initially scaffolds were seeded with 100,000 hBMSCs and changes in metabolic activity were evaluated over a 16 day time period of the silk control scaffolds (black circle), cartilage phase of the biphasic scaffolds (green square) and bone phase of biphasic scaffolds (blue triangle) ($n=4$ per group) were evaluated via alamarBlue assay. No significant difference between any scaffold at any time point was seen ($P>0.05$). However, all scaffolds showed a significant increase in metabolic activity over the 16-day time period ($p<0.001$). Data represent mean ± SD.
LDH activity

Figure 41 Released LDH activity
LDH activity within culture media was measured over a 16 day time period. Scaffolds were initially seeded with 100,000 hBMSCs. silk control scaffolds (black circle), cartilage phase of biphasic scaffolds (green square) and bone phase of biphasic scaffolds (blue triangle) (n=4 per group). No significant difference between any scaffold at any time point was seen (P>0.05). All scaffolds showed a significant decrease (p<0.05) in LDH activity after 8 days, followed by no further significant changes (P>0.05). Data represent mean ± SD.

4.1.8 Scaffold seeding technique

To further investigate and confirm whether cells can be directed to different locations via the utilisation of static seeding orientation (as indicated in the static versus dynamic seeding experiments), multicoloured cell tracking was undertaken. This was undertaken to two individual populations of hBMSCs, pre-labelled with cell tracker green or red. Following this, scaffolds (silk control and biphasic) were placed in the bottom of screw-top Eppendorfs, and cells labelled with cell tracker green were placed onto the upward facing surface of the scaffold and left for 12 hours. Following this, scaffolds were inverted and placed in new Eppendorfs. Cells labelled with cell tracker red were then placed on the upward facing side of the scaffold and left for a further 12 hours. Scaffolds were then inspected under a...
confocal microscope, which demonstrated effective directing of cell types to the desired surface with no undesirable red labelled cells being seen on the surface seeded with green labelled cells (Figure 42 A, B) and vice versa (Figure 42 C, B). This lack of cross seeding was seen in both silk control scaffolds and biphasic scaffolds. These results indicated that this static seeding method is an effective way to direct different populations of cells to different scaffold surfaces. The silk component of both scaffolds was labelled red by excreted cell tracker red from the seeded cells. However, there was no impact on the experimental results as labelled cells are clearly present around the stained scaffold component.
two separate groups of hBMSCs were labelled with cell tracker green and red and statically seeded onto biphasic and silk scaffolds in opposite orientations 12 hours apart. Cells labelled with cell tracker green (500,000 cells) were seeded on to the cartilage phase of the biphasic scaffolds and the top of silk scaffolds. Scaffolds were then rotated after 12 hours and seeded with 500,000 cells on the opposite face (bone phase for biphasic scaffolds, lower face for silk scaffolds) with cells labelled with cell tracker red. Cells were found to be localised to the face seeded upwards during their respective seeding period, with no mixing of red and green labelled cells. (A) top of silk scaffolds, (B) cartilage phase of the biphasic scaffolds, (C) bottom of silk scaffolds, (D) bone phase of biphasic scaffolds (n=4 per group).
4.1.9 Culturing of hBMSCs on scaffolds under chondrogenic conditions

4.1.9.1 Evaluation of cell migration and morphology via H and E staining under Chondrogenic conditions

To understand the longer-term response of cells under chondrogenic conditions, and whether negative pressure rehydration is indeed necessary within scaffolds, silk control scaffolds and the cartilage phase of biphasic scaffolds were seeded with hBMSCs and placed under chondrogenic conditions for three weeks. Following this, scaffolds were embedded, sectioned and stained with H&E to identify cell nuclei and cytoplasm respectively. All scaffolds under these conditions, including scaffolds that had not undergone negative pressure rehydration, showed successful cell adhesion to the scaffold surface. However, the silk control and cartilage phase scaffolds that had not undergone negative pressure rehydration showed extremely poor cell infiltration, with cells remaining on the surface (Figure 43 A, B). However, after negative pressure rehydration of the scaffolds, there was satisfactory cell penetration within chondrogenic conditions during the three-week culture period which showed a thick cell layer along the seeded surface, with large quantities of extracellular matrix production; the cells were also able to penetrate the majority of the cartilage phase during the three-week culture period (Figure 43 C,D). Cell morphology and density was similar between the cartilage phase of biphasic scaffolds and silk scaffolds.

However, there were some cells present within the bone phase and non-seeded face of both scaffolds (Figure 43 G,H). Rather than this being due to cells penetrating fully through the scaffold, this was identified to be due to undesirable seeding of the cells from the culture dish, since at the time of culture there were no available low adhesion culture dishes (coronavirus related supply chain issues). It was believed to be this rather than cells penetrating through the whole scaffold due to the lack of presence of cells within the centre of the scaffold.
Figure 43 H&E staining of biphasic and silk control scaffolds under chondrogenic conditions

Representative images at five times magnification of H&E staining of silk (n=4) and biphasic scaffolds (n=4) following three weeks of chondrogenic culture in the presence or absence of a negative pressure rehydration step. Arrow indicates seeded face of scaffold (500,000 hBMSC per scaffold). (A) cartilage phase of the biphasic scaffolds that have not undergone negative pressure rehydration. (B) top of silk control scaffolds that have not undergone negative pressure rehydration. (C) cartilage phase of biphasic scaffolds that have undergone negative pressure rehydration. (D) top of silk control scaffolds that have undergone negative pressure rehydration. (E) bone phase of the biphasic scaffolds that have not undergone negative pressure rehydration. (F) bottom of silk control scaffolds that have not undergone negative pressure rehydration. (G) bone phase of the biphasic scaffolds that have undergone negative pressure rehydration. (H) bottom of silk control scaffolds that have undergone negative pressure rehydration.
4.1.9.2 Long term viability in chondrogenic conditions of cells on scaffolds

To investigate long-term viability of cells on the scaffold surface of the silk control scaffolds and the cartilage phase of the biphasic scaffolds, and to confirm no long-term contact cytotoxicity was present, live cell imaging was undertaken. This was with the aim to evaluate cell survival as well as cell morphology on the scaffold surface. This was evaluated by seeding and culturing of hBMSCs on the silk scaffold and cartilage phases of the biphasic scaffolds, followed by visualisation with cell tracker green labelling. The confocal laser scanning micrographs revealed a high proportion of viable green cells in both scaffold types and chondrogenic conditions (Figure 44); no observable differences were seen in viability in both groups at both the 24-hour (Figure 44 A,B) and the 3-week time points (Figure 44 C,D) in chondrogenic conditions, although a higher density of cells was seen at the 3 week time point for both scaffolds compared to the 24 hour time point. Within all scaffold types and culture conditions, cells appear to have an even distribution over the seeded surface. These findings demonstrate that the scaffolds have low cytotoxicity due to the high number of viable cells, further reinforcing the hypothesis that the poor cell infiltration seen in Figure 43 A,B resulted from incomplete rehydration rather than toxicity of the scaffolds. Dead staining with EthD-1 could not be undertaken due to preferential binding of the stain to the silk component of scaffolds, masking the presence or absence of dead cells. However, due to the extremely high prevalence and density of living cells, the scaffolds were confirmed to be non-toxic.
Live cell staining of hBMSCs on biphasic and silk control scaffolds under chondrogenic conditions

Representative images of the comparison of cell viability of hBMSCs labelled with CellTracker™ Green CMFDA after 24 hours of chondrogenic culture on (A) silk control scaffolds (n=4) and (B) the cartilage phase of the biphasic scaffolds (n=4); and after three weeks of chondrogenic culture (C) silk control scaffolds (n=4) and (D) the cartilage phase of the biphasic scaffolds (n=4). Seeding density of each scaffold was 500,000 hBMSCs.
4.1.9.3 Collagen and GAG deposition by hBMSCs within scaffolds under chondrogenic conditions.

To better understand the impact of chondrogenic culture and seeding on silk control scaffolds and biphasic scaffolds, staining was undertaken. The Picrosirius red/Alcian blue staining assessed the expression of collagens and GAGs of hBMSCs within both the biphasic scaffolds (Figure 45 C,D) and silk control scaffolds (Figure 45 A,B). This showed intense collagen staining (red) and GAG staining (blue) on the scaffolds’ surface with a large amount of extracellular matrix production. The beginnings of the formation of a cartilage-like surface was observed. No obvious differences were seen between the cartilage phase of the biphasic scaffolds and silk control scaffolds. Cells within both scaffolds demonstrated typical chondrocyte morphology with cells being seen to have formed dense extracellular matrix with lacunae formation, with no contact seen between cells as within native articular cartilage. Furthermore, the beginnings of cartilage stratification can be seen, with cells presenting a more flattened morphology at the surface of scaffolds, as seen within the superficial zone of native cartilage. Cells took on a more rounded or oval-shape deeper into the scaffold, more closely resembling chondrocytes seen within the mid zone of articular cartilage.
Figure 45 Picrosirius red/Alcian blue staining of biphasic and silk control scaffolds under chondrogenic conditions
Representative images of picrosirius red/Alcian blue staining of silk control scaffolds and the cartilage phase of the biphasic scaffolds after three weeks of chondrogenic culture with seeded hBMSCs (seeding density 500,000 cells per scaffold) (n=4). Collagen is stained with Picrosirius red and is represented by a red colour. GAGs are stained with Alcian blue and is represented in blue. (A). Silk control scaffolds at 10x magnification. (B) Silk control scaffolds at 20x magnification (C). Cartilage phase of biphasic scaffold at 10x magnification. (D) Cartilage phase of biphasic scaffold at 20x magnification.

4.1.9.4 Collagen Type I and II deposition by hBMSCs within scaffolds under chondrogenic conditions.

To further differentiate the type of collagen deposition seen by the Picosirius red staining and to better understand the exact collagen types deposited by cells within the scaffolds under chondrogenic conditions, immunohistochemistry was undertaken. This staining demonstrated the presence of Type I collagen shown by brown staining in both the biphasic (Figure 46 C,D) and silk scaffolds (Figure 46 A,B) with no obvious difference between both scaffold types. As well as this, Type II collagen deposition was also shown by brown staining in both the biphasic (Figure 46 G,H) and silk scaffolds (Figure 46 E,F), with no obvious difference between both scaffold types. It was selected to utilise Type I collagen staining as a negative
marker for cartilage formation and a positive marker for bone and fibrocartilage or fibrous tissue formation. As a mix of both Type I and Type II collagen (as seen in figure 46) would indicate the formation of fibrous cartilage rather than the more desirable hyaline.
Figure 46 ICH staining for Type I and Type II collagen of biphasic and silk control scaffolds under chondrogenic conditions

Representative images of collagen Type I and Type II staining by immunohistochemistry of silk control scaffolds and the cartilage phase of biphasic scaffolds after three weeks of chondrogenic culture with seeded hBMSCs (seeding density 500,000 hBMSC per scaffold) (n=4 per group). Positive staining is represented by a brown coloration. (A) Silk control scaffolds at 10x magnification stained for Type I collagen. (B) Silk control scaffolds at 20x magnification stained for Type I collagen. (C) Cartilage phase of biphasic scaffolds at 10x magnification stained for Type I collagen. (D) Cartilage phase of biphasic scaffolds at 20x magnification stained for Type I collagen. (E) Silk control scaffolds at 10x magnification stained for Type II collagen. (F) Silk control scaffolds at 20x magnification stained for Type II collagen. (G) Cartilage phase of the biphasic scaffolds at 10x magnification stained for Type II collagen. (H) Cartilage phase of biphasic scaffolds at 20x magnification stained for Type II collagen.
4.1.9.5 Proteoglycan deposition by hBMSCs within scaffolds under chondrogenic conditions.

Safranin-O staining was used to assess the expression of proteoglycan of hBMSCs within the cartilage phase of the biphasic scaffolds and silk control scaffolds after three weeks of culture. Both biphasic scaffolds (Figure 47 C,D) and silk control scaffolds (Figure 47 A,B) showed moderate proteoglycan staining on the scaffold surface with a large amount of extracellular matrix production. The beginnings of a formation of a cartilage-like surface was observed. No obvious differences were seen between the cartilage phase of the biphasic scaffolds and silk control scaffolds. Cartilage-like lacunae formation was also seen in both scaffold types similar to that seen in the Alcian blue and Picosirus red staining (Figure 46).

Figure 47 Safranin-O staining of biphasic and silk control scaffolds under chondrogenic conditions
Representative images of Safranin-O staining of silk control scaffolds and the cartilage phase of biphasic scaffolds after three weeks of chondrogenic culture, with seeded hBMSCs (seeding density 500,000 hBMSC) (n=4 per group). Proteoglycans are stained in pink with Safranin-O. (A) Silk control scaffolds at 10x magnification. (B) Silk control scaffolds at 20x magnification. (C) Cartilage phase of biphasic scaffolds at 10x magnification. (D) Cartilage phase of biphasic scaffolds at 20x magnification.
4.1.10 Culturing of hBMSCs on scaffolds under osteogenic conditions

4.1.10.1 Evaluation of cell migration and morphology via H&E staining under osteogenic conditions

To understand the long-term response of cells under osteogenic conditions, scaffolds were seeded with hBMSCs and placed under osteogenic conditions for six weeks. Following this, cells were embedded, sectioned and stained with H&E to identify cell nuclei and cytoplasm respectively. H&E staining of the seeded bone phase of the biphasic scaffolds and the silk control scaffolds was carried out under osteogenic conditions (Figure 48 C, D, G, H), also incorporating a negative pressure rehydration step (Figure 48 A, B, E, F). This experiment showed similar results to those seen under chondrogenic conditions (Figure 43); when a negative pressure rehydration step is not included, cells showed very little migration into the scaffold, even after six weeks of osteogenic culture. However, similarly to the results seen in chondrogenic culture, once the scaffold had undergone a negative pressure rehydration step to improve hydration, the scaffolds showed excellent cell migration throughout the entire bone phase and into the initial stages of the cartilage phase. The cells seen in the cartilage phase were believed to be due to cells penetrating through the scaffold, rather than undesirable seeding, as seen in chondrogenic culture- this is due to no cells being seen on the surface of the cartilage phase, rather a continuation of cells throughout the entire bone phase and into the cartilage phase. No difference in density or migration was seen between biphasic scaffolds and silk control scaffolds under osteogenic conditions when scaffolds had been exposed to a negative pressure rehydration step.
Figure 48 H&E staining of biphasic and silk control scaffolds under osteogenic conditions

Representative images at five times magnification of H&E staining of silk (n=4) and biphasic scaffolds (n=4) following 6 weeks of osteogenic culture in the presence or absence of a negative pressure rehydration step. Arrow indicates seeded face of scaffold (seeding density 500,000 hBMSC). (A) cartilage phase of the biphasic scaffolds that have not undergone negative pressure rehydration. (B) top of silk control scaffolds that have not undergone negative pressure rehydration. (C) cartilage phase of biphasic scaffolds that have undergone negative pressure rehydration. (D) top of silk control scaffolds that have undergone negative pressure rehydration. (E) bone phase of the biphasic scaffolds that have not undergone negative pressure rehydration. (F) bottom of silk control scaffolds that have not undergone negative pressure rehydration. (G) bone phase of the biphasic scaffolds that have undergone negative pressure rehydration. (H) bottom of silk control scaffolds that have undergone negative pressure rehydration.
4.1.10.2 Long term viability of cells on scaffolds under osteogenic conditions

To evaluate cell long-term survival on the bone phase of the biphasic scaffolds compared to the silk control scaffolds under osteogenic conditions, cells were labelled with cell tracker green and were evaluated under the same conditions as in Chondrogenic culture but with a longer culture time of six weeks and under osteogenic conditions. The confocal laser scanning micrographs revealed a high proportion of viable green cells in both scaffold types (n=4) under osteogenic conditions (Figure 49). No observable differences were seen in viability in both groups at both the 24 hour (Figure 49 A,B) and the 6-week time (Figure 49 C,D) points in osteogenic conditions; although a higher density of cells was seen at the 6-week time point for both scaffolds compared to the 24 hour time point. Within all scaffold types and culture conditions, cells appear to have an even distribution over the seeded surface with a spindle like morphology. However, in the 6-week culture group of the biphasic scaffolds, hBMSCs appear to show greater affinity to the silk component of the scaffold, with fewer being visibly attached to the 3D printed component. This was thought to be due to the porous nature of the silk component compared with the nonporous 3D printed component, allowing for a greater density of cells to grow and be visualised under the Z-stack. These findings demonstrate that the scaffolds have low cytotoxicity due to the high number of viable cells, further reinforcing the hypothesis that the poor cell infiltration seen in Figure 43 and Figure 48 was resultant from incomplete rehydration rather than toxicity of the scaffolds. As with the chondrogenic live cell imaging, dead staining with EthD-1 could not be undertaken due to preferential binding of the stain to the silk component of scaffolds masking the presence or absence of dead cells.
Figure 49 live cell staining of hBMSCs on biphasic and silk control scaffolds under osteogenic conditions
representative images of the comparison of cell viability of hBMSCs labelled with CellTracker™ Green CMFDA after 24 hours of osteogenic culture on (A) silk control scaffolds (n=4). (B) cartilage phase of Biphasic scaffolds (B) (n=4) and after 6 weeks of osteogenic culture on (C) silk control scaffolds (n=4). (D) cartilage phase of Biphasic scaffolds (B) (n=4). Seeding density of each scaffold was 500,000 hBMSCs per scaffold.
4.1.10.3 Collagen and GAG of hBMSCs within deposition within scaffolds under osteogenic conditions.

To better understand the impact of osteogenic culture and seeding on the silk control scaffolds and the biphasic scaffolds, staining was undertaken. This was done by utilising Picrosirius red/Alcian blue staining to assess the expression of collagens and GAGs respectively of hBMSCs within the bone phase of biphasic scaffolds (Figure 50 C,D) and silk control scaffolds (Figure 50 A,B) after 6 weeks of culture. Both the biphasic scaffolds and silk control scaffolds showed collagen staining (red) and GAG staining (blue) on the scaffold interior with a large amount of extracellular matrix production.

![Picrosirius red/Alcian blue staining staining of biphasic and silk control scaffolds under osteogenic conditions](image)

Figure 50 Picrosirius red/Alcian blue staining staining of biphasic and silk control scaffolds under osteogenic conditions
Representative images of picrosirius red/Alcian blue staining of silk control scaffolds and the bone phase of biphasic scaffolds after 6 weeks of osteogenic culture with seeded hBMSCs (seeding density 500,000 cells per scaffold) (n=4 per group). Collagen is stained with Picrosirius red and is represented by a red colour. GAGs are stained with Alcian blue and is represented in blue. (A) Silk control scaffolds at 10x magnification. (B) Silk control scaffolds at 20x magnification. (C) The bone phase of the biphasic scaffolds at 10x magnification. (D) The bone phase of the biphasic scaffolds at 20x magnification.
4.1.10.4 Collagen Type I and II deposition of hBMSCs within scaffolds under osteogenic conditions.

To further differentiate the type of collagen deposition seen by the Picrosirius red staining and to better understand the exact collagen types deposited by cells within the scaffolds under osteogenic conditions, immunohistochemistry was undertaken. This staining demonstrated the presence of only Type I collagen deposition shown by brown staining in both the biphasic (Figure 51 C,D) and silk control scaffolds (Figure 51 A,D), with no obvious difference between both scaffold types. No Type II collagen staining was seen in either the biphasic (Figure 51 G,H) or silk control scaffolds (Figure 51 E,F) under osteogenic conditions, indicating the deposition of the correct collagen type for bone. As previously mentioned, Type I collagen staining functioned as a negative marker for cartilage formation and a positive marker for bone and fibrocartilage or fibrous tissue formation, and Type II collagen staining functioned as a positive marker for cartilage formation.
Figure 51 IHC staining of Type I and Type II collagen of biphasic and silk control scaffolds under osteogenic conditions

Representative images of collagen Type I and Type II staining by immunohistochemistry of silk control scaffolds and the bone phase of biphasic scaffolds after 6 weeks of osteogenic culture with seeded hBMSCs (seeding density 500,000 cells per scaffold) (n=4 per group). Positive staining is represented by a brown coloration. (A) Silk control scaffolds at 10x magnification stained for Type I collagen. (B) Silk control scaffolds at 20x magnification stained for Type I collagen. (C) The bone phase of the biphasic scaffolds at 10x magnification stained for Type I collagen. (D) The bone phase of the biphasic scaffolds at 20x magnification stained for Type I collagen. (E) Silk control scaffolds at 10x magnification stained for Type II collagen. (F) Silk control scaffolds at 20x magnification stained for Type II collagen. (G) The bone phase of the biphasic scaffolds at 10x magnification stained for Type II collagen. (H) The bone phase of the biphasic scaffolds at 20x magnification stained for Type II collagen.
4.1.10.5 Mineral nodule deposition of hBMSCs within scaffolds under osteogenic conditions.

To evaluate calcium deposition, Von Kossa staining was utilised. This indicated small amounts of mineral nodule formation within both the bone phase of the biphasic scaffolds (Figure 52 C,D) and within the silk control scaffolds (Figure 52 A,B), with there being no clear difference between the two groups. A slightly larger density of mineral nodules was observed towards the seeded face of scaffolds.

Figure 52 Von Kossa staining of biphasic and silk control scaffolds under osteogenic conditions
Representative images of mineral nodule formation by Von Kossa staining of silk control scaffolds and the bone phase of biphasic scaffolds after 6 weeks of osteogenic culture with seeded hBMSCs (seeding density 500,000 cells per scaffold) (n=4 per group). Mineral nodules are indicated with black arrows. (A) Silk control scaffolds at 10x magnification. (B) Silk control scaffolds at 20x magnification. (C) The bone phase of the biphasic scaffolds at 10x magnification. (D) The bone phase of the biphasic scaffolds at 20x magnification.
4.1.11 Culturing of hBMSCs on scaffolds under osteochondral conditions

To investigate the potential of biphasic scaffolds to be used for osteochondral interventions, osteochondral culture was undertaken. This consisted of seeding the bone phase of the biphasic scaffolds and the bottom face of the silk control scaffolds with 500,000 hBMSCs, and then culturing them under osteogenic conditions for six weeks. Following this, the cartilage phase of the biphasic scaffolds and the top face of the silk control scaffolds were seeded with either 500,000 hBMSCs or 500,000 hBMSCs that had been pre-cultured in chondrogenic media for two weeks. Both scaffolds were then cultured for three weeks in chondrogenic media before embedding and sectioning.

4.1.11.1 Evaluation of cell migration and morphology via H&E staining within osteochondral conditions

H&E staining of osteochondral constructs showed excellent pore filling with a continuous, uninterrupted distribution of cells from the cartilage phase to the bone phase in the biphasic scaffolds and throughout the entirety of the silk control scaffolds (Figure 53 B,D,F,H,J,L). No obvious differences were seen in pore filling or cell distribution between scaffolds containing chondrogenic pre-cultured hBMSCs (Figure 53 B,C,F,H,J,L) and non-pre-cultured cells (Figure 53 A,C,E,G,J,K).
Figure 53 H&E staining of biphasic and silk control scaffolds under osteochondral conditions
Representative images at 10 times magnification of H&E staining of silk (n=4) and biphasic scaffolds (n=4), with (n=4) and without (n=4) chondrogenic pre-culture, following 9 weeks of osteochondral culture. Black arrow indicates seeded face of scaffold (seeding density 500,000 hBMSC per scaffold), green arrow represents secondary seeded face of scaffold (seeding density 500,000 hBMSC per scaffold). (A) top of silk scaffold. (B) top of silk scaffold that has undergone chondrogenic pre-culture of cells. (C) the cartilage phase of the biphasic scaffold. (D) the cartilage phase of the biphasic scaffold that has undergone chondrogenic pre-culture of cells. (E) middle of silk scaffold. (F) middle of silk scaffold that has undergone chondrogenic pre-culture of cells. (G) middle of the biphasic scaffold. (H) middle of the biphasic scaffold that has undergone chondrogenic pre-culture of cells. (I) bottom of silk scaffold. (J) bottom of silk scaffold that has undergone chondrogenic pre-culture of cells. (K) bone phase of the biphasic scaffold. (L) bone phase of the biphasic scaffold that has undergone chondrogenic pre-culture of cells.
4.1.11.2 Collagen and GAG deposition within scaffolds under osteochondral conditions.

Picrosirius red/Alcian blue staining was performed to assess the expression of collagens and GAGs respectively of hBMSCs. No obvious difference in staining was seen between the biphasic scaffolds and silk control scaffolds, as well as the chondrogenic pre-culture group for both the biphasic scaffolds and silk control scaffolds (Figure 54). All groups showed extensive GAG and collagen staining, with higher densities being seen in the chondrogenic phase of the biphasic scaffolds (Figure 54 I,J) and the top of silk scaffolds (Figure 54 A,B), with once again there being no obvious impact of chondrogenic pre-culture on collagen and GAGs of the biphasic (Figure 54 K,L) or silk scaffolds (Figure 54 C,D). However, all groups showed considerably reduced extracellular matrix deposition in the cartilage phase of the biphasic scaffolds and the top of the silk scaffolds compared to that seen within chondrogenic culture alone (Figure 45), along with a considerable reduction in lacunae formation.
Figure 54 Picrosirius red/Alcian blue staining of biphasic and silk control scaffolds under osteochondral conditions

Representative images of picrosirius red/Alcian blue staining of silk control scaffolds and biphasic scaffolds after 9 weeks of osteochondral culture with seeded hBMSCs (n=4 per group). Collagen is stained with Picrosirius red and is represented by a red colour. GAGs are stained with Alcian blue and is represented in blue. (A) Top of silk control scaffolds at 10x magnification. (B) Top of silk control scaffolds at 20x magnification. (C) Top of silk control scaffolds with chondrogenic pre-culture of hBMSCs at 10x magnification. (D) Top of silk control scaffolds with chondrogenic pre-culture of hBMSCs at 20x magnification. (E) The cartilage phase of the biphasic scaffolds at 10x magnification. (F) The cartilage phase of the biphasic scaffolds at 20x magnification. (G) The cartilage phase of the biphasic scaffolds with chondrogenic pre-culture of hBMSCs at 10x magnification. (H) The cartilage phase of the biphasic scaffolds with chondrogenic pre-culture of hBMSCs at 20x magnification. (I) Bottom of silk control scaffolds at 10x magnification. (J) Bottom of silk control scaffolds at 20x magnification. (K) Bottom of silk control scaffolds with chondrogenic pre-culture of hBMSCs at 10x magnification. (L) Bottom of silk control scaffolds with chondrogenic pre-culture of hBMSCs at 20x magnification. (M) The bone phase of the biphasic scaffolds at 10x magnification. (N) The bone phase of the biphasic scaffolds at 20x magnification. (O) The bone phase of the biphasic scaffolds with chondrogenic pre-culture of hBMSCs at 10x magnification. (P) The bone phase of the biphasic scaffolds with chondrogenic pre-culture of hBMSCs at 20x magnification.
4.1.11.3 Collagen Type I and II deposition of hBMSCs within scaffolds under osteochondral conditions.

Immunohistochemistry was used to identify the type of collagen seen within the scaffolds. This showed extensive Type I collagen deposition in both the bone phase (Figure 55 M,N) and the cartilage phase (Figure 55 I,J) of the biphasic scaffold, as well as within the top (Figure 55 A,B) and bottom of the silk control scaffolds (Figure 55 E,F). There was no impact of pre-culture on Type I collagen deposition within the biphasic (Figure 55 K,L,O,P) or silk scaffolds (Figure 55 C,D,G,H). No Type II collagen deposition was seen in any group (Figure 56), which demonstrated that osteochondral culture had changed the phenotype of collagen expression seen in the cartilage phase from the mix of Type I and Type II to Type I only expression (Figure 55). There was a shift from the formation of cartilage like tissue as seen under chondrogenic culture alone to the formation of fibrous tissue under osteochondral culture. As previously mentioned, Collagen Type I staining functioned as a negative marker for cartilage formation and a positive marker for bone and fibrocartilage or fibrous tissue formation, and Type II collagen staining functioned as a positive marker for cartilage formation.
Figure 55 IHC staining for Type I collagen of biphasic and silk control scaffolds under osteochondral conditions

Representative images of collagen Type I staining by immunohistochemistry of silk control scaffolds and the bone phase of the biphasic scaffolds after 9 weeks of osteochondral culture with seeded hBMSCs (n=4 per group). Positive staining is represented by a brown coloration. (A) Top of silk control scaffolds at 10x magnification. (B) Top of silk control scaffolds at 20x magnification. (C) Top of silk control scaffolds with chondrogenic pre-culture of hBMSCs at 10x magnification. (D) Top of silk control scaffolds with chondrogenic pre-culture of hBMSCs at 20x magnification. (E) The cartilage phase of the biphasic scaffolds at 10x magnification. (F) The cartilage phase of the biphasic scaffolds at 20x magnification. (G) The cartilage phase of the biphasic scaffolds with chondrogenic pre-culture of hBMSCs at 10x magnification. (H) The cartilage phase of the biphasic scaffolds with chondrogenic pre-culture of hBMSCs at 20x magnification. (I) Bottom of silk control scaffolds at 10x magnification. (J) Bottom of silk control scaffolds at 20x magnification. (K) Bottom of silk control scaffolds with chondrogenic pre-culture of hBMSCs at 10x magnification. (L) Bottom of silk control scaffolds with chondrogenic pre-culture of hBMSCs at 20x magnification. (M) The bone phase of the biphasic scaffolds at 10x magnification. (N) The bone phase of the biphasic scaffolds at 20x magnification. (O) The bone phase of the biphasic scaffolds with chondrogenic pre-culture of hBMSCs at 10x magnification. (P) The bone phase of the biphasic scaffolds with chondrogenic pre-culture of hBMSCs at 20x magnification.
Figure 56 IHC staining for type II collagen of biphasic and silk control scaffolds under osteochondral conditions

Representative images of collagen type II staining by immunohistochemistry of silk control scaffolds and the bone phase of biphasic scaffolds after 9 weeks of osteochondral culture, with seeded hBMSCs (n=4 per group). Positive staining is represented by a brown coloration. (A) Top of silk control scaffolds at 10x magnification. (B) Top of silk control scaffolds at 20x magnification. (C) Top of silk control scaffolds with chondrogenic pre-culture of hBMSCs at 10x magnification. (D) Top of silk control scaffolds with chondrogenic pre-culture of hBMSCs at 20x magnification. (E) The cartilage phase of the biphasic scaffolds at 10x magnification. (F) The cartilage phase of the biphasic scaffolds at 20x magnification. (G) The cartilage phase of the biphasic scaffolds with chondrogenic pre-culture of hBMSCs at 10x magnification. (H) The cartilage phase of the biphasic scaffolds with chondrogenic pre-culture of hBMSCs at 20x magnification. (I) Bottom of silk control scaffolds at 10x magnification. (J) Bottom of silk control scaffolds at 20x magnification. (K) Bottom of silk control scaffolds with chondrogenic pre-culture of hBMSCs at 10x magnification. (L) Bottom of silk control scaffolds with chondrogenic pre-culture of hBMSCs at 20x magnification. (M) The bone phase of the biphasic scaffolds at 10x magnification. (N) The bone phase of the biphasic scaffolds at 20x magnification. (O) The bone phase of the biphasic scaffolds with chondrogenic pre-culture of hBMSCs at 10x magnification. (P) The bone phase of the biphasic scaffolds with chondrogenic pre-culture of hBMSCs at 20x magnification.
4.11.4 Proteoglycan deposition of hBMSCs within scaffolds under osteochondral conditions.

Safranin-O staining was used to assess the expression of proteoglycans by hBMSCs. Moderate proteoglycan staining was seen in all groups (Figure 57), with no obvious differences being seen between any groups, similar to Alcian blue and picrosirius red staining (Figure 54). A higher proportion of proteoglycans was seen in the cartilage phase of the biphasic scaffolds (Figure 57 I,J) and the top of the silk scaffolds (Figure 57 A,B), compared to the bottom of the silk scaffolds (Figure 57 E,F) and the bone phase of the biphasic scaffolds (Figure 57 M,N), as demonstrated by a reduction in Safranin-O staining. Chondrogenic pre-culture also appeared to have no impact on the proteoglycans expression in biphasic (Figure 57 K,L,O,P) and silk scaffolds (Figure 57 C,D,G,H). A reduction in extracellular matrix production in the cartilage phase was seen compared to chondrogenic culture alone (Figure 47). All groups showed considerably reduced lacunae formation in comparison to during chondrogenic culture alone, with a reduction in cartilage-like tissue formation.
Figure 57 Safranin-O staining of biphasic and silk control scaffolds under osteochondral conditions

Representative images of Safranin-O staining of silk control scaffolds and the cartilage phase of biphasic scaffolds after 9 weeks of osteochondral culture, with seeded hBMSCs (n=4 per group). Proteoglycans stained in pink with Safranin-O. (A) Top of silk control scaffolds at 10x magnification. (B) Top of silk control scaffolds at 20x magnification. (C) Top of silk control scaffolds with chondrogenic pre-culture of hBMSCs at 10x magnification. (D) Top of silk control scaffolds with chondrogenic pre-culture of hBMSCs at 20x magnification. (E) The cartilage phase of the biphasic scaffolds at 10x magnification. (F) The cartilage phase of the biphasic scaffolds at 20x magnification. (G) The cartilage phase of the biphasic scaffolds with chondrogenic pre-culture of hBMSCs at 10x magnification. (H) The cartilage phase of the biphasic scaffolds with chondrogenic pre-culture of hBMSCs at 20x magnification. (I) Bottom of silk control scaffolds at 10x magnification. (J) Bottom of silk control scaffolds at 20x magnification. (K) Bottom of silk control scaffolds with chondrogenic pre-culture of hBMSCs at 10x magnification. (L) Bottom of silk control scaffolds with chondrogenic pre-culture of hBMSCs at 20x magnification. (M) The bone phase of the biphasic scaffolds at 10x magnification. (N) The bone phase of the biphasic scaffolds at 20x magnification. (O) The bone phase of the biphasic scaffolds with chondrogenic pre-culture of hBMSCs at 10x magnification. (P) The bone phase of the biphasic scaffolds with chondrogenic pre-culture of hBMSCs at 20x magnification.
4.11.5 Mineral nodule deposition of hBMSCs within scaffolds under osteochondral conditions.

To evaluate calcium deposition, Von Kossa staining was utilised. This indicated small amounts of mineral nodule formation on the bottom side of the silk control scaffolds (Figure 58 E,F) and the bone phase of the biphasic scaffolds (Figure 58 M,N). There was no clear difference in distribution of mineral nodules between groups and chondrogenic pre-culture appeared to have no impact on mineral deposition within biphasic (Figure 58 Q,P) and silk scaffolds (Figure 58 G,H). It was noted that there was slightly larger amounts of mineral nodule formation closer to the osteogenic seeded surface. No obvious mineral nodule formation was seen within the cartilage phase of the biphasic scaffolds (Figure 58 A-D) and the top of the silk control scaffolds (Figure 58 I-L).
Figure 58 Von Kossa staining of biphasic and silk control scaffolds under osteochondral conditions

Representative images of Mineral nodule formation by Von Kossa staining of silk control scaffolds and the bone phase of biphasic scaffolds after 9 weeks of osteochondral culture, with seeded hBMSCs (n=4 per group). Mineral nodule is indicated with black arrows. (A) Top of silk control scaffolds at 10x magnification. (B) Top of silk control scaffolds at 20x magnification. (C) Top of silk control scaffolds with chondrogenic pre-culture of hBMSCs at 10x magnification. (D) Top of silk control scaffolds with chondrogenic pre-culture of hBMSCs at 20x magnification. (E) The cartilage phase of the biphasic scaffolds at 10x magnification. (F) The cartilage phase of the biphasic scaffolds at 20x magnification. (G) The cartilage phase of the biphasic scaffolds with chondrogenic pre-culture of hBMSCs at 10x magnification. (H) The cartilage phase of the biphasic scaffolds with chondrogenic pre-culture of hBMSCs at 20x magnification. (I) Bottom of silk control scaffolds at 10x magnification. (J) Bottom of silk control scaffolds at 20x magnification. (K) Bottom of silk control scaffolds with chondrogenic pre-culture of hBMSCs at 10x magnification. (L) Bottom of silk control scaffolds with chondrogenic pre-culture of hBMSCs at 20x magnification. (M) The bone phase of the biphasic scaffolds at 10x magnification. (N) The bone phase of the biphasic scaffolds at 20x magnification. (O) The bone phase of the biphasic scaffolds with chondrogenic pre-culture of hBMSCs at 10x magnification. (P) The bone phase of the biphasic scaffolds with chondrogenic pre-culture of hBMSCs at 20x magnification.
4.1 Discussion

4.1.1 Scaffold sterilisation

The large number of potential sources of infection during surgical operations offers great concern, ranging from the operating room, surgical equipment or contaminated medical devices. It has been estimated within epidemiological studies that between 2% and 5% of all implant-related surgeries have post-operative infections (Darouiche, 2004; Johnson and García, 2015; Anastasiou et al., 2019). This introduces a dramatic risk to patient survival, which has been highlighted by a case where unsterilized allografts were used and disease transmission had occurred, giving rise to sepsis of the knee. Post-operative infections also lead to increased health-related costs in the form of prolonged hospitalisation and revision surgeries (Kainer et al., 2004; Knetsch and Koole, 2011; Holmes et al., 2014).

The autoclave step used in the creation of the scaffolds clearly showed successful sterilisation in both the silk control scaffolds and the biphasic scaffolds, with no infection being seen even after 14 days of testing. As well as this, no infection of cell cultures was seen throughout any of the other culture experiments. These results concur with the findings of (Rnjak-Kovacina et al., 2015a) which also used autoclaving as a step to sterilise silk scaffolds. This indicates that utilisation of an autoclave step to induce beta sheet formation within the scaffolds is also able to successfully sterilise biphasic scaffolds, eliminating the risk of patient-based infection from this source, as long as the scaffolds are properly handled post sterilisation.
4.1.2 Cytotoxicity

First and foremost, it is fundamental to understand whether a newly developed biomaterial is safe for use within living organisms (Liu et al., 2018; Podgórska, Wojasiński and Ciach, 2022). Whether it is a brand-new material or a unique combination of pre-existing materials, it is critical to understand the biocompatibility of the biomaterial and whether it possesses any cytotoxic properties. A scaffold can induce cytotoxicity from a variety of sources, for example from the scaffold itself, or from degradation products released from the scaffold (Forman et al., 1999; O’Brien, 2011; Liu et al., 2018; Iqbal et al., 2022; Chraniuk et al., 2022); although some degradation products may lead to retardation of cell growth rather than cytotoxicity. Interestingly, toxicity can also arise from the lowering or raising of local pH (Echeverria Molina, Malollari and Komvopoulos, 2021). It is therefore important to undertake a diverse range of experiments to determine potential sources of cytotoxicity or cell growth retardation before a scaffold can be thought of as biocompatible (Podgórska, Wojasiński and Ciach, 2022).

A wide range of cytotoxicity tests were undertaken because, as highlighted by Podgórska, Wojasiński and Ciach, 2022, when working with biological scaffolds the porous nature and material of the scaffold can impact the findings, leading to false negative or positive results. Therefore, to demonstrate in vitro biocompatibility contact cytotoxicity, indirect cytotoxicity, analysis of metabolic activity, LDH activity, and live cell staining (under chondrogenic and osteogenic conditions) were undertaken. All toxicity tests showed that all scaffold types were non-toxic, with no significant difference being seen between biphasic scaffolds and silk scaffolds. At no time point during any experiment was a change in the phenol red colour of media seen, which would have indicated a lowering of local pH due to scaffold degradation. No contact or indirect cytotoxicity was detected. Scaffolds also demonstrated their ability to support increased metabolic activity, and thus inferring a proliferation of cells over time. Although LDH activity showed an
initially high LDH level corresponding with initial seeding, this then settled over time and plateaued at a low level. A positive control demonstrating a 100% death rate was not included. Therefore, the LDH activity was only compared relative to the scaffold types, thus presenting a study limitation.

Live cell imaging demonstrated that under both osteogenic and chondrogenic conditions under long-term culture, cells were able to form dense monolayers on the scaffold surface as well as cell penetration into the scaffold. Unfortunately, no dead staining could be utilised as all dead staining preferentially bound to the scaffolds, staining them a bright red under confocal examination, making it impossible to see dead cells on the scaffold. Other dead staining was also selected not to be used such as propidium iodide as this stain has the same mechanism of labelling as EthD-1, therefore it was decided not to attempt to use another kind of dead staining due to the extremely high probability that it would also bond to the silk component. Furthermore, it is prevalent in the literature that only live staining can be conducted when utilising silk scaffolds (Rnjak-Kovacina et al., 2015b; Rnjak-Kovacina et al., 2015a; Lu et al., 2017).

Even with these results indicating a high level of in vitro biocompatibility of the materials, further testing is still required. In vivo tests on animals are necessary before entering a human clinical trial, and even throughout a product’s life cycle it is important to continue evaluating for potential cytotoxicity and proper reporting of negative effects needs to be undertaken. Furthermore, this in vitro data cannot show any inflammatory and immune response that may be seen in vivo, further reinforcing the need for animal testing and continuous screening post human implantation.
4.1.3 Cell adhesion

The ability for cells to adhere to scaffolds is fundamental for a wide array of cellular processes and the overall regenerative capacity of a scaffold. When cells attach to the scaffold, they form anchoring points and begin to spread out and interact with the scaffold surface (Revach, Grosheva and Geiger, 2020). This process triggers the activation of signalling pathways that can stimulate survival, migration, integration, cell proliferation, and differentiation (Collins et al., 2017). These processes are necessary for the formation of new tissue and scaffold remodelling. Without the ability to attach to the scaffold, cells would not be able to grow and differentiate in a controlled and organized manner. They would also be more likely to undergo apoptosis or detach and migrate away from the scaffold, which could impair tissue regeneration (Reddig and Juliano, 2005).

Previous attempts to utilise a synthetic 3D printed lattice for tissue regeneration have been successful (Ji and Guvendiren, 2019; Egan, 2019). However, these studies have also demonstrated an issue with the lattice structure; due to the large pore size seen within the lattice structure, cells often struggle to migrate between the filament’s large gaps, retarding the migration of cells. The larger pore size also demonstrates the problem of reduced cell adhesion due to the lower availability of specific area for ligand binding (O’Brien et al., 2005; Murphy, Haugh and O’Brien, 2010).

Therefore, within this study we investigated the potential of a novel infill material to increase surface area for ligand binding while simultaneously reducing the lattice pore size to increase cell migratory potential whilst maintaining scaffold porosity. Results indicate that hBMSCs show equivalent adherence and proliferation on silk control scaffolds as well as biphasic scaffolds. This demonstrates that the use of a silk infill is an effective technique to improve cell adherence and migratory potential for scaffolds incorporating 3D printed components. Furthermore, the behaviour of the infill silk material also showed...
similar characteristics to other freeze-dried silk scaffolds utilised for tissue regeneration (Rnjak-Kovacina et al., 2015b; Sang et al., 2018).

The use of FBS for scaffold surface modification is a technique used to improve the biocompatibility and functionality of scaffolds in tissue engineering applications (Yang et al., 2001). FBS is a nutrient-rich fluid that contains growth factors, cytokines, and other bioactive molecules that can enhance cell adhesion, proliferation, and differentiation (Liau et al., 2021). The process of FBS surface modification typically involves incubating the scaffold in a solution of FBS for a specified period of time, allowing the FBS molecules to adsorb onto the scaffold surface and create a protein layer (Tallawi et al., 2015; Sönmez et al., 2021). This layer can then facilitate cell attachment and growth, making the scaffold more suitable for tissue engineering applications (Luo, Humayun and Mills, 2020). There are several benefits to using FBS surface modification. First, FBS is a readily available and cost-effective source of bioactive molecules that can improve scaffold biological properties. Additionally, FBS has been extensively studied and characterized, making it a well-understood material in the field of tissue engineering (Courtenay et al., 2017; Luo, Humayun and Mills, 2020). However, there are also some limitations to using FBS surface modification. For example, FBS can contain variable levels of growth factors and other bioactive molecules, depending on the source and processing method leading to batch variation (Vetsch et al., 2015). Additionally, FBS surface modification may not be suitable for all tissue engineering applications, as the presence of FBS may interfere with certain cell signalling pathways or induce unwanted immune responses. Within this study, evaluation of cell adhesion indicated that, for both the silk control scaffolds and the biphasic scaffolds, pre-treatment with FBS prior to cell seeding was not necessary for cell adhesion and furthermore, no enhancement of cell adhesion was seen over scaffolds not preincubated in FBS. This indicated that silk alone contains appropriate binding ligands to allow for cell adhesion to its surface, which is beneficial, as this leads to a corresponding reduction in requirements in
scaffold processing and reduces requirement for additional animal derived products.

### 4.1.4 Cell seeding strategies

Cellular seeding is an extremely critical step in the creation of a functional scaffold, with the cellularity of the scaffold being able to dramatically increase the success of an intervention (Zhou et al., 2006; Yassin et al., 2015). The selection of the correct technique to do this can majorly impact a scaffold’s ability to provide uniform tissue regeneration (Kurzyk et al., 2019). Therefore, a variety of different seeding methods have been utilised within the literature; these can be broadly split into two approaches: dynamic and static. Dynamic seeding normally involves placing of the scaffold in a cell suspension and using agitation to move the fluid around the scaffold. This can be done by utilisation of perfusion bioreactors, spinner flasks, orbitals shakers and centrifugation (Vunjak-Novakovic et al., 1998; Zhao and Ma, 2005). This compares to static seeding, which involves placing the scaffolds into a cell solution or pipetting cells onto one surface of the scaffold; however, it should be noted that injecting cells into scaffolds has also been utilised (Hofmann et al., 2003; Wan et al., 2005).

In this study, it was shown that cells could attach to the surface of the biphasic scaffold, with no differences seen when compared to the silk controls in both static and dynamic seeding. The static seeding group showed a relatively dense homogeneous layer of cells on the scaffold surface, but this was only seen on one side, with the other sides presenting no cell attachment. On the other hand, the dynamic seeding group saw an even distribution of cells across all six of its sides, but at a lower density than the single side within the static seeding group. The reason for this difference in density can easily be explained by the fact that the same seeding density of cells was used for both groups (dynamic and static), therefore, in the static seeding group this cell number was focused onto a single
side, whereas the dynamic group was spread over all six. This distribution difference is similar to that found within the literature (Burg et al., 2000). It has also been previously demonstrated that an increased uniformity of cell distribution across the whole scaffold at the point of seeding increases the scaffold’s long-term cellularity and more even distribution of cells throughout the entire scaffold, thus leading to improved regenerative capacity of the scaffold as a whole in vivo and in vitro (Kim et al., 1998; Thevenot et al., 2008). However, in the case of biphasic scaffolds, a unique problem arises when utilising dynamic seeding, as often certain cell types need to be focused to different phases (chondrocytes to the cartilage phase, osteoblasts to the bone phase). A few studies have tried to subvert this problem using complex dynamic seeding techniques (Chang et al., 2004); however, within this study static seeding could be used to deploy cells into different phases within the scaffold, thus effectively seeding different cells to different phases. This was confirmed by cell tracker green and cell tracker red cell tracking which showed no mixing of cells between phases during seeding. This highlights the success of this easy and versatile method to meet the unique seeding requirements of biphasic scaffolds due to their usage within tissues that require regeneration of distinctly different tissue types within the same scaffold. Furthermore, this indicates that this seeding method can be deployed in a wide range of different tissues that require regeneration within distinct regions like that seen in a bone-tendon interface (Enthesis) (Baawad et al., 2022).

### 4.1.5 Long-term in vitro term cell culture

Overall, long-term cell culture is essential for the development of functional osteochondral scaffolds that can repair damaged or diseased bone and cartilage tissue. It allows for the optimization of scaffold design, tissue regeneration, preclinical testing, and biomaterial evaluation, which are critical steps in the development of safe and effective therapies for musculoskeletal disorders. As
previously mentioned, the cellularity of the scaffold for tissue regeneration is fundamental to its ability to regenerate tissue (Zhou et al., 2006; Yassin et al., 2015). The requirement for cells to be able to uniformly penetrate and colonise an entire scaffold over time to allow for its eventual degradation and replacement with newly formed natural tissue is essential to its function (Kurzyk et al., 2019). Due to funding limitations in conjunction with limited specimen availability, it was selected to not include basal media controls for comparison during long term cell culture. This is recognised as a study limitation as this group would be required to definitively demonstrate that silk has no innate differentiation capacity in regards to osteogenic and chondrogenic differentiation of BMSCs and rather, the cellular differentiation seen within this study was due to the osteogenic and chondrogenic induction media. Although it is likely that the differentiation observed was due to the culture media utilized rather than the scaffold material composition, as similar cellular behaviour was observed in the multilineage differentiation experiments compared to that observed in the osteogenic and chondrogenic culture of biphasic scaffolds and silk control scaffolds.

To further confirm that the negative pressure rehydration step was required for appropriate cell penetration, it was selected to compare scaffolds that have undergone negative pressure rehydration to scaffolds that have not. Scaffolds that had not been exposed to this negative pressure rehydration step showed poor penetration of hBMSCs into the biphasic scaffolds and the silk control scaffolds under osteogenic and chondrogenic conditions, with cells barely able to penetrate into the scaffolds surface. This is compared to scaffolds that had been rehydrated by negative pressure, which showed extensive cell penetration into the majority of the scaffold. These findings further reenforce the rehydration results seen within Chapter 4 and highlight a potential problem with utilising silk scaffolds with an approximate thickness of 3 mm or greater, in the fact that poor rehydration is seen. This also potentially shows a problem with using the scaffolds in environments or methods that do not incorporate a negative pressure rehydration or equivalent step to mechanically support an increase in scaffold
rehydration. A simple diffusion alone is unable to rehydrate the scaffolds, even with the addition of rocking, shaking or rotating the scaffolds during rehydration. Therefore, due to the extremely wide availability of desiccators or vacuum pumps within the biological lab setting, it is recommended for porous scaffolds to incorporate a negative pressure rehydration step, even if it is believed that the scaffold has been fully rehydrated by passive diffusion.

4.1.6 Scaffold capability for cartilage regeneration in vitro

To understand the potential of biphasic scaffolds to be utilised for osteochondral tissue regeneration, initially, the scaffolds’ potential to regenerate only cartilage tissue was evaluated. An osteochondral scaffold’s ability to regenerate cartilage tissue is fundamental to its role and usage. Thus, it is essential to understand and evaluate the potential for cartilage regeneration on and within the scaffold in vitro as this will give an analogue and indication for its potential for use in vivo, as well as its long-term regenerative capacity.

To evaluate the effectiveness of the cartilage phase of the biphasic scaffolds to regenerate cartilage, in vitro experimentation was undertaken by seeding constructs with hBMSCs for three weeks under chondrogenic conditions. Following this culture period, scaffolds were histologically evaluated for their ability to support growth and differentiation of seeded cells. Three weeks of chondrogenic culture was selected as due to its prevalence and wide use within the literature as a standard endpoint for chondrogenesis. At this point, the cells have had sufficient time to differentiate into chondrocytes and produce a significant amount of ECM (Zha et al., 2021). The results of chondrogenic culture of hBMSCs seeded on the biphasic scaffolds showed the ability of isolated hBMSCs to differentiate down a chondrocytic phenotype within the biphasic scaffolds with no histological differences to the silk control scaffolds over a three-week time
period. Cells were localised to the cartilage phase of the biphasic scaffolds and the upper region of the silk control scaffolds. Robust, continuous cartilage-like tissue can be observed along the entire length of the scaffold. Within this newly formed tissue there was extensive GAG and Type II collagen production and deposition, as well as cells within constructs showing a chondrocyte morphology being rounded and found within lacunae. However, Type I collagen deposition was also seen. The presence of both Type I and Type II collagen in a cartilage scaffold can indicate that the newly formed tissue is a mix of fibrocartilage and the more desirable hyaline (Armiento, Alini and Stoddart, 2019). Type II collagen is the main structural protein found in healthy cartilage tissue. Its presence in a cartilage scaffold indicates that the scaffold has successfully supported the growth of new cartilage tissue that closely resembles native tissue. Type I collagen, on the other hand, is the main structural protein found in other connective tissues, such as bone, skin, and tendon (Naomi, Ridzuan and Bahari, 2021). Its presence in a cartilage scaffold can indicate that the newly formed tissue may have a fibrous or fibrocartilage-like composition, which may not be as effective at providing the mechanical resilience and proper functionality as native cartilage tissue (Buchanan, 2022).

The distribution of Type II collagen and proteoglycans seen within *in vitro* culture presented within this project showed similar findings in cartilage quality and structure to that seen within Gu et al., 2022. Within this study, the authors utilised primary goat chondrocytes within a silk scaffold for cartilage regeneration over a 14 day culture period. Although, interestingly, within this project a greater quantity of cartilage like tissue formation was seen as represented by a thicker amount of cartilage tissue seen under histological analysis. There was also a greater quantity of lacunae seen. This difference was assigned to the longer culture period seen within this project of 21 days. Furthermore, the mix of type I and type II collagen seen within biphasic scaffolds demonstrated similar findings to those seen by Saha et al., 2013. In this study, silk scaffolds seeded with hBMSC were placed in an *in vivo* model of osteochondral defects. This model consisted of
placing the scaffold in the patellar groove of the knee joints of male Wistar rats for 8 weeks. With the immunohistochemistry showing silk scaffolds showed type one and type II collagen deposition.

These findings show that the cartilage phase of the biphasic scaffolds can support the differentiation of hBMSCs to differentiate down a chondrogenic lineage, allowing for extensive extracellular matrix deposition and the generation of cartilage like tissue, although a mix of Type I and Type II collagen deposition is seen. Furthermore, these results indicate the potential of the cartilage phase to be able to regenerate cartilage as part of an osteochondral unit for osteochondral tissue regeneration.

### 4.1.7 Scaffold capability for subchondral bone regeneration \textit{in vitro}

To provide further understanding to the potential for the biphasic scaffolds to be utilised for osteochondral tissue regeneration, the potential for the biphasic scaffolds to support bone tissue formation was evaluated. It is important for an osteochondral scaffold to support adequate bone regeneration as the subchondral bone plays a fundamental role in supporting the overlying cartilage, providing stability and support during joint loading and articulation (Yu et al., 2023; Yildirim et al., 2023). If the scaffold only regenerates cartilage and not bone, the joint may still be prone to damage and deterioration over time, leading to the need for additional surgeries or treatments. Furthermore, in order for the scaffold to be effective, it needs to integrate seamlessly with the surrounding bone tissue (Niu et al., 2023). Without proper bone regeneration, the scaffold may not be able to fuse properly with the existing bone, leading to instability and potential failure when implanted \textit{in vivo}. 
To evaluate the effectiveness of the bone phase of the biphasic scaffolds to regenerate subchondral bone, *in vitro* experimentation was undertaken by seeding constructs with hBMSCs for six weeks under osteogenic conditions. Following this culture period, the scaffolds were histologically evaluated for their ability to support growth and differentiation of seeded cells. Six weeks of osteogenic culture was selected as upon review of the literature this culture period appears to be an adequate amount of time to allow for osteogenic differentiation without being so long to make the experiments unfeasible in length due to time constraints (Lozito *et al.*, 2013; Persson *et al.*, 2018; Breathwaite *et al.*, 2020; Oliveros Anerillas *et al.*, 2021; Man *et al.*, 2022a).

The results of osteogenic culture of hBMSCs seeded on the biphasic scaffolds showed the ability of isolated hBMSCs to differentiate down an osteoblastic phenotype within the bone phase of the biphasic scaffolds, with no histological differences to the silk control scaffolds over a 6-week time period. These showed extensive Type I collagen deposition and low levels of mineral deposition within the scaffolds. The regions which demonstrated the greatest amount of mineral deposition corresponded to the regions closer to the seeded edge of the scaffold. Furthermore, these regions showed an increased amount of extracellular matrix deposition, inferring that the cells within this region have a more mature osteogenic phenotype. The presence of the 3-D printed component in the bone phase seem to have no impact on cell’s ability to migrate through the scaffold as well as their ability to proliferate and colonise scaffolds with a comparable depth of penetration of cells between the bone phase of biphasic scaffolds and silk control scaffolds. The level of mineral nodule deposition seen within the scaffolds seem comparable to other bone scaffolds seen within the literature that utilise silk alone in *in vitro* culture (Woloszyk *et al.*, 2014; Man *et al.*, 2022b).

These findings show that the bone phase of the biphasic scaffolds can support the differentiation of hBMSCs to differentiate down an osteogenic lineage, allowing for extensive extracellular matrix deposition and the generation of initial bone like tissue. Furthermore, these results indicate the potential of the bone phase to be
able to regenerate subchondral bone as part of an osteochondral unit for osteochondral tissue regeneration.

4.1.8 Scaffold capability for osteochondral tissue regeneration in vitro

Ultimately, it is important that an osteochondral scaffold is able to functionally regenerate both bone and cartilage. Due to the nature of the biphasic scaffold’s use within this study, there is a requirement for it to regenerate both bone and cartilage simultaneously within one scaffold, to provide a seamless osteochondral unit to be utilised during in vivo implantation for joint regeneration.

The split culture technique utilised within this study to attempt to create complete osteochondral units consisted of six weeks of osteogenic culture with only the bone phase of the scaffolds seeded, followed by three weeks of chondrogenic culture with the addition of new hBMSCs to the cartilage phase. The time periods selected (three weeks and six weeks of chondrogenic and osteogenic culture, respectively) were chosen to match up with the culture period selected when chondrogenic and osteogenic culture was undertaken separately, as this had previously shown to provide relatively successful regeneration of these tissue types individually. Furthermore, it was selected to initially begin with osteogenic culture as it was theorised differentiated osteoblasts would have a more stable phenotype than chondrocytes, and thus be more likely to maintain their phenotype when the culture media was exchanged in the second phase of seeding. To evaluate further whether hBMSCs would be driven towards the chondrogenic lineage, a pre-culture group was utilised which consisted of two weeks of chondrogenic culture prior to seeding. This was hoped to help lock in hBMSCs to a chondrogenic phenotype before experiencing split culture, hopefully reducing the likelihood of dedifferentiation/inappropriate osteogenic differentiation of the cells seeded to the cartilage phase. It was selected not to undertake pre-culture of hBMSCs under osteogenic conditions as the first 6 weeks
of osteochondral culture are conducted only under osteogenic conditions, which was previously shown to be successful.

The results of osteochondral culture of hBMSCs seeded on the biphasic scaffolds and the silk control scaffolds showed a dominance of a fibrous tissue morphology, with extensive Type I collagen deposition, low levels of mineral deposition and a dramatic suppression of any cartilage-like tissue formation in the scaffold. Unlike chondrogenic culture, no Type II collagen deposition was seen at all during osteochondral culture in the cartilage phase of the biphasic scaffolds or the silk control scaffolds. As well as this, a reduction in proteoglycan and GAG deposition was seen. Furthermore, hBMSCs in the cartilage phase presented far fewer cells possessing a chondrocyte-like phenotype, with very few lacunae formations being seen. No mineralisation of the cartilage phase is seen in the biphasic scaffolds or on the top of the silk control scaffolds. This data shows that, even in the presence of chondrogenic media, the six weeks of osteogenic culture before the seeding of the cartilage phase is able to completely suppress cartilage formation, even when hBMSCs have spent two weeks in pre-culture in chondrogenic media to direct them down the chondrogenic lineage. This suppression of chondrogenesis in the presence of osteoblasts is supported by the results of Chen et al., 2012, which found in a 2D–3D interface coculture model cartilage related protein expression such as Type II collagen and aggrecan were downregulated significantly, and a significant increase in Type I collagen expression was seen. Furthermore, Mukundan, Nirmal and Nair, 2022 also had a similar finding in which their osteochondral constructs utilising primary chondrocytes in their cartilage and BMSCs in their bone phase failed to create a phenotypically stable layer of cartilage tissue and rather in their opinion saw the formation of bone like tissue formation throughout their osteochondral scaffold. These results reinforce the idea that the reason that osteochondral culture failed within the biphasic scaffolds was due to cellular signalling and communication between the osteogenic differentiated cells seen within the bone phase and the chondrogenic differentiated cells in the cartilage phase, leading to the suppression
of chondrogenesis, and thus a failure to regenerate osteochondral tissue. This would also explain why osteogenic and chondrogenic differentiation was successful alone, as this cross talk between cell populations would not have been present. It is still unclear what the exact mechanism of action is in cell-cell communication that leads to the suppression of chondrogenesis and the development of fibrous tissue seen with in this study. Some studies have suggested that the presence of osteogenic differentiated cells leads to the formation of hypertrophic chondrocytes in coculture via cell-cell communication, thus resulting in the upregulation of collagen 1 and the downregulation of GAGs (Jiang, Nicoll and Lu, 2005; Chen et al., 2012; Zhang et al., 2018b; Wolff and Hartmann, 2019). To confirm whether hypertrophic chondrocytes were indeed forming in the cartilage phase of the biphasic scaffold, immunohistochemical staining for Sox 9 and collagen X would have to be undertaken, as Sox 9 is not expressed in hypertrophic chondrocytes and collagen X deposition is a hallmark of hypertrophic chondrocyte presence (Shen, 2005; Diederichs et al., 2016; Lefebvre and Dvir-Ginzberg, 2017; Yi et al., 2018; He et al., 2018). To evaluate the effectiveness of the pre-incubation on driving hBMSCs down the chondrogenic lineage and to investigate potential reasons for its failure to improve osteochondral tissue regeneration, characterization of cell chondrogenic lineage commitment could be undertaken on the pre-cultured cells. This would indicate whether this pre-incubation had any effect on chondrogenic lineage commitment and give an indication whether pre-culture failed due to an inability to initially direct chondrogenic lineage commitment, or whether the cell-cell interactions seen within the biphasic scaffolds were able to override any lineage commitment induced by pre-culture.

The limited success in osteochondral tissue regeneration seen within this project could be related to the relatively simple osteochondral culture strategy. It was hoped that the presence of the chondrogenic pre-culture for two weeks would be enough to drive hBMSCs down a chondrogenic lineage, thus allowing for a simple and scalable process for creating osteochondral constructs. However, as
previously discussed, the presence of differentiated hBMSCs down osteogenic lineages within the bone phase of biphasic scaffolds was able to overpower the presence of pure chondrogenic media. Thus, in future experimentation, osteochondral scaffolds may need to be subjected to more complex osteochondral culture methods such as those seen within Tuerlings et al., 2022 which created a microfluidic chip (Figure 59) for the organ on a chip model of osteoarthritis. Within this study, a functional osteochondral unit was able to be created before subjecting it to a disease state. Theoretically, the same microfluidic strategy could be utilised to create osteochondral constructs for implantation rather than disease modelling.

Figure 59 Microfluidic culture device for osteochondral tissue on a chip model
Rather than take a complex microfluidic strategy for osteochondral culture, alternative simpler strategies could be undertaken such as those shown within Fu et al., 2022, where three individual and separate scaffolds were created; one for cartilage regeneration, one for regeneration of transitional tissue between cartilage and bone, and one for bone tissue regeneration. By culturing scaffolds separately, they were able to create established generated tissues before combining them to make the full osteochondral complex. Within this study, a similar strategy could be undertaken as both phases have been individually shown to adequately support the growth and differentiation of the desired tissue types. It is only when a combined approach is taken that the scaffold fails in its function. Thus, by separately seeding the cartilage phase and the bone phase, and then recombining them prior to implantation, a functional osteochondral unit could be created. However, by undertaking this strategy, there runs the risk of creating two distinct tissue types (cartilage and bone) rather than creating a gradient from bone to cartilage, which more closely mimics native tissue (Grayson et al., 2008; Niu et al., 2023). Furthermore, additional strategies could be undertaken to add molecular cues to the scaffold itself, helping to give the scaffold chondrogenic and osteogenic differentiation capacity in its own right. This strategy was undertaken by Yang et al., 2017, who showed that the presence of TGF-β3 improved chondrogenic regeneration of their cartilage constructs. Other factors such as IGF have also previously demonstrated to show effectiveness when blended with cartilage constructs to improve cartilage relevant ECM deposition and chondrogenesis (Schmidt, Chen and Lynch, 2006; An et al., 2010; Gugjoo et al., 2017; Liebesny et al., 2019). Furthermore, growth factors have been incorporated into scaffold design to improve osteogenic capacity with the use BMP2 seeing a wide prevalence of use (Saha et al., 2013; Di Luca et al., 2017; Ruan et al., 2018; Bi et al., 2023).
4.1.9 Summary

Biphasic scaffolds were shown to be sterile and biocompatible, allowing for cell attachment, proliferation and migration. Static seeding was shown to be able to be effectively used to differentially direct cells to regions of the biphasic scaffolds, i.e. particular cells to the cartilage and bone phases. Scaffolds were also shown to separately be able to support chondrogenic differentiation and osteogenic differentiation, showing cartilage and bone like tissue formation in vitro, respectively. However, a failure to form osteochondral tissue was seen during the nine-week coculture experiments, with a preferential formation of a bone-like tissue and suppression of cartilage like tissue features and chondrogenesis of hBMSCs.
Chapter 5 General discussion

This chapter is designed to provide a general discussion combining findings and concepts previously discussed in Chapters 3 and 4 in relation to each other.
5.1.1 Project overview

The aim of this project was to regenerate osteochondral tissue in vitro utilising a novel biphasic 3D printed silk reinforced scaffold.

The development of osteochondral scaffolds has been driven by the need to address the limitations of traditional treatments for joint injuries and diseases, such as joint replacement. Osteochondral scaffolds offer the potential to provide a less invasive and more effective means of restoring joint function and improving patient outcomes.

Within this project, a unique biphasic scaffold was successfully fabricated. The scaffold consisted of a PEGT/PBT 3D printed lattice which was infilled with a 5% silk solution, the silk solution was then continued to create a seamless silk top layer on the top of the scaffold. The PEGT/PBT 3D printed lattice infilled with silk made up the bone phase of the scaffold and the seamless silk top layer made up the cartilage phase.

The scaffold was designed such that the 3D printed PEGT/PBT lattice would provide rigidity to the scaffold, helping it to create a mechanically stable bone phase. The silk component provided a secondary cell friendly environment to the 3D printed component of the bone phase whilst also simultaneously giving rise to a more compliant silk only cartilage phase. This, theoretically, gives rise to both a mechanically stable and cell friendly scaffold for osteochondral tissue regeneration.
5.1.2 Pore size and its impact on cellular differentiation

Evaluation of scaffold pore size indicated that the silk control scaffolds had a mean pore size of 103 ± 13 μm, the biphasic scaffolds had a mean pore size of 117 ± 15 μm in the cartilage phase and a mean pore size of 124 ± 24 μm in the bone phase. This was theorised to be large enough to allow for cell infiltration as well as chondrogenic differentiation (Kuboki, Jin and Takita, 2001; Kim et al., 2010; Wang et al., 2021). However, there were concerns that the porosity may be too small to allow for direct osteogenesis and rather bone formation would have to occur by osteochondral ossification (Tsuruga et al., 1997; Kuboki, Jin and Takita, 2001; Götz et al., 2004; Karageorgiou and Kaplan, 2005). In vitro culture of the scaffolds showed that the pore size was adequate to allow for chondrogenic differentiation of hBMSCs with mostly appropriate extracellular matrix deposition for cartilage regeneration. Osteogenic differentiation of hBMSCs was also seen, with cells depositing the appropriate extracellular matrix for subchondral bone regeneration. Mineral deposition was also seen, although this was not extensive. The level of osteogenic differentiation relieved any concerns that the pore size seen within the bone phase of the biphasic scaffolds would be too small to allow for osteogenic differentiation; however, it does remain to be seen whether a larger pore size would lead to increased osteogenic differentiation, and thus improved regenerative capacity of the scaffold.

The silk component of the bone phase of the biphasic scaffold was able to functionally reduce the pore size of the 3D printed component and dramatically increase scaffold surface area in this phase, compared to that found within the literature for other 3D printed lattices (Hu and Athanasiou, 2006; Ji and Guvendiren, 2019; Egan et al., 2019; Buenzli et al., 2020). This led to a dramatic increase in cell migration, as well as cell pore infilling ability compared to that seen within the literature of conventional 3D printed lattices.
5.1.3 Biocompatibility

Cells can be influenced by the materials that make up a biological scaffold in a multitude of different ways, ranging from the influence of direct contact between cells to how the products of scaffold degradation interact with cells (Zhang et al., 2018a; Iqbal et al., 2022). When biological scaffolds undergo degradation, waste products are generated as part of this process. These degradation products can have an impact on cell viability and cellular responses within the scaffold microenvironment. Biomaterial scaffolds can degrade through various mechanisms, such as enzymatic degradation, hydrolysis, or cellular-mediated degradation (Li, Ogiso and Minoura, 2003; Deschamps et al., 2004). The specific mechanisms by which scaffold degradation products influence cell viability and cellular responses are diverse and complex, with degradation products being able to interact with cell surface receptors, activate intracellular signalling pathways, and modulate gene expression (Polo-Corrales, Latorre-Esteves and Ramirez-Vick, 2014). They can also directly affect the physicochemical properties of the microenvironment, such as pH, oxygen tension, and nutrient availability, thereby influencing cell behaviour (Zhang et al., 2016). Scaffold degradation products can impact cell viability, either positively or negatively. Some scaffold degradation products such as β-tricalcium phosphate (β-TCP) have been shown to increase cell viability (Yi et al., 2016), whereas others such as the degradation products of PLGA and PLLA have been shown a decrease to cellular viability. This is because the degradation of these products leads to the production of lactate, which causes the lowering of local pH (Zhang et al., 2016). This lowered pH has been demonstrated to inhibit chondrocyte proliferation and matrix synthesis.

Elemental analysis via EDX of the biphasic scaffolds indicated only the presence of nitrogen, carbon, and oxygen, with no contaminants introduced as part of the scaffold fabrication process. This indicated that, along with the pre-existing research into utilisation of silk scaffolds and PEGT/PBT thermoplastic scaffolds and the impact on cellular behaviour of the degradation products, there was a high
likelihood that the scaffold would show adequate biocompatibility (Altman et al., 2003; Mutreja et al., 2015; Schuurman et al., 2016; Mekhileri et al., 2018; Chen et al., 2023b; Sapudom et al., 2023). However, this still needed to be investigated in vitro as to the best of our knowledge, these two materials (silk and PEGT/PBT) had not been combined and utilised together in a biological setting. All cytotoxicity and biocompatibility testing showed no indication of any cellular toxicity of the scaffold, rather the scaffold provided an excellent environment for cell attachment, proliferation and differentiation, although the material selected did not encourage differentiation in its own right. Furthermore, with all degradation products released over the eight week indirect cytotoxicity test, they were shown to have no influence on cells’ viability or growth rate.

5.1.4 Rehydration and cell penetration

Analysis of swelling behaviour of the scaffolds indicated that negative pressure rehydration was required to fully rehydrate the scaffolds- that is to ensure removal of all air from all open pores and replace it with fluid. This was indicated by examination of swelling potential over time. These results were reinforced by in vitro findings that scaffolds that had not been rehydrated using negative pressure did not allow for cell penetration into the core of the scaffold. This was hypothesised to be due to the presence of impassable air bubbles in the core of the scaffolds, retarding cell migration. These air bubbles are removed by negative pressure rehydration, and cells are then able to functionally pass through. This was furthermore reinforced by the fact that scaffolds transition to floating within liquid to sinking after the negative pressure rehydration.
5.1.5 Mechanical properties and handling

The main advantage of the 3D printed component within the biphasic scaffolds over the silk control scaffolds was the resistance to mechanical loading, as the 3D printed component provided rigidity to the scaffold. This increased rigidity and corresponding mechanical properties should theoretically allow for scaffold survival post-implantation. Furthermore, this rigidity led to noticeably easier handling of the biphasic scaffold with tweezers and other utensils compared to the silk control scaffolds.

However, the bulk mechanical properties of scaffolds and their survivability post implantation are not the only factors to bear in mind when considering a scaffold’s mechanical properties. It has been extensively shown that scaffold stiffness can dramatically impact the differentiation or capacity of hBMSCs (Discher, Janmey and Wang, 2005; Vining and Mooney, 2017; Gavazzo et al., 2021). Stiffer substrates have shown to direct hBMSCs down osteogenic lineage where softer substrates are more conducive of adipogenic differentiation; the optimal stiffness for chondrogenic differentiation seems to lie in between. This variation is thought to be due to differential activation of signalling pathways and gene expression patterns depending on the substrate stiffness. It has been shown that stiffer substrates lead to the increased formation of focal adhesions that tether the cell to the extracellular matrix (Gavazzo et al., 2021). Formation of these focal adhesions cause signalling pathway activation and thus a cellular response to surface stiffness (Huveneers and Danen, 2009; Vining and Mooney, 2017; Gavazzo et al., 2021).

Optimal substrate stiffness for osteogenic differentiation appears to vary widely between studies with an optimal stiffness appearing to lie between 40-100 kPa (Kong et al., 2005; Engler et al., 2006; Rowlands, George and Cooper-White, 2008; Shih et al., 2011; Witkowska-Zimny et al., 2013; Yang et al., 2017b; Datko Williams et al., 2018; Sun et al., 2018; Yang et al., 2020; Gavazzo et al., 2021). This stiffness
appears to sit many orders of magnitude less than the stiffness seen within the bone phase of the biphasic scaffolds within this project (12,560 KPa). However, due to the nuances of the scaffold, cells seeded on to the bone phase of the biphasic scaffolds are unlikely to register a stiffness of this magnitude, as the majority of the surface area available for cell binding is actually made of the silk infill material. Thus, it is more likely for the cells to register and experience a stiffness much more similar to that found within the silk control scaffolds (113 KPa); this still sits slightly higher than the optimal range seen within the literature, but not by such a dramatic margin. This indicates further versatility of the combination of a 3D printed lattice infilled with silk: the 3D printed component is able to give the bulk compressive modulus and resistance to compressive loading that can protect newly forming tissue, whilst still providing optimal substrate stiffness for osteogenic differentiation and subsequent bone regeneration.

The optimal substrate stiffness for chondrogenic differentiation of hBMSCs is not as well-defined as it is for osteogenic differentiation. However, some studies have suggested that an intermediate range of substrate stiffness, typically in the range of 10-50 kPa, may be optimal for promoting chondrogenic differentiation of hBMSCs. (Ahmed et al., 2015; Wang and Yang, 2017; Olivares-Navarrete et al., 2017; Zhan, 2020; Zhou et al., 2022; Volz et al., 2022). The stiffness of the cartilage phase of the biphasic scaffolds created with this project sits considerably higher than this optimal stiffness at a level of 152 KPa. However, the impact of growth factors and signalling molecules on the differentiation capacity of hBMSCs towards chondrogenic differentiation appeared to have a greater impact then substrate stiffness (Zhou et al., 2022). Therefore, it is still more likely that the failure to create osteochondral tissue in this project was due to cell interactions and signalling between the different phases rather than a lack of appropriate substrate stiffness. This was further supported by the ability of the biphasic scaffold to produce cartilage-like tissue when seeded with hBMSCs only under chondrogenic conditions.
5.1.6 Osteochondral culture

Biphasic scaffolds demonstrated that blending of both a rigid 3D printed lattice infilled with silk material provides an excellent cell supportive environment whilst maintaining structural rigidity. Although the created biphasic scaffolds within this project showed an excellent ability to support cell migration, cell proliferation and scaffold colonisation, they lacked an ability to support and drive cell differentiation in their own right. When combined with media supplemented for osteogenic and chondrogenic differentiation, they supported the differentiation of these hBMSCs down these lineages, respectively. However, when the scaffolds were placed in a more complex osteochondral environment the scaffold failed to regenerate osteochondral tissue, and rather saw dominance of a bone-like phenotype that overpowered any chondrogenic differentiation. These results indicate that this biphasic scaffold’s use within osteochondral tissue engineering requires further refinement of its capacity to support differentiation of seeded cells. As previously discussed, this could come from a number of adaptations to the scaffold, such as the addition of more complex culture methods utilising microfluidics or even splitting the scaffold into two distinct scaffolds (a silk scaffold for cartilage regeneration and a 3D printed silk reinforced scaffold for bone regeneration) that could be cultured separately and combined at a later point. Another adaptation that could be undertaken based on the proven platform shown within this project is the addition of growth factors and other bioactive molecules to the scaffold. Adding biological cues to the already demonstrated biocompatible cell supportive biphasic scaffolds created within this project could give the scaffold capacity to cause cartilage and bone differentiation in its own right, potentially without the requirements of supplemented media, microfluidics or scaffolds splitting.
5.1.7 Study limitations

Due to funding limitations in conjunction with low specimen availability, a number of experiments could not be undertaken, which led to a few notable study limitations. Basal controls were not included during long-term cell culture. This is recognized as a study limitation as this group would be required to definitively demonstrate that silk has no innate differentiation capacity in regards to osteogenic and chondrogenic differentiation of BMSCs, and rather, the cellular differentiation seen within this study was due to the osteogenic and chondrogenic induction media. This is recognized as a study limitation as this group would be required to definitively demonstrate that silk has no innate differentiation capacity in regards to osteogenic and chondrogenic differentiation of BMSCs and rather, the cellular differentiation seen within this study was due to the osteogenic and chondrogenic induction media. The method conducted to investigate scaffold degradation only investigated the mechanism of proteolytic degradation. This allowed for the analysis of silk degradation over time but fails to properly investigate the degradation of the thermoplastic component of the scaffolds. Mercury intrusion porosimetry could not be undertaken due to equipment and funding availability; thus, in-depth analysis of scaffold porosity and interconnectivity could not be undertaken. Due to limited donor tissue availability BMSCs were obtained from elderly patients (>72 years old). Thus, the cell population may be less relevant than seen within young trauma patients in which the biphasic scaffold is designed to treat.
Chapter 6 Conclusions and Future Work

This section is designed to provide a conclusion to the overall findings of the project as well as to discuss potential future directions for the osteochondral scaffold designed and created within this project.
6.1.1 Conclusion

Within this study, a novel biphasic scaffold was created. The use of 3D printing within this novel scaffold provides a solid framework and increases its versatility, providing a mechanically robust structure that can theoretically survive the forces seen during joint articulation, as well as improving the degradation profile. The silk infilling not only provides the secondary porous structure to the 3D printed scaffold for the bone phase, but also a superficial layer for the cartilage phase. Silk within both phases improves the scaffold’s biocompatibility and cell adhesion characteristics, increasing the scaffold’s surface area. This unique biphasic scaffold has the potential to fill a niche within osteochondral tissue regeneration, especially with the possibility for its use within personalised medicine, with the 3D printed structure easily being adapted to different individuals. However, although the scaffold provides an excellent biocompatibility environment for cell growth, proliferation and migration, it lacks biological cues to direct osteochondral tissue formation. Thus, when placed within osteochondral culture in vitro, a failure to create osteochondral tissue is seen, and a dominant bone-like tissue regeneration is seen instead.

6.1.2 Future work

Future experimentation on this work should focus on initially gaining a better understanding on why tissue regeneration in chondrogenic and osteogenic conditions was successful, but under osteochondral conditions a complete failure to make cartilage-like tissue was seen. This could consist of a more in-depth look into cartilage and bone specific markers via immunohistochemistry, such as SOX9 and Collagen X. SOX9 could demonstrate presence or absence of chondrogenesis, as well as helping to identify chondrocytes as it is permanently expressed within the cell type (Diederichs et al., 2016; Lefebvre and Dvir-Ginzberg, 2017; Yi et al., 2018). Collagen X would help to identify whether the tissue seen in the cartilage phase of biphasic scaffolds under osteochondral conditions is indeed a specific
fibrous tissue as suspected, or tissue created by hypertrophic chondrocytes undergoing osteochondral ossification (Shen, 2005; He et al., 2018). This would also work well in conjunction with the SOX9 staining as hypertrophic chondrocytes do not express SOX9 (Lui et al., 2019). In conjunction with this, bone specific markers such as RUNX2 could be investigated to glean further information on the stage and amount of osteogenic differentiation within osteogenic culture and osteochondral culture. RUNX2 is a critical factor in differentiation and maturation of osteoblasts (Kawane et al., 2018; Xin, Zhao and Wang, 2022). After further testing to help identify the failure mechanism of scaffolds under osteochondral culture, it would be important to investigate improving the scaffold’s capacity to drive cells down both the cartilage and bone lineages to better create osteochondral tissue. To investigate this, initially, biphasic scaffolds would have to be cultured within basal media to confirm whether they possess any innate differentiation or capacity. Once this is undertaken, research into adapting the biphasic scaffold to improve its differentiation or capacity can be conducted. This can be done by adapting both the physical characteristics of the scaffold, as well as its chemical makeup. Recent work by Joukhdar et al., 2023 has developed an easy method to create graded porosity within silk scaffolds. Thus, if applied to this work, a larger porosity could be caused in the bone phase and a smaller pore size in the cartilage phase; thus, potentially increasing osteogenesis and chondrogenesis, respectively. Furthermore, growth factors can be incorporated into the scaffold design to provide chemical cues to drive both chondrogenesis and osteogenesis within the biphasic scaffold. This is shown in Yang et al., 2017, where TGF-β3 was incorporated into scaffolds to improve chondrogenesis, and in Saha et al., 2013 where BMP-2 was incorporated to improve osteogenesis. Throughout experimentation with biphasic scaffolds, a preferential binding of positive dyes (DAPI and Ethidium Homodimer-1) to the silk structure has indicated it has a negative charge, thus, the utilisation of positively charged growth factors may be an easy way to absorb these molecules to the scaffold surface, thus improving its osteochondral regenerative capacity; although this will need to be confirmed via streaming zeta potential. Furthermore, ceramic components, such
as hydroxyapatite, could be incorporated into the thermoplastic (Bernardo et al., 2022) As shown by Castro, O'Brien and Zhang, 2015 where the incorporation of ceramic components dramatically increased osteogenesis within the scaffolds. Furthermore, more complex culturing techniques could be utilised in vitro (Tuerlings et al., 2022), such as the utilisation of microfluidics to provide specialised growth media to each phase of the biphasic scaffold during osteochondral culture.

After improvement of the scaffolds osteochondral regenerative capacity in vitro, in vivo experimentation can be undertaken to further investigate biphasic scaffold biocompatibility, as well as the effectiveness of treatment of OCD. The ideal animal model should sit is closely as possible to that seen within patients in the clinic, having similar biology and cartilage physiology to that seen within humans (Ahern et al., 2009; Li et al., 2015c). Initial in vivo testing should utilise small animal models for OCD regeneration, including rats and rabbits (da Silva Morais, Oliveira and Reis, 2018). Following successful small animal model in vivo testing, larger models can be utilised to reinforce data before clinical translation. Large animal models for OCD repair include dogs, pigs, sheep, goats, and horses (Dias, Viegas and Carvalho, 2018), although there is a wide range of animal models to consider for OCD regeneration it is also important to bear in mind. Each has their own unique advantages and disadvantages. The most appropriate small animal model for use with the scaffold created within this project is the rat OCD model. Rat OCD models present several advantages, with rats being relatively inexpensive and easy to handle and house with most academic settings having facilities to work with this model (McCoy, 2015). The reasoning for the selection of the rat OCD model over the rabbit is that although the rabbit model shows a larger joint making implantation easier and slightly more relevant to the human joint, the unusual gait of rabbits means that the forces applied to the implanted scaffold may be less clinically relevant than rats when compared to humans (Gushue, Houck and Lerner, 2005). Additionally, rabbits have a higher cost to purchase and house compared to rats. Overall, the rat model strikes a balance between
experimental feasibility and anatomical relevance for studying osteochondral tissue regeneration. It is also important to note when selecting which model to undertake that large animal models are still required for preclinical translation for both rat and rabbit models. (Meng et al., 2020). In regard to large animal models, a minipig model appears to be the most appropriate utilization with the biphasic scaffold designed within this study. The minipig joint size and weight requirements are close to that of humans, and the bone apposition rate and trabecular thickness also closely resemble those of humans (van der Staay et al., 2009; Søndergaard, Dagnæs-Hansen and Herskin, 2011). The cartilage thickness seen within the minipig presents the second thickest option at 1.5mm, only being outperformed by the horse model (1.75mm) among the available models, but both still sit below that of native human cartilage (2.35mm) (Frisbie, Cross and McIlwraith, 2006; Koch and Betts, 2007; Chu, Szczodry and Bruno, 2009; Fisher et al., 2014; Meng et al., 2020). The reasoning for not selecting the goat or sheep model for OCD is that the cartilage thickness in these animals is considerably lower, at approximately 1.1mm and 0.45mm respectively (Moran et al., 2016; Helgeland et al., 2018; González Vázquez et al., 2021). Although horses have cartilage that sits closest to human cartilage, their longer time to reach maturity (2-4 years compared to the minipig’s 18 months) and their extreme cost and difficulty to handle, as well as the requirement of specialist facilities, make the minipig a much more appealing option (Christensen et al., 2015; McCarrel et al., 2016; Dias, Viegas and Carvalho, 2018).
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Appendix 1

Trilineage differentiation assay

Trilineage differentiation assays were conducted for all collected hBMSC used within this thesis. All patient donors showed positive trilineage differentiation for adipogenic, osteogenic and Chondrogenic differentiation representative photos are shown in Figure 60.

After 21 days of incubation in osteogenic media, the hBMSC were shown to exhibit positive calcium staining by alizarin red, as well as positive alkaline phosphatase staining. Compared to their basal controls, which showed very little alizarin red and alkaline phosphatase staining.

After 21 days of culture in Chondrogenic conditions upon silk scaffolds. hBMSC is showed extensive GAG and collagen accumulation with a collagenous capsule on the upper surface and more extensive gag expression within the centre.

After 21 days culture in adipogenic media (StemMACS™ AdipoDiff, MACS, 130-091-677 ) hBMSC is showed lipid vesicle formation as determined by positive oil red O staining. Compared to basal controls, which showed no lipid formation indicated by no staining with oil red O.
Figure 60 (appendix) trilineage differentiation assay of isolated hBMSC from routine hip arthroplasty
Raw FTIR data

Figure 61 demonstrates raw FTIR data utilised to determine the protein’s secondary structure (beta sheets, random coils and alpha helixes) seen within Figure 21 in the Amide I region (1600–1800 cm$^{-1}$)

Figure 61 (appendix) Raw FTIR data utilised to determine protein secondary structure. Comparing (A) silk scaffolds (B) the cartilage phase of biphasic scaffolds (D) the bone phase of biphasic scaffolds. Data obtained in the 500 cm$^{-1}$ to 3500 cm$^{-1}$ regions at a resolution of 4 cm using the Vertex 70 FTIR spectrometer in attenuated total reflection mode.