#### ABSTRACT

# Fabrication and Characterization of Three-DimensionalNano-FibrousScaffolds for Tissue EngineeringApplications

#### Mahesh Kumar Joshi

Department of Bionanosystem Engineering Graduate School Chonbuk National University

In the past decade, considerable efforts have been made to fabricate the biomimetic scaffolds from electrospun nanofibers for tissue engineering applications.Electrospinning technique offers unique advantages in the production of tissue engineering scaffolds compared to other methods in terms of simplicity, high surface-to-volume ratio scaffolds and process versatility. As promising as it may seem, this technology is still in its infancy, and further development is critical before it can be used for any practical biomedical applications. One of the major concerns with electrospunnanofibrous scaffolds is that they have only a superficially porous network, resulting in a sheet-like two-dimensional (2D) framework that restricts cell infiltration and growth. Moving towards the next generation of electrospun scaffolds, increasing research efforts are being focused on issues such as three-dimensionality, bio-functionalization, and improved biomechanical properties of the scaffolds.

The research project outlined in this dissertation was aimed to address the first two issue mentioned. To do so, a novelpost electrospinning process isdeveloped for the modification of two dimensional (2D) electrospun membrane into macro-porous, multi-layered, low-density, three-dimensional (3D) scaffolds. In situ gas foaming process is explored for the post electrospinning modifications. The theoretical model was developed to fabricate the 3D scaffolds and then validated with experimental findings. Sodium borohydride was used as gas foaming agent. Hypothesis is that when electrospun membranes immerged in sodium borohydride solution, the interconnected pores will be filled with the SB solution driven by capillary forces where SB solution will undergoes hydrolysis producing hydrogen gas. The gas molecules generated in-situ in the pores will form clusters to minimize the free energy resulting in pore nucleation that will reorganizes the nanofibers to form a low density, macro-porous, spongy, and multi-layered 3D scaffold. To validate the hypothesis, electrospun membranes of various polar and non-polar polymers were treated with SB solution varying the different parameters. It has been found that the solvent for sodium borohydride (either water or methanol) played a crucial role in postelectrospinning process. Only the electrospun mat of polar polymers were amended into 3D architecture using aqueous SB solution while methanol solution was found equally effective for both polar and non-polar polymers. Moreover, the fabrication process was fast in methanol solution compared to an aqueous solution due to the rapid liberation of hydrogen gas from the methanolysis reaction compared to the hydrolysis reaction.Experimental results showed that as- fabricated 3D scaffolds have excellent ability for cell infiltration, proliferation and growth. This method proved to be significantly better than other modifications methods attempted earlier.

Next part of this dissertation deals with the fabrication of 3D cellulose sponge for tissue engineering applications. Cellulose is an almost inexhaustible biopolymer that has been used in a number of industries due to its ecofriendly characteristics. Recent developments in cellulose research show that it is a promising biomaterial for tissue engineering, stem cell research, and regenerative medicine. Bacterial-produced cellulose is primarily studied for bone regeneration. However, it does not offer the ability to control the fibers on the nanoscale or microscale, which limits its applicability in tissue engineering. Due to strong inter- and intra-molecular interactions that originate from the hydrogen bonds and rigid backbone structure, cellulose does not melt or dissolve in conventional solvent systems which makes difficult for electrospinning. Compared to cellulose, cellulose acetate (CA), precursor of cellulose, is easy to process and has good spinnability. Taking the advantage of the expanded processability window of CA, cellulose fibers are produced through alkaline saponification of CA fibers. Thus produced cellulose fibers were treated with SB solution modifying into 3D cellulose sponge. As-fabricated 3D cellulose sponge showed better cell infiltration, growth and proliferations compared to the cellulose and cellulose acetate membranes.

Addressing the second issue of bio-functionalization, cellulose-synthetic hybrid fibers were fabricated. Electrospun membrane of synthetic polymers such as PCL and N6 are widely studied for tissue engineering applications. However, the poor wettability and hydraulic permeability of the membranes hinder their applications in tissue engineering applications. To enhance the biocompatibility and physicochemical properties of such synthetic polymers, cellulose-synthetic polymer composite fibers were fabricated. Cellulose acetate (CA) was blended with different synthetic polymers (PCL and N6) in various mass ratios, and nonwoven hybrid fibers were fabricated using an

electrospinning process. CA content of the hybrid fiber was transformed into cellulose (CL) by post-electrospinning treatment via alkaline saponification. The effect of the mass composition and subsequent saponification on the nanofiber morphology as well as physicochemical properties such as mechanical strength, crystallinity, surface wettability, bio-mineralization, and biocompatibility were determined. Regeneration of cellulose chains in the nanofibers increased the number of hydroxyl groups, which increased the hydrogen bonding, thereby improving the mechanical properties and wettability of the composite nanofibers. The improved wettability and presence of surface functional groups enhanced the ability to nucleate bioactive calcium phosphate crystals throughout the matrix when exposed to a simulated body fluid solution. Cellulose- synthetic hybrid fibers were found to be more thermally stable than pristine polymer (PCL and N6) nanofibers. Cell viability assay and microscopy imaging revealed that the cellulose-synthetic hybrid fibers have excellent cell proliferation and spreading compared to the pristine fibers.

In conclusion, the work presented in this dissertation provided a method of fabricating the next generation of electrospun scaffold capable of 3D tissue integration and improved physicochemical properties. Such a technological advancement will prove advantageous in achieving improved tissue regeneration and repair.

**Keywords:** Electrospinning; 3D Scaffolds; tissue engineering; post electrospinning process; gas foaming; alkaline saponification

## CONTENTS

Absti	act		i
Conte	ents		v
List o	of Tables		ix
List o	of Figures		х
List o	of abbrevi	ations	xvii
List o	of symbol		xix
Chap	oter 1.Intr	roduction	
1.1	Openi	ng Remarks	1
1.2	Thesis	overview	3
1.3	Discla	imer	4
Chap	oter 2.Mc	tivation and Objectives	
2.1	Motiv	ation	5
2.2	Object	tives	7
2.3	Research Methodology		
Chap	oter 3.Sta	te of the Art	
3.1	Nanos	tructured materials as tissue engineered scaffolds	10
3.2	Processing of nanofibers for tissue engineering		12
	3.2.1	Electrospinning	12
3.3	Devel	opment of 3D nanofibrous scaffolds	16
	3.3.1	Multi-layering electrospinning	17
	3.3.2	Post-processing after electrospinning	18
	3.3.3	Liquid-assisted collection	20
	3.3.4	Templet-assisted collection	21
	3.3.5	Using porogen	22
	3.3.6	Gas Foaming Technique	23

**Chapter 4.**Development of multi-layered macroporous threedimensional nanofibrous scaffold via a novel gas foaming technique Abstract

25

4.1	Introd	Introduction	
4.2	Result	Results and Discussion	
4.3	Conclu	Conclusion	
4.4	Materials and Methods		48
	4.4.1	Preparation of electrospinning solutions	48
	4.4.2	Electrospinning setups and procedure	48
	4.4.3	Post-electrospinning procedure	49
	4.4.4	Characterization of the three-dimensional mat	50
	4.4.5	In-vitro biocompability	51
		Acknowledgement	51

**Chapter 5.**Three-dimensional cellulose sponge: Fabrication, characterization, biomimetic mineralization, and in-vitro cell infiltration

Abstrac	et		52
5.1	Introduction		53
5.2	Results	Results and Discussion	
	5.2.1	Physicochemical properties of membrane	55
	5.2.2	Biomimetic mineralization	63
	5.2.3	Biocompatibility test	65
5.3	Conclusion		67
5.4	Materials and methods		68
	5.4.1	Preparation of electrospinning solutions	68
	5.4.2	Electrospinning setup and procedure	68
	5.4.3	Regeneration of Cellulose	68
	5.4.4	Fabrication of three-dimensional (3D) scaffold	69

5.5.5 In vivo Biomimetic mineralization 69			69
5.5.6 Scaffold Characterization			69
	5.5.7	Cell proliferation assay	70
		Acknowledgement	71
Chapte	er 6.	In situ generation of cellulose nanocrystals in	
polycap	orolacto	ne nanofibers: Effects on crystallinity, mechanical	
strengtl	n, bioco	mpatibility, and biomimetic mineralization	
Abstract			72
6.1	Introduction		73
6.2	Results	esults and discussion 7	
	6.2.1	Physicochemical properties of the membrane	76
	6.2.2	Biomimetic coating of hydroxyapatite	88
	6.2.3	In vitro biocompatibility	93
6.3	Conclu	elusions 9	
6.4	Materials and Methods		97
	6.4.1	Materials	97
	6.4.2	Electrospinning process	97
	6.4.3	Post-electrospinning treatment	98
	6.4.4	In vivo biomimetic mineralization	98
	6.4.5	In vitro biocompatibility	99
	6.4.6	Scaffold characterization	100
		Acknowledgement	101
Chapte	er 7.Ce	llulose reinforced nylon-6 nanofibrous membrane:	

Fabrication strategies, physicochemical characterizations, wicking properties and biomimetic mineralization

Abstract		102
7.1	Introduction	103
7.2	Results and discussion	106

	7.2.1	Physicochemical characterization	106
	7.2.2	Biomimetic mineralization	123
7.3	7.3 Conclusions		125
7.4	Materials and Methods		125
	7.4.1	Materials	125
	7.4.2	Electrospinning process	126
	7.4.3	Regeneration of cellulose from cellulose acetate	126
	7.4.4	Characterization	127
	7.4.5	Measurement of wicking properties	128
	7.4.6	In vivo biomimetic mineralization	128
		Acknowledgement	128
Chapte	er <b>8.</b> Eng	gineering of lactic acid coated nylon-6 core-shell fiber	
from si	ngle spir	nner net electrospining and its biomedical application	
Abstract 12			129
8.1	Introduction 1		
8.2	Result and discussion 1		
8.3	Conclusion 14		
8.4	Materials and Methods 1		
Chapter 9. Conclusion and Future work			141
9.1	Conclusion		142
9.2	Future Work		143
Appen	dices		
List of	publicat	ion	145
List of papers presented in conferences			147
List of patents			149
References			150
Acknowledgements			177
Summary (in Korean)			180

### **List of Tables**

**Table 4.1.** Summary of the mercury porosimetry result for pure N6 mat and3D mats obtained at different treating time

**Table 5.1.** Summary of the mercury porosimetry result for cellulose mat and3D cellulose sponge

**Table 6.1.** Viscosity and conductivity of different solutions and fiber size distribution in corresponding mats.

Table 6.2. Tensile properties of various samples.

**Table 7.1.** Viscosity and conductivity of different solutions and fiber size distribution in the corresponding mats.

**Table 7.2.** List of frequency values of various IR marker bands for  $\alpha$ - and  $\gamma$ -polymorphs of N6 proposed in the literature.

**Table 7.3.** DSC parameters obtained from the first heating scan for neat N6, N6/CA, and N6/CL fibers.

Table 7.4. Tensile properties of neat N6, N6/CA and N6/CL membranes

**Table 8.1.** Fiber diameter, tensile strength, water contact angle (at 1 s), and appearance of water

#### **List of Figures**

Figure 1.1. Schematic illustration of electrospinning setups

**Figure 1.2.** (a) Photograph of electrospinning jet, (b) Schematic representation for the formation of electrospun nanofibers.

**Figure 4.1**. Schematic illustration for the formation of low density, macroporous, spongy and multi-layered 3D scaffold

**Figure 4.2.** Digital images of (a) pristine N6 mat, (b) SB treated 3D N6 mat, (c) 3D mat in vacuum drying, and (d) cross-section of 3D mat.

**Figure 4.3.** Digital images (a-b) N6 mat, and (c-d) N6 thin film in SB solution for different time intervals

**Figure 4.4.** FE-SEM images of (a-c) pristine N6 mat, and (d-f) SB treated 3D N6 mat at different magnifications

**Figure 4.5**. (Left) Plot of log differential intrusion (mercury) vs pore size of a pristine and SB treated 3D N6 mats. (Right) XRD patterns of pristine and SB treated 3D N6 mats.

**Figure 4.6.** Mean fiber diameter and fiber size (diameter) distribution (a) 3D mat and (b) pristine N6 mat.

Figure 4.7. FT-IR spectra of pristine and SB treated mats

**Figure 4.8.** Digital images (a) pristine N6 thin film, and (b) 4h SB treated N6 thin film.

**Figure 4.9.** FE-SEM images (a) surface morphology of pristine CA mat, (b-c) cross-section of pristine CA mat, (d) surface morphology of SB treated 3D CA mat, (e-f) cross-section of 3D CA mat.

**Figure. 4.10.** Treatment of different nanofibrous mats after 5 mins (A) 0.1 M sodium borohydride solution prepared in methanol, and (B) 0.1M solution prepared in distilled water

**Figure 4.11.** Digital images (a) pristine PVDF mat, (b) SB treated 3D PVDF mat, and (c) pristine PCL mat, (d) SB treated 3D PCL mat.

**Figure 4.12.** FE-SEM images (a-b) cross-section of pristine PCL mat, and (c-d) cross-section of SB treated 3D PCL mat.

**Figure 4.13.** XRD (Left) and IR (Right) pattern of pristine and SB solution (methanol) treated PCL nanofibrous membrane

**Figure 4.14.** Typical tensile stress–strain curves of pristine and SB treated 3D mats of different polymers.

**Figure 4.15.** CCK assay test on pristine and SB treated 3D PCL mat after 1, 3 and 7 days culture. The viability of control cell was set at 100%, and viability relative to control was expressed. The data is reported as the mean deviation

(n = 5 and p < 0.05)

**Figure 4.16.** SEM images of cell growth (a and b) pure PCL mat, and (c and d) SB treated 3D PCL mat at different days.

**Figure 4.17.** Digital image showing the manual change in shape of 3D scaffold.

Figure. 4.1. Digital image of electrospinning setup used in this study

**Figure 5.1.** FE-SEM images of (a) cellulose acetate nanofibers, and (b) regenerated cellulose nanofibers. (Inset shows the water contact angle of corresponding membrane). FTIR (below, left) and XRD (below, right) spectra of different mats.

Figure 5.2. Schematic illustration for the fabrication of 3D cellulose sponge.

**Figure 5.3.** Digital images of (a) cellulose acetate mat, (b) regenerated cellulose mat, and (c) 3D cellulose sponge.

**Figure 5.4.** (a and b) FE-SEM images of 3D cellulose sponge in different magnification, and (c) EDX spectra.

**Figure 5.5.** (A)Plot of log differential intrusion (mercury) vs pore size of regenerated cellulose mat and 3D cellulose sponge. (B) SEM images of cross-section; (i and iii) cellulose mat, and (ii and iv) 3D cellulose sponge in different magnification.

**Figure 5.6.** XPS survey spectra of regenerated cellulose mat and 3D cellulose sponge (Inset table shows the elemental compositions obtained from XPS analysis).

**Figure 5.7.** (Left) FE-SEM images of 3 and 10 days mineralized mats; (a and b) cellulose acetate mat, (c and d) regenerated cellulose mat, and (e and f) 3D cellulose sponge, respectively. (Right) XRD pattern of synthetic HAp and SBF-treated cellulose sponge, and corresponding EDX spectra.

**Figure 5.8.** Cell viability (CCK assay) test for the regenerated cellulose mat and 3D cellulose sponge after 1, 3, and 7 days of cell culture. The viability of control cell was set at 100%, and viability relative to control was expressed.

**Figure 5.9.** SEM images showing the cell infiltration and growth on cellulose mats (a and b) and 3D cellulose sponge (c and d) after 3 days (a and c) and 7 days (b and d), respectively.

Figure 6.1. Schematic illustration for the fabrication of PCL/CL nanofibers

**Figure 6.2.** (A) FE-SEM images of composite mats before and after saponification. (B) Histogram showing fiber diameter distributions in different mats. (M1, M2, M3, and M4 represent the mats obtained by electrospinning of blend solutions with 20:80, 40:60, 60:40 and 80:20 mass

ratios of PCL to CA, respectively, and MR1, MR2, MR3, and MR4 represent the saponified mats corresponding to M1, M2, M3, and M4, respectively. Scale bar in FE-SEM images is  $4\mu$ m).

**Figure 6.3.** (A) FTIR spectra of (a) pristine CA mat, (b) M1, (c) M2, (d) M3, (e) M4, (f) pristine PCL mat. (B) FTIR spectra after saponification (a) regenerated cellulose, (b) MR1, (c) MR2, (d) MR3, and (e) MR4. (C) IR spectra showing the comparison between M3 and MR3.

**Figure 6.4.** (A) FTIR spectra of (a) pristine CA mat, (b) M1, (c) M2, (d) M3, (e) M4, (f) pristine PCL mat. (B) FTIR spectra after saponification (a) regenerated cellulose, (b) MR1, (c) MR2, (d) MR3, and (e) MR4.

**Figure 6.5.** (A) XRD patterns of (a) pristine PCL nanofiber, (b) M1, (c) M2, (d) M3, and (e) M4. (B) XRD pattern after saponification (a) MR1, (b) MR2, (c) MR3, and (d) MR4.

Figure 6.6. (A) TGA and (B) DSC curves of different composite mats.

**Figure 6.7.** Stress- strain curves for different mats.(B) Bar graph showing the Young's modulus for different mats; values were expressed as mean  $\pm$  S.E.M. (\*,# P <0.05 and \*\*,## P <0.01; One-way ANOVA post hoc Tukey test)

**Figure 6.8.** TEM images of (a) PCL/CA (M3) nanofiber and (b) corresponding PCL/CL (MR3) nanofiber

Figure 6.9. Water contact angle images of PCL/CA and corresponding saponified PCL/CL mats (mean  $\pm$ SD, n= 3).

**Figure 6.10.** Contact angle for different mats using diiodomethane and glycerol.

**Figure 6.11.** FE-SEM images of different samples exposed to SBF solution for one week: (a) Neat PCL mat, (b) PCL/CA (M3) mat, (c) PCL/CL (MR3) mat.

**Figure 6.12**. Absorbance shown by Alizarin Red S extracted from the stained calcium deposits in different mats treated with SBF solution for ten days. Inset shows the digital images of different mats stained with alizarin Red S. (Neat PCL mat is used as control, absorbance was measured at 492 nm)

**Figure. 6.13.** FE-SEM images of five days mineralized cellulose acetate mat (a) and regenerated cellulose mat (b).

Figure. 6.14. EDX spectra of ten days mineralized regenerated cellulose mat.

**Figure 6.15.** A. EDX analysis of PCL/CL (MR3) mat exposed to simulated body fluid for one week. B. XRD pattern of (a) PCL/CL mat, (b) PCL/CL mat exposed to simulated body fluid for one week, and (c) synthetic hydroxyapatite.

**Figure 6.16.** Graph showing the MC3T3-E1 cell viability indices for different mats on one, three and seven days. The viability of control cell was set at 100%, and viability relative to control was expressed. All values were expressed as mean  $\pm$  S.E.M. The data was individually analyzed with respect to days (\*\*, ## P <0.01, + P<0.05; One Way ANOVA post hoc Tukey test).

**Figure 6.17.** SEM images showing cell attachment on different scaffolds; (a, b) PCL/CA, (c, d) PCL/CL, and (e, f) SBF-incubated scaffolds at three days (a, c, e) and seven days (b, d, f)

**Figure 6.18.** Confocal microscopy. Cells on scaffolds were stained with DAPI to display blue (nuclei) and ActinGreen<sup>TM</sup> 488 to display green (cytoskeleton). MC3T3-E1 activity on different scaffolds (a, b) PCL/CA, (c, d) PCL/CL, and (e, f) SBF-incubated PCL/CL mat. (a, c, e) represent three days and (b, d, f) represent seven days incubation.

**Figure 7.1.** FE-SEM images of the different mats. (A) Before saponification: (i) pristine N6, (ii) N6-90/CA-10, (iii) N6-75/CA-25, (iv) N6-50/CA-50. (B)

After saponification: (i) N6 mat, (ii) N6-90/CL-10, (ii) N6-75/CA-25, (iv) N6-50/CA-50.

Figure 7.3. FT-IR spectra of neat CA, neat N6 and composite N6/CA mats

**Figure 7.4.** Schematic illustration of possible hydrogen bonding in N6 and N6/CL hybrid nanofibers.

Figure 7.5. XRD patterns of neat N6, N6/CA and N6/CL fibers

Figure 7.6. XRD pattern of CA, CL, N6, N6-75/CA-25, N6-75/CL-25, and N6 mats.

**Figure 7.7.** (A) TGA curve for different nanofibers. (B) DSC traces for different fibers at a heating rate of 10  $^{\circ}$ C min<sup>-1</sup>. (C) The crystallization behavior of different nanofibers cooling at a rate of 10  $^{\circ}$ C min<sup>-1</sup>

Figure 7.8. Stress-strain curves for N6, N6/CA and N6/CL mats

**Figure 7.9.** Water contact angle measurement for different membranes. (a) N6-90/CA-10, (b) N6-75/CA-25, (c) N6-50/CA-50, (d) pure N6 mat, (e) N6-90/CL-10, (f) N6-75/CL-25 and (g) N6-50/CL-50

Figure 7.10. Wicking rate for different mats.

**Figure. 7.11.** (I) FE-SEM images of nanofibers treated with SBF solution for seven days: (a) neat N6, (b) N6-75/CA-25 mat, and (c) N6-75/CL-25 mats. (II) Elemental analysis of seven mineralized N6-75/CL-25 mats

**Figure 8.1.** FE-SEM images of electrospun nanofibers obtained from nylon-6 solutions containing different amounts of LA. (a) Pristine N6, (b) 1gm LA/N6, (c)2gm LA/ N6, (d) 5gmLA/N6, and (e)10gm LA/N6 nanofibers

**Figure 8.2.** TEM images of pristine N6 (a), 5gm LA/ N6(b), 5gm LA/ N6 after water treatment

**Figure 8.3.** Typical tensile stress-strain curves of electrospun pristine N6 mat and different amounts of LA containing N6 hybrid mats.

**Figure 8.4.** X-ray profiles of pristine nylon-6 and LA/nylon-6 hybrid mat containing different amounts of LA

**Figure 8.5**. FT-IR spectra of pristine nylon-6 and LA/nylon-6 hybrid mat containing different amounts of LA.

**Figure 8.6.** FE-SEM images of (a) pristine, (b) LA/N6, and (c) CaL/N-6 fibers after one weak SBF incubation, high magnification (d)

**Figure 8.7.** MTT cytotoxicity test on pristine nylon-6 and CL/nylon-6 composite mats after 1 and 7 days culture. The viability of control cells was set at 100%, and the viability relative to the control was expressed. The data is reported as the mean  $\pm$  standard deviation (n = 5 and p < 0.05).

**Figure 8.8.** MTT cytotoxicity test on pristine nylon-6 and CL/nylon-6 composite mats after 1 and 7 days culture. The viability of control cells was set at 100%, and the viability relative to the control was expressed. The data is reported as the mean  $\pm$  standard deviation (n = 5 and p < 0.05).

## List of Abbreviations

2D -	Two dimensional
3D -	Three Dimensional
BSA -	Bovine Serum Albumin
ALP -	Alkaline Phosphatase
ARS -	Alizarin Red S
CaL-	Calcium Lactate
CaP-	Calcium phosphate
CL-	Cellulose
DAPI -	4',6-diamidino-2-phenylindole
DCM-	Dichloromethane
DMEM -	Dulbecco's Modified Eagle Media
DMF-	Dimethylformamide
DMAc-	Dimethylacetamide
DSC -	Differential Scanning Calorimetry
EBM-2 -	Endothelial Basal Media-2
ECM -	Extracellular Matrix
EDX -	Energy Dispersive X-Ray Spectroscopy
FBS -	Fetal Bovine Serum
HAp -	Hydroxyapatite
LA-	Lactic acid
IR-	Infra red
LCSM -	Laser Scanning Confocal Microscope
Mw-	Molecular weight
N6-	Nylon 6
PBS -	Phosphate-buffered Saline
PCL -	Poly (ε-caprolactone)

PEO -	Polyethylene oxide
PLA -	Polylactic acid
PVA -	Polyvinyl alcohol
SB-	Sodium borohydride
SBF-	Simulated body fluid
SEM -	Scanning Electron Microscopy
TEM-	Transmission electron microscopy
TGA-	Thermogravimetric analysis
Tc-	Crystallization peak temperature
Toc-	Crystallization onset temperature
Tom -	Melt onset temperature
T <sub>m</sub> -	Melt peak temperature
Tg -	Glass Transition Temperature
Tm -	Melting Temperature
UV -	Ultraviolet
XRD-	X-ray diffraction
XPS-	X-ray photoelectron spectroscopy

## List of Symbol

- μ- micro
- ε epsilon
- $\beta$  beta
- α- alpha
- $\Delta H_m$  melting enthalpy
- $\Delta$ Hc crystallization enthalpy