



ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT • OPEN ACCESS

A definition of bioinks and their distinction from biomaterial inks

To cite this article before publication: Juergen Groll *et al* 2018 *Biofabrication* in press <https://doi.org/10.1088/1758-5090/aaec52>

Manuscript version: Accepted Manuscript

Accepted Manuscript is “the version of the article accepted for publication including all changes made as a result of the peer review process, and which may also include the addition to the article by IOP Publishing of a header, an article ID, a cover sheet and/or an ‘Accepted Manuscript’ watermark, but excluding any other editing, typesetting or other changes made by IOP Publishing and/or its licensors”

This Accepted Manuscript is © 2018 IOP Publishing Ltd.

As the Version of Record of this article is going to be / has been published on a gold open access basis under a CC BY 3.0 licence, this Accepted Manuscript is available for reuse under a CC BY 3.0 licence immediately.

Everyone is permitted to use all or part of the original content in this article, provided that they adhere to all the terms of the licence <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0>

Although reasonable endeavours have been taken to obtain all necessary permissions from third parties to include their copyrighted content within this article, their full citation and copyright line may not be present in this Accepted Manuscript version. Before using any content from this article, please refer to the Version of Record on IOPscience once published for full citation and copyright details, as permissions may be required. All third party content is fully copyright protected and is not published on a gold open access basis under a CC BY licence, unless that is specifically stated in the figure caption in the Version of Record.

View the [article online](#) for updates and enhancements.

A Definition of Bioinks and their Distinction from Biomaterial Inks

J. Groll^{1,*}, J. A. Burdick², D.-W. Cho³, B. Derby⁴, M. Gelinsky⁵, S. C. Heilshorn⁶, T. Jüngst¹, J. Malda^{7,8}, V. A. Mironov^{9,10}, K. Nakayama¹¹, A. Ovsianikov^{12,13}, W. Sun^{14,15,16}, S. Takeuchi¹⁷, J. J. Yoo¹⁸, T. B. F. Woodfield¹⁹

¹Department of Functional Materials in Medicine and Dentistry and Bavarian Polymer Institute, University of Würzburg, 97070 Würzburg, Germany

²Department of Bioengineering, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA USA

³Department of Mechanical Engineering, Center for rapid prototyping based 3D tissue/organ printing, POSTECH, 77 Cheongam-ro, Nam-gu, Pohang, Kyungbuk 37673, Korea

⁴School of Materials, University of Manchester, Manchester, M13 9PL, UK

⁵Centre for Translational Bone, Joint and Soft Tissue Research, TU Dresden, 01307 Dresden, Germany

⁶Department of Materials Science & Engineering, Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94040, USA

⁷Department of Orthopedics, University Medical Center Utrecht, Utrecht University, Utrecht, The Netherlands

⁸Department of Equine Sciences, Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, Utrecht University, Utrecht, The Netherlands

⁹3D Bioprinting Solutions, Moscow, Russian Federation

¹⁰Regenerative Medicine Institute, Sechenov Medical University, Moscow, Russia

¹¹Department of Regenerative Medicine and Biomedical Engineering, Faculty of Medicine, Saga University, Saga City, 840-8502, Japan

¹²Additive Manufacturing Technologies (AMT) Group, Institute of Materials Science and Technology, TU Wien, 1060 Vienna, Austria

¹³Austrian Cluster for Tissue Regeneration (www.tissue-regeneration.at)

¹⁴Bio manufacturing and Rapid Forming Technology Key Laboratory of Beijing, Department of Mechanical Engineering, Tsinghua University, Beijing, People's Republic of China

¹⁵111 "Bio manufacturing and Engineering Living Systems" Innovation International Talents Base, Beijing, People's Republic of China

¹⁶Department of Mechanical Engineering, Drexel University, Philadelphia, PA, USA

¹⁷Institute of Industrial Science, University of Tokyo, Tokyo, Japan

¹⁸Wake Forest Institute for Regenerative Medicine, Wake Forest School of Medicine, Winston-Salem, NC, USA

¹⁹Department of Orthopedic Surgery and Centre for Bioengineering & Nanomedicine, University of Otago, Christchurch, New Zealand

*correspondence to: juergen.groll@fmz.uni-wuerzburg.de

Abstract

Biofabrication aims to fabricate biologically functional products through bioprinting or bioassembly [1]. In biofabrication processes, cells are positioned at defined coordinates in three-dimensional (3D) space using automated and computer controlled techniques [2], usually with the aid of biomaterials that are either (i) directly processed with the cells as suspensions/dispersions, (ii) deposited simultaneously in a separate printing process, or (iii) used as a transient support material. Materials that are suited for biofabrication are often referred to as bioinks and have become an important area of research within the field. In view of this special issue on bioinks, we aim herein to briefly summarize the historic evolution of this term within the field of biofabrication. Furthermore, we propose a simple but general definition of bioinks, and clarify its distinction from biomaterial inks.

Introduction

In recent years, the fabrication and characterization of new bioinks gained increasing attention, particularly as the lack of materials suitable for bioprinting was identified as one of the major drawbacks limiting rapid progress in the field [3, 4]. This resulted in the evolution of new strategies to develop and modify materials to be used as, or in, bioink formulations for bioprinting, which is elegantly reviewed in a number of recent articles [3-11]. However, along with this rising interest, the apparent definition of the term bioink became increasingly divergent. This is particularly obvious when the evolution of the use of the term is reviewed.

Origin of the term Bioink

The term bioink was first used in the context of organ printing in 2003 and was introduced together with the term biopaper [12, 13]. Initially, the concept was to provide, or even print, a biopaper (hydrogel) and then insert living cells or tissue spheroids as the “bioink” by bioprinting. Thus, the term bioink originally referred to the cellular component that was positioned in 3D on or within hydrogels. In many of the pioneering studies in the field, cells and cell aggregates were used as the bioink [12-14]. However, even at this stage, some authors were arguing that a practical bioink formulation should be “structurally and functionally more sophisticated” [12]. Simultaneously, the number of additive manufacturing techniques capable of being used for bioprinting increased over time to include extrusion, droplet deposition such as inkjet and microvalve based techniques, laser forward transfer, and lithography-based techniques, all of which have different physical and rheological requirements for a workable ink.

With the further development of the field of bioprinting and especially the increasing adaptation of direct write extrusion-based printing, appreciation for the understanding of material rheological properties used in the printing process increased. For example, in extrusion-based approaches, the key challenge is that the ink must be dispensed through a narrow nozzle, which is often achieved through exploiting shear-thinning behavior; however, after deposition, the printed 3D object must be stable. Therefore, the material must rapidly increase in viscosity after exiting the nozzle, which is typically supported by post-printing cross-linking. Consequently, the need for a separate biopaper was no longer required, and accordingly, a single unified concept of a bioink being the dispensed material was attained.

Recent trend for diversified use of the term Bioink

Regardless, the term bioink is now ubiquitously used in a growing number of review articles [7-11, 15, 16]. Some of these suggest an extension of the definition towards additively manufactured materials. For example, the term “fugitive bioink” has been introduced for sacrificial biomaterials that can be processed by an additive manufacturing technology and result in cytocompatible constructs that can be leached or washed away or dissolved to result in pores [17]. Recently, a division of the term bioink into four sub-categories was proposed [18]: support bioinks, fugitive bioinks, structural bioinks and functional bioinks. The suggested discrimination between the different classes in this case was that: i) *support bioinks* are materials designed to support cell populations during delivery and act as an artificial extracellular matrix as cells multiply; ii) *fugitive bioinks* are sacrificial or temporary materials that can be rapidly removed to form internal voids or channels within a printed construct; iii) *structural bioinks* are used to provide mechanical integrity to printed structures and may also be fugitive but over a relatively long timescale (e.g. thermoplastics such as polycaprolactone), and finally; iv) functional bioinks provide biochemical, mechanical or electrical cues to influence cellular behavior after a structure is printed. We think that this classification is unnecessarily complicated and, as pointed out in more detail below, derived from the definition of biomaterials, which in our opinion is not reasonable for a definition of bioinks.

Similar to other recent articles, this classification of four classes of bioink has been driven by the role of the constituent materials in the final function of a printed construct, rather than by the fabrication procedure itself. The definition of biomaterials has for a long time been a vital discussion that is still ongoing. This is due to the broad range of biomaterials (including metals, ceramics, polymers and semi-conductors as the most important examples) with strongly deviating properties, and an equally broad application from basic research to clinical translation, covering contact times with the body from seconds to decades. This led to an application and purpose driven definition of the term biomaterial, rather than a material-based definition. A comprehensive and well-accepted article by Williams describes the evolution of biomaterials research and the definitions for terms, such as *biomaterial* and *biocompatible* [19].

It is reasonable to define biomaterials, which comprise a variety of materials that are suitable for a broad range of manufacturing and processing techniques, including spinning, knitting, extruding, machining, chipping and additive manufacturing, from the perspective of their final purpose and utilization. Biofabrication, however, is a more focused field of research, and is characterized by the exploitation of automated procedures to directly create a 3D arrangement of cells, often with the aid of biomaterials. The potential applications of such products are not important for the definition of the bioink. Hence, the “bio” in the term bioink relates to cells as true biological components of the formulation. This is an important feature, as this biological component drastically limits the processes and most importantly the processing conditions that are suitable, and thus significantly raise the demands on biomaterials and technology.

In our view, and in agreement with the recently updated definition of Biofabrication [1], bioinks can generally be described as a formulation of cells that is suitable to be processed by an automated biofabrication technology. Cell-encapsulating materials are often used, but not necessarily mandatory as an additional bioink component, in line with the pioneering studies mentioned above where in these cases the bioink consisted of only aggregated cells in the form of cell spheroids or microtissues. Cell-based bioinks are a vital field of research today [20-22] and very promising studies involving functional tissue constructs and translational perspectives have recently evolved [23-25]. Therefore, cells are a

1
2
3 mandatory component of a bioink, so that a formulation that includes biologically active components
4 or molecules, but does not contain any cells, would not qualify as a bioink. By way of example,
5 formulations that cannot be considered as *bioinks* include: thermoplasts supplemented with drug
6 molecules, inorganic powders or slurries that release bioactive ions. Furthermore, aqueous
7 formulations of polymers or hydrogel-precursors that contain biological factors would be considered
8 *biomaterial inks*, that – by definition – would become *bioinks* following the addition of cells into that
9 formulation.
10
11

12 A relatively new set of technologies applied in Biofabrication are lithography-based technologies, such
13 as stereolithography (SLA), digital light processing (DLP), continuous liquid interface production (CLIP),
14 or two-photon polymerization (2PP), which allow for the fabrication of 3D structures with high spatial
15 resolution [26-31]. These approaches involve spatial patterning of light to photo-crosslink specific
16 regions of a bioink (acting as a resin), usually composed of a low-viscosity photocrosslinkable hydrogel
17 precursor [30, 32]. Thus, bioinks that are suitable for these technologies, so called bioresins, must
18 exhibit characteristics that are compatible for lithographic processes and which differ significantly from
19 the requirements for bioprinting [28]. These difference comprise, for example, rheological properties
20 facilitating layer-by-layer deposition in case of DLP and SLA, and/or supporting high spatial resolution,
21 which is usually a function of reactivity and number of cross-linkable groups per volume of the
22 material. Nonetheless, it is possible to develop systems that can be used for bioprinting and
23 lithography, and in some cases without the need for a photo-absorber [33]. Therefore, in addition to
24 the recently updated definition of Biofabrication and in agreement with our definition of bioinks,
25 bioresins could be considered as a subset of bioinks consisting of a formulation of cells that is suitable
26 to be processed by an automated lithography-based biofabrication technology. Further development
27 and characterization of this potential class of bioinks within this emerging field is required to elaborate
28 on this distinction.
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 **Bioinks and Biomaterial Inks**

39 With these definitions in mind, biomaterials that qualify as a bioink must serve as a cell-delivery
40 medium during formulation and processing [34]. It is often stated in literature that hydrogels are the
41 most commonly used bioinks. This is, however, only true for a few studies where physical hydrogels
42 are applied that form a gel before printing. Examples of this include, designed peptide-polymer hybrids
43 [35] and spider silk protein-based hydrogels [36]. In most studies, materials used for formulation of
44 bioinks are hydrogel precursors that can be cross-linked into hydrogels post-fabrication. A recent
45 intermediate approach is the pre-crosslinking of precursor solutions to a state of higher viscosity,
46 followed by complete cross-linking post fabrication [37]. This can generally be extended also to cross-
47 linking at the final stage of the extrusion process in the needle immediately before deposition for
48 extrusion-based biofabrication of bioinks [38], or by core-shell approaches at the timepoint when the
49 bioink leaves the nozzle [39]. In addition, it is important to note that bioinks are not restricted to
50 molecular solutions of precursors. Bioinks can also contain microcarriers that may be cell-seeded [40]
51 or nanoparticles that may serve for drug release [41] or to improve rheological and mechanical
52 properties [42]. Also, cell-loaded microgels [43] or microspheres [44] can be used as bioink
53 components to impart additional functionality (Figure 1).
54
55
56
57
58

59 For further clarification and distinction, (bio-)materials that can be printed and subsequently seeded
60 with cells after printing, but not directly formulated with cells, thus do not qualify as a bioink. We
suggest that these are termed *biomaterial inks*. Such biomaterial inks may be used to produce scaffolds

for cell seeding, bioreactors, implants, or they may be used in parallel to bioink-fabrication in hybrid approaches to generate an intrinsic mechanical support within the construct [45, 46]. Accordingly, sacrificial materials that can be printed and dissolved afterwards in a way that does not affect the survival of living cells are not bioinks, but biomaterial inks. This by no means diminishes their importance, but clarifies their terminology for this rapidly growing field. Examples of biomaterial inks are thermoplastic polymers such as polycaprolactone as a biodegradable example, polypropylene as non-degradable example, and polyoxazolines as a non-degradable but thermoresponsive example, biopolymers such as gelatin, inorganic materials such as cements and slurries, and metals, usually in the form of powders, thus covering a broad range of biomaterials, with the additional requirement that the material must be processable by an additive manufacturing or a biofabrication technology. These biomaterial inks may also include lithography-based resins which offer biocompatible substrates with high resolution features to support scaffold fabrication, cell seeding or microfluidic device fabrication, but do not contain cells which distinguishes them from a bioresin.




Figure 1: Distinction between a Bioink (left side), where cells are a mandatory component of the printing formulation in the form of single cells, coated cells and cell aggregates (of one or several cell types), or also in combination with materials (for example seeded onto microcarriers, embedded in microgels, formulated in a physical hydrogel, or formulated with hydrogel precursors), and a Biomaterial Ink (right side), where a biomaterial is used for printing and cell-contact occurs post fabrication. The images in this scheme are not displayed in scale.

Proposal for a definition of Bioinks

In summary, we would like to emphasize that, in contrast to the term biomaterials, the term bioink should be defined from a process and technology point of view. In order to embrace the two main

1
2
3 strategies of biofabrication, bioprinting and bioassembly, and the different possible compositions of
4 cells and materials in bioinks discussed above, we propose that bioinks should be defined as “**a**
5 **formulation of cells suitable for processing by an automated biofabrication technology that may also**
6 **contain biologically active components and biomaterials**”. Bioinks may include cells in different
7 environments and forms, such as: single cells, cells aggregated in spheroids, cellular rods, cells
8 organized in mini-tissues or organoids, cells coated by a thin layer of material, cells seeded onto
9 microcarriers, or encapsulated in tailored colloidal microenvironments. In addition, bioinks can, but do
10 not have to, contain bioactive molecules such as growth factors, DNA, miRNA, cytokines, exosomes or
11 also biomaterials. This definition of bioinks is independent of the technology used for biofabrication,
12 such as laser forward transfer, microfluidics, assembly, ink-jet, dispense plotting, and lithographic
13 techniques. This definition applies to all applications for which biofabrication is performed, including
14 but not limited to, cell printing, tissue or organ printing, fabrication of *in vitro* models, assembly of
15 organ- and body-on-a-chip systems, and the printing of bacteria, algae and plant cells for
16 biotechnological applications.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 Acknowledgement

27 J.G. thanks the German Research Foundation (DFG; collaborative research centre SFB/TRR225 „From
28 the fundamentals of Biofabrication to functional tissue models“, projects A06, B02 and B04) and the
29 European Research Council (consolidator grant 617989) for financial support. A.O. would like to
30 acknowledge support by European Research Council (starting grant-307701) and FWF (ProjectNumber
31 I 2444). T.W. acknowledges support through the Royal Society of New Zealand Rutherford Discovery
32 Fellowship (RDF-UOO1204).
33
34
35
36

37 References

- 38 [1] J. Groll, T. Boland, T. Blunk, J.A. Burdick, D.-W. Cho, P.D. Dalton, B. Derby, G. Forgacs, Q. Li, V.A.
39 Mironov, L. Moroni, M. Nakamura, W. Shu, S. Takeuchi, G. Vozzi, T.B.F. Woodfield, T. Xu, J.J. Yoo, J.
40 Malda: Biofabrication: Reappraising the definition of an evolving field. *Biofabrication* 2016, 8, 013001.
41 [2] L. Moroni, T. Boland, J.A. Burdick, C. De Maria, B. Derby, G. Forgacs, J. Groll, Q. Li, J. Malda, V. A.
42 Mironov, C. Mota, M. Nakamura, W. Shu, S. Takeuchi, T.B.F. Woodfield, T. Xu, J.J. Yoo, G. Vozzi:
43 Biofabrication: A Guide to Technology and Terminology. *Trends in Biotechnology* 2018, 36, 384–402.
44 [3] J. Malda, J. Visser, F.P. Melchels, T. Jüngst, W.E. Hennink, W.J.A. Dhert, J. Groll, D.W. Hutmacher:
45 Engineering Hydrogels for Biofabrication. *Advanced Materials* 2013, 25, 581–603.
46 [4] T. Jüngst, W. Smolan, K. Schacht, T. Scheibel, J. Groll: Strategies and Molecular Design Criteria for
47 3D Printable Hydrogels. *Chemical Reviews* 2016, 116, 1496–1539.
48 [5] D. Kilian, T. Ahlfeld, A. R. Akkineni, A. Lode, M. Gelinsky: 3D Bioprinting of Volumetric Tissues and
49 Organs. *MRS Bull.* 2017, 42, 582–592
50 [6] J. Jang, J. Y. Park, G. Gao, D.-W. Cho: Biomaterials-based 3D cell printing for next-generation
51 therapeutics and diagnostics. *Biomaterials* 2018, 156, 88–106.
52 [7] D. Chimene, K. K. Lennox, R. R. Kaunas, A. K. Gaharwar: Advanced Bioinks for 3D Printing: A
53 Materials Science Perspective. *Annals of Biomedical Engineering* 2016, 44, 2090–2102.
54 [8] K. Hölzl, S. Lin, L. Tytgat, S. Van Vlierberghe, L. Gu, A. Ovsianikov: Bioink properties before, during
55 and after 3D bioprinting. *Biofabrication* 2016, 8, 032002.
56 [9] S.E. Critchley, D.J. Kelly: Bioinks for bioprinting functional meniscus and articular cartilage. *J. 3D*
57 *Printing in Medicine* 2017, 1, 269–290.
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 [10] A. Panwar, L.P. Tan: Current Status of Bioinks for Micro-Extrusion-Based 3D Bioprinting. *Molecules* 2016, 21, 685.
4
5 [11] P.S. Gungor-Ozkerim, I. Inci, Y.S. Zhang, A. Khademhosseini, M.R. Dokmeci: Bioinks for 3D
6 bioprinting: an overview. *Biomaterials Science* 2018, 6(5), 915-946.
7
8 [12] V. Mironov: Printing technology to produce living tissue, *Expert Opinion on Biological Therapy*,
9 2003, 3, 701-704.
10
11 [13] V. Mironov, R.R. Markwald, G. Forgacs: Organ printing: self assembling cell aggregates as bioink,
12 *Science and Medicine*, 2003, 9, 69-71.
13
14 [14] T. Boland, V. Mironov, A. Gutowska, E.A. Roth, R. R. Markwald: Cell and Organ Printing 2: Fusion
15 of Cell Aggregates in Three-Dimensional Gels. *The Anatomical Record Part A*, 2003, 272A, 497-502.
16
17 [15] M. Hospodiuk, M. Dey, D. Sosnoski, I.T. Ozbolat: The bioink: A comprehensive review on
18 bioprintable materials. *Biotechnology Advances* 2017, 35, 217-239.
19
20 [16] I.T. Ozbolat, M. Hospodiuk: Current advances and future perspectives in extrusion-based
21 bioprinting. *Biomaterials* 2016, 76, 321-343.
22
23 [17] I.T. Ozbolat: Bioprinting scale-up tissue and organ constructs for transplantation. *Trends in*
24 *Biotechnology* 2015, 33, 395-400.
25
26 [18] D. Williams, P. Thayer, H. Martinez, E. Gatenholm, A. Khademhosseini: A perspective on the
27 physical, mechanical and biological specifications of bioinks and the development of functional tissues
28 in 3D bioprinting. *Bioprinting* 2018, 9, 19-36.
29
30 [19] D. F. Williams: On the nature of biomaterials. *Biomaterials* 2009, 30, 5897-5909.
31
32 [20] N. I. Moldovan, N. Hibino, K. Nakayama: Principles of the Kenzan Method for Robotic Cell
33 Spheroid-Based Three-Dimensional Bioprinting. *Tissue Engineering Part B: Reviews* 2017, 23, 237-
34 244.
35
36 [21] H. Onoe, T. Okitsu, A. Itou, M. Kato-Negishi, R. Gojo, D. Kiriya, K. Sato, S. Miura, S. Iwanaga, K.
37 Kuribayashi-Shigetomi, Y. T. Matsunaga, Y. Shimoyama, S. Takeuchi: Metre-long cell-laden microfibres
38 exhibit tissue morphologies and functions. *Nature Materials* 2013, 12, 584-590.
39
40 [22] N. V. Mekhileri, K. S. Lim, G. C. J. Brown, I. Mutreja, B. S: Schon, G. J. Hooper, T. B. F. Woodfield:
41 Automated 3D bioassembly of micro-tissues for biofabrication of hybrid tissue engineered constructs.
42 *Biofabrication* 2018, 10, 024103.
43
44 [23] X.-Y. Zhang, Y. Yanagi, Z. Sheng, K. Nagata, K. Nakayama, T. Taguchi: Regeneration of diaphragm
45 with bio-3D cellular patch. *Biomaterials* 2018, 167, 1-14
46
47 [24] D. Murata, S. Akieda, K. Misumi, K. Nakayama: Osteochondral Regeneration with a Scaffold-Free
48 Three-Dimensional Construct of Adipose Tissue-Derived Mesenchymal Stromal Cells in Pigs. *Tissue*
49 *Engineering and Regenerative Medicine* 2018, 15, 101-113.
50
51 [25] E. A. Bulanova, E. V. Koudan, J. Degosserie, C. Heymans, F. D. Pereira, V. A. Parfenov, Y. Sun, Q.
52 Wang, S. A. Akhmedova, I. K. Sviridova, N. S. Sergeeva, G. A. Frank, Y. D. Khesuani, C. E. Pierreux, V. A.
53 Mironov: Bioprinting of functional vascularized mouse thyroid gland construct. *Biofabrication* 2017,
54 9(3), 034105.
55
56 [26] X.-H. Qin, A. Ovsianikov, J. Stampfl, R. Liska: Additive manufacturing of photosensitive hydrogels
57 for tissue engineering applications. *BioNanoMaterials* 2014, 15, 49-70.
58
59 [27] H. Lin, D. Zhang, P.G. Alexander, G. Yang, J. Tan, A.W.-M. Cheng, R.S. Tuan: Application of visible
60 light-based projection stereolithography for live cell-scaffold fabrication with designed architecture.
Biomaterials 2013, 34, 331-339.
[28] J. Van Hoorick, P. Gruber, M. Markovic, M. Tromayer, J. Van Erps, H. Thienpont, R. Liska, A.
Ovsianikov, P. Dubruel, S. Van Vlierberghe: Cross-Linkable Gelatins with Superior Mechanical
Properties Through Carboxylic Acid Modification: Increasing the Two-Photon Polymerization Potential
Biomacromolecules 2017, 18, 3260-72.

- 1
2
3 [29] M. Tromayer, A. Dobos, P. Gruber, A. Ajami, R. Dedic, A. Ovsianikov and R. Liska, A biocompatible
4 diazosulfonate initiator for direct encapsulation of human stem cells via two-photon polymerization,
5 Polym. Chem. 2018 9, 3108.
- 6 [30] K.S. Lim, R. Levato, P.F. Costa, M.D. Castilho, C.R. Alcala-Orozco, K.M.A. van Dorenmalen, F.P.W.
7 Melchels, D. Gawlitta, G.J. Hooper, J. Malda, T.B.F. Woodfield: Bio-resin for high resolution lithography-
8 based biofabrication of complex cell-laden constructs. *Biofabrication* 2018, 10, 034101.
- 9 [31] A. Ovsianikov, S. Mühleder, J. Torgersen, Z. Li, X.-H. Qin, S. Van Vlierberghe, P. Dubruel, W.
10 Holnthoner, H. Redl, R. Liska, J. Stampfl: Laser Photofabrication of Cell-Containing Hydrogel Constructs.
11 *Langmuir* 2014, 30, 3787-3794.
- 12 [32] Miri A K, Nieto D, Iglesias L, Goodarzi Hosseinabadi H, Maharjan S, Ruiz-Esparza G U, Khoshakhlagh
13 P, Manbachi A, Dokmeci M R, Chen S, Shin S R, Zhang Y S and Khademhosseini A 2018 Microfluidics-
14 Enabled Multimaterial Maskless Stereolithographic Bioprinting *Adv. Mater.* **1800242** 1–9
- 15 [33] S. Bertlein, G. Brown, K.S. Lim, T. Juengst, T. Boeck, T. Blunk, J. Tessmar, G.J. Hooper, T.B.F.
16 Woodfield, J. Groll: Thiol-ene Clickable Gelatin: a Platform Bioink for Multiple 3D Biofabrication
17 Technologies. *Advanced Materials* 2017, 29, 1703404.
- 18 [34] R. Levato, W.R. Webb, I.A. Otto, A. Mensinga, Y. Zhang, M. van Rijen, R. van Weeren, I.M. Khan, J.
19 Malda: The bio in the ink: cartilage regeneration with bioprintable hydrogels and articular cartilage-
20 derived progenitor cells. *Acta Biomater.* 2017, 61, 41-53.
- 21 [35] K. Dubbin, Y. Hori, K.K. Lewi, S.C. Heilshorn: Dual-Stage Crosslinking of a Gel-Phase Bioink Improves
22 Cell Viability and Homogeneity for 3D Bioprinting. *Adv Healthc Mater.* 2016, 5, 2488-2492.
- 23 [36] K. Schacht, T. Jüngst, M. Schweinlin, A. Ewald, J. Groll, T. Scheibel: Biofabrication of Cell-loaded,
24 3D Recombinant Spider Silk Constructs. *Angewandte Chemie International Edition* 2015, 54, 2816–
25 2820.
- 26 [37] A.L. Rutz, K.E. Hyland, A.E. Jakus, W.R. Burghardt, R.N. Shah: A Multimaterial Bioink Method for
27 3D Printing Tunable, Cell-Compatible Hydrogels. *Advanced Materials* 2015, 27, 1607-1614.
- 28 [38] L. Ouyang, C.B. Highley, W. Sun, J.A. Burdick: A Generalizable Strategy for the 3D Bioprinting of
29 Hydrogels from Nonviscous Photo-crosslinkable Inks. *Adv. Mater.* 2017, 29, 1604983
- 30 [39] M. Costantini, J. Idaszek, K. Szöke, J. Jaroszewicz, M. Dentini, A. Barbetta, J. E. Brinchmann, W.
31 Świążzkowski: 3D bioprinting of BM-MSCs-loaded ECM biomimetic hydrogels for in vitro neocartilage
32 formation. *Biofabrication* 2016, 8, 035002.
- 33 [40] R. Levato, J. Visser, J.A. Planell, E. Engel, J. Malda, M.A. Mateos-Timoneda: Biofabrication of tissue
34 constructs by 3D bioprinting of cell-laden microcarriers. *Biofabrication* 2014, 6, 035020.
- 35 [41] B. Baumann, T. Jungst, S. Stichler, S. Feineis, O. Wiltschka, M. Kuhlmann, M. Lindén, J. Groll:
36 Control of nanoparticle release kinetics from 3D printed hydrogel scaffolds. *Angewandte Chemie*
37 *International Edition* 2017, 56, 4623-4628.
- 38 [42] T. Ahlfeld, G. Cidonio, D. Kilian, S. Duin, A.R. Akkineni, J.I. Dawson, S. Yang, A. Lode, R.O.C. Oreffo,
39 M. Gelinsky: Development of a clay based bioink for 3D cell printing for skeletal application.
40 *Biofabrication* 2017, 9, 034103.
- 41 [43] T. Kamperman, S. Henke, A. van den Berg, S.R. Shin, A. Tamayol, A. Khademhosseini, M. Karperien,
42 J. Leijten: Single Cell Microgel Based Modular Bioinks for Uncoupled Cellular Micro- and
43 Macroenvironments. *Adv. Healthcare Mater.* 2017, 1600913.
- 44 [44] N.V. Mekhileri, K.S. Lim, G. Brown, I. Mutreja, B.S. Schon, G.J. Hooper, T.B.F. Woodfield:
45 Automated 3D bioassembly of micro-tissues for biofabrication of hybrid tissue engineered constructs.
46 *Biofabrication* 2018, 10, 024103.
- 47 [45] W. Schuurman, V. Khristov, M.W. Pot, R. van Weeren, W.J. Dhert, J. Malda: Bioprinting of hybrid
48 tissue constructs with tailorable mechanical properties. *Biofabrication.* 2011, 3, 021001.
- 49 [46] J.H. Shim, J.Y. Kim, M. Park, J. Park, D.W. Cho: Development of a hybrid scaffold with synthetic
50 biomaterials and hydrogel using solid freeform fabrication technology. *Biofabrication.* 2011, 3, 034102.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60