

Control of Biodegradation of Chitosan/Gelatin Scaffolds for Tissue Engineering

(Proof of Principle Study)

Thesis

Submitted to the Faculty of Dentistry,

Ain-Shams University

For

Partial Fulfilment of Requirements of the Doctoral degree in
Dental Biomaterials

By

Reem Mohammed Ashraf

B.D.S (Cairo University, 2007)

M.Sc. (Cairo University, 2014)

Assistant lecturer of Biomaterials, Faculty of Dentistry, Ahram
Canadian University

-2018-

Supervisors

Dr. Ghada Atef Alian

Prof. of Dental Biomaterials

Faculty of Dentistry, Ain Shams University

Dr. Mohammed Salah Abd-ElAziz Nassif

Associate Prof. of Dental Biomaterials

Faculty of Dentistry, Ain Shams University

Dr. Amany Abdelmonem Mostafa

Prof. of Material Science

Head of Inorganic Chemical Industries and Mineral Resources

Research Division

Refractories, Ceramics and Building Materials Dept.

Nanomedicine and Tissue Engineering Lab, MRCE

National Research Centre

-2018-

Dedication

*This work is dedicated to the soul of my beloved brother
Adham. I wish you were here with that look on your face
that makes me feel proud.*

*My mother, my hero, my survivor, couldn't have made it
without you.*

*My greatest blessing, my son Mallek, my daughter Jamila
and my beloved husband.*

Last but not least, my father and sister I'm so grateful.

Acknowledgement

I would like to express my deep appreciation to all members who had contributed to this thesis. First, I'd like to express my sincere gratitude to my dear supervisor **Prof. Dr. Ghada Alian**, Professor of Dental Biomaterials, Faculty of Oral and Dental Medicine, Ain shams University, for her scientific efforts and continuous motivation throughout this work. Actually, she was always there whenever I need offering time, experiences and efforts in order to teach me well and to guide me to the right way.

Also, I would like to convey my great acknowledgement to my supervisor **Prof. Dr. Mohamed Salah Nassef**, Associate Professor of Dental Biomaterials, Faculty of Dentistry, Ain Shams University for his academic support, technical guidance, and sincere cooperation and for helping me in rough times.

My deep thanks are devoted to **Prof. Dr. Amany Abdel Monem Mostafa**, Professor of Material Science and Head of Inorganic Chemical Industries and Mineral Resources, Research Division, Refractories, Ceramics and Building Materials Dept. Medical Research Center of Excellence (MRCE), National Research Centre (NRC), for her efforts in designing the work of my thesis and the invaluable support she offered me, enabling all the facilities of her laboratory to be handy and going through every single detail in this work.

Also I would like to express my great acknowledgement to Assistant **Prof. Dr. Ramadan Elgamsy**, Faculty of engineering, Ain shams University, for his strong practical and scientific support.

I am greatly indebted to **Dr. Mohammed Salah El-Okaily**, Associate Researcher of Ceramics, Refractors and Building materials

department (Biomaterials Group). (MRCE), (NRC) , for being the unknown soldier in this work that helped me in the practical work step by step and worked hardly for the optimum feasible study.

I would further thank **Dr. Ahmed Abd Elrahman**, Assistant Lecturer of Biomaterials, Future University for his great efforts in the statistical analysis.

Also my deepest gratitude to all the members of Biomaterials Department, Ain Shams University for the continuous support, providing help and knowledge whenever needed.

List of abbreviations	<i>i</i>
List of figures	<i>i</i>
List of tables	<i>i</i>
Introduction	<i>1</i>
Review of Literature	<i>4</i>
<i>1. Requirements of an ideal scaffold.</i>	<i>5</i>
<i>1.1. Design Considerations.</i>	<i>5</i>
<i>1.2. Design Scales.</i>	<i>9</i>
<i>2. Materials used in scaffolding.</i>	<i>11</i>
<i>2.1 Ceramic scaffolds.</i>	<i>11</i>
<i>2.2 Synthetic biomaterials for tissue engineering.</i>	<i>13</i>
<i>2.3 Natural biomaterial for tissue engineering.</i>	<i>18</i>
<i>3. Scaffold fabrication protocols.</i>	<i>28</i>
<i>4. Crosslinking and tissue engineering.</i>	<i>34</i>
<i>4.1. Methods of crosslinking.</i>	<i>35</i>
<i>4.2. Cyto/biocompatibility of crosslinkers.</i>	<i>46</i>
<i>5. Scaffold biodegradability and crosslinking.</i>	<i>48</i>
<i>6. Factors affecting mechanical behavior of scaffolds.</i>	<i>50</i>
<i>7. Chitosan gelatin hydrogel as a scaffold.</i>	<i>53</i>
<i>8. Scaffolds evaluation and characterization.</i>	<i>54</i>
<i>9. Available biodegradable Materials for Bone Repair and TE Applications.</i>	<i>63</i>
Aim of study	<i>65</i>
Material and Methods	<i>66</i>
<i>1. Material</i>	<i>66</i>
<i>2. Methods</i>	<i>69</i>
<i>2.1. Scaffolds preparation.</i>	<i>69</i>
<i>2.2. Crosslinking of scaffolds.</i>	<i>72</i>

<i>3. Testing</i>	75
<i>4. Statistical analysis.</i>	85
Results	86
<i>1. Biodegradation rate in SBF for different scaffolds.</i>	86
<i>2. Effect of crosslinking on swelling behaviour of different scaffolds.</i>	91
<i>3. Effect of increasing temperature and TGA curves of different scaffolds.</i>	93
<i>4. Mechanical behavior of different scaffolds.</i>	98
<i>5. Cell culture studies.</i>	101
Discussion	105
Summary and Conclusions	124
<i>Summary</i>	124
<i>Conclusions</i>	125
References	127
Arabic summary	

List of abbreviations:

Name	Abbreviation
Tissue engineering	TE
Three dimensional	3D
Pondus hydrogenii or potential hydrogen	pH
Chitosan	C
Gelatin	G
Degree of deacetylation	DDA
Hydroxyapatite	H
β -tricalcium phosphate	β -TCP
Biphasic calcium phosphate	BCP
Synthetic hydroxyapatites	sHA
Thermal gravimetric analysis	TGA
Nano hydroxyapatite	nHA
Human mesenchymal stem cells	hMSCs
Hematoxylin and eosin	H&E
Polycaprolactone	PCL
Food and drug administration	FDA
Poly L-lactic acid	PLLA
Poly(L-lactide- <i>co</i> -D,L-lactide)	PLDLLA
Poly-lactic- <i>co</i> -glycolic acid	PLGA
Polyglycolic acid	PGA
Polyethylene glycol	PEG
Polybutylene terephthalate	PBT

List of abbreviations

Polyurethanes	PU
polyhedral oligomeric silsesquioxane	POSS
Glycosaminoglycans	GAGs
Ultraviolet radiation	UV
Thermally induced phase separation	TIPS
arginine–glycine–aspartic acid	RGD
Computer-assisted design	CAD
Computed tomography	CT
Dehydrothermal	DHT
Riboflavin and ultraviolet-A	RFUVA
Transglutaminase	TGase
Hydrogen peroxide	H ₂ O ₂
Glutaraldehyde	gl
Genipin	gp
1-ethyl-3-(3-dimethylaminopropyl) carbodiimide	EDC
Citric acid	CA
Mineral trioxide aggregate	MTA
Dibasic sodium phosphate	DSP
Scanning electron microscopy	SEM
Atomic force microscope	AFM
Simulated body Fluid	SBF
Bone morphogenic protein	BMP
Gram	gm
Kilo Newton	kN
Dalton	Da
Hour	H

Figure 1	Chemical structure of chitosan.	23
Figure 2	Chemical structure of gelatin.	27
Figure 3	Chemical structure of genipin.	43
Figure 4	Weighing of acetic acid.	71
Figure 5	Weighing of chitosan.	71
Figure 6	Stirring of chitosan-gelatin till complete homogenization.	71
Figure 7	Weighing of scaffolds for standardization.	71
Figure 8	Freezedryer.	72
Figure 9	Chitosan gelatin scaffold after dryness.	72
Figure 10	Crosslinking with gluteraldehyde vapors.	72
Figure 11	Different trials for crosslinking samples with gluteraldehyde.	72
Figure 12	Soaking of scaffolds in gluteraldehyde using vortex mixer.	74
Figure 13	Crosslinked sample after dryness.	74
Figure 14	Grouping for genipin crosslinking.	75
Figure 15	Genipin crosslinked scaffold.	75
Figure 16	pH meter.	76
Figure 17	Samples grouping for biodegradation test.	77
Figure18	Ultrasonic water bath.	77
Figure 19	Universal testing machine.	78
Figure 20	Thermogravimetric analyzer.	79
Figure 21	Aluminum pans.	79
Figure 22	MEMO cell culture medium.	82
Figure 23	Cell suspension.	82
Figure 24	The microtiter plates.	82
Figure 25	Inverted microscope.	82
Figure 26	Hemocytometer.	84
Figure 27	Counting cells on a hemocytometer.	84

Figure 28	Gridlines of the hemocytometer.	84
Figure 29	Line chart showing the mean Biodegradation (%) for different time periods for each scaffold.	88
Figure 30	Bar chart showing the mean Biodegradation (%) for different scaffold materials.	91
Figure 31	Bar chart showing the mean swelling (%) of the prepared scaffolds.	92
Figure 32	TGA analysis of the prepared scaffolds showing weight loss for increased temperature.	95
Figure 33	TGA analysis of the prepared scaffolds showing exothermic peaks.	96
Figure 34	Comparing TGA curves for CG, CG-gl and CG-gp groups.	96
Figure 35	Comparing TGA curves for CGH1, CGH1-gl and CGH1-gp groups.	97
Figure 36	Comparing TGA curves for CGH3, CGH3-gl and CGH3-gp groups.	97
Figure 37	Bar chart showing the mean Compressive strength of the prepared scaffolds.	99
Figure 38	Bar chart showing the mean Young's Modulus of the prepared scaffolds.	100
Figure 39	Bar chart showing the mean Viability (%) of the prepared scaffolds.	102
Figure 40	Bar chart showing the mean Proliferation (%) of the prepared scaffolds.	103

Figure 41	Cells in contact with different scaffolds: A) CG, B) CG-gl with low cell proliferation, C) CG-gp with high cell proliferation.	104
Figure 42	Cells in contact with different scaffolds: A) CGH1, B) CGH1-gl with low cell proliferation, C) CGH1-gp with high cell proliferation.	104
Figure 43	Cells in contact with different scaffolds: A) CGH3 B) CGH3-gl with low cell proliferation, C) CGH3-gp with high cell proliferation.	104
Figure 44	Interaction between chitosan and gelatin.	111
Figure 45	Mechanism of crosslinking of gluteraldehyde.	112
Figure 46	Mechanism of crosslinking of genipin.	113

Table 1: Physical properties of natural bone tissue compared with other degradable materials and their applications.	63
Table 2: The chemical name, manufacturer, presentation and batch/lot number of the material.	66
Table 3: Abbreviations for different groups.	68
Table 4: Means and standard deviations (SD) for Biodegradation (%) for different time periods for each scaffold material.	87
Table 5: Means and standard deviations (SD) for Biodegradation (%) for different scaffold material.	90
Table 6: Means and standard deviations (SD) for Swelling(%) of the prepared scaffolds.	92
Table 7: Means and standard deviations (SD) for Compressive strength (MPa) of the prepared scaffolds.	98
Table 8: Means and standard deviations (SD) for Young's modulus (MPa) of the prepared scaffolds.	100
Table 9: Means and standard deviations (SD) for Viability (%) for of the prepared scaffolds.	103
Table 10: Means and standard deviations (SD) for Proliferation (%) of the prepared scaffolds.	

Introduction

Every day thousands of surgical procedures are performed to replace or repair tissues that have been damaged through disease or trauma. The developing field of tissue engineering aims to regenerate damaged tissues by combining cells from the body with highly porous scaffold biomaterials, which act as templates for tissue regeneration, to guide the growth of new tissue.¹

The biological, chemical, and architectural requirements of the materials utilized in the manufacture of scaffolds are biocompatibility, biodegradation, adequate mechanical resistance, three-dimensional structure, uniformly interconnected pores, and the ability to be mold into different shapes or dimensions. Under suitable conditions, tissue repair is favored by the bioactive characteristics of the material(s) that make up the scaffold.²⁻³

From different materials used in fabrication of scaffolds chitosan and gelatin have been studied and applied commonly to form porous sponges that render good infiltration to the cells at the implantation site.⁴

They are commonly blended for use in bone tissue engineering as this blend offers the structural similarity of chitosan to the extracellular matrix and the lower antigenicity of gelatin in comparison to collagen prior to its low cost. In addition, gelatin also retains some information signals, such as arginine–glycine–aspartic acid (RGD), which is conducive to the acceleration of cell differentiation, proliferation, and attachment to materials.⁵

Both chitosan and gelatin are biodegradable, biocompatible, and nontoxic, and they are beneficial for cell attachment and proliferation but

they lack the bioactivity offered by the combination of inorganic particles such as hydroxyapatite which can further facilitate the repair of bones. Furthermore, they both have water as their basic solvent, and this benefits freeze-drying preparation.⁶

However, the physical and mechanical stability of this blend in aqueous solutions is limited and crosslinking agents are required to increase their performances in a biological environment to offer a chance for the new bone to be formed and act as a mechanical support to tissues.⁷

Glutaraldehyde and genipin are two crosslinking agents that are commonly used with chitosan and gelatin. The amines of chitosan and gelatin can be formed into amine–amine bonds via crosslinking with glutaraldehyde and genipin enhancing their degradation rate. With the glutaraldehyde that is well known to be a strong crosslinker despite its potential cytotoxicity, and the genipin being a natural crosslinker that is safe on tissues we might be able to tailor the degradation rate of the scaffold.⁸

Despite the numerous reports on the potential applications of chitosan based scaffolds as biomaterials in clinical and the pharmaceutical field, reports on control of biodegradation that compare the effect of different crosslinkers are still lacking.⁹

For this reason in this work we were aiming to control the rate of degradation without compromising the physicochemical, thermal, mechanical properties of the scaffolds even after the incorporation of bioactive materials and affecting its role in cell proliferation.