

# Layer by Layer Three-Dimensional Tissue Epitaxy by Cell-Laden Hydrogel Droplets

SangJun Moon, Ph.D.,<sup>1,\*</sup> Syed K. Hasan, M.D.,<sup>1,\*</sup> Young S. Song, Ph.D.,<sup>1</sup>  
Feng Xu, Ph.D.,<sup>1</sup> Hasan Onur Keles, B.Sc.,<sup>1</sup> Fahim Manzur, B.Sc.,<sup>1</sup> Sohan Mikkilineni,<sup>1</sup>  
Jong Wook Hong, Ph.D.,<sup>2</sup> Jiro Nagatomi, Ph.D.,<sup>3</sup> Edward Haeggstrom, Ph.D.,<sup>4</sup>  
Ali Khademhosseini, Ph.D.,<sup>5,6</sup> and Utkan Demirci, Ph.D.<sup>1,5,6</sup>

The ability to bioengineer three-dimensional (3D) tissues is a potentially powerful approach to treat diverse diseases such as cancer, loss of tissue function, or organ failure. Traditional tissue engineering methods, however, face challenges in fabricating 3D tissue constructs that resemble the native tissue microvasculature and microarchitectures. We have developed a bioprinter that can be used to print 3D patches of smooth muscle cells (5 mm×5 mm×81 μm) encapsulated within collagen. Current inkjet printing systems suffer from loss of cell viability and clogging. To overcome these limitations, we developed a system that uses mechanical valves to print high viscosity hydrogel precursors containing cells. The bioprinting platform that we developed enables (i) printing of multilayered 3D cell-laden hydrogel structures (16.2 μm thick per layer) with controlled spatial resolution (proximal axis: 18.0 ± 7.0 μm and distal axis: 0.5 ± 4.9 μm), (ii) high-throughput droplet generation (1 s per layer, 160 droplets/s), (iii) cell seeding uniformity (26 ± 2 cells/mm<sup>2</sup> at 1 million cells/mL, 122 ± 20 cells/mm<sup>2</sup> at 5 million cells/mL, and 216 ± 38 cells/mm<sup>2</sup> at 10 million cells/mL), and (iv) long-term viability in culture (>90%, 14 days). This platform to print 3D tissue constructs may be beneficial for regenerative medicine applications by enabling the fabrication of printed replacement tissues.

## Introduction

RECENT BREAKTHROUGHS in regenerative medicine and tissue engineering present bioengineered three-dimensional (3D) tissues as an alternative treatment for various diseases such as loss of tissue function or organ failure.<sup>1–5</sup> Often in tissue engineering, two-dimensional (2D) or 3D scaffolds are employed to generate tissues *in vitro*.<sup>6,7</sup> However, engineered tissues generated in 2D cultures do not mimic the complex microarchitecture of native tissues. Also, current 3D polymer scaffolding approaches are not suitable for fabricating complex tissue structures due to lack of spatial and temporal control during cell seeding.<sup>8–10</sup> In the past decade, deposition of polymers/metals/cells by printing has gained momentum in electronic circuit board printing, printing of transistors, and tissue printing.<sup>11,12</sup> Printing technology shows promise in overcoming the limitations associated with seeding cells on scaffolds. For example, bio-

printing methods, such as inkjet<sup>13–15</sup> and laser printing<sup>16–19</sup> techniques, have been employed to control cell placement in 2D or 3D. However, some challenges still remain in existing tissue printing systems such as low cell viability, loss of cellular functionality, and clogging.<sup>20–22</sup> Cell printing also requires extracellular matrix (ECM) to build 3D structures for long-term culture. However, the current piezo-based inkjet printing system is not easily adapted for high viscosity solutions such as collagen ECM, since it requires high impact force to generate droplets. To overcome these limitations, alginate-based cell printing<sup>23,24</sup> and 3D fiber deposition<sup>25</sup> approaches were used to encapsulate cells in ECM. Alginate-based cell printing is adapted to the conventional piezo-based bioprinter to prevent the rapid clogging issues by printing a low viscosity calcium chloride as crosslinking agent. However, for gelation the calcium must diffuse into alginate, which limits the droplet placement resolution. During the diffusion process, a change in pH also affects cell

<sup>1</sup>Bio-Acoustic MEMS in Medicine (BAMM) Laboratory, Center for Biomedical Engineering, Brigham and Women's Hospital, Harvard Medical School, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

<sup>2</sup>Department of Mechanical Engineering, Materials Research and Education Center, Auburn University, Auburn, Alabama.

<sup>3</sup>Department of Bioengineering, 313 Rhodes Engineering Research Center, Clemson University, Clemson, South Carolina.

<sup>4</sup>Department of Physics, University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland.

<sup>5</sup>Harvard-Massachusetts Institutes of Technology Health Sciences and Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

<sup>6</sup>Center for Biomedical Engineering, Brigham and Women's Hospital, Harvard Medical School, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

\*These authors contributed equally to this work.

viability.<sup>23</sup> The other approach uses the squeezing of ECM precursors from the nozzle to eliminate clogging. This approach may be limited in terms of low resolution and throughput.

An emerging approach to enhance bioprinting is to use a nozzle-free acoustic ejector, which prevents clogging during droplet generation.<sup>26–28</sup> Another approach features a mechanical valve ejector that uses a pressure source to overcome the surface tension of high viscosity liquids.<sup>29–31</sup> This mechanical ejector was applied for cryopreservation of cells in droplets and for cell printing. In this article, we built on the system by creating a cell-laden hydrogel droplet deposition system that can create 3D structures made of collagen, a temperature-sensitive gel. We adopted the system to evaluate a model structure using bladder smooth muscle cells (SMCs) to engineer tissues. We demonstrate that this bioprinting system can be used to (i) pattern cell-laden hydrogel droplets with microscale resolution, (ii) print hydrogel droplets containing cells in a rapid and uniform manner, and (iii) maintain long-term cell viability.

## Materials and Methods


### SMC collagen encapsulation

Primary bladder SMCs from Sprague Dawley rat were harvested according to a previously established protocol.<sup>32</sup>

SMC culture medium was prepared by mixing 445 mL Dulbecco's modified Eagle's medium (Gibco, Carlsbad, CA, 11965-092), 50 mL fetal bovine serum (Gibco, 10439-024), and 5 mL Pen/Strep (Sigma, St. Louis, MO, P4333) through a sterile filter (500 mL, Express Plus 0.22  $\mu$ m membrane, SCGPU05RE). SMCs were cultured under standard conditions (37°C, 5% CO<sub>2</sub>) in a humidified incubator (Forma Scientific, Waltham, MA, CO<sub>2</sub> water jacketed incubator). After the culture reached 80% confluency, cells were trypsinized (10 $\times$ , 0.5 trypsin-EDTA; Gibco, 15400), washed, and resuspended in SMC medium to be mixed with collagen. Collagen solution was prepared by mixing 250  $\mu$ L type I bovine collagen (MP Biomedicals, Solon, OH) with 50  $\mu$ L sterile H<sub>2</sub>O, 50  $\mu$ L 10 $\times$  phosphate-buffered saline (PBS) (DPBS, Carlsbad, CA, 14190), 50  $\mu$ L fetal bovine serum, 50  $\mu$ L SMC medium, and 50  $\mu$ L NaOH (0.1 M, Sigma, 55881) and kept at 4°C before being mixed with SMCs (1:1 ratio).

### 3D printing using a droplet ejector

The droplet generation process was adjusted by controlling nitrogen gas pressure, valve opening duration, and cell concentration (Fig. 1). To fabricate a collagen-coated substrate, agarose (10% v/v mixture with distilled water and agarose powder; Fisher, Pittsburgh, PA, BP1360-100) was poured on the bare Petri dish (Falcon, Pittsburgh, PA,



**FIG. 1.** Illustration of cell encapsulating droplet printing onto a substrate. (a) Image of the cell printing setup enclosed in a sterile field (Cleanroom International, Grand Rapids, MI, 13202). (b) Schematic of droplet ejector shows cells and collagen mixture flowing into the valve driven by constant air pressure. Mixture of cells and collagen solution was loaded into a 10 mL syringe reservoir. (c) Signal flow chart shows that the *xyz* stage is controlled by a controller that was synchronized with a pulse generator and a control PC. With programmed sequences to build a three-dimensional (3D) structure, the apparatus can control ejection conditions, that is, stage speed, pressure, valve on/off frequency, and valve opening duration. Color images available online at [www.liebertonline.com/ten](http://www.liebertonline.com/ten).

35-3002) to enhance adhesion between the Petri dish and collagen. Collagen solution was then manually spread on the agarose surface and gelled. The cell-laden collagen droplets were printed onto the collagen-coated substrate. To maintain the droplet size, we kept the valve opening duration at 60  $\mu$ s and nitrogen gas pressure at 34.4 kPa. To control the cell density in droplets, we used three different cell concentrations,  $1 \times 10^6$ ,  $5 \times 10^6$ , and  $10 \times 10^6$  cells/mL. The cell viability before and after printing was evaluated using a Live/Dead kit (Invitrogen, Carlsbad, CA, L3224). The staining solution was prepared with 0.5  $\mu$ L of (1 mg/mL) calcein AM and 2  $\mu$ L of (1 mg/mL) ethidium homodimer solution in 1 mL of PBS for 1 min. The staining solution was poured onto printed structures and incubated for 10 min at 37°C. The stained cells in the patch were manually counted under a fluorescent microscope (Eclipse Ti-s; Nikon, Melville, NY).

### Epitaxial layering

Using the valve-based droplet ejector setup that was previously described,<sup>29,30</sup> cells were ejected on the prepared substrate. Using  $1 \times 10^6$ ,  $5 \times 10^6$ , or  $10 \times 10^6$  cells/mL, the 10 mL syringe attached to the ejector was filled with the desired cell/collagen suspension. The ejector and collagen were kept cool with liquid nitrogen (LN<sub>2</sub>, ~5°C in gas phase) vapor to minimize viscosity changes of collagen that can solidify at room temperature. Each printed layer was gelled by incubation at 37°C for 5 min. Subsequently, another layer of collagen was printed onto the first layer. This process of layering was repeated to create 3D tissue structures.

### Staining and microscopy

Printed SMC patches were gelled at 37°C for 5 min before SMC medium was added and incubated overnight. After 24 h, medium was aspirated off, and printed patches were washed three times with PBS at room temperature and fixed in 2 mL of 4% paraformaldehyde (Sigma). These patches were then rinsed with PBS three times and permeabilized with 1 mL of detergent solution (mixture of 4% bovine serum albumin and 0.1% TritonX-100 in PBS solution; Sigma). The specimens were incubated with primary antibody (actin, connexin-43, and mouse monoclonal immunoglobulin G [IgG], 1:50 dilution in PBS; Santa Cruz Biotechnology, Santa Cruz, CA) and 5  $\mu$ g/mL nuclear stain 4',6-diamidino-2-phenylindole (Invitrogen) at 37°C for 40 min. Secondary antibodies (goat anti-mouse IgG fluorescein isothiocyanate and IgG R, 1:50 dilution in PBS; Santa Cruz Biotechnology) were also incubated at 25°C for 40 min. After each incubation process, excess antibody was washed off, and stained SMC patches were imaged under the fluorescent microscope (Eclipse Ti-s; Nikon). The number of cells per square millimeter was plotted using SigmaPlot<sup>®</sup> that depicted cell distribution as a contour plot of an entire patch.

## Results and Discussions


Uniform cell seeding density is critical for tissue engineering, since it controls the average cell-to-cell distances that influence cell-to-cell communication. The overall morphological characteristics of a tissue construct depend on this uniformity. To achieve 3D tissue structures with spatial control of cell seeding, we characterized (i) the number of

cells per droplet as a function of cell loading concentration, (ii) droplet printing precision, (iii) overlapping cell-laden collagen droplets to fabricate seamless line structures, and (iv) number of cells per unit area in a printed patch.


The mechanical valve was attached to a micrometer precision *xyz* stage that enabled 3D spatial motion. The movement of the stage was synchronized with droplet generation signal resulting in 3D patterning capability. The platform spatially and temporally controlled the droplet placement (Fig. 1). First, we evaluated the position and density of cells in the biomaterial by printing cell-laden droplets in multiple layers. The cell-laden collagen droplets landed onto a Petri dish surface that was coated with collagen gel (Fig. 2a). This controlled placement allowed the system to deposit a cell-laden hydrogel droplet epitaxially in 2D and 3D using droplets with  $650 \pm 18 \mu$ m spread diameter on the surface. Uniform cell seeding was investigated by characterizing where droplets land onto a surface during droplet generation and *xyz* stage movement along a temporal line (distal axis, Fig. 2a). The landing locations and placement variation ( $\delta x$  and  $\delta y$ ) of droplets determine the overlap between droplets when patterning lines and patches in 3D. The droplet ejection directionality was the major determinant of this variation. The system achieves  $0.5 \pm 4.9$  and  $18.0 \pm 7.0 \mu$ m variation in the *x* (distal) and *y* (proximal) directions, respectively. These variations were negligible compared to the  $650 \pm 18 \mu$ m spread droplet diameter. To create layered structures using an intermediate collagen layer was printed between the first layer of droplets and second layer of droplets (Fig. 2b). The adjacent droplets gel together and form a single seamless layer. Further, a secondary droplet array was printed on top of the gelled layers to pattern droplets in a 3D micro-architecture (Fig. 2c). The cell-laden collagen droplet in the first layer was printed at a lower cell concentration on the substrate than the collagen droplet printed in the secondary layer to depict a layered structure.

Second, we characterized the number of cells per droplet at three cell loading densities and the cell viability of the printing platform (Fig. 2d). It showed  $6 \pm 1$  cells per droplet at  $1 \times 10^6$  cells/mL,  $29 \pm 5$  cells per droplet at  $5 \times 10^6$  cells/mL, and  $54 \pm 8$  cells per droplet at  $10 \times 10^6$  cells/mL. The number of cells per droplet was repeatable over ejected droplets at various cell loading concentrations. Further, the number of cells per droplet increased with increasing cell loading density in the ejector reservoir. The number of cells that can be packed in a single droplet does not increase linearly with the loading density. Consequently, it is harder to pack more cells into a fixed droplet volume. To better understand cell seeding density, the mean and standard deviation for number of cells per droplet were investigated. Smaller standard deviation can be translated into a more uniform seeding density as cells are patterned to create 3D constructs. The platform also printed cells with high viability  $94.8 \pm 0.8\%$  compared to the culture flask viability. The viability was calculated by the ratio of pre-ejection cell viability ( $96.1 \pm 1.9\%$ ) and post-ejection cell viability ( $91.1 \pm 2.3\%$ ) by counting 250 printed cells (Fig. 2d). The results showed that system precision, printing cell viability, and cells per droplet uniformity sufficed to establish controlled cell seeding density with high cell viability.

The third step was to print overlapping collagen droplets to pattern cell-laden collagen lines as we build a 3D structure.



**FIG. 2.** Printing platform for 3D cell-laden droplet printing. (a) Cell-laden hydrogel droplets are generated by a mechanical valve that is operated by a controlled pulse width (open period of the valve) and a frequency (on/off time of the valve) to generate required volume and timed placement of droplets onto a substrate, respectively (Fig. 1). Droplets are printed to form multiple layers of collagen; smooth muscle cell (SMC)-laden collagen droplet array (gray color sphere), intermediate collagen layer, and top SMC-laden droplet layer (blue color sphere). Image of a printed array of collagen droplets (b) and image of a multilayered array on a slide glass (c). A gray-colored droplet indicates the bottom layer of collagen shown in (c).  $\delta x$  and  $\delta y$  are measured between centers of each droplet in different layers. Mean and standard deviation values of  $x$  (distal axis) and  $y$  (proximal axis; moving axis) directional variations were  $0.5 \pm 4.9$  and  $18.0 \pm 7.0 \mu\text{m}$ , respectively. (d) Number of cells per droplet and cell viability as a function of loading concentrations. Mean and standard deviation values of encapsulated cells were  $6 \pm 1$ ,  $29 \pm 5$ , and  $54 \pm 8$  cells per droplet in  $1 \times 10^6$ ,  $5 \times 10^6$ , and  $10 \times 10^6$  cells/mL, respectively. The cell printing platform showed  $94.8 \pm 0.8\%$  average cell viability for three different concentrations compared to the culture flask. Each cell loading concentration had  $94.9 \pm 1.7\%$ ,  $95.8 \pm 1.3\%$ , and  $93.5 \pm 3.0\%$  cell viability. Scale bar:  $200 \mu\text{m}$ . Color images available online at [www.liebertonline.com/ten](http://www.liebertonline.com/ten).




**FIG. 3.** Printing of cells in lines of hydrogel microstructures. (a) Illustration of printed droplets in a line pattern. Top layer of the line pattern form a 3D structure like a bridge separated by a spacing layer of hydrogel. (b, c) Dot and solid lines represent the edge of bottom and top collagen lines; dried collagen line pattern in (b) and multilayered line pattern in (c). (d, e) Magnified images show cross-patterned lines on separate layers. The top and bottom layers are shown with two focused images: bottom focused image in (d) and top focused image in (e). Scale bar: 200  $\mu\text{m}$ . Color images available online at [www.liebertonline.com/ten](http://www.liebertonline.com/ten).

An illustration describing placement of droplets in a printed line pattern is shown by overhanging printed cell-line bridges in separate layers (Fig. 3a). The overlap between the adjacent droplets was maintained at 50% by the temporally controlled ejection. To test the system operation, two collagen lines were printed side by side in a single layer (Fig. 3b), and multiple lines were printed within separate layers of a

3D structure in a crossover pattern (Fig. 3c). These cell-laden collagen lines were placed on top of each other in the  $z$  direction by printing a cell-less collagen layer within between two layers. The magnified images of the cross-pattern bridges of printed cell lines are shown in Figures 3d and e.


Finally, native tissue comprises multiple cell layers. To mimic such tissue architecture, the bioprinting system




**FIG. 4.** Focal images of a printed 3D SMC tissue construct and two-dimensional cell seeding distribution. (a) Illustration of 3D patch imaging. The distance between each imaged layer is  $16.2\ \mu\text{m}$  which is controlled by timed imaging and moving speed of a z-axis knob (Fig. 5). (b–e) Focal images of 3D patch layers; top layer of printed collagen in (b), second layer of SMC patch in (c), intermediate collagen layer in (d), and first layer of SMC patch in (e). (f) Cell distribution of two-dimensional patch of 1, 5, and 10 million cells/mL concentration after printing (day 0). Each patch size is  $5 \times 5\ \text{mm}$ . Average number and standard deviation of printed cells for each patch were  $26 \pm 2\ \text{cells}/\text{mm}^2$  (average  $\pm$  standard deviation) at  $1 \times 10^6\ \text{cells}/\text{mL}$ ,  $122 \pm 20\ \text{cells}/\text{mm}^2$  at  $5 \times 10^6\ \text{cells}/\text{mL}$ , and  $216 \pm 38\ \text{cells}/\text{mm}^2$  at  $10 \times 10^6\ \text{cells}/\text{mL}$ . The number of cells is represented in log scale for comparison between  $1 \times 10^6$  and  $10 \times 10^6\ \text{cells}/\text{mL}$ . Scale bar:  $100\ \mu\text{m}$ . Color images available online at [www.liebertonline.com/ten](http://www.liebertonline.com/ten).

employs a 3D printing capability using an epitaxial method (layer by layer) (Fig. 4a). To print smooth muscle tissue constructs, cell-laden collagen droplets were patterned on top of earlier printed layers. The challenge of 3D patterning was overcome by first gelling the initial printed layer and then depositing additional cell-laden hydrogel droplets on top of the previously printed layer like in layer-by-layer epitaxy. First, a bottom cell-less collagen layer was placed in agarose. Then, on top of this layer a cell-laden collagen layer was printed. This process was repeated creating five cell-less


and two cell-laden collagen layers ( $81\ \mu\text{m}$  thick). To observe the multiple layers, a motorized system was created that steps the microscope focus (Fig. 5). Images were taken at each focus point with  $16.2\ \mu\text{m}$  steps (Fig. 4b–e). The printed 3D multilayer SMC-laden collagen construct was stained with 4',6-diamidino-2-phenylindole. Focal images show printed layers with stained cells and without cells. The cell-laden layers (Fig. 4c, e) show stained circular cellular nuclei, whereas the cell-less collagen layers only show background due to staining of the gel (Fig. 4b, d). The described epitaxial



**FIG. 5.** Focal 3D imaging method using a motorized microscope. A direct current motor was connected to control the z-axis knob of a fluorescence microscope body by a timing belt. Each image was taken at a scheduled time by a charge-coupled device camera control software. The distance of each layer was calculated by the reference index of the microscope ( $65\ \mu\text{m}/360^\circ$ ), motor speed ( $180^\circ/\text{s}$ ), and imaging time control ( $0.5\ \text{s}/\text{image}$ ). These conditions gave a resolution of  $16.2\ \mu\text{m}$  separation between each image for an  $81\text{-}\mu\text{m}$  thick patch (five layers). Color images available online at [www.liebertonline.com/ten](http://www.liebertonline.com/ten).



**FIG. 6.** Cell distribution of printed SMC patch in culture. (a–d) Quantification of cell distribution and cell proliferation within a single layer of printed SMC patch: day(s) 1 in (a), 2 in (b), 4 in (c), and 7 in (d) for  $5 \times 10^6$  cells/mL. Each patch size is  $5 \times 5$  mm ( $xy$ -axis index). The cell distribution of printed cells for each patch was  $289 \pm 47$  cells/ $\text{mm}^2$  (average  $\pm$  standard deviation) in (a),  $489 \pm 48$  cells/ $\text{mm}^2$  in (b),  $897 \pm 125$  cells/ $\text{mm}^2$  in (c), and  $1183 \pm 236$  cells/ $\text{mm}^2$  in (d). Color images available online at [www.liebertonline.com/ten](http://www.liebertonline.com/ten).



**FIG. 7.** Characterization of printed SMC patch in culture. The proliferation graph shows increasing number of cells over a period of time in collagen patches for three initial cell concentrations ( $C_{init}$ ), that is,  $1 \times 10^6$ ,  $5 \times 10^6$ , and  $10 \times 10^6$  cells/mL. (a) The total number of cells per square millimeter in three different initial printing concentrations were measured from day 0 to 7. Inset represents an enlarged figure of  $1 \times 10^6$  cells/mL initial cell loading density. After 7 days of culturing ( $C_{sat}$ ),  $270 \pm 25$ ,  $1183 \pm 236$ , and  $2097 \pm 287$  cells/ $\text{mm}^2$  were observed for  $1 \times 10^6$ ,  $5 \times 10^6$ , and  $10 \times 10^6$  cells/mL, respectively. The inflection time ( $t_{inflection}$ ) of sigmoid regression curves was 2.6 days for  $5 \times 10^6$  cells/mL and 3.2 days for  $10 \times 10^6$  cells/mL. In case of  $26 \pm 1.7$  cells/ $\text{mm}^2$  initial cell loading density, proliferation rate of cells showed an exponential increment. The unknown factor for cell proliferation  $b$  is a factor of each exponent and sigmoid regression functions, 0.2 for  $1 \times 10^6$  cells/mL, 1.3 for  $5 \times 10^6$  cells/mL, and 1.7 for  $10 \times 10^6$  cells/mL. (b–e) Stained SMC patch images for  $1 \times 10^6$  cells/mL concentration after day(s) in culture: day 4 culture of SMC patch stained with 4',6-diamidino-2-phenylindole (DAPI) (blue) and actin (green) under a light microscope (10 $\times$ ) in (b), day 7 SMCs stained with DAPI and actin in (c), SMCs stained with DAPI (blue) at day 14 in culture in (d), SMCs stained with DAPI and connexin-43 (red) at day 14 in culture in (e). Scale bar: 100  $\mu\text{m}$ . Color images available online at [www.liebertonline.com/ten](http://www.liebertonline.com/ten).



method was used to observe cell seeding densities within a single printed layer at three different cell densities,  $1 \times 10^6$ ,  $5 \times 10^6$ , and  $10 \times 10^6$  cells/mL (Fig. 4f). As shown, the cell seeding density of the printed patches was uniform right after printing:  $216 \pm 38$  cells/mm<sup>2</sup> at  $10 \times 10^6$  cells/mL,  $122 \pm 20$  cells/mm<sup>2</sup> at  $5 \times 10^6$  cells/mL, and  $26 \pm 2$  cells/mm<sup>2</sup> at  $1 \times 10^6$  cells/mL.

The patches were imaged after printing, and the number of cells was averaged per square millimeter in each image for an entire patch area of 25 mm<sup>2</sup>. We validated the distribution, uniformity, and variation of cell seeding density by the printing method. The topographic color coding of the top view of these patches reveals the cell distribution over 1–7 days for  $5 \times 10^6$  cells/mL cell printing concentration (Fig. 6a–d). The color coding indicates the cell concentration in that area (see the legend). The increased cell seeding density correlates with the increased number of cells per droplet (Fig. 7a). This characterization is crucial, since it builds the logical tie between a cell-laden hydrogel droplet and a printed 3D tissue construct. However, the proliferation rate is not linear as a function of cell density and culture time. The rates show a sigmoid tendency as a function of culture duration, which indicates that initial high proliferation rates decrease as the number of cells per unit area increases. The inflection time,  $t_{\text{inflection}}$ , of the sigmoid regression curves were 2.6 days for  $5 \times 10^6$  cells/mL and 3.2 days  $10 \times 10^6$  cells/mL. In case of  $26 \pm 1.7$  cells/mm<sup>2</sup> initial cell loading density, the proliferation rate of cells showed an exponential increment. The exponent and the sigmoid regression functions feature unknown factor,  $b$ , which is related to cell proliferation, 0.2 for  $1 \times 10^6$  cells/mL, 1.3 for  $5 \times 10^6$  cells/mL, and 1.7 for  $10 \times 10^6$  cells/mL. The number of cells per droplet and the precise positioning of these droplets in a 3D architecture determine the cell seeding density of the patch before the long-term culture. Such high-throughput capability and cell seeding control to create 3D tissue constructs allow potentially rapid characterization and optimization of tissues. Printing a  $5 \times 5$  mm patch takes 10 s with 160 Hz ejection frequency. The total time becomes 10 min including the gelation time to build a secondary layer. This processing time indicates the high-throughput aspect of the system compared to the conventional scaffold methods that take 1–2 h to build a single patch. Cells are also observed to adhere and spread within the printed cell-laden collagen layer (Fig. 7b–e). In long-term culture, cells were observed to be viable as demonstrated by histological stains. During days 4 and 7, the printed cells expressed actin after the printing and culturing steps (Fig. 7b, c). Patches on the 14th day of culture expressed connexin-43 (Fig. 7d, e). This marks a positive turning point for the printed patches and indicates future possibilities for tissue engineering by this 3D bioprinting platform technology. This technology employed for tissue engineering and regenerative medicine could create avenues for functional tissues and could create a clinical impact by enhancing the quality of life for patients.

Briefly, we presented a 3D cell patterning platform that allows efficient cell–matrix deposition with microscale spatial resolution and uniform initial cell seeding density, while maintaining cell viability over long-term culture. This high-throughput system to print tissue constructs from microdroplets has the potential to enable future therapies by providing (i) uniform cell seeding, (ii) 3D cell patterning layer by layer, and (iii) viability over long-term culture.

## Acknowledgments

We would like to thank The Randolph Hearst Foundation and the department of Medicine, Brigham and Women's Hospital for the Young Investigators in Medicine Award. Y.S., F.X., and U.D. were also partially supported by R21 (EB007707). This work was performed at the BAMB Labs at the HST-Brigham and Women's Hospital Center for Bioengineering, Harvard Medical School.

## Disclosure Statement

No competing financial interests exist.

## References

- Langer, R., and Vacanti, J.P. Tissue engineering. *Science* **260**, 920, 1993.
- Atala, A., Bauer, S.B., Soker, S., Yoo, J.J., and Retik, A.B. Tissue-engineered autologous bladders for patients needing cystoplasty. *Lancet* **367**, 1241, 2006.
- Macchiarini, P., Jungebluth, P., Go, T., Asnaghi, M.A., Rees, L.E., Cogan, T.A., Dodson, A., Martorell, J., Bellini, S., Parnigotto, P.P., Dickinson, S.C., Hollander, A.P., Mantero, S., Conconi, M.T., and Birchall, M.A. Clinical transplantation of a tissue-engineered airway. *Lancet* **372**, 2023, 2008.
- Khademhosseini, A., Langer, R., Borenstein, J., and Vacanti, J.P. Microscale technologies for tissue engineering and biology. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **103**, 2480, 2006.
- Nerem, R.M. Cellular engineering. *Ann Biomed Eng* **19**, 529, 1991.
- Glicklis, R., Shapiro, L., Agbaria, R., Merchuk, J.C., and Cohen, S. Hepatocyte behavior within three-dimensional porous alginate scaffolds. *Biotechnol Bioeng* **67**, 344, 2000.
- Wang, X., Yan, Y., Pan, Y., Xiong, Z., Liu, H., Cheng, J., Liu, F., Lin, F., Wu, R., Zhang, R., and Lu, Q. Generation of three-dimensional hepatocyte/gelatin structures with rapid prototyping system. *Tissue Eng* **12**, 83, 2006.
- Yan, Y., Wang, X., Pan, Y., Liu, H., Cheng, J., Xiong, Z., Lin, F., Wu, R., Zhang, R., and Lu, Q. Fabrication of viable tissue-engineered constructs with 3D cell-assembly technique. *Biomaterials* **26**, 5864, 2005.
- Ling, Y., Rubin, J., Deng, Y., Huang, C., Demirci, U., Karp, J.M., and Khademhosseini, A. A cell-laden microfluidic hydrogel. *Lab Chip* **7**, 756, 2007.
- Jakab, K., Norotte, C., Damon, B., Marga, F., Neagu, A., Besch-Williford, C.L., Kachurin, A., Church, K.H., Park, H., Mironov, V., Markwald, R., Vunjak-Novakovic, G., and Forgacs, G. Tissue Engineering by self-assembly of cells printed into topologically defined structures. *Tissue Eng A* **14**, 413, 2008.
- Yan, H., Chen, Z., Zheng, Y., Newman, C., Quinn, J.R., Dotz, F., Kastler, M., and Facchetti, A. A high-mobility electron-transporting polymer for printed transistors. *Nature* **457**, 679, 2009.
- Calvert, P. Materials science. Printing cells. *Science* **318**, 208, 2007.
- Nakamura, M., Kobayashi, A., Takagi, F., Watanabe, A., Hiruma, Y., Ohuchi, K., Iwasaki, Y., Horie, M., Morita, I., and Takatani, S. Biocompatible inkjet printing technique for designed seeding of individual living cells. *Tissue Eng* **11**, 1658, 2005.
- Mironov, V. Toward human organ printing: Charleston Bioprinting Symposium. *ASAIO J* **52**, e27, 2006.
- Boland, T., Xu, T., Damon, B., and Cui, X. Application of inkjet printing to tissue engineering. *Biotechnol J* **1**, 910, 2006.

16. Ringeisen, B.R., Kim, H., Barron, J.A., Krizman, D.B., Christy, D.B., Jackman, S., Auyeung, R.Y.C., and Spargo, B.J. Laser printing of pluripotent embryonal carcinoma cells. *Tissue Eng* **10**, 483, 2004.
17. Ringeisen, B.R., Othon, C.M., Barron, J.A., Young, D., and Spargo, B.J. Jet-based methods to print living cells. *Biotechnol J* **1**, 930, 2006.
18. Barron, J.A., Wu, P., Ladouceur, H.D., and Ringeisen, B.R. Biological laser printing: a novel technique for creating heterogeneous 3-dimensional cell patterns. *Biomed Microdevices* **6**, 139, 2004.
19. Chang, R., Nam, J., and Sun, W. Direct cell writing of 3D microorgan for *in vitro* pharmacokinetic model. *Tissue Eng C Methods* **14**, 157, 2008.
20. Sikavitsas, V.I., Bancroft, G.N., Holtorf, H.L., Jansen, J.A., and Mikos, A.G. Mineralized matrix deposition by marrow stromal osteoblasts in 3D perfusion culture increases with increasing fluid shear forces. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **100**, 14683, 2003.
21. Martin, I., Wendt, D., and Heberer, M. The role of bioreactors in tissue engineering. *Trends Biotechnol* **22**, 80, 2004.
22. Xu, T., Gregory, C.A., Molnar, P., Cui, X., Jalota, S., Bhaduri, S.B., and Boland, T. Viability and electrophysiology of neural cell structures generated by the inkjet printing method. *Biomaterials* **27**, 3580, 2006.
23. Nakamura, M., Nishiyama, Y., Henmi, C., Iwanaga, S., Nakagawa, H., Yamaguchi, K., Akita, K., Mochizuki, S., and Takiura, K. Ink Jet Three-dimensional digital fabrication for biological tissue manufacturing: analysis of alginate microgel beads produced by ink jet droplets for three dimensional tissue fabrication. *J Imaging Sci Technol* **52**, 1, 2008.
24. Yuichi, N., Makoto, N., Chizuka, H., Kumiko, Y., Shuichi, M., Hidemoto, N., and Koki, T. Development of a Three-dimensional bioprinter: construction of cell supporting structures using hydrogel and state-of-the-art inkjet technology. *J Biomech Eng* **131**, 035001, 2009.
25. Fedorovich, N.E., de Wijn, J.R., Verbout, A.J., Alblas, J., and Dhert, W.J.A. Three-dimensional fiber deposition of cell-laden, viable, patterned constructs for bone tissue printing. *Tissue Eng A* **14**, 127, 2008.
26. Demirci, U., Yaralioglu, G.G., Haeggstrom, E., Percin, G., Ergun, S., and Khuri-Yakub, B.T. Acoustically actuated flexensional SixNy and single-crystal silicon 2-D micro-machined ejector arrays. *IEEE Trans Semicond Manuf* **17**, 517, 2004.
27. Demirci, U. Acoustic picoliter droplets for emerging applications in semiconductor industry and biotechnology. *J Microelectromech Syst* **15**, 957, 2006.
28. Demirci, U., and Montesano, G. Single cell epitaxy by acoustic picolitre droplets. *Lab Chip* **7**, 1139, 2007.
29. Demirci, U., and Montesano, G. Cell encapsulating droplet vitrification. *Lab Chip* **7**, 1428, 2007.
30. Moon, S., Lin, P.A., Keles, H.O., Yoo, S.S., and Demirci, U. Cell encapsulation by droplets. *J Vis Exp* **8**, 316, 2007.
31. Lee, W., Debasitis, J.C., Lee, V.K., Lee, J.-H., Fischer, K., Edminster, K., Park, J.-K., and Yoo, S.-S. Multi-layered culture of human skin fibroblasts and keratinocytes through three-dimensional freeform fabrication. *Biomaterials* **30**, 1587, 2009.
32. Roby, T., Olsen, S., and Nagatomi, J. Effect of sustained tension on bladder smooth muscle cells in three-dimensional culture. *Ann Biomed Eng* **36**, 1744, 2008.

Address correspondence to:

*Utkan Demirci, Ph.D.*

*Bio-Acoustic MEMS in Medicine (BAMM) Laboratory*

*Center for Biomedical Engineering*

*Brigham and Women's Hospital*

*Harvard Medical School*

*Cambridge, MA 02139*

*E-mail: udemirci@rics.bwh.harvard.edu*

*Received: March 16, 2009*

*Accepted: July 8, 2009*

*Online Publication Date: August 17, 2009*

**This article has been cited by:**

1. Stuart Williams, James Hoying Adipose Stromal Vascular Fraction Cells for Vascularization of Engineered Tissues 59-82. [[CrossRef](#)]
2. Hao Qi, Guoyou Huang, Yu Long Han, Wang Lin, Xiujun Li, Shuqi Wang, Tian Jian Lu, Feng Xu. 2014. In vitro spatially organizing the differentiation in individual multicellular stem cell aggregates. *Critical Reviews in Biotechnology* 1-12. [[CrossRef](#)]
3. Umut A. Gurkan, Rami El Assal, Simin E. Yildiz, Yuree Sung, Alexander J. Trachtenberg, Winston P. Kuo, Utkan Demirci. 2014. Engineering Anisotropic Biomimetic Fibrocartilage Microenvironment by Bioprinting Mesenchymal Stem Cells in Nanoliter Gel Droplets. *Molecular Pharmaceutics* 11, 2151-2159. [[CrossRef](#)]
4. Savas Tasoglu, Umut Gurkan, Sinan Guven, Utkan Demirci Organ Printing and Cell Encapsulation 491-527. [[CrossRef](#)]
5. Luiz E Bertassoni, Juliana C Cardoso, Vijayan Manoharan, Ana L Cristino, Nupura S Bhise, Wesleyan A Araujo, Pinar Zorlutuna, Nihal E Vrana, Amir M Ghaemmaghami, Mehmet R Dokmeci, Ali Khademhosseini. 2014. Direct-write bioprinting of cell-laden methacrylated gelatin hydrogels. *Biofabrication* 6:2, 024105. [[CrossRef](#)]
6. Chengyang Wang, Zhenyu Tang, Yu Zhao, Rui Yao, Lingsong Li, Wei Sun. 2014. Three-dimensional in vitro cancer models: a short review. *Biofabrication* 6:2, 022001. [[CrossRef](#)]
7. Wei Zhu, Christopher O'Brien, Joseph R O'Brien, Lijie Grace Zhang. 2014. 3D nano/microfabrication techniques and nanobiomaterials for neural tissue regeneration. *Nanomedicine* 9, 859-875. [[CrossRef](#)]
8. B.D. Walters, J.P. Stegemann. 2014. Strategies for directing the structure and function of three-dimensional collagen biomaterials across length scales. *Acta Biomaterialia* 10:4, 1488-1501. [[CrossRef](#)]
9. Roger D. Kamm, Rashid Bashir. 2014. Creating Living Cellular Machines. *Annals of Biomedical Engineering* 42:2, 445-459. [[CrossRef](#)]
10. Tao Xu, Jorge I. Rodriguez-Devora, Daniel Reyna-Soriano, Mohammad Bhuyan, Lei Zhu, Kun Wang, Yuyu Yuan Principles of Bioprinting Technology 67-79. [[CrossRef](#)]
11. Matthew McCune, Ashkan Shafiee, Gabor Forgacs, Ioan Kosztin. 2014. Predictive modeling of post bioprinting structure formation. *Soft Matter* 10:11, 1790. [[CrossRef](#)]
12. B. Guillotin, S. Catros, V. Keriquel, A. Souquet, A. Fontaine, M. Remy, J.-C. Fricain, F. Guillemot Rapid prototyping of complex tissues with laser assisted bioprinting (LAB) 156-175. [[CrossRef](#)]
13. V. Tran, X. Wen Rapid prototyping technologies for tissue regeneration 97-155. [[CrossRef](#)]
14. Yong Wang, Ping Wu, Zhaofeng Luo, Yuting Li, Meixiang Liao, Yue Li, Liqun He. 2014. Controllable geometry-mediated droplet fission using "off-the-shelf" capillary microfluidics device. *RSC Advances* 4, 31184. [[CrossRef](#)]
15. Andreas Blaeser, Daniela F. Duarte Campos, Michael Weber, Sabine Neuss, Benjamin Theek, Horst Fischer, Willi Jahnen-Dechent. 2013. Biofabrication Under Fluorocarbon: A Novel Freeform Fabrication Technique to Generate High Aspect Ratio Tissue-Engineered Constructs. *BioResearch Open Access* 2:5, 374-384. [[Abstract](#)] [[Full Text HTML](#)] [[Full Text PDF](#)] [[Full Text PDF with Links](#)]
16. J. Carlos Rodríguez-Cabello, A. Fernández-Colino, M. J. Piña, M. Alonso, M. Santos, A. M. Testera Bioactive and Smart Hydrogel Surfaces 239-268. [[CrossRef](#)]
17. Christopher Moraes, Arlyne B. Simon, Andrew J. Putnam, Shuichi Takayama. 2013. Aqueous two-phase printing of cell-containing contractile collagen microgels. *Biomaterials* . [[CrossRef](#)]
18. Jos Malda, Jetze Visser, Ferry P. Melchels, Tomasz Jüngst, Wim E. Hennink, Wouter J. A. Dhert, Jürgen Groll, Dietmar W. Hutmacher. 2013. 25th Anniversary Article: Engineering Hydrogels for Biofabrication. *Advanced Materials* 25:36, 5011-5028. [[CrossRef](#)]
19. David Petrak, Ehsan Atefi, Liya Yin, William Chilian, Hossein Tavana. 2013. Automated, spatio-temporally controlled cell microprinting with polymeric aqueous biphasic system. *Biotechnology and Bioengineering* n/a-n/a. [[CrossRef](#)]
20. Ali Tamayol, Mohsen Akbari, Nasim Annabi, Arghya Paul, Ali Khademhosseini, David Juncker. 2013. Fiber-based tissue engineering: Progress, challenges, and opportunities. *Biotechnology Advances* 31:5, 669-687. [[CrossRef](#)]
21. Lixue Wang, Waseem Asghar, Utkan Demirci, Yuan Wan. 2013. Nanostructured substrates for isolation of circulating tumor cells. *Nano Today* 8:4, 374-387. [[CrossRef](#)]
22. Botao Gao, Tomohiro Konno, Kazuhiko Ishihara. 2013. A simple procedure for the preparation of precise spatial multicellular phospholipid polymer hydrogels. *Colloids and Surfaces B: Biointerfaces* 108, 345-351. [[CrossRef](#)]

23. Rúben F Pereira, Cristina C Barrias, Pedro L Granja, Paulo J Bartolo. 2013. Advanced biofabrication strategies for skin regeneration and repair. *Nanomedicine* 8:4, 603-621. [[CrossRef](#)]
24. Cameron J. Ferris, Kerry G. Gilmore, Gordon G. Wallace, Marc Panhuis. 2013. Biofabrication: an overview of the approaches used for printing of living cells. *Applied Microbiology and Biotechnology* . [[CrossRef](#)]
25. Mohammad Vaezi, Srisit Chianrabutra, Brian Mellor, Shoufeng Yang. 2013. Multiple material additive manufacturing – Part 1: a review. *Virtual and Physical Prototyping* 8:1, 19-50. [[CrossRef](#)]
26. Umut Atakan Gurkan, Yantao Fan, Feng Xu, Burcu Erkmen, Emel Sokullu Urkac, Gunes Parlakgul, Jacob Bernstein, Wangli Xing, Edward S. Boyden, Utkan Demirci. 2013. Simple Precision Creation of Digitally Specified, Spatially Heterogeneous, Engineered Tissue Architectures. *Advanced Materials* 25:8, 1192-1198. [[CrossRef](#)]
27. Savas Tasoglu, Utkan Demirci. 2013. Bioprinting for stem cell research. *Trends in Biotechnology* 31:1, 10-19. [[CrossRef](#)]
28. Cameron J. Ferris, Kerry J. Gilmore, Stephen Beirne, Donald McCallum, Gordon G. Wallace, Marc in het Panhuis. 2013. Bio-ink for on-demand printing of living cells. *Biomaterials Science* 1:2, 224. [[CrossRef](#)]
29. Gulden Camci-Unal, Pinar Zorlutuna, Ali Khademhosseini Fabrication of Microscale Hydrogels for Tissue Engineering Applications 59-80. [[CrossRef](#)]
30. Milind Singh, F. Kurtis Kasper, Antonios G. Mikos Tissue Engineering Scaffolds 1138-1159. [[CrossRef](#)]
31. Savas Tasoglu, Umut Atakan Gurkan, ShuQi Wang, Utkan Demirci. 2013. Manipulating biological agents and cells in micro-scale volumes for applications in medicine. *Chemical Society Reviews* 42:13, 5788. [[CrossRef](#)]
32. Tao Xu, Weixin Zhao, Jian-Ming Zhu, Mohammad Z. Albanna, James J. Yoo, Anthony Atala. 2013. Complex heterogeneous tissue constructs containing multiple cell types prepared by inkjet printing technology. *Biomaterials* 34:1, 130-139. [[CrossRef](#)]
33. Eva Hoch, Thomas Hirth, Günter E. M. Tovar, Kirsten Borchers. 2013. Chemical tailoring of gelatin to adjust its chemical and physical properties for functional bioprinting. *Journal of Materials Chemistry B* 1:41, 5675. [[CrossRef](#)]
34. Aoi Odawara, Masao Gotoh, Ikuro Suzuki. 2013. A three-dimensional neuronal culture technique that controls the direction of neurite elongation and the position of soma to mimic the layered structure of the brain. *RSC Advances* . [[CrossRef](#)]
35. Yuchun Liu, Jerry K Y Chan, Swee-Hin Teoh. 2012. Review of vascularised bone tissue-engineering strategies with a focus on co-culture systems. *Journal of Tissue Engineering and Regenerative Medicine* n/a-n/a. [[CrossRef](#)]
36. Jorge I Rodríguez-Dévara, Bimeng Zhang, Daniel Reyna, Zhi-dong Shi, Tao Xu. 2012. High throughput miniature drug-screening platform using bioprinting technology. *Biofabrication* 4:3, 035001. [[CrossRef](#)]
37. Xiangcheng Zhu, Qiang Zheng, Hu Yang, Jin Cai, Lei Huang, Yanwen Duan, Zhinan Xu, Peilin Cen. 2012. Recent advances in inkjet dispensing technologies: applications in drug discovery. *Expert Opinion on Drug Discovery* 7:9, 761-770. [[CrossRef](#)]
38. Thomas Billiet, Mieke Vandenhoute, Jorg Schelfhout, Sandra Van Vlierberghe, Peter Dubruel. 2012. A review of trends and limitations in hydrogel-rapid prototyping for tissue engineering. *Biomaterials* 33:26, 6020-6041. [[CrossRef](#)]
39. CHIRAG KHATIWALA, RICHARD LAW, BENJAMIN SHEPHERD, SCOTT DORFMAN, MARIE CSETE. 2012. 3D CELL BIOPRINTING FOR REGENERATIVE MEDICINE RESEARCH AND THERAPIES. *Gene Therapy and Regulation* 1-19. [[CrossRef](#)]
40. Feng Xu, Fatih Inci, Omer Mullick, Umut Atakan Gurkan, Yuree Sung, Doga Kavaz, Baoqiang Li, Emir Baki Denkbas, Utkan Demirci. 2012. Release of Magnetic Nanoparticles from Cell-Encapsulating Biodegradable Nanobiomaterials. *ACS Nano* 120727134526008. [[CrossRef](#)]
41. Vítor E Santo, Manuela E Gomes, João F Mano, Rui L Reis. 2012. From nano- to macro-scale: nanotechnology approaches for spatially controlled delivery of bioactive factors for bone and cartilage engineering. *Nanomedicine* 7:7, 1045-1066. [[CrossRef](#)]
42. Xiaohui Zhang, Imran Khimji, Lei Shao, Hooman Safaee, Khanjan Desai, Hasan Onur Keles, Umut Atakan Gurkan, Emre Kayaalp, Aida Nureddin, Raymond M Anchan, Richard L Maas, Utkan Demirci. 2012. Nanoliter droplet vitrification for oocyte cryopreservation. *Nanomedicine* 7:4, 553-564. [[CrossRef](#)]
43. Umut Atakan Gurkan, Savas Tasoglu, Doga Kavaz, Melik C. Demirel, Utkan Demirci. 2012. Emerging Technologies for Assembly of Microscale Hydrogels. *Advanced Healthcare Materials* 1:2, 149-158. [[CrossRef](#)]
44. Matthew E Pepper, Vidya Seshadri, Timothy C Burg, Karen J L Burg, Richard E Groff. 2012. Characterizing the effects of cell settling on bioprinter output. *Biofabrication* 4:1, 011001. [[CrossRef](#)]
45. Sylvain Catros, Fabien Guillemot, Anandkumar Nandakumar, Sophia Ziane, Lorenzo Moroni, Pamela Habibovic, Clemens van Blitterswijk, Benoit Rousseau, Olivier Chassande, Joëlle Amédée, Jean-Christophe Fricain. 2012. Layer-by-Layer Tissue Microfabrication Supports Cell Proliferation In Vitro and In Vivo. *Tissue Engineering Part C: Methods* 18:1, 62-70. [[Abstract](#)] [[Full Text HTML](#)] [[Full Text PDF](#)] [[Full Text PDF with Links](#)]

46. Sungmin Hong, Hui-Ju Hsu, Roland Kaunas, Jun Kameoka. 2012. Collagen microsphere production on a chip. *Lab on a Chip* 12:18, 3277. [[CrossRef](#)]
47. Elvan Ceyhan, Feng Xu, Umut Atakan Gurkan, Ahmet Emrehan Emre, Emine Sumeysra Turali, Rami El Assal, Ali Acikgenc, Chung-an Max Wu, Utkan Demirci. 2012. Prediction and control of number of cells in microdroplets by stochastic modeling. *Lab on a Chip* 12:22, 4884. [[CrossRef](#)]
48. Xiaofeng Qu, Yechun Wang. 2012. Dynamics of concentric and eccentric compound droplets suspended in extensional flows. *Physics of Fluids* 24:12, 123302. [[CrossRef](#)]
49. Roland Partridge, Noel Conlisk, Jamie A. Davies. 2012. In-lab three-dimensional printing: An inexpensive tool for experimentation and visualization for the field of organogenesis. *Organogenesis* 8:1, 22-27. [[CrossRef](#)]
50. Silke Wüst, Ralph Müller, Sandra Hofmann. 2011. Controlled Positioning of Cells in Biomaterials—Approaches Towards 3D Tissue Printing. *Journal of Functional Biomaterials* 2:4, 119-154. [[CrossRef](#)]
51. G. Alex Bishop, Alexandra F. Sharland, Francesco L. Ierino, Mauro S. Sandrin, Bruce M. Hall, Stephen I. Alexander, P. Toby Coates, Geoffrey W. McCaughan. 2011. Operational Tolerance in Organ Transplantation Versus Tissue Engineering: Into the Future. *Transplantation* 92:8, e39. [[CrossRef](#)]
52. Albert R. Liberski, Joseph T. Delaney, Hendrik Schäfer, Jolke Perelaer, Ulrich S. Schubert. 2011. Organ Weaving: Woven Threads and Sheets As a Step Towards a New Strategy for Artificial Organ Development. *Macromolecular Bioscience* n/a-n/a. [[CrossRef](#)]
53. Feng Xu, JinHui Wu, ShuQi Wang, Naside Gozde Durmus, Umut Atakan Gurkan, Utkan Demirci. 2011. Microengineering methods for cell-based microarrays and high-throughput drug-screening applications. *Biofabrication* 3:3, 034101. [[CrossRef](#)]
54. Feng Xu, Chung-an Max Wu, Venkatakrisnan Rengarajan, Thomas Dylan Finley, Hasan Onur Keles, Yuree Sung, Baoqiang Li, Umut Atakan Gurkan, Utkan Demirci. 2011. Three-Dimensional Magnetic Assembly of Microscale Hydrogels. *Advanced Materials* n/a-n/a. [[CrossRef](#)]
55. Feng Xu, Thomas D. Finley, Muge Turkeydin, Yuree Sung, Umut A. Gurkan, Ahmet S. Yavuz, Rasim O. Guldiken, Utkan Demirci. 2011. The assembly of cell-encapsulating microscale hydrogels using acoustic waves. *Biomaterials* . [[CrossRef](#)]
56. Feng Xu, Turker Beyazoglu, Evan Hefner, Umut Atakan Gurkan, Utkan Demirci. 2011. Automated and Adaptable Quantification of Cellular Alignment from Microscopic Images for Tissue Engineering Applications. *Tissue Engineering Part C: Methods* 17:6, 641-649. [[Abstract](#)] [[Full Text HTML](#)] [[Full Text PDF](#)] [[Full Text PDF with Links](#)] [[Supplemental Material](#)]
57. Sachin Jambovane, Duck Jong Kim, Evert C. Duin, Se-Kwon Kim, Jong Wook Hong. 2011. Creation of Stepwise Concentration Gradient in Picoliter Droplets for Parallel Reactions of Matrix Metalloproteinase II and IX. *Analytical Chemistry* 83:9, 3358-3364. [[CrossRef](#)]
58. KYLE W. BINDER, ARTHUR J. ALLEN, JAMES J. YOO, ANTHONY ATALA. 2011. DROP-ON-DEMAND INKJET BIOPRINTING: A PRIMER. *Gene Therapy and Regulation* 06:01, 33-49. [[CrossRef](#)]
59. Vladimir Mironov, Vladimir Kasyanov, Roger R Markwald. 2011. Organ printing: from bioprinter to organ biofabrication line. *Current Opinion in Biotechnology* . [[CrossRef](#)]
60. Guo You Huang, Li Hong Zhou, Qian Cheng Zhang, Yong Mei Chen, Wei Sun, Feng Xu, Tian Jian Lu. 2011. Microfluidic hydrogels for tissue engineering. *Biofabrication* 3:1, 012001. [[CrossRef](#)]
61. Feng Xu, Jonathan Celli, Imran Rizvi, Sangjun Moon, Tayyaba Hasan, Utkan Demirci. 2011. A three-dimensional in vitro ovarian cancer coculture model using a high-throughput cell patterning platform. *Biotechnology Journal* 6:2, 204-212. [[CrossRef](#)]
62. Xiaohui Zhang, Imran Khimji, Umut Atakan Gurkan, Hooman Safae, Paolo Nicolas Catalano, Hasan Onur Keles, Emre Kayaalp, Utkan Demirci. 2011. Lensless imaging for simultaneous microfluidic sperm monitoring and sorting. *Lab on a Chip* 11:15, 2535. [[CrossRef](#)]
63. Feng Xu, BanuPriya Sridharan, ShuQi Wang, Umut Atakan Gurkan, Brian Syverud, Utkan Demirci. 2011. Embryonic stem cell bioprinting for uniform and controlled size embryoid body formation. *Biomicrofluidics* 5:2, 022207. [[CrossRef](#)]
64. Sudhir Khetan, Jason A. Burdick. 2011. Patterning hydrogels in three dimensions towards controlling cellular interactions. *Soft Matter* 7:3, 830. [[CrossRef](#)]
65. Hossein Tavana, Bobak Mosadegh, Parsa Zamankhan, James B. Grotberg, Shuichi Takayama. 2011. Microprinted feeder cells guide embryonic stem cell fate. *Biotechnology and Bioengineering* n/a-n/a. [[CrossRef](#)]
66. Shabnam Parsa, Madhuj Gupta, Frédéric Loizeau, Karen C Cheung. 2010. Effects of surfactant and gentle agitation on inkjet dispensing of living cells. *Biofabrication* 2:2, 025003. [[CrossRef](#)]
67. Hikmet Geckil, Feng Xu, Xiaohui Zhang, SangJun Moon, Utkan Demirci. 2010. Engineering hydrogels as extracellular matrix mimics. *Nanomedicine* 5:3, 469-484. [[CrossRef](#)]

68. Younggeun Park, Yeonho Choi, Debkishore Mitra, Taewook Kang, Luke P. Lee. 2010. Study of microscale hydraulic jump phenomenon for hydrodynamic trap-and-release of microparticles. *Applied Physics Letters* **97**:15, 154101. [[CrossRef](#)]
69. Savas Tasoglu, Gozde Kaynak, Andrew J. Szeri, Utkan Demirci, Metin Muradoglu. 2010. Impact of a compound droplet on a flat surface: A model for single cell epitaxy. *Physics of Fluids* **22**:8, 082103. [[CrossRef](#)]