

LIST OF TABLES

Table No.	Title	Page No.
2.1	Materials used in Bone repair, restoration and substitution	16
2.2	Bioceramics utilized in research study with properties and applications	17
2.3	Selection criteria for scaffolds for BTE applications	25
2.4	Advantages and Challenges of Natural Polymers	28-29
2.5	Advantages and Challenges of Synthetic Polymers	29-30
2.6	Methods of fabrication of scaffold and their advantages and disadvantages	32
2.7	Doping and its advantages in Bone Tissue Engineering	38-40
2.8	Application of metal ions and their biological effect in different systems	41-42
3.1	Composition of developed scaffolds	50
3.2	Composition of nHAP and CN incorporated scaffolds	51-52
3.3	Composition of NBG and TCP scaffolds	54
3.4	Composition of NBG and GO incorporated scaffolds	56
4.1	Comparison among developed scaffolds in dissertation	121

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure No.	Title	Page No.
2.1	Steps involved in the Bone tissue engineering process	8
2.2	Spongy and compact layers of Bone tissue	9
2.3	Different types of bone cells involved in the formation of a bone	10
2.4	Process of fracture healing and mechanism involved in complete bone healing	13
2.5	Factors responsible for fracture healing, including local and systemic factors	13
3.1	Synthesis of Copper Nanoparticles through chemical reduction approach	49
3.2	Fabrication of CN based scaffolds for tissue engineering	50
3.3(a)	ECIS system for monitoring cell behaviour. Mechanism involved for ECIS study of cell behaviour	53
3.3(b)		
3.4	Fabrication of NBG and TCP reinforced Chitosan-gelatin scaffolds for Bone tissue engineering application	54
3.5	Fabrication of GO and NBG incorporated Chitosan and gelatin based scaffolds	55
3.6	Cell isolated for in-vitro cell-culture study	60
4.1.1(a)	HRSEM image of synthesized copper nanoparticles from chemical reduction method. EDAX graph for synthesized copper nanoparticles	66
4.1.1(b)		
4.1.2(a)	TEM micrograph of synthesized CN nanoparticles. SAED pattern for synthesized CN nanoparticles showing the shape of nanoparticles formed	67
4.1.2(b)		
4.1.3	FTIR spectra of synthesized CN nanoparticles showing different functional groups interaction	67
4.1.4	XRD spectra of synthesized CN nanoparticles showing its structural composition	68
4.1.5	Digital image of scaffolds without CN and with CN	69
4.1.6(a-c)	SEM images of Chitosan/Gelatin scaffolds. SEM images of Chitosan/Gelatin scaffolds with 0.01CN, 0.02CN and 0.03CN	70
4.1.6(d-f)		
4.1.7	FTIR spectra and XRD spectra of developed scaffolds without copper nanoparticles and with copper nanoparticles	71

4.1.8	Graphical representation of porosity of developed scaffolds with and without Cu Nanoparticles	72
4.1.9	Graphical representation of swelling ratio of developed scaffolds with and without CN	73
4.1.10	Biodegradation study (28days) for developed scaffolds with CN and without CN	74
4.1.11	Mechanical strength analysis of developed scaffolds with and without copper nanoparticles	75
4.1.12	MTT assay of L979 cell-line over developed scaffolds with and without CN	76
4.1.13	Microscopic images of cells seeded scaffolds with and without CN	77
4.1.14(a-c) 4.1.14(d-f)	SEM micrographs of cell-seeded Ch-G scaffolds without CN. SEM micrographs of cell-seeded Ch-G scaffolds with 0.01CN, 0.02CN and 0.03CN respectively	78
4.2.1(a) 4.2.1(b) 4.2.1(c) 4.2.1(d)	HRSEM micrograph of synthesized nano-hydroxyapatite and its physical appearance. EDAX pattern of synthesized nano-HAP. FTIR spectrum of nano-HAP synthesized by sol-gel method. XRD spectra of nano-HAP synthesized	81
4.2.2 (a) 4.2.2 (b) 4.2.2 (c) 4.2.2(d-f)	Digital image and SEM micrograph of developed scaffolds. SEM image of Chitosan scaffold. SEM micrograph of chitosan gelatin composite scaffold. SEM micrograph of nHAP incorporated chitosan-gelatin blend. SEM images of CN-based scaffolds.	83
4.2.3(a) 4.2.3(b) 4.2.3(c) 4.2.3(d)	FTIR spectra for developed scaffolds with and without copper nanoparticles. XRD spectra for developed scaffolds. Graphical representation for Swelling capacity of developed scaffolds. Compressive strength for developed scaffolds. Experiments were performed in triplicates for both swelling and compressive strength evaluation including controls. The data represents the mean± standard deviation of all three experiments and the statistical difference between the different types of scaffolds is expressed by *p <0.05; **p <0.01; ***p<0.001; #p<0.0001	84

4.2.4(a)	DSC graph of Chitosan scaffold.	86
4.2.4(b)	DSC graph of C-G scaffold.	
4.2.4(c)	DSC graph for C-G-nHAP scaffold.	
4.2.4(d)	DSC graph for 0.01CN based scaffold.	
4.2.4(e)	DSC graph for 0.02CN based scaffold. DSC	
4.2.4(f)	graph for 0.03CN based scaffold	
4.2.5(a)	Graphical representation of Porosity of fabricated scaffolds.	87
4.2.5(b)	In-vitro degradation study for developed scaffolds for 28 days. The data are represented as mean \pm standard deviation obtained from three different experiments performed in triplicates. Statistical analysis was performed by ANOVA analysis of variance followed by Tukey's test wherein *p < 0.05, **p < 0.01, ***p < 0.001, #p < 0.0001	
4.2.6(a)	Stress-strain plot for positive control C-G-nHAP scaffold.	89
4.2.6(b-d)	Stress-strain curve for all the CN-based scaffolds with 0.01, 0.02 and 0.03 CN nanoparticles composition respectively.	89
4.2.7(a)	Resistance generated by cells spread over the 2d array.	91
4.2.7(b)	Capacitance measurement for the osteoblast cells developed over scaffolds on the 2D array.	91
4.2.7(c)	Impedance graph for MG-63 cells cultured over the scaffolds for 45 h.	91
4.2.8	Bright field, DAPI and AOPI microscopic images of osteoblast cells on 7th day of culture	92
4.2.9(a)	MTT assay of osteoblast cells over fabricated scaffolds for 3,7 and 14 days.	93
4.2.9(b)	ALP activity of osteoblast cells over developed scaffolds for 21 days. All the experiments were performed in triplicates and the data sets are represented as mean \pm standard deviation. The significance study was conducted using ANOVA analysis and Tukey's test wherein *p < 0.05, **p < 0.01, ***p < 0.001	
4.2.10(a-e)	SEM micrographs of cell-seeded scaffolds after 7 days of culturing; a. C-G, b. C-G-nHAP, c. C-G-nHAP-0.01CN, d. C-G-nHAP-0.02CN, e. C-G-nHAP-0.03CN	94
4.2.11	Alizarin red staining of all the developed scaffolds on day 7 as control and osteogenic differentiation on day 14.	95
4.2.12	Graphical representation showing the mineralization occurring on day 14 depicting the osteogenic differentiation of MG-63 cells over the developed scaffolds. All the experiments were	95

	conducted in triplicates. Every data set is represented as mean \pm standard deviation for the individual experiments. The significance analysis was performed by ANOVA analysis and then Tukey's test: *$p < 0.05$, **$p < 0.01$, #$p < 0.0001$	
4.3.1(a)	Photographic image of nanobioglass and HRSEM image of freshly prepared Nanobioglass.	98
4.3.1(b)	XRD spectra of NBG synthesized	99
4.3.1(c-e)	TEM image and SAED pattern of developed NBG.	99
4.3.2(a)	Ch-G scaffold and its HRSEM images at 200 and 500μm scales.	100
4.3.2(b)	Ch-G-NBG scaffolds with HRSEM images. Ch-G-TCP scaffold with HRSEM images.	100
4.3.2(c)	Ch-G-NBG/TCP scaffolds with HRSEM images	100
4.3.2(d)	at 200 and 500μm scale.	100
4.3.3(a)	FTIR spectra of all the fabricated scaffolds including control.	101
4.3.3(b)	XRD spectra of developed scaffolds	101
4.3.4(a-d)	It represents the different pore sizes for all the developed scaffolds (a)Ch-G. (b)Ch-G-NBG, (c)Ch-G-TCP and (d)Ch-G-NBG/TCP respectively.	102
4.3.4(e)	Tabular representation of average pore size for developed scaffolds estimated through image J software using the HRSEM images. Graphical representation of Porosity of	102
4.3.4(f)	developed scaffolds through liquid displacement method. Experiments were performed in triplicates and the data is represented as mean\pm standard deviation for the experiments. The statistical difference between the scaffolds of different types is expressed as ***$p < 0.05$.	102
4.3.5(a)	Graphical presentation of compressive strength of developed scaffolds.	103
4.3.5(b)	Swelling uptake study of developed scaffolds. Graphical presentation of SBF-treated scaffolds	103
4.3.5(c)	for 0,7 and 14 days. 21 days degradation evaluation graph of the	103
4.3.5(d)	scaffolds. All the experiments were performed in triplicates and the data is represented as mean\pm standard deviation for the experiments. The statistical difference between the different kinds of scaffolds is expressed as *$p < 0.05$; **$p < 0.01$; ***$p < 0.001$.	103
4.3.6(a-d)	DSC graph for the developed scaffolds showing their thermal stability at a higher and lower temperature.	105

4.3.7	DAPI and AOPI images of Ch-G, Ch-G-NBG, Ch-G-TCP and Ch-G-NBG/TCP scaffolds on the 5 th and 7 th day	106
4.3.8(a)	MTT assay of developed scaffolds	107
4.3.8(b)	ALP activity of MG-63 cells over developed scaffolds	107
4.3.9(a)	Inverted phase contrast microscopic images of Alizarin Red S. stained cultured cells for 2 weeks.	198
4.3.9(b)	Biom mineralization of scaffolds cultured for 2 weeks	108
4.3.10(a)	SEM image of cell attachment and spreading over Ch-G scaffold.	109
4.3.10(b)	SEM micrograph of cell spreading over Ch-G- NBG scaffold.	109
4.3.10(c)	Cell spreading over Ch-G-TCP scaffold.	109
4.3.10(d)	Cell spreading over Ch-G-NBG/TCP scaffold.	109
4.4.1(a)	Photographic image of graphene oxide utilized for scaffold fabrication.	112
4.4.1(b)	XRD spectra of graphene oxide.	112
4.4.1(c)	TEM micrograph of graphene oxide.	113
4.4.1(d)	SAED pattern of graphene oxide for scaffold development.	112
4.4.1(e)	TGA graph of graphene oxide.	112
4.4.1(f)	FTIR graph of graphene oxide used in the experiment.	112
4.4.2(a)	Digital images and SEM micrographs of developed scaffolds. SEM image of Ch-G scaffold.	113
4.4.2(b)	SEM image of Ch-G-NBG scaffold.	
4.4.2(c-e)	SEM image of Ch-G-NBG 30% GO, 60% GO and 90% GO respectively.	
4.4.3(a-b)	FTIR and XRD graph of developed scaffolds without GO and with GO	114
4.4.4	Thermal stability analysis of developed scaffolds. DSC graphical evaluation of developed scaffolds with and without GO nanoparticles	115
4.4.5(a)	Biodegradation study of fabricated scaffolds for 28 days.	116
4.4.5(b)	Water retention capacity analysis of manufactured scaffold including GO based scaffolds.	
4.4.6(a)	Porosity evaluation graph of developed scaffolds.	117
4.4.6(b)	Compressive strength graph for prepared scaffolds with GO and without GO nanoparticles	
4.4.7(a)	Stress-strain plot for fabricated scaffolds. Stress strain plot for Ch-G scaffold.	118
4.4.7(b)	Stress-strain curve for Ch-G-NBG scaffold.	
4.4.7(c-e)	Stress-Strain curve for Ch-G-NBG-30%GO, 60%GO and 90%GO respectively.	

4.4.8	Live and dead assay of 3rd and 5th day of cell-scaffold culture over developed scaffolds.	119
4.4.9	MTT assay graphical representation for all the scaffolds. Fig4.4.10(b). Graphical representation of ALP activity of developed scaffolds for 21 days.	120
4.4.10	Cell spreading evaluation over developed scaffolds with GO nanoparticles and without GO nanoparticles (SEM Micrographs)	120

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

TE	Tissue engineering
BTE	Bone Tissue engineering
MSCs	Mesenchymal stem cells
ECM	Extracellular matrix
HAP	Hydroxyapatite
TCP	Tricalcium phosphate
3D	Three dimensional
PVA	Polyvinyl alcohol
HP	Hyperbranched polymer
ICP-OES	Inductively coupled plasma-optical emission spectrometry
PCL	Poly ϵ-caprolactone
PEG	Polyethylene glycol
GFs	Growth factors
PLGA	Poly (lactic-co-glycolic acid)
CL	Cellulose
NHS	N-hydroxysuccinimide
EDC	1-Ethyl-3-(3-dimethylaminopropyl)carbodiimide
rhBMP-2	Recombinant human bone morphogenetic protein
SBF	Simulated bodily fluids
Alg	Alginate
CS	Chondroitin sulfate
AA	Amino acid
SF	Silk fibroin
PD-RGO	Polydopamine-reduced graphene oxide
HA	Hyaluronic acid
Ch	Chitosan
Gel	Gelatin
Col	Collagen
VEGF	Vascular endothelial growth factor
BMPs	Bone morphogenetic proteins
TNF-alpha	Tumor necrosis factor-alpha
SLRPs	Small leucine-rich proteoglycans
MGO	Magnetic graphene oxide
PVA/SA/HAP	Polyvinyl alcohol/sodium alginate/hydroxyapatite
AM	Additive manufacturing
PMPV	Polyacrylamide/poly (vinyl alcohol)
HNTs	Halloysite nanotubes
BG	Bioactive glass
PADH	Polymer of acrylamide -Urethacrylate dextran
PLLA	Poly(L-lactic acid)

Dex-U	Urethacrylate dextran
PMMA	Polymer of acrylamide
PGA	Polyglycolic acid
PU	Polyurethane
PPF	Poly(propylene fumarate)
QDs	Quantum dots
rBMSC	Recombinant Bone marrow stromal cells
SMAD	Mothers against decapentaplegic
hASC	Human adult stromal cells
SBMs	Smart biomaterials
PVDF	Polyvinylidene fluoride
SAMs	Self-assembled monolayers
CNTs	Carbon nanotubes
f-MWCNT	Multiwalled Carbon Nanotubes
ERMs	Enzyme-responsive materials