WORLD JOURNAL OF PHARMACEUTICAL RESEARCH
Coden USA: WJPRAP Impact Factor 8.453
Volume 15, Issue 2, 1152-1162. Review Article ISSN 2277–7105

ADVANCING NEURAL TISSUE ENGINEERING: A REVIEW OF 3D BIOPRINTING, BIOINKS AND TRANSLATIONAL APPROACH

Jeevith Kumar V.[1]*, Siva S.[2], Manikandan A.[3], Sethupathi S.[4], Karthick T. M.[5], Dr. Sathish A.[6]

*[1,2,3,4]Postgraduate Research Scholar, GRD College of Pharmacy, Thiruvallur, Affiliated to The Tamil Nadu Dr. M.G.R Medical University, Chennai.

[5]Associate Professor, GRD College of Pharmacy, Thiruvallur, Affiliated to The Tamil Nadu Dr. M.G.R Medical University, Chennai.

[6]Principal, GRD College of Pharmacy, Thiruvallur, Affiliated to The Tamil Nadu Dr. M.G.R Medical University, Chennai.

Article Received on 15 Dec. 2025,
Article Revised on 05 Jan. 2026,
Article Published on 16 Jan. 2026,

https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18266820

***Corresponding Author**

Jeevith Kumar V.

Postgraduate Research Scholar, GRD College of Pharmacy, Thiruvallur, Affiliated to The Tamil Nadu Dr. M.G.R Medical University, Chennai.

How to cite this Article: Jeevith Kumar V.1*, Siva S.2, Manikandan A.3, Sethupathi S.4, Karthick T. M.5, Dr. Sathish A.6 (2026). Advancing neural tissue engineering: a review of 3d bioprinting, bioinks and translational approach. "World Journal of Pharmaceutical Research, 15(2), 1152–1162.

This work is licensed under Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International license.

ABSTRACT

Three-dimensional (3D) bioprinting represents a transformative platform in regenerative medicine, offering the capability to precisely replicate the structural and functional complexity of the central and peripheral nervous systems. This technology is crucial for advancing neural tissue engineering (NTE) by enabling the construction of engineered tissues that closely mimic the native neural microenvironment. This article provides a critical synthesis of current bioprinting strategies for neural tissue engineering, focusing on the comparative analysis of natural, synthetic, and hybrid polymer-based bioinks from mechanistic and translational viewpoints. Special attention is given to various printing modalities— including extrusion, inkjet, and electro-hydrodynamic jet printing—and their capacity to control spatial organization and micro-environmental cues. The review highlights key applications, such as models for brain development, neurodegenerative diseases, and glioblastoma scaffolds. Furthermore, it addresses significant translational barriers, such as host tissue integration

and bioink standardization, and explores promising future directions, including artificial intelligence (AI)-guided biofabrication and organ-on-chip integration, to enhance the fidelity and therapeutic potential of bioprinted neural constructs.

KEYWORDS: 3D Bioprinting, Neural Tissue Engineering, Bioinks, Neurodegenerative diseases.

INTRODUCTION

The nervous system, an exceptionally intricate network, is responsible for regulating sensory processing and cognitive function. Damage or dysfunction within the CNS and PNS, often resulting from traumatic injury, neurodegenerative diseases, or peripheral nerve injuries (PNIs), leads to significant and often debilitating neurological impairments. [1] The global incidence of these disorders is rising, driven by an aging population, which underscores the urgent need for more effective therapeutic strategies.[2–4]

Current interventions, such as surgical nerve grafting and pharmacological therapies, frequently fail to restore full function due to the limited intrinsic regenerative capacity of neural tissue, its structural complexity, and the inadequacy of existing treatment options. [5] To overcome these limitations, neural tissue engineering (NTE) has emerged as a multidisciplinary field integrating biomaterials, cell therapy, and advanced manufacturing technologies. The goal of NTE is to accurately reproduce the neural microenvironment and promote functional restoration.[6] Three-dimensional bioprinting, in particular, allows for the precise control of cell distribution, spatial regulation of tissue structure, and biochemical signaling pathways, opening new avenues for creating complex, bioinspired neural tissue structures.

NEURAL TISSUE ENGINEERING AND THE ROLE OF 3D BIOPRINTING

The nervous system is composed of specialized cells, primarily neurons, which form an intricate network for transmitting electrical impulses. The CNS (brain, cerebellum, and spinal cord) coordinates sensory and motor functions, while the PNS consists of nerves extending from the CNS to transmit information.[7,8] A critical challenge in NTE is the stark difference in regenerative capacity: the PNS retains some ability for axonal regeneration, but the CNS lacks intrinsic regenerative ability, with recovery limited to injuries less than 1 cm in length.[9,10]

Compared to other tissues, nerve tissue exhibits significantly lower regenerative capacity and greater functional complexity.[11] The CNS's limited self-repair is due to inhibitory molecules, reduced neurogenesis, and highly intricate synaptic architecture.[12] Therefore, NTE constructs must meet unique design criteria, including controlled anisotropy, targeted delivery of neurotrophic factors, and the ability to reproduce the native electrophysiological environment.

Traditional fabrication methods, such as solvent casting, freeze-drying, and electrospinning, have been widely used but possess significant limitations. Solvent casting lacks precise control over pore shape and distribution, leading to uneven cell distribution and potential cytotoxicity from residual solvents.[13] Freeze-drying produces highly porous scaffolds but often lacks the necessary mechanical strength and fails to reproduce unique neural microenvironments like axial anisotropy.[14] Electrospinning creates nanofiber scaffolds that mimic the extracellular matrix (ECM) but primarily yields 2D or pseudo-3D constructs, limiting control over multilayered cell arrangements.[15]

Three-dimensional bioprinting addresses these limitations by precisely depositing bioinks in digitally programmed layers, enabling the integration of various cell types, growth factors, and anisotropic physical properties within a single construct. This precision is vital for replicating biologically relevant structures and creating functional tissue models.[16-22]

FUNDAMENTALS OF THREE-DIMENSIONAL BIOPRINTING FOR NEURAL TISSUES

3D bioprinting technologies utilize computer-aided design and manufacturing to deposit biomaterials at specified locations, fabricating complex 3D biological structures. [23] Scaffolds for nerve tissue regeneration must possess biocompatibility, biodegradability, appropriate porosity, and sufficient mechanical strength, while also supporting cell adhesion and viability.[24] The main categories of bioprinting technologies, their principle, advantages and limitations are listed in Table 1.

Table 1: List of various 3D bioprinting technologies.

Technology	Principle	Advantages	Limitations
Extrusion-based	Continuous deposition of bioink through a nozzle, driven by pneumatic or mechanical force.	High cell density, suitable for high-viscosity bioinks, scalable for large constructs.	High shear stress can compromise cell viability, lower resolution compared to other methods.
Inkjet-based	Thermal or piezoelectric actuators generate droplets of bioink.	High resolution, low cost, high throughput, low shear stress (biocompatible).	Limited to low- viscosity bioinks, potential for nozzle clogging, limited scalability for large tissues.
Electrohydrodynamic (EHD)	Electric fields generate ultra-fine jets or droplets for high-resolution patterning.	Nanoscale resolution, fine droplet control, suitable for complex tissue fabrication.	Low throughput, high voltage risks, complex setup requirements.
Laser-assisted	Laser-induced forward transfer (LIFT) ejects bioink droplets onto a substrate.	Excellent precision and patterning capabilities, high resolution.	High cost, cell viability can be affected by laser exposure duration.
Stereolithography (SLA)	Patterned light projections polymerize photosensitive bioinks layer-by- layer.	High resolution, rapid fabrication of complex geometries.	Limited to photosensitive bioinks, potential for phototoxicity.
Two-Photon Polymerization (2PP)	Femtosecond laser creates highly precise, sub-micrometer features.	Ultra-high resolution, ideal for micro-scale features and vascularized models.	Very high cost, low throughput, limited material compatibility.

Extrusion-based bioprinting is often favored for its scalability and ability to handle diverse bioink viscosities, despite the risk of shear stress-induced cell damage. Inkjet printing offers high resolution and biocompatibility but is restricted to low- viscosity bioinks. EHD bioprinting provides nanoscale resolution but suffers from low throughput and complex setup.[25]

BIOINKS FOR NEURAL TISSUE ENGINEERING

The selection of bioink is paramount, as it dictates the mechanical, biochemical, and structural properties of the bioprinted construct. Bioinks for NTE must mimic the native ECM, providing structural support and crucial signaling cues for neural cell survival, differentiation, and neurite outgrowth. Bioinks are broadly categorized into natural, synthetic, and hybrid polymers.

Natural Polymer-Based Bioinks

Naturalpolymers are highly favored due to their inherent biocompatibility, biodegradability, and the presence of cell-recognition motifs.

(i) Collagen and Gelatin

Collagen is a primary component of the ECM, promoting cell adhesion and proliferation. Gelatin, a denatured form of collagen, is often used due to its low cost and ability to form hydrogels. Both are widely used in neural applications for their ability to support neurite outgrowth.[26,27]

(ii) Alginate

Derived from brown algae, alginate is non-immunogenic and forms hydrogels rapidly via ionic cross-linking with calcium ions. It is frequently used as a structural component in bioinks, often blended with other materials to enhance cell-material interactions.[28]

(iii) Hyaluronic Acid (HA)

A major component of the neural ECM, HA is critical for cell migration and differentiation. Its functionalized derivatives, such as Gel MA/HA blends, have been used to create scaffolds for traumatic brain injury therapy.[11]

Synthetic and Hybrid Polymer-Based Bioinks

Synthetic polymers offer tunable mechanical properties, degradation rates, and chemical modification sites, overcoming the batch-to-batch variability of natural materials.

(i) Polyethylene Glycol (PEG)

PEG is highly biocompatible and resistant to protein adsorption, making it useful for creating inert structural scaffolds. Its mechanical properties can be easily tuned via cross-linking.[29]

(ii) Polycaprolactone (PCL)

PCL is a biodegradable polyester known for its excellent mechanical strength and slow degradation rate, making it suitable for long-term structural support in nerve guidance conduits.[30]

(iii) Hybrid Bioinks

Combining natural and synthetic polymers leverages the best of both worlds—the bioactivity of natural materials and the mechanical tenability of synthetic ones. For instance, GelMA/PEG-based hybrid hydrogels are commonly used to balance mechanical stability with biological signaling.[31]

APPLICATIONS OF 3D BIOPRINTED NEURAL TISSUES

3D bioprinting is rapidly expanding its utility from basic research models to potential therapeutic applications.

Disease Modeling and Drug Screening

Bioprinted neural constructs provide superior in vitro models compared to traditional 2D cultures and animal models, offering a more physiologically relevant environment.[32–35]

(i) Brain Development and Neurodegenerative Disease Models

3D bioprinted models, such as those for Alzheimer's and Parkinson's diseases, allow for the study of disease progression and the testing of new drug candidates in a human- relevant context.[36,37]

(ii) Glioblastoma Scaffolds

Bioprinting is used to create complex tumor microenvironments, including the tumor-stroma interface and the blood-brain barrier (BBB), which are critical for understanding tumor invasion and evaluating anti-cancer therapies. A multilayered BBB model has been effectively developed to investigate drug permeability.[38]

Neural Regeneration and Repair

The technology is particularly promising for repairing damaged neural pathways.

(i) Peripheral Nerve Regeneration

Bioprinted Nerve Guidance Conduits (NGCs) are a central focus. These conduits can be loaded with cells (e.g., Schwann cells) and growth factors, and their internal structure can be precisely patterned to guide axonal pathfinding, overcoming the limitations of traditional nerve grafts.[39]

(ii) Axonal Guidance Platforms

Recent advances enable the fabrication of microenvironments with biophysical gradients (mechanical and chemical) that are crucial for peripheral nerve regeneration. These patterned constructs can modulate Schwann cell behavior and promote targeted axonal pathfinding.[40]

TRANSLATIONAL BARRIERS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

Despite significant progress, several challenges must be addressed before 3D bioprinted neural tissues can be widely translated into clinical practice.

Translational Barriers

(i) Host Tissue Integration

Achieving seamless integration of the bioprinted construct with the host tissue remains a major hurdle. This requires the construct to not only survive but also establish functional neural and vascular connections.[41]

(ii) Bioink Standardization and Regulatory Hurdles

A lack of standardized protocols for bioink preparation and characterization, coupled with complex regulatory pathways for combination products (cells, biomaterials, and devices), slows down clinical translation.[42]

(iii) Vascularization

The creation of a functional vascular network within the thick bioprinted tissue is essential for nutrient and oxygen supply, a challenge often addressed through co-printing with endothelial cells or the use of sacrificial materials.[43]

Future Directions

(i) Artificial Intelligence (AI)-Guided Biofabrication

AI integration is expected to forecast biological responses, automate image analysis, and optimize bioprinting parameters, leading to more consistent and effective constructs.[44]

(ii) Organ-on-Chip Integration

Combining 3D bioprinting with microfluidic organ- on-chip platforms allows for the creation of dynamic, functional models that better simulate the physiological environment and enable real-time monitoring of cellular responses.[45]

(iii) 4D Bioprinting

The emergence of 4D bioprinting, which involves materials that change shape or function over time in response to external stimuli, offers a strategy for creating dynamically adaptive neural constructs that can evolve with the healing process.[21]

CONCLUSION

3D bioprinting has revolutionized NTE, moving beyond the limitations of conventional fabrication methods to create complex, functional neural constructs. The precise control over spatial organization, cell placement, and microenvironmental cues offered by advanced printing modalities and tailored bioinks is driving innovation in disease modeling, drug

screening, and regenerative therapies. While challenges related to vascularization, host integration, and standardization persist, the integration of cutting-edge technologies like AI and organ-on-chip platforms promises to accelerate the translation of 3D bioprinted neural tissues from the laboratory to the clinic, offering new hope for patients suffering from neurological impairments.

REFERENCES

1. Choi, T.; Park, J.; Lee, S.; Jeon, H.-J.; Kim, B.H.; Kim, H.-O.; Lee, H. 3D Bioprinted Neural Tissues: Emerging Strategies for Regeneration and Disease Modeling. Pharmaceutics, 20205; 17: 1176.
2. Feigin VL, Nichols E, Alam T, Bannick MS, Beghi E, Blake N, Culpepper WJ, Dorsey ER, Elbaz A, Ellenbogen RG, Fisher JL. Global, regional, and national burden of neurological disorders, 1990–2016: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2016. Lancet Neurol., 2019 May 1; 18(5): 459-80.
3. Feigin, V.L.; Vos, T.; Nichols, E.; Owolabi, M.O.; Carroll, W.M.; Dichgans, M.; Deuschl, G.; Parmar, P.; Brainin, M.; Murray, C. The global burden of neurological disorders: translating evidence into policy. Lancet Neurol., 2020; 19: 255–265.
4. World Health Organization. Global status report on the public health response to dementia. World Health Organization, 2021.
5. Ahuja, C.S.; Nori, S.; Tetreault, L.; Wilson, J.; Kwon, B.; Harrop, J.; Fehlings, M. Traumatic Spinal Cord Injury—Repair and Regeneration. Neurosurgery, 2017; 80: S9– S22.
6. Gu BK, Choi DJ, Park SJ, Kim YJ, Kim CH. 3D bioprinting technologies for tissue engineering applications. Cutting-edge enabling technologies for regenerative medicine, 2018 Oct 25; 15-28.
7. Kandel, E.R.; Schwartz, J.H.; Jessell, T.M.; Siegelbaum, S.A.; Hudspeth, A.J. Principles of Neural Science, 5th ed.; McGraw-Hill: New York, NY, USA, 2013.
8. Squire, L.R.; Berg, D.; Bloom, F.E.; du Lac, S.; Ghosh, A.; Spitzer, N.C. Fundamental Neuroscience, 4th ed.; Academic Press: Cambridge, MA, USA, 2012.
9. Jessen, K.R.; Mirsky, R. The success and failure of the Schwann cell response to nerve injury. Front. Cell. Neurosci., 2019; 13: 33.
10. He, Z.; Jin, Y. Intrinsic regenerative capacity of CNS axons. Neurosci. Lett., 2016; 652: 38–44.

11. Spencer, K.C.; Sy, J.C.; Ramadi, K.B.; Gray, S.J.; Langer, R.; Cima, M.J. Characterization of mechanically matched hydrogel coatings to improve the biocompatibility of neural implants. Sci. Rep., 2017; 7: 1952.
12. Schwab, M.E.; Strittmatter, S.M. Nogo-A and Myelin-Associated Inhibitors of Neurite Outgrowth. Curr. Opin. Neurobiol., 2014; 27: 137–144.
13. Gunatillake, P.A.; Adhikari, R. Biodegradable synthetic polymers for tissue engineering. Eur. Cell. Mater., 2003; 5: 1–16.
14. O'Brien, F.J.; Harley, B.A.; Yannas, I.V.; Gibson, L.J. The effect of pore size on cell adhesion in collagen-GAG scaffolds. Biomaterials, 2005; 26: 433–441.
15. Bhardwaj, N.; Kundu, S.C. Electrospinning: A fascinating fiber fabrication technique. Biotechnol. Adv., 2010; 28: 325–347.
16. Wilson, W.C.; Boland, T. Cell and organ printing 1: protein and cell printers. Anat. Rec. A Discov. Mol. Cell. Evol. Biol., 2003; 272: 491–496.
17. Barron, J.A.; Wu, P.; Ladouceur, H.D.; Ringeisen, B.R. Biological laser printing: a novel technique for creating heterogeneous 3-dimensional cell patterns. Biomed. Microdevices, 2004; 6: 139–147.
18. Ringeisen, B.R.; Othon, C.M.; Barron, J.A.; Young, D.; Spargo, B.J. Jet-based methods to print living cells. Biotechnol. J., 2006; 1: 930–948.
19. Johnson, B.N.; Lancaster, K.Z.; Hogue, I.B.; Meng, F.; Kong, H.; Miller, M.J. 3D printed anatomical nerve regeneration pathways. Adv. Funct. Mater, 2016; 26: 3021– 3031.
20. Owji, N.; Nezafati, N.; Sefat, F.; Zandi, M. 3D-printed scaffolds for peripheral nerve regeneration. J. Tissue Eng., 2021; 12: 20417314211026693.
21. Momeni, F.; Hassani, S.M.M.; Liu, X.; Ni, J. A review of 4D printing. Mater. Des., 2017; 122: 42–79.
22. Ahn, S.I.; Lee, H.J.; Lee, J.S.; Lee, J.M.; Kim, S.Y.; Park, J.H.; Cho, D.W. A 3D-printed, multiphenotype, in vitro blood-brain barrier model with functional tight junctions. Adv. Mater, 2021; 33: e2100569.
23. Murphy, S.V.; Atala, A. 3D bioprinting of tissues and organs. Nat. Biotechnol., 2014; 32: 773–785.
24. Williams, D.F. On the mechanisms of biocompatibility. Biomaterials, 2008; 29: 2941–2953.
25. Mandrycky, C.; Wang, Z.; Kim, K.; Kim, D.H. 3D bioprinting for engineering complex tissues. Biotechnol. Adv., 2016; 34: 422–434.

26. Yannas, I.V. Tissue and organ regeneration in adults. Springer Science & Business Media, 2001.
27. Lee, B.H.; Kim, G.H. 3D printing of tissue-engineered constructs for in vitro and in vivo applications. J. Biomed. Mater. Res. B Appl. Biomater., 2018; 106: 1365–1376.
28. Axpe, E.; Oyen, M.L. Applications of alginate-based hydrogels in tissue engineering. Int. J. Mol. Sci., 2016; 17: 1976.
29. Zhu, J. Bioactive modification of poly(ethylene glycol) hydrogels for tissue engineering. Biomaterials, 2010; 31: 4639–4656.
30. Woodruff, M.A.; Hutmacher, D.W. The return of a forgotten polymer— Polycaprolactone in the 21st century. Prog. Polym. Sci., 2010; 35: 1217–1256.
31. Van Den Bulcke, A.I.; Bogdanov, B.; De Rooze, N.; Schacht, E.H.; Cornelissen, M.; Berghmans, H. Structural and rheological properties of methacrylamide modified gelatin hydrogels. Biomacromolecules, 2000; 1: 31–38.
32. Duval, K.; Grover, H.; Han, L.H.; Mou, Y.; Pegoraro, A.F.; Fredberg, J.; Chen, Z. Modeling physiological events in 2D vs. 3D cell culture. Physiology, 2017; 32: 266–277.
33. Ravi, M.; Paramesh, V.; Kaviya, S.R.; Anuradha, E.; Solomon, F.D.P. 3D cell culture systems: Advantages and applications. J. Cell. Physiol., 2015; 230: 16–26.
34. van der Worp, H.B.; Howells, D.W.; Sena, E.S.; Porritt, M.J.; Rewell, S.; O'Collins, V.; Macleod, M.R. Can animal models of disease reliably inform human studies? PLoS Med., 2010; 7: e1000245.
35. Pound, P.; Ritskes-Hoitinga, M. Is it possible to overcome issues of external validity in preclinical animal research? Why most animal models are bound to fail. J. Transl. Med., 2018; 16: 304.
36. Zhang, Y.S.; Yue, K.; Aleman, J.; Moghaddam, K.M.; Bakht, S.M.; Yang, J.; Jia, W.; Dell, R.W.; Asghari, M.; Shin, S.R.; et al. 3D bioprinting for tissue and organ fabrication. Ann. Biomed. Eng., 2017; 45: 148–163.
37. Yi, H.G.; Lee, H.; Cho, D.W. 3D printing of a brain-like structure for brain research. Biomaterials, 2017; 124: 124–133.
38. Heinrich, M.A.; Bansal, R.; Lammers, T.; Zhang, Y.S.; Michel, J.P.; Prakash, J. 3D-bioprinted cancer models: a powerful platform for testing and developing novel immunotherapies. Adv. Mater. 2019, 31, e1806689.
39. Soman, S.S.; Vijayavenkataraman, S. Perspectives on 3D Bioprinting of Peripheral Nerve Conduits. Int. J. Mol. Sci., 2020; 21: 5792.
40. Luo, L. Axon guidance: a growing field of gradients. Neuron, 2002; 35: 1–3.

41. Williams, D.F. Challenges with the development of biomaterials for sustainable, global healthcare. Biomaterials, 2014; 35: 6671–6673.
42. Jessop, Z.M.; Al-Sabah, A.; Gardiner, M.D.; Combellack, E.; Hawkins, K.; Whitaker, I.S. 3D bioprinting for reconstructive surgery: a systematic review of the current landscape and a look to the future. Front. Bioeng. Biotechnol., 2017; 5: 7.
43. Kolesky, D.B.; Truby, R.L.; Gladman, A.S.; Busbee, T.A.; Homan, K.A.; Lewis, J.A. 3D bioprinting of vascularized, heterogeneous cell-laden tissue constructs. Adv. Mater, 2014; 26: 3124–3130.
44. Lee, H.; Yeo, M.; Lee, S.J. Artificial intelligence for 3D printing in tissue engineering. Int. J. Bioprint., 2022; 8: 531.
45. Zhang, Y.S.; Aleman, J.; Arneri, A.; Bersini, S.; Piraino, F.; Shin, S.R.; Oklu, R.; Dokmeci, M.R.; Khademhosseini, A. From organ-on-a-chip to body-on-a-chip: a review of the development of microfluidic multi-organ systems. Anal. Bioanal. Chem., 2015; 407: 6533–6546.