

ACCEPTED PAPER · MAIN TEXT

Bioprinted biomaterials for tendon repair and regeneration: Material systems and functional strategies

Paper version: Accepted Paper

Accepted Papers are manuscripts accepted for publication, encompassing all changes made following the peer review process, along with a standard cover page indicating the paper version and an “Accepted Paper” watermark, but excluding any other editing, typesetting or other changes made by AccScience Publishing and/or authors post-acceptance.

Article ID: IJB026200189

Citation: Gao L, Zhang J, Zhao X, *et al.* Bioprinted biomaterials for tendon repair and regeneration: Material systems and functional strategies. *Int J Bioprint*. 2026. doi: 10.36922/IJB026200189

Copyright: © 2026 Author(s). This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, permitting distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Publisher’s Note: AccScience Publishing remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

AccScience Publishing

REVIEW ARTICLE

Volume X Issue X (2026)

doi: 10.36922/IJB026200189

Bioprinted biomaterials for tendon repair and regeneration: Material systems and functional strategies

Running title: Bioprinted biomaterials for tendon repair

Le Gao ^{1†}, Jinbo Zhang ^{1†}, Xue Zhao ^{2†}, Hao Chen ¹, Weilong Zhang ¹, Zhidong Liang ¹, Jincheng Wang ¹, Qing Han^{1*}, and Bingpeng Chen ^{1*}

¹ Department of Orthopedics, The Second Hospital of Jilin University, Changchun, Jilin, China

² Department of Endocrinology and Metabolism, The First Hospital of Jilin University, Changchun, Jilin, China

(This article belongs to the *Special Issue: Bioprinting Strategies for Musculoskeletal Integration: Enhancing Bone and Tendon-to-Bone Repair*)

[†]*These authors contributed equally to this work.*

***Corresponding authors:**

Qing Han (my.hanqing@163.com)

Bingpeng Chen (chenbingpeng@jlu.edu.cn)

Citation: Gao L, Zhang J, Zhao X, *et al.* Bioprinted biomaterials for tendon repair and regeneration: Material systems and functional strategies. *Int J Bioprint.* 2026. doi: 10.36922/IJB026200189

Received: May 13, 2026

Revised: June 21, 2026

Accepted: July 1, 2026

Published online: July 2, 2026

Copyright: © 2026 Author(s). This is an Open-Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, permitting distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Publisher's Note: AccScience Publishing remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

ACCEPTED PAPER

Abstract

Tendon injuries often heal slowly because of the limited vascularity, low cellularity, and low metabolic activity of native tendon tissue. Newly formed tendon tissue is frequently characterized by disorganized collagen alignment, reduced mechanical performance, and scar-like remodeling, making it difficult to restore the structure and function of native tendon. Bioprinting enables precise control over material composition, spatial architecture, fiber orientation, and the distribution of cells and bioactive components, thereby providing a promising strategy for functional tendon regeneration. However, tendon is a highly load-bearing and anisotropic tissue, whereas most hydrogel-based bioinks, despite their favorable cytocompatibility and cell-loading capacity, often remain biomechanically weak, with insufficient tensile strength, limited fatigue stability, and inadequate long-term shape fidelity, making them insufficient to independently meet the biomechanical requirements of tendon repair. This review summarizes natural and modified natural bioinks, synthetic reinforcing materials, printed load-bearing frameworks, and inorganic or ion-releasing functional components for tendon bioprinting, with emphasis on printability, biocompatibility, mechanical reinforcement, degradation behavior, and structural stability. We further discuss functional strategies involving structural and topographical modulation, bioactive molecule delivery, immunomodulatory regulation, physical stimulation, and smart responsiveness. Future studies should prioritize multi-material cooperative printing, tendon–bone interface gradient construction, responsive bioink development, long-term in vivo functional evaluation, and translational validation to advance tendon bioprinting materials toward functional regenerative applications.

Keywords: Bioprinting; Tendon repair; Bioink; Functionalized scaffolds; Immunomodulation

1. Introduction

Tendons are dense connective tissues that connect muscles to bones and play essential roles in force transmission, joint stability, and coordinated movement¹. Acute trauma, excessive exercise, chronic overuse, and age-related degeneration can all lead to tendon injuries, resulting in pain, restricted mobility, and functional impairment². Current treatments, including conservative management, suture repair, autograft or allograft reconstruction, and artificial material-assisted repair, remain unable to simultaneously address large-defect regeneration, restoration of mechanical function, donor-site morbidity, immune rejection, and insufficient long-term integration³. This limitation is closely related to the unique structural and biological characteristics of native tendon. Native tendons rely on highly aligned type I collagen fibers and hierarchical architectures to achieve efficient stress transmission. After injury, however, newly formed tissue is mainly characterized by rapid deposition of type III collagen, accompanied by disorganized alignment, insufficient crosslinking, and reduced mechanical performance. In addition, the limited vascularity, low cellularity, and low metabolic activity of tendon tissue further restrict cell recruitment and matrix reconstruction, making the repair process more prone to scar-like remodeling rather than functional regeneration^{4,5}. Therefore, materials for tendon repair need not only to fill tissue defects, but also to provide regulatory conditions closer to native tendon in terms of structural alignment, mechanical support, cellular microenvironment, and matrix reconstruction, which provides an important rationale for introducing bioprinting material design into tendon repair.

Tendon repair is not merely a process of defect filling, but rather a coordinated continuum involving inflammatory initiation, cell recruitment, matrix deposition, and collagen remodeling⁶. Early inflammation contributes to the clearance of necrotic tissue. However, if the classically activated pro-inflammatory M1 macrophage response persists, sustained elevation of pro-inflammatory mediators such as tumor necrosis factor- α (TNF- α), interleukin-1 β (IL-1 β), and interleukin-6 (IL-6) may exacerbate matrix degradation, adhesion formation, and scar remodeling. In contrast, a

timely alternatively activated reparative M2 macrophage response can promote inflammation resolution, angiogenesis, and collagen reconstruction through factors such as interleukin-10 (IL-10), vascular endothelial growth factor (VEGF), transforming growth factor- β (TGF- β), and insulin-like growth factor-1 (IGF-1) ^{7,8}. However, excessive or persistent M2 polarization may also promote fibrotic matrix deposition and scar-like remodeling, indicating that immunomodulatory materials should regulate macrophage responses in a time-dependent manner rather than simply enhancing M2 polarization. During the proliferative and remodeling phases, tenocytes, tendon stem/progenitor cells (TSPCs), and mesenchymal stem cells (MSCs) participate in cell migration, tenogenic differentiation, and matrix deposition ⁹⁻¹¹. Therefore, ideal materials should be designed according to stage-specific repair requirements, with the capacity to regulate inflammation, support directional cell alignment, promote organized type I collagen deposition, and guide the repair tissue toward a mechanically organized structure resembling native tendon ¹². For bioprinting materials, this means that material composition, spatial architecture, cell distribution, and bioactive component delivery need to be co-designed rather than serving merely as passive defect-filling scaffolds.

Against this background, bioprinting provides a designable approach for constructing materials for tendon repair ¹³. Compared with conventional scaffolds, bioprinting enables precise control over material composition, pore architecture, fiber orientation, mechanical gradients, and the spatial distribution of cells and bioactive components, making it particularly suitable for recapitulating the anisotropic and hierarchical structures of native tendon ¹⁴. Natural or modified natural materials, such as collagen, gelatin methacryloyl (GelMA), alginate, hyaluronic acid, silk fibroin, and tendon-derived decellularized extracellular matrix (dECM), can serve as cell-laden bioinks or printable hydrogel matrices, providing microenvironments for cell adhesion, bioactive delivery, and local matrix mimicry. Synthetic materials, including polycaprolactone (PCL), poly(lactic-co-glycolic acid) (PLGA), poly(lactide-co-caprolactone) (PLCL), and polyethylene glycol diacrylate (PEGDA), are more suitable

as printed load-bearing frameworks, structural reinforcing phases, or tunable crosslinked networks, thereby compensating for the insufficient mechanical support and long-term shape retention of single hydrogel-based bioinks. Bioactive glass, molybdenum-containing silicate bioceramics, and related ion-releasing functional components can further act as functional additives in printable composite systems or post-printing regulatory modules, contributing to immunomodulation, angiogenesis, interfacial mineralization, and stage-specific responsive regulation¹⁵⁻¹⁷. Accordingly, the value of bioprinting materials is no longer limited to defect filling, but lies in integrating structural design, bioactive delivery, immunomodulatory and inflammatory regulation, physical stimulation, and smart responsiveness into a comprehensive platform for functional tendon regeneration¹⁸. Based on this perspective, this review summarizes the tendon repair process, the fundamental requirements of bioprinting materials, major material systems, and functionalization strategies for tendon repair.

1.1. Literature sources and selection principles

This article is a narrative review that aims to provide a thematic integration of bioprinted material systems and functionalization strategies for tendon repair and regeneration. Relevant studies were mainly identified through searches of PubMed, Web of Science, and Scopus, supplemented by checking the reference lists of included articles. The search terms included "tendon repair", "tendon regeneration", "tendon injury", "bioprinting", "3D bioprinting", "bioink", "hydrogel", "tendon-derived extracellular matrix", "polycaprolactone", "tendon–bone interface", "immunomodulation", "mechanical stimulation", and "smart responsive biomaterials". The literature selection focused on representative bioprinting-related studies relevant to tendon or tendon–bone interface repair, including bioinks, printed scaffold architectures, cell-laden printed constructs, and post-printing functionalization strategies. Studies not directly using bioprinting were discussed only when they were closely related to tendon repair material design and provided clear design-relevant evidence for printable material systems, such as rheological regulation, mechanical reinforcement, degradation control, immunomodulatory microenvironment regulation,

bioactive molecule delivery, physical stimulation responsiveness, or interfacial functionalization. Studies with limited relevance to tendon repair or printable material design, reports lacking key experimental information, and conference abstracts without sufficient methodological details were not emphasized in this review.

Unlike previous reviews that mainly focused on tendon tissue engineering scaffolds, general bioink development, or broad applications of 3D bioprinting, this review emphasizes a stage-specific and function-oriented framework for tendon bioprinting. The main contribution of this review is to integrate the stage-specific requirements of tendon repair, the functional roles of different material systems, and major functionalization strategies within a unified bioprinting design framework. Rather than simply listing materials according to their source or isolated biological effects, we discuss how natural and modified natural bioinks, synthetic reinforcing materials, printed load-bearing frameworks, and ion-releasing functional components can serve as bioink matrices, mechanical-supporting phases, functional additives, delivery modules, or regulatory units for tendon and tendon–bone interface repair. By further linking material selection with printability, mechanical evaluation, phase-specific regulation, and translational challenges, this review aims to provide a practical design reference for the selection, combination, and functional optimization of bioprinted materials for tendon repair.

2. Tendon Repair Process

Tendon injuries are commonly caused by acute mechanical stress, direct trauma, or chronic overload, which can disrupt collagen fiber continuity, alignment, and local mechanical transmission^{19,20}. Native tendon is hierarchically assembled from collagen fibrils, collagen fibers, fascicles, and the whole tendon, and its highly aligned and hierarchical structure provides the basis for tensile strength and stress transmission (Fig. 1A), also serving as an important biomimetic reference for aligned architecture construction, hierarchical pore design, and mechanical reinforcement in bioprinted scaffolds. After injury, tendon repair can be divided into intrinsic and extrinsic healing: the former mainly depends on cells from the tendon substance and endotenon and is

associated with relatively better tissue integration and mechanical recovery; the latter relies more on cells from the tendon sheath and circulation and may accelerate defect filling, but is more likely to be accompanied by persistent inflammation, adhesion formation, and scar-like remodeling^{21,22}. Regardless of the healing mode, tendon repair usually involves three interconnected and partially overlapping phases: inflammation, proliferation, and remodeling²³. The inflammatory phase is mainly characterized by neutrophil and macrophage recruitment and the clearance of necrotic tissue and matrix debris, suggesting that early printed constructs should not only stabilize the defect area but also support cell protection and local immune microenvironment regulation; the proliferative phase is accompanied by gradual inflammation resolution, during which macrophages release anti-inflammatory factors and growth factors to promote the proliferation and differentiation of tendon-resident tendon stem/progenitor cells (TSPCs) and tendon-related cells as well as new extracellular matrix deposition, thereby requiring bioinks to provide cell-loading capacity, pore interconnectivity, bioactive component delivery, and early matrix-guiding functions; during the remodeling phase, inflammatory cells gradually decrease, collagen fibers become rearranged and progressively mature, and the repair tissue transitions toward a more organized mechanical structure, which further requires printed scaffolds to maintain aligned architecture and mechanical support during degradation and to promote collagen reorganization along the loading direction (Fig. 1B). Therefore, clarifying the main tasks of each phase helps shift bioprinting material design from simple defect filling toward multidimensional goals, including printability, shape retention, structural support, immunomodulation, bioactive delivery, spatial cell distribution, and functional recovery^{24,25}.




Fig. 1. Hierarchical structure of tendon and repair process after injury. (A) Tendon is hierarchically assembled from collagen fibrils, collagen fibers, and fascicles to the whole tendon, forming a highly ordered hierarchical structure. (B) After injury, tendon repair sequentially proceeds through the inflammatory, proliferative, and remodeling phases. The inflammatory phase is mainly characterized by immune cell recruitment, transendothelial migration across vascular endothelial cells, and debris clearance; the proliferative phase is characterized by

inflammation resolution, repair-associated macrophage activity, proliferation/differentiation of tendon-resident tendon stem/progenitor cells (TSPCs), and increased extracellular matrix (ECM) production; and during the remodeling phase, macrophage infiltration gradually decreases, while the collagen matrix becomes aligned and mature, contributing to the restoration of tendon structure and function.

2.1. Inflammatory Phase

Chisari et al. noted that the inflammatory phase is the earliest phase initiated after tendon injury, with the central task of clearing necrotic tissue and establishing an early microenvironment required for subsequent regeneration⁷. After injury, platelets release factors such as platelet-derived growth factor (PDGF), TGF- β , and VEGF, thereby increasing vascular permeability, promoting immune cell recruitment, and initiating the repair response^{26,27}. Damage-associated molecular patterns released from injured tissues further amplify inflammation²⁸. Darrieutort-Laffite et al. reported that IL-1 β and IL-6 are markedly elevated at the early stage, during which neutrophils and macrophages participate in tissue clearance⁵. Wang et al. emphasized that a persistent and excessive M1 response may increase TNF- α , IL-1 β , IL-6, and matrix metalloproteinases (MMPs), thereby inducing matrix degradation and fibrosis^{8,29}. In contrast, an M2 response established within an appropriate time window is conducive to inflammation resolution, angiogenesis, and matrix reconstruction³⁰, although excessive or persistent M2 polarization may also promote fibrotic matrix deposition and scar-like remodeling. Therefore, the inflammatory phase does not imply that material design should simply pursue anti-inflammatory effects, but rather requires bioprinting materials to balance early defect stabilization, cell protection, and local immune microenvironment regulation. By modulating bioink composition, interfacial architecture, degradation behavior, and local release of immunomodulatory ions or factors, printed constructs may provide early structural support while limiting excessive pro-inflammatory responses and guiding the immune response from clearance toward repair³¹.

2.2. Proliferative Phase

As inflammation becomes controlled, tendon repair enters the proliferative phase, which is mainly characterized by cell proliferation, angiogenesis, and matrix deposition^{23,24}. Darrieutort-Laffite et al. noted that TGF- β , basic fibroblast growth factor (bFGF), PDGF, VEGF, and IGF-1 jointly participate in the migration of fibroblasts and tendon-related cells, vascular formation, and extracellular matrix deposition⁵. Wang et al. and Docheva et al. also considered these factors to constitute a key growth factor network in tendon repair^{26,32}. Maffulli et al. reported that tenocytes from ruptured and tendinopathic Achilles tendons produce greater quantities of type III collagen than those from normal Achilles tendons, suggesting that type III collagen is involved in tendon injury- and repair-related matrix remodeling³³. Lu et al. and Huang et al. further emphasized that TSPCs participate in cell proliferation, migration, and collagen production^{10,34}. These features suggest that material design during the proliferative phase should not focus only on defect filling, but should provide a suitable spatial microenvironment for cell migration, vascular ingrowth, early matrix deposition, and tenogenic induction. Therefore, in tendon bioprinting, scaffolds designed for the proliferative phase need to integrate cell-friendly bioinks, interconnected pore architectures, aligned printed strands, and region-specific bioactive signal delivery, thereby promoting directional cell alignment, vascular support, and formation of a tenogenic microenvironment through both structural guidance and signals such as PDGF, bFGF, VEGF, and IGF-1^{26,32}.

2.3. Remodeling Phase

The remodeling phase is a critical stage during which tendon repair shifts from early tissue restoration toward long-term functional recovery^{19,23}. Maffulli et al. also showed increased type III collagen production by tenocytes from ruptured and tendinopathic Achilles tendons, indicating that repair-associated collagen remodeling differs from the organized collagen matrix of normal tendon³³. Darrieutort-Laffite et al. suggested that the remodeling phase usually begins approximately 4 weeks after injury and continues until repair is completed, with extracellular matrix reorganization and optimization of collagen alignment as its core processes⁵. Previous studies have

shown that mechanical loading influences tendon repair throughout the healing process. Appropriate tensile loading facilitates collagen reorganization along the direction of force, whereas insufficient or abnormal loading may lead to structural disorder^{35,36}. Therefore, material design during the remodeling phase should not remain limited to early defect filling or initial strength, but should maintain appropriate structural continuity and load transmission as the newly formed matrix gradually matures. For bioprinted scaffolds, aligned printing paths, anisotropic pore architectures, and mechanically reinforced frameworks can provide structural guidance for collagen reorganization along the loading direction; meanwhile, material degradation should be coordinated with new tissue formation to avoid premature loss of support or prolonged interference with matrix remodeling, thereby supporting organized type I collagen reconstruction and functional recovery^{25,35}.

Taken together, tendon repair involves overlapping inflammatory, proliferative, and remodeling phases, each of which imposes distinct requirements on bioprinting material design. Early printed constructs should stabilize the defect microenvironment and regulate excessive inflammatory responses; proliferative-stage printed constructs should support cell loading, migration, angiogenesis, and early tenogenic matrix formation; and remodeling-stage printed constructs should maintain structural continuity, match material degradation with tissue maturation, and promote collagen alignment and mechanical functional recovery. The phase-specific design goals, material strategies, functional cues, and evaluation indicators for tendon bioprinting are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1. Phase-specific bioprinting design framework for tendon repair.

Repair phase	Design goal	Material strategy	Functional cues	Evaluation indicators	References
Inflammatory phase	Stabilize the early defect microenvironment, protect cells, limit excessive pro-inflammatory responses, and guide the transition from inflammatory clearance to reparative remodeling rather than simply suppressing inflammation.	Immunomodulatory hydrogels; hyaluronic acid (HA)-, decellularized extracellular matrix (dECM)-, gelatin methacryloyl (GelMA)-, or alginate-based composite bioinks; reactive oxygen species (ROS)- or pH-responsive delivery systems; ion-releasing or anti-inflammatory functional components.	Interleukin-10 (IL-10) and other anti-inflammatory signals; regulation of tumor necrosis factor- α (TNF- α), interleukin-1 β (IL-1 β), interleukin-6 (IL-6), and interleukin-1 β (IL-1 β), interleukin-6 (IL-6), and reactive oxygen species (ROS); macrophage phenotype modulation from excessive M1 activation toward a balanced reparative response.	Tumor necrosis factor- α (TNF- α), interleukin-1 β (IL-1 β), interleukin-6 (IL-6), and reactive oxygen species (ROS) levels; cluster of differentiation 86 (CD86) or inducible nitric oxide synthase (iNOS); cluster of differentiation 206 (CD206) or arginase-1 (Arg-1); macrophage infiltration; early matrix degradation; local inflammatory microenvironment.	5,7,8,24,25,28-31
Proliferative phase	Support cell loading, migration, proliferation, angiogenesis, early extracellular matrix deposition, and tenogenic induction while maintaining printed construct stability.	Cell-friendly bioinks, including collagen, gelatin methacryloyl (GelMA), alginate, and tendon-derived decellularized extracellular matrix (dECM); interconnected pores; aligned strands; polycaprolactone (PCL) or poly(lactic-co-glycolic acid) (PLGA) frameworks; and region-specific delivery systems.	Platelet-derived growth factor (PDGF), basic fibroblast growth factor (bFGF), vascular endothelial growth factor (VEGF), insulin-like growth factor-1 (IGF-1), growth differentiation factor-7 (GDF-7), and exosome-related bioactive signals; structural guidance for directional cell alignment and vascular support.	Cell viability and proliferation; TSPCs/MSCs migration; tenogenic marker expression (SCX, TNMD, COL1, and COL3); angiogenic indicators (CD31 or VEGF); collagen deposition, cell alignment, and early tenogenic matrix formation.	5,10,23,24,26,32-34

Remodeling phase	Maintain long-term structural continuity and load transfer, match material degradation with tissue maturation, promote collagen alignment and type I collagen-dominant matrix remodeling, and support functional recovery.	Aligned printing paths; anisotropic pore structures; multi-material cooperative printing; polycaprolactone (PCL)-, poly(lactic-co-glycolic acid) (PLGA)-, or poly(lactide-co-caprolactone) (PLCL)-based load-bearing frameworks; decellularized extracellular matrix (dECM)-containing composite systems; mechanically responsive or multi-stimuli-responsive materials.	Mechanical loading or Tensile strength, elastic mechanoresponsive cues; modulus, ultimate load, structural anisotropy; fatigue resistance, and suture degradation-matched support; retention strength; type I physical stimulation or collagen to type III collagen responsive regulation to ratio; collagen alignment; promote collagen gliding resistance; adhesion organization and matrix score; mechanical recovery and functional outcome.	5,19,23,25,33,35,36
------------------	--	--	--	---------------------

Abbreviations: HA, hyaluronic acid; dECM, decellularized extracellular matrix; GelMA, gelatin methacryloyl; ROS, reactive oxygen species; IL-10, interleukin-10; M1, classically activated pro-inflammatory macrophage phenotype; TNF- α , tumor necrosis factor- α ; IL-1 β , interleukin-1 β ; IL-6, interleukin-6; CD86, cluster of differentiation 86; iNOS, inducible nitric oxide synthase; CD206, cluster of differentiation 206; Arg-1, arginase-1; PDGF, platelet-derived growth factor; bFGF, basic fibroblast growth factor; VEGF, vascular endothelial growth factor; IGF-1, insulin-like growth factor-1; GDF-7, growth differentiation factor-7; TSPCs, tendon stem/progenitor cells; MSCs, mesenchymal stem cells; SCX, scleraxis; TNMD, tenomodulin; COL1, type I collagen; COL3, type III collagen; CD31, cluster of differentiation 31; PCL, polycaprolactone; PLGA, poly(lactic-co-glycolic acid); PLCL, poly(lactide-co-caprolactone).

3. Fundamental Requirements of Bioprinting Materials for Tendon Repair

Bioprinting materials for tendon repair must not only meet the requirements for printability and shape formation, but also adapt to the tissue environment of tendon, which is characterized by high alignment, long-term mechanical loading, and limited regenerative capacity^{37,38}. Therefore, material evaluation should not be restricted to formability alone, but should also consider printability, biocompatibility, mechanical matching, degradation behavior, and structural stability³⁹. Ideally, these materials should enable controllable fabrication while supporting directional cell alignment, matrix deposition, and tissue integration^{12,25}.

3.1. Printability

Printability is a fundamental requirement for bioprinting materials⁴⁰. For extrusion-based printing, materials should exhibit appropriate viscosity, shear-thinning behavior, yield stress, and elastic recovery, allowing them to flow smoothly through the nozzle and rapidly recover after extrusion to maintain the printed structure^{41,42}. Hull et al. summarized the key rheological characteristics of cell-laden hydrogel bioinks, including shear storage/loss moduli (G'/G''), yield stress, shear-thinning behavior, and post-shear structural recovery. Together, these parameters determine the printability and shape fidelity of extrusion-based bioprinting (Fig. 2A)⁴³. Excessively low viscosity can lead to scaffold collapse and blurred boundaries, whereas excessively high viscosity increases extrusion pressure and may damage encapsulated cells⁴⁴. For tendon scaffolds, materials should also possess adequate layer-by-layer stacking ability and shape retention, as unstable construct formation may compromise subsequent cell alignment and matrix reconstruction⁴⁵.

3.2. Biocompatibility

Materials should support cell survival, adhesion, migration, proliferation, and differentiation, while minimizing cytotoxicity, adverse or excessive foreign body responses, and excessive inflammation^{46,47}. For cell-laden printing systems, extrusion pressure, nozzle-induced shear stress, tensile/extensional stress, crosslinking conditions, and light intensity should also be carefully controlled to reduce the adverse effects of the printing process on cell membrane integrity and cellular function, thereby maintaining cell viability during printing^{48,49}. Hull et al. further noted that appropriate yield stress helps maintain homogeneous cell suspension and reduce cell sedimentation, whereas shear-thinning behavior and plug-like flow can decrease shear and tensile damage to cells during extrusion, thereby improving the printing safety of cell-laden bioinks (Fig.

2B)⁴³. For tendon repair, materials should not only support cell growth, but also facilitate host cell recruitment, local inflammatory regulation, and integration of newly formed tissue.

3.3. Mechanical Matching

Tendons are subjected to long-term tensile loading. Zhu et al. divided the stress–strain response of the Achilles tendon during tensile loading into the toe region, linear region, yield region, and failure region, reflecting the progressive mechanical response of the tendon matrix, including collagen fiber uncrimping, fiber alignment, interfibrillar sliding, disruption of matrix or fibril interactions, and eventual tissue-level failure (Fig. 2C)⁵⁰. Therefore, materials that are too soft may fail to provide sufficient support for the defect area, whereas excessively stiff materials may impair tissue compliance and cellular mechanosensing^{35,36}. An ideal scaffold should maintain mechanical continuity during the early repair stage and gradually transfer load as the newly formed matrix develops^{25,51}. Jiang et al. constructed 3D-printed multilayered PLGA scaffolds combined with collagen–fibrin hydrogels. In their study, tensile properties were evaluated by uniaxial tensile testing and force–strain curve analysis. Compared with single-layered PLGA scaffolds, the multilayered printed structures showed higher elastic stiffness and ultimate force, indicating enhanced tensile stiffness and load-bearing capacity. These findings suggest that layered structural design may improve the compatibility between the scaffold and the tensile loading environment of tendon repair by enhancing tensile support, ultimate load-bearing capacity, structural stability, and load transfer, rather than simply increasing material strength⁵². For oriented tendon scaffolds, materials should not only possess sufficient strength and fatigue stability, but also support cell alignment along the loading direction and promote organized collagen deposition.

3.4. Degradation Behavior and Structural Stability

Material degradation should match the temporal progression of tendon repair. Excessively rapid degradation may cause the scaffold to lose support before newly formed tissue matures, whereas excessively slow degradation may hinder tissue integration and induce persistent inflammation^{53,54}. After printing, materials usually require further crosslinking or solidification to maintain shape and enhance structural stability. Common strategies include thermally induced crosslinking, spray crosslinking, crosslinking baths, pre-crosslinking, and photocrosslinking^{48,55}. Ionic crosslinking, photocrosslinking, and chemical crosslinking each have distinct advantages and limitations; therefore, practical material design should balance cell safety, shape maintenance, mechanical support, and degradation rate.

3.5 Mechanical Evaluation and Functional Outcome Assessment

Because tendon is a mechanically loaded and anisotropic tissue, evaluation of tendon bioprinting scaffolds should extend beyond cell viability, tenogenic marker expression, and histological appearance. Mechanical testing is needed to determine whether printed constructs can provide early support, maintain structural continuity, and transfer load during matrix remodeling. Commonly used parameters include tensile strength, elastic modulus, ultimate load or failure load, failure strain, fatigue resistance, and failure mode, which together reflect load-bearing capacity, deformation behavior, and structural stability under repeated loading^{50,52,56}.

For surgically implanted scaffolds, suture retention strength is also important because it reflects fixation stability and resistance to early postoperative loading. For flexor tendons and other adhesion-prone sites, gliding resistance, tendon excursion, adhesion score, and range of motion should be considered, as excessive friction or adhesion may impair tendon sliding despite favorable histological repair. In vivo studies should further combine explant mechanical testing with functional assessments such as gait analysis, weight-bearing behavior, grip strength, joint range of motion, and gross motor recovery. These outcome measures help connect scaffold architecture, degradation behavior, and mechanical performance with clinically meaningful tendon repair^{25,35,56}.




Fig. 2. Schematic illustration of the fundamental performance requirements of bioprinting materials for tendon repair. (A) Schematic illustration of key rheological parameters related to bioink printability, including shear modulus, yield stress, shear-thinning behavior, and self-healing properties. Reprinted with permission from Hull et al.⁴³ Copyright © 2021 Wiley-VCH GmbH. (B) Schematic illustration showing the effects of bioink rheological properties on cell distribution and cell damage during extrusion. Appropriate yield stress and shear-thinning behavior help reduce cell sedimentation and decrease mechanical damage caused by extensional flow. Reprinted with permission from Hull et al.⁴³ Copyright © 2021 Wiley-VCH GmbH. (C) Schematic illustration of a typical tendon stress–strain curve, showing the mechanical response of tendon from the physiological deformation range to the yield and failure regions. Zhu et al.⁵⁰.

Overall, the fundamental requirements of bioprinting materials for tendon repair do not lie in maximizing any single property, but rather in achieving a coordinated balance among printability, biocompatibility, mechanical matching, degradation behavior, and structural stability^{38,39}. Only when this foundation is established can subsequent functionalization strategies, including structural optimization, bioactive delivery, immunomodulation, physical stimulation, and smart responsiveness, become practically meaningful^{12,24}.

4. Bioprinting Material Systems for Tendon Repair

Tendon tissue is highly aligned, mechanically anisotropic, and limited in regenerative capacity. Therefore, bioprinting materials should simultaneously provide biomimetic properties, mechanical support, cytocompatibility, and repair-regulating capability^{16,56}. Natural biomaterials are more suitable for providing cell-adhesive sites and biological signals, whereas synthetic biomaterials are more commonly used as load-bearing frameworks and structural platforms. Inorganic ions are mainly incorporated to enhance functions such as immunomodulation, angiogenesis, interfacial integration, and matrix maturation^{14,56}. Accordingly, the focus of material design has shifted from the use of single materials toward multi-material synergy^{14,16}.

4.1. Natural Biomaterials for Bioprinting

Natural biomaterials generally more closely resemble the extracellular matrix and can provide cell-adhesive sites, a supportive spatial microenvironment, and biological cues. These properties have important effects on the alignment, phenotype maintenance, and collagen reconstruction of tenocytes and TSPCs^{57,58}. However, in tendon bioprinting, the applicability of natural biomaterials is determined not only by their biological activity, but also by their rheological properties, cell-loading capacity, shape stability, and post-printing structural fidelity^{40,41}. Commonly used natural biomaterials include collagen, alginate, hyaluronic acid, and silk fibroin, while tissue-specific dECM is also emerging as a promising direction for enhancing biomimicry⁵⁹.

4.1.1. Collagen

Collagen is the major structural protein of the extracellular matrix in native tendon. It provides cell-adhesive sites and supports three-dimensional cell adhesion, spreading, tendon-like phenotype maintenance, and matrix deposition, making it an important component for constructing biomimetic hydrogels^{57,60}. However, collagen gels usually exhibit weak mechanical properties, limited shape retention, and relatively rapid degradation, making them insufficient to independently provide early tensile support for tendon repair⁶¹. In addition, collagen-based

bioinks are also limited by low-pH preparation and gelation-related conditions. Collagen solutions usually need to be prepared and stored under acidic conditions to maintain solubility; before cell-laden printing or gel formation, they should be neutralized to near-physiological pH. This neutralization process is not merely a procedural step, because pH adjustment, together with temperature, ionic strength, and gelation time, can influence collagen fibrillogenesis, gelation kinetics, final gel microstructure, viscosity evolution, extrusion stability, cell encapsulation performance, post-printing construct stability, and cell viability. Inadequate neutralization or poorly controlled processing conditions may further compromise the viability and function of encapsulated cells ⁶². Therefore, in tendon bioprinting, collagen is more suitable as a biomimetic matrix component in composite bioinks rather than as an independent load-bearing bioink, and it is often combined with GelMA, alginate, PCL, or dECM to improve printing stability and mechanical performance while preserving cytocompatibility ^{16,61}.

4.1.2. Alginate

Alginate has mild gelation conditions and good printing compatibility. It can rapidly crosslink through divalent cations such as Ca^{2+} to form an ionically crosslinked network and maintain three-dimensional structures, making it suitable for live-cell encapsulation, extrusion-based printing, and improving shape fidelity ^{63,64}. Its major limitation is the lack of cell-adhesive sites, and its long-term mechanical support capacity is also limited. When used alone, alginate is therefore insufficient to support the adhesion, spreading, and directional behavior of tendon-related cells ⁶⁵. For example, RGD-modified alginate can be mixed with human adipose-derived stem cells (hADSCs) to form a cell-laden bioink and printed onto a calcium-containing substrate, where Ca^{2+} -mediated ionic crosslinking enables hydrogel construct formation. This strategy takes advantage of the rapid gelation and shape-retention properties of alginate, while the RGD peptide provides cell-adhesive sites to improve cell adhesion and spreading within the printed hydrogel constructs (Fig. 3A) ⁶³. In addition, the long-term structural stability and degradation behavior of alginate are jointly affected by ionic crosslinking stability, ion exchange, swelling, and chemical modification. Because mammalian tissues lack alginase or alginate lyase capable of efficiently degrading the alginate backbone, unmodified alginate does not primarily undergo enzymatic degradation in the same manner as collagen, gelatin, or dECM. Instead, Ca^{2+} -crosslinked alginate networks may gradually soften because of Ca^{2+} loss, exchange with monovalent ions such as Na^+ , swelling, and relaxation of the gel network, leading to reduced shape retention and mechanical support ⁶⁶.

Oxidation, molecular weight, and crosslinking density can further regulate the degradation rate and mechanical retention of alginate hydrogels; oxidation introduces more degradable structures, whereas higher crosslinking density generally delays network loosening but may also restrict cell migration and tissue ingrowth⁶⁷. Accordingly, in tendon bioprinting, alginate is more suitable as a basic printable component or rheology-modulating material and is often combined with collagen, gelatin, GelMA, dECM, or other reinforcing components to take advantage of its rapid gelation, cell encapsulation, and shape-retention properties while compensating for its limited bioactivity, restricted cell adhesion, and insufficient long-term load-bearing support^{64,65}.

4.1.3. Hyaluronic Acid

Hyaluronic acid is an important polysaccharide in the extracellular matrix and plays roles in water retention, lubrication, cell migration support, and regulation of the inflammatory microenvironment⁶⁸. For tendon tissue, which is poorly vascularized, sparsely cellular, and prone to adhesion formation, hyaluronic acid is more suitable as a microenvironment-modulating component. It can improve hydration, facilitate cell migration, and alleviate inflammatory interference⁶⁹. However, unmodified or weakly crosslinked HA systems generally have low mechanical strength and limited shape stability, and they may be affected by hyaluronidase-mediated degradation; therefore, HA alone is difficult to use as a stand-alone load-bearing bioink for long-term maintenance of printed structures. Chen et al. summarized that HA and its derivatives often require chemical modification and crosslinking strategies to improve printability, gel stability, and post-printing shape fidelity when used as bioinks⁷⁰. Luo et al. further summarized that HA can form more stable and tunable hydrogel networks through methacrylation, thiolation, tyramine modification, aldehyde functionalization, and dynamic covalent crosslinking⁷¹. For example, methacrylated hyaluronic acid (HAMA) can form tunable networks through photocrosslinking; thiolated HA and tyramine-modified HA can enhance gel stability through thiol-related reactions or enzymatic oxidative crosslinking, respectively; and aldehyde-functionalized or hydrazone-crosslinked HA can provide design flexibility for shear recovery, injectability, and dynamic structural regulation. It should be noted that although higher crosslinking density can improve shape retention and resistance to degradation, excessive crosslinking may also restrict cell migration, matrix remodeling, and tissue ingrowth. Therefore, in bioprinting, hyaluronic acid is usually combined with other natural or synthetic materials to improve the repair interface, prevent adhesion, and enable bioactive molecule delivery⁶⁹, and in

tendon bioprinting it is more suitable as a microenvironment-modulating and functional component in composite bioinks, with a balance among stability, cytocompatibility, and tissue remodeling capacity.

4.1.4. Silk Fibroin

Silk fibroin exhibits good biocompatibility, tunable mechanical properties, processability, and controllable degradation, making it one of the natural biomaterials more suitable for the mechanically loaded environment of tendon⁷². As a bioink or composite printing component, silk fibroin can improve scaffold shape stability, biocompatibility, and tissue engineering applicability through compositional modification and crosslinking strategies⁷³. Kim et al. developed a methacrylated silk fibroin (Sil-MA) bioink for digital light processing three-dimensional bioprinting. The rheological and mechanical properties of this bioink could be modulated by varying the Sil-MA content, and the system enabled the fabrication of complex three-dimensional constructs with good structural stability and biocompatibility⁷³. Ning et al. further developed a silk fibroin–hydroxypropyl cellulose–TSPC bioink and fabricated porous Achilles tendon scaffolds using three-dimensional bioprinting. This system showed favorable cytocompatibility, rheological properties, printability, mechanical strength, controlled biodegradability, and suitable porosity, and supported TSPC survival, migration, proliferation, and tenogenic differentiation, providing more direct evidence for the application of silk fibroin-containing composite bioinks in Achilles tendon-related repair scenarios⁷⁴. However, silk fibroin still has several limitations as a bioink. When used alone, it often cannot simultaneously satisfy the requirements for printability, shape fidelity, cytocompatibility, and long-term mechanical retention. Therefore, methacrylation, combination with cellulose derivatives or other rheology-modulating components, and optimized crosslinking strategies are usually required to broaden the printable window and enhance structural stability^{73,74}. In addition, compared with tissue-specific materials such as tendon-derived dECM, silk fibroin does not provide the complete tendon extracellular matrix (ECM) composition or tenogenic inductive cues⁷⁵⁻⁷⁷. Therefore, in tendon bioprinting, silk fibroin is more suitable as a mechanical-reinforcing and structure-stabilizing component in composite bioinks rather than as a stand-alone repair system⁷²⁻⁷⁴.

4.1.5. Decellularized Extracellular Matrix

The main advantage of decellularized extracellular matrix (dECM) lies in its tissue specificity. Compared with conventional collagen or gelatin, tendon-derived dECM retains part of the

structural proteins, glycosaminoglycans, and endogenous biological cues, which is more conducive to mimicking the native tendon microenvironment, maintaining the tenocyte phenotype, and supporting matrix reconstruction^{59,75}. However, dECM bioinks still face limitations related to compositional and processing stability. Their major challenges include variability in tissue source, decellularization protocol, digestion degree, and batch-to-batch composition, all of which may affect compositional stability and reproducibility. In addition, dECM bioinks used alone often exhibit weak mechanical properties, insufficient viscosity, and limited post-printing structural maintenance; therefore, polymer blending, supporting frameworks, or crosslinking strategies are commonly required to improve printability and shape fidelity⁷⁶. Zhao et al. systematically compared the effects of different acidic solutions on the preparation of tendon-derived dECM bioinks and found that the acidic digestion system and digestion degree can markedly alter the viscoelasticity, osmolarity, gel stiffness, and post-printing stability of dECM precursors, thereby influencing cell viability, spreading, proliferation, and tenogenic induction. These findings suggest that the function of dECM bioinks is determined not only by tissue origin, but also by preparation parameters and the physical microenvironment (Fig. 3B)⁷⁷. Therefore, dECM is more suitable as a tissue-specific bioactive component that works synergistically with printable and load-bearing materials to enhance biomimicry while improving printing stability and structural maintenance^{59,76,77}.




Fig. 3. Schematic illustration of natural biomaterials and tissue-specific decellularized extracellular matrix (dECM) bioinks for tendon repair. (A) Schematic illustration of an arginine-glycine-aspartic acid (RGD)-modified alginate bioink. RGD-modified oxidized alginate is mixed with human adipose-derived stem cells (hADSCs) to form a cell-laden bioink, which is printed onto a calcium-containing substrate and ionically crosslinked through Ca^{2+} to form hydrogel constructs. The RGD peptide provides cell-adhesive sites for alginate hydrogels and thereby improves cell adhesion and spreading. Reprinted with permission from Jia et al.⁶³ Copyright © 2014 Acta Materialia Inc. Published by Elsevier Ltd. (B) Schematic illustration of the preparation parameters of tendon-derived dECM bioinks. Different acidic solutions, osmotic pressure, and stiffness can affect the cytocompatibility, cell spreading, and tenogenic induction capacity of dECM bioinks. Reprinted with permission from Zhao et al.⁷⁷ Copyright © 2021 The Author(s). Published by Elsevier Ltd on behalf of Acta Materialia Inc.

4.2. Synthetic Biomaterials

Synthetic biomaterials offer advantages in mechanical performance, structural stability, manufacturing consistency, and parameter controllability, and are therefore commonly used as load-bearing frameworks in tendon bioprinting^{51,78}. Their significance lies not only in supporting the defect area, but also in providing a designable, reproducible, and tunable structural basis for complex repair systems, with controllable degradation after the maturation of newly formed tissue⁷⁹. However, most synthetic materials lack intrinsic cell-adhesive sites and tendon-specific

biological cues. When used alone, they are often insufficient to support cell loading, phenotype maintenance, and organized matrix reconstruction. Some materials may also exhibit hydrophobicity, mismatched degradation rates, degradation products that affect the local microenvironment, or printing conditions that are unfavorable for live-cell encapsulation. Therefore, in tendon bioprinting, synthetic materials are more suitable as load-bearing frameworks, structural reinforcement phases, or degradable supporting systems, and they are often combined with natural hydrogels, dECM, cells, and bioactive factors to balance mechanical stability, printability, and biological function ^{51,78,79}.

4.2.1. Polycaprolactone

Polycaprolactone (PCL) exhibits good mechanical properties, pronounced thermoplasticity, mature melt-printing capability, and relatively slow degradation, making it suitable for constructing oriented fibrous frameworks with long-term shape retention. Such frameworks can provide physical guidance for directional cell alignment and organized collagen deposition ^{78,79}. However, PCL is intrinsically hydrophobic, has low bioactivity and limited cell-adhesive capacity, and its melt-printing process usually requires relatively high temperatures, making it unsuitable as a directly cell-laden bioink ⁷⁸. Through surface modification, aligned structural optimization, post-printing cell seeding, or combination with cytocompatible hydrogels such as collagen, GelMA, and alginate, PCL can help balance mechanical support, structural guidance, and tissue compatibility ⁸⁰.

4.2.2. Polylactic Acid-Based Materials and Their Copolymers

Polylactic acid-based materials and their copolymers, including PLA, PLGA, and PLCL, can provide good structural stability for scaffolds ⁵¹. PLA has relatively high stiffness and good shape retention, but its compliance is limited. PLGA has a tunable degradation rate and can be used not only as a scaffold material, but also in microspheres, nanoparticles, and drug delivery systems. PLCL exhibits better flexibility and is more suitable for dynamically loaded soft tissues such as tendons and ligaments ⁸¹. It should be noted that these materials generally lack cell-adhesive sites and tendon-specific biological cues, and the degradation products of some polyester-based materials may alter the local microenvironment. Therefore, in tendon bioprinting, they are more suitable as degradable load-bearing frameworks, structural reinforcement phases, or drug-delivery carriers rather than as stand-alone cell-laden bioinks. Jiang et al. combined a 3D-printed multilayered PLGA framework with a collagen-fibrin hydrogel to construct a composite scaffold

consisting of regular porous gaps, solid end structures, and hydrogel-filled regions. In this system, the PLGA scaffold mainly provided shape stability and mechanical support, whereas the hydrogel regions provided space for cell loading, growth, and matrix deposition. TNMD immunofluorescence and the expression of tenogenic genes, including SCX, TNMD, and COL3, further indicated that this system could support stem cell tenogenic differentiation (Fig. 4A) ⁵². This study suggests that integrating a degradable synthetic framework with a cytocompatible hydrogel can help balance structural stability, cell-loading capacity, and a tenogenic microenvironment. Overall, these materials are suitable for providing stable structures and tunable degradation, but they often need to be combined with natural polymers, functional ions, or bioactive molecules to compensate for their limited bioactivity ^{51,52}.

4.2.3. Polyethylene Glycol and Its Derivatives

Polyethylene glycol (PEG) and its derivatives, such as polyethylene glycol diacrylate (PEGDA), are typical synthetic hydrogel systems. Their main advantage lies in the designability of their network structure, which allows the modulation of modulus, degradation behavior, drug-loading capacity, and pore networks by adjusting molecular weight, crosslinking density, and functional group modification ⁸². In bioprinting, PEG-based materials are particularly suitable as photocrosslinkable, tunable, and relatively inert bioink platforms for constructing controllable microenvironments, spatially delivering bioactive molecules, and regulating cell behavior; however, they are generally not suitable for providing the high-strength mechanical support required for tendon repair ⁸³. Because PEG-based materials inherently lack cell-adhesive sites, adhesive peptides are often introduced, or PEG-based systems are combined with natural materials such as collagen, gelatin, or hyaluronic acid to improve cell adhesion, migration, and functional expression ⁸⁴. Therefore, in tendon bioprinting, PEG and PEGDA are more suitable as tunable hydrogel matrices, crosslinked networks, or bioactive molecule delivery platforms rather than as stand-alone load-bearing repair materials.

4.3. Inorganic Ions

In tendon bioprinting systems, inorganic ions and ion-releasing inorganic functional components are generally more suitable as auxiliary functional phases in composite bioinks or printable scaffolds rather than as primary shape-forming materials. Mg^{2+} , Zn^{2+} , and Cu^{2+} have been used to modulate inflammation, oxidative stress, angiogenesis, and the tendon–bone interface microenvironment; however, in this review, they are briefly summarized only as auxiliary

functional components rather than discussed as an independent core material category ⁸⁵⁻⁸⁹. Bioactive glass can also serve as an ion-releasing inorganic component in tendon–bone interface-related composite systems. Liu et al. reported that a bioactive glass-containing gradient hydrogel promoted synchronized regeneration of tendon, fibrocartilage, and bone tissues by continuously releasing bioactive ions such as Si, Ca, and P and providing gradient cues, while also enhancing interfacial biomechanical strength ⁹⁰. This study provides a useful design reference for ion-releasing materials oriented toward tendon–bone interface regeneration, although it should be interpreted mainly as functional material evidence rather than direct tendon bioprinting evidence. Du et al. further incorporated molybdenum-containing silicate bioceramics (MS) into gelatin methacryloyl (GelMA)-based multicellular bioinks containing tendon stem/progenitor cells (TSPCs) and bone marrow mesenchymal stem cells (BMSCs), thereby using MS as an inorganic bioactive component for three-dimensional bioprinting of regionally organized tendon–bone interface scaffolds (Fig. 4B) ⁹¹. The corresponding cell-staining images showed that TSPCs and BMSCs maintained cell spreading and organized distribution within the GelMA-based printed constructs over 7 and 14 days, suggesting that MS-containing multicellular bioinks can integrate inorganic functional regulation with spatially patterned cellular organization (Fig. 4C) ⁹¹. Overall, the value of inorganic functional components in tendon bioprinting should be reflected in their functional supplementation, local release, spatial organization, and interface regulation within printable composite systems, rather than in the isolated biological effects of a single ion ^{85,88,91}.




Fig. 4. Schematic illustration of synthetic material scaffolds and ion-functionalized multicellular bioprinted scaffolds for tendon and tendon-bone interface repair. (A) Schematic illustration of the structural design of a 3D-printed multilayered poly(lactic-co-glycolic acid) (PLGA) scaffold combined with a collagen-fibrin hydrogel, including a separate layer-by-layer structure and a tri-layered structure. This system can be used to construct a rotator cuff tendon repair scaffold that provides both mechanical support and a cell-friendly microenvironment. Reprinted with permission from Jiang et al.⁵² Copyright © 2020 The Authors. Publishing services by Elsevier B.V. on behalf of KeAi Communications Co., Ltd. (B) Gelatin methacryloyl (GelMA)-based multicellular bioprinting strategy incorporating molybdenum-containing silicate bioceramics (MS). MS is integrated into the printable hydrogel matrix as an inorganic bioactive component, while tendon stem/progenitor cells (TSPCs) and bone marrow mesenchymal stem cells (BMSCs) provide region-specific cellular cues for tendon-bone interface repair. Du et al.⁹¹. (C) Cell-staining images of MS-containing GelMA-based printed constructs showing the morphology, spreading, and spatial distribution of TSPCs and BMSCs at days 7 and 14. Du et al.⁹¹.

Overall, different bioprinting materials play distinct functional roles in tendon repair. Natural biomaterials mainly provide cytocompatibility, cell-adhesive cues, and tissue-specific

microenvironmental support, whereas synthetic materials are more suitable as load-bearing frameworks or structural reinforcing phases. Inorganic or ion-releasing components primarily serve as functional additives for immunomodulation, angiogenesis, matrix maturation, and tendon–bone interface integration. The major material types and their functional roles in tendon bioprinting are summarized in Table 2.

ACCEPTED PAPER

Table 2. Major material types and their functional roles in tendon bioprinting.

Bioprinting material type	Printing-related features	Advantages	Limitations	Functional role	References
Collagen	ECM-mimetic protein hydrogel with cell-adhesive motifs. Requires low-pH dissolution, neutralization, and controlled gelation to maintain printability and cell viability.	High biological relevance; supports cell adhesion, spreading, tendon-like phenotype maintenance, and early matrix deposition.	Weak tensile support, limited shape fidelity, and rapid degradation. Process variables may affect alginate, PCL, or fibrillogenesis, viscosity, derived dECM to improve construct stability, and cell shape retention and function.	Biomimetic matrix phase for composite bioinks, particularly with GelMA, PCL, or tendon- dECM to improve mechanical support.	16,57,60-62
Alginate	Natural polysaccharide with rapid Ca^{2+} -mediated ionic crosslinking. Useful for extrusion printability, construct stabilization, rheology regulation, cell encapsulation, and initial shape retention.	Mild gelation, good extrusion compatibility, and rapid long-term construct stabilization. Helps improve initial shape fidelity in hydrogel blends.	Lacks cell-adhesive sites and modulating tendon-specific cues; limited extrusion-based capacity. Ca^{2+} loss, Na^{+} exchange, swelling, and relaxation may soften the network.	Printable base and rheology-phase for composite bioinks, commonly combined with collagen, gelatin, GelMA, dECM, or reinforcing the frameworks to improve bioactivity and structural support.	63-67

Hyaluronic acid (HA) and methacrylated hyaluronic acid (HAMA)	ECM-associated polysaccharide with hydration, lubrication, anti-adhesion, and microenvironment-modulating functions. HAMA improves crosslinking stability and shape retention.	Supports cell migration, anti-interface and inflammatory microenvironment regulation, degradation may reduce retention; useful for bioactive delivery.	Unmodified or weakly crosslinked HA has low mechanical strength and poor shape stability. Hyaluronidase delivery systems, often combined with GelMA, PEG-based hydrogels, PCL frameworks, or reinforcing components, may restrict tissue ingrowth.	68-71
Silk fibroin	Natural protein with tunable mechanics, processability, and controllable degradation. Printability is improved by methacrylation, blending, or optimized crosslinking.	Better mechanical potential than many soft natural hydrogels; contributes to shape stability, structural retention, and reinforcement in mechanically loaded tendon constructs.	Limited tendon-specific ECM composition and tenogenic cues. Alone, it may not simultaneously satisfy printability, shape fidelity, cytocompatibility, and long-term mechanical retention.	72-74,77

Tendon-derived decellularized extracellular matrix (dECM)	Tissue-specific decellularized ECM bioink retaining tendon-related proteins, glycosaminoglycans, and endogenous cues. Printing behavior depends on solubilization and digestion.	Strong tendon-mimetic biological relevance; supports decellularization protocol, preferably with GelMA, tendon-like microenvironment enzymatic digestion degree, collagen, alginate, PCL, PEG-reconstruction, phenotype viscosity, gel stiffness, and based networks, or maintenance, and tenogenic post-printing stability affect crosslinking strategies to reproducibility. Weak improve printability and mechanics alone. structural maintenance.	Batch variability, tissue- differences, phase in composite bioinks, Tissue-specific bioactive	59,75-77
--	---	--	--	-----------------

Polycaprolactone (PCL)	Synthetic thermoplastic polymer suitable for melt-based printing. Functions mainly as a printed load-bearing framework, oriented guide, and long-term structural support.	Good shape retention, Hydrophobic and bioinert mechanical stability, and load- surface; limited cell adhesion transfer capacity; suitable for and low intrinsic bioactivity. aligned architectures and Slow degradation may interfere with remodeling if hydrogel-reinforced constructs. not properly matched.	Oriented scaffolds, load-bearing frameworks, and hydrogel-reinforced composite constructs, particularly with natural bioinks, dECM, cells, or bioactive coatings.	51,78-80
-------------------------------	--	---	--	-----------------

Poly(lactic acid (PLA), poly(lactic-co-glycolic acid) (PLGA), and poly(lactide-co-caprolactone) (PLCL)	Biodegradable synthetic Good structural stability and Multilayered scaffolds, polyesters with adjustable design flexibility. PLGA Limited intrinsic bioactivity degradable reinforcing stiffness, flexibility, provides tunable degradation and lack of tendon-specific frameworks, tendon-bone degradation rate, and scaffold and delivery potential; PLCL cues. Polyester degradation interface support systems, and architecture. Useful as offers flexibility for products and local drug-delivery carriers, usually structural frameworks or dynamically loaded soft acidification require attention. combined with cell-friendly delivery carriers. tissues. hydrogels or bioactive factors.	51,52,81
---	---	-----------------

Polyethylene glycol (PEG) and polyethylene glycol diacrylate (PEGDA)	Designable synthetic hydrogel Chemically defined and highly Lacks natural cell-adhesive Tunable hydrogel networks, controlled-delivery platforms, and composite bioink systems, often functionalized with crosslinking, modulus, pore building tailored biological cues. Limited high-adhesive peptides or combined with collagen, gelatin, HA, structure, degradation, and microenvironments and strength support unless dECM, or reinforcing delivery behavior. controlled-release platforms. reinforced or functionalized. frameworks.	82-84
---	--	--------------

Ion-releasing functional additives	Magnesium ions (Mg^{2+}), zinc ions (Zn^{2+}), copper ions (Cu^{2+}), molybdenum-containing silicate bioceramics (MS), and bioactive glass. Serve as auxiliary functional additives or post-printing regulatory modules, not primary bioinks. Provide ion-mediated regulation of immunomodulation, angiogenesis, maturation, mineralization, and bone interface integration.	Cannot independently serve as the main bioink or load-bearing scaffold. Dose, release kinetics, particle dispersion, rheological effects, bioactive coatings, cytocompatibility, and long-term safety require optimization.	Auxiliary functional additives in composite hydrogels, molybdenum-containing silicate bioceramics (MS)-containing gelatin methacryloyl (GelMA)-based multicellular bioinks, and tendon-bone interface constructs, preferably combined with natural bioinks, synthetic frameworks, and regionally organized bioprinting strategies.
------------------------------------	--	---	--

85-91

Abbreviations: ECM, extracellular matrix; GelMA, gelatin methacryloyl; HA, hyaluronic acid; HAMA, methacrylated hyaluronic acid; dECM, decellularized extracellular matrix; PCL, polycaprolactone; PLA, polylactic acid; PLGA, poly(lactic-co-glycolic acid); PLCL, poly(lactide-co-caprolactone); PEG, polyethylene glycol; PEGDA, polyethylene glycol diacrylate; MS, molybdenum-containing silicate bioceramics.

5. Functionalization Strategies of Bioprinting Materials for Tendon Repair

Relying solely on material composition and basic mechanical properties is insufficient to meet the stage-specific requirements of tendon repair. In the early phase, materials should stabilize the defect, regulate inflammation, and maintain cell viability. In the intermediate phase, they should promote cell migration, angiogenesis, and matrix deposition. In the later phase, greater emphasis should be placed on organized collagen alignment, tissue maturation, and mechanical recovery^{92,93}. For tendon bioprinting, the value of scaffolds or bioinks should not be limited to the formation of visible three-dimensional structures. Instead, they should further enable active intervention across different repair stages through architectural design, bioactive factor delivery, immune regulation, spatial cell distribution, and modulation of the mechanical microenvironment. Therefore, current research has shifted from scaffold construction itself toward active regulation of the repair process, making functionalization strategies a central approach for improving repair outcomes⁹⁴. This section summarizes the major functionalization strategies for tendon bioprinting materials, including structural and topographical regulation, chemical and bioactive modification, immune microenvironment modulation, cell loading, and mechanical stimulation.

Functionalization does not simply mean adding more material components; rather, it involves targeted design around the key challenges of tendon regeneration. Structural and topographical modulation can guide directional cell alignment; bioactive molecule delivery can supplement stage-specific regenerative signals; immunomodulation can reduce excessive inflammation and scar formation; conductive, piezoelectric, or mechanically responsive materials can mimic physical stimulation; and pH-, ROS-, or temperature-responsive systems may enable dynamic intervention in response to local microenvironmental changes^{95,96}. It should be noted that these functionalization strategies are not independent of one another, but should be co-designed with material printability, cytocompatibility, degradation behavior, and mechanical stability. The core principle is to match material functions with the inflammatory, proliferative, and remodeling phases of tendon repair.

Current bioprinted scaffolds are shifting from single-material constructs toward integrated systems that combine structural design, bioactive delivery, microenvironmental regulation, and stimulus responsiveness^{92,94}. The key determinant of scaffold performance is no longer limited to material source or mechanical strength, but rather lies in whether the scaffold can coordinate printability, structural stability, biological activity, and stage-specific regulation to create a

regenerative microenvironment that supports cell survival, matrix deposition, collagen alignment, and functional maturation^{93,96}.

5.1. Structural and Topographical Modulation Strategies

Tendon exhibits pronounced anisotropy, and its native structure is composed of parallel collagen fiber bundles and hierarchical architectures¹. Beyond defect filling, bioprinted scaffolds should provide directional structural cues for cells through pore architecture, fiber arrangement, surface topography, and the local mechanical microenvironment, thereby guiding cell adhesion and spreading along the loading direction and promoting the secretion of organized extracellular matrix⁹⁷. Compared with random structures, aligned scaffolds are more favorable for cell alignment and collagen reconstruction⁷⁹. Therefore, structural and topographical modulation in tendon bioprinting should not be regarded merely as scaffold-shape design, but rather as a core functionalization strategy that regulates cell behavior, matrix deposition, and mechanical maturation through printable structural units.

5.1.1. Pore Size and Porosity

Pore size and porosity directly influence cell infiltration, nutrient exchange, tissue ingrowth, and mechanical support. Caliri et al. compared anisotropic pore structures of 55, 152, and 243 μm and found that pore size affected tenocyte viability, proliferation, metabolic activity, and infiltration into the deeper regions of the scaffold. Among these structures, the 243 μm aligned pores were more conducive to cell alignment and migration along the pore channels than the smaller pore groups⁹⁷. For 3D-printed porous Ti-6Al-4V titanium alloy scaffolds, Zheng et al. compared pore sizes of 657.65, 527.15, 348.68, and 169.20 μm and found that the 527.15 μm group showed more favorable fibroblast adhesion, infiltration, and tendon ingrowth than the 657.65, 348.68, and 169.20 μm groups in a rabbit rotator cuff model⁹⁸. Therefore, pore architecture should not simply pursue larger or smaller pores, nor should findings from conventional porous scaffolds be directly generalized into a universal optimal pore size for tendon bioprinting. In tendon bioprinting, pore architecture should be optimized together with filament spacing, nozzle scale, pore interconnectivity, bioink rheology, cell-loading strategy, post-printing collapse risk, shape fidelity, and mechanical stability^{16,40,41,97,98}.

5.1.2. Micropore Morphology and Alignment Direction

Micropore morphology and alignment direction likewise determine the cell-guiding capacity of scaffolds⁹⁷. In anisotropic collagen–glycosaminoglycan scaffolds, oriented elliptical pores can

improve tenocyte alignment consistency, deep infiltration, and metabolic activity, indicating that pore channels should not only be interconnected but also possess a defined orientation ⁹⁷. Bioprinting can generate continuous parallel microstructures by controlling printing paths, interlayer angles, and fiber deposition directions ¹⁶, and can further translate pore orientation, regional architecture, and cell distribution into programmable spatial parameters, thereby enabling coordinated regulation of cell alignment, material compartmentalization, and the local microenvironment. Yao et al. constructed a multiscale biomimetic tendon scaffold with a shell–core structure, in which the outer porous shell mimicked the tendon sheath and provided support, while the inner microscale wavy fibers and nanoscale hybrid structures corresponded to the macro-, micro-, and nanoscale levels of native tendon, respectively. This design enabled biomimetic reconstruction of collagen fibrils, collagen fibers/fascicles, and the overall tendon structure (Fig. 5A) ⁹⁹. Li et al. reported that aligned fiber-based composite constructs could increase cell density and alignment consistency ¹⁰⁰. These studies mainly provide design references for multiscale structural biomimicry and aligned construct fabrication, suggesting that bioprinted scaffolds can be further optimized in terms of hierarchical architecture, orientational continuity, and cell guidance. However, when the repair target extends from the tendon midsubstance to the tendon–bone interface, the structural design goal is no longer limited to restoring aligned collagen organization on the tendon side, but also requires reconstruction of stable and continuous interfacial integration capable of load transfer between tendon and bone. The tendon–bone interface generally corresponds to the tendon enthesis and is not a simple contact surface between tendon and bone, but rather a highly hierarchical soft-to-hard tissue transition. Its core function is to gradually transmit tensile loads from tendon to bone while buffering the stiffness mismatch between soft and hard tissues and reducing interfacial stress concentration ¹⁰¹. A typical fibrocartilaginous tendon enthesis usually consists of a gradual transition from tendon to unmineralized fibrocartilage, mineralized fibrocartilage, and bone, with continuous gradients in collagen fiber orientation, cell phenotype, extracellular matrix composition, mineralization degree, and mechanical stiffness across different regions ¹⁰². After injury or surgical reconstruction, tendon–bone healing often fails to regenerate this organized hierarchical transitional structure and instead tends to form a fibrous scar-like attachment, resulting in insufficient interfacial mechanical strength, discontinuous load transfer, local stress concentration, and an increased risk of reinjury. Therefore, tendon–bone interface bioprinting should not be limited to the fabrication of tendon–

like scaffolds, but should integrate tenogenic, fibrocartilage-like, and mineralized bone-like microenvironments within a single printed construct through region-specific bioink deposition, gradient material composition, zonal structural design, and spatial organization of multiple cell populations, thereby providing structural and biological support for fibrocartilage formation, interfacial mineralization, and restoration of load transfer. Based on this design rationale, Kim et al. used tendon- and bone-derived dECM bioinks to construct a gradient core-shell interface, thereby promoting fibrocartilage formation and regeneration of the tendon-bone interface in a rabbit rotator cuff model ¹⁰³. Chae et al. further fabricated a gradient multi-tissue interfacial scaffold by 3D cell printing using tendon-derived dECM, bone-derived dECM, and mixed bioinks. In this scaffold, the upper, middle, and lower regions corresponded to tenogenic, fibrocartilage-like, and osteogenic microenvironments, respectively, and were used for rotator cuff tendon-bone interface regeneration. These findings indicate that gradient structural design can integrate spatial partitioning, material composition, and cell induction ¹⁰⁴. These more direct bioprinting studies further indicate that the value of microstructural and gradient design in tendon and tendon-bone interface bioprinting lies not only in reproducing the hierarchical morphology of native tissues, but also in integrating structural biomimicry, material compartmentalization, and tissue induction into printable constructs through region-specific bioink deposition, interface zoning, and spatial cell organization.

5.1.3. Surface Topography

Surface topography affects cell adhesion, morphology, and alignment through surface roughness, microgrooves, ridge-like structures, micro/nanopatterns, and local stiffness ^{105,106}. Kapoor et al. found that regular microgrooves could alter tendon cell morphology and orientation ¹⁰⁵. English et al. further reported that groove depths of approximately 317 nm and 1988 nm both promoted parallel alignment of human tendon cells, indicating that directional topography itself can serve as a cell-alignment cue ¹⁰⁶. Tsiapalis et al. reported that bidirectionally aligned electrospun fibers enhanced cell growth and tendon-related matrix deposition ¹⁰⁷. Long et al. found that ordered topography could induce adipose-derived stem cell (ADSC) alignment and alter their secretome, thereby promoting TSPC proliferation and tenogenic differentiation, enhancing ECM deposition, and regulating local immune responses through pathways related to mitogen-activated protein kinase (MAPK), G protein-coupled receptor (GPCR), integrin signaling involving ITGA1, ITGA11, and ITGB1, and complement signaling. These effects contributed to the formation of a

repair-associated macrophage microenvironment with increased M2-related features (Fig. 5B)¹⁰⁸. These findings indicate that surface topographical modulation not only provides physical guidance, but also reshapes the repair microenvironment through paracrine signaling and immunomodulation¹⁰⁹. In tendon bioprinting, these topographical and aligned-structure studies should be translated into the design of printed-filament surface roughness, micro/nanopatterned interfaces, aligned strand deposition, and post-printing surface functionalization, rather than being interpreted simply as direct bioprinting evidence. Their application still needs to be coordinated with bioink rheology, printing resolution, nozzle- or strand-induced microarchitecture, structural fidelity, and cell-loading strategies^{16,40,41,109}.

Overall, structural and topographical modulation represents one of the most fundamental functionalization strategies in tendon bioprinting. Its value lies not only in maintaining scaffold morphology and mechanical support, but also in providing spatial structural cues for cell alignment, collagen deposition, and neotissue reconstruction through designable pore architectures, printing paths, filament spacing, printed-strand alignment, interlayer angles, surface micro/nanotopography, and the local mechanical microenvironment^{16,97}. On this structural basis, bioactive delivery, immunomodulation, cell loading, and physical stimulation strategies can be spatially coupled with printed scaffold architectures through region-specific bioink deposition, controlled pore interconnectivity, aligned strand organization, and post-printing surface functionalization, thereby establishing a more controllable stage-specific regenerative microenvironment^{16,100,109}. Therefore, future structural and topographical optimization should not merely pursue morphological biomimicry, but should be co-designed with bioink rheology, crosslinking kinetics, printing resolution, nozzle scale, shape fidelity, post-printing structural stability, and cell-loading strategies^{40,41}.




Fig. 5. Schematic illustration of multiscale biomimetic scaffolds and aligned topography-regulated adipose-derived stem cell (ADSC) secretome for promoting tendon regeneration. (A) Schematic illustration of the structural design of a multiscale biomimetic tendon scaffold (MBT scaffold). This scaffold mimics the hierarchical structure of native tendon, including collagen fibrils, collagen fibers, and fascicles, through nanoscale, microscale, and macroscale structures . Reprinted with permission from Yao et al. ⁹⁹Copyright © 2024 Wiley-VCH GmbH. (B) Schematic illustration of the mechanism by which aligned topography regulates the ADSC secretome and promotes tendon regeneration. Conditioned medium derived from aligned ADSCs can promote tendon stem/progenitor cell (TSPC) proliferation and tenogenic differentiation, extracellular matrix (ECM) deposition, and M2

macrophage-related reparative polarization, and is associated with the regulation of mitogen-activated protein kinase (MAPK), G protein-coupled receptor (GPCR), integrin, and complement-related pathways . Long et al.¹⁰⁸ .

5.2. Material Chemical Modulation Strategies

In addition to structural factors, the chemical composition and interfacial chemistry of materials also influence cell behavior, oxidative stress, inflammatory responses, and tissue integration during tendon repair. Chemical modulation mainly acts through surface functional groups, chiral molecules, dynamic crosslinking, or the incorporation of functional components, thereby shifting materials from passive structural supports toward active regulators of the local microenvironment ¹¹⁰.

5.2.1. External Chemical Modulation

External chemical modulation alters the chemical environment first encountered by cells through surface or interfacial modification, thereby influencing cell adhesion, migration, orientation, differentiation, and immune responses ¹¹⁰. Unlike surface topographical regulation, this strategy places greater emphasis on the roles of functional groups, chiral molecules, hydrophilicity, charge distribution, and bioactive groups in cell recognition and signal transduction ¹¹¹. Wang et al. reported that chiral arginine-modified collagen electrospun membranes could alleviate TSPC injury under oxidative stress and improve tendon healing. After L-Arg@CM was wrapped around the injured tendon, it promoted cell proliferation, tenogenic differentiation, and collagen deposition through the integrin/vinculin/FAK/YAP pathway, while alleviating local oxidative stress injury through L-Arg-mediated NO production and ROS scavenging. These findings highlight the regulatory effects of external chemical modification on cell–material interfacial behavior and the local oxidative stress microenvironment (Fig. 6A) ¹¹². Further cellular fluorescence results showed that L-Arg treatment enhanced NO-related fluorescence signals and reduced H₂O₂-induced ROS signals, further validating the roles of L-Arg-mediated NO production and ROS scavenging (Fig. 6B) ¹¹². Although this study was not based on a directly bioprinted construct, its findings can provide design references for translating external chemical modification into tendon bioprinting systems. For example, similar chiral amino acids, NO-regulating components, or antioxidant functional groups could be incorporated into printable collagen-based bioinks, printed-strand surface chemical modification, or post-printing interfacial functionalization strategies. Their translational application still requires further validation of how these chemical modifications affect bioink rheology, crosslinking kinetics, cell-loading capacity, printing

resolution, shape fidelity, stable retention, local release or sustained action of functional components, and post-printing structural stability^{42,49,110,112}.

5.2.2. Internal Chemical Modulation

Internal chemical modulation emphasizes the introduction of sustained functions into constructs through internal material composition and crosslinked networks, such as dynamic covalent/coordination bonds, antibacterial components, tunable degradation networks, and immunomodulatory microenvironments⁴⁹. In tendon bioprinting, internal chemical modulation should not be understood merely as material modification of functional hydrogels or repair patches; rather, it should be translated into the design of internal networks within printable bioinks. Specifically, growth factors, antioxidant components, immunomodulatory units, or dynamic crosslinked networks should be stably incorporated into printed constructs while maintaining suitable rheological properties, shear-thinning behavior, crosslinking kinetics, cytocompatibility, and post-printing structural stability^{40-42,49}. Yao et al. developed a dual-dynamic crosslinked hydrogel patch with both antibacterial and macrophage-regulating functions. This patch promoted macrophage polarization toward a reparative phenotype, thereby reducing peritendinous adhesion while supporting tissue regeneration¹¹³. Ouyang et al. constructed a one-step Janus hydrogel with an asymmetric structure formed by gradient emulsion droplets and photocrosslinking. One side faced the injured tendon to provide wet adhesion, mechanical support, and in situ sealing, whereas the other side faced the surrounding tissue to serve as an anti-adhesion barrier. Its functional components could also scavenge ROS, downregulate inflammation-related signals such as IL-6, IL-1 β , TNF- α , and HIF-1 α , and promote macrophage polarization from an M1 toward an M2 phenotype. In this way, the hydrogel achieved temporal inflammatory regulation and spatial anti-adhesion/pro-repair effects (Fig. 6C)¹¹⁴. Gross observation of tendons and three-dimensional reconstruction of adhesion tissue at 14 and 28 days postoperatively further showed that the PZBA-EGCG₃-ALC Janus hydrogel reduced peritendinous adhesion formation, providing in vivo morphological evidence for its unilateral adhesion, physical barrier, and anti-adhesion design (Fig. 6D)¹¹⁴. These findings indicate that internal chemical modulation does not merely enhance material stability, but can also participate in immune rhythm regulation and suppression of adverse repair responses through the synergy between dynamic networks and functional chemical components. Overall, the significance of chemical modulation lies in enabling materials to provide structural support while acquiring the capacity to regulate the local microenvironment^{110,113}.

External chemical modulation mainly focuses on interfacial recognition and cellular responses, whereas internal chemical modulation emphasizes the intrinsic antibacterial, anti-inflammatory, anti-adhesion, and pro-repair functions of the material itself. These two strategies can be combined with structural design, bioactive delivery, and smart responsiveness^{110,112}. The studies by Yao et al. and Ouyang et al. suggest that dynamic crosslinked networks, ROS-scavenging capability, antibacterial components, unilateral adhesion and anti-adhesion interfaces, and immunomodulatory units may provide important design references for future printable hydrogel networks, post-printing interfacial functionalization, and immunomodulatory bioinks. However, when these strategies are further integrated into cell-laden bioinks or printed constructs, their effects on bioink rheology, crosslinking kinetics, cell-loading capacity, printing resolution, shape fidelity, post-printing structural stability, and post-printing functional durability still need to be systematically evaluated^{40,49,110,113,114}.




Fig. 6. Schematic illustration of external and internal chemical modulation strategies for tendon repair. (A) Schematic illustration of the mechanism by which L-arginine-modified collagen membrane (L-Arg@CM) promotes tendon healing. This membrane regulates cell proliferation, tenogenic differentiation, and collagen deposition through the integrin/vinculin/focal adhesion kinase (FAK)/Yes-associated protein (YAP) pathway and is also involved in nitric oxide (NO) production and reactive oxygen species (ROS) scavenging. Reprinted with permission from Wang et al.¹¹² Copyright © 2024 Wiley-VCH GmbH. (B) Cellular fluorescence validation of L-arginine (L-Arg)-mediated NO production and ROS scavenging, showing changes in NO and ROS signals under different treatment conditions. Reprinted with permission from Wang et al.¹¹² Copyright © 2024 Wiley-VCH GmbH. (C) Schematic illustration of the spatiotemporal regulatory effects of the PZBA-EGCG₃-ALC Janus hydrogel. This hydrogel modulates the tendon repair microenvironment through ROS scavenging, inflammatory regulation, unilateral adhesion,

mechanical support, and an anti-adhesion barrier effect . Ouyang et al.¹¹⁴ . (D) In vivo validation of the anti-adhesion effects of the PZBA-EGCG₃-ALC Janus hydrogel, showing gross tendon observation and three-dimensional reconstruction of adhesion tissue in different treatment groups at 14 and 28 days postoperatively . Ouyang et al.¹¹⁴ .

5.3. Bioactive Molecule Delivery Strategies

Tendon repair depends on local signal regulation, and scaffold support alone is insufficient to reconstruct the complex repair microenvironment^{26,32}. Bioactive molecule delivery integrates growth factors, exosomes, or cell-related components into scaffolds, enabling sustained or stage-specific release of regulatory signals after implantation. These signals can influence cell recruitment, proliferation, angiogenesis, matrix deposition, and collagen maturation^{26,32}. The value of this strategy lies in providing regenerative signals in a local, controllable, and stage-matched manner. In tendon bioprinting, bioactive molecule delivery should not be understood simply as adding bioactive factors to scaffolds, but should be integrated with bioink design and printed-structure construction. Specifically, growth factors, exosomes, cytokines, or cell-derived bioactive components can be incorporated into printed constructs through direct mixing into bioinks, microsphere- or nanoparticle-mediated encapsulation, binding within degradable networks, region-specific printing deposition, or post-printing surface loading, thereby enabling local delivery, spatially compartmentalized delivery, or gradient release. At the same time, the delivery system must preserve the stability of bioactive molecules during extrusion shear, photocrosslinking, ionic crosslinking, or enzymatic crosslinking, while avoiding adverse effects on bioink rheology, cytocompatibility, printing resolution, and shape fidelity^{40-42,49}. Therefore, the core value of bioactive delivery in tendon bioprinting is not merely to prolong factor release, but to match regenerative signals with printing paths, pore architecture, spatial cell distribution, and stage-specific repair requirements, thereby establishing a more controllable local regenerative microenvironment^{26,32,40,49}.

5.3.1. Growth Factors

Growth factor delivery mainly supports cell migration, proliferation, angiogenesis, collagen synthesis, and tissue maturation. PDGF, bFGF, VEGF, TGF- β , IGF-1, and connective tissue growth factor (CTGF) are among the most extensively studied factors in tendon repair³². PDGF-BB is mainly associated with early cell recruitment and proliferative activation. Evrova et al. found that PDGF-BB enhanced rabbit tenocyte proliferation and influenced matrix deposition¹¹⁵. bFGF is commonly used to support early cell activation and tenogenic differentiation. Li et al. loaded

bFGF into bovine serum albumin (BSA) nanoparticles and incorporated them into aligned PCL electrospun scaffolds, achieving sustained release, promoting tenogenic differentiation of human amniotic mesenchymal stem cells (hAMSCs), and improving repair of Achilles tendon defects in rats¹¹⁶. VEGF mainly enhances angiogenesis in poorly vascularized environments, whereas CTGF and IGF-1 are more closely associated with matrix reconstruction and phenotype maintenance^{26,32}. TGF- β can promote collagen synthesis, but excessive activation may also increase the risk of fibrosis³². As direct tendon bioprinting evidence, Ruiz-Alonso et al. developed a hydrogel bioink composed of alginate, hyaluronic acid, gelatin, and fibrinogen, and incorporated PDGF-BB and VEGF into the bioink for three-dimensional bioprinting of biomimetic scaffolds for partial tendon injury. This system exhibited favorable rheological behavior and printability, enabled growth factor delivery, and helped maintain tenocyte metabolic activity, phenotype, and tendon ECM-related gene expression, indicating that growth factors can be internally incorporated into bioinks to endow printed constructs with structural support, cell-loading capacity, and bioactive delivery functions¹¹⁷. Chen et al. constructed a collagen-binding peptide (CBP)-modified growth factor (GF)-loaded book-shaped decellularized enthesis matrix (O-BDEM). By delivering CBP-modified bone morphogenetic protein-2 (C-BMP-2), transforming growth factor- β 3 (C-TGF- β 3), and growth differentiation factor-7 (C-GDF-7) to the bone, fibrocartilage, and tendon regions, respectively, this system achieved region-specific osteogenic, chondrogenic, and tenogenic induction. The CBP-GFs/O-BDEM design visually demonstrated the regional integration of C-GDF-7, C-TGF- β 3, and C-BMP-2 within the tendon zone (TZ), fibrocartilage zone (FZ), and bone zone (BZ), respectively (Fig. 7A)¹¹⁸. Further fluorescence tracing showed that differently labeled GDF-7, TGF- β 3, and BMP-2 were spatially distributed within their corresponding functional regions and gradually released over time, supporting the rationale of this system for region-specific growth factor delivery at the tendon–bone interface (Fig. 7B)¹¹⁸. In tendon bioprinting systems, the stability of growth factors during extrusion-induced shear, photocrosslinking, ionic crosslinking, or enzymatic crosslinking should also be further considered, together with their effects on bioink rheological properties, cytocompatibility, printing resolution, shape fidelity, and post-printing release behavior^{45,117,118}.

5.3.2. Exosomes

Exosomes contain various bioactive components, including proteins, lipids, and microRNAs (miRNAs), and are more suitable than single growth factors for regulating intercellular

communication and the repair microenvironment. Kim et al. noted that exosomes possess good biocompatibility and intrinsic delivery properties; however, source standardization, loading efficiency, scalable production, in vivo stability, and targeted control remain major challenges ¹¹⁹. In the context of tendon repair, exosomes from different sources have distinct functional emphases. Yu et al. found that BMSC-derived exosomes could promote TSPC proliferation and migration and enhance the expression of tenogenic markers ¹²⁰. Shen et al. reported that extracellular vesicles derived from adipose-derived stem cells (ASCs) could attenuate early inflammation after Achilles tendon injury in mice and improve repair quality ¹²¹. Chen et al. showed that dendritic cell-derived exosomes promoted macrophage polarization from an M1 toward an M2 phenotype through the phosphoinositide 3-kinase/protein kinase B (PI3K/AKT) pathway, reduced IL-1 β , IL-6, and TNF- α levels, and promoted type I collagen synthesis ¹²². Xu et al. further suggested that bioactive glass-induced MSC-derived exosomes could promote M2 macrophage-associated angiogenesis through repair-related miRNAs, thereby improving tendon regeneration and functional recovery ¹²³. Dou et al. reported that human umbilical vein endothelial cell (HUVEC)-derived exosome-loaded chitosan hydrogel could serve as a local delivery platform, enabling sustained release of bioactive exosomes at the Achilles tendon injury site, thereby reducing inflammation, decreasing apoptosis of tendon-derived stem cells (TDSCs), and promoting tendon regeneration ¹²⁴.

For tendon bioprinting, the key value of exosomes does not lie in simply replacing cell-based therapy, but in serving as cell-free bioactive modules that can be integrated with printable material systems and three-dimensional scaffold architectures. Zhang et al. developed a tendon stem cell-derived exosome-loaded scaffold (TSC-Exos-S), in which TSC-derived exosomes and type I collagen were incorporated into a three-dimensional bioprinted PCL-based scaffold for bridging unrepairable massive rotator cuff tears. This system promoted BMSC proliferation, migration, and tenogenic differentiation in vitro and enhanced tendon-like tissue regeneration in the bridging region in a rabbit model of unrepairable massive rotator cuff tear, suggesting that exosomes can be combined with three-dimensional bioprinted load-bearing scaffolds to provide both structural support and tenogenic regulatory signals ¹²⁵.

Exosomes can be integrated into printed constructs through direct mixing with bioinks, encapsulation in microspheres or nanoparticles, incorporation into degradable hydrogel networks, region-specific bioink deposition, post-printing surface loading, or post-loading onto three-dimensional printed scaffolds. Future exosome-loaded tendon bioprinting materials should further

optimize exosome bioactivity retention during mixing, extrusion-induced shear, photocrosslinking, or ionic crosslinking, as well as spatial distribution uniformity, release stability, effective dosage, and post-printing functional durability. The effects of exosome incorporation on bioink rheological properties, cytocompatibility, printing resolution, and shape fidelity should also be systematically evaluated^{49,123-125}

5.3.3. Stem Cell-Related Strategies

The significance of stem cell-related strategies lies not only in supplementing cell numbers, but also in improving the repair environment through direct participation in tissue formation and paracrine regulation^{11,34}. Commonly used cell types include BMSCs, ASCs, and TSPCs. BMSCs are often used to support tenogenic differentiation and matrix formation. ASCs are abundant and readily accessible; Deng et al. demonstrated in a rabbit Achilles tendon defect model that autologous ASC-engineered constructs could promote repair¹²⁶, while Kokubu et al. found that ASCs could also reduce early inflammation and promote vascular formation¹²⁷. TSPCs exhibit stronger tissue specificity. Shen et al. loaded allogeneic TSPCs onto a knitted silk-collagen sponge scaffold and observed improvements in collagen deposition, tissue structure, and biomechanical properties, suggesting that TSPCs may improve the local environment through anti-inflammatory factors¹²⁸. In tendon bioprinting, these stem cell-related strategies should further shift from conventional cell seeding toward the design of cell-laden bioinks and spatially patterned cell deposition. By encapsulating BMSCs, ASCs, or TSPCs within printable hydrogels, dECM bioinks, or composite bioinks, and combining them with printing paths, region-specific deposition, and gradient architectures, printed constructs can generate cellular spatial distributions and local inductive microenvironments that more closely resemble tendon or the tendon–bone interface. Particularly for tendon–bone interface repair, multicellular or regionally patterned bioprinting can be used to construct tenogenic, fibrocartilage-like, and osteogenic microenvironments, allowing cell source, material composition, and structural compartmentalization to jointly participate in tissue regeneration^{91,104}.

Compared with conventional cell seeding, bioprinting enables spatial control of cell distribution in three dimensions, allowing better matching between cells and material composition, pore architecture, and oriented structural design¹⁵. Zhao et al. showed in their study of tendon-derived dECM bioinks that the degree of enzymatic digestion of tendon-derived decellularized extracellular matrix (tendon-derived dECM) during bioink preparation simultaneously affected

print shape retention and cell behavior: a lower digestion degree was beneficial for shape fidelity and stacking accuracy, whereas softer systems were more favorable for stem cell spreading, proliferation, and tenogenic induction⁷⁷. Park et al. further demonstrated in their study of tissue-specific dECM bioinks that dECM bioinks can provide encapsulated cells with a local microenvironment more closely resembling the target tissue¹⁵. Therefore, cell delivery should be integrated with scaffold architecture, the material microenvironment, and inflammatory regulation, rather than simply increasing the cell-loading density^{15,77}.

Overall, bioactive molecule delivery shifts scaffolds from structural support toward sustained signal regulation^{26,32}. Future efforts should focus on integrating growth factor, exosome, and cell-based strategies with structural design and material-responsive mechanisms to establish phased and controllable delivery systems that match the signaling requirements of different stages of tendon repair^{26,119}.

5.4. Immunomodulatory and Inflammatory Regulation Strategies

Tendon repair is closely associated with local immunoinflammatory responses^{7,8}. Inflammation is necessary for the initiation of repair, but the key issue is whether it can smoothly transition from early clearance to later reconstruction³¹. Chisari et al. noted that a persistent and excessive M1 macrophage response, accompanied by sustained elevation of pro-inflammatory factors such as IL-1 β , TNF- α , and IL-6, can aggravate matrix degradation and functional impairment⁷. Wang et al. emphasized that the establishment of M2 macrophages within an appropriate time window is beneficial for inflammation resolution, angiogenesis, and matrix reconstruction⁸, whereas excessive or persistent M2 polarization may also contribute to fibrotic extracellular matrix deposition and scar-like remodeling. Therefore, the goal of immunomodulation is not simply to suppress inflammation or continuously enhance M2 polarization, but to coordinate macrophage responses within an appropriate time window and promote a dynamic balance among inflammation resolution, angiogenesis, and matrix reconstruction. In tendon bioprinting, this immunomodulatory logic should be further translated into the design of printable material systems. Specifically, printed constructs capable of regulating macrophage phenotypic transition and local inflammatory dynamics may be developed through bioink composition, delivery of immunomodulatory ions or factors, exosome or cell loading, region-specific bioink deposition, and post-printing release control^{16,42,49,127}.

Materials themselves can also participate in immunoregulation. Scaffold surface roughness, pore architecture, hydrophilicity, stiffness, and degradation behavior can all influence macrophage adhesion, morphology, and secretory profiles ¹²⁹. In bioprinting systems, these material-mediated immunomodulatory factors can be further translated into programmable printing parameters and bioink design variables, such as printed-strand surface morphology, pore interconnectivity, local stiffness, degradation rate, release of immunomodulatory components, and region-specific bioink deposition. Wei et al. constructed a Wnt3a-modified nanofibrous scaffold that promoted early macrophage recruitment and increased the proportion of M2 macrophages, thereby improving tendon healing outcomes. This finding indicates that structural design and bioactive modification can jointly regulate the local immune rhythm and further affect collagen reconstruction and tissue maturation ¹³⁰. Feng et al. further developed an MDP1&HA scaffold for rotator cuff tendon–bone interface repair. Through the synergistic action of the M2 macrophage-derived peptide MDP1 and the hyaluronic acid scaffold, this system regulated the local immune microenvironment and promoted the coupling of immunoregulatory and tissue regenerative signals in the bone, fibrocartilage, and tendon regions (Fig. 7C) ¹³¹. Immunohistochemical results for CD206 and IL-6 further showed that the MDP1&HA scaffold enhanced reparative immune phenotypes while reducing the expression of inflammatory factors, thereby providing histological evidence for an immunomodulatory tendon–bone interface scaffold (Fig. 7D) ¹³¹. These studies provide design references for immunomodulatory bioinks, post-printing interfacial functionalization, and multicompartment tendon–bone interface bioprinted constructs by highlighting the roles of Wnt signaling modulation, immunomodulatory peptides, HA matrices, surface architecture, and region-specific interface design. Thus, immunomodulatory bioprinting should focus not only on suppressing inflammation, but also on regulating macrophage phenotypic transition and local inflammatory dynamics to prevent persistent early pro-inflammatory damage and promote later angiogenesis and matrix reconstruction. Future translation should further evaluate the effects of these immunomodulatory components on bioink rheology, crosslinking kinetics, cell-loading capacity, printing resolution, shape fidelity, release stability, and post-printing functional durability ^{129,131}.

Integrating immunomodulatory bioactive components into bioprinted scaffolds represents an important direction for enhancing local immunomodulation ^{24,129}. Compared with systemic administration, local delivery is more likely to maintain effective concentrations at the lesion site

while reducing systemic exposure and off-target effects. Immunomodulatory multicellular scaffolds targeting the tendon–bone interface have also shown the potential to simultaneously support inflammatory regulation and tissue integration^{91,132}. These studies suggest that immunomodulatory bioprinting should integrate bioink composition, region-specific bioactive delivery, interfacial design, spatial cell distribution, and post-printing release control to establish a sustained and temporally regulated local immune microenvironment, rather than relying on a single anti-inflammatory signal^{24,91,129,130}.




Fig. 7. Region-specific growth factor delivery and immunomodulatory scaffolds for promoting tendon–bone interface repair. (A) Schematic illustration of the construction of collagen-binding peptide-modified growth factor-loaded book-shaped decellularized enthesis matrix (CBP-GFs/O-BDEM). This scaffold uses collagen-binding peptide-modified growth factors and regionally integrates collagen-binding peptide-modified growth differentiation factor-7 (C-GDF-7), transforming growth factor- β 3 (C-TGF- β 3), and bone morphogenetic protein-2 (C-BMP-2) into the tendon zone (TZ), fibrocartilage zone (FZ), and bone zone (BZ), respectively. Reprinted with permission from Chen et al.¹¹⁸ Copyright © 2021 The Authors. Publishing services by Elsevier B.V. on behalf of KeAi Communications Co. Ltd. (B) Validation of region-specific growth factor delivery by CBP-GFs/O-BDEM, showing the spatial distribution and release process of growth differentiation factor-7 (GDF-7), transforming growth factor- β 3 (TGF- β 3), and bone morphogenetic protein-2 (BMP-2) within different functional regions. Modified and reprinted with permission from Chen et al.¹¹⁸ Copyright © 2021 The Authors. Publishing services by Elsevier B.V. on behalf of KeAi Communications Co. Ltd. (C) Schematic illustration of the mechanism by which the MDP1 and hyaluronic acid (HA) scaffold mediates immunoregulation at the tendon–bone interface, showing its regulatory effects on the immune microenvironment and regenerative signals in the bone, fibrocartilage, and tendon regions in a rabbit rotator cuff injury model. Reprinted with permission from Feng et al.¹³¹ Copyright © 2025 The Authors. Publishing services by Elsevier B.V. on behalf of KeAi Communications Co. Ltd. (D) Histological validation of the immunomodulatory effects of the MDP1 and HA scaffold, showing the immunohistochemical staining results of cluster of differentiation 206 (CD206), an M2 macrophage marker, and interleukin-6 (IL-6) at 2 and 4 months.

5.5. Physical Stimulation Strategies

Tendon development, homeostasis, and injury repair all depend on mechanical loading^{35,36}. Native tendons are continuously subjected to tension, recoil, and stress transmission, during which local cells constantly receive physical signals. Therefore, bioprinted scaffolds that provide only static support may be insufficient to fully mimic the physiological environment required for repair^{91,92}. Physical stimulation strategies emphasize the regulation of cell behavior through external signals or material-derived signals, thereby promoting cell alignment, tenogenic differentiation, collagen remodeling, and functional recovery^{36,91,92}. In tendon bioprinting, these strategies should be further integrated with printed structural anisotropy, fiber or printed-strand alignment, local stiffness regulation, deformable materials, conductive or piezoelectric components, and mechanically responsive bioink design, enabling printed constructs to provide not only morphological support but also physical cues that more closely resemble the native tendon microenvironment.

Electrical stimulation strategies are mainly based on cellular responses to local electrophysiological signals. Although tendon is not a typical electroactive tissue, collagen fibers possess piezoelectric properties, and cell migration, changes in membrane potential, and the expression of certain genes can also be influenced by electrical signals⁹⁵. Fernandez-Yague et al. developed a self-powered piezoelectric bioelectronic device and showed that electrical signals generated by the piezoelectric scaffold under mechanical stimulation could upregulate tenogenic markers, including the tenogenic transcription factor scleraxis (SCX), tenomodulin (TNMD), and collagen type I alpha 1 chain (COL1A1)¹³³. Luo et al. constructed a piezoelectric injectable anti-adhesion hydrogel (PE-IAH), which could convert mechanical stimulation into local electrical signals under ultrasound stimulation. Combined with its anti-adhesion barrier effect, this hydrogel reduced extrinsic healing while promoting TSPC-mediated intrinsic tendon repair (Fig. 8A)¹³⁴. These studies suggest that conductive or piezoelectric components can provide sustained physical regulatory signals for tendon repair through electromechanical coupling and may serve as design references for future conductive or piezoelectric bioinks, functional components in printed scaffolds, and post-printing physical stimulation systems. Their translation into tendon bioprinting still requires further balancing of electrical responsiveness, mechanical stability, bioink rheology, cytocompatibility, printing resolution, and shape fidelity^{49,95,133,134}.

Mechanical stimulation more closely resembles the native mechanical microenvironment of tendon. Tenocytes and tendon progenitor cells are sensitive to tensile, compressive, and shear signals, among which cyclic tensile loading is the most representative³⁵. Current studies commonly use 3%–10% uniaxial cyclic stretching to mimic physiological tensile loading, whereas excessive loading may lead to cell damage, enhanced inflammation, or abnormal differentiation. Xu et al. found that cyclic stretching could induce tenogenic differentiation of TSPCs¹³⁵. Park et al. further showed that short-term mechanical activation in aligned dense collagen hydrogels increased SCX expression and enhanced collagen remodeling¹³⁶. Mechanical stimulation should be matched with loading magnitude, frequency, duration, cell type, and material mechanics, and in tendon bioprinting, this strategy can be translated into the coordinated design of aligned printed strands, anisotropic pore architectures, mechanically responsive bioinks, and post-printing dynamic culture systems to provide both structural guidance and dynamic tendon-like mechanical cues^{35,135,136}.

The effects of physical stimulation are highly dependent on intensity, frequency, duration, and timing of application^{35,36}. Insufficient stimulation may fail to produce clear biological effects, whereas excessive stimulation may cause cell damage, enhanced inflammation, or secondary injury¹³³. In tendon bioprinting, future strategies should integrate printed structural design, conductive or piezoelectric components, mechanically responsive bioinks, and post-printing stimulation systems to establish a sustained, tunable, and tendon-like physical regulatory microenvironment^{95,136}.

5.6. Smart Responsiveness

Conventional materials often function in a fixed manner after implantation, whereas the degree of inflammation, oxidative stress, pH, temperature, and cellular and matrix states after tendon injury continue to change dynamically^{93,96}. Smart responsive materials can dynamically regulate release behavior or material state in response to local microenvironmental changes, and in tendon bioprinting, they can be integrated with responsive bioinks, degradable networks, bioactive delivery, region-specific architectures, and post-printing release control to enable more precise stage-specific repair regulation.

Currently, widely investigated strategies include pH responsiveness, ROS responsiveness, thermoresponsiveness, and photothermal responsiveness⁹⁶. Li et al. developed an HAPP@H-EXO Janus hydrogel that could release exosomes derived from hypoxia-preconditioned TSPCs in

response to pH changes and suppress the NF- κ B pathway to reshape macrophage responses. Meanwhile, this hydrogel combined asymmetric adhesion, antibacterial and anti-inflammatory effects, and stress redistribution, thereby improving the local microenvironment after infected Achilles tendon injury and promoting structural repair (Fig. 8B)¹³⁷. Wu et al. constructed a pH-responsive hydrogel for delayed release of the mitogen-activated protein kinase kinase (MEK) inhibitor CI1040, enabling localized drug release in response to the inflammatory microenvironment¹³⁸. ROS-responsive systems are more suitable for chronic injury or persistent inflammatory conditions and can alleviate oxidative stress by scavenging excessive ROS¹³⁹. Thermoresponsive materials are suitable for local injection and sustained release, whereas photothermal responsiveness emphasizes externally controllable short-term activation¹⁴⁰. These studies suggest that pH, ROS, thermal, and photothermal responsiveness may provide design references for responsive bioinks, temporally controlled bioactive release, region-specific printed architectures, and post-printing controllable intervention. However, their translation into tendon bioprinting still requires further balancing of response sensitivity, release stability, bioink rheology, cytocompatibility, printing resolution, and shape fidelity^{43,49,96,137,139}.




Fig. 8. Schematic illustration of piezoelectric stimulation-enhanced intrinsic healing and multifunctional Janus hydrogel-promoted regeneration of infected tendon. (A) Schematic illustration of Achilles tendon repair promoted by a piezoelectric injectable anti-adhesion hydrogel (PE-IAH) combined with ultrasound. This hydrogel reduces extrinsic healing through an anti-adhesion/anti-inflammatory physical barrier and promotes tendon stem/progenitor cell (TSPC)-mediated intrinsic tendon healing via the piezoelectric response of poly-L-lactic acid (PLLA) short fibers. Reprinted with permission from Luo et al.¹³⁴ Copyright © 2025 Wiley-VCH GmbH. (B) Schematic illustration of the multifunctional HAPP@H-EXO Janus hydrogel, an exosome-loaded multifunctional Janus hydrogel, for the repair of infected Achilles tendon rupture. This hydrogel promotes structural repair and

functional regeneration of infected tendon through asymmetric adhesion, antibacterial and anti-inflammatory effects, exosome delivery, and stress redistribution . Reprinted with permission from Li et al.¹³⁷ Copyright © 2026 The Author(s).

For tendon tissue, which has a long repair cycle and a continuously changing microenvironment, the focus of smart responsive design should not be limited to environmental sensing alone. Rather, scaffolds should provide more stage-matched local interventions at different phases of repair¹⁴¹. Future studies should integrate responsive mechanisms with responsive bioinks, growth factor or exosome delivery, immunomodulation, anti-adhesion strategies, physical stimulation, region-specific printed architectures, and post-printing release control to establish temporally regulated integrated repair systems^{93,96}.

6. Conclusions and Perspectives

With the development of tissue engineering and bioprinting technologies, tendon repair materials have evolved from providing simple structural support toward actively regulating cell behavior, the inflammatory microenvironment, matrix reconstruction, and tissue maturation. Natural biomaterials offer bioactivity and cytocompatibility, synthetic biomaterials provide mechanical support and structural stability, and inorganic ions and functional components can further enhance immunomodulation, angiogenesis, physical stimulation, and smart responsiveness. Future material design should focus on integrating these advantages into comprehensive systems that are printable, degradable, controllable, and matched to the stages of tendon repair.

Several challenges remain. Most material systems still struggle to simultaneously achieve printability, biocompatibility, mechanical matching, and long-term stability. Current scaffolds remain insufficient in recapitulating the hierarchical structure, interfacial gradients, and long-term mechanical function of native tendon. The release timing, safety, and translational evaluation of bioactive molecules, cells, and functional ions still require further optimization. In addition, many immunomodulatory, physical stimulation, and smart responsive strategies remain limited to in vitro studies or small-animal models. Future studies should strengthen the synergistic design of natural biomaterials, synthetic biomaterials, and functional components; integrate anisotropic structures, interfacial gradients, controllable delivery, and responsive regulation; and further conduct large-animal studies, long-term functional evaluations, and clinical translational research. More standardized material evaluation systems and bioprinting process standards should also be established.

Clinical translation remains a major challenge for tendon bioprinting materials. Most current

studies are still based on in vitro experiments or small-animal models, whereas human tendon injuries often involve larger defects, higher and more complex mechanical loads, longer healing periods, and substantial patient-to-patient variability. Therefore, results from small-animal models alone are insufficient to predict clinical efficacy, and future studies should incorporate large-animal models and long-term in vivo evaluations to assess tissue integration, immune and foreign-body responses, material degradation, adhesion formation, mechanical recovery, and functional outcomes. From a manufacturing and regulatory perspective, scalability, sterilization-compatible processing, aseptic fabrication, batch-to-batch reproducibility, storage and transportation, cost control, and quality control standards must also be considered at an early stage of material design. These issues are particularly important for cell-laden bioinks, exosome delivery systems, and multifunctional responsive materials, for which long-term safety, immunological risk, release stability, and regulatory classification remain insufficiently defined.

Future tendon bioprinting research should focus on several priority directions. First, multi-material cooperative printing should be further developed to integrate cell-friendly hydrogels, bioactive components, and load-bearing frameworks, thereby balancing cell loading, shape fidelity, and mechanical support. Second, gradient tendon–bone interface construction should be strengthened through region-specific control of material composition, cell distribution, mineralization degree, and mechanical properties to better mimic the continuous transition from tendon to fibrocartilage and bone. Third, immune-responsive bioinks should be designed to regulate inflammation resolution, macrophage phenotypic transition, cell recruitment, and matrix remodeling in a phase-specific manner. Fourth, mechanoresponsive and multi-stimuli-responsive systems, including ROS-responsive and pH-responsive bioinks, should be explored to adapt to the dynamic mechanical and inflammatory microenvironment during tendon healing. Fifth, long-term in vivo validation and standardized evaluation should be emphasized, with outcome measures extending from short-term cell viability, tenogenic markers, and histological observations to tensile strength, elastic modulus, fatigue resistance, suture retention strength, gliding resistance, adhesion formation, material degradation, immune safety, and functional recovery.

Acknowledgments

None.

Funding

This work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (grant numbers 82472460, 82272504 and U23A20523), the Jilin Province Health Talent Specialisation (grant number 2024WSZX-C12), Jilin University Lixin Excellent Young Teacher Training Program (grant number 4190805LX119), Key Training Plan for Outstanding Youth of Jilin University (grant number 419070623036).

Conflict of interest

Jincheng Wang is an Editorial Board Member of this journal. Both Jincheng Wang and Qing Han serve as the Guest Editors of this special issue. Both of them were not in any way involved in the editorial and peer-review process conducted for this paper, directly or indirectly. The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have influenced the work reported in this paper.

Author contributions

Conceptualization: Le Gao, Xue Zhao, Hao Chen

Data curation: Jinbo Zhang, Le Gao, Xue Zhao, Weilong Zhang

Software: Zhidong Liang

Writing—original draft: Le Gao, Jinbo Zhang

Writing—review & editing: Le Gao, Jincheng Wang, Qing Han, Bingpeng Chen

Ethics approval and consent to participate

Not applicable.

Consent for publication

Not applicable.

Availability of data

Not applicable.

References

1. Benjamin M, Kaiser E, Milz S. Structure-function relationships in tendons: a review. *J Anat.* Mar 2008;212(3):211–28. doi:10.1111/j.1469-7580.2008.00864.x
2. Sharma P, Maffulli N. Tendon injury and tendinopathy: healing and repair. *J Bone Joint Surg Am.* Jan 2005;87(1):187–202. doi:10.2106/JBJS.D.01850
3. Voleti PB, Buckley MR, Soslowsky LJ. Tendon healing: repair and regeneration. *Annu Rev Biomed Eng.* 2012;14:47–71. doi:10.1146/annurev-bioeng-071811-150122
4. Snedeker JG, Foleen J. Tendon injury and repair - A perspective on the basic mechanisms of tendon disease and future clinical therapy. *Acta Biomater.* Nov 2017;63:18–36. doi:10.1016/j.actbio.2017.08.032
5. Darrieutort-Laffite C, Blanchard F, Soslowsky LJ, Le Goff B. Biology and physiology of tendon healing. *Joint Bone Spine.* Sep 2024;91(5):105696. doi:10.1016/j.jbspin.2024.105696
6. Arvind V, Huang AH. Reparative and Maladaptive Inflammation in Tendon Healing. *Front Bioeng Biotechnol.* 2021;9:719047. doi:10.3389/fbioe.2021.719047
7. Chisari E, Rehak L, Khan WS, Maffulli N. The role of the immune system in tendon healing: a systematic review. *Br Med Bull.* May 15 2020;133(1):49–64. doi:10.1093/bmb/ldz040
8. Wang Y, Lu X, Lu J, Hernigou P, Jin F. The role of macrophage polarization in tendon healing and therapeutic strategies: Insights from animal models. *Front Bioeng Biotechnol.* 2024;12:1366398. doi:10.3389/fbioe.2024.1366398
9. Bi Y, Ehrichou D, Kilts TM, et al. Identification of tendon stem/progenitor cells and the role of the extracellular matrix in their niche. *Nat Med.* Oct 2007;13(10):1219–27. doi:10.1038/nm1630
10. Lu J, Chen H, Lyu K, et al. The Functions and Mechanisms of Tendon Stem/Progenitor Cells in Tendon Healing. *Stem Cells Int.* 2023;2023:1258024. doi:10.1155/2023/1258024
11. Jiang L, Lu J, Chen Y, et al. Mesenchymal stem cells: An efficient cell therapy for tendon repair (Review). *Int J Mol Med.* Aug 2023;52(2)doi:10.3892/ijmm.2023.5273
12. Ruiz-Alonso S, Lafuente-Merchan M, Ciriza J, Saenz-Del-Burgo L, Pedraz JL. Tendon tissue engineering: Cells, growth factors, scaffolds and production techniques. *J Control Release.* May 10 2021;333:448–486. doi:10.1016/j.jconrel.2021.03.040
13. Mandrycky C, Wang Z, Kim K, Kim DH. 3D bioprinting for engineering complex tissues. *Biotechnol Adv.* Jul–Aug 2016;34(4):422–434. doi:10.1016/j.biotechadv.2015.12.011
14. Bai X, Yang Y, Chu J, Deng Y, Li M, Yang H. 3D bioprinting patient-specific grafts for tendon/ligament repair in motion: emerging trends and challenges. *Front Bioeng Biotechnol.* 2025;13:1643430. doi:10.3389/fbioe.2025.1643430
15. Park W, Gao G, Cho DW. Tissue-Specific Decellularized Extracellular Matrix Bioinks for Musculoskeletal Tissue Regeneration and Modeling Using 3D Bioprinting Technology. *Int J Mol Sci.* Jul 22 2021;22(15)doi:10.3390/ijms22157837
16. Rosset J, Olaniyanu E, Stein K, Almeida ND, França R. Exploring the frontier of 3D bioprinting for tendon regeneration: a review. *Eng.* 2024;5(3):1838–1849. doi:10.3390/eng5030098
17. Zhou H, Chen Y, Yan W, Chen X, Zi Y. Advances and challenges in biomaterials for tendon and enthesis repair. *Bioact Mater.* May 2025;47:531–545. doi:10.1016/j.bioactmat.2025.01.001
18. Alvarez-Lorenzo C, Zarur M, Seijo-Rabina A, Blanco-Fernandez B, Rodriguez-Moldes I, Concheiro A. Physical stimuli-emitting scaffolds: The role of piezoelectricity in tissue regeneration. *Mater Today Bio.*

Oct 2023;22:100740. doi:10.1016/j.mtbio.2023.100740

19. Wu F, Nerlich M, Docheva D. Tendon injuries: Basic science and new repair proposals. *EFORT Open Rev.* Jul 2017;2(7):332–342. doi:10.1302/2058-5241.2.160075
20. Leong NL, Kator JL, Clemens TL, James A, Enamoto-Iwamoto M, Jiang J. Tendon and Ligament Healing and Current Approaches to Tendon and Ligament Regeneration. *J Orthop Res.* Jan 2020;38(1):7–12. doi:10.1002/jor.24475
21. Wong JK, Lui YH, Kapacee Z, Kadler KE, Ferguson MW, McGrouther DA. The cellular biology of flexor tendon adhesion formation: an old problem in a new paradigm. *Am J Pathol.* Nov 2009;175(5):1938–51. doi:10.2353/ajpath.2009.090380
22. Zhao X, Jiang S, Liu S, et al. Optimization of intrinsic and extrinsic tendon healing through controllable water-soluble mitomycin-C release from electrospun fibers by mediating adhesion-related gene expression. *Biomaterials.* Aug 2015;61:61–74. doi:10.1016/j.biomaterials.2015.05.012
23. Chartier C, ElHawary H, Baradaran A, Vorstenbosch J, Xu L, Efanov JI. Tendon: Principles of Healing and Repair. *Semin Plast Surg.* Aug 2021;35(3):211–215. doi:10.1055/s-0041-1731632
24. Hou J, Yang R, Vuong I, Li F, Kong J, Mao HQ. Biomaterials strategies to balance inflammation and tenogenesis for tendon repair. *Acta Biomater.* Aug 2021;130:1–16. doi:10.1016/j.actbio.2021.05.043
25. Vasiliadis AV, Katakalos K. The Role of Scaffolds in Tendon Tissue Engineering. *J Funct Biomater.* Nov 1 2020;11(4)doi:10.3390/jfb11040078
26. Wang Y, Li J. Current progress in growth factors and extracellular vesicles in tendon healing. *Int Wound J.* Nov 2023;20(9):3871–3883. doi:10.1111/iwj.14261
27. Evrova O, Buschmann J. In vitro and in vivo effects of PDGF-BB delivery strategies on tendon healing: a review. *Eur Cell Mater.* Jul 17 2017;34:15–39. doi:10.22203/eCM.v034a02
28. Crowe LAN, McLean M, Kitson SM, et al. S100A8 & S100A9: alarmin mediated inflammation in tendinopathy. *Scientific Reports.* 2019;9:1463. doi:10.1038/s41598-018-37684-3
29. D'Addona A, Maffulli N, Formisano S, Rosa D. Inflammation in tendinopathy. *Surgeon.* Oct 2017;15(5):297–302. doi:10.1016/j.surge.2017.04.004
30. Xu HT, Lee CW, Li MY, Wang YF, Yung PS, Lee OK. The shift in macrophages polarisation after tendon injury: A systematic review. *J Orthop Translat.* Mar 2020;21:24–34. doi:10.1016/j.jot.2019.11.009
31. Russo V, El Khatib M, Prencipe G, et al. Tendon Immune Regeneration: Insights on the Synergetic Role of Stem and Immune Cells during Tendon Regeneration. *Cells.* Jan 27 2022;11(3)doi:10.3390/cells11030434
32. Docheva D, Muller SA, Majewski M, Evans CH. Biologics for tendon repair. *Adv Drug Deliv Rev.* Apr 2015;84:222–39. doi:10.1016/j.addr.2014.11.015
33. Maffulli N, Ewen SW, Waterston SW, Reaper J, Barrass V. Tenocytes from ruptured and tendinopathic achilles tendons produce greater quantities of type III collagen than tenocytes from normal achilles tendons. An in vitro model of human tendon healing. *Am J Sports Med.* Jul–Aug 2000;28(4):499–505. doi:10.1177/03635465000280040901
34. Huang Z, Yin Z, Xu J, et al. Tendon Stem/Progenitor Cell Subpopulations and Their Implications in Tendon Biology. *Front Cell Dev Biol.* 2021;9:631272. doi:10.3389/fcell.2021.631272
35. Galloway MT, Lalley AL, Shearn JT. The role of mechanical loading in tendon development, maintenance, injury, and repair. *J Bone Joint Surg Am.* Sep 4 2013;95(17):1620–8. doi:10.2106/JBJS.L.01004
36. Killian ML, Cavinatto L, Galatz LM, Thomopoulos S. The role of mechanobiology in tendon healing. *J Shoulder Elbow Surg.* Feb 2012;21(2):228–37. doi:10.1016/j.jse.2011.11.002
37. Murphy SV, Atala A. 3D bioprinting of tissues and organs. *Nat Biotechnol.* Aug 2014;32(8):773–85. doi:10.1038/nbt.2958
38. Hospodiuk M, Dey M, Sosnoski D, Ozbolat IT. The bioink: A comprehensive review on bioprintable materials. *Biotechnol Adv.* Mar–Apr 2017;35(2):217–239. doi:10.1016/j.biotechadv.2016.12.006

39. Malda J, Visser J, Melchels FP, et al. 25th anniversary article: Engineering hydrogels for biofabrication. *Adv Mater*. Sep 25 2013;25(36):5011–28. doi:10.1002/adma.201302042
40. Schwab A, Levato R, D'Este M, Piluso S, Eglin D, Malda J. Printability and Shape Fidelity of Bioinks in 3D Bioprinting. *Chem Rev*. Oct 14 2020;120(19):11028–11055. doi:10.1021/acs.chemrev.0c00084
41. Paxton N, Smolan W, Bock T, Melchels F, Groll J, Jungst T. Proposal to assess printability of bioinks for extrusion-based bioprinting and evaluation of rheological properties governing bioprintability. *Biofabrication*. Nov 14 2017;9(4):044107. doi:10.1088/1758-5090/aa8dd8
42. Ouyang L, Yao R, Zhao Y, Sun W. Effect of bioink properties on printability and cell viability for 3D bioplotting of embryonic stem cells. *Biofabrication*. Sep 16 2016;8(3):035020. doi:10.1088/1758-5090/8/3/035020
43. Hull SM, Brunel LG, Heilshorn SC. 3D Bioprinting of Cell-Laden Hydrogels for Improved Biological Functionality. *Adv Mater*. Jan 2022;34(2):e2103691. doi:10.1002/adma.202103691
44. Boularaoui S, Al Hussein G, Khan KA, Christoforou N, Stefanini C. An overview of extrusion-based bioprinting with a focus on induced shear stress and its effect on cell viability. *Bioprinting*. 2020;20:e00093. doi:10.1016/j.bprint.2020.e00093
45. Temirel M, Dabbagh SR, Tasoglu S. Shape Fidelity Evaluation of Alginate-Based Hydrogels through Extrusion-Based Bioprinting. *J Funct Biomater*. Nov 7 2022;13(4)doi:10.3390/jfb13040225
46. Unagolla JM, Jayasuriya AC. Hydrogel-based 3D bioprinting: A comprehensive review on cell-laden hydrogels, bioink formulations, and future perspectives. *Appl Mater Today*. Mar 2020;18doi:10.1016/j.apmt.2019.100479
47. Gopinathan J, Noh I. Recent trends in bioinks for 3D printing. *Biomater Res*. 2018;22:11. doi:10.1186/s40824-018-0122-1
48. Chen XB, Anvari-Yazdi AF, Duan X, et al. Biomaterials / bioinks and extrusion bioprinting. *Bioactive Materials*. 2023;28:511–536. doi:10.1016/j.bioactmat.2023.06.006
49. GhavamiNejad A, Ashammakhi N, Wu XY, Khademhosseini A. Crosslinking Strategies for 3D Bioprinting of Polymeric Hydrogels. *Small*. Sep 2020;16(35):e2002931. doi:10.1002/smll.202002931
50. Zhu S, He Z, Ji L, et al. Advanced Nanofiber-Based Scaffolds for Achilles Tendon Regenerative Engineering. *Front Bioeng Biotechnol*. 2022;10:897010. doi:10.3389/fbioe.2022.897010
51. Silva M, Ferreira FN, Alves NM, Paiva MC. Biodegradable polymer nanocomposites for ligament/tendon tissue engineering. *J Nanobiotechnology*. Jan 30 2020;18(1):23. doi:10.1186/s12951-019-0556-1
52. Jiang X, Wu S, Kuss M, et al. 3D printing of multilayered scaffolds for rotator cuff tendon regeneration. *Bioact Mater*. Sep 2020;5(3):636–643. doi:10.1016/j.bioactmat.2020.04.017
53. Zhang H, Zhou L, Zhang W. Control of scaffold degradation in tissue engineering: a review. *Tissue Eng Part B Rev*. Oct 2014;20(5):492–502. doi:10.1089/ten.TEB.2013.0452
54. Middleton JC, Tipton AJ. Synthetic biodegradable polymers as orthopedic devices. *Biomaterials*. Dec 2000;21(23):2335–46. doi:10.1016/s0142-9612(00)00101-0
55. Lai Y, Xiao X, Huang Z, et al. Photocrosslinkable Biomaterials for 3D Bioprinting: Mechanisms, Recent Advances, and Future Prospects. *Int J Mol Sci*. Nov 22 2024;25(23)doi:10.3390/ijms252312567
56. Chen R, Chen F, Chen K, Xu J. Advances in the application of hydrogel-based scaffolds for tendon repair. *Genes Dis*. Jul 2024;11(4):101019. doi:10.1016/j.gendis.2023.04.039
57. Benwood C, Chrenek J, Kirsch RL, et al. Natural Biomaterials and Their Use as Bioinks for Printing Tissues. *Bioengineering (Basel)*. Feb 20 2021;8(2)doi:10.3390/bioengineering8020027
58. Yang G, Rothrauff BB, Lin H, Yu S, Tuan RS. Tendon-Derived Extracellular Matrix Enhances Transforming Growth Factor-beta3-Induced Tenogenic Differentiation of Human Adipose-Derived Stem Cells. *Tissue Eng Part A*. Feb 2017;23(3-4):166–176. doi:10.1089/ten.TEA.2015.0498
59. Al-Hakim Khalak F, Garcia-Villen F, Ruiz-Alonso S, Pedraz JL, Saenz-Del-Burgo L. Decellularized Extracellular Matrix-Based Bioinks for Tendon Regeneration in Three-Dimensional Bioprinting. *Int J Mol*

Sci. Oct 26 2022;23(21)doi:10.3390/ijms232112930

60. Pires Figueiredo M, Rodriguez-Fernandez S, Copes F, Mantovani D. Review of collagen type I-based hydrogels: focus on composition-structure-properties relationships. *NPJ Biomed Innov.* 2025;2(1):16. doi:10.1038/s44385-025-00018-w
61. Sarrigiannidis SO, Rey JM, Dobre O, Gonzalez-Garcia C, Dalby MJ, Salmeron-Sanchez M. A tough act to follow: collagen hydrogel modifications to improve mechanical and growth factor loading capabilities. *Mater Today Bio.* Mar 2021;10:100098. doi:10.1016/j.mtbio.2021.100098
62. Stepanovska J, Otahal M, Hanzalek K, Supova M, Matejka R. pH Modification of High-Concentrated Collagen Bioinks as a Factor Affecting Cell Viability, Mechanical Properties, and Printability. *Gels.* Dec 7 2021;7(4)doi:10.3390/gels7040252
63. Jia J, Richards DJ, Pollard S, et al. Engineering alginate as bioink for bioprinting. *Acta Biomater.* Oct 2014;10(10):4323–31. doi:10.1016/j.actbio.2014.06.034
64. Piras CC, Smith DK. Multicomponent polysaccharide alginate-based bioinks. *J Mater Chem B.* Sep 23 2020;8(36):8171–8188. doi:10.1039/d0tb01005g
65. Gonzalez-Fernandez T, Tenorio AJ, Campbell KT, Silva EA, Leach JK. Alginate-Based Bioinks for 3D Bioprinting and Fabrication of Anatomically Accurate Bone Grafts. *Tissue Eng Part A.* Sep 2021;27(17-18):1168–1181. doi:10.1089/ten.TEA.2020.0305
66. Lee KY, Mooney DJ. Alginate: properties and biomedical applications. *Prog Polym Sci.* Jan 2012;37(1):106–126. doi:10.1016/j.progpolymsci.2011.06.003
67. Boontheekul T, Kong HJ, Mooney DJ. Controlling alginate gel degradation utilizing partial oxidation and bimodal molecular weight distribution. *Biomaterials.* May 2005;26(15):2455–65. doi:10.1016/j.biomaterials.2004.06.044
68. Zhou H, Lu H. Advances in the Development of Anti-Adhesive Biomaterials for Tendon Repair Treatment. *Tissue Eng Regen Med.* Feb 2021;18(1):1–14. doi:10.1007/s13770-020-00300-5
69. Miescher I, Schaffner N, Rieber J, et al. Hyaluronic acid/PEO electrospun tube reduces tendon adhesion to levels comparable to native tendons - An in vitro and in vivo study. *Int J Biol Macromol.* Jul 2024;273(Pt 2):133193. doi:10.1016/j.ijbiomac.2024.133193
70. Chen H, Xue H, Zeng H, Dai M, Tang C, Liu L. 3D printed scaffolds based on hyaluronic acid bioinks for tissue engineering: a review. *Biomater Res.* Dec 24 2023;27(1):137. doi:10.1186/s40824-023-00460-0
71. Luo Z, Wang Y, Xu Y, Wang J, Yu Y. Modification and crosslinking strategies for hyaluronic acid-based hydrogel biomaterials. *Smart Med.* Nov 2023;2(4):e20230029. doi:10.1002/SMMD.20230029
72. Sun W, Gregory DA, Tomeh MA, Zhao X. Silk Fibroin as a Functional Biomaterial for Tissue Engineering. *Int J Mol Sci.* Feb 2 2021;22(3)doi:10.3390/ijms22031499
73. Kim SH, Yeon YK, Lee JM, et al. Precisely printable and biocompatible silk fibroin bioink for digital light processing 3D printing. *Nature Communications.* 2018;9:1620. doi:10.1038/s41467-018-03759-y
74. Ning X, Du R, Zhang M, et al. Three-dimensional bioprinted silk fibroin-hydroxypropyl cellulose scaffold loaded with tendon stem/progenitor cells for the prevention of heterotopic ossification following Achilles tendon injury. *International Journal of Bioprinting.* 2025;11(4):297–314. doi:10.36922/IJB025210203
75. Zhao F, Cheng J, Sun M, et al. Digestion degree is a key factor to regulate the printability of pure tendon decellularized extracellular matrix bio-ink in extrusion-based 3D cell printing. *Biofabrication.* Jul 29 2020;12(4):045011. doi:10.1088/1758-5090/aba411
76. Zhang H, Wang Y, Zheng Z, et al. Strategies for improving the 3D printability of decellularized extracellular matrix bioink. *Theranostics.* 2023;13(8):2562–2587. doi:10.7150/thno.81785
77. Zhao F, Cheng J, Zhang J, et al. Comparison of three different acidic solutions in tendon decellularized extracellular matrix bio-ink fabrication for 3D cell printing. *Acta Biomater.* Sep 1 2021;131:262–275. doi:10.1016/j.actbio.2021.06.026
78. Yang G, Lin H, Rothrauff BB, Yu S, Tuan RS. Multilayered polycaprolactone/gelatin fiber-hydrogel

- composite for tendon tissue engineering. *Acta Biomater.* Apr 15 2016;35:68–76. doi:10.1016/j.actbio.2016.03.004
79. Yang Q, Li J, Su W, et al. Electrospun aligned poly(epsilon-caprolactone) nanofiber yarns guiding 3D organization of tendon stem/progenitor cells in tenogenic differentiation and tendon repair. *Front Bioeng Biotechnol.* 2022;10:960694. doi:10.3389/fbioe.2022.960694
 80. Baudequin T, Gaut L, Mueller M, et al. The Osteogenic and Tenogenic Differentiation Potential of C3H10T1/2 (Mesenchymal Stem Cell Model) Cultured on PCL/PLA Electrospun Scaffolds in the Absence of Specific Differentiation Medium. *Materials (Basel).* Dec 4 2017;10(12)doi:10.3390/ma10121387
 81. Cai J, Xie X, Li D, et al. A novel knitted scaffold made of microfiber/nanofiber core-sheath yarns for tendon tissue engineering. *Biomater Sci.* Aug 11 2020;8(16):4413–4425. doi:10.1039/d0bm00816h
 82. Paxton JZ, Donnelly K, Keatch RP, Baar K. Engineering the bone-ligament interface using polyethylene glycol diacrylate incorporated with hydroxyapatite and the cell-adhesive peptide RGD. *Tissue Engineering Part A.* 2009;15(6):1201–1209. doi:10.1089/ten.tea.2008.0105
 83. Xu Z, Fang Y, Chen Y, Zhao Y, Wei W, Teng C. Hydrogel Development for Rotator Cuff Repair. *Front Bioeng Biotechnol.* 2022;10:851660. doi:10.3389/fbioe.2022.851660
 84. Chen CH, Chang CH, Wang KC, et al. Enhancement of rotator cuff tendon-bone healing with injectable periosteum progenitor cells-BMP-2 hydrogel in vivo. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc.* 2011;19(9):1597–1607. doi:10.1007/s00167-010-1373-085. Xie X, Wang Y, Li Z, et al. Recent advances in gradient biomimetic scaffolds for tendon-bone interface repair. *Frontiers in Bioengineering and Biotechnology.* 2025;13:1629816. doi:10.3389/fbioe.2025.1629816
 86. Cheng P, Weng Z, Hamushan M, et al. High-purity magnesium screws modulate macrophage polarization during the tendon-bone healing process in the anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction rabbit model. *Regen Biomater.* 2022;9:rbac067. doi:10.1093/rb/rbac067
 87. Gao X, Wu S, Yao Z, et al. Engineered decellularized tendon hydrogel with sustained zinc ion release orchestrates anti-inflammatory microenvironment and functional regeneration in Achilles tendinopathy. *Mater Today Bio.* Oct 2025;34:102104. doi:10.1016/j.mtbio.2025.102104
 88. Li J, Ke H, Wu D, et al. Bilayer book- like decellularized extracellular matrix scaffold with bioactive coatings for rotator cuff repair. *Mater Today Bio.* Aug 2025;33:102038. doi:10.1016/j.mtbio.2025.102038
 89. Wu C, Zhou Y, Xu M, et al. Copper-containing mesoporous bioactive glass scaffolds with multifunctional properties of angiogenesis capacity, osteostimulation and antibacterial activity. *Biomaterials.* 2013;34(2):422–433. doi:10.1016/j.biomaterials.2012.09.066
 90. Liu Y, Xu J, Yuan J, et al. Gradient hydrogel with bioactive glass for tendon-bone interface regeneration: Enhancing biomechanical strength and synchronized tissue regeneration. *Acta Biomater.* Sep 15 2025;204:643–656. doi:10.1016/j.actbio.2025.07.072
 91. Du L, Qin C, Zhang H, et al. Multicellular Bioprinting of Biomimetic Inks for Tendon-to-Bone Regeneration. *Adv Sci (Weinh).* Jul 2023;10(21):e2301309. doi:10.1002/advs.202301309
 92. Tang Y, Wang Z, Xiang L, Zhao Z, Cui W. Functional biomaterials for tendon/ligament repair and regeneration. *Regen Biomater.* 2022;9:rbac062. doi:10.1093/rb/rbac062
 93. Hu J, Liu S, Fan C. Applications of functionally-adapted hydrogels in tendon repair. *Front Bioeng Biotechnol.* 2023;11:1135090. doi:10.3389/fbioe.2023.1135090
 94. Wang S, Ou Z, Xiao F, et al. Advanced bioactive materials and strategies for tendon repair and function restoration. *J Orthop Translat.* Nov 2025;55:204–227. doi:10.1016/j.jot.2025.08.012
 95. Wu W, Yang H, Li T, Xie Y, Huang G, Zhang W. Conductive and piezoelectric biomaterials: a comprehensive review of load-bearing soft tissue repair. *Biomater Sci.* Jul 8 2025;13(14):3755–3771. doi:10.1039/d5bm00368g
 96. Jiang Y, Zhu C, Ma X, Fan D. Smart hydrogel-based trends in future tendon injury repair: A review. *Int J Biol Macromol.* Dec 2024;282(Pt 5):137092. doi:10.1016/j.ijbiomac.2024.137092
 97. Caliarì SR, Harley BAC. The effect of anisotropic collagen-GAG scaffolds and growth factor

supplementation on tendon cell recruitment, alignment, and metabolic activity. *Biomaterials*. 2011;32(23):5330–5340. doi:10.1016/j.biomaterials.2011.04.021

98. Zheng Y, Han Q, Li D, Sheng F, Song Z, Wang J. Promotion of tendon growth into implant through pore-size design of a Ti-6Al-4V porous scaffold prepared by 3D printing. *Materials & Design*. 2021;197:109219. doi:10.1016/j.matdes.2020.109219

99. Yao K, Lv S, Zhang X, et al. 3D printing of multiscale biomimetic scaffold for tendon regeneration. *Advanced Functional Materials*. 2025;35(4):2413970. doi:10.1002/adfm.202413970

100. Li M, Wu Y, Yuan T, et al. Biofabrication of Composite Tendon Constructs with the Fibrous Arrangement, High Cell Density, and Enhanced Cell Alignment. *ACS Appl Mater Interfaces*. Oct 18 2023;15(41):47989–48000. doi:10.1021/acsami.3c10697

101. Fang J, Wang X, Lai H, et al. Decoding the mechanical characteristics of the human anterior cruciate ligament entheses through graduated mineralization interfaces. *Nat Commun*. Oct 26 2024;15(1):9253. doi:10.1038/s41467-024-53542-5

102. Killian ML. Growth and mechanobiology of the tendon-bone enthesis. *Semin Cell Dev Biol*. Mar 2022;123:64–73. doi:10.1016/j.semcdb.2021.07.015

103. Kim W, Kwon DR, Lee H, et al. 3D bioprinted multi-layered cell constructs with gradient core-shell interface for tendon-to-bone tissue regeneration. *Bioact Mater*. Jan 2025;43:471–490. doi:10.1016/j.bioactmat.2024.10.002

104. Chae S, Sun Y, Choi YJ, Ha DH, Jeon I, Cho DW. 3D cell-printing of tendon-bone interface using tissue-derived extracellular matrix bioinks for chronic rotator cuff repair. *Biofabrication*. Apr 2 2021;13(3)doi:10.1088/1758-5090/abd159

105. Kapoor A, Caporali EH, Kenis PJ, Stewart MC. Microtopographically patterned surfaces promote the alignment of tenocytes and extracellular collagen. *Acta Biomater*. Jul 2010;6(7):2580–9. doi:10.1016/j.actbio.2009.12.047

106. English A, Azeem A, Spanoudes K, et al. Substrate topography: A valuable in vitro tool, but a clinical red herring for in vivo tenogenesis. *Acta Biomater*. Nov 2015;27:3–12. doi:10.1016/j.actbio.2015.08.035

107. Tsiapalis D, Rana S, Doulgeroglou M, et al. The effect of aligned electrospun fibers and macromolecular crowding in tenocyte culture. *Methods Cell Biol*. 2020;157:225–247. doi:10.1016/bs.mcb.2019.11.003

108. Long Q, Liu C, Zheng H, et al. Enhancing Tendon Regeneration: Investigating the Impact of Topography on the Secretome of Adipose-Derived Stem Cells. *Adv Sci (Weinh)*. May 2025;12(18):e2417447. doi:10.1002/advs.202417447

109. Vermeulen S, Vasilevich A, Tsiapalis D, et al. Identification of topographical architectures supporting the phenotype of rat tenocytes. *Acta Biomater*. Jan 1 2019;83:277–290. doi:10.1016/j.actbio.2018.10.041

110. Keselowsky BG, Collard DM, Garcia AJ. Surface chemistry modulates focal adhesion composition and signaling through changes in integrin binding. *Biomaterials*. Dec 2004;25(28):5947–54. doi:10.1016/j.biomaterials.2004.01.062

111. Place ES, Evans ND, Stevens MM. Complexity in biomaterials for tissue engineering. *Nat Mater*. Jun 2009;8(6):457–70. doi:10.1038/nmat2441

112. Wang H, Sun Z, Wang S, et al. Chiral arginine modified electrospun membrane for enhancing tendon healing. *Advanced Functional Materials*. 2024;34(38):2402845. doi:10.1002/adfm.202402845

113. Yao X, Hu W, Li Y, et al. Dual dynamic crosslinked hydrogel patch embodied with anti-bacterial and macrophage regulatory properties for synergistic prevention of peritendinous adhesion. *Advanced Functional Materials*. 2024;34(34):2400660. doi:10.1002/adfm.202400660

114. Ouyang C, Tu T, Yu H, et al. One-Step Formed Janus Hydrogel with Time-Space Regulating Properties for Suture-Free and High-Quality Tendon Healing. *Adv Sci (Weinh)*. Apr 2025;12(13):e2411400. doi:10.1002/advs.202411400

115. Evrova O, Kellenberger D, Calcagni M, Vogel V, Buschmann J. Supporting Cell-Based Tendon Therapy:

- Effect of PDGF-BB and Ascorbic Acid on Rabbit Achilles Tenocytes in Vitro. *Int J Mol Sci.* Jan 10 2020;21(2)doi:10.3390/ijms21020458
116. Li Y, Ge Z, Liu Z, et al. Integrating electrospun aligned fiber scaffolds with bovine serum albumin-basic fibroblast growth factor nanoparticles to promote tendon regeneration. *J Nanobiotechnology.* Dec 27 2024;22(1):799. doi:10.1186/s12951-024-03022-1
117. Ruiz-Alonso S, Ordoyo-Pascual J, Lafuente-Merchan M, et al. Hydrogel bioink formulation for 3D bioprinting: Sustained delivery of PDGF-BB and VEGF in biomimetic scaffolds for tendon partial rupture repair. *International Journal of Bioprinting.* 2024;10(3):442–467. doi:10.36922/ijb.2632
118. Chen C, Shi Q, Li M, et al. Engineering an enthesis-like graft for rotator cuff repair: An approach to fabricate highly biomimetic scaffold capable of zone-specifically releasing stem cell differentiation inducers. *Bioact Mater.* Oct 2022;16:451–471. doi:10.1016/j.bioactmat.2021.12.021
119. Kim HI, Park J, Zhu Y, Wang X, Han Y, Zhang D. Recent advances in extracellular vesicles for therapeutic cargo delivery. *Exp Mol Med.* Apr 2024;56(4):836–849. doi:10.1038/s12276-024-01201-6
120. Yu H, Cheng J, Shi W, et al. Bone marrow mesenchymal stem cell-derived exosomes promote tendon regeneration by facilitating the proliferation and migration of endogenous tendon stem/progenitor cells. *Acta Biomater.* Apr 1 2020;106:328–341. doi:10.1016/j.actbio.2020.01.051
121. Shen H, Yoneda S, Abu-Amer Y, Guilak F, Gelberman RH. Stem cell-derived extracellular vesicles attenuate the early inflammatory response after tendon injury and repair. *J Orthop Res.* Jan 2020;38(1):117–127. doi:10.1002/jor.24406
122. Chen R, Ai L, Zhang J, Jiang D. Dendritic Cell-Derived Exosomes Promote Tendon Healing and Regulate Macrophage Polarization in Preventing Tendinopathy. *Int J Nanomedicine.* 2024;19:11701–11718. doi:10.2147/IJN.S466363
123. Xu H, Zhu Y, Hsiao AW, et al. Bioactive glass-elicited stem cell-derived extracellular vesicles regulate M2 macrophage polarization and angiogenesis to improve tendon regeneration and functional recovery. *Biomaterials.* Mar 2023;294:121998. doi:10.1016/j.biomaterials.2023.121998
124. Dou Y, Zhai H, Li H, Xing H, Zhu C, Xuan Z. Endothelial cells-derived exosomes-based hydrogel improved tendinous repair via anti-inflammatory and tissue regeneration-promoting properties. *J Nanobiotechnology.* Jul 9 2024;22(1):401. doi:10.1186/s12951-024-02607-0
125. Zhang X, Wu Y, Han K, et al. 3-Dimensional Bioprinting of a Tendon Stem Cell-Derived Exosomes Loaded Scaffold to Bridge the Unrepairable Massive Rotator Cuff Tear. *Am J Sports Med.* Jul 2024;52(9):2358–2371. doi:10.1177/03635465241255918
126. Deng D, Wang W, Wang B, et al. Repair of Achilles tendon defect with autologous ASCs engineered tendon in a rabbit model. *Biomaterials.* Oct 2014;35(31):8801–8809. doi:10.1016/j.biomaterials.2014.06.058
127. Kokubu S, Inaki R, Hoshi K, Hikita A. Adipose-derived stem cells improve tendon repair and prevent ectopic ossification in tendinopathy by inhibiting inflammation and inducing neovascularization in the early stage of tendon healing. *Regen Ther.* Jun 2020;14:103–110. doi:10.1016/j.reth.2019.12.003
128. Shen W, Chen J, Yin Z, et al. Allogeneous tendon stem/progenitor cells in silk scaffold for functional shoulder repair. *Cell Transplant.* 2012;21(5):943–58. doi:10.3727/096368911X627453
129. Zhang J, Han Q, Zhao X, et al. Recent advances in immunoregulatory biomaterials for tendon healing: From immune remodeling to functional regeneration. *Mater Today Bio.* 2026;38:103090. doi:10.1016/j.mtbio.2026.103090
130. Wei Y, Yun X, Guan Y, et al. Wnt3a-Modified Nanofiber Scaffolds Facilitate Tendon Healing by Driving Macrophage Polarization during Repair. *ACS Appl Mater Interfaces.* Feb 22 2023;15(7):9010–9023. doi:10.1021/acsami.2c20386
131. Feng H, Zhang G, Xiong L, et al. Functionally graded scaffold with M2 macrophage-derived LncRNA-Encoded peptide: Mechanistic and therapeutic evaluation for rotator cuff repair. *Bioact Mater.* Oct 2025;52:668–686. doi:10.1016/j.bioactmat.2025.06.032

132. Du L, Wu J, Han Y, Wu C. Immunomodulatory multicellular scaffolds for tendon-to-bone regeneration. *Sci Adv*. Mar 8 2024;10(10):eadk6610. doi:10.1126/sciadv.adk6610
133. Fernandez-Yague MA, Trotier A, Demir S, et al. A self-powered piezo-bioelectric device regulates tendon repair-associated signaling pathways through modulation of mechanosensitive ion channels. *Advanced Materials*. 2021;33(40):2008788. doi:10.1002/adma.202008788
134. Luo R, Xiong Y, Li J, et al. Piezoelectric Injectable Anti-Adhesive Hydrogel to Promote Endogenous Healing of Tendon Injuries. *Adv Mater*. Oct 2025;37(40):e2501306. doi:10.1002/adma.202501306
135. Xu Y, Wang Q, Li Y, et al. Cyclic Tensile Strain Induces Tenogenic Differentiation of Tendon-Derived Stem Cells in Bioreactor Culture. *Biomed Res Int*. 2015;2015:790804. doi:10.1155/2015/790804
136. Park H, Nazhat SN, Rosenzweig DH. Mechanical activation drives tenogenic differentiation of human mesenchymal stem cells in aligned dense collagen hydrogels. *Biomaterials*. Jul 2022;286:121606. doi:10.1016/j.biomaterials.2022.121606
137. Li J, Wang Z, Yang W, et al. Bionic Janus hydrogel drives infected Achilles tendon regeneration via mechano-immune spatiotemporal steering. *Nat Commun*. Jan 20 2026;17(1):1805. doi:10.1038/s41467-026-68514-0
138. Wu R, Pang S, Lv W, et al. Injectable pH-responsive CI1040 delayed-release hydrogel for the treatment of tendon adhesion. *Advanced Functional Materials*. 2024;34(30):2314731. doi:10.1002/adfm.202314731
139. Zhu YL, Gu SC, Lu BL, et al. ROS-responsive hydrogel loaded with capsaicin promotes tenogenic differentiation of tendon stem/progenitor cells and enhances tendon injury repair. *Mater Today Bio*. Feb 2026;36:102707. doi:10.1016/j.mtbio.2025.102707
140. Zhou Z, Li S, Gong X. Polydopamine nanoparticles-based photothermal effect against adhesion formation in a rat model of Achilles tendon laceration repair. *Int J Nanomedicine*. 2023;18:1765–1776. doi:10.2147/IJN.S393454
141. Tan S, Cui C, Ma S, Zhu L, Liu X. Introducing nanocrystalline/amorphous heterostructures on laminated FeSiBCr to synchronously enhance absorption, expand absorption bandwidth and reduce matching thickness. *Acta Physico-Chimica Sinica*. 2026;42(7):100283. doi:10.1016/j.actphy.2026.100283