Published in final edited form as:

Trends Biotechnol. 2017 October ; 35(10): 971–982. doi:10.1016/j.tibtech.2017.06.008.

Manufacturing Cell Therapies Using Engineered Biomaterials

Amr A Abdeen^{a,b} and Krishanu Saha^{a,b,c,*}

^aWisconsin Institute for Discovery, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison, WI, USA

^bDepartment of Biomedical Engineering, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison, WI, USA

^cDepartment of Medical History and Bioethics, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison, WI, USA

Abstract

Emerging manufacturing processes to generate advanced regenerative cell therapies involve extensive genomic and/or epigenomic manipulation of autologous or allogeneic cells. These cell engineering processes need to be carefully controlled and standardized in order to maximize safety and efficacy in clinical trials. Engineered biomaterials with smart and tunable properties offer an intriguing tool to provide or deliver cues to retain stemness, direct differentiation, promote reprogramming, manipulate the genome, or select functional phenotypes. This review discusses the use of engineered biomaterials to control human cell manufacturing. Future work exploiting engineered biomaterials has the potential to generate manufacturing processes that produce standardized cells with well-defined critical quality attributes appropriate for clinical testing.

Keywords

stem cells; biomanufacturing; cell therapies; immunotherapy; biomaterials; regenerative medicine; reprogramming; gene editing

Cell Therapies in the Clinic

Successful translation of cell therapies into clinical trials and on to the clinic has been enabled by the convergence of several fields of research, including **biomaterials** (see Glossary), stem cell and developmental biology, immunotherapy, **reprogramming**, and **gene editing**. There are currently thousands of active clinical trials for cell therapies[1], including therapies for cancer, cardiovascular disease, and neurological disorders. **Stem cell** and gene editing-based cell therapies are a rapidly growing sector within the cell therapy industry. Stem cells, with their ability to self-renew *in vitro* and differentiate into specialized cell lines, are an already attractive cell source for cell and tissue engineered therapies. The ability

*Correspondence: Saha, K (ksaha@wisc.edu).

Publisher's Disclaimer: This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final citable form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

to manipulate stem cell genomes creates additional opportunities for modifying cell behavior, functionality and clinical utility.

Engineering patient cells to impart new functionality shows promise for targeted therapies, as exemplified by the recent prominence of cancer immunotherapy using engineered T-cells [2]. **Autologous** T-cells have been genetically engineered to express chimeric antigen receptors (CARs) targeting the patient's own cancer cells, and have demonstrated positive outcomes in clinical trials against blood malignancies resistant to currently available therapeutic options. For example, Qasim and colleagues recently reported leukemia remission in infants using **allogenic** CAR T-cell transplantation [3]. Companies and researchers in this field are starting to apply synthetic biology methods to further engineer T-cells to add new functionalities to therapies [2].

Apart from genetic engineering, cellular reprogramming using non-integrating genetic engineering tools to obtain pluripotent cells that self-renew in culture can be used to generate a rich source of somatic cells for transplantation as well as for disease modeling 'in a dish' [4]. Induced pluripotent stem cells (iPSCs) are being used as precursors to manufacture both progenitor and differentiated somatic cells in ongoing clinical trials [5] for age related macular degeneration (AMD), Parkinson's disease, spinal cord injury, and other diseases [6]. In AMD, which involves the progressive loss of the retinal epithelium monolayer, iPSC-derived retinal pigmented epithelium has been generated [7] that has been shown to partially repopulate the macula [8]. iPSC-derived pancreatic β -cell progenitor cells have also been deployed in clinical trials for type 1 diabetes [9].

Alternatively, the use of adult stem cells sidesteps some of the potential translational issues with pluripotent stem cells including extended differentiation procedures and possible teratoma formation. Adult stem cells, including hematopoietic, neural, and mesenchymal stem cells (MSCs), are currently being assessed in multiple clinical trials [10]. Neural stem cells are being used in several clinical trials targeting degenerative neural diseases, central nervous system damage, stroke, and ischemia [10]. As a prominent example, adult mesenchymal stromal cells that exhibit multi-lineage potential [11] can potentially be used in an autologous manner, are easy to isolate and expand, and they show reparative effects in clinical models [12]. *In vivo*, MSCs exert therapeutic effects through multiple pathways including secretion of cytokines and growth factors into the extracellular space [13], immunomodulation [14], and possibly differentiation, although this is still unclear. Injected MSCs have been tested as therapies targeting cardiac [15], bone/cartilage [16], and neural [17] regeneration and disease treatment [18]. MSCs can be 'primed' or preconditioned to increase their efficacy using physiological, chemical, molecular or genetic manipulation [19]. Moreover, MSC homing properties can be utilized for the delivery of growth factors via transgenic modification [20], potentially in a differentiation-dependent manner [21].

Emerging Cell Therapies

Increased accessibility and reliability of gene editing and cellular reprogramming have enabled the emergence of the next generation of cell-based therapies. Multiplexed gene editing is being used to improve **chimeric antigen receptor T-cell (CAR-T) therapies** by

enabling the use of allogenic cells [22], circumventing graft versus host disease [23], CTLA-4 inhibition or PD1 inhibition resistance [24] or combinations thereof, paving the way for much more feasible and effective therapy. **Epigenomic** transdifferentiation, or the conversion between cell types without passing through an intermediate pluripotent state, is an attractive option for generating desired cell populations while avoiding laborious reprogramming and differentiation processes [25]. This technique may additionally allow access to other healing modes, such as therapeutic transdifferentiation using either implanted cells [26] or small molecules *in vivo* [27]. Finally, combined gene editing and reprogramming technologies enable powerful expansion of cell replacement therapies and disease models through the introduction and correction of therapeutic mutations in wild type or patient-derived cell lines, the ability to create gene knock outs/knock ins, and various screening approaches [5]. However, despite these advances, human cell manufacturing is throttled by the lack of sufficient control over cell characteristics, especially after extensive manipulation and culture (Figure 1). Here, we review key issues facing **biomanufacturing** of human cells appropriate for clinical application, as well as novel biomaterials-based methods to address them.

Problem: Poorly characterized cells are entering the clinic

Epigenomic Heterogeneity in Human Cultures

A major roadblock in clinical translation is the donor-to-donor heterogeneity in cell populations. Heterogeneity can originate within the initial cell sources or be introduced through *ex vivo* processing, severely limiting the efficacy, ease of control and quality of therapies [1]. Initial cell populations may vary based on parameters such as donor age and condition or cell source. T-cells for immunotherapies, for instance, are often isolated from cancer patients undergoing chemotherapy. Chemotherapeutic treatments can deplete the host hematopoietic system and introduce variability in the expansion and cytotoxic efficiency of these cells. Additionally, MSCs are harvested from various cell sources, and extracted populations are often functionally heterogeneous [28]. Some of the heterogeneities among donors can be traced to epigenomic variability [1], although other genomic, metabolic and proteomic changes could also contribute to donor-to-donor variation.

Along with initial cell source, cell processing steps can introduce further epigenomic heterogeneity (Figure 1), as in the example of somatic cell reprogramming. This process is stochastic [29] and involves erasing source cell epigenetic marks, often resulting in cell populations with extensive functional, epigenetic, and gene expression variability [30,31]. Moreover, prolonged cell culture of pluripotent stem cells has been demonstrated to induce epigenetic abnormalities in these cells [32,33].

Prolonged cell culture is not solely an issue with iPSCs, as most cell types are cultured *in vitro* in environments dramatically different to those from their native environment, often resulting in altered cell state [30]. While *in vitro* culture is typically performed on tissue culture plastic, the *in vivo* **extracellular matrix (ECM)** is a very complex and rich environment [34], providing a heterogeneous mix of signaling cues from multiple components including fibrous structural proteins and proteoglycans. The ECM can present different ligands, apply mechanical forces, and dynamically interact with cells, instructing

their behavior. Multiple ECM properties, such as fibrous structures, matrix composition and elasticity [35–37], geometry [38], nanotopography [39] and shear flow [40], have been shown to dramatically direct cellular behavior in the absence of other soluble chemical stimuli. The culturing and processing of cell populations *in vitro*, within environments vastly different from their native niche can introduce large epigenomic and functional heterogeneities in these populations, often severely hampering clinical translation [41].

Genomic Heterogeneity

Regardless of epigenomic changes, permanent genomic changes can also occur in cultured cells. Culture-associated point mutations, copy number variants and chromosomal translocations within cell populations can be generated with extended culture and can seriously influence clinical outcomes. For example, sources of genetic changes through the process of cell reprogramming [31] include background mutations in parental cell lines [42], selection protocols that amplify specific mutations (especially those that may confer survival advantages) [43], or during reprogramming and subsequent culture [44]. Together, these factors make genomic stability an important consideration when characterizing cells during manufacturing processes.

Genomic heterogeneity has also been observed upon genome editing, an issue made more pressing with the increased application of gene editing using the CRISPR-Cas9 system. Uncontrolled subcellular delivery and the imprecise stoichiometry of nuclease components within cells can cause differences in editing efficiencies and outcomes amongst cell populations. The use of powerful site-directed nucleases that induce breaks in DNA can cause unintended local or large-scale genomic alterations, due to the mechanics of DNA repair. DNA breaks can be repaired through imprecise non homologous end joining (NHEJ), or more precise homology directed repair (HDR) [45]. NHEJ can introduce insertions, substitutions or deletions at the cut site (indels), often in a stochastic manner, causing genetic heterogeneity in edited populations. This imprecise mutation correction generates broad mutagenic spectra that can be detected by next-generation sequencing (NGS), ranging from single nucleotide polymorphisms to frameshift mutations resulting from indels. Nucleases can also cut at ‘untargeted’ sites causing off-target editing. Off-target editing can lead to unintended activation or deactivation of off-target genes, or large scale genomic alterations such as translocations or inversions [46]. Finally, introducing sequences novel to patients may generate neoantigens ultimately provoking an immune response. This could be an important concern when using mixed cell populations, large gene edits, or repeated dosing of **cell therapy products**.

A Need for Better Characterization and Standards

To harness the full potential of cell-based therapeutics, cellular heterogeneity and stochasticity in processing should give way to high quality, potent cellular products and reliable, reproducible and scalable processing. Thus, for the rational design of cell therapies, defining **critical quality attributes (CQAs)** are imperative [47]. CQAs such as cell **identity**, **purity** and **potency** could be rigorously defined and controlled for throughout the biomanufacturing process. The characterization toolkit could encompass cell and nuclear morphology, genomic, epigenomic and phenotypic assays, as well as metabolomics and

proteomics readouts. Currently, international standards are being established and disseminated to identify, characterize and standardize CQAs [48] (Box 1).

In the next section we discuss ways in which novel biomaterials can resolve some of the challenges facing emerging cell therapies, including their use for tackling genomic and epigenomic heterogeneity, cellular and subcellular delivery and the reliable scaling and quality control of biomanufacturing processes.

Roles for Engineered Biomaterials

In the last decade, there has been incredible growth in the manner in which materials have been used to manipulate, study and interact with biological matter. Synthetic and natural biomaterials have a wide range of tunable properties. They offer the ability to observe, probe, and direct cell behavior, sometimes in ways not accessible by regular *in vitro* culture or even *in vivo*, allowing distinct opportunities for cell based therapies (Figure 2, Key Figure). The ability to interact with specific cell types, specifically engineered cellular interactions and environmental responsiveness can enable these materials to behave in a smart manner.

Engineering Tunable Scaffolds

Biomaterials have been engineered to both recapitulate many aspects of *in vivo* environments and incorporate novel functionality. Several studies have shown that cells are most similar to their *in vivo* phenotype when they are cultured in matrices and scaffolds resembling their native physiological niche [50]. For example, MSCs can be directed to differentiate towards adipogenic, myogenic or osteogenic lineages *in vitro* through culture on substrates with elasticity similar to fat, muscle, or bone tissue, respectively [35]. While 2D and 3D culture substrates coated with engineered biomaterials are commonly used for adherent cells, even suspension culture can employ synthetic beads with tunable biomaterials to control signaling in order to expand particular cell types, such as activated T-cell subsets [51].

Matrix properties such as shape, stiffness, composition, force and topography are sensed by cells through membrane and transmembrane receptors, although there is very limited scope for manipulating these factors through traditional *in vitro* cell culture methods. By controlling these interactions biomaterials can be engineered for a range of desired functionalities. Integrins, for instance, mediate cell adhesion and signaling through particular peptide motifs, such as **arginine-glycine-aspartic acid (RGD)** peptides. By modifying scaffold surfaces to incorporate RGD peptides, otherwise non-adhesive surfaces enable cell attachment and growth [52]. By varying peptides or adhesion ligands presented to cells, different cell-specific integrin interactions can be engineered. For example, biomaterials tailored for specific integrin interactions promote adhesion of select cell types and activate downstream kinase signaling to control MSC differentiation[53] or iPSC pluripotency[54]. Similarly, materials can be designed to control multiple ECM properties. Matrix composition can be established by adsorption or chemical conjugation of matrix proteins, peptides or other moieties onto synthetic scaffolds. Alternatively, ECM components such as collagen, decellularized matrices or cell-derived matrices can be utilized to form more

‘organic,’ albeit less defined, scaffolds. Photo-lithography, microcontact printing and other patterning techniques can be used to pattern single cell shapes or multiple cell aggregates [55,56]. Other sophisticated fabrication techniques such as block copolymer micelle nanolithography allow subcellular, nanoscale ligand patterning, and control over parameters such as ligand spacing, presentation and **focal adhesion** size [57]. The use of hydrogels and other tunable-stiffness materials enables access to a wide range of elasticity encountered physiologically [58] to modulate ECM elasticity and other mechanical properties in synthetic scaffolds. Using micro- and nano-fabrication techniques to regulate matrix nanotopography permits manipulation of the physical architecture of the ECM [39]. Notably, for the aforementioned properties, differences between 2D flat culture and 3D biomimetic environments are well documented, usually suggesting 3D cell culture platforms may be preferred [59]. Finally, a wide variety of switchable materials have been developed that enable temporal control of an assortment of matrix properties including engineered surfaces with switchable adhesion to stiffening hydrogels [60].

The precise control of ECM properties in such a regulated manner can advance cell therapies:

Reduce variability in cell populations: Precise control of the environment and presentation of a defined niche to all cells could reduce variability among cells and provide a reliable, consistent growth environment. This potentially allows for more stable and predictable epigenomic and phenotypic states, leading to more robust biomanufacturing processes. This is particularly useful with stem cells, which are extremely sensitive to ECM properties [61] and prone to differentiation *in vitro*. Fully defined synthetic scaffolds are now available for stem cell maintenance and culture *in vitro* [62,63]. Xeno-free microenvironments having a fully defined, reproducible niche may abrogate much of the epigenetic variation caused by uncontrolled or variable ECM during cell maintenance [64] and reduce batch-to-batch variation, an issue especially common with naturally-derived components such as Matrigel.

Cellular perturbation, monitoring and screening: Cell-biomaterial interactions may be used to direct cells towards favorable functional states. Increased understanding of sophisticated biological processes and specific cell-ECM interactions enable engineering of a wide range of tailored matrix-mediated cellular perturbations. For instance, substrate-mediated epigenetic regulation of matrix properties can guide MSC differentiation [36] and secretion [65], as well as chromatin remodeling [56] and reprogramming efficiency of iPSCs [66]. iPSC differentiation and tissue or **organoid** formation may be enhanced through the use of biomaterials [67,68]. In these cases, organoid formation requires sophisticated matrix interactions to self-assemble and form functional units; mechanical, physical and chemical properties and organization of the niche all affect form and function of organoids, making control of the matrix critical, especially if organoids are to be leveraged for therapeutic purposes[67]. Microparticles have been developed that provide stimulatory cues, such as IL-2, to enhance T-cell effector function and expansion [51]. Techniques such as micropatterning, that segregate populations into unique units, lend themselves well to high content imaging, analysis and screening [69] which enables facile assaying of phenotype and the selection of homogenous subpopulations. Previous studies demonstrated the utility of this *in situ* monitoring approach in evaluating heterogeneity in CRISPR-Cas9 delivery

strategies [70] and editing of pluripotent stem cells [71]. Taken together, this body of work illustrates how biomaterials can provide a powerful platform for the guidance, monitoring, analysis, and quality control of cell populations.

Engineering Smart Delivery Strategies

Traditional methods for delivery of nucleic acids, proteins or drugs involve viruses, electroporation, or nonviral transfection agents. These strategies either rely on an integrating virus, which is efficient but may induce insertional mutagenesis, or non-integrating delivery, which typically suffers from lower efficiency and variable spatiotemporal expression profiles [72]. Biomaterial delivery strategies based on micro- and nanoparticles can be designed for controlled release of factors at desired stoichiometry. This precision control is accomplished through chemically controlled molecular stoichiometry and degradation kinetics of particles. There are several technical limitations for the standardization of drug delivery to cells. However, by standardizing the components of drug delivery systems, biomaterials approaches such as high density nanoneedles [73] are demonstrating more uniform and reproducible delivery. The regulated control of delivery strategies has several implications for cell therapies:

Standardizing factor delivery: Tunable properties of biomaterial carriers enable control of factor delivery and release and alleviate some of the stochasticity in the reprogramming process. These carriers have been shown to decrease variability and enhance efficiency in reprogramming outcomes across cell populations [74]. mRNA, with its ability to act from the cytoplasm, may present a compelling, safer alternative to DNA-based reprogramming strategies that could integrate elements into the host genome [75]. Non nucleic-acid based techniques including controlled protein delivery can be effective and abrogate the need for genetic material entirely [76]. Vector free, microfluidics-based techniques are attractive potential alternatives for *in vitro* cell engineering as well [77]. In addition to transcription factor-mediated reprogramming, an emerging set of epigenomic regulators employing catalytically-inactive Cas9 could also be delivered in a standard fashion to modify gene expression and reprogram cells efficiently to reduce cell population heterogeneity [78]. For CRISPR-Cas9 gene editing, tunable biomaterial carriers could provide efficient, temporally controlled delivery of Cas9 nuclease and guide RNA. Gene editing efficiency with nonviral methods remains a concern [79], especially with stem cells, which are notoriously hard to transfect [72]; thus, it is imperative to improve editing potency through enhanced delivery. Furthermore, more uniform delivery across cells could help reduce genetic heterogeneity resulting from gene editing processes.

Standardizing *in vivo* delivery of cells: Once therapeutic cells are ready, they have to be delivered to the right spot *in vivo* and allowed to perform their therapeutic function. Effective *in vivo* cell delivery is a major challenge, as cell death, loss of injected cells or changes in cell behavior occur upon transplantation [80]. Furthermore, it may be desirable to localize cells to a specific area or organ. In these aspects, biomaterials can be used to direct and tether cells to a specific location, protect them, control their behavior, or isolate them from the host, particularly the host immune system [81,82]. During cell delivery, scaffolds can anchor cells as well as provide an engineered microenvironment for optimal function

[83]. For example, biopolymer carriers for cell delivery could support T-cell expansion and dispersal upon implantation [84]. Moreover, biomaterials can deliver cells less invasively, without surgery, through injectable cell carriers [85]. Microencapsulation or macroencapsulation of cells can be utilized for the efficient diffusion of growth factors and nutrients, while preventing attack on cells via antibodies or other immune system components.

End-to-End Use in Biomanufacturing

Taken together, biomaterials could be utilized to improve every step of the biomanufacturing and delivery of emerging cell therapy products (Figure 2). Biomaterials provide a well-defined, less complex and more tunable environment than ECM derived substrates or feeder cells (cell layers – typically fibroblasts – grown in the same dish as iPSCs in order to provide proteins, growth factors and nutrients). Furthermore, their production is more amenable to scale up [74] and the final products can be made xeno-free. 3D biomaterial culturing of stem cells yields higher cell numbers than 2D systems and are inherently more scalable, although methods for facile cell extraction and resuspension need to be established [62]. Automation and *in situ* monitoring enables continuous improvement and implementation of lean manufacturing techniques for any biomanufacturing system. Microcarrier-based systems can be integrated into available bioreactor formats, while microfluidics would enable perfusable, continuously monitored culture systems [1]. Furthermore, successful biomanufacturing of cells will require reliable and scalable expansion procedures, especially in processes that introduce population bottlenecks (e.g., selection steps in reprogramming or gene editing).

To overcome the current variability in cell therapy products, standards and CQAs must be developed and supplemented with high throughput, reliable characterization methods [48] with functionally relevant outputs. Biomaterials offer a much wider parameter space compared to traditional *in vitro* assays that may be more suitable for probing the wide range of properties required for the identification and characterization of CQAs. Engineered biomaterials can be utilized to characterize cells based on surface markers, proteomics, secretomics, physical properties, epigenetics and functional behavior. Their tunable, well-controlled properties allow the determination and deconvolution of sources of variability. This can be done using multivariate design of experiments (DOE) approaches to systematically examine the significance and interactions of process parameters, while reducing sample size and effort required compared to conventional methods. For example, integrating biomaterials with DOE methods allow efficient optimization of biomaterial properties for factor delivery[70] or cell functionality[86]. Altogether, biomaterials are suitable as standardized reference materials that could be used as benchmarks in the biomanufacturing process. Table 1 provides examples of the use of engineered biomaterials for the establishment, characterization and maintenance of CQAs in some representative cell therapies: iPSC-derived cardiomyocytes, MSCs for ischemic stroke, and CAR T-cell therapies. For all three of these cell types, biomaterials are particularly well suited for CQAs involving physical properties of cells and the ECM and those involving *in vitro* modeling.

Outlook

Sophisticated engineered therapies are likely on the horizon, including newer methodologies that will enable extended control over the cellular niche, allowing the manipulation of more dynamic elements *in situ*. Successes in cell engineering have encouraged the move from single gene editing to multiplexed editing and design of synthetic circuits to impart functionality [87,88]. However, in order to realize precise biomanufacturing of cell therapies, several challenges need to be resolved (see Outstanding Questions). The development of efficient, precise genome editing techniques that can be delivered to desired somatic tissues, the derivation of high-quality, patient-derived iPSCs in a facile, cost effective and efficient manner, and the development of standards, measures and quality control procedures that follow good manufacturing practice [41] are key bottlenecks. Reduction of the variability inherent to some of these processes would ease the way for clinical translation of cell based therapies.

As cell-based therapies become more intricate and rationally programmed, biomaterials enabled precise control will play a significant role in directing the process, from biomanufacturing to final delivery. Biomaterials have several features that lend themselves to improving biomanufacturing processes including a large parameter space for properties, reproducibility and scalability. Biomaterials are particularly suited to applications where physical and mechanical properties are important, precise control over cellular environment is required or when complex behaviors may be required *in vivo*. Recently, engineered nanocarriers could genetically edit T-cells effectively *in situ* in mice, resulting in long term remission[89]. The move to *in situ* cell engineering has the potential to simplify or even abrogate the need for *ex-vivo* biomanufacturing. However, biomaterials-based platforms have their own limitations that need to be considered. Although synthetic biomaterials have become more sophisticated in recent years, they still do not rival the complexity of natural systems. Furthermore, as biomaterials get more complex, their behavior may become harder to predict and control. Biomaterials-based manufacturing workflows have different parameters from those currently in clinical and industrial settings, requiring more work to establish and test CQAs, standards and scalable biomanufacturing processes. Nevertheless, in the next decade, engineered biomaterials are likely to be key players in establishing more potent, well-defined and well-characterized cell therapy products.

Acknowledgments

We thank members of the Saha lab for helpful discussion and comments on the manuscript. We also thank Ahmed Hany for figure advice. We acknowledge generous financial support from the National Science Foundation (CBET-1350178, CBET-1645123), National Institute for Health (1R35GM119644-01), Environmental Protection Agency (EPA-G2013 –STAR-L1), John Merck Fund (Translational Research Program), Brain & Behavior Research Foundation (NARSAD Young Investigator Grant), Burroughs Wellcome Fund (Innovation in Regulatory Science Award), Wisconsin Alumni Research Foundation and the Wisconsin Institute for Discovery.

References

1. Roh KH, et al. Biomanufacturing of Therapeutic Cells: State of the Art, Current Challenges, and Future Perspectives. *Annu Rev Chem Biomol Eng.* 2016; 7:455–478. [PubMed: 27276552]
2. Fesnak AD, et al. Engineered T cells: the promise and challenges of cancer immunotherapy. *Nat Rev Cancer.* 2016; 16:566–81. [PubMed: 27550819]

3. Qasim W, et al. Molecular remission of infant B-ALL after infusion of universal TALEN gene-edited CAR T cells. *Sci Transl Med.* 2017; 9:eaaj2013. [PubMed: 28123068]
4. Hockemeyer D, Jaenisch R. Induced pluripotent stem cells meet genome editing. *Cell Stem Cell.* 2016; 18:573–586. [PubMed: 27152442]
5. González F. CRISPR/Cas9 genome editing in human pluripotent stem cells: Harnessing human genetics in a dish. *Dev Dyn.* 2016; 245:788–806. [PubMed: 27145095]
6. Trounson A, DeWitt ND. Pluripotent stem cells progressing to the clinic. *Nat Rev Mol Cell Biol.* 2016; 17:194–200. [PubMed: 26908143]
7. Pennington BO, et al. Protocols and Manufacturing for Cell-Based Therapies PROTOCOLS AND MANUFACTURING FOR CELL-BASED THERAPIES Defined Culture of Human Embryonic Stem Cells and Xeno-Free Derivation of Retinal Pigmented Epithelial Cells on a Novel, Synthetic Substrate. *Stem Cells Transl Med.* 2015; 4:165–177. [PubMed: 25593208]
8. Schwartz SD, et al. Human embryonic stem cell-derived retinal pigment epithelium in patients with age-related macular degeneration and Stargardt's macular dystrophy: Follow-up of two open-label phase 1/2 studies. *Lancet.* 2015; 385:509–516. [PubMed: 25458728]
9. Schulz TC. Concise Review: Manufacturing of Pancreatic Endoderm Cells for Clinical Trials in Type 1 Diabetes. *Stem Cells Transl Med.* 2015; 4:927–931. [PubMed: 26062982]
10. Trounson A, McDonald C. Stem Cell Therapies in Clinical Trials: Progress and Challenges. *Cell Stem Cell.* 2015; 17:11–22. [PubMed: 26140604]
11. Pittenger MF, et al. Multilineage potential of adult human mesenchymal stem cells. *Science.* 1999; 284:143–7. [PubMed: 10102814]
12. Wei X, et al. Mesenchymal stem cells: a new trend for cell therapy. *Acta Pharmacol Sin.* 2013; 34:747–54. [PubMed: 23736003]
13. Caplan AI, Correa D. The MSC: An injury drugstore. *Cell Stem Cell.* 2011; 9:11–15. [PubMed: 21726829]
14. Zhao Q, et al. Mesenchymal stem cells: Immunomodulatory capability and clinical potential in immune diseases. *J Cell Immunother.* 2016; 2:3–20.
15. Golpanian S, et al. Rebuilding the Damaged Heart: Mesenchymal Stem Cells, Cell-Based Therapy, and Engineered Heart Tissue. *Physiol Rev.* 2016; 96:1127–68. [PubMed: 27335447]
16. Grayson WL, et al. Stromal cells and stem cells in clinical bone regeneration. *Nat Rev Endocrinol.* 2015; 11:140–150. [PubMed: 25560703]
17. Joyce N, et al. Mesenchymal stem cells for the treatment of neurodegenerative disease. *Regen Med.* 2011; 5:933–946.
18. Squillaro T, et al. Clinical Trials With Mesenchymal Stem Cells: An Update. 2016; 25:829–848.
19. Ranganath SH, et al. Harnessing the mesenchymal stem cell secretome for the treatment of cardiovascular disease. *Cell Stem Cell.* 2012; 10:244–258. [PubMed: 22385653]
20. D'souza N, et al. Mesenchymal stem/stromal cells as a delivery platform in cell and gene therapies. *BMC Med.* 2015; 13:186. [PubMed: 26265166]
21. Conrad C, et al. Linking transgene expression of engineered mesenchymal stem cells and angiopoietin-1-induced differentiation to target cancer angiogenesis. *Ann Surg.* 2011; 253:566–71. [PubMed: 21169810]
22. Poirot L, et al. Multiplex Genome-Edited T-cell Manufacturing Platform for “Off-the-Shelf” Adoptive T-cell Immunotherapies. *Cancer Res.* 2015; 75:3853–3864. [PubMed: 26183927]
23. Derniame S, et al. Multiplex Genome Editing As a Platform for “Off-the-Shelf” Adoptive CAR T-Cell Immunotherapies. *Blood.* 2014; 124:1111 LP–1111.
24. Ren J, et al. Multiplex genome editing to generate universal CAR T cells resistant to PD1 inhibition. *Clin Cancer Res.* 2016; 30:392–402.
25. Pournasr B, et al. Concise review: Alchemy of biology: Generating desired cell types from abundant and accessible cells. *Stem Cells.* 2011; 29:1933–1941. [PubMed: 21997905]
26. Merrell AJ, Stanger BZ. Adult cell plasticity in vivo: de-differentiation and transdifferentiation are back in style. *Nat Rev Mol Cell Biol.* 2016; 17:413–25. [PubMed: 26979497]
27. Ibrahim M, Atluri P. Transdifferentiation: A new frontier in cardiovascular cell therapy. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg.* 2017; 153:130–131. [PubMed: 27726874]

28. Phinney DG. Functional heterogeneity of mesenchymal stem cells: Implications for cell therapy. *J Cell Biochem.* 2012; 113:2806–2812. [PubMed: 22511358]
29. Hanna J, et al. Direct cell reprogramming is a stochastic process amenable to acceleration. *Nature.* 2009; 462:595–601. [PubMed: 19898493]
30. Liang G, Zhang Y. Genetic and epigenetic variations in iPSCs: Potential causes and implications for application. *Cell Stem Cell.* 2013; 13:149–159. [PubMed: 23910082]
31. Cahan P, Daley GQ. Origins and implications of pluripotent stem cell variability and heterogeneity. *Nat Rev Mol Cell Biol.* 2013; 14:357–68. [PubMed: 23673969]
32. Tanasijevic B, et al. Progressive accumulation of epigenetic heterogeneity during human ES cell culture. *Epigenetics.* 2009; 4:330–338. [PubMed: 19571681]
33. Wutz A. Epigenetic alterations in human pluripotent stem cells: A tale of two cultures. *Cell Stem Cell.* 2012; 11:9–15. [PubMed: 22770238]
34. Frantz C, et al. The extracellular matrix at a glance. *J Cell Sci.* 2010; 123:4195–4200. [PubMed: 21123617]
35. Engler AJ, et al. Matrix Elasticity Directs Stem Cell Lineage Specification. 2006; 126:677–689.
36. Lee J, et al. Directing stem cell fate on hydrogel substrates by controlling cell geometry, matrix mechanics and adhesion ligand composition. *Biomaterials.* 2013; 34:8140–8148. [PubMed: 23932245]
37. Saha K, et al. Substrate modulus directs neural stem cell behavior. *Biophys J.* 2008; 95:4426–38. [PubMed: 18658232]
38. Kilian, Ka, et al. Geometric cues for directing the differentiation of mesenchymal stem cells. *Proc Natl Acad Sci.* 2010; 107:4872–7. [PubMed: 20194780]
39. Kim DH, et al. Matrix nanotopography as a regulator of cell function. *J Cell Biol.* 2012; 197:351–360. [PubMed: 22547406]
40. Sonam S, et al. Cell contractility arising from topography and shear flow determines human mesenchymal stem cell fate. *Sci Rep.* 2016; 6:20415. [PubMed: 26879739]
41. Mao AS, Mooney DJ. Regenerative medicine: Current therapies and future directions. *Proc Natl Acad Sci.* 2015; 112:14452–14459. [PubMed: 26598661]
42. Young MA, et al. Background mutations in parental cells account for most of the genetic heterogeneity of induced pluripotent stem cells. *Cell Stem Cell.* 2012; 10:570–582. [PubMed: 22542160]
43. Gore A, et al. Somatic coding mutations in human induced pluripotent stem cells. *Nature.* 2011; 471:63–67. [PubMed: 21368825]
44. Laurent LC, et al. Dynamic changes in the copy number of pluripotency and cell proliferation genes in human ESCs and iPSCs during reprogramming and time in culture. *Cell Stem Cell.* 2011; 8:106–118. [PubMed: 21211785]
45. Wang H, et al. CRISPR/Cas9 in Genome Editing and Beyond. *Annu Rev Biochem.* 2016; 85:227–264. [PubMed: 27145843]
46. Araki M, Ishii T. Providing appropriate risk information on genome editing for patients. *Trends Biotechnol.* 2016; 34:86–90. [PubMed: 26802361]
47. Lipsitz YY, et al. Quality cell therapy manufacturing by design. *Nat Biotechnol.* 2016; 34:393–400. [PubMed: 27054995]
48. Simon CG, et al. Strategies for Achieving Measurement Assurance for Cell Therapy Products. *Stem Cells Transl Med.* 2016; 5:705–708. [PubMed: 27386605]
49. Zylberberg C, et al. Manufacturing Cell Therapies: The Paradigm Shift in Healthcare of this Century. *Natl Acad Med Perspect.* in press.
50. Abdeen AA, et al. Capturing extracellular matrix properties in vitro: Microengineering materials to decipher cell and tissue level processes. *Exp Biol Med.* 2016; 241:930–938.
51. Gu L, Mooney DJ. Biomaterials and emerging anticancer therapeutics: engineering the microenvironment. *Nat Rev Cancer.* 2015; 16:56–66.
52. Hersel U, et al. RGD modified polymers: biomaterials for stimulated cell adhesion and beyond. *Biomaterials.* 2003; 24:4385–4415. [PubMed: 12922151]

53. Lee J, et al. Geometric guidance of integrin mediated traction stress during stem cell differentiation. *Biomaterials*. 2015; 69
54. Caiazzo M, et al. Defined three-dimensional microenvironments boost induction of pluripotency. *Nat Mater*. 2016; 15:344–352. [PubMed: 26752655]
55. Théry M. Micropatterning as a tool to decipher cell morphogenesis and functions. *J Cell Sci*. 2010; 123:4201–13. [PubMed: 21123618]
56. Harkness T, et al. High-content imaging with micropatterned multiwell plates reveals influence of cell geometry and cytoskeleton on chromatin dynamics. *Biotechnol J*. 2015; 10:1555–1567. [PubMed: 26097126]
57. Deeg JA, et al. Impact of local versus global ligand density on cellular adhesion. *Nano Lett*. 2011; 11:1469–1476. [PubMed: 21425841]
58. Akhtar R, et al. Europe PMC Funders Group Characterizing the elastic properties of tissues. *Mater Today*. 2012; 14:96–105.
59. Baker BM, Chen CS. Deconstructing the third dimension - how 3D culture microenvironments alter cellular cues. *J Cell Sci*. 2012; 125:3015–3024. [PubMed: 22797912]
60. Burdick JA, Murphy WL. Moving from static to dynamic complexity in hydrogel design. *Nat Commun*. 2012; 3:1269. [PubMed: 23232399]
61. Murphy WL, et al. Materials as stem cell regulators. *Nat Mater*. 2014; 13:547–557. [PubMed: 24845994]
62. Seale NM, Varghese S. Biomaterials for pluripotent stem cell engineering: from fate determination to vascularization. *J Mater Chem B*. 2016; 4:3454–3463.
63. Saha K, et al. Surface-engineered substrates for improved human pluripotent stem cell culture under fully defined conditions. *Proc Natl Acad Sci*. 2011; 108:18714–18719. [PubMed: 22065768]
64. Rojas-Ríos P, González-Reyes A. Concise review: The plasticity of stem cell niches: A general property behind tissue homeostasis and repair. *Stem Cells*. 2014; 32:852–859. [PubMed: 24356972]
65. Abdeen AA, et al. Matrix composition and mechanics direct proangiogenic signaling from mesenchymal stem cells. *Tissue Eng Part A*. 2014; 20:2737–45. [PubMed: 24701989]
66. Downing TL, et al. Biophysical regulation of epigenetic state and cell reprogramming. *Nat Mater*. 2013; 12:1154–1162. [PubMed: 24141451]
67. Yin X, et al. Engineering Stem Cell Organoids. *Cell Stem Cell*. 2016; 18:25–38. [PubMed: 26748754]
68. Gjorevski N, et al. Designer matrices for intestinal stem cell and organoid culture. *Nat Publ Gr*. 2016; 539:560–564.
69. Boutros M, et al. Microscopy-Based High-Content Screening. *Cell*. 2015; 163:1314–1325. [PubMed: 26638068]
70. Steyer B, et al. High content analysis platform for optimization of lipid mediated CRISPR-Cas9 delivery strategies in human cells. *Acta Biomater*. 2016; 34:143–158. [PubMed: 26747759]
71. Carlson-Stevermer J, et al. High-Content Analysis of CRISPR-Cas9 Gene-Edited Human Embryonic Stem Cells. *Stem Cell Reports*. 2016; 6:109–120. [PubMed: 26771356]
72. González F, et al. Methods for making induced pluripotent stem cells: reprogramming a la carte. *Nat Rev Genet*. 2011; 12:231–242. [PubMed: 21339765]
73. Chiappini C, et al. Biodegradable silicon nanoneedles delivering nucleic acids intracellularly induce localized in vivo neovascularization. *Nat Mater*. 2015; 14:532–539. [PubMed: 25822693]
74. Tong Z, et al. Application of biomaterials to advance induced pluripotent stem cell research and therapy. *EMBO J*. 2015; 34:987–1008. [PubMed: 25766254]
75. Islam MA, et al. Biomaterials for mRNA delivery. *Biomater Sci*. 2015; 3:1519–33. [PubMed: 26280625]
76. Kim D, et al. Generation of Human Induced Pluripotent Stem Cells by Direct Delivery of Reprogramming Proteins. *Cell Stem Cell*. 2009; 4:472–476. [PubMed: 19481515]
77. Sharei A, et al. A vector-free microfluidic platform for intracellular delivery. *Proc Natl Acad Sci*. 2013; 110:2082–2087. [PubMed: 23341631]

78. Black JB, et al. Targeted Epigenetic Remodeling of Endogenous Loci by CRISPR/Cas9-Based Transcriptional Activators Directly Converts Fibroblasts to Neuronal Cells. *Cell Stem Cell*. 2016; 19:406–414. [PubMed: 27524438]
79. Yin H, et al. Delivery technologies for genome editing. *Nat Rev Drug Discov*. 2017; doi: 10.1038/nrd.2016.280
80. Mooney DJ, Vandenburgh H. Cell Delivery Mechanisms for Tissue Repair. *Cell Stem Cell*. 2008; 2:205–213. [PubMed: 18371446]
81. Qi C, et al. Biomaterials as carrier, barrier and reactor for cell-based regenerative medicine. *Protein Cell*. 2015; 6:638–653. [PubMed: 26088192]
82. Hotaling N, et al. Biomaterial Strategies for Immunomodulation. *Annu Rev Biomed Eng*. 2015; doi: 10.1146/annurev-bioeng-071813-104814
83. Cai L, et al. Regulating Stem Cell Secretome Using Injectable Hydrogels with In Situ Network Formation. *Adv Healthc Mater*. 2016; 5:2758–2764. [PubMed: 27709809]
84. Stephan SB, et al. Biopolymer implants enhance the efficacy of adoptive T-cell therapy. *Nat Biotechnol*. 2015; 33:97–101. [PubMed: 25503382]
85. Kearney CJ, Mooney DJ. Macroscale delivery systems for molecular and cellular payloads. *Nat Mater*. 2013; 12:1004–17. [PubMed: 24150418]
86. Murphy KC, et al. Multifactorial Experimental Design to Optimize the Anti-Inflammatory and Proangiogenic Potential of Mesenchymal Stem Cell Spheroids. *Stem Cells*. 2017; doi: 10.1002/stem.2606
87. Lipsitz YY, et al. Achieving Efficient Manufacturing and Quality Assurance through Synthetic Cell Therapy Design. *Cell Stem Cell*. 2017; 20:13–17. [PubMed: 28061350]
88. Weinberg BH, et al. Large-scale design of robust genetic circuits with multiple inputs and outputs for mammalian cells. *Nat Biotechnol*. 2017; doi: 10.1038/nbt.3805
89. Smith TT, et al. In situ programming of leukaemia-specific T cells using synthetic DNA nanocarriers. *Nat Nanotechnol*. 2017; doi: 10.1038/nnano.2017.57
90. Prowse ABJ, et al. Transforming the Promise of Pluripotent Stem Cell-Derived Cardiomyocytes to a Therapy: Challenges and Solutions for Clinical Trials. *Can J Cardiol*. 2014; 30:1335–1349. [PubMed: 25442434]
91. Denning C, et al. Cardiomyocytes from human pluripotent stem cells: From laboratory curiosity to industrial biomedical platform. *Biochim Biophys Acta - Mol Cell Res*. 2016; 1863:1728–1748.
92. Zhang B, et al. Label-free enrichment of functional cardiomyocytes using microfluidic deterministic lateral flow displacement. *PLoS One*. 2012; 7:1–9.
93. Polio SR, et al. A micropatterning and image processing approach to simplify measurement of cellular traction forces. *Acta Biomater*. 2012; 8:82–88. [PubMed: 21884832]
94. Beussman KM, et al. Micropost arrays for measuring stem cell-derived cardiomyocyte contractility. *Methods*. 2016; 94:43–50. [PubMed: 26344757]
95. Stoehr A, et al. Automated analysis of contractile force and Ca²⁺ transients in engineered heart tissue. *Am J Physiol Heart Circ Physiol*. 2014; 306:H1353–63. [PubMed: 24585781]
96. Tian B, et al. Three-dimensional, flexible nanoscale field-effect transistors as localized bioprobes. *Science*. 2010; 329:830–4. [PubMed: 20705858]
97. Santoro F, et al. On chip guidance and recording of cardiomyocytes with 3D mushroom-shaped electrodes. *Nano Lett*. 2013; 13:5379–5384. [PubMed: 24088026]
98. Martin C, et al. Revisiting MSC expansion from critical quality attributes to critical culture process parameters. *Process Biochem*. 2016; doi: 10.1016/j.procbio.2016.04.017
99. Geng Z, et al. Separation and Enrichment of Mesenchymal Stem Cells on a Chip. *Comp Gen Pharmacol*. 2010
100. Morin KT, Tranquillo RT. In vitro models of angiogenesis and vasculogenesis in fibrin gel. *Exp Cell Res*. 2013; 319:2409–2417. [PubMed: 23800466]
101. King SN, et al. In vitro characterization of macrophage interaction with mesenchymal stromal cell-hyaluronan hydrogel constructs. *J Biomed Mater Res - Part A*. 2014; 102:890–902.
102. Jensen MC, Riddell SR. Design and implementation of adoptive therapy with chimeric antigen receptor-modified T cells. *Immunol Rev*. 2014; 257:127–144. [PubMed: 24329794]

103. Sarkar A, et al. Multiplexed Affinity-Based Separation of Proteins and Cells Using Inertial Microfluidics. *Sci Rep.* 2016; 6:23589. [PubMed: 27026280]
104. Phan-Lai V, et al. Three-dimensional scaffolds to evaluate tumor associated fibroblast-mediated suppression of breast tumor specific T cells. *Biomacromolecules.* 2013; 14:1330–1337. [PubMed: 23517456]
105. Hirt C, et al. “In vitro” 3D models of tumor-immune system interaction. *Adv Drug Deliv Rev.* 2014; 79:145–154. [PubMed: 24819215]
106. Mannino RG, et al. 3D microvascular model recapitulates the diffuse large B-cell lymphoma tumor microenvironment in vitro. *Lab Chip.* 2017; 17:407–414. [PubMed: 28054086]

Glossary

Allogenic

cells or tissue obtained from an external donor

Arginine-glycine-aspartic acid (RGD)

a tripeptide composed of the amino acids Arg-Gly-Asp (RGD), identified from fibronectin, that's known to facilitate cell binding through integrin receptors

Autologous

cells or tissue obtained from the patient himself or herself. Autologous transplantation doesn't require an external donor and, as the body recognizes the cells, helps avoids rejection

Biomanufacturing

the use of living biological systems or their products to generate materials, devices and biological products, in a scalable, industrial manner

Biomaterials

natural or synthetic materials with biological activity or functionality

Chimeric antigen receptor T-cell (CAR-T) therapy

a type of immunotherapy where T-cells are genetically modified with a synthetic receptor, which binds to tumors and potentiates a cytotoxic response within the T-cell. T-cells could be harvested directly from the patient in an autologous manner or be derived from allogeneic sources

Cell therapy product

autologous or allogenic living cells used within the body for therapeutic benefit

Critical quality attributes (CQAs)

physical, chemical or biological properties that are associated with or affect safety and efficacy of therapy products

Extracellular matrix (ECM)

the non-cellular material external to cells, composed of structural and soluble molecules that can provide a rich biochemical and biomechanical signaling environment to cells

Epigenome

the set of chemical modifications to DNA and DNA-associated proteins, which regulate gene expression without modification of the DNA sequence. These modifications are heritable to daughter cells after cell division

Focal adhesions

multi-protein clusters containing integrins that act as links between the ECM and the cellular cytoskeleton, relaying mechanical forces and signaling to the cell

Gene editing

controlled modification of DNA sequences through the use of engineered nucleases to induce double stranded breaks in DNA. Zinc finger nucleases, Tal-like effector nucleases (TALENs), and clustered regularly interspaced short palindromic repeats (CRISPR) are popular methods of editing genes within human cells

Identity

specifications of cell-based therapies to confirm the desired characteristics

Organoid

a self-assembling 3D structure generated from stem cells, containing organ-specific cell types that may incorporate some features of the represented organ

Potency

existence and effectiveness of the desired biological functionality

Purity

lack of undesired components (contaminants) in the final product

Reprogramming

modifying the epigenomic state of cells to change their identity

Stem cells

cells that can self-renew and differentiate into multiple different cell types. Pluripotent stem cells can differentiate into any cell type in the adult organism, and induced pluripotent stem cells (iPSCs) can be generated through reprogramming somatic cells. Adult stem cells are present in multiple organs and are more restricted in the range of cell types they can differentiate into. They can be found in bone marrow (hematopoietic and mesenchymal stem cells), the brain (neural stem cells) and several other organs

Trends Box

Recent developments in several fields, including somatic cell reprogramming and precise gene editing, are leading to novel cell-based therapies.

Inherent heterogeneities in cell populations and methods for cell extraction, culture and processing produce cell therapy products with considerable inter- and intra-batch variability, hampering clinical translation and adoption of therapies.

Standards and critical quality attributes need to be developed and verified to have clear benchmarks for the development of cell therapy products.

Biomaterials could be engineered to reduce the root causes of heterogeneity, enhance functionality of cell-based therapies and develop new standards for manufacturing.

Outstanding Questions Box

How much of the variability in current biomanufacturing processes can be eliminated through the optimization of biomaterials?

Can in vitro biomaterials-based assays meaningfully characterize cell therapy products with in vivo relevance, abrogating the need for more expensive in vivo testing?

Will rational design of cell therapies based on standards and CQAs accelerate clinical adoption of cell based therapies?

Box 1**International standards for biomaterials and cell therapy products**

Several organizations are working towards developing standards for cell therapy products [49]. Currently in the United States, the National Institute of Standards & Technology (NIST) Biosystems and Biomaterials Division is working to develop standards and measurement assurance for regenerative medicine biomanufacturing including several biomaterials standards (<https://www.nist.gov/resources/guides-protocols>). ASTM International Committee F04 on Medical and Surgical Materials and Devices (<https://www.astm.org/COMMIT/SUBCOMMIT/F04.htm>) also publishes several standards relevant for cell therapy products and biomaterials characterization. Finally, ISO Technical Committee 276 (Biotechnology) also produces standards, which are generally less specific to regenerative medicine and wider in scope. These are all works in progress: CQAs and benchmarks will require deep collaboration among academic, industrial, regulatory bodies and standards organizations as new biomaterials enter this field.

Figure 1. Variability in cell therapy products can be introduced during biomanufacturing

In addition to the initial heterogeneity present in starting cell populations, cell culture and processing introduce additional variability in cell populations through poorly defined ECM, uncontrolled subcellular delivery, and stoichiometry of delivered factors, as well as genomic/epigenomic heterogeneities. Variability creates a challenge for quality assurance during clinical application, as one or more critical quality attributes for such variable cell therapy products need to be well defined. Purple cells delineate harvested, unprocessed cells that may have low functionality, while orange cells delineate cells after processing to generate a functional cell therapy product.

Figure 2. Key Figure. Roles for engineered biomaterials in reducing variability and enhancing the efficiency and quality control of cell therapy products

Potential roles for engineered and smart biomaterials include tailored cell-niche interactions, controlled subcellular delivery and stoichiometry of delivered factors (e.g. Cas9/sgRNA complexes or reprogramming factors - shown here in yellow/violet), cell delivery and monitoring and quality control of cell therapy products. Purple cells delineate harvested, unprocessed cells that may have low functionality, while orange cells delineate cells after processing to generate a functional cell therapy product.

Table 1

Examples of the potential use of biomaterials for the development, monitoring and evaluation of critical quality attributes (CQAs) for three types of cellular therapies.

Cell Type	CQA Category	CQA	Potential role for biomaterials	References
iPSC-derived cardiomyocytes [90,91]	<i>Identity</i>	Mature cardiomyocytes (surface markers, morphology, multinucleation)	Phenotyping through micropatterning and high content imaging	[70] [71]
	<i>Purity</i>	Low number of cardiac fibroblasts (CD90+), pluripotent (Oct4+) and non-mesoderm (Nestin+) cells	Label free microfluidic enrichment	[92]
	<i>Potency</i>	Contraction Force	Micropatterning and traction force microscopy	[93]
		Calcium Transients	Micropost arrays	[94]
			Engineered heart tissue	[95]
		Electrophysiology	Nanoelectronic probes	[96]
			Nanostructured multi electrode arrays	[97]
MSCs for ischemic stroke [98]	<i>Identity</i>	Trilineage potential <i>in vitro</i>	Microfluidic based enrichment	[99]
	<i>Potency</i>	Trophic effect (pro-angiogenic potential)	<i>in vitro</i> angiogenesis models	[100]
		Immunomodulation	<i>in vitro</i> hydrogel co-culture models with immune cells	[101]
CAR T- cell therapy [102]	<i>Identity</i>	Effector T-cells (CD3+, CAR+)	Affinity based microfluidic cell sorting and expansion	[103]
	<i>Purity</i>	CD4/CD8 ratio		
	<i>Potency</i>	Anti-tumor efficacy	<i>In vitro</i> 3D model of tumor- T-cell interactions, high throughput	[104] [105] [106]
		CAR-Targeting efficiency		

CQA: Critical Quality attribute. iPSC: induced pluripotent stem cell. CAR: Chimeric antigen receptor