UC Berkeley
Research Papers

Title

Bridging the Gap: Regenerative Medicines and the Future of Personalized Treatment and Research

Permalink

https://escholarship.org/uc/item/8fj053xd

Authors

Yanamandra, Bhavya
Chan, Alyssa
Ip, Gabriella
et al.

Publication Date

2024-12-09

eScholarship.org Powered by the California Digital Library
University of California

Bridging the Gap: Regenerative Medicines and the Future of Personalized Treatment and Research

Authors: Alyssa Chan, Gabriella Ip, Alyssa Liu, Eliana Matos, Xochitl Pedraza, Bhavya Yanamandra

University of California, Berkeley

INTRODUCTION

Regenerative medicine stems from a broader field based on tissue engineering, but incorporates research on self-healing [1]. With regard to self-healing, the body either uses its own systems to restore health, or is supplemented with foreign biological material in recreating and rebuilding cells, tissues, and organs. Cells become the foundation of tissue, and tissue makes up the entirety of a human body and its organs. Groups of these cells have extracellular matrices, in which they generate their own support structures. These matrices not only provide foundation for these groups of cells to thrive, but they also facilitate communication and signaling between cells and their environment. By understanding how extracellular matrices facilitate communication and signaling between cells and environment, researchers can develop strategies to manipulate these processes, enabling the creation, restoration, and repair of tissues—advances that hold significant potential for clinical applications such as organ transplantation and regenerative therapies.

In current medicinal practices, regenerative medicine plays a small, yet important role, in patient treatment. Supplemental organs have been implanted in patients, like entire bladders or tracheas, but these procedures remain experimental and exorbitant. Still, these treatments are useful in research, especially research encompassing drug development. Although it will take

time before these treatments are reproducible, research on regenerative medicine shows promising results and could provide key tools and advancements for personalized medicine and treatment of chronic or long lasting diseases.

ABSTRACT

Regenerative medicine, otherwise known as tissue engineering, focuses on the repair and regeneration of cells, tissues, and organs using cellular therapies, stem cells, and foreign biological material. This paper explores a variety of advancements in regenerative medicine, including treatments like Lantidra for Type 1 diabetes, platelet-rich plasma (PRP) therapy for tissue repair, and umbilical cord blood (UCB) transplants for hematologic conditions.
The research reviewed includes studies and clinical trials that highlight the efficacy, applications, and underlying challenges of these innovative therapies. Within our sources, the research includes FDA-approved treatments, clinical outcomes from UCB transplants, and the budding role of PRP in regenerative medicine. Although the paper highlights the importance of these up-and-coming treatments, ethical considerations and accessibility issues related to these treatments are noted as well.

Lantidra, the first FDA approved allogeneic pancreatic islet cell therapy, for the treatment of type 1 diabetes, has demonstrated significant potential in reducing or eliminating insulin dependency in Type 1 diabetes patients [2]. PRP therapy has proven effective in thorough acceleration of tissue repair in sports and chronic injuries, as well as cosmetic procedures. [3]. UCB transplants offer promising alternatives for patients with no suitable bone marrow donors, though challenges in immune reconstitution, side effects, and equitable access to these transplants remain. While regenerative medicine therapies provide promising treatments to chronic diseases and promote tissue repair, all challenges and consequences including

accessibility, cost, and ethical concerns must be thoroughly examined prior to implementation into present-day medicine. Continued research and policy development are crucial to expanding the benefits of these treatments worldwide.

DISCUSSION

Over 10% of the US population is affected by diabetes, and this number has been increasing steadily over the last few decades. Common treatments involve insulin injections and dietary supplements, but as of June 2023 there still remains no cure for Type 1 Diabetes [2]. The United States Food and Drug Administration approved Latindra, a revolutionary, innovative treatment for Type 1 Diabetes. Lantidra is an allogeneic pancreatic islet cellular therapy that is infused into the hepatic portal vein to assist with the secretion of insulin. Depending on the patient's response and needs, Lantidra may require multiple infusions, or potentially reduce or eliminate the need for routine insulin injections to achieve the desired effect. From a study with thirty Type 1 Diabetic participants, [after receiving Lantidra] eleven did not need insulin for 1-5 years, ten were insulin-free for at least 5 years, and 5 were unable to see any results [2]. Whereas the exact number of insulin injections one needs to administer may vary from person to person, most people must inject insulin up to four or five times a day. Latindra offers a groundbreaking alternative: a single infusion that is sufficient to last five years, relieving patients of this daily management for their condition. However, as with most new and upcoming cellular therapies, adverse reactions are apparent, with the most common symptoms being nausea, fatigue, anemia, diarrhea, and abdominal pain. Consequently, if treatments similar to Lantidra were to be prescribed by doctors and distributed by pharmaceutical companies, their side effects and benefits should be thoroughly evaluated to maximize optimal results within the patient's treatment experience.

Building upon the objective of innovative therapies, another treatment that has gained scientific recognition is platelet-rich plasma (PRP) therapy, which focuses on regenerative medicine. Platelet-rich plasma (PRP) therapy has gained attention across medical fields due to its potential to accelerate tissue repair and healing processes [3]. The treatment involves using a patient's blood cells, specifically plasma and platelets. Plasma and platelets play a significant role in wound healing and blood clotting [4]. The whole process starts with clinicians extracting a blood sample from the patient; they then separate the blood's components with the help of centrifugal force. The centrifugation helps create a concentrated solution of platelets and plasma. The end result is a rich solution of growth factors, cytokines, and adhesion proteins. Growth factors stimulate cell regeneration, cytokines manage inflammation, and adhesion proteins are known to enable the structural support for new tissue formation. The patient's blood cells are then injected directly into the patient's injury site with extra support from an ultrasound, in order to initiate repair via stimulating cell reproduction and tissue generation. PRP therapy is widely used for sports injuries, chronic tendon injuries, hair loss, and even cosmetic and anti-aging treatments. The procedure is low risk, since it utilizes the patient's cells, making adverse reactions rare. However, minor side effects and potential risks like bleeding, infection, and tissue damage always remain possible. As a whole, PRP's safe, minimally invasive process is proven to be effective in promoting recovery, making it appealing for patients and clinicians.

While therapies like platelet-rich-plasma therapy offer personalized treatment and recovery, advancements in umbilical cord blood (UCB) transplants highlight the intersection of regenerative medicine and equitable healthcare innovations. Umbilical cord blood (UCB) is a source of hematopoietic stem cells with distinct properties from bone marrow, making it a more effective treatment for certain hematologic and metabolic storage diseases. An article titled

"Umbilical Cord Blood Transplantation: Connecting Its Origin to Its Future" characterizes UCB as having a wider disparity in human leukocyte antigen (HLA) levels between donors and recipients, lowering the risk of graft-versus-host disease [5]. UCB is especially useful when there are no available donors who are HLA identical, a requirement for bone marrow transplants; this provides expanded transplant eligibility. UCB has extensive proliferative advantages: high levels of proliferation potential, the capacity to produce autocrine growth factors, and longer telomeres. Currently, UCB is used most commonly to treat leukemia, severe bone marrow failure syndrome, and inborn metabolic errors; however, future research will potentially implicate treatments for adenovirus, cytomegalovirus, Epstein-Barr virus, and even nonhematologic conditions. A Eurocord study found that there was a 63% one year survival rate for individuals receiving a UCB transplant from a related donor and a 29% survival rate from an unrelated donor [5]. Additionally, there is a 73% one year survival rate for transplants with matched HLA blood and a 33% survival rate for unmatched HLA blood [5]. 94% of patients were off of immunosuppressants and they returned to school or work within one year of their transplant [5]. While there are many advantages to UCB transplants, the article does an important job of outlining several disadvantages: it is only a one time supply, an increased treatment-related mortality, increased risk of infection, and high storage costs. Cord blood banks have an estimated operating cost of $60 to $70 million. Many of the limitations to UCB are due to delayed engraftment and immune reconstitution. With the use of cord blood that comes from individuals that aren't the patient, there are many ethical implications that must be considered. One is the idea of donor babies, in which parents conceive a child solely for the purpose of saving another. This can be extremely problematic, especially if parents try to deliver before the baby becomes viable in order to save their living child. There are concerns of who gets priority for access to

cord blood, especially when there are public *and* private banks. In the face of this new technology, those in healthcare are prompted to think about policy that regulates accessibility, including cost, and policy that also considers the ethical implications of this treatment.

While the innovation of umbilical cord blood transplantation highlights ethical and logistical challenges in regenerative medicine, the global distribution of stem cell therapies raises questions of overall accessibility. In recent years, stem cell research has been at the forefront of both healthcare and research, with universities across the country developing new treatments with a focus in biotechnology. This new research has led to advancements in treatments to certain diseases, especially those that are chronic and affecting certain groups of individuals across the country. These treatments have been groundbreaking for their ability to address diseases that have plagued certain populations for centuries. This continuous development and focus on intersection between healthcare and technology promises hope for even the deadliest illnesses. However, much of this research is mainly conducted nationwide, isolating third world countries from the promises of these innovations. Treatments developed in the United States are often inaccessible to countries with high populations of affected individuals. For example, sickle cell disease is predominantly seen in India and sub-Saharan Africa, yet the cost of treatment makes it widely unavailable to these populations. The global population suffering from sickle cell disease is around eight million, with more than one million of affected individuals living in India and five million living in sub-saharan Africa [6]. Yet, the cost of treatment ranges from 2.2 to 3.1 million dollars alone. This raises necessary questions that must be considered as stem cell research continues to advance: Who are these treatments for? How can accessibility of these treatments be increased in order to accommodate affected individuals outside of the United States?

CONCLUSION

Regenerative medicine, or tissue engineering, is a rapidly advancing field; specifically in cellular therapies like Lantidra, platelet-rich plasma (PRP) therapy, and umbilical cord blood (UCB) transplants. Through these examples, regenerative treatment offers revolutionary potential in addressing chronic conditions, reducing stress around management of said conditions, enhancing tissue repair, and allowing the body to repair and heal on its own.

Each study highlighted the importance of continued research, development, and focus on regenerative medicine to optimize treatment and ensure efficacy in patients and overall availability on a global scale. While Lantidra offers consolation for T1D patients by reducing insulin dependency and time consumption revolving daily management of the condition, its accessibility and long-term effects require further examination. Similarly, while PRP therapy treats injuries and promotes healing, its applications remain limited, but can expand with more robust studies on longer term efficacy and treatment. UCB transplants, though advantageous for treating blood disorders, present possible ethical issues and policies should be implemented accordingly.

As regenerative medicine continues to evolve, future research should prioritize increasing treatment accessibility, minimizing side effects and consequential health outcomes, exploring cost-effective solutions, and addressing ethical concerns with fitting federal policies. Regenerative medicines show promise, and if researchers ensure global access to these innovations, particularly in under-resourced and under-represented regions. In order to improve patient outcomes beyond the United States, we must push the boundaries of this transformative field. Revolutionizing the treatment of chronic and life-threatening diseases in terms of *both* research and accessibility is crucial for improving the world of medicine as we know it.

References

1. Commissioner O of the FDA. *FDA Approves First Cellular Therapy to Treat Patients with Type 1 Diabetes.* FDA; 2023. Available from: https://www.fda.gov/news-events/press-announcements/fda-approves-first-cellular-therapy-treat-patients-type-1-diabetes
2. Azhin. *Writing: Literature Review Basics: Conclusions.* Available from: https://azhin.org/cummings/basiclitreview/conclusions
3. Everts P, Onishi K, Jayaram P, Lana JF, Mautner K. Platelet-Rich Plasma: New Performance Understandings and Therapeutic Considerations in 2020. *Int J Mol Sci.* 2020;21(20):7794. doi: 10.3390/ijms21207794.
4. Ghoshal K, Bhattacharyya M. Overview of platelet physiology: its hemostatic and non-homeostatic role in disease pathogenesis. *Sci World J.* 2014 Mar 3;2014:781857. doi: 10.1155/2014/781857. PMID: 24729754; PMCID: PMC3960550.
5. Sanchez-Petitto G, Rezvani K, Daher M, Rafei H, Kebriaei P, Shpall EJ, Olson A. Umbilical Cord Blood Transplantation: Connecting Its Origin to Its Future. *Stem Cells Transl Med.* 2023;12(2):55-71. doi: 10.1093/stcltm/szac086.
6. Ungar L. *Sickle Cell Affects More Families in Africa and India, but New Gene Therapies Are Out of Reach.* AP News; 2023. Available from: https://apnews.com/article/sickle-cell-gene-therapy-crispr-global-0a76d10be53462d57e9d3cc07d15fc02