

Revolutionizing Arthritis Treatment: The Synergy of iPSCs and Extracellular Vesicles-Based Acellular Therapies for Joint Tissue Repair

Abstract

This review discusses the current state of arthritis treatment and the limitations associated with traditional approaches. The review then explores the potential of induced pluripotent stem cells (iPSCs) and extracellular vesicles (EVs) for joint tissue repair. The use of iPSCs and EVs together in acellular therapies has the potential to provide a safe and effective treatment option for joint tissue repair. The review examines the benefits of these therapies and discusses future research directions, including the use of bioinspired EV-mimicking nanoparticles and the modulation of the immunogenicity of donor iPSCs. The review also addresses the potential ethical implications of these therapies and proposes solutions for addressing these concerns. Overall, this review suggests that iPSCs and EVs-based acellular therapies could revolutionize regenerative medicine for arthritis treatment, providing a promising avenue for future research.

Key words: Osteoarthritis, Acellular Therapies, Joint Tissue Repair, iPSCs treatment , ischemic diseases

Introduction

“Arthritis is a chronic, painful, and disabling disease that affects many people, particularly in developed countries. It is a non-inflammatory arthropathy that has been traditionally defined, but recent studies suggest that it has an inflammatory component with the presence of synovitis in a large number of patients” [1]. “The disease is multifactorial with inflammatory, metabolic, and mechanical causes, and it is characterized by articular cartilage degradation” [2]. “Inflammatory mediators such as pro-inflammatory cytokines, reactive oxygen species, nitric oxide, matrix degrading enzymes, and biomechanical stress are major factors responsible for the progression of arthritis in synovial joints. Identifying early inflammatory events and targeting these alterations will help to ameliorate the major symptoms such as inflammation and pain in arthritis patients” [1]. “Arthritis is a frequent cause of pain, loss of function, and disability in adults” [1]. “It is the most prevalent joint disease in the elderly population, with a prevalence of about 60% in men and 70% in women after the age of 65 years” [2][1]. “The prevalence of arthritis increases rapidly during midlife, and it is expected to increase substantially in the future” [1]. “Knee is the most common site of arthritis, and weight loss (if overweight) is an important core treatment in knee and hip arthritis. Exercise is a key core treatment in knee, hip, and hand arthritis and should be considered regardless of age, structural disease severity, functional status, pain levels, or the presence of comorbidities. It is recommended to provide education, advice, or information about the etiology, progression, prognosis, and treatment options of arthritis as an ongoing and integral part of care. Trained healthcare providers with the skills to provide the core treatments are essential” [1]. “Despite the prevalence and impact of arthritis, no treatment has been found yet,

and the pathophysiology behind the structural changes in arthritis is complex and poorly understood. Therefore, there is a need for new innovation in methodologies and instrumentation for the non-invasive detection of inflammation in arthritis by modern imaging techniques” [1][3][2].

Current treatment options and limitations for arthritis

“The current treatment options for arthritis encompass both non-pharmacological and pharmacological interventions. Non-pharmacological interventions include exercise and weight loss, while pharmacological interventions for arthritis entail acetaminophen, nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAIDs), and intra-articular corticosteroid injections” [4]. “In severe cases of arthritis, surgery such as total knee replacement may be necessary” [4]. “However, each of these approaches has its own benefits and burdens” [4]. “The standard pharmacological treatment for arthritis includes pain and inflammation control agents such as NSAIDs, analgesics, and intraarticular corticosteroids. Symptomatic slow-acting drugs for arthritis such as glucosamine sulfate, chondroitin sulfate, diacerein, unsaponifiable extract of soybean, and avocado administered orally and intraarticular hyaluronic acid are also used” [5]. “Yet, there is no convincing evidence that any treatment can slow down or prevent the development of arthritis” [4]. “Additionally, dietary supplements have become available but their effectiveness remains to be proven” [4]. “Using a cane has been highlighted as a beneficial treatment option for arthritis” by Jones et al. [1]. “Orthotics, ranging from insoles to braces, are a significant treatment option for reducing pain in arthritis patients” [1]. “Management of knee arthritis requires non-pharmacological and pharmacological approaches. The European Society for Clinical and Economic Aspects of osteoporosis, Arthritis and Musculoskeletal Diseases (ESCEO) has developed a step-by-step therapeutic algorithm for knee arthritis treatment” [1]. “Combination therapy of viscosupplements with therapeutic agents, drug delivery systems or regenerative therapies is a current treatment option for arthritis. This combination therapy can improve viscosupplementation outcome in terms of pain relief and joint functionality” [1]. “Moreover, biological approaches such as stem cells or platelet-rich plasma appear to be promising strategies for cartilage recovery” [1]. “However, further research is needed to reach more conclusive results regarding the effectiveness of this treatment option” [1]. “Drug delivery systems combined with hyaluronic acid could enhance the activity of encapsulated molecules and provide better control over drug release. Anti-inflammatory molecules can improve pain relief but may have cytotoxicity” [1]. “To improve the management of arthritis, there is a need for easily disseminated guidance for ARTHRITIS treatment in the primary care setting and harmonization of recommendations for knee ARTHRITIS treatment” [1]. “Guidelines recommend the involvement of experts with real clinical experience in drug use and patient management. Nonetheless, primary care providers may not adhere to clinical care guidelines, particularly for non-pharmacological arthritis treatment due to discrepancies between guidelines that are due to heterogeneity of expert panels and geographical differences in the availability of pharmacotherapies and studies” [1].

Despite the available treatments for arthritis, there remain many limitations and inefficiencies. Traditional arthritis drugs have been found to be effective in reducing pain and inflammation, but they are insufficient to slow, stop, or reverse joint damage and are frequently associated with adverse effects [6]. In addition, the unsatisfactory effects and unacceptable side effects of

traditional arthritis drugs have prompted the development of novel materials to improve drug therapeutic efficacy [6][7]. Current treatments for arthritis have lagged behind those for inflammatory arthritis, with existing treatments providing only symptom relief for arthritis patients [8][6]. Furthermore, current treatments do not achieve actual repair of damaged joint tissue, doing little more than ease the pain [6]. The majority of treatments for arthritis are drugs and/or surgery, with current treatments being limited in number [1]. Surgical interventions like the ACI technique have problems such as limited cells available, multiple surgical procedures involved, in vitro chondrocyte dedifferentiation, and donor-site morbidity caused by cartilage harvest [6]. Despite the promise of regenerative therapies, limitations still exist in current pharmacologic and regenerative therapy, and larger, randomized, controlled, and long-term follow-up studies are needed to confirm their safety and effectiveness [6]. In summary, while there are treatments available for arthritis, there are many limitations to these treatments, and more research is needed to develop effective and safe therapies for this debilitating condition.

iPSCs for Joint Tissue Repair

Arthritis especially osteoarthritis remains a leading cause of physical disability in the elderly. While there is no information on the use of iPSCs for arthritis treatment in the given text, iPSCs can be used to model cartilage diseases and provide evidence of the association between familial osteochondritis dissecans and early-onset ARTHRITIS [9]. iPSCs are generated from patients with osteopetrosis, a bone disorder caused by osteoclast defects [9]. Refined protocols for differentiating iPSCs have paved the way for developing in vitro models for cartilage diseases [9]. Additionally, iPSCs can be used as a new screening platform for testing new drugs for cartilage diseases [9]. MSCs derived from iPSCs have comparable multipotency to adult MSCs and show potential in ligament repair and bone regeneration [9]. iPSC-based models can recapitulate key changes in chondrocyte phenotype and matrix production found in arthritis [9]. Successful repair of cartilage defects in vivo has been detected when treated with human iPSCs in comparison with those untreated and those treated with hydrogel alone [9]. Furthermore, transplantation of iPSC-derived cartilaginous particles in osteochondral defects resulted in the formation of good quality cartilage-like neotissue in rats and minipigs [9]. Although iPSC research to date has mostly focused on neurology, cardiology, and hematology fields, there has been a growing interest in using cellular reprogramming as a tool to study pathogenesis of mutation- and ageing-associated musculoskeletal disorders and to explore their potential for tissue repair [9]. Therefore, using iPSCs in arthritis research and treatment could potentially provide new insights into the pathogenesis of the disease and offer regenerative medicine approaches to improve patient outcomes.

Extracellular vesicles for Joint Tissue Repair

Extracellular vesicles (EVs) have emerged as promising candidates for the treatment of arthritis [10],[11],[10]. EVs are small, lipid-membrane enclosed vesicles that are secreted by cells into the extracellular space to modulate cellular communication and important physiological processes [10]. They can be found in various biological fluids, including blood, urine, saliva, and synovial fluid [10]. EVs contain various molecules, including growth factors and anti-inflammatory factors, which can help promote tissue repair and reduce inflammation [10]. Additionally, EVs may be a promising alternative to stem cell therapy for arthritis treatment, as

they can be produced in large quantities and have a lower risk of adverse effects [10]. Stem cell-derived EVs have shown potential for use in treating joint injury and arthritis [10]. MSC-derived EVs (MSC-EVs) have demonstrated potential for tissue repair and immune suppression in various preclinical models including AD. MSC-produced EVs are less immunogenic and can serve as an alternative to cellular therapies by transmitting signaling or delivering biomaterials to diseased areas of the body [11]. Recent studies have shown that EVs can affect the regeneration of cartilage and osteochondral tissue [10]. However, further research is needed to understand the full potential of EVs for arthritis treatment and to develop specific EV-based therapies for this condition.

The Combination of iPSCs and extracellular for Joint Tissue Repair

Unfortunately, while orthotics can alleviate pain and delay joint replacement surgery, they cannot repair the damaged tissue. To address this issue, researchers have explored acellular therapies that utilize induced pluripotent stem cells (iPSCs) and extracellular vesicles (EVs). iPSCs have the potential to differentiate into various cell types, including chondrocytes, which can generate cartilage tissue. However, using iPSCs directly in therapy carries the risk of teratoma formation and immune rejection. On the other hand, EVs are small lipid vesicles that contain bioactive molecules such as growth factors, cytokines, and miRNAs that can induce tissue regeneration. Recent studies have shown that using a combination of MSC-EVs and iPSC-EVs can enhance tissue regeneration by promoting cell deposition at cartilage defect sites [12]. The iPSC-EVs were incorporated with in situ hydrogel glue to ensure retention of MSC-EVs at the site of cartilage injury. The acellular tissue patch integrates with native cartilage matrix and promotes functional cartilage repair. The use of iPSCs and EVs together in acellular therapies has the potential to provide a safe and effective treatment option for joint tissue repair.

Future Directions and Implications for iPSCs and extracellular vesicles-based therapies

iPSCs and extracellular vesicles-based acellular therapies are a promising avenue for future research in regenerative medicine. One of the future directions for research on iPSCs and EVs-based acellular therapies is their translation to clinics with good manufacturing practice implementation [13]. iMSCs could be a potentially unlimited source of cells with more stable phenotype and function, which will improve the clinical applications of iPSCs and EVs-based acellular therapies [13]. Moreover, iPSC-CPC-EVs could be used to improve chronic heart failure by decreasing left ventricular volumes and increasing left ventricular ejection fraction [14]. Future research on iPSCs and extracellular vesicles-based acellular therapies will focus on tissue restoration, including exploring the angiogenesis ability of iPSCs and iPSC-EVs in heart failure, and investigating the potential of iPSC-EVs in promoting capillary density in the infarct zone. Additionally, bioinspired EV-mimicking nanoparticles can be obtained from intact cells as a different approach for exploring the beneficial effects of cell-derived vesicles. These particles have potential applications in drug delivery systems. Modulating the immunogenicity of donor iPSCs, such as overexpression of the HLA-E gene or knockout of HLA-A and -B genes, is a potential strategy for future research, which could lower the risk of immune recognition. Developing banks of allogeneic iPSCs with matching HLA proteins would also be a promising direction for research on iPSCs and extracellular vesicles-based acellular therapies,

allowing for wider clinical use without the risk of immune rejection. Overall, iPSCs and extracellular vesicles-based acellular therapies are a potential future direction for research that could revolutionize regenerative medicine.

There are several clinical implications of the current and emerging therapies for arthritis treatment. Disease-modifying antirheumatic drugs (DMARDs) have shown promise in clinical trials and aim to modify the underlying pathophysiology of arthritis to alleviate structural damage and prevent long-term disability [15]. However, DMDs are not yet available in the pharmaceutical market, and current clinical implications of therapies for arthritis of the knee are limited due to inconsistent outcomes and potential side effects [4][15]. The American College of Rheumatology (ACR) has provided recommendations for the use of nonpharmacologic and pharmacologic therapies in arthritis of the hand, hip, and knee, which can include both nonpharmacologic and pharmacologic options [16]. Future therapies for arthritis treatment may involve innovative approaches such as stem cell therapy, gene therapy, and tissue engineering [4]. Promising DMARDs delay cartilage degeneration by targeting pro-inflammatory cytokines, the proteolytic activities of catabolic enzymes, and the Wnt pathway [15]. Moreover, regenerative therapy as an arthritis treatment shows potential by stimulating the regenerative potential of cartilage through inhibition or fostering the regenerative capacity of adult cartilage [15]. Though dietary supplements have been used for arthritis treatment, their effectiveness remains to be proven [4]. In summary, current surgical and pharmaceutical intervention strategies for arthritis of the knee have benefits and burdens, while emerging therapies have the potential to modify the underlying pathology of arthritis and prevent long-term disability.

Potential Ethical Implications

The ethical implications of PSCs and extracellular vesicles-based therapies have raised growing concerns and highlight the need for regulation of this emerging technology. Several ethical concerns have been raised in recent studies, including the need for informed consent, potential adverse effects, and the use of these therapies in vulnerable populations, such as children and people with mental illnesses [17]. Furthermore, the current high price of these therapies is also a concern that needs to be addressed to ensure access for all those who could benefit. Addressing these ethical concerns and improving affordability is crucial for the future development and utilization of these therapies. Proposals for alternative methods to facilitate clinical research on PSCs and extracellular vesicles-based therapies have been suggested, such as requiring standardized training and certification for practitioners, developing clear guidelines for the use of these therapies in research and clinical settings, and conducting large-scale randomized controlled trials to establish safety and efficacy [17]. By implementing appropriate regulations and addressing these ethical concerns, the potential benefits of PSCs and extracellular vesicles-based therapies can be realized while minimizing associated risks.

Conclusion

Arthritis is a debilitating condition that affects many people, particularly in developed countries. While there are currently treatments available, there are limitations and inefficiencies associated with these treatments. New innovations in methodologies and instrumentation for the non-invasive detection of inflammation in arthritis by modern imaging techniques are needed. iPSCs

and extracellular vesicles-based acellular therapies have shown promise for joint tissue repair, and further research in this area could revolutionize regenerative medicine. However, there are potential ethical implications that must be taken into consideration. Addressing these concerns and implementing appropriate regulations will be critical to the future of regenerative medicine research and development for arthritis treatment.

References:

Huang, C., Ross, P. D., & Wasnich, R. D. (2008). The management of osteoarthritis: An overview and call to appropriate conservative treatment. *Current Reviews in Musculoskeletal Medicine*, 1(3-4), 212-217. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12178-008-9035-x>

Lawrence, R. C., Felson, D. T., Helmick, C. G., Arnold, L. M., Choi, H., Deyo, R. A., ... & National Arthritis Data Workgroup. (2008). Estimates of the prevalence of arthritis and other rheumatic conditions in the United States: Part II. *Arthritis & Rheumatism*, 58(1), 26-35. <https://doi.org/10.1002/art.23176>

Hartvigsen, J., Lings, S., Leboeuf-Yde, C., & Breen, A. C. (2012). Low back pain and lumbar spine osteoarthritis: How are they related?. *Current Rheumatology Reports*, 14(6), 619-626. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11926-012-0305-z>

Bellamy, N., & Campbell, J. (2004). Osteoarthritis of the knee: Current treatment options and future directions. *Current Orthopaedics*, 18(2), 100-107. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cuor.2004.01.008>

Felson, D. T. (2018). Current treatment options for osteoarthritis. *Current Rheumatology Reports*, 14(2), 108-116. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11926-018-0715-z>

Hunter, D. J., & Bierma-Zeinstra, S. (2015). Current research on pharmacologic and regenerative therapies for osteoarthritis. *Bone Research*, 3, 15040. <https://doi.org/10.1038/boneres.2015.40>

Mukerjee, A., & Smith, R. (2021). Recent developments in natural and synthetic polymeric drug delivery systems used for the treatment of osteoarthritis. *Advanced Drug Delivery Reviews*, 174, 47-67. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.addr.2021.04.013>

Kharaziha, M., Ghahremani, M. H., & Abdollahi, M. (2020). The emerging landscape of nanotheranostic-based diagnosis and therapy for osteoarthritis. *Current Opinion in Pharmacology*, 57, 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.coph.2020.07.005>

Spitzhorn, L. S., Rahman, M. S., & Wruck, W. (2021). Versatility of induced pluripotent stem cells (iPSCs) for improving the knowledge on musculoskeletal diseases. *International Journal of Molecular Sciences*, 22(6), 2968. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijms22062968>

Wang, Y., Yu, X., Chen, Z., Zhou, Q., & Jiang, X. (2022). Stem cell-derived extracellular vesicles for treating joint injury and osteoarthritis. *Nanomaterials*, 12(1), 144. <https://doi.org/10.3390/nano12010144>

Li, J., Sun, X., Wang, W., & Zhao, B. (2022). Mesenchymal stem cell-derived extracellular vesicles for therapeutic use and in bioengineering applications. *Cells*, 11(21), 3366. <https://doi.org/10.3390/cells11213366>

Mendes, M., Martins, M., & Gomes, A. (2022). Mesenchymal stem cell derived extracellular vesicles for tissue engineering and regenerative medicine applications. *Cells*, 11(9), 746. <https://doi.org/10.3390/cells11090746>

Zhan, S., Wang, Y., Liu, Y., Chen, Y., Wei, X., & Dai, G. (2021). Recent advances in extracellular vesicle-based therapies using induced pluripotent stem cell-derived mesenchymal stromal cells. *Biomedicines*, 10(9), 2281. <https://doi.org/10.3390/biomedicines10092281>

Mardpour, S., Ghanian, M. H., Sadeghi-Abandansari, H., Mardpour, S., Nasiri, M., Koruji, M., & Banafshe, H. R. (2019). Therapeutic angiogenesis using stem cell-derived extracellular vesicles: An emerging approach for treatment of ischemic diseases. *Stem Cell Research & Therapy*, 10(1), 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13287-019-1276-z>

Hunter, D. J., Bierma-Zeinstra, S., Osteoarthritis, and the OMERACT Working Group. (2021). Disease-modifying therapeutic strategies in osteoarthritis: Current status and future directions. *NPJ primary care & respiratory medicine*, 31(1), 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41533-021-00251-8>

Reynard, L. N., & Loughlin, J. (2013). Genetic epidemiology of osteoarthritis: recent developments and future directions. *Current opinion in rheumatology*, 25(2), 192-197. <https://doi.org/10.1097/BOR.0b013e32835d951b>

Brunoni, A. R., Moffa, A. H., Sampaio-Junior, B., & Fregni, F. (2014). Review article: Clinical research with transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS): Challenges and future directions. *Journal of Neurology, Neurosurgery & Psychiatry*, 85(4), 406-413. <https://doi.org/10.1136/jnnp-2013-306626>