Facial reconstruction direct impact on maxillofacial to rectify definite identification and its recent advancement

Sakshi[1] and Himanshu Yadav[2*]

Author Affiliations

[1]Sakshi,
Student, B.Sc. Forensic Science, Department of Forensic Science, School of Allied Health Sciences, Sharda University, Greater Noida, Uttar Pradesh, India

[2]Himanshu Yadav
Assistant Professor, Department of Forensic Science, School of Allied Health Sciences, Sharda University, Greater Noida, Uttar Pradesh, India

***Corresponding Author**

Himanshu Yadav
Assistant Professor, Department of Forensic Science, School of Allied Health Sciences, Sharda University, Greater Noida, Uttar Pradesh, India
E-mail: himanshu.yadav@sharda.ac.in

Received on: 04.08.2025

Revised on: 12.08.2025

Accepted on: 20.08.2025

Abstract

Three-dimensional (3D) printing of scaffolds for facial reconstruction represents a cutting-edge approach in tissue engineering and regenerative medicine. This technique allows for the creation of highly customized, biocompatible scaffolds tailored to patient-specific facial defects, using imaging data from CT and MRI scans. Various 3D printing methods, including stereolithography (SLA) and fused deposition modelling (FDM), are employed to fabricate scaffolds using materials like biodegradable polymers, hydrogels, and ceramics. These scaffolds serve as temporary matrices that promote tissue regeneration, with the potential to integrate growth factors and stem cells for enhanced healing. Applications include the reconstruction of facial bones, cartilage, and soft tissues following trauma, congenital defects, or surgical resection. Despite promising developments, challenges such as vascularization, scaffold integration, and clinical translation remain, with future advancements likely to include bioprinting for complex tissue regeneration.

Keywords: Scaffolds, Fused Deposition Modelling, Stereolithography, facial reconstruction etc.

Introduction

One significant area of forensic science and archaeology that has shown tremendous growth is that of facial reconstruction. The field reconstructs facial features from skeletal remains (Guleria et al., 2023). Technological and methodological advances have contributed to this phenomenal growth of the field. Currently, applications include 3D imaging, computer-aided design, and artificial intelligence, all of which enhance reconstruction by accuracy and efficiency compared to the previous measures (Ambujakshi Manjunatha et al., 2024). These studies allow for more accurate interpretations of biological and cultural aspects of individuals belonging to different historical contexts.

The application of machine learning algorithms has been incorporated into the process to improve facial reconstruction, meaning huge datasets are analysed, which contributes to higher accuracy in predictions (Wang et al., 2024). Virtual reality applications provide an immersive experience; researchers and members of the public engage with reconstructions in innovative ways (Conservation & 2025, 2025).

These technological advances support the forensic use of facial reconstruction in solving crime cases and also assist in historical research and outreach to the public. With advancing development, there are increasing opportunities for interdisciplinary collaboration toward a greater understanding of human identity and heritage (Vaverková et al., 2025). Against this background, the introduction stresses potential transformative impacts with reconstruction be seen on a larger canvas in exploring current practice and implications (Celuch & Neuhofer, 2025).

Three-dimensional printing of scaffolds for facial reconstruction

3D printing technologies used- (for scaffold fabrication)

Stereolithography (SLA)- SLA is a type of 3D printing process that ultraviolet light to cure liquid resin into solid objects (Kushwaha et al., n.d.). SLA is often used to fabricate intricate scaffolds for facial reconstruction due to its precision. These scaffolds can support the regeneration of bone, cartilage, or soft tissues and can be customized to fit the specific anatomical needs of patients (Bigi et al., 2023).

Fused deposition modeling (FDM)- FDM is one of the most popular AM methods for polymeric materials. FDM works basically by melting a thermoplastic polymeric material and then extruding it through a nozzle to create a layer (Shanmugam et al., 2021). Extrusion is a common manufacturing technique. For polymers. However, the extrusion of multiple layers based on a computer file to create a 3D object is a novelty for FDM (Ali et al., n.d.). Thus, additive manufacturing can be considered to borrow conventional manufacturing ideas and then apply them in a nonconventional method within the direct building of 3D parts without any use of part-specific tooling.

3-Polycaprolactone (PCL) scaffold: - PCL scaffolds can be 3D-printed to fit patient-specific facial defects (Datta et al., 2025). The printing process allows for the creation of porous structures that mimic the architecture of natural tissue. The scaffold porosity is crucial for cell attachment, nutrient diffusion, and tissue growth. PCL scaffolds can be engineered to have optimal pore sizes for various applications, including bone and cartilage regeneration.

Biomaterials used

Bio-ceramics- Bio-ceramics play a significant role due to their biocompatibility, ability to bond with bone, and customizable shapes that can be used to repair or replace damaged facial structures (Ellakwa et al., 2025). They are commonly used in surgeries to reconstruct areas of the face affected by trauma, disease, or congenital defects.

Biocompatible- (able to support normal cellular activity without toxic effects to host tissue), bioresorbable (able to degrade at controlled rates while facilitating bone ingrowth), and mechanically strong (capable of withstanding mechanical loads during daily activity).

Common materials include

- **Polymers**: Such as PLA, PCL, and PLGA, are often used for their biodegradable properties.
- **Hydrogels**: Such as collagen and alginate, which mimic soft tissue environments.
- **Ceramics**: Such as hydroxyapatite and bioglass, are used for bone reconstruction.
- **Composite materials**: A mix of polymers and ceramics to mimic natural tissue properties.

Bony integration of 3D printed scaffolds

- 3D-printed scaffolds are designed with porous structures to mimic the natural bone architecture. This structure allows for cell migration and vascularization, which are critical for osteoconductive the process by which bone grows on and into a scaffold (Bisht et al., 2021).

- Materials like β-tricalcium phosphate (β-TCP) and hydroxyapatite (HAP) are commonly used in these scaffolds due to their chemical similarity to natural bone and their ability to promote bone growth and integration (Kucko et al., 2023).
- While bio ceramics are excellent in terms of osteoconductive, they can be brittle. 3D printing techniques allow optimization of the scaffold's microarchitecture to improve mechanical strength while maintaining enough porosity to support vascularization (Joshi et al., 2022).

Trials and commercialization

Phases of Clinical Trials for 3D-Printed Scaffolds

Preclinical Studies: In these early stages, 3D-printed scaffolds are first tested on animal models to assess biocompatibility, safety, and osteointegration (bone bonding). Studies evaluate how well the scaffold promotes bone regeneration and how it interacts with biological tissues (Avanzi et al., 2023).

Phase I Trials: The initial human trials involve small groups of patients to test safety. In these trials, bio ceramic scaffolds (e.g., hydroxyapatite or β-tricalcium phosphate scaffolds) are implanted in patients with bone defects to observe basic safety outcomes and any adverse reactions (Noordin et al., n.d.).

Phase II Trials: After proving safe, scaffolds are tested on a larger group to determine the effectiveness and optimal dosage. Here, researchers assess how well the scaffold promotes bone healing and regeneration in human subjects with non-critical bone defects (like dental implants, and small bone fractures).

Phase III Trials: This stage involves larger populations, often across multiple clinical sites, to confirm the scaffold's effectiveness. The trials compare 3D-printed scaffolds with traditional bone grafts or other implants, analysing long-term outcomes, including the strength and function of the regenerated bone (Laubach et al., 2023).

Types of Clinical Trials

Bone Repair in Orthopaedics: Trials have been conducted to repair large bone defects, such as those from trauma or tumour resection. Scaffolds have been used for spinal fusion surgeries or for reconstructing long bones like the femur or tibia (Meng et al., 2021).

Maxillofacial and Dental Applications: Clinical trials in this area focus on 3D-printed scaffolds for dental implants and facial bone reconstruction (Matheus et al., n.d.). These applications are up-and-coming due to the high demand for customized, precise-fitting implants.

Ongoing Clinical Trials: Many clinical trials are testing 3D-printed calcium phosphate scaffolds for bone regeneration in both the dental and orthopaedic fields (Anderson et al., n.d.). Some involve testing scaffolds combined with growth factors (like BMP-2 or stem cells) to enhance bone healing and Oste inductivity (the ability to stimulate new bone formation).

Challenges in Clinical Trials

Regulatory Hurdles: Obtaining approval from regulatory agencies (e.g., the FDA, EMA) is a major challenge. Stringent safety and efficacy criteria must be met, which can slow down the progress of clinical trials.

Complexity of Bone Defects: Not all bone defects are alike, so one challenge in trials is showing consistent, reproducible results across different defect types, sizes, and patient populations.

Commercialization of 3D-printed Scaffolds

Current Commercial Products: -Several companies have already brought 3D-printed scaffolds for bone regeneration to market. These scaffolds often serve as alternatives to traditional bone grafts or metal implants. Examples include:

- **OssDsign**: This company has developed **patient-specific cranial and facial implants** using 3D printing technologies and bioactive materials. Its products are used to repair skull defects and reconstruct facial features.
- **Materialise**: Known for its 3D printing expertise, this company manufactures custom-made implants using **porous titanium scaffolds** for orthopaedic applications.
- **Zorion Medical** focuses on biodegradable 3D-printed scaffolds for bone and tissue repair. These scaffolds are designed to gradually degrade as new bone forms.

Factors Driving Commercialization

- **Customization and Personalization**: One of the keys selling points of 3D-printed scaffolds is the ability to **customize implants** to match each patient's unique anatomy. This allows for better integration, faster recovery times, and improved outcomes.
- **Reduced Surgery Time**: Custom-fit scaffolds often reduce the complexity of surgeries, as there's less need to reshape or adjust implants during the procedure. This can lower the risks associated with surgery and decrease the time required in the operating room.
- **Growing Demand for Bone Repair Solutions**: With the rise in aging populations and the increased incidence of bone-related disorders (such as osteoporosis), there's significant demand for effective bone regeneration products.

Regulatory Pathway

- **FDA Approval**: In the U.S., 3D-printed scaffolds must pass through the FDA's 510(k) clearance or Premarket Approval (PMA) depending on their intended use (Injury & 2025, n.d.). Some products, especially those intended for load-bearing applications, may need more stringent testing and approval.
- **CE Marking**: In Europe, products must receive CE marking to be marketed, indicating compliance with European health, safety, and environmental regulations (Sustainability & 2021, n.d.).
- **Regenerative Medicine and Advanced Therapies**: Products incorporating stem cells or biologics may face additional regulatory scrutiny, as they must meet guidelines for both medical devices and biologics (Sawarkar et al., 2022).

Challenges in Commercialization

- **Cost**: Custom 3D-printed scaffolds are expensive to produce. This may limit their use to high-end or specialized medical facilities unless costs can be reduced through scaling and technological advances.
- **Reimbursement**: Gaining approval from insurance providers to reimburse these cutting-edge treatments can be challenging, particularly if the scaffolds are significantly more expensive than traditional bone grafts or implants.
- **Manufacturing Scalability**: While 3D printing is excellent for creating custom implants, scaling the production process to meet large market demand remains a challenge. Companies must balance customization with efficiency to drive commercial success.

Conclusion

Three-dimensional (3D) printing of scaffolds for facial reconstruction offers highly personalized solutions for repairing complex craniofacial defects. By using patient-specific data, such as CT scans, 3D-printed scaffolds are tailored to fit the exact geometry of the affected area, ensuring better functional and aesthetic outcomes. Made from biocompatible materials like bioceramics and bioresorbable polymers, these scaffolds promote osteoconductive, encouraging bone integration and regeneration. Additionally, scaffold designs incorporate porosity to enhance cell growth and vascularization, which accelerates healing.

3D-printed scaffolds are especially useful in treating trauma, congenital defects, and post-tumour resections, reducing surgery time and improving recovery. However, challenges such as production costs, mechanical properties, and regulatory approvals remain. Ongoing research focuses on enhancing scaffold functionality with biologically active components. Despite these hurdles, 3D-printed scaffolds represent a transformative step in facial reconstruction, offering more precise and effective treatment options than traditional methods.

References

1. Ali, M., Kurokawa, S., … E. S.-I. J. of, & 2023, undefined. (n.d.). Development of a large-scale multi-extrusion FDM printer, and its challenges. *Elsevier*. Retrieved December 2, 2025, from https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2588840422000701
2. Ambujakshi Manjunatha, V., Parisarla, H., & Parasher, S. (2024). IP International Journal of Maxillofacial Imaging A systematic review on recent advancements in 3D surface imaging and artificial intelligence for enhanced dental research and clinical practice. *IP International Journal of Maxillofacial Imaging*, *10*(4), 132–139. https://doi.org/10.18231/j.ijmi.2024.029
3. Anderson, M., Dubey, N., Bogie, K., Cao, C., Materials, J. L.-D., & 2022, undefined. (n.d.). Three-dimensional printing of clinical scale and personalized calcium phosphate scaffolds for alveolar bone reconstruction. *Elsevier*. Retrieved December 3, 2025, from https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0109564121004759
4. Avanzi, I. R., Parisi, J. R., Souza, A., Cruz, M. A., Martignago, C. C. S., Ribeiro, D. A., Braga, A. R. C., & Renno, A. C. (2023). 3D-printed hydroxyapatite scaffolds for bone tissue engineering: a systematic review in experimental animal studies. *Wiley Online Library*, *111*(1), 203–219. https://doi.org/10.1002/JBM.B.35134
5. Bigi, A., Laubach, M., Hildebrand, F., Suresh, S., Wagels, M., Kobbe, P., Gilbert, F., Kneser, U., Holzapfel, B. M., & Hutmacher, D. W. (2023). The concept of scaffold-guided bone regeneration for the treatment of long bone defects: current clinical application and future perspective. *Mdpi.Com*, *14*, 341. https://doi.org/10.3390/jfb14070341
6. Bisht, B., Hope, A., Mukherjee, A., & Paul, M. K. (2021). Advances in the fabrication of scaffold and 3D printing of biomimetic bone graft. *Springer*, *49*(4), 1128–1150. https://doi.org/10.1007/S10439-021-02752-9
7. Celuch, K., & Neuhofer, B. (2025). Transformative event experiences: A visual in-situ study of change. *Taylor & Francis*, *28*(5), 751–772. https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2024.2309147
8. Conservation, N. H.-S. in, & 2025, undefined. (2025). Insight on 3D virtual reconstruction of architectural and archaeological cultural heritage: Critical assessment, comprehensive guidelines, and recommendations. *Taylor & Francis*. https://doi.org/10.1080/00393630.2025.2529089
9. Datta, S., Barua, R., Mahto, B., for, A. P.-R. P., & 2025, undefined. (2025). Advanced 3D-Printed Drug-Eluting Resorbable Implants and Fixation Devices. *Springer*, 85–103. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-96-9306-1_4

10. Ellakwa, D. E. S., Abu-Khadra, A. S., & Ellakwa, T. E. (2025). Insight into bioactive glass and bio-ceramics uses: unveiling recent advances for biomedical application. *Springer*, *5*(1), 78. https://doi.org/10.1007/S43939-025-00254-2
11. Guleria, A., Krishan, K., Sharma, V., & Kanchan, T. (2023). Methods of forensic facial reconstruction and human identification: historical background, significance, and limitations. *The Science of Nature 2023 110:2*, *110*(2), 8-. https://doi.org/10.1007/S00114-023-01838-9
12. Injury, C. H.-, & 2025, undefined. (n.d.). FDA regulatory considerations for innovative orthopedic devices: A review. *Elsevier*. Retrieved December 3, 2025, from https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0020138325001512
13. Joshi, A., Choudhury, S., Gugulothu, S. B., Visweswariah, S. S., & Chatterjee, K. (2022). Strategies to promote vascularization in 3D printed tissue scaffolds: trends and challenges. *ACS Publications*, *23*(7), 2730–2751. https://doi.org/10.1021/ACS.BIOMAC.2C00423
14. Kucko, S. K., Raeman, S. M., & Keenan, T. J. (2023). Current advances in hydroxyapatite-and β-tricalcium phosphate-based composites for biomedical applications: a review. *Springer*, *1*(1), 49–65. https://doi.org/10.1007/S44174-022-00037-W
15. Kushwaha, A., Rahman, M., Hart, D., … B. H.-T. of additively, & 2022, undefined. (n.d.). Fundamentals of stereolithography: techniques, properties, and applications. *Elsevier*. Retrieved December 2, 2025, from https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/B9780128213285000032
16. Laubach, M., Hildebrand, F., Suresh, S., Wagels, M., Kobbe, P., Gilbert, F., Kneser, U., Holzapfel, B. M., & Hutmacher, D. W. (2023). The Concept of Scaffold-Guided Bone Regeneration for the Treatment of Long Bone Defects: Current Clinical Application and Future Perspective. *Journal of Functional Biomaterials*, *14*(7), 341. https://doi.org/10.3390/JFB14070341/S1
17. Matheus, H., … H. H.-F. of O. and, & 2024, undefined. (n.d.). The state of 3D printing of bioengineered customized maxillofacial bone scaffolds: a narrative review. *Fomm.Amegroups.Org*. Retrieved December 3, 2025, from https://fomm.amegroups.org/article/view/67416/html
18. Meng, B., Bunch, J., Burton, D., & Wang, J. (2021). Lumbar interbody fusion: recent advances in surgical techniques and bone healing strategies. *Springer*, *30*(1), 22–33. https://doi.org/10.1007/S00586-020-06596-0
19. Noordin, N., Ahmad, N., … M. J.-B. P., & 2022, undefined. (n.d.). A review of bioceramics scaffolds for bone defects in different types of animal models: HA and β-TCP. *Iopscience.Iop.Org*. https://doi.org/10.1088/2057-1976/AC867F/META
20. Sawarkar, S., Processes, A. B.-P., Regulations, P. and, & 2022, undefined. (2022). Global Regulatory Frameworks and Quality Standards for Stem Cells Therapy and Regenerative Medicines. *Springer*, 69–111. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-16-7589-8_4
21. Shanmugam, V., Pavan, M. V., Babu, K., & Karnan, B. (2021). Fused deposition modeling based polymeric materials and their performance: A review. *Wiley Online Library*, *42*(11), 5656–5677. https://doi.org/10.1002/PC.26275
22. Sustainability, S. W.-, & 2021, undefined. (n.d.). CE marking of construction products—evolution of the european approach to harmonisation of construction products in the light of environmental sustainability. *Mdpi.Com*. Retrieved December 3, 2025, from https://www.mdpi.com/2071-1050/13/11/6396

23. Vaverková, M. D., Polak, J., Kurcjusz, M., Jena, M. K., Murali, A. P., Nair, S. S., Aktaş, H., Hadinata, M. E., Ghezelayagh, P., Andik, S. D. S., Rahmana, A., & Franc-Dąbrowska, J. (2025). Enhancing sustainable development through interdisciplinary collaboration: Insights from diverse fields. *Wiley Online Library*, *33*(3), 3427–3454. https://doi.org/10.1002/SD.3302
24. Wang, D. X., Huai, B. C., Ma, X., Jin, B. M., Wang, Y. G., Chen, M. Y., Sang, J. Z., & Liu, R. N. (2024). Application of artificial intelligence-assisted image diagnosis software based on volume data reconstruction technique in medical imaging practice teaching. *BMC Medical Education 2024 24:1*, *24*(1), 405-. https://doi.org/10.1186/S12909-024-05382-6