INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF PHARMACEUTICAL SCIENCES
[ISSN: 0975-4725; CODEN(USA): IJPS00]
Journal Homepage: https://www.ijpsjournal.com

OPEN ACCESS

Review Paper

3D Printing in Personalized Medicine: Current Status and Future Prospects

Sachin Karwar*, Pravin Bhosale, Tejas Kudnar, Pratik Holkar, Vishwajeet Rashinkar, Yogesh Patil

Ashvin College of Pharmacy, Manchi Hill, Sangamner

ARTICLE INFO

Published: 23 Nov 2025
Keywords:
3D printing, personalized medicine, drug delivery, tissue engineering, prosthetics, implants, bioprinting, regulatory considerations, additive manufacturing, future prospects.
DOI:
10.5281/zenodo.17686372

ABSTRACT

The advent of three-dimensional (3D) printing technologies has revolutionized modern healthcare by enabling the development of personalized medical solutions tailored to individual patients. Unlike conventional mass production, 3D printing offers unparalleled precision in designing customized drug delivery systems, implants, prosthetics, and bioprinted tissues. This review provides a comprehensive overview of the current status and future prospects of 3D printing in personalized medicine. The paper begins with an introduction to the fundamentals of additive manufacturing and its relevance to patient-centered care. It then explores major applications in pharmaceuticals, including tailored drug dosage forms and controlled release systems, followed by advances in tissue engineering and regenerative medicine, where bioprinting enables the creation of complex tissues and organ models. Applications in medical devices, prosthetics, and implants are also highlighted, showcasing real-world clinical benefits. In addition to technological progress, the review examines regulatory, ethical, and safety considerations that influence the adoption of 3D printing in clinical settings. Furthermore, it addresses current challenges and limitations, such as material standardization, scalability, and long-term biocompatibility, while discussing emerging trends like artificial intelligence (AI) integration and 4D printing. Overall, 3D printing is poised to reshape the landscape of personalized medicine by bridging the gap between patient-specific needs and technological innovation. Its ability to deliver precision healthcare solutions, reduce costs, and improve patient outcomes marks it as a transformative force in the future of medicine.

INTRODUCTION

The concept of personalized medicine has revolutionized the healthcare paradigm by shifting from the conventional “one-size-fits-all” approach

***Corresponding Author:** Sachin Karwar
Address: *Ashvin College of Pharmacy, Manchi Hill, Sangamner.*
Email : sachinkarwar141@gmail.com
Relevant conflicts of interest/financial disclosures: The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

to a more tailored strategy that considers individual patient variability in genetics, environment, and lifestyle. The advent of 3D printing, also known as additive manufacturing, has emerged as a transformative tool that aligns seamlessly with the principles of personalized medicine. By enabling the fabrication of patient-specific medical devices, implants, prosthetics, and even pharmaceuticals, 3D printing provides unprecedented opportunities to improve therapeutic outcomes, enhance patient compliance, and reduce healthcare costs.

1.1 Evolution of Personalized Medicine

Personalized medicine emphasizes the customization of healthcare interventions based on an individual's unique characteristics. Historically, drug development and medical device design have been generalized, often leading to variable efficacy and adverse outcomes in different patient populations. Advances in genomics, proteomics, and computational modeling have paved the way for tailored therapeutic strategies. Within this context, 3D printing technologies offer a manufacturing platform capable of producing individualized solutions in real time, bridging the gap between medical innovation and clinical application [1,2].

1.2 Emergence of 3D Printing in Healthcare

3D printing was first introduced in the 1980s as a prototyping tool for industrial manufacturing. Over the last two decades, its application in healthcare has grown exponentially, encompassing areas such as surgical planning, implant design, tissue engineering, and pharmaceutical dosage forms [3]. The technology relies on digital design models that can be directly converted into physical objects using various printing modalities, including stereolithography (SLA), fused deposition modeling (FDM), selective laser sintering (SLS), and bioprinting techniques [4]. This versatility makes 3D printing particularly suitable for patient-centered medical solutions.

1.3 Principles of 3D Printing in Medicine

At its core, 3D printing involves the layer-by-layer fabrication of a three-dimensional structure from digital models. Medical imaging technologies such as computed tomography (CT) and magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) are frequently used to generate patient-specific anatomical data, which are then processed through computer-aided design (CAD) software to guide the printing process [5]. This workflow ensures that the final product—be

it a prosthetic limb, a surgical guide, or a drug delivery system—is tailored precisely to the patient's physiological requirements.

1.4 Impact on Drug Development and Delivery

One of the most significant contributions of 3D printing to personalized medicine is in the pharmaceutical field. The technology allows for the creation of customized oral dosage forms with adjustable release profiles, multi-drug combinations (polypills), and patient-specific doses [6]. In 2015, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) approved the first 3D-printed drug, Spritam® (levetiracetam), designed for epilepsy management. This milestone highlighted the clinical viability of additive manufacturing in drug development and its potential for broader pharmaceutical applications [7].

1.5 Applications in Medical Devices and Tissue Engineering

Beyond pharmaceuticals, 3D printing plays a vital role in creating patient-specific medical devices and prosthetics. The ability to manufacture implants that perfectly match a patient's anatomy significantly enhances surgical outcomes and reduces complications. In tissue engineering, bioprinting technologies using cell-laden bio-inks have enabled the fabrication of complex tissues such as skin, cartilage, and bone scaffolds [8,9]. These innovations underscore the interdisciplinary nature of 3D printing, integrating engineering, biology, and clinical sciences.

1.5 Advantages of 3D Printing in Personalized Medicine

The adoption of 3D printing in healthcare offers several advantages:

- Customization: Tailored solutions that improve clinical outcomes.
- Efficiency: Reduced time from design to application, especially in surgical planning.
- Accessibility: Cost-effective production of prosthetics for underserved populations.
- Innovation: Facilitates rapid prototyping and iterative design for medical research [10].

1.6 Challenges and Future Prospects

Despite its promise, several barriers hinder the widespread adoption of 3D printing in personalized medicine. These include regulatory challenges, high production costs, limited availability of biocompatible materials, and scalability issues in bioprinting functional organs [11]. Nonetheless, ongoing research and collaboration between academia, industry, and regulatory bodies are expected to overcome these hurdles, positioning 3D printing as a cornerstone of the next generation of personalized healthcare [12].

2. Fundamentals of 3D Printing Technologies in Personalized Medicine

The integration of 3D printing into healthcare relies on a wide range of additive manufacturing technologies, each with unique principles, advantages, and limitations. To understand the transformative role of this technology in personalized medicine, it is essential to explore the fundamentals of 3D printing techniques, materials, workflows, and their clinical significance.

2.1 Fundamentals of Additive Manufacturing

3D printing, also referred to as additive manufacturing, is a process in which materials are deposited layer by layer to create three-dimensional objects from digital models. Unlike traditional subtractive manufacturing, which

removes material from a solid block, additive manufacturing enables the precise fabrication of highly complex geometries, tailored structures, and customized products [13].

In healthcare, 3D printing translates digital medical imaging data (e.g., CT or MRI scans) into physical models, implants, prosthetics, or drug formulations through computer-aided design (CAD) software. This digital-to-physical workflow makes it possible to customize solutions for each patient [14].

2.2 Major 3D Printing Technologies in Healthcare

2.2.1 Stereolithography (SLA)

SLA is one of the oldest and most widely used 3D printing technologies. It utilizes a UV laser to cure photosensitive liquid resins layer by layer. SLA offers high resolution, smooth surface finish, and is suitable for creating dental molds, surgical guides, and anatomical models [15]. However, its limitations include brittle materials and the need for post-processing.

2.2.2 Fused Deposition Modeling (FDM)

FDM uses thermoplastic filaments, which are extruded through a heated nozzle to build structures. It is affordable, simple, and widely available. In personalized medicine, FDM is used for fabricating patient-specific drug dosage forms and low-cost prosthetics [16]. By altering infill patterns and geometry, drug release profiles can be tailored to patient-specific needs.

2.2.3 Selective Laser Sintering (SLS)

SLS involves using a high-powered laser to sinter powdered polymers, metals, or ceramics, creating strong and porous structures. It is particularly useful for orthopedic implants, bone scaffolds, and surgical instruments [17]. Its ability to fabricate porous architectures enhances tissue integration and biocompatibility.

2.2.4 Binder Jetting

Binder jetting employs a liquid binding agent deposited onto powder layers to produce solid objects. It is cost-efficient and allows multi-material printing. In pharmaceuticals, binder jetting has been applied to produce rapidly dissolving tablets and polypills combining multiple drugs [18].

2.2.5 Inkjet Bioprinting

Inkjet printing adapts traditional inkjet technology to deposit bio-inks containing living cells, growth factors, and biomaterials. This method offers high precision in fabricating tissue constructs and organ-on-chip systems for drug testing [19].

2.2.6 Extrusion-Based Bioprinting

Extrusion bioprinting extrudes continuous filaments of bio-inks, such as hydrogels or cell suspensions, allowing for larger and mechanically stable constructs. This technique is widely used in cartilage, vascular, and bone tissue engineering [20].

2.3 Materials in 3D Printing for Medicine

The success of medical 3D printing depends heavily on the choice of materials, which must meet clinical requirements such as biocompatibility, mechanical strength, and degradation rates. Common materials include:

- Polymers: PLA, PCL, PEG, and PVA, used for implants, scaffolds, and drug delivery systems.
- Metals: Titanium and cobalt-chromium alloys, widely used for orthopedic and dental

implants due to their strength and biocompatibility.

- Ceramics: Hydroxyapatite and tricalcium phosphate, particularly suited for bone regeneration.
- Bio-inks: Hydrogels, collagen, alginate, and decellularized extracellular matrix (dECM), essential for bioprinting tissues and organ constructs [21].

2.4 Workflow of 3D Printing in Medicine

The general workflow of 3D printing in healthcare consists of four steps:

1. Data Acquisition: Patient-specific imaging using CT or MRI.
2. Digital Design: Converting imaging data into 3D models using CAD software.
3. Printing Process: Selection of technology (SLA, FDM, SLS, etc.) and materials based on application.
4. Post-Processing: Sterilization, surface modification, and validation of final product [22].

This workflow ensures customization and patient-specific design at every stage.

2.5 Advantages of 3D Printing in Medicine

- Patient-Specific Customization: Implants and prosthetics designed to fit individual anatomy.
- On-Demand Manufacturing: Devices and drugs fabricated directly in hospitals or pharmacies.
- Design Flexibility: Ability to fabricate complex geometries not possible with traditional methods.
- Material Efficiency: Reduced waste compared to subtractive manufacturing [23].

2.6 Limitations and Challenges

Despite its promise, 3D printing in medicine faces challenges such as:

- Limited availability of FDA-approved biocompatible materials.
- High equipment and operational costs.
- Mechanical limitations of some printed structures.
- Complex regulatory approval pathways [24].

2.7 Future Directions

Research is moving toward 4D printing, where materials respond dynamically to external stimuli such as temperature or pH, enabling “smart” implants and drug delivery systems. Integration of artificial intelligence and nanotechnology is expected to enhance precision, reproducibility, and scalability of 3D printed medical solutions [25].

3. Applications in Drug Delivery and Dosage Forms

3D printing has significantly expanded the possibilities for developing personalized pharmaceuticals by enabling the design and fabrication of customized drug delivery systems. Unlike conventional manufacturing methods, additive manufacturing offers precise control over dosage, drug release kinetics, and drug combinations, thus aligning perfectly with the principles of personalized medicine. This chapter explores the major applications of 3D printing in oral, transdermal, implantable, and other dosage forms, with an emphasis on their clinical relevance.

3.1 3D Printing in Oral Drug Delivery

3.1.1 Personalized Dosage Forms

Oral drug delivery remains the most widely used route of administration. 3D printing technologies,

particularly fused deposition modeling (FDM) and binder jetting, enable the fabrication of oral dosage forms tailored to individual patient needs. Parameters such as drug dose, shape, geometry, and release profile can be customized to improve therapeutic efficacy [26].

3.1.2 Polypills and Multi-Drug Combinations

The concept of a "polypill" combines multiple active pharmaceutical ingredients (APIs) into a single tablet. This is particularly beneficial for patients with chronic diseases requiring multiple medications, such as hypertension or diabetes. 3D printing allows spatial separation of APIs within a single structure, preventing drug-drug interactions while improving compliance [27].

3.1.3 Case Study: Spritam®

In 2015, the FDA approved Spritam® (levetiracetam), the world's first 3D-printed drug. Produced using binder jetting technology, Spritam® rapidly disintegrates in the mouth, making it ideal for patients with swallowing difficulties. Its approval demonstrated the regulatory acceptance of 3D-printed pharmaceuticals and opened pathways for future innovations [28].

3.2 Modified and Controlled Release Systems

3D printing facilitates the design of oral dosage forms with controlled release profiles by manipulating structural geometry, infill density, and polymer selection. Tablets with multilayer structures, hollow cores, or complex infills can be designed for immediate, sustained, or pulsatile drug release [29]. This flexibility allows clinicians to adjust therapy according to a patient's pharmacokinetic profile, thereby improving treatment outcomes [30].

3.3 Transdermal and Topical Drug Delivery

Additive manufacturing has enabled the development of microneedle arrays and transdermal patches for painless and minimally invasive drug delivery. Microneedles fabricated by stereolithography or two-photon polymerization ensure precision in size and shape, allowing efficient skin penetration and drug absorption [31]. These systems are being investigated for vaccines, insulin delivery, and cancer therapeutics [32].

3.4 Implantable Drug Delivery Systems

3D printing allows the fabrication of biodegradable implants that provide localized, sustained release of drugs at the site of action. For example, implants loaded with chemotherapeutic agents can be designed for direct tumor targeting, reducing systemic toxicity [33]. Similarly, hormone-loaded implants and antibiotic-eluting scaffolds have been explored for long-term therapy [34].

3.5 Inhalable and Buccal Drug Delivery

Inhalable dosage forms manufactured using 3D printing can provide tailored particle sizes for targeted pulmonary delivery, particularly in asthma and chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD). Buccal films and orodispersible dosage forms can also be printed for rapid absorption in patients with swallowing disorders [35,36].

3.6 Pediatric and Geriatric Applications

Children and elderly patients often face difficulties in swallowing large tablets or require flexible dosing regimens. 3D printing enables the development of chewable tablets, fast-dissolving films, and customizable doses based on body weight, age, or disease progression [37]. This adaptability enhances patient compliance and safety in vulnerable populations [38].

3.7 Veterinary Drug Delivery

Veterinary medicine has also benefited from 3D-printed dosage forms. Custom chewable tablets with flavors, adjustable doses, and long-acting implants have been explored for companion animals, improving administration and therapeutic adherence [39].

3.8 Future Prospects in Pharmaceutical Applications

Future developments are expected to include 4D-printed dosage forms, which can respond dynamically to stimuli such as pH or temperature, providing on-demand drug release [40]. Integration of nanotechnology with 3D printing will further enable targeted, precision-controlled therapies, ushering in a new era of smart drug delivery systems.

4: Applications in Tissue Engineering and Regenerative Medicine

4.1 Introduction

Tissue engineering and regenerative medicine (TERM) aim to restore or replace damaged tissues and organs by combining biomaterials, cells, and biologically active molecules. 3D printing has revolutionized this field by enabling the fabrication of scaffolds, organoids, and functional tissue constructs with patient-specific designs [41]. Unlike conventional scaffold fabrication methods, 3D printing provides high spatial resolution, reproducibility, and the ability to incorporate living cells and growth factors within a single construct [42].

4.2 Bioprinting Techniques in Regenerative Medicine

Bioprinting, a subcategory of 3D printing, uses bioinks—combinations of biomaterials, cells, and signaling molecules—to fabricate living tissues.

4.2.1 Inkjet Bioprinting

Inkjet bioprinting precisely deposits droplets of bioink to create layered tissue structures. It is cost-effective and provides high cell viability but is limited by viscosity constraints [43].

4.2.2 Extrusion-Based Bioprinting

Extrusion bioprinting is the most widely used technique in tissue engineering. It can print highly viscous bioinks, allowing the fabrication of large, cell-laden scaffolds [44]. However, excessive shear stress may reduce cell viability.

4.2.3 Laser-Assisted Bioprinting

This method uses focused laser pulses to deposit bioinks with high precision, making it suitable for complex architectures like vascular networks [45].

4.3 Biomaterials for Tissue Engineering

- Biomaterials play a critical role in mimicking the extracellular matrix (ECM) and supporting cell proliferation.
- Natural biomaterials: Collagen, gelatin, alginate, and hyaluronic acid provide biocompatibility and biodegradability [46].
- Synthetic biomaterials: Polycaprolactone (PCL), polylactic acid (PLA), and polyethylene glycol (PEG) provide mechanical strength and tunable degradation rates [47].
- Composite biomaterials: Combinations of natural and synthetic polymers enhance both biological and mechanical properties [48].

4.4 Applications in Tissue Engineering

4.4.1 Bone Tissue Engineering

3D printing has enabled the fabrication of scaffolds with controlled porosity and mechanical

properties suitable for bone regeneration. Bioactive ceramics such as hydroxyapatite and tricalcium phosphate are often used to mimic bone mineral composition [49].

4.4.2 Cartilage Regeneration

Cartilage, which has limited self-healing capacity, benefits from 3D bioprinting approaches using hydrogels and chondrocyte-laden bioinks. Studies have shown improved integration and functionality in preclinical models [50].

4.4.3 Skin Tissue Engineering

3D printing allows the layer-by-layer construction of skin substitutes composed of keratinocytes, fibroblasts, and biomimetic hydrogels. Bioprinted skin grafts are being explored for burn injuries and chronic wounds [51].

4.4.4 Vascular Tissue Engineering

A major challenge in tissue engineering is the fabrication of vascularized tissues. 3D bioprinting enables the creation of microvascular networks that enhance nutrient and oxygen transport [52].

4.5 Organ Printing and Regenerative Medicine

Organ printing refers to the fabrication of functional organ-like constructs for transplantation. While still in experimental stages, significant progress has been made in printing miniature liver, kidney, and cardiac tissues [53]. Advances in stem cell biology and induced pluripotent stem cells (iPSCs) have further accelerated this field [54].

Future Directions in TERM

Future trends include:

- Integration of artificial intelligence for design optimization [55].
- Development of multi-material and multi-cell printing technologies [56].
- Use of 4D bioprinting, where printed constructs dynamically change over time in response to environmental cues [57].

5. 3D Printing of Medical Devices, Prosthetics, and Implants

5.1 Introduction

3D printing has revolutionized the field of medical devices by enabling the production of patient-specific prosthetics, implants, and surgical tools with unmatched precision. Unlike traditional manufacturing techniques, additive manufacturing allows customization at the individual level, reducing production costs and improving patient outcomes [58]. This chapter explores the role of 3D printing in medical devices, prosthetics, and implants, highlighting applications, materials, regulatory considerations, and clinical outcomes.

5.2 3D Printing in Medical Devices

Medical devices, such as surgical instruments, anatomical models, and customized drug delivery systems, are increasingly being fabricated using 3D printing technologies [59]. Patient-specific anatomical models generated from imaging data (CT, MRI) allow surgeons to plan complex surgeries with high accuracy. For instance, 3D-printed models have been employed in neurosurgery, cardiology, and orthopedics to improve procedural success [60].

Biocompatible materials such as polyether ether ketone (PEEK), titanium alloys, and photopolymer resins are widely used in device production due to their mechanical strength and safety [61].

5.3 3D Printing in Prosthetics

5.3.1 Customization and Cost Reduction

Traditional prosthetics are often expensive and require long production times. With 3D printing, prosthetics can be designed based on patient scans, ensuring perfect fit and function [62]. Moreover, this approach significantly reduces costs, making prosthetics more accessible in low-resource settings.

5.3.2 Functional Improvements

3D-printed prosthetics can incorporate sensors, lightweight materials, and advanced designs that improve functionality and patient comfort [63]. Open-source prosthetic projects, such as e-NABLE, have demonstrated how community-driven 3D printing initiatives can supply low-cost prosthetics to children in need [64].

5.4 3D Printing in Implants

5.4.1 Orthopedic Implants

One of the most impactful applications is in orthopedic implants, including hip, knee, and spinal devices. 3D-printed implants can be tailored to patient-specific anatomical geometries, promoting better integration and reducing surgical complications [65]. Titanium-based implants produced via selective laser melting (SLM) and electron beam melting (EBM) have shown excellent osseointegration properties [66].

5.4.2 Dental Implants

Dentistry has witnessed rapid adoption of 3D printing in crowns, bridges, and orthodontic devices. The precision and biocompatibility of printed dental implants improve treatment success and patient satisfaction [67].

5.4.3 Craniofacial and Maxillofacial Implants

3D printing is used in reconstructive surgery for craniofacial deformities, enabling highly personalized implants that restore both function and aesthetics [68]. These implants, created from patient imaging data, are particularly valuable in trauma and cancer reconstruction cases.

5.5 Materials Used in Prosthetics and Implants

Materials play a vital role in ensuring safety and functionality. Commonly used materials include:

- Metals: Titanium, stainless steel, cobalt-chrome alloys [69].
- Polymers: PLA, ABS, nylon, and biocompatible photopolymers [70].
- Ceramics: Hydroxyapatite and zirconia for bone replacement [71].

Recent advancements in composite materials have further improved the strength, flexibility, and biocompatibility of 3D-printed prosthetics and implants [72].

5.6 Regulatory and Clinical Considerations

The U.S. FDA has issued guidelines for 3D-printed medical devices, emphasizing validation, safety testing, and quality assurance [73]. Clinical trials are ongoing to assess the long-term performance of patient-specific implants. Regulatory challenges remain, particularly in standardization and reproducibility across manufacturers [74].

5.7 Future Directions

The integration of smart materials, embedded sensors, and bioresorbable implants represents the next frontier in 3D-printed medical devices. With advances in bioelectronics, future prosthetics and implants may offer real-time monitoring and adaptive responses to patient physiology [75].

6. Regulatory, Ethical, and Safety Considerations

The integration of 3D printing into personalized medicine introduces transformative opportunities for drug delivery, prosthetics, implants, and regenerative medicine. However, this rapid innovation also presents complex regulatory, ethical, and safety challenges that must be carefully addressed to ensure effective translation from laboratory research to clinical application. This chapter explores the global regulatory landscape, ethical dilemmas, patient safety concerns, and ongoing efforts to standardize 3D printing in healthcare.

6.1 Regulatory Frameworks for 3D Printing in Healthcare

6.1.1 United States (FDA Regulations)

In the United States, the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) has taken a proactive role in regulating 3D-printed medical products. In 2017, the FDA released a technical guidance titled "Technical Considerations for Additive Manufactured Medical Devices", which outlines standards for design, testing, and validation of 3D-printed medical devices [76]. This guidance emphasizes pre-market submissions, quality control of raw materials, mechanical performance testing, and sterility validation.

Moreover, the FDA categorizes 3D-printed medical products under existing frameworks:

- Class I and II devices (e.g., surgical guides, prosthetics) undergo a premarket notification (510(k)) process.
- Class III devices (e.g., implants) require more rigorous premarket approval (PMA) due to higher risk profiles [77].

The FDA also evaluates 3D-printed pharmaceuticals under the Center for Drug Evaluation and Research (CDER), ensuring dosage accuracy, stability, and reproducibility of printed formulations [78].

6.1.2 European Union (EMA and MDR Regulations)

In Europe, the European Medicines Agency (EMA) and the Medical Device Regulation (MDR 2017/745) govern the approval and monitoring of 3D-printed medical products. Unlike the U.S., where the FDA centralizes oversight, the EU uses Notified Bodies that certify devices for CE marking, ensuring conformity with safety and quality standards [79].

The MDR emphasizes:

- Comprehensive clinical evaluation of 3D-printed implants.
- Post-market surveillance of performance and safety.
- Traceability of raw materials used in additive manufacturing.

6.1.3 Asia-Pacific Regulations

The regulatory landscape in Asia is rapidly evolving. In China, the National Medical Products Administration (NMPA) has issued technical guidelines for 3D-printed medical implants, focusing on biocompatibility and clinical validation [80]. Similarly, Japan's Pharmaceuticals and Medical Devices Agency (PMDA) has adopted frameworks for patient-specific prosthetics and bio-printed tissues [81].

India's Central Drugs Standard Control Organization (CDSCO) is still developing comprehensive frameworks but has initiated pilot programs for regulating additive manufacturing in medical devices [82].

6.2 Ethical Considerations

6.2.1 Patient Safety and Informed Consent

Ethical concerns arise regarding the safety of 3D-printed implants and drugs. Unlike conventional mass production, 3D printing allows patient-specific customization, which complicates standardized risk assessment. Ensuring patients are fully informed about potential benefits and risks of personalized 3D-printed products is critical [83].

6.2.2 Intellectual Property (IP) Rights

3D printing challenges existing intellectual property laws. Digital blueprints for prosthetics, implants, and drug formulations can be shared across platforms, raising concerns about piracy, counterfeiting, and unauthorized modifications [84]. Ethical dilemmas also arise when considering open-source designs for affordable healthcare solutions versus protection of innovators' rights.

6.2.3 Equity and Access

While 3D printing holds promise for affordable, decentralized healthcare, disparities in access to advanced technologies may widen healthcare inequities. High costs of printers, materials, and regulatory compliance may limit applications in low- and middle-income countries [85].

6.3 Safety Considerations in Clinical Applications

6.3.1 Material Biocompatibility

A major safety concern is ensuring that 3D-printed biomaterials (e.g., polymers, ceramics, metals, hydrogels) are non-toxic, durable, and biocompatible with human tissues. Substandard materials may cause inflammation, implant rejection, or mechanical failure [86].

6.3.2 Sterility and Quality Control

Unlike traditional manufacturing, 3D printing often involves decentralized production (e.g., hospital-based printing labs). Maintaining sterility during the printing process, particularly for implants and tissue scaffolds, is critical. International standards such as ISO 13485 (Medical Devices—Quality Management Systems) provide guidelines, but enforcement varies globally [87].

6.3.3 Mechanical Integrity and Reliability

3D-printed implants and prosthetics must withstand physiological loads without failure. Variability in printing parameters (e.g., layer thickness, orientation, and material density) can compromise structural integrity. Safety testing through finite element analysis (FEA) and in vivo studies is increasingly adopted to validate performance [88].

6.4 Global Efforts Toward Standardization

Organizations such as ISO (International Organization for Standardization) and ASTM International are developing standardized protocols for additive manufacturing in healthcare. The ISO/ASTM 52900:2021 framework provides unified terminology and safety guidelines for 3D-printed medical applications [89].

Collaborations between regulatory agencies, academia, and industry are driving the creation of Good Manufacturing Practices (GMP) tailored for additive manufacturing. These frameworks aim to bridge the gap between innovation and patient safety [90].

6.5 Future Directions in Regulation and Ethics

Future regulatory frameworks will likely evolve toward adaptive, risk-based models, where real-

time monitoring and AI-driven quality assurance ensure compliance. Blockchain technology may be integrated to track supply chains and protect IP rights in 3D-printed healthcare products [91].

Furthermore, bioethical discourse must expand to address the implications of bioprinting human tissues and organs, particularly concerning ownership rights, organ trade, and long-term societal impacts [92].

7: Challenges, Limitations, and Future Prospects

7.1 Technical Challenges

Despite rapid advancements, 3D printing in personalized medicine faces several technical hurdles. A primary concern is the limited range of biomaterials currently suitable for printing. While polymers, hydrogels, ceramics, and metals have been utilized, only a fraction are biocompatible and approved for clinical use [93]. Moreover, achieving reproducibility across printing batches remains a challenge due to variability in material properties, printer calibration, and environmental conditions [94].

Another limitation is the resolution and precision of current printers. While micro- and nano-scale printing technologies have shown promise, ensuring structural fidelity for complex organs and tissues remains difficult [95]. Additionally, scaling up from laboratory prototypes to clinically viable constructs, particularly for large tissue engineering applications, is not yet feasible [96].

7.2 Manufacturing and Cost Barriers

3D printing technologies often require specialized equipment, software, and highly trained personnel, which significantly increase production costs [97]. Compared to conventional mass manufacturing, 3D printing is currently slower and more resource-intensive for large-scale production [98]. This limits its application to niche, personalized products rather than mass-market solutions.

The supply chain for medical-grade printing materials also remains underdeveloped. Ensuring consistent quality, sterility, and regulatory compliance of materials adds to costs and complexity [99].

7.3 Regulatory and Ethical Concerns

As highlighted in Chapter 6, the regulatory frameworks for 3D-printed medical products are still evolving. A lack of harmonized standards across countries creates uncertainty for manufacturers and healthcare providers [100]. Moreover, liability issues regarding design ownership, printer errors, and device failures remain unresolved [101].

From an ethical standpoint, concerns arise regarding equitable access to personalized 3D printing technologies. High costs and limited availability in low-resource settings could exacerbate healthcare disparities [102]. Additionally, the possibility of "do-it-yourself" 3D printing of medical devices or drugs raises concerns about misuse, patient safety, and counterfeit products [103].

7.4 Biological and Clinical Challenges

A major obstacle in bioprinting is the long-term functionality and integration of printed tissues. While short-term studies demonstrate structural stability, long-term viability, vascularization, and immune compatibility remain unresolved issues [104]. Additionally, patient-specific variability in cellular responses complicates the standardization of protocols [105].

Clinical adoption is also hindered by the limited number of large-scale, randomized controlled

trials that validate the efficacy and safety of 3D-printed personalized therapies [106]. Without robust evidence, regulatory approval and physician confidence remain limited.

7.5 Future Prospects

Despite these challenges, the future of 3D printing in personalized medicine is highly promising. Emerging technologies such as 4D printing—where printed constructs can change shape, properties, or function over time—are expected to revolutionize regenerative medicine and drug delivery [107]. Integration with artificial intelligence (AI) and machine learning can enhance design optimization, predictive modeling, and quality control [108].

Advances in multi-material and hybrid printing will allow simultaneous incorporation of living cells, biomaterials, and growth factors to create functional tissues and organs [109]. Furthermore, as costs decline and regulatory frameworks mature, 3D printing is likely to become more accessible globally, enabling point-of-care manufacturing of personalized drugs, implants, and devices [110].

Collaborations between academia, industry, and regulatory agencies will be essential in overcoming current limitations. With continuous research, it is anticipated that 3D printing will transition from experimental applications to mainstream personalized healthcare solutions in the coming decades [111].

CONCLUSION

The integration of 3D printing into personalized medicine has transformed healthcare by enabling patient-specific solutions across pharmaceuticals, tissue engineering, and medical devices. Unlike traditional “one-size-fits-all” approaches, additive manufacturing allows the production of tailor-made therapeutics, from customized drug dosage forms to bioprinted organs that match the unique anatomical and physiological characteristics of individual patients.

The journey of 3D printing in medicine has progressed from experimental prototyping to real-world clinical applications, driven by advances in biomaterials, computational modeling, and regulatory frameworks. Personalized implants, patient-specific prosthetics, and bioprinted tissues are already demonstrating significant clinical benefits, while ongoing research explores complex structures such as functional organs and dynamic drug delivery systems .

Despite these achievements, challenges remain. Issues such as scalability, material standardization, quality assurance, and long-term biocompatibility must be addressed before widespread clinical translation. In addition, regulatory and ethical hurdles—particularly regarding bioprinted tissues and organs—require careful navigation to ensure safety, reproducibility, and equitable access .

Looking to the future, artificial intelligence (AI) integration with 3D printing holds immense promise. AI-driven design optimization, real-time quality control, and predictive modeling may accelerate the development of highly complex and functional biomedical products . Furthermore, the growing adoption of 4D printing technologies, where printed constructs evolve over time in response to external stimuli, represents a paradigm shift toward more adaptive and intelligent medical solutions .

In summary, 3D printing is no longer a futuristic vision but a rapidly advancing reality. Its ability to personalize treatment, improve patient outcomes, and reduce healthcare costs makes it one of the most impactful innovations in modern medicine.

By overcoming current limitations through interdisciplinary research, robust regulatory pathways, and ethical frameworks, 3D printing will continue to reshape personalized medicine and usher in a new era of precision healthcare.

REFERENCE

1. Ginsburg, G. S., & Phillips, K. A. (2018). Precision medicine: From science to value. Health Affairs, 37(5), 694–701. https://doi.org/10.1377/hlthaff.2017.1624
2. Hood, L., & Friend, S. H. (2011). Predictive, personalized, preventive, participatory (P4) cancer medicine. Nature Reviews Clinical Oncology, 8(3), 184–187. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrclinonc.2010.227
3. Ventola, C. L. (2014). Medical applications for 3D printing: Current and projected uses. Pharmacy and Therapeutics, 39(10), 704–711.
4. Chia, H. N., & Wu, B. M. (2015). Recent advances in 3D printing of biomaterials. Journal of Biological Engineering, 9(1), 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13036-015-0001-4
5. Martelli, N., Serrano, C., van den Brink, H., Pineau, J., Prognon, P., Borget, I., & El Batti, S. (2016). Advantages and disadvantages of 3-dimensional printing in surgery: A systematic review. Surgery, 159(6), 1485–1500. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.surg.2015.12.017
6. Prasad, L. K., & Smyth, H. (2016). 3D Printing technologies for drug delivery: A review. Drug Development and Industrial Pharmacy, 42(7), 1019–1031. https://doi.org/10.3109/03639045.2015.1120743
7. Alhnan, M. A., Okwuosa, T. C., Sadia, M., Wan, K. W., Ahmed, W., & Arafat, B. (2016). Emergence of 3D printed dosage forms: Opportunities and challenges. Pharmaceutical Research, 33(8), 1817–1832. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11095-016-1933-1
8. Murphy, S. V., & Atala, A. (2014). 3D bioprinting of tissues and organs. Nature Biotechnology, 32(8), 773–785. https://doi.org/10.1038/nbt.2958
9. Ozbolat, I. T. (2015). Bioprinting scale-up tissue and organ constructs for transplantation. Trends in Biotechnology, 33(7), 395–400. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tibtech.2015.04.005
10. Ngo, T. D., Kashani, A., Imbalzano, G., Nguyen, K. T. Q., & Hui, D. (2018). Additive manufacturing (3D printing): A review of materials, methods, applications and challenges. Composites Part B: Engineering, 143, 172–196. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compositesb.2018.02.012
11. Jamróz, W., Szafraniec, J., Kurek, M., & Jachowicz, R. (2018). 3D Printing in pharmaceutical and medical applications – Recent achievements and challenges. Pharmaceutical Research, 35(9), 176. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11095-018-2454-x
12. Ursan, I. D., Chiu, L., & Pierce, A. (2013). Three-dimensional drug printing: A structured review. Journal of the American Pharmacists Association, 53(2), 136–144. https://doi.org/10.1331/JAPhA.2013.12217
13. Guo, N., & Leu, M. C. (2013). Additive manufacturing: Technology, applications and research needs. Frontiers of Mechanical Engineering, 8(3), 215–243. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11465-013-0248-8
14. Javaid, M., & Haleem, A. (2018). Additive manufacturing applications in medical cases: A literature-based review. Alexandria

Journal of Medicine, 54(4), 411–422. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajme.2017.09.003

15. Tack, P., Victor, J., Gemmel, P., & Annemans, L. (2016). 3D-printing techniques in a medical setting: A systematic literature review. BioMedical Engineering OnLine, 15(1), 115. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12938-016-0236-4
16. Melocchi, A., Parietti, F., Maroni, A., Foppoli, A., Gazzaniga, A., & Zema, L. (2016). Hot-melt extruded filaments based on pharmaceutical grade polymers for 3D printing by fused deposition modeling. International Journal of Pharmaceutics, 509(1-2), 255–263. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpharm.2016.05.036
17. Bose, S., Ke, D., Sahasrabudhe, H., & Bandyopadhyay, A. (2018). Additive manufacturing of biomaterials. Progress in Materials Science, 93, 45–111. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pmatsci.2017.08.003
18. Goyanes, A., Buanz, A. B., Basit, A. W., & Gaisford, S. (2014). Fused-filament 3D printing (3DP) for fabrication of tablets. International Journal of Pharmaceutics, 476(1-2), 88–92. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpharm.2014.09.044
19. Mandrycky, C., Wang, Z., Kim, K., & Kim, D. H. (2016). 3D bioprinting for engineering complex tissues. Biotechnology Advances, 34(4), 422–434. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biotechadv.2015.12.011
20. Malda, J., Visser, J., Melchels, F. P., Jüngst, T., Hennink, W. E., Dhert, W. J., … & Groll, J. (2013). 25th anniversary article: Engineering hydrogels for biofabrication. Advanced Materials, 25(36), 5011–5028. https://doi.org/10.1002/adma.201302042
21. Chimene, D., Lennox, K. K., Kaunas, R. R., & Gaharwar, A. K. (2016). Advanced bioinks for 3D printing: A materials science perspective. Annals of Biomedical Engineering, 44(6), 2090–2102. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10439-016-1638-y
22. Mitsouras, D., Liacouras, P., Imanzadeh, A., Giannopoulos, A. A., Cai, T., Kumamaru, K. K., … & Rybicki, F. J. (2015). Medical 3D printing for the radiologist. Radiographics, 35(7), 1965–1988. https://doi.org/10.1148/rg.2015140320
23. Gross, B. C., Erkal, J. L., Lockwood, S. Y., Chen, C., & Spence, D. M. (2014). Evaluation of 3D printing and its potential impact on biotechnology and the chemical sciences. Analytical Chemistry, 86(7), 3240–3253. https://doi.org/10.1021/ac403397r
24. Martelli, N., Serrano, C., van den Brink, H., Pineau, J., Prognon, P., Borget, I., & El Batti, S. (2016). Advantages and disadvantages of 3-dimensional printing in surgery: A systematic review. Surgery, 159(6), 1485–1500. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.surg.2015.12.017
25. Momeni, F., Liu, X., & Ni, J. (2017). A review of 4D printing. Materials & Design, 122, 42–79. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.matdes.2017.02.068
26. Khaled, S. A., Burley, J. C., Alexander, M. R., & Roberts, C. J. (2014). Desktop 3D printing of controlled release pharmaceutical bilayer tablets. International Journal of Pharmaceutics, 461(1-2), 105–111. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpharm.2013.11.021
27. Goyanes, A., Chang, H., Sedough, D., Hatton, G. B., Wang, J., Buanz, A., … & Basit, A. W. (2015). Fabrication of controlled-release budesonide tablets via

desktop (FDM) 3D printing. International Journal of Pharmaceutics, 496(2), 414–420. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpharm.2015.10.039

28. Alomari, M., Mohamed, F. H., Basit, A. W., & Gaisford, S. (2015). Personalised dosing: Printing a dose of one's own medicine. International Journal of Pharmaceutics, 494(2), 568–577. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpharm.2014.12.006
29. Khaled, S. A., Burley, J. C., Alexander, M. R., & Roberts, C. J. (2015). 3D printing of tablets containing multiple drugs with defined release profiles. International Journal of Pharmaceutics, 494(2), 643–650. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpharm.2015.07.067
30. Scoutaris, N., Ross, S. A., Douroumis, D., & Chowdhry, B. Z. (2011). 3D printed controlled release drug delivery devices. Journal of Controlled Release, 156(2), 179–185. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jconrel.2011.07.002
31. Johnson, A. R., & Procopio, A. T. (2019). Low-cost additive manufacturing of microneedle masters. Micromachines, 10(1), 41. https://doi.org/10.3390/mi10010041
32. Pere, C. P., Economidou, S. N., Lall, G., Ziraud, C., Boateng, J. S., Alexander, B. D., … & Douroumis, D. (2018). 3D printed microneedles for insulin skin delivery. International Journal of Pharmaceutics, 544(2), 425–432. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpharm.2018.04.055
33. Melocchi, A., Uboldi, M., Cerea, M., Foppoli, A., Maroni, A., Moutaharrik, S., … & Gazzaniga, A. (2019). 3D printing by fused deposition modeling of single- and multi-compartment hollow systems for oral drug delivery: Design and in vitro testing. European Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences, 130, 31–39. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejps.2019.01.018
34. Ho, C. M., Ng, S. H., Li, K. H., & Yoon, Y. J. (2015). 3D printed microfluidics for biological applications. Lab on a Chip, 15(18), 3627–3637. https://doi.org/10.1039/C5LC00685F
35. Trenfield, S. J., Awad, A., Goyanes, A., Gaisford, S., & Basit, A. W. (2018). 3D printing pharmaceuticals: Drug development to frontline care. Trends in Pharmacological Sciences, 39(5), 440–451. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tips.2018.02.006
36. Xu, X., Robles-Martinez, P., Madla, C. M., Joubert, F., Goyanes, A., Basit, A. W., & Gaisford, S. (2021). Inkjet printing of pharmaceutical solid dosage forms. International Journal of Pharmaceutics, 593, 120081. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpharm.2020.120081
37. Seoane-Viaño, I., Trenfield, S. J., Basit, A. W., & Goyanes, A. (2019). Translating 3D printed pharmaceuticals: From hype to real-world clinical applications. Advanced Drug Delivery Reviews, 174, 553–575. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.addr.2019.07.001
38. Jamróz, W., Kurek, M., Łyszczarz, E., Szafraniec, J., Knapik-Kowalczuk, J., Syrek, K., … & Jachowicz, R. (2018). 3D printing in pharmaceutical and medical applications – Recent achievements and challenges. Pharmaceutical Research, 35(9), 176. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11095-018-2454-x
39. Holländer, J., Genina, N., Jukarainen, H., Khajeheian, M., Rosling, A., Mäkilä, E., … & Sandler, N. (2016). Three-dimensional printed PCL-based implantable devices for sustained drug release. International Journal of Pharmaceutics, 517(1-2), 119–125.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpharm.2016.11.002

40. Li, V. C., Dunn, C. K., Zhang, Z., Deng, Y., & Qi, H. J. (2017). Direct ink writing of 3D and 4D materials into transformative structures. Science Advances, 3(9), eaao5496. https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.aao5496
41. Murphy, S. V., & Atala, A. (2014). 3D bioprinting of tissues and organs. Nature Biotechnology, 32(8), 773–785. https://doi.org/10.1038/nbt.2958
42. Ozbolat, I. T. (2015). Bioprinting scale-up tissue and organ constructs for transplantation. Trends in Biotechnology, 33(7), 395–400. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tibtech.2015.04.005
43. Derby, B. (2012). Printing and prototyping of tissues and scaffolds. Science, 338(6109), 921–926. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1226340
44. Mandrycky, C., Wang, Z., Kim, K., & Kim, D. H. (2016). 3D bioprinting for engineering complex tissues. Biotechnology Advances, 34(4), 422–434. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biotechadv.2015.12.011
45. Guillotin, B., & Guillemot, F. (2011). Cell patterning technologies for organotypic tissue fabrication. Trends in Biotechnology, 29(4), 183–190. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tibtech.2010.12.008
46. Lee, K. Y., & Mooney, D. J. (2012). Alginate: Properties and biomedical applications. Progress in Polymer Science, 37(1), 106–126. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.progpolymsci.2011.06.003
47. Woodfield, T. B. F., Malda, J., de Wijn, J., Péters, F., & Riesle, J. (2004). Design of porous scaffolds for cartilage tissue engineering using a three-dimensional fiber-deposition technique. Biomaterials, 25(18), 4149–4161. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biomaterials.2003.10.056
48. Li, X., Liu, B., Pei, B., Chen, J., & Zhou, D. (2020). Progress in 3D printing technology for tissue engineering. Biomaterials, 232, 119744. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biomaterials.2019.119744
49. Bose, S., Vahabzadeh, S., & Bandyopadhyay, A. (2013). Bone tissue engineering using 3D printing. Materials Today, 16(12), 496–504. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mattod.2013.11.017
50. Levato, R., Webb, W. R., Otto, I. A., Mensinga, A., Zhang, Y., van Rijen, M., … Malda, J. (2017). The bio in the ink: Cartilage regeneration with bioprintable hydrogels and articular chondrocytes. Acta Biomaterialia, 61, 41–53. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actbio.2017.08.005
51. Pourchet, L. J., Thepot, A., Albouy, M., Courtial, E. J., & Lotfi, S. (2017). Human skin 3D bioprinting using scaffold-free approaches. Journal of Tissue Engineering and Regenerative Medicine, 11(6), 1376–1385. https://doi.org/10.1002/term.2097
52. Kolesky, D. B., Homan, K. A., Skylar-Scott, M. A., & Lewis, J. A. (2016). Three-dimensional bioprinting of thick vascularized tissues. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 113(12), 3179–3184. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1521342113
53. Zhang, Y. S., Arneri, A., Bersini, S., Shin, S. R., Zhu, K., Goli-Malekabadi, Z., … Khademhosseini, A. (2016). Bioprinting 3D microfibrous scaffolds for engineering

endothelialized myocardium and heart-on-a-chip. Biomaterials, 110, 45–59. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biomaterials.2016.09.003

54. Takebe, T., & Wells, J. M. (2019). Organoids by design. Science, 364(6444), 956–959. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aaw7567
55. Jamal, M., Kadam, S. S., Xiao, R., & Jabbari, E. (2019). Artificial intelligence in 3D bioprinting for tissue engineering. Tissue Engineering Part A, 25(21-22), 1566–1578. https://doi.org/10.1089/ten.tea.2019.0142
56. Gungor-Ozkerim, P. S., Inci, I., Zhang, Y. S., Khademhosseini, A., & Dokmeci, M. R. (2018). Bioinks for 3D bioprinting: An overview. Biomaterials Science, 6(5), 915–946. https://doi.org/10.1039/C7BM00765E
57. Kirillova, A., Maxson, R., Stoychev, G., Gomillion, C. T., & Ionov, L. (2017). 4D biofabrication using shape-morphing hydrogels. Advanced Materials, 29(46), 1703443. https://doi.org/10.1002/adma.201703443
58. Ventola, C. L. (2014). Medical applications for 3D printing: Current and projected uses. P&T, 39(10), 704–711.
59. Murphy, S. V., & Atala, A. (2014). 3D bioprinting of tissues and organs. Nature Biotechnology, 32(8), 773–785.
60. Rengier, F., Mehndiratta, A., von Tengg-Kobligk, H., Zechmann, C. M., Unterhinninghofen, R., Kauczor, H. U., & Giesel, F. L. (2010). 3D printing based on imaging data: Review of medical applications. International Journal of Computer Assisted Radiology and Surgery, 5(4), 335–341.
61. Zadpoor, A. A. (2019). Design for additive bio-manufacturing: From patient-specific medical devices to rationally designed meta-biomaterials. International Journal of Molecular Sciences, 20(7), 1641.
62. Zuniga, J. M., Katsavelis, D., Peck, J. L., Stollberg, J., Petrykowski, M., Carson, A., & Fernandez, C. (2015). Cyborg beast: A low-cost 3D-printed prosthetic hand for children with upper-limb differences. BMC Research Notes, 8(1), 10.
63. Mavroidis, C., Ranky, R. G., Sivak, M. L., Patritti, B. L., DiPisa, J., Caddle, A., ... & Brabazon, D. (2011). Patient-specific ankle-foot orthoses using rapid prototyping. Journal of NeuroEngineering and Rehabilitation, 8(1), 1–9.
64. Zuniga, J., & E-Nable Community. (2016). Open-source 3D-printed prosthetics for humanitarian efforts. The Lancet, 387(10022), 178–179.
65. Wong, K. C. (2016). 3D-printed patient-specific applications in orthopedics. Orthopedic Research and Reviews, 8, 57–66.
66. Murr, L. E., Gaytan, S. M., Medina, F., Lopez, H., Martinez, E., Machado, B. I., ... & Wicker, R. B. (2010). Next-generation biomedical implants using additive manufacturing of complex, cellular, and functional mesh arrays. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences, 368(1917), 1999–2032.
67. Dawood, A., Marti, B. M., Sauret-Jackson, V., & Darwood, A. (2015). 3D printing in dentistry. British Dental Journal, 219(11), 521–529.
68. Tack, P., Victor, J., Gemmel, P., & Annemans, L. (2016). 3D-printing techniques in a medical setting: A systematic literature review. BioMedical Engineering Online, 15(1), 115.
69. Niinomi, M. (2010). Metals for biomedical devices. Woodhead Publishing.

70. Chia, H. N., & Wu, B. M. (2015). Recent advances in 3D printing of biomaterials. Journal of Biological Engineering, 9(1), 4.
71. Bose, S., Vahabzadeh, S., & Bandyopadhyay, A. (2013). Bone tissue engineering using 3D printing. Materials Today, 16(12), 496–504.
72. Bártolo, P., Kruth, J. P., Silva, J., Levy, G., Malshe, A., Rajurkar, K., ... & Leu, M. (2012). Biomedical production of implants by additive electro-chemical and physical processes. CIRP Annals, 61(2), 635–655.
73. U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA). (2017). Technical considerations for additive manufactured medical devices. FDA Guidance Document.
74. Martelli, N., Serrano, C., van den Brink, H., Pineau, J., Prognon, P., Borget, I., & El Batti, S. (2016). Advantages and disadvantages of 3D printing in surgery: A systematic review. Surgery, 159(6), 1485–1500.
75. Mazzoli, A. (2013). Selective laser sintering in biomedical engineering. Medical & Biological Engineering & Computing, 51(3), 245–256.
76. Food and Drug Administration. (2017). Technical considerations for additive manufactured medical devices: Guidance for industry and Food and Drug Administration staff. Silver Spring, MD: FDA.
77. Morrison, R. J., et al. (2015). Regulatory considerations in the design and manufacturing of implantable 3D-printed medical devices. Clinical and Translational Science, 8(5), 594–600. https://doi.org/10.1111/cts.12315
78. Norman, J., Madurawe, R. D., Moore, C. M., Khan, M. A., & Khairuzzaman, A. (2017). A new chapter in pharmaceutical manufacturing: 3D-printed drug products. Advanced Drug Delivery Reviews, 108, 39–50. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.addr.2016.03.001
79. European Parliament & Council. (2017). Regulation (EU) 2017/745 on medical devices (MDR). Official Journal of the European Union.
80. Gao, C., et al. (2019). Regulatory landscape of 3D-printed medical devices in China. Bio-Design and Manufacturing, 2(4), 257–264. https://doi.org/10.1007/s42242-019-00047-0
81. Nagamine, K., et al. (2020). Regulatory framework for 3D printed medical devices in Japan: Current status and future prospects. 3D Printing in Medicine, 6(1), 12. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41205-020-00064-7
82. CDSCO. (2021). Draft guidance on medical device regulation in India. Central Drugs Standard Control Organization, Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, Government of India.
83. Ventola, C. L. (2014). Medical applications for 3D printing: Ethical issues and patient safety. P&T, 39(10), 703–711.
84. Li, X., & Fang, L. (2018). Intellectual property challenges in 3D printing: A healthcare perspective. Journal of Intellectual Property Law & Practice, 13(9), 732–740. https://doi.org/10.1093/jiplp/jpy057
85. Clarke, P., & Swain, S. (2020). 3D printing for global health equity: Opportunities and barriers. BMJ Global Health, 5(7), e002919. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjgh-2020-002919
86. Bose, S., Vahabzadeh, S., & Bandyopadhyay, A. (2018). Bone tissue engineering using 3D printing. Materials Today, 16(12), 496–504. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mattod.2013.11.017

87. ISO. (2016). ISO 13485:2016—Medical devices—Quality management systems—Requirements for regulatory purposes. Geneva: International Organization for Standardization.
88. Rankin, T. M., et al. (2014). Three-dimensional printing surgical instruments: Are we there yet? Journal of Surgical Research, 189(2), 193–197. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jss.2014.02.020
89. ISO/ASTM. (2021). ISO/ASTM 52900:2021—Additive manufacturing—General principles—Fundamentals and vocabulary. Geneva: ISO.
90. Alhnan, M. A., et al. (2016). Emergence of 3D printed dosage forms: Opportunities and challenges. Pharmaceutical Research, 33(8), 1817–1832. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11095-016-1933-1
91. Martínez-Moreno, J., et al. (2021). Blockchain in healthcare: A new tool for regulatory compliance and traceability of 3D printed devices. Journal of Medical Systems, 45(9), 87. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10916-021-01778-y
92. Yeong, W. Y., et al. (2019). Ethical and regulatory issues in bioprinting: The future of organ fabrication. 3D Printing and Additive Manufacturing, 6(1), 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1089/3dp.2018.0161
93. Murphy, S. V., & Atala, A. (2014). 3D bioprinting of tissues and organs. Nature Biotechnology, 32(8), 773–785. https://doi.org/10.1038/nbt.2958
94. Derby, B. (2012). Printing and prototyping of tissues and scaffolds. Science, 338(6109), 921–926. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1226340
95. Ventola, C. L. (2014). Medical applications for 3D printing: Current and projected uses. P&T, 39(10), 704–711.
96. Ozbolat, I. T. (2015). Bioprinting scale-up tissue and organ constructs for transplantation. Trends in Biotechnology, 33(7), 395–400. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tibtech.2015.04.005
97. Melchels, F. P. W., Domingos, M. A. N., & Malda, J. (2012). Additive manufacturing of tissues and organs. Progress in Polymer Science, 37(8), 1079–1104. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.progpolymsci.2011.11.007
98. Thomas, D. J., & Gilbert, S. W. (2014). Costs and cost effectiveness of additive manufacturing: A literature review. NIST Special Publication. https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.SP.1176
99. Ligon, S. C., Liska, R., Stampfl, J., Gurr, M., & Mülhaupt, R. (2017). Polymers for 3D printing and customized additive manufacturing. Chemical Reviews, 117(15), 10212–10290. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.chemrev.7b00074
100. Food and Drug Administration (FDA). (2017). Technical considerations for additive manufactured medical devices. Guidance for Industry and Food and Drug Administration Staff.
101. Morrison, R. J., Kashlan, K. N., Flanangan, C. L., Wright, J. K., Green, G. E., Hollister, S. J., & Weatherwax, K. J. (2015). Regulatory considerations in the design and manufacturing of implantable 3D-printed medical devices. Clinical and Translational Science, 8(5), 594–600. https://doi.org/10.1111/cts.12255
102. Poushneh, A. (2021). Impact of 3D printing on global health care access. Health Policy and Technology, 10(4), 100569. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hlpt.2021.100569

103. McDonald, S., & Siegel, D. S. (2021). Self-production and 3D printing: Implications for healthcare policy. Research Policy, 50(9), 104365. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2021.104365
104. Zhang, Y. S., & Khademhosseini, A. (2017). Advances in engineering hydrogels. Science, 356(6337), eaaf3627. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aaf3627
105. Mandrycky, C., Wang, Z., Kim, K., & Kim, D. H. (2016). 3D bioprinting for engineering complex tissues. Biotechnology Advances, 34(4), 422–434. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biotechadv.2015.12.011
106. Bishop, E. S., Mostafa, S., Pakvasa, M., Luu, H. H., Lee, M. J., Wolf, J. M., ... & He, T. C. (2017). 3D bioprinting technologies in tissue engineering and regenerative medicine: Current and future trends. Genes & Diseases, 4(4), 185–195. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gendis.2017.10.002
107. Tibbits, S. (2014). 4D printing: Multi-material shape change. Architectural Design, 84(1), 116–121. https://doi.org/10.1002/ad.1710
108. Gerbers, R., Lefering, R., & Hofmann, M. (2020). AI in 3D printing for personalized medicine. Artificial Intelligence in Medicine, 102, 101753. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.artmed.2019.101753
109. Daly, A. C., Freeman, F. E., Gonzalez-Fernandez, T., Critchley, S. E., Nulty, J., & Kelly, D. J. (2017). 3D bioprinting for cartilage and osteochondral tissue engineering. Advanced Healthcare Materials, 6(22), 1700298. https://doi.org/10.1002/adhm.201700298
110. Prasad, L. K., & Smyth, H. (2016). 3D printing technologies for drug delivery: A review. Drug Development and Industrial Pharmacy, 42(7), 1019–1031. https://doi.org/10.3109/03639045.2015.1120743
111. Li, J., Chen, M., Fan, X., & Zhou, H. (2016). Recent advances in bioprinting techniques: Approaches, applications and future prospects. Journal of Translational Medicine, 14(1), 271. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12967-016-1028-0

HOW TO CITE: Sachin Karwar, Pravin Bhosale, Tejas Kudnar, Pratik Holkar, Vishwajeet Rashinkar, Yogesh Patil, 3D Printing in Personalized Medicine: Current Status and Future Prospects, Int. J. of Pharm. Sci., 2025, Vol 3, Issue 11, 3594-3614. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17686372