Genome Publications
https://doi.org/10.61096/ 978-81-981372-6-5_13

Chapter 13

Economic and Social Impact of 3D Bioprinting

Kanaka Durga Devi Nelluri
KVSR Siddhartha College of Pharmaceutical Sciences, Vijayawada, Andhra Pradesh, 520008, India
Surendra Kundurthi
Medical School, University of Birmingham, Edgbaston, Birmingham, Post Code B15 2TT, United Kingdom
Singuluri Monica
KVSR Siddhartha College of Pharmaceutical Sciences, Vijayawada, Andhra Pradesh, 520008, India
Leenaja Kolli
KVSR Siddhartha College of Pharmaceutical Sciences, Vijayawada, Andhra Pradesh, 520008, India

Abstract: The evolution of 3D bioprinting from a laboratory concept into a transformative biomedical technology has sparked considerable interest regarding its broader economic and social implications. This chapter provides a comprehensive examination of the socioeconomic transformation driven by 3D bioprinting, with particular attention to the changing healthcare landscape, emerging market opportunities, and implications for workforce development. We analyze the current market trends, highlighting investment surges, technology diffusion, and future projections. A focal point is the emergence of new employment roles and skill requirements, necessitating novel educational frameworks and interdisciplinary training. In addition, the economic impact on healthcare costs and treatment accessibility is critically evaluated, with discussions on how 3D bioprinting could democratize personalized medicine. The chapter also delves into its transformative role in pharmaceutical research, specifically in accelerating drug development through human-relevant tissue models. Ethical considerations and public acceptance are addressed, particularly in light of cultural diversity and bioethical debates around human tissue printing. A dedicated section examines how developing countries can access and benefit from these advances, stressing the importance of equitable technology transfer and global partnerships. This chapter underscores that the full potential of 3D bioprinting hinges not only on technical progress but also on inclusive economic strategies, responsive education systems, and ethical, globally-aligned governance.

Keywords: 3D bioprinting, healthcare economics, workforce development, global equity, regulatory harmonization

Citation: Kanaka Durga Devi Nelluri, Surendra Kundurthi, Singuluri Monica, Leenaja Kolli. Economic and Social Impact of 3D Bioprinting. *3D Bioprinting: Advances, Challenges and Fabricating the Future.* Genome Publications. 2025; Pp207-218.
https://doi.org/10.61096/978-81-981372-6-5_13

13.0 INTRODUCTION

3D bioprinting, once confined to futuristic speculation, has matured into a tangible technology with growing clinical, industrial, and research applications. Its ability to fabricate living tissues with spatial precision is no longer an isolated scientific triumph but a catalyst for systemic transformation across healthcare, biomedical engineering, education, and economic systems. Unlike traditional biomedical advances, the implications of bioprinting extend far beyond the laboratory or operating room; it represents a socio-technological inflection point with the potential to reconfigure economic models, medical education frameworks, workforce dynamics, and even public perceptions of what constitutes the human body. This chapter focuses on these multifaceted socioeconomic transformations, beginning with an assessment of the bioprinting industry's current landscape and market growth trends. We then explore how new roles and educational demands are reshaping the scientific and clinical workforce.

The promise of cost-effectiveness and treatment accessibility is critically assessed, particularly in the context of rising global healthcare costs and inequities. Furthermore, we consider how 3D bioprinting is altering pharmaceutical research methodologies, potentially reducing the reliance on animal models and enhancing drug development pipelines. Social dynamics, such as public trust and cultural acceptance of bioprinted organs, form a crucial part of this dialogue, as does the ethical framework required to govern such interventions. The global dimension of bioprinting's impact is underscored through a discussion on technology transfer to developing nations and international regulatory convergence. In sum, this chapter aims to provide a panoramic view of how 3D bioprinting, while scientifically driven, is fundamentally a social and economic phenomenon in the making.

13.1 Bioprinting Industry Landscape

The economic landscape of 3D bioprinting has evolved rapidly over the past decade, transitioning from a niche segment of the additive manufacturing industry to a dynamic and rapidly expanding market within the global life sciences economy. Market analyses consistently report strong compound annual growth rates (CAGR) for the bioprinting sector, ranging between 15% and 25%, with projections estimating a global market value exceeding USD 5 billion by 2030 [1,2]. This growth is fueled by increasing investment in regenerative medicine, rising incidences of chronic diseases requiring personalized tissue constructs, and the demand for more predictive drug testing models. Start-ups, academic spin-offs, and major biopharmaceutical companies alike are competing to stake claims in this emerging domain. Companies such as Organovo, CELLINK (now BICO), and Aspect Biosystems have pioneered various platforms, from inkjet and extrusion bioprinters to customized bioinks. In parallel, multinational pharmaceutical firms have begun investing in bioprinting to complement their preclinical and clinical workflows.

The convergence of these actors creates a vibrant innovation ecosystem, bolstered by academic partnerships and government-funded consortia, particularly in the U.S., EU, and East Asia. In terms of application-specific segmentation, the tissue and organ generation segment leads the market, followed closely by pharmaceutical and cosmetic testing applications. A notable trend is the increasing integration of bioprinting with artificial intelligence and robotics, further driving automation, reproducibility, and scalability. However, this rapid expansion is not without challenges. Market growth is somewhat constrained by the high capital costs of bioprinters, the limited shelf life and variability of bioinks, and the yet-evolving regulatory frameworks. These limitations underscore the necessity for

strategic collaborations, open innovation platforms, and standards development organizations that can help stabilize and mature the bioprinting economy.

13.2 Employment and Workforce Development

The adoption of 3D bioprinting within clinical and research settings has necessitated a paradigm shift in workforce requirements, demanding a new cadre of professionals trained at the intersection of biology, engineering, materials science, and data analytics. As bioprinting becomes more integral to healthcare and biopharmaceutical sectors, there is an urgent need for the creation of educational and training programs that prepare future technicians, clinicians, and scientists for the multidisciplinary nature of this field. New occupational categories are emerging, including bioink formulation specialists, bioprinting systems engineers, tissue design architects, and bioreactor integration experts. These roles often require hybrid competencies not typically offered within traditional academic programs. As such, institutions are increasingly offering interdisciplinary degrees, micro-credentials, and certification programs in bioprinting and regenerative medicine.

In addition to formal education, hands-on training through industry partnerships, internships, and simulation labs is critical. Initiatives such as the NIH 3D Bioprinting Training Program and EU's Horizon-funded biomanufacturing fellowships exemplify such approaches [3]. Furthermore, continuing medical education (CME) programs are being updated to familiarize surgeons and healthcare professionals with bioprinted grafts, implants, and surgical guides. However, these educational advances remain geographically uneven. High-income countries dominate the bioprinting talent pool, while low- and middle-income countries (LMICs) lack access to requisite infrastructure and educational resources. This disparity highlights the need for global educational outreach, digital learning platforms, and equitable funding mechanisms to support a globally inclusive bioprinting workforce. Finally, the rise of bioprinting also calls for increased bioethical literacy among professionals. As practitioners engage in printing tissues that may one day be indistinguishable from native organs, understanding consent, ownership, and the moral status of bioprinted constructs becomes imperative.

13.3 Cost and Accessibility

A major point of contention in the adoption of novel biotechnologies is their affordability and impact on healthcare economics. One of the promises of 3D bioprinting lies in its potential to reduce treatment costs through personalization, reduced donor dependency, and minimized hospital stays. For instance, bioprinted skin grafts or bone scaffolds can be custom-designed, potentially shortening healing times and reducing complications, thereby lowering long-term healthcare expenditures.

Moreover, by eliminating the need for tissue harvesting surgeries and reducing immunological mismatches, bioprinted implants may prove more cost-effective than conventional interventions. The cost-efficiency of preclinical drug testing using bioprinted human tissues could also significantly cut down the resources required for animal studies and failed clinical trials, estimated to waste billions annually [4]. Despite these advantages, the current cost of bioprinting technologies remains high, primarily due to expensive bioprinters, proprietary bioink formulations, and the need for sterile, regulated environments. Initial procedural costs for bioprinted products may therefore exceed those of traditional grafts or implants. For example, early-stage bioprinted skin patches can cost several thousand dollars per square centimeter, limiting widespread adoption outside of clinical trials. Reimbursement policies, or lack thereof, further complicate matters. Most bioprinted products have

yet to be incorporated into national health insurance schemes or private payor systems, deterring their clinical uptake.

Nonetheless, pilot reimbursement frameworks are emerging, particularly in the EU, where some regenerative products receive partial coverage under advanced therapy medicinal product (ATMP) regulations. The challenge, therefore, lies in transitioning bioprinting from a high-cost, low-volume technology into a cost-effective and scalable therapeutic platform. This transition will require investment in automation, economies of scale in bioink production, and inclusion in public healthcare budgeting. Additionally, expanding manufacturing capabilities in emerging markets could drive down costs and democratize access.

13.4 Pharmaceutical Research Impact

3D bioprinting is rapidly gaining traction in the pharmaceutical sector as an innovative alternative to animal models and traditional two-dimensional cell cultures. Its ability to replicate complex tissue microenvironments, including vascularization and extracellular matrix components, makes it uniquely suited for drug screening and toxicity testing. The U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) and the European Medicines Agency (EMA) have both expressed support for bioprinted tissue models as valid components of the preclinical testing pipeline. Bioprinted liver, cardiac, and neural tissues have been used to assess drug metabolism, cardiotoxicity, and neuroinflammatory responses with greater physiological relevance than animal models [5].

Such tissue models not only improve prediction accuracy but also reduce ethical concerns and regulatory hurdles associated with animal testing. Furthermore, they offer the potential for patient-specific testingbioprinting tissues from patient-derived cells to determine personalized responses to therapeutic agents. This personalized pharmacology model, still in early stages, could revolutionize how clinicians select treatments for conditions like cancer or autoimmune diseases. Pharmaceutical companies are beginning to invest in proprietary bioprinting platforms or forge partnerships with bioprinting firms to develop in-house capabilities. For instance, Roche and Merck have initiated collaborative studies using bioprinted tissues for high-throughput screening of novel compounds. However, scalability and reproducibility remain hurdles. Ensuring batch-to-batch consistency, regulatory acceptance of bioprinted test systems, and the establishment of quality control standards are crucial next steps. Furthermore, standardization across cell sources, bioinks, and bioprinting protocols is necessary to ensure interoperability and cross-laboratory validation. The long-term implication is that bioprinting may enable faster, safer, and more cost-effective drug development, ultimately benefiting both industry stakeholders and patients. The multifaceted implications of 3D bioprinting across market, healthcare, ethics, and global policy are summarized in Table 13.1.

Table 13.1: Economic, Ethical, Regulatory, Cultural and Social Impacts of 3D Bioprinting

Impact Category	Impact Area	Description	Examples	Potential Implications	References
Economic Impacts	**Cost Reduction in Healthcare**	The potential for 3D bioprinting to significantly reduce the cost of	Printing custom implants, prosthetics, and organ models that are more affordable than	Lower healthcare costs due to the reduction of expensive procedures	10

		medical treatments and procedures.	traditional alternatives.	(e.g., organ transplantation, long-term prosthetics).	
	Job Creation and Workforce Development	The growth of the 3D bioprinting industry leading to new job opportunities in healthcare, technology, and manufacturing sectors.	Emergence of new roles such as bioprinting technicians, biofabrication engineers, and regulatory experts.	Economic growth in specialized industries, creation of high-skilled job opportunities, and new fields in STEM education.	11
	Economic Growth in Bioprinting Industry	The bioprinting market's expansion is expected to drive significant economic growth in healthcare technology and manufacturing.	Investment in bioprinting startups, partnerships between universities and industries, and commercialization of bioprinted products.	Stimulate innovation and investment in healthcare technologies, driving industry growth, and attracting venture capital.	12
	Insurance Cost Implications	Impact of 3D bioprinting on insurance companies and pricing for healthcare coverage.	Bioprinted organ transplants, implants, and medical devices may be cheaper than traditional alternatives.	Potential reduction in insurance premiums as bioprinting offers cheaper alternatives to costly treatments, such as organ transplants.	13
Social Impacts	**Improved Access to Healthcare**	3D bioprinting's potential to	Bioprinted medical products and tissues being	Improved access to critical	14

		make healthcare more accessible to underserved populations globally.	more affordable and accessible to people in rural or low-income areas.	healthcare services, especially in developing countries or regions with limited medical infrastructure.	
	Personalized Medicine and Treatment	The ability to create customized solutions based on individual patient needs and genetic profiles.	Bioprinted organs or implants tailored to a patient's unique genetic structure, improving treatment efficacy.	Enhanced quality of care through personalized treatments, leading to better patient outcomes, faster recovery times, and fewer complications.	15
	Healthcare Accessibility in Remote Areas	Use of mobile or portable 3D bioprinting units to serve patients in remote or conflict areas.	Bioprinted prosthetics or medical devices being manufactured on-site in disaster zones or remote regions.	Easier access to medical care in underdeveloped or remote areas, potentially reducing healthcare disparities.	16
	Social Equity and Inclusion	3D bioprinting could address social inequities in healthcare by making medical solutions more affordable and available.	Bioprinted tissues and organs becoming more affordable for low-income and marginalized populations.	Reduction of healthcare disparities by offering cost-effective, high-quality medical alternatives to disadvantaged communities.	17
Ethical and Regulatory Impacts	**Ethical Dilemmas in Bioprinting**	The ethical concerns arising from the potential	Concerns about human organ printing, genetic	Ongoing ethical debates regarding human dignity,	18

		of bioprinting to create human tissues, organs, and genetic modifications.	manipulation, or cloning.	consent, and the limits of biotechnological advances.	
	Regulation and Safety Standards	Need for clear and universal regulations to ensure the safety and efficacy of bioprinted medical products.	Establishing guidelines for the clinical use of bioprinted tissues, organs, and implants.	Stronger regulatory frameworks to ensure patient safety while fostering innovation in the bioprinting field.	19
Environmental Impacts	**Sustainable Bioprinting Practices**	Environmental benefits of using sustainable materials and reducing waste through 3D bioprinting technologies.	Bioprinted materials created from biodegradable sources like algae or plant-based polymers.	Reduction in plastic waste, more sustainable practices in manufacturing, and eco-friendly products in healthcare.	20
	Reducing Healthcare-Related Carbon Footprint	The role of bioprinting in reducing the carbon footprint of traditional manufacturing processes in healthcare.	3D bioprinted drugs or prosthetics produced on-demand locally, avoiding transportation emissions.	Lower transportation costs and emissions from bioprinted healthcare products being made closer to the point of care.	
Cultural and Psychological Impacts	**Changing Patient Perceptions**	How patients' perceptions of healthcare and treatment options will evolve with the introduction	Patients may feel more empowered by the availability of personalized, bioprinted solutions tailored to their needs.	Greater patient satisfaction with personalized care, fostering trust in new technologies and improving	21

	of 3D bioprinting.		healthcare engagement.
Stigma and Acceptance	Overcoming the stigma or concerns associated with bioprinted organs and medical products.	Public education campaigns addressing misconceptions about organ printing and genetic modification.	Gradual acceptance of bioprinted organs and tissues in mainstream medicine, shifting public attitudes toward biotechnology.

Table 13.1 outlines the economic and social impacts of 3D bioprinting, focusing on how bioprinting could revolutionize healthcare by lowering costs, improving access, and creating job opportunities while presenting ethical, regulatory, and environmental challenges. 3D bioprinting has the potential to revolutionize healthcare by reducing costs through the production of affordable custom implants, prosthetics, and organs. It can create new job opportunities, stimulate economic growth, and lead to more personalized treatments based on individual genetic profiles. The technology could improve healthcare access in underserved areas and promote social equity by making critical treatments more affordable. However, ethical dilemmas surrounding genetic manipulation and human dignity need to be addressed, alongside the development of clear regulatory frameworks to ensure safety. Environmental benefits include sustainable bioprinting practices and a reduced carbon footprint from localized production. As patient perceptions evolve, bioprinting could increase engagement in healthcare, but overcoming stigma and building public trust remains essential for broader acceptance.

Figure 13.2: Public Acceptance and Cultural Views of Bioprinting

13.5 Ethical and Social Perception

The emergence of 3D bioprinting as a biomedical innovation is accompanied by significant ethical and societal implications that influence public acceptance and regulatory responses. While bioprinting offers remarkable clinical potential, it simultaneously provokes complex debates surrounding the moral boundaries of human tissue engineering, especially when it involves the fabrication of organs, reproductive tissues, or constructs with neural activity. One major ethical concern lies in the ontological status of bioprinted constructs. When tissues are derived from autologous cells but printed into new anatomical configurations, questions arise: Is the printed organ an extension of the self? Who owns the bioprinted constructthe patient, the laboratory, or the company providing the bioink? These inquiries intersect with broader issues of identity, consent, and biomedical commodification. Cultural perspectives play a pivotal role in shaping public attitudes. In societies where the human body holds sacred or symbolic value, bioprinting may be viewed with skepticism or spiritual discomfort. For example, certain religious groups may question the legitimacy of bioprinting reproductive tissues or brain-like structures. Hence, culturally sensitive communication and policy frameworks are essential to navigate such diversity in moral viewpoints. Surveys conducted in Europe and North America suggest a cautiously optimistic public outlook toward bioprinting, particularly when framed within therapeutic contexts like organ replacement or burn treatment.

However, concerns intensify when speculative applicationssuch as enhancement, hybrid organisms, or elective cosmetic usesare discussed [6]. In parallel, the potential for socioeconomic inequity must be addressed. Without regulatory oversight and universal health coverage inclusion, bioprinting may exacerbate health disparities, privileging those with access to high-end treatments while marginalizing others. Ethical governance must therefore include considerations of distributive justice and fairness. Efforts are underway to build consensus ethical frameworks. The International Society for Biofabrication and the Nuffield Council on Bioethics have published guiding principles

emphasizing informed consent, beneficence, non-maleficence, and public engagement [7]. These documents urge proactive, inclusive dialogue between scientists, ethicists, policymakers, and the general public to ensure that the benefits of bioprinting are realized responsibly. Ultimately, the trajectory of 3D bioprinting will be shaped not solely by technical feasibility but also by its resonance with societal values, ethical norms, and the degree of trust it inspires among the public.

13.6 Developing Countries and Global Access

Despite the promising global utility of 3D bioprinting, the benefits of this technology remain concentrated in high-income countries, raising concerns over equitable access in developing nations. The disparity stems from multiple systemic barriers including inadequate infrastructure, high upfront costs, limited trained personnel, and a lack of supportive policy environments. To bridge this gap, technology transfer strategies and international collaborations must become central components of the global bioprinting agenda. Organizations such as the World Health Organization (WHO) and United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) are increasingly advocating for open innovation ecosystems and south-south collaborations in biomedical technologies, including bioprinting. Establishing regional centers of excellence in Africa, South Asia, and Latin America could help decentralize expertise and foster localized bioprinting innovation tailored to region-specific health challenges. For instance, bioprinted skin constructs for burn victims or bone grafts for orthopedic trauma could dramatically reduce surgical burden in conflict zones and underserved populations [8].

Another promising pathway is the development of low-cost, modular bioprinting systems adapted for constrained environments. Open-source designs and community-driven initiatives like the NIH 3D Print Exchange and Reprap-based bioprinters offer viable models for cost-effective deployment in resource-limited settings. However, translating these blueprints into clinically viable tools requires regulatory flexibility and public-sector investment. Intellectual property (IP) policies must also be reevaluated. The dominance of patent-protected bioinks and proprietary printer hardware by a few global firms can stifle innovation in developing countries. Licensing frameworks and patent pools that encourage fair access without compromising innovation incentives are essential to prevent the monopolization of this emergent field. Educational outreach is another pillar. International academic exchanges, online training modules, and regional scholarship programs can equip researchers in LMICs with the interdisciplinary skills needed to contribute to and benefit from bioprinting developments. Equally important is fostering local manufacturing capabilities and entrepreneurship, ensuring that bioprinting solutions are not merely imported but sustainably co-created. Global health equity in the bioprinting era requires coordinated action, inclusive policies, and a commitment to ensuring that life-saving innovations do not become another tool of disparity but a bridge toward universal healthcare advancement.

13.7 Regulatory Policy and Innovation

Regulatory frameworks are foundational to the safe, ethical, and equitable implementation of 3D bioprinting technologies. However, the unique characteristics of bioprinted productsranging from living cell-based constructs to patient-specific implantspose significant challenges to existing biomedical regulatory paradigms. Current regulations struggle to classify bioprinted products within the conventional categories of medical devices, biologics, or pharmaceuticals. Efforts to harmonize global standards are gaining momentum. The U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA), European Medicines Agency (EMA), and Japan's Pharmaceuticals and Medical Devices Agency (PMDA) have

begun exploratory regulatory pilots for advanced bioprinted constructs under frameworks such as ATMPs (Advanced Therapy Medicinal Products) and HCT/Ps (Human Cells, Tissues, and Cellular and Tissue-Based Products) [9].

One key challenge is the dynamic nature of bioprinting. The customization inherent to patient-specific bioprinting complicates batch-based approval systems. Regulators must therefore develop adaptive oversight models that evaluate products not only based on final structure, but also on process control, software validation, and bioprinter calibration. The concept of a "bioprinting workflow approval" rather than a fixed product approval is being considered by some regulatory think tanks. Data standards and interoperability are also vital. Regulators are now collaborating with industry and academia to establish benchmarks for bioink characterization, sterility testing, and biocompatibility. Additionally, AI-integrated bioprinting systems introduce the need for validation protocols around algorithm performance and data transparency. Another pressing issue is cross-border regulation. Given the global nature of medical research and technology transfer, countries must align on definitions, ethical considerations, and approval processes to facilitate innovation without compromising safety. Initiatives like the International Medical Device Regulators Forum (IMDRF) and the Global Harmonization Task Force (GHTF) are pivotal in this context. Regulatory foresight will be critical in preventing both under- and over-regulation. Excessive restrictions may hinder innovation and delay patient access, while lax governance could expose patients to unproven or unsafe interventions. Thus, regulators must collaborate with technologists, clinicians, ethicists, and patient advocacy groups to strike a balance that fosters innovation while safeguarding public health. Ultimately, building flexible, transparent, and globally coordinated regulatory systems is not just a bureaucratic necessity it is a catalyst for responsible and inclusive bioprinting advancement.

CONCLUSION

This chapter concludes that 3D bioprinting is not only a scientific breakthrough but also a catalyst for profound economic and social transformation. As the technology continues to mature, it is reshaping the global healthcare landscape through its potential to reduce treatment costs, personalize medical care, and revolutionize pharmaceutical research. The growth of the bioprinting industry is driving the emergence of new job roles, prompting urgent reforms in education and interdisciplinary workforce training. Simultaneously, the technology offers promise for reducing reliance on animal models and enhancing drug development efficiency. However, these advancements bring ethical, regulatory, and equity challenges particularly around public acceptance, moral boundaries of human tissue fabrication, and access disparities between high-income and low-income countries. Equitable deployment will depend on deliberate policy interventions, global collaboration, and the development of low-cost, accessible solutions. Regulatory systems must also evolve to accommodate the complexity of living, customizable bioprinted products. In essence, the future of 3D bioprinting hinges not solely on its technical success but on how effectively it is integrated into economic structures, healthcare systems, ethical norms, and global governance frameworks. The chapter underscores that realizing the full potential of bioprinting requires a holistic approach that is inclusive, ethically grounded, and globally coordinated.

REFERENCES

1. Allied Market Research. 3D Bioprinting Market by Component, Application, and End User: Global Opportunity Analysis and Industry Forecast, 2020–2030. 2021.

2. MarketsandMarkets. 3D Bioprinting Market by Component (Bioink, Bioprinters), Application (Research, Clinical), Material (Hydrogels, Alginate, Gelatin), End User (Pharmaceutical, Research Institutes) - Global Forecast to 2025. 2020.
3. National Institutes of Health (NIH). NIH 3D Bioprinting Training Program. https://3dprint.nih.gov
4. DiMarco RL, Gaetani R, Cassady SJ, et al. Engineering bioinks for 3D bioprinting. In: Zhang LG, et al. 3D Bioprinting and Nanotechnology in Tissue Engineering and Regenerative Medicine. Academic Press; 2016. p. 233–58.
5. Duval K, Grover H, Han LH, et al. Modeling physiological events in 2D vs. 3D cell culture. Physiology. 2017;32(4):266–77.
6. Master Z, Resnik DB. Hype and public trust in science. Sci Eng Ethics. 2013;19(2):321–35.
7. Nuffield Council on Bioethics. Bioethics briefing note: 3D bioprinting in living tissues. London: Nuffield Council on Bioethics; 2020.
8. Mahdavi A, Behnamfar N, Heidari M, et al. Bioprinting in low-resource settings: Opportunities, innovations, and implementation challenges. Bioprinting. 2022;28: e00209.
9. U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA). Discussion Paper: 3D Printing Medical Devices at the Point of Care. Center for Devices and Radiological Health (CDRH), 2021.
10. Lee W, et al. Sustainability in bioprinting: Environmental implications of bioprinting technologies. *J Clean Prod*. 2017;142:2552–61.
11. Roberts J, et al. Carbon footprint and energy consumption of bioprinting healthcare products. *J Environ Manage*. 2018;224:171–8.
12. Roussos M, et al. Patient perspectives on 3D bioprinting in healthcare. *Patient Exp J*. 2020;7(3):24–33.
13. Fisher B. Public perception and ethical implications of bioprinting. *Sci Eng Ethics*. 2019;25(6):1601–15.
14. Lee W, et al. Sustainability in bioprinting: Environmental implications of bioprinting technologies. *J Clean Prod*. 2017;142:2552–61.
15. Roberts J, et al. Carbon footprint and energy consumption of bioprinting healthcare products. *J Environ Manage*. 2018;224:171–8.
16. Roussos M, et al. Patient perspectives on 3D bioprinting in healthcare. *Patient Exp J*. 2020;7(3):24–33.
17. Fisher B. Public perception and ethical implications of bioprinting. *Sci Eng Ethics*. 2019;25(6):1601–15.
18. Lee W, et al. Sustainability in bioprinting: Environmental implications of bioprinting technologies. *J Clean Prod*. 2017;142:2552–61.
19. Roberts J, et al. Carbon footprint and energy consumption of bioprinting healthcare products. *J Environ Manage*. 2018;224:171–8.
20. Roussos M, et al. Patient perspectives on 3D bioprinting in healthcare. *Patient Exp J*. 2020;7(3):24–33.
21. Fisher B. Public perception and ethical implications of bioprinting. *Sci Eng Ethics*. 2019;25(6):1601–15.