

Modeling Cell-Material Interactions in Wound Healing Scaffolds Using Machine Learning and Deep Learning Approaches

Lakshmi Y Sujeeun^{1,2,3,4}, Nowsheen Goonoo¹, Itisha Chummun Phul¹, Shakuntala Baichoo³, Nicolas A Kotov^{3,4}, Archana Bhaw-Luximon^{*1}

¹Biomaterials, Drug Delivery and Nanotechnology Unit, Center for Biomedical and Biomaterials Research (CBBR), ²Department of Digital Technologies, Faculty of Information, Communication and Digital Technologies, University of Mauritius, Réduit, Mauritius; ³Department of Chemical Engineering, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI, USA; ⁴National Science Foundation (NSF), Science and Technology Centers (STC), Center of Complex Particle Systems (COMPASS)



Introduction

1950s: Emergence of Artificial Intelligence (AI) as a field of study.

1980s–1990s: Growing interest in applying AI techniques across various clinical settings in healthcare.

2010s: Rapid expansion of AI-driven applications healthcare, revolutionizing diagnostics, in treatment planning, and patient care.

2010s–Present: Increasing use of AI and computational models to **optimize scaffold design** and enhance tissue regeneration strategies.



1970s: 1st generation of scaffolds – **Bioinert materials** introduced.

1980s: 2nd generation – Development of **degradable** scaffolds.

1990s: 3rd generation – Introduction of **bioactive** scaffolds.

2000s: 4th generation – Scaffolds capable of encapsulating genes, cells, and molecules.

2010s: 5th generation – **Stimuli-responsive** scaffolds.

Significance of study: Reverse engineering of wound healing scaffolds via computational modeling



Results & Discussion

Predicting miscibility of polymer blends¹

Predicting cell-material-interactions during the

Miscibility: one of the key factors affecting the structure and properties of a polymer blend.



Two colored concentration ellipses IM and PM (size of ellipses determines by a 0.95 probability level). Principal component analysis (PCA) biplot for PC1 (29.1% explained variability) and PC2 (19.8% explained variability) of polyester/polysaccharides and polysaccharides/polyamides blends.

Confusion matrix for Random Forest



Model performance for Random Forest classifier

- Accuracy: 96.1% for the training set; 95.7% for the testing set.
- Testing set included 47 polymer blends.
- 14 out of 15 immiscible blends were predicted correctly.
- 31 out of 32 partially miscible blends were predicted correctly.

Conclusion & Future Work

- Polymer blends affect scaffold properties, influencing cell-material interactions.
- Fiber and pore diameters are critical for promoting cell growth and penetration in scaffolds. Predicting specific cell-scaffold interactions can enhance therapeutic outcomes.
- Future work: investigating graph theory to characterize complex nanofiber networks and using molecular docking to study interactions between scaffoldloaded biomolecules and target proteins.

inflammation and proliferation phases²

45000

25000

Pre-trained models by large image datasets



Fiber diameter and pore diameter were identified key parameters influencing in vitro cell as proliferation and inflammatory responses.

CellProfiler and CellProfiler Analyst to classify macrophage phenotypes









Actual TNF-α levels (y_test)

v = 0.263x + 26547

v = 0.9x + 47.675

 $R^2 = 0.8369$

 $R^2 = 0.3073$

000 30000 40000 50000 60000 70000 80000 Actual number of fibroblasts (v test)

Fibroblast cell proliferation

Accuracy: 63 % for the training set; 61 % for the testing set.



IOCBE2024.sciforum.net

With 10 epochs, the VGG16 and ResNet50 models generated validation accuracies of 90.3% and 91.4% respectively.

ResNet50

References

- Sujeeun et al. (2020), Royal Society Open Science, 7(12), 201293. doi.org/10.1098/rsos.201293
- Sujeeun et al. (2023) Macromolecular Research, 31, 379–392. doi.org/10.1007/s13233-023-00155-4
- Sujeeun et al. (2024, submitted)