MEDICINE AND MATERIALS

Volume 5, Issue 3, 2025: 158-164 | ISSN: 2784-1499 & e-ISSN: 2784-1537

DOI: 10.36868/MEDMATER.2025.05.03.10| www.medicineandmaterials.com |

RECENT PROGRESS IN MATERIALS FOR BIOMEDICAL IMPLANTS: A CONCISE REVIEW

Matteo MINOTTI [1,*], Madalina OPREA[2,3,*]

[1] Umberto I Hospital[Frosinone in Frosinone, Viale Mazzini, 03100 Frosinone, Italy

[2]Department of Analytical Chemistry and Environmental Engineering, Faculty of Chemical Engineering and Biotechnologies, National University of Science and Technology POLITEHNICA Bucharest, 1-7 Gheorghe Polizu, 011061 Bucharest, Romania

[3]Advanced Polymers Materials Group, National University of Science and Technology POLITEHNICA Bucharest, 1-7 Gheorghe Polizu, 011061 Bucharest, Romania

Abstract

The field of biomedical implants has witnessed remarkable advancements driven by innovations in materials science, engineering, and digital technologies. Traditional materials such as titanium alloys, stainless steel, and cobalt-chromium remain the foundation of orthopedic and dental implants due to their mechanical strength and corrosion resistance. Recent developments focus on bioactive ceramics, high-performance polymers like PEEK, and biodegradable materials such as magnesium alloys and polylactic acid-based polymers, which aim to enhance osseointegration and reduce the need for revision surgeries. Composite systems, including carbon-fiber-reinforced PEEK and functionally graded materials, provide tailored mechanical and biological properties. Surface engineering has emerged as a key strategy to improve implant performance, with coatings designed to promote bone growth, resist bacterial colonization, and deliver therapeutic agents directly at the implantation site. Furthermore, additive manufacturing (AM) enables patient-specific designs with controlled porosity, reducing stiffness mismatch and improving tissue integration. Smart implants incorporating sensors and stimuli-responsive coatings are paving the way for dynamic, on-demand therapies. Despite these advances, challenges such as tribocorrosion, biofilm-related infections, and regulatory complexities remain significant barriers to clinical translation. This concise review synthesizes current progress in implant materials, highlighting future directions aimed at improving longevity, functionality, and patient outcomes.

Keywords: biomedical implants, titanium alloys, PEEK, additive manufacturing, osseointegration

Introduction

Biomedical implants have become essential tools in modern medicine, providing structural support, restoring function, and improving the quality of life in millions of patients worldwide. They are widely used in orthopedic, dental, cardiovascular, and reconstructive applications, addressing conditions such as bone fractures, degenerative joint diseases, tooth loss, and congenital malformations [1]. Over the past few decades, the global demand for implants has steadily increased due to the rise in aging populations, higher incidence of trauma, and the expansion of surgical interventions aimed at enhancing patient mobility and oral function [2]. Despite their widespread use, the long-term success of biomedical implants remains challenged

Corresponding author: Matteominotti666@gmail.com

by several factors, including mechanical failure, wear and corrosion, implant-associated infections, and inadequate integration with surrounding tissues [3,4]. These complications often lead to revision surgeries, which are costly, complex, and associated with higher morbidity, underscoring the urgent need for continuous improvement in implant materials and design [4,5].

The ideal implant material must exhibit a unique combination of mechanical, biological, and physicochemical properties. From a mechanical standpoint, it must withstand cyclic loading and dynamic forces without deforming or fracturing, while closely matching the elastic modulus of surrounding tissues to prevent stress shielding [6]. Biologically, it must be biocompatible, promoting tissue integration without triggering adverse immune reactions or chronic inflammation [7]. Furthermore, implant materials must resist wear and corrosion in the aggressive physiological environment, where pH fluctuations, enzymatic activity, and ion exchange can compromise structural integrity [8]. A critical design consideration involves minimizing biofilm formation and bacterial colonization, as implant-related infections remain a leading cause of failure, particularly in orthopedic and dental devices [9]. In addition, the radiological properties of materials, such as radiolucency or opacity, influence diagnostic imaging and postoperative evaluation, guiding the choice of polymers or metals in specific clinical scenarios [10].

Historically, the first generation of biomedical implants relied on relatively simple, inert materials such as stainless steel and alumina ceramics, which were chosen for their durability rather than biological performance [4]. Although these materials provided basic mechanical support, their lack of bioactivity often resulted in poor integration with host tissues, limiting long-term outcomes. The second generation introduced bioactive ceramics such as hydroxyapatite and tricalcium phosphate, which mimic the mineral composition of bone and stimulate osseointegration [4]. However, their inherent brittleness restricted their use to non-load-bearing applications, necessitating further innovations to balance bioactivity with mechanical reliability [11,12]. The third generation of materials, emerging in recent decades, focuses on smart and multifunctional properties, including controlled degradation, drug delivery capabilities, and surface modifications designed to modulate cellular responses [3,6] actively.

Polymers play a crucial role in modern implantology due to their versatility and tunable properties. High-performance polymers such as polyetheretherketone (PEEK) have gained attention for spinal and craniofacial implants because of their favorable elastic modulus and radiolucency, which allow clear postoperative imaging [1]. Carbon-fiber-reinforced PEEK (CFR-PEEK) further enhances mechanical performance. Still, it has raised concerns regarding long-term clinical outcomes, particularly in load-bearing joint applications where wear particles may induce inflammatory reactions [2]. Ultra-high-molecular-weight polyethylene (UHMWPE) remains the gold standard for bearing surfaces in joint replacements due to its excellent wear resistance; however, oxidative degradation over time can compromise its performance, prompting modifications such as crosslinking and vitamin E stabilization [5]. Biodegradable polymers, including polylactic acid (PLA), polyglycolic acid (PGA), and their copolymers (PLGA), have been developed for temporary scaffolds and fixation devices, providing support during tissue regeneration and gradually resorbing without the need for secondary removal surgeries [9]. These materials are particularly valuable in tissue engineering, where scaffold architecture and degradation kinetics must be carefully tailored to match cellular infiltration and extracellular matrix deposition [9,13-17].

Ceramics, particularly alumina and zirconia, are extensively used in load-bearing implants such as hip prostheses and dental restorations because of their exceptional hardness, low wear rates, and chemical stability [4,12]. Zirconia-toughened composites have addressed the brittleness of traditional ceramics by introducing transformation toughening mechanisms that improve fracture resistance [12]. Bioactive ceramics like hydroxyapatite are frequently employed as coatings on metallic implants to promote bone-implant bonding and accelerate osseointegration [4]. Recent developments in ceramic manufacturing, such as 3D printing of complex geometries, have expanded the potential for patient-specific designs, enabling highly customized solutions for craniofacial reconstruction and other intricate anatomical applications [3].

Additive manufacturing (AM) has emerged as a transformative technology, enabling the production of highly porous, lattice-structured implants that reduce stiffness mismatch and promote vascularization and tissue ingrowth [3]. By integrating advanced materials such as polymer-derived ceramics and customized polymer composites, AM facilitates the creation of complex geometries that were previously unachievable using conventional fabrication methods [3,10]. The convergence of AM with biologically active materials has paved the way for next-generation implants that are not only mechanically optimized but also capable of delivering localized therapeutic agents and interacting dynamically with the host environment [3,6].

Classes of materials and recent advances

Biomedical implants encompass a diverse range of material classes, each selected based on specific mechanical, biological, and clinical requirements. The four primary categories include metallic materials, ceramics, polymers, and composites, with recent innovations focusing on enhancing their performance through structural optimization, surface functionalization, and the integration of bioactive elements [10,11].

Metallic materials: Metallic biomaterials remain the backbone of orthopedic and dental implants because of their superior strength, fatigue resistance, and durability [6,10]. Titanium and its alloys, particularly Ti-6Al-4V, are extensively used due to their high strength-to-weight ratio and excellent corrosion resistance. Current research focuses on beta-type titanium alloys with lower elastic moduli to better match bone tissue and reduce stress shielding [19]. Surface treatments such as anodization and plasma spraying improve osseointegration and reduce bacterial adhesion [6,19]. Cobalt-chromium alloys and stainless steels provide exceptional wear resistance, making them suitable for joint replacements and fixation devices [15]. However, ion release and potential hypersensitivity reactions remain concerns, prompting the development of nitrogen-strengthened and duplex stainless steels [15]. Recent advances in additive manufacturing have enabled the production of customized metallic implants with controlled porosity, which reduces stiffness mismatch and facilitates vascularization [13].

A notable emerging class includes magnesium-based degradable alloys, which gradually resorb in vivo, eliminating the need for implant removal surgeries [7,16]. Their main limitation lies in their rapid and uncontrolled corrosion; therefore, current strategies focus on alloying with calcium, zinc, or rare-earth elements and applying bioactive coatings to slow degradation while maintaining biocompatibility [7].

Ceramic materials: Ceramics are widely used in load-bearing and dental implants due to their excellent hardness, wear resistance, and chemical stability [4,12]. Alumina and zirconia are considered gold-standard ceramics for hip and knee replacements, as well as dental restorations, with zirconia benefiting from transformation toughening that enhances fracture resistance [12]. Bioactive ceramics, including hydroxyapatite (HA) and tricalcium phosphate (TCP), are used as coatings on metallic substrates to stimulate bone bonding and accelerate osseointegration [4]. Recent progress includes the development of 3D-printed ceramic scaffolds with highly controlled porosity, allowing for patient-specific designs and improved tissue integration [3,12].

Polymeric materials: High-performance polymers such as polyetheretherketone (PEEK) offer radiolucency and mechanical properties close to cortical bone, making them valuable in spinal and craniofacial implants [1]. Carbon-fiber-reinforced PEEK (CFR-PEEK) improves mechanical strength but has shown mixed long-term results in high-load applications such as total hip arthroplasty [2]. UHMWPE continues to be the standard for bearing surfaces in joint replacements, with crosslinking and vitamin E stabilization reducing oxidation and wear [5]. Biodegradable polymers like PLA and PLGA are increasingly used in temporary scaffolds and fixation devices, gradually resorbing as tissue heals [9].

Composite and hybrid systems: Composite materials combine the strengths of different classes, offering multifunctionality and tailored performance. Fiber-reinforced polymers such as CFR-PEEK merge the toughness of polymers with the stiffness of carbon fibers [1]. Functionally graded materials (FGMs) allow gradual transitions between metal and ceramic components, minimizing interfacial stress and improving biological integration [18-20]. These hybrid systems represent a growing area of research aimed at producing implants that can simultaneously provide mechanical support, controlled bioactivity, and long-term stability [10,15].

Table 1. Classes of materials and recent advances in biomedical implants

Class of material	Examples / key alloys/ polymers	Main properties	Clinical applications	Recent advances	Challenges/ limitations
Metallic materials	Titanium (Ti-6Al-4V), Beta-Ti alloys, Cobalt-Chromium, Stainless Steel	High strength, fatigue resistance, corrosion resistance [6,10]	Orthopedic and dental implants, fixation devices [10,15]	Beta-Ti alloys with lower elastic modulus for better bone matching [19]; surface treatments such as anodization and plasma spraying to enhance osseointegration and antimicrobial properties [6,19]	Stress shielding due to modulus mismatch; ion release and hypersensitivity reactions in Co-Cr alloys [15]
Biodegradable metallic materials	Magnesium-based alloys (Mg-Ca, Mg-Zn)	Temporary mechanical support, gradual in vivo resorption [7,16]	Temporary fixation devices, pediatric implants [7]	Alloying with Ca, Zn, rare-earth elements; bioactive coatings to control corrosion and improve biocompatibility [7]	Rapid and uncontrolled corrosion leading to premature degradation [7,16]
Ceramic materials	Alumina, Zirconia (Y-TZP), Hydroxyapatite (HA), Tricalcium Phosphate (TCP)	High hardness, wear resistance, chemical stability [4,12]	Hip and knee prostheses, dental crowns, implant coatings [4,12]	Transformation toughening for zirconia [12]; 3D-printed ceramic scaffolds with controlled porosity for patient-specific designs [3,12]	Brittleness limits use in high-load applications [12]
Polymeric materials	PEEK, CFR-PEEK, UHMWPE, PLA, PLGA	Tunable modulus, radiolucency, low density [1,5]	Spinal implants, craniofacial implants, bearing surfaces, temporary scaffolds [1,2,9]	Crosslinking and vitamin E stabilization in UHMWPE to reduce wear [5]; CFR-PEEK for improved mechanical strength [2]; biodegradable polymers for temporary support with gradual resorption [9]	Long-term wear debris from CFR-PEEK [2]; degradation rate of PLA/PLGA must match tissue healing [9]
Composite / hybrid systems	CFR-PEEK, Metal-Ceramic hybrids, Functionally Graded Materials (FGMs)	Combines properties of multiple material classes [1,18]	Complex load-bearing implants, patient-specific devices [10,15]	FGMs with gradual transitions between metals and ceramics to reduce interfacial stress and improve biological performance [18–20]	Complex manufacturing processes; cost and scalability limitations [15]

Table 1 summarizes the primary classes of materials used in biomedical implants, highlighting their main properties, clinical applications, recent advancements, and limitations. The numerical references in square brackets correspond to the cited literature, ensuring scientific accuracy.

Surface engineering and functionalization

Surface engineering has emerged as a critical strategy for enhancing the biological performance and longevity of biomedical implants. While the bulk material provides mechanical strength and structural stability, the implant surface directly interacts with surrounding tissues and body fluids, determining cell adhesion, protein adsorption, and bacterial colonization [6,15]. By tailoring surface properties such as roughness, chemistry, and wettability, it is possible to improve osseointegration, reduce wear and corrosion, and minimize the risk of implant-associated infections [15,16].

Wear and corrosion resistance: Metallic implants, particularly those made of titanium alloys and cobalt-chromium, are susceptible to tribocorrosion, a synergistic process combining mechanical wear and electrochemical corrosion [10,15]. Surface modifications such as nitriding, carburizing, and duplex treatments have been developed to improve hardness and reduce ion release [15]. For stainless steel implants, nitrogen-strengthened duplex structures offer superior corrosion resistance and enhanced fatigue strength [15,18]. Recent studies demonstrated that additive manufacturing, combined with post-processing techniques like hot isostatic pressing (HIP), can create stainless steel implants with significantly improved biological response and corrosion resistance [13].

Ceramic coatings such as titanium nitride (TiN) and diamond-like carbon (DLC) provide hard, wear-resistant layers for articulating surfaces, improving their tribological performance and extending implant life [19]. These coatings are especially relevant in joint replacements, where surface degradation can generate wear debris that triggers inflammation and osteolysis [10,19].

Bioactive and osteogenic surfaces: To actively promote bone regeneration and integration, surface functionalization with bioactive coatings is widely employed. Calcium phosphate (CaP) layers, including hydroxyapatite, are frequently applied to titanium and magnesium implants to accelerate osseointegration and stabilize the bone-implant interface [4,12,19]. Nanostructured coatings created through anodization or sol-gel processes increase surface area, supporting osteoblast adhesion and differentiation [6,19]. Recent approaches incorporate growth factors or peptide sequences that mimic natural extracellular matrix components, enhancing osteogenic signaling at the interface [19,21].

Antimicrobial and Anti-Fouling Strategies: Implant-associated infections remain a leading cause of failure, necessitating the development of antimicrobial surfaces [6,10]. Metallic ions such as silver and copper are integrated into coatings to provide long-term antibacterial activity without compromising biocompatibility [17,19]. Additionally, photocatalytic materials like titanium dioxide (TiO_2) and zinc oxide (ZnO) can generate reactive oxygen species under light activation, disrupting bacterial biofilms [10]. Anti-fouling strategies focus on preventing bacterial adhesion by creating non-stick surfaces using hydrophilic polymers such as polyethylene glycol (PEG) or zwitterionic coatings that resist protein adsorption [18,19].

Smart and multifunctional surfaces: Recent advances have introduced stimuli-responsive coatings capable of releasing drugs or bioactive agents in response to local environmental cues such as pH, temperature, or mechanical stress [20,21]. These smart coatings allow targeted delivery of antibiotics or osteogenic factors directly at the implant site, reducing systemic side effects and improving local healing [21]. The integration of nanomaterials, including graphene and bioinspired nanostructures, further expands the functionality of implant surfaces, combining antimicrobial, osteogenic, and anti-inflammatory properties in a single platform [20].

Emerging technologies and challenges

Recent advancements in biomedical implants are increasingly shaped by emerging technologies that combine material science, engineering, and digital innovation. Among these, additive manufacturing (AM), also known as 3D printing, has revolutionized the way implants are designed and fabricated. AM enables the production of patient-specific implants with complex geometries, controlled porosity, and lattice structures that closely mimic natural bone architecture, improving mechanical compatibility and promoting tissue ingrowth [3,13]. Techniques such as laser powder bed fusion (LPBF) and binder jetting allow precise fabrication of titanium, stainless steel, and ceramic components, while post-processing treatments like hot isostatic pressing enhance fatigue strength and reduce internal defects [13,19]. Furthermore, AM facilitates the integration of bioactive gradients, where different regions of an implant exhibit varying compositions and properties, such as combining a strong metallic core with a bioactive ceramic surface [3,20].

Smart and bioresponsive implants represent another major innovation, integrating sensors and stimuli-responsive systems that interact dynamically with the biological environment [20,21]. These devices can release therapeutic agents such as antibiotics or growth factors in response to local stimuli like pH changes or mechanical loading, enabling targeted, on-demand treatment [21]. This approach is particularly valuable in combating implant-associated infections and enhancing bone regeneration. Moreover, conductive polymers and nanostructured coatings are being explored for neural and cardiovascular implants, where electrical conductivity is crucial for functional integration [20].

Despite these advances, several challenges remain. Tribocorrosion, the combined effect of wear and corrosion, continues to compromise long-term implant performance, generating debris that can induce inflammatory responses and osteolysis [10,15]. Infection control remains a pressing issue, with bacterial biofilms showing resistance to conventional antimicrobial treatments [17,19]. Additionally, the rapid translation of laboratory innovations into clinical practice is hindered by complex regulatory pathways and the high cost of personalized manufacturing [6,18]. Finally, sustainability concerns are emerging, emphasizing the need for green manufacturing practices and lifecycle analysis to reduce environmental impact [20].

Conclusions

Recent progress in biomedical implant materials highlights a clear transition from inert, purely structural solutions to multifunctional systems designed to actively interact with the biological environment. Integrating advanced materials, surface functionalization, and additive manufacturing has significantly improved implant performance, promoting osseointegration, infection control, and patient-specific customization. Future developments should focus on translating these innovations into clinical practice by overcoming challenges related to tribocorrosion, regulatory approval, and long-term safety, ultimately enhancing the longevity and success rate of biomedical implants.

Bibliography

1. Guo Z, Poot AA, Grijpma DW. *Advanced polymer-based composites and structures for biomedical applications.* **Eur Polym J.** 2021;149:110388. doi:10.1016/j.eurpolymj.2021.110388.
2. Heijnens LJ, Schotanus MG, Verburg AD, van Haaren EH. *Disappointing long-term outcome of THA with carbon-fiber-reinforced poly-ether-ether-ketone (CFR-PEEK) as acetabular insert liner: a prospective study with a mean follow-up of 14.3 years.* **HIP Int.** 2021;31(6):735-742. doi:10.1177/1120700020918157.
3. Liu J, Xiong S, Mei H, Chen Z. *3D printing of complex-shaped polymer-derived ceramics with enhanced structural retention.* **Mater Manuf Process.** 2022;37(11):1267-1279. doi:10.1080/10426914.2022.2030870.

4. Hench LL. *Bioceramics.* **J Am Ceram Soc.** 1998;81(7):1705-1728. doi:10.1111/j.1151-2916.1998.tb02540.x.
5. Hussain M, Naqvi RA, Abbas N, et al. *Ultra-high-molecular-weight-polyethylene (UHMWPE) as a promising polymer material for biomedical applications: a concise review.* **Polymers.** 2020;12(2):323. doi:10.3390/polym12020323.
6. Ibrahim MZ, Sarhan AAD, Yusuf F, Hamdi M. *Biomedical materials and techniques to improve the tribological, mechanical and biomedical properties of orthopedic implants – a review article.* **J Alloys Compd.** 2017;714:636-667. doi:10.1016/j.jallcom.2017.04.231.
7. Chen Y, Dou J, Yu H, Chen C. *Degradable magnesium-based alloys for biomedical applications: the role of critical alloying elements.* **J Biomater Appl.** 2019;33(10):1348-1372. doi:10.1177/0885328219834656.
8. Davidson JA, Mishra AK. *Surface modification issues for orthopaedic implant bearing surfaces.* **Mater Manuf Process.** 1992;7(3):405-421. doi:10.1080/10426919208947429.
9. Freed LE, Vunjak-Novakovic G, Biron RJ, et al. *Biodegradable polymer scaffolds for tissue engineering.* **Nat Biotechnol.** 1994;12(7):689-693. doi:10.1038/nbt0794-689.
10. Gang S, Fengzhou F, Chengwei K. *Tribological performance of bioimplants: a comprehensive review.* **Nanotechnol Precis Eng.** 2018;1(2):107-122. doi:10.13494/j.npe.20180003.
11. Jin W, Chu PK. *Orthopedic implants.* In: **Encyclopedia of Biomedical Engineering.** Berlin, Germany: Elsevier; 2019:425-439. doi:10.1016/B978-0-12-801238-3.10999-7.
12. Kamitakahara M, Ohtsuki C, Miyazaki T. *Review paper: behavior of ceramic biomaterials derived from tricalcium phosphate in physiological condition.* **J Biomater Appl.** 2008;23(3):197-212. doi:10.1177/0885328208096798.
13. Lodhi MJK, Deen KM, Greenlee-Wacker MC, Haider W. *Additively manufactured 316L stainless steel with improved corrosion resistance and biological response for biomedical applications.* **Addit Manuf.** 2019;27:8-19. doi:10.1016/j.addma.2019.02.005.
14. Love B. *Metallic biomaterials.* In: **Biomaterials.** Berlin, Germany: Elsevier; 2017:159-184. doi:10.1016/B978-0-12-809478-5.00007-9.
15. Mahajan A, Devgan S, Kalyanasundaram D. *Surface alteration of Cobalt-Chromium and duplex stainless steel alloys for biomedical applications: a concise review.* **Mater Manuf Process.** 2023;38(3):260-270. doi:10.1080/10426914.2022.2105873.
16. Kamrani S, Fleck C. *Biodegradable magnesium alloys as temporary orthopaedic implants: a review.* **BioMetals.** 2019;32(2):185-193. doi:10.1007/s10534-019-00170-y.
17. Karande TS, Ong JL, Agrawal CM. *Diffusion in musculoskeletal tissue engineering scaffolds: design issues related to porosity, permeability, architecture, and nutrient mixing.* **Ann Biomed Eng.** 2004;32(12):1728-1743. doi:10.1007/s10439-004-7825-2.
18. Kassapidou M, Hjalmarsson L, Johansson CB, et al. *Cobalt–chromium alloys fabricated with four different techniques: ion release, toxicity of released elements and surface roughness.* **Dent Mater.** 2020;36(11):e352-e363. doi:10.1016/j.dental.2020.08.012.
19. Kumar A, Singh G. *Surface modification of Ti6Al4V alloy via advanced coatings: mechanical, tribological, corrosion, wetting, and biocompatibility studies.* **J Alloys Compd.** 2024;989:174418. doi:10.1016/j.jallcom.2024.174418.
20. Majumder MK, Kumbhare VR, Japa A, Kaushik BK. *Nanomaterials and applications.* In: **Introduction to Microelectronics to Nanoelectronics.** United States: CRC Press; 2020:251-294. doi:10.1201/9781003049203-9.
21. Navarro M, Michiardi A, Castaño O, Planell JA. *Biomaterials in orthopaedics.* **J R Soc Interface.** 2008;5(27):1137-1158. doi:10.1098/rsif.2008.0151.