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Chondropathies are increasing worldwide, but effective treatments are currently lacking. Mesenchymal stromal cell (MSCs) transplantation represents a promising approach to counteract the degenerative and inflammatory environment characterizing those pathologies, such as osteoarthritis (OA) and rheumatoid arthritis (RA). Umbilical cord- (UC-) MSCs gained increasing interest due to their multilineage differentiation potential, immunomodulatory, and anti-inflammatory properties as well as higher proliferation rates, abundant supply along with no risks for the donor compared to adult MSCs. In addition, UC-MSCs are physiologically adapted to survive in an ischemic and nutrient-poor environment as well as to produce an extracellular matrix (ECM) similar to that of the cartilage. All these characteristics make UC-MSCs a pivotal source for a stem cell-based treatment of chondropathies. In this review, the regenerative potential of UC-MSCs for the treatment of cartilage diseases will be discussed focusing on in vitro, in vivo, and clinical studies.

1. Introduction

Chondropathies are a group of cartilage diseases that deviate from or interrupt the normal structure and function of cartilage, including osteoarthritis (OA), achondroplasia, spinal disc herniation (SDH), relapsing polychondritis, cartilage tumor (CT), and chondrocalcinosis [1]. There are over 100 types of arthritis. The most common forms are OA (degenerative joint disease) and rheumatoid arthritis (RA, autoimmune form of arthritis). OA is the most well-known chondropathy in the world, affecting the health of 343 million of people, while RA affects 14 million of people [2]. OA is a multifactorial and complex degenerative joint disease characterized by age-related “wear and tear,” chondrocytes’ poor response to growth factors, altered biomechanical properties of articular cartilage, mitochondrial dysfunction, oxidative stress, and inflammation [3]. The degenerative lesions in cartilage are secondary to inflammation associated with hyperplasia and chondrocyte apoptosis [4]. Increasing age is linked to a reduction in subchondral blood vessels resulting in cartilage-related physiological and biochemical anomalies [5]. This pathological process results in secondary joint fibrosis, stiffness, pain, and decreased function, leading to a poor quality of life. Risk factors for chondropathies include trauma, genetics, age, sex, obesity, and degenerative pathology. The biological mechanisms of chondropathies remain largely unknown, and there is no effective way to treat the cartilage damage because of its nature.

Cartilage is a supportive connective tissue, and it has a dense and highly organized extracellular matrix (ECM) embedding chondrocytes [6]. Three types of cartilage tissue
are present throughout the body at various sites: hyaline, elastic, and fibrocartilaginous. Hyaline cartilage is the predominant form of cartilage and is present on the articular surfaces of synovial joints. Type II collagen is the main component in healthy articular cartilage. Other collagens of cartilage ECM are types III, VI, IX, XI, XII, and XIV. The main proteoglycan present in cartilage is aggrecan, but other proteoglycans found in cartilage include the syndecans, glypican, decorin, biglycan, fibromodulin, lumican, epiphycan, and perlecCan. The chondrocytes are contained in cavities called lacunae embedded in the network of collagen fibrils and proteoglycans [6].

Cartilage has a decreased ability to self-repair because it is avascular, resulting in a poor replicative capacity of chondrocytes. The lack of vascularity, along with the dense packing of ECM components, hinders the transport of drugs in the tissue, thus, challenging the treatments of cartilage diseases. In addition, cartilage also lacks nerve cells or endings and, therefore, cannot directly generate pain that is the main symptom of a chondropathy [7]. Therefore, symptoms usually occur only after the significant structural destruction of the cartilage ECM (with the damage affecting other tissues of the whole joint that do contain nociceptors), thus, making treatments difficult.

Current treatment of articular cartilage defects includes pharmacological management of pain, weight reduction, and exercises as well as intra-articular treatments with corticosteroid or hyaluronic and hylan derivatives injections [8]. Surgical options consist in bone marrow stimulation procedures such as subchondral drilling, microfracture, and abrasion arthroplasty, allowing endogenous mesenchymal stem cells (MSCs) to migrate into the lesion [9]. However, no treatment or procedure represents a cure for cartilaginous defects.

MSC-based therapy is beginning to show great potential in cartilage regeneration through several mechanisms including homing, angiogenesis, differentiation, and response to inflammatory condition. The most widely studied sources of MSCs are bone marrow (BM) and adipose tissue (AT). However, umbilical cord-derived MSCs (UC-MSCs) compared to AT- and BM-MSCs have many advantages such as higher proliferation rates, greater expansion ability, higher purity, and abundant supply along with no risks for the donor, since the UC is usually discarded after birth [10]. In Table 1 are listed the advantages and disadvantages of the different populations of stem/stromal cells used so far for cartilage regeneration purposes. UC-MSCs can be isolated from different regions of the UC stromal tissue called Wharton’s jelly (WJ), and three different populations of UC-MSCs have been obtained: perivascular (PV-MSCs), intermediate WJ (WJ-MSCs), and subamniotic stromal region or cord lining (CL-MSCs) [11]. Notably, ECM components in WJ share several features with cartilage ECM. To this regard, UC-MSCs express aggrecan, type II collagen, and SOX-9 [12]. In addition, UC-MSCs express growth factors, chemokines, and cytokines at similar levels to those of cartilage [12]. Finally, since UC relies on only two arteries and one vein to supply oxygen and nutrients, without any capillary circulation, UC-MSCs are physiologically adapted to survive in a relatively hypoxic environment leading to the potential advantage to survive in cartilage. These results reinforce the concept of UC-MSCs as one of the best candidates for MSC-based therapy for cartilage regeneration.

2. Regeneration Mechanisms of UC-MSCs for Cartilage Diseases

There are two main concepts for UC-MSCs’ contribution to cartilage repair: preventing the degradation of cartilage, through the secretion of bioactive factors, and/or the differentiative potential of UC-MSCs to become chondrocytes. Several ind and in vivo studies indicated that UC-MSCs can play crucial roles in cartilage repair and regeneration by several mechanisms including (i) migration and homing, (ii) adaption to cartilage hypoxic and nutrient-poor environment, (iii) chondrogenesis differentiation potential and promotion of survival, proliferation and differentiation of endogenous MSCs, (iv) synthesis and prevention of cartilage ECM degradation, and (v) anti-inflammatory and immunomodulatory properties.

2.1. Homing and Migration. MSCs exhibit certain capabilities of the homing of local mature leukocytes to inflammatory sites, such as rolling and adhesion [13]. Migration and homing ability into injured sites are considered as the primary steps for tissue repair in regenerative medicine. Different molecules mediate cell retention or mobilization such as adhesion molecules (E and P-selectin), integrins (particularly a4b1), stromal-derived factor 1 (SDF-1), and its receptor CXC chemokine receptor 4 (CXCR4) [13]. In addition, other factors play a key role in damaged joints homing such as CXCR1 and CXCR2, CC chemokine receptor 1 (CCR1), and monocyte chemoattractant protein 1 (MCP-1) through its receptor CCR2, vascular endothelial growth factor receptor 1 (Flt-1), platelet-derived growth factor receptor a (PDGFR-a, CD140a), PDGFR-β (CD140b), and their respective ligands IL-8, macrophage inflammatory protein 1α (MIP-1α), placenta growth factor (PIGF), and PDGF [14]. In Table 2, we reported different proteins involved in homing and migration of UC-MSCs in comparison with those expressed by BM- and AT-MSCs. In particular, BM- and AT-MSCs show similar expression pattern. On the other hand, based on the quantitative data reported in literature, UC-MSCs express higher levels of different proteins than BM- and AT-MSCs such as HGF, IL-8, IL-1RA, IGF-1, ICAM-1, bFGF, MCP-1, MIP-1β, PDGF-α, PDGFR-β, PDGFR-α, PDGF-AB, PDGF-R, CXCR4, CCR2, VEGF-A, and VEGF-1. Interestingly, unlike cells from BM- and AT-MSCs, UC-MSCs express integrin a4 and MIP-1β suggesting their strong ability in homing and migration. In addition, UC-MSCs show less hematopoietic effects than BM- and AT-MSCs (low levels of SDF-1 and VCAM-1). Increased levels of SDF-1, MCP-1, IL-8, MIP-1α, PIGF, and PDGF were found in synovial fluid of OA and RA patients [14]. Shen et al. demonstrated that UC-MSCs secrete growth factors and chemokines which may contribute to a chemoattractive environment such as SDF-1, MCP-1, hepatocyte growth factor (HGF), vascular cell adhesion protein-1 (VCAM-1), IL-8, insulin-like growth factor-1 (IGF-1), and vascular endothelial growth factor (VEGF) [15]. In addition, UC-MSCs express CXCR4, CCR2, and c-
| Source          | Advantages                                      | Disadvantages                                                                 | Ref.     |
|-----------------|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|
| ESCs            | Pluripotent                                     | Difficulty of controlling ESCs differentiation                               | [99]     |
|                 | Chondrocytes differentiation capacity           | Ethical concerns                                                             |          |
|                 | Synthesis of cartilage ECM                      | Risk of immune rejection                                                      |          |
|                 | Pluripotent                                     | Risk of teratoma formation                                                   |          |
| iPSCs           | Chondrocytes differentiation capacity           | Complex and expensive iPSC generation procedures                            | [100]    |
|                 | Synthesis of cartilage ECM                      | Risk of immune rejection                                                      |          |
|                 | No ethical concerns                             | Risk of teratoma formation                                                   |          |
| BM-MSCs         | Chondrocytes differentiation capacity           | Invasive isolation procedure with risk of infection                          |          |
|                 | Synthesis of cartilage ECM                      | Low isolation yield (about 1 in 1 \times 10^5 cells in the BM)               |          |
|                 | No ethical concerns                             | Donor age affects initial yield of isolation and the proliferative and differentiation properties | [101]    |
|                 | Low immunogenicity                              | Sign of senescence from passage 4                                            |          |
| AT-MSCs         | Chondrocytes differentiation capacity           | Invasive isolation procedure with risk of infection                          | [101]    |
|                 | Synthesis of cartilage ECM                      | Heterogeneity of AT-MSCs extracted from different body sites                 |          |
|                 | No ethical concerns                             | Sign of senescence from passage 8                                            |          |
|                 | Low immunogenicity                              |                                                                                 |          |
|                 | Isolation yield 500 times more than BM-MSCs     |                                                                                 |          |
|                 | Pluripotent without teratoma formation risk     |                                                                                 |          |
| UC-MSCs         | Chondrocytes differentiation capacity           | Limited knowledge about the UC-MSCs populations                               | [102]    |
|                 | Synthesis of cartilage ECM                      |                                                                                 |          |
|                 | No ethical concerns                             |                                                                                 |          |
|                 | Low immunogenicity                              |                                                                                 |          |
|                 | High isolation yield (about 1 \times 10^5 cells from 1 cm of cord) |                                                                                 |          |
|                 | No sign of senescence or abnormality over 16 passages |                                                                                 |          |
|                 | 300 fold expansions reached within 6-7 passages |                                                                                 |          |
| IPFSCs          | Multipotent                                     | Limited source of tissue (7.5 million cells from 5 g of tissue)               | [103]    |
|                 | High chondrogenic potential                     |                                                                                 |          |
| SD-MSCs         | Multipotent                                     | Limited source of tissue (knee: 10.5 \pm 8.1 \times 10^3 cells/mg; hip: 3.1 \pm 2.2 \times 10^3 cells/mg) | [104]    |
|                 | Higher chondrogenic potential than BM-MSCs      |                                                                                 |          |
|                 | Higher colony-forming potential and proliferation rate than BM- and AT-MSCs |                                                                                 |          |

AT-MSCs: adipose tissue-derived mesenchymal stem cells (MSCs); BM-MSCs: bone marrow-derived MSCs; ESCs: embryonic stem cells; IPFSCs: infrapatellar fat pad-derived stem cells; iPSCs: induced pluripotent stem cells; UC-MSCs: umbilical cord-derived MSCs; SD-MSCs: synovium-derived MSCs.
| Marker                  | UC-MSCs | BM-MSCs | AT-MSCs | Ref.     |
|------------------------|---------|---------|---------|----------|
| **Secreted factors**   |         |         |         |          |
| COX-2                  | ↑       | ↓       | ↓       | [45]     |
| bFGF (FGF-2)           | ↑↑      | ↓       | ↑       | [45]     |
| HGF                    | ↑↑      | ↓       | ↓↓      | [45, 105]|
| IGF-1                  | ↑       | ↓       | ↓       | [54]     |
| IL-1α                   | ↑↑      | ↓       | ND      | [54]     |
| IL-1β                   | ↑↑      | ↓       | ↑       | [54, 105, 106] |
| IL-6                   | ↔       | ↔       | ↔       | [45]     |
| IL-8                   | ↑       | ↓       | ↓       | [105]    |
| IL-1RA                  | ↑       | ↓       | ↓       | [105]    |
| MCP-1 (CCL2)           | ↔       | ↔       | ↔       | [45]     |
| MIP-1α (CCL3)          | ↓       | ↑       | +       | [107, 108]|
| MIP-1β (CCL4)          | +       | -       | -       | [105]    |
| OPN                    | ↓       | ↑       | ↓       | [109]    |
| PDGF-AA                | ↑       | ↓       | ↓       | [105, 107]|
| PDGF-AB                | ↑       | ↓       | -       | [107, 110]|
| PDGF-BB                | -       | ↓       | -       | [105]    |
| PGE2                   | ↓       | ↓       | ↓       | [106]    |
| PlGF                   | ↓       | ↓↓      | ↑       | [105]    |
| SDF-1                  | ↑       | ↑       | ↓       | [111, 112]|
| SDF-1α                 | ↔       | ↔       | ↔       | [45]     |
| TGF-β1                 | ↔       | ↔       | ↔       | [105]    |
| TGF-β2                 | ↑       | ↓       | ↓       | [105]    |
| VEGF-A                 | ↑       | ↓       | ↓       | [45]     |
| VEGF-D                 | ↑       | ↓       | ↓       | [105, 107]|
| **MMPs and TIMPs**     |         |         |         |          |
| MMP-1                  | ↑       | ↓       | ↑↑      | [105]    |
| MMP-2                  | ↔       | ↑       | ↔       | [113]    |
| MMP-3                  | ↓       | ↓       | ↑       | [105]    |
| MMP-7                  | ↓       | ↑       | -       | [105]    |
| MMP-8                  | -       | ↑       | -       | [105]    |
| MMP-13                 | -       | -       | +       | [105]    |
| TIMP-1                 | ↔       | ↔       | ↔       | [113]    |
| TIMP-2                 | ↔       | ↔       | ↔       | [113]    |
| **Adhesion molecules and receptors** |         |         |         |          |
| CCR2                   | ↑       | ↓       | ↓       | [54]     |
| CXCR4                  | ↑       | ↓       | ↓       | [114]    |
| Flt-1 (VEGFR1)         | ↑       | ↓       | ND      | [54]     |
| ICAM-1                 | ↑↑      | ↓       | ↑       | [45]     |
| Integrin α4            | ↑↑      | ↓       | -       | [54]     |
| PDGF-Ra                | ↔       | ↔       | ↔       | [107]    |
| PDGF-Rb                | ↑       | ↓       | ↓       | [107]    |
| VCAM-1                 | ↓       | ↑       | ↓       | [45]     |
| **Immunoregulatory molecules** |         |         |         |          |
| B7-H3 (CD276)          | +       | +       | +       | [71]     |
| CD200                  | ↑       | ↓       | ↓       | [54, 115]|

Table 2: Expression analysis of different markers involved in homing and migration.
met receptors. Therefore, UC-MSCs are able to migrate in vitro and in vivo via the SDF-1/CXCR4 and MCP-1/CCR2 axes, and the secreted factors may induce the recruitment of cells from the surrounding tissues and promote regeneration of injured tissue [15]. To this regard, the SDF-1/CXCR4 axis has been shown to play a key role in endogenous and transplanted stem cell homing in the injured site promoting the regeneration of different tissues including cartilage [16, 17].

Another key player in cell adhesion is integrin α4β1 (very late antigen-4, VLA-4). It has been demonstrated a crucial link between the CXCR4/SDF-1 homing axis and the VLA-4/VCAM-1 (vascular cell adhesion molecule-1, CD106) adhesion axis [18]. In particular, SDF-1 (through CXCR4) increases VLA-4 adhesion to VCAM-1. VLA-4 is an integrin dimer composed of α4 (CD49d) and β1 (CD29) [19]. Although MSCs lack the expression of selectins, they express integrin β1. Interestingly, in contrast to BM-MSCs, UC-MSCs express integrin α4, VCAM-1, and intercellular adhesion molecule-1 (ICAM-1; CD54) supporting their stronger potential in homing [20].

One more ligand of integrin β1 is osteopontin (OPN), an osteogenic marker with several biological functions including migration, adhesion, and survival of MSCs [21]. On the other hand, OPN is also involved in regulation and propagation of inflammatory responses of macrophages, T-cells, and dendritic cells [22]. Notably, OPN is involved in different inflammatory pathologies including RA and OA pathogenesis [23, 24]. In a study of Schneider et al., UC-MSCs showed similar osteogenic and migration abilities compared to BM-MSCs with the lesser expression of OPN and the major expression of matrix metalloproteinases (MMP)-1 and -2 [25].

Moreover, extensive evidence found that growth factors play an important role in homing and migration of MSCs, as seen for basic fibroblast growth factor (bFGF), VEGF, HGF, IGF-1, PDGF, and transforming growth factor β1 (TGF-β1) [26]. In particular, UC-MSCs are able to migrate in vitro and in vivo, in response to chemotactic factors such as EGF, FGF-2, HGF, IGF-1, PDGF-BB, TGF-β, and VEGF, along with SDF-1, MCP-1, and VCAM-1 [15].

2.2. Capacity of Adaptation to Cartilage Hypoxic Environment. Because of the lack of vascularization, the physiological oxygen tension (physioxia) within human articular cartilage ranges between 2 and 5% [27]. Therefore, any MSC candidate for stem cell therapy of cartilage diseases should be able to adapt to a hypoxic environment with limited nutrient supply while maintaining its regenerative properties. Oxygen tension ranges from 1%-7% in bone marrow and from 10%-15% in adipose tissue [28, 29]. Regarding perinatal tissues such as the UC, oxygen tension within the mammalian female reproductive tract is low, between 1.5% and 8%, and lasts throughout the fetal development with dissolved oxygen in the fetal circulation rarely exceeding 5% [30]. Moreover, the UC is supplied by only two arteries and one vein and lacking in capillaries or lymphatics suggesting that UC-MSCs are physiologically adapted to survive in a hypoxic environment. It has been shown that low oxygen tension increases UC-MSC proliferation potential and matrix production and enhanced

| Marker         | UC-MSCs | BM-MSCs | AT-MSCs | Ref. |
|----------------|---------|---------|---------|------|
| Galectin 1     | ↑       | ↑       | ↓       | [113]|
| HLA-ABC        | ↔↔      | ↔↔      | ↔↔      | [54, 116]|
| HLA-DR         | ↔↔      | ↔↔      | ↔↔      | [54, 116]|
| HLA-G          | ↑       | ↓       | ↓       | [54, 116]|
| HLA-E          | ↑       | ↓       | ↓       | [54, 117]|
| HLA-F          | ↑       | ↓       | -       | [54, 117]|
| IDO            | ↔↔      | ↑       | ND      | [45] |
| IP-10          | ↑       | ↓       | ↓       | [105] |
| LIF            | ↑       | ↓       | ↓       | [54, 113]|
| PD-L1 (B7-H1)  | ↑       | ↓       | +       | [54, 119]|
| PD-L2 (B7-DC/CD273) | ↑ | ↓ | + | [54, 119]|
| RANTES (CCL5)  | ↑       | ↓       | ↓       | [105] |
| TLR-1          | ↔↔      | ↔↔      | ↔↔      | [106] |
| TLR-2          | ↔↔      | ↔↔      | ↔↔      | [106] |
| TLR-3          | ↔↔      | ↔↔      | ↔↔      | [106] |
| TLR-4          | ↔↔      | ↔↔      | ↔↔      | [106] |
| TLR-5          | ↔↔      | ↔↔      | ↔↔      | [106] |
| TLR-6          | ↔↔      | ↔↔      | ↔↔      | [106] |
| TLR-9          | ↔↔      | ↔↔      | ↔↔      | [106] |

Expression: ↑: higher; ↑↑: significantly higher; ↓: lower; ↓↓: significantly lower; ↔: similar; +: qualitatively expressed, but not quantified; -: not expressed; ND: not detected.
chondrogenic marker expression in UC-MSCs [31, 32]. This increased chondrogenic differentiation can lead to hypoxia-inducible factor-1 alpha (HIF-1α) and HIF-2α increased expression, NOTCH signaling activation, and the subsequent Sox-9 induction [33]. In addition, the UC-MSCs cultured under hypoxic conditions showed increased expression of energy metabolism-associated genes including GLUT-1, LDH, and PDK1 suggesting a switching of cell metabolism from oxidative phosphorylation to anaerobic glycolysis [32]. The yield of lactate production from glucose, however, is significantly lower in UC-MSCs than it has been reported in BM- and AT-MSCs in both hypoxic and normoxic conditions [32]. This finding could be explained by our recent study [34]. We demonstrated that all the three UC-MSC populations (PV-, WJ-, and CL-MSCs) exhibit low levels of mitochondrial and glycolytic activities. Moreover, PV-, WJ-, and CL-MSCs showed comparable mitochondrial respiration parameters in both normal and oxygen and glucose deprivation followed by reperfusion (OGD/R) conditions maintaining their proliferation capacity. Interestingly, PV-MSCs showed the highest oxygen consumption rate and OGD/R affected their metabolism but not their viability suggesting a superior mitochondrial activity compared to the other UC-MSC populations. While CL-MSCs were the cells least affected suggesting their robust survival in ischemic environment. These evidences taken together suggest that UC-MSCs may be a pivotal source for stem cell-based therapy of ischemic pathologies including chondropathies, brain, heart, and lung diseases [35–38]. Further investigations are needed to better understand whether these slight but significant differences among the three UC-MSCs are due to the specific region’s composition of different number of healthy mitochondria or improved adaptation of mitochondria to ischemic conditions.

2.3. Promotion of Survival, Proliferation, and Differentiation. MSCs secrete growth factors that are involved in several biological processes such as homing and migration as well as promotion of survival, proliferation, and differentiation. Some of growth factors with a key role in cartilage repair are bone morphogenetic proteins (BMPs), epidermal growth factor (EGF), HGF, IGF, PDGF, VEGF, FGF, and TGF families and UC-MSCs are a rich source of them [39].

EGF is one of the ligands of EGF receptor (EGFR) that plays a key role in joint homeostasis. In particular, EGFR stimulates chondrocyte proliferation and survival as well as maintenance of cartilage in adulthood. On one hand, EGFR signaling promotes the lubrication of the articular surface by increasing the boundary lubricants Prg4 and HA from superficial chondrocytes [40]. On the other hand, EGFR signaling also can play a catabolic action by inhibiting the expression of the chondrogenic master transcription factor Sox9, thereby suppressing the synthesis of cartilage matrix proteins, such as type II collagen (Col II) and aggrecan, as well as by stimulating the expression of MMPs involved in cartilage degradation, such as MMP-13 [41]. Interestingly, Zhang et al. recently showed the UC-MSCs release EGF ligands TGF-α and EGF attenuating OA progression via EGF signaling pathway of cartilage superficial layer cells [42]. In addition, UC-MSCs inhibited the apoptosis of chondrocytes, increased the expression of chondrogenesis-related genes (Col-2, Sox9), and reduced the expression of cartilage catabolism-related genes (MMP-13, ADAMTS-5) in vitro and in vivo [42].

HGF is a multifunctional growth factor that affects cell survival and proliferation, matrix metabolism, inflammatory response, and neurotrophic action playing an important role in normal bone and cartilage turnover [43]. In particular, HGF and VEGF can reduce tissue injury, inhibit fibrotic remodeling and apoptosis, promote angiogenesis, stimulate stem cell recruitment and proliferation, and reduce oxidative stress [44]. A recent comparative study showed that the secretion of HGF was three times higher in UC-MSCs compared to AT-MSCs and around nine times higher than in BM-MSCs [45]. In contrast, UC-MSCs secreted the lower levels of VEGF-A. This is probably due to the fact that VEGF-A and HGF signaling pathways reciprocally modulate each other [46].

IGF1 has been implicated in promotion of chondrogenesis and accumulation of cartilage-specific ECM molecules [47]. In addition, the synergy between TGF-β3 and IGF-1 promotes intervertebral disc regeneration [48]. Wnts contain large amounts of IGF-I and IGF-I-binding proteins BP-3 and BP-1 suggesting a key role in stimulation of UC-MSCs to produce collagen and glycosaminoglycans (GAGs) in UC matrix as well as influencing the chondrogenic differentiation of these cells [49, 50].

TGF-β superfamily consists of about 30–35 different proteins including TGF-β proteins (TGF-β1,-β2,-β3), Bone Morphogenetic Proteins (BMPs), and Growth Differentiation Factors (GDFs) involved in chondrogenic differentiation and production of cartilage extracellular matrix as well as stimulation of cartilage repair [51]. TGF-β1,-β2, and -β3 play key roles in regulation of chondrocyte differentiation from early to terminal stages, including condensation, proliferation, terminal differentiation, and ECM synthesis as well as maintenance of articular chondrocytes [52]. All the three isoforms are expressed in mesenchymal condensations and secreted by UC-MSCs [53–55]. BMPs play important roles in bone and cartilage formation, including various aspects of embryonic development, such as skeletogenesis, and hematopoietic and epithelial cell differentiation [56]. Moreover, BMPs can induce protection against cartilage damage caused by inflammation or trauma, as well as stimulation of regenerative processes. BMPs are classified into subfamilies, including BMP subfamily (from BMP1 to BMP15), the osteogenic protein (OP) subfamily (OP1, OP2, and OP3 also known as BMP7, BMP8, and BMP8b, respectively), the GDF subfamily (GDF1, GDF2/BMP9, GDF3, GDF5/BMP14, GDF6/BMP13, GDF7/BMP12, GDF8, GDF9, GDF10, and GDF11/BMP11), and the cartilage-derived morphogenetic proteins (CDMP1/ BMP14 and CDMP2/BMP13) [56]. BMP2, 4, 6, 7, and 9 have been reported to induce in vitro chondrogenesis of human MSCs [57]. UC-MSCs have been demonstrated to secrete BMP2 in vitro and to induce the increase of endogenous BMP4, 5, and 7 levels in vivo [58–60]. In addition, UC-MSCs induce overexpression of GDF5/BMP14/CDMP1, promoting chondrogenic differentiation in cocultures with fibroblast-like synoviocytes, thus, suggesting their potential in cartilage repair [61]. Moreover, UC-MSCs respond to
BMP6 via decapentaplegic homolog (SMAD) signaling (SMAD 1/4/5, BMPR1A, and BMPR2 receptors) enhancing osteogenic differentiation [62]. In particular, BMP-2 stimulates osteogenesis as well as matrix synthesis, promoting cartilage repair (by upregulation of tissue inhibitors of metalloproteinases-1, TIMP-1) and reversing chondrocyte dedifferentiation [63]. BMP-7 promotes cartilage matrix synthesis by acting synergistically with other anabolic growth factors and also inhibits catabolic factors, such as matrix metalloproteinase-1 (MMP-1), MMP-13, IL-1, IL-6, and IL-8 [64].

2.4. Cartilage Extracellular Matrix Repair. UC-MSCs can increase the ECM synthesis and inhibit the cartilage ECM destruction supporting the tissue repair. UC stromal tissue shares a number of features with cartilage ECM: UC-MSCs are able to synthesize aggrecan, type II collagen, and express SOX-9 transcription factor [12]. The deposition of ECM molecules and regulation of MMPs and their inhibitors (TIMPs) are the main mechanisms involved in cartilage ECM synthesis. MSCs secrete high levels of TIMP-1 and TIMP-2, which inhibit MMP-9 and MMP-2, respectively, thus, suppressing cartilage ECM resorption [65]. UC-MSCs secrete MMP-2, -8, -9, and -13 as well as TIMP-1 and TIMP-2 suggesting a balance between protection of ECM and antifibrotic activity (Table 2) [66–68]. In addition, UC-MSCs secrete growth factors such as HGF, IGF-1, and TGF-β superfamily members that stimulate cartilage ECM synthesis. In particular, HGF has been involved in inhibition of the fibrosis and apoptosis of chondrocytes and increase ECM synthesis [65]. IGF-1 and IGF-1-BP-3 and -BP-1 stimulate UC-MSCs to produce collagen and glycosaminoglycans (GAGs) [49]. BMP-2 increases TIMP-1 expression while BMP-7 inhibits MMP-1 and MMP-13 suppressing the ECM degradation [63, 64].

2.5. Anti-Inflammatory and Immunomodulatory Properties. The microenvironment of damaged articular cartilage is particularly challenging, due to hypoxia, insufficient blood supply, and concurrent inflammation. The latter contributes to the degeneration of the joints because it hampers the proliferation of chondrocytes and the deposition of cartilage matrix, resulting in low efficiency of repair. Immunomodulatory and anti-inflammatory properties of UC-MSCs have been widely described (Table 2) [69]. In particular, UC-MSCs express MHC class I (HLA-ABC) at low levels and lack MHC class II (HLA-DR, -DP, and -DQ). Moreover, they express other molecules belonging to noncanonical type I MHC such as HLA-G, HLA-E, and HLA-F [70–72]. Interestingly, HLA-G interacts with Ig-like transcript (ILT) receptors (ILT-2, ILT-3, and ILT-4), which are expressed by T and B lymphocytes, as well as natural killer (NK) cells and mononuclear phagocytes [69]. Through this interaction, HLA-G displays relevant immune functions which physiologically contribute to maternal-fetal immunotolerance. In addition, UC-MSCs lack CD40/CD40L, CD80, CD86, and B7 costimulatory antigens implicated in the activation of T and B cell responses and express coinhibitory molecules including B7-H3/CD276, CD73, Indolamine 2,3-dioxygenase-1 (IDO-1), Galectin-1 (Gal-1), and leukemia inhibitory factor (LIF) [73]. WJ-MSCs showed an immunosuppressive function by inhibiting the proliferative response of T helper cells (Th/CD4+) Type 1 (Th1) and Th17 and increasing Th2 and regulatory T cells (Tregs) [74]. UC-MSCs have been shown to be able to suppress the proliferation of both CD4 and CD8 cytotoxic T lymphocytes (Tc) and to decrease proinflammatory IFN-γ in activated peripheral blood mononuclear cells (PBMCs) [54, 75]. Moreover, secreted factors such as HGF and TGF-β1 may function as mediators for T cell suppression [76, 77]. UC-MSCs are also able to inhibit B-cells and natural killer (NK) cell proliferation as well as regulate monocyte/macrophage system by reducing the infiltration of macrophages in injured tissues and shifting macrophages toward a M2 anti-inflammatory phenotype [78, 79].

In the synovia of OA patients, various immune cells have been identified including M1 macrophages, T cells Th1, Th17 and Tc, and B cells, leading to chronic inflammation, exacerbation of arthritides, and tissue damage [80]. UC-MSCs have been shown to reduce synovial inflammatory cells infiltration, such as CD4+ T cells and macrophages, as well as significantly decrease the expression of interleukin- (IL-) 1β and tumor necrosis factor-α (TNF-α), while increasing anti-inflammatory factors TNF-α-induced protein 6 (TSG-6) and IL-1 receptor antagonist (IL-1RA) in rat OA models induced by monosodium iodoacetate (MIA) [81, 82]. In another study of MIA-induced OA in rabbits, UC-MSCs showed a prominent cartilage protective effect due to upregulation of growth factors FGF-2, TGF-β1, and IGF-1, secretion of ECM molecules (collagen type-I alpha-1 chain, collagen type-II alpha-1 chain, and aggrecan), reduction of the expression levels of pro-inflammatory cytokines Tnf-α, IL-1β, IL-6, and IL-17, and increase of anti-inflammatory cytokines TGF-β1, IL-10, and IL-1RA [83]. Interestingly, our group and others showed that UC-MSCs keep their hypoimmunogenic and immunomodulatory properties even when they had undergone in vitro chondrocyte differentiation [50, 84].

RA is a chronic inflammatory autoimmune disease characterized by chronic proliferation of synovial cells and progressive joint damage [85]. Fibroblast-like synoviocytes (FLS) play an important role in thickening of the synovium determining arthritis and cartilage degradation as well as inflammation and degradation of the joints. UC-MSCs inhibit Cadherin 11 expression in RA FLS by secreting IL-10. This event precludes the ability of FLS from RA patients to migrate and erode cartilage of other joints, thereby improving arthritis [86].

3. Preclinical and Clinical Studies of UC-MSCs for the Treatment of Cartilaginous Diseases

Thanks to their chondrogenic potential and immunomodulatory and anti-inflammatory properties, as well as their ability to promote endogenous repair mechanisms, UC-MSCs have been regarded as potential therapeutic agents against cartilage degradation. In particular, early evidences that emerged from in vitro studies on cell cultures (summarized in Table 3) have been confirmed in several in vivo animal experiments.
| Study type                                      | Source                                          | Aim                                              | Culture system                                                                 | Results                                                                                                                                                                                                 | Ref.          |
|-----------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------|
| Human UC-MSCs                                 | UC- and AT-MSC comparison                       | Chondrogenic differentiation                     | Cultured in CM supplemented with TGFβ and BMP-6                                | A more fibrous than hyaline cartilage phenotype in UC-MSCs compared to AT-MSCs                                                                                                                         | Hildner et al., 2010 [87] |
| Human WJ-MSCs                                 | Differentiation into NP-like cells               | Coculture with NPCs                              | Increased expression of aggrecan, collagen II, and SRY-type HMG box-9 genes    |                                                                                                                                                                                                         | Ruan et al., 2012 [88] |
| Human UC-MSCs                                 | Differentiation into NP-like cells               | Cultured in a laminin-rich pseudo-3D culture system |                                                                                          |                                                                                                                                                                                                         | Chon et al., 2013 [89] |
| Human WJ-MSCs                                 | Immunomodulatory properties test                | Cultured in CM                                   | Differentiated WJ-MSCs maintain their immune privilege                           |                                                                                                                                                                                                         | La Rocca et al., 2013 [50] |
| Human UC-MSCs                                 | Elastic cartilage differentiation                | Seeded on PLGA nanofiber scaffolds with CM and CTGF | Increase of GAG/DNA ratio, collagen II, elastin mRNA and protein. No difference  | TE elastic cartilage from UC-MSCs expresses embryonic fibrillin III and similar levels of elastin, fibrillin I, collagens I and X when compared to native cartilage.                                             | Caballero et al., 2013 [90] |
| Human UC-MSCs                                 | Tissue-engineered (TE) elastic cartilage from UC-MSCs and human cartilage comparison |                                                                                          |                                                                                          |                                                                                                                                                                                                         | Pappa et al., 2014 [120] |
| Human UC-MSCs                                 | Chondrogenic differentiation                     | Cultured in chondrogenic or osteogenic medium and exposed to 1 or 100Hz frequency vibrations | 1 Hz stimulation resulted in a cartilage phenotype while 100 Hz stimulation resulted in a bone phenotype for both human and porcine UC-MSCs |                                                                                                                                                                                                         | Cashion et al. 2014 [121] |
| Human UC-MSCs                                 | UC-, BM-, and AT-MSC chondrogenesis comparison   | Cultured in CM                                   | Slightly differences in chondrogenesis between the MSCs. BM-MSCs showed the best chondrogenic potential |                                                                                                                                                                                                         | Danišović et al., 2016 [92] |
| Human UC-MSCs                                 | Effect of mechanical compression on UC-MSC chondrogenesis | Seeded in PVA-PCL scaffold with CM and subjected to dynamic compression | Increase in chondrogenic differentiation                                          |                                                                                                                                                                                                         | Remya et al., 2016 [122] |
| Human WJ-MSCs                                 | Simulation of the articular cartilage microenvironment | Coculture of WJ-MSCs and primary ACs in ACECM- oriented scaffold | Chondrogenic differentiation of WJ-MSCs without any inducer, hyaline cartilage phenotype, and improved cytotoxicity of ACs |                                                                                                                                                                                                         | Zhang et al., 2019a [96] |
| Human UC-MSCs                                 | Interactions between ACs and UC-MSCs.           | Coculture with direct cell-cell contact          | Enhanced differentiation of UC-MSCs and reduced dedifferentiation of chondrocytes |                                                                                                                                                                                                         | Li et al., 2019 [97] |
| WJ-MSCs                                       | Immunomodulatory properties test                | Chondrogenic differentiation in Alg/HA scaffold  | Differentiated WJ-MSCs inhibit T cell alloproliferation and maintain paracrine activity and functional immunomodulation |                                                                                                                                                                                                         | Voisin et al., 2020 [84] |
| Cartilage tissue engineering                   | Human UC-MSCs                                   | PGA and PLLA scaffolds comparison                | Seeded on nonwoven PGA or PLLA scaffolds in CM                                  | Similar chondrogenic potential of UC-MSCs in PLLA and PGA scaffolds.                                                                                                                                     | Zhao et al., 2010 [123] |
| Study type | Source | Aim | Culture system | Results | Ref. |
|------------|--------|-----|----------------|---------|------|
| Human WJ-MSCs | WJ- and BM-MSCs | chondrogenesis comparison | Seeded in PCL/Coll nanofibrous scaffolds in CM | Enhanced cell attachment, proliferation, and chondrogenesis of WJ-MSCs over BM-MSCs | Fong et al., 2012 [124] |
| Human UC-MSCs | Chondrogenic differentiation | | Embedded in collagen hydrogel scaffold with CM | Increased expressions of collagen II, aggrecan, COMP, and sox9 | Chen et al., 2013 [125] |
| Human UC-MSCs | Chondrogenic differentiation in PVA-PCL scaffolds | | Seeded in PVA-PCL scaffolds with individual TGFβ1, TGFβ3, IGF, BMP2 and their combination with BMP2 | SOX9, collagen II and aggrecan expression. The combination TGF-β3 and BMP-2 was the more effective for chondrogenesis | Nirmal et al., 2013 [126] |
| Human WJ-MSCs | Fabrication of a nonscaffold tissue-engineered cartilage | | Pellet culture combined with RCCS | RCCS formed larger and condenser cartilage-like tissue enriched of GAGs and collagen II than pellet culture | Liu et al., 2014 [12] |
| Human WJ-MSCs | WJ- and BM-MSCs | chondrogenesis in agarose hydrogel | Encapsulation of WJ-MSCs or BM-MSCs aggregates in agarose hydrogels | Both BM-MSCs and WJ-MSCs did better in matrix biosynthesis and chondrogenesis when in aggregates than in free cell suspension | Sridharan et al., 2015 [127] |
| Human UC-MSCs | Chondrogenic differentiation in SF/HA scaffold | | Seeded in different ratios of SF/HA with CM | Expression of collagen II, aggrecan, and Sox9. SF80 and SF70 scaffolds are the best for chondrogenesis | Jaipaew et al., 2016 [128] |
| Human WJ-MSCs | Chondrogenesis of WJ-MSCs in PLLA-collagen nanofibers scaffold | | Seeded on PLLA-collagen nanofibers scaffold with CM | PLLA-collagen nanofibers scaffold promotes the chondrogenic differentiation of WJ-MSCs | Wang et al., 2017 [129] |
| Human WJ-MSCs | Chondrogenesis of WJ-MSCs in hyaluronic acid-based hydrogels | | Seeded in hyaluronic acid-based hydrogels with CM | Increase of GAGs, collagen II and aggrecan, | Aleksander-Konert et al., 2016 [130] |
| Human UC-MSC-ECM | Effect of decellularized UC-MSC-ECM on ACs | | AGs seeded in culture plates coated with UC-MSC-ECM | Promotion of the proliferation and differentiation of chondrocytes | Zhang et al., 2019b [131] |
| Human UC-MSCs | UC- and BM-MSCs chondrogenesis comparison | | Seeded onto PGA scaffolds in chondrogenic medium | More GAGs, collagen I, and aggrecan and less collagen II in UC-MSCs than BM-MSCs | Wang et al., 2009a [132] |
| Human UC-MSCs | Best density for UC-MSCs chondrogenesis | | Seeded on nonwoven PGA scaffold in CM | More collagen I and II, aggrecan, GAGs, and mechanical integrity in high-density groups | Wang et al., 2009b [133] |
| Human UC-MSCs | Chondrogenic and osteogenic differentiation | | Seeded between chondrogenic and osteogenic PLLA constructs | Both chondrogenic and osteogenic differentiation of UC-MSCs in the respective sides of constructs | Wang et al., 2011 [134] |
| Human UC-MSCs | Chondrogenic and osteogenic differentiation | | Seeded in osteogenic scaffold and in Collagen I and III- or HA-based chondrogenic scaffolds in normoxic or hypoxic (8% O2) conditions. | Both chondrogenic and osteogenic differentiation of UC-MSCs. Hypoxia improved the expression of these chondrogenic markers | Marmotti et al., 2017 [31] |
| Study type            | Source                      | Aim                                     | Culture system                                                                 | Results                                                                                   | Ref.              |
|----------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|
| Orthopaedic tissue   | Human UC-MSCs               | Multilineage differentiation            | Cultured in adipogenic, osteogenic, chondrogenic, or myogenic medium             | Multilineage differentiation potential toward bone, fat, cartilage, and muscle             | Marmotti et al., 2012 [91] |
| engineering          | Human UC-MSCs               | UC- and D-NP-MSCs comparison           | Cultured with CM                                                                | D-NPMSGs expressed lower expression levels of CD29 and CD105, reduced proliferation capability and differentiation potentials | Wu et al., 2017 [93] |
|                      | Human WJ-MSCs               | Interactions between WJ-MSGs and degenerative NPCs | Coculture with or without direct cell-cell contact                            | NP-like cell differentiation of WJ-MSCs and biological status of degenerative NPCs restoration. The direct cell-cell contact yielded more favorable gene expressions | Han et al., 2018 [98] |
| IVD degeneration     | Human UC-MSCs secretome    | UC-MSC-conditioned medium (CM) effect on damaged NP-MSCs | Treatment of high glucose-induced degradation of NP-MSCs with UC-MSCs-CM | Reduction of apoptosis and ECM degradation via the p38 MAPK pathway | Qi 2019 et al., 2019 [135] |
|                      | Human UC-MSCs-ECM           | Effect of UC-MCS-ECM on IVD cells       | IVD cells seeded on decellularized UC-MSCs-ECM                                 | UC-MSCs-ECM improved the degenerated phenotype of human IVD cells affecting the expression of Sox2, Sox 9 and TRPS1 | Penolazzi et al., 2020 [136] |
| OA                   | Human UC-MSCs secretome    | Comparison of articular cartilage (AC), Hoffa’s fat pad (HFP), synovial membrane (SM), and UC-MSC secretomes | Secretome analysis by mass spectrometry and effect on AC chondrogenesis and immunosuppressive and anti-inflammatory effects on PBMCs and macrophages | UC-MSCs-CM displayed superior anti-inflammatory, immunomodulatory and trophic effects compared to adult MSCs | Islam et al., 2019 [95] |
| RA                   | Human UC-MSCs               | UC-MSCs effect on FLS                   | Coculture                                                                       | Increase of FLS apoptosis, collagen II, and aggregan; decrease of IL-1β, IL-6 and CCL-2     | Zeng et al., 2016 [61] |
| TMJ disorders        | Human UC-MSCs               | UC-MSCs and TMJ condylar chondrocytes comparison | Seeded in PGA scaffolds in CM                                                    | More collagen I and II, GAGs, and cellular density in UC-MSCs than TMJ construct           | Bailey et al., 2007 [94] |

AC: articular cartilage cells; ACECM: acellular cartilage extracellular matrix; Alg/HA: alginate enriched in hyaluronic acid; CTGF: connective tissue growth factor; CM: chondrogenic medium; D-NP-MSCs: NP stem/progenitor cells isolated from degenerated IVD; ECM: extracellular matrix; FLS: fibroblast-like synoviocytes; GAGs: glycosaminoglycans; n.a.: not applicable; IVD: intervertebral disc; NP: nucleus pulposus; NPCs: nucleus pulposus cells; OA: osteoarthritis; PCL/Col: polycaprolactone/collagen; PGA: polygalactic acid; PLGA: poly L-lactide/D-lactide/glycolide; PLLA: poly-L-lactic acid; PMEF: pulsed electromagnetic field; PVA-PCL: polyvinyl alcohol-polycaprolactone; RA: rheumatoid arthritis; RCCS: rotary cell-culture system; SF/HA: silk fibroin/hyaluronic acid; TMJ: temporomandibular joint.
| Pathology | Source        | Host  | Study design                                                                 | Results                                                                                                                                                                                                 | Ref.      |
|-----------|---------------|-------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|
| IVD degeneration | Human UC-MSCs | Rabbit | $1 \times 10^5$ UC-MSCs injected into degenerated IVD                     | Increase in cellularity and a relative preservation of architecture                                                                                                                                 | Leckie et al., 2013 [137] |
|            | Human UC-MSCs | Rabbit | $1 \times 10^6$ UC-MSCs or $1 \times 10^6$ UC-MSC-derived CPCs injected into degenerated IVD | Improvement in the histology, cellularity, ECM proteins, water, and GAGs contents and higher expression of NP specific markers SOX9, ACAN, COL2, FOXF1, and KRT19 with CPCs | Beeravolu et al., 2018 [138] |
|            | Human UC-MSCs | Rabbit | $1 \times 10^6$ UC-MSC-derived NPCs injected into degenerated IVD         | Improvement in the histology, cellularity, sulfated GAGs, and water contents of the NP, Expression of SOX9, ACAN, COL2, FOXF1, KRT19, PAX6, CA12, and COMP | Perez-Cruet et al., 2019 [139] |
|            | Human UC-MSCs | Rat   | $1 \times 10^6$ UC-MSCs or UC-MSC-derived CPCs injected into degenerated IVD | Expression of chondrogenic markers and downregulation of pain and inflammatory genes. Differentiation of transplanted UC-MSCs and CPCs in functional NPCs. Better survival, homing, and distribution in IVD with CPCs. | Ekram et al., 2021 [140] |
| AM/UC particulate | Equine UC-MSCs | Rabbit | Early (day 3) or delayed (day 15) intra-articular injection of 3,5,10^6 UC-MSCs | Early IA injection of UC-MSCs exerted better anti-inflammatory and anticaatabolic effects (reduction of MMPs -1, -3, -13, and TNF-a) | Saulnier et al., 2015 [141] |
|            | Human UC-MSCs | Mouse | Intra-articular injection of $1 \times 10^5$ UC-MSCs                        | Attenuation of cartilage destruction, significant increase in cartilage thickness and volume, significant decrease in total lesion area with high dose at 4 weeks postinjection | Chang et al., 2018 [143] |
| OA        | Canine UC-MSCs | Dog   | Intra-articular injection of $1 \times 10^6$ UC-MSCs on days 1 and 3       | Repair of cartilage and patella, improvement of the healing of the surrounding tissue, reduction of joint effusion and inflammation (reduction of TNF-a, IL-6, and IL-7 blood levels) | Zhang et al., 2018 [144] |
|            | Canine UC-MSCs | Dog   | Intra-articular injection of $7 \times 10^5$ UC-MSCs                        | Improvement of clinical signs related to OA in treated dogs | Kim et al., 2019 [145] |
|            | Human UC-MSCs | Rabbit | Intra-articular injection of $1 \times 10^5$, $5 \times 10^5$ or $1 \times 10^6$ UC-MSCs | Chondrogenesis induction, upregulation of the expression of growth factors, ECM markers, and anti-inflammatory cytokines, and reduced expression of proinflammatory cytokines. Medium dose exerted the best effects | Kim et al., 2019 [83] |
|            | Human UC-MSCs | Rat   | Intra-articular injection of $1 \times 10^7$ UC-MSCs overexpressing miR-140-5p | UC-MSCs overexpressing miR-140-5p significantly enhanced articular cartilage self-repairing in comparison to normal UC-MSCs | Geng et al., 2019 [146] |
| Pathology       | Source          | Host      | Study design                                                                 | Results                                                                                                                                  | Ref.               |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|
| Human UC-MSCs   | Minipig         | Intra-articular injection of a UC-MSCs (5 × 10^6 cells) and HA composite (4%) | Significant gross and histological improvements in hyaline cartilage regeneration                                                                 | Wu et al., 2019 [147] |
| Equine UC-MSCs  | Horse           | 1 or 2 intra-articular injections (at 1-month interval) of 10 × 10^6 UC-MSCs | Improvement of lameness and total clinical score. No apparent clinical benefit of repeated intra-articular administration                              | Magri et al., 2019 [148] |
| Human UC-MSCs   | Mouse           | Intra-articular injection of 5 × 10^5 UC-MSCs at 3 or 6 weeks                | Significantly reduction of the loss of joint space and no evidence of an inflammatory response                                             | Perry et al., 2020 [149] |
| Human UC-MSCs   | Rat             | Single (day 1) or three (on days 1, 7 and 14) intra-articular injections of 2.5 × 10^5 UC-MSCs | Amelioration of cartilage erosion, alleviation of inflammatory cells infiltration and hyperplasia of the synovium by repeated injections. Increase number of SFCs on the articular cartilage surface | Tong et al., 2020 [81] |
| Human UC-MSCs   | Rat             | Intra-articular injection of 1 × 10^6 UC-MSCs in 100 μL HA                    | Temporary effects that decelerate the progression of cartilage degeneration, but may not inhibit OA progression in the long-term.        | Xing et al., 2020 [150] |
| Human UC-MSCs   | Mouse           | Intra-articular injection of low-dose UC-MSCs or UC-MSC-loaded GMs (3 × 10^6 cells) or high-dose UC-MSCs (3 × 10^5 cells) | UC-MSC-GMs promoted cartilage regeneration and inhibited macrophage-mediated synovitis better than low-dose and similar to high-dose UC-MSCs | Zhang et al., 2021 [42] |
| Human UC-MSCs   | Rat             | Intra-articular injection of 2.5 × 10^5 UC-MSCs once a week for 3 weeks       | UC-MSCs prevent cartilage degradation, restore the proliferation of chondrocytes, and inhibit the inflammatory response               | Zhang et al., 2021 [82] |
| Human UC-MSCs   | Rabbit          | Intra-articular injection of UC-MSCs with GO granular lubricant              | UC-MSCs loaded with the GO granular lubricant reduce the inflammatory level and improve the level of biochemical environment in the joint | Wang et al., 2021 [151] |
| Human UC-MSCs   | Mouse           | Intraperitoneal injection of 1 × 10^6 UC-MSCs each day for 5 days            | Reduction of the severity of RA, reduced levels of proinflammatory cytokines and chemokines (TNF-α, IL-6, and MCP-1) and increased levels of the anti-inflammatory cytokine (IL-10), Th1/Th2 type responses shifting and Tregs induction | Liu et al., 2010 [152] |
| Human UC-MSCs   | Mouse           | Intra-articular injection of 1 × 10^6 UC-MSCs and/or 100 μg/mL TNF-α inhibitor | Inhibition of TNF-α decreases cartilage destruction by suppressing the immunogenicity of UC-MSCs                                         | Wu et al., 2012 [153] |
| RA              | Rat             | Tail vein injection of 1 × 10^6 UC-MSCs                                     | Markedly increased percentage of Tregs and antithrombin levels, decrease of IL-1, IL-17, TNF-α, VEGF, and tissue factor levels          | Gu et al., 2015 [154] |
| Human UC-MSCs   | Mouse           | Tail vein injection of 1 × 10^6 UC-MSCs or BM-MSCs or SHED                   | UC-MSCs exert the best therapeutic effect in reducing bone resorption, joint destruction, and inflammatory factor expression               | Zhang et al. 2019 [155] |
| Human UC-MSCs   | Rat             | Intravenous injection of 2 × 10^6 UC-MSCs                                   | Improvement arthritis, delay of radiological progression, and inhibition of synovial hyperplasia by downregulation of RORγt and upregulation of Foxp3 expression, inhibition of IL-17 and promotion of TGF-β | Ma et al., 2019 [156] |
| Pathology               | Source                | Host    | Study design                                                                 | Results                                                                                                                                                                                                 | Ref.               |
|------------------------|-----------------------|---------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|
| Human UC-MSCs          | Rat                   |         | Intraperitoneal injection of $2 \times 10^6$ UC-MSCs                          | expression, inhibition of proliferation and promotion of apoptosis in T lymphocytes and increased Tregs ratio. Slow down the progression of disease activity and reversal of arthritic processes along with triggering of joint tissue repair mechanisms. | Vohra et al., 2020 [157] |
| Human UC-MSCs           | Rat                   |         | ND                                                                            | Ameliorate arthritis and inhibit synovial hyperplasia in a dose-dependent manner by inhibiting T lymphocyte proliferation and promoting their apoptosis, decreasing Th17 cell proportion and increasing that of Tregs, decreasing serum IL-17, and enhanced IL-10 and TGF-β expression, decreasing RORγt and increased FOXP3 expression. | Xu et al., 2021 [158] |
| Human WJ-ECM           | Rabbit                |         | $1 \times 10^6$ rabbit chondrocytes seeded in decellularized WJ-ECM scaffold inserted into the cartilage defects | All defects were filled completely with repaired tissue, and most of which were hyaline cartilage compared to WJ-ECM alone in which the defects filled partially with repaired tissue. | Zhao et al., 2018 [159] |
| Human WJ-MSCs          | Goat                  |         | $1 \times 10^6$ WJ-MSCs seeded in ACECM-oriented scaffold implanted into the articular cartilage defect | The WJ-MSCs-ACECM scaffold complex achieved better quality repair and regeneration of hyaline cartilage compared to microfracture (predominant clinical treatment strategy for damaged cartilage). 50:50 ratio was more similar to native cartilage and better integrated with the surrounding tissue, more abundant cartilage-specific content and significantly higher mechanical strength, no significant joint effusion or bone marrow edema signal. WJ-MSCs possessed low immunogenicity and escaped destruction by the immune system. | Zhang et al., 2018 [160] |
| Human WJ-MSCs          | Goat                  |         | $1 \times 10^7$ WJ-MSCs and pACs mixed in 3 ratios: 100:0, 0:100 and 50:50 and seeded into ACECM-oriented scaffolds implanted into the articular cartilage defect | Tissues repair observed over 16 months, with a hyaline-like neocartilage layer and regenerated subchondral bone. No immune rejection. WJ-MSCs were superior to those differentiated. | Zhang et al., 2020 [161] |
| Human UC-MSCs-Exosomes | Rabbit                |         | Intra-articular injection of $1 \times 10^{10}$ mL−1 of 2D or 3D culture in hollow-fiber bioreactor of UC-MSCs exosomes | Enhanced gross appearance and attenuated cartilage defect; 3D-cultured exosomes showed a superior therapeutic effect. | Yan et al., 2020 [162] |
| Human UC-MSCs          | Rat                   |         | WJ/CS composite scaffold loaded with UC-MSCs implanted into the articular cartilage defect | The composite scaffold loaded with UC-MSCs repaired cartilage defects better than did the WJ scaffold loaded with UC-MSCs. Both the scaffold and UC-MSCs showed low immunogenicity. | Li et al., 2021 [163] |
| Rabbit UC-MSCs         | Rabbit                |         | PLGA scaffold with a continuous gradient transition between TGF-β1 and BMP-2 seeded with $3 \times 10^5$ UC-MSCs implanted into articular osteochondral defect | Beneficial effect for bone and cartilage regeneration. | Domer et al., 2012 [164] |
| Human WJ-MSCs          | Rabbit                |         | $3 \times 10^7$ undifferentiated or chondrogenically induced WJ-MSCs seeded in ECM of swine cartilage-derived scaffolds | Tissues repair observed over 16 months, with a hyaline-like neocartilage layer and regenerated subchondral bone. No immune rejection. WJ-MSCs were superior to those differentiated. | Liu et al., 2017 [165] |
Table 4: Continued.

| Pathology  | Source | Host | Study design | Results | Ref. |
|------------|--------|------|--------------|---------|------|
| Human WJ-MSCs exosomes | Rat and Rabbit | Rat: 25 μg/mL of WJ-MSC exosomes injected in joint cavity (5 times, every 7 days) | WJ-MSC exosomes enhance the effect of the ACECM scaffold and promote osteochondral regeneration, regulate the microenvironment of the articular cavity promoting the polarization of macrophages toward the M2 phenotype and inhibiting the inflammatory response. WJ-MSC exosomes contain many miRNAs that can promote the regeneration of hyaline cartilage | Jiang et al., 2021 [166] |
Table 5: Clinical trials of cartilage repair with UC-MSCs or their secretome.

| Pathology | Source | Study design | Delivery mode | Patients (N°) | Results | Ref. |
|-----------|--------|--------------|---------------|--------------|---------|------|
| OA        | Human UC-MSCs | Randomized, double-blind, controlled phase I/II | Intra-articular injection of $20 \times 10^6$ UC-MSCs once or twice vs. HA injection | 29 | Double injection group showed significant amelioration of pain and disability at 6 and 12 months of follow-up compared to HA group. No severe adverse events were reported. | Matas et al., 2019 [167] |
| AM/UC particulate | Human UC-MSCs | Open-label, single arm, phase I/II | Injection of $10 \times 10^6$ UC-MSCs in 2 mL secretome + 2 mL HA | 29 | Significant reduction of the pain and greatest improvement in knee function after 6th-month follow-up. | Dilogo et al., 2020 [168] |
|          | AM/UC particulate | Single-center, investigator-initiated, retrospective study | Inta-articular injection of 100 mg of AM/UC particulate | 42 | Significant clinical improvement of pain and function in patients with moderate to severe knee OA, with the potential to delay total knee replacement for up to 12 months | Mead et al., 2020 [169] |
| RA       | Human UC-MSCs | Prospective phase I/II study | Intravenous injection of $2 \times 10^7$ UC-MSCs | 64 | Lower levels of serological markers ESR, CRP, RF at 1 and 3 years and anti-CCP at 3 years after treatment. Decrease of health and joint function indexes 1 and 3 years after treatment. | Wang et al., 2019 [170] |
| RA       | Human UC-MSCs | Phase I/II study | Intravenous drip of $4 \times 10^7$ UC-MSCs and intravenous injection of 24 mg of cervus and cucumis peptides | 119 | Significant reduction of serological markers ESR, CRP, RF, and anti-CCP and improvement of health index and joint function index 1 year after treatment. | Qi et al., 2020 [171] |
|           | Human UC-MSCs | Randomized, controlled phase I/II | Intravenous infusion of $1 \times 10^6$ cells/kg of body weight with or without a single intramuscular infusion of 1 million IU of IFN-γ | 63 | Efficacy and ACR20 response rates attained in 53.3% patients with UC-MSCs alone and in 93.3% patients with UC-MSCs combined with IFN-γ at 3-month follow-up. No new or unexpected safety issues in 1-year follow-up. | He et al., 2020 [172] |

ACR20: American College of Rheumatology 20; AM/UC: amniotic membrane/umbilical cord; CCP: cyclic citrullinated peptide (CCP) antibody; CRP: C-reactive protein; ESR: the erythrocyte sedimentation rate; HA: hyaluronic acid; OA: osteoarthritis; RA: rheumatoid arthritis; RF: rheumatoid factor.
models (listed in Table 4) and in recent clinical trials (reported in Table 5).

Preliminary in vitro studies investigated the chondrogenic potential of UC-MSCs, demonstrating their ability to achieve both hyaline, fibrous, and elastic cartilage phenotypes as well as nucleus pulposus-like cell differentiation capacity [87–90]. In addition, also the osteogenic, adipogenic, and myogenic differentiation potential have been reported suggesting UC-MSCs could be a pivotal stem cells source for tissue engineering applications in orthopaedics [91]. Comparative studies reported slightly differences in chondrogenesis between the UC-, BM-, and AT-MSCs. In particular, according to Danisović et al., BM-MSCs showed the best chondrogenic potential while Hildner and coworkers showed that differentiated UC-MSCs present a more fibrous than hyaline cartilage phenotype compared to AT-MSCs suggesting their role in regeneration of fibrocartilage-like meniscus [87, 92]. Moreover, the results of Wu and coworkers indicate that, although nucleus pulposus stem/progenitor cells (D-NP-MSCs) isolated from degenerated intervertebral disc (IVD) shared the MSCs characteristics with UC-MSCs, the latter showed better proliferation capacity and differentiation potential, suggesting that UC-MSCs as a suitable source for regenerative therapy of IVD degeneration [93]. Furthermore, UC-MSCs may be an attractive alternative to condylar cartilage cells for temporomandibular joint tissue engineering applications [94]. Interestingly, UC-MSCs displayed superior anti-inflammatory, immunomodulatory, and trophic effects compared to adult MSCs including articular cartilage (AC), Hoffa’s fat pad (HFP), synovial membrane (SM), and maintain their immunomodulatory and anti-inflammatory properties after differentiation [50, 84, 95]. Moreover, coculture experiments of UC-MSCs and articular cartilage cells (ACs), fibroblast-like synoviocytes (FLSs), and nucleus pulposus cells (NPCs) showed their suitability for the treatment of arthritis, synovitis, and IVD degeneration [61, 96–98]. Finally, there are several cartilage tissue engineering studies that demonstrated the osteochondral differentiation capacity of UC-MSCs in different scaffold constituted by acellular cartilage extracellular matrix (ACECM), alginate enriched in hyaluronic acid (Alg/HA), polycaprolactone/collagen (PCL/Coll), polyglycolic acid (PGA), poly L-lactide/D-lactide/glycolide (PLGA), poly-L-lactic acid (PLLA), polyvinyl alcohol-polycaprolactone (PVA-PCL), and silk fibroin/hyaluronic acid (SF/HA).

In vivo studies in different animal models from mice to horses confirmed in vitro studies showing the feasibility of using UC-MSCs for the treatment of IVD degeneration, OA, RA, and cartilage defects repair. UC-MSC transplantation promotes chondrogenesis and improves the histology, cellularity, and ECM proteins content along with reduction of inflammation in a preclinical model of IVD degeneration. In the same way, UC-MSCs induce regeneration and repair of cartilage reducing its destruction, promote recovery from movement impairment, and reduce joint effusion and inflammation slowing down the progression of OA animal models. In addition, preclinical studies on RA treatment showed that UC-MSCs exerted the best therapeutic effect in reducing bone resorption, joint destruction, and inflammatory factor expression compared to BM-MSCs. Interestingly, several evidences support the regenerative potential of UC-MSCs in cartilage and osteochondral defects repair.

Following the promising in vitro and in vivo results, clinical applications have been attempted using UC-MSCs for the treatment of OA and RA (Table 5). In summary, clinical trials for the treatment of OA showed significant amelioration of pain and disability at 6 and 12 months of follow-up. No severe adverse events were reported. The main outcomes for RA patients treated with UC-MSCs were significant reduction of RA serological markers and improvement of health index and joint function index 1 year after treatment. No new or unexpected safety issues in 1-year follow-up. Despite the promising results of clinical trials, further basic and translational research investigations are needed to better understand the best stem cell candidate, scaffold materials, and/or best cellular derivatives which can be suitable for the different types of cartilage regeneration. In parallel, there is the need to increase the knowledge about underlying regenerative mechanisms. Finally, more research is needed to convert preclinical evidences obtained in animal models, to human-based clinical applications for cartilage regeneration. Consensus is still lacking in key points such as the methods to obtain the cell source, the use of scaffolds as well as bioactive molecules in parallel to the administration of stromal cells. As shown in the human studies reviewed so far, the achievement of amelioration of some parameters and confirmation of the safety of the overall procedure still needs more data generated on the interaction of the transplanted cells with the host tissue, their proper differentiation in vivo, as well as the long-term achievements of this cellular replacement strategy.

4. Conclusions

In conclusion, UC-MSCs represent a promising candidate for the therapy of chondropathies, as highlighted by the encouraging results emerged from in vitro and in vivo investigations and from the available results from clinical trials. UC-MSCs are characterized by several potential advantages such as a frank multilineage differentiation potential, immunomodulatory, and anti-inflammatory properties, as well as MSCs the ability to constitutively produce molecules that are involved in cartilage matrix biogenesis and in the trophic and reparative functions. In addition, UC-MSCs are able to migrate, home, and survive in an ischemic and nutrient-poor environment like cartilage as well as to produce an extracellular matrix (ECM) similar to that and induce endogenous repair mechanisms. We believe that these results warrant the need for further researches that can better define the criteria leading to the adoption of UC-MSCs in the stem cell-based therapy of cartilage diseases, as well as characterizing the mechanism of repair and increase the knowledge on the biomechanical properties of the regenerated cartilage tissue in vivo.

Conflicts of Interest

Prof. Giampiero La Rocca is member of the Scientific board of Auxocell Laboratories, Inc. The other authors report no conflicts.
Acknowledgments

GLR is a recipient of a PRIN 2017 fund by the Italian Ministry of University.

References

[1] Y. Krishnan and A. J. Grodzinsky, "Cartilage diseases," *Matrix Biology*, vol. 71-72, pp. 51–69, 2018.

[2] A. Cieza, K. Causey, K. Kamenov, S. W. Hanson, S. Chatterji, and T. Vos, "Global estimates of the need for rehabilitation based on the Global Burden of Disease study 2019: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2019," *The Lancet*, vol. 396, no. 100267, pp. 2006–2017, 2021.

[3] Y. P. Li, X. C. Wei, J. M. Zhou, and L. Wei, "The age-related changes in cartilage and osteoarthritis," *BioMed Research International*, vol. 2013, Article ID 916530, 12 pages, 2013.

[4] N. Arden and M. Nevitt, "Osteoarthritis: epidemiology," *Best Practice & Research. Clinical Rheumatology*, vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 3–25, 2006.

[5] W. M. Hopman, M. B. Harrison, H. Coo, E. Friedberg, M. Buchanan, and E. G. VanDerkerkhof, "Associations between chronic disease, age and physical and mental health status," *Chronic Diseases in Canada*, vol. 29, no. 3, pp. 108–117, 2009.

[6] D. Umlauf, S. Frank, T. Pap, and J. Bertrand, "Cartilage biology, pathology, and repair," *Cellular and Molecular Life Sciences*, vol. 67, no. 24, pp. 4197–4211, 2010.

[7] T. W. O’Neill and D. T. Felson, "Mechanisms of osteoarthritis (OA) pain," *Current Osteoporosis Reports*, vol. 16, no. 5, pp. 611–616, 2018.

[8] M. C. Reid, R. Shengelia, and S. J. Parker, "Pharmacologic management of osteoarthritis-related pain in older adults," *HSS Journal*, vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 159–164, 2012.

[9] P. Orth, A. Rey-Rico, J. K. Venkatesan, H. Madry, and M. Cucchiarini, "Current perspectives in stem cell research for knee cartilage repair," *Stem Cells Cloning*, vol. 7, pp. 1–17, 2014.

[10] D. L. Troyer and M. L. Weiss, "Concise review: Wharton’s jelly-derived cells are a primitive stromal cell population," *Stem Cells*, vol. 26, no. 3, pp. 591–599, 2008.

[11] J. E. Davies, J. T. Walker, and A. Keating, "Concise review: Wharton’s jelly: the rich, but enigmatic, source of mesenchymal stromal cells," *Stem Cells Translational Medicine*, vol. 6, no. 7, pp. 1620–1630, 2017.

[12] S. Liu, K. D. Hou, M. Yuan et al., "Characteristics of mesenchymal stem cells derived from Wharton’s jelly of human umbilical cord and for fabrication of non-scaffold tissue-engineered cartilage," *Journal of Bioscience and Bioengineering*, vol. 117, no. 2, pp. 229–235, 2014.

[13] Y. Yin, X. Li, X. T. He, R. X. Wu, H. H. Sun, and F. M. Chen, "Leveraging stem cell homing for therapeutic regeneration," *Journal of Dental Research*, vol. 96, no. 6, pp. 601–609, 2017.

[14] O. I. Eseonu and C. De Bari, "Homing of mesenchymal stem cells: mechanistic or stochastic? Implications for targeted delivery in arthritis," *Rheumatology*, vol. 54, no. 2, pp. 210–218, 2015.

[15] C. Shen, P. Lie, T. Miao et al., "Conditioned medium from umbilical cord mesenchymal stem cells induces migration and angiogenesis," *Molecular Medicine Reports*, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 20–30, 2015.

[16] T. Kitaori, H. Ito, E. M. Schwarz et al., "Stromal cell-derived factor 1/CXCR4 signaling is critical for the recruitment of mesenchymal stem cells to the fracture site during skeletal repair in a mouse model," *Arthritis and Rheumatism*, vol. 60, no. 3, pp. 813–823, 2009.

[17] W. Zhang, J. Chen, J. Tao et al., "The use of type 1 collagen scaffold containing stromal cell-derived factor-1 to create a matrix environment conducive to partial-thickness cartilage defects repair," *Biomaterials*, vol. 34, no. 3, pp. 713–723, 2013.

[18] J. M. Petty, C. C. Lenox, D. J. Weiss, M. E. Poynter, and B. T. Suratt, "Crosstalk between CXCR4/Stromal Derived Factor-1 and VLA-4/VCAM-1 pathways regulates neutrophil retention in the bone marrow," *The Journal of Immunology*, vol. 182, no. 1, pp. 604–612, 2009.

[19] D. Cox, M. Brennan, and N. Moran, "Integrins as therapeutic targets: lessons and opportunities," *Nature Reviews Drug Discovery*, vol. 9, no. 10, pp. 804–820, 2010.

[20] N. L. Payne, G. Sun, C. McDonald et al., "Distinct immunomodulatory and migratory mechanisms underpin the therapeutic potential of human mesenchymal stem cells in autoimmune demyelination," *Cell Transplantation*, vol. 22, no. 8, pp. 1409–1425, 2013.

[21] C. Zou, Q. Luo, J. Qin et al., "Osteopontin promotes mesenchymal stem cell migration and lessens cell stiffness via integrin β1, FAK, and ERK pathways," *Cell Biochemistry and Biophysics*, vol. 65, no. 3, pp. 455–462, 2013.

[22] S. A. Lund, C. M. Giachelli, and M. Scatena, "The role of osteopontin in inflammatory processes," *Journal of Cell Communication and Signaling*, vol. 3, no. 3–4, pp. 311–322, 2009.

[23] F. Zhang, W. Luo, Y. Li, S. Gao, and G. Lei, "Role of osteopontin in rheumatoid arthritis," *Rheumatology International*, vol. 35, no. 4, pp. 589–595, 2015.

[24] C. Cheng, S. Gao, and G. Lei, "Association of osteopontin with osteoarthritis," *Rheumatology International*, vol. 34, no. 12, pp. 1627–1631, 2014.

[25] R. K. Schneider, A. Puellen, R. Kramann et al., "The osteogenic differentiation of adult bone marrow and perinatal umbilical mesenchymal stem cells and matrix remodelling in three-dimensional collagen scaffolds," *Biomaterials*, vol. 31, no. 3, pp. 467–480, 2010.

[26] X. Fu, G. Liu, A. Halim, Y. Ju, Q. Luo, and G. Song, "Mesenchymal stem cell migration and tissue repair," *Cell*, vol. 8, no. 8, p. 784, 2019.

[27] G. Pattappa, B. Johnstone, J. Zellner, D. Docheva, and P. Angele, "The importance of physioxia in mesenchymal stem cell chondrogenesis and the mechanisms controlling its response," *International Journal of Molecular Sciences*, vol. 20, no. 3, p. 484, 2019.

[28] D. C. Chow, L. A. Wenning, W. M. Miller, and E. T. Papoutsakis, "Modeling PO2 Distributions in the Bone Marrow Hematopoietic Compartment. I. Krogh’s Model," *Biophysical Journal*, vol. 81, no. 2, pp. 675–684, 2001.

[29] A. Bizzarri, H. Koehler, M. Caijakovic et al., "Continuous oxygen monitoring in subcutaneous adipose tissue using microdialysis," *Analytica Chimica Acta*, vol. 573-574, pp. 48–56, 2006.

[30] B. Fischer and B. D. Bavister, "Oxygen-tension in the oviduct and uterus of rhesus-monkeys, hamsters and rabbits," *Journal of Reproduction and Fertility*, vol. 99, no. 2, pp. 673–679, 1993.
[31] A. Marmotti, S. Mattia, F. Castoldi et al., “Allogeneic umbilical cord-derived mesenchymal stem cells as a potential source for cartilage and bone regeneration: an in vitro study,” Stem Cells International, vol. 2017, Article ID 1732094, 16 pages, 2017.

[32] A. Lavrentieva, I. Majore, C. Kasper, and R. Hass, “Effects of hypoxic culture conditions on umbilical cord-derived human mesenchymal stem cells,” Cell Communication and Signaling: CCS, vol. 8, no. 1, p. 18, 2010.

[33] U. Nekanti, S. Dastidar, P. Venugopal, S. Totey, and M. Ta, “Increased proliferation and analysis of differential gene expression in human Wharton’s jelly-derived mesenchymal stromal cells under hypoxia,” International Journal of Biological Sciences, vol. 6, no. 5, pp. 499–512, 2010.

[34] E. Russo, J. Y. Lee, H. Nguyen et al., “Energy metabolism analysis of three different mesenchymal stem cell populations of umbilical cord under normal and pathologic conditions,” Stem Cell Reviews and Reports, vol. 16, no. 3, pp. 585–595, 2020.

[35] Y. Kaneko, J. Y. Lee, N. Tajiri et al., “Translating intracardiot artery transplantation of bone marrow-derived NCS-01 cells for ischemic stroke: behavioral and histological readouts and mechanistic insights into stem cell therapy,” Stem Cells Translational Medicine, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 203–220, 2020.

[36] E. G. Neal, M. G. Liska, T. Lippert et al., “An update on intracerebral stem cell grafts,” Expert Review of Neurotherapeutics, vol. 18, no. 7, pp. 557–572, 2018.

[37] B. Cozene, E. Russo, R. Anzalone, G. La Rocca, and C. Borlongan, “Mitochondrial activity of human umbilical cord mesenchymal stem cells,” Brain Circulation, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 33–36, 2021.

[38] E. Russo, T. Lippert, J. P. Tuazon, and C. V. Borlongan, “Advancing stem cells: new therapeutic strategies for treating central nervous system disorders,” Brain Circulation, vol. 4, no. 3, pp. 81–83, 2018.

[39] K. Sobolewski, A. Malkowski, E. Bańkowski, and S. Jaworski, “Wharton’s jelly as a reservoir of peptide growth factors,” Placenta, vol. 26, no. 10, pp. 747–752, 2005.

[40] L. Qin and F. Beier, “EGFR Signaling: friend or foe for cartilage?,” JBMR Plus, vol. 3, no. 2, article e10177, 2019.

[41] D. L. Long, V. Ulici, S. Chubinskaya, and R. F. Loeser, “Heparin-binding epithelial growth factor-like growth factor (HB-EGF) is increased in osteoarthritis and regulates chondrocyte catabolic and anabolic activities,” Osteoarthritis and Cartilage, vol. 23, no. 9, pp. 1523–1531, 2015.

[42] X. Zhang, S. Liu, Z. Wang et al., “Implanted 3D gelatin microcryogel enables low-dose cell therapy for osteoarthritis by preserving the viability and function of umbilical cord MSCs,” Chemical Engineering Journal, vol. 416, article 129140, 2021.

[43] H. Tonomura, M. Nagae, R. Takаторi, H. Ishibashi, T. Itsuji, and K. Takahashi, “The potential role of hepatocyte growth factor in degenerative disorders of the synovial joint and spine,” International Journal of Molecular Sciences, vol. 21, no. 22, p. 8717, 2020.

[44] Y. Wang, M. Yuan, Q. Guo, S. Lu, and J. Peng, “Mesenchymal stem cells for treating articular cartilage defects and osteoarthritis,” Cell Transplantation, vol. 24, no. 9, pp. 1661–1678, 2015.

[45] Y. Petrenko, I. Vackova, K. Kekulova et al., “A comparative analysis of multipotent mesenchymal stromal cells derived from different sources, with a focus on neuroregenerative potential,” Scientific Reports, vol. 10, no. 1, p. 4290, 2020.

[46] E. Sulpiace, B. Ding, B. Muscatelli-Groux et al., “Cross-talk between the VEGF-A and HGF signalling pathways in endothelial cells,” Biology of the Cell, vol. 101, no. 9, pp. 525–539, 2009.

[47] B. E. Bobick, F. H. Chen, A. M. Le, and R. S. Tuan, “Regulation of the chondrogenic phenotype in culture,” Birth Defects Research Part C: Embryo Today: Reviews, vol. 87, no. 4, pp. 351–371, 2009.

[48] Y. Tao, X. Zhou, C. Liang et al., “TGF-β3 and IGF-1 synergy ameliorates nucleus pulposus mesenchymal stem cell differentiation towards the nucleus pulposus cell type through MAPK/ERK signaling,” Growth Factors, vol. 33, no. 5-6, pp. 326–336, 2015.

[49] J. Palka, E. Bańkowski, and S. Jaworski, “An accumulation of IGF-I and IGF-binding proteins in human umbilical cord,” Molecular and Cellular Biochemistry, vol. 206, no. 1/2, pp. 133–139, 2000.

[50] G. La Rocca, M. L. Iacono, T. Corsello, S. Corrao, F. Farina, and R. Anzalone, “Human Wharton’s jelly mesenchymal stem cells maintain the expression of key immunomodulatory molecules when subjected to osteogenic, adiogenic and chondrogenic differentiation in vitro: new perspectives for cellular therapy,” Current Stem Cell Research & Therapy, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 100–113, 2013.

[51] W. Wang, D. Rigueur, and K. M. Lyons, “TGFβ signaling in cartilage development and maintenance,” Birth Defects Research Part C: Embryo Today: Reviews, vol. 102, no. 1, pp. 37–51, 2014.

[52] A. S. Patil, R. B. Sable, and R. M. Kothari, “An update on transforming growth factor-β (TGF-β): sources, types, functions and clinical applicability for cartilage/bone healing,” Journal of Cellular Physiology, vol. 226, no. 12, pp. 3094–3103, 2011.

[53] G. Y. Liu, Y. Xu, Y. Li, L. H. Wang, J. Y. Liu, and D. Zhu, “Secreted galectin-3 as a possible biomarker for the immunomodulatory potential of human umbilical cord mesenchymal stromal cells,” Cytotherapy, vol. 15, no. 10, pp. 1208–1217, 2013.

[54] R. Donders, J. F. Boge, S. Ravanidis et al., “Human Wharton’s jelly-derived stem cells display a distinct immunomodulatory and pro-regenerative transcriptional signature compared to bone marrow-derived stem cells,” Stem Cells and Development, vol. 27, no. 2, pp. 65–84, 2018.

[55] L. B. Copland, S. L. Adamson, M. Post, S. J. Lye, and I. Caniggia, “TGF-β3 Expression During Umbilical Cord Development and its Alteration in Pre-eclampsia,” Placenta, vol. 23, no. 4, pp. 311–321, 2002.

[56] Z. H. Deng, Y. S. Li, X. Gao, G. H. Lei, and J. Huard, “Bone morphogenetic proteins for articular cartilage regeneration,” Osteoarthritis and Cartilage, vol. 26, no. 9, pp. 1153–1161, 2018.

[57] S. Scarfi, “Use of bone morphogenetic proteins in mesenchymal stem cell stimulation of cartilage and bone repair,” World Journal of Stem Cells, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 1–12, 2016.

[58] M. Kosinski, A. Figiel-Dabrowska, W. Lech et al., “Bone defect repair using a bone substitute supported by mesenchymal stem cells derived from the umbilical cord,” Stem Cells International, vol. 2020, Article ID 1321283, 15 pages, 2020.

[59] J. Choi, T. Bae, N. Byambasuren et al., “CRISPR-Cpf1 Activation of Endogenous _BMP4_ Gene for Osteogenic
Stem Cells International

Differentiation of Umbilical-Cord-Derived Mesenchymal Stem Cells,” Molecular Therapy - Methods & Clinical Development, vol. 17, pp. 309–316, 2020.

[60] D. B. Guo, X. Q. Zhu, Q. Q. Li et al., “Efficacy and mechanisms underlying the effects of allogeneic umbilical cord mesenchymal stem cell transplantation on acute radiation injury in tree shrews,” Cytotechnology, vol. 70, no. 5, pp. 1447–1468, 2018.

[61] J. Zeng, F. Wang, and M. Mao, “Co-culture of fibroblast-like synoviocytes with umbilical cord-mesenchymal stem cells inhibits expression of pro-inflammatory proteins, induces apoptosis and promotes chondrogenesis,” Molecular Medicine Reports, vol. 14, no. 4, pp. 3887–3893, 2016.

[62] Q. Wang, L. Xu, R. Willumeit-Römer, and B. J. Luthringer-S. R. Frenkel, P. B. Saadeh, B. J. Mehrara et al., “J. Zeng, F. Wang, and M. Mao, “Wharton’s jelly mesenchymal stem cells as candidates for beta cells regeneration: extending the differentiative and immunomodulatory benefits of adult mesenchymal stem cells for the treatment of type 1 diabetes,” Stem Cell Reviews and Reports, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 342–363, 2011.

[73] T. Corsello, G. Amico, S. Corrao et al., “Wharton’s jelly mesenchymal stromal cells from human umbilical cord: a close-up on immunomodulatory molecules featured in situ and in vitro,” Stem Cell Reviews and Reports, vol. 15, no. 6, pp. 900–918, 2019.

[74] Q. Wang, Q. Yang, Z. Wang et al., “Comparative analysis of human mesenchymal stem cells from fetal-bone marrow, adipose tissue, and Wharton’s jelly as sources of cell immunomodulatory therapy,” Human Vaccines & Immunotherapeutics, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 85–96, 2016.

[75] M. Najjar, G. Raicevic, H. I. Bouker et al., “Mesenchymal stromal cells use PGE2 to modulate activation and proliferation of lymphocyte subsets: combined comparison of adipose tissue, Wharton’s Jelly and bone marrow sources,” Cellular Immunology, vol. 264, no. 2, pp. 171–179, 2010.

[76] R. Anzalone, M. L. Iacono, S. Corrao et al., “New emerging potentials for human Wharton’s jelly mesenchymal stem cells: immunological features and hepatocyte-like differentiative capacity,” Stem Cells and Development, vol. 19, no. 4, pp. 423–438, 2010.

[77] A. Gupta, S. F. el-Amin III, H. J. Levy, R. Sze-Tu, S. E. Ibim, and R. Anzalone, “Comparative analysis of Wharton’s jelly mesenchymal stem cells and inhibiting synovitis with umbilical cord-mesenchymal stem cells,” The Journal of the American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons, vol. 21, no. 5, pp. 303–311, 2013.

[78] S. Frenkel, P. B. Saadeh, B. J. Mehrara et al., “Transforming growth factor beta superfamily members: role in cartilage modeling,” Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery, vol. 105, no. 3, pp. 980–990, 2000.

[79] R. S. Tuan, A. F. Chen, and B. A. Klatt, “Cartilage regeneration,” The American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons, vol. 21, no. 5, pp. 303–311, 2013.

[80] Z. Wang, J. Xue, R. Willumeit-Römer, and B. J. Luthringer-S. R. Frenkel, P. B. Saadeh, B. J. Mehrara et al., “Wharton’s jelly mesenchymal stem cells: amazing remedies for bone and cartilage defects,” Stem Cell Research & Therapy, vol. 11, no. 1, p. 492, 2020.

[81] A. Mauro, M. Buscemi, and A. Gerbino, “Immunohistochemical and transcriptional expression of matrix metalloproteinase in full-term human umbilical cord and human umbilical vein endothelial cells,” Journal of Molecular Histology, vol. 41, no. 6, pp. 367–377, 2010.

[82] M. Lo Iacono, E. Russo, R. Anzalone et al., “Wharton’s jelly mesenchymal stromal cells support the expansion of cord blood-derived CD34+ cells mimicking a hematopoietic niche in a direct cell-cell contact culture system,” Cell Transplantation, vol. 27, no. 1, pp. 117–129, 2018.

[83] A. Gupta, S. F. el-Amin III, H. J. Levy, R. Sze-Tu, S. E. Ibim, and N. Maffulli, “Umbilical cord-derived Wharton’s jelly for regenerative medicine applications,” Journal of Orthopaedic Surgery and Research, vol. 15, no. 1, p. 49, 2020.

[84] M. Trapani, G. La Rocca, and O. Parolini, “Chapter 6. The immunomodulatory features of mesenchymal stromal cells derived from Wharton’s jelly, amniotic membrane, and chorionic villi: in vitro and in vivo data,” in Placenta: The Tree of Life, pp. 91–128, CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL, USA, 2016.

[85] G. la Rocca, R. Anzalone, S. Corrao et al., “Isolation and characterization of Oct-4+/HLA-G+ mesenchymal stem cells from human umbilical cord matrix: differentiation potential and detection of new markers,” Histochemistry and Cell Biology, vol. 131, no. 2, pp. 267–282, 2009.

[86] G. La Rocca, S. Corrao, M. Lo Iacono, T. Corsello, F. Farina, and R. Anzalone, “Novel immunomodulatory markers expressed by human WJ-MSC: an updated review in regenerative and reparative medicine,” The Open Tissue Engineering and Regenerative Medicine Journal, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 50–58, 2012.

[87] R. Anzalone, M. Lo Iacono, T. Loria et al., “Wharton’s jelly mesenchymal stem cells as candidates for beta cells regeneration: extending the differentiative and immunomodulatory benefits of adult mesenchymal stem cells for the treatment of type 1 diabetes,” Stem Cell Reviews and Reports, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 342–363, 2011.

[88] T. Corsello, G. Amico, S. Corrao et al., “Wharton’s jelly mesenchymal stromal cells from human umbilical cord: a close-up on immunomodulatory molecules featured in situ and in vitro,” Stem Cell Reviews and Reports, vol. 15, no. 6, pp. 900–918, 2019.

[89] Q. Wang, Q. Yang, Z. Wang et al., “Comparative analysis of human mesenchymal stem cells from fetal-bone marrow, adipose tissue, and Wharton’s jelly as sources of cell immunomodulatory therapy,” Human Vaccines & Immunotherapeutics, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 85–96, 2016.

[90] M. Najjar, G. Raicevic, H. I. Bouker et al., “Mesenchymal stromal cells use PGE2 to modulate activation and proliferation of lymphocyte subsets: combined comparison of adipose tissue, Wharton’s Jelly and bone marrow sources,” Cellular Immunology, vol. 264, no. 2, pp. 171–179, 2010.

[91] A. Gupta, S. F. El-Amin III, H. J. Levy, R. Sze-Tu, S. E. Ibim, and R. Anzalone, “Comparative analysis of Wharton’s jelly mesenchymal stem cells and inhibiting synovitis with umbilical cord-mesenchymal stem cells,” The Journal of the American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons, vol. 21, no. 5, pp. 303–311, 2013.
rheumatoid arthritis,” *Clinical and Experimental Rheumatology*, vol. 38, no. 3, pp. 387–397, 2020.

[86] C. Zhao, L. Zhang, W. Kong et al., “Umbilical cord-derived mesenchymal stem cells inhibit cadherin-11 expression by fibroblast-like synoviocytes in rheumatoid arthritis,” *Journal of Immunology Research*, vol. 2015, Article ID 137695, 10 pages, 2015.

[87] F. Hildner, S. Wolbank, H. Redl, M. van Griensven, and A. Peterbauer, “How chondrogenic are human umbilical cord matrix cells? A comparison to adipose-derived stem cells,” *Journal of Tissue Engineering and Regenerative Medicine*, vol. 4, no. 3, pp. 242–245, 2010.

[88] D. Ruan, Y. Zhang, D. Wang et al., “Differentiation of human Wharton’s jelly cells toward nucleus pulposus-like cells after coculture with nucleus pulposus CellsIn vitro,” *Tissue Engineering Part A*, vol. 18, no. 1-2, pp. 167–175, 2012.

[89] B. H. Chon, E. J. Lee, L. Jing, L. A. Setton, and J. Chen, “Human umbilical cord mesenchymal stromal cells exhibit immature nucleus pulposus cell phenotype in a laminin-rich pseudo-three-dimensional culture system,” *Stem Cell Research & Therapy*, vol. 4, no. 5, p. 120, 2013.

[90] M. Caballero, M. D. Skancke, A. E. Halevi et al., “Effects of connective tissue growth factor on the regulation of elastogenesis in human umbilical cord-derived mesenchymal stem cells,” *Annals of Plastic Surgery*, vol. 70, no. 5, pp. 568–573, 2013.

[91] A. Marmotti, S. Mattia, M. Bruzzone et al., “Minced umbilical cord fragments as a source of cells for orthopaedic tissue engineering: an in vitro study,” *Stem Cells International*, vol. 2012, Article ID 326813, 13 pages, 2012.

[92] L. Danič, R. Zamborský et al., “Wharton’s jelly and bone marrow-derived mesenchymal stem cells inhibit cadherin-11 expression by pericyte marker 3G5 and show enhanced chondrogenesis after expansion in fibroblast growth factor-2,” *Arthritis Research & Therapy*, vol. 10, no. 4, p. R74, 2008.

[93] A. Hatakeyama, S. Uchida, H. Utsunomiya et al., “Isolation and characterization of synovial mesenchymal stem cell derived from hip joints: a comparative analysis with a matched control knee group,” *Stem Cells International*, vol. 2017, Article ID 9312329, 13 pages, 2017.

[94] P. R. Amable, M. V. Teixeira, R. B. Carias, J. M. Granjeiro, and R. Borojevic, “Renal fibroblast-like synoviocytes in rheumatoid arthritis,” *Cytotherapy*, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 26–33, 2012.

[95] F. McKinnirey, B. Herbert, G. Vesey, and S. McCracken, “Immune modulation via adipose derived mesenchymal stem cells is driven by donor sex in vitro,” *Scientific Reports*, vol. 11, no. 1, p. 12454, 2021.

[96] S. Mohamed-Ahmed, I. Fristad, S. A. Lie et al., “Adipose-derived and bone marrow mesenchymal stem cells: a donor-matched comparison,” *Stem Cell Research & Therapy*, vol. 9, no. 1, p. 168, 2018.

[97] B. Mead, A. Logan, M. Berry, W. Leadbeater, and B. A. Schevén, “Paracrine-mediated neuroprotection and neuritogenesis of axotomised retinal ganglion cells by human dental pulp stem cells: comparison with human bone marrow and adipose-derived mesenchymal stem cells,” *PLoS One*, vol. 9, no. 10, article e109305, 2014.
mesenchymal stem cells," Stem Cell Research & Therapy, vol. 8, no. 1, p. 102, 2017.

[112] C. Y. Li, X. Y. Wu, J. B. Tong et al., "Comparative analysis of human mesenchymal stem cells from bone marrow and adipose tissue under xeno-free conditions for cell therapy," Stem Cell Research & Therapy, vol. 6, no. 1, p. 55, 2015.

[113] S. Shin, J. Lee, Y. Kwon et al., "Comparative proteomic analysis of the mesenchymal stem cells secretome from adipose, bone marrow, placenta and Wharton’s jelly," International Journal of Molecular Sciences, vol. 22, no. 2, p. 845, 2021.

[114] A. Heirani-Tabasi, S. Toosi, M. Mirahmadi et al., "Chemo-kine receptors expression in MSCs: comparative analysis in different sources and passages," Tissue engineering and regenerative medicine, vol. 14, no. 5, pp. 605–615, 2017.

[115] M. Najari, G. Raicevic, F. Jeebawi et al., "Characterization and functionality of the CD200-CD200R system during mesenchymal stromal cell interactions with T-lymphocytes," Immunology Letters, vol. 146, no. 1–2, pp. 50–56, 2012.

[116] E. Karaoz, P. C. Demircan, G. Erman, E. Gungorurler, and A. E. Sarboyaci, "Comparative analyses of immunosuppressive characteristics of bone-marrow, Wharton’s jelly, and adipose tissue-derived human mesenchymal stem cells," Turkish Journal of Haematology, vol. 34, no. 3, pp. 213–225, 2017.

[117] B. Purandare, T. Teklemariam, L. Zhao, and B. M. Hantash, "Temporal HLA profiling and immunomodulatory effects of human adult bone marrow- and adipose-derived mesenchymal stem cells," Regenerative Medicine, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 67–79, 2014.

[118] C. Mennan, J. Garcia, S. Roberts, C. Hulme, and K. Wright, "A comprehensive characterisation of large-scale expanded human bone marrow and umbilical cord mesenchymal stem cells," Stem Cell Research & Therapy, vol. 10, no. 1, p. 99, 2019.

[119] E. T. Camilleri, M. P. Gustafson, A. Dudakovic et al., "Identification and validation of multiple cell surface markers of clinical-grade adipose-derived mesenchymal stromal cells as novel release criteria for good manufacturing practice-compliant production," Stem Cell Research & Therapy, vol. 7, no. 1, p. 107, 2016.

[120] A. K. Pappa, M. Caballero, R. G. Dennis et al., "Biochemical properties of tissue-engineered cartilage," The Journal of Craniofacial Surgery, vol. 25, no. 1, pp. 111–115, 2014.

[121] A. T. Cashion, M. Caballero, A. Halevi, A. Pappa, R. G. Dennis, and J. A. van Aalst, "Programmable mechano-bioreactor for exploration of the effects of periodic vibratory stimulus on mesenchymal stem cell differentiation," BioResearch Open Access, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 19–28, 2014.

[122] N. S. Remya and P. D. Nair, "Mechanoresponsiveness of human umbilical cord mesenchymal stem cells in vitro chondrogenesis-a comparative study with growth factor induction," Journal of Biomedical Materials Research. Part A, vol. 104, no. 10, pp. 2554–2566, 2016.

[123] L. Zhao and M. S. Detamore, "Chondrogenic differentiation of stem cells in human umbilical cord stroma with PGA and PLLA scaffolds," Journal of Biomedical Science and Engineering, vol. 3, no. 11, pp. 1041–1049, 2010.

[124] C. Y. Fong, A. Subramanian, K. Gauthaman et al., "Human umbilical cord Wharton’s jelly stem cells undergo enhanced chondrogenic differentiation when grown on nanofibrous scaffolds and in a sequential two-stage culture medium environment," Stem Cell Reviews and Reports, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 195–209, 2012.

[125] X. Chen, F. Zhang, X. He et al., "Chondrogenic differentiation of umbilical cord-derived mesenchymal stem cells in type I collagen-hydrogel for cartilage engineering," Injury, vol. 44, no. 4, pp. 540–549, 2013.

[126] R. S. Nirmal and P. D. Nair, "Significance of soluble growth factors in the chondrogenic response of human umbilical cord matrix stem cells in a porous three dimensional scaffold," European Cells & Materials, vol. 26, pp. 234–251, 2013.

[127] B. Sridharan, S. M. Lin, A. T. Hwu, A. D. Lafflin, and M. S. Detamore, "Stem cells in aggregate form to enhance chondrogenesis in hydrogels," PLoS One, vol. 10, no. 12, article e0141479, 2015.

[128] J. J. Krajpaew, P. Wangkulangkul, J. Meesane, P. Raungrut, and P. Puttawibul, "Mimicked cartilage scaffolds of silk fibroin/ hyaluronic acid with stem cells for osteoarthritis surgery: morphological, mechanical, and physical cues," Materials Science & Engineering. C, Materials for Biological Applications, vol. 64, pp. 173–182, 2016.

[129] J. Wang, B. Sun, L. Tian et al., "Evaluation of the potential of rhTGF- β3 encapsulated P(LA-CL)/collagen nanofibers for tracheal cartilage regeneration using mesenchymal stem cells derived from Wharton's jelly of human umbilical cord," Materials Science & Engineering. C, Materials for Biological Applications, vol. 70, Part 1, pp. 637–645, 2017.

[130] E. Aleksander-Konert, P. Paduszynski, A. Zajdel, Z. Dzierszewicz, and A. Wilczok, "In vitro chondrogenesis of Wharton’s jelly mesenchymal stem cells in hyaluronic acid-based hydrogels," Cellular & Molecular Biology Letters, vol. 21, p. 11, 2016.

[131] W. Zhang, J. Yang, Y. Zhu et al., "Extracellular matrix derived by human umbilical cord-deposited mesenchymal stem cells accelerates chondrocyte proliferation and differentiation potential in vitro," Cell and Tissue Banking, vol. 20, no. 3, pp. 351–365, 2019.

[132] L. Wang, I. Tran, K. Seshareddy, M. L. Weiss, and M. S. Detamore, "A comparison of human bone marrow-derived mesenchymal stem cells and human umbilical cord-derived mesenchymal stem cells for cartilage tissue engineering," Tissue Engineering. Part A, vol. 15, no. 8, pp. 2259–2266, 2009.

[133] L. Wang, K. Seshareddy, M. L. Weiss, and M. S. Detamore, "Effect of initial seeding density on human umbilical cord mesenchymal stem cells for fibrocartilage tissue engineering," Tissue Engineering. Part A, vol. 15, no. 5, pp. 1009–1017, 2009.

[134] L. Wang, L. Zhao, and M. S. Detamore, "Human umbilical cord mesenchymal stem cells in a sandwich approach for osteochondral tissue engineering," Journal of Tissue Engineering and Regenerative Medicine, vol. 5, no. 9, pp. 712–721, 2011.

[135] L. Qi, R. Wang, Q. Shi, M. Yuan, M. Jin, and D. Li, "Umbilical cord mesenchymal stem cell conditioned medium restored the expression of collagen II and aggrecan in nucleo pulposus mesenchymal stem cells exposed to high glucose," Journal of Bone and Mineral Metabolism, vol. 37, no. 3, pp. 455–466, 2019.

[136] L. Penolazzi, M. Pozzobon, L. S. Bergamin et al., "Extracellular matrix from decellularized Wharton’s jelly improves the behavior of cells from degenerated intervertebral disc," Frontiers in Bioengineering and Biotechnology, vol. 8, p. 262, 2020.

[137] S. K. Leckie, G. A. Sowa, B. P. Bechara et al., "Injection of human umbilical tissue-derived cells into the nucleus
pulpus alters the course of intervertebral disc degeneration in vivo,” The Spine Journal, vol. 13, no. 3, pp. 263–272, 2013.

[138] N. Beeravolu, J. Brougham, I. Khan, C. McKee, M. Perez-Cruet, and G. R. Chaudhry, “Human umbilical cord derivatives regenerate intervertebral disc,” Journal of Tissue Engineering and Regenerative Medicine, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. e579–e591, 2018.

[139] M. Perez-Cruet, N. Beeravolu, C. McKee et al., “Potential of human nucleus pulposus-like cells derived from umbilical cord to treat degenerative disc disease,” Neurosurgery, vol. 84, no. 1, pp. 272–283, 2019.

[140] S. Ekram, S. Khalid, I. Bashir, A. Salim, and I. Khan, “Human umbilical cord-derived mesenchymal stem cells and their chondrogenic progenitors derivatives reduced pain and inflammation signaling and promote regeneration in a rat intervertebral disc degeneration model,” Molecular and Cellular Biochemistry, vol. 476, no. 8, pp. 3191–3205, 2021.

[141] N. Saulnier, E. Viguier, E. Perrier-Groult et al., “Intra-articular administration of xenogeneic neonatal mesenchymal stromal cells early after meniscal injury down-regulates metalloprotease gene expression in synovium and prevents cartilage degradation in a rabbit model of osteoarthritis,” Osteoarthritis and Cartilage, vol. 23, no. 1, pp. 122–133, 2015.

[142] A. L. Raines, M. Shih, L. Chua, C. Su, S. C. Tseng, and J. O’Connell, “Efficacy of particulate amniotic membrane and umbilical cord tissues in attenuating cartilage destruction in an osteoarthritis model,” Tissue Engineering, Part A, vol. 23, no. 1-2, pp. 12–19, 2017.

[143] H. S. Chang, K. C. Wu, H. W. Liu, T. Y. Chu, and D. C. Ding, “Human umbilical cord-derived mesenchymal stem cells reduce monosodium iodoacetate-induced apoptosis in cartilage,” Ci Ji Yi Xue Za Zhi, vol. 30, no. 2, pp. 71–80, 2018.

[144] B. Y. Zhang, B. Y. Wang, S. C. Li et al., “Evaluation of the curative effect of umbilical cord mesenchymal stem cell therapy for knee arthritis in dogs using imaging technology,” Stem Cells International, vol. 2018, Article ID 1983025, 12 pages, 2018.

[145] S. E. Kim, A. Pozzi, J. C. Yeh et al., “Intra-articular umbilical cord derived mesenchymal stem cell therapy for chronic elbow osteoarthritis in dogs: a Double-Blinded, Placebo-Controlled Clinical Trial,” Frontiers in veterinary science, vol. 6, p. 474, 2019.

[146] Y. Geng, J. Chen, M. Alahdal et al., “Intra-articular injection of hUC-MSCs expressing miR-140-5p induces cartilage self-repairing in the rat osteoarthritis,” Journal of Bone and Mineral Metabolism, vol. 38, no. 3, pp. 277–288, 2020.

[147] K. C. Wu, Y. H. Chang, H. W. Liu, and D. C. Ding, “Transplanting human umbilical cord mesenchymal stem cells and hyaluronate hydrogel repairs cartilage of osteoarthritis in the minipig model,” Ci Ji Yi Xue Za Zhi, vol. 31, no. 1, pp. 11–19, 2019.

[148] C. Magri, M. Schramme, M. Febre et al., “Comparison of efficacy and safety of single versus repeated intra-articular injection of allogeneic neonatal mesenchymal stem cells for treatment of osteoarthritis of the metacarpophalangeal/metatarsophalangeal joint in horses: a clinical pilot study,” PLoS One, vol. 14, no. 8, article e0221317, 2019.

[149] J. Perry, H. S. McCarthy, G. Bou-Gharios et al., “Injected human umbilical cord-derived mesenchymal stromal cells do not appear to elicit an inflammatory response in a murine model of osteoarthritis,” Osteoarthritis and cartilage open, vol. 2, no. 2, article 100044, 2020.

[150] D. Xing, J. Wu, B. Wang et al., “Intra-articular delivery of umbilical cord-derived mesenchymal stem cells temporarily retard the progression of osteoarthritis in a rat model,” International Journal of Rheumatic Diseases, vol. 23, no. 6, pp. 778–787, 2020.

[151] X. D. Wang, X. C. Wan, A. F. Liu, R. Li, and Q. Wei, “Effects of umbilical cord mesenchymal stem cells loaded with graphene oxide granular lubrication on cytokine levels in animal models of knee osteoarthritis,” International Orthopaedics, vol. 45, no. 2, pp. 381–390, 2021.

[152] Y. Liu, R. Mu, S. Wang et al., “Therapeutic potential of human umbilical cord mesenchymal stem cells in the treatment of rheumatoid arthritis,” Arthritis Research & Therapy, vol. 12, no. 6, p. R210, 2010.

[153] C. C. Wu, T. C. Wu, F. L. Liu, H. K. Sytwu, and D. M. Chang, “TNF-α inhibitor reverse the effects of human umbilical cord-derived stem cells on experimental arthritis by increasing immunosuppression,” Cellular Immunology, vol. 273, no. 1, pp. 30–40, 2012.

[154] J. Gu, W. Gu, C. Lin et al., “Human umbilical cord mesenchymal stem cells improve the immune-associated inflammatory and prothrombotic state in collagen type-II-induced arthritic rats,” Molecular Medicine Reports, vol. 12, no. 5, pp. 7463–7470, 2015.

[155] Q. Zhang, Q. Li, J. Zhu et al., “Comparison of therapeutic effects of different mesenchymal stem cells on rheumatoid arthritis in mice,” PeerJ, vol. 7, p. e7023, 2019.

[156] D. Ma, K. Xu, G. Zhang et al., “Immunomodulatory effect of human umbilical cord mesenchymal stem cells on T lymphocytes in rheumatoid arthritis,” International Immunopharmacology, vol. 74, article 105687, 2019.

[157] M. Vohra, A. Sharma, R. Bagga, and S. K. Arora, “Human umbilical cord-derived mesenchymal stem cells induce tissue repair and regeneration in collagen-induced arthritis in rats,” Journal of Clinical and Translational Research, vol. 6, no. 6, pp. 203–216, 2020.

[158] K. Xu, D. Ma, G. Zhang et al., “Human umbilical cord mesenchymal stem cell-derived small extracellular vesicles ameliorate collagen-induced arthritis via immunomodulatory T lymphocytes,” Molecular Immunology, vol. 135, pp. 36–44, 2021.

[159] P. Zhao, S. Liu, Y. Bai et al., “hWJECM-derived oriented scaffolds with autologous chondrocytes for rabbit cartilage defect repairing,” Tissue Engineering Part A, vol. 24, no. 11-12, pp. 905–914, 2018.

[160] Y. Zhang, S. Liu, W. Guo et al., “Human umbilical cord Wharton’s jelly mesenchymal stem cells combined with an acellular cartilage extracellular matrix scaffold improve cartilage repair compared with microfracture in a caprine model,” Osteoarthritis and Cartilage, vol. 26, no. 7, pp. 954–965, 2018.

[161] Y. Zhang, C. Hao, W. Guo et al., “Co-culture of hWJMSCs and pACs in double biomimetic ACECM oriented scaffold enhances mechanical properties and accelerates articular cartilage regeneration in a caprine model,” Stem Cell Research & Therapy, vol. 11, no. 1, p. 180, 2020.

[162] L. Yan and X. Wu, “Exosomes produced from 3D cultures of umbilical cord mesenchymal stem cells in a hollow-fiber bioreactor show improved osteochondral regeneration activity,” Cell Biology and Toxicology, vol. 36, no. 2, pp. 165–178, 2020.

[163] Z. Li, Y. Bi, Q. Wu et al., “A composite scaffold of Wharton’s jelly and chondroitin sulphate loaded with human umbilical cord mesenchymal stem cells repairs articular cartilage
defects in rat knee,” *Journal of Materials Science. Materials in Medicine*, vol. 32, no. 4, p. 36, 2021.

[164] N. H. Dormer, M. Singh, L. Zhao, N. Mohan, C. J. Berkland, and M. S. Detamore, “Osteochondral interface regeneration of the rabbit knee with macroscopic gradients of bioactive signals,” *Journal of Biomedical Materials Research. Part A*, vol. 100, no. 1, pp. 162–170, 2012.

[165] S. Liu, Y. Jia, M. Yuan et al., “Repair of Osteochondral Defects Using Human Umbilical Cord Wharton’s Jelly- Derived Mesenchymal Stem Cells in a Rabbit Model,” *BioMed Research International*, vol. 2017, Article ID 8760383, 12 pages, 2017.

[166] S. Jiang, G. Tian, Z. Yang et al., “Enhancement of acellular cartilage matrix scaffold by Wharton’s jelly mesenchymal stem cell-derived exosomes to promote osteochondral regeneration,” *Bioactive Materials*, vol. 6, no. 9, pp. 2711–2728, 2021.

[167] J. Matas, M. Orrego, D. Amenabar et al., “Umbilical cord-derived mesenchymal stromal cells (MSCs) for knee osteoarthritis: repeated MSC dosing is superior to a single MSC dose and to hyaluronic acid in a controlled randomized phase I/II trial,” *Stem Cells Translational Medicine*, vol. 8, no. 3, pp. 215–224, 2019.

[168] I. H. Dilogo, A. F. Canintika, A. L. Hanitya, J. A. Pawitan, I. K. Liem, and J. Pandelaki, “Umbilical cord-derived mesenchymal stem cells for treating osteoarthritis of the knee: a single-arm, open-label study,” *European Journal of Orthopaedic Surgery and Traumatology*, vol. 30, no. 5, pp. 799–807, 2020.

[169] O. G. Mead and L. P. Mead, “Intra-articular injection of amniotic membrane and umbilical cord particulate for the management of moderate to severe knee osteoarthritis,” *Orthopedic Research and Reviews*, vol. 12, pp. 161–170, 2020.

[170] L. Wang, S. Huang, S. Li et al., “Efficacy and safety of umbilical cord mesenchymal stem cell therapy for rheumatoid arthritis patients: a prospective phase I/II study,” *Drug Design, Development and Therapy*, vol. Volume 13, pp. 4331–4340, 2019.

[171] T. Qi, H. Gao, Y. Dang, S. Huang, and M. Peng, “Cervus and cucumis peptides combined umbilical cord mesenchymal stem cells therapy for rheumatoid arthritis,” *Medicine (Baltimore)*, vol. 99, no. 28, article e21222, 2020.

[172] X. He, Y. Yang, M. Yao et al., “Combination of human umbilical cord mesenchymal stem (stromal) cell transplantation with IFN-γ treatment synergistically improves the clinical outcomes of patients with rheumatoid arthritis,” *Annals of the Rheumatic Diseases*, vol. 79, no. 10, pp. 1298–1304, 2020.