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Abstract
Background and Aim: Using different osteogenic growth factors, which is still under investigation, is a favorable method for bone regeneration. This systematic review is aimed at evaluating the effects of different growth factors and their carriers on osteogenesis.

Materials and Methods: Electronic databases (Medline, EMBase and Cochrane) were searched by the authors for articles published from 1999 to April 2010. Clinical and animal studies evaluating bone formation by applying a specific growth factor and the related carrier were included in this investigation. Obtained data were organized in a table and evaluated through a qualitative analysis.

Results: Sixty-three studies most of which evaluated the effects of BMP-2 osteogenesis in different models were included in this study. Totally, twenty-five carriers were applied with different growth factors in the experiments. Among these carriers, poly lactic–co glycolic acid (PLGA), hydroxyapatite/tricalcium phosphate/absorbable collagen sponge (HA/TCP/ACS) and BioOss were the most frequently used carriers with the growth factors in bone regeneration studies.

Conclusion: The current evidence, although not strong enough, confirms that BMP-2 has more favorable results in osteogenesis compared with other factors. The carrier scaffold, methods of measurement (histologic or radiographic), type of animal, defect diameter and the length of follow-up are the variables that should be matched before reaching definite results for the effect of growth factors in bone regeneration.
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Introduction
Repair of fractured bones and regeneration of widespread osseous defects has become a challenge for orthopedists and maxillofacial surgeons in recent years [1], so that The United Nations Organization and World Health Organization have called years 2000 through 2010 as the decade of bones and joints [2]. Different materials and methods have been used for osseous regeneration (especially around implants) such as use of autogenous, allogeneous, and xenogenous grafts as well as alloplastic materials, among which autogenous grafts are considered as the gold standard for osseous regeneration [3] However, use of such grafts have limitations such as lack of access to an appropriate graft tissue, pos-
sibility of transplant rejection, and high cost of the procedure which has led to development of other techniques for osseous regeneration [4,5]. Current literature has focused on three novel methods: transferring genes encoding osteogenic cytokines into the cells of the region (gene therapy); culturing the bone marrow stem cells of the patient and then implantation of osteogenic cells in the area of interest (stem cell-aided therapy); and use of osseous growth stimulation agents (protein therapy) [6]. The first two methods require especial considerations and widespread evaluations, the procedures are difficult and expensive [7]. In protein therapy which has the most laboratory and clinical evidence, osseous growth stimulation agents such as bone morphogenetic proteins (BMPs) [8,9], as well as other growth stimulation agents like vascular endothelial growth factor (VEGF) [10], platelet-derived growth factor (PDGF) [11] and transforming growth factor-beta-2 (TGF-β2) [12] are used. Although BMPs are more extensively studied [13], other investigations show that use of other growth factors can have positive results providing new hopes in future. In addition, the synergistic effect of two or more growth factors are studied in a number of studies [14,15]. Since, the evaluated factors and their carriers are variable and studies are conducted differently, the obtained results are different and confusing to some extent.

The objective of this systematic review was to evaluate the effects of different growth factors in bone regeneration.

Materials and Methods

In this systematic review, the available literature was electronically searched within MedLine, EMBase and Cochrane Library databases. The searched articles were published from 1999 to April 2010. The key words by which the search was carried out contained words declaring bone formation such as bone regeneration OR bone formation OR bone reconstruction. Key words declaring growth factors (e.g. osteogenic factor OR growth factor) were added with AND. Certain growth factors such as BMP, PDGF, VEGF and TGF were used as key words for a detailed search. All articles included in this review were written in English. (See table 1)

The inclusion criteria for the articles in this review were as follows:

- Publication years between 1999 to April 2010
- Articles published in English
- Clinical and original studies on human (clinical trials) or animal models (animal studies) with in vivo settings
- Articles concerning formation and growth of bone in correlation with a growth factor or a certain carrier.
- Studies investigating the effects of a certain growth factor on repair of experimentally induced bone defects

The exclusion criteria were as follows:

- In vitro studies
- Reviews, letters and case reports
- Studies concerning success or failure of implants and osseointegration
- Studies evaluating the effect of a certain growth factor on repair of natural or pre-existing bony defects
- Non-randomized clinical trials
- Studies in which the evaluated factor differed in case and control groups.

Results

After selecting the articles according to the exclusion/inclusion criteria, various parts of each article including its primary information (such as the name of the journal, the publication year, and the authors’ names), title, aim, methodology and results were separated to establish a single blind condition for the evaluator and to prevent bias towards a certain factor or a well-known author. Therefore, all possible attempts were done to prevent reviewer bias [8,9]. In each article the growth factor type, its carrier, the animal on which the study was performed, the site of the lesion, the evaluation time, the methodology of evaluation, the success rate, and the results were
extracted and organized in a table. At first, the data was extracted and organized in a table. At first, the key words were found. After reading the abstracts, relevant studies according to the inclusion criteria were determined. Among the total articles found, 63 articles were included in the project. (fig. 1) According to the available evidence, it seems that BMP-2 possesses the highest capability for differentiation of mesenchymal cells into osteoblasts among all bone morphogenetic proteins. This has made BMP-2 at the center of attraction for researchers in comparison with other factors [1, 13]. Thoroughly, 11 different evaluations have been carried out concerning the effect of BMP-2 in formation of new bone with different carriers. This factor has been most frequently utilized with gelatin hydrogel and hyaluronic acid. The bone morphogenetic protein which is produced via recombinant DNA (rhBMP) is considered as one of the growth factors with bone inductive activity [25]. Application of this growth factor accompanied by an appropriate carrier such as absorbable collagen sponge (ACS) provides a proper bed for migration, proliferation, and differentiation of bone.

### Results

In the primary search, 171 articles related to the effect of different growth factors on new bone formation were found and analyzed. After reading the abstracts, 63 articles were included in the project. (fig. 1) According to the available evidence, it seems that BMP-2 possesses the highest capability for differentiation of mesenchymal cells into osteoblasts among all bone morphogenetic proteins. This has made BMP-2 at the center of attraction for researchers in comparison with other factors [1, 13]. Thoroughly, 11 different evaluations have been carried out concerning the effect of BMP-2 in formation of new bone with different carriers. This factor has been most frequently utilized with gelatin hydrogel and hyaluronic acid. The bone morphogenetic protein which is produced via recombinant DNA (rhBMP) is considered as one of the growth factors with bone inductive activity [25]. Application of this growth factor accompanied by an appropriate carrier such as absorbable collagen sponge (ACS) provides a proper bed for migration, proliferation, and differentiation of bone.

### Table 1: search strategy of articles according to the key words and inclusion/exclusion criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study steps</th>
<th>Procedure</th>
<th>Number of remaining articles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>Searching within Cochrane, EMBase, and PubMed databases</td>
<td>2868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td>Omitting irrelevant articles</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exclusion criteria in this step:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Non-randomized articles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3</td>
<td>2. Evaluation of success/failure of implants and osseointegration</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exclusion criteria in this step:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. In vitro designs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 4</td>
<td>2. Review articles, case reports and letters</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 5</td>
<td>Extracting identity information about articles</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 6</td>
<td>Considering variables of growth factor, carrier, animal type, site of action, time of research, and success rate, and classifying these variables in a qualitative table</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 7</td>
<td>Registration of bone regeneration based on bone reconstruction(%)</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>height of reconstructed bone (mm), amount of bone reconstruction radiographically (%), bone density (g/mm³), and the volume of reconstructed bone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 8</td>
<td>Comparison of articles with equal conditions, evaluation of the effects of contributing factors and related carriers in bone regeneration</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 9</td>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Discussion

(Continued from the previous discussion on the effect of BMP-2 and other growth factors on new bone formation).
Table 2: Qualitative data resulting from evaluation of articles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Growth factor</th>
<th>Article</th>
<th>carrier</th>
<th>Evaluation time/defect location/animal type</th>
<th>Evaluation technique</th>
<th>The obtained results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BMP-2</td>
<td>Yamamoto M. et al (2006) (30)</td>
<td>Gelatin Hydrogel</td>
<td>Rabbit/Ulna/6</td>
<td>Histology and Radiography</td>
<td>Increased bone density in gelatin hydrogel with 97.8% water was significantly more than other types of gelatin hydrogel (with different vol% water)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Takahashi Y. et al (2006) (29)</td>
<td>Gelatin Hydrogel</td>
<td>Monkey/Parietal/12</td>
<td>Radiography and Histology</td>
<td>Bone density increased with increased concentration of BMP-2 in the gelatin carrier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chung Y. et al (2007) (44)</td>
<td>Nanoparticle–hydrogel complex/Fibrin gel</td>
<td>Rat/Cranium/4</td>
<td>Radiography and Histology</td>
<td>Bone reconstruction was enhanced by BMP-2. However, use of the considered carrier resulted in bone formation with improved mineralization and development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tien-Min G. Chu et al (2007) (33)</td>
<td>Dicalcium phosphate dehydrate</td>
<td>Rat/Femur/6</td>
<td>Radiography and Histology</td>
<td>After weeks 6, 12, and 15, the results of radiographic evaluation were considerably better for BMP-2 compared with other groups, which shows the influence of this factor in better osseous reconstruction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Samee M. et al (2008) (36)</td>
<td>β-TCP&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Rat/Thigh muscle/8</td>
<td>Histology</td>
<td>Ectopic bone was seen in all areas after 4 weeks and was considerably increased after 8 weeks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aghaloo T. et al (2010) (21)</td>
<td>PLGA</td>
<td>Rat/Calvarium/8</td>
<td>Live micro-CT</td>
<td>After 4 weeks, 90% of lesions were replaced by bone. This amount approximated to 100% with time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Young S. et al (2009) (14)</td>
<td>Gelatin microparticles/Poly(propylene fumarate)</td>
<td>Rat/Calvarium/</td>
<td>Histomorphometry and micro-CT</td>
<td>According to the concentration of BMP-2, bone reconstruction was at least 6% and at most 19.5%. Eight weeks following implantation of the samples, using 5 to 20mg BMP, complete bone reconstruction was observed in all cases. In addition, using the considered carrier resulted in a 1/10 decrease in amount of the required BMP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kaito T. et al (2005) (45)</td>
<td>IPCHA&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; + PLA–PEG&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Rabbit/Radius/8</td>
<td>Radiography, Histology, micro-CT and mechanical compression test</td>
<td>Bone regeneration and growth were considerably more in samples containing BMP-2. However, there was not a significant difference between the formed osteoid and the estimated volume in experimental samples.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arosarena O.A. et al (2004) (22)</td>
<td>HA&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt; Or HA/TCP/ACS&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Rat/Mandible/</td>
<td>Histology</td>
<td>The volume of the constructed bone increased with an increase in BMP-2, although statistically non-significant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arosarena O. et al (2005) (31)</td>
<td>Hyaluronic acid</td>
<td>Rat/Mandible/</td>
<td>Histology</td>
<td>Histologic evaluations showed that use of hydrogels accompanied with BMP-2 and MSCs caused maximal expression of osteocalcin and developed bone in comparison with other groups.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Dicalcium phosphate dehydrate, <sup>b</sup> Poly(lactic-co-glycolic acid), <sup>c</sup> Poly(lactic acid), <sup>d</sup> Hydroxyapatite, <sup>e</sup> Polylactic acid.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Growth Factor</th>
<th>Carrier</th>
<th>Animal</th>
<th>Tissue</th>
<th>Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marukawa E. et al (2001) (18)</td>
<td>PLGA</td>
<td>Monkey/Mandible/12</td>
<td>Radiography and Histology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Matin K. et al (2003) (20)</td>
<td>PLGA</td>
<td>Rat/Maxilla/12</td>
<td>Microscopic analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carstens M.H. et al (2005) (24)</td>
<td>ACS</td>
<td>Pig/Mandible/12</td>
<td>Radiography and Histology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Trabecular bone volume was quite less in samples without gelatin carrier than those with carrier.**

**Bone regeneration in samples with growth factor and gelatin hydrogel carrier was quite more than other samples.**

**No significant statistical difference was seen between experimental and control groups.**

**The new bone was a combination of woven and lamellar bones. The amount of lamellar bone increased after 12 weeks. The thickness of trabecular bone was significantly increased in comparison with the 6th week.**

**In experimental group, new bone covered all coronal parts of implants. New bone had a smooth surface with osteocytic lacunae creating an appearance similar to that of alveolar bone.**

**Transverse bone reconstruction in groups with rhBMP-2 was significantly more than that in other groups. There was no significant difference in using TCP/HA/ACS or a-BSM as carriers.**

**Bone regeneration was observed unevenly after 60 days. Complete bone regeneration was seen after 90 days.**

**Complete bone regeneration was seen in histologic and radiographic evaluations.**

**Bone regeneration in the group with the growth factor and ACS carrier was much more than in control group. Histologic evaluation declared complete bone reconstruction in the experimental group. A significant increase was observed in density and structure of trabecular bone between the 6th and 8th weeks. However a decrease in bone volume and height was also observed. Histometric evaluation revealed a minute difference between control and experimental groups.**
There was no significant difference between experimental and control groups.

The decrease from the baseline in height of the bony defect in both control and experimental groups was statistically significant.

No statistically significant difference in implants was observed experimental and control groups.

Partial and inadequate reconstruction of bone was seen in control group whereas more bone with a higher quality was observed in rhBMP2-h/DBM group.

Ectopic bone was seen in all areas after 4 weeks and was considerably increased after 8 weeks.

Use of gelatin hydrogel and PRP in combination with the considered factor resulted in a complete bone regeneration in the area.

Use of the considered carrier to transfer the osteoblastic progenitors caused a significant increase in new bone volume.

Formation of even trabecular bone in both coronal and central directions was observed and was initiated primarily around NBM.

Histologic evaluation revealed a complete regeneration of periodontal apparatus including cementum, PDL, and bone in furcation involvement are.

Level of regeneration as well as the amount of mineralization was significantly more in experimental than control groups.

VEGF microspheres with PLGA membranes caused a significant increase in bone reconstruction compared with other groups.

There was an observable amount of bone formation in experimental group but its difference with the control group was not statistically significant.

Bone regeneration in VEGF/BMP-2 group was significantly more than other groups in days 21c and 28, but there was no significant difference between VEGF and the control group.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Growth Factor</th>
<th>Carrier</th>
<th>Animal</th>
<th>Tissue</th>
<th>Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VEGF</td>
<td>Polymeric scaffolds with a bioactive glass coating</td>
<td>Rat/Calvarium/12</td>
<td>micro-CT</td>
<td>The carrier containing VEGF caused a significant increase in bone density with respect to control groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDGF/VEGF</td>
<td>Biphasic calcium phosphate</td>
<td>Rat/Calvarium/4</td>
<td>Histomorphometry</td>
<td>Superficial absorption of VEGF was not influential in bone formation. The carrier containing PDGF caused a significant increase in bone regeneration. Also, combined use of PDGF/VEGF enhanced bone reconstruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bFGF</td>
<td>β-TCP</td>
<td>Rat/Femur/3</td>
<td>Histomorphometry</td>
<td>There was no statistically significant difference between experimental and control groups. The height of regenerated bone was higher in the group with a concentration of 10 micrograms and 95 volume percent of gelatin hydrogel. Simultaneous use of bFGF and the considered carrier resulted in stimulation of cellular proliferation and increased bone mineralization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGF-2</td>
<td>Gelatin Hydrogel</td>
<td>Dog/Mandible/4</td>
<td>Histomorphometry</td>
<td>The amount of new bone formation, new trabecular bone formation and new cementum regeneration was significantly higher in samples with bFGF compared with controls. Amount of bone regeneration in Ti-HA-GM was significantly higher than Ti, Ti-HA, and Ti-HA+FGF-2 groups. Rate of alveolar bone height increase in experimental group was significantly higher than that in control group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRGF</td>
<td>Collagen type 1</td>
<td>Pig/Mandible/</td>
<td>Collagen type 1</td>
<td>There was no significant difference between (collagen I + PRP) and (collagen only) groups and between (collagen+PRGF) and (control) groups. However, the difference between (collagen) group and (control) was statistically significant. Marginal hardness of bone in (bone graft) group was significantly more than those of (PLA/rTGF β-3) and (PLA) groups. Also, radiographic evaluation revealed a significant difference between the bone graft group and other two groups. Alveolar bone regeneration and cementum formation in furation defects are positively related to the concentration of TGF-β3 of matrigel matrix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TGF-β3</td>
<td>PLGA</td>
<td>Sheep/Tibia/12</td>
<td>Radiography and CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Matrigel matrix</td>
<td>Monkey/Mandible/</td>
<td>Histomorphometry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>Tissue</td>
<td>Method</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ehrhart et al. (2004)</td>
<td>rhTGF-β1, Gelatin Hydrogel</td>
<td>Rabbit/Ulna</td>
<td>Radiography and Histomorphometry</td>
<td>New bone formation in experimental defects (containing factor) was significantly more than control (carrier only).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanzler et al. (2009)</td>
<td>BMP-2/VEGF, PLGA/Alginate</td>
<td>Rat/Femur</td>
<td>Histology and micro-CT</td>
<td>Volume of new bone in Alginate-VEGF165/PDLLA-BMP-2 + HBMSC group was significantly more than that in Alginate/PDLA group and Alginate-VEGF165/PDLLA-BMP-2 group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kempen et al. (2008)</td>
<td>Gelatin Hydrogel, PLGA</td>
<td>Rat/Femur</td>
<td>Histomorphometry and micro-CT</td>
<td>Although VEGF did not stimulate bone formation, it was able to enhance formation of a supporting vascular plexus. Simultaneous release of VEGF and BMP-2 in an ectopic area improved bone regeneration and provided better results than the use of BMP-2 alone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young et al. (2008)</td>
<td>Poly(propylene fumarate), Gelatin micro particle</td>
<td>Rat/Calvarium</td>
<td>Histomorphometry and micro-CT</td>
<td>Percentage of bone regeneration was related to the amount of BMP-2. In this certain model simultaneous release of BMP-2 and VEGF was not significantly influential and bone regeneration was not more than that of BMP-2 only group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patel et al. (2008)</td>
<td>Poly(propylene fumarate), Gelatin micro particle</td>
<td>Rat/Calvarium</td>
<td>Histomorphometry and micro-CT</td>
<td>Addition of VEGF to BMP-2 did not have a significant effect on the regenerated bone, but could help in homogeneity and integrity of the new bone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gruber et al. (2007)</td>
<td>rhGDF-5, β-TCP</td>
<td>Pig/Maxilla</td>
<td>Histomorphometry</td>
<td>After 4 weeks, new bone density in a group with TCP carrier concentration of 400mg/g was more than control.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weng et al. (2008)</td>
<td>β-TCP</td>
<td>Dog/Mandible</td>
<td>Histomorphometry</td>
<td>Although there was no significant difference between the experimental and control group, samples containing GDF tend to indicate more bone formation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim et al. (2009)</td>
<td>ACS</td>
<td>Dog/Mandible</td>
<td>Histomorphometry</td>
<td>There was no significant difference between experimental and control groups in the amounts used in this experiment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schwarz et al. (2009)</td>
<td>Natural bone mineral (NBM)</td>
<td>Rat/Calvarium</td>
<td>Histomorphometry</td>
<td>Mineralized tissue content in rhBMP-2 +NBM+ collagen membrane group was significantly more than that in other groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canter et al. (2010)</td>
<td>BMP-2/TGF-β2, Chitosan Gel Matrix</td>
<td>Rat/Calvarium</td>
<td>Radiography and Histomorphometry</td>
<td>Combined use of TGF-2 and BMP-2 did not have a significant effect on bone regeneration compared with the use of BMP-2 only and the synergistic effect of these two factors is insignificant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kikuchi et al. (2007)</td>
<td>Gelatin Hydrogel/Collagen sponge</td>
<td>Rat/Femur</td>
<td>Histology</td>
<td>Use of CCN2 accompanied with gelatin carrier and collagen sponge had a significant effect on stimulation of bone mineralization.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Although there was a slight predilection for better bone regeneration following 3 and 6 months (positive median values) and this predilection to regeneration is corroborated after 12 months (negative median values), the data were quite inconstant and no significant superiority was attributable to any of the methods.

Figure 1: stages of accessibility to the articles
marrow stem cells [24]. Numerous articles taken into consideration in the current investigation (n=16) have focused on this factor. In the majority of these articles this factor had been used with ACS (n=5) and polylactic co-glycolic acid(PLGA) (n=2). Growth and differentiation factor 5 (GDF-5) is a member of morphogenetic proteins family and is also known as BMP-14. [64] Osteogenic potency of the recombinant form of this factor (rhGDF-5) was evaluated in four studies two of which used β-tricalcium phosphate (β-TCP) as the carrier. Fibroblast growth factors (FGFs) are a group of proteins that have a crucial role in cellular proliferation, angiogenesis, and fibroblast differentiation. Totally, six studies have been performed on different types of FGFs, each using different carriers. Platelet-derived growth factor (PDGF) have been used in five different studies, each using different carriers. Vascular endothelial growth factor (VEGF) is considered an angiogenic factor and is increased in response to hypoxia, ischemia, as well as tissue regeneration and repair. Totally, there were ten studies evaluating the role of VEGF in bone reconstruction, among which five studies evaluated the effect of VEGF per se on bone reconstruction. In four other studies, the combined effect of VEGF and BMP-2 and in the remaining study the simultaneous effect of VEGF and PDGF was evaluated. Plasma rich growth factor (PRGF) was used only in one study accompanied with collagen type I as the carrier and caused no significant difference in bone reconstruction. TGF- β, one of the important growth factors in bone formation, was evaluated in three studies for its effect on marginal bone reconstruction. In all of the evaluated articles 25 carriers were used accompanied with growth factors, among which 11 carriers were more extensively studied. Out of these 11 carriers, three had considerable effects on bone reconstruction, which are described as follows:

1. Polylactic co-glycolic acid (PLGA) [16-21].

This material was used as carrier in seven studies. The highest amount of bone reconstruction has been reported to be with the use of rhBMP-2. Use of this carrier in combination with an appropriate factor has led to about 65% increase in new bone formation.

2. Simultaneous use of hydroxyapatite/tricalcium phosphate/absorbable gelatin sponge (HA/TCP /ACS) [22]

Use of this carrier in combination with an appropriate growth factor can help increase bone minerals density (BMD) to about 80%. In both studies in which this carrier was used with rh-BMP-2 or BMP-2, a considerable volume of bony defects were reconstructed by new bone.

3. BioOSS [23]

The effect of rhBMP-2 with the use of this carrier was studied in only one article, concluding that this carrier was able to increase bone volume to 58.5% in case it is used with an appropriate growth factor.

4. Absorbable collagen sponge (ACS) [24-26, 28,48,66]

ACS was used in six studies mainly with rhBMP-2 (in five studies). In most studies in which this carrier was used with rhBMP-2, favorable results have been achieved in bone regeneration.

5. Gelatin/ hydrogel [29,30,37,39,41,46,58,60,68]

Gelatin hydrogel is one of the most frequently used carrier agents which had been used in nine studies alone or in combination with other materials. In general, use of this carrier with a large number of other factors have shown relatively promising results. But, in many studies the results have shown that the volume percent of water in gelatin hydrogel can play a crucial role in the amount of bone regeneration.

6. Hydroxyapatite (HA) [22]

Hydroxyapatite has rarely been used alone in the studies. It has been most frequently used with other agents such as absorbable collagen sponge and tri-calcium phosphate.

7. Hyaluronic acid [31,32]

Hyaluronic acid had only been used in only two studies as a carrier with BMP-2. The number of
studies in this regard is scarce and therefore not documentable enough.

8. Natural bone matrix (NBM) [52,67]
In two separate studies, this carrier was used with rhPDGF and rhGDF-5. In these two studies the initiation of bone formation was found to be around NBM.

9. Demineralized bone matrix (DBM) [51]
DBM was used in only in one study with rh-BMP-2. Use of this carrier with rh-BMP-2 gave rise to better results in bone reconstruction in comparison with the control group, but such difference was not statistically significant.

10. Collagen [35,38,49,68]
Collagen was used in four separate studies with rh-BMP-2, rhPDGF, PRGF, or VEGF.

11. Beta tri-calcium phosphate (β-TCP) [36,57,64,65,69]
β-TCP was used in five studies but not with promising results in all of them. Qualitative results of the evaluated articles are represented and classified in table 1.

Discussion
Bone morphogenetic proteins (BMPs) comprise a superfamily of inductive agents for growth and development that are found in different tissues such as cartilage, bone, and even myocardium [29,30] Several studies have declared that use of this agent with PLGA carrier had a significant effect in new bone formation [19,21]. In other studies, simultaneous use of this agent with a gelatin hydrogel carrier [29,30] and hyaluronic acid [31,32] has been proved to increase bone minerals density (BMD) and construct new bone. In fact, numerous studies have confirmed the effect of this factor in bone regeneration using radiographic or tomographic methods [19,33]. Allegri et al conducted a study on the effect of BMP-2 in sinus lifting of rabbits in 2003 in Brazil. They demonstrated that use of this factor with hydroxyapatite increased rate of bone formation to 7.12%. Further electron microscopic evaluations revealed that the highest growth rate occurred in days 21 and 24 in experimental and in days 21 and 28 in control group. [34] The positive effect of rh-BMP-2 and the collagen carrier in new bone formation and increased bone density is well understood [24-26]. Kokubo and colleagues evaluated the effect of rh-BMP-2 with PLGA on bone regeneration in 2003. In this investigation bone formation was evaluated in defects induced in diaphysis of ulnar bones in rabbits. It was demonstrated by radiographic pOCT method that the radiographic union rate was 100% for the new bones after 16 weeks. Biomechanical test disclosed that the maximal torque of the experimental group was 75.6% that of healthy bone showing a significant difference with the control group [17]. The most pronounced effect of rhBMP was observed on bone minerals density, whereas BMP-2 had a significant effect on the amount of bone formation. (Bone formation was more than other factors based on histomorphometric evaluations of similar investigations.) Equivalent evaluations revealed that the effect of rhBMP-2 is not at the level of BMP-2, but still is acceptable. Regarding the available literature, rhBMP-2 is not significantly effective in promoting longitudinal bone formation. The inadequate number of article failed to provide a documentable evidence for other factors. Therefore the obtained results failed to have a comparative value. One of the members of BMP superfamily is rhGDF-5 which I also known as BMP-14 [64]. Studies declare that use of rhGDF-5 alone could not have a significant effect on bone regeneration [65-67]. However, Gruber et al demonstrated that combination of this factor with β-TCP could significantly increase the amount of bone formation [64]. This signifies the importance of agent used as carrier. Some carrier agents such as β-TCP and BioOSS have some chemical properties in common with those of bone. Use of these materials can provide an organized bed for bone regeneration. On the other hand, such materials are not resorbed during remodeling process and there is a possibility for them to delay osseous regeneration. Taking this into consideration, use
of resorbable carriers such as ACS is justifiable. Hence, a large number of included studies used this material as a carrier for rhBMP-2 with promising results [24-26, 28,48]. Schwarz and co-workers in 2009 compared rhGDF-5 and rhBMP-2 in reconstruction of bony defects on murine cranium. They concluded that the ability of rhBMP-2 in bone regeneration was significantly more than that of rhGDF-5 [67]. FGFs are proteins that have a crucial role in cellular proliferation and fibroblast differentiation. Generally, according to the results of the studies, the role of FGF in promoting bone regeneration is not well understood. A number of studies disclosed the effective role of this factor in osteogenesis. [58-60,62], whereas other studies revealed contradictory results [57, 61] Nevertheless, one has to bear in mind that such difference can be due to the use of different carrier materials. Hence, more extensive studies are required to obtain more accurate results in this regard. Some studies have focused on the effect of angiogenic factors such as VEGF [35,36], PDGF [37,38], and TGF-β [16,39] on bone regeneration. These factors are assumed to have a role in new bone formation due to their potential in angiogenesis. Although adequate blood supply is a prerequisite for anabolic activity of bone cells, theses factors are not significantly effective in the process of osseous regeneration. PDGF is one of the growth factors used in bone regeneration. Its mode of action is still a matter of debate for the authors. [40] Carrier agents used with PDGF are not uniform in any of the articles [40,52-54]. Indicating inadequate information about application of this growth factor. PDGF-BB is one of the members of this family with the highest mitogenic and chemotactic activity [37,40]. It is presumed that members of this family cause an increase in formation of osteopontin and a decrease in production of osteocalcin [40]. Although, positive effects of these factors including rhPDGF in reconstruction of periodontal and alveolar bone defects is proposed by some [40,52-54], it is suggested that cellular and molecular investigations be conducted to confirm its mode of action. Platelet-rich plasma (PRP) is also one of the agents used to regenerate bone. In order to produce plasma-rich growth factor, cells in plasma are activated by thrombin and then centrifuged. Then PRGF is derived from the supernatant. This factor causes an increase in proliferation of bone cells and fibroblasts [38]. Nonetheless, adequate findings to conclude about the added effects of this agent in new bone formation compared with factors is still lacking emphasizing on the need for further investigations. TGF-β is an important growth factor in bone formation. The considerable potential for the members of this family to induce new bone formation has led to the widespread use of these factors in osseous reconstruction. Bone morphogenetic proteins are important members of this superfamily which were previously discussed. TGF-β1 and rhTGF-β3 are other members presumed to have the ability to stimulate osteoblast proliferation and extracellular matrix formation [16,64]. Use of TGF-β1 with gelatin hydrogel has led to promising results [39]. However, in order to obtain more favorable results, there is a continuous emphasize on its use with one of BMP family members [70]. Vascular endothelial growth factor (VEGF) is another angiogenic factor that is increased in response to hypoxia, ischemia, repair, and tissue regeneration. Studies demonstrate that VEGGF increases the repair rate of tissues, but its use alone does not have a significant role in enhancing bone formation and mineralization [29,56]. Probably, the most controversial results are related to the simultaneous use of VEGF and BMP-2. Samee and coworkers evaluated the role of this factor with β-TCP carrier in ectopic bone formation in muscles of the murine foot. The results indicated that the amount of bone formation was significantly higher in VEGF/BMP-2 group in days 21 and 28 compared with other groups. On the other hand, no significant difference was found between VEGF group and controls [29]. In 2009, Patel et al evaluated the combined effect of VEGF/BMP-2 in
reconstruction of cranial defects in mice. They concluded that addition of VEGF to BMP-2 did not significantly affect the amount of regenerated bone, but could help in homogeneity and integrity of the bone [42]. These two studies and other investigations [14,15,19], are indicative of ambiguity in application of VEGF. In fact, this can be attributable to the carrier with which VEGF is used. All studies using PLGA as a carrier demonstrated significant results from simultaneous application of VEGF and BMP-2 [15,19], but in other studies the results failed to show a statistical significance. This can declare the importance of carrier in the growth factor’s mode of action [14,42]

Conclusion
The available evidence, although feeble, could demonstrate the stronger effect of BMP-2 and rhBMP-2 in the process of bone formation and regeneration. It should be borne in mind that suspicions exist concerning application of other growth factors including angiogenic factors. In all cases, appropriate carriers are required for releasing and transferring growth factors due to their short half-lives. Amongst all carrier agents, gelatin hydrogel has been of widespread acceptance indicating relatively promising results when used with some growth factors. On the other hand, it appears that simultaneous use of the three carriers ACS, HA, and TCP can be influential in better transfer of the growth factor and improved bone regeneration. In general, regarding the numerous and widespread studies performed and the differences between them, as well as the use of variable carriers and few available evaluations on most of the factors, it is impossible to issue a conclusion with certainty or introduce a certain carrier or factor as the best in this regard.
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