

Osteoarthritis and Cartilage



Review

Mesenchymal stem cells for the management of inflammation in osteoarthritis: state of the art and perspectives



Y.-M. Pers †‡§, M. Ruiz †‡, D. Noël †‡*^a, C. Jorgensen †‡§^a

† Inserm U1183, Hôpital Saint-Eloi, Montpellier, F-34295, France

‡ Université Montpellier, UFR de Médecine, Montpellier, F-34000, France

§ Service d'immuno-Rhumatologie, Hôpital Lapeyronie, Montpellier, F-34295, France

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 19 February 2015

Received in revised form

29 June 2015

Accepted 7 July 2015

Keywords:

Mesenchymal stem cells

Trophic factors

miRNA

Regenerative medicine

Rheumatic diseases

SUMMARY

Osteoarthritis (OA) is the most common form of degenerative arthritis, mainly characterized by the degradation of articular cartilage and associated with subchondral bone lesions. Novel therapeutic approaches for OA include cell-based therapies that have become thriving areas of research and development. In this context, mesenchymal stem or stromal cells (MSCs) have gained much interest based on their trophic and immunomodulatory properties that can help tissue repair/regeneration. The present review article discusses the interest of using MSCs in cell-therapy approaches with a focus on the mechanisms by which MSCs might exhibit a therapeutic potential in OA. Special attention is given to the anti-inflammatory function of MSCs and on miRNA modulation in OA for possible future innovative strategies. The paper also presents the current data on the undergoing MSCs-based clinical trials in OA.

© 2015 Osteoarthritis Research Society International. Published by Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

Introduction

Osteoarthritis (OA), the most prevalent form of arthritis, affects up to 15% of the adult population and is principally characterized by degradation of the articular cartilage of the joint, associated with subchondral bone lesions. Chronic, low-grade inflammation contributes to symptoms and disease progression. Networks of diverse innate inflammatory danger signals, including chemokines, cytokines and alarmins are activated in OA. Besides inflammatory mediators, biomechanical injury and oxidative stress compromise the viability of chondrocytes, leading to hypertrophic differentiation and pro-catabolic responses with further extracellular matrix (ECM) degradation. Better understanding the inflammatory pathophysiology should help identifying different OA subtypes in the population and should lead to the development of new therapeutic options.

OA is one of the most prevalent diseases of the elderly and is a top cause of disability. There are few treatment options for OA

patients and most of them aim at reducing pain and controlling inflammation to improve function. Non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAIDs) and corticosteroid injections are largely used since many years but the current treatment strategies have no impact on the progressive degeneration of joint tissues^{1,2}. Recent studies suggest that disease-modifying treatments are possible. Similar to the approach that has been successful for rheumatoid arthritis (RA), biotherapies targeting inflammatory mediators such as TNF- α , IL1 or IL6 have been tested. Although these strategies led to a majority of disappointing results^{3–5}, some biotherapies are still under evaluation. As an example, we would like to point out a recent study using adalimumab (a humanized monoclonal antibody targeting TNF α) that reports statistically significant less erosive evolution on the radiological image in erosive hand OA patients with clinical joint swelling⁶. The current data indeed suggest that co-inhibition of several pro-inflammatory cytokines may be more efficient in OA⁷. In this context, mesenchymal stromal/stem cell (MSC)-based therapy seems attractive because this innovative therapeutic strategy could provide an enlarged anti-inflammatory potential. MSCs are immunosuppressive cells, which can decrease inflammation through the release of anti-inflammatory factors (including IL1RA) and decrease monocyte activation. In this review, we summarize recent data confirming the role of MSCs as a potential therapeutic strategy in OA.

* Address correspondence and reprint requests to: D. Noël, Inserm U1183, CHRU Saint Eloi, 80 Avenue Augustin Fliche, Montpellier, F-34295, France. Tel: 33-(0)-4-67-33-04-73; Fax: 33-(0)-4-67-33-01-13.

E-mail address: daniele.noel@inserm.fr (D. Noël).

^a Equally contributing authors.

The role of inflammation in OA

Although OA has generally been proposed as a degenerative disease, recent work suggested that low-grade inflammatory processes could promote disease symptoms and accelerate disease progression⁸. Some of the cartilage matrix catabolic products probably activate macrophages and other innate immune cells to release inflammatory cytokines, which in turn promote cartilage damage progression by altering chondrocyte function⁹. The interplay between the immune system and cartilage is not well understood but evidence of regulation of acute-phase response signaling pathway, the complement pathway, and the coagulation pathway in the joint fluid of OA patients has been reported, suggesting a contribution of inflammation to joint damage¹⁰.

GWAS and studies of familial clusters and twins have also shown a relation of OA susceptibility with inflammation; the influence of genetic factors being close to 70%. Studies of candidate genes and genome analysis have identified polymorphisms or mutations in genes involved in the synthesis of ECM or the signaling pathways of inflammation. Among the identified genes are *ADAMTS-12*, cartilage intermediate layer protein (*CILP*), vitamin D receptor (*VDR*), cyclooxygenase (*COX2*), asporin (*ASPN*), Growth and Differentiation Factor (*GDF*)5, IL4 receptor. The polymorphism rs20417 in the promoter of the *COX2* gene contributes to the genetic risk for hip and knee OA¹¹. However a correlation with the expression level of PGE2 in the synovial fluid has not been demonstrated.

Synovial membranes from patients with OA demonstrate low grade synovitis compared to RA but with high expression of cytokines. OA synovial tissue shows an increase in immune cell infiltrates associated with pro-inflammatory cytokine expression, including tumor necrosis factor (TNF) α , IL1 β , IL6, IL8 and IL22. Moreover, activation of the innate immune system contributes to the persistence of OA synovial low-grade inflammation. Damage to cells and cartilage ECM resulting from repeated microtrauma and senescence generates damage-associated molecular patterns (DAMPs) that activate the innate immune system through the toll-like receptor (TLR) pathway¹². DAMPs include fragments generated from ECM degradation such as proteoglycans, intracellular proteins such as heat-shock proteins or DNA. By inducing the release of Alarmins (high mobility group box protein 1 S100A8 and S100A9) by monocytes, they contribute to the inflammatory cascade. The inflammatory process activates the release of enzymes by chondrocytes and monocytes resulting in enhanced catabolic process. These enzymes include proteins of A Disintegrin And Metalloproteinase with Thrombospondin motifs (ADAMTS) family and matrix metalloproteinases (MMP)1, 3, 13, which are directly responsible of ECM remodeling. It has also been shown that the joint synovial fluid from OA patients contains a small number of MSCs but their role in OA pathogenesis or cartilage regeneration has yet to be established¹³. OA is therefore an inflammatory musculoskeletal disease involving both innate and adaptive immune response as shown by high levels of pro-inflammatory cytokines and downstream target factors.

Characteristics and properties of mesenchymal stem cells

Mesenchymal stromal or stem cells (MSCs) can be isolated from a variety of adult or neonatal tissues, primarily bone marrow, fat tissue, dental pulp, placenta or umbilical cord. They are characterized by their fibroblastic shape, their immunophenotype (CD11b⁻, CD14⁻, CD34⁻, CD45⁻, HLA-DR⁻, CD73⁺, CD90⁺, CD105⁺) and their trilineage potential of differentiation towards bone, cartilage and adipose tissue¹⁴. Endogenous MSCs have been proposed to localize in a perisinusoidal location in the bone marrow¹⁵ and to be marked by nestin or leptin-receptor^{16,17} in mice or CD146 in humans¹⁸. But

perisinusoidal cells do not display all the properties of MSCs suggesting that another skeletal stem cell should exist. Indeed, two studies have very recently reported the identification of endogenous mouse skeletal stem cell (mSSC). The first one identified osteo-chondroreticular stem cells in the bone marrow on the basis of Gremlin 1 expression while the other identified a subpopulation of stem cells that generates two multipotent progenitor cell types giving rise to bone, cartilage and stromal tissue^{19,20}.

MSCs exert different functions thanks to a variety of secreted factors. They produce growth factors, such as transforming growth factor (TGF) β , hepatocyte growth factor (HGF), basic fibroblast growth factor (FGF) or vascular endothelial growth factor (VEGF), that induce proliferation and angiogenesis of various cell types, in particular fibroblasts, epithelial or endothelial cells. Another important property of MSCs is their capacity to rescue cells from apoptosis induced by trauma, oxidative environment, radiation or chemical injury. Some key proteins have been proposed to play such role. Insulin growth factor (IGF)1, interleukin (IL)6 and stanniocalcin-1 are essential for apoptotic reversal in fibroblasts while VEGF, HGF and TGF β 1 have been shown to protect endothelial cells from apoptosis^{21,22}. The anti-fibrotic effect of MSCs has been largely shown *in vitro* and in different pre-clinical models of fibrosis (for review, see Ref. 23). Although it has been argued that MSCs might exert profibrotic function, there is no example from the literature that shows that MSC transplantation induces fibrosis on a developing or established disease. The protective effect of MSCs extends beyond anti-fibrosis to reduction of scar tissue formation as exemplified in a recent review of the literature²⁴.

Finally, maybe the most studied property of MSCs is their anti-inflammatory and immunosuppressive role on cells from the adaptive and innate immune responses. MSCs interact with T cells and inhibit the proliferation and differentiation of naive T lymphocytes towards the Th1 or Th17 phenotype. We also demonstrated that repolarization of Th17 cells depends on PD-L1 expression on MSCs²⁵. The inhibition of differentiation of naive T lymphocytes was associated with an increase in the number of functional natural Treg cells and enhanced IL-10 secretion. However, MSCs were not able to generate Treg cells when cultured with mature Th1 or Th17 lymphocytes²⁶. In parallel, MSCs induce a Th2-like immune response, independently of T regulatory cell generation²⁷. The immunomodulatory effect of MSCs is not specific, and primary skin fibroblasts are able to inhibit an inflammatory immune response, as efficiently as MSCs. Similar to MSCs, skin fibroblasts secreted nitric oxide (NO), IL6, prostaglandin (PG)E2 and induced a Th2-like immune response²⁸. The secretion of PGE2 induced by IL6 plays an important role in this immunomodulatory effect²⁷.

Both soluble and contact-dependent signals from the environment trigger the therapeutic effect of MSCs, which in turn, accordingly respond via the secretion of various mediators. The soluble factors are released in the extracellular environment at the vicinity of the cells or entrapped into extracellular vesicles (EVs), which can transfer their content from one cell to another over long distances and have been isolated from virtually all body fluids²⁹. In studies on tissue regeneration, injection of MSC-derived EVs has been shown to improve at least one major/clinical parameter associated with organ dysfunction³⁰. Although the effect of MSC-derived EVs has not been addressed in rheumatic diseases, it may be speculated that they may improve the outcomes of OA or RA³¹.

The choice of MSC source for efficient therapeutic effect

Since the identification of MSCs as regulators of the immune response in the late 1990's, the concept that MSCs are immune

privileged cells has been proposed³². This has stimulated research using major histocompatibility (MHC)-unmatched allogeneic cells in several clinical applications. For osteo-articular diseases, the use of allogeneic MSCs or MSCs from human origin was reported to be efficient in reducing the clinical signs of collagen-induced arthritis^{33–35} or in improving OA in murine models without the need of immunosuppressive drugs addition (for review, see³⁶). However, several preclinical and clinical studies have pointed out that allogeneic cells may elicit a humoral and cellular immune response *in vivo* and harbor the risk of inducing MHC specific reactivity^{37,38}. While the use of allogeneic MSCs has to face significant challenges, the therapy using autologous MSCs may raise several difficulties. In addition to the expansion time required for producing sufficient quantities of cells, the variable potency of MSCs between patients and the need for suitable quantities of MSCs in acute conditions may limit the use of autologous MSCs in some clinical applications³⁹. Half of the clinical trials relied on the use of autologous cells but the efficacy of autologous over allogeneic MSCs-based therapy still needs to be demonstrated. Because the therapeutic effect of MSCs is proposed to be due to a hit-and-run mechanism, the rapid elimination of allogeneic MSCs may not be a problem, even though we may assume that MSC therapy may gain by prolonging the persistence of the cells.

Another mean of enhancing MSC therapy could be to pre-activate the cells before injection. Pre-activation of MSCs by inflammatory mediators was evaluated in the murine model of acute respiratory distress syndrome⁴⁰. It resulted in higher protective capacity which was associated with increased expression of IL10 and IL1RA (receptor antagonist), reduction of the lung injury score, lower pulmonary edema and reduced accumulation of bronchoalveolar lavage inflammatory cells and cytokines compared with non activated cells. However contradictory results are available. MSCs pre-activation with IFN- γ failed to prolong allograft survival in a model of rat corneal allograft survival⁴¹. In rheumatic diseases, pre-activation of MSCs with IFN- γ and TNF- α failed to ameliorate established arthritis⁴². The inflammatory environment encountered by MSCs upon injection is likely sufficient to activate their anti-inflammatory function.

A better appreciation of the tissue origin of MSCs as well as the heterogeneity of MSC subpopulations within a tissue is of importance for optimizing their therapeutic efficacy for specific disease targets. MSCs isolated from bone marrow or synovial tissue have higher chondrogenic differentiation potential than those isolated from other tissues while higher adipogenic activity was demonstrated in synovium- and adipose-derived cells⁴³. While the differentiation potential of MSCs may vary from source to source, the age of the donor as well as the health status may influence their therapeutic effectiveness in certain diseases⁴⁴. Indeed, MSCs from healthy donors and OA patients present similar colony forming unit-fibroblast (CFU-F) capacity but a loss of proliferative activity related with age⁴⁵. MSCs isolated from patients with end stage OA are functionally deficient in terms of their *in vitro* proliferation and differentiation potential⁴⁶. These data suggest that MSCs from OA patients have become senescent and that a correlation between the proliferative potential and the age of native MSCs is suggested³⁶. On the other hand, specific markers for human MSC subsets are lacking and most of the procedures used for MSC expansion under Good Laboratory Practices (GLP) rely on plastic adherence and give rise to heterogeneous cell populations. There is evidence that MSCs change their properties according to different culture conditions and in response to different tissue environments⁴⁷. Moreover, culture-expanded MSCs have been reported to lose their trophic function^{48,49}. Indeed, potency assays must be established and standardized to ensure that patients will receive functional MSCs and comparable doses of cells.

Understanding the molecular mechanisms associated with the therapeutic effect of MSCs in OA

The interest of using MSCs in stem cell therapies for cartilage regeneration in osteoarticular diseases has been largely discussed^{31,50,51}. They have been used in tissue engineering approaches where they can be associated with a scaffold and implanted in cartilage lesions. Clinical evidence supports the notion that MSCs may be an effective treatment for traumatic injury in chondral and osteochondral cartilage defects but few studies report the interest of MSC-based tissue engineering approaches in OA⁵². In one study focusing on patients with OA of the knee, equivalent clinical outcomes were observed with patients receiving MSC- or cell-free scaffolds but better arthroscopic and histological scores were shown in the cell-transplanted group⁵³. However, evidence that MSCs could be better than chondrocytes is still lacking and an easier and more direct approach could be the injection of MSCs without scaffold^{36,54}. Indeed, MSCs have also been evaluated as paracrine factors-releasing cell therapy products after local or systemic injection (for review see Ref. 31). Through the secretion of mediators, which may stimulate endogenous regeneration and proliferation of tissue progenitors or, counteract apoptosis or cartilage degeneration, they may contribute to cartilage repair/protection.

The proliferation of chondrocytes has been shown to be stimulated by coculture with bone marrow- or synovium-derived MSCs^{55,56}. In a coculture model where human OA chondrocytes were incubated with adipose-derived MSCs (ASCs), we were also able to demonstrate a reduction in the expression of hypertrophic, fibrotic and inflammatory markers^{57,58}. The anti-fibrotic effect was mainly attributed to the secretion of HGF by ASCs⁵⁸. In this system, ASCs alone produced very low levels of pro-inflammatory cytokines and chemokines but they significantly decreased the secretion of IL6, IL8, monocyte chemoattractant protein (MCP)1 and macrophage inflammatory protein (MIP)1 α of both chondrocytes and synoviocytes⁵⁷.

In addition to their anti-inflammatory potential and their capacity to stimulate endogenous cartilage regeneration, MSCs could differentiate *in vivo* and replace injured cartilage⁵⁹. However, few studies have investigated the immunosuppressive potential of differentiated MSCs towards chondrocytes⁶⁰. Although one study reported that differentiated MSCs retained their ability to suppress allogeneic immune responses⁶¹, other reports indicated that MSC differentiation resulted in the loss of their immunosuppressive properties^{62,63}. Differentiated MSCs were shown to secrete lower levels of PGE2 and NO, two important mediators of MSC-based immunosuppression, and to express higher levels of major histocompatibility component (MHC)-I, MHC-II, CD80 and CD86⁶³. These findings suggest that chondrogenically differentiated MSCs not only may lose *in vivo* their immunosuppressive potential but also promote the proliferation and activation of T lymphocytes. The mechanisms by which MSCs could regenerate cartilage in OA are not elucidated but whether their ability to differentiate into chondrocytes may impact their capacity to inhibit inflammatory responses *in vivo* needs further investigation.

The regenerative potential of MSCs was confirmed *in vivo* using experimental OA models. Intra-articular injection of murine ASCs reduced the histological lesions of cartilage degradation in the experimental model of collagenase-induced OA (CIOA) when injected in a preventive protocol⁶⁴. Moreover, the therapeutic effect was significant in this inflammatory CIOA model while no effect of ASC treatment on cartilage destruction, osteophyte formation or chondrogenesis in ligaments was found in the destabilization of median meniscus (DMM) model⁶⁵. In the CIOA model, lower levels of S100A8, S100A9 alarmins and IL1 β were detected few hours after

ASC injection suggesting that ASCs reduced macrophage activation. Indeed, efficacy of ASC injection was observed in the model with high activation of the synovial membrane and therefore correlated with their anti-inflammatory property. In a rabbit model, Desando *et al.* demonstrated that intra-articular injection of ASCs had a structural benefit. ASC treatment inhibited the progression of OA, and was associated with a significant decrease of Laverty's score at 16 weeks compared to the controls⁶⁶. A decreased expression of TNF- α and MMP-1 was observed in the ASC-treated groups at 16 and 24 weeks. In the low dose group (2×10^6 cells/joint), the reduction of MMPs and TNF- α expression in menisci and synovial membrane was more effective than in the high dose (6×10^6 cells/joint). Several other studies reported the effect of MSCs or ASCs on cartilage protection and OA prevention in different models of OA^{67–69}. Indeed, MSCs are not only involved in the maintenance of joint homeostasis but may be of interest to restore or protect against inflammation or degenerative changes associated with OA progression.

Role of microRNAs (miRNAs) in the molecular mechanisms sustaining MSC functions

miRNAs are small non-coding endogenous RNAs with the capacity to modulate the expression of multiple protein-encoding genes at the posttranscriptional level. MicroRNAs control a huge number of biologic functions such as proliferation, apoptosis or differentiation⁷⁰. In MSCs, the function of more than 60 miRNAs has been described in a recent review article⁷¹. Most of them have been shown to be involved in differentiation and proliferation. Indeed, global miRNA disruption through Droscha and Dicer knockdown (both are essential component for biogenesis of miRNAs) resulted in significantly reduced potential of differentiation of human MSCs⁷². In chondrocytes, Dicer knockdown induced a decreased proliferation and accelerated differentiation towards a hypertrophic phenotype⁷³. Several miRNAs including miR-23b, -29a, -140, -194, -199 and -574-3p have been shown to regulate the differentiation of MSCs into chondrocytes^{74–79}. In addition, miRNAs have been found to function in migration or apoptosis of MSCs. More recently, the role of miRNAs in the paracrine effect of MSCs has been exemplified.

Various recent papers highlighted the importance of miRNAs in controlling the immunosuppressive function of MSCs. As an example, miR-27b knockdown had a positive influence on the allosuppressive activity that inhibits T-cell proliferation via inverse correlation of CXCL12 expression in cultured ASCs⁸⁰. MiR-181a regulated the proliferation of MSCs through TGF- β signaling pathway and MSC immunosuppressive properties through the MAPK signaling pathway. Specifically, miR-181a enhanced IL-6, VEGF, and indoleamine 2,3-dioxygenase (IDO) expression, resulting in attenuation of the MSC immunosuppressive properties *in vitro* and *in vivo*⁸¹. Up-regulation of miR-155 reduced the immunosuppressive capacity of MSCs by repressing iNOS expression⁸². In addition, correction of the diabetic wound-healing impairment with MSC treatment was associated with a significantly increased expression of miR-146a and related down-regulation of its target pro-inflammatory genes⁸³. Conversely, Matysiak *et al.* have identified miR-146a as a negative regulator of BM-MSC immunosuppressive function via targeting PGE2 secretion⁸⁴.

Validation of new miRNAs in this process could have implications in basic science but also potentially in clinical research if the modulation of the expression of one miRNA can enhance the immunosuppressive effect of MSCs. Indeed, up- or down-regulation of the expression of some miRNAs may represent a new interesting strategy in stem cell-based therapy in OA. Over-

expression of miR-140 may have a regulatory role in modulating cartilage homeostasis and OA development through the inhibition of several OA-related genes, such as ADAMTS5⁸⁵. MiR-145 is another potential candidate because it up-regulates the expression of genes, such as collagen II and miRNAs, such as miR-140 and miR-655, which play important roles in cartilage⁸⁶. A complementary strategy is to use miRNAs able to inhibit or prevent OA-associated inflammation. MiR-146 and miR-15a have been shown to reduce inflammation and degradation initiated by IL1 β and reduce synovial hyperplasia in RA, respectively^{87,88}. However, additional work will be necessary to determine the optimal procedure to improve stem cell technology for the treatment of OA.

Deregulation of microRNAs in OA

The altered expression of several miRNAs in OA cartilage has initially been described in two different studies although no common miRNA was reported^{89,90}. Overexpression of miR-22 in normal chondrocytes resulted in an increased expression of IL1 β and MMP13 and a decreased expression of Aggrecan. Inhibition of miR-22 in OA chondrocytes blocked the inflammatory processes by inhibiting IL1 β and MMP13⁸⁹. Other studies described the overexpression of miR-146a, miR-9 and miR-34a, which regulate TNF- α or MMP13, suggesting that they may have a protective role in OA^{88,91}. A more recent study has showed differential expression of seven novel miRNAs in OA and normal chondrocytes whose function still need to be validated⁹².

IL1 β is one of the major cytokine responsible for cartilage degradation in OA and in a previous study, we have shown that miR-24 is repressed in IL1 β -treated chondrocytes and in cartilage of OA patients⁹³. MiR-146a has been proposed to negatively regulate MMP13 although its expression gradually decreases with advancement of the disease⁹⁴. The expression of miR-146a was inversely correlated with the expression of MMP-13 and was strongly induced after chondrocyte stimulation with IL1 β ⁸⁷. MiR-146a was reported to be a negative regulator of the inflammatory response and it could also be a negative regulator of MMP13 in osteoarthritic cartilage. MiR-140 is a critical miRNA in OA as it plays important role in chondrogenesis and cartilage development^{85,95}. *In vivo* knockout of miR-140 predisposed to age-related OA while overexpression of miR-140 protected mice from OA through the modulation of MMP13 and ADAMTS5 expression. More recently, the importance of miR-125b, miR-127-5p, miR-148a and miR-21 in OA development and progression has been described⁹⁶. Finally, Beyer and co-authors identified a signature of circulating microRNAs differentially expressed in OA⁹⁷. Three miRNAs, let-7e, miR-454 and miR-885-5p were identified as predictors for severe knee or hip OA. Let-7e was the most promising OA biomarker candidate since it was associated with a higher susceptibility to get more than one joint replacement surgery independently of age, sex or body mass index.

All of these data highlight the utmost importance of miRNAs in MSC homeostasis. Deregulation of miRNAs in OA patients seems critical since they impact the inflammatory environment as well as the functional properties of MSCs, in particular their differentiation and immunosuppressive potential. Modulation of individual miRNAs in MSCs is therefore a promising strategy to enhance the therapeutic efficacy of MSCs⁹⁸.

Application of MSCs to cell therapy for OA patients

Despite encouraging pre-clinical data, only few preliminary clinical studies on the use of autologous stem cells have been published for articular cartilage damaging diseases. Actually, the original clinical studies focused on the use of MSCs for cartilage

repair with in mind the observation that articular cartilage has to be repaired to prevent subsequent OA changes. Most clinical studies concerned knee joint injuries^{99–101} while one study was on ankle cartilage defect¹⁰². Wakitani and collaborators injected autologous BM-MSCs embedded in a collagen gel directly into the articular cartilage defect of osteoarthritic knee joints⁵³. Twelve patients received autologous bone marrow cell transplants, and twelve were cell-free controls. A better arthroscopic and histological score was observed in the cell-transplanted group even though no clinical improvement was demonstrated after 6 months. Another non-randomized study compared 36 patients with autologous chondrocyte implantation and 36 patients with autologous BM-MSCs. After 2 years, similar outcomes were obtained for the two procedures but the autologous BM-MSC-based approach was safer and less expensive⁹⁹. A recent study compared the safety of chondrocytes vs MSC implantation. Neither tumors nor infections were observed on a mean 75 months of follow-up¹⁰³. All these studies generally reported presence of a hyaline-like cartilage repair tissue within the primitive cartilage defects.

In OA, no randomized studies have been performed yet. Two studies reporting the use of autologous BM-MSCs for treating a small number of patients with moderate-to-severe knee OA were recently published by Iranian groups^{104,105}. Absence of side effects was reported after 1-year follow-up together with an improvement in walking time and reduction in walking pain. Moreover, MRI displayed an increase of cartilage thickness and a decrease in the size of subchondral edemas in half of patients¹⁰⁵. Another non-controlled clinical trial has shown that local injection of ASCs improved clinical symptoms of pain and WOMAC index¹⁰⁶ and in a dose-escalation study, up to 100 millions of cells were well tolerated¹⁰⁷. A last report on 12 patients who received 40×10^6 autologous BM-MSCs into the knee joint revealed improvement of cartilage morphology and quality using MRI T2 mapping suggesting a possible structural benefit of stem cell therapy¹⁰⁸. Finally, our recent results from a phase I dose escalation study on 18 patients with knee OA showed safety of the procedure and improvement of pain and quality of life for patients who received the lowest dose of ASCs (2×10^6 cells) (Pers et al., submitted).

It might be intuitive to think that cartilage regeneration will be especially difficult to reach when the tissue is severely damaged⁷. The radiographic stage that would be optimal for MSC infusion is

still not clearly defined although lesions of large size ($\geq 5.4 \text{ cm}^2$) have been associated with poor clinical and arthroscopic outcomes, suggesting a better benefit for patients with less severe OA¹⁰⁶. Nevertheless, Orozco et al. did not report higher benefit with the four patients with early stage OA on the 12 patients enrolled, likely due to the small number of individuals¹⁰⁸. All other studies included late stage OA patients^{105,107}; Pers et al., submitted. A summary of on-going or completed clinical trials on stem cell therapy in OA is given in Table 1 (ClinicalTrials.gov sources). All these data support the trophic action of MSCs for reducing synovial inflammation and protecting cartilage from degradation. Although the preliminary results from these studies seem encouraging for severe OA lesions, prospective studies should focus on OA patients with early radiographic stage in order to prevent or limit the structural progression of the disease. Further insight on the therapeutic utility of MSCs for OA patients will come from the on-going phase I and II trials.

Conclusion

OA is a complex disease characterized by the alteration of various molecular pathways in several compartments in the joint. Altered pathways are likely to be different depending on OA subsets (mechanically-induced OA, metabolic disorder associated OA, inflammatory OA, ...), joint location (knee, ankle, hip, ...) or individuals. In this context, cell therapy approaches using MSCs may be of high interest since they exert pleiotropic functions that may give therapeutic benefit on OA lesions. Preliminary results of pre-clinical and phase I or II clinical studies using BM- or adipose tissue-derived MSCs are promising since MSC therapy was shown to be safe and well-tolerated. Other approaches based on the use of embryonic stem cells (ES) or induced pluripotent stem cells (iPS) are currently under investigation for proposing therapeutic options or evaluating new drugs that could prevent cartilage degradation and modify the course of OA^{109,110}. iPS can be generated from different tissues with significantly less invasive procedures than MSCs, reprogrammed towards the desired phenotype and used in regenerative medicine¹¹¹. Together with the need of controlled long-term studies to confirm whether this new strategy of MSC-based therapy can improve pain and induce structural benefit,

Table 1

Summary of clinical trials (on-going or completed) on stem cell therapy in OA (ClinicalTrials.gov sources)

Type of stem cells	Localization	Autologous or allogeneic	Phase study	ClinicalTrials.gov identifier	Nb patients enrolled	Status	Sponsor country
ASC	IA Knee	Autologous	I	NCT01585857	18	C	France
ASC	IA Knee	Autologous	I–II	NCT02219113	12	R	Russia
ASC	IA Knee	Autologous	I–II	NCT01300598	18	C	Korean
ASC + PRP	IA Knee	Autologous	I–II	NCT01739504	500	R	USA
BM–MSC	IA Knee	Allogeneic	I–II	NCT01586312	30	C	Spain
BM–MSC	IA Knee	Autologous	I–II	NCT01183728	12	C	Spain
BM–MSC	IA Knee	Autologous	II	NCT01459640	50	R	Malaysia
BM–MSC	IA Knee	Autologous	I–II	NCT02351011	12	R	Canada
BM–MSC	IA Knee	Autologous	I	NCT01207661	6	C	Iran
BM–MSC	IA Knee	Autologous	I–II	NCT01227694	15	C	Spain
BM–MSC	IA Knee	Autologous	I–II	NCT02123368	30	R	Spain
BM–MSC	IA Knee	Autologous	II	NCT01504464	40	C	Iran
BM–MSC	IA Knee	Autologous	I–II	NCT01183728	12	C	Spain
BM–MSC	IA Knee	Autologous	I–II	NCT01152125	10	R	India
BM–MSC	IA Knee	Autologous	I–II	NCT01485198	30	R	Mexico
BM–MSC	IA Hip	Autologous	I	NCT01499056	30	C	Iran
BM–MSC	IA Ankle	Autologous	I	NCT01436058	6	C	Iran
BM–MSC	IA Knee	Allogeneic	I	NCT01448434	72	R	Malaysia
UC–MSC	IV or IA Knee	Allogeneic	I–II	NCT02237846	40	R	Panama

ASC: adipose-derived stem cell; BM: bone marrow; UC: umbilical cord; PRP: platelet rich plasma; IA: intra-articular; IV: intra-venous; R: recruiting; C: completed study; Nb: number.

the possibility of using other stem cell-based approaches has to be evaluated.

Contributorship

All authors were involved in drafting the article or revising it critically for important intellectual content, and all authors approved the final version to be published.

Funding

Work in the laboratory Inserm U1183 was supported by the Inserm Institute and the University of Montpellier. Funding was obtained from the European Community's Horizon 2020 program (643809) for the collaborative project: "ADIPOA2: Clinical trial of autologous adipose-derived mesenchymal stromal cells in the treatment of mild to moderate osteoarthritis" and from the Arthritis R&D through the program "ROAD: Research on OsteoArthritis Diseases". We also thank the Agence Nationale pour la Recherche for support of the national infrastructure: "ECELLFRANCE: Development of a national adult mesenchymal stem cell based therapy platform" (ANR-11-INSB-005).

Conflict of interest

None.

Acknowledgments

None.

References

- Hochberg MC, Altman RD, April KT, Benkhalti M, Guyatt G, McGowan J, *et al.* American College of Rheumatology 2012 recommendations for the use of nonpharmacologic and pharmacologic therapies in osteoarthritis of the hand, hip, and knee. *Arthritis Care Res (Hoboken)* 2012;64:465–74.
- Zhang W, Moskowitz RW, Nuki G, Abramson S, Altman RD, Arden N, *et al.* OARSI recommendations for the management of hip and knee osteoarthritis, Part II: OARSI evidence-based, expert consensus guidelines. *Osteoarthritis Cartilage* 2008;16:137–62.
- Chevalier X, Goupille P, Beaulieu AD, Burch FX, Bensen WG, Conrozier T, *et al.* Intraarticular injection of anakinra in osteoarthritis of the knee: a multicenter, randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled study. *Arthritis Rheum* 2009;61:344–52.
- Chevalier X, Ravaud P, Maheu E, Baron G, Rialland A, Vergnaud P, *et al.* Adalimumab in patients with hand osteoarthritis refractory to analgesics and NSAIDs: a randomised, multicentre, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial. *Ann Rheum Dis* 2014 May 9, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/annrheumdis-2014-205348> [Epub ahead of print].
- Cohen SB, Proudman S, Kivitz AJ, Burch FX, Donohue JP, Burstein D, *et al.* A randomized, double-blind study of AMG 108 (a fully human monoclonal antibody to IL-1R1) in patients with osteoarthritis of the knee. *Arthritis Res Ther* 2011;13:R125.
- Verbruggen G, Wittoek R, Vander Cruyssen B, Elewaut D. Tumour necrosis factor blockade for the treatment of erosive osteoarthritis of the interphalangeal finger joints: a double blind, randomised trial on structure modification. *Ann Rheum Dis* 2012;71:891–8.
- Chevalier X, Eymard F, Richette P. Biologic agents in osteoarthritis: hopes and disappointments. *Nat Rev Rheumatol* 2013;9:400–10.
- Liu-Bryan R, Terkeltaub R. Emerging regulators of the inflammatory process in osteoarthritis. *Nat Rev Rheumatol* 2015;11:35–44.
- van Lent PL, Grevers L, Blom AB, Sloetjes A, Mort JS, Vogl T, *et al.* Myeloid-related proteins S100A8/S100A9 regulate joint inflammation and cartilage destruction during antigen-induced arthritis. *Ann Rheum Dis* 2008;67:1750–8.
- Ritter SY, Subbaiah R, Bebek G, Crish J, Scanzello CR, Krastins B, *et al.* Proteomic analysis of synovial fluid from the osteoarthritic knee: comparison with transcriptome analyses of joint tissues. *Arthritis Rheum* 2013;65:981–92.
- Schneider EM, Du W, Fiedler J, Hogel J, Gunther KP, Brenner H, *et al.* The (-765 G->C) promoter variant of the COX-2/PTGS2 gene is associated with a lower risk for end-stage hip and knee osteoarthritis. *Ann Rheum Dis* 2011;70:1458–60.
- Liu-Bryan R. Synovium and the innate inflammatory network in osteoarthritis progression. *Curr Rheumatol Rep* 2013;15:323.
- Jones EA, English A, Henshaw K, Kinsey SE, Markham AF, Emery P, *et al.* Enumeration and phenotypic characterization of synovial fluid multipotential mesenchymal progenitor cells in inflammatory and degenerative arthritis. *Arthritis Rheum* 2004;50:817–27.
- Dominici M, Le Blanc K, Mueller I, Slaper-Cortenbach I, Marini F, Krause D, *et al.* Minimal criteria for defining multipotent mesenchymal stromal cells. The International Society for Cellular Therapy position statement. *Cytotherapy* 2006;8:315–7.
- Bianco P, Cao X, Frenette PS, Mao JJ, Robey PG, Simmons PJ, *et al.* The meaning, the sense and the significance: translating the science of mesenchymal stem cells into medicine. *Nat Med* 2013;19:35–42.
- Mendez-Ferrer S, Michurina TV, Ferraro F, Mazloom AR, MacArthur BD, Lira SA, *et al.* Mesenchymal and haematopoietic stem cells form a unique bone marrow niche. *Nature* 2010;466:829–34.
- Ding L, Saunders TL, Enikolopov G, Morrison SJ. Endothelial and perivascular cells maintain haematopoietic stem cells. *Nature* 2012;481:457–62.
- Sacchetti B, Funari A, Michienzi S, Di Cesare S, Piersanti S, Saggio I, *et al.* Self-renewing osteoprogenitors in bone marrow sinusoids can organize a hematopoietic microenvironment. *Cell* 2007;131:324–36.
- Worthley DL, Churchill M, Compton JT, Taylor Y, Rao M, Si Y, *et al.* Gremlin 1 identifies a skeletal stem cell with bone, cartilage, and reticular stromal potential. *Cell* 2015;160:269–84.
- Chan CK, Seo EY, Chen JY, Lo D, McArdle A, Sinha R, *et al.* Identification and specification of the mouse skeletal stem cell. *Cell* 2015;160:285–98.
- Gnecchi M, He H, Noiseux N, Liang OD, Zhang L, Morello F, *et al.* Evidence supporting paracrine hypothesis for Akt-modified mesenchymal stem cell-mediated cardiac protection and functional improvement. *Faseb J* 2006;20:661–9.
- Rehman J, Traktuev D, Li J, Merfeld-Clauss S, Temm-Grove CJ, Bovenkerk JE, *et al.* Secretion of angiogenic and antiapoptotic factors by human adipose stromal cells. *Circulation* 2004;109:1292–8.
- Usunier B, Benderitter M, Tamarat R, Chapel A. Management of fibrosis: the mesenchymal stromal cells breakthrough. *Stem Cells Int* 2014;2014. 340257.
- Jackson WM, Nesti LJ, Tuan RS. Mesenchymal stem cell therapy for attenuation of scar formation during wound healing. *Stem Cell Res Ther* 2012;3:20.
- Luz-Crawford P, Noel D, Fernandez X, Khoury M, Figueroa F, Carrion F, *et al.* Mesenchymal stem cells repress Th17

- molecular program through the PD-1 pathway. *PLoS One* 2012;7:e45272.
26. Luz-Crawford P, Kurte M, Bravo-Alegria J, Contreras R, Nova-Lamperti E, Tejedor G, *et al.* Mesenchymal stem cells generate a CD4+CD25+Foxp3+ regulatory T cell population during the differentiation process of Th1 and Th17 cells. *Stem Cell Res Ther* 2013;4:65.
 27. Bouffi C, Bony C, Courties G, Jorgensen C, Noel D. IL-6-dependent PGE2 secretion by mesenchymal stem cells inhibits local inflammation in experimental arthritis. *PLoS One* 2010;5:e14247.
 28. Bouffi C, Bony C, Jorgensen C, Noel D. Skin fibroblasts are potent suppressors of inflammation in experimental arthritis. *Ann Rheum Dis* 2011;70:1671–6.
 29. van der Meel R, Fens MH, Vader P, van Solinge WW, Eniola-Adefeso O, Schiffelers RM. Extracellular vesicles as drug delivery systems: lessons from the liposome field. *J Control Release* 2014;195:72–85.
 30. Akyurekli C, Le Y, Richardson RB, Fergusson D, Tay J, Allan DS. A systematic review of preclinical studies on the therapeutic potential of mesenchymal stromal cell-derived microvesicles. *Stem Cell Rev* 2015;11:150–60.
 31. Maumus M, Jorgensen C, Noel D. Mesenchymal stem cells in regenerative medicine applied to rheumatic diseases: role of secretome and exosomes. *Biochimie* 2013;95:2229–34.
 32. Klyushnenkova E, Mosca JD, Zernetkina V, Majumdar MK, Beggs KJ, Simonetti DW, *et al.* T cell responses to allogeneic human mesenchymal stem cells: immunogenicity, tolerance, and suppression. *J Biomed Sci* 2005;12:47–57.
 33. Augello A, Tasso R, Negrini SM, Cancedda R, Pennesi G. Cell therapy using allogeneic bone marrow mesenchymal stem cells prevents tissue damage in collagen-induced arthritis. *Arthritis Rheum* 2007;56:1175–86.
 34. Gonzalez MA, Gonzalez-Rey E, Rico L, Buscher D, Delgado M. Treatment of experimental arthritis by inducing immune tolerance with human adipose-derived mesenchymal stem cells. *Arthritis Rheum* 2009;60:1006–19.
 35. Zhou B, Yuan J, Zhou Y, Ghawji Jr M, Deng YP, Lee AJ, *et al.* Administering human adipose-derived mesenchymal stem cells to prevent and treat experimental arthritis. *Clin Immunol* 2011;141:328–37.
 36. Barry F, Murphy M. Mesenchymal stem cells in joint disease and repair. *Nat Rev Rheumatol* 2013;9:584–94.
 37. Hoogduijn MJ, Roemeling-van Rhijn M, Engela AU, Korevaar SS, Mensah FK, Franquesa M, *et al.* Mesenchymal stem cells induce an inflammatory response after intravenous infusion. *Stem Cells Dev* 2013;22:2825–35.
 38. Roemeling-van Rhijn M, Reinders ME, Franquesa M, Engela AU, Korevaar SS, Roelofs H, *et al.* Human allogeneic bone marrow and adipose tissue derived mesenchymal stromal cells induce CD8+ cytotoxic T cell reactivity. *J Stem Cell Res Ther* 2013;3:004.
 39. Ankrum JA, Ong JF, Karp JM. Mesenchymal stem cells: immune evasive, not immune privileged. *Nat Biotechnol* 2014;32:252–60.
 40. Bustos ML, Huleihel L, Meyer EM, Donnenberg AD, Donnenberg VS, Sciarba JD, *et al.* Activation of human mesenchymal stem cells impacts their therapeutic abilities in lung injury by increasing interleukin (IL)-10 and IL-1RN levels. *Stem Cells Transl Med* 2013;2:884–95.
 41. Treacy O, O'Flynn L, Ryan AE, Morcos M, Lohan P, Schu S, *et al.* Mesenchymal stem cell therapy promotes corneal allograft survival in rats by local and systemic immunomodulation. *Am J Transpl* 2014;14:2023–36.
 42. Papadopoulou A, Yiangou M, Athanasiou E, Zogas N, Kaloyannidis P, Batsis I, *et al.* Mesenchymal stem cells are conditionally therapeutic in preclinical models of rheumatoid arthritis. *Ann Rheum Dis* 2012;71:1733–40.
 43. Yoshimura H, Muneta T, Nimura A, Yokoyama A, Koga H, Sekiya I. Comparison of rat mesenchymal stem cells derived from bone marrow, synovium, periosteum, adipose tissue, and muscle. *Cell Tissue Res* 2007;327:449–62.
 44. Dimarino AM, Caplan AL, Bonfield TL. Mesenchymal stem cells in tissue repair. *Front Immunol* 2013;4:201.
 45. Jones E, English A, Churchman SM, Kouroupis D, Boxall SA, Kinsey S, *et al.* Large-scale extraction and characterization of CD271+ multipotential stromal cells from trabecular bone in health and osteoarthritis: implications for bone regeneration strategies based on uncultured or minimally cultured multipotential stromal cells. *Arthritis Rheum* 2010;62:1944–54.
 46. Murphy JM, Dixon K, Beck S, Fabian D, Feldman A, Barry F. Reduced chondrogenic and adipogenic activity of mesenchymal stem cells from patients with advanced osteoarthritis. *Arthritis Rheum* 2002;46:704–13.
 47. Prockop DJ. Concise review: two negative feedback loops place mesenchymal stem/stromal cells at the center of early regulators of inflammation. *Stem Cells* 2013;31:2042–6.
 48. Galipeau J. The mesenchymal stromal cells dilemma—does a negative phase III trial of random donor mesenchymal stromal cells in steroid-resistant graft-versus-host disease represent a death knell or a bump in the road? *Cytotherapy* 2013;15:2–8.
 49. von Bahr L, Sundberg B, Lonnie L, Sander B, Karbach H, Hagglund H, *et al.* Long-term complications, immunologic effects, and role of passage for outcome in mesenchymal stromal cell therapy. *Biol Blood Marrow Transpl* 2012;18:557–64.
 50. Djouad F, Bouffi C, Ghannam S, Noel D, Jorgensen C. Mesenchymal stem cells: innovative therapeutic tools for rheumatic diseases. *Nat Rev Rheumatol* 2009;5:392–9.
 51. Mazor M, Lespessailles E, Coursier R, Daniellou R, Best TM, Toumi H. Mesenchymal stem-cell potential in cartilage repair: an update. *J Cell Mol Med* 2014;18:2340–50.
 52. Bornes TD, Adesida AB, Jomha NM. Mesenchymal stem cells in the treatment of traumatic articular cartilage defects: a comprehensive review. *Arthritis Res Ther* 2014;16:432.
 53. Wakitani S, Imoto K, Yamamoto T, Saito M, Murata N, Yoneda M. Human autologous culture expanded bone marrow mesenchymal cell transplantation for repair of cartilage defects in osteoarthritic knees. *Osteoarthritis Cartilage* 2002;10:199–206.
 54. Ringe J, Burmester GR, Sittlinger M. Regenerative medicine in rheumatic disease—progress in tissue engineering. *Nat Rev Rheumatol* 2012;8:493–8.
 55. Ryu JS, Jung YH, Cho MY, Yeo JE, Choi YJ, Kim YI, *et al.* Co-culture with human synovium-derived mesenchymal stem cells inhibits inflammatory activity and increases cell proliferation of sodium nitroprusside-stimulated chondrocytes. *Biochem Biophys Res Commun* 2014;447:715–20.
 56. Wu L, Leijten J, van Blitterswijk CA, Karperien M. Fibroblast growth factor-1 is a mesenchymal stromal cell-secreted factor stimulating proliferation of osteoarthritic chondrocytes in co-culture. *Stem Cells Dev* 2013;22:2356–67.
 57. Manfredini C, Maumus M, Gabusi E, Piacentini A, Filardo G, Peyrafitte JA, *et al.* Adipose-derived mesenchymal stem cells exert antiinflammatory effects on chondrocytes and synovioocytes from osteoarthritis patients through prostaglandin E2. *Arthritis Rheum* 2013;65:1271–81.

58. Maumus M, Manferdini C, Toupet K, Peyrafitte JA, Ferreira R, Facchini A, et al. Adipose mesenchymal stem cells protect chondrocytes from degeneration associated with osteoarthritis. *Stem Cell Res* 2013;11:834–44.
59. Jorgensen C, Noel D. Mesenchymal stem cells in osteoarticular diseases. *Regen Med* 2011;6:44–51.
60. Lohan P, Coleman CM, Murphy JM, Griffin MD, Ritter T, Ryan AE. Changes in immunological profile of allogeneic mesenchymal stem cells after differentiation: should we be concerned? *Stem Cell Res Ther* 2014;5:99.
61. Zheng ZH, Li XY, Ding J, Jia JF, Zhu P. Allogeneic mesenchymal stem cell and mesenchymal stem cell-differentiated chondrocyte suppress the responses of type II collagen-reactive T cells in rheumatoid arthritis. *Rheumatology (Oxford)* 2008;47:22–30.
62. Chen X, McClurg A, Zhou GQ, McCaigue M, Armstrong MA, Li G. Chondrogenic differentiation alters the immunosuppressive property of bone marrow-derived mesenchymal stem cells, and the effect is partially due to the upregulated expression of B7 molecules. *Stem Cells* 2007;25:364–70.
63. Ryan AE, Lohan P, O'Flynn L, Treacy O, Chen X, Coleman C, et al. Chondrogenic differentiation increases antidonor immune response to allogeneic mesenchymal stem cell transplantation. *Mol Ther* 2014;22:655–67.
64. Ter Huurne M, Schelbergen R, Blattes R, Blom A, de Munter W, Grevers LC, et al. Antiinflammatory and chondroprotective effects of intraarticular injection of adipose-derived stem cells in experimental osteoarthritis. *Arthritis Rheum* 2012;64:3604–13.
65. Schelbergen RF, van Dalen S, Ter Huurne M, Roth J, Vogl T, Noel D, et al. Treatment efficacy of adipose-derived stem cells in experimental osteoarthritis is driven by high synovial activation and reflected by S100A8/A9 serum levels. *Osteoarthritis Cartilage* 2014;22:1158–66.
66. Desando G, Cavallo C, Sartoni F, Martini L, Parrilli A, Veronesi F, et al. Intra-articular delivery of adipose derived stromal cells attenuates osteoarthritis progression in an experimental rabbit model. *Arthritis Res Ther* 2013;15:R22.
67. Shen W, Chen J, Zhu T, Yin Z, Chen X, Chen L, et al. Osteoarthritis prevention through meniscal regeneration induced by intra-articular injection of meniscus stem cells. *Stem Cells Dev* 2013;22:2071–82.
68. Diekman BO, Wu CL, Louer CR, Furman BD, Huebner JL, Kraus VB, et al. Intra-articular delivery of purified mesenchymal stem cells from C57BL/6 or MRL/MpJ superhealer mice prevents posttraumatic arthritis. *Cell Transpl* 2013;22:1395–408.
69. Shen W, Chen J, Zhu T, Chen L, Zhang W, Fang Z, et al. Intra-articular injection of human meniscus stem/progenitor cells promotes meniscus regeneration and ameliorates osteoarthritis through stromal cell-derived factor-1/CXCR4-mediated homing. *Stem Cells Transl Med* 2014;3:387–94.
70. Ambros V. microRNAs: tiny regulators with great potential. *Cell* 2001;107:823–6.
71. Clark EA, Kalomoiris S, Nolta JA, Fierro FA. Concise review: MicroRNA function in multipotent mesenchymal stromal cells. *Stem Cells* 2014;32:1074–82.
72. Oskowitz AZ, Lu J, Penforis P, Ylostalo J, McBride J, Flemington EK, et al. Human multipotent stromal cells from bone marrow and microRNA: regulation of differentiation and leukemia inhibitory factor expression. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 2008;105:18372–7.
73. Kobayashi T, Lu J, Cobb BS, Rodda SJ, McMahon AP, Schipani E, et al. Dicer-dependent pathways regulate chondrocyte proliferation and differentiation. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 2008;105:1949–54.
74. Guerit D, Brondello JM, Chuchana P, Philipot D, Toupet K, Bony C, et al. FOXO3A regulation by miRNA-29a controls chondrogenic differentiation of mesenchymal stem cells and cartilage formation. *Stem Cells Dev* 2014;23:1195–205.
75. Guerit D, Philipot D, Chuchana P, Toupet K, Brondello JM, Mathieu M, et al. Sox9-regulated miRNA-574-3p inhibits chondrogenic differentiation of mesenchymal stem cells. *PLoS One* 2013;8:e62582.
76. Karlsten TA, Jakobsen RB, Mikkelsen TS, Brinchmann JE. microRNA-140 targets RALA and regulates chondrogenic differentiation of human mesenchymal stem cells by translational enhancement of SOX9 and ACAN. *Stem Cells Dev* 2014;23:290–304.
77. Lin EA, Kong L, Bai XH, Luan Y, Liu CJ. miR-199a, a bone morphogenic protein 2-responsive MicroRNA, regulates chondrogenesis via direct targeting to Smad1. *J Biol Chem* 2009;284:11326–35.
78. Ham O, Lee CY, Song BW, Lee SY, Kim R, Park JH, et al. Upregulation of miR-23b enhances the autologous therapeutic potential for degenerative arthritis by targeting PRKACB in synovial fluid-derived mesenchymal stem cells from patients. *Mol Cells* 2014;37:449–56.
79. Xu J, Kang Y, Liao WM, Yu L. MiR-194 regulates chondrogenic differentiation of human adipose-derived stem cells by targeting Sox5. *PLoS One* 2012;7:e31861.
80. Chen KD, Goto S, Hsu LW, Lin TY, Nakano T, Lai CY, et al. Identification of miR-27b as a novel signature from the mRNA profiles of adipose-derived mesenchymal stem cells involved in the tolerogenic response. *PLoS One* 2013;8:e60492.
81. Liu L, Wang Y, Fan H, Zhao X, Liu D, Hu Y, et al. MicroRNA-181a regulates local immune balance by inhibiting proliferation and immunosuppressive properties of mesenchymal stem cells. *Stem Cells* 2012;30:1756–70.
82. Xu C, Ren G, Cao G, Chen Q, Shou P, Zheng C, et al. miR-155 regulates immune modulatory properties of mesenchymal stem cells by targeting TAK1-binding protein 2. *J Biol Chem* 2013;288:11074–9.
83. Xu J, Wu W, Zhang L, Dorset-Martin W, Morris MW, Mitchell ME, et al. The role of microRNA-146a in the pathogenesis of the diabetic wound-healing impairment: correction with mesenchymal stem cell treatment. *Diabetes* 2012;61:2906–12.
84. Matysiak M, Fortak-Michalska M, Szymanska B, Orlowski W, Jurewicz A, Selmaj K. MicroRNA-146a negatively regulates the immunoregulatory activity of bone marrow stem cells by targeting prostaglandin E2 synthase-2. *J Immunol* 2013;190:5102–9.
85. Miyaki S, Sato T, Inoue A, Otsuki S, Ito Y, Yokoyama S, et al. MicroRNA-140 plays dual roles in both cartilage development and homeostasis. *Genes Dev* 2010;24:1173–85.
86. Martinez-Sanchez A, Dudek KA, Murphy CL. Regulation of human chondrocyte function through direct inhibition of cartilage master regulator SOX9 by microRNA-145 (miRNA-145). *J Biol Chem* 2012;287:916–24.
87. Taganov KD, Boldin MP, Chang KJ, Baltimore D. NF-kappaB-dependent induction of microRNA miR-146, an inhibitor targeted to signaling proteins of innate immune responses. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 2006;103:12481–6.
88. Nagata Y, Nakasa T, Mochizuki Y, Ishikawa M, Miyaki S, Shibuya H, et al. Induction of apoptosis in the synovium of mice with autoantibody-mediated arthritis by the intra-articular injection of double-stranded MicroRNA-15a. *Arthritis Rheum* 2009;60:2677–83.

89. Iliopoulos D, Malizos KN, Oikonomou P, Tsezou A. Integrative microRNA and proteomic approaches identify novel osteoarthritis genes and their collaborative metabolic and inflammatory networks. *PLoS One* 2008;3:e3740.
90. Jones SW, Watkins G, Le Good N, Roberts S, Murphy CL, Brockbank SM, et al. The identification of differentially expressed microRNA in osteoarthritic tissue that modulate the production of TNF-alpha and MMP13. *Osteoarthritis Cartilage* 2009;17:464–72.
91. Abouheif MM, Nakasa T, Shibuya H, Niimoto T, Kongcharoensombat W, Ochi M. Silencing microRNA-34a inhibits chondrocyte apoptosis in a rat osteoarthritis model *in vitro*. *Rheumatology (Oxford)* 2010;49:2054–60.
92. Diaz-Prado S, Cicione C, Muinos-Lopez E, Hermida-Gomez T, Oreiro N, Fernandez-Lopez C, et al. Characterization of microRNA expression profiles in normal and osteoarthritic human chondrocytes. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord* 2012;13:144.
93. Philipot D, Guerit D, Platano D, Chuchana P, Olivotto E, Espinoza F, et al. p16INK4a and its regulator miR-24 link senescence and chondrocyte terminal differentiation-associated matrix remodeling in osteoarthritis. *Arthritis Res Ther* 2014;16:R58.
94. Yamasaki K, Nakasa T, Miyaki S, Ishikawa M, Deie M, Adachi N, et al. Expression of MicroRNA-146a in osteoarthritis cartilage. *Arthritis Rheum* 2009;60:1035–41.
95. Miyaki S, Nakasa T, Otsuki S, Grogan SP, Higashiyama R, Inoue A, et al. MicroRNA-140 is expressed in differentiated human articular chondrocytes and modulates interleukin-1 responses. *Arthritis Rheum* 2009;60:2723–30.
96. Tsezou A. Osteoarthritis year in review 2014: genetics and genomics. *Osteoarthritis Cartilage* 2014;22:2017–24.
97. Beyer C, Zampetaki A, Lin NY, Kleyer A, Perricone C, Iagnocco A, et al. Signature of circulating microRNAs in osteoarthritis. *Ann Rheum Dis* 2015;74:e18.
98. Pers YM, Jorgensen C. MicroRNA in 2012: biotherapeutic potential of microRNAs in rheumatic diseases. *Nat Rev Rheumatol* 2013;9:76–8.
99. Nejadnik H, Hui JH, Feng Choong EP, Tai BC, Lee EH. Autologous bone marrow-derived mesenchymal stem cells versus autologous chondrocyte implantation: an observational cohort study. *Am J Sports Med* 2010;38:1110–6.
100. Wakitani S, Nawata M, Tensho K, Okabe T, Machida H, Ohgushi H. Repair of articular cartilage defects in the patellofemoral joint with autologous bone marrow mesenchymal cell transplantation: three case reports involving nine defects in five knees. *J Tissue Eng Regen Med* 2007;1:74–9.
101. Saw KY, Anz A, Siew-Yoke Jee C, Merican S, Ching-Soong Ng R, Roohi SA, et al. Articular cartilage regeneration with autologous peripheral blood stem cells versus hyaluronic acid: a randomized controlled trial. *Arthroscopy* 2013;29:684–94.
102. Giannini S, Buda R, Battaglia M, Cavallo M, Ruffilli A, Ramponi L, et al. One-step repair in talar osteochondral lesions: 4-year clinical results and t2-mapping capability in outcome prediction. *Am J Sports Med* 2013;41:511–8.
103. Wakitani S, Okabe T, Horibe S, Mitsuoka T, Saito M, Koyama T, et al. Safety of autologous bone marrow-derived mesenchymal stem cell transplantation for cartilage repair in 41 patients with 45 joints followed for up to 11 years and 5 months. *J Tissue Eng Regen Med* 2011;5:146–50.
104. Davatchi F, Abdollahi BS, Mohyeddin M, Shahram F, Nikbin B. Mesenchymal stem cell therapy for knee osteoarthritis. Preliminary report of four patients. *Int J Rheum Dis* 2011;14:211–5.
105. Emadedin M, Aghdami N, Taghiyar L, Fazeli R, Moghadasali R, Jahangir S, et al. Intra-articular injection of autologous mesenchymal stem cells in six patients with knee osteoarthritis. *Arch Iran Med* 2012;15:422–8.
106. Koh YG, Choi YJ, Kwon OR, Kim YS. Second-look arthroscopic evaluation of cartilage lesions after mesenchymal stem cell implantation in osteoarthritic knees. *Am J Sports Med* 2014;42:1628–37.
107. Jo CH, Lee YG, Shin WH, Kim H, Chai JW, Jeong EC, et al. Intra-articular injection of mesenchymal stem cells for the treatment of osteoarthritis of the knee: a proof-of-concept clinical trial. *Stem Cells* 2014;32:1254–66.
108. Orozco L, Munar A, Soler R, Alberca M, Soler F, Huguet M, et al. Treatment of knee osteoarthritis with autologous mesenchymal stem cells: two-year follow-up results. *Transplantation* 2014;97:e66–68.
109. Cheng A, Kapacee Z, Peng J, Lu S, Lucas RJ, Hardingham TE, et al. Cartilage repair using human embryonic stem cell-derived chondroprogenitors. *Stem Cells Transl Med* 2014;3:1287–94.
110. Willard VP, Diekman BO, Sanchez-Adams J, Christoforou N, Leong KW, Guilak F. Use of cartilage derived from murine induced pluripotent stem cells for osteoarthritis drug screening. *Arthritis Rheumatol* 2014;66:3062–72.
111. Lee J, Kim Y, Yi H, Diecke S, Kim J, Jung H, et al. Generation of disease-specific induced pluripotent stem cells from patients with rheumatoid arthritis and osteoarthritis. *Arthritis Res Ther* 2014;16:R41.