Molecular Therapy
Nucleic Acids
Commentary

Deconvoluting the cellular black box of cell therapies for osteoarthritis: A mandate for protocol standardization

Feng-Juan Lyu[1]

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.omtn.2026.102916

Autologous cell therapies for knee osteoarthritis, including bone marrow aspirate concentrate (BMAC) and stromal vascular fraction (SVF), have advanced clinically despite an incomplete understanding of their mechanisms. Chatterjee et al. apply single-cell transcriptomics to multicenter trial of stem cell therapy for osteoarthritis (MILES) trial samples, revealing that site-to-site technical variability in BMAC composition overwhelms biological signals associated with treatment response. This finding mandates urgent standardization of harvest protocols before personalized genomic profiling can be meaningfully implemented. While responder/non-responder differences were subtle, pathway enrichment analyses and cell-cell communication inferences suggest that therapeutic outcomes may depend more on dynamic post-injection interactions than on baseline cellular states. The study establishes a foundational framework for evidence-based quality control in cellular orthopedics.

Stem cells, such as mesenchymal stem cells[1,2] and stromal vascular fraction (SVF),[3] have been proven to deliver encouraging effects in laboratory tissue regeneration studies. However, when it comes to clinical deployment, cell therapies for knee osteoarthritis (OA) has, in many ways, sprinted ahead of our fundamental understanding of what these complex biologics actually are and how they function. While systematic reviews confirm that bone marrow aspirate concentrate (BMAC) and SVF can reduce pain, they also highlight the frustrating reality that these improvements often fail to translate into substantial, long-term functional restoration and that significant heterogeneity in outcomes persists across trials and individuals.[4,5] This variability has long been attributed to patient-specific factors, but the study by Chatterjee et al. forces us to confront a more proximal and controllable source of noise: the therapeutic product itself.[6] By applying single-cell transcriptomics to one of the largest and best-characterized cell therapy cohorts for OA to date, the multicenter trial of stem cell therapy for osteoarthritis (MILES) trial, Chatterjee et al. peer into the cellular and molecular composition of these products with unprecedented resolution. Their most arresting finding is that the dominant biological signal in the data is not the distinction between future clinical responders and non-responders but rather the profound site-to-site variability in BMAC composition and gene expression. This serves as a powerful and necessary reality check, compellingly arguing that before the field can successfully navigate toward personalized, genomically informed therapies, it must first confront and standardize the pre-analytical variables that currently drown out the signal of interest.

The translational promise of regenerative medicine for OA lies in moving beyond symptom palliation toward true disease modification. However, clinical trials have yielded heterogeneous results, partly because the therapeutic products themselves, BMAC and SVF, are minimally manipulated mixtures whose cellular constituencies are assumed, rather than known, to be potent. The MILES trial, from which this study derives, represents a state-of-the-art effort, and secondary analyses have begun to identify patient subpopulations, such as younger males, who may respond more favorably to specific cellular injections.[7] Yet, the cellular mechanisms underpinning these differential responses have remained obscure. Following their prior work, which first revealed significant immune alterations and enrichment of stress-related pathways, such as phosphoinositide 3 kinase-protein kinase B-mammalian target of rapamycin (PI3K-AKT-mTOR) and interferon (IFN), in the bone marrow of patients with OA compared to controls,[8] Chatterjee and their team directly tackle this obscurity by applying a rigorous single-cell analytical framework. The study's central methodological insight is the stark contrast in procedural robustness between the two autologous products. While SVF samples demonstrated remarkable transcriptional consistency across multiple clinical sites, BMAC was plagued by significant, site-specific variability in both cell type abundance and gene expression. This confirms, at single-cell resolution, concerns raised about the inherent variability introduced by manual bone marrow aspiration techniques.[9] The primary axis of variation in the BMAC data, identified through tensor decomposition, was not a biological feature of the patient but the collection site itself. This is an actionable finding of immense importance: it strongly suggests that the "drug" being administered to patients in the BMAC arm was systematically different depending on the clinical site. Such technical variability can severely compromise reproducibility and demands standardized collection protocols and operator training. The fact that SVF, harvested via lipoaspiration, was far more consistent implies that the manual, physician-dependent technique of bone marrow aspiration is a critical and correctable point of failure.

After meticulously correcting for this site effect, the authors report a negative result that

[1]Joint Center for Regenerative Medicine Research of South China University of Technology and the University of Western Australia, School of Medicine, South China University of Technology, Guangzhou 515000, P.R. China

Correspondence: Feng-Juan Lyu, PhD, Joint Center for Regenerative Medicine Research of South China University of Technology and the University of Western Australia, School of Medicine, South China University of Technology, Guangzhou 515000, P.R. China.
E-mail: lufj0@scut.edu.cn

is arguably as significant as a positive one: baseline cellular and molecular profiles did not robustly distinguish future responders from non-responders using standard differential expression analysis. While likelihood ratio tests hinted at an enrichment of cellular stress pathways, including oxidative phosphorylation, unfolded protein response, and tumor necrosis factor α (TNF-α) signaling, in non-responders, these signals were subtle and swamped by inter-individual heterogeneity. This echoes their previous findings in OA bone marrow[8] and suggests that clinical outcome is not predetermined solely by the baseline state of the injected cells. It is likely more dependent on the dynamic, post-injection interaction between the graft and the recipient's unique joint microenvironment, a complex ecosystem of synovial inflammation, cartilage degradation, and subchondral bone remodeling, which may have enormous influence on the fate of injected cells.[10] The cell-cell communication analyses support this view, showing that mesenchymal stem cells (MSCs) from responders are predicted to engage in more coordinated, immunomodulatory dialogues, such as via thymus cell antigen 1 (THY1), CD40, insulin-like growth factor 1 (IGF1), etc., whereas those from non-responders are biased toward inflammatory human leukocyte antigen (HLA) signaling. This elegantly shifts the paradigm from viewing the therapeutic product as a static entity to recognizing it as a catalyst that initiates a complex, patient-specific biological process whose trajectory may only be revealed through longitudinal sampling.

Looking forward, this study provides both a roadmap and a cautionary signpost. The immediate translational impact must be the development and implementation of stringent, device-guided standardization protocols for BMAC harvest in future multi-site trials. Without this, the field risks repeatedly misattributing procedural noise as biological effect.[5] Furthermore, the work compels a deeper, longitudinal analysis. Future studies must move beyond baseline profiling to track the fate and function of the infused cells within the joint, perhaps using emerging spatial transcriptomics to map cellular crosstalk *in situ* or sampling synovial fluid at serial time points to capture the evolving inflammatory and regenerative landscape. The subtle enrichment of metabolic and stress pathways in non-responders also warrants validation in larger cohorts, as these could eventually serve as biomarkers to guide patient selection, perhaps identifying individuals who might benefit more from the immune-regulatory profile of SVF than from metabolically-stressed BMAC.

In conclusion, Chatterjee and colleagues have laid bare a fundamental truth: we cannot personalize what we do not first standardize. By quantifying the noise inherent in current procurement practices, they have illuminated the path forward. The journey toward personalized cell therapy for OA will not be charted by genomics alone but by a rigorous, integrated approach that combines a standardized, high-fidelity product with a deep, dynamic understanding of the patient it is meant to heal. As Im notes in a recent review, the high cost of cell therapy must be justified by demonstrable efficacy, and multi-omics technologies like the one deployed here are essential to identify which subgroups of patients will truly benefit.[11] The crystal ball reveals a future where a patient's baseline cellular profile, the standardized quality of their harvested cells, and their longitudinal response dynamics are integrated into an adaptive treatment algorithm, one that might recommend SVF for some, BMAC for others, or even a re-harvest for those whose initial product falls below a molecular quality threshold. This study marks not an end, but a beginning: the start of evidence-based quality control in cellular orthopedics.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We acknowledge the support of the National Natural Science Foundation of China (82272552).

DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

The authors declare no competing interests.

DECLARATION OF GENERATIVE AI AND AI-ASSISTED TECHNOLOGIES IN THE WRITING PROCESS

During the preparation of this work, the author used ChatGPT in order to improve grammar and language. After using this tool/service, the authors reviewed and edited the content as needed and take full responsibility for the content of the publication.

REFERENCES

1. Deng, Z., Jin, J., Wang, S., Qi, F., Chen, X., Liu, C., Li, Y., Ma, Y., Lyu, F., and Zheng, Q. (2020). Narrative review of the choices of stem cell sources and hydrogels for cartilage tissue engineering. Ann. Transl. Med. *8*, 1598.
2. Deng, Z., Zeng, X., Lin, B., Chen, L., Wu, J., Zheng, J., Ma, Y., Lyu, F.J., and Zheng, Q. (2024). Human umbilical cord mesenchymal stem cells on treating osteoarthritis in a rabbit model: Injection strategies. Heliyon *10*, e38384.
3. Chen, W., He, Z., Li, S., Wu, Z., Tan, J., Yang, W., Li, G., Pan, X., Liu, Y., Lyu, F.J., and Li, W. (2022). The Effect of Tissue Stromal Vascular Fraction as Compared to Cellular Stromal Vascular Fraction to Treat Anal Sphincter Incontinence. Bioengineering *10*, 32.
4. Hohmann, E., Keough, N., Stokes, D., Frank, R., and Rodeo, S. (2025). Adipose- and bone marrow-derived stromal cells reduce pain in patients with knee osteoarthritis but do not substantially improve knee functionality: an updated systematic review and meta-analysis. Eur. J. Orthop. Surg. Traumatol. *35*, 214.
5. Fucaloro, S., Bragg, J.T., Feldman, M.W., Krivicich, L., and Salzler, M.J. (2025). Complication rates of bone marrow aspirate concentrate injections versus other injectable therapies for knee osteoarthritis: A systematic review and meta-analysis. J. Orthop. *62*, 36–42.
6. Chatterjee, P., Stevens, H.Y., Kippner, L.E., Yeago, C., Drissi, H., Mautner, K., Boden, S.D., Gibson, G., and Roy, K. (2026). Single-cell transcriptomics of multi-site cell therapy in osteoarthritis: Tissue-specific treatment correlations. Mol. Ther. Nucleic Acids *37*, 102839.
7. Mautner, K., Kaiser, J.M., Boggess, B., Hackel, J., Kurtenbach, C., Noonan, B., Shenvi, N., Easley, K.A., Myer, G.D., Jayaram, P., et al. (2025). Autologous Cell Injections for Knee Osteoarthritis Display Greater Responsiveness Than Allogenic Cellular Products and Corticosteroids in a Sex-Dependent Manner. Am. J. Sports Med. *53*, 2889–2897.
8. Chatterjee, P., Stevens, H.Y., Kippner, L.E., Bowles-Welch, A.C., Drissi, H., Mautner, K., Yeago, C., Gibson, G., and Roy, K. (2024). Single-cell transcriptome and crosstalk analysis reveals immune alterations and key pathways in the bone marrow of knee OA patients. iScience *27*, 110827.
9. Kim, G.B., Seo, M.S., Park, W.T., and Lee, G.W. (2020). Bone Marrow Aspirate Concentrate: Its Uses in Osteoarthritis. Int. J. Mol. Sci. *21*, 3224.
10. Huang, Y.C., Li, Z., Li, J., and Lyu, F.J. (2020). Interaction between Stem Cells and the Microenvironment for Musculoskeletal Repair. Stem Cells Int. *2020*, 7587428.
11. Im, G.I. (2025). Clinical updates in mesenchymal stromal cell therapy for osteoarthritis treatment. Expert Opin. Biol. Ther. *25*, 187–195.