

The Patterning Problem: Why Making New Cells Is Not Enough

ABSURD HEALTH INSTITUTE — MEDICAL CONCEPT PAPERS · VOLUME SIX · PAPER 10

**Research series:* * Lost Instructions of Regeneration

**Article URL upon publication:* * <https://absurd.health/research/volume-six/the-patterning-problem-why-making-new-cells-is-not-enough/>

**Abstract (original summary):* * New cells cannot automatically recreate a functioning organ. This essay argues that regenerative engineering must demonstrate appropriate cell composition, spatial geometry, physiological connectivity and performance. Examples from tissue patches and neural repair illustrate why proliferation alone can be ineffective or harmful, and why safety and architecture should be central endpoints.

Proliferation is not reconstruction

A damaged organ may require replacement cells, but a growing collection of cells is not yet a functioning organ. Regeneration demands correct cell identity, tissue boundaries, microvascular networks, innervation, extracellular support and mechanical integration. Tumors demonstrate that proliferation can be vigorous and biologically disastrous. Scar tissue demonstrates that survival and wound closure can occur without restoring the original architecture. This creates a central problem for regenerative engineering: how can new growth be constrained into useful form?

Lessons from development and transplantation

Embryonic tissues develop through reciprocal signaling. A developing blood vessel influences adjacent tissue, while organ-specific matrix, mechanical strain and morphogen gradients influence maturation. Transplanted stem cells face an older or diseased niche with immune defenses, altered vascular supply and sometimes fibrosis. Even if injected cells express attractive laboratory markers, they may fail to engraft, differentiate incorrectly or provide a temporary paracrine effect rather than lasting replacement. A genuine regenerative claim must distinguish these possibilities.

A reconstruction standard

We propose measuring regeneration along four axes: composition, geometry, connection and function. Composition asks whether appropriate cell types exist. Geometry asks whether they occupy the right places. Connection evaluates innervation, perfusion and signaling integration. Function asks whether the restored tissue performs useful work under real demand. An organoid can be impressive on composition while immature on connection; a nerve graft can restore some continuity but not adequate function.

What may limit ambition

Some organs lack readily accessible progenitors or have architecture that is difficult to recreate after extensive injury. Stimulating developmentally powerful pathways can increase the risk of dysplasia and cancer. The best near-term clinical success may be partial functional restoration, not complete anatomical replacement. That is still meaningful progress, provided it is described accurately rather than marketed as a universal awakening of dormant regeneration.

A clinical thought experiment

An engineered cardiac patch may contain beating cardiomyocytes but fail clinically if it cannot perfuse, conduct electrical signals safely or integrate mechanically. A laboratory success in cell identity can therefore coexist with an organ-level failure. Conversely, a patch that offers passive structural support may improve function without producing extensive new muscle. Either result can be useful when described accurately.

What would discriminate among explanations

The proposed four-axis reconstruction standard should be challenged against actual patient outcomes. If geometry, cell type and connectivity add no predictive value beyond functional testing, the framework is unnecessarily elaborate. If they explain why plausible therapies fail, it can guide more discriminating experimental design without promising complete organ replacement.

Cell production is not organ construction

A tissue's working properties arise from arrangements and connections among cell types. The heart requires synchronized electrical activation, compliant valves and vessels capable of matching perfusion to demand. Skeletal muscle requires aligned fibers attached to tendons and innervated by appropriate motor units. The kidney requires glomeruli, tubules, collecting structures and a vascular network positioned so that filtration and selective reabsorption work together. Generating large numbers of appropriate cells does not solve these architectural constraints. A regenerated tissue can be histologically recognizable yet physiologically deficient.

This is one reason that organoid research, though scientifically transformative, must not be equated with clinical organ replacement. Many organoids reproduce selected developmental features and cell types but lack full maturation, vascularization, innervation or organ-scale geometry. Cell-state similarity is not functional equivalence. Transplantation also introduces immune compatibility and integration problems beyond the challenge of building the structure.

Four failures of patterning

The first failure is incorrect identity: cells differentiate into the wrong lineage or retain an immature state. The second is incorrect location: the needed cell types appear, but in the wrong relative positions. The third is failed connectivity: nerve, vascular, ductal or electrical connections remain incomplete. The fourth is failed feedback: structures perform briefly but cannot regulate growth, remodeling or demand over time. These failures require different measurements. Histology may detect identity and gross location; imaging can reveal geometry; physiological testing is needed for function and long-term studies for stability.

The heart provides a useful thought experiment. Imagine an intervention that increases cardiomyocyte number after myocardial infarction. If the new cells lack appropriate electrical coupling, they may fail to improve contraction or potentially contribute to arrhythmogenic substrate. If they are poorly perfused, survival will be limited. If excessive matrix surrounds them, effective mechanical transmission may remain impaired. A larger count of contractile cells is therefore not proof of restored myocardial performance, let alone durable clinical benefit.

Why nature can accomplish what engineering struggles to reproduce

Embryonic development builds organs through staged signaling and mechanical interactions. Patterning is not specified by a single instruction but emerges from feedback among localized cell populations, morphogen gradients, matrix properties and physical forces. Regenerative animals can reuse parts of this developmental logic in adults. Human therapies must either recreate such logic or bypass some of its requirements through engineered

constructs, surgery and rehabilitation. The appropriate strategy will vary by tissue and clinical problem.

This distinction helps reinterpret claims about stem-cell therapy. Pluripotency creates possibility, not predetermined correct anatomy. Differentiation protocols reduce unwanted cell states but do not automatically provide the spatial and physiological integration necessary for safe repair. Transplanted cells may contribute through secreted signals rather than direct structural replacement; a functional improvement, if verified, should not be described as 'the organ regenerated' without evidence of new functional tissue.

The core experiment

A useful experimental comparison would deliver equal numbers of viable cells in different arrangements or scaffolds and assess whether spatial organization affects physiological output. Another would manipulate vascularization or neural integration independently from cell supply. If increased cell counts repeatedly fail while improved anatomical organization restores function, the patterning bottleneck gains support. If cell supply alone produces durable, safe recovery in a particular tissue, patterning may not be its dominant limitation.

The clinically meaningful endpoint remains organ-specific. For an injured kidney it might be filtration, electrolyte handling and long-term stability; for a muscle, controlled force and endurance; for a nerve, recovered sensation or movement without debilitating pain. A beautiful tissue section can be scientifically useful and still tell only part of the story.

The premise of this essay is that regeneration is an information and integration problem as much as a proliferation problem. The harder and more consequential question is how to supply correct developmental instructions without unleashing unchecked growth or destroying the identity of surrounding adult tissue.

Architecture can impose a ceiling on regeneration

If new functional cells are introduced into a profoundly scarred organ, the existing geometry can limit their usefulness. Dense matrix may prevent appropriate alignment; destroyed ducts or vessels may deprive cells of necessary transport connections; persistent abnormal mechanical signals may push them toward an unwanted phenotype. A strategy focused solely on cells can therefore underestimate the amount of reconstruction required. Conversely, a fully engineered scaffold may fail if implanted cells cannot maintain mature identity or connect to surviving tissue.

The analogy to building construction is imperfect but instructive. A house can contain new materials while still lacking safe wiring, plumbing and load-bearing integration. Biological tissues add complexity because the 'construction workers' are living cells that respond to—and alter—the structures around them. The therapeutic challenge is an evolving feedback system, not assembly from inert parts.

This should affect the language used in regenerative trials: an observed increase in cell survival, a histological pattern, and a restored clinical function are separate results. Each deserves recognition without substituting one for the others.

The easiest component to build may not be the limiting component

In engineered tissue, researchers may be able to produce millions of lineage-specific cells while still struggling with oxygen delivery or a stable interface with the recipient organ. In another setting, cell supply may be the decisive problem. A repair-code analysis should therefore resist choosing its preferred mechanism before examining the structure under treatment.

The central experimental comparison is a factorial one: increase cell supply, improve patterning support, do both, and compare with neither. If better architecture adds no benefit when cells are adequate, that particular tissue may not have a patterning bottleneck. If organized scaffolds improve function only when viable cells are also supplied, regeneration is jointly constrained. Such experiments are valuable because they can expose interactions that a one-target approach misses.

Selected scientific readings

- Molecular basis of positional memory in limb regeneration. Nature (2025). <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41586-025-09036-5>
- Lu Y et al. (2020). Reprogramming to recover youthful epigenetic information and restore vision. Nature. <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41586-020-2975-4>
- Neural control of growth and size in the axolotl limb regenerate. eLife (2021). <https://elifesciences.org/articles/68584>

This is an evidence-informed conceptual essay, not a systematic review, clinical trial, validated diagnostic instrument, or treatment recommendation.

Editorial status: substantially revised conceptual article. Evidence-informed, not peer-reviewed, not a systematic review or clinical treatment guidance.