How to improve your in vitro model?

Authors: Eline Geervliet, Suzie Grigorjan, Susan Roelofs

In vitro models have long served as a cornerstone in biological and medical research, offering a controlled and simplified platform to study cellular behaviors, disease mechanisms, and drug responses. However, while these systems provide invaluable insights, they inherently come with both advantages and limitations. In this blog, we'll explore how in vitro models can be refined to better mimic physiological conditions and yield more accurate, translatable results.

Benefits and pit falls of in vitro models

The primary appeal of in vitro models lies in their simplicity and controllability. They allow researchers to isolate specific variables, focus on individual cell types, and conduct high-throughput experiments without the ethical and logistical complexities associated with in vivo studies. Additionally, these models are cost-effective, reproducible, and relatively easy to maintain [1].

On the other hand, the simplicity of in vitro systems is also their pit fall. Traditional 2D cultures lack the structural complexity of real tissues, fail to capture dynamic interactions between multiple cell types, and often omit key environmental factors such as mechanical stress, fluid flow, or extracellular matrix (ECM) cues. This gap between in vitro and in vivo environments can limit the physiological relevance of findings, reducing the predictive power of these models for clinical outcomes [1], [2].

Possible improvements of in vitro models

Fortunately, several strategies exist to enhance the accuracy and functionality of in vitro models. Let’s dive into the main aspects that can be optimized:

Cell type and origin: primary cells vs. cell lines

Cell lines, especially immortalized ones, are widely used due to their ease of culture and consistency. However, they often diverge significantly from their in vivo counterparts in terms of gene expression, differentiation potential, and response to stimuli. To increase physiological relevance, consider integrating primary cells, which better retain native phenotypes and functionality. While primary cells can be more challenging to maintain and standardize, their use can substantially improve the biological relevance of your model [3].

Extracellular matrix: chemical, and mechanical properties

The extracellular matrix is more than a scaffold; it plays a crucial role in cell signaling, differentiation, and migration. Traditional flat plastic surfaces do little to replicate this environment. Incorporating biomimetic ECM components such as collagen, laminin, or synthetic hydrogels with tunable porosity, stiffness, and bioactive ligands can significantly improve cell behavior. Modifying the chemical and mechanical properties of the ECM to match tissue-specific conditions leads to better cell adhesion, proliferation, and overall functionality [4].

Environmental condition: static vs. dynamic

In vivo, cells are rarely in static environments. Shear stress from blood flow, mechanical stretching, and nutrient gradients all influence cellular behavior. Static in vitro cultures miss out on these critical stimuli. To bridge this gap, dynamic systems such as bioreactors, perfused plates, and microfluidic "organ-on-a-chip" platforms can be introduced. These systems provide mechanical cues, maintain optimal nutrient exchange, and allow real-time monitoring, resulting in a more physiologically accurate microenvironment [5].

Cellular arrangement: single vs. co-culture

Monocultures, while easy to analyze, fail to capture the complex interplay between different cell types within tissues. Co-culture models, involving two or more cell types, can simulate paracrine signaling, immune responses, or epithelial-mesenchymal interactions more accurately. Advanced techniques even allow for spatial organization of cells, promoting tissue-like architecture. By adopting co-culture systems, researchers can better study disease mechanisms, tissue development, and drug responses in a more integrative context [6].

Conclusion

While in vitro models have already revolutionized biological research, there's always room for improvement. By carefully selecting relevant cell types, designing appropriate extracellular matrices, incorporating dynamic environmental conditions, and embracing co-culture strategies, researchers can develop models that more closely mimic in vivo physiology. These enhancements not only improve experimental accuracy but also increase the translatability of findings, ultimately accelerating the journey from bench to bedside.

Join the conversation

How have you improved your in vitro model? What are other improvements that you would like to implement?

References

[1] N. R. C. (US) C. on M. of P. Monoclonal Antibodies, “Summary of Advantages and Disadvantages of In Vitro and In Vivo Methods,” 1999, Accessed: Mar. 18, 2025. [Online]. Available: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK100200/

[2] T. H. Phan *et al.*, “Advanced pathophysiology mimicking lung models for accelerated drug discovery,” *Biomater Res*, vol. 27, no. 1, pp. 1–21, Dec. 2023, doi: 10.1186/S40824-023-00366-X/FIGURES/8.

[3] G. Kaur and J. M. Dufour, “Cell lines: Valuable tools or useless artifacts,” *Spermatogenesis*, vol. 2, no. 1, p. 1, Jan. 2012, doi: 10.4161/SPMG.19885.

[4] M. H. Kim, S. Y. Tan, K. Yamahara, and M. Kino-oka, “An in vitro culture platform to study the extracellular matrix remodeling potential of human mesenchymal stem cells,” *Acta Biomater*, vol. 170, pp. 376–388, Oct. 2023, doi: 10.1016/J.ACTBIO.2023.08.035.

[5] P. H. Mangin *et al.*, “In vitro flow-based assay: From simple toward more sophisticated models for mimicking hemostasis and thrombosis,” *J Thromb Haemost*, vol. 19, no. 2, pp. 582–587, Feb. 2021, doi: 10.1111/JTH.15143.

[6] M. A. M. Vis, K. Ito, and S. Hofmann, “Impact of Culture Medium on Cellular Interactions in in vitro Co-culture Systems,” *Front Bioeng Biotechnol*, vol. 8, p. 561429, Aug. 2020, doi: 10.3389/FBIOE.2020.00911/BIBTEX.