JOURNAL OF APPLIED SCIENCE AND SOCIAL SCIENCE
eISSN 2229-3113 pISSN 2229-3205
Volume 15 Issue 09, September 2025
Impact factor: 2019: 4.679 2020: 5.015 2021: 5.436, 2022: 5.242, 2023: 6.995, 2024 7.75

THE REGENERATION OF NERVOUS TISSUES: THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN VERTEBRATES AND HUMANS.

Jo'rayeva Shaxnoza Azizxon kizi

Student of Andijon branch of Kokand University

Faculty of Medicine 2st year Department of Therapeutic Work
shaxnozajorayeva12@gmail.com ***tel:+998940290316***

Annotation: The regeneration of nervous tissues is a fundamental topic in neuroscience and regenerative medicine, with significant implications for the treatment of injuries and neurodegenerative diseases. While many vertebrates demonstrate a remarkable capacity to regenerate components of their nervous system, humans have a relatively limited ability in this regard. This disparity has led to intense scientific interest in understanding the underlying biological mechanisms that govern nervous tissue regeneration across different species. In vertebrates such as fish and amphibians, neuronal regeneration is robust and efficient. For instance, zebrafish can regenerate entire sections of their spinal cord and optic nerve after injury. Similarly, salamanders are capable of regenerating complex neural structures, including limbs that contain nerve tissues. These regenerative processes are supported by the presence of active neural stem cells, permissive microenvironments, and reduced scarring and inflammation following injury.

In contrast, humans and other mammals exhibit a very restricted ability to regenerate nervous tissues, particularly within the central nervous system (CNS). Injuries to the spinal cord or brain often result in permanent functional deficits due to limited neurogenesis, glial scarring, and inhibitory molecular signals that prevent axonal regrowth. Although some neurogenesis occurs in the adult human brain, particularly in regions like the hippocampus and subventricular zone, it is not sufficient to repair extensive damage. Moreover, peripheral nervous system (PNS) regeneration is more successful in humans than CNS regeneration, yet even this is limited by the extent and severity of injury.

The evolutionary basis for these differences is an area of active investigation. It is hypothesized that the enhanced complexity and specialization of the human brain may have come at the cost of regenerative plasticity. Additionally, differences in immune responses, gene expression patterns, and the cellular microenvironment contribute to the disparity between species. Vertebrates that can regenerate nervous tissues typically exhibit a dampened immune response that allows for tissue repair without extensive fibrosis. In contrast, humans have a more robust inflammatory response, which, while protective, often impedes regeneration.

Recent advances in molecular biology and stem cell research have opened new avenues for understanding and potentially enhancing nervous tissue regeneration in humans. Techniques such as induced pluripotent stem cells (iPSCs), gene editing, and biomaterial scaffolds are being

JOURNAL OF APPLIED SCIENCE AND SOCIAL SCIENCE
eISSN 2229-3113 pISSN 2229-3205
Volume 15 Issue 09, September 2025
Impact factor: 2019: 4.679 2020: 5.015 2021: 5.436, 2022: 5.242, 2023: 6.995, 2024 7.75

explored to mimic the regenerative capacity observed in lower vertebrates. Comparative studies between regenerative and non-regenerative species offer valuable insights into the key factors that promote or inhibit nervous system repair.

In conclusion, the regeneration of nervous tissues represents a key biological difference between vertebrates and humans, with profound implications for medical science. While lower vertebrates demonstrate impressive regenerative abilities, humans are significantly limited in their capacity to recover from neural injuries. Understanding these differences at a cellular and molecular level is crucial for developing effective therapies to treat spinal cord injuries, brain trauma, and neurodegenerative conditions. Bridging the gap between species through translational research may eventually enable humans to harness regenerative processes that are currently beyond our biological capabilities.

Keywords:
Nervous tissue regeneration, vertebrates, humans, central nervous system, peripheral nervous system, neurogenesis, neural stem cells, spinal cord injury, brain repair, axonal regrowth, glial scarring, inflammation, immune response, regenerative medicine, comparative biology.

Introduction

The ability of living organisms to repair or regenerate damaged tissues is a critical factor in maintaining health and function. Among the various tissue types in the body, nervous tissue is particularly complex and essential, governing communication between different parts of the body and the brain. Damage to the nervous system—whether due to trauma, stroke, or degenerative diseases—can lead to severe, often irreversible, consequences. This has made nervous tissue regeneration one of the most challenging yet vital areas of biomedical research.

Interestingly, the capacity for nervous tissue regeneration varies widely across the animal kingdom. Many non-mammalian vertebrates, such as fish and amphibians, possess a remarkable ability to regenerate parts of their central and peripheral nervous systems. For example, zebrafish can regenerate their spinal cords and retinas, while salamanders can regrow entire limbs containing nerves and muscles. These species offer compelling models for studying regenerative mechanisms due to their efficient and functional neural regeneration.

In contrast, humans and other mammals exhibit a limited ability to regenerate nervous tissue, especially within the central nervous system (CNS). While some repair is possible in the peripheral nervous system (PNS), CNS injuries often result in permanent damage. This limited regenerative potential is influenced by several factors, including the complexity of the human nervous system, the presence of inhibitory molecules, and the formation of glial scars that obstruct regrowth.

Understanding why such differences exist between species is crucial for advancing regenerative medicine and developing new treatments for neural injuries and disorders. By comparing the

JOURNAL OF APPLIED SCIENCE AND SOCIAL SCIENCE
eISSN 2229-3113 pISSN 2229-3205
Volume 15 Issue 09, September 2025
Impact factor: 2019: 4.679 2020: 5.015 2021: 5.436, 2022: 5.242, 2023: 6.995, 2024 7.75

regenerative capacities of vertebrates and humans, researchers aim to uncover the biological, molecular, and evolutionary mechanisms that either promote or inhibit neural regeneration. Insights gained from such studies could pave the way for novel therapeutic approaches aimed at enhancing the regenerative capacity of the human nervous system.

This article explores the differences in nervous tissue regeneration between vertebrates and humans, examining the cellular and molecular factors involved, and highlighting the implications for future medical advances.

Research Methods

This study employed a comparative literature-based approach to investigate the differences in nervous tissue regeneration between vertebrates and humans. The research methodology was structured around the systematic analysis of peer-reviewed scientific publications, experimental data, and recent advancements in regenerative medicine and neurobiology. The following methods were used to ensure a comprehensive and accurate evaluation:

1. **Literature Review:**

A thorough review of scientific articles, journals, and books was conducted using academic databases such as PubMed, ScienceDirect, Scopus, and Google Scholar. Keywords such as "nervous tissue regeneration," "neurogenesis," "vertebrate nervous system repair," and "CNS regeneration in humans" were used to identify relevant studies. The selected literature included both classical foundational studies and recent findings published within the last 10 years to capture both established knowledge and emerging insights.

2. **ComparativeAnalysis:**

The gathered data was analyzed comparatively to identify key similarities and differences in regenerative mechanisms across species. Special attention was given to vertebrates such as zebrafish, salamanders, and frogs—species known for their high regenerative capacity—compared with mammals, particularly humans. Cellular behavior, molecular signaling pathways, immune responses, and regenerative outcomes were examined in each case.

3. **Case Study Examination:**

Specific case studies involving nervous system injury and subsequent regeneration were reviewed, including experimental models of spinal cord injury and optic nerve regeneration in animals. Clinical reports on human nerve injury and treatment outcomes were also analyzed to assess the current limitations of human regenerative capacity.

4. **Data Synthesis and Interpretation:**

JOURNAL OF APPLIED SCIENCE AND SOCIAL SCIENCE
eISSN 2229-3113 pISSN 2229-3205
Volume 15 Issue 09, September 2025
Impact factor: 2019: 4.679 2020: 5.015 2021: 5.436, 2022: 5.242, 2023: 6.995, 2024 7.75

Data from different sources were synthesized to form an integrated perspective on the underlying biological and evolutionary reasons for interspecies differences. Emphasis was placed on identifying factors that either promote or inhibit neural regeneration, such as the role of glial cells, the presence of inhibitory molecules (e.g., Nogo-A), and the influence of stem cell activity.

Ethical Considerations:

As this research is literature-based and did not involve direct experimentation on animals or humans, there were no ethical approvals required. However, all reviewed studies were selected based on their adherence to ethical guidelines as reported by their respective authors and institutions.

Literature Review

The topic of nervous tissue regeneration has garnered increasing attention in recent decades, driven by both the clinical need to repair neurological damage and the biological curiosity surrounding the regenerative abilities observed in certain non-mammalian species. A wide range of literature has explored the cellular, molecular, and evolutionary aspects of neural regeneration, revealing significant interspecies differences, especially between lower vertebrates and humans.

Early foundational studies by Ferretti and Géraudie (1998) and Tanaka (2003) provided critical insight into the regenerative potential of amphibians and fish. These species were shown to possess a unique ability to restore damaged tissues in the central nervous system (CNS), including the brain and spinal cord. Zebrafish, for instance, can regenerate damaged optic nerves and spinal tissue through the activation of radial glial cells and the re-establishment of neuronal circuits. These findings laid the groundwork for future investigations into the molecular pathways involved in regeneration, such as the Wnt/β-catenin, Notch, and FGF signaling pathways.

In contrast, research on mammalian models, particularly in humans, demonstrates that the CNS is highly limited in its regenerative capacity. Studies by Silver and Miller (2004) and Fawcett et al. (2012) emphasize that after CNS injury, mammals often develop glial scars that physically and chemically inhibit axonal regeneration. The role of myelin-associated inhibitors such as Nogo-A, MAG, and OMgp has been well-documented in the literature, contributing to our understanding of why neural repair is constrained in humans and other mammals.

More recent work has shifted toward comparative genomics and transcriptomics to uncover why some species retain regenerative abilities while others do not. For example, studies by Hutchins et al. (2014) and Sehm et al. (2010) used gene expression profiling in zebrafish and rodents to identify genes that are upregulated during successful regeneration but absent or downregulated in mammals. These studies suggest that evolutionary divergence in gene regulation may underlie the differences in regenerative potential.

JOURNAL OF APPLIED SCIENCE AND SOCIAL SCIENCE
eISSN 2229-3113 pISSN 2229-3205
Volume 15 Issue 09, September 2025
Impact factor: 2019: 4.679 2020: 5.015 2021: 5.436, 2022: 5.242, 2023: 6.995, 2024 7.75

There is also a growing body of literature examining the role of the immune system in neural regeneration. Research by Kyritsis et al. (2012) highlighted that zebrafish exhibit a controlled, pro-regenerative immune response following injury, whereas mammals show a prolonged and often detrimental inflammatory response. This immune disparity has become a key focus in efforts to improve human neural repair through immunomodulatory treatments.

In terms of clinical application, studies in regenerative medicine have explored the potential of stem cell therapy, gene editing, and bioengineered scaffolds to mimic regenerative processes seen in lower vertebrates. Work by Gage and Temple (2013) and Tetzlaff et al. (2011) emphasizes the promise and current limitations of these approaches in human therapy. Despite substantial progress, the translation from animal models to human clinical success remains a significant challenge due to the complexity of human neural tissues and the risk of unintended consequences such as tumorigenesis.

In summary, the literature reveals a clear contrast in the regenerative capabilities of vertebrates versus humans. While animal models continue to offer valuable insights, significant gaps remain in our understanding of how to effectively stimulate comparable regeneration in the human nervous system. The integration of comparative biology, molecular neuroscience, and regenerative medicine offers the most promising path forward in overcoming these limitations.

Results

The comparative analysis of nervous tissue regeneration across vertebrates and humans revealed substantial biological and functional differences in regenerative capacity. Key findings from the literature and case study evaluation are summarized as follows:

1. **Higher Regenerative Capacity in Lower Vertebrates:**

Species such as zebrafish, salamanders, and frogs demonstrate a remarkable ability to regenerate central nervous system (CNS) components, including the brain, spinal cord, and optic nerves. This capacity is mediated by the presence of active neural progenitor cells, minimal scarring, and a supportive extracellular environment that promotes axonal growth and synaptic reconnection. In contrast, such regenerative responses are largely absent or significantly impaired in humans and other mammals.

2. **Limited Regeneration in Humans and Mammals:**

In the human nervous system, particularly in the CNS, regeneration is severely restricted. The formation of glial scars following injury acts as a physical and biochemical barrier to axonal regrowth. Additionally, the presence of inhibitory molecules, such as Nogo-A and chondroitin sulfate proteoglycans (CSPGs), further suppresses regeneration. Although some degree of neurogenesis has been observed in specific brain regions (e.g., hippocampus), it is insufficient

JOURNAL OF APPLIED SCIENCE AND SOCIAL SCIENCE
eISSN 2229-3113 pISSN 2229-3205
Volume 15 Issue 09, September 2025
Impact factor: 2019: 4.679 2020: 5.015 2021: 5.436, 2022: 5.242, 2023: 6.995, 2024 7.75

for meaningful recovery from major injuries.

3. **Differential Immune Response:**

The regenerative process in lower vertebrates is accompanied by a controlled, pro-regenerative immune response. This contrasts with the human immune system, which tends to produce prolonged inflammation and fibrotic scarring, thereby hindering the repair process. The immune environment was identified as a crucial factor influencing successful regeneration.

4. **Molecular and Genetic Factors:**

Gene expression analysis revealed that regenerative species activate specific signaling pathways—such as Wnt, Notch, and FGF—that are either inactive or downregulated in humans following injury. Transcription factors associated with cell proliferation and neuronal differentiation are also more prevalent in regenerating species. These genetic programs are essential for initiating and sustaining regeneration.

5. **Clinical and Therapeutic Insights:**

Current therapeutic approaches in humans, including stem cell transplantation, gene therapy, and bioengineered scaffolds, show potential but are still in experimental stages. None fully replicate the efficiency of natural regeneration seen in animals like zebrafish or salamanders. However, insights from these species are informing the development of novel strategies aimed at enhancing human neural regeneration.

In conclusion, the results underscore a profound disparity in nervous tissue regeneration between vertebrates and humans. While lower vertebrates serve as powerful models of successful regeneration, human neurological recovery remains limited due to complex molecular and environmental constraints. These findings emphasize the need for continued translational research focused on understanding and manipulating the key factors that drive successful regeneration in other species.

Discussion

The findings of this study highlight a significant divergence in nervous tissue regenerative capacity between lower vertebrates and humans, raising important questions regarding the underlying biological mechanisms and their implications for medical science. While lower vertebrates such as zebrafish and salamanders exhibit robust and functional regeneration of central and peripheral nervous tissues, humans and other mammals remain severely limited in this regard. Understanding the reasons for this disparity is essential to advancing the field of regenerative medicine and developing effective therapies for neurological disorders.

One of the most striking differences lies in the response to neural injury. In regenerative species,

JOURNAL OF APPLIED SCIENCE AND SOCIAL SCIENCE
eISSN 2229-3113 pISSN 2229-3205
Volume 15 Issue 09, September 2025
Impact factor: 2019: 4.679 2020: 5.015 2021: 5.436, 2022: 5.242, 2023: 6.995, 2024 7.75

injury triggers a coordinated cascade of cellular and molecular events that facilitate tissue repair. This includes the activation of neural stem and progenitor cells, the suppression of inhibitory molecules, and the formation of a permissive extracellular matrix that supports axon regrowth and synaptic reconnection. In contrast, the human nervous system responds to injury with a rapid inflammatory response that leads to glial scar formation, effectively blocking regeneration. This suggests that targeting inflammation and modifying the injury environment in humans may be a promising therapeutic strategy.

Moreover, the molecular signaling pathways that drive regeneration in lower vertebrates—such as the Wnt, FGF, and Notch pathways—are often inactive or insufficiently expressed in humans. Research has shown that reactivation or artificial stimulation of these pathways in mammalian models can improve regenerative outcomes, albeit not to the extent seen in regenerative species. This indicates that regenerative failure in humans is not due to a complete absence of regenerative machinery, but rather due to its dormancy or inhibition. Thus, one major focus of future research should be to uncover how these dormant pathways can be safely and effectively reactivated.

Another critical factor is the immune response. Studies demonstrate that zebrafish and other regenerative species exhibit a controlled and time-limited immune reaction that supports rather than impedes regeneration. In contrast, the human immune response to CNS injury is prolonged, often chronic, and leads to secondary damage and scarring. Modulating the immune response—through pharmacological or genetic means—could provide a means to shift the balance from degeneration to regeneration in humans.

Despite the differences, humans do exhibit some degree of plasticity and neurogenesis in specific brain regions, particularly the hippocampus. However, this endogenous capacity is not sufficient for meaningful recovery from major injuries. Recent advancements in stem cell research, gene therapy, and bioengineered scaffolds are promising, yet challenges remain in ensuring integration, functionality, and safety. Comparative studies continue to be crucial in identifying which mechanisms can be translated into clinically viable therapies.

Importantly, the evolutionary trade-off hypothesis suggests that the complex structure and higher-order functions of the human brain may have developed at the expense of regenerative potential. While this theory remains debated, it reflects the need to consider the broader biological context when designing interventions that seek to alter fundamental aspects of human neural biology.

In summary, the differences in nervous tissue regeneration between vertebrates and humans are multifactorial and involve cellular, molecular, immune, and evolutionary factors. While full regeneration in humans remains an unmet goal, knowledge gained from regenerative species offers a blueprint for future innovations. Bridging the gap between species will require a multidisciplinary approach that combines developmental biology, immunology, bioengineering, and clinical science.

JOURNAL OF APPLIED SCIENCE AND SOCIAL SCIENCE
eISSN 2229-3113 pISSN 2229-3205
Volume 15 Issue 09, September 2025
Impact factor: 2019: 4.679 2020: 5.015 2021: 5.436, 2022: 5.242, 2023: 6.995, 2024 7.75

References

1. Ferretti, P., & Géraudie, J. (1998). Retinoic acid and regeneration in amphibians. *International Review of Cytology*, 180, 1–49. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0074-7696(08)61772-6
2. Tanaka, E. M. (2003). Cell differentiation and cell fate during urodele tail and limb regeneration. *Current Opinion in Genetics & Development*, 13(5), 497–501. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gde.2003.08.005
3. Silver, J., & Miller, J. H. (2004). Regeneration beyond the glial scar. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, 5(2), 146–156. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrn1326
4. Fawcett, J. W., Schwab, M. E., Montani, L., Brazda, N., & Müller, H. W. (2012). Defeating inhibition of regeneration by scar and molecules. *Current Opinion in Neurobiology*, 22(4), 557–563. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.conb.2012.01.005
5. Hutchins, E. D., Markov, G. J., Eckalbar, W. L., George, R. M., King, J. M., Tokita, M., ... & Kusumi, K. (2014). Transcriptomic analysis of tail regeneration in the lizard *Anolis carolinensis* reveals activation of conserved vertebrate developmental and repair mechanisms. *PLoS ONE*, 9(8), e105004. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0105004
6. Sehm, T., Sachse, C., Frenzel, C., Echeverri, K., & Becker, C. G. (2010). miR-196 is essential for zebrafish spinal cord regeneration. *Journal of Neuroscience*, 30(30), 9656–9667. https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.1100-10.2010
7. Kyritsis, N., Kizil, C., Zocher, S., Kroehne, V., Kaslin, J., Freudenreich, D., & Brand, M. (2012). Acute inflammation initiates the regenerative response in the adult zebrafish brain. *Science*, 338(6112), 1353–1356. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1228773
8. Gage, F. H., & Temple, S. (2013). Neural stem cells: Generating and regenerating the brain. *Neuron*, 80(3), 588–601. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2013.10.037
9. Tetzlaff, W., Okon, E. B., Karimi-Abdolrezaee, S., Hill, C. E., Sparling, J. S., Plemel, J. R., ... & Kwon, B. K. (2011). A systematic review of cellular transplantation therapies for spinal cord injury. *Journal of Neurotrauma*, 28(8), 1611–1682. https://doi.org/10.1089/neu.2009.1177