




CRC Concise Encyclopedia of NANOTECHNOLOGY



Edited by

Boris Ildusovich Kharisov • Oxana Vasilievna Kharissova • Ubaldo Ortiz-Mendez



CRC Press
Taylor & Francis Group

Biomimetics: Biomimetics in Nanotechnology

Ille C. Gebeshuber and Manfred Drack

CONTENTS

Introduction.....	37
Common Ground of Biomimetics and Nanotechnology	38
What Is Biomimetics?.....	38
What Is Nanotechnology?.....	39
Fields of Common Potential	40
Technology Pull	41
Biology Push	41
Reverse Biomimetics.....	41
Metascienti c Considerations.....	41
Conclusions and Outlook.....	43
Acknowledgments.....	44
References.....	44

INTRODUCTION

This chapter deals with the biomimetic method in nanoscience and nanotechnology. Predictability on the basis of scientific understanding is a precondition for technology. The aims of science are to *explain* and *understand* and to *organize knowledge*. With a solid scientific basis, it shall be possible to *make predictions*, for example, about the movement of planets or asteroids, molecules, water flow around pillars, or emergent properties such as bird flocking patterns and swarm intelligence in ants. To achieve this, various techniques and methods are applied.

Nanoscience and nanotechnology tools and techniques have rapidly developed since the 1980s. Current tools and techniques for characterization, manipulation, and fabrication of matter at the nanoscale are manifold. The four major groups of nanoscale probing tools are scanning probe microscopy, (including scanning tunneling microscopy, atomic force microscopy (AFM), and scanning near field optical microscopy), as well as electron microscopy, x-ray methods, and optical techniques (Bhushan 2010). The core tool, the AFM, was invented in 1986 (Binnig et al. 1986). This lenseless microscope has subnanometer resolution, can be used for imaging as well as *manipulation* down to the single atom level, and works in various environments such as vacuum, air, water, buffer solutions, and oil (Haugstad 2012). This makes it so interesting for applications regarding the investigation of biological samples (Parot et al. 2007). Even live cells (Henderson 1994) or protein–protein interactions on the single protein level can be imaged with this device in real time at unprecedented resolution (Viani et al. 2000).

Nanotechnological *products and processes* can be developed on the grounds of nanofabrication (lab scale), molecular manufacturing (manufacture of complex nanoscale structures by means of nonbiological mechanosynthesis and subsequent assembly), and nanomanufacturing (industrial scale) (Bhushan 2010). In such products and processes, nanotechnology can be embedded in numerous aspects of the manufacturing processes. While the physics itself is the same across all length scales, materials and structures have unique size-dependent properties (that may be very different from the properties of bulk material). Also, the smaller the size, the more relevant the structure of the material becomes. Single atoms, molecules and nanostructures exhibit unusual physical, chemical, and biological properties when compared to the bulk material. Gold, for example, has golden coloration at the macroscale and is known as a highly inert material; nanogold colloids, however, exhibit different colors at different sizes and concentrations, and they are not bio-inert (Brown et al. 2008).

The ideas for new nanotechnological products and processes are often rooted in physics or inorganic chemistry. There is, however, also a considerable and expanding body of knowledge at the nanoscale in biology. Such knowledge about materials, structures and functions in living nature can be applied in different ways. One possibility is to use macromolecules or organisms directly, like in biotechnology. Another way is to strive for the understanding of principles behind particular phenomena and to apply them in distinct areas, like in biomimetics. The following focuses on biomimetics.

What we describe here is perhaps a small but probably significant method for nanotechnology, because the role models

that can be found in living nature have been tested in evolution since billions of years.

COMMON GROUND OF BIOMIMETICS AND NANOTECHNOLOGY

Most often biology and engineering do not touch on each other (Figure 30). There is, however, an intersection of both fields. Different disciplines are found in this intersection, such as the two distinct fields of biotechnology and biomimetics. Biotechnology is not our concern here; we only deal with biomimetics. The intersection itself can be sliced into pieces according to their scale. By doing so, the field discussed in this chapter can be illustrated like in Figure 30.

In the following, the fields of biomimetics and nanotechnology are characterized in order to investigate how the former can contribute to the latter.

WHAT IS BIOMIMETICS?

Biomimetics is about transferring principles from biology to engineering to enhance and bring up new products and processes for human needs. Although the name and the scientific field were only established in the last decades, the method is an old one. Leonardo da Vinci and his studies of bird flight, for example, eventually have led to airplanes. At the end of the twentieth century, the field of biomimetics became established both methodically and institutionally, leading to an ever-increasing number of applications.

In this recent definition, the main aspects are covered: "Biomimetics combines the disciplines of biology and technology with the goal of solving technical problems through the abstraction, transfer, and application of knowledge gained from biological models" (VDI 6220 2012).

At the core, biomimetics is about understanding functional or operational principles that are at work in biology and results in the abstractions of them in order to find out if they might also work in engineering. This procedure is different from biotechnology, which is not necessarily about transferring principles.




FIGURE 30 Biomimetics and biotechnology are some of the few areas at the intersection of engineering and biology. Biomimetics at the nanoscale is a small but probably significant method in nanotechnology.

Biomimetics works because biological and engineering entities are part of the same world and therefore underlie the same natural laws. Hence, principles in living organisms can also work in technical applications. Nevertheless, there are large differences between entities from the respective fields. One difference is the development throughout which a fertilized egg turns into an embryo and eventually into a mature organism. This is completely different from production devices or machines in engineering. Another difference is that every machine has its engineer who builds it, whereas organisms do not. But this paradigm is slowly changing, with the development of engineered self-replicating machines (see, e.g., Griffith et al. 2005).

Basically, two ways of working in biomimetics can be distinguished. They are referred to as technology pull (also called top-down biomimetics and biomimetics by analogy) and biology push (also called bottom-up biomimetics and biomimetics by induction) (see, e.g., Gebeshuber and Drack 2008).

Technology pull biomimetics is problem based: it starts with a problem in engineering. The next step is to see if similar "problems" occur in living nature. Drag reduction, for instance, is a problem for ship builders and similarly for fish. After such equal problems are found, the biological role models are investigated with the tools and methods of engineering. The term "technical biology" (*Technische Biologie*) was introduced by Nachtigall to name this methodical part of biomimetics (cf. Nachtigall 1998). In the drag reduction case, for example, the engineer would measure relevant parameters of the fish and look at the surface, shape, and so on. In doing so, the researcher might find interesting features, so far not thought about in engineering. The process of finding out more about the principles starts with the potential result of an abstraction that can be transferred and applied in human-built devices or machines.

Biology push biomimetics starts with basic research in biology, without having an application in mind. During or after such work, it might turn out that the found results are also useful for engineering (solution-based biomimetics). The found principles are then transferred and applied.

Technology pull, in general, has a large potential for finding within a short time principles that are useful for particular problems. Utilization of such principles is usually restricted to a small area of application. In contrast, biology push biomimetics has a lower potential for immediate applications, but the chance for finding revolutionary or generic principles is much higher.

Whether a product or technology is the result of biomimetics or not follows from the description of the method. Three necessary conditions have to be fulfilled (i.e., answered with yes) to legitimately speak about biomimetics (Frey et al. 2011, VDI 6220 2012):

1. *Role model from biology*: Did the inspiration come from living nature (biology)?
2. *Abstraction from biological role model*: Was there an abstraction (of a principle) of the natural role

model? Was the biological knowledge analyzed and abstracted step by step (with an understanding of the principle)?

3. *Transfer to technical application*: Was the principle applied in engineering?

The scope of biomimetics is broad. Most of the established knowledge transfer was done in the field of constructions. However, processes in living nature are also of interest, for example, photosynthesis. Furthermore, information processing like in neuronal networks or optimization with genetic algorithms can be referred to as biomimetics (Gruber et al. 2011).

As we have seen, research in biomimetics can lead to applications in engineering. Additionally, the process of doing biomimetics can also reveal new insights for biology, besides those accomplished with technical biology. This can be termed as reverse biomimetics (cf. Masselter et al. 2012, p. 380). One example is the evolutionary strategy of Rechenberg (1994). He introduced algorithms for optimization in engineering based on the concepts of mutation, selection, and recombination from evolutionary biology and achieved good results in engineering. Analyzing those algorithms in turn was of interest for evolutionary biology (cf. Wagner and Altenberg 1996).

WHAT IS NANOTECHNOLOGY?

According to ISO definition ISO/TS 80004-1:2010, nanotechnology is the “application of scientific knowledge to manipulate and control matter in the nanoscale [...] in order to make use of size- and structure-dependent properties and phenomena, as distinct from those associated with individual atoms or molecules or with bulk materials.” In a note to this entry, ISO states that manipulation and control includes material synthesis. Nanotechnology has functional parts in the range of nanometers to some hundreds of nanometers. The rise of nanotechnology began when we were able not just to image but also to manipulate matter on the nanometer scale. These possibilities were greatly enhanced with the increasing availability of scanning probe microscopes for the scientific community (Meyer et al. 2004/2012). One of the early examples of nanotechnological manipulation is the spelling of the company name IBM by Don Eigler and coworkers from IBM Almaden with just 35 xenon atoms on a single-crystal nickel surface (Eigler and Schweizer 1990). The group thereby demonstrated tailored manipulation of single atoms.

The two major approaches for obtaining nanotechnological products and processes are termed *top down* and *bottom up* (not to be confused with the terms as used in biomimetics).

In top-down approaches, nanoobjects are constructed from larger entities without atomic-level control. Top-down approaches comprise lithography, deposition, and etching. In bottom-up approaches, materials and devices are built from

molecular components that assemble themselves chemically by principles of molecular recognition. Bottom-up methods include (self-)assembly of atomic and molecular building blocks to form nanostructures. This method is widely used in sol-gel and chemical vapor deposition. In nature, self-assembly has existed for billions of years, from simple biomolecules to complete organisms.

Gebeshuber et al. (2010)

The history of nanomaterials can be dated back to pre-Columbian times: The first permanent organic blue pigment, Maya Blue, is a result of ancient “nanotechnology” (Chiari et al. 2008). Further examples of historical nanomaterials are the Lycurgus Cup in the British Museum, dating back to the late Roman Empire, and stained glasses in Medieval Europe (Francis 2010). Properties of nanomaterials are responsible for the respective effects described in this paragraph. It remains to be discussed if it is justified to call such ancient approaches “nanotechnology,” since the people back then did not know the reason for the respective material properties.

In general, nanoscience deals with research on materials, structures, and processes on the nanometer scale, and nanotechnology deals with the development of materials, structures, and processes where the functional units are in the nanometer range (generally from a few nanometers to some hundreds of nanometers). Nanoscience and nanotechnology can rather be associated with tools, techniques, and methods than with established research fields. Most research in these fields is rather interdisciplinary and touches upon pure and applied mathematics, physics, chemistry, materials science, engineering, and life sciences. The methods, concepts, and goals of the respective fields converge. This inherent interdisciplinarity of nanotechnology poses a challenge and offers an enormous potential for fruitful cross-fertilization among specialist areas. The properties of many materials change when they exist as nanosized particles. Besides the chemistry, surface physics becomes increasingly important, and not just the material itself but also its structure is of relevance for its mechanical, electrical, catalytic, optical, and toxic properties. Furthermore, quantum effects such as the tunneling effect, confinement properties, spin effects, and quantum coherence are important.

The scope of nanotechnology is to individually address, control, and modify structures, materials, and devices with nanometer precision and to synthesize such structures into systems of micro- and macroscopic dimensions such as microelectromechanical systems-based devices. For this, we need to establish a thorough understanding of the fundamental physics, chemistry, biology, toxicology and technology of nanoscale objects (nanomaterials, nanoparticles, nanostructures), the respective fabrication, diagnostics and analytics and of how such objects can be used in areas such as computation, cosmetics, engineering, medicine, nanobiotechnology, nanostructured materials, optics, resource sustainability, science, sensors, textiles, and many more.

FIELDS OF COMMON POTENTIAL

Phenomena of life occur on different hierarchical levels, down to the nanoscale. The micro- and nanoscale are of special importance in living systems. Single molecules, their interactions, and emergent properties on larger length scales are the very constituents of life. The complexity of a single cell in the human body by far exceeds any current engineered device. A cell's activities such as sensing, actuation, energy conversion, or information storage are carried out with the contribution of biomolecules, such as proteins. Protein sizes range from about 1 to about 20 nm; there are millions of different proteins. Biological materials are amazing: there are tough materials, "smart" materials, adaptive materials, functional materials, materials with molecular precision, hierarchical materials, and multifunctional materials. Many functionalities on the macroscale are based on functionalities on the nanoscale. The more we understand and abstract deep principles of biology on these length scales, the more successful can the biomimetic method transfer knowledge from materials, structures, and processes in living nature to engineering, for independent technological applications and devices.

With increasingly powerful microscopes, researchers have started to see amazing order, structure, and functionalities of biological materials, down to very small scales. Biomolecular "machines" such as the ribosome, built with atomic precision (Yusupov et al. 2001), powerful composites such as the Abalone shell (Smith et al. 1999) or the crystal eyes of brittle stars (Aizenberg et al. 2001), biomineralized beautifully structured little gems such as diatoms (Gebeshuber and Crawford 2006, Round et al. 1990/2007), optimized biotribological properties, for example, decreasing the friction coefficient to numbers so low that lubrication engineers are amazed (Gebeshuber 2007) and functional surfaces with nanoscale properties responsible for exciting tricks such as increased antireflective properties (Stavenga et al. 2006) or iridescent coloration in plants and microorganisms based on nanostructures (Gebeshuber and Lee 2012) are just some examples for the properties of organisms that are also interesting for engineering.

Currently, merging of nanoscience and nanotechnology with the life sciences, especially biology, biotechnology, biomimetics, nanomedicine, genetic engineering, and synthetic biology, can be recognized (see, e.g., Bainbridge 2007, Chen and Ho 2006, Ulvick 2010). This new and emerging field with enormous creative potential is called nanobioconvergence.

Andreas Lymberis from the European Commission, Information Society and Media Directorate-General, describes converging micro- and nanobiotechnologies toward integrated biomedical systems as

research and development at the convergence of microelectronics, nano-materials, biochemistry, measurement technology and information technology that is leading to a new class of biomedical systems and applications, e.g., molecular imaging, point of care testing, gene therapy and bionics (including on and inside the body sensors and other miniaturised smart systems) which are expected to revolutionise the healthcare provision and quality of life. In particular they are expected

to identify diseases at the earliest possible stage, intervene before symptomatic disease becomes apparent and monitor both the progress of the diseases and the effect of intervention and therapeutic procedures.

Lymberis (2008)

Nanobioconvergence is an emerging field, and no rigid definition has been established yet. One potential definition is the following: "Nanobioconvergence denotes the merging of life sciences, especially biology and biotechnology, with nanoscience and nanotechnology, focusing on the technical output from the connections of these particular fields as well as on the unified opportunities and challenges they present to human nature and our values" (Gebeshuber et al. 2013). Biotechnology (genetic engineering, engineering of proteins, etc.), bionanoscience (focusing on molecular building blocks of living cells), and biomimetics form important constituents of nanobioconvergence. Biomimetics can be done on many length scales, but because of the hierarchical organization of organisms, with many properties based on functionalities originating from the nanoscale, biomimetics is especially rewarding when taking into account nanoscale properties of life.

Since all these fields are currently emerging, there is still a lot of defining and categorizing going on. What one set of researchers would place in biotechnology, others categorize as biomimetics. Research toward producing spider silk is a case in point. The categories can also change with time. Sarikaya and coworkers, for example, wrote in their 2003 paper "Molecular biomimetics: nanotechnology through biology" (Sarikaya et al. 2003): "Molecular biomimetics is an emerging field in which hybrid technologies are developed by using the tools of molecular biology and nanotechnology. Taking lessons from biology, polypeptides can now be genetically engineered to specifically bind to selected inorganic compounds for applications in nano- and biotechnology." Eight years later, the group reports the fabrication of hierarchical hybrid structures using bioenabled layer-by-layer self-assembly, functional hybrid nanomaterials with well-defined hierarchical and spatial organization (Hnilova et al. 2012)—something one would nowadays rather call biotechnology than biomimetics.

Biomimetic techniques applied to nanotechnology comprise technology pull and biology push. Examples for biomimetics in nanotechnology are principles of self-assembly (Valéry et al. 2003), self-repairing materials (dynamic breaking and repair of "sacrificial" bonds) (Fantner et al. 2005), bioinspired sensors (Barth et al. 2012), mass production of nanostructures (Guozhong and Ying 2011), and artificial photosynthesis (Razeghifard 2013).

On a more abstract level, Werner Nachtigall, the doyen of biomimetics in Germany, identified 10 general principles of biomimetics that can be applied by everybody working in the field, even by people who are not (or who do not want to be) involved in biology at all (Nachtigall 2009). These principles are as follows:

1. Integration instead of additive construction
2. Optimization of the whole instead of maximization of a single component feature

3. Multifunctionality instead of monofunctionality
4. Fine-tuning regarding the environment
5. Energy efficiency
6. Direct and indirect usage of solar energy
7. Limitation in time instead of unnecessary durability
8. Full recycling instead of piling waste
9. Interconnectedness as opposed to linearity
10. Development via trial-and-error processes

Nachtigall's general principles are of high relevance for biomimetics that draws its inspiration from nanoscale properties of living matter. One example for "fine-tuning regarding the environment" is navigation in honeybees. These animals orient themselves with the help of the polarization of the skylight. Abstraction of the deep principles of polarized skylight-based navigation leads to the development of technical navigation systems (produced with micro- and nanofabrication techniques) that are completely independent from the normally used GPS systems (reviewed in Karman et al. 2012).

Biomimetics at the nanoscale has as integral parts abstraction of the principles of the investigated nanomaterials, nanostructures, and nanoprocesses, followed by principle transfer to nanotechnology. In the remainder of this section, we illustrate in two examples the technology pull and biology push methods of biomimetic nanotechnology.

TECHNOLOGY PULL

The Carinthia University of Applied Sciences in Austria offers the MSc course "Biomimetics in Energy Systems." One of the authors of this chapter (ICG) supervised the MSc thesis "Biomimetic potential of sponge spicules" by Ehret (2012). The work performed in this thesis shall now serve as an example for "technology pull." Bioinspired improvement of daylight-guidance systems in buildings was the problem in engineering on which the thesis is based. Glass sponges (animals) were selected as model organisms with similar "problems" in living nature. The silica spicules of glass sponges serve as light guides, providing light to the photosynthesizing microorganisms and algae that live in close association with the "glass fiber" in the interior from the sponge. Detailed description of investigations of the biological role model, the glass sponges, with tools and methods from engineering, including dynamical mechanical analysis, light transmission studies, and the propagation of ultra short laser pulses, lead to the following abstractions that can subsequently be transferred to engineering: self-assembly of metal oxides on functionalized surfaces, the manufacturing of layered organic-inorganic composites with enhanced mechanical properties, and the tuning of optical and mechanical properties by means of nanostructuring and hierarchical architecture. Application of these abstractions in construction of daylight-guidance systems shall yield more conveniently illuminated workspaces in offices proof (Figure 31).

BIOLOGY PUSH

One example for successful "biology push" is nanoscale structures on moth eyes (Figure 32). The eyes of certain moths are covered with nipple-like arrays, which basic biological research revealed to be antireflective (Vukusic and Sambles 2003). The nipple array gradually matches the optical impedance of one medium with that of its neighbor across the interface. Such a property is of paramount interest in engineering applications, for example, for lens surfaces of camera and photographic equipment. Principle transfer to engineering is straightforward, since the property in question is dependent on the structure rather than on the material. Man-made similar nanofabricated structures (Relexite™) yield amazing antireflective properties in a wide bandwidth, from 400 to 700 nm (Boden and Bagnall 2006, Figure 32).

REVERSE BIOMIMETICS

Prominent examples for reverse biomimetics at the nanoscale remain to be seen. Nevertheless, there is a considerable potential for such examples. Though not in the realm of reverse biomimetics, the discovery of the mechanism of ATP production in mitochondria can serve as an illustration. ATP is a universal carrier molecule of energy in organisms. Peter D. Mitchell proposed the chemiosmotic theory to explain how ATP production could work, for which he received the Nobel Prize. For the production of ATP, an electrochemical (proton) gradient across the membrane of the mitochondrion was proposed. Experiments to support this theory were performed by Racker and Stoerkenius (1974). They artificially "built" vesicles that contained ATPase (the enzyme that catalyze the decomposition of ATP into ADP and a free phosphate ion) in their membranes and through some other means they provided for a proton gradient. The arrangement of these components turned out to be causally sufficient to explain the processes in the organism (Weber 2005). Similarly, one can think of future examples where, by building of biomimetic nanoproducts, knowledge can be gained in biology.

METASCIENTIFIC CONSIDERATIONS

In this section, we deal with further considerations that are deemed important when describing biomimetics in nanotechnology: the goal and future of nanotechnology, ethical, legal, and social issues (leading to governance and risk research) and educational as well as accessibility issues in an age of converging technologies.

According to the Foresight Institute (Palo Alto, California), the goal of nanotechnology is "to improve our control over how we build things, so that our products can be of the highest quality [...] while causing the lowest environmental impact." (Foresight Institute 2015). However, it needs to be ensured that nanotechnology that is intended to cause the lowest environmental impact is not only upfront "green" with negative side effects on ourselves, further organisms, and the environment. Some human actions and technological developments might




FIGURE 31 (a) A member of the 1910–1913 British Arctic expedition with a glass sponge. Some glass sponges have hydrated silica spicules that are 3 m long. Based on functionalities on the nanoscale, such spicules can be very effective fracture-resistant light guides. (Copyright Ponting Collection, Scott Polar Research Institute, Cambridge, U.K., <http://www.spri.cam.ac.uk/>.) (b) The largest biosilica structure on Earth: the giant basal spicule from the deep-sea glass sponge *Monorhaphis chuni*. (Reproduced from Wang, X. et al., *Evid. Based Compl. Altern. Med.*, 540987, 14, Copyright 2011. With permission.) (c) Principle of daylight guiding in buildings. (Copyright Dr. Aziz Laouadi, National Research Council Canada, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada.)

have short-term benefits on the environment, but come with unforeseeable long-term effects that are hard and impossible to predict for the complex system we are all embedded in.

The progress of nanoscience and nanotechnology is accompanied by important ethical, health, environmental, and social issues. Because of the huge envisaged impact of science and technology on society, increasingly also social scientists and technology assessment specialists deal with nanoscience and nanotechnology. Prospects, problems, and potential risks require focused consideration by third parties such as parliaments, NGOs, sociologists, philosophers, insurance companies, law enforcement agencies, or scientific researchers from other fields.

Technological, environmental, societal, health, and safety issues must be addressed in research, societal studies, regulatory measures, and government policies (Holsapple et al. 2005, Holsapple and Lehman-McKeeman 2005, Huber 2010, Powers et al. 2006, Thomas and Sayre 2005, Thomas et al. 2006a,b, Tsuji et al. 2006).

Societal implications of nanoscience and nanotechnology should be judged using a balanced approach between the potential achievements (leading to envisioned societal benefits) and potential hazardous consequences (which could be a combination of unexpected benefits and risks) (Roco 2003).

“Futures” in terms of visions, expectations, scenarios, fears, and hopes increasingly dominate science outreach and the




FIGURE 32 Antireflective surfaces on moth eyes (a) and the respective engineered biomimetic antireflective structures (b). (a): (A) SEM of a moth eye, showing nipple-like structures. *Inset*: Moth. Scale bar, 1 μm . (B) Similar structures on transparent wings of hawkmoths. Scale bar, 1 μm . *Inset*: Single nipple. Scale bar, 100 nm. (b): (A) Reflectance measurements on engineered antireflective surface structures. For the surface called “third iteration moth eye,” reflectance is below 1% for the whole spectrum that is visible to humans. (B) Biomimetic structure, machined in silico. Scale bar, 2 μm . (a): Reproduced by permission from Macmillan Publishers Ltd. *Nature*, Vukusic, P. and Sambles, J.R., Photonic structures in biology, 424, 852–855, Corrigendum in *Nature*, 429, 680, Copyright 2003; b: Boden, S.A. and Bagnall, D.M., Biomimetic subwavelength surfaces for near-zero reflection sunrise to sunset, *Proceedings of the Fourth IEEE World Conference on Photovoltaic Energy Conversion*, Waikoloa, HI, pp. 1358–1361, 2006 © IEEE.)

drive and motivation of scientists (Grunwald 2007). Futures are socially constructed. Especially concerning nanoscience and nanotechnologies, the ongoing debate is very much a debate about futures. The visions for the future of nanotechnology have a wide bandwidth, ranging from “expectations of salvation and anticipations of paradise” (Grunwald 2010) to the announcement of the “ultimate catastrophe” (Grunwald 2010)—both extremes being based on the same futuristic technical ground.

The high degree of interdisciplinarity in nanoscience and nanotechnology poses a grand challenge as well as provides great opportunities to today’s mainly specialist scientists.

To fully exploit the potential of biomimetics in the age of nanotechnology, scientists and engineers will have to substantially change their ways of thinking, especially on the level of fundamental research and education (Casert and Deboelpaep 2006, Gebeshuber and Majlis 2010, Roco 2002). Still, many researchers use for their research on a specific field in nanotechnology just the instruments they or their close collaborators have at their disposal, which are not always the best-suited ones. We

have to move from tool-based nanotechnology to understanding-based nanotechnology. Martin Rees from Trinity College in Cambridge describes in his foreword to James Lovelock’s 2010 book the current way of doing science as “the specialized quasi-industrial style in which most research is conducted” (Rees 2009). In such a way, true interdisciplinarity cannot be obtained. Interdisciplinary scientific principles and concepts that allow specialist scientists to understand complex phenomena need to be developed toward a unification of science (Roco and Bainbridge 2002). To allow for proper, accessible organization of knowledge, the specialist results that currently appear in increasingly specialist journals need to be rearranged and connected across fields (Gebeshuber and Majlis 2010).

CONCLUSIONS AND OUTLOOK

One of the paramount advantages of the biomimetic method as opposed to other innovation methods in nanotechnology is that we have biological “best practice” examples and know that they

work. However, due to the integrated multifunctionality of biological materials, structures, and processes, it might sometimes be hard to identify the respective principles responsible for one single technological aspect that we want to transfer to research and development. In the biomimetic method applied to nanoscience and nanotechnology, we have the option to go along two roads: either to take the typical Western science approach and try to dissect the best practice models in living nature to various single, unrelated properties, some of which may be highly intriguing and successful for immediate application in common products, but that might come with unintended long-term effects, or to take a more holistic approach and appreciate the best practice models as a whole, trying to develop a deep understanding why life as we know it has developed the way we currently experience it and to develop a kind of engineering and way of *managing* resources that is closer to the way nature does it—biomimetic nanotechnology with the strive for sustainability.

Organisms show us, for example, a completely different way of resource “management” as opposed to the one we currently have in engineering and construction. They predominantly use water-based chemistry, are subject to limits and boundaries, and are in a state of dynamic nonequilibrium. They are locally attuned and responsive (they harvest locally, use common materials, etc.), integrate cyclic processes via feedback loops, cross-pollinate and mutate, and are resilient (diverse, decentralized and distributed, redundant) (Biomimicry 3.8 2014).

Biomimetics is perhaps a small but probably significant method, because the role models that can be found in living nature have been tested in evolution since billions of years and promise great nanoscience and nanotechnology-based innovations. To sum up, biomimetics in nanotechnology has great potential for exciting nanoscience and nanotechnology-based innovations.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Part of this work was funded by grant UKM-AP-NBT-16-2010 (University Kebangsaan Malaysia) and grant FRGS/1/2013/TK02/UKM/01/1 (Government of Malaysia). Research of MD was funded by the Austrian Science Fund (FWF): P22955-G17. Part of this work was funded by Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG) grant SFB-TRR 141.

REFERENCES

Aizenberg J., Tkachenko A., Weiner S., Addadi L., and Hendler G. (2001) Calcitic microlenses as part of the photoreceptor system in brittlestars, *Nature* 412, 819–822.

Bainbridge W.S. (2007) *Nanoconvergence: The Unity of Nanoscience, Biotechnology, Information Technology and Cognitive Science*, Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ.

Barth F.G., Humphrey J.A.C., and Srinivasan M.V. (Eds.) (2012) *Frontiers in Sensing—From Biology to Engineering*, Springer, Vienna, Austria.

Bhushan B. (Ed.) (2010) *Springer Handbook of Nanotechnology*, 3rd edn., Springer, Berlin, Germany.

Binnig G., Quate C.F., and Gerber C. (1986) Atomic force microscope, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 56(9), 930–934.

Biomimicry 3.8 (2014) Life's principles. <http://biomimicry.net/about/biomimicry/biomimicry-designlens/lifes-principles/> (last accessed July 21, 2015)

Boden S.A. and Bagnall D.M. (2006) Biomimetic subwavelength surfaces for near-zero reflection sunrise to sunset, *Proceedings of the Fourth IEEE World Conference on Photovoltaic Energy Conversion*, Waikoloa, HI, pp. 1358–1361.

Brown C.L., Whitehouse M.W., Tiekink E.R.T., and Bushell G.R. (2008) Colloidal metallic gold is not bio-inert, *Inflammopharmacology* 16(3), 133–137.

Casert R. and Deboelpaep R. (2006) Technology assessment on converging technologies: Final report, European Technology Assessment Group. Deliverable of the project Technology Assessment on Converging Technologies, Brussels, Belgium.

Chen J.M. and Ho C.-M. (2006) Path to bio-nano-information fusion, *Ann. N. Y. Acad. Sci.* 1093(12), 123–142.

Chiari G., Giustetto R., Druzik J., Doehne E., and Ricchiardi G. (2008) Pre-columbian nanotechnology: Reconciling the mysteries of the maya blue pigment, *Appl. Phys. A* 90, 3–7.

Ehret S. (2012) Biomimetic potential of sponge spicules, MSc thesis, Carinthia University of Applied Sciences, Carinthia, Austria, <http://permalink.obvsg.at/fhk/AC09582941> (last accessed July 21, 2015).

Eigler D.M. and Schweizer E.K. (1990) Positioning single atoms with a scanning tunnelling microscope, *Nature* 344, 524–526.

Fantner G.E., Hassenkam T., Kindt J.H. et al. (2005) Sacri cial bonds and hidden length dissipate energy as mineralized brils separate during bone fracture, *Nat. Mater.* 4(8), 612–616.

Foresight Institute (2015) Frequently asked questions—nanotechnology. <https://www.foresight.org/nano/whatisnano.html> (last accessed July 21, 2015).

Francis S. (2010) Historical examples of nanomaterials, in: *Encyclopedia of Nano-Science and Society*, Vol. 1 (Ed. Guston D.H.), Sage Publications, Los Angeles, CA, pp. 313–315.

Frey E., Masselter T., and Speck T. (2011) Was ist bionisch?—Eine Analyse des Ideen usses von der Biologie in die Technik, *Naturwissenschaftliche Rundschau* 64, 117–126.

Gebeshuber I.C. (2007) Biotribology inspires new technologies, *Nano Today* 2(5), 30–37.

Gebeshuber I.C. and Crawford R.M. (2006) Micromechanics in biogenic hydrated silica: Hinges and interlocking devices in diatoms, *Proc. IMechE Part J: J. Eng. Tribol.* 220(J8), 787–796.

Gebeshuber I.C. and Drack M. (2008) An attempt to reveal synergies between biology and mechanical engineering, *Proc. IMechE Part C: J. Mech. Eng. Sci.* 222(7), 1281–1287.

Gebeshuber I.C. and Lee D.W. (2012) Nanostructures for coloration (organisms other than animals), in: *Springer Encyclopedia of Nanotechnology* (Ed. Bhushan B.), Springer, Dordrecht, the Netherlands, pp. 1790–1803.

Gebeshuber I.C., Macqueen M.O., Majlis B.Y., and Drack M. (2013) Nanobioconvergence, in: *Nanotechnology in the Edge of Convergence*, (Eds. Majlis B.Y., Kostadinov K.G. and Bhatti A.S.), COMSATS & NAM S&T Centre, New Dehli, India, pp. 123–139.

Gebeshuber I.C. and Majlis B.Y. (2010) New ways of scientific publishing and accessing human knowledge inspired by trans-disciplinary approaches, *Tribol. Mater. Surf. Interfaces* 4(3), 143–151.

Gebeshuber I.C., Yunas J., and Dee C.F. (2010) Nanomanufacturing, in: *Encyclopedia of Nanoscience and Society*, Vol. 1 (Ed. Guston D.H.), Sage Publications, Los Angeles, CA, pp. 494–498.

Grif th S., Goldwater D., and Jacobson J.M. (2005) Self-replication from random parts, *Nature* 437, 636.

- Gruber P., Bruckner D., Hellmich C., Schmiedmayer H.-B., Stachelberger H., and Gebeshuber I.C. (Eds., 2011) *Biomimetics—Materials, Structures and Processes. Examples, Ideas and Case Studies*, Springer, Heidelberg, Germany.
- Grunwald A. (2007) Converging technologies: Visions, increased contingencies of the *conditio humana*, and search for orientation, *Futures* 39(4), 380–392.
- Grunwald A. (2010) Future, in: *Encyclopedia of Nanoscience and Society*, Vol. 1 (Ed. Guston D.H.), Sage Publications, Los Angeles, CA, pp. 265–267.
- Guozhong C. and Ying W. (2011) *Nanostructures and Nanomaterials: Synthesis, Properties, and Applications*, 2nd edn., World Scientific Publishing Company, Singapore.
- Haugstad G. (2012) *Atomic Force Microscopy: Understanding Basic Modes and Advanced Applications*, Wiley, Hoboken, NJ.
- Henderson E. (1994) Imaging of living cells by atomic force microscopy, *Progr. Surf. Sci.* 46(1), 39–60.
- Hnilova M., Karaca B.T., Park J. et al. (2012) Fabrication of hierarchical hybrid structures using bio-enabled layer-by-layer self-assembly, *Biotechnol. Bioeng.* 109(5), 1120–1130.
- Holsapple M.P., Farland W.H., Landry T.D. et al. (2005) Research strategies for safety evaluation of nanomaterials, Part II: Toxicological and safety evaluation of nanomaterials, current challenges and data needs, *Toxicol. Sci.* 88(1), 12–17.
- Holsapple M.P. and Lehman-McKeeman L.D. (2005) Forum series: Research strategies for safety evaluation of nanomaterials, *Toxicol. Sci.* 87(2), 315.
- Huber H. (2010) Governance, in: *Encyclopedia of Nanoscience and Society*, Vol. 1, Guston D.H., Ed., Sage Publications, Los Angeles, CA, pp. 291–296.
- Karman S.B., Diah S.Z.M., and Gebeshuber I.C. (2012) Bio-inspired polarized skylight-based navigation sensors: A review, *Sensors* 12(11), 14232–14261.
- Lymberis A. (2008) Converging micro-nano-bio technologies towards integrated biomedical systems: State of the art and future perspectives under the EU-information and communication technologies program, *Conference Proceedings of the IEEE Engineering in Medicine and Biology Society*, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada, pp. 6–8.
- Masselter T., Bauer G., Gallenmüller F. et al. (2012) Biomimetic products, in: *Biomimetics: Nature-Based Innovation* (Ed. Bar-Cohen Y.), CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL, pp. 377–429.
- Meyer E., Hug H.J., and Bennewitz R. (2004/2012) *Scanning Probe Microscopy: The Lab on a Tip*, Advanced Texts in Physics. Paperback Edn. of the 2004 Edn., Springer, Berlin, Germany.
- Nachtigall W. (1998) *Bionik*, 2nd edn., Springer, Berlin, Germany.
- Nachtigall W. (2009) *Vorbild Natur: Bionik-Design für funktionelles Gestalten*, Springer, Berlin, Germany.
- Parot P., Dufrene Y.F., Hinterdorfer P. et al. (2007) Past, present and future of atomic force microscopy in life sciences and medicine, *J. Mol. Recognit.* 20(6), 418–431.
- Powers K.W., Brown S.C., Krishna V.B. et al. (2006) Research strategies for safety evaluation of nanomaterials. Part VI. Characterization of nanoscale particles for toxicological evaluation, *Toxicol. Sci.* 90(2), 296–303.
- Racker E. and Stoerkenius W. (1974) Reconstitution of purple membrane vesicles catalyzing light-driven proton uptake and adenosine triphosphate formation, *J. Biol. Chem.* 249(2), 662–663.
- Razeghifard R. (2013) *Natural and Artificial Photosynthesis: Solar Power as an Energy Source*, Wiley, Hoboken, NJ.
- Rechenberg I. (1994) *Evolutionsstrategie'94*, Frommann, Stuttgart, Germany.
- Rees M. (2009) Foreword to Lovelock J., *The Vanishing Face of Gaia—A Final Warning*, Allen Lane, London, U.K., p. xii.
- Roco M.C. (2002) Nanoscale science and engineering educational activities in the US, *J. Nanoparticle Res.* 4(3), 271–274.
- Roco M.C. (2003) Perspectives: Broader societal issues of nanotechnology, *J. Nanopart. Res.* 5, 181–189.
- Roco M.C. and Bainbridge W.S. (2002) Converging technologies for improving human performance. Nanotechnology, biotechnology, information technology and cognitive science, NSF/DOC-sponsored report, Arlington, TX.
- Round F.E., Crawford R.M., and Mann D.G. (1990/2007) *Diatoms: Biology and Morphology of the Genera*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, U.K. (paperback reprint 2007).
- Sarikaya M., Tamerler C., Jen A.Y., Schulten K., and Baneyx F. (2003) Molecular biomimetics: Nanotechnology through biology, *Nat. Mater.* 2, 577–585.
- Smith B.L., Schäffer T.E., Viani M. et al. (1999) Molecular mechanistic origin of the toughness of natural adhesives, fibres and composites, *Nature* 399, 761–763.
- Stavenga D.G., Foletti S., Palasantzas G., and Arikawa K. (2006) Light on the moth-eye corneal nipple array of butterflies, *Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* 273(1587), 661–667.
- Thomas K., Aguar P., Kawasaki H., Morris J., Nakanishi, J., and Savage N. (2006a) Research strategies for safety evaluation of nanomaterials, Part VIII: International efforts to develop risk-based safety evaluations for nanomaterials, *Toxicol. Sci.* 92(1), 23–32.
- Thomas K. and Sayre P. (2005) Research strategies for safety evaluation of nanomaterials, Part I: Evaluating the human health implications of exposure to nanoscale materials, *Toxicol. Sci.* 87(2), 316–321.
- Thomas T., Thomas K., Sadrieh N., Savage N., Adair P., and Bronaugh R. (2006b) Research strategies for safety evaluation of nanomaterials, Part VII: Evaluating consumer exposure to nanoscale materials, *Toxicol. Sci.* 91(1), 14–19.
- Tsuji J.S., Maynard A.D., Howard P.C. et al. (2006) Research strategies for safety evaluation of nanomaterials, Part IV: Risk assessment of nanoparticles, *Toxicol. Sci.* 89(1), 42–50.
- Ulvick S. (2010) On our radar: Nano-bio convergence, *IQT Quart.* 1(2), 2–3.
- Valéry C., Paternostre M., Robert B. et al. (2003) Biomimetic organization: Octapeptide self-assembly into nanotubes of viral capsid-like dimension, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* 100(18), 10258–10262.
- VDI 6220. (2012). *Biomimetics, Conception and Strategy, Differences between Biomimetics and Conventional, Methods/Products*, VDI-Richtlinien, Beuth, Berlin, Germany.
- Viani M.B., Pietrasanta L.I., Thompson J.B. et al. (2000) Probing protein-protein interactions in real time, *Nat. Struct. Biol.* 7(8), 644–647.
- Vukusic P. and Sambles J.R. (2003) Photonic structures in biology, *Nature* 424, 852–855. Corrigendum in *Nature* 429, 680.
- Wagner G.P. and Altenberg L. (1996) Complex adaptations and the evolution of evolvability, *Evolution* 50, 967–976.
- Wang X., Gan L., Jochum K.P., Schröder H.C., and Müller W.E.G. (2011) The largest bio-silica structure on Earth: The giant basal spicule from the deep-sea glass sponge *Monorhaphis chuni*, *Evid. Based Compl. Altern. Med.* 540987, 14. doi: 10.1155/2011/540987.
- Weber M. (2005) Philosophie des biologischen Experiments, in: *Philosophie der Biologie* (Eds. Krohs U. and Toepfer G.) Frankfurt am Main, Suhrkamp, Germany, pp. 359–378.
- Yusupov M.M., Yusupova G.Z., Baucom A. et al. (2001) Crystal structure of the ribosome at 5.5 Å resolution, *Science* 292(5518), 883–896.