





Nanoindentation of trabecular bone in human vertebrae classified as normal, osteopenic and osteoporotic by ultrasonometry of the calcaneus

• The evaloution $\cap f$ microarchitecture resistance of the trabecular bone may contribute in determining the risk and preventing fractures associated to osteoporosis



Do the mechanical properties of trabecular bone microstructure allow us to indicate the bone quality of human vertebrae?

Is it possible to indentify (Mechnically) osteoporosis IN one single trabecula?

Evaluate the "quality" of trabecular microarchitecture bone of vertebrae (human cadavers), classified as normal, osteopenic osteoporotic and by ultrasonometry technique of the through calcaneus, nanoindentation test.

Introdution

Loss of bone mass (density); Increased porosity and fracture risk;
Specifically in trabeculae the reduction of connectivity, number,
thickness and deterioration of plate to rod format.

Osteoporosis



FIG. 1 - Trabecular bone of human vertebrae classified as: a) normal; b) osteopenic; c) osteoporotic

Introdution —

Trabecular bone



FIG. 2 – Trabecular bone of human vertebrae classified as normal

- Composite
- Heterogeneous
- Orthotropic
- Anisotropic
- Viscoelastic

Introduction – Ultrasonometry of calcaneous

Classification of calcaneus ultrasonometry



FIG. 3 – Procedure for ultrasonometry analysis of calcaneus: a) Hygiene treatment with isopropyl alcohol; b) leg coupling in the Achilles Insight equipment; c) Results of an individual considered as normal (T-score -0.9) in function parameters such as gender, ethnicity, weight, age and bone stiffness of the calcaneus (elastic module).

Samples

• A total of 90 human trabecular vertebrae were dried (dehydrated), distributed proportionally by the regions T_{12} , L_1 and L_4 in a total of 30 vertebrae segments of each normal osteopenic and osteoporotic group extracted from individuals (human cadavers of Brazilian nationality).

Samples

 They are classified trough bone quality index (BQI) as normal, osteopenic and osteoporotic bones through the ultrasometry of the calcaneous bone.

Preparation of samples



FIG. 04 – a) Vertebral body penetration through the trephine drill; b) Cylindrical specimens of trabecular bone; c) Proof bodies (20 by 10) mm without bone marrow of L_1 region, classified as normal, osteopenic and osteoporotic

Bone marrow removal with physiological saline soluction (NaCl 0.9%)

Preparation of samples



FIG. 05 - Test samples without bone marrow, built into acrylic resin L1 region, classified as normal, osteopenic and osteoporotic

 The nanoindentation technique allowed the evaluation of the elastic module (E) and nanohardness (H) in one single trabecula in each respective group: Normal, Osteopenic and osteoportic.

Trabecular Bone Test Bodies Mecanical Resistence Analysis When Subjected To Punctual External Loads



Depth of indentation, h

FIG. 6 - a) Typical nanoindentation curve; b) The surface profile and geometric parameters of an indented sample.

Nanoindentation test



FIG. 07 – a) Nanoindentation System (Nano Indenter XP), **b**) Realization of 24 indentations (6x4) in trabecular bone of the T12 region of the normal group.

The vertebrae of the regions T_{12} and L₁, were chosen beacause they have a higher rate of fractures and the L_4 has a better distribution of trabeculae and axial alignment to the cranial-caudal axis in the vertebrae body.

The minimum numbes of samples (N = 8.64) was determined as function of the quantitative variables for an infinite population and is defined by Equation.

$$N = \left(\frac{Z_{\alpha/2}SD}{SE}\right)^2 \rightarrow N = 8.6$$

Were $Z_{\alpha/2}$: critical value for the desired degree of confidence (usually: 1.96 (95%); SD: standard deviation of the average; and SE: standard error of the average (SD = 1.80 MPa, SE = 1.2 MPa). The adopted sample size was ten (N = 10) for each group: normal, osteopenic and osteoporotic, totalizing thirty (30) subjects.

Statistical method

✓ Descriptive statistics: Mean (M), Median (Md), Standard Deviation (SD), Standard Error (SE), Minimum Value (Min), Maximum Value (Max), Variational Coefficient (VC) and number of samples (N).

✓ Normality test by Shapiro-Wilk method

✓ Analysis of comparisons by ANOVA methods and multiple comparisons by Tukey HSD Kramer

Statistical method

- Descriptive statistics of **BQIs** of **30** individuals classified as normal, osteopenic and osteoporotic bone by the ultrasonometry of the calcaneus.
- Descriptive statistics of mean E of trabecular bone between the regions T₁₂, L₁ and L₄ of **30 human vertebral segments**, determined by mechanical testing of nanoindentation and classified as normal, osteopenic and osteoporotic bone by the QUS.
- Descriptive statistics of mean H of trabecular bone between the regions T₁₂, L₁ and L₄ of **30 human vertebral segments**, determined by mechanical testing of nanoindentation and classified as normal, osteopenic and osteoporotic bone by the QUS.

Ultrasonometry of calcaneous



Results

Results

Nanoindentation



Results

Nanoindentation



Results

TAB. 1 – Correlation of bone quality index (**BQI**), modulus of elasticity (**E**) and mechanical compression test USC (Ultimate Compressive Strength to Trabecular Bone = 2.48 ± 1.8 MPa) **maximum load supported by the bone** by the Spearman test.

The value of r \leq than 0.5 \rightarrow rejected.

Variable	Correlation	r
	Age (years)	-0.501
	E (MPa)	0.499
BQI	Ultimate Compressive Strengh To Trabecular Bone UCS = 2.48 ± 1.8 MPa	0.508
E	Age (years)	-0.584
Ultimate Compressive Strength To Trabecular Bone UCS = 2.48 ± 1.8 MPa	Age (years)	-0.684

•The nanoindentation test of vertebrae proof bodies (human cadaver) allowed the analysis of the mechanical properties in a single dehydrated trabecular The suggested hypothesis was not confirmed, there were no significant differences between the normal osteopenic and osteoporotic groups.

 The tests demonstrated that the fracture resistance associated with osteoporosis is more closely linked to the architecture (macroscopic condition) of the set of trabeculae, than to the bone matrix (microscopic condition) of a single trabecula, because there were no significant differences between groups.

REFERENCES

ANTUNES, J. M. et al. Ultra-microhardness testing procedure with Vickers indenter. Surface & Coatings Technology v. 149 (1), p. 27–35, 2002.

BAUER, D. C. et al. Quantitative ultrasound predicts hip and non-spine fracture in men: the MrOS study. **Osteoporosis International**, v. 18, n. 6, p. 771-7, 2007.

BOUXSEIN, M. L. et. al. Guidelines for Assessment of Bone Microstructure in Rodents Using Micro–Computed Tomography, **Journal of Bone and Mineral Research**, v. 25, n. 7, p 1468–1486. 2010.

NAGALE, E. et al. Technical Considerations for Microstructural Analysis of Human Trabecular Bone from Specimens Excised from Various Skeletal Sites. Springer-Verlag, New York, LLC. **Calcified Tissue International**, v. 75, p. 15–22, 2004.

DIEZ-PEREZ A. et al. Prediction of absolute risk of non-spinal fractures using clinical risk factors and heel quantitative ultrasound. **Osteoporosis International,** v. 18, n. 5, p. 629-39, 2007.

KUNKEL, M.E. et al. Correlação entre as propriedades do osso esponjoso analisado por ultra-sonometria e por ensaio mecânico de compressão. **Anais.** In: 50. Congresso Latino Americano de Órgãos Artificiais e Biomateriais, Ouro Preto, Mg., 2008.

LIU, J. M., et al. A population based study examining calcaneus quantitative ultrasound and its optimal cut-points to discriminate osteoporotic fractures among 9352 Chinese women and men. **The Journal of Clinical Endocrinology and Metabolism**, v. 97, n. 3, p. 800-9, 2012.