



HAL
open science

Mechanical effects of load speed on the human colon

Catherine Masson

► **To cite this version:**

Catherine Masson. Mechanical effects of load speed on the human colon. Journal of Biomechanics, 2019. hal-02512575

HAL Id: hal-02512575

<https://hal.science/hal-02512575>

Submitted on 25 Oct 2021

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial 4.0 International License

Mechanical effects of load speed on the human colon

D. Massalou* £†, C. Masson †, S. Afquir †, P. Baqué £, P-J Arnoux †, T. Bège ‡†

£ Emergency surgery unit, University Hospital of Nice, CHU de Nice Hôpital Pasteur 2,
Université de Nice Sophia-Antipolis, France

† Biomechanical Applied Laboratory, UMRT24, IFSTTAR, Aix-Marseille University, France

‡ Department of Visceral Surgery, AP-HM Hôpital Nord, Aix-Marseille University, France

***Corresponding author**

Dr Damien MASSALOU, MD. PhD.

Chirurgie Générale d'Urgence, Hôpital Pasteur 2, 30 voie romaine, 06000 Nice, FRANCE

Tel: +33 663269264 and +33 492038614

Fax: +33 492033390

Email: massalou.d@chu-nice.fr and damienmassalou@gmail.com

Keywords: colonic mechanical response, human colon, biomechanics, uniaxial solicitation

Type of manuscript: original article

This manuscript is not under submission in another journal.

Abstract

The aim of this study was to examine the mechanical behavior of the colon using tensile tests under different loading speeds.

Specimens were taken from different locations of the colonic frame from refrigerated cadavers. The specimens were submitted to uniaxial tensile tests after preconditioning using a dynamic load (1 m/s), intermediate load (10 cm/s), and quasi-static load (1 cm/s).

A total of 336 specimens taken from 28 colons were tested. The stress-strain analysis for longitudinal specimens indicated a Young's modulus of 3.17 ± 2.05 MPa under dynamic loading (1 m/s), 1.74 ± 1.15 MPa under intermediate loading (10 cm/s), and 1.76 ± 1.21 MPa under quasi-static loading (1 cm/s) with $p < 0.001$. For the circumferential specimen, the stress-strain curves indicated a Young's modulus of 3.15 ± 1.73 MPa under dynamic loading (1 m/s), 2.14 ± 1.3 MPa under intermediate loading (10 cm/s), and 0.63 ± 1.25 MPa under quasi-static loading (1 cm/s) with $p < 0.001$. The curves reveal two types of behaviors of the colon: fast break behavior at high speed traction (1 m/s) and a lower break behavior for lower speeds (10 cm/s and 1 cm/s). The circumferential orientation required greater levels of stress and strain to obtain lesions than the longitudinal orientation. The presence of *taeniae coli* changed the mechanical response during low-speed loading.

Colonic mechanical behavior varies with loading speeds with two different types of mechanical behavior: more fragile behavior under dynamic load and more elastic behavior for quasi-static load.

Number of words:

- Abstract: 245 words
- Manuscript (except references): 2706 words

1 **Mechanical effects of load speed on the human colon**

2

3 **1. Introduction**

4 Knowledge about the mechanical properties of the digestive tract is essential, and
5 understanding of physiological phenomena can be obtained through quasi-static tests
6 (Egorov, Schastlivtsev, Prut, Baranov, & Turusov, 2002). Traumatic phenomena can be
7 investigated with dynamic tests (Crandall et al., 2011). Quasi-static tests can also be used
8 to install materials that allow digestive sutures or surgical simulation. Realistic modeling
9 of soft tissue biomechanics and mechanical interactions between tissues has been shown
10 to be very suitable for simulating soft tissue biomechanics and has been successfully used
11 in a number of image-guidance systems (Johnsen et al., 2015).

12 The colon is an anisotropic viscoelastic material, and its experimental
13 biomechanical characterization has been limited compared to other abdominal organs
14 (Higa et al., 2007; Carter, Frank, Davies, McLean, & Cuschieri, 2001; Egorov et al.,
15 2002; Watters et al., 1985; Kauer, Vuskovic, Dual, Szekely, & Bajka, 2002; Yamada,
16 1970; Fung, 1993; Rubod et al., 2012). The morphology of the colon varies depending on
17 the location. For example, there is a large diameter and thin wall in the ascending colon,
18 but it gradually tapers to a small diameter and thick wall for the sigmoid colon. Like
19 small intestine, the colonic wall is mechanically divided into two layers (from inner to
20 outer): the mucosa, submucosa, inner circular muscular layer, and the outer layer with
21 outer longitudinal muscular layers and serosa (Bourgouin et al., 2012; Massalou et al.,
22 2016).

23 Only a few tensile tests have been performed on human tissue. For example,

1 Egorov performed such tests under quasi-static load (Egorov et al., 2002), Howes
2 performed high-rate equibiaxial elongation tests (Howes & Hardy, 2012), and our team
3 carried out dynamic tensile tests at 1 m/s (Massalou et al., 2016). Dynamic tests are
4 characterized by loading speeds in the order of m/s, whereas tests are considered static
5 when they are on the order of cm/s or mm/s (Rosen, Brown, De, Sinanan, & Hannaford,
6 2008; Rubod et al., 2012; Egorov et al., 2002). No studies have been published
7 concerning the mechanical variability of the human colon subjected to various speeds
8 under uniaxial stress. Our main objective is to determine the mechanical variability of the
9 human colon when subjected to various speeds of uniaxial stress by observing its
10 behavior until complete rupture.

11

12 **2. Methods**

13 2.1. Origin of the tissue

14 The tested colonic specimens were samples obtained from 28 human subjects (17
15 females and 11 males, mean age: 85,2 years) stored at 1°C with an average retention
16 period of 22 days. The removed colon was immediately tested. The use of cadaveric
17 human tissue was part of a protocol approved by the ethics committee of the Medical
18 school of Nice concerning the donation of bodies to science. The study included only
19 adult subjects whose colon showed no signs of pathology (cancer or inflammation). The
20 presence of diverticula was not a reason for exclusion of samples given the high
21 prevalence in the adult human population. However, the colonic specimens did not
22 contain colonic diverticula.

1

2 2.2. Tissue sampling

3 The specimens were colon segments taken from the antimesenteric border after
4 performing a longitudinal opening by following a standardized format using a rectangular
5 punch. Gaur et al. (Gaur et al. 2016) noted that most experimental studies on tensile
6 testing of soft tissues have used aspect ratio between 1.3–2 to ensure a shear free
7 deformation and rupture of tissue within the gauge length of the specimen. Hence we
8 chose an aspect ratio of 1.6, with a width of 25mm and a gauge length of 40 mm. The
9 gripper length being 30mm, the total length of the specimen was 100mm.

10 In longitudinal direction, for each anatomical subject, 2 specimens (one with *taeniae coli*
11 and one without *taeniae coli*) were taken from four colonic segments (ascending,
12 transverse, descending, and sigmoid colon). The specimens with *taeniae coli* were made
13 parallel to the axis of the strip and included the strip. In circumferential direction, for
14 each anatomical subject, only 1 specimen was taken from each colonic segment. The
15 specimens were made perpendicular to the axis of the muscle strip with the strip situated
16 in the middle of the specimen. Therefore, the number of longitudinal specimens is double
17 of circumferential specimen due to the presence or lack of *taeniae coli*. The full
18 description of the specimen preparation protocol has been described in one of our
19 previous articles (Massalou et al., 2016).

20

21 2.3. Number of specimens

1 Specimens were taken from a total of 28 different colons, including 17 from females
2 and 11 from males. The average age was 85.2 ± 10.3 years, and the bodies had been
3 conserved for an average of 22.2 ± 10.1 days. A total of 336 specimens were subjected to
4 tensile tests after preconditioning (Table 1). The tests were conducted with the following
5 conditions:

- 6 - 80 longitudinal and 40 circumferential specimens under quasi-static load (1 cm/s),
- 7 - 64 longitudinal and 32 circumferential specimens under intermediate load (10
8 cm/s),
- 9 - 80 longitudinal and 40 circumferential specimens under dynamic load (1 m/s).

10

11 2.4. Tensile tests

12 The initial length (L_0) of all the specimens was 40 mm, both longitudinal and
13 circumferential. The experimental characterization of the mechanical behavior of the
14 colon was done using uniaxial tensile tests under dynamic load (1 m/s), intermediate load
15 (10 cm/s), or static load (1 cm/s). The test was performed using a hydraulic test system
16 (MTS 370.10, Landmark®, USA) under controlled displacement. The sample was first
17 hung in the top gripper, and then was clamped in the bottom gripper. It is well known that
18 the determination of the initial state of strain of the soft tissues is very difficult in tensile
19 tests. As previous studies (Gaur et al., 2016) we chose to define the point of zero stress-
20 strain with an arbitrary force value (2N).

21 Because the colon is viscoelastic, a pre-conditioning test phase of the specimen was
22 applied with test parameters chosen to avoid the occurrence of lesions. Ten sinusoidal

1 preconditioning cycles were carried out with an amplitude of 6 mm and a speed of 0.5
2 m/s, as described in a previous study on the small intestine (Bourgouin et al., 2012). The
3 preconditioning phase was immediately followed by a tensile load of 1 m/s, 10 cm/s, or 1
4 cm/s up to a distance of 10 cm.

5

6 2.5. Data acquisition and post-processing of results

7 The engineering strain ϵ was calculated from the initial length L_0 (fixed to 40 mm)
8 and the final gauge length L (gripper to gripper strain), using the following equation:

$$9 \quad \epsilon (\%) = [(L - L_0) / L_0] * 100.$$

10 The engineering stress σ was calculated from the initial cross-sectional area S_0 and the
11 load measured by the load cell F , using the following equation:

$$12 \quad \sigma (\text{MPa}) = \text{force (N)} / S_0 (\text{mm}^2).$$

13 The thickness of the specimen was based on literature data (Sandek et al, 2014): 1.2mm
14 for ascending, 1.2mm for transverse, 1.4mm for descending and 1.5 mm for sigmoid.

15 From strain-stress curves, stress and strain at yield point and ultimate tensile strain and
16 stress were noted. Ultimate strain is the strain value at the point of maximum stress. The
17 elastic modulus was calculated as the slope of a linear curve fit to the stress-strain region
18 extending from the end of the toe-in region to the yield point, as explained in Gallagher et
19 al. (Gallagher et al. 2012).

20 Statistical analyses were performed using Statistica software for Windows. The normality

1 condition of the variables was rejected by the Shapiro test (p-value <1%), so we used the
2 nonparametric Kruskal-Wallis test to test whether the independent samples come from
3 the same population. The results were considered statistically significant in cases of p <
4 0.05.

5

1 **3. Results**

2 For each speed loading (1cm/s, 10cm/s and 1m/s) and each sample orientation
3 (longitudinal and circumferential), the typical responses stress-strain are presented in
4 figure 1, and the values of the mechanical parameters are presented in table 2.

5

6 3.1. Influence of speed loading: 1cm/s versus 10cm/s versus 1m/s

7 The mechanical response of the colon depends on the speed loading. Figures 1 and
8 2 reveals two types of behavior of the colon according to the loading speed: few
9 differences were noted in the response between the static and the intermediate speed
10 loads whereas a dynamic tensile load modified the behavior increasing the stiffness of the
11 samples.

12 The statistical differences of mechanical parameters between the 3 test velocities are
13 presented in tables 2, 3 and 4.

14 The Young modulus and the stress at the second inflexion were statistically correlated
15 with the speed load for both longitudinal and circumferential samples.

16 The influence of the speed on the strain was observed for the longitudinal samples
17 whereas no significant difference was observed for the circumferential samples.

18

19 3.2. Mechanical behavior as a function of the load

20 3.2.1. Mechanical behavior as a function of the load – longitudinal specimen

1 The mechanical response differed according to the speed of the load. There was a
2 significant statistical difference in the modulus (Tables 2, 3 and 5). Stress-strain curves
3 indicated a Young's modulus of 3.17 ± 2.05 MPa in the first quasi-linear phase for each
4 loading speed under dynamic loading (1 m/s), 1.74 ± 1.15 MPa under intermediate
5 loading (10 cm/s), and 1.76 ± 1.21 MPa under quasi-static loading (1 cm/s) with $p < 0.001$
6 (figure 2.A). The curves reveal two types of behavior of the colon according to the
7 loading speed: fast break behavior at high-speed traction (dynamic protocol at 1 m/s) and
8 a different type of behavior for lower speeds (intermediate protocols at 10 cm/s and
9 quasi-static at 1 cm/s). Changes in loading speed resulted in different profile curves of the
10 colon, changed the Young's modulus but did not modify the stress necessary for the first
11 point of rupture.

12

13 3.2.2. Mechanical behavior as a function of the load – circumferential specimen

14 The mechanical response differed according to the speed of the load. There was a
15 significant statistical difference in the Young's modulus (Tables 3, 4 and 6). The stress-
16 strain curves indicated a Young's modulus of 3.15 ± 1.73 MPa in the first quasi-linear
17 phase for each loading speed under dynamic loading (1 m/s), 2.14 ± 1.3 MPa under
18 intermediate loading (10 cm/s), and 0.63 ± 1.25 MPa under quasi-static loading (1 cm/s)
19 with $p < 0.001$ (figure 2.B). Dynamic loading results in more fragile mechanical behavior
20 than slower loads.

21

22 3.3. Mechanical behavior as a function of the *taeniae coli* – longitudinal specimen

1 For longitudinal specimens, we performed tests with or without the *taeniae coli*
2 for the three different speed loadings. The mechanical response with or without *taeniae*
3 *coli* differed depending on the speed of the load: there was no effect for dynamic load,
4 but the *taeniae coli* modified the mechanical behavior of the specimens for lower-speed
5 load (Table 5, figure 3).

6 For an intermediate speed, the *taeniae* leads to a significant increase of the
7 modulus and a decrease of the strain at first inflexion. For a static speed, the *taeniae* leads
8 to a significant decrease of the strain and stress at first inflexion and an increase of strain
9 at second inflexion.

10

11

12 3.4. Mechanical behavior as a function of location

13 The mechanical response differs slightly depending on the colonic segment location:
14 ascending, transverse, descending or sigmoid colon. Only Young's modulus and stress at
15 1st point of inflexion are modified by the location of the specimens for some speed
16 solicitation:

- 17 - for longitudinal and dynamical solicitation (1m/s): Young's modulus $p=0.03$ and
18 stress at 1st point of inflexion $p=0.08$;
- 19 - for circumferential and intermediate solicitation (10cm/s): Young's modulus is
20 $p=0.06$ and stress at 1st point of inflexion $p=0.04$;
- 21 - for circumferential and static solicitation (1cm/s): Young's modulus is $p=0.06$ and
22 stress at 1st point of inflexion $p=0.01$.

23

1

2 **4. Discussion**

3 This study on the human colon completes the earlier work of Yamada (Yamada,
4 1970), Fung (Fung, 1993), Egorov et al. (Egorov et al., 2002), and our laboratory
5 (Massalou et al., 2016). From a mechanical point of view, the colon is composed of
6 viscoelastic tissue and described as contractile and anisotropic (Rubod et al., 2012;
7 Egorov et al., 2002; Fung, 1993). Knowledge of the passive properties of the colon is
8 crucial for understanding colonic functioning (Fung, 1991). Gregersen and Kassab
9 (Gregersen & Kassab, 1996) demonstrated a better reflection of passive mechanical
10 behavior with circular segments of a hollow organ rather than uniaxial tensile samples.
11 However, the digestive tract is an anisotropic material (Rubod et al., 2012; Yamada,
12 1970; Fan, Gregersen, & Kassab, 2004; Gao & Gregersen, 2000; Liao, Zhao, Fan, &
13 Gregersen, 2004), and the use of longitudinal samples allows a more precise
14 characterization of the longitudinal fibers (Gao & Gregersen, 2000).

15 The objective of this study was to describe the differences in mechanical behavior
16 of refrigerated human colon subjected to different rates of uniaxial tensile stress. The
17 colon behaved as a viscoelastic material with different mechanical responses that depend
18 on the speed of loading. The dynamic solicitation leads to lower rupture strain. The
19 typical curves in the quasi-static and intermediate tests are very similar to the curves
20 published by Egorov et al. (Egorov et al., 2002) during transverse tests of static traction
21 on transverse colon samples. They demonstrated a modification of the colonic
22 mechanical response by *taeniae coli* (longitudinal muscle strips of the colon). Under
23 static and intermediate stress, our study also showed a mechanical impact of the *taeniae*

1 *coli*. However, in dynamic traction, we did not observe an effect of *taeniae coli*, even
2 though the levels of deformation seem identical between the study by Egorov et al. and
3 ours. We did not study the impact of *taeniae coli* separately.

4 Other anisotropic and viscoelastic materials appear to behave in the same way. For
5 striated muscular fibers, an increase of the speed of stress decreases the force necessary
6 for rupture in both static and dynamic situations (Roberts, 2016; Rosario, Sutton, Patek,
7 & Sawicki, 2016). As in our study, there is fragile behavior under dynamic stress, while
8 for slower stresses, the results are then superimposable and more elastic. Many structures
9 within the muscles intervene in this reaction: actomyosin bypasses, actin and myosin
10 filaments, titin, and the scaffolding of the connective tissue of the extracellular matrix
11 (Fallqvist & Kroon, 2013; Fallqvist, Kulachenko, & Kroon, 2014; Kroon, 2011; Roberts,
12 2016). Collagen is likely the main determinant for the intestinal wall stiffness since
13 collagen in most tissues is the stress-bearing structure (Y.-C. Fung, 1993). It was found
14 that the collagen distribution was axial preferred in both layers and the mucosa contained
15 more collagen. The collagen distributes more axially for both the muscle and mucosal
16 layers; the collagen content is higher for the mucosa than for the muscle. The load-
17 bearing collagen content increases and the collagen fibers rotate towards to the axial
18 direction with the increase of the axial stretch (W. Yang, Fung, Chian, & Chong, 2006).
19 This collagen axial-orientation could explain the need for more stress for longitudinal
20 tensile tests to obtain similar damages than circumferential tensile tests. The predominant
21 collagen content in the mucosa could also explain the more visco-elastic behavior of the
22 internal layer of the colon.

23 The anisotropic material of the colon has different mechanical properties between

1 longitudinal and circumferential uniaxial stress tests (Massalou et al., 2016; Merlo &
2 Cohen, 1988). Howes and Hardy (Howes & Hardy, 2012) also highlighted this property
3 in uniaxial and bi-axial dynamic tests. We confirmed this property for dynamic speeds as
4 well as slower loads. Indeed, the mechanical response of the colon subjected to
5 circumferential traction is more elastic, requiring higher levels of stress and strain to
6 obtain lesions in the specimens.

7

8 Other factors may also modify the experimental results with respect to the behavior
9 of the colon in vivo:

- 10 - Active properties of muscle cells responsible for the propulsion of the digestive
11 contents (Kroon, 2010)
- 12 - Modification of digestive tonicity: intestinal mechanoreceptors are sensitive to the
13 stress stimulus and a linear association between stress relaxation and afferent
14 discharge adaptation has been found (Liao et al., 2012)
- 15 - Modification of the composition of the inter or intracellular fluid: the presence of
16 certain neuropeptides or the concentration of calcium will modify the recorded
17 mechanical response (La et al., 2005; Merlo & Cohen, 1988; Middleton, Cuthbert,
18 Shorthouse, & Hunter, 1993; Washabau & Sammarco, 1996)
- 19 - Pathological phenomena: inflammatory bowel diseases or the deletion of certain
20 genes can lead to a modification of the mechanical behavior of the colon (Onori et
21 al., 2005; Sung, La, Kang, Kim, & Yang, 2015; J. Yang, Zhao, Nakaguchi, &

1 Gregersen, 2009).

2 It is therefore difficult to determine the mechanical behavior of the human colon in
3 a physiological situation, as well as in our tests. The completion of bi-axial tests would
4 describe the behavior of the colon more completely. Since the tissue has a muscular layer,
5 the synchronous realization of contraction tests would also approach the behavior of the
6 human colon in vivo (Murtada, Humphrey, & Holzapfel, 2017). This experimental study
7 has made it possible to obtain reference values for the colon when subjected to different
8 stresses. These values could be used for finite element models of virtual trauma and
9 quasi-static simulation, as in the case of surgical simulation or the improvement of
10 colonic stent deployments.

11

12 **5. Conclusion**

13 Tensile tests were performed on human colic samples at 1cm/s, 10cm/s and 1m/s.
14 There is variability in the mechanical behavior of the colon as a function of the loading
15 speed. The colonic tissue behaves in the same way under static and intermediate stress,
16 and then its behavior becomes more fragile under dynamic stress. In the case of quasi-
17 static stress, *taeniae coli* modify the mechanical response of the colon. Regardless of the
18 loading speed, the circumferential stress requires higher levels of stress and strain to
19 obtain lesions. This study could be useful to improve the biofidelity of colon numerical
20 models.

21

1 Conflict of interest: none

2 Funding: none

3 Acknowledgements: English editing by American Manuscript Editors©

4

1 References

- 2 Bourgooin, S., Bège, T., Masson, C., Arnoux, P.-J., Mancini, J., Garcia, S., ... Berdah, S.
3 V. (2012). Biomechanical characterisation of fresh and cadaverous human small
4 intestine: applications for abdominal trauma. *Medical & Biological Engineering*
5 *& Computing*, 50(12), 1279–1288. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11517-012-0964-y>
- 6 Carter, F. J., Frank, T. G., Davies, P. J., McLean, D., & Cuschieri, A. (2001).
7 Measurements and modelling of the compliance of human and porcine organs.
8 *Medical Image Analysis*, 5(4), 231–236.
- 9 Crandall, J. R., Bose, D., Forman, J., Untaroiu, C. D., Arregui-Dalmases, C., Shaw, C. G.,
10 & Kerrigan, J. R. (2011). Human surrogates for injury biomechanics research.
11 *Clinical Anatomy (New York, N.Y.)*, 24(3), 362–371.
12 <https://doi.org/10.1002/ca.21152>
- 13 Egorov, V. I., Schastlivtsev, I. V., Prut, E. V., Baranov, A. O., & Turusov, R. A. (2002).
14 Mechanical properties of the human gastrointestinal tract. *Journal of*
15 *Biomechanics*, 35(10), 1417–1425.
- 16 Fallqvist, B., & Kroon, M. (2013). A chemo-mechanical constitutive model for
17 transiently cross-linked actin networks and a theoretical assessment of their
18 viscoelastic behaviour. *Biomechanics and Modeling in Mechanobiology*, 12(2),
19 373–382. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10237-012-0406-7>
- 20 Fallqvist, B., Kulachenko, A., & Kroon, M. (2014). Modelling of cross-linked actin
21 networks - Influence of geometrical parameters and cross-link compliance.
22 *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, 350, 57–69.
23 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtbi.2014.01.032>

1 Fan, Y., Gregersen, H., & Kassab, G. (2004). A two-layered mechanical model of the rat
2 esophagus. Experiment and theory. *BioMedical Engineering OnLine*, 3(1), 1–9.
3 <https://doi.org/10.1186/1475-925X-3-40>

4 Fung, Y. C. (1991). What are the residual stresses doing in our blood vessels? *Annals of*
5 *Biomedical Engineering*, 19(3), 237–249.

6 Fung, Y.-C. (1993). *Biomechanics – Mechanical properties of living tissues* (2nd edition,
7 Vols. 1–1). Springer.

8 Gallagher A.J., Ni Annaidh A., Bruyère K. (2012). Dynamic Tensile Properties of
9 Human Skin. *IRCOBI conference proceedings*

10 Gao, C., & Gregersen, H. (2000). Biomechanical and morphological properties in rat
11 large intestine. *Journal of Biomechanics*, 33(9), 1089–1097.
12 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0021-9290\(00\)00067-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0021-9290(00)00067-1)

13 Gaur, P., Chawlaa, A., Vermaa, K., Mukherjeea, S., Lalvanib, S., Malhotrab, R., Mayer, C.
14 (2016). Characterisation of human diaphragm at high strain rate loading, *J Mech*
15 *Behav Biomed Mater*, 603-616)

16 Gregersen, H., & Kassab, G. (1996). Biomechanics of the gastrointestinal tract.
17 *Neurogastroenterology and Motility: The Official Journal of the European*
18 *Gastrointestinal Motility Society*, 8(4), 277–297.

19 Higa, M., Luo, Y., Okuyama, T., Takagi, T., Shiraishi, Y., & Yambe, T. (2007). Passive
20 mechanical properties of large intestine under in vivo and in vitro compression.
21 *Medical Engineering & Physics*, 29(8), 840–844.
22 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.medengphy.2006.09.003>

- 1 Howes, M. K., & Hardy, W. N. (2012). Material properties of the post-mortem colon in
2 high-rate equibiaxial elongation. *Biomedical Sciences Instrumentation*, *48*, 171–
3 178.
- 4 Johnsen, S. F., Taylor, Z. A., Han, L., Hu, Y., Clarkson, M. J., Hawkes, D. J., & Ourselin,
5 S. (2015). Detection and modelling of contacts in explicit finite-element
6 simulation of soft tissue biomechanics. *International Journal of Computer
7 Assisted Radiology and Surgery*, *10*(11), 1873–1891.
8 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11548-014-1142-5>
- 9 Kauer, M., Vuskovic, V., Dual, J., Szekely, G., & Bajka, M. (2002). Inverse finite
10 element characterization of soft tissues. *Medical Image Analysis*, *6*(3), 275–287.
- 11 Kroon, M. (2010). A constitutive model for smooth muscle including active tone and
12 passive viscoelastic behaviour. *Mathematical Medicine and Biology: A Journal of
13 the IMA*, *27*(2), 129–155. <https://doi.org/10.1093/imammb/dqp017>
- 14 Kroon, M. (2011). Influence of dispersion in myosin filament orientation and anisotropic
15 filament contractions in smooth muscle. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, *272*(1),
16 72–82. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtbi.2010.11.037>
- 17 La, J.-H., Kim, T.-W., Sung, T.-S., Kim, H.-J., Kim, J.-Y., & Yang, I.-S. (2005). Increase
18 in neurokinin-1 receptor-mediated colonic motor response in a rat model of
19 irritable bowel syndrome. *World Journal of Gastroenterology*, *11*(2), 237–241.
- 20 Liao, D., Lu, X., Kirkup, A. J., Jiang, W., Grundy, D., & Gregersen, H. (2012).
21 Interdependency of stress relaxation and afferent nerve discharge in rat small
22 intestine. *Journal of Biomechanics*, *45*(9), 1574–1579.
23 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbiomech.2012.04.013>

- 1 Liao, D., Zhao, J., Fan, Y., & Gregersen, H. (2004). Two-layered quasi-3D finite element
2 model of the oesophagus. *Medical Engineering & Physics*, 26(7), 535–543.
3 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.medengphy.2004.04.009>
- 4 Massalou, D., Masson, C., Foti, P., Afquir, S., Baqué, P., Berdah, S.-V., & Bège, T.
5 (2016). Dynamic biomechanical characterization of colon tissue according to
6 anatomical factors. *Journal of Biomechanics*, 49(16), 3861–3867.
7 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbiomech.2016.10.023>
- 8 Merlo, A., & Cohen, S. (1988). Neuropeptide responses and mechanics of the proximal
9 and distal feline colon in vitro. *The American Journal of Physiology*, 255(6 Pt 1),
10 G787-793. <https://doi.org/10.1152/ajpgi.1988.255.6.G787>
- 11 Middleton, S. J., Cuthbert, A. W., Shorthouse, M., & Hunter, J. O. (1993). Nitric oxide
12 affects mammalian distal colonic smooth muscle by tonic neural inhibition.
13 *British Journal of Pharmacology*, 108(4), 974–979.
- 14 Murtada, S.-I., Humphrey, J. D., & Holzapfel, G. A. (2017). Multiscale and Multiaxial
15 Mechanics of Vascular Smooth Muscle. *Biophysical Journal*, 113(3), 714–727.
16 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bpj.2017.06.017>
- 17 Onori, L., Aggio, A., D'Alo', S., Muzi, P., Cifone, M. G., Mellillo, G., ... Latella, G.
18 (2005). Role of nitric oxide in the impairment of circular muscle contractility of
19 distended, uninflamed mid-colon in TNBS-induced acute distal colitis in rats.
20 *World Journal of Gastroenterology*, 11(36), 5677–5684.
- 21 Roberts, T. J. (2016). Contribution of elastic tissues to the mechanics and energetics of
22 muscle function during movement. *The Journal of Experimental Biology*, 219(Pt
23 2), 266–275. <https://doi.org/10.1242/jeb.124446>

1 Rosario, M. V., Sutton, G. P., Patek, S. N., & Sawicki, G. S. (2016). Muscle-spring
2 dynamics in time-limited, elastic movements. *Proceedings. Biological Sciences*,
3 283(1838). <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2016.1561>

4 Rosen, J., Brown, J. D., De, S., Sinanan, M., & Hannaford, B. (2008). Biomechanical
5 properties of abdominal organs in vivo and postmortem under compression loads.
6 *Journal of Biomechanical Engineering*, 130(2), 021020.
7 <https://doi.org/10.1115/1.2898712>

8 Rubod, C., Brieu, M., Cosson, M., Rivaux, G., Clay, J.-C., de Landsheere, L., & Gabriel,
9 B. (2012). Biomechanical properties of human pelvic organs. *Urology*, 79(4),
10 968.e17-22. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.urology.2011.11.010>

11 Sandek A, Swidsinski A, Schroedl W, Watson A, Valentova M, Herrmann R,
12 Scherbakov N, Cramer L, Rauchhaus M, Grosse-Herrenthey A, Krueger M, von
13 Haehling S, Doehner W, Anker S, Bauditz J.(2014) Intestinal Blood Flow in Patients
14 With Chronic Heart Failure A Link With Bacterial Growth, Gastrointestinal
15 Symptoms, and Cachexia. *Journal of the American College of Cardiology*, vol 64 , no 1.
16 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jacc.2014.06.1179>

17 Sung, T. S., La, J.-H., Kang, T. M., Kim, T. W., & Yang, I.-S. (2015). Visceral
18 Hypersensitivity and Altered Colonic Motility in Type 2 Diabetic Rat. *Journal of*
19 *Neurogastroenterology and Motility*, 21(4), 581–588.
20 <https://doi.org/10.5056/jnm15058>

21 Washabau, R. J., & Sammarco, J. (1996). Effects of cisapride on feline colonic smooth
22 muscle function. *American Journal of Veterinary Research*, 57(4), 541–546.

1 Watters, D. A., Smith, A. N., Eastwood, M. A., Anderson, K. C., Elton, R. A., &
2 Mugerwa, J. W. (1985). Mechanical properties of the colon: comparison of the
3 features of the African and European colon in vitro. *Gut*, 26(4), 384–392.
4 Yamada, H. (1970). *Strength of Biological Materials*. Baltimore: Williams & Wilkins.
5 Yang, J., Zhao, J., Nakaguchi, T., & Gregersen, H. (2009). Biomechanical changes in
6 oxazolone-induced colitis in BALB/C mice. *Journal of Biomechanics*, 42(7),
7 811–817. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbiomech.2009.01.028>
8 Yang, W., Fung, T. C., Chian, K. S., & Chong, C. K. (2006). 3D Mechanical Properties
9 of the Layered Esophagus: Experiment and Constitutive Model. *Journal of*
10 *Biomechanical Engineering*, 128(6), 899–908. <https://doi.org/10.1115/1.2354206>
11
12






Figure 1: stress-strain curves for uniaxial test


A. 1cm/s. LS: longitudinal static ; CS: circumferential static

B. 10cm/s. LI: longitudinal intermediate ; CI: circumferential intermediate

C. 1m/s. LD: longitudinal dynamic ; CD: circumferential dynamic

The standard deviations are represented on these curves for the rupture points during the tensile tests

A.



B.




Figure 2: stress-strain curves for the 3 protocols under longitudinal and circumferential solicitation.

L: longitudinal and C: circumferential

S: static (1 cm/s) ; I: intermediate (10 cm/s) ; D: dynamic (1 m/s)

The standard deviations are represented on these curves for the rupture points during the tensile tests.






Figure 3: stress-strain curves with or without *taeniae coli* for uniaxial test

A. 1cm/s. LS: longitudinal static

B. 10cm/s. LI: longitudinal intermediate

C. 1m/s. LD: longitudinal dynamic

The standard deviations are represented on these curves for the breaking points during the tensile tests.

Nb of subject	Genre	Nb longitudinal specimens	Nb circumferential specimens	1cm/s	10cm/s	1m/s
6	F	48	24	-	-	72
6	F	48	24	36	36	-
5	F	40	20	40	20	-
4	M	32	16	-	-	48
2	M	16	8	24	-	-
5	M	40	20	20	40	-
28	17 F / 11 M	224	112	120	96	120

Table 1: specimens included in this study. F: female ; M: male.

The number of longitudinal specimens is twice than the circumferential specimens because the longitudinal specimens are taken with and without *taeniae coli*.

	1 cm/s		10 cm/s		1 m/s	
	Longitudinal	Circumferential	Longitudinal	Circumferential	Longitudinal	Circumferential
Modulus of the elastic phase (MPa)	1.76 ± 1.21	0.63 ± 1.25	1.74 ± 1.15	2.14 ± 1.3	3.17 ± 2.05	3.15 ± 1.73
Strain at 1st inflexion (%)	40.45 ± 25.49	61.31 ± 21.96	36.72 ± 19.84	64.63 ± 24.23	27.61 ± 14.44	56.06 ± 15.04
Stress at 1st inflexion (MPa)	0.36 ± 0.21	0.64 ± 0.38	0.35 ± 0.21	0.76 ± 0.38	0.42 ± 0.29	0.93 ± 0.52
Strain at 2nd inflexion (%)	78.75 ± 45.15	81.24 ± 37.54	87.76 ± 51.63	80.76 ± 33.43	55.41 ± 31.66	68.6 ± 21.72
Stress at 2nd inflexion (MPa)	0.46 ± 0.22	0.7 ± 0.35	0.48 ± 0.22	0.84 ± 0.39	0.7 ± 0.34	1.02 ± 0.5

Table 2 : mechanical parameters values for longitudinal and circumferential samples at different loading speed

	p-value	
	Longitudinal	Circumferential
	1cm/s vs 10cm/s vs 1m/s	1cm/s vs 10cm/s vs 1m/s
Modulus of the elastic phase (MPa)	<0.001	<0.001
Strain at 1st inflexion (%)	<0.001	0.45
Stress at 1st inflexion (MPa)	0.31	0.005
Strain at 2nd inflexion (%)	<0.001	0.18
Stress at 2nd inflexion (MPa)	<0.001	0.001

Table 3: statistical analysis of the speed influence on the mechanical behavior for both longitudinal and circumferential samples. Bold p-values are statistically significant

	p-value		
	Longitudinal versus circumferential		
	1 cm/s	10 cm/s	1 m/s
Modulus of the elastic phase (MPa)	0.93	0.1	0.88
Strain at 1st inflexion (%)	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001
Stress at 1st inflexion (MPa)	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001
Strain at 2nd inflexion (%)	0.35	0.74	<0.001
Stress at 2nd inflexion (MPa)	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001

Table 4: statistical analysis of the sample orientation influence on the mechanical behavior at different loading speed. Bold p-values are statistically significant

	Longitudinal					
	1 cm/s		10 cm/s		1 m/s	
	Taeniae	No taeniae	Taeniae	No taeniae	Taeniae	No taeniae
Modulus of the elastic phase (MPa)	1,93 ±1,21	1,60 ±1,20	2,01 ±1,15	1,46 ±1,09	3,41 ±2,3	2,92 ±1,75
Strain at 1st inflexion (%)	35,40 ±28,75	45,38 ±21,06	28,09 ±12,94	45,62 ±21,88	26,59 ±15,10	28,65 ±13,86
Stress at 1st inflexion (MPa)	0,31 ±0,13	0,42 ±0,25	0,31 ±0,18	0,39 ±0,23	0,40 ±0,30	0,43 ±0,28
Strain at 2nd inflexion (%)	91,71 ±52,85	66,10 ±31,99	91,96 ±62,09	83,43 ±38,56	54,30 ±35,67	56,56 ±27,37
Stress at 2nd inflexion (MPa)	0,44 ±0,39	0,48 ±0,25	0,46 ±0,21	0,50 ±0,22	0,68 ±0,20	0,72 ±0,28

Table 5: mechanical parameters values for longitudinal samples with and without taeniae coli at different loading speed

	LS Taeniae versus no taeniae	LI Taeniae versus no taeniae	LD Taeniae versus no taeniae
Modulus of the elastic phase (MPa)	0.07	0.02	0.26
Strain at 1st inflexion (%)	< 0.001	< 0.001	0.19
Stress at 1st inflexion (MPa)	0.04	0.21	0.75
Strain at 2nd inflexion (%)	0.04	0.95	0.78
Stress at 2nd inflexion (MPa)	0.78	0.5	0.14

Table 6: statistical analysis of the taeniae coli influence on the mechanical behavior for the longitudinal specimen at different speed loading. Bold p-values are statistically significant