

# **Effect of density to mechanical properties relationships on simulated vertebral failure load**

Valentin Allard, Jean-Paul Roux, Cyrille Confavreux, François Bermond,

David Mitton, Hélène Follet

## **To cite this version:**

Valentin Allard, Jean-Paul Roux, Cyrille Confavreux, François Bermond, David Mitton, et al.. Effect of density to mechanical properties relationships on simulated vertebral failure load. 46ème Congrès de la Société de Biomécanique, Oct 2021, Saint Etienne, France. pp S308-S309. hal-03479707

## **HAL Id: hal-03479707 <https://hal.science/hal-03479707>**

Submitted on 14 Dec 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.





**Computer Methods in Biomechanics and Biomedical Engineering**

**ISSN: (Print) (Online) Journal homepage:<https://www.tandfonline.com/loi/gcmb20>**

# **ABSTRACTS 46ème Congrès Société Biomécanique**

**To cite this article:** (2021) ABSTRACTS 46ème Congrès Société Biomécanique, Computer Methods in Biomechanics and Biomedical Engineering, 24:sup1, S1-S325, DOI: [10.1080/10255842.2021.1978758](https://www.tandfonline.com/action/showCitFormats?doi=10.1080/10255842.2021.1978758)

**To link to this article:** <https://doi.org/10.1080/10255842.2021.1978758>

© 2021 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group.



3

Published online: 26 Nov 2021.



 $\mathbb S$  [Submit your article to this journal](https://www.tandfonline.com/action/authorSubmission?journalCode=gcmb20&show=instructions)  $\mathbb S$ 





[View related articles](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/mlt/10.1080/10255842.2021.1978758)  $\mathbb{Z}$ 



[View Crossmark data](http://crossmark.crossref.org/dialog/?doi=10.1080/10255842.2021.1978758&domain=pdf&date_stamp=2021-11-26)  $\mathbb{Z}$ 

### <span id="page-2-0"></span>Effect of density to mechanical properties relationships on simulated vertebral failure load

V. Allard<sup>a,b</sup>, J-P. Roux<sup>a</sup>, C. Confavreux<sup>a,c</sup>, F. Bermond<sup>b</sup>, D. Mitton<sup>b</sup> and H. Follet<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Univ Lyon, Université Claude Bernard Lyon 1, INSERM, LYOS UMR 1033, Lyon, France; <sup>b</sup>Univ Lyon, Univ Gustave Eiffel, Universite Claude Bernard Lyon 1, LBMC UMR\_T9406, Lyon, France; <sup>c</sup>Centre Expert des Métastases et d'Oncologie Osseuses (CEMOS), Service de Rhumatologie Sud, Hospices Civils de Lyon, Lyon, France

#### 1. Introduction

Vertebral fractures are frequent with the decrease of bone density due to age [1]. Finite element models of bone failure have been proposed to estimate failure load of single vertebrae including vertebral endplates e.g. [2, 3, 4, 5], but there is no international standard for these Finite Element (FE) models. Especially, many density to mechanical properties

Table 1. Density to Young's modulus relationships used in the current models ( $\rho_{ash} = 0.6 * \rho_{app}$ )

<b>Studies</b>	E (MPa)
Kopperdahl et al. (2002) [7]	$3230 \times \rho_{OCT}$ - 34,7
Prado et al. (2021) [8]	10494 $\times$ $\rho_{app}^{1,56}$
Morgan et al. (2003) [9]	4730 $\times$ $\rho_{app}^{1,56}$
Keller (1994) [10]	1890 $\times$ $\rho_{ash}^{1,92}$

relationships can be found in the literature and none has been significantly proven to be better than another to predict failure load on the same dataset. The aim of this study is to compare different density to mechanical properties relationships using a tetrahedral model using the same elastoplastic model found in literature [2, 3, 4].

#### 2. Methods

Seventeen L3 vertebrae without posterior arch (9 females, 8 males,  $75.7 \pm 11.2$  y.o.) were mechanically tested under compression until failure as described in [7]. Image acquisitions before failure were performed using a High-Resolution peripheral Quantitative Computed Tomography (XtremeCT, Scanco Medical AG, Bassersdorf, Switzerland,) with an isotropic voxel size of 82  $\mu$ m.

For the modelling purpose, quadratic tetrahedron mesh were created by down sampling scan to 984  $\mu$ m voxel size before segmentation done on 3D slicer (v4.10.2). A hydroxyapatite phantom composed of several known densities was used to calibrate grey levels into bone densities. Average grey levels for each element were assigned using Bonemat (v3.2, Bologna, Italy). Then the same relationships as the ones proposed in [7, 8, 9, 10] (Table 1) were used to attribute Young's modulus to each element leading to 4 different models for each vertebra. Specific yield stress was computed using a constant yield strain of 0.7% and the Young's modulus of each element. Perfect plasticity was given to each element once they reached their yield stress. Each vertebra was compressed



Figure 1. Simulated versus experimental failure load for different laws of the current study (in red) (a) [7]; (b) [8], (c) [9], (d) [10], in comparison to the literature in black (square) [2], (circle) [3], (diamond) [4], (triangle) [5].

<span id="page-3-0"></span>

Figure 2. Differences between numerical and experimental failure loads, mean  $\pm$  SD, for studies in the literature (left) in comparison to the current study using four conversion's laws (right).

to reach a total strain of 1.9% according to failure criteria in [2, 3, 4]. Non-linear finite element analysis was performed with ANSYS (v19R1; Houston, USA).

#### 3. Results and discussion

Simulated against experimental failure loads are presented in [Figure 1.](#page-2-0) Scatter plots for the current study in red are similar to literature in black for  $(a, b, c)$  except for  $(d)$ .

Figure 2 shows the difference between simulated and experimental failure load (mean ± SD) for the different relationships. Models using laws of Kopperdahl et al. (2002) and Morgan et al. (2003) show a significantly smaller SD than the ones with Keller (1994) and Prado et al. (2020) (Figure 2). Furthermore, the law of Kopperdahl et al. (2002) displays a lower mean than the one of Morgan et al. (2003). The choice of Kopperdahl et al. (2002) [7] relationship is confirmed by the current study in comparison to studies [2, 3, 4, 5] using relationship from [7] as well.

The model proposed by Choisne et al. (2018) model displays a lower mean and SD of the difference between the simulated and experimental failure load than the current model using relationship from [7] as well. These discrepancies might be due to the following reasons. Poisson's coefficient in [5] is 0.4 while 0.3 was used in the current study; the failure criteria is based on total strain of a linear elastic perfectly plastic model while for [5] it was defined by a volume exceeding its yield strain in a linear elastic model. In addition, the mechanical properties attribution to elements and the number of materials considered for the simulation has not been detailed in literature which could induce uncertainties [11].

#### 4. Conclusions

From this study, we can conclude that the Kopperdahl et al. (2002) relationship should be considered to convert density to mechanical properties in model assessing failure load of a single vertebra. However, some models using the same relationship display better results and further studies should explore the influence of the operator and the uncertainties of the experimental data.

#### Acknowledgements

This project has received funding from LabEx PRIMES (ANR-11-LABX-0063) and MSDAvenir.

#### Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

#### **References**

- Silverman SL. 1992. The clinical consequences of vertebral compression fracture. Bone Osteoporot Verteb Fract. 13: S27–S31.
- Crawford et al. 2003. Finite element models predict in vitro vertebral body compressive strength better than quantitative computed tomography. Bone 33:744–750.
- Buckley, J. M., Loo, K. and Motherway, J. (2007) 'Comparison of quantitative computed tomography-based measures in predicting vertebral compressive strength. Bone. 40(3):767–774.
- Wang et al. 2012. Prediction of new clinical vertebral fractures in elderly men using finite element analysis of CT scans. J Bone Mineral Res. 27:808–816.
- Choisne et al. 2018. Vertebral strength prediction from Bi-Planar dual energy x-ray absorptiometry under anterior compressive force using a finite element model: an in vitro study. J Mech Behav Biomed Mater. 87:190–196.
- Wegrzyn et al. 2011. Determinants of the mechanical behavior of human lumbar vertebrae after simulated mild fracture. J Bone Miner Res. 26:739–746.
- Kopperdahl et al. [2002.](#page-2-0) Quantitative computed tomography estimates of the mechanical properties of human vertebral trabecular bone. J Orthopaed Res. 20:801–805.
- Prado et al. 2020. Density-dependent material and failure criteria equations highly affect the accuracy and precision of qct/fea-based predictions of osteoporotic vertebral fracture properties. Ann Biomed Eng. 9(2):663–672.
- Morgan et al. [2003](#page-2-0). Trabecular bone modulus–density relationships depend on anatomic site. J Biomech. 36: 897–904.
- Keller, T.S. [1994.](#page-2-0) Predicting the compressive mechanical behavior of bone. J Biomech. 27:1159–1168.
- Zannoni, C., Mantovani, R. and Viceconti, M. 1999. Material properties assignment to finite element models of bone structures: a new method. Med Eng Phys. 20(10):735–740.

KEYWORDS Vertebra; FEA; failure; numerical; comparison **A** helene.follet@inserm.fr