



HAL
open science

Guidelines for Assessment of Bone Density and Microarchitecture In Vivo Using High-Resolution Peripheral Quantitative Computed Tomography

D.E. Whittier, S.K. Boyd, A.J. Burghardt, Julien Paccou, A. Ghasem-Zadeh, R. Chapurlat, K. Engelke, M.L. Bouxsein

► **To cite this version:**

D.E. Whittier, S.K. Boyd, A.J. Burghardt, Julien Paccou, A. Ghasem-Zadeh, et al.. Guidelines for Assessment of Bone Density and Microarchitecture In Vivo Using High-Resolution Peripheral Quantitative Computed Tomography. *Osteoporosis International*, 2020, 31 (9), pp.1607-1627. 10.1007/s00198-020-05438-5 . hal-04444876

HAL Id: hal-04444876

<https://hal.science/hal-04444876v1>

Submitted on 12 Feb 2024

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.

1 Title: **Guidelines for Assessment of Bone Density and Microarchitecture *In Vivo* Using**
2 **High-Resolution Peripheral Quantitative Computed Tomography**

3
4 Running Title: HR-pQCT Guidelines
5

6 Danielle E Whittier¹, Steven K Boyd¹, Andrew J Burghardt², Julien Paccou³, Ali Ghasem-
7 Zadeh⁴, Roland Chapurlat⁵, Klaus Engelke^{6,7}, Mary L. Bouxsein⁸

8
9 **Running affiliation list:**

10 ¹McCaig Institute for Bone and Joint Health and Department of Radiology, University of Calgary, Calgary
11 AB, Canada.

12 ²Department of Radiology and Biomedical Imaging, University of California, San Francisco, CA, USA.

13 ³ Univ. Lille, CHU Lille, MABlab UR 4490, Department of Rheumatology, 59000 Lille, France.

14 ⁴Departments of Endocrinology and Medicine, Austin Health, The University of Melbourne, Melbourne,
15 Australia.

16 ⁵INSERM UMR 1033, Lyon, France and Université de Lyon, Lyon, France; Hôpital Edouard Herriot,
17 Hospice Civils de Lyon, Lyon, France.

18 ⁶Department of Medicine 3, FAU University Erlangen-Nürnberg and Universitätsklinikum Erlangen,
19 Erlangen, Germany.

20 ⁷Bioclinica, Inc., Hamburg, Germany.

21 ⁸Center for Advanced Orthopedic Studies, Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center, and Harvard Medical
22 School, Boston, MA, USA.

23
24
25 **DISCLOSURES**

26 Dr. Boyd is a co-founder and co-owner of Numerics88 Solutions Inc, creator of finite element
27 package FAIM. Dr. Ghasem-Zadeh is one of the inventors of the StrAx algorithm. Dr. Burghardt
28 is a consultant and served on an Advisory Board to Mereo BioPharma.

29
30 **Address for correspondence:**

31 Danielle Whittier
32 McCaig Institute for Bone and Joint Health
33 University of Calgary
34 Room HRIC 3AC60
35 3280 Hospital Dr NW
36 Calgary, Alberta, Canada
37 T2N 4Z6
38 Phone: 587-582-1640
39 Email: danielle.whittier1@ucalgary.ca

40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63

ABSTRACT

The application of high-resolution peripheral quantitative computed tomography (HR-pQCT) to assess bone microarchitecture has grown rapidly since its introduction in 2005. As the use of HR-pQCT for clinical research continues to grow, there is an urgent need to form a consensus on imaging and analysis methodologies so that studies can be appropriately compared. In addition, with the recent introduction of the second-generation HR-pQCT, which has differences in scan region, resolution, and morphological measurement techniques, there is a need for guidelines on appropriate reporting of results and considerations as the field adopts newer systems. This article addresses the need for standardization of HR-pQCT imaging techniques and terminology, provides guidance on interpretation and reporting of results, and discusses unresolved issues in the field. Specifically, we provide an overview and discussion of 1) standardized protocol for imaging distal radius and tibia sites using HR-pQCT, with the importance of quality control and operator training discussed, 2) standardized terminology and recommendations on reporting results, 3) factors influencing accuracy and precision error, with considerations for longitudinal and multi-center study designs, and finally 4) comparison between scanner generations and other high-resolution CT systems.

KEYWORDS

high-resolution peripheral quantitative computed tomography, guidelines, bone microarchitecture, imaging protocol

63

64 **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

65 High-resolution peripheral quantitative computed tomography (HR-pQCT) is a non-invasive,
66 low-radiation approach for assessing compartment-specific volumetric bone mineral density and
67 bone microarchitecture in the peripheral skeleton, most commonly the distal radius and tibia.
68 Until the introduction of the first HR-pQCT device in 2005 [1], assessment of human bone
69 microarchitecture was limited to histomorphometric analysis of iliac crest biopsies or micro-CT
70 of post mortem bone biopsies. The ability to investigate bone microarchitecture *in vivo* has
71 provided novel insights into differences due to age, sex and ethnicity [2-10]; changes due to
72 disease [11-14]; response to nutritional and pharmacologic treatments [15-19]; the impact of
73 physical activity [20-23], and deficits associated with increased fracture risk [24]. The use of
74 HR-pQCT for clinical research studies has grown rapidly in the past decade, and as its
75 application continues to expand, there is a need to establish recommendations for best practices
76 and to discuss unresolved issues related to its use in clinical studies. Further, with the recent
77 introduction of a second-generation HR-pQCT device with improved resolution and longer scan
78 region, it is important to highlight the differences and comparability between scanner
79 generations, future HR-pQCT devices, and alternative systems, such as cone-beam CT.

80

81 Thus, the objective of this manuscript is to provide guidance on the technical aspects of HR-
82 pQCT for use in the clinical setting, including best practices for acquisition and analysis of
83 scans, as well as provide guidance on presentation and interpretation of results. The work
84 presented here is a product of a joint IOF-ASBMR-ECTS working group, which met in person

85 and by teleconference over several years to produce this document. The final document was
86 approved by the IOF, ASBMR and ECTS.

87

88 **2.0 OVERVIEW OF HR-pQCT TECHNIQUES**

89 The following sections describe the steps involved in the conventional evaluation of bone
90 mineral density and microarchitecture *in vivo* using HR-pQCT. Each section provides best
91 practices and considerations when conducting clinical studies. In most cases the first-generation
92 HR-pQCT (XtremeCT, Scanco Medical AG, Brütisellen, Switzerland) is used as a standard for
93 outlining each step, as it is widely used today. However these practices are intended to be
94 applicable broadly to other HR-pQCT scanners, namely the second-generation HR-pQCT
95 (XtremeCT II, Scanco Medical AG, Brütisellen, Switzerland), as well as future devices that may
96 be developed by other manufacturers. The basic steps include image acquisition, image
97 processing, image analysis and reporting of results.

98

99 **2.1 Imaging Principles and Radiation Dose**

100 HR-pQCT provides a method to non-destructively and three-dimensionally evaluate bone
101 mineral density and microarchitecture at high resolutions. The benefit of HR-pQCT over
102 comparable micro-CT systems is the ability to obtain images of human extremities *in vivo* due to
103 the relatively larger gantry size, at the compromise of somewhat reduced resolution. The basic
104 imaging principles are based on the interaction of ionizing radiation (i.e. X-rays) with matter. As
105 an X-ray beam passes through matter it is attenuated in relation to its density, with denser
106 materials such as bone, resulting in greater attenuation than low-density materials, such as soft
107 tissue. In computed tomography, X-ray attenuation data is acquired at multiple projections

108 around the specimen, which allows for a 3D image to be reconstructed [25]. The effective
109 radiation dose from a standard HR-pQCT scan at the distal radius or tibia is 3-5 μSv depending
110 on the scanner generation [26]. In comparison to other common medical imaging techniques, this
111 is considered a low radiation dose procedure. For example, a hip scan using dual-energy X-ray
112 absorptiometry (DXA), commonly used for monitoring osteoporosis, has an effective dose of
113 approximately 9 μSv , a standard chest X-ray has an effective dose of approximately 100 μSv ,
114 and a hip CT scan has an approximate effective dose of 286 – 506 μSv [27, 28].

115

116 **2.2 Image Acquisition**

117 Positioning and Selection of Scan Region

118 Properly positioning the patient's limb in the scanner and identifying the appropriate scan region
119 is fundamental to all imaging protocols. The limb should be immobilized to minimize motion,
120 and properly positioned by using a padded, anatomically formed carbon fiber cast provided by
121 the manufacturer. If not scanning bi-laterally, the non-dominant limb should be scanned, unless
122 prior fracture, surgery, or metal is present, in which case the contralateral side should be
123 scanned.

124

125 Once the limb is placed into the gantry of the scanner, a 2D scout view is obtained to select the
126 region of interest for the 3D measurement (this process takes approximately 2-4 minutes per
127 limb). There are then two approaches used to define the region where the scan is acquired: 1)
128 fixed offset distance and 2) relative offset distance, also called the %-of-length offset. For the
129 fixed offset method, the operator places a reference line at the inflection point on the endplate of
130 the distal radius or tibial plafond, and the scan region begins 9.5 mm and 22.5 mm proximal to

131 the reference line for the radius and tibia, respectively (Figure 1). The scan region then extends
132 proximally from this point by 9.02 mm (110 slices) for first-generation scanners and 10.20 mm
133 (168 slices) for second-generation scanners [1, 29]. This approach has been implemented in early
134 studies using the second-generation HR-pQCT [29, 30], however due to the increased scan
135 region, an additional 1.0 mm is acquired proximally, a predominantly cortical region. As a result,
136 the manufacturer-recommended fixed offset from the reference line is 9.0 mm and 22.0 mm
137 proximal to the reference line of the radius and tibia, respectively [26]. This difference positions
138 the scan region so that it aligns with the center of the first-generation scan region, extending an
139 additional 0.5 mm in both the proximal and distal region.

140

141 In the %-of-length approach, the operator measures the limb length and then selects a certain
142 percent of the limb length, depending on the specific protocol, as the center point for the scan
143 region. In this approach, the reference line placement is identical as above for the tibia, but for
144 the radius the reference line is placed at the proximal margin of the radial head (Figure 1) [31,
145 32].

146

147 The limitation of a %-of-length measure is that it requires an accurate external physical limb
148 length measurement prior to scanning, and it assumes that bone regions (epiphysis, metaphysis
149 and diaphysis) are proportional to limb length. The ulnar length is recommended as a surrogate
150 for radial length because it is more reliable to identify the distal and proximal ends of the ulna.
151 The ulnar length should be taken as the Euclidean distance between a horizontal surface on
152 which the elbow is rested and the styloid process at the wrist. The tibial length should be taken as
153 the Euclidean distance between the tibial plateau at the knee and the medial tibial malleolus at

154 the ankle [33]. For a detailed description of measurement methods, we recommend the
155 guidelines provided by Bonaretti and colleagues [33]. If using a %-of-length offset, for adults we
156 recommend the scan position be centered at 4.0% offset from the proximal margin of the
157 radiocarpal joint surface of the distal radius, and 7.3% offset from the tibial plafond (Figure 1).
158 These relative offsets align, on average, with the standard fixed-length offset of the first-
159 generation scanner. Centering the scan offset in this way yields equivalent variability in distal
160 and proximal directions, minimizing bias introduced by differences in relative length of the
161 measured limb [34]. In longitudinal studies in adults, limb length should be measured at baseline,
162 and the same length measurement used at follow-up visits in lieu of repeating the limb length
163 measurement at each follow-up time point.

164

165 To date, most HR-pQCT studies in adults have employed the fixed offset distance approach,
166 though this method is likely to confound the interpretation of results for studies that compare
167 groups of differing heights (and therefore limb length), such as comparisons by sex and
168 race/ethnicity, and even age, due to secular trends in limb length [34-37]. This is because a fixed
169 distance offset from an anatomic reference results in measurements that are acquired at a
170 relatively “too” distal location in individuals with long limbs and relatively “too” proximal
171 position in individuals with short limbs. These differences cannot necessarily be made equivalent
172 by statistical adjustment for height or limb length [34]. However, while the bone
173 microarchitecture in the metaphyseal region is highly variable as a function of limb length [35],
174 the difference in scan location between a relative (%-of-length) and a fixed offset approach is
175 generally small. Nevertheless, an individual with a stature that is different from the population

176 mean will have some measurement bias exceeding typical motion-induced errors due to
177 positioning from a fixed offset [34, 38].

178

179 Another form of measurement error that arises from reference line placement is operator-driven
180 variability. Bonaretti and colleagues reported that intra-operator variability in scan positioning
181 corresponds to up to 4% of the total scan length, while inter-operator positioning variability is up
182 to 7.5% of total scan length [39]. This translates to significant measurement precision error, often
183 exceeding the precision error attributable to subject motion. Standardized training for scan
184 positioning, described by Bonaretti and colleagues, can reduce operator positioning error by
185 approximately half [39].

186

187 In addition to the conventional scan region, it is possible to acquire scans more proximal to the
188 standard position in order to investigate predominantly cortical bone, either as a proximal subset
189 of slices extracted from a standard distal scan [40], an additional contiguous scan [41], or an
190 independent scan proximal to the standard position [23, 42, 43]. Accordingly, there is some
191 evidence that more proximal locations along the radius and tibia provide greater sensitivity to
192 cortical bone changes. The second-generation HR-pQCT allows greater access to proximal scan
193 positions at the forearm and tibia, and it is now possible to develop diaphyseal scan protocol
194 centered at 30% of the ulnar/tibial length using the standard leg and forearm casts, and up to 66%
195 of ulnar/tibial length using custom casts. Acquisition of scans at these regions allows for
196 additional measurement of cortical bone, muscle and fat, analogous to lower-resolution pQCT
197 [44, 45], however development of standardized scan acquisition and analysis protocols is
198 ongoing.

199

200 In summary, it is recommended that research centers transition to a standardized protocol in
201 future study designs, using the %-of-length offset scan region described above. However, given
202 the historical use of a fixed offset scan region, there exists valuable cross-sectional and
203 longitudinal datasets worldwide based upon this scan protocol. Consequently, the use of the
204 fixed offset is an acceptable alternative, should studies need to compare results to historical
205 databases. Due to differences across research centers, it is important to report in all publications
206 how the scan region was selected, including choice of reference line placement, type of offset
207 (fixed vs. relative), distance of offset, and total scan length.

208

209 *Scan Acquisition & Motion Artifacts*

210 Scan acquisition varies depending on the *in vivo* measurement protocol, which is scanner and
211 study specific. The standard protocol and scanner specifications for the commonly used HR-
212 pQCT scanners, XtremeCT and XtremeCT II, are summarized in Table 1.

213

214 Scanned images should be inspected visually for motion artifacts, especially at the distal radius
215 due to higher prevalence of motion at this location. Subject motion during image acquisition can
216 lead to degraded image quality and introduce error, particularly for trabecular and cortical
217 microarchitecture [38, 46, 47]. To determine what degree of motion is acceptable, several
218 grading scales have been developed, where the most commonly used is a 5-level motion grading
219 scale (best score is 1, worst score is 5) that aims to differentiate motion on severity of artifacts,
220 summarized in Figure 2 [38]. However, even with a standardized scoring system, motion scoring
221 remains subjective, and operator agreement has shown to remain only moderate, even with

222 intensive training [46-48]. Automatic techniques analyzing CT projections have been suggested
223 to provide a standardized approach [47], however these procedures have not yet been integrated
224 into HR-pQCT protocols. Until automated techniques are integrated, the 5-level grading scale is
225 recommended, with scoring done consistently by the same operator where possible. At the time
226 of scanning, if motion artifacts with a score of three or more are observed, then it is
227 recommended the scan be repeated.

228

229 In general, density-based measures are less sensitive to motion artifacts than structure-based
230 measures. It is acceptable to include all outcome variables from scans with a motion score of
231 three or less, as precision error is not substantially compromised for density (<1% error),
232 microarchitecture (<5% error), and biomechanical parameters, such as estimated failure load
233 (<4% error) [47]. Scans with a motion score of four may be acceptable for density-based
234 measurements, but should not be used for trabecular and cortical microarchitecture or
235 biomechanical assessment. Scans with a motion artifact score of 5 should not be used.

236

237 **2.3 Image Processing**

238 Segmentation of the cortical and trabecular bone compartments is necessary for density and
239 structural analysis. Over the past decades automated and semi-automated methods have been
240 developed to improve accurate and repeatable extraction of the cortical and trabecular
241 compartments.

242

243 *Standard vs. Extended Cortical Analysis*

244 In the first-generation HR-pQCT standard analysis, the operator guides a semi-automated slice-
245 by-slice contouring process to identify the periosteal boundary of the bone, thereby extracting the
246 bone region from surrounding soft tissue (Figure 3a). The bone region is extracted using a
247 Laplace-Hamming filter and global threshold cut-off of 400 permille (‰) to generate the
248 segmented bone volume be used for proceeding morphological analysis (Figure 3b). Delineation
249 of the cortical and trabecular compartments is done automatically using a filter and threshold-
250 based algorithm, where the original greyscale bone region is smoothed using a high-Gaussian
251 weighted filter, then a cut-off of 160 permille (‰) is used to identify voxels that belong to
252 cortical bone [49]. However, this method is insufficient for extraction of the cortex when it is
253 thin and/or highly porous (Figure 3c) [50, 51] or when trabecular structure is rich and well
254 connected to the cortex. Thus, an alternate algorithm, the so-called “extended cortical analysis”
255 which uses a dual-threshold segmentation technique, has been incorporated to provide a more
256 robust extraction of the cortical and trabecular compartments [52, 53]. It involves a two-step
257 algorithm to automatically identify the periosteal and then the endocortical surface. In the first
258 step, a connectivity filter is applied to the previously generated segmented bone volume to create
259 a mask of the whole bone region. In the second step, a dilation-erosion operation is applied to the
260 background (i.e. marrow cavity) of the original segmented bone volume to remove trabeculae,
261 thus leaving a mask of the cortical compartment (Figure 3d) [52]. Once the compartments are
262 defined the extended cortical analysis allows for assessment of cortical porosity and cortical
263 tissue mineral density, as well as a direct measure of cortical thickness, described in detail in the
264 later sections. With deployment of the second-generation HR-pQCT scanner, the dual-threshold
265 technique is the default segmentation method, and the image filtration and segmentation
266 thresholds have been adjusted to account for the increased resolution, summarized in Table 1.

267

268 Manual Correction

269 Although the dual-threshold technique improves segmentation of the cortical and trabecular
270 compartments, errors can persist. It is imperative that operators check the periosteal and
271 endocortical contours visually for errors and apply manual corrections as necessary. Omitting
272 corrections of the automatically generated contours leads to greater accuracy errors arising in
273 very low or high density bone, resulting in a systematic bias with certain parameters, such as
274 cortical density and thickness [54]. This has potential to skew results of studies that investigate
275 osteoporotic or highly active populations, therefore we advise that contours be checked and
276 manually corrected [55].

277

278 Drawbacks to manual corrections include the increased time spent visually inspecting images
279 and the potential for increased precision error that arises when manual corrections are applied
280 [56, 57]. In particular, the endocortical contour can be highly subjective in low-density bone, and
281 human interpretation by one or more operators introduces precision error. Nevertheless, inter-
282 operator variability introduces less error than the accuracy error resulting from uncorrected
283 contours [57]. Short-term precision between using corrected versus uncorrected contours is
284 comparable [56]. If manual corrections are applied, it is essential the operator has a suitable level
285 of training to minimize precision error [55].

286

287 **2.3 Image Analysis**

288 The defined cortical and trabecular compartments are the basis for measuring density and
289 microarchitecture properties. Table 2 and 3 provide a summary of common parameters, units,

290 and methods of measurement from HR-pQCT modalities as have been previously described in
291 the literature [1, 29].

292

293 Trabecular microarchitecture

294 Trabecular microarchitecture is assessed from the segmented image, however, the spatial
295 resolution of the first-generation HR-pQCT limits the ability to measure trabecular thickness,
296 and as a result some of the trabecular morphology measures are derived using 2D stereologic
297 methods rather than directly measured. Specifically, trabecular bone volume fraction
298 (Tb.BV/TV) is computed as the ratio of trabecular bone mineral density (Tb.BMD) and 1200 mg
299 HA/cm³, which is assumed to be the density of fully mineralized bone (Table 3). Alternatively,
300 trabecular number (Tb.N) is directly measured using a ridge extraction technique [49].
301 Trabecular separation (Tb.Sp) and trabecular thickness (Tb.Th) are then derived from these two
302 parameters assuming a plate-like morphology, as described in Table 3 [58].

303

304 In contrast, the second-generation HR-pQCT has sufficient spatial resolution to “directly”
305 measure Tb.BV/TV, Tb.Th and Tb.Sp. Accordingly, Tb.BV/TV is defined as the ratio of voxels
306 in the mineralized bone phase to the total number of voxels in the trabecular compartment. Tb.Sp
307 and Tb.Th are measured using the distance transformation method, where 3D distances are
308 estimated by fitting maximal spheres inside the structure (or void space in the case of Tb.Sp) and
309 taking the average sphere diameter as the mean thickness [59].

310

311 In addition to common morphometric indices, additional parameters have been developed to
312 estimate the level of anisotropy in trabecular microarchitecture from HR-pQCT images. These

313 non-metric indices include the structure model index (SMI) [58], connectivity density (Conn.D)
314 [60], and mean intercept length (MIL) [61], outlined in Table 3. Another non-standard analysis
315 includes individual trabecular bone segmentation (ITS)-based morphological analysis [62]. This
316 approach performs a complete volumetric decomposition of individual trabecular plates and rods
317 to characterize bone morphology and orientation of trabecular bone. These non-standard analyses
318 are susceptible to resolution effects and demand cautious interpretation.

319

320 Cortical Microarchitecture

321 Primary cortical microarchitecture parameters include the cortical thickness (Ct.Th) and cortical
322 porosity (Ct.Po). The standard analysis for first-generation HR-pQCT derives Ct.Th from the
323 mean cortical volume divided by the periosteal surface area. However, in the extended cortical
324 analysis, the cortical thickness is directly measured using distance transformation methods once
325 the cortical compartment has been extracted using the dual-threshold segmentation technique.
326 Measurement of Ct.Po is limited by spatial resolution of the HR-pQCT images, as Haversian
327 canals can range in size from 30 to 350 μm . However, it is estimated that pores smaller than 90
328 μm contribute to only 5–8% of the total pore volume [63]. Measurement of Ct.Po is improved
329 with the second-generation of HR-pQCT due to increased resolution [30].

330

331 Two methods currently exist to assess Ct.Po: 1) the threshold-based approach [52, 53]
332 implemented in the XtremeCT analysis software provided by Scanco, and 2) the density-based
333 approach implemented in the StrAx1.0 software [40]. The threshold-based approach is a fully
334 automated segmentation contouring approach integrated with extended cortical analysis method.
335 Briefly, intracortical porosity (Ct.Po) is calculated as the ratio of the total pore volume within the

336 cortical compartment to the sum of the cortical volume [53]. This method has the advantage of
337 segmenting the individual pores from the scan, which allows for structural information to be
338 measured, including mean cortical pore diameter (Ct.Po.Dm), however it is limited to capturing
339 only pores within the limits of resolution and pores that do not intersect the periosteal or
340 endocortical surfaces.

341
342 Alternatively, the density-based approach segments bone into a compact-appearing cortex,
343 transitional zone, and trabecular compartment, described in detail elsewhere by Zebaze and
344 colleagues [40]. In brief, Ct.Po is quantified in each of these regions by assuming that fully
345 mineralized bone has a density between 1000-1200 mg HA/cm³. Voxels with a density lower
346 than 1000 mg HA/cm³ indicate that some ratio of the voxel, proportional to its density, is
347 composed of void space (i.e. pores). Porosity is quantified by estimating the ratio of void space
348 present in each voxel, and taking the mean across all voxels in the compartment of interest [40].
349 The density-based method of assessing Ct.Po aims to capture pores with diameters below the
350 spatial resolution of the scanner, however relies on the assumption of a fixed bone tissue mineral
351 density, and is susceptible to image noise and beam hardening.

352
353 A comparison of methods for *in vivo* assessment of Ct.Po revealed that both approaches are well
354 correlated with gold standard porosity measurements from synchrotron radiation micro-
355 computed tomography (SR μ CT), however each method has inherent systematic errors. In
356 compact-appearing cortical bone specimens, the threshold-based approach underestimates Ct.Po
357 by 3 to 11% as it does not capture smaller pores, whereas the density-based approach
358 overestimates Ct.Po by 6 to 21% due to misclassifying image noise and artifacts as void space

359 [63]. Both methods are widely-adopted measures of Ct.Po, but due to methodologic differences,
360 they cannot be directly compared and study methodologies should clearly state which method is
361 used.

362

363 **2.4 Finite Element Analysis**

364 Morphometric parameters are numerous and provide valuable insight describing the structure of
365 a bone, but interpretation of these data can be complex. Finite element (FE) analysis is a
366 computer modeling technique that, when coupled with HR-pQCT, provides a non-invasive
367 approach to intrinsically account for the complex bone structure and estimate bone strength [64].

368 The fundamental requirements for an FE model are selecting the bone geometry, assigning
369 material properties and defining boundary conditions to simulate loading conditions, typically
370 determined through validation studies using experimental loading tests of cadaveric bones [65-
371 67]. The application of FE procedures to HR-pQCT images has been explored in depth and is
372 often referred to as micro-FE (μ FE). Most HR-pQCT-based μ FE models to date have defined
373 constitutive properties that are linear, with uniform elastic material properties. However, non-
374 linear models and density-based elastic material properties have also been implemented [65, 68-
375 70]. Here we outline key considerations and recommendations when choosing a μ FE procedure,
376 with a specific focus on linear, homogeneous models for standard HR-pQCT scan regions.

377

378 *Model Generation and Boundary Conditions*

379 Geometry is determined from the segmented HR-pQCT image by converting it into an FE mesh,
380 most commonly using a voxel-by-voxel conversion where each voxel is converted into a cubic
381 hexahedral finite element [71]. First-generation HR-pQCT images typically result in FE models

382 with 1-9 million elements [64] and second-generation in the range of 2-24 million elements,
383 depending on the scan site and bone volume, resulting in a direct representation of the bone
384 microarchitecture (Figure 4).

385

386 Boundary conditions are selected to simulate a loading condition. Standard HR-pQCT scans are
387 best suited for simulating a compression test along the z-axis (longitudinal axis), defined
388 perpendicular to scan cross-section. One end is assigned a fixed constraint in the z-direction and
389 a fixed displacement is applied to the opposite end resulting in 1% apparent strain. If the fixed
390 constraint surface includes conditions that prevent lateral expansion during compression, the test
391 is referred to as axial compression, otherwise it is termed a uniaxial compression. The results of a
392 compression test will differ slightly depending on whether axial or uniaxial boundary conditions
393 are applied, but they are strongly linearly associated ($r^2 > 0.99$), and methods have been
394 developed to allow harmonization by applying a linear correction factor [72] .

395

396 Material properties must also be defined for the model, including Poisson's ratio and the elastic
397 modulus (also called the tissue modulus or Young's modulus). A Poisson's ratio of 0.3 is
398 conventionally used for all μ FE models. However, selection of the elastic modulus requires
399 closer consideration as it ultimately defines the stiffness of the material under tension or
400 compression. The most common approach is to assign a uniform elastic modulus, previously
401 determined through direct comparison to experimental loading tests, to all bone tissue in the
402 model. A summary of common elastic modulus values (and their respective boundary
403 conditions) for first- and second-generation HR-pQCT scanners are summarized in Table 4. The
404 modulus utilized for a given scanner generation will not yield the same results if applied to

405 another generation, as the elastic modulus is dependent on both the mesh resolution and
406 segmentation protocol, which impact the bone structure extracted from the image. Hence, for
407 second-generation HR-pQCT, an elastic modulus of 8,748 MPa has been determined from *in*
408 *silico* conversion of elastic modulus validated for first-generation HR-pQCT [72], and 10,000
409 MPa has been determined from direct comparison to experimental loading tests [66].

410 FE Outcomes

411 Table 5 provides a summary of common outcomes from μ FE models, with proposed
412 nomenclature and units. The most relevant primary outcomes include stiffness [kN/mm] and
413 yield load, commonly referred to as estimated failure load [kN]. A linear, elastic FE model
414 intrinsically cannot directly measure failure load, however non-linear approaches that are more
415 appropriate for strength measurement are computationally demanding, and therefore not often
416 employed in high-resolution models [65, 73]. Instead, a failure criterion often used with linear
417 FE models assumes bone yields when a specified volume of bone tissue (critical volume)
418 exceeds a specified critical strain. This is often referred to as the “Pistoia criterion”, and a typical
419 set of yield parameters used assumes failure load can be estimated when the critical strain of
420 0.7% is exceeded for 2% for the bone tissue [74]; however, a complete table of parameters used
421 is provided (Table 4). Use of this criterion to HR-pQCT-derived μ FE models led to strong
422 correlations ($r^2 = 0.73-0.95$) with experimentally-measured whole bone strength for the first-
423 generation HR-pQCT [65, 75, 76], although some have suggested a 7.5% critical volume and
424 0.7% critical strain are more appropriate [75]. For the second-generation HR-pQCT, where scan
425 volume and resolution differ, appropriate criterion need to be adjusted [72]. A recent study by
426 Arias-Moreno and colleagues determined that the appropriate failure criterion for the second-
427 generation HR-pQCT should be a critical strain of 1.0% and critical volume of 5% under axial

428 loading conditions [66]. Regardless of the specific parameters chosen, these variations of criteria
429 provide highly comparable correlations with experimental bone strength, and have been shown
430 to be suitable predictors for failure load, but absolute values obtained using different conditions
431 should not be directly compared. μ FE-estimated failure load at the distal tibia scan site has been
432 shown to be well correlated to bone strength at the femoral neck and vertebra [77].

433

434 A common misconception is that μ FE models predict failure load in a fall condition; however,
435 boundary conditions in that scenario are prohibitively difficult to estimate with an enormous
436 range of loading possibilities. Instead, standardized axial or uniaxial μ FE tests of bone strength
437 provide a reproducible approach that gives insight into the effect of bone microarchitecture on
438 estimated bone strength. In addition to failure load, there are several other μ FE model outputs
439 that provide additional insight into the biomechanical properties of bone, details are provided in
440 Table 5.

441

442 In summary, for first-generation HR-pQCT, the choice of boundary conditions, elastic modulus,
443 and yield criterion have varied among studies, but harmonization techniques are available to
444 compare results using the different configurations summarized in Table 4 [72]. For the second-
445 generation HR-pQCT we recommend using an elastic modulus of 10,000 MPa with axial
446 boundary conditions, and yield criterion of 1.0% critical strain and 5% critical volume. However,
447 if this is not feasible, harmonization methods like those used for the first-generation HR-pQCT
448 should be developed and used to compare results across studies [72]. As future systems become
449 available it will be necessary to determine the appropriate elastic modulus and yield criterion

450 through *in silico* conversion or direct validation for that particular system, ideally so that
451 comparisons across HR-pQCT technologies are possible.

452

453 FE Solvers

454 Due to the resolution of the images, μ FE models tend to be very large, on the order of 10's of
455 millions of degrees of freedom, and thus the models pose a challenge for traditional commercial
456 FE solvers. Fortunately, this problem has been overcome by the use of specialized solvers that
457 are designed to leverage the fact that each element in the model (i.e. voxel) has the same
458 hexahedral shape [78]. Scanco Medical provides built-in linear elastic FE software for the
459 XtremeCT and XtremeCT II scanners, with libraries of pre-defined tests that may be applied.
460 Specialized third-party FE-solvers are also available that allow for faster computation time and
461 flexibility, including commercial software (e.g. Numerics88 Solutions) as well as open sourced
462 versions (e.g. ParFE).

463

464 Assumptions

465 It is important to be aware that μ FE, carries assumptions about the tissue behaviour. For
466 instance, in μ FE models bone is assumed to be isotropic and behave purely linearly, both of
467 which are only approximations of the true case. If applied to atypical bone, this could possibly
468 result in erroneous assumptions about bone strength in certain circumstances (e.g. osteogenesis
469 imperfecta, fracture healing, or altered tissue-level properties) and care must be taken in
470 designing studies and interpreting μ FE results in these cases.

471

472 **2.5 Image Registration for Longitudinal Studies**

473 A growing number of studies are producing longitudinal data to evaluate the effects of aging [8,
474 79] as well as pharmacologic [16, 80] or exercise interventions [22]. Small differences in
475 participant positioning in follow-up scans can result in variations of axial position and in the
476 degree of tilt, illustrated in Figure 5, and this reduces the ability to detect longitudinal change,
477 particularly for parameters that vary considerably along the length of the bone (e.g. cortical
478 geometry). Despite procedures to ensure that positioning is standardized as much as possible
479 during each image acquisition, small variations in scan region are inevitable. Consequently,
480 reproducibility has been shown to be suboptimal with precision errors for trabecular and cortical
481 parameters of up to 7.0% and 20.3% RMS-CV% respectively in the radius [81]. Registration
482 techniques reduce positioning errors and are necessary in longitudinal studies to ensure the same
483 region of the image is analyzed at each time point.

484

485 2D Registration

486 A common 2D registration technique uses the total cross-sectional area of each slice to determine
487 an optimal offset between paired (baseline and follow-up) scans resulting in a common volume
488 of interest with a subset of the original slices acquired [1, 53]. This 2D technique is implemented
489 in the Scanco software. It is capable of correcting for discrepancies in an axial direction, but
490 cannot take into consideration the variation in tilt of the limb (see Figure 5). Notably, the 2D
491 registration technique precludes evaluation of periosteal bone apposition, and thus limits
492 interpretation of studies where a change in bone size is anticipated, such as growth, exercise or
493 perhaps aging over an extended observation.

494

495 3D Registration

496 Methods using 3D rigid registration account for both positional (axial) and angular differences in
497 images by determining the necessary 3D transform (translational and rotational) between two
498 images. The method is based on optimally overlapping all image data within a volume of interest
499 (e.g. within the periosteal contours) and so noise or structures outside the bone of interest do not
500 impact registration. It is somewhat more complex to implement because it requires an
501 optimization process, typically including a pre-alignment (e.g. based on center of masses of the
502 two images) followed by an optimizer-guided alignment based on a metric of best overlap (e.g.
503 mutual information), ultimately resulting in a 3D transform matrix [82]. Strategies to maximize
504 efficiency and minimize risk of errors include using down-scaled images for initial alignment,
505 and then increasing to full resolution to refine the alignment. Nevertheless, as with any
506 automated process, it can result in errors and therefore it is imperative to visually assess the
507 degree of overlap to ensure a reasonable solution has been achieved. The resulting 3D transform
508 is used to identify a common region between multiple scans in a series, and the masks for that
509 region are transformed, rather than the images themselves, to prevent image degradation
510 associated with interpolation [82]. Currently, the 3D registration procedures are not part of the
511 standard Scanco software.

512

513 While 3D registration provides excellent reproducibility for morphological parameters, it is
514 unfortunately not as effective for μ FE analysis. The application of boundary conditions to non-
515 parallel surfaces resulting from common regions of interest from 3D registration in μ FE models
516 is not trivial, and currently there is ongoing research in this area. To date, reproducibility of μ FE
517 outputs has not been found to be greater with 3D than 2D registration, therefore use of 3D
518 registration is not yet recommended for μ FE [82]. Instead, the recommended approach is to

519 apply μ FE to 2D registered data, however only relative changes should be compared in this
520 context, and not absolute outcomes, as a shorter segment of bone will yield different results from
521 a full-height image. If absolute outcomes are to be compared, unregistered data should be used
522 for μ FE analyses and comparisons.

523

524

525 *Additional Considerations for Image Registration*

526 Typically, in longitudinal studies the periosteal and endocortical surfaces are defined
527 independently between baseline and follow-up scans. However, in some cases it may be
528 preferable to compare changes in a fixed region over time, such as for detecting trabecularization
529 of the cortical region. This can be accomplished by taking the defined cortical and trabecular
530 regions at baseline and applying these to the follow-up scans (in lieu of re-defining the regions
531 independently) [83]. This method ensures the exact same region of bone is compared between
532 baseline and follow-up. Consequently, this approach precludes detecting changes in cortical
533 thickness, perimeter or changes in total, cortical, or trabecular areas. When conducting 3D
534 registration, it is important to specify if trabecular and cortical compartments were defined
535 independently or if regions were defined at baseline and applied during registration on follow-up
536 scans.

537

538 There are circumstances where the value of registration may be diminished. In long-term
539 treatment and ageing studies there can be significant changes in bone geometry and
540 microstructure. This can lead to inaccuracies when using both 2D and 3D registration.
541 Consequently, shorter intervals may be required to allow sequential transformations to take

542 place, with smaller incremental changes, to allow a more optimal comparison of bone health
543 between the start and end of the study. Furthermore, in children bone growth leads to challenges
544 because a fixed distance from the endplate will gradually become a more distal part of the bone
545 and bone size is anticipated to change substantially. Lastly, in the case of fracture healing, rapid
546 remodeling occurs that changes overall bone geometry. These applications pose challenges in
547 terms of image registration and longitudinal comparison of bone morphology. It is imperative
548 visually inspect registered images to confirm unexpected errors have not occurred during
549 registration before quantitative assessment is performed.

550

551 In general, follow-up scans should be registered to ensure the equivalent region is assessed,
552 where 3D registration is the preferred method, however if this approach is not feasible, 2D
553 registration is an acceptable alternative. In both cases, a reasonable level of overlap must exist to
554 include results from morphological or μ FE analysis, so that the region is representative of the
555 full scan length. An optimal minimum overlap between baseline and follow-up scans has not
556 been validated, but we recommend a minimum volumetric overlap of 75%. There are
557 circumstances where in a series of multiple follow-up scans there is one scan that is poorly
558 positioned (i.e. less than 75% overlap). Rather than removing the entire series, that single scan
559 can be removed so that the remainder of the subject's data can be used in analysis. The choice of
560 overlap cut-off should be specified in the study design and median or average overlap reported in
561 the results.

562

563 **3.0 REPORTING RESULTS**

564 **3.1 Reporting Density and Morphometric Data**

565 The decision of which density and microarchitecture parameters to report depends on the
566 research question. However, with a goal to develop standardized procedures when using HR-
567 pQCT for clinical studies, a minimum set of parameters should be reported to appropriately
568 characterize the trabecular and cortical bone. As the research field shifts from the first-generation
569 to the second-generation HR-pQCT, appropriate terminology is necessary, as certain
570 morphological parameters, such as Tb.Th, have fundamentally different methods of
571 measurement between scanner generations, and thus cannot be directly compared.

572

573 Historically, with the introduction of direct 3D morphological measures, bone microarchitecture
574 that was measured directly instead of derived was denoted with an asterisk (e.g. TbSp*) [59].
575 However, this naming convention has not been used consistently in the literature. As direct
576 measurement becomes more commonplace with regular use of the extended cortical analysis
577 protocol and shift towards the second-generation HR-pQCT, we propose instead that direct
578 measures be denoted without an asterisk (e.g. Tb.Sp), whereas derived measures be identified
579 with the superscript “d” (e.g. TbSp^d). Although the type of measurement method can often be
580 inferred based on the scanner generation, it is more appropriate to explicitly use the appropriate
581 nomenclature. Although inconsistencies exist in literature to date, this approach will help avoid
582 confusion in future studies. For example, Ct.Th can be measured directly or derived using the
583 first-generation HR-pQCT scanner, but if not explicitly stated it is not clear which approach was
584 used. Tables 2 and 3 provide a summary of recommended terminology for common indices for
585 future studies, and the minimum set of parameters to be reported are provided in bold.

586

587 **3.2 Reporting μ FE Data**

588 The choice of reported μ FE outputs should be chosen with consideration of what biomechanical
589 properties are most relevant to the research question. In many cases, μ FE outputs are highly
590 correlated, and it is not advised to report all available parameters without reasonable
591 justification. Commonly reported parameters for standard HR-pQCT scans are summarized in
592 Table 5. Primary outcomes are strength estimates (such as failure load) and stiffness, it is
593 recommended at least one of these parameters are reported at minimum, however it is usually not
594 necessary to report both due to high correlation (ie, $r > 0.9$). Other insightful parameters include
595 load-distribution properties, specifically compartment load-sharing at the distal and proximal
596 ends of the scan region, or in certain cases stress/strain distributions within the model. As μ FE
597 outputs are highly dependent on model properties and loading conditions, it is important to
598 provide sufficient details of the μ FE analysis conducted (as summarized in Table 4) as well as
599 the mesh generation method, and computational solver used. Additional information that is
600 beneficial to report, especially for non-standard scan sites or techniques, is the model complexity
601 (usually reported and the average number of elements in the models), the average computation
602 time per model, and specifications of the computing system (i.e. hardware) used.

603

604 **3.3 Precision Error**

605 An important factor in clinical application of HR-pQCT is its ability to produce highly precise
606 and accurate results. Precision error arises from a combination of technical and operational
607 factors, and is specific to the scanner, parameter, operator(s), and study design. As discussed
608 throughout this article, important contributors to precision error are motion artifacts [46, 48],
609 subject positioning and reference line placement [39], manual correction of periosteal and
610 endocortical contours [56, 57, 84], and use of registration techniques [82]. Precision error is most

611 often reported as the root-mean-squared coefficient of variance (RMS-CV%) of repeated
612 measurements in a group of individuals. Reported ranges of short-term precision for first and
613 second-generation HR-pQCT are summarized in Table 4 [24]. Although these ranges provide an
614 idea of expected precision error, it is nevertheless dependent on the individual scanner and
615 operators, and precision should be determined for each scanner and research center in a manner
616 that reflects the study design. For cross-sectional study designs, precision should be measured
617 without registration techniques applied. Longitudinal studies should report precision values with
618 registration applied in a manner that reflects the technique that will be applied to the dataset. In
619 addition, the precision measurements should be conducted on a cohort that reflects the
620 demographics of the study (ie. elderly versus younger subjects).

621

622 **3.4 Reporting Results from Longitudinal Studies**

623 When reporting results for longitudinal studies, the method used for image registration should be
624 reported, along with the average amount of overlap obtained between accepted baseline and
625 follow-up scans, and number of scans or subjects excluded from the analyses due to poor
626 overlap. Depending on the study design, investigators may also consider reporting results in
627 comparison to the least significant change (LSC), defined as the minimum change observed in an
628 individual that can be considered statistically significant, calculated by multiplying precision
629 error by 2.77 [85]. A summary of ranges reported for LSC (primarily from the first-generation
630 XtremeCT) are provided in Table 4, however LSC should be estimated from the precision error
631 of the specific scanner and registration methods used.

632

633 **3.5 Considerations for Multiple Comparisons**

634 Due to the large number of parameters that are produced using HR-pQCT and high correlation
635 between some parameters, studies are susceptible to the issue of multiple comparisons and
636 falsely positive statistical tests, or type I error. For example, there are often at least 11 parameters
637 that are presented in HR-pQCT studies (see Tables 2 and 3) and this number is multiplied by two
638 when examining both the radius and tibia. If a p-value threshold of 0.05 is used to denote
639 statistical significant between groups, then it is expected that by chance at least one comparison
640 may be significant, when in reality it is not. When reporting results, investigators must interpret
641 their results with this in mind.

642

643 Although there are no specific recommendations for how to address this issue, one approach
644 could be to formally control for the potential of false positive statistical tests, with the selection
645 of statistical test dependent on the study design and power. The most conservative approach
646 would be a Bonferroni correction, an alternate option is the Benjamini-Hochberg correction,
647 which is advantageous as it accounts for the false discovery rate with a limited impact on power.
648 It also favors large studies and it is easy to implement [86, 87]. Another way to preserve power
649 in small studies could be to use a hierarchical method, adjusting for the false discovery rate [88].
650 Though not commonly employed for HR-pQCT studies, this method has the theoretical
651 advantage of relying on *a priori* hypotheses in the analysis of HR-pQCT data. For instance, a
652 first step could be to test for differences in total density, then in trabecular and cortical density if
653 the comparison of total density is significant. Thereafter, the various parameters of each
654 compartment can be tested if there is a significant difference for the compartment [89].

655

656 **4.0 QUALITY CONTROL AND TRAINING**

657 Routine steps should be taken to ensure that the HR-pQCT system is working properly, and
658 operators should be trained appropriately. The system should undergo routine service and
659 maintenance check by the manufacturer annually.

660

661 **4.1 Daily & Weekly Quality Control**

662 The user should follow the manufacturer's protocol for quality control to ensure the system is
663 functioning properly. This typically includes daily and weekly scans of a quality control phantom
664 to check performance prior to *in vivo* scanning and to monitor stability of density and
665 microarchitecture parameters. A drift over time in the phantom measurements signals decay in
666 the X-ray emission, which has potential to confound longitudinal studies if not addressed. Use of
667 Shewhart charts to track scanner stability are recommended and although no specific guidelines
668 for when a scanner should be recalibrated have been developed, typically changes on the order of
669 1.5% from the mean phantom density are considered a threshold for when an intervention should
670 take place. Daily quality control scans should also be inspected visually to identify common
671 artifacts, such as ring artifacts, or distortions that would affect measurement outcomes. These
672 should only be corrected by the manufacturer during routine maintenance, but it is prudent for
673 the user to carefully monitor image quality control.

674

675 **4.2 Operator Training**

676 Operator training is an essential aspect of obtaining high-quality data. Although there is no
677 formal training course or certification for operators of the HR-pQCT device, it is recommended
678 that new operators undergo thorough training from experienced operators in patient management
679 and positioning, location of the reference line, and manual correction of contours generated by

680 the automated and semi-automated protocols. Unfortunately, limited formal training is available
681 despite the knowledge that scan precision and inter-operator variability can be reduced using a
682 standard training platform [39]. In terms of reference line placement, it is recommended that new
683 operators complete the online training developed by UCSF
684 (<http://webapps.radiology.ucsf.edu/refline/>) [39]. Comparable training for contouring has yet to
685 be developed, and so it is recommended new operators receive training from an experienced
686 operator, and guidelines previously reported be followed to minimize error bias [55]. In the
687 future, standardized training courses should be offered.

688

689 **5.0 OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

690 **5.1 Multi-Center Studies**

691 Measurement of multi-center precision and cross-calibration is important when pooling data
692 from multiple research groups and scan sites, as inter-scanner differences are a key source of
693 error. When compared to single-center precision, HR-pQCT parameters are less precise across
694 different scanners, which may be attributed to differences in quality control of scanners,
695 calibration and intrinsic manufacturer differences. Burghardt and colleagues reported LSC values
696 for the first-generation HR-pQCT ranging from twice to five times that of short-term single-
697 center precision [90]. There is some evidence in that second-generation HR-pQCT scanners have
698 notably improved inter-scanner precision, resulting in differences below LSC [91]. However, this
699 may not apply broadly and cross-calibration procedures should still be employed for future
700 studies using second-generation HR-pQCT. Although no standardized procedure exists for
701 estimation of multi-center precision, the use of a phantom that mimics geometry,
702 microarchitecture and composition of standard scans regions is recommended for cross-

703 calibration [90]. This information collected can be employed to establish cross-calibration
704 procedures to minimize inter-scanner errors, however individual approaches vary and there is
705 currently no standardized approach. Optimal methods for cross-calibration in multi-center
706 studies have not yet been established and studies in this area are greatly needed. Of note, the
707 issue of multi-center calibration is more important for cross-sectional studies; in longitudinal
708 studies that have primary outcomes of individual change the concern for inter-scanner variation
709 is lessened.

710

711 **5.2 Adjusting for Different Scanner Generations**

712 The introduction of the second-generation HR-pQCT poses a challenge of comparing research
713 findings across different systems. Factors such as differences in resolution, scan region of
714 interest, and measurement methods make it challenging to compare data from different
715 generations, and this will be further confounded when future systems become available.
716 Although it is possible for the second-generation HR-pQCT to be operated in a configuration
717 mimicking the original system, this is not ideal because it defeats the purpose of having
718 improved signal-to-noise and better quality images. Cross-calibration between scanner
719 generations has demonstrated that some parameters from the first-generation can be converted to
720 equivalent parameters for the second-generation, however some parameters such as TbTh, which
721 are highly dependent on resolution, should not be compared across systems [26, 30].

722

723 **5.3 Beam Hardening**

724 Beam hardening effects that can arise due to increase adipose (fat) tissue overlying the scan
725 region, as might be expected in an obese population, can introduce measurable bias in HR-

726 pQCT parameters [92]. Specifically, overlying adipose tissue can result in underestimation of
727 density measurements and failure load, and altered trabecular microarchitecture, often leading to
728 overestimation of bone microarchitecture impairment [92]. Similarly, high density objects such
729 as a clinical cast composed of plaster-of-Paris or fiberglass can result in similar bias, due to beam
730 hardening effects, and should be accounted for in a quantitative analysis, if they are present in
731 the scan [93, 94]. Future work is needed to determine the appropriate standardized procedures for
732 overweight and obese individuals.

733

734 **5.4 Other High-Resolution Systems**

735 The HR-pQCT systems discussed here focuses currently only on available systems,
736 manufactured by Scanco Medical AG. It is expected HR-pQCT systems developed by other
737 manufacturers will become available in the near future. In addition, existing imaging
738 technologies are being adapted to study extremity bone microarchitecture as a substitute to HR-
739 pQCT, namely cone-beam CT (CBCT) [95-98]. Current CBCT systems designed for extremity
740 scanning offer larger scan lengths and shorter scanning times relative to HR-pQCT, with some
741 systems allowing for scan acquisition in a weight-bearing configuration [98]. These benefits
742 come with the trade-off of lower resolution, typically 127 μm nominal resolution reconstructed
743 to a 75 μm voxel size [95]. Consequently, CBCT is susceptible to partial volume effects, and can
744 struggle to distinguish thinner trabecular structures that are visible with HR-pQCT [97]. As the
745 application of CBCT for bone microarchitecture grows, and new HR-pQCT systems become
746 available, the recommendations and guidelines outlined in this article should be considered.

747

748 **5.5 Pediatric Studies**

749 There is growing interest in the application of HR-pQCT in pediatrics for the study of normal
750 skeletal acquisition [6], as well as the impact of disease [12] and physical activity [21] on
751 skeletal acquisition. However, measurement of bone density and microarchitecture in children
752 and adolescents poses unique challenges due the complexities of long bone growth and presence
753 of the growth plate near the scan region [99]. Non-linear bone growth, and differences in
754 maturation between sexes and ethnicities poses challenges in the appropriate selection of a
755 standardized scan region. Several protocols have been proposed for selection of the scan region
756 to account for long bone growth [100], and although there is no consensus regarding most
757 appropriate scan site, there is agreement that a relative offset should be used in children and
758 adolescents. Further work is required to form a consensus on a standardized protocol for
759 pediatric studies, including how to handle the transition from a pediatric to adult scanning
760 protocol in longitudinal studies where participants are followed from childhood into adulthood.

761

762 **5.6 Non-Standard Applications**

763 HR-pQCT is specifically designed to measure the distal radius and distal tibia in adults, but its
764 application to study bone microarchitecture at other sites has expanded in recent years. The
765 introduction of XtremeCT II, which has a larger gantry and redesigned staging mechanism,
766 permits knee and elbow joints to be imaged [101]. Furthermore, applications beyond the standard
767 protocol have included the study of fracture healing at the distal radius [69], quantification of
768 muscle morphometry [44], progression of inflammatory arthritis through quantification of joint
769 space narrowing and development of erosions in finger and wrist joints [102, 103], and
770 investigation of changes in bone microarchitecture at the knee due to injury or osteoarthritis
771 [104]. These emerging applications are likely to become more prominent in HR-pQCT research

772 and will require careful development of standardized protocols. A prominent example of this is
773 the development of research focused on inflammatory arthritis, with as many as 20 research
774 centers actively publishing in this area. Ongoing standardization of this novel application is
775 overseen by the international consortium, SPECTRA (Study grouP for xtrEme-Computed
776 Tomography in Rheumatoid Arthritis) [105, 106].

777

778 **6.0 SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS**

779 Recommendations for best practices for acquisition and analysis of HR-pQCT imaging
780 techniques have been presented here, with nomenclature and recommendations on presenting and
781 interpreting results. Many decisions on appropriate techniques and study design remain
782 dependent on the research question. However, with the uptake in clinical application of HR-
783 pQCT, a certain degree of standardization is necessary to support the further advancement of
784 clinical application of HR-pQCT. The key recommendations for standard analysis of distal
785 radius and tibia HR-pQCT scans are summarized in Table 7. Implementation of these
786 recommendations as “best practices” should facilitate comparison of results across studies by
787 minimizing technical variation in scan acquisition and analysis.

788

789 **REFERENCES**

790

- 791 1. Boutroy S, Bouxsein ML, Munoz F, Delmas PD (2005) In vivo assessment of trabecular
792 bone microarchitecture by high-resolution peripheral quantitative computed tomography. *The*
793 *Journal of clinical endocrinology and metabolism* 90:6508-6515
- 794 2. Burt LA, Bhatla JL, Hanley DA, Boyd SK (2017) Cortical porosity exhibits accelerated
795 rate of change in peri- compared with post-menopausal women. *Osteoporos Int* 28:1423-1431
- 796 3. Burt LA, Liang Z, Sajobi TT, Hanley DA, Boyd SK (2016) Sex- and Site-Specific
797 Normative Data Curves for HR-pQCT. *J Bone Miner Res* 31:2041-2047
- 798 4. Burt LA, Macdonald HM, Hanley DA, Boyd SK (2014) Bone microarchitecture and
799 strength of the radius and tibia in a reference population of young adults: an HR-pQCT study.
800 *Arch Osteoporos* 9:183
- 801 5. Gabel L, Macdonald HM, McKay HA (2017) Sex Differences and Growth-Related
802 Adaptations in Bone Microarchitecture, Geometry, Density, and Strength From Childhood to
803 Early Adulthood: A Mixed Longitudinal HR-pQCT Study. *J Bone Miner Res* 32:250-263
- 804 6. Gabel L, Macdonald HM, Nettlefold LA, McKay HA (2018) Sex-, Ethnic-, and Age-
805 Specific Centile Curves for pQCT- and HR-pQCT-Derived Measures of Bone Structure and
806 Strength in Adolescents and Young Adults. *J Bone Miner Res* 33:987-1000
- 807 7. Hansen S, Shanbhogue V, Folkestad L, Nielsen MM, Brixen K (2014) Bone
808 microarchitecture and estimated strength in 499 adult Danish women and men: a cross-sectional,
809 population-based high-resolution peripheral quantitative computed tomographic study on peak
810 bone structure. *Calcif Tissue Int* 94:269-281
- 811 8. Macdonald HM, Nishiyama KK, Kang J, Hanley DA, Boyd SK (2011) Age-related
812 patterns of trabecular and cortical bone loss differ between sexes and skeletal sites: a population-
813 based HR-pQCT study. *J Bone Miner Res* 26:50-62
- 814 9. Popp KL, Hughes JM, Martinez-Betancourt A, et al. (2017) Bone mass,
815 microarchitecture and strength are influenced by race/ethnicity in young adult men and women.
816 *Bone* 103:200-208
- 817 10. Vilayphiou N, Boutroy S, Sornay-Rendu E, Van Rietbergen B, Chapurlat R (2016) Age-
818 related changes in bone strength from HR-pQCT derived microarchitectural parameters with an
819 emphasis on the role of cortical porosity. *Bone* 83:233-240
- 820 11. Bacchetta J, Boutroy S, Vilayphiou N, et al. (2010) Early impairment of trabecular
821 microarchitecture assessed with HR-pQCT in patients with stage II-IV chronic kidney disease. *J*
822 *Bone Miner Res* 25:849-857
- 823 12. Braun C, Bacchetta J, Braillon P, Chapurlat R, Drai J, Reix P (2017) Children and
824 adolescents with cystic fibrosis display moderate bone microarchitecture abnormalities: data
825 from high-resolution peripheral quantitative computed tomography. *Osteoporos Int* 28:3179-
826 3188
- 827 13. Nour MA, Burt LA, Perry RJ, Stephure DK, Hanley DA, Boyd SK (2016) Impact of
828 Growth Hormone on Adult Bone Quality in Turner Syndrome: A HR-pQCT Study. *Calcif Tissue*
829 *Int* 98:49-59
- 830 14. Samelson EJ, Demissie S, Cupples LA, et al. (2018) Diabetes and Deficits in Cortical
831 Bone Density, Microarchitecture, and Bone Size: Framingham HR-pQCT Study. *J Bone Miner*
832 *Res* 33:54-62

- 833 15. Boyd SK, Burt LA, Sevik LK, Hanley DA (2015) The relationship between serum
834 25(OH)D and bone density and microarchitecture as measured by HR-pQCT. *Osteoporos Int*
835 26:2375-2380
- 836 16. Burghardt AJ, Kazakia GJ, Sode M, de Papp AE, Link TM, Majumdar S (2010) A
837 longitudinal HR-pQCT study of alendronate treatment in postmenopausal women with low bone
838 density: Relations among density, cortical and trabecular microarchitecture, biomechanics, and
839 bone turnover. *Journal of bone and mineral research : the official journal of the American*
840 *Society for Bone and Mineral Research* 25:2558-2571
- 841 17. Tsai JN, Nishiyama KK, Lin D, Yuan A, Lee H, Bouxsein ML, Leder BZ (2017) Effects
842 of Denosumab and Teriparatide Transitions on Bone Microarchitecture and Estimated Strength:
843 the DATA-Switch HR-pQCT study. *J Bone Miner Res* 32:2001-2009
- 844 18. Langsetmo L, Shikany JM, Burghardt AJ, et al. (2018) High dairy protein intake is
845 associated with greater bone strength parameters at the distal radius and tibia in older men: a
846 cross-sectional study. *Osteoporos Int* 29:69-77
- 847 19. Burt LA, Billington EO, Rose MS, Raymond DA, Hanley DA, Boyd SK (2019) Effect of
848 High-Dose Vitamin D Supplementation on Volumetric Bone Density and Bone Strength: A
849 Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA* 322:736-745
- 850 20. Burt LA, Schipilow JD, Boyd SK (2016) Competitive trampolining influences trabecular
851 bone structure, bone size, and bone strength. *J Sport Health Sci* 5:469-475
- 852 21. Gabel L, Macdonald HM, Nettlefold L, McKay HA (2017) Physical Activity, Sedentary
853 Time, and Bone Strength From Childhood to Early Adulthood: A Mixed Longitudinal HR-pQCT
854 study. *J Bone Miner Res* 32:1525-1536
- 855 22. Hughes JM, Gaffney-Stomberg E, Guerriere KI, et al. (2018) Changes in tibial bone
856 microarchitecture in female recruits in response to 8weeks of U.S. Army Basic Combat Training.
857 *Bone* 113:9-16
- 858 23. Kazakia GJ, Tjong W, Nirody JA, Burghardt AJ, Carballido-Gamio J, Patsch JM, Link T,
859 Feeley BT, Ma CB (2014) The influence of disuse on bone microstructure and mechanics
860 assessed by HR-pQCT. *Bone* 63:132-140
- 861 24. Mikolajewicz N, Bishop N, Burghardt AJ, et al. (2019) HR-pQCT Measures of Bone
862 Microarchitecture Predict Fracture: Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *J Bone Miner Res*
- 863 25. Stauber M, Müller R (2008) Micro-computed tomography: a method for the non-
864 destructive evaluation of the three-dimensional structure of biological specimens. *Methods Mol*
865 *Biol* 455:273-292
- 866 26. Agarwal S, Rosete F, Zhang C, McMahon DJ, Guo XE, Shane E, Nishiyama KK (2016)
867 In vivo assessment of bone structure and estimated bone strength by first- and second-generation
868 HR-pQCT. *Osteoporos Int* 27:2955-2966
- 869 27. Bandirali M, Lanza E, Messina C, et al. (2013) Dose absorption in lumbar and femoral
870 dual energy X-ray absorptiometry examinations using three different scan modalities: an
871 anthropomorphic phantom study. *J Clin Densitom* 16:279-282
- 872 28. Wylie JD, Jenkins PA, Beckmann JT, Peters CL, Aoki SK, Maak TG (2018) Computed
873 Tomography Scans in Patients With Young Adult Hip Pain Carry a Lifetime Risk of
874 Malignancy. *Arthroscopy* 34:155-163 e153
- 875 29. Manske SL, Zhu Y, Sandino C, Boyd SK (2015) Human trabecular bone
876 microarchitecture can be assessed independently of density with second generation HR-pQCT.
877 *Bone* 79:213-221

- 878 30. Manske SL, Davison EM, Burt LA, Raymond DA, Boyd SK (2017) The Estimation of
879 Second-Generation HR-pQCT From First-Generation HR-pQCT Using In Vivo Cross-
880 Calibration. *J Bone Miner Res* 32:1514-1524
- 881 31. Wang Q, Wang XF, Iuliano-Burns S, Ghasem-Zadeh A, Zebaze R, Seeman E (2010)
882 Rapid growth produces transient cortical weakness: a risk factor for metaphyseal fractures during
883 puberty. *J Bone Miner Res* 25:1521-1526
- 884 32. Burrows M, Liu D, Moore S, McKay H (2010) Bone microstructure at the distal tibia
885 provides a strength advantage to males in late puberty: an HR-pQCT study. *J Bone Miner Res*
886 25:1423-1432
- 887 33. Bonaretti S, Majumdar S, Lang TF, Khosla S, Burghardt AJ (2017) The comparability of
888 HR-pQCT bone measurements is improved by scanning anatomically standardized regions.
889 *Osteoporos Int* 28:2115-2128
- 890 34. Shanbhogue VV, Hansen S, Halekoh U, Brixen K (2015) Use of Relative vs Fixed Offset
891 Distance to Define Region of Interest at the Distal Radius and Tibia in High-Resolution
892 Peripheral Quantitative Computed Tomography. *J Clin Densitom* 18:217-225
- 893 35. Boyd SK (2008) Site-specific variation of bone micro-architecture in the distal radius and
894 tibia. *J Clin Densitom* 11:424-430
- 895 36. Hauspie RC, Vercauteren M, Susanne C (1997) Secular changes in growth and
896 maturation: an update. *Acta Paediatr Suppl* 423:20-27
- 897 37. Ghasem-Zadeh A, Burghardt A, Wang XF, Iuliano S, Bonaretti S, Bui M, Zebaze R,
898 Seeman E (2017) Quantifying sex, race, and age specific differences in bone microstructure
899 requires measurement of anatomically equivalent regions. *Bone* 101:206-213
- 900 38. Sode M, Burghardt AJ, Pialat JB, Link TM, Majumdar S (2011) Quantitative
901 characterization of subject motion in HR-pQCT images of the distal radius and tibia. *Bone*
902 48:1291-1297
- 903 39. Bonaretti S, Vilayphiou N, Chan CM, et al. (2017) Operator variability in scan
904 positioning is a major component of HR-pQCT precision error and is reduced by standardized
905 training. *Osteoporos Int* 28:245-257
- 906 40. Zebaze R, Ghasem-Zadeh A, Mbala A, Seeman E (2013) A new method of segmentation
907 of compact-appearing, transitional and trabecular compartments and quantification of cortical
908 porosity from high resolution peripheral quantitative computed tomographic images. *Bone* 54:8-
909 20
- 910 41. Schafer AL, Burghardt AJ, Sellmeyer DE, Palermo L, Shoback DM, Majumdar S, Black
911 DM (2013) Postmenopausal women treated with combination parathyroid hormone (1-84) and
912 ibandronate demonstrate different microstructural changes at the radius vs. tibia: the PTH and
913 Ibandronate Combination Study (PICS). *Osteoporos Int* 24:2591-2601
- 914 42. Cheung AM, Majumdar S, Brixen K, et al. (2014) Effects of odanacatib on the radius and
915 tibia of postmenopausal women: improvements in bone geometry, microarchitecture, and
916 estimated bone strength. *Journal of bone and mineral research : the official journal of the*
917 *American Society for Bone and Mineral Research* 29:1786-1794
- 918 43. Patsch JM, Burghardt AJ, Yap SP, Baum T, Schwartz AV, Joseph GB, Link TM (2013)
919 Increased cortical porosity in type 2 diabetic postmenopausal women with fragility fractures.
920 *Journal of bone and mineral research : the official journal of the American Society for Bone and*
921 *Mineral Research* 28:313-324

- 922 44. Wong AK (2016) A comparison of peripheral imaging technologies for bone and muscle
923 quantification: a technical review of image acquisition. *J Musculoskelet Neuronal Interact*
924 16:265-282
- 925 45. Stagi S, Cavalli L, Cavalli T, de Martino M, Brandi ML (2016) Peripheral quantitative
926 computed tomography (pQCT) for the assessment of bone strength in most of bone affecting
927 conditions in developmental age: a review. *Ital J Pediatr* 42:88
- 928 46. Engelke K, Stampa B, Timm W, Dardzinski B, de Papp AE, Genant HK, Fuerst T (2012)
929 Short-term in vivo precision of BMD and parameters of trabecular architecture at the distal
930 forearm and tibia. *Osteoporos Int* 23:2151-2158
- 931 47. Pauchard Y, Liphardt AM, Macdonald HM, Hanley DA, Boyd SK (2012) Quality control
932 for bone quality parameters affected by subject motion in high-resolution peripheral quantitative
933 computed tomography. *Bone* 50:1304-1310
- 934 48. Pialat JB, Burghardt AJ, Sode M, Link TM, Majumdar S (2012) Visual grading of motion
935 induced image degradation in high resolution peripheral computed tomography: impact of image
936 quality on measures of bone density and micro-architecture. *Bone* 50:111-118
- 937 49. Laib A, Hauselmann HJ, Ruegsegger P (1998) In vivo high resolution 3D-QCT of the
938 human forearm. *Technol Health Care* 6:329-337
- 939 50. Davis KA, Burghardt AJ, Link TM, Majumdar S (2007) The effects of geometric and
940 threshold definitions on cortical bone metrics assessed by in vivo high-resolution peripheral
941 quantitative computed tomography. *Calcified tissue international* 81:364-371
- 942 51. Nishiyama KK, Macdonald HM, Buie HR, Hanley DA, Boyd SK (2010) Postmenopausal
943 women with osteopenia have higher cortical porosity and thinner cortices at the distal radius and
944 tibia than women with normal aBMD: an in vivo HR-pQCT study. *Journal of bone and mineral*
945 *research : the official journal of the American Society for Bone and Mineral Research* 25:882-
946 890
- 947 52. Buie HR, Campbell GM, Klinck RJ, MacNeil JA, Boyd SK (2007) Automatic
948 segmentation of cortical and trabecular compartments based on a dual threshold technique for in
949 vivo micro-CT bone analysis. *Bone* 41:505-515
- 950 53. Burghardt AJ, Buie HR, Laib A, Majumdar S, Boyd SK (2010) Reproducibility of direct
951 quantitative measures of cortical bone microarchitecture of the distal radius and tibia by HR-
952 pQCT. *Bone* 47:519-528
- 953 54. Whittier DE, Mudryk A, Vandergaag I, Burt L, Boyd S (2020 (In Press)) Optimizing HR-
954 pQCT workflow: A comparison of bias and precision error for quantitative bone analysis.
955 *Osteoporos Int*
- 956 55. Whittier DE, Mudryk AN, Vandergaag ID, Burt LA, Boyd SK (2019) Optimizing HR-
957 pQCT workflow: a comparison of bias and precision error for quantitative bone analysis.
958 *Osteoporos Int*
- 959 56. Kawalilak CE, Johnston JD, Cooper DM, Olszynski WP, Kontulainen SA (2016) Role of
960 endocortical contouring methods on precision of HR-pQCT-derived cortical micro-architecture
961 in postmenopausal women and young adults. *Osteoporos Int* 27:789-796
- 962 57. de Waard EAC, Sarodnik C, Pennings A, et al. (2018) Reliability of HR-pQCT Derived
963 Cortical Bone Structural Parameters When Using Uncorrected Instead of Corrected
964 Automatically Generated Endocortical Contours in a Cross-Sectional Study: The Maastricht
965 Study. *Calcif Tissue Int* 103:252-265
- 966 58. Hildebrand T, Ruegsegger P (1997) Quantification of Bone Microarchitecture with the
967 Structure Model Index. *Comput Methods Biomech Biomed Engin* 1:15-23

- 968 59. Hildebrand T, Laib A, Müller R, Dequeker J, Rüeegsegger P (1999) Direct three-
969 dimensional morphometric analysis of human cancellous bone: microstructural data from spine,
970 femur, iliac crest, and calcaneus. *J Bone Miner Res* 14:1167-1174
- 971 60. Odgaard A, Gundersen HJ (1993) Quantification of connectivity in cancellous bone, with
972 special emphasis on 3-D reconstructions. *Bone* 14:173-182
- 973 61. Whitehouse WJ (1974) The quantitative morphology of anisotropic trabecular bone. *J*
974 *Microsc* 101:153-168
- 975 62. Liu XS, Sajda P, Saha PK, Wehrli FW, Bevil G, Keaveny TM, Guo XE (2008)
976 Complete volumetric decomposition of individual trabecular plates and rods and its
977 morphological correlations with anisotropic elastic moduli in human trabecular bone. *J Bone*
978 *Miner Res* 23:223-235
- 979 63. Jorgenson BL, Buie HR, McErlain DD, Sandino C, Boyd SK (2015) A comparison of
980 methods for in vivo assessment of cortical porosity in the human appendicular skeleton. *Bone*
981 73:167-175
- 982 64. van Rietbergen B, Ito K (2015) A survey of micro-finite element analysis for clinical
983 assessment of bone strength: the first decade. *J Biomech* 48:832-841
- 984 65. MacNeil JA, Boyd SK (2008) Bone strength at the distal radius can be estimated from
985 high-resolution peripheral quantitative computed tomography and the finite element method.
986 *Bone* 42:1203-1213
- 987 66. Arias-Moreno AJ, Hosseini HS, Bevers M, Ito K, Zysset P, van Rietbergen B (2019)
988 Validation of distal radius failure load predictions by homogenized- and micro-finite element
989 analyses based on second-generation high-resolution peripheral quantitative CT images.
990 *Osteoporos Int* 30:1433-1443
- 991 67. Pistoia W, van Rietbergen B, Lochmuller EM, Lill CA, Eckstein F, Rüeegsegger P (2002)
992 Estimation of distal radius failure load with micro-finite element analysis models based on three-
993 dimensional peripheral quantitative computed tomography images. *Bone* 30:842-848
- 994 68. Christen D, Zwahlen A, Müller R (2014) Reproducibility for linear and nonlinear micro-
995 finite element simulations with density derived material properties of the human radius. *J Mech*
996 *Behav Biomed Mater* 29:500-507
- 997 69. de Jong JJ, Willems PC, Arts JJ, Bours SG, Brink PR, van Geel TA, Poeze M, Geusens
998 PP, van Rietbergen B, van den Bergh JP (2014) Assessment of the healing process in distal
999 radius fractures by high resolution peripheral quantitative computed tomography. *Bone* 64:65-74
- 1000 70. Engelke K, van Rietbergen B, Zysset P (2016) FEA to Measure Bone Strength: A
1001 Review. *Clinic Rev Bone Miner Metab* 14:26-37
- 1002 71. Müller R, Rüeegsegger P (1995) Three-dimensional finite element modelling of non-
1003 invasively assessed trabecular bone structures. *Med Eng Phys* 17:126-133
- 1004 72. Whittier DE, Manske SL, Kiel DP, Bouxsein M, Boyd SK (2018) Harmonizing finite
1005 element modelling for non-invasive strength estimation by high-resolution peripheral
1006 quantitative computed tomography. *J Biomech* 80:63-71
- 1007 73. Christen D, Melton LJ, 3rd, Zwahlen A, Amin S, Khosla S, Muller R (2013) Improved
1008 fracture risk assessment based on nonlinear micro-finite element simulations from HRpQCT
1009 images at the distal radius. *Journal of bone and mineral research : the official journal of the*
1010 *American Society for Bone and Mineral Research* 28:2601-2608
- 1011 74. Pistoia W, van Rietbergen B, Lochmuller EM, Lill CA, Eckstein F, Rüeegsegger P (2004)
1012 Image-based micro-finite-element modeling for improved distal radius strength diagnosis:
1013 moving from bench to bedside. *J Clin Densitom* 7:153-160

1014 75. Mueller TL, Christen D, Sandercott S, Boyd SK, van Rietbergen B, Eckstein F,
1015 Lochmuller EM, Muller R, van Lenthe GH (2011) Computational finite element bone mechanics
1016 accurately predicts mechanical competence in the human radius of an elderly population. *Bone*
1017 48:1232-1238

1018 76. Varga P, Pahr DH, Baumbach S, Zysset PK (2010) HR-pQCT based FE analysis of the
1019 most distal radius section provides an improved prediction of Colles' fracture load in vitro. *Bone*
1020 47:982-988

1021 77. Kroker A, Plett R, Nishiyama KK, McErlain DD, Sandino C, Boyd SK (2017) Distal
1022 skeletal tibia assessed by HR-pQCT is highly correlated with femoral and lumbar vertebra failure
1023 loads. *J Biomech* 59:43-49

1024 78. van Rietbergen B, Weinans H, Huiskes R, Odgaard A (1995) A new method to determine
1025 trabecular bone elastic properties and loading using micromechanical finite-element models. *J*
1026 *Biomech* 28:69-81

1027 79. Chen H, Zhou X, Fujita H, Onozuka M, Kubo KY (2013) Age-related changes in
1028 trabecular and cortical bone microstructure. *International journal of endocrinology* 2013:213234

1029 80. Seeman E, Delmas PD, Hanley DA, et al. (2010) Microarchitectural deterioration of
1030 cortical and trabecular bone: differing effects of denosumab and alendronate. *Journal of bone and*
1031 *mineral research : the official journal of the American Society for Bone and Mineral Research*
1032 25:1886-1894

1033 81. Paggiosi MA, Eastell R, Walsh JS (2014) Precision of high-resolution peripheral
1034 quantitative computed tomography measurement variables: influence of gender, examination
1035 site, and age. *Calcified tissue international* 94:191-201

1036 82. Ellouz R, Chapurlat R, van Rietbergen B, Christen P, Pialat JB, Boutroy S (2014)
1037 Challenges in longitudinal measurements with HR-pQCT: evaluation of a 3D registration
1038 method to improve bone microarchitecture and strength measurement reproducibility. *Bone*
1039 63:147-157

1040 83. Nishiyama KK, Pauchard Y, Nikkel LE, Iyer S, Zhang C, McMahon DJ, Cohen D, Boyd
1041 SK, Shane E, Nickolas TL (2015) Longitudinal HR-pQCT and image registration detects
1042 endocortical bone loss in kidney transplantation patients. *J Bone Miner Res* 30:554-561

1043 84. Chiba K, Okazaki N, Kurogi A, Isobe Y, Yonekura A, Tomita M, Osaki M (2018)
1044 Precision of Second-Generation High-Resolution Peripheral Quantitative Computed
1045 Tomography: Intra- and Intertester Reproducibilities and Factors Involved in the Reproducibility
1046 of Cortical Porosity. *J Clin Densitom* 21:295-302

1047 85. Shepherd JA, Lu Y (2007) A generalized least significant change for individuals
1048 measured on different DXA systems. *J Clin Densitom* 10:249-258

1049 86. Benjamini Y, Hochberg Y (1995) Controlling the false discovery rate: a practical and
1050 powerful approach to multiple testing. *J R Stat Soc Series B Stat Methodol* 57:289-300

1051 87. Boutroy S, Khosla S, Sornay-Rendu E, et al. (2016) Microarchitecture and Peripheral
1052 BMD are Impaired in Postmenopausal White Women With Fracture Independently of Total Hip
1053 T-Score: An International Multicenter Study. *J Bone Miner Res* 31:1158-1166

1054 88. Yekutieli D (2008) Hierarchical false discovery rate-controlling methodology. *J Am Stat*
1055 *Assoc* 103:309-316


1056 89. Gensburger D, Boutroy S, Chapurlat R, Nove-Josserand R, Roche S, Rabilloud M,
1057 Durieu I (2016) Reduced bone volumetric density and weak correlation between infection and
1058 bone markers in cystic fibrosis adult patients. *Osteoporos Int* 27:2803-2813

- 1059 90. Burghardt AJ, Pialat JB, Kazakia GJ, et al. (2013) Multicenter precision of cortical and
1060 trabecular bone quality measures assessed by high-resolution peripheral quantitative computed
1061 tomography. *J Bone Miner Res* 28:524-536
- 1062 91. Cauley JA, Burghardt AJ, Harrison SL, et al. (2018) Accelerated Bone Loss in Older
1063 Men: Effects on Bone Microarchitecture and Strength. *J Bone Miner Res* 33:1859-1869
- 1064 92. Caksa S, Yuan A, Rudolph SE, Yu EW, Popp KL, Bouxsein ML (2019) Influence of soft
1065 tissue on bone density and microarchitecture measurements by high-resolution peripheral
1066 quantitative computed tomography. *Bone* 124:47-52
- 1067 93. de Jong JJ, Arts JJ, Meyer U, Willems PC, Geusens PP, van den Bergh JP, van
1068 Rietbergen B (2016) Effect of a Cast on Short-Term Reproducibility and Bone Parameters
1069 Obtained from HR-pQCT Measurements at the Distal End of the Radius. *J Bone Joint Surg Am*
1070 98:356-362
- 1071 94. Whittier DE, Manske SL, Boyd SK, Schneider PS (2018) The Correction of Systematic
1072 Error due to Plaster and Fiberglass Casts on HR-pQCT Bone Parameters Measured In Vivo at
1073 the Distal Radius. *J Clin Densitom*
- 1074 95. de Charry C, Boutroy S, Ellouz R, Duboeuf F, Chapurlat R, Follet H, Pialat JB (2016)
1075 Clinical cone beam computed tomography compared to high-resolution peripheral computed
1076 tomography in the assessment of distal radius bone. *Osteoporos Int* 27:3073-3082
- 1077 96. Klintstrom E, Smedby O, Moreno R, Brismar TB (2014) Trabecular bone structure
1078 parameters from 3D image processing of clinical multi-slice and cone-beam computed
1079 tomography data. *Skeletal Radiol* 43:197-204
- 1080 97. Mys K, Varga P, Gueorguiev B, Hemmatian H, Stockmans F, van Lenthe GH (2019)
1081 Correlation Between Cone-Beam Computed Tomography and High-Resolution Peripheral
1082 Computed Tomography for Assessment of Wrist Bone Microstructure. *J Bone Miner Res*
1083 34:867-874
- 1084 98. Brehler M, Cao Q, Moseley KF, Osgood G, Morris C, Demehri S, Yorkston J,
1085 Siewerdsen JH, Zbijewski W (2018) Robust Quantitative Assessment of Trabecular
1086 Microarchitecture in Extremity Cone-Beam CT Using Optimized Segmentation Algorithms. *Proc*
1087 *SPIE Int Soc Opt Eng* 10578:
- 1088 99. Adams JE, Engelke K, Zemel BS, Ward KA, International Society of Clinical D (2014)
1089 Quantitative computer tomography in children and adolescents: the 2013 ISCD Pediatric Official
1090 Positions. *J Clin Densitom* 17:258-274
- 1091 100. Kawalilak CE, Bunyamin AT, Bjorkman KM, Johnston JD, Kontulainen SA (2017)
1092 Precision of bone density and micro-architectural properties at the distal radius and tibia in
1093 children: an HR-pQCT study. *Osteoporos Int* 28:3189-3197
- 1094 101. Kroker A, Besler BA, Bhatla JL, Shtil M, Salat P, Mohtadi N, Walker RE, Manske SL,
1095 Boyd SK (2019) Longitudinal Effects of Acute Anterior Cruciate Ligament Tears on Peri-
1096 Articular Bone in Human Knees Within the First Year of Injury. *J Orthop Res* 37:2325-2336
- 1097 102. Burghardt AJ, Lee CH, Kuo D, Majumdar S, Imboden JB, Link TM, Li X (2013)
1098 Quantitative in vivo HR-pQCT imaging of 3D wrist and metacarpophalangeal joint space width
1099 in rheumatoid arthritis. *Ann Biomed Eng* 41:2553-2564
- 1100 103. Nagaraj S, Finzel S, Stok KS, Barnabe C, Collaboration S (2016) High-resolution
1101 Peripheral Quantitative Computed Tomography Imaging in the Assessment of Periarticular Bone
1102 of Metacarpophalangeal and Wrist Joints. *J Rheumatol* 43:1921-1934
- 1103 104. Kroker A, Zhu Y, Manske SL, Barber R, Mohtadi N, Boyd SK (2017) Quantitative in
1104 vivo assessment of bone microarchitecture in the human knee using HR-pQCT. *Bone* 97:43-48

- 1105 105. Manske SL, Brunet SC, Finzel S, Stok KS, Conaghan PG, Boyd SK, Barnabe C (2019)
1106 The SPECTRA Collaboration OMERACT Working Group: Construct Validity of Joint Space
1107 Outcomes with High-resolution Peripheral Quantitative Computed Tomography. *J Rheumatol*
1108 46:1369-1373
- 1109 106. Stok KS, Finzel S, Burghardt AJ, Conaghan PG, Barnabe C, Collaboration S (2017) The
1110 SPECTRA Collaboration OMERACT Special Interest Group: Current Research and Future
1111 Directions. *J Rheumatol* 44:1911-1915
- 1112 107. Vilayphiou N, Boutroy S, Sornay-Rendu E, Van Rietbergen B, Munoz F, Delmas PD,
1113 Chapurlat R (2010) Finite element analysis performed on radius and tibia HR-pQCT images and
1114 fragility fractures at all sites in postmenopausal women. *Bone* 46:1030-1037
- 1115 108. Hosseini HS, Dunki A, Fabeck J, Stauber M, Vilayphiou N, Pahr D, Pretterklieber M,
1116 Wandel J, Rietbergen BV, Zysset PK (2017) Fast estimation of Colles' fracture load of the distal
1117 section of the radius by homogenized finite element analysis based on HR-pQCT. *Bone* 97:65-75
1118


1118
1119
1120

Figures (low resolution included here)



1121
1122
1123
1124
1125
1126
1127

Figure 1: Scout view from a first-generation HR-pQCT showing reference line placement for the fixed offset distance (left) and relative offset distance (right) methods for the radius and tibia [33]. The edge of the radiocarpal joint surface of the distal radius and tibial plafond are marked in red. Scan regions represented here are approximate and illustrate a scenario where the fixed and relative offset are aligned.




1	2	3	4	5
No visible motion artifacts.	Very slight artifacts. Horizontal streaks at the upper and lower ends are visible.	Some artifacts. Horizontal streaks are visible, but cortex is intact.	Large horizontal streaks are visible. Cortex continuity is moderately disrupted at places and trabeculae are smeared.	Major horizontal streaks are visible. Complete disruption of continuity of the cortex and trabecular structure.

1128
 1129 **Figure 2:** Motion grading guideline as recommended by the manufacturer and presented by Sode
 1130 et al. [38], with visual examples provided here for second-generation radius (top row) and tibia
 1131 (bottom row) scans.

1132
 1133
 1134
 1135

1135



1136

1137

1138

1139

1140


1141

1142

1143

Figure 3: Example of distal radius scan from a first-generation HR-pQCT and outputs from image processing protocol, where A) is the greyscale slice-wise view with the periosteal contour (green) identified, B) segmented whole bone volume, C) cortical bone region extracted using the standard analysis protocol, and D) cortical bone region extracted using the dual-threshold technique.


1143
1144



1145
1146
1147
1148
1149
1150
1151

Figure 4: Example a segmented second-generation HR-pQCT tibia scan converted into an FE mesh using a voxel-by-voxel conversion approach. The model is composed of millions of hexahedral elements.

1151



1152

1153

1154

1155

1156

Figure 5: Examples of axial (A) and angular (B) offsets in between scan regions captured at baseline (blue) and follow-up (red).

1156
1157 **List of Tables**

1158
1159 **Table 1:** Technical parameters of first-generation (XtremeCT) and second generation
1160 (XtremeCT II) HR-pQCT standard in vivo scan protocol. Technical specifications adapted from
1161 Manske et al. [29]

	First-generation XtremeCT	Second-generation XtremeCT II
<i>Technical Specifications</i>		
Energy (kVp)	59.4	68.0
Current (μ A)	900	1470
Integration Time (ms)	100	43
Field of View (cm)	12.6	14.0
Scan Time (min)	2.8	2.0
Stack Length (mm)	9.02	10.2
Isotropic Voxel Size (μ m)	82.0	60.7
Spatial Resolution (μ m)	134.6 – 154.4	92.5 – 112.6
Effective Patient Dose (μ Sv)	3-5	5
<i>Standard Image Processing Specifications</i>		
Image Filtering	Laplace-Hamming Filter: ε 0.5, cut-off 0.4,	Gaussian Filter: σ 0.8, support 1.0,
Bone Volume Segmentation Threshold	Global Threshold: 400 permille (‰)	Trabecular: 320 mg HA /cm ³ Cortical: 450 mg HA /cm ³
Morphological Analysis	Direct and derived measurements	Direct measurements

1162