

University of Technology, Sydney

Faculty of Science

**Analysis of trabecular bone mechanical properties  
from magnetic resonance images**

Thesis submitted for the degree of

PhD in Science

**Zahra Zabolizadeh**

August 2012

## **CERTIFICATE OF AUTHORSHIP/ORIGINALITY**

I certify that the work in this thesis has not previously been submitted for a degree nor has it been submitted as part of requirements for a degree except as fully acknowledged within the text.

I also certify that the thesis has been written by me. Any help that I have received in my research work and the preparation of the thesis itself has been acknowledged. In addition, I certify that all information sources and literature used are indicated in the thesis.

Signature of Student

---

# ACKNOWLEDGMENT

In acknowledging the contributions of a number of people to this thesis, it is difficult to know where to start and where to stop. I have been inspired on my learning journey by a number of people, many of whom contributed to my development well before the research commenced. I therefore want to thank to my parents and sisters for the inspiration, love and support that they have provided me in my life journey. I want to thank my amazing husband Kazem for his encouragement and support, and my two wonderful sons Taha and Arad. Without their sacrifice and love, I doubt that I would have made it this far.

I would like to take this opportunity to express my sincere gratitude and appreciation to my supervisor Dr Michael Braun for his guidance, support, encouragement, and empathy throughout the candidature. He gave me so much of his time and effort that I am in debt to him forever.

I would like to extend my great appreciation to my co-supervisor Dr Ali Saleh for his support and guidance. I want also to thank Dr Geoff Anstis who was my associate supervisor at the start. I would also like to thank Dr Terry Brown for his help with finite element analysis software. I am grateful for the support and help shown by Professor William Walsh and his team members Dr Nicky Bertollo and Mr Nick Russell, in the Surgical Orthopaedic Research Lab, and Dr Carl Power at the Oncology Research Centre, Prince of Wales Hospital, University of New South Wales.

I would like to thank to my friends and staff in the Faculty of Science and School of Physics and Advanced Materials, who have supported and encouraged me throughout the duration of this PhD, especially Ms Rochelle Seneviratne and Ms Linda Foley. Special thanks are due to Dr Norman Booth in UTS Material testing lab, Mr Gregory Dalsanto and Mr Greg Evans in Science workshop, Mr Michael Lake, Mr Philip Lawrence and Mr Harry Simpson. I would also like to thank to Professor Geraldine Naughton for her encouragement and Dr Felix Wehrli for providing MR image data, ANSYS technical support team at LEAP Australia, and Dr Matthew Gaston in the Faculty of Engineering and IT.

I would like to thank Dr Gary Cowin and Dr Karine Mardon at the Centre for Advanced Imaging, University of Queensland, for their help and support with  $\mu$ CT,  $\mu$ MR, and whole-body MR imaging. Finally, I would like to acknowledge the University of Technology Sydney for the IRS scholarship.

## **Dedication**

This thesis is dedicated to my husband Kazem for his patience, sacrifice, courage and support. Without his willingness to share parenting, while he was also doing his PhD during my study, I would not have considered undertaking this project.

# Table of Contents

<b>CERTIFICATE OF AUTHORSHIP/ORIGINALITY.....</b>	<b>I</b>
<b>ACKNOWLEDGMENT .....</b>	<b>II</b>
<b>DEDICATION.....</b>	<b>IV</b>
<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS.....</b>	<b>XIV</b>
<b>LIST OF FIGURES .....</b>	<b>XVIII</b>
<b>LIST OF TABLES .....</b>	<b>XXI</b>
<b>LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS .....</b>	<b>XXII</b>
<b>ABSTRACT .....</b>	<b>XXIV</b>
<b>CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Introduction .....	1
1.2 Research aims .....	5
1.3 Thesis Outline.....	6
<b>CHAPTER 2: BACKGROUND AND LITERATURE REVIEW.....</b>	<b>8</b>
2.1 Introduction .....	8
2.2 Basic Bone Morphology and Mechanical Function .....	8
2.3 Imaging Modalities of Bone.....	11
2.3.1 Plain X-ray .....	11
2.3.2 Dual energy X-ray absorptiometry.....	12
2.3.3 Computed tomography.....	13

2.3.4	Micro-computed tomography.....	15
2.3.5	Quantitative-computed tomography .....	16
2.3.6	Magnetic resonance imaging.....	17
2.3.6.1	Principles of MRI.....	18
2.3.7	Image segmentation .....	28
2.4	Estimation of Bone Strength .....	29
2.4.1	Bone mineral density (BMD).....	29
2.4.2	Quantification of trabecular bone structure.....	30
2.4.3	Characterization of trabecular bone mechanical properties .....	32
2.4.3.1	Mechanical test .....	33
2.4.3.2	Strain gauge measurement .....	37
2.4.3.3	Finite element method .....	38
2.4.4	Validating FE models.....	47
2.4.5	Previous MRI-based FE models and motivation of the current study ..	49
<b>CHAPTER 3: MATERIALS AND METHODS .....</b>		<b>52</b>
3.1	Introduction .....	52
3.2	Development of a Compressive Mechanical Loading Chamber.....	53
3.3	Physical Phantom .....	55
3.4	Trabecular Bone Preparation and Mechanical Testing .....	56
3.4.1	Trabecular bone sample preparation .....	56
3.4.2	Mechanical testing .....	59

3.5	Image Acquisition .....	62
3.5.1	Micro-CT images of the phantom .....	62
3.5.2	Micro-MR images of the trabecular bone specimens .....	64
3.5.3	Whole-body MR images of the trabecular bone specimens .....	64
3.5.4	Micro-CT images of the trabecular bone specimens.....	65
3.6	Transformation of Image Data into a Volumetric Mesh .....	66
3.6.1	Transformation of image data into a volumetric mesh .....	66
3.6.1.1	Importing DICOM image data.....	66
3.6.1.2	Thresholding .....	69
3.6.1.3	Region growing.....	69
3.6.1.4	Volumetric mesh generation.....	70
3.7	Finite Element Modelling of Phantom and Trabecular Bone.....	70
3.7.1	Element description and material selection.....	71
3.7.2	Boundary conditions .....	72
3.7.3	Solution and output data .....	72
3.8	Comparison of Displacement Fields from FE Analysis .....	73
<b>CHAPTER 4: RESULTS AND DISCUSSION .....</b>		<b>77</b>
4.1	Mechanical Testing of Trabecular Bone and Physical Phantom.....	77
4.2	Validating FE Analysis .....	79
4.2.1	Evaluating high resolution $\mu$ CT-based FE analysis.....	79
4.2.2	Validating high resolution $\mu$ MR-based FE analysis .....	80



4.3	Linear and Geometric Non-linear FE Analysis .....	81
4.4	The Effect of Voxel Size on the apparent tissue elastic modulus .....	82
4.5	Displacement Field Visualization.....	86
4.6	Displacement Fields Comparison.....	89
4.6.1	Comparison of $\mu$ CT and high resolution $\mu$ MRI (30 $\mu$ m) .....	89
4.6.2	Comparison of MR images of different voxel sizes .....	91
4.7	The Limitation of Study .....	96
4.8	Conclusions .....	97
<b>APPENDIX A: SELECTED FE INPUT FILE.....</b>		<b>100</b>
<b>APPENDIX B: IDL PROCEDURES .....</b>		<b>102</b>
B.1	Procedure for the Image Registration .....	102
B.2	Discrepancy between Two Displacement Fields .....	104
<b>REFERENCES.....</b>		<b>107</b>

## List of Figures

Figure 2.1 A typical long bone is shown (a). The spongy-like structure (b) is the trabecular bone (named spongy bone in this figure). The cortical bone (compact bone) is the outer layer of the long bone structure (c) (From Carter 2011). ....	9
Figure 2.2 A comparison between healthy bone (left) and osteoporotic (right) bone microstructure (From Evert 2011). ....	10
Figure 2.3 Precession of a spin about the main magnetic field $B_0$ . ....	19
Figure 2.4 In a reference frame rotating with Larmor frequency, a $90^\circ$ RF pulse tips the net magnetization $M$ , initially at equilibrium, to lie in the transverse plane (From Brown & Semelka 2005). ....	21
Figure 2.5 Magnetization decay after $90^\circ$ pulse, showing in a rotating frame (top). Free induction decay (FID) of magnetization after a $90^\circ$ pulse (bottom). At the end of the $90^\circ$ pulse, all magnetization is aligned with the rotating x-axis. The individual magnetic moments continue to precess at different frequencies, resulting in the decrease of the magnetization component in the transverse plane (x-y plane) $M_{xy}$ over time. When the individual vectors are uniformly distributed in x-y plane, the net magnetization is zero and the signal vanishes (Adapted from Brown & Semelka 2005). ....	22
Figure 2.6 $\mu$ MR image of a bovine trabecular bone specimen .....	24
Figure 2.7 Typical stress-strain curve of a core sample of the trabecular bone from the bovine proximal femur, under uniaxial compressive testing. ....	34
Figure 3.1 The compressive mechanical loading chamber (mini-jig). ....	54
Figure 3.2 The manufactured phantom has the form of a rectangular lattice of cylindrical beams and the dimensions of 16 mm $\times$ 12 mm $\times$ 32 mm. ....	56
Figure 3.3 The outline of a femoral head, showing the 21-mm thick bone slab with end planes perpendicular to MTD (left). The bone slab was cut out from the head, and then cylindrical cores were drilled out from the slab. The extracted trabecular bone cylinder was 8.7 mm in diameter and 21 mm in height (right). (Adapted from Perilli, Baleani et al. 2008). ....	57

Figure 3.4 The surface of the bovine bone slab with cored cylindrical bone samples in situ (left), and a trabecular core with diameter of 8.7 mm and length of 17.4 mm (right).....	58
Figure 3.5 Set-up for compression testing of the trabecular bone specimen in the mechanical testing device (Instron 6022, 10 kN).....	61
Figure 3.6 A stress-strain curve obtained for a trabecular bone sample, illustrating the toe, elastic and plastic regions. The toe region located at the left of the curve is the end-artifact of the platen test .....	62
Figure 3.7 Experimental setup showing the placement of the jig in the $\mu$ CT scanner.....	63
Figure 3.8 The imported $\mu$ CT image data of the trabecular bone specimen inside the mini-jig before compression.....	68
Figure 3.9 Representations of roughly the same cross section of the trabecular bone sample in $\mu$ CT (left), $\mu$ MR (middle) and whole-body MR (right).....	68
Figure 3.10 An illustrated example of the determination of corresponding geometric structures from $\mu$ CT (top left) and $\mu$ MR (top right) images, and the 3D segmented structures (bottom). .....	75
Figure 4.1 Relationship of the estimated apparent elastic modulus from $\mu$ MRI-based FEA with image voxel size (left), and BVF (right) for bone sample.....	84
Figure 4.2 The relation between the bone volume fraction and MR image voxel size.....	85
Figure 4.3 The displacement magnitude from FE analysis based on $\mu$ MR image data for the applied displacement of 0.2 mm at the top of specimen, the bottom left is a central longitudinal section of the top model. Because of the density of the displacement field, the individual vector cannot be seen, a zoomed version of the portion of the sample is provided on the right of figure.....	86
Figure 4.4 The displacement magnitude from FE analysis based on $\mu$ MR image data (top), and whole-body MR image (bottom) for the applied displacement of 0.4 mm at the top of specimen. ....	88

Figure 4.5 The relationship between the mean norm displacement error and MR image voxel size .....	93
Figure 4.6 Variation of the mean displacement norm error with the apparent elastic modulus error. ....	94

## List of Tables

Table 3.1 Image data information .....	67
Table 3.2 The element numbers of the FE meshes and required time to run FEA ...	70
Table 4.1 Apparent elastic modulus, ultimate stress and ultimate strain for bovine trabecular bone samples. ....	78
Table 4.2 Apparent elastic modulus of phantom in-camera.....	79
Table 4.3 Apparent elastic modulus and tissue effective elastic modulus of bone samples (high resolution $\mu$ CT-based FEA) .....	80
Table 4.4 Apparent elastic modulus and tissue effective elastic modulus of bone samples (high resolution $\mu$ MR-based FEA) .....	81
Table 4.5 Reaction forces of linear and geometric non-linear FEA based on MR with image voxel size 50 $\mu$ m.....	82
Table 4.6 Apparent elastic modulus, tissue effective elastic modulus and stiffness from $\mu$ MRI- and whole-body MRI-based FEA for bone samples, and BVF.....	83
Table 4.7 Paired coordinate measurements .....	89
Table 4.8 Errors in transformed coordinates of $\mu$ CT image.....	90
Table 4.9 The components of displacement errors between FE results of $\mu$ CT (36 $\mu$ m) with high resolution $\mu$ MR (30 $\mu$ m) for the applied displacement of 0.4 mm ...	91
Table 4.10 Errors in transformed coordinates of $\mu$ MRI (30 $\mu$ m).....	91
Table 4.11 The components of displacement errors between FE results of lower resolution $\mu$ MR, whole-body MR and high resolution $\mu$ MR (30 $\mu$ m) for the applied displacement of 0.4 mm.....	92
Table 4.12 The components of displacement between FE results of whole-body MR and high resolution $\mu$ MR (30 $\mu$ m) .....	95

## List of Abbreviations

aBMD	Areal bone mineral density
BMD	Bone mineral density
BV/TV	Bone volume fraction
CT	Computed tomography
DICOM	Digital Imaging and Communications in Medicine
DXA	Dual energy x-ray absorptiometry
FE	Finite element
FEA	Finite element analysis
FEM	Finite element method
FID	Free induction decay
FLASE	Fast large-angle spin echo
FLASH	Fast low-angle shot
FSE	Fast spin echo
HR-pQCT	High resolution peripheral quantitative computed tomography
IDL	Interactive Data Language
IGFA	Image guided failure assessment
IOF	International Osteoporosis Foundation
MIMICS	Materialises Interactive Medical Image Control System
MR	Magnetic resonance
MRI	Magnetic resonance imaging
MSE	Multiple spin echoes
MTD	Main trabecular direction
NMR	Nuclear magnetic resonance
PCG	Preconditioned conjugate gradient
PBS	Phosphate buffered saline
PD	Proton density
PVE	Partial volume effect
QCT	Quantitative computed tomography
RF	Radio frequency

SE	Spin echo
SNR	Signal-to-noise ratio
Tb.N	Trabecular number
Tb.Sp	Trabecular separation
Tb.Th	Trabecular thickness
TE	Echo time
TR	Repetition time
$\mu$ CT	Micro computed tomography
$\mu$ MRI	Micro magnetic resonance imaging
vBMD	Volumetric bone mineral density
WHO	World Health Organization

## ABSTRACT

Bone mineral density (BMD) measured by dual energy x-ray absorptiometry (DXA) is often used in the clinical diagnosis of bone disorders such as osteoporosis. However, several studies have shown that measuring BMD alone does not provide sufficient discrimination between individuals with and without increased fracture risk. In fact, bone quality is affected also by the bone micro-architecture and material properties. The development of imaging techniques, particularly computed tomography (CT) and magnetic resonance (MR) imaging, allowed the generation of three-dimensional (3D) images for the morphological analysis of trabecular bone. Furthermore, the 3D image data can be the source of finite element (FE) models. FE analysis of such data represents a means to assess the mechanical response virtually. Whole-body CT and MRI scanners are able to provide three-dimensional images *in vivo* of human femoral and spinal sites but compared to  $\mu$ CT and  $\mu$ MR, have poorer resolution and lower signal-to-noise ratio. As a result of the low resolution, a significant partial volume effect is expected to affect the reconstructed images primarily by blurring the interface between bone and soft tissue. Thus, the implications of such limitations on the FE assessment of mechanical properties should be investigated.

The main goal of this study was to assess the capability of whole-body low resolution MRI-based finite element model for the prediction of trabecular bone mechanical properties. The apparent elastic modulus and the displacement field were assessed and compared to a high resolution MR model. The effect of image voxel



size on these properties was examined using  $\mu$ MR images acquired with different resolutions.

The estimated mechanical properties of two trabecular bone samples (A and B), as assessed by whole-body MRI-based FE analysis, were compared with the corresponding measurements obtained from the validated  $\mu$ MRI-based FE analysis. It was found that increasing the voxel size from 30  $\mu$ m to 200  $\mu$ m raised the apparent elastic modulus by up to 13% and 21% for bone samples A and B, respectively. For whole-body MR, with voxel size of 260  $\mu$ m, the overestimate rose to 24% for both bone samples. However, the apparent tissue elastic modulus stayed within the range (722- 1207) MPa, and (777 – 1228) MPa for bone samples A and B, respectively, imaged with high resolution  $\mu$ MR. The variations in the apparent elastic modulus appear to correlate with differences in the bone volume fraction, which varied between 0.44 and 0.68. FE analysis of load levels in the elastic range indicated that the more computationally costly geometric non-linear analysis did not improve the results significantly. Hence, a linear elastic FE analysis was deemed to be sufficiently accurate at low load levels.

In addition to estimating the apparent elastic modulus, FE analysis can produce a displacement field that represents the response to applied compression at every point in the trabecular bone. The results show that increasing the voxel size leads to a systematic overestimation of the mean displacement compared to the reference values. However, the mean norm displacement estimated from whole-body MR (0.64 mm) in the direction of the applied compression force falls within the range obtained from high resolution  $\mu$ MR ( $0.64 \pm 0.13$  mm). The results also suggest that the information provided by displacement field values may be statistically

uncorrelated with the apparent elastic modulus and hence serve as an additional source of parameterization of the mechanical response of trabecular bone.

The application of whole-body MRI to trabecular bone analysis is expected to be affected not only by resolution but also by other effects arising from the low strength of the steady magnetic field, the large imaging volume, and motion artefacts. Nevertheless, both the estimated apparent elastic modulus and displacement field are compatible with those obtained from  $\mu$ MR of comparable resolution.

Within the limit of this study the predictions of FE analysis derived from whole-body MR are within the range of predictions based on high resolution  $\mu$ MR, indicating a potential suitability of MR for assessment of bone strength.