NC STATE UNIVERSITY

Investigation, Modeling, and Reconstruction of the Tendon-to-Bone Insertion

Brett Austin McCandless and Hsiao-Ying Shadow Huang

Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering Department, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC

Introduction and Background

Methods and Results

Current Knowledge

- Tendon-bone insertion tissue is structurally and functionally graded to alleviate stress concentration from soft tendon to hard bone
- Gradation in microstructure is not recreated in a healing insertion as in a native tissue

Current Limitations

- There is insufficient understanding of tissue microstructure and the property governing regeneration and repair post iniurv
- There is no comprehensive. three-dimensional mathematical model that may be used for modeling the insertion tissue

Objectives and Approaches

- Utilize an emerging, highresolution cross-sectional imaging technique, cone-beam computed tomography, to obtain tissue information
- Varied scan parameters used to obtain pixel values for tendon and bone; values compared for accuracy
- Image slices obtained from reconstructions pieced together in ImageJ to create 3D rendering of tissue

Imaging and Scanning

- Imaging and scanning was performed using digital flexor tendon-bone units procured from the local abattoir (Nahunta Pork Center, Pikeville, NC) immediately after slaughtering.
- Tendon-to-bone connections were dissected
- from the two middle digits on the pigs' feet immediately after obtaining the feet. Sample was immediately chemically fixed and critical point dried before imaging and scanning.
- Imaging was done using cone-beam computed tomography (Xradia 510 Versa, Zeiss, Germany) (Fig. 1). Various combinations of scanning parameters, such as voltages, filters, binning sections, detector locations, and beam hardening coefficients (for reconstruction) were used during scanning.





in Xradia Versa 510.

- Wide Range of X-ray voltages, setups 30-160 kV,12 filters for energy selection
- **Contrast-optimized Detectors** 2k x 2k pixel, noise suppressed chargecoupled detector

Vibrational isolation, thermal stabilization

Xradia 510 Specifications:

High Spatial Resolution

< 0.7 um resolution

Scotch tape applied to both sides of tissue and was mounted in pin via a sample holder (Fig. 3).

Results and Discussion

Pixel Values

- Regions of interest (ROI) were drawn on each image slice of scan reconstructions. Pixel values within region were analyzed using ImageJ (National Institutes of Health, Maryland, USA) (Fig. 4).
- Mean pixel values for different sets of scan parameters taken, plotted on same axes (Fig. 5).



Difference, kVs

Difference, BH

70,60 kV

80.70 kV

Future work investigates the construction of finite element models of this tissue and the impact of these results on generation^a of these models.

400	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	0000	Differ Differ		
100	\wedge \wedge		D Hal, Dział		
			B2near,B2far		
	1 1 4	a 6000	B2near B1far		
200		i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i			
		S 4000			
		- 4000			
	$ \rangle \rangle \rangle \rangle \rangle \rangle \rangle \rangle \rangle \rangle$	×			
0	$V \to V \to V$	G 2000			
	V	2000			
	BH Differences		$\sim \sim$		
-200	Dif Diferences	1 0	_		
200	Fig. C. Differences of Mason Divel Malues				
	FIG. 6: Differences of Mean Pixel Values				

a 3000

2000

Difference, Filters

Difference, Detec/Bir

- Filter Difference

Table 1: Tabulated Significance Values					
Differing Parameters	Tendon, p-value	Bone, p-value	Difference, p-value		
60 kV, 70kV	0.0916	0.0679	0.1584		
60 kV, 80 kV	0.5176	0.2769	0.0258+		
70 kV, 80 kV	0.0071+	0.0046+	0.9113		
No Filter, LE2 Filter	3.0854 * 10-4+	0.6101	1.7696 * 10-5+		
Beam Hardening Coefficients	0.0058+	0.6478	7.2714 * 10-4+		
B2far, B1far	1.2346 * 10-13+	0.0309+	8.8824 * 10-7+		
B2far, B2near	1.4189 * 10-14+	0.4790	6.9290 * 10-14+		
B1far, B2near	0.0345+	0.0908	1.3424 * 10-14+		

