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ABSTRACT

Balloon kyphoplasty (BKP) is one of the most reliable minimally invasive surgery (MIS) procedure to treat osteoporotic vertebral compression fractures (VCFs). However, untoward complications of high incidence of adjacent vertebral fractures after BKP and their risk factors are still equivocal. To further investigate the underlying cause of this phenomenon, non-linear finite element analysis (FEA) was fully utilized based on load sharing distribution, strain energy distribution and fracture risks evaluation. For this purpose, an image-based pre and postoperative three-dimensional (3D) finite element models of thoracic and lumbar spinal unit (T11-L3) for an osteoporotic patient were developed. After BKP, the load sharing distribution (between anterior and posterior column), strength and stiffness of the augmented vertebra has significantly improved. However, higher generation of interface stresses and deformation energy were found immediately at the adjacent vertebral bodies, which makes them susceptible to the risks of bone failures. Failure risks evaluation based on the incremented loads of 1kN to 10kN (50% risk of spinal injury) have shown very encouraging results. Apparently, the postoperative deformation onset loading (5kN) was fallen within the acceptable range that was higher than the standard normal daily activities (1kN). It is believed that, the optimization of the material properties used in BKP procedure with the depth understanding on the historical and natural evolution of the osteoporosis could achieve optimal clinical outcomes in the future.
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INTRODUCTION

Vertebral compression fractures (VCFs) has become a global issue in relation to the improved healthcare and lifestyle. The underlying cause of this disease might be due to trauma, disease of the spine and the most common cause is osteoporosis. The clinical significance of osteoporotic lies in its high vulnerability and susceptibility to bone fractures (Homingga et al., 2004), and the most prevalent fracture site is the spine (Melton and Chrischillies, 1992). It is characterized by the low bone mass and micro-architectural deterioration of the bone tissues (Peck et al., 1993). It has been reported that two-thirds of VCFs was detected asymptomatically (Cooper, O’Neill and Silman, 1993) and if left untreated VCFs would increase the chance of subsequent fractures by 500% leading to a dramatic health deterioration and perhaps increase the risk of mortality (Mathis et al., 2001). In Japan, there are more than 10 million osteoporosis patients (Tawara et al., 2006). It is believed that this number will significantly increase in relation to Japan’s life expectancy continues to rise.

Minimal invasive surgery (MIS) procedure of balloon kyphoplasty (BKP) is of the most reliable treatment to treat VCFs disease. BKP requires the injection of bone cement into the vertebrae in order to stabilize fractured vertebrae, restore the height of the compressed vertebral body, relieve pain, reduce the incidence of cement leakage into spinal canal, correct kyphosis deformities, and achieve a fully spinal functional outcomes (Zhang et al., 2010). Apparently, the selection of the bone cement as a filling material play the utmost role in determining the effectiveness of the treatment (He et al., 2015). Basically, the bone cement must have the considerable mechanical strength and toughness, they must be radiopaque under fluoroscopy, and they should have an adequate viscosity and be injectable for facilitating BKP procedure (He et al., 2015), (Zhang et al., 2010), (Lavelle and Cheney, 2006). Many reports have shown clinical improvements for patient treated with BKP (Luo, Adams and Dolan, 2010). However, recurrent vertebral compression fractures, particularly at the adjacent levels has been raising consternation about its further complications.

The objectives of this study were to quantitatively analyze the load transfer mechanisms of pre and postoperative models of patient with VCFs treated with BKP procedures. It was also to investigate to what extent would BKP procedures increase the strength and stiffness of the treated vertebra and concurrently induce the occurrence of VCFs at the adjacent non-treated vertebral level.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

FE modeling

Three-dimensional FE models of pre and
postoperative vertebrae column (T12-L3) of an osteoporotic patient (Figure-1) were constructed in MECHANICAL FINDER™ software (Research Center of Computational Mechanics Co. Ltd. Japan). Written informed consent, permission and cooperation of 74-year-old Japanese female osteoporotic patient was obtained. To create the FE models, CT scan images of the osteoporotic subjects (Department of Orthopedic Surgery, Juntendo University, Japan) were taken pre and postoperatively and transferred to FE software. From the obtained CT scan images, the FE models were then constructed based on the extracted bone edges of the region of interests (ROI) around the outer region of the cortical bone to obtain the anatomical structure of the spinal bone. The same process was also repeated in order to obtain the physical structure of the augmented bone cement in the postoperative model. The FE models were then modelled with 1mm linear tetrahedral and triangular elements. The tetrahedral element was used to represent the bone cement and the inner portion of the cortical and cancellous bone. The triangular element with the thickness of 0.4mm was used to represent the outer cortex.

To reflect the heterogeneity of the FE models, the mechanical properties for each element were calculated from the Hounsfield Unit (HU) values. Young’s modulus of each element were obtained using the relationship as reported by Keyak et al. (1998). Poisson’s ratio was set to a constant value of 0.4 (Keyak et al., 1998), (Reilly and Burstein, 1975), (Van Burskik and Ashman, 1981). Facet joint cartilages and intervertebral discs were created based on the approximation and visualization of their actual structure and position that were verified by orthopaedic surgeons. Poisson’s ratio for the intervertebral discs and the facet joint cartilages were set at 0.45 and 0.2, correspondingly. Meanwhile, the young’s modulus were set at 8.4MPa and 11MPa, respectively (Table-1). The material properties of the bone cement are listed in Table-2.

Analysis

The FE models were loaded with compressive loading of 1kN (Tawara et al., 2006), (Mazlan et al, 2014). The load was then incrementally increased up to 10kN in order to evaluate the failure risks in the vertebrae. The 10kN compressive/impact loading was used to simulate the worst loading condition, the force at which there is 50% risk of injury (Meyerhoff et al., 2008). The loadings were applied to the superior surface of T11, while the inferior surface of L3 was fixed in all directions (Figure 1). The loads were modeled according to the three-column load distribution (85% of the load was applied to the vertebral body, 15% to the neural arch) (Zhang et al., 2010).

The biomechanical effects of the pre and postoperative models were thoroughly analyzed and investigated based on the non-linear finite element analysis. The analysis was focused on the load sharing distribution at the anterior and posterior column of the vertebrae, and the interface stresses at the intervertebral disc-endplate and facet joint cartilage junction. In addition, the strain energy distribution (SED) variations were also investigated. The SED was obtained from the principle stress and stress invariant (Chiang and Wang, 2006). It was reported that the load transmission mechanism of the SED can be used as a failure criterion of an element.

The fracture risks evaluation of the vertebrae were analyzed based on the Newton-Raphson method (Bessho et al., 2007), (Tawara et al., 2014). The analysis were translated into a graphical representation of failure and yielding element distributions. The criteria of the failure elements were divided into compressive and tensile directions. The initiation of the failure in a tensile direction was initiated when the maximum principle stress is higher than the ultimate tensile stress. The ultimate tensile stress was set as 80% of the compressive yield stress. As for the compressive direction, the failure criteria was divided into two stages according to Drucker-Prager yield criterion. The first stage known as a yielded state and it occurs when the Drucker-Prager equivalent stress

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Young’s Modulus (MPa)</th>
<th>Poisson’s Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intervertebral Disc</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facet Joint</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table-2. Bone cement material properties (Kurtz, Villarragaa and Zhao, 2005(a)), (Kurtz, Villarragaa and Zhao, 2005(b)).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material properties</th>
<th>Bone cement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poisson’s ratio</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young’s modulus</td>
<td>3700MPa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical strength</td>
<td>31MPa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yield strength</td>
<td>111MPa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
exceeds the compressive yield stress. The second stage or the state of the initiation of failure commences when the minimum principle strain of an element is less than -10000 microstrains in a yielded state.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Drucker-Prager stress distribution for the pre and postoperative models under the application of 1kN compressive loading are shown in Figure-2. In general, the Drucker-Prager stress of the postoperative model was distributed more evenly than the preoperative model. This condition was closely related to the failure of the intervertebral disc to distribute the compressive stress evenly on the adjacent vertebral bodies preoperatively. By implementing the BKP procedure, the disc pressure could be restored back to normal and the stress could be distributed more evenly on the adjacent vertebral bodies. Obviously, for the treated L1 vertebra, the highest stress concentration could be found at the interface between the bone cement and the cancellous bone junction. This condition might be related to the stiffness mismatch between the bone cement and the cancellous bone, which might cause bone resorption in the long run (Mazlan et al., 2014). This condition could be reduced by enhancing the bone cement material properties to the value that is close to the cancellous bone material properties with improved mechanical strength and stiffness.

Figure-3 shows the stress distribution between the anterior (vertebral body) and posterior column (neural arch) of the vertebrae. Obviously, BKP has significantly reduced the stress concentration gap between the two segments especially at the L1 vertebra. The neural arch load bearing for the postoperative model at the L1 and L2 experienced lower stress concentration than the preoperative model. The most affected region was at the pedicle region of the L1 vertebra as depicted in Figure-2. However, the risk of the bone failure was still exist at the T12 vertebra based on the high stress concentration gap difference postoperatively. This is based on the fact that, the high stress concentration gap between the neural arch and vertebral body might cause the area with lower stress concentration would be stress shielded, reducing the bone density and finally increased the risk of bone failures (Luo, Adams and Dolan, 2010). It has to be borne in mind that, it is also not good to have a high stress concentration on the anterior column of the vertebrae, since the anterior column is more susceptible to damage due to its low bone mineral density especially in elderly spine (Lavelle and Cheney, 2006).

Table-3 and Table-4 show the distribution of the Maximal Drucker-Prager stress at disc-endplates and facet joints junctions, respectively. Obviously, after BKP surgery, the maximum L1 superior and inferior endplates Drucker-Prager stresses increased by 27.27% and 96.5%, respectively. However, at the adjacent non-treated vertebrae two contradictory results were observed. The maximum T12 inferior endplate Drucker-Prager stress decreased by 16.46%, while the maximum L2 superior endplate increased by 48.98%. The reduction of the maximal Drucker-Prager stress at the T12 endplate was compensated with the increased of the stress at the T12 inferior articular facet, while the increment of the maximal Drucker-Prager stress at the L2 superior endplate was compensated with the decrease of the stress at the L2 superior articular facet. Obviously, after BKP the interface stresses (inferior and superior endplates) at the treated vertebrae has increased significantly and therefore the adjacent non-treated vertebrae has to absorb the higher load impacts produced at this region. This showed that the bone cement has increased the total strength and stiffness level of the treated vertebra and thus increasing the stress on the endplates immediately above and below the treated vertebral body, leading to increase pressure on the adjacent discs, and eventually producing higher stress on the endplate of the adjacent vertebrae (Zhang et al., 2010), (Luo, Adams and Dolan, 2010).
Figure-3. Graph of Maximal Drucker-Prager stress distribution at the anterior and posterior column for the (a) pre and (b) postoperative models.

Table-3. Maximal Drucker-Prager interface stress at disc-endplates junction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-operative</th>
<th>Post-operative</th>
<th>Percentage difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T12 inferior endplate</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>-16.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1 superior endplate</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1 inferior endplate</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>96.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2 superior endplate</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>49.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table-4. Maximal Drucker-Prager interface stress at the facet joint cartilages junction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-operative</th>
<th>Post-operative</th>
<th>Percentage difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T12 inferior articular facet</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>150.7</td>
<td>811.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1 superior articular facet</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>76.2</td>
<td>296.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1 inferior articular facet</td>
<td>314.3</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>-85.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2 superior articular facet</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>-20.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SED variations as shown in Figure-4 and Figure-5 is one of a reliable method to interpret the load transfer mechanism and the risk of bone fractures in vertebrae. For the both cases (pre and postoperative models) the adjacent non-fractured and non-treated vertebrae experienced higher SED than the fractured and treated vertebra. Since the input energy of the motion segment was remained the same, therefore the adjacent non-treated and non-fractured vertebrae have to absorb the extra energy and hence increases the risk of vertebral bone failures. For the postoperative model, the strain energy density at the L1 has been significantly reduced and the risk of fracture at this area was assumed reduced. By virtue of the potential energy stored in a volume, the SED is reflecting the amount of work that has to be done to produce the elastic deformation (Chiang and Wang, 2006). Therefore, this mechanism could be used as a tool to predict which area of the vertebral bodies that are susceptible to vertebral failures based on this energy type failure criterion (Li, 2001). In addition, the results showed that the adjacent non-treated vertebrae were weaker and less stiff than those treated with BKP. This mechanism may explain the clinical observation of the adjacent vertebral failure after BKP.

Figure-4. Strain energy density distribution.
To further enhance the investigation on the phenomenon of the adjacent non-treated vertebral fractures, bone fracture analysis based on the Newton-Raphson method was applied. The distribution of the failure and yielding shell elements in tensile and compressive directions under the incremented compressive loading of 1kN to 10kN are given in Figure-6. Apparently, the initiation of element failure was started to show its significant impact when the load was increased from 7kN to 10kN. The amount of failure and yielding shell elements at the adjacent non-treated vertebrae T12 and L2 were comparably higher for the postoperative than the preoperative model. However, at the treated vertebra L1 the number of the yielding and failure elements has decreased postoperatively as described in Figure-6(b). These phenomena were believed to have a strong relationship with the improved mechanical properties of the treated vertebra. As a result, the fractures were initiated at the adjacent vertebral bodies. This situation could be translated into a graphical representation as depicted in Figure-7. The fracture of the vertebrae were defined as occurring when at least one shell element failed. Therefore, it was comprehensively understood that these results will be highly reflected its clinical outcomes in a real situation (Bessho et al. 2007).

The Finite element analysis have shown a very significant impact on the evaluation of BKP procedures. The adverse effect of the VCFs in osteoporotic and elderly people is well understood (Uppin et al. 2003). Spinal deformity biomechanically produced uneven high stress and strain distributions leading to the initiation of subsequent fractures even with a normal daily living
activities (Mazlan et al. 2014). Postoperative results has shown that BKP has significantly improved the load sharing distributions between the anterior and the posterior vertebral column and tremendously increased the stiffness and strength of the fractured vertebral body towards prefraction levels. Moreover, the onset load for the initiation of the failure and yielding elements at the treated vertebral level of L1 was significantly improved in comparison to the preoperative model. As for the fractured vertebra, the onset load could be detected as early as 5kN, whereas for the treated vertebra only microdamages were detected at the maximum load of 10kN. Generally, after BKP surgery, bone damage formation was started to occur under the impact loading of 7kN. This condition is mechanically acceptable since the onset load was much more higher than the normal daily living activities as reported by Han et al. 2013. However, the bone failure risks was still exist at higher load and therefore high risks activity must be completely avoided. Inevitable events such as falling or accidents might still have imposed high susceptibility of bone failure either on the treated or non-treated vertebrae.

Despite its superior characteristic in improving the mechanical properties of the fratured vertebra, the result has suggested that BKP could increase the stress on the endplates immediately above and below it, and hence producing higher stress on the adjacent vertebral endplates, which then putting them in a state of bone failures. It has also shown that the results of the SED load transfer mechanisms (Chiang and Wang, 2006) was correlated well with the results of the failure analysis utilizing by Newton-Raphson method (Bessho et al. 2007), (Tawara et al. 2014). Eventhough the main contributing factors of this phenomenon is still equivocal, we are strongly believed that a few factors like the type and amount of the injected bone cement, bone loss and natural evolution of osteoporosis on the spine were underlying the cause of this problem (Uppin et al. 2003) (Luo, Adams and Dolan, 2010), (Zhang et al. 2010), (He et al. 2011) (He et al. 2015). In a related study, bone cement leakage into vertebral disc was detected as one of the confounding factors that increases the risk of a new fracture at the adjacent vertebral bodies (Lin et al. 2004). In addition, rapid clinical improvement postoperatively might cause the patient to be able to get involve in more active activities that they were unable to do it previously. Eventhough they may resume fully recovery, the new axial load on the veretbra may be stressful and leading to a new compression fractures on the adjacent vertebrae (Uppin et al. 2003).

Improving mechanical properties of the bone cement has been one of the main focus in optimizing the usage of the materials in BKP development. Biomechanically, the bone cement must be have an adequate stiffness, compressive, shear and tensile strength in order to avoid massive biomechanical alteration of the spine (Zhang et al. 2010), (He et al. 2015). Besides, the bone cement choices must be based on comprehensive mechanical consideration to be able to be well adapted to the natural environment of the spinal bone (Verlan, Oner and Dhert, 2006). Moreover, being able to simultaneously promote bone formation yet suppress bone resorption is an added advantage for a promising type of bone cement utilizes in BKP procedure (He et al. 2015). Thus, the recurrent VCFs at the adjacent non-treated vertebrae could be highly avoided in the future.

CONCLUSIONS

FEA studies have shown that BKP procedure on the osteoporotic patient has significantly improved the biomechanical outcomes of the treated and non-treated vertebral bodies. Moreover, the postoperative deformation onset loading was fallen within the acceptable range that was higher than the normal daily living activities. The phenomenon of high incidence of adjacent vertebral bone failures could be well understood and showed very encouraging results. Therefore, the complimentary mechanisms of the stress distribution, SED distribution and non-linear fracture analysis could be used as reliable tools to predict and investigate the effectiveness of the given surgical procedure.
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