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ABSTRACT

In osteoporosis, changes in tissue structure and composition impair the mechanical strength of bone and increase the risk of fractures. Osteoporosis causes millions of bone fractures annually worldwide. It is commonly diagnosed by means of dual energy X-ray absorptiometry (DXA), a technique that provides information on areal bone mineral density (BMD, g/cm²). However, most of the low trauma fractures occur in people with normal BMD values.

Quantitative ultrasound (QUS) propagation and scattering depend on both the material and structural properties of bone. Thus, ultrasound measurements provide a method for osteoporosis diagnosis. As ultrasound devices are portable, cheap and do not apply ionizing radiation, they might be suitable for osteoporosis screening.

In the present thesis work, the composition of trabecular bone and its calcified matrix was analysed and compared experimentally, and by using numerical analyses, to ultrasound speed, attenuation and backscattering parameters. In addition, the diagnostic potential of a point-like ultrasound measurement and that of quantitative ultrasound imaging were compared. Further, the effect of overlying soft tissue on the measurement of human trabecular bone was investigated at various ultrasound frequencies. Finally, a novel dual frequency ultrasound technique (DFUS) was evaluated for the soft tissue correction of bone ultrasound measurements.

Bone quantity was the strongest determinant of ultrasound parameters ($r = 0.64-0.84$, $p < 0.01$). Ultrasound backscattering was also significantly related ($r = -0.66, p < 0.01$) to the content of calcified matrix collagen. Variation in ultrasound parameter values within the region of interest was seen to relate with the ultimate strength of trabecular bone ($r = -0.82, p < 0.01$). Soft tissues overlying the bone induced significant errors (4% - 127%) in the ultrasound measurements. This effect increased with the ultrasound frequency. After correction with the DFUS technique, the magnitude of errors induced by soft tissue on ultrasound backscattering diminished significantly, typically to one tenth.

QUS parameters of trabecular bone are related to both the quantity and quality of trabecular bone. In addition, measurement of the variation in QUS parameters within the area of interest significantly improves the prediction of bone mechanical strength. The present findings together with the novel DFUS method may enable reliable QUS measurements of trabecular bone at various clinically relevant sites. This could have a significant clinical value.
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Osteoporosis affects over 200 million individuals worldwide (159). The economic impact of osteoporosis in Europe was about 36 billion euros in 2000 (42). It has been estimated that both the number of patients and the economic impact of osteoporosis will further increase along with the aging of the population (113, 143, 147). In osteoporosis, changes in tissue structure and composition impair the mechanical strength of bone and increase the risk of fractures. Thus, early diagnosis of osteoporosis is essential for prevention of fractures. Currently, osteoporosis diagnosis is based on information on areal bone mineral density (BMD) (95), traditionally determined with dual energy X-ray absorptiometry (DXA). Unfortunately, the availability of the DXA devices is low relative to the number of potential patients. Although patients with osteoporotic BMD values (i.e. BMD < 2.5 SD below young adult BMD) have a higher risk for fractures than patients with normal BMD values (95–97), most of the low trauma fractures occur in people with normal BMD values (36, 157).

Quantitative ultrasound (QUS) measurements of the heel have been demonstrated to predict osteoporotic fractures with a similar accuracy as BMD (54, 70, 86). As ultrasound propagation and scattering depend on bone structure, composition and mechanical properties (28, 55, 66, 76–78, 125, 129, 170, 175) quantitative ultrasound measurements provide a potential method for osteoporosis diagnosis. Since ultrasound devices are portable and cheap, and use no ionizing radiation, they might be suitable for osteoporosis screening.

The current clinical QUS parameters include the speed of sound (SOS) and the broadband ultrasound attenuation (BUA). The clinical QUS parameters suffer from the uncertainties arising from variable bone size and marrow composition (3, 76, 125, 183). Moreover, soft tissues overlying the bone have a significant impact on the parameters measured (29, 57, 99).

Clinical QUS instruments typically measure the acoustic properties of the calcaneus, which is not a common osteoporotic fracture site (71). In contrast to current clinical through-transmission measurements, backscattering measurements in pulse-echo geometry could more easily enable analyses of common fracture sites, such as the vertebrae, hip and wrist. This could significantly improve the clinical prediction of an individual’s susceptibility for bone fracture. Unfortunately, the backscattering
measurements suffer from the uncertainties induced by soft tissue and bone marrow as well (3, 125).

The mechanical properties of trabecular bone depend on its trabecular structure, organic composition and mineral density (24, 119, 132, 168). In osteoporosis, the volume fraction of calcified bone (or BMD) is known to decrease, while the osteoporotic changes in the properties of calcified matrix are not fully understood. However, in certain bone diseases, such as osteogenesis imperfecta, bone collagen is known to be affected and the overall bone strength is decreased (41). QUS may detect decollagenization and diagnose collagen disruption (Ehlers-Danlos syndrome) with more sensitivity than the DXA (31, 78).

Most commercially available ultrasound devices measure acoustic properties at a single point or by scanning an acoustic map of the heel (37, 47, 49, 93, 138, 164). However, the variation in the ultrasound parameters within the region of interest (ROI) and the relation of spatial variation in parameters with the mechanical properties of trabecular bone is poorly known. In addition, as trabecular bone is structurally heterogeneous, the selection of the tissue depth for analysis inside the bone may significantly affect the values of backscattering parameters. However, this issue has not been extensively investigated.

This thesis work investigated the potential of the through-transmission and pulse-echo ultrasound techniques for evaluating the composition of the calcified matrix. The relation between the spatial variation in ultrasound parameters and the bone mechanical strength was also analysed. The effect of tissue depth applied in ultrasound backscattering measurement was also characterized. The effect of overlying soft tissue on acoustic measurements of trabecular bone was examined, and the dual frequency ultrasound technique (DFUS) for minimization of soft tissue effects was introduced. The DFUS technique was initially evaluated using elastomer samples and then validated using human trabecular bone samples overlaid by heterogeneous soft tissue layers.
CHAPTER II
Properties of trabecular bone

The bony skeleton protects internal organs, and together with ligaments, tendons and muscles it enables locomotion (15, 52, 94, 156). Bone stores various minerals such as calcium, phosphorus, magnesium, sodium and potassium, and blood cells are produced in bone marrow. The human skeleton consists of two types of bone, cortical and trabecular. All the bones in the human skeleton are covered by a cortical bone layer, also called the compact bone layer. The shafts of long bones consist of a cortical bone pipe and a central cavity filled with bone marrow. Trabecular bone can be found in the ends of long bones (e.g. femur) and in cuboid bones (e.g. calcaneus). Trabecular bone structure is spongy, consisting of calcified matrix and bone marrow (Fig 2.1).

2.1 Structure of trabecular bone

The calcified matrix of trabecular bone consists of a network of interconnected trabeculae (154). In the network, the trabeculae are oriented optimally to resist the prevailing loads. The trabeculae may be of various sizes and shapes, such as rods and plates.
2.2. Composition of trabecular bone

The amount and direction of the mechanical stress control the size, shape and orientation of trabeculae. This functional adaptation is described by Wolff’s law (182), which states that trabeculae orientate gradually along the direction of the mechanical loading. The structure of trabecular bone can be described with morphometric parameters such as bone volume fraction (BV/TV), trabeculae thickness (Tb.Th.), trabeculae separation (Tb.Sp.), trabeculae number (Tb.N.), the degree of anisotropy (DA) and the structural model index (SMI). These parameters may be determined e.g. by means of microCT imaging (72–74, 135, 142). Bone volume fraction is the ratio of calcified matrix volume and total trabecular bone volume. The degree of anisotropy reflects the orientation of the trabeculae, whereas the structural model index indicates their shape whether plate-like or rod-like (Fig. 2.1). Fully isotropic material has a DA value of 1, while the anisotropic structures are described with DA values higher than 1. For a structure constructed ideally of either plates or rods, the SMI value is 0 or 3, respectively. Typical values of morphometric parameters for specific anatomical sites are presented in Table 2.1.

Table 2.1: Morphometric parameters of human trabecular bone at different skeletal sites (33, 44, 58, 100, 124, 144, 149). Extensive variation in the structure between different skeletal sites can be seen.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>BV/TV (%)</th>
<th>Tb.Th. (µm)</th>
<th>Tb.Sp. (µm)</th>
<th>Tb.N (mm⁻¹)</th>
<th>DA</th>
<th>SMI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Calcaneus</td>
<td>0.9 - 39.4</td>
<td>70 - 307</td>
<td>501 - 4010</td>
<td>0.21 - 1.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rupprecht et al. (149)</td>
<td>14.0 ± 4.9</td>
<td>726 ± 132</td>
<td>1.31 ± 0.19</td>
<td>1.66 ± 0.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eckstein et al. (44)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distal radius</td>
<td>28.4 ± 4.3</td>
<td>226 ± 18</td>
<td>594 ± 105</td>
<td>1.26 ± 0.17</td>
<td>1.88 ± 0.45</td>
<td>2.01 ± 0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pothuau et al. (144)</td>
<td>12.0 ± 7.1</td>
<td>148 ± 26</td>
<td>792 ± 113</td>
<td>1.12 ± 0.12</td>
<td>1.07 ± 0.45</td>
<td>1.87 ± 0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nägele et al. (124)</td>
<td>9.0 ± 3.3</td>
<td>123 ± 17</td>
<td>895 ± 128</td>
<td>1.12 ± 0.13</td>
<td>1.78 ± 0.37</td>
<td>1.87 ± 0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximal femur</td>
<td>26.2 ± 6.7</td>
<td>239 ± 23</td>
<td>750 ± 378</td>
<td>1.10 ± 0.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chevalier et al. (33)</td>
<td>9.3 - 31.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lai et al. (100)</td>
<td>20.6 ± 12.8</td>
<td>207 ± 57</td>
<td>951 ± 417</td>
<td>1.09 ± 0.33</td>
<td>2.31 ± 0.61</td>
<td>1.01 ± 0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eckstein et al. (44)</td>
<td>17.6 ± 9.3</td>
<td>182 ± 46</td>
<td>2.00 ± 0.39</td>
<td>1.27 ± 0.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vertebral body</td>
<td>30.6 ± 5.5</td>
<td>233 ± 14</td>
<td>551 ± 139</td>
<td>1.31 ± 0.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pothuau et al. (144)</td>
<td>10.2 ± 4.1</td>
<td>140 ± 14</td>
<td>986 ± 177</td>
<td>0.99 ± 0.17</td>
<td>1.50 ± 0.29</td>
<td>1.71 ± 0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nägele et al. (124)</td>
<td>7.5 ± 1.8</td>
<td>113 ± 13</td>
<td>1.17 ± 0.19</td>
<td>1.43 ± 0.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distal tibia</td>
<td>7.6 ± 4.5</td>
<td>125 ± 30</td>
<td>979 ± 164</td>
<td>1.02 ± 0.15</td>
<td>2.01 ± 0.26</td>
<td>2.25 ± 0.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BV/TV = bone volume fraction, Tb.Th. = trabeculae thickness, Tb.Sp. = trabeculae separation, Tb.N. = trabeculae number, DA = degree of anisotropy and SMI = structural model index.

2.2 Composition of trabecular bone

Trabecular bone consists of bone marrow and calcified matrix (15, 52, 94, 156). In the human skeleton, the relative portion of calcified matrix in trabecular bone volume, i.e. the bone volume fraction, varies typically between 1% and 40% (33, 44, 58, 100, 124, 144, 149). Calcified matrix consists of two phases, i.e. an inorganic and an organic phase; 65-70% and 30-35% of the calcified matrix weight consists of inorganic and organic substances, respectively. The inorganic part consists mainly of hydroxyapatite...
(\(Ca_{10}(PO_4)_6(OH)_2\)) while the organic part consists of various proteins. The predominant protein is type I collagen, which accounts for 85-90\% of the weight of the organic component in the calcified matrix (6)(Fig. 2.2). Typical values for calcified matrix mineral and collagen contents at specific anatomical sites are presented in Table 2.2.

![Figure 2.2: Calcified matrix consists of inorganic (mainly hydroxyapatite) and organic (mainly collagen I) parts.]

**Table 2.2:** Mineral (ash) and collagen content of calcified matrix at different human skeletal sites (1, 40). Significant variation in composition can be seen between the sites. Ding et al. (1997) (40) assumed that 13.4\% of the collagen content is hydroxyproline. This assumption is used to derive the collagen content from the results of the study by Aerssens et al. (1997)(1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Collagen content (%)</th>
<th>Mineral content (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Calcaneus</td>
<td>Aerssens et al. (1)</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iliac crest</td>
<td>Aerssens et al. (1)</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximal femur</td>
<td>Aerssens et al. (1)</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vertebra</td>
<td>Aerssens et al. (1)</td>
<td>24.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximal tibia</td>
<td>Ding et al. (40)</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Almost all (99\%) of the calcium in the body is stored in the bones, in the form of calcium hydroxyapatite. With this dynamic calcium storage, the body can regulate the calcium balance in the blood circulation. Collagen I is a highly cross-linked protein (41) with a diameter and length of 50-80 nm and 300 nm, respectively. The tensile strength of collagen fiber is higher even than that of steel (52), and, together with hydroxyapatite, collagen determines the mechanical properties of bone (48, 165).

Most of the bone marrow can be found in the central cavity of long bone shafts and also in pores within the trabecular structure (156). All the marrow cavities of a newborn human contain hemapoietically active red marrow whereas the marrow cavities of an adult also contain yellow marrow, which is mainly fat. The central cavity of long bone shafts of an adult human consists mainly of yellow marrow whereas red marrow can be found in trabecular bone marrow cavities (59).
2.3 Mechanical properties of trabecular bone

Since the skeleton enables locomotion and protects the internal organs, the mechanical properties of bone are important for functionality and wellbeing. The mechanical properties of trabecular bone depend on the structure, composition and quantity of calcified matrix. These properties are strongly affected by the mechanical stresses applied to the bone. According to Wolff’s law, the trabeculae orientate gradually along the direction of mechanical loading, so that eventually the trabeculae will be parallel with the prevailing loading direction. This structure is strong when loaded in the direction of the trabeculae but weaker for loads in other directions. The mechanical properties of trabecular bone can be determined in vitro e.g. by using tension (4, 26), compression (11, 27, 34, 51, 56, 87, 107, 115, 151, 179) and shear tests (69). With these techniques the mechanical properties are derived by analysing the stress-strain behaviour of the sample under mechanical loading (Fig. 2.3).

Figure 2.3: A compression test of a trabecular bone sample. The sample is immersed in a saline bath and compressed destructively with a constant strain rate. When the force ($F$) is normalized by the area of the sample ($A$), the stress that produces the deformation of the sample (strain) is determined. Finally, the strain is determined by normalizing the deformation of the sample with the original thickness of the sample. During an experiment, the stress and strain are recorded. The Yield point divides the stress-strain curve into elastic and plastic phases. In addition, the area under the stress-strain curve before the Yield point (shaded area) defines the resilience, i.e. the energy stored in the sample. Young’s modulus ($E$) is determined as the slope of the linear part of the curve and the ultimate strength ($\sigma_{\text{max}}$) is determined as the local maximum of the stress.

In the compression test, the compressive stress and deformation (i.e. strain) of the sample are recorded. The test may be conducted in confined (27) or unconfined geometry (Fig. 2.3). Typically, the sample is compressed with a constant strain rate and the induced stress is continuously recorded. The result is a stress-strain curve (161) (Fig. 2.3). Mechanical parameters such as Young’s modulus ($E$), ultimate strength ($\sigma_{\text{max}}$) (161) and strain, yield stress and strain and resilience can be determined from the stress-strain curve. Young’s modulus is a measure of the elastic stiffness of trabecular bone. Ultimate strength indicates the stress value where the calcified matrix structure collapses permanently. The yield point divides the stress-strain curve into elastic and plastic phases (Fig. 2.3), i.e. the deformation of the trabecular bone sample...
2. Properties of trabecular bone

is permanent after the Yield point. The area under the stress-strain curve before the Yield point defines the resilience (Fig. 2.3), i.e. the energy stored in the sample during the elastic phase. Young’s modulus (\(E\)) is determined as the slope of the linear part of the curve (Fig. 2.3) and ultimate strength is determined as the local maximum stress value (Fig. 2.3). Typical values of Young’s modulus and ultimate strength at several anatomical sites of the human skeleton are presented in Table 2.3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extensive variation in mechanical parameters between different skeletal sites can be seen.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ultimate strength (MPa)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Calcaneus</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mittra et al. (118)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Distal femur</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burgers et al. (23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hakulinen et al. (67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proximal femur</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schoenfeld et al. (151)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proximal tibia</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hakulinen et al. (67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vertebra</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholson et al. (127)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholson et al. (127)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholson et al. (127)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ML, medial-lateral; AP, anterior-posterior; SI, superior-inferior

In the compression test, the sample preparation, hydration, temperature and strain rate influence the values of the mechanical parameters of trabecular bone. Misaligned surfaces of the sample can cause underestimation of Young’s modulus and ultimate strength (109, 160, 161), whereas dehydration of the sample causes overestimation of the mechanical parameters (110). Young’s modulus of bone has been found to be 7% higher at room temperature than at body temperature (21). Therefore, it is important to control the variation of the ambient temperature. Control of the strain rate is important in trabecular bone mechanical testing (27, 108). Trabecular bone consists of solid (calcified matrix) and fluid (marrow) phases, which is characteristic of poroviscoelastic material (108). Because of this property, high strain rates induce hydraulic stiffening of bone, as there is not enough time for the marrow to flow out of the bone. Further, due to the intrinsic viscoelasticity of calcified matrix, both ultimate strength and Young’s modulus may increase with strain rate even when the marrow is removed (27).

2.4 Bone changes in osteoporosis

In osteoporosis, bone mass decreases and the calcified matrix structure deteriorates. Three bone cell types are responsible for the variation in bone mass: osteoblasts, osteocytes and osteoclasts (15, 52, 94, 156). Osteoblasts produce osteons and help them to mineralize, whereas the osteoclasts dissolve the mineralized osteons. Osteocytes are osteoblasts which have drifted into mineralized bone. It is thought that osteocytes
play an active role in bone turnover but the function of osteocytes is not fully understood (122). However, the osteoclasts are more active than the osteoblasts in bone turnover in osteoporosis. As the osteoclasts and osteoblasts act at the bone surface, this is the area where the bone turnover takes place. Although 80% of the skeleton mass consists of cortical bone, the surface of cortical bone covers only 20% of the total bone surface within the skeleton. Because of this, trabecular bone is renewed about eight times faster than cortical bone (141, 154). For this reason, measurement of the properties of trabecular bone is thought to be essential in osteoporosis diagnosis.

In osteoporosis, the cortical bone layer becomes thinner and trabecular bone structure becomes more sparse. Furthermore, the thickness and connectivity of trabeculae decrease and the separation of trabeculae increases (7) (Table 2.4). As a consequence, the bone volume fraction and the mechanical strength decrease.

Table 2.4: Morphometric properties of healthy and osteoporotic trabecular bone at different skeletal sites (18, 80, 122, 153).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BV/TV (%)</th>
<th>Tb.Th. (µm)</th>
<th>Tb.Sp. (µm)</th>
<th>Tb.N. (mm⁻¹)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vertebra</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homminga et al. (80)</td>
<td>Healthy</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Osteoporotic</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>1111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Iliac crest</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mullender et al. (122)</td>
<td>Healthy</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Osteoporotic</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shahtaheri et al. (153)</td>
<td>Healthy</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Osteoporotic</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Distal radius</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boutroy et al. (18)</td>
<td>Healthy</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Osteoporotic</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Distal tibia</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boutroy et al. (18)</td>
<td>Healthy</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Osteoporotic</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BV/TV = bone volume fraction, Tb.Th. = trabeculae thickness, Tb.Sp. = trabeculae separation and Tb.N. = trabeculae number.
3.1 Basic physics of ultrasound

Ultrasound is defined as a propagating mechanical wave with a frequency of over 20 kHz. Sound waves can be divided into transverse, longitudinal, surface and plate wave modes. However, only the longitudinal wave mode is considered in the present studies. In a transverse wave, particles of the medium vibrate perpendicularly to the travelling direction of the wave, whereas in a longitudinal wave the particles vibrate in parallel with the wave direction. The sound wave can be described in three dimensions using the wave equation (75)

\[
\nabla^2 p - \frac{1}{c^2} \frac{\partial^2 p}{\partial t^2} = \frac{1}{c^2} \bar{\beta} \frac{\partial^2 p}{\partial t^2} + \nabla \cdot [\bar{\rho} \nabla p],
\]

where \(\nabla\) is the gradient operator, \(c\) the average sound speed in medium, \(p\) the sound pressure, \(t\) the time, \(\bar{\beta}\) the fluctuation of compressibility and \(\bar{\rho}\) is the fluctuation of density of the medium. With an assumption that the medium exhibits constant compressibility and density, equation 3.1 can be written as follows (75):

\[
\nabla^2 p - \frac{1}{c^2} \frac{\partial^2 p}{\partial t^2} = 0.
\]

By simplifying the presentation from three dimensions to one, a solution for the partial differential equation 3.2 can be expressed as follows (43, 75):

\[
p(x, t) = Ae^{ik(x-ct)},
\]

where \(x\) is distance, \(A\) is the amplitude, \(k\) the wave number and \(i\) the imaginary unit. Newton’s second law can be written as follows (75):

\[
\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} = -\frac{1}{\rho} \nabla p,
\]

where \(u\) is the velocity of medium particles and \(\rho\) the density of the medium. The velocity of medium particles \(u\) can be solved from equations 3.3 and 3.4 as follows:
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\[
    u(x, t) = \int \frac{1}{\rho} \frac{\partial A e^{ik(x-ct)}}{\partial x} \, dt = \frac{1}{c\rho} A e^{ik(x-ct)}. \quad (3.5)
\]

Acoustic impedance \( Z \) is the ratio of pressure \( p \) and particle velocity \( u \) (14, 75, 181).

For the plane wave, the acoustic impedance can be solved from equations 3.3 and 3.5 as follows:

\[
    Z = \frac{A e^{ik(x-ct)}}{\frac{1}{cp} A e^{ik(x-ct)}} = \rho c. \quad (3.6)
\]

Table 3.1: An ultrasound wave is reflected at the interface of two acoustically different materials. The amplitude of the reflected wave depends on the difference between the acoustic impedances of the materials (75). The speed of sound in isotropic solid material depends on the mechanical properties and density of the material (180).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Equation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reflection coefficient</td>
<td>( R = \left( \frac{Z_2 \cos \theta_1 - Z_1 \cos \theta_2}{Z_2 \cos \theta_1 + Z_1 \cos \theta_2} \right)^2 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transmission coefficient</td>
<td>( T = \frac{4Z_1 Z_2 \cos \theta_1 \cos \theta_2}{(Z_2 \cos \theta_1 + Z_1 \cos \theta_2)^2} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound speed in isotropic solid</td>
<td>( c = \sqrt{\frac{E(1-\nu)}{\rho(1+\nu)(1-2\nu)}} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressure field</td>
<td>( p(x, t) = A e^{ik(x-ct)} e^{i\alpha} )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( Z \) = acoustic impedance, \( A \) = amplitude, \( E \) = Young’s modulus, \( \nu \) = Poisson’s ratio, \( \rho \) = density, \( i \) = imaginary unit, \( k \) = wave number, \( x \) = distance, \( t \) = time and \( \alpha \) = attenuation coefficient. \( \theta_1 \) and \( \theta_2 \) are the angles of the incidence and refraction, respectively. Subscripts 1 and 2 refer to the first and second medium.

When the ultrasound wave travels through the medium, it is attenuated (43, 75) (Table 3.1). The main causes of attenuation are scattering, reflection and absorption (180). Scattering is due to elastic discontinuities (i.e. scatterers) in a medium. Ultrasound scattering can be divided into three categories based on sound wavelength. The scattering phenomenon is different when the ultrasound wavelength is shorter than, the same as, or greater than the size of the scatterers in the medium (181). When the wavelength is shorter than the scatterer dimensions, the scattering can be described as a reflection phenomenon. When the wavelength is the same as the dimensions of the scatterer, the scattered sound field has a complex distribution and is sensitive to changes in scatterer dimensions and acoustic impedances (45). When the wavelength is much greater than the scatterer, the scattered sound field is uniformly distributed. For example, with spherical scatterers the intensity of scattering sound \( (I) \) is proportional to wavelength \( \lambda \) and the radius of the scatterer \( (a) \) as follows (181):
In absorption, the energy of the mechanical ultrasound wave is dissipated as heat and in other forms of energy through heat conduction, viscous relaxation and some other relaxation processes (75, 181). Absorption ($\alpha_a$) can be described mathematically as follows (75, 92):

$$\alpha_a(f, T) = \frac{4\pi^2 f^2}{\rho c^4} \left[ \frac{4\eta}{3} + \frac{(\gamma - 1)\chi}{C_p} \right] + \sum_j B(f, T)$$

where $f$ is the ultrasound frequency, $T$ the temperature of the medium, $\rho$ the density of the medium, $c$ the sound speed in the medium, $\eta$ the viscosity, $\gamma$ the gas constant, $\chi$ the thermal conductivity, $C_p$ the heat capacity at constant pressure, and $B$ the absorption due to other relaxation processes.

### 3.2 Quantitative ultrasound methods in osteoporosis diagnosis

The first studies on the ultrasonic determination of the mechanical properties of trabecular and cortical bone date back to the 1970s (102, 186). At that time, the interest was in basic ultrasound research. In the 1980s, interest in using ultrasound for osteoporosis diagnosis increased rapidly. Christian Langton’s study on the ultrasound attenuation in the calcaneus (104) initiated a new field in osteoporosis diagnosis.

#### 3.2.1 Clinical methods

Clinical ultrasound devices designed for osteoporosis diagnosis can make measurements of peripheral skeletal sites such as the calcaneus (35, 50, 53, 54, 70, 86, 88, 93, 117, 134, 148, 164), radius (8, 20, 35, 158) and phalanxes (2, 8, 35, 54, 158). The peripheral sites are easily reachable since the thickness of the disturbing soft tissue layer overlying the bone is smaller than at central skeletal sites such as the lumbar spine and proximal femur.

Current clinical methods can be divided into through-transmission and axial-transmission techniques (133). The most common clinical approach has been the measurement of the acoustic properties of the heel using the through-transmission technique (Fig. 3.1). With this technique, ultrasound attenuation and speed through the heel are determined. Two measurement techniques have been commonly applied: *i.e.* substitution (104) and contact techniques (3). In the substitution technique, the time of flight and the frequency spectrum of an ultrasound pulse are measured through the water bath with and without the heel. The difference in the time of flight through the water bath with and without the heel is used in the calculation of the sound speed (Table 3.2). The ultrasound attenuation spectrum can be determined by comparing the frequency spectra of the ultrasound pressure amplitude measured through the water bath with and without the heel. The broadband ultrasound attenuation (BUA) is determined as the slope of the linear part of the attenuation spectrum (Table 3.2). In the
contact method, ultrasound transducers are located on the skin surface and coupled with acoustic gel. The ultrasound signal measured through the heel is compared with a reference signal measured through the phantom for determination of speed and attenuation. The sound speed is calculated by comparing the distance of transducers and the time of flight through the heel (Table 3.2). The BUA is calculated similarly as in the substitution technique, although the reference spectrum is determined through a phantom.

Although the heel measurement is a relatively simple ultrasound technique, there are several sources for uncertainty in the technique. The size of the calcaneus (30, 162, 183) and the amount of overlying soft tissue (29, 57, 90, 99) are significant error sources which might affect the measurement. Some devices using the substitution technique assume constant thickness of bone for all subjects, which inevitably induces inaccuracy in the calculated ultrasound parameters (Table 3.2). Further, the size of the foot may introduce variations in the values of the ultrasound measurement (37, 39, 163, 164) because the anatomical locations of the acoustic measurement for small and large feet may not be identical. This error source can be minimized using imaging devices with which the region of interest in the calcaneus can be accurately located. Furthermore, as the composition of the overlying soft tissue may vary, it can affect the measurements. This is important, since the current clinical ultrasound devices do not take into account the variation in thickness and composition of overlying soft tissue.

In the axial-transmission technique (Fig. 3.1), both ultrasound transducers are located on the same side of the bone. With this technique, the speed of sound on the surface of cortical bone (Table 3.2) can be measured at various locations. For example, the acoustic properties of the radius and phalanxes can be measured. As the speed of ultrasound propagation in the cortical bone layer depends on the elastic properties,
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Porosity and geometrical properties of the cortical bone, this technique can provide clinically valuable information (17, 123, 145). Soft tissues overlying the bone affect the values of sound speed and only peripheral sites can be measured reliably.

**Table 3.2:** Basic ultrasound equations used in the determination of the ultrasound parameters of bone in clinical ultrasound devices.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technique</th>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Equation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Substitution             | Speed of Sound           | \[
\frac{c_w s_h}{s_h - (\Delta t c_w)}
\]                                                                 |
| Contact                  | Limb Velocity            | \[
\frac{s_h}{t_h}
\]                                                                 |
| Axial                    | Ultrasound Velocity      | \[
\frac{s}{t}
\]                                                                 |
| Substitution and Contact | Ultrasound attenuation spectrum* | \[
8.686 \left( \ln \left( \frac{A_w(f)}{A_b(f)} \right) + \ln (T_{sb} T_{bs}) \right)
\] |

\(c_w\) = sound speed in water, \(s_h\) = thickness of the heel, \(\Delta t\) = time of flight difference through the water bath with and without the heel, \(t_h\) = time of flight through the heel, \(s\) = distance between the ultrasound transducers, \(t\) = time of flight between the ultrasound transducers, \(A_w\) and \(A_b\) = ultrasound pressure amplitude spectra measured through the water bath with and without the heel, respectively. \(T\) = transmission coefficient. Subscripts \(sb\) and \(bs\) refer to soft tissue-bone and bone-soft tissue interfaces, respectively.

*Broadband Ultrasound Attenuation (BUA) is determined as the slope of the linear part of the attenuation spectrum.

### 3.2.2 Potential ultrasound methods for diagnosis

Fractures in the lumbar spine and proximal femur may be most accurately predicted when the bone properties are measured directly at the fracture sites, not at the peripheral sites (19, 114). Thus, current clinical ultrasound devices which are capable of only peripheral measurements are not optimal for the prediction of osteoporotic fractures at central sites. Consequently, there is increasing interest in the possibility of ultrasound measurements of central skeletal sites (9, 10, 38, 60, 62, 63, 126, 138).

The acoustic properties of the proximal femur have been measured with the through-transmission technique in vitro (10, 38, 60, 62, 63, 138) and in vivo (9). In these studies, ultrasound was successfully applied for parametric imaging of the human proximal femur. The speed of sound and broadband ultrasound attenuation in the proximal femur were found to be significant predictors of bone mineral density. Further, Nicholson et al. (2007)(126) measured the acoustic properties of the vertebra lumbaris by using the through-transmission technique and compared these with the mechanical properties of the samples. In that study, ultrasound speed and attenuation were found to be significant predictors of failure load of the vertebrae.

An alternative to through-transmission and axial-transmission methods is the pulse-echo ultrasound technique (Fig. 3.2). In this technique, only one ultrasound transducer is used for the measurement of ultrasound scattering and reflection. The reflec-
tion and backscattering parameters have been shown to relate with the mechanical properties, structure and mineral density of trabecular bone (28, 66–68, 77, 125, 175, 176, 178). There is also some evidence that by using the pulse-echo technique it is possible to measure the thickness of the cortical bone layer in long bone shafts (98, 172) with comparable accuracy to peripheral quantitative computed tomography (98). Advantageously, the pulse-echo measurements may be conducted at typical fracture sites that are not readily accessible by trough-transmission techniques.

**Figure 3.2:** Pulse-echo ultrasound measurement of the trochanter major. This kind of *in vivo* measurement set-up is used for measurement of the calcaneus (174) and preliminary trochanter major (in our laboratory in 2008). Reflection and backscattering of ultrasound from the trochanter major may predict hip fractures. An acoustic stand-off pad may be used to focus the ultrasound beam on the surface of the bone.
4.1 Analytical models

Quantitative ultrasound measurements of trabecular bone have been in use for over 20 years. However, the relationships between the ultrasound propagation and the structural, compositional and mechanical properties of trabecular bone are not fully understood. Modelling ultrasound propagation through bone tissue provides tools for understanding the interaction between ultrasound and trabecular bone.

Biot’s theory, traditionally used in geophysical applications, has been applied in modelling ultrasound propagation through trabecular bone (46, 65, 85, 105, 152, 177). Biot’s theory considers the propagation of longitudinal and transverse elastic waves in porous solids (12, 13) by assuming that the medium is isotropic and scattering is negligible. As input Biot’s theory requires 14 different parameters for the wave calculations. For example, material parameters such as densities of calcified matrix and marrow, Young’s modulus for calcified matrix and bulk modulus for marrow are required (46, 65, 85, 105). Moreover, specific structural parameters, such as porosity and the sample pore size must be known. Some of the input parameters are difficult to determine experimentally, so the application of Biot’s theory is rather difficult in the case of trabecular bone. However, when applied successfully, Biot’s theory has been found to predict the propagation of fast and slow compressive waves in trabecular bone, which has been verified in experimental studies (83).

Schoenberg’s theory of ultrasound propagation in a periodic stratified medium assumes that the medium is layered (84, 85, 106, 171). When modelling ultrasound propagation in a trabecular bone layered medium, the assumption is valid only for a plate-like trabecular bone structure (84, 85, 106). Schoenberg’s theory needs only six input parameters for wave calculations: the densities of calcified matrix and marrow, porosity, speed of the longitudinal wave in calcified matrix and marrow, and speed of the transverse wave in calcified matrix. Schoenberg’s theory has been reported to predict the dependence of the phase velocity of a fast wave with trabecular orientation (84). It has also been shown to predict the slow wave when ultrasound propagates in parallel with the orientation of plate-like trabeculae (84). Importantly, Schoenberg’s
theory can predict the positive linear relation between ultrasound attenuation and frequency (106).

Biot’s and Schoenberg’s theories have been used to model ultrasound propagation in trabecular bone. There are also models for ultrasound backscattering inside the trabecular bone (89, 130, 140, 169). Wear (1999) used the theory for acoustic wave scattering from solid cylinders to model ultrasound backscattering in trabecular bone. Jenson et al. (2003) used autocorrelation functions to compute the ultrasound backscattering coefficient for human trabecular bone. These studies reported an agreement between the experimental backscattering measurements and the model prediction of frequency dependence of backscattering (89, 169). The ultrasound model developed for scattering in soft tissues may also be applied for trabecular bone (130). In this model, scattering is assumed to depend on the sound speed fluctuation between bone and marrow. Nicholson et al. (2000) applied this model and showed that the acoustic properties of trabecular bone were affected by bone structure (size of scatterers) independently of bone volume fraction.

4.2 Numerical models

Analytical models are generally applicable when the structure of the medium is homogeneous, isotropic or otherwise periodical. However, the structure of trabecular bone is more complicated and varies typically with bone volume fraction; the structure of dense bone is more plate-like than that of porous bone (72, 100). Numerical models combine acoustic theories (wave equation) and complicated trabecular bone structure (81, 82). Real trabecular bone structure, obtained using the microCT technique, is used as a basis for the numerical model (61, 64, 112, 139). In these models, the wave equation is solved using numerical techniques, for example using the finite-difference time-domain (FDTD) algorithm (61, 64, 81, 82, 139). This makes it possible to study the interactions between the ultrasound and bone structure and composition. Since it is complicated or even impossible to solve the detailed interactions of the structure and composition of calcified matrix on ultrasound speed, attenuation and scattering with experimental studies, numerical simulations play an important role in bone ultrasound research.

Hosokawa (2006) found that an FDTD model extended with Biot’s theory can predict both fast and slow waves when ultrasound propagates through the trabecular bone in a direction parallel to the trabeculae orientation in a 2D structure (82). Hosokawa also found that the model predicted the amplitude ratio of fast and slow waves more precisely than the analytical Biot’s theory did (81). Padilla et al. (2006)(139) investigated the numerical simulation of ultrasound propagation in 3D trabecular bone geometry (61, 64, 139). They found, in agreement with the experiments, that an increase in ultrasound speed and attenuation is positively related with the bone volume fraction. Furthermore, they also observed the fast and slow waves when ultrasound propagated through trabecular bone in a direction parallel to the orientation of the trabeculae. With these 3D simulation techniques it is possible to evaluate the effect of the quality and quantity of calcified matrix on ultrasound propagation...
and scattering. Haiat et al. (2006 and 2007) have investigated this issue and report that the quantity (i.e. volume fraction) significantly affects the ultrasound parameters, whereas the quality (i.e. properties of trabeculae) has only a minor affect (61, 64).
4.2. Numerical models
Clinical ultrasound measurements can predict future bone fractures with moderate accuracy. Typically, clinical measurements are conducted in the heel using the through-transmission technique. Unfortunately, the typical osteoporotic fracture sites, i.e. the vertebra and proximal femur, are not accessible with current clinical ultrasound techniques. Further, the effect of soft tissues overlying the bone on bone ultrasound measurements is not controlled. Moreover, the optimal ultrasound frequency and the region of interest to predict the mechanical properties of trabecular bone are still unknown.

The aims of the present study were:

1. To investigate the relationships of ultrasound parameters with the composition and mechanical properties of trabecular bone

2. To compare the feasibility of a single value, spatial variation and mean value of ultrasound parameters within the region of interest to predict the mechanical properties of trabecular bone

3. To clarify, at various ultrasound frequencies, the effects of overlying soft tissues on the acoustic parameters of trabecular bone

4. To develop a novel method for minimizing the effects of soft tissues on bone ultrasound measurements
This thesis work consists of four independent Studies (I - IV). In this section the materials and methods used in the Studies are summarized.

6.1 Materials

The material investigated in Studies I - IV is summarized in Table 6.1. Human trabecular bone specimens were investigated in all Studies. Porcine soft tissues and elastomer samples were also investigated in Studies III and IV.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Materials</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Geometry</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Human trabecular bone</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Cylindrical samples</td>
<td>$d = 16 \text{ mm}$, $h = 8 \text{ mm}$</td>
<td>FMC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Human trabecular bone</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Cylindrical samples</td>
<td>$d = 16 \text{ mm}$, $h = 8 \text{ mm}$</td>
<td>FMC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>Human trabecular bone</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Cylindrical samples</td>
<td>$d = 16 \text{ mm}$, $h = 7.5 \text{ mm}$</td>
<td>FLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Porcine adipose and lean tissue</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Cylindrical samples</td>
<td>$d = 48 \text{ mm}$, $h = 10 - 20 \text{ mm}$</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Elastomer</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Cylindrical samples</td>
<td>$d = 15 - 26 \text{ mm}$, $h = 4 - 10 \text{ mm}$</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human trabecular bone</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Cylindrical samples</td>
<td>$d = 16 \text{ mm}$, $h = 7.5 \text{ mm}$</td>
<td>FLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Porcine lean tissue</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Cylindrical samples</td>
<td>$d = 48 \text{ mm}$, $h = 10 - 20 \text{ mm}$</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FMC = femoral medial condyle, TMP = tibial medial plateau, FG = femoral groove, FLC = femoral lateral condyle and TLP = tibial lateral plateau.
6.1. Materials

Figure 6.1: The anatomical sites of the human trabecular bone samples investigated in Studies I - IV.

6.1.1 Human samples

In Studies I - IV, human trabecular bone samples were collected from cadaver knees ($n = 13$, Figure 6.1) with the permission of the National Authority of Medicolegal Affairs (Helsinki, Finland, permission 1781/32/200/01). In Studies I and II, cylindrical plugs of trabecular bone were drilled from the medial femoral condyle, femoral groove and tibial plateau ($n = 20 - 26$), whereas in Studies III and IV the samples were drilled from the lateral femoral condyle ($n = 13$) and lateral tibial plateau ($n = 12$), using a hollow drill bit. The sample surfaces were cut so as to be parallel using a low speed diamond saw (Buehler Isomet Low Speed Saw, Buehler Ltd., Lake Bluff, IL, USA) and the EXACT micro-grinding system (Macro Exact 310 CP, EXACT Apparatebau GmbH & Co., Norderstedt, Germany). Subsequently, the samples were immersed in phosphate buffered saline (PBS) and stored in a freezer (-20°C) until measurement.

6.1.2 Porcine samples

In Studies III and IV, cylindrical soft tissue disks were prepared just before measurement from fresh porcine adipose ($n = 25$, fat content 70%) and lean ($n = 25$, fat content 4%) tissues provided by the local slaughterhouse (Atria Oy, Kuopio, Finland). The disks (diameter = 48 mm, thickness = 1 - 2 cm) were prepared using a custom-made biopsy punch (diameter = 48 mm). In addition, the typical composition of human soft tissue was mimicked in backscatter and reflection measurements using porcine lean tissue ($n = 25$) with a fat content of 30%.

6.1.3 Elastomer samples

In Study IV, the acoustic properties of three elastomers (3a-c, Teknikum Oy, Vammala, Finland, diameter = 26 mm) were analysed. The thickness of the elastomers 3a, 3b and 3c were 10.25 mm, 5.50 mm and 6.00 mm, respectively ($x_3$ in Figure 6.3, diameter = 16 mm). The elastomers 3a-c (Figure 6.3) were measured with and without the overlying elastomers 1 and 2 (RAPRA Technology Ltd, Shropshire, UK) (Figure 6.3). Three
interfering layers were constructed by applying different thicknesses for elastomers 1 and 2 (\(x_1\) and \(x_2\) in Figure 6.3, respectively), i.e. 1.19 mm and 3.22 mm (combination 1), 2.00 mm and 1.85 mm (combination 2) and 3.01 mm and 0.97 mm (combination 3), respectively. Thus, the elastomers 3a, 3b and 3c were measured with three different combinations (1-3) of overlying interfering elastomers.

6.2 Methods

The methodology used in Studies I-IV is summarized in Table 6.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>Device</th>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>Voltage/Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>QUS</td>
<td>UltraPAC</td>
<td>nBUA, SOS, AA, BUB, IRC.</td>
<td>2.25 MHz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>microCT</td>
<td>SkyScan 1072</td>
<td>BV/TV</td>
<td>80 kV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Biochemical assay</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Water content, fat content, (CC_{CM}, PC_{CM})</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DXA</td>
<td>Lunar Prodigy</td>
<td>BMD</td>
<td>76 kV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(K-edge filter)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>QUS</td>
<td>UltraPAC</td>
<td>nBUA, SOS, AA, AIB, IRC, (\sigma_{max})</td>
<td>2.25 MHz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mechanical testing</td>
<td>Zwick 1484</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>QUS</td>
<td>Optel</td>
<td>nBUA, SOS, AA, BUB, IRC.</td>
<td>0.5 MHz, 1.0 MHz, 2.25 MHz, 3.5 MHz, 5.0 MHz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.5 MHz, 5.0 MHz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DXA</td>
<td>Lunar Prodigy</td>
<td>BMD</td>
<td>76 kV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mechanical testing</td>
<td>Instron 8874</td>
<td>(E, \sigma_{max})</td>
<td>(K-edge filter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>QUS</td>
<td>Optel</td>
<td>BU, IRC</td>
<td>2.25 MHz, 5.0 MHz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UltraPAC</td>
<td>SOS, AA, IRC</td>
<td>2.25 MHz, 5.0 MHz</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

QUS = quantitative ultrasound, nBUA = normalized broadband ultrasound attenuation, SOS = speed of sound, AA = average attenuation, BUB = broadband ultrasound backscatter, IRC = integrated reflection coefficient, BV/TV = bone volume fraction, \(CC_{CM}\) = calcified matrix collagen content, \(PC_{CM}\) = calcified matrix proteglycan content, BMD = bone mineral density, DXA = dual energy X-ray absorptiometry, AIB = apparent integrated backscattering, \(\sigma_{max}\) = ultimate strength and \(E\) = Young’s modulus.

6.2.1 Experimental ultrasound methods

In Studies I, II and IV, acoustic measurements were conducted with an ultrasound system (UltraPAC, Physical Acoustic Co., NJ, USA) consisting of a 500 MHz A/D-board and a 0.2 - 100 MHz pulser-receiver board. In Studies III and IV, ultrasound measurements were conducted with the Opbox-01/100 (Optel Ltd., Wroclaw, Poland) portable ultrasound instrument. The resolution and sampling frequency of the A/D converter were 8 bits and 100 MHz, respectively. The pulser-receiver bandwidth (-6 dB) was 0.1 - 25 MHz. In Studies I and II, the UltraPAC ultrasound system was equipped with a tank and scanning drives (Fig 6.2 a), whereas in Studies III and IV a custom measurement set-up was constructed for ultrasound measurements (Fig. 6.2 b). In Studies I and II, the measurements were conducted using a single pair of ultrasound transducers (2.25 MHz) whereas in Study III five pairs of ultrasound transducers (Panametrics Inc., Waltham, MA, USA) with different focal properties and centre frequencies (0.5
MHz, 1.0 MHz, 2.25 MHz, 3.5 MHz and 5.0 MHz) were used. In Study IV, the measurements were conducted using two pairs of ultrasound transducers (2.25 MHz and 5.0 MHz). In Studies I and II, the measurements were performed in a scanning mode (scan area of 16 mm × 16 mm, step size 0.5 mm), whereas in Studies III and IV the measurements were conducted at a single point within the sample. Prior to ultrasound measurement, bone and soft tissue samples were degassed in PBS. All measurements were conducted in a degassed temperature-controlled (TES 1310 TYPE K, TES Electrical Electronic Corp., Taipei, Taiwan) water bath. Custom LabVIEW (version 6.1, National Instrument, Austin, Texas, USA) measurement and analysis programs were developed for each study.

PULSE-ECHO MEASUREMENTS

In Studies I - IV, echo signals recorded from the samples were compared with the echo signal recorded from the reference surface (a polished steel plate). All pulse-echo parameters were analysed within the effective frequency range of each transducer (0.3-0.7 MHz, 0.7-1.5 MHz, 1.5-3.8 MHz, 2.0-5.5 MHz and 3.2-6.7 MHz for transducers with centre frequencies of 0.5 MHz, 1.0 MHz, 2.25 MHz, 3.5 MHz and 5.0 MHz, respectively). In Studies I, III and IV, IRC (32) and BUB (148) were determined whereas in Study II AIB (32) was derived with the reference method (Table 6.3). In addition, to investigate the effect of signal windowing, the AIB was analysed using five different time window lengths from 1 to 5 µs with 1 microsecond steps. The BUB was determined from the AIB by compensating the AIB value with the ultrasound attenuation within the sample. The attenuation compensation was determined by using an approximation (Nicholson and Bouxsein 2002) (125) of a more complex compensation term (O’Donnell and Miller 1981) (136). The sample specific attenuation and SOS values determined with the through-transmission technique were used in the attenuation correction (125). In Studies I and II, acoustic parameters were calculated as a mean value within a circular ROI (88 mm², the total number of the pixels was 352). In addition, in Study II standard deviations of the parameters within the ROI were analysed. In Studies III and IV, acoustic parameters were determined at a single measurement point.

THROUGH-TRANSMISSION MEASUREMENTS

In Studies I - III, speed of sound (SOS), normalized BUA (nBUA) and average attenuation (AA) were determined with the substitution method (104) (Table 6.3). In Study IV, only SOS and AA were determined. SOS was determined with the time of flight (TOF) method (131). TOF was analysed from the radio frequency signal using the threshold technique (128) with a 20% threshold value. AA was determined from the effective range of each transducer, whereas nBUA was calculated as a slope of the linear part of the attenuation spectrum normalized with the sample thickness. The linear part of the attenuation spectrum was defined as a part where the linear correlation coefficient between the attenuation coefficient and the frequency was > 0.9. In Studies I and II, the nBUA was determined using the frequency range of 0.3 - 0.6 MHz, 0.7 -
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Figure 6.2: The experimental set-up for acoustic measurements applied in Studies I-IV. (a) In Studies I and II, the trabecular bone samples were acoustically imaged (scan area of 16 mm × 16 mm, step size 0.5 mm). (b) In Studies III and IV, the trabecular bone samples were placed in the focal plane of the transducers positioned on opposite sides of the sample and the ultrasound measurements were conducted at a single point. The sample holder stabilized the soft tissues on both sides of the specimen.
Table 6.3: The mathematical definitions of ultrasound parameters determined in Studies I - IV.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technique</th>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Equation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Substitution</td>
<td>SOS</td>
<td>$\frac{c_w s}{s - (\Delta t c_w)}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substitution</td>
<td>Attenuation*</td>
<td>$\frac{8.686}{\Delta f} \int_{\Delta f} \ln\left(\frac{A_b(f)}{A_r(f)}\right) + \ln(T_{sw} T_{ws})$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substitution</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>$\frac{8.686}{\Delta f} \int_{\Delta f} \ln\left(\frac{A_b(f)}{A_r(f)}\right)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>IRC</td>
<td>$\frac{8.686}{\Delta f} \int_{\Delta f} \ln\left(\frac{A_b(f)}{A_r(f)}\right)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>AIB</td>
<td>$\frac{8.686}{\Delta f} \int_{\Delta f} \ln\left(\frac{A_b(f)}{A_r(f)}\right)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>BUB</td>
<td>$\frac{8.686}{\Delta f} \int_{\Delta f} \ln\left(\frac{A_b(f)}{A_r(f)}\right) + \frac{\alpha_b(f) c_b t_w}{2}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$c_w$ = sound speed in water, $s$ = thickness of the sample, $\Delta t$ = time of flight difference through the water bath with and without the sample, $A_b$ and $A_w$ = ultrasound pressure amplitude spectra measured through the water bath with and without the sample, respectively. $T$ = transmission coefficient calculated based on the measured ultrasound reflection coefficient at the surface of the sample. Subscripts $ws$ and $sw$ refer to water-sample and sample-water interfaces, respectively. $\Delta f$ = effective frequency range, $A_b$ and $A_r$ = ultrasound pressure amplitude spectra analysed from the echo signal from the sample surface and the reference, respectively. $A_b$ = ultrasound pressure amplitude spectra of the echo signal (backscattering) from the inner structure of the sample. $\alpha_b$ = attenuation coefficient of the sample, $c_b$ = sound speed in the sample and $t_w$ = time window length for the determination of backscattering.

*normalized Broadband Ultrasound Attenuation (nBUA) is determined as a slope of the linear part of attenuation spectrum normalized with the sample thickness.

1.5 MHz, 1.0 - 2.8 MHz, 1.0 - 3.0 MHz and 1.5 - 3.0 MHz for the center frequency of 0.5 MHz, 1.0 MHz, 2.25 MHz, 3.5 MHz and 5.0 MHz, respectively. In Study III, the nBUA was calculated using the frequency range of 0.2 - 0.5 MHz, 0.7 - 1.5 MHz, 0.5 - 2.0 MHz, 0.5 - 2.0 MHz and 1.0 - 4.0 MHz for the center frequency of 0.5 MHz, 1.0 MHz, 2.25 MHz, 3.5 MHz and 5.0 MHz, respectively.

6.2.2 Ultrasound analysis of overlying soft tissues

In Study III, the trabecular bone samples were measured with and without an interfering layer of overlying soft tissue. In addition, sound speed and attenuation in overlying adipose and lean tissues were measured separately. Uncorrected (without the soft tissue correction) ultrasound parameters for trabecular bone samples were determined as presented in Table 6.3. When applying numerical soft tissue correction, the ultrasound parameters were determined as presented in Table 6.4.
Table 6.4: The mathematical definitions of soft tissue corrected ultrasound parameters (Study III).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Equation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| SOS       | $c_l c_w s_b$  
|           | $-(\Delta t c_w c_{lw}) - c_a c_w s_l - c_2 c_{lw} s_a$ |
| Attenuation* | $\frac{8.666}{\Delta f} \ln \left( \frac{A_{lw}(f)}{A_{lw}(f)} \right) + \ln \left( 1 - R_{lw}(f) \right) \left( 1 - R_{lw}(f) \right) \left( 1 + R_{lw}(f) \right) \left( 1 + R_{lw}(f) \right)$ |
| IRC       | $\frac{8.666}{\Delta f} \int_{df} \ln \left( \frac{A_{lw}(f)}{A_{lw}(f)} \right) - \ln \left( 1 - R_{lw}^2(f) \right) + 2\alpha_s(f) s_a$ |
| AIB       | $\frac{8.666}{\Delta f} \int_{df} \ln \left( \frac{A_{lw}(f)}{A_{lw}(f)} \right) - \ln \left( 1 - R_{lw}^2(f) \right) + 2\alpha_s(f) s_a$ |
| BUB       | $\frac{8.666}{\Delta f} \int_{df} \ln \left( \frac{A_{lw}(f)}{A_{lw}(f)} \right) + \frac{\alpha_s(f) s_a}{2} - \ln \left( 1 - R_{lw}^2(f) \right) + 2\alpha_s(f) s_a$ |

$c$ = sound speed. Subscripts $l$, $a$, $b$ and $w$ refer to lean tissue, adipose tissue, bone and water, respectively. $s$ = thickness of the sample. $\Delta t$ = time of flight difference through the water bath with and without the soft tissue-bone combination. $A_{bw}$ and $A_w$ = ultrasound pressure amplitude spectra measured through the water bath with and without the soft tissue-bone combination, respectively. $R$ = reflection coefficient. Subscripts $s$, $lh$, $lb$, $wa$ and $ws$ refer to water-lean tissue, lean tissue-bone, water-adipose tissue and water soft tissue interfaces, respectively. $\Delta f$ = effective frequency range, $A_s$ and $A_l$ = ultrasound pressure amplitude spectra of the echo signal recorded from the sample surface and the reference, respectively. $A_b$ = ultrasound pressure amplitude spectra recorded from the echo signal (backscattering part) from the inner structure of the sample. $\alpha$ = attenuation coefficient. Subscript $s$ refers to soft tissue. $tw$ = time window length for the determination of backscattering.

*normalized Broadband Ultrasound Attenuation (nBUA) is determined as a slope of the linear part of the attenuation spectrum normalized with the sample thickness.

### 6.2.3 Dual frequency ultrasound technique

**THEORY OF DUAL FREQUENCY ULTRASONIC TECHNIQUE**

In Study IV, a new technique for the elimination of the soft tissue effect on bone ultrasound measurement was introduced. The DFUS technique utilizes prior knowledge of the values of the ultrasound (US) attenuation coefficient and speed at two frequencies in multilayered materials consisting of two different materials. The US reflection is measured from the front (first) and the back (last) surface of the multilayered structure using two different US frequencies. However, during in vivo measurement the US transducer is set against the skin and only the echo arising from the soft tissue-bone interface is recorded.

Ultrasound reflection amplitudes at low and high frequency ($A_l$, $A_h$) from the first surface of the object of interest (e.g. bone or elastomer 3 (figure 6.3)) can be expressed as follows:

$$A_l = H_l e^{-2\alpha_1 \cdot x_1} e^{-2\alpha_2 \cdot x_2} A_{0,l}, \quad (6.1)$$

$$A_h = H_h e^{-2\alpha_1 \cdot x_1} e^{-2\alpha_2 \cdot x_2} A_{0,h}, \quad (6.2)$$

where $H$ is the term including ultrasound reflections at the surfaces of the interfering layers and the object of interest, $\alpha$ the attenuation coefficient and $x$ the thickness.
of an interfering layer. Subscripts 1 and 2 and \( l \) and \( h \) refer to interfering layers 1 and 2 and low and high ultrasound frequencies, respectively. \( A_{0,l} \) and \( A_{0,h} \) refer to ultrasound reflection amplitudes from the polished steel plate (reference) at low and high frequencies, respectively. If the ultrasound reflection coefficient depends on the frequency, it can be taken into account in the calculations:

\[
H(f) = af^b, \quad (6.3)
\]

where coefficients \( a \) and \( b \) denote the frequency dependence of the reflection term. Thus, the relation between the term \( H \) at low and high frequencies can be expressed as follows:

\[
H_l = H_h \left( \frac{f_l}{f_h} \right)^b = m H_h, \quad (6.4)
\]

where \( f \) is the frequency and the coefficient \( m \) denotes the frequency dependence of \( H \). The ultrasound reflection amplitude \( A_l \) (equation 6.1) can now be expressed as

---

**Figure 6.3:** Experimental set-up for acoustic measurement of elastomer samples. The region of interest in the ultrasound signal is located at the echo arising from the surface of elastomer 3. The dual frequency ultrasound technique was used to minimize the artifacts induced by elastomers 1 and 2 in the determination of the acoustic properties of elastomer 3 (Study IV).
follows:

\[ A_l = m \left( \frac{A_{h}}{A_{0,h}} \right) e^{2(\alpha_{1,h} x_{1} + \alpha_{2,h} x_{2})} e^{-2\alpha_{1,l} x_{1} e^{-2\alpha_{2,l} x_{2} A_{0,l}}} \]  \hspace{1cm} (6.5)

By substituting:

\[ S = 2\alpha_{1,h} - 2\alpha_{1,l}, \]  \hspace{1cm} (6.6)
\[ J = 2\alpha_{2,h} - 2\alpha_{2,l}, \]  \hspace{1cm} (6.7)

equation 6.5 can be expressed as follows:

\[ \frac{A_{l} A_{0,h}}{m A_{h} A_{0,l}} = e^{x_{1} S + x_{2} J}. \]  \hspace{1cm} (6.8)

The time difference \( \Delta t \) between the reflections from the first surface of the interfering layer and from the surface of the sample (see figure 6.3) can be written as follows:

\[ \Delta t = 2\left( x_{1} \frac{c_{1}}{c_{2}} + x_{2} \frac{c_{1}}{c_{w}} + \frac{2 x_{w}}{c_{w}} \right), \]  \hspace{1cm} (6.9)

where \( c_{1}, c_{2} \) and \( c_{w} \) are the average sound speeds measured at low and high ultrasound frequencies. The subscript \( w \) refers to water. The thickness of interfering layer 1 can be expressed as:

\[ x_{1} = \left( \frac{\Delta t}{2} - \frac{x_{2}}{c_{2}} - \frac{2 x_{w}}{c_{w}} \right) c_{1}. \]  \hspace{1cm} (6.10)

The thickness of interfering layer 2 can now be solved from equations 6.8 and 6.10:

\[ x_{2} = \ln\left( \frac{A_{l}}{A_{0,l}} \right) - \ln\left( \frac{A_{h}}{A_{0,h}} \right) - \left( \frac{\Delta t}{2} - \frac{2 x_{w}}{c_{w}} \right) c_{1} S - \frac{J c_{1}}{c_{2}} \]  \hspace{1cm} (6.11)

Using the determined thickness of layer 2, the thickness of interfering layer 1 can now be solved from equation 6.10.

**Determination of soft tissue composition with the DFUS technique**

In measurement of a bone-soft tissue combination, the thickness of adipose (fat) and lean tissue can be solved with the dual frequency ultrasound technique. Reflection at the bone surface was found to be frequency independent (2.25 MHz vs. 5.0 MHz, Study III) and the reflections from the soft tissue surface and adipose-lean tissue interfaces were minimal, thus \( h = 0 \) (equation 6.3) and therefore \( m = 1 \) (equation 6.4). As there is no water layer \( (x_{w} = 0) \) between the adipose and lean tissue, equation 6.11 can be simplified and the lean tissue thickness can be expressed as:

\[ x_{2} = \ln\left( \frac{A_{l}}{A_{0,l}} \right) - \ln\left( \frac{A_{h}}{A_{0,h}} \right) - \left( \frac{\Delta t}{2} \right) c_{1} S \]  \hspace{1cm} (6.12)

where subscripts 1 and 2 refer to adipose and lean tissues, respectively.
Numerical correction of ultrasound parameters

In Study IV, to eliminate the error induced by interfering elastomers, their thicknesses and acoustic properties must be known. The thicknesses of the interfering layers can be determined using the DFUS technique. In Study IV, three IRC values for each elastomer (3a, 3b and 3c) were determined: (1) IRC: parameter determined without the interfering overlying elastomers; (2) IRC\textsubscript{uncorr}: parameter determined with the interfering overlying elastomers; and (3) IRC\textsubscript{corr}: parameter determined with the interfering overlying elastomers by means of the DFUS attenuation correction. The corrected IRC (IRC\textsubscript{corr}) can be determined as follows:

\[
\text{IRC}_{corr} = \text{IRC}_{uncorr} + 2x_1\alpha_1 + 2x_2\alpha_2 + K_i, \tag{6.13}
\]

where \(x\) is the elastomer thickness and \(\alpha\) is the ultrasound attenuation coefficient for an investigated elastomer. Subscripts 1 and 2 refer to elastomers 1 and 2, respectively. \(K_i\) is the correction factor for the compensation of ultrasound reflections at the surfaces of elastomers 1 and 2:

\[
K_i = 8.68 \ln((1 - R_1^2)^2(1 - R_2^2)^2), \tag{6.14}
\]

where \(R\) is the reflection coefficient. In addition, three average attenuation values for elastomers 3a-c were determined and named analogously with the IRC. The corrected average attenuation (AA\textsubscript{corr}) can be determined as follows:

\[
\text{AA}_{corr} = \text{AA}_{uncorr} - x_1\alpha_1 - x_2\alpha_2 - K_a, \tag{6.15}
\]

where AA\textsubscript{uncorr} is the uncorrected average attenuation and \(K_a\) is the correction factor for the compensation of ultrasound reflections at the surfaces of elastomers 1, 2 and 3.

\[
K_a = 8.68 \ln((1 - R_1^2)^2(1 - R_2^2)^2(1 - R_3^2)). \tag{6.16}
\]

To analyse precision errors, one elastomer (3c) was measured five times with and without the interfering overlying elastomers (combinations 1-3). Twenty measurements was conducted and the coefficient of variation (CV)(133) was determined.

For IRC and BUB measurements in living tissues, the soft tissue correction was conducted similarly as for elastomers (equation 6.13). Since no clear acoustic boundaries existed in the heterogeneous mixture of lean and adipose tissue, the \(K_i\) term could be neglected.

6.2.4 MicroCT measurement of trabecular bone

In Study II, the bone volume fraction (BV/TV, \%), i.e. the volume fraction of the calcified matrix within the sample, was determined using a microCT (SkyScan 1072, SkyScan, Aartselaar, Belgium) (Hakulinen et al. 2006, (66)). The voxel size was 18 \(\times\) 18 \(\times\) 18 \(\mu\text{m}^3\). Subsequently, the image data were segmented to include calcified matrix and marrow using the local threshold method (166).
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6.2.5 Analyses of bone composition

**Dual energy X-ray measurements**

In Studies I and III, the bone mineral densities (BMD, g/cm$^2$) of the samples were measured in a direction perpendicular to the parallel ends of the plugs using a Lunar Prodigy DXA system (GE Medical, Wessling, Germany) in the spine measurement mode (voltage = 76 kV, current = 0.75 mA). During measurement, the bone samples were placed in a water bath to simulate overlying soft tissues and to optimize the measurement accuracy. Volumetric BMD (vBMD, g/cm$^3$) values were calculated by normalizing measured areal BMD values with the sample thickness, as determined with a digital micrometer (Mitutoyo Co., Mexico City, Mexico).

**Water and fat content**

In Study I, the volumes, weights and densities of the bone cylinders were determined using Archimedes’ principle. Subsequently, the samples were freeze-dried (Christ Alpha 1-2, B. Braun Biotech International, Melsungen, Germany) for the determination of dry weights. To determine the fat-free weight of the sample, the fat was dissolved in acetone. The acetone was then removed from the samples by drying them at 45°C for 18 hours. Finally, the water and fat contents were determined by normalizing water and fat masses with the sample volume.

**Composition of calcified matrix**

In Study I, the composition of calcified matrix (trabeculae) was determined by normalizing the biochemically determined collagen and proteoglycan masses and DXA-measured BMC with the calcified matrix volume, as determined with the microCT. To determine the masses of collagen and proteoglycan, the fat-free bone samples were pulverized. Some of the powder (approximately 20 mg) from each sample was taken for acid hydrolysis in 5 M hydrogen chloride (HCl) at 108°C for 16 hours, and hydroxyproline content was analyzed using a microplate assay (22). Collagen contains approximately 14% of hydroxyproline by mass, so estimates for total collagen contents were obtained by multiplying the hydroxyproline content by a factor of 7 (155). To investigate the yield of the assay, soluble rat type I collagen was also added to defatted bone samples before acid hydrolysis. The yield of the added collagen was 91.8 ± 1.3%. Proteoglycans were extracted from the fat-free bone powder (approximately 20 mg) with 4 M guanidine hydrochloride (GuHCl) containing 0.2 M ethylenediamine tetraacetic acid (EDTA) in 50 mM sodium acetate buffer, pH 6.0, for 70 hours. Uronic acid content was then measured using a spectrophotometric assay (16). An estimate for proteoglycan content was derived by assuming that the major proteoglycans, decorin and biglycan (167), are present in approximately equal molar contents. The average molecular weight of glycosaminoglycan chains was assumed to be 30 kDa, based on decorin and biglycan molecular weights of 70 and 100 kDa, respectively (91, 146). Therefore, the uronic acid content represents approximately 26% of
the proteoglycan pool, which gives a factor of 3.78 to be used for the determination of proteoglycan content from the uronic acid results.

6.2.6 Analyses of bone mechanical properties

In Studies II and III, the mechanical properties of the bone samples were determined with servo-hydraulic material testing devices (Zwick 1484, Zwick GmbH & Co., KG, Ulm, Germany, and Instron 8874, Instron Co., Canton, MA, USA, respectively). During the test teflon foils were set between the sample surfaces and the compressive plates to minimize the friction between the surfaces (Study II). In Study II, bone samples were subjected to prestress of 0.25 MPa before testing, and preconditioned with five consecutive nondestructive cycles to 0.5% strain. Subsequently, the bone samples were destructively compressed to 5% strain, using the strain rate of $4.5 \times 10^{-3} \text{ s}^{-1}$. In Study II, the measurement protocol was the same but the prestress applied was 0.10 MPa and the strain rate was $8.2 \times 10^{-5} \text{ s}^{-1}$. In Study II, Young’s modulus was determined as a linear fit to the stress-strain data between 45% and 60% of the maximum stress whereas in Study III Young’s modulus was determined as a linear fit to the stress-strain data between 40% and 65% of the maximum stress. Ultimate strength was obtained as the maximum stress recorded during the test.

6.2.7 Numerical modelling

In Study I, Wave2000 Pro software (Cyberlogic Inc., New York, NY, USA) was used to simulate acoustic wave propagation through a trabecular bone sample. MicroCT images (one 2D cut of a 3D image set) of the trabecular samples (Study II) were used in the numerical modelling. The software solves the 2D wave equation by utilizing the finite difference time domain technique (FDTD). Earlier, we have demonstrated a good agreement between the experimental ultrasound measurements and two-dimensional (2D) numerical simulations (Hakulinen et al. 2006, (66)). The acoustic simulations were based on the real 2D microCT images of three trabecular bone samples with characteristic bone volume fraction ranging from 9% to 24%. Trabecular bone was assumed to consist of two components, i.e., calcified tissue (trabeculae) and fat (marrow). The reference values of the acoustic and material properties for calcified matrix and fat were obtained from the material library of Wave2000 Pro. The reference value for the density of calcified matrix was set to be equal to that of the cortical bone (1850 kg/m$^3$). For fat tissue the density was set to 937 kg/m$^3$. In the model, calcified tissue was assumed to be an isotropic elastic solid with a Poisson ratio of 0.37 (5). In further simulations, trabecular architecture was kept constant while density and Young’s modulus of the calcified matrix were altered. According to Bossy et al. (2004, Figure 6)(17) the bulk velocity of ultrasound in cortical bone increases by 140 m/s as the cortical bone density increases by 50 kg/m$^3$. Therefore, the values of Young’s modulus were altered correspondingly, i.e. the increase in bulk velocity was 138-140 m/s when the calcified matrix density increased by 50 kg/m$^3$. These calculations were based on the relation between the ultrasound velocity and the material
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properties of the isotropic elastic medium

\[ c = \sqrt{\frac{E(1 - \nu)}{\rho(1 + \nu)(1 - 2\nu)}} \]  \hspace{1cm} (6.17)

where \( c \) is the bulk velocity, \( E \) is the Young’s modulus, \( \rho \) is the density and \( \nu \) is Poisson’s ratio. Similarly, for shear velocity \( (c_s) \) in isotropic elastic material

\[ c_s = \sqrt{\frac{E}{2\rho(1 + \nu)}}. \]  \hspace{1cm} (6.18)

The simulation geometry was identical to that of the experimental set-up. However, in the simulations the samples were immersed in deionized water (21°C) instead of PBS as in the experiments (Hakulinen et al. 2005, (67)). The characteristics of the 2.25 MHz ultrasound transducer used in the experimental measurements were adopted from the calibration data provided by the transducer manufacturer (Panametrics V304, Panametrics Inc., Waltham, MA, USA) and used in the simulations. The QUS parameters were determined from the simulation outputs similarly as from the experimentally measured signals.

In Study III, numerical simulations were conducted to investigate the effect of soft tissue thickness and composition on the measured attenuation and SOS values. The typical adipose to lean tissue ratio in human soft tissue, 25/75 (Morabia et al. 1999, (121)), was used to represent the real soft tissue composition in the simulations. The experimentally measured mean attenuation spectra and SOS values in bone and adipose and lean tissues were used for the simulations. Thereafter, the differences between uncorrected and corrected acoustic parameters were calculated with various soft tissue thickness and adipose to lean tissue ratios.

6.2.8 Statistical analyses

In Studies I - III, a normal distribution of compositional, mechanical and ultrasound parameters was tested with the Shapiro-Wilk test. Pearson’s correlation analysis was used for the investigation of linear associations between the parameters. In Study I, to adjust the specific correlation analyses for other variables, partial correlation coefficients were calculated. In Study II, the Wilcoxon two-related-samples test was used to investigate the significance of the differences in ultrasound parameter values determined at discrete point at the ROI center and as a mean within the ROI. In addition, in Study II a stepwise linear regression analysis was used to investigate the relations between the ultimate strength and the linear combinations of ultrasound parameters. A \( p \) value of < 0.05 defined the statistical significance. SPSS v.11.5 and 14.0 softwares (SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL, USA) were used for the statistical analyses.
7.1 Relations of acoustic, compositional and mechanical properties in trabecular bone

In Study I, QUS parameters were found to be significantly related to bone volume fraction \( (r = 0.64 - 0.84) \) and fat content \( (r = -0.47 - 0.54) \). In addition, linear correlations between the ultrasound parameters \( (\text{SOS, nBUA, AA and AIB}) \) and the calcified matrix collagen content were statistically significant \( (r = -0.46 - 0.66, \text{Table 7.1}) \). Bone ultimate strength was significantly related to bone volume fraction \( (r = 0.95) \) and fat content \( (r = -0.51) \).

When the correlations were adjusted for other compositional variables (partial correlation), in addition to bone volume fraction, the collagen and proteoglycan content of calcified matrix were significant independent determinants of bone ultimate strength \( (r = 0.63 \text{ and } r = -0.55, \text{respectively, } p < 0.05) \). Moreover, bone volume fraction was significantly related to SOS \( (r = 0.68) \). Only a moderate association was found between fat content and AIB \( (r = -0.59) \). Partial correlation analysis of ultrasound and composition parameters suggested that AIB and BUB are the only QUS parameters that are independent predictors of the calcified matrix collagen content \( (r = -0.66 \text{ vs. } r = -0.69 \text{ and } r = -0.62 \text{ vs. } r = -0.66, \text{respectively}) \).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BV/TV</th>
<th>Water content</th>
<th>Fat content</th>
<th>( c_{\text{CM}} )</th>
<th>( P_{\text{CM}} )</th>
<th>( M_{\text{CM}} )</th>
<th>( \sigma_{\text{max}} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOS</td>
<td>0.84**( (0.68**))</td>
<td>-0.18 (0.41)</td>
<td>-0.43( (0.08))</td>
<td>-0.39**( (0.46))</td>
<td>-0.14 (0.08)</td>
<td>-0.03 (0.11)</td>
<td>0.75**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nBUA</td>
<td>0.64**( (0.49))</td>
<td>0.08 (0.46)</td>
<td>0.53( (0.07))</td>
<td>-0.46( (0.42))</td>
<td>0.07 (0.11)</td>
<td>0.14 (0.23)</td>
<td>0.55*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>0.76**( (0.29))</td>
<td>-0.13 (-0.01)</td>
<td>-0.54( (-0.39))</td>
<td>-0.54( (-0.50))</td>
<td>0.10 (0.15)</td>
<td>-0.10 (-0.35)</td>
<td>0.65**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRC</td>
<td>0.84**( (0.42))</td>
<td>-0.34 (-0.24)</td>
<td>-0.54( (-0.36))</td>
<td>-0.39 (-0.19)</td>
<td>-0.13 (-0.37)</td>
<td>0.13 (0.10)</td>
<td>0.69**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIB</td>
<td>0.66**( (-0.19))</td>
<td>-0.31 (-0.44)</td>
<td>-0.39( (-0.59))</td>
<td>-0.66**( (-0.69**))</td>
<td>-0.02 (0.10)</td>
<td>-0.08 (-0.26)</td>
<td>0.62**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUB</td>
<td>0.80**( (0.37))</td>
<td>-0.17 (-0.01)</td>
<td>-0.55( (-0.46))</td>
<td>-0.62**( (-0.66**))</td>
<td>-0.06 (0.05)</td>
<td>-0.07 (-0.32)</td>
<td>0.70**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \sigma_{\text{max}} )</td>
<td>0.95**( (0.91**))</td>
<td>-0.42 (0.39)</td>
<td>-0.51( (0.40))</td>
<td>-0.31 (0.63*)</td>
<td>-0.02 (-0.55*)</td>
<td>0.21 (0.37)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vBMD</td>
<td>0.95**( (0.99**))</td>
<td>-0.41 (-0.35)</td>
<td>-0.53( (-0.12))</td>
<td>-0.39 (-0.03)</td>
<td>0.12 (0.24)</td>
<td>0.39 (0.98**)</td>
<td>0.92**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.1: Linear correlations between the mean values of ultrasound parameters within the circular ROI \( (88 \text{ mm}^2) \) and the composition and ultimate strength of trabecular bone \( (n = 19 - 20) \). Partial correlation between parameters are shown in brackets.\( * p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01.\)
7.2 Spatial variation of ultrasound parameters

In Study II, SOS and AIB, but not nBUA, AA or IRC, were significantly different when determined as a mean value within the ROI or as a discrete value at the center of the ROI \( (p = 0.03, n = 19 - 20, \text{Table 7.2}) \). Linear correlation coefficients between the mean values of ultrasound parameters within the ROI and the ultimate strength were higher than those obtained for the single point measurements (Fig. 7.1). Based on the stepwise linear regression analysis, the linear combination of mean and SD of AA was a significantly stronger predictor of the ultimate strength than either the mean or SD of AA alone \( (r = 0.76 \text{ vs. } 0.65 \text{ and } -0.32, \text{respectively}) \). However, from variations (SD) of ultrasound parameters within the ROI, only SD of AIB was a significant predictor of ultimate strength (Fig. 7.1).

Table 7.2: Mean values of ultrasound parameters within the ROI and at the discrete measurement point of the ROI center. A significant difference was revealed in SOS and AIB \( (p = 0.03, n = 19 - 20) \), whereas no statistically significant differences were found in nBUA, AA or IRC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SOS (m/s)</th>
<th>nBUA (dB/MHz/cm)</th>
<th>AA (dB/cm)</th>
<th>IRC (dB)</th>
<th>AIB (2 µs tw) (dB)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ROI mean</td>
<td>2236</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>-12.7</td>
<td>-26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROI Center</td>
<td>2451</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>-12.2</td>
<td>-27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROI SD</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7.1: Linear correlations between the mean values of ultrasound parameters within the ROI and the ultimate strength showed a trend for higher values than those obtained for a single point measurement. SD of AIB within the ROI was a significant predictor of the ultimate strength \( (n = 19 - 20) \). * \( p < 0.05 \), ** \( p < 0.01 \)

7.3 Effect of time window length on AIB analysis

The increase in time window length increased the values of AIB within the ROI and decreased the variation of AIB within the ROI (Fig. 7.2). Further, the strength of cor-
7. Results

relation between AIB and ultimate strength was dependent on the window length (Fig. 7.2). Mean AIB within the ROI predicted ultimate strength strongly only when assessed using a short time window (tw = 1 µs, \( r = 0.62 \)). However, the strongest association (\( r = -0.82, p < 0.01 \)) between SD of AIB within the ROI and ultimate strength was revealed with the long time window (tw = 4 µs).

Pulse-echo parameters (IRC and AIB) were analysed from the same echo signal and therefore these parameters were measured simultaneously. Based on the stepwise linear regression analysis, the linear combination of mean IRC and SD of AIB within the ROI served as a strong predictor (\( r = 0.92, p < 0.01 \)) of the bone ultimate strength.

![Figure 7.2](image)

**Figure 7.2**: (a) The effect of time window length (tw) on the values and variation (SD) of AIB within the ROI. (b) Mean value of AIB within the ROI was significantly correlated with the ultimate strength only when using a short time window. SD of AIB within the ROI was significantly related with the ultimate strength (\( n = 19 \)) also when determined by using long time windows. The time window length 1 µs corresponds to the distance of 1.1 mm when the mean SOS value for the bone samples (2236 m/s) is used.

7.4 Effect of overlying soft tissue on ultrasound measurement of trabecular bone

The overlying soft tissues induced significant errors in the measurement of bone acoustic properties (Fig. 7.3 and 7.4). The error in SOS (at the centre frequency of 5 MHz) was 7% when the effect of soft tissue was ignored (i.e. uncorrected values) and 3% when the soft tissue induced errors were mathematically minimized (i.e. corrected values) (Fig. 7.3). In Study III, all corrections were calculated using average SOS and attenuation values measured for adipose and lean tissue. At the centre frequency of 2.25 MHz, the error in average attenuation decreased from 22% to 3% (Fig. 7.3) and, in IRC, from 60% to 20%, when the soft tissue correction was applied (Fig. 7.4). Similarly, the error in BUB (at the centre frequency of 5 MHz) was reduced from 60% to 5% when the soft tissue induced errors were mathematically minimized (Fig. 7.4).
7.4. Effect of overlying soft tissue on ultrasound measurement of trabecular bone

Figure 7.3: (a, c) The mean values of through-transmission parameters, SOS and average attenuation, before and after the numerical soft tissue correction and as measured without overlying soft tissues. (b, d) The error induced by soft tissue increased as a function of ultrasound frequency. The error could be effectively reduced by means of numerical correction (Study III).

Figure 7.4: (a, c) The mean values of pulse-echo parameters, IRC and BUB, before and after the soft tissue correction and as measured without the overlying soft tissues. (b, d) The error induced by soft tissue increased as a function of ultrasound frequency. The error could be effectively reduced by means of numerical correction (Study III).
7. Results

7.5 The dual frequency ultrasound technique

In Study IV, the relative precision (CV) of IRC and AA for the elastomers measured with 5.0 MHz were 1.2% and 1.3%, respectively, so only single measurements were conducted for other elastomer measurements. The DFUS technique reduced the mean error induced by interfering elastomers in IRC and in AA (at 2.25 MHz) from 37.5 - 77.5% to -12.0 - 4.9% and from 70.0 - 201.1% to -1.1 - 34.6%, respectively (Fig. 7.5). At the higher frequency (5.0 MHz), the DFUS technique reduced the mean error induced by interfering elastomers in IRC and in AA from 103.6 - 289.4% to -15.9 - 5.6% and from 33.8 - 158.3% to -29.7 - 6.5%, respectively (Fig. 7.5).

Figure 7.5: (a, b) The errors induced by interfering elastomers in IRC before and after the DFUS correction with a frequency of (a) 2.25 MHz and (b) 5.0 MHz. (c, d) The errors induced by interfering elastomers in AA before and after the DFUS correction with a frequency of (c) 2.25 MHz and (d) 5.0 MHz. The absolute errors are determined by using the mean values of parameters (Table 7.3).

In the soft tissue-bone combination, the DFUS technique reduced the mean error in BUB and in IRC (at 5.0 MHz) from 58.6% to -4.9% and from 127.4% to 23.8%, respectively (Fig. 7.6).
Table 7.3: Values of the integrated reflection coefficient (IRC) and average attenuation (AA) of elastomers (3a-c) at 2.25 MHz and 5.0 MHz. The values of acoustic parameters for elastomers 3a-c were also determined with the interfering overlying elastomers (1 and 2) present (Fig. 6.3). Uncorrected (mean±SD) as well as corrected values (mean±SD, DFUS-technique) are also presented. The absolute errors are determined by using the mean values of parameters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elastomer</th>
<th>2.25 MHz</th>
<th>5.0 MHz</th>
<th>2.25 MHz</th>
<th>5.0 MHz</th>
<th>2.25 MHz</th>
<th>5.0 MHz</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3a IRC (dB)</td>
<td>-35.7 ± 2.7</td>
<td>-31.4 ± 1.7</td>
<td>-49.0 ± 2.7</td>
<td>-64.5 ± 2.7</td>
<td>-55.0 ± 5.5</td>
<td>-49.6 ± 4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a AA (dB/cm)</td>
<td>10.5 ± 1.7</td>
<td>33.2 ± 4.3</td>
<td>40.1 ± 1.6</td>
<td>72.3 ± 4.3</td>
<td>46.1 ± 6.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b IRC (dB)</td>
<td>-18.7 ± 2.8</td>
<td>-20.2 ± 0.9</td>
<td>-33.4 ± 2.8</td>
<td>-11.9 ± 2.8</td>
<td>-19.4 ± 0.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b AA (dB/cm)</td>
<td>16.9 ± 4.5</td>
<td>8.2 ± 0.6</td>
<td>24.0 ± 1.9</td>
<td>30.1 ± 4.5</td>
<td>19.0 ± 1.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3c IRC (dB)</td>
<td>20.1 ± 1.7</td>
<td>31.7 ± 1.7</td>
<td>64.5 ± 2.7</td>
<td>40.1 ± 1.6</td>
<td>72.3 ± 4.3</td>
<td>46.1 ± 6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3c AA (dB/cm)</td>
<td>16.9 ± 4.5</td>
<td>8.2 ± 0.6</td>
<td>24.0 ± 1.9</td>
<td>30.1 ± 4.5</td>
<td>19.0 ± 1.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7.6: (a) The errors induced by overlying soft tissues in IRC before and after the DFUS correction at frequencies of 2.25 MHz and 5.0 MHz. (b) The errors induced by overlying soft tissues in BUB before and after the DFUS correction at frequencies of 2.25 MHz and 5.0 MHz. The absolute errors are determined by using the mean values of parameters (Table 7.4).

Table 7.4: Values (mean ± SD) of IRC and BUB in human trabecular bone at 2.25 MHz and 5.0 MHz. The acoustic properties of the bone samples were also determined with the overlying soft tissue layers. Uncorrected (mean±SD) as well as corrected values (mean±SD, DFUS-technique) are also presented. Absolute errors are calculated using the mean values of parameters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trabecular bone (n=26)</th>
<th>2.25 MHz</th>
<th>5.0 MHz</th>
<th>2.25 MHz</th>
<th>5.0 MHz</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IRC (dB)</td>
<td>-10.1 ± 2.8</td>
<td>-22.9 ± 5.6</td>
<td>-10.1 ± 2.8</td>
<td>-22.9 ± 5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUB (dB)</td>
<td>-15.5 ± 4.3</td>
<td>-26.1 ± 6.3</td>
<td>-16.5 ± 3.8</td>
<td>-26.1 ± 6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncorrected values</td>
<td>-16.4 ± 4.0</td>
<td>-22.9 ± 5.6</td>
<td>-15.5 ± 4.3</td>
<td>-26.1 ± 6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected values</td>
<td>-12.5 ± 4.0</td>
<td>-12.5 ± 4.0</td>
<td>-12.5 ± 4.0</td>
<td>-12.5 ± 4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There are several challenges in the sensitive ultrasound diagnostics of trabecular bone. Clinical ultrasound devices are designed for the measurement of only peripheral sites. Novel ultrasound techniques should be developed for the measurement of central skeletal sites, and the selection of clinical reference measure is crucial in this endeavour. Most studies compare clinical ultrasound devices with DXA devices, the present gold standard in osteoporosis diagnosis. However, the DXA technique determines only the areal bone mineral density. Although it is an important determinant of bone strength, areal bone density is only one of many compositional, structural and geometrical factors affecting the probability of bone fracture. The potential of a novel ultrasound technique should be evaluated by comparing it with mechanical testing or the prevalence of fractures. Further, soft tissues overlying the bone are a major challenge in bone ultrasound measurements. Extensive individual variation in the thickness and composition of the soft tissue layer creates significant uncertainty. Moreover, the effect of the cortical layer has to be eliminated to obtain an accurate clinical ultrasound measurement of trabecular bone.

In the present thesis work, the composition of trabecular bone and calcified matrix was analysed and related to measured ultrasound parameters (Study I). Bone quantity was the strongest determinant of ultrasound parameters, while backscattering was also found to be significantly related to the collagen content of calcified matrix. In Study II, the diagnostic potential of a single point measurement and quantitative ultrasound imaging was compared. In addition, the spatial variation in ultrasound parameter values within the region of interest was investigated. A significant variation in ultrasound parameter values within the ROI was found, and the variation was found to be related to the mechanical parameters of trabecular bone. In Study III, the effect of overlying soft tissue on the ultrasound measurement of human trabecular bone was investigated at various frequencies. Soft tissue was found to induce significant errors in the ultrasound measurements of trabecular bone, and the effect of overlying soft tissue was found to increase with the ultrasound frequency. To minimize this source of measurement uncertainty, a new ultrasound method (DFUS) was introduced for soft tissue correction (Study IV). After DFUS correction, the error caused by the soft tissues on the QUS parameters was typically 1/10 of the error without any
correction.

EFFECT OF COMPOSITION ON THE ACOUSTIC AND MECHANICAL PROPERTIES OF TRABECULAR BONE

In Study I, the partial correlation analysis indicated, as expected, that vBMD is affected only by the bone volume fraction and mineral content of trabeculae. Interestingly, partial correlation coefficients between the ultrasound parameters and bone volume fraction were lower than the linear correlation coefficients. This suggests that ultrasound parameters are influenced not only by bone volume fraction but also by other compositional properties of bone. Furthermore, AIB showed a significant negative correlation, even after adjustment by other variables of composition, with the collagen content of calcified matrix. Wear (1999)(169) has demonstrated less scattering from elastic scatterers than from inelastic scatterers. Thus, the negative association between AIB and collagen content may be explained by the variation in the elastic properties of the scatter (78).

Since collagen is an important determinant of bone toughness, ultrasound backscattering may provide information that is valuable when predicting fracture risk. Huopio et al. (2004)(86) demonstrated that calcaneal ultrasound measurements predicted early postmenopausal fractures as accurately as axial BMD. Fracture risk depends on bone volume fraction, bone microstructure, and the composition and mechanical properties of the calcified matrix as well as tissue turnover and microdamage accumulation (25, 41). Bone ultimate strength and toughness are known to decrease significantly along with collagen denaturation (168). In Study I, however, the ultimate strength of trabecular bone was dependent on the bone volume fraction, but not on the calcified matrix collagen content. Low variation (CV) in the calcified matrix collagen content (11.2%) among the samples may explain this finding. Since there was a considerable variation in donor age (24 - 76 years) and bone volume fraction (CV = 25.1%), the detected low variation in collagen content suggests that the collagen content of calcified matrix is relatively constant, exhibiting only minor variation within the healthy population. However, quantitative information on bone organic composition, e.g. collagen content, could be of clinical benefit. Taken together, the present findings suggest that acoustic measurements may provide diagnostically useful information not only about bone volume fraction but also about the composition of trabecular calcified matrix.

SPATIAL VARIATION OF ULTRASOUND PARAMETERS

Variation of AIB within the ROI was found to be a significant predictor of bone ultimate strength (Study II). Notably, the linear association between the variation of AIB and ultimate strength was negative. Backscattering is related to scatterer size i.e. to the thickness of the trabeculae or to the size of the pores (28). With small pore sizes, e.g. in compact bone, trabecular bone is acoustically more homogenous diminishing the variation of AIB. With greater pore sizes, e.g. in osteoporotic trabecular bone, trabecular bone is acoustically more heterogeneous, increasing the variation in AIB.
The high variation of ultrasound parameter values within the ROI raises the question of the value of point measurements and emphasizes the potential and role of parametric imaging. Since spatial variation in ultrasound parameters within e.g. the human proximal femur has been reported (138), the present findings are not surprising. The variation in acoustic properties may be explained by the structural characteristics of trabecular bone and the relatively small focus size of the applied transducer (a beam diameter (-6 dB) = 1.4 mm at focus). The more focused the beam is, the more it is affected by spatial variation in trabecular structure, density and mechanical properties. As the mean trabecular separation of the samples was between 0.3 and 0.8 mm, the variation in pore size and porosity can significantly contribute to the spatial variation detected in ultrasound parameter values. When conducting ultrasound imaging of trabecular bone, the phase cancellation effect (173) may also contribute to spatial variation in the backscattering parameters. Based on the investigations by Wear (173), the phase cancellation effects are more significant at high frequencies.

**Effect of time window length on AIB analysis**

In Study II, the association between AIB and ultimate strength was dependent on the length of the time window in ultrasound analysis. Mean AIB within the ROI predicted ultimate strength significantly only with a short time window \( (r = 0.62, \text{tw} = 1 \mu s) \), while significant associations were observed between the variation of AIB within the ROI and ultimate strength also when longer time windows were applied \( (r = -0.82, \text{tw} = 4 \mu s) \). Hoffmeister et al. (2002)(78) found weak negative and positive correlations \( (r = -0.35 - 0.50) \) between AIB and BMD in human trabecular bone in vitro. In bovine trabecular bone, Hoffmeister et al. (2000)(79) reported a weak negative association between AIB and apparent density \( (r = -0.34 - -0.51) \). Both studies (Hoffmeister et al. 2000, 2002) were conducted using an ultrasound transducer with a 2.25 MHz center frequency. In their analyses, a 4 \( \mu s \) time window length was applied. Recently, Hoffmeister et al. (2006)(77) reported a strong negative correlation \( (r = -0.90) \) between AIB and BMD, measured using a 5.0 MHz center frequency and a 4 \( \mu s \) time window length. The positive linear correlation between AIB and ultimate strength reported in Study II may be explained by the smaller effect of ultrasound attenuation. Since ultrasound backscattering arises from the deeper bone structures with long time windows, the backscattered sound is more attenuated. Further, ultrasound attenuation increases as a function of frequency, so the attenuation effect on AIB is higher at 5.0 MHz than at 2.25 MHz. This may explain the negative association between AIB and BMD reported by Hoffmeister et al. (2006) as well as the positive correlation between AIB and ultimate strength reported in Study II. In human trabecular bone, the true backscattering (broadband ultrasound backscattering, BUB), compensated by attenuation, is similar to that measured with 2.25 or 5.0 MHz (67). Our results suggest that the association between AIB and mechanical properties is positive when low frequencies and short time windows (in the present Study II, \( f = 2.25 \) MHz and \( \text{tw} = 1 \mu s \)) are used. Due to the attenuation, an increase in frequency and time window length diminishes the strength of the correlation between AIB and mechanical properties.
INVESTIGATION AND ELIMINATION OF THE EFFECT OF OVERLYING SOFT TISSUES ON QUS PARAMETERS

In Study III, overlying soft tissues were found to influence significantly the measured values of ultrasound attenuation, speed, reflection and backscattering in bone in vitro. The earlier studies have also demonstrated the influence of soft tissue on measured SOS in bone (29, 57, 99). Both Kotzki et al. (1994)(99) and Gomez et al. (1997)(57) reported that an increasing amount of adipose tissue significantly reduces the SOS values measured for bone. Similarly, ankle oedema has been shown to significantly decrease the measured BUA and SOS values (90). In Study III, the effect of soft tissues was eliminated by applying a numerical correction with a priori knowledge of soft tissue thickness and the lean and adipose tissue ratio. Soft tissue-related errors were seen to increase as a function of ultrasound frequency; however, with the numerical correction the soft tissue-induced errors could be effectively minimized.

In Study IV, a new dual frequency ultrasound (DFUS) method for soft tissue correction of bone ultrasound measurement was introduced. The initial validation with elastomer samples demonstrated a significant improvement in the accuracy of ultrasound measurements. The error of IRC at 5.0 MHz diminished from 103.6 - 289.4% to -15.9 - 5.6%. The reproducibility (CV) of the IRC measurements for the elastomers was 1.2% (at 5.0 MHz). Similarly, with human trabecular bone samples with 10 - 20 mm of overlying soft tissue the error in BUB (at 5.0 MHz) diminished from 58.6% to -4.9%.

Several patent descriptions (101, 103, 116, 120, 150, 184, 185) and scientific papers (111, 137) have been published on ultrasound techniques for the determination of soft tissue composition and the correction of the soft tissue effect in bone ultrasound measurements. However, these techniques are based on the through-transmission technique, assume a linear relation between attenuation and ultrasound frequency, or require detection of acoustic interfaces between the adipose and lean tissue layers.

In the patent GB2257253 (103), bone properties are measured with the through-transmission technique, while the effect of soft tissue is determined with the pulse-echo technique. The thickness of the soft tissue is analysed with the assumption of constant sound speed in the soft tissue. In addition, the reflections from the interfaces between the adipose and lean tissues must be detected in order to determine the thickness of the adipose and lean tissue layers.

In the patent US4512195 (120), a technique for the ultrasonic characterization of living body tissues is described. The thickness of the tissue layers is analysed from the echo signal by assuming constant sound speed in all tissues. Moreover, the ultrasound attenuation in tissues is analysed with the echo signals arising from the front and back surfaces of the tissue layers. With this technique, the front and back surfaces of the tissues have to be parallel in order to analyse the attenuation correction. Furthermore, all interfaces between the tissue layers must be acoustically visible.

Lu et al. (1995)(111) introduced a soft tissue correction method for backscatter measurements. In this technique, two different frequencies are used to estimate the effective attenuation coefficient of soft tissue between the ultrasound transducer and the
object of interest. However, this technique assumes constant sound speed in different tissues, so it estimates the thickness of tissues differently than the DFUS technique. In addition, the technique assumes a linear relation between the attenuation of ultrasound in soft tissue and frequency. The DFUS technique is free from this assumption.

In summary, the DFUS technique introduced in Study IV is the first pulse-echo ultrasound technique capable of determining the amount and composition of overlying soft tissue without reflection information from the interfaces between adipose and lean tissues, and may therefore enhance the accuracy of clinical ultrasound measurements significantly.
CHAPTER IX

Summary and conclusions

The gold standard in osteoporosis diagnosis is currently dual energy X-ray absorptiometry. DXA provides information about the areal bone mineral density. However, bone strength depends on both the quantity and quality of the calcified matrix of trabecular bone. These are the properties which also affect the QUS measurements. Unfortunately, current clinical QUS measurements are only moderately good predictors of osteoporotic bone fractures.

In this thesis work, the effect of trabecular bone composition on ultrasound, DXA and mechanical parameters was analysed. The effect of spatial variation in 2D ultrasound parametric images was also investigated, as was the effect of overlying soft tissue on trabecular bone ultrasound measurements. A novel soft tissue correction method (DFUS) was introduced and evaluated.

The most important results can be summarized as follows:

1. Ultrasound backscattering is a significant predictor of collagen content in calcified matrix.

2. Spatial variation of ultrasound backscattering is significantly associated with the ultimate strength of trabecular bone.

3. Overlying soft tissues can induce significant errors in the values of ultrasound parameters of trabecular bone.

4. The DFUS technique can be used to determine the thickness and composition of overlying soft tissues. Therefore, the DFUS technique reduces significantly the error induced by soft tissues in the ultrasound measurement of bone.
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