Published in final edited form as:

J Clin Densitom. 2010 April ; 13(2): 228–236. doi:10.1016/j.jocd.2010.01.001.

Dynamic Bone Quality – A Non-invasive Measure of Bone's Biomechanical Property in Osteoporosis

Amit Bhattacharya¹, Nelson B. Watts², Kermit Davis¹, Susan Kotowski¹, Rakesh Shukla¹, Alok Kumar Dwivedi¹, and Robert Coleman³

¹ University of Cincinnati College of Medicine, Department of Environmental Health, Cincinnati, OH

² University Bone Health and Osteoporosis Center, Department of Internal Medicine, Cincinnati, OH

³ SignalLysis Co., Cincinnati, OH

Abstract

We describe a novel approach to non-invasively characterize bone quality, a measurement that quantitates aggregate shock absorption capacity of load-bearing bones as a measure of mechanical structural integrity during exposure to real-time self-induced in-vivo loading associated with heel strike. The outcome measure, damping factor, was estimated at five load bearing anatomical sites: ankle, tibial tuberosity, femoral condyle, lower back (at 3rd lumbar vertebra) and upper back (7th thoracic vertebra) plus the forehead in 67 patients with postmenopausal osteoporosis with and without documented vertebral fractures. The damping value was significantly lower in patients with vertebral fractures compared with those without fracture (range –36% to –72%, median –44%). In these women with osteoporosis, damping factor was able to discriminate between patients with and without vertebral fractures, whereas traditional measures of bone density and biomechanical measures obtained from bone geometry were not significantly different between the groups.

Keywords

dynamic bone quality; damping; osteoporosis; fracture; shock absorption

Introduction

The objective of this study was to further develop and evaluate an inexpensive noninvasive screening tool as a supplement to bone mineral density (BMD) for discriminating women with postmenopausal osteoporosis who had vertebral fracture from those without fracture.

The incidence of osteoporosis is higher in women than men. About 50% of women of the age >50 years will develop osteoporosis during their remaining life (1). The “gold standard” for the pre-fracture diagnosis of osteoporosis is measurement of BMD by dual x-ray absorptiometry (DXA). BMD correlates with fracture risk better than cholesterol with heart disease and as well as blood pressure with stroke. However, although patients with osteoporosis are at high risk of fracture, most patients with “osteoporosis” by DXA criteria do not fracture,

Corresponding Author: Nelson B. Watts, MD, University of Cincinnati Bone Health and Osteoporosis Center, 222 Piedmont Ave., Suite 6300, Cincinnati OH 45219, Phone 513-475-7401, Fax 801-838-1966, nelson.watts@uc.edu.

Publisher's Disclaimer: This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final citable form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

and most fractures occur in patients who do not meet the DXA criteria for osteoporosis. There are other determinants of bone strength and fracture risk besides BMD, such as micro-architecture, mechanical structural integrity and bone turnover (2–6). Thus, although BMD measurement by DXA is a useful test, having complimentary measures of bone quality or bone strength should provide additional information to assess fracture risk (7–11).

We describe a complimentary measure of bone quality by evaluating bone shock absorption (BSA), damping factor (ζ), as an aggregate response of bone's structural integrity under self-induced dynamic “realistic” in-vivo loading. Structural failure of human bone and/or any mechanical system rarely occurs under unloaded or static conditions. Therefore, better understanding of bone fracture and prevention requires measurement of both static and dynamic biomechanical properties of bone when exposed to realistic “real-world” in-vivo external loadings (12;13). The importance of understanding dynamic mechanical behavior of bone has been discussed in the literature but so far no study has presented a non-invasive tool for quantifying this property in humans. The BSA measurement is designed to capture non-invasively “dynamic bone quality” properties as measured by damping factor (ζ), while traditional techniques such as DXA provide information about static bone quality properties. Osteoporosis is associated with decreased bone mass (as reflected by decrease in BMD and bone mineral content) and deterioration of trabecular architecture, which collectively impact detrimentally on the quality of bone, i.e., increased stiffness and brittleness and decreased strength (2;3). Among all natural shock absorbers in the human body, trabecular bone has the highest capacity (170 times higher than that provided by cartilage and synovial fluid) to attenuate the incoming shock wave associated with heel-strike during walking and running (14–17). In healthy subjects, 70% of the incoming shock waves associated with natural daily activity of heel strike are absorbed by the body's natural shock absorbers before reaching the forehead (18–20). Previous researchers have suggested that cumulative everyday cyclic loading activities may give rise to microdamage in the form of microcracks, thereby affecting the mechanical property of bone, toughness i.e. its shock absorbing capacity (14;21–23). Because trabecular bones are detrimentally affected by osteoporosis, the natural shock absorbing capacity will be compromised.

The current study describes measurement of BSA capacity of individuals with postmenopausal osteoporosis during exposure to realistic in-vivo loading associated with heel strike. BSA evaluation provides a “signature” of dynamic bone quality because the measurement of shock absorption capacity captures an aggregate response of the load-bearing bone due to dynamic loading associated with heel-strike.

The main focus of this study was to determine if the information provided by BSA evaluation could serve as a supplementary tool (along with BMD) to better discriminate patients with postmenopausal osteoporosis with and without fractures. Non-invasive measures of natural shock absorbers of musculoskeletal systems may be potentially effective and economical descriptors of clinical and pre-clinical status of degenerative musculoskeletal diseases for elderly individuals (15;24–26). The BSA evaluation approach is based on sound theories in engineering, physics, mechanics and physiology. The BSA technique is totally non-invasive, objective, simple and quick to administer (25–27). Preliminary studies from our group and others have shown that natural shock absorbers of the musculoskeletal system are impaired in osteoarthritic patients, but there is no information regarding how osteoporosis affects natural shock absorption, thus the rationale for conducting the current study (22;23;25–27).

Materials and Methods

Subjects

Sixty-seven Caucasian women between 65 and 86 years of age were recruited from the clinical practice of a co-investigator (NBW) at the Bone Health and Osteoporosis Center at the University of Cincinnati. All subjects met the WHO BMD criterion for osteoporosis; T-score 2.5 S.D. or more below the mean values for young healthy adult females in the spine or hip (1). Eligibility criteria required subjects have at least two vertebrae from L1 through L4 unaffected by degenerative change or fracture. Subjects were physically and mentally able to perform the heel strike maneuver, able to walk at a moderate pace for 5 minutes without cane or other assistance and lift and hit their foot five times while standing on the other foot unassisted. Subjects were excluded who had factors that might confound the results of the heel strike test, including significant arthritis in the hip or knee that limited ambulation, fracture of a lower-extremity bone within the last two years or surgery to the spine, hip, knee or ankle.

One investigator (NBW) was aware of the subjects' fracture status but was blinded to the BSA test results and the remaining investigators were aware of the BSA test results but blinded about the subjects' fracture status.

The protocol was approved by the University Institutional Review Board (IRB) and all subjects gave informed consent.

Bone Densitometry and Fracture Assessment

Bone mineral density of 34 patients were determined using DXA a Hologic Delphi device (version 11.2:30) and the remaining 33 subjects were tested with a GE Lunar Prodigy (version 8.8, DF+13153). Coefficient of variations in adults for both devices was 0.8% in the spine and approximately 1%–2% for hip regions. BMD values obtained from GE Lunar device were converted to get Hologic equivalent values using equations developed at our center based on cross-calibration of GE and Hologic equipment. Vertebral fractures were assessed from lateral spine images acquired using the DXA device or lateral spine x-rays; reduction in anterior, middle, and/or posterior vertebral height by 20% or more constituted a fracture.(28) Twenty eight of the subjects had one or more vertebral fractures while thirty nine subjects had no vertebral fractures.

Static Bone Quality Properties

Biomechanical properties of bone under unloaded or static condition were calculated from bone density and bone geometry data obtained from DXA for the femoral neck. Since the empirical equations used for the calculation of biomechanical measures were based on data collected with Hologic device, only subset of our data (n=34) were used for this calculation (29). Biomechanical measures were calculated to capture bone's bending resistance, cortical instability and compressive strength. These biomechanical variables include section modulus, buckling ratio, cortical, thickness and compressive strength. Formulas to calculate these variables were obtained from Riancho et al (29).

Dynamic Bone Response Properties -- Measurement Tool and Experimental Task

Low mass, skin-mounted accelerometers were attached to the bony prominences by metal/hard Lexican holders secured on the skin with micropore tape at the following five load-bearing anatomical sites: ankle, tibial tuberosity, femoral condyle, lower back (at the 3rd lumbar vertebra), upper back (7th thoracic vertebra) and forehead (Figure 1). Previous studies from our group (25;26) and others (30;31) have shown that use of low mass accelerometers (i.e., increasing its resonance frequency) minimizes the effect of soft tissue under the accelerometers (<5% loss of accelerometer information), thereby providing a faithful measure of shock wave

propagation during heel strike. A previous study (32) showed that whole bone strength is influenced by both trabecular structure as well as by the cortical bone surrounding the trabecular structure. Therefore, in this study, accelerometers were attached on the bony prominences of the whole bone, giving an aggregate damping value for both trabecular and cortical bone. The signals from accelerometers were sampled at 640 Hz with a 16 bit A/D board equipped with sample and hold circuit.

The subjects completed stationary foot striking tasks in our gait laboratory fitted with a force platform system (Model OR6 AMTI force platform system). The stationary task consisted of lifting the foot (while keeping the other foot stationary on the ground) and placing down with the heel striking the force platform with a force equivalent to that used during natural walking. This stationary task was repeated 5 times. The results from 5 foot strikes were averaged for statistical analysis. During testing all subjects wore full-body safety harness.

Dynamic Bone Quality Measure: Measurement of Bone Shock Absorption (BSA)

Bone damping (ζ) and resonance/dominant frequencies at the anatomical sites were calculated assuming the musculoskeletal system being modeled as a single degree of freedom system (SDOF) responding to the transient force due to heel strike in accordance with the solution to the second order differential equation (33–36). The second order differential equation solution may take the form of a Frequency Response Function (FRF) or transfer function between force plate and the acceleration at the measurement site. The advantage of this form is that the equation is known explicitly and the FRF is obtained experimentally. Thus, ζ was obtained directly from the measured FRF using the structural bandwidth and resonance frequency method (34;35). The structural bandwidth is manifest in the FRF real part as the frequency separation between two extremes, symmetric about the resonance frequency, whereas the resonance frequency coincides with a single peak in the FRF imaginary part. The ζ is calculated as the ratio: one-half the structural bandwidth divided by the resonance frequency. Using the above-mentioned structural bandwidth and resonance frequency method, ζ were obtained directly from a measured FRF (34;35). We have used these variables successfully in our earlier studies in adults as well as adolescents (25;37). As waveforms vary due to the frequency content of the force transient and acceleration transient the ratios of heel-strike force and the accelerations can only be consistent on a frequency-by-frequency basis and that is the rationale for using the frequency domain or FRF analysis. Another advantage of conducting the analysis in frequency domain is that it permits calculation of the damping value independent of surface and force-time peak level. Test and retest of BSA trial was carried out in our earlier study where the mean coefficient of variation was 5% and 8.6% for resonant frequency and damping, respectively (37).

Data Analysis

All study-related data were checked for transcriptional errors by comparing against the originals. The statistical software used for the purpose of advanced analyses was SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Sciences) version 11.5. Descriptive data analysis summarized the data in terms of certain descriptive statistics such as means, median, standard deviation, skewness, kurtosis, range, etc. Box plots were generated for each continuous variable to identify potential outliers and extreme observations for each variable. This was done separately for the two groups (fracture and non-fracture patients). The influence of outliers and extreme observations were assessed by conducting all statistical analyses ‘with’ and ‘without’ such observations in the analyses, ensuring that the results was both qualitatively as well as quantitatively similar. The variables that follow normality had a t-test performed on them and the variables that were non-normal had the nonparametric test (Mann Whitney Test) performed on them.

At the multivariate level, Linear Discriminant Analysis was used to assess the performance of the BSA. This statistical approach was used to formulate a function or rule(s) that would permit subjects to be classified into one of the predefined classifications: 1) individuals with osteoporosis who had one or more vertebral fractures and 2) individuals with osteoporosis without vertebral fractures. The Linear Discriminant Analysis follows very closely the logic of the Multiple Regression Analysis. The Linear Discriminant Analysis was performed on those variables that showed a significant difference in mean between the two groups (fractured and non-fractured osteoporosis patients) at the 0.05 significance level. Age was also considered for the Linear Discriminant Analysis. The performance of the classification rule was summarized by means of misclassification error. To obtain a reliable estimate of future performance, one should use a data set other than that used to derive the classification rule. However, in the face of limited resources with small sample size such as that used in this study, the data were repeatedly split into two parts, creating the rule on one dataset and testing the rule on the remaining data set. The method of cross-validation (leave-one-out) was employed. Here, a single subject was chosen for testing and the rest of the data were used to create the discriminant function. This was repeated for all the subjects. The predicted error rate of the rule based on all the subjects was estimated as the proportion of misclassifications. Receiver Operating Characteristics (ROC) curves were also constructed for each of the variables under BSA to classify the non-fracture and fracture group separately for each of the leg. Further, using ROC analysis, area under curve (AUC) and cut off of the damping variables were also obtained to assess the performance of the variables separately for each of the leg. The cut-off was decided where the sensitivity and specificity both were found to be higher. In addition, ROC analysis was also carried for each of the BMD variables.

Results

Table 1 provides demographic data, dietary calcium intake and fracture status for the study groups. The age range of patients in the non-fracture group was 65 to 86 and in the fracture group was 67 to 85. There was no statistically significant difference between fracture and non-fracture groups for body weight, height, BMI or dietary calcium intake. Age was significantly different between the groups ($p = 0.0133$).

BMD

Table 2 provides mean values of BMD and T-scores for femoral neck, trochanter, total hip and lumbar spine for both groups. There was no statistically significant difference between the fracture and the non-fracture group for any of the BMD outcomes.

Static bone quality property

Table 3 provides biomechanical variables calculated from femoral neck geometry. None of the biomechanical variables were significantly different between the fracture and non-fracture groups.

Dynamic bone quality measure: bone shock absorption (BSA): Figures 2 and 3 provide bone damping values (ζ) for the right and left legs testing along with values from healthy young adults (25;26). Based on the results of right foot heel strike, the fracture group showed statistically significantly lower ζ than the non fracture group for all anatomical sites (range of p values were 0.033 to 0.001) (Figure 2). However, for the left foot heel strike, the fracture group showed statistically significantly lower ζ than the non fracture group for all anatomical sites except for the below knee site (range of p values were 0.047 to 0.001) (Figure 3). As expected, the ζ values at the fracture region [i.e. between upper ($\zeta_{\text{UPPER BACK}}$) and lower back ($\zeta_{\text{LOWER BACK}}$)] were much lower than that recorded for the remaining sites for both groups (Figures 2 and 3). In comparison with the non-fracture group, on the average, across all

anatomical sites, the fracture group showed 40% and 50% lower damping for the left heel strike and the right heel strike, respectively. Overall, the resonance frequencies at all anatomical sites were numerically higher for the fracture group than the non-fracture group but the differences were not statistically significant. At the spine, the average resonance frequency in the fracture group was 47% to 52% higher than that of non-fracture group for the lower back and the upper back respectively (figure not shown).

The results from linear discriminant analysis performed on those variables that showed a significant difference ($p \leq 0.05$) in mean values between the two groups (fractured and non-fractured) for FRF analyses provided following model for left leg heel strike case:

$$\text{GROUP (Fracture or No Fracture)} = 4.4 + 0.188 \zeta_{\text{LOWER BACK}} + 0.817 \zeta_{\text{UPPER BACK}} - 0.086 \text{ Age}.$$

Using the above discriminate analysis for left leg, about 74% of original grouped cases were correctly classified. In the above, negative coefficient for age implies that older patients are more likely to be in fracture group; positive coefficients for $\zeta_{\text{LOWER BACK}}$ and $\zeta_{\text{UPPER BACK}}$ imply that individuals with higher damping at the lower back and upper back are less likely to be in the fracture group.

For the right leg heel strike case the following model was obtained:

$$\text{GROUP (Fracture or No Fracture)} = -1.283 + 0.147 \zeta_{\text{ABOVE KNEE}}$$

Using the above discriminate analysis for right leg, about 66% of original grouped cases were correctly classified. In the above positive coefficient for $\zeta_{\text{ABOVE KNEE}}$ as expected implies that a higher damping at right above knee is associated with less likelihood of being in the fracture group.

In Figures 4 and 5, results from ROC analysis are provided for right and left leg testing. In these figures, ROC analysis provides relative comparison of area under the curve (AUC) values for damping (ζ) measured at various anatomical sites. For the left leg $\zeta_{\text{LOWERBACK}}$ was the best discriminator [AUC = 0.91 (95% CI 0.83–1.0)] with $\zeta_{\text{ABOVE KNEE}}$ [AUC=0.87 (95% CI 0.76–0.98)] to be the second best. The remaining anatomical sites at head, ankle, upper back and below knee reported AUC values of 0.82 (95% CI 0.68–0.96), 0.75 (95% CI 0.59–0.92), 0.72 (95% CI 0.56–0.88) and 0.82 (95% CI 0.68–0.97), respectively. For the left leg test, the cut off values for ζ at head, above knee, ankle, lower back, below knee and upper back were 9.0, 3.87, 5.55, 4.33, 6.12 and 1.04, respectively.

For the right leg, the best discriminator was the $\zeta_{\text{ABOVE KNEE}}$ [AUC=0.81 (95% CI 0.67–0.93)] and the second best was ζ_{ANKLE} [AUC=0.77 (95% CI 0.63–0.9)]. The remaining anatomical sites at head, lower back, upper back and below knee reported AUC values of 0.75 (95% CI 0.61–0.89), 0.76 (95% CI 0.62–0.90), 0.70 (95% CI 0.54–0.85) and 0.74 (95% CI 0.61–0.88), respectively. For the right leg test, the cut off values for ζ at head, above knee, ankle, lower back, below knee and upper back were 9.66, 5.95, 7.04, 3.21, 5.32 and 1.15, respectively.

The ROC analysis for the femoral neck BMD, trochanter BMD, total hip BMD and lumbar spine BMD provided following AUC values: 0.52 (95% CI 0.35–0.69), 0.55 (95% CI 0.38–0.72), 0.57 (95% CI 0.40–0.73) and 0.63 (95% CI 0.48–0.78), respectively.

Discussion

We describe a non-invasive measure of bone quality, bone shock absorption property, damping factor (ζ), as an aggregate response of bone's structural integrity under dynamic "realistic" in-vivo loading associated with simple heel strike. In women with osteoporosis, the bone shock absorption property, ζ , was able to discriminate between those with and without fracture, whereas BMD and static biomechanical measures alone were not significantly different between the groups, as would be expected from the literature (38–40).

Based on the literature, skeletal disorders such as osteoporosis detrimentally impact bone's quality as characterized by decreases in section modulus, cortical thickness, compressive strength and increase in buckling ratio (38). These traditional measures of bone quality, static biomechanical properties, based on bone geometry data (from DXA testing), are estimated using classical strength of materials equations from the literature (29). We calculated these variables in the subset of our patients using the method and software published by Riancho et al and compared those to data from the literature (29;37). While our fracture group showed lower values for section modulus, compressive strength, cortical thickness and higher values for buckling ratio than the non-fracture group, these differences were not statistically significant (Table 3). In comparison to values for static biomechanical properties for healthy subjects reported in the literature, our subjects were much lower, suggesting poorer structural integrity of their bones (29;38).

As discussed above, bone quantity as measured by BMD and traditional measures of "bone quality" described by static biomechanical properties were not sensitive enough to discriminate between fracture and non-fracture groups of patients with osteoporosis. Fracture is a structural failure phenomenon and structural failure of human bone and/or any mechanical system rarely occurs under static conditions (12). Therefore, better understanding of bone fracture and prevention requires that traditional measures of BMD and static biomechanical properties be supplemented with measures of dynamic biomechanical properties of bone when exposed to realistic "real-world" in-vivo external loadings. The BSA measurement was designed to capture non-invasively "dynamic bone quality" properties (as measured by BSA outcome, damping factor, ζ) when exposed to realistic dynamic loading associated with simple heel strike. Because osteoporosis is associated with decreased bone mass and deterioration of trabecular architecture which collectively impact bone's mechanical properties, it will detrimentally change bone's natural shock absorbing capacity, which can be quantified with the BSA measurement system. In our current study, BSA outcome, ζ , was capable of discriminating between post-menopausal osteoporosis patients with and without vertebral fractures. While the fracture was limited to the spinal region, ζ was also significantly different between the groups at all anatomical measurement sites, implying that structural integrity was compromised systemically (Figures 2 and 3). Based these results, it appears that decreased ζ observed at the site of fragility fracture was also present at other load-bearing anatomical sites such as tibia and femur. However, as expected, the absolute ζ values (compared with healthy young adults [n=10], mean ζ =24.3 [SEM1.9]), due to right leg heel-strike, at the fracture sites (ζ at upper back: 1.26 and ζ at lower back: 3.15) were significantly lower than that at tibia (ζ = 5.3) and femoral (ζ 5.1) bone sites because osteoporosis will have larger detrimental impact on damping properties of the bone at the fracture site compared to non-fracture anatomical sites (Figure 2) (25;26).

Based on the ROC analysis, BSA outcomes at all anatomical sites provided much higher AUC values than that obtained for the BMD outcomes. The ranges of AUC values for the BSA outcomes for the left leg test and the right leg test were 0.72 to 0.91 and 0.7 to 0.81, respectively. On the other hand, range of AUC values for the BMD outcomes was 0.52 to 0.63. Compared

with AUC for BMD, the BSA outcomes provide better capability in discriminating patients with osteoporosis with and without fracture.

The linear discriminate analysis models for left leg and the right leg tests show that sensitive BSA variables were $\zeta_{\text{LOWER BACK}}$ and $\zeta_{\text{UPPER BACK}}$ and $\zeta_{\text{ABOVE KNEE}}$, respectively, for correctly identifying fracture category. It is not clear why two different sets of BSA variables were found to be associated with left and right leg tests as there were no experimental differences in carrying out the left/right leg testing. The mean values of damping factor, ζ for the fracture and the non fracture groups were about 78% and 42% lower, respectively, than that reported for young healthy adults and youths (25;26;37). While such a drastically lower damping value in osteoporosis compared with a normal healthy bone is not surprising, it is not clear how much normal aging affects the damping properties. Further studies are needed to address the age-associated issues of damping properties.

In the present study, calculation of ζ was based on classical structural dynamic theory, which directly relates damping of a structure to its viscous damping coefficient and inversely to the square root of its resonance frequency (34–37). Therefore, a lower value of ζ and a higher resonance frequency found in the patients with osteoporosis with and without fracture compared with healthy adults implies lower viscous damping properties of the bone among the patient groups. Such a finding is consistent with recent report of collagen loss as a contributing factor in decreased viscoelastic properties of bones and potential association with pathogenesis of osteoporosis (41;42). Previous studies with bone turnover markers have also suggested that bone matrix component type-I collagen level is a contributing factor in determining damping/viscoelastic capacity of bone (42–45). Therefore, in our study, a lower value of ζ for the fracture group implies that their bones have lower viscous damping capacity and therefore are stiffer than that for the non-fracture group.

We believe that “dynamic bone quality” property damping factor, ζ is an aggregate response of bone’s structural integrity under “realistic” in-vivo loading. The bone’s response under realistic dynamic loading provides a better picture of its structural integrity than that obtained under unloaded condition as structural failure of human bone and/or any mechanical system rarely occurs under static conditions (12;13). Recent studies indicate that static testing alone does not provide true response of the composite materials constituting the bone (13). As bone is a composite material comprised of mineral and organic materials as well as water, its viscoelastic properties describing its damping capacity can only be truly captured when the bone is exposed to realistic self-induced in-vivo loading (such as heel strike used in our study) that permits aggregate response due to interactions of some or all of these components of bone (13;46). This comparison between measures of dynamic bone quality and static bone quality can be analogous to comparing evaluating heart conditions with a treadmill based stress-induced ECG (dynamic test) with that obtained with a resting ECG (static test). It is well known that a stress-induced ECG reveals more about the heart condition than that obtained with a resting ECG.

While we measured damping capacity of bone by in-vivo mechanical stimulation associated with self induced heel strike in our study, others have estimated damping properties using externally applied acoustic energy in animal model (47;48). These animal studies have shown that measures of damping properties are early indicator of bone’s structural integrity compared with those obtained by conventional tools. Similarly, the BSA technique used in our study measured damping factor ζ , which is better at discriminating between osteoporosis patients with and without fracture than the conventional measures of BMD and static biomechanical properties (26;37). Obviously, future studies are needed to evaluate the “dynamic bone quality” measure, ζ , as a sensitive measure of bone’s structural integrity for predicting fracture and discriminating patients with varying degrees of severity of osteoporosis with and without

fracture. The results presented in our study and those in the literature suggests that precise prediction of fracture risk should combine both measures of static and dynamic mechanical properties as well as BMD (13;49).

Limitations of our study include a small sample size; therefore, findings should be interpreted with caution. Second, attachment of skin-mounted accelerometers might have introduced some relative movement between the bone and the skin, but this was minimal, as we used low-mass accelerometers with appropriate band pass filters that have been found to be effective in accurately representing bone vibration by others (30;31). Because the accelerometers were attached on the bony prominences of the whole bone, the response obtained was reflective of aggregate damping value for both trabecular and cortical bone. Biomechanical properties, calculated using bone geometry obtained from DXA (measured by Hologic only), have limitations because shapes were assumed to be symmetrical which might not be true in all directions (49). While Lunar- based DXA data could have been also used for the calculation of biomechanical properties, it assumes that both devices are calibrated identically to mineral mass which might not be necessarily true. With such assumptions in calibration it is possible that biomechanical values obtained by these formulae would be crude estimates.

Acknowledgments

The authors thank the patients and their families for their participation and cooperation. Thanks are due Cyndy Cox, Alina Spataru, Nathan Bullen, Fang Li, Balaji Sharma and Chunhui He for bone vibration data collection and analysis and Terri Schmitter and Angie Buettner for DXA measurements. Thanks are also due Shriram Venkatraman for his assistance in SPSS programming and analysis. We also thank Dr. Jose A. Riancho of Department of Internal Medicine, Hospital U.M. Valdecilla, University of Cantabria, Santander, Spain for giving us a copy of the software for the calculation of biomechanical variables using bone geometry data. This study was supported by a NIH grant 1R21 AR51702-01(High Impact-High Risk Program). Based on the findings from this study a non-provisional patent application for the BSA technology has been filed by the authors' institution (Serial No. 12/402,586).

Reference List

1. Fleisch, H. Bisphosphonates in bone disease: From the laboratory to the patient. New York: Academic Press; 2000.
2. Liu XS, Sajda P, Saha PK, Wehrli FW, Guo XE. Quantification of the roles of trabecular microarchitecture and trabecular type in determining the elastic modulus of human trabecular bone. *J Bone Miner Res* 2006;21:1608–1617. [PubMed: 16995816]
3. Turner CH. Biomechanics of bone: Determinants of skeletal fragility and bone quality. *Osteoporosis Int* 2002;13:97–104.
4. Cremers S, Garnero P. Biochemical markers of bone turnover in the clinical development of drugs for osteoporosis and metastatic bone disease: potential uses and pitfalls. *Drugs* 2006;66:2031–2058. [PubMed: 17112299]
5. Donescu OS, Battie MC, Videman T, Risteli J, Eyre D. The predictive role of bone turnover markers for BMD in middle-aged men. *Aging Male* 2006;9:97–102. [PubMed: 16916744]
6. Looker AC, Bauer DC, Chesnut CH III, Gundberg CM, Hochberg MC, Klee G, Kleerekoper M, Watts NB, Bell NH. Clinical use of biochemical markers of bone remodeling: current status and future directions. *Osteoporosis Int* 2000;11:467–480. [PubMed: 10982161]
7. Consensus Development Conference. Diagnosis, Prophylaxis, and Treatment of Osteoporosis. *Am J Med* 1993;94:646–650. [PubMed: 8506892]
8. Heaney R, Avioli L, Chestnut C, Recker R, Gallagher J. Is bone loss the cause of osteoporotic fracture or its consequence? *J Bone Miner Res* 1988;3:88.
9. Kimmel D, Recker R, Gallagher J, Vaswani A, Aloia J. A comparison of iliac bone histomorphometric data in postmenopausal osteoporotic and normal subjects. *Bone Min* 1990;11:217–235.
10. Watts NB, Geusens P, Barton IP, Felsenberg D. Relationship between changes in BMD and nonvertebral fracture incidence associated with risedronate: reduction in risk of nonvertebral fracture is not related to change in BMD. *J Bone Miner Res* 2005;20:2097–2104. [PubMed: 16294263]

11. Watts NB. Bone quality: getting closer to a definition. *J Bone Miner Res* 2002;17:1148–1150. [PubMed: 12096827]
12. McElhaney JH. Dynamic response of bone and muscle tissue. *J Appl Physiol* 1966;21:1231–1236. [PubMed: 5916656]
13. Yamashita J, Li X, Furman BR, Rawls HR, Wang X, Agrawal CM. Collagen and bone viscoelasticity: a dynamic mechanical analysis. *J Biomed Mater Res* 2002;63:31–36. [PubMed: 11787026]
14. Paul JL, Munro MB, Abernethy P. Musculoskeletal shock absorption: relative contribution of bone and soft tissues at various frequencies. *J Biomech* 1978;11:237–239. [PubMed: 711772]
15. Radin EL, Burr DB, Caterson B, Fyhrie D, Brown TD, Boyd RD. Mechanical determinants of osteoarthritis. *Sem Arthritis Rheum* 1991;21:12–21.
16. Radin EL, Paul IL. Does cartilage compliance reduce skeletal impact loads? The relative force-attenuating properties of articular cartilage, synovial fluid, periarticular soft tissues and bone. *Arthritis Rheum* 1970;13:139–144. [PubMed: 5421724]
17. Hoshino A, Wallace WA. Impact-absorbing properties of the human knee. *J Bone Joint Surg* 1987;69:807–811. [PubMed: 3597492]
18. Bhattacharya A, McCutcheon EP, Greenleaf JE, Shvartz E. Body acceleration distribution and uptake in man during running and jumping. *J Appl Physiol* 1980;49(5):881–887. [PubMed: 7429911]
19. Voloshin A, Wosk J. Impulse attenuation in the human body. *Biomed Sci Instrum* 1980;16:55–59. [PubMed: 7407306]
20. Voloshin A, Wosk J, Brull M. Force wave transmission through the human locomotor system. *J Biomech Eng* 1981;103:48–50. [PubMed: 7253613]
21. Zioupos P. Accumulation of in-vivo fatigue microdamage and its relation to biomechanical properties in ageing human cortical bone. *J Microsc* 2001;201:270–278.
22. Day JS, Van Der Linden JC, Bank RA, Ding M, Hvid I, Sumner DR, Weinans H. Adaptation of subchondral bone in osteoarthritis. *Biorheology* 2004;41:359–368. [PubMed: 15299268]
23. Wei HW, Sun SS, Jao SH, Yeh CR, Cheng CK. The influence of mechanical properties of subchondral plate, femoral head and neck on dynamic stress distribution of the articular cartilage. *Med Eng Phys* 2005;27:295–304. [PubMed: 15823470]
24. Van Audekercke R, Van Der Perre G. The effect of osteoporosis on the mechanical properties of bone structures. *Clin Rheum* 1994;13:38–44.
25. Huang S, Bhattacharya A. The effects of osteoarthritis on the biomechanical properties of the tibia. *Chinese J Med and Biol Eng* 1993;13 (3):255–264.
26. Bhattacharya, A.; Watts, NB.; Davis, K.; Kotowski, S.; Shukla, S. Dynamic bone quality – a non-invasive measure of bone's biomechanical property. *J Clin Densitom*; Presented at the 14th Annual Conference of International Society for Clinical Densitometry; San Francisco, CA. March 12–15; 2008. p. 449
27. Alexander, J.; Bhattacharya, A.; Patel, P.; Brooks, S. Biomechanical aspects of preclinical descriptors of osteoarthritis. Presented at Combined 10th Annual Conference of American Society of Biomechanics and the 4th Biannual Conference of the Canadian Society of Biomechanics; Montreal, Canada. August 25–27. 1986; 1986.
28. Genant HK, Delmas PD, Chen P, Jiang Y, Eriksen EF, Dalsky GP, Marcus R, San MJ. Severity of vertebral fracture reflects deterioration of bone microarchitecture. *Osteoporos Int* 2007;18:69–76. [PubMed: 17028792]
29. Riancho JA, Valero C, Hernandez JL, Olmos JM, Paule B, Zarrabeitia A, Gonzalez-Macias J. Biomechanical indices of the femoral neck estimated from the standard DXA output: age- and sex-related differences. *J Clin Densitom* 2007;10:39–45. [PubMed: 17289525]
30. Saha S, Lakes RS. The effect of soft tissue on wave-propagation and vibration tests for determining the in vivo properties of bone. *J Biomech* 1977;10:393–401. [PubMed: 885890]
31. Ziegert JC, Lewis JL. The effect of soft tissue on measurements of vibrational bone motion by skin-mounted accelerometers. *J Biomech Eng* 1979;101:218–220.
32. Stenstrom M, Olander B, Lehto-Axtelius D, Madsen JE, Nordsletten L, Carlsson GA. Bone mineral density and bone structure parameters as predictors of bone strength: an analysis using computerized microtomography and gastrectomy-induced osteopenia in the rat. *J Biomech* 2000;33:289–297. [PubMed: 10673112]

33. Aersospace Medical Research Lab. Symposium on biodynamic models and their applications; Ohio: Aerospace Medical Division, AMRL-TR-71-29, Wright Patterson Air Force Base; 1971. p. 1-980.
34. Bendat, JS.; Piersol, AG. Random Data Analysis and Measurement Procedures. John Wiley & Sons; NY: 1986. p. 30
35. Coleman, R. Experimental structural dynamics: An introduction to experimental methods of characterizing vibrating structures. AuthorHOUSE; Bloomington, IN: 2004. p. 140-226.
36. Meirovitch, L. Elements of vibration analysis. McGraw Hill; New York: 1975. p. 1-86.
37. Bhattacharya A, Watts N, Gordon J, Shukla R, Waters T, Bartels S, Coleman R. Bone quantity and quality of youths working in farm - a pilot study. *J Agromed Pract, Pol & Res* 2007;12:27–38.
38. Duan Y, Beck TJ, Wang XF, Seeman E. Structural and biomechanical basis of sexual dimorphism in femoral neck fragility has its origins in growth and aging. *J Bone Miner Res* 2003;18:1766–1774. [PubMed: 14584886]
39. Nguyen ND, Pongchaiyakul C, Center JR, Eisman JA, Nguyen TV. Identification of high-risk individuals for hip fracture: a 14-year prospective study. *J Bone Miner Res* 2005;20:1921–1928. [PubMed: 16234964]
40. Pongchaiyakul C, Panichkul S, Songpatanasilp T, Nguyen TV. A nomogram for predicting osteoporosis risk based on age, weight and quantitative ultrasound measurement. *Osteoporos Int* 2007;18:525–531. [PubMed: 17216132]
41. Trento LK, Pietropolli A, Ticconi C, Gravotta E, De Martino MU, Fabbri A, Piccione E. Role of type I collagen C telopeptide, bone-specific alkaline phosphatase and osteocalcin in the assessment of bone status in postmenopausal women. *J Obstet Gynaecol Res* 2009;35:152–159. [PubMed: 19215563]
42. Shuster S. Osteoporosis, a unitary hypothesis of collagen loss in skin and bone. *Med Hypotheses* 2005;65:426–432. [PubMed: 15951132]
43. Leeming DJ, Henriksen K, Byrjalsen I, Qvist P, Madsen SH, Garnero P, Karsdal MA. Is bone quality associated with collagen age? *Osteoporos Int* 2009;20(9):1461–1470. [PubMed: 19330423]
44. Trento LK, Pietropolli A, Ticconi C, Gravotta E, De Martino MU, Fabbri A, Piccione E. Role of type I collagen C telopeptide, bone-specific alkaline phosphatase and osteocalcin in the assessment of bone status in postmenopausal women. *J Obstet Gynaecol Res* 2009;35:152–159. [PubMed: 19215563]
45. Allen MR, Iwata K, Sato M, Burr DB. Raloxifene enhances vertebral mechanical properties independent of bone density. *Bone* 2006;39:1130–1135. [PubMed: 16814622]
46. Bembey AK, Oyen ML, Bushby AJ, Boyde A. Viscoelastic properties of bone as a function of hydration state determined by nanoindentation. *Philosophical Magazine* 2006;86:5691–5703.
47. Christopoulou GE, Stavropoulou A, Anastassopoulos G, Panteliou SD, Papadaki E, Karamanos NK, Panagiotopoulos E. Evaluation of modal damping factor as a diagnostic tool for osteoporosis and its relation with serum osteocalcin and collagen I N-telopeptide for monitoring the efficacy of alendronate in ovariectomized rats. *J Pharm Biomed Anal* 2006;41:891–897. [PubMed: 16488571]
48. Panteliou SD, Xirafaki AL, Panagiotopoulos E, Varakis JN, Vagenas NV, Kontoyannis CG. Modal damping for monitoring bone integrity and osteoporosis. *J Biomech Eng* 2004;126:1–5. [PubMed: 15171123]
49. Beck TJ. Measuring the structural strength of bones with dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry: principles, technical limitations, and future possibilities. *Osteoporos Int* 2003;14:S81–S88. [PubMed: 14504711]

Figure 1.
Schematic of accelerometer placement sites.

Figure 2. Mean $\pm$ SEM. Damping values at various anatomical sites for patients with osteoporosis (ankle, below-knee and above-knee are for right leg).

Figure 3. Mean $\pm$ SEM damping values at various anatomical sites for patients with osteoporosis (ankle, below-knee and above-knee shown for left leg).

Figure 4.

Receiver operating curves for damping (ζ) at three anatomical sites showing the top two and the lowest values of area under the curve (AUC) for right leg testing. The remaining anatomical sites at head, lower back and below knee reported AUC values of 0.75, 0.76 and 0.74, respectively.

Figure 5.

Receiver operating curves for damping (ζ) at three anatomical sites showing the top two and the lowest values of area under the curve (AUC) for left leg testing. The remaining anatomical sites at head, ankle, and below knee reported AUC values of 0.82, 0.75 and 0.82, respectively.

Table 1

Demographics and dietary calcium intake. Results are given as mean $\pm$ SEM.

	Fracture	Non-fracture
Body Weight (Kg)	59.4 $\pm$ 1.6	59.6 $\pm$ 1.5
BMI (Kg/m ²)	23.3 $\pm$ 0.6	23.3 $\pm$ 0.6
Age (years)	75.8 $\pm$ 1.0*	72.2 $\pm$ 0.9
Height (cm)	159.7 $\pm$ 1.3	158.9 $\pm$ 1.1
Calcium Intake (mg/day)	1880 $\pm$ 127	1690 $\pm$ 101

*
p=0.013

Table 2

Bone mineral density (BMD) and T-scores. GE-Lunar results were converted to Hologic units and T-scores for GE-Lunar hip sites were calculated from the converted units. There was no statistically significant difference between groups.

	Fracture	Non-fracture
Femoral neck BMD (g/cm ²)	0.570 ± 0.018	0.590 ± 0.012
T-score	-2.6 ± 0.17	-2.4 ± 0.11
Trochanter BMD (g/cm ²)	0.469 ± 0.018	0.495 ± 0.013
T-score	-2.6 ± 0.20	-2.3 ± 0.14
Total hip BMD (g/cm ²)	0.623 ± 0.014	0.646 ± 0.014
T-score	-2.8 ± 0.18	-2.7 ± 0.13
Lumbar spine BMD (g/cm ²)	0.678 ± 0.023	0.726 ± 0.016
T-score	-3.3 ± 0.21	-2.9 ± 0.14

Table 3

Biomechanical variables from femoral neck geometry (Hologic only; Fracture=16; Non-fracture=18). There was no statistically significant difference between groups.

	Fracture	Non-fracture
Compressive Strength (gm/cm)	1.96 ± 0.10	1.98 ± 0.07
Buckling Ratio (unitless)	17.6 ± 1.2	16.2 ± 0.4
Section Modulus (cm ³)	0.99 ± 0.06	0.98 ± 0.04
Cortical Thickness (cm)	0.105 ± 0.003	0.108 ± 0.003