Characterisation and Comparison of **Centre for Doctoral** Training in Medical Human and Ovine Spinal Ligaments

Ayesha Bint-E-Siddiq¹, V. N. Wijayathunga¹, M. Mengoni¹, A. C. Jones¹, R. K. Wilcox¹ ¹Institute of Medical and Biological Engineering, University of Leeds, Leeds, LS2 9JT

Introduction

Study Aims

and Biological

Engineering

- Develop a methodology to test and compare the stiffness of ovine and human spinal ligaments.
- Devise a methodology for specimen-specific modelling of ligaments.
- Combine experimental & computational approach to mechanically characterise ALL & PLL spinal structures.

Example of a disc repla cement

flexion respectively¹.

Spinal ligaments provide passive stability to the

(ALL) and posterior longitudinal ligament (PLL)

play a major mechanical role in extension and

The literature on the physical and mechanical

spine particularly the anterior longitudinal ligament

Ovine spine models are commonly employed in preclinical research studies as a precursor to clinical trials for the evaluation of interventions and devices. However, limited studies have been conducted to characterise the mechanical properties of ovine spinal ligaments to justify the use of ovine spine as an alternative model for the human spine.

Significance

- Demonstrates the mechanical differences between human and ovine spinal ligaments.
- Marks a step change from the current state-of-art where ligament properties and geometry are derived from widely varying data in literature.
- Enables the mechanical contribution of the ligaments to be more realistically represented in future FE models

1.5



- Sharma et al., Spine (Phila Pa 1976), 1995. 20(8):p.887-900.
- Tsuang et al., Med Eng Phys, 2009. 31:p.565-570
- Bellini et al., J Spinal Disord Tech, 2007. 20(6):p.423-429. 3
- Grev H. Anatomy of the Human Body. 20th ed. Lea and Febiger 1918. [online]. Accessed 03 Mar 2017]. Available from World Wide Web:
- <https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File%3AGray301.png> Herbert et al., JBiomech, 2016. 49(9):p.1607-1612.

Engineering and Physical Sciences European Research Council

Displacement (mm) Example of m stiffn significant difference (p<0.05) between the human and

Force (N) 25



Comparison of Mean Bilinear Stiffness for ALL and PLL Poor agreement between the material parameters derived from FE models and values derived assuming uniaxial

benaviour.							
	Assuming constant CSA and L				Derived from FE model		
Specimen	µ/GPa	α	D/GPa ⁻¹	% diff.	µ/GPa	α	D/GPa ⁻¹
1: T2-3	3.9E-04	6.3	2339	56.8	7.9E-04	9.4	1170
1: T4-5	7.4E-04	5.6	1244	35.4	9.9E-04	7.9	933
2: T2-3	1.4E-03	3.0	682	36.8	1.9E-03	3.8	477
2: T4-5	1.6E-03	5.1	559	56.5	3.0E-03	7.4	308
2: T8-9	1.5E-03	6.6	602	15.5	1.5E-03	9.2	602
3: T4-5	1.5E-03	4.9	596	73.1	4.4E-03	8.3	209
3: T6-7	1.8E-03	6.2	522	97.9	3.9E-03	8.9	235
Material model constants for the human ALL							

Conclusion

The differences in the material properties between human and ovine ligaments should be borne in mind when making a transition from the ovine model to the human spine.

A specimen-specific image-based approach needs to be applied to derive the elastic properties of the ligaments due to its non-uniform shape and cross-sectional area.





Lateral view of a functional spinal unit with ligaments⁴

properties of spinal ligaments span a large range and these values have been used extensively in finite element models of the spine, assuming uniaxial behaviour i.e. using mean values for cross sectional area (CSA) and length (L)^{2,3}.

