Quasi-static and dynamic properties of the intervertebral disc: experimental study and model parameter determination for the porcine lumbar motion segment
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Purpose: The study of axial loading is essential to determine the properties of intervertebral disc. The objectives of this work are (1) to quantify the mechanical properties of porcine lumbar intervertebral discs under static and cyclic compressive loading, and (2) to determine the parameters of a five-parameter rheological model for porcine and compare them with those obtained for human lumbar intervertebral discs. Methods: Thus, the porcine lumbar motion segments were subjected to quasi-static and dynamic compression tests. The quasi-static tests were used to obtain the static stiffness coefficient at different strain rates, while the data from the cyclic compressive tests were used to both determine the dynamic stiffness coefficient and to be fitted in a 5-parameter model, in order to simulate the creep response of the porcine intervertebral discs. Results: The results demonstrated that dynamic stiffness coefficient of porcine discs is between four and ten times higher than the static stiffness coefficient, depending on load applied. The parameters of the rheological model suggested a low permeability of nucleus and endplate during the fast response of porcine discs. In addition, the fast response in terms of displacement is four times higher than those documented for human discs. Conclusions: This study revealed that care must be taken on the comparison between porcine and human discs, since they present different behaviour under quasi-static and dynamic compressive loading.
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1. Introduction

The IVD is comprised by a peripheral angle-ply laminated ring, the annulus fibrosus – AF, with the gelatinous nucleus pulposus (NP) in its center, bounded by the cartilaginous endplate (CEP). This intricate and inhomogeneous IVD structure allows six degrees of freedom load-bearing movement, load transfer and energy dissipation to the spine [25].

The mechanical response of the disc to loading is time-dependent, presenting a complex behavior: while the short time response is governed by viscoelastic phenomena [9], the long term response is guided by osmotic events – the fluid flows through NP, AF and endplate, ruled by fixed proteoglycans charges [31].

During daily routine events, this structure is subjected to several ranges of loads, where the quasi-static and cyclic axial compressions are the predominant ones. Several studies showed that compressive loads are responsible for great oscillations on intradiscal pressure [31], disc height [18] and disc volume [24]. In terms of intradiscal pressure, an increase on the compressive load applied to healthy discs promotes an upturn on NP pressure [31]. Since the NP can be considered as incompressible, the AF bulges outward [33], which, together with osmotic phenomenon, lead to a loss on both disc height and volume. Thus, the disc hydration influences the disc mechanics, namely the stiffness and creep properties during axial loading [14, 25].

To assess the mechanical properties of the IVD, several samples of animal spines are widely used, namely the smallest functional unit of the spine, the motion segment – MS [19], [21], [25], [33] (Fig. 1). The animal disc samples are commonly used since...
they present higher availability and lower cost when compared with human tissues. Among disc animal models, rat [21], goat [35], bovine [27] and porcine [29], [33] are widely used in both in vivo and in vitro studies. They can be prepared directly and gripped to perform MS studies and surgical techniques.

Although the common use of these animal models, data extrapolation from different animal tests to human IVD properties should be carefully done, since benchmark values are normally not significant due to interspecies variability. Among the animal models, porcine lumbar intervertebral discs (PLIVD) are considered as an accepted model for mechanical testing of the spine, as they present both functional and anatomical similarities with human ones [29], [33]. However, there is a lack of information about the differences between the mechanical properties of PLIVD and human lumbar intervertebral discs (HLIVDs) [29].

Thus, the first aim of this work is to quantify the mechanical properties of PLIVD under quasi-static and cyclic axial compressive loading. Consequently the $K_s$ and $K_d$ of PLIVDs will be experimentally determined and compared. The acquired values will be also correlated with those reported on literature for HLIVDs, to check if PLIVDs are a good model to study the mechanical properties of human samples under compression.

In addition, to numerically describe the viscoelastic behavior of IVDs, several rheological mathematical models were used [14], [16], [19], [25], [28]. The formulation adopted to model the creep behavior of the disc results from the combination of parallel springs and dashpots sets (viscoelastic solid Voigt model) with a spring in serial, representing the initial elastic behavior [14], [16], [19], [25], [28]. These mathematical models are very useful since they allow the state prediction of the IVD after a certain time [25], being also used to test differences between study groups, such as comparing the behavior of human and animal samples.

As second goal, this work proposes to compare the model parameters obtained for the PLIVD with the values reported on literature for the HLIVD. To achieve it, a phenomenological model [25] was used to fit on experimental creep data for PLIVDs. This study considered that the adjacent vertebral bodies are uncompressible, for the range of loads applied. Consequently, the IVD is the only structure subjected to deformation on the MS.

In this study, the optimized set of model parameters was determined and compared with those found in literature, for HLIVDs. The premise is that the parameters values may help understanding the differences between the HLIVDs and PLIVD behavior.

2. Materials and methods

2.1. MS collection and preparation

Two porcine lumbar spines, from young cadavers (with approximately eighteen months), were collected from an abattoir. Motion segments (IVD and half of both the adjacent vertebral bodies, without posterior elements) were cut from the spines, parallel to the mid-transverse plane of the disc. In addition, all specimens were visually inspected before and immediately after the mechanical test. Care was taken to remove the surrounded tissues during dissection. The segments were stored at 4°C before testing, which were performed within 24 h after dissection, in accordance with a protocol approved by the Institutional Human Tissue Committee [5].

The specimens were immersed in a phosphate saline solution (PBS 1X) before, during and after the mechanical test, to prevent the dehydration. The degeneration grade was assessed by Thompson five-category grading scheme [32], after testing. All discs presented a level I on Thompson degeneration scale.

2.2. Testing equipment and MS positioning

The testing equipment consists of a servo hydraulic testing system, Instron 8874, with both quasi-static
and dynamic loading modes, equipped with a 2500 kN load cell. The samples were placed on compression grips and aligned to minimize the effects of bending/extension that could occur on a compression test with a misaligned sample. Thus, the samples were positioned in a center of a cast aluminum pot, parallel to the base. This pot was filled with PBS (1X), to keep the samples entirely submerged. All tests were carried out at room temperature.

2.3. Quasi-static axial compressive test

During quasi-static axial compressive tests, the samples \((n = 7)\) were first submitted to a pre-load of 30 N, during 10 minutes, to ensure the contact with loading platen, helping to minimize errors due to post-mortem effects, such as the super hydration [5]. Then, load and displacement was set to zero and each sample was submitted to 50 N load (Phase 1). Then, the displacement reached for 50 N load was maintained during 7.5 min and, subsequently, the samples were loaded until reach 500 N (Phase 2). This kind of loading was applied in order to understand the effect of loading magnitudes on the \(K_s\) of lumbar porcine IVDs. In this work, we adopted a range of loading considered as an appropriate estimation for the PLIVDs axial loading experienced in daily life [29]. A generic example of the quasi-static axial compressive test input is shown in Fig. 2.

![Fig. 2. A generic example of the quasi-static axial compressive test input, used for the disc 1. After pre-load application, load and deformation were set to zero and each sample was submitted to 50 N load. The displacement reached at 50 N is kept during 7.5 min. Consequently, the samples were loaded with 500 N (\(n = 7\)), at different strain rates (4 and 16 mm/min). Finally, the displacement, reached at 500 N, is kept during 12 minutes](image)

In addition, the displacement rates were set to 4 mm/min and 16 mm/min, which correspond to the physiological load rates, experimented by a human when submitted to an inclination of 30 degrees and when a human is getting up, respectively. The displacement rates were determined from the curves presented on the database OrthoLoad [2], from which the slope of the curves force as function of time, for these movements, was converted into displacement rates.

The displacement rates used on this work are considered as quasi-static. Thus, the static stiffness coefficient, \(K_s\), was defined as the slope of each loading increment (from both 0–50 N and 50-500 N increments), being determined using a linear trend on the load-displacement curve.

In terms of statistical analysis, the four groups of \(K_s\) values (phase 1 at 4 mm/min; phase 1 at 16 mm/min; phase 2 at 4 mm/min and phase 2 at 16 mm/min) were compared by a 2-factor ANOVA. According to this analysis, a \(t\)-test with two-sample was used to characterize the significant differences between each phase and displacement rate. All statistical analyses were performed with Microsoft Excel® and significance level \(p < 0.05\).

2.4. Cyclic compressive tests

An initial 30 N compressive load was applied, in order to ensure the contact loading platen. Each MS \((n = 5)\) was subjected to 1200 cycles of axial compressive loading, at a frequency of 1 Hz. The mean load was 500 N, with amplitude of 125 N.

The data from cyclic load phase was used to determine the dynamic stiffness coefficient \(K_d\), which was calculated dividing the peak-to-peak load applied by the peak-to-peak displacement, for each loading cycle [19]. The final \(K_d\) value in this study was determined by the arithmetic mean of dynamic stiffness coefficient, obtained for each cycle.

2.5. Five-parameter rheological model for creep response analysis

To compare the creep behaviour of LPIVD with HPIVD, the experimental data were fitted into a phenomenological model, using equation (1), developed by O’Connell [25]. This model allows the prediction of the displacement that occurs on human IVDs, as a function of time. It consists on a five-parameter rheological model, composed by two Voigt solids and a spring in series and it is used to determine the displacement \((d, \text{ in millimetres})\), as a function of time \((t, \text{ in seconds})\) and applied load \((L, \text{ in newtons})\). The model is mathematically described as
where $S_1$ and $\tau_1$ are related to the fast response, $S_2$ and $\tau_2$ to the slow response, and $S_E$ the elastic response. In addition, $i$ and $i+1$ represent the start and the end time for the creep test.

The experimental data were filtered and the displacement-time curve was traced considering the average displacement for each compression cycle. The objective was to minimize the noise resulting from a cyclic curve. A mean force of 500 N was adopted as the $L$ value. The minimization of the sum of the squared error between the predicted and the experimental displacement during creep test allows the determination of the constants of the 5-parameter model for the IVDs. The parameters acquired experimentally were compared directly with reported literature for human samples.

3. Results

Previous studies showed that IVDs from the lumbar zone present a non-linear load-deflection curve in quasi-static conditions [11]. However, in this study the $K_s$ values were obtained from a linear regression with $R^2 > 0.92$ (Fig. 3), indicating this approach presents a good fit for the experimental data.

In this study, for the first slope (0 until 50 N), the values of stiffness coefficient were lower 0.485 ± 0.127 MN/m (mean ± SD) than those found on load slope (until 500 N), where the $K_s$ is 1.215 ± 0.248 MN/m (Fig. 4). The ANOVA test showed that there are significant differences between the mean values of the data groups analysed. Then, the $t$-test revealed that there are significant differences on $K_s$ according to the magnitude of the load applied (between phase 1 at 4 mm/min and phase 2 at 4 mm/min; between phase 1 at 16 mm/min and phase 2 at 16 mm/min; $p < 0.05$), while non-significant differences were found when different displacement rates were applied (between phase 1 at 4 mm/min and phase 1 at 16 mm/min; between phase 2 at 4 mm/min and phase 2 at 16 mm/min; $p < 0.05$).

In terms of $K_d$, the results (Table 1) indicated an oscillation of the $K_d$ between specimens, for five IVDs. The comparison of the $K_d$ results with those obtained in a previous study for human IVDs [19] (Table 1), revealed that $K_d$ is, at least, two times higher than the values presented for human samples. In addition, the magnitude of $K_d$ values is between four and ten times higher than those obtained for $K_s$, depending on load applied.

### Table 1. Experimental dynamic stiffness coefficient ($K_d$), obtained in this study PLIVDs ($n = 5$; mean and standard deviation), and HLIVDs $K_d$ (mean) found in a previous study performed by Li et al. [19], at 1 Hz

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Li et al. [19]</th>
<th>This study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$K_d$ (MN/m)</td>
<td>2.42 ± 0.51</td>
<td>5.41 ± 0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The five-parameter model presented an average relative error of 0.2% for the fitting to the experimental data (Fig. 5). Thus, the rheological model presented a good fit for the set of parameters found during this study (Table 2).

**Fig. 5.** A comparison between the creep responses of the experimental obtained with PLIVD and the five parameter rheological model. The values were fit by the inferior and superior limits, with a confidence interval of 95%

| Table 2. Comparison between model parameters obtained with the best fit to the experimental results with PLIVDs (mean, inferior and superior limit with a confidence interval of 95%) and the values obtained by O’Connell et al. [25] for HLIVDs (mean and interquartile range). |
|---|---|---|
| Authors | $K_s$ (MN/m) | Maximum load (N) |
| Virgin [34] | 2.5 | 4500 |
| Hirsch and Nachemson [10] | 0.7 | 1000 |
| Brown et al. [3] | 0.1–1.5 (initial slope) 2.1–3.6 (major slope) | 450–900 |
| Markolf and Morris [23] | 1.23–3.32 (tangent at max. load) | 220–670 |
| Asano et al. [1] | 0.49 (0.04) (0–0.5 mm) 0.73 (0.06) (0.5–1 mm) 1.18 (0.09) (1–1.5 mm) | 1500 |
| Izambert et al. [11] | 0.05 (0.02) (until 0.5 mm) 0.64 (0.1) (until 1.5 mm) 0.60–0.94 (tangent at max. load) | 400 |
| Present study | 0.49 (0.13) (until 0.5 mm – 50 N) 1.215 (0.248) (from 0.5 mm – 50 N – until 1.5 mm – 500 N) | 500 |

These data are confirmed by earlier studies (Table 3), where it is reported that $K_s$ presents a high dependence on load or displacement imposed on the specimen. This phenomena is even more evident by the highest value for $K_s$ documented for human IVDs [34], which is not mechanically representative, since 4.5 kN is above the maximum physiological values (forces that did not induce irreversible deformation on discs) for humans [6]. For the first slope (until 0.5 mm of displacement and 50 N of load), the values present the

**4. Discussion**

In this study, the mechanical properties of PLIVD were evaluated under quasi-static and dynamic conditions and the obtained data were compared with published values for HLIVD. Moreover, the experimental data were fitted into a phenomenological model (equation (1)), developed by O’Connell et al. [25]. The results documented in this paper lead to important considerations, in both quasi-static and dynamic conditions.

A linear regression was used to calculate the $K_s$ with a minimum $R^2$ of 0.92, indicating a good fit to experimental data. However, the values of $K_s$ are lower for PLIVDs than for human samples (Table 3), which can be explained by the fact of PLIVDs in this study derived from young animal specimens and so, it is expected that they behave more elastically and less stiffly than the human samples used in the previous studies. Since the load was applied on fresh thawed lumbar spines, the $K_s$ magnitude should be significantly lower for smaller loads. Thus, a lower value of $K_s$ for Phase 1 (0–50 N load) is an expectable value. In addition, a higher value of $K_s$ was obtained on this PLIVD during the application of the second loading phase (from 50 N to 500N), since this is stiffer than the first loading phase (from 0 to 50 N).
same magnitude of those found by Asano et al. [1];
the results for phase 2 (slope until reaching 500 N) are
also close to those found in literature, namely for
those obtained for Markolf and Morris [23] and Asano
et al. [1]. These data indicate that the magnitude of
load applied and the method of stiffness calculation
[11] are likely the causes for the divergence found
between human data in Table 3.

No difference was detected in the magnitude of $K_s$
found in human and porcine samples, for both load-
displacement slopes, indicating that PLIVD can be
useful for the determination of quasi-static behaviour
of HLIVD. Moreover, the values of $K_s$ of the IVDs
did not reveal significant differences for different
physiological displacement rates, meaning that
changes in displacement rate, during the daily routine
movements, do not have an important effect on the $K_s$
of PLIVDs.

It is important to note that several options could be
considered for the calculation of the elastic stiffness
response of the IVD, since it presents an elastoplastic
behavior, i.e., some of the mechanical work (or energy)
is irreversibly dissipated into heat, in a way that it can
never be recovered as such again [20]. However, in this
study, the $K_s$ was calculated using a simplified ap-
proach referenced in literature [25]: the slope of the
linear-region of the force-displacement curve.

The comparison of the $K_d$ results with those ob-
tained in previous study for HLIVDs [19] showed that
porcine $K_d$ is two times higher than the human one.
Furthermore, the $K_d$ is between four and ten times
higher than $K_s$, which is in opposition to what is re-
ferred to in literature, where $K_d$ and $K_s$ appear to
present the same range of values, for low frequencies [11].
The differences between these literature and the litera-
ture could be justified by the choice of the viscoelastic
model (which affects the mode of $K_d$ calculation [11])
and the different experimental setups adopted [15].
Here, the $K_d$ calculation came directly from experi-
mental data, without any model manipulation. In ad-
dition, this work revealed a short variation (SD) when
compared to the data exposed by Li et al. [19]. Since
the samples were originating from different porcine
lumbar motion segments of the same specimen, this
could indicate that there is a minimal $K_d$ difference for
different intra-specimen PLIVDs samples.

Concerning the IVD fluid flow and transport, it
represents a complex three-dimensional problem,
evolving several questions such as the strain-dependent
permeability, anisotropy and inhomogeneity [6]. Thus,
although the use of sophisticated models to under-
stand the mechanisms of IVD flow and transport un-
der load [7], [22], this process remains still unclear.
Consequently, the development of optimized consti-
tutive models and experiments is essential in order to
better understand the process of fluid flow.

However, the viscoelastic models can be used as
simplified tool to understand the mechanics of fluid
flow on the IVD [14], [25], [28]. These models provide
parameters that can be useful to describe the time-
dependent mechanics and the viscoelasticity of IVD, as
well as to identify the fluid flow differences between
animal and human IVDs [14], [16], [19], [28].

For the parameters of the viscoelastic model
adopted in this study (Table 2), the authors associated
the differences in time constants $\tau_1$ and $\tau_2$ to the
changes in the fluid flow pathway, while the dis-
placement amplitude constants ($L/S_1$, $L/S_2$ and $L/S_3$) were related to the quantity of fluid exchange in that
pathway [25]. The difference between human and
porcine time constants are likely linked to the influ-
ence of fluid flow pathway and strain-dependent per-
meability [13], [33]. Previous studies proposed that
parameters of fast response ($\tau_1$ and $L/S_1$) are more
connected to the fluid flow through NP or endplate,
and the slow response, $\tau_2$ and $L/S_2$, is more related to
AF fluid flow [13], [25].

Earlier studies also showed that $\tau_1$ increases with
nucleotomy, in a compressive cyclic loading [13],
resulting in both a lower NP and endplate perme-
bility. However, it is also known that NP presents
an increased permeability with severe degeneration,
resulting in an easier and faster flow [12]. Therefore,
the higher porcine $\tau_1$ is presumably caused by a
lower NP and endplate permeability, which could
be explained by the age and condition of PLIVDs
used in this study: they were taken from young ani-
mals and were not frozen, allowing keeping a good
physiological condition of IVD, in a non-degenerated
state. In addition, while test executed by O’Connell
et al. [25] was performed during 5 hours, the present
experiment took around half hour. Thus, the poro-
elastic response, which is normally a slow response
event, was minimized [6]. Consequently, the pa-
rameters of slow response reported in this work are
not relevant, since their effect is only visible in the
magnitude of hours.

The displacement parameters $L/S_2$ and $L/S_3$, which
correspond to slow displacement and elastic dis-
placement, respectively, indicate that the volume and
distance of fluid flowing on the pathway is likely
higher during the fast response and lower for slow
response. This is expectable, since this study is fo-
cused on the fast response due to the short time of test
applied on IVD, being predictable that the fluid flow
occurs predominantly during the fast response.
Although during the fast response the NP and endplate present low permeability, the major displacement due to fluid flow occurs during this phase. This suggests that after the load application, even though the AF fluid outflow normally occurs during slow response, in the case of PLIVDs it may also occur during fast response, overwhelming the low permeability of NP and endplate. This is supported by Ellingson and Nuckley [9], who noticed that AF has a significant role in the IVD’s fast response, whereas the NP may have a minor intervention during this phase.

Even though the load has been normalized by the viscoelastic model, these assumptions can be influenced by the magnitude of the load applied. Previous studies had reported that 1000 N load on human IVD samples (used by O’Connell et al. [25]) correspond to a load limit of the IVD [6], which is a force magnitude that could lead to a dramatic change in the osmotic pressure of IVD, promoting a quick expel of the fluid out of the system [31]. In this study, 500 N of creep load was applied, which corresponds, even in PLIVDs, to a loading range (0–800 N) considered as an appropriate estimation for the axial loading experienced in daily life [29].

There are obviously many aspects to consider when an animal model is chosen, and these differences must be considered in both experimental design and data interpretation [8]. However, the existence of striking similarities between the spines of human and quadrupeds is unarguable: the quadruped spine is essentially loaded in the same way as that of a human [30]; in addition, the curvature of the spine does not influence the way a motion segment or an intervertebral disc is loaded [26]. In the particular case of the lumbar porcine models, they are readily available and not subject to stringent regulations. Moreover, the morphometric data for both porcine vertebrae and disc are described in detail, helping the researchers to choose the most appropriate experimental procedure [4], [28]. All of these facts help to justify the use of these animals as model for the study of human spine behavior.

Moreover, the viscoelastic model applied can be considered as simplification of a complex mechanical and physiological process, bringing important parameters to better understand the fluid flowing in IVD. This model presents an excellent agreement between experimental and predicted displacements, showing that it is well suited to analyze the creep of an entire motion segment. However, it presented some limitations, including the fact that the parameters of the simple viscoelastic model did not represent invariant material properties since they could vary with testing conditions [28]. Still, this model showed that care must be taken in the direct mechanical behaviour comparison between PLIVDs and HLIVD: they present different anatomical and physiological properties [29], as well as relevant differences in terms of quasi-static and dynamic response.

Concluding, although the complex poroelastic flow under load is not totally understood, this model confirmed that several phenomena govern the fluid flow in the IVD. Thus, the present model could act as an important tool to understand the differences between PLIVD and HLIVD behaviour.

Future works should be focused on the long term effect of the IVD hydration and the influence of the ligaments on the response of motion segment to quasi-static and dynamic load. In addition, techniques as ultrasonic tests [17] or quasi-static unloading experiments [20] had revealed to be promising and must be considered in capturing the “truly” elastic behavior of IVD.
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