

A STUDY ON THE BIOMECHANICS
OF AXONAL INJURY

dedicated to Ingrid and Benjamin

A study on the biomechanics of axonal injury

Robert W. G. Anderson

Road Accident Research Unit
and the
Department of Mechanical Engineering
The University of Adelaide
South Australia 5005

© Robert Anderson & the University of Adelaide 2000

Abstract

The current focus of research efforts in the area of the biomechanics of traumatic brain injury is the development of numerical (finite element) models of the human head. A validated numerical model of the human head may lead to better head injury criteria than those used currently in crashworthiness studies. A critical step in constructing a validated finite element model of the head is determining the mechanical threshold, should it exist, for various types of injury to brain tissue.

This thesis describes a biomechanical study of axonal injury in the anaesthetised sheep. The study used the measurements of the mechanics of an impact to the living sheep, and a finite element model of the sheep skull and brain, to investigate the mechanics of the resulting axonal injury. Sheep were subjected to an impact to the left lateral region of the skull and were allowed to survive for four hours after the impact. The experiments were designed specifically with the numerical model in mind; sufficient data were collected to allow the mechanics of the impact to be faithfully reproduced in the numerical model. The axonal injury was identified using immunohistological methods and the injury was mapped and quantified. Axonal injury was produced consistently in all animals. Commonly injured regions included the sub-cortical and deep white matter, the hippocampi and the margins of the lateral ventricles. The degree of injury was closely related to the peak impact force and to kinematic measurements, particularly the peak change in linear and angular velocity. There was significantly more injury in animals receiving fractures.

A three-dimensional finite element model of the sheep skull and brain was constructed to simulate the dynamics of the brain during the impact. The model was used to investigate different regimes of material properties and boundary conditions, in an effort to produce

a realistic model of the skull and brain. Model validation was attempted by comparing pressure measurements in the experiment with those calculated by the model. The distribution of axonal injury was then compared with the output of the finite element model. The finite element model was able to account for approximately thirty per cent of the variation in the distribution and extent of axonal injury, using von Mises stress as the predictive variable. Logistic regression techniques were used to construct sets of curves which related the extent of injury, to the predictions of the finite element model, on a regional basis.

The amount of observable axonal injury in the brains of the sheep was clearly related to the severity of the impact, and was related to the predictions of a finite element model of the impact. Future improvements to the fidelity of the finite element model may improve the degree to which the model can explain the variation in injury throughout the brain of the animal and variations between animals.

This thesis presents results, and a methodological framework, that may be used to further our understanding of the limits of human endurance, in the tolerance of the brain to head impact.

All experiments reported herein conformed with the Australian Code of Practice for the Care and Use of Animals for Scientific Purposes.

Foreword

To the best of my knowledge and belief, all the material presented in this thesis, except where otherwise acknowledged, is my own original work and has not been published previously for the award of any other degree or diploma in any university. If accepted for the award of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, I consent that this thesis be made available for loan and photocopying.

ROBERT ANDERSON

Contents

	PAGE
Abstract	vii
Foreword	ix
Contents	xi
List of tables	xv
List of illustrations	xvii
Acknowledgments	xxi
1 Introduction	1
The tolerance of the brain to an impact to the head	2
Axonal injury and its study in biomechanics	4
The use of animals as models of human AI, for the study of the biomechanics of AI	6
Aims of the study	6
Methodology	7
<i>The sheep as a model of AI in the human • Neuropathology • Head dynamics • Finite element model • Axonal injury prediction • Ethics</i>	
2 Review of the literature	13
Axonal anatomy, physiology and the pathology of axonal injury	13
Biomechanics of axonal injury	16
<i>Contact effects • Physiological considerations • Summary</i>	
3 Methods used in the laboratory	35
Introduction	35
Sheep anatomy and physiology	36
<i>The sheep SKull • The sheep brain</i>	
Animal preparation, monitoring and termination	37
<i>Anaesthetic induction • Maintenance anaesthetic and physiological monitoring • Animal monitoring • Termination and Fixation</i>	

	Neuropathological investigation	43
	<i>Initial preparation of histology slides • Antigen retrieval for immunohistochemistry • Application of antibodies and stain</i>	
	Biomechanical equipment and measurements	46
	<i>Data acquisition and signal processing • Captive bolt stunner • Dynamic intracranial pressure changes</i>	
	Accelerometer array design	56
	<i>Background • Accelerometer array Mark 1 • Accelerometer array Mark II</i>	
	Array performance	64
	<i>Accelerometer misalignment • Effects of transverse sensitivity and redundancy • Quality of attachment and other considerations • Validation of acceleration measurements using a reference accelerometer • The reference coefficient • Performance of the reference accelerometer • Discussion</i>	
	Transformation of measured accelerations to an anatomical coordinate system	85
	<i>The definition of coordinate systems • Dual-plane X-ray technique • Determining the location of an object using dual plane X-ray images • Determining the locations of the X-ray sources • Technique using direct coordinate measurement • Coordinate transformation between vector bases</i>	
4	Results of the sheep experiments	97
	Introduction	97
	<i>Protocol changes</i>	
	Biomechanical characterisation	100
	<i>Impact dynamics • Reference acceleration measurements • Impact pressure dynamics</i>	
	Baseline physiology and changes after impact	111
	Macroscopic injury description	114
	Axonal injury scores	116
	<i>Observation • Injury distribution • Quantification of injury • Control animals</i>	
	The relationship between injury and raised intracranial pressure	124
	The relationship between injury and loading parameters	125
	<i>Impact force and injury • Skull kinematics and brain injury</i>	

	Discussion	129
5	Application of the finite element method	133
	Introduction	133
	Mesh generation	134
	<i>Geometrical data collection • Surface extraction for the finite element model • Definition of the tentorium • Meshing the brain • Meshing the skull</i>	
	Inertial properties of CT data	142
	<i>Inertial properties of the finite element model</i>	
	Application of impact loads	148
	Numerical aspects	150
	<i>Hourglass control • Damping</i>	
	Pressure estimates	152
	Material properties and interface definitions	153
	<i>Material properties of the brain • Properties used in this study • Model A • Model B</i>	
	Comparison between model results and histology data	166
	<i>Definition of results planes • Correlation between model results and injury • Correlation analysis using all simulation data</i>	
	Discussion	174
	A logistical regression model for injury prediction	175
	<i>SAIS probability in non-fracture experiments • SAIS probability in all experiments</i>	
6	Discussion, conclusions and recommendations	183
	Discussion	183
	<i>Kinematic measurements • The relationship between the mechanics of the impact and the resulting axonal injury. • The relationship between the SAIS and the estimates of tissue loading as estimated by the finite element model</i>	
	Conclusions	189
	Recommendations for future work	191
7	References	193
	Appendix A Detailed results by experiment	A1
	Appendix B Publications arising from this thesis	A87

List of tables

TABLE 3.1	Target values for baseline physiology	42
TABLE 4.1.	Experimental protocols	99
TABLE 4.2.	Summary of rigid body dynamic results	101
TABLE 4.3.	Gauge pressure measurements in the experiments	107
TABLE 4.4.	Baseline physiology	113
TABLE 4.5.	Blood gas physiology during the survival period	113
TABLE 4.6.	Macroscopic injury descriptions	116
TABLE 4.7.	Grading system for mapping axonal injury	118
TABLE 4.8.	BAIS and SAIS for the experiments	123
TABLE 4.9.	BAIS by fracture severity	126
TABLE 5.1	Inertial properties of the CT data	146
TABLE 5.2	Element numbers for the mesh of the sheep skull and brain	151
TABLE 5.3	Published hyperelastic material properties of brain tissue	156
TABLE 5.4	Published viscoelastic material properties of brain tissue	156
TABLE 5.5	Material properties used to characterise brain tissue in published finite element models	157
TABLE 5.6	The characteristics of variants of the finite element model	159
TABLE 5.7	Material properties assigned to the finite element model	160
TABLE 5.8	Material properties used in Model B	163
TABLE 5.9	Parameters for the ordinal logistical model of the regressions of injury on von Mises stress and on principal logarithmic strain	177
TABLE 5.10	Parameters for the ordinal logistical model of the regressions of SAIS categories of all experimental results on von Mises stress and on principal logarithmic strain	180

List of illustrations

FIGURE 1.1.	Model for the threshold of axonal injury	7
FIGURE 2.1.	Structure of a neuron	14
FIGURE 2.2.	Anatomical features mentioned in the text	32
FIGURE 2.3.	The falx cerebri	33
FIGURE 3.1.	The bones of the sheep skull	38
FIGURE 3.2.	Lateral view of the sheep brain	38
FIGURE 3.3.	Ventral view of the sheep brain	39
FIGURE 3.4.	Median section of the brain	40
FIGURE 3.5.	Modified captive bolt gun	47
FIGURE 3.6.	Impact location on the skull of the sheep	48
FIGURE 3.7.	Striker designs, from top Mk.I, Mk. II and Mk. III	49
FIGURE 3.8.	Velocity measurement technique using displacement sensors	50
FIGURE 3.9.	Lumped parameter analogy of the striker	51
FIGURE 3.10.	Rigid frame for mounting the captive bolt gun	52
FIGURE 3.11.	Typical pressure transducer locations	54
FIGURE 3.12.	Pressure transducer mounted in the modified Camino bolt	55
FIGURE 3.13.	The tip of each transducer is mounted flush with the under surface of the skull	56
FIGURE 3.14.	Accelerometer scheme for measurement of linear and angular acceleration of a body-fixed frame	57
FIGURE 3.15.	An array of nine accelerometers (in a 3-2-2-2 arrangement), allowing the calculation of angular accelerations independently at each time point	58
FIGURE 3.16.	3-2-2-2 accelerometer array for measuring head kinematics	60
FIGURE 3.17.	The original array mounting plate system (left); later the mounting technique was modified to increase the stiffness of the attachment (right).	61
FIGURE 3.18.	3-2-2-2 array mark 2 in position on the frontal bone	63
FIGURE 3.19.	The frontal sinuses of the sheep	63
FIGURE 3.20.	3-2-2-2 array layout	66
FIGURE 3.21.	'Back to side' calibration setup for measuring transverse sensitivities	69
FIGURE 3.22.	'True' accelerations used to examine effect of transverse sensitivity	72
FIGURE 3.23.	Effect of 5% transverse sensitivity on the measurement of a typical head acceleration in the 6 and 9 accelerometer arrays	74
FIGURE 3.24.	Typical array acceleration from the first array design	76
FIGURE 3.25.	MADYMO model of the accelerometer array	77
FIGURE 3.26.	Example of the velocity measured with the first array	78
FIGURE 3.27.	Shaker test setup	81
FIGURE 3.28.	Average transfer function and coherence between the predicted and measured acceleration of the reference accelerometer	82
FIGURE 3.29.	A sample of predicted and measured acceleration from the transfer function test	83
FIGURE 3.30.	Coordinate system definitions	86
FIGURE 3.31.	Source-film plane system 1	89

FIGURE 3.32.	Source-film plane system 2	90
FIGURE 3.33.	Calibration system for determining the source of the X-rays	91
FIGURE 3.34.	Image of calibration markers, subject to perspective distortion	91
FIGURE 4.1.	Array acceleration in Experiment 1097	102
FIGURE 4.2.	The trajectory of the centre of percussion in Experiment 0598	103
FIGURE 4.3.	Impact force, linear acceleration and angular acceleration of the head measured in Experiment 0298	104
FIGURE 4.4.	Chart showing the predicted acceleration at the reference location and that measured by the reference accelerometer in Experiment 0997 ($C = 0.484$).	105
FIGURE 4.5.	Reference accelerometer reading and that predicted by the array in Experiment 1097 ($C = 0.967$)	106
FIGURE 4.6.	Pressure and impact force readings in Experiment 0498	108
FIGURE 4.7.	Pressure and impact force measurements in Experiment 0198	109
FIGURE 4.8.	Pressure and impact force measurements in Experiment 0997	109
FIGURE 4.9.	Pressure and impact force measurements in Experiment 0897	110
FIGURE 4.10.	Pressure and impact force readings in Experiment 0598	110
FIGURE 4.11.	Physiological changes in the first hour in Experiment 0897	111
FIGURE 4.12.	Physiological changes during the survival period in Experiment 0897	112
FIGURE 4.13.	Macroscopic injury in Experiment 1896 displaying an impact contusion, overlying subarachnoid haemorrhage and a cortical defect from the use of an ICP monitor	115
FIGURE 4.14.	A contre coup contusion was noted in Experiment 0298	115
FIGURE 4.15.	Sections used for injury scoring	117
FIGURE 4.16.	Typical levels of injury associated with an injury score of 2	119
FIGURE 4.17.	Illustration of axonal injury at level 3	120
FIGURE 4.18.	Composite figure showing commonly injured regions	121
FIGURE 4.19.	The relationship between peak mean ICP and the Brain Axonal Injury Score	124
FIGURE 4.20.	The relationship between peak impact force and BAIS	126
FIGURE 4.21.	The relationship between peak linear acceleration of the anatomical origin and the BAIS	127
FIGURE 4.22.	The relationship between peak angular acceleration and the BAIS	128
FIGURE 4.23.	Relationship between peak change in linear velocity and BAIS	130
FIGURE 4.24.	Relationship between peak change in angular velocity and BAIS	130
FIGURE 4.25.	The correlation between peak angular velocity and peak impact force	132
FIGURE 5.1.	Interior surface of skull produced by projection	138
FIGURE 5.2.	A photograph of the tentorium and the mesh	139
FIGURE 5.3.	Right hemisphere component divided for meshing	140
FIGURE 5.4.	The brain mesh	141
FIGURE 5.5.	The skull mesh	142
FIGURE 5.6.	Each slice represented the tissue between it and the following slice	145
FIGURE 5.7.	The location of the centre of gravity of the head by analysis of CT data	146
FIGURE 5.8.	The von Mises stress in the skull at peak force in a simulation of experiment 0598	149

FIGURE 5.9.	Single point (solid) and fully integrated elements (wire frame) used in the model of the cerebrum	151
FIGURE 5.10.	Schematic diagram showing the location of pressure calculation in the finite element model	153
FIGURE 5.11.	Pressures predicted by Model A, and those recorded in Experiment 0398, Experiment 0498 and Experiment 0598	161
FIGURE 5.12.	Pressures predicted by Model B, and those recorded in Experiment 0398, Experiment 0498 and Experiment 0598	164
FIGURE 5.13.	Typical pressure response of Model B	165
FIGURE 5.14.	A histology section and the equivalent MRI cross-section	168
FIGURE 5.15.	Example of the histology plane transformed to finite element coordinates	169
FIGURE 5.16.	Relationship between peak von Mises stress in Model B and the Sector Axonal Injury Score of each sector	171
FIGURE 5.17.	Relationship between the peak principal logarithmic strain in Model B and the Sector Axonal Injury Score of each sector	172
FIGURE 5.18.	Relationship between peak von Mises stress in Model B and the Sector Axonal Injury Score of each sector for experiments and simulations	173
FIGURE 5.19.	Relationship between peak maximum logarithmic strain in Model B and the Sector Axonal Injury Score of each sector for experiments and simulations	174
FIGURE 5.20.	Logistic analysis comparing the predicted peak von Mises stress in the model and the extent of 2+ injury in the brains of animals that sustained no significant skull fracture	178
FIGURE 5.21.	Logistic analysis comparing the predicted peak maximum principal logarithmic strain in the model and the extent of 2+ injury in the brains of animals that sustained no significant skull fracture.	178
FIGURE 5.22.	Logistic analysis comparing the predicted peak von Mises stress in the model and the extent of 2+ injury in the brains of animals that sustained no significant skull fracture.	180
FIGURE 5.23.	Logistic analysis comparing the predicted peak maximum principal logarithmic strain in the model and the extent of 2+ injury in the brains of animals that sustained no significant skull fracture.	181

Acknowledgments

I would like to acknowledge the advice and help given by my colleagues. Without their sense of collaboration and enthusiasm, this study would not have been possible. In particular I would like to thank and acknowledge the contribution of Mr. Chris Brown of the Department of Surgery (Neurosurgery), University of Adelaide¹, who organised all aspects of the surgical protocol, and ran the surgery on the experiment days. He was also instrumental in enhancing the immunohistochemistry protocol, and was ever enthusiastic about the experimental design of the study. He carried out the histology used in this study and supplied the immunohistochemistry protocol included in Section 3.4. Others who worked at getting the study off the ground, and generously gave their time and advice, include Prof. Peter Blumbergs and Dr. Grace Scott, of the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science (IMVS), who assisted with the observation of injury, and whose department prepared the tissue for sectioning, Prof. Nigel Jones and Prof. Peter Reilley of the Department of Surgery, University of Adelaide, Dr. John Finney and Mr. Jim Manavis of the IMVS, and Dr. Corrina Van den Heuval, Dept. of Pathology, University of Adelaide, who assisted in many of the experiments. I am grateful for the excellent support of the animal services team at the IMVS, and I particularly thank Ms. Glenda Summersides for her assistance.

For assistance with the construction of the equipment used in this study, I thank Mr. Ron Jager and the team in the Mechanical Workshop in the Department of Mechanical Engineering. For their instrumentation genius, I thank Mr. George Osborne and Mr. Silvio DeIeso from the Instrumentation Section of the Department of Mechanical Engineering.

1. Affiliations are given as they were at the time. Some of these affiliations may have changed.

I would like to acknowledge the assistance of people from other institutions who freely gave of their time and advice to either directly assist with the study or to critique and discuss my ideas. Direct assistance was given by Dr. David Netherway of the Australian Craniofacial Unit, the Department of Radiology at the Royal Adelaide Hospital, the Department of Radiology at the Adelaide Women's and Children's Hospital, and Dr. Maurice Claessens of the Eindhoven Technical University. For invaluable advice and encouragement, I thank Dr. Remy Willinger from the University Louis Pasteur, Strasbourg, and Dr. Jac Wismans from of the Eindhoven Technical University, both of whom spent a considerable amount of time advising me and discussing the project in its early stages. Prof. Albert King of Wayne State University, Dr. David Meaney and Dr. Susan Margulies of the University of Pennsylvania, willingly gave their time and experience to encourage me at various stages. For advice on numerical modelling, thanks to Mr. Douglas Bradshaw, of the University of Southampton, Dr. Ben Cazzolato and Dr. Carl Howard of the Department of Mechanical Engineering, University of Adelaide.

Not least, I sincerely thank my supervisors Prof. Colin Hansen and Prof. Jack McLean; Prof. Hansen for taking the project on, and Prof. McLean who was prepared to support me and the project, both financially and morally, at every stage.

I acknowledge the support of the National Health and Medical Research Council, who supported this project through a Research Unit Grant to the Road Accident Research Unit.