# UNIVERSITY<sup>OF</sup> BIRMINGHAM University of Birmingham Research at Birmingham

# Biomechanical analysis of Combi-hole locking compression plate during fracture healing

Li, Zeyang; Pollard, Stuart; Smith, Gemma; Deshmukh, Subodh; Ding, Ziyun

License: Other (please specify with Rights Statement)

Document Version Peer reviewed version

#### Citation for published version (Harvard):

Li, Z, Pollard, S, Smith, G, Deshmukh, S & Ding, Z 2024, 'Biomechanical analysis of Combi-hole locking compression plate during fracture healing: a numerical study of screw configuration', *Institution of Mechanical Engineers. Proceedings. Part H: Journal of Engineering in Medicine*.

Link to publication on Research at Birmingham portal

#### Publisher Rights Statement:

This is the accepted author manuscript of an article accepted for publication in Proceedings of the Institution of Mechanical Engineers, Part H: Journal of Engineering in Medicine; the final published version will be available at http://www.uk.sagepub.com/journals/Journal202022 Reuse is restricted to non-commercial and no derivative uses.

#### **General rights**

Unless a licence is specified above, all rights (including copyright and moral rights) in this document are retained by the authors and/or the copyright holders. The express permission of the copyright holder must be obtained for any use of this material other than for purposes permitted by law.

•Users may freely distribute the URL that is used to identify this publication.

•Users may download and/or print one copy of the publication from the University of Birmingham research portal for the purpose of private study or non-commercial research.

•User may use extracts from the document in line with the concept of 'fair dealing' under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (?) •Users may not further distribute the material nor use it for the purposes of commercial gain.

Where a licence is displayed above, please note the terms and conditions of the licence govern your use of this document.

When citing, please reference the published version.

#### Take down policy

While the University of Birmingham exercises care and attention in making items available there are rare occasions when an item has been uploaded in error or has been deemed to be commercially or otherwise sensitive.

If you believe that this is the case for this document, please contact UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk providing details and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate.

## Biomechanical analysis of Combi-hole locking compression plate during fracture healing: a numerical study of screw configuration

| Journal:                         | Part H: Journal of Engineering in Medicine  |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Manuscript ID                    | JOEIM-23-0211.R1  |
| Manuscript Type:                 | Original article  |
| Date Submitted by the<br>Author: | 20-Dec-2023   |
| Complete List of Authors:        | Li, Zeyang; Cardiff University<br>Pollard, Stuart; University of Birmingham<br>Smith, Gemma; Royal Orthopaedic Hospital<br>Deshmukh, Subodh; Sandwell and West Birmingham Hospitals NHS Trust<br>Ding, Ziyun; University of Birmingham, School of Engineering   |
| Keywords:                        | Finite Element [Biomechanics], Bone Biomechanics, Bone Remodelling,<br>Implants/ Prosthetics, Finite Element Modelling/ Analysis [Medical]  |
| Abstract:                        | Background: Locking compression plates (LCPs) have become a widely used option for treating femur bone fractures. However, the optimal screw configuration with combi-holes remains a subject of debate. The study aims to create a time-dependent finite element (FE) model to assess the impacts of different screw configurations on LCP fixation stiffness and healing efficiency across four healing stages during a complete fracture healing process. Methods: To simulate the healing process, we integrated a time-dependent callus formation mechanism into a FE model of the LCP with combi-holes. Three screw configuration parameters, namely working length, screw number, and screw position, were investigated. Results: Increasing the working length negatively affected axial stiffness and healing efficiency ( $p < 0.001$ ), while screw number or position had no significant impact ( $p > 0.01$ ). The time-dependent model displayed a moderate correlation with the conventional time-independent model for axial stiffness and healing efficiency ( $p \leq 0.733$ , $p \leq 0.025$ ). The highest healing efficiency ( $95.2\%$ ) was observed in screw configuration $C125$ during the 4-8-week period. Conclusions: The results provide insights into managing fractures using LCPs with combi-holes over an extended duration. Under axial compressive loading conditions, the use of the C125 screw configuration can enhance callus formation during the 4-12-week period for transverse fractures. When employing the C12345 configuration, it becomes crucial to avoid overconstraint during the 4-8-week period. |
|                                  |   |

# SCHOLARONE<sup>™</sup> Manuscripts

| 1                                |    |   |
|----------------------------------|----|---|
| 2<br>3                           |    |   |
| 4<br>5                           | 1  | Biomechanical analysis of Combi-hole locking compression  |
| 6<br>7<br>0                      | 2  | plate during fracture healing: a numerical study of screw   |
| 9<br>10                          | 3  | configuration   |
| 11<br>12<br>13                   | 4  | Zeyang Li <sup>1</sup> , Stuart Pollard <sup>2</sup> , Gemma Smith <sup>3</sup> , Subodh Deshmukh <sup>3</sup> , Ziyun Ding <sup>2*</sup> |
| 14<br>15<br>16                   | 5  |   |
| 17<br>18                         | 6  | 1. School of Engineering, Cardiff University, Cardiff, UK   |
| 19<br>20<br>21                   | 7  | 2. School of Engineering, University of Birmingham, Birmingham, UK  |
| 22<br>23                         | 8  | 3. Royal Orthopaedic Hospital, Birmingham, UK   |
| 24<br>25<br>26                   | 9  |   |
| 27<br>28<br>29                   | 10 |   |
| 30<br>31                         | 11 | Correspondence:   |
| 32<br>33<br>34                   | 12 | Ziyun Ding  |
| 35<br>36<br>37                   | 13 | School of Engineering   |
| 38<br>39                         | 14 | University of Birmingham  |
| 40<br>41<br>42                   | 15 | Birmingham  |
| 43<br>44                         | 16 | UK  |
| 45<br>46<br>47                   | 17 | B15 2TT   |
| 48<br>49<br>50                   | 18 | z.ding@bham.ac.uk   |
| 51<br>52                         | 19 |   |
| 53<br>54                         | 20 |   |
| 55<br>56<br>57<br>58<br>59<br>60 | 21 |   |

### 22 Abstract

Background: Locking compression plates (LCPs) have become a widely used option for treating femur bone fractures. However, the optimal screw configuration with combi-holes remains a subject of debate. The study aims to create a time-dependent finite element (FE) model to assess the impacts of different screw configurations on LCP fixation stiffness and healing efficiency across four healing stages during a complete fracture healing process. Methods: To simulate the healing process, we integrated a time-dependent callus formation mechanism into a FE model of the LCP with combi-holes. Three screw configuration parameters, namely working length, screw number, and screw position, were investigated. Results: Increasing the working length negatively affected axial stiffness and healing efficiency (p < 0.001), while screw number or position had no significant impact (p > 0.01). The time-dependent model displayed a moderate correlation with the conventional time-independent model for axial stiffness and healing efficiency ( $p \ge 0.733$ ,  $p \le 0.733$ ) 0.025). The highest healing efficiency (95.2%) was observed in screw configuration C125 during the 4-8-week period. Conclusions: The results provide insights into managing fractures using LCPs with combi-holes over an extended duration. Under axial compressive loading conditions, the use of the C125 screw configuration can enhance callus formation during the 4-12-week period for transverse fractures. When employing the C12345 configuration, it becomes crucial to avoid overconstraint during the 4-8-week period. 

| 44 | Keywords: screw configuration; fracture healing; finite element; callus; |
|----|--|
| 45 | locking compression plate  |
| 46 |  |
| 47 |  |
| 48 |  |
| 70 |  |
| 49 |  |
|    |  |
|    |  |
|    |  |
|    |  |
|    |  |
|    |  |
|    |  |
|    |  |
|    |  |
|    |  |
|    |  |
|    |  |
|    |  |
|    |  |
|    |  |
|    |  |
|    |  |
|    |  |
|    |  |
|    |  |

# 50 1. Introduction

The use of locking compression plates (LCP) in plate osteosynthesis is a significant advancement. In comparison to conventional plates, such as dynamic compression plates (DCP), LCPs offer several advantages in reducing the risk of biological complications, including infection and non-union.<sup>1,2</sup> This is achieved through indirect reduction that avoids direct bone-implant contact, promoting relative stability rather than absolute stability. The non-contact features of LCPs contribute to optimal healing and biological callus formation, with factors such as axial stiffness and inter-fragmentary movement (IFM) being crucial to the process.<sup>3,4</sup> Proper levels of axial stiffness and IFM are beneficial to healing,<sup>5-9</sup> but excessive or insufficient levels can be detrimental and even cause non-union. Therefore, achieving the optimal trade-off between these mechanical variables is essential for successful healing.<sup>10-13.</sup> 

LCPs with combi-holes, which combine conventional and threaded holes, provide versatility and flexibility by accommodating both conventional and locking head screws. However, this introduces uncertainty that requires careful consideration of the biomechanical implications of different screw configurations. Although previous biomechanical studies have mainly investigated the effects of screw configurations, none have analysed the use of LCPs with combi-holes.<sup>9-16</sup> Therefore, it is important to investigate the mechanical properties of LCPs with combi-holes to determine the most effective 

72 screw configurations and optimize their clinical use.

During the fracture healing process, bone and soft tissues undergo continuous changes in shape and material properties, posing a challenge in determining the optimal screw configurations. Numerical finite element (FE) modelling has shown promise in simulating this healing process. For example, Gardner et al. simulated the formation of callus tissue successfully and calculated the Young's modulus of callus at different healing stages<sup>17</sup>; expanding upon Gardner's works, Kim developed a time-dependent callus model to investigate the influence of the plate materials on tibia DCP fixation stiffness<sup>18</sup>; building on this research, Mehboob et al. used a stress-based rejection coefficient algorithm to calculate callus properties during the healing process.<sup>19</sup> However, these studies focused primarily on healing simulation or were limited to a DCP system, making them incapable of investigating the effects of different screw configurations in an LCP system over an extended duration.

This study aims to develop a finite element modelling framework for simulating callus growth during the fracture healing process. To achieve this, a timedependent callus model was incorporated into an FE model of the bone-implant construct. Three configuration parameters, namely the working length (WL), screw number (SN) and screw position (SP) were investigated to assess the quantitative impact of screw configuration on fracture healing under given

| -        |     |   |
|----------|-----|---|
| 2        |     |   |
| 3<br>4   | 04  | loading conditions. We hypothesised that the screw configuration affects        |
| 5        | 34  | loading conditions. We hypothesised that the screw configuration affects        |
| 6        |     |   |
| 7        | 95  | mechanical variables, specifically, axial stiffness and interfragmentary strain |
| 8        |     |   |
| 9        | 96  | (IFS), which were known to influence healing efficiency. This information can   |
| 10       |     |   |
| 11       | 97  | provide insights into managing fractures at different stages based on the       |
| 12       | 57  | provide insights into managing indotates at amerent stages based on the         |
| 14       | 00  | astation of communications for LCD plates with combination. Qual                |
| 15       | 98  | selection of screw configurations for LCP plates with compl-holes. Such         |
| 16       |     |   |
| 17       | 99  | consideration may potentially contribute to improved healing efficiency         |
| 18       |     |   |
| 19       | 100 | throughout the entire healing process.  |
| 20       |     |   |
| 22       | 101 |   |
| 23       |     |   |
| 24       |     |   |
| 25       |     |   |
| 26       |     |   |
| 27<br>28 |     |   |
| 29       |     |   |
| 30       |     |   |
| 31       |     |   |
| 32       |     |   |
| 33       |     |   |
| 34       |     |   |
| 36       |     |   |
| 37       |     |   |
| 38       |     |   |
| 39       |     |   |
| 40       |     |   |
| 41<br>42 |     |   |
| 43       |     |   |
| 44       |     |   |
| 45       |     |   |
| 46       |     |   |
| 47<br>49 |     |   |
| 48<br>49 |     |   |
| 50       |     |   |
| 51       |     |   |
| 52       |     |   |
| 53       |     |   |
| 54<br>55 |     |   |
| 55<br>56 |     |   |
| 57       |     |   |
| 58       |     |   |
| 59       |     |   |
| 60       |     |   |

Page 7 of 38

1

| 2        |  |
|----------|--|
| 3        |  |
| 1        |  |
| -        |  |
| S        |  |
| 6        |  |
| 7        |  |
| 8        |  |
| õ        |  |
| 9<br>10  |  |
| 10       |  |
| 11       |  |
| 12       |  |
| 13       |  |
| 11       |  |
| 14       |  |
| 15       |  |
| 16       |  |
| 17       |  |
| 18       |  |
| 19       |  |
| 20       |  |
| ∠∪<br>21 |  |
| 21       |  |
| 22       |  |
| 23       |  |
| 24       |  |
| 25       |  |
| 25       |  |
| 20       |  |
| 27       |  |
| 28       |  |
| 29       |  |
| 30       |  |
| 31       |  |
| 27       |  |
| 22       |  |
| 33       |  |
| 34       |  |
| 35       |  |
| 36       |  |
| 37       |  |
| 20       |  |
| 20       |  |
| 39       |  |
| 40       |  |
| 41       |  |
| 42       |  |
| 43       |  |
| 11       |  |
| 44       |  |
| 45       |  |
| 46       |  |
| 47       |  |
| 48       |  |
| 49       |  |
| 50       |  |
| 50       |  |
| 21       |  |
| 52       |  |
| 53       |  |
| 54       |  |
| 55       |  |
| 56       |  |
| 50       |  |
| 5/<br>5/ |  |
| 58       |  |
| 59       |  |
| 60       |  |

| 102 <b>2. Me</b> | thods and | materials |
|------------------|-----------|-----------|
|------------------|-----------|-----------|

## 103 2.1 The bone-implant construct

A standardised LCP with ten combi-holes (VP4031, APLUS BIOTEC Ltd) and locking screws (LS5034, APLUS BIOTEC Ltd) was modelled using Solidworks 2020 (DS Solidworks Copr., USA), as illustrated in Figure 1a. The LCP had dimensions of 150 mm length, 10 mm width, and 4 mm thickness, with an 11 mm distance between adjacent combi-holes. The locking head screw had a length of 34 mm, an inner diameter of 7.2 mm, an external diameter of 5 mm and a shaft diameter of 4.3 mm.

111

112 (Insert Figure 1)

113

To construct the bone-implant model, the contour of femoral cortical bone was 114 derived from magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) scans of a healthy male 115 116 subject (age: 44 years, height: 1.84 m, weight: 96 kg) using Mimics (Mimics 19.0, Materialise, Belgium). The average cross-sectional area was 103.9 mm<sup>2</sup> 117 118 and the cortical thickness was 3.5 mm, as shown in Figure 1b. It was then extruded longitudinally to a length of 140 mm to construct the three-dimensional 119 120 shape. To enhance computational efficiency, this work excluded the trabecular structure.<sup>19,21</sup> In addition, to simulate a 32-A3 femoral shaft fracture, a 121 122 transverse gap of 2.1 mm was created in the middle of the cortical bone. The transverse fracture introduces symmetry along the fracture gap, and the size of 123

the transverse gap is consistent with previous studies, within the range of 2 mm to 5 mm.<sup>7-9,22</sup> In the context of midshaft transverse fracture, previous studies also indicated the limited impact of the bone length.<sup>18,25,31</sup> A time-independent FE model was created using ABAQUS (2020, Dassault Systèmes, USA). The model incorporated a 2 mm offset between the bone and plate, and symmetry along the longitudinal axis, effectively reducing computational cost.<sup>23</sup> The screw-bone and screw-plate interfaces were represented as tied. One end of the bone was fixed, while the other end was

subjected to a compressive load of 1053.6 N, equivalent to 1.12 times the body
 weight of the subject.<sup>24</sup> The LCP plate and screws were made of homogeneous

135 and isotropic Titanium alloy (Ti–6Al–4V) and cobalt-based superalloy,
136 respectively. The cortical bone was anisotropic. Table 1 provides detailed

137 information on the material properties.

139 (Insert Table 1)

The screws and cortical bone were meshed using an 8-node linear hexahedral solid element with reduced integration (C3D8R), while the plate was meshed using a tetrahedron element (C3D4).<sup>4</sup> A mesh convergence analysis was performed iteratively until the maximum stress change was less than 2% with decreasing mesh size.<sup>20</sup> A smaller mesh size of 0.15 mm was required at the

| 3<br>4<br>5    | 146 | tied interfaces, reducing the maximum stress from 10.4% to 1.5% (Figure. 1c).   |
|----------------|-----|---|
| 6<br>7         | 147 | The remaining part had an average size between 0.5 mm to 0.7 mm. The model  |
| 8<br>9<br>10   | 148 | consisted of approximately 50,000 and 572,000 hexahedral elements for the   |
| 11<br>12<br>13 | 149 | screws and bone, and 725,600 tetrahedron elements for the plate.  |
| 14<br>15       | 150 |   |
| 16<br>17<br>18 | 151 | 2.2 A time-dependent model  |
| 19<br>20<br>21 | 152 | In addition to the time-independent model described in Section 2.1, a time-   |
| 22<br>23       | 153 | dependent model was proposed by modelling the callus tissue, which  |
| 24<br>25<br>26 | 154 | possesses time-dependent material properties in different healing stages <sup>18,25,28</sup> .                                |
| 27<br>28<br>20 | 155 | Only the central component of the callus was modelled as it provides the  |
| 30<br>31       | 156 | primary load-bearing capacity and is the most sensitive to the IFM.   |
| 32<br>33<br>34 | 157 |   |
| 35<br>36       | 158 | According to the interfragmentary strain theory, <sup>29</sup> callus growth can be   |
| 37<br>38<br>39 | 159 | determined by interfragmentary strain (IFS, $\epsilon$ ): an IFS between 2-10% promotes                                       |
| 40<br>41       | 160 | callus growth, while an IFS below 2% or above 10% inhibits it. <sup>18,30</sup> IFS was                                       |
| 42<br>43<br>44 | 161 | calculated as the displacement of the fracture gap divided by its original size   |
| 45<br>46<br>47 | 162 | (as illustrated in Figure 2b). The success of callus growth determines healing  |
| 48<br>49       | 163 | efficiency ( $\delta$ ), expressed as the ratio of A <sub>c</sub> and A <sub>t</sub> . A <sub>c</sub> is the area with an IFS |
| 50<br>51<br>52 | 164 | between 2-10% and $A_t$ is the total fracture area (as illustrated in Figure 2b).   |
| 53<br>54       | 165 |   |
| 55<br>56<br>57 | 166 | (Insert Figure 2)   |
| 58<br>59<br>60 | 167 |   |

| In our study, we divided a complete healing process into four stages (i.e., 1-4<br>weeks, 4-8 weeks, 8-12 weeks and 12-16 weeks). <sup>17</sup> As a result, the Young's<br>modulus of callus ( $E_n$ ) during a particular healing stage ( $n$ ) was estimated as<br>follows:<br>$E_n = \delta_{n-1} \cdot E_{standard,n} + (1 - \delta_{n-1}) \cdot E_{n-1}$ (1)<br>where $E_{standard,n}$ represents the standard callus modulus and its values at four<br>stages are outlined in Table 2. These values are determined under the condition<br>where the healing efficiency ( $\delta$ ) is equal to 100%; <sup>17</sup> $E_{n-1}$ is Young's modulus<br>of the callus at the ( $n - 1$ ) healing stage; $\delta_{n-1}$ is the healing efficiency at the<br>( $n - 1$ ) healing stage, calculated from the FE model. The iterative calculation<br>for the callus modulus is illustrated in Figure 2b. There are four layers of callus<br>connecting the fracture gap along the axial direction, meshed using 8-node<br>linear hexahedral solid elements with reduced integration (C3D8R) and a size<br>of 0.5 mm. In total, there are 2852 elements.<br>The compressive loading conditions were varied in the time-dependent model<br>to account for the mobility improvement after the operation (Table 2): during the<br>initial two stages (1-4 weeks and 4-8 weeks), the compressive load was equal<br>to 1.12 times body weight (BW); <sup>24</sup> in the third stage (8-12 weeks), the load was<br>increased to 2 times BW, representative of walking with a walking-stick; <sup>31</sup> in the<br>final stage (12-16 week), the load was raised to 3 times BW, representative of |     |  |
|---|-----|--|
| weeks, 4-8 weeks, 8-12 weeks and 12-16 weeks). <sup>17</sup> As a result, the Young's<br>modulus of callus ( $E_n$ ) during a particular healing stage ( $n$ ) was estimated as<br>follows:<br>$E_n = \delta_{n-1} \cdot E_{standard, n} + (1 - \delta_{n-1}) \cdot E_{n-1}$ (1)<br>where $E_{standard, n}$ represents the standard callus modulus and its values at four<br>stages are outlined in Table 2. These values are determined under the condition<br>where the healing efficiency ( $\delta$ ) is equal to 100%; <sup>17</sup> $E_{n-1}$ is Young's modulus<br>of the callus at the ( $n - 1$ ) healing stage; $\delta_{n-1}$ is the healing efficiency at the<br>( $n - 1$ ) healing stage, calculated from the FE model. The iterative calculation<br>for the callus modulus is illustrated in Figure 2b. There are four layers of callus<br>connecting the fracture gap along the axial direction, meshed using 8-node<br>linear hexahedral solid elements with reduced integration (C3D8R) and a size<br>of 0.5 mm, in total, there are 2852 elements.<br>The compressive loading conditions were varied in the time-dependent model<br>to account for the mobility improvement after the operation (Table 2): during the<br>initial two stages (1-4 weeks and 4-8 weeks), the compressive load was equal<br>to 1.12 times body weight (BW); <sup>24</sup> in the third stage (8-12 weeks), the load was<br>increased to 2 times BW, representative of walking with a walking-stick; <sup>31</sup> in the<br>final stage (12-16 week), the load was raised to 3 times BW, representative of  | 168 | In our study, we divided a complete healing process into four stages (i.e., 1-4                        |
| modulus of callus $(E_n)$ during a particular healing stage $(n)$ was estimated as<br>follows:<br>$E_n = \delta_{n-1} \cdot E_{standard, n} + (1 - \delta_{n-1}) \cdot E_{n-1}$ (1)<br>where $E_{standard, n}$ represents the standard callus modulus and its values at four<br>stages are outlined in Table 2. These values are determined under the condition<br>where the healing efficiency $(\delta)$ is equal to $100\%$ ; <sup>17</sup> $E_{n-1}$ is Young's modulus<br>of the callus at the $(n-1)$ healing stage; $\delta_{n-1}$ is the healing efficiency at the<br>(n-1) healing stage, calculated from the FE model. The iterative calculation<br>for the callus modulus is illustrated in Figure 2b. There are four layers of callus<br>connecting the fracture gap along the axial direction, meshed using 8-node<br>linear hexahedral solid elements with reduced integration (C3D8R) and a size<br>of 0.5 mm. In total, there are 2852 elements.<br>The compressive loading conditions were varied in the time-dependent model<br>to account for the mobility improvement after the operation (Table 2): during the<br>initial two stages (1-4 weeks and 4-8 weeks), the compressive load was equal<br>to 1.12 times body weight (BW); <sup>24</sup> in the third stage (8-12 weeks), the load was<br>increased to 2 times BW, representative of walking with a walking-stick; <sup>31</sup> in the<br>final stage (12-16 week), the load was raised to 3 times BW, representative of   | 169 | weeks, 4-8 weeks, 8-12 weeks and 12-16 weeks). <sup>17</sup> As a result, the Young's                  |
| follows:<br>$E_n = \delta_{n-1} \cdot E_{standard, n} + (1 - \delta_{n-1}) \cdot E_{n-1} \qquad (1)$ where $E_{standard, n}$ represents the standard callus modulus and its values at four<br>stages are outlined in Table 2. These values are determined under the condition<br>where the healing efficiency ( $\delta$ ) is equal to 100%; <sup>17</sup> $E_{n-1}$ is Young's modulus<br>of the callus at the $(n - 1)$ healing stage; $\delta_{n-1}$ is the healing efficiency at the<br>(n - 1) healing stage, calculated from the FE model. The iterative calculation<br>for the callus modulus is illustrated in Figure 2b. There are four layers of callus<br>connecting the fracture gap along the axial direction, meshed using 8-node<br>linear hexahedral solid elements with reduced integration (C3D8R) and a size<br>of 0.5 mm. In total, there are 2852 elements.<br>The compressive loading conditions were varied in the time-dependent model<br>to account for the mobility improvement after the operation (Table 2): during the<br>initial two stages (1-4 weeks and 4-8 weeks), the compressive load was equal<br>to 1.12 times body weight (BW); <sup>24</sup> in the third stage (8-12 weeks), the load was<br>increased to 2 times BW, representative of walking with a walking-stick; <sup>31</sup> in the<br>final stage (12-16 week), the load was raised to 3 times BW, representative of   | 170 | modulus of callus $(E_n)$ during a particular healing stage $(n)$ was estimated as                     |
| 172 $E_n = \delta_{n-1} \cdot E_{standard, n} + (1 - \delta_{n-1}) \cdot E_{n-1}$ (1)<br>173 where $E_{standard, n}$ represents the standard callus modulus and its values at four<br>174 stages are outlined in Table 2. These values are determined under the condition<br>175 where the healing efficiency ( $\delta$ ) is equal to 100%; <sup>17</sup> $E_{n-1}$ is Young's modulus<br>176 of the callus at the $(n - 1)$ healing stage; $\delta_{n-1}$ is the healing efficiency at the<br>177 $(n - 1)$ healing stage, calculated from the FE model. The iterative calculation<br>178 for the callus modulus is illustrated in Figure 2b. There are four layers of callus<br>179 connecting the fracture gap along the axial direction, meshed using 8-node<br>180 linear hexahedral solid elements with reduced integration (C3D8R) and a size<br>181 of 0.5 mm. In total, there are 2852 elements.<br>182<br>183 The compressive loading conditions were varied in the time-dependent model<br>184 to account for the mobility improvement after the operation (Table 2): during the<br>185 initial two stages (1-4 weeks and 4-8 weeks), the compressive load was equal<br>186 to 1.12 times body weight (BW); <sup>24</sup> in the third stage (8-12 weeks), the load was<br>187 increased to 2 times BW, representative of walking with a walking-stick; <sup>31</sup> in the<br>188 final stage (12-16 week), the load was raised to 3 times BW, representative of  | 171 | follows:   |
| where $E_{standard, n}$ represents the standard callus modulus and its values at four<br>stages are outlined in Table 2. These values are determined under the condition<br>where the healing efficiency ( $\delta$ ) is equal to 100%; <sup>17</sup> $E_{n-1}$ is Young's modulus<br>of the callus at the $(n-1)$ healing stage; $\delta_{n-1}$ is the healing efficiency at the<br>(n-1) healing stage, calculated from the FE model. The iterative calculation<br>for the callus modulus is illustrated in Figure 2b. There are four layers of callus<br>connecting the fracture gap along the axial direction, meshed using 8-node<br>linear hexahedral solid elements with reduced integration (C3D8R) and a size<br>of 0.5 mm. In total, there are 2852 elements.   | 172 | $E_n = \delta_{n-1} \cdot E_{standard, n} + (1 - \delta_{n-1}) \cdot E_{n-1} $ (1)                     |
| 174 stages are outlined in Table 2. These values are determined under the condition<br>175 where the healing efficiency ( $\delta$ ) is equal to 100%; <sup>17</sup> $E_{n-1}$ is Young's modulus<br>176 of the callus at the $(n-1)$ healing stage; $\delta_{n-1}$ is the healing efficiency at the<br>177 $(n-1)$ healing stage, calculated from the FE model. The iterative calculation<br>178 for the callus modulus is illustrated in Figure 2b. There are four layers of callus<br>179 connecting the fracture gap along the axial direction, meshed using 8-node<br>180 linear hexahedral solid elements with reduced integration (C3D8R) and a size<br>181 of 0.5 mm. In total, there are 2852 elements.<br>182<br>183 The compressive loading conditions were varied in the time-dependent model<br>184 to account for the mobility improvement after the operation (Table 2): during the<br>185 initial two stages (1-4 weeks and 4-8 weeks), the compressive load was equal<br>186 to 1.12 times body weight (BW); <sup>24</sup> in the third stage (8-12 weeks), the load was<br>187 increased to 2 times BW, representative of walking with a walking-stick; <sup>31</sup> in the<br>188 final stage (12-16 week), the load was raised to 3 times BW, representative of  | 173 | where $E_{standard, n}$ represents the standard callus modulus and its values at four                  |
| where the healing efficiency ( $\delta$ ) is equal to 100%; <sup>17</sup> $E_{n-1}$ is Young's modulus<br>of the callus at the $(n - 1)$ healing stage; $\delta_{n-1}$ is the healing efficiency at the<br>(n - 1) healing stage, calculated from the FE model. The iterative calculation<br>for the callus modulus is illustrated in Figure 2b. There are four layers of callus<br>connecting the fracture gap along the axial direction, meshed using 8-node<br>linear hexahedral solid elements with reduced integration (C3D8R) and a size<br>of 0.5 mm. In total, there are 2852 elements.   | 174 | stages are outlined in Table 2. These values are determined under the condition                        |
| of the callus at the $(n - 1)$ healing stage; $\delta_{n-1}$ is the healing efficiency at the<br>( $n - 1$ ) healing stage, calculated from the FE model. The iterative calculation<br>for the callus modulus is illustrated in Figure 2b. There are four layers of callus<br>connecting the fracture gap along the axial direction, meshed using 8-node<br>linear hexahedral solid elements with reduced integration (C3D8R) and a size<br>of 0.5 mm. In total, there are 2852 elements.<br>The compressive loading conditions were varied in the time-dependent model<br>to account for the mobility improvement after the operation (Table 2): during the<br>initial two stages (1-4 weeks and 4-8 weeks), the compressive load was equal<br>to 1.12 times body weight (BW); <sup>24</sup> in the third stage (8-12 weeks), the load was<br>increased to 2 times BW, representative of walking with a walking-stick; <sup>31</sup> in the<br>final stage (12-16 week), the load was raised to 3 times BW, representative of  | 175 | where the healing efficiency ( $\delta$ ) is equal to 100%; <sup>17</sup> $E_{n-1}$ is Young's modulus |
| 177 $(n-1)$ healing stage, calculated from the FE model. The iterative calculation178for the callus modulus is illustrated in Figure 2b. There are four layers of callus179connecting the fracture gap along the axial direction, meshed using 8-node180linear hexahedral solid elements with reduced integration (C3D8R) and a size181of 0.5 mm. In total, there are 2852 elements.182183184to account for the mobility improvement after the operation (Table 2): during the185initial two stages (1-4 weeks and 4-8 weeks), the compressive load was equal186to 1.12 times body weight (BW); <sup>24</sup> in the third stage (8-12 weeks), the load was187increased to 2 times BW, representative of walking with a walking-stick; <sup>31</sup> in the188final stage (12-16 week), the load was raised to 3 times BW, representative of  | 176 | of the callus at the $(n-1)$ healing stage; $\delta_{n-1}$ is the healing efficiency at the            |
| <ul> <li>for the callus modulus is illustrated in Figure 2b. There are four layers of callus</li> <li>connecting the fracture gap along the axial direction, meshed using 8-node</li> <li>linear hexahedral solid elements with reduced integration (C3D8R) and a size</li> <li>of 0.5 mm. In total, there are 2852 elements.</li> <li>The compressive loading conditions were varied in the time-dependent model</li> <li>to account for the mobility improvement after the operation (Table 2): during the</li> <li>initial two stages (1-4 weeks and 4-8 weeks), the compressive load was equal</li> <li>to 1.12 times body weight (BW); <sup>24</sup> in the third stage (8-12 weeks), the load was</li> <li>increased to 2 times BW, representative of walking with a walking-stick;<sup>31</sup> in the</li> <li>final stage (12-16 week), the load was raised to 3 times BW, representative of</li> </ul>  | 177 | (n-1) healing stage, calculated from the FE model. The iterative calculation                           |
| <ul> <li>connecting the fracture gap along the axial direction, meshed using 8-node</li> <li>linear hexahedral solid elements with reduced integration (C3D8R) and a size</li> <li>of 0.5 mm. In total, there are 2852 elements.</li> <li>The compressive loading conditions were varied in the time-dependent model</li> <li>to account for the mobility improvement after the operation (Table 2): during the</li> <li>initial two stages (1-4 weeks and 4-8 weeks), the compressive load was equal</li> <li>to 1.12 times body weight (BW); <sup>24</sup> in the third stage (8-12 weeks), the load was</li> <li>increased to 2 times BW, representative of walking with a walking-stick;<sup>31</sup> in the</li> <li>final stage (12-16 week), the load was raised to 3 times BW, representative of</li> </ul>   | 178 | for the callus modulus is illustrated in Figure 2b. There are four layers of callus                    |
| <ul> <li>linear hexahedral solid elements with reduced integration (C3D8R) and a size</li> <li>of 0.5 mm. In total, there are 2852 elements.</li> <li>The compressive loading conditions were varied in the time-dependent model</li> <li>to account for the mobility improvement after the operation (Table 2): during the</li> <li>initial two stages (1-4 weeks and 4-8 weeks), the compressive load was equal</li> <li>to 1.12 times body weight (BW); <sup>24</sup> in the third stage (8-12 weeks), the load was</li> <li>increased to 2 times BW, representative of walking with a walking-stick;<sup>31</sup> in the</li> <li>final stage (12-16 week), the load was raised to 3 times BW, representative of</li> </ul>   | 179 | connecting the fracture gap along the axial direction, meshed using 8-node                             |
| <ul> <li>of 0.5 mm. In total, there are 2852 elements.</li> <li>The compressive loading conditions were varied in the time-dependent model</li> <li>to account for the mobility improvement after the operation (Table 2): during the</li> <li>initial two stages (1-4 weeks and 4-8 weeks), the compressive load was equal</li> <li>to 1.12 times body weight (BW); <sup>24</sup> in the third stage (8-12 weeks), the load was</li> <li>increased to 2 times BW, representative of walking with a walking-stick;<sup>31</sup> in the</li> <li>final stage (12-16 week), the load was raised to 3 times BW, representative of</li> </ul>   | 180 | linear hexahedral solid elements with reduced integration (C3D8R) and a size                           |
| 182<br>183 The compressive loading conditions were varied in the time-dependent model<br>184 to account for the mobility improvement after the operation (Table 2): during the<br>185 initial two stages (1-4 weeks and 4-8 weeks), the compressive load was equal<br>186 to 1.12 times body weight (BW); <sup>24</sup> in the third stage (8-12 weeks), the load was<br>187 increased to 2 times BW, representative of walking with a walking-stick; <sup>31</sup> in the<br>188 final stage (12-16 week), the load was raised to 3 times BW, representative of  | 181 | of 0.5 mm. In total, there are 2852 elements.  |
| The compressive loading conditions were varied in the time-dependent model<br>to account for the mobility improvement after the operation (Table 2): during the<br>initial two stages (1-4 weeks and 4-8 weeks), the compressive load was equal<br>to 1.12 times body weight (BW); <sup>24</sup> in the third stage (8-12 weeks), the load was<br>increased to 2 times BW, representative of walking with a walking-stick; <sup>31</sup> in the<br>final stage (12-16 week), the load was raised to 3 times BW, representative of   | 182 |  |
| <ul> <li>to account for the mobility improvement after the operation (Table 2): during the</li> <li>initial two stages (1-4 weeks and 4-8 weeks), the compressive load was equal</li> <li>to 1.12 times body weight (BW); <sup>24</sup> in the third stage (8-12 weeks), the load was</li> <li>increased to 2 times BW, representative of walking with a walking-stick;<sup>31</sup> in the</li> <li>final stage (12-16 week), the load was raised to 3 times BW, representative of</li> </ul>  | 183 | The compressive loading conditions were varied in the time-dependent model                             |
| <ul> <li>initial two stages (1-4 weeks and 4-8 weeks), the compressive load was equal</li> <li>to 1.12 times body weight (BW); <sup>24</sup> in the third stage (8-12 weeks), the load was</li> <li>increased to 2 times BW, representative of walking with a walking-stick;<sup>31</sup> in the</li> <li>final stage (12-16 week), the load was raised to 3 times BW, representative of</li> </ul>   | 184 | to account for the mobility improvement after the operation (Table 2): during the                      |
| <ul> <li>to 1.12 times body weight (BW); <sup>24</sup> in the third stage (8-12 weeks), the load was</li> <li>increased to 2 times BW, representative of walking with a walking-stick;<sup>31</sup> in the</li> <li>final stage (12-16 week), the load was raised to 3 times BW, representative of</li> </ul>   | 185 | initial two stages (1-4 weeks and 4-8 weeks), the compressive load was equal                           |
| <ul> <li>increased to 2 times BW, representative of walking with a walking-stick;<sup>31</sup> in the</li> <li>final stage (12-16 week), the load was raised to 3 times BW, representative of</li> </ul>  | 186 | to 1.12 times body weight (BW); <sup>24</sup> in the third stage (8-12 weeks), the load was            |
| 188 final stage (12-16 week), the load was raised to 3 times BW, representative of  | 187 | increased to 2 times BW, representative of walking with a walking-stick; <sup>31</sup> in the          |
|   | 188 | final stage (12-16 week), the load was raised to 3 times BW, representative of                         |
| 189 normal walking without a walking-stick. 31 The axial stiffness is defined as the  | 189 | normal walking without a walking-stick. <sup>31</sup> The axial stiffness is defined as the            |

1

| 2                  |  |
|--------------------|--|
| 2                  |  |
| 3                  |  |
| 4                  |  |
| 5                  |  |
| ر<br>م             |  |
| 6                  |  |
| 7                  |  |
| 8                  |  |
| 0                  |  |
| 9                  |  |
| 10                 |  |
| 11                 |  |
| 12                 |  |
| 12                 |  |
| 13                 |  |
| 14                 |  |
| 15                 |  |
| 10                 |  |
| 10                 |  |
| 17                 |  |
| 18                 |  |
| 10                 |  |
| 17                 |  |
| 20                 |  |
| 21                 |  |
| 22                 |  |
| 22                 |  |
| 23                 |  |
| 24                 |  |
| 25                 |  |
| 26                 |  |
| 20                 |  |
| 27                 |  |
| 28                 |  |
| 29                 |  |
| 20                 |  |
| 50                 |  |
| 31                 |  |
| 32                 |  |
| 33                 |  |
| ⊃^                 |  |
| 54                 |  |
| 35                 |  |
| 36                 |  |
| 27                 |  |
| 5/                 |  |
| 38                 |  |
| 39                 |  |
| 40                 |  |
| 44                 |  |
| 41                 |  |
| 42                 |  |
| 43                 |  |
| <u></u><br><u></u> |  |
| 44                 |  |
| 45                 |  |
| 46                 |  |
| 47                 |  |
| -+/                |  |
| 48                 |  |
| 49                 |  |
| 50                 |  |
| £1                 |  |
| 21                 |  |
| 52                 |  |
| 53                 |  |
| 51                 |  |
| J4                 |  |
| 55                 |  |
| 56                 |  |
| 57                 |  |
| 57                 |  |
| 58                 |  |
| 59                 |  |
| •••                |  |

axial compressive load divided by the displacement at the centre points of the
two ends of the bone (as illustrated in Figure 1a).

193 **2.3 Design of screw configurations** 

194 Different screw configurations were studied (Figure 3) by varying the working 195 length (the distance between the closest screws on either side of the fracture, case 1), the number of screws (case 2), and the position of screws (case 3). 196 For case 1 (C15, C25, C35, C45), the working length was increased with two 197 screws. For case 2 (C15, C145, C1345, C12345) the screw numbers were 198 increased with a constant working length. For case 3 (C125, C135, C145), the 199 middle screw was positioned differently relative to the fracture gap with a 200 201 constant screw number and working length. The fifth screw (the screw near the distal side) was tightened in each configuration to ensure an adequate torsion 202 stiffness of fixation <sup>4</sup>. This resulted in nine different screw configurations, each 203 204 tested under five scenarios: post-operation using the time-independent model; 1-4 weeks, 4-8 weeks, 8-12 weeks and 12-16 weeks using the time-dependent 205 206 model. In total, 45 simulation scenarios were conducted.

207

208 (Insert Figure 3)

209

210 **2.4 Data processing and analysis** 

211 Non-parametric repeated measure Friedman tests were employed to assess

| 2      |  |
|--------|--|
| 3      |  |
| 4      |  |
|        |  |
| ر<br>د |  |
| 0      |  |
| /      |  |
| 8      |  |
| 9      |  |
| 10     |  |
| 11     |  |
| 12     |  |
| 13     |  |
| 14     |  |
| 15     |  |
| 16     |  |
| 10     |  |
| 1/     |  |
| 18     |  |
| 19     |  |
| 20     |  |
| 21     |  |
| 22     |  |
| 23     |  |
| 24     |  |
| 25     |  |
| 25     |  |
| 20     |  |
| 27     |  |
| 28     |  |
| 29     |  |
| 30     |  |
| 31     |  |
| 32     |  |
| 33     |  |
| 34     |  |
| 25     |  |
| 22     |  |
| 36     |  |
| 37     |  |
| 38     |  |
| 39     |  |
| 40     |  |
| 41     |  |
| 42     |  |
| 43     |  |
| 44     |  |
| 15     |  |
| 45     |  |
| 46     |  |
| 47     |  |
| 48     |  |
| 49     |  |
| 50     |  |
| 51     |  |
| 52     |  |
| 52     |  |
| 55     |  |
| 54     |  |
| 55     |  |
| 56     |  |
| 57     |  |
| 58     |  |
| 59     |  |

| 212 | the differences in axial stiffness and corresponding healing efficiency in                               |
|-----|--|
| 213 | different healing stages. Post-hoc comparisons were then conducted using a                               |
| 214 | Wilcoxon signed-rank test with Bonferroni correction. Furthermore, Spearman's                            |
| 215 | correlation coefficient ( $\rho$ ) was used to calculate any correlations in predicted                   |
| 216 | stiffness and healing efficiency between the time-independent model and the                              |
| 217 | time-dependent model. The strength of the correlations was categorized as                                |
| 218 | poor ( $\rho$ < 0.3), fair (0.3 < $\rho$ < 0.5), moderately strong (0.6 < $\rho$ < 0.8), very strong     |
| 219 | (0.8 < $\rho$ < 1), and perfect ( $\rho$ = 1). <sup>36</sup> All statistical analysis was performed with |
| 220 | SPSS (R26, IBM co. ltd, US) with a significance level of $\alpha$ = 0.01.                                |
| 221 |  |

| 2        |  |
|----------|--|
| 3        |  |
| 4        |  |
| 5        |  |
| 6        |  |
| 7        |  |
| ,<br>0   |  |
| 0        |  |
| 9        |  |
| 10       |  |
| 11       |  |
| 12       |  |
| 13       |  |
| 14       |  |
| 15       |  |
| 16       |  |
| 17       |  |
| 18       |  |
| 19       |  |
| 20       |  |
| 21       |  |
| 22       |  |
| 23       |  |
| 24       |  |
| 25       |  |
| 26       |  |
| 27       |  |
| 28       |  |
| 29       |  |
| 30       |  |
| 31       |  |
| 37       |  |
| J∠<br>22 |  |
| 22<br>24 |  |
| 34<br>25 |  |
| 35       |  |
| 30       |  |
| 37       |  |
| 38       |  |
| 39       |  |
| 40       |  |
| 41       |  |
| 42       |  |
| 43       |  |
| 44       |  |
| 45       |  |
| 46       |  |
| 47       |  |
| 48       |  |
| 49       |  |
| 50       |  |
| 51       |  |
| 52       |  |
| 53       |  |
| 54       |  |
| 55       |  |
| 56       |  |
| 57       |  |
| 58       |  |
| 59       |  |
| 60       |  |
| ~~       |  |

# 222 **3. Result**

The predicted axial stiffness using the time-independent model was compared with previous studies, as shown in Figure 4. Despite the variations in material properties and loading conditions, our estimations were within a reasonable range (between 713.1 N/mm and 836.8 N/mm), indicating that our model was capable of predicting LCP stiffness accurately.

228

(Insert Figure 4)

230

| 231 | In the time-dependent model, Young's modulus of callus increased across four                    |
|-----|---|
|     |   |
| 232 | stages, resulting in a corresponding increase in axial stiffness (Figure 5).                    |
|     |   |
| 233 | Notably, the configuration of C45 exhibited the lowest axial stiffness (Figure                  |
|     |   |
| 234 | 6a). The predicted axial stiffness from the time-dependent model exhibited a                    |
| 00E | significant correlation with that from the time independent model (Figure 6a. a                 |
| 235 | significant correlation with that from the time-independent model (Figure oc, p                 |
| 236 | $\geq 0.733$ $p \leq 0.025$ ) as well as with the healing efficiency (Figure 6d, $o \geq 0.717$ |
| 200 | = 0.100, p = 0.020) do won do with the fielding enclosed (figure out, p = 0.11),                |
| 237 | <i>p</i> ≤ 0.030).  |

238

# 239 (Insert Figure 5 and Figure 6)

240

The highest healing efficiency accompanied by a strain of less than 2%, was observed at 4-8 weeks post-operation (Figure 7). Among the configurations tested, C12345 exhibited the largest area of strain that is less than 2% (Table

| 2   |     |  |
|---|-----|--|
| 3<br>4  | 244 | 3).  |
| 5<br>6<br>7   | 245 |  |
| 8<br>9<br>10  | 246 | (Insert Figure 7, Table 3)   |
| 11<br>12<br>12  | 247 |  |
| 14<br>15  | 248 | The working length had a significant effect on both axial stiffness and healing                    |
| 16<br>17<br>18  | 249 | efficiency ( <i>p</i> -adjust < 0.001). The addition of screws increased both the stiffness        |
| 19<br>20<br>21  | 250 | and healing efficiency, but its effect was not statistically significant ( <i>p</i> -adjust $\geq$ |
| 21<br>22<br>23  | 251 | 0.017 and <i>p</i> -adjust $\geq$ 0.024).  |
| 24<br>25<br>26  | 252 |  |
| 27         28         29         30         31         32         33         34         35         36         37         38         39         40         41         42         43         44         45         46         47         48         90         51         52         53         54         55         56         57         58         90 | 253 | (Insert Figure 8)  |

| 2        |  |
|----------|--|
| 3        |  |
| 4        |  |
| 5        |  |
| 6        |  |
| 7        |  |
| ,<br>o   |  |
| 0        |  |
| 9        |  |
| 10       |  |
| 11       |  |
| 12       |  |
| 13       |  |
| 14       |  |
| 15       |  |
| 16       |  |
| 17       |  |
| 18       |  |
| 19       |  |
| 20       |  |
| 21       |  |
| 22       |  |
| 23       |  |
| 24       |  |
| 25       |  |
| 26       |  |
| 27       |  |
| 22       |  |
| 20       |  |
| 29       |  |
| 50<br>21 |  |
| 31       |  |
| 32       |  |
| 33       |  |
| 34       |  |
| 35       |  |
| 36       |  |
| 37       |  |
| 38       |  |
| 39       |  |
| 40       |  |
| 41       |  |
| 42       |  |
| 43       |  |
| 44       |  |
| 45       |  |
| 46       |  |
| 47       |  |
| 48       |  |
| 40       |  |
| 50       |  |
| 50       |  |
| 51       |  |
| 52<br>52 |  |
| 55<br>۲  |  |
| 54       |  |
| 55       |  |
| 56       |  |
| 57       |  |
| 58       |  |
| 59       |  |
| 60       |  |

| 254 4 | 4. Dis | scussion |
|-------|--------|----------|
|-------|--------|----------|

| 255 | I his study aimed to develop a finite element modelling framework for simulating   |
|-----|--|
| 256 | <mark>callus growth during the fracture healing process</mark> , considering three |
| 257 | configuration parameters: working length, screw number and screw position.         |
| 258 | According to clinical recommendations, <sup>41</sup> the C12345 configuration is   |
| 259 | commonly believed to provide the highest stiffness and stability. However,         |
| 260 | when comparing different configurations over an extended duration, our             |
| 261 | modelling framework revealed that C125 outperformed C12345 in terms of both        |
| 262 | stiffness and healing efficiency during weeks 4-12, despite using fewer screws.    |
| 263 | During the 4-8-week period, C12345 exhibited the largest area of strain that       |
| 264 | was less than 2%, potentially impeding callus growth and resulting in lower        |
| 265 | healing efficiency. This effect persisted until the 8-12-week period, as the       |
| 266 | reduced healing efficiency at the 4-8-weeks contributed to the reduced callus      |
| 267 | modulus at the later stage. This finding suggests that C125 may represent a        |
| 268 | more effective screw configuration for LCP fixation under the given conditions,    |
| 269 | as indicated by the higher mean healing efficiency of 75.3% when compared to       |
| 270 | the mean healing efficiency of 73.7% in C12345 between weeks 4-12.                 |
| 271 |  |
|     |  |

This study provided novel insights into the relationship between stiffness and healing efficiency in the LCP with combi-holes during the healing process. Our time-dependent model revealed a significant, positive correlation between stiffness and healing efficiency in four different healing stages ( $\rho \ge 0.717$ )

> highlighting the importance of achieving an optimal level of stiffness for promoting bone healing. Interestingly, our results showed that most of the screw configurations resulted in a "loose" fixation, as identified by the IFS greater than 10% (Figure 7). However, a moderate increase in fixation stiffness could increase the area of IFS between 2-10%, promoting callus growth and bone healing. This finding is consistent with the available literature, which suggests that increased compressive force can accelerate bone healing.<sup>42,43</sup> Moreover, our study indicates that weight-bearing activities after four weeks of operation could be an effective means of achieving this goal.

Our hypothesis that the screw configuration affects fracture healing was partially supported. We found that only the working length significantly affected healing efficiency (Figure 8, p < 0.001), while the effects of the screw number and position were not significant in the healing process (Figure 8). Our findings are in line with previous studies, which have indicated that using an excessive number of screws may not always result in improved healing efficiency.44-46 While it is challenging to recommend a definite number of screws for LCP usage. it is advisable to anchor in the fragments proximal and distal to the fracture zone.<sup>47</sup> Our findings align with this recommendation, as C15 outperformed the others with the same number of screws in terms of axial stiffness and healing efficiency.

Our time-dependent callus modelling was based on the strain-driven mechanism in which a displacement index IFS was applied to calculate the material property of the callus. This approach differs from some modelling studies that have used a stress-driven mechanism.<sup>48</sup> Stress-driven models can be more susceptible to boundary conditions, and the strain-driven approach employed in this study could avoid contradictory results with previous studies. In the Appendix, the predicted stress pattern at the bone-callus interface was provided for comparison with the IFS strain pattern observed in previous studies.<sup>18</sup>

The study had several limitations that need to be considered when interpreting the results. Firstly, we only modelled one fracture scenario, namely the transverse fracture with a gap size of 2.1 mm. This established a baseline for the investigation of screw configurations. Additionally, only a limited set of screw configurations were modelled; other potential configurations, such as C1245, C2345, and C1235, were not considered. Importantly, it's worth noting that the relative differences between screw configurations are not expected to be influenced by the size of the transverse fracture gap. Secondly, our model only incorporated the central callus and excluded the peripheral and adjacent regions, which avoids geometric nonlinearity and convergence issues. However, this limitation may affect the predicted stiffness due to peripheral tissue differentiation during the healing process. Third, the study did not 

http://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/(site)

account for intra-operative variability, such as soft tissues and patient/surgeon factors, which may confound the theoretical findings. Fourth, our FE model solely accounted for the compressive force along the longitudinal direction of the femur and its increase at different healing stages, indicating improved mobility post-operation. However, it fails to adequately represent the physiological loading conditions as it overlooks thigh muscle contractions and shear from internal hip joint contact forces. These estimations pose computational challenges and are sometimes infeasible. Considering these limitations and modelling assumptions, we acknowledge that our results may not be directly transferable to clinical recommendations for patients. In clinical practice, significant variations exist among different fracture types and circumstances, both between patients and surgeons. However, our study leverages the advantages of numerical simulation to investigate the effects of screw configuration at different healing stages and their resulting influence on later stages, providing insights to enhance overall healing efficiency throughout the entire healing process, specifically for simple transverse fractures under axial loading conditions.

| 337 | 5. | Conc | lusions |
|-----|----|------|---------|
|     |    |      |         |

A novel time-dependent FE model was developed to assess the impact of screw configurations on the LCP fixation stiffness and healing efficiency throughout a complete fracture healing process. Under axial compressive loading conditions, our findings suggest that a decrease in the working length can effectively promote fixation stability and healing efficiency. The positive correlation between healing efficiency and axial stiffness also underscores the importance of using configurations with higher stiffness. However, it is important to note that during the 4-8-week post-surgery, configurations like C12345 may lead to overconstraint in bone motion. Overall, our study suggests that under axial compressive loading conditions, the use of the C125 screw configuration can enhance callus formation during the 4-12-week period for transverse fractures. The findings provide insights into managing fractures using LCPs with combi-holes over an extended duration, with the potential to improve healing efficiency.

| 2<br>3    |  |
|-----------|--|
| 4         |  |
| 5         |  |
| 6         |  |
| 7         |  |
| 0<br>9    |  |
| 10        |  |
| 11        |  |
| 12        |  |
| 13        |  |
| 14        |  |
| 16        |  |
| 17        |  |
| 18        |  |
| 20        |  |
| 21        |  |
| 22        |  |
| 23        |  |
| 24<br>25  |  |
| 26        |  |
| 27        |  |
| 28        |  |
| 29<br>30  |  |
| 31        |  |
| 32        |  |
| 33<br>24  |  |
| 35        |  |
| 36        |  |
| 37        |  |
| 38        |  |
| 39<br>40  |  |
| 41        |  |
| 42        |  |
| 43        |  |
| 44<br>45  |  |
| 46        |  |
| 47        |  |
| 48<br>40  |  |
| 49<br>50  |  |
| 51        |  |
| 52        |  |
| 53<br>F 4 |  |
| 54<br>55  |  |
| 56        |  |
| 57        |  |
| 58        |  |

#### 352 Acknowledgements

- Zeyang Li would like to thank the support of the China Scholarship Council for 353
- sponsoring his PhD project at Cardiff University. 354

355

1

- **Conflict of Interest** 356
- No benefits in any form have been or will be received from a commercial party 357

related directly or indirectly to the subject of this manuscript. 358

| 1<br>2      |     |
|-------------|-----|
| 3<br>4<br>5 | 360 |
| 6           | 361 |
| 7           | 362 |
| 8<br>9      | 363 |
| 10          | 364 |
| 11          | 365 |
| 12          | 366 |
| 13          | 367 |
| 15          | 368 |
| 16          | 369 |
| 17          | 370 |
| 19          | 371 |
| 20          | 372 |
| 21<br>22    | 373 |
| 22          | 374 |
| 24          | 375 |
| 25<br>26    | 376 |
| 26<br>27    | 377 |
| 28          | 378 |
| 29          | 379 |
| 30<br>31    | 380 |
| 32          | 381 |
| 33          | 382 |
| 34<br>35    | 383 |
| 36          | 384 |
| 37          | 385 |
| 38          | 386 |
| 39<br>40    | 387 |
| 41          | 388 |
| 42          | 389 |
| 43<br>44    | 390 |
| 45          | 391 |
| 46          | 392 |
| 47<br>48    | 393 |
| 48<br>49    | 394 |
| 50          | 395 |
| 51<br>52    | 396 |
| 52<br>53    | 397 |
| 54          | 398 |
| 55          | 399 |
| 56<br>57    | 400 |
| 58          | 401 |
| 59          | 402 |
| 60          |     |

360 References

Farouk O, Krettek C, Miclau T, et al. Effects of percutaneous and
 conventional plating techniques on the blood supply to the femur. *Arch Orthop Trauma Surg* 1998; 117: 438-441.

2. Hasenboehler E, Rikli D, and Babst R. Locking Compression Plate with
Minimally Invasive Plate Osteosynthesis in diaphyseal and distal tibial fracture:
A retrospective study of 32 patients. *Injury* 2007; 38: 365-370.

369 3. Duda N, Kirchner H, Wilke J, et al. A method to determine the 3-D stiffness 370 of fracture fixation devices and its application to predict inter-fragmentary 371 movement. *J Biomech* 1997; 31(3): 247-252.

4. MacLeod A, Simpson AH and Pankaj P. Experimental and numerical
investigation into the influence of loading conditions in biomechanical testing of
locking plate fracture fixation devices. *Bone Jt Res* 2018; 7(1): 111-120.

5. JoonHoe T, Natarajan E, Lim W, et al. Effects of bone-plate materials on the healing process of fractured tibia bone under time-varying conditions: a finite element analysis. *Mater Res Express* 2021; 8: 095308.

381 6. Lujan J, Henderson C, Madey S, et al. Locked plating of distal femur
382 fractures leads to inconsistent and asymmetric callus formation. *J Orthop*383 *Trauma* 2010; 24: 156-162.

7. Frank A, Brianza S, Plecko M et al. Variable Fixation Technology Provides
Rigid as Well as Progressive Dynamic Fixation: A Biomechanical Investigation. *J Bone Jt Surg* 2020; 102: e115,.

8. Layher F, Matziolis G, and Kayhan L N. Minimally Invasive Internal Fixation
of Femoral Shaft Fractures—A Biomechanical Study with a Disruptive
Technique. *Life* 2021, 11(11): 1254.

393 9. Hak J, Althausen P and Hazelwood S. Locked Plate Fixation of
 394 Osteoporotic Humeral Shaft Fractures: Are Two Locking Screws Per Segment
 395 Enough? *J Orthop Trauma* 2010; 24: 207-211.

397 10. Augat P, Burger J, Schorlemmer S, et al. Shear movement at the fracture
 398 site delays healing in a diaphyseal fracture model. *J Orthop Res* 2010; 21:
 399 1011-1017.

401 11. Kuhn S, Appelmann P, Pairon P, et al. A new angle stable nailing concept 402 for the treatment of distal tibia fractures. *Int Orthop* 2014; 38: 1255-1260.

| <ul> <li>403</li> <li>403</li> <li>404</li> <li>412. Kenwright J and Gardner T. Mechanical influences on tibial fracture healing.<br/><i>Clin Orthop Relat Res</i> 1998; 355: 179-190.</li> <li>407</li> <li>408</li> <li>409</li> <li>409</li> <li>409</li> <li>409</li> <li>409</li> <li>409</li> <li>409</li> <li>401</li> <li>410</li> <li>411</li> <li>414. Snow M, Thompson G and Turner P. A Mechanical Comparison of the<br/>Locking Compression Plate (LCP) and the Low Contact-Dynamic Compression<br/>Plate (DCP) in an Osteoporotic Bone Model. <i>J Orthop Trauma</i> 2008; 22: 121-<br/>125.</li> <li>416</li> <li>415. Beaino E, Morris R, Lindsey R, et al. Biomechanical Evaluation of Dual Plate<br/>Configurations for Femoral Shaft Fracture Fixation. <i>BioMed Research<br/>International</i> 2019; 5958631.</li> <li>418</li> <li>419</li> <li>420</li> <li>430</li> <li>441</li> <li< th=""></li<></ul>                      |
|---|
| <ol> <li>12. Kenwright J and Gardner T. Mechanical influences on tibial fracture healing.<br/><i>Clin Orthop Relat Res</i> 1998; 355: 179-190.</li> <li>13. Dobele S, Horn C, Eichhorn S, et al. The dynamic locking screw (DLS) can<br/>increase interfragmentary motion on the near cortex of locked plating constructs<br/>by reducing the axial stiffness. <i>Langenbeck's Arch Surg</i> 2010; 395: 421-428.</li> <li>14. Snow M, Thompson G and Turner P. A Mechanical Comparison of the<br/>Locking Compression Plate (LCP) and the Low Contact-Dynamic Compression<br/>Plate (DCP) in an Osteoporotic Bone Model. <i>J Orthop Trauma</i> 2008; 22: 121-<br/>125.</li> <li>15. Beaino E, Morris R, Lindsey R, et al. Biomechanical Evaluation of Dual Plate<br/>Configurations for Femoral Shaft Fracture Fixation. <i>BioMed Research<br/>International</i> 2019; 5958631.</li> <li>16. Mariolani L and Belangero W. Comparing the In Vitro Stiffness of Straight-<br/>DCP, Wave-DCP, and LCP Bone Plates for Femoral Osteosynthesis. <i>Int sch<br/>res notices</i> 2013.</li> <li>17. Gardner N, Stoll T, Marks L, et al. The influence of mechanical stimulus on<br/>the pattern of tissue differentiation in a long bone fracture-an FEM study. <i>J<br/>Biomech</i> 2000; 33: 415-425.</li> <li>18. Kim H, Chang S and Jung H. The finite element analysis of a fractured tibia<br/>applied by composite bone plates considering contact conditions and time-<br/>varying properties of curing tissues. <i>Compos Struct</i> 2010; 92: 2109-2118.</li> <li>19. Mehboob A and Chang S. Effect of composite bone plates on callus<br/>generation and healing of fractured tibia with different screw configurations.<br/><i>Compos Sci Technol</i> 2018; 167: 96-105.</li> </ol>  |
| 405       Clin Orthop Relat Res 1998; 355: 179-190.         406       407       13. Dobele S, Horn C, Eichhorn S, et al. The dynamic locking screw (DLS) can         408       increase interfragmentary motion on the near cortex of locked plating constructs         409       by reducing the axial stiffness. Langenbeck's Arch Surg 2010; 395: 421-428.         411       14. Snow M, Thompson G and Turner P. A Mechanical Comparison of the         412       Locking Compression Plate (LCP) and the Low Contact-Dynamic Compression         413       Plate (DCP) in an Osteoporotic Bone Model. J Orthop Trauma 2008; 22: 121-         414       125.         415       15. Beaino E, Morris R, Lindsey R, et al. Biomechanical Evaluation of Dual Plate         416       Configurations for Femoral Shaft Fracture Fixation. BioMed Research         418       International 2019; 5958631.         419       16. Mariolani L and Belangero W. Comparing the In Vitro Stiffness of Straight-         421       DCP, Wave-DCP, and LCP Bone Plates for Femoral Osteosynthesis. Int sch         422       res notices 2013.         43       17. Gardner N, Stoll T, Marks L, et al. The influence of mechanical stimulus on         422       the pattern of tissue differentiation in a long bone fracturean FEM study. J         423       Biomech 2000; 33: 415-425.         424       17. Gardner N, Stoll T, Marks L, et al. The influe  |
| 406         9       13. Dobele S, Horn C, Eichhorn S, et al. The dynamic locking screw (DLS) can         10       408         11       13. Dobele S, Horn C, Eichhorn S, et al. The dynamic locking screw (DLS) can         11       14. Snow M, Thompson G and Turner P. A Mechanical Comparison of the         12       14. Snow M, Thompson G and Turner P. A Mechanical Comparison of the         13. Dobele S, Horn C, Eichhorn S, et al. The dynamic locking screw (DLS) can         14       11. Snow M, Thompson G and Turner P. A Mechanical Comparison of the         14       Locking Compression Plate (LCP) and the Low Contact-Dynamic Compression         14       12. Snow M, Thompson G and Turner P. A Mechanical Comparison of the         14       Locking Compression Plate (LCP) and the Low Contact-Dynamic Compression         14       14. Snow M, Thompson G and Turner P. A Mechanical Comparison of the         15. Beaino E, Morris R, Lindsey R, et al. Biomechanical Evaluation of Dual Plate         16. Mariolani L and Belangero W. Comparing the In Vitro Stiffness of Straight-         17       DCP, Wave-DCP, and LCP Bone Plates for Femoral Osteosynthesis. Int sch         18       res notices 2013.         19       Ho anter of tissue differentiation in a long bone fracturean FEM study. J         19       Biomech 2000; 33: 415-425.         19       Nehboob A and Chang S. Effect of composite bone plates on c  |
| <ul> <li>407</li> <li>13. Dobele S, Horn C, Eichhorn S, et al. The dynamic locking screw (DLS) can<br/>increase interfragmentary motion on the near cortex of locked plating constructs<br/>by reducing the axial stiffness. <i>Langenbeck's Arch Surg</i> 2010; 395: 421-428.</li> <li>410</li> <li>14. Snow M, Thompson G and Turner P. A Mechanical Comparison of the<br/>Locking Compression Plate (LCP) and the Low Contact-Dynamic Compression<br/>Plate (DCP) in an Osteoporotic Bone Model. <i>J Orthop Trauma</i> 2008; 22: 121-<br/>125.</li> <li>415</li> <li>15. Beaino E, Morris R, Lindsey R, et al. Biomechanical Evaluation of Dual Plate<br/>Configurations for Femoral Shaft Fracture Fixation. <i>BioMed Research<br/>International</i> 2019; 5958631.</li> <li>16. Mariolani L and Belangero W. Comparing the In Vitro Stiffness of Straight-<br/>DCP, Wave-DCP, and LCP Bone Plates for Femoral Osteosynthesis. <i>Int sch<br/>res notices</i> 2013.</li> <li>17. Gardner N, Stoll T, Marks L, et al. The influence of mechanical stimulus on<br/>the pattern of tissue differentiation in a long bone fracturean FEM study. <i>J<br/>Biomech</i> 2000; 33: 415-425.</li> <li>18. Kim H, Chang S and Jung H. The finite element analysis of a fractured tibia<br/>applied by composite bone plates considering contact conditions and time-<br/>varying properties of curing tissues. <i>Compos Struct</i> 2010; 92: 2109-2118.</li> <li>19. Mehboob A and Chang S. Effect of composite bone plates on callus<br/>generation and healing of fractured tibia with different screw configurations.<br/><i>Compos Sci Technol</i> 2018; 167: 96-105.</li> <li>20. Eraslan O and Inan Ö. The effect of thread design on stress distribution in<br/>a confid acrew implement an 2D fiele for thread design on stress distribution in<br/>a confid acrem implement and path and benerat analysis of a 1<br/>a public do and Long D. The effect of thread design on stress distribution in<br/>a complexent and healing of fractured tibia with different screw configurations.</li> </ul>  |
| <ul> <li>increase interfragmentary motion on the near cortex of locked plating constructs<br/>by reducing the axial stiffness. <i>Langenbeck's Arch Surg</i> 2010; 395: 421-428.</li> <li>11 14. Snow M, Thompson G and Turner P. A Mechanical Comparison of the<br/>Locking Compression Plate (LCP) and the Low Contact-Dynamic Compression<br/>Plate (DCP) in an Osteoporotic Bone Model. <i>J Orthop Trauma</i> 2008; 22: 121-<br/>125.</li> <li>15. Beaino E, Morris R, Lindsey R, et al. Biomechanical Evaluation of Dual Plate<br/>Configurations for Femoral Shaft Fracture Fixation. <i>BioMed Research<br/>International</i> 2019; 5958631.</li> <li>16. Mariolani L and Belangero W. Comparing the In Vitro Stiffness of Straight-<br/>DCP, Wave-DCP, and LCP Bone Plates for Femoral Osteosynthesis. <i>Int sch<br/>res notices</i> 2013.</li> <li>17. Gardner N, Stoll T, Marks L, et al, The influence of mechanical stimulus on<br/>the pattern of tissue differentiation in a long bone fracturean FEM study. <i>J<br/>Biomech</i> 2000; 33: 415-425.</li> <li>18. Kim H, Chang S and Jung H. The finite element analysis of a fractured tibia<br/>applied by composite bone plates considering contact conditions and time-<br/>varying properties of curing tissues. <i>Compos Struct</i> 2010; 92: 2109-2118.</li> <li>19. Mehboob A and Chang S. Effect of composite bone plates on callus<br/>generation and healing of fractured tibia with different screw configurations.<br/><i>Compos Sci Technol</i> 2018; 167: 96-105.</li> <li>20. Eraslan O and Inan Ö. The effect of thread design on stress distribution in<br/>a confid acrow implante a 20 Fielie alement analysis of a stress distribution in</li> </ul>  |
| 11409by reducing the axial stiffness. Langenbeck's Arch Surg 2010; 395: 421-428.124101411114. Snow M, Thompson G and Turner P. A Mechanical Comparison of the12Locking Compression Plate (LCP) and the Low Contact-Dynamic Compression13Plate (DCP) in an Osteoporotic Bone Model. J Orthop Trauma 2008; 22: 121-14125.15Beaino E, Morris R, Lindsey R, et al. Biomechanical Evaluation of Dual Plate1615. Beaino E, Morris R, Lindsey R, et al. Biomechanical Evaluation of Dual Plate1716. Mariolani L and Belangero W. Comparing the In Vitro Stiffness of Straight-18International 2019; 5958631.1916. Mariolani L and Belangero W. Comparing the In Vitro Stiffness of Straight-11DCP, Wave-DCP, and LCP Bone Plates for Femoral Osteosynthesis. Int sch12res notices 2013.1342417. Gardner N, Stoll T, Marks L, et al. The influence of mechanical stimulus on14the pattern of tissue differentiation in a long bone fracturean FEM study. J13Biomech 2000; 33: 415-425.14191419. Mehboob A and Chang S. Effect of composite bone plates on callus13generation and healing of fractured tibia with different screw configurations.1419. Mehboob A and Chang S. Effect of thread design on stress distribution in19Nehboob A and Chang S. Effect of thread design on stress distribution in19Nehboob A and Chang S. Effect of thread design on stress distribution in19Nehboob A and Chang N. The effect of thread design on st  |
| <ul> <li>410</li> <li>411</li> <li>14. Snow M, Thompson G and Turner P. A Mechanical Comparison of the<br/>Locking Compression Plate (LCP) and the Low Contact-Dynamic Compression<br/>Plate (DCP) in an Osteoporotic Bone Model. <i>J Orthop Trauma</i> 2008; 22: 121-<br/>125.</li> <li>416</li> <li>15. Beaino E, Morris R, Lindsey R, et al. Biomechanical Evaluation of Dual Plate<br/>Configurations for Femoral Shaft Fracture Fixation. <i>BioMed Research</i><br/><i>International</i> 2019; 5958631.</li> <li>418</li> <li>420</li> <li>16. Mariolani L and Belangero W. Comparing the In Vitro Stiffness of Straight-<br/>DCP, Wave-DCP, and LCP Bone Plates for Femoral Osteosynthesis. <i>Int sch</i><br/><i>res notices</i> 2013.</li> <li>423</li> <li>424</li> <li>17. Gardner N, Stoll T, Marks L, et al. The influence of mechanical stimulus on<br/>the pattern of tissue differentiation in a long bone fracturean FEM study. <i>J</i><br/><i>Biomech</i> 2000; 33: 415-425.</li> <li>426</li> <li>427</li> <li>428</li> <li>428</li> <li>429</li> <li>429</li> <li>430</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>432</li> <li>431</li> <li>432</li> <li>433</li> <li>434</li> <li>434</li> <li>434</li> <li>435</li> <li>436</li> <li>436</li> <li>436</li> <li>436</li> <li>436</li> <li>437</li> <li>438</li> <li>438</li> <li>439</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>432</li> <li>433</li> <li>434</li> <li>434</li> <li>434</li> <li>435</li> <li>435</li> <li>436</li> <li>436</li> <li>437</li> <li>437</li> <li>438</li> <li>438</li> <li>438</li> <li>439</li> <li>439</li> <li>430</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>432</li> <li>433</li> <li>434</li> <li>434</li> <li>435</li> <li>435</li> <li>436</li> <li>436</li> <li>437</li> <li>438</li> <li>438</li> <li>438</li> <li>439</li> <li>439</li> <li>430</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>432</li> <li>433</li> <li>434</li> <li>434</li> <li>435</li> <li>435</li> <li>436</li> <li>436</li> <li>437</li> <li>438</li> <li>438</li> <li>438</li> <li>439</li> <li>439</li> <li>430</li> <li>430</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>4</li></ul> |
| 1414. Snow M, Thompson G and Turner P. A Mechanical Comparison of the15Locking Compression Plate (LCP) and the Low Contact-Dynamic Compression16113Plate (DCP) in an Osteoporotic Bone Model. J Orthop Trauma 2008; 22: 121-17141125.1815. Beaino E, Morris R, Lindsey R, et al. Biomechanical Evaluation of Dual Plate191615. Beaino E, Morris R, Lindsey R, et al. Biomechanical Evaluation of Dual Plate1016. Mariolani S for Femoral Shaft Fracture Fixation. BioMed Research18International 2019; 5958631.1916. Mariolani L and Belangero W. Comparing the In Vitro Stiffness of Straight-10DCP, Wave-DCP, and LCP Bone Plates for Femoral Osteosynthesis. Int sch19res notices 2013.1017. Gardner N, Stoll T, Marks L, et al. The influence of mechanical stimulus on1118. Kim H, Chang S and Jung H. The finite element analysis of a fractured tibia17applied by composite bone plates considering contact conditions and time-18Kim H, Chang S and Jung H. The finite element analysis of a fractured tibia19applied by composite bone plates considering contact conditions and time-10varying properties of curing tissues. Compos Struct 2010; 92: 2109-2118.1119. Mehboob A and Chang S. Effect of composite bone plates on callus13generation and healing of fractured tibia with different screw configurations.1414210. Eraslan O and Inan Ö. The effect of thread design on stress distribution in1414220. Eraslan O and Inan Ö. The effect of thread design on stress dist  |
| 15412Locking Compression Plate (LCP) and the Low Contact-Dynamic Compression16413Plate (DCP) in an Osteoporotic Bone Model. J Orthop Trauma 2008; 22: 121-17141125.1841615. Beaino E, Morris R, Lindsey R, et al. Biomechanical Evaluation of Dual Plate1941615. Beaino E, Morris R, Lindsey R, et al. Biomechanical Evaluation of Dual Plate2041615. Beaino E, Morris R, Lindsey R, et al. Biomechanical Evaluation of Dual Plate21417Configurations for Femoral Shaft Fracture Fixation. BioMed Research22418International 2019; 5958631.2441916. Mariolani L and Belangero W. Comparing the In Vitro Stiffness of Straight-2542016. Mariolani L and Belangero W. Comparing the In Vitro Stiffness of Straight-26272878272817. Gardner N, Stoll T, Marks L, et al. The influence of mechanical stimulus on28422782942317. Gardner N, Stoll T, Marks L, et al. The influence of mechanical stimulus on2042417. Gardner N, Stoll T, Marks L, et al. The influence of mechanical stimulus on2942542630426Biomech 2000; 33: 415-425.3142718. Kim H, Chang S and Jung H. The finite element analysis of a fractured tibia3742818. Kim H, Chang S and Jung H. The finite element analysis of a fractured tibia3742919. Mehboob A and Chang S. Effect of composite bone plates on callus3843043143119. Mehboo  |
| 16413Plate (DCP) in an Osteoporotic Bone Model. J Orthop Trauma 2008; 22: 121-17141125.1841615. Beaino E, Morris R, Lindsey R, et al. Biomechanical Evaluation of Dual Plate171615. Beaino E, Morris R, Lindsey R, et al. Biomechanical Evaluation of Dual Plate1817Configurations for Femoral Shaft Fracture Fixation. BioMed Research18International 2019; 5958631.1916. Mariolani L and Belangero W. Comparing the In Vitro Stiffness of Straight-10DCP, Wave-DCP, and LCP Bone Plates for Femoral Osteosynthesis. Int sch10res notices 2013.1117. Gardner N, Stoll T, Marks L, et al. The influence of mechanical stimulus on12the pattern of tissue differentiation in a long bone fracturean FEM study. J13Biomech 2000; 33: 415-425.1418. Kim H, Chang S and Jung H. The finite element analysis of a fractured tibia17applied by composite bone plates considering contact conditions and time-18Varying properties of curing tissues. Compos Struct 2010; 92: 2109-2118.19Mehboob A and Chang S. Effect of composite bone plates on callus19Mehboob A and Chang S. Effect of composite bone plates on callus1920Eraslan O and Inan Ö. The effect of thread design on stress distribution in1920Eraslan O and Inan Ö. The effect of thread design on stress distribution in1920Eraslan O and Inan Ö. The effect of thread design on stress distribution in1920Eraslan O and Inan Ö. The effect of thread design on stress distribution in   |
| 11414125.1241615. Beaino E, Morris R, Lindsey R, et al. Biomechanical Evaluation of Dual Plate131415. Beaino E, Morris R, Lindsey R, et al. Biomechanical Evaluation of Dual Plate1417. Configurations for Femoral Shaft Fracture Fixation. <i>BioMed Research</i> 18 <i>International</i> 2019; 5958631.1916. Mariolani L and Belangero W. Comparing the In Vitro Stiffness of Straight-10DCP, Wave-DCP, and LCP Bone Plates for Femoral Osteosynthesis. <i>Int sch</i> 12 <i>res notices</i> 2013.134241417. Gardner N, Stoll T, Marks L, et al. The influence of mechanical stimulus on14the pattern of tissue differentiation in a long bone fracturean FEM study. J13 <i>Biomech</i> 2000; 33: 415-425.1418. Kim H, Chang S and Jung H. The finite element analysis of a fractured tibia19Mehboob A and Chang S. Effect of composite bone plates on callus19Mehboob A and Chang S. Effect of composite bone plates on callus1119. Mehboob A and Chang S. Effect of thread design on stress distributions.13 <i>Compos Sci Technol</i> 2018; 167: 96-105.1410. Eraslan O and Inan Ö. The effect of thread design on stress distribution in1419. Certal and and Inan Ö. The effect of thread design on stress distribution in1516171617171918191910191019101910191019101910<   |
| <ul> <li>415</li> <li>416</li> <li>15. Beaino E, Morris R, Lindsey R, et al. Biomechanical Evaluation of Dual Plate<br/>Configurations for Femoral Shaft Fracture Fixation. <i>BioMed Research</i><br/><i>International</i> 2019; 5958631.</li> <li>419</li> <li>420</li> <li>16. Mariolani L and Belangero W. Comparing the In Vitro Stiffness of Straight-<br/>DCP, Wave-DCP, and LCP Bone Plates for Femoral Osteosynthesis. <i>Int sch</i><br/><i>res notices</i> 2013.</li> <li>423</li> <li>424</li> <li>17. Gardner N, Stoll T, Marks L, et al. The influence of mechanical stimulus on<br/>the pattern of tissue differentiation in a long bone fracturean FEM study. <i>J</i><br/><i>Biomech</i> 2000; 33: 415-425.</li> <li>425</li> <li>426</li> <li>427</li> <li>428</li> <li>428</li> <li>429</li> <li>429</li> <li>420</li> <li>420</li> <li>420</li> <li>421</li> <li>421</li> <li>422</li> <li>423</li> <li>423</li> <li>424</li> <li>425</li> <li>425</li> <li>426</li> <li>427</li> <li>428</li> <li>429</li> <li>429</li> <li>420</li> <li>420</li> <li>420</li> <li>420</li> <li>420</li> <li>421</li> <li>421</li> <li>422</li> <li>422</li> <li>423</li> <li>423</li> <li>424</li> <li>431</li> <li>432</li> <li>434</li> <li>434</li> <li>434</li> <li>435</li> <li>436</li> <li>436</li> <li>436</li> <li>436</li> <li>437</li> <li>438</li> <li>438</li> <li>439</li> <li>439</li> <li>430</li> <li>430</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>432</li> <li>434</li> <li>435</li> <li>435</li> <li>436</li> <li>436</li> <li>436</li> <li>437</li> <li>438</li> <li>438</li> <li>439</li> <li>439</li> <li>430</li> <li>430</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>432</li> <li>433</li> <li>434</li> <li>434</li> <li>434</li> <li>435</li> <li>436</li> <li>436</li> <li>436</li> <li>437</li> <li>438</li> <li>438</li> <li>438</li> <li>439</li> <li>439</li> <li>430</li> <li>430</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>432</li> <li>431</li> <li>432</li> <li>433</li> <li>434</li> <li>434</li> <li>434</li> <li>435</li> <li>436</li> <li>436</li> <li>436</li> <li>437</li> <li>438</li> <li>438</li> &lt;</ul>                    |
| <ul> <li>15. Beaino E, Morris R, Lindsey R, et al. Biomechanical Evaluation of Dual Plate<br/>Configurations for Femoral Shaft Fracture Fixation. <i>BioMed Research</i><br/><i>International</i> 2019; 5958631.</li> <li>16. Mariolani L and Belangero W. Comparing the In Vitro Stiffness of Straight-<br/>DCP, Wave-DCP, and LCP Bone Plates for Femoral Osteosynthesis. <i>Int sch</i><br/><i>res notices</i> 2013.</li> <li>17. Gardner N, Stoll T, Marks L, et al. The influence of mechanical stimulus on<br/>the pattern of tissue differentiation in a long bone fracturean FEM study. <i>J</i><br/><i>Biomech</i> 2000; 33: 415-425.</li> <li>18. Kim H, Chang S and Jung H. The finite element analysis of a fractured tibia<br/>applied by composite bone plates considering contact conditions and time-<br/>varying properties of curing tissues. <i>Compos Struct</i> 2010; 92: 2109-2118.</li> <li>19. Mehboob A and Chang S. Effect of composite bone plates on callus<br/>generation and healing of fractured tibia with different screw configurations.<br/><i>Compos Sci Technol</i> 2018; 167: 96-105.</li> <li>20. Eraslan O and Inan Ö. The effect of thread design on stress distribution in</li> <li>and in a context of thread design on stress distribution in</li> <li>and in a context of thread design on stress distribution in</li> <li>and in a Composite on the alphanet analysis of 200 for the strest of thread design on stress distribution in</li> </ul>   |
| <ul> <li>417 Configurations for Femoral Shaft Fracture Fixation. <i>BioMed Research</i></li> <li>418 <i>International</i> 2019; 5958631.</li> <li>419</li> <li>420 16. Mariolani L and Belangero W. Comparing the In Vitro Stiffness of Straight-</li> <li>421 DCP, Wave-DCP, and LCP Bone Plates for Femoral Osteosynthesis. <i>Int sch</i></li> <li>422 <i>res notices</i> 2013.</li> <li>423</li> <li>424 17. Gardner N, Stoll T, Marks L, et al. The influence of mechanical stimulus on</li> <li>425 the pattern of tissue differentiation in a long bone fracturean FEM study. <i>J</i></li> <li>426 <i>Biomech</i> 2000; 33: 415-425.</li> <li>427</li> <li>428 18. Kim H, Chang S and Jung H. The finite element analysis of a fractured tibia</li> <li>429 applied by composite bone plates considering contact conditions and time-</li> <li>431 varying properties of curing tissues. <i>Compos Struct</i> 2010; 92: 2109-2118.</li> <li>431</li> <li>432 19. Mehboob A and Chang S. Effect of composite bone plates on callus</li> <li>433 generation and healing of fractured tibia with different screw configurations.</li> <li>434 <i>Compos Sci Technol</i> 2018; 167: 96-105.</li> <li>435 20. Eraslan O and Inan Ö. The effect of thread design on stress distribution in</li> <li>436 20. Eraslan O and Inan Ö. The effect of thread design on stress distribution in</li> </ul>  |
| <ul> <li>417 Commandations for Femoral ontait Fracture Fr</li></ul>  |
| <ul> <li>418 International 2019, 5930031.</li> <li>419</li> <li>419</li> <li>420</li> <li>16. Mariolani L and Belangero W. Comparing the In Vitro Stiffness of Straight-<br/>DCP, Wave-DCP, and LCP Bone Plates for Femoral Osteosynthesis. Int sch<br/>res notices 2013.</li> <li>423</li> <li>424</li> <li>17. Gardner N, Stoll T, Marks L, et al. The influence of mechanical stimulus on<br/>the pattern of tissue differentiation in a long bone fracturean FEM study. J<br/>Biomech 2000; 33: 415-425.</li> <li>426</li> <li>428</li> <li>428</li> <li>428</li> <li>429</li> <li>429</li> <li>420</li> <li>420</li> <li>420</li> <li>420</li> <li>420</li> <li>421</li> <li>422</li> <li>422</li> <li>423</li> <li>424</li> <li>425</li> <li>426</li> <li>427</li> <li>428</li> <li>428</li> <li>429</li> <li>429</li> <li>420</li> <li>420</li> <li>420</li> <li>429</li> <li>420</li> <li>420</li> <li>420</li> <li>420</li> <li>420</li> <li>421</li> <li>422</li> <li>422</li> <li>432</li> <li>433</li> <li>434</li> <li>434</li> <li>435</li> <li>436</li> <li>436</li> <li>436</li> <li>436</li> <li>437</li> <li>438</li> <li>438</li> <li>439</li> <li>439</li> <li>430</li> <li>430</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>432</li> <li>433</li> <li>434</li> <li>435</li> <li>435</li> <li>436</li> <li>436</li> <li>437</li> <li>438</li> <li>438</li> <li>439</li> <li>439</li> <li>430</li> <li>430</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>432</li> <li>433</li> <li>434</li> <li>435</li> <li>435</li> <li>436</li> <li>436</li> <li>437</li> <li>438</li> <li>438</li> <li>439</li> <li>439</li> <li>439</li> <li>430</li> <li>430</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>432</li> <li>433</li> <li>434</li> <li>435</li> <li>435</li> <li>435</li> <li>436</li> <li>436</li> <li>437</li> <li>438</li> <li>438</li> <li>439</li> <li>439</li> <li>439</li> <li>430</li> <li>430</li> <li>430</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>432</li> <li>433</li> <li>434</li> <li>435</li> <li>435</li> <li>435</li> <li>436</li> <li>436</li> <li>437</li> <li>437</li> <li>438</li> <l< td=""></l<></ul>  |
| <ul> <li>419</li> <li>420</li> <li>16. Mariolani L and Belangero W. Comparing the In Vitro Stiffness of Straight-</li> <li>421</li> <li>DCP, Wave-DCP, and LCP Bone Plates for Femoral Osteosynthesis. <i>Int sch</i></li> <li>422</li> <li>423</li> <li>424</li> <li>425</li> <li>425</li> <li>426</li> <li>427</li> <li>426</li> <li>427</li> <li>427</li> <li>428</li> <li>428</li> <li>428</li> <li>429</li> <li>429</li> <li>4200; 33: 415-425.</li> <li>427</li> <li>428</li> <li>429</li> <li>4200; 33: 415-425.</li> <li>421</li> <li>420</li> <li>428</li> <li>429</li> <li>4200; 33: 415-425.</li> <li>420</li> <li>428</li> <li>429</li> <li>4200; 33: 415-425.</li> <li>427</li> <li>428</li> <li>429</li> <li>420</li> <li>420</li> <li>420</li> <li>420</li> <li>421</li> <li>420</li> <li>421</li> <li>421</li> <li>421</li> <li>422</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>432</li> <li>433</li> <li>434</li> <li>434</li> <li>435</li> <li>435</li> <li>436</li> <li>436</li> <li>436</li> <li>436</li> <li>436</li> <li>437</li> <li>436</li> <li>436</li> <li>436</li> <li>437</li> <li>437</li> <li>438</li> <li>438</li> <li>439</li> <li>439</li> <li>430</li> <li>430</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>432</li> <li>433</li> <li>434</li> <li>435</li> <li>436</li> <li>436</li> <li>436</li> <li>436</li> <li>437</li> <li>436</li> <li>438</li> <li>436</li> <li>436</li> <li>437</li> <li>437</li> <li>438</li> <li>438</li> <li>439</li> <li>439</li> <li>430</li> <li>430</li> <li>430</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>432</li> <li>433</li> <li>434</li> <li>434</li> <li>435</li> <li>435</li> <li>436</li> <li>436</li> <li>437</li> <li>437</li> <li>438</li> <li>438</li> <li>439</li> <li>439</li> <li>430</li> <li>430</li> <li>430</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li></ul>   |
| <ul> <li>420 16. Mariolani L and Belangero W. Comparing the In Vitro Stiffness of Straight-</li> <li>421 DCP, Wave-DCP, and LCP Bone Plates for Femoral Osteosynthesis. <i>Int sch</i></li> <li>422 <i>res notices</i> 2013.</li> <li>423</li> <li>424 17. Gardner N, Stoll T, Marks L, et al. The influence of mechanical stimulus on</li> <li>425 the pattern of tissue differentiation in a long bone fracturean FEM study. <i>J</i></li> <li>426 <i>Biomech</i> 2000; 33: 415-425.</li> <li>427</li> <li>428 18. Kim H, Chang S and Jung H. The finite element analysis of a fractured tibia</li> <li>429 applied by composite bone plates considering contact conditions and time-</li> <li>430 varying properties of curing tissues. <i>Compos Struct</i> 2010; 92: 2109-2118.</li> <li>431</li> <li>432 19. Mehboob A and Chang S. Effect of composite bone plates on callus</li> <li>433 generation and healing of fractured tibia with different screw configurations.</li> <li>434 <i>Compos Sci Technol</i> 2018; 167: 96-105.</li> <li>435</li> <li>436 20. Eraslan O and Inan Ö. The effect of thread design on stress distribution in</li> <li>437 a colid corrowimplanti a 2D finite element analysis O's O's O's O's O's O's O's O's O's O'</li></ul>   |
| <ul> <li>DCP, Wave-DCP, and LCP Bone Plates for Femoral Osteosynthesis. <i>Int sch</i></li> <li><i>res notices</i> 2013.</li> <li>17. Gardner N, Stoll T, Marks L, et al. The influence of mechanical stimulus on</li> <li>the pattern of tissue differentiation in a long bone fracturean FEM study. <i>J</i></li> <li><i>Biomech</i> 2000; 33: 415-425.</li> <li>18. Kim H, Chang S and Jung H. The finite element analysis of a fractured tibia</li> <li>applied by composite bone plates considering contact conditions and time-</li> <li>varying properties of curing tissues. <i>Compos Struct</i> 2010; 92: 2109-2118.</li> <li>19. Mehboob A and Chang S. Effect of composite bone plates on callus</li> <li>generation and healing of fractured tibia with different screw configurations.</li> <li><i>Compos Sci Technol</i> 2018; 167: 96-105.</li> <li>20. Eraslan O and Inan Ö. The effect of thread design on stress distribution in</li> <li>applied argum implant a 2D finite element analysis Of a first light of the stress distribution in</li> </ul>   |
| <ul> <li>422 res notices 2013.</li> <li>423</li> <li>424 17. Gardner N, Stoll T, Marks L, et al. The influence of mechanical stimulus on</li> <li>425 the pattern of tissue differentiation in a long bone fracturean FEM study. J</li> <li>426 Biomech 2000; 33: 415-425.</li> <li>427</li> <li>428 18. Kim H, Chang S and Jung H. The finite element analysis of a fractured tibia</li> <li>429 applied by composite bone plates considering contact conditions and time-</li> <li>430 varying properties of curing tissues. Compos Struct 2010; 92: 2109-2118.</li> <li>431</li> <li>432 19. Mehboob A and Chang S. Effect of composite bone plates on callus</li> <li>433 generation and healing of fractured tibia with different screw configurations.</li> <li>434 Compos Sci Technol 2018; 167: 96-105.</li> <li>435</li> <li>436 20. Eraslan O and Inan Ö. The effect of thread design on stress distribution in</li> <li>437 applied by composite a 2D finite element analysis O and line of the plates of</li></ul>  |
| <ul> <li>423</li> <li>424</li> <li>424</li> <li>424</li> <li>425</li> <li>426</li> <li>426</li> <li>427</li> <li>427</li> <li>428</li> <li>428</li> <li>428</li> <li>428</li> <li>428</li> <li>428</li> <li>429</li> <li>429</li> <li>429</li> <li>429</li> <li>429</li> <li>429</li> <li>429</li> <li>420</li> <li>420</li> <li>420</li> <li>420</li> <li>420</li> <li>421</li> <li>421</li> <li>422</li> <li>422</li> <li>423</li> <li>424</li> <li>431</li> <li>432</li> <li>431</li> <li>432</li> <li>431</li> <li>432</li> <li>433</li> <li>434</li> <li>434</li> <li>435</li> <li>435</li> <li>436</li> <li>436</li> <li>436</li> <li>437</li> <li>437</li> <li>438</li> <li>438</li> <li>439</li> <li>439</li> <li>430</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>432</li> <li>434</li> <li>435</li> <li>435</li> <li>435</li> <li>436</li> <li>436</li> <li>437</li> <li>437</li> <li>438</li> <li>438</li> <li>439</li> <li>439</li> <li>430</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>432</li> <li>433</li> <li>434</li> <li>434</li> <li>435</li> <li>435</li> <li>436</li> <li>436</li> <li>436</li> <li>437</li> <li>438</li> <li>439</li> <li>439</li> <li>439</li> <li>430</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>432</li> <li>433</li> <li>434</li> <li>435</li> <li>435</li> <li>435</li> <li>436</li> <li>436</li> <li>437</li> <li>437</li> <li>438</li> <li>439</li> <li>439</li> <li>430</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>432</li> <li>433</li> <li>434</li> <li>435</li> <li>435</li> <li>435</li> <li>435</li> <li>436</li> <li>436</li> <li>437</li> <li>437</li> <li>438</li> <li>439</li> <li>439</li> <li>439</li> <li>430</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>432</li> <li>433</li> <li>434</li> <li>435</li> <li>435</li> <li>435</li> <li>435</li> <li>436</li> <li>436</li> <li>437</li> <li>437</li> <li>438</li> <li>439</li> <li>439</li> <li>439</li> <li>440</li> <li>441</li> <li>441</li> <li>441</li> <li>442</li> <li>441</li></ul>  |
| <ul> <li>424 17. Gardner N, Stoll T, Marks L, et al. The influence of mechanical stimulus on</li> <li>425 the pattern of tissue differentiation in a long bone fracturean FEM study. J</li> <li>426 Biomech 2000; 33: 415-425.</li> <li>427</li> <li>428 18. Kim H, Chang S and Jung H. The finite element analysis of a fractured tibia</li> <li>429 applied by composite bone plates considering contact conditions and time-</li> <li>430 varying properties of curing tissues. Compos Struct 2010; 92: 2109-2118.</li> <li>431</li> <li>432 19. Mehboob A and Chang S. Effect of composite bone plates on callus</li> <li>433 generation and healing of fractured tibia with different screw configurations.</li> <li>434 Compos Sci Technol 2018; 167: 96-105.</li> <li>435</li> <li>436 20. Eraslan O and Inan Ö. The effect of thread design on stress distribution in</li> <li>436 areaw implant a 2D finite element analysis O'an law effect of thread design on stress distribution in</li> </ul>   |
| <ul> <li>the pattern of tissue differentiation in a long bone fracturean FEM study. J</li> <li><i>Biomech</i> 2000; 33: 415-425.</li> <li>18. Kim H, Chang S and Jung H. The finite element analysis of a fractured tibia</li> <li>applied by composite bone plates considering contact conditions and time-</li> <li>varying properties of curing tissues. <i>Compos Struct</i> 2010; 92: 2109-2118.</li> <li>19. Mehboob A and Chang S. Effect of composite bone plates on callus</li> <li>generation and healing of fractured tibia with different screw configurations.</li> <li><i>Compos Sci Technol</i> 2018; 167: 96-105.</li> <li>20. Eraslan O and Inan Ö. The effect of thread design on stress distribution in</li> <li>a calid corrow implant a 2D figite element analysis O(in Oral lowertin 2010) 41.</li> </ul>   |
| <ul> <li>Biomech 2000; 33: 415-425.</li> <li>427</li> <li>428</li> <li>428</li> <li>428</li> <li>428</li> <li>429</li> <li>429</li> <li>429</li> <li>429</li> <li>420</li> <li>429</li> <li>420</li> <li>430</li> <li>430</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>432</li> <li>431</li> <li>433</li> <li>434</li> <li>435</li> <li>435</li> <li>436</li> <li>436</li> <li>436</li> <li>436</li> <li>437</li> <li>437</li> <li>438</li> <li>438</li> <li>439</li> <li>439</li> <li>439</li> <li>430</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>432</li> <li>433</li> <li>434</li> <li>434</li> <li>435</li> <li>435</li> <li>436</li> <li>436</li> <li>436</li> <li>436</li> <li>436</li> <li>437</li> <li>437</li> <li>438</li> <li>438</li> <li>439</li> <li>439</li> <li>430</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>434</li> <li>435</li> <li>435</li> <li>435</li> <li>436</li> <li>436</li> <li>436</li> <li>437</li> <li>437</li> <li>438</li> <li>439</li> <li>439</li> <li>439</li> <li>430</li> <li>431</li> <li>434</li> <li>435</li> <li>435</li> <li>435</li> <li>436</li> <li>436</li> <li>436</li> <li>437</li> <li>437</li> <li>438</li> <li>439</li> <li>439</li> <li>439</li> <li>430</li> <li>430</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>432</li> <li>433</li> <li>434</li> <li>434</li> <li>435</li> <li>435</li> <li>435</li> <li>436</li> <li>436</li> <li>437</li> <li>437</li> <li>438</li> <li>438</li> <li>439</li> <li>439</li> <li>439</li> <li>430</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>432</li> <li>433</li> <li>434</li> <li>435</li> <li>435</li> <li>435</li> <li>435</li> <li>436</li> <li>436</li> <li>437</li> <li>437</li> <li>438</li> <li>438</li> <li>439</li> <li>439</li> <li>439</li> <li>430</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>432</li> <li>431</li> <li>434</li> <li>435</li> <li>435</li> <li>435</li> <li>435</li> <li>435</li> <li>436</li> <li>436</li> <li>437</li> <li>438</li> <li< td=""></li<></ul>   |
| <ul> <li>427</li> <li>428</li> <li>428</li> <li>428</li> <li>428</li> <li>428</li> <li>429</li> <li>430</li> <li>430</li> <li>430</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>432</li> <li>431</li> <li>432</li> <li>433</li> <li>434</li> <li>434</li> <li>435</li> <li>435</li> <li>436</li> <li>436</li> <li>437</li> <li>437</li> <li>438</li> <li>439</li> <li>439</li> <li>439</li> <li>430</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>432</li> <li>431</li> <li>433</li> <li>434</li> <li>434</li> <li>434</li> <li>435</li> <li>435</li> <li>436</li> <li>436</li> <li>436</li> <li>437</li> <li>437</li> <li>438</li> <li>439</li> <li>439</li> <li>430</li> <li>430</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>434</li> <li>435</li> <li>435</li> <li>436</li> <li>436</li> <li>436</li> <li>437</li> <li>437</li> <li>438</li> <li>439</li> <li>439</li> <li>439</li> <li>430</li> <li>431</li> <li>434</li> <li>435</li> <li>435</li> <li>435</li> <li>436</li> <li>436</li> <li>437</li> <li>437</li> <li>438</li> <li>439</li> <li>439</li> <li>439</li> <li>430</li> <li>430</li> <li>431</li> <li>432</li> <li>433</li> <li>434</li> <li>434</li> <li>435</li> <li>435</li> <li>436</li> <li>436</li> <li>437</li> <li>437</li> <li>438</li> <li>439</li> <li>439</li> <li>439</li> <li>430</li> <li>431</li> <li>432</li> <li>433</li> <li>434</li> <li>434</li> <li>435</li> <li>435</li> <li>435</li> <li>435</li> <li>435</li> <li>436</li> <li>436</li> <li>437</li> <li>438</li></ul>  |
| <ul> <li>18. Kim H, Chang S and Jung H. The finite element analysis of a fractured tibia applied by composite bone plates considering contact conditions and time-varying properties of curing tissues. <i>Compos Struct</i> 2010; 92: 2109-2118.</li> <li>19. Mehboob A and Chang S. Effect of composite bone plates on callus generation and healing of fractured tibia with different screw configurations. <i>Compos Sci Technol</i> 2018; 167: 96-105.</li> <li>20. Eraslan O and İnan Ö. The effect of thread design on stress distribution in a colid eareur implant is 2D finite element analysis of a fractureatin 2010; 41.</li> </ul>  |
| <ul> <li>applied by composite bone plates considering contact conditions and time-</li> <li>applied by composite bone plates considering contact conditions and time-</li> <li>varying properties of curing tissues. <i>Compos Struct</i> 2010; 92: 2109-2118.</li> <li>431</li> <li>432</li> <li>433</li> <li>434</li> <li>434</li> <li>435</li> <li>436</li> <li>436</li> <li>436</li> <li>437</li> <li>437</li> <li>438</li> <li>438</li> <li>439</li> <li>439</li> <li>439</li> <li>430</li> <li>430</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>432</li> <li>433</li> <li>434</li> <li>434</li> <li>435</li> <li>435</li> <li>435</li> <li>436</li> <li>436</li> <li>437</li> <li>437</li> <li>438</li> <li>439</li> <li>439</li> <li>439</li> <li>430</li> <li>430</li> <li>430</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>432</li> <li>433</li> <li>434</li> <li>434</li> <li>435</li> <li>435</li> <li>435</li> <li>436</li> <li>436</li> <li>437</li> <li>437</li> <li>438</li> <li>439</li> <li>439</li> <li>430</li> <li>430</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>432</li> <li>433</li> <li>434</li> <li>435</li> <li>435</li> <li>435</li> <li>436</li> <li>436</li> <li>437</li> <li>437</li> <li>438</li> <li>439</li> <li>439</li> <li>439</li> <li>430</li> <li>430</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>432</li> <li>431</li> <li>434</li> <li>435</li> <li>435</li> <li>435</li> <li>436</li> <li>436</li> <li>437</li> <li>437</li> <li>438</li> <li>439</li> <li>439</li> <li>439</li> <li>430</li> <li>430</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>432</li> <li>433</li> <li>434</li> <li>435</li> <li>435</li> <li>435</li> <li>436</li> <li>437</li> <li>437</li> <li>438</li> <li>439</li> <li>439</li> <li>439</li> <li>430</li> <li>430</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>432</li> <li>431</li> <li>433</li> <li>434</li> <li>435</li> <li>435</li> <li>435</li> <li>441</li></ul>  |
| <ul> <li>429 applied by composite bone plates considering contact conditions and time-varying properties of curing tissues. <i>Compos Struct</i> 2010; 92: 2109-2118.</li> <li>431</li> <li>432 433</li> <li>434 434</li> <li>435 435</li> <li>436 436 20. Eraslan O and İnan Ö. The effect of thread design on stress distribution in</li> <li>437 437</li> </ul>  |
| <ul> <li>430 Varying properties of caring tissues. Compositive 2010, 92. 2109-2110.</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>432 19. Mehboob A and Chang S. Effect of composite bone plates on callus</li> <li>433 generation and healing of fractured tibia with different screw configurations.</li> <li>434 435</li> <li>435</li> <li>435</li> <li>436 20. Eraslan O and Inan Ö. The effect of thread design on stress distribution in</li> <li>437 a calid acrow implants a 2D finite element analysis. Of a Cont Investige 2010;144.</li> </ul>  |
| <ul> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>432</li> <li>432</li> <li>433</li> <li>433</li> <li>433</li> <li>434</li> <li>434</li> <li>434</li> <li>435</li> <li>435</li> <li>436</li> <li>436</li> <li>437</li> <li>437</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>434</li> <li>435</li> <li>435</li> <li>435</li> <li>436</li> <li>436</li> <li>437</li> <li>437</li> <li>438</li> <li>439</li> <li>439</li> <li>430</li> <li>430</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>432</li> <li>433</li> <li>434</li> <li>434</li> <li>435</li> <li>435</li> <li>435</li> <li>435</li> <li>436</li> <li>436</li> <li>437</li> <li>437</li> <li>438</li> <li>439</li> <li>439</li> <li>439</li> <li>430</li> <li>430</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>432</li> <li>431</li> <li>432</li> <li>433</li> <li>434</li> <li>435</li> <li>435</li> <li>435</li> <li>435</li> <li>435</li> <li>436</li> <li>436</li> <li>437</li> <li>437</li> <li>438</li> <li>439</li> <li>439</li> <li>439</li> <li>430</li> <li>430</li> <li>430</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>432</li> <li>431</li> <li>432</li> <li>433</li> <li>434</li> <li>435</li> <li>435</li> <li>435</li> <li>435</li> <li>436</li> <li>437</li> <li>437</li> <li>437</li> <li>438</li> <li>438</li> <li>439</li> <li>439</li> <li>439</li> <li>430</li> <li>430</li> <li>430</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>432</li> <li>431</li> <li>432</li> <li>432</li> <li>432</li> <li>433</li> <li>434</li> <li>435</li> <li>435</li> <li>435</li> <li>435</li> <li>436</li> <li>436</li> <li>437</li> <li>437</li> <li>437</li> <li>438</li> <li>438</li> <li>439</li> <li>439</li> <li>439</li> <li>430</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>432</li> <li>431</li> <li>432</li> <li>432</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>432</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>432</li> <li>432</li> <li>431</li> <li>432</li> <li>432</li> <li>431</li> <li>432</li> <li>432</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>432</li> <li>431</li> <li>432</li> <li>431</li> <li>432</li> <li>432</li> <li>432</li> <li>433</li></ul>  |
| <ul> <li>41 432 19. Menboob A and Chang S. Effect of composite bone plates on callus</li> <li>42 433 generation and healing of fractured tibia with different screw configurations.</li> <li>43 434 Compos Sci Technol 2018; 167: 96-105.</li> <li>45 435</li> <li>46 436 20. Eraslan O and Inan Ö. The effect of thread design on stress distribution in</li> <li>47 437 a colid acrow implants a 2D finite element archivity. Order Investige 2010;144.</li> </ul>  |
| <ul> <li>433 generation and healing of fractured tibla with different screw configurations.</li> <li>434 434 Compos Sci Technol 2018; 167: 96-105.</li> <li>435</li> <li>436 436 20. Eraslan O and İnan Ö. The effect of thread design on stress distribution in</li> <li>47 437 a colid acrow implants a 2D finite clement archivity. Order Investign 2010;144.</li> </ul>   |
| <ul> <li>434 Compos Sci Technol 2018; 167: 96-105.</li> <li>435</li> <li>435</li> <li>46</li> <li>436</li> <li>436 20. Eraslan O and İnan Ö. The effect of thread design on stress distribution in</li> <li>47</li> <li>437 a solid acrow implanti a 2D finite alement archivity Order to solid acrow implantia.</li> </ul>   |
| <ul> <li>435</li> <li>436</li> <li>436</li> <li>436</li> <li>436</li> <li>437</li> <li>437</li> <li>438</li> <li>439</li> <li>439</li> <li>430</li> <li>430</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>432</li> <li>431</li> <li>432</li> <li>433</li> <li>434</li> <li>434</li> <li>435</li> <li>435</li> <li>436</li> <li>437</li> <li>437</li> <li>438</li> <li>438</li> <li>439</li> <li>439</li> <li>430</li> <li>430</li> <li>431</li> <li>431</li> <li>432</li> <li>432</li> <li>434</li> <li>435</li> <li>435</li> <li>436</li> <li>436</li> <li>437</li> <li>437</li> <li>437</li> <li>438</li> <li>438</li> <li>438</li> <li>438</li> <li>438</li> <li>439</li> <li>430</li> <li>431</li> <li>432</li> <li>435</li> <li>435</li> <li>436</li> <li>436</li> <li>436</li> <li>437</li> <li>437</li> <li>438</li> /ul>   |
| <sup>46</sup> 436 20. Eraslan O and Inan Ö. The effect of thread design on stress distribution in<br><sup>47</sup> a calid acrow implants a 2D finite element and tails. <i>Olive Oral Investig</i> 2010;11:  |
| 4/ ADZ a polid paraw implants a 2D finite alament analysis. Olis Over Investive 004044  |
| 43 437 a solid screw implant: a 3D finite element analysis. Clin Oral Investig 2010;14:   |
| 49 438 411-416.   |
| 50 439  |
| <sup>51</sup> 440 21. Kim J. Nam J and Jang I. Computational study of estimating 3D trabecular  |
| 52<br>441 bone microstructure for the volume of interest from CT scan data <i>Int i numer</i>   |
| 54 <i>AA2</i> method biomed and 2018: 34: e2950   |
| 55 442 method blomed eng 2010, 34. 02000.   |
| 56<br>144 22 Loo H. Shih K. Hou C. et al. Simulation based particle owers estimication  |
| $_{57}$ 444 22. Let $\Pi$ , $\Im$ $\Pi$ $\Lambda$ , $\Pi$ $\Im$ $U$ , et al. $\Im$ $\Pi$ $\Pi$ $\Pi$ $\Omega$ as a particle swarm optimisation  |
| 58 445 and mechanical validation of screw position and number for the fixation stability  |
| 446 of a remoral locking compression plate. <i>Med Eng Phys</i> 2014;36: 57-64.   |

| •        |     |   |
|----------|-----|---|
| 2        |     |   |
| 4        | 447 |   |
| 5        | 448 | 23. Knor F, Cronin D, Watson B, et al. Importance of asymmetry and anisotropy   |
| 6        | 449 | in predicting cortical bone response and fracture using human body model        |
| /<br>8   | 450 | femur in three-point bending and axial rotation. J Mech Behav Biomed Mater      |
| 9        | 451 | 2018; 87: 213-229.  |
| 10       | 452 |   |
| 11       | 453 | 24. Duda N, Schneider E and Chao E. Internal forces and moments in the          |
| 12       | 454 | femur during walking <i>J Biomech</i> 1997:30: 933-941                          |
| 13       | 455 |   |
| 14<br>15 | 456 | 25 Kim H I S H Kim and S H Chang Finite element analysis using                  |
| 16       | 400 | 25. Kill, H. J., S. H. Kill, and S. H. Charly. Fille element analysis using     |
| 17       | 457 | interragmentary strain theory for the fracture healing process to which         |
| 18       | 458 | composite bone plates are applied. <i>Compos Struct</i> 2011; 93: 2953-2962.    |
| 19       | 459 |   |
| 20       | 460 | 26. Cep, R., A. Janasek, J. Petru, L. Cepova, and J. Valicek. Hard Machinable   |
| 21       | 461 | Machining of Cobalt-based Superalloy. Manuf Technol 2013; 13: 142-147,.         |
| 23       | 462 |   |
| 24       | 463 | 27. Shams, S. F., A. Mehdizadeh, M. M. Movahedi, S. Pavdar, and S. A.           |
| 25       | 464 | Hadhpanah The comparison of stress and strain between custom-designed           |
| 26       | 465 | hope plates (CDBP) and locking compression plate (LCP) for distal femure        |
| 27       | 405 | frosture Fur LOrthan Surg Troumatel 2022  |
| 20<br>29 | 400 | nacture. Eur J Onnop Surg Traumator. 2022.                                      |
| 30       | 467 |   |
| 31       | 468 | 28. Liu, C., R. Carrera, V. Flamini, et al. Effects of mechanical loading on    |
| 32       | 469 | cortical defect repair using a novel mechanobiological model of bone healing.   |
| 33       | 470 | Bone 2017; 145-155.   |
| 34<br>35 | 471 |   |
| 36       | 472 | 29. Perren, S. Physical and biological aspects of fracture healing with special |
| 37       | 473 | reference to internal fixation Clin Orthon Relat Res 1979 175-196               |
| 38       | 474 |   |
| 39       | 475 | 20 East A Kubick N Eulkorson E at al Riemochanics of locked plates and          |
| 40       | 475 | So. Lyor A, Rublak IN, Fulkerson L, et al. Diomechanics of locked plates and    |
| 41       | 476 | sciews. J Onnop Trauma 2004, 18(8). 488-493.                                    |
| 43       | 477 |   |
| 44       | 478 | 31. Mehboob, H., and S. H. Chang. Optimal design of a functionally graded       |
| 45       | 479 | biodegradable composite bone plate by using the Taguchi method and finite       |
| 46       | 480 | element analysis. Compos Struct 2015; 119: 166-173.                             |
| 4/       | 481 |   |
| 40<br>49 | 482 | 32. Akoglu, H. User's guide to correlation coefficients. Turk J Emerg Med       |
| 50       | 483 | 2018:18: 91-93  |
| 51       | 191 | 2010,10.01.00.  |
| 52       | 404 | 22 Cay P. M. Cluda, C. Haagaad, at al. Diamaghanigal comparison of a            |
| 53       | 460 | 33. Gay B., M. Giyue, G. Hosgoou, et al. Biomechanical comparison of a          |
| 54<br>55 | 486 | notched head locking I-Plate and a straight locking compression plate in a      |
| 56       | 487 | Juxta-Articular fracture model. Vet Comp Orthop Traumatol 2021; 34: 161-170.    |
| 57       | 488 |   |
| 58       | 489 | 34. Ahmad M, Nanda R, Bajwa A, et al. Biomechanical testing of the locking      |
| 59       | 490 | compression plate: when does the distance between bone and implant              |
| 00       |     |   |

| 2        |     |  |
|----------|-----|--|
| 3<br>4   | 491 | significantly reduce construct stability? Injury. 2007; 38: 358-364.                 |
| 5        | 492 |  |
| 6        | 493 | 35. Rowe M, Markel M and Bleedorn J. Mechanical evaluation of locking,               |
| /        | 494 | nonlocking, and hybrid plating constructs using a locking compression plate in       |
| o<br>9   | 495 | a canine synthetic bone model. Vet Surg 2015; 44: 838-842.                           |
| 10       | 496 |  |
| 11       | 497 | 36. Schmidt U and Penzkofer R. Implant Material and Design Alter Construct           |
| 12       | 498 | Stiffness in Distal Femur Locking Plate Fixation: A Pilot Study. Clin Orthop Relat   |
| 13<br>14 | 499 | Res 2013: 471: 2808-2814.  |
| 15       | 500 |  |
| 16       | 501 | 37 Libi I M B Sequin A S Kanatkin K S Schulz T C Garcia and S M                      |
| 17       | 501 | Stover, Mechanical comparison of 3.5 mm broad dynamic compression plate              |
| 18       | 502 | broad limited contrast dynamic compression plate, and parrow looking                 |
| 19<br>20 | 503 | broad infited-contact dynamic compression plate, and harrow locking                  |
| 21       | 504 | compression plate systems using interfragmentary gap models. Vet Surg 2008;          |
| 22       | 505 | 37: 663-673.   |
| 23       | 506 |  |
| 24<br>25 | 507 | 38. Nasr, S., S. Hunt, and N. A. Duncan. Effect of screw position on bone tissue     |
| 25<br>26 | 508 | differentiation within a fixed femoral fracture. <i>J Biomed Sci Eng</i> 2013;6: 71. |
| 27       | 509 |  |
| 28       | 510 | 39. Chao, P., B. P. Conrad, D. D. Lewis, M. Horodyski, and A. Pozzi. Effect of       |
| 29       | 511 | plate working length on plate stiffness and cyclic fatigue life in a cadaveric       |
| 30<br>21 | 512 | femoral fracture gap model stabilized with a 12-hole 2.4 mm locking                  |
| 32       | 513 | compression plate BMC Vet Res 2013 9:1-7   |
| 33       | 514 |  |
| 34       | 515 | 40 Stoffel K II Dieter G Stachowiak A Gächter and M S Kuster                         |
| 35       | 516 | Biomechanical testing of the LCPhow can stability in locked internal fixators        |
| 30<br>37 | 510 | be controlled? Injury 2002: 24: P11 10   |
| 38       | 517 | be controlled? Injury 2003, 34. BT1-19.  |
| 39       | 518 | 14 Oneith D. Zinen D. Anglen, I. et al. Lealing, platest ting, and trialing. ( Dans  |
| 40       | 519 | 41. Smith R, Ziran B, Anglen J, et al. Locking plates: tips and tricks. J Bone       |
| 41       | 520 | Joint Surg. 2007;89: 2298-2307.  |
| 42       | 521 |  |
| 44       | 522 | 42. Mavčič, B., and V. Antolič. Optimal mechanical environment of the healing        |
| 45       | 523 | bone fracture/osteotomy. Int Orthop 2012;36: 689-695.                                |
| 46       | 524 |  |
| 47<br>48 | 525 | 43. Field R, Törnkvist H, Hearn T, et al. The influence of screw omission on         |
| 49       | 526 | construction stiffness and bone surface strain in the application of bone plates     |
| 50       | 527 | to cadaveric bone. <i>Iniury</i> 1999:30: 591-598.                                   |
| 51       | 528 |  |
| 52       | 529 | 44 Wagner M General principles for the clinical use of the LCP <i>Injury</i> 2003    |
| 53<br>54 | 520 | $31 \cdot 31 - 12$   |
| 55       | 521 | די יס דע.  |
| 56       | 551 | 45 Sommer C. F. Coutier M. Müller D. I. Helfet and M. Manner First                   |
| 57       | 532 | 45. Sommer, C., E. Gautier, W. Muller, D. L. Helfet, and M. Wagner. First            |
| 58<br>50 | 533 | clinical results of the Locking Compression Plate (LCP). Injury 2003; 34: 43-54.     |
| 60       | 534 |  |

| 1        |     |   |
|----------|-----|---|
| 2        |     |   |
| 4        | 535 | 46. Sanders, R., G. J. Haidukewych, T. Milne, J. Dennis, and L. L. Latta.       |
| 5        | 536 | Minimal versus maximal plate fixation techniques of the ulna: the biomechanical |
| 6        | 537 | effect of number of screws and plate length. J Orthop Trauma 2002; 16: 166-     |
| 7        | 538 | 171.  |
| 8        | 539 |   |
| 9<br>10  | 540 | 47. Niemever, P. and Sudkamp, N.P., 2006. Principles and clinical application   |
| 11       | 541 | of the locking compression plate (LCP) Acta Chir Orthop Traumatol Cech 2006     |
| 12       | 542 | 73(4) 221_228   |
| 13       | 542 | 10(4), 221 220.   |
| 14<br>15 | 545 | 49 Nouriss I. A. Basari I. Sudak and C. Baubi. The Effects of Basa Saraw        |
| 16       | 544 | 40. Nourisa, J., A. Baseri, L. Suuak, and G. Rouri. The Effects of Bone Sciew   |
| 17       | 545 | Configurations on the internagmentary Movement in a Long Bone Fixed by a        |
| 18       | 546 | Limited Contact Locking Compression Plate. J Blomed Eng 2005; 08: 590-600.      |
| 19<br>20 | 547 |   |
| 20<br>21 | 548 |   |
| 22       | 540 |   |
| 23       |     |   |
| 24       |     |   |
| 25<br>26 |     |   |
| 20<br>27 |     |   |
| 28       |     |   |
| 29       |     |   |
| 30<br>21 |     |   |
| 32       |     |   |
| 33       |     |   |
| 34       |     |   |
| 35       |     |   |
| 30<br>37 |     |   |
| 38       |     |   |
| 39       |     |   |
| 40<br>41 |     |   |
| 41<br>42 |     |   |
| 43       |     |   |
| 44       |     |   |
| 45<br>46 |     |   |
| 40<br>47 |     |   |
| 48       |     |   |
| 49       |     |   |
| 50<br>51 |     |   |
| 51<br>52 |     |   |
| 53       |     |   |
| 54       |     |   |
| 55<br>56 |     |   |
| סכ<br>57 |     |   |
| 58       |     |   |
| 59       |     |   |
| 60       |     |   |
|          |     |   |

Figure 1. A schematic diagram of a typical 32-A3 internal fixation for a fracture.
(a) A combi-hole LCP model with a fracture gap of 2.1 mm; (b) A transverse
section of the bone and LCP; (c) Details of the interfaces between the LCP,
screw, and bone with tie constraints. The LCP combi-hole has the smallest
tetrahedron element size of 0.15 mm.



Figure 2. An illustration diagram of callus growth in the time-dependent model. 556 (a) The "central callus" was modelled in the fracture gap; (b) The iterative 557 calculation of callus properties is shown in the flowchart. The definitions of 558 interfragmentary strain ( $\epsilon$ ) and healing efficiency ( $\delta$ ) are displayed in the graph. 559 (a) Peripheral callus Bone segments Simplify Central callus Adjacent callus Revised model with Central callus (b) Time-dependent model Initial FEM model Deformation result Computing  $l_o=2.1$  mm  $\varepsilon = |(l_d - l_o)/l_o|$  $l_d$ Input: Interfragmentary initial callus E: Updating callus 1 strain & calculation 0.19MPa property, Loading in initial loading: time period n 1.12BW Axial stiffness calculation Updating Callus modulus by Eq.1 Healing efficiency  $\delta$  calculation  $\delta = Ac/At$ Ac = shadow area where  $\varepsilon$ Output: Updating in 2-10% healing efficacy δ, time period At = total section area axial stiffness n=n+1 Fracture cross-section 560 561

Figure 3. Nine different screw configurations. The configurations are denoted as C15, C25, C35, and C45 for variations in working length; C15, C135, C1345, and C12345 for variations in screw number; and C125, C135, and C145 for variations in screw position. The screw holes are named from proximal to distal to the fracture gap by ID 1-5, and all configurations are symmetrically distributed around the fracture gap.

Configuration variation: Working length



**Figure 4.** Comparisons of axial stiffness between our study (red) and the other studies (blue-experimental measures; yellow-computational modelling). The axial stiffness predicted from our study was within the range of other studies.<sup>4 5</sup> 7. <sup>13, 22,33-40</sup> The plate material and boundary conditions are given at the bottom and top, respectively. The labels "Clamp", "Pin" and "Free" represent fixed 6 degrees of freedom (DOF) jig, fixed 3 translational DOF jig and direct loading without constraint at the femur, respectively.





**Figure 6.** (a) Predicted axial stiffness and (b) healing efficiency using the timeindependent model. (c) The predicted axial stiffness using the timeindependent model is correlated with that from the time-dependent model. (d) there is a correlation between the predicted axial stiffness and the healing efficiency.



**Figure 7**. The contour of the fracture area for different configurations during four healing stages. The coloured areas indicate an interfragmentary strain (IFS) between 2-10%; the grey areas indicate an IFS greater than 10%; and the black areas indicate an IFS less than 2% (i.e., C15, C125, C135, C145 and C12345 in 4-8 weeks post-operation)



**Figure 8.** Statistical distributions of the axial stiffness (a) and healing efficiency (b) under the different working lengths (WL), screw numbers (SN) and screw position (SP), represented by box plots. The upper and lower edges of each box represent the 75th and 25th percentiles, respectively; the upper and lower bars extend to the largest and smallest values within 1.5 times the interquartile range (IQR); the horizontal line inside each box represents the median, and the square represents the mean. The differences in axial stiffness and healing efficiency were tested using the Friedman test with a significance level of 0.01, with significant differences indicated by \*\* (*p*-adjust < 0.01). Post-hoc comparisons were performed using a Wilcoxon signed-rank test with Bonferroni correction.



|     | Parts          | Young's modulus     |            | Poisson ratio |      | Yielding  |  |
|-----|----------------|---------------------|------------|---------------|------|-----------|--|
|     |                | (GPa)               |            |               |      | stress (I |  |
|     | Cortical bone  | Axial               | transverse | -             |      |           |  |
|     | Oshalt hasad   | 18.4 <sup>25</sup>  | 7.2        | 0.12          | 0.37 | 106.2     |  |
|     |                | 215.0 <sup>26</sup> |            | 0.29          | 0.29 |           |  |
|     | Titopium allov |                     |            |               |      |           |  |
|     |                | 113.8 <sup>27</sup> |            | 0.33          |      | 839.9     |  |
|     | LCP            |                     |            |               |      |           |  |
| 609 |                |                     |            |               |      |           |  |
| 610 |                |                     |            |               |      |           |  |
|     |                |                     |            |               |      |           |  |
|     |                |                     |            |               |      |           |  |
|     |                |                     |            |               |      |           |  |
|     |                |                     |            |               |      |           |  |
|     |                |                     |            |               |      |           |  |
|     |                |                     |            |               |      |           |  |
|     |                |                     |            |               |      |           |  |
|     |                |                     |            |               |      |           |  |
|     |                |                     |            |               |      |           |  |
|     |                |                     |            |               |      |           |  |
|     |                |                     |            |               |      |           |  |
|     |                |                     |            |               |      |           |  |
|     |                |                     |            |               |      |           |  |
|     |                |                     |            |               |      |           |  |
|     |                |                     |            |               |      |           |  |
|     |                |                     |            |               |      |           |  |
|     |                |                     |            |               |      |           |  |
|     |                |                     |            |               |      |           |  |

|                         | 1-4 week              | 4-8 week | 8-12 week             | 12-16 wee             |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|----------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Standard callus modulus | 0.19                  | 28       | 30.6                  | 75                    |
| Loading                 | <mark>1053.6 N</mark> |          | <mark>1881.6 N</mark> | <mark>2822.4 N</mark> |
| (N and BW)              | (1.12×BW)             | 24       | (2×BW) <sup>31</sup>  | (3×BW) <sup>31</sup>  |
|                         |                       |          |                       |                       |
|                         |                       |          |                       |                       |
|                         |                       |          |                       |                       |
|                         |                       |          |                       |                       |
|                         |                       |          |                       |                       |
|                         |                       |          |                       |                       |
|                         |                       |          |                       |                       |
|                         |                       |          |                       |                       |
|                         |                       |          |                       |                       |
|                         |                       |          |                       |                       |
|                         |                       |          |                       |                       |
|                         |                       |          |                       |                       |
|                         |                       |          |                       |                       |
|                         |                       |          |                       |                       |
|                         |                       |          |                       |                       |
|                         |                       |          |                       |                       |
|                         |                       |          |                       |                       |
|                         |                       |          |                       |                       |
|                         |                       |          |                       |                       |
|                         |                       |          |                       |                       |
|                         |                       |          |                       |                       |
|                         |                       |          |                       |                       |
|                         |                       |          |                       |                       |
|                         |                       |          |                       |                       |
|                         |                       |          |                       |                       |
|                         |                       |          |                       |                       |
|                         |                       |          |                       |                       |
|                         |                       |          |                       |                       |
|                         |                       |          |                       |                       |
|                         |                       |          |                       |                       |
|                         |                       |          |                       |                       |
|                         |                       |          |                       |                       |
|                         |                       |          |                       |                       |
|                         |                       |          |                       |                       |
|                         |                       |          |                       |                       |
|                         |                       |          |                       |                       |

| IFS area | 1-4 v | veek |      | 4-8 w | eek  |      | 8-12 | week |      | 12-16 | week |      |
|----------|-------|------|------|-------|------|------|------|------|------|-------|------|------|
| (%)      | < 2   | 2-10 | > 10 | < 2   | 2-10 | > 10 | < 2  | 2-10 | >10  | < 2   | 2-10 | >10  |
| C15      | 0.0   | 61.9 | 38.1 | 1.2   | 93.2 | 5.6  | 0.0  | 54.8 | 45.2 | 0.0   | 57.9 | 42.1 |
| C25      | 0.0   | 57.9 | 42.1 | 0.0   | 86.6 | 13.4 | 0.0  | 51.3 | 48.7 | 0.0   | 55.2 | 44.8 |
| C35      | 0.0   | 57.3 | 42.7 | 0.0   | 83.6 | 16.4 | 0.0  | 50.6 | 49.4 | 0.0   | 54.5 | 45.5 |
| C45      | 0.0   | 57.1 | 42.9 | 0.0   | 83.1 | 16.9 | 0.0  | 50.1 | 49.9 | 0.0   | 53.6 | 46.4 |
| C125     | 0.0   | 63.9 | 36.1 | 2.8   | 95.2 | 2.0  | 0.0  | 55.3 | 44.7 | 0.0   | 58.8 | 41.2 |
| C135     | 0.0   | 63.5 | 36.5 | 2.1   | 94.0 | 3.9  | 0.0  | 55.1 | 44.9 | 0.0   | 58.5 | 41.5 |
| C145     | 0.0   | 63.1 | 36.9 | 1.8   | 93.3 | 4.9  | 0.0  | 54.7 | 45.3 | 0.0   | 58.2 | 41.9 |
| C1345    | 0.0   | 63.6 | 36.4 | 2.2   | 94.3 | 3.5  | 0.0  | 54.9 | 45.1 | 0.0   | 60.1 | 39.9 |
| C12345   | 0.0   | 64.3 | 35.7 | 4.2   | 92.5 | 3.3  | 0.0  | 54.9 | 45.1 | 0.0   | 61.9 | 38.1 |

**Table 3.** The percentage of interfragmentary strain (IFS) area

616 <2, 2-10 and >10 indicate the percentage of IFS area of less than 2%,

Zicz

617 between 2-10% and greater than 10%, respectively.

# 619 Appendix

620 Fig.A1 The stress pattern at fracture section for nine screw configuration in four

healing period.



The von Mise stress pattern at the fracture section is shown in Fig.A1. Among the nine different screw configurations, their stress pattern showed a similarity during the same healing stage. The high-stress location presented an excellent correspondence with the high IFS strain area in Fig.6. For the four healing stages, the stress values continuously increased with the increased femur loading. It is also observed the stress pattern experienced a significant change

| 2              |     |   |
|----------------|-----|---|
| 2<br>3<br>4    | 630 | after the 4th week; the stress distribution becomes less uniform due to the |
| 5<br>6<br>7    | 631 | callus modulus update.  |
| 8<br>9         | 632 |   |
| 10<br>11<br>12 | 633 |   |
| 13<br>14       | 000 |   |
| 15<br>16<br>17 |     |   |
| 18<br>19       |     |   |
| 20<br>21<br>22 |     |   |
| 23<br>24       |     |   |
| 25<br>26<br>27 |     |   |
| 28<br>29       |     |   |
| 30<br>31<br>32 |     |   |
| 33<br>34<br>35 |     |   |
| 36<br>37       |     |   |
| 38<br>39<br>40 |     |   |
| 41<br>42       |     |   |
| 43<br>44<br>45 |     |   |
| 46<br>47<br>48 |     |   |
| 49<br>50       |     |   |
| 51<br>52<br>53 |     |   |
| 54<br>55       |     |   |
| 50<br>57<br>58 |     |   |
| 59<br>60       |     |   |
|                |     |   |